

# THE PSALTER

## Preface

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

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

myself alone, but also to him who is since deceased, to explain that this has not been done in accordance with his wish.

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

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

Delitzsch.

Erlangen, 7th July 1867.

## Note on HWHY

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

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

## Note by the Translator

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

The Hebrew numbering of the verses is followed in the text of each Psalm, and in the references generally. In a few instances only, where the difference between the Hebrew and the English divisions might prove perplexing to the English reader, both are given; e.g., Lev. 6: 5 [12], Joe. 4:[3]3. To the student Baer's critical text of the Psalter (*Liber Psalmorum Hebraicus. Textum masorethicum accuratius quam adhuc factum est expressit, brevem de accentibus metricis institutionem praemisit, notas criticas adjecit S. Baer. Praefatus est Fr. Delitzsch.* 1861. Lipsiae, Dörffling et Franke. Cr. 8vo, pp. xiv. 134), often referred to by Dr. Delitzsch, will be found to be a useful companion to this Commentary, and more particularly as illustrating the pointings and accentuation adopted or mentioned in the notes.

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

F. B.

Elland, 31st January 1871.

# Introduction to the Psalter

Πάντα ὡσπερ ἐν μεγάλῳ τινὶ καὶ κοινῷ ταμιείῳ τῇ βίβλῳ τῶν ψαλμῶν τεθησαύρισταί.

*BASIL*

## § 1. Position of the Psalter among the Hagiographa, and More Especially among the Poetical Books

The Psalter is everywhere regarded as an essential part of the *Kethubim* or *Hagiographa*; but its position among these varies. It seems to follow from Luk. 24:44 that it opened the Kethubim in the earliest period of the Christian era. <sup>f1</sup>

The order of the books in the Hebrew MSS of the German class, upon which our printed editions in general use are based, is actually this: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, and the five Megilloth. But the Masora and the MSS of the Spanish class begin the Kethubim with the Chronicles which they awkwardly separate from Ezra and Nehemiah, and then range the Psalms, Job, Proverbs and the five Megilloth next. <sup>f2</sup>

And according to the Talmud (*Baba Bathra 14b*) the following is the right order: Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs; the Book of Ruth precedes the Psalter as its prologue, for Ruth is the ancestor of him to whom the sacred lyric owes its richest and most flourishing era. It is undoubtedly the most natural order that the Psalter should open the division of the Kethubim, and for this reason: that, according to the stock which forms the basis of it, it represents the time of David, and then afterwards in like manner the Proverbs and Job represent the Chokma-literature of the age of Solomon. But it is at once evident that it could have no other place but among the Kethubim.

The codex of the giving of the Law, which is the foundation of the old covenant and of the nationality of Israel, as also of all its subsequent literature, occupies the first place in the canon. Under the collective title of **נבִיאִים**, a series of historical writings of a prophetic character, which trace the history of Israel from the occupation of Canaan to the first gleam of light in the gloomy retributive condition of the Babylonish Exile (*Prophetæ priores*) is first attached to these five books of the *Thôra*; and then a series of strictly prophetic writings by the prophets themselves which extend to the time of Darius Nothus, and indeed to the time of Nehemiah's second sojourn in Jerusalem under this Persian king (*Prophetæ posteriores*). Regarded chronologically, the first series would better correspond to the second if the historical books of the Persian period (Chronicles with Ezra, Nehemiah, and

Esther) were joined to it; but for a very good reason this has not been done. The Israelitish literature has marked out two sharply defined and distinct methods of writing history, viz., the annalistic and the prophetic. The so-called Elohist and so-called Jehovistic form of historical writing in the Pentateuch might serve as general types of these. The historical books of the Persian period are, however, of the annalistic, not of the prophetic character (although the Chronicles have taken up and incorporated many remnants of the prophetic form of historical writing, and the Books of the Kings, *vice versâ*, many remnants of the annalistic): they could not therefore stand among the *Prophetae priores*. But with the Book of Ruth it is different. This short book is so like the end of the Book of the Judges (Judges 17-21), that it might very well stand between Judges and Samuel; and it did originally stand after the Book of the Judges, just as the Lamentations of Jeremiah stood after his prophecies. It is only on liturgical grounds that they have both been placed with the so-called Megilloth (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, as they are arranged in our ordinary copies according to the calendar of the festivals). All the remaining books could manifestly only be classed under the third division of the canon, which (as could hardly have been otherwise in connection with תורה and נביאים) has been entitled, in the most general way, כתובים, — a title which, as the grandson of Ben-Sira renders it in his prologue [to Ecclesiasticus], means simply τὰ ἄλλα πάτρια βιβλία, or τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων, and nothing more. For if it were intended to mean writings, written ברוח הקדש, — as the third degree of inspiration which is combined with the greatest spontaneity of spirit, is styled according to the synagogue notion of inspiration, — then the words ברוח הקדש would and ought to stand with it.

## § 2. Names of the Psalter

At the close of the seventy-second Psalm (v. 20) we find the subscription: “*Are ended the prayers of David, the Son of Jesse.*” The whole of the preceding Psalms are here comprehended under the name תְּפִלּוֹת. This strikes one as strange, because with the exception of Psalm 17 (and further on Psalm 86, 90, 102, 142) they are all inscribed otherwise; and because in part, as e.g., Psalm chp. 1 and 2, they contain no supplicatory address to God and have therefore not the form of prayers. Nevertheless the collective name *Tephilloth* is suitable to all Psalms. The essence of prayer is a direct and undiverted looking towards God, and the absorption of the mind in the thought of Him. Of this nature of prayer all Psalms partake; even the didactic and laudatory, though containing no supplicatory address, — like Hannah’s song of praise which is introduced with ותתפלל (1Sa. 2: 1). The title inscribed on the Psalter is סֵפֶר תְּהִלִּים for which תְּלִים (apocopated תְּלִי) is also

commonly used, as Hippolytus (*ed. de Lagarde* p. 188) testifies: **Εβραῖοι περιέγραψαν τὴν βίβλον Σέφρα θελείμ.**<sup>f3</sup>

This name may also seem strange, for the Psalms for the most part are hardly hymns in the proper sense: the majority are elegiac or didactic; and only a solitary one, Psalm 145, is directly inscribed **תהלה**. But even this collective name of the Psalms is admissible, for they all partake of the nature of the hymn, to wit the purpose of the hymn, the glorifying of God. The narrative Psalms praise the *magnalia Dei*, the plaintive likewise praise Him, since they are directed to Him as the only helper, and close with grateful confidence that He will hear and answer. The verb **לָלַח** includes both the *Magnificat* and the *De profundis*.

The language of the Masora gives the preference to the feminine form of the name, instead of **תהלים**, and throughout calls the Psalter **ספר תהלות** (e.g., on 2Sa. 22: 5).<sup>f4</sup>

In the Syriac it is styled *k<sup>e</sup>tobo d<sup>e</sup>mazmûre*, in the Koran *zabûr* (not as Golius and Freytag point it, *zubûr*), which in the usage of the Arabic language signifies nothing more than “writing” (synon. *kitâb*: vid., on 3: 1), but is perhaps a corruption of *mizmor* from which a plural *mezâmîr* is formed, by a change of vowels, in Jewish-Oriental MSS. In the Old Testament writings a plural of *mizamor* does not occur. Also in the post-biblical usage *mizmorîm* or *mizmoroth* is found only in solitary instances as the name for the Psalms. In Hellenistic Greek the corresponding word **ψαλμοί** (from **ψάλλειν** = **זָמַר**) is the more common; the Psalm collection is called **βίβλος ψαλμῶν** (Luke 20:42, Act. 1:20) or **ψαλτήριον**, the name of the instrument (*psantērîn* in the Book of Daniel)<sup>f5</sup> being transferred metaphorically to the songs that are sung with its accompaniment. Psalms are songs for the lyre, and therefore lyric poems in the strictest sense.

### § 3. The History of Psalm Composition

Before we can seek to obtain a clear idea of the origin of the Psalm-collection we must take a general survey of the course of the development of psalm writing. The lyric is the earliest kind of poetry in general, and the Hebrew poetry, the oldest example of the poetry of antiquity that has come down to us, is therefore essentially lyric. Neither the Epos nor the Drama, but only the *Mashal*, has branched off from it and attained an independent form. Even prophecy, which is distinguished from psalmody by a higher impulse which the mind of the writer receives from the power of the divine mind, shares with the latter the common designation of **נְבִיא** (1Ch. 24: 1-3), and the psalm-singer, **מְשִׁיר**, is also as such called **חֲנֻנִי** (1Ch. 25: 5; 2Ch. 29:30; 35:15, cf.

1Ch. 15:19 and freq.); for just as the sacred lyric often rises to the height of prophet vision, so the prophetic epic of the future, because it is not entirely freed from the subjectivity of the prophet, frequently passes into the strain of the psalm.

The time of Moses was the period of Israel's birth as a nation and also of its national lyric. The Israelites brought instruments with them out of Egypt and these were the accompaniments of their first song (Exodus 15) — the oldest hymn, which re-echoes through all hymns of the following ages and also through the Psalter (comp. v. 2 with Psa. 118:14; v. 3 with Psa. 24: 8; v. 4, 14:27 with Psa. 136:15; v. 8 with Psa. 78:13, v. 11 with Psa. 77:14; 86: 8; 89: 7 f.; v. 13, 17 with Psa. 78:54, and other parallels of a similar kind). If we add to these, Psalm 90 and Deuteronomy 32, we then have the prototypes of all Psalms, the hymnic, elegiac, and prophetic-didactic. All three classes of songs are still wanting in the strophic symmetry which characterises the later art. But even Deborah's song of victory, arranged in hexastichs, — a song of triumph composed eight centuries before Pindar and far outstripping him, — exhibits to us the strophic art approximating to its perfect development. It has been thought strange that the very beginnings of the poesy of Israel are so perfect, but the history of Israel, and also the history of its literature, comes under a different law from that of a constant development from a lower to a higher grade. The redemptive period of Moses, unique in its way, influences as a creative beginning, every future development. There is a constant progression, but of such a kind as only to develop that which had begun in the Mosaic age with all the primal force and fulness of a divine creation. We see, however, how closely the stages of this progress are linked together, from the fact that Hannah the singer of the Old Testament *Magnificat*, was the mother of him who anointed, as King, the sweet singer of Israel, on whose tongue was the word of the Lord.

In David the sacred lyric attained its full maturity. Many things combined to make the time of David its golden age. Samuel had laid the foundation of this both by his energetic reforms in general, and by founding the schools of the prophets in particular, in which under his guidance (1Sa. 19:19 f.), in conjunction with the awakening and fostering of the prophetic gift, music and song were taught. Through these *coenobia*, whence sprang a spiritual awakening hitherto unknown in Israel, David also passed. Here his poetic talent, if not awakened, was however cultivated. He was a musician and poet born. Even as a Bethlehemite shepherd he played upon the harp, and with his natural gift he combined a heart deeply imbued with religious feeling. But the Psalter contains as few traces of David's Psalms before his anointing (vid., on Psalm ch. 8, 144) as the New Testament does of the writings of the Apostles before the time of Pentecost. It was only from the time when the Spirit of

Jahve came upon him at his anointing as king of Israel, and raised him to the dignity of his calling in connection with the covenant of redemption, that he sang Psalms, which have become an integral part of the canon. They are the fruit not only of his high gifts and the inspiration of the Spirit of God (2Sa. 23: 2), but also of his own experience and of the experience of his people interwoven with his own. David's path from his anointing onwards, lay through affliction to glory. Song however, as a Hindu proverb says, is the offspring of suffering, the *çloka* springs from the *çoka*. His life was marked by vicissitudes which at one time prompted him to elegiac strains, at another to praise and thanksgiving; at the same time he was the founder of the kingship of promise, a prophecy of the future Christ, and his life, thus typically moulded, could not express itself otherwise than in typical or even consciously prophetic language. Raised to the throne, he did not forget the harp which had been his companion and solace when he fled before Saul, but rewarded it with all honour. He appointed 4000 Levites, the fourth division of the whole Levitical order, as singers and musicians in connection with the service in the tabernacle on Zion and partly in Gibeon, the place of the Mosaic tabernacle. These he divided into 24 classes under the Precentors, Asaph, Heman, and Ethan = Jeduthun (1 Chronicles 25 comp. 15:17 ff.), and multiplied the instruments, particularly the stringed instruments, by his own invention (1Ch. 23: 5, Neh. 12:36<sup>f6</sup>).

In David's time there were three places of sacrifice: on Zion beside the ark (2Sa. 6:17 f.), in Gibeon beside the Mosaic tabernacle (1Ch. 16:39 f.) and later, on the threshing-floor of Ornan, afterwards the Temple-hill (1Ch. 21:28-30). Thus others also were stimulated in many ways to consecrate their offerings to the God of Israel. Beside the 73 Psalms bearing the inscription **לְדָוִד**, — Psalms the direct Davidic authorship of which is attested, at least in the case of some fifty, by their creative originality, their impassioned and predominantly plaintive strain, their graceful flow and movement, their ancient but clear language, which becomes harsh and obscure only when describing the dissolute conduct of the ungodly, — the collection contains the following which are named after contemporary singers appointed by David: 12 **לְאַסָּף** (Psalm 50, 78-83), of which the contents and spirit are chiefly prophetic, and 12 by the Levite family of singers, the **בְּנֵי־קֵרַח** (Psalm 42-49, 84, 85, 87, 88, including Psalm 43), bearing a predominantly regal and priestly impress. Both the Psalms of the Ezrahite, Psalm 88 by Heman and 89 by Ethan, belong to the time of Solomon whose name, with the exception of Psalm 72, is borne only by Psalm 127. Under Solomon psalm-poesy began to decline; all the existing productions of the mind of that age bear the mark of thoughtful contemplation rather than of direct conception, for restless eagerness had yielded to enjoyable contentment, national concentration to cosmopolitan expansion. It was the age



of the Chokma, which brought the apophthegm to its artistic perfection, and also produced a species of drama. Solomon himself is the perfecter of the *Mashal*, that form of poetic composition belonging strictly to the Chokma, Certainly according to 1Ki. 5:12 [Hebr.; 4:32, Engl.] he was also the author of 1005 songs, but in the canon we only find two Psalms by him and the dramatic Song of Songs. This may perhaps be explained by the fact that he spake of trees from the cedar to the hyssop, that his poems, mostly of a worldly character, pertained rather to the realm of nature than to the kingdom of grace.

Only twice after this did psalm-poesy rise to any height and then only for a short period: viz., under Jehoshaphat and under Hezekiah. Under both these kings the glorious services of the Temple rose from the desecration and decay into which they had fallen to the full splendour of their ancient glory. Moreover there were two great and marvellous deliverances which aroused the spirit of poesy during the reigns of these kings: under Jehoshaphat, the overthrow of the neighbouring nations when they had banded together for the extirpation of Judah, predicted by Jahaziel, the Asaphite; under Hezekiah the overthrow of Sennacherib's host foretold by Isaiah. These kings also rendered great service to the cause of social progress. Jehoshaphat by an institution designed to raise the educational status of the people, which reminds one of the Carolingian *missi* (2Ch. 17: 7-9); Hezekiah, whom one may regard as the Pisistratus of Israelitish literature, by the establishment of a commission charged with collecting the relics of the early literature (Pro. 25: 1); he also revived the ancient sacred music and restored the Psalms of David and Asaph to their liturgical use (2Ch. 29:25 ff.). And he was himself a poet, as his מכתב (מכתב?) (Isaiah 38) shows, though certainly a reproductive rather than a creative poet. Both from the time of Jehoshaphat and from the time of Hezekiah we possess in the Psalter not a few Psalms, chiefly Asaphic and Korahitic, which, although bearing no historical heading, unmistakably confront us with the peculiar circumstances of those times. <sup>f7</sup>

With the exception of these two periods of revival the latter part of the regal period produced scarcely any psalm writers, but is all the more rich in prophets. When the lyric became mute, prophecy raised its trumpet voice in order to revive the religious life of the nation, which previously had expressed itself in psalms. In the writings of the prophets, which represent the *λείμμα χάριτος* in Israel, we do indeed find even psalms, as Jonah 2, Isaiah 12, Habakkuk 3, but these are more imitations of the ancient congregational hymns than original compositions. It was not until after the Exile that a time of new creations set in.

As the Reformation gave birth to the German church-hymn, and the Thirty years' war, without which perhaps there might have been no Paul Gerhardt,

called it into life afresh, so the Davidic age gave birth to psalm-poesy and the Exile brought back to life again that which had become dead. The divine chastisement did not fail to produce the effect designed. Even though it should not admit of proof, that many of the Psalms have had portions added to them, from which it would be manifest how constantly they were then used as forms of supplication, still it is placed beyond all doubt, that the Psalter contains many psalms belonging to the time of the Exile, as e.g., Psalm 102. Still far more new psalms were composed after the Return. When those who returned from exile, among whom were many Asaphites,<sup>18</sup>

again felt themselves to be a nation, and after the restoration of the Temple to be also a church, the harps which in Babylon hung upon the willows, were tuned afresh and a rich new flow of song was the fruit of this re-awakened first love. But this did not continue long. A sanctity founded on good works and the service of the letter took the place of that outward, coarse idolatry from which the people, now returned to their fatherland, had been weaned while undergoing punishment in the land of the stranger. Nevertheless in the era of the Seleucidae the oppressed and injured national feeling revived under the Maccabees in its old life and vigour. Prophecy had then long been dumb, a fact lamented in many passages in the 1st Book of the Maccabees. It cannot be maintained that psalm-poesy flourished again at that time. Hitzig has recently endeavoured to bring forward positive proof, that it is Maccabean psalms, which form the proper groundwork of the Psalter. He regards the Maccabean prince Alexander Jannaeus as the writer of Psalm 1 and 2, refers Psalm 44 to 1 Macc. 5:56-62, and maintains both in his *Commentary* of 1835-36 and in the later edition of 1863-65 that from Psalm 73 onwards there is not a single pre-Maccabean psalm in the collection and that, from that point, the Psalter mirrors the prominent events of the time of the Maccabees in chronological order. Hitzig has been followed by von Lengerke and Olshausen. They both mark the reign of Joh. Hyrcanus (B.C. 135-107) as the time when the latest psalms were composed and when the collection as we now have it was made: whereas Hitzig going somewhat deeper ascribes Psalm 1, 2, 150 with others, and the arrangement of the whole, to Hyrcanus' son, Alexander Jannaeus.

On the other hand both the existence and possibility of Maccabean psalms is disputed not only by Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and Keil but also by Gesenius, Hassler, Ewald, Thenius, Böttcher, and Dillmann. For our own part we admit the possibility. It has been said that the ardent enthusiasm of the Maccabean period was more human than divine, more nationally patriotic than theocratically national in its character, but the Book of Daniel exhibits to us, in a prophetic representation of that period, a holy people of the Most High contending with the god-opposing power in the world, and claims for this contest the highest significance in relation to the history of redemption. The

history of the canon, also, does not exclude the possibility of there being Maccabean psalms. For although the chronicler by 1Ch. 16:36 brings us to the safe conclusion that in his day the Psalter (comp. τὰ τοῦ Δαυΐδ, 2 Macc. 2:13<sup>f9</sup>) was already a whole divided into five books (vid., on Psalm 96, 105, 106): it might nevertheless, after having been completely arranged still remain open for later insertions (just as the ספר הישר cited in the Book of Joshua and 2 Samuel ch. 1, was an anthology which had grown together in the course of time). When Judas Maccabaeus, by gathering together the national literature, followed in the footsteps of Nehemiah (2 Macc. 2:14: ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας τὰ δεισκορπισμένα διὰ τὸν πόλεμον τὸν γεγονότα ἡμῖν ἐπισυνήγαγε πάντα, καὶ ἔστι παρ' ἡμῖν), we might perhaps suppose that the Psalter was at that time enriched by some additions. And when Jewish tradition assigns to the so-called Great Synagogue (כנסת הגדולה) a share in the compilation of the canon, this is not unfavourable to the supposition of Maccabean psalms, since this συναγωγή μεγάλη was still in existence under the domination of the Seleucidae (1 Macc. 14:28).

It is utterly at variance with historical fact to maintain that the Maccabean period was altogether incapable of producing psalms worthy of incorporation in the canon. Although the Maccabean period had no prophets, it is nevertheless to be supposed that many possessed the gift of poesy, and that the Spirit of faith, which is essentially one and the same with the Spirit of prophecy, might sanctify this gift and cause it to bear fruit. An actual proof of this is furnished by the so-called Psalter of Solomon (Ψαλτήριον Σαλομῶντος in distinction from the canonical Psalter of David)<sup>f10</sup> consisting of 18 psalms, which certainly come far behind the originality and artistic beauty of the canonical Psalms; but they show at the same time, that the feelings of believers, even throughout the whole time of the Maccabees, found utterance in expressive spiritual songs. Maccabean psalms are therefore not an absolute impossibility — no doubt they were many; and that some of them were incorporated in the Psalter, cannot be denied *à priori*. But still the history of the canon does not favour this supposition. And the circumstance of the LXX version of the Psalms (according to which citations are made even in the first Book of the Maccabees) inscribing several Psalms Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου, while however it does not assign the date of the later period to any, is against it. And if Maccabean psalms be supposed to exist in the Psalter they can at any rate only be few, because they must have been inserted in a collection which was already arranged. And since the Maccabean movement, though beginning with lofty aspirations, gravitated, in its onward course, towards things carnal, we can no longer expect to find psalms relating to it, or at least none belonging to the period after Judas Maccabaeus; and from all that we know of the character and disposition of Alexander Jannaeus it is morally impossible that

this despot should be the author of the first and second Psalms and should have closed the collection.

## § 4. Origin of the Collection

The Psalter, as we now have it, consists of five books. <sup>f11</sup>

Τούτό σε μὴ παρέλθοι, ὦ φιλόλογε — says Hippolytus, whose words are afterwards quoted by Epiphanius — ὅτι καὶ τὸ ψαλτήριον εἰς πέντε διείλον βιβλία οἱ Εβραῖοι, ὥστε εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸ ἄλλον πεντάτευχον. This accords with the Midrash on Psa. 1: 1: Moses gave the Israelites the five books of the *Thôra* and corresponding to these (כנגדם) David gave them the book of Psalms which consists of five books (ספר תהלים שיש בו חמשה ספרים). The division of the Psalter into five parts makes it the copy and echo of the *Thôra*, which it also resembles in this particular: that as in the *Thôra* Elohist and Jehovistic sections alternate, so here a group of Elohist Psalms (42-84) is surrounded on both sides by groups of Jehovistic (1-41, 85-150). The five books are as follow: — 1-41, 42-72, 83-89, 90-106, 107-150. <sup>f12</sup>

Each of the first four books closes with a doxology, which one might erroneously regard as a part of the preceding Psalm (Psa. 41:14; 72:18 f., 89:53; 106:48), and the place of the fifth doxology is occupied by Psalm 150 as a full toned finale to the whole (like the relation of Psalm 139 to the so-called Songs of degrees). These doxologies very much resemble the language of the liturgical *Beracha* of the second Temple. The אָמֵן אָמֵן coupled with א (cf. on the contrary Num. 5:22 and also Neh. 8: 6) is exclusively peculiar to them in Old Testament writings. Even in the time of the writer of the Chronicles the Psalter was a whole divided into five parts, which were indicated by these landmarks. We infer this from 1Ch. 16:36. The chronicler in the free manner which characterises Thucydides or Livy in reporting a speech, there reproduces David's festal hymn that resounded in Israel after the bringing home of the ark; and he does it in such a way that after he has once fallen into the track of Psalm 106, he also puts into the mouth of David the *beracha* which follows that Psalm. From this we see that the Psalter was already divided into books at that period; the closing doxologies had already become thoroughly grafted upon the body of the Psalms after which they stand. The chronicler however wrote under the pontificate of Johanan, the son of Eliashib, the predecessor of Jaddua, towards the end of the Persian supremacy, but a considerable time before the commencement of the Grecian.

Next to this application of the *beracha* of the Fourth book by the chronicler, Psa. 72:20 is a significant mark for determining the history of the origin of the Psalter. The words: “are ended the prayers of David the son of Jesse,” are without doubt the subscription to the oldest psalm-collection, which preceded

the present psalm- pentateuch. The collector certainly has removed this subscription from its original place close after Psa. 72:17, by the interpolation of the *beracha* Psa. 72:18 f., but left it, at the same time, untouched. The collectors and those who worked up the older documents within the range of the Biblical literature appear to have been extremely conscientious in this respect and they thereby make it easier for us to gain an insight into the origin of their work, — as, e.g., the composer of the Books of Samuel gives intact the list of officers from a later document 2Sa. 8:16-18 (which closed with that, so far as we at present have it in its incorporated state), as well as the list from an older document (2Sa. 20:23-26); or, as not merely the author of the Book of Kings in the middle of the Exile, but also the chronicler towards the end of the Persian period, have transferred unaltered, to their pages, the statement that the staves of the ark are to be found in the rings of the ark “to this day,” which has its origin in some annalistic document (1Ki. 8: 8, 2Ch. 5: 9). But unfortunately that subscription, which has been so faithfully preserved, furnishes us less help than we could wish. We only gather from it that the present collection was preceded by a primary collection of very much more limited compass which formed its basis and that this closed with the Salomonic Psalm 72; for the collector would surely not have placed the subscription, referring only to the prayers of David, after this Psalm if he had not found it there already. And from this point it becomes natural to suppose that Solomon himself, prompted perhaps by the liturgical requirements of the new Temple, compiled this primary collection, and by the addition of Psalm 72 may have caused it to be understood that he was the originator of the collection.

But to the question whether the primary collection also contained only Davidic songs properly so called or whether the subscribed designation תהלות דוד is only intended *a potiori*, the answer is entirely wanting. If we adopt the latter supposition, one is at a loss to understand for what reason only Psalm 50 of the Psalms of Asaph was inserted in it. For this psalm is really one of the old Asaphic psalms and might therefore have been an integral part of the primary collection. On the other hand it is altogether impossible for all the Korahitic psalms 42-49 to have belonged to it, for some of them, and most undoubtedly Psalm 47 and Psalm 48 were composed in the time of Jehoshaphat, the most remarkable event of which, as the chronicler narrates, was foretold by an Asaphite and celebrated by Korahitic singers. It is therefore, apart from other psalms which bring us down to the Assyrian period (as 66, 67) and the time of Jeremiah (as Psalm 71) and bear in themselves traces of the time of the Exile (as Psa. 69:35 ff.), absolutely impossible that the primary collection should have consisted of Psalm ch. 2-72, or rather (since Psalm ch. 2 appears as though it ought to be assigned to the later time of the kings, perhaps the time of Isaiah) of Psalm ch. 3-72. And if we leave the later insertions out of

consideration, there is no arrangement left for the Psalms of David and his contemporaries, which should in any way bear the impress of the Davidic and Salomonic mind. Even the old Jewish teachers were struck by this, and in the Midrash on Psalm ch. 3 we are told, that when Joshua ben Levi was endeavouring to put the Psalm in order, a voice from heaven cried out to him: arouse not the slumberer (אל-תפיחי את-הישן) i.e., do not disturb David in his grave! Why Psalm ch. 3 follows directly upon Psalm ch. 2, or as it is expressed in the Midrash פרשת גוג ומגוג פרשת אבשלום follows, may certainly be more satisfactorily explained than is done there: but to speak generally the mode of the arrangement of the first two books of the Psalms is of a similar nature to that of the last three, viz., that which in my *Symbolae ad Psalmos illustrandos isagogicae* (1846) is shown to run through the entire Psalter, more according to external than internal points of contact. <sup>f13</sup>

On the other side it cannot be denied that the groundwork of the collection that formed the basis of the present Psalter must lie within the limits of Psalm ch. 3-72, for nowhere else do old Davidic psalms stand so closely and numerously together as here. The Third book (Psalm 73-89) exhibits a marked difference in this respect. We may therefore suppose that the chief bulk of the oldest hymn book of the Israelitish church is contained in Psalm ch. 3-72. But we must at the same time admit, that its contents have been dispersed and newly arranged in later redactions and more especially in the last of all; and yet, amidst these changes the connection of the subscription, Psal. 72:20, with the psalm of Solomon was preserved. The two groups 3-72, 73-89, although not preserved in the original arrangement, and augmented by several kinds of interpolations, at least represent the first two stages of the growth of the Psalter. The primary collection may be Salomonic. The after portion of the second group was, at the earliest, added in the time of Jehoshaphat, at which time probably the book of the Proverbs of Solomon was also compiled. But with a greater probability of being in the right we incline to assign them to the time of Hezekiah, not merely because some of the psalms among them seem as though they ought to be referred to the overthrow of Assyria under Hezekiah rather than to the overthrow of the allied neighbouring nations under Jehoshaphat, but chiefly because just in the same manner “the men of Hezekiah” appended an after gleanings to the older Salomonic book of Proverbs (Pro. 25: 1), and because of Hezekiah it is recorded, that he brought the Psalms of David and of Asaph (the bulk of which are contained in the Third book of the Psalms) into use again (2Ch. 29:30). In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the collection was next extended by the songs composed during and (which are still more numerous) after the Exile. But a gleanings of old songs also had been reserved for this time. A Psalm of Moses was placed first, in order to give a pleasing relief to the beginning of the new psalter by this glance back into the

earliest time. And to the 56 Davidic psalms of the first three books, there are seventeen more added here in the last two. They are certainly not all directly Davidic, but partly the result of the writer throwing himself into David's temper of mind and circumstances. One chief store of such older psalms were perhaps the historical works of an annalistic or even prophetic character, rescued from the age before the Exile. It is from such sources that the historical notes prefixed to the Davidic hymns (and also to one in the Fifth book: Psalm 142) come. On the whole there is unmistakeably an advance from the earliest to the latest; and we may say, with Ewald, that in Psalm 1-41 the real bulk of the Davidic and, in general, of the older songs, is contained, in Psalm 42-89 predominantly songs of the middle period, in Psalm 90-150 the large mass of later and very late songs. But moreover it is with the Psalm-collection as with the collection of the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel: the chronological order and the arrangement according to the matter are at variance; and in many places the former is intentionally and significantly disregarded in favour of the latter. We have often already referred to one chief point of view of this arrangement according to matter, viz., the imitation of the *Thôra*; it was perhaps this which led to the opening of the Fourth book, which corresponds to the Book of Numbers, with a psalm of Moses of this character.

## § 5. Arrangement and Incriptions

Among the Fathers, Gregory of Nyssa has attempted to show that the Psalter in its five books leads upward as by five steps to moral perfection, *ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ὑψηλότερον τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπερτιθεῖς, ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκρότατον ἐφίκηται τῶν ἀγαθῶν*; <sup>f14</sup> and down to the most recent times attempts have been made to trace in the five books a gradation of principal thoughts, which influence and run through the whole collection. <sup>f15</sup>

We fear that in this direction, investigation has set before itself an unattainable end. Nevertheless, as we shall see, the collection bears the impress of one ordering mind. For its opening is formed by a didactic-prophetic couplet of psalms (Psalm 1-2), introductory to the whole Psalter and therefore in the earliest times regarded as one psalm, which opens and closes with *אשר*; and its close is formed by four psalms (Psalm 146-149) which begin and end with *הללויה*. We do not include Psalm 150 for this psalm takes the place of the *beracha* of the Fifth book, exactly as the recurring verse Psa. 148:22 is repeated in Psa. 57:21 with fuller emphasis, but is omitted at the close of the third part of this address of Isaiah to the exiles, its place being occupied by a terrifying description of the hopeless end of the wicked. The opening of the Psalter celebrates the blessedness of those who walk according to the will of God in redemption, which has been revealed in the law and in history; the close of the Psalter calls upon all creatures to praise this God of redemption, as

it were on the ground of the completion of this great work. Bede has already called attention to the fact that the Psalter from Psalm 146 ends in a complete strain of praise; the end of the Psalter soars upward to a happy climax. The assumption that there was an evident predilection for attempting to make the number 150 complete, as Ewald supposes, cannot be established; the reckoning 147 (according to a Haggadah book mentioned in *Jer. Sabbath* xvi., parallel with the years of Jacob's life), and the reckoning 149, which frequently occurs both in Karaitic and Rabbinic MSS, have also been adopted; the numbering of the whole and of particular psalms varies. <sup>f16</sup>

There are in the Psalter 73 psalms bearing the inscription לְדָוִד, viz., (reckoning exactly) 37 in book 1; 18 in book 2; 1 in book 3; 2 in book 4; 15 in book 5. The redaction has designed the pleasing effect of closing the collection with an imposing group of Davidic psalms, just as it begins with the bulk of the Davidic psalms. And the Hallelujahs which begin with Psalm 146 (after the 15 Davidic psalms) are the preludes of the closing doxology. The Korahitic and Asaphic psalms are found exclusively in the Second and Third books. There are 12 Asaphic psalms: 50, 73-83, and also 12 Korahitic: 42, 43, 44-49, 84, 85, 87, 88, assuming that Psalm 43 is to be regarded as an independent twin psalm to 42 and that Psalm 88 is to be reckoned among the Korahitic psalms. In both of these divisions we find psalms belonging to the time of the Exile and to the time after the Exile (74, 79, 85). The fact of their being found exclusively in the Second and Third books cannot therefore be explained on purely chronological grounds. Korahitic psalms, followed by an Asaphic, open the Second book; Asaphic psalms, followed by four Korahitic, open the Third book.

The way in which Davidic psalms are interspersed clearly sets before us the principle by which the arrangement according to the matter, which the collector has chosen, is governed. It is the principle of homogeneousness, which is the old Semitic mode of arranging things: for in the alphabet, the hand and the hollow of the hand, water and fish, the eye and the mouth, the back and front of the head have been placed together. In like manner also the psalms follow one another according to their relationship as manifested by prominent external and internal marks. The Asaphic psalm, Psalm 50, is followed by the Davidic psalm, 51, because they both similarly disparage the material animal sacrifice, as compared with that which is personal and spiritual. And the Davidic psalm 86 is inserted between the Korahitic psalms 85 and 87, because it is related both to *Psa. 85: 8* by the prayer: "*Show me Thy way, O Jahve*" and "*give Thy conquering strength unto Thy servant,*" and to Psalm 87 by the prospect of the conversion of the heathen to the God of Israel. This phenomenon, that psalms with similar prominent thoughts, or even with only markedly similar passage, especially at the beginning and the end, are thus



strung together, may be observed throughout the whole collection. Thus e.g., Psalm 56 with the inscription, “*after (the melody): the mute dove among strangers,*” is placed after Psalm 55 on account of the occurrence of the words: “*Oh that I had wings like a dove!*” etc., in that psalm; thus Psalm 34 and 35 stand together as being the only psalms in which “the Angel of Jahve” occurs; and just so Psalm ch. 9 and 10 which coincide in the expression **עֲתוֹת בַּצָּרָה** .

Closely connected with this principle of arrangement is the circumstance that the Elohimic psalms (i.e., those which, according to a peculiar style of composition as I have shown in my *Symbolae*, not from the caprice of an editor,<sup>17</sup> almost exclusively call God **אלהים**, and beside this make use of such compound names of God as **יהוה צבאות**, **יהוה אלהים צבאות**, and the like) are placed together without any intermixture of Jehovic psalms. In Psalm 1-41 the divine name **יהוה** predominates; it occurs 272 times and **אלהים** only 15 times, and for the most part under circumstances where **יהוה** was not admissible. With Psalm 42 the Elohimic style begins; the last psalm of this kind is the Korahitic psalm 84, which for this very reason is placed after the Elohimic psalms of Asaph. In the Psalm 85-150 **יהוה** again becomes prominent, with such exclusiveness, that in the Psalms of the Fourth and Fifth books **יהוה** occurs 339 times (not 239 as in *Symbolae* p. 5), and **אלהים** of the true God only once (Psa. 144: 9). Among the psalms of David 18 are Elohimic, among the Korahitic 9, and the Asaphic are all Elohimic. Including one psalm of Solomon and four anonymous psalms, there are 44 in all (reckoning Psalm 42 and 43 as two). They form the middle portion of the Psalter, and have on their right 41 and on their left 65 Jahve-psalms.

Community in species of composition also belongs to the manifold grounds on which the order according to the subject-matter is determined. Thus the **מִשְׁכִּיל** (42-43, 44, 45, 52-55) and **מִכְתָּם** (56-60) stand together among the Elohim-psalms. In like manner we have in the last two books the **הַמְעֵלוֹת** **שִׁיר** (120-134) and, divided into groups, those beginning with **הַדָּרוֹ** (105-107) and those beginning and ending with **הַלְלוּיָהּ** (111-117, 146-150) — whence it follows that these titles to the psalms are older than the final redaction of the collection.

It could not possibly be otherwise than that the inscriptions of the psalms, after the harmless position which the monographs of Sonntag (1687), Celsius (1718), Irhof (1728) take with regard to them, should at length become a subject for criticism; but the custom which has gained ground since the last decade of the past century of rejecting what has been historically handed down, has at present grown into a despicable habit of forming a decision too

hastily, which in any other department of literature where the judgment is not so prejudiced by the drift of the enquiry, would be regarded as folly. Instances like Hab. 3: 1 and 2Sa. 1:18, comp. Ps. 60: 1, show that David and other psalm-writers might have appended their names to their psalms and the definition of their purport. And the great antiquity of these and similar inscriptions also follows from the fact that the LXX found them already in existence and did not understand them; that they also cannot be explained from the Books of the Chronicles (including the Book of Ezra, which belongs to these) in which much is said about music, and appear in these books, like much besides, as an old treasure of the language revived, so that the key to the understanding of them must have been lost very early, as also appears from the fact that in the last two books of the Psalter they are of more rare, and in the first three of more frequent occurrence.

## § 6. The Strophe-System of the Psalms

The early Hebrew poetry has neither rhyme nor metre, both of which (first rhyme and then afterwards metre) were first adopted by Jewish poesy in the seventh century after Christ. True, attempts at rhyme are not wanting in the poetry and prophecy of the Old Testament, especially in the *tephilla* style, Ps. 106: 4-7 cf. Jer. 3:21-25, where the earnestness of the prayer naturally causes the heaping up of similar flexional endings; but this assonance, in the transition state towards rhyme proper, had not yet assumed such an established form as is found in Syriac. <sup>f18</sup>

It is also just as difficult to point out verses of four lines only, which have a uniform or mixed metre running through them. Notwithstanding, Augustine, *Ep. cxiii ad Memorium*, is perfectly warranted in saying of the Psalms: *certis eos constare numeris credo illis qui eam linguam probe callent*, and it is not a mere fancy when Philo, Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome and others have detected in the Old Testament songs, and especially in the Psalms, something resembling the Greek and Latin metres. For the Hebrew poetry indeed had a certain syllabic measure, since, — apart from the audible *Shebâ* and the *Chateph*, both of which represent the primitive shortenings, — all syllables with a full vowel are intermediate, and in ascending become long, in descending short, or in other words, in one position are strongly accented, in another more or less slurred over. Hence the most manifold rhythms arise, e.g., the anapaestic *wenashlîcha miménnu abothêmo* (Psa. 2: 3) or the dactylic *áz jedabbér elêmo beappó* (Psa. 2: 5). The poetic discourse is freer in its movement than the Syriac poetry with its constant ascending ( \_ ) or descending spondees ( ^ ); it represents all kinds of syllabic movements and thus obtains the appearance of a lively mixture of the Greek and Latin metres. But it is only an appearance — for the forms of verse, which conform to the

laws of quantity, are altogether foreign to early Hebrew poetry, as also to the oldest poetry; and these rhythms which vary according to the emotions are not metres, for, as Augustine says in his work *De Musica*, “*Omne metrum rhythmus, non omnis rhythmus etiam metrum est.*” Yet there is not a single instance of a definite rhythm running through the whole in a shorter or longer poem, but the rhythms always vary according to the thoughts and feelings; as e.g., the evening song Psalm ch. 4 towards the end rises to the anapaestic measure: *ki-attá Jahawé lebadád*, in order then quietly to subside in the iambic: *labétach tóshibéni*.<sup>f19</sup>

With this alternation of rise and fall, long and short syllables, harmonizing in lively passages with the subject, there is combined, in Hebrew poetry, and expressiveness of accent which is hardly to be found anywhere else to such an extent. Thus e.g., Psa. 2: *5a* sounds like pealing thunder, and *5b* corresponds to it as the flashing lightning. And there are a number of dull toned Psalms as 17, 49, 58, 59, 73, in which the description drags heavily on and is hard to be understood, and in which more particularly the suffixes in *mo* are heaped up, because the indignant mood of the writer impresses itself upon the style and makes itself heard in the very sound of the words. The *non plus ultra* of such poetry, whose very tones heighten the expression, is the cycle of the prophecies of Jeremiah 24-27.

Under the point of view of rhythm the so-called *parallelismus membrorum* has also been rightly placed: that fundamental law of the higher, especially poetic, style for which this appropriate name as been coined, not very long since.<sup>f20</sup>

The relation of the two parallel members does not really differ from that of the two halves on either side of the principal caesura of the hexameter and pentameter; and this is particularly manifest in the double long line of the caesural schema (more correctly: the diaeretic schema) e.g., Psa. 48: 6, 7: *They beheld, straightway they marvelled, | bewildered they took to flight. Trembling took hold upon them there | anguish, as a woman in travail.* Here the one thought is expanded in the same verse in two parallel members. But from the fact of the rhythmical organization being carried out without reference to the logical requirements of the sentence, as in the same psalm vv. 4, 8: *Elohim in her palaces | was known as a refuge. With an east wind Thou breakest | the ships of Tarshish,* we see that the rhythm is not called into existence as a necessity of such expansion of the thought, but *vice versâ* this mode of expanding the thought results from the requirements of the rhythm. Here is neither synonymous or identical (tautological), nor antithetical, nor synthetical parallelism, but merely that which De Wette calls rhythmical, merely the rhythmical rise and fall, the diastole and systole, which poetry is otherwise (without binding itself) wont to accomplish by two different kinds of ascending and descending logical organization. The ascending and descending

rhythm does not usually exist within the compass of one line, but it is distributed over two lines which bear the relation to one another of rhythmical antecedent and consequent, of *πρωδός* and *επωδός*. This distich is the simplest ground-form of the strophe, which is visible in the earliest song, handed down to us, Gen. 4:23 f. The whole Psalm 119 is composed in such distichs, which is the usual form of the apophthegm; the acrostic letter stands there at the head of each distich, just as at the head of each line in the likewise distichic pair, Psalm 111, 112. The tristich is an outgrowth from the distich, the ascending rhythm being prolonged through two lines and the fall commencing only in the third, e.g., 25: 7 (the *Π* of this alphabetical Psalm):

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

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

*Ah! how doth the city sit solitary, otherwise full of people!  
She is become as a widow, the great one among nations,  
The princess among provinces, she is become tributary.  
By night she weepeth sore and her tears are upon her cheeks;  
There is not one to comfort her of all her lovers,  
All her friends have betrayed her, they are become her enemies.*

If we now further enquire, whether Hebrew poesy goes beyond these simplest beginnings of the strophe-formation and even extends the network of the rhythmical period, by combining the two and three line strophe with ascending and descending rhythm into greater strophic wholes rounded off into themselves, the alphabetical Psalm 37 furnishes us with a safe answer to the question, for this is almost entirely tetrastichic, e.g.,

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

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

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

From this point the sure guidance of the alphabetical Psalms <sup>f21</sup> fails us in investigating the Hebrew strophe-system. But in our further confirmatory investigations we will take with us from these Psalms, the important conclusion that the verse bounded by *Sôph pasûk*, the placing of which harmonizes with the accentuation first mentioned in the post-Talmudic tractate *Sofrim*, <sup>f22</sup> is by no means (as, since Köster, 1831, it has been almost universally supposed) the original form of the strophe but that strophes are a whole consisting of an equal or symmetrical number of stichs. <sup>f23</sup>

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

But does it therefore follow, that a strophe is to be measured according to the number of distichs? The distich is itself only the smallest strophe, viz., one consisting of two lines. And it is even forbidden to measure a greater strophe by the number of distichs, because the rhythmical unit, of which the distich is the ground-form, can just as well be tristichic, and consequently these so-called rhythmical units form neither according to time nor space parts of equal value. But this applies still less to the Masoretic verses. True, we have shown in our larger Commentary on the Psalms, ii. 522 f., in agreement with Hupfeld, and in opposition to Ewald, that the accentuation proceeds upon the law of dichotomy. But the Masoretic division of the verses is not only obliged sometimes to give up the law of dichotomy, because the verse (as e.g., Psa. 18: 2; 25: 1; 92: 9), does not admit of being properly divided into two parts; and it subjects not only verses of three members (as e.g., Psa. 1: 1; 2: 2) in which the third member is embellishingly or synthetically related to the other two — both are phenomena which in themselves furnish proof in favour of the relative independence of the lines of the verse — but also verses of four members where the sense requires it (as Psa. 1: 3; 18:16) and where it does not require it (as Psa. 22:15; 40: 6), to the law of dichotomy. And these Masoretic verses of such various compass are to be the constituent parts according to which strophes of a like cipher shall be measured! A strophe only becomes a strophe by virtue of its symmetrical relation to others, to the ear it must have the same time, to the eye the same form and it must consequently represent the same number of lines (clauses). The fact of these clauses, according to the special characteristic of Hebrew poetry, moving on with that rising and falling movement which we call parallelism until they come to the close of the strophe

where it gently falls to rest, is a thing *sui generis*, and, within the province of the strophe, somewhat of a substitute for metre; but the strophe itself is a section which comes to thorough repose by this species of rhythmical movement. So far, then, from placing the rhythm on one leg only, we give it its two: but measure the strophe not by the two feet of the Masoretic verses or even couplets of verses, but by the equal, or symmetrically alternating number of the members present, which consist mostly of two feet, often enough however of three, and sometimes even of four feet.

Whether and how a psalm is laid out in strophes, is shown by seeing first of all what its pauses are, where the flow of thoughts and feelings falls in order to rise anew, and then by trying whether these pauses have a like or symmetrically correspondent number of stichs (e.g., 6. 6. 6. 6 or 6. 7. 6. 7) or, if their compass is too great for them to be at once regarded as one strophe, whether they cannot be divided into smaller wholes of an equal or symmetrical number of stichs. For the peculiarity of the Hebrew strophe does not consist in a run of definite metres closely united to form one harmonious whole (for instance, like the Sapphic strophe, which the four membered verses, Isa. 16: 9, 10, with their short closing lines corresponding to the Adonic verse, strikingly resemble), but in a closed train of thought which is unrolled after the distichic and tristichic ground-form of the rhythmical period. The strophe-schemata, which are thus evolved, are very diverse. We find not only that all the strophes of a poem are of the same compass (e.g., 4. 4. 4. 4), but also that the poem is made up of symmetrical relations formed of strophes of different compass. The condition laid down by some, <sup>f24</sup> that only a poem that consists of strophes of equal length can be regarded as strophic, is refuted not only by the Syriac <sup>f25</sup> but also by the post-biblical Jewish poetry. <sup>f26</sup>

We find the following variations: strophes of the same compass followed by those of different compass (e.g., 4. 4. 6. 6); as in the chiasmus, the outer and inner strophes of the same compass (e.g., 4. 6. 6. 4); the first and third, the second and fourth corresponding to one another (e.g., 4. 6. 4. 6); the mingling of the strophes repeated antistrophically, i.e., in the inverted order (e.g., 4. 6. 7. 6. 4); strophes of equal compass surrounding one of much greater compass (e.g., 4. 4. 10. 4. 4), what Köster calls the pyramidal schema; strophes of equal compass followed by a short closing stanza (e.g., 3. 3. 2); a longer strophe forming the base of the whole (e.g., 5. 3. 3. 7), and these are far from being all the different figures, which the Old Testament songs and more especially the Psalms present to us, when we arrange their contents in stichs.

With regard to the compass of the strophe, we may expect to find it consisting of as many as twelve lines according to the Syrian and the synagogue poetry. The line usually consists of three words, or at least only of three larger words; in this respect the Hebrew exhibits a capacity for short but emphatic

expressions, which are inadmissible in German [or English]. This measure is often not uniformly preserved throughout a considerable length, not only in the Psalms but also in the Book of Job. For there is far more reason for saying that the strophe lies at the basis of the arrangement of the Book of Job, than for G. Hermanjn's observation of strophic arrangement in the Bucolic writers and Köchly's in the older portions of Homer.

## § 7. Temple Music and Psalmody

The *Thôra* contains no directions respecting the use of song and music in divine worship except the commands concerning the ritualistic use of silver trumpets to be blown by the priests (Numbers 10). David is really the creator of liturgical music, and to his arrangements, as we see from the Chronicles, every thing was afterwards referred, and in times when it had fallen into disuse, restored. So long as David lived, the superintendence of the liturgical music was in his hands (1Ch. 25: 2). The instrument by means of which the three choir-masters (Heman, Asaph, and Ethan-Jeduthun) directed the choir was the cymbals (מְצַלְתִּים or צִלְצְלִים<sup>f27</sup>) which served instead of wands for beating time; the harps (נְבָלִים) represented the soprano, and the bass (the male voice in opposition to the female) was represented by the citherns an octave lower (1Ch. 15:17-21), which, to infer from the word לְנִצָּח used there, were used at the practice of the pieces by the מְנַצֵּחַ appointed. In a Psalm where סָלָה is appended (vid., on Psalm 3), the stringed instruments (which הַגִּיטוֹן סָלָה 9:17 definitely expresses), and the instruments generally, are to join in<sup>f28</sup>

in such a way as to give intensity to that which is being sung. To these instruments, besides those mentioned in Psalm 150, 2Sa. 6: 5, belonged also the flute, the liturgical use of which (vid., on 5: 1) in the time of the first as of the second Temple is undoubted: it formed the peculiar musical accompaniment of the *hallel* (vid., Psalm 113) and of the nightly torch-light festival on the semi-festival days of the Feast of Tabernacles (*Succa* 15 a). The trumpets (חֲצֻצְרוֹת) were blown exclusively by the priests to whom no part was assigned in the singing (as probably also the horn שׁוֹפָר Ps. 81: 4; 98: 6; 150: 3), and according to 2Ch. 5:12 f. (where the number of the two Mosaic trumpets appears to be raised to 120) took their turn *unisono* with the singing and the music of the Levites. At the dedication of Solomon's Temple the Levites sing and play and the priests sound trumpets נְגִדִים, 2Ch. 7: 6, and at the inauguration of the purified Temple under Hezekiah the music of the Levites and priests sound in concert until all the burnt offerings are laid upon the altar fire, and then (probably as the wine is being poured on) began (without any further thought of the priests) the song of the Levites, 2Ch. 29:26-

30. In the second Temple it was otherwise: the sounding of the trumpets by the priests and the Levitical song with its accompanying music alternated, they were not simultaneous. The congregation did not usually sing with the choir, but only uttered their Amen; nevertheless they joined in the *Hallel* and in some psalms after the first clause with its repetition, after the second with hallelujah (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Megilla*, 3). 1Ch. 16:36 points to a similar arrangement in the time of the first Temple. Just so does Jer. 33:11 in reference to the “*Give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good.*” Antiphonal singing in the part of the congregation is also to be inferred from Ezr. 3:10 f. The Psalter itself is moreover acquainted with an allotment of the **עלמות**, comp. **משררות** Ezr. 2:65 (whose treble was represented by the Levite boys in the second Temple, vid., on 46: 1) in choral worship and speaks of a praising of God “in full choirs,” 26:12; 68:27. And responsive singing is of ancient date in Israel: even Miriam with the women answered the men (**להם** Exo. 15:21) in alternating song, and Nehemiah (Neh. 12:27 ff.) at the dedication of the city walls placed the Levites in two great companies which are there called **תודות**, in the midst of the procession moving towards the Temple. In the time of the second Temple each day of the week had its psalm. The psalm for Sunday was 24, for Monday 48, Tuesday 82, Wednesday 94, Thursday 81, Friday 93, the Sabbath 92. This arrangement is at least as old as the time of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae, for the statements of the Talmud are supported by the inscriptions of Psalm 24, 48, 94, 93 in the LXX, and as respects the connection of the daily psalms with the drink-offering, by Sir. 50:14-16. The psalms for the days of the week were sung, to wit, at the time of the drink-offering (**נְסִיךְ**) which was joined with the morning *Tamid*:<sup>f29</sup> two priests, who stood on the right and left of the player upon the cymbal (*Zelazal*) by whom the signal was given, sounded the trumpets at the nine pauses (**פְּרָקִים**), into which it was divided when sung by the Levites, and the people bowed down and worshipped.<sup>f30</sup>

The Levites standing upon the *suggestus* (**הַיִּבֵּן**), — i.e., upon a broad staircase consisting of a few steps, which led up from the court of the laity to that of the priests, — who were both singers and musicians, and consequently played only on stringed instruments and instruments of percussion, not wind-instruments, were at least twelve in number, with 9 citherns, 2 harps, and one cymbal: on certain days the flute was added to this number.<sup>f31</sup>

The usual *suggestus* on the steps at the side of the altar was changed for another only in a few cases; for it is noticed as something special that the singers had a different position at the festival of water-drawing during the Feast of Tabernacles (vid., introduction to Psalm 120-134), and that the flute-players who accompanied the *Hallel* stood before the altar, **לפני המזבח**



(*Erachin* 10a). The treble was taken by the Levite youths, who stood below the *suggestus* at the feet of the Levites (vid., on Psalm 46). The daily **שִׁיר הַקֶּרְבָּן** (i.e., the week-day psalm which concluded the morning sacrifice) was sung in nine (or perhaps more correctly 3<sup>f32</sup>) pauses, and the pauses were indicated by the trumpet-blasts of the priests (vid., on Psalm 38, 81: 4). Beside the seven Psalms which were sung week by week, there were others appointed for the services of the festivals and intervening days (vid., on Psalm 81), and in *Biccurim* 3, 4 we read that when a procession bearing the firstfruits accompanied by flute playing had reached the hill on which the Temple stood and the firstfruits had been brought up in baskets, at the entrance of the offerers into the *Azara*, Psalm 30 was struck up by the Levites. This singing was distinct from the mode of delivering the *Tefilla* (vid., on Psalm 44 *ad fin.*) and the benediction of the priests (vid., on Psalm 67), both of which were unaccompanied by music. Distinct also, as it seems, from the mode of delivering the *Hallel*, which was more as a recitative, than sung (*Pesachim* 64a, **קְרָאוּ אֶת הַהֲלֵל**). It was probably similar to the Arabic, which delights in shrieking, long-winded, trilling, and especially also nasal tones. For it is related of one of the chief singers that in order to multiply the tones, he placed his thumb in his mouth and his fore finger **בֵּין הַנִּימִין** (between the hairs, i.e., according to Rashi: on the furrow of the upper lip against the partition of the nostrils), and thus (by forming mouth and nose into a trumpet) produced sounds, before the volume of which the priests started back in astonishment. <sup>f33</sup>

This mode of psalm-singing in the Temple of Herod was no longer the original mode, and if the present accentuation of the Psalms represents the fixed form of the Temple song, it nevertheless does not convey to us any impression of that before the Exile. It does, however, neither the one nor the other.

The accents are only musical, and indirectly interpunctional, signs for the chanting pronunciation of the synagogue. And moreover we no longer possess the key to the accents of the three metrical (i.e., consisting of symmetrical stichs and strophes) books as musical signs. For the so-called Sarkatables (which give the value of the accents as notes, beginning with *Zarka*, **זֶרְקָא**), e.g., at the end of the second edition of Nägelsbach's *Gramm.*, relate only to the reading of the pentateuchal and prophetic pericope, — consequently to the system of prose accents. In the German synagogue there is no tradition concerning the value of the so-called metrical accents as notes, for the Psalms were not recited according to the accents; but for all the Psalms, there are only two different modes, at least in the German ritual, viz., 1) the customary one according to which verse after verse is recited by the leader and the congregation, as e.g., Psalm 95-99, 29 every Friday evening; and 2) that peculiar to Psalm 119 in which the first seven verses of the eight are recited

alternately by the leader and the congregation, but the eighth as a concluding verse is always closed by the congregation with a cadence. This psalmody does not always follow the accents. We can only by supposition approximately determine how the Psalms were to be recited according to them. For we still possess at least a few statements of Ben-Asher, Shemtob and Moses Provenzalo (in his grammatical didactic poem **בְּשֵׁם קְדָמוֹן**) concerning the intonation of single metrical accents. *Pazzer* and *Shalshéleth* have a like intonation, which rises with a trill; though *Shalshéleth* is more prolonged, about a third longer than that of the prose books. *Legarme* (in form *Mahpach* or *Azla* followed by *Psik*) has a clear high pitch, before *Zinnor*, however, a deeper and more broken tone; *Rebia magnum* a soft tone tending to repose. By *Silluk* the tone first rises and then diminishes. The tone of *Mercha* is according to its name *andante* and sinking into the depths; the tone of *Tarcha* corresponds to *adagio*. Further hints cannot be traced: though we may infer with respect to *Ole we-jored* (*Mercha mahpachatum*) and *Athnach*, that their intonation ought to form a cadence, as that *Rebia parvum* and *Zinnor* (*Zarka*) had an intonation hurrying on to the following distinctive accent. Further, if we place *Dechi* (*Tiphcha initiale*) and *Rebia gereshatum* beside the remaining six *servi* among the notes, we may indeed produce a sarka-table of the metrical accentuation, although we cannot guarantee its exact agreement with the original manner of singing.

Following Gerbert (*De musica sacra*) and Martini (*Storia della musica*), the view is at present very general that in the eight Gregorian tones together with the extra tone (*tonus peregrinus*), <sup>f34</sup> used only for Psalm 113 (= 114-115 in the Hebrew numeration), we have a remnant of the ancient Temple song; and this in itself is by no means improbable in connection with the Jewish nationality of the primitive church and its gradual severance at the first from the Temple and synagogue. In the convents of Bethlehem, which St. Paula founded, psalms were sung at six hours of prayer from early morn till midnight, and she herself was so well versed in Hebrew, *ut Psalmos hebraice caneret et sermonem absque ulla Latinae linguae proprietate personaret* (*Ep.* 108 *ad Eustoch.* c. 26). This points to a connection between the church and synagogue psalm-melodies in the *mos orientalium partium*, the oriental psalmody, which was introduced by Ambrose into the Milanese church. Nevertheless, at the same time the Jewish element has undergone scarcely any change; it has been developed under the influence of the Greek style, but is, notwithstanding, still recognizable. <sup>f35</sup>

Pethachja of Ratisbon, the Jewish traveller in the 12th century, when in Bagdad, the ancient seat of the Geonim (**גְּאוֹנִים**), heard the Psalms sung in a manner altogether peculiar; <sup>f36</sup> and Benjamin of Tudela, in the same century, became acquainted in Bagdad with a skilful singer of the Psalms used in divine

worship. Saadia on Psa. 6: 1, infers from על-השמינית that there were eight different melodies (Arab. *I-ḥân*). And eight נגינית are also mentioned elsewhere; <sup>f37</sup> perhaps not without reference to those eight church-tones, which are also found among the Armenians. <sup>f38</sup>

Moreover the two modes of using the accents in chanting, which are attested in the ancient service-books, <sup>f39</sup>

may perhaps be not altogether unconnected with the distinction between the festival and the simpler ferial manner in the Gregorian style of church-music.

## § 8. Translations of the Psalms

The earliest translation of the Psalms is the Greek Alexandrine version. When the grandson of the son of Sirach came to Egypt in the year 132 B.C., not only the Law and the Prophets, but also the Hagiographa were already translated into the Greek; of course therefore also the Psalms, by which the Hagiographa are directly named in Luke 24:44. The story of the LXX (LXXII) translators, in its original form, refers only to the *Thôra*; the translations of the other books are later and by different authors. All these translators used a text consisting only of consonants, and these moreover were here and there more or less indistinct; this text had numerous glosses, and was certainly not yet, as later, settled on the Masoretic basis. This they translated literally, in ignorance of the higher exegetical and artistic functions of the translator, and frequently the translation itself is obscure. From Philo, Josephus and the New Testament we see that we possess the text of this translation substantially in its original form, so that criticism, which since the middle of the last century has acquired many hitherto unknown helps, <sup>f40</sup> more especially also in the province of the Psalms, will not need to reverse its judgment of the character of the work.

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

In one other respect this version claims a still greater significance. Next to the Book of Isaiah, no book is so frequently cited in the New Testament as the Psalter. The Epistle to the Hebrews has grown up entirely from the roots of the language of the Old Testament psalms. The Apocalypse, the only book which does not admit of being referred back to any earlier formula as its basis, is nevertheless not without references to the Psalter: Psalm ch. 2 in particular has a significant part in the moulding of the apocalyptic conceptions and language. These New Testament citations, with few exceptions (as Joh. 13:18), are based

upon the LXX, even where this translation (as e.g., Psa. 19: 5; 51: 6; 116:10), only in a general way, correctly reproduces the original text. The explanation of this New Testament use of the LXX is to be found in the high esteem in which this translation was held among the Jewish people: it was accounted, not only by the Hellenistic, but also by the Palestinian Jews, as a providential and almost miraculous production; and this esteem was justified by the fact, that, although altogether of unequal birth with the canonical writings, it nevertheless occupies a position in the history of divine revelation which forms a distinct epoch. For it was the first opportunity afforded to the gentile world of becoming acquainted with the Old Testament revelation, and thus the first introduction of Japheth into the tents of Shem. At the same time therewith, a distinct breaking down of the barriers of the Old Testament particularism was effected. The Alexandrine translation was, therefore, an event which prepared the way for that Christianity, in which the appointment of the religion of Israel to be the religion of the world is perfected. This version, at the outset, created for Christianity the language which it was to use; for the New Testament Scriptures are written in the popular Greek dialect (κοινή) with an Alexandrine colouring. And in a general way we may say that Alexandrinism moulded the forms beforehand, which Christianity was afterwards to fill up with the substance of the gospel. As the way of Jesus Christ lay by Egypt (Mat. 2:15), so the way of Christianity also lay by Egypt, and Alexandria in particular.

Equally worthy of respect on account of its antiquity and independence, though not of the same importance as the LXX from a religio-historical point of view, is the Targum or Chaldee version of the Psalms: a version which only in a few passages assumed the form of a paraphrase with reference to Midrash interpretations. The date of its composition is uncertain. But as there was a written Targum to the Book of Job <sup>f41</sup> even during the time of the Temple, there was also a Targum of the Psalms, though bearing in itself traces of manifold revisions, which probably had its origin during the duration of the Temple. In distinction from the Targums of Onkelos to the Pentateuch and of Jonathan to the minor Prophets the Targum of the Psalms belongs to the so-called Jerusalem group, <sup>f42</sup> for the Aramaic idiom in which it is written, — while, as the Jerusalem Talmud shows, it is always distinguished in no small degree from the Palestinian popular dialect as being the language of the literature — abounds in the same manner as the former in Greek words (as אַγγֵלוֹי, ἄγγελοι, אֲנֹכִי, ἐξέδραι, קִרְיִם, κύριος), and like it also closely approximates, in sound and formation, to the Syriac. From this translation which excels the LXX in grammatical accuracy and has at its basis a more settled and stricter text, we learn the meaning of the Psalms as understood in the synagogue, as the interpretation became fixed, under the influence of early tradition, in the first centuries of the Christian era. The text of the Targum itself is at the

present day in a very neglected condition. The most correct texts are to be found in Buxtorf and Norzi's Bibles. Critical observations on the Targums of the Hagiographa are given in the treatise **עומה אור** by Benzion Berkowitz (Wilna, 1843).

The third most important translation of the Psalms is the *Peshîto*, the old version of the Syrian church, which was made not later than in the second century. Its author translated from the original text, which he had without the vowel points, and perhaps also in a rather incorrect form: as is seen from such errors as 17:15 (**תמונתך** instead of **אמונתך**), 83:12 (**שדמו ואבדמי** *dele eos et perde eos* instead of **שיתמו נדיבמו**), 139:16 (**גמלי** *retributionem meam* instead of **גלמי**). In other errors he is influenced by the LXX, as 56: 9 (**בנגדך** LXX **ἐνώπιόν σου** instead of **בנאדך**), he follows this version in such departures from the better text sometimes not without additional reason, as 90: 5 (*generationes eorum annus erunt*, i.e., **זרעותיו שנה יהיו**, LXX **τὰ ἔξουθενώματα αὐτῶν ἔτη ἔσσονται**), Ps. 110: 3 (*populus tuus gloriosus*, i.e., **עמך נדבות** in the sense of **נדיבה**, Job. 30:15, nobility, rank, LXX **μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχή**). The fact that he had the LXX before him beside the original text is manifest, and cannot be done away by the supposition that the text of the *Peshîto* has been greatly distorted out of the later Hexaplarian translation; although even this is probable, for the LXX won such universal respect in the church that the Syrians were almost ashamed of their ancient version, which disagreed with it in many points, and it was this very circumstance which gave rise in the year 617 A.D. to the preparation of a new Syriac translation from the Hexaplarian LXX-text. It is not however merely between the *Peshîto* and the LXX, but also between the *Peshîto* and the Targum, that a not accidental mutual relation exists, which becomes at once apparent in Psalm 1 (e.g., in the translation of **לצים** by **ממיקני** and of **תורת** by **נמוסא**) and hardly admits of explanation by the use of the Christian *Peshîto* on the part of Jewish Targumist. <sup>f43</sup>

It may be more readily supposed that the old Syriac translator of the Psalms, of whom we are now speaking, was a Jewish Christian and did not despise the welcome assistance of the Targum, which was already at hand, in whatever form it might be. It is evident that he was a Christian from passages like Ps. 19: 5; Ps. 110: 3, also from Ps. 68:19 comp. with Eph. 4: 8, Jer. 31:31 comp. with Heb. 8: 8; and his knowledge of the Hebrew language, with which, as was then generally the case, the knowledge of Greek was united, shows that he was a Jewish Christian. Moreover the translation has its peculiar Targum characteristics: tropical expressions are rendered literally, and by a remarkable process of reasoning interrogative clauses are turned into express declarations: Ps. 88:11-13 is an instance of this with a bold inversion of the true meaning to

its opposite. In general the author shuns no violence in order to give a pleasing sense to a difficult passage e.g., 12: 6b, 60: 6. The musical and historical inscriptions, and consequently also the סלה (including הגיון סלה 9:17) he leaves untranslated, and the division of verses he adopts is not the later Masoretic. All these peculiarities make the *Peshîto* all the more interesting as a memorial in exegetic-historical and critical enquiry: and yet, since Dathe's edition, 1768, who took the text of Erpenius as his ground-work and added valuable notes,<sup>f44</sup> scarcely anything has been done in this direction.

In the second century new Greek translations were also made. The high veneration which the LXX had hitherto enjoyed was completely reversed when the rupture between the synagogue and the church took place, so that the day when this translation was completed was no longer compared to the day of the giving of the Law, but to the day of the golden calf. Nor was it possible that it should be otherwise than that its defects should become more and more perceptible. Even the New Testament writers found it requiring correction here and there, or altogether unfit for use, for the Palestinian text of the Old Testament which had been handed down, was not merely as regards the consonants but also as to pronunciation substantially the same as that which has been fixed by the Masoretes since the sixth century. Consequently Aquila of Pontus (a proselyte from heathenism to Judaism) in the first half of the 2nd century, made a Greek translation of the Old Testament, which imitated the original text word for word even at the risk of un-Greek expressions, and in the choice of the Greek words used is determined by the etymology of the Hebrew words. Not to lose any of the weighty words he translates the first sentence of the *Thôra* thus: Ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς σὺν (סס) τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν (סס) τὴν γῆν. In the fragments of the translation of the Psalms, one of which has been preserved in the Talmudic literature (vid., on Psa. 48:15), we do not meet with such instances of violence in favour of literalness, although also even there he forces the Greek into the form of the Hebrew, and always renders the words according to their primary meaning (e.g., דביר χρηματιστήριον, מגלה εἶλημα, פתח ἄνοιγμα, רהב ὄρμημα, זמזז πεπιστευμένως), sometimes unhappily and misled by the usage the language had acquired in his time. In some passages he reads the text differently from our present pointing (e.g., 10: 4 ὅταν ὑψωθῆ), but he moreover follows the tradition (e.g., סלה ἀεὶ, שדי' יκανός, מכתם τοῦ ταπεινόφρονος καὶ ἀπλοῦ = סס ומך) and also does not despise whatever the LXX may offer that is of any worth (e.g., במנים ἐν χορδαίς), as his translation throughout, although an independent one, relies more or less upon the pioneering work of its predecessor, the LXX. His talent as a translator is unmistakeable. He has perfect command of the Hebrew, and handles the treasures of the Greek with a

master-hand. For instance, in the causative forms he is never in difficulty for a corresponding Greek word (לְפִי לַ פְּטוֹמַטִּיזֵיב, גִּרְיִן דְּרוֹמוֹב, הַשְּׂכִּיל עִיסְטִימוֹב and the like). The fact that he translated for the synagogue in opposition to the church is betrayed by passages like 2:12; 22:17; 110: 3 and perhaps also Psa. 84:10, comp. Dan. 9:26, where he prefers ἡλειμμένον to Χριστοῦ: nevertheless one must not in this respect charge him with evil intentions throughout. Even Jerome, on calmer reflection, moderated his indignation against Aquila's translation to a less harsh judgment: *ut amicae menti fatear, quae ad nostram fidem pertineant roborandam plura reperio*, and praised it even at the expense of the translations of Theodotion and Symmachus: *Isti Semichristiani Judaice transtulerunt, et Judaeus Aquila interpretatus est ut Christianus*.

The translation of Theodotion is not an original work. It is based upon the LXX and brings this version, which was still the most widely used, into closer relation to the original text, by making use of Aquila's translation. The fragments that are preserved to us of passages independently translated contain nothing pre-eminently characteristic. Symmachus also takes the LXX as his basis, but in re-moulding it according to the original text he acts far more decidedly and independently than Theodotion, and distinguishes himself from Aquila by endeavouring to unite literalness with clearness and verbal accuracy: his translation of the Psalms has even a poetic inspiration about it. Both Aquila and Symmachus issued their translations twice, so that some passages are extant translated in a twofold form (vid., 110: 3).

Beside the LXX Aq. Symm. and Theod. there are also a fifth, sixth and seventh Greek translation of the Psalms. The fifth is said to have been found in Jericho under the emperor Caracalla, the sixth in Nicopolis under the emperor Alexander Severus. The former, in its remains, shows a knowledge of the language and tradition, the latter is sometimes (Psa. 37:35, Hab. 3:13) paraphrastic. A seventh is also mentioned besides, it is not like Theodotion. In the Hexapla of Origen, which properly contains only six columns (the Hebrew text, the Hebr. text in Greek characters, Aq., Symm., LXX, Theod.), in the Psalm and elsewhere a *Quinta* (E), *Sexta* (ς), and *Septima* (Z) are added to these six columns: thus the Hexapla (apart from the Seventh) became an Octapla. Of the remains of these old versions as compiled by Origen, after the labours of his predecessors Nobilius and Drusius, the most complete collection is that of Bernard de Montfaucon in his *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt* (2 vols. folio, Paris 1713); the rich gleanings since handed down from many different quarters<sup>f45</sup> are unfortunately still scattered and uncollated.

Euthymius Zigadenus mentions beside the LXX, Aq., Symm., Theod., V, and VI, as a Seventh version that of Lucian which attempts to restore the original

Septuagint-text by a comparison with the original text. Lucian died as a martyr 311 A.D. in Nicomedia, whither he had been dragged from Antioch. The autograph of this translation was found in Nicomedia, hidden in a small rough-plastered tower. <sup>f46</sup>

We are as little able to form a conception of this Septuagint-recension of Lucian as of that of the contemporary Egyptian bishop Hesychius, since not a single specimen of either is extant. It would be interesting to know the difference of treatment of the two critics from that of Origen, who corrected the text of the *κοινή* after the Hebrew original by means of Theodotion's, *obelis jugulans quae abundare videbantur, et quae deerant sub asteriscis interserens*, which produced a confusion that might easily have been foreseen.

From the Old Latin translation, the so-called *Itala*, made from the LXX, we possess the Psalter complete: Blanchini has published this translation of the Psalms (1740) from the Veronese Psalter, and Sabbatier in the second volume of his *Latinae Versiones Antiquae* (1751) from the Psalter of the monastery of St. Germain. The text in Faber Stapulensis' *Quincuplex Psalterium* (1509) is compiled from Augustine; for Augustine, like Hilary, Ambrose, Prosper, and Cassiodorus, expounds the Psalms according to the old Latin text. Jerome first of all carefully revised this in Rome, and thus originated the *Psalterium Romanum*, which has been the longest retained by the church of Milan and the Basilica of the Vatican. He then in Bethlehem prepared a second more carefully revised edition, according to the Hexaplarian Septuagint-text <sup>f47</sup> with daggers (as a sign of additions in the LXX contrary to the original) and asterisks (a sign of additions in the LXX from Theodotion in accordance with the original), and this second edition which was first adopted by the Gallican churches obtained the name of the *Psalterium Gallicanum*. It is not essentially different from the Psalter of the Vulgate, and appeared, with its critical signs, from a MS of Bruno, bishop of Würzburg (died 1045), for the first time in the year 1494 (then edited by Cochleus, 1533): both Psalters, the Romish and the Gallican, are placed opposite one another in Faber's *Quincuplex Psalterium*, in t. x. p. 1 of the *Opp. Hieronymi, ed. Vallarsi* and elsewhere.

The Latin Psalters, springing from the common or from the Hexaplarian Septuagint-text, as also the Hexapla-Syriac and the remaining Oriental versions based upon the LXX and the *Peshîto*, have only an indirectly exegetico-historical value. On the contrary Jerome's translation of the Psalter, *juxta Hebraicam veritatem*, is the first scientific work of translation, and, like the whole of his independent translation of the Old Testament from the original text, a bold act by which he has rendered an invaluable service to the church, without allowing himself to be deterred by the cry raised against such innovations. This independent translation of Jerome has become the Vulgate of the church: but in a text in many ways estranged from its original form, with



the simple exception of the Psalter. For the new translation of this book was opposed by the inflexible liturgical use it had attained; the texts of the *Psalterium Romanum* and *Gallicanum* maintained their ground and became (with the omission of the critical signs) an essential portion of the Vulgate. On this account it is the more to be desired that Jerome's Latin Psalter *ex Hebraeo* (*Opp. ed. Vallarsi* t. ix. p. 333) were made more generally known and accessible by a critical edition published separately. It is not necessary to search far for critical helps for such an undertaking. There is an excellent MS, *Cod.* 19, in the library of St. Gall, presented by the abbot Hartmot (died 895).

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

Jerome's translation of the Psalter has not its equal either in the synagogue or the church until the time of Saadia Gaon of Fajum, the Arabian translator of the Psalms. Two MSS of his translation of the Psalms are to be found at Oxford; but the most important, which also contains his annotations complete, is in Munich. Schnurrer (1791) contributed Psalm 16, 40 and 110 to Eichhorn's *Biblioth. der Bibl. Lit.* iii, from *Cod. Pocock.* 281, then Haneberg (1840) Psalm 68 and several others from the Munich *Cod.*; the most extensive excerpts from *Cod. Pocock.* 281 and *Cod. Huntingt.* 416 (with various readings from *Cod. Mon.* appended) are given by Ewald in the first vol. of his *Beiträge zur ältesten Ausleg. u. Spracherkklärung des A. T.* 1844. The gain which can be drawn from Saadai for the interpretation of the Psalms, according to the requirements of the present day, is very limited; but he promises a more interesting and rich advantage to philology and the history of exegesis. Saadia stands in the midst of the still ever mysterious process of development out of which the finally established and pointed text of the Old Testament came forth. He has written a treatise on the punctuation (ניקוד) to which Rashi refers in Psa. 45:10, but in his treatment of the Old Testament text shows himself to be unfettered by its established punctuation. His translation is the first scientific work on the Psalms in the synagogue. The translation of Jerome is five hundred years older, but only the translation of Luther has been able to stand

side by side with it and that because he was the first to go back to the fountain head of the original text.

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

## § 9. History of the Exposition of the Psalms

If we now take a glance over the history of the exposition of the Psalms, we shall see from it how late it was before the proper function of scientific exposition was recognised. We begin with the apostolic exposition. The Old Testament according to its very nature tends towards and centres in Christ. Therefore the innermost truth of the Old Testament has been revealed in the revelation of Jesus Christ. But not all at once: His passion, resurrection, and ascension are three steps of this progressive opening up of the Old Testament, and of the Psalms in particular. Our Lord himself, both before and after His resurrection, unfolded the meaning of the Psalms from His own life and its vicissitudes; He showed how what was written in the Law of Moses, in the Prophets and in the Psalms was fulfilled in Him; He revealed to His disciples the meaning τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς Luk. 24:44 f. Jesus Christ's exposition of the Psalms is the beginning and the goal of Christian Psalm-interpretation. This began, as that of the Christian church, and in fact first of all that of the Apostles, at Pentecost when the Spirit, whose instrument David acknowledges himself to have been (2Sa. 23: 2), descended upon the Apostles as the Spirit of Jesus, the fulfiller and fulfilment of prophecy. This Spirit of the glorified Jesus completed what, in His humiliation and after His resurrection, he had begun:

He opened up to the disciples the meaning of the Psalms. How strongly they were drawn to the Psalms is seen from the fact that they are quoted about seventy times in the New Testament, which, next to Isaiah, is more frequently than any other Old Testament book. From these interpretations of the Psalms the church will have to draw to the end of time. For only the end will be like the beginning and even surpass it. But we must not seek in the New Testament Scriptures what they are not designed to furnish, viz., an answer to questions belonging to the lower grades of knowledge, to grammar, to contemporary history and to criticism. The highest and final questions of the spiritual meaning of Scripture find their answer here; the grammatico-historico-critical under-structure, — as it were, the candlestick of the new light, — it was left for succeeding ages to produce.

The post-apostolic, patristic exposition was not capable of this. The interpreters of the early church with the exception of Origen and Jerome possessed no knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, and even these two not sufficient to be able to rise to freedom from a dependence upon the LXX which only led them into frequent error. Of Origen's Commentary and Homilies on the Psalm we possess only fragments translated by Rufinus, and his *ὑπόμνημα εἰς τοὺς ψαλμοῦς* (edited complete by Kleopas, 1855, from a MS in the monastery of Mar-Saba). Jerome, *contra Rufinum* i. § 19, indeed mentions *Commentarioli* on the Psalm by himself, but the *Breviarium in Psalterium* (in t. vii. p. ii. of his *Opp. ed. Vallarsi*) bearing his name is allowed not to be genuine, and is worthless as regards the history of the text and the language. The almost complete Commentary (on Psalm 1-119 according to the Hebrew reckoning) of Eusebius, made known by Montfaucon (*Collectio nova Patrum et Scriptorum Graec.* t. i.) is unsuspected. Eusebius, though living in Palestine and having a valuable library at command, is nevertheless so ignorant of the Hebrew, that he considers it is possible *Μαριαμ* (מרימ) in Psalm 110 may refer to Mary. But by contributions from the Hexapla he has preserved many acceptable treasures of historical value in connection with the translation, but of little worth in other respects, for the interpretation is superficial, and capriciously allegorical and forced. Athanasius in his short explanation of the Psalms (in t. i. p. ii. of the Benedictine edition) is entirely dependent on Philo for the meaning of the Hebrew names and words. His book: *πρὸς Μαρκελλῖνον εἰς τὴν ἐρμηνείαν τῶν ψαλμῶν* (in the same vol. of the Benedictine edition) is a very beautiful essay. It treats of the riches contained in the Psalms, classifies them according to their different points of view, and gives directions how to use them profitably in the manifold circumstances and moods of the outward and inner life. Johann Reuchlin has translated this little book of Athanasius into Latin, and Jörg Spalatin from the Latin of Reuchlin into German (1516. 4to.). Of a similar kind are the two books of Gregory of Nyssa *εἰς τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν τῶν ψαλμῶν* (*Opp.*

*ed. Paris*, t. i.), which treat of the arrangement and inscriptions; but in respect of the latter he is so led astray by the LXX, that he sets down the want of titles of 12 Psa. (this is the number according to Gregory), which have titles in the LXX, to Jewish *ἀπιστία* and *κακία*. Nevertheless there are several valuable observations in this introduction of the great Nyssene. About contemporaneously with Athanasius, Hilarius Pictaviensis, in the Western church, wrote his allegorizing (after Origen's example) *Tractatus in librum Psalmorum* with an extensive prologue, which strongly reminds one of Hippolytus'. We still have his exposition of Psalm chp. 1, 2, 9, 13, 14, 51, 52, 53-69, 91, 118-150 (according to the numbering of the LXX); according to Jerome (*Ep. ad Augustin.* cxii <sup>f48</sup>) it is transferred from Origen and Eusebius. It is throughout ingenious and pity, but more useful to the dogmatic theologian than the exegete (t. xxvii., xxviii. of the *Collectio Patrum* by Caillau and Guillon). <sup>f49</sup>

Somewhat later, but yet within the last twenty years of the fourth century (about 386-397), come Ambrose's *Enarrationes in Psalm 1*, 35-40, 43, 45, 47, 48, 61, 118 (in t. ii. of the Benedictine edition). The exposition of Psalm 1 is likewise an introduction to the whole Psalter, taken partly from Basil. He and Ambrose have pronounced the highest eulogiums on the Psalter. The latter says:

*Psalmus enim benedictio populi est, Dei laus, plebis laudatio, plausus omnium, sermo uniuersorum, vox Ecclesiae, fidei canora confessio, auctoritatis plena devotio, libertatis laetitia, clamor iucunditatis, laetitiae resultatio. Ab iracundia mitigat, a sollicitudine abdicat, a maerore allevat. Nocturna arma, diurna magisteria; scutum in timore, festum in sanctitate, imago tranquillitatis, pignus pacis atque concordiae, citharae modo ex diversis et disparibus vocibus unam exprimens cantilenam. Diei ortus psalmum resultat, psalmum resonat occasus.*

After such and similar prefatory language we are led to expect from the exposition great fervour and depth of perception: and such are really its characteristics, but not to so large an extent as might have been the case had Ambrose — whose style of writing is as musical as that of Hilary is stiff and angular — worked out these expositions, which were partly delivered as sermons, partly dictated, and his own hand.

The most comprehensive work of the early church on the Psalms was that of Chrysostom, which was probably written while at Antioch. We possess only the exposition of 58 Psalm or (including Psalm ch. 3 and 41, which in their present form do not belong to this work) 60 Psa. (in t. v. of Montfaucon's edition). Photius and Suidas place this commentary on the Psalms in the

highest rank among the works of Chrysostom. It is composed in the form of sermons, the style is brilliant, and the contents more ethical than dogmatic. Sometimes the Hebrew text according to the Hexapla is quoted, and the Greek versions which depart from the original are frequently compared, but, unfortunately, generally without any name. There is hardly any trace in it of the renowned philologico-historical tendency of the school of Antioch. Theodoret (in t. ii. p. ii. of the Halle edition) was the first to set before himself the middle course between an extravagant allegorising and an unspiritual adherence to the literal historical sense (by which he doubtless has reference to Theodore of Mopsuestia), and thus to a certain extent he makes a beginning in distinguishing between the province of exegesis and practical application. But this scientific commencement, with even more of the grammatico-historical tendency, is still defective and wanting in independence. For example, the question whether all the Psalms are by David or not, is briefly decided in the affirmative, with *κρατεῖτω τῶν πλειόνων ἡ ψῆφος*.<sup>f50</sup>

The designed, minute comparison of the Greek translators is most thankworthy; in other respect, this expositor, like the Syrians generally, is wanting in the mystic depth which might compensate for the want of scientific insight. All this may be also said of Euthymius Zigadenus (Zigabgenues): his commentary on the Psalms (in Greek in t. iv. of the Venetian edition of the *Opp. Theophylacti*), written at the desire of the emperor Alexius Comnenus, is nothing but a skilful compilation, in the preparation of which he made good use of the Psalm-catena, likewise a compilation, of the somewhat earlier *Νικήτας Σερρών*,<sup>f51</sup> which is to be found on Mount Athos and is still unprinted.

The Western counterpart to Chrysostom's commentary are Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos* (in t. iv. of the Benedictine edition). The psalm-singing in the Milanese church had contributed greatly to Augustine's conversion. But his love to his Lord was fired still more by the reading of the Psalms when he was preparing himself in solitude for his baptism. His commentary consists of sermons which he wrote down in part himself and in part dictated. Only the thirty-two *sermones* on Psalm 118 (119), which he ventured upon last of all, were not actually delivered. He does not adopt the text of Jerome as his basis, but makes use of the older Latin version, the original text of which he sought to establish, and here and there to correct, by the LXX; whereas Arnobius, the Semi-Pelagian, in his paraphrastic Africano-Latin commentary on the Psalms (first edition by Erasmus, *Basileae, Forben.* 1522, who, as also Trithemnius, erroneously regarded the author as one and the same with the Apologist) no longer uses the so-called Itala, but takes Jerome's translation as his basis. The work of Augustine far surpassing that of Chrysostom in richness and depth of thought, has become, in the Western

church, the chief mine of all later exposition of the Psalms. Cassiodorus in his *Expositiones in omnes Psalmos* (in t. ii. of the Bened. ed.) draws largely from Augustine, though not devoid of independence.

What the Greek church has done for the exposition of the Psalms has been garnered up many times since Photius in so-called *Σειραί*, *Catenaë*. That of Nicetas archbishop of Serra in Macedonia (about 1070), is still unprinted. One, extending only to Psalm 50, appeared at Venice 1569, and a complete one, edited by Corderius, at Antwerp 1643 (3 vols., from Vienna and Munich MSS). Folckmann (1601) made extracts from the *Catena* of Nicetas Heracleota, and Aloysius Lippomanus began a *Catena* from Greek and Latin writers on the largest scale (one folio vol. on Psalm 1-10, *Romæ* 1585). The defects to be found in the ancient exposition of the Psalms are in general the same in the Greek and in the Western expositors. To their want of acquaintance with the text of the original was added their unmethodical, irregular mode of procedure, their arbitrary straining of the prophetic character of the Psalms (as e.g., Tertullian, *De spectaculis*, takes the whole of Psalm 1 as a prophecy concerning Joseph of Arimathea), their unhistorical perception, before which all differences between the two Testaments vanish, and their misleading predilection for the allegorical method. In all this, the meaning of the Psalms, as understood by the apostles, remains unused; they appropriate it without rightly apprehending it, and do not place the Psalms in the light of the New Testament fulfilment of them, but at once turn them into New Testament language and thoughts. But the church has never found such rapturous delight in the Psalms, which it was never weary of singing day and night, never used them with richer results even to martyrdom, than at that period. Instead of profane popular songs, as one passed through the country one might hear psalms resounding over the fields and vineyards. *Quocunque te verteris*, writes Jerome to the widow of Marcellus from the Holy Land,

*arator stivam tenens Alleluja decantat, sudans messor psalmis se  
avocat et curva attondens vitem falce vinitor aliquid Davidicum canit.  
Haec sunt in hac provincia carmina, hae (ut vulgo dicitur) amatoriae  
cantiones, hic pastorum sibilus, haec arma culturae.*

The delights of country life he commends to Marcella in the following among other words: *Vere ager floribus pingitur et inter querulas aves Psalmi dulcius cantabuntur*. In Sidonius Apollinaris we find even psalm-singing in the mouth of the men who tow the boats, and the poet takes from this a beautiful admonition for Christians in their voyage and journey through this life:

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

And how many martyrs have endured every form of martyrdom with psalms upon their lips! That which the church in those days failed to furnish in writing towards the exposition of the Psalms, it more than compensated for by preserving the vitality of the Psalms with its blood. Practice made far more rapid progress than theory. <sup>152</sup>

These patristic works are patterns for every age of the true fervour which should characterise the expositor of the Psalms.

The mediaeval church exposition did not make any essential advance upon the patristic. After Cassiodorus, came Haymo (d. 853) and Remigius of Auxerre (d. about 900), still less independent compilers; the commentary of the former, edited by Erasmus, appeared *Trib.* 1531, of the latter, first *Colon.* 1536, and then in the *Bibl. maxima Lugdunensis*. That of Petrus Lombardus (d. about 1160) is a catena taken directly from earlier expositors from Jerome to Alcuin. Of a more independent character are the commentaries of Thomas Aquinas, who however only completed 51 Ps., and Alexander of Hales, if the Commentary which appeared under his name (*Venet.* 1496) is not rather to be attributed to cardinal Hugo. Besides, these, Bonaventura (d. 1274) and Albertus Magnus (d. 1280) stand out prominently in the Middle Ages as expositors of the Psalms; and on the border of the Middle Ages Michael Aygvanus (about 1400) whose commentary has been frequently reprinted since its first appearance, *Mediol.* 1510. If you know one of these expositors, you know them all. The most that they have to offer us is an echo of the earlier writers. By their dependence on the letter of the Vulgate, and consequently indirectly of the LXX, they only too frequently light upon a false track and miss the meaning. The *literalis sensus* is completely buried in *mysticae intelligentiae*. Without observing the distinction between the two economies, the conversion of the Psalms into New Testament language and thought, regardless of the intermediate steps of development, is here continued. Thus, for example, Albertus Magnus in his commentary (*Opp.* t. vii.), on the principle: *Constat, quod totus liber iste de Christo*, at once expounds *Beatus vir* (Psa. 1: 1), and the whole Ps., *de Christo et ejus corpore ecclesia*. But as we find in the Fathers occasional instances of deep insight into the meaning of passages, and occasional flashes of thought of lasting value, so even here the reading, especially of the mystics, will repay one. — The greatest authority in psalm-exposition for the Middle Ages was Augustine. From Augustine, and perhaps we may add from Cassiodorus, Notker Labeo (d. 1022), the monk of St. Gall, drew the short annotations which, verse by verse, accompany his

German translation of the Psalms (vol. ii. of H. Hattemer's *Denkmahle des Mittelalters*). In like manner the Latin Psalter-catena of bishop Bruno of Würzburg (d. 1045), mentioned above, is compiled from Augustine and Cassiodorus, but also from Jerome, Bede and Gregory. And the Syriac annotations to the Psalms of Gregory Barhebraeus (d. 1286), — of which Tullberg and Koraen, Upsala 1842, and Schröter, Breslau 1857, have published specimens, — are merely of importance in connection with the history of exposition, and are moreover in no way distinguished from the mediaeval method.

The mediaeval synagogue exposition is wanting in the recognition of Christ, and consequently in the fundamental condition required for a spiritual understanding of the Psalms. But as we are indebted to the Jews for the transmission of the codex of the Old Testament, we also owe the transmission of the knowledge of Hebrew to them. So far the Jewish interpreters give us what the Christian interpreters of the same period were not able to tender. The interpretations of passages from the Psalms scattered up and down in the Talmud are mostly unsound, arbitrary, and strange. And the Midrash on the Ps., bearing the title **שׁוֹחַר טוֹב** (vid., Zunz, *Vorträge*, § 266 ff.), and the Midrash-catena entitled **יִלְקוּט שְׁמַעוֹנִי** (by Simeon Kara ha-Darshan) is known, and **יִלְקוּט מַכִּירִי** (by Machir b. Abba-Mari), contain far more that is limitlessly digressive than what is to the point and usable. This class of psalm-exposition was always employed for the thoroughly practical end of stimulating and edifying discourse. It is only since about 900 A.D., when indirectly under Syro-Arabian influence, the study of grammar began to be cultivated among the Jews, that the exposition and the application of Scripture began to be disentangled. At the head of this new era of Jewish exegesis stands Saadia Gaon (d. 941-2), from whose Arabic translation and annotations of the Psalm Haneberg (1840) and Ewald (1844) have published extracts. The Karaites, Salmon b. Jerocham and Jefeth, both of whom have also expounded the Psalms, are warm opponents of Saadia; but Jefeth whose commentary on the Psalms <sup>f53</sup> has been in part made known by Bargès (since 1846), nevertheless already recognises the influence of grammar, which Saadia raised to the dignity of a science, but which Salmon utterly discards. The next great expositor of the Psalms is Rashi (i.e., Rabbi Salomo Isaaki) of Troyes (d. 1105), who has interpreted the whole of the Old Testament (except the Chronicles) and the whole of the Talmud; <sup>f54</sup> and he has not only treasured up with pithy brevity the traditional interpretations scattered about in the Talmud and Midrash, but also (especially in the Psalms) made use of every existing grammatico-lexical help. Aben-Ezra of Toledo (d. 1167) and David Kimchi of Narbonne (d. about 1250) are less dependent upon tradition, which for the most part expended itself upon strange interpretations. The



former is the more independent and genial, but seldom happy in his characteristic fancies; the latter is less original, but gifted with a keener appreciation of that which is simple and natural, and of all the Jewish expositors he is the pre-eminently grammatico-historical interpreter. Gecatilia's (Mose ha-Cohen Chiquitilla) commentary on the Psalms written in Arabic is only known to us from quotations, principally in Aben-Ezra. In later commentaries, as those of Mose *Alshêch* (Venice 1601) and Joel Shoëb (Salonica 1569), the simplicity and elegance of the older expositors degenerates into the most repulsive scholasticism. The commentary of Obadia Sforno (d. at Bologna 1550), Reuchlin's teacher, is too much given to philosophising, but is at least withal clear and brief. Their knowledge of the Hebrew gives all these expositors a marked advantage over their Christian contemporaries, but the veil of Moses over their eyes is thicker in proportion to their conscious opposition to Christianity. Nevertheless the church has not left these preparatory works unused. The Jewish Christians, Nicolaus de Lyra (d. about 1340), the author of the *Postillae perpetuae*, and Archbishop Paul de Santa Maria of Burgos (d. 1435), the author of the *Additiones ad Lyram*, took the lead in this respect. Independently, like the last mentioned writers, Augustinus Justinianus of Genoa, in his *Octaplus Psalterii* (Genoa, 1516, folio), drew chiefly from the Midrash and Sohar. The preference however was generally given to the use of Aben-Ezra and Kimchi; e.g., Bucer, who acknowledges his obligation to these, says: *neque enim candidi ingenii est dissimulare, per quos profeceris*. Justinianus, Pagninus, and Felix were the three highest authorities on the original text at the commencement of the Reformation. The first two had gained their knowledge of the original from Jewish sources and Felix Pratensis, whose *Psalterium ex hebreo diligentissime ad verbum fere translatum*, 1522, appeared under Leo X, was a proselyte.

We have now reached the threshold of the Reformation exposition. Psalmody in the reigning church had sunk to a lifeless form of service. The exposition of the Psalms lost itself in the dependency of compilation and the chaos of the schools. *Et ipsa quamvis frigida tractatione Psalmorum* — says Luther in his preface to Bugenhagen's Latin Psalter —

*aliquis tamen odor vitae oblatus est plerisque bonae mentis hominibus,  
et utcunque ex verbis illis etiam non intellectis semper aliquid  
consolationis et aurulae senserunt e Psalmis pii, veluti ex roseto leniter  
spirantis.*

Now, however, when a new light dawned upon the church through the Reformation — the light of a grammatical and deeply spiritual understanding of Scripture, represented in Germany by Reuchlin and in France by Vatablus — then the rose-garden of the Psalter began to breathe forth its perfumes as with the renewed freshness of a May day; and born again from the Psalter,

German hymns resounded from the shores of the Baltic to the foot of the Alps with all the fervour of a newly quickened first-love. "It is marvellous" — says the Spanish Carmelite Thomas à Jesu, — "How greatly the hymns of Luther helped forward the Lutheran cause. Not only the churches and schools echo with them, but even the private houses, the workshops, the markets, streets, and fields." For converted into imperishable hymns (by Luther, Albinus, Franck, Gerhardt, Jonas, Musculus, Poliander, Ringwaldt, and many more) the ancient Psalms were transferred anew into the psalmody of the German as of the Scandinavian <sup>f55</sup>

Lutheran church. In the French church Clément Marot translated into verse 30 Ps., then 19 more (1541-43) and Theodore Beza added the rest (1562). <sup>f56</sup> Calvin introduced the Psalms in Marot's version as early as 1542 into the service of the Geneva church, and the Psalms have since continued to be the favorite hymns of the Reformed church. Goudimel, the martyr of St. Bartholemew's night and teacher of Palestrina, composed the melodies and chorales. The English Established church adopted the Psalms direct as they are, as a portion of its liturgy, the Congregational church followed the example of the sister-churches of the Continent. And how industriously the Psalter was moulded into Greek verse, as by Olympia Morata (d. 1555) <sup>f57</sup> and under the influence of Melanthon <sup>f58</sup> into Latin! The paraphrases of Helius Eoban Hesse (of whom Martin Herz, 1860, has given a biographical sketch), <sup>f59</sup>

Joh. Major, Jacob Micyllus (whose life Classen has written, 1859), Joh. Stigel (whose memory has been revived by Paulus Cassel 1860), Gre. Bersmann (d. 1611), and also that begun by Geo. Buchanan during his sojourn in a Portuguese monastery, are not only learned performances, but productions of an inward spiritual need; although one must assent to the judgment expressed by Harless, that the best attempts of this kind only satisfy one in proportion as we are able first of all to banish the remembrance of the original from our mind.

But since the time of the Reformation the exegetical functions of psalm-exposition have been more clearly apprehended and more happily discharged than ever before. In Luther, who opened his academical lectures in 1514 with the Psa. (in Latin in Luther's own hand writing in Wolfenbüttel) and began to publish a part of them in 1519 under the title *Operationes in duas Psalmorum decades*, the depth of experience of the Fathers is united to the Pauline recognition (which he gave back to the church) of the doctrine of free grace. It is true, he is not entirely free from the allegorising which he rejected *in thesi*, and, in general, from a departure *a sensu literae*, and there is also still wanting in Luther the historical insight into the distinctive character of the two Testaments; but with respect to experimental, mystical, and withal sound, understanding he is incomparable. His interpretations of the Psalms, especially

of the penitential Psalm and of Psalm 90, excel every thing hitherto produced, and are still a perpetual mine of wealth. Bugenhagen's exposition of the Psalms (Basel 1524, 4to. and freq.) continued the interrupted work of Luther, who in a brief but forcible preface says in its praise, that it is the first worthy of the name of an exposition. Penetration and delicacy of judgment distinguish the interpretation of the five books of the Psalms by Aretius Felinus i.e., Martin Bucer (1529, 4to. and freq.). The *Autophyes* (= *a se et per se Existens*), by which throughout he translates פִּינִי, gives it a remarkable appearance. But about the same time, as an exegete, Calvin came forward at the side of the German reformer. His commentary (first published at Geneva 1564) combines with great psychological penetration more discernment of the types and greater freedom of historical perception, but is not without many errors arising from this freedom. Calvin's strict historical method of interpretation becomes a caricature in Esrom Rüdinger, the schoolmaster of the Moravian brethren, who died at Altorf in 1591 without being able, as he had intended, to issue his commentary, which appeared in 1580-81, in a new and revised form. His is an original work which, after trying many conjectures, at last assigns even the first Psalm to the era of the Seleucidae.

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

Not only the two Protestant churches, but also the Romish church took part in the advancing work of psalm-exposition. Its most prominent expositors from 1550-1650 are Genebrardus, Agellius, and De Muis, all of whom possessing a knowledge of the Semitic languages, go back to the original, and Gallarmin, who brings to the work not merely uncommon natural talents, but, within the limits of papistical restraint, a deep spiritual penetration. Later on psalm-

exposition in the Romish church degenerated into scholasticism. This is at its height in Le Blanc's *Psalmorum Davidicorum Analysis* and in Joh. Lorinus' *Commentaria in Psalmos* (6 folio vols. 1665-1676). In the protestant churches, however, a lamentable decline from the spirit of the men of the Reformation in like manner manifested itself. The *Adnotationes uberiores in Hagiographa* (t. i. 1745, 4 to.: Psalm and Prov.) of Joh. Heinrich Michaelis are a mass of raw materials: the glossarial annotations groan beneath the burden of numberless unsifted examples and parallel passages. What had been done during the past sixteen hundred years remains almost entirely unnoticed; Luther is not explored, even Calvin within the pale of his own church no longer exerts any influence over the exposition of Scripture. After 1750, the exposition of Scripture lost that spiritual and ecclesiastical character which had gained strength in the seventeenth century, but had also gradually become torpid; whereas in the Romish church, as the Psalm-expositions of De Sacy, Berthier and La Harpe show, it never sank so low as to deny the existence of revealed religion. That love for the Ps., which produced the evangelical hymn-psalter of that truly Christian poet and minister Christoph Karl Ludwig von Pfeil (1747),<sup>160</sup> prefaced by Bengel, degenerated to a merely literary, or at most poetical, interest, — exegesis became carnal and unspiritual. The remnant of what was spiritual in this age of decline, is represented by Burk in his *Gnomon* to the Psa. (1760) which follows the model of Bengel, and by Chr. A. Crusius in the second part of his *Hypomnemata ad Theologiam Propheticam* (1761), a work which follows the track newly opened up by Bengel, and is rich in germs of progressive knowledge (vid., my *Biblisches-prophetische Theologie*, 1845). We may see the character of the theology of that age from Joh. Dav. Michaelis' translation of the Old Testament, with notes for the unlearned (1771), and his writings on separate Psalms. From a linguistic and historical point of view we may find something of value here; but besides, only wordy, discursive, tasteless trifling and spiritual deadness. It has been the honour of Herder that he has freed psalm-exposition from this want of taste, and the merit of Hengstenberg (first of all in his Lectures), that he has brought it back out of this want of spirituality to the believing consciousness of the church.

The transition to modern exposition is marked by Rosenmüller's *Scholia* to the Psa. (first published in 1798-1804), a compilation written in pure clear language with exegetical tact and with a thankworthy use of older expositors who had become unknown, as Rüdinger, Bucer, and Agellius, and also of Jewish writers. De Wette's commentary on the Psalms (first published in 1811, 5th edition by Gustav Baur, 1856) was far more independent and forms an epoch in exegesis. De Wette is precise and clear, and also not without a perception of the beautiful; but his position in relation to the Scripture writers is too much like that of a reviewer, his research too sceptical, and his estimate of the Psalm does not sufficiently recognise their place in the history of

redemption. He regards them as national hymns, partly in the most ordinary patriotic sense, and when his theological perception fails him, he helps himself out with sarcasm against the theocratic element, which he carries to the extreme of disgust. Nevertheless, De Wette's commentary opens up a new epoch so far as it has first of all set in order the hitherto existing chaos of psalm-exposition, and introduced into it taste and grammatical accuracy, after the example of Herder and under the influence of Gesenius. He is far more independent than Rosenmüller, who though not wanting in taste and tact, is only a compiler. In investigating the historical circumstances which gave rise to the composition of the different psalms, De Wette is more negative than assumptive. Hitzig in his historical and critical commentary (1835. 36), which has appeared recently in a revised form (Bd. 1, 1863, Bd. 2. Abth. 1, 1864, Abth. 2, 1865), has sought to supplement positively the negative criticism of De Wette, by ascribing to David fourteen Psalm of the seventy three that bear the inscription לַדָּוִד, assigning all the Psalm from the 73 onwards, together with 1, 2, 60 (these three, as also 142-144, 150, by Alexander Jannæus) to the Maccabean period (e.g., 138-141 to Alexander's father, Joh. Hyrcanus), and also inferring the authors (Zechariah, 2Ch. 26: 5; Isaiah, Jeremiah) or at least the date of composition of all the rest.

Von Lengerke, in his commentary compiled half from Hengstenberg, half from Hitzig (1847), has attached himself to this so-called positive criticism, which always arrives at positive results and regards Maccabean psalms as the primary stock of the Psalter. Von Lengerke maintains that not a single Psalm can with certainty be ascribed to David. Olshausen (in his *Comment.* 1853), who only leaves a few Ps., as 2, 20, 21, to the time of the kings prior to the Exile, and with a propensity, which he is not able to resist, brings down all the others to the time of the Maccabees, even to the beginning of the reign of Joh. Hyrcanus, also belongs to the positive school. Whereas Hupfeld in his commentary, 1855-1862 (4 vols.), considers it unworthy of earnest investigation, to lower one's self to such "childish trifling with hypotheses" and remains true to De Wette's negative criticism: but he seeks to carry it out in a different way. He also maintains that none of the Psalm admit of being with certainty ascribed to David; and proceeds on the assumption, that although only a part of the inscriptions are false, for that very reason none of them can be used by us.

We stand neither on the side of this scepticism, which everywhere negatives tradition, nor on the side of that self-confidence, which mostly negatives it and places in opposition to it its own positive counter-assumptions; but we do not on this account fail to recognise the great merit which Olshausen, Hupfeld and Hitzig have acquired by their expositions of the Psalms. In Olshausen we prize his prominent talent for critical conjectures; in Hupfeld grammatical

thoroughness, and solid study so far as it is carried; in Hitzig the stimulating originality everywhere manifest, his happy perspicacity in tracing out the connection of the thoughts, and the marvellous amount of reading which is displayed in support of the usage of language and of that which is admissible according to syntax. The commentary of Ewald (*Poetische Bücher*, 1839, 40. 2nd edition 1866), apart from the introductory portion, according to its plan only fragmentarily meets the requirements of exposition, but in the argument which precedes each Psalm gives evidence of a special gift for piercing the emotions and throbbings of the heart and entering into the changes of feeling.

None of these expositors are in truly spiritual *rapport* with the spirit of the psalmists. The much abused commentary of Hengstenberg 1842-1847 (4 vols. 2nd edition 1849-1852) consequently opened a new track, in as much as it primarily set the exposition of the Psalms in its right relation to the church once more, and was not confined to the historico-grammatical function of exposition. The kindred spirited works of Umbreit (*Christliche Erbauung aus dem Psalter* 1835) and Stier (*Siebenzig Psalmen* 1834. 36), which extend only to a selection from the Psalms, may be regarded as its forerunners, and the commentary of Tholuck (1847) who excludes verbal criticism and seeks to present the results of exegetical progress in a practical form for the use of the people, as its counterpart. For the sake of completeness we may also mention the commentary of Köster (1837) which has become of importance for its appreciation of the artistic form of the Psalms, especially the strophe-system, and Vaihinger's (1845). Out of Germany, no work on the Psalms has appeared which could be placed side by side with those of Hengstenberg, Hupfeld and Hitzig. And yet the inexhaustible task demands the combined work of many hands. Would that the examples set by Björk, by Perret-Gentil, Armand deo Mestral and J. F. Thrupp, of noble rivalry with German scholarship might find many imitators in the countries of the Scandinavian, Latin, and English tongues! Would that the zealous industry of Bade and Reinke, the noble endeavours so Schegg and König, might set an example to many in the Romish church! Would that also the Greek church on the basis of the criticism of the LXX defended by Pharmakides against Oikonomos, far surpassing the works on the Psalm of Nicodimos and Anthimos, which are drawn from the Fathers, might continue in that rival connection with German scholarship of which the Prolegomena to the Psalm-commentary of the Jerusalem patriarch Anthimos, by Dionysios Kleopas (Jerusalem 1855. 4to.) give evidence! *Non plus ultra* is the watchword of the church with regard to the word of God, and *plus ultra* is its watchword with regard to the understanding of that word. Common work upon the Scriptures is the finest union of the severed churches and the surest harbinger of their future unity. The exposition of Scripture will rear the Church of the Future.

## § 10. Theological Preliminary Considerations

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

We will consider 1) the relation of the Psalms to the prophecy of the future Christ. When man whom God had created, had corrupted himself by sin, God did not leave him to that doom of wrath which he had chosen for himself, but visited him on the evening of that most unfortunate of all days, in order to make that doom the disciplinary medium of His love. This visitation of Jahve Elohim was the first step in the history of redemption towards the goal of the incarnation, and the so-called protevangelium was the first laying of the foundation of His verbal revelation of law and gospel — a revelation in accordance with the plan of salvation, and preparing the way towards this goal of the incarnation and the recovery of man. The way of this salvation, which

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

The fact that among all the Davidic psalms there is only a single one, viz., Psalm 110, in which David (as in his last words 2Sa. 23: 1-7) looks forth into the future of his seed and has the Messiah definitely before his mind, can only be explained by the consideration, that he was hitherto himself the object of Messianic hope, and that this hope was first gradually (especially in consequence of his deep fall) separated from himself individually, and transferred to the future. Therefore when Solomon came to the throne the Messianic desires and hopes of Israel were directed towards him, as Psalm 72 shows; they belonged only to the one final Christ of God, but they clung for a long time enquiringly and with a perfect right (on the ground of 2 Samuel 7) to the direct son of David. Also in Psalm 45 it is a son of David, contemporary with the Korahite singer, to whom the Messianic promise is applied as a marriage benediction, wishing that the promise may be realized in him.

But it soon became evident that He, in whom the full realization of the idea of the Messiah is to be found, had not yet appeared either in the person of this king or of Solomon. And when in the later time of the kings the Davidic line became more and more inconsistent with its vocation in the sacred history, then the hope of the Messiah was completely weaned of its expectation of immediate fulfilment, and the present became merely the dark ground from which the image of the Messiah, as purely future, stood forth in relief. The **בְּיָדוֹ**, in whom the prophecy of the later time of the kings centres, and whom also Psalm ch. 2 sets forth before the kings of the earth that they may render homage to Him, is an eschatological character (although the **אַחֲרֵיתוֹ** was looked for as dawning close upon the border of the present). In the mouth



of the congregation Psalm 45 and 132, since their contents referred to the future, have become too prophetically and eschatologically Messianic. But it is remarkable that the number of these psalms which are not merely typically Messianic is so small, and that the church of the period after the Exile has not enriched the Psalter with a single psalm that is Messianic in the stricter sense. In the later portion of the Psalter, in distinction from the strictly Messianic psalms, the theocratic psalms are more numerous represented, i.e., those psalms which do not speak of the kingdom of Jahve's Anointed which shall conquer and bless the world, not of the Christocracy, in which the theocracy reaches the pinnacle of its representation, but of the theocracy as such, which is complete inwardly and outwardly in its own representation of itself, — not of the advent of a human king, but of Jahve Himself, with the kingdom of God manifest in all its glory. For the announcement of salvation in the Old Testament runs on in two parallel lines: the one has as its termination the Anointed of Jahve, who rules all nations out of Zion, the other, the Lord Himself sitting above the Cherubim, to whom all the earth does homage. These two lines do not meet in the Old Testament; it is only the fulfilment that makes it plain, that the advent of the Anointed one and the advent of Jahve is one and the same. And of these two lines the divine is the one that preponderates in the Psalter; the hope of Israel, especially after the kingship had ceased in Israel, is directed generally beyond the human mediation directly towards Jahve, the Author of salvation. The fundamental article of the Old Testament faith runs **ישועתה ליהוה** (Psa. 3: 9, Jon. 2:10). The Messiah is not yet recognised as a God-man. Consequently the Psalms contain neither prayer to Him, nor prayer in His name. But prayer to Jahve and for Jahve's sake is essentially the same. For Jesus is in Jahve. Jahve is the Saviour. And the Saviour when he shall appear, is nothing but the visible manifestation of the **ישועה** of this God (Isa. 49: 6).

In considering the goal of the Old Testament history in its relation to the God-man, we distinguish five classes of psalms which are directed towards this goal. After 2 Samuel 7 the Messianic promise is no longer in a general way connected with the tribe of Judah, but with David; and is referred not merely to the endless duration of his kingdom, but also to one scion of his house, in whom that to which God has appointed the seed of David in its relation to Israel first, and from Israel to all the other nations, shall be fully realised, and without whom the kingdom of David is like a headless trunk. Psalms in which the poet, looking beyond his own age, comforts himself with the vision of this king in whom the promise is finally fulfilled, we call eschatological psalms, and in fact directly eschatologically Messianic psalms. These connect themselves not merely with the already resisting prophetic utterances, but carry

them even further, and are only distinguished from prophecy proper by their lyric form; for prophecy is a discourses and the psalms are spiritual songs.

The Messianic character of the Psalms is, however, not confined to prophecy proper, the subject of which is that which is future. Just as nature exhibits a series of stages of life in which the lower order of existence points to the next order above it and indirectly to the highest, so that, for instance, in the globular form of a drop we read the intimation of the struggle after organism, as it were, in the simplest barest outline: so also the progress of history is typical, and not only as a whole, but also most surprisingly in single traits, the life of David is a *vaticinium reale* of the life of Him, whom prophecy calls directly עבדי דוד Eze. 34:23 f., 37:24 f. and דוד מלכם Hos. 3: 5, Jer. 30: 9, as the David who is, as it were, raised from the dead in a glorified form. Those psalms in which David himself (or even a poet throwing himself into David's position and mood) gives expression in lyric verse to prominent typical events and features of his life, we call typically Messianic psalms. This class, however, is not confined to those, of which David is directly or indirectly the subject, for the course of suffering of all the Old Testament saints, and especially of the prophets in their calling (vid., on 34:20 f. and Psalm 69), was to a certain extent a τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. All these psalms, not less than those of the first class, may be quoted in the New Testament with the words ἵνα πληρωθῆ, with this difference only, that in the former it is the prophetic word, in the latter the prophetic history, that is fulfilled. The older theologians, especially the Lutheran, contended against the supposition of such typological citations of the Old Testament in the New: they were destitute of that perception of the organic element in history granted to our age, and consequently were lacking in the true counterpoise to their rigid notions of inspiration.

But there is also a class of Psalms which we call typico-prophetically Messianic, viz., those in which David, describing his outward and inward experiences, — experiences even in themselves typical, — is carried beyond the limits of his individuality and present condition, and utters concerning himself that which, transcending human experience, is intended to become historically true only in Christ. Such psalms are typical, in as much as their contents is grounded in the individual, but typical, history of David; they are, however, at the same time prophetic, in as much as they express present individual experience in laments, hopes, and descriptions which point far forward beyond the present and are only fully realised in Christ. The psychological possibility of such psalms has been called in question; but they would only be psychologically impossible, if one were obliged to suppose that David's self-consciousness must under such circumstances pass over into that of his antitype; but it is in reality quite otherwise. As the poet in order to describe his experiences in verse, idealises them, i.e., seizes the idea of them at

the very root, and, stripping off all that is adventitious and insignificant, rises into the region of the ideal: so David also in these psalms idealises his experiences, which even in itself results in the reduction of them to all that is essential to their continuance as types. This he does, however, not from his own poetic impulse, but under the inspiration of the Spirit of God; and a still further result which follows from this is, that the description of his typical fortunes and their corresponding states of feeling is moulded into the prophetic description of the fortunes and feelings of his antitype.

Beside these three classes of Messianic psalms one may regard psalms like 45 and 72 as a fourth class of indirectly eschatologically Messianic psalms. They are those in which, according to the time of their composition, Messianic hopes are referred to a contemporary king, but without having been fulfilled in him; so that, in the mouth of the church, still expecting their final accomplishment, these psalms have become eschatological hymns and their exposition as such, by the side of their chronological interpretation, is fully warranted.

A fifth class is formed by the eschatologically Jehovic psalms, which are taken up with describing the advent of Jahve and the consummation of His kingdom, which is all through brought about by judgment (vid., Psalm 93). The number of these psalms in the Psalter greatly preponderates. They contain the other premiss to the divine-human end of the history of salvation. There are sudden flashes of light thrown upon this end in the prophets. But it remains reserved to the history itself to draw the inference of the *unio personalis* from these human and divine premises. The Redeemer, in whom the Old Testament faith reposed, is Jahve. The centre of the hope lay in the divine not in the human king. That the Redeemer, when He should appear, would be God and man in one person was alien to the mind of the Old Testament church. And the perception of the fact that He would be sacrifice and priest in one person, only penetrates in single rays into the Old Testament darkness, the cynosure of which is יהוה, and יהוה' only.

Coming now to consider 2) the relation of the Psalms to the legal sacrifice, we shall find this also different from what we might expect from the stand-point of fulfilment. Passages certainly are not wanting where the outward legal sacrifice is acknowledged as an act of worship on the part of the individual and of the congregation (Psa. 66:15; 51:21); but those occur more frequently, in which in comparison with the λογική λατρεία it is so lightly esteemed, that without respect to its divine institution it appears as something not at all desired by God, as a shell to be cast away, and as a form to be broken in pieces (Psa. 40: 7 f., 50, 51:18 f.). But it is not this that surprises us. It is just in this respect that the psalms contribute their share towards the progress of sacred

history. It is that process of spiritualisation which beings even in Deuteronomy, and which is continued by reason of the memorable words of Samuel, 1Sa. 15:22 f. It is the spirit of the New Testament, growing more and more in strength, which here and in other parts of the Psalter shakes the legal barriers and casts off the **στοιχῆα τοῦ κόσμου** as a butterfly does its chrysalis shell. But what is substituted for the sacrifice thus criticised and rejected? Contrition, prayer, thanksgiving, yielding one's self to God in the doing of His will, as Pro. 21: 3 to do justly, Hos. 6: 6 kindness, Mic. 6: 6-8 acting justly, love, and humility, Jer. 7:21-23 obedience. This it is that surprises one. The disparaged sacrifice is regarded only as a symbol not as a type; it is only considered in its ethical character, not in its relation to the history of redemption. Its nature is unfolded only so far as it is a gift to God (**קרבן**), not so far as the offering is appointed for atonement (**כפרה**); in one word: the mystery of the blood remains undisclosed. Where the New Testament mind is obliged to think of the sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ, it is, in Psa. 51: 9, the sprinkling of the legal ritual of purification and atonement that is mentioned, and that manifestly figuratively but yet without the significance of the figure. Whence is it? — Because the sacrifice with blood, as such, in the Old Testament remains a question to which Isaiah, in Isaiah 53, gives almost the only distinct answer in accordance with its historical fulfilment; for passages like Dan. 9:24 ff., Zec. 12:10; 13: 7 are themselves questionable and enigmatical. The prophetic representation of the passion and sacrifice of Christ is only given in direct prophetic language thus late on, and it is only the evangelic history of the fulfilment that shows, how exactly the Spirit which spoke by David has moulded that which he says concerning himself, the type, into correspondence with the antitype. The confidence of faith under the Old Testament, as it finds expression in the Psalms, rested upon Jahve even in reference to the atonement, as in reference to redemption in general. As He is the Saviour, so is He also the one who makes the atonement (**מכפר**), from whom expiation is earnestly sought and hoped for (Psa. 79: 9; 65: 4; 78:38; 85: 3 and other passages). It is Jahve who at the end of His course of the redemptive history is the God-man, and the blood given by Him as the medium of atonement (Lev. 17:11) is, in the antitype, His own blood.

Advancing from this point, we come to examine 3) the relation of the Psalms to the New Testament righteousness of faith and to the New Testament morality which flows from the primary command of infinite love. Both with respect to the atonement and to redemption the Psalms undergo a complete metamorphosis in the consciousness of the praying New Testament church — a metamorphosis, rendered possible by the unveiling and particularising of salvation that has since taken place, and to which they can without any reserve be accommodated. There are only two points in which the prayers of the

Psalms appear to be difficult of amalgamation with the Christian consciousness. These are the moral self-confidence bordering on self-righteousness, which is frequently maintained before God in the Psalms, and the warmth of feeling against enemies and persecutors which finds vent in fearful cursings. The self-righteousness here is a mere appearance; for the righteousness to which the psalmists appeal is not the merit of works, not a sum of good works, which are reckoned up before God as claiming a reward, but a godly direction of the will and a godly form of life, which has its root in the surrender of one's whole self to God and regards itself as the operation and work of justifying, sanctifying, preserving and ruling grace (Psa. 73:25 f., 25: 5-7; 19:14 and other passages). There is not wanting an acknowledgement of the innate sinfulness of our nature (Psa. 51: 7), of the man's exposure to punishment before God apart from His grace (Psa. 143: 2), of the many, and for the most part unperceived, sins of the converted (Psa. 19:13), of the forgiveness of sins as a fundamental condition to the attainment of happiness (Psa. 32: 1 f.), of the necessity of a new divinely-created heart (Psa. 51:12), in short, of the way of salvation which consists of penitential contrition, pardon, and newness of life.

On the other hand it is not less true, that in the light of the vicarious atonement and of the Spirit of regeneration it becomes possible to form a far more penetrating and subtle moral judgment of one's self; it is not less true, that the tribulation, which the New Testament believer experiences, though it does not produce such a strong and overwhelming sense of divine wrath as that which is often expressed in the psalms, nevertheless sinks deeper into his inmost nature in the presence of the cross on Golgotha and of the heaven that is opened up to him, in as much as it appears to him to be sent by a love that chastens, proves, and prepares him for the future; and it is not less true, that after the righteousness of God — which takes over our unrighteousness and is accounted even in the Old Testament as a gift of grace — lies before us for believing appropriation as a righteousness redemptively wrought out by the active and passive obedience of Jesus, the distinctive as well as the reciprocally conditioned character of righteousness of faith and of righteousness of life is become a more clearly perceived fact of the inner life, and one which exercises a more powerful influence over the conduct of that life. <sup>f61</sup>

Nevertheless even such personal testimonies, as Psa. 17: 1-5, do not resist conversion into New Testament forms of thought and experience, for they do not hinder the mind from thinking specially, at the same time, of righteousness of faith, of God's acts which are performed through the medium of sacraments, and of that life resulting from the new birth, which maintains itself victorious in the old man; moreover the Christian ought to be himself earnestly warned

by them to examine himself whether his faith is really manifest as an energising power of a new life; and the difference between the two Testaments loses its harshness even here, in the presence of the great verities which condemn all moral infirmity, viz., that the church of Christ is a community of the holy, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin, and that whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin.

But as to the so-called imprecatory psalms, <sup>f62</sup> in the position occupied by the Christian and by the church towards the enemies of Christ, the desire for their removal is certainly outweighed by the desire for their conversion: but assuming, that they will not be converted and will not anticipate their punishment by penitence, the transition from a feeling of love to that of wrath is warranted in the New Testament (e.g., Gal. 5:12), and assuming their absolute Satanic hardness of heart the Christian even may not shrink from praying for their final overthrow. For the kingdom of God comes not only by the way of mercy but also of judgment; and the coming of the kingdom of God is the goal of the Old as well as of the New Testament saint (vid., 9:21; 59:14 and other passages), and every wish that judgment may descend upon those who oppose the coming of the kingdom of God is cherished even in the Psalms on the assumption of their lasting impenitence (vid., 7:13 f., 109:17). Where, however, as in Psalm 69 and 109, the imprecations go into particulars and extend to the descendants of the unfortunate one and even on to eternity, the only justification of them is this, that they flow from the prophetic spirit, and for the Christian they admit of no other adoption, except as, reiterating them, he gives the glory to the justice of God, and commends himself the more earnestly to His favour.

Also 4) the relation of the Psalms to the Last Things is such, that in order to be used as prayer expressive of the New Testament faith they require deepening and adjusting. For what Julius Africanus says of the Old Testament: οὐδέπω δέδοτο ἐλπίς ἀναστάσεως σαφῆς, holds good at least of the time before Isaiah. For Isaiah is the first to foretell, in one of his latest apocalyptic cycles (Isaiah 24-27), the first resurrection, i.e., the re-quickening of the martyr-church that has succumbed to death (Isa. 26:19), just as with an extended vision he foretells the termination of death itself (Isa. 25: 8); and the Book of Daniel — that Old Testament apocalypse, sealed until the time of its fulfilment — first foretells the general resurrection, i.e., the awakening of some to life and others to judgment (Dan. 12: 2). Between these two prophecies comes Ezekiel's vision of Israel's return from the Exile under the figure of a creative quickening of a vast field of corpses (Ezekiel 37) — a figure which at least assumes that what is represented is not impossible to the wonder-working power of God, which is true to His promises. But also in the latest psalms the perception of salvation nowhere appears to have made such advance, that these

words of prophecy foretelling the resurrection should have been converted into a dogmatic element of the church's belief. The hope, that the bones committed, like seed, to the ground would spring forth again, finds expression first only in a bold, but differently expressed figure (Psa. 141: 7); the hopeless darkness of *Sheôl* (Psa. 6: 6; 30:10; 88:11-13) remained unilluminated, and where deliverance from death and Hades is spoken of, what is meant is the preservation of the living, either experienced (e.g., Psa. 86:13) or hoped for (e.g., Psa. 118:17) from falling a prey to death and Hades, and we find in connection with it other passages which express the impossibility of escaping this universal final destiny (Psa. 89:49). The hope of eternal life after death is nowhere definitely expressed, as even in the Book of Job the longing for it is never able to expand into a hope, because no light of promise shines into that night, which reigns over Job's mind, — a night, which the conflict of temptation through which he is passing makes darker than it is in itself. The pearl which appears above the waves of temptation is only too quickly swallowed up again by them.

Also in the Psalms we find passages in which the hope of not falling a prey to death is expressed so broadly, that the thought of the final destiny of all men being inevitable is completely swallowed up by the living one's confidence of living in the strength of God (Psa. 56:14 and esp. 16: 9-11); passages in which the covenant relation with Jahve is contrasted with this present life and its possession, in such a manner that the opposite of a life extending beyond the present time is implied (Psa. 17:14 f., 63: 4); passages in which the end of the ungodly is compared with the end of the righteous as death and life, defeat and triumph (Psa. 49:15), so that the inference forces itself upon one, that the former die although they seem to live for ever, and the latter live for ever although they die at once; and passage in which the psalmist, though only by way of allusion, looks forward to a being borne away to God, like Enoch and Elijah (Psa. 49:16; 73:24). Nowhere, however, is there any general creed to be found, but we see how the belief in a future life struggles to be free, at first only, as an individual conclusion of the believing mind from premises which experience has established. And far from the grave being penetrated by a glimpse of heaven, it has, on the contrary, to the ecstasy of the life derived from God, as it were altogether vanished; for life in opposition to death only appears as the lengthening of the line of the present *ad infinitum*. Hence it is that we no more find in the Psalms than in the Book of Job a perfectly satisfactory theodicy with reference to that distribution of human fortunes in this world, which is incompatible with God's justice. — Psalm ch. 7, 49, 73 certainly border on the right solution of the mystery, but it stops short at mere hint and presage, so that the utterances that touch upon it admit of different interpretation. <sup>163</sup>

But on the other hand, death and life in the mind of the psalmists are such deep-rooted notions (i.e., taken hold of at the very roots, which are grounded in the principles of divine wrath and divine love), that it is easy for the New Testament faith, to which they have become clear even to their back ground of hell and heaven, to adjust and deepen the meaning of all utterances in the Psalms that refer to them. It is by no means contrary to the meaning of the psalmist when, as in passages like Psa. 6: 6, Gehenna is substituted for Hades to adapt it to the New Testament saint; for since the descent of Jesus Christ into Hades there is no longer any *limbus patrum*, the way of all who die in the Lord is not earthwards but upwards, Hades exists only as the vestibule of hell. The psalmists indeed dread it, but only as the realm of wrath or of seclusion from god's love, which is the true life of man. Nor is it contrary to the idea of the poets to think of the future vision of God's face in all its glory in Psa. 17:15 and of the resurrection morn in Psa. 49:15; for the hopes expressed there, though to the Old Testament consciousness they referred to this side the grave, are future according to their New Testament fulfilment, which is the only truly satisfying one. There is, as Oetinger says, no essential New Testament truth not contained in the Psalms either *voï* (according to its unfolded meaning), or at least *πνεύματι*. The Old Testament barrier encompasses the germinating New Testament life, which at a future time shall burst it. The eschatology of the Old Testament leaves a dark background, which, as is designed, is divided by the New Testament revelation into light and darkness, and is to be illumined into a wide perspective extending into the eternity beyond time. Everywhere, where it begins to dawn in this eschatological darkness of the Old Testament, it is the first morning rays of the New Testament sun-rise which is already announcing itself. The Christian also here cannot refrain from leaping the barrier of the psalmists, and understanding the Psalms according to the mind of the Spirit whose purpose in the midst of the development of salvation and of the perception of it, is directed towards its goal and consummation. Thus understood the Psalms are the hymns of the New Testament Israel as of the Old. The church by using the language of the Psalms in supplication celebrates the unity of the two Testaments, and scholarship in expounding them honours their distinctiveness. Both are in the right; the former in regarding the Psalms in the light of the one great salvation, the latter in carefully distinguishing the eras in the history, and the steps in the perception, of this salvation.

## EXPOSITION OF THE PSALTER

*Cum consummaverit homo, tunc incipiet, et cum quieverit, aperiabitur (novis aperiis urgebatur).*

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



# First Book of the Psalter

## PSALMS 1-41

### Psalm 1

#### THE RADICALLY DISTINCT LOT OF THE PIOUS AND THE UNGODLY

*1: 1 BLESSED is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly,  
And standeth not in the way of sinners,  
And sitteth not in the company of scorers,*

*1: 2 But his delight is in the Law of Jahve  
And in His Law doth he meditate day and night —*

*1: 3 And he is like a tree planted by the water-courses,  
Which bringeth forth its fruit in its season,  
And its leaf withereth not,  
And whatsoever he doeth, he carrieth through.*

*1: 4 Not thus are the ungodly,  
But they are like the chaff which the wind driveth away.*

*1: 5 Therefore the ungodly cannot stand in the judgment,  
Nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous;*

*1: 6 For Jahve knoweth the way of the righteous,  
But the way of the ungodly perisheth.*

The collection of the Psalms and that of the prophecies of Isaiah resemble one another in the fact, that the one begins with a discourse that bears no superscription, and the other with a Psalm of the same character; and these form the prologues to the two collections. From Act. 13:33, where the words: *Thou art My Son...* are quoted as being found *ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ*, we see that in early times Psalm chp. 1 was regarded as the prologue to the collection. The reading *ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ*, rejected by Griesbach, is an old correction. But this way of numbering the Psalms is based upon tradition. A scholium from Origen and Eusebius says of Psalm chp. 1 and 2: *ἐν τῷ Εβραϊκῷ συνημμένοι*, and just so Apollinaris:

*Ἐπιγραφῆς ὁ ψαλμὸς εὐρέθη δίχα,  
HīnwmeĀnoj deĀ toiĪj par' EĪbraiĀoij stiĀxoij.*

For it is an old Jewish way of looking at it, as Albertus Magnus observes: *Psalmus primus incipit a beatitudine et terminatur a beatitudine*, i.e., it begins with *שׁוּב* Psa. 1: 1 and ends with *שׁוּב* Psa. 2:12, so that consequently

Psalm chp. 1 and 2, as is said in *B. Berachoth 9b* (cf. *Jer. Taanith ii. 2*), form one Psalm (חדא פרשה). As regards the subject-matter this is certainly not so. It is true Psalm chp. 1 and 2 coincide in some respects (in the former יהגה, in the latter יהגו; in the former ותאבדו דרך ... ודרך, in the latter ודרך; in the former אשרי at the beginning, in the latter, at the end), but these coincidences of phraseology are not sufficient to justify the conclusion of unity of authorship (Hitz.), much less that the two Psalms are so intimately connected as to form one whole. These two anonymous hymns are only so far related, as that the one is adapted to form the *proaemium* of the Psalter from its ethical, the other from its prophetic character. The question, however, arises whether this was in the mind of the collector. Perhaps Psalm ch. 2 is only attached to Psalm 1 on account of those coincidences; Psalm 1 being the proper prologue of the Psalter in its pentateuchal arrangement after the pattern of the *Tôra*. For the Psalter is the Yea and Amen in the form of hymns to the word of God given in the *Tôra*. Therefore it begins with a Psalm which contrasts the lot of him who loves the *Tôra* with the lot of the ungodly, — an echo of that exhortation, *Jos. 1: 8*, in which, after the death of Moses, Jahve charges his successor Joshua to do all that is written in the book of the *Tôra*. As the New Testament sermon on the Mount, as a sermon on the spiritualized Law, begins with μακάριοι, so the Old Testament Psalter, directed entirely to the application of the Law to the inner life, begins with אשרי. The First book of the Psalms begins with two אשרי Psa. 1: 1; 2:12, and closes with two אשרי Psa. 40: 5; 41: 2. A number of Psalms begin with אשרי, Psalm 32, 41, 112, 119, 128; but we must not therefore suppose the existence of a special kind of *ashrê*-psalms; for, e.g., Psalm 32 is a משכיל, Psalm 112 a *Hallelujah*, Psalm 128 a שיר המעלות .

As regards the time of the composition of the Psalm, we do not wish to lay any stress on the fact that *2Ch. 22: 5* sounds like an allusion to it. But 1st, it is earlier than the time of Jeremiah; for Jeremiah was acquainted with it. The words of curse and blessing, *Jer. 17: 5-8*, are like an expository and embellished paraphrase of it. It is customary with Jeremiah to reproduce the prophecies of his predecessors, and more especially the words of the Psalms, in the flow of his discourse and to transform their style to his own. In the present instance the following circumstance also favours the priority of the Psalm: Jeremiah refers the curse corresponding to the blessing to Jehoiakim and thus applies the Psalm to the history of his own times. It is 2ndly, not earlier than the time of Solomon. For לצים occurring only here in the whole Psalter, a word which came into use, for the unbelievers, in the time of the Chokma (vid., the definition of the word, *Pro. 21:24*), points us to the time of Solomon and onwards. But since it contains no indications of contemporary history

whatever, we give up the attempt to define more minutely the date of its composition, and say with St. Columba (against the reference of the Psalm to Joash the *protegé* of Jehoiada, which some incline to): *Non audiendi sunt hi, qui ad excludendam Psalmorum veram expositionem falsas similitudines ab historia petitas conantur inducere.* <sup>f64</sup>

*Psa. 1: 1-3.* The exclamatory אֲשֶׁרִי, as also Psa. 32: 2; 40: 5, Pro. 8:34, has *Gaja* (*Metheg*) by the *Aleph*, and in some Codd. even a second by וְ, because it is intended to be read *ash'rê* as an exception, on account of the significance of the word (Baer, in *Comm.* ii. 495). It is the construct of the *pluralet*. אֲשֶׁרִים (from אָשַׁר, cogn. יָשַׁר, כָּשַׁר, to be straight, right, well-ordered), and always in the form אֲשֶׁרִי, even before the light suffixes (Olsh. § 135, c), as an exclamation: O the blessedness of so and so. The man who is characterised as blessed is first described according to the things he does not do, then (which is the chief thought of the whole Ps.) according to what he actually does: he is not a companion of the unrighteous, but he abides by the revealed word of God. רִשְׁעִים are the godless, whose moral condition is lax, devoid of stay, and as it were gone beyond the reasonable bounds of true unity (wanting in stability of character), so that they are like a tossed and stormy sea, Isa. 57:20 f.; <sup>f65</sup>

חַטָּאִים (from the *sing.* חַטָּא, instead of which חַטָּא is usually found) sinners, ἁμαρτωλοί, who pass their lives in sin, especially coarse and manifest sin; לְצַיִם (from לִיץ, as מַת from מוֹת) scoffers, who make that which is divine, holy, and true a subject of frivolous jesting. The three appellations form a climax: *impii corde, peccatores opere, illusores ore*, in accordance with which עֲצָה (from נָאץ *figere, statuere*), resolution, bias of the will, and thus way of thinking, is used in reference to the first, as in Job. 21:16; 22:18; in reference to the second, דְּרָךְ mode of conduct, action, life; in reference to the third, מְנַשֵּׁב which like the Arabic *méglis* signifies both seat (Job. 29: 7) and assembling (Psa. 107:32), be it official or social (cf. 26: 4 f., Jer. 15:17). On בְּ הַלֵּךְ, in an ethical sense, cf. Mic. 6:16, Jer. 7:24. Therefore: Blessed is he who does not walk in the state of mind which the ungodly cherish, much less that he should associate with the vicious life of sinners, or even delight in the company of those who scoff at religion. The description now continues with כִּי אֵם (*imo si*, Ges. § 155, 2, 9): but (if) his delight is, = (substantival instead of the verbal clause:) he delights (בְּ חִפְּזוֹ cf. Arab. *chfd.f. i.* with the primary notion of firmly adhering, vid., on Job. 40:17) in תּוֹרַת ה', the teaching of Jahve, which is become Israel's νόμος, rule of life; in this he meditates profoundly by day and night (two *acc.* with the old accusative terminations *am*

and *ah*). The *perff.* in v. 1 describe what he all along has never done, the *fut.* **יְהַגֵּה**, what he is always striving to do; **יְהַגֵּה** of a deep (cf. Arab. *hij*, *depressum esse*), dull sound, as if vibrating between within and without, here signifies the quiet soliloquy (cf. Arab. *hjs*, *mussitando secum loqui*) of one who is searching and thinking.

With **יְהַגֵּה**, <sup>f66</sup> in v. 3, the development of the **אֲשֶׁר־י** now begins; it is the *praet. consec.*: he becomes in consequence of this, he is thereby, like a tree planted beside the water-courses, which yields its fruit at the proper season and its leaf does not fall off. In distinction from **נִמְוָא**, according to *Jalkut* § 614, **שְׂתוּל** means firmly planted, so that no winds that may rage around it are able to remove it from its place (**אֵין מְזִיזִין אֹתוֹ מִמְקוֹמוֹ**). In **פְּלָגֵי מַיִם**, both **מַיִם** and the plur. serve to give intensity to the figure; **פְּלָג** (Arab. *fal'g*, from **פָּלַג** to divide, Job. 38:25) means the brook meandering and cleaving its course for itself through the soil and stones; the *plur.* denotes either one brook regarded from its abundance of water, or even several which from different directions supply the tree with nourishing and refreshing moisture. In the relative clause the whole emphasis does not rest on **בְּעֵתוֹ** (Calvin: *imp̄ii, licet praecoces fructus ostendent, nihil tamen producunt nisi abortivum*), but **פְּרִיּוֹ** is the first, **בְּעֵתוֹ** the second tone-word: the fruit which one expects from it, it yields (equivalent to **יַעֲשֶׂה** it produces, elsewhere), and that at its appointed, proper time (= **בְּעֵדָתוֹ**, for **עֵת** is = **עֵדָת** or **עֵדָתָהּ**, like **לְדָתָהּ**, **רְדָתָהּ**, from **וָאָדָהּ**), without ever disappointing that hope in the course of the recurring seasons. The clause **וְעֵלְהוֹ לֹא יִבּוֹל** is the other half of the relative clause: and its foliage does not fall off or wither (**נִבּוֹל** like the synon. Arab. *abl*, from the root **בָּל**).

The green foliage is an emblem of faith, which converts the water of life of the divine word into sap and strength, and the fruit, an emblem of works, which gradually ripen and scatter their blessings around; a tree that has lost its leaves, does not bring its fruit to maturity. It is only with **וְכָל**, where the language becomes unemblematic, that the man who loves the Law of God again becomes the direct subject. The accentuation treats this member of the verse as the third member of the relative clause; one may, however, say of a thriving plant **צָלַח**, but not **הִצְלִיחַ**. This *Hiph.* (from **צָלַח**, Arab. *slh*, to divide, press forward, press through, vid., 45: 5) signifies both causative: to cause anything to go through, or prosper (Gen. 34:23), and transitive: to carry through, and intransitive: to succeed, prosper (Jud. 18: 5). With the first meaning, Jahve would be the subject; with the third, the project of the righteous; with the middle one, the righteous man himself. This last is the most natural: everything he takes in hand he brings to a successful issue (an expression like 2Ch. 7:11;

31:21, Dan. 8:24). What a richly flowing brook is to the tree that is planted on its bank, such is the word of God to him who devotes himself to it: it makes him, according to his position and calling, ever fruitful in good and well-timed deeds and keeps him fresh in his inner and outward life, and whatsoever such an one undertakes, he brings to a successful issue, for the might of the word and of the blessing of God is in his actions.

*Psa. 1: 4-6.* The ungodly (הרשעים, with the demonstrative art.) are the opposite of a tree planted by the water-courses: they are כַּפְמִץ, like chaff (from מוץ to press out), which the wind drives away, viz., from the loftily situated threshing-floor (Isa. 17:13), i.e., without root below, without fruit above, devoid of all the vigour and freshness of life, lying loose upon the threshing-floor and a prey of the slightest breeze, — thus utterly worthless and unstable. With אֶל־כֶּבֶן an inference is drawn from this moral characteristic of the ungodly: just on account of their inner worthlessness and instability they do not stand בַּמִּשְׁפָּט. This is the word for the judgment of just recompense to which God brings each individual man and all without exception with all their words (Ecc. 12:14), — His righteous government, which takes cognisance of the whole life of each individual and the history of nations and recompenses according to desert. In this judgment the ungodly cannot stand (קום to continue to stand, like עָמַד Psa. 130: 3 to keep one's self erect), nor sinners בַּעֲדַת צְדִיקִים. The congregation (עדה = *idah*, from נָאֵד, נָאֵד) of the righteous is the congregation of Jahve (עֲדַת ה'), which, according to its nature which is ordained and inwrought by God, is a congregation of the righteous, to which consequently the unrighteous belong only outwardly and visibly: οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, οὐτοὶ Ἰσραήλ, Rom. 9: 6. God's judgment, when and wheresoever he may hold it, shall trace back this appearance to its nothingness. When the time of the divine decision shall come, which also separates outwardly that which is now inwardly separate, viz., righteous and unrighteous, wheat and chaff, then shall the unrighteous be driven away like chaff before the storm, and their temporary prosperity, which had no divine roots, come to a fearful end. For Jahve knoweth the way of the righteous, יוֹדֵא as in Psa. 37:18, Mat. 7:23, 2Ti. 2:19, and frequently. What is intended is, as the schoolmen say, a *nosse con affectu et effectu*, a knowledge which is in living, intimate relationship to its subject and at the same time is inclined to it and bound to it by love. The way, i.e., the life's course, of the righteous has God as its goal; God knows this way, which on this very account also unflinchingly reaches its goal. On the contrary, the way of the ungodly הַתֵּאֵבֵד, perishes, because left to itself, — goes down to אֶבְדוֹן, loses itself, without reaching the goal set before it, in darkest night. The way of the righteous only

is **דֶּרֶךְ עוֹלָם**, Psa. 139:24, a way that ends in eternal life. Psalm 112 which begins with **אִשְׁרֵי** ends with the same fearful **תֵּאבֵד**.

## Psalm 2

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

*2: 1 WHY do the people rage,  
And the nations imagine a vain thing?!*

*2: 2 The kings of the earth rise in rebellion,  
And the rulers take counsel together —  
Against Jahve and against His Anointed.*

*2: 3 “Up! let us burst their bands asunder,  
And cast away their cords from us!”*

*2: 4 He who is enthroned in the heavens laughs,  
The Lord hath them in derision.*

*2: 5 Then shall He speak to them in His wrath,  
And thunder them down in His hot displeasure:*

*2: 6 “And yet have I set My King  
Upon Zion, My holy hill.”*

#### (THE DIVINE KING:)

*2: 7 “I will speak concerning a decree!  
Jahve saith unto me: Thou art My Son,  
This day have I begotten Thee.*

*2: 8 Demand of Me, and I will give  
Thee the nations for Thine inheritance,  
And the ends of the earth for Thy possession.*

*2: 9 Thou shalt break them with an iron sceptre,  
Like a potter’s vessel shalt Thou dash them in pieces.”*

*2:10 And now, O ye kings, be wise,  
Be admonished, ye judges of the earth!*

*2:11 Serve Jahve with fear,  
And rejoice with trembling.*

*2:12 Kiss the Son, lest He be angry and ye perish,  
For His wrath may kindle suddenly —  
Blessed are all they who hide in Him!*

The didactic Psalm 1 which began with **אֲשֶׁר־**, is now followed by a prophetic Psalm, which closes with **אֲשֶׁר־**. It coincides also in other respects with Psalm 1, but still more with Psalms of the earlier time of the kings (Psa. 59: 9; 83: 3-9) and with Isaiah's prophetic style. The rising of the confederate nations and their rulers against Jahve and His Anointed will be dashed to pieces against the imperturbable all-conquering power of dominion, which Jahve has entrusted to His King set upon Zion, His Son. This is the fundamental thought, which is worked out with the vivid directness of dramatic representation. The words of the singer and seer begin and end the Psalm. The rebels, Jahve, and His Anointed come forward, and speak for themselves; but the framework is formed by the composer's discourse, which, like the chorus of the Greek drama, expresses the reflexions and feelings which are produced on the spectators and hearers. The poem before us is not purely lyric. The personality of the poet is kept in the background. The Lord's Anointed who speaks in the middle of the Psalm is not the anonymous poet himself. It may, however, be a king of the time, who is here regarded in the light of the Messianic promise, or that King of the future, in whom at a future period the mission of the Davidic kingship in the world shall be fulfilled: at all events this Lord's Anointed comes forward with the divine power and glory, with which the Messiah appears in the prophets.

The Psalm is anonymous. For this very reason we may not assign it to David (Hofm.) nor to Solomon (Ew.); for nothing is to be inferred from Act. 4:25, since in the New Testament "hymn of David" and "psalm" are co-ordinate ideas, and it is always far more hazardous to ascribe an anonymous Psalm to David or Solomon, than to deny to one inscribed **לְדָוִד** or **לְשֹׁלֹמֹה** direct authorship from David or Solomon. But the subject of the Psalm is neither David (Kurtz) nor Solomon (Bleek). It might be David, for in his reign there is at least one coalition of the peoples like that from which our Psalm takes its rise, vid., 2Sa. 10: 6: on the contrary it cannot be Solomon, because in his reign, though troubled towards its close (1Ki. 11:14 ff.), no such event occurs, but would then have to be inferred to have happened from this Psalm. We might rather guess at Uzziah (Meier) or Hezekiah (Maurer), both of whom inherited the kingdom in a weakened condition and found the neighbouring peoples alienated from the house of David. The situation might correspond to these times, for the rebellious peoples, which are brought before us, have been hitherto subject to Jahve and His Anointed. But all historical indications which might support the one supposition or the other are wanting. If the God-anointed one, who speaks in v. 7, were the psalmist himself, we should at least know the Psalm was composed by a king filled with a lofty Messianic consciousness. But the dramatic movement of the Psalm up to the **וְעַתָּה** (v. 10) which follows, is opposed to such an identification of the God-anointed

one with the poet. But that Alexander Jannaeus (Hitz.), that blood-thirsty ruler, so justly hated by his people, who inaugurated his reign by fratricide, may be both at the same time, is a supposition which turns the moral and covenant character of the Psalm into detestable falsehood. The Old Testament knows no kingship to which is promised the dominion of the world and to which sonship is ascribed (2Sa. 7:14, Psa. 89:28), but the Davidic. The events of his own time, which influenced the mind of the poet, are no longer clear to us. But from these he is carried away into those tumults of the peoples which shall end in all kingdoms becoming the kingdom of God and of His Christ (Rev. 11:15; 12:10).

In the New Testament this Psalm is cited more frequently than any other. According to Act. 4:25-28, vv. 1 and 2 have been fulfilled in the confederate hostility of Israel and the Gentiles against Jesus the holy servant of God and against His confessors. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, Psalm 110 and 2 stand side by side, the former as a witness of the eternal priesthood of Jesus after the order of Melchisedek, the latter as a witness of His sonship, which is superior to that of the angels. Paul teaches us in Act. 13:33, comp. Rom. 1:4, how the “to-day” is to be understood. The “to-day” according to its proper fulfilment, is the day of Jesus’ resurrection. Born from the dead to the life at the right hand of God, He entered on this day, which the church therefore calls *dies regalis*, upon His eternal kingship.

The New Testament echo of this Psalm however goes still deeper and further. The two names of the future One in use in the time of Jesus, ὁ Χριστός and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, Joh. 1:50, Mat. 26:63 (in the mouth of Nathanael and of the High Priest) refer back to this Psalm and Dan. 9:25, just as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου incontrovertibly refers to Psa. 8:5 and Dan. 7:13. The view maintained by De Wette and Hupfeld, that the Psalm is not applicable to the Christian conceptions of the Messiah, seems almost as though these were to be gauged according to the authoritative utterances of the professorial chair and not according to the language of the Apostles. Even in the Apocalypse, Psa. 19:15; 12:5, Jesus appears exactly as this Psalm represents Him, as ποιμαίνων τὰ ἔθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ. The office of the Messiah is not only that of Saviour but also of Judge. Redemption is the beginning and the judgment the end of His work. It is to this end that the Psalm refers. The Lord himself frequently refers in the Gospels to the fact of His bearing side by side with the sceptre of peace and the shepherd’s staff, the sceptre of iron also, Mat. 24:50 f., 21:44, Luke 19:27. The day of His coming is indeed a day of judgment — the great day of the ὀργὴ τοῦ ἀγνίου, Rev. 6:17, before which the ultra-spiritual Messianic creations of enlightened exegetes will melt away, just as the carnal Messianic hopes of the Jews did before His first coming.



*Psa. 2: 1-3.* The Psalm begins with a seven line strophe, ruled by an interrogative Wherefore. The mischievous undertaking condemns itself, It is groundless and fruitless. This certainty is expressed, with a tinge of involuntary astonishment, in the question. לָמָּה followed by a *praet.* enquires the ground of such lawlessness: wherefore have the peoples banded together so tumultuously (Aquila: ἔθορυσθήθησαν)? and followed by a *fut.*, the aim of this ineffectual action: wherefore do they imagine emptiness? רִיק might be adverbial and equivalent to לָרִיק, but it is here, as in Psa. 4: 3, a governed accusative; for הִנְהָה which signifies in itself only quiet inward musing and yearning, expressing itself by a dull muttering (here: something deceitful, as in 38:13), requires an object. By this רִיק the involuntary astonishment of the question justifies itself: to what purpose is this empty affair, i.e., devoid of reason and continuance? For the psalmist, himself a subject and member of the divine kingdom, is too well acquainted with Jahve and His Anointed not to recognise beforehand the unwarrantableness and impotency of such rebellion. That these two things are kept in view, is implied by v. 2, which further depicts the position of affairs without being subordinated to the לָמָּה. The *fut.* describes what is going on at the present time: they set themselves in position, they take up a defiant position (הִתְנַצַּב as in 1Sa. 17:16), after which we again (comp. the reverse order in Psa. 83: 6) have a transition to the *perf.* which is the more uncoloured expression of the actual: נוֹסֵד (with יָחַד as the exponent of reciprocity) prop. to press close and firm upon one another, then (like Arab. *sâwada*, which, according to the correct observation of the Turkish Kamus, in its signification *clam cum aliquo locutus est*, starts from the very same primary meaning of pressing close to any object): to deliberate confidentially together (as Psa. 31:14 and נוֹאֵץ 71:10). The subjects מְלִכֵי-אֶרֶץ and רוֹזְנִים (according to the Arabic *razuna*, to be weighty: the grave, dignitaries, *σεμνοί*, *augusti*) are only in accordance with the poetic style without the article. It is a general rising of the people of the earth against Jahve and His מְשִׁיחַ, Χριστός, the king anointed by Him by means of the holy oil and most intimately allied to Him. The psalmist hears (v. 3) the decision of the deliberating princes. The pathetic suff. *êmō* instead of *êhém* refers back to Jahve and His Anointed. The cohortatives express the mutual kindling of feeling; the sound and rhythm of the exclamation correspond to the dull murmur of hatred and threatening defiance: the rhythm is iambic, and then anapaestic. First they determine to break asunder the fetters (מִסְרֹת = מִסְרֹת) to which the אֵת, which is significant in the poetical style, points, then to cast away the cords from them (מִמֶּנּוּ *a nobis*, this is the Palestinian mode of writing, whereas the Babylonians said and wrote מִמֶּנּוּ *a nobis* in distinction from מִמֶּנּוּ *ab eo*, B. Sota 35a) partly with the vexation of captives, partly with the triumph of freedmen. They

are, therefore, at present subjects of Jahve and His Anointed, and not merely because the whole world is Jahve's, but because He has helped His Anointed to obtain dominion over them. It is a battle for freedom, upon which they are entering, but a freedom that is opposed to God.

*Psa. 2: 4-6.* Above the scene of this wild tumult of battle and imperious arrogance the psalmist in this six line strophe beholds Jahve, and in spirit hears His voice of thunder against the rebels. In contrast to earthly rulers and events Jahve is called **יֹשֵׁב בַּשָּׁמַיִם** : He is enthroned above them in unapproachable majesty and ever-abiding glory; He is called **אֲדֹנָי** as He who controls whatever takes place below with absolute power according to the plan His wisdom has devised, which brooks no hindrance in execution. The *futt.* describe not what He will do, but what He does continually (cf. Isa. 18: 4 f.). **לְמוֹ** also belongs, according to Psa. 59: 9; 37:13, to **יִשְׁחַק** (**שַׁחַק** which is more usual in the post-pentateuchal language = **צַחַק**). He laughs at the defiant ones, for between them and Him there is an infinite distance; He derides them by allowing the boundless stupidity of the infinitely little one to come to a climax and then He thrusts him down to the earth undeceived. This climax, the extreme limit of the divine forbearance, is determined by the **אֲזַ**, as in Deu. 29:19, cf. **שָׁ** 14: 5; 36:13, which is a “then” referring to the future and pointing towards the crisis which then supervenes. Then He begins at once to utter the actual language of His wrath to his foes and confounds them in the heat of His anger, disconcerts them utterly, both outwardly and in spirit. **בְּהִל**, Arab. *bhl*, cogn. **בָּלַה**, means originally to let loose, let go, then in Hebrew sometimes, externally, to overthrow, sometimes, of the mind, to confound and disconcert.

*Psa. 2: 5.* V. 5a is like a peal of thunder (cf. Isa. 10:33); **בְּחֲרוֹנוֹ**, 5b, like the lightning's destructive flash. And as the first strophe closed with the words of the rebels, so this second closes with Jahve's own words. With **וְאֲנִי** begins an adverbial clause like Gen. 15: 2; 18:13, Psa. 50:17. The suppressed principal clause (cf. Isa. 3:14; Ew. § 341, c) is easily supplied: ye are revolting, whilst notwithstanding I.... With **וְאֲנִי** He opposes His irresistible will to their vain undertaking. It has been shown by Böttcher, that we must not translate “I have anointed” (Targ., Symm.). **נָסַךְ**, Arab. *nsk*, certainly means to pour out, but not to pour upon, and the meaning of pouring wide and firm (of casting metal, libation, anointing) then, as in **הַצִּיִּק, הַצִּיִּג**, goes over into the meaning of setting firmly in any place (*fundere* into *fundare, constituere*, as LXX, Syr., Jer., and Luther translate), so that consequently **נָסִיךְ** the word for prince cannot be compared with **מְשִׁיחַ**, but with **נָצִיב**.<sup>f67</sup>

The Targum rightly inserts **וּמִנִּיתִיהָ** (*et praefeci eum*) after **רַבִּיתִי** (*unxi*), for the place of the anointing is not **אֶל־צִיּוֹן**. History makes no mention of a king of Israel being anointed on Zion. Zion is mentioned as the royal seat of the Anointed One; there he is installed, that He may reign there, and rule from thence, 110: 2. It is the hill of the city of David (2Sa. 5: 7, 9, 1Ki. 8: 1) including Moriah, that is intended. That hill of holiness, i.e., holy hill, which is the resting-place of the divine presence and therefore excels all the heights of the earth, is assigned to Him as the seat of His throne.

**Psa. 2: 7-9.** The Anointed One himself now speaks and expresses what he is, and is able to do, by virtue of the divine decree. No transitional word or formula of introduction denotes this sudden transition from the speech of Jahve to that of His Christ. The psalmist is the seer: his Psalm is the mirrored picture of what he saw and the echo of what he heard. As Jahve in opposition to the rebels acknowledges the king upon Zion, so the king on Zion appeals to Him in opposition to the rebels. The name of God, **יְהוָה**, has *Rebia magnum* and, on account of the compass of the full intonation of this accent, a *Gaja* by the *Shebâ* (comp. **אֱלֹהֵי** Psa. 25: 2, **אֱלֹהִים** Psa. 68: 8, **אֲדֹנָי** Psa. 90: 1). <sup>f68</sup>

The construction of **סִפֵּר** with **אֶל** (as Psa. 69:27, comp. **אָמַר** Gen. 20: 2, Jer. 27:19, **דִּבֶּר** 2Ch. 32:19, **הוֹדִיעַ** Isa. 38:19): to narrate or make an announcement with respect to... is minute, and therefore solemn. Self-confident and fearless, he can and will oppose to those, who now renounce their allegiance to him, a **חֶק**, i.e., an authentic, inviolable appointment, which can neither be changed nor shaken. All the ancient versions, with the exception of the Syriac, read **חֶק־יְהוָה** together. The line of the strophe becomes thereby more symmetrical, but the expression loses in force. **אֶל־חֶק** rightly has *Olewejored*. It is the amplificative use of the noun when it is not more precisely determined, known in Arabic grammar: such a decree! majestic as to its author and its matter. Jahve has declared to Him: **בְּנִי אַתָּה** <sup>f69</sup>, and that on the definite day on which He has begotten or born him into this relationship of son. The verb **יָלַד** (with the changeable vowel *i* <sup>f70</sup>) unites in itself, like **γεννᾶν**, the ideas of begetting and bearing (LXX **γενγέννηκα**, Aq. **ἔτεκον**); what is intended is an operation of divine power exalted above both, and indeed, since it refers to a setting up (**נִסָּךְ**) in the kingship, the begetting into a royal existence, which takes place in and by the act of anointing (**מִשָּׁח**). Whether it be David, or a son of David, or the other David, that is intended, in any case 2 Samuel 7 is to be accounted as the first and oldest proclamation of this decree; for there David, with reference to his own anointing, and at the same time with the promise of everlasting dominion, receives the witness of the

eternal sonship to which Jahve has appointed the seed of David in relation to Himself as Father, so that David and his seed can say to Jahve: אָבִי אֲתָהּ, Thou art my Father, Psa. 89:27, as Jahve can to him: בְּנִי אֲתָהּ, Thou art My son. From this sonship of the Anointed one to Jahve, the Creator and Possessor of the world, flows His claim to and expectation of the dominion of the world. The cohortative, natural after challenges, follows upon שָׂאֵל, Ges. § 128, 1. Jahve has appointed the dominion of the world to His Son: on His part therefore it needs only the desire for it, to appropriate to Himself that which is allotted to Him. He needs only to be willing, and that He is willing is shown by His appealing to the authority delegated to Him by Jahve against the rebels. This authority has a supplement in v. 9, which is most terrible for the rebellious ones. The *suff.* refer to the גְּוִיִּם, the ἑθνη, sunk in heathenism. For these his sceptre of dominion (Psa. 90: 2) becomes a rod of iron, which will shatter them into a thousand pieces like a brittle image of clay (Jer. 19:11). With נִפֵּץ alternates רָאָע (= רָאָץ *frangere*), *fut.* תָּרָא; whereas the LXX (Syr., Jer.), which renders ποιμανεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ (as 1Co. 4:21) σοδοηρᾶ, points it תְּרָעָם from רָעָה. The staff of iron, according to the Hebrew text the instrument of punitive power, becomes thus with reference to שֶׁבֶט as the shepherd's staff Psa. 23: 4, Mic. 7:14, an instrument of despotism.

**Psa. 2:10-12.** The poet closes with a practical application to the great of the earth of that which he has seen and heard. With אֲתָהּ, καὶ σὺν (1Jo. 2:28), *itaque*, appropriate conclusions are drawn from some general moral matter of fact (e.g., Pro. 5: 7) or some fact connected with the history of redemption (e.g., Isa. 28:22). The exhortation is not addressed to those whom he has seen in a state of rebellion, but to kings in general with reference to what he has prophetically seen and heard. שֹׁפְטֵי אֶרֶץ are not those who judge the earth, but the judges, i.e., rulers (Amo. 2: 3, cf. 1: 8), belonging to the earth, throughout its length or breadth. The *Hiph.* הִשְׁבִּיל signifies to show intelligence or discernment; the *Niph.* נִוָּסַר as a so-called *Niph. tolerativum*, to let one's self be chastened or instructed, like נוֹאֵץ Pro. 13:10, to allow one's self to be advised, נִדְרָשׁ Eze. 14: 3, to allow one's self to be sought, נִמְצָא to allow one's self to be found, 1Ch. 28: 9, and frequently. This general call to reflection is followed, in v. 11, by a special exhortation in reference to Jahve, and in v. 12, in reference to the Son. עֲבְדוּ and גִּילוּ answer to each other: the latter is not according to Hos. 10: 5 in the sense of חִילוּ Psa. 96: 9, but, — since “to shake with trembling” (Hitz.) is a tautology, and as an imperative גִּילוּ everywhere else signifies: rejoice, — according to Psa. 100: 2, in the sense of rapturous manifestation of joy at the happiness and honour of being

permitted to be servants of such a God. The LXX correctly renders it: ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ. Their rejoicing, in order that it may not run to the excess of security and haughtiness, is to be blended with trembling (צָרָה as Zep. 3:17), viz., with the trembling of reverence and self-control, for God is a consuming fire, Heb. 12:28.

The second exhortation, which now follows, having reference to their relationship to the Anointed One, has been missed by all the ancient versions except the Syriac, as though its clearness had blinded the translators, since they render בָּר, either בָּר purity, chastity, discipline (LXX, Targ., Ital., Vulg.), or בָּר pure, unmixed (Aq., Symm., Jer.: *adore pure*). Thus also Hupfeld renders it “yield sincerely,” whereas it is rendered by Ewald “receive wholesome warning,” and by Hitzig “submit to duty” (בָּר like the Arabic *birr* = בָּר); Olshausen even thinks, there may be some mistake in בָּר, and Diestel decides for בּו instead of בָּר. But the context and the usage of the language require *osculamini filium*. The *Piel* נִשָּׂק means to kiss, and never anything else; and while בָּר in Hebrew means purity and nothing more, and בָּר as an adverb, *pure*, cannot be supported, nothing is more natural here, after Jahve has acknowledged His Anointed One as His Son, than that בָּר (Pro. 31: 2, even בָּר = בְּנִי) — which has nothing strange about it when found in solemn discourse, and here helps one over the dissonance of בֵּן בֵּן — should, in a like absolute manner to אֱחָד, denote the unique son, and in fact the Son of God.

<sup>f71</sup>

The exhortation to submit to Jahve is followed, as Aben-Ezra has observed, by the exhortation to do homage to Jahve’s Son. To kiss is equivalent to to do homage. Samuel kisses Saul (1Sa. 10: 1), saying that thereby he does homage to him. <sup>f72</sup>

The subject to what follows is now, however, not the Son, but Jahve. It is certainly at least quite as natural to the New Testament consciousness to refer “lest He be angry” to the Son (vid., Rev. 6:16 f.), and since the warning against putting trust (הַסֹּתָה) in princes, Psal. 118: 9; Psal. 146: 3, cannot be applied to the Christ of God, the reference of בּו to Him (Hengst.) cannot be regarded as impossible. But since בְּהַסָּה is the usual word for taking confiding refuge in Jahve, and the future day of wrath is always referred to in the Old Testament (e.g., 110: 5) as the day of the wrath of God, we refer the *ne irascatur* to Him whose son the Anointed One is; therefore it is to be rendered: lest Jahve be angry and ye perish דָּרְדָּר. This דָּרְדָּר is the *accus.* of more exact definition. If the way of any one perish. Psal. 1: 6, he himself is lost with regard to the way,

since this leads him into the abyss. It is questionable whether **בְּמִשְׁכָּה** means “for a little” in the sense of *brevi* or *facile*. The *usus loquendi* and position of the words favour the latter (Hupf.). Everywhere else **בְּמִשְׁכָּה** means by itself (without such additions as in Ezr. 9: 8, Isa. 26:20, Eze. 16:47) “for a little, nearly, easily.” At least this meaning is secured to it when it occurs after hypothetical antecedent clauses as in Psa. 81:15, 2Sa. 19:37, Job. 32:22. Therefore it is to be rendered: for His wrath might kindle easily, or might kindle suddenly. The poet warns the rulers in their own highest interest not to challenge the wrathful zeal of Jahve for His Christ, which according to v. 5 is inevitable. Well is it with all those who have nothing to fear from this outburst of wrath, because they hide themselves in Jahve as their refuge. The construct state **חֹסֵי** connects **בּוֹ**, without a genitive relation, with itself as forming together one notion, Ges. § 116, 1. **חֹסֵהוּ** the usual word for fleeing confidently to Jahve, means according to its radical notion not so much *refugere*, *confugere*, as *se abdere*, *condere*, and is therefore never combined with **אֶל**, but always with **בְּ**.<sup>f73</sup>

## Psalm 3

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

**3: 2** *JAHVE, how many are my oppressors!  
Many rise up against me,*

**3: 3** *Many say of my soul:  
“There is no help for him in God”. (Sela)*

**3: 4** *But Thou, O Jahve, art a shield for me,  
My glory and the lifter up of my head.*

**3: 5** *I cried unto Jahve with my voice  
And He answered me from His holy hill. (Sela)*

**3: 6** *I laid me down, and slept;  
I awaked, for Jahve sustaineth me.*

**3: 7** *I will not be afraid of ten thousands of the people  
Who have set themselves against me round about.*

**3: 8** *Arise, O Jahve, help me, O my God!  
For Thou smitest all mine enemies on the cheek,  
Thou breakest the teeth of the ungodly.*

**3: 9** *To Jahve belongeth salvation —  
Upon Thy people be Thy blessing! (Sela)*

The two Psalms forming the prologue, which treat of cognate themes, the one ethical, from the standpoint of the **חכמה**, and the other related to the history of redemption from the standpoint of the **נבואה**, are now followed by a morning prayer; for morning and evening prayers are surely the first that one expects to find in a prayer- and hymn-book. The morning hymn, Psalm ch. 3, which has the mention of the “holy hill” in common with Psalm ch. 2, naturally precedes the evening hymn Psalm ch. 4; for that Psalm ch. 3 is an evening hymn as some are of opinion, rests on grammatical misconception.

With Psalm ch. 3, begin, as already stated, the hymns arranged for music. By **מְזֻמָּר לְדָוִד**, a *Psalm of David*, the hymn which follows is marked as one designed for musical accompaniment. Since **מְזֻמָּר** occurs exclusively in the inscriptions of the Psalms, it is no doubt a technical expression coined by David. **זָמַר** (root **זם**) is an onomatopoeic word, which in *Kal* signifies to cut off, and in fact to prune or lop (the vine) (cf. Arabic *zbr*, to write, from the buzzing noise of the style or reed on the writing material). The signification of singing and playing proper to the *Piel* are not connected with the signification “to nip.” For neither the rhythmical division (Schultens) nor the articulated speaking (Hitz.) furnish a probable explanation, since the caesura and syllable are not natural but artificial notions, nor also the nipping of the strings (Böttch., Ges.), for which the language has coined the word **נָנַן** (of like root with **נָנַע**). Moreover, the earliest passages in which **זָמַר** and **זִמְרָה** occur (Gen. 43:11, Exo. 15: 2, Jud. 5: 3), speak rather of song than music and both words frequently denote song in distinction from music, e.g., *Psa.* 98: 5; 81: 3, cf. *Son.* 2:12. Also, if **זָמַר** originally means, like *ψάλλειν*, *carpere (pulsare) fides*, such names of instruments as Arab. *zemr* the hautboy and *zummâra* the pipe would not be formed. But **זִמְרָה** means, as Hupfeld has shown, as indirect an onomatope as *canere*, “to make music” in the widest sense; the more accurate usage of the language, however, distinguishes **זָמַר** and **שָׁיר** as to play and to sing. With **בַּ** of the instrument **זָמַר** denotes song with musical accompaniment (like the Aethiopic **זָמַר** *instrumento canere*) and **זִמְרָה** (Aram. **זָמַר**) is sometimes, as in *Amo.* 5:23, absolutely: music. Accordingly **מְזֻמָּר** signifies technically the music and **שָׁיר** the words. And therefore we translate the former by “Psalm,” for *ὁ ψαλμός ἐστίν* — says Gregory of Nyssa — *ἡ δια τοῦ ὄργανου τοῦ μουσικοῦ μελωδία, ὡδὴ δὲ ἡ δια στόματος γενομένου τοῦ μέλους μετὰ ῥημάτων ἐκφώνησις*.

That Psalm ch. 3 is a hymn arranged for music is also manifest from the **סְלָה** which occurs here 3 times. It is found in the Psalter, as Bruno has correctly calculated, 71 times (17 times in the 1st book, 30 in the 2nd, 20 in the 3rd, 4 in

the 4th) and, with the exception of the anonymous Psalm 66, 67, always in those that are inscribed by the name of David and of the psalmists famed from the time of David. That it is a marginal note referring to the Davidic Temple-music is clearly seen from the fact, that all the Psalms with סלה have the לַמְנִצֵּחַ which relates to the musical execution, with the exception of eight (32, 48, 50, 82, 83, 87, 89, 143) which, however, from the designation מְזוֹמָר are at least manifestly designed for music. The Tephilla of Habbakuk, Psalm ch. 3, the only portion of Scripture in which סלה occurs out of the Psalter, as an exception has the לַמְנִצֵּחַ at the end. Including the three סלה of this tephilla, the word does not occur less than 74 times in the Old Testament.

Now as to the meaning of this musical *nota bene*, 1st, every explanation as an abbreviation, — the best of which is = סֹב לַמַּעְלָה הַשָּׁרָה (turn thyself towards above i.e., towards the front, O Singer! therefore: *da capo*), — is to be rejected, because such abbreviations fail of any further support in the Old Testament. Also 2ndly, the derivation from שָׁלָה = סָלָה *silere*, according to which it denotes a pause, or orders the singers to be silent while the music strikes up, is inadmissible, because סלה in this sense is neither Hebrew nor Aramaic and moreover in Hebrew itself the interchange of ש with ס (שָׁרִיזוֹן, סָרִיזוֹן) is extremely rare. There is but one verbal stem with which סָלָה can be combined, viz., סָלַל or סָלָה (סָלָה). The primary notion of this verbal stem is that of lifting up, from which, with reference to the derivatives סָלַל a ladder and מַסְלָה in the signification an ascent, or steps, 2Ch. 9:11, comes the general meaning for סָלָה, of a musical rise. When the tradition of the Mishna explains the word as a synonym of נִצְחָה and the Targum, the Quinta, and the Sexta (and although variously Aquila and sometimes the Syriac version) render it in accordance therewith “for ever (always),” — in favour of which Jerome also at last decides, *Ep. ad Marcellam* “*quid sit Sela*”, — the original musical signification is converted into a corresponding logical or lexical one. But it is apparent from the διάψαλμα of the LXX (adopted by Symm., Theod., and the Syr.), that the musical meaning amounts to a strengthening of some kind or other; for διάψαλμα signifies, according to its formation (-μα -μενον), not the pause as Gregory of Nyssa defines it: ἡ μεταξὺ τῆς ψαλμωδίας γενομένη κατὰ τὸ ἄθροον ἐπιρέμησις πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ θεόθεν ἐπικρινομένου νοήματος, but either the interlude, especially of the stringed instruments, (like διαύλιον [διαύλειον], according to Hesychius the interlude of the flutes between the choruses), or an intensified playing (as διαψάλλειν τριγώνοις is found in a fragment of the comedian Eupolis in Athenaeus of the strong play of triangular harps).<sup>174</sup>



According to the pointing of the word as we now have it, it ought apparently to be regarded as a noun סַל with the *ah* of direction (synonymous with גָּוָה, up! Job. 22:29); for the omission of the *Dagesh* beside the *ah* of direction is not without example (cf. 1Ki. 2:40 גָּתָה which is the proper reading, instead of גִּתָה, and referred to by Ewald) and the ׀, with *Dag. forte implicitum*, is usual before liquids instead of ׀, as בִּדְנָה Gen. 28: 2, הָרָה Gen. 14:10 instead of *paddannah*, *harrah*, as also בְּרַמְלָה 1Sa. 25: 5 instead of בִּרְמָלָה. But the present pointing of this word, which is uniformly included in the accentuation of the Masoretic verse, is scarcely the genuine pointing: it looks like an imitation of נִצָּח. The word may originally have been pronounced סָלָה (*elevatio* after the form בִּתְלָה, בְּדָלָה). The combination הַגִּיּוֹן סָלָה 9:17, in which הַגִּיּוֹן refers to the playing of the stringed instruments (Psa. 92: 4) leads one to infer that סָלָה is a note which refers not to the singing but to the instrumental accompaniment. But to understand by this a heaping up of weighty expressive accords and powerful harmonies in general, would be to confound ancient with modern music. What is meant is the joining in of the orchestra, or a reinforcement of the instruments, or even a transition from *piano* to *forte*.

Three times in this Psalm we meet with this Hebrew *forte*. In sixteen Psalms (7, 10, 21, 44, 47, 48, 50, 54, 60, 61, 75, 81, 82, 83, 85, 143) we find it only once; in fifteen Psalms (4, 9, 24, 39, 49, 52, 55, 57, 59, 62, 67, 76, 84, 87, 88), twice; in but seven Psalms (3, 32, 46, 56, 68, 77, 140 and also Hab. 3), three times; and only in one (89), four times. It never stands at the beginning of a Psalm, for the ancient music was not as yet so fully developed, that סָלָה should absolutely correspond to the *ritornello*. Moreover, it does not always stand at the close of a strophe so as to be the sign of a regular interlude, but it is always placed where the instruments are to join in simultaneously and take up the melody — a thing which frequently happens in the midst of the strophe. In the Psalm before us it stands at the close of the 1st, 2nd, and 4th strophes. The reason of its omission after the third is evident.

Not a few of the Psalms bear the date of the time of the persecution under Saul, but only this and probably Psalm 63 have that of Absalom. The Psalter however contains other Psalms which reflect this second time of persecution. It is therefore all the more easy to accept as tradition the inscription: *when he fled before Absalom, his son*. And what is there in the contents of the Psalm against this statement? All the leading features of the Psalm accord with it, viz., the mockery of one who is rejected of God 2Sa. 16: 7 f., the danger by night 2Sa. 17: 1, the multitudes of the people 2Sa. 15:13; 17:11, and the high position of honour held by the psalmist. Hitzig prefers to refer this and the

following Psalm to the surprise by the Amalekites during David's settlement in Ziklag. But since at that time Zion and Jerusalem were not free some different interpretation of v. 5b becomes necessary. And the fact that the Psalm does not contain any reference to Absalom does not militate against the inscription. It is explained by the tone of 2Sa. 19: 1 [18:33 Engl.]. And if Psalms belonging to the time of Absalom's rebellion required any such reference to make them known, then we should have none at all.

**Psa. 3: 2-3.** The first strophe contains the lament concerning the existing distress. From its combination with the exclamative **רָבוּ מָה** is accented on the *ultima* (and also in Psa. 104:24); the accentuation of the *perf.* of verbs **עַע** very frequently (even without the *Waw consec.*) follows the example of the strong verb, Ges. § 67 rem. 12. A declaration then takes the place of the summons and the **רָבִים** implied in the predicate **רָבוּ** now becomes the subject of participial predicates, which more minutely describe the continuing condition of affairs. The **לְ** of **לְנַפְשִׁי** signifies "in the direction of," followed by an address in Psa. 11: 1 (= "to"), or, as here and frequently (e.g., Gen. 21: 7) followed by narration (= "of," concerning). **לְנַפְשִׁי** instead of **לִי** implies that the words of the adversaries pronounce a judgment upon his inmost life, or upon his personal relationship to God. **יְשׁוּעָתָהּ** is an intensive form for **יְשׁוּעָה**, whether it be with a double feminine termination (Ges., Ew., Olsh.), or, with an original (accusative) *ah* of the direction: we regard this latter view, with Hupfeld, as more in accordance with the usage and analogy of the language (comp. Psa. 44:27 with Psa. 80: 3, and **לִלְהָה** prop. **λύκτα**, then as common Greek **ἢ λύκτα, λύχθα**). God is the ground of help; to have no more help in Him is equivalent to being rooted out of favour with God. Open enemies as well as disconcerted friends look upon him as one henceforth cast away. David had plunged himself into the deepest abyss of wretchedness by his adultery with Bathsheba, at the beginning of the very year in which, by the renewal of the Syro-Ammonitish war, he had reached the pinnacle of worldly power. The rebellion of Absalom belonged to the series of dire calamities which began to come upon him from that time. Plausible reasons were not wanting for such words as these which give up his cause as lost.

**Psa. 3: 4-5.** But cleansed by penitence he stands in a totally different relationship to God and God to him from that which men suppose. Every hour he has reason to fear some overwhelming attack but Jahve is the shield which covers him behind and before (**בְּאַדְרֵי** constr. of **בְּאַדְרֵי** = Arab. *ba'da*, prop. *pone, post*). His kingdom is taken from him, but Jahve is his glory. With covered head and dejected countenance he ascended the Mount of Olives (2Sa. 15:30), but Jahve is the "lifter up of his head," inasmuch as He comforts and helps

him. The primary passage of this believing utterance “God is a shield” is Gen. 15: 1 (cf. Deu. 33:29). Very far from praying in vain, he is assured, that when he prays his prayer will be heard and answered. The rendering “I cried and He answered me” is erroneous here where אָקַרָא does not stand in an historical connection. The future of sequence does not require it, as is evident from Psa. 55:17 f. (comp. on Psa. 120: 1); it is only an expression of confidence in the answer on God’s part, which will follow his prayer. In constructions like אָקַרָא קוֹלִי, Hitzig and Hupfeld regard קוֹלִי as the narrower subject-notion beside the more general one (as Psa. 44: 3; 69:11; 83:19): my voice — I cried; but the position of the words is not favourable to this in the passage before us and in Psa. 17:10; 27: 7; 57: 5; 66:17; 142: 2, Isa. 36: 9, though it may be in Psa. 69:11; 108: 2. According to Ew. § 281, c, קוֹלִי is an accusative of more precise definition, as without doubt in Isa. 10:30 cf. Psa. 60: 7; 17:13 f.; the cry is thereby described as a loud cry. <sup>f75</sup>

To this cry, as וַיַּעֲנֵנִי as being a pure mood of sequence implies, succeeds the answer, or, which better corresponds to the original meaning of עֲנָה (comp. Arab. ‘*nn*, to meet, stand opposite) reply; <sup>f76</sup> and it comes from the place whither it was directed: מִהַר קִדְשׁוֹ . He had removed the ark from Kirjath Jeraim to Zion. He had not taken it with him when he left Jerusalem and fled before Absalom, 2Sa. 15:25. He was therefore separated by a hostile power from the resting-place of the divine presence. But his prayer urged its way on to the cherubim-throne; and to the answer of Him who is enthroned there, there is no separating barrier of space or created things.

**Psa. 3: 6-7.** That this God will protect him, His protection during the past night is now a pledge to him in the early morning. It is a violation of the rules of grammar to translate וְאֵשְׁנָה: I shall go to sleep, or: I am going to sleep. The 1 *pers. fut. consec.* which is indicated by the ׀, is fond of taking an *ah* of direction, which gives subjective intensity to the idea of sequence: “and thus I then fell asleep,” cf. Psa. 7: 5; 119:55, and frequently, Gen. 32: 6, and more especially so in the later style, Ezr. 9: 3, Neh. 13:21, vid., Ges. § 49, 2, Böttcher, *Neue Aehrenlese*, No. 412. It is a retrospective glance at the past night. Awakening in health and safety, he feels grateful to Him to whom he owes it: יְהוָה יִסְמְכֵנִי . It is the result of the fact that Jahve supports him, and that God’s hand is his pillow. <sup>f77</sup>

Because this loving, almighty hand is beneath his head (Son. 2: 6) he is inaccessible and therefore also devoid of fear. שִׁית (שׁוּת) carries its object in itself: to take up one’s position, as in Isa. 22: 7, synon. חָנָה 28: 3 and שִׁים 1Ki. 20:12, cf. ἐπιδοθῆναι τινί. David does not put a merely possible case. All

Israel, that is to say ten thousands, myriads, were gone over to Absalom. Here, at the close of the third strophe, סלה is wanting because the לא אִירָא (I will not fear) is not uttered in a tone of triumph, but is only a quiet, meek expression of believing confidence. If the instruments struck up boldly and suddenly here, then a cry for help, urged forth by the difficulties that still continually surrounded him, would not be able to follow.

*Psa. 3: 8-9.* The bold קוֹמָה is taken from the mouth of Moses, Num. 10:35. God is said to arise when He takes a decisive part in what takes place in this world. Instead of *ḵûmah* it is accented *ḵumáh* as *Milra*, in order (since the reading קוֹמָה אֲדֹנִי is assumed) that the final *áh* may be sharply cut off from the guttural initial of the next word, and thus render a clear, exact pronunciation of the latter possible (Hitz., Ew. § 228, b).<sup>178</sup>

Beside יהוה we have אֱלֹהֵי, with the *suff.* of appropriating faith. The cry for help is then substantiated by כִּי and the retrospective *perf.* They are not such *perff.* of prophetically certain hope as in Psa. 6: 9; 7: 7; 9: 5 f., for the logical connection requires an appeal to previous experience in the present passage: they express facts of experience, which are taken from many single events (hence כָּל) down to the present time. The verb הִכָּה is construed with a double accusative, as e.g., *Iliad* xvi. 597 τὸν μὲν ἄρα Γλαῦκος στήθος μέσον οὐτάσε δούρι. The idea of contempt (Job. 16:10) is combined with that of rendering harmless in this “smiting upon the cheek.” What is meant is a striking in of the jaw-bone and therewith a breaking of the teeth in pieces (שָׁבַר). David means, an ignominious end has always come upon the ungodly who rose up against him and against God’s order in general, as their punishment. The enemies are conceived of as monsters given to biting, and the picture of their fate is fashioned according to this conception. Jahve has the power and the will to defend His Anointed against their hostility: לַיהוָה הַיְשׁוּעָה *penes Jovam est salus. יְשׁוּעָה* (from יָשַׁע, Arab. *wasi’a*, *amplum esse*) signifies breadth as applied to perfect freedom of motion, removal of all straitness and oppression, prosperity without exposure to danger and unbecloved. In the לְ of possession lies the idea of the exclusiveness of the possession and of perfect freedom of disposal. At Jahve’s free disposal stands הַיְשׁוּעָה, salvation, in all its fulness (just so in Jon. 2:10, Rev. 7:10). In connection therewith David first of all thinks of his own need of deliverance. But as a true king he cannot before God think of himself, without connecting himself with his people. Therefore he closes with the intercessory inference: אֶל-אֱמֶךָ בְּרַכְתֶּךָ Upon Thy people by Thy blessing! We may supply תְּהִי or תִּבָּא. Instead of cursing his faithless people he implores a blessing upon those who have been piteously led astray and deceived. This “upon Thy people be Thy blessing!” has its counterpart in

the “Father forgive them” of the other David, whom His people crucified. The one concluding word of the Psalm — observes Ewald — casts a bright light into the very depths of his noble soul.

## Psalm 4

### EVENING HYMN OF ONE WHO IS UNMOVED BEFORE BACKBITERS AND MEN OF LITTLE FAITH

*4: 2 WHEN I call answer me, O God of my righteousness,  
Who hast made space for me in straitness;  
Be merciful unto me and hear my prayer!*

*4: 3 Ye sons of men, how long shall my honour become shame,  
Since ye love appearance, ye seek after leasing?! (Sela)*

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

*4: 5 Be ye angry, yet sin ye not! —  
Commune with your own heart upon your bed and be still! (Sela)*

*4: 6 Offer the sacrifices of righteousness,  
And put your trust in Jahve!*

*4: 7 Many say: “How can we experience good!?”  
O lift up the light of Thy countenance upon us, Jahve!*

*4: 8 Thou hast put gladness into my heart,  
More than in the time when their corn and wine abound.*

*4: 9 In peace will I lay me down and forthwith sleep,  
For Thou, O Jahve, in seclusion  
Makest me to dwell securely.*

The Davidic morning hymn is now followed by a Davidic evening hymn. It is evident that they belong together from the mutual relation of Psa. 4: 7 with Psa. 3: 3, and Psa. 3: 6 with Psa. 4: 9. They are the only two Psalms in which the direct words of others are taken up into a prayer with the formula “many say,” רבים אמרים. The history and chronological position of the one is explained from the inscription of the other. From the *quousque* Psa. 4: 3, and the words of the feeble-faiths Psa. 4: 7, it follows that Psalm ch. 4 is the later of the two.

It is at the head of this Psalm that we are first met by לִמְנוּצָה (or לִמְנוּצָה with *Gaja*, Hab. 3:19), which still calls for investigation. It is found fifty five times in the Psalter, not 54 as is usually reckoned: viz., 19 times in book 1, 25 times in book 2, 8 times in book 3, 3 times in book 4. Only two of the Psalms, at the

head of which it is found, are anonymous: viz., 66, 67. All the others bear the names of David and of the psalmists celebrated from David's time, viz., 39 of David, 9 of the Korahites, 5 of Asaph. No fewer than 30 of these Psalms are Elohimic. **לִמְנַצֵּחַ** is always the first word of the inscription; only in Psalm 88, which is easily liable to be overlooked in reckoning, is it otherwise, because there two different inscriptions are put together.

The meaning of the verb **נָצַח** is evident from the Chronicles and the Book of Ezra, which belongs to them. The predilection of the chronicler for the history of religious worship and antiquarian lore is also of use in reference to this word. He uses it in the history of the time of David, of Solomon, of Josiah, of Zerubbabel and Joshua, and always in connection with the accounts of the Temple-service and the building of single parts of the Temple. To discharge the official duties of the Temple-service is called **נָצַח אֶל-מְלֹאכֶת בֵּית-ה'** 1Ch. 23: 4 (comp. 28-32), and the expression is used in Ezr. 3: 8 f. of the oversight of the work and workmen for the building of the Temple. The same 3300 (3600) overseers, who are called **הַרְרָדִים בָּעַם הָעֹשִׂים בְּמְלָאכָה** in 1Ki. 5:30 are described by the chronicler (2Ch. 2: 1) as **מְנַצְּחִים עֲלֵיהֶם**. In connection with the repair of the Temple under Josiah we read that Levites were appointed **לְנִצְחָה** (2Ch. 34:12), namely **לְכֹל עֹשֶׂה מְלָאכָה** (v. 13), instead of which we find it said in Psa. 2:17 **לְהַעֲבִיד**, to keep the people at their work. The primary notion of **נָצַח** is that of shining, and in fact of the purest and most dazzling brightness; this then passes over to the notion of shining over to outshining, and in fact both of uninterrupted continuance and of excellence and superiority (vid., *Ithpa*. Dan. 6: 4, and cf. 1Ch. 23: 4 with 9:13; 1Co. 15:54 with Isa. 25: 8). Thus, therefore, **מְנַצֵּחַ** is one who shows eminent ability in any department, and then it gains the general signification of master, director, chief overseer. At the head of the Psalms it is commonly understood of the direct of the Temple-music. **מְנַצֵּחַ est dux cantus** — Luther says in one place — *quem nos dicimus den Kappellenmeister* [the band-master], *qui orditur et gubernat cantum*, ἑξαρχος (*Opp. lat.* xvii. 134 *ed. Erl.*). But 1st, even the Psalms of Asaph have this **לִמְנַצֵּחַ** at the beginning, and he was himself a director of the Temple-music, and in fact the chief-director (**הָרֹאשׁ**) 1Ch. 16: 5, or at any rate he was one of the three (Heman, Asaph, Ethan), to whom the 24 classes of the 4000 Levite singers under the Davidico-Salomonian sanctuary were subordinate; 2ndly, the passage of the chronicler (1Ch. 15:17-21) which is most prominent in reference to this question, does not accord with this explanation. According to this passage the three directors of the Temple-music managed the cymbals **לְהַשְׁמִיחַ**, to sound aloud; eight other musicians of high rank the nablans and six others the citherns **לְנִצְחָה**. This expression cannot

mean “to direct,” for the direction belonged to the three, and the cymbals were also better adapted to it than the citherns. It means “to take the lead in the playing”: the cymbals directed and the citherns, better adapted to take the lead in the playing, were related to them, somewhat as the violins to the clarinets now-a-days. Hence **מְנַצֵּחַ** is not the director of the Temple-music but in general the master of song, and **לְמַנְצֵחַ** addresses the Psalm to him whose duty it is to arrange it and to train the Levite choristers; it therefore defines the Psalm as belonging to the songs of the Temple worship that require musical accompaniment. The translation of the Targum (Luther) also corresponds to this general sense of the expression: **לְשַׁבְּחָא** “to be sung liturgically,” and the LXX: **εἰς τὸ τέλος**, if this signifies “to the execution” and does not on the contrary ascribe an eschatological meaning to the Psalm. <sup>179</sup>

The **בְּנִינֹת** which is added is not governed by it. This can be seen at once from Hab. 3:19: to the chief singer, with an accompaniment of my stringed instruments (vid., my *Commentary*), which Hitzig renders: to the chief singer of my musical pieces; but **נִצָּח ב** is not a phrase that can be supported, and **נְגִינָה** does not mean a piece of music. The *Piel*, **נָגַן**, complete with **בְּיָד**, signifies to touch the strings (cogn. **נָגַע**), to play a stringed instrument. Whence comes **נְגִינֹת** (Psa. 77: 7, Isa. 38:20) which is almost always used as a *pluralet.*: the play of the stringed instruments, and the superscribed **בְּנִינֹת** Psalm ch. 4, 6, 54, 55, 67, 76: with an accompaniment of the stringed instruments; and **ב** is used as in Psa. 49: 5, Isa. 30:29, 32. The hymn is to be sung in company with, probably with the sole accompaniment of, the stringed instruments. The fact of the inscribed words **לְמַנְצֵחַ בְּנִינֹת** preceding **לְדוֹר מְזֻמָּר** probably arises from the fact of their being written originally at the top over the chief title which gave the generic name of the hymn and the author.

*Psa. 4: 2.* Jahve is **אֱלֹהֵי צְדָקָה**, the possessor of righteousness, the author of righteousness, and the vindicator of misjudged and persecuted righteousness. This God of righteousness David believingly calls his God (cf. Psa. 24: 5; 59:11); for the righteousness he possesses, he possesses in Him, and the righteousness he looks for, he looks for in Him. That this is not in vain, his previous experience assures him: Thou hast made a breadth (space) for me when in a strait. In connection with this confirmatory relation of **הִרְחַבְתָּ לִּי** **בְצָר** it is more probable that we have before us an attributive clause (Hitz.), than that we have an independent one, and at any rate it is a retrospective clause. **הִרְחַבְתָּ** is not precative (Böttch.), for the *perf.* of certainty with a precative colouring is confined to such exclamatory utterances as Job. 21:16 (which see). He bases his prayer on two things, viz., on his fellowship with

God, the righteous God, and on His justifying grace which he has already experienced. He has been many times in a strait already, and God has made a broad place for him. The idea of the expansion of the breathing (of the stream of air) and of space is attached to the ה, Arab. *h*, of רחב, root רח (Deusch. *Morgenl. Zeitschr.* xii. 657). What is meant is the expansion of the straitened heart, Psa. 25:17. Isa. 60: 5, and the widening of a straitened position, Psa. 18:20; 118: 5. On the *Dag.* in לִי vid., on 84: 4.

*Psa. 4: 3-4.* Righteous in his relation to God he turns rebukingly towards those who contemn his whose honour is God's honour, viz., to the partisans of Absalom. In contrast with בְּנֵי אָדָם, men who are lost in the multitude, אִישׁ בְּנֵי denotes such as stand prominently forward out of the multitude; passages like Psa. 49: 3; 62:10, Pro. 8: 4, Isa. 2: 9; 5:15, show this distinction. In this and the preceding Psalm David makes as little mention of his degenerate son as he does of the deluded king in the Psalms belonging to the period of his persecution by Saul. The address is directed to the aristocratic party, whose tool Absalom has become. To these he says: till when (אֲדַמָּה) beside the non-guttural which follows with *Segol*, without any manifest reason, as in 10:13, Isa. 1: 5, Jer. 16:10), i.e., how long shall my honour become a mockery, namely to you and by you, just as we can also say in Latin *quousque tandem dignitas mea ludibrio?* The two following members are circumstantial clauses subordinate to the principal clause with אֲדַמָּה (similar to Isa. 1: 5a; Ew. § 341, b). The energetic *fut.* with *Nun parag.* does not usually stand at the head of independent clauses; it is therefore to be rendered: since ye love רִיק, that which is empty — the proper name for their high rank is hollow appearance — how long will ye pursue after כֶּזֶב, falsehood? — they seek to find out every possible lying pretext, in order to trail the honour of the legitimate king in the dust. The assertion that the personal honour of David, not his kingly dignity, is meant by בְּבוֹדֵי, separates what is inseparable. They are eager to injure his official at the same time as his personal reputation. Therefore David appeals in opposition to them (v. 4) not only to the divine choice, but also to his personal relationship to God, on which that choice is based. The ו of וְדַעוּ is, as in 2Ki. 4:41, the ו of sequence: so know then. The *Hiph.* הִפְלָה (from פָּלָה = פָּלַא, cogn. פָּלַל, prop. to divide) to make a separation, make a distinction Exo. 9: 4; 11: 7, then to distinguish in an extraordinary and remarkable way Exo. 8:18, and to show Psa. 17: 7, cf. 31:22, so that consequently what is meant is not the mere selection (בְּחָר), but the remarkable selection to a remarkable position of honour (LXX, Vulg. *mirificavit*, Windberg translation of the Psalms *gewunderlichet*). לוֹ belongs to the verb, as in 135: 4, and the principal accent lies on הַסִּיד: he whom Jahve Himself, not men, has thus



remarkably distinguished is a חַסִּיד, a pious man, i.e., either, like the Syriac אַסְיִדָּא = אַרְחִימָא: God’s favourite, or, according to the biblical usage of the language (cf. Psa. 12: 2 with Isa. 17: 1), in an active signification like פְּלִיט, פְּרִיץ, and the like: a lover of God, from חַסֵּד (root חס Arab. *ḥs*, *stringere*, whence *ḥassa* to curry, *maḥassa* a curry-comb) prop. to feel one’s self drawn, i.e., strongly affected (comp. *hiss* is mental impression), in Hebrew, of a strong ardent affection. As a חַסִּיד he does not call upon God in vain, but finds a ready hearing. Their undertaking consequently runs counter to the miraculously evidenced will of God and must fail by reason of the loving relationship in which the dethroned and debased one stands to God.

*Psa. 4: 5-6.* The address is continued: they are to repent and cleave to Jahve instead of allowing themselves to be carried away by arrogance and discontent. The LXX has rendered it correctly: ὀργίξεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε (cf. Eph. 4:26): if ye will be angry beware of sinning, viz., backbiting and rebellion (cf. the similar paratactic combinations 28: 1, Jos. 6:18, Isa. 12: 1). In connection with the rendering *contremiscite* we feel to miss any expression of that before which they are to tremble (viz., the sure punishment which God decrees). He warns his adversaries against blind passion, and counsels them to quiet converse with their own hearts, and solitary meditation, in order that they may not imperil their own salvation. To commune with one’s own heart, without the addition of the object, is equivalent to to think alone by one’s self, and the bed or resting-place, without requiring to be understood literally, points to a condition of mind that is favourable to quiet contemplation. The heart is the seat of the conscience, and the Spirit of God (as Hamann, *Werke* i. 98, observes on this subject) disguises itself as our own voice that we may see His exhortation, His counsel, and His wisdom well up out of our own stony heart. The second *imper.* continues the first: and cease, prop. be still (סָמַךְ from the sound of the closed mouth checking the discourse), i.e., come to your right mind by self-examination, cease your tumult — a warning coming with the semblance of command by reason of the consciousness of innocence on his part; and this impression has to be rendered here by the striking in of the music. The dehortation passes over into exhortation in v. 6. Of course the sacrifices were continued in the sanctuary while David, with his faithful followers, was a fugitive from Jerusalem. Referring to this, David cries out to the Absolomites: offer זְבַח־יִצְדִּיק. Here at least these are not offerings consisting of actions which are in accordance with the will of God, instead of slaughtered animals, but sacrifices offered with a right mind, conformed to the will of God, instead of the hypocritical mind with which they consecrate their evil doings and think to flatter God. In Psa. 51:21, Deu. 33:19 also, “the sacrifices of righteousness” are real sacrifices, not merely symbols of moral

acts. Not less full of meaning is the exhortation **וּבַטְחוּ אֶל־ה'**. The verb **בַּטַח** is construed with **אֶל** as in Psa. 31: 7; 56: 4; 86: 2, combining with the notion of trusting that of drawing near to, hanging on, attaching one's self to any one. The Arabic word *bṭḥ*, *expandere*, has preserved the primary notion of the word, a notion which, as in the synon. Arab. *bst*, when referred to the effect which is produced on the heart, countenance and whole nature of the man by a joyous cheerful state of mind, passes over to the notion of this state of mind itself, so that **בַּטַח** (like the Arab. *inbasata* to be cheerful, fearless, bold, lit., expanded [cf. **רָהַב** Isa. 60: 5] = unstrained) consequently signifies to be courageous, confident. They are to renounce the self-trust which blinds them in their opposition to the king who is deprived of all human assistance. If they will trustingly submit themselves to God, then at the same time the murmuring and rancorous discontent, from which the rebellion has sprung, will be stilled. Thus far the address to the rebellious magnates goes.

*Psa. 4: 7-8.* Looking into his own small camp David is conscious of a disheartened feeling which is gaining power over him. The words: who will make us see, i.e., (as in Psa. 34:13) experience any good? can be taken as expressive of a wish according to 2Sa. 23:15, Isa. 42:23; but the situation gives it the character of a despondent question arising from a disheartened view of the future. The gloom has now, lasted so long with David's companions in tribulation that their faith is turned to fear, their hope to despair. David therefore prays as he looks upon them: Oh lift upon us (**נִסְהֵ־אֱלֹהֵינוּ**)<sup>180</sup> the light of Thy countenance. The form of the petition reminds one of the priestly benediction in Numbers 6. There it is: **אֵר ה' פָּנָיו** in the second portion, in the third **יִשָּׂא ה' פָּנָיו**, here these two wishes are blended into one prayer; and moreover in **נִסָּה** there is an allusion to **נִס** a banner, for the *imper.* of **נִשָּׂא**, the regular form of which is **שָׂא**, will also admit of the form **נִשָּׂא** (Psa. 10:12), but the mode of writing **נִסָּה** (without example elsewhere, for **נִסָּה** Job. 4: 2 signifies "to be attempted") is only explained by the mingling of the verbs **נִשָּׂא** and **נִסָּס**, Arab. *nṣṣ*, *extollere* (Psa. 60: 6); **ה' נִסִּי** (cf. Psa. 60: 6) is, moreover, a primeval word of the *Tôra* (Exo. 17:15). If we may suppose that this mingling is not merely a mingling of forms in writing, but also a mingling of the ideas in those forms, then we have three thoughts in this prayer which are brought before the eye and ear in the briefest possible expression: may Jahve cause His face to shine upon them; may He lift upon them the light of His countenance so that they may have it above them like the sun in the sky, and may that light be a banner promising them the victory, around which they shall rally.

David, however, despite the hopelessness of the present, is even now at peace in His God. The joy which Jahve has put into his heart in the midst of outward trial and adversity is **מֵעַת דָּגְגַם וְתִירָוֶשֶׁם רָבוּ**. The expression is as concise as possible: (1) *gaudium prae* equivalent to *gaudium magnum prae - majus quam*; then (2) **מֵעַת** after the analogy of the *comparatio decurtata* (e.g., 18:34 my feet are like hinds, i.e., like the feet of hinds) is equivalent to **מִשְׁמַחַת עַת**; (3) **אֲשֶׁר** is omitted after **עַת** according to Ges. § 123, 3, for **אֵת** is the construct state, and what follows is the second member of the genitival relation, dependent upon it (cf. Psa. 90:15, Isa. 29: 1); the plurality of things: corn and new wine, inasmuch as it is the stores of both that are specially meant, is exceptionally joined with the *plur.* instead of the *sing.*, and the chief word *rābbu* stands at the end by way of emphasis. The *suff.* does not refer to the people of the land in general (as in Psa. 65:10), but, in accordance with the contrast, to the Absalomites, to those of the nation who have fallen away from David. When David came to Mahanaim, while the rebels were encamped in Gilead, the country round about him was hostile, so that he had to receive provisions by stealth, 2Sa. 17:26-29. Perhaps it was at the time of the feast of tabernacles. The harvest and the vintage were over. A rich harvest of corn and new wine was garnered. The followers of Absalom had, in these rich stores which were at their disposal, a powerful reserve upon which to fall back. David and his host were like a band of beggars or marauders. But the king brought down from the sceptre of the beggar's staff is nevertheless happier than they, the rebels against him. What he possesses in his heart is a richer treasure than all that they have in their barns and cellars.

**Psa. 4: 9.** Thus then he lies down to sleep, cheerfully and peacefully. The hymn closes as it began with a three line verse. **יְחַדּוּ** (lit., in its unions = collectively, Olshausen, § 135, c, like **בְּלוּ** altogether, **בְּעֵתוֹ** at the right time) is by no means unemphatic; nor is it so in Psa. 19:10 where it means "all together, without exception." With synonymous verbs it denotes the combination of that which they imply, as Isa. 42:14. It is similar in Psa. 141:10 where it expresses the coincidence of the fall of his enemies and the escape of the persecuted one. So here: he wishes to go to sleep and also at once he falls asleep (**וְאִישְׁנָה** in a likewise cohortative sense = **וְאִישְׁנָה**). His God makes him to dwell in seclusion free of care. **לְבַדָּד** is a first definition of condition, and **לְבִטָּח** a second. The former is not, after Deu. 32:12, equivalent to **לְבַדָּד**, an addition which would be without any implied antithesis and consequently meaningless. One must therefore, as is indeed required by the situation, understand **לְבַדָּד** according to Num. 23: 9, Mic. 7:14, Deu. 33:28, Jer. 49:31. He needs no guards for he is guarded round about by Jahve and kept in safety.

The seclusion, **סֶדֶד**, in which he is, is security, **סֶבֶב**, because Jahve is near him. Under what a many phases and how sweetly the nature of faith is expressed in this and the foregoing Psalm: his righteousness, exaltation, joy, peace, contentment in God! And how delicately conceived is the rhythm! In the last line the evening hymn itself sinks to rest. The iambs with which it closes are like the last strains of a lullaby which die away softly and as though falling asleep themselves. Dante is right when he says in his *Convito*, that the sweetness of the music had harmony of the Hebrew Psalter is lost in the Greek and Latin translations.

## **Psalm 5**

### **MORNING PRAYER BEFORE GOING TO THE HOUSE OF GOD**

*5: 2 GIVE ear to my words, O Jahve,  
Consider my meditation!*

*5: 3 Hearken unto my loud cry, my King and my God,  
For unto Thee do I pray.*

*5: 4 Jahve, in the morning shalt Thou hear my voice  
In the morning will I prepare an offering for Thee and look forth.*

*5: 5 For Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness,  
An evil man cannot dwell with Thee.*

*5: 6 Boasters cannot stand in Thy sight,  
Thou hatest all workers of iniquity;*

*5: 7 Thou destroyest them that speak lies,  
The man of blood-guiltiness and malice Jahve abhorreth.*

*5: 8 Yet I, through Thy rich grace, may enter Thy house,  
I may worship towards Thy holy Temple in Thy fear.*

*5: 9 Jahve, lead me by Thy righteousness, because of them that lie in wait for me,  
Make Thy way even before my face —*

*5:10 For in his mouth is nothing certain, their inward part is an abyss,  
An open sepulchre is their throat, with a smooth tongue.*

*5:11 Punish them, Elohim, let them fall from their counsels,  
In the multitude of their transgressions cast them away, who defy Thee;*

*5:12 That all they who trust in Thee may rejoice, may ever shout for joy;  
And defend Thou them that they may exult in Thee, who love Thy name.*

*5:13 For Thou, even Thou, dost bless the righteous —  
Jahve! with favour dost Thou compass him as with a shield.*

The evening prayer is now followed by a second morning prayer, which like the former draws to a close with **כִּי־אֶתָּה** (Psa. 4:19; 5:13). The situation is different from that in Psalm ch. 3. In that Psalm David is fleeing, here he is in Jerusalem and anticipates going up to the Temple service. If this Psalm also belongs to the time of the rebellion of Absalom, it must have been written when the fire which afterwards broke forth was already smouldering in secret.

The inscription **אֶל־הַנְּחִילוֹת** is certainly not a motto indicative of its contents (LXX, Vulg., Luther, Hengstenberg). As such it would stand after **מִזְמוֹר**. Whatever is connected with **לִמְנֻצָּה**, always has reference to the music. If **נחילות** came from **נָחַל** it might according to its use in the biblical use of this verb signify “inheritances,” or according to its use in the Talmud “swarms,” and in fact swarms of bees (Arab. *nahl*); and **נחילות** ought then to be the beginning of a popular melody to which the Psalm is adapted. Hai Gaon understands it to denote a melody resembling the hum of bees; Reggio a song that sings of bees. Or is **נחילות** equivalent to **נְחֻלוֹת** (*excavatae*) and this a special name for the flutes (**חֲלִילִים**)? The use of the flute in the service of the sanctuary is attested by Isa. 30:29, cf. 1Sa. 10: 5, 1Ki. 1:40.<sup>181</sup>

The *praep.* **אֶל** was, then, more appropriate than **אֵל**; because, as Redslob has observed, the singer cannot play the flute at the same time, but can only sing to the playing of another.

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

*Psa. 5: 2-4. The introit:* Prayer to be heard. The thoughts are simple but the language is carefully chosen. **אִמְרִים** is the *plur.* of **אָמַר** (**אָמַר**), one of the words peculiar to the poetic prophetic style. The denominative **הִאֲזִין** (like *audire* = *aus*, **אָזַע**, *dare*) belongs more to poetry than prose. **הִגִּי** (like **אָבִיב**) or **הִגִּי** (like **מְחִיר**) occurs only in two Psalms **לְדוֹד**, viz., here and 34: 4. It is derived from **הִגָּה** = **הָגָה** (vid., 1: 2) and signifies that which is spoken meditatively, here praying in rapt devotion. Beginning thus the prayer gradually rises to a *vox clamoris*. **שָׁעֵי** from **שָׁעַע**, to be distinguished from **שָׁעֵי** (*inf. Pi.*) 28: 2; 31:23, is one word with the Aram. **צוּח**, Aethiop. **צוּע** (to call). On **הִקְשִׁיב** used of intent listening, vid., 10:17. The invocation **וַאֲלֵהִי מַלְכִּי**, when it is a king who utters it, is all the more significant. David, and in general the theocratic king, is only the representative of the Invisible One,

whom he with all Israel adores as his King. Prayer to Him is his first work as he begins the day. In the morning, בִּפְקֹד (as in Psa. 65:18 for בִּפְקֹד, Psa. 88:14), shalt Thou hear my cry, is equivalent to my cry which goes forth with the early morn. Hupfeld considers the mention of the morning as only a “poetical expression” and when getting rid of the meaning *prima luce*, he also gets rid of the beautiful and obvious reference to the daily sacrifice. The verb עָרַךְ is the word used of laying the wood in order for the sacrifice, Lev. 1: 7, and the pieces of the sacrifice, Lev. 1: 8, 12; 6: 5, of putting the sacred lamps in order, Exo. 27:21, Lev. 24: 3 f., and of setting the shew-bread in order, Exo. 40:23, Lev. 24: 8. The laying of the wood in order for the morning offering of a lamb (Lev. 6: 5 [12], cf. Num. 28: 4) was one of the first duties of the priest, as soon as the day began to dawn; the lamb was slain before sun-rise and when the sun appeared above the horizon laid piece by piece upon the altar. The morning prayer is compared to this morning sacrifice. This is in its way also a sacrifice. The object which David has in his mind in connection with אָעָרַךְ is תְּפִלָּתִי. As the priests, with the early morning, lay the wood and pieces of the sacrifices of the *Tamid* upon the altar, so he brings his prayer before God as a spiritual sacrifice and looks out for an answer (צָפָה *speculari* as in Hab. 2: 1), perhaps as the priest looks out for fire from heaven to consume the sacrifice, or looks to the smoke to see that it rises up straight towards heaven.

*Psa. 5: 5-7.* The basing of the prayer on God’s holiness. The verbal adjective חָפֵץ (coming from the primitive signification of adhering firmly which is still preserved in Arab. *chfd, fut. i.*) is in the *sing.* always (Psa. 34:13; 35:27) joined with the accusative. רָע is conceived as a person, for although גֹּוֹר may have a material object, it cannot well have a material subject. נָגַד is used for brevity of expression instead of נָגַד עִמָּךְ (Ges. § 121, 4). The verb נָגַד (to turn in, to take up one’s abode with or near any one) frequently has an accusative object, Psa. 120: 5, Jud. 5:17, and Isa. 33:14 according to which the light of the divine holiness is to sinners a consuming fire, which they cannot endure. Now there follow specific designations of the wicked. הוֹלָלִים *part. Kal = hōl’alim*, or even *Poal = hōl’alim* (= שוֹרְרִים ni sa,ereh hcihw ot gnidrocca,elur eht nO=),<sup>f81a</sup> are the foolish, and more especially foolish boasters; the primary notion of the verb is not that of being hollow, but that of sounding, then of loud boisterous, non-sensical behaviour. Of such it is said, that they are not able to maintain their position when they become manifest before the eye of God לִנְגַד as in Psa. 101: 7 manifest before any one, from נָגַד to come forward, be visible far off, be distinctly visible). פְּעֻלֵי אָוֶן are those who work (οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι Mat. 7:23) iniquity; אָוֶן (ἄνεμος) is sometimes trouble, in connection

with which one pants, sometimes wickedness, in which there is not even a trace of any thing noble, true, or pure. Such men Jahve hates; for if He did not hate evil (Psa. 11: 5), His love would not be a holy love. In **דְּבַרִי, דְּבַרִי כָזָב** is the usual form in combination when the *plur.* is used, instead of **מִדְּבַרִי**. It is the same in Psa. 58: 4. The style of expression is also Davidic in other respects, viz., **אִישׁ דָּמִים וּמְרָמָה** as in Psa. 55:24, and **אֶבֶד** as in Psa. 9: 6, cf. 21:11. **תַּעֲב** (in Amos, Amo. 6: 8 **תֵּאָב**) appears to be a secondary formation from **עוֹב**, like **תֵּאָב** to desire, from **אָבָה**, and therefore to be of a cognate root with the Aram. **אָיַב** to despise, treat with indignity, and the Arabic 'aib a stain (cf. on Lam. 2: 1). The fact that, as Hengstenberg has observed, wickedness and the wicked are described in a sevenfold manner is perhaps merely accidental.

**Psa. 5: 8-10.** Since the Psalm is a morning hymn, the *futt.* in v. 8 state what he, on the contrary, may and will do (Psa. 66:13). By the greatness and fulness of divine favour (Psa. 69:14) he has access (**εἰσόδον**, for **בֹּאֵ** means, according to its root, “to enter”) to the sanctuary, and he will accordingly repair thither to-day. It is the tabernacle on Zion in which was the ark of the covenant that is meant here. That daily liturgical service was celebrated there must be assumed, since the ark of the covenant is the sign and pledge of Jahve’s presence; and it is, moreover, attested by 1Ch. 16:37 f. It is also to be supposed that sacrifice was offered daily before the tabernacle. For it is not to be inferred from 1Ch. 16:39 ff. that sacrifice was only offered regularly on the *Bama* (high place) in Gibeon before the Mosaic tabernacle. <sup>182</sup>

It is true sacrifice was offered in Gibeon, where the old tabernacle and the old altars (or at least the altar of burnt-offering) were, and also that after the removal of the ark to Zion both David (1Ch. 21:29 f.) and Solomon (1Ki. 3: 4, 2Ch. 1: 2-6) worshipped and sacrificed in Gibeon. But it is self-evident sacrifices might have been offered where the ark was, and that even with greater right than in Gibeon; and since both David, upon its arrival (2Sa. 6:17 f.), and Solomon after his accession (1Ki. 3:15), offered sacrifices through the priests who were placed there, it is probable, — and by a comparison of the Davidic Psalms not to be doubted, — that there was a daily service, in conjunction with sacrifices, before the ark on Zion.

But, moreover, is it really the **אֹהֶל** in Zion which is meant here in v. 8 by the house of God? It is still maintained by renowned critics that the tabernacle pitched by David over the sacred ark is never called **בֵּית ה'** or **הַיֵּכָל** or **ה'** **מִשְׁכָּן** or **מִקְדָּשׁ** or **קֹדֶשׁ**. But why could it not have all these names? We will not appeal to the fact that the house of God at Shilo (1Sa. 1: 9; 3: 3) is called

בית and היכל ה', since it may be objected that it was really more of a temple than a tabernacle, <sup>f83</sup> although in the same book, ch. 2:22 it is called מועד אהל, and in connection with the other appellations the poetic colouring of the historical style of 1 Samuel ch. 1-3 is to be taken into consideration. Moreover, we put aside passages like Exo. 23:19; 34:26, since it may be said that the future Temple was present to the mind of the Lawgiver. But in Jos. 6:24, 2Sa. 12:20, the sanctuary is called בית ה' without being conceived of as a temple. Why then cannot the tabernacle, which David pitched for the ark of the covenant when removed to Zion (2Sa. 6:17), be called בית ה' ? It is only when אהל and בית are placed in opposition to one another that the latter has the notion of a dwelling built of more solid materials; but in itself *beit* (*bêt*) in Semitic is the generic term for housing of every kind whether it be made of wool, felt, and hair-cloth, or of earth, stone, and wood; consequently it is just as much a tent as a house (in the stricter sense of the word), whether the latter be a hut built of wood and clay or a palace. <sup>f84</sup>

If a dwelling-house is frequently called אהל, then a tent that any one dwells in may the more naturally be called his בית. And this we find is actually the case with the dwellings of the patriarchs, which, although they were not generally solid houses (Gen. 33:17), are called בית (Gen. 27:15). Moreover, היכל (from יכל = כול to hold, *capacem esse*), although it signifies a palace does not necessarily signify one of stone, for the heavens are also called Jahve's היכל, e.g., 18: 7, and not necessarily one of gigantic proportions, for even the Holy of holies of Solomon's Temple, and this *par excellence*, is called היכל, and once, 1Ki. 6: 3, היכל הבית. Of the spaciousness and general character of the Davidic tabernacle we know indeed nothing: it certainly had its splendour, and was not so much a substitute for the original tabernacle, which according to the testimony of the chronicler remained in Gibeon, as a substitute for the Temple that was still to be built. But, however insignificant it may have been, Jahve had His throne there, and it was therefore the היכל of a great king, just as the wall-less place in the open field where God manifested Himself with His angels to the homeless Jacob was בית אלהים (Gen. 28:17).

Into this tabernacle of God, i.e., into its front court, will David enter (בוא with *acc.* as in Psa. 66:13) this morning, there will he prostrate himself in worship, προσκυνεῖν (השתחווה) reflexive of the *Pilel* שחנה, Ges. § 75, rem. 18), towards אל as in Psa. 28: 2, 1Ki. 8:29, 35, cf. לְ Psa. 99: 5, 9) Jahve's קדש היכל, i.e., the דביר, the Holy of holies 28: 2, and that "in Thy fear," i.e., in reverence before Thee (*genit. objectivus*). The going into the Temple which David purposes, leads his thoughts on to his way through life, and the special



δέσις, which only begins here, moulds itself accordingly: he prays for God's gracious guidance as in Psa. 27:11; 86:11, and frequently. The direction of God, by which he wishes to be guided he calls צִדְקָה. Such is the general expression for the determination of conduct by an ethical rule. The rule, acting in accordance with which, God is called *par excellence* צְדִיק, is the order of salvation which opens up the way of mercy to sinners. When God forgives those who walk in this way their sins, and stands near to bless and protect them, He shows Himself not less צְדִיק (just), than when He destroys those who despise Him, in the heat of His rejected love. By this righteousness, which accords with the counsel and order of mercy, David prays to be led שׁוֹרְרֵי לְמַאן, in order that the malicious desire of those who lie in wait for him may not be fulfilled, but put to shame, and that the honour of God may not be sullied by him. שׁוֹרֵר is equivalent to מְשׁוֹרֵר (Aquila ἐφοδύων, Jerome *insidiator*) from the *Pilel* שׁוֹרֵר to fix one's eyes sharply upon, especially of hostile observation. David further prays that God will make his way (i.e., the way in which a man must walk according to God's will) even and straight before him, the prayer one, in order that he may walk therein without going astray and unimpeded. The adj. יָשָׁר signifies both the straightness of a line and the evenness of a surface. The fut. of the *Hiph.* הִישִׁיר is יִשְׁיֵר in Pro. 4:25, and accordingly the *Kerî* substitutes for the *imper.* הוֹשֵׁר the corresponding form הִישֵׁר, just as in Isa. 45: 2 it removes the *Hiphil* form אוֹשֵׁר (cf. Gen. 8:17 הוֹצֵא *Kerî* הִצֵּא), without any grammatical, but certainly not without some traditional ground.

בִּי in v. 10 is closely connected with לְמַעַן שׁוֹרְרֵי : on account of my way-layers, for the following are their characteristics. אֵין is separated by בְּפִיהוּ (= בפיו Psa. 62: 5) from נִכְנָה the word it governs; this was the more easily possible as the usage of the language almost entirely lost sight of the fact that אֵין is the construct of אֵין, Ges. § 152, 1. In his mouth is nothing that should stand firm, keep its ground, remain the same (cf. Job. 42: 7 f.). The singular suffix of בְּפִיהוּ has a distributive meaning: *in ore uniuscujusque eorum*.

Hence the *sing.* at once passes over into the *plur.*: קִרְבָּם הוֹת their inward part, i.e., that towards which it goes forth and in which it has its rise (vid., 49:12) is הוֹת corruption, from הִנָּה which comes from הָנָה = Arab. *hawâ*, to yawn, gape, χάλναιν, *hiare*, a yawning abyss and a gaping vacuum, and then, inasmuch as, starting from the primary idea of an empty space, the verbal significations *libere ferri* (especially from below upwards) and more particularly *animo ad* or *in aliquid ferri* are developed, it obtains the pathological sense of strong desire, passion, just as it does also the intellectual

sense of a loose way of thinking proceeding from a self-willed tendency (vid., Fleischer on Job. 37: 6). In Hebrew the prevalent meaning of the word is corruption, Psa. 57: 2, which is a metaphor for the abyss, *barathrum*, (so far, but only so far Schultens on Pro. 10: 3 is right), and proceeding from this meaning it denotes both that which is physically corruptible (Job. 6:30) and, as in the present passage and frequently, that which is corruptible from an ethical point of view. The meaning strong desire, in which **הָנָה** looks as though it only differed from **הָנָס** in one letter, occurs only in Psa. 52: 9, Pro. 10: 3, Mic. 7: 3. The substance of their inward part is that which is corruptible in every way, and their throat, as the organ of speech, as in Psa. 115: 7; 149: 6, cf. 69: 4, is (perhaps a figure connected with the primary meaning of **הוֹוֹת**) a grave, which yawns like jaws, which open and snatch and swallow down whatever comes in their way. To this “they make smooth their tongue” is added as a circumstantial clause. Their throat is thus formed and adapted, while they make smooth their tongue (cf. Pro. 2:16), in order to conceal their real design beneath flattering language. From this meaning, **הַחֲלִיק** directly signifies to flatter in Psa. 36: 3, Pro. 29: 5. The last two lines of the strophe are formed according to the caesura schema. This schema is also continued in the concluding strophe.

*Psa. 5:11-13.* The verb **אָשָׁם** or **אָשַׁם** unites in itself the three closely allied meanings of becoming guilty (e.g., Lev. 5:19), of a feeling of guilt (Lev. 5: 4 f.), and of expiation (Psa. 34:22 f.); just as the verbal adj. **אָשָׁם** also signifies both liable to punishment and expiating, and the substantive **אָשָׁם** both the guilt to be expiated and the expiation. The *Hiph.* **הִאֲשִׁים** signifies to cause any one to render the expiation due to his fault, to make him do penance. As an exception God is here, in the midst of the Jehovic Psalms, called **אֱלֹהִים**, perhaps not altogether unintentionally as being God the Judge. The **מִן** of **מִמַּעְצוֹתֵיהֶם** (with *Gaja* by the **מִן** and a transition of the counter-tone *Metheg* into *Galgal*, as in Hos. 11: 6 into *Meajla*, vid., *Psalter* ii. 526) is certainly that of the cause in Hos. 11: 6, but here it is to be explained with Olsh. and Hitz. according to Sir. 14: 2, Judith 11: 6 (cf. Hos. 10: 6): may they fall from their own counsels, i.e., founder in the execution of them. Therefore **מִן** in the sense of “down from, away,” a sense which the parallel **הִדְיָחמוּ** thrust them away (cf. **דָּחוּ** from **דָּחָה** 36:13), presupposes. The **ב** of **בְּרַב** is to be understood according to Joh. 8:21, 24 “ye shall die *ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν*“. The multitude of their transgressions shall remain unforgiven and in this state God is to cast them into hades. The ground of this terrible prayer is set forth by **כִּי מָרוּ בְךָ**. The tone of **מָרוּ**, for a well-known reason (cf. e.g., Psa. 37:40; 64:11; 72:17) has retreated to the *penult.* **מָרָה**, root **מַר**, prop. to be

or hold one's self stiff towards any one, compare Arab. *mârr*, *tmârr*, to press and stiffen against one another in wrestling, Arab. *mârâ*, *tmârâ*, to struggle against anything, whether with outward or mental and moral opposition. Their obstinacy is not obstinacy against a man, but against God Himself; their sin is, therefore, Satanic and on that account unpardonable. All the prayers of this character are based upon the assumption expressed in Psa. 7:13, that those against whom they are directed do not wish for mercy. Accordingly their removal is prayed for. Their removal will make the *ecclesia pressa* free and therefore joyous. From this point of view the prayer in v. 12 is inspired by the prospect of the result of their removal. The *futt.* do not express a wish, but a consequence. The division of the verse is, however, incorrect. The rise of the first half of the verse closes with **בָּךְ** (the pausal form by *Pazer*), its fall is **לְעוֹלָם יִרְנְנוּ**; then the rise begins anew in the second half, extending to **בְּךָ** which ought likewise to be pointed **בְּךָ**, and **אֱהָבֵי שִׁמְךָ** is its fall. **עֲלִימוּ** (from **הִסְדָּךְ** *Hiph.* of **סָבַךְ** Psa. 91: 4) is awkward in this sequence of thoughts. Hupfeld and Hitzig render it: “they shall rejoice for ever whom Thou defendest;” but then it ought not only to be pointed **יִרְנְנוּ**, but the **ן** must also be removed, and yet there is nothing to characterise **הִסְדָּךְ עֲלִימוּ** as being virtually a subject. On the other hand it does not harmonise with the other consecutive futures. It must therefore, like **יִפְּלוּ**, be the optative: “And do Thou defend them, then shall those who love Thy name rejoice in Thee.” And then upon this this joy of those who love the name of Jahve (i.e., God in His revelation of Himself in redemption) Psa. 69:37; 119:132, is based by **כִּי־אֶתְּהַלַּלְךָ** from a fact of universal experience which is the sum of all His historical self-attestations. **עֲלִימוּ** is used instead of **עֲלִיָּהֶם** as a graver form of expression, just like **הִדְיָחֶמוּ** for **הִדְיָחֶם** as an indignant one. The form **וַיַּעֲלֶצְוּ** (Ges. § § 63, 3) is chosen instead of the **וַיֵּאֲלָצוּ** found in Psa. 25: 2; 68: 4, in order to assist the rhythm. The *futt.* are continuative. **תַּעֲטֶרְנֵנוּ**, *cinges eum*, is not a contracted *Hiph.* according to 1Sa. 17:25, but *Kal* as in 1Sa. 23:26; here it is used like the *Piel* in 8: 6 with a double accusative. The **צָנָה** (from **צָנַן** Arab. *šân*, *med. Waw*, Aethiop. **צֹן** to hedge round, guard) is a shield of a largest dimensions; larger than **מָגֵן** 1Ki. 10:16 f. (cf. 1Sa. 17: 7, where Goliath has his **צָנָה** borne by a shield-bearer). **כַּצָּנָה** “like a shield” is equivalent to: as with a shield (Ges. § 118, 3, rem.). The name of God, **יְהוָה**, is correctly drawn to the second member of the verse by the accentuation, in order to balance it with the first; and for this reason the first clause does not begin with **כִּי־אֶתְּהַלַּלְךָ** here as it does elsewhere (Psa. 4: 9; 12: 8). **רְצוֹן** delight, goodwill, is also a synonym for the divine blessing in Deu. 33:23.

## Psalm 6

### A CRY FOR MERCY UNDER JUDGMENT

*6: 2 JAHVE, not in Thy wrath rebuke me,  
And not in Thy hot displeasure chasten me!*

*6: 3 Be gracious unto me, for I am fading away;  
Oh heal me, Jahve, for my bones are affrighted,*

*6: 4 And my soul is affrighted exceedingly —  
And Thou, O Jahve, how long?!*

*6: 5 Return, Jahve, rescue my soul,  
Save me for Thy mercy's sake.*

*6: 6 For in death there is no remembrance of Thee,  
In Sheôl who can give Thee thanks?*

*6: 7 I am exhausted with my groaning,  
Every night make I my bed to swim —  
With my tears I flood my couch.*

*6: 8 Sunken is mine eye with grief,  
It is grown old because of all mine oppressors.*

*6: 9 Depart from me all ye who deal wickedly!  
For Jahve hath heard my loud weeping,*

*6:10 Jahve hath heard my supplication:  
Jahve will accept my prayer.*

*6:11 All mine enemies shall be ashamed and affrighted exceedingly,  
They shall turn away ashamed suddenly.*

The morning prayer, Psalm ch. 5, is followed by a “*Psalm of David*,” which, even if not composed in the morning, looks back upon a sleepless, tearful night. It consists of three strophes. In the middle one, which is a third longer than the other two, the poet, by means of a calmer outpouring of his heart, struggles on from the cry of distress in the first strophe to the believing confidence of the last. The hostility of men seems to him as a punishment of divine wrath, and consequently (but this is not so clearly expressed as in Psalm 38, which is its counterpart) as the result of his sin; and this persecution, which to him has God’s wrath behind it and sin as the sting of its bitterness, makes him sorrowful and sick even unto death. Because the Psalm contains no confession of sin, one might be inclined to think that the church has wrongly reckoned it as the first of the seven (probably selected with reference to the seven days of the week) *Psalmi paenitentiales* (6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143). A. H. Francke in his *Introductio in Psalterium* says, it is rather *Psalmus*

*preparatorius hominis gravissimi tentati a paenitente probe distinguendi.* But this is a mistake. The man who is tempted is distinguished from a penitent man by this, that the feeling of wrath is with the one perfectly groundless and with the other well-grounded. Job was one who was tempted thus. Our psalmist, however, is a penitent, who accordingly seeks that the punitive chastisement of God, as the just God, may for him be changed into the loving chastisement of God, as the merciful One.

We recognise here the language of penitently believing prayer, which has been coined by David. Compare v. 2 with Psa. 38: 2; 3 with Psa. 41: 5; 5 with Psa. 109:26; 6 with Psa. 30:10; 7 with Psa. 69: 4; 8 with 31:10; 11 with Psa. 35: 4, 26. The language of Heman's Psalm is perceptibly different, comp. v. 6 with Psa. 87:11-13; 8 with Psa. 88:10. And the corresponding strains in Jeremiah (comp. v. 2, 38: 2 with Jer. 10:24; 3 and 5 with Jer. 17:14; 7 with Jer. 45: 3) are echoes, which to us prove that the Psalm belongs to an earlier age, not that it was composed by the prophet (Hitzig). It is at once probable, from the almost anthological relationship in which Jeremiah stands to the earlier literature, that in the present instance also he is the reproducer. And this idea is confirmed by the fact that in Jer. 10:25, after language resembling the Psalm before us, he continues in words taken from Psa. 79: 6 f. When Hitzig maintains that David could no more have composed this disconcertedly despondent Psalm than Isaiah could the words in Isa. 21: 3, 4, we refer, in answer to him, to Isa. 22: 4 and to the many attestations that David did weep, 2Sa. 1:12; 3:32; 12:21; 15:30; 19: 1.

The accompanying musical direction runs: *To the Precentor, with accompaniment of stringed instruments, upon the Octave.* The LXX translates ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀγδόης, and the Fathers associate with it the thought of the octave of eternal happiness, ἡ ὀγδόη ἁεὶνῆ, as Gregory of Nyssa says, ἡτὶς ἔστιν ὁ ἔφεξις αἰών. But there is no doubt whatever that אֶל-הַשְּׁמִינִית has reference to music. It is also found by Psalm 12, and besides in 1Ch. 15:21. From this latter passage it is at least clear that it is not the name of an instrument. An instrument with eight strings could not have been called an *octave* instead of an *octachord*. In that passage they played upon nablās אֶל-עֲלָמוֹת, and with citherns אֶל-הַשְּׁמִינִית. If עֲלָמוֹת denotes maidens = maidens' voices i.e., *soprano*, then, as it seems, אֶל-הַשְּׁמִינִית is a designation of the bass, and אֶל-הַשְּׁמִינִית equivalent to *all' ottava bassa*. The fact that Psalm 46, which is accompanied by the direction אֶל-עֲלָמוֹת, is a joyous song, whereas Psalm ch. 6 is a plaintive one and Psalm ch. 12 not less gloomy and sad, accords with this. These two were to be played in the lower octave, that one in the higher.

*Psa. 6: 2-4.* There is a chastisement which proceeds from God's love to the man as being pardoned and which is designed to purify or to prove him, and a chastisement which proceeds from God's wrath against the man as striving obstinately against, or as fallen away from, favour, and which satisfies divine justice. Psa. 94:12; 118:17, Pro. 3:11 f. speak of this loving chastisement. The man who should decline it, would act against his own salvation. Accordingly David, like Jeremiah (Jer. 10:24), does not pray for the removal of the chastisement but of the chastisement *in wrath*, or what is the same thing, of the judgment proceeding from wrath [*Zorngericht*]. בַּחֲמָתְךָ and בְּאַפֶּיךָ stand in the middle, between לֹא and the verbs, for the sake of emphasis. Hengstenberg indeed finds a different antithesis here. He says: "The contrast is not that of chastisement in love with chastisement in wrath, but that of loving rescue in contrast with chastisement, which always proceeds from the principle of wrath." If what is here meant is, that always when God chastens a man his wrath is the true and proper motive, it is an error, for the refutation of which one whole book of the Bible, viz., the Book of Job, has been written. For there the friends think that God is angry with Job; but we know from the prologue that, so far from being angry with him, he on the contrary glories in him. Here, in this Psalm, assuming David to be its author, and his adultery the occasion of it, it is certainly quite otherwise. The chastisement under which David is brought low, has God's wrath as its motive: it is punitive chastisement and remains such, so long as David remains fallen from favour. But if in sincere penitence he again struggles through to favour, then the punitive becomes a loving chastisement: God's relationship to him becomes an essentially different relationship. The evil, which is the result of his sin and as such indeed originates in the principle of wrath, becomes the means of discipline and purifying which love employs, and this it is that he here implores for himself. And thus Dante Alighieri <sup>185</sup> correctly and beautifully paraphrases the verse:

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

In דַּוִּד David prays God to let him experience His loving-kindness and tender mercy in place of the punishment He has a right to inflict; for anguish of soul has already reduced him to the extreme even of bodily sickness: he is withered up and weary. אִמְלַל has *Pathach*, and consequently seems to be the 3 *pers. Pul.* as in Joe. 1:10, Nah. 1: 4; but this cannot be according to the rules of grammar. It is an adjective, like שֹׁאֵן, רַעֲוֵן, with the passive pointing. The formation אִמְלַל (from אָמַל Arab. *aml*, with the primary meaning to stretch out lengthwise) is analogous to the IX and XI forms of the Arabic verb which serve especially to express colours and defects (Caspari § 59). The two words

אֲמַלְלָ אֲנִי have the double accent *Mercha-Mahpach* together, and according to the exact mode of writing (vid., Baer in my *Psalter* ii. 492) the *Mahpach*, (the sign resembling *Mahpach* or rather *Jethib*), ought to stand between the two words, since it at the same time represents the *Makkeph*. The principal tone of the united pair, therefore, lies on *āni*; and accordingly the adj. אֲמַלְלָ is shortened to אֲמַלְלָ (cf. אֲדַמְדַּם, הִפְכַּכְפַּךְ, מְרַמַּס, and the like) — a contraction which proves that אֲמַלְלָ is not treated as *part. Pul.* (= מְאֲמַלְלָ), for its characteristic *ā* is unchangeable. The prayer for healing is based upon the plea that his bones (Job. 4:14, Isa. 38:13) are affrighted. We have no German word exactly corresponding to this נִבְהַל which (from the radical notion “to let go,” cogn. בָּלָה) expresses a condition of outward overthrow and inward consternation, and is therefore the effect of fright which disconcerts one and of excitement that deprives one of self-control. <sup>186</sup>

His soul is still more shaken than his body. The affliction is therefore not a merely bodily ailment in which only a timorous man loses heart. God’s love is hidden from him. God’s wrath seems as though it would wear him completely away. It is an affliction beyond all other afflictions. Hence he enquires: And Thou, O Jahve, how long?! Instead of אַתָּה it is written אַתָּה, which the *Keri* says is to be read אַתָּה, while in three passages (Num. 11:15, Deu. 5:24, Eze. 28:14) אַתָּה is admitted as *masc.*

*Psa. 6: 5-8.* God has turned away from him, hence the prayer שׁוּבָה, viz., אֲנִי. The tone of שׁוּבָה is on the *ult.*, because it is assumed to be read אֲנִי שׁוּבָה. The *ultima* accentuation is intended to secure its distinct pronunciation to the final syllable of שׁוּבָה, which is liable to be drowned and escape notice in connection with the coming together of the two aspirates (vid., on 3: 8). May God turn to him again, rescue חַיְלִי from חַלִּי, which is transitive in Hebr. and Aram., to free, *expedire, exuere*, Arab. *chalaṣa*, to be pure, prop. to be loose, free) his soul, in which his affliction has taken deep root, from this affliction, and extend to him salvation on the ground of His mercy towards sinners. He finds this cry for help upon his yearning to be able still longer to praise God, — a happy employ, the possibility of which would be cut off from him if he should die. זָכַר, as frequently הִזְכִּיר, is used of remembering one with reverence and honour; הִנָּדָה (from נָדָה) has the *dat. honoris* after it. שְׁאוּל, v. 6b, ἄδης (Rev. 20:13), alternates with מְנוֹת. Such is the name of the grave, the yawning abyss, into which everything mortal descends (from שְׁאָל = שׁוּל Arab. *sāl*, to be loose, relaxed, to hang down, sink down: a sinking in, that which is sunken in, <sup>187</sup>

a depth). The writers of the Psalms all (which is no small objection against Maccabean Psalms) know only of one single gathering-place of the dead in the depth of the earth, where they indeed live, but it is only a *quasi* life, because they are secluded from the light of this world and, what is the most lamentable, from the light of God's presence. Hence the Christian can only join in the prayer of v. 6 of this Psalm and similar passages (Psa. 30:10; 88:11-13; 115:17, Isa. 38:18 f.) so far as he transfers the notion of hades to that of gehenna. <sup>f88</sup>

In hell there is really no remembrance and no praising of God. David's fear of death as something in itself unhappy, is also, according to its ultimate ground, nothing but the fear of an unhappy death. In these "pains of hell" he is wearied with (ב as in Psa. 69: 4) groaning, and bedews his couch every night with a river of tears. Just as the *Hiph.* הִשְׁחָה signifies to cause to swim from שָׁחָה to swim, so the *Hiph.* הִמָּסָה signifies to dissolve, cause to melt, from מָסָה (cogn. מָסַם) to melt. דִּמְעָה, in Arabic a *nom. unit.* a tear, is in Hebrew a flood of tears.

In v. 8 עֵינַי does not signify my "appearance" (Num. 11: 7), but, as becomes clear from Psa. 31:10; 88:10, Job. 17: 7, "my eye;" the eye reflects the whole state of a man's health. The verb עָשַׁשׁ appears to be a denominative from עָשׂ: to be moth-eaten. <sup>f89</sup>

The signification *senescere* for the verb עָתַק is more certain. The closing words בְּכָל-צוּרָרַי (cf. Num. 10: 9 הִצַּר הַצֹּרֵר the oppressing oppressor, from the root צָר Arab. *ṣr*, to press, squeeze, and especially to bind together, *constringere, coartare* <sup>f90</sup>), in which the writer indicates, partially at least, the cause of his grief (בָּאֵם, in Job. 18: 7 בָּאֵשׁ), are as it were the socket into which the following strophe is inserted.

*Psa. 6: 9-11.* Even before his plaintive prayer is ended the divine light and comfort come quickly into his heart, as Frisch says in his "*Neuklingende Harfe Davids.*" His enemies mock him as one forsaken of God, but even in the face of his enemies he becomes conscious that this is not his condition. Thrice in vv. 9, 10 his confidence that God will answer him flashes forth: He hears his loud sobbing, the voice of his weeping that rises towards heaven, He hears his supplication, and He graciously accepts his prayer. The twofold שָׁמַע expresses the fact and יָקַח its consequence. That which he seems to have to suffer, shall in reality be the lot of his enemies, viz., the end of those who are rejected of God: they shall be put to shame. The בּוֹשׁ, Syr. *b<sup>e</sup>het*, Chald. בְּהַת, בְּהַת, which we meet with here for the first time, is not connected with the Arab. *bht*, but (since the Old Arabic as a rule has *t* as a mediating vowel



between ש and t, ת) with Arab. *bât*, which signifies “to turn up and scatter about things that lie together (either beside or upon each other)” *erueret et diruere, disturbare*, — a root which also appears in the reduplicated form Arab. *btt* : *to root up and disperse, whence Arab. battun*, sorrow and anxiety, according to which therefore בּוֹשׁ (= בּוֹשׁ as Arab. *bâta* = *bawata*) prop. signifies *disturbare*, to be perplexed, lose one’s self-control, and denotes shame according to a similar, but somewhat differently applied conception to *confundi*, συγγεῖσθαι, συγχύνεσθαι. יִבְהִלוּ points back to vv. 2, 3: the lot at which the malicious have rejoiced, shall come upon themselves. As is implied in יָשׁוּבוּ יְבוֹשׁוּ, a higher power turns back the assailants filled with shame (Psa. 9: 4; 35: 4).

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

## Psalm 7

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

*7: 2 JAHVE, my God, in Thee do I hide myself;  
Save me from all my persecutors, and deliver me!*

*7: 3 Lest he tear my soul like a lion,  
Rending it in pieces while there is none to deliver.*

*7: 4 Jahve, my God, if I have done this,  
If iniquity cling to my hands,*

*7: 5 If I have rewarded evil to him that was at peace with me  
And plundered mine enemy without cause:*

*7: 6 Then let the enemy persecute my soul and take [it],  
And tread down my life to the earth,  
And lay my dignity in the dust. (Sela)*

*7: 7 Arise, Jahve, in Thine anger,  
Lift up Thyself against the rage of mine oppressors,  
And awake for me, Thou hast indeed arranged justice!*

*7: 8 And let the host of the nations stand round about Thee  
And over it do Thou return again on high!*

*7: 9 Jahve shall judge the peoples —  
Jahve, judge me according to my righteousness  
and my innocence in me!*

*7:10 Oh let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end,  
establish the righteous,  
Thou art He who trieth the hearts and reins, a just God.*

*7:11 My shield is borne by Elohim,  
The Saviour of the upright in heart.*

*7:12 Elohim is a righteous Judge  
And a God threatening day by day.*

*7:13 If a man will not repent, He whetteth His sword,  
He hath bent His bow and made it ready,*

*7:14 And against him He directeth the weapon of death,  
His arrows He maketh burning arrows.*

*7:15 Behold, he travaileth with evil:  
he conceiveth trouble and bringeth forth falsehood.*

*7:16 He hath digged a pit and hollowed it out,  
And falleth into the hollow that he is making.*

*7:17 His trouble cometh back upon his own head,  
And his violent dealing cometh down upon his own pate.*

*7:18 I will give thanks to Jahve according to His righteousness,  
And will sing praise to the name of Jahve, the Most High.*

In the second part of Psalm ch. 6 David meets his enemies with strong self-confidence in God. Psalm 7, which even Hitzig ascribes to David, continues this theme and exhibits to us, in a prominent example taken from the time of persecution under Saul, his purity of conscience and joyousness of faith. One need only read 1Sa. 24-26 to see how this Psalm abounds in unmistakable references to this portion of David's life. The superscribed statement of the events that gave rise to its composition point to this. Such statements are found exclusively only by the Davidic Psalms. <sup>f91</sup>

The inscription runs: *Shiggajon of David, which he sang to Jahve on account of the sayings of Cush a Benjamite.* אֱלֹהֵי דָבָר is intentionally chosen instead of אֱלֹהֵי which has other functions in these superscriptions. Although דָבָר and דְבָרִי can mean a thing, business, affairs (Exo. 22: 8, 1Sa. 10: 2, and freq.) and אֱלֹהֵי דָבָרִי “in reference to” (Deu. 4:21, Jer. 7:22) or “on occasion of” (Jer. 14: 1), still we must here keep to the most natural signification: “on account of the words (speeches).” *Cûsh* (LXX falsely Χουσί = כּוּשִׁי; Luther,

likewise under misapprehension, “the Moor”) must have been one of the many servants of Saul, his kinsman, one of the talebearers like Doeg and the Ziphites, who shamefully slandered David before Saul, and roused him against David. The epithet **בְּיָמֵי** (as in 1Sa. 9: 1, 21, cf. **אִשְׁיָמֵי** 2Sa. 20: 1) describes him as “a Benjamite” and does not assume any knowledge of him, as would be the case if it were **הַבְּנֵימִי**, or rather (in accordance with biblical usage) **בְּיָהוּמֵי**. And this accords with the actual fact, for there is no mention of him elsewhere in Scripture history. The statement **עַל־דְּבָרֵי וְגו'** is hardly from David’s hand, but written by some one else, whether from tradition or from the **דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים** of David, where this Psalm may have been interwoven with the history of its occasion. Whereas there is nothing against our regarding **שְׁנִיּוֹן לְדָוִד**, or at least **שְׁנִיּוֹן**, as a note appended by David himself.

Since **שְׁנִיּוֹן** (after the form **חֲזִיוֹן** a vision) belongs to the same class as superscribed appellations like **מְזֻמָּר** and **מְשֻׁבָּל**, and the *Tephilla* of Habakkuk, Hab. 3: 1 (vid., my *Commentary*), has the addition **אֶל־שְׁנִינּוֹת**, **שְׁנִיּוֹן** must be the name of a kind of lyric composition, and in fact a kind described according to the rhythm of its language or melody. Now since **שָׁגָה** means to go astray, wander, reel, and is cognate with **שָׁגַע** (whence comes **שְׁגָעוֹן** madness, a word formed in the same manner) **שְׁנִיּוֹן** may mean in the language of prosody a reeling poem, i.e., one composed in a most excited movement and with a rapid change of the strongest emotions, therefore a dithyrambic poem, and **שְׁנִינּוֹת** dithyrambic rhythms, variously and violently mixed together. Thus Ewald and Rödiger understand it, and thus even Tarnov, Geier, and other old expositors who translate it *cantio erratica*. What we therefore look for is that this Psalm shall consist, as Ainsworth expresses it (1627), “of sundry variable and wandering verses,” that it shall wander through the most diverse rhythms as in a state of intoxication — an expectation which is in fact realized. The musical accompaniment also had its part in the general effect produced. Moreover, the contents of the Psalm corresponds to this poetic musical style. It is the most solemn pathos of exalted self-consciousness which is expressed in it. And in common with Hab. 3 it gives expression to the joy which arises from zealous anger against the enemies of God and from the contemplation of their speedy overthrow. Painful unrest, defiant self-confidence, triumphant ecstasy, calm trust, prophetic certainty — all these states of mind find expression in the irregular arrangement of the strophes of this Davidic dithyramb, the ancient customary Psalm for the feast of Purim (*Sofrim* xviii. § 2).

*Psa. 7: 2-3.* With this word of faith, love, and hope בְּיָהוָה חֲסִיתִי (as in Psa. 141: 8), this holy *captatio benevolentiae*, David also begins in Psa. 11: 1; 16: 1; 31: 2, cf. 71: 1. The *perf.* is inchoative: in Thee have I taken my refuge, equivalent to: in Thee do I trust. The transition from the multitude of his persecutors to the *sing.* in v. 3 is explained most naturally, as one looks at the inscription, thus: that of the many the one who is just at the time the worst of all comes prominently before his mind. The verb מָרַף from the primary signification *carpere* (which corresponds still more exactly to חָרַף) means both to tear off and to tear in pieces (whence מְרֻפָּה that which is torn in pieces); and פָּרַק from its primary signification *frangere* means both to break loose and to break in pieces, therefore to liberate, e.g., in Psa. 136:24, and to break in small pieces, 1Ki. 19:11. The persecutors are conceived of as wild animals, as lions which rend their prey and crunch its bones. Thus blood-thirsty are they for his soul, i.e., his life. After the painful unrest of this first strophe, the second begins the tone of defiant self-consciousness.

*Psa. 7: 4-6.* According to the inscription זֹאת points to the substance of those slanderous sayings of the Benjamite. With אִם־שֶׁעוֹל בִּכְפִי one may compare David's words to Saul אִין בְּיַדִּי רָעָה 1Sa. 24:12; 26:18; and from this comparison one will at once see in a small compass the difference between poetical and prose expression. שְׁלָמִי (Targ. לְבַעַל שְׁלָמִי) is the name he gives (with reference to Saul) to him who stands on a peaceful, friendly footing with him, cf. the adjct. שְׁלוֹם, Psa. 55:21, and אִישׁ שְׁלוֹם, 41:10. The verb גָּמַל, cogn. גָּמַר, signifies originally to finish, complete, (root גָּם, כָּם, cf. כִּימָה to be or to make full, to gather into a heap). One says גָּמַל טוֹב and גָּמַל רָע, and also without a material object גָּמַל עָלַי or גָּמַלְנִי *benefecit* or *malefecit mihi*. But we join גָּמַלְתִּי with רָע according to the Targum and contrary to the accentuation, and not with שְׁלָמִי (Olsh., Böttch., Hitz.), although שְׁלָם beside מְשָׁלָם, as e.g., דִּבֵּר beside מְדַבֵּר might mean "requiting." The poet would then have written: אִם שְׁלַמְתִּי גָּמַלְתִּי רָע i.e., if I have retaliated upon him that hath done evil to me. In v. 5 we do not render it according to the meaning to חָלַץ which is usual elsewhere: but rather I rescued... (Louis de Dieu, Ewald § 345, a, and Hupfeld). Why cannot חָלַץ in accordance with its primary signification *expedire, exuere* (according to which even the signification of rescuing, taken exactly, does not proceed from the idea of drawing out, but of making loose, *exuere vinclis*) signify here *exuere = spoliare*, as it does in Aramaic? And how extremely appropriate it is as an allusion to the incident in the cave, when David did not rescue Saul, but, without indeed designing to take חָלִיצָה, *exuviae*, cut off the hem of his garment! As Hengstenberg observes, "He

affirms his innocence in the most general terms, thereby showing that his conduct towards Saul was not anything exceptional, but sprang from his whole disposition and mode of action.” On the 1 *pers. fut. conv.* and *ah, vid.*, on 3: 6. **רִיָּקֶם** belongs to **צוֹרָרִי**, like Psa. 25: 3; 69: 5.

In the apodosis, v. 6, the *fut. Kal* of **רָדַף** is made into three syllables, in a way altogether without example, since, by first making the *Shebâ* audible, from **רָדַף** it is become **רָדַף** (like **צָחַק** Gen. 21: 6, **תַּהַלֵּךְ** Psa. 73: 9, Exo. 9:23, **שָׁמְעָה** 39:13), and this is then sharpened by an euphonic *Dag. forte*.<sup>192</sup>

Other ways of explaining it, as that by Cahjúg = **יִתְרַדֵּף**, or by Kimchi as a mixed form from *Kal* and *Piel*,<sup>193</sup> have been already refuted by Baer, *Thorath Emeth*, p. 33. This dactylic jussive form of *Kal* is followed by the regular jussives of *Hiph.* **יִשָּׁג** and **יִשְׁכַּן**. The rhythm is similar so that in the primary passage Exo. 15: 9, which also finds its echo in Psa. 18:38, — viz. iambic with anapaests interspersed. By its parallelism with **נַפְשִׁי** and **חַיִּי**, **כְּבוֹדִי** acquires the signification “my soul,” as Saadia, Gecatilia and Aben-Ezra have rendered it — a signification which is secured to it by Psa. 16: 9; 30:13; 57: 9; 108: 2, Gen. 49: 6. Man’s soul is his *doxa*, and this it is as being the copy of the divine *doxa* (*Bibl. Psychol.* S. 98, [tr. p. 119], and frequently). Moreover, “let him lay in the dust” is at least quite as favourable to this sense of **כְּבוֹדִי** as to the sense of personal and official dignity (Psa. 3: 4; 4: 3). To lay down in the dust is equivalent to: to lay in the dust of death, Psa. 22:16. **שְׁכַנֵי עָפָר**, Isa. 26:19, are the dead. According to the biblical conception the soul is capable of being killed (Num. 35:11), and mortal (Num. 23:10). It binds spirit and body together and this bond is cut asunder by death. David will submit willingly to death in case he has ever acted dishonourably.

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

**Psa. 7: 7-9.** In the consciousness of his own innocence he calls upon Jahve to sit in judgment and to do justice to His own. His vision widens and extends from the enemies immediately around to the whole world in its hostility towards Jahve and His anointed one. In the very same way special judgments and the judgment of the world are portrayed side by side, as it were on one canvas, in the prophets. The truth of this combination lies in the fact of the final judgment being only the finale of that judgment which is in constant execution in the world itself. The language here takes the highest and most majestic flight conceivable. By **קוֹמָה** (*Milra*, ass in 3: 8), which is one of

David's words of prayer that he has taken from the lips of Moses (Psa. 9:20; 10:12), he calls upon Jahve to interpose. The parallel is **הִנָּשֵׂא** lift Thyself up, show thyself in Thy majesty, Psa. 94: 2, Isa. 33:10. The anger, in which He is to arise, is the principle of His judicial righteousness. With this His anger He is to gird Himself (Psa. 76:11) against the ragings of the oppressors of God's anointed one, i.e., taking vengeance on their many and manifold manifestations of hostility. **עֲבָרוֹת** is a shorter form of the construct (instead of **עֲבָרוֹתָ** Job. 40:11, cf. 21:31) of **עֲבָרָה** which describes the anger as running over, breaking forth from within and passing over into words and deeds (cf. Arab. *fās*, used of water: it overflows the dam, of wrath: it breaks forth). It is contrary to the usage of the language to make **מִשְׁפָּט** the object to **עוֹרָה** in opposition to the accents, and it is unnatural to regard it as the accus. of direction = **לְמִשְׁפָּט** (Psa. 35:23), as Hitzig does. The accents rightly unite **אֱלֹהֵי עוֹרָה** : awake (stir thyself) for me i.e., to help me (**אֱלֹהֵי** like **לְקַרְאֲתִי**, Psa. 59: 5). The view, that **צִוִּיתָ** is then precative and equivalent to **צִוֶּה**: command judgment, is one that cannot be established according to syntax either here, or in Psa. 71: 3. It ought at least to have been **וְצִוִּיתָ** with *Waw consec.* On the other hand the relative rendering: Thou who hast ordered judgment (Maurer, Hengst.), is admissible, but unnecessary. We take it by itself in a confirmatory sense, not as a circumstantial clause: having commanded judgment (Ewald), but as a co-ordinate clause: Thou hast indeed enjoined the maintaining of right (Hupfeld).

The psalmist now, so to speak, arranges the judgment scene: the assembly of the nations is to form a circle round about Jahve, in the midst of which He will sit in judgment, and after the judgment He is to soar away (Gen. 17:22) aloft over it and return to the heights of heaven like a victor after the battle (see Psa. 68:19). Although it strikes one as strange that the termination of the judgment itself is not definitely expressed, yet the rendering of Hupfeld and others: sit Thou again upon Thy heavenly judgment-seat to judge, is to be rejected on account of the **שׁוּבָה** (cf. on the other hand Psa. 21:14) which is not suited to it; **שׁוּב לְמָרוֹם** can only mean Jahve's return to His rest after the execution of judgment. That which vv. 7 and 8 in the boldness of faith desire, the beginning of v. 9 expresses as a prophetic hope, from which proceeds the prayer, that the Judge of the earth may also do justice to him (**שְׁפַטְנִי** *vindica me*, as in Psa. 26: 1; 35:24) according to his righteousness and the purity of which he is conscious, as dwelling in him. **עִלֵּי** is to be closely connected with **תָּמִי**, just as one says **נִפְשִׁי עִלֵּי** (*Psychol.* S. 152 [tr. p. 180]). That which the individual as ego, distinguishes from itself as being in it, as subject, it denotes by **עִלֵּי**. In explaining it elliptically: "come upon me" (Ew., Olsh., Hupf.) this

psychologically intelligible usage of the language is not recognised. On אָהַם vid., on Psa. 25:21; 26: 1.

**Psa. 7:10-11.** In this strophe we hear the calm language of courageous trust, to which the rising and calmly subsiding caesural schema is particularly adapted. He is now concerned about the cessation of evil: Oh let it come to an end (נָמַר intransitive as in Psa. 12: 2; 77: 9)... His prayer is therefore not directed against the individuals as such but against the wickedness that is in them. This Psalm is the key to all Psalms which contain prayers against one's enemies. Just in the same manner וְהִכֹּנֵן is intended to express a wish; it is one of the comparatively rare voluntatives of the 2 *pers.* (Ew. § 229): and mayst Thou be pleased to establish.... To the termination of evil which is desired corresponds, in a positive form of expression, the desired security and establishment of the righteous, whom it had injured and whose continuance was endangered by it. וְבִחַן is the beginning of a circumstantial clause, introduced by וְ, but without the personal pronoun, which is not unfrequently omitted both in the leading participial clause, as in Isa. 29: 8 (which see), and in the minor participial clause as here (cf. Psa. 55:20): *cum sis = quoniam es*. The reins are the seat of the emotions, just as the heart is the seat of the thoughts and feelings. Reins and heart lie naked before God — a description of the only καρδιογνώστης, which is repeated in Jer. 11:20; 20:12, Rev. 2:23. In the thesis the adjective is used with אֱלֹהִים in the *sing.* as in Psa. 78:56, cf. 58:12. God is the righteous God, and by his knowledge of the inmost part He is fully capable of always showing Himself both righteous in anger and righteous in mercy according to the requirements and necessity of the case. Therefore David can courageously add מִגְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים, my shield doth God carry; אֱלֹהִים (Psa. 89:19) would signify: He has it, it (my shield) belongs to Him, אֱלֹהִים (1Ch. 18: 7) signifies: He bears it, or if one takes shield in the sense of protection: He has taken my protection upon Himself, has undertaken it (as in Psa. 62: 8, cf. Jud. 19:20), as He is in general the Saviour of all who are devoted to Him with an upright heart, i.e., a heart sincere, guileless (cf. 32 with v. 2). צַדִּיקִים is intentionally repeated at the end of the first two lines — the favourite palindrome, found more especially in Isa. 40-56. And to the mixed character of this Psalm belongs the fact of its being both Elohimic and Jehovic. From the calm language of heartfelt trust in God the next strophe passes over into the language of earnest warning, which is again more excited and somewhat after the style of didactic poetry.

**Psa. 7:12-14.** If God will in the end let His wrath break forth, He will not do it without having previously given threatenings thereof every day, viz., to the ungodly, cf. Isa. 66:14, Mal. 1: 4. He makes these feel His אַסְּף beforehand in

order to strike a wholesome terror into them. The subject of the conditional clause אִם-לֹא יָשׁוּב is any ungodly person whatever; and the subject of the principal clause, as its continuation in v. 14 shows, is God. If a man (any one) does not repent, then Jahve will whet His sword (cf. Deu. 32:41). This sense of the words accords with the connection; whereas with the rendering: “forsooth He (Elohim) will again whet His sword” (Böttch., Ew., Hupf.) יָשׁוּב, which would moreover stand close by יִלְמֹשׁ (cf. e.g., Gen. 30:31), is meaningless; and the אִם-לֹא of asseveration is devoid of purpose. Judgment is being gradually prepared, as the *fut.* implies; but, as the *perff.* imply, it is also on the other hand like a bow that is already strung against the sinner with the arrow pointed towards him, so that it can be executed at any moment. כּוֹנֵן of the making ready, and הַכִּין of the aiming, are used alternately. לוֹ, referring to the sinner, stands first by way of emphasis as in Gen. 49:10, 1Sa. 2: 3, and is equivalent to אָלָיו, Eze. 4: 3. “Burning” arrows are fire-arrows (זִיקוֹת, זְקִים, *malleoli*); and God’s fire-arrows are the lightnings sent forth by Him, 18:15, Zec. 9:14. The *fut.* יַפְעֵל denotes the simultaneous charging of the arrows aimed at the sinner, with the fire of His wrath. The case illustrated by Cush is generalised: by the sword and arrows the manifold energy of the divine anger is symbolised, and it is only the divine forbearance that prevents it from immediately breaking forth. The conception is not coarsely material, but the vividness of the idea of itself suggests the form of its embodiment.

**Psa. 7:15-18.** This closing strophe foretells to the enemy of God, as if dictated by the judge, what awaits him; and concludes with a prospect of thanksgiving and praise. Man brings forth what he has conceived, he reaps what he has sown. Starting from this primary passage, we find the punishment which sin brings with it frequently represented under these figures of הָרָה and יָלַד (חֵיל, חָבַל, הוֹלִיד), זָרַע and קָצַר, and first of all in Job. 15:35. The act, guilt, and punishment of sin appear in general as notions that run into one another. David sees in the sin of his enemies their self-destruction. It is singular, that travail is first spoken of, and then only afterwards pregnancy. For חָבַל signifies, as in Son. 8: 5, ὄδιναι, not: to conceive (Hitz.). The Arab. *ḥabila* (synonym of *ḥamala*) is not to conceive in distinction from being pregnant, but it is both: to be and to become pregnant. The accentuation indicates the correct relationship of the three members of the sentence. First of all comes the general statement: Behold he shall travail with, i.e., bring forth with writhing as in the pains of labour, אָוֶן, evil, as the result which proceeds from his wickedness. Then, by this thought being divided into its two factors (Hupf.) it goes on to say: that is, he shall conceive (*concipere*) עָמַל, and bear שָׁקַד. The former signifies trouble, *molestia*, just as *πovηρία* signifies that



which makes *πρόνοια*; the latter falsehood, viz., self-deception, delusion, vanity, inasmuch as the burden prepared for others, returns as a heavy and oppressive burden upon the sinner himself, as is said in v. 17; cf. Isa. 59: 4, where *אָנָן* instead of *שֶׁקֶר* denotes the accursed wages of sin which consist in the unmasking of its nothingness, and in the undeceiving of its self-delusion. He diggeth a pit for himself, is another turn of the same thought, 57: 7, Ecc. 10: 8. Psalm ch. 7 V. 16a mentions the digging, and 16b the subsequent falling into the pit; the aorist *וַיִּפֹּל* is, for instance, like v. 13b, 16: 9; 29:10. The attributive *וַיַּעַל* is virtually a genitive to *שַׁחַת*, and is rightly taken by Ges. § 124, 3, *a* as present: in the midst of the execution of the work of destruction prepared for others it becomes his own. The trouble, *עֲמַל*, prepared for others returns upon his own head (*בְּרֵאשׁוֹ*, clinging to it, just as *אֶל-רֵאשׁוֹ* signifies descending and resting upon it), and the violence, *חֲמָס*, done to others, being turned back by the Judge who dwells above (Mic. 1:12), descends upon his own pate (*קָדְקָדוֹ* with *ō* by *q*, as e.g., in Gen. 2:23). Thus is the righteousness of God revealed in wrath upon the oppressor and in mercy upon him who is innocently oppressed. Then will the rescued one, then will David, give thanks unto Jahve, as is due to Him after the revelation of His righteousness, and will sing of the name of Jahve the Most High (*עֲלִיּוֹן* as an appended name of God is always used without the *art.*, e.g., 57: 3). In the revelation of Himself He has made Himself a name. He has, however, revealed Himself as the almighty Judge and Deliverer, as the God of salvation, who rules over everything that takes place here below. It is this name, which He has made by His acts, that David will then echo back to Him in his song of thanksgiving.

## Psalm 8

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

*8: 2 JAHVE, our Lord,  
How excellent is Thy name in all the earth,  
Who hast covered the heavens with Thy glory!*

*8: 3 Out of the mouth of children and sucklings hast Thou founded a power,  
Because of Thine adversaries,  
To still the enemy and the revengeful.*

*8: 4 When I see Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers,  
The moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained:*

*8: 5 What is mortal man, that Thou art mindful of him,  
And the son of man that Thou carest for him!*

*8: 6 And hast made him a little less than divine,  
And crowned him with glory and honour.*

*8: 7 Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands,  
Thou hast put all things under his feet:*

*8: 8 Sheep and oxen all together,  
And also the beasts of the field,*

*8: 9 The fowls of heaven and the fishes of the sea,  
Whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea.*

*8:10 Jahve, our Lord,  
How excellent is Thy name in all the earth!*

Psalm ch. 7 closed with a similar prospect of his enemies being undeceived by the execution of the divine judgments to Psalm ch. 6. The former is the pendant or companion to the latter, and enters into detail, illustrating it by examples. Now if at the same time we call to mind the fact, that Psalm ch. 6, if it be not a morning hymn, at any rate looks back upon sleepless nights of weeping, then the idea of the arrangement becomes at once clear, when we find a hymn of the night following Psalm ch. 6 with its pendant, Psalm ch. 7. David composes even at night; Jahve's song, as a Korahite psalmist says of himself in Psa. 42: 9, was his companionship even in the loneliness of the night. The omission of any reference to the sun in v. 4 shows that Psalm ch. 8 is a hymn of this kind composed in the night, or at least one in which the writer transfers himself in thought to the night season. The poet has the starry heavens before him, he begins with the glorious revelation of Jahve's power on earth and in the heavens, and then pauses at man, comparatively puny man, to whom Jahve condescends in love and whom He has made lord over His creation. Ewald calls it a flash of lightning cast into the darkness of the creation.

Even Hitzig acknowledges David's authorship here; whereas Hupfeld is silent, and Olshausen says that nothing can be said about it. The idea, that David composed it when a shepherd boy on the plains of Judah, is rightly rejected again by Hitzig after he has been at the pains to support it. (This thought is pleasingly worked out by Nachtigal, *Psalmen gesungen vor David's Thronbesteigung*, 1797, after the opinion of E. G. von Bengel, *cum magna veri specie*.) For, just as the Gospels do not contain any discourses of our Lord belonging to the time prior to His baptism, and just as the New Testament canon does not contain any writings of the Apostles from the time prior to Pentecost, so the Old Testament canon contains no Psalms of David belonging to the time prior to his anointing. It is only from that time, when he is the anointed one of the God of Jacob, that he becomes the sweet singer of Israel, on whose tongue is the word of Jahve, 2Sa. 23: 1 f.

The inscription runs: *To the Precentor, on the Gittith, a Psalm of David*. The Targum translates it *super cithara, quam David de Gath attulit*. According to which it is a Philistine cithern, just as there was (according to Athenaeus and Pollux) a peculiar Phoenician and Carian flute played at the festivals of Adonis, called *γίγγραξ*, and also an Egyptian flute and a Doric lyre. All the Psalms bearing the inscription *אֶל־הַגִּיטִית* (8, 81, 84) are of a laudatory character. The gittith was, therefore, an instrument giving forth a joyous sound, or (what better accords with its occurring exclusively in the inscriptions of the Psalms), a joyous melody, perhaps a march of the Gittite guard, 2Sa. 15:18 (Hitzig).

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

*Psa. 8: 2-3*. Here, for the first time, the subject speaking in the Psalm is not one individual, but a number of persons; and who should they be but the church of Jahve, which (as in Neh. 10:30) can call Jahve its Lord (*אֱלֹהֵינוּ*), like *אֱלֹהֵינוּ* from *אֱלֹהִים plur. excellentiae*, Ges. § 108, 2); but knowing also at the same time that what it has become by grace it is called to be for the good of the whole earth? The *שֵׁם* of God is the impress (cognate Arabic *wasm*, a sign, Greek *σημα*) of His nature, which we see in His works of creation and His acts of salvation, a nature which can only be known from this visible and comprehensible representation (*nomen = gnomen*).<sup>194</sup>

This name of God is certainly not yet so known and praised everywhere, as the church to which it has been made known by a positive revelation can know and praise it; but, nevertheless, it, viz., the divine name uttered in creation and its works, by which God has made Himself known and capable of being recognised and named, if *אֶשֶׁר* *amplum et gloriosum*, everywhere throughout the earth, even if it were entirely without any echo. The clause with *אֶשֶׁר* must not be rendered: Who, do Thou be pleased to put Thy glory upon the heavens (Gesenius even: *quam tuam magnificentiam pone in caelis*), for such a use of the *imperat.* after *אֶשֶׁר* is unheard of; and, moreover, although it is true a thought admissible in its connection with the redemptive history (Psa. 57: 6, 12) is thus obtained, it is here, however, one that runs counter to the fundamental tone, and to the circumstances, of the Psalm. For the primary thought of the Psalm is this, that the God, whose glory the heavens reflect, has also glorified Himself in the earth and in man; and the situation of the poet is

this, that he has the moon and stars before his eyes: how then could he wish that heaven to be made glorious whose glory is shining into his eyes! It is just as impracticable to take **תָּנָה** as a contraction of **נִתְנָה**, like **תָּתָה** 2Sa. 22:41, = **נִתְתָה**, as Ammonius and others, and last of all Böhl, have done, or with Thenius (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1860 S. 712 f.) to read it so at once. For even if the thought: “which (the earth) gives (announces) Thy glory all over the heavens” is not contrary to the connection, and if **נָתַן עֲזוֹ**, Psal. 68:34, and **נָתַן כְּבוֹד**, Jer. 13:16, can be compared with this **נָתַן הוֹד**, still the phrase **נָתַן הוֹד אֵל** means nothing but to lay majesty on any one, to clothe him with it, Num. 27:20, 1Ch. 29:25, Dan. 11:21, cf. Psal. 21: 6; and this is just the thought one looks for, viz., that the name of the God, who has put His glory upon the heavens (Psal. 148:13) is also glorious here below. We must, therefore, take **תָּנָה**, although it is always the form of the *imper.* elsewhere, as *infin.*, just as **רָדָה** occurs once in Gen. 46: 3 as *infin.* (like the Arab. *rīda* a giving to drink, *līda* a bringing forth — forms to which **לָדָה** and the like in Hebrew certainly more exactly correspond).

**תָּנָה הוֹדָה** signifies the setting of Thy glory (prop. **τὸ τιθέναι τὴν δόξαν σου**) just like **שִׁים קִנְיָה**, the knowledge of Jahve, and Oba. 1: 5, **שִׁים קִנְיָה**, probably the setting of thy nest, Ges. § 133. 1. It may be interpreted: O Thou whose laying of Thy glory is upon the heavens, i.e., Thou who hast chosen this as the place on which Thou hast laid Thy glory (Hengst.). In accordance with this Jerome translates it: *qui posuisti gloriam tuam super caelos*. Thus also the Syriac version with the Targum: *dʿjabt* (**דִּיהַבַּת**) *shubhoch* ‘*al shʿmajo*, and Symmachus: **ὁς ἔταξας τὸν ἔπαινον σου ὑπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν**. This use of the *nomen verbale* and the genitival relation of **אֲשֶׁר** to **תָּנָה הוֹדָה**, which is taken as one notion, is still remarkable. Hitzig considers that no reasonable man would think and write thus: but thereby at the same time utterly condemns his own conjecture **תָּנָה הוֹדָה** (whose extending of glory over the heavens). This, moreover, goes beyond the limits of the language, which is only acquainted with **תָּן** as the name of an animal. All difficulty would vanish if one might, with Hupfeld, read **נִתְתָה**. But **תָּנָה** has not the slightest appearance of being a corruption of **נִתְתָה**. It might be more readily supposed that **תָּנָה** is an erroneous pointing for **תָּנָה** (to stretch or extend, cf. Hos. 8:10 to stretch forth, distribute): Thou whose glory stretches over the heavens, — an interpretation which is more probable than that it is, with Paulus and Kurtz, to be read **תָּנָה**: Thou whose glory is praised (*pass.* of the **תָּנָה** in Jud. 5:11; 11:40, which belongs to the dialect of Northern Palestine), instead of which one would more readily expect **תָּנָה**. The verbal notion, which is tacitly implied in Psal. 113: 4;

148:13, would then be expressed here. But perhaps the author wrote הוֹדָד instead of נִתְּתָה הוֹדָד, because he wishes to describe the setting out of the heavens with divine splendour <sup>195</sup> as being constantly repeated and not as done once for all.

There now follows, in v. 3, the confirmation of v. 2 *a*: also all over the earth, despite its distance from the heavens above, Jahve's name is glorious; for even children, yea even sucklings glorify him there, and in fact not mutely and passively by their mere existence, but with their mouth. עוֹלֵל (= מְעוֹלֵל), or עוֹלֵל is a child that is more mature and capable of spontaneous action, from עוֹלֵל (*Poel* of עָלַל *ludere*), <sup>196</sup> according to 1Sa. 22:19; 15: 3, distinct from יוֹנֵק, i.e., a suckling, not, however, *infans*, but, — since the Hebrew women were accustomed to suckle their children for a long period, — a little child which is able to lisp and speak (vid., 2 Macc. 7:27). Out of the mouth of beings such as these Jahve has founded for Himself עוֹ. The LXX translates it the utterance of praise, *αἴνον*; and עוֹ certainly sometimes has the meaning of power ascribed to God in praise, and so a laudatory acknowledgment of His might; but this is only when connected with verbs of giving, Psa. 29: 1; 68:35; 96: 7. In itself, when standing alone, it cannot mean this. It is in this passage: might, or victorious power, which God creates for Himself out of the mouths of children that confess Him. This offensive and defensive power, as Luther has observed on this passage, is conceived of as a strong building, עוֹ as מְעוֹז (Jer. 16:19) i.e., a fortress, refuge, bulwark, fortification, for the foundation of which He has taken the mouth, i.e., the stammering of children; and this He has done because of His enemies, to restrain (הִשְׁבִּיתָ to cause any one to sit or lie down, rest, to put him to silence, e.g., Isa. 16:10, Eze. 7:24) such as are enraged against Him and His, and are inspired with a thirst for vengeance which expresses itself in curses (the same combination is found in Psa. 44:17). Those meant, are the fierce and calumniating opponents of revelation. Jahve has placed the mouth of children in opposition to these, as a strong defensive controversial power. He has chosen that which is foolish and weak in the eyes of the world to put to shame the wise and that which is strong (1Co. 1:27). It is by obscure and naturally feeble instruments that He makes His name glorious here below. and overcomes whatsoever is opposed to this glorifying.

*Psa. 8: 4-6.* Stier wrongly translates: For I shall behold. The principal thought towards which the rest tends is v. 5 (parallel are vv. 2 *a*, 3), and consequently v. 4 is the protasis (par., v. 2 *b*), and כִּי accordingly is = *quum*, *quando*, in the sense of *quoties*. As often as he gazes at the heavens which bear upon themselves the name of God in characters of light (wherefore he says שָׁמַיִם), the heavens with their boundless spaces (an idea which lies in the *plur.*

(שָׁמַיִם) extending beyond the reach of mortal eye, the moon (יָרַח, dialectic וּרַח, perhaps, as Maurer derives it, from יָרַח = יָרַק = *subflavum esse*), and beyond this the innumerable stars which are lost in infinite space (בְּכֹכְבִים = בְּכַבְּבִים prop. round, ball-shaped, spherical bodies) to which Jahve appointed their fixed place on the vault of heaven which He has formed with all the skill of His creative wisdom (כִּוְנֵן to place and set up, in the sense of existence and duration): so often does the thought “what is mortal man...?” increase in power and intensity. The most natural thought would be: frail, puny man is as nothing before all this; but this thought is passed over in order to celebrate, with grateful emotion and astonished adoration, the divine love which appears in all the more glorious light, — a love which condescends to poor man, the dust of earth. Even if אָנוּשׁ does not come from אָנַשׁ to be fragile, nevertheless, according to the usage of the language, it describes man from the side of his impotence, frailty, and mortality (vid., Psa. 103:15, Isa. 51:12, and on Gen. 4:26). בְּיָרֵאֲדָם, also, is not without a similar collateral reference. With retrospective reference to עֹלָלִים וַיְנַקִּים, בְּיָרֵאֲדָם is equivalent to יְלֹדֵי-אִשָּׁה in Job. 14: 1: man, who is not, like the stars, God’s directly creative work, but comes into being through human agency born of woman. From both designations it follows that it is the existing generation of man that is spoken of. Man, as we see him in ourselves and others, this weak and dependent being is, nevertheless, not forgotten by God, God remembers him and looks about after him (פָּקַד of observing attentively, especially visitation, and with the *accus.* it is generally used of lovingly provident visitation, e.g., Jer. 15:15). He does not leave him to himself, but enters into personal intercourse with him, he is the special and favoured object whither His eye turns (cf. Psa. 144: 3, and the parody of the tempted one in Job. 7:17 f.).

It is not until v. 6 that the writer glances back at creation. וַתִּתְּסַרְהוּ (differing from the *fut. consec.* Job. 7:18) describes that which happened formerly. מִן הַתִּסְרָה signifies to cause to be short of, wanting in something, to deprive any one of something (cf. Ecc. 4: 8). מִן is here neither comparative (*paullum inferiorem eum fecisti Deo*), nor negative (*paullum derogasti ei, ne esset Deus*), but partitive (*paullum derogasti ei divinae naturae*); and, without אֱלֹהִים being on that account an abstract plural, *paullum Deorum*, = *Dei* (vid., *Genesis* S. 66 f.), is equivalent to *paullum numinis Deorum*. According to Gen. 1:27 man is created בְּצַלְמֵ אֱלֹהִים, he is a being in the image of God, and, therefore, nearly a divine being. But when God says: “let us make man in our image after our likeness,” He there connects Himself with the angels. The translation of the LXX ἡλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους, with which the Targum and the prevailing Jewish interpretations also harmonize, is, therefore, not

unwarranted. Because in the biblical mode of conception the angels are so closely connected with God as the nearest creaturely effulgence of His nature, it is really possible that in מַאֲלָהִים David may have thought of God including the angels. Since man is in the image of God, he is at the same time in the likeness of an angel, and since he is only a little less than divine, he is also only a little less than angelic. The position, somewhat exalted above the angels, which he occupies by being the bond between all created things, in so far as mind and matter are united in him, is here left out of consideration. The writer has only this one thing in his mind, that man is inferior to God, who is רִוּחַ, and to the angels who are רוּחֹת (Isa. 31: 3, Heb. 1:14) in this respect, that he is a material being, and on this very account a finite and mortal being; as Theodoret well and briefly observes: τῷ θνητῷ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἡλάττωται. This is the מַאֲט in which whatever is wanting to him to make him a divine being is concentrated. But it is nothing more than מַאֲט. The assertion in v. 6a refers to the fact of the nature of man being in the image of God, and especially to the spirit breathed into him from God; v. 6b, to his godlike position as ruler in accordance with this his participation in the divine nature: *honore ac decore coronasti eum*. כְּבוֹד is the manifestation of glory described from the side of its weightiness and fulness; הוֹד (cf. הֵד, הִדָּד) from the side of its far resounding announcement of itself (vid., on Job. 3: 9:20); הִדָּד from the side of its brilliancy, majesty, and beauty. הוֹד וְהִדָּד, Psal. 96: 6, or also הוֹד הִדָּד כְּבוֹד הוֹד, Psal. 145: 5, is the appellation of the divine *doxa*, with the image of which man is adorned as with a regal crown. The preceding *fut. consec.* also stamps תִּמְשִׁילֶהוּ and תִּתְאַטְרֶהוּ as historical retrospects. The next strophe unfolds the regal glory of man: he is the lord of all things, the lord of all earthly creatures.

*Psa. 8: 7-9.* Man is a king, and not a king without territory; the world around, with the works of creative wisdom which fill it, is his kingdom. The words “put under his feet” sound like a paraphrase of the רָדָה in Gen. 1:26, 28, כָּל is unlimited, as in Job. 13: 1; 42: 2, Isa. 44:24. But the expansion of the expression in vv. 8, 9 extends only to the earth, and is limited even there to the different classes of creatures in the regions of land, air, and water. The poet is enthusiastic in his survey of this province of man’s dominion. And his lofty poetic language corresponds to this enthusiasm. The enumeration begins with the domestic animals and passes on from these to the wild beasts — together the creatures that dwell on *terra firma*. צִנָּה (צִנָּא Num. 32:24) from צָנָה (צָנָא) Arab. *ḍnâ* (*ḍn*), as also Arab. *ḍân*, *fut. o., proliferum esse* is, in poetry, equivalent to צָנָן, which is otherwise the usual name for small cattle. אֶלְפִים (in Aramaic, as the name of the letter shows, a prose word) is in Hebrew

poetically equivalent to בָּקָר; the oxen which willingly accommodate themselves to the service of man, especially of the husbandman, are so called from אָלַף to yield to. Wild animals, which in prose are called חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ, (הַשָּׂדֶה) here bear the poetical name בְּהֵמוֹת שָׂדֵי, as in Joe. 2:22, cf. 1:20, 1Sa. 17:44. שָׂדֵי (in pause שָׂדֵי) is the primitive form of שָׂדֶה, which is not declined, and has thereby obtained a collective signification. From the land animals the description passes on to the fowls of the air and the fishes of the water. צִפּוֹר is the softer word, instead of עוֹף; and שָׁמַיִם is water. צִפּוֹר is the softer word, instead of עוֹף; and שָׁמַיִם is used without the *art.* according to poetical usage, whereas הַיָּם without the *art.* would have sounded too scanty and not sufficiently measured. In connection with יַמִּים the article may be again omitted, just as with שָׁמַיִם. עֵבֶר is a collective participle. If the following were intended: he (or: since he), viz., man, passes through the paths of the sea (Böttcher, Cassel, and even Aben-Ezra and Kimchi), then it would not have been expressed in such a monostich, and in a form so liable to lead one astray. The words may be a comprehensive designation of that portion of the animal kingdom which is found in the sea; and this also intended to include all from the smallest worm to the gigantic leviathan: ὀππόσα ποντοπόρουσ παραπιστείβουσι κελεύθουσι (Apollinaris). If man thus rules over every living thing that is round about him from the nearest to the most remote, even that which is apparently the most untameable: then it is clear that every lifeless created thing in his vicinity must serve him as its king. The poet regards man in the light of the purpose for which he was created.

*Psa. 8:10.* He has now demonstrated what he expressed in v. 2, that the name of Jahve whose glory is reflected by the heavens, is also glorious on earth. Thus, then, he can as a conclusion repeat the thought with which he began, in a wider and more comprehensive meaning, and weave his Psalm together, as it were, into a wreath.

It is just this Psalm, of which one would have least expected it, that is frequently quoted in the New Testament and applied to the Messiah. Indeed Jesus' designation of Himself by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, however far it may refer back to the Old Testament Scriptures, leans no less upon this Psalm than upon Dan. 7:13. The use the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 2: 6-8) makes of vv. 5-7 of this Psalm shows us how the New Testament application to the Messiah is effected. The psalmist regards man as one who glorifies God and as a prince created of God. The deformation of this position by sin he leaves unheeded. But both sides of the mode of regarding it are warranted. On the one hand, we see that which man has become by creation still in operation even in his present state; on the other hand, we see it distorted and stunted. If



we compare what the Psalm says with this shady side of the reality, from which side it is incongruous with the end of man's creation, then the song which treats of the man of the present becomes a prophecy of the man of the future. The Psalm undergoes this metamorphosis in the New Testament consciousness, which looks more to the loss than to that which remains of the original. In fact, the centre of the New Testament consciousness is Jesus the Restorer of that which is lost. The dominion of the world lost to fallen man, and only retained by him in a ruined condition, is allotted to mankind, when redeemed by Him, in fuller and more perfect reality. This dominion is not yet in the actual possession of mankind, but in the person of Jesus it now sits enthroned at the right hand of God. In Him the idea of humanity is transcendentally realised, i.e., according to a very much higher standard than that laid down when the world was founded. He has entered into the state — only a little (βραχύ τι) beneath the angels — of created humanity for a little while (βραχύ τι), in order to raise redeemed humanity above the angels. Everything (לְכָל) is really put under Him with just as little limitation as is expressed in this Psalm: not merely the animal kingdom, not merely the world itself, but the universe with all the ruling powers in it, whether they be in subjection or in hostility to God, yea even the power of death (1Co. 15:27, cf. Eph. 1:22). Moreover, by redemption, more than heretofore, the confession which comes from the mouth of little children is become a bulwark founded of God, in order that against it the resistance of the opponents of revelation may be broken. We have an example of this in Mat. 21:16, where our Lord points the pharisees and scribes, who are enraged at the Hosanna of the children, to Psal. 8:3. Redemption demands of man, before everything else, that he should become as a little child, and reveals its mysteries to infants, which are hidden from the wise and intelligent. Thus, therefore, it is μικροὶ καὶ νήπιοι, whose tongue is loosed by the Spirit of God, who are to put to shame the unbelieving; and all that this Psalm says of the man of the present becomes in the light of the New Testament in its relation to the history of redemption, a prophecy of the Son of man κατ' ἐξοχήν, and of the new humanity.

## Psalm 9

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

9: 2 *§ I WILL give thanks to Jahve with my whole heart,  
§ I will recount all Thy marvellous works —*

9: 3 *§ I will be glad and rejoice in Thee,  
§ I will sing praise to Thy name, O Most High!*

9: 4 ☐ *When mine enemies turned back,  
When they fell and perished before Thine angry face.*

9: 5 *For Thou hast maintained my right and my cause,  
Thou hast sat down on the throne, a righteous Judge.*

9: 6 ☐ *Thou didst rebuke peoples, Thou didst destroy the wicked,  
Their name didst Thou blot out for ever and ever.*

9: 7 ☐ *The enemy are perished, perpetual ruins;  
And cities hast Thou rooted out, effaced is their very memory.*

9: 8 ☐ *But Jahve sits enthroned for ever,  
He hath set His throne for judgment.*

9: 9 *And He shall judge the earth in righteousness,  
He shall minister judgment to the nations in uprightness.*

9:10 ☐ *So will Jahve be a stronghold to the oppressed,  
A stronghold in times of trouble;*

9:11 *Thus shall they trust in Thee who know Thy name,  
Because Thou hast not forsaken them who ask after Thee, Jahve!*

9:12 ☐ *Sing praises to Jahve, who dwelleth in Zion,  
Declare among the peoples His deeds;*

9:13 *That the Avenger of blood hath remembered them,  
He hath not forgotten the cry of the sufferer.*

9:14 ☐ *“Have mercy upon me,  
O Jahve; behold mine affliction from them that hate me,  
“My lifter-up from the gates of death,*

9:15 *“That I may tell all Thy praise,  
“That in the gates of the daughter of Zion I may rejoice in Thy salvation!”*

9:16 ☐ *The peoples have sunk down in the pit they have made,  
In the net, that they hid, were their own feet taken.*

9:17 *Jahve hath made Himself known: He hath executed judgment,  
Snaring the wicked in the work of his own hands. (Stringed Instruments, Sela.)*

9:18 ☐ *Yea back to Hades must the wicked return,  
All the heathen, that forget God.*

9:19 *For the poor shall not always be forgotten,  
The hope of the afflicted is (not) perished for ever.*

9:20 ☐ *Arise, Jahve, let not mortal man be defiant,  
Let the heathen be judged in Thy sight!*

**9:21 Put them in fear, O Jahve,  
Let the heathen know they are mortals! (Sela).**

Just as Psalm ch. 7 is placed after Psalm ch. 6 as exemplifying it, so Psalm ch. 9 follows Psalm ch. 8 as an illustration of the glorifying of the divine name on earth. And what a beautiful idea it is that Psalm ch. 8, the Psalm which celebrates Jahve's name as being glorious in the earth, is introduced between a Psalm that closes with the words "I will sing of the name of Jahve, the Most High" (Psa. 7:18) and one which begins: "I will sing of Thy name, O Most High!" (Psa. 9: 3).

The LXX translates the inscription **על-מות לבן** by **ὕπερ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ** (Vulg. *pro occultis filii*) as though it were **אל-עלמות**. Luther's rendering is still bolder: of beautiful (perhaps properly: lily-white) youth. Both renderings are opposed to the text, in which **על** occurs only once. The Targum understands **בן** of the duellist Goliath (= **אִישׁ הַבְּנִים**); and some of the Rabbis regard **לבן** even as a transposition of **נבל**: on the death of Nabal.

Hengstenberg has revived this view, regarding **נבל** as a collective designation of all Nabal-like fools. All these and other curious conceits arise from the erroneous idea that these words are an inscription referring to the contents of the Psalm. But, on the contrary, they indicate the tune or melody, and that by means of the familiar words of the song, — perhaps some popular song, — with which this air had become most intimately associated. At the end of Psalm 48 this indication of the air is simply expressed by **אל-מות**. The view of the Jewish expositors, who refer **לבן** to the musician **בן** mentioned in 1Ch. 15:18, has, therefore, some probability in its favour. But this name excites critical suspicion. Why may not a well-known song have begun **לבן מות** "dying (is) to the son..." or (if one is inclined to depart from the pointing, although there is nothing to render this suspicious) **מִתְּ לַבֵּן** "Death makes white?"

Even Hitzig does not allow himself to be misled as to the ancient Davidic origin of Psalm ch. 9 and 10 by the fact of their having an alphabetical arrangement. These two Psalms have the honour of being ranked among the thirteen Psalms which are acknowledged by him to be genuine Davidic Psalms. Thus, therefore, the alphabetical arrangement found in other Psalms cannot, in itself, bring us down to "the times of poetic trifling and degenerated taste." Nor can the freedom, with which the alphabetical arrangement is handled in Psalm ch. 9 and 10 be regarded as an indication of an earlier antiquity than these times. For the Old Testament poets, even in other instances, do not allow themselves to be fettered by forms of this character (vid., on Psalm 145, cf. on 42: 2); and the fact, that in Psalm ch. 9, 10 the alphabetical arrangement is not

fully carried out, is accounted for otherwise than by the license in which David, in distinction from later poets, indulged. In reality this pair of Psalms shows, that even David was given to acrostic composition. And why should he not be? Even among the Romans, Ennius (Cicero, *De Divin.* ii. 54 § 111), who belongs not to the leaden, but to the iron age, out of which the golden age first developed itself, composed in acrostics. And our oldest Germanic epics are clothed in the garb of alliteration, which Vilmar calls the most characteristic and most elevated style that the poetic spirit of our nation has created.

Moreover, the alphabetical form is adapted to the common people, as is evident from Augustine's *Retract.* i. 20. It is not a paltry substitute for the departed poetic spirit, not merely an accessory to please the eye, an outward embellishment — it is in itself indicative of mental power. The didactic poet regards the array of the linguistic elements as the steps by which he leads his pupils up into the sanctuary of wisdom, or as the many-celled casket in which he stores the pearls of the teachings of his wisdom. The lyric writer regards it as the keys on which he strikes every note, in order to give the fullest expression to his feelings. Even the prophet does not disdain to allow the order of the letters to exert an influence over the course of his thoughts, as we see from Nah. 1: 3-7. <sup>197</sup>

Therefore, when among the nine <sup>198</sup> alphabetical Psalms (9, 10, 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145) four bear the inscription לְדָוִד (9, 25, 34, 145), we shall not at once regard them as non-Davidic just because they indicate an alphabetical plan which is more or less fully carried out.

This is not the place to speak of the relation of the anonymous Psalm ch. 10 to Psalm ch. 9, since Psalm ch. 9 is not in any way wanting in internal roundness and finish. It is thoroughly hymnic. The idea that v. 14 passes from thanksgiving into supplication rests on a misinterpretation, as we shall presently see. This Psalm is a thoroughly national song of thanksgiving for victory by David, belonging to the time when Jahve was already enthroned on Zion, and therefore, to the time after the ark was brought home. Was it composed after the triumphant termination of the Syro-Ammonitish war? — The judgment of extermination already executed, Psa. 9: 8 f., harmonises with what is recorded in 2Sa. 12:31; and the גִּרְיָנִים, who are actually living within the borders of Israel, appear to be Philistines according to the annalistic passage about the Philistine feuds, 2Sa. 21:15 ff., cf. 8: 1 in connection with 1Sa. 13: 6.

*Psa. 9: 2-3.* In this first strophe of the Psalm, which is laid out in tetrastichs, — the normative strophe, — the alphabetical form is carried out in the fullest possible way: we have four lines, each of which begins with א. It is the prelude of the song. The poet rouses himself up to a joyful utterance of Jahve's praise. With his whole heart (Psa. 138: 1), i.e., all his powers of mind and soul as

centred in his heart taking part in the act, will he thankfully and intelligently confess God, and declare His wondrous acts which exceed human desire and comprehension (Psa. 26: 7); he will rejoice and be glad in Jahve, as the ground of his rejoicing and as the sphere of his joy; and with voice and with harp he will sing of the name of the Most High. **עֲלִיּוֹן** is not an attributive of the name of God (Hitz.: Thine exalted name), but, as it is everywhere from Gen. 14:18-22 onward (e.g., Psa. 97: 9), an attributive name of God. As an attributive to **שִׁמְךָ** one would expect to find **הָעֲלִיּוֹן**.

**Psa. 9: 4-5.** The call upon himself to thanksgiving sounds forth, and the **ב**-strophe continues it by expressing the ground of it. The preposition **ב** in this instance expresses both the time and the reason together (as in Psa. 76:10, 2Ch. 28: 6); in Latin it is *recedentibus hostibus meis retro*. **אָחֹר** serves to strengthen the notion of being driven back, as in Psa. 56:10, cf. Psa. 44:11; and just as, in Latin, verbs compounded of *re* are strengthened by *retro*. In v. 4b finite verbs take the place of the infinitive construct; here we have *futt.* with a present signification, just as in 2Ch. 16: 7 we find a *praet.* intended as perfect. For the rendering which Hitzig adopts: When mine enemies retreat backwards, they stumble... is opposed both by the absence of any syntactic indication in v. 4b of an apodosis (cf. 27: 2); and also by the fact that **יִפְּשְׁלוּ** is well adapted to be a continuation of the description of **שׁוּב אָחֹר** (cf. Joh. 18: 6), but is tame as a principal clause to the definitive clause **בְּשׁוּב אֹיְבֵי אָחֹר**. Moreover, **אָחֹר** does not signify backwards (which would rather be **אָחֲרָיִת** [Gen. 9:23, 1Sa. 4:18]), but back, or into the rear. The **מִן** of **מִפְּנֵיךָ** is the **מִן** of the cause, whence the action proceeds. What is intended is God's angry countenance, the look of which sets his enemies on fire as if they were fuel (Psa. 21:10), in antithesis to God's countenance as beaming with the light of His love. Now, while this is taking place, and because of its taking place, will be sing praise to God. From v. 2 we see that the Psalm is composed directly after the victory and while the destructive consequences of it to the vanquished are still in operation. David sees in it all an act of Jahve's judicial power. To execute any one's right, **מִשְׁפָּט** (Mic. 7: 9), to bring to an issue any one's suit or lawful demand, **דָּיַן** (Psa. 140:13), is equivalent to: to assist him and his good cause in securing their right. The phrases are also used in a judicial sense without the suffix. The genitive object after these principal words never denotes the person against whom, but the person on whose behalf, the third party steps forward with his judicial authority. Jahve has seated Himself upon His judgment-seat as a judge of righteousness (as in Jer. 11:20), i.e., as a judge whose judicial mode of procedure is righteousness, justice,<sup>199</sup>

and has decided in his favour. In **יָשַׁב ל** (as in Psa. 132:11), which is distinguished in this respect from **יָשַׁב אֶל** (Psa. 47: 9), the idea of motion, *considerere*, comes prominently forward.

**Psa. 9: 6-7.** The strophe with **ג**, which is perhaps intended to represent **ג** and **ג** as well, continues the confirmation of the cause for thanksgiving laid down in v. 4. He does not celebrate the judicial act of God on his behalf, which he has just experienced, alone, but in connection with, and, as it were, as the sum of many others which have preceded it. If this is the case, then in v. 6 beside the Ammonites one may at the same time (with Hengstenb.) think of the Amalekites (1Sa. 8:12), who had been threatened since the time of Moses with a “blotting out of their remembrance” (Exo. 17:14, Deu. 25:19, cf. Num. 24:20). The divine threatening is the word of omnipotence which destroys in distinction from the word of omnipotence that creates. **רָשַׁע** in close connection with **גוֹיִם** is individualising, cf. v. 18 with vv. 16, 17. **וְעַד** is a sharpened pausal form for **וְאֵד**, the *Pathach* going into a *Segol* (**פָּתַח קָמֶן**); perhaps it is in order to avoid the threefold *a*-sound in **לְעוֹלָם וְעַד** (Nägelsbach § 8 *extr.*). In v. 7 **הָאֹיִב** (with *Azla legarme*) appears to be a vocative. In that case **נִתְשַׁתָּה** ought also to be addressed to the enemy. But if it be interpreted: “Thou hast destroyed thine own cities, their memorial is perished,” destroyed, viz., at the challenge of Israel, then the thought is forced; and if we render it: “the cities, which thou hast destroyed, perished is the remembrance of them,” i.e., one no longer thinks of thine acts of conquest, then we have a thought that is in itself awkward and one that finds no support in any of the numerous parallels which speak of a blotting out and leaving no trace behind. But, moreover, in both these interpretations the fact that **זִכְרָם** is strengthened by **הִמָּה** is lost sight of, and the twofold masculine **זִכְרָם הִמָּה** is referred to **עָרִים** (which is carelessly done by most expositors), whereas **עִיר**, with but few exceptions, is feminine; consequently **זִכְרָם הִמָּה**, so far as this is not absolutely impossible, must be referred to the enemies themselves (cf. Psa. 34:17; 109:15). **הָאֹיִב** might more readily be *nom. absol.*: “the enemy — it is at end for ever with his destructions,” but **הִרְבָּה** never has an active but always only a neuter signification; or: “the enemy — ruins are finished for ever,” but the signification to be destroyed is more natural for **תָּמָם** than to be completed, when it is used of *ruinae*. Moreover, in connection with both these renderings the retrospective pronoun (**הִרְבְּנוֹתָיו**) is wanting, and this is also the case with the reading **הִרְבּוֹת** (LXX, Vulg., Syr.), which leaves it uncertain whose swords are meant. But why may we not rather connect **הָאֹיִב** at once with **תָּמוּ** as subject? In other instances **תָּמוּ** is also joined to a singular

collective subject, e.g., Isa. 16: 4; here it precedes, like **הָאֲרָב** in Jud. 20:37. **חָרְבוֹת לְנֶצַח** is a nominative of the product, corresponding to the factitive object with verbs of making: the enemies are destroyed as ruins for ever, i.e., so that they are become ruins; or, more in accordance with the accentuation: the enemy, destroyed as ruins are they for ever. With respect to what follows the accentuation also contains hints worthy of our attention. It does not take **נִתְשָׁת** (with the regular *Pathach* by *Athnach* after *Olewejored*, vid., on 2: 7) as a relative clause, and consequently does not require **זָכְרָם הַמָּה** to be referred back to **עָרִים**.

We interpret the passage thus: and cities (viz., such as were hostile) thou hast destroyed (**נִתְשָׁת** *evellere, extirpare*), perished is their (the enemies') memorial. Thus it also now becomes intelligible, why **זָכְרָם**, according to the rule Ges. § 121, 3, is so remarkably strengthened by the addition of **הַמָּה** (cf. Num. 14:32, 1Sa. 20:42, Pro. 22:19; 23:15, Eze. 34:11). Hupfeld, whose interpretation is exactly the same as ours, thinks it might perhaps be the enemies themselves and the cities set over against one another. But the contrast follows in v. 8: their, even their memorial is perished, while on the contrary Jahve endures for ever and is enthroned as judge. This contrast also retrospectively gives support to the explanation, that **זָכְרָם** refers not to the cities, but to **הָאֲרָב** as a collective. With this interpretation of v. 7 we have no occasion to read **מִהֶמָּה זָכְרָם** (Targ.), nor **זָכַר מִהֶמָּה** (Paul., Hitz.). The latter is strongly commended by Job. 11:20, cf. Jer. 10: 2; but still it is not quite admissible, since **זָכַר** here is not subjective (their own remembrance) but objective (remembrance of them). But may not **עָרִים** perhaps here, as in 139:20, mean zealots = adversaries (from **עִיר** *fervere, zelare*)? We reply in the negative, because the Psalm bears neither an Aramaising nor a North Palestinian impress. Even in connection with this meaning, the harshness of the **עָרִים** without any suffix would still remain. But, that the cities that are, as it were, plucked up by the root are cities of the enemy, is evident from the context.

**Psa. 9: 8-9.** Without a trace even of the remembrance of them the enemies are destroyed, while on the other hand Jahve endureth for ever. This strophe is the continuation of the preceding with the most intimate connection of contrast (just as the **ב**-strophe expresses the ground for what is said in the preceding strophe). The verb **יָשַׁב** has not the general signification "to remain" here (like **עָמַד** to endure), but just the same meaning as in Psa. 29:10. Everything that is opposed to Him comes to a terrible end, whereas He sits, or (which the *fut.* implies) abides, enthroned for ever, and that as Judge: He hath prepared His throne for the purpose of judgment. This same God, who has just given proof

that He lives and reigns, will by and by judge the nations still more comprehensively, strictly, and impartially. תָּבֵל, a word exclusively poetic and always without the article, signifies first (in distinction from אֶרֶץ the body of the earth and אֲדָמָה the covering or soil of the earth) the fertile (from יָבֵל) surface of the globe, the οἰκουμένη. It is the last Judgment, of which all preceding judgments are harbingers and pledges, that is intended. In later Psalms this Davidic utterance concerning the future is repeated.

*Psa. 9:10-11.* Thus judging the nations Jahve shows Himself to be, as a second 1-strophe says, the refuge and help of His own. The voluntative with *Waw* of sequence expresses that which the poet desires for his own sake and for the sake of the result mentioned in v. 11. מִשְׁגָּב, a high, steep place, where one is removed from danger, is a figure familiar to David from the experiences of his time of persecution. יָדָּ (in pause יָדָּ) is properly one who is crushed (from דָּכָה = דָּכָא, דָּכָה to crush, break in pieces, דָּקַק to pulverize), therefore one who is overwhelmed to the extreme, even to being completely crushed. The parallel is לְעִתּוֹת בְּצָרָה with the datival לְ (as probably also in Psa. 10: 1). עִתּוֹת from אֵת (time, and then both continuance, Psa. 81:16, and condition) signifies the public relations of the time, or even the vicissitudes of private life, Psa. 31:16; and בְּצָרָה is not הַצָּרָה with בַּ (Böttch.), which gives an expression that is meaninglessly minute (“for times in the need”), but one word, formed from בָּצַר (to cut off, Arab. to see, prop. to discern keenly), just like בִּקְשָׁה from בִּקֵּשׁ, prop. a cutting off, or being cut off, i.e., either restraint, especially motionlessness (= בְּצָרָת, Jer. 17: 8, plur. בְּצָרוֹת Jer. 14: 1), or distress, in which the prospect of deliverance is cut off. Since God is a final refuge for such circumstances of hopelessness in life, i.e., for those who are in such circumstances, the confidence of His people is strengthened, refreshed, and quickened. They who know His name, to them He has now revealed its character fully, and that by His acts; and they who inquire after Him, or trouble and concern themselves about Him (this is what דָּרַשׁ signifies in distinction from בִּקֵּשׁ), have now experienced that He also does not forget them, but makes Himself known to them in the fulness of His power and mercy.

*Psa. 9:12-13.* Thus then the 1-strophe summons to the praise of this God who has done, and will still do, such things. The summons contains a moral claim, and therefore applies to all, and to each one individually. Jahve, who is to be praised everywhere and by every one, is called יֹשֵׁב צִיּוֹן, which does not mean: He who sits enthroned in Zion, but He who inhabiteth Zion, Ges. § 138, 1. Such is the name by which He is called since the time when His earthly throne, the ark, was fixed on the castle hill of Jerusalem, Psa. 76: 3. It is the



epithet applied to Him during the period of the typical kingship of promise. That Jahve's salvation shall be proclaimed from Zion to all the world, even outside Israel, for their salvation, is, as we see here and elsewhere, an idea which throbs with life even in the Davidic Psalms; later prophecy beholds its realisation in its wider connections with the history of the future. That which shall be proclaimed to the nations is called **עֲלִילָוֹתָיו**, a designation which the *magnalia Dei* have obtained in the Psalms and the prophets since the time of Hannah's song, 1Sa. 2: 3 (from **עָלָל**, root **על**, to come over or upon anything, to influence a person or a thing, as it were, from above, to subject them to one's energy, to act upon them).

With **כִּי**, *quod*, in v. 13, the subject of the proclamation of salvation is unfolded as to its substance. The *praett.* state that which is really past; for that which God has done is the assumption that forms the basis of the discourse in praise of God on account of His mighty acts. They consist in avenging and rescuing His persecuted church, — persecuted even to martyrdom. The **אֲנֹתָם**, standing by way of emphasis before its verb, refers to those who are mentioned afterwards (cf. v. 21): the *Chethîb* calls them **עֲנִיִּים**, the *Keri* **עֲנָוִים**. Both words alternate elsewhere also, the *Keri* at one time placing the latter, at another the former, in the place of the one that stands in the text. They are both referable to **אָנָה** to bend (to bring low, Isa. 25: 5). The neuter signification of the verb **עָנָה** = **עָנָו**, Arab. *ʿnâ, fut. o.*, underlies the noun **עָנָו** (cf. **שָׁלוּ**), for which in Num. 12: 3 there is a *Keri* **עָנָוִי** with an incorrect *Jod* (like **שָׁלוּ** Job. 21:23). This is manifest from the substantive **עָנָה**, which does not signify affliction, but passiveness, i.e., humility and gentleness; and the noun **עָנִי** is passive, and therefore does not, like **עָנָו**, signify one who is lowly-minded, in a state of **עָנָה**, but one who is bowed down by afflictions, **עָנִי**. But because the twin virtues denoted by **עָנָה** are acquired in the school of affliction, there comes to be connected with **עָנִי** — but only secondarily — the notion of that moral and spiritual condition which is aimed at by dispensations of affliction, and is joined with a suffering life, rather than with one of worldly happiness and prosperity, — a condition which, as Num. 12: 3 shows, is properly described by **עָנָו** (**ταπεινός** and **πραΰς**). It shall be proclaimed beyond Israel, even among the nations, that the Avenger of blood, **דָּרַשׁ דָּמִים**, thinks of them (His **דָּרָשִׁים**), and has been as earnest in His concern for them as they in theirs for Him. **דָּמִים** always signifies human blood that is shed by violence and unnaturally; the *plur.* is the plural of the product discussed by Dietrich, *Abhandl.* S. 40. **דָּרַשׁ** to demand back from any one that which he has

destroyed, and therefore to demand a reckoning, indemnification, satisfaction for it, Gen. 9: 5, then absolutely to punish, 2Ch. 24:22.

**Psa. 9:14-15.** To take this strophe as a prayer of David at the present time, is to destroy the unity and hymnic character of the Psalm, since that which is here put in the form of prayer appears in what has preceded and in what follows as something he has experienced. The strophe represents to us how the עֲנִיִּים (עֲנִיִּים) cried to Jahve before the deliverance now experienced. Instead of the form חָנְנִי used everywhere else the resolved, and as it were tremulous, form חָנְנִי is designedly chosen. According to a better attested reading it is חָנְנִי (*Pathach* with *Gaja* in the first syllable), which is regarded by Chajug and others as the *imper. Piel*, but more correctly (Ewald § 251, c) as the *imper. Kal* from the intransitive imperative form חָנַן מְרוֹמָמִי. חָנַן is the vocative, cf. 17: 7. The gates of death, i.e., the gates of the realm of the dead (שְׁאוֹל, Isa. 38:10), are in the deep; he who is in peril of death is said to have sunk down to them; he who is snatched from peril of death is lifted up, so that they do not swallow him up and close behind him. The church, already very near to the gates of death, cried to the God who can snatch from death. Its final purpose in connection with such deliverance is that it may glorify God. The form אֲשַׁמְחֵנִי is *sing.* with a plural suffix just like אֲשַׁמְחֵנִי Eze. 35:11, אֲשַׁמְחֵנִי Eze. 9:15. The punctuists maintained (as עֲצַתֶּךָ in Isa. 47:13 shows) the possibility of a plural inflexion of a collective singular. In antithesis to the gates of death, which are represented as beneath the ground, we have the gates of the daughter of Zion standing on high. צִיּוֹן is *gen. appositionis* (Ges. § 116, 5). The daughter of Zion (Zion itself) is the church in its childlike, bride-like, and conjugal relation to Jahve. In the gates of the daughter of Zion is equivalent to: before all God's people, Psa. 116:14. For the gates are the places of public resort and business. At this period the Old Testament mind knew nothing of the songs of praise of the redeemed in heaven. On the other side of the grave is the silence of death. If the church desires to praise God, it must continue in life and not die.

**Psa. 9:16-17.** And, as this ה-*strophe* says, the church is able to praise God; for it is rescued from death, and those who desired that death might overtake it, have fallen a prey to death themselves. Having interpreted the ה-*strophe* as the representation of the earlier צַעֲקַת עֲנִיִּים we have no need to supply *dicendo* or *dicturus*, as Seb. Schmidt does, before this strophe, but it continues the *praett.* preceding the ה-*strophe*, which celebrate that which has just been experienced. The verb מָבַע (root מָבַע, whence also מָבַל) signifies originally to press upon anything with anything flat, to be pressed into, then, as here and in

Psa. 69: 3, 15, to sink in. **זו מָמְנוּ** (pausal form in connection with *Mugrash*) in the parallel member of the verse corresponds to the attributive **עָשׂוּ** (cf. **יַפְעֵל**, Psa. 7:16). The union of the epicene **זו** with **רָשָׁת** by *Makkeph* proceeds from the view, that **זו** is demonstrative as in Psa. 12: 8: the net there (which they have hidden). The punctuation, it is true, recognises a relative **זו**, Psa. 17: 9; 68:29, but it mostly takes it as demonstrative, inasmuch as it connects it closely with the preceding noun, either by *Makkeph* (Psa. 32: 8; 62:12; 142: 4; 143: 8) or by marking the noun with a conjunctive accent (Psa. 10: 2; 31: 5; 132:12). The verb **לָכַד** (Arabic to hang on, adhere to, IV to hold fast to) has the signification of seizing and catching in Hebrew.

In v. 17 Ben Naphtali points **נִדְרַע** with *ā*: Jahve is known (*part. Niph.*); Ben Asher **נִדְרַע**, Jahve has made Himself known (3 *pers. praet. Niph.* in a reflexive signification, as in Eze. 38:23). The readings of Ben Asher have become the *textus receptus*. That by which Jahve has made Himself known is stated immediately: He has executed judgment or right, by ensnaring the evil-doer (**רָשָׁע**, as in v. 6) in his own craftily planned work designed for the destruction of Israel. Thus Gussetius has already interpreted it. **נִדְרַע** is *part. Kal* from **נִדְרַע**. If it were *part. Niph.* from **נִדְרַע** the *ā*, which occurs elsewhere only in a few **עַע** verbs, as **נִמַּם** *liquefactus*, would be without an example. But it is not to be translated, with Ges. and Hengst.: “the wicked is snared in the work of his own hands,” in which case it would have to be pointed **נִדְרַע** (3 *pers. praet. Niph.*), as in the old versions. Jahve is the subject, and the suffix refers to the evil-doer. The thought is the same as in Job. 34:11, Isa. 1:31. This figure of the net, **רָשָׁת** (from **יָרַשׁ** *capere*), is peculiar to the Psalms that are inscribed **לְדָוִד**. The music, and in fact, as the combination **הַגִּיּוֹן סִלָּה** indicates, the playing of the stringed instruments (Psa. 92: 4), increases here; or the music is increased after a solo of the stringed instruments. The song here soars aloft to the climax of triumph.

**Psa. 9:18-19.** Just as in vv. 8 ff. the prospect of a final universal judgment was opened up by Jahve’s act of judgment experienced in the present, so here the grateful retrospect of what has just happened passes over into a confident contemplation of the future, which is thereby guaranteed. The LXX translates **יָשׁוּבוּ** by **ἀποστραφήτωσαν**, Jer. *convertantur*, a meaning which it may have (cf. e.g., 2Ch. 18:25); but why should it not be **ἀναστραφήτωσαν**, or rather: **ἀναστραφήσονται**, since v. 19 shows that v. 18 is not a wish but a prospect of that which is sure to come to pass? To be resolved into dust again, to sink away into nothing (*redactio in pulverem, in nihilum*) is man’s return to his original condition, — man who was formed from the dust, who was called into

being out of nothing. To die is to return to the dust, Psa. 104:29, cf. Gen. 3:19, and here it is called the return to *Sheôl*, as in Job. 30:23 to death, and in Psa. 90: 3 to atoms, inasmuch as the state of shadowy existence in Hades, the condition of worn out life, the state of decay is to a certain extent the renewal (*Repristination*) of that which man was before he came into being. As to outward form **לְשֹׂאנֵלָה** may be compared with **לִישְׁעָתָהּ** in Psa. 80: 3; the **ל** in both instances is that of the direction or aim, and might very well come before **שֹׂאֵלָה**, because this form of the word may signify both *ἐν ἄδου* and *εἰς ἄδου* (cf. **מִבְּקָלָהּ** Jer. 27:16). R. Abba ben Zabda, in *Genesis Rabba* cap. 50, explains the double sign of the direction as giving intensity to it: *in imum ambitum orci*. The heathen receive the epithet of **שְׂבִיחֵי אֱלֹהִים** (which is more neuter than **שְׂבִיחֵי**, 50:22); for God has not left them without a witness of Himself, that they could not know of Him, their alienation from God is a forgetfulness of Him, the guilt of which they have incurred themselves, and from which they are to turn to God (Isa. 19:22). But because they do not do this, and even rise up in hostility against the nation and the God of the revelation that unfolds the plan of redemption, they will be obliged to return to the earth, and in fact to Hades, in order that the persecuted church may obtain its longed for peace and its promised dominion. Jahve will at last acknowledge this *ecclesia pressa*; and although its hope seems like to perish, inasmuch as it remains again and again unfulfilled, nevertheless it will not always continue thus. The strongly accented **ל** rules both members of v. 19, as in 35:19; 38: 2, and also frequently elsewhere (Ewald § 351, a). **אֲבִיּוֹן**, from **אָבָה** to wish, is one eager to obtain anything = a needy person. The Arabic *ba*, which means the very opposite, and according to which it would mean “one who restrains himself,” viz., because he is obliged to, must be left out of consideration.

**Psa. 9:20-21.** By reason of the act of judgment already witnessed the prayer now becomes all the more confident in respect of the state of things which is still continually threatened. From **י** the poet takes a leap to **ק** which, however, seems to be a substitute for the **כ** which one would expect to find, since the following Psalm begins with **ל**. David's **קוֹמָה** (Psa. 3: 8; 7: 7) is taken from the lips of Moses, Num. 10:35. “Jahve arises, comes, appears” are kindred expressions in the Old Testament, all of which point to a final personal appearing of God to take part in human history from which He has now, as it were, retired into a state of repose becoming invisible to human eyes. Hupfeld and others wrongly translate “let not man become strong.” The verb **עָזַז** does not only mean to be or become strong, but also to feel strong, powerful, possessed of power, and to act accordingly, therefore: to defy, Psa. 52: 9, like **אָזַז** defiant, impudent (post-biblical **אָזַזָה** shamelessness). **אָנוּשׁ**, as in

2Ch. 14:10, is man, impotent in comparison with God, and frail in himself. The enemies of the church of God are not unfrequently designated by this name, which indicates the impotence of their pretended power (Isa. 51: 7, 12). David prays that God may repress the arrogance of these defiant ones, by arising and manifesting Himself in all the greatness of His omnipotence, after His forbearance with them so long has seemed to them to be the result of impotence. He is to arise as the Judge of the world, judging the heathen, while they are compelled to appear before Him, and, as it were, defile before Him (אֶל־פָּנָי), He is to lay מְנִרָה on them. If “razor” be the meaning it is equivocally expressed; and if, according to Isa. 7:20, we associate with it the idea of an ignominious rasure, or of throat-cutting, it is a figure unworthy of the passage. The signification master (LXX, Syr., Vulg., and Luther) rests upon the reading מְנִרָה, which we do not with Thenius and others prefer to the traditional reading (even Jerome translates: *pone, Domine, terrorem eis*); for מְנִרָה, which according to the Masora is instead of מְנִרָה (like מְכָלָה Hab. 3:17 for מְכָלָה), is perfectly appropriate. Hitzig objects that fear is not a thing which one lays upon any one; but מוֹרָא means not merely fear, but an object, or as Hitzig himself explains it in Mal. 2: 5 a “lever,” of fear. It is not meant that God is to cause them to be overcome with terror (אֶל), nor that He is to put terror into them (ב), but that He is to make them ל in no way differing from Psa. 31: 4; 140: 6, Job. 14:13) an object of terror, from which to their dismay, as the wish is further expressed in v. 21b, they shall come to know (Hos. 9: 7) that they are mortal men. As in Psa. 10:12; 49:12; 50:21; 64: 6, Gen. 12:13, Job. 35:14, Amo. 5:12, Hos. 7: 2, יִדְעוּ is followed by an only half indirect speech, without פִּי or אֲשֶׁר. אֲשֶׁר has *Dag. forte conj.* according to the rule of the אֲתִי מֵרַחֵק (concerning which vid., on 52: 5), because it is erroneously regarded as an essential part of the text.

## Psalm 10

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

*10: 1 לֹא WHY, Jahve, standest Thou afar off,  
Why hidest Thou Thyself in times of trouble!?*

*10: 2 Through the pride of the evil-doer the afflicted burneth with fear,  
They are taken in the plots which they have devised.*

*10: 3 For the evil-doer boasteth of his soul's desire,  
And the covetous renounceth [and] despiseth Jahve.*

*10: 4 The evil-doer in his scornfulness — : “With nothing will He punish!  
There is no God!” is the sum of his thoughts.*

*10: 5 Sure are his ways at all times;  
Far above are Thy judgments, out of his sight;  
All his adversaries, he puffeth at them.*

*10: 6 He saith in his heart: with nothing shall I be moved,  
From one generation to another I am he to whom no misfortune comes.*

*10: 7 Of cursing is his mouth full, and of deceit and oppression,  
Under his tongue is trouble and evil.*

*10: 8 He sitteth in the lurking-places of the villages,  
In the secret corners doth he slay the innocent;  
His eyes, they lie in wait for the weak.*


*10: 9 He lieth in wait in the secret corner as a lion in his lair,  
He lieth in wait to carry off the afflicted,  
He carrieth off the afflicted, drawing him away in his net.*


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

*10:11 He saith in his heart: “God hath forgotten,  
He hath hidden His face, He hath never seen.”*


*10:12  Arise, Jahve; O God lift up Thine hand,  
Forget not the sufferer!*

*10:13 Wherefore should the evil-doer blaspheme the Deity,  
Saying in his heart: Thou dost not punish?!*

*10:14  Thou dost indeed see it; for  
Thou beholdest trouble and grief, to lay it in Thy hand;  
The weak committeth himself to Thee,  
Thou art the helper of the orphan.*

*10:15  Break Thou the arm of the evil-doer;  
And the wicked man — punish his evil-doing,  
that it may vanish before Thee!*

*10:16 Jahve is King for ever and ever,  
The heathen are perished out of His land.*

*10:17  The desire of the sufferers hast Thou heard, Jahve,  
Thou didst establish their heart, didst cause Thine ear to hear,*

*10:18 To obtain justice for the orphan and the oppressed,  
That man of the earth may no more terrify.*

This Psalm and Psalm 33 are the only ones that are anonymous in the First book of the Psalms. But Psalm ch. 10 has something peculiar about it. The LXX gives it with Psalm ch. 9 as one Psalm, and not without a certain amount of warrant for so doing. Both are laid out in tetrastichs; only in the middle portion of Psalm ch. 10 some three line strophes are mixed with the four line. And assuming that the פ-strophe, with which Psalm ch. 9 closes, stands in the place of a כ-strophe which one would look for after the ך-strophe, then Psalm 10, beginning with ל, continues the order of the letters. At any rate it begins in the middle of the alphabet, whereas Psalm ch. 9 begins at the beginning. It is true the ל-strophe is then followed by strophes without the letters that come next in order; but their number exactly corresponds to the letters between ל and ק, ר, ש, ת with which the last four strophes of the Psalm begin, viz., six, corresponding to the letters מ, נ, ס, ע, פ, צ, which are not introduced acrostically. In addition to this it is to be remarked that Psalm ch. 9 and 10 are most intimately related to one another by the occurrence of rare expressions, as לַעֲתוֹת בְּצַרָה and יָדָד; by the use of words in the same sense, as אָנוּשׁ and גּוֹיִם; by striking thoughts, as “Jahve doth not forget” and “Arise;” and by similarities of style, as the use of the *oratio directa* instead of *obliqua*, Psa. 9:21; 10:13. And yet it is impossible that the two Psalms should be only one. Notwithstanding all their community of character they are also radically different. Psalm ch. 9 is a thanksgiving Psalm, Psalm ch. 10 is a supplicatory Psalm. In the latter the personality of the psalmist, which is prominent in the former, keeps entirely in the background. The enemies whose defeat Psalm ch. 9 celebrates with thanksgiving and towards whose final removal it looks forward are גּוֹיִם, therefore foreign foes; whereas in Psalm ch. 10 apostates and persecutors of his own nation stand in the foreground, and the גּוֹיִם are only mentioned in the last two strophes. In their form also the two Psalms differ insofar as Psalm ch. 10 has no musical mark defining its use, and the tetrastich strophe structure of Psalm 9, as we have already observed, is not carried out with the same consistency in Psalm 10. And is anything really wanting to the perfect unity of Psalm 9? If it is connected with Psalm ch. 10 and they are read together *uno tenore*, then the latter becomes a tail-piece which disfigures the whole. There are only two things possible: Psalm ch. 10 is a pendant to Psalm ch. 9 composed either by David himself, or by some other poet, and closely allied to it by its continuance of the alphabetical order. But the possibility of the latter becomes very slight when we consider that Psalm ch. 10 is not inferior to Psalm ch. 9 in the antiquity of the language and the characteristic nature of the thoughts. Accordingly the mutual coincidences point to the same author, and the two Psalms must be regarded as “two co-ordinate halves of one whole, which make a higher unity” (Hitz.). That hard,

dull, and tersely laconic language of deep-seated indignation at moral abominations for which the language has, as it were, no one word, we detect also elsewhere in some Psalms of David and of his time, those Psalms, which we are accustomed to designate as Psalms written in the indignant style (*in grollendem Stil*).

**Psa. 10: 1-2.** The Psalm opens with the plaintive inquiry, why Jahve tarries in the deliverance of His oppressed people. It is not a complaining murmuring at the delay that is expressed by the question, but an ardent desire that God may not delay to act as it becomes His nature and His promise. לָמָּה, which belongs to both members of the sentence, has the accent on the *ultima*, as e.g., before עֲזֹבֹתַי in 22: 2, and before הִרְעַתָּהּ in Exo. 5:22, in order that neither of the two gutturals, pointed with *a*, should be lost to the ear in rapid speaking (vid., on 3: 8, and Luzzatto on Isa. 11: 2, נָחָה עָלָיו<sup>f100</sup>). For according to the primitive pronunciation (even before the Masoretic) it is to be read: *lam h Adonaj*; so that consequently ה and א are coincident. The poet asks why in the present hopeless condition of affairs (on בְּצָרָה vid., on 9:10) Jahve stands in the distance (בְּרָחוֹק, only here, instead of מְרָחוֹק), as an idle spectator, and why does He cover (תַּעֲלִים with orthophonic *Dagesh*, in order that it may not be pronounced תַּעֲלִים), viz., His eyes, so as not to see the desperate condition of His people, or also His ears (Lam. 3:56) so as not to hear their supplication. For by the insolent treatment of the ungodly the poor burns with fear (Ges., Stier, Hupf.), not vexation (Hengst.). The assault is a *πύρωσις*, 1Pe. 4:12. The verb דָּלַק which calls to mind דָּלַקְתָּ, *πυρετός*, is perhaps chosen with reference to the heat of feeling under oppression, which is the result of the persecution, of the (בֹּי) דָּלַק אֲחֵרָיו of the ungodly. There is no harshness in the transition from the singular to the plural, because רָשָׁע and עֲנִי are individualising designations of two different classes of men. The subject to יִתְפָּשׂוּ is the עֲנִיִּים, and the subject to חֲשָׁבוּ is the רָשָׁעִים. The futures describe what usually takes place. Those who, apart from this, are afflicted are held ensnared in the crafty and malicious devices which the ungodly have contrived and plotted against them, without being able to disentangle themselves. The punctuation, which places *Tarcha* by וּ, mistakes the relative and interprets it: “in the plots there, which they have devised.”

**Psa. 10: 3-4.** The prominent features of the situation are supported by a detailed description. The *praett.* express those features of their character that have become a matter of actual experience. הִלֵּל, to praise aloud, generally with the *accus.*, is here used with אֵל of the thing which calls forth praise. Far from hiding the shameful desire or passion (Psa. 112:10) of his soul, he makes



it an object and ground of high and sounding praise, imagining himself to be above all restraint human or divine. Hupfeld translates wrongly: “and he blesses the plunderer, he blasphemes Jahve.” But the **רָשָׁע** who persecutes the godly, is himself a **בַּצֵּעַ**, a covetous or rapacious person; for such is the designation (elsewhere with **בַּצֵּעַ** Pro. 1:19, or **רַע בַּצֵּעַ** Hab 2: 9) not merely of one who “cuts off” (Arab. *bḏ*), i.e., obtains unjust gain, by trading, but also by plunder, **πλεονέκτης**. The verb **בָּרַךְ** (here in connection with *Mugrash*, as in Num. 23:20 with *Tiphcha* **בָּרַךְ**) never directly signifies *maledicere* in biblical Hebrew as it does in the alter Talmudic (whence **בִּרְבַת הַשָּׁם** blasphemy, *B. Sanhedrin* 56a, and frequently), but to take leave of any one with a benediction, and then to bid farewell, to dismiss, to decline and abandon generally, Job. 1: 5, and frequently (cf. the word *remercier*, *abdanken*; and the phrase “*das Zeitliche segnen*” = to depart this life). The declaration without a conjunction is climactic, like Isa. 1: 4, Amo. 4: 5, Jer. 15: 7. **נָאץ**, properly to prick, sting, is sued of utter rejection by word and deed. <sup>f101</sup>

In v. 4, “the evil-doer according to his haughtiness” (cf. Pro. 16:18) is *nom. absol.*, and **בְּלִי-יָדָשׁ אֵין אֱלֹהִים** (contrary to the accentuation) is virtually the predicate to **בְּלִי-מִזְמָנָתוֹ**. This word, which denotes the intrigues of the ungodly, in v. 2, has in this verse, the general meaning: thoughts (from **זָמַם**, Arab. *zmm*, to join, combine), but not without being easily associated with the secondary idea of that which is subtly devised. The whole texture of his thoughts is, i.e., proceeds from and tends towards the thought, that he (viz., Jahve, whom he does not like to name) will punish with nothing (**בִּל** the strongest form of subjective negation), that in fact there is no God at all. This second follows from the first; for to deny the existence of a living, acting, all-punishing (in one word: a personal) God, is equivalent to denying the existence of any real and true God whatever (Ewald).

*Psa. 10: 5.* This strophe, consisting of only three lines, describes his happiness which he allows nothing to disturb. The signification: to be lasting (prop. stiff, strong) is secured to the verb **חִיל** (whence **חִיל**) by Job. 20:21. He takes whatever ways he chooses, they always lead to the desired end; he stands fast, he neither stumbles nor goes astray, cf. Jer. 12: 1. The *Chethib* **דָּרְכוֹ** (**דָּרְכָו**) has no other meaning than that give to it by the *Kerî* (cf. *Psa.* 24: 6; 58: 8). Whatever might cast a cloud over his happiness does not trouble him: neither the judgments of God, which are removed high as the heavens out of his sight, and consequently do not disturb his conscience (cf. *Psa.* 28: 5, *Isa.* 5:12; and the opposite, 18:23), nor his adversaries whom he bloweth upon contemptuously. **מְרוֹם** is the predicate: *altissime remota*. And **הַפִּיָּה ב**, to

breathe upon, does not in any case signify: actually to blow away or down (to express which **נָשַׁב** or **נָשַׁף** would be used), but either to “snub,” or, what is more appropriate to v. 5b, to blow upon them disdainfully, to puff at them, like **הִפִּיחַ** in Mal. 1:13, and *flare rosas* (to despise the roses) in Prudentius. The meaning is not that he drives his enemies away without much difficulty, but that by his proud and haughty bearing he gives them to understand how little they interfere with him.

*Psa. 10: 6-7.* Then in his boundless carnal security he gives free course to his wicked tongue. That which the believer can say by reason of his fellowship with God, **בַּל־אֲמוּט** (Psa. 30: 7; 16: 8), is said by him in godless self-confidence. He looks upon himself in age after age, i.e., in the endless future, as **אֲשֶׁר לֹא בָרַע**, i.e., as one who (**אֲשֶׁר** as in Isa. 8:20) will never be in evil case (**בָּרַע** as in Exo. 5:19, 2Sa. 16: 8). It might perhaps also be interpreted according to Zec. 8:20, 23 (vid., Köhler, *in loc.*): in all time to come (it will come to pass) that I am not in misfortune. But then the personal pronoun (**אֲנִי** or **הוּא**) ought not be omitted; whereas with our interpretation it is supplied from **אֲמוּט**, and there is no need to supply anything if the clause is taken as an apposition: in all time to come he who.... In connection with such unbounded self-confidence his mouth is full of **אָלָה**, cursing, *execratio* (not perjury, *perjurium*, a meaning the word never has), **מַרְמוֹת**, deceit and craft of every kind, and **תִּדְךָ**, oppression, violence. And that which he has under his tongue, and consequently always in readiness for being put forth (Psa. 140: 4, cf. 66:17), is trouble for others, and in itself matured wickedness. Paul has made use of this v. 7 in his contemplative description of the corruptness of mankind, Rom. 3:14.

*Psa. 10: 8.* The ungodly is described as a liar in wait; and one is reminded by it of such a state of anarchy, as that described in Hos. 6: 9 for instance. The picture fixes upon one simple feature in which the meanness of the ungodly culminates; and it is possible that it is intended to be taken as emblematical rather than literally. **הִצֵּר** (from **הִצַּר** to surround, cf. Arab. *ḥḍr*, *ḥṣr*, and especially *ḥḍr*) is a farm premises walled in (Arab. *ḥaḍar*, *ḥaḍâr*, *ḥaḍâra*), then losing the special characteristic of being walled round it comes to mean generally a settled abode (with a house of clay or stone) in opposition to a roaming life in tents (cf. Lev. 25:31, Gen. 25:16). In such a place where men are more sure of falling into his hands than in the open plain, he lies in wait (**יָשַׁב**, like Arab. *q'd lh*, *subsedit = insidiatus est ei*), murders unobserved him who had never provoked his vengeance, and his eyes **לְחַלְכֶּה יִצְפְּנוּ**. **צָפָה** to spie, 37:32, might have been used instead of **צָפַן**; but **צָפַן** also obtains the

meaning, to lie in ambush (Psa. 56: 7, Pro. 1:11, 18) from the primary notion of restraining one's self (Arab. *ḏfn, fut. i.* in Beduin Arabic: to keep still, to be immoveably lost in thought, vid., on Job. 24: 1), which takes a transitive turn in צָפַן “to conceal.” חֲלָכָה, the dative of the object, is pointed just as though it came from חֵיל: Thy host, i.e., Thy church, O Jahve. The pausal form accordingly is חֲלָכָה with *Segol*, in v. 14, not with *Tsere* as in incorrect editions. And the appeal against this interpretation, which is found in the plur. חֲלָכָיִם v. 10, is set aside by the fact that this plural is taken as a double word: host (חֵל = חֵיל = חֵיל as in Oba. 1:20) of the troubled ones (בָּאִים, not as Ben-Labrat supposes, for נִבְאִים, but from פָּאָה weary, and mellow and decayed), as the *Kerî* (which is followed by the Syriac version) and the Masora direct, and accordingly it is pointed חֲלָכָיִם with *Tsere*. The punctuation therefore sets aside a word which was unintelligible to it, and cannot be binding on us. There is a verb חָלַךְ, which, it is true, does not occur in the Old Testament, but in the Arabic, from the root Arab. *ḥk, firmus fuit, firmum fecit* (whence also Arab. *ḥkl, intrans. to be firm, fermé, i.e., closed*), it gains the signification in reference to colour: to be dark (cognate with חָבַל, whence חֲבִילִי) and is also transferred to the gloom and blackness of misfortune. <sup>f102</sup>

From this an abstract is formed חֲלָךְ or חֲלָךְ (like חֲפֹשׁ): blackness, misfortune, or also of a defective development of the senses: imbecility; and from this an adjective חֲלָכָה = חֲלָכִי, or also (cf. חֲפֹשִׁי עֲלֶפְהָ Eze. 31:15 = one in a condition of languishing, חֲלָכָה = חֲלָכִי, plur. חֲלָכָיִם, after the form חֲדָאִים, from חֲדָאִי, Ew. § 189, g.

*Psa. 10: 9.* The picture of the רָשָׁע, who is become as it were a beast of prey, is now worked out further. The *lustrum* of the lion is called סֶדֶךְ Jer. 25:38, or סִבָּה Job. 38:40: a thicket, from סָבַךְ, which means both to interweave and to plait over = to cover (without any connection with שֶׁךְ a thorn, Arab. *shôk, a thistle*). The figure of the lion is reversed in the second line, the עֵנִי himself being compared to the beast of prey and the רָשָׁע to a hunter who drives him into the pit-fall and when he has fallen in hastens to drag him away (מִשְׁדֵּה, as in 28: 3, Job. 24:22) in, or by means of (Hos. 11: 4, Job. 40:25), his net, in which he has become entangled.

*Psa. 10:10-11.* The comparison to the lion is still in force here and the description recurs to its commencement in the second strophe, by tracing back the persecution of the ungodly to its final cause. Instead of the *Chethib* וְדָכָה (הַדָּכָה perf. consec.), the *Kerî* reads וְדָכָה more in accordance with the

Hebrew use of the tenses. Job. 38:40 is the rule for the interpretation. The two futures depict the settled and familiar lying in wait of the plunderer. True, the *Kal* **דָּבָה** in the signification “to crouch down” finds no support elsewhere; but the Arab. *dakka* to make even (cf. Arab. *ršd*, *fīrmiter inhaesit loco*, of the crouching down of beasts of prey, of hunters, and of foes) and the Arab. *dagga*, compared by Hitzig, to move stealthily along, to creep, and *dugjeh* a hunter’s hiding-place exhibit synonymous significations. The **ταπεινώσει αὐτόν** of the LXX is not far out of the way. And one can still discern in it the assumption that the text is to be read **יָשָׁב וְדָבָה** : and crushed he sinks (Aquila: **ὁ δὲ λασθεὶς καμφοθήσεται**); but even **דָּבָה** is not found elsewhere, and if the poet meant that, why could he not have written **נִדְבָה**? (cf. moreover Jud. 5:27). If **דָּבָה** is taken in the sense of a position in which one is the least likely to be seen, then the first two verbs refer to the sculker, but the third according to the usual *schema* (as e.g., Psa. 124: 5) is the predicate to **חֲלַפְאִים** (**חֲלַפְאִים**) going before it. Crouching down as low as possible he lies on the watch, and the feeble and defenceless fall into his strong ones, **עֲצוּמִיו**, i.e., claws. Thus the ungodly slays the righteous, thinking within himself: God has forgotten, He has hidden His face, i.e., He does not concern Himself about these poor creatures and does not wish to know anything about them (the denial of the truth expressed in Psa. 9:13, 19); He has in fact never been one who sees, and never will be. These two thoughts are blended; **בַּל** with the *perf.* as in Psa. 21: 3, and the addition of **לִנְצַח** (cf. Psa. 94: 7) denies the possibility of God seeing now any more than formerly, as being an absolute absurdity. The thought of a personal God would disturb the ungodly in his doings, he therefore prefers to deny His existence, and thinks: there is only fate and fate is blind, only an absolute and it has no eyes, only a notion and that cannot interfere in the affairs of men.

**Psa. 10:12-13.** The six strophes, in which the consecutive letters from **מ** to **ז** are wanting, are completed, and now the acrostic strophes begin again with **פ**. In contrast to those who have no God, or only a lifeless idol, the psalmist calls upon his God, the living God, to destroy the appearance that He is not an omniscient Being, by arising to action. We have more than one name of God used here; **אֱל** is a vocative just as in Psa. 16: 1; 83: 2; 139:17, 23. He is to lift up His hand in order to help and to punish (**נָשָׂא יָד**), whence comes the *imperat.* **נָשָׂא = שָׂא**, cf. **נָסָה** 4: 7, like **שָׁלַח יָד** Psa. 138: 7 and **נָטָה יָד** Exo. 7: 5 elsewhere). Forget not is equivalent to: fulfil the **לֹא שָׁכַח** of Psa. 9:13, put to shame the **שָׁכַח אֱל** of the ungodly, v. 11! Our translation follows the *Keri* **עֲנִיִּים**. That which is complained of in vv. 3, 4 is put in the

form of a question to God in v. 13: wherefore (אל־מָה, instead of which we find אל־מָה in Num. 22:32, Jer. 9:11, because the following words begin with letters of a different class) does it come to pass, i.e., is it permitted to come to pass? On the *perf.* in this interrogative clause vid., 11: 3. מִדּוֹאֵי inquires the cause, לָמָּה the aim, and עַל־מָה the motive, or in general the reason: on what ground, since God's holiness can suffer no injury to His honour? On תִּדְרֹשׁ לֹא with כִּי, the *oratio directa* instead of *obliqua*, vid., on Psa. 9:21.

**Psa. 10:14.** Now comes the confirmation of his cry to God: It is with Him entirely different from what the ungodly imagine. They think that He will not punish; but He does see (cf. 2Ch. 24:22), and the psalmist knows and confesses it: רָאִיתָהּ (defective = רָאִיתָהּ Psa. 35:22), Thou hast seen and dost see what is done to Thine own, what is done to the innocent. This he supports by a conclusion *a genere ad speciem* thus: the trouble which is prepared for others, and the sorrow (כַּאֲסִי, as in Ecc. 7: 3) which they cause them, does not escape the all-seeing eye of God, He notes it all, to give it into (lay it in) His hand. "To give anything into any one's hand" is equivalent to, into his power (1Ki. 20:28, and frequently); but here God gives (lays) the things which are not to be administered, but requited, into His own hand. The expression is meant to be understood according to Psa. 56: 9, cf. Isa. 49:16: He is observant of the afflictions of His saints, laying them up in His hand and preserving them there in order, in His own time, to restore them to His saints in joy, and to their enemies in punishment. Thus, therefore, the feeble and helpless (read חֲלֹבָה or חֲלֹבָה; according to the Masoretic text חֲלֹבָה Thy host, not חֲלֹבָה, which is contrary to the character of the form, as pausal form for חֲלֹבָה) can leave to Him, viz., all his burden (יָהֳבוֹ, Psa. 55:23), everything that vexes and disquiets him. Jahve has been and will be the Helper of the fatherless. יְהוָה stands prominent by way of emphasis, like אֲנֹתָם Psa. 9:13, and Bakius rightly remarks *in voce pupilli synecdoche est, complectens omnes illos, qui humanis praesidiis destituuntur.*

**Psa. 10:15-16.** The desire for Jahve's interposition now rises again with fresh earnestness. It is a mistake to regard דְּרֹשׁ and מְצָא as correlative notions. In the phrase to seek and not find, when used of that which has totally disappeared, we never have דְּרֹשׁ, but always בִּקֵּשׁ, Psa. 37:36, Isa. 41:12, Jer. 50:20, and frequently. The verb דְּרֹשׁ signifies here exactly the same as in vv. 4, 13, and 9:13: "and the wicked (*nom. absol.* as in v. 4) — mayst Thou punish his wickedness, mayst Thou find nothing more of it." It is not without a meaning that, instead of the form of expression usual elsewhere (Psa. 37:36, Job. 20: 8), the address to Jahve is retained: that which is no longer visible to

the eye of God, not merely of man, has absolutely vanished out of existence. This absolute conquest of evil is to be as surely looked for, as that Jahve's universal kingship, which has been an element of the creed of God's people ever since the call and redemption of Israel (Exo. 15:18), cannot remain without being perfectly and visibly realised. His absolute and eternal kingship must at length be realised, even in all the universality and endless duration foretold in Zec. 14: 9, Dan. 7:14, Rev. 11:15. Losing himself in the contemplation of this kingship, and beholding the kingdom of God, the kingdom of good, as realised, the psalmist's vision stretches beyond the foes of the church at home to its foes in general; and, inasmuch as the heathen in Israel and the heathen world outside of Israel are blended together into one to his mind, he comprehends them all in the collective name of גוֹיִם, and sees the land of Jahve (Lev. 25:23), the holy land, purified of all oppressors hostile to the church and its God. It is the same that is foretold by Isaiah (Isa. 52: 1), Nah. (Nah. 2: 1), and in other passages, which, by the anticipation of faith, here stands before the mind of the suppliant as an accomplished fact — viz. the consummation of the judgment, which has been celebrated in the hymnic half (Psalm 9) of this double Psalm as a judgment already executed in part.

*Psa. 10:17-18.* Still standing on this eminence from which he seems to behold the end, the poet basks in the realisation of that which has been obtained in answer to prayer. The ardent longing of the meek and lowly sufferers for the arising, the *parusia* of Jahve (Isa. 26: 8), has now been heard by Him, and that under circumstances which find expression in the following *futt.*, which have a past signification: God has given and preserved to their hearts the right disposition towards Himself (הִכִּינִי), as in Psa. 78: 8, Job. 11:13, Sir. 2:17 ἔτοιμάζειν καρδίας, post-biblical בִּינָן <sup>f103</sup> and to be understood according to 1Sa. 7: 3, 2Ch. 20:33, cf. לֵב נָכוֹן 51:12; 78:37; it is equivalent to “the single eye” in the language of the New Testament), just as, on the other hand, He has set His ear in the attitude of close attention to their prayer, and even to their most secret sighings (הִקְשִׁיב with אָזְנוֹ, as in Pro. 2: 2; to stiffen the ear, from קָשָׁב, Arab. *qasuba*, root קח to be hard, rigid, firm from which we also have קָשָׁה, Arab. *qsâ*, קָשָׁח, Arab. *qsh*, *qsn*, cf. on Isa. 21: 7). It was a mutual relation, the design of which was finally and speedily to obtain justice for the fatherless and oppressed, yea crushed, few, in order that mortal man of the earth may no longer (בַּל, as in Isa. 14:21, and in post-biblical Hebrew בַּל and לְבַל instead of בִּינָן) terrify. From the parallel conclusion, 9:20, 21, it is to be inferred that אֲנוֹשׁ does not refer to the oppressed but to the oppressor, and is therefore intended as the subject; and then the phrase מִן־הָאָרֶץ also belongs to it, as in 17:14, people of the world, 80:14 boar of the woods,

whereas in Pro. 30:14 מִאֲרֶץ belongs to the verb (to devour from off the earth). It is only in this combination that אָנוּשׁ מִן־הָאָרֶץ forms with לְעֶרְוָה a significant paronomasia, by contrasting the conduct of the tyrant with his true nature: a mortal of the earth, i.e., a being who, far removed from any possibility of vying with the God who is in heaven, has the earth as his birth-place. It is not מִן־הָאֲדָמָה, for the earth is not referred to as the material out of which man is formed, but as his ancestral house, his home, his bound, just as in the expression of Joh. 6:31 (Lat. *ut non amplius terreat homo terrenus*). A similar play of words was attempted before in Psa. 9:20 אֶל־יַעֲזֹב אָנוּשׁ. The Hebrew verb עָרַץ signifies both to give way to fear, Deu. 7:21, and to put in fear, Isa. 2:19, 21; 47:12. It does mean “to defy, rebel against,” although it might have this meaning according to the Arabic ʿird (to come in the way, withstand, according to which Wetzstein explains עָרַץ Job. 30: 6, like Arab. ʿird, “a valley that runs slantwise across a district, a gorge that blocks up the traveller’s way”<sup>f104</sup>). It is related to Arab. ʿrs, to vibrate, tremble (e.g., of lightning).

## Psalm 11

### REFUSAL TO FLEE WHEN IN A PERILOUS SITUATION.

*11: 1 IN Jahve put I my trust — how say ye to my soul:  
“Flee to your mountain [as] a bird!*

*11: 2 “For, lo, the wicked have bent the bow,  
“They have made ready their arrow upon the string,  
“To shoot the upright in heart in the dark.*

*11: 3 “When the pillars are pulled down,  
“The righteous — what will he do?!”*

*11: 4 Jahve in His holy temple,  
Jahve, who hath His throne in heaven —  
His eyes behold, His eyelids try the children of men.*

*11: 5 Jahve, He trieth the righteous,  
And the wicked and him that loveth violence His soul hateth.*

*11: 6 Upon the wicked He shall rain snares;  
Fire, brimstone, and burning wind is the portion of their cup.*

*11: 7 For Jahve is righteous, loving righteousness:  
The upright shall behold His countenance.*

Psalm ch. 11, which likewise confidently sets the all-seeing eye of Jahve before the ungodly who carry out their murderous designs under cover of the

darkness, is placed after Psalm 10. The life of David (to whom even Hitzig and Ewald ascribe this Psalm) is threatened, the pillars of the state are shaken, they counsel the king to flee to the mountains. These are indications of the time when the rebellion of Absalom was secretly preparing, but still clearly discernible. Although hurrying on with a swift measure and clear in the principal thoughts, still this Psalm is not free from difficult points, just as it is with all the Psalms which contain similar dark passages from the internal condition of Israel. The gloomy condition of the nation seems to be reflected in the very language. The strophic plan is not easily discernible; nevertheless we cannot go far wrong in dividing the Psalm into two seven line strophes with a two line *epiphonema*.

*Psa. 11: 1-3.* David rejects the advice of his friends to save his life by flight. Hidden in Jahve (Psa. 16: 1; 36: 8) he needs no other refuge. However well-meant and well-grounded the advice, he considers it too full of fear and is himself too confident in God, to follow it. David also introduces his friends as speaking in other passages in the Psalms belonging to the period of the Absalom persecution, Psa. 3: 3; 4: 7. Their want of courage, which he afterwards had to reprove and endeavour to restore, showed itself even before the storm had burst, as we see here. With the words “how can you say” he rejects their proposal as unreasonable, and turns it as a reproach against them. If the *Chethib*, נודו, is adopted, then those who are well-disposed, say to David, including with him his nearest subjects who are faithful to him: retreat to your mountain, (ye) birds (צפור collective as in Psa. 8: 9; 148:10); or, since this address sounds too derisive to be appropriate to the lips of those who are supposed to be speaking here: like birds (*comparatio decurtata* as in Psa. 22:14; 58: 9; Job. 24: 5; Isa. 21: 8). הַרְכֵם which seems more natural in connection with the vocative rendering of צפור (cf. Isa. 18: 6 with Eze. 39: 4) may also be explained, with the comparative rendering, without any need for the conjecture הַר כְּמוֹ צִפּוֹר (cf. Deu. 33:19), as a retrospective glance at the time of the persecution under Saul: to the mountains, which formerly so effectually protected you (cf. 1Sa. 26:20; 23:14). But the *Keri*, which is followed by the ancient versions, exchanges נודו for גודי, cf. שחי Isa. 51:23. Even reading it thus we should not take צפור, which certainly is epicoene, as vocative: flee to your mountain, O bird (Hitz.); and for this reason, that this form of address is not appropriate to the idea of those who profer their counsel. But we should take it as an equation instead of a comparison: fly to your mountain (which gave you shelter formerly), a bird, i.e., after the manner of a bird that flies away to its mountain home when it is chased in the plain. But this *Keri* appears to be a needless correction, which removes the difficulty of



נודו coming after לנפשי, by putting another in the place of this *synallage numeri*. <sup>f105</sup>

In v. 2 the faint-hearted ones give as the ground of their advice, the fearful peril which threatens from the side of crafty and malicious foes. As הנהה implies, this danger is imminent. The perfect overrides the future: they are not only already in the act of bending the bow, they have made ready their arrow, i.e., their deadly weapon, upon the string (יָתַר = מִיָּתַר, Psa. 21:13, Arab. *watar*, from יָתַר, *watara*, to stretch tight, extend, so that the thing is continued in one straight line) and even taken aim, in order to discharge it (יָרָה with לְ of the aim, as in Psa. 54: 5, with *acc.* of the object) in the dark (i.e., secretly, like an assassin) at the upright (those who by their character are opposed to them). In v. 3 the faint-hearted still further support their advice from the present total subversion of justice. הַשְׁתוֹת are either the highest ranks, who support the edifice of the state, according to Isa. 19:10, or, according to Psa. 82: 5, Eze. 30: 4, the foundations of the state, upon whom the existence and well-being of the land depends. We prefer the latter, since the king and those who are loyal to him, who are associated in thought with צַדִּיק, are compared to the שְׁתוֹת. The construction of the clause beginning with כִּי is like Job. 38:41. The *fut.* has a present signification. The *perf.* in the principal clause, as it frequently does elsewhere (e.g., Psa. 39: 8; 60:11; Gen. 21: 7; Num. 23:10; Job. 12: 9, 2Ki. 20: 9) in interrogative sentences, corresponds to the Latin conjunctive (here *quid fecerit*), and is to be expressed in English by the auxiliary verbs: when the bases of the state are shattered, what can the righteous do? he can do nothing. And all counter-effort is so useless that it is well to be as far from danger as possible.

*Psa. 11: 4-6.* The words of David's counsellors who fear for him are now ended. And David justifies his confidence in God with which he began his song. Jahve sits enthroned above all that takes place on earth that disheartens those of little faith. At an infinite distance above the earth, and also above Jerusalem, now in rebellion, is a הַיָּבֵל קֹדֶשׁ, Psa. 18: 7; 29: 9, and in this holy temple is Jahve, the Holy One. Above the earth are the heavens, and in heaven is the throne of Jahve, the King of kings. And this temple, this palace in the heavens, is the place whence issues the final decision of all earthly matters, Hab. 2:20, Mic. 1: 2. For His throne above is also the super-terrestrial judgment-seat, 9: 8; 103:19. Jahve who sits thereon is the all-seeing and omniscient One. הָנָהּ prop. to split, cf. *cernere*, is used here according to its radical meaning, of a sharp piercing glance. בִּיחַן prop. to try metals by fire, of a fixed and penetrating look that sees into a thing to the foundation of its inmost nature. The mention of the eyelids is intentional. When we observe a

thing closely or ponder over it, we draw the eyelids together, in order that our vision may be more concentrated and direct, and become, as it were, one ray piercing through the object. Thus are men open to the all-seeing eyes, the all-searching looks of Jahve: the just and the unjust alike. He tries the righteous, i.e., He knows that in the depth of his soul there is an upright nature that will abide all testing (Psa. 17: 3, Job. 23:10), so that He lovingly protects him, just as the righteous lovingly depends upon Him. And His soul hates (i.e., He hates him with all the energy of His perfectly and essentially holy nature) the evildoer and him that delights in the violence of the strong towards the weak. And the more intense this hatred, the more fearful will be the judgments in which it bursts forth.

*Psa. 11: 7.* Ver. 7, which assumes a declaration of something that is near at hand, is opposed to our rendering the voluntative form of the *fut.*, יִמָּטֵר, as expressive of a wish. The shorter form of the future is frequently indicative in the sense of the future, e.g., Psa. 72:13, or of the present, e.g., Psa. 58: 5, or of the past, Psa. 18:12. Thus it here affirms a fact of the future which follows as a necessity from vv. 4, 5. Assuming that פָּחִים might be equivalent to פְּחָמִים, even then the Hebrew פָּחִים, according to the general usage of the language, in distinction from נִחְלָת, does not denote burning, but black coals. It ought therefore to have been פְּחָמֵי אֵשׁ. Hitzig reads פָּחִים from פִּיחַ ashes; but a rain of ashes is no medium of punishment. Böttcher translates it “lumps” according to Exo. 39: 3, Num. 17: 3; but in these passages the word means thin plates. We adhere to the signification snares, Job. 22:10, cf. 21:17, Pro. 27: 5; and following the accentuation, we understand it to be a means of punishment by itself. First of all descends a whole discharge of missiles which render all attempt at flight impossible, viz., lightnings; for the lightning striking out its course and travelling from one point in the distance, bending itself like a serpent, may really be compared to a snare, or noose, thrown down from above. In addition to fire and brimstone (Gen. 19:24) we have also זְלַעְפוֹת רֶוֶחַ. The LXX renders it πνεῦμα καταγίδος, and the Targum זַעְפָּא עֲלֵעוּלָא, *procella turbinea*. The root is not לַעַף, which cannot be sustained as a cognate form of לָאב, לָאב to burn, but זַעַף, which (as 1Sa. 5:10 shows) exactly corresponds to the Latin *aestuarē* which combines in itself the characteristics of heat and violent motion, therefore perhaps: a wind of flames, i.e., the deadly simoom, which, according to the present division of the verse is represented in connection with אֵשׁ וְנִפְרִית, as the breath of the divine wrath pouring itself forth like a stream of brimstone, Isa. 30:33. It thus also becomes clear how this can be called the portion of their cup, i.e., what is adjudged to them as the contents of their cup which they must drain off. מְנָת (only found in the

Davidic Psalms, with the exception of 2Ch. 31: 4) is both *absolutivus* and *constructivus* according to Olshausen (§ § 108, c, 165, i), and is derived from *manajath*, or *manawath*, which the original feminine termination *ath*, the final weak radical being blended with it. According to Hupfeld it is *constr.*, springing from מְנִית, like קָצַת (in Dan. and Neh.) from קָצַת. But probably it is best to regard it as = מְנִית or מְנִית, like גְּלוּת = גְּלוּת.

*Psa. 11: 7.* Thus then Jahve is in covenant with David. Even though he cannot defend himself against his enemies, still, when Jahve gives free course to His hatred in judgment, they will then have to do with the powers of wrath and death, which they will not be able to escape. When the closing distich bases this different relation of God towards the righteous and the unrighteous and this judgment of the latter on the righteousness of God, we at once perceive what a totally different and blessed end awaits the righteous. As Jahve Himself is righteous, so also on His part (1Sa. 12: 7, Mic. 6: 5, and frequently) and on the part of man (Isa. 33:15) He loves צְדָקוֹת, the works of righteousness. The object of אֱהָב (= אָהַב) stands at the head of the sentence, as in Psa. 99: 4, cf. 10:14. In v. 7b יָשָׁר designates the upright as a class, hence it is the more natural for the predicate to follow in the *plur.* (cf. Psa. 9: 7, Job. 8:19) than to precede as elsewhere (Pro. 28: 1, Isa. 16: 4). The rendering: “His countenance looks upon the upright man” (Hengst. and others) is not a probable one, just because one expects to find something respecting the end of the upright in contrast to that of the ungodly. This rendering is also contrary to the general usage of the language, according to which פָּנִים is always used only as that which is to be seen, not as that which itself sees. It ought to have been עֵינָיו, Psa. 33:18; 34:16, Job. 36: 7. It must therefore be translated according to Psa. 17:15; 140:13: the upright (*quisquis probus est*) shall behold His countenance. The pathetic form פָּנָיו instead of פָּנִיו was specially admissible here, where God is spoken of (as in Deu. 33: 2, cf. Isa. 44:15). It ought not to be denied any longer that *mo* is sometimes (e.g., Job. 20:23, cf. 22: 2; 27:23) a dignified singular suffix. To behold the face of God is in itself impossible to mortals without dying. But when God reveals Himself in love, then He makes His countenance bearable to the creature. And to enjoy this vision of God softened by love is the highest honour God in His mercy can confer on a man; it is the blessedness itself that is reserved for the upright, Psa. 140:14. It is not possible to say that what is intended is a future vision of God; but it is just as little possible to say that it is exclusively a vision in this world. To the Old Testament conception the future עוֹלָם is certainly lost in the night of *Sheôl*. But faith broke through this night, and consoled itself with a future beholding of God, Job. 19:26. The redemption of the New Testament has realised this aspiration of faith, since the Redeemer has broken through the

night of the realm of the dead, has borne on high with Him the Old Testament saints, and translated them into the sphere of the divine love revealed in heaven.

## Psalm 12

### LAMENT AND CONSOLATION IN THE MIDST OF PREVAILING FALSEHOOD

*12: 2 HELP, Jahve, for the godly man ceaseth,  
For the faithful have vanished from among the children of men!*

*12: 3 They speak falsehood one with another,  
Flattering lips with a double heart, they speak.*

*12: 4 May Jahve root out all flattering lips,  
The tongue that speaketh great swelling words,*

*12: 5 Which say: to our tongue we impart strength,  
Our lips are with us, who is lord over us?!*

*12: 6 “Because of the desolation of the afflicted, the sighing of the poor,  
“Will I now arise — saith Jahve —  
“In safety will I set him who languisheth for it.” —*

*12: 7 The words of Jahve are pure words,  
Silver melted down in the furnace, to the earth,  
Purified seven times.*

*12: 8 Thou, O Jahve, wilt defend them,  
Thou wilt preserve him from this generation for ever;*

*12: 9 The wicked strut about on every side,  
When vileness among the children of men is exalted.*

Psalm ch. 11 is appropriately followed by Psalm ch. 12, which is of a kindred character: a prayer for the deliverance of the poor and miserable in a time of universal moral corruption, and more particularly of prevailing faithlessness and boasting. The inscription: *To the Precentor, on the Octave, a Psalm of David* points us to the time when the Temple music was being established, i.e., the time of David — incomparably the best age in the history of Israel, and yet, viewed in the light of the spirit of holiness, an age so radically corrupt. The true people of Jahve were even then, as ever, a church of confessors and martyrs, and the sighing for the coming of Jahve was then not less deep than the cry “Come, Lord Jesus!” at the present time.

This Psalm ch. 12 together with Psalm ch. 2 is a second example of the way in which the psalmist, when under great excitement of spirit, passes over into the

tone of one who directly hears God's words, and therefore into the tone of an inspired prophet. Just as lyric poetry in general, as being a direct and solemn expression of strong inward feeling, is the earliest form of poetry: so psalm-poetry contains in itself not only the *maschal*, the epos, and the drama in their preformative stages, but prophecy also, as we have it in the prophetic writings of its most flourishing period, has, as it were, sprung from the bosom of psalm-poetry. It is throughout a blending of prophetic epic and subjective lyric elements, and is in many respects the echo of earlier psalms, and even in some instances (as e.g., Isaiah 12, Habakkuk 3) transforms itself into the strain of a psalm. Hence Asaph is called אֲשָפֵר in 2Ch. 29:30, not from the special character of his Psalms, but from his being a psalmist in general; for Jeduthun has the same name given to him in 2Ch. 35:15, and נָבִיא in 1Ch. 25: 2 f. (cf. προφητεύειν, Luk. 1:67) is used directly as an epithet for psalm-singing with accompaniment — a clear proof that in prophecy the co-operation of a human element is no less to be acknowledged, that the influence of a divine element in psalm-poesy.

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

*Psa. 12: 2-3.* The sigh of supplication, הוֹשִׁיעָה, has its object within itself: work deliverance, give help; and the motive is expressed by the complaint which follows. The verb נָמַד to complete, means here, as in 7 Psa. :10, to have an end; and the אַפ. λεγ. פָּסַם is equivalent to אָפַס in Psa. 77: 9, to come to the extremity, to cease. It is at once clear from the predicate being placed first in the plur., that אֲמוֹנִים in this passage is not an *abstractum*, as e.g., in Pro. 13:17; moreover the parallelism is against it, just as in 31:24. חָסִיד is the pious man, as one who practises חֶסֶד towards God and man. אֲמוֹן, primary form אֲמוֹן (plur. אֲמוֹנִים; whereas from אֲמוֹן we should expect אֲמוֹנִים), — used as an adjective (cf. on the contrary Deu. 32:20) here just as in 31:24, 2Sa. 20:19, — is the reliable, faithful, conscientious man, literally one who is firm, i.e., whose word and meaning is firm, so that one can rely upon it and be certain in relation to it. <sup>f106</sup>

We find similar complaints of the universal prevalence of wickedness in Mic. 7: 2, Isa. 57: 1, Jer. 7:28, and elsewhere. They contain their own limitation. For although those who complain thus without pharisaic self-righteousness would convict themselves of being affected by the prevailing corruption, they are still, in their penitence, in their sufferings for righteousness' sake, and in their cry for help, a standing proof that humanity has not yet, without exception, become a *massa perditā*. That which the writer

especially laments, is the prevailing untruthfulness. Men speak שָׁוְא (= שָׁוְא from שָׁו), desolation and emptiness under a disguise that conceals its true nature, falsehood (Psa. 41: 7), and hypocrisy (Job. 35:13), ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ (LXX, cf. Eph. 4:25, where the greatness of the sin finds its confirmation according to the teaching of the New Testament: ὅτι ἔσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη). They speak lips of smoothnesses (תְּלִקְתָּ, plural from תְּלִקְתָּ, *laevitates*, or from תְּלִקְתָּ, *laevia*), i.e., the smoothest, most deceitful language (accusative of the object as in Isa. 19:18) with a double heart, inasmuch, namely, as the meaning they deceitfully express to others, and even to themselves, differs from the purpose they actually cherish, or even (cf. 1Ch. 12:33 בְּלֹא לֵב וּלֵב, and Jam. 1: 8 δίστοχος, wavering) inasmuch as the purpose they now so flatteringly put forth quickly changes to the very opposite.

*Psa. 12: 4-5.* In this instance the voluntative has its own proper signification: may He root out (cf. Psa. 109:15, and the oppositive Psa. 11: 6). Flattering lips and a vaunting tongue are one, insofar as the braggart becomes a flatterer when it serves his own selfish interest. אֲשֶׁר refers to lips and tongue, which are put for their possessors. The *Hiph.* תְּגַבִּיר may mean either to impart strength, or to give proof of strength. The combination with ל, not ב, favours the former: we will give emphasis to our tongue (this is their self-confident declaration). Hupfeld renders it, contrary to the meaning of the *Hiph.*: over our tongue we have power, and Ewald and Olshausen, on the ground of an erroneous interpretation of Dan. 9:27, render: we make or have a firm covenant with our tongue. They describe their lips as being their confederates (אֶת as in 2Ki. 9:32), and by the expression “who is lord over us” they declare themselves to be absolutely free, and exalted above all authority. If any authority were to assert itself over them, their mouth would put it down and their tongue would thrash it into submission. But Jahve, whom this making of themselves into gods challenges, will not always suffer His own people to be thus enslaved.

*Psa. 12: 6-7.* In v. 6 the psalmist hears Jahve Himself speak; and in v. 7 he adds his Amen. The two מִן in v. 6 denote the motive, אֶתְּהָא the decisive turning-point from forbearance to the execution of judgment, and אֶתְּהָא the divine determination, which has just now made itself audible; cf. Isaiah’s echo of it, Isa. 33:10. Jahve has hitherto looked on with seeming inactivity and indifference, now He will arise and place in יָשֶׁע, i.e., a condition of safety (cf. שִׁים בְּיָמַי Psa. 66: 9), him who languishes for deliverance. It is not to be explained: him whom he, i.e., the boaster, blows upon, which would be

expressed by **יָפִיחַ בּוֹ**, cf. *Psa.* 10: 5; but, with Ewald, Hengstenberg, Olshausen, and Böttcher, according to *Hab.* 2: 3, where **הִפִּיחַ לְ** occurs in the sense of panting after an object: him who longs for it. **יָפִיחַ** is, however, not a participial adjective = **יָפַח**, but the *fut.*, and **יָפִיחַ לוֹ** is therefore a relative clause occupying the place of the object, just as we find the same thing occurring in *Job.* 24:19, *Isa.* 41: 2, 25, and frequently. Hupfeld's rendering: "in order that he may gain breath (*respiret*)" leaves **אָשִׁית** without an object, and accords more with Aramaic and Arabic than with Hebrew usage, which would express this idea by **יָרוּחַ לוֹ** or **יָנוּחַ לוֹ**.

In v. 7 the announcement of Jahve is followed by its echo in the heart of the seer: the words (**אִמְרוֹת** instead of **אִמְרוֹת** by changing the *Shebâ* which closes the syllable into an audible one, as e.g., in **אִשְׁרֵי**) of Jahve are pure words, i.e., intended, and to be fulfilled, absolutely as they run without any admixture whatever of untruthfulness. The poetical **אִמְרָה** (after the form **זִמְרָה**) serves pre-eminently as the designation of the divine power-words of promise. The figure, which is indicated in other instances, when God's word is said to be **צְרוּפָה** (*Psa.* 18:31; 119:140, *Pro.* 30: 5), is here worked out: silver melted and thus purified **בְּעִלִּי לְאָרֶץ**. **עִלִּי** signifies either a smelting-pot from **עָלַל**, Arab. *gll*, *immittere*, whence also **עַל** (Hitz.); or, what is more probable since the language has the epithets **בּוֹר** and **מְצַרֵּף** for this: a workshop, from **עָלַל**, Arab. *'ll*, *operari* (prop. to set about a thing), first that which is wrought at (after the form **מְעִיל**, **פְּסִיל**, **שְׁבִיל**), then the place where the work is carried on. From this also comes the Talm. **בְּעִלִּי** = **בְּגִלּוֹי** *manifeste*, occurring in the Mishna *Rosh ha-Shana* 1. 5 and elsewhere, and which in its first meaning corresponds to the French *en effet*.<sup>f107</sup>

According to this, the **ל** in **לְאָרֶץ** is not the **ל** of property: in a fining-pot built into the earth, for which **לְאָרֶץ** without anything further would be an inadequate and colourless expression. But in accordance with the usual meaning of **לְאָרֶץ** as a collateral definition it is: smelted (purified) down to the earth. As Olshausen observes on this subject, "Silver that is purified in the furnace and flows down to the ground can be seen in every smelting hut; the pure liquid silver flows down out of the smelting furnace, in which the ore is piled up." For it cannot be **ל** of reference: "purified with respect to the earth," since **אָרֶץ** does not denote the earth as a material and cannot therefore mean an earthy element. We ought then to read **לְאָבֵץ**, which would not mean "to a white brilliancy," i.e., to a pure bright mass (Böttch.), but "with respect to the *stannum*, lead" (vid., on *Isa.* 1:25). The verb **נָקַק** to strain, filter, cause to ooze

through, corresponds to the German *seihen*, *seigen*, old High German *sīhan*, Greek σακκῆιν, σακκί(ζ)ειν), to clean by passing through a cloth as a strainer, שֶׁק. God's word is solid silver smelted and leaving all impurity behind, and, as it were, having passed seven times through the smelting furnace, i.e., the purest silver, entirely purged from dross. Silver is the emblem of everything precious and pure (vid., Bähr, *Symbol.* i. 284); and seven is the number indicating the completion of any process (*Bibl. Psychol.* S. 57, transl. p. 71).

*Psa. 12: 8-9.* The supplicatory complaint contained in the first strophe has passed into an ardent wish in the second; and now in the fourth there arises a consolatory hope based upon the divine utterance which was heard in the third strophe. The suffix *ēm* in v. 8a refers to the miserable and poor; the suffix *ennu* in v. 8b (him, not: us, which would be pointed תַּצְרֵנּוּ, and more especially since it is not preceded by תִּשְׁמְרֵנּוּ) refers back to the man who yearns for deliverance mentioned in the divine utterance, v. 6. The “preserving for ever” is so constant, that neither now nor at any future time will they succumb to this generation. The oppression shall not become a thorough depression, the trial shall not exceed their power of endurance. What follows in v. 9 is a more minute description of this depraved generation. דֹּר is the generation whole and entire bearing one general character and doing homage to the one spirit of the age (cf. e.g., Pro. 30:11-14, where the characteristics of a corrupt age are portrayed). זֶה (always without the article, Ew. § 293, a) points to the present and the character is has assumed, which is again described here finally in a few outlines of a more general kind than in vv. 3-5. The wicked march about on every side (הִתְהַלֵּךְ used of going about unopposed with an arrogant and vaunting mien), when (while) vileness among (ל) the children of men rises to eminence (רום as in Pro. 11:11, cf. משל Pro. 29: 2), so that they come to be under its dominion. Vileness is called זָלוּת from זָל (cogn. דָּלַל) to be supple and lax, narrow, low, weak and worthless. The form is passive just as is the Talm. זִלוּת (from זִיל = זָלִיל), and it is the epithet applied to that which is depreciated, despised, and to be despised; here it is the opposite of the disposition and conduct of the noble man, נְדִיב, Isa. 32: 8, — a baseness which is utterly devoid not only of all nobler principles and motives, but also of all nobler feelings and impulses. The כּ of כָּרַם is not the expression of simultaneousness (as e.g., in Pro. 10:25): immediately it is exalted — for then v. 9 would give expression to a general observation, instead of being descriptive — but כָּרַם is equivalent to בָּרַם, only it is intentionally used instead of the latter, to express a coincidence that is based upon an intimate relation of cause and effect, and is not merely accidental. The wicked are puffed up on all sides, and encompass the better disposed on every side as



their enemies. Such is the state of things, and it cannot be otherwise at a time when men allow meanness to gain the ascendancy among and over them, as is the case at the present moment. Thus even at last the depressing view of the present prevails in the midst of the confession of a more consolatory hope. The present is gloomy. But in the central hexastich the future is lighted up as a consolation against this gloominess. The Psalm is a ring and this central oracle is its jewel.

## Psalm 13

### SUPPLIANT CRY OF ONE WHO IS UTTERLY UNDONE

*13: 2 HOW long, Jahve, wilt Thou forget me,  
How long wilt Thou veil Thy face from me?!*

*13: 3 How long shall I cherish cares in my soul,  
Sorrow in my heart by day?!  
How long shall mine enemy be exalted over me?!*

*13: 4 Look, answer me, Jahve, my God,  
Lighten mine eyes, that I fall not asleep in death,*

*13: 5 That mine enemy may not say: "I have prevailed against him",  
That mine oppressors may not rejoice, when I stumble.*

*13: 6 And as for me, in Thy mercy do I trust,  
My heart shall rejoice at Thy salvation;  
I will sing of Jahve, because He hath dealt bountifully with me.*

The **וַיִּקְרָא** of the personal cry with which David opens Psalm ch. 13 harmonizes with **וַיִּבְרַח** of the general lament which he introduces into Psalm ch. 12; and for this reason the collector has coupled these two Psalms together. Hitzig assigns Psalm ch. 13 to the time when Saul posted watchers to hunt David from place to place, and when, having been long and unceasingly persecuted, David dared to cherish a hope of escaping death only by indefatigable vigilance and endurance. Perhaps this view is correct. The Psalm consists of three strophes, or if it be preferred, three groups of decreasing magnitude. A long deep sigh is followed, as from a relieved breast, by an already much more gentle and half calm prayer; and this again by the believing joy which anticipates the certainty of being answered. This song as it were casts up constantly lessening waves, until it becomes still as the sea when smooth as a mirror, and the only motion discernible at last is that of the joyous ripple of calm repose.

*Psa. 13: 2-3.* The complicated question: till when, how long...for ever (as in Psa. 74:10; 79: 5; 89:47), is the expression of a complicated condition of soul,

in which, as Luther briefly and forcibly describes it, amidst the feeling of anguish under divine wrath “hope itself despairs and despair nevertheless begins to hope.” The self-contradiction of the question is to be explained by the conflict which is going on within between the flesh and the spirit. The dejected heart thinks: God has forgotten me for ever. But the spirit, which thrusts away this thought, changes it into a question which sets upon it the mark of a mere appearance not a reality: how long shall it seem as though Thou forgettest me for ever? It is in the nature of the divine wrath, that the feeling of it is always accompanied by an impression that it will last for ever; and consequently it becomes a foretaste of hell itself. But faith holds fast the love that is behind the wrath; it sees in the display of anger only a self-masking of the loving countenance of the God of love, and longs for the time when this loving countenance shall be again unveiled to it. Thrice does David send forth this cry of faith out of the inmost depths of his spirit. To place or set up contrivances, plans, or proposals in his soul, viz., as to the means by which he may be able to escape from this painful condition, is equivalent to, to make the soul the place of such thoughts, or the place where such thoughts are fabricated (cf. Pro. 26:24). One such **עֲצָה** chases the other in his soul, because he recognises the vanity of one after another as soon as they spring up. With respect to the **יָמָם** which follows, we must think of these cares as taking possession of his soul in the night time; for the night leaves a man alone with his affliction and makes it doubly felt by him. It cannot be proved from Eze. 30:16 (cf. Zep. 2: 4 **בַּצְהָרִים**), that **יָמָם** like **יוֹם** (Jer. 7:25, short for **יוֹם יוֹם**) may mean “daily” (Ew. § 313, a). **יוֹמָם** does not mean this here, but is the antithesis to **לַיְלָה** which is to be supplied in thought in v. 3a. By night he proposes plan after plan, each one as worthless as the other; and by day, or all the day through, when he sees his distress with open eyes, sorrow (**יָגוֹן**) is in his heart, as it were, as the feeling the night leaves behind it and as the direct reflex of his helpless and hopeless condition. He is persecuted, and his foe is in the ascendant. **רוּם** is both to be exalted and to rise, raise one’s self, i.e., to rise to position and arrogantly to assume dignity to one’s self (*sich brüsten*). The strophe closes with *ad-āna* which is used for the fourth time.

**Psa. 13: 4-5.** In contrast to God’s seeming to have forgotten him and to wish neither to see nor know anything of his need, he prays: **הַבִּיטָה** (cf. Isa. 63:15). In contrast to his being in perplexity what course to take and unable to help himself, he prays: **עֲנֵנִי**, answer me, who cry for help, viz., by the fulfilment of my prayer as a real, actual answer. In contrast to the triumphing of his foe: **הָאֵרְחָה עֵינַי**, in order that the triumph of his enemy may not be made complete by his dying. To lighten the eyes that are dimmed with sorrow and ready to break, is equivalent to, to impart new life (Ezr. 9: 8), which is reflected in the

fresh clear brightness of the eye (1Sa. 14:27, 29). The lightening light, to which **הָאֵר** points, is the light of love beaming from the divine countenance, Psa. 31:17. Light, love, and life are closely allied notions in the Scriptures. He, upon whom God looks down in love, continues in life, new powers of life are imparted to him, it is not his lot to sleep the death, i.e., the sleep of death, Jer. 51:39, 57, cf. Psa. 76: 6. **הַמָּוֶת** is the accusative of effect or sequence: to sleep so that the sleep becomes death (LXX **εἰς θάνατον**), Ew. § 281, *e*. Such is the light of life for which he prays, in order that his foe may not be able at last to say **יְכַלְתִּיו** (with accusative object, as in Jer. 38: 5) = **יְכַלְתִּי לוֹ**, Psa. 129: 2, Gen. 32:26, I am able for him, a match for him, I am superior to him, have gained the mastery over him. **בִּי**, on account of the future which follows, had better be taken as temporal (*quum*) than as expressing the reason (*quod*), cf. **בְּמוֹט רַגְלִי**, 38:17.

*Psa. 13: 6.* Three lines of joyous anticipation now follow the five of lament and four of prayer. By **וְאֲנִי** he sets himself in opposition to his foes. The latter desire his death, but he trusts in the mercy of God, who will turn and terminate his affliction. **בְּמַחַב** denotes faith as clinging fast to God, just as **חִסָּה בְּ** denotes it as confidence which hides itself in Him. The voluntative **יִגַּל** presupposes the sure realisation of the hope. The perfect in v. 6c is to be properly understood thus: the celebration follows the fact that inspires him to song. **אֵל יַמְלֵךְ** to do good to any one, as in Psa. 116: 7; 119:17, cf. the radically cognate (**עַל**) **נָמַר** Psa. 57: 3. With the two iambics *gamal' alaj* the song sinks to rest. In the storm-tossed soul of the suppliant all has now become calm. Though it rage without as much now as ever — peace reigns in the depth of his heart.

## Psalm 14

### THE PREVAILING CORRUPTION AND THE REDEMPTION DESIRED

*14: 1 THE fool hath said in his heart: "There is no God";  
Corrupt, abominable are their doings,  
There is none that doeth good.*

*14: 2 Jahve looketh down from heaven upon the children of men  
To see if there be any that have understanding,  
If any that seek after God.*

*14: 3 They are all fallen away, altogether they are corrupt,  
There is none that doeth good,  
Not even one.*

*14: 4 “Are they so utterly devoid of understanding,  
all the workers of iniquity,  
Who eating up my people, eat up bread,  
They call not on Jahve?”*

*14: 5 Then were they in great fear,  
For God is in the righteous generation.*

*14: 6 Would ye bring to shame the counsel of the afflicted,  
For Jahve is indeed his refuge!*

*14: 7 Oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion!  
When Jahve turneth the captivity of His people,  
Jacob shall rejoice, Israel shall be glad.*

Just as the general lamentation of Psalm ch. 12 assumes a personal character in Psalm ch. 13, so in Psalm ch. 14 it becomes again general; and the personal desire **יִגַּל לְבִי**, 13: 6, so full of hope, corresponds to **יִגַּל יַעֲקֹב**, which is extended to the whole people of God in Psa. 14: 7. Moreover, Psalm ch. 14, as being a gloomy picture of the times in which the dawn of the divine day is discernible in the background, is more closely allied to Psalm ch. 12 than to Psalm ch. 13, although this latter is not inserted between them without some recognised reason. In the reprobation of the moral and religious character of the men of the age, which Psalm ch. 14 has in common with Psalm ch. 12, we at once have a confirmation of the **לְדוֹד**. But Psa. 14: 7 does not necessitate our coming down to the time of the Exile.

In Psalm 53 we find this Psalm which is Jehovic, occurring again as Elohimic. The position of Psalm ch. 14 in the primary collection favours the presumption, that it is the earlier and more original composition. And since this presumption will bear the test of a critical comparison of the two Psalms, we may leave the treatment of Psalm 53 to its proper place, without bringing it forward here. It is not as though Psalm ch. 14 were intact. It is marked out as seven three-line verses, but vv. 5 and 6, which ought to be the fifth and sixth three lines, are only two; and the original form appears to be destroyed by some deficiency. The difficulty is got over in Psalm 53, by making the two two-line verses into one three-line verse, so that it consists only of six three-line verses. And in that Psalm the announcement of judgment is applied to foreign enemies, a circumstance which has influenced some critics and led them astray in the interpretation of Psalm 14.

*Psa. 14: 1.* The perfect **אָמַר**, as in Psa. 1: 1; 10: 3, is the so-called abstract present (Ges. § 126, 3), expressing a fact of universal experience, inferred from a number of single instances. The Old Testament language is unusually rich in epithets for the unwise. The simple, **פְּתִי**, and the silly, **בְּסִיל**, for the lowest

branches of this scale; the fool, **אָוִיל**, and the madman, **הוֹלֵל**, the uppermost. In the middle comes the notion of the simpleton or maniac, **נָבֵל**, — a word from the verbal stem **נָבַל** which, according as that which forms the centre of the group of consonants lies either in **נב** (*Genesis* S. 636), or in **בל** (comp. **אבל**, **אול**, **אמל**, **קמל**), signifies either to be extended, to relax, to become frail, to wither, or to be prominent, *eminere*, Arab. *nabula*; so that consequently **נָבֵל** means the relaxed, powerless, expressed in New Testament language: **πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔχοντα**. Thus Isaiah (Isa. 32: 6) describes the **נָבֵל**: “a simpleton speaks simpleness and his heart does godless things, to practice tricks and to say foolish things against Jahve, to leave the soul of the hungry empty, and to refuse drink to the thirsty.” Accordingly **נָבֵל** is the synonym of **לֵץ** the scoffer (vid., the definition in Pro. 21:24). A free spirit of this class is reckoned according to the Scriptures among the empty, hollow, and devoid of mind. The thought, **אֵין אֱלֹהִים**, which is the root of the thought and action of such a man, is the climax of imbecility. It is not merely practical atheism, that is intended by this maxim of the **נָבֵל**. The heart according to Scripture language is not only the seat of volition, but also of thought. The **נָבֵל** is not content with acting as though there were no God, but directly denies that there is a God, i.e., a personal God. The psalmist makes this prominent as the very extreme and depth of human depravity, that there can be among men those who deny the existence of a God. The subject of what follows are, then, not these atheists but men in general, among whom such characters are to be found: they make the mode of action, (their) doings, corrupt, they make it abominable. **עֲלִילָה**, a poetical brevity of expression for **עֲלִילוֹתָם**, belongs to both verbs, which have *Tarcha* and *Mercha* (the two usual conjunctives of *Mugrash*) in correct texts; and is in fact not used as an adverbial accusative (Hengstenberg and others), but as an object, since **הַשְׁחִית** is just the word that is generally used in this combination with **עֲלִילָה** Zep. 3: 7 or, what is the same thing, **דָּרַךְ** Gen. 6:12; and **הַתְּעִיב** (cf. 1Ki. 21:26) is only added to give a superlative intensity to the expression. The negative: “there is none that doeth good” is just as unrestricted as in Psa. 12: 2. But further on the psalmist distinguishes between a **דוֹר צַדִּיק**, which experiences this corruption in the form of persecution, and the corrupt mass of mankind. He means what he says of mankind as **κόσμος**, in which, at first the few rescued by grace from the mass of corruption are lost sight of by him, just as in the words of God, Gen. 6: 5, 12. Since it is only grace that frees any from the general corruption, it may also be said, that men are described just as they are by nature; although, be it admitted, it is not hereditary sin but actual sin, which springs up from it, and grows apace if grace do not interpose, that is here spoken of.

*Psa. 14: 2.* The second tristich appeals to the infallible decision of God Himself. The verb **הִשְׁקִיף** means to look forth, by bending one's self forward. It is the proper word for looking out of a window, 2Ki. 9:30 (cf. *Niph.* Jud. 4:28, and frequently), and for God's looking down from heaven upon the earth, Psa. 102:20, and frequently; and it is cognate and synonymous with **הִשְׁגִּיחַ**, Psa. 33:13, 14; cf. moreover, Son. 2: 9. The *perf.* is used in the sense of the perfect only insofar as the divine survey is antecedent to its result as given in v. 3. Just as **הִשְׁחִיתוּ** reminds one of the history of the Flood, so does **לְרֵאוֹת** of the history of the building of the tower of Babel, Gen. 11: 5, cf. 18:21. God's judgment rests upon a knowledge of the matter of fact, which is represented in such passages after the manner of men. God's all-seeing, all-piercing eyes scrutinise the whole human race. Is there one who shows discernment in thought and act, one to whom fellowship with God is the highest good, and consequently that after which he strives? — this is God's question, and He delights in such persons, and certainly none such would escape His longing search. On **אַתָּה־אֱלֹהִים**, τὸν Θεόν, vid., Ges. § 117, 2.

*Psa. 14: 3.* The third tristich bewails the condition in which He finds humanity. The universality of corruption is expressed in as strong terms as possible. **הַכֹּל** they all (lit., the totality); **יַחְדָּו** with one another (lit., in its or their unions, i.e., *universi*); **אִין גַּם־אֶחָד** not a single one who might form an exception. **סָר** (probably not 3 *praet.* but *partic.*, which passes at once into the finite verb) signifies to depart, viz., from the ways of God, therefore to fall away (*ἀποστάτης*). **חָצַל**, as in Job. 15:16, denotes the moral corruptness as a becoming sour, putrefaction, and suppuration. Instead of **אִין גַּם־אֶחָד**, the LXX translates οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός (as though it were **עַד־אֶחָד**, which is the more familiar form of expression). Paul quotes the first three verses of this Psalm (Rom. 3:10-12) in order to show how the assertion, that Jews and heathen all are included under sin, is in accordance with the teaching of Scripture. What the psalmist says, applies primarily to Israel, his immediate neighbours, but at the same time to the heathen, as is self-evident. What is lamented is neither the pseudo-Israelitish corruption in particular, nor that of the heathen, but the universal corruption of man which prevails not less in Israel than in the heathen world. The citations of the apostle which follow his quotation of the Psalm, from **τάφος ἀνεωγμένος** to **ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν** were early incorporated in the Psalm in the *Koinḗ* of the LXX. They appear as an integral part of it in the *Cod. Alex.*, in the Greco-Latin *Psalterium Vernonense*, and in the Syriac *Psalterium Mediolanense*. They are also found in Apollinaris' paraphrase of the Psalms as a later interpolation; the *Cod. Vat.* has them in the margin; and the words **σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς**

ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν have found admittance in the translation, which is more Rabbinical than Old Hebrew, מִזֶּל רַע וּפְנֵעַ רַע בְּדַרְכֵיהֶם even in a Hebrew codex (Kennicott 649). Origen rightly excluded this apostolic Mosaic work of Old Testament testimonies from his text of the Psalm; and the true representation of the matter is to be found in Jerome, in the preface to the xvi. book of his commentary on Isaiah. <sup>f108</sup>

*Psa. 14: 4.* Thus utterly cheerless is the issue of the divine scrutiny. It ought at least to have been different in Israel, the nation of the positive revelation. But even there wickedness prevails and makes God's purpose of mercy of none effect. The divine outburst of indignation which the psalmist hears here, is applicable to the sinners in Israel. Also in Isa. 3:13-15 the Judge of the world addresses Himself to the heads of Israel in particular. This one feature of the Psalm before us is raised to the consistency of a special prophetic picture in the Psalm of Asaph, 82. That which is here clothed in the form of a question, יִדְעוּ הֲלֵא, is reversed into an assertion in v. 5 of that Psalm. It is not to be translated: will they not have to feel (which ought to be יִדְעוּ); but also not as Hupfeld renders it: have they not experienced. "Not to know" is intended to be used as absolutely in the signification *non sapere*, and consequently *insipientem esse*, as it is in Psa. 82: 5; 73:22; 92: 7, Isa. 44:18, cf. 9, 45:20, and frequently. The perfect is to be judged after the analogy of *novisse* (Ges. § 126, 3), therefore it is to be rendered: have they attained to no knowledge, are they devoid of all knowledge, and therefore like the brutes, yea, according to Isa. 1: 2, 3 even worse than the brutes, all the workers of iniquity? The two clauses which follow are, logically at least, attributive clauses. The subordination of אָכְלוּ לֶחֶם to the participle as a circumstantial clause in the sense of פָּאָכַל לֶחֶם is syntactically inadmissible; neither can אָכְלוּ לֶחֶם, with Hupfeld, be understood of a brutish and secure passing away of life; for, as Olshausen, rightly observes אָכַל לֶחֶם does not signify to feast and carouse, but simply to eat, take a meal. Hengstenberg correctly translates it "who eating my people, eat bread," i.e., who think that they are not doing anything more sinful, — indeed rather what is justifiable, irreproachable and lawful to them, — than when they are eating bread; cf. the further carrying out of this thought in Mic. 3: 1-3 (especially v. 3 *extr.*: "just as in the pot and as flesh within the caldron."). Instead of הֲ לֵא קָרְאוּ Jeremiah says in Jer. 10:21 (cf. however, 10:25): וְאֵתֵהוּ לֵא דָרְשׁוּ. The meaning is like that in Hos. 7: 7. They do not pray as it becomes man who is endowed with mind, therefore they are like cattle, and act like beasts of prey.

*Psa. 14: 5.* When Jahve thus bursts forth in scorn His word, which never fails in its working, smites down these brutish men, who are without knowledge and

conscience. The local demonstrative **שָׁם** is used as temporal in this passage just as in Psa. 66: 6, Hos. 2:17, Zep. 1:14, Job. 23: 7; 35:12, and is joined with the perfect of certainty, as in Psa. 36:13, where it has not so much a temporal as a local sense. It does not mean “there = at a future time,” as pointing into the indefinite future, but “there = then,” when God shall thus speak to them in His anger. Intensity is here given to the verb **פָּחַד** by the addition of a substantival object of the same root, just as is frequently the case in the more elevated style, e.g., Hab. 3: 9; and as is done in other cases by the addition of the adverbial infinitive. Then, when God’s long-suffering changes into wrath, terror at His judgement seizes them and they tremble through and through. This judgment of wrath, however, is on the other hand a revelation of love. Jahve avenges and thus delivers those whom He calls **אָמִי** (My people); and who are here called **דּוֹר צְדִיק**, the generation of the righteous, in opposition to the corrupted humanity of the time (Psa. 12: 8), as being conformed to the will of God and held together by a superior spirit to the prevailing spirit of the age. They are so called inasmuch as **דּוֹר** passes over from the signification *generatio* to that of *genus hominum* here and also elsewhere, when it is not merely a temporal, but a moral notion; cf. Psa. 24: 6; 83:15; 112: 2, where it uniformly denotes the whole of the children of God who are in bondage in the world and longing for deliverance, not Israel collectively in antithesis to the Scythians and the heathen in general (Hitzig).

**Psa. 14: 6.** The psalmist himself meets the oppressed full of joyous confidence, by reason of the self-manifestation of God in judgment, of which he is now become so confident and which so fills him with comfort. Instead of the sixth tristich, which we expected, we have another distich. The *Hiph.* **הִבִּישׁ** with a personal object signifies: to put any one to shame, i.e., to bring it about that any one must be ashamed, e.g., Psa. 44: 8 (cf. 53: 6, where the accusative of the person has to be supplied), or absolutely: to act shamefully, as in the phrase used in Proverbs, **בֶּן מִיָּבֵשׁ** (a prodigal son). It appears only here with a neuter accusative of the object, not in the signification to defame (Hitz.), — a meaning it never has (not even in Pro. 13: 5, where it is blended with **הִבְאִישׁ** to make stinking, i.e., a reproach, Gen. 34:30), — but to confound, put to shame = to frustrate (Hupf.), which is at once the most natural meaning in connection with **עֲצָת**. But it is not to be rendered: ye put to shame, because..., for to what purpose is this statement with this inapplicable reason in support of it? The *fut.* **תִּבְיָשׁוּ** is used with a like shade of meaning as in Lev. 19:17, and the imperative elsewhere; and **כִּי** gives the reason for the tacitly implied clause, or if a line is really lost from the strophe, the lost clause (cf. Isa. 8: 9 f.): ye will not accomplish it. **עֲצֵה** is whatsoever the pious man,



who as such suffers reproach, plans to do for the glory of his God, or even in accordance with the will of his God. All this the children of the world, who are in possession of worldly power, seek to frustrate; but viewed in the light of the final decision their attempt is futile: Jahve is his refuge, or, literally the place whither he flees to hide himself and finds a hiding or concealment (צִל, Arab. *dall*, סִתָּר, Arab. *sitr*, Arabic also *drá*). מַחֲסֵהוּ has an orthophonic Dag., which obviates the necessity for the reading מַחֲסֵהוּ (cf. (ת):לִים Psa. 10: 1, מ:ו Psa. 34: 1, ל:סָר Psa. 105:22, and similar instances).

*Psa. 14: 7.* This tristich sounds like a liturgical addition belonging to the time of the Exile, unless one is disposed to assign the whole Psalm to this period on account of it. For elsewhere in a similar connection, as e.g., in Psalm 126, שׁוֹב שְׁבוּת means to turn the captivity, or to bring back the captives. שׁוֹב has here, — as in Psa. 126: 4, Nah. 2: 3 (followed by ת), cf. Eze. 47: 7, the Kal being preferred to the Hiph. הִשִּׁיב (Jer. 32:44; 33:11) in favour of the alliteration with שְׁבוּת (from שָׁבָה to make any one a prisoner of war), — a transitive signification, which Hengstenberg (who interprets it: to turn back, to turn to the captivity, of God's merciful visitation), vainly hesitates to admit. But Isa. 66: 6, for instance, shows that the exiles also never looked for redemption anywhere but from Zion. Not as though they had thought, that Jahve still dwelt among the ruins of His habitation, which indeed on the contrary was become a ruin because He had forsaken it (as we read in Ezekiel); but the moment of His return to His people is also the moment when He entered again upon the occupation of His sanctuary, and His sanctuary, again appropriated by Jahve even before it was actually reared, is the spot whence issues the kindling of the divine judgment on the enemies of Israel, as well as the spot whence issues the brightness of the reverse side of this judgment, viz., the final deliverance, hence even during the Exile, Jerusalem is the point (the kibla) whither the eye of the praying captive was directed, Dan. 6:11. There would therefore be nothing strange if a psalm-writer belonging to the Exile should express his longing for deliverance in these words: who gives = oh that one would give = oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion! But since שׁוֹב שְׁבוּת also signifies metaphorically to turn misfortune, as in Job. 42:10, Eze. 16:53 (perhaps also in Psa. 85: 2, cf. v. 5), inasmuch as the idea of שְׁבוּת has been generalised exactly like the German “Elend,” exile (Old High German *elilenti* = sojourn in another country, banishment, homelessness), therefore the inscribed לְדוֹד cannot be called in question from this quarter. Even Hitzig renders: “if Jahve would but turn the misfortune of His people,” regarding this Psalm as composed by Jeremiah during the time the Scythians were in the land. If this rendering is possible, and

that it is undeniable, then we retain the inscription **לְדוֹר**. And we do so the more readily, as Jeremiah's supposed authorship rests upon a non-recognition of his reproductive character, and the history of the prophet's times make no allusion to any incursion by the Scythians.

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

## Psalm 15

### THE CONDITIONS OF ACCESS TO GOD

**15: 1** JAHVE, who may sojourn in Thy tabernacle,  
Who may dwell on Thy holy mountain?

**15: 2** He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness,  
And speaketh truth in his heart.

**15: 3** That taketh not slander upon his tongue,  
Nor doeth evil to his companion,  
Nor bringeth a reproach upon his neighbour;

**15: 4** That is displeasing in his own eyes, to be despised,  
But those who fear Jahve he honoureth;  
He sweareth to [his own] hurt — he changeth not.

**15: 5** He putteth not out his money to usury,  
And taketh not a bribe against the innocent —  
He that doeth these things shall never be moved.

The preceding Psalm distinguished **דוֹר צַדִּיק**, a righteous generation, from the mass of the universal corruption, and closed with a longing for the salvation out of Zion. Psalm ch. 15 answers the question: who belongs to this **דוֹר צַדִּיק**, and whom shall the future salvation avail? Psalm 24, composed in connection with the removal of the Ark to Zion, is very similar. The state of mind expressed in this Psalm exactly corresponds to the unhypocritical piety and genuine lowliness which were manifest in David in their most beautiful light on that occasion; cf. v. 4b with 2Sa. 6:19; v. 4a with 2Sa. 6:21 f. The fact, however, that Zion (Moriah) is called simply **הַר הַקֹּדֶשׁ** in v. 1, rather favours

the time of the Absolomic exile, when David was cut off from the sanctuary of his God, whilst it was in the possession of men the very opposite of those described in this Psalm (vid., 4: 6). Nothing can be maintained with any certainty except that the Psalm assumes the elevation of Zion to the special designation of “the holy mountain” and the removal of the Ark to the אֶדְלָה erected there (2Sa. 6:17). Isa. 33:13-16 is a fine variation of this Psalm.

*Psa. 15: 1-2.* That which is expanded in the tristichic portion of the Psalm, is all contained in this distichic portion in nuce. The address to God is not merely a favourite form (Hupfeld), but the question is really, as its words imply, directed to God. The answer, however, is not therefore to be taken as a direct answer from God, as it might be in a prophetic connection: the psalmist addresses himself to God in prayer, he as it were reads the heart of God, and answers to himself the question just asked, in accordance with the mind of God. גִּוֵר and שָׁכֵן which are usually distinguished from each other like παροικεῖν and κατοικεῖν in Hellenistic Greek, are alike in meaning in this instance. It is not a merely temporary גִּוֵר (Psa. 61: 5), but for ever, that is intended. The only difference between the two interchangeable notions is this, the one denotes the finding of an abiding place of rest starting from the idea of a wandering life, the other the possession of an abiding place of rest starting from the idea of settled family life. <sup>f109</sup>

The holy tabernacle and the holy mountain are here thought of in their spiritual character as the places of the divine presence and of the church of God assembled round the symbol of it; and accordingly the sojourning and dwelling there is not to be understood literally, but in a spiritual sense. This spiritual depth of view, first of all with local limitations, is also to be found in Psa. 27: 4, 5; Psa. 61: 5. This is present even where the idea of earnestness and regularity in attending the sanctuary rises in intensity to that of constantly dwelling therein, Psa. 65: 5; 84: 4-5; while elsewhere, as in Psa. 24: 3, the outward materiality of the Old Testament is not exceeded. Thus we see the idea of the sanctuary at one time contracting itself within the Old Testament limits, and at another expanding more in accordance with the spirit of the New Testament; since in this matter, as in the matter of sacrifice, the spirit of the New Testament already shows signs of life, and works powerfully through its cosmical veil, without that veil being as yet rent. The answer to the question, so like the spirit of the New Testament in its intention, is also itself no less New Testament in its character: Not every one who saith Lord, Lord, but they who do the will of God, shall enjoy the rights of friendship with Him. But His will concerns the very substance of the Law, viz., our duties towards all men, and the inward state of the heart towards God.

In the expression הוֹלֵךְ תָּמִים (here and in Pro. 28:18), תָּמִים is either a closer definition of the subject: one walking as an upright man, like הוֹלֵךְ רָכִיל one going about as a slanderer, cf. הַיָּשָׁר הוֹלֵךְ Mic. 2: 7 “the upright as one walking;” or it is an accusative of the object, as in הוֹלֵךְ צְדָקוֹת Isa. 33:15: one who walks uprightness, i.e., one who makes uprightness his way, his mode of action; since תָּמִים may mean *integrum* = *integritas*, and this is strongly favoured by הֹלְכִים בְּתָמִים, which is used interchangeably with it in Psa. 84:12 (those who walk in uprightness). Instead of עֲשֵׂה צְדָקָה we have the poetical form of expression פִּיעַל צְדָק . The characterising of the outward walk and action is followed in v. 2b by the characterising of the inward nature: speaking truth in his heart, not: with his heart (not merely with his mouth); for in the phrase אָמַר בְּלֵב ב, אָמַר is always the *Beth* of the place, not of the instrument — the meaning therefore is: it is not falsehood and deceit that he thinks and plans inwardly, but truth (Hitz.). We have three characteristics here: a spotless walk, conduct ordered according to God’s will, and a truth-loving mode of thought.

*Psa. 15: 3-5.* The distich which contains the question and that containing the general answer are now followed by three tristichs, which work the answer out in detail. The description is continued in independent clauses, which, however, have logically the value of relative clauses. The *perff.* have the signification of abstract presents, for they are the expression of tried qualities, of the habitual mode of action, of that which the man, who is the subject of the question, never did and what consequently it is not his wont to do. רָגַל means to go about, whether in order to spie out (which is its usual meaning), or to gossip and slander (here, and the *Piel* in 2Sa. 19:28; cf. רָכִיל, רָכַל). Instead of בְּלִשְׁנוֹ we have אֶל-לִשְׁנוֹ (with *Dag.* in the second ל, in order that it may be read with emphasis and not slurred over <sup>f110</sup>), because a word lies upon the tongue ere it is uttered, the speaker brings it up as it were from within on to his tongue or lips, Psa. 16: 4; 50:16, Eze. 36: 3. The assonance of לְרַעְהוּ רָעָה is well conceived. To do evil to him who is bound to us by the ties of kindred and friendship, is a sin which will bring its own punishment. קָרוֹב is also the parallel word to רָא in Exo. 32:27. Both are here intended to refer not merely to persons of the same nation; for whatever is sinful in itself and under any circumstances whatever, is also sinful in relation to every man according to the morality of the Old Testament. The assertion of Hupfeld and others that נָשָׂא in conjunction with חָרְפָה means *efferre* = *effari*, is opposed by its combination with אֶל and its use elsewhere in the phrase נָשָׂא חָרְפָה “to bear reproach” (Psa. 69: 8). It means (since נָשָׂא is just as much *tollere* as *ferre*) to bring

reproach on any one, or load any one with reproach. Reproach is a burden which is more easily put on than cast off; *audacter calumniare, semper aliquid haeret*.

In v. 4a the interpretation “he is little in his own eyes, despised,” of which Hupfeld, rejecting it, says that Hitzig has picked it up out of the dust, is to be retained. Even the Targ., Saad., Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Urbino (in his Grammar, אהל מועד) take נבזה בעיניו together, even though explaining it differently, and it is accordingly accented by Baer נְבִיזָה בְּעֵינָיו | נְמָאָס (Mahpach, Asla Legarme, *Rebia magnum*). <sup>f111</sup>

God exalts him who is קָטַן בְּעֵינָיו, 1Sa. 15:17. David, when he brought up the ark of his God, could not sufficiently degrade himself (נִקְלַל), and appeared שָׂפָל בְּעֵינָיו, 2Sa. 6:22. This lowliness, which David also confesses in Psalm 131, is noted here and throughout the whole of the Old Testament, e.g., Isa. 57:15, as a condition of being well-pleasing before God; just as it is in reality the chief of all virtues. On the other hand, it is mostly translated either, according to the usual accentuation, with which the *Beth* of בְּעֵינָיו is dageshed: the reprobate is despised in his eyes (Rashi, Hupf.), or in accordance with the above accentuation: despised in his eyes is the reprobate (Maurer, Hengst., Olsh., Luzzatto); but this would say but little, and be badly expressed. For the placing together of two participles without an article, and moreover of similar meaning, with the design of the one being taken as subject and the other as predicate, is to be repudiated simply on the ground of style; and the difference among expositors shows how equivocal the expression is.

On the other hand, when we translate it: “despicable is he in his own eyes, worthy to be despised” (Ges. § 134, 1), we can appeal to 14: 1, where הַשְׁחִיתוּ is intensified just in the same way by הִתְעִיבוּ, as נְבִיזָה is here by נְמָאָס; cf. also Gen. 30:31, Job. 31:23, Isa. 43: 4. The antithesis of v. 4b to v. 4a is also thus fully met: he himself seems to himself unworthy of any respect, whereas he constantly shows respect to others; and the standard by which he judges is the fear of God. His own fear of Jahve is manifest from the self-denying strictness with which he performs his vows. This sense of נִשְׁבַּע לְהִרְעֵהוּ is entirely misapprehended when it is rendered: he swears to his neighbour (רַע = רָא), which ought to be לְרַעְנוּ, or: he swears to the wicked (and keeps to what he has thus solemnly promised), which ought to be לְרַע; for to what purpose would be the omission of the elision of the article, which is extremely rarely (Psa. 36: 6) not attended to in the classic style of the period before the Exile? The words have reference to Lev. 5: 4: if any one swear, thoughtlessly pronouncing לְהִרְעֵהוּ אוֹ לְהִיטִיב, to do evil or to do good, etc. The subject

spoken of is oaths which are forgotten, and the forgetting of which must be atoned for by an *asham*, whether the nature of the oath be something unpleasant and injurious, or agreeable and profitable, to the person making the vow. The retrospective reference of להרע to the subject is self-evident; for to injure another is indeed a sin, the vowing and performance of which, not its omission, would require to be expiated. On להרא = להרע vid., Ges. § 67, rem. 6. The hypothetical antecedent (cf. e.g., 2Ki. 5:13) is followed by ימר ולא is an apodosis. The verb המיר is native to the law of vows, which, if any one has vowed an animal in sacrifice, forbids both changing it for its money value (החליף) and exchanging it for another, be it טוב ברע או-רע בטוב, Lev. 27:10, 33. The psalmist of course does not use these words in the technical sense in which they are used in the Law. Swearing includes making a vow, and לא ימר disavows not merely any exchanging of that which was solemnly promised, but also any alteration of that which was sworn: he does not misuse the name of God in anywise, לשוא.

In v. 5a the psalmist also has a passage of the *Tôra* before his mind, viz., Lev. 25:37, cf. Exo. 22:24, Deu. 23:20, Eze. 18: 8. נתן בנשך signifies to give a thing away in order to take usury (נשך from נשך to bite, δάκνειν) for it. The receiver or demander of interest is משך, the one who pays interest נשך, the interest itself נשך. The trait of character described in v. 5b also recalls the language of the Mosaic law: שחד לא לקח, the prohibition Exo. 23: 8, Deu. 16:19; and אל-נקי, the curse Deu. 27:25: on account of the innocent, i.e., against him, to condemn him. Whether it be as a loan or as a gift, he gives without conditions, and if he attain the dignity of a judge he is proof against bribery, especially with reference to the destruction of the innocent. And now instead of closing in conformity with the description of character already given: such a man shall dwell, etc., the concluding sentence takes a different form, moulded in accordance with the spiritual meaning of the opening question: he who doeth these things shall never be moved (ימות fut. Niph.), he stands fast, being upheld by Jahve, hidden in His fellowship; nothing from without, no misfortune, can cause his overthrow.

## Psalm 16

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

*16: 1 PRESERVE me, O God, for in Thee do I hide myself*

*16: 2 I say unto Jahve: “Thou art my Lord,  
Besides Thee I have no good”,*

*16: 3 And to the saints who are in the earth:  
“These are the excellent, in whom is all my delight”.*

*16: 4 Their sorrows shall be multiplied who have bartered for an idol —  
I will not pour out their drink-offerings of blood,  
Nor take their names upon my lips.*

*16: 5 Jahve is the portion of my land and of my cup,  
Thou makest my lot illustrious.*

*16: 6 The lines have fallen unto me in pleasant places,  
Yea, the heritage appears fair to me.*

*16: 7 I will bless Jahve, who hath given me counsel;  
In the night-seasons also my reins instruct me.*

*16: 8 I have set Jahve always before me,  
For He is at my right hand — therefore I shall not be moved.*

*16: 9 Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory exulteth,  
My flesh also shall dwell free of care.*

*16:10 For Thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades,  
Nor give up Thy Holy One to see the pit;*

*16:11 Thou wilt make me know the path of life —  
Fulness of joy is in Thy countenance,  
Pleasures are in Thy right hand for evermore.*

The preceding Psalm closed with the words **לֹא יִמוּט** ; this word of promise is repeated in Psa. 16: 8 as an utterance of faith in the mouth of David. We are here confronted by a pattern of the unchangeable believing confidence of a friend of God; for the writer of Psalm 16 is in danger of death, as is to be inferred from the prayer expressed in v. 1 and the expectation in v. 10. But there is no trace of anything like bitter complaint, gloomy conflict, or hard struggle: the cry for help is immediately swallowed up by an overpowering and blessed consciousness and a bright hope. There reigns in the whole Psalm, a settled calm, an inward joy, and a joyous confidence, which is certain that everything that it can desire for the present and for the future it possesses in its God.

The Psalm is inscribed **לְדָוִד**; and Hitzig also confesses that “David may be inferred from its language.” Whatever can mark a Psalm as Davidic we find combined in this Psalm: thoughts crowding together in compressed language, which becomes in v. 4 bold even to harshness, but then becomes clear and

moves more rapidly; an antiquated, peculiar, and highly poetic impress (אֲדֹנָי, *my Lord*, מְנַת, נְחֻלַת, שִׁפְר, תּוֹמִיךְ); and a well-devised grouping of the strophes. In addition to all these, there are manifold points of contact with indisputably genuine Davidic Psalms (comp. e.g., v. 5 with Psa. 11: 6; v. 10 with Psa. 4: 4; v. 11 with 17:15), and with indisputably ancient portions of the Pentateuch (Exo. 23:13; 19: 6, Gen. 49: 6). Scarcely any other Psalm shows so clearly as this, what deep roots psalm-poetry has struck into the *Tôra*, both as it regards the matter and the language. Concerning the circumstances of its composition, vid., on Psalm 30.

The superscription מִכְתָּם לְדָוִד, Psalm 16 has in common with Psalm 56-60. After the analogy of the other superscriptions, it must have a technical meaning. This at once militates against Hitzig's explanation, that it is a poem hitherto unknown, an ἀνέκδοτον, according to the Arabic *mâktum*, hidden, secret, just as also against the meaning κειμήλιον, which says nothing further to help us. The LXX translates it στηλογραφία (εἰς στηλογραφίαν), instead of which the Old Latin version has *tituli inscriptio* (Hesychius τίτλος: πτυχίον ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον). That this translation accords with the tradition is shown by that of the Targum גְּלִיפָא תְרִיצָא *sculptura recta* (not *erecta* as Hupfeld renders it). Both versions give the verb the meaning בְּתַם *insculpere*, which is supported both by a comparison with בְּתַב, cogn. עֲצַב, חֲצַב, and by חֲתַם *imprimere* (*sigillum*). Moreover, the sin of Israel is called נִכְתָּם in Jer. 2:22 (cf. Psa. 17: 1) as being a deeply impressed spot, not to be wiped out. If we now look more closely into the *Michtam* Psalms as a whole, we find they have two prevailing features in common. Sometimes significant and remarkable words are introduced by אָמַרְתִּי, וַיֹּאמֶר, דָּבַר, Psa. 16: 2; 58:12; 60: 8, cf. Isa. 38:10, 11 (in Hezekiah's psalm, which is inscribed מִכְתָּם = מִכְתָּם as it is perhaps to be read); sometimes words of this character are repeated after the manner of a refrain, as in Psalm 56: *I will not fear, what can man do to me!* in Psalm 57: *Be Thou exalted, Elohim, above the heavens, Thy glory above all the earth!* and in Psalm 59: *For Elohim is my high tower, my merciful God.* Hezekiah's psalm unites this characteristic with the other. Accordingly מִכְתָּם, like ἐπίγραμμα,<sup>fl12</sup> appears to mean first of all an inscription and then to be equivalent to an inscription-poem or epigram, a poem containing pithy sayings; since in the Psalms of this order some expressive sentence, after the style of an inscription or a motto on a monument, is brought prominently forward, by being either specially introduced or repeated as a refrain.

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



*Psa. 16: 1-3.* The Psalm begins with a prayer that is based upon faith, the special meaning of which becomes clear from v. 10: May God preserve him (which He is able to do as being אֱלֹהִים, the Almighty, able to do all things), who has no other refuge in which he has hidden and will hide but Him. This short introit is excepted from the parallelism; so far therefore it is monostichic, — a sigh expressing everything in few words. And the emphatic pronunciation שְׁמֵרֵנִי *shām<sup>e</sup>reni* harmonises with it; for it is to be read thus, just as in Psa. 86: 2; 119:167 *shām<sup>e</sup>rah* (cf. on Isa. 38:14 עֲשֶׂקָה), according to the express testimony of the Masora. <sup>f113</sup>

The text of the next two verses (so it appears) needs to be improved in two respects. The reading אֲמַרְתָּ as addressed to the soul (Targ.), cf. Lam. 3:24 f., is opposed by the absence of any mention of the thing addressed. It rests upon a misconception of the defective form of writing, אָמַרְתָּ (Ges. § 44, rem. 4). Hitzig and Ewald (§ 190, *d*) suppose that in such cases a rejection of the final vowel, which really occurs in the language of the people, after the manner of the Aramaic (אָמַרְתָּ or אָמַרְתָּ), lies at the bottom of the form. And it does really seem as though the frequent occurrence of this defective form (דַּעַת = דַּעַתִּי Psa. 140:13, Job. 42: 2, בְּנִיתָ = בְּנִיתִי 1Ki. 8:48, עֲשִׂיתָ = עֲשִׂיתִי Eze. 16:59, cf. 2Ki. 18:20, אָמַרְתָּ now pointed אֲמַרְתָּ, with Isa. 36: 5) has its occasion at least in some such cutting away of the *i*, peculiar to the language of the common people; although, if David wrote it so, אָמַרְתָּ is not intended to be read otherwise than it is in Psa. 31:15; 140: 7. <sup>f114</sup>

First of all David gives expression to his confession of Jahve, to whom he submits himself unconditionally, and whom he sets above everything else without exception. Since the suffix of אֲדֹנָי (properly *domini mei = domine mi*, Gen. 18: 3, cf. 19: 2), which has become mostly lost sight of in the usage of the language, now and then retains its original meaning, as it does indisputably in 35:23, it is certainly to be rendered also here: “Thou art my Lord” and not “Thou art the Lord.” The emphasis lies expressly on the “my.” It is the unreserved and joyous feeling of dependence (more that of the little child, than of the servant), which is expressed in this first confession. For, as the second clause of the confession says: Jahve, who is his Lord, is also his benefactor, yea even his highest good. The preposition אֵל frequently introduces that which extends beyond something else, Gen. 48:22 (cf. 89: 8; 95: 3), and to this passage may be added Gen. 31:50; 32:12, Exo. 35:22, Num. 31: 8, Deu. 19: 9; 22: 6, the one thing being above, or co-ordinate with, the other. So also here: “my good, i.e., whatever makes me truly happy, is not above Thee,” i.e., in addition to Thee, beside Thee; according to the sense it is equivalent to out of Thee or without Thee (as the Targ., Symm., and Jerome render it), Thou alone,

without exception, art my good. In connection with this rendering of the אֵל, the בַּל (poetic, and contracted from בְּלִי), which is unknown to the literature before David's time, presents no difficulty. As in Pro. 23: 7 it is short for בַּל־תִּהְיֶה. Hengstenberg remarks, "Just as *Thou art the Lord!* is the response of the soul to the words *I am the Lord thy God* (Exo. 20: 2), so *Thou only art my salvation!* is the response to *Thou shalt have no other gods beside Me* (אֵל־פְּנֵי)." The psalmist knows no fountain of true happiness but Jahve, in Him he possesses all, his treasure is in Heaven.

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

וּלְקְדוּשִׁים אֲשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ  
הַמָּה אֲדִירֵי כָל־חַפְצֵי־בָם

While Diestel's alteration: "to the saints, who are in his land, he makes himself glorious, and all his delight is in them," is altogether strange to this verse: the above transfer of the *Waw*<sup>f115</sup> suffices to remove its difficulties, and that in a way quite in accordance with the connection. Now it is clear, that לְקְדוּשִׁים, as has been supposed by some, is the dative governed by אֲמַרְתִּי, the influence of which is thus carried forward; it is clear what is meant by the addition אֲשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ, which distinguishes the object of his affection here below from the One above, who is incomparably the highest; it is clear, as to what הַמָּה defines, whereas otherwise this purely descriptive relative clause בְּאֶרֶץ הַמָּה אֲשֶׁר (which von Ortenberg transposes into אֲשֶׁר אֶרְצָה בְּהַמָּה) appears to be useless and surprises one both on account of its redundancy (since הַמָּה is superfluous, cf. e.g., 2Sa. 7: 9; 2:18) and on account of its arrangement of the words (an arrangement, which is usual in connection with a negative construction, Deu. 20:15, 2Ch. 8: 7, cf. Gen. 9: 3, Eze. 12:10); it is clear, in what sense אֲדִירֵי alternates with קְדוּשִׁים, since it is not those who are accounted by the world as אֲדִירִים on account of their worldly power and possessions (Psa. 136:18, 2Ch. 23:20), but the holy, prized by him as being also glorious, partakers of higher glory and worthy of higher honour; and moreover, this corrected arrangement of the verse harmonises with the *Michtam* character of the Psalm. The thought thus obtained, is the thought one expected (love to God and love to His saints), and the one which one is also obliged to wring from the text as we have it, either by translating with De Welte, Maurer, Dietrich and others: "the saints who are in the land, they are the excellent in whom I have all my delight," — a *Waw apodoseos*, with which one could only be satisfied if it were וְהַמָּה (cf. 2Sa. 15:34) — or: "the saints

who are in the land and the glorious — all my delight is in them.” By both these interpretations, ל would be the exponent of the *nom. absol.* which is elsewhere detached and placed at the beginning of a sentence, and this ל of reference (Ew. § 310, *a*) is really common to every style (Num. 18: 8, Isa. 32: 1, Ecc. 9: 4); whereas the ל understood of the fellowship in which he stands when thus making confession to Jahve: associating myself with the saints (Hengst.), with (von Lengerke), among the saints (Hupf., Thenius), would be a preposition most liable to be misapprehended, and makes v. 3 a cumbersome appendage of v. 2. But if ל be taken as the *Lamed* of reference then the elliptical construct וְאֲדִירִי, to which הָאָרֶץ ought to be supplied, remains a stumbling-block not to be easily set aside. For such an isolation of the connecting form from its genitive cannot be shown to be syntactically possible in Hebrew (vid., on 2Ki. 9:17, Thenius, and Keil); nor are we compelled to suppose in this instance what cannot be proved elsewhere, since כָּל־הַפְּצִי־בָּם is, without any harshness, subordinate to וְאֲדִירִי as a genitival notion (Ges. § 116, 3). And still in connection with the reading וְאֲדִירִי, both the formation of the sentence which, beginning with ל, leads one to expect an apodosis, and the relation of v. 3 to v. 2, according to which the central point of the declaration must lie just within כָּל־הַפְּצִי־בָּם, are opposed to this rendering of the words וְאֲדִירִי כָּל־הַפְּצִי־בָּם.

Thus, therefore, we come back to the above easy improvement of the text. קְדוֹשִׁים are those in whom the will of Jahve concerning Israel, that it should be a holy nation (Exo. 19: 6, Deu. 7: 6), has been fulfilled, viz., the living members of the *ecclesia sanctorum* in this world (for there is also one in the other world, 89: 6). Glory, δόξα, is the outward manifestation of holiness. It is ordained of God for the sanctified (cf. Rom. 8:30), whose moral nobility is now for the present veiled under the menial form of the עֲנִי; and in the eyes of David they already possess it. His spiritual vision pierces through the outward form of the servant. His verdict is like the verdict of God, who is his all in all. The saints, and they only, are the excellent to him. His whole delight is centred in them, all his respect and affection is given to them. The congregation of the saints is his *Chephzibah*, Isa. 62: 4 (cf. 2Ki. 21: 1).

*Psa. 16: 4-5.* As he loves the saints so, on the other hand, he abhors the apostates and their idols. אַחַר מְהָרוּ is to be construed as an appositional relative clause to the preceding: *multi sunt cruciatus* (cf. *Psa. 32:10 eorum, eorum scil. qui alium permutant.* The expression would flow on more smoothly if it were יִרְבּוּ: they multiply, or increase their pains, who..., so that אַחַר מְהָרוּ would be the subject, for instance like הִי אֲהָבֹו (he whom Jahve

loves), Isa. 48:14. This v. 4 forms a perfect antithesis to v. 3. In David's eyes the saints are already the glorified, in whom his delight centres; while, as he knows, a future full of anguish is in store for the idolatrous, and their worship, yea, their very names are an abomination to him. The suffixes of נִסְכֵיהֶם and שְׁמֹתָם might be referred to the idols according to Exo. 23:13, Hos. 2:19, if אֱחָר be taken collectively as equivalent to אֱחָרִים, as in Job. 8:19. But it is more natural to assign the same reference to them as to the suffix of אֲצִבֹתָם, which does not signify "their idols" (for idols are עֲצָבִים), but their torments, pains (from אֲצָבָת derived from עֲצָב), Psa. 147: 3, Job. 9:28. The thought is similar to 1Ti. 6:10, *ἑαυτοὺς περιέπειραν ὀδύνας ποικίλαις*. אֱחָר is a general designation of the broadest kind for everything that is not God, but which man makes his idol beside God and in opposition to God (cf. Isa. 42: 8; 48:11). מְהָרוּ cannot mean *festinant*, for in this signification it is only found in *Piel* מְהָרָה, and that once with a local, but not a personal, accusative of the direction, Nah. 2: 6. It is therefore to be rendered (and the *perf.* is also better adapted to this meaning): they have taken in exchange that which is not God (מְהָרָה like הִמְרִיר, Psa. 106:20, Jer. 2:11). Perhaps (cf. the phrase זָנְהוּ אֱחָרִי the secondary meaning of wooing and fondling is connected with it; for מְהָרָה is the proper word for acquiring a wife by paying down the price asked by her father, Exo. 22:15. With such persons, who may seem to be אֱדִירִים in the eyes of the world, but for whom a future full of anguish is in store, David has nothing whatever to do: he will not pour out drink-offerings as they pour them out. נִסְכֵיהֶם has the *Dag. lene*, as it always has. They are not called מְדָם as actually consisting of blood, or of wine actually mingled with blood; but consisting as it were of blood, because they are offered with blood-stained hands and blood-guilty consciences. מִן is the *min* of derivation; in this instance (as in Amo. 4: 5, cf. Hos. 6: 8) of the material, and is used in other instances also for similar virtually adjectival expressions. Psa. 10:18; 17:14; 80:14.

In v. 4c the expression of his abhorrence attains its climax: even their names, i.e., the names of their false gods, which they call out, he shuns taking upon his lips, just as is actually forbidden in the *Tōra*, Exo. 23:13 (cf. *Const. Apost.* V. 10 *εἰδωλον μνημονεύειν ὀνόματα δαιμονικά*).; He takes the side of Jahve. Whatever he may wish for, he possesses in Him; and whatever he has in Him, is always secured to him by Him. חֲלָקִי does not here mean food (Böttch.), for in this sense חֲלָק (Lev. 6:10) and מְנָה (1Sa. 1: 4) are identical; and parallel passages like Psa. 142: 6 show what חֲלָקִי means when applied to Jahve. According to Psa. 11: 6, כּוֹסִי is also a genitive just like חֲלָקִי; מְנָת חֲלָקִי is the

share of landed property assigned to any one; מִנַּת כּוֹס the share of the cup according to paternal apportionment. The tribe of Levi received no territory in the distribution of the country, from which they might have maintained themselves; Jahve was to be their חֶלֶק, Num. 18:20, and the gifts consecrated to Jahve were to be their food, Deu. 10: 9; 18: 1 f. But nevertheless all Israel is βασιλειον ἱεράτευμα, Exo. 19: 6, towards which even קְדוּשִׁים and אֲדָרִים in v. 3 pointed; so that, therefore, the very thing represented by the tribe of Levi in outward relation to the nation, holds good, in all its deep spiritual significance, of every believer. It is not anything earthly, visible, created, and material, that is allotted to him as his possession and his sustenance, but Jahve and Him only; but in Him is perfect contentment. In v. 5b, תּוֹמִיךְ, as it stands, looks at first sight as though it were the *Hiph.* of a verb יָמַךְ (יָמַךְ). But such a verb is not to be found anywhere else, we must therefore seek some other explanation of the word. It cannot be a substantive in the signification of possession (Maurer, Ewald), for such a substantival form does not exist. It might more readily be explained as a participle = תּוֹמִיךְ, somewhat like יוֹסִיף, Isa. 29: 4; 38: 5, Ecc. 1:18, = יוֹסֵף, — a comparison which has been made by Aben-Ezra (*Sefath Jether* No. 421) and Kimchi (*Michlol* 11a), — a form of the participle to which, in writing at least, סוֹבִיב, 2Ki. 8:21, forms a transition; but there is good reason to doubt the existence of such a form. Had the poet intended to use the *part.* of תָּמַךְ, it is more probable he would have written אַתָּה תּוֹמְכִי גוֹרְלִי, just as the LXX translators might have had it before them, taking the *Chirek compaginis* as a suffix: σὺ εἶ ὁ ἀποκαθιστῶν τὴν κληρονομίαν μου ἐμοί (Böttcher). For the conjecture of Olshausen and Thenius, תּוֹסִיף in the sense: “thou art continually my portion” halts both in thought and expression. Hitzig’s conjecture תּוֹמִיךְ “thou, thy *Tummim* are my lot,” is more successful and tempting. But the fact that the תְּמִים are never found (not even in Deu. 33: 8) without the אֲוִרִים, is against it. Nevertheless, we should prefer this conjecture to the other explanations, if the word would not admit of being explained as *Hiph.* from יָמַךְ (יָמַךְ), which is the most natural explanation. Schultens has compared the Arabic *wamika*, to be broad, from which there is a *Hiphil* form Arab. *awmaka*, to make broad, in Syro-Arabic, that is in use even in the present day among the common people. <sup>f16</sup>

And since we must at any rate come down to the supposition of something unusual about this תּוֹמִיךְ, it is surely not too bold to regard it as a ἀπαξ γεγραμμ.: Thou makest broad my lot, i.e., ensurest for me a spacious habitation, a broad place, as the possession that falleth to me, <sup>f17</sup> — a thought, that is expanded in v. 6.

*Psa. 16: 6-8.* The measuring lines (חִבְלִים) are cast (Mic. 2: 5) and fall to any one just where and as far as his property is assigned to him; so that חָבַל נָפַל (Jos. 17: 5) is also said of the falling to any one of his allotted portion of land. נְעֻמִים (according to the Masora defective as also in v. 11 נְעֻמוֹת) is a *pluralet.*, the plural that is used to denote a unity in the circumstances, and a similarity in the relations of time and space, Ges. § 108, 2, *a*; and it signifies both pleasant circumstances, Job. 36:11, and, as here, a pleasant locality, Lat. *amaena* (to which נְעֻמוֹת in v. 11, more strictly corresponds). The lines have fallen to him in a charming district, viz., in the pleasurable fellowship of God, this most blessed domain of love has become his paradisaic possession. With אֵף he rises from the fact to the perfect contentment which it secures to him: such a heritage seems to him to be fair, he finds a source of inward pleasure and satisfaction in it. נִחְלַת — according to Ew. § 173, *d*, lengthened from the construct form נִחְלַת (like נְגִינַת Psa. 61: 1); according to Hupfeld, springing from נִחְלַתִי (by the same apocope that is so common in Syriac, perhaps like אִמְרַתִּי v. 1 from אִמְרַתִּי) just like זְמַרַת Exo. 15: 2 — is rather, since in the former view there is no law for the change of vowel and such an application of the form as we find in Psa. 60:13 (Psa. 108:13) is opposed to the latter, a stunted form of נִחְלַתָּה: the heritage = such a heritage pleases me, lit., seems fair to me (שָׁפַר, cognate root סָפַר, צָפַר, cognate in meaning בָּשַׁר, Arab. *bšr*, to rub, polish, make shining, intr. שָׁפַר to be shining, beautiful). עָלִי of beauty known and felt by him (cf. Est. 3: 9 with 1Sa. 25:36 טוֹב עָלָיו, and the later way of expressing it Dan. 3:32). But since the giver and the gift are one and the same, the joy he has in the inheritance becomes of itself a constant thanksgiving to and blessing of the Giver, that He (אֲשֶׁר *quippe qui*) has counselled him (Psa. 73:24) to choose the one thing needful, the good part. Even in the night-seasons his heart keeps watch, even then his reins admonish him (יָסַר, here of moral incitement, as in Isa. 8:11, to warn). The reins are conceived of as the seat of the blessed feeling that Jahve is his possession (vid., *Psychol.* S. 268; tr. p. 316). He is impelled from within to offer heartfelt thanks to his merciful and faithful God. He has Jahve always before him, Jahve is the point towards which he constantly directs his undiverted gaze; and it is easy for him to have Him thus ever present, for He is מִיְמִינִי (supply הוּא, as in Psa. 22:29; 55:20; 112: 4), at my right hand (i.e., where my right hand begins, close beside me), so that he has no need to draw upon his power of imagination. The words בְּלֹא־אֲמוֹת, without any conjunction, express the natural effect of this, both in consciousness and in reality: he will not and cannot totter, he will not yield and be overthrown.

*Psa. 16: 9-11.* Thus then, as this concluding strophe, as it were like seven rays of light, affirms, he has the most blessed prospect before him, without any need to fear death. Because Jahve is thus near at hand to help him, his heart becomes joyful (שָׂמַח) and his glory, i.e., his soul (vid., on 7: 6) rejoices, the joy breaking forth in rejoicing, as the *fut. consec.* affirms. There is no passage of Scripture that so closely resembles this as 1 Thess. 5:23. לֵב is πνεῦμα (νοῦς), כְּבוֹד, ψυχὴ (vid., *Psychol.* S. 98; tr. p. 119), בְּשָׂרָה (according to its primary meaning, *attractabile*, that which is frail), סֹדֵמָה. The ἀμέμπτως τηρηθῆναι which the apostle in the above passage desires for his readers in respect of all three parts of their being, David here expresses as a confident expectation; for אֵלֵי implies that he also hopes for his body that which he hopes for his spirit-life centred in the heart, and for his soul raised to dignity both by the work of creation and of grace. He looks death calmly and triumphantly in the face, even his flesh shall dwell or lie securely, viz., without being seized with trembling at its approaching corruption. David's hope rests on this conclusion: it is impossible for the man, who, in appropriating faith and actual experience, calls God his own, to fall into the hands of death. For v. 10 shows, that what is here thought of in connection with שָׁכַן לְבַמְצָח, dwelling in safety under the divine protection (Deu. 33:12, 28, cf. Pro. 3:24), is preservation from death. שָׁחַת is rendered by the LXX διαφθορά, as though it came from שָׁחַת διαφθεῖρουν, as perhaps it may do in Job. 17:14. But in 7:16 the LXX has βόθρος, which is the more correct: prop. a sinking in, from שָׁחַח to sink, to be sunk, like נָחַת from נוּחַ, רָחַת from רוּחַ. To leave to the unseen world (עָזַב prop. to loosen, let go) is equivalent to abandoning one to it, so that he becomes its prey. V. 10b — where to see the grave (Psa. 49:10), equivalent to, to succumb to the state of the grave, i.e., death (Psa. 89:49, Luke 2:26, Joh. 8:51) is the opposite of “seeing life,” i.e., experiencing and enjoying it (Ecc. 9: 9, Joh. 3:36), the sense of sight being used as the noblest of the senses to denote the *sensus communis*, i.e., the common sense lying at the basis of all feeling and perception, and figuratively of all active and passive experience (*Psychol.* S. 234; tr. p. 276) — shows, that what is said here is not intended of an abandonment by which, having once come under the power of death, there is no coming forth again (Böttcher). It is therefore the hope of not dying, that is expressed by David in v. 10. for by אֲנִי David means himself. According to Norzi, the Spanish MSS have אֲנִי with the Masoretic note יִתִּיר יוֹד, and the LXX, Targ., and Syriac translate, and the Talmud and Midrash interpret it, in accordance with this *Kerî*. There is no ground for the reading אֲנִי, and it is also opposed by the personal form of expression surrounding it. <sup>f118</sup>

The positive expression of hope in v. 11 comes as a companion to the negative just expressed: Thou wilt grant me to experience (הוֹדִיעַנִי, is used, as usual, of the presentation of a knowledge, which concerns the whole man and not his understanding merely) אֶרְכֵּה חַיִּים, the path of life, i.e., the path to life (cf. Pro. 5: 6; 2:19 with *ib.* 10:17, Mat. 7:14); but not so that it is conceived of as at the final goal, but as leading slowly and gradually onwards to life; חַיִּים in the most manifold sense, as, e.g., in Psa. 36:10, Deu. 30:15: life from God, with God, and in God, the living God; the opposite of death, as the manifestation of God's wrath and banishment from Him. That his body shall not die is only the external and visible phase of that which David hopes for himself; on its inward, unseen side it is a living, inwrought of God in the whole man, which in its continuance is a walking in the divine life. The second part of v. 11, which consists of two members, describes this life with which he solaces himself. According to the accentuation, — which marks חַיִּים with *Olewejored* not with *Rebia magnum* or *Pazer*, — שְׂבַע שְׂמֵחוֹת is not a second object dependent upon הוֹדִיעַנִי, but the subject of a substantival clause: a satisfying fulness of joy is אֶת־פְּנֵיךָ, with Thy countenance, i.e., connected with and naturally produced by beholding Thy face (אֶת preposition of fellowship, as in Psa. 21: 7; 140:14); for joy is light, and God's countenance, or doxa, is the light of lights. And every kind of pleasurable things, נְעֻמֹת, He holds in His right hand, extending them to His saints — a gift which lasts for ever; נֹצֵחַ equivalent to לְנֹצֵחַ. נֹצֵחַ, from the primary notion of conspicuous brightness, is duration extending beyond all else — an expression for לְעֹלָם, which David has probably coined, for it appears for the first time in the Davidic Psalms. Pleasures are in Thy right hand continually — God's right hand is never empty, His fulness is inexhaustible.

The apostolic application of this Psalm (Act. 2:29-32; 13:35-37) is based on the considerations that David's hope of not coming under the power of death was not realised in David himself, as is at once clear, to the unlimited extent in which it is expressed in the Psalm; but that it is fulfilled in Jesus, who has not been left to Hades and whose flesh did not see corruption; and that consequently the words of the Psalm are a prophecy of David concerning Jesus, the Christ, who was promised as the heir to his throne, and whom, by reason of the promise, he had prophetically before his mind. If we look into the Psalm, we see that David, in his mode of expression, bases that hope simply upon his relation to Jahve, the ever-living One. That it has been granted to him in particular, to express this hope which is based upon the mystic relation of the חַסִּיד to Jahve in such language, — a hope which the issue of Jesus' life has sealed by an historical fulfilment, — is to be explained from the relation,



according to the promise, in which David stands to his seed, the Christ and Holy One of God, who appeared in the person of Jesus. David, the anointed of God, looking upon himself as in Jahve, the God who has given the promise, becomes the prophet of Christ; but this is only indirectly, for he speaks of himself, and what he says has also been fulfilled in his own person. But this fulfilment is not limited to the condition, that he did not succumb to any peril that threatened his life so long as the kingship would have perished with him, and that, when he died, the kingship nevertheless remained (Hofmann); nor, that he was secured against all danger of death until he had accomplished his life's mission, until he had fulfilled the vocation assigned to him in the history of the plan of redemption (Kurtz) — the hope which he cherishes for himself personally has found a fulfilment which far exceeds this. After his hope has found in Christ its full realisation in accordance with the history of the plan of redemption, it receives through Christ its personal realisation for himself also. For what he says, extends on the one hand far beyond himself, and therefore refers prophetically to Christ: *in decachordo Psalterio* — as Jerome boldly expresses it — *ab inferis suscitatur resurgentem*. But on the other hand that which is predicted comes back upon himself, to raise him also from death and Hades to the beholding of God. *Verus justitiae sol* — says Sontag in his *Tituli Psalmorum*, 1687 — *e sepulcro resurrexit, στήλη seu lapis sepulcralis a monumento devolutus, arcus triumphalis erectus, victoria ab hominibus reportata. En vobis Michtam! En Evangelium!* —

## **Psalm 17**

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

*17: 1 HEAR, O Jahve, righteousness, hearken to my cry,  
Give ear to my prayer with undecitful lips!*

*17: 2 From Thy presence let my right go forth,  
Thine eyes behold rightly.*

*17: 3 Thou hast proved my heart, Thou hast visited (me) by night,  
Thou hast tried me — Thou findest nothing:  
If I think evil, it doth not pass my mouth.*

*17: 4 In connection with the doings of men, by the words of Thy lips  
I have guarded myself against the paths of the destroyer;*

*17: 5 My steps held fast to Thy paths,  
My footsteps have not slipped.*

*17: 6 As such an one I call upon Thee, for Thou hearest me, O God!  
Incline Thine ear unto me, hear my speech.*

*17: 7 Shew Thy marvellous lovingkindness,  
Helper of those who seek refuge  
From those that rise up [against them], at Thy right hand.*

*17: 8 Keep me as the apple — the pupil — of the eye;  
Hide me in the shadow of Thy wings*

*17: 9 From the wicked, who would destroy me,  
From my deadly enemies, who compass me about.*

*17:10 They have shut up their fat,  
They speak proudly with their mouth;*

*17:11 At every step they have surrounded me,  
Their purpose is to smite down to the earth.*

*17:12 He is like a lion that is greedy to ravin,  
And like a young lion lurking in the lair.*

*17:13 Arise, Jahve, go forth to meet him, cast him down,  
Deliver my soul from the wicked, with Thy sword,*

*17:14 From men, with Thy hand, Jahve — from men of this world,  
Whose portion is in life, and with Thy treasures Thou fillest their belly,  
They have plenty of children and leave their abundance to their young ones.*

*17:15 As for me — in righteousness shall I behold Thy face,  
I will satisfy myself, when I awake, with Thine image.*

Psalm 17 is placed after Psalm 16, because just like the latter (cf. Psa. 11: 7) it closes with the hope of a blessed and satisfying vision of God. In other respects also the two Psalms have many prominent features in common: as, for instance, the petition **שְׁמֶרְנִי**, Psa. 16: 1; 17: 8; the retrospect on nightly fellowship with God, Psa. 16: 7; 17: 3; the form of address in prayer **אל**, Psa. 16: 1; 17: 6; the verb **תִּמָּךְ**, Psa. 16: 5; 17: 5, etc. (vid., *Symbolae* p. 49), notwithstanding a great dissimilarity in their tone. For Psalm 16 is the first of those which we call Psalms written in the indignant style, in the series of the Davidic Psalms. The language of the Psalms of David, which is in other instances so flowing and clear, becomes more harsh and, in accordance with the subject and mood, as it were, full of unresolved dissonances (Psalm 17, 140, 58, 36: 2 f., cf. 10: 2-11) when describing the dissolute conduct of his enemies, and of the ungodly in general. The language is then more rough and unmanageable, and wanting in the clearness and transparency we find elsewhere. The tone of the language also becomes more dull and, as it were, a dull murmur. It rolls on like the rumble of distant thunder, by piling up the suffixes *mo*, *āmo*, *ēmo*, as in Psa. 17:10; 35:16; Psa. 64: 6, 9, where David speaks of his enemies and describes them in a tone suggested by the

indignation, which is working with his breast; or in Psa. 59:12-14; 56: 8; 21:10-13; 140:10; 58: 7, where, as in prophetic language, he announces to them of the judgment of God. The more vehement and less orderly flow of the language which we find here, is the result of the inward tumult of his feelings.

There are so many parallels in the thought and expression of thought of this Psalm in other Davidic Psalms (among those we have already commented on we may instance more especially Psalm ch. 7 and 11, and also 4 and 10), that even Hitzig admits the **לדוד**. The author of the Psalm is persecuted, and others with him; foes, among whom one, their leader, stands prominently forward, plot against his life, and have encompassed him about in the most threatening manner, eager for his death. All this corresponds, line for line, with the situation of David in the wilderness of *Maon* (about three hours and three quarters S.S.E. of Hebron), as narrated in 1Sa. 23:25 f., when Saul and his men were so close upon the heels of David and his men, that he only escaped capture by a most fortunate incident.

The only name inscribed on this Psalm is **תפלה** (a prayer), the most comprehensive name for the Psalms, and the oldest (Psa. 72:20); for **שיר** and **מזמור** were only given to them when they were sung in the liturgy and with musical accompaniment. As the title of a Psalm it is found five times (17, 86, 90, 92, 142) in the Psalter, and besides that once, in Hab. 3. Habakkuk's **תפלה** is a hymn composed for music. But in the Psalter we do not find any indication of the Psalms thus inscribed being arranged for music. The strophe schema is 4. 7; 4. 4. 6. 7.

*Psa. 17: 1-2.* **צדק** is the accusative of the object: the righteousness, intended by the suppliant, is his own (v. 15a). He knows that he is not merely righteous in his relation to man, but also in his relation to God. In all such assertions of pious self-consciousness, that which is intended is a righteousness of life which has its ground in the righteousness of faith. True, Hupfeld is of opinion, that under the Old Testament nothing was known either of righteousness which is by faith or of a righteousness belonging to another and imputed. But if this were true, then Paul was in gross error and Christianity is built upon the sand. But the truth, that faith is the ultimate ground of righteousness, is expressed in Gen. 15: 6, and at other turning-points in the course of the history of redemption; and the truth, that the righteousness which avails before God is a gift of grace is, for instance, a thought distinctly marked out in the expression of Jeremiah **ה' צדקנו**, "the Lord our righteousness." The Old Testament conception, it is true, looks more to the phenomena than to the root of the matter (*ist mehr phänomenell als wurzelhaft*), is (so to speak) more Jacobic than Pauline; but the righteousness of life of the Old Testament and that of the

New have one and the same basis, viz., in the grace of God, the Redeemer, towards sinful man, who in himself is altogether wanting in righteousness before God (Psa. 143: 2). Thus there is no self-righteousness, in David's praying that the righteousness, which in him is persecuted and cries for help, may be heard. For, on the one hand, in his personal relation to Saul, he knows himself to be free from any ungrateful thoughts of usurpation, and on the other, in his personal relation to God free from **מִרְמָה**, i.e., self-delusion and hypocrisy. The shrill cry for help, **רִנָּה**, which he raises, is such as may be heard and answered, because they are not lips of deceit with which he prays. The actual fact is manifest **לִפְנֵי יְהוָה**, therefore may his right go forth **מִלְפָּנָיו**, — just what does happen, by its being publicly proclaimed and openly maintained — from Him, for His eyes, the eyes of Him who knoweth the hearts (Psa. 11: 4), behold **מִיִּשְׂרָיִם** (as in Psa. 58: 2; 75: 3 = **בְּמִיִּשְׂרָיִם**, 9: 9, and many other passages), in uprightness, i.e., in accordance with the facts of the case and without partiality. **מִיִּשְׂרָיִם** might also be an accusative of the object (cf. 1Ch. 29:17), but the usage of the language much more strongly favours the adverbial rendering, which is made still more natural by the confirmatory relation in which v. 2*b* stands to 2*a*.

*Psa. 17: 3-5.* David refers to the divine testing and illumination of the inward parts, which he has experienced in himself, in support of his sincerity. The preterites in v. 3 express the divine acts that preceded the result **צָרְפָתָנִי**, viz., the testing He has instituted, which is referred to in **צָרְפָתָנִי** and also **בַּחֲנִיתָ** as a trying of gold by fire, and in **פָּקַד** as an investigation (Job. 7:18). The result of the close scrutiny to which God has subjected him in the night, when the bottom of a man's heart is at once made manifest, whether it be in his thoughts when awake or in the dream and fancies of the sleeper, was and is this, that He does not find, viz., anything whatever to punish in him, anything that is separated as dross from the gold. To the mind of the New Testament believer with his deep, and as it were microscopically penetrating, insight into the depth of sin, such a confession concerning himself would be more difficult than to the mind of an Old Testament saint. For a separation and disunion of flesh and spirit, which was unknown in the same degree to the Old Testament, has been accomplished in the New Testament consciousness by the facts and operations of redemption revealed in the New Testament; although at the same time it must be remembered that in such confessions the Old Testament consciousness does not claim to be clear from sins, but only from a conscious love of sin, and from a self-love that is hostile to God.

With **נִמְוָתִי** David begins his confession of how Jahve found him to be, instead of finding anything punishable in him. This word is either an infinitive like

חַנּוּת (Psa. 77:10) with the regular *ultima* accentuation, formed after the manner of the ל"ה verbs, — in accordance with which Hitzig renders it: my thinking does not overstep my mouth, — or even *1 pers. praet.*, which is properly *Milel*, but does also occur as *Milra*, e.g., Deu. 32:41, Isa. 44:16 (vid., on Job. 19:17), — according to which Böttcher translates: should I think anything evil, it dare not pass beyond my mouth, — or (since זָמַם may denote the determination that precedes the act, e.g., Jer. 4:28, Lam. 2:17): I have determined my mouth shall not transgress. This last rendering is opposed by the fact, that עָבַר by itself in the ethical signification “to transgress” (cf. post-biblical עֲבָרָה παράβασις) is not the usage of the biblical Hebrew, and that when יַעֲבֹר־פִּי stand close together, פִּי is presumptively the object. We therefore give the preference to Böttcher’s explanation, which renders זְמוּתִי as a hypothetical perfect and is favoured by Pro. 30:32 (which is to be translated: and if thou thinkest evil, (lay) thy hand on thy mouth!). Nevertheless בַּל יַעֲבֹר־פִּי is not the expression of a fact, but of a purpose, as the combination of בַּל with the future requires it to be taken. The psalmist is able to testify of himself that he so keeps evil thoughts in subjection within him, even when they may arise, that they do not pass beyond his mouth, much less that he should put them into action. But perhaps the psalmist wrote פִּיךָ originally, “my reflecting does not go beyond Thy commandment” (according to Num. 22:18, 1Sa. 15:24, Pro. 8:29), — a meaning better suited, as a result of the search, to the nightly investigation. The ל of לַפְעֻלוֹת need not be the ל of reference (as to); it is that of the state or condition, as in Psa. 32: 6; 69:22. אָדָם, as perhaps also in Job. 31:33, Hos. 6: 7 (if אָדָם is not there the name of the first man), means, men as they are by nature and habit. בְּדַבַּר שְׁפָתֶיךָ does not admit of being connected with לַפְעֻלוֹת: at the doings of the world contrary to Thy revealed will (Hofmann and others); for פָּאֵל בִּי cannot mean: to act contrary to any one, but only: to work upon any one, Job. 35: 6. These words must therefore be regarded as a closer definition, placed first, of the שְׁמֵרָתִי which follows: in connection with the doings of men, by virtue of the divine commandment, he has taken care of the paths of the oppressor, viz., not to go in them; 1Sa. 25:21 is an instance in support of this rendering, where שְׁמֵרָתִי, as in Job. 2: 6, means: I have kept (Nabal’s possession), not seizing upon it myself. Jerome correctly translates *vias latronis*; for פָּרִיץ signifies one who breaks in, i.e., one who does damage intentionally and by violence. The confession concerning himself is still continued in v. 5, for the *inf. absol.* תִּמְךָ, if taken as imperative would express a prayer for constancy, that is alien to the circumstances described. The perfect after בַּל is also against such a

rendering. It must therefore be taken as *inf. historicus*, and explained according to Job. 23:11, cf. Ps. 41:13. The noun following the *inf. absol.*, which is usually the object, is the subject in this instance, as, e.g., in Job. 40: 2, Pro. 17:12, Ecc. 4: 2, and frequently. It is אֲשׁוּרִי, and not אֲשׁוּר, אֲשׁוּר (a step) never having the וּ dageshed, except in v. 11 and Job. 31: 7.

**Psa. 17: 6-7.** It is only now, after his inward parts and his walk have been laid open to Jahve, that he resumes his petition, which is so well justified and so soundly based, and enters into detail. The אֲנִי<sup>f119</sup> found beside קָרָאתִיךָ (the perfect referring to that which has just now been put into execution) is meant to imply: such an one as he has described himself to be according to the testimony of his conscience, may call upon God, for God hears such and will therefore also hear him. הִמְאָזְנֶךָ exactly corresponds to the Latin *au-di* (*aus-cul-ta*). The *Hiph.* הִפְלֵא (הִפְלִיא), Ps. 31:22, cf. 4: 4) signifies here to work in an extraordinary and marvellous manner. The danger of him who thus prays is great, but the mercies of God, who is ready and able to help, are still greater. Oh that He may, then, exhibit all its fulness on his behalf. The form of the address resembles the Greek, which is so fond of participles. If it is translated as Luther translates it: “Show Thy marvellous lovingkindness, Thou Saviour of those who trust in Thee, Against those who so set themselves against Thy right hand,” then חוֹסִים is used just as absolutely as in Pro. 14:32, and the right hand of God is conceived of as that which arranges and makes firm. But “to rebel against God’s right (not *statuta*, but *desteram*)“ is a strange expression. There are still two other constructions from which to choose, viz., “Thou Deliverer of those seeking protection from adversaries, with Thy right hand” (Hitz.), or: “Thou Helper of those seeking protection from adversaries, at Thy right hand” (Aben-Ezra, Tremell.). This last rendering is to be preferred to the two others. Since, on the one hand, one says מִן מַחֲסֵה, refuge from..., and on the other, בְּ חֲסֵה to hide one’s self in any one, or in any place, this determining of the verbal notion by the preposition (on this, see above on Ps. 2:12) must be possible in both directions. מִמְּתַקְוֵמִים is equivalent to מִמְּתַקְוֵמִיָּהֶם Job. 27: 7; and חוֹסִים בִּימִינְךָ, those seeking protection at the strong hand of Jahve. The force of the בְּ is just the same as in connection with הִסְתַּתֵּר, 1Sa. 23:19. In Damascus and throughout Syria — Wetzstein observes on this passage — the weak make use of these words when they surrender themselves to the strong: Arab. *anâ b-qabḏt ydk*, “I am in the grasp of thy hand (in thy closed hand) i.e., I give myself up entirely to thee.”<sup>f120</sup>

**Psa. 17: 8-9.** The covenant relationship towards Himself in which Jahve has placed David, and the relationship of love in which David stands to Jahve, fully justified the oppressed one in his extreme request. The apple of the eye,

which is surrounded by the iris, is called **אִישׁוֹן**, the man (Arabic *insân*), or in the diminutive and endearing sense of the termination *on*: the little man of the eye, because a picture in miniature of one's self is seen, as in a glass, when looking into another person's eye. **בֵּת־אֵין** either because it is as if born out of the eye and the eye has, as it were, concentrated itself in it, or rather because the little image which is mirrored in it is, as it were, the little daughter of the eye (here and Lam. 2:18). To the Latin *pupilla* (*pupula*), Greek **κόρη**, corresponds most closely **בֵּת־אֵין**, Zec. 2:12, which does not signify the gate, aperture, sight, but, as **בֵּת** shows, the little boy, or more strictly, the little girl of the eye. It is singular that **אִישׁוֹן** here has the feminine **בֵּת־עֵין** as the expression in apposition to it. The construction might be genitival: "as the little man of the apple of the eye," inasmuch as the saint knows himself to be so near to God, that, as it were, his image in miniature is mirrored in the great eye of God. But (1) the more ordinary name for the pupil of the eye is not **בֵּת־אֵין**, but **אִישׁוֹן**; and (2) with that construction the proper point of the comparison, that the apple of the eye is an object of the most careful self-preservation, is missed. There is, consequently, a combination of two names of the pupil or apple of the eye, the usual one and one more select, without reference to the gender of the former, in order to give greater definition and emphasis to the figure. The primary passage for this bold figure, which is the utterance of loving entreaty, is Deu. 32:10, where the dazzling anthropomorphism is effaced by the LXX and other ancient versions; <sup>f121</sup> cf. also Sir. 17:22. Then follows another figure, taken from the eagle, which hides its young under its wings, likewise from Deu. 32, viz., v. 11, for the figure of the hen (Mat. 23:37) is alien to the Old Testament. In that passage, Moses, in his great song, speaks of the wings of God; but the double figure of the shadow of God's wings (here and in Psa. 36: 8; 57: 2; 63: 8) is coined by David. "God's wings" are the spreadings out, i.e., the manifestations of His love, taking the creature under the protection of its intimate fellowship, and the "shadow" of these wings is the refreshing rest and security which the fellowship of this love affords to those, who hide themselves beneath it, from the heat of outward or inward conflict.

From v. 9 we learn more definitely the position in which the psalmist is placed. **שָׂדֵד** signifies to use violence, to destroy the life, continuance, or possession of any one. According to the accentuation **בְּנִפְשׁ** is to be connected with **אִבִּי**, not with **אֶקְיִפוּ**, and to be understood according to Eze. 25: 6: "enemies with the soul" are those whose enmity is not merely superficial, but most deep-seated (cf. **אֵלֶּה פְּשָׁטֵי**, Eph. 6: 6, Col. 3:23). The soul (viz., the hating and eagerly longing soul, Psa. 27:12; 41: 3) is just the same as if **בְּנִפְשׁ** is

combined with the verb, viz., the soul of the enemies; and **אִיבֵי נַפְשִׁי** would therefore not be more correct, as Hitzig thinks, than **אִיבֵי בִנְפֶשׁ**, but would have a different meaning. They are eager to destroy him (*perf. conatus*), and form a circle round about him, as ravenous ones, in order to swallow him up.

*Psa. 17:10-12.* Vv. 10-12 tell what sort of people these persecutors are. Their heart is called fat, *adeps*, not as though **חֶלֶב** could in itself be equivalent to **לֶב**, more especially as both words are radically distinct (**חֶלֶב** from the root **לֶב**, *λιπ*; **לֶב** from the root **לֶב**, *לף* to envelope: that which is enveloped, the kernel, the inside), but (without any need for von Ortenberg's conjecture **סָגְרוּ לְבָמוֹ חֶלֶב** "they close their heart with fat") because it is, as it were, entirely fat (*Psa. 119:70, cf. 73: 7*), and because it is inaccessible to any feeling of compassion, and in general incapable of the nobler emotions. To shut up the fat = the heart (*cf. κλειειν τὰ σπλάγχνα 1Jo. 3:17*), is equivalent to: to fortify one's self wilfully in indifference to sympathy, tender feeling, and all noble feelings (*cf. הַשְׁמִין לֶב* = to harden, *Isa. 6:10*). The construction of **פִּימוֹ** (which agrees in sound with **פִּימָה**, *Job. 15:27*) is just the same as that of **קוֹלֵי**, *3: 5*. On the other hand, **אֲשׁוּרְנוּ** (after the form **אָמוּד** and written *plene*) is neither such an accusative of the means or instrument, nor the second accusative, beside the accusative of the object, of that by which the object is surrounded, that is usually found with verbs of surrounding (*e.g., 5:13; 32: 7*); for "they have surrounded me (us) with our step" is unintelligible. But **אֲשׁוּרְנוּ** can be the accusative of the member, as in *Psa. 3: 8, cf. 22:17, Gen. 3:15*, for "it is true the step is not a member" (*Hitz.*), but since "step" and "foot" are interchangeable notions, *Psa. 73: 2*, the *σχήμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος* is applicable to the former, and as, *e.g., Homer says, Iliad vii. 355: σὲ μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν*, the Hebrew poet can also say: they have encompassed us (and in fact) our steps, each of our steps (so that we cannot go forwards or backwards with our feet). The *Keri* **סָבְבוּנוּ** gets rid of the change in number which we have with the *Chethib* **סִבְבוּנוּ**; the latter, however, is admissible according to parallels like *Psa. 62: 5*, and corresponds to David's position, who is hunted by Saul and at the present time driven into a strait at the head of a small company of faithful followers. Their eyes — he goes on to say in *v. 11b* — have they set to fell, viz., us, who are encompassed, to the earth, i.e., so that we shall be cast to the ground. **נָטָה** is transitive, as in *Psa. 18:10; 62: 4*, in the transitively applied sense of *Psa. 73: 2 (cf. Psa. 37:31)*: to incline to fall (whereas in *Psa. 44:19, Job. 31: 7*, it means to turn away from); and **בְּאֲרָץ** (without any need for the conjecture **בְּאֲרָח**) expresses the final issue, instead of **לְאֲרָץ**, *Psa. 7: 6*. By the expression **דְּמִינוּ** one is



prominently singled out from the host of the enemy, viz., its chief, the words being: his likeness is as a lion, according to the peculiarity of the poetical style, of changing verbal into substantival clauses, instead of **דָּמָה בְּאַרְיֵיהָ**. Since in Old Testament Hebrew, as also in Syriac and Arabic, **כִּי** is only a preposition, not a connective conjunction, it cannot be rendered: as a lion longs to prey, but: as a lion that is greedy or hungry (cf. Arab. *ksf*, used of sinking away, decline, obscuring or eclipsing, growing pale, and Arab. *chsf*, more especially of enfeebling, hunger, distinct from **חָשַׁף** = Arab. *kšf*, to peel off, make bare) to ravin. In the parallel member of the verse the participle alternates with the attributive clause. **כִּפְיֹר** is (according to Meier) the young lion as being covered with thicker hair.

**Psa. 17:13-15.** The phrase **קָדַם בְּנִי**, *antevertere faciem alicujus*, means both to appear before any one with reverence, Psa. 95: 2 (post-biblical: to pay one's respects to any one) and to meet any one as an enemy, rush on him. The foe springs like a lion upon David, may Jahve — so he prays — as his defence cross the path of the lion and intercept him, and cast him down so that he, being rendered harmless, shall lie there with bowed knees (**בָּרַע**, of the lion, Gen. 49: 9, Num. 24: 9). He is to rescue his soul from the ungodly **חֲרָבָה**. This **חֲרָבָה**, and also the **יָדָה** which follows, can be regarded as a permutative of the subject (Böttcher, Hupfeld, and Hitzig), an explanation which is commended by Psa. 44: 3 and other passages. But it is much more probable that more exact definitions of this kind are treated as accusatives, vid., on Psa. 3: 5. At any rate “sword” and “hand” are meant as the instruments by which the **פְּלֹט**, rescuing, is effected. The force of **פְּלֹטָה** extends into v. 14, and **מַמְתִּים** (with a *Chateph* under the letter that is freed from reduplication, like **מַמְכוֹן**, Psa. 33:14) corresponds to **מַרְשָׁע**, as **יָדָה** to **חֲרָבָה**. The word **מַמְתִּים** (plural of **מַת**, men, Deu. 2:34, whence **מַתָּם**, each and every one), which of itself gives no complete sense, is repeated and made complete after the interruption cause by the insertion of **יָדָה ה'**, — a remarkable manner of obstructing and then resuming the thought, which Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis* ii. 2. 495) seeks to get over by a change in the division of the verse and in the interpunction. **חָלָה**, either from **חָלָה** Syriac to creep, glide, slip away (whence **חָלָה** a weasel, a mole) or from **חָלָה** Talmudic to cover, hide, signifies: this temporal life which glides by unnoticed (distinct from the Arabic *chald*, *chuld*, an abiding stay, endless duration); and consequently **חָלָה**, limited existence, from **חָלָה** to have an end, alternates with **חָלָה** as a play upon the letters, comp. Psa. 49: 2 with Isa. 38:11. The combination **מַתִּים מַחְלָה** resembles Psa. 10:18; 16: 4. What is meant, is: men who have no other home but the

world, which passeth away with the lust thereof, men **ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου**, or **ύιοι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου**. The meaning of the further description **בְּחַיִּים חֶלְקָם** (cf. Ecc. 9: 9) becomes clear from the converse in Psa. 16: 5. Jahve is the **חֶלֶק** of the godly man; and the sphere within which the worldling claims his **חֶלֶק** is **הַחַיִּים**, this temporal, visible, and material life. This is everything to him; whereas the godly man says: **טוֹב חֶסֶדְךָ מִחַיִּים**, Psa. 63: 4. The contrast is not so much between this life and the life to come, as between the world (life) and God. Here we see into the inmost nature of the Old Testament faith. To the Old Testament believer, all the blessedness and glory of the future life, which the New Testament unfolds, is shut up in Jahve. Jahve is his highest good, and possessing Him he is raised above heaven and earth, above life and death. To yield implicitly to Him, without any explicit knowledge of a blessed future life, to be satisfied with Him, to rest in Him, to hide in Him in the face of death, is the characteristic of the Old Testament faith. **חֶלְקָם בְּחַיִּים** expresses both the state of mind and the lot of the men of the world. Material things which are their highest good, fall also in abundance to their share. The words “whose belly Thou fillest with Thy treasure” (*Chethib*: **וַצְפִּינֶךָ** the usual participial form, but as a participle an Aramaising form) do not sound as though the poet meant to say that God leads them to repentance by the riches of His goodness, but on the contrary that God, by satisfying their desires which are confined to the outward and sensuous only, absolutely deprives them of all claim to possessions that extend beyond the world and this present temporal life. Thus, then, **צָפוֹן** in this passage is used exactly as **צְפוּנִים** is used in Job. 20:26 (from **צָפַן** to hold anything close to one, to hold back, to keep by one). Moreover, there is not the slightest alloy of murmur or envy in the words. The godly man who lacks these good things out of the treasury of God, has higher delights; he can exclaim, 31:20: “how great is Thy goodness which Thou hast laid up (**צְפוּנֶיךָ**) for those who fear Thee!” Among the good things with which God fills the belly and house of the ungodly (Job. 22:17 f.) are also children in abundance; these are elsewhere a blessing upon piety (Psa. 127: 3 f., 128: 3 f.), but to those who do not acknowledge the Giver they are a snare to self-glorifying, Job. 21:11 (cf. Wisdom 4: 1). **בְּנִים** is not the subject, but an accusative, and has been so understood by all the old translators from the original text, just as in the phrase **שָׂבַע יָמִים** to be satisfied with, or weary of, life. On **עוֹלָלִים** vid., on 8: 3. **יָתֵר** (from **יָתַר** to stretch out in length, then to be overhanging, towering above, projecting, superfluous, redundant) signifies here, as in Job. 22:20, riches and the abundance of things possessed.

*Psa. 17:15.* With **וְאֵל** he contrasts his incomparably greater prosperity with that of his enemies. He, the despised and persecuted of men, will behold God's face **בְּצִדְקָה**, in righteousness, which will then find its reward (Mat. 5: 8, Heb. 12:14), and will, when this hope is realised by him, thoroughly refresh himself with the form of God. It is not sufficient to explain the vision of the divine countenance here as meaning the experience of the gracious influences which proceed from the divine countenance again unveiled and turned towards him. The parallel of the next clause requires an actual vision, as in Num. 12: 8, according to which Jahve appeared to Moses in the true form of His being, without the intervention of any self-manifestation of an accommodative and visionary kind; but at the same time, as in Exo. 33:20, where the vision of the divine countenance is denied to Moses, according to which, consequently, the self-manifestation of Jahve in His intercourse with Moses is not to be thought of without some veiling of Himself which might render the vision tolerable to him. Here, however, where David gives expression to a hope which is the final goal and the very climax of all his hopes, one has no right in any way to limit the vision of God, who in love permits him to behold Him (vid., on 11: 7), and to limit the being satisfied with His **הַמִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה** (LXX *τὴν δόξαν σου*, vid., *Psychol.* S. 49; transl. p. 61). If this is correct, then **וְיָקִיץ** cannot mean "when I wake up from this night's sleep" as Ewald, Hupfeld and others explain it; for supposing the Psalm were composed just before falling asleep what would be the meaning of the postponement of so transcendent a hope to the end of his natural sleep? Nor can the meaning be to "awake to a new life of blessedness and peace through the sunlight of divine favour which again arises after the night of darkness and distress in which the poet is now to be found" (Kurtz); for to awake from a night of affliction is an unsuitable idea and for this very reason cannot be supported. The only remaining explanation, therefore, is the waking up from the sleep of death (cf. Böttcher, *De inferis* § 365-367). The fact that all who are now in their graves shall one day hear the voice of Him that wakes the dead, as it is taught in the age after the Exile (Dan. 12: 2), was surely not known to David, for it was not yet revealed to him. But why may not this truth of revelation, towards which prophecy advances with such giant strides (Isa. 26:19. Eze. 37: 1-14), be already heard even in the Psalms of David as a bold demand of faith and as a hope that has struggled forth to freedom out of the comfortless conception of *She'ol* possessed in that age, just as it is heard a few decades later in the master-work of a contemporary of Solomon, the Book of Job? The morning in Psa. 49:15 is also not any morning whatever following upon the night, but that final morning which brings deliverance to the upright and inaugurates their dominion. A sure knowledge of the fact of the resurrection such as, according to Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis* ii. 2, 490), has existed in the Old Testament from the beginning, is not expressed

in such passages. For laments like Psa. 6: 6; 30:10; 88:11-13, show that no such certain knowledge as then in existence; and when the Old Testament literature which we now possess allows us elsewhere an insight into the history of the perception of redemption, it does not warrant us in concluding anything more than that the perception of the future resurrection of the dead did not pass from the prophetic word into the believing mind of Israel until about the time of the Exile, and that up to that period faith made bold to hope for a redemption from death, but only *by means of an inference drawn from that which was conceived and existed within itself*, without having an express word of promise in its favour. <sup>f122</sup>

Thus it is here also. David certainly gives full expression to the hope of a vision of God, which, as righteous before God, will be vouchsafed to him; and vouchsafed to him, even though he should fall asleep in death in the present extremity (Psa. 13: 4), as one again awakened from the sleep of death, and, therefore (although this idea does not directly coincide with the former), as one raised from the dead. But this hope is not a believing appropriation of a “certain knowledge,” but a view that, by reason of the already existing revelation of God, lights up out of his consciousness of fellowship with Him.

## **Psalm 18**

### **DAVID’S HYMNIC RETROSPECT OF A LIFE CROWNED WITH MANY MERCIES**

*18: 2 FERVENTLY do I love Thee, Jahve, my strength,*

*18: 3 Jahve, my rock, and my fortress, and my Deliverer,  
My God, my fastness wherein I hide myself,  
My shield, and the horn of my salvation, my high tower!*

*18: 4 As worthy to be praised do I call upon Jahve,  
And against mine enemies shall I be helped.*

*18: 5 The bands of death had compassed me  
And the floods of the abyss came upon me.*

*18: 6 The bands of hades had surrounded me,  
The snares of death assaulted me.*

*18: 7 In my distress I called upon Jahve,  
And unto my God did I cry;  
He heard my call out of His temple,  
And my cry before Him came into His ears.*

*18: 8 The earth shook and quaked,  
And the foundations of the mountains trembled,  
And they swung to and fro, for He was wroth.*

*18: 9 There went up a smoke in His nostrils,  
And fire out of His mouth devoured,  
Coals were kindled by it.*

*18:10 Then He bowed the heavens and came down,  
And thick darkness was under His feet*

*18:11 And He rode upon a cherub and did fly,  
And floated upon the wings of the wind;*

*18:12 He made darkness His covering,  
His pavilion round about Him  
Darkness of waters, thick clouds of the skies.*

*18:13 Out of the brightness before  
Him there broke through His clouds  
Hail-stones and coals of fire.*

*18:14 Then Jahve thundered in the heavens,  
And the Highest made His voice to sound forth.  
[Hail-stones and coals of fire.]*

*18:15 And He sent forth His arrows and scattered them,  
And lightnings in abundance and discomfited them.*

*18:16 And the channels of the waters became visible,  
And the foundations of the earth were laid bare,  
At Thy threatening, Jahve,  
At the snorting of the breath of Thy wrath.*

*18:17 He reached from the height, He seized me,  
He drew me up out of great waters;*

*18:18 He delivered me from my grim foe,  
And from them that hated me,  
because they were too strong for me.*

*18:19 They came upon me in the day of my calamity,  
Then Jahve was a stay to me,*

*18:20 And brought me forth into a large place;  
He delivered me, for He delighted in me.*

*18:21 Jahve rewarded me according to my righteousness,  
According to the cleanness of my hands did He recompense me.*

*18:22 For I have kept the ways of Jahve,  
And have not wickedly departed from my God.*

*18:23 Far from this, all His judgments are my aim,  
And His statutes I do not put away from me.*

*18:24 And I was spotless towards Him,  
And I have kept myself from mine iniquity.*

*18:25 Therefore Jahve recompensed me  
according to any righteousness,  
According to the cleanness of my hands,  
which was manifest in His eyes.*

*18:26 Towards the good Thou shewest Thyself good  
Towards the man of perfect submission  
Thou shewest Thyself yielding.*

*18:27 Towards him who sanctifies himself Thou shewest Thyself pure,  
And towards the perverse Thou shewest Thyself froward.*

*18:28 For Thou, Thou savest the afflicted people,  
And high looks Thou bringest down.*

*18:29 For Thou makest my lamp light;  
Jahve, my God, enlighteneth my darkness.*

*18:30 For by Thee do I scatter a troop,  
And by my God do I leap walls.*

*18:31 As for God — spotless in His way,  
The word of Jahve is tried;  
A shield is He to all who hide in Him.*

*18:32 For who is a divine being, but Jahve alone,  
And who is a rock save our God?*

*18:33 The God, who girded me with strength,  
And made my way perfect,*

*18:34 Making my feet like hinds' feet,  
And who set me upon my high places,*

*18:35 Training my hands for war,  
And mine arms bent a bow of brass.*

*18:36 And Thou gavest me also the shield of Thy salvation,  
And Thy right hand upheld me,  
And Thy lowliness made me great.*

*18:37 Thou madest room for my footsteps under me,  
And mine ankles have not slipped.*

*18:38 I pursued mine enemies and overtook them,  
And turned not back, till they were consumed.*

*18:39 I smote them, so that they could not rise,  
They fell under my feet*

*18:40 And Thou didst gird me with strength for the battle,  
Thou madest my foes to bow down under me,*

*18:41 Thou gavest me the necks of mine enemies,  
And those that hated me, I utterly destroyed.*

*18:42 They cried, but there was no helper,  
Even to Jahve, but He answered them not.*

*18:43 And I crushed them as dust before the wind,  
Like the dirt of the streets I emptied them out.*

*18:44 Thou didst deliver me from the strivings of the people,  
Thou didst make me Head of the nations;  
A people that I knew not, served me.*

*18:45 At the hearing of the ear, they obeyed me,  
Strangers submitted to me,*

*18:46 Strangers faded away,  
And came forth trembling from their strongholds.*

*18:47 Jahve liveth, and blessed be my Rock,  
And let the God of my salvation be exalted;*

*18:48 The God, who gave me revenges  
And bent back peoples under me,*

*18:49 My Deliverer from mine enemies,  
Yea, Thou who liftest me up above my foes,  
Who rescuest me from the violent man.*

*18:50 Therefore will I praise Thee among the nations, O Jahve,  
And I will sing praises unto Thy name,*

*18:51 As He, who giveth great deliverance to His king  
And sheweth favour to His anointed,  
To David and his seed for ever.*

Next to a **תְּפִלָּה** of David comes a **שִׁירָה** (*nom. unitatis* from **שִׁיר**), which is in many ways both in words and thoughts (*Symbolae* p. 49) interwoven with the former. It is the longest of all the hymnic Psalms, and bears the inscription: *To the Precentor, by the servant of Jahve, by David, who spake unto Jahve the words of this song in the day that Jahve had delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies and out of the hand of Saül: then he said.* The original inscription of the Psalm in the primary collection was probably only **ה' לְדָוִד** **לְמִנְצַח לְעַבְדֵךְ**, like the inscription of Psalm 36. The rest of the inscription

resembles the language with which songs of this class are wont to be introduced in their connection in the historical narrative, Exo. 15: 1, Num. 21:17, and more especially Deu. 31:30. And the Psalm before us is found again in 2 Samuel 22, introduced by words, the manifestly unaccidental agreement of which with the inscription in the Psalter, is explained by its having been incorporated in one of the histories from which the Books of Samuel are extracted, — probably the Annals (*Dibre ha-Jamim*) of David. From this source the writer of the Books of Samuel has taken the Psalm, together with that introduction; and from this source also springs the historical portion of the inscription in the Psalter, which is connected with the preceding by אֲנִשָּׁר.

David may have styled himself in the inscription עֶבֶד ה', just as the apostles call themselves δούλοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. He also in other instances, in prayer, calls himself “the servant of Jahve,” Psa. 19:12, 14; 144:10, 2Sa. 7:20, as every Israelite might do; but David, who is the first after Moses and Joshua to bear this designation or by-name, could do so in an especial sense. For he, with whom the kingship of promise began, marks an epoch in his service of the work of God no less than did Moses, through whose mediation Israel received the Law, and Joshua, through whose instrumentality they obtained the Land of promise.

The terminology of psalm-poesy does not include the word שִׁירָה, but only שִׁיר. This at once shows that the historical portion of the inscription comes from some other source. בְּיוֹם is followed, not by the *infin.* הַצִּיל: on the day of deliverance, but by the more exactly *plusquamperf.* הַצִּיל: on the day (בְּיוֹם = at the time, as in Gen. 2: 4, and frequently) when he had delivered — a genitival (Ges. § 116, 3) relative clause, like Psa. 138: 3, Exo. 6:28, Num. 3: 1, cf. Psa. 56:10. מִיַּד alternates with מִכַּף in this text without any other design than that of varying the expression. The deliverance out of the hand of Saul is made specially prominent, because the most prominent portion of the Psalm, vv. 5-20, treats of it. The danger in which David the was placed, was of the most personal, the most perilous, and the most protracted kind. This prominence was of great service to the collector, because the preceding Psalm bears the features of this time, the lamentations over which are heard there and further back, and now all find expression in this more extended song of praise.

Only a fondness for doubt can lead any one to doubt the Davidic origin of this Psalm, attested as it is in two works, which are independent of one another. The twofold testimony of tradition is supported by the fact that the Psalm contains nothing that militates against David being the author; even the mention of his own name at the close, is not against it (cf. 1Ki. 2:45). We have



before us an Israelitish counterpart to the cuneiform monumental inscriptions, in which the kings of worldly monarchies recapitulate the deeds they have done by the help of their gods. The speaker is a king; the author of the Books of Samuel found the song already in existence as a Davidic song; the difference of his text from that which lies before us in the Psalter, shows that at that time it had been transmitted from some earlier period; writers of the later time of the kings here and there use language which is borrowed from it or are echoes of it (comp. Pro. 30: 5 with v. 31; Hab. 3:19 with v. 34); it bears throughout the mark of the classic age of the language and poetry, and “if it be not David’s, it must have been written in his name and by some one imbued with his spirit, and who could have been this contemporary poet and twin-genius?” (Hitzig). All this irresistibly points us to David himself, to whom really belong also all the other songs in the Second Book of Samuel, which are introduced as Davidic (over Saul and Jonathan, over Abner, etc.). This, the greatest of all, springs entirely from the new self-consciousness to which he was raised by the promises recorded in 2Sa. 7; and towards the end, it closes with express retrospective reference to these promises; for David’s certainty of the everlasting duration of his house, and God’s covenant of mercy with his house, rests upon the announcement made by Nathan.

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

The traditional mode of writing out this Psalm, as also the *Cantica*, 2Sa. 22 and Judges 5, is “a half-brick upon a brick, and a brick upon a half-brick” (אריח על גבי לבנה ולבנה על גבי אריח): i.e., one line consisting of two, and one of three parts of a verse, and the line consisting of the three parts has only one word on the right and on the left; the whole consequently forms three columns. On the other hand, the song in Deu. 32 (as also Jos. 12: 9 ff., Est. 9: 7-10) is to be written “a half-brick upon a half-brick and a brick upon a brick,” i.e., in only two columns, cf. *infra* p. 168.

*Psa. 18: 2-4.* The poet opens with a number of endearing names for God, in which he gratefully comprehends the results of long and varied experience. So far as regards the parallelism of the members, a monostich forms the beginning of this Psalm, as in Psalm 16, 23, 25 and many others. Nevertheless the matter

assumes a somewhat different aspect, if v. 3 is not, with Maurer, Hengstenberg and Hupfeld, taken as two predicate clauses (Jahve is..., my God is...), but as a simple vocative — a rendering which alone corresponds to the intensity with which this greatest of the Davidic hymns opens — God being invoked by יה, יהי, אֱלֹהֵי, and each of these names being followed by a predicative expansion of itself, which increases in fulness of tone and emphasis. The אֶרְחַמְךָ (with ā, according to Ew. § 251, b), which carries the three series of the names of God, makes up in depth of meaning what is wanting in compass. Elsewhere we find only the *Piel* רָחַם of tender sympathising love, but here the *Kal* is used as an Aramaism. Hence the Jalkut on this passages explains it by רַחֲמַי יִתֵּן “I love thee,” or ardent, heartfelt love and attachment. The primary signification of softness (root רַח, Arab. *rh, rch*, to be soft, lax, loose), whence רָחַם, *uterus*, is transferred in both cases to tenderness of feeling or sentiment. The most general predicate חֲזַק (from חָזַק according to a similar inflexion to אָמַר, אָמַר, plur. עָמַק, plur. עָמַק, Pro. 9:18) is followed by those which describe Jahve as a protector and deliverer in persecution on the one hand, and on the other as a defender and the giver of victory in battle. They are all typical names symbolising what Jahve is in Himself; hence instead of וּמִפְלִטִי it would perhaps have been more correct to point וּמִפְלִטִי (and my refuge). God had already called Himself a shield to Abram, Gen. 15: 1; and He is called צוּר (cf. אֶבֶן Gen. 49:24) in the great Mosaic song, Deu. 32: 4, 37 (the latter verse is distinctly echoed here).

סֶלַע from סָלַע, Arab. *sl'*, *findere*, means properly a cleft in a rock (Arabic סֶלַע<sup>f123</sup>), then a cleft rock, and צוּר, like the Arabic *sachr*, a great and hard mass of rock (Aramaic טוּר, a mountain). The figures of the מְצוּדָה (מְצוּדָה, מְצוּדָה) and the מְשַׁנֵּב are related; the former signifies properly *specula*, a watch-tower,<sup>f124</sup> and the latter, a steep height. The horn, which is an ancient figure of victorious and defiant power in Deu. 33:17, 1Sa. 2: 1, is found here applied to Jahve Himself: “horn of my salvation” is that which interposes on the side of my feebleness, conquers, and saves me. All these epithets applied to God are the fruits of the affliction out of which David’s song has sprung, viz., his persecution by Saul, when, in a country abounding in rugged rocks and deficient in forest, he betook himself to the rocks for safety, and the mountains served him as his fortresses. In the shelter which the mountains, by their natural conformations, afforded him at that time, and in the fortunate accidents, which sometimes brought him deliverance when in extreme peril, David recognises only marvellous phenomena of which Jahve Himself was to him the final cause. The confession of the God tried and known in many ways is

continued in v. 5 by a general expression of his experience. **מִהֲלֵל** is a predicate accusative to **יְהוָה**: As one praised (worthy to be praised) do I call upon Jahve, — a rendering that is better suited to the following clause, which expresses confidence in the answer coinciding with the invocation, which is to be thought of as a cry for help, than Olshausen's, "Worthy of praise, do I cry, is Jahve," though this latter certainly is possible so far as the style is concerned (vid., on Isa. 45:24, cf. also Gen. 3: 3, Mic. 2: 6). The proof of this fact, viz., that calling upon Him who is worthy to be praised, who, as the history of Israel shows, is able and willing to help, is immediately followed by actual help, as events that are coincident, forms the further matter of the Psalm.

*Psa. 18: 5-7.* In these verses David gathers into one collective figure all the fearful dangers to which he had been exposed during his persecution by Saul, together with the marvellous answers and deliverances he experienced, that which is unseen, which stands in the relation to that which is visible of cause and effect, rendering itself visible to him. David here appears as passive throughout; the hand from out of the clouds seizes him and draws him out of mighty waters: while in the second part of the Psalm, in fellowship with God and under His blessing, he comes forward as a free actor.

The description begins in vv. 5-7 with the danger and the cry for help which is not in vain. The verb **אָפַךְ** according to a tradition not to be doubted (cf. **אָפַךְ** a wheel) signifies to go round, surround, as a poetical synonym of **סָבַב**, **הִקִּיף**, **בָּתַר**, and not, as one might after the Arabic have thought: to drive, urge. Instead of "the bands of death," the LXX (cf. Act. 2:24) renders it **ὠδίνες** (constrictive pains) **θανάτου**; but v. 6b favours the meaning bands, cords, cf. Psa. 119:61 (where it is likewise **חֶבְלֵי** instead of the **חֶבְלֵי**, which one might have expected, Jos. 17: 5, Job. 36: 8), death is therefore represented as a hunter with a cord and net, Psa. 91: 3. **בְּלֵי־אֵל**, compounded of **בְּלֵי** and **אֵל** (from **אֵל**, **אֵל**, root **על**), signifies unprofitableness, worthlessness, and in fact both deep-rooted moral corruption and also abysmal destruction (cf. 2Co. 6:15, **Βελίαρ** = **Βελίαλ** as a name of Satan and his kingdom). Rivers of destruction are those, whose engulfing floods lead down to the abyss of destruction (Jon. 2: 7). Death, *Beljâal*, and *Sheôl* are the names of the weird powers, which make use of David's persecutors as their instruments. *Futt.* in the sense of imperfects alternate with *praett.* **בִּיעַת** (= Arab. *bgt*) signifies to come suddenly upon any one (but compare also Arab. *b't*, to startle, *excitare*, to alarm), and **קָרַם**, to rush upon; the two words are distinguished from one another like *überfallen* and *anfallen*. The **הֵיכָל** out of which Jahve hears is His heavenly dwelling-place, which is both palace and temple, inasmuch as He sits enthroned there, being worshipped by blessed spirits. **לְפָנָיו** belongs to

**וְשִׁוּעִתִּי**: my cry which is poured forth before Him (as e.g., in 102: 1), for it is tautological if joined with **בְּאָזְנוֹי** beside **תְּבֵא**. Before Jahve's face he made supplication and his prayer urged its way into His ears.

*Psa. 18: 8-10.* As these verses go on to describe, the being heard became manifest in the form of deliverance. All nature stands to man in a sympathetic relationship, sharing his curse and blessing, his destruction and glory, and to God is a (so to speak) synergetic relationship, furnishing the harbingers and instruments of His mighty deeds. Accordingly in this instance Jahve's interposition on behalf of David is accompanied by terrible manifestations in nature. Like the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, Psalm 68, 77, and the giving of the Law on Sinai, Exo. 19, and like the final appearing of Jahve and of Jesus Christ according to the words of prophet and apostle (Habakkuk 3, 2Th. 1: 7 f.), the appearing of Jahve for the help of David has also extraordinary natural phenomena in its train. It is true we find no express record of any incident in David's life of the kind recorded in 1Sa. 7:10, but it must be some real experience which David here idealises (i.e., seizes at its very roots, and generalises and works up into a grand majestic picture of his miraculous deliverance). Amidst earthquake, a black thunderstorm gathers, the charging of which is heralded by the lightning's flash, and its thick clouds descend nearer and nearer to the earth. The aorists in v. 8 introduce the event, for the introduction of which, from v. 4 onwards, the way has been prepared and towards which all is directed. The inward excitement of the Judge, who appears to His servant for his deliverance, sets the earth in violent oscillation. The foundations of the mountains (Isa. 24:18) are that upon which they are supported beneath and within, as it were, the pillars which support the vast mass. **גַּעַשׁ** (rhyming with **רַעַשׁ**) is followed by the *Hithpa.* of the same verb: the first impulse having been given they, viz., the earth and the pillars of the mountains, continue to shake of themselves. These convulsions occur, because "it is kindled with respect to God;" it is unnecessary to supply **חָרָה לוֹ, אָפוּ** is a synonym of **לֹהֵט לוֹ**. When God is wrath, according to Old Testament conception, the power of wrath which is present in Him is kindled and blazes up and breaks forth. The panting of rage may accordingly also be called the smoke of the fire of wrath (Psa. 74: 1; 80: 5). The smoking is as the breathing out of the fire, and the vehement hot breath which is inhaled and exhaled through the nose of one who is angry (cf. Job. 41:12), is like smoke rising from the internal fire of anger. The fire of anger itself "devours out of the mouth," i.e., flames forth out of the mouth, consuming whatever it lays hold of, — in men in the form of angry words, with God in the fiery forces of nature, which are of a like kind with, and subservient to, His anger, and more especially in the lightning's flash. It is the lightning chiefly, that is compared here to the blazing up of burning coals. The power of wrath in God, becoming manifest in

action, breaks forth into a glow, and before it entirely discharges its fire, it gives warning of action like the lightning's flash heralding the outburst of the storm. Thus enraged and breathing forth His wrath, Jahve bowed the heavens, i.e., caused them to bend towards the earth, and came down, and darkness of clouds (עֲרֵפֶל) similar in meaning to ὄρφνη, cf. ἕρεβος) was under His feet: black, low-hanging clouds announced the coming of Him who in His wrath was already on His way downwards towards the earth.

*Psa. 18:11-13.* The storm, announcing the approaching outburst of the thunderstorm, was also the forerunner of the Avenger and Deliverer. If we compare v. 11 with Psa. 104: 3, it is natural to regard כְּרוֹב as a transposition of רֶכֶב (a chariot, Ew. § 153, a). But assuming a relationship between the biblical *Cherub* and (according to Ctesias) the Indo-Persian griffin, the word (from the Zend *grab, garew, garefsh*, to seize) signifies a creature seizing and holding irrecoverably fast whatever it seizes upon; perhaps in Semitic language the strong creature, from כָּרַב = Arab. *krb, torquere, constringere*, whence *mukrab*, tight, strong). It is a passive form like לְבוּשׁ, יָסַד, גְּבוּל. The cherubim are mentioned in Gen. 3:24 as the guards of Paradise (this alone is enough to refute the interpretation recently revived in the *Evang. Kirchen-Zeit.*, 1866, No. 46, that they are a symbol of the unity of the living One, כְּרוֹב = כְּרוֹב “like a multitude!”), and elsewhere, as it were, as the living mighty rampart and vehicle of the approach of the inaccessible majesty of God; and they are not merely in general the medium of God's personal presence in the world, but more especially of the present of God as turning the fiery side of His doxa towards the world. As in the Prometheus of Aeschylus, Oceanus comes flying τὸν πτερυγακῆ τόνδ' οὐρανὸν γνώμη στομάτων ἄτερ εὐθύνων, so in the present passage Jahve rides upon the cherub, of which the heathenish griffin is a distortion; or, if by a comparison of passages like Psa. 104: 3, Isa. 66:15, we understand David according to Ezekiel, He rides upon the cherub as upon His living throne-chariot (מְרִכְבָּה). The throne floats upon the cherubim, and this cherub-throne flies upon the wings of the wind; or, as we can also say: the cherub is the celestial spirit working in this vehicle formed of the spirit-like elements. The Manager of the chariot is Himself hidden behind the thick thunder-clouds. יָשַׁת is an aorist without the consecutive ו (cf. יָד Hos. 6: 1). הִשְׁתַּד is the accusative of the object to it; and the accusative of the predicate is doubled: His covering, His pavilion round about Him. In Job. 36:29 also the thunder-clouds are called God's סִפָּה, and also in Psa. 97: 2 they are סְבִיבֵי, concealing Him on all sides and announcing only His presence when He is wroth. In v. 12b the accusative of the object, הִשְׁתַּד, is expanded into “darkness of waters,” i.e., swelling with waters <sup>f125</sup> and billows

of thick vapour, thick, and therefore dark, masses (עב in its primary meaning of denseness, or a thicket, Exo. 19: 9, cf. Jer. 4:29) of שְׁחָקִים, which is here a poetical name for fleecy clouds. The dispersion and discharge, according to v. 13, proceeded from נִגְהָ נִגְדָו . Such is the expression for the doxa of God as being a mirroring forth of His nature, as it were, over against Him, as being therefore His brightness, or the reflection of His glory. The doxa is fire and light. On this occasion the forces of wrath issue from it, and therefore it is the fiery forces: heavy and destructive hail (cf. Exo. 9:23 f., Isa. 30:30) and fiery glowing coals, i.e., flashing and kindling lightning. The object עֲבָיו stands first, because the idea of clouds, behind which, according to v. 11, the doxa is concealed, is prominently connected with the doxa. It might be rendered: before His brightness His clouds turn into hail..., a rendering which would be more in accordance with the structure of the stichs, and is possible according to Ges. § 138, rem. 2. Nevertheless, in connection with the combination of עבר with clouds, the idea of breaking through (Lam. 3:44) is very natural. If עביו is removed, then עברו signifies “thence came forth hail...” But the mention of the clouds as the medium, is both natural and appropriate.

*Psa. 18:14-16.* Amidst thunder, Jahve hurled lightnings as arrows upon David’s enemies, and the breath of His anger laid bare the beds of the flood to the very centre of the earth, in order to rescue the sunken one. Thunder is the rumble of God, and as it were the hollow murmur of His mouth, Job. 37: 2. עֲלִיוֹן, the Most High, is the name of God as the inapproachable Judge, who governs all things. The third line of v. 14 is erroneously repeated from the preceding strophe. It cannot be supported on grammatical grounds by Exo. 9:23, since נָתַן קוֹל, *edere vocem*, has a different meaning from the קָלַת נָתַן, *dare tonitrua*, of that passage. The symmetry of the strophe structure is also against it; and it is wanting both in 2Sa. and in the LXX. רָב, which, as the opposite of מְאֹד Neh. 2:12, Isa. 10: 7, means adverbially “in abundance,” is the parallel to וַיִּשְׁלַח. It is generally taken, after the analogy of Gen. 49:23, in the sense of בָּרַק, Psa. 144: 6: רָב in pause = רָב (the *ō* passing over into the broader *ā* like עָו instead of עֹו in Gen. 49: 3) = רָבָב, cognate with רָבָה, רָמָה; but the forms סָבּוּ, סָבּוּ, here, and in every other instance, have but a very questionable existence, as e.g., רָב, Isa. 54:13, is more probably an adjective than the third person *praet.* (cf. Böttcher, *Neue Aehrenlese* No. 635, 1066). The suffixes *ēm* do not refer to the arrows, i.e., lightnings, but to David’s foes. הִמָּם means both to put in commotion and to destroy by confounding, Exo. 14:24; 23:27. In addition to the thunder, the voice of Jahve, comes the stormwind, which is the snorting of the breath of His nostrils. This makes the

channels of the waters visible and lays bare the foundations of the earth. אֲפִיק (collateral form to אֲפִק) is the bed of the river and then the river or brook itself, *a continendo aquas* (Ges.), and exactly like the Arabic *mesîk, mesâk, mesek* (from Arab. *msk*, the VI form of which, *tamâsaka*, corresponds to אֲפִיק), means a place that does not admit of the water soaking in, but on account of the firmness of the soil preserves it standing or flowing. What are here meant are the water-courses or river beds that hold the water. It is only needful for Jahve to threaten (ἐπιτιμασθαι Mat. 8:26) and the floods, in which he, whose rescue is undertaken here, is sunk, flee (Psa. 104: 7) and dry up (Psa. 106: 9, Nah. 1: 4). But he is already half engulfed in the abyss of Hades, hence not merely the bed of the flood is opened up, but the earth is rent to its very centre. From the language being here so thoroughly allegorical, it is clear that we were quite correct in interpreting the description as ideal. He, who is nearly overpowered by his foes, is represented as one engulfed in deep waters and almost drowning.

*Psa. 18:17-20.* Then Jahve stretches out His hand from above into the deep chasm and draws up the sinking one. The verb שָׁלַח occurs also in prose (2Sa. 6: 6) without יָד (Psa. 57: 4, cf. on the other hand the borrowed passage, 144: 7) in the signification to reach (after anything). The verb מָשָׁה, however, is only found in one other instance, viz., Exo. 2:10, as the root (transferred from the Egyptian into the Hebrew) of the name of Moses, and even Luther saw in it an historical allusion, “He hath made a Moses of me,” He hath drawn me out of great (many) waters, which had well nigh swallowed me up, as He did Moses out of the waters of the Nile, in which he would have perished. This figurative language is followed, in v. 18, by its interpretation, just as in 144: 7 the “great waters” are explained by מַיִם בְּנֵי יָבֵר, which, however, is not suitable here, or at least is too limited.

With v. 17 the hymn has reached the climax of epic description, from which it now descends in a tone that becomes more and more lyrical. In the combination עָז, אֲיִבִי עָז is not an adverbial accusative, but an adjective, like רֹחֵק טוֹבָה Psa. 143:10, and ὁ ἀνήρ ἀγαθός (*Hebräerbrief* S. 353). כִּי introduces the reason for the interposition of the divine omnipotence, viz., the superior strength of the foe and the weakness of the oppressed one. On the day of his אִיד, i.e., (vid., on Psa. 31:12) his load or calamity, when he was altogether a homeless and almost defenceless fugitive, they came upon him (קָדַם Psa. 17:13), cutting off all possible means of delivering himself, but Jahve became the fugitive’s staff (Psa. 23: 4) upon which he leaned and kept himself erect. By the hand of God, out of straits and difficulties he reached a broad place, out of the dungeon of oppression to freedom, for Jahve had

delighted in him, he was His chosen and beloved one. **חָפֵץ** has the accent on the penult here, and *Metheg* as a sign of the lengthening (**הַעֲמֻדָה**) beside the *e*, that it may not be read *ě*.<sup>f126</sup>

The following strophe tells the reason of his pleasing God and of His not allowing him to perish. This **בִּי חָפֵץ בִּי** (for He delighted in me) now becomes the primary thought of the song.

*Psa. 18:21-24.* On **נָמַל** (like **שָׁלַם** with the accusative not merely of the thing, but also of the person, e.g., 1Sa. 24:18), *εὖ* or *κακῶς πράττειν τινά*, vid., on Psa. 7: 5. **שָׁמַר**, to observe = to keep, is used in the same way in Job. 22:15. **רָשַׁע מִן** is a pregnant expression of the *malitiosa desertio*. “From God’s side,” i.e., in His judgment, would be contrary to the general usage of the language (for the **מִן** in Job. 4:17 has a different meaning) and would be but a chilling addition. On the poetical form **מָנִי**, in pause **מָנִי**, vid., Ew. § 263, *b*. The *fut.* in v. 23*b*, close after the substantival clause v. 23*a*, is not intended of the habit in the past, but at the present time: he has not wickedly forsaken God, but (**בִּי** = *imo, sed*) always has God’s commandments present before him as his rule of conduct, and has not put them far away out of his sight, in order to be able to sin with less compunction; and thus then (*fut. consec.*) in relation (**עִם**, as in Deu. 18:13, cf. 2Sa. 23: 5) to God he was **תָּמִים**, with his whole soul undividedly devoted to Him, and he guarded himself against his iniquity (**עֵוֹן**, from **עָוָה**, Arab. *‘wā*, to twist, pervert, cf. Arab. *gwā*, of error, delusion, self-enlightenment), i.e., not: against acquiescence in his in-dwelling sin, but: against iniquity becoming in any way his own; **מַעֲוֹנִי** equivalent to **מַעֲוֹתַי** (Dan. 9: 5), cf. **מֵחַיִּי** = than that I should live, Jon. 4: 8. In this strophe, this Psalm strikes a cord that harmonises with Psalm 17, after which it is therefore placed. We may compare David’s own testimony concerning himself in 1Sa. 26:23 f., the testimony of God in 1Ki. 14: 8, and the testimony of history in 1Ki. 15: 5; 11: 4.

*Psa. 18:25-28.* What was said in v. 21 is again expressed here as a result of the foregoing, and substantiated in vv. 26, 27. **חָסִיד** is a friend of God and man, just as *pious* is used of behaviour to men as well as towards God. **תָּמִים** **גִּבֹּר** the man (construct of **גִּבֹּר**) of moral and religious completeness (*integri = integritatis*, cf. Psa. 15: 2), i.e., of undivided devotion to God. **נָבַר** (instead of which we find **בָּר לָבַב** elsewhere, Psa. 24: 4; 73: 1) not one who is purified, but, in accordance with the reflexive primary meaning of *Niph.*, one who is purifying himself, *ἀγνίζων ἑαυτόν*, 1Jo. 3: 3. **עִקְשׁ** (the opposite of **יָשַׁר**) one



who is morally distorted, perverse. Freely formed *Hithpaels* are used with these attributive words to give expression to the corresponding self-manifestation: **הִתְחַסֵּד**, **הִתְמַם** (Ges. § 54, 2, *b*), **הִתְבַּרֵּר**, and **הִתְפַּתֵּל** (to show one's self **נִפְתָּל** or **פְּתִילָל**). The fervent love of the godly man God requites with confiding love, the entire submission of the upright with a full measure of grace, the endeavour after purity by an unbecloved charity (cf. 73: 1), moral perverseness by paradoxical judgments, giving the perverse over to his perverseness (Rom. 1:28) and leading him by strange ways to final condemnation (Isa. 29:14, cf. Lev. 26:23 f.). The truth, which is here enunciated, is not that the conception which man forms of God is the reflected image of his own mind and heart, but that God's conduct to man is the reflection of the relation in which man has placed himself to God; cf. 1Sa. 2:30; 15:23. This universal truth is illustrated and substantiated in v. 28. The people who are bowed down by affliction experience God's condescension, to their salvation; and their haughty oppressors, god's exaltation, to their humiliation. Lofty, proud eyes are among the seven things that Jahve hateth, according to Pro. 6:17. The judgment of God compels them to humble themselves with shame, Isa. 2:11.

*Psa. 18:29-31.* The confirmation of what has been asserted is continued by David's application of it to himself. Hitzig translates the futures in vv. 29 f. as imperfects; but the sequence of the tenses, which would bring this rendering with it, is in this instance interrupted, as it has been even in v. 28, by **כִּי**. The lamp, **נֵר** (contracted from *nawer*), is an image of life, which as it were burns on and on, including the idea of prosperity and high rank; in the form **נִיר** (from *niwr*, *nijr*) it is the usual figurative word for the continuance of the house of David, 1Ki. 11:36, and frequently. David's life and dominion, as the covenant king, is the lamp which God's favour has lighted for the well-being of Israel, and His power will not allow this lamp (2Sa. 21:17) to be quenched. The darkness which breaks in upon David and his house is always lighted up again by Jahve. For His strength is mighty in the weak; in, with, and by Him he can do all things. The fut. **אֶרְצֵן** may be all the more surely derived from **רָצַץ** (= **אֶרְצֵן**), inasmuch as this verb has the changeable *u* in the future also in Isa. 42: 4, Ecc. 12: 6. The text of 2Sa. 22, however, certainly seems to put "rushing upon" in the stead of "breaking down." With v. 31 the first half of the hymn closes epiphonematically. **הָאֵל** is a *nom. absol.*, like **הַצִּוֹר**, Deu. 32: 4. This old Mosaic utterance is re-echoed here, as in 2Sa. 7:22, in the mouth of David. The article of **הָאֵל** points to God as being manifest in past history. His way is faultless and blameless. His word is **צִרְיָפָה**, not slaggy ore, but purified solid gold, Psa. 12: 7. Whoever retreats into Him, the God of the

promise, is shielded from every danger. Pro. 30: 5 is borrowed from this passage.

*Psa. 18:32-35.* The grateful description of the tokens of favour he has experienced takes a new flight, and is continued in the second half of the Psalm in a more varied and less artificial mixture of the strophes. What is said in v. 31 of the way and word of Jahve and of Jahve Himself, is confirmed in v. 32 by the fact that He alone is אֱלֹהֵהּ, a divine being to be revered, and He alone is צוּר, a rock, i.e., a ground of confidence that cannot be shaken. What is said in v. 31 consequently can be said only of Him. וּלְתִי and מִבְּלִעְדִי alternate; the former (with a negative intensive מִן) signifies “without reference to” and then absolutely “without” or besides, and the latter (with *î* as a connecting vowel, which elsewhere has also the function of a suffix), from זולָה (זולָה), “exception.” The verses immediately following are attached descriptively to אֱלֹהֵינוּ, our God (i.e., the God of Israel), the God, who girded me with strength; and accordingly (*fut. consec.*) made my way תְּמִים, “perfect,” i.e., absolutely smooth, free from stumblings and errors, leading straight forward to a divine goal. The idea is no other than that in v. 31, cf. Job. 22: 3, except that the freedom from error here is intended to be understood in accordance with its reference to the way of a man, of a king, and of a warrior; cf. moreover, the other text. The verb שָׁוָה signifies, like Arab. *swwā*, to make equal (*aequare*), to arrange, to set right; the dependent passage Hab. 3:19 has, instead of this verb, the more uncoloured שִׁים. The hind, אֵילָה or אֵילָה, is the perfection of swiftness (cf. ἔλαφος and ἔλαφρός) and also of gracefulness among animals. “Like the hinds” is equivalent to like hinds’ feet; the Hebrew style leaves it to the reader to infer the appropriate point of comparison from the figure. It is not swiftness in flight (De Wette), but in attack and pursuit that is meant, — the latter being a prominent characteristic of warriors, according to 2Sa. 1:23; 2:18, 1Ch. 12: 8. David does not call the high places of the enemy, which he has made his own by conquest “my high places,” but those heights of the Holy Land which belong to him as king of Israel: upon these Jahve preserves him a firm position, so that from them he may rule the land far and wide, and hold them victoriously (cf. passages like Deu. 32:13, Isa. 58:14). The verb לָמַד, which has a double accusative in other instances, is here combined with לִּי of the subject taught, as the aim of the teaching. The verb נָחַת (to press down = to bend a bow) precedes the subject “my arms” in the singular; this inequality is admissible even when the subject stands first (e.g., Gen. 49:22, Joe. 1:20, Zec. 6:14). קֶשֶׁת נְחוּשָׁה a bow of brazen = of brass, as in Job. 20:24. It is also the manner of heroes in Homer

and in the *Ramâ-jana* to press down and bend with their hand a brazen bow, one end of which rests on the ground.

*Psa. 18:36-37.* Yet it is not the brazen bow in itself that makes him victorious, but the helpful strength of his God. “Shield of Thy salvation” is that consisting of Thy salvation. **מָגֵן** has an unchangeable *â*, as it has always. The salvation of Jahve covered him as a shield, from which every stroke of the foe rebounded; the right hand of Jahve supported him that his hands might not become feeble in the conflict. In its ultimate cause it is the divine **עֲנֹוּה**, to which he must trace back his greatness, i.e., God’s lowliness, by virtue of which His eyes look down upon that which is on the earth (Psa. 113: 6), and the poor and contrite ones are His favourite dwelling-place (Isa. 57:15; 66: 1 f.); cf. *B. Megilla* 31a, “wherever Scripture testifies of the **גְבוּרָה** of the Holy One, blessed be He, it gives prominence also, in connection with it, to His condescension, **אֲנִיחָנוּתוֹ**, as in Deu. 10:17 and in connection with it v. 18, Isa. 57:15a and 15b, Psa. 68: 5 and 6.” The rendering of Luther, who follows the LXX and Vulgate, “When Thou humblest me, Thou makest me great” is opposed by the fact that **עֲנֹוּה** means the bending of one’s self, and not of another. What is intended is, that condescension of God to mankind, and especially to the house of David, which was in operation, with an ultimate view to the incarnation, in the life of the son of Jesse from the time of his anointing to his death, viz., the divine **χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία** (Tit. 3: 4), which elected the shepherd boy to be king, and did not cast him off even when he fell into sin and his infirmities became manifest. To enlarge his steps under any one is equivalent to securing him room for freedom of motion (cf. the opposite form of expression in Pro. 4:12). Jahve removed the obstacles of his course out of the way, and steeled his ankles so that he stood firm in fight and endured till he came off victorious. The *praet.* **מַעֲדוֹ** substantiates what, without any other indication of it, is required by the *consecutio temporum*, viz., that everything here has a retrospective meaning.

*Psa. 18:38-41.* Thus in God’s strength, with the armour of God, and by God’s assistance in fight, he smote, cast down, and utterly destroyed all his foes in foreign and in civil wars. According to the Hebrew syntax the whole of this passage is a retrospect. The imperfect signification of the futures in vv. 38, 39 is made clear from the aorist which appears in v. 40, and from the perfects and futures in what follows it. The strophe begins with an echo of Exo. 15: 9 (cf. *supra* 7: 6). The poet calls his opponents **קָמִי**, as in v. 49, 44: 6; 74:23, cf. **קִימָנוּ** Job. 22:20, inasmuch as **קִימָנוּ** by itself has the sense of rising up in hostility and consequently one can say **קָמִי** instead of **קָמִים עָלַי** (**קוֹמִים** 2Ki. 16: 7).<sup>f127</sup>

The frequent use of this phrase (e.g., 36:13, Lam. 1:14) shows that קום in v. 39a does not mean “to stand (resist),” but “to rise (again).” The phrase עָרַף נֶתַן, however, which in other passages has those fleeing as its subject (2Ch. 29: 6), is here differently applied: Thou gavest, or madest me mine enemies a back, i.e., those who turn back, as in Exo. 23:27. From 21:13 (שָׁכַם תְּשִׁיחֵמוּ, Symm. τάξεις αὐτοὺς ἀποστρόφους) it becomes clear that עָרַף is not an accusative of the member beside the accusative of the person (as e.g., in Deu. 33:11), but an accusative of the factitive object according to Ges. § 139, 2.

*Psa. 18:42-43.* Their prayer to their gods, wrung from them by their distress, and even to Jahve, was in vain, because it was for their cause, and too late put up to Him. אֶל = עַל; in Psa. 42: 2 the two prepositions are interchanged. Since we do not pulverize dust but to dust, בָּעֶפֶר is to be taken as describing the result: so that they became as dust (cf. Job. 38:30, בְּאֶבֶן, so that it is become like stone, and the extreme of such pregnant brevity of expression in Isa. 41: 2) before the wind (אֶל-פְּנֵי as in 2Ch. 3:17, before the front). The second figure is to be explained differently: I emptied them out (הִרִיק אֶרְיָקִים) from הִרִיק (like the dirt of the streets, i.e., not merely: so that they became such, but as one empties it out, — thus contemptuously, ignominiously and completely (cf. Isa. 10: 6, Zec. 10: 5). The LXX renders it λεανῶ from הִרַק (root רַק to stretch, make thin, cf. *tendo tenius, dehnen dünn*); and the text of 2Sa. 22 present the same idea in אֶרְיָקִים.

*Psa. 18:44-46.* Thus victorious in God, David became what he now is, viz., the ruler of a great kingdom firmly established both in home and foreign relations. With respect to the גִּוִּים and the verb תִּפְלִטֵנִי which follows, עָם רִיבִי can only be understood of the conflicts among his own people, in which David was involved by the persecution of Saul and the rebellions of Absalom and Sheba the son of Bichri; and from which Jahve delivered him, in order to preserve him for his calling of world-wide dominion in accordance with the promise. We therefore interpret the passage according to בְּרִית עָם in Isa. 49: 8, and קִנְאָתֵךְ עָם in Isa. 26:11; whereas the following אִם comes to have a foreign application by reason of the attributive clause לֹא-יִדְעֵתִי (Ges. § 123, 3). The *Niph.* נִשְׁמַע in v. 45 is the reflexive of שָׁמַע, to obey (e.g., Exo. 24: 7), and is therefore to be rendered: show themselves obedient (= *Ithpa.* in Dan. 7:27). לְשִׁמְעֵ אֹזֶן implies more than that they obeyed at the word; שָׁמַע means information, rumour, and אֹזֶן שָׁמַע is the opposite of personal observation (Job. 42: 5), it is therefore to be rendered: they submitted

even at the tidings of my victories; and 2Sa. 8: 9 f. is an example of this. כָּחַשׁ to lie, disown, feign, and flatter, is sued here, as it is frequently, of the extorted humility which the vanquished show towards the conqueror. V. 46 completes the picture of the reason of the sons of a foreign country “putting a good face on a bad game.” They faded away, i.e., they became weak and faint-hearted (Exo. 18:18), incapable of holding out against or breaking through any siege by David, and trembled, surrendering at discretion, out of their close places, i.e., out of their strongholds behind which they had shut themselves in (cf. Psa. 142: 8). The signification of being alarmed, which in this instance, being found in combination with a local מָן, is confined to the sense of terrified flight, is secured to the verb חָרַג by the Arabic *harija* (root *hr*, of audible pressure, crowding, and the like) to be pressed, crowded, tight, or narrow, to get in a strait, and the Targumic אִמְתָּא דְמוֹתָא = חָרְנָא דְמוֹתָא (vid., the Targums on Deu. 32:25). Arab. *hjl*, to limp, halt, which is compared by Hitzig, is far removed as to the sound; and the most natural, but colourless Arab. *chrj*, to go out of (according to its radical meaning — cf. Arab. *chrq*, *chr'*, etc. — : to break forth, *erumpere*), cannot be supported in Hebrew or Aramaic. The חָרְנָא found in the borrowed passage in Micah, Mic. 7:17, favours our rendering.

*Psa. 18:47-49.* The hymn now draws towards the end with praise and thanksgiving for the multitude of God’s mighty deeds, which have just been displayed. Like the (חַי הוֹי בְּרוּךְ צוּרֵי) which is always doxological, חַי הוֹי (*vivus Jahve*) is meant as a predicate clause, but is read with the accent of an exclamation just as in the formula of an oath, which is the same expression; and in the present instance it has a doxological meaning. Accordingly יִרְוֹם also signifies “exalted be,” in which sense it is written וִירָם (וִירָם = וִירָם) in the other text. There are three doxological utterances drawn from the events which have just been celebrated in song. That which follows, from הָאֵל onwards, describes Jahve once more as the living, blessed (εὐλογητόν), and exalted One, which He has shown Himself to be. From וַיִּדְבֵר we see that הַנּוֹתֵן is to be resolved as an imperfect. The proofs of vengeance, נִקְמוֹת, are called God’s gift, insofar as He has rendered it possible to him to punish the attacks upon his own dignity and the dignity of his people, or to witness the punishment of such insults (e.g., in the case of Nabal); for divine vengeance is a securing by punishment (*vindicatio*) of the inviolability of the right. It is questionable whether הַדְּבִיר (synonym דָּדָה, Psa. 144: 2) here and in Psa. 47: 4 means “to bring to reason” as an intensive of דָּבַר, to drive (Ges.); the more natural meaning is “to turn the back” according to the Arabic *adbara* (Hitzig), cf. *dabar*, *dabre*, flight, retreat; *debira* to be wounded behind;

*medbûr*, wounded in the back. The idea from which **הַדְּבִיר** gains the meaning “to subdue” is that of flight, in which hostile nations, overtaken from behind, sank down under him (Psa. 45: 6); but the idea that is fully worked out in 129: 3, Isa. 51:23, is by no means remote. With **מִפְּלִטִי** the assertion takes the form of an address. **רֹמֵם מִן** does not differ from 9:14: Thou liftest me up away from mine enemies, so that I hover above them and triumph over them. The climactic **אֵף**, of which poetry is fond, here unites two thoughts of a like import to give intensity of expression to the one idea. The participle is followed by futures: his manifold experience is concentrated in one general ideal expression.

*Psa. 18:50-51.* The praise of so blessed a God, who acts towards David as He has promised him, shall not be confined within the narrow limits of Israel. When God’s anointed makes war with the sword upon the heathen, it is, in the end, the blessing of the knowledge of Jahve for which he opens up the way, and the salvation of Jahve, which he thus mediatorially helps on. Paul has a perfect right to quote v. 50 of this Psalm (Rom. 15: 9), together with Deu. 32:43 and Psa. 117: 1, as proof that salvation belongs to the Gentiles also, according to the divine purpose of mercy. What is said in v. 51 as the reason and matter of the praise that shall go forth beyond Israel, is an echo of the Messianic promises in 2Sa. 7:12-16 which is perfectly reconcilable with the Davidic authorship of the Psalm, as Hitzig acknowledges. And Theodoret does not wrongly appeal to the closing words **אֵד-עֲוֹלָם** against the Jews. In whom, but in Christ, the son of David, has the fallen throne of David any lasting continuance, and in whom, but in Christ, has all that has been promised to the seed of David eternal truth and reality? The praise of Jahve, the God of David, His anointed, is, according to its ultimate import, a praising of the Father of Jesus Christ.

## **Psalm 18 according to the Text of 2 Samuel 22**

*2 Samuel 22.* On the differences of the introductory superscription, see on Psa. 18: 1. The relation of the prose accentuation of the Psalm in 2 Samuel 22 to the poetical accentuation in the Psalter is instructive. Thus, for example, instead of *Mercha mahpach.* (*Olewejored*) in the Psalter we here find *Athnach*; instead of the *Athnach* following upon *Mercha mahpach.*, here is *Zakeph* (cf. Psa. 18: 7, 16, 31 with 2Sa. 22: 7, 16, 31); instead of *Rebia mugrash*, here *Tiphcha* (cf. Psa. 18: 4 with 2Sa. 22: 4); instead of *Pazer* at the beginning of a verse, here *Athnach* (cf. Psa. 18: 2 with 2Sa. 22: 2).<sup>f128</sup>

The peculiar mode of writing the stichs, in which we find this song in our editions, is the old traditional mode. If a half-line is placed above a half-line,

so that they form two columns, it is called **על-גבי לבנה אריח על-גבי אריח**, brick upon brick, a half-brick upon a half-brick, as the song *Haazinu* in Deuteronomy 32 is set out in our editions. On the other hand if the half-lines appear as they do here divided and placed in layers one over another, it is called **אריח על-גבי לבנה ולבנה על-גבי אריח**. According to *Megilla* 16b all the *cantica* in the Scriptures are to be written thus; and according to *Sofrim* xiii., Psalm 18 has this form in common with 2 Samuel 22.

**2Sa. 22: 2-4.** This strophe is stunted by the falling away of its monostichic introit, Psa. 18: 2. In consequence of this, the vocatives in vv. 2 f. are deprived of their support and lowered to substantival clauses: *Jahve is my Rock*, etc., which form no proper beginning for a hymn. Instead of **וּמִפְלֵטִי** we have, as in Psa. 144: 2, **וּמִפְלֵטֵי-לִי**; and instead of **אֱלֹהֵי צוּרִי** we find **אֱלֹהֵי צוּרִי**, which is contrary to the usual manner of arranging these emblematical names. The loss the strophe sustains is compensated by the addition: *and my Refuge, my Saviour, who savest me from violence*. In v. 4b as in v. 49b the non-assimilated **לִי** (cf. v. 14, Psa. 30: 4; 73:19) is shortened into an assimilated one. May **לִי** perhaps be the remains of the obliterated **אֱלִי**, and **אֱלֹהֵי**, as it were, the clothing of the **צוּרִי** which was then left too bare?

**2Sa. 22: 5-7.** The connection of this strophe with the preceding by **כִּי** accords with the sense, but is tame. On the other hand, the reading **מִשְׁבְּרֵי** instead of **חֲבָלֵי** (even though the author of Psa. 116: 3 may have thus read it) is commended by the parallelism, and by the fact, that now the latter figure is not repeated in vv. 5, 6. **מִשְׁבְּרֵי** are not necessarily waves that break upon the shore, but may also be such as break one upon another, and consequently **אֶפְפוּנֵי** is not inadmissible. The **ו** of **וְנַחֲלֵי**, which is not wanted, is omitted. Instead of the fuller toned from **סִבְבוּנֵי**, which is also more commensurate with the closing cadence of the verse, we have here the usual syncopated **סִבּוּנֵי** (cf. Psa. 118:11). The repetition of the **אֶקְרָא** (instead of **אֲשׁוּא**) is even more unpoetical than the repetition of **חֲבָלֵי** would be. On the other hand, it might originally have been **וַיִּשְׁמַע** instead of **יִשְׁמַע**; without **ו** it is an expression (intended retrospectively) of what takes place simultaneously, with **ו** it expresses the principal fact. The concluding line **וְשׁוּעָתִי בְּאֲזִנָּיו** is stunted: the brief substantival clause is not meaningless (cf. Job. 15:21, Isa. 5: 9), but is only a fragment of the more copious, fuller toned conclusion of the strophe which we find in the Psalter.

**2Sa. 22: 8-10.** The *Kerî* here obliterates the significant alternation of the *Kal* and *Hithpa.* of **נָאֵשׁ**. Instead of **וּמוֹסְרֵי** we have the feminine form of the

plural **מוֹסְדוֹת** (as in both texts in v. 16) without **ו**. Instead of the genitive **הַרִים**, by an extension of the figure, we have **הַשָּׁמַיִם** (cf. the pillars, Job. 26:11), which is not intended of the mountains as of Atlases, as it were, supporting the heavens, but of the points of support and central points of the heavens themselves: the whole universe trembles.

**2Sa. 22:11-13**. Instead of the pictorial **וַיִּדָּא** (Deu. 28:49, and hence in Jeremiah), which is generally used of the flight of the eagle, we have the plain, uncoloured **וַיִּרָא** *He appeared*. Instead of **יָשַׁת**, which is intended as an aorist, we meet the more strictly regular, but here, where so many aorists with **ו** come together, less poetical **וַיִּשַׁת**. In v. 12a the rise and fall of the parallel members has grown over till it forms one heavy clumsy line: *And made darkness round about Him a pavilion* (**סִכּוֹת**). But the **ἀπ. λεγ. ἡσῆρτη**, to which the signification of a “massive gathering together” is secured by the Arabic, is perhaps original. The word Arab. *ḥsr*, frequently used in the Koran of assembling to judgment, with the radical signification *stipare, cogere* (to crowd together, compress) which is also present in Arab. *ḥsā, ḥās, ḥsd*, is here used like **ἀγείρειν** in the Homeric **νεφεληγερέτα** (the cloud-gatherer).<sup>f129</sup>

V. 13 is terribly mutilated. Of **עָבְיוּ עָרְרוּ בָרַד וְ** of the other text there are only the four letters **בְּעָרוּ** (as in v. 9c) left.

**2Sa. 22:14-16**. Instead of **וַיִּרְעֵם** we find **וַיִּרְעַם**, which is less admissible here, where a principal fact is related and the description is drawing nearer and nearer to its goal. Instead of **מִן־שָׁמַיִם** the other text has **בְּשָׁמַיִם**; in 30: 4 also, **מִן** is retained without being assimilated before **ש**. But the fact, however, that the line **בָּרַד וְגַחְלֵי־אֵשׁ** is wanting, is a proof, which we welcome, that it is accidentally repeated from the preceding strophe, in the other text. On the other hand, **הַצִּים** is inferior to **הַצִּיּוֹ**; **וּבְרָקִים רַב** is corrupted into a tame **בְּרָק**; and the *Keri* **וַיִּפְּצֵם** erroneously assumes that the suffix of **וַיִּפְּצֵם** refers to the arrows, i.e., lightnings. Again on the other hand, **אֲפִיקֵי יָם**, channels of the sea, is perhaps original; **מִים** in this connection expresses too little, and, as being the customary word in combination with **אֲפִיקֵי** (Psa. 42: 2, Joe. 1:20), may easily have been substituted after it. At any rate **יָם** and **תָּבַל** form a more exact antithesis. **וַיִּגְלוּ** instead of **וַיִּגְלוּ** is the same in meaning. The close of the strophe is here also weakened by the obliteration of the address to God: *by* (**בְּ** instead of the **מִ** of the other text) *the threatening of Jahve, at the snorting of His breath of anger*. The change of the preposition in this surge (so-to-speak) of the members of the verse is rather interruptive than pleasing.



2Sa. 22:17-20. The variant **מִשְׁנֵאֵי** instead of **וּמִשְׁאֵנִי** is unimportant; but **מִשְׁעָן** instead of **לְמִשְׁעָן**, for a support, is less pleasing both as it regards language and rhythm. The resolution of **וַיּוֹצֵאֵנִי** into **אֶתִּי ... וַיַּצֵּא** is a clumsy and needless emphasising of the *me*.

2Sa. 22:21-24. Instead of **בְּצַדְקָתִי**, we find **בְּצַדְקָתִי** here and in v. 25, contrary to usage of the language of the Psalms (cf. *Psa.* 7: 9 with *1Ki.* 8:32). Instead of the poetical **אָסִיר מְנִי** (*Job.* 27: 5; 23:12) we have **אָסִיר מִמֶּנָּה** (with the *fem.* used as a neuter), according to the common phrase in *2Ki.* 3: 3, and frequently (cf. *Deu.* 5:32). Instead of **וְאֵדָה**, the not less (e.g., *102:* 8) usual **וְאֵדָה**; and instead of **וְאִשְׁתַּמֵּר**, the form with *ah* of direction which occurs very frequently with the first person of the *fut. convers.* in the later Hebrew, although it does also occur even in the older Hebrew (*Psa.* 3: 6; 7: 5, *Gen.* 32: 6, *Job.* 19:20). And instead of **עָמוּ** we find **לוֹ**, which does not commend itself, either as a point of language or of rhythm; and by comparison with vv. 26, 27, it certainly is not original.

2Sa. 22:25-28. On **בְּצַדְקָתִי** see v. 21. **כְּבָרִי** is without example, since elsewhere **בְּרֵי יָדַיִם (כְּפַיִם)** is the only expression for innocence. In the equally remarkable expression **גִּבּוֹר תָּמִים** (*the upright "man of valour"*), **גִּבּוֹר** is used just as in the expression **גִּבּוֹר חַיִל**. The form **תִּתְבָּר**, has only the sound of an assimilated *Hithpa.* like **תִּתְתַּמֵּם (= תִּתְתַּמֵּם)**, and is rather a reflexive of the *Hiph.* **הִבָּר** after the manner of the Aramaic *Ittaphal* (therefore = **תִּתְבָּר**); and the form **תִּתְפַּל** sounds altogether like a *Hithpa.* from **תִּפַּל** (thou showest thyself insipid, absurd, foolish), but — since **תִּתְפַּלָּה** cannot be ascribed to God (*Job.* 1:22), and is even unseemly as an expression — appears to be treated likewise as an *Ittaphal* with a kind of inverted assimilation = **תִּתְתַּפַּל** (Böttcher). They are contractions such as are sometimes allowed by the dialect of the common people, though contrary to all rules. **וְאֵת** instead of **כִּי** at the beginning of v. 28 changes what is confirmatory into a mere continuation of the foregoing. One of the most sensible variations is the change of **וְעֵינַיִם רְמוֹת** to **וְעֵינַיִךְ אֶל־רָמִים**. The rendering: And Thine eyes (are directed down) upon the haughty that Thou mayst bring (them) low (Stier, Hengst., and others), violates the accentuation and is harsh so far as the language is concerned (**לְהַשְׁפִּילָם** for **תִּשְׁפִּיל**). Hitzig renders it, according to the accents: And Thou lowerest Thine eyes against the proud, **הַשְׁפִּיל עֵינַיִם = הַפִּיל פָּנִים** (*Jer.* 3:12). But one would expect **בְּ** instead of **אֶל**, if this were the meaning. It is better to render it according to *Psa.* 113: 6: *And Thou dost cast down Thine eyes upon the haughty*, in which rendering the haughty are

represented as being far beneath Jahve notwithstanding their haughtiness, and the “casting down or depressing of the eyes” is an expression of the utmost contempt (*despectus*).

**2Sa. 22:29-31.** Here in v. 29a תֵּאִיר has been lost, for Jahve is called, and really is, אֹר in Psa. 27: 1, but not נֵר. The form of writing נִיר is an incorrect wavering between נֵר and נִיר. The repetition יְהוָה וַיְהוָה, by which the loss of תֵּאִיר, and of אֱלֹהֵי in v. 29b, is covered, is inelegant. We have בָּכָה here instead of בָּדָה, as twice besides in the Old Testament. The form of writing אָרוּץ, as Isa. 42: 4 shows, does not absolutely require that we should derive it from רוּץ; nevertheless רוּץ can be joined with the accusative just as well as דָּלַג, in the sense of running against, rushing upon; therefore, since the parallelism is favourable, it is to be rendered: *by Thee I rush upon a troop*. The omission of the ו before בְּאֱלֹהֵי is no improvement to the rhythm.

**2Sa. 22:32-35.** The variety of expression in v. 32 which has been preserved in the other text is lost here. Instead of הַמְאַזְרֵנִי חֵיל we find, as if from a faded MS, מְעוּזֵי חֵיל (according to Norzi מְעוּזֵי my refuge (lit., hiding) of strength, i.e., my strong refuge, according to a syntactically more elegant style of expression (= מְעוּזֵי מְעוּזֵי חֵיל), like Psa. 71: 7, Lev. 6: 3; 26:42; vid., Nägelsbach § 63, g, where it is correctly shown, that this mode of expression is a matter of necessity in certain instances. <sup>f130</sup>

The form of writing מְעוּזֵי, seems here to recognise a מְעוּז, a hiding-place, refuge, = Arab. *m'ād*, which is different from מְעוּזָה a fortress (from עוּז); but just as in every other case the punctuation confuses the two substantives (vid., on Psa. 31: 3), so it does even here, since מְעוּזָה, from עוּז, ought to be inflected מְעוּזָה, like מְנוּסָה, and not מְעוּזֵי. Nevertheless the *plena scriptio* may avail to indicate to us, that here מְעוּזֵי is intended to be by a synonym of מְחַסֵּה. Instead of וַיִּתֵּן (תָּמִים דְּרָכֵי) we have וַיִּתֵּר here; perhaps it is He let, or caused, my way to be spotless, i.e., made it such. Thus Ewald renders it by referring to the modern Arabic *hllâ*, to let, cause [Germ. *lassen*, French *faire* ] = to make, effect; even the classic ancient Arabic language uses *trk* (*Lassen*) in the sense of *j'l* (to make), e.g., “I have made (Arab. *taraktu*) the sword my camp-companion,” i.e., my inseparable attendant (lit., I have caused it to be such), as it is to be translated in Nöldeck'e *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber*, S. 131. <sup>f131</sup>

Or does הִתִּיר retain its full and proper meaning “to unfetter?” This is more probable, since the usage of Hebrew shows no example of הִתִּיר in the post-

biblical signification “to allow, permit,” which ought to form the transition to “to cause to be = to effect.” Therefore we may compare on the contrary Koran ix. 15, *challu sebî-lahum* loose their way, i.e., let them go forth free, and render it: He unfettered, unbound, left to itself, *let my way go on as faultless* (unobstructed). Hitzig, following the *Chethîb* דרכו, renders it differently: “and made the upright skip on his way.” But תמים beside דרכו is to be regarded at the outset as its predicate, and הִתִּיר means “to cause to jump up,” Hab. 3: 6, not “to skip along.” Nevertheless, the *Chethîb* דרכו, which, from the following *Chethîb* רגליו, bears the appearance of being designed, at any rate seems to have understood תמים personally: *He unfettered (expedit) the upright his way, making his feet like* etc. The reading וְנַחְתָּה instead of וְנַחֲתָה, although admissible so far as the syntax is concerned (Ges. § 147, a), injures the flow of the rhythm.

**2Sa. 22:36-37.** The pentastich is stunted here by the falling away of the middle line of v. 36: *and Thy right hand supported me*. Instead of the expressive וְאַנְוִתָּךְ (and Thy condescension) we find here וְעֲנִיתָךְ which, in accordance with the usage of the language, does not mean Thy being low (Hengst.), but rather: Thy labour (Böttch.), or more securely: *Thine answering*, LXX βρακοή (i.e., the actual help, wherewith Thou didst answer my prayer). Instead of תַּחֲתֵי we find, as also in vv. 40, 48, תַּחֲתֵנִי with a verbal suffix, like בִּאֲד in Psa. 139:11; it is perhaps an inaccuracy of the common dialect, which confused the genitive and accusative suffix. But instances of this are not wanting even in the written language, Ges. § 103, rem. 3.

**2Sa. 22:38-41.** The cohortative אֲרִדְפָּה, as frequently, has the sense of a hypothetical antecedent, whether it refers to the present, as in Psa. 139: 8, or to the past as in Psa. 73:16 and here: *in case I pursued*. In the text in the Psalter it is וְאַשְׁיִגֶם, here it is וְאַשְׁמִידֶם, by which the echo of Exodus 15 is obliterated. And after עַד-כִּלּוֹתֶם how tautological is the וְאֶכְלֶם which is designed to compensate for the shortening of the verse! The verse, to wit, is shortened at the end, וְלֹא יִקְוּמוּן וְלֹא יִכְלוּ קוּם, being transformed into וְלֹא יִקְוּמוּן . Instead of וְיִפְלוּ, וְיִפְלוּ is not inappropriate. Instead of וְהִאֲזַנְנִי we find וְהִאֲזַנְנִי, by a syncope that belongs to the dialect of the people, cf. תִּזְלִי for תִּאֲזַלִּי Jer. 2:36, מִלֵּךְ for מִמֶּלֶךְ Job. 35:11. Of the same kind is נַתַּתָּה = תַּתַּתָּה, an apocope taken from the mouths of the people, with which only נָדָה, Jud. 19:11, if equivalent to נִדָה, can be compared. The conjunctive ו of וּמְשַׁנְּאֵי stands here in connection with אֲצַמִּיתֶם as a *consec.*: *my haters, whom I destroyed*. The other text is altogether more natural, better conceived, and more elegant in this instance.

2Sa. 22:42-43. Instead of יִשְׁעוּ we have יִשְׁעֵי, a substitution which is just tolerable: they look forth for help, or even: they look up expectantly to their gods, Isa. 17: 8; 31: 1. The two figurative expressions in v. 43, however, appear here, in contrast with the other text, in a distorted form: *And I pulverised them as the dust of the earth, as the mire of the street did I crush them, I trampled them down.* The lively and expressive figure עַל-פְּנֵי רוּחַ כַּעֲפַר is weakened into כַּעֲפַר-אַרְצָן. Instead of אֲרִיקָם, we have the overloaded glossarial אֲדָקָם אֲרָקָם. The former (root דָּק, דָּךְ, to break in pieces) is a word that is interchanged with the אֲרִיקָם of the other text in the misapprehended sense of אֲרָקָם. The latter (root רָק, to stretch, to make broad, thin, and compact) looks like a gloss of this אֲדָקָם. Since one does not intentionally either crush or trample upon the dirt of the street nor tread it out thin or broad, we must in this instance take not merely כַּעֲפַר-אַרְצָן but also כַּמִּטְחֹצוֹת as expressing the issue or result.

2Sa. 22:44-46. The various reading רִיבֵי אֲמִי proceeds from the correct understanding, that רִיבֵי refers to David's contentions within his kingdom. The supposition that אֲמִי is a plur. apoc. and equivalent to אֲמִים, as it is to all appearance in Psa. 144: 2, and like מְנִי = מְנִים Psa. 45: 9, has no ground here. The reasonable variation תִּשְׁמְרֵנִי harmonises with אֲמִי: *Thou hast kept me (preserved me) for a head of the nations*, viz., by not allowing David to become deprived of the throne by civil foes. The two lines of v. 45 are reversed, and not without advantage. The *Hithpa.* יִתְבַּחְשׂוּ instead of the *Piel* יִבְחָשׂוּ (cf. Psa. 66: 3; 81:16) is the reflexive of the latter: they made themselves flatterers (cf. the *Niph.* Deu. 33:29: to show themselves flattering, like the יִשְׁמְעוּ which follows here, *audientes se praestabant = obedebant*). Instead of לְשִׁמְעַ (אֲזִן) we have here, in a similar signification, but less elegant, לְשִׁמוֹא (אֲזִן) according to the hearing of the ear, i.e., hearsay. Instead of וַיִּחְרְגוּ we find וַיִּחְגְּרוּ, which is either a transposition of the letters as a solecism (cf. פָּצַר 2Sa. 13:27 for פָּצַר), or used in a peculiar signification. "They gird (*accincti prodeunt*)" does not give any suitable meaning to this picture of voluntary submission. But חָגַר (whence Talmudic חָגַר lame) may have signified "to limp" in the dialect of the people, which may be understood of those who drag themselves along with difficulty and reluctance (Hitz.). "Out of their closed placed (castles)," here with the suff. *ām* instead of *êhém*.

2Sa. 22:47-49. The צוּר thrust into v. 47b is troublesome. וַיִּרָם (without any necessity for correcting it to וַיִּרָם) is optative, cf. Gen. 27:31, Pro. 9: 4,

16. Instead of **וַיִּדְבֹר** we have **וּמְרִיד** *and who subdueth*, which is less significant and so far as the syntax is concerned less elegant. Also here consequently **תַּחְתֵּי** for **תַּחְתֵּי**. Instead of **מִכָּל־טֵי** we find **וּמוֹצֵי־אֵי** *and who bringeth me forth out of my enemies*, who surround me — a peculiar form of expression and without support elsewhere (for it is different in v. 20). The poetical **אֵר** is exchanged for the prose **וּ** **מִן־קָמִי** for **מִקָּמִי**, and **חָמָס** (**אִישׁ**) for **חָמָסִים** (**אִישׁ**); the last being a *plur.* (Psa. 140: 2, 5, Pro. 4: 1,7), which is foreign to the genuine Davidic Psalms.

**2Sa. 22:50-51.** The change of position of **יְהוָה** in v. 50a, as well as **אֹמֵר** for **אֹמְרָה**, is against the rhythm; the latter, moreover, is contrary to custom, Psa. 57:10; 108: 4. While **מִגְדָּל** of the other text is not pointed **מִגְדָּל**, but **מִגְדָּל**, it is corrected in this text from **מִגְדָּל** into **מִגְדּוֹל** *tower of salvation* — a figure that recalls Psa. 61: 4, Pro. 18:10, but is obscure and somewhat strange in this connection; moreover, *migdol* for *migdal*, a tower, only occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament as a proper name.

If we now take one more glance over the mutual relationship of the two texts, we cannot say that both texts equally partake of the original. With the exception of the correct omission of v. 14c and the readings **חֲשֵׁרֶת**, **מִשְׁבְּרֵי**, and **אִפְיָקִי יָם** there is scarcely anything in the text of 2Sa. 22 that specially commends itself to us. That this text is a designed, and perhaps a Davidic, revision of the other text (Hengst.), is an assumption that is devoid of reason and appearance; for in 2Sa. 22 we have only a text that varies in some instances, but not a substantially new form of the text. The text in 2Sa. 22, as it has shown us, is founded upon careless written and oral transmission. The rather decided tendency towards a defective form of writing leads one to conjecture the greater antiquity of the copy from which it is taken. It is easy to understand how poetical passages inserted in historical works were less carefully dealt with. It is characteristic of the form of the text of the Psalm in 2Sa. 22, that in not a few instances the licences of popular expression have crept into it. There is some truth in what Böttcher says, when he calls the text in the Psalter the recension of the priests and that in the Second Book of Samuel the recension of the laity.

## Psalm 19

### PRAYER TO GOD, WHOSE REVELATION OF HIMSELF IS TWOFOLD

*19: 2 THE heavens are telling the glory of God,  
And the work of His hands doth the firmament declare.*

*19: 3 Day unto day poureth forth speech,  
And night unto night sheweth knowledge —*

*19: 4 There is no speech and there are no words,  
Whose voice is inaudible.*

*19: 5 Into all lands is their line gone forth,  
And to the end of the world their utterances:  
To the sun hath He appointed a tabernacle there.*

*19: 6 And he is like a bridegroom coming out of his chamber,  
He rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course.*

*19: 7 From the end of the heaven is his going forth  
And his circuit unto the end of it,  
And nothing can hide itself from his heat.*

*19: 8 The Law of Jahve is spotless, restoring the soul;  
The testimony of Jahve is sure, making wise the simple.*

*19: 9 The statutes of Jahve are right, rejoicing the heart;  
The commandment of Jahve is pure, enlightening the eyes;*

*19:10 The fear of Jahve is clean enduring for ever;  
The decisions of Jahve are truth, righteous altogether.*

*19:11 More to be desired are they than gold, and much fine gold,  
And sweeter than honey and honey-comb.*

*19:12 Moreover Thy servant is instructed by them,  
in keeping them there is great reward.*

*19:13 As for errors who observeth them?!  
From hidden sins do Thou pronounce me clear!*

*19:14 Also from presumptuous sins keep  
Thy servant back, that they may not have dominion over me!  
Then shall I be guiltless and clean from great transgression.*

*19:15 Thus let be acceptable the words of my mouth  
and the meditation of my heart  
Before Thy face, O Jahve, my rock and my Redeemer!!*

In the inscription of Psalm 18 David is called עֶבֶד יְהוָה, and in Psalm 19 he gives himself this name. In both Psalms, in the former at the beginning, in the latter at the close, he calls upon Jahve by the name צוּרִי, my rock. These and other points of contact (*Symbolae* p. 49) have concurred to lead the collector to append Psalm 19, which celebrates God's revelation of Himself in nature and in the Law, to Psalm 18, which celebrates God's revelation of Himself in the history of David. The view, that in Psalm 19 we have before us two torsi

blown together from some quarter or other, is founded upon a defective insight into the relationship, which accords with a definite plan, of the two halves vv. 2-7, 8-15, as Hitzig has recently shown in opposition to that view. The poet begins with the praise of the glory of God the Creator, and rises from this to the praise of the mercy of God the Lawgiver; and thus through the praise, springing from wondering and loving adoration, he clears the way to the prayer for justification and sanctification. This prayer grows out of the praise of the mercy of the God who has revealed Himself in His word, without coming back to the first part, vv. 2-7. For, as Lord Bacon says, the heavens indeed tell of the glory of God, but not of His will, according to which the poet prays to be pardoned and sanctified. Moreover, if we suppose the Psalm to be called forth by the aspect of the heavens by day, just as Psalm ch. 8 was by the aspect of the heavens by night, then the unity of this praise of the two revelations of God becomes still more clear. It is morning, and the psalmist rejoices on the one hand at the dawning light of day, and on the other he prepares himself for the days' work lying before him, in the light of the *Tôra*. The second part, just like the first part, consists of fourteen lines, and each of them is naturally divided into a six and an eight line strophe. But in the second part, in the place of the short lines comes the caesural schema, which as it were bounds higher, draws deeper breaths and surges as the rise and fall of the waves, for the *Tôra* inspires the psalmist more than does the sun. And it is also a significant fact, that in the first part God is called אֱלֹהִים according to his relationship of power to the world, and is only mentioned once; whereas in the second part, He is called by His covenant name יְהוָה, and mentioned seven times, and the last time by a threefold name, which brings the Psalm to a close with a full toned וַיִּשְׁמַח וַיִּשְׂמְרֵן יְהוָה צוּרֵי . What a depth of meaning there is in this distinction of the revelation of God, the Redeemer, from the revelation of God, the Creator!

The last strophe presents us with a sharply sketched soteriology *in nuce*. If we add Psalm 32, then we have the whole of the way of salvation in almost Pauline clearness and definiteness. Paul, moreover, quotes both Psalms; they were surely his favourites.

*Psa. 19: 2-4.* The heavens, i.e., the superterrestrial spheres, which, so far as human vision is concerned, are lost in infinite space, declare how glorious is God, and indeed אֱלֹהִים, as the Almighty; and what His hands have made, i.e., what He has produced with a superior power to which everything is possible, the firmament, i.e., vault of heaven stretched out far and wide and as a transparency above the earth (Graeco-Veneta *τάμα* = *ἕκταμα*, from קָטַע, root קָטַע, to stretch, *τείνειν*), distinctly expresses. The sky and firmament are not conceived of as conscious beings which the middle ages, in dependence upon Aristotle (vid., Maimonides, *More Nebuchim* ii. 5), believed could be proved

fro this passage, cf. Neh. 9: 6, Job. 38: 7. Moreover, Scripture knows nothing of the “music of the spheres” of the Pythagoreans. What is meant is, as the old expositors correctly say, *objectivum vocis non articulatae praeconium*. The doxa, which God has conferred upon the creature as the reflection of His own, is reflected back from it, and given back to God as it were in acknowledgment of its origin. The idea of perpetuity, which lies even in the participle, is expanded in v. 3. The words of this discourse of praise are carried forward in an uninterrupted line of transmission. **הִבִּיאַ** (fr. **נָבַע**, Arab. *nb'*, root **נב**, to gush forth, nearly allied to which, however, is also the root **בַּע**, to spring up) points to the rich fulness with which, as from an inexhaustible spring, the testimony passes on from one day to the next. The parallel word **הִנְהָה** is an unpictorial, but poetic, word that is more Aramaic than Hebrew (= **הִנְיָד**). **אִמְשׁ** also belongs to the more elevated style; the **γῶστος τῶν Θεῶν** deposited in the creature, although not reflected, is here called **דָּאֵת**. The poet does not say that the tidings proclaimed by the day, if they gradually die away as the day declines, are taken up by the night, and the tidings of the night by the day; but (since the knowledge proclaimed by the day concerns the visible works of God by day, and that proclaimed by the night, His works by night), that each dawning day continues the speech of that which has declined, and each approaching night takes up the tale of that which has passed away (*Psychol.* S. 347, tr. p. 408). If v. 4 were to be rendered “there is no speech and there are no words, their voice is inaudible,” i.e., they are silent, speechless witnesses, uttering no sound, but yet speaking aloud (Hengst.), only inwardly audible but yet intelligible everywhere (Then.): then, v. 5 ought at least to begin with a *Waw adversativum*, and, moreover, the poet would then needlessly check his fervour, producing a tame thought and one that interrupts the flow of the hymn. To take v. 4 as a circumstantial clause to v. 5, and made to precede it, as Ewald does, “without loud speech...their sound has resounded through all the earth” (§ 341, *d*), is impossible, even apart from the fact of **אָמַר** not meaning “Loud speech” and **קָנָם** hardly “their sound.” V. 4 is in the form of an independent sentence, and there is nothing whatever in it to betray any designed subordination to v. 5. But if it be made independent in the sense “there is no loud, no articulate speech, no audible voice, which proceeds from the heavens,” then v. 5 would form an antithesis to it; and this, in like manner, there is nothing to indicate, and it would at least require that the verb **יִצְא** should be placed first. Luther’s rendering is better: There is no language nor speech, where their voice is not heard, i.e., as Calvin also renders it, the testimony of the heavens to God is understood by the peoples of every language and tongue. But this ought to be **אִין לְשׁוֹן** or **אִין שְׂפָה** (Gen. 11: 1). Hofmann’s rendering is similar, but more untenable: “There is no speech and there are no words, that their cry is not heard, i.e., the language of the heavens



goes forth side by side with all other languages; and men may discourse ever so, still the speech or sound of the heavens is heard therewith, it sounds above them all.” But the words are not **בְּלִי נִשְׁמַע** (after the analogy of Gen. 31:20), or rather **בְּלִי יִשְׁמַע** (as in Job. 41: 8, Hos. 8: 7). **בְּלִי** with the *part.* is a poetical expression for the *Alpha privat.* (2Sa. 1:21), consequently **בְּלִי נִשְׁמַע** is “unheard” or “inaudible,” and the opposite of **נִשְׁמַע**, audible, Jer. 31:15. Thus, therefore, the only rendering that remains is that of the LXX., Vitringa, and Hitzig: There is no language and no words, whose voice is unheard, i.e., inaudible. Hupfeld’s assertion that this rendering destroys the parallelism is unfounded. The structure of the distich resembles 139: 4. The discourse of the heavens and the firmament, of the day (of the sky by day) and of the night (of the sky by night), is not a discourse uttered in a corner, it is a discourse in speech that is everywhere audible, and in words that are understood by all, a **φανερών**, Rom. 1:19.

*Psa. 19: 5-7.* Since **אָמַר** and **דְּבָרִים** are the speech and words of the heavens, which form the ruling principal notion, comprehending within itself both **יוֹם** and **לַיְלָה**, the suffixes of **קָוָם** and **מְלִיָּהֶם** must unmistakably refer to **הַשָּׁמַיִם** in spite of its being necessary to assign another reference to **קוֹלָם** in v. 4. Jer. 31:39 shows how we are to understand **קוֹ** in connection with **צֵן**. The measuring line of the heavens is gone forth into all the earth, i.e., has taken entire possession of the earth. V. 5b tells us what kind of measuring line is intended, viz., that of their heraldship: their words (from **מְלָה**, which is more Aramaic than Hebrew, and consequently more poetic) reach to the end of the world, they fill it completely, from its extreme boundary inwards. Isaiah’s **קוֹ**, Isa. 28:10, is inapplicable here, because it does not mean commandment, but rule, and is there used as a word of derision, rhyming with **צֵן**. The **ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν** of the LXX (**ὁ ἤχος αὐτῶν** Symm.) might more readily be justified, inasmuch as **קוֹ** might mean a harpstring, as being a cord in tension, and then, like **τόνος** (cf. **τοναία**), a tone or sound (Gesenius in his *Lex.*, and Ewald), if the reading **קוֹלָם** does not perhaps lie at the foundation of that rendering. But the usage of the language presents with signification of a measuring line for **קוֹ** when used with **צֵן** (Aq. **κανών**, cf. 2Co. 10:13); and this gives a new thought, whereas in the other case we should merely have a repetition of what has been already expressed in v. 4. Paul makes use of these first two lines of the strophe in order, with its very words, to testify to the spread of the apostolic message over the whole earth. Hence most of the older expositors have taken the first half of the Psalm to be an allegorical prediction, the heavens being a figure of the church and the sun a figure of the gospel. The apostle does not, however, make a formal citation in the passage referred to, he

merely gives a New Testament application to Old Testament language, by taking the all-penetrating *praeconium coelorum* as figure of the all-penetrating *praeconium evangelii*; and he is fully justified in so doing by the parallel which the psalmist himself draws between the revelation of God in nature and in the written word.

The reference of **בָּהֶם** to **הַשָּׁמַיִם** is at once opposed by the tameness of the thought so obtained. The tent, viz., the retreat (**אֹהֶל**, according to its radical meaning a dwelling, from **אָהַל**, cogn. **אוּל**, to retire from the open country) of the sun is indeed in the sky, but it is more naturally at the spot where the sky and the **קִצְוֵה תִּבְלַל** meet. Accordingly **בָּהֶם** has the neuter signification “there” (cf. Isa. 30: 6); and there is so little ground for reading **שָׁם** instead of **שָׁמָּה**, as Ewald does, that the poet on the contrary has written **בָּהֶם** and not **שָׁם**, because he has just used **שָׁם** (Hitzig). The name of the sun, which is always feminine in Arabic, is predominantly masculine in Hebrew and Aramaic (cf. on the other hand Gen. 15:17, Nah. 3:17, Isa. 45: 6, Mal. 3:20); just as the Sabians and heathen Arabs had a sun-god (*masc.*). Accordingly in v. 6 the sun is compared to a bridegroom, who comes forth in the morning out of his **חֶפְזוֹ**. Joe. 2:16 shows that this word means a bride-chamber; properly (from **חָפַר** to cover) it means a canopy (Isa. 4: 5), whence in later Hebrew the bridal or portable canopy (Talmud. **בֵּית גִּנְנָא**), which is supported by four poles and borne by four boys, at the consecration of the bridal pair, and then also the marriage itself, is called *chuppa*. The morning light has in it a freshness and cheerfulness, as it were a renewed youth. Therefore the morning sun is compared to a bridegroom, the desire of whose heart is satisfied, who stands as it were at the beginning of a new life, and in whose youthful countenance the joy of the wedding-day still shines. And as at its rising it is like a bridegroom, so in its rapid course (Sir. 43: 5) it is like a hero (vid., on Psa. 18:34), inasmuch as it marches on its way ever anew, light-giving and triumphant, as often as it comes forth, with **גְּבוּרָה** (Jud. 5:31). From one end of heaven, the extreme east of the horizon, is its going forth, i.e., rising (cf. Hos. 6: 3; the opposite is **מִבּוֹא** going in = setting), and its circuit (**תְּקוּפָה**, from **קוּרַר** = **קָרַר**, Isa. 29: 1, to revolve) **אֶל-קִצְוֵתָם**, to their (the heavens’) end (= **עַד** Deu. 4:32), cf. 1 Esdr. 4:34: **ταχύς τῷ δρόμῳ ὁ ἥλιος ὅτι στρέφεται ἐν τῷ κύκλῳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πάλιν ἀποτρέχει εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ**. On this open way there is not **נִסְתָּר**, anything hidden, i.e., anything that remains hidden, before its heat. **חֶמְדוֹ** is the enlightening and warming influence of the sun, which is also itself called **חֶמְדוֹ** in poetry.

*Psa. 19: 8-10.* No sign is made use of to mark the transition from the one part to the other, but it is indicated by the introduction of the divine name יהוה instead of אל. The word of nature declares אל (God) to us, the word of Scripture יהוה (Jahve); the former God's power and glory, the latter also His counsel and will. Now follow twelve encomiums of the Law, of which every two are related as antecedent and consequent, rising and falling according to the caesural schema, after the manner of waves. One can discern how now the heart of the poet begins to beat with redoubled joy as he comes to speak of God's word, the revelation of His will. תּוֹרָה does not in itself mean the law, but a pointing out, instruction, doctrine or teaching, and more particularly such as is divine, and therefore positive; whence it is also used of prophecy, Isa. 1:10; 8:16, and prophetically of the New Testament gospel, Isa. 2: 3. But here no other divine revelation is meant than that given by the mediation of Moses, which is become the law, i.e., the rule of life (νόμος), of Israel; and this law, too, as a whole not merely as to its hortatory and disciplinary character, but also including the promises contained in it. The praises which the poet pronounces upon the Law, are accurate even from the standpoint of the New Testament. Even Paul says, Rom. 7:12, 14, "The Law is holy and spiritual, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." The Law merits these praises in itself; and to him who is in a state of favour, it is indeed no longer a law bringing a curse with it, but a mirror of the God merciful in holiness, into which he can look without slavish fear, and is a rule for the direction of his free and willing obedience. And how totally different is the affection of the psalmists and prophets for the Law, — an affection based upon the essence and universal morality of the commandments, and upon a spiritual realisation of the letter, and the consolation of the promises, — from the pharisaical rabbinical service of the letter and the ceremonial in the period after the Exile!

The divine Law is called תְּמִימָה, "perfect," i.e., spotless and harmless, as being absolutely well-meaning, and altogether directed towards the well-being of man. And מְשִׁיבַת נֶפֶשׁ restoring, bringing back, i.e., imparting newness of life, quickening the soul (cf. *Pil. שׁוֹבֵב*, Psa. 23: 3), to him, viz., who obeys the will of God graciously declared therein, and enters upon the divine way or rule of salvation. Then in the place of the word תּוֹרָה we find עֲדוּת, — as the tables of the Ten Commandments (לְחֹת הָעֲדוּת) are called, — from עוֹד (הָעֵיד), which signifies not merely a corroborative, but also a warning and instructive testimony or attestation. The testimony of Jahve is נֶאֱמָנָה, made firm, sure, faithful, i.e., raised above all doubt in its declarations, and verifying itself in its threatenings and promises; and hence מִחְבִּימַת פֶּתִי making wise simplicity, or the simple, lit., openness, the open (root פֶּתַח to spread out, open,

Indo-Germ. *prat*, *πετ*, *pat*, *pad*), i.e., easily led astray; to such an one it gives a solid basis and stability, *σοφίξει αὐτόν*, 2Ti. 3:15. The Law divides into *פְּקוּדִים*, precepts or declarations concerning man's obligation; these are *יְשָׁרִים*, straight or upright, as a *norma normata*, because they proceed from the upright, absolutely good will of God, and as a *norma normans* they lead along a straight way in the right track. They are therefore *מְשַׁמְחֵי לֵב*, their educative guidance, taking one as it were by the hand, frees one from all tottering, satisfies a moral want, and preserves a joyous consciousness of being in the right way towards the right goal. *מִצְוַת יְהוָה*, Jahve's statute (from *צָוָה* *statuere*), is the tenour of His commandments. The statute is a lamp — it is said in Pro. 6:23 — and the law a light. So here: it is *בְּרָה*, clear, like the light of the sun (Son. 6:10), and its light is imparted to other objects: *מְאִירַת עֵינַיִם*, enlightening the eyes, which refers not merely to the enlightening of the understanding, but of one's whole condition; it makes the mind clear, and body as well as mind healthy and fresh, for the darkness of the eyes is sorrow, melancholy, and bewilderment. In this chain of names for the Law, *יְרֵאת ה'* is not the fear of God as an act performed, but as a precept, it is what God's revelation demands, effects, and maintains; so that it is the revealed way in which God is to be feared (Psa. 34:12), — in short, it is the religion of Jahve (cf. Pro. 15:33 with Deu. 17:19). This is *טְהוֹרָה*, clean, pure, as the word which is like to pure gold, by which it is taught, Psa. 12: 7, cf. Job. 28:19; and therefore *עֹמֶדֶת לְאָדָם*, enduring for ever in opposition to all false forms of reverencing God, which carry their own condemnation in themselves. *ה'* *מִשְׁפָּטֵי* are the *jura* of the Law as a *corpus juris divini*, everything that is right and constitutes right according to the decision of Jahve. These judgments are *אֱמֻנָה*, truth, which endures and verifies itself; because, in distinction from most others and those outside Israel, they have an unchangeable moral foundation: *צְדָקוֹ יַחְדָּו*, i.e., they are *צְדִיקִים*, in accordance with right and appropriate (Deu. 4: 8), altogether, because no reproach of inappositeness and sanctioned injustice or wrong clings to them. The eternal will of God has attained a relatively perfect form and development in the Law of Jahve according to the standard set up as the law of the nation.

*Psa. 19:11-15*. With *הִנְחָמְדִים* (for which, preferring a simple *Shebâ* with the gutturals, Ben-Naphtali writes *הִנְחָמְדִים*) the poet sums up the characteristics enumerated; the article is summative, as in *הַשְּׁשִׁי* at the close of the hexahemeron, Gen. 1:31. *כֶּפֶז* is the finest purified gold, cf. 1Ki. 10:18 with 2Ch. 9:17. *נֶפֶת צוּפִים* “the discharge (from *נפת* = Arab. *nft*) of the honeycombs” is the virgin honey, i.e., the honey that flows of itself out of the

cells. To be desired are the revealed words of God, to him who possesses them as an outward possession; and to him who has received them inwardly they are sweet. The poet, who is himself conscious of being a servant of God, and of striving to act as such, makes use of these words for the end for which they are revealed: he is **נִזְהָר**, one who suffers himself to be enlightened, instructed, and warned by them. **גַּם** belongs to **נִזְהָר** (according to the usual arrangement of the words, e.g., Hos. 6:11), just as in v. 14 it belongs to **חֲשֵׁךְ**. He knows that **בְּשִׂמְרָם** (with a subjective suffix in an objective sense, cf. Pro. 25: 7, just as we may also say:) in their observance is, or is included, great reward. **עֵקֶב** is that which follows upon one's heels (**עֵקֶב**), or comes immediately after anything, and is used here of the result of conduct. Thus, then, inasmuch as the Law is not only a copy of the divine will, but also a mirror of self-knowledge, in which a man may behold and come to know himself, he prays for forgiveness in respect of the many sins of infirmity, — though for the most part unperceived by him, — to which, even the pardoned one succumbs. **שִׁנְיָאָה** (in the terminology of the Law, **שִׁנְיָגָה**, **ἀγνοήμα**) comprehends the whole province of the peccatum involuntarium, both the peccatum ignorantiae and the peccatum infirmitatis. The question *delicta quis intelligit* is equivalent to the negative clause: no one can discern his faults, on account of the heart of man being unfathomable and on account of the disguise, oftentimes so plausible, and the subtlety of sin. Hence, as an inference, follows the prayer: pronounce me free also **מִמְסִתְרוֹת**, *ab occultis* (*peccatis*, which, however, cannot be supplied on grammatical grounds), equivalent to **מֵעֲלָמִים** (Psa. 90: 8), i.e., all those sins, which even he, who is most earnestly striving after sanctification, does not discern, although he may desire to know them, by reason of the ever limited nature of his knowledge both of himself and of sin.

f132

**נִקְיָה**, **δικαιοσύνη**, is a *vox judicialis*, to declare innocent, pronounce free from, to let go unpunished. The prayer for justification is followed in v. 14 by the prayer for sanctification, and indeed for preservation against deliberate sins. From **זוֹד**, **זִיד**, to seethe, boil over, *Hiph.* to sin wilfully, deliberately, insolently, — *opp.* of sin arising from infirmity, Exo. 21:14, Deu. 18:22; 17:12, — is formed **זִיד** an insolent sinner, one who does not sin **בְּשִׁנְיָגָה**, but **בְּזָדוֹן** (cf. 1Sa. 17:28, where David's brethren bring this reproach against him), or **בְּיַד רָמָה**, and the neuter collective **זִידִים** (cf. **סְטִיִּים**, 101: 3, Hos. 5: 2) *peccata proaeretica* or *contra conscientiam*, which cast one out of the state of grace or favour, Num. 15:27-31. For if **זִידִים** had been intended of arrogant and insolent possessors of power (Ewald), the prayer would have taken some other form than that of “keeping back” (**חֲשֵׁךְ** as in 1Sa. 25:39 in the mouth of

David). זָדִים, presumptuous sins, when they are repeated, become dominant sins, which irresistibly enslave the man (מַשְׁלָה with a non-personal subject, as in Isa. 3: 4b, cf. Psa. 103:19); hence the last member of the climax (which advances from the *peccatum involuntarium* to the *proaereticum*, and from this to the *regnans*): let them not have dominion over me (בִּי with *Dechî* in Baer; generally wrongly marked with *Munach*).

Then (אָ), when Thou bestowest this twofold favour upon me, the favour of pardon and the grace of preservation, shall I be blameless (אִתָּם 1 fut. Kal, instead of אָתָם, with ׀ as a characteristic of ē) and absolved (וְנִקִּיתִי not *Piel*, as in v. 13, but *Niph.*, to be made pure, absolved) from great transgression.

פָּשַׁע <sup>f133</sup>

from פָּשַׁע (root פָּח), to spread out, go beyond the bounds, break through, trespass, is a collective name for deliberate and reigning, dominant sin, which breaks through man's relation of favour with God, and consequently casts him out of favour, — in one word, for apostasy. Finally, the psalmist supplicates a gracious acceptance of his prayer, in which both mouth and heart accord, supported by the faithfulness, stable as the rock (צוּרִי), and redeeming love (גּוֹאֲלִי *redemptor, vindex*, root גָּל, חָל, to loose, redeem) of his God. לְרִצּוֹן לְפָנֶיךָ is a standing expression of the sacrificial *tôra*, e.g., Lev. 1: 3 f. The לְרִצּוֹן, which, according to Exo. 28:38, belongs to לְרִצּוֹן, stands in the second member in accordance with the “parallelism by postponement.” Prayer is a sacrifice offered by the inner man. The heart meditates and fashions it; and the mouth presents it, by uttering that which is put into the form of words.

## Psalm 20

### PRAYER FOR THE KING IN TIME OF WAR

*20: 2 JAHVE answer thee in the day of distress,  
The name of the God of Jacob set thee up on high,*

*20: 3 Send thee help from the sanctuary,  
And uphold thee out of Zion!*

*20: 4 Remember all thy meat-offerings,  
And graciously accept thy burnt offerings! (Sela).*

*20: 5 Give thee according to thine own heart,  
And fulfil all thy counsel!*

*20: 6 We will shout for joy because of Thy help,  
And in the name of our God will we raise our banners —  
Jahve fulfil all thy wishes.*

*20: 7 Now know I that Jahve giveth help to His Anointed;  
He will answer him from His holy heaven  
With the helpful mighty deeds of His right hand.*

*20: 8 Some [praise] chariots and some horses,  
And we, we praise the name of Jahve, our God.*

*20: 9 If those have bowed down and fallen,  
Then we have risen up and stand firm.*

*20:10 Jahve, Oh help the king! —  
May He hear us in the day we call.*

To Psalm 19 is closely attached Psalm 20, because its commencement is as it were the echo of the prayer with which the former closes; and to Psalm 20 is closely attached Psalm 21, because both Psalms refer to the same event relatively, as prayer and thanksgiving. Psalm 20 is an intercessory psalm of the nation, and Psalm 21 a thanksgiving psalm of the nation, on behalf of its king. It is clearly manifest that the two Psalms form a pair, being connected by unity of author and subject. They both open somewhat uniformly with a synonymous parallelism of the members, Psa. 20: 2-6; 21: 2-8; they then increase in fervour and assume a more vivid colouring as they come to speak of the foes of the king and the empire, Psa. 20: 7-9; 21: 9-13; and they both close with an ejaculatory cry to Jahve, Psa. 20:10; 21:14. In both, the king is apostrophised through the course of the several verses, Psa. 20: 2-6; 21: 9-13; and here and there this is done in a way that provokes the question whether the words are not rather addressed to Jahve, Psa. 20: 6; 21:10. In both Psalms the king is referred to by **הַמֶּלֶךְ**, Psa. 20:10; 21: 8; both comprehend the goal of the desires in the word **יְשׁוּעָה**, Psa. 20: 6, cf. 7, 21: 2, 6; both delight in rare forms of expression, which are found only in these instances in the whole range of Old Testament literature, viz., **נִדְגַל** Psa. 20: 6, **נִתְעַדַּד** Psa. 20: 9, **אֲרֻשֶׁת** Psa. 21: 3, **תַּחֲדָהוּ**, Psa. 21: 7.

If, as the **לְדָוִד** indicates, they formed part of the oldest Davidic Psalter, then it is notwithstanding more probable that their author is a contemporary poet, than that it is David himself. For, although both as to form of expression (cf. Psa. 21:12 with Psa. 10: 2) and as to thoughts (cf. Psa. 21: 7 with Psa. 16:11), they exhibit some points of contact with Davidic Psalms, they still stand isolated by their peculiar character. But that David is their subject, as the inscription **לְדָוִד**, and their position in the midst of the Davidic Psalms, lead one to expect, is capable of confirmation. During the time of the Syro-

Ammonitish war comes David's deep fall, which in itself and in its consequences made him sick both in soul and in body. It was not until he was again restored to God's favour out of this self-incurred peril, that he went to his army which lay before Rabbath Ammon, and completed the conquest of the royal city of the enemy. The most satisfactory explanation of the situation referred to in this couplet of Psalms is to be gained from 2Sa. 11, 12. Psalm 20 prays for the recovery of the king, who is involved in war with powerful foes; and Psalm 21 gives thanks for his recovery, and wishes him a victorious issue to the approaching campaign. The "chariots and horses" (Psa. 20: 8) are characteristic of the military power of Aram (2Sa. 10:18, and frequently), and in 21: 4 and 10 we perceive an allusion to 2Sa. 12:30, 31, or at least a remarkable agreement with what is there recorded.

*Psa. 20: 2-6.* Litany for the king in distress, who offers sacrifices for himself in the sanctuary. The futures in vv. 2-5, standing five times at the head of the climactic members of the parallelism, are optatives. **יְמֵלֵא**, v. 6, also continues the chain of wishes, of which even **נִרְנְנָה** (cf. Psa. 69:15) forms one of the links. The wishes of the people accompany both the prayer and the sacrifice. "The Name of the God of Jacob" is the self-manifesting power and grace of the God of Israel. **עֶקֶב** is used in poetry interchangeably with **יִשְׂרָאֵל**, just like **אֱלֹהִים** with **יְהוָה**. *Alshêch* refers to Gen. 35: 3; and it is not improbable that the desire moulds itself after the fashion of the record of the fact there handed down to us. May Jahve, who, as the history of Jacob shows, hears (and answers) in the day of distress, hear the king; may the Name of the God of Jacob bear him away from his foes to a triumphant height. **שָׁנַב** alternates with **רוֹמַם** (Psa. 18:49) in this sense. This intercession on the behalf of the praying one is made in the sanctuary on the heights of Zion, where Jahve sits enthroned. May He send him succour from thence, like auxiliary troops that decide the victory. The king offers sacrifice. He offers sacrifice according to custom before the commencement of the battle (1Sa. 13: 9 f., and cf. the phrase **קָדַשׁ מִלְחָמָה**), a whole burnt-offering and at the same time a meat or rather meal offering also, **מִנְחֹת**; <sup>f134</sup> for every whole offering and every *shelamim*- or peace-offering had a meat-offering and a drink-offering as its indispensable accompaniment. The word **זָכַר** is perfectly familiar in the ritual of the meal-offering. That portion of the meal-offering, only a part of which was placed upon the altar (to which, however, according to traditional practice, does not belong the accompanying meal-offering of the **מִנְחַת נֹסְכִים**, which was entirely devoted to the altar), which ascended with the altar fire is called **אֲזִכָּרָה**, **μνημόσυνον** (cf. Act. 10: 4), that which brings to remembrance with God him for whom it is offered up (not "incense," as Hupfeld renders it); for



the designation of the offering of jealousy, Num. 5:15, as “bringing iniquity to remembrance before God” shows, that in the meal-offering ritual **זָבַח** retains the very same meaning that it has in other instances. Every meal-offering is in a certain sense a **מִנְחַת זָבָחוֹן**. Hence here the prayer that Jahve would graciously remember them is combined with the meal-offerings.

As regards the *‘olah*, the wish “let fire from heaven (Lev. 9:24, 1Ki. 18:38, 1Ch. 21:26) turn it to ashes,” would not be vain. But the language does not refer to anything extraordinary; and in itself the consumption of the offering to ashes (Böttcher) is no mark of gracious acceptance. Moreover, as a denominative from **דָּשַׁן**, fat ashes, **דָּשַׁן** means “to clean from ashes,” and not: to turn into ashes. On the other hand, **דָּשַׁן** also signifies “to make fat,” 23: 5, and this effective signification is applied declaratively in this instance: may He find thy burnt-offering fat, which is equivalent to: may it be to Him a **נִיחֹחַ** **רִיחַ** [an odour of satisfaction, a sweet-smelling savour]. The voluntative *ah* only occurs here and in Job. 11:17 (which see) and Isa. 5:19, in the 3 *pers.*; and in this instance, just as with the cohortative in 1Sa. 28:15, we have a change of the lengthening into a sharpening of the sound (cf. the exactly similar change of forms in 1Sa. 28:15, Isa. 59: 5, Zec. 5: 4, Pro. 24:14, Eze. 25:13) as is very frequently the case in **מָה** for **מַה**. The alteration to **יְדִשְׁנָה** or **יְדִשְׁנָה** (Hitzig) is a felicitous but needless way of getting rid of the rare form. The explanation of the intensifying of the music here is, that the intercessory song of the choir is to be simultaneous with the presentation upon the altar (**הַקְטֹרֶת**). **עֲצָה** is the resolution formed in the present wartime. “Because of thy salvation,” i.e., thy success in war, is, as all the language is here, addressed to the king, cf. Psal. 21: 2, where it is addressed to Jahve, and intended of the victory accorded to him. It is needless to read **בְּנִדָּל** instead of **נִדָּל**, after the rendering of the LXX **μεγαλυνθῆσόμεθα**. **נִדָּל** is a denominative from **דָּגַל**: to wave a banner. In the closing line, the rejoicing of hope goes back again to the present and again assumes the form of an intercessory desire.

**Psa. 20: 7-9.** While vv. 2-6 were being sung the offering of the sacrifice was probably going on. Now, after a lengthened pause, there ascends a voice, probably the voice of one of the Levites, expressing the cheering assurance of the gracious acceptance of the offering that has been presented by the priest. With **וַאֲתָה** or **וַאֲתָה**, the usual word to indicate the turning-point, the instantaneous entrance of the result of some previous process of prolonged duration, whether hidden or manifest (e.g., 1Ki. 17:24, Isa. 29:22), is introduced. **הוֹשִׁיא** is the perfect of faith, which, in the certainty of being answered, realises the fulfilment in anticipation. The exuberance of the

language in v. 7 corresponds to the exuberance of feeling which thus finds expression.

In v. 3 the answer is expected out of Zion, in the present instance it is looked for from God's holy heavens; for the God who sits enthroned in Zion is enthroned for ever in the heavens. His throne on earth is as it were the vestibule of His heavenly throne; His presence in the sanctuary of Israel is no limitation of His omnipresence; His help out of Zion is the help of the Celestial One and Him who is exalted above the heaven of heavens. **נְבוֹרֹת** does not here mean the fulness of might (cf. Psa. 90:10), but the displays of power (Psa. 106: 2; 145: 4; 150: 2, Isa. 63:15), by which His right hand procures salvation, i.e., victory, for the combatant. The glory of Israel is totally different from that of the heathen, which manifests itself in boastful talk. In v. 8a **הַזְכִּירוּ** or **זְכִּירוּ** must be supplied from the **נִזְכָּר** in v. 8b (LXX **μεγαλυνθησόμεθα** = **נְבוֹר**, Psa. 12: 5); **הַזְכִּיר**, to make laudatory mention of any matter, to extol, and indirectly therefore to take credit to one's self for it, to boast of it (cf. **הִלֵּל**, Psa. 44: 9). According to the Law Israel was forbidden to have any standing army; and the law touching the king (Deu. 17:16) speaks strongly against his keeping many horses. It was also the same under the judges, and at this time under David; but under Solomon, who acquired for himself horses and chariots in great number (1Ki. 10:26-29), it was very different. It is therefore a confession that must belong to the time of David which is here made in v. 8, viz., that Israel's glory in opposition to their enemies, especially the Syrians, is the sure defence and protection of the Name of their God alone. The language of David to Goliath is very similar, 1Sa. 17:45. The preterites in v. 9 are *praet. confidentiae*. It is, as Luther says, "a song of triumph before the victory, a shout of joy before succour." Since **קָם** does not mean to stand, but to rise, **קָמְנִי** assumes the present superiority of the enemy. But the position of affairs changes: those who stand fall, and those who are lying down rise up; the former remain lying, the latter keep the field. The *Hithpa.* **הִתְעוֹדַד** signifies to show one's self firm, strong, courageous; like **עוֹדַד**, Psa. 146: 9; 147: 6, to strengthen, confirm, recover, from **עוֹד** to be compact, firm, cogn. Arab. *âdf*. i., inf. *aid*, strength; as, e.g., the Koran (*Sur.* xxxviii. 16) calls David *dhâ-l-aidi*, possessor of strength, II *ajjada*, to strengthen, support, and Arab. 'dd, inf. *add*, strength superiority, V *taaddada*, to show one's self strong, brave, courageous.

**Psa. 20:10.** After this solo voice, the chorus again come on. The song is closed, as it was opened, by the whole congregation; and is rounded off by recurring to its primary note, praying for the accomplishment of that which is sought and pledged. The accentuation construes **הַמֶּלֶךְ** with **יַעֲנֵנוּ** as its

subject, perhaps in consideration of the fact, that הוֹשִׁיעָה is not usually followed by a governed object, and because thus a medium is furnished for the transition from address to direct assertion. But if in a Psalm, the express object of which is to supplicate salvation for the king, הוֹשִׁיעָה הַמֶּלֶךְ stand side by side, then, in accordance with the connection, הַמֶּלֶךְ must be treated as the object; and more especially since Jahve is called מֶלֶךְ רַב in Psa. 48: 3, and the like, but never absolutely הַמֶּלֶךְ. Wherefore it is, with Hupfeld, Hitzig, and others, to be rendered according to the LXX and Vulgate, *Domine salvum fac regem*. The New Testament cry Ὁσαυτὰ τῷ ὑἱῷ Δαυὶδ is a peculiar application of this Davidic “God bless the king (God save the king),” which is brought about by means of Psa. 118:25. The closing line, v. 10*b*, is an expanded Amen.

## Psalm 21

### THANKSGIVING FOR THE KING IN TIME OF WAR

*21: 2 JAHVE, on account of Thy strength is the king glad,  
And on account of Thy succour how greatly doth he rejoice!*

*21: 3 The wish of his heart hast Thou granted him,  
And the desire of his lips hast Thou not refused. (Sela)*

*21: 4 For Thou dost meet him bringing blessings of good,  
Thou settest upon his head a crown of fine gold.*

*21: 5 He asked life of Thee, — Thou grantedst it to him,  
Length of days, for ever and ever.*

*21: 6 Great is his glory through Thy help,  
Praise and glory dost Thou lay upon him.*

*21: 7 For Thou makest him blessings for ever,  
Thou dost delight him with joy in Thy presence.*

*21: 8 For the king trusted in Jahve,  
And through the favour of the  
Most High he shall not be moved.*

*21: 9 Thy hand will reach to all thine enemies  
Thy right hand will reach all those that hate thee.*

*21:10 Thou shalt make them as a fiery oven, when thou art angry,  
Jahve in His wrath shall swallow them up,  
and a fire shall devour them.*

*21:11 Their fruit shalt thou destroy from the earth,  
And their seed from among the children of men.*

*21:12 For they intend evil against thee,  
They devise mischief: they shall accomplish nothing.*

*21:13 For thou wilt make them turn back,  
With thy strings wilt thou aim at their faces.*

*21:14 Be Thou exalted, Jahve, in Thy might;  
We will celebrate with voice and harp Thy strength.*

“*Jahve fulfil all thy desires*” cried the people in the preceding Psalm, as they interceded on behalf of their king; and in this Psalm they are able thankfully to say to God “*the desire of his heart hast Thou granted.*” In both Psalms the people come before God with matters that concern the welfare of their king; in the former, with their wishes and prayers, in the latter, their thanksgivings and hopes in the latter as in the former when in the midst of war, but in the latter after the recovery of the king, in the certainty of a victorious termination of the war.

The Targum and the Talmud, *B. Succa 52a*, understand this 21st Psalm of the king Messiah. Rashi remarks that this Messianic interpretation ought rather to be given up for the sake of the Christians. But even the Christian exposition cannot surely mean to hold fast this interpretation so directly and rigidly as formerly. This pair of Psalm treats of David; David’s cause, however, in its course towards a triumphant issue — a course leading through suffering — is certainly figuratively the cause of Christ.

*Psa. 21: 2-3.* The Psalm begins with thanksgiving for the bodily and spiritual blessings which Jahve has bestowed and still continues to bestow upon the king, in answer to his prayer. This occupies the three opening tetrastichs, of which these verses form the first. עֲזָ (whence עֲזָדָ, as in Psa. 74:13, together with עֲזָדָ, Psa. 63: 3, and frequently) is the power that has been made manifest in the king, which has turned away his affliction; יְשׁוּעָה is the help from above which has freed him out of his distress. The מִזָּה, which follows the מִזָּה of the exclamation, is naturally shortened by the *Kerî* into יָגַל (with the retreat of the tone); cf. on the contrary Pro. 20:24, where מִזָּה is interrogative and, according to the sense, negative). The ἄπ. λεγ. אֲרֵשֶׁת has the signification eager desire, according to the connection, the LXX δέησιν, and the perhaps also cognate רוּשׁ, to be poor; the Arabic Arab. *wrṣ*, *avidum esse*, must be left out of consideration according to the laws of the interchange of consonants, whereas נִרְשׁ, Arab. *wrt*, *capere*, *captare* (cf. Arab. *irt* = *wirt* an inheritance), but not רוּשׁ (vid., Psa. 34:11), belongs apparently to the same root. Observe the strong negation כֹּל: no, thou hast not denied, but done the very opposite.

The fact of the music having to strike up here favours the supposition, that the occasion of the Psalm is the fulfilment of some public, well-known prayer.

*Psa. 21: 4-5.* “Blessings of good” (Pro. 24:25) are those which consist of good, i.e., true good fortune. The verb **קָדַם**, because used of the favour which meets and presents one with some blessing, is construed with a double accusative, after the manner of verbs of putting on and bestowing (*Ges.* § 139). Since v. 4b cannot be intended to refer to David’s first coronation, but to the preservation and increase of the honour of his kingship, this particularisation of v. 4a sounds like a prediction of what is recorded in 2Sa. 22:30: after the conquest of the Ammonitish royal city Rabbah David set the Ammonitish crown (**עֲטָרֶת**), which is renowned for the weight of its gold and its ornamentation with precious stones, upon his head. David was then advanced in years, and in consequence of heavy guilt, which, however, he had overcome by penitence and laying hold on the mercy of God, was come to the brink of the grave. He, worthy of death, still lived; and the victory over the Syro-Ammonitish power was a pledge to him of God’s faithfulness in fulfilling his promises. It is contrary to the tenour of the words to say that v. 5b does not refer to length of life, but to hereditary succession to the throne. To wish any one that he may live **לְעוֹלָם**, and especially a king, is a usual thing, 1Ki. 1:31, and frequently. The meaning is, may the life of the king be prolonged to an indefinitely distant day. What the people have desired elsewhere, they here acknowledge as bestowed upon the king.

*Psa. 21: 6-7.* The help of God turns to his honour, and paves the way for him to honour, it enables him — this is the meaning of v. 6b — to maintain and strengthen his kingship with fame and glory. **שָׁנָה אֵל** used, as in Psa. 89:20, of divine investiture and endowment. To make blessings, or a fulness of blessing, is a stronger form of expressing God’s words to Abram, Gen. 12: 2: thou shalt be a blessing i.e., a possessor of blessing thyself, and a medium of blessing to others. Joy in connection with (**אֵל** as in Psa. 16:11) the countenance of God, is joy in delightful and most intimate fellowship with Him. **חָדַדְהָ**, from **חָדַד**, which occurs once in Exo. 18: 9, has in Arabic, with reference to nomad life, the meaning “to cheer the beasts of burden with a song and urge them on to a quicker pace,” and in Hebrew, as in Aramaic, the general signification “to cheer, enliven.”

*Psa. 21: 8-9.* With this strophe the second half of the Psalm commences. The address to God is now changed into an address to the king; not, however, expressive of the wishes, but of the confident expectation, of the speakers. Hengstenberg rightly regards v. 8 as the transition to the second half; for by its objective utterance concerning the king and God, it separates the language

hitherto addressed to God, from the address to the king, which follows. We do not render v. 8b: and [trusting] in the favour of the Most High — he shall not be moved; the mercy is the response of the trust, which (trust) does not suffer him to be moved; on the expression, cf. Pro. 10:30. This inference is now expanded in respect to the enemies who desire to cause him to totter and fall. So far from any tottering, he, on the contrary, makes a victorious assault upon his foes. If the words had been addressed to Jahve, it ought, in order to keep up the connection between vv. 9 and 8, at least to have been **שָׁנְאוּ** and **אֵיבָיו** (his, i.e., the king's, enemies). What the people now hope on behalf of their king, they here express beforehand in the form of a prophecy. **לְמַצָּא לְ** (as in Isa. 10:10) and **מַצָּא seq. acc.** (as in 1Sa. 23:17) are distinguished as: to reach towards, or up to anything, and to reach anything, attain it. Supposing **לְ** to represent the accusative, as e.g., in Psa. 69: 6, v. 9b would be a useless repetition.

**Psa. 21:10-11.** Hitherto the Psalm has moved uniformly in synonymous dipodia, now it becomes agitated; and one feels from its excitement that the foes of the king are also the people's foes. True as it is, as Hupfeld takes it, that **לְעֵת פְּנִיךָ** sounds like a direct address to Jahve, v. 10b nevertheless as truly teaches us quite another rendering. The destructive effect, which in other passages is said to proceed from the face of Jahve, 34:17, Lev. 20: 6, Lam. 4:16 (cf. **ἔχει θεὸς ἐκδικτικὸν ὄμμα**), is here ascribed to the face, i.e., the personal appearing (2Sa. 17:11) of the king. David's arrival did actually decide the fall of Rabbath Ammon, of whose inhabitants some died under instruments of torture and others were cast into brick-kilns, 2Sa. 12:26 ff. The prospect here moulds itself according to this fate of the Ammonites. **בְּתֵנּוֹר אֵשׁ** is a second accusative to **תַּשְׁוִתְמוּ**, thou wilt make them like a furnace of fire, i.e., a burning furnace, so that like its contents they shall entirely consume by fire (*synecdoche continentis pro contento*). The figure is only hinted at, and is differently applied to what it is in Lam. 5:10, Mal. 3:19. V. 10a and 10b are intentionally two long rising and falling wave-like lines, to which succeed, in v. 11, two short lines; the latter describe the peaceful gleaning after the fiery judgment of God that has been executed by the hand of David. **פְּרִימוֹ**, as in Lam. 2:20, Hos. 9:16, is to be understood after the analogy of the expression **פְּרִי הַבְּטָן**. It is the fate of the Amalekites (cf. 9: 6 f.), which is here predicted of the enemies of the king.

**Psa. 21:12-13.** And this fate is the merited frustration of their evil project. The construction of the sentences in v. 12 is like 27:10; 119:83; Ew. § 362, b. **נָטָה רָעָה** is not to be understood according to the phrase **נָטָה רָשָׁת (= פְּרָשׁ)**, for this phrase is not actually found; we have rather, with Hitzig, to compare

Psa. 55: 4, 2Sa. 15:14: to incline evil down upon any one is equivalent to: to put it over him, so that it may fall in upon him. נָטָה signifies “to extend lengthwise,” to unfold, but also to bend by drawing tight. שִׁית שָׁבֵם to make into a back, i.e., to make them into such as turn the back to you, is a more choice expression than נָתַן עֲרָף, Psa. 18:41, cf. 1Sa. 10: 9; the half segolate form שָׁבֵם, (= שָׁבֵם) becomes here, in pause, the full segolate form שָׁבֵם. חַצִּים must be supplied as the object to תִּכְוֶיֶן, as it is in other instances after הִנָּה, הַשְּׁלִיךְ, הָרָה; בּוֹנֵן חֵץ, Psa. 11: 2, cf. 7:14, signifies to set the swift arrow upon the bow-string (מִיתָר = יָתֵר) = to aim. The arrows hit the front of the enemy, as the pursuer overtakes them.

*Psa. 21:14.* After the song has spread abroad its wings in twice three tetrastichs, it closes by, as it were, soaring aloft and thus losing itself in a distich. It is a cry to God for victory in battle, on behalf of the king. “Be Thou exalted,” i.e., manifest Thyself in Thy supernal (Psa. 57: 6, 12) and judicial (Psa. 7: 7 f.) sovereignty. What these closing words long to see realised is that Jahve should reveal for world-wide conquest this גְּבוּרָה, to which everything that opposes Him must yield, and it is for this they promise beforehand a joyous gratitude.

## Psalm 22

### ELI ELI LAMA ASABTANI

*22: 2 MY God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?!  
Far from my help is my entreating cry,*

*22: 3 O my God, I cry in the daytime, but Thou answerest not,  
And in the night season, but I have no rest.*

*22: 4 Yet Thou art holy, sitting enthroned above the praises of Israel.*

*22: 5 In Thee our fathers trusted,  
They trusted, and Thou didst deliver them.*

*22: 6 Unto Thee they cried and were freed,  
In Thee trusting, they were not put to shame.*

*22: 7 But I am a worm, and not a man;  
A reproach of men and despised of the people.*

*22: 8 All they that see me laugh me to scorn;  
They shoot out the lip, they shake the head:*

*22: 9 “Roll it upon Jahve — let Him deliver him,  
“Let Him rescue him, when He delighteth in him.”*

*22:10 Yea Thou art He that took me out of the womb  
That inspired me with trust at my mother's breasts.*

*22:11 On Thee was I cast from my birth,  
From my mother's womb Thou art my God.*

*22:12 Be not far from me, for trouble is near,  
For there is no helper at hand.*

*22:13 Mighty bulls have compassed me,  
Strong ones of Bashan have beset me round.*

*22:14 They open their mouth against me —  
A lion ravening and roaring.*

*22:15 Like water am I poured out,  
And out of joint are all my bones.  
My heart is become like wax,  
Melted in the midst of my bowels.*

*22:16 Dried up like a potsherd is my strength,  
And my tongue cleaveth to my jaws,  
And Thou layest me in the dust of death.*

*22:17 For dogs have compassed me,  
A band of wicked men encircles me,  
Like a lion, my hands and my feet.*

*22:18 I can count all my bones,  
They look, they stare upon me.*

*22:19 They part my garments among them,  
And upon my vesture they cast lots.*

*22:20 And Thou, Jahve, remain not afar off!  
My strength, haste Thee to help me!*

*22:21 Rescue my soul from the sword,  
My only one from the paw of the dog.*

*22:22 Save me from the lion's jaws,  
And from the horns of the antilopes  
— Thou wilt answer me.*

*22:23 I will declare Thy name among my brethren,  
In the midst of the congregation will I praise Thee:*

*22:24 "Ye that fear Jahve, praise Him;  
"All ye the seed of Jacob, glorify Him,  
"And stand in awe of Him, all ye seed of Israel!"*



*22:25 “For He hath not despised nor  
abhorred the affliction of the afflicted,  
“Neither hath He hid His face from him,  
“And when he cried, He hath hearkened to him.”*

*22:26 From Thee cometh my praise in the great congregation —  
My vows will I pay before them that fear Him.*

*22:27 The meek shall eat and be satisfied,  
They shall praise Jahve that seek Him:  
“Let your heart refresh itself for ever!”*

*22:28 Remember and turn unto Jahve  
shall all the ends of the earth,  
And all the families of the nations  
shall bow down before Thee.*

*22:29 For Jahve’s is the kingship  
and He ruleth among the nations.*

*22:30 All the thriving of the earth shall eat and bow down,  
Before Him shall all they that go down  
to the dust sink down and they that cannot prolong their life.*

*22:31 A seed shall serve Him: it shall be told  
to the generation concerning the Lord;*

*22:32 They shall come and declare His righteousness  
to a future people, that He hath finished it.*

We have here a plaintive Psalm, whose deep complaints, out of the midst of the most humiliating degradation and most fearful peril, stand in striking contrast to the cheerful tone of Psalm 21 — starting with a disconsolate cry of anguish, it passes on to a trustful cry for help, and ends in vows of thanksgiving and a vision of world-wide results, which spring from the deliverance of the sufferer. In no Psalm do we trace such an accumulation of the most excruciating outward and inward suffering pressing upon the complainant, in connection the most perfect innocence. In this respect Psalm 69 is its counterpart; but it differs from it in this particular, that there is not a single sound of imprecation mingled with its complaints.

It is David, who here struggles upward out of the gloomiest depth to such a bright height. It is a Davidic Psalm belonging to the time of the persecution by Saul. Ewald brings it down to the time preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, and Bauer to the time of the Exile. Ewald says it is not now possible to trace the poet more exactly. And Maurer closes by saying: *illue unum equidem pro certo habeo, fuisse vatem hominem opibus praeditum atque illustrem, qui magna auctoritate valeret non solum apud suos, verum etiam apud barbaros.*

Hitzig persists in his view, that Jeremiah composed the first portion when cast into prison as an apostate, and the second portion in the court of the prison, when placed under this milder restraint. And according to Olshausen, even here again, the whole is appropriate to the time of the Maccabees. But it seems to us to be confirmed at every point, that David, who was so persecuted by Saul, is the author. The cry of prayer אֱלֹהֵי תַרְחַק (Psa. 22:12, 20; 35:22; 38:22, borrowed in Psa. 71:12); the name given to the soul, יְחִידָה (Psa. 22:21; 35:17); the designation of quiet and resignation by דּוֹמִיָּה (Psa. 22: 3; 39: 3; 62: 2, cf. 65: 2), are all regarded by us, since we do not limit the genuine Davidic Psalms to Psalm ch. 3-19 as Hitzig does, as Davidic idioms. Moreover, there is no lack of points of contact in other respects with genuine old Davidic hymns (cf. Psa. 22:30 with Psa. 28: 1, those that go down to the dust, to the grave; then in later Psalms as in Psa. 143: 7, in Isaiah and Ezekiel), and more especially those belonging to the time of Saul, as Psalm 69 (cf. Psa. 22:27 with Psa. 69:33) and 59 (cf. Psa. 22:17 with Psa. 59:15). To the peculiar characteristics of the Psalms of this period belong the figures taken from animals, which are heaped up in the Psalm before us. The fact that Psalm 22 is an ancient Davidic original is also confirmed by the parallel passages in the later literature of the *Shîr* (Psa. 71: 5 f. taken from 22:10 f.; Psa. 102:18 f. in imitation 22:25, 31 f.), of the *Chokma* (Pro. 16: 3, גַּל אֱלֹהֵי taken from Psa. 22: 9; 37: 5), and of prophecy (Isaiah, Isa. 49, 53; Jeremiah, in Lam. 4: 4; cf. Psa. 22:15, and many other similar instances). In spite of these echoes in the later literature there are still some expressions that remain unique in the Psalm and are not found elsewhere, as the hapaxlegomena אֲנִלּוֹת and עֲנוּת. Thus, then, we entertain no doubts respecting the truth of the לְדוֹד. David speaks in this Psalm, — he and not any other, and that out of his own inmost being. In accordance with the nature of lyric poetry, the Psalm has grown up on the soil of his individual life and his individual sensibilities.

There is also in reality in the history of David, when persecuted by Saul, a situation which may have given occasion to the lifelike picture drawn in this Psalm, viz., 1Sa. 23:25 f. The detailed circumstances of the distress at that time are not known to us, but they certainly did not coincide with the rare and terrible sufferings depicted in this Psalm in such a manner that these can be regarded as an historically faithful and literally exact copy of those circumstances; cf. on the other hand Psalm 17 which was composed at the same period. To just as slight a degree have the prospects, which he connects in this Psalm with his deliverance, been realised in David's own life. On the other hand, the first portion exactly coincides with the sufferings of Jesus Christ, and the second with the results that have sprung from His resurrection. It is the agonising situation of the Crucified One which is presented before our eyes in vv. 15-18 with such artistic faithfulness: the spreading out of the limbs

of the naked body, the torturing pain in hands and feet, and the burning thirst which the Redeemer, in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled, announced in the cry  $\delta\iota\psi\omega$ , Joh. 19:28. Those who blaspheme and those who shake their head at Him passed by His cross, Mat. 27:39, just as v. 8 says; scoffers cried out to Him: let the God in whom He trusts help Him, Mat. 27:43, just as v. 9 says; His garments were divided and lots were cast for His coat, Joh. 19:23 f., in order that v. 19 of our Psalm might be fulfilled. The fourth of the seven sayings of the dying One,  $\text{H}\lambda\lambda$ ,  $\text{H}\lambda\lambda$  κ.τ.λ., Mat. 27:46, Mar. 15:34, is the first word of our Psalm and the appropriation of the whole. And the Epistle to the Hebrews, Heb. 2:11 f., cites v. 23 as the words of Christ, to show that He is not ashamed to call them brethren, whose sanctifier God has appointed Him to be, just as the risen Redeemer actually has done, Mat. 28:10, Joh. 20:17. This has by no means exhausted the list of mutual relationships. The Psalm so vividly sets before us not merely the sufferings of the Crucified One, but also the salvation of the world arising out of His resurrection and its sacramental efficacy, that it seems more like history than prophecy, *ut non tam prophetia, quam historia videatur* (Cassiodorus). Accordingly the ancient Church regarded Christ, not David, as the speaker in this Psalm; and condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia who expounded it as contemporary history. Bakius expresses the meaning of the older Lutheran expositors when he says: *asserimus, hunc Psalmum ad literam primo, proprie et absque ulla allegoria, tropologia et ἀναγωγῇ integrum et per omnia de solo Christo exponendum esse*. Even the synagogue, so far as it recognises a suffering Messiah, hears Him speak here; and takes the “hind of the morning” as a name of the *Shechina* and as a symbol of the dawning redemption.

To ourselves, who regard the whole Psalm as the words of David, it does not thereby lose anything whatever of its prophetic character. It is a typical Psalm. The same God who communicates His thoughts of redemption to the mind of men, and there causes them to develop into the word of prophetic announcement, has also moulded the history itself into a prefiguring representation of the future deliverance; and the evidence for the truth of Christianity which is derived from this factual prophecy (*Thatweissagung*) is as grand as that derived from the verbal prediction (*Wortweissagung*). That David, the anointed of Samuel, before he ascended the throne, had to traverse a path of suffering which resembles the suffering path of Jesus, the Son of David, baptized of John, and that this typical suffering of David is embodied for us in the Psalms as in the images reflected from a mirror, is an arrangement of divine power, mercy, and wisdom. But Psalm 22 is not merely a typical Psalm. For in the very nature of the type is involved the distance between it and the antitype. In Psalm 22, however, David descends, with his complaint, into a depth that lies beyond the depth of his affliction, and rises, with his hopes, to a height that lies far beyond the height of the reward of his affliction.

In other words: the rhetorical figure hyperbole (Arab. *mubâlgat*, i.e., depiction, with colours thickly laid on), without which, in the eyes of the Semite, poetic diction would be flat and faded, is here made use of by the Spirit of God. By this Spirit the hyperbolic element is changed into the prophetic. This elevation of the typical into the prophetic is also capable of explanation on psychological grounds. Since David has been anointed with the oil of royal consecration, and at the same time with the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the kingship of promise, he regards himself also as the messiah of God, towards whom the promises point; and by virtue of this view of himself, in the light of the highest calling in connection with the redemptive history, the historical reality of his own experiences becomes idealised to him, and thereby both what he experiences and what he hopes for acquire a depth and height of background which stretches out into the history of the final and true Christ of God. We do not by this maintain any overflowing of his own consciousness to that of the future Christ, an opinion which has been shown by Hengstenberg, Tholuck and Kurtz to be psychologically impossible. But what we say is, that looking upon himself as the Christ of God, — to express it in the light of the historical fulfilment, — he looks upon himself in Jesus Christ. He does not distinguish himself from the Future One, but in himself he sees the Future One, whose image does not free itself from him till afterwards, and whose history will coincide with all that is excessive in his own utterances. For as God the Father moulds the history of Jesus Christ in accordance with His own counsel, so His Spirit moulds even the utterances of David concerning himself the type of the Future One, with a view to that history. Through this Spirit, who is the Spirit of God and of the future Christ at the same time, David's typical history, as he describes it in the Psalms and more especially in this Psalm, acquires that ideal depth of tone, brilliancy, and power, by virtue of which it (the history) reaches far beyond its typical facts, penetrates to its very root in the divine counsels, and grows to be the word of prophecy: so that, to a certain extent, it may rightly be said that Christ here speaks through David, insofar as the Spirit of Christ speaks through him, and makes the typical suffering of His ancestor the medium for the representation of His own future sufferings. Without recognising this incontestable relation of the matter Psalm 22 cannot be understood nor can we fully enter into its sentiments.

The inscription runs: *To the precentor, upon (after) the hind of the morning's dawn, a Psalm of David.* Luther, with reference to the fact that Jesus was taken in the night and brought before the Sanhedrim, renders it "*of the hind, that is early chased,*" for

*Patris Sapientia, Veritas divina,  
Deus homo captus est horâ matutinâ.*

This interpretation is certainly a well-devised improvement of the ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀντιλήψεως τῆς ἑωθινῆς of the LXX (Vulg. *pro susceptione matutina*), which is based upon a confounding of אֵילָה with אֵילוֹת (v. 20), and is thus explained by Theodoret: ἀντίληψις ἑωθινὴ ἢ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιφάνεια. Even the Midrash recalls Son. 2: 8, and the Targum the lamb of the morning sacrifice, which was offered as soon as the watchman on the pinnacle of the Temple cried: בָּרַק בְּרַקָּא (the first rays of the morning burst forth). הַשְּׁחָר אֵילָה is in fact, according to traditional definition, the early light preceding the dawn of the morning, whose first rays are likened to the horns of a hind. <sup>f135</sup>

But natural as it may be to assign to the inscription a symbolical meaning in the case of this Psalm, it certainly forms no exception to the technical meaning, in connection with the music, of the other inscriptions. And Melissus (1572) has explained it correctly “concerning the melody of a common song, whose commencement was *Ajéleth Hasháhar*, that is, The hind of the morning’s dawn.” And it may be that the choice of the melody bearing this name was designed to have reference to the glory which bursts forth in the night of affliction.

According to the course of the thoughts the Psalm falls into three divisions, vv. 2-12, 13-22, 23-32, which are of symmetrical compass, consisting of 21, 24, and 21 lines. Whether the poet has laid out a more complete strophic arrangement within these three groups or not, must remain undecided. But the seven long closing lines are detached from the third group and stand to the column of the whole, in the relation of its base.

*Psa. 22: 2-3.* In the first division, vv. 2-12, the disconsolate cry of anguish, beginning here in v. 2 with the lamentation over prolonged desertion by God, struggles through to an incipient, trustfully inclined prayer. The question beginning with לָמָּה (instead of לָמָּה before the guttural, and perhaps to make the exclamation more piercing, vid., on Psa. 6: 5; 10: 1) is not an expression of impatience and despair, but of alienation and yearning. The sufferer feels himself rejected of God; the feeling of divine wrath has completely enshrouded him; and still he knows himself to be joined to God in fear and love; his present condition belies the real nature of his relationship to God; and it is just this contradiction that urges him to the plaintive question, which comes up from the lowest depths: Why hast Thou forsaken me? But in spite of this feeling of desertion by God, the bond of love is not torn asunder; the sufferer calls God אֱלֹהֵי (my God), and urged on by the longing desire that God again would grant him to feel this love, he calls Him, אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהֵי . That complaining question: why hast Thou forsaken me? is not without example even elsewhere in the Psalms, Psa. 88:15, cf. Isa. 49:14. The forsakenness of the Crucified

One, however, is unique; and may not be judged by the standard of David or of any other sufferers who thus complain when passing through trial. That which is common to all is here, as there, this, viz., that behind the wrath that is felt, is hidden the love of God, which faith holds fast; and that he who thus complains even on account of it, is, considered in itself, not a subject of wrath, because in the midst of the feeling of wrath he keeps up his communion with God. The Crucified One is to His latest breath the Holy One of God; and the reconciliation for which He now offers himself is God's own eternal purpose of mercy, which is now being realised in the fulness of times. But inasmuch as He places himself under the judgment of God with the sin of His people and of the whole human race, He cannot be spared from experiencing God's wrath against sinful humanity as though He were himself guilty. And out of the infinite depth of this experience of wrath, which in His case rests on no mere appearance, but the sternest reality, <sup>f136</sup> comes the cry of His complaint which penetrates the wrath and reaches to God's love, ἤλι ἤλι λαμὰ σαβαχθανί, which the evangelists, omitting the additional <sup>f137</sup> *πρόσχεσ μοι*

of the LXX, render: Θεέ μου, θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες. He does not say עֲזַבְתַּנִּי, but שְׁבַקְתַּנִּי, which is the Targum word for the former. He says it in Aramaic, not in order that all may understand it, — for such a consideration was far from His mind at such a time, — but because the Aramaic was His mother tongue, for the same reason that He called God אֱלֹהִים in prayer. His desertion by God, as v. 2b says, consists in God's help and His cry for help being far asunder. שִׁשְׁאָה, prop. of the roar of the lion (Aq. βρῦχημα), is the loud cry extorted by the greatest agony, Psa. 38: 9; in this instance, however, as דְּבַרִּי shows, it is not an inarticulate cry, but a cry bearing aloft to God the words of prayer. רְחוֹק is not to be taken as an apposition of the subject of עֲזַבְתַּנִּי: far from my help, (from) the words of my crying (Riehm); for שִׁשְׁאָה דְּבַרִּי would then also, on its part, in connection with the non-repetition of the מִן, be in apposition to מִשְׁעֵתִי. But to this it is not adapted on account of its heterogeneousness; hence Hitzig seeks to get over the difficulty by the conjecture מִשְׁעֵתִי (“from my cry, from the words of my groaning”). Nor can it be explained, with Olshausen and Hupfeld, by adopting Aben-Ezra's interpretation, “My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me, far from my help? are the words of my crying.” This violates the structure of the verse, the rhythm, and the custom of the language, and gives to the Psalm a flat and unlyrical commencement. Thus, therefore, רְחוֹק in the primary form, as in Psa. 119:155, according to Ges. § 146, 4, will by the predicate to דְּבַרִּי and placed before it: far from my salvation, i.e., far from my being rescued, are the words of my cry; there is a great gulf between the two, inasmuch as God does not answer him though he cries unceasingly.

In v. 3 the reverential name of God אֱלֹהֵי takes the place of אֱלִי the name that expresses His might; it is likewise vocative and accordingly marked with *Rebia magnum*. It is not an accusative of the object after 18: 4 (Hitzig), in which case the construction would be continued with וְלֹא יַעֲנֶה . That it is, however, God to whom he calls is implied both by the direct address אֱלֹהֵי, and by וְלֹא תַעֲנֶה, since he from whom one expects an answer is most manifestly the person addressed. His uninterrupted crying remains unanswered, and unappeased. The clause וְלֹא־דַמְיָה לִי is parallel to תַעֲנֶה וְלֹא, and therefore does not mean: without allowing me any repose (Jer. 14:17, Lam. 3:49), but: without any rest being granted to me, without my complaint being appeased or stilled. From the sixth to the ninth hour the earth was shrouded in darkness. About the ninth hour Jesus cried, after a long and more silent struggle, ἤλί, ἤλί. The ἀνεβόησεν φωνῆ μεγάλη, Mat. 27:46, and also the κραυγῆ ἰσχυρά of Hebr. 5: 7, which does not refer exclusively to the scene in Gethsemane, calls to mind the שִׁאֲנַתִּי of v. 2b. When His passion reached its climax, days and nights of the like wrestling had preceded it, and what then becomes audible was only an outburst of the second David's conflict of prayer, which grows hotter as it draws near to the final issue.

*Psa. 22: 4-6.* The sufferer reminds Jahve of the contradiction between the long season of helplessness and His readiness to help so frequently and so promptly attested. וְאֵתָּה opens an adverbial clause of the counterargument: although Thou art...Jahve is קָדוֹשׁ, absolutely pure, lit., separated (root קָד, Arab. *qd*, to cut, part, just as *tahura*, the synonym of *ḡadusa*, as the intransitive of *tahara* = *ab'ada*, to remove to a distance, and בָּרַךְ pure, clean, radically distinct from *pû-rus*, goes back to בָּרַךְ to sever), viz., from that which is worldly and common, in one word: holy. Jahve is holy, and has shown Himself such as the תְּהִלּוֹת of Israel solemnly affirm, upon which or among which He sits enthroned. תְּהִלּוֹת are the songs of praise offered to God on account of His attributes and deeds, which are worthy of praise (these are even called תְּהִלּוֹת in Psa. 78: 4, Exo. 15:11, Isa. 63: 7), and in fact presented in His sanctuary (Isa. 64:10). The combination יוֹשֵׁב תְּהִלּוֹת (with the accusative of the verbs of dwelling and tarrying) is like יוֹשֵׁב בְּרָבִים, Psa. 99: 1; 80: 2. The songs of praise, which resounded in Israel as the memorials of His deeds of deliverance, are like the wings of the cherubim, upon which His presence hovered in Israel. In vv. 5, 6, the praying one brings to remembrance this graciously glorious self-attestation of God, who as the Holy One always, from the earliest times, acknowledged those who fear Him in opposition to their persecutors and justified their confidence in Himself. In v. 5 trust and rescue are put in the

connection of cause and effect; in v. 6 in reciprocal relation. מַלֵּט and פָּלֵט are only distinguished by the harder and softer sibilants, cf. Psa. 17:13 with Psa. 116: 4. It need not seem strange that such thoughts were at work in the soul of the Crucified One, since His divine-human consciousness was, on its human side, thoroughly Israelitish; and the God of Israel is also the God of salvation; redemption is that which He himself determined, why, then, should He not speedily deliver the Redeemer?

*Psa. 22: 7-9.* The sufferer complains of the greatness of his reproach, in order to move Jahve, who is Himself involved therein, to send him speedy succour. Notwithstanding his cry for help, he is in the deepest affliction without rescue. Every word of v. 7 is echoed in the second part of the Book of Isaiah. There, as here, Israel is called a worm, Isa. 41:14; there all these traits of suffering are found in the picture of the Servant of God, Psa. 49: 7; 53: 3, cf. Psa. 50: 6, and especially 52:14 “so marred was His appearance, that He no longer looked like a man.” תוֹלְאָה is more particularly the kermes, or cochineal (*vermiculus*, whence *color vermiculi*, *vermeil*, *vermiglio*); but the point of comparison in the present instance is not the blood-red appearance, but the suffering so utterly defenceless and even ignominious. עָם is *gen. subj.*, like גּוֹי, Isa. 49: 7. Jerome well renders the ἐξουθένωμα λαοῦ of the LXX by *abjectio* (Tertullian: *nullificamen*) *plebis*, not *populi*. The ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, by which the LXX translates יִלְעִיגוּ לִי, is used by Luke, Luk. 23:35, cf. 16:14, in the history of the Passion; fulfilment and prediction so exactly coincide, that no more adequate expressions can be found in writing the gospel history than those presented by prophecy. In הַפְּטִיר בְּשִׁפָּה, what appears in other instances as the object of the action (to open the mouth wide, *diducere labia*), is regarded as the means of its execution; so that the verbal notion being rendered complete has its object in itself: to make an opening with the mouth, cf. פָּאֵר בְּפִה, Job. 16:10, נָתַן בְּקוֹל 68:34; Ges. § 138, 1, rem. 3. The shaking of the head is, as in Psa. 109:25, cf. 44:15; 64: 9, a gesture of surprise and astonishment at something unexpected and strange, not a προσνεύειν approving the injury of another, although נוּא, נוּד, נוּט, νεύ-ω, nu-t-o, *nic-to*, *neigen*, *nicken*, all form one family of roots. In v. 9 the words of the mockers follow without גַּל לְאָמַר is not the 3 *praet.* (LXX, cf. Mat. 27:43) like אָזַר, בּוֹשׁ; it is not only in *Piel* (Jer. 11:20; 20:12, where גַּלְתִּי = גַּלִּיתִי, Ew. § 121, a) that it is transitive, but even in *Kal*; nor is it *inf. absol.* in the sense of the imperative (Hitz., Böttch.), although this infinitive form is found, but always only as an *inf. intens.* (Num. 23:25, Rut. 2:16, cf. Isa. 24:19); but, in accordance with the parallels 37: 5 (where it is written גוֹל), Pro. 16: 3, cf. Psa. 55:23, 1Pe. 5: 7, it is *imperat.*: roll, viz., thy doing and thy suffering to



Jahve, i.e., commit it to Him. The mockers call out this גַּל to the sufferer, and the rest they say of him with malicious looks askance. כִּי in the mouth of the foes is not confirmatory as in Psa. 18:20, but a conditional *ἕάν* (in case, provided that).

*Psa. 22:10-12.* The sufferer pleads that God should respond to his trust in Him, on the ground that this trust is made an object of mockery. With כִּי he establishes the reality of the loving relationship in which he stands to God, at which his foes mock. The intermediate thought, which is not expressed, “and so it really is,” is confirmed; and thus כִּי comes to have an affirmative signification. The verb גָּחַ (גִּיחַ) signifies both intransitive: to break forth (from the womb), Job. 38: 8, and transitive: to push forward (cf. Arab. *jchcha*), more especially, the fruit of the womb, Mic. 4:10. It might be taken here in the first signification: my breaking forth, equivalent to “the cause of my breaking forth” (Hengstenberg, Baur, and others); but there is no need for this metonymy. גָּחַי is either *part.* equivalent to גָּחַי, my pusher forth, i.e., he who causes me to break forth, or, — since גָּחַ in a causative signification cannot be supported, and participles like בּוֹס stamping and לוֹט veiling (Ges. § 72, rem. 1) are nowhere found with a suffix, — participle of a verb גָּחַה, to draw forth (Hitz.), which perhaps only takes the place, *per metaplasmum*, of the *Pil.* גָּחַח with the uneuphonic מִגָּחַח (Ewald S. 859, *Addenda*). Psalm 71 has גָּחַי (v. 6) instead of גָּחַי, just as it has מִבְטָחַי (v. 5) instead of מִבְטָחַי. The *Hiph.*

הִבְטִיחַ does not merely mean to make secure (Hupf.), but to cause to trust. According to biblical conception, there is even in the new-born child, yea in the child yet unborn and only living in the womb, a glimmering consciousness springing up out of the remotest depths of unconsciousness (*Psychol.* S. 215; transl. p. 254). Therefore, when the praying one says, that from the womb he has been cast <sup>f138</sup> upon Jahve, i.e., directed to go to Him, and to Him alone, with all his wants and care (Psa. 55:23, cf. 71: 6), that from the womb onwards Jahve was his God, there is also more in it than the purely objective idea, that he grew up into such a relationship to God. Twice he mentions his mother. Throughout the Old Testament there is never any mention made of a human father, or begetter, to the Messiah, but always only of His mother, or her who bare Him. And the words of the praying one here also imply that the beginning of his life, as regards its outward circumstances, was amidst poverty, which likewise accords with the picture of Christ as drawn both in the Old and New Testaments. On the ground of his fellowship with God, which extends so far back, goes forth the cry for help (v. 12), which has been faintly heard through all the preceding verses, but now only comes to direct utterance for the first time. The two כִּי are alike. That the necessity is near at hand, i.e., urgent,

refers back antithetically to the prayer, that God would not remain afar off; no one doth, nor can help except He alone. Here the first section closes.

*Psa. 22:13-14.* Looking back upon his relationship to God, which has existed from the earliest times, the sufferer has become somewhat more calm, and is ready, in vv. 13-22, to describe his outward and inner life, and thus to unburden his heart. Here he calls his enemies **פְּרִים**, bullocks, and in fact **בְּשֵׁן אַבְרִי** (cf. 50:13 with Deu. 32:14), strong ones of Bashan, the land rich in luxuriant oak forests and fat pastures (**בְּשֵׁן** = *buthêne*, which in the Beduin dialect means rich, stoneless meadow-land, vid., *Job* S. 509 f.; tr. ii. pp. 399 f.) north of Jabbok extending as far as to the borders of Hermon, the land of Og and afterwards of Manasseh (Num. 30: 1). They are so called on account of their robustness and vigour, which, being acquired and used in opposition to God is brutish rather than human (cf. Amo. 4: 1). Figures like these drawn from the animal world and applied in an ethical sense are explained by the fact, that the ancients measured the instincts of animals according to the moral rules of human nature; but more deeply by the fact, that according to the indisputable conception of Scripture, since man was made to fall by Satan through the agency of an animal, the animal and Satan are the two dominant powers in Adamic humanity. **כְּתֹר** is a climactic synonym of **סֹבֵב**. On v. 14a compare the echoes in Jeremiah, Lam. 2:16; 3:46. Finally, the foes are all comprehended under the figure of a lion, which, as soon as he sights his prey, begins to roar, Amo. 3: 4. The Hebrew **מִטְרֵף**, *discerpere*, according to its root, belongs to **רָפָה**, *carpere*. They are *instar leonis dilaniaturi et rugientis*.

*Psa. 22:15-16.* Now he described, how, thus encompassed round, he is still just living, but already as it were dead. The being poured out like water reminds us of the ignominious abandonment of the Crucified One to a condition of weakness, in which His life, deprived of its natural support, is in the act of dissolution, and its powers dried up (2Sa. 14:14); the bones being stretched out, of the forcible stretching out of His body (**הִתְפָּרַד**, from **פָּרַד** to separate, cf. Arab. *frd*, according to its radical signification, which has been preserved in the common Arabic dialect: so to spread out or apart that the thing has no bends or folds, <sup>f139</sup> Greek **ἐξάπλωσθαι**); the heart being melted, recalls His burning anguish, the inflammation of the wounds, and the pressure of blood on the head and heart, the characteristic cause of death by crucifixion. **נָמַס**, in pause **נָמַס**, is 3 *praet.*; wax, **דִּוְנַג**, receives its name from its melting (**דָּנַג**, root **דָּג**, **τῆκ**). In v. 16 the comparison **כְּחֶרֶשׁ** has reference to the issue of result (vid., 18:43): my strength is dried up, so that it is become like a potsherd. **חָבִי** (Saadia) instead of **כְּחִי** commends itself, unless, **כֵּחַ** perhaps, like the

Talmudic **בִּיחַ**, also had the signification “spittle” (as a more dignified word for **לִשׁוֹן**, with the exception perhaps of Pro. 26:28, is uniformly feminine; here the predicate has the masculine ground-form without respect to the subject. The *part. pass.* has a tendency generally to be used without reference to gender, under the influence of the construction laid down in Ges. § 143, 1, *b*, according to which **לִשְׁנֵי** may be treated as an accusative of the object; **מִלְקַנְהוּ**, however, is *acc. loci* (cf. **לְ** Psa. 137: 6, Job. 29:10; **אֵל** Lam. 4: 4, Eze. 3:26): my tongue is made to cleave to my jaws, *fauces meas*. Such is his state in consequence of outward distresses. His enemies, however, would not have power to do all this, if God had not given it to them. Thus it is, so to speak, God Himself who lays him low in death. **שָׁפַת** to put anywhere, to lay, with the accompanying idea of firmness and duration, Arab. *tbât*, Isa. 26:12; the future is used of that which is just taking place. Just in like manner, in Isaiah 53, the death of the Servant of God is spoken of not merely as happening thus, but as decreed; and not merely as permitted by God, but as being in accordance with the divine will. David is persecuted by Saul, the king of His people, almost to the death; Jesus, however, is delivered over by the Sanhedrim, the authority of His people, to the heathen, under whose hands He actually dies the death of the cross: it is a judicial murder put into execution according to the conditions and circumstances of the age; viewed, however, as to its final cause, it is a gracious dispensation of the holy God, in whose hands all the paths of the world’s history run parallel, and who in this instance makes sin subservient to its own expiation.

**Psa. 22:17-19.** A continuation, referring back to v. 12, of the complaint of him who is dying and is already as it were dead. In the animal name **בְּלָבִים**, figuratively descriptive of character, beside shamelessness and meanness, special prominence is given to the propensity for biting and worrying, i.e., for persecuting; hence Symmachus and Theodotion render it **θηράται, κυνηγέται**. In v. 17*b* **עַדַּת מְרַעִים** takes the place of **כלבים**; and this again is followed by **הַקִּיר** in the *plur.* (to do anything in a circle, to surround by forming a circle round, a climactic synonym, like **סָבַב** to **בָּתַר**) either *per attractionem* (cf. Psa. 140:10, 1Sa. 2: 4), or on account of the collective **עַדָּה**. Tertullian renders it *synagoga maleficorum*, Jerome *concilium pessimorum*. But a faction gathered together for some evil purpose is also called **עַדָּה קָרָה**, e.g., **עַדַּת קָרָה**. In v. 17*c* the meaning of **בְּאַרְיִ**, *instar leonis*, is either that, selecting a point of attack, they make the rounds of his hands and feet, just as a lion does its prey upon which it springs as soon as its prey stirs; or, that, standing round about him like lions, they make all defence impossible to his hands, and all escape impossible to his feet. But whether we take this **יְדֵי וְרַגְלֵי** as accusative of the

members beside the accusative of the person (vid., 17:11), or as the object of the **הִקִּיפוּ** to be supplied from v. 17b, it still remains harsh and drawing so far as the language is concerned. Perceiving this, the Masora on Isa. 38:13 observes, that **בְּאָרִי**, in the two passages in which it occurs (Psa. 22:17, Isa. 38:13), occurs in two different meanings (**בְּהָרִי לִישְׁנֵי**); just as the Midrash then also understands **בְּאָרִי** in the Psalm as a verb used of marking with conjuring, magic characters. <sup>f140</sup>

Is the meaning of the Masora that **בְּאָרִי**, in the passage before us, is equivalent to **בְּאָרִים**? If so the form would be doubly Aramaic: both the participial form **בְּאָר** (which only occurs in Hebrew in verbs *med. E*) and the apocopated plural, the occurrence of which in Hebrew is certainly, with Gesenius and Ewald, to be acknowledged in rare instances (vid., Psa. 45: 9, and compare on the other hand 2Sa. 22:44), but which would here be a capricious form of expression most liable to be misapprehended. If **בְּאָרִי** is to be understood as a verb, then it ought to be read **בְּאָרִי**. Tradition is here manifestly unreliable. Even in MSS the readings **בְּאָרִי** and **בְּאָרִי** are found. The former is attested both by the Masora on Num. 24: 9 and by Jacob ben Chajim in the *Masora finalis* as the MS *Chethîb*. <sup>f141</sup>

Even the Targum, which renders *mordent sicut leo manus et pedes meos*, bears witness to the ancient hesitancy between the substantival and verbal rendering of the **בְּאָרִי**. The other ancient versions have, without any doubt, read **בְּאָרוּ**. Aquila in the 1st edition of his translation rendered it **ἡσχυσαν** (from the Aramaic and Talmudic **בְּאָר = בְּאָר** to soil, *part. בְּאָרוּ*, dirty, nasty); but this is not applicable to hands and feet, and therefore has nothing to stand upon. In the 2nd edition of his translation the same Aquila had instead of this, like Symmachus, “they have bound,” <sup>f142</sup> after **כָּר**, Arab. *krr*, to twist, lace; but this rendering is improbable since the Hebrew has other words for “to bind,” *constringere*. On the other hand nothing of any weight can be urged against the rendering of the LXX **ὠρυξαν** (*Peshîto בּוּעוּ*, Vulg. *foderunt*, Jer. *fixerunt*); for (1) even if we do not suppose any special verb **בְּאָרִי, בְּאָרוּ** can be expanded from **בָּרוּ (פּוֹר) = בָּרָה (בְּרָה)** just in the same manner as **רָאָמָה**, Zec. 14:10 from **רָמָה**, cf. **קָאָמָא** Dan. 7:16. And (2) that **כּוֹר** and **בְּרָה** can signify not merely to dig out and dig into, engrave, but also to dig through, pierce, is shown, — apart from the derivative **מְבָרָה** (the similarity of the sound of which to **μάχαιρα** from the root **μαχ**, *maksh, mraksh*, is only accidental), — by the double meaning of the verbs **נָקַר, ὀρύσσειν** (e.g., **ὀρύσσειν τὸν ἰσθμὸν** Herod. i. 174), *fodere (hasta)*; the LXX version of Psa. 40: 7 would also

support this meaning, if **κατετήσω** (from **κατατιτῶν**) in that passage had been the original reading instead of **κατητίσω**. If **כְּאֲרוֹ** be read, then v. 17c, applied to David, perhaps under the influence of the figure of the attacking dogs (Böhl), says that the wicked bored into his hands and feet, and thus have made him fast, so that he is inevitably abandoned to their inhuman desires. The fulfilment in the nailing of the hands and (at least, the binding fast) of the feet of the Crucified One to the cross is clear. This is not the only passage in which it is predicated that the future Christ shall be murderously pierced; but it is the same in Isa. 53: 5 where He is said to be pierced (**מְחַלְלֵ**) on account of our sins, and in Zec. 12:10, where Jahve describes Himself as **ἐκκεντηθεὶς** in Him.

Thus, therefore, the reading **כְּאֲרוֹ** might at least have an equal right to be recognised with the present *recepta*, for which Hupfeld and Hitzig demand exclusive recognition; while Böttcher, — who reads **כְּאֲרִי**, and gives this the meaning “springing round about (after the manner of dogs),” — regards the *sicut leo* as “a production of meagre Jewish wit;” and also Thenius after taking all possible pains to clear it up gives it up as hopeless, and with Meier, adopting a different division of the verse, renders it: “a mob of the wicked has encompassed me like lions. On my hands and feet I can count all my bones.” But then, how **כְּאֲרִי** comes limping on after the rest! And how lamely does **יְדֵי וְרַגְלֵי** precede v. 18! How unnaturally does it limit **אֲצְמֹתַי**, with which one chiefly associates the thought of the breast and ribs, to the hands and feet! **אֲסַפֵּר** is *potentialis*. Above in v. 15 he has said that his bones are out of joint. There is no more reason for regarding this “I can count etc.” as referring to emaciation from grief, than there is for regarding the former as referring to writing with agony. He can count them because he is forcibly stretched out, and thereby all his bones stand out. In this condition he is a mockery to his foes. **הִבִּיט** signifies the turning of one’s gaze to anything, **רָאָה בְּ** the fixing of one’s sight upon it with pleasure. In v. 19 a new feature is added to those that extend far beyond David himself: they part my garments among them.... It does not say they purpose doing it, they do it merely in their mind, but they do it in reality. This never happened to David, or at least not in the literal sense of his words, in which it has happened to Christ. In Him v. 19a and 19b are literally fulfilled. The parting of the **בְּגָדִים** by the soldiers dividing his **ἵμάτια** among them into four parts; the casting lots upon the **לְבוּשׁ** by their not dividing the **χιτῶν ἄρραφος**, but casting lots for it, Joh. 19:23 f. **לְבוּשׁ** is the garment which is put on the body that it may not be bare; **בְּגָדִים** the clothes, which one wraps around one’s self for a covering; hence **לְבוּשׁ** is punningly explained in *B. Sabbath 77b* by **לֹא בֹשָׁה** (with which one has no need to be ashamed of being naked) in distinction from **גְּלִימָא**, a mantle (that through

which one appears בגולם, because it conceals the outline of the body). In Job. 24: 7, and frequently, לבוש is an undergarment, or shirt, what in Arabic is called absolutely Arab. *twb, thôb* “the garment,” or expressed according to the Roman distinction: the *tunica* in distinction from the *toga*, whose exact designation is מעיל. With v. 19 of this Psalm it is exactly as with Zec. 9: 9, cf. Mat. 21: 5; in this instance also, the fulfilment has realised that which, in both phases of the synonymous expression, is seemingly identical. <sup>f143</sup>

**Psa. 22:20-22.** In v. 19 the description of affliction has reached its climax, for the parting of, and casting lots for, the garments assumes the certain death of the sufferer in the mind of the enemies. In v. 20, with ואתה the looks of the sufferer, in the face of his manifold torments, concentrate themselves all at once upon Jahve. He calls Him אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהֵי *nom. abstr.* from אֵל, 88: 5: the very essence of strength, as it were the idea, or the ideal of strength; *le-<sup>c</sup>ezrāthi* has the accent on the *penult.*, as in Psa. 71:12 (cf. on the other hand 38:23), in order that two tone syllables may not come together. In v. 21, חֶרֶב means the deadly weapon of the enemy and is used exemplificatively. In the expression מִיַּד מִיַּד פֶּלֶק is not merely equivalent to מֵן, but יָד is, according to the sense, equivalent to “paw” (cf. פֶּה, Lev. 11:27), as פֶּה is equivalent to jaws; although elsewhere not only the expression “hand of the lion and of the bear,” 1Sa. 17:37, but also “hands of the sword,” Psa. 63:11, and even “hand of the flame,” Isa. 47:14 are used, inasmuch as יָד is the general designation of that which acts, seizes, and subjugates, as the instrument of the act. Just as in connection with the dog יָד, and in connection with the lion פֶּה (cf. however, Dan. 6:28) is mentioned as its weapon of attack, the horns, not the *horn* (also not in Deu. 33:17), are mentioned in connection with antilopes, רַמִּים (a shorter form, occurring only in this passage, for רַאמִּים, Psa. 29: 6, Isa. 34: 7). Nevertheless, Luther following the LXX and Vulgate, renders it “rescue me from the unicorns” (vid., thereon on Psa. 29: 6). יְחַדְדֵהּ, as the parallel member here and in Psa. 35:17 shows, is an epithet of נַפְשִׁי. The LXX in both instances renders it correctly τὴν μονογενῆ μου, Vulg. *unicam meam*, according to Gen. 22: 2, Jud. 11:34, the one soul besides which man has no second, the one life besides which man has no second to lose, applied subjectively, that is, soul or life as the dearest and most precious thing, cf. Homer’s φίλον κῆρ. It is also interpreted according to Psa. 25:16; 68: 7: my solitary one, *solitarium*, the soul as forsaken by God and man, or at least by man, and abandoned to its own self (Hupfeld, Kamphausen, and others). But the parallel נַפְשִׁי, and the analogy of כְּבוֹדִי (= נַפְשִׁי), stamp it as an universal name for the soul: the single one, i.e., that which does not exist in duplicate, and consequently that which cannot be

replaced, when lost. The *praet.* עֲנִיתָנִי might be equivalent to עֲנִי, provided it is a *perf. consec.* deprived of its *Waw convers.* in favour of the placing of מִקְרָנִי רַמִּים first for the sake of emphasis; but considering the turn which the Psalm takes in v. 23, it must be regarded as *perf. confidentiae*, inasmuch as in the very midst of his supplication there springs up in the mind of the suppliant the assurance of being heard and answered. To answer from the horns of the antelope is equivalent to hearing and rescuing from them; cf. the equally pregnant expression עָנָה בְּ Psalms 118: 5, perhaps also Hebr. 5: 7. <sup>f144</sup>

**Psa. 22:23-24.** In the third section, vv. 23-32, the great plaintive prayer closes with thanksgiving and hope. In certainty of being answered, follows the vow of thanksgiving. He calls his fellow-country men, who are connected with him by the ties of nature, but, as what follows, viz., “ye that fear Jahve” shows, also by the ties of spirit, “brethren.” קָהַל (from קָהַל = קָל, καλ-έω, *cal-o*, Sanscr. *kal*, to resound) coincides with ἀκαλλησία. The sufferer is conscious of the significance of his lot of suffering in relation to the working out of the history of redemption. Therefore he will make that salvation which he has experienced common property. The congregation or church shall hear the evangel of his rescue. In v. 24 follows the introduction to this announcement, which is addressed to the whole of Israel, so far as it fears the God of revelation. Instead of וְגֹרֵר the text of the Orientals (מַדְנַחֵא), i.e., Babylonians, had here the *Chethîb* גִּירוֹ with the *Kerî* וְגִירוֹ; the introduction of the jussive (Psa. 33: 8) after the two imperatives would not be inappropriate. גִּיר מִן (= יָגַר) is a stronger form of expression for יָרָא מִן, Psalms 33: 8.

**Psa. 22:25.** This tristich is the evangel itself. The *materia laudis* is introduced by עֲנֹתָ בִּי (principal form עֲנֹתָ) bending, bowing down, affliction, from עָנָה, the proper word to denote the Passion. For in Isaiah, Isa. 53: 4, 7, the Servant of God is also said to be מְעַנָּה and נִעְנָה, and Zechariah, Zec. 9: 9, also introduces Him as עָנִי and נוֹשָׁע. The LXX, Vulgate, and Targum erroneously render it “cry.” עָנָה does not mean to cry, but to answer, ἀμείβεσθαι; here, however, as the stem-word of עֲנֹתָ, it means to be bent. From the שָׁקַץ (to regard as an abhorrence), which alternates with בָּזָה, we see that the sufferer felt the wrath of God, but this has changed into a love that sends help; God did not long keep His countenance hidden, He hearkened to him, for his prayer was well-pleasing to Him. שָׂמָא is not the verbal adjective, but, since we have the definite fact of the rescue before us, it is a pausal form for שָׁמַע, as in Psalms 34: 7, 18, Jer. 36:13.

*Psa. 22:26-27.* The call to thanksgiving is now ended; and there follows a grateful upward glance towards the Author of the salvation; and this grateful upward glance grows into a prophetic view of the future. This fact, that the sufferer is able thus to glory and give thanks in the great congregation (Psa. 40:10), proceeds from Jahve (יְהוָה) as in Psa. 118:23, cf. Psa. 71: 6). The first half of the verse, according to Baer's correct accentuation, closes with רַב בְּקָהֶל יְרֵאֵיוּ . בְּקָהֶל does not refer to קָהֶל, but, as everywhere else, is meant to be referred to Jahve, since the address of prayer passes over into a declarative utterance. It is not necessary in this passage to suppose, that in the mind of David the paying of vows is purely ethical, and not a ritualistic act. Being rescued he will bring the שְׁלָמֵי נֶדֶר, which it is his duty to offer, the thank-offerings, which he vowed to God when in the extremest peril. When the sprinkling with blood (זֵרִיקָה) and the laying of the fat pieces upon the altar (הִקְמַרְדָּה) were completed, the remaining flesh of the shalemim was used by the offerer to make a joyous meal; and the time allowed for this feasting was the day of offering and on into the night in connection with the *tôda-shelamim* offering, and in connection with the shelamim of vows even the following day also (Lev. 7:15 f.). The invitation of the poor to share in it, which the law does not command, is rendered probable by these appointments of the law, and expressly commended by other and analogous appointments concerning the second and third tithes. V. 27 refers to this: he will invite the עֲנִיִּים, those who are outwardly and spiritually poor, to this "eating before Jahve;" it is to be a meal for which they thank God, who has bestowed it upon them through him whom He has thus rescued. V. 27c is as it were the host's blessing upon his guests, or rather Jahve's guests through him: "your heart live for ever," i.e., may this meal impart to you ever enduring refreshment. יְחִי optative of הִיָּה, here used of the reviving of the heart, which is as it were dead (1Sa. 25:37), to spiritual joy. The reference to the ritual of the peace offerings is very obvious. And it is not less obvious, that the blessing, which, for all who can be saved, springs from the salvation that has fallen to the lot of the sufferer, is here set forth. But it is just as clear, that this blessing consists in something much higher than the material advantage, which the share in the enjoyment of the animal sacrifice imparts; the sacrifice has its spiritual meaning, so that its outward forms are lowered as it were to a mere figure of its true nature; it relates to a spiritual enjoyment of spiritual and lasting results. How natural, then, is the thought of the sacramental eucharist, in which the second David, like to the first, having attained to the throne through the suffering of death, makes us partakers of the fruits of His suffering!

*Psa. 22:28-32.* The long line closing strophe, which forms as it were the pedestal to the whole, shows how far not only the description of the affliction



of him who is speaking here, but also the description of the results of his rescue, transcend the historical reality of David's experience. The sufferer expects, as the fruit of the proclamation of that which Jahve has done for him, the conversion of all peoples. The heathen have become forgetful and will again recollect themselves; the object, in itself clear enough in Psa. 9:18, becomes clear from what follows: there is a  $\gamma\upsilon\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\theta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  (*Psychol. S.* 346 ff.; tr. pp. 407 ff.) among the heathen, which the announcement of the rescue of this afflicted one will bring back to their consciousness. <sup>145</sup>

This prospect (Jer. 16:19 ff.) is, in v. 29 (cf. Jer. 10: 7), based upon Jahve's right of kingship over all peoples. A ruler is called  $\text{מֶשֶׁל}$  as being exalted above others by virtue of his office ( $\text{מֶשֶׁל}$  according to its primary meaning = Arab. *mtl, erectum stare*, synonymous with  $\text{בָּהֶן}$ , vid., on Psa. 110: 4, cf.  $\text{עֶמֶד}$  Mic. 5: 3). In  $\text{וּמֶשֶׁל}$  we have the *part.*, used like the 3 *praet.*, without any mark of the person (cf. Psa. 7:10; 55:20), to express the pure *praes.*, and, so to speak, as *tempus durans*: He rules among the nations ( $\text{ἐθνῶν}$ ). The conversion of the heathen by that sermon will, therefore, be the realisation of the kingdom of God.

*Psa. 22:30.* The eating is here again brought to mind. The perfect,  $\text{אָכְלוּ}$ , and the future of sequence,  $\text{וַיִּשְׂתַּחֲוּוּ}$ , stand to one another in the relation of cause and effect. It is, as is clear from v. 27, an eating that satisfies the soul, a spiritual meal, that is intended, and in fact, one that is brought about by the mighty act of rescue God has wrought. At the close of Psalm 69, where the form of the ritual thank-offering is straightway ignored,  $\text{רָאוּ}$  (v. 33) takes the place of the  $\text{אָכְלוּ}$ . There it is the view of one who is rescued and who thankfully glorifies God, which leads to others sharing with him in the enjoyment of the salvation he has experienced; here it is an actual enjoyment of it, the joy, springing from thankfulness, manifesting itself not merely in words but in a thank-offering feast, at which, in Israel, those who long for salvation are the invited guests, for with them it is an acknowledgment of the mighty act of a God whom they already know; but among the heathen, men of the most diversified conditions, the richest and the poorest, for to them it is a favour unexpectedly brought to them, and which is all the more gratefully embraced by them on that account. So magnificent shall be the feast, that all  $\text{דְּשֵׁנֵי-אָרֶץ}$ , i.e., those who stand out prominently before the world and before their own countrymen by reason of the abundance of their temporal possessions (compare on the ascensive use of  $\text{אָרֶץ}$ , Psa. 75: 9; 76:10, Isa. 23: 9), choose it before this abundance, in which they might revel, and, on account of the grace and glory which the celebration includes within itself, they bow down and worship. In antithesis to the "fat ones of the earth" stand

those who go down to the dust (עָפָר, always used in this formula of the dust of the grave, like the Arabic *turâb*) by reason of poverty and care. In the place of the participle יֹרְדֵי we now have with וְנִפְשׁוּ (= וְאֲשֶׁר נִפְשׁוּ) a clause with וְלֹא, which has the value of a relative clause (as in Psa. 49:21; 78:39, Pro. 9:13, and frequently): and they who have not heretofore prolonged and could not prolong their life (Ges. § 123, 3, c). By comparing Php. 2:10 Hupfeld understands it to be those who are actually dead; so that it would mean, His kingdom extends to the living and the dead, to this world and the nether world. But any idea of a thankful adoration of God on the part of the dwellers in Hades is alien to the Old Testament; and there is nothing to force us to it here, since יֹרְדֵי עָפָר, can just as well mean *descensuri* as *qui descenderunt*, and חָזָה נִפְשׁוּ (also in Eze. 18:27) means to preserve his own life, — a phrase which can be used in the sense of *vitam sustentare* and of *conservare* with equal propriety. It is, therefore, those who are almost dead already with care and want, these also (and how thankfully do these very ones) go down upon their knees, because they are accounted worthy to be guests at this table. It is the same great feast, of which Isaiah, Isa. 25: 6, prophesies, and which he there accompanies with the music of his words. And the result of this evangel of the mighty act of rescue is not only of boundless universality, but also of unlimited duration: it propagates itself from one generation to another.

Formerly we interpreted v. 31 “a seed, which shall serve Him, shall be reckoned to the Lord for a generation;” taking יִסְפַּר as a metaphor applying to the census, 2Ch. 2:16, cf. Psa. 87: 6, and לְדֹר, according to Psa. 24: 6 and other passages, as used of a totality of one kind, as זָרַע of the whole body of those of the same race. But the connection makes it more natural to take דֹּר in a genealogical sense; and, moreover, with the former interpretation it ought to have been לְדֹר instead of דֹּר. We must therefore retain the customary interpretation: “a seed (posterity) shall serve Him, it shall be told concerning the Lord to the generation (to come).” Decisive in favour of this interpretation is לְדֹר with the following יָבֵאוּ, by which דֹּר acquires the meaning of the future generation, exactly as in 71:18, inasmuch as it at once becomes clear, that three generations are distinctly mentioned, viz., that of the fathers who turn unto Jahve, v. 30, that of the coming דֹּר, v. 31, and אִם נִלְדָּד, to whom the news of the salvation is propagated by this דֹּר, v. 32: “They shall come (בֹּא as in Psa. 71:18: to come into being), and shall declare His righteousness to the people that shall be born, that He hath finished.” Accordingly זָרַע is the principal notion, which divides itself into דֹּר (יָבֵאוּ) and עַם נִלְדָּד; from which it is at once clear, why the expression could be thus general, “a

posterity,” inasmuch as it is defined by what follows. עַם נוֹלַד is the people which shall be born, or whose birth is near at hand (Psa. 78: 6); the LXX well renders it: λαῶ τῷ τεχθησομένῳ (cf. Psa. 102:19 אִם נִבְרָא *populus creandus*). צַדִּיקְתּוֹ is the δικαιοσύνη of God, which has become manifest in the rescue of the great sufferer. That He did not suffer him to come down to the very border of death without snatching him out of the way of his murderous foes and raising him to a still greater glory, this was divine צַדִּיקָה. That He did not snatch him out of the way of his murderous foes without suffering him to be on the point of death — even this wrathful phase of the divine צַדִּיקָה, is indicated in v. 16c, but then only very remotely. For the fact, that the Servant of God, before spreading the feast accompanying the shelamim (thank-offering) in which He makes the whole world participants in the fruit of His suffering, offered Himself as an asham (sin-offering), does not become a subject of prophetic revelation until later on, and then under other typical relationships. The nature of the עֲשָׂה, which is in accordance with the determinate counsel of God, is only gradually disclosed in the Old Testament. This one word, so full of meaning (as in Psa. 52:11; 37: 5, Isa. 44:23), implying the carrying through of the work of redemption, which is prefigured in David, comprehends everything within itself. It may be compared to the לַעֲשׂוֹת, Gen. 2: 3, at the close of the history of the creation. It is the last word of the Psalm, just as τετέλεσται is the last word of the Crucified One. The substance of the gospel in its preparatory history and its fulfilment, of the declaration concerning God which passes from generation to generation, is this, that God has accomplished what He planned when He anointed the son of Jesse and the Son of David as mediator in His work of redemption; that He accomplished it by leading the former through affliction to the throne, and making the cross to the latter a ladder leading up to heaven.

## Psalm 23

### PRAISE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD

*23: 1 JAHVE is my Shepherd, I shall not want.*

*23: 2 In green pastures He maketh me to lie down,  
Beside still waters He leadeth me.*

*23: 3 My soul He restoreth,  
He leadeth me in right paths —  
For His Name's sake.*

*23: 4 Yea, though I walk in the valley of the shadow of death:  
I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me,  
Thy rod and Thy staff — they comfort me.*

*23: 5 Thou preparest me a table  
in the presence of mine oppressors,  
Thou anointest my head with oil,  
My cup is fulness.*

*23: 6 Only prosperity and mercy shall follow me  
All the days of my life,  
And again shall I dwell in the house of Jahve  
For length of days.*

The arrangement, by which a Psalm that speaks of a great feast of mercy prepared for mankind is followed by a Psalm that praises Jahve as the Shepherd and Host of His own people, could not possibly be more sensible and appropriate. If David is the author, and there is no reason for doubting it, then this Psalm belongs to the time of the rebellion under Absalom, and this supposition is confirmed on every hand. It is like an amplification of Psa. 4: 8; and Psa. 3: 7 is also echoed in it. But not only does it contain points of contact with this pair of Psalms of the time mentioned, but also with other Psalms belonging to the same period, as Psa. 27: 4, and more especially Psalm 63, which is said to have been composed when David had retreated with his faithful followers over Kidron and the Mount of Olives into the plains of the wilderness of Judah, whither Hushai sent him tidings, which counselled him to pass over Jordan with all possible haste. It is characteristic of all these Psalms, that in them David yearns after the house of God as after the peculiar home of his heart, and, that all his wishes centre in the one wish to be at home again. And does not this short, tender song, with its depth of feeling and its May-like freshness, accord with David's want and wanderings to and fro at that time?

It consists of two hexastichs with short closing lines, resembling (as also in Isa. 16: 9, 10) the Adonic verse of the strophe of Sappho, and a tetrastich made up of very short and longer lines intermixed.

*Psa. 23: 1-3.* The poet calls Jahve רֵעִי, as He who uniformly and graciously provides for and guides him and all who are His. Later prophecy announces the visible appearing of this Shepherd, Isa. 40:11, Eze. 34:37, and other passages. If this has taken place, the הֵ רֵעִי from the mouth of man finds its cordial response in the words ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. He who has Jahve, the possessor of all things, himself has all things, he lacks nothing; viz., כָּל־טוֹב, whatever is good in itself and would be good for him, Psa. 34:11; 84:12. דְּשֵׂא נְאוֹת are the pastures of fresh and tender grass, where one lies at ease, and rest and enjoyment are combined. נְאוֹה (נֹה), according to its primary meaning, is a resting- or dwelling-place, specifically an oasis, i.e., a verdant spot in the desert. מֵי מְנוּחָה are waters, where the weary finds a most pleasant resting-

place (according to Hitzig, it is a plural brought in by the plural of the governing word, but it is at any rate a superlative plural), and can at the same time refresh himself. נִהַל is suited to this as being a pastoral word used of gentle leading, and more especially of guiding the herds to the watering-places, just as הִרְבִּיץ is used of making them to rest, especially at noon-tide, Son. 1: 7; cf. ὀδηγεῖν, Rev. 7:17. שׁוֹבֵב נֶפֶשׁ (elsewhere הִשִּׁיב) signifies to bring back the soul that is as it were flown away, so that it comes to itself again, therefore to impart new life, *recreate*. This He does to the soul, by causing it amidst the dryness and heat of temptation and trouble, to taste the very essence of life which refreshes and strengthens it. The *Hiph.* הִנְחָה (Arabic: to put on one side, as perhaps in Job. 12:23) is, as in 143:10 the intensive of נָחָה (Psa. 77:21). The poet glories that Jahve leads him carefully and without risk or wandering in מַעְגְלֵי־צֶדֶק, straight paths and leading to the right goal, and this לְמַאן שְׁמוֹ (for His Name's sake). He has revealed Himself as the gracious One, and as such He will prove and glorify Himself even in the need of him who submits to His guidance.

*Psa. 23: 4-5.* Rod and staff are here not so much those of the pilgrim, which would be a confusing transition to a different figure, but those of Jahve, the Shepherd (שָׂבַט, as in Mic. 7:14, and in connection with it, cf. Num. 21:18, מִשְׁעֶנֶת as the filling up of the picture), as the means of guidance and defence. The one rod, which the shepherd holds up to guide the flock, and upon which he leans and anxiously watches over the flock, has assumed a double form in the conception of the idea. This rod and staff in the hand of God comfort him, i.e., preserve to him the feeling of security, and therefore a cheerful spirit. Even when he passes through a valley dark and gloomy as the shadow of death, where surprises and calamities of every kind threaten him, he hears no misfortune. The LXX narrows the figure, rendering בגי' according to the Aramaic בגו'א, Dan. 3:25, ἐν μέσῳ. The noun צִלְמוֹת, which occurs in this passage for the first time in the Old Testament literature, is originally not a compound-word; but being formed from a verb צָלַם, Arab. *ḍlm* (root צַל, Arab. *ḍl*), to overshadow, darken, after the form אֲבָדוֹת, but pronounced צִלְמוֹת (cf. הַצְרָמוֹת, *Hadra-môt* = the court of death, בְּצִלְאֵל in-God's-shadow), it signifies the shadow of death as an epithet of the most fearful darkness, as of Hades, Job. 10:21 f., but also of a shaft of a mine, Job. 28: 3, and more especially of darkness such as makes itself felt in a wild, uninhabited desert, Jer. 2: 6.

After the figure of the shepherd fades away in v. 4, that of the host appears. His enemies must look quietly on (נָגַד as in Psa. 31:20), without being able to

do anything, and see how Jahve provides bountifully for His guest, anoints him with sweet perfumes as at a joyous and magnificent banquet (Psa. 92:11), and fills his cup to excess. What is meant thereby, is not necessarily only blessings of a spiritual kind. The king fleeing before Absalom and forsaken by the mass of his people was, with his army, even outwardly in danger of being destroyed by want; it is, therefore, even an abundance of daily bread streaming in upon them, as in 2Sa. 17:27-29, that is meant; but even this, spiritually regarded, as a gift from heaven, and so that the satisfying, refreshing and quickening is only the outside phase of simultaneous inward experiences. <sup>f146</sup>

The future **תֵּעָרֵךְ** is followed, according to the customary return to the perfect ground-form, by **דְּשָׁנָה**, which has, none the less, the signification of a present. And in the closing assertion, **בּוֹסִי**, my cup, is metonymically equivalent to the contents of my cup. This is **רִנָּה**, a fulness satiating even to excess.

**Psa. 23: 6.** Foes are now pursuing him, but prosperity and favour alone shall pursue him, and therefore drive his present pursuers out of the field. **אֵן**, originally affirmative, here restrictive, belongs only to the subject-notion in its signification *nil nisi* (Psa. 39: 6, 12; 139:11). The expression is remarkable and without example elsewhere: as good spirits Jahve sends forth **טוֹב** and **חֶסֶד** to overtake David's enemies, and to protect him against them to their shame, and that all his life long (accusative of continuance). We have now no need, in connection with our reference of the Psalm to the persecution under Absalom, either to persuade ourselves that **וְשָׁבְתִי** is equivalent to **וְשָׁבְתִי** Psa. 27: 4, or that it is equivalent to **וְיִשְׁבְּתִי**. The infinitive is logically inadmissible here, and unheard of with the vowel *ā* instead of *i*, which would here (cf. on the other hand **קָחְתִּי**) be confusing and arbitrary. Nor can it be shown from Jer. 42:10 to be probable that it is contracted from **וְיִשְׁבְּתִי**, since in that passage **שׁוֹב** signifies *redeundo = rursus*. The LXX, certainly, renders it by **καθίσαντες**, as in 1Sa. 12: 2 by **καὶ καθήσομαι**; but (since so much uncertainty attaches to these translators and their text) we cannot draw a safe inference as to the existing usage of the language, which would, in connection with such a contraction, go out of the province of one verb into that of another, which is not the case with **תָּתָה = נָתַתָּה** in 2Sa. 22:41. On the contrary we have before us in the present passage a *constructio praegnans*: “and I shall return (*perf. consec.*) in the house of Jahve,” i.e., again, having returned, dwell in the house of Jahve. In itself **וְשָׁבְתִי ב** might also even mean *et revertam ad* (cf.

Psa. 7:17, Hos. 12: 7), like **עָלָה ב**, Psa. 24: 3, *adscendere ad (in)*. But the additional assertion of continuance, **לְאָרְךָ יָמִים** (as in Psa. 93: 5, Lam. 5:20, **אָרְךָ**, root **רָךְ**, extension, lengthening = length) favours the explanation, that **ב**

is to be connected with the idea of **וישבת**, which is involved in **ושבת** as a natural consequence.

## **Psalm 24**

### **PREPARATION FOR THE RECEPTION OF THE LORD WHO IS ABOUT TO COME**

#### **A. PSALM ON GOING UP (BELOW, ON THE HILL OF ZION)**

##### ***CHORUS OF THE FESTIVE PROCESSION***

*24: 1 JAHVE's is the earth, and its fulness,  
The world, and they that dwell therein.*

*24: 2 For He, He hath founded it upon the seas,  
And upon streams did He set it fast.*

##### **A VOICE.**

*24: 3 Who may ascend the hill of Jahve,  
Who may stand in His holy place?*

##### **ANOTHER VOICE.**

*24: 4 He that is of innocent hands and of pure heart,  
He that doth not lift up his soul to vanity,  
And doth not swear deceitfully —*

##### **CHORUS.**

*24: 5 He shall receive a blessing from Jahve,  
And righteousness from the God of his salvation.*

*24: 6 This is the generation of those who aspire after Him,  
Who seek Thy face — Jacob. (Sela)*

#### **B. PSALM ON ENTERING (ABOVE, ON THE CITADEL OF ZION).**

##### ***CHORUS OF THE FESTIVE PROCESSION.***

*24: 7 Lift up, ye gates, your heads,  
And raise yourselves, ye ancient doors,  
That the King of Glory may come in.*

**A VOICE, AS IT WERE, FROM THE GATES.**

*24: 8 Who is, then, the King of Glory?*

**CHORUS.**

*Jahve, a mighty one and a hero,  
Jahve, a hero in battle.*

*24: 9 Lift up, ye gates, your heads,  
And raise yourselves, ye ancient doors,  
That the King of Glory may come in.*

**AS IT WERE, FROM THE GATES.**

*24:10 Who is He, then, the King of Glory?*

**CHORUS.**

*Jahve of Hosts,  
He is the King of Glory. (Sela)*

Psalm 23 expressed a longing after the house of Jahve on Zion; Psalm 24 celebrates Jahve's entrance into Zion, and the true character of him who may enter with Him. It was composed when the Ark was brought from Kirjath Jearim to Mount Zion, where David had caused it to be set up in a tabernacle built expressly for it, 2Sa. 6:17, cf. 11:11, 1Ki. 1:39; or else, which is rendered the more probable by the description of Jahve as a warrior, at a time when the Ark was brought back to Mount Zion, after having been taken to accompany the army to battle (vid., Psalm 68). Psalm ch. 15 is very similar. But only Psa. 24: 1-6 is the counterpart of that Psalm; and there is nothing wanting to render the first part of Psalm 24 complete in itself. Hence Ewald divides Psalm 24 into two songs, belonging to different periods, although both old Davidic songs, viz., Psa. 24: 7-10, the song of victory sung at the removal of the Ark to Zion; and Psa. 24: 1-6, a purely didactic song pre-supposing this event which forms an era in their history. And it is relatively more natural to regard this Psalm rather than Psalm 19, as two songs combined and made into one; but these two songs have an internal coherence; in Jahve's coming to His temple is found that which occasioned them and that towards which They point; and consequently they form a whole consisting of two divisions. To the inscription לדוד מזמור the LXX adds τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου<sup>f147</sup> (= אחד בשבת של, for the first day of the week), according to which this Psalm was a customary Sunday Psalm. This addition is confirmed by *B. Tamîd extr., Rosh ha-Shana* 31a, *Sofrim* xviii. (cf. *supra* p. 19). In the second of these passages



cited from the Talmud, R. Akiba seeks to determine the reasons for this choice by reference to the history of the creation.

Incorporated in Israel's hymn-book, this Psalm became, with a regard to its original occasion and purpose, an Old Testament Advent hymn in honour of the Lord who should come into His temple, Mal. 3: 1; and the cry: Lift up, ye gates, your heads, obtained a meaning essentially the same as that of the voice of the crier in Isa. 40: 3: Prepare ye Jahve's way, make smooth in the desert a road for our God! In the New Testament consciousness, the second appearing takes the place of the first, the coming of the Lord of Glory to His church, which is His spiritual temple; and in this Psalm we are called upon to prepare Him a worthy reception. The interpretation of the second half of the Psalm of the entry of the Conqueror of death into Hades, — an interpretation which has been started by the Gospel of Nicodemus (vid., Tischendorf's *Ev. apocrypha* p. 306 f.) and still current in the Greek church, — and the patristic interpretation of it of the εἰς οὐρανὸς ἀνάληψις τοῦ κυρίου, do as much violence to the rules of exegesis as to the parallelism of the facts of the Old and New Testaments.

*Psa. 24: 1-6.* Jahve, whose throne of grace is now set upon Zion, has not a limited dominion, like the heathen deities: His right to sovereignty embraces the earth and its fulness (Psa. 50:12; 89:12), i.e., everything that is to be found upon it and in it. <sup>f148</sup>

For He, הוּא, is the owner of the world, because its Creator. He has founded it upon seas, i.e., the ocean and its streams, נְהַרְוֹת, ῥέεθρα (Jon. 2: 4); for the waters existed before the dry land, and this has been cast up out of them at God's word, so that consequently the solid land, — which indeed also conceals in its interior a תְּהוֹם רַבָּה (Gen. 7:11), — rising above the surface of the sea, has the waters, as it were, for its foundation (Psa. 136: 6), although it would more readily sink down into them than keep itself above them, if it were not in itself upheld by the creative power of God. Hereupon arises the question, who may ascend the mountain of Jahve, and stand above in His holy place? The futures have a potential signification: who can have courage to do it? what, therefore, must he be, whom Jahve receives into His fellowship, and with whose worship He is well-pleased? Answer: he must be one innocent in his actions and pure in mind, one who does not lift up his soul to that which is vain (לִשְׁוֵא, according to the Masora with *Waw minusculum*). נֶפֶשׁ אֵל (ל) נֶפֶשׁ, to direct one's soul, Psa. 25: 1, or longing and striving, towards anything, Deu. 24:15, Pro. 19:18, Hos. 4: 8. The *Keri* נֶפֶשׁ is old and acknowledged by the oldest authorities. <sup>f149</sup>

Even the LXX *Cod. Alex.* translates: τὴν ψυχὴν μου; whereas *Cod. Vat.* (Eus., Apollin., Theodor., et al.): τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. Critically it is just as intangible, as it is exegetically incomprehensible; נַפְשִׁי might then be equivalent to שְׂמִי. Exo. 20: 7, an explanation, however, which does not seem possible even from Amo. 6: 8, Jer. 51:14. We let this *Kerî* alone to its undisturbed critical rights. But that the poet did actually write thus, is incredible.

In v. 5 (just as at the close of Psalm 15), in continued predicates, we are told the character of the man, who is worthy of this privilege, to whom the question in v. 3 refers. Such an one shall bear away, or acquire (נָשָׂא, as e.g., Est. 2:17) blessing from Jahve and righteousness from the God of his salvation (Psa. 25: 5; 27: 9). Righteousness, i.e., conformity to God and that which is well-pleasing to God, appears here as a gift, and in this sense it is used interchangeably with יָשַׁע (e.g., Psa. 132: 9, 16). It is the righteousness of God after which the righteous, but not the self-righteous, man hungers and thirsts; that moral perfection which is the likeness of God restored to him and at the same time brought about by his own endeavours; it is the being changed, or transfigured, into the image of the Holy One Himself. With v. 5 the answer to the question of v. 3 is at an end; v. 6 adds that those thus qualified, who may accordingly expect to receive God's gifts of salvation, are the true church of Jahve, the Israel of God. דְּוֹר (lit., a revolution, Arabic *dahr*, root דָּר, to turn, revolve) is used here, as in Psa. 14: 5; 73:15; 112: 2, of a collective whole, whose bond of union is not contemporaneousness, but similarity of disposition; and it is an alliteration with the דְּרָשָׁיו (*Chethîb* דָּרָשׁוּ, without the *Jod plur.*) which follows. מִמְּבַקְשֵׁי פָּנָיֶךָ is a second genitive depending on דְּוֹר, as in Psa. 27: 8. Here at the close the predication passes into the form of invocation (Thy face). And יַעֲקֹב is a summarising predicate: in short, these are Jacob, not merely after the flesh, but after the spirit, and thus in truth (Isa. 44: 2, cf. Rom. 9: 6, Gal. 6:16). By interpolating אֱלֹהֵי, as is done in the LXX and *Peshîto*, and adopted by Ewald, Olshausen, Hupfeld, and Böttcher, the nerve, as it were, of the assertion is cut through. The predicate, which has been expressed in different ways, is concentrated intelligibly enough in the one word יַעֲקֹב, towards which it all along tends. And here the music becomes *forte*. The first part of this double Psalm dies away amidst the playing of the instruments of the Levitical priests; for the Ark was brought in וּבְשִׁירִים וּבְכַלְעֹז, as 2Sa. 6: 5 (cf. 14) is to be read.

*Psa. 24: 7-10.* The festal procession has now arrived above at the gates of the citadel of Zion. These are called פְּתָחֵי עֹלָם, doors of eternity (not “of the world” as Luther renders it contrary to the Old Testament usage of the language) either as doors which pious faith hopes will last for ever, as Hupfeld

and Hitzig explain it, understanding them, in opposition to the inscription of the Psalm, to be the gates of Solomon's Temple; or, what seems to us much more appropriate in the mouth of those who are now standing before the gates, as the portals dating back into the hoary ages of the past (עֲלָם as e.g., in Gen. 49:26, Isa. 58:12), the time of the Jebusites, and even of Melchizedek, though which the King of Glory, whose whole being and acts is glory, is now about to enter. It is the gates of the citadel of Zion, to which the cry is addressed, to expand themselves in a manner worthy of the Lord who is about to enter, for whom they are too low and too strait. Rejoicing at the great honour, thus conferred upon them, they are to raise their heads (Job. 10:15, Zec. 2: 4), i.e., lift up their portals (lintels); the doors of antiquity are to open high and wide. <sup>f150</sup>

Then the question echoes back to the festal procession from Zion's gates which are wont only to admit mighty lords: who, then (הָ) giving vividness to the question, Ges. § 122, 2), is this King of Glory; and they describe Him more minutely: it is the Hero-god, by whom Israel has wrested this Zion from the Jebusites with the sword, and by whom he has always been victorious in time past. The adjectival climactic form עֲוֹז (like לְמוֹד, with *ř* instead of the *ǎ* in קָשׁוּב, הַנּוֹן) is only found in one other passage, viz., Isa. 43:17. גְּבוּר מְלַחֶמָה refers back to Exo. 15: 3. Thus then shall the gates raise their heads and the ancient doors lift themselves, i.e., open high and wide; and this is expressed here by *Kal* instead of *Niph*. (נָשָׂא) to lift one's self up, rise, as in Nah. 1: 5, Hos. 13: 1, Hab. 1: 3), according to the well-known order in which recurring verses and refrain-like repetitions move gently onwards. The gates of Zion ask once more, yet now no longer hesitatingly, but in order to hear more in praise of the great King. It is now the enquiry seeking fuller information; and the heaping up of the pronouns (as in Jer. 30:21, cf. 46: 7, Est. 7: 5) expresses its urgency (*quis tandem, ecquisnam*). The answer runs, "Jahve Tsebaoth, He is the King of Glory (now making His entry)." ה' צְבָאוֹת is the proper name of Jahve as King, which had become His customary name in the time of the kings of Israel. צְבָאוֹת is a genitive governed by ה'; and, while it is otherwise found only in reference to human hosts, in this combination it gains, of itself, the reference to the angels and the stars, which are called צְבָאִיו in Psa. 103:21; 148: 2: Jahve's hosts consisting of celestial heroes, Joe. 2:11, and of stars standing on the plain of the havens as it were in battle array, Isa. 40:26, — a reference for which experiences and utterances like those recorded in Gen. 32: 2 f., Deu. 33: 2, Jud. 5:20, have prepared the way. It is, therefore, the Ruler commanding innumerable and invincible super-terrestrial powers, who desires admission. The gates are silent and open wide; and Jahve, sitting enthroned above the Cherubim of the sacred Ark, enters into Zion.

## Psalm 25

### PRAYER FOR GRACIOUS PROTECTION AND GUIDANCE

25: 1 **⌘** UNTO Thee, Jahve, do I lift up my soul.

25: 2 **⌘** My God in Thee do I trust, let me not be ashamed,  
Let not mine enemies triumph over me.

25: 3 **⌘** Yea none that wait on Thee shall be ashamed,  
They shall be ashamed who are faithless without cause.

25: 4 **⌘** Thy ways, Jahve, make known to me,  
Thy paths teach Thou me.

25: 5 **⌘** Lead me in Thy truth, and teach me;  
For Thou art the God of my salvation,  
On Thee do I hope continually.

25: 6 **⌘** Remember, Jahve,  
Thy tender mercies and Thy loving-kindnesses,  
For they are ever of old.

25: 7 **⌘** The sins of my youth  
and my transgressions remember not,  
According to Thy mercy remember Thou me  
For Thy goodness' sake, Jahve!

25: 8 **⌘** Good and upright is Jahve;  
Therefore He instructeth sinners in the right way.

25: 9 **⌘** He leadeth the humble in that which is right,  
And teacheth the humble His way.

25:10 **⌘** All the paths of Jahve are mercy and truth,  
To such as keep His covenant and His testimonies.

25:11 **⌘** For Thy name's sake, Jahve, pardon my sin,  
For it is great.

25:12 **⌘** What man is he that feareth Jahve?  
Him shall He teach in the way of right choice.

25:13 **⌘** His soul shall dwell in prosperity,  
And his seed shall inherit the land.

25:14 **⌘** The secret of Jahve is with them that fear Him,  
And His covenant doth He make them know.

*25:15 ׀ Mine eyes are ever towards Jahve,  
For He will pluck my feet out of the net.*

*25:16 ׀ Turn Thee unto me and be gracious unto me,  
For I am desolate and needy.*

*25:17 ׀ Troubles have spread over my heart,  
Out of my distresses bring Thou me forth!*

*25:18 ׀ Look upon mine affliction and my trouble,  
And forgive all my sins.*

*25:19 ׀ Look upon mine enemies, that they are many,  
And with cruel hatred they hate me.*

*25:20 ׀ Keep my soul, and deliver me,  
Let me not be ashamed, for I trust in Thee.*

*25:21 ׀ Let integrity and uprightness preserve me,  
For I hope in Thee.*

*25:22 ׀ Redeem Israel, Elohim,  
Out of all his troubles.*

A question similar to the question, *Who may ascend the mountain of Jahve?* which Psalm 24 propounded, is thrown out by Psalm 25, *Who is he that feareth Jahve?* in order to answer it in great and glorious promises. It is calmly confident prayer for help against one's foes, and for God's instructing, pardoning, and leading grace. It is without any definite background indicating the history of the times in which it was composed; and also without any clearly marked traits of individuality. But it is one of the nine alphabetical Psalms of the whole collection, and the companion to Psalm 34, to which it corresponds even in many peculiarities of the acrostic structure. For both Psalms have no ׀ strophe; they are parallel both as to sound and meaning in the beginnings of the ׀, ׀, and the first ׀ strophes; and both Psalms, after having gone through the alphabet, have a ׀ strophe added as the concluding one, whose beginning and contents are closely related. This homogeneousness points to one common author. We see nothing in the alphabetical arrangement at least, which even here as in Psalm ch. 9-10 is handled very freely and not fully carried out, to hinder us from regarding David as this author. But, in connection with the general ethical and religious character of the Psalm, it is wanting in positive proofs of this. In its universal character and harmony with the plan of redemption Psalm 25 coincides with many post-exilic Psalms. It contains nothing but what is common to the believing consciousness of the church in every age; nothing specifically belonging to the Old Testament and Israelitish,

hence Theodoret says: ἀρμόζει μάλιστα τοῖς ἐξ ἔθνων κεκλημένοις. The introits for the second and third Quadragesima Sundays are taken from vv. 6 and 15; hence these Sundays are called *Reminiscere* and *Oculi*. Paul Gerhardt's hymn "*Nach dir, o Herr, verlangst mich*" is a beautiful poetical rendering of this Psalm.

*Psa. 25: 1-2.* The Psalm begins, like Psalm 16, 23, with a monostich. V. 2 is the ב strophe, אֱלֹהֵי (unless one is disposed to read בך אֱלֹהֵי according to the position of the words in Psa. 31: 2), after the manner of the interjections in the tragedians, e.g., ὦμοι, not being reckoned as belonging to the verse (J. D. Köhler). In need of help and full of longing for deliverance he raises his soul, drawn away from earthly desires, to Jahve (Psa. 86: 4; 143: 8), the God who alone can grant him that which shall truly satisfy his need. His ego, which has the soul within itself, directs his soul upwards to Him whom he calls אֱלֹהֵי, because in believing confidence he clings to Him and is united with Him. The two אֱלֹהֵי declare what Jahve is not to allow him to experience, just as in Psa. 31: 2, 18. According to Psa. 25:19, 24; 38:17, it is safer to construe לִי with יִאֲלָצֶנּוּ (cf. Psa. 71:10), as also in Psa. 27: 2; 30: 2, Mic. 7: 8, although it would be possible to construe it with אֲוִיבִי (cf. Psa. 144: 2). In v. 3 the confident expectation of the individual is generalised.

*Psa. 25: 3.* That wherewith the praying one comforts himself is no peculiar personal prerogative, but the certain, joyous prospect of all believers: ἡ ἐλπὶς οὐ κατασχύνει, Rom. 5: 5. These are called קוֹיָה (קוֹיָה participle to קָנָה, just as דִּבֵּר is the participle to דָּבַר). Hope is the eye of faith which looks forth clear and fixedly into the future. With those who hope in Jahve, who do not allow themselves to be in any way disconcerted respecting Him, are contrasted those who act treacherously towards Him (Psa. 119:158, Aq., Symm., Theodot. οἱ ἀποστατοῦντες), and that רִיקָם, *i.e.* — and it can only mean this — from vain and worthless pretexts, and therefore from wanton unconscientiousness.

*Psa. 25: 4.* Recognising the infamy of such black ingratitude, he prays for instruction as to the ways which he must take according to the precepts of God (Psa. 18:22). The will of God, it is true, lies before us in God's written word, but the expounder required for the right understanding of that word is God Himself. He prays Him for knowledge; but in order to make what he knows a perfect and living reality, he still further needs the grace of God, *viz.*, both His enlightening and also His guiding grace.

*Psa. 25: 5.* His truth is the lasting and self-verifying fact of His revelation of grace. To penetrate into this truth and to walk in it (Psa. 26: 3; 86:11) without God, is a contradiction in its very self. Therefore the psalmist prays, as in

119:35, ὁδήγησόν με ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου (LXX *Cod. Alex.*; whereas *Cod. Vat.* ἐπὶ τὴν..., cf. Joh. 16:13). He prays thus, for his salvation comes from Jahve, yea Jahve is his salvation. He does not hope for this or that, but for Him, all the day, i.e., unceasingly, <sup>f151</sup> for everything worth hoping for, everything that can satisfy the longing of the soul, is shut up in Him. All mercy or grace, however, which proceeds from Him, has its foundation in His compassion and condescension.

*Psa. 25: 6.* The supplicatory *reminiscere* means, may God never forget to exercise His pity and grace towards him, which are (as the plurals imply) so rich and superabundant. The ground on which the prayer is based is introduced with כִּי (*nam*, or even *quoniam*). God's compassion and grace are as old in their operation and efficacy as man's feebleness and sin; in their counsels they are eternal, and therefore have also in themselves the pledge of eternal duration (*Psa.* 100: 5; 103:17).

*Psa. 25: 7.* May Jahve not remember the faults of his youth (חַטָּאוֹתָי), into which lust and thoughtlessness have precipitated him, nor the transgressions (פְּשָׁעַי), by which even in maturer and more thoughtful years he has turned the grace of God into licentiousness and broken off his fellowship with Him (בִּפְשָׁעַי, of defection); but may He, on the contrary, turn His remembrance to him (לְזָכְרִי as in *Psa.* 136:23) in accordance with His grace or loving-kindness, which אֱמֶתֶה challenges as being the form of self-attestation most closely corresponding to the nature of God. *Memor esto quidem mei*, observes Augustine, *non secundum iram, qua ego dignus sum, sed secundum misericordiam tuam, quae te digna est.* For God is טוֹב, which is really equivalent to saying, He is ἀγάπη. The next distich shows that טוֹב is intended here of God's goodness, and not, as e.g., in *Neh.* 9:35, of His abundance of possessions.

*Psa. 25: 8.* The כִּי with הַדֶּרֶךְ denotes the way, i.e., the right way (*Job.* 31: 7), as the sphere and subject of the instruction, as in *Psa.* 32: 8, *Pro.* 4:11, *Job.* 27:11. God condescends to sinners in order to teach them the way that leads to life, for He is מוֹבִילֵי שָׁלוֹם; well-doing is His delight, and, if His anger be not provoked (*Psa.* 18:27 *b*), He has only the sincerest good intention in what He does.

*Psa. 25: 9.* The shortened form of the future stands here, according to *Ges.* § 128, 2, rem., instead of the full form (which, viz., יִדְרֶךְ, is perhaps meant); for the connection which treats of general facts, does not admit of its being taken as optative. The כִּי (cf. v. 5, *Psa.* 107: 7; 119:35) denotes the sphere of the

guidance. **מִשְׁפָּט** is the right so far as it is traversed, i.e., practised or carried out. In this course of right He leads the **עֲנָוִים**, and teaches them the way that is pleasing to Himself. **עֲנָוִים** is the one word for the gentle, *mansueti*, and the humble, *modesti*. Jerome uses these words alternately in v. 9a and 9b; but the poet designedly repeats the one word — the cardinal virtue of **עֲנָוָה** — here with the preponderating notion of lowliness. Upon the self-righteous and self-sufficient He would be obliged to force Himself even against their will. He wants disciples eager to learn; and how richly He rewards those who guard what they have learnt!

*Psa. 25:10.* The paths intended, are those which He takes with men in accordance with His revealed will and counsel. These paths are **חֶסֶד** [loving-kindness, mercy, or grace], for the salvation of men is their goal, and **אֱמֶת** [truth], for they give proof at every step of the certainty of His promises. But only they who keep His covenant and His testimonies faithfully and obediently shall share in this mercy and truth. To the psalmist the name of Jahve, which unfolds itself in mercy and truth, is precious. Upon it he bases the prayer that follows.

*Psa. 25:11.* The *perf. consec.* is attached to the **יְהוָה**, which is, according to the sense, implied in **לְמַאן שָׂמַד**, just as in other instances it follows adverbial members of a clause, placed first for the sake of emphasis, when those members have reference to the future, Ges. § 126, rem. 1. Separate and manifold sins (v. 7) are all comprehended in **עוֹן**, which is in other instances also the collective word for the corruption and the guilt of sin. **כִּי** gives the ground of the need and urgency of the petition. A great and multiform load of sin lies upon him, but the name of God, i.e., His nature that has become manifest in His mercy and truth, permits him to ask and to hope for forgiveness, not for the sake of anything whatever that he has done, but just for the sake of this name (Jer. 14: 7, Isa. 43:25). How happy therefore is he who fears God, in this matter!

*Psa. 25:12.* The question: *quisnam est vir*, which resembles Psa. 34:13; 107:43, Isa. 50:10, is only propounded in order to draw attention to the person who bears the character described, and then to state what such an one has to expect. In prose we should have a relative antecedent clause instead, viz., *qui (quisquis) talis est qui Dominum vereatur.* <sup>f152</sup>

The attributive **יִבְחָר**, (*viam*) *quam eligat* (cf. Isa. 48:17), might also be referred to God: in which He takes delight (LXX); but parallels like Psa. 119:30, 173, favour the rendering: which he should choose. Among all the



blessings which fall to the lot of him who fears God, the first place is given to this, that God raises him above the vacillation and hesitancy of human opinion.

*Psa. 25:13.* The verb לִיַן (לִיִן), probably equivalent to לִיַל (from לִיַל) signifies to tarry the night, to lodge. Good, i.e., inward and outward prosperity, is like the place where such an one turns in and finds shelter and protection. And in his posterity will be fulfilled what was promised to the patriarchs and to the people delivered from Egypt, viz., possession of the land, or as this promise runs in the New Testament, of the earth, Mat. 5: 5 (cf. Psa. 37:11), Rev. 5:10.

*Psa. 25:14.* The LXX renders סוֹד, κραταίωμα, as though it were equivalent to יסוֹד. The reciprocal נוֹסֵד, Psa. 2: 2 (which see), leads one to the right primary signification. Starting from the primary meaning of the root סֹד, “to be or to make tight, firm, compressed,” סוֹד signifies a being closely pressed together for the purpose of secret communication and converse, confidential communion or being together, Psa. 89: 8; 111: 1 (Symm. δμιλία), then the confidential communication itself, Psa. 55:15, a secret (Aquila ἀπόρρητον, Theod. μυστήριον). So here: He opens his mind without any reserve, speaks confidentially with those who fear Him; cf. the derivative passage Pro. 3:32, and an example of the thing itself in Gen. 18:17. In v. 14b the infinitive with לְ, according to Ges. § 132, rem. 1, as in Isa. 38:20, is an expression for the *fut. periphrast.*: *faedus suum notum facturum est iis*; the position of the words is like Dan. 2:16, 18; 4:15. הוֹדִיִּא is used of the imparting of not merely intellectual, but experimental knowledge. Hitzig renders it differently, viz., to enlighten them. But the *Hiph.* is not intended to be used thus absolutely even in 2Sa. 7:21. בְּרִיתוֹ is the object; it is intended of the rich and deep and glorious character of the covenant revelation. The poet has now on all sides confirmed the truth, that every good gift comes down from above, from the God of salvation; and he returns to the thought from which he started.

*Psa. 25:15.* He who keeps his eyes constantly directed towards God (Psa. 141: 8; 123: 1), is continually in a praying mood, which cannot remain unanswered. תַּמִּיד corresponds to ἀδιαλείπτως in 1Th. 5:17. The aim of this constant looking upwards to God, in this instance, is deliverance out of the enemy’s net. He can and will pull him out (Psa. 31: 5) of the net of complicated circumstances into which he has been ensnared without any fault of his own.

*Psa. 25:16.* The rendering “regard me,” so far as פָּנָה אֵל means God’s observant and sympathising turning to any one (LXX ἐπιβλέπειν), corresponds to Psa. 86:16, Lev. 26: 9. For this he longs, for men treat him as a stranger and

refuse to have anything to do with him. **יָחִיד** is the only one of his kind, one who has no companion, therefore the isolated one. The recurrence of the same sounds **עָנִי אָנִי** is designedly not avoided. To whom could he, the isolated one, pour forth his affliction, to whom could he unveil his inmost thoughts and feelings? to God alone! To Him he can bring all his complaints, to Him he can also again and again always make supplication.

*Psa. 25:17.* The *Hiph.* **הִרְחִיב** signifies to make broad, and as a transitive denominative applied to the mind and heart: to make a broad space = to expand one's self (cf. as to the idea, Lam, 2:13, "great as the sea is thy misfortune"), LXX *ἐπλαθύνθησαν*, perhaps originally it was *ἐπλατύνθησαν*. Accordingly **הִרְחִיבוּ** is admissible so far as language is concerned; but since it gives only a poor antithesis to **צָרוֹת** it is to be suspected. The original text undoubtedly was **הִרְחִיבוּ** (**הִרְחִיבוּ**), as in Psa. 77: 2, or **הִרְחִיבוּ**, as e.g., in 2Ki. 8: 6): the straits of my heart do Thou enlarge (cf. Psa. 119:32, 2Co. 6:11) and bring me out of my distresses (Hitzig and others).

*Psa. 25:18-19.* The falling away of the **ק** is made up for by a double **ר** strophe. Even the LXX has *ῥε* twice over. The seeing that is prayed for, is in both instances a seeing into his condition, with which is conjoined the notion of interposing on his behalf, though the way and manner thereof is left to God. **נָשָׂא לִי**, with the object in the dative instead of the accusative (*tollere peccata*), signifies to bestow a taking away, i.e., forgiveness, upon any one (synon. **לִי סָלַח**). It is pleasing to the New Testament consciousness that God's vengeance is not expressly invoked upon his enemies. **כִּי** is an expansive *quod* as in Gen. 1: 4. **שִׂנְאָת חָמָס** with an attributive genitive is hatred, which springs from injustice and ends in injustice.

*Psa. 25:20.* He entreats for preservation and deliverance from God; and that He may not permit his hope to be disappointed (**אֶל-אֲבוֹשָׁה**, cf. 1Ch. 21:13, instead of **אֶל-אֲבוֹשָׁה** which is usual in other instances). This his hope rests indeed in Him: he has taken refuge in Him and therefore He cannot forsake him, He cannot let him be destroyed.

*Psa. 25:21.* Devoutness that fills the whole man, that is not merely half-hearted and hypocritical, is called **יֵשָׁר**; and uprightness that follows the will of God without any bypaths and forbidden ways is called **יָשָׁר**. These two radical virtues (cf. Job. 1: 1) he desires to have as his guardians on his way which is perilous not only by reason of outward foes, but also on account of his own sinfulness. These custodians are not to let him pass out of their sight, lest he

should be taken away from them (cf. Psa. 40:12, Pro. 20:28). He can claim this for himself, for the cynosure of his hope is God, from whom proceed **אֱלֹהִים** and **אֲנֹכִי** like good angels.

*Psa. 25:22.* His experience is not singular, but the enmity of the world and sin bring all who belong to the people of God into straits just as they have him. And the need of the individual will not cease until the need of the whole undergoes a radical remedy. Hence the intercessory prayer of this meagre closing distich, whose connection with what precedes is not in this instance so close as in Psa. 34:23. It looks as though it was only added when Psalm 25 came to be used in public worship; and the change of the name of God favours this view. Both Psalms close with a **ב** in excess of the alphabet. Perhaps the first **ב** represents the  $\pi$ , and the second the  $\phi$ ; for Psa. 25:16; 34:17 follow words ending in a consonant, and Psa. 25:22; 34:23, words ending in a vowel. Or is it a propensity for giving a special representation of the final letters, just as these are sometimes represented, though not always perfectly, at the close of the hymns of the synagogue (*pijutim*)?

## Psalm 26

### THE LONGING OF THE ONE WHO IS PERSECUTED INNOCENTLY, TO GIVE THANKS TO GOD IN HIS HOUSE

*26: 1 VINDICATE my cause, Jahve, for I have walked in mine integrity,  
And in Jahve have I trusted without wavering.*

*26: 2 Prove me, Jahve, and try me,  
Purify my reins and my heart.*

*26: 3 For Thy loving-kindness is before mine eyes,  
And I walk in Thy truth.*

*26: 4 I have not sat with vain persons,  
And with dissemblers I have no intercourse.*

*26: 5 I hate the congregation of the wicked,  
And I sit not with the ungodly.*

*26: 6 I will wash my hands in innocency,  
And I desire to compass Thine altar, Jahve;*

*26: 7 That I may join in with the voice of thanksgiving,  
And tell of all Thy wondrous works.*

*26: 8 Jahve, I love the habitation of Thy house,  
And the place where Thy glory dwelleth.*

*26: 9 Gather not my soul with sinners,  
Nor my life with men of blood,*

*26:10 In whose hands is infamy,  
And whose right hand is full of bribery.*

*26:11 I, however, do walk in mine integrity —  
Deliver me and be gracious unto me!*

*26:12 My foot is come to stand in a wide plain,  
In the choirs of the congregation will I praise Jahve.*

Psalms 25 and 26 are bound together by similarity of thought and expression. In the former as in this Psalm, we find the writer's testimony to his trust in God (בְּטַחָתִי, Psa. 25: 2; 26: 1); there as here, the cry coming forth from a distressed condition for deliverance (פָּדֵה, Psa. 25:22; 26:11), and for some manifestation of mercy (יְהַנֵּנִי Psa. 26:11; 25:16); and in the midst of these, other prominent points of contact (Psa. 26:11; 25:21; 26: 3; 25: 5). These are grounds sufficient for placing these two Psalms close together. But in Psalm 26 there is wanting the self-accusation that goes hand in hand with the self-attestation of piety, that confession of sin which so closely corresponds to the New Testament consciousness (vid., *supra* p. 43), which is thrice repeated in Psalm 25. The harshness of the contrast in which the psalmist stands to his enemies, whose character is here more minutely described, does not admit of the introduction of such a lament concerning himself. The description applies well to the Absalomites. They are hypocrites, who, now that they have agreed together in their faithless and bloody counsel, have thrown off their disguise and are won over by bribery to their new master; for Absalom had stolen the hearts of the men of Israel, 2Sa. 15: 6. David at that time would not take the Ark with him in his flight, but said: If I shall find favour in the eyes of Jahve, He will bring me back, and grant me to see both it and His habitation, 2Sa. 15:25. The love for the house of God, which is expressed herein, is also the very heart of this Psalm.

*Psa. 26: 1-3.* The poet, as one who is persecuted, prays for the vindication of his rights and for rescue; and bases this petition upon the relation in which he stands to God. יָשָׁרָה, as in Psa. 7: 9; 35:24, cf. 43: 1. יָשָׁרָה (synon. יָשָׁרָה, which, however, does not take any suffix) is, according to Gen. 20: 5 f., 1Ki. 22:34, perfect freedom from all sinful intent, purity of character, pureness, guilelessness (ἀκακία, ἀπλότης). Upon the fact, that he has walked in a harmless mind, without cherishing or provoking enmity, and trusted unwaveringly (לֹא אֶמְעָד, an adverbial circumstantial clause, cf. 21: 8) in Jahve, he bases the petition for the proving of his injured right. He does not self-righteously hold himself to be morally perfect, he appeals only to the

fundamental tendency of his inmost nature, which is turned towards God and to Him only. V. 2 also is not so much a challenge for God to satisfy Himself of his innocence, as rather a request to prove the state of his mind, and, if it be not as it appears to his consciousness, to make this clear to him (Psa. 139:23 f.).

בְּחִן is not used in this passage of proving by trouble, but by a penetrating glance into the inmost nature (Psa. 11: 5; 17: 3). נִסָּה, not in the sense of πειράζειν, but of δοκομάζειν. צָרַר, to melt down, i.e., by the agency of fire, the precious metal, and separate the dross (Psa. 12: 7; 66:10). The *Chethîb* is not to be read צְרוּפָה (which would be in contradiction to the request), but צָרְנוּפָה, as it is out of pause also in Isa. 32:11, cf. Jud. 9: 8, 12, 1Sa. 28: 8. The reins are the seat of the emotions, the heart is the very centre of the life of the mind and soul.

*Psa. 26: 3.* V. 3 tells how confidently and cheerfully he would set himself in the light of God. God's grace or loving-kindness is the mark on which his eye is fixed, the desire of his eye, and he walks in God's truth. חֶסֶד is the divine love, condescending to His creatures, and more especially to sinners (Psa. 25: 7), in unmerited kindness; אֱמֶת is the truth with which God adheres to and carries out the determination of His love and the word of His promise. This lovingkindness of God has been always hitherto the model of his life, this truth of God the determining line and the boundary of his walk.

*Psa. 26: 4-5.* He still further bases his petition upon his comportment towards the men of this world; how he has always observed a certain line of conduct and continues still to keep to it. With v. 4a compare Jer. 15:17. שְׂוֵא מְתִי (Job. 11:11, cf. 31: 5, where the parallel word is מְרֻמָּה) are "not-real," unreal men, but in a deeper stronger sense than we are accustomed to use this word. שְׂוֵא (= שְׂוֵאָה, from שׂוּא) is aridity, hollowness, worthlessness, and therefore badness (Arab. *su'*) of disposition; the chaotic void of alienation from God; untruth white-washed over with the lie of dissimulation (Psa. 12: 3), and therefore nothingness: it is the very opposite of being filled with the fulness of God and with that which is good, which is the morally real (its synonym is אֱנִין, e.g., Job. 22:15). נִעְלָמִים, the veiled, are those who know how to keep their worthlessness and their mischievous designs secret and to mask them by hypocrisy; post-biblical צְבוּעִים, dyed (cf. ἀνυπόκριτος, Luther "ungefärbt," undyed). בּוֹא עִם (אִתּוֹ), to go in with any one, is a short expression for: to go in and out with, i.e., to have intercourse with him, as in Pro. 22:24, cf. Gen. 23:10. מְרַשָּׁע (from רָשָׁע) is the name for one who plots that which is evil and puts it into execution. On רָשָׁע see Psa. 1: 1.

*Psa. 26: 6-8.* The poet supports his petition by declaring his motive to be his love for the sanctuary of God, from which he is now far removed, without any fault of his own. The coloured future **וְאִסְבְּבָה**, distinct from **וְאִסְבְּבָה** (vid., on Psa. 3: 6 and Psa. 73:16), can only mean, in this passage, *et ambiam*, and not *et ambibam* as it does in a different connection (Isa. 43:26, cf. Jud. 6: 9); it is the emotional continuation (cf. Psa. 27: 6, Son. 7:12, Isa. 1:24; 5:19, and frequently) of the plain and uncoloured expression **אָרְחָץ**. He wishes to wash his hands in innocence (**צַדִּיק** of the state that is meant to be attested by the action), and compass (Psa. 59: 7) the altar of Jahve. That which is elsewhere a symbolic act (Deu. 21: 6, cf. Mat. 27:24), is in this instance only a rhetorical figure made use of to confess his consciousness of innocence; and it naturally assumes this form (cf. Psa. 73:13) from the idea of the priest washing his hands preparatory to the service of the altar (Exo. 32:20 f.) being associated with the idea of the altar. And, in general, the expression of vv. 6 f. takes a priestly form, without exceeding that which the ritual admits of, by virtue of the consciousness of being themselves priests which appertained even to the Israelitish laity (Exo. 19:16). For **סָבַב** can be used even of half encompassing as it were like a semi-circle (Gen. 2:11, Num. 21: 4), no matter whether it be in the immediate vicinity of, or at a prescribed distance from, the central point. **לְשִׁמָּא** is a syncopated and defectively written *Hiph.*, for **לְהִשְׁמִיא**, like **לְשִׁמְד**, Isa. 23:11. Instead of **קוֹל תְּזַדְּדָה**, “to cause the voice of thanksgiving to be heard,” since **הִשְׁמִיעַ** is used absolutely (1Ch. 15:19, 2Ch. 5:13) and the object is conceived of as the instrument of the act (Ges. § 138, 1, rem. 3), it is “in order to strike in with the voice of thanksgiving.” In the expression “all Thy wondrous works” is included the latest of these, to which the voice of thanksgiving especially refers, viz., the bringing of him home from the exile he had suffered from Absalom. Longing to be back again he longs most of all for the gorgeous services in the house of his God, which are performed around the altar of the outer court; for he loves the habitation of the house of God, the place, where His doxa, — revealed on earth, and in fact revealed in grace, — has taken up its abode. **מְעוֹן** does not mean refuge, shelter (Hupfeld), — for although it may obtain this meaning from the context, it has nothing whatever to do with Arab. *ʿân, med. Waw*, in the signification to help (whence *ma ʿûn, ma ʿûne, ma ʿâne*, help, assistance, succour or support), — but place, dwelling, habitation, like the Arabic *ma ʿân*, which the Kamus explains by *menzil*, a place to settle down in, and explains etymologically by Arab. *mħll l- ʿîn*, i.e., “a spot on which the eye rests as an object of sight;” for in the Arabic *ma ʿân* is traced back to Arab. *ʿân, med. Je*, as is seen from the phrase *hum minka bi-ma ʿânin*, i.e., they are from thee on a point of sight (= on a spot where thou canst see them from the spot on which thou standest). The signification place, sojourn,

abode (Targ. **מְדוּרָה**) is undoubted; the primary meaning of the root is, however, questionable.

*Psa. 26: 9-11.* It is now, for the first time, that the petition compressed into the one word **שְׁפַטְנִי** (v. 1) is divided out. He prays (as in Psa. 28: 3), that God may not connect him in one common lot with those whose fellowship of sentiment and conduct he has always shunned. **אֲנָשֵׁי דָמִים**, as in Psa. 5: 7, cf. **ἄνθρωποι αἱμάτων**, Sir. 31:25. Elsewhere **זְמָה** signifies purpose, and more particularly in a bad sense; but in this passage it means infamy, and not unnatural unchastity, to which **בִּידֵיהֶם** is inappropriate, but scum of whatever is vicious in general: they are full of cunning and roguery, and their right hand, which ought to uphold the right — David has the lords of his people in his eye — is filled (**מִלְּאָה**, not **מִלְּאָה**) with accursed (Deu. 27:25) bribery to the condemnation of the innocent. He, on the contrary, now, as he always has done, walks in his uprightness, so that now he can with all the more joyful conscience intreat God to interpose judicially in his behalf.

*Psa. 26:12.* The epilogue. The prayer is changed into rejoicing which is certain of the answer that shall be given. Hitherto shut in, as it were, in deep trackless gorges, he even now feels himself to be standing **בְּמִישׁוֹר**, <sup>f153</sup> upon a pleasant plain commanding a wide range of vision (cf. **בְּמִדְבָּר**, Psa. 31: 9), and now blends his grateful praise of God with the song of the worshipping congregation, **קָהַל** (LXX **ἐν ἑκκλησίαις**), and its full-voiced choirs.

## Psalm 27

### TAKING HEART IN GOD, THE ALL-RECOMPENSING ONE

*27: 1 JAHVE is my light and my salvation, whom shall I fear?  
Jahve is the defence of my life, of whom shall I be afraid?*

*27: 2 When the wicked come against me, to eat up my flesh,  
My oppressors and my enemies to me  
— they have stumbled and fallen.*

*27: 3 Though a host should encamp  
against me, my heart shall not fear,  
Though war should rise up against me,  
in spite of it I will be confident.*

*27: 4 One thing have I asked of Jahve, that do I desire:  
That I may dwell in the house of Jahve all the days of my life,  
To behold the graciousness of Jahve, and to meditate in His temple.*

*27: 5 For He concealeth me in His pavilion in the day of evil,  
He hideth me in the shelter of His tabernacle,  
Upon a rock doth He raise me up.*

*27: 6 Thus then shall my head be exalted  
above mine enemies round about me,  
And I will offer in His tabernacle sacrifices of thankful joy.  
I will sing and play the harp to Jahve.*

*27: 7 Hear, Jahve, when I cry aloud;  
be gracious unto me and answer me.*

*27: 8 To Thee saith my heart: Seek ye My face —  
This Thy face, Jahve, will I seek.*

*27: 9 Hide not Thy face from me,  
Put not Thy servant away in anger;  
Thou art my help, cast me not away,  
And forsake me not, O God of my salvation.*

*27:10 For my father and mother have forsaken me,  
But Jahve taketh me up.*

*27:11 Teach me, Jahve, Thy way,  
And lead me in an even path because of my liars in wait.*

*27:12 Give me not over into the will of mine oppressors,  
For false witnesses rise up against me  
and such as breathe out violence.*

*27:13 Did I not believe to see Jahve's  
goodness in the land of the living — !*

*27:14 Hope in Jahve,  
Be of good courage, and let thine heart be strong,  
And hope in Jahve.*

The same longing after Zion meets us sounding forth from this as from the preceding Psalm. To remain his whole life long in the vicinity of the house of God, is here his only prayer; and that, rescued from his enemies, he shall there offer sacrifices of thanksgiving, is his confident expectation. The **היכל** of God, the King, is at present only a **אהל** which, however, on account of Him who sits enthroned therein, may just as much be called **היכל** as the **היכל** which Ezekiel beheld in remembrance of the Mosaic tabernacle, **אהל**, Eze. 41: 1. Cut off from the sanctuary, the poet is himself threatened on all sides by the dangers of war; but he is just as courageous in God as in Psa. 3: 7, where the battle is already going on: “*I do not fear the myriads of people, who are encamped against me.*” The situation, therefore, resembles that of David



during the time of Absalom. But this holds good only of the first half, vv. 1-6. In the second half, v. 10 is not in favour of its being composed by David. In fact the two halves are very unlike one another. They form a *hysteron-proteron*, inasmuch as the *fides triumphans* of the first part changes into *fides supplex* in the second, and with the beginning of the **δέσις** in v. 7, the style becomes heavy and awkward, the strophic arrangement obscure, and even the boundaries of the lines of the verses uncertain; so that one is tempted to regard vv. 7-14 as the appendage of another writer. The compiler, however, must have had the Psalm before him exactly as we now have it; for the grounds for his placing it to follow Psalm 26 are to be found in both portions, cf. v. 7 with Psa. 26:11; v. 11 with Psa. 26:12.

**Psa. 27: 1-3.** In this first strophe is expressed the bold confidence of faith. It is a hexastich in the caesural schema. Let darkness break in upon him, the darkness of night, of trouble, and of spiritual conflict, yet Jahve is his Light, and if he is in Him, he is in the light and there shines upon him a sun, that sets not and knows no eclipse. This sublime, infinitely profound name for God, **אור־י**, is found only in this passage; and there is only one other expression that can be compared with it. viz., **בְּאֵ אֲוִרָךְ** in Isa. 60: 1; cf. **φῶς ἐλάληθα**, Joh. 12:46. **יְשַׁעִי** does not stand beside **אור־י** as an unfigurative, side by side with a figurative expression; for the statement that God is light, is not a metaphor. David calls Him his “salvation” in regard to everything that oppresses him, and the “stronghold (**מְעוֹז** from **עָזָז**, with an unchangeable *ā*) of his life” in regard to everything that exposes him to peril. In Jahve he conquers far and wide; in Him his life is hidden as it were behind a fortress built upon a rock (Psa. 31: 3). When to the wicked who come upon him in a hostile way (**קָרַב אֵל** differing from **קָרַב אֵל**), he attributes the intention of devouring his flesh, they are conceived of as wild beasts. To eat up any one’s flesh signifies, even in Job. 19:22, the same as to pursue any one by evil speaking (in Aramaic by slander, back-biting) to his destruction. In **בְּקָרַב** (the *Shebā* of the only faintly closed syllable is raised to a *Chateph*, as in **וְלִשְׁכֵנִי**, Psa. 31:12, **לִשְׂאוֹל**, and the like. The **לִי** of **אֹיְבֵי לִי** may, as also in Psa. 25: 2 (cf. Psa. 144: 2), be regarded as giving intensity to the notion of special, personal enmity; but a mere repetition of the subject (the enemy) without the repetition of their hostile purpose would be tame in the parallel member of the verse: **לִי** is a variation of the preceding **עָלַי**, as in Lam. 3:60 f. In the apodosis **הִמָּה בְּשִׁלּוֹ וְנִפְלוּ**, the overthrow of the enemy is regarded beforehand as an accomplished fact. The holy boldness and imperturbable repose are expressed in v. 3 in the very rhythm. The thesis or downward movement in v. 3a is spondaic: he does not allow himself to be disturbed; the thesis in v. 3b is iambic: he can be bold. The rendering of Hitzig (as of Rashi): “in this do I

trust, viz., that Jahve is my light, etc.,” is erroneous. Such might be the interpretation, if **בִּזְאוֹת אֲנִי בֹטַח** closed v. 2; but it cannot refer back over v. 2 to v. 1; and why should the poet have expressed himself thus materially, instead of saying **בִּיהוָה**? The fact of the case is this, **בֹּטַח** signifies even by itself “of good courage,” e.g., Pro. 11:15; and **בִּזְאוֹת** “in spite of this” (Coccejus: *hoc non obstante*), Lev. 26:27, cf. Ps. 78:32, begins the apodosis, at the head of which we expect to find an adversative conjunction.

**Psa. 27: 4-5.** There is only one thing, that he desires, although he also has besides full satisfaction in Jahve in the midst of strangers and in trouble. The future is used side by side with the perfect in v. 4a, in order to express an ardent longing which extends out of the past into the future, and therefore runs through his whole life. The one thing sought is unfolded in **שְׁבַתִּי וְגוֹ' .** A life-long dwelling in the house of Jahve, that is to say intimate spiritual intercourse with the God, who has His dwelling (**בֵּית**), His palace (**הַיְכָל**) in the holy tent, is the one desire of David’s heart, in order that he may behold and feast upon (**חָזַה בְּ**) of a clinging, lingering, chained gaze, and consequently a more significant form of expression than **חָזַה** with an accusative, Ps. 63: 3) **נֶאֱמַר ה'** (Psa. 90:17), the pleasantness (or gracefulness) of Jahve, i.e., His revelation, full of grace, which is there visible to the eye of the spirit. The interpretation which regards *amaenitas* as being equivalent to *amaenus cultus* takes hold of the idea from the wrong side. The assertion that **בִּבְקֹר בְּ** is intended as a synonym of **חָזַה בְּ**, of a pleased and lingering contemplation (Hupf., Hitz.), is contrary to the meaning of the verb, which signifies “to examine (with **ל** to seek or spie about after anything, Lev. 13:36), to reflect on, or consider;” even the post-biblical signification to visit, more especially the sick (whence **חָלִים בְּבִקֹּר**), comes from the primary meaning *investigare*. An appropriate sense may be obtained in the present instance by regarding it as a denominative from **בִּקֵּשׁ** and rendering it as Dunash and Rashi have done, “and to appear early in His temple;” but it is unnecessary to depart from the general usage of the language. Hengstenberg rightly retains the signification “to meditate on.” **בְּהַיְכָלוֹ** is a designation of the place consecrated to devotion, and **לְבִקֹּר** is meant to refer to contemplative meditation that loses itself in God who is there manifest. In v. 5 David bases the justification of his desire upon that which the sanctuary of God is to him; the futures affirm what Jahve will provide for him in His sanctuary. It is a refuge in which he may hide himself, where Jahve takes good care of him who takes refuge therein from the storms of trouble that rage outside: there he is far removed from all dangers, he is lifted high above them and his feet are upon rocky ground. The *Chethib* may be read **בְּסִכְּהָ**, as in Ps. 31:21 and with Ewald § 257, d; but, in this passage, with **אֶהָל**

alternates **דָּבַר**, which takes the place of **סָבַח** in the poetic style (Psa. 76: 3, Lam. 2: 6), though it does not do so by itself, but always with a suffix. <sup>f154</sup>

*Psa. 27: 6.* With **וַאֲתָהּ** the poet predicts inferentially (cf. 2:10) the fulfilment of what he fervently desires, the guarantee of which lies in his very longing itself. **זְבַחֵי תְרוּעָה** do not mean sacrifices in connection with which the trumpets are blown by the priests; for this was only the case in connection with the sacrifices of the whole congregation (Num. 10:10), not with those of individuals. **תְרוּעָה** is a synonym of **תְּוֹדָה**, Psa. 26: 7; and **זְבַחֵי תְרוּעָה** is a stronger form of expression for **זְבַחֵי תְוֹדָה** (Psa. 107:22), i.e., (cf. **זְבַחֵי צֶדֶק**, Psa. 4: 6, 51:21) sacrifices of jubilant thanksgiving: he will offer sacrifices in which his gratitude plays a prominent part, and will sing songs of thanksgiving, accompanied by the playing of stringed instruments, to his Deliverer, who has again and so gloriously verified His promises.

*Psa. 27: 7-8.* Vows of thanksgiving on the assumption of the answering of the prayer and the fulfilment of the thing supplicated, are very common at the close of Psalms. But in this Psalm the prayer is only just beginning at this stage. The transition is brought about by the preceding conception of the danger that threatens him from the side of his foes who are round about him. The reality, which, in the first part, is overcome and surmounted by his faith, makes itself consciously felt here. It is not to be rendered, as has been done by the Vulgate, *Exaudi Domine vocem qua clamavi* (rather, *clamo*) *ad te* (the introit of the *Dominica exspectionis* in the interval of preparation between Ascension and Pentecost). **שָׁמַע** has *Dechî*, and accordingly **קוּלִי אֶקְרָא**, *voce mea* (as in 3: 5) *clamo*, is an adverbial clause equivalent to *voce mea clamante me*. In v. 8 **לֵךְ** cannot possibly be so rendered that **לֵךְ** is treated as *Lamed auctoris* (Dathe, Olshausen): Thine, saith my heart, is (the utterance:) seek ye may face. The declaration is opposed to this sense, thus artificially put upon it. **לֵךְ אֶמַר** are undoubtedly to be construed together; and what the heart says to Jahve is not: Seek ye my face, but by reason of this, and as its echo (Calvin: *velut Deo succinens*): I will therefore seek Thy face. Just as in Job. 42: 3, a personal inference is drawn from a directly quoted saying of God. In the periodic style it would be necessary to transpose **בִּקְשׁוּ פָנַי** thus: since Thou hast permitted and exhorted us, or in accordance with Thy persuasive invitation, that we should seek Thy face, I do seek Thy face (Hupfeld). There is no retrospective reference to any particular passage in the *Tōra*, such as Deu. 4:29. The prayer is not based upon any single passage of Scripture, but upon God's commands and promises in general.

*Psa. 27: 9-10.* The requests are now poured forth with all the greater freedom and importunity, that God may be willing to be entreated and invoked. The *Hiph.* **הִפְתָּה** signifies in this passage standing by itself (cf. Job. 24: 4): to push aside. The clause **עֲזַרְתִּי הָיִיתָ** does not say: be Thou my help (which is impossible on syntactical grounds), nor is it to be taken relatively: Thou who wast my help (for which there is no ground in what precedes); but on the contrary the *praet.* gives the ground of the request that follows “Thou art my help (lit., Thou has become, or hast ever been) — cast me, then, not away,” and it is, moreover, accented accordingly. V. 10, as we have already observed, does not sound as though it came from the lips of David, of whom it is only said during the time of his persecution by Saul, that at that time he was obliged to part from his parents, 1Sa. 22: 3 f. The words certainly might be David’s, if v. 10a would admit of being taken hypothetically, as is done by Ewald, § 362, b: should my father and my mother forsake me, yet Jahve will etc. But the entreaty “forsake me not” is naturally followed by the reason: for my father and my mother have forsaken me; and just as naturally does the consolation: but Jahve will take me up, prepare the way for the entreaties which begin anew in v. 11. Whereas, if **כִּי** is taken hypothetically, v. 11 stands disconnectedly in the midst of the surrounding requests. On **אֲסַפְּנִי** cf. Jos. 20: 4.

*Psa. 27:11-12.* He is now wandering about like a hunted deer; but God is able to guide him so that he may escape all dangers. And this is what he prays for. As in Psa. 143:10, **מִישׁוֹר** is used in an ethical sense; and differs in this respect from its use in Psa. 26:12. On **שָׁרְרִים**, see the primary passage Psa. 5: 9, of which this is an echo. Wily spies dodge his every step and would gladly see what they have invented against him and wished for him, realised. Should he enter the way of sin leading to destruction, it would tend to the dishonour of God, just as on the contrary it is a matter of honour with God not to let His servant fall. Hence he prays to be led in the way of God, for a oneness of his own will with the divine renders a man inaccessible [to evil]. **נִפְשׁ**, v. 12, is used, as in Psa. 17: 9, and in the similar passage, which is genuinely Davidic, Psa. 41: 3, in the signification passion or strong desire; because the soul, in its natural state, is selfishness and inordinate desire. **נִפְחָ** is a collateral form of **נִפְחָ**; they are both adjectives formed from the future of the verb **פָּיַח** (like **נָרַב**, **נָרִיב**): accustomed to breathe out (exhale), i.e., either to express, or to snort, breathe forth (cf. **πνέιν**, or **ἐμπνέιν φόνον** and **φόνου**, **θυμῶν**, and the like, Act. 9: 1). In both Hitzig sees participles of **נִפְחָ** (Jer. 4:31); but 10: 5 and Hab. 2: 3 lead back to **פָּיַח** (**פִּיחָ**); and Hupfeld rightly recognises such nouns formed from futures to be, according to their original source, circumlocutions of the participle after the manner of an

elliptical relative clause (the *ṣifat* of the Arabic syntax), and explains **בְּזָבִים** יָפִיחַ, together with **יָפִיחַ הַמָּס**, from the verbal construction which still continues in force.

*Psa. 27:13-14.* Self-encouragement to firmer confidence of faith. Joined to v. 12 (Aben-Ezra, Kimchi), v. 13 trails badly after it. We must, with Geier, Dachselt, and others, suppose that the apodosis is wanting to the protasis with its **לוֹלֵא** pointed with three points above, <sup>f155</sup> and four below, according to the Masora (cf. *B. Berachoth* 4a), but a word which is indispensably necessary, and is even attested by the LXX (ἐαυτή) and the Targum (although not by any other of the ancient versions); cf. the protasis with **לוֹ**, which has no apodosis, in Gen. 50:15, and the apodoses with **כִּי** after **לוֹלֵי** in Gen. 31:42; 43:10, 1Sa. 35:34, 2Sa. 2:27 (also Num. 22:33, where **אוֹלֵי** = **לֵא** = **אוֹלֵי**), which are likewise to be explained *per aposiopesis*. The perfect after **לוֹלֵא** (**לוֹלֵי**) has sometimes the sense of a *plusquamperfectum* (as in Gen. 43:10, *nisi cunctati essemus*), and sometimes the sense of an *imperfect*, as in the present passage (cf. Deu. 32:29, *si saperent*). The poet does not speak of a faith that he once had, a past faith, but, in regard to the danger that is even now abiding and present, of the faith he now has, a present faith. The apodosis ought to run something like this (Psa. 119:92; 94:17): did I not believe, were not confidence preserved to me...then (**אָז** or **כִּי אָז**) I should perish; or: then I had suddenly perished. But he has such faith, and he accordingly in v. 14 encourages himself to go on cheerfully waiting and hoping; he speaks to himself, it is, as it were, the believing half of his soul addressing the despondent and weaker half. Instead of **וְאָמַן** (Deu. 31: 7) the expression is, as in Psa. 31:25, **וְאָמַן לְבָד**, let thy heart be strong, let it give proof of strength. The rendering “May He (Jahve) strengthen thy heart” would require **וְאָמַן**; but **הָאָמִין**, as e.g., **הִרְחִיב** Psa. 25:17, belongs to the transitive denominatives applying to the mind or spirit, in which the Hebrew is by no means poor, and in which the Arabic is especially rich.

## Psalm 28

### CRY FOR HELP AND THANKSGIVING, IN A TIME OF REBELLION

*28: 1 TO Thee, O Jahve, do I cry;  
My Rock, remain not deaf to me,  
Lest, if Thou be silent to me,  
I be like them that go down to the pit.*

*28: 2 Hear the voice of my supplication, when I cry unto Thee,  
When I lift up my hands to Thy holy sanctuary.*

*28: 3 Carry me not away with the ungodly  
and with the workers of iniquity,  
Who speak peace with their neighbours,  
While evil is in their hearts.*

*28: 4 Give to them according to their work  
and the wickedness of their deeds;  
According to the work of their hands give to them,  
Requite them what they have done!*

*28: 5 For they regard not the doings of Jahve,  
Nor the work of His hands —  
He shall pull them down, not build them up.*

*28: 6 Blessed be Jahve,  
Because He hath heard my loud supplication!*

*28: 7 Jahve is my defence and my shield,  
In Him my heart trusted and I was helped —  
Therefore my heart exulteth, and with my song do I praise Him.*

*28: 8 Jahve is a defence to them,  
And the saving defence of His anointed one is He.*

*28: 9 O help Thy people  
And bless Thy heritage,  
And feed them, and bear them up for ever!*

To Psalm 26 and 27 a third Psalm is here added, belonging to the time of the persecution by Absalom. In this Psalm, also, the drawing towards the sanctuary of God cannot be lost sight of; and in addition thereto we have the intercession of the anointed one, when personally imperilled, on behalf of the people who are equally in need of help, — an intercession which can only be rightly estimated in connection with the circumstances of that time. Like Psalm 27 this, its neighbour, also divides into two parts; these parts, however, though their lines are of a different order, nevertheless bear a similar poetic impress. Both are composed of verses consisting of two and three lines. There are many points of contact between this Psalm and Psalm 27; e.g., in the epithet applied to God, **מַעוּז**; but compare also v. 3 with Psa. 26: 9; v. 2 with Psa. 31:23; v. 9 with Psa. 29:11. The echoes of this Psalm in Isaiah are very many, and also in Jeremiah.

*Psa. 28: 1-5.* This first half of the Psalm (vv. 1-5) is supplicatory. The preposition **מִן** in connection with the verbs **חָרַשׁ**, to be deaf, dumb, and **חָשָׁה**, to keep silence, is a pregnant form of expression denoting an aversion or turning away which does not deign to give the suppliant an answer. Jahve is his **צוּר**, his ground of confidence; but if He continues thus to keep silence,

then he who confides in Him will become like those who are going down (Psa. 22:30), or are gone down (Isa. 14:19) to the pit. The participle of the past answers better to the situation of one already on the brink of the abyss. In the double sentence with **וְכֵן**, the chief accent falls upon the second clause, for which the first only paratactically opens up the way (cf. Isa. 5: 4; 12: 1); in Latin it would be *ne, te mihi non respondente, similis fiam*. Olshausen, and Baur with him, believes that because **וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי** has not the accent on the *ultima* as being *perf. consec.*, it must be interpreted according to the accentuation thus, “in order that Thou mayst no longer keep silence, whilst I am already become like...” But this ought to be **וְאֲנִי נִמְשַׁל**, or at least **וְאֲנִי נִמְשַׁלְתִּי**. And if **וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי** were to be taken as a real perfect, it would then rather have to be rendered “and I should then be like.” But, notwithstanding **וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי** is *Milel*, it is still *perf. consecutivum* (“and I am become like”); for if, in a sentence of more than one member following upon **וְכֵן**, the *fut.*, as is usually the case (vid., on Psa. 38:17), goes over into the *perf.*, then the latter, in most instances, has the tone of the *perf. consec.* (Deu. 4:19, Jud. 18:25, Pro. 5: 9-12, Mal. 3:24), but not always. The *penultima* -accentuation is necessarily retained in connection with the two great pausal accents, *Silluk* and *Athnach*, Deu. 8:12, Pro. 30: 9; in this passage in connection with *Rebia mugrash*, just as we may say, in general, the *perf. consec.* sometimes retains its *penultima* - accentuation in connection with distinctives instead of being accented on the *ultima*; e.g., in connection with *Rebia mugrash*, Pro. 30: 9; with *Rebia*, 19:14 (cf. Pro. 30: 9 with Eze. 14:17); with *Zakeph*. 1Sa. 29: 8; and even with *Tiphcha* Oba. 1:10, Joe. 4:21. The national grammarians are ignorant of any law on this subject. <sup>f156</sup>

The point towards which the psalmist stretches forth his hands in prayer is Jahve’s holy **דְּבִיר**. Such is the word (after the form **עֲטִין, בְּלִיא, בְּרִיחַ**) used only in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, with the exception of this passage, to denote the Holy of Holies, not as being  *χρηματιστήριον* (Aquila and Symmachus), or *λαλητήριον, oraculum* (Jerome), as it were, Jahve’s audience chamber (Hengstenberg) — a meaning that is not in accordance with the formation of the word, — but as the hinder part of the tent, from **דְּבִר**, Arabic *dabara*, to be behind, whence *dubr* (Talmudic **דְּוִבֵר**), that which is behind (opp. *kubl. kibal*, that which is in the front), cf. *Jesurun* p. 87 f. In vv. 3, 4 the prayer is expanded. **מִשְׁךְ** (instead of which we find **אָסַף** in Psa. 26: 9), to draw any one down forcibly to destruction, or to drag him to the place of judgment, Eze. 32:20, cf. 10: 8, Job. 24:22. The delineation of the ungodly David borrows from his actual foes, Should he succumb to them, then his fate would be like that which awaits them, to whom he is conscious that he is radically unlike. He therefore prays that God’s recompensing justice may anticipate him, i.e., that He may requite them according to their desert, before

he succumbs, to whom they have feigned **שְׁלוֹם**, a good understanding, or being on good terms, whereas they cherished in their heart the **רָעָה** that is now unmasked (cf. Jer. 9: 7). **נִתָּן**, used of an official adjudication, as in Hos. 9:14, Jer. 32:19. The *epanaphora* of **תִּתְּלֶהֱם** is like Psa. 27:14. <sup>f157</sup>

The phrase **הַשִּׁיב גְּמוּלָה** (שְׁלוֹם), which occurs frequently in the prophets, signifies to recompense or repay to any one his accomplishing, his manifestation, that is to say, what he has done and merited; the thoughts and expression call to mind more particularly Isa. 3: 8-11; 1:16. The right to pray for recompense (vengeance) is grounded, in v. 5, upon their blindness to God's just and merciful rule as it is to be seen in human history (cf. Isa. 5:12; 22:11). The contrast of **בְּנֶה** and **הָרַס**, to pull down (with a personal object, as in Exo. 15: 7), is like Jeremiah's style (ch. Psa. 42:10, cf. 1:10; 18: 9, and frequently, Sir. 49: 7). In v. 5a, the prominent thought in David's mind is, that they shamefully fail to recognise how gloriously and graciously God has again and again acknowledged him as His anointed one. He has (2 Samuel 7) received the promise, that God would build him a house, i.e., grant perpetual continuance to his kingship. The Absalomites are in the act of rebellion against this divine appointment. Hence they shall experience the very reverse of the divine promise given to David: Jahve will pull them down and not build them up, He will destroy, at its very commencement, this dynasty set up in opposition to God.

**Psa. 28: 6-9.** The first half of the Psalm prayed for deliverance and for judgment; this second half gives thanks for both. If the poet wrote the Psalm at one sitting then at this point the certainty of being answered dawns upon him. But it is even possible that he added this second part later on, as a memorial of the answer he experienced to his prayer (Hitzig, Ewald). It sounds, at all events, like the record of something that has actually taken place. Jahve is his defence and shield. The conjoined perfects in v. 7b denote that which is closely united in actual realisation; and in the *fut. consec.*, as is frequently the case, e.g., in Job. 14: 2, the historical signification retreats into the background before the more essential idea of that which has been produced. In **מִשִּׁירִי**, the song is conceived as the spring whence the **הוֹדוֹת** bubble forth; and instead of **אֲזַדְנֶנּוּ** we have the more impressive form **אֲזַהְדְּנֶנּוּ**, as in Psa. 45:18; 116: 6, 1Sa. 17:47, the syncope being omitted. From suffering (*Leid*) springs song (*Lied*), and from song springs the praise (*Lob*) of Him, who has "turned" the suffering, just as it is attuned in vv. 6 and 8. <sup>f158</sup>

The **αὐτοί**, who are intended by **לָמוּ** in v. 8a, are those of Israel, as in Psa. 12: 8, Isa. 33: 2 (Hitzig). The LXX (**κραταίωμα τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ**) reads



לְאָמֹר, as in Psa. 29:11, which is approved by Böttcher, Olshausen and Hupfeld; but לְמֹר yields a similar sense. First of all David thinks of the people, then of himself; for his private character retreats behind his official, by virtue of which he is the head of Israel. For this very reason his deliverance is the deliverance of Israel, to whom, so far as they have become unfaithful to His anointed, Jahve has not requited this faithlessness, and to whom, so far as they have remained true to him, He has rewarded this fidelity. Jahve is a עֵז to them, inasmuch as He preserves them by His might from the destruction into which they would have precipitated themselves, or into which others would have precipitated them; and He is the מְעוֹן יְשׁוּעוֹת of His anointed inasmuch as He surrounds him as an inaccessible place of refuge which secures to him salvation in all its fulness instead of the destruction anticipated. Israel's salvation and blessing were at stake; but Israel is in fact God's people and God's inheritance — may He, then, work salvation for them in every future need and bless them. Apostatised from David, it was a flock in the hands of the hireling — may He ever take the place of shepherd to them and carry them in His arms through the destruction. The נִשְׂאֵם coupled with וְרָעַם (thus it is to be pointed according to Ben-Asher) calls to mind Deu. 1:31, “Jahve carried Israel as a man doth carry his son,” and Exo. 19: 4, Deu. 32:11, “as on eagles' wings.” The *Piel*, as in Isa. 63: 9, is used of carrying the weak, whom one lifts up and thus removes out of its helplessness and danger. Psalm ch. 3 closes just in the same way with an intercession; and the close of Psalm 29 is similar, but promissory, and consequently it is placed next to Psalm 28.

## Psalm 29

### THE PSALM OF THE SEVEN THUNDERS

*29: 1 GIVE unto Jahve, ye sons of God,  
Give unto Jahve glory and might!*

*29: 2 Give unto Jahve the glory of His name,  
Do homage to Jahve in holy attire!*

*29: 3 The voice of Jahve is upon the waters,  
The God of Glory thundereth,  
Jahve is upon the great waters.*

*29: 4 The voice of Jahve goeth forth in power,  
The voice of Jahve goeth forth in majesty.*

*29: 5 The voice of Jahve breaketh the cedars,  
Yea, Jahve breaketh the cedars of Lebanon.*

*29: 6 And He maketh them to skip like a calf,  
Lebanon and Sirion like a young antelope.*

*29: 7 The voice of Jahve flameth forth quivering fire.*

*29: 8 The voice of Jahve shaketh the wilderness,  
Jahve shaketh the wilderness of Kadesh.*

*29: 9 The voice of Jahve maketh the hinds to travail,  
He strippeth the forest —  
And in His temple everything saith: “Glory!”*

*29:10 Jahve hath sat at the Flood,  
And Jahve sitteth a King for ever.*

*29:11 Jahve will give power to His people,  
Jahve will bless His people with peace.*

The occasion of this Psalm is a thunderstorm; it is not, however, limited to the outward natural phenomena, but therein is perceived the self-attestation of the God of the redemptive history. Just as in the second part of Psalm 19 the God of the revelation of salvation is called יהוה seven times in distinction from the God revealed in nature, so in this Psalm of thunders, קול ה' is repeated seven times, so that it may be called the Psalm of the ἐπτά βρονταί (Rev. 10: 3 f.). During the time of the second Temple, as the addition to the inscription by the LXX ἑξοδίου (ἑξόδου) σακηνης (= σακηνοπηγίας) seems to imply,<sup>f159</sup> it was sung on the *Shemini Azereth*, the last day (ἑξόδιον, Lev. 23:36) of the feast of tabernacles. Between two tetrastichs, in each of which the name יהוה occurs four times, lie three pentastichs, which, in their sevenfold קול ה', represent the peals of thunder which follow in rapid succession as the storm increases in its fury.

*Psa. 29: 1-2.* The opening strophe calls upon the celestial spirits to praise Jahve; for a revelation of divine glory is in preparation, which, in its first movements, they are accounted worthy to behold, for the roots of everything that takes place in this world are in the invisible world. It is not the mighty of the earth, who are called in Psa. 82: 6 בְּנֵי עֲלִיּוֹן, but the angels, who are elsewhere called בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (e.g., Job. 2: 1), that are here, as in Psa. 89: 7, called בְּנֵי אֱלִים. Since אֱלִים never means God, like אֱלֹהִים (so that it could be rendered sons of the deity), but gods, Exo. 15:11, Dan. 9:36, the expression בְּנֵי אֱלִים must be translated as a double plural from בְּנֵי אֱלִים, after the analogy of בְּתֵי כְּלָאִים, Isa. 42:22, from בֵּית כְּלָא (Ges. § 108, 3), “sons of God,” not “sons of gods.” They, the God-begotten, i.e., created in the image of God, who form with God their Father as it were one family (vid., *Genesis* S. 1212), are

here called upon to give unto God glory and might (the primary passage is Deu. 32: 3), i.e., to render back to Him cheerfully and joyously in a laudatory recognition, as it were by an echo, His glory and might, which are revealed and to be revealed in the created world, and to give unto Him the glory of His name, i.e., to praise His glorious name (Psa. 72:19) according its deserts. **הָבוּ** in all three instances has the accent on the *ultima* according to rule (cf. on the other hand, Job. 6:22). **הַדָּרָת קִדְשׁ** is holy vestments, splendid festal attire, 2Ch. 20:21, cf. Psa. 110: 3. <sup>f160</sup>

A revelation of the power of God is near at hand. The heavenly spirits are to prepare themselves for it with all the outward display of which they are capable. If v. 2 were a summons to the church on earth, or, as in Psa. 96: 9, to the dwellers upon the earth, then there ought to be some expression to indicate the change in the parties addressed; it is, therefore, in v. 2 as in v. 1, directed to the priests of the heavenly **הַיִּכּוֹל**. In the Apocalypse, also, the songs of praise and trumpeting of the angels precede the judgments of God.

*Psa. 29: 3-9.* Now follows the description of the revelation of God's power, which is the ground of the summons, and is to be the subject-matter of their praise. The All-glorious One makes Himself heard in the language (Rev. 10: 3 f.) of the thunder, and reveals Himself in the storm. There are fifteen lines, which naturally arrange themselves into three five-line strophes. The chief matter with the poet, however, is the sevenfold **קוֹל ה'**. Although **קוֹל** is sometimes used almost as an ejaculatory "Hark!" (Gen. 4:10, Isa. 52: 8), this must not, with Ewald (§ 286, f), be applied to the **קוֹל ה'** of the Psalm before us, the theme of which is the voice of God, who announced Himself from heaven, — a voice which moves the world. The dull sounding **קוֹל** serves not merely to denote the thunder of the storm, but even the thunder of the earthquake, the roar of the tempest, and in general, every low, dull, rumbling sound, by which God makes Himself audible to the world, and more especially from the wrathful side of His doxa. The waters in v. 3 are not the lower waters. Then the question arises what are they? Were the waters of the Mediterranean intended, they would be more definitely denoted in such a vivid description. It is, however, far more appropriate to the commencement of this description to understand them to mean the mass of water gathered together in the thick, black storm-clouds (vid., 18:12, Jer. 10:13). The rumbling <sup>f161</sup> of Jahve is, as the poet himself explains in v. 3b, the thunder produced on high by the **אֵל הַכְּבוֹד** (cf. **מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד**, Psa. 24: 7 ff.), which rolls over the sea of waters floating above the earth in the sky. V. 4a and 4b, just like v. 3a and 3b, are independent substantival clauses. The rumbling of Jahve is, issues forth, or passes by; **ב** with the abstract article as in 77:14, Pro. 24: 5 (cf. Pro. 8: 8, Luke

4:32, **עֲשׂוּתֵי** Rev. 18: 2), is the **ע** of the distinctive attribute. In v. 3 the first peals of thunder are heard; in v. 4 the storm is coming nearer, and the peals become stronger, and now it bursts forth with its full violence: v. 5a describes this in a general form, and v. 5b expresses by the *fut. consec.*, as it were inferentially, that which is at present taking place: amidst the rolling of the thunder the descending lightning flashes rive the cedars of Lebanon (as is well-known, the lightning takes the outermost points). The suffix in v. 6a does not refer proleptically to the mountains mentioned afterwards, but naturally to the cedars (Hengst., Hupf., Hitz.), which bend down before the storm and quickly rise up again. The skipping of Lebanon and Sirion, however, is not to be referred to the fact, that their wooded summits bend down and rise again, but, according to Psa. 114: 4, to their being shaken by the crash of the thunder, — a feature in the picture which certainly does not rest upon what is actually true in nature, but figuratively describes the apparent quaking of the earth during a heavy thunderstorm. **שִׂרְיֹן**, according to Deu. 3: 9, is the Sidonian name of Hermon, and therefore side by side with Lebanon it represents Anti-Lebanon. The word, according to the Masora, has **ש** *sinistrum*, and consequently is **שִׂרְיֹן**, wherefore Hitzig correctly derives it from Arab. *šrā*, *fut. i.*, to gleam, sparkle, cf. the passage from an Arab poet at Psa. 133: 3. The lightning makes these mountains bound (Luther, *lecken*, i.e., according to his explanation: to spring, skip) like young antelopes. **רְאִים**,<sup>f162</sup> like **βούβαλος, βούβαλις**, is a generic name of the antelope, and of the buffalo that roams in herds through the forests beyond the Jordan even at the present day; for there are antelopes that resemble the buffalo and also (except in the formation of the head and the cloven hoofs) those that resemble the horse, the LXX renders: **ὄς υἱὸς μονοκερώτων**. Does this mean the unicorn [Germ. one-horn] depicted on Persian and African monuments? Is this unicorn distinct from the one horned antelope? Neither an unicorn nor an one horned antelope have been seen to the present day by any traveller. Both animals, and consequently also their relation to one another, are up to the present time still undefinable from a scientific point of view.<sup>f163</sup>

Each peal of thunder is immediately followed by a flash of lightning; Jahve's thunder cleaveth flames of fire, i.e., forms (as it were **λατομεί**) the fire-matter of the storm-clouds into cloven flames of fire, into lightnings that pass swiftly along; in connection with which it must be remembered that **קוֹל ה'** denotes not merely the thunder as a phenomenon, but at the same time it denotes the omnipotence of God expressing itself therein. The brevity and threefold division of v. 7 depicts the incessant, zigzag, quivering movement of the lightning (*tela trisulca, ignes trisulci*, in Ovid). From the northern mountains the storm sweeps on towards the south of Palestine into the Arabian desert,

viz., as we are told in v. 8b (cf. v. 5, according to the schema of “parallelism by reservation”), the wilderness region of *Kadesh* (*Kadesh Barnea*), which, however we may define its position, must certainly have lain near the steep western slope of the mountains of Edom toward the Arabah. Jahve’s thunder, viz., the thunderstorm, puts this desert in a state of whirl, inasmuch as it drives the sand (חול) before it in whirlwinds; and among the mountains it, viz., the strong lightning and thundering, makes the hinds to writhe, inasmuch as from fright they bring forth prematurely. both the *Hiph.* יָחִיל and the *Pil.* יְחֹלֵל are used with a causative meaning (root חו, חי, to move in a circle, to encircle). The poet continues with וַיִּחַשֵּׁף, since he makes one effect of the storm to develop from another, merging as it were out of its chrysalis state. יְעָרוֹת is a poetical plural form; and חָשַׁף describes the effect of the storm which “shells” the woods, inasmuch as it beats down the branches of the trees, both the tops and the foliage. While Jahve thus reveals Himself from heaven upon the earth in all His irresistible power, בְּהִיכָלוֹ, in His heavenly palace (Psa. 11: 4; 18: 7), כָּלוּ (note how בְּהִיכָלוֹ resolves this כָּלוּ out of itself), i.e., each of the beings therein, says: כָּבֹד. That which the poet, in vv. 1-2, has called upon them to do, now takes place. Jahve receives back His glory, which is immanent in the universe, in the thousand-voiced echo of adoration.

*Psa. 29:10-11.* Luther renders it: “The Lord sitteth to prepare a Flood,” thus putting meaning into the unintelligible rendering of the Vulgate and LXX; and in fact a meaning that accords with the language — for יָשָׁב לְ is most certainly intended to be understood after the analogy of יָשָׁב לְמִשְׁפַּט, Psa. 122: 5, cf. 9: 8 — just as much as with the context; for the poet has not thus far expressly referred to the torrents of rain, in which the storm empties itself. Engelhardt also (*Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1861, 216 f.), Kurtz (*Bibel und Astronomie*, S. 568, Aufl. 4), Riehm (*Liter.-Blatt of the Allgem. Kirchen-Zeit.*, 1864, S. 110), and others understand by מָבּוּל the quasi-flood of the torrent of rain accompanying the lightning and thunder. But the word is not לְמָבּוּל, but לְמָבּוּל, and הַמָּבּוּל (Syr. *momûl*) occurs exclusively in Genesis 6-11 as the name of the great Flood. Every tempest, however, calls to mind this judgment and its merciful issue, for it comes before us in sacred history as the first appearance of rain with lightning and thunder, and of the bow in the clouds speaking its message of peace (*Genesis*, S. 276). The retrospective reference to this event is also still further confirmed by the aorist וַיֵּשֶׁב which follows the perfect יָשָׁב (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* i. 208). Jahve — says the poet — sat (upon His throne) at the Flood (to execute it), and sits (enthroned) in consequence thereof, or since that time, as this present revelation of Him in the tempest shows, as King for ever, inasmuch as He rules down here upon earth

from His throne in the heavens (Psa. 115:16) in wrath and in mercy, judging and dispensing blessing. Here upon earth He has a people, whom from above He endows with a share of His own might and blesses with peace, while the tempests of His wrath burst over their foes. How expressive is **בְּשָׁלוֹם** as the closing word of this particular Psalm! It spans the Psalm like a rain-bow. The opening of the Psalm shows us the heavens opened and the throne of God in the midst of the angelic songs of praise, and the close of the Psalm shows us, on earth, His people victorious and blessed with peace (**בְּ** as in Gen. 24: 1 <sup>f164</sup>), in the midst of Jahve's voice of anger, which shakes all things. *Gloria in excelsis* is its beginning, and *pax in terris* its conclusion.

## **Psalm 30**

### **SONG OF THANKSGIVING AFTER RECOVERY FROM DANGEROUS SICKNESS**

*30: 2 I WILL extol Thee, Jahve, that Thou hast raised me up,  
And hast not made mine enemies to rejoice over me.*

*30: 3 Jahve, my God, I cried to Thee, then Thou didst heal me;*

*30: 4 Jahve, Thou hast brought up my soul from Hades,  
Thou hast revived me, that I should not go down to the grave.*

*30: 5 Sing unto Jahve, ye saints of His,  
And give thanks to His holy name.*

*30: 6 For His anger endureth but for a moment,  
His favour for a life long;  
At eventide weeping cometh in for the night —  
And in the morning cometh a shout of joy.*

*30: 7 I, however, thought in my security:  
“I shall not totter for ever.”*

*30: 8 Jahve, by Thy favour hadst  
Thou made my mountain to stand strong;  
Thou hast hidden Thy face, — I became troubled.*

*30: 9 To Thee, Jahve, did I cry,  
And to Jahve, made I supplication:*

*30:10 “What profit is there in my blood,  
in my going down to the grave?  
“Shall the dust praise Thee? shall it declare Thy truth?*

*30:11 “Hear, Jahve, and be gracious unto me!  
“Jahve, be Thou my helper!”*

*30:12 Thou hast turned for me my mourning into dancing,  
Thou hast put off my sackcloth and didst gird me with joy;*

*30:13 To the end that my glory might sing of Thee, and not be silent —  
Jahve, my God, for ever will I praise Thee.*

The summons to praise God which is addressed to the angels above in Psalm 29, is directed in Psalm 30 to the pious here below. There is nothing against the adoption of the **לָדוּד**. Hitzig again in this instance finds all kinds of indications of Jeremiah's hand; but the parallels in Jeremiah are echoes of the Psalms, and **רָלִיתָנִי** in v. 2 does not need to be explained of a lowering into a tank or dungeon, it is a metaphorical expression for raising up out of the depths of affliction. Even Hezekiah's song of thanksgiving in Isa. 38 has grown out of the two closing strophes of this Psalm under the influence of an intimate acquaintance with the Book of Job. We are therefore warranted in supposing that it is David, who here, having in the midst of the stability of his power come to the verge of the grave, and now being roused from all carnal security, as one who has been rescued, praises the Lord, whom he has made his refuge, and calls upon all the pious to join with him in his song. The Psalm bears the inscription: *A Song-Psalms at the Dedication of the House, by David.* This has been referred to the dedication of the site of the future Temple, 2Sa. 24, 1 Chronicles 21; but although the place of the future Temple together with the altar then erected on it, can be called **בֵּית יְהוָה** (1Ch. 22: 1), and might also at any rate be called absolutely **הַבַּיִת** (as **הַר הַבַּיִת**, the Temple hill); yet we know that David did not himself suffer (2Sa. 24:17) from the pestilence, which followed as a punishment upon the numbering of the people which he instituted in his arrogant self-magnification. The Psalm, however, also does not contain anything that should point to a dedication of a sanctuary, whether Mount Moriah, or the tabernacle, 2Sa. 6:17. It might more naturally be referred to the re-consecration of the palace, that was defiled by Absalom, after David's return; but the Psalm mentions some imminent peril, the gracious averting of which does not consist in the turning away of bloodthirsty foes, but in recovery from some sickness that might have proved fatal. Thus then it must be the dedication of the citadel on Zion, the building of which was just completed. From 2Sa. 5:12 we see that David regarded this building as a pledge of the stability and exaltation of his kingdom; and all that is needed in order to understand the Psalm is, with Aben-Ezra, Flaminius, Crusius, and Vaihinger, to infer from the Psalm itself, that David had been delayed by some severe illness from taking possession of the new building. The situation of Psalm 16 is just like it. The regular official title **אֲשֶׁר אֶל־הַבַּיִת** (majordomo) shows, that **הַבַּיִת**, used thus absolutely, may denote the palace just as well as the Temple. The LXX which renders it **τοῦ ἐγκατασκευαστοῦ τοῦ οἴκου (τοῦ)**

Δαῶιδ, understands the palace, not the Temple. In the Jewish ritual, Psalm 30 is certainly, as is even stated in the Tractate *Sofrim* xviii. § 2, the Psalm for the feast of *Chanucca*, or Dedication, which refers to 1 Macc. 4:52 ff.

*Psa. 30: 2-4.* The Psalm begins like a hymn. The *Piel* דָּלָה (from דָּלָה, Arab. *dlā*, to hold anything long, loose and pendulous, whether upwards or downwards, conj. V Arab. *tdllā*, to dangle) signifies to lift or draw up, like a bucket (דָּלָה, Greek ἀντλίου, Latin *tollo, tolleno* in Festus). The poet himself says what that depth is into which he had sunk and out of which God had drawn him up without his enemies rejoicing over him (לִי as in *Psa. 25: 2*), i.e., without allowing them the wished for joy at his destruction: he was brought down almost into Hades in consequence of some fatal sickness. הִיָּה (never: to call into being out of nothing) always means to restore to life that which has apparently or really succumbed to death, or to preserve anything living in life. With this is easily and satisfactorily joined the *Keri* מִיָּרְדִי בֹר (without *Makkeph* in the correct text), *ita ut non descenderem*; the infinitive of יָרַד in this instance following the analogy of the strong verb is יָרַד, like יָשׁוּן, יָבֵשׁ, and with suffix *jordi* (like *josdi*, *Job. 38: 4*) or *jār<sup>e</sup>di*, for here it is to be read thus, and not *jordi* (vid., on *Psa. 16: 1; 86: 2*).<sup>f165</sup>

The *Chethib* מִיָּרְדִי might also be the infinitive, written with *Cholem plenum*, as an infinitive *Gen. 32:20*, and an imperative *Num. 23: 8*, is each pointed with *Cholem* instead of *Kametz chatuph*; but it is probably intended to be read as a participle, מִיָּרְדִי: Thou hast revived me from those who sink away into the grave (*Psa. 28: 1*), or out of the state of such (cf. *22:22b*) — a perfectly admissible and pregnant construction.

*Psa. 30: 5-6.* Ver. 5-6 call upon all the pious to praise this God, who after a short season of anger is at once and henceforth gracious. Instead of שֵׁם of Jahve, we find the expression זָכַר in this instance, as in *Psa. 97:12* after *Exo. 3:15*. Jahve, by revealing Himself, renders Himself capable of being both named and remembered, and that in the most illustrious manner. The history of redemption is, as it were, an unfolding of the Name of Jahve and at the same time a setting up of a monument, an establishment of a memorial, and in fact the erection of a זָכַר קֹדֶשׁ; because all God's self-attestations, whether in love or in wrath, flow from the sea of light of His holiness. When He manifests Himself to His won love prevails; and wrath is, in relation to them, only a vanishing moment: *a moment passes in His anger, a (whole) life in His favour*, i.e., the former endures only for a moment, the latter the whole life of a man. "*Alles Ding währt seine Zeit, Gottes Lieb' in Ewigkeit.*" All things last their season, God's love to all eternity. The preposition בְּ does not here, as in the



beautiful parallel Isa. 54: 7 f., cf. 60:10, denote the time and mode of that which takes place, but the state in which one spends the time. V. 6bc portrays the rapidity with which love takes back wrath (cf. Isa. 17:14): in the evening weeping takes up its abode with us for the night, but in the morning another guest, viz., רַנָּה, appears, like a rescuing angel, before whom בְּכִי disappears. The predicate יָלִין does not belong to v. 6c as well (Hupfeld, Hitzig). The substantival clause: and in the morning joy = joy is present, depicts the unexpectedness and surprise of the help of Him who sends בְּכִי and רַנָּה.

*Psa. 30: 7-8.* David now relates his experience in detail, beginning with the cause of the chastisement, which he has just undergone. In וְאֲנִי אֶמְרָתִי (as in Psa. 31:23, Psa. 49: 4) he contrasts his former self-confidence, in which (like the רַשָּׁע, Psa. 10: 6) he thought himself to be immovable, with the God-ward trust he has now gained in the school of affliction. Instead of confiding in the Giver, he trusted in the gift, as though it had been his own work. It is uncertain, — but it is all the same in the end, — whether שָׁלוֹי is the inflected infinitive הָלוּ of the verb שָׁלַי (which we adopt in our translation), or the inflected noun שָׁלוּ (שָׁלוּ) = שָׁלוּ, after the form שָׁחוּ, a swimming, Eze. 47: 5, = שָׁלוּהָ, Jer. 22:21. The inevitable consequence of such carnal security, as it is more minutely described in Deu. 8:11-18, is some humbling divine chastisement. This intimate connection is expressed by the perfects in v. 8, which represent God's pardon, God's withdrawal of favour, which is brought about by his self-exaltation, and the surprise of his being undeceived, as synchronous. הָעֵמִיד עִזּוֹ, to set up might is equivalent to: to give it as a lasting possession; cf. 2Ch. 33: 8, which passage is a varied, but not (as Riehm supposes) a corrupted, repetition of 2Ki. 21: 8. It is, therefore, unnecessary, as Hitzig does, to take לְ as accusative and עִזּוֹ as adverbial: in Thy favour hadst Thou made my mountain to stand firm. The mountain is Zion, which is strong by natural position and by the additions of art (2Sa. 5: 9); and this, as being the castle-hill, is the emblem of the kingdom of David: Jahve had strongly established his kingdom for David, when on account of his trust in himself He made him to feel how all that he was he was only by Him, and without Him he was nothing whatever. The form of the inflexion הָרָרִי, instead of הָרִי = harri, is defended by Gen. 14: 6 and Jer. 17: 3 (where it is הָרָרִי as if from הָרָר). The reading לַהֲרָרִי (LXX, Syr.), i.e., to my kingly dignity is a happy substitution; whereas the reading of the Targum לַהֲרָרִי, “placed (me) on firm mountains,” at once refutes itself by the necessity for supplying “me.”

*Psa. 30: 9-11.* Nevertheless he who is thus chastened prayed fervently. The futures in v. 9, standing as they do in the full flow of the narration, have the

force of imperfects, of “the present in the past” as the Arabian grammarians call it. From the question “What profit is there (the usual expression for  $\tau\acute{\iota}$  ὄφελος, *quid lucri*) in my blood?”, it is not to be inferred that David was in danger of death by the hand of a foe; for וְתֵרַפְאֲנִי in v. 3 teaches us very different, “what profit would there be in my blood?” is therefore equivalent to (cf. Job. 16:18) what advantage would there be in Thy slaying me before my time? On the contrary God would rob Himself of the praise, which the living one would render to Him, and would so gladly render. His request that his life may be prolonged was not, therefore, for the sake of worldly possessions and enjoyment, but for the glory of God. He feared death as being the end of the praise of God. For beyond the grave there will be no more psalms sung, 6: 6. In the Old Testament, Hades was as yet unvanquished, Heaven was not yet opened. In Heaven are the בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, but as yet no blessed בְּנֵי אָדָם .

*Psa. 30:12-13.* In order to express the immediate sequence of the fulfilling of the prayer upon the prayer itself, the otherwise (e.g., Psa. 32: 5) usual ו conjunction is omitted; on הַפְּכֵתִי וְגוֹ' cf. the echoes in Jer. 31:13, Lam. 5:15. According to our interpretation of the relation of the Psalm to the events of the time, there is as little reason for thinking of 2Sa. 6:14 in connection with מַחֲוִיל, as of 1Ch. 21:16 in connection with שָׁקִי. In place of the garment of penitence and mourning (cf. מַחְגֶּרֶת שֵׁק, Isa. 3:24) slung round the body (perhaps fastened only with a cord) came a girding up (אָזַר, synon. חָגַר Psa. 65:13, whence אָזַר, חָגַרָה) with joy. The designed result of such a speedy and radical change in his affliction, after it had had the salutary effect of humbling him, was the praise of Jahve: in order that my glory (כְּבוֹד for כְּבוֹדִי = נִפְשִׁי, as in Psa. 7: 6; 16: 9; 108: 2) may sing Thy praises without ceasing (יָדָם fut. Kal). And the praise of Jahve for ever is moreover his resolve, just as he vows, and at the same time carries it out, in this Psalm.

## Psalm 31

### SURRENDER OF ONE SORELY PERSECUTED INTO THE HAND OF GOD

*31: 2 IN Thee, Jahve, have I hidden —  
Let me not be ashamed for ever;  
In Thy righteousness set me free.*

*31: 3 Bow down Thine ear to me, deliver me speedily;  
Be Thou to me a rock of refuge,  
A house of fortresses, to save me.*

*31: 4 For my rock and my fortress art Thou,  
And for Thy Name's sake wilt Thou lead me and guide me.*

*31: 5 Thou wilt pull me out of the net they have laid privily for me,  
For Thou art my defence.*

*31: 6 Into Thy hand do I commend my spirit,  
Thou redeemest me, Jahve, God of truth!*

*31: 7 Hateful to me are the worshippers of vain idols,  
Whereas I cleave to Jahve.*

*31: 8 I will exult and rejoice in Thy mercy,  
That Thou hast regarded my poverty,  
That Thou hast taken knowledge of the distresses of my soul.*

*31: 9 And hast not shut me up in the hand of the enemy,  
Thou hast set my feet in a broad place.*

*31:10 Be gracious unto me, Jahve, for I am straitened:  
Consumed with grief is mine eye, and my soul, and my body.*

*31:11 For spent is my life with sorrow,  
And my years with sighing;  
My strength has failed by reason of mine iniquity,  
And my bones are consumed.*

*31:12 Because of all mine adversaries I am become a reproach,  
And a burden to my neighbours, and a terror to my friends;  
Those who see me in the streets flee from me.*

*31:13 I am forgotten as a dead man out of mind;  
I am become like a broken vessel.*

*31:14 For I hear the slander of many,  
Fear on every side;  
While they take counsel together against me—  
They devise to take away my life.*

*31:15 But I — in Thee do I trust, Jahve,  
I say: Thou art my God.*

*31:16 In Thy hand are my times,  
Deliver me out of the hand of mine enemies,  
and from my persecutors!*

*31:17 Make Thy face to shine upon Thy servant,  
Save me in Thy mercy.*

*31:18 Jahve, I shall not be ashamed, for on Thee do I call;  
The wicked shall be ashamed, they shall be silent in Hades.*

*31:19 Lying lips shall be put to silence,  
Which speak insolently of the righteous,  
With pride and contempt.*

*31:20 How great is Thy goodness, which  
Thou hast reserved for them that fear Thee,  
Which Thou dost effect for them that hide in  
Thee in the presence of the children of men.*

*31:21 Thou protectest them in the hiding-place  
of Thy presence from the factions of man;  
Thou keepest them in a pavilion from the strife of tongues.*

*31:22 Blessed be Jahve,  
That He hath shewed me marvellous  
lovingkindness in a strong city,*

*31:23 Whilst I said in my feeble faith:  
“I am cut off from the vision of Thine eyes.” —  
Nevertheless Thou heardest the cry of my  
supplication when I cried to Thee.*

*31:24 O love Jahve, all ye His saints;  
The faithful doth Jahve preserve,  
And plentifully rewardeth the proud doer.*

*31:25 Be strong and let your heart take courage,  
All ye that wait on Jahve!*

In Psalm 31 the poet also, in **וְאֲנִי אֶמְרָתִי** (v. 23), looks back upon a previous state of mind, viz., that of conflict, just as in Psa. 30: 7 upon that of security. And here, also, he makes all the **חֲסִידִים** partakers with him of the healthful fruit of his deliverance (cf. Psa. 31:24 with 30: 5). But in other respects the situation of the two Psalms is very different. They are both Davidic. Hitzig, however, regards them both as composed by Jeremiah. With reference to Psalm 31, which Ewald also ascribes to “Jéremjá,” this view is well worthy of notice. Not only do we find v. 14a recurring in Jeremiah, Psa. 20:10, but the whole Psalm, in its language (cf. e.g., v. 10 with Lam. 1:20; v. 11 with Jer. 20:18; v. 18 with Jer. 17:18; v. 23 with Lam. 3:54) and its plaintive tenderness, reminds one of Jeremiah. But this relationship does not decide the question. The passage Jer. 20:10, like many other passages of this prophet, whose language is so strongly imbued with that of the Psalter, may be just as much a reminiscence as Jon. 2: 5, 9; and as regards its plaintive tenderness there are no two characters more closely allied naturally and in spirit than David and Jeremiah; both are servants of Jahve, whose noble, tender spirits were capable of strong feeling, who cherished earnest longings, and abounded in tribulations. We abide, though not without some degree of hesitation, by the

testimony of the inscription; and regard the Psalm as a song springing from the outward and inward conflict (LXX ἑκστάσεως, probably by a combination of v. 23, ἐν ἑκστάσει, בַּחֲפוֹן, with 1Sa. 23:26) of the time of Saul. While v. 12c is not suited to the mouth of the captive Jeremiah (Hitzig), the Psalm has much that is common not only to Psalm 69 (more especially Ps. 69: 9, 33), a Psalm that sounds much like Jeremiah's, but also to others, which we regard as Davidic; viz., the figures corresponding to the life of warfare which David then lived among the rocks and caves of the wilderness; the cheering call, Ps. 31:25, cf. 22:27; 27:14; the rare use of the *Hiph.* הִפְלִיא Ps. 31:22; 17: 7; the desire to be hidden by God, Ps. 31:21, cf. 17: 8; 64: 3; etc. In common with Psalm 22 this may be noted, that the crucified Christ takes His last word from this Psalm, just as He takes His last utterance but three from that Psalm. But in Ps. 31:10-14, the prefigurement of the Passion is confined within the limits of the type and does not undergo the same prophetic enhancement as it does in that unique Psalm 22, to which only Psalm 69 is in any degree comparable. The opening, vv. 2-4, is repeated in the centonic Psalm 71, the work of a later anonymous poet, just as v. 23 is in part repeated in Ps. 116:11. The arrangement of the strophes is not very clear.

*Psa. 31: 2-9.* The poet begins with the prayer for deliverance, based upon the trust which Jahve, to whom he surrenders himself, cannot possibly disappoint; and rejoices beforehand in the protection which he assumes will, without any doubt, be granted. Out of his confident security in God (חֲסִיתִי) springs the prayer: may it never come to this with me, that I am put to confusion by the disappointment of my hope. This prayer in the form of intense desire is followed by prayers in the direct form of supplication. The supplicatory פְּלַטְנִי is based upon God's righteousness, which cannot refrain from repaying conduct consistent with the order of redemption, though after prolonged trial, with the longed for tokens of deliverance. In the second paragraph, the prayer is moulded in accordance with the circumstances of him who is chased by Saul hither and thither among the mountains and in the desert, homeless and defenceless. In the expression צוֹר מְעוֹז, *genit. appositionis*: a rock of defence (מְעוֹז from עוֹז, as in Ps. 27: 1), or rather: of refuge (מְעוֹז = Arab. *m'ad*, from עוֹז, עוֹז = Arab. *'ad*, as in Ps. 37:39; Ps. 52: 9, and probably also in Isa. 30: 2 and elsewhere); <sup>f166</sup> a rock-castle, i.e., a castle upon a rock, would be called מְעוֹז צוֹר, reversing the order of the words. צוֹר מְעוֹז in Ps. 71: 3, a rock of habitation, i.e., of safe sojourn, fully warrants this interpretation. מְצוּדָה, prop. *specula*, signifies a mountain height or the summit of a mountain; a house on the mountain height is one that is situated on some high mountain top and affords a safe asylum (vid., on 18: 3). The thought "show me Thy salvation, for Thou art my Saviour," underlies the connection expressed

by כִּי in vv. 4 and 5b. Löster considers it to be illogical, but it is the logic of every believing prayer. The poet prays that God would become to him, *actu reflexo*, that which to the *actus directus* of his faith He is even now. The futures in vv. 4, 5 express hopes which necessarily arise out of that which Jahve is to the poet. The interchangeable notions הַנְּחָה and נְהַל, with which we are familiar from Psalm 23, stand side by side, in order to give urgency to the utterance of the longing for God's gentle and safe guidance. Instead of translating it "out of the net, which etc.," according to the accents (cf. Psa. 10: 2; 12: 8) it should be rendered "out of the net there," so that מִמֶּנּוּ לִי is a relative clause without the relative.

Into the hand of this God, who is and will be all this to him, he commends his spirit; he gives it over into His hand as a trust or deposit (פְּקָדוֹן); for whatsoever is deposited there is safely kept, and freed from all danger and all distress. The word used is not נִפְשִׁי, which Theodotion substitutes when he renders it τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ ψυχὴν τῇ σῆ παρατίθημι προμηθείᾳ but רִוּחִי; and this is used designedly. The language of the prayer lays hold of life at its root, as springing directly from God and as also living in the believer from God and in God; and this life it places under His protection, who is the true life of all spirit-life (Isa. 38:16) and of all life. It is the language of prayer with which the dying Christ breathed forth His life, Luk. 23:46. The period of David's persecution by Saul is the most prolific in types of the Passion; and this language of prayer, which proceeded from the furnace of affliction through which David at that time passed, denotes, in the mouth of Christ a crisis in the history of redemption in which the Old Testament receives its fulfilment. Like David, He commends His spirit to God; but not, that He may not die, but that dying He may not die, i.e., that He may receive back again His spirit-corporeal life, which is hidden in the hand of God, in imperishable power and glory. That which is so ardently desired and hoped for is regarded by him, who thus in faith commends himself to God, as having already taken place, "Thou hast redeemed me, Jahve, God of truth." The perfect פְּדִיתָהּ is not used here, as in Psa. 4: 2, of that which is past, but of that which is already as good as past; it is not precative (Ew. § 223, b), but, like the perfects in vv. 8, 9, an expression of believing anticipation of redemption. It is the *praet. confidentiae* which is closely related to the *praet. prophet.*; for the spirit of faith, like the spirit of the prophets, speaks of the future with historic certainty. In the notion of אֱלֹהֵי אֱמֶת it is impossible to exclude the reference to false gods which is contained in אֱלֹהֵי אֱמֶת, 2Ch. 15: 3, since, in v. 7, "vain illusions" are used as an antithesis. הַבְּלָיִם, ever since Deu. 32:21, has become a favourite name for idols, and more particularly in Jeremiah (e.g., Jer. 8:19). On the other hand, according to the context, it may also not differ very greatly from אֱלֹהֵי אֱמוּנָה, Deu. 32: 4;

since the idea of God as a depositary or trustee still influences the thought, and אֱמֶת and אֱמוּנָה are used interchangeably in other passages as personal attributes. We may say that אֱמֶת is being that lasts and verifies itself, and אֱמוּנָה is sentiment that lasts and verifies itself. Therefore אֱלֹהֵי אֱמֶת is the God, who as the true God, maintains the truth of His revelation, and more especially of His promises, by a living authority or rule.

In v. 7, David appeals to his entire and simple surrender to this true and faithful God: hateful to him are those, who worship vain images, whilst he, on the other hand, cleaves to Jahve. It is the false gods, which are called הַבְּלִי־שׁוֹא, as beings without being, which are of no service to their worshippers and only disappoint their expectations. Probably (as in 5: 6) it is to be read שְׁנֵאתָ with the LXX, Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic versions (Hitzig, Ewald, Olshausen, and others). In the text before us, which gives us no corrective *Keri* as in 2Sa. 14:21, Rut. 4: 5, וְאֲנִי is not an antithesis to the preceding clause, but to the member of that clause which immediately precedes it. In Jonah's psalm, Psa. 2: 9, this is expressed by מְשַׁמְרִים הַבְּלִי־שׁוֹא; in the present instance the *Kal* is used in the signification *observare, colere*, as in Hos. 4:10, and even in Pro. 27:18. In the waiting of service is included, according to Psa. 59:10, the waiting of trust. The word בְּטַח which denotes the *fiducia fidei* is usually construed with בּ of adhering to, or אֵל of resting upon; but here it is combined with אֵל of hanging on. The cohortatives in v. 8 express intentions. Olshausen and Hitzig translate them as optatives: may I be able to rejoice; but this, as a continuation of v. 7, seems less appropriate. Certain that he will be heard, he determines to manifest thankful joy for Jahve's mercy, that אֲשֶׁר as in Gen. 34:27) He has regarded (ἐπέβλεψε, Luke 1:48) his affliction, that He has known and exerted Himself about his soul's distresses. The construction בּ יָדַע, in the presence of Gen. 19:33, 35, Job. 12: 9; 35:15, cannot be doubted (Hupfeld); it is more significant than the expression "to know of anything;" בּ is like ἐπί in ἐπιγιγνώσκειν used of the perception or comprehensive knowledge, which grasps an object and takes possession of it, or makes itself master of it. הִסְנִיר, v. 9, συγκαλείειν, as in 1Sa. 23:11 (in the mouth of David) is so to abandon, that the hand of another closes upon that which is abandoned to it, i.e., has it completely in its power. מְרַחֵב, as in Psa. 18:20, cf. 26:12. The language is David's, in which the language of the *Tôra*, and more especially of Deuteronomy (Deu. 32:30; 23:16), is re-echoed.

*Psa. 31:10-14.* After the paean before victory, which he has sung in the fulness of his faith, in this second part of the Psalm (with groups, or strophes, of diminishing compass: 6. 5. 4) there again breaks forth the petition, based

upon the greatness of the suffering which the psalmist, after having strengthened himself in his trust in God, now all the more vividly sets before Him. **צַר־לִי**, *angustum est mihi*, as in Psa. 69:18, cf. 18: 7. V. 10<sup>b</sup> is word for word like 6: 8, except that in this passage to **עֵינַי**, the eye which mirrors the state of suffering in which the sensuous perception and objective receptivity of the man are concentrated, are added **נַפְשִׁי**, the soul forming the *nexus* of the spirit and the body, and **בְּטִן**, the inward parts of the body reflecting the energies and feelings of the spirit and the soul. **חַיִּים**, with which is combined the idea of the organic intermingling of the powers of soul and body, has the predicate in the plural, as in Psa. 88: 4. The fact that the poet makes mention of his iniquity as that by which his physical strength has become tottering (**בְּשַׁל** as in Neh. 4: 4), is nothing surprising even in a Psalm that belongs to the time of his persecution by Saul; for the longer this persecution continued, the more deeply must David have felt that he needed this furnace of affliction.

The text of v. 12<sup>ab</sup> upon which the LXX rendering is based, was just the same as ours: *παρὰ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου ἐγενήθην ὄνειδος, καὶ τοῖς γείτοσί μου σφόδρα καὶ φόβος τοῖς γνωστοῖς μου*. But this *σφόδρα* (Jerome *nimis*) would certainly only be tolerable, if it could be rendered, “I am become a reproach even to my neighbours exceedingly” — in favour of this position of **מֵאֵד** we might compare Jud. 12: 2, — and this rendering is not really an impossible one; for not only has **אֵד** frequently the sense of “even” as in 2Sa. 1:23, but (independently of passages, in which it may even be explained as “and that,” an expression which takes up what has been omitted, as in Amo. 4:10) it sometimes has this meaning direct (like *καὶ, et - etiam*), Isa. 32: 7, Hos. 8: 6 (according to the accents), 2Ch. 27: 5, Ecc. 5: 5 (cf. Ew. § 352, *b*). Inasmuch, however, as this usage, in Hebrew, was not definitely developed, but was only as it were just developing, it may be asked whether it is not possible to find a suitable explanation without having recourse to this rendering of the **אֵד** as equivalent to **גַּם**, a rendering which is always hazardous. Olshausen places **לְמִידַעִי** after **וְלִשְׁכֵנִי**, a change which certainly gets rid of all difficulty. Hitzig alters **מֵאֵד** into **מִנָּד**, frightened, scared. But one naturally looks for a parallel substantive to **חֲרִפָּה**, somewhat like “terror” (Syriac) or “burden.” Still **מְגוֹר** (dread) and **מִשְׁאָת** (a burden) do not look as though **מֵאֵד** could be a corruption of either of those words. Is it not perhaps possible for **מֵאֵד** itself to be equivalent in meaning to **מִשְׁאָת**? Since in the signification *σφόδρα* it is so unsuited to this passage, the expression would not be ambiguous, if it were here used in a special sense. J. D. Michaelis has even compared the Arabic *awd* (*awdat*) in the sense of *onus*. We can, without the hesitation felt by



Maurer and Hupfeld, suppose that **מֵאֵד** has indeed this meaning in this passage, and without any necessity for its being pointed **מֵאֵד**; for even the adverb **מֵאֵד** is originally a substantive derived from **אֵד**, Arab. *âd* (after the form **מֵצֵד** from **צֵד**) *gravitas, firmitas*, which is then used in the sense of *graviter, firmiter* (cf. the French *ferme*). **אֵד**, Arab. *âd*, however, has the radical signification to be compressed, compact, firm, and solid, from which proceed the significations, which are divided between *âda, jaïdu*, and *âda, jaûdu*, to be strong, powerful, and to press upon, to burden, both of which meanings Arab. ‘*dd* unites within itself (cf. on 20: 9).

The number of opponents that David had, at length made him a reproach even in the eyes of the better disposed of his people, as being a revolter and usurper. Those among whom he found friendly shelter began to feel themselves burdened by his presence because they were thereby imperilled; and we see from the sad fate of Abimelech and the other priests of Nob what cause, humanly speaking, they, who were not merely slightly, but even intimately acquainted with him (**מִיָּדָעִים** as in Psa. 55:14; 88: 9, 19), had for avoiding all intercourse with him. Thus, then, he is like one dead, whom as soon as he is borne out of his home to the grave, men are wont, in general, to put out of mind also (**נִשְׁכַּח מֵלֵא**, *oblivione extingui ex corde*; cf. **מִפֶּה**, Deu. 31:21). All intimate connection with him is as it were sundered, he is become **כְּכֵלִי אֵבֶד**, — a phrase, which, as we consider the confirmation which follows in v. 14, has the sense of *vas periens* (not *vas perditum*), a vessel that is in the act of **אֵבֶד**, i.e., one that is set aside or thrown away, being abandoned to utter destruction and no more cared for (cf. Hos. 8: 8, together with Jer. 48:38, and Jer. 22:28). With **כִּי** he gives the ground for his comparison of himself to a household vessel that has become worthless. The insinuations and slanders of many brand him as a transgressor, dread surrounds him on every side (this is word for word the same as in Jer. 20:10, where the prophet, with whom in other passages also **מִגֹּר מִסְבִּיב** is a frequent and standing formula, under similar circumstances uses the language of the psalmist); when they come together to take counsel concerning him (according to the accents the second half of the verse begins with **בְּהִוָּסְדָם**), they think only how they may get rid of him. If the construction of **ב** with its infinitive were intended to be continued in v. 14*d*, it would have been **נַפְשִׁי יִזְמוּ וְיִזְמְמוּ לַקַּחַת נַפְשִׁי** or **נַפְשִׁי יִזְמוּ לַקַּחַת**.

**Psa. 31:15-19.** But, although a curse of the world and an offscouring of all people, he is confident in God, his Deliverer and Avenger. By **וְאֵי** prominence is given to the subject by way of contrast, as in v. 7. It appears as though Jahve

had given him up in His anger; but he confides in Him, and in spite of this appearance, he even confides in Him with the prayer of appropriating faith. **עתות** or **אִתִּים** (1Ch. 29:30) are the appointed events and circumstances, the vicissitudes of human life; like the Arabic *‘idât* (like **עַת** from **וְעַד**), the appointed rewards and punishments. The times, with whatsoever they bring with them, are in the Lord’s hand, every lot is of His appointment or sending. The Vulgate follows the LXX, *in manibus tuis sortes meae*. The petitions of vv. 16b, 17, spring from this consciousness that the almighty and faithful hand of God has mould his life. There are three petitions; the middle one is an echo of the Aaronitish blessing in Num. 6:25. **בִּי קָרָאתִיךָ**, which gives the ground of his hope that he shall not be put to shame (cf. v. 2), is to be understood like **אִמְרָתִי** in v. 15, according to Ges. § 126, 3. The expression of the ground for **אֶל-אֲבִנְשָׁה**, favours the explanation of it not so much as the language of petition (let me not be ashamed) of as hope. The futures which follow might be none the less regarded as optatives, but the order of the words does not require this. And we prefer to take them as expressing hope, so that the three petitions in vv. 16, 17, correspond to the three hopes in vv. 18, 19. He will not be ashamed, but the wicked shall be ashamed and silenced for ever. The form **יִדְמוּ**, from **דָּמַם**, is, as in Jer. 8:14, the plural of the *fut.* **יָדַם**, with the doubling of the first radical, which is customary in Aramaic (other examples of which we have in **יָקַד**, **יָשַׁם**, **יָרַחַם**), not of the *fut.* **נִיפַח**, the plural of which would be **יִדְמוּ**, as in 1Sa. 2: 9; *conticescere in orcum* is equivalent to: to be silent, i.e., being made powerless to fall a prey to hades. It is only in accordance with the connection, that in this instance **נִיפְּלָם**, v. 19, just like **דָּמַם**, denotes that which is forcibly laid upon them by the judicial intervention of God: all lying lips shall be dumb, i.e., made dumb. **עָתָק** prop. that which is unrestrained, free, insolent (cf. Arabic *‘atik*, *‘atík*, unrestrained, free<sup>f167</sup>) is the accusative of the object, as in Psa. 94: 4, and as it is the nominative of the subject in 1Sa. 2: 3.

**Psa. 31:20-25.** In this part well-grounded hope expands to triumphant certainty; and this breaks forth into grateful praise of the goodness of God to His own, and an exhortation to all to wait with steadfast faith on Jahve. The thought: how gracious hath Jahve been to me, takes a more universal form in v. 20. It is an exclamation (**מָה**, as in Psa. 36: 8) of adoring admiration. **טוֹב יְהוָה** is the sum of the good which God has treasured up for the constant and ever increasing use and enjoyment of His saints. **צָפַן** is used in the same sense as in Psa. 17:14; cf. **τὸ μάννα τὸ κεκρυμμένον**, Rev. 2:17. Instead of **פְּאַלָּה** it ought strictly to be **נְתָה**; for we can say **פְּאַל טוֹב**, but not **פְּאַל טוֹב**. What is meant is, the doing or manifesting of **טוֹב** springing from this **טוֹב**, which is the

treasure of grace. Jahve thus makes Himself known to His saints for the confounding of their enemies and in defiance of all the world besides, Psa. 23: 5. He takes those who are His under His protection from the **אִישׁ אֶרְכָּסֵי**, confederations of men (from **רָכַס**, Arab. *rks*, *magna copia*), from the wrangling, i.e., the slanderous scourging, of tongues. Elsewhere it is said, that God hides one in **סֶתֶר אֱהָלוֹ** (Psa. 27: 5), or in **סֶתֶר בְּנִפְיוֹ** (Psa. 61: 5), or in His shadow (**צֶלַל**, Psa. 91: 1); in this passage it is: in the defence and protection of His countenance, i.e., in the region of the unapproachable light that emanates from His presence. The **סֶכְכָּה** is the safe and comfortable protection of the Almighty which spans over the persecuted one like an arbour or rich foliage. With **בְּרוּךְ ה'** David again passes over to his own personal experience. The unity of the Psalm requires us to refer the praise to the fact of the deliverance which is anticipated by faith. Jahve has shown him wondrous favour, inasmuch as He has given him a **עִיר מְצוּרָה** as a place of abode. **מְצוּרָה**, from **צוּר** to shut in (Arabic *misr* with the denominative verb *maṣṣara*, to found a fortified city), signifies both a siege, i.e., a shutting in by siege-works, and a fortifying (cf. Psa. 60:11 with Psa. 108:11), i.e., a shutting in by fortified works against the attack of the enemy, 2Ch. 8: 5. The fenced city is mostly interpreted as God Himself and His powerful and gracious protection. We might then compare Isa. 33:21 and other passages. But why may not an actual city be intended, viz., Ziklag? The fact, that after long and troublous days David there found a strong and sure resting-place, he here celebrates beforehand, and unconsciously prophetically, as a wondrous token of divine favour. To him Ziklag was indeed the turning-point between his degradation and exaltation. He had already said in his trepidation (**תַּפְּוֹ**, *trepidare*), cf. Psa. 116:11: I am cut away from the range of Thine eyes. **נִגְרַתִּי** is explained according to **נִרְזֵן**, an axe; Lam. 3:54, **נִגְרַתִּי**, and Jon. 2: 5, **נִגְרַשְׁתִּי**, favour this interpretation. He thought in his fear and despair, that God would never more care about him. **אֲכַן**, *verum enim vero*, but Jahve heard the cry of his entreaty, when he cried unto Him (the same words as in Psa. 28: 2). On the ground of these experiences he calls upon all the godly to love the God who has done such gracious things, i.e., to love Love itself. On the one hand, He preserves the faithful (**אֲמוּנִים**, from **אֲמוּן** = **אֲמוּן**, **πιστοί**, as in Psa. 12: 2), who keep faith with Him, by also proving to them His faithfulness by protection in every danger; on the other hand, not scantily, but plentifully (**אֵל** as in Isa. 60: 7, Jer. 6:14: **κατὰ περισσεύειν**) He rewardeth those that practise pride — in the sight of God, the Lord, the sin of sins. An animating appeal to the godly (metamorphosed out of the usual form of the expression **חִזְקוּ וְאֲמִץ**, *macte esto*), resembling the animating call to his own heart in Psa. 27:14,

closes the Psalm. The godly and faithful are here called “those who wait upon Jahve.” They are to wait patiently, for this waiting has a glorious end; the bright, spring sun at length breaks through the dark, angry aspect of the heavens, and the *esto mihi* is changed into *halleluja*. This eye of hope patiently directed towards Jahve is the characteristic of the Old Testament faith. The substantial unity, however, of the Old Testament order of grace, or mercy, with that of the New Testament, is set before us in Psalm 32, which, in its New Testament and Pauline character, is the counterpart of Psalm 19.

## **Psalm 32**

### **THE WAY TO THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS**

*32: 1 BLESSED is he whose transgression is taken away, whose sin is covered.*

*32: 2 Blessed is the man to whom Jahve doth not reckon iniquity,  
And in whose spirit there is no guile.*

*32: 3 When I kept silence, my bones rotted  
Through my constant groaning.*

*32: 4 For day and night Thy hand was heavy upon me,  
My moisture was changed with the drought of summer. (Sela)*

*32: 5 I acknowledged my sin unto Thee and did not cover my guilt;  
I said: “I will confess my transgressions unto Jahve” —  
And Thou, Thou hast taken away the guilt of my sin. (Sela)*

*32: 6 For this cause let every godly man pray unto  
Thee in a time when Thou mayest be found;  
Surely, when the great waters rise —  
They shall not reach him.*

*32: 7 Thou art my hiding-place, from trouble Thou wilt guard me,  
With songs of deliverance wilt Thou compass me about. (Sela)*

*32: 8 I will instruct thee and teach thee concerning the way thou shalt go.  
I will give counsel, keeping mine eye upon thee.*

*32: 9 Be ye not as horses, as mules without understanding,  
With bit and bridle is their mouth to be curbed,  
Otherwise they will not come near unto thee.*

*32:10 Many sorrows are to the ungodly,  
But whoso trusteth in Jahve,  
with favour doth He compass him about.*

*32:11 Be glad in Jahve, and rejoice, ye righteous,  
And shout for joy all ye that are upright in heart!*

There are several prominent marks by which this Psalm is coupled with the preceding (vid., *Symbolae* § 52). In both Psalms, with the word אִמְרָתִי, the psalmist looks back upon some fact of his spiritual life; and both close with an exhortation to the godly, which stands in the relation of a general inference to the whole Psalm. But in other respects the two Psalms differ. For Psalm 31 is a prayer under circumstances of outward distress, and Psalm 32 is a didactic Psalm, concerning the way of penitence which leads to the forgiveness of sins; it is the second of the seven *Psalmi paenitentiales* of the church, and Augustine's favourite Psalm. We might take Augustine's words as its motto: *intelligentia prima est ut te noris peccatorem*. The poet bases it upon his own personal experience, and then applies the general teaching which he deduces from it, to each individual in the church of God. For a whole year after his adultery David was like one under sentence of condemnation. In the midst of this fearful anguish of soul he composed Psalm 51, whereas Psalm 32 was composed after his deliverance from this state of mind. The former was written in the very midst of the penitential struggle; the latter after he had recovered his inward peace. The theme of this Psalm is the precious treasure which he brought up out of that abyss of spiritual distress, viz., the doctrine of the blessedness of forgiveness, the sincere and unreserved confession of sin as the way to it, and the protection of God in every danger, together with joy in God, as its fruits.

In the signification *psalmus didascalicus s. informatorius* (Reuchlin: *ut si liceret dicere intellectificum vel resipiscentificum*), מְשֻׁבֵּל would after all be as appropriate a designation as we could have for this Psalm which teaches the way of salvation. This meaning, however, cannot be sustained. It is improbable that מְשֻׁבֵּל, which, in all other instances, signifies *intelligens*, should, as a technical term, mean *intelligentem faciens*; because the *Hiph.* הִשְׁבִּיל, in the causative meaning "to impart understanding," occurs only in solitary instances (v. 8, Pro. 21:11) in the Hebrew of the period before the Exile, and only came into common use in the later language (in Daniel, Chronicles, and Nehemiah). But, that which is decisive against the meaning "a didactic poem" is the fact, that among the thirteen Psalms which are inscribed מְשֻׁבֵּל, there are only two (32 and 78) which can be regarded as didactic poems. Psalm 45 is called, in addition, שִׁיר יְדִידָה, and Psalm 142, תְּפִלָּה, two names which ill accord with a didactic intention and plan. Even Psa. 47: 8, a passage of importance in the determining of the right idea of the word, in which מְשֻׁבֵּל occurs as an accusative of the object, excludes the meaning "didactic poem." Ewald observes (*Dichter des Alten Bundes*, i. 31) that "in Psa. 47: 8 we have the safest guide to the correct meaning of the word; in this passage מְשֻׁבֵּל stands side by side with זִמְרָה as a more exact definition of the

singing and there can be no doubt, that an *intelligent*, melodious song must be equivalent to *choice* or *delicate*, skillfully composed song.” But in all other cases, **משכיל** is only found as an attribute of persons, because it is not that which makes prudent, but that which is itself intelligent, that is so named. Even in 2Ch. 30:22, where allusion is made to the *Maskîl* Psalms, it is the Levite musicians themselves who are called (**שכל טוב**) **המשכילים** (i.e., those who play skillfully with delicate tact). Thus then we are driven to the Hiphil meaning of pensive meditation in Psa. 106: 7, cf. 41: 2, Pro. 16:20; so that **משכיל** signifies that which meditates, then meditation, just like **מכביר**, that which multiplies, and then fulness; **משחית**, that which destroys, and then destruction. From the *Maskîl* Psalms, as e.g., from 54 and 142, we cannot discover anything special as to the technical meaning or use of the word. The word means just *pia meditatio*, a devout meditation, and nothing more.

*Psa. 32: 1-2.* The Psalm begins with the celebration of the happiness of the man who experiences God’s justifying grace, when he gives himself up unreservedly to Him. Sin is called **פשע**, as being a breaking loose or tearing away from God; **חטא**, as a deviation from that which is well-pleasing to God; **עון**, as a perversion, distortion, misdeed. The forgiveness of sin is styled **נשא** (Exo. 34: 7), as a lifting up and taking away, **ἀρειν** and **ἀφαιρειν**, Exo. 34: 7; **כסה** (Psa. 85: 3, Pro. 10:12, Neh. 3:37), as a covering, so that it becomes invisible to God, the Holy One, and is as though it had never taken place; **לא חשב** (2Sa. 19:20, cf. Arab. *ḥsb*, to number, reckon, **οὐ λογιζεσθαι**, Rom. 4: 6-9), as a non-imputing; the **δικαιοσύνη χωρὶς ἔργων** is here distinctly expressed. The justified one is called **נשוי-פשע**, as being one who is exempted from transgression, *praevaricatione levatus* (Ges. § 135, 1); **נשוי**, instead of **נשא**, Isa. 33:24, is intended to rhyme with **כסוי** (which is the *part.* to **כסה**, just as **ברוך** is the participle to **ברך**); vid., on Isa. 22:13. One “covered of sin” is one over whose sin lies the covering of expiation (**כפר**, root **כפ**, to cover, cogn. Arab. *gfr*, *chfr*, *chmr*, *gmr*) before the holy eyes of God. The third designation is an attributive clause: “to whom Jahve doth not reckon misdeed,” inasmuch as He, on the contrary, regards it as discharged or as settled. He who is thus justified, however, is only he in whose spirit there is no **רמיה**, no deceit, which denies and hides, or extenuates and excuses, this or that favourite sin. One such sin designedly retained is a secret ban, which stands in the way of justification.

*Psa. 32: 3-5.* For, as his own experience has taught the poet, he who does not in confession pour out all his corruption before God, only tortures himself until he unburdens himself of his secret curse. Since v. 3 by itself cannot be

regarded as the reason for the proposition just laid down, כִּי signifies either “because, *quod*” (e.g., Pro. 22:22) or “when, *quum*” (Jud. 16:16, Hos. 11:10). The שִׁאָנָה was an outburst of the tortures which his accusing conscience prepared for him. The more he strove against confessing, the louder did conscience speak; and while it was not in his power to silence this inward voice, in which the wrath of God found utterance, he cried the whole day, viz., for help; but while his heart was still unbroken, he cried yet received no answer. He cried all day long, for God’s punishing right hand (Psa. 38: 3; 39:11) lay heavy upon him day and night; the feeling of divine wrath left him no rest, cf. Job. 33:14 ff. A fire burned within him which threatened completely to devour him. The expression is בְּחַרְבֵי (like בעֵשֶׂן in Psa. 37:20; 102: 4), without כּ, inasmuch as the fears which burn fiercely within him even to his heart and, as it were, scorch him up, he directly calls the droughts of summer. The ב is the *Beth* of the state or condition, in connection with which the change, i.e., degeneration (Job. 20:14), took place; for *mutare in aliquid* is expressed by הִפְּךָ לְ . The ל (which Saadia and others have mistaken) in לְשִׁדִּי is part of the root; לְשָׁד (from לָשַׁד, Arab. *lsd*, to suck), inflected after the analogy of נָמַל and the like, signifies *succus*. In the summer-heat of anxiety his vital moisture underwent a change: it burned and dried up. Here the music becomes louder and does its part in depicting these torments of the awakened conscience in connection with a heart that still remains unbroken. In spite of this διάψαλμα, however, the historical connection still retains sufficient influence to give אֹדִיעֵךְ the force of the imperfect (cf. Psa. 30: 9): “I made known my sin and my guilt did I not cover up (כָּסַף) used here as in Pro. 27:13, Job. 31:33); I made the resolve: I will confess my transgressions to the Lord (הִתְנַדְּדָה = הִתְנַדָּה, Neh. 1: 6; 9: 2; elsewhere construed with the accusative, vid., Pro. 28:13) — then Thou forgavest,” etc. Hupfeld is inclined to place חַמַּאתִי אֹדִיעֵךְ before חַמַּאתִי אֹדִיעֵךְ, by which אֹדִיעֵךְ and אֹדִיעֵךְ would become futures; but כִּסִּיתִי לֹא וְעוֹנִי נִשְׂאת וְאֵתָה is the natural continuation of the חַמַּאתִי which immediately precedes. The form וְאֵתָה נִשְׂאת is designedly used instead of וְנִשְׂאתָ. Simultaneously with his confession of sin, made *fide supplice*, came also the absolution: then Thou forgavest the guilt (עָוֹן, misdeed, as a deed and also as a matter of fact, i.e., guilt contracted, and penance or punishment, cf. Lam. 4: 6, Zec. 14:19) of my sin. *Vox nondum est in ore*, says Augustine, *et vulnus sanatur in corde*. The סִלָּה here is the antithesis of the former one. There we have a shrill lament over the sinner who tortures himself in vain, here the clear tones of joy at the

blessed experience of one who pours forth his soul to God — a musical Yea and Amen to the great truth of justifying grace.

**Psa. 32: 6-7.** For this mercy, which is provided for every sinner who repents and confesses his sin, let then, every **חֹסִיד**, who longs for **חֹסֶד**, turn in prayer to Jahve **לְעֵת מְצֵא**, at the time (Psa. 21:10, 1Ch. 12:22; cf. **בַּעַת**, Isa. 49: 8) when He, and His mercy, is to be found (cf. Deu. 4:29 with Jer. 29:13, Isa. 55: 6, **בְּהַמְצֵאוֹ**). This hortatory wish is followed by a promissory assurance. The fact of **לְשֹׁטֵף מַיִם רַבִּים** being virtually a protasis: *quam inundant aquae magnae* (**לְ** of the time), which separates **רַק** from **אֱלֹיוּ**, prohibits our regarding **רַק** as belonging to **אֱלֹיוּ** in this instance, although like **אֵף**, **אָד**, **גַּם**, **אָד**, and **רַק**, **רַק** is also placed *per hypallage* at the head of the clause (as in Pro. 13:10: with pride there is only contention), even when belonging to a part of the clause that follows further on. The restrictive meaning of **רַק** here, as is frequently the case (Deu. 4: 6, Jud. 14:16, 1Ki. 21:25, cf. Psa. 91: 8), has passed over to the affirmative: *certo quum*, etc. Inundation or flooding is an exemplificative description of the divine judgment (cf. Nah. 1: 8); v. 6bc is a brief form of expressing the promise which is expanded in Psalm 91. In v. 7, David confirms it from his own experience. The assonance in **מְצַר תְּצַרְנִי** (Thou wilt preserve me, so that **צָר**, *angustum = angustiae*, does not come upon me, Psa. 119:143) is not undesigned; and after **תְּצַרְנִי** comes **רַנִּי**, just like **כָּלוּ** after **בְּהִיכָלוּ** in Psa. 29: 9. There is no sufficient ground for setting aside **רַנִּי**, with Houbigant and others, as a repetition of the half of the word **תְּצַרְנִי**. The infinitive **רָן** (Job. 38: 7) might, like **רַב**, *plur.* **רַבִּי**, **חָק**, *plur.* **חֲקִי**, with equal right be inflected as a substantive; and **פָּלַט** (as in Psa. 56: 8), which is likewise treated as a substantive, cf. **נִפְיָן**, Dan. 12: 7, presents, as a genitive, no more difficulty than does **דַּעַת** in the expression **אִישׁ דַּעַת**. With songs of deliverance doth Jahve surround him, so that they encompass him on all sides, and on occasion of exulting meets him in whatever direction he turns. The music here again for the third time becomes *forte*, and that to express the highest feeling of delight.

**Psa. 32: 8-10.** It is not Jahve, who here speaks in answer to the words that have been thus far addressed to Him. In this case the person addressed must be the poet, who, however, has already attained the knowledge here treated of. It is he himself who now directly adopts the tone of the teacher (cf. Psa. 34:12). That which David, in Psa. 51:15, promises to do, he here takes in hand, viz., the instruction of sinners in the way of salvation. It is unnecessary to read **אִיעָצֶךָ** instead of **אִיעָצָה**, as Olshausen does; the suffix of **אִשְׁבִּילְךָ** and



אֲוֹרֵךְ (for אֲוֹרֵךְ) avails also for this third verb, to which עֲלִיךְ עֵינַי, equivalent to שָׁם עָלֶיךָ עֵינַי (fixing my eye upon thee, i.e., with sympathising love taking an interest in thee), stands in the relation of a subordinate relative clause. The LXX renders it by ἐπιστηριῶ ἐπὶ σὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, so that it takes יָאֵץ, in accordance with its radical signification *firmare*, as the *regens* of עֵינַי (I will fix my eye steadfastly upon thee); but for this there is no support in the general usage of the language. The accents give a still different rendering; they apparently make עֵינַי an *accus. adverb*. (Since אֵעֶצָה עֲלֶיךָ עֵינַי is transformed from אֵעֶצָה עֲלֶיךָ עֵינַי : I will counsel thee with mine eye; but in every other instance, יָאֵץ אֵל means only a hostile determination against any one, e.g., Isa. 7: 5. The form of address, without changing its object, passes over, in v. 9, into the plural and the expression becomes harsh in perfect keeping with the perverted character which it describes. The sense is on the whole clear: not constrained, but willing obedience is becoming to man, in distinction from an irrational animal which must be led by a bridle drawn through its mouth. The asyndeton clause: like a horse, a mule (פָּרֶד as an animal that is isolated and does not pair; cf. Arab. *fard*, alone of its kind, single, unlike, the opposite of which is Arab. *zawj*, a pair, equal number), has nothing remarkable about it, cf. Ps. 35:14, Isa. 38:14. But it is not clear what עֲדָיו is intended to mean. We might take it in its usual signification “ornament,” and render “with bit and bridle, its ornament,” and perhaps at once recognise therein an allusion to the senseless servility of the animal, viz., that its ornament is also the means by which it is kept in check, unless עֲדָי, ornament, is perhaps directly equivalent to “harness.” Still the rendering of the LXX is to be respected: *in campo et fraeno* — as Jerome reproduces it — *maxilas eorum constringere qui non approximant ad te*. If עֲדָי means jaw, mouth or check, then עֲדָיו לְבָלוֹם is equivalent to *ora eorum obturanda sunt* (Ges. § 132, rem. 1), which the LXX expressed by ἄγγαι, *constringe*, or following the *Cod. Alex.*, ἄγγις, ἄγγεις, *constringes*. Like Ewald and Hitzig (on Eze. 16: 7), we may compare with עֲדָי, the cheek, the Arabic *chadd*, which, being connected with גְּדוּד, a furrow, signifies properly the furrow of the face, i.e., the indented part running downwards from the inner corners of the eyes to both sides of the nose, but then by synecdoche the cheek. If עֲדָיו refers to the mouth or jaws, then it looks as if בֶּל קָרֵב אֵלַיךְ must be translated: in order that they may not come too near thee, viz., to hurt thee (Targ., Syriac, Rashi, etc.); but this rendering does not produce any point of comparison corresponding to the context of this Psalm. Therefore, it is rather to be rendered: otherwise there is no coming near to thee. This interpretation takes the emphasis of the בֶּל into account, and assumes that, according to a

usage of the language that is without further support, one might, for instance, say: *בִּלְלֹכְתִי שָׁמָּה*, “I will never go thither.” In Pro. 23:17, *בִּל* also includes within itself the verb to be. So here: by no means an approaching to thee, i.e., there is, if thou dost not bridle them, no approaching or coming near to thee. These words are not addressed to God, but to man, who is obliged to use harsh and forcible means in taming animals, and can only thus keep them under his control and near to him. In the antitype, it is the sinner, who will not come to God, although God only is his help, and who, as David has learned by experience, must first of all endure inward torture, before he comes to a right state of mind. This agonising life of the guilty conscience which the ungodly man leads, is contrasted in v. 10 with the mercy which encompasses on all sides him, who trusts in God. *רַב־יָמִים*, in accordance with the treatment of this adjective as if it were a numeral (vid., Psa. 89:51), is an attributive or adjective placed before its noun. The final clause might be rendered: mercy encompasses him; but the *Poel* and v. 7 favour the rendering: with mercy doth He encompass him.

*Psa. 32:11.* After the doctrine of the Psalm has been unfolded in three unequal groups of verses, there follows, corresponding to the brief introduction, a still shorter close, which calls upon those whose happy state is there celebrated, to join in songs of exultant joy.

## **Psalm 33**

### **PRAISE OF THE RULER OF THE WORLD AS BEING THE DEFENDER OF HIS PEOPLE**

*33: 1 SHOUT for joy, O ye righteous, in Jahve,  
For the upright praise is comely.*

*33: 2 Praise Jahve with cithern,  
With a ten-stringed nabla play unto Him.*

*33: 3 Sing unto Him a new song,  
Play merrily with a joyful noise.*

*33: 4 For upright is the word of Jahve,  
And all His working is in faithfulness.*

*33: 5 He loveth righteousness and judgment;  
The earth is full of the mercy of Jahve.*

*33: 6 By the word of Jahve were the heavens made,  
And by the breath of His mouth all their host.*

*33: 7 He gathereth the waters of the sea together as a heap,  
He layeth up the depths in storehouses.*

*33: 8 Let all the earth fear before Jahve,  
Let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of Him.*

*33: 9 For He spake, and it was done;  
He commanded, and it stood fast.*

*33:10 Jahve hath brought the counsel of the heathen to nought,  
He hath made the thoughts of the people of none effect.*

*33:11 The counsel of Jahve standeth for ever,  
The thoughts of His heart to all generations.*

*33:12 Blessed is the nation whose God is Jahve,  
The people whom He chooseth for His own inheritance.*

*33:13 From heaven Jahve looketh down,  
He seeth all the children of men.*

*33:14 From the place of His habitation He looketh  
Upon all the inhabitants of the earth,*

*33:15 He, who fashioneth their heart together,  
Who considereth all their works.*

*33:16 A king doth not triumph by great strength,  
A mighty man is not delivered by great power.*

*33:17 A vain thing is a horse for victory,  
And its great strength cannot deliver.*

*33:18 Behold, the eye of Jahve is upon them that fear Him,  
Upon them that hope in His mercy,*

*33:19 To deliver their soul from death,  
And to keep them alive in famine.*

*33:20 Our soul waiteth for Jahve,  
Our help and our shield is He.*

*33:21 For in Him shall our heart rejoice,  
Because we trust in His holy Name*

*33:22 Let, then, Thy mercy, O Jahve, be upon us,  
According as we hope in Thee!*

The Davidic *Maskîl*, Psalm 32, is followed by an anonymous congregational song of a hymnic character, which begins just like the former closes. It owes its composition apparently to some deliverance of the nation from heathen oppression, which had resulted from God's interposition and without war. Moreover it exhibits no trace of dependence upon earlier models, such as might compel us to assign a late date to it; the time of Jeremiah, for instance,

which Hitzig adopts. The structure is symmetrical. Between the two hexastichs, vv. 1-3, 20-22, the *materia laudis* is set forth in eight tetrastichs.

**Psa. 33: 1-3.** The call contained in this hexastich is addressed to the righteous and upright, who earnestly seek to live a godly and God-pleasing life, and the sole determining rule of whose conduct is the will and good pleasure of God. These alone know God, whose true nature finds in them a clear mirror; so on their part they are joyfully to confess what they possess in Him. For it is their duty, and at the same time their honour, to praise him, and make their boast in Him. נְאֻדָּה is the feminine of the adjective נְאֻדָּה (formed out of נְאֻדָּה), as in Psa. 147: 1, cf. Pro. 19:10. On כְּנֹר (LXX κίθára, κινύρα) and נָבֵל (LXX ψαλτήριον, νάβλα, ναύλα, etc.) vid., Introduction § II. נָבֵל is the name given to the harp or lyre on account of its resemblance to a skin bottle or flash (root נָבַל, to swell, to be distended), and נָבֵל עֶשׂוֹר, “harp of the decade,” is the ten-stringed harp, which is also called absolutely עֶשׂוֹר, and distinguished from the customary נָבֵל, in Psa. 92: 4. By a comparison of the asyndeton expressions in Psa. 35:14, Jer. 11:19, Aben-Ezra understands by נָבֵל עֶשׂוֹר two instruments, contrary to the tenour of the words. Gecatilia, whom he controverts, is only so far in error as that he refers the ten to holes (נְקִבִים) instead of to strings. The נָבֵל is *Beth instrum.*, just like the expression κίθαρίζειν ἐν κίθάραις, Rev. 14: 2. A “new song” is one which, in consequence of some new mighty deeds of God, comes from a new impulse of gratitude in the heart, Psa. 40: 4, and frequently in the Psalms, Isa. 42:10, Judith 6:13, Rev. 5: 9. In הִיטִיבוּ the notions of *scite* and *strenue, suaviter* and *naviter*, blend. With בְּתִרְוָעָה, referring back to רַנְּנוּ, the call to praise forms, as it were, a circle as it closes.

**Psa. 33: 4-5.** Now begins the body of the song. The summons to praise God is supported (1) by a setting forth of His praiseworthiness <sup>f168</sup>

(a) as the God of revelation in the kingdom of Grace. His word is יָשָׁר, upright in intention, and, without becoming in any way whatever untrue to itself, straightway fulfilling itself. His every act is an act in אֱמוּנָה, truth, which verifies the truth of His word, and one which accomplishes itself. On אֱהָב, equivalent to הוֹאֵב אֱהָב, vid., Psa. 7:10; 22:29. צְדָקָה is righteousness as conduct; מִשְׁפָּט is right as a rule of judgment and a state or condition. חֶסֶד is an accusative, as in Psa. 119:64: *misericiadiâ Domini plena est terra* (the introit for Misericordias Sunday or the second Sunday after Easter).

*Psa. 33: 6-9.* God's praiseworthiness (*b*) as the Creator of the world in the kingdom of Nature. Jahve's דְּבַר is His almighty "Let there be;" and רוּחַ פִּיּוֹ (inasmuch as the breath is here regarded as the material of which the word is formed and the bearer of the word) is the command, or in general, the operation of His commanding omnipotence (Job. 15:30, cf. 4: 9; Isa. 34:16, cf. 11: 4). The heavens above and the waters beneath stand side by side as miracles of creation. The display of His power in the waters of the sea consists in His having confined them within fixed bounds and keeping them within these. נָד is a pile, i.e., a piled up heap (Arabic *nadd*), and more especially an inference to harvest: like such a heap do the convex waters of the sea, being firmly held together, rise above the level of the continents. The expression is like that in Jos. 3:13, 15, cf. Exo. 15: 8; although there the reference is to a miracle occurring in the course of history, and in this passage to a miracle of creation. כְּנִיס refers to the heap itself, not to the walls of the storehouses as holding together. This latter figure is not introduced until v. 7*b*: the bed of the sea and those of the rivers are, as it were, אֲנָצְרוֹת, treasuries or storehouses, in which God has deposited the deep, foaming waves or surging mass of waters. The inhabitants (יְשֵׁבֵי, not יֹשְׁבֵי) of the earth have cause to fear God who is thus omnipotent (מֵן, in the sense of falling back *from* in terror); for He need only speak the word and that which He wills comes into being out of nothing, as we see from the hexaëmeron or history of Creation, but which is also confirmed in human history (Lam. 3:37). He need only command and it stands forth like an obedient servant, that appears in all haste at the call of his lord, Psa. 119:91.

*Psa. 33:10-11.* His praiseworthiness (*c*) as the irresistible Ruler in the history of men. Since in 2Sa. 15:34; 17:14, and frequently, הִפַּר עֲצָה is a common phrase, therefore הִפִּיר as in Psa. 89:34, Eze. 17:19, is equivalent to הִפַּר (Ges. § 67, rem. 9). The perfects are not used in the abstract, but of that which has been experienced most recently, since the "new song" presupposes new matter. With v. 11 compare Pro. 19:21. The עֲצַת of God is the unity of the "thoughts of His heart," i.e., of the ideas, which form the inmost part, the ultimate motives of everything that takes place. The whole history of the world is the uninterrupted carrying out of a divine plan of salvation, the primary object of which is His people, but in and with these are included humanity at large.

*Psa. 33:12-19.* Hence the call to praise God is supported (2) by a setting forth of that which His people possess in Him. This portion of the song is like a paraphrase of the אֲשֶׁר־י in Deu. 33:29. The theme in v. 12 is proved in vv. 13-15 by the fact, that Jahve is the omniscient Ruler, because He is the Creator

of men, without whose knowledge nothing is undertaken either secretly or openly, and especially if against His people. Then in vv. 16-19 it is supported by the fact, that His people have in Jahve a stronger defence than the greatest worldly power would be. Jahve is called the fashioner of all the hearts of men, as in Zec. 12: 1, cf. Pro. 24:12, as being their Maker. As such He is also the observer of all the works of men; for His is acquainted with their origin in the laboratory of the heart, which He as Creator has formed. Hupfeld takes **וְיָהוָה** as an equalisation (*pariter ac*) of the two appositions; but then it ought to be **וּמְבִין** (cf. Psa. 49: 3, 11). The LXX correctly renders it *καταμόνας*, *singillatim*. It is also needless to translate it, as Hupfeld does: He who formed, *qui finxit*; for the hearts of men were not from the very first created all at one time, but the primeval impartation of spirit-life is continued at every birth in some mysterious way. God is the Father of spirits, Hebr. 12: 9. For this very reason everything that exists, even to the most hidden thing, is encompassed by His omniscience and omnipotence. He exercises an omniscient control over all things, and makes all things subservient to the designs of His plan of the universe, which, so far as His people are concerned, is the plan of salvation. Without Him nothing comes to pass; but through Him everything takes place. The victory of the king, and the safety of the warrior, are not their own works. Their great military power and bodily strength can accomplish nothing without God, who can also be mighty in the feeble. Even for purposes of victory (**הַתְּשׁוּעָה**, cf. **יְשׁוּעָה**, Psa. 21: 2) the war-horse is **שֶׁקֶר**, i.e., a thing that promises much, but can in reality do nothing; it is not its great strength, by which it enables the trooper to escape (**יְמַלֵּט**). “The horse,” says Solomon in Pro. 21:31, “is equipped for the day of battle, but **לֹהֵי הַתְּשׁוּעָה**, Jahve’s is the victory,” He giveth it to whomsoever He will. The ultimate ends of all things that come to pass are in His hands, and — as vv. 18 f. say, directing special attention to this important truth by **הַיָּהוָה** — the eye of this God, that is to say the final aim of His government of the world, is directed towards them that fear Him, is pointed at them that hope in His mercy (**לְמִיחֲלִים**). In v. 19, the object, **לְחַסְדּוֹ**, is expanded by way of example. From His mercy or loving-kindness, not from any acts of their own, conscious of their limited condition and feebleness, they look for protection in the midst of the greatest peril, and for the preservation of their life in famine. Psa. 20: 8 is very similar; but the one passage sounds as independent as the other.

**Psa. 33:20-22.** Accordingly, in this closing hexastich, the church acknowledges Him as its help, its shield, and its source of joy. Besides the passage before us, **חֶבֶה** occurs in only one other instance in the Psalter, viz., Psa. 106:13. This word, which belongs to the group of words signifying hoping and waiting, is perhaps from the root **חָבַח** (Arab. *ḥkḥ*, *ḥkâ*, *firmiter constringere*

sc. *nodum*), to be firm, compact, like קָנָה from קָנָה, to pull tight or fast, cf. the German *harren* (to wait) and *hart* (hard, compact). In v. 20b we still hear the echo of the primary passage Deu. 33:29 (cf. v. 26). The emphasis, as in Psa. 115: 9-11, rests upon אֱלֹהִים, into which בּוֹ, in v. 21, puts this thought, viz., He is the unlimited sphere, the inexhaustible matter, the perennial spring of our joy. The second בֵּי confirms this subjectively. His holy Name is His church's ground of faith, of love, and of hope; for from thence comes its salvation. It can boldly pray that the mercy of the Lord may be upon it, for it waits upon Him, and man's waiting or hoping and God's giving are reciprocally conditioned. This is the meaning of the כִּשְׁתָּר. God is true to His word. The *Te Deum laudamus* of Ambrose closes in the same way.

## Psalm 34

### THANKSGIVING AND TEACHING OF ONE WHO HAS EXPERIENCED DELIVERANCE

34: 2 א I WILL bless Jahve at all times,  
Continually let His praise be in my mouth.

34: 3 ב In Jahve shall my soul make her boast,  
The patient shall hear thereof and be glad.

34: 4 ג O magnify Jahve with me,  
And let us exalt His name together.

34: 5 ד I sought Jahve, and He answered me,  
And out of all my fears did He deliver me.

34: 6 ה Looking unto Him they are lightened,  
And their faces shall not be ashamed.

34: 7 ו This afflicted one cried, and Jahve heard,  
And saved him out of all his troubles.

34: 8 ז The Angel of Jahve encampeth round about them that fear Him,  
And delivereth them.

34: 9 ח Taste and see, that Jahve is good —  
Blessed is the man that trusteth in Him.

34:10 ט Fear Jahve, ye His saints!  
For there is no want to them that fear Him.

34:11 י Young lions do lack and suffer hunger,  
But they that seek Jahve do not want any good thing.

34:12 **ו** *Come, ye children, hearken unto me!*  
*The fear of Jahve will I teach you.*

34:13 **מ** *Whosoever thou art, dost thou desire long life,*  
*Dost thou love days that thou mayst see good — :*

34:14 **נ** *Keep thy tongue from evil,*  
*And thy lips from deceitful speaking.*

34:15 **ס** *Depart from evil and do good,*  
*Seek peace, and pursue it.*

34:16 **ע** *The eyes of Jahve observe the righteous,*  
*And His ears their cry.*

34:17 **פ** *The face of Jahve is against the evil doers,*  
*To cut off their remembrance from the earth.*

34:18 **צ** *The former cry unto Jahve, and He heareth,*  
*And out of all their troubles He delivereth them.*

34:19 **ק** *Jahve is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart,*  
*And saveth such as be of a contrite spirit.*

34:20 **ר** *Many are the afflictions of the righteous,*  
*But out of them all doth Jahve deliver him.*

34:21 **ש** *He preserveth all his bones,*  
*Not one of them is broken.*

34:22 **ת** *Evil shall slay the wicked,*  
*And they that hate the righteous shall be punished.*

34:23 **י** *Jahve redeemeth the soul of His servant,*  
*And they shall not be punished who trust in Him.*

In Psa. 33:18 we heard the words, “Behold, the eye of Jahve is directed toward them that fear Him,” and in Psa. 34:16 we hear this same grand thought, “the eyes of Jahve are directed towards the righteous.” Psalm 34 is one of the eight Psalms which are assigned, by their inscriptions, to the time of David’s persecution by Saul, and were composed upon that weary way of suffering extending from Gibeon of Saul to Ziklag. (The following is an approximation to their chronological order: 7, 59, 56, 34, 52, 57, 142, 54). The inscription runs: *Of David, when he disguised his understanding (מַעְמוֹ with Dag., lest it should be pronounced מַעְמוֹ) before Abimelech, and he drove him away (וַיִּנְרֵשְׁהוּ with Chateph Pathach, as is always the case with verbs whose second radical is נ, if the accent is on the third radical) and he departed.*



David, being pressed by Saul, fled into the territory of the Philistines; here he was recognised as the man who had proved such a dangerous enemy to them years since and he was brought before Achish, the king. Psalm 56 is a prayer which implores help in the trouble of this period (and its relation to Psalm 24 resembles that of Psalm 51 to 32). David's life would have been lost had not his desperate attempt to escape by playing the part of a madman been successful. The king commanded him to depart, and David betook himself to a place of concealment in his own country, viz., the cave of Adullam in the wilderness of Judah.

The correctness of the inscription has been disputed. Hupfeld maintains that the writer has blindly taken it from 1Sa. 21:14. According to Redslob, Hitzig, Olshausen, and Stähelin, he had reasons for so doing, although they are invalid. The **מַעֲמוֹ** of the Psalm (v. 9) seemed to him to accord with **מַעֲמוֹ**, 1Sa. 21:14; and in addition to this, he combined **תִּתְהַלֵּל**, *gloraris*, of the Psalm (v. 3) with **וַיִּתְהַלֵּל**, *insanivit*, 1Sa. 21:14. We come to a different conclusion. The Psalm does not contain any express reference to that incident in Philistia, hence we infer that the writer of the inscription knew of this reference from tradition. His source of information is not the Books of Samuel; for there the king is called **אָכִישׁ**, whereas he calls him **אֲבִימֶלֶךְ**, and this, as even Basil has perceived (vid., Euthymius Zigadenus' introduction to this Psalm), is the title of the Philistine kings, just as *Pharaoh* is title of the Egyptian, *Agag* of the Amalekite, and *Lucumo* of the Etruscan kings. His source of information, as a comparison of 2Sa. 22: 1 with Psa. 18: 1 shows, is a different work, viz., the Annals of David, in which he has traced the Psalm before us and other Psalms to their historical connection, and then indicated it by an inscription in words taken from that source. The fact of the Psalm being alphabetical says nothing against David as its author (vid., on Psalm ch. 9-10). It is not arranged for music; for although it begins after the manner of a song of praise, it soon passes into the didactic tone. It consists of verses of two lines, which follow one another according to the order of the letters of the alphabet. The **ו** is wanting, just as the **נ** is wanting in Psalm 145; and after **ת**, as in Psalm 25, which is the counterpart to 34, follows a second supernumerary **ב**.

*Psa. 34: 2-4.* The poet begins with the praise of Jahve, and calls upon all the pious to unite with him in praising Him. The substantival clause v. 2b, is intended to have just as much the force of a cohortative as the verbal clause v. 2a. **אֲבָרְכָה**, like **וַיִּגְרְשֵׁהוּ**, is to be written with *Chateph-Pathach* in the middle syllable. In distinction from **עֲנִיִּים**, *afflicti*, **עֲנִיִּים** signifies *submissi*, those who have learnt endurance or patience in the school of affliction. The praise of the psalmist will greatly help to strengthen and encourage such; for it

applies to the Deliverer of the oppressed. But in order that this praise may sound forth with strength and fulness of tone, he courts the assistance of companions in v. 4. To acknowledge the divine greatness with the utterance of praise is expressed by גָּדַל with an accusative in Psa. 69:31; in this instance with לְ: to offer גָּדְלָהּ unto Him, cf. Psa. 29: 2. Even רוֹמֵם has this subjective meaning: with the heart and in word and deed, to place the exalted Name of God as high as it really is in itself. In accordance with the rule, that when in any word two of the same letters follow one another and the first has a *Sh<sup>e</sup>bâ*, this *Sh<sup>e</sup>bâ* must be an audible one, and in fact *Chateph Pathach* preceded by *Gaja* (*Metheg*), we must write גִּנְרוֹמָמָה.

*Psa. 34: 5-7.* The poet now gives the reason for this praise by setting forth the deliverance he has experienced. He longed for God and took pains to find Him (such is the meaning of דָּרַשׁ in distinction from בִּקֵּשׁ), and this striving, which took the form of prayer, did not remain without some actual answer (עָנָה is used of the being heard and the fulfilment as an answer to the petition of the praying one). The perfects, as also in vv. 6, 7, describe facts, one of which did not take place without the other; whereas וַיַּעֲנֵנִי would give them the relation of antecedent and consequent. In v. 6, his own personal experience is generalised into an experimental truth, expressed in the historical form: they look unto Him and brighten up, i.e., whosoever looketh unto Him (הִבִּיט אֵל of a look of intense yearning, eager for salvation, as in Num. 21: 9, Zec. 12:10) brightens up. It is impracticable to make the עָנִיִּים from v. 3 the subject; it is an act and the experience that immediately accompanies it, that is expressed with an universal subject and in gnomic perfects. The verb נָהַר, here as in Isa. 60: 5, has the signification to shine, glitter (whence נִהְרָה, light).

Theodoret renders it: Ὁ μετὰ πίστεως τῷ θεῷ προσίων φωτὸς ἀκτίνας δέχεται νοεροῦ, the gracious countenance of God is reflected on their faces; to the *actus directus* of *fides simplex* succeeds the *actus reflexus* of *fides triumphans*. It never comes to pass that their countenances must be covered with shame on account of disappointed hope: this shall not and cannot be, as the sympathetic force of אֵל implies. In all the three dialects הָפַר (הִפְרָה) has the signification of being ashamed and sacred; according to Gesenius and Fürst (root פָּר) it proceeds from the primary signification of reddening, blushing; in reality, however, since it is to be combined, not with Arab. *hmr*, but with *chmr* (cf. Arab. *kfr*, כִּפַּר, Arab. *gfr*, *gmr*), it proceeds from the primary signification of covering, hiding, veiling (Arabic *chafira*, *tachaffara*, used of a woman, cf. *chamara*, to be ashamed, to blush, to be modest, used of both sexes), so that consequently the shame-covered countenance is contrasted with that which has a bright, bold, and free look. In v. 7, this general truth is again individualised.

By **זֶה עָנִי** (like **זֶה סִינִי** in Psa. 68: 9) David points to himself. From the great peril in which he was placed at the court of the Philistines, from which God has rescued him, he turns his thoughts with gratitude and praise to all the deliverances which lie in the past.

**Psa. 34: 8-11.** This praise is supported by a setting forth of the gracious protection under which God's saints continually are. The **מְלֹאךְ יְהוָה**, is none other than He who was the medium of Jahve's intercourse with the patriarchs, and who accompanied Israel to Canaan. This name is not collective (Calvin, Hupfeld, Kamphausen, and others). He, the One, encampeth round about them, in so far as He is the Captain of the host of Jahve (Jos. 5:14), and consequently is accompanied by a host of inferior ministering angels; or insofar as He can, as being a spirit not limited by space, furnish protection that covers them on every side. **הַנֶּה** (cf. Zec. 9: 8) is perhaps an allusion to **מַחֲנֵי** in Gen. 32: 2 f., that angel-camp which joined itself to Jacob's camp, and surrounded it like a barricade or *carrago*. On the *fut. consec.* **וַיִּחְלְצֵם**, *et expedit eos*, as a simple expression of the sequence, or even only of a weak or loose internal connection, *vid.*, Ewald, § 343, *a*. By reason of this protection by the Angel of God arises (v. 9) the summons to test the graciousness of God in their own experience. Tasting (**γεύσασθαι**, Hebr. 6: 4 f., 1Pe. 2: 3) stands before seeing; for spiritual experience leads to spiritual perception or knowledge, and not *vice versa*. *Nisi gustaveris*, says Bernard, *non videbis*. David is desirous that others also should experience what he has experienced in order that they may come to know what he has come to know, *viz.*, the goodness of God. <sup>f169</sup>

Hence, in v. 10, the call to the saints to fear Jahve (**יִרְאוּ** instead of **יִרְאוּ**, in order to preserve the distinction between *veremini* and *videbunt*, as in Jos. 24:14, 1Sa. 12:24); for whoso fears Him, possesses everything in Him. The young mature lions may sooner lack and suffer hunger, because they have no prey, than that he should suffer any want whatsoever, the goal of whose striving is fellowship with God. The verb **רוּשׁ** (to lack, be poor, once by metaplasm **יִרְשׁ**, 1Sa. 2: 7, root **רשׁ**, to be or to make loose, lax), elsewhere used only of men, is here, like Psa. 104:21 **בִּקְשׁ מֵאֵל**, transferred to the lions, without **בְּפִירִים** being intended to refer emblematically (as in Psa. 35:17; 57: 5; 17:12) to his powerful foes at the courts of Saul and of Achish.

**Psa. 34:12-15.** The first main division of the Psalm is ended; the second (much the same as in Psalm 32) assumes more the tone of a didactic poem; although even vv. 6, 9-11 have something of the didactic style about them. The poet first of all gives a direction for fearing God. We may compare Psa. 32: 8; 51:15 — how thoroughly Davidic is the turn which the Psalm here takes! **בְּנִים**

are not children in years or in understanding; but it is a tender form of address of a master experienced in the ways of God to each one and to all, as in Pro. 1: 8, and frequently. In v. 13 he throws out the question, which he himself answers in vv. 14 f. This form of giving impressiveness to a truth by setting it forth as a solution of some question that has been propounded is a habit with David. 14: 1; 24: 8, 10; 25:12. In the use made of this passage from the Psalms in 1Pe. 3:10-12 (= vv. 13-17a of the Psalm) this form of the question is lost sight of. To **הִפֵּן חַיִּים**, as being just as exclusive in sense, corresponds **יָמֵי אֶהָב**, so that consequently **לְרֵאוֹת יָמִים** is a definition of the purpose. **יָמִים** signifies days in the mass, just as **חַיִּים** means long-enduring life. We see from Jam. 3: 2 ff., where v. 13 also, in its form, calls to mind the Psalm before us, why the poet gives the pre-eminence to the avoiding of sins of the tongue. In v. 15, from among what is good peace is made prominent, — peace, which not only are we not to disturb, but which we are to seek, yea, pursue it like as the hunter pursues the finest of the herds. Let us follow, says the apostle Paul also, Rom. 14:19 (cf. Heb. 12:14), after those things which make for peace. **שְׁלוֹם** is a relationship, harmonious and free from trouble, that is well-pleasing to the God of love. The idea of the bond of fellowship is connected with the corresponding word **ἐἰρήνη**, according to its radical notion.

*Psa. 34:17-22.* The poet now recommends the fear of God, to which he has given a brief direction, by setting forth its reward in contrast with the punishment of the ungodly. The prepositions **אֶל** and **בְּ**, in vv. 16a and 17a, are a well considered interchange of expression: the former, of gracious inclination (Psa. 33:18), the latter, of hostile intention or determining, as in Job. 7: 8, Jer. 21:10; 44:11, after the phrase in Lev. 17:10. The evil doers are overwhelmed by the power of destruction that proceeds from the countenance of Jahve, which is opposed to them, until there is not the slightest trace of their earthly existence left. The subjects to v. 18 are not, according to Psa. 107:17-19, the **עֲשֵׂי רָע** (evil doers), since the indispensable characteristic of penitence is in this instance wanting, but the **צַדִּיקִים** (the righteous). Probably the **בְּ** strophe stood originally before the **ע** strophe, just as in Lamentations 2-4 the **בְּ** precedes the **ע** (Hitzig). In connection with the present sequence of the thoughts, the structure of v. 18 is just like v. 6: *Clamant et Dominus audit = si qui (quicunque) clamant*. What is meant is the cry out of the depth of a soul that despairs of itself. Such crying meets with a hearing with God, and in its realisation, an answer that bears its own credentials. “The broken in heart” are those in whom the egotistical, i.e., self-loving life, which encircles its own personality, is broken at the very root; “the crushed or contrite (**דָּבַא**, from **דָּבַא**, with a changeable *ā*, after the form **אֵילוֹת** from **אֵיל**) in spirit” are those

whom grievous experiences, leading to penitence, of the false eminence to which their proud self-consciousness has raised them, have subdued and thoroughly humbled. To all such Jahve is nigh, He preserves them from despair, He is ready to raise up in them a new life upon the ruins of the old and to cover or conceal their infinitive deficiency; and, they, on their part, being capable of receiving, and desirous of, salvation, He makes them partakers of His salvation. It is true these afflictions come upon the righteous, but Jahve rescues him out of them all, מִכָּלֵם = מִכָּלָן (the same *enallage generis* as in Rut. 1:19; 4:11). He is under the most special providence, “He keepeth all his bones, not one of them (*ne unum quidem*) is broken” — a pictorial exemplification of the thought that God does not suffer the righteous to come to the extremity, that He does not suffer him to be severed from His almighty protecting love, nor to become the sport of the oppressors. Nevertheless we call to mind the literal fulfilment which these words of the psalmist received in the Crucified One; for the Old Testament prophecy, which is quoted in Joh. 19:33-37, may be just as well referred to our Psalm as to Exo. 12:46. Not only the Paschal lamb, but in a comparative sense even every affliction of the righteous, is a type. Not only is the essence of the symbolism of the worship of the sanctuary realised in Jesus Christ, not only is the history of Israel and of David repeated in Him, not only does human suffering attain in connection with Him its utmost intensity, but all the promises given to the righteous are fulfilled in Him κατ’ ἐξοχήν; because He is the righteous One in the most absolute sense, the Holy One of God in a sense altogether unique (Isa. 53:11, Jer. 23: 5, Psa. 9: 9, Act. 3:14; 22:14). — The righteous is always preserved from extreme peril, whereas evil (רָעָה) slays (מוֹתֵת stronger than הַמִּית) the ungodly: evil, which he loved and cherished, becomes the executioner’s power, beneath which he falls. And they that hate the righteous must pay the penalty. Of the meanings to incur guilt, to feel one’s self guilty, and to undergo punishment as being guilty, אָשָׁם (vid., on Psa. 4:11) has the last in this instance.

**Psa. 34:23.** The order of the alphabet having been gone through, there now follows a second פ exactly like Psa. 25:22. Just as the first פ, Psa. 25:16, is פִּנָּה, so here in v. 17 it is פִּנִּי; and in like manner the two supernumerary *Phe*’s correspond to one another — the Elohimic in the former Psalm, and the Jehovic in this latter.

## Psalm 35

### CALL TO ARMS AGAINST UNGRATEFUL PERSECUTORS, ADDRESSED TO GOD

*35: 1 CONTEND, Jahve, with those who contend with me,  
Fight Thou against those who fight against me.*

*35: 2 Lay hold of shield and buckler,  
And stand up as my help.*

*35: 3 And draw forth the spear and shut up the way against my persecutors,  
Say unto my soul: I am thy salvation.*

*35: 4 Let those be confounded and ashamed who seek after my soul,  
Let those fall back and be covered with shame who devise my hurt.*

*35: 5 Let them become as chaff before the wind,  
The Angel of Jahve thrusting them away.*

*35: 6 Let their way become darkness and slipperinesses,  
The Angel of Jahve pursuing them.*

*35: 7 For without cause have they hid for me their net,  
Without cause a pit have they digged for my soul.*

*35: 8 Let destruction come upon him at unawares,  
And let his net, which he hath hid, catch himself,  
With a crash let him fall into it.*

*35: 9 So shall my soul exult in Jahve,  
It shall rejoice in His salvation.*

*35:10 All my bones shall say: Jahve, who is like unto Thee,  
Who deliverest the afflicted from him who is too strong for him,  
The afflicted and the poor from him who robbeth him!*

*35:11 Unjust witnesses rise up;  
That which I know not, they ask of me.*

*35:12 They reward me evil for good,  
Bereavement hath come upon my soul.*

*35:13 And I — when they were sick, my clothing was sackcloth,  
I mortified my soul with fasting,  
And my prayer returned into my own bosom.*

*35:14 As for a friend, a brother to me, did I go about,  
As one who sorroweth for a mother,  
I went softly about in mourning attire.*

*35:15 And now when I halt they are joyous and  
gather themselves together,  
The abjects gather themselves together against me,  
and those whom I do not know,  
They mock and cease not.*

*35:16 After the manner of common parasites,  
They gnash upon me with their teeth.*

*35:17 O Lord, how long wilt Thou look on?!  
Bring back my soul from their destructions,  
My only one from the lions.*

*35:18 I will praise Thee in a great congregation,  
Among much people will I sing praise unto Thee.*

*35:19 Let not mine enemies falsely rejoice over me,  
Let not those who hate me without a cause wink the eye.*

*35:20 For they utter not peaceful words,  
But against those who are quiet in the  
land they devise deceitful matters.*

*35:21 And they open their mouth wide concerning me,  
They say: Aha, aha, now our eye sees it.*

*35:22 Thou seest it, Jahve, therefore keep not silence;  
O Lord, remain not far from me.*

*35:23 Stir up Thyself and awake to my right,  
My God and my Lord, to my cause.*

*35:24 Do justice to me according to  
Thy righteousness, Jahve, my God,  
And let them not rejoice over me.*

*35:25 Let them not say in their heart: Aha, it is our desire!  
Let them not say: We have swallowed him up.*

*35:26 Let those be ashamed and be covered with confusion together  
Who rejoice at my hurt,  
Let those be clothed with shame and dishonour  
Who magnify themselves against me.*

*35:27 Let those shout for joy and rejoice who do not envy me my right.  
And let them say continually: Jahve be magnified,  
Who hath pleasure in the prosperity of His servant.*

*35:28 And my tongue shall declare Thy righteousness,  
Thy praise at all times.*

This Psalm 35 and Psalm 34 form a pair. They are the only Psalms in which the name מלאך יהוה is mentioned. The Psalms that belong to the time of David's persecution by Saul are the Psalms which are more especially pervaded by such retrospective references to the *Tōra*. And in fact this whole Psalm is, as it were, the lyrical expansion of that which David expresses before Saul in 1Sa. 24:16 [15, Engl.]. The critical opinion as to the authorship of this Psalm is closely allied with that respecting the author of Psalm 40 and 69 to which Psalm 35 is nearly related; cf. vv. 21, 27 with Psa. 40:16 f.; v. 13 with Psa. 69:11 f.; whereas the relation of Psalm 71 to Psalm 35 is decidedly a secondary one. Hitzig conjectures it to be Jeremiah; but vv. 1-3 are appropriate in the lips of a persecuted king, and not of a persecuted prophet. The points of contact of the writings of Jeremiah with our Psalm (Jer. 18:19 f., 23:12, Lam. 2:16), may therefore in this instance be more safely regarded as reminiscences of an earlier writer than in Psalm 69. Throughout the whole Psalm there prevails a deep vexation of spirit (to which corresponds the suffix יָמוּ, as in Psalm 59, 56, 11, 17, 22, 64) and strong emotion; it is not until the second part, where the poet describes the base ingratitude of his enemies, that the language becomes more clam and transparent, and a more quiet sadness takes the place of indignation and rage.

Each of the three parts opens with a cry for deliverance; and closes, in the certain assumption that it will take place, with a vow of thanksgiving. The divisions cannot therefore be mistaken, viz., vv. 1-10, 11-18, 19-28. The relative numbers of the stichs in the separate groups is as follows: 6. 6. 5. 5. | 7. 7. 5. | 6. 6. 6. 5.

There are only a few Psalms of David belonging to the time of Saul's persecution, which, like Psalm 22, keep within the limits of deep inward grief; and in scarcely a single instance do we find him confining himself to the expression of the accursed fate of his enemies with prophetic certainty, as that which he confidently expects will be realised (as, e.g., in Psa. 7:13-17). But for the most part the objective announcement of punishment is swallowed up by the force of his inmost feelings, and changed into the most importunate prayer (as in Psa. 7: 7; 17:13, and frequently); and this feverish glow of feeling becomes still more harshly prominent, when the prayer for the revelation of divine judgment in punishment passes over into a wish that it may actually take place. In this respect Ps.; 7, 35, 69, 109 form a fearful gradation. In Psalm 109, the old expositors count as many as thirty anathemas. What explanation can we give of such language coming from the lips and heart of the poet? Perhaps as paroxysms of a desire for revenge? His advance against Nabal shows that even a David was susceptible of such feelings; but 1Sa. 25:32 f. also shows that only a gentle stirring up of his conscience was needed to dissuade him from it. How much more natural — we throw out this



consideration in agreement with Kurtz — that the preponderance of that magnanimity peculiar to him should have maintained its ascendancy in the moments of the highest religious consecration in which he composed his Psalms! It is inconceivable that the unholy fire of personal passion could be here mingled with the holy fire of his love to God. It is in fact the Psalms more especially, which are the purest and most faithful mirror of the piety of the Old Testament: the duty of love towards one's enemies, however, is so little alien to the Old Testament (Exo. 23: 4 f., Lev. 19:18, Pro. 20:22; 24:17; 25:21 f., Job. 31:29 f.), that the very words of the Old Testament are made use of even in the New to inculcate this love. And from Psalm ch. 7, in its agreement with the history of his conduct towards Saul, we have seen that David was conscious of having fulfilled this duty. All the imprecatory words in these Psalms come, therefore, from the pure spring of unself-seeking zeal for the honour of God. That this zeal appears in this instance as zeal for his own person or character arises from the fact, that David, as the God-anointed heir of the kingdom, stands in antagonism to Saul, the king alienated from God; and, that to his mind the cause of God, the continuance of the church, and the future of Israel, coincide with his own destiny. The fire of his anger is kindled at this focus (so to speak) of the view which he has of his own position in the course of the history of redemption. It is therefore a holy fire; but the spirit of the New Testament, as Jesus Himself declare sin Luke 9:55, is in this respect, nevertheless, a relatively different spirit from that of the Old. That act of divine love, redemption, out of the open fountain of which there flowed forth the impulse of a love which embraces and conquers the world, was then as yet not completed; and a curtain then still hung before eternity, before heaven and hell, so that imprecations like Psa. 69:20 were not understood, even by him who uttered them, in their infinite depth of meaning. Now that this curtain is drawn up, the New Testament faith shrinks back from invoking upon any one a destruction that lasts לעולם; and love seeks, so long as a mere shadow of possibility exists, to rescue everything human from the perdition of an unhappy future, — a perdition the full meaning of which cannot be exhausted by human thought.

In connection with all this, however, there still remains one important consideration. The curses, which are contained in the Davidic Psalms of the time of Saul's persecution, are referred to in the New Testament as fulfilled in the enemies of Jesus Christ, Act. 1:20, Rom. 11: 7-10. One expression found in our Psalm, ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν (cf. Psa. 69: 5) is used by Jesus (Joh. 15:25) as fulfilled in Him; it therefore appears as though the whole Psalm ought to be, or at least may be, taken typically as the words of Christ. But nowhere in the Gospels do we read an imprecation used by Jesus against His own and the enemies of the kingdom of God; David's imprecations are not suited to the lips

of the Saviour, nor do the instances in which they are cited in the New Testament give them the impress of being His direct words: they are treated as the language of prophecy by virtue of the Spirit, whose instrument David was, and whose work the Scriptures are. And it is only in this sense that the Christian adopts them in prayer. For after the pattern of his Lord, who on the cross prayed “Father forgive them,” he desires that even his bitterest enemies may not be eternally lost, but, though it be only when *in articulo mortis*, that they may come to their right mind. Even the anathemas of the apostle against the Judaising false teachers and against Alexander the smith (Gal. 1: 9; 5:12, 2Ti. 4:14), refer only to temporal removal and chastisement, not to eternal perdition. They mark the extreme boundary where, in extraordinary instances, the holy zeal of the New Testament comes in contact with the holy fervour of the Old Testament.

*Psa. 35: 1-3.* The psalmist begins in a martial and anthropomorphical style such as we have not hitherto met with. On the ultima-accentuation of רִיבָהּ, vid., on 3: 8. Both אַתָּה are signs of the accusative. This is a more natural rendering here, where the psalmist implores God to subjugate his foes, than to regard אַתָּה as equivalent to עַם (cf. Isa. 49:25 with *ib.* 27: 8, Job. 10: 2); and, moreover, for the very same reason the expression in this instance is לָחֵם, (in the *Kal*, which otherwise only lends the *part.* לָחֵם, Psa. 56: 2 f., to the *Niph.* נִלְחָם) instead of the reciprocal form הִלָּחֵם. It is usually supposed that לָחֵם means properly *vorare*, and war is consequently conceived of as a devouring of men; but the Arabic offers another primary meaning: to press close and compact (*Niph.* to one another), consequently מִלְחָמָה means a dense crowd, a dense bustle and tumult (cf. the Homeric κλόνος). The summons to Jahve to arm, and that in a twofold manner, viz., with the מִגֶּן for warding off the hostile blow and צָנָה (vid., 5:13) which covers the body like a *testudo* — by which, inasmuch as it is impossible to hold both shields at the same time, the figure is idealised — is meant to express, that He is to make Himself felt by the foes, in every possible way, to their own confounding, as the unapproachable One. The ב of בְּעִזְרָתִי (in the character of help turned towards me) is the so-called *Beth essentialis*,<sup>f170</sup> as in Exo. 18: 4, Pro. 3:26, Isa. 48:10 (*tanquam argentum*), and frequently. הֲרִיק has the same meaning as in Exo. 15: 9, cf. Gen. 14:14, viz., to bring forth, draw forth, to draw or unsheath (a sword); for as a sword is sheathed when not in use, so a spear is kept in the δουροδόκη (*Odys.* i. 128). Even Parchon understands סֶגֶר to mean a weapon; and the word σάγαρις, in Herodotus, Xenophon, and Strabo, a northern Asiatic, more especially a Scythian, battle-axe, has been compared here;<sup>f171</sup> but the battle-axe was not a Hebrew weapon, and סֶגֶר, which, thus defectively written, has the look of an

imperative, also gives the best sense when so taken (LXX σύγκλεισον, Targ. וּמְרוֹק), viz., close, i.e., cut off, *interclude* scil. *viam*. The word has *Dechî*, because לְקַרְאֵת רִדְפָי, “casting Thyself against my persecutors,” belongs to both the preceding summonses. Dachselt rightly directs attention to the similar sequence of the accents in Psa. 55:19; 66:15. The Mosaic figure of Jahve as a man of war (אִישׁ מַלְחָמָה, Exo. 15: 3, Deu. 32:41 f.) is worked out here with brilliant colours, under the impulse of a wrathful spirit. But we see from v. 3b what a spiritual meaning, nevertheless, the whole description is intended to convey. In God’s intervention, thus manifested in facts, he would gladly hear His consolatory utterance to himself. The burden of his cry is that God’s love may break through the present outward appearance of wrath and make itself felt by him.

*Psa. 35: 4-8.* Throughout the next two strophes follow terrible imprecations. According to Fürst and others the relation of בּוֹשׁ and חָפַר is like that of *erblassen*, to turn pale (cf. Isa. 29:22 with Psa. 34: 6), and *erröthen*, to turn red, to blush. בּוֹשׁ has, however, no connection with בּוֹיץ, nor has חָפַר, Arab. *chfr*, *chmr*, any connection with Arab. *hmr*, to be red; but, according to its radical notion, בּוֹשׁ means *disturbari* (vid., Psa. 6:11), and חָפַר, *obtegere*, *abscondere* (vid., Psa. 34: 6). יִסְגּוּ, properly “let them be made to fall back” (cf. e.g., Isa. 42:17). On the figure on v. 5a cf. Psa. 83:14. The clauses respecting the Angel of Jahve, vv. 5b and 6b, are circumstantial clauses, viz., clauses defining the manner. דָּחָה (giving, viz., them, the push that shall cause their downfall, equivalent to דָּחָם or דָּחַם, Psa. 68:28) is closely connected with the figure in v. 6a, and רִדְפָם, with the figure in v. 5a; consequently it seems as though the original position of these two clauses respecting the Angel of Jahve had been disturbed; just as in Psalm 34, the ע strophe and the פ strophe have changed their original places. It is the Angel, who took off Pharaoh’s chariot wheels so that they drave them heavily (Exo. 14:25) that is intended here. The fact that this Angel is concerned here, where the point at issue is whether the kingship of the promise shall be destroyed at its very beginning or not, harmonises with the appearing of the מַלְאֲכָה at all critical junctures in the course of the history of redemption. חֲלַקְלָקוֹת, *loca passim lubrica*, is an intensive form of expression for חֲלָקוֹת, 73:18. Just as דָּחָה recalls to mind Exo. 15, so רִדְפָם recalls Judges 5. In this latter passage the Angel of Jahve also appears in the midst of the conquerors who are pursuing the smitten foe, incarnate as it were in Deborah.

*Psa. 35: 7.* V. 7 also needs re-organising, just as in vv. 5 f. the original positions of דָּחָה and רִדְפָם are exchanged. שְׁחַת רִשְׁתָּם would be a pit

deceptively covered over with a net concealed below; but, as even some of the older critics have felt, שְׁחַת is without doubt to be brought down from v. 7a into 7b: without cause, i.e., without any provocation on my part, have they secretly laid their net for me (as in Psa. 9:16; 31: 5), without cause have they digged a pit for my soul. In v. 8 the foes are treated of collectively. לֹא יָדַע is a negative circumstantial clause (Ew. § 341, b): *improviso*, as in Pro. 5: 6, Isa. 47:11 *extrem.* Instead of תִּלְכְּדֵנִי the expression is תִּלְכְּדֵנִי, as in Hos. 8: 3; the sharper form is better adapted to depict the suddenness and certainty of the capture. According to Hupfeld, the verb שָׁשָׁה signifies a wild, dreary, confused noise or crash, then devastation and destruction, a transition of meaning which — as follows from שְׁחַת (cf. תְּהוּ) as a name of the desolate steppe, from שָׁשָׁה, a waste, emptiness, and from other indications — is solely brought about by transferring the idea of a desolate confusion of tones to a desolate confusion of things, without any intermediate notion of the crashing in of ruins. But it may be asked whether the reverse is not rather the case, viz., that the signification of a waste, desert, emptiness or void is the primary one, and the meaning that has reference to sound (cf. Arab. *hwâ*, to gape, be empty; to drive along, fall down headlong, then also: to make a dull sound as of something falling, just like *rumor* from *ruere*, *fragor* (from *frangi*) the derived one. Both etymology (cf. תְּהוּ, whence תְּהוּ) and the preponderance of other meanings, favour this latter view. Here the two significations are found side by side, inasmuch as שְׁחַת in the first instance means a waste = devastation, desolation, and in the second a waste = a heavy, dull sound, a rumbling (δουσιβ). In the Syriac version it is rendered: “into the pit which he has digged let him fall,” as though it were שְׁחַת in the second instance instead of שָׁשָׁה; and from his Hupfeld, with J. H. Michaelis, Stier, and others, is of opinion, that it must be rendered: “into the destruction which he himself has prepared let him fall.” But this *quam ipse paravit* is not found in the text, and to mould the text accordingly would be a very arbitrary proceeding.

*Psa. 35: 9-10.* This strophe, with which the first part of the song closes, contains the logical apodosis of those imprecatory jussives. The downfall of the power that is opposed to God will be followed by the joy of triumph. The bones of the body, which elsewhere are mentioned as sharing only in the anguish of the soul (Psa. 6: 3; 31:11; 32: 3; 51:10), are here made to share (as also in Psa. 51:10) in the joy, into which the anxiety, that agitated even the marrow of the bones, is changed. The joy which he experiences in his soul shall throb through every member of his body and multiply itself, as it were, into a choir of praiseful voices. בְּלִי with a conjunctive accent and without *Makkeph*, as also in Pro. 19: 7 (not בְּלִי, vid., the Masora in Baer’s *Psalterium*

p. 133), is to be read *cāl* (with קמץ רחב, *opp.* קמץ חטוף) according to Kimchi. According to Lonzano, however, it is to be read *col*, the conjunctive accent having an equal power with *Makkeph*; but this view is false, since an accent can never be placed against *Kametz chatuph*. The exclamation מִי בְמוֹדֵי is taken from Exo. 15:11, where, according to the Masora, it is to be pointed מִי בְמוֹדֵי, as Ben Naphtali also points it in the passage before us. The *Dagesh*, which is found in the former passage and is wanting here, sharpens and hardens at the same time; it requires that the expression should be emphatically pronounced (without there being any danger in this instance of its being slurred over); it does not serve to denote the closer connection, but to give it especial prominence. חָזַק מִמֶּנִּי, stronger than he, is equivalent to: strong, whereas the other is weak, just as in Jer. 31:11, cf. Hab. 1:13, צַדִּיק מִמֶּנִּי, righteous, whereas he is ungodly. The repetition of וְעֲנִי is meant to say: He rescues the עֲנִי, who is אֲבִיוֹן (poor) enough already, from him who would take even the few goods that he possesses.

*Psa. 35:11-16.* The second part begins with two strophes of sorrowful description of the wickedness of the enemy. The futures in vv. 11, 12 describe that which at present takes place. עֲדֵי חָמַס are μάρτυρες ἄδικοι (LXX). They demand from him a confession of acts and things which lie entirely outside his consciousness and his way of acting (cf. *Psa.* 69: 5): they would gladly brand him as a perjurer, as an usurper, and as a plunderer. What David complains of in v. 12a, we hear Saul confess in 1Sa. 24:18; the charge of ingratitude is therefore well-grounded. שָׁכַח לְנַפְשִׁי is not dependent on יִשְׁלַמוּנִי, in which case one would have looked for שָׁכַח rather than שָׁכַח, but a substantival clause: “bereavement is to my soul,” its condition is that of being forsaken by all those who formerly showed me marks of affection; all these have, as it were, died off so far as I am concerned. Not only had David been obliged to save his parents by causing them to flee to Moab, but Michal was also torn from him, Jonathan removed, and all those at the court of Saul, who had hitherto sought the favour and friendship of the highly-gifted and highly-honoured son-in-law of the king, were alienated from him. And how sincerely and sympathisingly had he reciprocated their leanings towards himself! By וְאֲנִי in v. 13, he contrasts himself with the ungrateful and unfeeling ones. Instead of לְבַשְׁתִּי שָׁק, the expression is לְבוּשֵׁי שָׁק; the tendency of poetry for the use of the substantival clause is closely allied to its fondness for well-conceived brevity and pictorial definition. He manifested towards them a love which knew no distinction between the *ego* and *tu*, which regarded their sorrow and their guilt as his own, and joined with them in their expiation for it; his head was lowered upon his breast, or he cowered, like Elijah (1Ki. 18:42),

upon the ground with his head hanging down upon his breast even to his knees, so that that which came forth from the inmost depths of his nature returned again as it were in broken accents into his bosom. Riehm's rendering, "at their ungodliness and hostility my prayer for things not executed came back," is contrary to the connection, and makes one look for אֲלֵי instead of אֶל־חִיקֵי. Perret-Gentil correctly renders it, *Je priai la tête penchée sur la poitrine*.

The Psalmist goes on to say in v. 14, I went about as for a friend, for a brother to me, i.e., as if the sufferer had been such to me. With הִתְהַלַּךְ, used of the solemn slowness of gait, which corresponds to the sacredness of pain, alternates שָׁחָה used of the being bowed down very low, in which the heavy weight of pain finds expression. בְּאַבְלֵ־אָם, not: like the mourning (from אָבַל, like הֵבֵל from הֵבֵל) of a mother (Hitzig), but, since a personal אָבַל is more natural, and next to the mourning for an only child the loss of a mother (cf. Gen. 24:67) strikes the deepest wound: like one who mourns (אַבְלֵ־, <sup>f172</sup> like לִבְנֵי, Gen. 49:12, from אָבַל, construct state, like תַּמָּא) for a mother (the objective genitive, as in Gen. 27:41, Deu. 34: 8, Amo. 8:10, Jer. 6:26). קָדַר signifies the colours, outward appearance, and attire of mourning: with dark clothes, with tearful unwashed face, and with neglected beard. But as for them — how do they act at the present time, when he finds himself in צָלַע (Psa. 38:17, Job. 18:12), a sideway direction, i.e., likely to fall (from צָלַע, Arab. *ḍl'*, to incline towards the side)? They rejoice and gather themselves together, and this assemblage of ungrateful friends rejoicing over another's misfortune, is augmented by the lowest rabble that attach themselves to them. The verb נָכָה means to smite; *Niph.* נִכָּה, Job. 30: 6, to be driven forth with a whip, after which the LXX renders it μάστιγες, Symm. πλῆκται, and the Targum *conterentes me verbis suis*; cf. הִכָּה בְּלִשׁוֹן, Jer. 18:18. But נִכִּים cannot by itself mean smiters with the tongue. The adjective נִכָּה signifies elsewhere with הִנְגְּלִים, one who is smitten in the feet, i.e., one who limps or halts, and with רוּחַ, but also without any addition, in Isa. 16: 7, one smitten in spirit, i.e., one deeply troubled or sorrowful. Thus, therefore, נִכִּים from נָכָה, like נְאִים from נָאָה, may mean smitten, men, i.e., men who are brought low or reduced (Hengstenberg). It might also, after the Arabic *nawika*, to be injured in mind, *anwak*, stupid, silly (from the same root נָךְ, to prick, smite, wound, cf. *ichtalla*, to be pierced through = mad), be understood as those mentally deranged, enraged at nothing or without cause. But the former definition of the notion of the word is favoured by the continuation of the idea of the verbal adjective נִכִּים by וְלֹא יָדַעְתִּי, persons of whom I have hitherto taken no notice because they were far removed from me, i.e., men belonging to the

dregs of the people (cf. Job. 19:18; 30: 1). The addition of **ולא ידעתי** certainly makes Olshausen's conjecture that we should read **נְכָרִים** somewhat natural; but the expression then becomes tautological, and there are other instances also in which psalm-poesy goes beyond the ordinary range of words, in order to find language to describe that which is loathsome, in the most glaring way. **קָרַע**, to tear, rend in pieces, viz., with abusive and slanderous words (like Arab. *qr'* II) also does not occur anywhere else.

And what remarkable language we now meet with in v. 16a ! **מְעוֹג** does not mean scorn or buffoonery, as Böttcher and Hitzig imagine, <sup>f173</sup> but according to 1Ki. 17:12, a cake of a round formation (like the Talmudic **עֲגָה**, a circle); **לְעַג**, jeering, jesting. Therefore **לְעֵגֵי מְעוֹג** means: mockers for a cake, i.e., those who for a delicate morsel, for the sake of dainty fare, make scornful jokes, viz., about me, the persecuted one, vile parasites; German *Tellerlecker*, *Bratenriecher*, Greek **κνισσοκόλακες**, **ψωμοκόλακες**, Mediaeval Latin *buccellarii*. This **לְעֵגֵי מְעוֹג**, which even Rashi interprets in substantially the same manner, stands either in a logical co-ordinate relation (vid., on Isa. 19:11) or in a logical as well as grammatical subordinate relation to its *regens* **חֲנֹפִי**. In the former case, it would be equivalent to: the profane, viz., the cake-jesters; in the latter, which is the more natural, and quite suitable: the profane (= the profanest, vid., 45:13, Isa. 29:19, Eze. 7:24) among cake-jesters. The **ב** is not the *Beth* of companionship or fellowship, to express which **עִם** or **אִתּוֹ** (Hos. 7: 5) would have been used, but *Beth essentialiae* or the *Beth* of characterisation: in the character of the most abject examples of this class of men do they gnash upon him with their teeth. The gerund **חֲרָק** (of the noise of the teeth being pressed together, like Arab. *ħrq*, of the crackling of a fire and the grating of a file), which is used according to Ges. § 131, 4, *b*, carries its subject in itself. They gnash upon him with their teeth after the manner of the profanest among those, by whom their neighbour's honour is sold for a delicate morsel.

**Psa. 35:17-18.** Just as the first part of the Psalm closed with wishes, and thanksgiving for their fulfilment, so the second part also closes with a prayer and thanksgiving. **בְּמָה** (compounded of **ב**, *instar*, and the interrogative **מָה** which is drawn into the genitive by it; Aramaic **בְּמַא**, Arabic *kam*, Hebrew, like **בְּמָה**, with *Dag. forte conjunct.*, properly: the total of what?), which elsewhere means *quot*, here has the signification of *quousque*, as in Job. 7:19. **מִשְׂאֵיהֶם** from **שָׂאָה**, the plural of which may be both **שְׂאִים** and **שְׂאוֹת** (this latter, however, does not occur), like the plural of **אִימָה**, terror, **אִימִים** and **אִימוֹת**. The suffix, which refers to the enemies as the authors of the

destructions (Pro. 3:25), shows that it is not to be rendered “from their destroyers” (Hitzig). If God continues thus to look on instead of acting, then the destructions, which are passing over David’s soul, will utterly destroy it. Hence the prayer: lead it back, bring that back, which is already well nigh borne away to destruction. On **יְחִידָה** vid., Psa. 22:21. The **בְּפִירִים**, which is intended literally in Psa. 34:11, is here emblematical. **אֲדַדְךָ** is the cohortative. **עֲצוּם** as a parallel word to **רַב** always refers, according to the context, to strength of numbers or to strength of power.

*Psa. 35:19-21.* In the third part, vv. 19-28 the description of the godlessness of his enemies is renewed; but the soul of the praying psalmist has become more tranquil, and accordingly the language also is more clear and moves on with its accustomed calmness. **שֶׁקֶר** and **חָנָם** are genitives, having an attributive sense (vid., on 2Sa. 22:23). The verb **קָרַץ** signifies both to pinch = nip, Job. 33: 6 (cf. the Arabic *ḵaraḍa*, to cut off), and to pinch together, compress = to wink, generally used of the eyes, but also of the lips, Pro. 16:30, and always as an insidiously malicious gesture. **אֵל** rules over both members of the verse as in Psa. 75: 6, and frequently. **שְׁלוֹם** in v. 20 is the word for whatever proceeds from good intentions and aims at the promotion or restoration of a harmonious relationship. **רִגְעֵי-אָרֶץ** (from **רָגַע**, cf. **אֲנִי-אָרֶץ**, Psa. 76:10, Zep. 2: 3, **צְפוּנִיָּה**, Psa. 83: 4) are those who quietly and unostentatiously walk in the ways of God. Against such they devise mischievous, lying slanders and accusations. And with wide-opened mouth, i.e., haughty scorn, they cry, as they carouse in sight of the misfortune of those they have persecuted: now we have that which we have longed to see. **הִשָּׂח** (composed of **הָהָה** and **אָח**) is a cry of joy, and more especially of malignant joy at another’s hurt (cf. Eze. 25: 3).

*Psa. 35:22-24.* The poet takes up this malignant “now our eye sees it” and gives another turn to it. With **יְהוּדָה**, alternates in vv. 22, 23, cf. v. 17, **אֲדַנִּי**, the pronominal force of which is revived in the combination **אֵלֵהִי וְאֲדַנִּי** (vid., Psa. 16: 2). **הִעִיר**, carrying its object within itself, signifies to stir, rouse up, and **הִקְיִץ**, to break off, tear one’s self away, gather one’s self up from, sleep. “To my right,” viz., to prove it by facts; “to my cause,” to carry it on in my defence.

*Psa. 35:25-26.* On the metonymical use of **נִפְשׁוֹ**, like **τὸ ὀρεκτικόν** for **ὄρεξις**, vid., *Psychol.* S. 203 [tr. p. 239]. The climax of desire is to swallow David up, i.e., to overpower him and clear him out of the way so that there is not a trace of him left. **בִּלְעֵנוּהוּ** with **ע** before **נ**, as in 132: 6, and frequently;



on the law of the vowels which applies to this, vid., Ewald, § 60, a. רָעַתִּי  
רָעַתִּי is a short form of expression for אֵל (ב) רָעַתִּי שְׂמֵחִים. To put on shame  
and dishonour (Psa. 109:29, cf. 18), so that these entirely cover them, and their  
public external appearance corresponds with their innermost nature.

*Psa. 35:27-28.* Those who wish that David's righteousness may be made  
manifest and be avenged are said to take delight in it. When this takes place,  
Jahve's righteousness is proved. יִגְדֹּל, let Him be acknowledged and praised  
as great, i.e., let Him be magnified! David desires that all who remain true to  
him may thus speak; and he, on his part, is determined to stir up the revelation  
of God's righteousness in his heart, and to speak of that of which his heart is  
full (Psa. 71:24).

## **Psalm 36**

### **THE CURSE OF ALIENATION FROM GOD, AND THE BLESSING OF FELLOWSHIP WITH HIM**

*36: 2 AN oracle of transgression hath the ungodly within his heart:  
There is no fear of God before his eyes.*

*36: 3 For it flattereth him in his own eyes,  
In order that he may become guilty, that he may hate.*

*36: 4 The words of his mouth are evil and deceit;  
He hath ceased to act wisely and well.*

*36: 5 Evil doth he devise upon his bed,  
He taketh his stand in a way that is not good,  
He abhorreth not evil.*

*36: 6 O Jahve, to the heavens doth Thy mercy extend,  
Thy faithfulness unto the clouds.*

*36: 7 Thy righteousness is like the mountains of God,  
Thy judgments are a great deep,  
Man and beast dost Thou preserve, O Jahve.*

*36: 8 How precious is Thy mercy, Elohim,  
That the children of men find refuge in the shadow of Thy wings!*

*36: 9 They become drunk with the fatness of Thy house,  
And Thou givest them to drink of the river of Thy pleasures.*

*36:10 For with Thee is the fountain of life,  
And in Thy light do we see light.*

*36:11 Lengthen out Thy mercy to those who know Thee,  
And Thy righteousness to those who are upright in heart.*

*36:12 Let not the foot of pride overtake me,  
And let not the hand of the wicked scare me away.*

*36:13 Behold, there have the workers of evil fallen,  
They are thrust down and are not able to rise.*

*Psalm 36.* The preceding Psalm, in the hope of speedy deliverance, put into the lips of the friends of the new kingship, who were now compelled to keep in the background, the words: “Jahve, be magnified, who hath pleasure in the well-being of *His servant*.” David there calls himself the servant of Jahve, and in the inscription to Psalm 36 he bears the very same name: *To the Precentor, by the servant of Jahve, by David*. The *textus receptus* accents למנצח with a conjunctive *Illuj*; Ben-Naphtali accents it less ambiguously with a disjunctive *Legarme* (vid., *Psalter*, ii. 462), since David is not himself the מנצח.

Psalm 12, 14 (53), 36, 37, form a group. In These Psalms David complains of the moral corruption of his generation. They are all merely reflections of the character of the time, not of particular occurrences. In common with Psalm 12, the Psalm before us has a prophetic colouring; and, in common with Psalm 37, allusions to the primeval history of the Book of Genesis. The strophe schema is 4. 5. 5. 6. 6.

*Psa. 36: 2-5.* At the outset the poet discovers to us the wickedness of the children of the world, which has its roots in alienation from God. Supposing it were admissible to render v. 2: “A divine word concerning the evil-doing of the ungodly is in the inward parts of my heart” (נאם with a genitive of the object, like מִשָּׁא, which is compared by Hofmann), then the difficulty of this word, so much complained of, might find the desired relief in some much more easy way than by means of the conjecture proposed by Diestel, נאם (נאם), “Pleasant is transgression to the evil-doer,” etc. But the genitive after נאם (which in Psa. 110: 1, Num. 24: 3 f., 15 f., 2Sa. 23: 1, Pro. 30: 1, just as here, stands at the head of the clause) always denotes the speaker, not the thing spoken. Even in Isa. 5: 1 שירת דודי לכרמו is not a song concerning my beloved in relation to His vineyard, but a song of my beloved (such a song as my beloved has to sing) touching His vineyard. Thus, therefore, פִּשַׁע must denote the speaker, and לְרָשָׁע, as in Psa. 110: 1 לְאֹדְנִי, the person or thing addressed; transgression is personified, and an oracular utterance is attributed to it. But the predicate בְּקִרְבִּי לְבִי, which is intelligible enough in connection with the first rendering of פִּשַׁע as *genit. obj.*, is difficult and harsh with the latter rendering of פִּשַׁע as *gen. subj.*, whatever way it may be understood:

whether, that it is intended to say that the utterance of transgression to the evil-doer is inwardly known to him (the poet), or it occupies and affects him in his inmost parts. It is very natural to read **לבו**, as the LXX, Syriac, and Arabic versions, and Jerome do. In accordance therewith, while with Von Lengerke he takes **נאם** as part of the inscription, Thenius renders it: “Sin is to the ungodly in the midst of his heart,” i.e., it is the inmost motive or impulse of all that he thinks and does. But this isolation of **נאם** is altogether at variance with the usage of the language and custom. The rendering given by Hupfeld, Hitzig, and at last also by Böttcher, is better: “The suggestion of sin dwells in the ungodly in the inward part of his heart;” or rather, since the idea of **בקרבו** is not central, but circumferential, in the realm of (within) his heart, altogether filling up and absorbing it. And in connection with this explanation, it must be observed that this combination **בקרבו לבו** (instead of **בקרבו**, or **בלבו**, **בלבבו**) occurs only here, where, together with a personification of sin, an incident belonging to the province of the soul’s life, which is the outgrowth of sin, is intended to be described. It is true this application of **נאם** does not admit of being further substantiated; but **נאם** (cognate **נָהַם**, **הָהָם**), as an onomatopoeic designation of a dull, hollow sound, is a suitable word for secret communication (cf. Arabic *nemmâm*, a tale-bearer), or even — since the genius of the language does not combine with it the idea of that which is significantly secretly, and solemnly silently communicated, but spoken out — a suitable word for that which transgression says to the ungodly with all the solemn mien of the prophet or the philosopher, inasmuch as it has set itself within his heart in the place of God and of the voice of his conscience. **לְרָשָׁע** does not, however, denote the person addressed, but, as in Psa. 32:10, the possessor. He possesses this inspiration of iniquity as the contents of his heart, so that the fear of God has no place therein, and to him God has no existence (objectivity), that He should command his adoration.

Since after this **נאם פִּשְׁעוֹ** we expect to hear further what and how transgression speaks to him, so before all else the most probable thing is, that transgression is the subject to **הַחֲלִיק**. We do not interpret: He flatters God in His eyes (with eye-service), for this rendering is contrary both to what precedes and to what follows; nor with Hupfeld (who follows Hofmann): “God deals smoothly (gently) with him according to his delusions,” for the assumption that **הַחֲלִיק** must, on account of **בְּעֵינָיו**, have some other subject that the evil-doer himself, is indeed correct. It does not, however, necessarily point to God as the subject, but, after the solemn opening of v. 2a, to transgression, which is personified. This addresses flattering words to him (**אֵל** like **אֵל** in Pro. 29: 5) in his eyes, i.e., such as are pleasing to him; and to what

end? For the finding out, i.e., establishing (מִצָּא עוֹן), as in Gen. 44:16, Hos. 12: 9), or — since this is not exactly suited to פֶּשַׁע as the subject, and where it is a purpose that is spoken of, the meaning *assequi*, originally proper to the verb מִצָּא, is still more natural — *to the attainment of his culpability*, i.e., in order that he may inculcate himself, *to hating*, i.e., that he may hate God and man instead of loving them. לְשָׂנֵא is designedly used without an object just as in Ecc. 3: 8, in order to imply that the flattering words of פֶּשַׁע incite him to turn into an object of hatred everything that he ought to love, and to live and move in hatred as in his own proper element. Thenius endeavours to get rid of the harshness of the expression by the following easy alteration of the text: לְמִצָּא עוֹן וְלִשְׂנֵא; and interprets it: Yea, it flatters him in his own eyes (it tickles his pride) to discover faults in others and to make them suffer for them. But there is no support in the general usage of the language for the impersonal rendering of the הַחֲלִיק; and the בְּעֵינָיו, which in this case is not only pleonastic, but out of place, demands a distinction between the flatterer and the person who feels himself flattered. The expression in v. 3b, in whatever way it may be explained, is harsh; but David's language, whenever he describes the corruption of sin with deep-seated indignation, is wont to envelope itself in such clouds, which, to our difficult comprehension, look like corruptions of the text. In the second strophe the whole language is more easy. לְמִצָּא עוֹנוֹ לְשָׂנֵא is just such another asyndeton as לְהִשָּׁבִיל לְהִיטִיב. A man who has thus fallen a prey to the dominion of sin, and is alienated from God, has ceased (חָדַל לְ), as in 1Sa. 23:13) to act wisely and well (things which essentially accompany one another). His words when awake, and even his thoughts in the night-time, run upon אָוֶן (Isa. 59: 7), evil, wickedness, the absolute opposite of that which alone is truly good. Most diligently does he take up his position in the way which leads in the opposite direction to that which is good (Pro. 16:29, Isa. 65: 2); and his conscience is deadened against evil: there is not a trace of aversion to it to be found in him, he loves it with all his soul.

**Psa. 36: 6-10.** The poet now turns from this repulsive prospect to one that is more pleasing. He contemplates, and praises, the infinite, ever sure mercy of God, and the salvation, happiness, and light which spring from it. Instead of בְּשִׂמְיִם, the expression is בְּהִשְׂמִיִם, the syncope of the article not taking place. בְּ alternating with אֶד, cf. Psa. 57:11, has here, as in Psa. 19: 5; 72:16, the sense of touching or reaching to the spot that is denoted in connection with it. The poet describes the exaltation and super-eminence of divine mercy and faithfulness figuratively, after earthly standards. They reveal themselves on earth in a height that reaches to the heavens and extends to שְׁחָקִים, i.e., the

thin veil of vapour which spreads itself like a veil over the depths of the heavens; they transcend all human thought, desire, and comprehension (Psa. 103:11, and cf. Eph. 3:18). The צדקה (righteousness) is distinguished from the אמונה (faithfulness) thus: the latter is governed by the promises of God, the former by His holiness; and further, the latter has its being in the love of God, the former, on the other hand, manifests itself partly as justifying in mercies, and partly as avenging in wrath. Concerning the righteousness, the poet says that it is like the mountains of God, i.e., (cf. cedars of God, Psa. 80:11) unchangeably firm (Psa. 111: 3), like the giant primeval mountains which bear witness to the greatness and glory of God; concerning God's judgments, that they are "a great deep," incomprehensible and unsearchable (ἀνεξερεύνηται, Rom. 11:33) as the great, deep-surg-ing mass of waters in the lower parts of the earth, which becomes visible in the seas and in the rivers. God's punitive righteousness, as at length becomes evident, has His compassion for its reverse side; and this, as in the case of the Flood (cf. Jon. 4:11), embraces the animal world, which is most closely involved, whether for weal or for woe, with man, as well as mankind.

Lost in this depth, which is so worthy of adoration, the Psalmist exclaims: How precious (cf. Psa. 139:17) is Thy mercy, Elohim! i.e., how valuable beyond all treasures, and how precious to him who knows how to prize it! The Waw of וְבִי is the explicative Waw = *et hoc ipsum quod*. The energetic form of the future, וְיִחַסֵּינִי, has the pre-tonic Kametz, here in pause, as in Psa. 36: 8; 39: 7; 78:44. The shadow of God's wings is the protection of His love, which hides against temptation and persecution. To be thus hidden in God is the most unspeakable blessedness, v. 9: they satiate themselves, they drink full draughts of "the fatness of Thy house." The house of God is His sanctuary, and in general the domain of His mercy and grace. יְדֹשֵׁן (cf. טוב, Psa. 65: 5) is the expression for the abundant, pleasant, and powerful gifts and goods and recreations with which God entertains those who are His; and רְנָה (whence רִנָּה, as in Deu. 8:13, Isa. 40:18) is the spiritual joy of the soul that experiences God's mercy to overflowing. The abundant fare of the priests from Jahve's table (vid., Jer. 31:14), and the festive joy of the guests at the shelamim-offering, i.e., the communion-offering, — these outward rites are here treated according to their spiritual significance, receive the depth of meaning which radically belongs to them, and are ideally generalized. It is a stream of pleasures (עֲדָנִים) with which He irrigates and fertilizes them, a paradisaic river of delights. This, as the four arms of the river of Paradise had one common source (Gen. 2:10), has its spring in God, yea, God is the fountain itself. He is "the fountain of life" (Jer. 2:13); all life flows forth from Him, who is the absolutely existing and happy One. The more inwardly, therefore, one is

joined to Him, the fuller are the draughts of life which he drinks from this first fountain of all life. And as God is the fountain of life, so also is He the fountain of light: “In Thy light do we see light;” out of God, seeing we see only darkness, whereas immersed in God’s sea of light we are illumined by divine knowledge, and lighted up with spiritual joy. The poet, after having taken a few glimpses into the chaos of evil, here moves in the blessed depths of holy mysticism [*Mystik*, i.e., mysticism in the good sense — true religion, vital godliness], and in proportion as in the former case his language is obscure. So here it is clear as crystal.

*Psa. 36:11-13.* Now for the first time, in the concluding hexastich, after complaint and commendation comes the language of prayer. The poet prays that God would lengthen out, i.e., henceforth preserve (לְשִׁמְךָ, as in Psa. 109:12), such mercy to His saints; that the foot of arrogance, which is conceived of as a tyrant, may not come suddenly upon him (בְּאוֹ, as in Psa. 35: 8), and that the hand of the wicked may not drive him from his home into exile (cf. Psa. 10:18). With חֶסֶד alternates צְדָקָה, which, on its merciful side, is turned towards them that now God, and bestows upon them the promised gracious reward. Whilst the Psalmist is thus praying, the future all at once becomes unveiled to him. Certain in his own mind that his prayer will be heard, he sees the adversaries of God and of His saints for ever overthrown. אֵשׁ, as in 14: 5, points to the place where the judgment is executed. The preterites are prophetic, as in Psa. 14: 5; 64: 8-10. The poet, like Isaiah (Isa. 26:14), beholds the whole tribe of the oppressors of Jahve’s Church changed into a field of corpses, without hope of any rising again.

## Psalm 37

### THE SEEMING PROSPERITY OF THE WICKED, AND THE REAL PROSPERITY OF THE GODLY

*37: 1 ❖ BE not incensed at the evil-doers,  
Be not envious of the workers of iniquity.*

*37: 2 For like grass they are soon cut down,  
And like a green herb they wither away.*

*37: 3 ☐ Trust in Jahve and do good,  
Dwell in the land and cultivate faithfulness.*

*37: 4 And delight thyself in Jahve,  
So shall He give thee the desires of thy heart.*

*37: 5 ♪ Commit thy way unto Jahve,  
And trust in Him; and He will bring it to pass.*

*37: 6 He will bring forth like the light thy righteousness,  
And thy right like the noon-day brightness.*

*37: 7 † Resign thyself to Jahve and wait for Him;  
Fret not thyself over him who prospereth in his way,  
Over the man who bringeth wicked devices to pass.*

*37: 8 † Cease from anger and let go wrath,  
Be not incensed, it leads only to evil-doing.*

*37: 9 For evil-doers shall be cut off,  
But they who hope in Jahve — they inherit the land.*

*37:10 † Yet a little while and the wicked is no more,  
And if thou observest his place, he is gone.*

*37:11 But the meek shall inherit the land,  
And delight themselves in the abundance of peace.*

*37:12 † The wicked deviseth evil against the righteous,  
And gnasheth upon him with his teeth —*

*37:13 The Lord laugheth at him,  
For He seeth that his day is coming.*

*37:14 † The wicked draw the sword and bend their bow,  
To cast down the poor and needy,  
To slay them that are of upright walk.*

*37:15 Their sword shall enter into their own heart,  
And their bows shall be broken.*

*37:16 † Better is the little that a righteous man hath,  
Than the riches of many wicked.*

*37:17 For the arms of the wicked shall be broken,  
And Jahve upholdeth the righteous.*

*37:18 † Jahve observeth the days of the perfect,  
And their inheritance shall endure for ever.*

*37:19 They are not ashamed in the evil time,  
And in the days of famine they are satisfied.*

*37:20 † But the wicked perish,  
And the enemies of Jahve are like the glory of the meadows,  
They vanish away like smoke, they disappear.*

*37:21 † The wicked is obliged to borrow and cannot pay,  
But the righteous is liberal and can give.*

*37:22 For they that are blessed of Him shall inherit the land,  
And they that are cursed of Him shall be cut off.*

*37:23 ☐ With Jahve are a man's steps established,  
And He hath delight in his way.*

*37:24 When he falls, he shall not be utterly cast down,  
For Jahve upholdeth his hand.*

*37:25 ☐ I have been young, and now am old,  
Yet have I not seen a righteous man forsaken,  
And his seed begging bread.*

*37:26 He continually giveth and lendeth,  
And his seed is a blessing.*

*37:27 ☐ Depart from evil and do good,  
And dwell for evermore.*

*37:28 For Jahve loveth the right,  
And will not forsake His saints.  
For ever are they preserved,  
But the seed of the wicked is cut off.*

*37:29 The righteous shall inherit the land,  
And dwell therein for ever.*

*37:30 ☐ The mouth of the righteous uttereth wisdom,  
And his tongue speaketh what is right.*

*37:31 The law of his God is in his heart,  
His steps do not slip.*

*37:32 ☐ The wicked lieth in wait for the righteous,  
And seeketh to slay him.*

*37:33 Jahve doth not give him over into his hand,  
Nor condemn him when he is judged.*

*37:34 ☐ Wait on Jahve and keep His way,  
So shall He exalt thee to inherit the land;  
With the cutting off the wicked shalt thou delight thine eyes.*

*37:35 ☐ I have seen a violent wicked man,  
And he spread himself like an indigenous  
tree of luxuriant foliage.*

*37:36 And one passed by, and lo he was not,  
And I sought him and he was not to be found.*



37:37 **□** *Mark the perfect man, and observe the upright;  
That the man of peace hath a posterity.*

37:38 *But the transgressors are destroyed together,  
The posterity of the wicked is cut off.*

37:39 **□** *And the salvation of the righteous is from Jahve,  
Who is their hiding-place in the time of trouble.*

37:40 *And Jahve helpeth them and rescueth them,  
He rescueth them from the wicked and saveth them,  
Because they trust in Him.*

*Psalm 37.* The bond of connection between Psalm 36 and 37 is their similarity of contents, which here and there extends even to accords of expression. The fundamental thought running through the whole Psalm is at once expressed in the opening verses: Do not let the prosperity of the ungodly be a source of vexation to thee, but wait on the Lord; for the prosperity of the ungodly will suddenly come to an end, and the issue determines between the righteous and the unrighteous. Hence Tertullian calls this Psalm *providentiae speculum*; Isodore, *potio contra murmur*; and Luther, *vestis piorum, cui adscriptum: Hic Sanctorum patientia est* (Rev. 14:12). This fundamental thought the poet does not expand in strophes of ordinary compass, but in shorter utterances of the proverbial form following the order of the letters of the alphabet, and not without some repetitions and recurrences to a previous thought, in order to impress it still more convincingly and deeply upon the mind. The Psalm belongs therefore to the series Psalm ch. 9 and 10, 25, 34, — all alphabetical Psalms of David, of whose language, cheering, high-flown, thoughtful, and at the same time so easy and unartificial, and withal elegant, this Psalm is fully worthy. The structure of the proverbial utterances is almost entirely tetrastichic; though **ד**, **כ**, and **ק** are tristichs, and **ח** (which is twice represented, though perhaps unintentionally), **ג**, and **ת** are pentastichs. The **ע** is apparently wanting; but, on closer inspection, the originally separated strophes **ס** and **ע** are only run into one another by the division of the verses. The **ע** strophe begins with **לעולם**, v. 28b, and forms a tetrastich, just like the **ס**. The fact that the preposition **ל** stands before the letter next in order need not confuse one. The **ת**, v. 39, also begins with **ותשועת**. The homogeneous beginnings, **זמם רשע**, **לוה רשע**, **צנפה רשע**, vv. 12, 21, 32, seem, as Hitzig remarks, to be designed to give prominence to the pauses in the succession of the proverbial utterances.

*Psa. 37: 1, 2.* Olshausen observes, “The poet keeps entirely to the standpoint of the old Hebrew doctrine of recompense, which the Book of Job so

powerfully refutes.” But, viewed in the light of the final issue, all God’s government is really in a word righteous recompense; and the Old Testament theodicy is only inadequate in so far as the future, which adjusts all present inconsistencies, is still veiled. Meanwhile the punitive justice of God does make itself manifest, as a rule, in the case of the ungodly even in the present world; even their dying is usually a fearful end to their life’s prosperity. This it is which the poet means here, and which is also expressed by Job himself in the Book of Job, Job. 27. With **הִתְחַרְרָה**, to grow hot or angry (distinct from **תִּחְרָרָה**, to emulate, Jer. 12: 5; 22:15), alternates **קָנָא**, to get into a glow, *excaescentia*, whether it be the restrained heat of sullen envy, or the uncontrollable heat of impetuous zeal which would gladly call down fire from heaven. This first distich has been transferred to the Book of Proverbs, Pro. 24:19, cf. 23:17; 24: 1; 3:31; and in general we may remark that this Psalm is one of the Davidic patterns for the Salomonic gnome system. The form **יָמְלוּ** is, according to Gesenius, Olshausen, and Hitzig, *fut. Kal* of **מָלַל**, cognate **אָמַל**, they wither away, pausal form for **יָמְלוּ** like **יָתְמוּ**, Psa. 102:28; but the signification to cut off also is secured to the verb **מָלַל** by the *Niph.* **נָמַל**, Gen. 17:11, whence *fut.* **יָמְלוּ** = **יָמְלוּ**; vid., on Job. 14: 2; 18:16. **דְּשֵׂא יֶרֶק** is a genitival combination: the green (*viror*) of young vigorous vegetation.

**Psa. 37: 3, 4.** The “land” is throughout this Psalm the promised possession (*Heilsgut*), viz., the land of Jahve’s presence, which has not merely a glorious past, but also a future rich in promises; and will finally, ore perfectly than under Joshua, become the inheritance of the true Israel. It is therefore to be explained: enjoy the quiet sure habitation which God gives thee, and diligently cultivate the virtue of faithfulness. The two imperatives in v. 3*b*, since there are two of them (cf. v. 27) and the first is without any conjunctive *Waw*, have the appearance of being continued admonitions, not promises; and consequently **אֲמוֹנָה** is not an adverbial accusative as in Psa. 119:75 (Ewald), but the object to **רָעָה**, to pasture, to pursue, to practise (Syriac **רָרַר**, Hos. 12: 2); cf. **רָאָה**, **רָאָה**, one who interests himself in any one, or anything; Beduin *râ â = sâhb*, of every kind of closer relationship (*Deutsch. Morgenländ. Zeitschr.* v. 9). In v. 4, **יִיתֶן** is an apodosis: delight in Jahve (cf. Job. 22:26; 27:10, Isa. 58:14), so will He grant thee the desire (**מִשְׁאֵלֶךָ**, as in Psa. 20:65) of thy heart; for he who, entirely severed from the creature, finds his highest delight in God, cannot desire anything that is at enmity with God, but he also can desire nothing that God, with whose will his own is thoroughly blended in love, would refuse him.

*Psa. 37: 5, 6.* The LXX erroneously renders גֹּל (= גַּל, Psa. 22: 9) by ἀποκάλυψον instead of ἐπιβρίψον, 1Pe. 5: 7: roll the burden of cares of thy life's way upon Jahve, leave the guidance of thy life entirely to Him, and to Him alone, without doing anything in it thyself: He will gloriously accomplish (all that concerns thee): עֲשֵׂה, as in Psa. 22:32; 52:11; cf. Pro. 16: 3, and Paul Gerhardt's *Befiehl du deine Wege*, "Commit thou all thy ways," etc. The perfect in v. 6 is a continuation of the promissory יַעֲשֵׂה הוֹצִיא, as in Jer. 51:10, signifies to set forth: He will bring to light thy misjudged righteousness like the light (the sun, Job. 31:26; 37:21, and more especially the morning sun, Pro. 4:18), which breaks through the darkness; and thy down-trodden right (מִשְׁפָּטָדְךָ is the pausal form of the singular beside *Mugrash*) like the bright light of the noon-day: cf. Isa. 58:10, as on v. 4, Isa. 58:14.

*Psa. 37: 7.* The verb דָּמַם, with its derivatives (Psa. 62: 2, 6, Lam. 3:28), denotes resignation, i.e., a quiet of mind which rests on God, renounces all self-help, and submits to the will of God. הִתְחַוֵּל (from חוּל, to be in a state of tension, to wait) of the inward gathering of one's self together in hope intently directed towards God, as in *B. Berachoth* 30b is a synonym of הִתְחַוֵּן, and as it were reflexive of חָלָה of the collecting one's self to importunate prayer. With v. 7b the primary tone of the whole Psalm is struck anew. On v. 7c compare the definition of the mischief-maker in Pro. 24: 8.

*Psa. 37: 8, 9.* On הִרְפֵּה (let alone), *imper. apoc. Hiph.*, instead of הִרְפֵּה, vid., Ges. § 75, rem. 15. אֵךְ לְהִרְאֵה is a clause to itself (cf. Pro. 11:24; 21: 5; 22:16): it tends only to evil-doing, it ends only in thy involving thyself in sin. The final issue, without any need that thou shouldst turn sullen, is that the מְרַעִים, like to whom thou dost make thyself by such passionate murmuring and displeasure, will be cut off, and they who, turning from the troublous present, make Jahve the ground and aim of their hope, shall inherit the land (vid., 25:13). It is the end, the final and consequently eternal end, that decides the matter.

*Psa. 37:10, 11.* The protasis in v. 10a is literally: *adhuc parum (temporis superest)*, עוֹד מְאֹד, as e.g., Exo. 23:30, and as in a similar connection וְ מְאֹד, Job. 24:24. וְהִתְבוֹנְנָה also is a protasis with a hypothetical perfect, Ges. § 155, 4, a. This promise also runs in the mouth of the Preacher on the Mount (Mat. 5: 5) just as the LXX renders v. 11a: οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι γῆν. Meekness, which is content with God, and renounces all earthly stays, will at length become the inheritor of the land, yea of the earth. Whatever God-opposed self-love may amass to itself and may seek to acquire, falls into the hands of the meek as their blessed possession.

**Psa. 37:12, 13.** The verb **נָמַם** is construed with **לְ** of that which is the object at which the evil devices aim. To gnash the teeth (elsewhere also: with the teeth) is, as in Psa. 35:16, cf. Job. 16: 9, a gesture of anger, not of mockery, although anger and mockery are usually found together. But the Lord, who regards an assault upon the righteous as an assault upon Himself, laughs (Psa. 2: 4) at the enraged schemer; for He, who orders the destinies of men, sees beforehand, with His omniscient insight into the future, his day, i.e., the day of his death (2Sa. 26:10), of his visitation (Psa. 137: 7, Oba. 1:12, Jer. 50:27, 31).

**Psa. 37:14, 15.** That which corresponds to the “treading” or stringing of the bow is the drawing from the sheath or unsheathing of the sword: **פָּתַח**, Eze. 21:33, cf. Psa. 55:22. The combination **יִשְׂרִי-דָרְדַר** is just like **תַּמִּי-דָרְדַר**, Psa. 119: 1. The emphasis in v. 14 is upon the suffix of **בְּלָבָם**: they shall perish by their own weapon. **קִשְׁתֹּתָם** has (in Baer) a *Shebā dirimens*, as also in Isa. 5:28 in correct texts.

**Psa. 37:16, 17.** With v. 16 accord Pro. 15:16; 16: 8, cf. Tobit 12: 8. The **ל** of **לְצַדִּיק** is a periphrastic indication of the genitive (Ges. § 115). **הַמִּזֶּן** is a noisy multitude, here used of earthly possessions. **רַבִּים** is not *per attract.* (cf. Psa. 38:11, **הֵם** for **הוּא**) equivalent to **רַב**, but the one righteous man is contrasted with many unrighteous. The arms are here named instead of the bow in v. 15b. He whose arms are broken can neither injure others nor help himself. Whereas Jahve does for the righteous what earthly wealth and human power cannot do: He Himself upholds them.

**Psa. 37:18, 19.** The life of those who love Jahve with the whole heart is, with all its vicissitudes, an object of His loving regard and of His observant providential care, Psa. 1: 6; 31: 8, cf. 16. He neither suffers His own to lose their heritage nor to be themselves lost to it. The **αἰώνιος κληρονομία** is not as yet thought of as extending into the future world, as in the New Testament. In v. 19 the surviving refers only to this present life.

**Psa. 37:20.** With **כִּי** the preceding assertion is confirmed by its opposite (cf. Psa. 130: 4). **פִּי-בָרִים** forms a fine play in sound; **יָקָר** is a substantivized adjective like **גָּדֹל**, Exo. 15:16. Instead of **בַּעֲשָׁן**, it is not to be read **בַּעֲשָׁן**, Hos. 13: 3; the **ב** is secured by Psa. 102: 4; 78:33. The idea is, that they vanish into smoke, i.e., are resolved into it, or also, that they vanish in the manner of smoke, which is first thick, but then becomes thinner and thinner till it disappears (Rosenmüller, Hupfeld, Hitzig); both expressions are admissible as to fact and as to the language, and the latter is commended by **בַּהֲבֵל**,

Psa. 78:33, cf. **בַּצְלָם**, Psa. 39: 7. **בְּעֶשֶׂן** belongs to the first, regularly accented **בְּלוּ**; for the *Munach* by **בְּעֶשֶׂן** is the substitute for *Mugrash*, which never can be used where at least two syllables do not precede the *Silluk* tone (vid., *Psalter* ii. 503). The second **בְּלוּ** has the accent on the *penult*. for a change (Ew. § 194, c), i.e., variation of the rhythm (cf. **לִמָּה לִמָּה**, Psa. 42:10; 43: 2; **עוֹרֵי עוֹרֵי**, Jud. 5:12, and on Psa. 137: 7), and in particular here on account of its pausal position (cf. **עָרוּ**, Psa. 137: 7).

**Psa. 37:21, 22.** It is the promise expressed in Deu. 15: 6; 28:12, 44, which is rendered in v. 21 in the more universal, sententious form. **לָזָה** signifies to be bound or under obligation to any one = to borrow and to owe (*nexum esse*). The confirmation of v. 22 is not inappropriate (as Hitzig considers it, who places v. 22 after v. 20): in that ever deeper downfall of the ungodly, and in that charitableness of the righteous, which becomes more and more easy to him by reason of his prosperity, the curse and blessing of God, which shall be revealed in the end of the earthly lot of both the righteous and the ungodly, are even now foretold. Whilst those who reject the blessing of God are cut off, the promise given to the patriarchs is fulfilled in the experience of those who are blessed of God, in all its fulness.

**Psa. 37:23, 24.** By Jahve (**יְהוָה**, *ἀπό*, almost equivalent to *ὑπό* with the passive, as in Job. 24: 1, Ecc. 12:11, and in a few other passages) are a man's steps made firm, established; not: ordered or directed (LXX, Jerome, *κατευθύνεται*), which, according to the extant usage of the language, would be **הוֹכִינוּ** (passive of **הִכִּין**, Pro. 16: 9, Jer. 10:23, 2Ch. 27: 6), whereas **בִּנְנוּ**, the *Pulal* of **בָּנָה**, is to be understood according to Psa. 40: 3. By **יָבֵר** is meant man in an emphatic sense (Job. 38: 3), and in fact in an ethical sense; compare, on the other hand, the expression of the more general saying, "Man proposes, and God disposes," Pro. 16: 9; 20:24, Jer. 10:23. V. 23b shows that it is the upright man that is meant in v. 23a: to the way, i.e., course of life, of such an one God turns with pleasure (**יְהַפֵּץ** pausal change of vowel for **יְהַפִּץ**): supposing he should fall, whether it be a fall arising from misfortune or from error, or both together, he is not prostrated, but Jahve upholds his hand, affords it a firm point of support or fulcrum (cf. **יָמַדְךָ**, Psa. 63: 9, and frequently), so that he can raise himself again, rise up again.

**Psa. 37:25, 26.** There is an old theological rule: *promissiones corporales intelligendae sunt cum exceptione crucis et castigationis*. Temporary forsakenness and destitution the Psalm does not deny: it is indeed even intended to meet the conflict of doubt which springs up in the minds of the God-fearing out of certain conditions and circumstances that are seemingly

contradictory to the justice of God; and this it does, by contrasting that which in the end abides with that which is transitory, and in fact without the knowledge of any final decisive adjustment in a future world; and it only solves its problem, in so far as it is placed in the light of the New Testament, which already dawns in the Book of Ecclesiastes.

*Psa. 37:27, 28a.* The round of the exhortations and promises is here again reached as in v. 3. The imperative **שָׁבֵן**, which is there hortatory, is found here with the **ו** of sequence in the sense of a promise: and continue, doing such things, to dwell for ever = so shalt thou, etc. (**שָׁבֵן**), pregnant as in Psa. 102:29, Isa. 57:15). Nevertheless the imperative retains its meaning even in such instances, inasmuch as the exhortation is given to share in the reward of duty at the same time with the discharge of it. On v. 28a compare Psa. 33: 5.

*Psa. 37:28b,29.* The division of the verse is wrong; for the **ו** strophe, without any doubt, closes with **וְחִסְדֵּי**, and the **ו** strophe begins with **לְעוֹלָם**, so that, according to the text which we possess, the **ו** of this word is the acrostic letter. The LXX, however, after **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα φυλαχθήσονται** has another line, which suggests another commencement for the **ו** strophe, and runs in *Cod. Vat.*, incorrectly, **ἄνομοι ἐκδικήσονται**, in *Cod. Alex.*, correctly, **ἄνομοι δὲ ἐκδιωχθήσονται** (Symmachus, **ἄνομοι ἐξαρθήσονται**). By **ἄνομος** the LXX translates **עָרִיץ** in Isa. 29:20; by **ἄνομα, הַאֲוָה** in Job. 27: 4; and by **ἐκδιώκειν, הַצְמִית**, the synonym of **הַשְׁמִיד**, in Psa. 101: 5; so that consequently this line, as even Venema and Schleusner have discerned, was **אֲוָהִים נִשְׁמְדוּ**. It will at once be seen that this is only another reading for **לְעוֹלָם נִשְׁמְרוּ**; and, since it stands side by side with the latter, that it is an ancient attempt to produce a correct beginning for the **ו** strophe, which has been transplanted from the LXX into the text. It is, however, questionable whether this reparation is really a restoration of the original words (Hupfeld, Hitzig); since **אֲוָה (עָוִיל)** is not a word found in the Psalms (for which reason Böttcher's conjecture of **עָשִׂי אֲוָהִים** more readily commends itself, although it is critically less probable), and **לְעוֹלָם נִשְׁמְרוּ** forms a continuation that is more naturally brought about by the context and perfectly logical.

*Psa. 37:30, 31.* The verb **הִקָּה** unites in itself the two meanings of meditating and of meditative utterance (vid., Psa. 2: 1), just as **אָמַר** those of thinking and speaking. V. 31b in this connection affirms the stability of the moral nature. The walk of the righteous has a fixed inward rule, for the *Tôra* is to him not merely an external object of knowledge and a compulsory precept; it is in his heart, and, because it is the *Tôra* of his God whom he loves, as the motive of

his actions closely united with his own will. On **תְּמַאֲד**, followed by the subject in the plural, compare Psa. 18:35; 73: 2 *Chethîb*.

*Psa. 37:32, 33.* The Lord as **ἀνακρίνων** is, as in 1Co. 4: 3 f., put in contrast with the **ἀνακρίνειν** of men, or of human **ἡμέρα**. If men sit in judgment upon the righteous, yet God, the supreme Judge, does not condemn him, but acquits him (cf. on the contrary Psa. 109: 7). *Si condemnamur a mundo*, exclaimed Tertullian to his companions in persecution, *absolvimur a Deo*.

*Psa. 37:34.* Let the eye of faith directed hopefully to Jahve go on its way, without suffering thyself to be turned aside by the persecution and condemnation of the world, then He will at length raise thee out of all trouble, and cause thee to possess (**לְרִשְׁתָּהּ**, *ut possidas et possideas*) the land, as the sole lords of which the evil-doers, now cut off, conducted themselves.

*Psa. 37:35, 36.* **עָרִיז** (after the form **צָדִיק**) is coupled with **רָשָׁע**, must as these two words alternate in Job. 15:20: a terror-inspiring, tyrannical evil-doer; cf. besides also Job. 5: 3. The participle in v. 35b forms a clause by itself: *et se diffundens*, scil. *erat*. The LXX and Jerome translate as though it were **הַלְבֵּנָן כְּאַרְזֵי**, “like the cedars of Lebanon,” instead of **כְּאַזְרַח רַעֲנָן**. But **אַזְרַח רַעֲנָן** is the expression for an oak, terebinth, or the like, that has brown from time immemorial in its native soil, and has in the course of centuries attained a gigantic size in the stem, and a wide-spreading overhanging head. **וַיֵּעָבֵר** does not mean: then he vanished away (Hupfeld and others); for **עָבֵר** in this sense is not suitable to a tree. Luther correctly renders it: *man ging vorüber*, one (they) passed by, Ges. § 137, 3. The LXX, Syriac, and others, by way of lightening the difficulty, render it: then I passed by.

*Psa. 37:37, 38.* **תָּם** might even be taken as neuter for **תָּם**, and **יָשָׁר** for **יָשָׁר**; but in this case the poet would have written **רַעַה** instead of **רָאָה**; **שָׁמֵר** is therefore used as, e.g., in 1Sa. 1:12. By **כִּי** that to which attention is specially called is introduced. The man of peace has a totally different lot from the evil-doer who delights in contention and persecution. As the fruit of his love of peace he has **אַחֲרֵיתָא**, a future, Pro. 23:18; 24:14, viz., in his posterity, Pro. 24:20; whereas the apostates are altogether blotted out; not merely they themselves, but even the posterity of the ungodly is cut off, Amo. 4: 2; 9: 1, Eze. 23:25. To them remains no posterity to carry forward their name, their **אַחֲרֵיתָא** is devoted to destruction (cf. Psa. 109:13 with Num. 24:20).

*Psa. 37:39, 40.* The salvation of the righteous cometh from Jahve; it is therefore characterized, in accordance with its origin, as sure, perfect, and

enduring for ever. **מַעוֹן** is an apposition; the *plena scriptio* serves, as in 2Sa. 22:33, to indicate to us that **מַעוֹן** is meant in this passage to signify not a fortress, but a hiding-place, a place of protection, a refuge, in which sense Arab. *m'âd 'Ilh* (the protection of God) and *m'âd wjh 'Ilh* (the protection of God's presence) is an Arabic expression (also used as a formula of an oath); vid., moreover on Psa. 31: 3. The moods of sequence in v. 40 are *aoristi gnomici*. The parallelism in v. 40*ab* is progressive after the manner of the Psalms of degrees. The short confirmatory clause *ki chā' su bo* forms an expressive closing cadence.

## Psalm 38

### PRAYER FOR THE CHANGING OF MERITED WRATH INTO RESCUING LOVE

38: 2 *JAHVE, do not in Thy wrath rebuke me,  
And in Thy hot displeasure chasten me.*

38: 3 *For Thine arrows have entered deep into me,  
And Thy hand hath sunk down upon me.*

38: 4 *There is no soundness in my flesh because of Thine anger,  
There is no health in my bones because of my sin.*

38: 5 *For mine iniquities are gone over my head,  
Like a heavy burden they are too heavy for me.*

38: 6 *My wounds stink and fester  
Because of my foolishness.*

38: 7 *I am bent, I am sore bowed down,  
All the day long do I go mourning.*

38: 8 *For my loins are full of burning,  
And there is no soundness in my flesh.*

38: 9 *I am benumbed and sore crushed,  
I roar by reason of the groaning of my heart.*

38:10 *O Lord, to Thee is all my desire manifest,  
And my sighing is not hidden from Thee.*

38:11 *My heart beateth quickly, my strength hath failed me,  
And the light of mine eyes, even of these, is gone from me.*

38:12 *My lovers and friends stand aloof from my stroke,  
[And my kinsmen stand afar off,]*



*38:13 And they lay snares for me who seek after my soul,  
And they who strive after my misfortune speak mischievous things,  
And utter falsehoods continually.*

*38:14 But I am like a deaf man, as though I heard not,  
And like one dumb that openeth not his mouth;*

*38:15 I am become like a man that heareth not,  
And in whose mouth are no replies.*

*38:16 For in Thee, Jahve, do I hope;  
Thou, Thou wilt answer, O Lord my God.*

*38:17 For I say: Let them not rejoice over me  
Who, when my foot tottereth,  
would magnify themselves against me.*

*38:18 For I am ready to fall,  
And my great sorrow is ever before me.*

*38:19 For mine iniquity must I confess,  
I must tremble on account of my sin.*

*38:20 But mine enemies are vigorous, they are numerous,  
And many are my lying haters.*

*38:21 And requiting evil for good,  
They are hostile towards me for my following that which is good.*

*38:22 Forsake me not, Jahve;  
My God, be not far from me.*

*38:23 Make haste to help me,  
O Lord, who art my salvation!*

*Psalm 38.* The Penitential Psalm 38, is placed immediately after Psalm 37 on account of the similarity of its close to the □ strophe of that Psalm. It begins like Psalm 6. If we regard David's adultery as the occasion of it (cf. more especially 2Sa. 12:14), then Psalm 6, 38, 51, 32 form a chronological series. David is distressed both in mind and body, forsaken by his friends, and regarded by his foes as one who is cast off for ever. The fire of divine anger burns within him like a fever, and the divine withdrawal as it were rests upon him like darkness. But he fights his way by prayer through this fire and this darkness to the bright confidence of faith. The Psalm, although it is the pouring forth of such elevated and depressed feelings, is nevertheless symmetrically and skilfully laid out. It consists of three main paragraphs, which divide into four (vv. 2-9), three (vv. 10-15), and four (vv. 16-23) tetrastichs. The way in which the names of God are brought in is well conceived. The first word of the first group or paragraph is יהוה, the first word of the second יהוה, and in the

third יהוה and אֲדֹנָי are used interchangeably twice. The Psalm, in common with Psalm 70, bears the inscription לְהַזְכִּיר. The chronicler, in 1Ch. 16: 4, refers to these *Hazkir* Psalms together with the *Hodu* and *Halleluja* Psalms. In connection with the presentation of meat-offerings, מִנְחֹת, a portion of the meat-offering was cast into the altar fire, viz., a handful of the meal mixed with oil and the whole of the incense. This portion was called אֲזָכְרָה, ἀνάμνησις, and to offer it הַזְכִּיר (a denominative), because the ascending smoke was intended to bring the owner of the offering into remembrance with God. In connection with the presentation of this memorial portion of the *mincha*, the two Psalms are appointed to be used as prayers; hence the inscription: *at the presentation of the Azcara* (the portion taken from the meal-offering). The LXX adds here περι (τοῦ) σαββάτου; perhaps equivalent to לַשַּׁבָּת.

In this Psalm we find a repetition of a peculiarity of the penitential Psalms, viz., that the praying one has to complain not only of afflictions of body and soul, but also of outward enemies, who come forward as his accusers and take occasion from his sin to prepare the way for his ruin. This arises from the fact that the Old Testament believer, whose perception of sin was not as yet so spiritual and deep as that of the New Testament believer, almost always calls to mind some sinful act that has become openly known. The foes, who would then prepare for his ruin, are the instruments of the Satanic power of evil (cf. v. 21, יִשְׁמְנוּנִי), which, as becomes perceptible to the New Testament believer even without the intervention of outward foes, desires the death of the sinning one, whereas God wills that he should live.

*Psa. 38: 2-9.* David begins, as in Psalm ch. 6, with the prayer that his punitive affliction may be changed into disciplinary. Bakius correctly paraphrases. v. 2: *Corripi sane per legem, castiga per crucem, millies promerui, negare non possum, sed castiga, quaeso, me ex amore ut pater, non ex furore et fervore ut iudex; ne punias justitiae rigore, sed misericordiae dulcore* (cf. on 6: 2). The negative is to be repeated in v. 2b, as in Psa. 1: 5; 9:19; 75: 6. In the description, which give the ground of the cry for pity, נַחַת, is not the *Piel*, as in Psa. 18:35, but the *Niphal* of the *Kal* נָחַת immediately following (root נח). קִצְרִי is anger as a breaking forth, *fragor* (cf. Hos. 10: 7, LXX φρύγανον), with ē instead of ĭ in the first syllable, vowels which alternate in this word; and חֲמָה, as a glowing or burning. הַצִּיִּים (in Homer, κήλα), God's wrath-arrows, i.e., lightnings of wrath, are His judgments of wrath; and יָד, as in Psa. 32: 4; 39:11, God's punishing hand, which makes itself felt in dispensing punishment, hence הַנְּחִית might be attached as a mood of sequence.

In v. 4 wrath is called **אַף** as a boiling up. Sin is the cause of this experiencing wrath, and the wrath is the cause of the bodily derangement; sin as an exciting cause of the wrath always manifests itself outwardly even on the body as a fatal power. In v. 5a sin is compared to waters that threaten to drown one, as in v. 5b to a burden that presses one down. **יִכְבְּדוּ מִמְּנִי**, they are heavier than I, i.e., than my power of endurance, too heavy for me. In v. 6 the effects of the operation of the divine hand (as punishing) are wounds, **חֲבוּרֹת** (properly, suffused variegated marks from a blow or wheals, Isa. 1: 6; from **חָבַר**, Arab. *ḥbr*, to be or make striped, variegated), which **הִבְאִישׁוּ**, send forth an offensive smell, and **נִמְקוּ**, suppurate. Sin, which causes this, is called **אוֹלֵת**, because, as it is at last manifest, it is always the destruction of itself. With emphasis does **מִפְּנֵי אוֹלֵתִי** form the second half of the verse. To take **נְעוּתִי** out of v. 7 and put it to this, as Meier and Thenius propose, is to destroy this its proper position. On the three **מִפְּנֵי**, vid., Ewald, § 217, *l*. Thus sick in soul and body, he is obliged to bow and bend himself in the extreme. **נִעְוָה** is used of a convulsive drawing together of the body, Isa. 21: 3; **שָׁחָה**, of a bowed mien, Psa. 35:14; **הִלָּךְ**, of a heavy, lagging gait. With **כִּי** in v. 8 the grounding of the petition begins for the third time. His **בְּסָלִים**, i.e., internal muscles of the loins, which are usually the fattest parts, are full of **נִקְלָה**, that which is burnt, i.e., parched. It is therefore as though the burning, starting from the central point of the bodily power, would spread itself over the whole body: the wrath of God works commotion in this latter as well as in the soul. Whilst all the energies of life thus yield, there comes over him a partial, almost total lifelessness. **פּוֹג** is the proper word for the coldness and rigidity of a corpse; the *Niphāl* means to be brought into this condition, just as **נִדְבָא** means to be crushed, or to be brought into a condition of crushing, i.e., of violent dissolution. The **מִן** of **מִנְהִמָּת** is intended to imply that the loud wail is only the utterance of the pain that is raging in his heart, the outward expression of his ceaseless, deep inward groaning.

**Psa. 38:10-15.** Having thus bewailed his suffering before God, he goes on in a somewhat calmer tone: it is the calm of weariness, but also of the rescue which shows itself from afar. He has complained, but not as if it were necessary for him first of all to make God acquainted with his suffering; the Omniscient One is directly cognisant of (has directly before Him, **נִגַּד**, like **לִנְגַד** in Psa. 18:25) every wish that his suffering extorts from him, and even his softer sighing does not escape His knowledge. The sufferer does not say this so much with the view of comforting himself with this thought, as of exciting God's compassion. Hence he even goes on to draw the piteous picture

of his condition: his heart is in a state of violent rotary motion, or only of violent, quickly repeated contraction and expansion (*Psychol. S. 252*; tr. p. 297), that is to say, a state of violent palpitation (סִחְרָרָר, *Pealal* according to Ges. § 55, 3). Strength of which the heart is the centre (Psa. 40:13) has left him, and the light of his eyes, even of these (by attraction for גַּם־הוּא, since the light of the eyes is not contrasted with anything else), is not with him, but has become lost to him by weeping, watching, and fever. Those who love him and are friendly towards him have placed themselves far from his stroke (נָגַע, the touch of God's hand of wrath), merely looking on (Oba. 1:11), therefore, in a position hostile (2Sa. 18:13) rather than friendly. מִנְגֵד, far away, but within the range of vision, within sight, Gen. 21:16, Deu. 32:52. The words עֲמָדוּ מְרַחֵק, which introduce a pentastich into a Psalm that is tetrastichic throughout, have the appearance of being a gloss or various reading: מִנְגֵד = מְרַחֵק, 2Ki. 2: 7. His enemies, however, endeavour to take advantage of his fall and helplessness, in order to give him his final death-blow. וַיִּנְקְשׁוּ (with the ק dageshed <sup>f174</sup>) describes what they have planned in consequence of the position he is in. The substance of their words is הוֹת, utter destruction (vid., Psa. 5:10); to this end it is מְרַמֶּת, deceit upon deceit, malice upon malice, that they unceasingly hatch with heart and mouth. In the consciousness of his sin he is obliged to be silent, and, renouncing all self-help, to abandon his cause to God. Consciousness of guilt and resignation close his lips, so that he is not able, nor does he wish, to refute the false charges of his enemies; he has no תִּפְכַּחֹת, counter-evidence wherewith to vindicate himself. It is not to be rendered: "just as one dumb opens not his mouth;" בְּ is only a preposition, not a conjunction, and it is just here, in vv, 14, 15, that the manifest proofs in support of this are found. <sup>f175</sup>

*Psa. 38:16-23.* Become utterly useless in himself, he renounces all self-help, for (בְּ) he hopes in Jahve, who alone can help him. He waits for His answer, for (בְּ) he says, etc. — he waits for an answer, for the hearing of this his petition which is directed towards the glory of God, that God would not suffer his foes to triumph over him, nor strengthen them in their mercilessness and injustice. V. 18b appears also to stand under the government of the בְּ; <sup>f176</sup> but, since in this case one would look for a *Waw relat.* and a different order of the words, v. 18b is to be regarded as a subject clause: "who, when my foot totters, i.e., when my affliction changes to entire downfall, would magnify themselves against me." In v. 18, בְּ connects what follows with בְּמוֹט רַגְלִי by way of confirmation: he is נָכוֹן לְצַלַע, ready for falling (Psa. 35:15), he will, if God does not graciously interpose, assuredly fall headlong. The fourth בְּ in v. 19 is

attached confirmatorily to v. 18b: his intense pain or sorrow is ever present to him, for he is obliged to confess his guilt, and this feeling of guilt is just the very sting of his pain. And whilst he in the consciousness of well-deserved punishment is sick unto death, his foes are numerous and withal vigorous and full of life. Instead of **חַיִּים**, probably **חַיִּים**, as in Psa. 35:19; 69: 5, is to be read (Houbigant, Hitzig, Köster, Hupfeld, Ewald, and Olshausen). But even the LXX read **חַיִּים**; and the reading which is so old, although it does not very well suit **עָצָמוּ** (instead of which one would look for **רַעְצוּמִים**), is still not without meaning: he looks upon himself, according to v. 9, more as one dead than living; his foes, however, are **חַיִּים**, living, i.e., vigorous. The verb frequently ash this pregnant meaning, and the adjective can also have it. Just as the accentuation of the form **סָבוּ** varies elsewhere out of pause, **וְרָבוּ** here has the tone on the *ultima*, although it is not *perf. consec.* <sup>f177</sup>

V. 21a is an apposition of the subject, which remains the same as in v. 20. Instead of **רָדוּפִי** (Ges. § 61, rem. 2) the *Kerî* is **רָדַפִּי**, *rād'phî* (without any *Makkeph* following), or **רָדַפִּי**, *rād'phî*; cf. on this pronunciation, Psa. 86: 2; 16: 1, and with the *Chethîb* **רָדוּפִי**, the *Chethîb* **צָרוּפָה**, Psa. 26: 2, also **מִיִּרְדִי**, Psa. 30: 4. By the “following of that which is good” David means more particularly that which is brought into exercise in relation to his present foes. <sup>f178</sup>

He closes in vv. 22 f. with sighs for help. No lighting up of the darkness of wrath takes place. The *fides supplex* is not changed into *fides triumphans*. But the closing words, “O Lord, my salvation” (cf. Psa. 51:16), show where the repentance of Cain and that of David differ. True repentance has faith within itself, it despairs of itself, but not of God.

## Psalm 39

### PRAYERS OF ONE SORELY TRIED AT THE SIGHT OF THE PROSPERITY OF THE UNGODLY

**39: 2 I SAID:** “*I will keep my ways against sinning with my tongue;  
I will keep a bridle on my mouth,  
So long as the wicked is before me.*”

**39: 3 I was dumb in silence,  
I held my peace taking no note of prosperity,  
Yet my pain became violent.**

**39: 4 My heart was hot within me,  
While I mused the fire burned —  
I spake with my tongue.**

*39: 5 Make me to know, O Jahve, mine end,  
And the measure of my days how short it is;  
Oh that I might know, how frail I am!*

*39: 6 Behold, Thou hast made my days as a handbreadth,  
And my lifetime is as nothing before Thee.  
Only a mere breath is every man,  
however firm he may stand. (Sela)*

*39: 7 Only as a shadow doth man wander to and fro,  
Only for a breath do they make an uproar;  
He heapeth up and knoweth not who will gather it.*

*39: 8 And now for what shall I wait, Lord!  
My hope is towards Thee.*

*39: 9 From all my transgressions rescue me,  
Make me not a reproach of the profane!*

*39:10 I am dumb, I open not my mouth,  
For Thou, Thou hast done it.*

*39:11 Take away from me Thy stroke,  
Before the blow of Thy hand I must perish.*

*39:12 When Thou with rebukes  
dost chasten a man for iniquity,  
Thou makest his beauty melt away,  
like the damage of the moth —  
Only a breath are all men. (Sela)*

*39:13 O hear my prayer, Jahve,  
And hearken to my cry!  
At my tears be not silent,  
For I am a guest with Thee,  
A sojourner, like all my fathers.*

*39:14 Look away from me, that I may rally,  
Before I go hence and am no more.*

*Psalm 39.* In Psa. 38:14 the poet calls himself a dumb person, who opens not his mouth; this submissive, resigned keeping of silence he affirms of himself in the same words in Psa. 39: 3 also. This forms a prominent characteristic common to the two Psalms, which fully warranted their being placed together as a pair. There is, however, another Psalm, which is still more closely related to Psalm 39, viz., Psalm 62, which, together with Psalm 4, has a similar historical background. The author, in his dignity, is threatened by those who from being false friends have become open enemies, and who revel in the enjoyment of illegitimately acquired power and possessions. From his own

experience, in the midst of which he commits his safety and his honour to God, he derives the general warnings, that to trust in riches is deceptive, and that power belongs alone to God the Avenger — two doctrines, in support of which the issue of the affair with Absalom was a forcible example. Thus it is with Psalm 62, and in like manner Psalm 39 also. Both Psalms bear the name of Jeduthun side by side with the name of David at their head; both describe the nothingness of everything human in the same language; both delight more than other Psalms in the use of the assuring, confident אָדָּ; both have סִלָּה twice; both coincide in some points with the Book of Job; the form of both Psalms, however, is so polished, transparent, and classic, that criticism is not authorized in assigning to this pair of Psalms any particular poet other than David. The reason of the redacteur not placing Psalm 62 immediately after Psalm 39 is to be found in the fact that Psalm 62 is an Elohim-Psalms, which could not stand in the midst of Jahve-Psalms.

To the inscribed לְמִנְצַח, לִידִיתוֹן is added in this instance. The name is also written thus in Psa. 77: 1, 1Ch. 16:38, Neh. 11:17, and always with the *Kerî* יְדוּתוֹן, which, after the analogy of זְבוּלוֹן, is the more easily pronounceable pointing (Psa. 62: 1). It is an offshoot of the form יְדוּת or יְדִית; cf. שְׁבוּת and שְׁבִית, חֶפְשִׁית and חֶפְשִׁוּת, and שְׁבִית. It is the name of one of David's three choir-masters or precentors — the third in conjunction with Asaph and Heman, 1Ch. 16:41 f., 25: 1 ff., 2Ch. 5:12; 35:15, and is, without doubt, the same person as אִיתָן, 1 Chronicles 15, a name which is changed into יְדוּתוֹן after the arrangement in Gibeon, 1 Chronicles 16. Consequently side by side with לְמִנְצַח, לִידִיתוֹן will be the name of the מִנְצַח himself, i.e., the name of the person to whom the song was handed over to be set to music. The fact that in two inscriptions (Psa. 62: 1; 77: 1) we read אֵל instead of the ל of לִידִיתוֹן, does not militate against this. By ל Jeduthun is denoted as the person to whom the song was handed over for performance; and by אֵל, as the person to whom the performance was assigned. The rendering: “to the director of the Jeduthunites,” adopted by Hitzig, is possible regarding the יְדוּתוֹן as used as a generic name like אֶהְרֵן in 1Ch. 12:27; 27:17; but the customary use of the ל in inscriptions is against it.

The Psalm consists of four stanzas without any strophic symmetry. The first three are of only approximately the same compass, and the final smaller stanza has designedly the character of an epilogue.

*Psa. 39: 2-4.* The poet relates how he has resolved to bear his own affliction silently in the face of the prosperity of the ungodly, but that his smart was so overpowering that he was compelled involuntarily to break his silence by loud

complaint. The resolve follows the introductory אָמַרְתִּי in cohortatives. He meant to take heed to his ways, i.e., his manner of thought and action, in all their extent, lest he should sin with his tongue, viz., by any murmuring complaint concerning his own misfortune, when he saw the prosperity of the ungodly. He was resolved to keep (i.e., cause invariably to press) a bridling (cf. on the form, Gen. 30:37), or a bridle (*capistrum*), upon his mouth, so long as he should see the ungodly continuing and sinning in the fulness of his strength, instead of his speedy ruin which one ought to expect. Then he was struck dumb דוּמְיָה, in silence, i.e., as in Psa. 62: 2, cf. Lam. 3:26, in resigned submission, he was silent מַטּוֹב, turned away from (vid., Psa. 28: 1, 1Sa. 7: 8, and frequently) prosperity, i.e., from that in which he saw the evil-doer rejoicing; he sought to silence for ever the perplexing contradiction between this prosperity and the righteousness of God. But this self-imposed silence gave intensity to the repressed pain, and this was thereby נִעְבָּר, stirred up, excited, aroused; the inward heat became, in consequence of restrained complaint, all the more intense (Jer. 20: 9): “and while I was musing a fire was kindled,” i.e., the thoughts and emotions rubbing against one another produced a blazing fire, viz., of irrepressible vexation, and the end of it was: “I spake with my tongue,” unable any longer to keep in my pain. What now follows is not what was said by the poet when in this condition. On the contrary, he turns away from his purpose, which has been proved to be impracticable, to God Himself with the prayer that He would teach him calm submission.

*Psa. 39: 5-7.* He prays God to set the transitoriness of earthly life clearly before his eyes (cf. Psa. 90:12); for if life is only a few spans long, then even his suffering and the prosperity of the ungodly will last only a short time. Oh that God would then grant him to know his end (Job. 6:11), i.e., the end of his life, which is at the same time the end of his affliction, and the measure of his days, how it is with this מָה, *interrog. extenuantis*, as in 8: 5), in order that he may become fully conscious of his own frailty! Hupfeld corrects the text to אָנִי מֵהֶחֱלֵד, after the analogy of Psa. 89:48, because חֵדֵל cannot signify “frail.” But חֵדֵל signifies that which leaves off and ceases, and consequently in this connection, finite and transitory or frail. מָה, *quam*, in connection with an adjective, as in Psa. 8: 2; 31:20; 36: 8; 66: 3; 133: 1. By הֵן (the customary form of introducing the *propositio minor*, Lev. 10:18; 25:20) the preceding petition is supported. God has, indeed, made the days, i.e., the lifetime, of a man מִפְּחוֹת, handbreadths, i.e., He has allotted to it only the short extension of a few handbreadths (cf. יָמִים, a few days, e.g., Isa. 65:20), of which nine make a yard (cf. πῆχυτος χρόνος in Mimnermus, and 1Sa. 20: 3); the duration of human life (on חֵדֵל vid., Psa. 17:14) is as a vanishing nothing before God



the eternal One. The particle אֵל is originally affirmative, and starting from that sense becomes restrictive; just as רַק is originally restrictive and then affirmative. Sometimes also, as is commonly the case with אִכֹּן, the affirmative signification passes over into the adversative (cf. *verum, verum enim vero*). In our passage, agreeably to the restrictive sense, it is to be explained thus: nothing but mere nothingness (cf. Psa. 45:14, Jam. 1: 2) is every man נִצָּב, standing firmly, i.e., though he stand never so firmly, though he be never so steadfast (Zec. 11:16). Here the music rises to tones of bitter lament, and the song continues in v. 7 with the same theme. צֶלֶם, belonging to the same root as צֵל, signifies a shadow-outline, an image; the בּוֹ is, as in Psa. 35: 2, *Beth essentialiae*: he walks about consisting only of an unsubstantial shadow. Only הַבֵּל, breath-like, or after the manner of breath (Psa. 144: 4), from empty, vain motives and with vain results, do they make a disturbance (pausal *fut. energicum*, as in 36: 8); and he who restlessly and noisily exerts himself knows not who will suddenly snatch together, i.e., take altogether greedily to himself, the many things that he heaps up (צָבַר, as in Job. 27:16); cf. Isa. 33: 4, and on *-ām* = ἀνά, Lev. 15:10 (in connection with which אֱלֹהֵי הַדְּבָרִים, cf. Isa. 42:16, is in the mind of the speaker).

*Psa. 39: 8-12.* It is customary to begin a distinct turning-point of a discourse with וְאַתָּה: and now, i.e., in connection with this nothingness of vanity of a life which is so full of suffering and unrest, what am I to hope, *quid sperem* (concerning the perfect, vid., on 11: 3)? The answer to this question which he himself throws out is, that Jahve is the goal of his waiting or hoping. It might appear strange that the poet is willing to make the brevity of human life a reason for being calm, and a ground of comfort. But here we have the explanation. Although not expressly assured of a future life of blessedness, his faith, even in the midst of death, lays hold on Jahve as the Living One and as the God of the living. It is just this which is so heroic in the Old Testament faith, that in the midst of the riddles of the present, and in the face of the future which is lost in dismal night, it casts itself unreservedly into the arms of God. While, however, sin is the root of all evil, the poet prays in v. 9a before all else, that God would remove from him all the transgressions by which he has fully incurred his affliction; and while, given over to the consequences of his sin, he would become, not only to his own dishonour but also to the dishonour of God, a derision to the unbelieving, he prays in v. 9b that God would not permit it to come to this. בָּל, v. 9a, has *Mercha*, and is consequently, as in Psa. 35:10, to be read with *â* (not *ō*), since an accent can never be placed by *Kametz chatûph*. Concerning נָבַל, v. 9b, see on 14: 1. As to the rest he is silent and calm; for God is the author, viz., of his affliction (עָשָׂה, used just as

absolutely as in Psa. 22:32; Psa. 37: 5; 52:11, Lam. 1:21). Without ceasing still to regard intently the prosperity of the ungodly, he recognises the hand of God in his affliction, and knows that he has not merited anything better. But it is permitted to him to pray that God would suffer mercy to take the place of right. **נִגְעַד** is the name he gives to his affliction, as in Psa. 38:12, as being a stroke (blow) of divine wrath; **תִּגְרַת יָדָךְ**, as a quarrel into which God's hand has fallen with him; and by **אֲנִי**, with the almighty (punishing) hand of God, he contrasts himself the feeble one, to whom, if the present state of things continues, ruin is certain. In v. 12 he puts his own personal experience into the form of a general maxim: when with rebukes (**תִּזְכְּחֶנּוּ** from **תִּזְכַּחַת**, collateral form with **תִּזְכַּחַת**, **תִּזְכְּחֶנּוּ**) Thou chastenest a man on account of iniquity (*perf. conditionale*), Thou makest his pleasantness (Isa. 53: 3), i.e., his bodily beauty (Job. 33:21), to melt away, moulder away (**וַתִּמַּס**, *fut. apoc.* from **הִמְסָה** to cause to melt, 6: 7), like the moth (Hos. 5:12), so that it falls away, as a moth-eaten garment falls into rags. Thus do all men become mere nothing. They are sinful and perishing. The thought expressed in v. 6c is here repeated as a refrain. The music again strikes in here, as there.

**Psa. 39:13, 14.** Finally, the poet renews the prayer for an alleviation of his sufferings, basing it upon the shortness of the earthly pilgrimage. The urgent **שְׁמַעָה** is here fuller toned, being **שְׁמַעָה**. <sup>fl79</sup>

Side by side with the language of prayer, tears even appear here as prayer that is intelligible to God; for when the gates of prayer seem to be closed, the gates of tears still remain unclosed (**שַׁעֲרֵי דַמְעוֹת לֹא נִנְעִלוּ**), *B. Berachoth 32b*. As a reason for his being heard, David appeals to the instability and finite character of this earthly life in language which we also hear from his own lips in 1Ch. 29:15. **גֵּר** is the stranger who travels about and sojourns as a guest in a country that is not his native land; **תִּשְׁבָּ** is a sojourner, or one enjoying the protection of the laws, who, without possessing any hereditary title, has settled down there, and to whom a settlement is allotted by sufferance. The earth is God's; that which may be said of the Holy Land (Lev. 25:23) may be said of the whole earth; man has no right upon it, he only remains there so long as God permits him. **בְּכָל-אַבְנֹתַי** glances back even to the patriarchs (Gen. 47: 9, cf. Psa. 23: 4). Israel is, it is true, at the present time in possession of a fixed dwelling-place, but only as the gift of his God, and for each individual it is only during his life, which is but a handbreadth long. May Jahve, then — so David prays — turn away His look of wrath from him, in order that he may shine forth, become cheerful or clear up, before he goes hence and it is too late. **הֲשַׁע** is *imper. apoc. Hiph.* for **הֲשַׁעָה** (in the signification of *Kal*), and

ought, according to the form **הָרַב**, properly to be **הִשָּׁע**; it is, however, pointed just like the *imper. Hiph.* of **שָׂאֵע** in Isa. 6:10, without any necessity for explaining it as meaning *obline (oculos tuos) = connive (Abulwalid)*, which would be an expression unworthy of God. It is on the contrary to be rendered: look away from me; on which compare Job. 7:19; 14: 6; on **אַבְלִיגָה** cf. *ib.* 10:20; 9:27; on **בְּטָרָם אֵלֶךְ**, *ib.* 10:21; on **וְאִינֵנִי**, *ib.* 7: 8, 21. The close of the Psalm, consequently, is re-echoed in many ways in the Book of Job The Book of Job is occupied with the same riddle as that with which this Psalm is occupied. But in the solution of it, it advances a step further. David does not know how to disassociate in his mind sin and suffering, and wrath and suffering. The Book of Job, on the contrary, thinks of suffering and love together; and in the truth that suffering also, even though it be unto death, must serve the highest interests of those who love God, it possesses a satisfactory solution.

## Psalm 40

### THANKSGIVING, AN OFFERING UP OF ONE'S SELF, AND PRAYER

*40: 2 I WAITED patiently upon Jahve,  
And He inclined unto me, and heard my cry.*

*40: 3 And He drew me up out of a pit of destruction,  
out of the mire of the swamp,  
And set my feet upon a rock, made my footsteps firm.*

*40: 4 And put into my mouth a new song, praise unto our God —  
Many see it and fear, and put their trust in Jahve.*

*40: 5 Blessed is the man who maketh Jahve his trust,  
And doth not turn to the proud and to lying apostates.*

*40: 6 Much hast Thou done, Jahve, my God,  
in Thy wonders and Thy thoughts on our behalf;  
Nothing can be compared unto Thee,  
Else would I declare and speak —  
They are too numerous to be numbered.*

*40: 7 Sacrifice and meat-offering dost Thou not desire,  
Ears hast Thou digged for me,  
Burnt-offering and sin-offering dost Thou not require.*

*40: 8 Then said I: "Lo, I come with the roll of the book  
which is written concerning me.*

*40: 9 To do Thy will, my God, do I desire,  
And Thy Law is in my inward part.”*

*40:10 I brought glad tidings of righteousness  
in the great congregation,  
Lo, I closed not my lips;  
Jahve, Thou, even Thou knowest it.*

*40:11 Thy righteousness did I not hide within my heart,  
Thy faithfulness and Thy salvation did I declare,  
I concealed not Thy loving-kindness and  
Thy truth from the great congregation.*

*40:12 Do Thou, then, Jahve, not shut up  
Thy tender mercies from me,  
Let Thy loving-kindness and  
Thy truth continually protect me.*

*40:13 For evils have surrounded me without number,  
Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me and I am not able to see;  
They are more numerous than the hairs of my head,  
And my heart hath failed me.*

*40:14 Be pleased, O Jahve, to deliver me;  
Jahve, to my help make haste!*

*40:15 Let those be ashamed and confounded together  
who seek my soul to destroy it;  
Let those fall back and be put to shame who desire my misfortune.*

*40:16 Let those be struck dumb on account  
of the merited punishment of their shame,  
Who say to me: Aha, aha!*

*40:17 Let all those heartily rejoice in Thee who seek Thee,  
Let those continually say “Jahve be magnified”  
who love Thy salvation.*

*40:18 Though I be both needy and poor,  
The Lord will care for me.  
My help and my deliverer art Thou!  
My God, make no tarrying!*

*Psalm 40.* Psalm 39 is followed by Psalm 40, because the language of thanksgiving with which it opens is, as it were, the echo of the language of prayer contained in the former. If Psalm 40 was composed by David, and not rather by Jeremiah — a question which can only be decided by including Psalm 69 (which see) in the same investigation — it belongs to the number of those Psalms which were composed between Gibeon of Saul and Ziklag. The

mention of the roll of the book in v. 8 harmonizes with the retrospective references to the *Tōra*, which abound in the Psalms belonging to the time of Saul. And to this we may add the vow to praise Jahve בְּקִדְּוָה, vv. 10 f., cf. Psa. 22:26; 35:18; the expression, “more in number than the hairs of my head,” v. 13, cf. Psa. 69: 5; the wish יִצְרֹנֵי, v. 12, cf. Psa. 25:21; the mocking הִשְׁחִיחַ, v. 16, cf. Psa. 35:21, 25; and much besides, on which vid., my *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, S. 457 [transl. vol. ii. p. 149]. The second half has an independent form in Psalm 70. It is far better adapted to form an independent Psalm than the first half, which merely looks back into the past, and for this very reason contains no prayer.

The long lines, more in keeping with the style of prayer than of song, which alternate with disproportionately shorter ones, are characteristic of this Psalm. If with these long lines we associate a few others, which are likewise more or less distinctly indicated, then the Psalm can be easily divided into seven six-line strophes.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, Heb. 10: 5-10, vv. 7-9 of this Psalm are, by following the LXX, taken as the language of the Christ at His coming into the world. There can be no doubt in this particular instance that, as we look to the second part of the Psalm, this rendering is brought about typically. The words of David, the anointed one, but only now on the way to the throne, are so moulded by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of prophecy, that they sound at the same time like the words of the second David, passing through suffering to glory, whose offering up of Himself is the close of the animal sacrifices, and whose person and work are the very kernel and star of the roll of the Law. We are not thereby compelled to understand the whole Psalm as typically predictive. It again descends from the typically prophetic height to which it has risen even from v. 10 onwards; and from v. 13 onwards, the typically prophetic strain which still lingers in vv. 10 and 11 has entirely ceased.

*Psa. 40: 1-4.* David, who, though not without some hesitation, we regard as the author, now finds himself in a situation in which, on the one hand, he has just been rescued from danger, and, on the other, is still exposed to peril. Under such circumstances praise rightly occupies the first place, as in general, according to Psa. 50:23, gratitude is the way to salvation. His hope, although תִּזְחַלֵּת מִמְּשָׁכָה (Pro. 13:12), has not deceived him; he is rescued, and can now again sing a new song of thanksgiving, an example for others, strengthening their trust. קָיָה קְיֹיִתִי, I waited with constancy and perseverance. יְהוָה is the accusative as in Psa. 25: 5; 130: 5, and not the vocative as in Psa. 39: 8. אֲסֹנֶה is to be supplied in thought to יְיָ, although after the analogy of Psa. 17: 6; 31: 3, one might have looked for the *Hiph.* יִטְ

instead of the *Kal*. בור שֶׁאוֹן does not mean a pit of roaring (of water), since שֶׁאוֹן standing alone (see, on the other hand, Psa. 65: 8, Isa. 17:12 f.) has not this meaning; and, moreover, “rushing, roaring” (Hengstenberg), tumultuous waters of a pit or a cistern does not furnish any idea that is true to nature; neither does it mean a pit of falling in, since שֶׁאֶדָה does not exhibit the signification *deorsum labi*; but the meaning is: a pit of devastation, of destruction, of ruin (Jer. 25:31; 46:17), vid., *supra* on 35: 8. Another figure is “mire of the marsh” (וַיִּן) found only here and in Psa. 69: 3), i.e., water, in the miry bottom of which one can find no firm footing — a combination like מִמַּרְגְּשֵׁם, Zec. 10: 1, אֲדָמַת־עֶפְרַיִם, Dan. 12: 2, explained in the Mishna, *Mikvaoth* ix. 2, by טֵיט הַבוֹרוֹת (mire of the cisterns). Taking them out of this, Jahve placed his feet upon a rock, established his footsteps, i.e., removed him from the danger which surrounded him, and gave him firm ground under his feet. The high rock and the firm footsteps are the opposites of the deep pit and the yielding miry bottom. This deliverance afforded him new matter for thanksgiving (cf. Psa. 33: 3), and became in his mouth “praise to our God;” for the deliverance of the chosen king is an act of the God of Israel on behalf of His chosen people. The futures in v. 4b (with an alliteration similar to Psa. 52: 8) indicate, by their being thus cumulative, that they are intended of the present and of that which still continues in the future.

*Psa. 40: 5, 6.* He esteems him happy who puts his trust (מִבְּטַחֹוּ, with a latent *Dagesh*, as, according to Kimchi, also in Psa. 71: 5, Job. 31:24, Jer. 17: 7) in Jahve, the God who has already made Himself glorious in Israel by innumerable wonderful works. Jer. 17: 7 is an echo of this אֲשֶׁר־י. Psa. 52: 9 (cf. Psa. 91: 9) shows how Davidic is the language. The expression is designedly not הָאִישׁ, but הַגִּבּוֹר, which is better adapted to designate the man as being tempted to put trust in himself. רָהֵב from רָהַב (not from רָהַב) are the impetuous or violent, who in their arrogance cast down everything. כָּזֵב שִׁמִּי, “turners aside of falsehood” (שִׁמִּי = שָׁמָה, cf. Psa. 101: 3), is the expression for apostates who yield to falsehood instead of to the truth: to take כָּזֵב as accusative of the aim is forbidden by the *status construct.*; to take it as the genitive in the sense of the accusative of the object (like הַלְכִי תָם, Pro. 2: 7) is impracticable, because שִׁמִּי (שָׁמָה) does not admit of a transitive sense; כָּזֵב is, therefore, *genit. qualit.* like אֲוִן in Psa. 59: 6. This second strophe contains two practical applications of that which the writer himself has experienced. From this point of view, he who trusts in God appears to the poet to be supremely happy, and a distant view of God’s gracious rule over His own people opens up before him. נִפְלְאוֹת are the thoughts of God realized, and

מְחֻשְׁבוֹת those that are being realized, as in Jer. 51:29, Isa. 55: 8 f. רְבוּת is an accusative of the predicate: in great number, in rich abundance; אֱלֵינוּ, “for us,” as e.g., in Jer. 15: 1 (Ew. § 217, c). His doings towards Israel were from of old a fulness of wondrous deeds and plans of deliverance, which was ever realizing and revealing itself. There is not עֲרֹךְ אֱלֹהִים, a possibility of comparison with Thee, וְסֹסִים וְסֹסִים — עֲרֹךְ as in Psa. 89: 7, Isa. 40:18 — they are too powerful (עֲצֵם of a powerful sum, as in Psa. 69: 5; 139:17, cf. Jer. 5: 6) for one to enumerate. According to Rosenmüller, Stier, and Hupfeld, אֵין עֲרֹךְ אֱלֹהִים even affirms the same thing in other words: it is not possible to lay them forth to Thee (before Thee); but that man should “lay forth” (Symmachus ἀθέσθαι) before God His marvellous works and His thoughts of salvation, is an unbecoming conception. The cohortative forms, which follow, אֲנִידָה וְאִדְבָּרָה, admit of being taken as a protasis to what follows, after the analogy of Job. 19:18; 16: 6; 30:26, Psa. 139: 8: if I wish to declare them and speak them forth, they are too powerful (numerous) to be enumerated (Ges. § 128, 1, d). The accentuation, however, renders it as a parenthetical clause: I would (as in Psa. 51:18; 55:13, Job. 6:10) declare them and speak them forth. He would do this, but because God, in the fulness of His wondrous works and thoughts of salvation, is absolutely without an equal, he is obliged to leave it undone — they are so powerful (numerous) that the enumeration of them falls far short of their powerful fulness. The words *alioqui pronunciarem et eloquerer* have the character of a parenthesis, and, as v. 7 shows, this accords with the style of this Psalm.

*Psa. 40: 7-9.* The connection of the thoughts is clear: great and manifold are the proofs of Thy loving-kindness, how am I to render thanks to Thee for them? To this question he first of all gives a negative answer: God delights not in outward sacrifices. The sacrifices are named in a twofold way: (a) according to the material of which they consist, viz., זֶבֶח, the animal sacrifice, and מִנְחָה, the meal or meat offering (including the נֶסֶךְ, the wine or drink offering, which is the inalienable accessory of the accompanying *mincha*); (b) according to their purpose, in accordance with which they bring about either the turning towards one of the good pleasure of God, as more especially in the case of the עֹלָה, or, as more especially in the case of the חֲטָאת (in this passage חֲטָאת), the turning away of the divine displeasure. The fact of the זֶבֶח and עֹלָה standing first, has, moreover, its special reason in the fact that זֶבֶח specially designates the *shelamim* offerings, and to the province of these latter belongs the thank-offering proper, viz., the *tôda-shelamim* offering; and that עֹלָה as the sacrifice of adoration (προσευχή), which is also always a

general thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία), is most natural, side by side with the shalemim, to him who gives thanks. When it is said of God, that He does not delight in and desire such non-personal sacrifices, there is as little intention as in Jer. 7:22 (cf. Amo. 5:21 ff.) of saying that the sacrificial *Tōra* is not of divine origin, but that the true, essential will of God is not directed to such sacrifices.

Between these synonymous utterances in v. 7a and 7c stands the clause לִי אָזְנִים כָּרִיתָ . In connection with this position it is natural, with Rosenmüller, Gesenius, De Wette, and Stier, to explain it “ears hast Thou pierced for me” = this hast Thou engraven upon my mind as a revelation, this disclosure hast Thou imparted to me. But, although כָּרָה, to dig, is even admissible in the sense of digging through, piercing (vid., on Psa. 22:17), there are two considerations against this interpretation, viz.: (1) that then one would rather look for אָזֵן instead of אָזְנִים after the analogy of the phrases אָזֵן, גָּלָה אָזֵן, אָזֵן הָעֵינַי, and פָּתַח אָזֵן, since the inner sense, in which the external organs of sense, with their functions, have their basis of unity, is commonly denoted by the use of the singular; (2) that according to the syntax, כָּרִיתָ, הַפְּצֵתָ, and שָׁאַלְתָּ are all placed on the same level. Thus, therefore, it is with this very לִי אָזְנִים כָּרִיתָ that the answer is intended, in its positive form, to begin; and the primary passage, 1Sa. 15:22, favours this view:

*“Hath Jahve delight in whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in one’s obeying the voice of Jahve? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, to attend better than the fat of rams!”*

The assertion of David is the echo of this assertion of Samuel, by which the sentence of death was pronounced upon the kingship of Saul, and consequently the way of that which is well-pleasing to God was traced out for the future kingship of David. God — says David — desires not outward sacrifices, but obedience; ears hath He digged for me, i.e., formed the sense of hearing, bestowed the faculty of hearing, and given therewith the instruction to obey.

f180

The idea is not that God has given him ears in order to hear that disclosure concerning the true will of God (Hupfeld), but, in general, to hear the word of God, and to obey that which is heard. God desires not sacrifices but hearing ears, and consequently the submission of the person himself in willing obedience. To interpret it “Thou hast appropriated me to Thyself עָזְבָתָ לְעַבְדְּךָ,” after Exo. 21: 6, Deu. 15:17, would not be out of harmony with the context; but it is at once shut out by the fact that the word is not אָזֵן, but אָזְנִים. Concerning the generalizing rendering of the LXX, ὄμμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μου,



following which Apollinaris renders it *αὐτὰρ ἔμοι Βροτέης τεκτῆναο σάρκα γενέθλης*, and the Italic (which is also retained in the *Psalterium Romanum*), *corpus autem perfecisti mihi; vide* on Heb. 10: 5, *Commentary*, S. 460 f. [transl. vol. ii. p. 153].

The **אֲנִי אֹמְרָתִי**, which follows, now introduces the expression of the obedience, with which he placed himself at the service of God, when he became conscious of what God's special will concerning him was. With reference to the fact that obedience and not sacrifice has become known to him as the will and requirement of God, he has said: "Lo, I come," etc. By the words "Lo, I come," the servant places himself at the call of his master, Num. 22:38, 2Sa. 19:21. It is not likely that the words **סֵפֶר כְּתוּב עָלַי** **בְּמַגֵּלְתָּ** then form a parenthesis, since v. 9 is not a continuation of that "Lo, I come," but a new sentence. We take the *Beth*, as in Psa. 66:13, as the *Beth* of the accompaniment; the roll of the book is the *Tôra*, and more especially Deuteronomy, written upon skins and rolled up together, which according to the law touching the king (Deu. 17:14-20) was to be the vade-mecum of the king of Israel. And **עָלַי** cannot, as synonymous with the following **בְּמֵאֵי**, signify as much as "written upon my heart," as De Wette and Thenius render it — a meaning which, as Maurer has already correctly replied, **עָלַי** obtains elsewhere by means of a conception that is altogether inadmissible in this instance. On the contrary, this preposition here, as in 2Ki. 22:13, denotes the object of the contents; for **כָּתַב אֵל** signifies to write anything concerning any one, so that he is the subject one has specially in view (e.g., of the judicial decision recorded in writing, Job. 13:26). Because Jahve before all else requires obedience to His will, David comes with the document of this will, the *Tôra*, which prescribes to him, as a man, and more especially as the king, the right course of conduct. Thus presenting himself to the God of revelation, he can say in v. 9, that willing obedience to God's Law is his delight, as he then knows that the written Law is written even in his heart, or, as the still stronger expression used here is, in his bowels. The principal form of **מֵאֵי**, does not occur in the Old Testament; it was **מַעִי** (from **מֵאָה**, **מֵעָה**, or even **מֵעִי**), according to current Jewish pronunciation **מַאִים** (which Kimchi explains dual); and the word properly means (vid., on Isa. 48:19) the soft parts of the body, which even elsewhere, like **רֵחַמִּים**, which is synonymous according to its original meaning, appear pre-eminently as the seat of sympathy, but also of fear and of pain. This is the only passage in which it occurs as the locality of a mental acquisition, but also with the associated notion of loving acceptance and cherishing protection (cf. the Syriac phrase **סַם בְּגוּ מַעִיא**, *som b<sup>e</sup> gau m<sup>e</sup> ajo*, to shut up in the heart = to love). That the *Tôra* is to be written upon the tables of the heart is even indicated by the Deuteronomion, Deu. 6: 6, cf.

Pro. 3: 3; 7: 3. This reception of the *Tôra* into the inward parts among the people hitherto estranged from God is, according to Jer. 36:33, the characteristic of the new covenant. But even in the Old Testament there is among the masses of Israel “a people with My law in their heart” (Isa. 51: 7), and even in the Old Testament, “he who hath the law of his God in his heart” is called righteous (Psa. 37:31). As such an one who has the *Tôra* within him, not merely beside him, David presents himself on the way to the throne of God.

*Psa. 40:10, 11.* The self-presentation before Jahve, introduced by אָמַרְתִּי אֲנִי, extends from הִנֵּה to מַעַי; consequently בִּשְׂרָתִי joins on to אָמַרְתִּי, and the אֲכַלֵּא which stands in the midst of perfects describes the synchronous past. The whole is a retrospect. בִּשֵׁר, Arab. *bššr* (root בִּש), starting from its sensible primary signification to scrape off, scratch off, rub smooth, means: to smooth any one (*glätten*), Engl. to gladden one, i.e., *vultum ejus diducere*, to make him joyful and glad, more especially to cheer one by good news (e.g., *basharahu* or *bashsharuhu bi-maulûdin*, he has cheered him by the intelligence of the birth of a son), in Hebrew directly equivalent to εὐαγγελίζειν, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι). He has proclaimed to all Israel the evangel of Jahve’s justifying and gracious rule, which only changes into retribution towards those who despise His love; and he can appeal to the Omniscient One (Jer. 15:15), that neither through fear of men, nor through shame and indolence, has he restrained his lips from confessing Him. God’s conduct, in accordance with the prescribed order of redemption, is as a matter of fact called צִדְקָה, and as an attribute of His holy love, צִדְקָה; just as אֱמוּנָה is His faithfulness which fulfils the promises made and which does not suffer hope to be put to shame, and תְּשׁוּעָה is His salvation as it is manifested in facts. This rich matter for the preaching of the evangel, which may be comprehended in the two words אָמַת וְהַסֵּד, the Alpha and Omega of God’s self-attestation in the course of the redemptive history, he has not allowed to slumber as a dead, unfruitful knowledge hidden deep down in his heart. The new song which Jahve put into his mouth, he has also really sung. Thus far we have the first part of the song, which renders thanks for past mercies.

*Psa. 40:12, 13.* Now, in accordance with the true art of prayer, petition develops itself out of thanksgiving. The two בָּלֵא, v. 10 and here, stand in a reciprocal relation to one another: he refrained not his lips; therefore, on His part, let not Jahve withhold His tender mercies so that they should not be exercised towards him (מִמְנִי). There is just the same correlation of mercy and truth in v. 11 and here: he wishes continually to stand under the protection of these two saving powers, which he has gratefully proclaimed before all Israel. With בִּי, v. 13, he bases these desires upon his own urgent need. רְעוּת are the

evils, which come even upon the righteous (Psa. 34:20) as trials or as chastenings. אָפְפוּ עָלַי is a more circumstantial form of expression instead of אָפְפוּנִי, 18: 5. His misdeeds have taken hold upon him, i.e., overtaken him in their consequences (הַשִּׁיג, as in Deu. 28:15, 45; cf. לָכַד, Pro. 5:22), inasmuch as they have changed into decrees of suffering. He cannot see, because he is closely encompassed on all sides, and a free and open view is thereby altogether taken from him (the expression is used elsewhere of loss of sight, 1Sa. 3: 2; 4:15, 1Ki. 14: 4). The interpretation adopted by Hupfeld and Hitzig: I am not able to survey, viz., their number, puts into the expression more than it really expresses in the common usage of the language. His heart, i.e., the power of vital consistence, has forsaken him he is disconcerted, dejected, as it were driven to despair (Psa. 38:11). This feeling of the misery of sin is not opposed to the date of the Psalm being assigned to the time of Saul, vid., on Psa. 31:11.

*Psa. 40:14-16.* In the midst of such sufferings, which, the longer they last, discover him all the more to himself as a sinner, he prays for speedy help. The cry for help in v. 14 turns with רָצָה towards the will of God; for this is the root of all things. As to the rest, it resembles Psa. 22:20 (Psa. 38:23). The persecuted one wishes that the purpose of his deadly foes may as it were rebound against the protection of God and miserably miscarry. לְסַפְּתָהּ, *ad abripiendam eam* (with *Dagesh* in the פ according to Ges. § 45, 2, Ew. § 245, a, and not as Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 1235, states, aspirated <sup>f181</sup>), is added to מִבְּקֵשֵׁי נַפְשִׁי by way of explanation and definiteness. יִשְׁמָו, from שָׁמַם, to become torpid, here used of outward and inward paralysis, which is the result of overpowering and as it were bewitching surprise or fright, and is called by the Arabs *ro'b* or *ra'b* (paralysis through terror) [cf. *Job*, note at 18:12]. An אֵל following upon יִשְׁמָו looks at first sight as though it introduced the object and reason of this fright; it is therefore not: as a reward, in consequence of their infamy, which would not be אֵל-עֲקָב, but merely the accusative עֲקָב (Isa. 5:23, Arabic *qîba*), it is rather: on account of the reward (Psa. 19:12) of their disgrace (cf. as belonging to the same period, Psa. 109:29; 35:26), i.e., of the reward which consists in their being put to shame (Hitzig). לִי as in Psa. 3: 3; 41: 6: with reference to me. חָסְךָ חָסְךָ (Aquila, ἁὰ ἁὰ, ἀντὶ συγχαρησάμενος, as Eusebius says, οὕτως ἐχούση τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ) is an exclamation of sarcastic delight, which finds its satisfaction in another's misfortune (Psa. 35:25).

*Psa. 40:17, 18.* On v. 17 compare Psa. 35:27. David wishes, as he does in that passage, that the pious may most heartily rejoice in God, the goal of their longing; and that on account of the salvation that has become manifest, which

they love (2Ti. 4: 8), they may continually say: Let Jahve become great, i.e., be magnified or celebrated with praises! In v. 18 with אָנִי he comes back to his own present helpless state, but only in order to contrast with it the confession of confident hope. True he is אֱנִי אֲשֶׁר־בִּיּוֹן (as in Psa. 109:22; 136: 1, cf. 25:16), but He who ruleth over all will care for him: *Dominus sollicitus erit pro me* (Jerome). חֲשַׁב in the same sense in which in v. 6 the מַחְשְׁבוֹת, i.e., God's thoughts of salvation, is conceived of (cf. the corresponding North-Palestinian expression in Jon. 1: 6). A sigh for speedy help (אֶל־הַצְּחָק, as in Dan. 9:19 with a transition of the merely tone-long *Tsere* into a pausal *Pathach*, and here in connection with a preceding closed syllable, Olshausen, § 91, *d*, under the accompanying influence of two final letters which incline towards the *a* sound) closes this second part of the Psalm. The first part is nothing but thanksgiving, the second is exclusively prayer.

## Psalm 41

### COMPLAINT OF A SUFFERER OF BEING SURROUNDED BY HOSTILE AND TREACHEROUS PERSONS

*41: 2 BLESSED is he who regardeth the afflicted,  
In the day of evil Jahve will deliver him.*

*41: 3 Jahve will protect him and preserve him,  
That he may be pronounced happy in the land;  
And Thou dost not give him over to the greed of his enemies.*

*41: 4 Jahve will support him on the bed of sickness,  
All his couch dost Thou turn, when he falleth sick.*

*41: 5 As for me, I say: Jahve, be merciful unto me,  
O heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee.*

*41: 6 Mine enemies, however, speak evil of me:  
“When will he die and his name perish?!”*

*41: 7 And if one cometh to see me, he speaketh deceit,  
His heart gathereth that which is groundless to itself,  
He goeth abroad, he telleth it.*

*41: 8 Together against me do all those  
whisper one to another who hate me,  
Against me do they imagine evil for me:*

*41: 9 “An incurable evil is welded to him,  
And when once he lieth down he will not rise up again.”*

*41:10 Even the man of my friendship in whom I trusted,  
Who did eat of my bread, lifteth his heel high against me.*

*41:11 And Thou, Jahve, be merciful unto me and raise me up,  
Then will I requite them.*

*41:12 By this I should like to know, that Thou hast pleasure in me:  
That mine enemy cannot exult over me.*

*41:13 And as for me, in mine integrity dost Thou uphold me,  
And dost set me before Thine eyes for ever.*

**41:14 BLESSED BE JAHVE THE GOD OF ISRAEL  
FROM EVERLASTING TO EVERLASTING.  
AMEN, AMEN.**

*Psalm 41.* After a Psalm with אֲשֶׁר follows one beginning with אֲשֶׁר; so that two Psalms with אֲשֶׁר close the First Book of the Psalms, which begins with אֲשֶׁר. Psalm 41 belongs to the time of the persecution by Absalom. Just as the Jahve-Psalms 39 forms with the Elohim-Psalms 62 a coherent pair belonging to this time, so does also the Jahve-Psalms 41 with the Elohim-Psalms 55. These two Psalms have this feature in common, viz., that the complaint concerning the Psalmist's foes dwells with especial sadness upon some faithless bosom-friend. In Psalm 41 David celebrates the blessing which accompanies sincere sympathy, and depicts the hostility and falseness which he himself experiences in his sickness, and more especially from a very near friend. It is the very same person of whom he complains in Psalm 55, that he causes him the deepest sorrow — no ideal character, as Hengstenberg asserts; for these Psalms have the most distinctly impressed individual physiognomy of the writer's own times. In Psalm 55 the poet wishes for the wings of a dove, in order that, far away from the city, he might seek for himself a safe spot in the wilderness; for in the city deceit, violence, and mischief prevail, and the storm of a wide-spread conspiracy is gathering, in which he himself sees his most deeply attached friend involved. We need only supplement what is narrated in the second Book of Samuel by a few features drawn from these two Psalms, and these Psalms immediately find a satisfactory explanation in our regarding the time of their composition as the period of Absalom's rebellion. The faithless friend is that Ahithophel whose counsels, according to 2Sa. 16:23, had with David almost the appearance of being divine oracles. Absalom was to take advantage of a lingering sickness under which his father suffered, in order to play the part of the careful and impartial judge and to steal the heart of the men of Israel. Ahithophel supported him in this project, and in four years after Absalom's reconciliation with his father the end was gained. These four years were for David a time of increasing care and anxiety; for that which was planned cannot have remained altogether concealed from him, but he had

neither the courage nor the strength to smother the evil undertaking in the germ. His love for Absalom held him back; the consciousness of his own deed of shame and bloodshed, which was now notorious, deprived him of the alacrity essential to energetic interference; and the consciousness of the divine judgments, which ought to follow his sin, must have determined him to leave the issue of the conspiracy that was maturing under his very eyes entirely to the compassion of his God, without taking any action in the matter himself. From the standpoint of such considerations, Psalm 41 and 55 lose every look of being alien to the history of David and his times. One confirmation of their Davidic origin is the kindred contents of Psalm 28.

Jesus explains (Joh. 13:18) that in the act of Judas Iscariot Psa. 41:10 is fulfilled, ὁ τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον, ἐπήρην ἐπ' ἐμε' τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ (not following the LXX), and Joh. 17:12, Act. 1:16 assume in a general way that the deed and fate of the traitor are foretold in the Old Testament Scriptures, viz., in the Davidic Psalms of the time of Absalom — the treachery and the end of Ahithophel belong to the most prominent typical features of David's affliction in this second stage of persecution (vid., Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, ii. 122).

*Psa. 41: 2-4.* The Psalm opens by celebrating the lot, so rich in promises, of the sympathetic man. לַדָּל is a general designation of the poor (e.g., Exo. 30:15), of the sick and weakly (Gen. 41:19), of the sick in mind (2Sa. 13: 4), and of that which outwardly or inwardly is tottering and consequently weak, frail. To show sympathising attention, thoughtful consideration towards such an one (לְהַשְׁכִּיל אֶל as in Neh. 8:13, cf. אֶל Pro. 17:20) has many promises. The verb חָיָה, which elsewhere even means to call to life again (Psa. 71:20), in this instance side by side with preserving, viz., from destruction, has the signification of preserving life or prolonging life (as in Psa. 30: 4; 22:30). The *Pual* אֲשַׂר signifies to be made happy (Pro. 3:18), but also declaratively: to be pronounced happy (Isa. 9:15); here, on account of the בְּאֲרָץ that stands with it, it is the latter. The *Chethîb* אֲשַׂר sets forth as an independent promise that which the *Kerî* אֲשַׂר joins on to what has gone before as a consequence. אֶל, v. 3c (cf. Psa. 34: 6 and frequently), expresses a negative with full sympathy in the utterance. נָתַן בְּנֶפֶשׁ as in Psa. 27:12. The supporting in v. 4a is a keeping erect, which stops or arrests the man who is sinking down into death and the grave. דָּוִי (= *davj*, similar form to מַאֲ, שָׁמִי, but wanting in the syllable before the tone) means sickness. If v. 4a is understood of the supporting of the head after the manner of one who waits upon the sick (cf. Son. 2: 6), then v. 4 must, with Mendelssohn and others, be understood of the making of the couch or bed. But what then is neat by the

word **מִשְׁכַּב כָּל** is a sick-bed in Exo. 21:18 in the sense of being bedridden; and **הַפְּכֵתָהּ** (cf. Psa. 30:12) is a changing of it into convalescence. By **כָּל-מִשְׁכַּבוֹ** is not meant the constant lying down of such an one, but the affliction that casts him down, in all its extent. This Jahve turns or changes, so often as such an one is taken ill (**בְּהִלְיוֹ**, at his falling sick, parallel with **דָּוַעַל-עַרְשׁוֹ**). He gives a complete turn to the “sick-bed” towards recovery, so that not a vestige of the sickness remains behind.

**Psa. 41: 5-7.** He, the poet, is treated in his distress of soul in a manner totally different from the way just described which is so rich in promises of blessing. He is himself just such a **דָּל**, towards whom one ought to manifest sympathising consideration and interest. But, whilst he is addressing God in the language of penitential prayer for mercy and help, his enemies speak evil to him, i.e., with respect to him, wishing that he might die and that his name might perish. **רָפְאָה** is as an exception *Milra*, inasmuch as **ס** draws the tone to its own syllable; cf. on the other hand **רָגְנָהּ**, Isa. 32:11 (Hitzig). **מָתִי** (prop. extension, length of time) has only become a Semitic interrogative in the signification *quando* by the omission of the interrogative **אֵי** (common Arabic in its full form Arab. *ymtā, êmata*). **וְאֵבֶר** is a continuation of the future. In v. 7 one is singled out and made prominent, and his hypocritically malicious conduct described. **רְאוּתָהּ** of a visit to a sick person as in 2Sa. 13: 5 f., 2Ki. 8:29. **אִם** is used both with the *perf.* (Psa. 50:18; 63: 7; 78:34; 94:18, Gen. 38: 9, Amo. 7: 2, Isa. 24:13; 28:25) and with the *fut.* (Psa. 68:14, Job. 14:14), like *quum*, as a blending together of *si* and *quando*, Germ. *wenn* (if) and *wann* (when). In **יְדַבֵּר לְבוֹ** two *Rebias* come together, the first of which has the greater value as a distinctive, according to the rule laid down in Baer's *Psalterium*, p. xiv. Consequently, following the accents, it must not be rendered: “falsehood doth his heart speak.” The LXX, Vulgate, and Targum have discerned the correct combination of the words. Besides, the accentuation, as is seen from the Targum and expositors, proceeds on the assumption that **לְבוֹ** is equivalent to **בְּלִבּוֹ**. But why may it not be the subject-notion: “His heart gathereth” is an expression of the activity of his mind and feelings, concealed beneath a feigned and friendly outward bearing. The asyndeton portrays the despatch with which he seeks to make the material for slander, which has been gathered together, public both in the city and in the country.

**Psa. 41: 8-10.** Continuation of the description of the conduct of the enemies and of the false friend. **הִתְלַחֵשׁ**, as in 2Sa. 12:19, to whisper to one another, or to whisper among themselves; the *Hithpa.* sometimes (cf. Gen. 42: 1) has a

reciprocal meaning like the *Niphal*. The intelligence brought out by hypocritical visitors of the invalid concerning his critical condition is spread from mouth to mouth by all who wish him ill as satisfactory news; and in fact in whispers, because at that time caution was still necessary. עָלַי stands twice in a prominent position in the sense of *contra me*. רָעָה לִי belong together: they maliciously invent what will be the very worst for him (going beyond what is actually told them concerning him). In this connection there is a feeling in favour of בְּלִיאַל being intended of an evil fate, according to 18: 5, and not according to Psa. 101: 3 (cf. Deu. 15: 9) of pernicious or evil thought and conduct. And this view is also supported by the predicate יָצוּק בּוֹ: “a matter of destruction, an incurable evil (Hitzig) is poured out upon him,” i.e., firmly cast upon him after the manner of casting metal (Job. 41:15 f.), so that he cannot get free from it, and he that has once had to lie down will not again rise up. Thus do we understand אֲשֶׁר in v. 9b; there is no occasion to take it as an accusative by departing from the most natural sense, as Ewald does, or as a conjunction, as Hitzig does. Even the man of his peace, or literally of his harmonious relationship (אִישׁ שְׁלוֹם) as in Oba. 1: 7, Jer. 20:10; 38:22), on whom he has depended with fullest confidence, who did eat his bread, i.e., was his messmate (cf. Psa. 55:15), has made his heel great against him, LXX ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν. The combination הִגְדִּיל עֶקֶב is explained by the fact that עֶקֶב is taken in the sense of a thrust with the heel, a kick: to give a great kick, i.e., with a good swing of the foot.

**Psa. 41:11-13.** Having now described their behaviour towards him, sick in soul and body as he is, so devoid of affection, yea, so malignantly hostile and so totally contrary to the will and promise of God, David prays that God would raise him up, for he is now lying low, sick in soul and in body. The prayer is followed, as in 39:14 and many other passages, by the future with *ah*: that I may be able to requite them, or: then will I requite them. What is meant is the requiting which it was David’s duty as a duly constituted king to exercise, and which he did really execute by the power of God, when he subdued the rebellion of Absalom and maintained his ground in opposition to faithlessness and meanness. Instead of בּוֹאֵת אֲדַע (Gen. 42:33, cf. 15: 8, Exo. 7:17, Num. 16:28, Jos. 3:10) the expression is בּוֹאֵת יִדְעֵתִי in the sense of (*ex hoc*) *cognoverim*. On חִפְצָתָ בִּי cf. Psa. 18:20; 22: 9; 35:27. By the second בִּי, the בּוֹאֵת, which points forwards, is explained. The adversatively accented subject אֲנִי stands first in v. 13a as a *nom. absol.*, just as in Psa. 35:13. V. 13 states, retrospectively from the standpoint of fulfilment, what will then be made manifest and assure him of the divine good pleasure, viz., Jahve upholds him (תִּמְךָ as in Psa. 63: 9), and firmly sets him as His chosen one before Him (cf.



Psa. 39: 6) in accordance with the Messianic promise in 2Sa. 7:16, which speaks of an unlimited future.

*Psa. 41:14.* The closing doxology of the First Book, vid., Introduction, p. 8. Concerning בְּרִיךְ vid., 18:47. The expression “from aeon to aeon” is, according to *Berachoth* ix. 5, directed against those who deny the truth of the future world. אָמֵן אָמֵן (a double ἀληθές or ἀληθῶς) seals it in a climactic form.

## Second Book of the Psalter

### PSALMS 42-72

#### **Psalms 42-43**

#### LONGING FOR ZION IN A HOSTILE COUNTRY

*42: 2 AS a hind, which panteth after the water-brooks,  
So panteth my soul after Thee, Elohim.*

*42: 3 My soul thirsteth for Elohim, for the living God:  
When shall I come and appear before Elohim?!*

*42: 4 My tears have been my food by day and night,  
While they say continually unto me: Where is thy God?*

*42: 5 I think thereon, pouring out my soul within me:  
How I passed along among the throng,  
how I accompanied them to the house of Elohim  
Among the sound of rejoicing and thanksgiving,  
— a multitude keeping holy-day.*

*42: 6 Why art thou bowed down, O my soul, and why groanest thou within me?  
Hope in Elohim, for I shall yet give thanks to Him,  
That He is the health of my countenance and my God.*

*42: 7 Within me is my soul bowed down, therefore do I remember Thee  
From the land of Jordan and of the Hermôn's, from the mountain of Miz'ar.*

*42: 8 Flood calleth to flood at the sound of Thy cataracts,  
All Thy breakers and Thy billows have passed over me.*

*42: 9 By day Jahve will command His loving-kindness,  
And at night a song concerning Him is with me, prayer to the God of my life.*

*42:10 Therefore say I to God, my rock: Why dost Thou forget me?  
Why must I go mourning under the oppression of the enemy?*

*42:11 Like a crushing in my bones my oppressors scoff at me,  
While they say to me continually: Where is thy God?*

*42:12 Why art thou bowed down, O my soul, and why groanest thou within me?  
Hope in Elohim, for I shall yet give thanks to Him,  
That He is the health of my countenance and my God.*

*43: 1 JUDGE me, Elohim, and plead my cause against an unmerciful people,  
From the man of deceit and roguery be Thou pleased to rescue me;*

*43: 2 For Thou art God, my fortress, why dost Thou spurn me?  
Why must I go about mourning under the oppression of the enemy?*

*43: 3 Send Thy light and Thy truth, let them lead me,  
Let them bring me to Thy holy mountain and to Thy tabernacles —*

*43: 4 Then will I go in unto the altar of Elohim,  
To the God of my exultant joy,  
And give thanks to Thee with the cithern, Elohim my God.*

*43: 5 Why art thou bowed down, O my soul, and why groanest thou within me?  
Hope in Elohim, for I shall yet give thanks to Him,  
That He is the health of my countenance and my God.*

*Psalms 42-43.* The Second Book of Psalms consists entirely of Elohimic Psalms (vid., Introduction, p. 12); for whilst in the First Book יהוה occurred 272 times and אלהים only 15 times, the relation is here reversed: אלהים occurs 164 times, and יהוה only 30 times, and in almost every instance by a departure from the customary mode of expression for reasons that lie close at hand.

At the head of these Psalms written in the Elohimic style there stand seven inscribed לַבְנֵי־קִרְחָה. That here as in לְאַסָּף the ל is *Lamed acutoris*, is made clear by the fact that none of these Psalms, as might be expected, have לְדָוִד in addition to the name of the author. The LXX renders it τοῖς υἱοῖς Κορέ, just as it does τῷ Δαυδ, without distinguishing the one ל from the other indicating the authorship, and even in the Talmud is similar meaning to the *Lamed of לְדָוִד* is assumed. It is certainly remarkable that instead of an author it is always the family that is named, a rule from which Psalm 88 (which see) is only a seeming departure. The designation “*Bohmische Brüder*” in the hymnology of the German church is very similar. Probably the Korahitic songs originally formed a book of themselves, which bore the title שִׁירֵי בְנֵי קִרְחָה or something similar; and then the בְנֵי קִרְחָה of this title passed over to the inscription of each separate song of those incorporated in two groups in the Psalm-collection, just as appears also to be the case with the inscription

שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת, which is repeated fifteen times. Or we must suppose that it had become a family custom in the circle of the singers among the Korahites to allow the individual to retreat behind the joint responsibility of family unity, and, vying together, to expiate the name of their unfortunate ancestor by the best liturgical productions.

For Korah, the great-grandson of Levi, and grandson of *Kehāth*, is the same as he who perished by a divine judgment on account of his rebellion against Moses and Aaron (Numbers 16), whose sons, however, were not involved with him in this judgment (Num. 26:11). In David's time the **בְּנֵי קֹרַח** were one of the most renowned families of the Levite race of the Kehathites. The kingship of the promise very soon found valiant adherents and defenders in this family. Korahites gathered together to David to Ziklag, in order to aid in defending him and his title to the throne with the sword (1Ch. 12: 6); for **הַקְּרָחִים** in this passage can hardly (as Bertheau is of opinion) be descendants of the **קֹרַח** of the family of Judah mentioned in 1Ch. 2:43, but otherwise unrenowned, since that name is elsewhere, viz., in Psa. 9:19, 31, a Levitic family name. In Jerusalem, after the Exile, Korahites were keepers of the temple gates (1Ch. 9:17, Neh. 11:19), and the chronicler there informs us that even in David's time they were keepers of the threshold of the **אֹהֶל** (erected over the Ark on Zion); and still earlier, in the time of Moses, in the camp of Jahve they were appointed as watchers of the entrance. They retained this ancient calling, to which allusion is made in Psa. 84:11, in connection with the new arrangements instituted by David. The post of door-keeper in the temple was assigned to two branches of the Korahite families together with one Merarite (1Ch. 26: 1-19). But they also even then served as musicians in the sanctuary. Heman, one of the three precentors (to be distinguished from Heman the wise man mentioned in 1Ki. 5:11 [Engl. 4:31]), was a Korahite (1Ch. 6:18-23); his fourteen sons belonged, together with the four sons of Asaph and the six sons of Ethan, to the twenty-four heads of the twenty-four divisions of the musicians (1 Chronicles 25). The Korahites were also renowned even in the days of Jehoshaphat as singers and musicians; see 2Ch. 20:19, where a plural **בְּנֵי הַקְּרָחִים** (cf. Ges. § § 108, 3) is formed from **בְּנֵי־קֹרַח**, which has as it were become smelted together as one word. Whereas in the period after the Exile there is no longer any mention of them in this character. We may therefore look for Korahitic Psalms belonging to the post-Davidic time of the kings; whereas we ought at the outset to be less inclined to find any post-exilic Psalms among them. The common feature of this circle of songs consists herein, — they delight in the praise of Elohim as the King who sits enthroned in Jerusalem, and join in the services in His temple with the tenderest and most

genuine emotion. And this impress of unity which they bear speaks strongly in favour of taking לבני־קרח in the sense of denoting authorship.

The composer of the משכיל, Psalm 42, finds himself, against his will, at a great distance from the sanctuary on Zion, the resting-place of the divine presence and manifestation, surrounded by an ungodly people, who mock at him as one forsaken of God, and he comforts his sorrowful soul, looking longingly back upon that which it has lost, with the prospect of God's help which will soon appear. All the complaints and hopes that he expresses sound very much like those of David during the time of Absalom. David's yearning after the house of God in Psalm 23, 26, 55, 63, finds its echo here: the conduct and outlines of the enemies are also just the same; even the sojourn in the country east of Jordan agrees with David's settlement at that time at Mahanaim in the mountains of Gilead. The Korahite, however, as is to be assumed in connection with a lyric poem, speaks out of the depth of his own soul, and not, as Hengstenberg and Tholuck maintain, "as from the soul of David." He merely shares David's vexation, just as he then in Psa. 84:10 prays for the anointed one. This Psalm 84 breathes forth the same feelings, and even in other respects bears traces of the same author; cf. אל־חַי, Psa. 84: 3; 42: 3; משבְּנוֹתֶיךָ, Psa. 84: 2; 43: 3; מְנוּבַחֲוֹתֶיךָ, 84: 4; 43: 4; and the similar use of עוֹד, Psa. 84: 5; 42: 6, cf. Isa. 49:20, Jer. 32:15. The distinguishing features of the Korahitic type of Psalm meet us in both Psalms in the most strong and vivid manner, viz., the being joyous and weeping with God's anointed, the praise of God the King, and the yearning after the services in the holy place. And there are, it is true, thoughts that have been coined by David which we here and there distinctly hear in them (cf. Psa. 42: 2 f., 84: 3, with Psa. 63: 2); but they are reproduced with a characteristic beauty peculiar to the author himself. We do not, therefore, in the least doubt that Psalm 42 is the poem of a Korahitic Levite, who found himself in exile beyond the Jordan among the attendants of David, his exiled king.

Concerning Psalm 43 Eusebius has said: ὅτι μέρος ἕοικεν εἶναι τοῦ πρὸ αὐτοῦ δεδήλωται ἕκ τε τῶν ὁμοίων ἐν ἀμφοτέροις λόγων καὶ ἕκ τῆς ἐμπεροῦς διανοίας, and an old Midrash reckons 147 Psalms, taking Psalm 42-43 together as one, just as with 9-10, 32-33. The similarity of the situation, of the general impress, of the structure, and of the refrain, is decisive in favour of these Psalms, which are commonly reckoned as two, being one. The one Psalm consists of three parts: thrice his pain breaks forth into complaint, and is each time again overcome by the admonitory voice of his higher consciousness. In the depicting of the past and the future there is unmistakeable progress. And it is not until the third part (Psalm 43) that complaint, resignation, and hope are perfected by the language of confident prayer which supervenes. The unity of

the Psalms is not affected by the repetition of *Psa. 42:10 b* in *Psa. 43: 2 b*, since *Psa. 42:11 b* is also a repetition of *Psa. 42: 4 b*. Beside an edging in by means of the refrain, the poet is also fond of such internal links of connection. The third part has thereby come to consist of thirteen lines, whereas the other two parts consist of twelve lines each.

What a variegated pattern card of hypotheses modern criticism opens out before us in connection with this Psalm (Psalm 42-43)! Vaihinger regards it as a song composed by one of the Levites who was banished by Athaliah. Ewald thinks that King Jeconiah, who was carried away to Babylon, may have composed the Psalm; and in fact, when (and this is inferred from the Psalm itself) on the journey to Babylon, he may have been detained just a night in the vicinity of Hermon. Reuss (in the *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie*, 1858) prefers to suppose it is one of those who were carried off with Jeconiah (among whom there were also priests, as Ezekiel). Hitzig, however, is no less decisive in his view that the author is a priest who was carried off in the direction of Syria at the time of the wars of the Seleucidae and Ptolemies; probably Onias III, high priest from 199 B.C., the collector of the Second Book of the Psalms, whom the Egyptians under the general Skopas carried away to the citadel of Paneas. Olshausen even here, as usual, makes Antiochus Epiphanes his watchword. In opposition to this positive criticism, Maurer adheres to the negative; he says: *quaerendo elegantissimi carminis scriptore frustra se fatigant interpretes*.

*Psa. 42: 2-6*. The poet compares the thirsting of his soul after God to the thirsting of a stag. אֵיל (like other names of animals is epicoene, so that there is no necessity to adopt Böttcher's emendation בְּאֵילַת הַעֵרָג) is construed with a feminine predicate in order to indicate the stag (hind) as an image of the soul. עֵרָג is not merely a quiet languishing, but a strong, audible thirsting or panting for water, caused by prevailing drought, *Psa. 63: 2*, *Joe. 1:20*; the signification *desiderare* refers back to the primary notion of *inclinare* (cf. Arab. *ʾ-mil*, the act of inclining), for the primary meaning of the verb Arab. *ʾrj* is to be slanting, inclined or bent, out of which has been developed the signification of ascending and moving upwards, which is transferred in Hebrew to an upward-directed longing. Moreover, it is not with Luther (LXX, Vulgate [and authorized version]) to be rendered: *as the (a) stag crieth*, etc., but (and it is accented accordingly): *as a stag, which*, etc. אֵפִיק = אָפֵק is, according to its primary signification, a watercourse holding water (vid., *Psa. 18:16*). By the addition of מַיִם the full and flowing watercourse is distinguished from one that is dried up. אֵל and אֵל point to the difference in the object of the longing, viz., the hind has this object beneath herself, the soul above itself; the longing of the one goes *deorsum*, the longing of the other *sursum*. The soul's longing is a thirsting לְאֵל ה' . Such is the name here applied to God (as in *Psa. 84: 3*) in

the sense in which flowing water is called living, as the spring or fountain of life (Psa. 36:10) from which flows forth a grace that never dries up, and which stills the thirst of the soul. The spot where this God reveals Himself to him who seeks Him is the sanctuary on Zion: when shall I come and appear in the presence of Elohim?! The expression used in the Law for the three appearances of the Israelites in the sanctuary at solemn feasts is **נִרְאָה אֱלֹהֵי פָנָי** or **אֵת־פָּנָי**, Exo. 23:17; 34:23. Here we find instead of this expression, in accordance with the license of poetic brevity, the bare *acc. localis* which is even used in other instances in the definition of localities, e.g., Eze. 40:44). Böttcher, Olshausen, and others are of opinion that **אֵרְאָה** in the mind of the poet is to be read **אֵרְאָה**, and that it has only been changed into **אֵרְאָה** through the later religious timidity; but the avoidance of the phrase **רְאָה פָּנָי ה'** is explained from the fundamental assumption of the *Tôra* that a man could not behold God's **פָּנִים** without dying, Exo. 33:20. The poet now tells us in v. 4 what the circumstances were which drove him to such intense longing. His customary food does not revive him, tears are his daily bread, which day and night run down upon his mouth (cf. Psa. 80: 6; 102:20), and that **בְּאָמַר**, when say to him, viz., the speakers, all day long, i.e., continually: Where is thy God? Without cessation, these mocking words are continually heard, uttered again and again by those who are found about him, as their thoughts, as it were, in the soul of the poet. This derision, in the Psalms and in the Prophets, is always the keenest sting of pain: Psa. 79:10; 115: 2 (cf. 71:11), Joe. 2:17, Mic. 7:10.

In this gloomy present, in which he is made a mock of, as one who is forsaken of God, on account of his trust in the faithfulness of the promises, he calls to remembrance the bright and cheerful past, and he pours out his soul within him (on the **עָלִי** used here and further on instead of **בִּי** or **בְּקִרְבִּי**, and as distinguishing between the *ego* and the soul, vid., *Psychol. S.* 152; tr. p. 180), inasmuch as he suffers it to melt entirely away in pain (Job. 30:16). As in Psa. 77: 4, the cohortatives affirm that he yields himself up most thoroughly to this bittersweet remembrance and to this free outward expression of his pain **אֵלָה** (*haecce*) points forwards; the **כִּי** (*quod*) which follows opens up the expansion of this word. The futures, as expressing the object of the remembrance, state what was a habit in the time past. **עָבַר** frequently signifies not *praeterire*, but, without the object that is passed over coming into consideration, *porro ire*. **סָךְ** (a collateral form of **סִךְ**), properly a thicket, is figuratively (cf. Isa. 9:17; 10:34) an interwoven mass, a mixed multitude. The rendering therefore is: that I moved on in a dense crowd (here the distinctive *Zinnor*). The form **אֵרְדָּם** is *Hithpa.*, as in Isa. 38:15, after the form **הִרְדַּמָּה** from the verb **רָדַד**, “to pass lightly and swiftly along,” derived by

reduplication from the root אד (cf. Arab. *d'ud'u*), which has the primary meaning to push, to drive (*ελαύνειν, pousser*), and in various combinations of the ד (אד, Arab. *dah*, חד, Arab. *da'*, דב, דף, דף) expresses manifold shades of onward motion in lighter or heavier thrusts or jerks. The suffix, as in גַּדְלָנִי = גַּדְל עִמִּי, Job. 31:18 (Ges. § 121, 4), denotes those in reference to whom, or connection with whom, this moving onwards took place, so that consequently אֲדַדְא includes within itself, together with the subjective notion, the transitive notion of אֲדַדְא, for the singer of the Psalm is a Levite; as an example in support of this אֲדַדְא, vid., 2Ch. 20:27 f., cf. v. 21. הַמִּן חוּגְגָה is the apposition to the personal suffix of this אֲדַדְא: with them, a multitude keeping holy-day. In v. 6 the poet seeks to solace and encourage himself at this contrast of the present with the past: Why art thou thus cast down... (LXX ἵνα τί περίλυπος εἶ, κ.τ.λ., cf. Mat. 26:38, Joh. 12:27). It is the spirit which, as the stronger and more valiant part of the man, speaks to the soul as to the σκευδος ὑσθενέστερον; the spiritual man soothes the natural man. The *Hithpa.* הִשְׁתַּחֲוּהָ, which occurs only here and in Psalm 43, signifies to bow one's self very low, to sit down upon the ground like a mourner (Psa. 35:14; 38: 7), and to bend one's self downwards (Psa. 44:26). הָמָה (the future of which Ben-Asher here points וְהִתְהַמָּה, but Ben-Naphtali וְהִתְהַמָּה), to utter a deep groan, to speak quietly and mumbling to one's self. Why this gnawing and almost desponding grief? I shall yet praise Him with thanksgiving, praise פְּנֵי יְשׁוּעוֹת, the ready succour of His countenance turned towards me in mercy. Such is the text handed down to us. Although it is, however, a custom with the psalmists and prophets not to express such refrainlike thoughts in exactly the same form and words (cf. Psa. 24: 7, 9; 49:13, 21; 56: 5, 11; 59:10, 18), nevertheless it is to be read here by a change in the division both of the words and the verses, according to v. 12 and Psa. 43: 5, יְשׁוּעוֹת פְּנֵי וְאֵלֹהֵי, as is done by the LXX (*Cod. Alex.*), Syriac, Vulgate, and most modern expositors. For the words יְשׁוּעוֹת פְּנֵי, though in themselves a good enough sense (vid., e.g., Psa. 44: 4, Isa. 64: 9), produce no proper closing cadence, and are not sufficient to form a line of a verse. <sup>f182</sup>

*Psa. 42: 7-12.* The poet here continues to console himself with God's help. God Himself is indeed dishonoured in him; He will not suffer the trust he has reposed in Him to go unjustified. True, אֱלֹהֵי seems at the beginning of the line to be tame, but from אֱלֹהֵי and אֲזַכְרֶךָ, the beginning and end of the line, standing in contrast, אֱלֹהֵי is made emphatic, and it is at the same time clear that אֱלֹהֵי is not equivalent to אֲשֶׁר אֱלֹהֵי — which Gesenius asserts in his *Lexicon*, erroneously referring to Psa. 1: 5; 45: 3, is a poetical usage of the

language; an assertion for which, however, there is a little support as that **כִּי אֶל־בֵּן** in Num. 14:43 and other passages is equivalent to **אֶל־בֵּן כִּי**. In all such passages, e.g., Jer. 48:36, **אֶל־בֵּן** means “therefore,” and the relationship of reason and consequence is reversed. So even here: within him his soul is bowed very low, and on account of this downcast condition he thinks continually of God, from whom he is separated. Even in Jon. 2: 8 this thinking upon God does not appear as the cause but as the consequence of pain. The “land of Jordan and of Hermonim” is not necessarily the northern mountain range together with the sources of the Jordan. The land beyond the Jordan is so called in opposition to **אֶרֶץ לְבָנוֹן**, the land on this side. According to Dietrich (*Abhandlungen*, S. 18), **הַרְמוֹנִים** is an amplificative plural: the Hermon, as a peak soaring far above all lower summits. Joh. Wilson (*Lands of the Bible*, ii. 161) refers the plural to its two summits. But the plural serves to denote the whole range of the Antilebanon extending to the south-east, and accordingly to designate the east Jordanic country. It is not for one moment to be supposed that the psalmist calls Hermon even, in comparison with his native Zion, the chosen of God. **הַר מִצְעָר**, i.e., the mountain of littleness: the other member of the antithesis, the majesty of Zion, is wanting, and the **מִן** which is repeated before **הַר** is also opposed to this. Hitzig, striking out the **מ** of **מִהַר**, makes it an address to Zion: “because I remember thee out of the land of Jordan and of summits of Hermon, thou little mountain;” but, according to v. 8, these words are addressed to Elohim. In the vicinity of *Mitz’ar*, a mountain unknown to us, in the country beyond Jordan, the poet is sojourning; from thence he looks longingly towards the district round about his home, and just as there, in a strange land, the wild waters of the awe-inspiring mountains roar around him, there seems to be a corresponding tumult in his soul. In v. 8a he depicts the natural features of the country round about him — and it may remind one quite as much of the high and magnificent waterfalls of the lake of *Muzêrib* (vid., *Job*, p. 721) as of the waterfall at the course of the Jordan near Paneas and the waters that dash headlong down the mountains round about — and in v. 8b he says that he feels just as though all these threatening masses of water were following like so many waves of misfortune over his head (Tholuck, Hitzig, and Riehm). Billow follows billow as if called by one another (cf. Isa. 6: 3 concerning the continuous antiphon of the seraphim) at the roar (**לְקוֹל**) as in Hab. 3:16) of the cataracts, which in their terrible grandeur proclaim the Creator, God (LXX **τῶν καταρρακτῶν σου**) — all these breaking, sporting waves of God pass over him, who finds himself thus surrounded by the mighty works of nature, but taking no delight in them; and in them all he sees nothing but the mirrored image of the many afflictions which threaten to involve him in utter destruction (cf. the borrowed passage in that mosaic work taken from the Psalms, Jon. 2: 4).



He, however, calls upon himself in v. 9 to take courage in the hope that a morning will dawn after this night of affliction (Psa. 30: 6), when Jahve, the God of redemption and of the people of redemption, will command His loving-kindness (cf. Psa. 44: 5, Amo. 9: 3 f.); and when this by day has accomplished its work of deliverance, there follows upon the day of deliverance a night of thanksgiving (Job. 35:10): the joyous excitement, the strong feeling of gratitude, will not suffer him to sleep. The suffix of שִׁירָה is the suffix of the object: a hymn in praise of Him, prayer (viz., praiseful prayer, Hab. 3: 1) to the God of his life (cf. Sir. 23: 4), i.e., who is his life, and will not suffer him to come under the dominion of death. Therefore will he say (אוֹמְרָה), in order to bring about by prayer such a day of loving-kindness and such a night of thanksgiving songs, to the God of his rock, i.e., who is his rock (*gen. apos.*): Why, etc.? Concerning the different accentuation of לִמָּה here and in Psa. 43: 2, vid., on Psa. 37:20 (cf. 10: 1). In this instance, where it is not followed by a guttural, it serves as a “variation” (Hitzig); but even the retreating of the tone when a guttural follows is not consistently carried out, vid., Psa. 49: 6, cf. 1Sa. 28:15 (Ew. § 243, b). The view of Vaihinger and Hengstenberg is inadmissible, viz., that vv. 10 to 11 are the “prayer,” which the psalmist means in v. 9; it is the prayerful sigh of the yearning for deliverance, which is intended to form the burthen of that prayer. In some MSS we find the reading בְּרִצָּח instead of בְּרִצָּח; the בּ is here really synonymous with the בּ, it is the *Beth essentiae* (vid., 35: 2): after the manner of a crushing (cf. Eze. 21:27, and the verb in Psa. 62: 4 of overthrowing a wall) in my bones, i.e., causing me a crunching pain which seethes in my bones, mine oppressors reproach me (חָרַף with the transfer of the primary meaning *carpere*, as is also customary in the Latin, to a plucking and stripping one of his good name). The use of בּ here differs from its use in v. 10b; for the reproaching is not added to the crushing as a continuing state, but is itself thus crushing in its operation (vid., v. 4). Instead of בְּאִמָּר we have here the easier form of expression בְּאִמָּרָם; and in the refrain בְּנִי וְאֱלֹהֵי, which is also to be restored in v. 6.

*Psa. 43: 1-3.* The Elohimic *Judica* (the introit of the so-called Cross or Passion Sunday which opens the *celebritas Passionis*), with which the supplicatory and plaintive first strophe of the Psalm begins, calls to mind the Jehovic *Judica* in Psa. 7: 9; 26: 1; 35: 1, 24: judge me, i.e., decide my cause (LXX κριθόν με, Symmachus κριθόν μου). רִיבָה has the tone upon the *ultima* before the רִיבִי which begins with the half-guttural ר, as is also the case in Psa. 74:22; Psa. 119:154. The second prayer runs: *vindica me a gente impia*; מִן standing for *contra* in consequence of a *constr. praegnans*. לֹא-חָסִיד is here equivalent to one practising no חֶסֶד towards men, that is to say, one

totally wanting in that **חסד**, by which God's **חסד** is to be imitated and repaid by man in his conduct towards his fellow-men. There is some uncertainty whether by **איש** one chief enemy, the leader of all the rest, is intended to be mentioned side by side with the unloving nation, or whether the special manner of his enemies is thus merely individualised. **אִנְיָה** means roguish, mischievous conduct, utterly devoid of all sense of right. In v. 2 the poet establishes his petition by a twofold Why. He loves God and longs after Him, but in the mirror of his present condition he seems to himself like one cast off by Him. This contradiction between his own consciousness and the inference which he is obliged to draw from his afflicted state cannot remain unsolved. **אֱלֹהֵי מְעוֹנִי**, God of my fortress, is equivalent to who is my fortress. Instead of **אֱלֹהֵי** we here have the form **אֶתְהַלֵּךְ**, of the slow deliberate gait of one who is lost in his own thoughts and feelings. The sting of his pain is his distance from the sanctuary of his God. In connection with v. 3 one is reminded of Psa. 57: 4 and Exo. 15:13, quite as much as of Psa. 42: 9. "Light and truth" is equivalent to mercy and truth. What is intended is the light of mercy or loving-kindness which is coupled with the truth of fidelity to the promises; the light, in which the will or purpose of love, which is God's most especial nature, becomes outwardly manifest. The poet wishes to be guided by these two angels of God; he desires that he may be brought (according to the *Chethib* of the Babylonian text **יבואוני**, "let come upon me;") but the **אל** which follows does not suit this form) to the place where his God dwells and reveals Himself. "Tabernacles" is, as in Psa. 84: 2; 46: 5, an amplificative designation of the tent, magnificent in itself and raised to special honour by Him who dwells therein.

*Psa. 43: 4, 5.* The poet, in anticipation, revels in the thought of that which he has prayed for, and calls upon his timorous soul to hope confidently for it. The cohortatives in v. 4 are, as in Psa. 39:14 and frequently, an apodosis to the petition. The poet knows no joy like that which proceeds from God, and the joy which proceeds from Him he accounts as the very highest; hence he calls God **אל שמחת גילי**, and therefore he knows no higher aim for his longing than again to be where the fountainhead of this exultant joy is (Hos. 9: 5), and where it flows forth in streams (Psa. 36: 9). Removed back thither, he will give thanks to Him with the cithern (*Beth instrum.*). He calls Him **אלהים אלהי**, an expression which, in the Elohim-Psalms, is equivalent to **יהוה אלהי** in the Jahve-Psalms. The hope expressed in v. 4 casts its rays into the prayer in v. 3. In v. 5, the spirit having taken courage in God, holds this picture drawn by hope before the distressed soul, that she may therewith comfort herself. Instead of **ותהמי**, Psa. 42: 6, the expression here used, as in Psa. 42:12, is **ומדה־תהמי**. Variations like these are not opposed to a unity of authorship.

## Psalm 44

### A LITANY OF ISRAEL, HARD PRESSED BY THE ENEMY, AND YET FAITHFUL TO ITS GOD

*44: 2 ELOHIM, with our own ears have we heard,  
Our fathers have declared to us:*

*A work hast Thou wrought in their days, in the days of old.*

*44: 3 Thou, — Thine own hand did drive out peoples and did plant them,  
Did destroy nations and did spread them out.*

*44: 4 For not by their own sword did they acquire the land,  
And their own arm did not obtain for them the victory;  
But Thy right hand, Thine arm, the light of  
Thy countenance, because Thou didst love them.*

*44: 5 Thou, Thou art my King, Elohim:  
Command the full salvation of Jacob!*

*44: 6 By Thee do we push down our oppressors,  
In Thy name do we tread down those who rise up against us.*

*44: 7 For not in mine own bow do I trust,  
And my sword doth not obtain for me the victory.*

*44: 8 No indeed, Thou givest us the victory over our oppressors,  
And dost put to shame those who hate us.*

*44: 9 In Elohim do we make our boast continually,  
And to Thy name will we ever give thanks. (Sela)*

*44:10 Nevertheless Thou hast cast off and put us to confusion,  
And wentest not forth with our armies;*

*44:11 Thou madest us to turn back before the oppressor,  
And those who hate us spoiled just as they liked.*

*44:12 Thou gavest us up like sheep for consumption,  
And among the heathen didst Thou scatter us,*

*44:13 Thou didst sell Thy people for a mere nothing,  
And didst not set a high price upon them.*

*44:14 Thou didst make us a reproach to our neighbours,  
A scorn and a derision to those who are round about us.*

*44:15 Thou didst make us a proverb among the heathen,  
A shaking of the head among the peoples.*

*44:16 Continually is my confusion before me,  
And the shame of my face covereth me;*

*44:17 Because of the voice of him who reproacheth and blasphemeth,  
Because of the sight of the enemy and the revengeful.*

*44:18 All this is come upon us and we have not forgotten Thee,  
And have not become faithless to Thy covenant.*

*44:19 Our heart has not turned back,  
That our step should have declined from Thy path,*

*44:20 That Thou hast crushed us in the place of jackals,  
And didst cover us with the shadow of death.*

*44:21 If we had forgotten the name of our God,  
And stretched out our hands to a strange god:*

*44:22 Would not Elohim have searched it out?  
For He knoweth the hidden things of the heart.*

*44:23 No indeed, for Thy sake are we slain continually,  
We are counted as sheep for the slaughter.*

*44:24 Awake then, why sleepest Thou, O Lord?  
Arouse Thyself, cast not off for ever!*

*44:25 Wherefore hidest Thou Thy face,  
Why forgettest Thou our affliction and oppression?*

*44:26 For our soul is bowed down to the dust,  
Our body cleaveth to the earth.*

*44:27 Oh arise for our help,  
And redeem us, for Thy loving-kindness' sake.*

*Psalm 44.* The Korahitic *Maskîl*/Psalm 42, with its counterpart Psalm 43, if followed by a second, to which a place is here assigned by manifold accords with Psalm 42-43, viz., with its complaints (cf. Psa. 44:26 with the refrain of 43, 42; 44:10, 24 f. with Psa. 43: 2; 42:10), and prayers (cf. Psa. 44: 5 with Psa. 43: 3; 42: 9). The counterpart to this Psalm is Psalm 85. Just as Psalm 42-43 and 84 form a pair, so do Psalm 44 and 85 as being Korahitic plaintive and supplicatory Psalms of a national character. Moreover, Psalm 60 by David, Psalm 80 by Asaph, and Psalm 89 by Ethan, are nearest akin to it. In all these three there are similar lamentations over the present as contrasting with the former times and with the promise of God; but they do not contain any like expression of consciousness of innocence, a feature in which Psalm 44 has no equal.

In this respect the Psalm seems to be most satisfactorily explained by the situation of the **חַסִּדִּים** (saints), who under the leadership of the Maccabees defended their nationality and their religion against the Syrians and fell as martyrs by thousands. The war of that period was, in its first beginnings at least, a holy war of religion; and the nation which then went forth on the side of Jahve against Jupiter Olympius, was really, in distinction from the apostates, a people true to its faith and confession, which had to lament over God's doom of wrath in 1 Macc. 1:64, just as in this Psalm. There is even a tradition that it was a stated lamentation Psalm of the time of the Maccabees. The Levites daily ascended the pulpit (**דִּוְכָן**) and raised the cry of prayer: Awake, why sleepest Thou, O Lord?! These Levite criers praying for the interposition of God were called **מַעֲוֵרִים** (wakers). It is related in *B. Sota* 48a of Jochanan the high priest, i.e., Joh. Hyrcanus (135-107 B.C.), that he put an end to these **מַעֲוֵרִים**, saying to them: "Doth the Deity sleep? Hath not the Scripture said: Behold the Keeper of Israel slumbereth not and sleepeth not!? Only in a time when Israel was in distress and the peoples of the world in rest and prosperity, only in reference to such circumstances was it said: Awake, why sleepest Thou, O Lord?"

Nevertheless many considerations are opposed to the composition of the Psalm in the time of the Maccabees. We will mention only a few. In the time of the Maccabees the nation did not exactly suffer any overthrow of its "armies" (v. 10) after having gathered up its courage: the arms of Judah, of Jonathan, and of Simon were victorious, and the one defeat to which Hitzig refers the Psalm, viz., the defeat of Joseph and Azaria against Gorgias in Jamnia (1 Macc. 5:55 ff.), was a punishment brought upon themselves by an indiscreet enterprise. The complaints in vv. 10 f. are therefore only partially explained by the events of that time; and since a nation is a unit and involved as a whole, it is also surprising that no mention whatever is made of the apostates. But Ewald's reference of the Psalm to the time of the post-exilic Jerusalem is still more inadmissible; and when, in connection with this view, the question is asked, What disaster of war is then intended? no answer can be given; and the reference to the time of Jehoiachin, which Tholuck in vain endeavours to set in a more favourable light — a king who did evil in the eyes of Jahve, 2Ch. 36: 9, with which the descriptions of character drawn by Jeremiah, Jer. 22:20-30, and by Ezekiel, Eze. 19, fully accord — is also inadmissible. On the other hand, the position of the Psalm in the immediate neighbourhood of Psalms belonging to the time of Jehoshaphat, and also to a certain extent its contents, favours the early part of the reign of king Joash, in which, as becomes evident from the prophecy of Joel, there was no idolatry on the part of the people to be punished, and yet there were severe afflictions of the people to be bewailed. It was then not long since the Philistines and Arabs from the neighbourhood of

the Cushites had broken in upon Judah, ransacked Jerusalem and sold the captive people of Judah for a mere song to the Greeks (2Ch. 21:16 f., Joe. 4: 2-8). But this reference to contemporary history is also untenable. That unhappy event, together with others, belongs to the category of well-merited judgments, which came upon king and people in the reign of Jehoram; nor does the Psalm sound like a retrospective glance at the time of Jehoram from the standpoint of the time of Joash: the defeat of which it complains, is one that is now only just experienced.

Thus we seem consequently driven back to the time of David; and the question arises, whether the Psalm does not admit, with Psalm 60, with which it forms a twin couple, of being understood as the offspring of a similar situation, viz., of the events which resulted from the Syro-Ammonitish war. The fact that a conflict with the foes of the kingdom in the south, viz., with the Edomites, was also mixed up with the wars with the Ammonites and their Syrian allies at that period, becomes evident from Psa. 60: 1 f. when compared with 2Sa. 8:13, where the words *ἐπάταξε τὴν Ἰδουμαίαν* (LXX) have fallen out. Whilst David was contending with the Syrians, the Edomites came down upon the country that was denuded of troops. And from 1Ki. 11:15 it is very evident that they then caused great bloodshed; for, according to that passage, Joab buried the slain and took fearful revenge upon the Edomites: he marched, after having slain them in the Valley of Salt, into Idumaea and there smote every male. Perhaps, with Hengstenberg, Keil, and others, the Psalm is to be explained from the position of Israel before this overthrow of the Edomites. The fact that in v. 12 the nation complains of a dispersion among the heathen may be understood by means of a deduction from Amo. 1: 6, according to which the Edomites had carried on a traffic in captive Israelites. And the lofty self-consciousness, which finds expression in the Psalm, is after all best explained by the times of David; for these and the early part of the times of Solomon are the only period in the history of Israel when the nation as a whole could boast of being free and pure of all foreign influence in its worship. In the kindred Psalm 60, 80 (also 89), it is true this self-consciousness does not attain the same lofty expression in this respect Psalm 40 stands perfectly alone: it is like the national mirroring of the Book of Job, and by reason of this takes a unique position in the range of Old Testament literature side by side with Lam. 3 and the deutero-Isaiah. Israel's affliction, which could not possibly be of a punitive character, resembles the affliction of Job; in this Psalm, Israel stands in exactly the same relation to God as Job and the "Servant of Jahve" in Isaiah, if we except all that was desponding in Job's complaint and all that was expiatory in the affliction of the Servant of Jahve. But this very self-consciousness does somewhat approximately find expression even in Psa. 60: 6 [4]. In that passage also no distinction is made between Israel and the God-fearing ones, and the

battle, in which Israel is defeated, but not without hope of final victory, is a battle for the truth.

The charge has been brought against this Psalm, that it manifests a very superficial apprehension of the nature of sin, in consequence of which the writer has been betrayed into accusing God of unfaithfulness, instead of seeking for guilt in the congregation of Israel. This judgment is unjust. The writer certainly cannot mean to disown the sins of individuals, nor even this or that transgression of the whole people. but any apostasy on the part of the nation from its God, such as could account for its rejection, did not exist at that time. The supremacy granted to the heathen over Israel is, therefore, an abnormal state of things, and for this very reason the poet, on the ground of Israel's fidelity and of God's loving-kindness, prays for speedy deliverance. A Psalm born directly out of the heart of the New Testament church would certainly sound very differently. For the New Testament church is not a national community; and both as regards the relation between the reality and idea of the church, and as regards the relation between its afflictions and the motive and design of God, the view of the New Testament church penetrates far deeper. It knows that it is God's love that makes it conformable to the passion of Christ, in order that, being crucified unto the world, it may become through suffering partaker of the glory of its Lord and Head.

*Psa. 44: 2-4.* The poet opens with a tradition coming down from the time of Moses and of Joshua which they have heard with their own ears, in order to demonstrate the vast distance between the character of the former times and the present, just as Asaph, also, in *Psa. 78: 3*, appeals not to the written but to the spoken word. That which has been heard follows in the *oratio directa*. *V. 3* explains what kind of "work" is intended: it is the granting of victory over the peoples of Canaan, the work of God for which Moses prays in *Psa. 90:16*. Concerning וַיִּצְדַּק, vid., on *Psa. 3: 5; 17:14*. The position of the words here, as in *Psa. 69:11; 83:19*, leads one to suppose that וַיִּצְדַּק is treated as a permutative of וַיִּצְדַּק, and consequently in the same case with it. The figure of "planting" (after *Exo. 15:17*) is carried forward in וַיִּשְׁלַח; for this word means to send forth far away, to make wide-branching, a figure which is wrought up in *Psalm 80*. It was not Israel's own work, but (כִּי, no indeed, for [Germ. *nein, denn*] = *imo*) God's work: "Thy right hand and Thine arm and the light of Thy countenance," they it was which brought Israel salvation, i.e., victory. The combination of synonyms יְמִינְךָ וְרוּעֵךָ is just as in *74:11, Sir. 33: 7, χαίρα καὶ βραχίονα δεξιόν*, and is explained by both the names of the members of the body as applied to God being only figures: the right hand being a figure for energetic interposition, and the arm for an effectual power that carries through the thing designed (cf. e.g., *77:16, Isa. 53: 1*), just as the light of His

countenance is a figure for His loving-kindness which lights up all darkness. The final cause was His purpose of love: for (inasmuch as) Thou wast favourable to them (רָצָה) as in Psa. 85: 2). The very same thought, viz., that Israel owes the possession of Canaan to nothing but Jahve's free grace, runs all through Deu. 9.

*Psa. 44: 5-9.* Out of the retrospective glance at the past, so rich in mercy springs up (v. 5) the confident prayer concerning the present, based upon the fact of the theocratic relationship which began in the time of the deliverance wrought under Moses (Deu. 33: 5). In the substantival clause אַתָּה הוּא מְלֹכִי, הוּא is neither logical copula nor predicate (as in Psa. 102:28, Deu. 32:39, there equivalent to אַתָּה הוּא אֲשֶׁר, cf. 1Ch. 21:17), but an expressive resumption of the subject, as in Isa. 43:25, Jer. 49:12, Neh. 9: 6 f., Ezr. 5:11, and in the frequently recurring expression 'יהוה הוא האלהים'; it is therefore to be rendered: Thou — He who (such an one) is my King. May He therefore, by virtue of His duty as king which He has voluntarily taken upon Himself, and of the kingly authority and power indwelling in Him, command the salvation of Jacob, full and entire (Psa. 18:51; 53: 7). צָוָה as in 42: 9. *Jacob* is used for *Israel* just as *Elohim* is used instead of *Jahve*. If Elohim, Jacob's King, now turns graciously to His people, they will again be victorious and invincible, as v. 6 affirms. נָגַח with reference to קֶרֶן as a figure and emblem of strength, as in Psa. 89:25 and frequently; קָמִים עֲלֵינוּ equivalent to קָמִים עֲלֵינוּ. But only in the strength of God (בַּיהוָה as in Psa. 18:30); for not in my bow do I trust, etc., v. 7. This teaching Israel has gathered from the history of the former times; there is no bidding defiance with the bow and sword and all the carnal weapons of attack, but Thou, etc., v. 8. This "Thou" in הוֹשִׁיעֵתָנוּ is the emphatic word; the preterites describe facts of experience belonging to history. It is not Israel's own might that gives them the supremacy, but God's gracious might in Israel's weakness. Elohim is, therefore, Israel's glory or pride: "In Elohim do we praise," i.e., we glory or make our boast in Him; cf. הִלַּל אֱלֹהִים, 10: 3. The music here joins in after the manner of a hymn. The Psalm here soars aloft to the more joyous height of praise, from which it now falls abruptly into bitter complaint.

*Psa. 44:10-13.* Just as אַיִן signifies *imo vero* (Psa. 58: 3) when it comes after an antecedent clause that is expressly or virtually a negative, it may mean "nevertheless, ὅμως," when it opposes a contrastive to an affirmative assertion, as is very frequently the case with אֵין or אֵינִי. True, it does not mean this in itself, but in virtue of its logical relation: we praise Thee, we celebrate Thy name unceasingly — also (= nevertheless) Thou hast cast off. From this point



the Psalm comes into closest connection with Psalms 89:39, on a still more extended scale, however, with Psalm 60, which dates from the time of the Syro-Ammonitish war, in which Psalm v. 10 recurs almost word for word. The **צְבָאוֹת** are not exactly standing armies (an objection which has been raised against the Maccabean explanation), they are the hosts of the people that are drafted into battle, as in Exo. 12:41, the hosts that went forth out of Egypt. Instead of leading these to victory as their victorious Captain (2Sa. 5:24), God leaves them to themselves and allows them to be smitten by the enemy. The enemy spoil **לָמוּ**, i.e., just as they like, without meeting with any resistance, to their hearts' content. And whilst He gives over (**נָתַן**) as in Mic. 5: 2, and the first **יָתַן** in Isa. 41: 2) one portion of the people as "sheep appointed for food," another becomes a *diaspora* or dispersion among the heathen, viz., by being sold to them as slaves, and that **בְּלֹא-הוֹן**, "for not-riches," i.e., for a very low price, a mere nothing. We see from Job. 4 [3]:3 in what way this is intended. The form of the litotes is continued in v. 13b: Thou didst not go high in the matter of their purchase-money; the rendering of Maurer is correct: *in statuendis pretiis eorum*. The **ב** is in this instance not the *Beth* of the price as in v. 13a, but, as in the phrase **הֲלֵל בְּ**, the *Beth* of the sphere and thereby indirectly of the object. **רָבָה** in the sense of the Aramaic **רַבֵּי** (cf. Pro. 22:16, and the derivatives **מְרַבֵּית**, **מְרַבֵּית**), to make a profit, to practise usury (Hupfeld), produces a thought that is unworthy of God; vid., on the other hand, Isa. 52: 3. At the heads of the strophe stands (v. 10a) a perfect with an aorist following: **וְלֹא תִצָּא** is consequently a negative **וְתִצָּא**. And v. 18, which sums up the whole, shows that all the rest is also intended to be retrospective.

**Psa. 44:14-17.** To this defeat is now also added the shame that springs out of it. A distinction is made between the neighbouring nations, or those countries lying immediately round about Israel (**סְבִיבוֹת**, as in the exactly similar passage Psalms 79: 4, cf. 80: 7, which closely resembles it), and the nations of the earth that dwell farther away from Israel. **מָשַׁל** is here a jesting, taunting proverb, and one that holds Israel up as an example of a nation undergoing chastisement (vid., Hab. 2: 6). The shaking of the head is, as in Psalms 22: 8, a gesture of malicious astonishment. In **נִגְדֵי תָמִיד** (as in Psalms 38:18) we have both the permanent aspect or look and the perpetual consciousness. Instead of "shame covers my face," the expression is "the shame of my face covers me," i.e., it has overwhelmed my entire inward and outward being (cf. concerning the radical notions of **בוֹשׁ**, Psalms 6:11, and **חָפַר**, Psalms 34: 6). The juxtaposition of "enemy and revengeful man" has its origin in 8: 3. In v. 17 **מִקּוֹל** and **מִפְּנֵי** alternate; the former is used of the impression

made by the jeering voice, the other of the impression produced by the enraged mien.

**Psa. 44:18-22.** If Israel compares its conduct towards God with this its lot, it cannot possibly regard it as a punishment that it has justly incurred. Construed with the accusative, **בֹּא** signifies, as in Psa. 35: 8; 36:12, to come upon one, and more especially of an evil lot and of powers that are hostile. **שִׁקֵּר**, to lie or deceive, with **בְּ** of the object on whom the deception or treachery is practised, as in Psa. 89:34. In v. 19b **אֲשׁוּר** is construed as *fem.*, exactly as in Job. 31: 8; the *fut. consec.* is also intended as such (as e.g., in Job. 3:10, Num. 16:14): that our step should have declined from, etc.; inward apostasy is followed by outward wandering and downfall. This is therefore not one of the many instances in which the **ל** of one clause also has influence over the clause that follows (Ges. § 152, 3). **בִּי**, v. 20, has the sense of *quod*: we have not revolted against Thee, that Thou shouldest on that account have done to us the thing which is now befallen us. Concerning **תַּנִּים** vid., Isa. 13:22. A “place of jackals” is, like a habitation of dragons (Jer. 10:22), the most lonesome and terrible wilderness; the place chosen was, according to this, an inhospitable **מִדְּבָר**, far removed from the dwellings of men. **כִּסָּה** is construed with **אֵל** of the person covered, and with **בְּ** of that with which (1Sa. 19:13) he is covered: Thou coveredst us over with deepest darkness (vid., Psa. 23: 4). **אִם**, v. 21, is not that of asseveration (verily we have not forgotten), but, as the interrogatory apodosis v. 22a shows, conditional: if we have (= should have) forgotten. This would not remain hidden from Him who knoweth the heart, for the secrets of men’s hearts are known to Him. Both the form and matter here again strongly remind one of Job. 31, more especially v. 4; cf. also on **תַּעֲלָמוֹת**, Job. 11: 6; 28:11.

**Psa. 44:23-27.** The church is not conscious of any apostasy, for on the contrary it is suffering for the sake of its fidelity. Such is the meaning intended by **בִּי**, v. 23 (cf. Psa. 37:20). The emphasis lies on **עֲלִידָה**, which is used exactly as in Psa. 69: 8. Paul, in Rom. 8:36, transfers this utterance to the sufferings of the New Testament church borne in witnessing for the truth, or I should rather say he considers it as a divine utterance corresponding as it were prophetically to the sufferings of the New Testament church, and by anticipation, coined concerning it and for its use, inasmuch as he cites it with the words **καθὼς γέγραπται**. The suppliant cries **עֲוֹנָה** and **הִקִּיצָהּ** are Davidic, and found in his earlier Psalms, Psa. 7: 7; 35:23; 59: 5 f., cf. 78:65. God is said to sleep when He does not interpose in whatever is taking place in the outward world here below; for the very nature of sleep is a turning in into one’s own self from all

relationship to the outer world, and a resting of the powers which act outwardly. The writer of our Psalm is fond of couplets of synonyms like עָנִינוּ וְלִחְצֵנוּ in v. 25; cf. v. 4, יְמִינֶךָ וְזִרְעֶךָ . Psa. 119:25 is an echo of v. 26. The suppliant cry קוֹמָה (in this instance in connection with the עֲזַרְתָּהּ which follows, it is to be accented on the *ultima*) is Davidic, Psa. 3: 8; 7: 7; but originally it is Mosaic. Concerning the *ah* of עֲזַרְתָּהּ, here as also in Psa. 63: 8 of like meaning with לְעֲזַרְתִּי, Psa. 22:20, and frequently, vid., on Psa. 3: 3.

## Psalm 45

### MARRIAGE SONG IN HONOUR OF THE PEERLESS KING

*45: 2 MY heart overflows with goodly speech,  
I say to myself: "My production is concerning a king,"  
My tongue is the pen of a quick writer.*

*45: 3 With beauty art thou arrayed beyond the children of men,  
Gracefulness is shed upon thy lips;  
Therefore hath Elohim blessed thee for ever.*

*45: 4 Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one,  
Thy brightness and thy majesty.*

*45: 5 And in thy majesty press through, ride on,  
For the sake of truth and of the suffering of innocence,  
And thy right hand shall teach thee terrible deeds.*

*45: 6 Thine arrows are sharp, — peoples shall fall under thee, —  
In the heart of the king's enemies!*

*45: 7 Thy throne, Elohim, endureth for ever and ever,  
An upright sceptre is the sceptre of thy kingdom.*

*45: 8 Loving righteousness, thou hatest wickedness;  
Therefore hath Elohim thy God anointed thee  
With the oil of joy above thy fellows.*

*45: 9 Myrrh and aloes, cassia are all thy garments;  
Out of ivory palaces doth the music of  
stringed instruments make thee glad.*

*45:10 Kings' daughters are among thy beloved ones,  
The queen hath set herself at thy right hand  
In ornaments of gold of Ophir.*

*45:11 Harken, O daughter, and see and incline thine ear,  
And forget thine own people and thy father's house;*

*45:12 And if the king desireth thy beauty, —  
For he is thy Lord, — then do thou do homage to him.*

*45:13 And the daughter of Tyre, with gifts shall they conciliate thy face,  
The richest among the peoples.*

*45:14 All glory is the king's daughter in the inner chamber,  
Of gold-woven textures is her clothing.*

*45:15 In variegated embroidered garments is she escorted to the king;  
Virgins after her, her companions,  
Are brought unto thee —*

*45:16 They are escorted with joy and exultation,  
They enter into the king's palace. —*

*45:17 Instead of thy fathers shall be thy sons,  
Thou shalt set them as princes in all lands.*

*45:18 Thy name will I remember in every generation,  
Therefore shall the peoples praise thee for ever and ever.*

*Psalm 45.* To a Korahitic *Maskîl* is appended a song of the same name, and likewise bearing a royal impress after the style of the Korahitic productions. But whilst in Psa. 44: 5 the words “*Thou, Thou art my King, Elohim,*” are addressed in prayer to the God of Israel, in this Psalm the person of the king who is celebrated is a matter of doubt and controversy. The Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 1: 8) proceeds on the assumption that it is the future Christ, the Son of God. It is supported in this view by a tradition of the ancient synagogue, in accordance with which the Targumist renders v. 3, “*Thy beauty, O King Messiah, is greater than that of the children of men.*” This Messianic interpretation must be very ancient. Just as Eze. 21:32 refers back to שִׁילָה, Gen. 49:10, אֵל גְּבוּרָה among the names of the Messiah in Isa. 9: 5 (cf. Zec. 12: 8) refers back in a similar manner to Psalm 45. And whilst the reception of the Song of Songs into the canon admits of being understood even without the assumption of any prophetically allegorical meaning in it, the reception of this Psalm without any such assumption is unintelligible. But this prophetically Messianic sense is therefore not the original meaning of the Psalm. The Psalm is a poem composed for some special occasion the motive of which is some contemporary event. The king whom it celebrates was a contemporary of the poet. If, however, it was a king belonging to David's family, then he was a possessor of a kingship to which were attached, according to 2 Samuel 7, great promises extending into the unlimited future, and on which, consequently, hung all the prospects of the future prosperity and glory of Israel; and the poet is therefore fully warranted in regarding him in the light of the Messianic idea, and the church is also fully warranted in referring

the song, which took its rise in some passing occasion, as a song for all ages, to the great King of the future, the goal of its hope. Moreover, we find only such poems of an occasional and individual character received into the Psalter, as were adapted to remain in constant use by the church as prayers and spiritual songs.

With respect to the historical occasion of the song, we adhere to the conjecture advanced in our commentary on Canticles and on the Epistle to the Hebrews, viz., that it was composed in connection with the marriage of Joram of Judah with Athaliah. The reference to the marriage of Ahab of Israel with Jezebel of Tyre, set forth by Hitzig, is at once set aside by the fact that the poet idealizes the person celebrated, as foreshadowing the Messiah, in a way that can only be justified in connection with a *Davidic* king. It could more readily be Solomon the king of Israel, whose appearance was fair as that of a woman, but majestic as that of a hero. <sup>f183</sup>

Even to the present day several interpreters <sup>f184</sup> explain the Psalm of Solomon's marriage with the daughter of Pharaoh; but the entire absence of any mention of Egypt is decisive against this view. Hence Hupfeld imagines a daughter of Hiram to be the bride, by reference to the Zidonian *Ashtôreth* which is mentioned among Solomon's strange gods (1Ki. 11: 5, 33). But the fact that the king here celebrated is called upon to go forth to battle, is also strange, whilst the glory of Solomon consists in his being, in accordance with his name, the Prince of Peace, or **אִישׁ מְנוּחָה**, 1Ch. 22: 9. Further, the wish is expressed for him that he may have children who shall take the place of his ancestors: Solomon, however, had a royal father, but not royal fathers; and there is the less ground for any retrospective reference to the princes of Judah as Solomon's ancestors (which Kurtz inclines to), since of these only one, viz., Nahshon, occurs among the ancestry of David.

All this speaks against Solomon, but just with equal force in favour of Joram, as being the king celebrated. This Joram is the son of Jehoshaphat, the second Solomon of the Israelitish history. He became king even during the lifetime of his pious father, under whom the Salomonic prosperity of Israel was revived (cf. 2Ch. 18: 1 with 21: 3, 2Ki. 8:16, and Winer's *Realwörterbuch* under *Jehoram*); he was also married to Athaliah during his father's lifetime; and it is natural, that just at that time, when Judah had again attained to the height of the glory of the days of Solomon, the highest hopes should be gathered around these nuptials. This explains the name **שָׁגַל** which the queen bears, — a name that is elsewhere Chaldaean (Dan. 5: 2 f.) and Persian (Neh. 2: 6), and is more North-Palestinian <sup>f185</sup> than Jewish; for Athaliah sprang from the royal family of Tyre, and was married by Joram out of the royal family of Israel. If she is the queen, then the exhortation to forget her people and her father's house has all

the greater force. And it becomes intelligible why the homage of Tyre in particular, and only of Tyre, is mentioned. The Salomonic splendour of Asiatic perfumes and costly things is thus quite as easily explained as by referring the Psalm to Solomon. For even Jehoshaphat had turned his attention to foreign wares, more especially Indian gold; he even prepared a fleet for the purpose of going to Ophir, but, ere it started, it was wrecked in the harbour of Ezion-geber (1Ki. 22:48-50, 2Ch. 20:35 ff.). And Solomon, it is true, had a throne of ivory (1Ki. 10:18), and the Salomonic Song of Songs (Psa. 7: 5) makes mention of a tower of ivory; but he had no ivory palace; whereas the mention of **הַבֵּיַת־יָשָׁן** in our Psalm harmonizes surprisingly with the fact that Ahab, the father of Athaliah, built a palace of ivory (**בֵּית־יָשָׁן**), which the Book of Kings, referring to the annals, announces as something especially worthy of note, 1Ki. 22:39 (cf. Amo. 3:15, **בְּתֵי הַיָּשָׁן**).

But why should not even Joram, at a crisis of his life so rich in hope, have been a type of the Messiah? His name is found in the genealogy of Jesus Christ, Mat. 1: 8. Joram and Athaliah are among the ancestors of our Lord. This significance in relation to the history of redemption is still left them, although they have not realized the good wishes expressed by the poet at the time of their marriage, just as in fact Solomon also began in the spirit and ended in the flesh. Joram and Athaliah have themselves cut away all reference of the Psalm to them by their own godlessness. It is with this Psalm just as it is with the twelve thrones upon which, according to the promise, Mat. 19:28, the twelve apostles shall sit and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. This promise was uttered even in reference to Judas Iscariot. One of the twelve seats belonged to him, but he has fallen away from it. Matthias became heir to the throne of Judas Iscariot, and who has become the heir to the promises in this Psalm? All the glorious things declared in the Psalm depend upon this as the primary assumption, as essential to their being a blessing and being realized, viz., that the king whom it celebrates should carry out the idea of the theocratic kingship. To the Old Testament prophecy and hope, more especially since the days of Isaiah, the Messiah, and to the New Testament conception of the fulfilment of prophecy Jesus Christ, is the perfected realization of this idea.

The inscription runs: *To the Precentor, upon Lilies, by the Benê-Korah, a meditation, a song of that which is lovely.* Concerning *Maskîl*, vid., on 32: 1. **שֹׁשַׁן** is the name for the (six-leafed) lily, <sup>f186</sup> that is wide-spread in its use in the East; it is not the (five-leafed) rose, which was not transplanted into Palestine until a much later period. In **אֵל־שֹׁשַׁנִּים** Hengstenberg sees a symbolical reference to the “lovely brides” mentioned in the Psalm. Luther, who renders it “concerning the roses,” understands it to mean the *rosae futurae* of the united church of the future. We would rather say, with Bugenhagen, Joh.

Gerhard, and other old expositors, “The heavenly Bridegroom and the spiritual bride, they are the two roses or lilies that are discoursed of in this Psalm.” But the meaning of **עֲדוֹת עֲלֵנִים** *must be such as will admit of the inscribed אֶל-שׁוֹשַׁן, Psa. 60: 1, and **עַל-שְׁשָׁנִים עֲדוֹת** (which is probably all one expression notwithstanding the *Athnach*), Psa. 80: 1, being understood after the analogy of it. The preposition **אֶל (אֵל)** forbids our thinking of a musical instrument, perhaps lily-shaped bells. <sup>f187</sup>*

There must therefore have been some well-known popular song, which began with the words “A lily is the testimony...” or “Lilies are the testimonies (עֲדוֹת)...;” and the Psalm is composed and intended to be sung after the melody of this song in praise of the *Tôra*. <sup>f188</sup>

It is questionable whether **יְדִידָת** (Origen **ἰδιδοθ**, Jerome *ididoth*) in the last designation of the Psalm is to be taken as a collateral form of **יְדִידָת** (love, and metonymically an object of love, Jer. 12: 7), or whether we are to explain it after the analogy of **צִחּוֹת**, Isa. 32: 4, and **נִכְחוֹת**, Isa. 26:10: it is just on this neuter use of the *plur. fem.* that the interchange which sometimes occurs of *ôth* with *ûth* in an abstract signification (Ew. § 165, c) is based. In the former case it ought to be rendered a song of love (Aquila **ἔσμα προσφιλίας**); in the latter, a song of that which is beloved, i.e., lovely, or lovable, and this is the more natural rendering. The adjective **יָדִיד** signified beloved, or even (Psa. 84: 2) lovable. It is things that are loved, because exciting love, therefore lovely, most pleasing things, which, as **שִׁיר יְדִידָת** says, form the contents of the song. **שִׁיר יְדִידָת** does not signify a marriage-song; this would be called **שִׁיר חֲתָנָה** (cf. Psa. 30: 1). Nor does it signify a secular erotic song, instead of which the expression **שִׁיר דּוֹדִים, שִׁיר עֲגָבִים**, would have been used. **יְדִיד** is a noble word, and used of holy love.

**Psa. 45: 2, 3.** The verb **רָחַשׁ**, as **מְרַחֶשֶׁת** shows, signifies originally to bubble up, boil, and is used in the dialects generally of excited motion and lively excitement; it is construed with the accusative after the manner of verbs denoting fulness, like the synonymous **נָבַע**, Psa. 119:171 (cf. Talmudic **רַנְנוֹת לְשׁוֹנֵךְ תִּרְחֹשׁ**, let thy tongue overflow with songs of praise). Whatever the heart is full of, with that the mouth overflows; the heart of the poet gushes over with a “good word.” **דְּבַר** is a matter that finds utterance and is put into the form of words; and **טוֹב** describes it as good with the collateral idea of that which is cheerful, pleasing, and rich in promise (Isa. 52: 7, Zec. 1:13). The fact that out of the fulness and oppression of his heart so good a word springs forth, arises from the subject in which now his whole powers of mind are absorbed: I

am saying or thinking (אָנִי pausal form by *Dechi*, in order that the introductory formula may not be mistaken), i.e., my purpose is: מַעֲשֵׂי לְמֶלֶךְ, my works or creations (not *sing.*, but *plur.*, just as also מִקְנֵי in Exo. 17: 3, Num. 20:19, where the connection leads one to expect the plural) shall be dedicated to the king; or even: the thought completely fills me, quite carries me away, that they concern or have reference to the king. In the former case לְמֶלֶךְ dispenses with the article because it is used after the manner of a proper name (as in Psa. 21: 2; 72: 1); in the latter, because the person retires before the office of dignity belonging to it: and this we, in common with Hitzig, prefer on account of the self-conscious and reflecting אָנִי אָמַר by which it is introduced. He says to himself that it is a king to whom his song refers; and this lofty theme makes his tongue so eloquent and fluent that it is like the style of a γραμματεὺς ὀξύγραφος. Thus it is correctly rendered by the LXX; whereas סוֹפֵר מְהִיר as an epithet applied to Ezra (Ezr. 7: 6) does not denote a rapid writer, but a learned or skilled scribe. Rapidly, like the style of an agile writer, does the tongue of the poet move; and it is obliged to move thus rapidly because of the thoughts and words that flow forth to it out of his heart. The chief thing that inspires him is the beauty of the king. The form יָפִיפִיָּה, which certainly ought to have a passive sense (Aquila κάλλει ἐκαλλίωθη), cannot be explained as formed by reduplication of the first two radicals of the verb יָפָה ("יָפִי"); for there are no examples to be found in support of quinqueliterals thus derived. What seems to favour this derivation is this, that the legitimately formed *Pealal* יָפִיפָה (cf. the adjective יָפִיפִי = יָפָהפִי, Jer. 46:20) is made passive by a change of vowels in a manner that is altogether peculiar, but still explicable in connection with this verb, which is a twofold weak verb. The meaning is: Thou art beyond compare beautifully fashioned, or endowed with beauty beyond the children of men. The lips are specially singled out from among all the features of beauty in him. Over his lips is poured forth, viz., from above, יָפִי (gracefulness of benevolence), inasmuch as, even without his speaking, the form of his lips and each of their movements awakens love and trust; it is evident, however, that from such lips, full of χάρις, there must proceed also λόγοι τῆς χάριτος (Luke 4:22, Ecc. 10:12). In this beauty of the king and this charm of his lips the psalmist sees a manifestation of the everlasting blessing of God, that is perceptible to the senses. It is not to be rendered: because Elohim hath blessed thee for ever. The assertion that אֶל-כֵּן is used in some passages for אֶל-כֵּן אֲשֶׁר cannot be proved (vid., on Psa. 42: 7). But the meaning of the psalmist is, moreover, not that the king, because he is so fair and has such gracious lips, is blessed of God. If this were the idea, then the noble moral qualities of which the beauty of this king is the transparent form, ought to be more definitely expressed. Thus personally conceived, as it is here,



beauty itself is a blessing, not a ground for blessing. The fact of the matter is this, beauty is denoted by **על-כן** as a reason for the blessing being known or recognised, not as a reason why the king should be blessed. From his outward appearance it is at once manifest that the king is one who is blessed by God, and that blessed for ever. The psalmist could not but know that “grace is deceitful and beauty vain” (Pro. 31:30), therefore the beauty of this king was in his eyes more than mere earthly beauty; it appears to him in the light of a celestial transfiguration, and for this very reason as an imperishable gift, in which there becomes manifest an unlimited endless blessing.

**Psa. 45: 4-6.** In the ever blessed one the greatest strength and vigour are combined with the highest beauty. He is a hero. The praise of his heroic strength takes the form of a summons to exert it and aid the good in obtaining the victory over evil. Brightness and majesty, as the objects to **תְּגוֹר**, alternating with the sword, are not in apposition to this which is their instrument and symbol (Hengstenberg), but permutatives, inasmuch as **תְּגוֹר** is zeugmatically referable to both objects: the king is (1) to gird himself with his sword, and (2) to surround himself with his kingly, God-like doxa. **הוֹד וְהָדָר** is the brilliancy of the divine glory (Psa. 96: 6), of which the glory of the Davidic kingship is a reflection (Psa. 21: 6); mentioned side by side with the sword, it is, as it were, the panoply that surrounds the king as bright armour. In v. 5 **וְהָדָר**, written accidentally a second time, is probably to be struck out, as Olshausen and Hupfeld are of opinion. Hitzig points it **וְהָדָרָה**, “and step forth;” but this is not Hebrew. As the text runs, *wa-hadārcha* (with *Legarme* preceded by *Illuj*, vid., *Accentsystem* xiii. § 8c, 9) looks as though it were repeated out of v. 4 in the echo-like and interlinked style that we frequently find in the songs of degrees, e.g., Psa. 121: 1, 2; and in fact repeated as an accusative of more exact definition (in the same bold manner as in Psa. 17:13, 14) to **צִלָּה**, which, like Arab. *ṣlḥ*, starting from the primary notion of cleaving, breaking through, pressing forward, comes to have the notion of carrying anything through prosperously, of being successful, *pervadere et bene procedere* (cf. the corresponding development of signification in Arab. *flḥ*, *ʿflḥ*), and, according to Ges. § 142, rem. 1, gives to **רָכַב** the adverbial notion of that which is effectual (victorious) or effective and successful. We cannot determine whether **רָכַב** is here intended to say *vehi curru* or *vehi equo*; but certainly not upon a mule or an ass (1Ki. 1:33, Zec. 9: 9), which are the beasts ridden in a time of peace. The king going forth to battle either rides in a war-chariot (like Ahab and Jehoshaphat, 1Ki. 22), or upon a war-horse, as in Rev. 19:11 the Logos of God is borne upon a white horse. That which he is to accomplish as he rides forth in majesty is introduced by **אֶל-דָּבָר** (for the sake of, on account of), which is used just as in Psa. 79: 9, 2Sa. 18: 5. The

combination אֲנִיָּה־צְדָק is very similar to עֲרִיָּה־בִּשְׁתׁ, Mic. 1:11 (nakedness-ignominy = ignominious nakedness), if אֲנִיָּה = עֲנָה is to be taken as the name of a virtue. The two words are then the names of virtues, like אֱמֶת (truth = veracity, which loves and practises that which is true and which is hostile to lying, falseness, and dissimulation); and whereas צְדָק עֲנָה would signify meek righteousness, and עֲנֹת צְדָק, righteousness meekness, this conjunction standing in the middle between an addition and an asyndeton denotes meekness and righteousness as twin-sisters and reciprocally pervasive. The virtues named, however, stand for those who exemplify them and who are in need of help, on whose behalf the king is called upon to enter the strife: the righteous, if they are at the same time עֲנָיִים (עֲנִיִּים), are doubly worthy and in need of his help. Nevertheless another explanation of אֲנִיָּה presents itself, and one that is all the more probable as occurring just in this Psalm which has such a North-Palestinian colouring. The observation, that North-Palestinian writers do not always point the construct state with *ath*, in favour of which Hitzig, on Psa. 68:29, wrongly appeals to Hos. 10: 6, Job. 39:13, but rightly to Jud. 7: 8; 8:32 (cf. Deu. 33: 4, 27), is perfectly correct. Accordingly עֲנָה may possibly be equivalent to אֲנִיָּה, but not in the signification business, affair = עֲנִין, parallel with דְּבַר, but in the signification *afflictio* (after the form רָאָה, Eze. 28:17); so that it may be rendered: in order to put a stop to the oppression of righteousness or the suffering of innocence. The jussive וְתוֹרַךְ, like וְתֵאָוֶר in v. 12, begins the apodosis of a hypothetical protasis that is virtually there (Ew. § 347, *b*): so shall thy right hand teach thee, i.e., lead thee forth and cause thee to see terrible things, i.e., awe-inspiring deeds.

But in v. 6 both summons and desire pass over into the expression of a sure and hopeful prospect and a vision, in which that which is to be is present to the mind: thine arrows are sharpened, and therefore deadly to those whom they hit; peoples shall fall (יִפְּלוּ) <sup>f189</sup> under thee, i.e., so that thou passest over them as they lie upon the ground; in the heart of the enemies of the king, viz., they (i.e., the arrows) will stick. The harsh ellipse is explained by the fact of the poet having the scene of battle before his mind as though he were an eye-witness of it. The words “in the heart of the king’s enemies” are an exclamation accompanied by a pointing with the finger. Thither, he means to say, those sharp arrows fly and smite. Crusius’ explanation is similar, but it goes further than is required: *apostrophe per prosopopaeiam directa ad sagittas quasi jubens, quo tendere debeant*. We are here reminded of Psa. 110: 2, where a similar בִּקְרָב occurs in a prophetic-messianic connection. Moreover, even according to its reference to contemporary history the whole of this strophe sounds Messianic. The poet desires that the king whom he celebrates may rule

and triumph after the manner of the Messiah; that he may succour truth and that which is truly good, and overcome the enmity of the world, or, as Psalm ch. 2 expresses it, that the God-anointed King of Zion may shatter everything that rises up in opposition with an iron sceptre. This anointed One, however, is not only the Son of David, but also of God. He is called absolutely **בַּר, ה' הַטָּהוֹר**. Isaiah calls Him, even in the cradle, **אֵל גְּבוּר**, Isa. 9: 5, cf. 10:21. We shall not, therefore, find it to be altogether intolerable, if the poet now addresses him as **אֱלֹהִים**, although the picture thus far sketched is thoroughly human in all its ideality.

*Psa. 45: 7, 8.* In order to avoid the addressing of the king with the word *Elohim*, v. 6a has been interpreted, (1) “Thy throne of God is for ever and ever,” — a rendering which is grammatically possible, and, if it were intended to be expressed, must have been expressed thus (Nagelsbach, § 64, g); (2) “Thy throne is God (= divine) for ever and ever;” but it cannot possibly be so expressed after the analogy of “the altar of wood = wooden” (cf. v. 9), or “the time is showers of rain = rainy” (Ezr. 10:13), since God is neither the substance of the throne, nor can the throne itself be regarded as a representation or figure of God: in this case the predicative *Elohim* would require to be taken as a genitive for **כִּסֵּא אֱלֹהִים**, which, however, cannot possibly be supported in Hebrew by any syntax, not even by 2Ki. 23:17, cf. Ges. § 110, 2, b. Accordingly one might adopt the first mode of interpretation, which is also commended by the fact that the earthly throne of the theocratic king is actually called **כִּסֵּא יְהוָה** in 1Ch. 29:23. But the sentence “thy throne of God is an everlasting one” sounds tautological, inasmuch as that which the predicate asserts is already implied in the subject; and we have still first of all to try whether **אֱלֹהִים** cannot, with the LXX **ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεός, εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος**, be taken as a vocative. Now, since before everything else God’s throne is eternal (Psa. 10:16, Lam. 5:19), and a love of righteousness and a hatred of evil is also found elsewhere as a description of divine holiness (Psa. 5: 5, Isa. 61: 8), **אֱלֹהִים** would be obliged to be regarded as addressed to God, if language addressed to the king did not follow with **אֵלֶיךָ**. But might **אֱלֹהִים** by any possibility be even addressed to the king who is here celebrated? It is certainly true that the custom with the *Elohim*-Psalms of using *Elohim* as of equal dignity with *Jahve* is not favourable to this supposition; but the following surpassing of the **אֱלֹהִים** by **אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֶיךָ** renders it possible. And since elsewhere earthly authorities are also called **אֱלֹהִים**, Exo. 21: 6; 22: 7 f., Psalm 82, cf. 138: 1, because they are God’s representatives and the bearers of His image upon earth, so the king who is celebrated in this Psalm may be all the more readily styled *Elohim*, when in his heavenly beauty, his irresistible doxa or glory, and his divine holiness, he seems to the psalmist to

be the perfected realization of the close relationship in which God has set David and his seed to Himself. He calls him **מְלִיכָא**, just as Isaiah calls the exalted royal child whom he exultingly salutes in Isa. 9: 1-6, **מְלִיכָא נְבוֹר**. He gives him this name, because in the transparent exterior of his fair humanity he sees the glory and holiness of God as having attained a salutary of merciful conspicuousness among men. At the same time, however, he guards this calling of the king by the name *Elohim* against being misapprehended by immediately distinguishing the God, who stands above him, from the divine king by the words “Elohim, thy God,” which, in the Korahitic Psalms, and in the Elohimic Psalms in general, is equivalent to Jahve, thy God” (Psa. 43: 4; 48:15; 50: 7); and the two words are accordingly united by *Munach*.<sup>f190</sup>

Because the king’s sceptre is a “sceptre of uprightness” (cf. Isa. 11: 4), because he loves righteousness and consequently (*fut. consec.*) hates iniquity, therefore God, his God, has anointed him with the oil of joy (Isa. 61: 3; cf. on the construction Amo. 6: 6) above his fellows. What is intended is not the anointing to his office (cf. Psa. 89:21 with Act. 10:38) as a dedication to a happy and prosperous reign, but that God has poured forth upon him, more especially on this his nuptial day, a superabundant joy, both outwardly and in his spirit, such as He has bestowed upon no other king upon the face of the earth. That he rises high above all those round about him is self-evident; but even among his fellows of royal station, kings like himself, he has no equal. It is a matter of question whether the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 1: 8) has taken the first **ὁ Θεός** of the expression **ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεός σου** as a vocative. Apollinaris does not seem so to have understood him; for he renders it **τοῦνεκά σοι Θεὸς αὐτὸς ἔην περιχευεν ἀλοιφήν χρίσας τερπωλῆς μετόχοις παρὰ πάντας ἐλαίω**, and the Greek expositors also take **ὁ Θεός** here as a nominative.

*Psa. 45: 9, 10.* The song of that which is lovely here reaches the height towards which it aspires from the beginning. It has portrayed the lovely king as a man, as a hero, and as a divine ruler; now it describes him as a bridegroom on the day of his nuptials. The sequence of the thoughts and of the figures corresponds to the history of the future. When Babylon is fallen, and the hero riding upon a white horse, upon whom is inscribed the name “King of kings and Lord of lords,” shall have smitten the hostile nations with the sword that goeth out of His mouth, there then follows the marriage of the Lamb, for which the way has been prepared by these avenging victories (Rev. 19: 7 f.). It is this final **γάμος** which the Psalm, as a song of the congregation, when the light was dawning upon the Old Testament church, sees by anticipation, and as it were goes forth to meet it, rejoicing to behold it afar off. The king’s garments are so thoroughly scented with costly spices that they seem to be altogether woven

out of them. And מְנִי out of the ivory palaces enchant him. This מְנִי has been taken mostly, according to Isa. 59:18 (cf. also Isa. 52: 6), as a repetition of the מֶן: “out of ivory palaces, whence they enchant thee.” But this repetition serves no special purpose. Although the apocopated plural in מְנִי, instead of מְנִים, is controvertible in Biblical Hebrew (vid., on 22:17, 2Sa. 22:44), still there is the venture that in this instance מְנִי is equivalent to מְנִים, the music of stringed instruments (Psa. 150: 4); and if in connection with any Psalm at all, surely we may venture in connection with this Psalm, which in other respects has such an Aramaic or North-Palestinian colouring, to acknowledge this apocope, here perhaps chosen on account of the rhythm. In accordance with our historical rendering of the Psalm, by the ivory palaces are meant the magnificent residences of the king, who is the father of the bride. Out of the inner recesses of these halls, inlaid within with ivory and consequently resplendent with the most dazzling whiteness, the bridegroom going to fetch his bride, as he approaches and enters them, is met by the sounds of festive music: viewed in the light of the New Testament, it is that music of citherns or harps which the seer (Rev. 14: 2) heard like the voice of many waters and of mighty thunder resounding from heaven. The Old Testament poet imagines to himself a royal citadel that in its earthly splendour far surpasses that of David and of Solomon. Thence issues forth the sound of festive music zealous, as it were, to bid its welcome to the exalted king.

Even the daughters of kings are among his precious ones. יָקָר is the name for that which is costly, and is highly prized and loved for its costliness (Pro. 6:26). The form בִּיקְרוֹתֶיהָ resembles the form לִיקָהָת, Pro. 30:17, in the appearance of the *i* and supplanting the *Sheba mobile*, and also in the *Dag. dirimens* in the ק (cf. עֲקָבִי, Gen. 49:17; מִקְדָּשׁ, Exo. 15:17).<sup>f191</sup>

Now, however, he has chosen for himself his own proper wife, who is here called by a name commonly used of Chaldaean and Persian queens, and, as it seems (cf. on Jud. 5:30), a North-Palestinian name, שָׁנַל,<sup>f192</sup> instead of גְּבִירָה. From the fact that, glittering with gold of Ophir, she has taken the place of honour at the right hand of the king (נִצְבָּה, 3rd *praet.*, not *part.*), it is evident that her relationship to the king is at this time just in the act of being completed. Who are those daughters of kings and who is this queen standing in closest relationship to the king? The former are the heathen nations converted to Christ, and the latter is the Israel which is remarried to God in Christ, after the fulness of the heathen is come in. It is only when Israel is won to Him, after the fulness of the heathen is come in (Rom. 11:25), that the morning of the great day will dawn, which this Psalm as a song of the church celebrates. בְּנוֹת מְלָכִים cannot certainly, like בִּתְ-צָר, be a personificative designation of

heathen kingdoms, although שָׁגֵל is the believing Israel conceived of as one person. It is actually kings' daughters as the representatives of their nations that are intended; and the relation of things is just the same here as in Isa. 49:23, where, of the Israelitish church of the future, it is predicted that kings shall be its foster-fathers and their princesses its nursing-mothers.

*Psa. 45:11-13.* The poet next turns to address the one bride of the king, who is now honoured far above the kings' daughters. With שָׁמַעַי he implores for himself a hearing; by רָאָה he directs her eye towards the new relationship into which she is just entering; by הִטָּה אָזְנוֹךָ he bespeaks her attention to the exhortation that follows; by בָּתּוֹ he puts himself in a position in relation to her similar to that which the teacher and preacher occupies who addresses the bridal pair at the altar. She is to forget her people and her father's house, to sever her natural, inherited, and customary relationships of life, both as regards outward form and inward affections; and should the king desire her beauty, to which he has a right, — for he, as being her husband (1Pe. 3: 6), and more especially as being king, is her lord, — she is to show towards him her profoundest, reverent devotion. יִתְרָאָה is a hypothetical protasis according to Ges. § 128, 2, c. The reward of this willing submission is the universal homage of the nations. It cannot be denied on the ground of syntax that וּבִתְצֹר admits of being rendered “and O daughter of Tyre” (Hitzig), — a rendering which would also give additional support to our historical interpretation of the Psalm, — although, apart from the one insecure passage, Jer. 20:12 (Ew. § 340, c), there is no instance to be found in which a vocative with ו occurs (Pro. 8: 5, Joe. 2:23, Isa. 44:21), when another vocative has not already preceded it. But to what purpose would be, in this particular instance, this apostrophe with the words וּבִתְצֹר, from which it looks as though she were indebted to her ancestral house, and not to the king whose own she is become, for the acts of homage which are prospectively set before her? Such, however, is not the case; “daughter of Tyre” is a subject-notion, which can all the more readily be followed by the predicate in the plural, since it stands first almost like a *nomin. absol.* The daughter, i.e., the population of Tyre — approaching with presents shall they court (lit., stroke) thy face, i.e., meeting thee bringing love, they shall seek to propitiate thy love towards themselves. הָלָהּ (פְּנֵי) corresponds to the Latin *mulcere* in the sense of *delenire*; for הָלָהּ, Arab. *ḥlā* (root חל, whence חָלַל, Arab. *ḥll, solvit, laxavit*), means properly to be soft and tender, of taste to be sweet (in another direction: to be lax, weak, sick); the *Piel* consequently means to soften, conciliate, to make gentle that which is austere. Tyre, however, is named only by way of example; עֲשִׂירֵי עָם is not an apposition, but a continuation of the subject: not only Tyre, but in general

those who are the richest among each separate people or nation. Just as אֲדָם אֲבִינִי (Isa. 29:19) are the poorest of mankind, so עֲשִׂירֵי עַם are the richest among the peoples of the earth.

As regards the meaning which the congregation or church has to assign to the whole passage, the correct paraphrase of the words “and forget thy people” is to be found even in the Targum: “Forget the evil deeds of the ungodly among thy people, and the house of the idols which thou hast served in the house of thy father.” It is not indeed the hardened mass of Israel which enters into such a loving relationship to God and to His Christ, but, as prophecy from Deu. 32 onward declares, a remnant thoroughly purged by desolating and sifting judgments and rescued, which, in order to belong wholly to Christ, and to become the holy seed of a better future (Isa. 6:13), must cut asunder all bonds of connection with the stiff-neckedly unbelieving people and paternal house, and in like manner to Abram secede from them. This church of the future is fair; for she is expiated (Deu. 32:43), washed (Isa. 4:4), and adorned (Isa. 61:3) by her God. And if she does homage to Him, without looking back, He not only remains her own, but in Him everything that is glorious belonging to the world also becomes her own. Highly honoured by the King of kings, she is the queen among the daughters of kings, to whom Tyre and the richest among peoples of every order are zealous to express their loving and joyful recognition. Very similar language to that used here of the favoured church of the Messiah is used in Psa. 72:10 f. of the Messiah Himself.

**Psa. 45:14-16.** Now follows the description of the manner in which she absolutely leaves her father’s house, and richly adorned and with a numerous train is led to the king and makes her entry into his palace; and in connection therewith we must bear in mind that the poet combines on the canvas of one picture (so to speak) things that lie wide apart both as to time and place. He sees her first of all in her own chamber (פְּנִימָה, prop. towards the inside, then also in the inside, Ges. § 90, 2, *b*), and how there <sup>f193</sup> she is nothing but splendour (כְּבוֹדָהּ, prop. mere splendour, *fem.* of כְּבוֹד as in Eze. 23:41; cf. כְּלוּמָהּ, Psa. 39:6, mere nothingness), her clothing is gold-interwoven textures (i.e., such as are interwoven with threads of gold, or woven in squares or diamond patterns and adorned with gold in addition). She, just like Esther (Est. 2:12), is being led to the king, her husband, and this takes place לְרִקְמוֹת, in variegated, embroidered garments (לְ used just as adverbially as in 2Ch. 20:21, לְהַדְרֹת), with a retinue of virgins, her companions, who at the same time with herself become the property of her spouse. According to the accents it is to be rendered: *virgines post eam, sociae ejus, adducuntur tibi*, so that רַעֲוֵתֶיהָ is an apposition. This is also in harmony with the allegorical

interpretation of the Psalm as a song of the church. The bride of the Lamb, whom the writer of the Apocalypse beheld, arrayed in shining white linen (*byssus*), which denotes her righteousness, just as here the variegated, golden garments denote her glory, is not just one person nor even one church, but the church of Israel together with the churches of the Gentiles united by one common faith, which have taken a hearty and active part in the restoration of the daughter of Zion. The procession moves on with joy and rejoicing; it is the march of honour of the one chosen one and of the many chosen together with her, of her friends or companions; and to what purpose, is shown by the hopes which to the mind of the poet spring up out of the contemplation of this scene.

*Psa. 45:17, 18.* All this has its first and most natural meaning in relation to contemporary history but without being at variance with the reference of the Psalm to the King Messiah, as used by the church. Just as the kings of Judah and of Israel allowed their sons to share in their dominion (2Sa. 8:18, 1Ki. 4: 7, cf. 2Ch. 11:23; 1Ki. 20:15), so out of the loving relationship of the daughter of Zion and of the virgins of her train to the King Messiah there spring up children, to whom the regal glory of the house of David which culminates in Him is transferred, — a royal race among which He divides the dominion of the earth (vid., Psalm 149); for He makes His own people “kings and priests, and they shall reign on the earth” (Rev. 5:10). Those children are to be understood here which, according to Psalm 110, are born to Him as the dew out of the womb of the morning’s dawn — the every-youthful nation, by which He conquers and rules the world. When, therefore, the poet says that he will remember the name of the king throughout all generations, this is based upon the twofold assumption, that he regards himself as a member of an imperishable church (Sir. 37:25), and that he regards the king as a person worthy to be praised by the church of every age. Elsewhere Jahve’s praise is called a praise that lives through all generations (Psa. 102:13; 135:13); here the king is the object of the everlasting praise of the church, and, beginning with the church, of the nations also. On יהוה־יהוה (as in the name יהוה־יהוה) cf. the forms in Psa. 116: 6; 131: 6. First of all Israel, whom the psalmist represents, is called upon to declare with praise the name of the Messiah from generation to generation. But it does not rest with Israel alone. The nations are thereby roused up to do the same thing. The end of the covenant history is that Israel and the nations together praise this love-worthy, heroic, and divine King: “His name shall endure for ever; as long as the sun shall His name bud, and all nations shall be blessed in Him (and) shall praise Him” (Psa. 72:17).



## Psalm 46

### A SURE STRONGHOLD IS OUR GOD <sup>f194</sup>

*46: 2 ELOHIM is unto us a refuge and safe retreat,  
As a help in distresses He is thoroughly proved.*

*46: 3 Therefore do we not fear when the earth changeth,  
And the mountains fall into the heart of the ocean;*

*46: 4 Let the waters thereof roar, let them foam,  
Let mountains shake at the swelling thereof. (Sela)*

*46: 5 There is a river — the streams whereof make glad the city of Elohim,  
The holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High.*

*46: 6 Elohim is in the midst of her, she tottereth not,  
Elohim helpeth her, when the morning dawneth.*

*46: 7 The peoples rage, the kingdoms totter —  
He raiseth His voice, and the earth melteth.*

*46: 8 Jahve of Hosts is with us,  
A stronghold unto us is the God of Jacob. (Sela)*

*46: 9 Go, behold the deeds of Jahve,  
Who maketh desolations upon the earth,*

*46:10 Who maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth,  
Who breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear in sunder,  
Who destroyeth the chariots by fire.*

*46:11 “Cease ye, and know that I am Elohim!  
I will be exalted among the peoples, I will be exalted upon the earth.”*

*46:12 Jahve of Hosts is with us,  
A stronghold unto us is the God of Jacob. (Sela)*

*Psalm 46.* When, during the reign of Jehoshaphat, the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites (more particularly the Maonites, for in 2Ch. 20: 1 it is to be read מַהֲפָעוּנִים) carried war into the kingdom of David and threatened Jerusalem, the Spirit of the Lord came upon Jahaziël the Asaphite in the temple congregation which the king had called together, and he prophesied a miraculous deliverance on the morrow. Then the Levite singers praised the God of Israel with jubilant voice, viz., singers of the race of *Kohāth*, and in fact out of the family of Korah. On the following day Levite singers in holy attire and with song went forth before the army of Jehoshaphat. The enemy, surprised by the attack of another plundering band of the sons of the desert, had turned their weapons against one another, being disbanded in the

confusion of flight, and the army of Jehoshaphat found the enemy's camp turned into a field of corpses. In the feast of thanksgiving for victory which followed in *Emek ha-Beracha* the Levite singers again also took an active part, for the spoil-laden army marched thence in procession to Jerusalem and to the temple of Jahve, accompanied by the music of the nabras, citherns, and trumpets. Thus in the narrative in 2 Chronicles 22 does the chronicler give us the key to the Asaphic Psalm 83 (76?) and to the Korahitic Psalm 46, 47, 48. It is indeed equally admissible to refer these three Korahitic Psalms to the defeat of Sennacherib's army under Hezekiah, but this view has not the same historical consistency. After the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign the congregation could certainly not help connecting the thought of the Assyrian catastrophe so recently experienced with this Psalm; and more especially since Isaiah had predicted this event, following the language of this Psalm very closely. For Isaiah and this Psalm are remarkably linked together.

Just as Psalm ch. 2 is, as it were, the quintessence of the book of Immanuel, Isaiah 7-12, so is Psalm 46 of Isaiah 33, that concluding discourse to Isaiah 28-32, which is moulded in a lyric form, and was uttered before the deliverance of Jerusalem at a time of the direst distress. The fundamental thought of the Psalm is expressed there in v. 2 in the form of a petition; and by a comparison with Isa. 25: 4 f. we may see what a similarity there is between the language of the psalmist and of the prophet. Isa. 33:13 closely resembles the concluding admonition; and the image of the stream in the Psalm has suggested the grandly bold figure of the prophet in v. 21, which is there more elaborately wrought up:

*“No indeed, there dwells for us a glorious One, Jahve — a place of streams, of canals of wide extent, into which no fleet of rowing vessels shall venture, and which no mighty man-of-war shall cross.”*

The divine determination expressed in אָרָם we also hear in Isa. 33:10. And the prospect of the end of war reminds us of the familiar prediction of Isaiah (Isaiah ch. 2), closely resembling Micah's in its language, of eternal peace; just as vv. 8, 12 remind us of the watch-word עֲמֵנוּ אֵל in Isaiah 7-12. The mind of Isaiah and that of Jeremiah have, each in its own peculiar way, taken germs of thought (lit., become impregnated) from this Psalm.

We have already incidentally referred to the inscribed words אֶל-עֲלָמוֹת, on Psa. 6: 1. Böttcher renders them *ad voces puberes*, “for tenor voices,” a rendering which certainly accords with the fact that, according to 1Ch. 15:20, they were accustomed to sing בְּנַבְלִים עַל-עֲלָמוֹת, and the Oriental sounds, according to Villoteau (*Description de l'Egypte*), correspond *aux six sons vers l'aigu de l'octave du medium de la voix de tenor*. But עֲלָמוֹת does not signify

*voces puberes*, but *puellae puberes* (from **עלם**, Arab. *glm*, cogn. **חלם**, Arab. *hlm*, to have attained to puberty); and although certainly no eunuchs sang in the temple, yet there is direct testimony that Levite youths were among the singers in the second temple; <sup>f195</sup> and Psalm 68 mentions the **עלמות** who struck the timbrels at a temple festival. Moreover, we must take into consideration the facts that the compass of the tenor extends even into the soprano, that the singers were of different ages down to twenty years of age, and that Oriental, and more particularly even Jewish, song is fond of falsetto singing. We therefore adopt Perret-Gentil's rendering, *chant avec voix de femmes*, and still more readily Armand de Mestral's, *en soprano*; whereas Melissus' rendering, "upon musical instruments called *Alamoth* (the Germans would say, upon the virginal)," has nothing to commend it.

**Psa. 46: 2-4.** The congregation begins with a general declaration of that which God is to them. This declaration is the result of their experience. Luther, after the LXX and Vulg., renders it, "in the great distresses which have come upon us." As though **נמצא** could stand for **הנמצאות**, and that this again could mean anything else but "at present existing," to which **מאד** is not at all appropriate. God Himself is called **נמצא מאד** as being one who allows Himself to be found in times of distress (2Ch. 15: 4, and frequently) exceedingly; i.e., to those who then seek Him He reveals Himself and verifies His word beyond all measure. Because God is such a God to them, the congregation or church does not fear though a still greater distress than that which they have just withstood, should break in upon them: if the earth should change, i.e., effect, enter upon, undergo or suffer a change (an inwardly transitive *Hiphil*, Ges. § 53, 2); and if the mountains should sink down into the heart (**בלב**) exactly as in Eze. 27:27, Jon. 2: 4) of the sea (ocean), i.e., even if these should sink back again into the waters out of which they appeared on the third day of the creation, so that consequently the old chaos should return. The church supposes the most extreme case, viz., the falling in of the universe which has been creatively set in order. We are no more to regard the language as being allegorical here (as Hengstenberg interprets it, the mountains being = the kingdoms of the world), than we would the language of Horace: *si fractus illabatur orbis* (*Carm.* iii. 3, 7). Since **ימים** is not a numerical but amplificative plural, the singular suffixes in v. 4 may the more readily refer back to it. **גאונה**, pride, self-exaltation, used of the sea as in Psa. 89:10 **גאות**, and in Job. 38:11 **גאות** are used. The futures in v. 4 do not continue the infinitive construction: if the waters thereof roar, foam, etc.; but they are, as their position and repetition indicate, intended to have a concessive sense. And this favours the supposition of Hupfeld and Ewald that the refrain, vv. 8, 12, which ought to form the apodosis of this concessive clause (cf. Psa. 139: 8-10,

Job. 20:24, Isa. 40:30 f.) has accidentally fallen out here. In the text as it lies before us v. 4 attaches itself to **לֹא-נִירָא**: (we do not fear), let its waters (i.e., the waters of the ocean) rage and foam continually; and, inasmuch as the sea rises high, towering beyond its shores, let the mountains threaten to topple in. The music, which here becomes *forte*, strengthens the believing confidence of the congregation, despite this wild excitement of the elements.

**Psa. 46: 5-8.** Just as, according to Gen. 2:10, a stream issued from Eden, to water the whole garden, so a stream makes Jerusalem as it were into another paradise: a river — whose streams make glad the city of Elohim (Psa. 87: 3; 48: 9, cf. 101: 8); **פְּלָנְיוֹ** (used of the windings and branches of the main-stream) is a second permutative subject (Psa. 44: 3). What is intended is the river of grace, which is also likened to a river of paradise in 36: 9. When the city of God is threatened and encompassed by foes, still she shall not hunger and thirst, nor fear and despair; for the river of grace and of her ordinances and promises flows with its rippling waves through the holy place, where the dwelling-place or tabernacle of the Most High is pitched. **קֹדֶשׁ**, *Sanctum* (cf. *El-Kuds* as a name of Jerusalem), as in Psa. 65: 5, Isa. 57:15; **גְּדֹלַיִם**, Exo. 15:16. **מִשְׁכְּבֵי**, dwellings, like **מִשְׁכְּבֹת**, Psa. 43: 3; 84: 2; 132: 5, 7, equivalent to “a glorious dwelling.” In v. 6 in the place of the river we find Him from whom the river issues forth. Elohim helps her **לַפְנוֹת בְּקָר** — there is only a night of trouble, the return of the morning is also the sunrise of speedy help. The preterites in v. 7 are hypothetical: if peoples and kingdoms become enraged with enmity and totter, so that the church is in danger of being involved in this overthrow — all that God need to is to make a rumbling with His almighty voice of thunder (**נָתַן בְּקוֹלוֹ**), as in Psa. 68:34, Jer. 12: 8, cf. **הָרִים בְּמַטָּה**, to make a lifting with the rod, Exo. 7:20), and forthwith the earth melts (**מוֹג**), as in Amo. 9: 5, *Niph.* Isa. 14:31, and frequently), i.e., their titanic defiance becomes cowardice, the bonds of their confederation slacken, and the strength they have put forth is destroyed — it is manifest that *Jahve Tsebaoth* is with His people. This name of God is, so to speak, indigenous to the Korahitic Psalms, for it is the proper name of God belonging to the time of the kings (vid., on Psa. 24:10; 59: 6), on the very verge of which it occurs first of all in the mouth of Hannah (1Sa. 1:11), and the Korahitic Psalms have a royal impress upon them. In the God, at whose summons all created powers are obliged to marshal themselves like the hosts of war, Israel has a steep stronghold, **מִשְׁגֵּב**, which cannot be scaled by any foe — the army of the confederate peoples and kingdoms, ere it has reached Jerusalem, is become a field of the dead.

*Psa. 46: 9-12.* The mighty deeds of Jahve still lie visibly before them in their results, and those who are without the pale of the church are to see for themselves and be convinced. In a passage founded upon this, Psa. 66: 5, stands מפעלות אלהים; here, according to Targum and Masora (vid., *Psalter*, ii. 472), מפעלות אלהים<sup>f196</sup>. Even an Elohimic Psalm gives to the God of Israel in opposition to all the world no other name than יהוה. שמות does not here signify *stupenda* (Jer. 8:21), but in accordance with the phrase לשמה שום, Isa. 13: 9, and frequently: devastations, viz., among the enemies who have kept the field against the city of God. The participle מִשְׁבִּית is designedly used in carrying forward the description. The annihilation of the worldly power which the church has just now experienced for its rescue, is a prelude to the ceasing of all war, Mic. 4: 3 (Isa. 2: 4). Unto the ends of the earth will Jahve make an end of waging war; and since He has no pleasure in war in general, much less in war waged against His own people, all the implements of war He in part breaks to pieces and in part consigns to the flames (cf. Isa. 54:16 f.). Cease, cries He (v. 12) to the nations, from making war upon my people, and know that I am God, the invincible One, — invincible both in Myself and in My people, — who will be acknowledged in My exaltation by all the world. A similar inferential admonition closes Psalm 2. With this admonition, which is both warning and threatening at the same time, the nations are dismissed; but the church yet once more boasts that Jahve Tsebaoth is its God and its stronghold.

## Psalm 47

### EXULTATION AT THE LORD'S TRIUMPHANT ASCENSION

*47: 2 ALL ye peoples, clap your hands,  
Shout unto Elohim with loud rejoicing.*

*47: 3 For Jahve is highly exalted, terrible,  
A great King over all the earth.*

*47: 4 He subdued peoples under us,  
And nations under our feet.*

*47: 5 He chose for us our inheritance,  
The pride of Jacob, whom He hath loved. (Sela)*

*47: 6 Elohim is gone up with a shout,  
Jahve with the sound of a trumpet.*

*47: 7 Harp ye to Elohim, harp,  
Harp ye to our King, harp!*

*47: 8 For the King of all the earth is Elohim —  
Harp ye songs of praise.*

*47: 9 Elohim ruleth as king over the nations,  
Elohim hath set Himself upon His holy throne.*

*47:10 The princes of the peoples gather themselves together —  
A people of the God of Abraham.  
For the shields of the earth are Elohim's,  
Very highly exalted is He.*

*Psalm 47.* Whilst between Psalm 45 and 46 scarcely any other bond of relationship but the similar use of the significant **יְהוָה** can be discovered, Psalm 47 has, in common with Psalm 46, not only the thought of the kingly exaltation of Jahve over the peoples of the earth, but also its historical occasion, viz., Jehoshaphat's victory over the allied neighbouring nations, — a victory without a conflict, and consequently all the more manifestly a victory of Jahve, who, after having fought for His people, ascended again amidst the music of their celebration of victory; an event that was outwardly represented in the conducting of the Ark back to the temple (2Ch. 20:28). Psalm 47 has grown out of this event. The strophe schema cannot be mistaken, viz., 8. 8. 4.

On account of the blowing of the trumpet <sup>f197</sup> mentioned in v. 6, this Psalm is the proper new year's Psalm in the synagogue (together with Psalm 81, the Psalm of the second new year's feast day); and on account of the mention of the ascension of Jahve, it is the Psalm for Ascension day in the church. Luther styles it, the "Christ ascended to Heaven of the sons of Korah." Paulus Burgensis quarrels with Lyra because he does not interpret it directly of the Ascension; and Bakius says: *Lyranus a Judaeis seductus, in cortice haeret.* The whole truth here, as is often the case, is not to be found on either side. The Psalm takes its occasion from an event in the reign of Jehoshaphat. But was the church of the ages succeeding required to celebrate, and shall more especially the New Testament church still celebrate, that defeat of the allied neighbouring peoples? This defeat brought the people of God repose and respect for a season, but not true and lasting peace; and the ascent at that time of Jahve, who had fought here on earth on behalf of His people, was not as yet the ascent above the powers that are most hurtful to His people, and that stand most in the way of the progress of salvation, viz., those powers of darkness which form the secret background of everything that takes place upon earth that is in opposition to God. Hence this Psalm in the course of history has gained a prophetic meaning, far exceeding its first occasion, which has only been fully unravelled by the ascension of Christ.

*Psa. 47: 2-4.* "Thereupon the fear of Elohim" — so closes the chronicler (2Ch. 20:29) the narrative of the defeat of the confederates — "came upon all

kingdoms of the countries, when they heard that Jahve had fought against the enemies of Israel.” The psalmist, however, does not in consequence of this particular event call upon them to tremble with fear, but to rejoice; for fear is an involuntary, extorted inward emotion, but joy a perfectly voluntary one. The true and final victory of Jahve consists not in a submission that is brought about by war and bloodshed and in consternation that stupefies the mind, but in a change in the minds and hearts of the peoples, so that they render joyful worship unto Him. In order that He may thus become the God of all peoples, He has first of all become the God of Israel; and Israel longs that this the purpose of its election may be attained. Out of this longing springs the call in v. 2. The peoples are to show the God of revelation their joy by their gestures and their words; for Jahve is absolutely exalted (עֲלִיּוֹן, here it is a predicate, just as in Psa. 78:56 it is an attribute), terrible, and the sphere of His dominion has Israel for its central point, not, however, for its limit, but it extends over the whole earth. Everything must do homage to Him in His own people, whether willingly or by constraint. According to the tenses employed, what is affirmed in v. 4 appears to be a principle derived from their recent experience, inasmuch as the contemporary fact is not expressed in an historical form, but generalized and idealised. But בָּחַר, v. 5a, is against this, since the choosing (election) is an act done once for all and not a continued act; we are therefore driven to regard the futures, as in Num. 23: 7, Jud. 2: 1, as a statement of historical facts. Concerning יָדַבֵּר, He bent, made to stoop, vid., 18:48. There is now no necessity for altering יָבִחַר into יָרַחַב, and more especially since this is not suited to the fact which has given occasion to the Psalm. On the contrary, בָּחַר presupposes that in the event of the day God has shown Himself to be a faithful and powerful Lord [*lit.* feudal Lord] of the land of Israel; the hostile confederation had thought of nothing less than driving Israel entirely out of its inheritance (2Ch. 20:11). The Holy Land is called the pride (גִּאּוֹן) of Jacob, as being the gift of grace of which this, the people of God’s love, can boast. In Amo. 6: 8 גִּאּוֹן יַעֲקֹב has a different meaning (of the sin of pride), and again another sense in Nah. 2: 3 (of the glory of all Israel in accordance with the promise); here it is similar to Isa. 13:19. גִּאּוֹן has a conjunctive accent instead of being followed by *Makkeph*, as in Psa. 60: 2, Pro. 3:12 (these are the only three instances). The strophe which follows supports the view that the poet, in v. 5, has a recent act of God before his mind.

**Psa. 47: 6-9.** The ascent of God presupposes a previous descent, whether it be a manifestation of Himself in order to utter some promise (Gen. 17:22, Jud. 13:20) or a triumphant execution of judgment (Psa. 7: 8; 68:19). So here: God has come down to fight on behalf of His people. They return to the Holy City and He to His throne, which is above on Zion, and higher still, is above in

heaven. On **בְּתִרְוָעָה** and **קוֹל שִׁנְפֹּר** cf. Psa. 98: 6, 1Ch. 15:28, but more especially Amo. 2: 2; for the “shout” is here the people’s shout of victory, and “the sound of the horn” the clear sound of the horns announcing the victory, with reference to the celebration of the victory in the Valley of praise and the homeward march amidst the clanging music (2Ch. 20:26 f.). The poet, who has this festival of victory before his mind as having recently taken place, desires that the festive sounds may find an unending and boundless echo unto the glory of God. **זִמְר** is first construed with the accusative as in 68:33, then with the dative. Concerning **מְשֻׁבֵּיל** = ὠδὴ πνευματικῆ (Eph. 5:19, Col. 3:16), vid., on 32: 1. That which excites to songs of praise is Jahve’s dominion of the world which has just been made manifest. **מִלְךָ** is to be taken in just the same historical sense as **ἑβασίλευσας**, Rev. 11:15-18. What has taken place is a prelude of the final and visible entering upon the kingdom, the announcement of which the New Testament seer there hears. God has come down to earth, and after having obtained for Himself a recognition of His dominion by the destruction of the enemies of Israel, He has ascended again in visible kingly glory. *Imago conscensi a Messia throni gloriae*, says Chr. Aug. Crusius, *tunc erat deportatio arcae faederis in sedem regni*.

**Psa. 47:10.** In the mirror of the present event, the poet reads the great fact of the conversion of all peoples to Jahve which closes the history of the world. The nobles of the peoples (**נְדִיבֵי** with the twofold meaning of *generosi*), the “shields (i.e., the lords who are the defenders of their people) of the earth” (Hos. 4:18), enter into the society of the people of the God of Abraham; **πέρας αἰ πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχην Ἀβραάμ ἔλαβον ὑποσχέσεις**, as Theodoret observes. The promise concerning the blessing of the tribes of the nations in the seed of the patriarch is being fulfilled; for the nobles draw the peoples who are protected by them after themselves. It is unnecessary to read **עֲ** instead of **ס** with Ewald, and following the LXX and Syriac; and it is also inadmissible, since one does not say **נִאֲסַף עֵם**, but **ל** or **לָאֵסֵף**. Even Eusebius has rightly praised Symmachus and Theodotion, because they have translated the ambiguous **אֵם** by **λαὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἀβραάμ**), viz., as being a nominative of the effect or result, as it is also understood by the Targum, Jerome, Luther, and most of the Jewish expositors, and among modern expositors by Crusius, Hupfeld, and Hitzig: They gather and band themselves together as a people or into a people of the God of Abraham, they submit themselves with Israel to the one God who is proved to be so glorious. <sup>f198</sup>

The conclusion (v. 11) reminds one of the song of Hannah, 1Sa. 2: 8. Thus universal homage is rendered to Him: He is gone up in triumph, and is in



consequence thereof highly exalted (נִעְלָה, 3rd praet., the result of consequence of the עֲלָה in v. 6).

## Psalm 48

### THE INACCESSIBLENESS OF THE CITY OF GOD

*48: 2 GREAT is Jahve and greatly to be praised  
In the city of our God, His holy mountain.*

*48: 3 Beautifully elevated, a joy of the whole earth  
Is mount Zion, the angle of the north.  
The city of the great King.*

*48: 4 Elohim in her palaces became known as a stronghold.*

*48: 5 For, lo, the kings allied advanced together;*

*48: 6 Yet they beheld, they were amazed immediately,  
bewildered they fled away.*

*48: 7 Trembling hath seized upon them there, pangs as of travail.*

*48: 8 With an east wind didst Thou break the ships of Tarshish,*

*48: 9 As we have heard, so have we seen  
In the city of Jahve of Hosts, the city of our God —  
Elohim upholdeth her for ever. (Sela)*

*48:10 We thought, Elohim, upon Thy loving-kindness  
In the midst of Thy temple.*

*48:11 As is Thy name, Elohim, so is Thy praise  
Unto the ends of the earth;  
Full of righteousness is Thy right hand.*

*48:12 Let mount Zion rejoice,  
Let the daughters of Judah exult  
Because of Thy judgments.*

*48:13 Walk ye about Zion and go round about her,  
Tell her towers,*

*48:14 Mark well her bulwark,  
March through her palaces,  
That ye may tell it the next generation.*

*48:15 That such an one is Elohim our God for ever —  
He will guide us . . . .  
After "Mûth."*

*Psalm 48.* Psalm 48 is also a song of thanksgiving for victory. It is connected with Psalm 46 and 47 by the fundamental thought of the exaltation of Jahve above the peoples of the earth; but is distinguished from them both in this respect, viz., that, in accordance with the favourite characteristic of Korahitic poetry, the song of thanksgiving for victory has become a song in praise of Jerusalem, the glorious and strong city, protected by God who sits enthroned in it. The historical occasion is the same. The mention of the kings points to an army of confederates; v. 10 points to the gathering held in the temple before the setting out of the army; and the figurative representation of the hostile powers by the shattered ships of Tarshish does not apply to any period so well as to the time of Jehoshaphat. The points of coincidence between this Psalm (cf. v. 7 with Isa. 33:14; v. 8 with Isa. 33:21; v. 13 with Isa. 33:18; v. 15 with Isa. 33:22), as well as Psalm 46, and Isaiah do not prove that he is its author.

*Psa. 48: 2-9.* Viewed as to the nature of its subject-matter, the Psalm divides itself into three parts. We begin by considering the three strophes of the first part. The middle strophe presents an instance of the rising and falling caesural schema. Because Jahve has most marvellously delivered Jerusalem, the poet begins with the praise of the great King and of His Holy City. Great and praised according to His due (מְהִלָּל as in Psa. 18: 4) is He in her, is He upon His holy mountain, which there is His habitation. Next follow, in v. 3, two predicates of a threefold, or fundamentally only twofold, subject; for צָפוֹן יְרֵבְתִי, in whatever way it may be understood, is in apposition to הַר־צִיּוֹן. The predicates consequently refer to Zion-Jerusalem; for קְרִית מְלֶךְ רַב is not a name for Zion, but, inasmuch as the transition is from the holy mountain to the Holy City (just as the reverse is the case in v. 2b), Jerusalem; ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως, Mat. 5:35. Of Zion-Jerusalem it is therefore said, it is יְפֵה נוֹף, beautiful in prominence or elevation (נוֹף from נוּף, Arabic *nāfa*, *nauf*, root נוּף, the stronger force of נָב, Arab. *nb*, to raise one's self, to mount, to come sensibly forward; just as יְפֵה also goes back to a root יָף, Arab. *yf*, *wf*, which signifies "to rise, to be high," and is transferred in the Hebrew to eminence, perfection, beauty of form), a beautifully rising terrace-like height;<sup>f199</sup> and, in the second place, it is the joy (מְשׁוֹשׁ) of the whole earth. It is deserving of being such, as the people who dwell there are themselves convinced (Lam. 2:15); and it is appointed to become such, it is indeed such even now in hope, — hope which is, as it were, being anticipatorily verified. but in what sense does the appositional צָפוֹן יְרֵבְתִי follow immediately upon הַר־צִיּוֹן? Hitzig, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Caspari (*Micha*, p. 359), and others, are of opinion that the hill of Zion is called the extreme north with reference to the old Asiatic conception of the mountain of the gods — old Persic *Ar-burgé*

(*Al-burgê*), and also called absolutely *hara* or *haraiti*, <sup>f200</sup> old Indian *Kailâsa* and *Mêru* <sup>f201</sup> — forming the connecting link between heaven and earth, which lay in the inaccessible, holy distance and concealment of the extreme north. But the poet in no way betrays the idea that he applies this designation to Zion in an ideal sense only, as being not inferior to the extreme north (Bertheau, *Lage des Paradieses*, S. 50, and so also S. D. Luzzatto on Isa. 14:13), or as having taken the place of it (Hitzig). That notion is found, it is true, in Isa. 14:13, in the mouth of the king of the Chaldeans; but, with the exception of the passage before us, we have no trace of the Israelitish mind having blended this foreign mythological style of speech with its own. We therefore take the expression “sides of the north” to be a topographical designation, and intended literally. Mount Zion is thereby more definitely designated as the Temple-hill; for the Temple-hill, or Zion in the narrower sense, formed in reality the north-eastern angle or corner of ancient Jerusalem. It is not necessarily the extreme north (Eze. 38: 6; 39: 2), which is called **יִרְכְּתֵי צַפּוֹן**; for **יִרְכְּתֵי** are the two sides, then the angle in which the two side lines meet, and just such a northern angle was Mount Moriah by its position in relation to the city of David and the lower city.

*Psa. 48: 4.* Ver. 4, where the pointing is rightly **נוֹדַע**, not **נִדְרַע**, shows that the praise sung by the poet is based upon an event in contemporary history. Elohim has made Himself known by the loftily built parts <sup>f202</sup> of Jerusalem (*Psa. 122: 7*) **לְמִשְׁנֵב** (the **ל** that is customary with verbs of becoming and making), i.e., as an inaccessible fortress, making them secure against any hostile attack. The fact by which He has thus made Himself known now immediately follows. **הַמְּלָכִים** points to a definite number of kings known to the poet; it therefore speaks in favour of the time of peril and war in the reign of Jehoshaphat and against that in the reign of Hezekiah. **נוֹאֵד** is reciprocal: to appoint themselves a place of meeting, and meet together there. **עָבַר**, as in Jud. 11:29, 2Ki. 8:21, of crossing the frontier and invasion (Hitzig), not of perishing and destruction, as in *Psa. 37:36*, *Nah. 1:12* (De Wette); for **נוֹעֵדוּ** requires further progress, and the declaration respecting their sudden downfall does not follow till later on. The allies encamped in the desert to Tekoa, about three hours distant from Jerusalem. The extensive view at that point extends even to Jerusalem: as soon as they saw it they were amazed, i.e., the seeing and astonishment, panic and confused flight, occurred all together; there went forth upon them from the Holy City, because Elohim dwells therein, a **אֱלֹהִים** **חֲרָדָה** (*1Sa. 14:15*), or as we should say, a panic or a panic-striking terror. Concerning **בְּ** as expressive of simultaneousness, vid., on *Hab. 3:10*. **בְּאִשֶׁר** in the correlative protasis is omitted, as in *Hos. 11: 2*, and frequently; cf. on

Isa. 55: 9. Trembling seized upon them there (רָעַד, as in Psa. 14: 5), pangs as of a woman in travail. In v. 8, the description passes over emotionally into the form of address. It moulds itself according to the remembrance of a recent event of the poet's own time, viz., the destruction of the merchant fleet fitted out by Jehoshaphat in conjunction with Ahaziah, king of Israel (1Ki. 22:49, 2Ch. 20:36 f.). The general meaning of v. 8 is, that God's omnipotence is irresistible. Concerning the "wind of the east quarter," which here, as in Eze. 27:26, causes shipwreck, vid., on Job. 27:21. The "ships of Tarshish," as is clear from the context both before and after, are not meant literally, but used as a figure of the worldly powers; Isaiah (Isaiah 33) also compares Assyria to a gallant ship. Thus, then, the church can say that in the case of Jerusalem it has, as an eye-witness, experienced that which it has hitherto only heard from the tradition of a past age (הָאָרֶץ and שָׁמַע as in Job. 42: 5), viz., that God holds it erect, establishes it, *for ever*. Hengstenberg observes here, "The Jerusalem that has been laid in ruins is not that which the psalmist means; it is only its outward form which it has put off" [*lit.* its broken and deserted pupa]. It is true that, according to its inner and spiritual nature, Jerusalem continues its existence in the New Testament church; but it is not less true that its being trodden under foot for a season in the *καίροι ἐθνῶν* no more annuls the promise of God than Israel's temporary rejection annuls Israel's election. The Holy City does not fall without again rising up.

*Psa. 48:10-12.* Now follows grateful praise to God, who hears prayer and executes justice, to the joy of His city and of His people. By דְּמִינֹהּ the poet refers back to the service held in the temple before the army set out, as narrated in 2 Chronicles 20, to the prayers offered in the time of their impending danger, and to the remembrance of the favour hitherto shown towards Jerusalem, from which source they drew the comfort of hope for the present time. הִמְצִיא, to compare, to hold one thing over against another, in this instance by causing the history of the past to pass before one's mind. To God's mighty deeds of old is now added a new one. The Name of God, i.e., the sum of His self-attestations hitherto, was the subject of the דְּמִינֹהּ in the temple, and more particularly of the Korahitic songs (2Ch. 20:19); and this name has gloriously verified itself by a new deed of righteousness. His fame extends even to the ends of the earth (2Ch. 20:29). He has proved Himself to be One whose right hand is full of righteousness, and who practises righteousness or justice where it is necessary. Let, then, the Holy City, let the country cities of Judah (Isa. 40: 9, cf. 16: 2) rejoice. The whole inheritance of Israel was threatened. Now it is most gloriously delivered.

*Psa. 48:13-15.* The call is addressed not to the enemies of Jerusalem — for it would be absurd to invite such to look round about upon Jerusalem with joy

and gladness — but to the people of Jerusalem itself. From the time of the going forth of the army to the arrival of the news of victory, they have remained behind the walls of the city in anxious expectation. Now they are to make the circuit of the city (הַקִּיף, still more definite than סָבַב, Jos. 6: 3) outside the walls, and examine them and see that its towers are all standing, its bulwark is intact, its palaces are resplendent as formerly. לְחֵילָהּ, “upon its bulwark,” = לְחֵילָהּ (Zec. 9: 4), with softened suffix as in Isa. 23:17; 45: 6, and frequently; Ew. § 247, *d.* פָּסַג (according to another reading, הַפְּסִיג) signifies, in *B. Baba kamma* 81*b*, to cut through (a vineyard in a part where there is no way leading through it); the signification “to take to pieces and examine, to contemplate piece by piece,” has no support in the usage of the language, and the signification “to extol” (*erhöhen*, Luther following Jewish tradition) rests upon a false deduction from the name פָּסַגָּה. Louis de Dieu correctly renders it: *Dividite palatia, h. e. obambulate inter palatia ejus, secundo omnes palatiorum vias, quo omnia possitis commode intueri*. They are to convince themselves by all possible means of the uninjured state of the Holy City, in order that they may be able to tell to posterity, that הָיָה, such an one, such a marvellous helper as is now manifest to them, is Elohim our God. He will also in the future guide us.... Here the Psalm closes; for, although נָהַג is wont to be construed with אָל in the signification ἄγειν ἐπί (Psa. 23: 2, Isa. 49:10), still “at death” [*lit.* dying], i.e., when it comes to dying (Hengstenberg), or “even unto (אָל as in v. 11, 19: 7) death” [*lit.* dying] (Hupfeld), forms no suitable close to this thoroughly national song, having reference to a people of whom the son of Sirach says (Psa. 37:25): ζῶν ἄνδρὸς ἐν ἀριθμῶ ἡμερῶν καὶ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀναρίθμητοι. The rendering of Mendelssohn, Stier, and others, “over death” i.e., beyond death (Syriac), would be better; more accurately: beyond dying = destruction (Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, Th. i. S. clxi.). but the expression does not admit of this extension, and the thought comes upon one unexpectedly and as a surprise in this Psalm belonging to the time before the Exile. The Jerusalem Talmud, *Megilla*, ch. ii. (fol. 73, col. *b*, *ed. Venet.*), present a choice of the following interpretations:

- (1) אֲלָמוֹת = בְּעֵלְמוֹת, in youthfulness, adopting which, but somewhat differently applied, the Targum renders, “in the days of youth;”
- (2) כְּאֵילֵין עֲלָמוֹת, like virgins, with which Luther’s rendering coincides: like youth (*wie die Jugend*);
- (3) according to the reading עֲלָמוֹת, which the LXX also reproduces: in this and the future world, noting at the same time that Akilas

(Aquila) translates the word by *ἀθανασία*: “in a world where there is no death.”

But in connection with this last rendering one would rather expect to find *אֶל־מוֹת* (Pro. 12:28) instead of *עַל־מוֹת*. *עַל־מוֹת*, however, as equivalent to *ἀλῶνες* is Mishnic, not Biblical; and a Hebrew word *אֶל־מוֹת* (*עַל־מוֹת*) in the sense of the Aramaic *עַל־מוֹת* cannot be justified elsewhere. We see from the wavering of the MSS, some of which give *אֶל־מוֹת*, and others *עַל־מוֹת*, and from the wavering of expositors, what little success is likely to follow any attempt to gain for *עַל־מוֹת*, as a substantial part of the Psalm, any sense that is secure and in accordance both with the genius of the language and with the context. Probably it is a marginal note of the melody, an abbreviation for *לִבֵּן אֶל־מוֹת*, Psa. 9: 1. And either this note, as in Hab. 3:19 *לְמַנְצָה בְּנִינְתִּי*, stands in an exceptional manner at the end instead of the beginning (Hitzig, Reggio), or it belongs to the *לְמַנְצָה* of the following Psalm, and is to be inserted there (Böttcher, *De inferis*, § 371). If, however, *עַל־מוֹת* does not belong to the Psalm itself, then it must be assumed that the proper closing words are lost. The original close was probably more full-toned, and somewhat like Isa. 33:22.

## Psalm 49

### OF THE VANITY OF EARTHLY PROSPERITY AND GOOD: A DIDACTIC POEM

*49: 2 HEAR ye this, all ye peoples  
Observe, all ye inhabitants of the world,*

*49: 3 Both low and high,  
Rich and poor together!*

*49: 4 My mouth shall utter wisdom  
And the meditation of my heart is understanding.*

*49: 5 I will incline mine ear to the maxim,  
I will disclose my riddle with the accompaniment of the cithern.*

*49: 6 Wherefore should I fear in the days of misfortune,  
When the evil-doing of my supplanters encompasseth me,*

*49: 7 Who trust in their wealth  
And boast themselves in the abundance of their riches?*

*49: 8 A man is not able by any means to redeem his brother,  
Nor can he give to God a ransom for him,*

*49: 9 (Too costly is the redemption of their soul,  
And he must give it up for ever);*

*49:10 That he should live continually,  
[And] not see the grave.*

*49:11 No indeed, he must see, that wise men the,  
Likewise the fool and the stupid man perish,  
And leave to others their wealth.*

*49:12 Their thought is that their houses are for ever,  
Their dwellings from generation to generation;  
They proclaim their names over lands.*

*49:13 But man in pomp hath no abiding,  
He is like to the beasts that are destroyed.*

*49:14 This is the lot of those who are full of self-confidence,  
And who following them yield assent to their mouth. (Sela)*

*49:15 Like sheep gathered to Hades death doth shepherd them,  
And the upright shall triumph over them on that morning,  
Whereas their form, falling a prey to the devouring of Hades, becomes  
habitationless.*

*49:16 Yet Elohim will redeem my soul from the power of Hades,  
For He will take me up. (Sela)*

*49:17 Be not thou afraid, when a man becometh rich,  
When the glory of his house is increased.*

*49:18 For when he dieth he shall take nothing away with him,  
His glory doth not go down after him.*

*49:19 Though a man blesseth his soul during his life —  
And they praise thee that thou dost enjoy thyself —*

*49:20 It shall come to the generation of his fathers:  
In eternity they shall never see the light.*

*49:21 Man in pomp, and yet having no understanding,  
Is like to the beasts that are destroyed.*

*Psalm 49.* To the pair of Psalm 47 and 48 is appended Psalm 49, which likewise begins with an appealing “all ye peoples;” in other respects, being a didactic song, it has nothing in common with the national and historical Psalm 46-48. The poet here steps forward as a preacher in the midst of men. His theme is the transitoriness of the prosperity of the ungodly, and, on the other hand, the hope of the upright which rests on God. Accordingly the Psalm falls into the following divisions: an introduction, vv. 2-5, which by its very

promissory tone reminds one of the speeches of Elihu in the Book of Job, and the two parts of the sermon following thereupon, vv. 6-13, 14-21, which are marked out by a refrain, in which there is only a slight variation of expression. In its dogmatic character it harmonizes with the Psalms of the time of David, and by its antique and bold form takes rank with such Psalms as Psalm 17 by David and 83 by Asaph. Since also in the didactic Psalms of David and Asaph we meet with a style differing from that of their other Psalms, and, where the doings of the ungodly are severely rebuked, we find a harsher and more concise mode of expression and a duller, heavier tone, there is nothing at variance with the assumption that Psalm 49 was composed by the writer of Psalm 42-43 and 84; and more especially since David has composed Psalms of a kindred character (39 and 62) in the time of the persecution by Absalom. Nothing, however, is involved in this unity of the author.

*Psa. 49: 2-5.* Introduction. Very similarly do the elder (in the reign of Jehoshaphat) and the younger Micha (Micah) introduce their prophecies (1Ki. 22:28, Mic. 1: 2); and Elihu in the Book of Job his didactic discourses (Job. 34: 2, cf. 33: 2). It is an universal theme which the poet intends to take up, hence he calls upon all peoples and all the inhabitants of the **הָעוֹלָם**. Such is the word first of all for this temporal life, which glides by unnoticed, them for the present transitory world itself (vid., on Psa. 17:14). It is his intention to declare to the rich the utter nothingness or vanity of their false ground of hope, and to the poor the superiority of their true ground of hope; hence he wishes to have as hearers both **בְּנֵי אָדָם**, children of the common people, who are men and have otherwise nothing distinctive about them, and **בְּנֵי-אִישׁ**, children of men, i.e., of rank and distinction (vid., on Psa. 4: 3) — rich and poor, as he adds to make his meaning more clear. For his mouth will, or shall, utter **הַכְּמוֹת**, not: all sorts of wise teachings, but: weighty wisdom. Just in like manner **תְּבוּנוֹת** signifies profound insight or understanding; cf. plurals like **בִּינוֹת**, Isa. 27:11, **יְשׁוּעַת**, Psa. 42:12 and frequently, **שְׁלוֹת**, Jer. 22:21. The parallel word **תְּבוּנוֹת** in the passage before us, and the plural predicate in Pro. 24: 7, show that **הַכְּמוֹת**, here and in Pro. 1:20; 9: 1, cf. 14: 1, is not to be regarded, with Hitzig, Olshausen, and others, as another form of the singular **הַכְּמוֹת**. Side by side with the speaking of the mouth stands **הַגְּנוֹת לֵב** (with an unchangeable *Kametz* before the tone-syllable, Ew. § 166, *c*): the meditation (LXX **μελέτη**) of the heart, and in accordance therewith the well-thought-out discourse. What he intends to discourse is, however, not the creation of his own brain, but what he has received. A **מִשְׁלַל**, a saying embodying the wisdom of practical life, as God teaches men it, presents itself to his mind demanding to be heard; and to this he inclines his ear in order that, from being a diligent scholar of the wisdom from above, he may become a useful teacher of men,



inasmuch as he opens up, i.e., unravels, the divine *Mashal*, which in the depth and fulness of its contents is a חִידָה, i.e., an involved riddle (from חוּד, cogn. עָקַד, אָגַד), and plays the cithern thereby (ב of the accompaniment). The opening of the riddle does not consist in the solving of it, but in the setting of it forth. פָּתַח, to open = to propound, deliver [of a discourse], comes from the phrase פָּתַח אֶת־פִּיו, Pro. 31:26; cf. Psa. 119:130, where פָּתַח, an opening, is equivalent to an unlocking, a revelation.

*Psa. 49: 6-13.* First division of the sermon. Those who have to endure suffering from rich sinners have no need to fear, for the might and splendour of their oppressors is hastening towards destruction. יְמֵי רָע are days in which one experiences evil, as in Psa. 94:13, cf. Amo. 6: 3. The genitive רָע is continued in v. 6b in a clause that is subordinate to the בִּימֵי of v. 6a (cf. 1Sa. 25:15, Job. 29: 2, Psa. 90:15). The poet calls his crafty and malicious foes עֲקָבִי. There is no necessity for reading עֲקָבִי as Böttcher does, since without doubt a participial noun עֲקָב, *supplantator*, can be formed from עָקַב, *supplantare*; and although in its branchings out it coincides with עָקַב, *planta*, its meaning is made secure by the connection. To render the passage: “when wickedness surrounds me about my heels,” whether with or without changing עוֹן into עוֹן (Hupfeld, von Ortenberg), is proved on all sides to be inadmissible: it ought to have been עוֹל instead of עוֹן; but even then it would still be an awkward expression, “to surround any one’s heels,” <sup>f203</sup> and the הַבְּמַחִים, which follows, would be unconnected with what precedes. This last word comes after עֲקָבִי, giving minuteness to the description, and is then continued quite regularly in v. 7b by the finite verb. Up to this point all is clear enough; but now the difficulties accumulate. One naturally expects the thought, that the rich man is not able to redeem himself from death. Instead of this it is said, that no man is able to redeem another from death. Ewald, Böttcher, and others, therefore, take אָח, as in Eze. 18:10; 21:20 (vid., Hitzig), to be a careless form of writing for אָדָּךְ, and change יִפְדֶּה into the reflexive יִפְדֶּה; but the thought that is sought thus to be brought to is only then arrived at with great difficulty: the words ought to be אָדָּךְ אִישׁ לֹא יִפְדֶּה נַפְשׁוֹ. The words as they stand assert: a brother (אָח), as a prominently placed object, with *Rebia magnum*, = אָחִיו, cf. Eze. 5:10; 18:18, Mic. 7: 6, Mal. 1: 6) can a man by no means redeem, i.e., men cannot redeem one another. Hengstenberg and Hitzig find the thought that is to be expected in v. 8b: the rich ungodly man can with all his riches not even redeem another (אָח), much less then can he redeem himself, offer a כֹּפֶר for himself. But if the poet meant to be so

understood, he must have written **וְלֹא** and **כֶּפֶר נַפְשׁוֹ**. Vv. 8a and 8b bear no appearance of referring to different persons; the second clause is, on the contrary, the necessary supplement of the first: Among men certainly it is possible under some circumstances for one who is delivered over to death to be freed by money, but no **כֶּפֶר** (= **כֶּפֶר נַפְשׁוֹ**, Exo. 21:30 and frequently) can be given to God (**לְאֱלֹהִים**).

All idea of the thought one would most naturally look for must therefore be given up, so far as it can be made clear why the poet has given no direct expression to it. And this can be done. The thought of a man's redeeming himself is far from the poet's mind; and the contrast which he has before his mind is this: no man can redeem another, Elohim only can redeem man. That one of his fellow-men cannot redeem a man, is expressed as strongly as possible by the words **לֹא־יִפְדֶּה יִפְדֶּה**; the negative in other instances stands after the intensive infinitive, but here, as in Gen. 3: 4, Amo. 9: 8, Isa. 28:28, before it. By an easy flight of irony, v. 9 says that the **λύτρον** which is required to be paid for the souls of men is too precious, i.e., exorbitant, or such as cannot be found, and that he (whoever might wish to lay it down) lets it alone (is obliged to let it alone) for ever. Thus much is clear enough, so far as the language is concerned (**וְיִחְדַּל** according to the *consec. temp.* = **וְיִחְדַּל**), and, although somewhat fully expressed, is perfectly in accordance with the connection. But how is v. 10 attached to what precedes? Hengstenberg renders it, "he must for ever give it up, that he should live continually and not see the grave." But according to the syntax, **וְיִחַי** cannot be attached to **וְיִחְדַּל**, but only to the futures in v. 8, ranking with which the voluntative **וְיִחַי**, *ut vivat* (Ew. § 347, a). Thus, therefore, nothing remains but to take v. 9 (which von Ortenberg expunges as a gloss upon v. 8) as a parenthesis; the principal clause affirms that no man can give to God a ransom that shall protect another against death, so that this other should still continue (**עוֹד**) to live, and that without end (**לְנֶצַח**), without seeing the grave, i.e., without being obliged to go down into the grave. The **כִּי** in v. 11 is now confirmatory of what is denied by its opposite; it is, therefore, according to the sense, *imo* (cf. 1Ki. 21:15): ...that he may not see the grave — no indeed, without being able to interpose and alter it, he must see how all men, without distinction, succumb to death. Designedly the word used of the death of wise men is **מוֹת**, and of the death of the fool and the stupid man, **אָבַד**. Kurtz renders: "together with the fool and the slow of understanding;"; but **יַחַד** as a proposition cannot be supported; moreover, **וְעֲזָבוּ** would then have "the wise" as its subject, which is surely not the intention of the poet. Everything without distinction, and in mingled confusion,

falls a prey to death; the rich man must see it, and yet he is at the same time possessed by the foolish delusion that he, with his wealth, is immortal.

The reading קָבְרָם (LXX, Targ., Syr.), preferred by Ewald, and the conjecture קָבְרָם, adopted by Olshausen and Riehm, give a thought that is not altogether contrary to the connection, viz., the narrow grave is the eternal habitation of those who called broad lands their own; but this thought appears here, in view of v. 12c, too early. קָרָב denotes the inward part, or that which is within, described according to that which encircles or contains it: that which is within them is, “their houses (pronounce *bāttemo*) are for ever” (Hengstenberg, Hitzig); i.e., the contents of their inward part is the self-delusion that their houses are everlasting, and their habitations so durable that one generation after another will pass over them; cf. the similar style of expression in 10: 4b, Est. 5: 7. Hitzig further renders: men celebrate their names in the lands; בָּשֵׁם קָרָא, to call with a name = solemnly to proclaim it, to mention any one’s name with honour (Isa. 44: 5). But it is unlikely that the subject of קָרָא should now again be any other than the rich men themselves; and עַל אֲדָמוֹת for בְּכַל-הָאָרֶץ or בְּאֲרָצוֹת is contrary to the usage of the language. אֲדָמָה is the earth as tillage, אֲדָמוֹת (only in this passage) in this connection, fields, estates, lands; the proclaiming of names is, according to 2Sa. 12:28, 1Ki. 8:43, Amo. 9:12, equivalent to the calling of the lands or estates after their (the possessors’) names (Böttcher, Hupfeld, Kurtz). The idea of the rich is, their houses and dwelling-places (and they themselves who have grown up together with them) are of eternal duration; accordingly they solemnly give their own names to their lands, as being the names of immortals. But, adds the poet, man בִּיקָר, in the pomp of his riches and outward show, abideth not (*non pernoctat* = *non permanet*). בִּיקָר is the complement of the subject, although it logically (cf. 245:13) also belongs to בְּלִיָּין. Böttcher has shown the impropriety of reading בְּלִיָּיִן here according to v. 21. There are other instances also of refrains that are not exact repetitions; and this correction is moreover at once overthrown by the fact that בָּל will not suit יִבִּין, it would stamp each man of rank, as such, as one deficient in intelligence. On the other hand, this emotional negative בָּל is admirably suitable to יִלִּין: no indeed, he has no abiding. He is compared (נִמְשָׁל like the New Testament ὡμοιωθή), of like kind and lot, to cattle (בָּ as in Job. 30:19). נִדְמוּ is an attributive clause to בְּבַהֲמוֹת: like heads of cattle which are cut off or destroyed. The verb is so chosen that it is appropriate at the same time to men who are likened to the beasts (Hos. 10: 7, 15, Oba. 1: 5, Isa. 6: 5).

*Psa. 49:14-21.* Second part of the discourse, of equal compass with the first. Those who are thought to be immortal are laid low in Hades; whilst, on the other hand, those who cleave to God can hope to be redeemed by Him out of Hades. Olshausen complains on this passage that the expression is abrupt, rugged, and in part altogether obscure. The fault, however, lies not, as he thinks, in a serious corruption of the text, but in the style, designedly adopted, of Psalms like this of a gloomy turn. **זֶה דְרָכָם** refers back to v. 13, which is the proper *mashal* of the Psalm: this is their way or walk (**דְרָךְ** as in *Psa. 37: 5*, cf. *Hag. 1: 5*). Close upon this follows **בְּסֵל לָמוֹ** (their way), of those (cf. *Psa. 69: 4*) who possess self-confidence; **בְּסֵל** signifies confidence both in a good and bad sense, self-confidence, impudence, and even (*Ecc. 7:25*) in general, folly. The attributive clause is continued in v. 14*b*: and of those who after them (i.e., when they have spoken, as Hitzig takes it), or in a more universal sense: after or behind them (i.e., treading in their footsteps), have pleasure in their mouth, i.e., their haughty, insolent, rash words (cf. *Jud. 9:38*). If the meaning were “and after them go those who,” etc., then one would expect to find a verb in connection with **אַחֲרֵיהֶם** (cf. *Job. 21:33*). As a collateral definition, “after them = after their death,” it would, however, without any reason, exclude the idea of the assent given by their contemporaries. It is therefore to be explained according to *Job. 29:22*, or more universally according to *Deu. 12:30*. It may seem remarkable that the music here strikes in *forte*; but music can on its part, in mournfully shrill tones, also bewail the folly of the world.

*Psa. 49:15.* V. 15, so full of eschatological meaning, now describes what becomes of the departed. The subject of **שְׁתֵי** (as in *Psa. 73: 9*, where it is *Milra*, for **שְׁתֵי**) is not, as perhaps in the case of **ἀπαιτοῦσιν**, *Luke 12:20*, higher powers that are not named; but **שְׁתֵי** (here **שְׁתֵי**), as in *Psa. 3: 7*, *Hos 6:11*, *Isa. 22: 7*, is used in a semi-passive sense: like a herd of sheep they lay themselves down or they are made to lie down **לְשֹׂאֵל** (thus it is pointed by Ben-Asher; whereas Ben-Naphtali points **לְשֹׂאֵל**, with a silent *Shebâ*), to Hades = down into Hades (cf. *Psa. 88: 7*), so that they are shut up in it like sheep in their fold. And who is the shepherd there who rules these sheep with his rod? **מִן יָרֵאִים**. Not the good Shepherd (*Psa. 23: 1*), whose pasture is the land of the living, but Death, into whose power they have fallen irrecoverably, shall pasture them. Death is personified, as in *Job. 18:14*, as the king of terrors. The *modus consecutivus*, **וַיִּרְדּוּ**, now expresses the fact that will be realized in the future, which is the reverse side of that other fact. After the night of affliction has swiftly passed away, there breaks forth, for the upright, a morning; and in this morning they find themselves to be lords over these their

oppressors, like conquerors, who put their feet upon the necks of the vanquished (the LXX well renders it by *κατακυριεύσουσιν*). Thus shall it be with the upright, whilst the rich at their feet beneath, in the ground, are utterly destroyed. **לַפְקָר** has *Rebia magnum*, **יְשָׁרִים** has *Asla-Legarme*; accordingly the former word does not belong to what follows (in the morning, then vanishes...), but to what precedes. **צוּר** or **צִיר** (as in Isa. 45:16) signifies a form or image, just as **צוּרָה** (Arab. *ṣūrat*) is generally used; properly, that which is pressed in or pressed out, i.e., primarily something moulded or fashioned by the pressure of the hand (as in the case of the potter, **יָצַר**) or by means of some instrument that impresses and cuts the material. Here the word is used to denote materiality or corporeity, including the whole outward appearance (**φαντασία**, Act. 25:23). The **לוֹ** which refers to this, shows that **וְצוּרָם** is not a contraction of **וְצוּרָתָם** (vid., on Psa. 27: 5). Their materiality, their whole outward form belonging to this present state of being, becomes (falls away) **לְבַלּוֹת שְׂאוּל**. The *Lamed* is used in the same way as in **לְבַעַר הַיָּה**, Isa. 6:13; and **שְׂאוּל** is subject, like, e.g., the noun that follows the infinitive in Psa. 68:19, Job. 34:22. The same idea is obtained if it is rendered: and their form Hades is ready to consume (*consumiturus est*); but the order of the words, though not making this rendering impossible (cf. Psa. 32: 9, so far as **עַדְיוֹ** there means “its cheek”), is, however, less favourable to it (cf. Pro. 19: 8, Est. 3:11). **בְּלָה** was the most appropriate word for the slow, but sure and entire, consuming away (Job. 13:28) of the dead body which is gnawed or destroyed in the grave, this gate of the lower world. To this is added **לֹא מִזְבֵּל לוֹ** as a negative definition of the effect: so that there no longer remains to it, i.e., to the pompous external nature of the ungodly, any dwelling-place, and in general any place whatever; for whatever they had in and about themselves is destroyed, so that they wander to and fro as bare shadows in the dreary waste of Hades. To them, who thought to have built houses for eternity and called great districts of country after their own names, there remains no longer any **זִבְלָה** of this corporeal nature, inasmuch as Hades gradually and surely destroys it; it is for ever freed from its solid and dazzling shell, it wastes away lonesome in the grave, it perishes leaving no trace behind. Hupfeld’s interpretation is substantially the same, and that of Jerome even is similar: *et figura eorum conteretur in infero post habitaculum suum*; and Symmachus: **τὸ δὲ κρατερὸν αὐτῶν παλαιώσει ἄδης ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίσεως τῆς ἐντίμου αὐτῶν**.

Other expositors, it is true, solve the riddle of the half-verse in a totally different way. Mendelssohn refers **וְצוּרָם** to the upright: whose being lasts longer than the grave (survives it), hence it cannot be a habitation (eternal

dwelling) to it; and adds, “the poet could not speak more clearly of the resurrection (immortality).” <sup>f204</sup>

A modern Jewish Christian, Isr. Pick, looked upon in Jerusalem as dead, sees here a prediction of the breaking through of the realm of the dead by the risen One: “Their Rock is there, to break through the realm of the dead, that it may no longer serve Him as an abode.” <sup>f205</sup>

Von Hofmann’s interpretation (last of all in his *Schriftbeweis* ii. 2, 499, 2nd edition) lays claim to a more detailed consideration, because it has been sought to maintain it against all objections. By the morning he understands the end of the state or condition of death both of the righteous and of the ungodly. “In the state of death have they both alike found themselves: but now the dominion of death is at an end, and the dominion of the righteous beings.” But those who have, according to v. 15, died are only the ungodly, not the righteous as well. Hofmann then goes on to explain: their bodily form succumbs to the destruction of the lower world, so that it no longer has any abode; which is said to convey the thought, that the ungodly, “by means of the destruction of the lower world, to which their corporeal nature in common with themselves becomes subject, lose its last gloomy abode, but thereby lose their corporeal nature itself, which has now no longer any continuance:” “their existence becomes henceforth one absolutely devoid of possessions and of space, [“the exact opposite of the time when they possessed houses built for eternity, and broad tracts of country bore their name.” ] But even according to the teaching of the Old Testament concerning the last things, in the period after the Exile, the resurrection includes the righteous and the unrighteous (Dan. 12: 2); and according to the teaching of the New Testament, the damned, after Death and Hades are cast into the lake of fire, receive another **זבול**, viz., Gehenna, which stands in just the same relation to Hades as the transformed world does to the old heavens and the old earth. The thought discovered in v. 15, therefore, will not bear being put to the proof. There is, however, this further consideration, that nothing whatever is known in any other part of the Old Testament of such a destruction of *Sheôl*; and **לבלות** found in the Psalm before us would be a most inappropriate word to express it, instead of which it ought to have been **לבלות**; for the figurative language in Psa. 102:27, Isa. 51: 6, is worthless as a justification of this word, which signifies a gradual wearing out and using up or consuming, and must not, in opposition to the usage of the language, be explained according to **בל** and **בלי**. For this reason we refrain from making this passage a *locus classicus* in favour of an eschatological conception which cannot be supported by any other passage in the Old Testament. On the other side, however, the meaning of **לבקר** is limited if it be understood only of the morning which dawns upon the righteous one after the night of affliction, as

Kurtz does. What is, in fact, meant is a morning which not merely for individuals, but for all the upright, will be the end of oppression and the dawn of dominion: the ungodly are totally destroyed, and they (the upright) now triumph above their graves. In these words is expressed, in the manner of the Old Testament, the end of all time. Even according to Old Testament conception human history closes with the victory of good over evil. So far v. 15 is really a “riddle” of the last great day; expressed in New Testament language, of the resurrection morn, in which οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινούσι (1Co. 6: 2).

With וְאֵל, in v. 16 (used here adversatively, as e.g., in Job. 13:15, and as וְאֵל is more frequently used), the poet contrasts the totally different lot that awaits him with the lot of the rich who are satisfied in themselves and unmindful of God. וְאֵל belongs logically to וְאֵל, but (as is moreover frequently the case with וְאֵל, וְאֵל, and וְאֵל) is, notwithstanding this relation to the following member of the sentence, placed at the head of the sentence: yet Elohim will redeem my soul out of the hand of *Sheôl* (Psa. 89:49, Hos. 13:14). In what sense the poet means this redemption to be understood is shown by the allusion to the history of Enoch (Gen. 5:24) contained in בְּיַד יְהוָה. Böttcher shrewdly remarks, that this line of the verse is all the more expressive by reason of its relative shortness. Its meaning cannot be: He will take me under His protection; for לְקַח does not mean this. The true parallels are Psa. 83:24, Gen. 5:24. The removals of Enoch and Elijah were, as it were, fingerposts which pointed forward beyond the cheerless idea they possessed of the way of all men, into the depth of Hades. Glancing at these, the poet, who here speaks in the name of all upright sufferers, gives expression to the hope, that God will wrest him out of the power of *Sheôl* and take him to Himself. It is a hope that possesses not direct word of God upon which it could rest; it is not until later on that it receives the support of divine promise, and is for the present only a “bold flight” of faith. Now can we, for this very reason, attempt to define in what way the poet conceived of this redemption and this taking to Himself. In this matter he himself has no fully developed knowledge; the substance of his hope is only a dim inkling of what may be. This dimness that is only gradually lighted up, which lies over the last things in the Old Testament, is the result of a divine plan of education, in accordance with which the hope of eternal life was gradually to mature, and to be born as it were out of this wrestling faith itself. This faith is expressed in v. 16; and the music accompanies his confidence in cheerful and rejoicing strains.

After this, in vv. 17 ff., there is a return from the lyric strain to the gnomic and didactic. It must not, with Mendelssohn, be rendered: let it (my soul) not be afraid; but, since the psalmist begins after the manner of a discourse: fear thou

not. The increasing **כבוד**, i.e., might, abundance, and outward show (all these combined, from **כָּבַד**, *grave esse*), of the prosperous oppressor is not to make the saint afraid: he must after all die, and cannot take hence with him **הכל**, the all = anything whatever (cf. **לכל**, for anything whatever, Jer. 13: 7). **פִּי**, v. 17, like *ἔάν*, puts a supposable case; **פִּי**, v. 18, is confirmatory; and **פִּי**, v. 19a, is concessive, in the sense of **גַּם־כִּי**, according to Ew. § 362, *b*: even though he blessed his soul during his life, i.e., called it fortunate, and flattered it by cherished voluptuousness (cf. Deu. 29:18, **הַתְּבַרֵךְ בְּנַפְשׁוֹ**, and the soliloquy of the rich man in Luk. 12:19), and though they praise thee, O rich man, because thou dost enjoy thyself (Luk. 16:25), wishing themselves equally fortunate, still it (the soul of such an one) will be obliged to come or pass **אֲדַדְדֹר אֲבִנְתִּיו**. There is no necessity for taking the noun **דֹר** here in the rare signification dwelling (Arabic *dār*, synonym of *Menzil*), and it appears the most natural way to supply **נַפְשׁוֹ** as the subject to **תְּבוֹא** (Hofmann, Kurtz, and others), seeing that one would expect to find **אֲבִנְתִּיךָ** in the case of **תְּבוֹא** being a form of address. And there is then no need, in order to support the synallage, which is at any rate inelegant, to suppose that the suffix **יָוֹ**— takes its rise from the formula **בּוֹא (נִאֲסַף) אֶל־אֲבִתִּיו**, and is, in spite of the unsuitable grammatical connection, retained, just as **יַחְדָּו** and **בְּלֵם**, without regard to the suffixes, signify “together” and “all together” (Böttcher). Certainly the poet delights in difficulties of style, of which quite sufficient remain to him without adding this to the list. It is also not clear whether v. 20b is intended to be taken as a relative clause intimately attached to **אֲבִנְתִּיו**, or as an independent clause. The latter is admissible, and therefore to be preferred: there are the proud rich men together with their fathers buried in darkness for ever, without ever again seeing the light of a life which is not a mere shadowy life.

The didactic discourse now closes with the same proverb as the first part, v. 13. But instead of **בְּלִי־גִלְיוֹן** the expression here used is **וְלֹא יָבִין**, which is coordinate with **בִּיקָר** as a second attributive definition of the subject (Ew. § 351, *b*): a man in glory and who has no understanding, viz., does not distinguish between that which is perishable and that which is imperishable, between time and eternity. The proverb is here more precisely expressed. The gloomy prospect of the future does not belong to the rich man as such, but to the worldly and carnally minded rich man.



## Psalm 50

### DIVINE DISCOURSE CONCERNING THE TRUE SACRIFICE AND WORSHIP

*50: 1 EL ELOHIM JAHVE speaketh,  
And summoneth the earth from the rising of the sun to its going down.*

*50: 2 Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, Elohim shineth.*

*50: 3 Our God will come and shall not keep silence;  
Fire devoureth before Him,  
And round about Him it is very tempestuous.*

*50: 4 He calleth to the heavens above  
And to the earth to come to judge His people.*

*50: 5 “Gather My saints together unto Me,  
Who make a covenant with Me over sacrifice!” —*

*50: 6 And the heavens proclaim His righteousness,  
For Elohim purposeth to sit in judgment. (Sela)*

*50: 7 Hear, then, My people, and I will speak;  
O Israel, and I will testify to thee —  
Elohim, thy God am I.*

*50: 8 Not for thy sacrifices do I reprove thee,  
And thy burnt-offerings are continually before Me.*

*50: 9 I have no need to take bullocks out of thy house,  
Nor he-goats out of thy folds.*

*50:10 For Mine is every beast of the forest,  
The cattle upon a thousand hills.*

*50:11 I know every bird of the mountains,  
And that which moveth on the meadows is with Me.*

*50:12 If I were hungry I would not tell thee,  
For Mine is the world and its fulness.*

*50:13 Should I eat the flesh of bulls?  
And the blood of he-goats should I drink?*

*50:14 Offer unto God thanksgiving,  
And pay to the Most High thy vows.*

*50:15 And call upon Me in the day of trouble —  
I will deliver thee, and thou shalt honour Me.*

*50:16 But to the evil-doer Elohim saith:  
How dost thou dare to tell My statutes,  
And that thou takest My covenant into thy mouth;*

*50:17 Whereas thou nevertheless hatest instruction,  
And castest My words behind thee?!*

*50:18 When thou seest a thief, thou takest pleasure in him,  
And with adulterers dost thou make thyself familiar.*

*50:19 Thou lettest thy mouth loose to wickedness,  
And thy tongue frameth deceit.*

*50:20 Thou sittest and slanderest thy brother,  
Upon thy mother's son thou bringest reproach.*

*50:21 These things doest thou, and, because I keep silence,  
Thou thinkest I am exactly like thee —  
I will show thee and set it before thine eyes.*

*50:22 Consider, now, this, ye who forget God,  
Lest I tear in pieces and there be none to rescue.*

*50:23 Whoso offereth thanksgiving, honoureth Me truly,  
And prepareth a way, in which I may show him the salvation of Elohim.*

*Psalm 50.* With the preceding Psalm the series of the Korahitic Elohim-Psalms of the primary collection (Psalm 1-72) closes. There are, reckoning Psalm 42 and 43 as one Psalm, seven of them (Psalm 42-49). They form the principal group of the Korahitic Psalms, to which the third book furnishes a supplement, bearing in part an Elohimic (Psalm 84) and in part a Jehovic impress (Psalm 85, 87, 88). The Asaphic Psalms, on the contrary, belong exclusively to the Elohimic style of Psalms, but do not, however, all stand together: the principal group of them is to be found in the third book (Psalm 73-83), and the primary collection contains only one of them, viz., Psalm 50, which is here placed immediately after Psalm 49 on account of several points of mutual relationship, and more especially because the prominent *Hear then, My people* (Psa. 50: 7), is in accord with the beginning of Psalm 49, *Hear, all ye peoples*.

According to 1Ch. 23: 2-5, the whole of the thirty-eight thousand Levites were divided by David into four divisions (24,000 + 6000 + 4000 + 4000). To the fourth division (4000) was assigned the music belonging to divine worship. Out of this division, however, a select company of two hundred and eighty-eight singers was further singled out, and divided into twenty-four classes. These last were placed under three leaders or precentors (*Sangmeister*), viz., fourteen classes under Heman the Kehathite and his fourteen sons; four classes under Asaph the Gersonite and his four sons; and six classes under

Ethan (Jeduthun) and his six sons (1Ch. 25, cf. ch. 15:17 ff.). The instruments played by these three leaders, which they made use of on account of their clear, penetrating sound, were the cymbals (1Ch. 15:19). Also in 1Ch. 16: 5, where Asaph is described as the chief (הַרְאֵשׁ) of the sacred music in the tent where the Ark was placed, he strikes the cymbals. That he was the chief, first leader, cannot be affirmed. The usual order of the names if “Heman, Asaph, and Ethan.” The same order is also observed in the genealogies of the three in 1Ch. 6:16-32. Heman takes the prominent place, and at his right hand stands Asaph, and on his left Ethan.

History bears witness to the fact that Asaph was also a Psalm-writer. For, according to 2Ch. 29:30, Hezekiah brought “the words of David and of Asaph the seer” into use again in the service of the house of God. And in the Book of Nehemiah, Neh. 12:46, David and Asaph are placed side by side as הַמְשִׁרְרִים רִאשִׁי in the days of old in Israel.

The twelve Psalms bearing the inscription לְאַסָּף are all Elohimic. The name of God יהוה does not occur at all in two (77, 82), and in the rest only once, or at the most twice. Side by side with אֱלֹהִים, אֲדֹנָי, and אֵל are used as favourite names, and especial preference is also given to עֲלִיּוֹן. Of compounded names of God, אֵל אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה (only besides in Jos. 22:22) in the Psalter, and אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת in the Old Testament Scriptures generally (vid., *Symbolae*, pp. 14-16), are exclusively peculiar to them. So far as concerns their contents, they are distinguished from the Korahitic Psalms by their prophetically judicial character. As in the prophets, God is frequently introduced as speaking; and we meet with detailed prophetic pictures of the appearing of God the Judge, together with somewhat long judicial addresses (Psalm 50, 75, 82). The appellation הַחַיָּה, which Asaph bears in 2Ch. 29:30, accords with this; notwithstanding the chronicler also applies the same epithet to both the other precentors. The ground of this, as with נָבִיא, which is used by the chronicler of the singing and playing of instruments in the service of the house of God, is to be found in the intimate connection between the sacred lyric and prophecy as a whole. The future visionary character of the Asaphic Psalms has its reverse side in the historical past. We frequently meet with descriptive retrospective glances at facts of the primeval history (Psa. 74:13-15; 77:15 ff., 80: 9-12; 81: 5-8; 83:10-12), and Psalm 78 is entirely taken up with holding up the mirror of the ancient history of the nation to the people of the present. If we read the twelve Psalms of Asaph in order one after the other, we shall, moreover, observe this striking characteristic, that mention is made of Joseph and the tribes descended from him more frequently than anywhere else (Psa. 77:16; 78: 9, 67 f., 81: 6; 80: 2 f.). Nor is another feature less remarkable,

viz., that the mutual relationship of Jahve to Israel is set forth under the figure of the shepherd and his flock rather than any other (Psa. 74: 1; 77:21; 78:52, cf. 70-72, 79:13; 80: 2). Moreover these Psalms delight in other respects to vary the designations for the people of God as much as possible.

In Psalm 50, chs. 73-83, we have before us a peculiar type of Psalms. The inscription **לְאַסָּף** has, so to speak, deep-lying internal grounds in its support. But it does not follow from this inscription that all these Psalms were composed by the aged Asaph, who, as Psa. 78:69 shows, lived until the early part of Solomon's reign. The outward marks peculiar to Asaph were continued in his posterity even into the period after the Exile. History mentions Asaphites under Jehoshaphat (2Ch. 20:14), under Hezekiah (2Ch. 29:13), and among the exiles who returned (Ezr. 2:41, cf. 3:10, one hundred and twenty-eight Asaphites; Neh. 7:44, cf. 11:22, a hundred and forty-eight of them). Since down to the period after the Exile even the cymbals (**מִצְלֵתִים**) descended to them from their ancestor, the poetic talent and enthusiasm may also have been hereditary among them. The later "Psalms of Asaph," whether composed by later Asaphites or some other person, are inscribed **לְאַסָּף** because, by whomsoever, they are composed in the style of Asaph and after Asaphic models. Psalm 50, however, is an original Psalm of Asaph.

After the manner of the prophets the twofold truth is here advanced, that God has no delight in animal sacrifice without the sacrifice of prayer in which the heart is engaged, and that the confession of His word without a life that accords with His word is an abomination to Him. It is the very same fundamental thought which is expressed in Psa. 40: 7-9; 69:31 f., 51:18 f., and underlies Psalm 24 (1-6) and 15; they are all echoes of the grand utterance of Samuel (1Sa. 15:22), the father of the poetry of the Psalms. It cannot surprise one that stress is laid on this denunciation of a heartless service of works by so many voices during the Davidic age. The nothingness of the *opus operatum* is also later on the watchword of the prophets in times when religious observances, well ordered and in accordance with legal prescription, predominate in Judah. Nor should it seem strange that Asaph the Levite, who was appointed to the sanctuary on Zion, expresses himself thus; for Jeremiah was also a Levite and even a priest (*cohen*), and yet no one has spoken a bolder, and more cutting word against the outward and formal service of sacrifice than he (Jer. 7:22 f.). Both these objections being removed, there is nothing else that stands in the way of our ascribing this Psalm to Asaph himself. This is favoured by echoes of the Psalm in the prophets (cf. v. 2 with Lam. 2:15, and the verse-ending v. 8, 38:18, with Isa. 49:16), and there is nothing opposed to it in the form of the language.

*Psa. 50: 1-3.* The theophany. The names of God are heaped up in v. 1 in order to gain a thoroughly full-toned exordium for the description of God as the Judge of the world. Hupfeld considers this heaping up cold and stiff; but it is exactly in accordance with the taste of the Elohimic style. The three names are co-ordinate with one another; for אֱלֹהִים אֵל does not mean “God of gods,” which would rather be expressed by אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱלֹהִים or אֵל אֱלֹהִים. אֵל is the name for God as the Almighty; אֱלֹהִים as the Revered One; יְהוָה as the Being, absolute in His existence, and who accordingly freely influences and moulds history after His own plan — this His peculiar proper-name is the third in the triad. Perfects alternate in vv. 1-6 with futures, at one time the idea of that which is actually taking place, and at another of that which is future, predominating. Jahve summons the earth to be a witness of the divine judgment upon the people of the covenant. The addition “from the rising of the sun to its going down,” shows that the poet means the earth in respect of its inhabitants. He speaks, and because what He speaks is of universal significance He makes the earth in all its compass His audience. This summons precedes His self-manifestation. It is to be construed, with Aquila, the Syriac, Jerome, Tremellius, and Montanus, “out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, Elohim shineth.” Zion, the perfect in beauty (cf. the dependent passage Lam. 2:15, and 1 Macc. 2:12, where the temple is called ἡ καλλωνὴ ἡμῶν), because the place of the presence of God the glorious One, is the bright spot whence the brightness of the divine manifestation spreads forth like the rising sun. In itself certainly it is not inappropriate, with the LXX, Vulgate, and Luther, to take מְכַלְלֵי-יָפִי as a designation of the manifestation of Elohim in His glory, which is the *non pius ultra* of beauty, and consequently to be explained according to Eze. 28:12, cf. Exo. 33:19, and not according to Lam. 2:15 (more particularly since Jeremiah so readily gives a new turn to the language of older writers). But, taking the fact into consideration that nowhere in Scripture is beauty (יָפִי) thus directly predicated of God, to whom peculiarly belongs a glory that transcends all beauty, we must follow the guidance of the accentuation, which marks מְכַלְלֵי-יָפִי by *Mercha* as in apposition with צִיּוֹן (cf. *Psychol.* S. 49; tr. p. 60). The poet beholds the appearing of God, an appearing that resembles the rising of the sun (הוֹפִיא), as in the Asaph Psalm 80: 2, after Deu. 33: 2, from יָפַע, with a transition of the primary notion of rising, Arab. *yf*, *wf*, to that of beaming forth and lighting up far and wide, as in Arab. *st*); for “our God will come and by no means keep silence.” It is not to be rendered: Let our God come (Hupfeld) and not keep silence (Olshausen). The former wish comes too late after the preceding הוֹפִיעַ (וּבֵא) is consequently *veniet*, and written as e.g., in Psa. 37:13), and the latter is superfluous. אֵל, as in Psa. 34: 6; 41: 3, Isa. 2: 9, and frequently,

implies in the negative a lively interest on the part of the writer: He cannot, He dare not keep silence, His glory will not allow it. He who gave the Law, will enter into judgment with those who have it and do not keep it; He cannot long look on and keep silence. He must punish, and first of all by word in order to warn them against the punishment by deeds. Fire and storm are the harbingers of the Lawgiver of Sinai who now appears as Judge. The fire threatens to consume the sinners, and the storm (viz., a tempest accompanied with lightning and thunder, as in Job. 38: 1) threatens to drive them away like chaff. The expression in v. 3b is like Psa. 18: 9. The *fem. Niph.* נִשְׁעָרָה does not refer to שָׂא, but is used as neuter: it is stormed, i.e., a storm rages (Apollinaris, ἔλαιλαπίσθη σφόδρα). The fire is His wrath; and the storm the power or force of His wrath.

*Psa. 50: 4-6.* The judgment scene. To the heavens above (מֵעַל, elsewhere a preposition, here, as in Gen. 27:39; 49:25, an adverb, *desuper, superne*) and to the earth God calls (קָרָא אֵל, as, e.g., Gen. 28: 1), to both לְדִין אָמוֹ, in order to sit in judgment upon His people in their presence, and with them as witnesses of His doings. Or is it not that they are summoned to attend, but that the commission, v. 5, is addressed to them (Olshausen, Hitzig)? Certainly not, for the act of gathering is not one that properly belongs to the heavens and the earth, which, however, because they exist from the beginning and will last for ever, are suited to be witnesses (Deu. 4:26; 32: 1, Isa. 1: 2, 1 Macc. 2:37). The summons אִסְפוּ is addressed, as in Mat. 24:31, and frequently in visions, to the celestial spirits, the servants of the God here appearing. The accused who are to be brought before the divine tribunal are mentioned by names which, without their state of mind and heart corresponding to them, express the relationship to Himself in which God has placed them (cf. Deu. 32:15, Isa. 42:19). They are called חֲסִידִים, as in the Asaph Psalm 79: 2. This contradiction between their relationship and their conduct makes an undesigned but bitter irony. In a covenant relationship, consecrated and ratified by a covenant sacrifice (עֲלִי-זֶבַח similar to Psa. 92: 4, Num. 10:10), has God placed Himself towards them (Exo. 24); and this covenant relationship is also maintained on their part by offering sacrifices as an expression of their obedience and of their fidelity. The participle כֹּרְתִי here implies the constant continuance of that primary covenant-making. Now, while the accused are gathered up, the poet hears the heavens solemnly acknowledge the righteousness of the Judge beforehand. The participial construction שֹׁפֵט הוּא, which always, according to the connection, expresses the present (Nah. 1: 2), or the past (Jud. 4: 4), or the future (Isa. 24:31), is in this instance an expression of that which is near at hand (*fut. instans*). הוּא has not the sense of *ipse* (Ew. § 314, a), for it corresponds to the “I” in אֲנִי שֹׁפֵט or הֲנִי שֹׁפֵט; and

כִּי is not to be translated by *nam* (Hitzig), for the fact that God intends to judge requires no further announcement. On the contrary, because God is just now in the act of sitting in judgment, the heavens, the witnesses most prominent and nearest to Him, bear witness to His righteousness. The earthly music, as the סִלְה directs, is here to join in with the celestial praise. Nothing further is now wanting to the completeness of the judgment scene; the action now begins.

*Psa. 50: 7-15.* Exposition of the sacrificial *Tôra* for the good of those whose holiness consists in outward works. The forms strengthened by *ah*, in v. 7, describe God's earnest desire to have Israel for willing hearers as being quite as strong as His desire to speak and to bear witness. בְּהֵעִיד, *obtestari aliquem*, to come forward as witness, either solemnly assuring, or, as here and in the Psalm of Asaph, 81: 9, earnestly warning and punishing (cf. Arab. *šahida* with *b*, to bear witness against any one). On the *Dagesh forte conjunctive* in בְּכִי, vid., Ges. § 20, 2, *a*. He who is speaking has a right thus to stand face to face with Israel, for he is Elohim, the God of Israel — by which designation reference is made to the words אֲנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ (Exo. 20: 2), with which begins the Law as given from Sinai, and which here take the Elohimic form (whereas in Psa. 81:11 they remain unaltered) and are inverted in accordance with the context. As v. 8 states, it is not the material sacrifices, which Israel continually, without cessation, offers, that are the object of the censuring testimony. וְעֹלֹתֶיךָ, even if it has *Mugrash*, as in Baer, is not on this account, according to the interpretation given by the accentuation, equivalent to וְעַל-עֹלֹתֶיךָ (cf. on the other hand Psa. 38:18); it is a simple assertory substantival clause: thy burnt-offerings are, without intermission, continually before Me. God will not dispute about sacrifices in their outward characteristics; for — so vv. 9-11 go on to say — He does not need sacrifices for the sake of receiving from Israel what He does not otherwise possess. His is every wild beast (חִיתוֹ, as in the Asaph Psa. 79: 2) of the forest, His the cattle בַּהֲרַרֵי אֱלֵף, upon the mountains of a thousand, i.e., upon the thousand (and myriad) mountains (similar to מְתֵי מֵאָט or מְתֵי מִסְפָּר), or: where they live by thousands (a similar combination to נִבְלַע עֶשְׂוֹר). Both explanations of the genitive are unsupported by any perfectly analogous instance so far as language is concerned; the former, however, is to be preferred on account of the singular, which is better suited to it. He knows every bird that makes its home on the mountains; יָדַע, as usually, of a knowledge which masters a subject, compasses it and makes it its own. Whatever moves about the fields if with Him, i.e., is within the range of His knowledge (cf. Job. 27:11; 10:13), and therefore of His power; זָיִי (here and in the Asaph Psa. 80:14) from זָאָזַי = זָעָזַי, to move to and fro, like מִיָּט from מִיָּטָא, to swept out, cf. κινώπτεον,

κνώδαλον, from κινεῖν. But just as little as God requires sacrifices in order thereby to enrich Himself, is there any need on His part that might be satisfied by sacrifices, vv. 12 f. If God should hunger, He would not stand in need of man's help in order to satisfy Himself; but He is never hungry, for He is the Being raised above all carnal wants. Just on this account, what God requires is not by any means the outward worship of sacrifice, but a spiritual offering, the worship of the heart, v. 14. Instead of the **שְׁלָמִים**, and more particularly **תְּנֻחָה זָבַח**, Lev. 7:11-15, and **שְׁלָמֵי נֶדָר**, Lev. 7:16 (under the generic idea of which are also included, strictly speaking, vowed thank-offerings), God desires the thanksgiving of the heart and the performance of that which has been vowed in respect of our moral relationship to Himself and to men; and instead of the **עֲוֹלָה** in its manifold forms of devotion, the prayer of the heart, which shall not remain unanswered, so that in the round of this **λογικὴ λατρεία** everything proceeds from and ends in **εὐχαριστία**. It is not the sacrifices offered in a becoming spirit that are contrasted with those offered without the heart (as, e.g., Sir. 32 [35]:1-9), but the outward sacrifice appears on the whole to be rejected in comparison with the spiritual sacrifice. This entire turning away from the outward form of the legal ceremonial is, in the Old Testament, already a predictive turning towards that worship of God in spirit and in truth which the new covenant makes alone of avail, after the forms of the Law have served as swaddling clothes to the New Testament life which was coming into being in the old covenant. This "becoming" begins even in the *Tōra* itself, especially in Deuteronomy. Our Psalm, like the Chokma (Pro. 21: 3), and prophecy in the succeeding age (cf. Hos. 6: 6, Mic. 6: 6-8, Isa. 1:11-15, and other passages), stands upon the standpoint of this concluding book of the *Tōra*, which traces back all the requirements of the Law to the fundamental command of love.

*Psa. 50:16-21.* The accusation of the manifest sinners. It is not those who are addressed in vv. 7 ff., as Hengstenberg thinks, who are here addressed. Even the position of the words **וְלִרְשָׁעִים אָמַר** clearly shows that the divine discourse is now turned to another class, viz., to the evil-doers, who, in connection with open and manifest sins and vices, take the word of God upon their lips, a distinct class from those who base their sanctity upon outward works of piety, who outwardly fulfil the commands of God, but satisfy and deceive themselves with this outward observance. **לִּמָּה לָּךְ**, what hast thou, that thou = it belongs not to thee, it does not behove thee. With **וְאֵתָּה**, in v. 17, an adversative subordinate clause beings: since thou dost not care to know anything of the moral ennobling which it is the design of the Law to give, and my words, instead of having them as a constant test-line before thine eyes, thou castest behind thee and so turnest thy back upon them (cf. Isa. 38:17).



וַתִּרְיַץ is not from רִיץ (LXX, Targum, and Saadia), in which case it would have to be pointed וַתִּרְיַץ, but from רָצָה, and is construed here, as in Job. 34: 9, with עַם: to have pleasure in intercourse with any one. In v. 18a the transgression of the eighth commandment is condemned, in v. 18b that of the seventh, in vv. 19 f. that of the ninth (concerning the truthfulness of testimony). שְׁלַח פִּה בְרָעָה, to give up one's mouth unrestrainedly to evil, i.e., so that evil issues from it. תִּשָּׁב, v. 20a, has reference to gossiping company (cf. Psa. 1: 1). דָּפַי signifies a thrust, a push (cf. הִדְרִי), after which the LXX renders it ἐτίθεισ σκάνδαλον (cf. Lev. 19:14), but it also signifies vexation and mockery (cf. גִּדְרִי); it is therefore to be rendered: to bring reproach (Jerome, *opprobrium*) upon any one, to cover him with dishonour. The preposition בְּ with דָּפַר has, just as in Num. 12: 1, and frequently, a hostile signification. "Thy mother's son" is he who is born of the same mother with thyself, and not merely of the same father, consequently thy brother after the flesh in the fullest sense. What Jahve says in this passage is exactly the same as that which the apostle of Jesus Christ says in Rom. 2:17-24. This contradiction between the knowledge and the life of men God must, for His holiness' sake, unmask and punish, v. 21. The sinner thinks otherwise: God is like himself, i.e., that is also not accounted by God as sin, which he allows himself to do under the cloak of his dead knowledge. For just as a man is in himself, such is his conception also of his God (vid., 18:26 f.). But God will not encourage this foolish idea: "I will therefore reprove thee and set (it) in order before thine eyes" (וַאֲעָרְכָה, not וַאֲעָרְכָה, in order to give expression, the second time at least, to the mood, the form of which has been obliterated by the suffix); He will set before the eyes of the sinner, who practically and also in theory denies the divine holiness, the real state of his heart and life, so that he shall be terrified at it. Instead of הָיָה, the *infin. intensit.* here, under the influence of the close connection of the clauses (Ew. § 240, c), is הָיִיתָ; the *oratio obliqua* begins with it, without בִּי (*quod*). כְּמוֹךָ exactly corresponds to the German *deines Gleichen*, thine equal.

*Psa. 50:22, 23.* Epilogue of the divine discourse. Under the name אֱלֹהֵי שְׂכָחִי are comprehended the decent or honourable whose sanctity relies upon outward works, and those who know better but give way to licentiousness; and they are warned of the final execution of the sentence which they have deserved. In dead works God delighteth not, but whoso offereth thanksgiving (viz., not *shelamim-tôda*, but the *tôda* of the heart), he praises Him <sup>f206</sup>

and שֵׁם דָּרָךְ. It is unnecessary with Luther, following the LXX, Vulgate, and Syriac versions, to read וְשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵי וְשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵי וְשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵי.

[do not read וְשָׁ, but וְשָׁ] assumes וְשָׁ to be the traditional reading. If we take וְשָׁ דָרְךָ as a thought complete in itself, — which is perfectly possible in a certain sense (vid., Isa. 43:19), — then it is best explained according to the Vulgate (*qui ordinat viam*), with Böttcher, Maurer, and Hupfeld: *viam h. e. recta incedere (legel agere) parans*; but the expression is inadequate to express this ethical sense (cf. Pro. 4:26), and consequently is also without example. The LXX indicates the correct idea in the rendering καὶ ἐκεῖ ὁδὸς ἣ δείξω αὐτῷ τὸ σωτήριον Θεοῦ. The וְשָׁ דָרְךָ (designedly not pointed דָרְךָ), which standing entirely by itself has no definite meaning, receives its requisite supplement by means of the attributive clause that follows. Such an one prepares a way along which I will grant to him to see the salvation of Elohim, i.e., along which I will grant him a rapturous vision of the full reality of My salvation. The form 'כַּבְּדֵנִי' is without example elsewhere. It sounds like the likewise epenthetical 'יִקְרָאֵנִי', Pro. 1:28, cf. 8:17, Hos. 5:15, and may be understood as an imitation of it as regards sound. 'יִכְבְּדֵנִי' (= 'כַּבְּדֵנִי') is in the writer's mind as the form out of pause (Ges. § 58, 4). With v. 23 the Psalm recurs to its central point and climax, v. 14 f. What Jahve here discourses in a post-Sinaitic appearing, is the very same discourse concerning the worthlessness of dead works and concerning the true will of God that Jesus addresses to the assembled people when He enters upon His ministry. The cycle of the revelation of the Gospel is linked to the cycle of the revelation of the Law by the Sermon on the Mount; this is the point at which both cycles touch.

## Psalm 51

### PENITENTIAL PRAYER AND INTERCESSION FOR RESTORATION TO FAVOUR

*51: 3 BE merciful to me, Elohim, according to Thy loving-kindness,  
According to the greatness of Thy compassion blot out my transgressions!*

*51: 4 Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity,  
And from my sin make me clean.*

*51: 5 For of my transgressions I am conscious,  
And my sin is ever present to me.*

*51: 6 Against Thee only have I sinned,  
And done that which is evil in Thine eyes;  
That Thou mayest appear just when Thou speakest,  
Clear when Thou judgest.*

*51: 7 Behold, in iniquity was I born,  
And in sin did my mother conceive me.*

*51: 8 Behold, truth dost Thou desire in the reins,  
And in the hidden part do Thou make me to know wisdom.*

*51: 9 Oh purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean;  
Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.*

*51:10 Make me to hear joy and gladness,  
That the bones which Thou hast crushed may exult.*

*51:11 Hide Thy face from my sins,  
And all my iniquities do Thou blot out.*

*51:12 Create me a clean heart, Elohim,  
And renew a stedfast spirit in my inward part.*

*51:13 Cast me not from Thy presence,  
And Thy Holy Spirit take not from me.*

*51:14 Turn again upon me the joy of Thy salvation,  
And with a spirit of willingness uphold me.*

*51:15 Then will I teach transgressors Thy ways,  
And sinners shall be converted to Thee.*

*51:16 Deliver me from blood-guiltiness, Elohim, God of my salvation,  
Then shall my tongue exult over Thy righteousness.*

*51:17 O Lord, open Thou my lips,  
And my mouth shall declare Thy praise.*

*51:18 For Thou delightest not in sacrifice, else would I give it,  
Burnt-offering Thou desirest not.*

*51:19 The sacrifices of Elohim are a broken spirit,  
A heart broken and contrite, Elohim, Thou dost not despise! —*

*51:20 Do good in Thy good pleasure unto Zion,  
Build Thou the walls of Jerusalem;*

*51:21 Then shalt Thou delight in true sacrifices, burnt-offering and whole-burnt-offering; Then shall bullocks be offered on Thine altar.*

*Psalm 51.* The same depreciation of the external sacrifice that is expressed in Psalm 50 finds utterance in Psalm 51, which supplements the former, according as it extends the spiritualizing of the sacrifice to the offering for sin (cf. 40: 7). This Psalm is the first of the Davidic Elohim-Psalms. The inscription runs: *To the Precentor, a Psalm by David, when Nathan the prophet came to him, after he had gone in to Bathsheba.* The carelessness of the Hebrew style shows itself in the fact that one and the same phrase is used of Nathan's coming in an official capacity to David (cf. 2Sa. 12: 1) and of

David's going in unto Bathsheba (בֹּאֵ אֶל, as in Gen. 6: 4; 16: 2, cf. 2Sa. 11: 4). The comparative בְּאִשֶּׁר, as a particle of time in the whole compass of the Latin *quum*, holds together that which precedes and that which subsequently takes place. Followed by the perfect (2Sa. 12:21, 1Sa. 12: 8), it has the sense of *postquam* (cf. the confusing of this כְּאִשֶּׁר with אַחֲרֵי אִשֶּׁר, Jos. 2: 7). By בְּבוֹאֵ the period within which the composition of the Psalm falls is merely indicated in a general way. The Psalm shows us how David struggles to gain an inward and conscious certainty of the forgiveness of sin, which was announced to him by Nathan (2Sa. 12:13). In Psalm ch. 6 and 38 we have already heard David, sick in soul and body, praying for forgiveness; in Psalm 51 he has even become calmer and more cheerful in his soul, and there is nothing wanting to him except the rapturous realization of the favour within the range of which he already finds himself. On the other hand, Psalm 32 lies even beyond Psalm 51. For what David promises in Psa. 51:15, viz., that, if favour is again shown to him, he will teach the apostate ones the ways of God, that he will teach sinners how they are to turn to God, we heard him fulfil in the sententious didactic Psalm 32.

Hitzig assigns Psalm 51, like Psalm 50, to the writer of Isa. 40-66. But the manifold coincidences of matter and of style only prove that this prophet was familiar with the two Psalms. We discern in Psalm 51 four parts of decreasing length. The first part, vv. 3-11, contains the prayer for remission of sin; the second, vv. 12-15, the prayer for renewal; the third, vv. 16-19, the vow of spiritual sacrifices; the fourth, vv. 20, 21, the intercession for all Jerusalem. The divine name *Elohim* occurs five times, and is appropriately distributed throughout the Psalm.

*Psa. 51: 3, 4.* Prayer for the remission of sin. Concerning the interchangeable names for sin, vid., on Psa. 32: 1 f. Although the primary occasion of the Psalm is the sin of adultery, still David says פְּשָׁאֵ, not merely because many other sins were developed out of it, as his guilt of blood in the case of Uriah, the scandal put into the mouths of the enemies of Jahve, and his self-delusion, which lasted almost a whole year; but also because each solitary sin, the more it is perceived in its fundamental character and, as it were, microscopically discerned, all the more does it appear as a manifold and entangled skein of sins, and stands forth in a still more intimate and terrible relation, as of cause and effect, to the whole corrupt and degenerated condition in which the sinner finds himself. In מְחַהֵ sins are conceived of as a cumulative debt (according to Isa. 44:22, cf. 43:25, like a thick, dark cloud) written down (Jer. 17: 1) against the time of the payment by punishment. In פְּבַסְנִי (from פָּסַם, πλύνειν, to wash by rubbing and kneading up,

distinguished from רָחַץ, λούειν, to wash by rinsing) iniquity is conceived of as deeply ingrained dirt. In מְהַרְרֵנִי, the usual word for a declarative and *de facto* making clean, sin is conceived of as a leprosy, Lev. 13: 6, 34. the *Kerî* runs הָרַב כְּבִסְנִי (imperat. Hiph., like הָרַף, 37: 8), “make great or much, wash me,” i.e., (according to Ges. § 142, 3, *b*) wash me altogether, *penitus et totum*, which is the same as is expressed by the *Chethîb* הָרַבָּה (prop. *multum faciendo* = *multum, prorsus*, Ges. § 131, 2). In פָּרַב (Isa. 63: 7) and הָרַב is expressed the depth of the consciousness of sin; *profunda enim malitia*, as Martin Geier observes, *insolitam raramque gratiam postulat*.

*Psa. 51: 5, 6.* Substantiation of the prayer by the consideration, that his sense of sin is more than superficial, and that he is ready to make a penitential confession. True penitence is not a dead knowledge of sin committed, but a living sensitive consciousness of it (Isa. 59:12), to which it is ever present as a matter and ground of unrest and pain. This penitential sorrow, which pervades the whole man, is, it is true, no merit that wins mercy or favour, but it is the condition, without which it is impossible for any manifestation of favour to take place. Such true consciousness of sin contemplates sin, of whatever kind it may be, directly as sin against God, and in its ultimate ground as sin against Him alone (אֶת־לִּי with לְ of the person sinned against, Isa. 42:24, Mic. 7: 9); for every relation in which man stands to his fellow-men, and to created things in general, is but the manifest form of his fundamental relationship to God; and sin is “that which is evil in the eyes of God” (Isa. 65:12; 66: 4), it is contradiction to the will of God, the sole and highest Lawgiver and Judge. Thus it is, as David confesses, with regard to his sin, in order that... This לְמַאן must not be weakened by understanding it to refer to the result instead of to the aim or purpose. If, however, it is intended to express intention, it follows close upon the moral relationship of man to God expressed in לֵךְ לְבָרְךָ and בְּעֵינֶיךָ בְּהִרְעֵה, — a relationship, the aim of which is, that God, when He now condemns the sinner, may appear as the just and holy One, who, as the sinner is obliged himself to acknowledge, cannot do otherwise than pronounce a condemnatory decision concerning him. When sin becomes manifest to a man as such, he must himself say Amen to the divine sentence, just as David does to that passed upon him by Nathan. And it is just the nature of penitence so to confess one’s self to be in the wrong in order that God may be in the right and gain His cause. If, however, the sinner’s self-accusation justifies the divine righteousness or justice, just as, on the other hand, all self-justification on the part of the sinner (which, however, sooner or later will be undeceived) accuses God of unrighteousness or injustice (Job. 40: 8): then all human sin must in the end tend towards the glorifying of God. In this sense v. 6*b* is applied by Paul (Rom. 3: 4), inasmuch as he regards what is here written in the Psalter — ὄψως

ἄν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου, καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε (LXX) — as the goal towards which the whole history of Israel tends. Instead of בְּדַבְרֶיךָ (*infin.* like שְׁלַחָךְ, Gen. 38:17, in this instance for the sake of similarity of sound <sup>f207</sup> instead of the otherwise usual form דַּבְרֶיךָ), in *Thy speaking*, the LXX renders ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου = בְּדַבְרֶיךָ; instead of בְּשִׁפְטֶיךָ, ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε = בְּהַשְׁפִּטֶיךָ (*infin. Niph.*), provided κρίνεσθαί is intended as passive and not (as in Jer. 2: 9 LXX, cf. Mat. 5:40) as middle. The thought remains essentially unchanged by the side of these deviations; and even the taking of the verb זָכָה, to be clean, pure, in the Syriac signification *νικᾶν*, does not alter it. That God may be justified in His decisive speaking and judging; that He, the Judge, may gain His cause in opposition to all human judgment, towards this tends David's confession of sin, towards this tends all human history, and more especially the history of Israel.

*Psa. 51: 7, 8.* David here confesses his hereditary sin as the root of his actual sin. The declaration moves backwards from his birth to conception, it consequently penetrates even to the most remote point of life's beginning. חָלַלְתִּי stands instead of נִלְדָּתִי, perhaps (although elsewhere, i.e., in Psa. 90: 2, the idea of painfulness is kept entirely in the background) with reference to the decree, "with pain shalt thou bring forth children," Gen. 3:16 (Kurtz); instead of הִרְתָּה אֶתִּי, with still more definite reference to that which precedes conception, the expression is יְחַמְתֵּנִי (for יְחַמְתֵּנִי, following the same interchange of vowel as in Gen. 30:39, Jud. 5:28). The choice of the verb decides the question whether by עוֹן and חַטָּא is meant the guilt and sin of the child or of the parents. יָחַם (to burn with desire) has reference to that, in coition, which partakes of the animal, and may well awaken modest sensibilities in man, without עוֹן and חַטָּא on that account characterizing birth and conception itself as sin; the meaning is merely, that his parents were sinful human begins, and that this sinful state (*habitus*) has operated upon his birth and even his conception, and from this point has passed over to him. What is thereby expressed is not so much any self-exculpation, as on the contrary a self-accusation which glances back to the ultimate ground of natural corruption. He is sinful מִלִּדָּה וּמִהָרִיוֹן (Psa. 58: 4, Gen. 8:21), is מִטְמֵא מִטְמֵא, an unclean one springing from an unclean (Job. 14: 4), flesh born of flesh. That man from his first beginning onwards, and that this beginning itself, is stained with sin; that the proneness to sin with its guilt and its corruption is propagated from parents to their children; and that consequently in the single actual sin the sin-pervaded nature of man, inasmuch as he allows himself to be determined by it and himself resolves in accordance with it, become outwardly manifest — therefore the fact of hereditary sin is here more distinctly

expressed than in any other passage in the Old Testament, since the Old Testament conception, according to its special character, which always fastens upon the phenomenal, outward side rather than penetrates to the secret roots of a matter, is directed almost entirely to the outward manifestation only of sin, and leaves its natural foundation, its issue in relation to primeval history, and its demonic background undisclosed. The **יְהִי** in v. 7 is followed by a correlative second **יְהִי** in v. 8 (cf. Isa. 55: 4 f., 54:15 f.). Geier correctly says: *Orat ut sibi in peccatis concepto veraque cordis probitate carenti penitentiorem ac mysticam largiri velit sapientiam, cujus medio liberetur a peccati tum reatum dominio.* **טָמֵא** is the nature and life of man as conformed to the nature and will of God (cf. ἀλήθεια, Eph. 4:21). **חָכְמָה**, wisdom which is most intimately acquainted with (*eindringlich weiss*) such nature and life and the way to attain it. God delights in and desires truth **בְּטוֹת**. The *Beth* of this word is not a radical letter here as it is in Job. 12: 6, but the preposition. The reins *utpote adipe obducti*, here and in Job. 38:36, according to the Targum, Jerome, and Parchon, are called **מַחֲוֹת** (*Psychol.* S. 269; tr. p. 317). Truth in the reins (cf. 40: 9, God's law *in visceribus meis*) is an upright nature in man's deepest inward parts; and in fact, since the reins are accounted as the seat of the tenderest feelings, in man's inmost experience and perception, in his most secret life both of conscience and of mind (Psa. 16: 7). In the parallel member **מַחֲוֹת** denotes the hidden inward part of man. Out of the confession, that according to the will of God truth ought to dwell and rule in man even in his reins, comes the wish, that God would impart to him (i.e., teach him and make his own), — who, as being born and conceived in sin, is commended to God's mercy, — that wisdom in the hidden part of his mind which is the way to such truth.

**Psa. 51: 9-11.** The possession of all possessions, however, most needed by him, the foundation of all other possessions, is the assurance of the forgiveness of his sins. The second futures in v. 9 are consequents of the first, which are used as optatives. V. 9a recalls to mind the sprinkling of the leper, and of one unclean by reason of his contact with a dead body, by means of the bunch of hyssop (Lev. 14, Num. 19), the **βοτάνη καθαρτική** (Bähr, *Symbol.* ii. 503); and v. 9b recalls the washings which, according to priestly directions, the unclean person in all cases of uncleanness had to undergo. Purification and washing which the Law enjoins, are regarded in connection with the idea implied in them, and with a setting aside of their symbolic and carnal outward side, inasmuch as the performance of both acts, which in other cases takes place through priestly mediation, is here supplicated directly from God Himself. Manifestly **בְּאֵזוֹב** (not **בְּכַבְּאֵזוֹב**) is intended to be understood in a spiritual sense. It is a spiritual medium of purification without the medium itself being

stated. The New Testament believer confesses, with Petrarch in the second of his seven penitential Psalms: *omnes sordes meas una gutta, vel tenuis, sacri sanguinis absterget*. But there is here no mention made of atonement by blood; for the antitype of the atoning blood was still hidden from David. The operation of justifying grace on a man stained by the blood-red guilt of sin could not, however, be more forcibly denoted than by the expression that it makes him whiter than snow (cf. the dependent passage Isa. 1:18). And history scarcely records a grander instance of the change of blood-red sin into dazzling whiteness than this, that out of the subsequent marriage of David and Bathsheba sprang Solomon, the most richly blessed of all kings. At the present time David's very bones are still shaken, and as it were crushed, with the sense of sin. דְּבִיָּתָא is an attributive clause like יַפְעֵל in Psa. 7:16. Into what rejoicing will this smitten condition be changed, when he only realizes within his soul the comforting and joyous assuring utterance of the God who is once more gracious to him! For this he yearns, viz., that God would hide His face from the sin which He is now visiting upon him, so that it may as it were be no longer present to Him; that He would blot out all his iniquities, so that they may no longer testify against him. Here the first part of the Psalm closes; the close recurs to the language of the opening (v. 3b).

*Psa. 51:12, 13.* In the second part, the prayer for justification is followed by the prayer for renewing. A clean heart that is not beclouded by sin and a consciousness of sin (for לֵב includes the conscience, *Psychology*, S. 134; tr. p. 160); a stedfast spirit (נְכוֹן, cf. Psa. 78:37; 112: 7) is a spirit certain respecting his state of favour and well-grounded in it. David's prayer has reference to the very same thing that is promised by the prophets as a future work of salvation wrought by God the Redeemer on His people (Jer. 24: 7, Eze. 11:19; 36:26); it has reference to those spiritual facts of experience which, it is true, could be experienced even under the Old Testament relatively and anticipatively, but to the actual realization of which the New Testament history, fulfilling ancient prophecy has first of all produced effectual and comprehensive grounds and motives, viz., μετάνοια (לֵב = νοῦς), καινή κτίσις, παλιγγενεσία και ἀνακαίνωσις πνεύματος (Tit. 3: 5). David, without distinguishing between them, thinks of himself as king, as Israelite, and as man. Consequently we are not at liberty to say that רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ (as in Isa. 63:16), πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης = ἄγιον, is here the Spirit of grace in distinction from the Spirit of office. If Jahve should reject David as He rejected Saul, this would be the extreme manifestation of anger (2Ki. 24:20) towards him as king and as a man at the same time. The Holy Spirit is none other than that which came upon him by means of the anointing, 1Sa. 16:13. This Spirit, by sin, he has grieved and forfeited. Hence he prays God to show favour rather than execute His right, and not to take this His Holy Spirit from him.



*Psa. 51:14, 15.* In connection with רֹחַ נְדִיבָה, the old expositors thought of נְדִיב, a noble, a prince, and נְדִיבָה, nobility, high rank, Job. 30:15, LXX πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῷ (*spiritu principali*) στήριξόν με, — the word has, however, without any doubt, its ethical sense in this passage, Isa. 32: 8, cf. נְדָבָה, Psa. 54: 8; and the relation of the two words רֹחַ נְדִיבָה is not to be taken as adjectival, but genitival, since the poet has just used רֹחַ in the same personal sense in v. 12a. Nor are they to be taken as a nominative of the subject, but — what corresponds more closely to the connection of the prayer — according to Gen. 27:37, as a second accusative of the object: with a spirit of willingness, of willing, noble impulse towards that which is good, support me; i.e., imparting this spirit to me, uphold me constantly in that which is good. What is meant is not the Holy Spirit, but the human spirit made free from the dominion of sin by the Holy Spirit, to which good has become an inward, as it were instinctive, necessity. Thus assured of his justification and fortified in new obedience, David will teach transgressors the ways of God, and sinners shall be converted to Him, viz., by means of the testimony concerning God's order of mercy which he is able to bear as the result of his own rich experience.

*Psa. 51:16-19.* The third part now begins with a doubly urgent prayer. The invocation of God by the name *Elohim* is here made more urgent by the addition of אֱלֹהֵי תְשׁוּעָתִי; inasmuch as the prayers for justification and for renewing blend together in the “deliver me.” David does not seek to lessen his guilt; he calls it in דְּמַיִם by its right name, — a word which signifies blood violently shed, and then also a deed of blood and blood-guiltiness (Psa. 9:13; 106:38, and frequently). We have also met with הַצִּילִי construed with מִן of the sin in 39: 9. He had given Uriah over to death in order to possess himself of Bathsheba. And the accusation of his conscience spoke not merely of adultery, but also of murder. Nevertheless the consciousness of sin no longer smites him to the earth, Mercy has lifted him up; he prays only that she would complete her work in him, then shall his tongue exultingly praise (רִנֵּן) with an accusative of the object, as in Psa. 59:17) God's righteousness, which, in accordance with the promise, takes the sinner under its protection. But in order to perform what he vowed he would do under such circumstances, he likewise needs grace, and prays, therefore, for a joyous opening of his mouth. In sacrifices God delighteth not (Psa. 40: 7, cf. Isa. 1:11), otherwise he would bring some (וְאִתְּנָה), *darem*, sc. *si velles*, vid., on Psa. 40: 6); whole-burnt-offerings God doth not desire: the sacrifices that are well-pleasing to Him and most beloved by Him, in comparison with which the flesh and the dead work of the עֹלוֹת and the (שְׁלָמִים) זִבְחִים is altogether worthless, are thankfulness (Psa. 50:23)

out of the fulness of a penitent and lowly heart. There is here, directly at least, no reference to the spiritual antitype of the sin-offering, which is never called זֶבַח. The inward part of a man is said to be broken and crushed when his sinful nature is broken, his ungodly self slain, his impenetrable hardness softened, his haughty vainglory brought low, — in fine, when he is in himself become as nothing, and when God is everything to him. Of such a spirit and heart, panting after grace or favour, consist the sacrifices that are truly worthy God's acceptance and well-pleasing to Him (cf. Isa. 57:15, where such a spirit and such a heart are called God's earthly temple). <sup>r208</sup>

*Psa. 51:20, 21.* From this spiritual sacrifice, well-pleasing to God, the Psalm now, in vv. 20 f., comes back to the material sacrifices that are offered in a right state of mind; and this is to be explained by the consideration that David's prayer for himself here passes over into an intercession on behalf of all Israel: Do good in Thy good pleasure unto Zion. אֶת־ may be a sign of the accusative, for הַיָּמִיב (הַיָּמִיב) does take the accusative of the person (Job. 24:21); but also a preposition, for as it is construed with לְ and עִם, so also with אֶת in the same signification (Jer. 18:10; 32:41). זִבְחֵי־צֶדֶק are here, as in 4: 6, Deu. 33:19, those sacrifices which not merely as regards their outward character, but also in respect of the inward character of him who causes them to be offered on his behalf, are exactly such as God the Lawgiver will have them to be. By כָּלִיל beside עֹלָה might be understood the priestly vegetable whole-offering, Lev. 6:15 f. (מִנְחַת חֲבֵתִין, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, ii. 8), since every עֹלָה as such is also כָּלִיל; but Psalm-poetry does not make any such special reference to the sacrificial *tôra*. וְכָלִיל is, like כָּלִיל in 1Sa. 7: 9, an explicative addition, and the combination is like יִמִּינְךָ וּזְרוּעֶךָ, Psa. 44: 4, אֶרֶץ וּתְבֵל, Psa. 90: 2, and the like. A שְׁלָם כָּלִיל (Hitzig, after the Phoenician sacrificial tables) is unknown to the Israelitish sacrificial worship. The prayer: *Build Thou the walls of Jerusalem*, is not inadmissible in the mouth of David; since בָּנָה signifies not merely to build up what has been thrown down, but also to go on and finish building what is in the act of being built (Psa. 89: 3); and, moreover, the wall built round about Jerusalem by Solomon (1Ki. 3: 1) can be regarded as a fulfilment of David's prayer.

Nevertheless what even Theodoret has felt cannot be denied: τοῖς ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ... ἀρμόττει τὰ ῥήματα. Through penitence the way of the exiles led back to Jerusalem. The supposition is very natural that vv. 20 f. may be a liturgical addition made by the church of the Exile. And if the origin of Isaiah 40-66 in the time of the Exile were as indisputable as the reasons against such a position are forcible, then it would give support not merely to the derivation of vv. 20 f. (cf. Isa. 60:10, 5, 7), but of the whole Psalm, from the time of the Exile; for the

general impress of the Psalm is, according to the accurate observation of Hitzig, thoroughly deutero-Isaianic. But the writer of Isaiah 40-66 shows signs in other respects also of the most families acquaintance with the earlier literature of the *Shîr* and the *Mashal*; and that he is none other than Isaiah reveals itself in connection with this Psalm by the echoes of this very Psalm, which are to be found not only in the second but also in the first part of the Isaianic collection of prophecy (cf. on vv. 9, 18). We are therefore driven to the inference, that Psalm 51 was a favourite Psalm of Isaiah's, and that, since the Isaianic echoes of it extend equally from the first verse to the last, it existed in the same complete form even in his day as in ours; and that consequently the close, just like the whole Psalm, so beautifully and touchingly expressed, is not the mere addition of a later age.

## Psalm 52

### THE PUNISHMENT THAT AWAITS THE EVIL TONGUE

*52: 3 WHY boastest thou thyself of wickedness, O thou mighty one?! —  
The mercy of God endureth continually.*

*52: 4 Destruction doth thy tongue devise,  
Like a sharpened razor, O worker of guile!*

*52: 5 Thou lovest evil rather than good,  
Lying instead of speaking that which is right. (Sela)*

*52: 6 Thou lovest only destroying words, O deceitful tongue!*

*52: 7 Thus then will God smite thee down for ever,  
He will seize thee and pluck thee out of the tent,  
And root thee out of the land of the living. (Sela)*

*52: 8 The righteous shall see it and fear,  
And over him shall they laugh:*

*52: 9 "Behold there the man who made not Elohim his hiding-place,  
And boasted of the abundance of his riches, trusted in his self-devotedness!"*

*52:10 I, however, am like a green olive-tree in the house of Elohim,  
I trust in the mercy of Elohim for ever and ever.*

*52:11 I will give thanks to Thee for ever, that Thou hast accomplished it;  
And I will wait on Thy name, because it is so gracious,  
in the presence of Thy saints.*

*Psalm 52.* With Psalm 52, which, side by side with Psalm 51, exhibits the contrast between the false and the right use of the tongue, begins a series of Elohimic *Maskîl*s (Psalm 52-55) by David. It is one of the eight Psalms which,

by the statements of the inscriptions, of which some are capable of being verified, and others at least cannot be replaced by anything that is more credible, are assigned to the time of his persecution by Saul (7, 59, 56, 34, 52, 57, 142, 54). Augustine calls them *Psalms fugitivos*. The inscription runs: *To the Precentor, a meditation* (vid., Psa. 32: 1), *by David, when Doeg the Edomite came and told Saul and said to him: David is gone in to the house of Ahimelech*. By **בבוא**, as in Psa. 51: 2; 54: 2, the writer of the inscription does not define the exact moment of the composition of the Psalm, but only in a general way the period in which it falls. After David had sojourned a short time with Samuel, he betook himself to Nob to Ahimelech the priest; and he gave him without hesitation, as being the son-in-law of the king, the shewbread that had been removed, and the sword of Goliath that had been hung up in the sanctuary behind the ephod. Doeg the Edomite was witness of this; and when Saul, under the tamarisk in Gibeon, held an assembly of his serving men, Doeg, the overseer of the royal mules, betrayed what had taken place between David and Ahimelech to him. Eighty-five priests immediately fell as victims of this betrayal, and only Abiathar (*Ebjathar*) the son of Ahimelech escaped and reached David, 1Sa. 22: 6-10 (where, in v. 9, **פרדי** is to be read instead of **עבדי**, cf. 21: 8).

**Psa. 52: 3-6**. It is bad enough to behave wickedly, but bad in the extreme to boast of it at the same time as an heroic act. Doeg, who causes a massacre, not, however, by the strength of his hand, but by the cunning of his tongue, does this. Hence he is sarcastically called **גבור** (cf. Isa. 5:22). David's cause, however, is not therefore lost; for it is the cause of God, whose loving-kindness endures continually, without allowing itself to be affected, like the favour of men, by calumny. Concerning **הוֹת** vid., on 5:10. **לְשׁוֹן** is as usual treated as *fem*; **עֵשָׂה רְמִיָּה** (according to the Masora with *Tsere*) is consequently addressed to a person. In v. 5 **רָע** after **אֶהְבֵּת** has the *Dagesh* that is usual also in other instances according to the rule of the **אֶתִי מֵרַחֵק**, especially in connection with the letters **בגד"כפת** (with which *Resh* is associated in the Book of Jezira, *Michlol* 96b, cf. 63b).<sup>f209</sup>

The **מִן** or **מֵטוֹב** and **מִדָּבָר** is not meant to affirm that he loves good, etc., less than evil, etc., but that he does not love it at all (cf. Psa. 118: 8 f., Hab. 2:16). The music which comes in after v. 5 has to continue the accusations *con amarezza* without words. Then in v. 6 the singing again takes them up, by addressing the adversary with the words "thou tongue of deceit" (cf. Psa. 120: 3), and by reproaching him with loving only such utterances as swallow up, i.e., destroy without leaving a trace behind (**בָּלַע**, pausal form of **בָּלַע**, like **בָּצַע** in Psa. 119:36, cf. the verb in Psa. 35:25, 2Sa. 17:16; 20:19 f.),

his neighbour's life and honour and goods. Hupfeld takes v. 6*b* as a second object; but the figurative and weaker expression would then follow the unfigurative and stronger one, and "to love a deceitful tongue" might be said with reference to this character of tongue as belonging to another person, not with reference to his own.

*Psa. 52: 7-9.* The announcement of the divine retribution begins with **נָם** as in Isa. 66: 4, Eze. 16:43, Mal. 2: 9. The **אֹהֶל** is not, as one might suppose, the holy tent or tabernacle, that he has desecrated by making it the lurking-place of the betrayer (1Sa. 21: 8 [7]), which would have been expressed by **מִאֹהֶלוֹ**, but his own dwelling. God will pull him, the lofty and imperious one, down (**נָתַץ**), like a tower perhaps, Jud. 8: 9, Eze. 26: 9) from his position of honour and his prosperity, and drag him forth out of his habitation, much as one rakes a coal from the hearth (**הִתָּה** Biblical and Talmudic in this sense), and tear him out of this his home (**נָסַח**, cf. **נָתַק**, Job. 18:14) and remove him far away (Deu. 28:63), because he has betrayed the homeless fugitive; and will root him out of the land of the living, because he has destroyed the priests of God (1Sa. 22:18). It then proceeds in vv. 8 f. very much like Psa. 40: 4 *b*, 5, just as the figure of the razor also coincides with Psalms belonging to exactly the same period (Psa. 51: 8; 57: 5, cf. **לָמַשׁ**, 7:13). The excitement and indignant anger against one's foes which expresses itself in the rhythm and the choice of words, has been already recognised by us since Psalm ch. 7 as a characteristic of these Psalms. The hope which David, in v. 8, attaches to God's judicial interposition is the same as e.g., in Psa. 64:10. The righteous will be strengthened in the fear of God (for the play of sounds cf. Psa. 40: 4) and laugh at him whom God has overthrown, saying: Behold there the man, etc. According to Psa. 58:11, the laughing is joy at the ultimate breaking through of justice long hidden and not discerned; for even the moral teaching of the Old Testament (Pro. 24:17) reprobates the low malignant joy that glories at the overthrow of one's enemy. By **וַיִּבְמַח** the former trust in mammon on the part of the man who is overtaken by punishment is set forth as a consequence of his refusal to put trust in God, in Him who is the true **מְעוֹז** = Arab. *m'ād*, hiding-place or place of protection (vid., on Psa. 31: 3, 37:39, cf. 17: 7, 2Sa. 22:33). **הִתָּה** is here the passion for earthly things which rushes at and falls upon them (*animo fertur*).

*Psa. 52:10, 11.* The gloomy song now brightens up, and in calmer tones draws rapidly to a close. The betrayer becomes like an uprooted tree; the betrayed, however, stands firm and is like to a green-foliaged olive (Jer. 11:16) which is planted in the house of Elohim (Psa. 90:14), that is to say, in sacred and inaccessible ground; cf. the promise in Isa. 60:13. The weighty expression

בִּי עָשִׂיתָ refers, as in Psa. 22:32, to the gracious and just carrying out of that which was aimed at in the election of David. If this be attained, then he will for ever give thanks and further wait on the Name, i.e., the self-attestation, of God, which is so gracious and kind, he will give thanks and “wait” in the presence of all the saints. This “waiting,” וַאֲקַיֵּה, is open to suspicion, since what he intends to do in the presence of the saints must be something that is audible or visible to them. Also “hoping in the name of God” is, it is true, not an unbiblical notional combination (Isa. 36: 8); but in connection with כִּי טוֹב שָׁמַךְ which follows, one more readily looks for a verb expressing a thankful and laudatory proclamation (cf. Psa. 54: 8). Hitzig’s conjecture that we should read וַאֲחַיֵּה is therefore perfectly satisfactory. נִגַּד חֲסִידֶיךָ does not belong to טוֹב, which would be construed with בְּעֵינַי, and not נִגַּד, but to the two votive words; cf. Psa. 22:26; 138: 1, and other passages. The whole church (Psa. 22:23 f., 40:10 f.) shall be witness of his thankfulness to God, and of his proclamation of the proofs which God Himself has given of His love and favour.

## Psalm 53

### ELOHIMIC VARIATION OF THE JAHVE-PSALM 14

*53: 2 THE fool hath said in his heart: “There is no God;”  
Corruptly and abominably do they carry on their iniquity,  
There is none that doeth good.*

*53: 3 Elohim looketh down from heaven upon the children of men,  
To see if there be any that have understanding,  
If any that seek after God.*

*53: 4 Every one of them is gone back, altogether they are corrupt,  
There is none that doeth good,  
Not even one.*

*53: 5 Are the workers of iniquity so utterly devoid of understanding,  
Who eating up my people eat up bread,  
(And) call not on Elohim?*

*53: 6 Then were they in great fear, when there was no fear;  
For Elohim scattered the bones of him that encamped round about thee;  
Thou didst put them to shame, for Elohim had despised them.*

*53: 7 Oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion!  
When Elohim turneth the captivity of His people,  
Jacob shall rejoice, Israel shall be glad.*

*Psalm 53.* Psalm 52 and 53, which are most closely related by occasion, contents, and expression, are separated by the insertion of Psalm 53, in which the individual character of Psalm 52, the description of moral corruption and the announcement of the divine curse, is generalized. Psalm 53 also belongs to this series according to its species of poetic composition; for the inscription runs: *To the Precentor, after Machalath, a Maskîl of David.* The formula **אֶל־מַחֲלָתָהּ** recurs in Psa. 88: 1 with the addition of **לְאַנְוֹתָהּ**. Since Psalm 88 is the gloomiest of all the Psalms, and Psalm 53, although having a bright border, is still also a dark picture, the signification of **מַחֲלָה**, laxness (root **חל**, *opp. מר*), sickness, sorrow, which is capable of being supported by Exo. 15:26, must be retained. **עַל־מַחֲלָתָהּ** signifies *after a sad tone or manner*; whether it be that **מַחֲלָתָהּ** itself (with the ancient dialectic feminine termination, like **נְגִינָתָהּ**, Psa. 61: 1) is a name for such an elegiac kind of melody, or that it was thereby designed to indicate the initial word of some popular song. In the latter case **מַחֲלָתָהּ** is the construct form, the standard song beginning **מַחֲלָתָהּ לֵב** or some such way. The signification to be sweet (Aramaic) and melodious (Aethiopic), which the root **חלי** obtains in the dialects, is foreign to Hebrew. It is altogether inadmissible to combine **מַחֲלָתָהּ** with Arab. *mahlit*, ease, comfort (Germ. *Gemächlichkeit*, cf. *mächlich*, easily, slowly, with *mählich*, by degrees), as Hitzig does; since **מַחֲלָתָהּ**, Rabbinic, to pardon, coincides more readily with **מַחֲלָתָהּ**, Psa. 51: 3, 11. So that we may regard *machalath* as equivalent to *mesto*, not *piano* or *andante*.

That the two texts, Psalm ch. 14 and 53, are “vestiges of an original identity” (Hupfeld) is not established: Psalm 53 is a later variation of Psalm 14. The musical designation, common only to the earlier Psalms, at once dissuades one from coming down beyond the time of Jehoshaphat or Hezekiah. Moreover, we have here a manifest instance that even Psalms which are composed upon the model of, or are variations of Davidic Psalms, were without any hesitation inscribed **לְדָוִד**.

Beside the critical problem, all that remains here for the exegesis is merely the discussion of anything peculiar in the deviations in the form of the text.

*Psa. 53: 2.* The well-grounded asyndeton **הַשְּׁחִיתוּ הַתְּעִיבוּ** is here dismissed; and the expression is rendered more bombastic by the use of **עָוָל** instead of **עָוֹל**. **עָוָל** (the masculine to **אָוֹלָהּ**), *pravitas*, is the accusative of the object (cf. Eze. 16:52) to both verbs, which give it a twofold superlative attributive notion. Moreover, here **הַשְּׁחִיתוּ** is accented with *Mugrash* in our

printed texts instead of *Tarcha*. One *Mugrash* after another is contrary to all rule.

*Psa. 53: 3*. In both recensions of the Psalm the name of God occurs seven times. In Psalm ch. 14 it reads three times *Elohim* and four times *Jahve*; in the Psalm before us it is all seven times *Elohim*, which in this instance is a proper name of equal dignity with the name *Jahve*. Since the mingling of the two names in Psalm ch. 14 is perfectly intentional, inasmuch as *Elohim* in vv. 1, 2c describes God as a Being most highly exalted and to be reverentially acknowledged, and in v. 5 as the Being who is present among men in the righteous generation and who is mighty in their weakness, it becomes clear that David himself cannot be the author of this levelling change, which is carried out more rigidly than the Elohimic character of the Psalm really demands.

*Psa. 53: 4*. Instead of הַכֹּל, the totality, we have בְּלוֹ, which denotes each individual of the whole, to which the suffix, that has almost vanished (*Psa. 29: 9*) from the genius of the language, refers. And instead of סֵר, the more elegant סָג, without any distinction in the meaning.

*Psa. 53: 5*. Here in the first line the word בְּלִי, which, as in *Psa. 5: 6; 6: 9*, is in its right place, is wanting. In Psalm ch. 14 there then follow, instead of two tristichs, two distichs, which are perhaps each mutilated by the loss of a line. The writer who has retouched the Psalm has restored the tristichic symmetry that had been lost sight of, but he has adopted rather violent means: inasmuch as he has fused down the two distichs into a single tristich, which is as closely as possible adapted to the sound of their letters.

*Psa. 53: 6*. The last two lines of this tristich are in letters so similar to the two distichs of Psalm 14, that they look like an attempt at the restoration of some faded manuscript. Nevertheless, such a close following of the sound of the letters of the original, and such a changing of the same by means of an interchange of letters, is also to be found elsewhere (more especially in Jeremiah, and e.g., also in the relation of the Second Epistle of Peter to Jude). And the two lines sound so complete in themselves and full of life, that this way of accounting for their origin takes too low an estimate of them. A later poet, perhaps belonging to the time of Jehoshaphat or Hezekiah, has here adapted the Davidic Psalm to some terrible catastrophe that has just taken place, and given a special character to the universal announcement of judgment. The addition of לֹא־תִירָא פֶּחַד (supply אֲשֶׁר = שָׁם, *Psa. 84: 4*) is meant to imply that fear of judgment had seized upon the enemies of the people of God, when no fear, i.e., no outward ground for fear, existed; it was



therefore **תְּרַדַּת אֱלֹהִים** (1Sa. 14:15), a God-wrought panic. Such as the case with the host of the confederates in the days of Jehoshaphat (2Ch. 20:22-24); such also with the army of Sennacherib before Jerusalem (Isa. 37:36). **בִּי** gives the proof in support of this fright from the working of the divine power. The words are addressed to the people of God: *Elohim hath scattered the bones* (so that unburied they lie like dirt upon the plain a prey to wild beasts, 141: 7, Eze. 6: 5) *of thy besieger*, i.e., of him who had encamped against thee. **חֲנֹךְ** instead of **חֲנֹךְ = חֲנֹךְ עָלֶיךָ** <sup>f210</sup>

By the might of his God, who has overthrown them, the enemies of His people, Israel has put them to shame, i.e., brought to nought in a way most shameful to them, the project of those who were so sure of victory, who imagined they could devour Israel as easily and comfortably as bread. It is clear that in this connection even v. 5 receives a reference to the foreign foes of Israel originally alien to the Psalm, so that consequently Mic. 3: 3 is no longer a parallel passage, but passages like Num. 14: 9, *our bread are they* (the inhabitants of Canaan); and Jer. 30:16, *all they that devour thee shall be devoured*.

*Psa. 53: 7.* The two texts now again coincide. Instead of **יְשׁוּעָה**, we here have **יְשׁעוֹת**; the expression is strengthened, the plural signifies entire, full, and final salvation.

## Psalm 54

### CONSOLATION IN THE PRESENCE OF BLOODTHIRSTY ADVERSARIES

*54: 3 ELOHIM, by Thy name save me,  
And by Thy strength maintain my cause!*

*54: 4 Elohim, hear my prayer,  
Hearken to the words of my mouth:*

*54: 5 For strangers are risen up against me,  
And violent men seek after my life;  
They set not Elohim before their eyes. (Sela)*

*54: 6 Behold, Elohim is my helper,  
The Lord it is who upholdeth my soul.*

*54: 7 He will requite the evil to mine enemies —  
By virtue of Thy truth cut Thou them off.*

*54: 8 With willing mind will I sacrifice unto Thee,  
I will give thanks to Thy name, Jahve, that it is gracious.*

*54: 9 For out of all distress hath it delivered me,  
And upon mine enemies doth mine eye delight itself.*

*Psalm 54.* Here again we have one of the eight Psalms dates from the time of Saul's persecution, — a *Maskil*, like the two preceding Psalms, and having points of close contact both with Psalm 53 (cf. v. 5 with Ps. 53: 3) and with Psalm 52 (cf. the resemblance in the closing words of. v. 8 and Ps. 52:11): *To the Precentor, with the accompaniment of stringed instruments* (vid., on Ps. 4: 1), *a meditation, by David, when the Ziphites came and said to Saul: Is not David hidden among us?* Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech, had escaped to David, who with six hundred men was then in the fortified town of Keila (Keilah), but received through Abiathar the divine answer, that the inhabitants would give him up if Saul should lay siege to the town. Thereupon we find him in the wilderness of *Ziph*; the Ziphites betray him and pledge themselves to capture him, and thereby he is in the greatest straits, out of which he was only rescued by an invasion of the Philistines, which compelled Saul to retreat (1Sa. 23:19 ff.). The same history which the earlier narrator of the Books of Samuel relates here, we meet with once more in 1 Samuel 26, related with fuller colouring. The form of the inscription of the Psalm is word for word the same as both in 1Sa. 23:19 and in 1Sa. 26: 1; the annals are in all three passages the ultimate source of the inscription.

*Psa. 54: 3-5.* This short song is divided into two parts by *Sela* The first half prays for help and answer. The Name of God is the manifestation of His nature, which has mercy as its central point (for the Name of God is טוב, v. 8, Ps. 52:11), so that בַּשֵּׁמֶךְ (which is here the parallel word to בְּגִבּוֹרֶתֶךָ) is consequently equivalent to בְּחַסְדֶּךָ. The obtaining of right for any one (דִּין) like שָׁפַט, Ps. 7: 9, and frequently, עָשָׂה דִּין, Ps. 9: 5) is attributed to the all-conquering might of God, which is only one side of the divine Name, i.e., of the divine nature which manifests itself in the diversity of its attributes. הַאֲזִין (v. 4b) is construed with לְ (cf. אֵל, Ps. 87: 2) like הִטָּה אֲזִין, Ps. 78: 1. The Targum, misled by Ps. 86:14, reads זְרִים instead of זָרִים in v. 5. The inscription leads one to think of the Ziphites in particular in connection with “strangers” and “violent men.” The two words in most instances denote foreign enemies, Isa. 25: 2 f., 29: 5, Eze. 31:12; but זָר is also a stranger in the widest sense, regulated in each instance according to the opposite, e.g., the non-priest, Lev. 22:10; and one's fellow-countrymen can also turn out to be עַרְצִים, Jer. 15:21. The Ziphites, although Judaeans like David, might be called “strangers,” because they had taken the side against David; and “violent men,” because they pledged themselves to seize and deliver him up. Under other circumstances this might have been their duty as subjects. In this instance,

however, it was godlessness, as v. 5c (cf. Psa. 86:14) says. Any one at that time in Israel who feared God more than man, could not lend himself to be made a tool of Saul's blind fury. God had already manifestly enough acknowledged David.

*Psa. 54: 6-9.* In this second half, the poet, in the certainty of being heard, rejoices in help, and makes a vow of thanksgiving. The **ב** of **בְּסִמְכֵי** is not meant to imply that God is one out of many who upheld his threatened life; but rather that He comes within the category of such, and fills it up in Himself alone, cf. Psa. 118: 7; and for the origin of this *Beth essentiae*, Psa. 99: 6, Jud. 11:35. In v. 7 the *Kerī* merits the preference over the *Chethib* (evil shall “revert” to my spies), which would at least require **אֵל** instead of **ל** (cf. Psa. 7:17). Concerning **שָׂרָרִי**, vid., on Psa. 27:11. In the rapid transition to invocation in v. 7b the end of the Psalm announces itself. The truth of God is not described as an instrumental agent of the cutting off, but as an impelling cause. It is the same *Beth* as in the expression **בְּנִדְבָה** (Num. 15: 3): by or out of free impulse. These free-will sacrifices are not spiritual here in opposition to the ritual sacrifices (Psa. 50:14), but ritual as an outward representation of the spiritual. The subject of **הַצִּילָנִי** is the Name of God; the post-biblical language, following Lev. 24:11, calls God straightway **הַשֵּׁם**, and passages like Isa. 30:27 and the one before us come very near to this usage. The praeterites mention the ground of the thanksgiving. What David now still hopes for will then lie behind him in the past. The closing line, v. 9b, recalls Psa. 35:21, cf. Psa. 59:11; Psa. 92:12; the invoking of the curse upon his enemies in v. 8 recalls Psa. 17:13; 56: 8; 59:12 ff.; and the vow of thanksgiving in v. 8 recalls Psa. 22:26; 35:18; 40:10 ff.

## Psalm 55

### PRAYER OF ONE WHO IS MALICIOUSLY BESET AND BETRAYED BY HIS FRIEND

*55: 2 GIVE ear, Elohim, to my prayer,  
And veil not Thyself from my supplication;*

*55: 3 Oh hearken to me and answer me!  
I toss to and fro in my thoughts and must groan,*

*55: 4 Because of the voice of the enemy,  
because of the oppression of the evil-doer.  
For they roll iniquity upon me,  
And in anger do they pursue me.*

*55: 5 My heart writhes within me,  
And the terrors of death have fallen upon me.*

*55: 6 Fear and trembling come upon me,  
And horror hath covered me.*

*55: 7 I thought: Oh that I had wings like a dove,  
Then would I fly away and be at rest!*

*55: 8 Yea, I would flee afar off,  
I would lodge in the wilderness. (Sela)*

*55: 9 I would soar to my place of refuge  
From the raging wind, from the tempest.*

*55:10 Destroy, O Lord, divide their tongues,  
For I see violence and strife in the city.*

*55:11 Day and night they go their rounds upon its walls,  
And evil and trouble are in the midst of it.*

*55:12 Destruction is in the midst of it,  
And oppression and guile depart not from its market-place.*

*55:13 For it is not an enemy that reproacheth me, then I would bear it;  
Neither is it he that hateth me that exalteth himself against me,  
Then I could indeed hide myself from him.*

*55:14 But thou wast a man on an equality with me,  
my companion and familiar friend,*

*55:15 We who were wont to have sweet intercourse together,  
To the house of Elohim we walked in the festive throng.*

*55:16 Let death surprise them,  
Let them go down alive to Hades;  
For wickedness is in their dwelling, in their inward part.*

*55:17 As for me, to Elohim do I cry,  
And Jahve will save me.*

*55:18 Evening and morning and at noon will I meditate and groan,  
And He will hear my voice,*

*55:19 He will deliver, in peace, my soul, so that they come not at me;  
For they are very many against me.*

*55:20 God will hear, and answer them —  
Yea, He sitteth enthroned from the very beginning — (Sela)  
Even them, who think nothing of another,  
And who fear not Elohim.*

*55:21 He layeth his hand upon those who are at peace with him,  
He violateth his covenant.*

*55:22 Smooth are the butter-words of his mouth, and war is his heart;  
Soft are his words as oil, and yet are sword-blades.*

*55:23 Cast thy burden upon Jahve,  
He, He will sustain thee;  
He will never suffer the righteous to be moved.*

*55:24 And Thou, Elohim, shalt cast them down into the abyss of the pit,  
Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their lives;  
But I trust in Thee.*

*Psalm 55.* Psalm 54 is followed by another Davidic Psalm bearing the same inscription: *To the Precentor, with accompaniment of stringed instruments, a meditation, by David.* It also accords with the former in the form of the prayer with which it opens (cf. v. 2 with Psa. 54: 3 f.); and it is the Elohimic counterpart of the Jahve-Psalm 41. If the Psalm is by David, we require (in opposition to Hengstenberg) an assignable occasion for it in the history of his life. For how could the faithless bosom friend, over whom the complaint concerning malicious foes here, as in Psalm 41, lingers with special sadness, be a mere abstract personage; since it has in the person of Judas Iscariot its historical living antitype in the life and passion of the second David? This Old Testament Judas is none other than *Ahithôphel*, the right hand of Absalom. Psalm 55 belongs, like Psalm 41, to the four years during which the rebellion of Absalom was forming; only to a somewhat later period, when Absalom's party were so sure of their cause that they had no need to make any secret of it. How it came to pass that David left the beginnings and progressive steps of the rebellion of Absalom to take their course without bringing any other weapon to bear against it than the weapon of prayer, is discussed on Psalm 41.

Hitzig also holds this Psalm to be Jeremianic. But it contains no coincidences with the language and thoughts of Jeremiah worth speaking of, excepting that this prophet, in Jer. 9: 1, gives utterance to a similar wish to that of the psalmist in vv. 7-9, and springing from the same motive. The argument in favour of Jeremiah in opposition to David is consequently referred to the picture of life and suffering which is presented in the Psalm; and it becomes a question whether this harmonizes better with the persecuted life of Jeremiah or of David. The exposition which follows here places itself — and it is at least worthy of being attempted — on the standpoint of the writer of the inscription.

*Psa. 55: 2-9.* In this first group sorrow prevails. David spreads forth his deep grief before God, and desires for himself some lonely spot in the wilderness far away from the home or lurking-place of the confederate band of those who are

compassing his overthrow. “Veil not Thyself” here, where what is spoken of is something audible, not visible, is equivalent to “veil not Thine ear,” Lam. 3:56, which He designedly does, when the right state of heart leaves the praying one, and consequently that which makes it acceptable and capable of being answered is wanting to the prayer (cf. Isa. 1:15). **שִׁחַ** signifies a shrub (Syriac *shucho*, Arabic *ših*), and also reflection and care (Arabic, carefulness, attention; Aramaic, **סח**, to babble, talk, discourse). The *Hiph.* **הִרִיד**, which in Gen. 27:40 signifies to lead a roving life, has in this instance the signification to move one’s self backwards and forwards, to be inwardly uneasy; root **רד**, Arab. *rd*, to totter, whence *râda*, *jarûda*, to run up and down (IV to desire, will); *raïda*, to shake (said of a soft bloated body); *radda*, to turn (whence *taraddud*, a moving to and fro, doubting); therefore: I wander hither and thither in my reflecting or meditating, turning restlessly from one thought to another. It is not necessary to read **וְאִהְיֶמָה** after Psa. 77: 4 instead of **וְאִהְיֶמָה**, since the verb **הוּם = הָמָה**, Psa. 42: 6, 12, is secured by the derivatives. Since these only exhibit **הוּם**, and not **הִים** (in Arabic used more particularly of the raving of love), **וְאִהְיֶמָה**, as also **אֲרִיד**, is *Hiph.*, and in fact like this latter used with an inward object: I am obliged to raise a tumult or groan, break out into the dull murmuring sounds of pain. The cohortative not unfrequently signifies “I have to” or “I must” of incitements within one’s self which are under the control of outward circumstances. In this restless state of mind he finds himself, and he is obliged to break forth into this cry of pain on account of the voice of the foe which he cannot but hear; by reason of the pressure or constraint (**עֲקָתָהּ**) of the evil-doer which he is compelled to feel. The conjecture **צַעֲקָתָהּ** (Olshausen and Hupfeld) is superfluous. **עֲקָתָהּ** is a more elegant Aramaizing word instead of **צָרָה**.

The second strophe begins with a more precise statement of that which justifies his pain. The *Hiph.* **הִמִּיט** signifies here, as in 140:11 (*Chethib*), *declinare*: they cast or roll down evil (calamity) upon him and maliciously lay snares for him **בְּאֵר**, breathing anger against him who is conscious of having manifested only love towards them. His heart turns about in his body, it writhes (**יְחִיל**); cf. on this, Psa. 38:11. Fear and trembling take possession of his inward parts; **יָבֵא** in the expression **בִּי יָבֵא**, as is always the case when followed by a tone syllable, is a so-called **נִסּוּג אַחֲוֹר**, i.e., it has the tone that has retreated to the *penult*. (Deu. 1:38, Isa. 7:24; 60:20), although this is only with difficulty discernible in our printed copies, and is therefore (vid., *Accentsystem*, vi. § 2) noted with *Mercha*. The *fut. consec.* which follows introduces the heightened state of terror which proceeds from this crowding on of fear and trembling. Moreover, the wish that is thereby urged from him,

which David uttered to himself, is introduced in the third strophe by a *fut. consec.* <sup>f211</sup>

“Who will give me?” is equivalent to “Oh that I had!” Ges. § 136, 1. In **וְאִשְׁכְּנָה** is involved the self-satisfying signification of settling down (Eze. 31:13), of coming to rest and remaining in a place (2Sa. 7:10). Without going out of our way, a sense perfectly in accordance with the matter in hand may be obtained for **אִשְׁכְּנָה מִפְּלֵט לִי**, if **אִשְׁכְּנָה** is taken not as *Kal* (Psa. 71:12), but after Isa. 5:19; 60:12, as *Hiph.*: I would hasten, i.e., quickly find for myself a place which might serve me as a shelter from the raging wind, from the storm. **רוּחַ סְעָה** is equivalent to the Arabic *rihin sâjat-in*, inasmuch as Arab. *sâ*, “to move one’s self quickly, to go or run swiftly,” can be said both of light (Koran, Psa. 66: 8) and of water-brooks (vid., Jones, *Comm. Poes. Asiat., ed. Lipsiae*, p. 358), and also of strong currents of air, of winds, and such like. The correction **סְעָה**, proposed by Hupfeld, produces a disfiguring tautology. Among those about David there is a wild movement going on which is specially aimed at his overthrow. From this he would gladly flee and hide himself, like a dove taking refuge in a cleft of the rock from the approaching storm, or from the talons of the bird of prey, fleeing with its noiseless but persevering flight. <sup>f212</sup>

**Psa. 55:10-17.** In the second group anger is the prevailing feeling. In the city all kinds of party passions have broken loose; even his bosom friend has taken a part in this hostile rising. The retrospective reference to the confusion of tongues at Babel which is contained in the word **פָּלַג** (cf. Gen. 10:25), also in remembrance of **פָּלַל** (Gen. 11: 1-9), involves the choice of the word **בָּלַע**, which here, after Isa. 19: 3, denotes a swallowing up, i.e., annihilation by means of confounding and rendering utterly futile. **לְשֹׁנָם** is the object to both imperatives, the second of which is **פָּלַג** (like the pointing usual in connection with a final guttural) for the sake of similarity of sound. Instead of **חָמַס וְרִיב**, the pointing is **חָמַס וְרִיב**, which is perfectly regular, because the **וְרִיב** with a conjunctive accent logically hurries on to **בְּעִיר** as its supplement. <sup>f213</sup>

The subjects to v. 11a are not violence and strife (Hengstenberg, Hitzig), for it is rather a comical idea to make these personified run round about upon the city walls; but (cf. Psa. 59: 7, 15) the Absalomites, and in fact the spies who incessantly watch the movements of David and his followers, and who to this end roam about upon the heights of the city. The narrative in 2 Samuel 15 shows how passively David looked on at this movement, until he abandoned the palace of his own free will and quitted Jerusalem. The espionage in the circuit of the city is contrasted with the movements going on within the city

itself by the word **בִּקְרָב**. We are acquainted with but few details of the affair; but we can easily fill in the details for ourselves in accordance with the ambitious, base, and craftily malicious character of Absalom. The assertion that deceit (**מְרָמָה**) and the extremest madness had taken possession of the city is confirmed in v. 13 by **כִּי**. It is not open enemies who might have had cause for it that are opposed to him, but faithless friends, and among them that Ahithophel of Giloh, the scum of perfidious ingratitude. The futures **וְאָשָׂא** and **וְאִסְתָּר** are used as subjunctives, and **וְ** is equivalent to *alioqui*, as in Psa. 51:18, cf. Job. 6:14. He tells him to his face, to his shame, the relationship in which he had stood to him whom he now betrays. V. 14 is not to be rendered: and thou art, etc., but: *and thou* (who dost act thus) *wast*, etc.; for it is only because the principal clause has a retrospective meaning that the futures **נִמְתִּיק** and **נִהְלַךְ** describe what was a custom in the past. The expression is designedly **אָנוּשׁ בְּעַרְבֵי** and not **אִישׁ כְּעַרְבֵי**; David does not make him feel his kingly eminence, but places himself in the relation to him of man to man, putting him on the same level with himself and treating him as his equal. The suffix of **כְּעַרְבֵי** is in this instance not subjective as in the **כְּעַרְכֶךָ** of the law respecting the *asham* or trespass-offering: according to my estimation, but objectively: equal to the worth at which I am estimated, that is to say, equally valued with myself. What heart-piercing significance this word obtains when found in the mouth of the second David, who, although the Son of God and peerless King, nevertheless entered into the most intimate human relationship as the Son of man to His disciples, and among them to that Iscariot! **אֶלְיָהוּ** from **אֶלְיָה**, Arabic *alifa*, to be accustomed to anything, *assuescere*, signifies one attached to or devoted to any one; and **מִיָּדַע**, according to the Hebrew meaning of the verb **יָדַע**, an intimate acquaintance. The first of the relative clauses in v. 15 describes their confidential private intercourse; the second the unrestrained manifestation of it in public. **סוֹד** here, as in Job. 19:19 (vid., *supra* on Psa. 25:14). **הַמְתִּיק סוֹד**, to make friendly intercourse sweet, is equivalent to cherishing it. **רָגַשׁ** stands over against **סוֹד**, just like **סוֹד**, secret counsel, and **רִגְשָׁה**, loud tumult, in Psa. 64: 3. Here **רָגַשׁ** is just the same as that which the Korahitic poet calls **הַמּוֹן חוֹגֵג** in Psa. 42: 5.

In the face of the faithless friends who has become the head of the Absalomite faction David now breaks out, in v. 16, into fearful imprecations. The *Chethib* is **יְשִׁימוֹת**, *desolationes (super eos)*; but this word occurs only in the name of a place (“House of desolations”), and does not well suit such direct reference to persons. On the other hand, the *Keri* **יְשִׁיאַ מוֹת**, let death ensnare or impose upon them, gives a sense that is not to be objected to; it is a pregnant



expression, equivalent to: let death come upon them unexpectedly. To this **יְשִׁי** corresponds the **יִי** of the second imprecation: let them go down alive into Hades (**שְׂאוֹל**, perhaps originally **שְׂאֹלָה**, the **ה** of which may have been lost beside the **ן** that follows), i.e., like the company of Korah, while their life is yet vigorous, that is to say, let them die a sudden, violent death. The drawing together of the *decipiat (opprimat) mors* into one word is the result of the ancient *scriptio continua* and of the defective mode of writing, **יְשִׁי**, like **יְנִי**, Psa. 141: 5, **אָבִי**, 1Ki. 21:29. Böttcher renders it differently: let death crash in upon them; but the future form **יְשִׁי** = **יְשָׁה** from **שָׁה** = **שִׁי** is an imaginary one, which cannot be supported by Num. 21:30. Hitzig renders it: let death benumb them (**יְשִׁי**); but this gives an inconceivable figure, with the turgidity of which the *trepidantes Manes* in Virgil, *Aenid* viii. 246, do not admit of comparison. In the confirmation, v. 16c, **בְּמִגְוֹרָם**, together with the **בְּקִרְבָּם** which follows, does not pretend to be any advance in the thought, whether **מִגְוֹר** be rendered a settlement, dwelling, *παροικία* (LXX, Targum), or an assembly (Aquila, Symmachus, Jerome). Hence Hitzig's rendering: in their shrine, in their breast (= *ἐν τῷ θησαυρῷ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν*, Luke 6:45), **מִגְוֹרָם** being short for **מִגְוֹרָתָם** in accordance with the love of contraction which prevails in poetry (on Psa. 25: 5). But had the poet intended to use this figure he would have written **בְּמִגְוֹרַת קִרְבָּם**, and is not the assertion that wickedness is among them, that it is at home in them, really a climax? The change of the names of God in v. 17 is significant. He calls upon Him who is exalted above the world, and He who mercifully interposes in the history of the world helps him.

*Psa. 55:18-24.* In the third group confidence prevails, the tone that is struck up in v. 17 being carried forward. Evening morning, and noon, as the beginning, middle, and close of the day, denote the day in its whole compass or extent: David thus gives expression to the incessancy with which he is determined to lay before God, both in the quiet of his spirit and in louder utterances, whatsoever moves him. The *fut. consec.* **יִשְׁמַע** connects the hearing (answer) with the prayer as its inevitable result. Also in the *praet.* **פָּדָה** expression is given to the certainty of faith; and **בְּשָׁלוֹם** side by side with it denotes, with the same pregnancy of meaning as in Psa. 118: 5, the state of undisturbed outward and inward safety and prosperity, into which God removes his soul when He rescues him. If we read *mi-k<sup>e</sup>rob*, then **קִרְב** is, as the ancient versions regard it, the infinitive: *ne appropinquent mihi*; whereas since the time of J. H. Michaelis the preference has been given to the pronunciation *mi-k<sup>e</sup>rāb*: *a conflictu mihi sc. parato*, in which case it would be

pointed מִקְרָב־ (with *Metheg*), whilst the MSS, in order to guard against the reading with *ā*, point it מִקְרָב־. Hitzig is right when he observes, that after the negative מִן the infinitive is indicated beforehand, and that עֲלֵי = לֵי, Psa. 27: 2, is better suited to this. Moreover, the confirmatory clause v. 19b is connected with what precedes in a manner less liable to be misunderstood if מִקְרָב is taken as infinitive: that they may not be able to gain any advantage over me, cannot come near me to harm me (Psa. 91:10). For it is not until now less precarious to take the enemies as the subject of הָיוּ, and to take עֲמָדִי in a hostile sense, as in Job. 10:17; 13:19; 23: 6; 31:13, cf. עַם 94:16, and this is only possible where the connection suggests this sense. Heidenheim's interpretation: among the magnates were those who succoured me (viz., Hushai, Zadok, and Abiathar, by whom the counsel of Athithopel was frustrated), does not give a thought characteristic of the Psalms. And with Aben-Ezra, who follows *Numeri Rabba* 294a, to think of the assistance of angels in connection with בְּרַבִּים, certainly strongly commends itself in view of 2Ki. 6:16 (with which Hitzig also compares 2Ch. 32: 7); here, however, it has no connection, whereas the thought, "as many (consisting of many) are they with me, i.e., do they come forward and fight with me," is very loosely attached to what has gone before. The *Beth essentiae* serves here, as it does frequently, e.g., Psa. 39:17, to denote the qualification of the subject. The preterite of confidence is followed in v. 20 by the future of hope. Although side by side with שָׁמַע, עֲנָה presumptively has the signification to answer, i.e., to be assured of the prayer being heard, yet this meaning is in this instance excluded by the fact that the enemies are the object, as is required by v. 20d (even if v. 19b is understood of those who are on the side of the poet). The rendering of the LXX: εἰσακουσεται ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ταπεινώσει αὐτούς ὁ ὑπάρχων πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, is appropriate, but requires the pronunciation to be יְאִאֲנִם, since the signification to bow down, to humble, cannot be proved to belong either to *Kal* or *Hiphil*. But even granted that יַעֲנֵם might, according to 1Ki. 8:35 (vid., Keil), signify ταπεινώσει αὐτούς, it is nevertheless difficult to believe that יַעֲנֵם is not intended to have a meaning correlative with יִשְׁמַע, of which it is the continuation. Saadia has explained יַעֲנֵם in a manner worthy of attention, as being for יַעֲנֵה בָם, he will testify against them; an interpretation which Aben-Ezra endorses. Hengstenberg's is better: "God will hear (the tumult of the enemies) and answer them (judicially)." The original text may have been יַעֲנֵמוּ יֵשֶׁב קְדָם. But as it now stands, יֵשֶׁב קְדָם represents a subordinate clause, with the omission of the הוּא, pledging that judicial response: since He it is who sitteth enthroned from earliest times (vid., on Psa. 7:10). The bold expression יֵשֶׁב קְדָם is an abbreviation of the view of

God expressed in Psa. 74:12, Hab. 1:12, cf. Deu. 33:27, as of Him who from primeval days down to the present sits enthroned as King and Judge, who therefore will be able even at the present time to maintain His majesty, which is assailed in the person of His anointed one.

*Psa. 55:20c.* In spite of this interruption and the accompanying clashing in of the music. אֲשֶׁר with its dependent clause continues the וַיַּעֲנֵם, more minutely describing those whom God will answer in His wrath. The relative clause at the same time gives the ground for this their fate from the character they bear: they persevere in their course without any regard to any other in their godlessness. The noun חֲלִיפָה, which is used elsewhere of a change of clothes, of a reserve in time of war, of a relief of bands of workmen, here signifies a change of mind (Targum), as in Job. 14:14 a change of condition; the plural means that every change of this kind is very far from them. In v. 21 David again has the one faithless foe among the multitude of the rebels before his mind. שְׁלֵמִיּוֹ is equivalent to שְׁלָמִים אִתּוֹ, Gen. 34:21, those who stood in peaceful relationship to him (שָׁלוֹם, Psa. 41:10). David classes himself with his faithful adherents. בְּרִית is here a defensive and offensive treaty of mutual fidelity entered into in the presence of God. By שְׁלַח and חָלַל is meant the intention which, though not carried out as yet, is already in itself a violation and profanation of the solemn compact. In v. 22 the description passes into the tone of the caesural schema. It is impossible for מִחֲמַאֲתָא, so far as the vowels are concerned, to be equivalent to מִחֲמַאֲוֹת, since this change of the vowels would obliterate the preposition; but one is forbidden to read מִחֲמַאֲוֹת (Targum, Symmachus, Jerome) by the fact that פִּיּוֹ (LXX τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, as in Pro. 2: 6) cannot be the subject to חָלַקְוּ. Consequently מ belongs to the noun itself, and the denominative מִחֲמַאֲוֹת (from חֲמָאָה), like מַעֲדָנוֹת (from עָדָן), dainties, signifies articles of food prepared from curdled milk; here it is used figuratively of “milk-words” or “butter-words” which come from the lips of the hypocrite softly, sweetly, and supplely as cream: *os nectar promit, mens aconita vomit*. In the following words וַיִּקְרַבְּלָבוּ (וַיִּקְרַב) the *Makkeph* (in connection with which it would have to be read *uk<sup>e</sup>rob* just the same as in v. 19, since the —ָ has not a *Metheg*) is to be crossed out (as in fact it is even wanting here and there in MSS and printed editions). The words are an independent substantival clause: war (קָרַב, a pushing together, assault, battle, after the form בָּתַב with an unchangeable *ā*) is his inward part and his words are swords; these two clauses correspond. רַכְּוֹ (properly like Arab. *rkk*, to be thin, weak, then also: to be soft, mild; root רָק, רַק, *tendere, tenuare*) has

the accent on the *ultima*, vid., on Psa. 38:20. פְּתִיחָהּ is a drawn, unsheathed sword (Psa. 37:14).

The exhortation, v. 23, which begins a new strophe and is thereby less abrupt, is first of all a counsel which David gives to himself, but at the same time to all who suffer innocently, cf. Psa. 27:14. Instead of the obscure ἄπαξ γεγραμ. יְהִבְךָ, we read in Psa. 37: 5 דַּרְכְּךָ, and in Pro. 16: 3 מַעֲשֶׂיךָ, according to which the word is not a verb after the form יְדַעְךָ (Chajug?, Gecatilia, and Kimchi), but an accusative of the object (just as it is in fact accented; for the *Legarme* of יְהוּה has a lesser disjunctive value than the *Zinnor* of יְהִבְךָ). The LXX renders it ἐπιρροψον ἐπὶ κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου. Thus are these words of the Psalm applied in 1Pe. 5: 7. According to the Talmud יְהִבְךָ (the same form as יְקַבְךָ) signifies a burden. “One day,” relates Rabba bar-Chana, *B. Rosh ha-Shana*, 26b, and elsewhere, “I was walking with an Arabian (Nabataean?) tradesman, and happened to be carrying a heavy pack. And he said to me, שְׂקִיל יְהִבְךָ וּשְׂדֵי אֲגַמְלֵאִי, Take thy burden and throw it on my camel.” Hence it is wiser to refer יְהִבְךָ to יְהַבְךָ, to give, apportion, than to a stem יְהִבְךָ = יֵאָבְךָ, Psa. 119:131 (root אָב, אָו), to desire; so that it consequently does not mean desiring, longing, care, but that which is imposed, laid upon one, assigned or allotted to one (Böttcher), in which sense the Chaldee derivatives of יְהִבְךָ (Targum Psa. 11: 6; 16: 5, for מְנַתְךָ) do actually occur. On whomsoever one casts what is allotted to him to carry, to him one gives it to carry. The admonition proceeds on the principle that God is as willing as He is able to bear even the heaviest burden for us; but this bearing it for us is on the other side our own bearing of it in God’s strength, and hence the promise that is added runs: He will sustain thee (בְּלִבְךָ), that thou mayest not through feebleness succumb. V. 23c also favours this figure of a burden: He will not give, i.e., suffer to happen (Psa. 78:66), tottering to the righteous for ever, He will never suffer the righteous to totter. The righteous shall never totter (or be moved) with the overthrow that follows; whereas David is sure of this, that his enemies shall not only fall to the ground, but go down into Hades (which is here, by a combination of two synonyms, בְּאֵר שְׁחַת, called a well, i.e., an opening, of a sinking in, i.e., a pit, as e.g., in Pro. 8:31, Eze. 36: 3), and that before they have halved their days, i.e., before they have reached the half of the age that might be attained under other circumstances (cf. Psa. 102:25, Jer. 16:11). By וְאַתָּה אֱלֹהִים prominence is given to the fact that it is the very same God who will not suffer the righteous to fall who casts down the ungodly; and by וְאַנִּי David contrasts himself with them, as being of good courage now and in all time to come.

## Psalm 56

### CHEERFUL COURAGE OF A FUGITIVE

*56: 2 BE gracious unto me, Elohim, for man is greedy after me,  
All the day he, fighting, oppresseth me.*

*56: 3 Mine adversaries are greedy after me all the day,  
For many are they who proudly war against me.*

*56: 4 In the day that I fear do I cling confidingly to Thee.*

*56: 5 Through Elohim will I praise His word,  
In Elohim do I trust, without fearing:  
What can flesh do unto me?*

*56: 6 All the day long they wrest my words,  
Against me are all their thoughts for evil.*

*56: 7 They band together, they set spies —  
They watch my heels, because seeking after my life.*

*56: 8 By such evil-doing shall they escape? —  
In wrath cast down the peoples, Elohim!*

*56: 9 My fugitive life Thou hast told,  
My tears are laid up in Thy bottle —  
Are they not in Thy book?*

*56:10 Then must mine enemies fall back in the day that I call;  
This I know: that Elohim is for me.*

*56:11 Through Elohim do I praise the word,  
Through Jahve do I praise the word.*

*56:12 In Elohim do I trust without fearing:  
What can men do unto me?*

*56:13 Binding upon me, Elohim, are Thy vows;  
I will pay thank-offerings unto Thee.*

*56:14 For Thou hast delivered my soul from death,  
Yea my feet from falling,  
That I might walk before Elohim in the light of life.*

*Psalm 56.* To Psalm 55, which is vv. 7 f. gives utterance to the wish: “*Oh that I had wings like a dove,*” etc., no Psalm could be more appropriately appended, according to the mode of arrangement adopted by the collector, than Psalm 56, the musical inscription of which runs: *To the Precentor, after “The silent dove among the far off,”* by David, a Michtam. מְחִיטָם is a second

genitive, cf. Isa. 28: 1, and either signifies distant men or *longiqua*, distant places, as in Psa. 65: 6, cf. נְעִימִים, Psa. 16: 6. Just as in Psa. 58: 2, it is questionable whether the punctuation אֶלֶם has lighted upon the correct rendering. Hitzig is anxious to read אֶלֶם, “Dove of the people in the distance;” but אֶלֶם, people, in spite of Egli’s commendation, is a word unheard of in Hebrew, and only conjectural in Phoenician. Olshausen’s אֶלֶם more readily commends itself, “Dove of the distant terebinths.” As in other like inscriptions, אֶלֶם does not signify *de* (as Joh. Campensis renders it in his paraphrase of the Psalms [1532] and frequently): *Praefecto musices, de columba muta quae procul avolaverat*), but *secundum*; and the coincidence of the defining of the melody with the situation of the writer of the Psalm is explained by the consideration that the melody is chosen with reference to that situation. The LXX (cf. the Targum), interpreting the figure, renders: ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγίων (from the sanctuary) μεμακρυσμένου, for which Symmachus has: φύλου ἀπωσμένου. The rendering of Aquila is correct: ὑπὲρ περιστερᾶς ἀλάλου μακρυσμῶν. From Psalm 55 (vv. 7 f., cf. Psa. 38:14) we may form an idea of the standard song designated by the words יִנַּת אֶלֶם רַחֲקִים; for Psalm 55 is not this song itself, and for this reason, that it belongs to the time of Absalom, and is therefore of later date than Psalm 56, the historical inscription of which, “when the Philistines assaulted him in Gath” (cf. בִּידָם, 1Sa. 21:14), carries us back into the time of Saul, to the same time of the sojourn in Philistia to which Psalm 34 is assigned. Psalm 56 exhibits many points of the closest intermingling with the Psalms of this period, and thus justifies its inscription. It is a characteristic possessed in common by these Psalms, that the prospect of the judgment that will come upon the whole of the hostile world is combined with David’s prospect of the judgment that will come upon his enemies: Psa. 56: 8; 7: 9; 59: 6 (12). The figure of the bottle in which God preserves the tears of the suffering ones corresponds to the sojourn in the wilderness. As regards technical form, Psalm 56 begins the series of Davidic Elohimic *Michtammim*, Psalm 56-60. Three of these belong to the time of Saul. These three contain refrains, a fact that we have already recognised on 16: 1 as a peculiarity of these “favourite-word-poems.” the favourite words of this Psalm 56 are (אָדָם) לִי and בְּאֵלֶּהִם אֶהְלֵל דְּבַר (1) מִה־יַּעֲשֶׂה בְּשָׂר .

*Psa. 56: 2-5.* אֶלֶהִים and אֲנֹשׁ, v. 2 (Psa. 9:20; 10:18), are antitheses: over against God, the majestic One, men are feeble beings. Their rebellion against the counsel of God is ineffective madness. If the poet has God’s favour on his side, then he will face these pigmies that behave as though they were giants, who fight against him מְרוֹם, moving on high, i.e., proudly (cf. מְמָרוֹם,

Psa. 73: 8), in the invincible might of God. **שָׁאֵךְ**, *inhiare*, as in Psa. 57: 4; **לֹחֵם**, as in 35: 1, with **ל** like **אֵל**, e.g., in Jer. 1:19. Thus, then, he does not fear; in the day when (Ges. § 123, 3, *b*) he might well be afraid (conjunctive future, as e.g., in Jos. 9:27), he clings trustfully to (**אֵל** as in Psa. 4: 6, and frequently, Pro. 3: 5) his God, so that fear cannot come near him. He has the word of His promise on his side (**דְּבַר** as e.g., Psa. 130: 5); **בְּאֱלֹהִים**, through God will he praise this His word, inasmuch as it is gloriously verified in him. Hupfeld thus correctly interprets it; whereas others in part render it “in Elohim do I praise His word,” in part (and the form of this favourite expression in v. 11*ab* is opposed to it): “Elohim do I celebrate, His word.” Hitzig, however, renders it: “Of God do I boast in matter,” i.e., in the present affair; which is most chillingly prosaic in connection with an awkward brevity of language. The exposition is here confused by Psa. 10: 3 and Psa. 44: 9. **הִלֵּל** does not by any means signify *gloriarī* in this passage, but *celebrare*; and **בְּאֱלֹהִים** is not intended in any other sense than that in Psa. 60:14. **בְּמַחְבֵּי** is equivalent to the New Testament phrase **לֹא אֵינְךָ אֵל** is a circumstantial clause with a finite verb, as is customary in connection with **לֹא**, Psa. 35: 8, Job. 29:24, and **בְּל**, Pro. 19:23.

**Psa. 56: 6-8.** This second strophe describes the adversaries, and ends in imprecation, the fire of anger being kindled against them. Hitzig’s rendering is: “All the time they are injuring my concerns,” i.e., injuring my interests. This also sounds unpoetical. Just as we say **הָמַס תּוֹרָה**, to do violence to the *Tōra* (Zep. 3: 4, Eze. 22:26), so we can also say: to torture any one’s words, i.e., his utterances concerning himself, viz., by misconstruing and twisting them. It is no good to David that he asseverates his innocence, that he asserts his filial faithfulness to Saul, God’s anointed; they stretch his testimony concerning himself upon the rack, forcing upon it a false meaning and wrong inferences. They band themselves together, they place men in ambush. The verb **גִּוַר** signifies sometimes to turn aside, turn in, dwell (= Arab. *jâr*); sometimes, to be afraid (= **גָּרַר**, Arab. *wjr*); sometimes, to stir up, excite, Psa. 140: 3 (= **גָּרַר**); and sometimes, as here, and in Psa. 59: 4, Isa. 54:15: to gather together (= **אָגַר**). The *Kerî* reads **יַצְפִּינוּ** (as in Psa. 10: 8, Pro. 1:11), but the *scriptio plena* points to *Hiph.* (cf. Job. 24: 6, and also Psa. 126: 5), and the following **הָמָה** leads one to the conclusion that it is the causative **יַצְפִּינוּ** that is intended: they cause one to keep watch in concealment, they lay an ambush (synon. **הָאָרִיב**, 1Sa. 15: 5); so that **הָמָה** refers to the liers-in-wait told off by them: as to these — they observe my heels or (like the feminine plural in Psa. 77:20; 89:52) footprints (Rashi: *mes traces*), i.e., all my footsteps or movements, because

(properly, “in accordance with this, that,” as in Mic. 3: 4) they now as formerly (which is implied in the perfect, cf. Psa. 59: 4) attempt my life, i.e., strive after, lie in wait for it (קָוָה like שָׁמַר, Psa. 71:10, with the accusative = לְ קָוָה in Psa. 119:95). To this circumstantial representation of their hostile proceedings is appended the clause אֶל-אֲוֹן פְּלִט-לָמוּ, which is not to be understood otherwise than as a question, and is marked as such by the order of the words (2Ki. 5:26, Isa. 28:28): *In spite of iniquity [is there] escape for them?* i.e., shall they, the liers-in-wait, notwithstanding such evil good-for-nothing mode of action, escape? At any rate פְּלִט is, as in Psa. 32: 7, a substantivized finitive, and the “by no means” which belongs as answer to this question passes over forthwith into the prayer for the overthrow of the evil ones. This is the customary interpretation since Kimchi’s day. Mendelssohn explains it differently: “In vain be their escape,” following Aben-Jachja, who, however, like Saadia, takes פֹּלֵט to be imperative. Certainly adverbial notions are expressed by means of אֶל, — e.g., אֶל-יָתֵר, abundantly, Psa. 31:24; אֶל-שָׁקֶר, falsely, Lev. 5:22 (vid., Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 1028), — but one does not say אֶל-הֶבֶל, and consequently also would hardly have said אֶל-אֲוֹן (by no means, for nothing, in vain); moreover the connection here demands the prevailing ethical notion for אֲוֹן. Hupfeld alters פֹּלֵט to פֹּלֵס, and renders it: “recompense to them for wickedness,” which is not only critically improbable, but even contrary to the usage of the language, since פֹּלֵס signifies to weigh out, but not to requite, and requires the accusative of the object. The widening of the circle of vision to the whole of the hostile world is rightly explained by Hengstenberg by the fact that the special execution of judgment on the part of God is only an outflow of His more general and comprehensive execution of judgment, and the belief in the former has its root in a belief in the latter. The meaning of הוֹרֵד becomes manifest from the preceding Psalm (Psa. 55:24), to which the Psalm before us is appended by reason of manifold and closely allied relation.

**Psa. 56: 9-12.** What the poet prays for in v. 8, he now expresses as his confident expectation with which he solaces himself. נָד (v. 9) is not to be rendered “flight,” which certainly is not a thing that can be numbered (Olshausen); but “a being fugitive,” the unsettled life of a fugitive (Pro. 27: 8), can really be numbered both by its duration and its many temporary stays here and there. And upon the fact that God, that He whose all-seeing eye follows him into every secret hiding-place of the desert and of the rocks, counteth (telleth) it, the poet lays great stress; for he has long ago learnt to despair of man. The accentuation gives special prominence to נָדִי as an emphatically placed object, by means of *Zarka*; and this is then followed by סִפְרָתָהּ with



the conjunctive *Galgal* and the pausal **אָתָּה** with *Olewejored* (the \_ of which is placed over the final letter of the preceding word, as is always the case when the word marked with this double accent is monosyllabic, or dissyllabic and accented on the first syllable). He who counts (Job. 31: 4) all the steps of men, knows how long David has already been driven hither and thither without any settled home, although free from guilt. He comforts himself with this fact, but not without tears, which this wretched condition forces from him, and which he prays God to collect and preserve. Thus it is according to the accentuation, which takes **שִׁמָּה** as imperative, as e.g., in 1Sa. 8: 5; but since **שִׁמָּה, שִׁים**, is also the form of the passive participle (1Sa. 9:24, and frequently, 2Sa. 13:32), it is more natural, in accordance with the surrounding thoughts, to render it so even in this instance (*posita est lacrima mea*), and consequently to pronounce it as *Milra* (Ewald, Hupfeld, Böttcher, and Hitzig). **דַּמְעָתִי** (Ecc. 4: 1) corresponds chiasmically (crosswise) to **נָדִי**, with which **בְּנֹאֲדֶךָ** forms a play in sound; and the closing clause **הֲלֹא בְּסִפְרָתְךָ** unites with **סִפְרָתָהּ** in the first member of the verse. Both v. 9b and v. 9c are wanting in any particle of comparison. The fact thus figuratively set forth, viz., that God collects the tears of His saints as it were in a bottle, and notes them together with the things which call them forth as in a memorial (Mal. 3:16), the writer assumes; and only appropriatingly applies it to himself. The **וְ** which follows may be taken either as a logical “in consequence of so and so” (as e.g., Psa. 19:14; 40: 8), or as a “then” fixing a turning-point in the present tearful wandering life (viz., when there have been enough of the “wandering” and of the “tears”), or “at a future time” (more abruptly, like **שָׁמַע** in Psa. 14: 5; 36:13, vid., on 2: 5). **אֶקְרָא בְיֹום** is not an expansion of this **וְ**, which would trail awkwardly after it. The poet says that one day his enemies will be obliged to retreat, inasmuch as a day will come when his prayer, which is even now heard, will be also outwardly fulfilled, and the full realization of the succour will coincide with the cry for help. By **וְיָדַעְתִּי** in v. 10b he justifies this hope from his believing consciousness. It is not to be rendered, after Job. 19:19: “I who know,” which is a trailing apposition without any proper connection with what precedes; but, after 1Ki. 17:24: this I know (of this I am certain), that Elohim is for me. **וְ** as a neuter, just as in connection with **יָדַע** in Pro. 24:12, and also frequently elsewhere (Gen. 6:15, Exo. 13: 8; 30:13, Lev. 11: 4, Isa. 29:11, cf. Job. 15:17); and **לִי** as e.g., in Gen. 31:42. Through Elohim, v. 11 continues, will I praise **דְּבָר**: thus absolutely is the word named; it is therefore the divine word, just like **בֶּר** in Psa. 2:12, the Son absolutely, therefore the divine Son. Because the thought is repeated, *Elohim* stands in the first case and then *Jahve*, in accordance with the Elohimic Psalm style, as in 58: 7. The refrain in v. 12 (cf.

v. 5b) indicates the conclusion of the strophe. The fact that we read אָדָם instead of בָּשָׂר in this instance, just as in v. 11 דָּבָר instead of דְּבָרוֹ (v. 5a), is in accordance with the custom in the Psalms of not allowing the refrain to recur in exactly the same form.

*Psa. 56:13, 14.* In prospect of his deliverance the poet promises beforehand to fulfil the duty of thankfulness. עָלַי, incumbent upon me, as in Pro. 7:14, 2Sa. 18:11. נִדְרֵי־יְיָ, with an objective subject, are the vows made to God; and תּוֹדוֹת are distinguished from them, as e.g., in 2Ch. 29:31. He will suffer neither the pledged נֶדֶר שְׁלָמִי nor the תְּנָדָה שְׁלָמִי to be wanting; for — so will he be then able to sing and to declare — Thou hast rescued, etc. The perfect after כִּי denotes that which is then past, as in Psa. 59:17, cf. the dependent passage Psa. 116: 8 f. There the expression is אֲרֻצוֹת הַחַיִּים instead of אֹר הַחַיִּים (here and in Elihu's speech, Job. 33:30). Light of life (Joh. 8:12) or of the living (LXX τὸν ζῶντων) is not exclusively the sun-light of this present life. Life is the opposite of death in the deepest and most comprehensive sense; light of life is therefore the opposite of the night of Hades, of this seclusion from God and from His revelation in human history.

## Psalm 57

### BEFORE FALLING ASLEEP IN THE WILDERNESS

*57: 2 BE gracious unto me, Elohim, be gracious unto me,  
For in Thee hath my soul hidden;  
And in the shadow of Thy wings do I seek refuge,  
Until the destruction passeth by.*

*57: 3 I call upon Elohim, the Most High,  
Upon God who performeth it for me:*

*57: 4 He will send from heaven and save me.  
If he who is greedy for me doth slander — (Sela)  
Elohim will send His mercy and truth.*

*57: 5 My soul is in the midst of lions,  
I will lie down among those who breathe forth fire.  
The children of men — their teeth are spears and arrows,  
And their tongue is a sharp sword.*

*57: 6 Oh show Thyself exalted above the heavens, Elohim,  
Above the whole earth Thy glory!*

*57: 7 They had laid a net for my steps,  
They had bowed down my soul,  
They had digged out a pit before me —  
They themselves fall therein. (Sela)*

*57: 8 Confident is my heart, Elohim, confident is my heart,  
I will sing and play upon the harp.*

*57: 9 Awake up, my glory,  
Awake up, O harp and cithern,  
I will awake the morning dawn!*

*57:10 I will praise Thee among the peoples, O Lord,  
I will praise Thee upon the harp among the nations.*

*57:11 For great unto the heavens is thy mercy,  
And unto the clouds Thy truth.*

*57:12 Oh show Thyself exalted above the heavens, Elohim,  
Above the whole earth Thy glory.*

*Psalm 57.* The Psalms that are to be sung after the melody אֶל-תִּשְׁחַת (57, 58, 59 Davidic, 75 Asaphic) begin here. The direction referring to the musical execution of the Psalm ought properly to be אֶל אֶל-תִּשְׁחַת (אל); but this is avoided as being unmelodious, and harsh so far as the syntax is concerned. The Geneva version is correct: *pour le chanter sur Al taschchet*. There is no actual reference in the words to Deu. 9:26, or 1Sa. 26: 9 (why not also to Isa. 65: 8?).

The historical inscription runs: *when he fled from Saul, in the cave*. From the connection in the history from which this statement is extracted, it will have been clear whether the Psalm belongs to the sojourn in the cave of Adullam (1Sa. 22) or in the labyrinthine cave upon the alpine heights of Engedi, “by the sheep-folds” (1 Samuel 24), described in Van de Velde’s *Journey*, ii. 74-76.

How manifold are the points in which these Psalms belonging to the time of Saul run into one another! Psalm 57 has not merely the supplicatory “Be gracious unto me, Elohim,” at the beginning, but also שָׁאף applied in the same way (Psa. 57: 4, 56: 2 f.), in common with Psalm 56; in common with Psalm ch. 7, כְּבוֹדִי = נַפְשִׁי (Psa. 57: 9, 7: 6); the comparison of one’s enemies to lions and lionesses (Psa. 57: 5, 7: 3); the figure of the sword of the tongue (Psa. 57: 5, 59: 8, cf. 52: 4); with Psalm 52 the poetical expression הוֹוֶת (Psa. 57: 2, 52: 4); with Psalm 22 the relation of the deliverance of the anointed one to the redemption of all peoples (Psa. 57:10, 22:28 ff.). Also with Psalm 36 it has one or two points of contact, viz., the expression “refuge under the shadow of God’s wings” (v. 2, Psa. 36: 8), and in the measuring of the mercy and truth of God by the height of the heavens (v. 11, Psa. 36: 6). Yet, on

the other hand, it has a thoroughly characteristic impress. Just as Psalm 56 delighted in confirming what was said by means of the interrogatory **הֲלֹא** (vv. 9, 14), so Psalm 57 revels in the figure epizeuxis, or an emphatic repetition of a word (vv. 2, 4, 8, 9). Psalm 108 (which see) is a cento taken out of Psalm 57 and 60.

The strophe-schema of Psalm 57 is the growing one: 4. 5. 6; 4. 5. 6. <sup>r214</sup> Here also the *Michtam* is not wanting in its prominent favourite word. A refrain of a lofty character closes the first and second parts. In the first part cheerful submission rules, in the second a certainty of victory, which by anticipation takes up the song of praise.

*Psa. 57: 2-6.* By means of the two distinctive tense-forms the poet describes his believing flight to God for refuge as that which has once taken place (**הִסְתָּיָה**) from **הִסָּה** = **הִסָּי** out of pause, like the same forms in Psa. 73: 2, 122: 6), and still, because it is a living fact, is ever, and now in particular, renewed (**הִסְתָּיָה**). The shadow of the wings of God is the protection of His gentle, tender love; and the shadow of the wings is the quickening, cordial solace that is combined with this protection. Into this shadow the poet betakes himself for refuge now as he has done before, until **הַיּוֹת**, i.e., the abysmal danger that threatens him, be overpast, *praeteriverit* (cf. Isa. 26:20, and on the *enallage numeri* 10:10, Ges. § 147, a). Not as though he would then no longer stand in need of the divine protection, but he now feels himself to be specially in need of it; and therefore his chief aim is an undaunted triumphant resistance of the impending trials. The effort on his own part, however, by means of which he always anew takes refuge in this shadow, is prayer to Him who dwells above and rules the universe. **עֲלֵיוֹן** is without the article, which it never takes; and **גִּמְרָה** (v. 3b) is the same, because it is regularly left out before the participle, which admits of being more fully defined, Amo. 9:12, Eze. 21:19 (Hitzig). He calls upon God who accomplisheth concerning, i.e., for him (Est. 4:16), who carrieth out his cause, the cause of the persecuted one; **גִּמְרָה** is transitive as in Psa. 138: 8. The LXX renders **τὸν εὐεργετήσαντά με**, as though it were **עֲלֵי גִמְלָה** (Psa. 13: 6, and frequently); and even Hitzig and Hupfeld hold that the meaning is exactly the same. But although **גִּמְלָה** and **גִּמְרָה** fall back upon one and the same radical notion, still it is just their distinctive final letters that serve to indicate a difference of signification that is strictly maintained. In v. 4 follow futures of hope. In this instance “that which brings me deliverance” is to be supplied in thought to **יְשַׁלַּח** (cf. Psa. 20: 3) and not **יָרוּ** as in Psa. 18:17, cf. Psa. 144: 7; and this general and unmentioned object is then specialized and defined in the words “His mercy and His truth” in v. 4c. Mercy and truth are as it were the two good spirits, which descending from heaven to earth (cf. 43: 3)

bring the divine **יְשׁוּעָה** to an accomplishment. The words **חָרַף שְׂאֵפֵי** standing between *a* and *c* have been drawn by the accentuators to the first half of the verse, they probably interpreting it thus: He (God) reproacheth my devourers for ever (*Sela*). But **חָרַף** always (e.g., Isa. 37:23) has God as its object, not as its subject. **חָרַף שְׂאֵפֵי** is to be connected with what follows as a hypothetical protasis (Ges. § 155, 4, *a*): supposing that he who is greedy or pants for me (*inhians mihi*) slandereth, then Elohim will send His mercy and His truth. The music that becomes *forte* in between, introduces and accompanies the throbbing confidence of the apodosis.

In v. 5, on the contrary, we may follow the interpretation of the text that is handed down and defined by the accentuation, natural as it may also be, with Luther and others, to take one's own course. Since **לְבָאִים** (has *Zarka* (*Zinnor*)) and **לְהָטִים** *Olewejored*, it is accordingly to be rendered: "My soul is in the midst of lions, I will (must) lie down with flaming ones; the children of men — their teeth are a spear and arrows." The rendering of the LXX, of Theodotion, and of the Syriac version accords with the interpunction of our text so far as both begin a new clause with **ἐκοιμήθην** (**וַדַּמַּכְתָּ**, and I slept); whereas Aquila and Symmachus (taking **נַפְשִׁי**, as it seems, as a periphrastic expression of the subject-notion placed in advance) render all as afar as **לְהָטִים** as one clause, at least dividing the verse into two parts, just as the accentuators do, at **לְהָטִים**. The rendering of Aquila is *ἐν μέσῳ λεαινῶν κοιμηθήσομαι λάβρων*; that of Symmachus: *ἐν μέσῳ λεόντων εὐθαρσῶν ἐκοιμήθην*; or according to another reading, *μεταξὺ λεόντων ἐκοιμήθην φλεγόντων*. They are followed by Jerome, who, however, in order that he may be able to reproduce the **נַפְשִׁי**, changes **אֲשַׁכְּבָה** into **שַׁכְּבָה**: *Anima mea in medio leonum dormivit ferocientium*. This construction, however, can be used in Greek and Latin, but not in Hebrew. We therefore follow the accents even in reference to the *Zarka* above **לְבָאִים** (a plural form that only occurs in this one passage in the Psalter, = **לְבָאִים**). In a general way it is to be observed that this **לְבָאִים** in connection with **אֲשַׁכְּבָה** is not so much the accusative of the object as the accusative of the place, although it may even be said to be the customary local accusative of the object with verbs of dwelling; on **שָׁכַב** cf. Rut. 3: 8, 14, and Psal. 88: 6, Mic. 7: 5 (where at least the possibility of this construction of the verb is presupposed). But in particular it is doubtful

(1) what **לְהָטִים** signifies. The rendering "flaming ones" is offered by the Targum, Saadia, and perhaps Symmachus. The verb **לָהַט** obtains this signification apparently from the fundamental notion of licking or swallowing; and accordingly Theodotion renders it by *ἀναλίσκόντων*, and Aquila most

appropriately by **λάβρων** (a word used of a ravenous furious longing for anything). But **להט** nowhere means “to devour;” the poet must, therefore, in connection with **להטים**, have been thinking of the flaming look or the fiery jaws of the lions, and this attributive will denote figuratively their strong desire, which snorts forth as it were flames of fire. The question further arises,

(2) how the cohortative **אשכבה** is meant to be taken. Since the cohortative sometimes expresses that which is to be done more by outward constraint than inward impulse — never, however, without willing it one’s self (Ew. § 228, a) — the rendering “I must,” or “therefore must I lie down,” commends itself. But the contrast, which has been almost entirely overlooked, between the literal beasts of prey and the children of men, who are worse than these, requires the simple and most natural rendering of the cohortative. We need only picture to ourselves the situation. The verb **שכב** here has the sense of *cubitus ire* (Psa. 4: 9). Starting from this **אשכבה** we look to v. 9, and it at once becomes clear that we have before us an evening or nightly song. David the persecuted one finds himself in the wilderness and, if we accept the testimony of the inscription, in a cave: his soul is in the midst of lions, by which he means to say that his life is exposed to them. Here bold in faith, he is resolved to lie down to sleep, feeling himself more secure among lions than among men; for the children of men, his deadly foes both in word and in deed, are worse than beasts of prey: teeth and tongue are murderous weapons. This more than brutal joy at the destruction of one’s neighbour <sup>f215</sup> which prevails among men, urges him to put forth the prayer that God, who in Himself is exalted above the heavens and the whole earth, would show Himself by some visible manifestation over the heavens above as the exalted One, and the prayer that His glory may be, i.e., may become manifest (or even: exalted be His glory, **יְרוֹם**), over the whole earth beneath, — His glory which to His saints is a health-diffusing light, and to the heartless foes of men and God a consuming fire, — so that the whole world shall be compelled to acknowledge this glory in which His holiness manifests itself, and shall become conformed to it after everything that is hostile is overthrown.

**Psa. 57: 7-12.** In this second half of the Psalm the poet refreshes himself with the thought of seeing that for which he longs and prays realized even with the dawning of the morning after this night of wretchedness. The perfect in v. 7d is the perfect of certainty; the other perfects state what preceded and is now changed into the destruction of the crafty ones themselves. If the clause **נַפְשִׁי כִּפְּרָה** is rendered: my soul was bowed down (cf. **הָלַל**, Psa. 109:22), it forms no appropriate corollary to the crafty laying of snares. Hence **כִּפְּרָה** must be taken as transitive: he had bowed down my soul; the change of number in the

mention of the enemies is very common in the Psalms relating to these trials, whether it be that the poet has one enemy *κατ' ἐξοχήν* before his mind or comprehends them all in one. Even the LXX renders *καὶ κατέκαμψαν τὴν ψυχὴν μου*, it is true, as though it were *וככפפו*, but can scarcely have read it thus. This line is still remarkable; one would expect for v. 7*b* a thought parallel with v. 7*d*, and perhaps the poet wrote *ככפף נפשו*, his (the net-layer's) own soul bends (viz., in order to fall into the net). Then *ככפף* like *נפל* would be *praet. confidentiae*. In this certainty, to express which the music here becomes triumphantly *forte*, David's heart is confident, cheerful (Symmachus *ἔδραλα*), and a powerful inward impulse urges him to song and harp. Although *נכון* may signify ready, equipped (Exo. 34: 2, Job. 12: 5), yet this meaning is to be rejected here in view of Psa. 51:12, 78:37, 112: 7: it is not appropriate to the emphatic repetition of the word. His evening mood which found expression in v. 4, was hope of victory; the morning mood into which David here transports himself, is certainty of victory. He calls upon his soul to awake (*כבודי* as in Psa. 16: 9, 30:13), he calls upon harp and cithern to awake (*הנבל וְכנור* with one article that avails for both words, as in Jer. 29: 3, Neh. 1: 5; and *עורה* with the accent on the *ultima* on account of the coming together of two aspirates), from which he has not parted even though a fugitive; with the music of stringed instruments and with song he will awake the not yet risen dawn, the sun still slumbering in its chamber: *אעירה*, *expergeficiam* (not *expergiscar*), as e.g., in Son. 2: 7, and as Ovid (*Metam.* xi. 597) says of the cock, *evocat auroram*.<sup>f216</sup>

His song of praise, however, shall not resound in a narrow space where it is scarcely heard; he will step forth as the evangelist of his deliverance and of his Deliverer in the world of nations (*בְּאֲמִים*; and the parallel word, as also in Psa. 108: 4, 149: 7, is to be written *בְּלִאֲמִים* with *Lamed raphatum* and *Metheg* before it); his vocation extends beyond Israel, and the events of his life are to be for the benefit of mankind. Here we perceive the self-consciousness of a comprehensive mission, which accompanied David from the beginning to the end of his royal career (vid., 18:50). What is expressed in v. 11 is both motive and theme of the discourse among the peoples, viz., God's mercy and truth which soar high as the heavens (Psa. 36: 6). That they extend even to the heavens is only an earthly conception of their infinity (cf. Eph. 3:18). In the refrain, v. 12, which only differs in one letter from v. 6, the Psalm comes back to the language of prayer. Heaven and earth have a mutually involved history, and the blessed, glorious end of this history is the sunrise of the divine doxa over both, here prayed for.

## Psalm 58

### CRY FOR VENGEANCE UPON THOSE WHO PERVERT JUSTICE

*58: 2 DO ye really, O ye gods, speak righteousness,  
Do ye in uprightness judge the children of men?*

*58: 3 Nay, in heart ye work iniquities,  
In the land ye weigh out the violence of your hands.*

*58: 4 Apostate are the ungodly from the womb,  
Gone astray from the birth are the speakers of lies.*

*58: 5 Poison have they after the likeness of the poison of the serpent,  
Like a deaf adder which stoppeth her ear,*

*58: 6 That she may not hear the voice of the charmers,  
The skilful practiser of sorcery.*

*58: 7 Elohim, break their teeth in their mouth,  
The teeth of the lions do Thou wrench out, Jahve!*

*58: 8 They must melt away as running water;  
When he shooteth his arrows they are as though cut off.*

*58: 9 (Let them be) as a snail that goes along dissolving as it goes,  
(As) the untimely birth of a woman, that hath not seen the sun.*

*58:10 Before, then, your pots feel the thorn,  
Whether it be raw or at boiling heat — He whirleth it away.*

*58:11 The righteous shall rejoice that he seeth vengeance,  
He shall bathe his footsteps in the blood of the ungodly.*

*58:12 And men shall confess: Verily the righteous findeth fruit,  
Verily there is a deity judging in the earth.*

*Psalm 58.* Their teeth, said Psalm 57, are spear and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword; Psalm 58 prays: *crush their teeth in their mouth.* This prominent common thought has induced the collector to append the one *Michtam* of David, to be sung *altashcheth*, to the other. Psalm 58, however, belongs to another period, viz., to the time of Absalom. The incomparable boldness of the language does not warrant us in denying it to David. In no one Psalm do we meet with so many high-flown figures coming together within the same narrow compass. But that it is David who speaks in this Psalm is to a certain extent guaranteed by Psalm 64 and 140. These three Psalms, of which the closing verses so closely resemble one another that they at once invite comparison, show that the same David who writes elsewhere so beautifully, tenderly, and clearly, is able among his manifold transitions to rise to an



elevation at which his words as it were roll along like rumbling thunder through the gloomy darkness of the clouds, and more especially where they supplicate (Psa. 58: 7) or predict (Psa. 140:10) the judgment of God.

The cumulative use of **כְּמוֹ** in different applications is peculiar to this Psalm. Its *Michtam* character becomes clearly defined in the closing verse.

**Psa. 58: 2, 3.** The text of v. 2a runs: *Do ye really dictate the silence of righteousness?* i.e., that before which righteousness must become silent, as the collector (cf. Psa. 56: 1) appears to have read it (**אֱלֹהִים = אֱלֹהִים**, *B. Chullin* 89a). But instead of **אֱלֹהִים** it is, with Houbigant, J. D. Michaelis, Mendelssohn, and others, to be read **אֱלֹהִים** (= **אֱלִים**, as in Exo. 15:11), as an apostrophe of those who discharge the godlike office of rulers and judges. Both the interrogative **הֲאִמְנָם** (with *ū* as is always the case at the head of interrogative clauses), *num vere*, which proceeds from doubt as to the questionable matter of fact (Num. 22:37, 1Ki. 8:27, 2Ch. 6:18), and the parallel member of the verse, and also the historical circumstances out of which the Psalm springs, demand this alteration. Absalom with his followers had made the administration of justice the means of stealing from David the heart of his people; he feigned to be the more impartial judge. Hence David asks: Is it then really so, ye gods (**אֱלִים** like **אֱלֹהִים**, Psa. 82: 1, and here, as there, not without reference to their superhumanly proud and assumptive bearing), that ye speak righteousness, that ye judge the children of men in accordance with justice? Nay, on the contrary (**אֲרָא**, *imo*, introducing an answer that goes beyond the first No), in heart (i.e., not merely outwardly allowing yourselves to be carried away) ye prepare villainies (**פְּאֵל**, as in Mic. 2: 1; and **עוֹלָה**, as in Psa. 64: 7, from **עוֹלָה = אֲוֹלָה**, Psa. 92:16, Job. 5:16, with  $\hat{o} = \check{a} + w$ ), in the land ye weigh out the violence of your hands (so that consequently violence fills the balances of your pretended justice). **בְּנֵי אָדָם** in v. 2b is the accusative of the object; if it had been intended as a second vocative, it ought to have been **בְּנֵי-אִישׁ** (Psa. 4: 3). The expression is inverted in order to make it possible to use the heavy energetic futures. **בְּאֲרָץ** (mostly erroneously marked with *Pazer*) has *Athnach*, cf. Psa. 35:20, 76:12.

**Psa. 58: 4-6.** After this bold beginning the boldest figures follow one another rapidly; and the first of these is that of the serpent, which is kept up longer than any of the others. The verb **זוּר** (cogn. **סוּר**) is intentionally written **זוּר** in this instance in a neuter, not an active sense, plural **זָרוּ**, like **בָּשׂוּ**, **טָבוּ**. Bakius recognises a retrospective reference to this passage in Isa. 48: 8. In such passages Scripture bears witness to the fact, which is borne out by

experience, that there are men in whom evil from childhood onwards has a truly diabolical character, i.e., a selfish character altogether incapable of love. For although hereditary sinfulness and hereditary sin (guilt) are common to all men, yet the former takes the most manifold combinations and forms; and, in fact, the inheriting of sin and the complex influence of the power of evil and of the power of grace on the propagation of the human race require that it should be so. The Gospel of John more particularly teaches such a dualism of the natures of men. **חַמְתָּ לָמוֹ** (with *Rebia*, as in 18:18a) is not the subject: the poison belonging to them, etc., but a clause by itself: poison is to them, they have poison; the construct state here, as in Lam. 2:18, Eze. 1:27, does not express a relation of actual union, but only a close connection. **אָטַם** (with the orthophonic *Dagesh* which gives prominence to the *Teth* as the commencement of a syllable) is an optative future form, which is also employed as an indicative in the poetic style, e.g., Psa. 18:11. The subject of this attributive clause, continuing the adjective, is the deaf adder, such an one, viz., as makes itself deaf; and in this respect (as in their evil serpent nature) it is a figure of the self-hardening evil-doer. Then with **אֲשֶׁר** begins the more minute description of this adder. There is a difference even among serpents. *They* belong to the worst among them that are inaccessible to any kind of human influence. All the arts of sorcery are lost upon them. **מְלַחְשִׁים** are the whisperers of magic formulae (cf. Arabic *naffathât*, adjurations), and **חֹבְרִים** **חֹבֵר** is one who works binding by spells, exorcism, and tying fast by magic knots (cf. **חָבַר**, to bind = to bewitch, cf. Arab. ‘*qqd*, ‘*nn*, Persic *bend* = *κατάδεσμος*, vid., *Isaiah*, i. 118, ii. 242). The most inventive affection and the most untiring patience cannot change their mind. Nothing therefore remains to David but to hope for their removal, and to pray for it.

*Psa. 58: 7-10.* The verb **חָרַם** is used much in the same way in v. 7a as *ἄρασσειν* (e.g., *Iliad*, xiii. 577, *ἄπο δὲ τρυφάλειαν ἄραξεν*), which presents a similar onomatopoe. The form **מֵאָסוּ** is, as in Job. 7: 5, = **יָמַסוּ**. The Jewish expositors, less appropriately, compare **צִנְאָכֶם**, Num. 32:24, and **בָּזְאוּ = בָּזְאוּ**, Isa. 18: 2, 7; **שָׂאֲסִיד**, *Chethib*, Jer. 30:16, and **רָאָמָה**, Zec. 14:10, more nearly resemble it. The treading (bending) of the bow is here, as in Psa. 64: 4, transferred to the arrows (= **בִּזְנֵן**, Psa. 11: 2): he bends and shoots off his arrows, they shall be as though cut off in the front, i.e., as inoperative as if they had no heads or points (**בָּמוֹ** as in Isa. 26:18). In v. 9 follow two figures to which the apprecatory “let them become” is to be supplied. Or is it perhaps to be rendered: As a snail, which Thou causest to melt away, i.e., squashest with the foot (**תִּמָּס**, as in Psa. 39:12, *fut. Hiph.* of **מָסָה = מָסַס**), let him perish? The change of the number does not favour this; and according to the usage of the

language, which is fond of construing הִלָּךְ with gerunds and participles, and also with abstract nouns, e.g., הִלָּךְ קָרִי, הִלָּךְ תָּם, the words תָּם יִהְיֶה belong together, and they are also accented accordingly: as a snail or slug which goes along in dissolution, goes on and dissolves as it goes (תָּם after the form תָּבַל form בָּלַל <sup>f217</sup>). The snail has received its name from this apparent dissolving into slime. For שְׂבִלּוּל (with *Dag. dirimens* for שְׂבִלּוּל) is the naked slimy snail or slug (Targum, according to ancient conception, זָחִיל תְּבַלְלָא “the slimeworm”), from שְׂבִלַל, to make wet, moist. <sup>f218</sup>

In the second figure, the only sense in which נִפְלָא אִשָּׁת belong together is “the untimely birth of a woman;” and rather than explain with the Talmud (*B. Mōed katan 6b*) and Targum (contrary to the accents): as an abortion, a mole, <sup>f219</sup> one would alter אִשָּׁת into אִשָּׁה. But this is not necessary, since the construct form אִשָּׁת is found also in other instances (Deu. 21:11, 1Sa. 28: 7) out of the genitival relation, in connection with a close coordinate construction. So here, where בְּלִי-חַזוֹן שָׁמֶשׁ, according to Job. 3:16, Ecc. 6: 3-5, is an attributive clause to נִפְלָא אִשָּׁת (the falling away of a woman = abortions), which is used collectively (Ew. § 176, *b*). The accentuation also harmonizes here with the syntactic relation of the words. In v. 10, אֶמְדָּ (plural in African, i.e., Punic, in Dioscorides ἀταδίν) is the rhamnus or buckthorn, which, like רִתָּם, the broom, not only makes a cheerful crackling fire, but also produces an ash that retains the heat a long time, and is therefore very useful in cooking. The alternative כְּמוֹ — כְּמוֹ signifies *sive, sive*, whether the one or the other. חַי is that which is living, fresh, viz., the fresh, raw meat still having the blood in it, the opposite of מְבֻשָּׁל (1Sa. 2:15); חֲרוֹן, a fierce heat or fire, here a boiling heat. There is no need to understand חֲרוֹן metonymically, or perhaps as an adjective = *charrôn*, of boiled meat: it is a statement of the condition. The suffix of יִשְׁעָרְנוּ, however, refers, as being neuter, to the whole cooking apparatus, and more especially to the contents of the pots. The rendering therefore is: whether raw or in a state of heat, i.e., of being cooked through, He (Jahve) carries it away as with a whirlwind. Hengstenberg rightly remarks, “To the raw meat correspond the immature plots, and to the cooked the mature ones.” To us, who regard the Psalm as belonging to the time of Absalom, and not, like Hengstenberg, to the time of Saul, the meat in the pots is the new kingship of Absalom. The greater the self-renunciation with which David at that time looked on at the ripening revolt, disclaiming all action of his own, the stronger the confidence with which he expected the righteous interposition of God that did actually follow, but (as he here supposes possible) not until the meat in the

pot was almost done through; yet, on the other side, so quickly, that the pots had scarcely felt the crackling heat which should fully cook the meat.

*Psa. 58:11, 12.* Finally, we have a view of the results of the judicial interposition of God. The expression made use of to describe the satisfaction which this gives to the righteous is thoroughly Old Testament and warlike in its tone (cf. Psa. 68:24). David is in fact king, and perhaps no king ever remained so long quiet in the face of the most barefaced rebellion, and checked the shedding of blood, as David did at that time. If, however, blood must nevertheless flow in streams, he knows full well that it is the blood of the partisans of his deluded son; so that the men who were led the further astray in their judgment concerning him, the more inactive he remained, will at last be compelled to confess that it does really repay one to be just, and that there is really one higher than the high ones (Ecc. 5: 7 [8]), a deity (אֱלֹהִים) above the gods (אֱלִים) who, though not forthwith, will nevertheless assuredly execute judgment in the earth. אֱלִים here, as in Job. 18:21, Isa. 45:14, retains its originally affirmative signification, which it has in common with אֱלֹהִים. אֱלִים is construed with the plural (Ges. § 112, rem. 3), as is frequently the case, e.g., 2Sa. 7:23 (where, however, the chronicler, in 1Ch. 17:21, has altered the older text). This is not because the heathen are speaking (Baur), but in order to set the infinite majesty and omnipotence of the heavenly Judge in contrast with these puffed-up “gods.”

## Psalm 59

### PRAYER OF AN INNOCENT MAN WHOM MEN ARE TRYING TO TAKE

*59: 2 DELIVER me from mine enemies, O my God,  
From those who rise up against me bear me away!*

*59: 3 Deliver me from the workers of iniquity,  
And from men of blood save me!*

*59: 4 For, lo, they lie in wait for my soul,  
The shameless gather themselves together against me —  
Not on account of transgression on my part and on account of sin, Jahve!*

*59: 5 Without sin they run and make themselves ready;  
Awake to meet me, and examine!*

*59: 6 And do Thou, Jahve Elohim of hosts, God of Israel,  
Stir Thyself to visit all the heathen,  
Spare not all those who are atrociously faithless. (Sela)*

*59: 7 They come again at evening, they howl like dogs,  
And go the rounds in the city.*

*59: 8 Lo they foam at their mouth;  
Swords are in their lips,  
For “who doth hear it?!”*

*59: 9 And Thou, Jahve, laughest at them,  
Thou mockest at all the heathen.*

*59:10 My strength, upon Thee will I wait,  
For Elohim is my fortress.*

*59:11 My God will come to meet me with His mercy,  
Elohim will cause me to rejoice over those who lie in wait for me.*

*59:12 Slay them not, lest my people forget it,  
Cause them to go astray by Thy power and cast them down;  
Thou art our shield, O Lord!*

*59:13 The sin of their mouth is the word of their lips,  
Therefore let them be ensnared in their pride,  
And on account of the curse and the deceit which they utter.*

*59:14 Destroy in wrath, destroy, that they may be no more,  
And that they may know that Elohim is Ruler in Jacob  
Unto the ends of the earth! (Sela)*

*59:15 They come again at evening, they howl like dogs,  
And go the rounds in the city.*

*59:16 They wander to and fro in order to eat;  
If they are not satisfied, they stay over night —*

*59:17 But as for me, I shall sing of Thy strength,  
And exult, in the morning, over Thy mercy;  
That Thou hast been a fortress to me,  
And a refuge in the day when I was afraid.*

*59:18 My strength, to Thee will I harp,  
For Elohim is my fortress, my merciful God.*

*Psalm 59.* This *Michtam*, after the melody *Al-tashcheth*, coinciding with Psa. 57: 5 and Psa. 58: 7 in the figure used in v. 8, is the earliest among the Davidic Psalms which are dated from the time of Saul's persecution. *When Saul sent and they* (those who were sent by him) *watched the house in order to slay him* (David); it therefore belongs to the time spoken of in 1Sa. 19:11 ff. This inscription is no more intended to imply that the Psalm was composed on that night before the flight, which was rendered possible by the artifice of Michal, than the inscription of Psalm 51 is meant to imply that the origin of the

Psalm was coincident with the arrival of Nathan. The **ב** of such inscriptions only sets forth in a general way the historical groundwork of the song. If we consider the contents of the Psalm from this point of view, we shall obtain a tolerably distinct picture of the situation. We must imagine that Saul, even before he issued that command to watch David's house the night through and to slay him in the morning, i.e., to assassinate him behind Michal's back (1Sa. 19:11), sought to get rid of him in some more secret way; that the venal men of his court, themselves not less ill-disposed towards David, had offered him their hand for the deed; and that in consequence of this, great activity, which was probably seen through by him whose life was threatened, was observable in Gibea, and that more especially every evening, when the bandits strolled through the city in order to meet with the dreaded rival and give him his deathblow. The Psalms and the Prophets are often the medium through which we gain a deeper insight into events which are only sketched in the historical books after their most prominent outward features.

In consideration of the fact that the description of the nightly proceedings of the enemies is repeated after the manner of a refrain, and that the poet in v. 17 contrasts his believingly joyous prospects for the coming morning with the ineffectual ardour with which they pass the night patrolling the streets, Psalm 59 seems to be an evening song belonging to those perilous days spent in Gibea.

*Psa. 59: 2-10.* First part. As far as v. 4 we recognise strains familiar in the Psalms. The enemies are called **מִתְקַוְמִי** as in Job. 27: 7, cf. *Psa.* 17: 7; **אֲזִים** as shameless, **אֲזִי פָּנִים** or **אֲזִי נֶפֶשׁ**; as in *Isa.* 56:11, on account of their bold shameless greediness, dogs. On **לֹא** in a subordinate clause, vid., Ewald, § 286, g: without there being transgression or sin on my side, which might have caused it. The suffix (transgression on my part) is similar to *Psa.* 18:24. **בְּלִי-עוֹן** (cf. *Job.* 34: 6) is a similar adverbial collateral definition: without there existing any sin, which ought to be punished. The energetic future *jeruzûn* depicts those who servilely give effect to the king's evil caprice; they run hither and thither as if attacking and put themselves in position. **הַכּוֹנֵן** = **הַתְּכוֹנֵן**, like the *Hithpa.* **הִכְפֶּסָה**, *Pro.* 26:26, the *Hothpa.* **הִכְפַּסְם**, *Lev.* 13:55 f., and the *Hithpa.* **נִכְפַּר**, *Deu.* 21: 8. Surrounded by such a band of assassins, David is like one besieged, who sighs for succour; and he calls upon Jahve, who seems to be sleeping and inclined to abandon him, with that bold **יְרֵאָה** **עוֹרָה לְקַרְאֹתִי**, to awake to meet him, i.e., to join him with His help like a relieving army, and to convince Himself from personal observation of the extreme danger in which His charge finds himself. The continuation was obliged to be expressed by **וְאָתָּה**, because a special appeal to God interposes

between עֹרָה and הַקִּיָּצָה. In the emphatic “Thou,” however, after it has been once expressed, is implied the conditional character of the deliverance by the absolute One. And each of the divine names made use of in this lengthy invocation, which corresponds to the deep anxiety of the poet, is a challenge, so to speak, to the ability and willingness, the power and promise of God. The juxtaposition *Jahve Elohim Tsebaoth* (occurring, besides this instance, in Psa. 80: 5, 20, 84: 9), which is peculiar to the Elohimic Psalms, is to be explained by the consideration that *Elohim* had become a proper name like *Jahve*, and that the designation *Jahve Tsebaoth*, by the insertion of *Elohim* in accordance with the style of the Elohimic Psalms, is made still more imposing and solemn; and now צְבָאוֹת is a genitive dependent not merely upon יְהוָה but upon יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים (similar to Psa. 56: 1 a, Isa. 28: 1 b; *Symbolae*, p. 15). אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is in apposition to this threefold name of God. The poet evidently reckons himself as belonging to an Israel from which he excludes his enemies, viz., the true Israel which is in reality the people of God. Among the heathen, against whom the poet invokes God’s interposition, are included the heathen-minded in Israel; this at least is the view which brings about this extension of the prayer. Also in connection with the words כָּל-בְּגֵדֵי אֹן the poet, in fact, has chiefly before his mind those who are immediately round about him and thus disposed. It is those who act treacherously from extreme moral nothingness and worthlessness (אֹן *genit. epexeg.*). The music, as *Sela* directs, here becomes more boisterous; it gives intensity to the strong cry for the judgment of God; and the first unfolding of thought of this *Michtam* is here brought to a close.

The second begins by again taking up the description of the movements of the enemy which was begun in vv. 4, 5. We see at a glance how here v. 7 coincides with v. 5, and v. 8 with v. 4, and v. 9 with v. 6. Hence the imprecatory rendering of the futures of v. 7 is not for a moment to be entertained. By day the emissaries of Saul do not venture to carry out their plot, and David naturally does not run into their hands. They therefore come back in the evening, and that evening after evening (cf. Job. 24:14); they snarl or howl like dogs (הָמָה, used elsewhere of the growling of the bear and the cooing of the dove; it is distinct from נָבַח, Arab. *nbb, nbh*, to bark, and כָּלַב, to yelp), because they do not want to betray themselves by loud barking, and still cannot altogether conceal their vexation and rage; and they go their rounds in the city (like סֹבֵב בְּעִיר, Son. 3: 2, cf. *supra* 55:11), in order to cut off their victim from flight, and perhaps, what would be very welcome to them, to run against him in the darkness. The further description in v. 8 follows them on this patrol. What they belch out or foam out is to be inferred from the fact that swords are in their lips, which they, as it were, draw so soon as they merely

move their lips. Their mouth overflows with murderous thoughts and with slanders concerning David, by which they justify their murderous greed to themselves as if there were no one, viz., no God, who heard it. But Jahve, from whom nothing, as with men, can be kept secret, laughs at them, just as He makes a mockery of all heathen, to whom this murderous band, which fears the light and is unworthy of the Israelitish name, is compared. This is the primary passage to Psa. 37:13, 2: 4; for Psalm 59 is perhaps the oldest of the Davidic Psalms that have come down to us, and therefore also the earliest monument of Israelitish poetry in which the divine name *Jahve Tsebaoth* occurs; and the chronicler, knowing that it was the time of Samuel and David that brought it into use, uses this name only in the life of David. Just as this strophe opened in v. 7 with a distich that recurs in v. 15, so it also closes now in v. 10 with a distich that recurs below in v. 18, and that is to be amended according to the text of that passage. For all attempts to understand עֲנֵה as being genuine prove its inaccuracy. With the old versions it has to be read עֲנֵי; but as for the rest, אֲשַׁמְרֶה must be retained in accordance with the usual variation found in such refrains: my strength, Thee will I regard (1Sa. 26:15; observe, 2Sa. 11:16), or upon Thee will I wait (cf. לָ, Psa. 130: 6); i.e., in the consciousness of my own feebleness, tranquil and resigned, I will look for Thine interposition on my behalf.

*Psa. 59:11-18.* In this second half of the Psalm the cry of fear is hushed. Hope reigns, and anger burns more fiercely. The *Kerî* says that v. 11a is to be read: אֱלֹהֵי חַסְדֵי יִקְדָּמְנִי, my gracious God will anticipate me, — but with what? This question altogether disappears if we retain the *Chethib* and point אֱלֹהֵי חַסְדֵּי : my God will anticipate me with His mercy (cf. 21: 4), i.e., will meet me bringing His mercy without any effort of mine. Even the old translators have felt that חַסְדֵּי must belong to the verb as a second object. The LXX is perfectly correct in its rendering, ὁ Θεός μου τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ προφθάσει με. The *Kerî* has come into existence in looking to v. 18, according to which it seems as though אֱלֹהֵי חַסְדֵּי ought to be added to the refrain, v. 10 (cf. a similar instance in Psa. 42: 6, 7). But v. 11a would be stunted by doing this, and it accords with Biblical poetic usage that the refrain in v. 18 should be climactic in comparison with v. 10 (just as it also does not altogether harmonize in its first half); so that Olshausen's proposal to close v. 10 with אֱלֹהֵי חַסְדֵּי and to begin v. 11 with חַסְדֵּי (cf. Psa. 79: 8) is only just to be put on record. The prayer "slay them not" does not contradict the prayer that follows for their destruction. The poet wishes that those who lie in wait for him, before they are totally swept away, may remain for a season before the eyes of this people as an example of punishment. In accordance with this, הִנֵּנִי אָמוּ, by a comparison of the *Hiph.* in Num. 32:13, and of the *Kal* in v. 16,



Psa. 109:10, is to be rendered: cause them to wander about (Targum, cf. *Genesis Rabba*, Psalm 38 *init.*, **טַלְטַלְמוּ**); and in connection with **בְּחִילָךְ** one is involuntarily reminded of Psa. 10:10, 14, and is tempted to read **בְּחַלְךְ** or **בְּחַלְךָ**: cause them to wander about in adversity or wretchedness, = Arab. *‘umr ḥālik, vita caliginosa h. e. misera*), and more especially since **בְּחִילָךְ** occurs nowhere else instead of **בְּזַרְעֶךָ** or **בְּיַמִּינֶךָ**. But the *Jod* in **בְּחִילָךְ** is unfavourable to this supposition; and since the martial apostrophe of God by “our shield” follows, the choice of the word is explained by the consideration that the poet conceives of the power of God as an army (Joe. 2:25), and perhaps thinks directly of the heavenly host (Joe. 4 [3]:11), over which the Lord of Hosts holds command (Hitzig). By means of this He is first of all to cause them to go astray (**נָע וָנָד**, Gen. 4:12), then utterly to cast them down (Psa. 56: 8). The Lord (**אֱלֹהֵינוּ**) is to do this, as truly as He is Israel’s shield against all the heathen and all pseudo-Israelites who have become as heathen. The first member of v. 13 is undoubtedly meant descriptively: “the sin of their mouth (the sin of the tongue) is the word of their lips” (with the dull-toned suffix *mo*, in the use of which Psalm 59 associates itself with the Psalms of the time of Saul, 56, 11, 17, 22, 35, 64). The combination **וַיְלַכְדוּ בְּגִאוֹנָם**, however, more readily suggests parallel passages like Pro. 11: 6 than Pro. 6: 2; and moreover the **מִן** of the expression **וּמִאֲלֵה וּמִבְּחַשׁ**, which is without example in connection with **סִפְר**, and, taken as expressing the motive (Hupfeld), ought to be joined with some designations of the disposition of mind, is best explained as an appended statement of the reason for which they are to be ensnared, so that consequently **יְסַפְרוּ** (cf. Psa. 69:27, 64: 6) is an attributive clause; nor is this contrary to the accentuation, if one admits the *Munach* to be a transformation of *Mugrash*. It is therefore to be rendered: “let them, then, be taken in their pride, and on account of the curse and deceit which they wilfully utter.” If, by virtue of the righteousness of the Ruler of the world, their sin has thus become their fall, then, after they have been as it were a warning example to Israel, God is utterly to remove them out of the way, in order that they (it is unnecessary to suppose any change of subject), while perishing, may perceive that Elohim is Ruler in Jacob (**בְּ**, used elsewhere of the object, e.g., Mic. 5: 1, is here used of the place of dominion), and as in Jacob, so from thence unto the ends of the earth (**לְ** like **אֵל**, Psa. 48:11) wields the sceptre. Just like the first group of the first part, this first group of the second part also closes with *Sela*.

The second group opens like the second group in the first part, but with this exception, that here we read **וַיִּשְׁבוּ**, which loosely connects it with what precedes, whereas there it is **יָשׁוּבוּ**. The poet’s gaze is again turned towards

his present straitened condition, and again the pack of dogs by which Saul is hunting him present themselves to his mind. הָמָּה points towards an antithesis that follows, and which finds its expression in וַאֲנִי וַיְלִינוּ and לְבַקֵּר stand in direct contrast to one another, and in addition to this לְעֵרֵב has preceded. The reading of the LXX (Vulgate, Luther, [and authorized version]), καὶ γογγύσους = וַיְלִינוּ or וַיִּלְנוּ, is thereby proved to be erroneous. But if וַיְלִינוּ is the correct reading, then it follows that we have to take v. 16 not as foretelling what will take place, but as describing that which is present; so that consequently the *fut. consec.* (as is frequently the case apart from any historical connection) is only a consecutive continuation of יָנוּעוּן (for which the *Kerî* has יָנִיעוּן; the form that was required in v. 12, but is inadmissible here): they wander up and down (נָאָס as in Psa. 109:10, cf. נָוַד, Job. 15:23) to eat (that is to say, seeking after food); and if they are not satisfied, they pass the night, i.e., remain, eager for food and expecting it, over night on the spot. This interpretation is the most natural, the simplest, and the one that harmonizes best not only with the text before us (the punctuation יִשְׁבְּעוּ, not יִשְׁבְּעוּ, gives the member of the clause the impress of being a protasis), but also with the situation. The poet describes the activity of his enemies, and that by completing or retouching the picture of their comparison to dogs: he himself is the food or prey for which they are so eager, and which they would not willingly allow to escape them, and which they nevertheless cannot get within their grasp. Their morbid desire remains unsatisfied: he, however, in the morning, is able to sing of the power of God, which protects him, and exultantly to praise God's loving-kindness, which satiates and satisfies him (Psa. 90:14); for in the day of fear, which to him is now past, God was his inaccessible stronghold, his unapproachable asylum. To this God, then, even further the play of his harp shall be directed (אֲזַמְרָה), just as was his waiting or hoping (אֲשַׁמְרָה, v. 10).

## Psalm 60

### DRILL PSALM AFTER A LOST BATTLE

*60: 3 ELOHIM, Thou hast cast us off, Thou hast scattered us,  
Thou hast been angry, restore us again!*

*60: 4 Thou hast made the land to tremble, Thou hast torn it asunder,  
Heal its breaches, for it tottereth!!*

*60: 5 Thou hast made Thy people experience a hard thing,  
Thou hast given us wine to drink to intoxication.*

*60: 6 Thou hast given those who fear Thee a banner  
To lift themselves up on account of the truth. (Sela)*

*60: 7 In order that Thy beloved may be delivered,  
Save now with Thy right hand and answer me!!!*

*60: 8 Elohim hath promised in His holiness:  
I shall rejoice, I shall portion out Shechem,  
And measure out the valley of Succoth.*

*60: 9 Mine is Gilead and mine Manasseh,  
And Ephraim is the helm of my head,  
Judah is my sceptre,*

*60:10 Moab is my wash-pot,  
Upon Edom I cast my shoe.  
Cry out concerning me, O Philistia!*

*60:11 Who will conduct me to the fortified city?  
Who will bring me to Edom?!*

*60:12 Hast not Thou, Elohim, cast us off,  
And goest not forth, Elohim, with our armies? —*

*60:13 Grant us deliverance from the oppressor;  
Yea, vain is the help of man.*

*60:14 In Elohim shall we obtain the victory,  
And He will tread down our oppressors.*

*Psalm 60.* This last of the Elohimic *Michtammîm* of David is dated from the time of the Syro-Ammonitish war: *When he* (David) *waged war* (*Hiph.* of **נָצַד**, to pull, to seize by the hair) *with* (**אִשָּׁה** like **אִל** in Num. 26: 9; according to Ben-Asher, with *Segol* instead of *Makkeph* here, as in Psa. 47: 5, Pro. 3:12, three passages which are noted by the Masora) *Aram of the two rivers* (the people of the land of the twin streams, **Μεσοποταμία**) *and with Aram Zobah* (probably between the Euphrates and Orontes north-east of Damascus), *and Joab returned* (**וַיָּשָׁב**), transition from the infinitive to the finite verb, Ges. § 132, rem. 2) *and smote Edom in the Valley of Salt* (the Edomitish *Ghor*, i.e., the salt plain, some ten miles wide, at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea) *with twelve thousand men*. This historical inscription comes from an historical work which gave the Psalm in this connection. It is not take out of any of the histories that have been preserved to us. For both in 2Sa. 8:13 and in 1Ch. 18:12 we find the number eighteen thousand instead of twelve. In the former passage, in which **עָשָׂה שָׁם** is substantially equivalent to the Roman *triumphum agere*, we have to read **אֶת-אֲרָם** after the inscription of our Psalm instead of **אֶת-אֲרָם**. It is, however, still more probable that the words

לַחֲמַת־יָדָיו (LXX ἑπάταξε τὴν Ἰδουμαίαν) have accidentally fallen out. The fact that here in the Psalm the victory over the Edomites is ascribed to Joab, in the Chronicles to Abshai (Abishai), and in 2 Samuel 8 to David, is a difference which may easily be reconciled by the consideration that the army of David was under the supreme command of Joab, and this battle in the Valley of Salt was fought against the Edomites by Joab indirectly through his brother (cf. 2Sa. 10:10).

The inscription carries us into the time of the greatest, longest, and most glorious of David's wars, that with the Ammonites, which, so far as these were concerned, ended in the second year in the conquest of Rabbah (vid., Psalm 21), and with their Aramaean allies, among whom Hadadezer, the ruler of the powerful kingdom of Zobah, was defeated in the first year at *Chélam* on the other side the Jordan. Then when, in the second year, he endeavoured to fortify himself anew in the districts on the banks of the Euphrates, he was completely subjugated together with the Syrians who had come to his assistance. Thus are the accounts of Aramaean wars related in 2Sa. 8 and 10-12 to be combined. Whilst, now, the arms of David were making such triumphant progress in the north, the Edomites in the south had invaded the land which was denuded of troops, and here a new war, which jeopardized all the results that had been gained in the north, awaited the victorious army. Psalm 60 refers more especially to this Edomitish war. Hengstenberg is wrong when he infers from the inscription that it was composed after the victory in the Valley of Salt and before the conquest of Idumaea. The inscription only in a general way gives to the Psalm its historical setting. It was composed before the victory in the Valley of Salt, and presupposes the Israelitish south had been at that time grievously laid waste by the Edomites, against whom they were unable to oppose an adequate force. We may also infer from other indications how the occupation of the neighbouring and brother-country by the Edomites called for vengeance against them; vid., on Psalm 44. That Korahitic Psalm may have been composed after the Davidic Psalm, and is designedly, by v. 10, brought into relationship with it. In the cento Psalm 108 vv. 7-14 correspond to Psa. 60: 7-14.

The *Michtam* character of the Psalm manifests itself both in the fact that a divine oracle is unfolded in it, and also in the fact that the language of complaint, "Elohim, Thou hast cast us off" (cf. Psa. 44:10), is repeated as its favourite utterance. Concerning אֶל-שׁוֹשַׁן עֲדוּת, after "A Lily is the testimony" (or "The Lily of the testimony"), vid., on Psa. 45: 1. The addition of לְלַמֵּד is to be interpreted according to בְּנִי-יְהוּדָה קָנְשָׁתָהּ, 2Sa. 1:18: the song is thereby appointed to be sung in connection with the practice of the bow. The elegy on Saul and Jonathan was suited to this by reason of the praise which is therein given to the bow of Jonathan, the favourite weapon of that

brave warrior, and by the indirect remembrance of the skilful Philistine archers, who brought a disgrace upon the name of Israel in the battle on Gilboa, that needed as speedily as possible to be wiped out. Psalm 60, this most martial of all the Psalms, is also a song at the practice of arms, which was designed to inflame and to hallow the patriotic martial ardour of the young men when they were being exercised.

Hengstenberg and others, who reckon according to the Masoretic verses, divide the Psalm into three strophes of four Masoretic verses each. The fact that the use made of Psalm 60 in Psalm 108 begins with v. 7, למען יחלצון, lends some colour to this division, which is also strengthened by the *Sela*. Nevertheless vv. 6 and 7 belong inseparably together.

*Psa. 60: 3-7.* This first strophe contains complaint and prayer; and establishes the prayer by the greatness of the need and Israel's relationship to God. The sense in which פִּרְצָתָנוּ is intended becomes clear from 2Sa. 5:20, where David uses this word of the defeat of the Philistines, and explains it figuratively. The word signifies to break through what has hitherto been a compact mass, to burst, blast, scatter, disperse. The prayer is first of all timidly uttered in תִּשׁוּבָה לָנוּ in the form of a wish; then in רָפָה (v. 4b) and הוֹשִׁיעָה (v. 7b) it waxes more and more eloquent. שׁוּבָה לְ here signifies to grant restoration (like הָנִיחַ לְ, to give rest; Psa. 23: 3, Isa. 58:12). The word also signifies to make a turn, to turn one's self away, in which sense, however, it cannot be construed with לְ. On פְּצַמְתָּהּ Dunash has already compared Arab. *f̄sm*, *rumpere*, *scindere*, and Mose ha-Darshan the Targumic קָרַע = פָּצַם, Jer. 22:14. The deep wounds which the Edomites had inflicted upon the country, are after all a wrathful visitation of God Himself — reeling or intoxicating wine, or as יַיִן תִּרְעָלָה (not יַיִן), properly conceived of, is: wine which is sheer intoxication (an apposition instead of the genitive attraction, vid., on Isa. 30:20), is reached out by Him to His people. The figure of the intoxicating cup has passed over from the Psalms of David and of Asaph to the prophets (e.g., Isa. 51:17, 21). A kindred thought is expressed in the proverb: *Quem Deus perdere vult, eum dementat*. All the preterites as far as הִשְׁקִיתָנוּ (v. 5b) glance back plaintively at that which has been suffered.

But v. 6 cannot be thus intended; for to explain with Ewald and Hitzig, following the LXX, “Thou hast set up a banner for those who reverence Thee, not for victory, but for flight,” is inadmissible, notwithstanding the fact that נִוּם מִפְּנֵי קָשָׁת is a customary phrase and the inscribed לְלִמּוֹד is favourable to the mention of the bow. For (1) The words, beginning with נָתַתָּה, do not sound like an utterance of something worthy of complaint, — in this case it ought at

least to have been expressed by אָדָּה לְהִתְנוּסָה (only for flight, not for victory); (2) it is more than improbable that the bow, instead of being called קִשֶּׁת (feminine of the Arabic masculine *kaus*), is here, according to an incorrect Aramaic form of writing, called קִשֶּׁמ, whereas this word in its primary form קִשֶּׁמ (Pro. 22:21) corresponds to the Aramaic קִשְׁמָא not in the signification “a bow,” but (as it is also intended in the Targum of our passage) in the signification “truth” (Arabic *kīst* of strict unswerving justice, root קִש, to be hard, strong, firm; just as, *vice versâ*, the word *sidk*, coming from a synonymous root, is equivalent to “truth”). We therefore take the perfect predication, like v. 4a, as the foundation of the prayer which follows: Thou hast given those who fear Thee a banner to muster themselves (*sich aufpanieren*), i.e., to raise themselves as around a standard or like a standard, on account of the truth — help then, in order that Thy beloved ones may be delivered, with Thy right hand, and answer me. This rendering, in accordance with which v. 6 expresses the good cause of Israel in opposition to its enemies, is also favoured by the heightened effect of the music, which comes in here, as *Sela* prescribes. The reflexive הִתְנוּסָה here therefore signifies not, as *Hithpal.* of נוּס, “to betake one’s self to flight,” but “to raise one’s self” — a signification on behalf of which we cannot appeal to Zec. 9:16, where מִתְנוּסוֹת is apparently equivalent to מִתְנוּצוֹת “sparkling,” but which here results from the juxtaposition with נָס (cf. נָסָה, Psa. 4: 7), inasmuch as נָס itself, like Arab. *našsun*, is so called from נָסָה, Arab. *našš*, to set up, raise, whether it be that the *Hithpo.* falls back upon the *Kal* of the verb or that it is intended as a denominative (to raise one’s self as a banner, *sich aufpanieren*).

f220

It is undeniable that not merely in later (e.g., Neh. 5:15), but also even in older Hebrew, מִפְּנֵי denotes the reason and motive (e.g., Deu. 28:20). Moreover Psalm 44 is like a commentary on this מִפְּנֵי קִשֶּׁמ, in which the consciousness of the people of the covenant revelation briefly and comprehensively expresses itself concerning their vocation in the world. Israel looks upon its battle against the heathen, as now against Edom, as a rising for the truth in accordance with its mission. By reason of the fact and of the consciousness which are expressed in v. 6, arises the prayer in v. 7, that Jahve would interpose to help and to rescue His own people from the power of the enemy. מִיְּמִנֶהּ is instrumental (vid., on Psa. 3: 5). It is to be read עֲנֵנִי according to the *Kerî*, as in Psa. 108: 7, instead of עֲנֵנִי; so that here the king of Israel is speaking, who, as he prays, stands in the place of his people.

*Psa. 60: 8-10.* A divine utterance, promising him victory, which he has heard, is expanded in this second strophe. By reason of this he knows himself to be in the free and inalienable possession of the land, and in opposition to the neighbouring nations, Moab, Edom, and Philistia, to be the victorious lord to whom they must bow. The grand word of promise in 2Sa. 7: 9 f. is certainly sufficient in itself to make this feeling of certainty intelligible, and perhaps vv. 8-10 are only a pictorial reproduction of that utterance; but it is also possible that at the time when Edom threatened the abandoned bordering kingdom, David received an oracle from the high priest by means of the Urim and Thummim, which assured him of the undiminished and continued possession of the Holy Land and the sovereignty over the bordering nations. That which God speaks “in His holiness” is a declaration or a promise for the sure fulfilment and inviolability of which He pledges His holiness; it is therefore equal to an oath “by His holiness” (Psa. 89:36, Amo. 4: 2). The oracle does not follow in a direct form, for it is not God who speaks (as Olshausen thinks), to whom the expression אֵלֶיךָ is unbecoming, nor is it the people (as De Wette and Hengstenberg), but the king, since what follows refers not only to the districts named, but also to their inhabitants. כִּי might have stood before אֵלֶיךָ, but without it the mode of expression more nearly resembles the Latin *me exultaturum esse* (cf. Psa. 49:12). Shechem in the centre of the region on this side the Jordan, and the valley of Succoth in the heart of the region on the other side, from the beginning; for there is not only a [Arab.] *sākūt* (the name both of the eminence and of the district) on the west side of the Jordan south of *Beisân* (Scythopolis), but there must also have been another on the other side of the Jordan (Gen. 33:17 f., Jud. 8: 4 f.) which has not as yet been successfully traced. It lay in the vicinity of Jabbok (*ez-Zerka*), about in the same latitude with Shechem (Sichem), south-east of Scythopolis, where Estori ha-Parchi contends that he had found traces of it not far from the left bank of the Jordan. Jos. 13:27 gives some information concerning the עֲמֹק (valley) of Succoth. The town and the valley belonged to the tribe of Gad. Gilead, side by side with Manasseh, v. 9a, comprehends the districts belonging to the tribes of Gad and Reuben. As far as v. 9c, therefore, free dominion in the cis- and trans-Jordanic country is promised to David. The proudest predicates are justly given to Ephraim and Judah, the two chief tribes; the former, the most numerous and powerful, is David’s helmet (the protection of his head), and Judah his staff of command (מַחֲבֵק, the command-giving = staff of command, as in Gen. 49:10, Num. 21:18); for Judah, by virtue of the ancient promise, is the royal tribe of the people who are called to the dominion of the world. This designation of Judah as the king’s staff or sceptre and the marshal’s baton shows that it is the king who is speaking, and not the people. To him, the king,

who has the promise, are Joab, Edom, and Philistia subject, and will continue so. Joab the boastful serves him as a wash-basin; <sup>f221</sup>

Edom the crafty and malicious is forcibly taken possession of by him and obliged to submit; and Philistia the warlike is obliged to cry aloud concerning him, the irresistible ruler. **סִיר רַחֵץ** is a wash-pot or basin in distinction from a seething-pot, which is also called **סִיר**. The throwing of a shoe over a territory is a sign of taking forcible possession, just as the taking off of the shoe (חֲלִיצָה) is a sign of the renunciation of one's claim or right: the shoe is in both instances the symbol of legal possession. <sup>f222</sup>

The rendering of the last line, with Hitzig and Hengstenberg: “exult concerning me, O Philistia,” i.e., hail me, though compelled to do so, as king, is forbidden by the **עָלִי**, instead of which we must have looked for **לִי**. The verb **רוּץ** certainly has the general signification “to break out into a loud cry,” and like the *Hiph.* (e.g., Isa. 15: 4) the *Hithpal.* can also be used of a loud outcry at violence.

**Psa. 60:11-14.** The third strophe reverts to prayer; but the prayer now breathes more freely with a self-conscious courage for the strife. The fortified city (**עִיר מְצוּרָה**) is not Rabbath Ammon; but, as becomes evident from the parallel member of the verse and 2Ki. 14: 7, the Idumaeen chief city of Sela' (**סֶלַע**) or Petra (vid., Knobel on Gen. 36:42, cf. Psa. 31:22, 2Ch. 8: 5, 11: 5 together with 14: 5). The wish: who will conduct me = Oh that one would conduct me (Ges. § 136, 1)! expresses a martial desire, joyful at the prospect of victory; concerning **מִי נָחֲנִי**, *quis perduxerit me*, vid., on Psa. 11: 3. What follows is not now to be rendered: Not Thou (who but Thou), Elohim, who...(Hitzig) — for in order to have been understood thus and not as in v. 3, Psa. 44:10, the poet could not have omitted **אֲשֶׁר** — on the contrary, the interrogatory **הֲלֹא** is the foundation on which the supplicatory **הֲבֵה** is raised. The king of Israel is hard pressed in the battle, but he knows that victory comes from above, from the God who has hitherto in anger refused it to His people, inasmuch as He has given power to Edom to break through the defensive forces of Israel (vid., Psa. 44:10). **עֲזָרָה** (not **עֲזָרָה** = **עֲזָרָה**) is, as in Psa. 108:13, equivalent to **עֲזָרָתָהּ**. The view that it is equal to **עֲזָרָתִי**, the suffix being cast away, is not confirmed in this instance, vid., on Psa. 16: 6, cf. 3: 3. How vain is human succour, has been seen only very recently in the case of the kings of Zobah and Ammon, who have succumbed in spite of their confederates. Israel prays for its victorious power from above, and also obtains it thence, as is most confidently expressed in v. 14. **עָשָׂה חַיִל**, to do valiantly, to show valour, is equivalent to: to be victorious, as in Psa. 118:16. In God



does Israel conquer, and God, who is in Israel, will by means of Israel tread down Edom in accordance with its deserts.

## Psalm 61

### PRAYER AND THANKSGIVING OF AN EXPELLED KING ON HIS WAY BACK TO THE THRONE

*61: 2 OH hear, Elohim, my plaintive cry,  
Oh hearken to my prayer!*

*61: 3 From the end of the earth I cry to Thee when my heart languisheth,  
Up a rock too high for me do Thou lead me;*

*61: 4 For Thou hast become a refuge for me,  
A strong tower, hiding me from the enemy.*

*61: 5 I shall dwell in Thy tabernacle for aeons,  
I shall find refuge in the protection of Thy wings. (Sela)*

*61: 6 For Thou, Elohim, hast hearkened to my vows,  
Thou hast given back the heritage of those who fear Thy name.*

*61: 7 Days to the days of the king do Thou add,  
Let his years be as a generation and a generation.*

*61: 8 Let him remain for ever in the presence of Elohim —  
Mercy and truth do Thou appoint to preserve him —*

*61: 9 So will I harp unto Thy name for it for ever,  
That I may pay my vows day by day.*

*Psalm 61.* The Davidic *Michtammîm* are now ended, and there follows a short Davidic song אֶל-בְּנֵינִת. Does this expression mean “with the accompaniment of stringed instruments?” Not strictly, for this is expressed by the inscription בְּבִנְיֹת (Psa. 4: 1, cf. Isa. 30:29, 32). But the formula may signify “upon the music of stringed instruments,” i.e., upon stringed instruments. And this is more probable than that בְּנֵינִת is the beginning of a standard song. The termination *ath* is not necessarily the construct state. It was the original feminine termination; and the prevailing one in Phoenician.

Some expositors, like Köster, Ewald, Hitzig, and Olshausen, feel themselves here also bound, by reason of the לְדוֹד of the inscription, to seek a place for this Psalm as far down as the Babylonian exile and the times of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae. Hupfeld deals somewhat more kindly with the לְדוֹד in this instance, and Böttcher (*De Inferis*, p. 204) refutes the hypotheses set up in its stead in order finally to decide in favour of the idea that the king of whom the

Psalm speaks is Cyrus — which is only another worthless bubble. We abide by the proudly ignored לָדָר, and have as our reward a much more simple interpretation of the Psalm, without being obliged with Ewald to touch it up by means of a verse of one's own invention interwoven between verses 5 and 6. It is a Psalm of the time of Absalom, composed in Mahanaim or elsewhere in Gilead, when the army of the king had smitten the rebels in the wood of Ephraim. It consists of two parts of eight lines.

*Psa. 61: 2-5.* Hurlled out of the land of the Lord in the more limited sense <sup>f223</sup> into the country on the other side of the Jordan, David felt only as though he were banished to the extreme corner of the earth (not: of the land, cf. 46:10, Deu. 28:49, and frequently), far from the presence of God (Hengstenberg). It is the feeling of homelessness and of separation from the abode of God by reason of which the distance, in itself so insignificant (just as was the case with the exiles later on), became to him immeasurably great. For he still continually needed God's helpful intervention; the enveloping, the veiling, the faintness of his heart still continues (עֲטָרָה, Arab. *ʿṯ*, according to its radical signification: to bend and lay anything round so that it lies or draws over something else and covers it, here of a self-enveloping); a rock of difficulties still ever lies before him which is too high for his natural strength, for his human ability, therefore insurmountable. But he is of good courage: God will lead him up with a sure step, so that, removed from all danger, he will have rocky ground under his feet. He is of good courage, for God has already proved Himself to be a place of refuge to him, to be a strong tower, defying all attack, which enclosed him, the persecuted one, so that the enemy can gain no advantage over him (cf. Pro. 18:10). He is already on the way towards his own country, and in fact his most dearly loved and proper home: he will or he has to (in accordance with the will of God) dwell (cf. the cohortative in Isa. 38:10, Jer. 4:21) in God's tabernacle (vid., on Psa. 15: 1) throughout aeons (an utterance which reminds one of the synchronous Psa. 23: 6). With נִנָּח is combined the idea of the divine protection (cf. Arabic *géâr ollah*, the charge or protégé of God, and Beduinic *géaur*, the protecting hearth; *géawir*, according to its form = נָח, one who flees for refuge to the hearth). A bold figure of this protection follows: he has to, or will trust, i.e., find refuge, beneath the protection of God's wings. During the time the tabernacle was still being moved from place to place we hear no such mention of dwelling in God's tabernacle or house. It was David who coined this expression for loving fellowship with the God of revelation, simultaneously with his preparation of a settled dwelling-place for the sacred Ark. In the Psalms that belong to the time of his persecution by Saul such an expression is not yet to be found; for in Psa. 52: 7, when it is desired that Doeg may have the opposite of an eternal dwelling-place, it is not the sacred tent that is meant. We see also from its second part that this Psalm 61 does not belong

to the time of Saul; for David does not speak here as one who has drawn very near to his kingly office (cf. Psa. 40: 8), but as one who is entering upon a new stage in it.

*Psa. 61: 6-9.* The second part begins with a confirmation of the gracious purpose of God expressed in v. 5. David believes that he shall experience what he gives expression to in v. 5; for God has already practically shown him that neither his life nor his kingship shall come to an end yet; He has answered the prayers of His chosen one, that, blended with vows, resulted from the lowly, God-resigned spirit which finds expression in 2Sa. 15:25 f., and He has given or delivered up to him the land which is his by inheritance, when threatened by the rebels as robbers, — the land to which those who fear the covenant God have a just claim. It is clear enough that the receivers are “those who fear the name of Jahve;” the genitive relation describes the **יְרֵשָׁה** as belonging to them in opposition to those who had usurped it. Or does **יְרֵשָׁה** here perhaps mean the same as **אֲרֵשֶׁת** in Psa. 21: 3? Certainly not. **נָתַן יְרֵשָׁה לְ** is a customary phrase, the meaning of which, “to give anything to any one as his inheritance or as his own property,” is to be retained (e.g., Deu. 2:19). God has acknowledged David’s cause; the land of Israel is again wrested from those to whom it does not belong; and now begins a new era in the reign of its rightful king. In view of this the king prays, in vv. 7, 8, that God would add another goodly portion to the duration of his life. The words sound like intercession, but the praying one is the same person as in vv. 2-5. The expression **מְשִׁיחָא מְלִכָא** (the King Messiah) of the Targum shows to whom the church referred the word “king” after the extinction of the Davidic dynasty. The exalted tone of the wish expressed in v. 7b (cf. Joe. 2: 2) favours this without absolutely requiring it (cf. **עֲוֹלָמִים**, v. 5, 21: 5, and the royal salutation, 1Ki. 1:31, Dan. 2: 4, and frequently). There ought (as also e.g., in Psa. 9: 8) not to be any question whether **יֹשֵׁב** in v. 8 signifies “to sit enthroned,” or “to sit” = “to abide;” when the person spoken of is a king it means “to remain enthroned,” for with him a being settled down and continuous enthronement are coincident. **מִן** in v. 8b is *imperat. apoc.* for **מִנָּה** (after the form **הֵם, נִם, צו**). The poet prays God to appoint mercy and truth as guardian angels to the king (Psa. 40:12, Pro. 20:28, where out of pause it is **יִצְרוּ**; cf. on the other hand 78: 7, Pro. 2:11, 5: 2). Since the poet himself is the king for whom he prays, the transition to the first person in v. 9 is perfectly natural. **בֵּן** signifies, as it always does, so or thus = in accordance therewith, corresponding to the fulfilment of these my petitions, thankfully responding to it. **לְשִׁלְמִי** is the infinitive of the aim or purpose. Singing praise and accompanying it with music, he will make his whole life one continuous paying of vows.

## Psalm 62

### RESIGNATION TO GOD WHEN FOES CROWD IN UPON ONE

*62: 2 VERILY resignation to Elohim is my soul,  
From Him cometh my salvation.*

*62: 3 Verily He is my rock and my salvation,  
My fortress, I shall not be greatly moved.*

*62: 4 How long will ye rush in upon a man,  
How long will ye thrust him in all of you as  
a bowing wall, a tottering fence?! —*

*62: 5 Only from his exaltation have they determined to thrust him down,  
Seeing they love lies, each one blesseth with his mouth,  
And in their inward part they curse. (Sela)*

*62: 6 Verily to Elohim resign thyself, my soul;  
For from Him cometh my hope.*

*62: 7 Verily He is my rock and my salvation,  
My fortress, I shall not be moved.*

*62: 8 Upon Elohim dependeth my salvation and my glory;  
The rock of my defence, and my refuge, have I in Elohim.*

*62: 9 Trust in Him at all times, ye people!  
Pour out your heart before Him,  
Elohim is a refuge for us! (Sela)*

*62:10 Only a breath are the children of men, the sons of nobles a lie;  
Going swiftly upward in the balance, they are altogether like a breath.*

*62:11 Trust not in oppression, and through plunder become not vain,  
Increase of wealth do not deign to regard!*

*62:12 One thing hath Elohim spoken,  
These two have I heard:  
That power is of Elohim,*

*62:13 And Thine, O Lord, is mercy —  
For Thou recompensest every man according to his work.*

*Psalm 62.* Concerning this Psalm, which is placed next to the preceding Psalm by reason of several points of mutual relationship (cf. Psa. 62: 8*b* with Psa. 61: 4, 8; 62: 9*b* with Psa. 61: 4; 62:13*b* with Psa. 61: 9), as being a product of the time of the persecution by Absalom, and also concerning אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה, we have spoken already in the introduction to Psalm 39, which forms with it a twin pair. The particle יְהוָה occurs there four times, and in this

Psalms even as many as six times. The strophic structure somewhat resembles that of Psalm 39, in that here we also have longer strophes which are interspersed by tristichs.

*Psa. 62: 2-5.* The poet, although apparently irrecoverably lost, does not nevertheless despair, but opposes one thing to the tumultuous crowding in upon him of his many foes, viz., quiet calm submission, — not, however, a fatalistic resignation, but that which gives up everything to God, whose hand (vid., 2Sa. 12: 7-13) can be distinctly recognised and felt in what is now happening to him. **אָי** (yea, only, nevertheless) is the language of faith, with which, in the face of all assault, established truths are confessed and confirmed; and with which, in the midst of all conflict, resolutions, that are made and are to be firmly kept, are deliberately and solemnly declared and affirmed. There is no necessity for regarding **דְּוֹמָה** (not **דְּוֹמָה**), which is always a substantive (not only in Psa. 22: 3, 39: 3, but also in this instance and in Psa. 65: 2), and which is related to **דְּוֹמָה**, silence, Psa. 94:17, 115:17, just as **עֲלִילָה**, Jer. 32:19, is related to **עֲלִילָה**, as an *accus. absol.*: in silent submission (Hupfeld). Like **תְּפִלָּה** in Psa. 109: 4, it is a predicate: his soul is silent submission, i.e., altogether resigned to God without any purpose and action of its own. His salvation comes from God, yea, God Himself is his salvation, so that, while God is his God, he is even already in possession of salvation, and by virtue of it stands imperturbably firm. We see clearly from Psa. 37:24, what the poet means by **רָבָה**. He will not greatly, very much, particularly totter, i.e., not so that it should come to his falling and remaining down. **רָבָה** is an adverb like **רַבַּת**, Psa. 123: 4, and **הִרְבָּה**, Ecc. 5:19.

There is some difficulty about the **ἄπαξ λεγομ. תְּהוֹתָתוּ** (v. 4a). *Abulwalid*, whom Parchon, Kimchi, and most others follow, compares the Arabic *hatta* ‘*l-rajul*, the man brags; but this Arab. *ht* (intensive form *htht*) signifies only in a general way to speak fluently, smoothly and rapidly one word after another, which would give too poor an idea here. There is another Arab. *htt* (cogn. *htk*, *proscindere*) which has a meaning that is even better suited to this passage, and one which is still retained in the spoken language of Syria at the present day: *hattani* is equivalent to “he compromised me” (= *hataka es-sitra* ‘*annî*, he has pulled my veil down), dishonoured me before the world by speaking evil concerning me; whence in Damascus *el-hettât* is the appellation for a man who without any consideration insults a person before others, whether he be present or absent at the time. But this Arab. *htt* only occurs in *Kal* and with an accusative of the object. The words **עַד-אָנָה תְּהוֹתָתוּ אֶל-אִישׁ** find their most satisfactory explanation in the Arab. *hwwt* in common use in Damascus at the present day, which is not used in *Kal*, but only in the intensive form. The *Piel*

Arab. *hwwt lā flān* signifies to rush upon any one, viz., with a shout and raised fist in order to intimidate him. <sup>f224</sup>

From this הוֹת, of which even the construction with Arab. *lā*, together with the intensive form is characteristic, we here read the *Pil.* הוֹתֵת, which is not badly rendered by the LXX ἐπιτίθεσθε, Vulgate *irruitis*.

In v. 4b it is a question whether the reading תִּרְצָחוּ of the school of Tiberias or the Babylonian תִּרְצָחוּ is to be preferred. Certainly the latter; for the former (to be rendered, “may you” or “ye shall be broken in pieces, slain”) produces a thought that is here introduced too early, and one that is inappropriate to the figures that follow. Standing as it still does under the regimen of אֲדָרְסָנָה, תִּרְצָחוּ is to be read as a *Piel*; and, as the following figures show, is to be taken, after Psa. 42:11, in its primary signification *contundere* (root רִץ <sup>f225</sup>). The sadness of the poet is reflected in the compressed, obscure, and peculiar character of the expression. אִישׁ and בְּלִבְכֶם (a single one — ye all) stand in contrast. בְּקִיר וּגוֹ, *sicut parietem = similem parieti* (cf. Psa. 63: 6), forms the object to תִּרְצָחוּ. The transmitted reading גְּדָר תְּחִוּיָה, although not incorrect in itself so far as the gender (Pro. 24:31) and the article are concerned (Ges. § 111, 2, a), must apparently be altered to גְּדָרָה תְּחִוּיָה (Olshausen and others) in accordance with the parallel member of the verse, since both גְּדָרָה and גְּדָר are words that can be used of every kind of surrounding or enclosure. To them David seems like a bent, overhanging wall, like a wall of masonry that has received the thrust that must ultimately cause its fall; and yet they rush in upon him, and all together they pursue against the one man their work of destruction and ruin. Hence he asks, with an indignation that has a somewhat sarcastic tinge about it, how long this never-satiated self-satisfying of their lust of destruction is meant to last. Their determination (אִץ as in Isa. 14:24) is clear. It aims only or entirely (אֵד, here *tantummodo, prorsus*) at thrusting down from his high position, that is to say from the throne, viz., him, the man at whom they are always rushing (לְהַדְרִיחוּ = לְהַדְרִים). No means are too base for them in the accomplishment of their object, not even the mask of the hypocrite. The clauses which assume a future form of expression are, logically at least, subordinate clauses (EW. § 341, b). The Old Testament language allows itself a change of number like בְּפִיָּהֶם instead of בְּפִי, even to the very extreme, in the hurry of emotional utterance. The singular is distributive in this instance: *suo quisque ore*, like לוֹ in Isa. 2:20, מִמֶּנּוּ, Isa. 5:23, cf. 30:22, Zec. 14:12. The pointing יִקְלְלוּ follows the rule of יִהְלְלוּ, Psa. 22:27, יִרְנְנוּ, Psa. 149: 5, and the like (to which the only exceptions are הִנְנִי, חִקְקִי, הִנְנִי).

*Psa. 62: 6-9.* The beginning of the second group goes back and seizes upon the beginning of the first. **יְשׁוּעָה** is affirmative both in v. 6 and in v. 7. The poet again takes up the emotional affirmations of vv. 2, 3, and, firm and defiant in faith, opposes them to his masked enemies. Here what he says to his soul is very similar to what he said of his soul in v. 2, inasmuch as he makes his own soul objective and exalts himself above her; and it is just in this that the secret of personality consists. He here admonishes her to that silence which in v. 2 he has already acknowledged as her own; because all spiritual existence as being living remains itself unchanged only by means of a perpetual “becoming” (*mittelst steten Werdens*), of continuous, self-conscious renovation. The “hope” in v. 6b is intended to be understood according to that which forms its substance, which here is nothing more nor less than salvation, v. 2b. That for which he who resigns himself to God hopes, comes from God; it cannot therefore fail him, for God the Almighty One and plenteous in mercy is surety for it. David renounces all help in himself, all personal avenging of his own honour — his salvation and his honour are **אֱלֹהִים** (vid., on 7:11). The rock of his strength, i.e., his strong defence, his refuge, is **בְּאֱלֹהִים**; it is where Elohim is, Elohim is it in person (**בְּ** as in Isa. 26: 4). By **עַם**, v. 9, the king addresses those who have remained faithful to him, whose feeble faith he has had to chide and sustain in other instances also in the Psalms belonging to this period. The address does not suit the whole people, who had become for the most part drawn into the apostasy. Moreover it would then have been **עַמִּי** (my people). **עַמִּי** frequently signifies the people belonging to the retinue of a prince (Jud. 3:18), or in the service of any person of rank (1Ki. 19:21), or belonging to any union of society whatever (2Ki. 4:42 f.). David thus names those who cleave to him; and the fact that he cannot say “my people” just shows that the people as a body had become alienated from him. But those who have remained to him of the people are not therefore to despair; but they are to pour out before God, who will know how to protect both them and their king, whatever may lie heavily upon their heart.

*Psa. 62:10-13.* Just as all men with everything earthly upon which they rely are perishable, so also the purely earthly form which the new kingship has assumed carries within itself the germ of ruin; and God will decide as Judge, between the dethroned and the usurpers, in accordance with the relationship in which they stand to Him. This is the internal connection of the third group with the two preceding ones. By means of the strophe vv. 10-13, our Psalm is brought into the closest reciprocal relationship with Psalm 39. Concerning **בְּנֵי-אִישׁ** and **בְּנֵי-אָדָם** vid., on Psa. 49: 3, 4: 3. The accentuation divides v. 10 quite correctly. The *Athnach* does not mark **בְּמֵאֲזָנִים לְעֹלֹת** as an independent clause: they are upon the balance **לְעֹלֹת**, for a going up; they

must rise, so light are they (Hengstenberg). Certainly this expression of the periphrastic future is possible (vid., on Psa. 25:14, Hab. 1:17), still we feel the want here of the subject, which cannot be dispensed within the clause as an independent one. Since, however, the combining of the words with what follows is forbidden by the fact that the infinitive with **ל** in the sense of the *ablat. gerund.* always comes after the principal clause, not before it (Ew. § 280, d), we interpret: upon the balances *ad ascendendum = certo ascensuri*, and in fact so that this is an attributive that is co-ordinate with **פְּנֵב**. Is the clause following now meant to affirm that men, one and all, belong to nothingness or vanity (**לֵא** *partitivum*), or that they are less than nothing (**לֵא** *comparat.*)? Umbreit, Stier, and others explain Isa. 40:17 also in the latter way; but parallels like Isa. 41:24 do not favour this rendering, and such as Isa. 44:11 are opposed to it. So also here the meaning is not that men stand under the category of that which is worthless or vain, but that they belong to the domain of the worthless or vain.

The warning in v. 11 does not refer to the Absalomites, but, pointing to these as furnishing a salutary example, to those who, at the sight of the prosperous condition and joyous life on that side, might perhaps be seized with envy and covetousness. Beside **בְּטַח ב** the meaning of **בְּהַבֵּל ב** is nevertheless not: to set in vain hope upon anything (for the idea of hoping does not exist in this verb in itself, Job. 27:12, Jer. 2: 5, nor in this construction of the verb), but: to be befooled, blinded by something vain (Hitzig). Just as they are not to suffer their heart to be befooled by their own unjust acquisition, so also are they not, when the property of others increases (**נִבַּח**, root **נב**, to raise one's self, to mount up; cf. Arabic *nabata*, to sprout up, grow; *nabara*, to raise; intransitive, to increase, and many other verbal stems), to turn their heart towards it, as though it were something great and fortunate, that merited special attention and commanded respect. Two great truths are divinely attested to the poet. It is not to be rendered: once hath God spoken, now twice (Job. 40: 5, 2Ki. 6:10) have I heard this; but after Psa. 89:36: One thing hath God spoken, two things (it is) that I have heard; or in accordance with the interpunction, which here, as in Psa. 12: 8 (cf. on Psa. 9:16), is not to be called in question: these two things have I heard. Two divine utterances actually do follow. The two great truths are:

**(1)** that God has the power over everything earthly, that consequently nothing takes place without Him, and that whatever is opposed to Him must sooner or later succumb;

**(2)** that of this very God, the sovereign Lord (**אֱלֹהֵינוּ**), is mercy also, the energy of which is measured by His omnipotence, and which does not suffer him to



succumb upon whom it is bestowed. With פֶּן the poet establishes these two revealed maxims which God has impressed upon his mind, from His righteous government as displayed in the history of men. He recompenses each one in accordance with his doing, *κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, as Paul confesses (Rom. 2: 6) no less than David, and even (vid., LXX) in the words of David. It shall be recompensed unto every man according to his conduct, which is the issue of his relationship to God. He who rises in opposition to the will and order of God, shall feel God's power (עֲזָרָה) as a power for punishment that dashes in pieces; and he who, anxious for salvation, resigns his own will to the will of God, receives from God's mercy or loving-kindness (רַחֲמֵי), as from an overflowing fulness, the promised reward of faithfulness: his resignation becomes experience, and his hoping attainment.

## Psalm 63

### MORNING HYMN OF ONE WHO IS PERSECUTED, IN A WATERLESS DESERT

*63: 2 ELOHIM, Thou art my God, early do I seek Thee;  
My soul thirsteth after Thee, my flesh pineth for Thee  
In a land of dryness, and is wearied without water.*

*63: 3 Thus have I looked after Thee in the sanctuary,  
To see Thy power and Thy glory.*

*63: 4 For Thy loving-kindness is better than life,  
My lips shall praise Thee.*

*63: 5 Thus will I bless Thee while I live,  
In Thy name will I lift up my hands.*

*63: 6 As with marrow and fat is my soul satisfied,  
And with jubilant lips doth my mouth sing praise.*

*63: 7 When I remember Thee upon my bed,  
Throughout the night-watches do I meditate upon Thee.*

*63: 8 For Thou hast become a help to me,  
And in the shadow of Thy wings can I shout for joy.*

*63: 9 My soul followeth hard after Thee,  
Thy right hand holdeth me fast.*

*63:10 But they, to destruction do they seek my soul:  
They shall go into the abysses of the earth.*

*63:11 They deliver him into the power of the sword,  
A portion of jackals do they become.*

*63:12 Nevertheless the king shall rejoice in Elohim,  
Every one shall glory who sweareth by Him;  
For the mouth of those who speak lies shall be stopped.*

*Psalm 63.* Now follows Psalm 63, the morning Psalm of the ancient church with which the singing of the Psalms was always introduced at the Sunday service. <sup>f226</sup>

This Psalm is still more closely related to Psalm 61 than Psalm 62. Here, as in Psalm 61, David gives utterance to his longing for the sanctuary; and in both Psalms he speaks of himself as king (vid., *Symbolae*, p. 56). All the three Psalm 61-63, were composed during the time of Absalom; for we must not allow ourselves to be misled by the inscription, *A Psalm, by David, when he was in the wilderness of Judah* (also LXX, according to the correct reading and the one preferred by Euthymius, τῆς Ἰουδαίας, not τῆς Ἰδομμαίας), into transferring it, as the old expositors do, to the time of Saul. During that period David could not well call himself “the king” and even during the time of his persecution by Absalom, in his flight, before crossing the Jordan, he tarried one or two days בערבות המדבר, in the steppes of the desert (2Sa. 15:23, 28; 17:16), i.e., of the wilderness of Judah lying nearest to Jerusalem, that dreary waste that extends along the western shore of the Dead Sea. We see clearly from 2Sa. 16: 2 (הַיַּעַר בַּמִּדְבָּר) and Psa. 16:14 (עֵיפִים), that he there found himself in the condition of a עֵיף. The inscription, when understood thus, throws light upon the whole Psalm, and verifies itself in the fact that the poet is a king; that he longs for the God on Zion, where he has been so delighted to behold Him, who is there manifest; and that he is persecuted by enemies who have plotted his ruin. The assertion that he is in the wilderness (v. 21) is therefore no mere rhetorical figure; and when, in v. 11, he utters the imprecation over his enemies, “let them become a portion for the jackals,” the influence of the desert upon the moulding of his thoughts is clearly seen in it.

We have here before us the Davidic original, or at any rate the counterpart, to the Korahitic pair of Psalm 42, 43. It is a song of the most delicate form and deepest spiritual contents; but in part very difficult of exposition. When we have, approximately at least, solved the riddle of one Psalm, the second meets us with new riddles. It is not merely the poetical classic character of the language, and the spiritual depth, but also this half-transparent and half-opaque covering which lends to the Psalms such a powerful and unvarying attractiveness. They are inexhaustible, there always remains an undeciphered residue; and therefore, though the work of exposition may progress, it does not come to an end. But how much more difficult is it to adopt this choice spiritual love-song as one’s own prayer! For this we need a soul that loves after the

same manner, and in the main it requires such a soul even to understand it rightly; for, as the saintly Bernard says, *lingua amoris non amanti barbara est*.

*Psa. 63: 2-4*. If the words in v. 2 were אֱלֹהִים אַתָּה אֲשַׁחֲרֶכָּ, then we would render it, with Böttcher, after Gen. 49: 8: Elohim, Thee do I seek, even Thee! But אֱלִי forbids this construction; and the assertion that otherwise it ought to be, “Jahve, my God art Thou” (Psa. 140: 7), rests upon a non-recognition of the Elohimic style. *Elohim* alone by itself is a vocative, and accordingly has *Mehupach legarme*. The verb שָׁחַר signifies earnest, importunate seeking and inquiring (e.g., Psa. 78:34), and in itself has nothing to do with שָׁחַר, the dawn; but since v. 7 looks back upon the night, it appears to be chosen with reference to the dawning morning, just as in Isa. 26: 9 also, שָׁחַר stands by the side of אֲנִיָּה בְלִילָה. The LXX is therefore not incorrect when it renders it: πρὸς δὲ ὀρθρίζω (cf. ὁ λαὸς ὄρθριζεν πρὸς αὐτόν, Luke 21:38); and Apollinaris strikes the right note when he begins his paraphrase,

*Νύκτα μετ’ ἀμφιλύκην σὲ μάκαρ μάκαρ ἀμφιγορεύσω —  
At night when the morning dawns will I exult around Thee, most blessed One.*

The supposition that בְּאֶרֶץ is equivalent to בְּאֶשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ, or even that the *Beth* is *Beth essentiae* (“as a,” etc.), are views that have no ground whatever, except as setting the inscription at defiance. What is meant is the parched thirsty desert of sand in which David finds himself. We do not render it: in a dry and languishing land, for צָיָה is not an adjective, but a substantive, — the transition of the feminine adjective to the masculine primary form, which sometimes (as in 1Ki. 19:11) occurs, therefore has no application here; nor: in the land of drought and of weariness, for who would express himself thus? וְעַרְיָ, referring to the nearest subject בְּשָׂרִי, continues the description of the condition (cf. Gen. 25: 8). In a region where he is surrounded by sun-burnt aridity and a nature that bears only one uniform ash-coloured tint, which casts its unrefreshing image into his inward part, which is itself in much the same parched condition, his soul thirsts, his flesh languishes, wearied and in want of water (*languidus deficiente aqua*), for God, the living One and the Fountain of life. כְּמָה (here with the tone drawn back, כְּמָה, like כְּחָר, 1Ch. 28:10, עָמַד, Hab. 3:11) of ardent longing which consumes the last energies of a man (root כָּמַן, whence כָּמַן and כָּמַס to conceal, and therefore like עָמַר, עָלַר, proceeding from the idea of enveloping; Arabic Arab. *kamiha*, to be blind, dark, pale, and disconcerted). The LXX and Theodotion erroneously read כְּמָה (how frequently is this the case!); whereas Aquila renders it ἑπετάθη, and Symmachus still better, ἡμείρεται (the word used of the longing of love). It is not a small matter that David is able to predicate such languishing desire after

God even of his flesh; it shows us that the spirit has the mastery within him, and not only forcibly keeps the flesh in subjection, but also, so far as possible, draws it into the realm of its own life — an experience confessedly more easily attained in trouble, which mortifies our carnal nature, than in the midst of the abundance of outward prosperity. The God for whom he is sick [*lit.* love-sick] in soul and body is the God manifest upon Zion.

Now as to the כֵּן in v. 3 — a particle which is just such a characteristic feature in the physiognomy of this Psalm as אֵלֶּם is in that of the preceding Psalm — there are two notional definitions to choose from: thus = so, as my God (Ewald), and: with such longing desire (as e.g., Oettinger). In the former case it refers back to the confession, “Elohim, my God art Thou,” which stands at the head of the Psalm; in the latter, to the desire that has just been announced, and that not in its present exceptional character, but in its more general and constant character. This reference to what has immediately gone before, and to the modality, not of the object, but of the disposition of mind, deserves the preference. “Thus” is accordingly equivalent to “longing thus after Thee.” The two כֵּן in vv. 3 and 5 are parallel and of like import. The alternation of the perfect (v. 3) and of the future (v. 5) implies that what has been the Psalmist’s favourite occupation heretofore, shall also be so in the future. Moreover, צִיָּה בְּאֶרֶץ and בְּקִדְשׁ form a direct antithesis. Just as he does not in a dry land, so formerly in the sanctuary he looked forth longingly towards God (תִּזְדָּרֶה with the conjoined idea of solemnity and devotion). We have now no need to take לִרְאוֹת as a gerundive (*videndo*), which is in itself improbable; for one looks, peers, gazes at anything just for the purpose of seeing what the nature of the object is (Psa. 14: 2, Isa. 42:18). The purpose of his gazing upon God as to gain an insight into the nature of God, so far as it is disclosed to the creature; or, as it is expressed here, to see His power and glory, i.e., His majesty on its terrible and on its light and loving side, to see this, viz., in its sacrificial appointments and sacramental self-attestations. Such longing after God, which is now all the more intense in the desert far removed from the sanctuary, filled and impelled him; for God’s loving-kindness is better than life, better than this natural life (*vid.*, on Psa. 17:14), which is also a blessing, and as the prerequisite of all earthly blessings a very great blessing. The loving-kindness of God, however, is a higher good, is in fact the highest good and the true life: his lips shall praise this God of mercy, his morning song shall be of Him; for that which makes him truly happy, and after which he even now, as formerly, only and solely longs, is the mercy or loving-kindness (חֶסֶד) of this God, the infinite wrath of which is measured by the greatness of His power (עֹז) and glory (כְּבוֹד). It might also be rendered, “Because Thy loving-kindness is better than life, my lips shall praise Thee;” but if כֵּן is taken as demonstrative

(for), it yields a train of thought that that is brought about not merely by what follows (as in the case of the relative because), but also by what precedes: “for Thy loving-kindness...my lips shall then praise Thee” (שִׁבְחֹנֶיךָ with the suffix appended to the energetic plural form *ûn*, as in Isa. 60: 7, 10, Jer. 2:24).

*Psa. 63: 5-9.* This strophe again takes up the בָּךְ (v. 3): thus ardently longing, for all time to come also, is he set towards God, with such fervent longing after God will he bless Him in his life, i.e., entirely filling up his life therewith (בְּךָ as in Psa. 104:33, 146: 2; cf. Baruch 4:20, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις μου), and in His name, i.e., invoking it and appealing to it, will he lift up his hands in prayer. The being occupied with God makes him, even though as now in the desert he is obliged to suffer bodily hunger, satisfied and cheerful like the fattest and most marrowy food: *velut adipe et pinguedine satiatur anima mea*. From Lev. 3:17, 7:25, Grussetius and Frisch infer that *spiritualies epulae* are meant. And certainly the poet cannot have had the sacrificial feasts (Hupfeld) in his mind; for the לֶחֶם of the *shelamim* is put upon the altar, and is removed from the part to be eaten. Moreover, however, even the *Tôra* does not bind itself in its expression to the letter of that prohibition of the fat of animals, vid., Deu. 32:14, cf. Jer. 31:14. So here also the expression “with marrow and fat” is the designation of a feast prepared from well-fed, noble beasts. He feels himself satisfied in his inmost nature just as after a feast of the most nourishing and dainty meats, and with lips of jubilant songs (*accus. instrum.* according to Ges. § 138, rem. 3), i.e., with lips jubilant and attuned to song, shall his mouth sing praise. What now follows in v. 7 we no longer, as formerly, take as a protasis subsequently introduced (like Isa. 5: 4 f.): “when I remembered...meditated upon Thee,” but so that v. 7a is the protasis and v. 7b the apodosis, cf. Psa. 21:12, Job. 9:16 (Hitzig): When I remember Thee (*meminerim*, Ew. § 355, b) upon my bed (*stratis meis*, as in Psa. 132: 3, Gen. 49: 4, cf. 1Ch. 5: 1) — says he now as the twilight watch is passing gradually into the morning — I meditate upon Thee in the night-watches (Symmachus, καθ’ ἐκάστην φυλακὴν), or during, throughout the night-watches (like בְּךָ in v. 5); i.e., it is no passing remembrance, but it so holds me that I pass a great part of the night absorbed in meditation on Thee. He has no lack of matter for his meditation; for God has become a help (*auxilio*, vid., on 3: 3) to him: He has rescued him in this wilderness, and, well concealed under the shadow of His wings (vid., on Psa. 17: 8, 36: 8, 57: 2), which affords him a cool retreat in the heat of conflict and protection against his persecutors, he is able to exult (יִרְנָס, the potential). Between himself and God there subsists a reciprocal relationship of active love. According to the schema of the crosswise position of words (*Chiasmus*), תִּרְנָס and בִּי intentionally jostle close against one another: he depends upon God, following close behind Him,

i.e., following Him everywhere and not leaving Him when He wishes to avoid him; and on the other side God's right hand holds him fast, not letting him go, not abandoning him to his foes.

*Psa. 63:10-12.* The closing strophe turns towards these foes. By **וְהִמָּה** he contrasts with his own person, as in Psa. 59:16 f., 56: 7 f., the party of the enemy, before which he has retreated into the desert. It is open to question whether **לְשׂוֹאָה** is intended to be referred, according to Psa. 35:17, to the persecuted one (to destroy my life), or, with Hupfeld, to the persecutors (to their own destruction, they themselves for destruction). If the former reference to the persecuted be adopted, we ought, in order to give prominence to the evidently designed antithesis to v. 9, to translate: those, however, who..., shall go down into the depths of the earth (Böttcher, and others); a rendering which is hazardous as regards the syntax, after **וְהִמָּה** and in connection with this position of the words. Therefore translate: On the other hand, those, to (their own) ruin do they seek my soul. It is true this ought properly to be expressed by **לְשׂוֹאָתָם**, but the absence of the suffix is less hazardous than the above relative rendering of **יִבְקְשׂוּ**. What follows in v. 10b -11 is the expansion of **לְשׂוֹאָה**. The futures from **יָבֵאוּ** onwards are to be taken as predictive, not as imprecatory; the former accords better with the quiet, gentle character of the whole song. It shall be with them as with the company of Korah. **הָאָרֶץ** **תַּחְתִּיּוֹת** is the interior of the earth down into its deepest bottom; this signification also holds good in Psa. 139:15, Isa. 44:23. <sup>r227</sup>

The phrase **הַגִּיר אֶל-יְדֵי חֶרֶב** here and in Jer. 18:21, Eze. 35: 5 (*Hiph.*, not of **גָּרַר**, to drag, tear away, but **נָגַר**, to draw towards, flow), signifies properly to pour upon = into the hands (Job. 16:11), i.e., to give over (**הַסִּגִּיר**) into the power of the sword; *effundent eum* is (much the same as in Job. 4:19, 18:18, and frequently) equivalent to *effundetur*. The enallage is like 5:10, 7: 2 f., and frequently: the singular refers to each individual of the homogeneous multitude, or to this multitude itself as a concrete *persona moralis*. The king, however, who is now banished from Jerusalem to the habitation of jackals, will, whilst they become a portion (**מִנְתָּה** = **מִנְנוֹת**), i.e., prey, of the jackals (vid., the fulfilment in 2Sa. 18: 7 f.), rejoice in Elohim. Every one who sweareth by Him shall boast himself. Theodoret understands this of swearing **κατὰ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως σωτηρίαν**. Hengstenberg compares the oath **חַי פְּרַעָה**, Gen. 42:15. Ewald also (§ 217, f) assumes this explanation to be unquestionable. But the Israelite is to swear by the name of Jahve and by no other, Deu. 6:13, Isa. 65:16, cf. Amo. 8:14. If the king were meant, why was it not rather expressed by **הַנִּשְׁבַּע לוֹ**, he who swears allegiance to him? The syntax does

not help us to decide to what the בָּרָא refers. Neinrich Moeller (1573) says of the בָּרָא as referred to the king: *peregrinum est et coactum*; and A. H. Franke in his *Introductio in Psalterium* says of it as referred to Elohim: *coactum est*. So far as the language is concerned, both references are admissible; but as regards the subject-matter, only the latter. The meaning, as everywhere else, is a searing by God. He who, without allowing himself to turn from it, swore by Elohim, the God of Israel, the God of David His anointed, and therefore acknowledged Him as the Being exalted above all things, shall boast himself or “glory,” inasmuch as it shall be practically seen how well-founded and wise was this recognition. He shall glory, for the mouth of those who speak lies shall be stopped, forcibly closed, viz., those who, together with confidence in the Christ of God, have by falsehood also undermined the reverence which is due to God Himself. Psalm 64 closes very similarly, and hence is placed next in order.

## Psalm 64

### INVOCATION OF DIVINE PROTECTION AGAINST THE FALSENESS OF MEN

*64: 2 HEAR, Elohim, my voice in my complaint,  
From the terror of the enemy do Thou preserve my life;*

*64: 3 Hide me from the conspiracy of evil-doers,  
From the tumultuous throng of the workers of iniquity,*

*64: 4 Who whet their tongue like a sword,  
Who aim their arrows, bitter words,*

*64: 5 To shoot, in lurking-places, at the virtuous —  
Suddenly they shoot at him, and fear not.*

*64: 6 They make firm for themselves an evil agreement,  
They decide to lay snares,  
They ask, who can observe them?*

*64: 7 They search out knavish things —  
They are ready with a cunningly-wrought-out plan —  
And the inward part of a man, and the heart, is deep!*

*64: 8 But Elohim will shoot them with an arrow,  
Suddenly do their wounds come.*

*64: 9 And they are obliged to fall, upon them cometh their own tongue;  
All who see them shall shake the head.*

*64:10 Then all men shall fear and declare the deed of Elohim,  
And His work shall they consider well.*

**64:11 The righteous shall rejoice in Jahve and trust in Him,  
And all the upright in heart shall glory.**

**Psalm 64.** Even Hilary begins the exposition of this Psalm with the words *Psalmi superscriptio historiam non continet*, in order at the outset to give up all attempt at setting forth its historical connection. The Midrash observes that it is very applicable to Daniel, who was cast into the lions' den by the satraps by means of a delicately woven plot. This is indeed true; but only because it is wanting in any specially defined features and cannot with any certainty be identified with one or other of the two great periods of suffering in the life of David.

**Psa. 64: 2-5.** The Psalm opens with an octostich, and closes in the same way. The infinitive noun **שָׁוֶה** signifies a complaint, expressed not by the tones of pain, but in words. The rendering of the LXX (here and in Psa. 55: 3) is too general, **ἐν τῷ θέεσθαι με**. The “terror” of the enemy is that proceeding from him (*gen. obj.* as in Deu. 2:15, and frequently). The generic singular **אֹיֵב** is at once particularized in a more detailed description with the use of the plural. **סוּד** is a club or clique; **רְנָשָׁה** (Targumic = **הַמּוֹן**, e.g., Eze. 30:10) a noisy crowd. The perfects after **אֲשֶׁר** affirm that which they now do as they have before done; cf. Psa. 140: 4 and Psa. 58: 8, where, as in this passage, the treading or bending of the bow is transferred to the arrow. **דָּבַר מָר** is the interpretation added to the figure, as in Psa. 144: 7. That which is bitter is called **מָר**, root **מַר**, *stringere*, from the harsh astringent taste; here it is used tropically of speech that wounds and inflicts pain (after the manner of an arrow or a stiletto), **πικροὶ λόγοι**. With the *Kal* **לִירוֹת** (Psa. 11: 2) alternates the *Hiph.* **יִרְאוּ**. With **פְּתָאִים** the description takes a new start. **וְלֹא יִירָאוּ**, forming an assonance with the preceding word, means that they do it without any fear whatever, and therefore also without fear of God (Psa. 55:20, Deu. 25:18).

**Psa. 64: 6, 7.** The evil speech is one with the bitter speech in v. 4, the arrow which they are anxious to let fly. This evil speech, here agreement or convention, they make firm to themselves (*sibi*), by securing, in every possible way, its effective execution. **סִפְּר** (frequently used of the cutting language of the ungodly, Psa. 59:13; 69:27; cf. Talmudic **סִפְּר לְשׁוֹן שְׁלִישִׁי**, to speak as with three tongues, i.e., slanderously) is here construed with **לְ** of that at which their haughty and insolent utterances aim. In connection therewith they take no heed of God, the all-seeing One: they say (ask), *quis conspiciat ipsas*. There is no need to take **לְמֹ** as being for **לוֹ** (Hitzig); nor is it the dative of the object instead of the accusative, but it is an ethical dative: who will see or look to them, i.e., exerting any sort of influence upon them? The form of the question



is not the direct (Psa. 59: 8), but the indirect, in which **מִי**, *seq. fut.*, is used in a simply future (Jer. 44:28) or potential sense (Job. 22:17, 1Ki. 1:20).

Concerning **עוֹלָת**, *vid.*, Psa. 58: 3. It is doubtful whether **תִּמְנוּ** <sup>f228</sup>

is the first person (= **תִּמְנוּ**) as in Num. 17:28, Jer. 44:18, or the third person as in Lam. 3:22 (= **תִּמְנוּ**, which first of all resolved is **תִּמְנוּ**, and then transposed **תִּמְנוּ**, like **מִעֲזוּיָהּ = מִעֲזוּיָהּ = מִעֲזוּיָהּ**, Isa. 23:11). The reading **טִמְנוּ**, from which Rashi proceeds, and which Luther follows in his translation, is opposed by the LXX and Targum; it does not suit the governing subject, and is nothing but an involuntary lightening of the difficulty. If we take into consideration, that **תָּמַם** signifies not to make ready, but to be ready, and that consequently **הַפֶּשֶׁת מִהָפֶשֶׁת** is to be taken by itself, then it must be rendered either: they excogitate knavish tricks or villainies, “we are ready, a clever stroke is concocted, and the inward part of man and the heart is deep!” or, which we prefer, since there is nothing to indicate the introduction of any soliloquy: they excogitate knavish tricks, they are ready — a delicately devised, clever stroke (nominative of the result), and (as the poet ironically adds) the inward part of man and the heart is (verily) deep. There is nothing very surprising in the form **תִּמְנוּ** for **תָּמַם**, since the Psalms, whenever they depict the sinful designs and doings of the ungodly, delight in singularities of language. On **וְלֹב** (not **וְלֹב**) = **(אִישׁ) וְלֹב = וְלֹבוּ**, cf. Psa. 118:14a.

**Psa. 64: 8-11.** Deep is man’s heart and inward part, but not too deep for God, who knoweth the heart (Jer. 17: 9 f.). And He will just as suddenly surprise the enemies of His anointed with their death-blow, as they had plotted it for him. The *futt. consec.* that follow represent that which is future, with all the certainty of an historical fact as a retribution springing from the malicious craftiness of the enemies. According to the accentuation, v. 8 is to be rendered: “then will Elohim shoot them, a sudden arrow become their wounds.” Thus at length Hupfeld renders it; but how extremely puzzling is the meaning hidden behind this sentence! The Targum and the Jewish expositors have construed it differently: “Then will Elohim shoot them with arrows suddenly;” in this case, however, because v. 8b then becomes too blunt and bald, **פְּתָאִם** has to be repeated in thought with this member of the verse, and this is in itself an objection to it. We interpunctuate with Ewald and Hitzig thus: then does Elohim shoot them with an arrow, suddenly arise (become a reality) their wounds (cf. Mic. 7: 4), namely, of those who had on their part aimed the murderous weapon against the upright for a sudden and sure shot. V. 9a is still more difficult. Kimchi’s interpretation, which accords with the accents: *et corruere facient eam super se, linguam suam*, is intolerable; the proleptic suffix, having reference to **לְשׁוֹנָם** (Exo. 3: 6, Job. 33:20), ought to have been

feminine (vid., on Psa. 22:16), and “to make their own tongue fall upon themselves” is an odd fancy. The objective suffix will therefore refer *per enallagen* to the enemy. But not thus (as Hitzig, who now seeks to get out of the difficulty by an alteration of the text, formerly rendered it): “and they cause those to fall whom they have slandered [*lit.* upon whom their tongue came].” This form of retribution does not accord with the context; and moreover the gravely earnest **עֲלִימוֹ**, like the **הוּ**—, refers more probably to the enemies than to the objects of their hostility. The interpretation of Ewald and Hengstenberg is better: “and one overthrows him, inasmuch as their tongue, i.e., the sin of their tongue with which they sought to destroy others, comes upon themselves.” The subject to **וַיִּכְשִׁילֵהוּ**, as in Psa. 63:11, Job. 4:19; 7: 3, Luke 12:20, is the powers which are at the service of God, and which are not mentioned at all; and the thought **עֲלִימוֹ לְשֹׁנָם** (a circumstantial clause) is like Psa. 140:10, where in a similar connection the very same singularly rugged lapidary, or terse, style is found. In v. 9*b* we must proceed on the assumption that **רָאָה בְּ** in such a connection signifies the gratification of looking upon those who are justly punished and rendered harmless. But he who tarries to look upon such a scene is certainly not the person to flee from it; **הִתְנַדֵּד** does not here mean “to betake one’s self to flight” (Ewald, Hitzig), but to shake one’s self, as in Jer. 48:27, viz., to shake the head (Psa. 44:15, Jer. 18:16) — the recognised (vid., 22: 8) gesture of malignant, mocking astonishment. The approbation is awarded, according to v. 10, to God, the just One. And with the joy at His righteous interposition, — viz. of Him who has been called upon to interpose, — is combined a fear of the like punishment. The divine act of judicial retribution now set forth becomes a blessing to mankind. From mouth to mouth it is passed on, and becomes an admonitory *nota bene*. To the righteous in particular it becomes a consolatory and joyous strengthening of his faith. The judgment of Jahve is the redemption of the righteous. Thus, then, does he rejoice in his God, who by thus judging and redeeming makes history into the history of redemption, and hide himself the more confidingly in Him; and all the upright boast themselves, viz., in God, who looks into the heart and practically acknowledges them whose heart is directed unswervingly towards Him, and conformed entirely to Him. In place of the *futt. consec.*, which have a prophetic reference, simple *futt.* come in here, and between these *perf. consec.* as expressive of that which will then happen when that which is prophetically certain has taken place.

## Psalm 65

### THANKSGIVING SONG FOR VICTORY AND BLESSINGS BESTOWED

*65: 2 TO Thee resignation is as praise, Elohim, in Zion,  
And to Thee is the vowed paid.*

*65: 3 O Thou who answerest prayer! to Thee doth all flesh come.*

*65: 4 If instances of iniquity have overpowered me —  
Our transgressions Thou, Thou expiatest them.*

*65: 5 Blessed is he who is chosen to dwell near Thee in Thy courts!  
We will enjoy the good of Thy house, of Thy holy Temple!!*

*65: 6 In terrible deeds of righteousness dost Thou answer us, O God of our  
salvation,  
The confidence of all the ends of the earth and of the farthest sea,*

*65: 7 Who setteth fast the mountains by His strength, girded with might,*

*65: 8 Who stilleth the roar of the seas, the roar of their waves,  
And the tumult of the nations.*

*65: 9 Therefore the dwellers at the boundaries of the earth are afraid at Thy tokens,  
The outgoings of the morning and of the evening Thou makest to sing for joy.*

*65:10 Thou hast visited the land, that it should overflow,  
Abundantly didst Thou enrich it.  
The fountain of Elohim was full of water —  
Thou didst prepare their corn, for Thou didst thus prepare it;*

*65:11 Watering the furrows of the land, softening the ridges thereof.  
By showers of rain Thou madest it loose;  
Its increase didst Thou bless.*

*65:12 Thou hast crowned the year of Thy goodness,  
And Thy tracks drop with fat.*

*65:13 The pastures of the steppe drop,  
And with rejoicing do the hills gird themselves.*

*65:14 The meadows are clothed with flocks,  
And the valleys are covered over with corn —  
Everything shouts for joy, everything sings.*

*Psalm 65.* In this Psalm, the placing of which immediately after the preceding is at once explicable by reason of the **אֲשֶׁר** so prominent in both (Psa. 64:10; 65: 9), we come upon the same intermingling of the natural and

the historical as in Psalm 8, 19, 29. The congregation gathered around the sanctuary on Zion praises its God, by whose mercy its imperilled position in relation to other nations has been rescued, and by whose goodness it again finds itself at peace, surrounded by fields rich in promise. In addition to the blessing which it has received in the bounties of nature, it does not lose sight of the answer to prayer which it has experienced in its relation to the world of nations. His rule in human history and His rule in nature are, to the church, reflected the one in the other. In the latter, as in the former, it sees the almighty and bountiful hand of Him who answers prayer and expiates sins, and through judgment opens up a way for His love. The deliverance which it has experienced redounds to the acknowledgment of the God of its salvation among the most distant peoples; the beneficial results of Jahve's interposition in the events transpiring in the world extend temporally as well as spiritually far beyond the bounds of Israel; it is therefore apparently the relief of Israel and of the peoples in general from the oppression of some worldly power that is referred to. The spring of the third year spoken of in Isa. 37:30, when to Judah the overthrow of Assyria was a thing of the past, and they again had the fields ripening for the harvest before their eyes, offers the most appropriate historical basis for the twofold purport of the Psalm. The inscription, *To the Precentor, a Psalm, by David, a song* (cf. *Psa.* 75: 1; 76: 1), does not mislead us in this matter. For even we regard it as uncritical to assign to David all the Psalms bearing the inscription לְדָוִד. The Psalm in many MSS (Complutensian, Vulgate), beside the words *Εἰς τὸ τέλος ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυίδ ᾠδὴ*, has the addition *ᾠδὴ Ἱερεμίου καὶ Ἰεζεκιῆλ, (ἐκ) τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς παροικίας ὅτε ἔμελλον ἐκπορεύεσθαι*. At the head of the following Psalm it might have some meaning, — here, however, it has none.

*Psa.* 65: 2-5. The praise of God on account of the mercy with which He rules out of Zion. The LXX renders σοὶ πρέπει ὕμνος, but תִּיבִי פָרְעֵס, *tibi par est, h. e. convenit laus* (Ewald), is not a usage of the language (cf. *Psa.* 33: 1, *Jer.* 10: 7). תִּיבִי signifies, according to *Psa.* 22: 3, silence, and as an ethical notion, resignation, *Psa.* 62: 2. According to the position of the words it looks like the subject, and תִּיבִי like the predicate. The accents at least (*Illuj, Shalsheth*) assume the relationship of the one word to the other to be that of predicate and subject; consequently it is not: To Thee belongeth resignation, praise (Hengstenberg), but: To Thee is resignation praise, i.e., resignation is (given or presented) to Thee as praise. Hitzig obtains the same meaning by an alteration of the text: לְךָ דְמִיָּה תְהַלֵּל ; but opposed to this is the fact that תְהַלֵּל is not found anywhere in the Psalter, but only in the writings of the chronicler. And since it is clear that the words לְךָ תְהַלֵּל belong together (*Psa.* 40: 4), the poet had no need to fear any ambiguity when he inserted דְמִיָּה between them as

that which is given to God as praise in Zion. What is intended is that submission or resignation to God which gives up its cause to God and allows Him to act on its behalf, renouncing all impatient meddling and interference (Exo. 14:14). The second member of the sentence affirms that this praise of pious resignation does not remain unanswered. Just as God in Zion is praised by prayer which resigns our own will silently to His, so also to Him are vows paid when He fulfils such prayer. That the answers to prayer are evidently thought of in connection with this, we see from v. 3, where God is addressed as the “Hearer or Answerer of prayer.” To Him as being the Hearer and Answerer of prayer all flesh comes, and in fact, as **עֲרִיךָ** implies (cf. Isa. 45:24), without finding help anywhere else, it clear a way for itself until it gets to Him; i.e., men, absolutely dependent, impotent in themselves and helpless, both collectively and individually (those only excepted who are determined to perish or despair), flee to Him as their final refuge and help. Before all else it is the prayer for the forgiveness of sin which He graciously answers. The perfect in v. 4a is followed by the future in v. 4b. The former, in accordance with the sense, forms a hypothetical protasis: granted that the instances of faults have been too powerful for me, i.e., (cf. Gen. 4:13) an intolerable burden to me, our transgressions are expiated by Thee (who alone canst and also art willing to do it). **דְּבַרְךָ** is not less significant than in Psa. 35:20; 105:27; 145: 5, cf. 1Sa. 10: 2, 2Sa. 11:18 f.: it separates the general fact into its separate instances and circumstances. How blessed therefore is the lot of that man whom (supply **אֲשֶׁר**) God chooses and brings near, i.e., removes into His vicinity, that he may inhabit His courts (future with the force of a clause expressing a purpose, as e.g., in Job. 30:28, which see), i.e., that there, where He sits enthroned and reveals Himself, he may have his true home and be as if at home (vid., 15: 1)! The congregation gathered around Zion is esteemed worthy of this distinction among the nations of the earth; it therefore encourages itself in the blessed consciousness of this its privilege flowing from free grace (**בַּחֵר**), to enjoy in full draughts (**שָׂבַע** with **בְּ** as in Psa. 103: 5) the abundant goodness or blessing (**טוֹב**) of God’s house, of the holy (**ἅγιον**) of His temple, i.e., of His holy temple (**קֹדֶשׁ** as in Psa. 46: 5, cf. Isa. 57:15). For for all that God’s grace offers us we can give Him no better thanks than to hunger and thirst after it, and satisfy our poor soul therewith.

*Psa. 65: 6-9.* The praise of God on account of the lovingkindness which Israel as a people among the peoples has experienced. The future **תַּעֲנֵנוּ** confesses, as a present, a fact of experience that still holds good in all times to come. **נִזְרָאוֹת** might, according to Psa. 20: 7, as in Psa. 139:14, be an accusative of the more exact definition; but why not, according to 1Sa. 20:10, Job. 9: 3, a second accusative under the government of the verb? God answers

the prayer of His people superabundantly. He replies to it **נוראות**, terrible deeds, viz., **בַּצֶּדֶק**, by a rule which stringently executes the will of His righteousness (vid., on Jer. 42: 6); in this instance against the oppressors of His people, so that henceforth everywhere upon earth He is a ground of confidence to all those who are oppressed. “The sea (**ים**) construct state, as is frequently the case, with the retention of the *â*) of the distant ones” is that of the regions lying afar off (cf. *Psa.* 56: 1). Venema observes, *Significatur, Deum esse certissimum praesidium, sive agnoscatur ab hominibus et ei fidatur, sive non* (therefore similar to **γρόντες**, *Rom.* 1:21; *Psychol.* S. 347; tr. p. 408). But according to the connection and the subjective colouring the idea seems to have, **מִבְּמַתַּח וְגו'** is to be understood of the believing acknowledgment which the God of Israel attains among all mankind by reason of His judicial and redemptive self-attestation (cf. *Isa.* 33:13, *2Ch.* 32:22 f.). In the natural world and among men He proves Himself to be the Being girded with power to whom everything must yield. He it is who setteth fast the mountains (cf. *Jer.* 10:12) and stilleth the raging of the ocean. In connection with the giant mountains the poet may have had even the worldly powers (vid., *Isa.* 41:15) in his mind; in connection with the seas he gives expression to this allegorical conjunction of thoughts. The roaring of the billows and the wild tumult of the nations as a mass in the empire of the world, both are stilled by the threatening of the God of Israel (*Isa.* 17:12-14). When He shall overthrow the proud empire of the world, whose tyranny the earth has been made to feel far and wide, then will reverential fear of Him and exultant joy at the end of the thralldom (vid., *Isa.* 13: 4-8) become universal. **אוֹתוֹת** (from the originally feminine **אוֹת** = *āwājat*, from **אָהַךְ**, to mark, *Num.* 34:10), **σημεία**, is the name given here to His marvellous interpositions in the history of our earth. **קִצְוֵי**, v. 6 (also in *Isa.* 26:15), out of construction is **קִצְוֹת**. “The exit places of the morning and of the evening” are the East and West with reference to those who dwell there. Luther erroneously understands **מוֹצָאֵי** as directly referring to the creatures which at morning and evening “sport about (*webern*), i.e., go safely and joyfully out and in.” The meaning is, the regions whence the morning breaks forth and where the evening sets. The construction is zeugmatic so far as **בוֹא**, not **יָצָא**, is said of the evening sun, but only to a certain extent, for neither does one say **מבוא ערב** (Ewald). Perret-Gentil renders it correctly: *les lieux d'où surgissent l'aube et le crépuscule*. God makes both these to shout for joy, inasmuch as He commands a calm to the din of war.

**Psa. 65:10-14.** The praise of God on account of the present year's rich blessing, which He has bestowed upon the land of His people. In vv. 10, 11 God is thanked for having sent down the rain required for the ploughing (vid.,

*Commentary on Isaiah*, ii. 522) and for the increase of the seed sown, so that, as vv. 12-14 affirm, there is the prospect of a rich harvest. The harvest itself, as follows from v. 14b, is not yet housed. The whole of vv. 10, 11 is a retrospect; in vv. 12-14 the whole is a description of the blessing standing before their eyes, which God has put upon the year now drawing to a close. Certainly, if the forms **רִיחַ** and **נִחַת** were supplicatory imperatives, then the prayer for the early or seed-time rain would attach itself to the retrospect in v. 11, and the standpoint would be not about the time of the Passover and Pentecost, both festivals belonging to the beginning of the harvest, but about the time of the feast of Tabernacles, the festival of thanksgiving for the harvest, and vv. 12-14 would be a glance into the future (Hitzig). But there is nothing to indicate that in v. 11 the retrospect changes into a looking forward. The poet goes on with the same theme, and also arranges the words accordingly, for which reason **רִיחַ** and **נִחַת** are not to be understood in any other way. **הַעֲשִׂיר שֶׁקֶק** beside **הַעֲשִׂיר** (to enrich) signifies to cause to run over, overflow, i.e., to put anything in a state of plenty or abundance, from **שִׁיק** (*Hiph. Joe. 2:24*, to yield in abundance), Arab, *sâq*, to push, impel, to cause to go on in succession and to follow in succession. **רַבַּת** (for which we find **רַבָּה** in 62: 3) is an adverb, copiously, richly (Psa. 120: 6; 123: 4; 129: 1), like **מֵאֵת**, a hundred times (Ecc. 8:12). **תַּעֲשֶׂרְנָה** is *Hiph.* with the middle syllable shortened, Ges. § 53, 3, rem. 4. The fountain (**פְּלֵגָה**) of God is the name given here to His inexhaustible stores of blessing, and more particularly the fulness of the waters of the heavens from which He showers down fertilizing rain. **בֵּן**, “thus thoroughly,” forms an alliteration with **הַכִּיָּן**, to prepare, and thereby receives a peculiar twofold colouring. The meaning is: God, by raising and tending, prepared the produce of the field which the inhabitants of the land needed; for He thus thoroughly prepared the land in conformity with the fulness of His fountain, viz., by copiously watering (**רִיחַה** *infin. absol.* instead of **רִיחַה**, as in 1Sa. 3:12, 2Ch. 24:10; Exo. 22:22, Jer. 14:19, Hos. 6: 9) the furrows of the land and pressing down, i.e., softening by means of rain, its ridges (**גְּדִירָה**, defective plural, as e.g., in Ruth 2:13), which the ploughshare has made. **תֵּלָם** (related by root with Arab. *tll*, *tell*, a hill, prop. that which is thrown out to a place, that which is thrown up, a mound) signifies a furrow as being formed by casting up or (if from Arab. *tlm*, *ébrécher*, to make a fracture, rent, or notch in anything) by tearing into, breaking up the ground; **גְּדִירָה** (related by root with *uchdûd* and *chatt*, the usual Arabic words for a furrow <sup>f229</sup>) as being formed by cutting into the ground.

In v. 12 the year in itself appears as a year of divine goodness (**טוֹבָה**, *bonitas*), and the prospective blessing of harvest as the crown which is set upon it. For

Thou hast crowned “the year of Thy goodness” and “with Thy goodness” are different assertions, with which also different (although kindred as to substance) ideas are associated. The futures after עֲמַרְתָּ depict its results as they now lie out to view. The chariot-tracks (vid., Deu. 33:26) drop with exuberant fruitfulness, even the meadows of the uncultivated and, without rain, unproductive pasture land (Job. 38:26 f.). The hills are personified in v. 13b in the manner of which Isaiah in particular is so fond (e.g., Isa. 44:23; 49:13), and which we find in the Psalms of his type (Psa. 96:11 ff., 98: 7 ff., cf. 89:13). Their fresh, verdant appearance is compared to a festive garment, with which those which previously looked bare and dreary gird themselves; and the corn to a mantle in which the valleys completely envelope themselves (עֲמַרְתָּ with the accusative, like Arab. *t.iff* with *b* of the garment: to throw it around one, to put it on one’s self). The closing words, locking themselves as it were with the beginning of the Psalm together, speak of joyous shouting and singing that continues into the present time. The meadows and valleys (Böttcher) are not the subject, of which it cannot be said that they sing; nor can the same be said of the rustling of the waving corn-fields (Kimchi). The expression requires men to be the subject, and refers to men in the widest and most general sense. Everywhere there is shouting coming up from the very depths of the breast (*Hithpal.*), everywhere songs of joy; for this is denoted by שִׁיר in distinction from קִיִּין.

## Psalm 66

### THANKSGIVING FOR A NATIONAL AND PERSONAL DELIVERANCE

*66: 1 RAISE a joyful shout unto Elohim, all ye lands,*

*66: 2 Harp the glory of His name,  
Give glory as praise unto Him.*

*66: 3 Say unto Elohim: “How terrible are Thy works!  
By reason of Thine omnipotence must Thy foes submit to Thee.*

*66: 4 All lands shall do homage to Thee and harp to Thee,  
They shall harp to Thy name.” (Sela)*

*66: 5 Come ye and see the mighty deeds of Elohim,  
Who ruleth terribly over the children of men!*

*66: 6 He hath turned the sea into dry land,  
Through the river they passed on foot —  
Then we rejoiced in Him!*



66: 7 *He who ruleth in His strength for ever —  
His eyes keep watch upon the nations.  
Let not the rebellious thus exalt themselves! (Sela)*

66: 8 *Bless, O ye peoples, our God,  
And make His praise to sound aloud —*

66: 9 *Who putteth our soul in life,  
And hath not given our feet over to stumbling.*

66:10 *For Thou hast proved us, Elohim,  
Thou hast smelted us as the smelting of silver.*

66:11 *Thou didst bring us into the mountain-hold,  
Thou didst lay an oppressive burden upon our loins;*

66:12 *Thou didst cause men to ride over our head,  
We fell into fire and into water —  
Yet Thou didst bring us out into rich abundance.*

66:13 *I will enter Thy house with burnt-offerings,  
I will pay Thee my vows,*

66:14 *Which my lips have uttered,  
And which my mouth hath spoken, when I was straitened.*

66:15 *Burnt-offerings of fat sheep will I bring to Thee,  
Together with the incense of rams,  
I will offer bullocks with kids. (Sela)*

66:16 *Come, hear, and I will tell, all ye who fear Elohim,  
What He hath done for my soul.*

66:17 *Unto Him with my mouth did I cry —  
And a hymn was under my tongue.*

66:18 *If I had purposed evil in my heart,  
The Lord would not hear.*

66:19 *Elohim hath, however, heard,  
He hath hearkened to the cry of my prayer.*

66:20 *Blessed be Elohim,  
Who hath not turned away my prayer  
And His mercy from me.*

*Psalm 66.* From Psalm 65 onwards we find ourselves in the midst of a series of Psalms which, with a varying arrangement of the words, are inscribed both *מזמור* and *שיר* (65-68). The two words *שיר מְזֻמָּר* stand according to the accents in the *stat. constr.* (Psa. 88: 1), and therefore signify a *Psalm-song*. <sup>f230</sup>

This series, as is universally the case, is arranged according to the community of prominent watchwords. In Psa. 65: 2 we read: “To Thee is the vow paid,” and in 66:13: “*I will pay Thee my vows;*” in Psa. 66:20: “*Blessed be Elohim,*” and in 67: 8: “*Elohim shall bless us.*” Besides, Psalm 66 and 67 have this feature in common, that **לְמַנְצָהּ**, which occurs fifty-five times in the Psalter, is accompanied by the name of the poet in every instance, with the exception of these two anonymous Psalms. The frequently occurring *Sela* of both Psalms also indicates that they were intended to have a musical accompaniment. These annotations referring to the temple-music favour the pre-exilic rather than the post-exilic origin of the two Psalms. Both are purely Elohimic; only in one instance (Psa. 6:18) does **אֲדֹנָי**, equally belonging to this style of Psalm, alternate with *Elohim*.

On the ground of some deliverance out of oppressive bondage that has been experienced by Israel arises in Psalm 66 the summons to the whole earth to raise a shout of praise unto God. The congregation is the subject speaking as far as v. 12. From v. 13 the person of the poet appears in the foreground; but that which brings him under obligation to present a thank-offering is nothing more nor less than that which the whole congregation, and he together with it, has experienced. It is hardly possible to define this event more minutely. The lofty consciousness of possessing a God to whom all the world must bow, whether cheerfully or against its will, became strong among the Jewish people more especially after the overthrow of Assyria in the reign of Hezekiah. But there is no ground for conjecturing either Isaiah or Hezekiah to be the composer of this Psalm. If **עוֹלָם** in v. 7 signified the world (Hitzig), then he would be (vid., Psa. 24: 9) one of the latest among the Old Testament writers; but it has the same meaning here that it has everywhere else in Old Testament Hebrew.

In the Greek Church this Psalm is called **Ψαλμὸς ἀναστάσεως**; the LXX gives it this inscription, perhaps with reference to v. 12, **ἐξήγαγες ἡμᾶς εἰς ἀναψυχήν**.

*Psa. 66: 1-4.* The phrase **שִׁים כְּבוֹד לְ** signifies “to give glory to God” in other passages (Jos. 7:19, Isa. 42:12), here with a second accusative, either

- (1) if we take **תְּהַלְתּוּ** as an accusative of the object: *facite laudationem ejus gloriam = gloriosam* (Maurer and others), or
- (2) if we take **כְּבוֹד** as an accusative of the object and the former word as an accusative of the predicate: *reddite honorem laudem ejus* (Hengstenberg), or

(3) also by taking **תהלתו** as an apposition: *reddite honorem, scil. laudem ejus* (Hupfeld).

We prefer the middle rendering: give glory as His praise, i.e., to Him as or for praise. It is unnecessary, with Hengstenberg, to render: How terrible art Thou in Thy works! in that case **אִתָּהּ** ought not to be wanting. **מַעֲשֵׂיךָ** might more readily be singular (Hupfeld, Hitzig); but these forms with the softened *Jod* of the root dwindle down to only a few instances upon closer consideration. The singular of the predicate (what a terrible affair) here, as frequently, e.g., Psa. 119:137, precedes the plural designating things. The song into which the Psalmist here bids the nations break forth, is essentially one with the song of the heavenly harpers in Rev. 15: 3 f., which begins, **Μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά τὰ ἔργα σου**.

**Psa. 66: 5-7**. Although the summons: Come and see... (borrowed apparently from Psa. 46: 9), is called forth by contemporary manifestations of God's power, the consequences of which now lie open to view, the rendering of v. 6c, "then will we rejoice in Him," is nevertheless unnatural, and, rightly looked at, neither grammar nor the matter requires it. For since **שׁוּב** in this passage is equivalent to **שָׂא**, and the future after **שָׂא** takes the signification of an aorist; and since the cohortative form of the future can also (e.g., after **אִם**, Psa. 73: 7, and in clauses having a hypothetical sense) be referred to the past, and does sometimes at least occur where the writer throws himself back into the past (2Sa. 22:38), the rendering: Then did we rejoice in Him, cannot be assailed on syntactical grounds. On the "we," cf. Jos. 5: 1, *Chethib*, Hos. 12: 5 [4]. The church of all ages is a unity, the separate parts being jointly involved in the whole. The church here directs the attention of all the world to the mighty deeds of God at the time of the deliverance from Egypt, viz., the laying of the Red Sea and of Jordan dry, inasmuch as it can say in ver. 7, by reason of that which it has experienced in the present, that the sovereign power of God is ever the same: its God rules in His victorious might **עֲלָם**, i.e., not "over the world," because that ought to be **בְּעֲלָם**, but "in eternity" (accusative of duration, as in Psa. 89: 2 f., 45: 7), and therefore, as in the former days, so also in all time to come. His eyes keep searching watch among the peoples; the rebellious, who struggle against His yoke and persecute His people, had better not rise, it may go ill with them. The *Chethib* runs **קְרִימוּ**, for which the *Kerî* is **קְרוּמוּ**. The meaning remains the same; **קְרִימוּ** can (even without **קָדַשׁ**, ראש, קָדַשׁ, Psa. 65: 5) mean "to practise exaltation," *superbire*. By means of **לְמוֹ** this proud bearing is designated as being egotistical, and as unrestrainedly boastful. Only let them not imagine themselves secure in their arrogance!

There is One more exalted, whose eye nothing escapes, and to whose irresistible might whatever is not conformed to His gracious will succumbs.

*Psa. 66: 8-12.* The character of the event by which the truth has been verified that the God who redeemed Israel out of Egypt still ever possesses and exercises to the full His ancient sovereign power, is seen from this reiterated call to the peoples to share in Israel's *Gloria*. God has averted the peril of death and overthrow from His people: He has put their soul in life (בְּחַיִּים, like בִּישָׁע in Psa. 12: 6), i.e., in the realm of life; He has not abandoned their foot to tottering unto overthrow (מוֹט the substantive, as in Psa. 121: 3; cf. the reversed construction in Psa. 55:23). For God has cast His people as it were into a smelting-furnace or fining-pot in order to purify and to prove them by suffering; — this is a favourite figure with Isaiah and Jeremiah, but is also found in Zec. 13: 9, Mal. 3: 3. Eze. 19: 9 is decisive concerning the meaning of מְצוּדָה, where הֵבִיא בַּמְצוּדוֹת signifies “to bring into the holds or prisons;” besides, the figure of the fowling-net (although this is also called מְצוּדָה as well as מְצוּדָה) has no footing here in the context. מְצוּדָה (vid., Psa. 18: 3) signifies *specula*, and that both a natural and an artificial watch-post on a mountain; here it is the mountain-hold or prison of the enemy, as a figure of the total loss of freedom. The laying on of a heavy burden mentioned by the side of it in v. 11*b* also accords well with this. מוֹעֵקָה, a being oppressed, the pressure of a burden, is a *Hophal* formation, like מִטָּה, a being spread out, Isa. 8: 8; cf. the similar masculine forms in Psa. 69: 3, Isa. 8:13; 14: 6; 29: 3. The loins are mentioned because when carrying heavy loads, which one has to stoop down in order to take up, the lower spinal region is called into exercise. אֲנוּשׁ is frequently (Psa. 9:20 f., 10:18; 56: 2, Isa. 51:12, 2Ch. 14:10) the word used for tyrants as being wretched mortals, perishable creatures, in contrast with their all the more revolting, imperious, and self-deified demeanour. God so ordered it, that “wretched men” rode upon Israel's head. Or is it to be interpreted: He caused them to pass over Israel (cf. Psa. 129: 3, Isa. 51:23)? It can scarcely mean this, since it would then be *in dorso nostro*, which the Latin versions capriciously substitute. The preposition לְ instead of אֶל is used with reference to the phrase יָשַׁב לְ: sitting upon Israel's head, God caused them to ride along, so that Israel was not able to raise its head freely, but was most ignominiously wounded in its self-esteem. Fire and water are, as in Isa. 43: 2, a figure of vicissitudes and perils of the most extreme character. Israel was nigh to being burnt up and drowned, but God led it forth לְרֵוָה, to an abundant fulness, to abundance and superabundance of prosperity. The LXX, which renders εἰς ἀναψυχήν (Jerome absolutely: *in refrigerium*), has read לְרֵוָה; Symmachus, εἰς εὐψυχῶσαν, probably reading לְרֵוָה (Psa. 119:45; 18:20).

Both give a stronger antithesis. But the state of straitness or oppression was indeed also a state of privation.

**Psa. 66:13-15.** From this point onwards the poet himself speaks, but, as the diversity and the kind of the sacrifices show, as being a member of the community at large. The **עולות** stand first, the gifts of adoring homage; **ב** is the *Beth* of the accompaniment, as in Lev. 16: 3, 1Sa. 1:24, cf. Heb. 9:25. “My vows” refer more especially to **שְׁלָמֵי נֶדֶר**. **פְּצָה פֶּה** also occurs elsewhere of the involuntary vowing to do extraordinary things urged from one by great distress (Jud. 11:35). **אֲשֶׁר** is an accusative of the object relating to the vows, *quae aperuerunt = aperiendo nuncupaverunt labia mea* (Geier). In v. 15 **עָשָׂה**, used directly (like the Aramaic and Phoenician **עבד**) in the signification “to sacrifice” (Exo. 29:36-41, and frequently), alternates with **הֶעֱלָה**, the synonym of **הִקְטִיר**. The sacrifices to be presented are enumerated. **מִיָּחִים** (incorrect for **מִמָּחִים**) are marrowy, fat lambs; lambs and bullocks (**בָּקָר**) have the most universal appropriation among the animals that were fit for sacrifices. The ram (**אֵיל**), on the contrary, is the animal for the whole burnt-offering of the high priest, of the princes of the tribes, and of the people; and appears also as the animal for the shelamim only in connection with the shelamim of Aaron, of the people, of the princes of the tribes, and, in Num. 6:14, of the Nazarite. The younger he-goat (**אֶתְוֹד**) is never mentioned as an animal for the whole burnt-offering; but, indeed, as an animal for the shelamim of the princes of the tribes in Num. 7. It is, therefore, probable that the shelamim which were to be offered in close connection with the whole burnt-offerings are introduced by **עַם**, so that **קִמְרַת** signifies the fat portions of the shelamim upon the altar smoking in the fire. The mention of “rams” renders it necessary that we should regard the poet as here comprehending himself among the people when he speaks thus.

**Psa. 66:16-20.** The words in v. 16 are addressed in the widest extent, as in vv. 5 and 2, to all who fear God, wheresoever such are to be found on the face of the earth. To all these, for the glory of God and for their own profit, he would gladly relate what God has made him to experience. The individual-looking expression **לְנַפְשִׁי** is not opposed to the fact of the occurrence of a marvellous answering of prayer, to which he refers, being one which has been experienced by him in common with the whole congregation. He cried unto God with his mouth (that is to say, not merely silently in spirit, but audibly and importunately), and a hymn (**רִנָּה**, <sup>f231</sup> something that rises, collateral form to **רִנָּה**, as **עָלַל** and **שָׁבַב** to **עוֹלַל** and **שׁוֹבַב**) was under my tongue; i.e., I became also at once so sure of my being heard, that I even had the song of praise in readiness (vid., 10: 7), with which I had determined to break forth

when the help for which I had prayed, and which was assured to me, should arrive. For the purpose of his heart was not at any time, in contradiction to his words, אָנִי, God-aborred vileness or worthlessness; אָנִי with the accusative, as in Gen. 20:10, Psa. 37:37: to aim at, or design anything, to have it in one's eye. We render: If I had aimed at evil in my heart, the Lord would not hear; not: He would not have heard, but: He would not on any occasion hear. For a hypocritical prayer, coming from a heart which has not its aim sincerely directed towards Him, He does not hear. The idea that such a heart was not hidden behind his prayer is refuted in v. 19 from the result, which is of a totally opposite character. In the closing doxology the accentuation rightly takes תְּפִלְתִּי וְחַסְדּוֹ as belonging together. Prayer and mercy stand in the relation to one another of call and echo. When God turns away from a man his prayer and His mercy, He commands him to be silent and refuses him a favourable answer. The poet, however, praises God that He has deprived him neither of the joyfulness of prayer nor the proof of His favour. In this sense Augustine makes the following practical observation on this passage: *Cum videris non a te amotam deprecationem tuam, securus esto, quia non est a te amota misericordia ejus.*

## Psalm 67

### HARVEST THANKSGIVING SONG

*67: 2 ELOHIM be merciful unto us and bless us,  
May He cause His face to shine among us — (Sela)*

*67: 3 That Thy way may be known upon earth,  
Among all the heathen Thy salvation.*

*67: 4 Peoples shall praise Thee, Elohim,  
The peoples shall praise Thee, all of them.*

*67: 5 Nations shall rejoice and shout for joy,  
For Thou wilt judge peoples in uprightness,  
And the nations upon earth Thou wilt lead. (Sela)*

*67: 6 Peoples shall praise Thee, Elohim,  
The peoples shall praise Thee, all of them.*

*67: 7 The earth hath yielded her fruit,  
Elohim our God doth bless us.*

*67: 8 Elohim shall bless us,  
And all the ends of the earth shall fear Him.*

*Psalm 67.* Like Psalm 65, this Psalm, inscribed *To the Precentor*, with accompaniment of stringed instruments, a song-Psalm (מְזֻמָּר שִׁיר), also

celebrates the blessing upon the cultivation of the ground. As Psalm 65 contemplated the corn and fruits as still standing in the fields, so this Psalm contemplates, as it seems, the harvest as already gathered in, in the light of the redemptive history. Each plentiful harvest is to Israel a fulfilment of the promise given in Lev. 26: 4, and a pledge that God is with His people, and that its mission to the whole world (of peoples) shall not remain unaccomplished. This mission-tone referring to the end of God's work here below is unfortunately lost in the church's closing strain, "God be gracious and merciful unto us," but it sounds all the more distinctly and sweetly in Luther's hymn, "*Es woll uns Gott genädig sein*," throughout.

There are seven stanzas: twice three two-line stanzas, having one of three lines in the middle, which forms the clasp or spangle of the septiad, a circumstance which is strikingly appropriate to the fact that this Psalm is called "the Old Testament Paternoster" in some of the old expositors. <sup>f232</sup>

The second half after the three-line stanza begins in v. 6 exactly as the first closed in v. 4. **יְבָרְכֵנוּ** is repeated three times, in order that the whole may bear the impress of the blessing of the priest, which is threefold.

*Psa. 67: 2, 3.* The Psalm begins (v. 2) with words of the priest's benediction in Num. 6:24-26. By **אֲרַנּוּ** the church desires for itself the unveiled presence of the light-diffusing loving countenance of its God. Here, after the echo of the holiest and most glorious benediction, the music strikes in. With v. 3 the *Beracha* passes over into a *Tephilla*. **לְדָאֵת** is conceived with the most general subject: that one may know, that may be known Thy way, etc. The more graciously God attests Himself to the church, the more widely and successfully does the knowledge of this God spread itself forth from the church over the whole earth. They then know His **דְּרָךְ**, i.e., the progressive realization of His counsel, and His **יְשׁוּעָה**, the salvation at which this counsel aims, the salvation not of Israel merely, but of all mankind.

*Psa. 67: 4, 5.* Now follows the prospect of the entrance of all peoples into the kingdom of God, who will then praise Him in common with Israel as their God also. His judging (**שֹׁפֵט**) in this instance is not meant as a judicial punishment, but as a righteous and mild government, just as in the christological parallels *Psa. 72:12 f.*, *Isa. 11: 3 f.* **מִיֶּשֶׁר** in an ethical sense for **מִישְׁרִים**, as in *Psa. 45: 7*, *Isa. 11: 4*, *Mal. 2: 6*. **הַנְּחָה** as in *31: 4* of gracious guidance (otherwise than in *Job. 12:23*).

*Psa. 67: 6-8.* The joyous prospect of the conversion of heathen, expressed in the same words as in v. 4, here receives as its foundation a joyous event of the

present time: the earth has just yielded its fruit (cf. Psa. 85:13), the fruit that had been sown and hoped for. This increase of corn and fruits is a blessing and an earnest of further blessing, by virtue of which (Jer. 33: 9, Isa. 60: 3; cf. on the contrary Joe. 2:17) it shall come to pass that all peoples unto the uttermost bounds of the earth shall reverence the God of Israel. For it is the way of God, that all the good that He manifests towards Israel shall be for the well-being of mankind.

## **Psalm 68**

### **HYMN OF WAR AND VICTORY IN THE STYLE OF DEBORAH**

*68: 2 LET Elohim arise, let His enemies be scattered,  
And let those who hate Him flee before His face.*

*68: 3 As smoke is driven away, do Thou drive them away;  
As wax melteth before the fire,  
Let the wicked perish before Elohim.*

*68: 4 And let the righteous rejoice, let them exult before Elohim,  
And let them be glad with joy.*

*68: 5 Sing unto Elohim, harp His name,  
Pave a highway for Him who rideth along through the steppes;  
Jāh is His name, and exult ye before Him.*

*68: 6 A Father of the fatherless and an Advocate of the widows  
Is Elohim in His holy habitation.*

*68: 7 Elohim maketh a household for the solitary,  
He leadeth forth prisoners into prosperity;  
Yet the rebellious abide in a land of drought.*

*68: 8 Elohim, when Thou wentest forth before Thy people,  
When Thou didst march along in the wilderness — (Sela)*

*68: 9 The earth shook,  
The heavens also dropped before Elohim,  
Yon Sinai before Elohim, the God of Israel.*

*68:10 With plentiful rain didst Thou, Elohim, water Thine inheritance,  
And when it was parched, THOU hast confirmed it.*

*68:11 Thy creatures have settled down therein,  
Thou didst provide with Thy goodness for the poor, Elohim.*

*68:12 The Lord will sound forth the mandate;  
Of the women who herald victory there is a great army.*



*68:13 The kings of hosts shall flee, shall flee,  
And she that tarrieth at home shall divide the spoil.*

*68:14 If ye encamp among the sheep-folds,  
The dove's wings are covered with silver  
And her feathers with glistening gold.*

*68:15 When the Almighty scattereth kings therein,  
It becometh snow-white upon Zalmon.*

*68:16 A mountain of Elohim is the mountain of Bashan,  
A mountain full of peaks is the mountain of Bashan.*

*68:17 Why look ye enviously, ye many-peaked mountains,  
Upon the mountain which Elohim hath chosen, to dwell thereon?  
Yea, Jahve will dwell [there] for ever.*

*68:18 The war-chariots of Elohim are myriads, a thousand thousands,  
The Lord is among them, it is a Sinai in holiness.*

*68:19 Thou hast ascended up to the height, Thou hast led captives captive,  
Thou hast received gifts among men,  
Even from the rebellious, that Jāh Elohim might dwell [there].*

*68:20 Blessed be the Lord:  
Day by day doth He bear our burden,  
He, God, is our salvation. (Sela)*

*68:21 He, God, is to us a God for deeds of deliverance,  
And Jahve the Lord hath ways of escape for death.*

*68:22 Yea, Elohim will smite the head of His enemies,  
The hairy scalp of him who stalketh along in his trespasses.*

*68:23 The Lord hath said: Out of Bashan will I bring back,  
I will bring back out of the depths of the sea,*

*68:24 That thou mayest bathe thy foot in blood,  
That the tongue of thy dogs may have its share of the enemy.*

*68:25 They behold Thy splendid procession, Elohim,  
The splendid procession of my God, my King in holiness.*

*68:26 Before went the singers, behind the players on stringed instruments,  
In the midst of damsels striking timbrels.*

*68:27 In the choirs of the congregation bless ye Elohim,  
The Lord, ye who are out of the fountain of Israel.*

*68:28 There is Benjamin the youngest, their ruler;  
The princes of Judah — their motley band,  
The princes of Zebulun, the princes of Naphtali.*

*68:29 Thy God hath commanded thy supreme power —  
Uphold in power, Elohim, what Thou hast wrought for us! —*

*68:30 From Thy temple above Jerusalem  
Let kings present offerings into Thee.*

*68:31 Threaten the wild beast of the reed,  
the troops of bulls with the calves of the people,  
That they may prostrate themselves with ingots of silver! —  
He hath scattered the peoples that delight in wars.*

*68:32 Magnates come out of Egypt,  
Cush — quickly do his hands stretch out unto Elohim.*

*68:33 Ye kingdoms of the earth, sing unto Elohim,  
Praising the Lord with stringed instruments — (Sela)*

*68:34 To Him who rideth in the heaven of heavens of the primeval time —  
Lo, He made Himself heard with His voice, a mighty voice.*

*68:35 Ascribe ye might unto Elohim!  
Over Israel is His majesty,  
And His omnipotence in the heights of the heavens.*

*68:36 Terrible is Elohim out of thy sanctuaries;  
“The God of Israel giveth might and abundant strength to the people!”  
Blessed be Elohim!*

*Psalm 68.* Is it not an admirably delicate tact with which the collector makes the *מזמור שִׁיר* 68 follow upon the *מזמור שִׁיר* 67? The latter began with the echo of the benediction which Moses puts into the mouth of Aaron and his sons, the former with a repetition of those memorable words in which, at the breaking up of the camp, he called upon Jahve to advance before Israel (Num. 10:35). “It is in reality,” says Hitzig of Psalm 68, “no easy task to become master of this Titan.” And who would not agree with him in this remark? It is a Psalm in the style of Deborah, stalking along upon the highest pinnacle of hymnic feeling and recital; all that is most glorious in the literature of the earlier period is concentrated in it: Moses’ memorable words, Moses’ blessing, the prophecies of Balaam, the Deuteronomy, the Song of Hannah re-echo here. But over and above all this, the language is so bold and so peculiarly its own, that we meet with no less than thirteen words that do not occur anywhere else. It is so distinctly Elohimic in its impress, that the simple *Elohim* occurs twenty-three times; but in addition to this, it is as though the whole cornucopia of divine names were poured out upon it: *יְהוָה* in v. 17; *אֲדֹנָי* six times; *הָאֵל* twice; *שֶׁנִּי* in v. 15; *יְהוָה* in v. 5; *יְהוָה אֲדֹנָי* in v. 21; *יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים* in v. 19; so that this Psalm among all the Elohimic Psalms is the most resplendent. In connection with the great difficulty that is involved in it,

it is no wonder that expositors, more especially the earlier expositors, should differ widely in their apprehension of it as a whole or in separate parts. This circumstance has been turned to wrong account by Ed. Reuss in his essay, "*Der acht-und-sechzigste Psalm, Ein Denkmal exegetischer Noth und Kunst zu Ehren unsrer ganzen Zunft*, Jena, 1851," for the purpose of holding up to ridicule the uncertainty of Old Testament exegesis, as illustrated in this Psalm.

The Psalm is said, as Reuss ultimately decides, to have been written between the times of Alexander the Great and the Maccabees, and to give expression to the wish that the Israelites, many of whom were far removed from Palestine and scattered abroad in the wide earth, might soon be again united in their fatherland. But this apprehension rests entirely upon violence done to the exegesis, more particularly in the supposition that in v. 23 the exiles are the persons intended by those whom God will bring back. Reuss makes out those who are brought back out of Bashan to be the exiles in Syria, and those who are brought back out of the depths of the sea he makes out to be the exiles in Egypt. He knows nothing of the remarkable concurrence of the mention of the Northern tribes (including Benjamin) in v. 28 with the Asaphic Psalms: Judah and Benjamin, to his mind, is Judaea; and Zebulun and Naphtali, Galilee in the sense of the time after the return from exile. The "wild beast of the reed" he correctly takes to be an emblem of Egypt; but he makes use of violence in order to bring in a reference to Syria by the side of it. Nevertheless Olshausen praises the services Reuss has rendered with respect to this Psalm; but after incorporating two whole pages of the "*Denkmal*" in his commentary he cannot satisfy himself with the period between Alexander and the Maccabees, and by means of three considerations arrives, in this instance also, at the common refuge of the Maccabean period, which possesses such an irresistible attraction for him.

In opposition to this transplanting of the Psalm into the time of the Maccabees we appeal to Hitzig, who is also quick-sighted enough, when there is any valid ground for it, in finding out Maccabean Psalms. He refers the Psalm to the victorious campaign of Joram against faithless Moab, undertaking in company with Jehoshaphat. Böttcher, on the other hand, sees in it a festal hymn of triumph belonging to the time of Hezekiah, which was sung antiphonically at the great fraternizing Passover after the return home of the young king from one of his expeditions against the Assyrians, who had even at that time fortified themselves in the country east of the Jordan (Bashan). Thenius (following the example of Rödiger) holds a different view. He knows the situation so very definitely, that he thinks it high time that the discussion concerning this Psalm was brought to a close. It is a song composed to inspire the army in the presence of the battle which Josiah undertook against Necho, and the prominent, hateful character in v. 22 is Pharaoh with his lofty artificial

adornment of hair upon his shaven head. It is, however, well known what a memorably tragical issue for Israel that battle had; the Psalm would therefore be a memorial of the most lamentable disappointment.

All these and other recent expositors glory in hot advancing any proof whatever in support of the inscribed לָדָד. And yet there are two incidents in David's life, with regard to which the Psalm ought first of all to be accurately looked at, before we abandon this לָדָד to the winds of conjecture. The first is the bringing home of the Ark of the covenant to Zion, to which, e.g., Franz Volkmar Reinhard (in vol. ii. of the *Velthusen Commentationes Theol.* 1795), Stier, and Hofmann refer the Psalm. But the manner in which the Psalm opens with a paraphrase of Moses' memorable words is at once opposed to this; and also the impossibility of giving unity to the explanation of its contents by such a reference is against it. Jahve has long since taken up His abode upon the holy mountain; the poet in this Psalm, which is one of the Psalms of war and victory describes how the exalted One, who now, however, as in the days of old, rides along through the highest heavens at the head of His people, casts down all powers hostile to Him and to His people, and compels all the world to confess that the God of Israel rules from His sanctuary with invincible might. A far more appropriate occasion is, therefore, to be found in the Syro-Ammonitish war of David, in which the Ark was taken with them by the people (2Sa. 11:11); and the hymn was not at that time first of all composed when, at the close of the war, the Ark was brought back to the holy mountain (Hengstenberg, Reinke), but when it was set in motion from thence at the head of Israel as they advanced against the confederate kings and their army (2Sa. 10: 6). The war lasted into the second year, when a second campaign was obliged to be undertaken in order to bring it to an end; and this fact offers at least a second possible period for the origin of the Psalm. It is clear that in vv. 12-15, and still more clear that in vv. 20-24 (and from a wider point of view, vv. 29-35), the victory over the hostile kings is only hoped for, and in vv. 25-28, therefore, the pageantry of victory is seen as it were beforehand. It is the spirit of faith, which here celebrates beforehand the victory of Jahve, and sees in the single victory a pledge of His victory over all the nations of the earth. The theme of the Psalm, generalized beyond its immediate occasion, is the victory of the God of Israel over the world. Regarded as to the nature of its contents, the whole divides itself into two halves, vv. 2-19, 20-35, which are on the whole so distinct that the first dwells more upon the mighty deed God has wrought, the second upon the impressions it produces upon the church and upon the peoples of the earth; in both parts it is viewed now as future, now as past, inasmuch as the longing of prayer and the confidence of hope soar aloft to the height of prophecy, before which futurity lies as a fulfilled fact. The musical *Sela* occurs three times (vv. 8, 20, 33). These three *forte* passages

furnish important points of view for the apprehension of the collective meaning of the Psalm.

But is David after all the author of this Psalm? The general character of the Psalm is more Asaphic than Davidic (vid., *Habakkuk*, S. 122). Its references to Zalmon, to Benjamin and the Northern tribes, to the song of Deborah, and in general to the Book of Judges (although not in its present form), give it an appearance of being Ephraimitish. Among the Davidic Psalms it stands entirely alone, so that criticism is quite unable to justify the לָדָוִד. And if the words in v. 29a are addressed to the king, it points to some other poet than David. But is it to a contemporary poet? The mention of the sanctuary on Zion in vv. 30, 36, does not exclude such an one. Only the threatening of the “wild beast of the sedge” (v. 31) seems to bring us down beyond the time of David; for the inflammable material of the hostility of Egypt, which broke out into a flame in the reign of Rehoboam, was first gathering towards the end of Solomon’s reign. Still Egypt was never entirely lost sight of from the horizon of Israel; and the circumstance that it is mentioned in the first rank, where the submission of the kingdoms of this world to the God of Israel is lyrically set forth in the prophetic prospect of the future, need not astonish one even in a poet of the time of David. And does not v. 28 compel us to keep on this side of the division of the kingdom? It ought then to refer to the common expedition of Jehoram and Jehoshaphat against Moab (Hitzig), the indiscriminate celebration of which, however, was no suitable theme for the psalmist.

*Psa. 68: 2-7.* The Psalm begins with the expression of a wish that the victory of God over all His foes and the triumphant exultation of the righteous were near at hand. Ewald and Hitzig take יָקוּם אֱלֹהִים hypothetically: If God arise, He enemies will be scattered. This rendering is possible in itself so far as the syntax is concerned, but here everything conspires against it; for the futures in vv. 2-4 form an unbroken chain; then a glance at the course of the Psalm from v. 20 onwards shows that the circumstances of Israel, under which the poet writes, urged forth the wish: let God arise and humble His foes; and finally the primary passage, Num. 10:35, makes it clear that the futures are the language of prayer transformed into the form of the wish. In v. 3 the wish is addressed directly to God Himself, and therefore becomes petition. הִנְדִּיף is inflected (as *vice versâ* יִרְדֹּף, Psa. 7: 6, from יִרְדֹּף) from הִנְדִּיף (like הִנְתִּין, Jer. 32: 4); it is a violation of all rule in favour of the conformity of sound (cf. הִקְצוֹת for הִקְצוֹת, Lev. 14:43, and *supra* on Psa. 51: 6) with הִנְדִּיף, the object of which is easily supplied (*dispellas*, sc. *hostes tuos*), and is purposely omitted in order to direct attention more steadfastly to the omnipotence which to every creature is so irresistible. Like smoke, wax (הִנְנֵג, root דָּג, דָּק, Sanscrit *tak*, to shoot past, to run, Zend *tak’*, whence *vitak’ina*, dissolving, Neo-Persic *gudâchten*;

causative: to cause to run in different directions = to melt or smelt) is an emblem of human feebleness. As Bakiuds observes, *Si creatura creaturam non fert, quomodo creatura creatoris indignantis faciem ferre possit?* The wish expressed in v. 4 forms the obverse of the preceding. The expressions for joy are heaped up in order to describe the transcendency of the joy that will follow the release from the yoke of the enemy. לְפָנָי is expressively used in alternation with מִפָּנָי in vv. 2, 3: by the wrathful action, so to speak, that proceeds from His countenance [just as the heat radiating from the fire melts the wax] the foes are dispersed, whereas the righteous rejoice before His gracious countenance.

As the result of the challenge that has been now expressed in vv. 2-4, Elohim, going before His people, begins His march; and in v. 5 an appeal is made to praise Him with song, His name with the music of stringed instrument, and to make a way along which He may ride בְּעֶרְבוֹת. In view of v. 34 we cannot take עֶרְבוֹת, as do the Targum and Talmud (*B. Chagiga* 12*b*), as a name of one of the seven heavens, a meaning to which, apart from other considerations, the verb עָרַב, to be effaced, confused, dark, is not an appropriate stem-word; but it must be explained according to Isa. 40: 3. There Jahve calls in the aid of His people, here He goes forth at the head of His people; He rides through the steppes in order to fight against the enemies of His people. Not merely the historical reference assigned to the Psalm by Hitzig, but also the one adopted by ourselves, admits of allusion being made to the “steppes of Moab;” for the way to *Médebâ*, where the Syrian mercenaries of the Ammonites had encamped (1Ch. 19: 7), lay through these steppes, and also the way to Rabbath Ammon (2Sa. 10: 7 f.). סָלוּ calls upon them to make a way for Him, the glorious, invincible King (cf. Isa. 57:14; 62:10); סָלַל signifies to cast up, heap up or pave, viz., a raised and suitable street or highway, Symmachus καταστρώσατε. He who thus rides along makes the salvation of His people His aim: “*Jah* is His name, therefore shout with joy before Him.” The Beth in בְּיָהּ (Symmachus, Quinta: ἰα) is the *Beth essentiae*, which here, as in Isa. 26: 4, stands beside the subject: His name is (exists) in יָהּ, i.e., His essential name is יָהּ, His self-attestation, by which He makes Himself capable of being known and named, consists in His being the God of salvation, who, in the might of free grace, pervades all history. This Name is a fountain of exultant rejoicing to His people.

This Name is exemplificatively unfolded in vv. 6 f. The highly exalted One, who sits enthroned in the heaven of glory, rules in all history here below and takes an interest in the lowliest more especially, in all circumstances of their lives following after His own to succour them. He takes the place of a father to

the orphan. He takes up the cause of the widow and contests it to a successful issue. Elohim is one who makes the solitary or isolated to dwell in the house; **בֵּיתָהּ** with *He locale*, which just as well answers the question where? as whither? **בֵּית**, a house = family bond, is the opposite of **יְחִיד**, *solitarius*, recluse, Psa. 25:16. Dachselt correctly renders it, *in domum, h.e. familiam numerosam durabilemque eos ut patres-familias plantabit*. He is further One who brings forth (out of the dungeon and out of captivity) those who are chained into abundance of prosperity. **בְּנִשְׂרוֹת**, occurring only here, is a *pluralet*. from **בָּשָׂר**, synonym **אֲשֶׁר**, to be straight, fortunate. V. 7c briefly and sharply expresses the reverse side of this His humanely condescending rule among mankind. **אֵי** is here (cf. Gen. 9: 4, Lev. 11: 4) restrictive or adversative (as is more frequently the case with **אֲכַן**); and the preterite is the preterite of that which is an actual matter of experience. The **סוֹרְרִים**, i.e., (not from **סוֹר**, the apostate ones, Aquila **ἀφιστάμενοι**, but as in 66: 7, from **סָרַר**) the rebellious, Symmachus **ἀπειθείς**, who were not willing to submit to the rule of so gracious a God, had ever been excluded from these proofs of favour. These must inhabit **צָחָהּ** (accusative of the object), a sun-scorched land; from **חָצָה**, to be dazzlingly bright, sunny, dried or parched up. They remain in the desert without coming into the land, which, fertilized by the waters of grace, is resplendent with a fresh verdure and with rich fruits. If the poet has before his mind in connection with this the bulk of the people delivered out of Egypt, **ὦν τὰ κῶλα ἔπεσαν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ** (Heb. 3:17), then the transition to what follows is much more easily effected. There is, however, no necessity for any such intermediation. The poet had the march through the desert to Canaan under the guidance of Jahve, the irresistible Conqueror, in his mind even from the beginning, and now he expressly calls to mind that marvellous divine leading in order that the present age may take heart thereat.

**Psa. 68: 8-11.** In vv. 8 f. the poet repeats the words of Deborah (Jud. 5: 4 f.), and her words again go back to Deu. 33: 2, cf. Exo. 19:15 ff.; on the other hand, our Psalm is the original to Hab. 3. The martial verb **אָצַף** represents Elohim as, coming forth from His heavenly dwelling-place (Isa. 26:21), He places Himself at the head of Israel. The stately verb **צָאָד** represents Him as He accompanies the hosts of His people with the step of a hero confident of victory; and the terrible name for the wilderness, **יְשִׁמוֹן**, is designedly chosen in order to express the contrast between the scene of action and that which they beheld at that time. The verb to **יָזַה סִינַי** is easily supplied; Dachselt's rendering according to the accents is correct: *hic mons Sinai* (sc. *in specie ita tremuit*). The description fixes our attention upon Sinai as the central point of all revelations of God during the period of deliverance by the hand of Moses,

as being the scene of the most gloriously of them all (vid., on Hab. p. 136 f.). The majestic phenomena which proclaimed the nearness of God are distributed over the whole journeying, but most gloriously concentrated themselves at the giving of the Law of Sinai. The earth trembled throughout the extended circuit of this vast granite range, and the heavens dropped, inasmuch as the darkness of thunder clouds rested upon Sinai, pierced by incessant lightnings (Exo. 19). There, as the original passages describe it, Jahve met His people; He came from the east, His people from the west; there they found themselves together, and shaking the earth, breaking through the heavens, He gave them a pledge of the omnipotence which should henceforth defend and guide them. The poet has a purpose in view in calling Elohim in this passage “the God of Israel;” the covenant relationship of God to Israel dates from Sinai, and from this period onwards, by reason of the *Tôra*, He became Israel’s King (Deu. 33: 5). Since the statement of a fact of earlier history has preceded, and since the preterites alternate with them, the futures that follow in vv. 10, 11 are to be understood as referring to the synchronous past; but hardly so that v. 10 should refer to the miraculous supply of food, and more especially the rain of manna, during the journeyings through the wilderness. The giving of the Law from Sinai has a view to Israel being a settled, stationary people, and the deliverance out of the land of bondage only finds its completion in the taking and maintaining possession of the Land of Promise. Accordingly vv. 10, 11 refer to the blessing and protection of the people who had taken up their abode there.

The **נְחֻלָּה** of God (*genit. auctoris*, as in 2 Macc. 2: 4) is the land assigned by Him to Israel as an inheritance; and **גְּשֵׁם נְדָבוֹת** an emblem of the abundance of gifts which God has showered down upon the land since Israel took up its abode in it. **נְדָבָה** is the name given to a deed and gift springing from an inward impulse, and in this instance the intensive idea of richness and superabundance is associated therewith by means of the plural; **גְּשֵׁם נְדָבוֹת** is a shower-like abundance of good gifts descending from above. The *Hiphil* **יְהַנִּיף** here governs a double accusative, like the *Kal* in Pro. 7:17, in so far, that is, as **נַחֲלַתְךָ** is drawn to v. 10a; for the accentuation, in opposition to the Targum, takes **נַחֲלַתְךָ וְנִלְאָה** together: Thine inheritance and that the parched one (*Waw epexeget.* as in 1Sa. 28: 3, Amo. 3:11; 4:10). But this “and that” is devoid of aim; why should it not at once be read **הַנִּלְאָה**? The rendering of Böttcher, “Thy sickened and wearied,” is inadmissible, too, according to the present pointing; for it ought to be **נְחֻלַּתְךָ** or **נְחֻלָּתְךָ**. And with a suffix this *Niphil* becomes ambiguous, and more especially so in this connection, where the thought of **נְחֻלָּה**, an inherited possession, a heritage, lies so naturally at hand. **נְחֻלַּתְךָ** is therefore to be drawn to v. 10a, and v. 10b must begin with



הַלְּשָׁה, as in the LXX, καὶ ἡσθένησε, σὺ δὲ κατηρτίσω αὐτήν. It is true הַלְּשָׁה is not a hypothetical preterit equivalent to הַלְּשָׁתָה; but, as is frequently the case with the anarthrous participle (Ew. § 341, *b*), it has the value of a hypothetical clause: “and if it (Israel’s inheritance) were in a parched, exhausted condition (cf. the cognate root הִלָּךְ, Gen. 47:13), then hast Thou always made it again firm” (Psa. 8: 4, Exo. 15:17), i.e., strengthened, enlivened it. Even here the idea of the inhabitants is closely associated with the land itself; in v. 11 they are more especially thought of: “They creatures dwelt therein.” Nearly all modern expositors take הִתְּחַו either according to 2Sa. 23:11, 13 (cf. 1Ch. 11:15), in the signification tent-circle, ring-camp (root חוּ, Arab. *ḥw*, to move in a circle, to encircle, to compass), or in the signification of Arab. *ḥayy* (from Arab. *ḥayiya* = הִיָּי, הִתְּחַו), a race or tribe, i.e., a collection of living beings (cf. הִיָּי, 1Sa. 18:18). But the Asaphic character of this Psalm, which is also manifest in other points, is opposed to this rendering. This style of Psalm is fond of the comparison of Israel to a flock, so that also in 74:19 חֵית עֲנִיָּךְ signifies nothing else than “the creatures [*Getheir*, collective] of Thy poor, Thy poor creatures.” This use of הִתְּחַו is certainly peculiar; but not so remarkable as if by the “creatures of God” we had to understand, with Hupfeld, the quails (Exo. 16). The avoiding of בְּהִמָּה on account of the idea of *brutum* (Psa. 73:22) which is inseparable from this word, is sufficient to account for it; in חֵיהָ, ζῷον, there is merely the notion of moving life. We therefore are to explain it according to Mic. 7:14, where Israel is called a flock dwelling in a wood in the midst of Carmel: God brought it to pass, that the flock of Israel, although sorely persecuted, nevertheless continued to inhabit the land. בְּפָה, as in v. 15, refers to Canaan. עֲנִי in v. 11*b* is the *ecclesia pressa* surrounded by foes on every side: Thou didst prepare for Thy poor with Thy goodness, Elohim, i.e., Thou didst regale or entertain Thy poor people with Thy possessions and Thy blessings. הַכִּיֵּן לְ, as in Gen. 43:16, 1Ch. 12:39, to make ready to eat, and therefore to entertain; טָנְבַה as in Psa. 65:12, טוֹב ה', Jer. 31:12. It would be quite inadmissible, because tautological, to refer תְּכִיֵּן to the land according to Psa. 65:10 (Ewald), or even to the desert (Olshausen), which the description has now left far behind.

**Psa. 68:12-15.** The futures that now follow are no longer to be understood as referring to previous history; they no longer alternate with preterites. Moreover the transition to the language of address in v. 14 shows that the poet here looks forth from his present time and circumstances into the future; and the introduction of the divine name אֱלֹהֵי, after *Elohim* has been used eleven times, is an indication of a new commencement. The prosperous condition in which God places His church by giving it the hostile powers of the world as a

spoil is depicted. The noun אָמַר, never occurring in the genitival relationship, and never with a suffix, because the specific character of the form would be thereby obliterated, always denotes an important utterance, more particularly God's word of promise (Psa. 77: 9), or His word of power (Hab. 3: 9), which is represented elsewhere as a mighty voice of thunder (Psa. 68:34, Isa. 30:30), or a trumpet-blast (Zec. 9:14); in the present instance it is the word of power by which the Lord suddenly changes the condition of His oppressed church. The entirely new state of things which this omnipotent behest as it were conjures into existence is presented to the mind in v. 12b: the women who proclaim the tidings of victory — a great host. Victory and triumph follow upon God's אָמַר, as upon His creative יָהִי. The deliverance of Israel from the army of Pharaoh, the deliverance out of the hand of Jabin by the defeat of Sisera, the victory of Jephthah over the Ammonites, and the victorious single combat of David with Goliath were celebrated by singing women. God's decisive word shall also go forth this time, and of the evangelists, like Miriam (Mirjam) and Deborah, there shall be a great host.

*Psa. 68:13.* describes the subject of this triumphant exultation. Hupfeld regards vv. 13-15 as the song of victory itself, the fragment of an ancient triumphal ode (*epinikion*) reproduced here; but there is nothing standing in the way that should forbid our here regarding these verses as a direct continuation of v. 12. The "hosts" are the numerous well-equipped armies which the kings of the heathen lead forth to the battle against the people of God. The unusual expression "kings of hosts" sounds very much like an ironically disparaging antithesis to the customary "Jahve of Hosts" (Böttcher). He, the Lord, interposes, and they are obliged to flee, staggering as they go, to retreat, and that, as the anadiplosis (cf. Jud. 5: 7; 19:20) depicts, far away, in every direction. The *fut. energicum* with its *ultima* -accentuation gives intensity to the pictorial expression. The victors then turn homewards laden with rich spoils. נָנוּת בַּיִת, here in a collective sense, is the wife who stays at home (Jud. 5:24) while the husband goes forth to battle. It is not: the ornament (נָנוּת) as in Jer. 6: 2) of the house, which Luther, with the LXX, Vulgate, and Syriac, adopts in his version, <sup>f233</sup> but: the dweller or homely one (cf. נָנוּת, a dwelling-lace, Job. 8: 6) of the house, ἡ οἰκουρός. The dividing of the spoil elsewhere belongs to the victors; what is meant here is the distribution of the portions of the spoil that have fallen to the individual victors, the further distribution of which is left for the housewife (Jud. 5:30 f., 2Sa. 1:24). Ewald now recognises in vv. 14 f. the words of an ancient song of victory; but v. 13b is unsuitable to introduce them. The language of address in v. 14 is the poet's own, and he here describes the condition of the people who are victorious by the help of their God, and who again dwell peaceably in the land after the war. אָמַר passes out

of the hypothetical signification into the temporal, as e.g., in Job. 14:14 (vid., on 59:16). The lying down among the sheep-folds (מִשְׁפָּתִים = שְׁפָתִים, cf. מִשְׁפָּט, מִשְׁפָּט, the staked-in folds or pens consisting of hurdles standing two by two over against one another) is an emblem of thriving peace, which (like vv. 8, 28) points back to Deborah's song, Jud. 5:16, cf. Gen. 49:14. Just such a time is now also before Israel, a time of peaceful prosperity enhanced by rich spoils. Everything shall glitter and gleam with silver and gold. Israel is God's turtle-dove, Psa. 74:19, cf. 56: 1, Hos. 7:11; 11:11. Hence the new circumstances of ease and comfort are likened to the varied hues of a dove disporting itself in the sun. Its wings are as though overlaid with silver (נִחְפָּה, not 3. *praet*, but *part. fem. Niph.* as predicate to בְּנִפְי, cf. 1Sa. 4:15, Mic. 4:11; 1: 9; Ew. § 317 *a*), therefore like silver wings (cf. Ovid, *Metam.* ii. 537: *Niveis argentea pennis Ales*); and its pinions with gold-green, <sup>f234</sup> and that, as the reduplicated form implies, with the iridescent or glistening hue of the finest gold (חֲרוֹץ, not dull, but shining gold).

Side by side with this bold simile there appears in v. 15 an equally bold but contrastive figure, which, turning a step or two backward, likewise vividly illustrates the results of their God-given victory. The suffix of בָּהַ refers to the land of Israel, as in Isa. 8:21; 65: 9. צְלָמוֹן, according to the usage of the language so far as it is now preserved to us, is not a common noun: deep darkness (Targum = צְלָמוֹת), it is the name of a mountain in Ephraim, the trees of which Abimelech transported in order to set fire to the tower of Shechem (Jud. 9:48 ff.). The Talmudic literature was acquainted with a river taking its rise there, and also somewhat frequently mentions a locality bearing a similar name to that of the mountain. The mention of this mountain may in a general way be rendered intelligible by the consideration that, like Shiloh (Gen. 49:10), it is situated about in the centre of the Holy Land. <sup>f235</sup>

הַשְּׁלִיג signifies to bring forth snow, or even, like Arab. *atlj*, to become snow-white; this *Hiph.* is not a word descriptive of colour, like הִלְבִּין. Since the protasis is בִּפְרֹשֶׁת, and not בִּפְרֹשֶׁת, תִּשְׁלַג is intended to be impersonal (cf. Psa. 50: 3, Amo. 4: 7, Mich.. 3: 6); and the voluntative form is explained from its use in apodoses of hypothetical protases (Ges. § 128, 2). It indicates the issue to which, on the supposition of the other, it must and shall come. The words are therefore to be rendered: then it snows on Zalmon; and the snowing is either an emblem of the glistening spoil that falls into their hands in such abundance, or it is a figure of the becoming white, whether from bleached bones (cf. Virgil, *Aen.* v. 865: *albi ossibus scopuli*; xii. 36: *campi ossibus albet*; Ovid, *Fasti* i. 558: *humanis ossibus albet humus*) or even from the naked corpses (2Sa. 1:19, אֶל-בְּמוֹתֵיךָ חָלָל). Whether we consider the point

of comparison to lie in the spoil being abundant as the flakes of snow, and like to the dazzling snow in brilliancy, or in the white pallid corpses, at any rate **בַּצְלָמוֹן** is not equivalent to **בְּבַצְלָמוֹן**, but what follows “when the Almighty scatters kings therein” is illustrated by Zalmon itself. In the one case Zalmon is represented as the battle-ground (cf. *Psa.* 110: 6), in the other (which better corresponds to the nature of a wooded mountain) as a place of concealment. The protasis **בַּפְּרֶשׁ וְגוֹ** favours the latter; for **פָּרֶשׁ** signifies to spread wide apart, to cause a compact whole — and the host of “the kings” is conceived of as such — to fly far asunder into many parts (*Zec.* 2:10, cf. the *Niph.* in *Eze.* 17:21). The hostile host disperses in all directions, and Zalmon glitters, as it were with snow, from the spoil that is dropped by those who flee. Homer also (*Iliad*, xix. 357-361) likens the mass of assembled helmets, shields, armour, and lances to the spectacle of a dense fall of snow. In this passage of the Psalm before us still more than in Homer it is the spectacle of the fallen and far seen glistening snow that also is brought into the comparison, and not merely that which is falling and that which covers everything (vid., *Iliad*, xii. 277 ff.). The figure is the pendant of the figure of the dove. <sup>f236</sup>

**Psa. 68:16-19.** This victory of Israel over the kings of the Gentiles gives the poet the joyful assurance that Zion is the inaccessible dwelling-place of Elohim, the God of the heavenly hosts. The mention of Zalmon leads him to mention other mountains. He uses the mountains of Bashan as an emblem of the hostile powers east of Jordan. These stand over against the people of God, as the mighty mountains of Bashan rising in steep, only slightly flattened peaks, to little hill-like Zion. In the land on this side Jordan the limestone and chalk formation with intermingled strata of sandstone predominates; the mountains of Bashan, however, are throughout volcanic, consisting of slag, lava, and more particularly basalt (*basanites*), which has apparently taken its name from Bashan (Basan). <sup>f237</sup>

As a basalt range the mountains of Bashan are conspicuous among other creations of God, and are therefore called “the mountain of Elohim:” the basalt rises in the form of a cone with the top lopped off, or even towers aloft like so many columns precipitous and rugged to sharp points; hence the mountains of Bashan are called **הַר גְּבַנִּים**, i.e., a mountain range (for **הַר**, as is well known, signifies both the single eminence and the range of summits) of many peaks = a many-peaked mountain; **גְּבַנִּי** is an adjective like **אַמְלֵל רַעְנָן**. With this boldly formed mass of rock so gloomily majestic, giving the impression of antiquity and of invincibility, when compared with the ranges on the other side of unstable porous limestone and softer formations, more particularly with Zion, it is an emblem of the world and its powers standing over against the people of God as a threatening and seemingly invincible colossus. The poet

asks these mountains of Bashan “why,” etc.? רָצַד is explained from the Arabic *r̥sd*, which, in accordance with its root Arab. *r̥s*, signifies to cleave firmly to a place (*firmiter inhaesit loco*), properly used of a beast of prey couching down and lying in wait for prey, of a hunter on the catch, and of an enemy in ambush; hence then: to lie in wait for, lurk, ἐνεδρεύειν, craftily, *insidiose* (whence *râsid*, a liar-in-wait, *tarraşsud*, an ambush), here: to regard enviously, *invidiose*. In Arabic, just as in this instance, it is construed as a direct transitive with an accusative of the object, whereas the original signification would lead one to look for a dative of the object (רָצַד לְ), which does also really occur in the common Arabic. *Olewejored* is placed by גַּבְנִים, but what follows is not, after all, the answer: “the mountain — Elohim has chosen it as the seat of His throne,” but הָהָר is the object of the interrogative clause: *Quare indiviose observatis, montes cacuminosi, hunc montem* (δεικτικῶς: that Zion yonder), *quem*, etc. (an attributive clause after the determinate substantive, as in Psa. 52: 9; 89:50, and many other instances, contrary to the Arabic rule of style). Now for the first time, in v. 17c, follows that which is boastfully and defiantly contrasted with the proud mountains: “Jahve will also dwell for ever;” not only that Elohim has chosen Zion as the seat of His throne, it will also continue to be the seat of His throne, Jahve will continue to dwell [there] for ever. Grace is superior to nature, and the church superior to the world, powerful and majestic as this may seem to be. Zion maintains its honour over against the mountains of Bashan.

*Psa. 68:18.* Ver. 18 now describes the kind of God, so to speak, who sits enthroned on Zion. The war-chariots of the heavenly hosts are here collectively called רָכָב, as in 2Ki. 6:17. רַבְתִּים (with *Dechî*, not *Olewejored*) is a dual from רַבּוֹת; and this is either an abstract noun equivalent to רַבּוֹת (from which comes the apocopated רַבּוֹ = רַבּוֹ), a myriad, consequently רַבְתִּים, two myriads, or a contracted plural out of רַבָּאוֹת, Ezer. 2:69, therefore the dual of a plural (like לוֹחוֹתִים, חוֹמוֹתִים): an indefinite plurality of myriads, and this again doubled (Hofmann). With this sense, in comparison with which the other is poor and meagre, also harmonies the expression שְׁנָאֵן אֲלֵפֵי, thousands of repetition (ἄπαξ λεγοµ. = שְׁנָיִן), i.e., thousands and again thousands, numberless, incalculable thousands; cf. the other and synonymous expression in Dan. 7:10. <sup>f238</sup>

It is intended to give a conception of the “hosts” which Elohim is to set in array against the “kings of hosts,” i.e., the martial power of the kingdom of the world, for the protection and for the triumph of His own people. Chariots of fire and horses of fire appear in 2Ki. 2:11; 6:17 as God’s retinue; in Dan. 7:10 it is angelic forces that thus make themselves visible. They surround Him on

both sides in many myriads, in countless thousands. אֲדֹנָי בָּם (with *Beth raphatum* <sup>f239</sup>), the Lord is among them (cf. Isa. 45:14), i.e., they are round about Him, He has them with Him (Jer. 41:15), and is present with them. It now becomes clear why Sinai is mentioned, viz., because at the giving of the Law Jahve revealed Himself on Sinai surrounded by “ten thousands of saints” (Deu. 33: 2 f.). But in what sense is it mentioned? Zion, the poet means, presents to the spiritual eye now a spectacle such as Sinai presented in the earlier times, although even Sinai does not belong to the giants among the mountains: <sup>f240</sup>

God halts there with His angel host as a protection and pledge of victory to His people. The conjectures בָּם מְסִינִי and בַּא מְסִינִי (Hitzig) are of no use to us. We must either render it: Sinai is in the sanctuary, i.e., as it were transferred into the sanctuary of Zion; or: a Sinai is it in holiness, i.e., it presents a spectacle such as Sinai presented when God by His appearing surrounded it with holiness. The use of the expression בְּקִדְשׁ in v. 25, Psa. 77:14, Exo. 15:11, decides in favour of the latter rendering.

With v. 19 the Psalm changes to prayer. According to Psa. 7: 8; 47: 6, לְמָרוֹם appears to be the height of heaven; but since in vv. 16-18 Zion is spoken of as Jahve’s inaccessible dwelling-place, the connection points to מְרוֹם צִיּוֹן, Jer. 31:12, cf. Eze. 17:23; 20:40. Moreover the preterites, which under other circumstances we should be obliged to take as prophetic, thus find their most natural explanation as a retrospective glance at David’s storming of “the stronghold of Zion” (2Sa. 5: 6-10) as the deed of Jahve Himself. But we should exceed the bounds of legitimate historical interpretation by referring בְּאָדָם לְקַחְתָּ מִתְּנוּת to the *Nethînim*, Ezr. 8:20 (cf. Num. 17: 6), those bondmen of the sanctuary after the manner of the Gibeonites, Jos. 9:23. The *Beth* of בָּאָדָם is not *Beth substantiae*: gifts consisting of men, so that these themselves are the thing given (J. D. Michaelis, Ewald), but the expression signifies *inter homines*, as in Psa. 78:60, 2Sa. 23: 3, Jer. 32:20. עֲלִיתָ לְמָרוֹם mentions the ascending of the triumphant One; שְׁבִיתָ שָׁבִי (cf. Jud. 5:12), the subjugation of the enemy; לְקַחְתָּ וּגְוֹ, the receiving of the gifts betokening homage and allegiance (Deu. 28:38, and frequently), which have been presented to Him since He has taken possession of Zion, — there He sits enthroned henceforth over men, and receives gifts like to the tribute which the vanquished bring to the victor. These He has received among men, and even (וְאִף), *atque etiam*, as in Lev. 26:39-42) among the rebellious ones. Or does a new independent clause perhaps begin with וְאִף סוֹבְרִים ? This point will be decided by the interpretation of the words that follow. Side by side with an infinitive with לְ

expressing a purpose, the one following noun (here a twofold name) has the assumption against it of being the subject. Is **יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים** then consequently the object, or is it an apostrophe? If it be taken as the language of address, then the definition of the purpose, **לְשַׁכֵּן**, ought, as not being suited to what immediately precedes, to refer back to **עֲלִיתָ**; but this word is too far off. Thus, therefore, the construction of **יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים** with **לְשַׁכֵּן**, as its object, is apparently intended (Ewald, Hupfeld): and even the rebellious are to dwell (Ges. § 132, rem. 1) with *Jāh Elohim* descend and dwell; the Syriac version: and even the rebellious will (“not” is probably to be crossed out) dwell before God (**אֱלֹהֵא קְדָם יַעֲמַדוּן קְדָם דְּעֻמָּא**); and Jerome: *insuper et non credentes inhabitare Dominum Deum*. Thus Theodoret also understands the versions of the LXX and of Aquila: “Thou hast not regarded their former disobedience, but notwithstanding their rebellion hast Thou continually been gracious to them **ἔως αὐτοὺς οἰκητήριον οἰκεῖον ἀπέφηνας.**” The expression, however, sounds too grand to have “the rebellious ones” as its subject, and more particularly in view of v. 7. Hence we take **וְאֵף סוֹרְרִים בְּאָדָם**: and even among rebellious ones (hast Thou received gifts), or: and even rebellious ones (give Thee); and **לְשַׁכֵּן** as a clause denoting the purpose, followed by the subject (as e.g., in 2Sa. 19:20): in order that *Jāh Elohim* may dwell, i.e., continue to dwell (as in v. 17, cf. Isa. 57:15).

The first half of the Psalm ends here. With the words *Jāh Elohim* the Psalm has reached a summit upon which it takes its rest. God has broken forth on behalf of His people against their enemies, and He now triumphs over and on behalf of men. The circumstance of Elohim arising is the raise of the final glory, and His becoming manifest as *Jāh Elohim* is its zenith. Paul (Eph. 4: 8) gathers up the meaning of v. 19, without following the LXX, in the following manner: **ἀναβάς εἰς ὕψος ἠγμάλωτευσεν αἰγμάλωσίαν καὶ ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.** Might he perhaps have had the Targum, with which the Syriac version agrees, in his mind at the time: **יְהִיבְתָא לְהוֹן מְתַנֵּן לְבְנֵי נִשְׂאָא**? He interprets in the light and in the sense of the history that realizes it. For the ascension of Elohim in its historical fulfilment is none other than the ascension of Christ. This latter was, however, as the Psalm describes it, a triumphal procession (Col. 2:15); and what the Victor has gained over the powers of darkness and of death, He has gained not for His own aggrandisement, but for the interests of men. It is **מְתַנּוֹת בְּאָדָם**, gifts which He now distributes among men, and which benefit even the erring ones. So the apostle takes the words, inasmuch as he changes **ἔλαβες** into **ἔδωκε**. The gifts are the *charismata* which come down from the Exalted One upon His church. <sup>f241</sup>

It is a distribution of gifts, a dispensing of blessing, which stands related to His victory as its primary cause; for as Victor He is also the possessor of blessing, His gifts are as it were the spoils of the victory He has gained over sin, death, and Satan. <sup>f242</sup>

The apostle is the more warranted in this interpretation, since Elohim in what follows is celebrated as the Lord who also brings out of death. This praise in the historical fulfilment applies to Him, who, as Theodoret observes on v. 21, has opened up the prison-house of death, which for us had no exit, and burst the brazen doors, and broken asunder the iron bolts, <sup>f243</sup> viz., to Jesus Christ, who now has the keys of Death and of Hades.

*Psa. 68:20-28.* Now begins the second circuit of the hymn. Comforted by the majestic picture of the future that he has beheld, the poet returns to the present, in which Israel is still oppressed, but yet not forsaken by God. The translation follows the accentuation, regular and in accordance with the sense, which has been restored by Baer after Heidenheim, viz., אֲדַנִּי has *Zarka*, and יַעֲמֵס לָנוּ *Olewejored* preceded by the sub- distinctive *Rebia parvum*; it is therefore: *Benedictus Dominator: quotidie bajulat nobis*, — with which the Targum, Rashi, and Kimchi agree. <sup>f244</sup>

עָמַס, like נָשָׂא and סָבַל, unites the significations to lay a burden upon one (Zec. 12: 3, Isa. 46: 1, 3), and to carry a burden; with אָל it signifies to lay a burden upon any one, here with לְ to take up a burden for any one and to bear it for him. It is the burden or pressure of the hostile world that is meant, which the Lord day by day helps His church to bear, inasmuch as He is mighty by His strength in her who of herself is so feeble. The divine name אָל, as being the subject of the sentence, is הָאֵל: God is our salvation. The music here again strikes in *forte*, and the same thought that is emphasized by the music in its turn, is also repeated in v. 21a with heightened expression: God is to us a God לְמַנְשְׁעוֹת, who grants us help in rich abundance. The *pluralet.* denotes not so much the many single proofs of help, as the riches of rescuing power and grace. In v. 21b לְמֹת לָנוּ corresponds to the לָנוּ; for it is not to be construed תְּנַצְּאוֹת לְמֹת: Jahve's, the Lord, are the outgoing to death (Böttcher), i.e., He can command that one shall not fall a prey to death. תְּנַצְּאוֹת, the parallel word to מוֹשְׁעוֹת, signifies, and it is the most natural meaning, the escapings; יָצָא, *evadere*, as in 1Sa. 14:41, 2Ki. 13: 5, Ecc. 7:18. In Jahve's power are means of deliverance for death, i.e., even for those who are already abandoned to death. With אָל a joyously assuring inference is drawn from that which God is to Israel. The parallelism of the correctly divided verse shows that רָאשׁ here, as in 110: 6, signifies *caput* in the literal sense, and not in the sense of



*princeps*. The hair-covered scalp is mentioned as a token of arrogant strength, and unhumiliated and impenitent pride, as in Deu. 32:42, and as the Attic *κομῶν* directly signifies to strut along, give one's self airs. The genitival construction is the same as in Isa. 28: 1b, 32:13b. The form of expression refers back to Num. 24:17, and so to speak inflects this primary passage very similarly to Jer. 48:45. If *קדקד שער* be an object, then *ראש* ought also to be a second object (that of the member of the body); the order of the words does not in itself forbid this (cf. Ps. 3: 8 with Deu. 33:11), but would require a different arrangement in order to avoid ambiguities.

In v. 23 the poet hears a divine utterance, or records one that he has heard: "From Bashan will I bring back, I will bring back from the eddies of the sea (from *צוּל* = *צָלַל*, to whiz, rattle; to whirl, eddy), i.e., the depths or abysses of the sea." Whom? When after the destruction of Jerusalem a ship set sail for Rome with a freight of distinguished and well-formed captives before whom was the disgrace of prostitution, they all threw themselves into the sea, comforting themselves with this passage of Scripture (*Gittin 57b*, cf. *Echa Rabbathi 66a*). They therefore took v. 23 to be a promise which has Israel as its object; <sup>f245</sup> but the clause expressing a purpose, v. 24, and the paraphrase in Amo. 9: 2 f., show that the foes of Israel are conceived of as its object. Even if these have hidden themselves in the most out-of-the-way places, God will fetch them back and make His own people the executioners of His justice upon them. The expectation is that the flight of the defeated foes will take a southernly direction, and that they will hide themselves in the primeval forests of Bashan, and still farther southward in the depths of the sea, i.e., of the Dead Sea (*םָ* as in Isa. 16: 8, 2Ch. 20: 2). Opposite to the hiding in the forests of the mountainous Bashan stands the hiding in the abyss of the sea, as the extreme of remoteness, that which is in itself impossible being assumed as possible. The first member of the clause expressing the purpose, v. 24, becomes more easy and pleasing if we read *תִּרְחֹץ* (LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate, *ut intingatur*), according to Ps. 58:11. So far as the letters are concerned, the conjecture *תִּרְחֹץ* (from which *תִּרְחֹץ*, according to Chajug', is transposed), after Isa. 63: 1, is still more natural (Hitzig): that thy foot may redden itself in blood. This is certainly somewhat tame, and moreover *תִּרְחֹץ* would be better suited to this rendering than *תִּרְחֹץ*. As the text now stands, *תִּרְחֹץ* <sup>f246</sup> is equivalent to *תִּרְחֹץ* (them, viz., the enemies), and *תִּרְחֹץ* is an adverbial clause (setting or plunging thy foot in blood). It is, however, also possible that *תִּרְחֹץ* is used like Arab. *machāḍa* (*vehementer commovere*): *ut concutias s. agites pedem tuam in sanguine*. Can it now be that in v. 24b from among the number of the enemies of the one who goes about glorying in his sins, the *רָשָׁע* *κατ' ἐξοχήν* (cf. Isa. 11: 4, Hab. 3:13, and other passages), is

brought prominently forward by מְנִהוּ? Hardly so; the absence of תִּלְקֵי (lambat) cannot be tolerated, cf. 1Ki. 21:19; 22:38. It is more natural, with Simonis, to refer מְנִהוּ back to לְשׁוֹן (a word which is usually fem., but sometimes perhaps is masc., Psa. 22:16, Pro. 26:28); and, since side by side with מִמֶּנּוּ only מְנִהוּ occurs anywhere else (Ew. § 263, b), to take it in the signification *pars ejus* (מִן from מִנָּה = מְנִהוּ, after the form גִּז, חֵן, קֶץ, of the same meaning as מְנִהוּ, מְנַת, Psa. 63:11), in favour of which Hupfeld also decides.

What is now described in vv. 25-28, is not the rejoicing over a victory gained in the immediate past, nor the rejoicing over the earlier deliverance at the Red Sea, but Israel's joyful celebration when it shall have experienced the avenging and redemptive work of its God and King. According to Psa. 77:14, Hab. 3: 6, הַלְיוֹת appears to be God's march against the enemy; but what follows shows that the *pompa magnifica* of God is intended, after He has overcome the enemy. Israel's festival of victory is looked upon as a triumphal procession of God Himself, the King, who governs in holiness, and has now subjugated and humbled the unholy world; בְּקִדְשׁ as in v. 18. The rendering "in the sanctuary" is very natural in this passage, but Exo. 15:11, Psa. 77:14, are against it. The subject of רָאוּ is all the world, more especially those of the heathen who have escaped the slaughter. The perfect signifies: they have seen, just as קָדְמוּ, they have occupied the front position. Singers head the procession, after them (אָחַר, <sup>f247</sup> an adverb as in Gen. 22:13, Exo. 5: 1) players upon citherns and harps (נָגְנִים, participle to נָגַן), and on either side virgins with timbrels (Spanish *adufe*); תּוֹפְפוֹת, apocopated *part. Poel* with the retention of *ē* (cf. שׁוֹקֵקָה, Psa. 107: 9), from תָּפַף, to strike the תָּף (Arab. *duff*). It is a retrospective reference to the song at the Sea, now again come into life, which Miriam and the women of Israel sang amidst the music of timbrels. The deliverance which is now being celebrated is the counterpart of the deliverance out of Egypt. Songs resound as in v. 27, "in gatherings of the congregation (and, so to speak, in full choirs) praise ye Elohim." מְקַהְלוֹת (מְקַהְלִים, Psa. 26:12) is the plural to קָהַל (Psa. 22:23), which forms none of its own (cf. post-biblical קַהְלוֹת from קָהַל). V. 27b is abridged from מִמְּקוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרַכּוּ אֱדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם, praise ye the Lord, ye who have Israel for your fountainhead. אֱדֹנָי, in accordance with the sense, has *Mugrash*. *Israel* is here the name of the patriarch, from whom as from its fountainhead the nation has spread itself abroad; cf. Isa. 48: 1; 51: 1, and as to the syntax מִמֶּךָ, those who descend from thee, Isa. 58:12. In the festive assembly all the tribes of Israel are represented by their princes. Two each from the southern and northern tribes

are mentioned. Out of Benjamin was Israel's first king, the first royal victor over the Gentiles; and in Benjamin, according to the promise (Deu. 33:12) and according to the accounts of the boundaries (Jos. 18:16 f., 15: 7 f.), lay the sanctuary of Israel. Thus, therefore, the tribe which, according both to order of birth (Gen. 43:29 ff.) and also extent of jurisdiction and numbers (1Sa. 9:21), was "little," was honoured beyond the others. <sup>f248</sup>

Judah, however, came to the throne in the person of David, and became for ever the royal tribe. Zebulun and Naphtali are the tribes highly praised in Deborah's song of victory (Jud. 5:18, cf. 4: 6) on account of their patriotic bravery. רָדָה, giving no sense when taken from the well-known verb רָדָה, falls back upon דָּדָה, and is consequently equivalent to רָדָה (cf. Lam. 1:13), subduing or ruling them; according to the sense, equivalent to בָּהֶם רָדָה (1Ki. 5:30; 9:23, 2Ch. 8:10), like הִמְעֵלֵם, not "their leader up," but ὁ ἀναγαγὼν αὐτούς, Isa. 63:11, not = רָדָה (like עֲשִׂיהֶם, רְאִייהֶם), which would signify their subduer or their subduers. The verb רָדָה, elsewhere to subjugate, oppress, hold down by force, Eze. 34: 4, Lev. 25:53, is here used of the peaceful occupation of the leader who maintains the order of a stately and gorgeous procession. For the reference to the enemies, "their subduer," is without any coherence. But to render the parallel word רָגְמָתָם "their (the enemies') stoning" (Hengstenberg, Vaihinger, and others, according to Böttcher's "Proben"), is, to say nothing more, devoid of taste; moreover רָגַם does not mean to throw stones with a sling, but to stone as a judicial procedure. If we assign to the verb רָגַם the primary signification *congerere, accumulare*, after Arab. *rajama* VIII, and *rakama*, then רָגְמָתָם signifies their closely compacted band, as Jewish expositors have explained it (קהלם או קבוצם). Even if we connect רָגַם with רָקַם, *variegare*, or compare the proper name רָגַם = Arab. *rajm, socius* (Böttcher), we arrive at much the same meaning. Hupfeld's conjecture רָגְשָׁתָם is consequently unnecessary.

*Psa. 68:29-36.* The poet now looks forth beyond the domain of Israel, and describes the effects of Jahve's deed of judgment and deliverance in the Gentile world. The language of v. 29a is addressed to Israel, or rather to its king (Psa. 86:16; 110: 2): God, to whom everything is subject, has given Israel עָז, victory and power over the world. Out of the consciousness that He alone can preserve Israel upon this height of power upon which it is placed, who has placed it thereon, grows the prayer: establish (עֲזֹדָה with ו for ũ, as is frequently the case, and with the accent on the *ultima* on account of the following *Aleph*, vid., on Psa. 6: 5), Elohim, that which Thou hast wrought for us; עָזוּ, *roborare*, as in Pro. 8:28, Ecc. 7:19, LXX δυνάμωσον, Symmachus

ἐνίσχυσον. It might also be interpreted: show Thyself powerful (cf. רומָה, Psa. 21:14), Thou who (Isa. 42:24) hast wrought for us (פָּאַל as in Isa. 43:13, with לְ, like עֲשֵׂה לְ, Isa. 64: 3); but in the other way of taking it the prayer attaches itself more sequentially to what precedes, and Psa. 62:12 shows that זֶה can also represent the neuter. Hitzig has a still different rendering: the powerful divine help, which Thou hast given us; but although הָ— instead of הַ— in the *stat. construct.* is Ephraimitish style (vid., on Psa. 45: 5), yet עוֹזָה for עֹז is an unknown word, and the expression “from Thy temple,” which is manifestly addressed to Elohim, shows that פָּאַלְתָּ is not the language of address to the king (according to Hitzig, to Jehoshaphat). The language of prayerful address is retained in v. 30. From the words מְהִיכֵלְךָ עַל יְרוּשָׁלַם there is nothing to be transported to v. 29b (Hupfeld); for v. 30 would thereby become stunted. The words together are the statement of the starting-point of the oblations belonging to יוֹבִילוֹ: starting from Thy temple, which soars aloft over Jerusalem, may kings bring Thee, who sittest enthroned there in the Holy of holies, tributary gifts (שִׁי as in Psa. 76:12, Isa. 18: 7). In this connection (of prayer) it is the expression of the desire that the Temple may become the zenith or cynosure, and Jerusalem the metropolis, of the world. In this passage, where it introduces the seat of religious worship, the taking of מִן as expressing the primary cause, “because or on account of Thy Temple” (Ewald), is not to be entertained.

In v. 31 follows a summons, which in this instance is only the form in which the prediction clothes itself. The “beast of the reed” is not the lion, of which sojourn among the reeds is not a characteristic (although it makes its home *inter arundineta Mesopotamiae*, Ammianus, Psa. 18: 7, and in the thickets of the Jordan, Jer. 49:19; 50:44, Zec. 11: 3). The reed is in itself an emblem of Egypt (Isa. 36: 6, cf. 19: 6), and it is therefore either the crocodile, the usual emblem of Pharaoh and of the power of Egypt (Eze. 29: 3, cf. Psa. 74:13 f.) that is meant, or even the hippopotamus (Egyptian *p-ehe-môut*), which also symbolizes Egypt in Isa. 30: 6 (which see), and according to Job. 40:21 is more appropriately than the crocodile (הַתַּנִּין אֲשֶׁר בַּיָּם, Isa. 27: 1) called קִנְיָה חַיָּה. Egypt appears here as the greatest and most dreaded worldly power. Elohim is to check the haughty ones who exalt themselves over Israel and Israel’s God. אֲבִירִים, strong ones, are bulls (Psa. 22:13) as an emblem of the kings; and עֲגֹלִי explains itself by the *genit. epexeg.* אֲמִים: together with (*Beth* of the accompaniment as in v. 31b, Psa. 66:13, and beside the *plur. humanus*, Jer. 41:15) the calves, viz., the peoples, over whom those bulls rule. With the one emblem of Egypt is combined the idea of defiant self-confidence, and with the other the idea of comfortable security (vid., Jer. 46:20 f.). That which is

brought prominently forward as the consequence of the menace is moulded in keeping with these emblems. **מְתַרְפֵּס**, which has been explained by Flaminus substantially correctly: *ut supplex veniat*, is intended to be taken as a *part. fut.* (according to the Arabic grammar, *ḥāl muqaddar*, lit., a predisposed condition). It thus comprehensively in the singular (like **עִבַר** in Psa. 8: 9) with one stroke depicts thoroughly humbled pride; for **רָפַס** (cf. **רָמַס**) signifies to stamp, pound, or trample, to knock down, and the *Hithpa.* either to behave as a trampling one, Pro. 6: 3, or to trample upon one's self, i.e., to cast one's self violently upon the ground. Others explain it as *conculcandum se praeberere*; but such a meaning cannot be shown to exist in the sphere of the Hebrew *Hithpael*; moreover this "suffering one's self to be trampled upon" does not so well suit the words, which require a more active sense, viz., **בְּרַצִּי-כֶסֶף**, in which is expressed the idea that the riches which the Gentiles have hitherto employed in the service of God-opposed worldliness, are now offered to the God of Israel by those who both in outward circumstances and in heart are vanquished (cf. Isa. 60: 9). **רֶץ-כֶּסֶף** (from **רָצַץ**, *confringere*) is a piece of uncoined silver, a bar, wedge, or ingot of silver. In **בְּזַר** there is a wide leap from the call **בְּזַר** to the language of description. This rapid change is also to be found in other instances, and more especially in this dithyrambic Psalm we may readily give up any idea of a change in the pointing, as **בְּזַר** or **בְּזַר** (LXX **διασκόρπισον**); **בְּזַר**, as it stands, cannot be imperative (Hitzig), for the final vowel essential to the *imperat. Piel* is wanting. God hath scattered the peoples delighting in war; war is therefore at an end, and the peace of the world is realized.

In v. 32, the contemplation of the future again takes a different turn: futures follow as the most natural expression of that which is future. The form **יִאֲתָיוּ**, more usually found in pause, here stands pathetically at the beginning, as in Job. 12: 6. **הַשְּׂמָנִים**, compared with the Arabic *chšm* (whence Arab. *chaššm*, a nose, a word erroneously denied by Gesenius), would signify the supercilious, contemptuous (cf. Arab. *āšammun*, *nasutus*, as an appellation of a proud person who will put up with nothing). On the other hand, compared with Arab. *ḥšm*, it would mean the fat ones, inasmuch as this verbal stem (root Arab. *ḥšš*, cf. **הִשְׂרַת**, 2Sa. 22:12), starting from the primary signification "to be pressed together," also signifies "to be compressed, become compact," i.e., to regain one's plumpness, to make flesh and fat, applied, according to the usage of the language, to wasted men and animals. The commonly compared Arab. *ḥšīm*, *vir magni famulitii*, is not at all natural, — a usage which is brought about by the intransitive signification proper to the verb starting from its radical signification, "to become or be angry, to be zealous about any one or anything," inasmuch as the *nomen verbale* Arab. *ḥašamun* signifies in the concrete sense a person, or collectively persons, for whose maintenance,

safety, and honour one is keenly solicitous, such as the members of the family, household attendants, servants, neighbours, clients or protégés, guest-friends; also a thing which one ardently seeks, and over the preservation of which one keeps zealous watch (Fleischer). Here there does not appear to be any connecting link whatever in the Arabic which might furnish some hold for the Hebrew; hence it will be more advisable, by comparison of **הַשְׁמַל** and **הַשֵּׁן**, to understand by **הַשְּׂמַנִּים**, the resplendent, most distinguished ones, *perillustres*. The dignitaries of Egypt come to give glory to the God of Israel, and Aethiopia, disheartened by fear before Jahve (cf. Hab. 3: 7), causes his hands to run to Elohim, i.e., hastens to stretch them out. Thus it is interpreted by most expositors. But if it is **יָדָיו**, why is it not also **יָרִיז**? We reply, the Hebrew style, even in connection with words that stand close beside one another, does not seek to avoid either the *enallage generis* (e.g., Job. 39: 3, 16), or the *enall. numeri* (e.g., Psa. 62: 5). But “to cause the hands to run” is a far-fetched and easily misunderstood figure. We may avoid it, if, with Böttcher and Olshausen, we disregard the accentuation and interpret thus, “Cush — his hands cause to hasten, i.e., bring on in haste (1Sa. 17:17, 2Ch. 35:13), to Elohim,” viz., propitiating gifts; **יָרִיז** being the predicate to **יָדָיו**, according to Ges. § 146, 3.

**Psa. 68:33**. The poet stands so completely in the midst of this glory of the end, that soaring onwards in faith over all the kingdoms of the world, he calls upon them to render praise to the God of Israel. **לָרֶכֶב** attaches itself to the dominating notion of **שִׁירוּ** in v. 33a. The heavens of heavens (Deu. 10:14) are by **קֶדֶם** described as primeval (perhaps, following the order of their coming into existence, as extending back beyond the heavens that belong to our globe, of the second and fourth day of Creation). God is said to ride along in the primeval heavens of the heavens (Deu. 33:26), when by means of the cherub (Psa. 18:11) He extends His operations to all parts of these infinite distances and heights. The epithet “who rideth along in the heavens of heavens of the first beginning” denotes the exalted majesty of the superterrestrial One, who on account of His immanency in history is called “He who rideth along through the steppes” (**רֶכֶב בְּעֵרְבוֹת**, v. 5). In **יָתֵן בְּקוֹלוֹ** we have a repetition of the thought expressed above in v. 12 by **יָתֵן אָמַר**; what is intended is God’s voice of power, which thunders down everything that contends against Him. Since in the expression **נָתַן בְּקוֹל** (Psa. 46: 7, Jer. 12: 8) the voice, according to Ges. § 138, rem. 3, note, is conceived of as the medium of the giving, i.e., of the giving forth from one’s self, of the making one’s self heard, we must take **קוֹל עֵז** not as the object (as in the Latin phrase *sonitum dare*), but as an apposition:<sup>f249</sup> behold, He maketh Himself heard with His voice, a powerful voice. Thus let them then give God **עֵז**, i.e., render back to Him in

praise that acknowledges His omnipotence, the omnipotence which He hath, and of which He gives abundant proof. His glory (נִסְאוֹתָא) rules over Israel, more particularly as its guard and defence; His power (עֹז), however, embraces all created things, not the earth merely, but also the loftiest regions of the sky. The kingdom of grace reveals the majesty and glory of His redemptive work (cf. Eph. 1: 6), the kingdom of nature the universal dominion of His omnipotence. To this call to the kingdoms of the earth they respond in v. 36: “Awful is Elohim out of thy sanctuaries.” The words are addressed to Israel, consequently מִקְדָּוְשָׁיִם is not the heavenly and earthly sanctuary (Hitzig), but the one sanctuary in Jerusalem (Eze. 21: 7 [2]) in the manifold character of its holy places (Jer. 51:51, cf. Amo. 7: 9). Commanding reverence — such is the confession of the Gentile world — doth Elohim rule from thy most holy places, O Israel, the God who hath chosen thee as His mediatorial people. The second part of the confession runs: the God of Israel giveth power and abundant strength to the people, viz., whose God He is, equivalent to לְאִמּוֹ, Psa. 29:11. Israel’s might in the omnipotence of God it is which the Gentile world has experienced, and from which it has deduced the universal fact of experience, v. 36b. All peoples with their gods succumb at last to Israel and its God. This confession of the Gentile world closes with פְּרוּךְ אֱלֹהִים (which is preceded by *Mugrash* transformed out of *Athnach*). That which the psalmist said in the name of Israel in v. 20, “Blessed be the Lord,” now re-echoes from all the world, “Blessed be Elohim.” The world is overcome by the church of Jahve, and that not merely in outward form, but spiritually. The taking up of all the kingdoms of the world into the kingdom of God, this the great theme of the Apocalypse, is also after all the theme of this Psalm. The first half closed with Jahve’s triumphant ascension, the second closes with the results of His victory and triumph, which embrace the world of peoples.

## Psalm 69

### PRAYER OUT OF THE DEPTH OF AFFLICTION BORNE FOR THE SAKE OF THE TRUTH

*69: 2 SAVE me, Elohim, for the waters press upon my life.*

*69: 3 I have sunk in the mud of the abyss, and there is no standing;  
I am fallen into the depths of the waters and a flood overfloweth me.*

*69: 4 I am wearied by my calling, my throat is parched,  
Mine eyes have failed, I who wait for my God.*

*69: 5 More than the hairs of my head are those who hate me without a cause,  
Numerous are my destroyers, mine enemies falsely —  
That which I stole not, I must then restore.*

*69: 6 Elohim, Thou knowest of my folly,  
And my guiltinesses are not hidden from Thee.*

*69: 7 Let not those be ashamed, in me, who wait on Thee, O Lord, Jahve of hosts,  
Let not those be confounded, in me, who seek Thee, O God of Israel!*

*69: 8 For for Thy sake have I borne reproach,  
Shame hath covered my face.*

*69: 9 I am become estranged from my brethren,  
And an alien to my mother's children.*

*69:10 For the zeal of Thy house hath consumed me,  
And the reproaches of those who reproach Thee are fallen upon me.*

*69:11 As for me, my soul wept fasting,  
And it became reproaches to me.*

*69:12 I made sackcloth my garment,  
And became a satire to them.*

*69:13 Those who sit in the gate talk of me.  
And the music of the carousers.*

*69:14 Yet I, I pray to Thee, Jahve, in a time of favour,  
Elohim, by reason of Thy great mercy;  
Answer me with the truth of Thy salvation!*

*69:15 Rescue me out of the mud, that I sink not;  
Let me be rescued from my haters and out of the depths of the waters.*

*69:16 Let not the flood of waters overflow me,  
And let not the abyss swallow me up,  
And let not the well close its mouth upon me.*

*69:17 Answer me, Jahve, for good is Thy loving-kindness;  
According to the abundance of Thy compassion turn Thou unto me.*

*69:18 And hide not Thy face from Thy servant,  
For I am afraid, speedily answer me.*

*69:19 Draw near to my soul, redeem it,  
Because of mine enemies deliver me.*

*69:20 Thou knowest my reproach, and my shame, and my dishonour;  
Present to Thee are all mine adversaries.*

*69:21 Reproach hath broken my heart, and I became sick unto death,  
I hoped for pity, but in vain,  
And for comforters — finding none.*



*69:22 They gave me for my meat gall,  
And for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.*

*69:23 Let their table before them become a snare,  
And to the unconcerned a trap.*

*69:24 Let their eyes be darkened that they see not,  
And make their loins continually to shake.*

*69:25 Pour out upon them Thine indignation,  
And let the burning of Thine anger seize them.*

*69:26 Let their village be desolate,  
In their tents let there be no dweller.*

*69:27 For him who is smitten of Thee they persecute,  
And of the pain of Thy pierced ones do they tell.*

*69:28 Add Thou iniquity to their iniquity,  
And let them not enter into Thy righteousness.*

*69:29 Let them be blotted out of the book of life,  
And with the righteous let them not be written down!*

*69:30 I, however, am afflicted and in pain,  
Thy help, Elohim, shall set me up on high.*

*69:31 I will praise the name of Elohim with song,  
And extol it with thanksgiving.*

*69:32 And it shall please Jahve better than young bullocks,  
Having horns, cleaving the hoof.*

*69:33 The afflicted seeing it, shall rejoice;  
Ye who seek after Elohim — let your heart revive!*

*69:34 For observant of the needy is Jahve,  
And His captives doth He not despise.*

*69:35 Let heaven and earth praise Him,  
The seas and everything that moveth therein.*

*69:36 For Elohim will save Zion and build the cities of Judah,  
That they may dwell there and possess them.*

*69:37 And the seed of His servants shall inherit them,  
And those who love His name shall dwell therein.*

*Psalm 69.* This Psalm follows Psalm 68 because in vv. 36 f. the very same thought is expressed in unfigurative language, that we found in 68:11 represented under a figure, viz., *Thy creatures dwelt therein*. In other respects the two Psalms are as different as day and night. Psalm 69 is not a martial and

triumphal Psalm, but a Psalm of affliction which does not brighten until near the close; and it is not the church that is the speaker here, as in the preceding Psalm, but an individual. This individual, according to the inscription, is David; and if David, it is not the ideal righteous man (Hengstenberg), but David the righteous, and that when he was unjustly persecuted by Saul. The description of suffering harmonizes in many points with the Psalms belonging to the time of Saul, even the estrangement of his nearest adherents, Psa. 69: 9; 31:12 (cf. 27:10); the fasting till he is thoroughly enfeebled, Psa. 69:11; 109:24; the curse upon his foes, in which respect Psalm 35, 69, and 109 form a fearful gradation; and the inspiring call to the saints who are his companions in suffering, Psa. 69:33; 22:27; 31:25. Were there no doubt about Psalm 40 being Davidic, then the Davidic origin of Psalm 69 would at the same time be firmly established; but instead of their inscriptions **לָדוֹד** being mutually confirmatory, they tend, on the contrary, to shake our confidence. These two Psalms are closely related as twin-Psalms: in both the poet describes his suffering as a sinking into a miry pit; in both we meet with the same depreciation of ceremonial sacrifice; the same method of denoting a great multitude, “more than the hairs of my head,” Psa. 69: 5; 40:13; and the same prospect of the faith of the saints being strengthened, Psa. 69:33, 7; 40:17, 4.

But whilst in Psalm 40 it is more the style and in general the outward form than the contents that militate against its Davidic authorship, in Psalm 69 it is not so much in form as in subject-matter that we find much that does not accord with David’s authorship. For this reason Clericus and Vogel (in his dissertation *Inscriptiones Psalmorum serius demum additas videri*, 1767) have long ago doubted the correctness of the **לָדוֹד**; and Hitzig has more fully supported the conjecture previously advanced by Seiler, von Bengel, and others, that Psalm 69, as also Psalm 40, is by Jeremiah. The following points favour this view:

- (1) The martyrdom which the author endured in his zeal for the house of God, in his self-mortification, and in this consuming of himself with the scorn and deadly hostility of his foes; we may compare more particularly Jer. 15:15-18, a confession on the part of the prophet very closely allied in spirit to both these Psalms.
- (2) The murderous animosity which the prophet had to endure from the men of Anathoth, Jer. 11:18 f., with which the complaint of the psalmist in v. 9 fully accords.
- (3) The close of the Psalm, vv. 35-37, which is like a summary of that which Jeremiah foretells in the Book of the Restoration, Jer. 30-33.

(4) The peculiar character of Jeremiah's sufferings, who was cast by the princes, as being an enemy to his country, into the waterless but muddy cistern of prince Malchiah (*Malkîja*) in the court of the guard, and there as it were buried alive. It is true, in Jer. 38: 6 it is said of this cistern that there was "no water, but only mire," which seems to contradict the language of the Psalm; but since he sank into the mud, the meaning is that just then there was no water standing in it as at other times, otherwise he must at once have been drowned. Nevertheless, that he was in peril of his life is clear to us from the third *kînah* (Lamentations 3), which in other respects also has many points of close contact with Psalm 69; for there in vv. 53-58 he says:

*"They cut off my life in the pit and cast stones at me. Waters flowed over my head; I thought: I am undone. I called upon Thy name, Jahve, out of the lowest pit. Thou didst hear my cry: Hide not Thine ear from the outpouring of my heart, from my cry for help! Thou didst draw near in the day that I cried, Thou saidst: Fear not."*

The view of Hitzig, that in Psalm 69 we have this prayer out of the pit, has many things in its favour, and among them,

(5) the style, which on the whole is like that of Jeremiah, and the many coincidences with the prophet's language and range of thought visible in single instance. But how could this Psalm have obtained the inscription לדרר? Could it be on account of the similarity between the close of Psalm 69 and the close of Psalm 22? And why should not Psalm 71, which is to all appearance by Jeremiah, also have the inscription לדרר? Psalm 69 is wanting in that imitative character by which Psalm 71 so distinctly points to Jeremiah. Therefore we duly recognise the instances and considerations brought forward against the Jeremianic authorship by Keil (*Luth. Zeitschrift*, 1860, S. 485 f.) and Kurtz (*Dorpater Zeitschrift*, 1865, S. 58 ff.), whilst, on the contrary, we still maintain, as formerly, that the Psalm admits of being much more satisfactorily explained from the life of Jeremiah than that of David.

The passion Psalms are the part of the Old Testament Scriptures most frequently cited in the New Testament; and after Psalm 22 there is no Psalm referred to in so many ways as Psalm 69.

(1) The enemies of Jesus hated Him without a cause: this fact, according to Joh. 15:25, is foretold in v. 5. It is more probable that the quotation by John refers to Psa. 69: 5 than to Psa. 35:19.

(2) When Jesus drove the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, v. 10a received its fulfilment, according to Joh. 2:17: the fierce flame of zeal against the

profanation of the house of God consumes Him, and because of this zeal He is hated and despised.

(3) He willingly bore this reproach, being an example to us; v. 10*b* of our Psalm being, according to Rom. 15: 3, fulfilled in Him.

(4) According to Act. 1:20, the imprecation in v. 26*a* has received its fulfilment in Judas Iscariot. The suffixes in this passage are plural; the meaning can therefore only be that indicated by J. H. Michaelis, *quod ille primus et prae reliquis hujus maledictionis se fecerit participem*.

(5) According to Rom. 11: 9 f., vv. 23 f. of the Psalm have been fulfilled in the present rejection of Israel. The apostle does not put these imprecations directly into the mouth of Jesus, just as in fact they are not appropriate to the lips of the suffering Saviour; he only says that what the psalmist there, in the zealous ardour of the prophetic Spirit — a zeal partaking of the severity of Sinai and of the spirit of Elias — invokes upon this enemies, has been completely fulfilled in those who wickedly have laid violent hands upon the Holy One of God. The typically prophetic hints of the Psalm are far from being exhausted by these New Testament quotations. One is reminded, in connection with v. 13, of the mockery of Jesus by the soldiers in the praetorium, Mat. 27:27-30; by v. 22, of the offer of vinegar mingled with gall (according to Mar. 15:23, wine mingled with myrrh) which Jesus refused, before the crucifixion, Mat. 27:34, and of the sponge dipped in vinegar which they put to the mouth of the crucified One by means of a stalk of hyssop, Joh. 19:29 f. When Joh. there says that Jesus, freely and consciously preparing Himself to die, only desired a drink in order that, according to God's appointment, the Scripture might receive its utmost fulfilment, he thereby points back to Psa. 22:16 and 69:22. And what an amount of New Testament light, so to speak, falls upon v. 27*a* when we compare with it Isa. 53 and Zec. 13: 7! The whole Psalm is typically prophetic, in as far as it is a declaration of a history of life and suffering moulded by God into a factual prediction concerning Jesus the Christ, whether it be the story of a king or a prophet; and in as far as the Spirit of prophecy has even moulded the declaration itself into the language of prophecy concerning the future One.

The Psalm falls into three parts, consisting of the following strophes: (1) 3. 5. 6. 6. 7; (2) 5. 6. 7; (3) 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. Does שֹׁשַׁנִּים perhaps point to the preponderating six-line strophes under the emblem of the six-leaved lily? This can hardly be the case. The old expositors said that the Psalm was so inscribed because it treats of the white rose of the holy innocence of Christ, and of the red rose of His precious blood. שֹׁשַׁן properly does not signify a rose; this flower was altogether unknown in the Holy Land at the time this Psalm was written. The rose was not transplanted thither out of Central Asia until much

later, and was called **רָד** (**ródon**); **שׁוֹשַׁן**, on the other hand, is the white, and in the Holy Land mostly red, lily — certainly, as a plant, a beautiful emblem of Christ. *Propter me*, says Origen, *qui in convalle eram, Sponsus descendit et fit lilium*.

**Psa. 69: 2-14.** Out of deep distress, the work of his foes, the complaining one cries for help; he thinks upon his sins, which sufferings bring to his remembrance, but he is also distinctly conscious that he is an object of scorn and hostility for God's sake, and from His mercy he looks for help in accordance with His promises. The waters are said to rush in unto the soul (**אֲדַנְפֵשׁ**), when they so press upon the imperilled one that the soul, i.e., the life of the body, more especially the breath, is threatened; cf. Jon. 2: 6, Jer. 4:10. Waters are also a figure of calamities that come on like a flood and drag one into their vortex, Psa. 18:17; 32: 6; 124: 5, cf. 66:12; 88: 8, 18; here, however, the figure is cut off in such a way that it conveys the impression of reality expressed in a poetical form, as in Psalm 40, and much the same as in Jonah's psalm. The soft, yielding morass is called **יִוֵן**, and the eddying deep **מִצְוֵלָה**. The *Nomen Hophal*. **מֵעֵמָד** signifies properly a being placed, then a standing-place, or firm standing (LXX **ὑπόστασις**), like **מִטָּה**, that which is stretched out, extension, Isa. 8: 8. **שִׁבְלָתָהּ** (Ephraimitish **סִבְלָתָהּ**) is a streaming, a flood, from **שָׁבַל**, Arab. *sbl*, to stream, flow (cf. note on Psa. 58: 9 a). **בֹּא בְּ**, to fall into, as in Psa. 66:12, and **שָׁמַרְךָ** with an accusative, to overflow, as in Psa. 124: 4. The complaining one is nearly drowned in consequence of his sinking down, for he has long cried in vain for help: he is wearied by continual crying (**בָּגַע בְּ**, as in Psa. 6: 7, Jer. 45: 3), his throat is parched (**נִחַר** from **חָרַר**; LXX and Jerome: it is become hoarse), his eyes have failed (Jer. 14: 6) him, who waits upon his God. The participle **מִיַּחַל**, equal to a relative clause, is, as in Psa. 18:51, 1Ki. 14: 6, attached to the suffix of the preceding noun (Hitzig). Distinct from this use of the participle without the article is the adverbially qualifying participle in Gen. 3: 8, Son. 5: 2, cf. **חַי**, 2Sa. 12:21; 18:14. There is no necessity for the correction of the text **מִיַּחַל** (LXX **ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλπίζειν με**). Concerning the accentuation of **רַבּוֹ** vid., on Psa. 38:20. Apart from the words "more than the hairs of my head" (Psa. 40:13), the complaint of the multitude of groundless enemies is just the same as in Psa. 38:20; 35:19, cf. 109: 3, both in substance and expression. Instead of **מַצְמִיתֵי**, my destroyers, the Syriac version has the reading **מֵאַצְמוֹתַי** (more numerous than my bones), which is approved by Hupfeld; but to reckon the multitude of the enemy by the number of one's own bones is both devoid of taste and unheard of. Moreover the reading of our text finds support, if it need any, in Lam. 3:52 f. The words, "what I have not taken away, I must then restore," are intended by way of

example, and perhaps, as also in Jer. 15:10, as a proverbial expression: that which I have not done wrong, I must suffer for (cf. Jer. 15:10, and the similar complaint in Psa. 35:11). One is tempted to take **לִשְׁ** in the sense of “nevertheless” (Ewald), a meaning, however, which it is by no means intended to convey. In this passage it takes the place of **זִשְׁ** (cf. **οὐτως** for **ταῦτα**, Mat. 7:12), inasmuch as it gives prominence to the restitution desired, as an inference from a false assumption: then, although I took it not away, stole it not.

The transition from the bewailing of suffering to a confession of sin is like Psa. 40:13. In the undeserved persecution which he endures at the hand of man, he is obliged nevertheless to recognise well-merited chastisement from the side of God. And whilst by **שָׁתָה יְדַעַתָּה** (cf. Psa. 40:10, Jer. 15:15; 17:16; 18:23, and on **ל** as an exponent of the object, Jer. 16:16; 40: 2) he does not acknowledge himself to be a sinner after the standard of his own shortsightedness, but of the divine omniscience, he at the same time commends his sinful need, which with self-accusing modesty he calls **שְׁגִלָּה** (Psa. 38: 6) and **שְׁשָׁמוֹת** (2Ch. 28:10), to the mercy of the omniscient One. Should he, the sinner, be abandoned by God to destruction, then all those who are faithful in their intentions towards the Lord would be brought to shame and confusion in him, inasmuch as they would be taunted with this example. **קִיָּיִ** designates the godly from the side of the **πίστις**, and **מִבְּקִשְׁיָיִ** from the side of the **ἀγάπη**. The multiplied names of God are so many appeals to God’s honour, to the truthfulness of His covenant relationship. The person praying here is, it is true, a sinner, but that is no justification of the conduct of men towards him; he is suffering for the Lord’s sake, and it is the Lord Himself who is reviled in him. It is upon this he bases his prayer in v. 8. **עָלֶיךָ**, for thy sake, as in Psa. 44:23, Jer. 15:15. The reproach that he has to bear, and ignominy that has covered his face and made it quite unrecognisable (Psa. 44:16, cf. 83:17), have totally estranged (Psa. 38:12, cf. 88: 9, Job. 19:13-15, Jer. 12: 6) from him even his own brethren (**אֶחָיִ**, parallel word **בְּנֵי אִמִּי**, as in Psa. 50:20; cf. on the other hand, Gen. 49: 8, where the interchange designedly takes another form of expression); for the glow of his zeal (**קִנְיָה** from **קָנָה**, according to the Arabic, to be a deep or bright red) for the house of Jahve, viz., for the sanctity of the sanctuary and of the congregation gathered about it (which is never directly called “the house of Jahve” in the Old Testament, vid., Köhler on Zec. 9: 8, but here, as in Num. 12: 7, Hos. 8: 1, is so called in conjunction with the sanctuary), as also for the honour of His who sits enthroned therein, consumes him, like a fire burning in his bones which incessantly breaks forth and rages all through him (Jer. 20: 9; 23: 9), and therefore all the malice of those who are estranged from God is concentrated upon and against him.

He now goes on to describe how sorrow for the sad condition of the house of God has brought nothing but reproach to him (cf. V109:24 f.). It is doubtful whether **נִפְשִׁי** is an alternating subject to **וְאִכְבְּהָ** (*fut. consec.* without being apocopated), cf. Jer. 13:17, or a more minutely defining accusative as in Isa. 26: 9 (vid., on 3: 5), or whether, together with **בְּצוֹם**, it forms a circumstantial clause (*et flevi dum in jejunio esset anima mea*), or even whether it is intended to be taken as an accusative of the object in a pregnant construction (= **וְשָׁפַךְ נַפְשׁוֹ**, Psa. 42: 5, 1Sa. 1:15): I wept away my soul in fasting. Among all these possible renderings, the last is the least probable, and the first, according to Psa. 44: 3; 83:19, by far the most probable, and also that which is assumed by the accentuation. <sup>£250</sup>

The reading of the LXX **וְאִכְבְּהָ**, *καὶ συνέκαμα* (Olshausen, Hupfeld, and Böttcher), is a very natural (Psa. 35:13) exchange of the poetically bold expression for one less choice and less expressive (since **עָנָה נִפְשִׁי** is a phrase of the Pentateuch equivalent to **צוֹם**). The garb of mourning, like the fasting, is an expression of sorrow for public distresses, not, as in Psa. 35:13, of personal condolence; concerning **וְאִכְבְּהָ**, vid., on Psa. 3: 6. On account of this mourning, reproach after reproach comes upon him, and they fling gibes and raillery at him; everywhere, both in the gate, the place where the judges sit and where business is transacted, and also at carousals, he is jeered at and traduced (Lam. 3:14, cf. 5:14, Job. 30: 9). **בְּ** **שִׁיחַ** signifies in itself *fabulari de...* without any bad secondary meaning (cf. Pro. 6:22, *confabulabitur tecum*); here it is construed first with a personal and then a neuter subject (cf. Amo. 8: 3), for in v. 13*b* neither **דְּיִיתִי** (Job. 30: 9, Lam. 3:14) nor **אֲנִי** (Lam. 3:63) is to be supplied. V. 14 tells us how he acts in the face of such hatred and scorn; **וְאִנִּי**, as in Psa. 109: 4, *sarcasmis hostium suam opponit in precibus constantiam* (Geier). As for himself, his prayer is directed towards Jahve at the present time, when his affliction as a witness for God gives him the assurance that He will be well-pleased to accept it (**עַתָּה רְצוֹן** = **בְּעַת רְצוֹן**, Isa. 49: 8). It is addressed to Him who is at the same time *Jahve* and *Elohim*, — the revealed One in connection with the history of redemption, and the absolute One in His exaltation above the world, — on the ground of the greatness and fulness of His mercy: may He then answer him with or in the truth of His salvation, i.e., the infallibility with which His purpose of mercy verifies itself in accordance with the promises given. Thus is v. 14 to be explained in accordance with the accentuation. According to Isa. 49: 8, it looks as though **עַתָּה רְצוֹן** must be drawn to **עֲנִי** (Hitzig), but Psa. 32: 6 sets us right on this point; and the fact that **בְּרַב־חַסְדְּךָ** is joined to v. 14*a* also finds support from 5: 8. But the repetition of the divine name perplexes one, and it may be asked whether or

not the accent that divides the verse into its two parts might not more properly stand beside רצון, as in Psa. 32: 6 beside מִצָּן; so that v. 14b runs: *Elohim, by virtue of the greatness of Thy mercy hear me, by virtue of the truth of Thy salvation.*

**Psa. 69:15-22.** In this second part the petition by which the first is as it were encircled, is continued; the peril grows greater the longer it lasts, and with it the importunity of the cry for help. The figure of sinking in the mire or mud and in the depths of the pit (בְּאֵר, Psa. 55:24, cf. בּוֹר, Psa. 40: 3) is again taken up, and so studiously wrought out, that the impression forces itself upon one that the poet is here describing something that has really taken place. The combination “from those who hate me and from the depths of the waters” shows that “the depths of the waters” is not a merely rhetorical figure; and the form of the prayer: let not the pit (the well-pit or covered tank) close (תִּאָּטַר with *Dagesh* in the *Teth*, in order to guard against its being read תִּאָּטַר; cf. on the signification of אָּטַר, *clausus* = *claudus*, scil. *manu*) its mouth (i.e., its upper opening) upon me, exceeds the limits of anything that can be allowed to mere rhetoric. “Let not the water-flood overflow me” is intended to say, since it has, according to v. 3, already happened, let it not go further to my entire destruction. The “answer me” in v. 17a is based upon the plea that God’s loving-kindness is טוֹב, i.e., good, absolutely good (as in the kindred passion-Psa. 109:21), better than all besides (Psa. 63: 4), the means of healing or salvation from all evil. On v. 17b cf. Psa. 51: 3, Lam. 3:32. In v. 18 the prayer is based upon the painful situation of the poet, which urgently calls for speedy help (מִהֵרָה beside the imperative, Psa. 102: 3; 143: 7, Gen. 19:22, Est. 6:10, is certainly itself not an imperative like הֵרָבֵה, Psa. 51: 4, but an adverbial infinitive as in Psa. 79: 8). קָרְבָּה, or, in order to ensure the pronunciation *ḳorbah* in distinction from *ḳārbah*, Deu. 15: 9, קָרְבָּה (in Baer<sup>f251</sup>), is *imperat. Kal*; cf. the fulfilment in Lam. 3:57. The reason assigned, “because of mine enemies,” as in Psa. 5: 9; 27:11, and frequently, is to be understood according to Psa. 13: 5: the honour of the all-holy One cannot suffer the enemies of the righteous to triumph over him. <sup>f252</sup>

The accumulation of synonyms in v. 20 is Jeremiah’s custom, Psa. 13:14; 21: 5, 7; 32:37, and is found also in Psalm 31 (v. 10) and 44 (vv. 4, 17, 25). On לְבִי הִרְפָּה שְׁבָרָה לְבִי, cf. Psa. 51:19, Jer. 23: 9. The ἄπαξ γεγραμ. וְאֲנוּשָׁה (historical tense), from נוּשׁ, is explained by אָנוּשׁ from אָנַשׁ, sickly, dangerously ill, evil-disposed, which is a favourite word in Jeremiah. Moreover נוּד in the signification of manifesting pity, not found elsewhere in the Psalter, is common in Jeremiah, e.g., Jer. 15: 5; it signifies originally to nod to any one as a sign of a pity that sympathizes with him and recognises the



magnitude of the evil. “To give wormwood for meat and מִי־רֹאשׁ to drink” is a Jeremicanic (Jer. 8:14; 9:14; 23:15) designation for inflicting the extreme of pain and anguish upon one. רֹאשׁ (רוֹשׁ) signifies first of all a poisonous plant with an umbellated head of flower or a capitate fruit; but then, since bitter and poisonous are interchangeable notions in the Semitic languages, it signifies gall as the bitterest of the bitter. The LXX renders: *καὶ ἔδωκαν εἰς τὸ βρωμᾶ μου χολήν, καὶ εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισάν με ὄξος*. Certainly בָּנַתְן can mean to put something into something, to mix something with it, but the parallel word לְצַמְאִי (for my thirst, i.e., for the quenching of it, Neh. 9:15, 20) favours the supposition that the בָּ of בְּבְרוֹתַי is *Beth essentiae*, after which Luther renders: “they give me gall to eat.” The ἄπαξ γεγραμ. בְּרוֹת (בְּרוֹת) signifies βρωσις, from בָּרָה, βιβρώσκειν (root βωρ, Sanscrit *gar*, Latin *vor-are*).

*Psa. 69:23-37*. The description of the suffering has reached its climax in v. 22, at which the wrath of the persecuted one flames up and bursts forth in imprecations. The first imprecation joins itself upon v. 22. They have given the sufferer gall and vinegar; therefore their table, which was abundantly supplied, is to be turned into a snare to them, from which they shall not be able to escape, and that לְפִנְיָהֶם, in the very midst of their banqueting, whilst the table stands spread out before them (Eze. 23:41). שְׁלוֹמִים (collateral form of שְׁלָמִים) is the name given to them as being carnally secure; the word signifies the peaceable or secure in a good (Psa. 55:21) and in a bad sense. Destruction is to overtake them suddenly, “when they say: Peace and safety” (1Th. 5: 3). The LXX erroneously renders: *καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν = וּלְשְׁלוֹמִים*. The association of ideas in v. 24 is transparent. With their eyes they have feasted themselves upon the sufferer, and in the strength of their loins they have ill-treated him. These eyes with their bloodthirsty malignant looks are to grow blind. These loins full of defiant self-confidence are to shake (הִמְאֵד, *imperat. Hiph.* like הִרְחַק, Job. 13:21, from הִמְעִיד, for which in Eze. 29: 7, and perhaps also in Dan. 11:14, we find הִעַמִּיד). Further: God is to pour out His wrath upon them (Psa. 79: 6, Hos. 5:10, Jer. 10:25), i.e., let loose against them the cosmical forces of destruction existing originally in His nature. זַעֲמָךְ has the *Dagesh* in order to distinguish it in pronunciation from זַעֲמָךְ. In v. 26 מִיָּרְהָ (from מָוֵר, to encircle) is a designation of an encamping or dwelling-place (LXX ἔπαυλις) taken from the circular encampments (Arabic *širât, širât*, and *dwâr, duâr*) of the nomads (Gen. 25:16). The laying waste and desolation of his own house is the most fearful of all misfortunes to the Semite (*Job*, note to 18:15). The poet derives the justification of such fearful imprecations from

the fact that they persecute him, who is besides smitten of God. God has smitten him on account of his sins, and that by having placed him in the midst of a time in which he must be consumed with zeal and solicitude for the house of God. The suffering decreed for him by God is therefore at one and the same time suffering as a chastisement and as a witnessing for God; and they heighten this suffering by every means in their power, not manifesting any pity for him or any indulgence, but imputing to him sins that he has not committed, and requiting him with deadly hatred for benefits for which they owed him thanks.

There are also some others, although but few, who share this martyrdom with him. The psalmist calls them, as he looks up to Jahve, **הַלְלִיךָ**, Thy fatally smitten ones; they are those to whom God has appointed that they should bear within themselves a pierced or wounded heart (vid., Psa. 109:22, cf. Jer. 8:18) in the face of such a godless age. Of the deep grief (**אֵל**, as in 2: 7) of these do they tell, viz., with self-righteous, self-blinded mockery (cf. the Talmudic phrase **ספר לשון הרע** or **ספר בלשון הרע**, of evil report or slander). The LXX and Syriac render **יוֹסִיפוּ** (**προσέθηκαν**): they add to the anguish; the Targum, Aquila, Symmachus, and Jerome follow the traditional text. Let God therefore, by the complete withdrawal of His grace, suffer them to fall from one sin into another — this is the meaning of the *da culpam super culpam eorum* — in order that accumulated judgment may correspond to the accumulated guilt (Jer. 16:18). Let the entrance into God's righteousness, i.e., His justifying and sanctifying grace, be denied to them for ever. Let them be blotted out of **סֵפֶר חַיִּים** (Exo. 32:32, cf. Isa. 4: 3, Dan. 12: 1), that is to say, struck out of the list of the living, and that of the living in this present world; for it is only in the New Testament that we meet with the Book of Life as a list of the names of the heirs of the **ζωὴ αἰώνιος**. According to the conception both of the Old and of the New Testament the **צַדִּיקִים** are the heirs of life. Therefore v. 29b wishes that they may not be written by the side of the righteous, who, according to Hab. 2: 4, "live," i.e., are preserved, by their faith. With **וְאֲנִי** the poet contrasts himself, as in Psa. 40:18, with those deserving of execration. They are now on high, but in order to be brought low; he is miserable and full of poignant pain, but in order to be exalted; God's salvation will remove him from his enemies on to a height that is too steep for them (Psa. 59: 2; 91:14). Then will he praise (**הִלֵּל**) and magnify (**גִּדֵּל**) the Name of God with song and thankful confession. And such spiritual **תְּפִלָּה**, such thank-offering of the heart, is more pleasing to God than an ox, a bullock, i.e., a young ox (= **פֶּרֶשׁ הַשּׁוֹר**, an ox-bullock, Jud. 6:25, according to Ges. § 113), one having horns and a cloven hoof (Ges. § 53, 2). The attributives do not denote the rough material animal nature (Hengstenberg), but their legal qualifications

for being sacrificed. **מִקְרִין** is the name for the young ox as not being under three years old (cf. 1Sa. 1:24, LXX *ἐν μόσχῳ τριετίζοντι*); **מִפְרִים** as belonging to the clean four-footed animals, viz., those that are cloven-footed and chew the cud, Lev. 11. Even the most stately, full-grown, clean animal that may be offered as a sacrifice stands in the sight of Jahve very far below the sacrifice of grateful praise coming from the heart.

When now the patient sufferers (**עֲנִיִּים**) united with the poet by community of affliction shall see how he offers the sacrifice of thankful confession, they will rejoice. **יִרְאוּ** is a hypothetical preterite; it is neither **יִרְאוּ** (*perf. consec.*), nor **יָרְאוּ** (Psa. 40: 4; 52: 8; 107:42, Job. 22:19). The declaration conveying information to be expected in v. 33*b* after the *Waw apodoseos* changes into an apostrophe of the “seekers of Elohim:” their heart shall revive, for, as they have suffered in company with him who is now delivered, they shall now also refresh themselves with him. We are at once reminded of Psa. 22:27, where this is as it were the exhortation of the entertainer at the thank-offering meal. It would be rash to read **שָׂמַע** in v. 23, after 22:25, instead of **שָׂמְעָה** (Olshausen); the one object in that passage is here generalized: Jahve is attentive to the needy, and doth not despise His bound ones (Psa. 107:10), but, on the contrary, He takes an interest in them and helps them. Starting from this proposition, which is the clear gain of that which has been experienced, the view of the poet widens into the prophetic prospect of the bringing back of Israel out of the Exile into the Land of Promise. In the face of this fact of redemption of the future he calls upon (cf. Isa. 44:23) all created things to give praise to God, who will bring about the salvation of Zion, will build again the cities of Judah, and restore the land, freed from its desolation, to the young God-fearing generation, the children of the servants of God among the exiles. The feminine suffixes refer to **עֲרֵב** (cf. Jer. 2:15; 22: 6 *Chethîb*). The tenor of Isa. 65: 9 is similar. If the Psalm were written by David, the closing turn from v. 23 onwards might be more difficult of comprehension than Psa. 14: 7; 51:20 f. If, however, it is by Jeremiah, then we do not need to persuade ourselves that it is to be understood not of restoration and re-peopling, but of continuance and completion (Hofmann and Kurtz). Jeremiah lived to experience the catastrophe he foretold; but the nearer it came to the time, the more comforting were the words with which he predicted the termination of the Exile and the restoration of Israel. Jer. 34: 7 shows us how natural to him, and to him in particular, was the distinction between Jerusalem and the cities of Judah. The predictions in Jer. 32, 33, which sound so in accord with vv. 36 f., belong to the time of the second siege. Jerusalem was not yet fallen; the strong places of the land, however, already lay in ruins.

## Psalm 70

### CRY OF A PERSECUTED ONE FOR HELP

*70: 2 ELOHIM, to deliver me —  
Jahve to my help, make haste!*

*70: 3 Let those be ashamed and confounded who seek my soul,  
Let those fall back and be put to shame who desire my misfortune,*

*70: 4 Let those turn back as a reward of their shame,  
Who say: Aha, aha!*

*70: 5 Let all those heartily rejoice in Thee who seek Thee,  
And let those continually say “Elohim be magnified” who love Thy salvation.*

*70: 6 I, however, am needy and poor —  
Elohim, make haste unto me!  
My help and my Deliverer art Thou,  
Jahve, make no tarrying!*

*Psalm 70.* This short Psalm, placed after Psalm 69 on account of the kindred nature of its contents (cf. more especially v. 6 with Psa. 69:30), is, with but few deviations, a repetition of Psa. 40:14 ff. This portion of the second half of Psalm 40 is detached from it and converted into the Elohimic style.

Concerning **לְהִזְכִּיר**, at the presentation of the memorial portion of the *mincha*, vid., Psa. 38: 1. It is obvious that David himself is not the author of the Psalm in this stunted form. The **לְדוֹד** is moreover justified, if he composed the original Psalm which is here modified and appropriated to a special liturgical use.

*Psa. 70: 2-4.* We see at once at the very beginning, in the omission of the **רָצָה** (Psa. 40:14), that what we have here before us is a fragment of Psalm 40, and perhaps a fragment that only accidentally came to have an independent existence. The **לְהִצִּילֵנִי**, which was under the government of **רָצָה**, now belongs to **הוֹשֵׁה**, and the construction is without example elsewhere. In v. 3 (=Psa. 40:15) **יָחַד** and **לְסִפְּוֹתָהּ** are given up entirely; the original is more full-toned and soaring. Instead of **יִשְׁמֹו**, *torpescant*, v. 4a has **יָשׁוּבוּ**, *recedant* (as in Psa. 6:11, cf. Psa. 9:18), which is all the more flat for coming after **אֶחָד** **יִסְגּוּ**. In v. 4b, after **הָאֲמָרִים** the **לִי**, which cannot here (cf. on the contrary, 35:21) be dispensed with, is wanting.

*Psa. 70: 5, 6.* **וַיֹּאמְרוּ** instead of **אָמְרוּ** is unimportant. But since the divine name *Jahve* is now for once chosen side by side with *Elohim*, it certainly had a

strong claim to be retained in v. 5b. Instead of **תְּשׁוּעַתְךָ** we have **יְשׁוּעַתְךָ** here; instead of **עֲזָרְתִּי**, here **עֲזָרִי**. And instead of **אֲדֹנָי יִחְשָׁב לִי** we have here **אֱלֹהִים חֹשֵׁה לִי**, — the hope is turned into petition: *make haste unto me*, is an innovation in expression that is caused by the taking over of the **לִי**.

## **Psalm 71**

### **PRAYER OF A GREY-HEADED SERVANT OF GOD FOR FURTHER DIVINE AID**

*71: 1 IN Thee, Jahve, have I hidden, let me not be ashamed for ever.*

*71: 2 Through Thy righteousness deliver me and rescue me,  
Incline Thou Thine ear unto me and save me.*

*71: 3 Be Thou to me a rock of habitation to take me up always;  
Thou hast given commandment to save me,  
For my rock and my fortress art Thou.*

*71: 4 My God, rescue me out of the hand of the wicked,  
Out of the grasp of the evil-doer and the violent man.*

*71: 5 For Thou art my hope, O Lord Jahve,  
My trust from my youth.*

*71: 6 Upon Thee have I been supported from the womb,  
Thou art He who didst separate me from my mother's bowels,  
Of Thee is my song of praise continually.*

*71: 7 As a wonder am I to many,  
But Thou art my refuge, a strong one.*

*71: 8 My mouth shall be filled with Thy praise,  
All the day long with Thy glorification.*

*71: 9 Cast me not away in the time of old age;  
Now when my strength faileth, forsake me not!*

*71:10 For mine enemies speak concerning me,  
And those who lie in wait for my soul take counsel together,*

*71:11 Saying: "Elohim hath forsaken him;  
Persecute and seize him, for he cannot be rescued."*

*71:12 Elohim, be not far from me,  
My God, to my help make haste!*

*71:13 Let be ashamed, let vanish away, the adversaries of my soul;  
Let those be covered with reproach and dishonour who seek my hurt.*

*71:14 But I will hope continually,  
And will yet praise Thee more and more.*

*71:15 My mouth shall tell of Thy righteousness,  
Of Thy salvation continually, for I know not the numbers thereof.*

*71:16 I will come with the mighty deeds of the Lord Jahve,  
I will praise Thy righteousness, Thee alone.*

*71:17 Elohim, Thou hast taught me from my youth up,  
And until now do I declare Thy wondrous works.*

*71:18 Even to old age and white hairs, Elohim, forsake me not,  
Till I declare Thine arm to posterity, to all that shall come Thy strength.*

*71:19 And Thy righteousness, Elohim, reacheth to the sky;  
Thou who doest great things — Elohim, who is like Thee?!*

*71:20 Who hast caused us to see distresses many and sore,  
Thou wilt quicken us again,  
And out of the abysses of the earth Thou wilt bring us up again;*

*71:21 Thou wilt increase my dignity and turn Thy self to comfort me.*

*71:22 I will also praise Thee upon the nablá, Thy truth, my God;  
I will play to Thee upon the cithern, O Holy One of Israel.*

*71:23 My lips shall exult, when I shall harp to Thee,  
And my soul, which Thou hast redeemed.*

*71:24 Also my tongue shall continually make known Thy righteousness,  
That those are ashamed, that those are put to the blush who seek my hurt.*

*Psalm 71.* The Davidic Psalm 70 is followed by an anonymous Psalm which begins like Psalm 31 and closes like Psalm 35, in which v. 12, just like Psa. 70: 2, is an echo of Psa. 40:14. The whole Psalm is an echo of the language of older Psalms, which is become the mental property, so to speak, of the author, and is revived in him by experiences of a similar character. Notwithstanding the entire absence of any thorough originality, it has an individual, and in fact a Jeremianic, impress.

The following reasons decide us in considering the Psalm as coming from the pen of Jeremiah: —

(1) Its relationship to Psalms of the time of David and of the earlier times of the kings, but after David, leads us down to somewhere about the age of Jeremiah.

(2) This anthological weaving together of men's own utterances taken from older original passages, and this skilful variation of them by merely slight touches of his own, is exactly Jeremiah's manner.

(3) In solitary instances the style of Psalm 69, slow, loose, only sparingly adorned with figures, and here and there prosaic, closely resembles Jeremiah; also to him corresponds the situation of the poet as one who is persecuted; to him, the retrospect of a life rich in experience and full of miraculous guidings; to him, whose term of active service extended over a period of more than thirty years under Zedekiah, the transition to hoary age in which the poet finds himself; to him, the reference implied in v. 21 to some high office; and to him, the soft, plaintive strain that pervades the Psalm, from which it is at the same time clearly seen that the poet has attained a degree of age and experience, in which he is accustomed to self-control and is not discomposed by personal misfortune. To all these correspondences there is still to be added an historical testimony. The LXX inscribes the Psalm  $\tau\omega$  Δαυίδ, υἱὼν Ἰωναδάβ και τῶν πρώτων ἀιχμαλωτισθέντων. According to this inscription, the  $\tau\omega$  Δαυίδ of which is erroneous, but the second part of which is so explicit that it must be based upon tradition, the Psalm was a favourite song of the Rechabites and of the first exiles. The Rechabites are that tribe clinging to a homely nomad life in accordance with the will of their father, which Jeremiah (Jeremiah 35) holds up before the men of his time as an example of self-denying faithful adherence to the law of their father which puts them to shame. If the Psalm is by Jeremiah, it is just as intelligible that the Rechabites, to whom Jeremiah paid such a high tribute of respect, should appropriate it to their own use, as that the first exiles should do so. Hitzig infers from v. 20, that at the time of its composition Jerusalem had already fallen; whereas in Psalm 69 it is only the cities of Judah that as yet lie in ashes. But after the overthrow of Jerusalem we find no circumstances in the life of the prophet, who is no more heard of in Egypt, that will correspond to the complaints of the psalmist of violence and mockery. Moreover the foe in v. 4 is not the Chaldaean, whose conduct towards Jeremiah did not merit these names. Nor can v. 20 have been written at the time of the second siege and in the face of the catastrophe.

*Psa. 71: 1-6.* Stayed upon Jahve, his ground of trust, from early childhood up, the poet hopes and prays for deliverance out of the hand of the foe. The first of these two strophes (vv. 1-3) is taken from 31: 2-4, the second (vv. 4-6, with the exception of vv. 4 and 6c) from Psa. 22:10, 11; both, however, in comparison with Psalm 70 exhibit the far more encroaching variations of a poet who reproduces the language of others with a freer hand. Olshausen wishes to read  $\text{מַעוֹן}$  in v. 3, Psa. 90: 1; 91: 9, instead of  $\text{מַעוֹן}$ , which he holds to be an error in writing. But this old Mosaic, Deuteronomial word (vid., on Psa. 90: 1) — cf. the post-biblical oath  $\text{הַמַּעוֹן}$  (by the Temple!) — is

unassailable. Jahve, who is called a rock of refuge in Psa. 31: 3, is here called a rock of habitation, i.e., a high rock that cannot be stormed or scaled, which affords a safe abode; and this figure is pursued still further with a bold remodelling of the text of Psa. 31: 3: **לָבוֹא תָמִיד**, constantly to go into, i.e., which I can constantly, and therefore always, as often as it is needful, betake myself for refuge. The additional **צוֹיֵת** is certainly not equivalent to **צוּה**; it would more likely be equivalent to **אֲשֶׁר צוֹיֵת**; but probably it is an independent clause: Thou hast (in fact) commanded, i.e., unalterably determined (Psa. 44: 5; 68:29; 133: 3), to show me salvation, for my rock, etc. To the words **לָבוֹא תָמִיד צוֹיֵת** corresponds the expression **לְבֵית מְצוּדוֹת** in Psa. 31: 3, which the LXX renders *καὶ εἰς οἶκον καταφυγῆς*, whereas instead of the former three words it has *καὶ εἰς τόπον ὄχυρόν*, and seems to have read **לְבֵית מְבַצְרוֹת**, cf. Dan. 11:15 (Hitzig). In v. 5, *Thou art my hope* reminds one of the divine name **מִקְוֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל** in Jer. 17:13; 50: 7 (cf. *ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν* used of Christ in 1 Tim. 1: 1, Col. 1:27). **נִסְמְכֵתִי** is not less beautiful than **הַשְּׁלֵכֵתִי** in Psa. 22:11. In its incipient slumbering state (cf. Psa. 3: 6), and in its self-conscious continuance. He was and is the upholding prop and the supporting foundation, so to speak, of my life. And **גִּזְוִי** instead of **גִּחִי** in Psa. 22:10, is just such another felicitous modification. It is impracticable to define the meaning of this **גִּזְוִי** according to **גָּזָה = גָּזָה**, Arab. *gz'*, *retribuere* (prop. to cut up, distribute), because **גָּזַל** is the representative of this Aramaeo-Arabic verb in the Hebrew. Still less, however, can it be derived from **גָּזָה**, *transire*, the participle of which, if it would admit of a transitive meaning = **מוֹצִיאִי** (Targum), ought to be **גָּזִי**. The verb **גָּזָה**, in accordance with its radical signification of *abscindere* (root **גָּזָה**, synon. **קָץ**, **קָד**, **קָט**, and the like), denotes in this instance the separating of the child from the womb of the mother, the retrospect going back from youth to childhood, and even to his birth. The LXX **σκεπαστής (μου)** is an erroneous reading for **ἔσπαστής**, as is clear from Psa. 22:10, **ὁ ἔσπασας με. ב. הַלֵּל ב.** Psa. 44: 9 (cf. **ב. שִׁיחַ ב.** Psa. 69:13), is at the bottom of the expression in v. 6c. The God to whom he owes his being, and its preservation thus far, is the constant, inexhaustible theme of his praise.

**Psa. 71: 7-12.** Brought safely through dangers of every kind, he is become **בְּמוֹפֶת**, as a wonder, a miracle (Arabic *aft* from *afata*, cognate *afaka*, **הַפְּךָ**, to bend, distort: a turning round, that which is turned round or wrenched, i.e., that which is contrary to what is usual and looked for) to many, who gaze upon him as such with astonishment (Psa. 40: 4). It is his God, however, to whom, as hitherto so also in time to come, he will look to be thus wonderfully preserved: **מִחֲסִי-עוֹ**, as in 2Sa. 22:33. **עוֹ** is a genitive, and the suffix is thrown back



(vid., *supra*, p 171) in order that what God is to, and does for, the poet may be brought forward more clearly and independently [*lit.* unalloyed]. V. 8 tells us what it is that he firmly expects on the ground of what he possesses in God. And on this very ground arises the prayer of v. 9 also: Cast me not away (viz., from Thy presence, Psa. 51:13, Jer. 7:15, and frequently) in the time (לַעֲתָה, as in Gen. 8:11) of old age — he is therefore already an old man (זָקֵן), though only just at the beginning of the זְקִנָּה. He supplicates favour for the present and for the time still to come: now that my vital powers are failing, forsake me not! Thus he prays because he, who has been often wondrously delivered, is even now threatened by foes. V. 11, introduced by means of v. 10, tells us what their thoughts of him are, and what they purpose doing. לִי, v. 10a, does not belong to אוֹיְבָי, as it does not in Psa. 27: 2 also, and elsewhere. The לִי is that of relation or of reference, as in Psa. 41: 6. The unnecessary לְאִמֶּר betrays a poet of the later period; cf. Psa. 105:11; 119:82 (where it was less superfluous), and on the contrary, Psa. 83: 5 f. The later poet also reveals himself in v. 12, which is an echo of very similar prayers of David in Psa. 22:12, 20 (Psa. 40:14, cf. 70: 2), Psa. 35:22; 38:22 f. The Davidic style is to be discerned here throughout in other points also. In place of הַיְשָׁה the *Kerî* substitutes הַיְשָׁה, which is the form exclusively found elsewhere.

*Psa. 71:13-18.* In view of Psa. 40:15 (Psa. 70: 3), Psa. 35: 4, 26; 109:29, and other passages, the reading of יִבְלְמוּ, with the Syriac, instead of יִבְלוּ in v. 13a commends itself; but there are also other instances in this Psalm of a modification of the original passages, and the course of the thoughts is now climactic: confusion, ruin (cf. Psa. 6:11), and in fact ruin accompanied by reproach and shame. This is the fate that the poet desires for his deadly foes. In prospect of this he patiently composes himself, v. 14a (cf. Psa. 31:25); and when righteous retribution appears, he will find new matter and ground and motive for the praise of God in addition to all such occasion as he has hitherto had. The late origin of the Psalm betrays itself again here; for instead of the *praet. Hiph.* הוֹסִיף (which is found only in the Books of Kings and in Ecclesiastes), the older language made use of the *praet. Ka.* Without ceasing shall his mouth tell (סִפֵּר, as in Jer. 51:10) of God's righteousness, of God's salvation for he knows not numbers, i.e., the counting over or through of them (Psa. 139:17 f.); <sup>f253</sup> the divine proofs of righteousness or salvation מִסִּפְרֵי עֲצָמוֹ (Psa. 40: 6), they are in themselves endless, and therefore the matter also which they furnish for praise is inexhaustible. He will tell those things which cannot be so reckoned up; he will come with the mighty deeds of the Lord Jahve, and with praise acknowledge His righteousness, Him alone. Since נִבְרוֹת, like the New Testament δυνάμεις, usually signifies the proofs of the

divine **נְבוֹרָה** (e.g., Psa. 20: 7), the *Beth* is the *Beth* of accompaniment, as e.g., in Psa. 40: 8; 66:13. **בְּאוֹ בְּ**, *vernire cum*, is like Arab. *j'â' b (atâ)*, equivalent to *afferre*, he will bring the proofs of the divine power, this rich material, with him. It is evident from vv. 18 f. that **בְּגִבּוֹרוֹת** does not refer to the poet (in the fulness of divine strength), but, together with **צְדִקְתֶּךָ**, forms a pair of words that have reference to God. **לְבִדְךָ**, according to the sense, joins closely upon the suffix of **צְדִקְתֶּךָ** (cf. Psa. 83:19): Thy righteousness (which has been in mercy turned towards me), Thine alone (*te solum = tui solius*). From youth up God has instructed him, viz., in His ways (Psa. 25: 4), which are worthy of all praise, and hitherto (**אֲדַרְשֶׁנָּה**, found only in this passage in the Psalter, and elsewhere almost entirely confined to prose) has he, “the taught of Jahve” (**הַלְמוֹד**), had to praise the wonders of His rule and of His leadings. May God, then, not forsake him even further on **אֲדַרְשֶׁנָּה וְשִׁיבָה**. The poet is already old (**זָקֵן**), and is drawing ever nearer to **שִׁיבָה**, silvery, hoary old age (cf. 1Sa. 12: 2). May God, then, in this stage of life also to which he has attained, preserve him in life and in His favour, until (**אֲדַרְשֶׁנָּה = אֲדַרְשֶׁנָּה**, as in Psa. 132: 5, Gen. 38:11, and frequently) he shall have declared His arm, i.e., His mighty interposition in human history, to posterity (**דִּוְרָה**), and to all who shall come (supply **אֲשֶׁר**), i.e., the whole of the future generation, His strength, i.e., the impossibility of thwarting His purposes. The primary passage for this is Psa. 22:31 f.

**Psa. 71:19-24.** The thought of this proclamation so thoroughly absorbs the poet that he even now enters upon the tone of it; and since to his faith the deliverance is already a thing of the past, the tender song with its uncomplaining prayer dies away into a loud song of praise, in which he pictures it all to himself. Without vv. 19-21 being subordinate to **עַד־אֵינִי** in v. 18, **וְצְדִקְתֶּךָ** is coupled by close connection with **בְּגִבּוֹרוֹתֶךָ**. V. 19a is an independent clause; and **אֲדַרְשֶׁנָּה** takes the place of the predicate: the righteousness of God exceeds all bounds, is infinite (Psa. 36: 6 f., 57:11). The cry **מִי כַמּוֹדְךָ**, as in Psa. 35:10; 69: 9, Jer. 10: 6, refers back to Exo. 15:11. According to the *Chethîb*, the range of the poet’s vision widens in v. 20 from the proofs of the strength and righteousness of God which he has experienced in his own case to those which he has experienced in common with others in the history of his own nation. The *Kerî* (cf. on the other hand Psa. 60: 5; 85: 7, Deu. 31:17) rests upon a failing to discern how the experiences of the writer are interwoven with those of the nation. **תְּשׁוּבָה** in both instances supplies the corresponding adverbial notion to the principal verb, as in Psa. 85: 7 (cf. Psa. 51: 4). **תְּהוֹמוֹת**, prop. a rumbling, commonly used of a deep heaving of

waters, here signifies an abyss. “The abysses of the earth” (LXX ἔκ τῶν ἄβύσσων τῆς γῆς, just as the old Syriac version renders the New Testament ἄβυσσος, e.g., in Luke 8:31, by Syr. *tehūmā* ܚܘܡܐ) are, like the gates of death (Psa. 9:14), a figure of extreme perils and dangers, in the midst of which one is as it were half hidden in the abyss of Hades. The past and future are clearly distinguished in the sequence of the tenses. When God shall again raise His people out of the depth of the present catastrophe, then will He also magnify the גְּדֻלָּהּ of the poet, i.e., in the dignity of his office, by most brilliantly vindicating him in the face of his foes, and will once more (תְּסוּב, *fut. Niph.* like תְּשׁוּב above) comfort him. He on his part will also (cf. Job. 40:14) be grateful for this national restoration and this personal vindication: he will praise God, will praise His truth, i.e., His fidelity to His promises. בְּכִלְי־נֶבֶל instead of בְּנֶבֶל sounds more circumstantial than in the old poetry. The divine name “The Holy One of Israel” occurs here for the third time in the Psalter; the other passages are Psa. 78:41; 89:19, which are older in time, and older also than Isaiah, who uses it thirty times, and Habakkuk, who uses it once. Jeremiah has it twice (Jer. 50:29; 51: 5), and that after the example of Isaiah. In vv. 23, 24a the poet means to say that lips and tongue, song and speech, shall act in concert in the praise of God. תִּרְנְנָה with *Dagesh* also in the second *Nun*, after the form תִּקְוִינָה, תִּשְׁכַּנָּה, side by side with which we also find the reading תִּרְנְנָה, and the reading תִּרְנָה, which is in itself admissible, after the form תִּאֲמָנָה, תִּשְׁגָּנָה, but is here unattested. <sup>f254</sup>

The cohortative after כִּי (LXX ὄταν) is intended to convey this meaning: when I feel myself impelled to harp unto Thee. In the perfects in the closing line that which is hoped for stands before his soul as though it had already taken place. כִּי is repeated with triumphant emphasis.

## Psalm 72

### PRAYER FOR THE DOMINION OF PEACE OF THE ANOINTED ONE OF GOD

*72: 1 ELOHIM, give Thy rights unto the king,  
And Thy righteousness unto the king's son.*

*72: 2 May he govern Thy people with uprightness,  
And Thine afflicted with justice.*

*72: 3 May the mountains bring peace to the people,  
And the hills by righteousness.*

*72: 4 May he judge the afflicted among the people,  
Save the children of the needy, and crush the oppressor.*

*72: 5 May they fear Thee as long as the sun,  
And before the moon to all generations.*

*72: 6 May he come down like rain upon the meadow-grass,  
As showers, a heavy rain upon the earth.*

*72: 7 In his days may the righteous flourish,  
And abundance of peace, till the moon be no more.*

*72: 8 And may he have dominion from sea to sea,  
And from the river unto the ends of the earth.*

*72: 9 Before him shall the inhabitants of the wilderness bow,  
And his enemies shall lick the dust.*

*72:10 The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring gifts,  
The kings of Saba and Meroë shall offer tribute.*

*72:11 And all kings shall do homage to him,  
All peoples shall serve him.*

*72:12 For he shall deliver the needy who crieth,  
And the afflicted who have no succour.*

*72:13 He shall deal gently with the poor and needy,  
And help the souls of the needy;*

*72:14 From oppression and violence he shall redeem their soul,  
And precious is their blood in his eyes:*

*72:15 And he shall live, and he will present him with gold of Saba,  
And he will pray for him always, bless him continually.*

*72:16 May there be abundance of corn in the land unto the top of the mountains,  
May its fruit wave like Lebanon,  
And may they blossom out of cities like the herbs of the earth.*

*72:17 May his name endure for ever,  
Before the sun may his name throw out shoots.  
And may they bless themselves in him, may all peoples call him blessed.*

**72:18 BLESSED BE JAHVE ELOHIM THE GOD OF ISRAEL,  
WHO ALONE DOETH WONDROUS THINGS.**

**72:19 AND BLESSED BE HIS GLORIOUS NAME FOR EVER,  
AND LET THE WHOLE EARTH BE FILLED WITH HIS GLORY.  
AMEN, AND AMEN.**

*72:20 Ended are the prayers of David the son of Jesse.*

*Psalm 72.* This last Psalm of the primary collection, united to Psalm 71 by community of the prominent word **צדקה**, appears, as we look to the superscription, Psa. 72:20, to be said to be a Psalm of David; so that consequently **לשלמה** designates Solomon as the subject, not the author. But the *Lamed* of **לשלמה** here and in Psa. 127: 1 cannot have any other meaning than that which the *Lamed* always has at the head of the Psalms when it is joined to proper names; it is then always the expression denoting that the Psalm belongs to the person named, as its author. Then in style and general character the Psalm has not the least kinship with the Psalms of David. Characteristic of Solomon, on the other hand, are the movement proverb-like, and for the most part distichic, which has less of original freshness and directness than of an artificial, reflective, and almost sluggish manner, the geographic range of view, the richness in figures drawn from nature, and the points of contact with the Book of Job, which belongs incontrovertibly to the circle of the Salomonic literature: these are coincident signs which are decisive in favour of Solomon. But if Solomon is the author, the question arises, who is the subject of the Psalm? According to Hitzig, Ptolemy Philadelphus; but no true Israelite could celebrate him in this manner, and there is no reliable example of carmina of this character having found their way into the song-book of Israel. The subject of the Psalm is either Solomon (LXX **εις Σαλωμών**) or the Messiah (Targum, “O God, give Thy regulations of right to the King Messiah, **למלכא משיחא** “). Both are correct. It is Solomon himself to whom the intercession and desires of blessing of this Psalm refer. Solomon, just as David with Psalm 20 and 21, put it into the heart and mouth of the people, probably very soon after his accession, it being as it were a church-prayer on behalf of the new, reigning king. But the Psalm is also none the less Messianic, and with perfect right the church has made it the chief Psalm of the festival of Epiphany, which has received its name of *festum trium regum* out of it.

Solomon was in truth a righteous, benign, God-fearing ruler; he established and also extended the kingdom; he ruled over innumerable people, exalted in wisdom and riches above all the kings of the earth; his time was the most happy, the richest in peace and joy that Israel has ever known. The words of the Psalm were all fulfilled in him, even to the one point of the universal dominion that is wished for him. But the end of his reign was not like the beginning and the middle of it. That fair, that glorious, that pure image of the Messiah which he had represented waxed pale; and with this fading away its development in relation to the history of redemption took a new turn. In the time of David and of Solomon the hope of believers, which was attached to the kingship of David, had not yet fully broken with the present. At that time, with few exceptions, nothing was known of any other Messiah than the Anointed One of God, who was David or Solomon himself. When, however, the

kingship in these its two most glorious impersonations had proved itself unable to bring to full realization the idea of the Messiah or of the Anointed One of God, and when the line of kings that followed thoroughly disappointed the hope which clung to the kingship of the present, — a hope which here and there, as in the reign of Hezekiah, blazed up for a moment and then totally died out, and men were driven from the present to look onward into the future, — then, and not until then, did any decided rupture take place between the Messianic hope and the present. The image of the Messiah is now painted on the pure ethereal sky of the future (though of the immediate future) in colours which were furnished by older unfulfilled prophecies, and by the contradiction between the existing kingship and its idea; it becomes more and more, so to speak, an image, super-earthly, super-human, belonging to the future, the invisible refuge and invisible goal of a faith despairing of the present, and thereby rendered relatively more spiritual and heavenly (cf. the Messianic image painted in colours borrowed from our Psalm in Isaiah 11, Mic. 5: 3, 6, Zec. 9: 9 f.). In order rightly to estimate this, we must free ourselves from the prejudice that the centre of the Old Testament proclamation of salvation [or gospel] lies in the prophecy of the Messiah. Is the Messiah, then, anywhere set forth as the Redeemer of the world? The Redeemer of the world is Jahve. The appearing (*parusia*) of Jahve is the centre of the Old Testament proclamation of salvation. An allegory may serve to illustrate the way in which the Old Testament proclamation of salvation unfolds itself. The Old Testament in relation to the Day of the New Testament is Night. In this Night there rise in opposite directions two stars of Promise. The one describes its path from above downwards: it is the promise of Jahve who is about to come. The other describes its path from below upwards: it is the hope which rests on the seed of David, the prophecy of the Son of David, which at the outset assumes a thoroughly human, and merely earthly character. These two stars meet at last, they blend together into one star; the Night vanishes and it is Day. This one Star is Jesus Christ, Jahve and the Son of David in one person, the King of Israel and at the same time the Redeemer of the world, — in one word, the God-man.

*Psa. 72: 1-4.* The name of God, occurring only once, is *Elohim*; and this is sufficient to stamp the Psalm as an Elohimic Psalm. מֶלֶךְ (cf. Psa. 21: 2) and בֶּן־מֶלֶךְ are only used without the article according to a poetical usage of the language. The petition itself, and even the position of the words, show that the king's son is present, and that he is king; God is implored to bestow upon him His מְשָׁפְטִים, i.e., the rights or legal powers belonging to Him, the God of Israel, and צְדָקָה, i.e., the official gift in order that he may exercise those rights in accordance with divine righteousness. After the supplicatory הִנֵּן the futures which now follow, without the *Waw apodoseos*, are manifestly

optatives. Mountains and hills describe synecdochically the whole land of which they are the high points visible afar off. **נָשָׂא** is used in the sense of **פָּרַי** **נָשָׂא** Eze. 17: 8: may **שָׁלוֹם** be the fruit which ripens upon every mountain and hill; universal prosperity satisfied and contented within itself. The predicate for v. 3b is to be taken from v. 3a, just as, on the other hand, **בְּצִדְקָה**, “in or by righteousness,” the fruit of which is indeed peace (Isa. 32:17), belongs also to v. 3a; so that consequently both members supplement one another. The wish of the poet is this: By righteousness, may there in due season be such peaceful fruit adorning all the heights of the land. V. 3b, however, always makes one feel as though a verb were wanting, like **הִפְרֵחְהָנָה** suggested by Böttcher. In v. 4 the wishes are continued in plain unfigurative language. **הוֹשִׁיא** in the signification to save, to obtain salvation for, has, as is frequently the case, a dative of the object. **בְּנֵי־אֲבִיוֹן** are those who are born to poverty, just like **בְּנֵי־מֶלֶךְ**, one who is born a king. Those who are born to poverty are more or less regarded, by an unrighteous government, as having no rights.

*Psa. 72: 5-8.* The invocation of v. 1 is continued in the form of a wish: may they fear Thee, Elohim, **עַם־שָׁמֶשׁ**, with the sun, i.e., during its whole duration (**עַם** in the sense of contemporary existence, as in Dan. 3:33). **לְפָנֵי־יָרֵחַ**, in the moonlight (cf. Job. 8:16, **לְפָנֵי־שֶׁמֶשׁ**, in the sunshine), i.e., so long as the moon shines. **דוֹר דּוֹרִים** (accusative of the duration of time, cf. Psa. 102:25), into the uttermost generation which outlasts the other generations (like **הַשָּׁמַיִם** **שָׁמַי** of the furthest heavens which surround the other heavens). The first two periphrastic expressions for unlimited time recur in Psa. 89:37 f., a Psalm composed after the time of Solomon; cf. the unfigurative expression in Solomon’s prayer at the dedication of the Temple in 1Ki. 8:40. The continuance of the kingship, from the operation of which such continuance of the fear of God is expected, is not asserted until v. 17. It is capricious to refer the language of address in v. 5 to the king (as Hupfeld and Hitzig do), who is not directly addressed either in v. 4, or in v. 6, or anywhere in the Psalm. With respect to God the desire is expressed that the righteous and benign rule of the king may result in the extension of the fear of God from generation to generation into endless ages. The poet in v. 6 delights in a heaping up of synonyms in order to give intensity to the expression of the thoughts, just as in v. 5; the last two expressions stand side by side one another without any bond of connection as in v. 5. **רְבִיבִים** (from **רָבַב**, Arab. *rbb*, *densum*, *spissum esse*, and then, starting from this signification, sometimes *multum* and sometimes *magnum esse*) is the shower of rain pouring down in drops that are close together; nor is **נְרִיף** a synonym of **נָזַף**, but (formed from **נָרַף**, Arab. *drf*, to flow, by means of a rare reduplication of the first two letters of the root, Ew. §

157, *d*) properly the water running from a roof (cf. *B. Joma* 87a: “when the maid above poured out water, **אורוֹפֵי דמֵיא** came upon his head”). **גַּז**, however, is not the meadow-shearing, equivalent to a shorn, mown meadow, any more than **גַּז, גִּזָּה**, Arabic *gézza*, signifies a shorn hide, but, on the contrary, a hide with the wool or feathers (e.g., ostrich feathers) still upon it, rather a meadow, i.e., grassy plain, that is intended to be mown. The closing word **אָרְץ** (*accus. loci* as in *Psa.* 147:15) unites itself with the opening word **יָרֵד**: *descendat in terram*. In his last words (2Sa. 23) David had compared the effects of the dominion of his successor, whom he beheld as by vision, to the fertilizing effects of the sun and of the rain upon the earth. The idea of v. 6 is that Solomon’s rule may prove itself thus beneficial for the country. The figure of the rain in v. 7 gives birth to another: under his rule may the righteous blossom (expanding himself unhindered and under the most favourable circumstances), and (may there arise) salvation in all fulness **אֲדֹבֵלֵי יָרֵם**, until there is no more moon (cf. the similar expression in *Job.* 14:12). To this desire for the uninterrupted prosperity and happiness of the righteous under the reign of this king succeeds the desire for an unlimited extension of his dominion, v. 8. The sea (the Mediterranean) and the river (the Euphrates) are geographically defined points of issue, whence the definition of boundary is extended into the unbounded. Solomon even at his accession ruled over all kingdoms from the Euphrates as far as the borders of Egypt; the wishes expressed here are of wider compass, and Zechariah repeats them predictively (*Zec.* 9:10) with reference to the King Messiah.

**Psa. 72: 9-11.** This third strophe contains prospects, the ground of which is laid down in the fourth. The position of the futures here becomes a different one. The contemplation passes from the home relations of the new government to its foreign relations, and at the same time the wishes are changed into hopes. The awe-commanding dominion of the king shall stretch even into the most distant corners of the desert. **צִיִּים** is used both for the animals and the men who inhabit the desert, to be determined in each instance by the context; here they are men beyond all dispute, but in *Psa.* 74:14, *Isa.* 23:13, it is matter of controversy whether men or beasts are meant. Since the LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, and Jerome here, and the LXX and Jerome in *Psa.* 74:14, render **Αἰθίοπες**, the nomadic tribes right and left of the Arabian Gulf seem traditionally to have been associated in the mind with this word, more particularly the so-called Ichthyophagi. These shall bend the knee reverentially before him, and those who contend against him shall be compelled at last to veil their face before him in the dust. The remotest west and south become subject and tributary to him, viz., the kings of Tartessus in the south of Spain, rich in silver, and of the islands of the Mediterranean and the countries on its



coasts, that is to say, the kings of the Polynesian portion of Europe, and the kings of the Cushitish or of the Joktanitish **שְׁבָא** and of the Cushitish **סְבָא**, as, according to Josephus, the chief city of Meroë was called (vid., *Genesis*, S. 206). It was a queen of that Joktanitish, and therefore South Arabian *Sheba*, — perhaps, however, more correctly (vid., Wetzstein in my *Isaiah*, ii. 529) of the Cushitish (Nubian) *Sheba*, — whom the fame of Solomon’s wisdom drew towards him, 1Ki. 10. The idea of their wealth in gold and in other precious things is associated with both peoples. In the expression **הָשִׁיב מְנַחָה** (to pay tribute, 2Ki. 17: 3, cf. 3: 4) the tribute is not conceived of as rendered in return for protection afforded (Maurer, Hengstenberg, and Olshausen), nor as an act repeated periodically (Rödiger, who refers to 2Ch. 27: 5), but as a bringing back, i.e., repayment of a debt, *referre s. reddere debitum* (Hupfeld), after the same idea according to which obligatory incomings are called *reditus* (revenues). In the synonymous expression **הַקְרִיב אֲשֶׁכֶר** the presentation appears as an act of sacrifice. **אֲשֶׁכֶר** signifies in Eze. 27:15 a payment made in merchandise, here a rent or tribute due, from **שְׁכָר**, which in blending with the *Aleph prostheticum* has passed over into **שָׁכָר** by means of a shifting of the sound after the Arabic manner, just as in **אֲשַׁכֵּל** the verb **שָׁכַל**, to interweave, passes over into **שָׁכַל** (Rödiger in Gesenius’ *Thesaurus*). In v. 11 hope breaks through every bound: everything shall submit to his world-subduing sceptre.

*Psa. 72:12-15.* The confirmation of these prospects is now given.

Voluntative forms are intermingled because the prospect extending into the future is nevertheless more lyrical than prophetic in its character. The elevation of the king to the dominion of the world is the reward of his condescension; he shows himself to be the helper and protecting lord of the poor and the oppressed, who are the especial object upon which God’s eye is set. He looks upon it as his task to deal most sympathizingly and most considerately (**יָחַם**) just with those of reduced circumstances and with the poor, and their blood is precious in his eyes. V. 12 is re-echoed in Job. 29:12. The meaning of v. 14b is the same as Psa. 116:15. Instead of **יָקָר**, by a retention of the *Jod* of the stem it is written **יִיקָר**. Just as in Psa. 49:10, **יִיקָר** here also is followed by **וַיַּחֲיֶה**. The assertion is individualized: and he (who was threatened with death) shall live (voluntative, having reference to the will of the king). But who is now the subject to **וַיַּחֲיֶה**? Not the rescued one (Hitzig), for after the foregoing designations (vv. 11 f.) we cannot expect to find “the gold of Sheba” (gold from Jeman or Aethiopia) in his possession. Therefore it is the king, and in fact Solomon, of whom the disposal of the gold of Sheba (Saba) is characteristic. The king’s thought and endeavour are directed to this, that the poor man who has almost fallen a victim shall live or revive, and not only will he maintain his

cause, he will also bestow gifts upon him with a liberal hand, and he (the poor one who has been rescued and endowed from the riches of the king) shall pray unceasingly for him (the king) and bless him at all times. The poor one is he who is restored to life and endowed with gifts, and who intercedes and blesses; the king, however, is the beneficent giver. It is left for the reader to supply the right subjects in thought to the separate verbs. That clearly marked precision which we require in rhetorical recital is alien to the Oriental style (vid., my *Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*, S. 189). Maurer and Hofmann also give the same interpretation as we have done.

*Psa. 72:16, 17.* Here, where the futures again stand at the head of the clauses, they are also again to be understood as optatives. As the blessing of such a dominion after God's heart, not merely fertility but extraordinary fruitfulness may be confidently desired for the land פְּסָה (ἀπ. λεγ.), rendered by the Syriac version *sugo*, abundance, is correctly derived by the Jewish lexicographers from פִּסָּה = פְּשָׁה (in the law relating to leprosy), Mishnic פְּסָה, Aramaic פִּסָּא, Arabic *fṣâ*, but also *fṣš* (vid., *Job*, at Psa. 35:14-16), to extend, *expandere*; so that it signifies an abundance that occupies a broad space. בְּרֹאשׁ, unto the summit, as in Psa. 36: 6; 19: 5. The idea thus obtained is the same as when Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. 180 f.) takes פְּסָה (from פִּסָּה = אִפְסָה) in the signification of a boundary line: "close upon the summit of the mountain shall the last corn stand," with reference to the terrace-like structure of the heights. פְּרִיֹו does not refer back to בְּאֶרֶץ (Hitzig, who misleads one by referring to Joe. 2: 3), but to בֵּר: may the corn stand so high and thick that the fields, being moved by the wind, shall shake, i.e., wave up and down, like the lofty thick forest of Lebanon. The LXX, which renders ὑπεραρθῆσεται, takes יִרְעֵשׁ for יִרְאֵשׁ, as Ewald does: may its fruit rise to a summit, i.e., rise high, like Lebanon. But a verb יִרְאֵשׁ is unknown; and how bombastic is this figure in comparison with that grand, but beautiful figure, which we would not willingly exchange even for the conjecture יִעֲשֶׂר (may it be rich)! The other wish refers to a rapid, joyful increase of the population: may men blossom out of this city and out of that city as the herb of the earth (cf. Job. 5:25, where צִיֵּצִיֹו also accords in sound with יִצִּיֹו), i.e., fresh, beautiful, and abundant as it. Israel actually became under Solomon's sceptre as numerous "as the sand by the sea" (1Ki. 4:20), but increase of population is also a settled feature in the picture of the Messianic time (Psa. 110: 3, Isa. 9: 2; 49:20, Zec. 2: 8 [4]; cf. Sir. 44:21). If, however, under the just and benign rule of the king, both land and people are thus blessed, eternal duration may be desired for his name. May this name, is the wish of the poet, ever send forth new shoots (יִנְיֹו *Chethib*), or receive new shoots (יִנּוֹן *Kerî*, from *Niph.* יִנּוֹן),

as long as the sun turns its face towards us, inasmuch as the happy and blessed results of the dominion of the king ever afford new occasion for glorifying his name. May they bless themselves in him, may all nations call him blessed, and that, as **וַיְתַבְּרְכוּ בּוֹ**<sup>f255</sup> implies, so blessed that his abundance of blessing appears to them to be the highest that they can desire for themselves. To *et benedicant sibi in eo* we have to supply in thought the most universal, as yet undefined subject, which is then more exactly defined as *omnes gentes* with the second synonymous predicate. The accentuation (*Athnach, Mugerash, Silluk*) is blameless.

**Psa. 72:18, 19.** Closing *Beracha* of the Second Book of the Psalter. It is more full-toned than that of the First Book, and God is intentionally here called *Jahve Elohim the God of Israel* because the Second Book contains none but Elohim-Psalms, and not, as there, *Jahve the God of Israel*. “Who alone doeth wonders” is a customary praise of God, Psa. 86:10; 136: 4, cf. Job. 9: 8. **שֵׁם כְּבוֹדוֹ** is a favourite word in the language of divine worship in the period after the Exile (Neh. 9: 5); it is equivalent to the **שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ** in the liturgical *Beracha*, God’s glorious name, the name that bears the impress of His glory. The closing words: and let the whole earth be full, etc., are taken from Num. 14:21. Here, as there, the construction of the active with a double accusative of that which fills and that which is to be filled is retained in connection with the passive; for **כְּבוֹדוֹ** is also accusative: let be filled with His glory the whole earth (let one make it full of it). The **אָמֵן** coupled by means of *Waw* is, in the Old Testament, exclusively peculiar to these doxologies of the Psalter.

**Psa. 72:20.** Superscription of the primary collection. The origin of this superscription cannot be the same as that of the doxology, which is only inserted between it and the Psalm, because it was intended to be read with the Psalm at the reading in the course of the service (*Symbolae*, p. 19). **כָּלוּ = כָּלוּ**, like **דָּחוּ** in Psa. 36:13, **כָּסוּ**, Psa. 80:11, all being *Pual* forms, as is manifest in the accented *ultima*. A parallel with this verse is the superscription “*are ended the words of Job*” in Job. 31:40, which separates the controversial speeches and Job’s monologue from the speeches of God. No one taking a survey of the whole Psalter, with the many Psalms of David that follow beyond Psalm 72, could possibly have placed this key-stone here. If, however, it is more ancient than the doxological division into five books, it is a significant indication in relation to the history of the rise of the collection. It proves that the collection of the whole as it now lies before us was at least preceded by one smaller collection, of which we may say that it extended to Psalm 72, without thereby meaning to maintain that it contained all the Psalms up to that one, since

several of them may have been inserted into it when the redaction of the whole took place. But it is possible for it to have contained Psalm 72, since at the earliest it was only compiled in the time of Solomon. The fact that the superscription following directly upon a Psalm of Solomon is thus worded, is based on the same ground as the fact that the whole Psalter is quoted in the New Testament as Davidic. David is the father of the **שִׁיר דָּוִד**, 2Ch. 29:27, and hence all Psalms may be called Davidic, just as all **מִשְׁלֵי** may be called Salomonic, without meaning thereby that they are all composed by David himself.

## Third Book of the Psalter

### PSALMS 73-89

#### Psalm 73

#### TEMPTATION TO APOSTASY OVERCOME

*73: 1 VERILY good to Israel is Elohim,  
To those who are of a clean heart.*

*73: 2 But as for me — my feet had almost tottered,  
My steps had well-nigh slipped.*

*73: 3 For I was incensed at the boastful,  
When I saw the prosperity of the wicked.*

*73: 4 For they suffer no pangs,  
Healthy and fat is their belly.*

*73: 5 In the trouble of men they are not,  
And not as other men are they plagued.*

*73: 6 Therefore pride encircleth their neck,  
Violence covereth them round about as a garment.*

*73: 7 Their eyes stand out with fat,  
The imaginations of the heart appear outwardly.*

*73: 8 They mock and speak oppression in wickedness,  
They speak from on high.*

*73: 9 They set their mouth in the heavens,  
And their tongue stalketh along upon the earth.*

*73:10 Therefore their people turn hither,  
And water in abundance is swallowed down by them.*

*73:11 And they say: "How should God know,  
And knowledge dwell in the Most High?!"*

*73:12 Behold those are godless,  
And always reckless have they attained to great power!*

*73:13 Only in vain have I cleansed my heart,  
And washed my hands in innocence,*

*73:14 And yet was plagued all the day long,  
And my chastisement was present every morning." —*

*73:15 Had I thought: I will speak thus,  
Behold, I should have dealt faithlessly with the generation of Thy children.*

*73:16 Yet when I mused in order to solve the riddle,  
It was too difficult in mine eyes —*

*73:17 Until I went into the sanctuary of God,  
Until I gave good heed unto their end:*

*73:18 Surely in slippery places dost Thou set them,  
Thou castest them down to ruins.*

*73:19 How are they become a desolation as in a moment,  
Brought to an end, gone by reason of terrors!*

*73:20 As a dream, as soon as one awaketh,  
O Lord, being aroused, Thou dost get rid of their image.*

*73:21 If my heart should grow bitter,  
And I should be pricked in my reins:*

*73:22 Then I should be a stupid one and without understanding,  
A behēmôth should I be in comparison with Thee.*

*73:23 But I remain continually with Thee,  
Thou hast taken hold of my right hand.*

*73:24 According to Thy counsel wilt Thou lead me,  
And afterward receive me to honour.*

*73:25 Whom have I in the heavens?  
And if Thou art mine, the earth doth not delight me!*

*73:26 My flesh and my heart may fail —  
The refuge of my heart and my portion is Elohim for ever.*

*73:27 For, lo, those who are estranged from Thee shall perish,  
Thou destroyest all those who wantonly forsake Thee.*

*73:28 But as for me — to be united to Elohim is my happiness,  
I make in the Lord, Jahve, my refuge,  
That I may declare all Thy works.*

*Psalm 73.* After the one Asaph Psalm of the Second Book, Psalm 50, follow eleven more of them from Psalm 73 to 83. They are all Elohimic, whereas the Korah Psalms divide into an Elohimic and a Jehovic group. Psalm 84 forms the transition from the one to the other. The Elohim-Psalms extend from Psalm 42-84, and are fenced in on both sides by Jahve-Psalms.

In contents Psalm 73 is the counterpart of pendant of Psalm 50. As in that Psalm the semblance of a sanctity based upon works is traced back to its nothingness, so here the seeming good fortune of the ungodly, by which the poet felt himself tempted to fall away, not into heathenism (Hitzig), but into that free-thinking which in the heathen world does not less cast off the **δεισιδαιμονία** than it does the belief in Jahve within the pale of Israel. Nowhere does there come to light in the national history any back ground that should contradict the **לְאִסָּרָה**, and the doubts respecting the moral order of the world are set at rest in exactly the same way as in Psalm 37, 49, and in the Book of Job. Theodicy, or the vindication of God's ways, does not as yet rise from the indication of the retribution in this present time which the ungodly do not escape, to a future solution of all the contradictions of this present world; and the transcendent glory which infinitely outweighs the suffering of this present time, still remains outside the range of vision. The stedfast faith which, gladly renouncing everything, holds fast to God, and the pure love to which this possession is more than heaven and earth, is all the more worthy of admiration in connection with such defective knowledge.

The strophe schema of the Psalm is predominantly octastichic: 4. 8. 8. 8; 8. 8. 5. Its two halves are vv. 1-14, 15-28.

*Psa. 73: 1, 2.* **יֵשׁ**, belonging to the favourite words of the faith that bids defiance to assault, signifies originally “thus = not otherwise,” and therefore combines an affirmative and restrictive, or, according to circumstances, even an adversative signification (vid., on Psa. 39: 6). It may therefore be rendered: yea good, assuredly good, or: only good, nothing but good; both renderings are an assertion of a sure, infallible relation of things. God appears to be angry with the godly, but in reality He is kindly disposed towards them, though He send affliction after affliction upon them (Lam. 3:25). The words **אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל** are not to be taken together, after Gal. 6:16 (**τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ**); not, “only good is it with the Israel of Elohim,” but “only good to Israel is Elohim,” is the right apprehension of the truth or reality that is opposed to what seems to be the case. The Israel which in every relationship has a good

and loving God is limited in v. 1*b* to the pure in heart (Psa. 24: 4, Mat. 5: 8). Israel in truth are not all those who are descended from Jacob, but those who have put away all impurity of disposition and all uncleanness of sin out of their heart, i.e., out of their innermost life, and by a constant striving after sanctification (v. 13) maintain themselves in such purity. In relation to this, which is the real church of God, God is pure love, nothing but love. This it is that has been confirmed to the poet as he passed through the conflict of temptation, but it was through conflict, for he almost fell by reason of the semblance of the opposite. The *Chethib* נְטוּי רַגְלִי (cf. Num. 24: 4) or נְטוּי (cf. 2Sa. 15:32) is erroneous. The narration of that which is past cannot begin with a participial clause like this, and בְּמֵאֵט, in such a sense (*non multum abfuit quin*, like בְּאֵין, *nihil abfuit quin*), always has the perfect after it, e.g., Psa. 94:17; 119:87. It is therefore to be read נְטוּי (according to the fuller form for נָטוּ, which is used not merely with great distinctives, as in Psa. 36: 8; 122: 6, Num. 24: 6, but also with conjunctives out of pause, e.g., Psa. 57: 2, cf. 36: 9, Deu. 32:37, Job. 12: 6): my feet had almost inclined towards, had almost slipped backwards and towards the side. On the other hand the *Chethib* שִׁפְכָהּ is unassailable; the feminine singular is frequently found as predicate both of a plural subject that has preceded (Psa. 18:35, cf. Deu. 21: 7, Job. 16:16) and also more especially of one that is placed after it, e.g., Psa. 37:31, Job. 14:19. The footsteps are said to be poured out when one “flies out or slips” and falls to the ground.

*Psa. 73: 3-6.* Now follows the occasion of the conflict of temptation: the good fortune of those who are estranged from God. In accordance with the gloominess of the theme, the style is also gloomy, and piles up the full-toned suffixes *amo* and *emo* (vid., Psa. 78:66; 80: 7; 83:12, 14); both are after the example set by David. קִנְיָא with *Beth* of the object ion which the zeal or warmth of feeling is kindled (Psa. 37: 1, Pro. 3:31) here refers to the warmth of envious ill-feeling. Concerning חוֹלָל vid., 5: 6. V. 3*b* tells under what circumstances the envy was excited; cf. so far as the syntax is concerned, Psa. 49: 6; 76:11. In v. 4 חֲרָצְבוֹת (from חֲרָצַב = חָצַב from חָצַב, cognate עָצַב, whence עָצַב, pain, Arabic *‘asābe*, a snare, cf. חָבַל, ὠδύς, and חָבַל σχοινο(ov), in the same sense as the Latin *tormenta* (from *torquere*), is intended of pains that produce convulsive contractions. But in order to give the meaning “they have no pangs (to suffer) till their death,” לָהֶם (לָמוֹ) could not be omitted (that is, assuming also that לְ, which is sometimes used for אֶד, vid., Psa. 59:14, could in such an exclusive sense signify the *terminus ad quem*). Also “there are no pangs for their death, i.e., that bring death to them,” ought to be expressed by לָהֶם לָמוֹת. The clause as it stands affirms that their dying

has no pangs, i.e., it is a painless death; but not merely does this assertion not harmonize with vv. 18 f., but it is also introduced too early here, since the poet cannot surely begin the description of the good fortune of the ungodly with the painlessness of their death, and then for the first time come to speak of their healthy condition. We may therefore read, with Ewald, Hitzig, Böttcher, and Olshausen:

דִּי אֵין חרצבות למו  
תם ובריא אולם

i.e., *they have* (suffer) *no pangs, vigorous* (תם like תם, Job. 21:23, תמים, Pro. 1:12) *and well-nourished is their belly*; by which means the difficult למותם is got rid of, and the gloomy picture is enriched by another form ending with *mo*. אול, here in a derisive sense, signifies the body, like the Arabic *allun, âlun* (from *âl, coaluit, cohaesit*, to condense inwardly, to gain consistency).<sup>f256</sup>

The observation of v. 4a is pursued further in v. 5: whilst one would have thought that the godly formed an exception to the common wretchedness of mankind, it is just the wicked who are exempt from all trouble and calamity. It is also here to be written אֵינמו, as in Psa. 59:14, not אֵינימו. Therefore is haughtiness their neck-chain, and brutishness their mantle. עֵנֶק is a denominative from עָנַק = ἀναγκάω: to hang round the neck; the neck is the seat of pride (ἀναγκάω): haughtiness hangs around their neck (like עֵנֶק, a neck-ornament). Accordingly in v. 6b הָמַס is the subject, although the interpunction construes it differently, viz., “they wrap round as a garment the injustice belonging to them,” in order, that is, to avoid the construction of יַעֲטֶף (vid., Psa. 65:14) with לָמוּ; but active verbs can take a dative of the object (e.g., לָ אָהַב לָ, אָהַב לָ, אָהַב לָ, אָהַב לָ, אָהַב לָ) in the sense: to be or to grant to any one that which the primary notion of the verb asserts. It may therefore be rendered: they put on the garment of violence (שֵׁית הָמַס like בְּגֵדֵי נָקָם, Isa. 59:17), or even by avoiding every *enallage numeri*: violence covers them as a garment; so that שֵׁית is an apposition which is put forth in advance.

*Psa. 73: 7-10.* The reading עֵוֹנָמוּ, ἡ ἀδικία αὐτῶν (LXX (cf. in Zec. 5: 6 the עֵינָם, which is rendered by the LXX in exactly the same way), in favour of which Hitzig, Böttcher, and Olshausen decide, “their iniquity presses forth out of a fat heart, out of a fat inward part,” is favoured by Psa. 17:10, where חָלַב obtains just this signification by combination with סָגַר, which it would obtain here as being the place whence sin issues; cf. ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς καρδίας,



Mat. 15:18 f.; and the parallelism decides its superiority. Nevertheless the traditional reading also gives a suitable sense; not (since the fat tends to make the eyes appear to be deeper in) “their eyes come forward *prae adipe*,” but, “they stare forth *ex adipe*, out of the fat of their bloated visage,” מחלב being equivalent to מחלב פניהם, Job. 15:27. This is a feature of the character faithfully drawn after nature. Further, just as in general τὸ περίσσευμα τῆς καρδίας wells over in the gestures and language (Mat. 12:34), so is it also with their “views or images of the heart” (from שָׁכָה, like שָׁכֹנִי, the cock with its gift of divination as *speculator*): the illusions of their unbounded self-confidence come forth outwardly, they overflow after the manner of a river, <sup>f257</sup> viz., as v. 8 says, in words that are proud beyond measure (Jer. 5:28). Luther: “they destroy everything” (synon. they make it as or into rottenness, from מִמָּק). But המִיִּק is here equivalent to the Aramaic מִיִּק (μοκᾶσθαι): they mock and openly speak בָּרַע (with *ā* in connection with *Munach* transformed from *Dechî*), with evil disposition (cf. Exo. 32:12), oppression; i.e., they openly express their resolve which aims at oppression. Their fellow-man is the sport of their caprice; they speak or dictate מִמָּרוֹם, down from an eminence, upon which they imagine themselves to be raised high above others. Even in the heavens above do they set (שָׁתוּ) as in Psa. 49:15 instead of שָׁתִּי, — there, in accordance with tradition, *Milel*; here at the commencement of the verse *Milra*) their mouth; even these do not remain untouched by their scandalous language (cf. Jude 1:16); the Most High and Holy One, too, is blasphemed by them, and their tongue runs officiously and imperiously through the earth below, everywhere disparaging that which exists and giving new laws. תִּהְלֵךְ, as in Exo. 9:23, a *Kal* sounding much like *Hithpa.*, in the signification *grassari*. In v. 10 the *Chethib* יָשִׁיב (therefore he, this class of man, turns a people subject to him hither, i.e., to himself) is to be rejected, because הָלֵם is not appropriate to it. אָמוֹ is the subject, and the suffix refers not to God (Stier), whose name has not been previously mentioned, but to the kind of men hitherto described: what is meant is the people which, in order that it may turn itself hither (שׁוּב, not: to turn back, but to turn one’s self towards, as e.g., in Jer. 15:19 <sup>f258</sup>), becomes his, i.e., this class’s people (cf. for this sense of the suffix as describing the issue or event, Psa. 18:24; 49: 6; 65:12). They gain adherents (Psa. 49:14) from those who leave the fear of God and turn to them; and מִי מְלֵא, water of fulness, i.e., of full measure (cf. Psa. 74:15, streams of duration = that do not dry up), which is here an emblem of their corrupt principles (cf. Job. 15:16), is quaffed or sucked in (מָצָה, root מָצָה, whence first of all מָצָה, Arab. *māss*, to suck) by these befooled ones (לָמוֹ, αὐτοῖς = ἑπ’ αὐτῶν). This is what is meant to be further said, and not that this band of

servile followers is in fulness absorbed by them (Sachs). Around the proud free-thinkers there gathers a rabble submissive to them, which eagerly drinks in everything that proceeds from them as though it were the true water of life. Even in David's time (Psa. 10: 4; 14: 1; 36: 2) there were already such stout spirits (Isa. 46:12) with a *servûm imitatorum pecus*. A still far more favourable soil for these לְצִיִּים was the worldly age of Solomon.

**Psa. 73:11-14.** The persons speaking are now those apostates who, deluded by the good fortune and free-thinking of the ungodly, give themselves up to them as slaves. concerning the modal sense of יָדַע, *quomodo sciverit*, vid., Psa. 11: 3, cf. Job. 22:13. With וַיִּשַׁק the doubting question is continued. Böttcher renders thus: nevertheless knowledge is in the Most High (a circumstantial clause like Pro. 3:28, Mal. 1:14, Jud. 6:13); but first of all they deny God's actual knowledge, and then His attributive omniscience. It is not to be interpreted: behold, such are (according to their moral nature) the ungodly (אֱלֹהִים, *tales*, like וְזֶה, 48:15, Deu. 5:26, cf. הַמָּה, Isa. 56:11); nor, as is more in accordance with the parallel member v. 12b and the drift of the Psalm: behold, thus it befalleth the ungodly (such as they according to their lot, as in Job. 18:21, cf. Isa. 20: 6); but, what forms a better connection as a statement of the ground of the scepticism in v. 11, either, in harmony with the accentuation: behold, the ungodly, etc., or, since it is not הַרְשָׁעִים: behold, these are ungodly, and, ever reckless (Jer. 12: 1), they have acquired great power. With the bitter הִנֵּה, as Stier correctly observes, they bring forward the obvious proof to the contrary. How can God be said to be the omniscient Ruler of the world? — the ungodly in their carnal security become very powerful and mighty, but piety, very far from being rewarded, is joined with nothing but misfortune. My striving after sanctity (cf. Pro. 20: 9), my abstinence from all moral pollution (cf. Pro. 26: 6), says he who has been led astray, has been absolutely (אֵין as in 1Sa. 25:21) in vain; I was notwithstanding (Ew. § 345, a) incessantly tormented (cf. v. 5), and with every morning's dawn (לְבַקְרִים, as in Psa. 101: 8, cf. לְבַקְרִים in Job. 7:18) my chastitive suffering was renewed. We may now supply the conclusion in thought in accordance with v. 10: Therefore have I joined myself to those who never concern themselves about God and at the same time get on better.

**Psa. 73:15-18.** To such, doubt is become the transition to apostasy. The poet has resolved the riddle of such an unequal distribution of the fortunes of men in a totally different way. Instead of כִּמּוֹ in v. 15, to read כִּמּוֹהֶם (Böttcher), or better, by taking up the following הִנֵּה, which even Saadia allows himself to do, contrary to the accents (Arab. *mtl hdâ*), כִּמּוֹ הִנֵּה (Ewald), is unnecessary,

since prepositions are sometimes used elliptically (בְּאֵל, Isa. 59:18), or even without anything further (Hos 7:16; 11: 7) as adverbs, which must therefore be regarded as possible also in the case of בְּמֹ (Aramaic, Arabic بَمَّا, Aethiopic kem). The poet means to say, If I had made up my mind to the same course of reasoning, I should have faithlessly forsaken the fellowship of the children of God, and should consequently also have forfeited their blessings. The subjunctive signification of the perfects in the hypothetical protasis and apodosis, v. 15 (cf. Jer. 23:22), follows solely from the context; futures instead of perfects would signify *si dicerem...perfide agerem*. דְּוֹר בְּנֵיךְ is the totality of those, in whom the filial relationship in which God has placed Israel in relation to Himself is become an inward or spiritual reality, the true Israel, v. 1, the “righteous generation,” Psa. 14: 5. It is an appellative, as in Deu. 14: 1, Hos. 2: 1. For on the point of the υἱοθεσία the New Testament differs from the Old Testament in this way, viz., that in the Old Testament it is always only as a people that Israel is called בְּ, or as a whole בְּנִים, but that the individual, and that in his direct relationship to God, dared not as yet call himself “child of God.” The individual character is not as yet freed from its absorption in the species, it is not as yet independent; it is the time of the minor’s νηπιότης, and the adoption is as yet only effected nationally, salvation is as yet within the limits of the nationality, its common human form has not as yet appeared. The verb בָּגַד with בְּ signifies to deal faithlessly with any one, and more especially (whether God, a friend, or a spouse) faithlessly to forsake him; here, in this sense of malicious desertion, it contents itself with the simple accusative.

On the one side, by joining in the speech of the free-thinkers he would have placed himself outside the circle of the children of God, of the truly pious; on the other side, however, when by meditation he sought to penetrate it (לְדַאֵת), the doubt-provoking phenomenon (זֹאֵת) still continued to be to him עֲמַל, trouble, i.e., something that troubled him without any result, an unsolvable riddle (cf. Ecc. 8:17). Whether we read הָאֵס or הָאֵס, the sense remains the same; the *Kerî* הָאֵס prefers, as in Job. 31:11, the attractional gender. Neither here nor in Job. 30:26 and elsewhere is it to be supposed that אֲחַשְׁבָּה is equivalent to אֲחַשְׁבָּה (Ewald, Hupfeld). The cohortative from of the future here, as frequently (Ges. § 128, 1), with or without a conditional particle (Psa. 139: 8, 2Sa. 22:38, Job. 16: 6; 11:17; 19:18; 30:26), forms a hypothetical protasis: and (yet) when I meditated; Symmachus (according to Montfaucon), εἰ ἐλογιζόμην. As Vaihinger aptly observes, “thinking alone will give neither the right light nor true happiness.” Both are found only in faith. The poet at last struck upon the way of faith, and there he found light and peace. The future after אֲס frequently has the signification of the imperfect subjunctive,

Job. 32:11, Ecc. 2: 3, cf. Pro. 12:19 (*donec nutem* = only a moment); also in an historical connection like Jos. 10:13, 2Ch. 29:34, it is conceived of as subjunctive (*donec ulciseretur, se sanctificarent*), sometimes, however, as indicative, as in Exo. 15:16 (*donec transibat*) and in our passage, where עַד introduces the objective goal at which the riddle found its solution: until I went into the sanctuary of God, (purposely) attended to (לְ) as in the primary passage Deu. 32:29, cf. Job. 14:21) their life's end. The cohortative is used here exactly as in וְאֶבְרַיְנָהּ, but with the collateral notion of that which is intentional, which here fully accords with the connection. He went into God's dread sanctuary (plural as in Psa. 68:36, cf. מִקְדָּשׁ in the Psalms of Asaph, Psa. 67: 7; 78:69); here he prayed for light in the darkness of his conflict, here were his eyes opened to the holy plans and ways of God (Psa. 77:14), here the sight of the sad end of the evil-doers was presented to him. By "God's sanctuaries" Ewald and Hitzig understand His secrets; but this meaning is without support in the usage of the language. And is it not a thought perfectly in harmony with the context and with experience, that a light arose upon him when he withdrew from the bustle of the world into the quiet of God's dwelling-place, and there devoutly gave his mind to the matter?

The strophe closes with a summary confession of the explanation received there. שִׁית is construed with *Lamed* inasmuch as *collocare* is equivalent to *locum assignare* (vid., v. 6b). God makes the evil-doers to stand on smooth, slippery places, where one may easily lose one's footing (cf. 35: 6, Jer. 23:12). There, then, they also inevitably fall; God casts them down לְמִשְׁוֹאוֹת, into ruins, *fragores* = *ruinae*, from שׁוֹא = שָׁאָה, to be confused, desolate, to rumble. The word only has the appearance of being from שָׁאָה: ensnarings, sudden attacks (Hitzig), which is still more ill suited to 74: 3 than to this passage; desolation and ruin can be said even of persons, as הָרַס, 28: 5, וְנִשְׁבְּרוּ, Isa. 8:15, נִפְץ, Jer. 51:21-23. The poet knows no other theodicy but this, nor was any other known generally in the pre-exilic literature of Israel (vid., Psalm 37, 39, Jeremiah 12, and the Book of Job). The later prophecy and the Chokma were much in advance of this, inasmuch as they point to a last universal judgment (vid., more particularly Mal. 3:13 ff.), but not one that breaks off this present state; the present state and the future state, time and eternity, are even there not as yet thoroughly separated.

*Psa. 73:19-22.* The poet calms himself with the solution of the riddle that has come to him; and it would be beneath his dignity as a man to allow himself any further to be tempted by doubting thoughts. Placing himself upon the standpoint of the end, he sees how the ungodly come to terrible destruction in a moment: they come to an end (סָפָה from סָפַר, not סָפְדָה), it is all over with

them (תמו) in consequence of (מ) as in Psa. 76: 7, and unconnected as in Psa. 18: 4; 30: 4, 2Sa. 22:14) frightful occurrences (בְּלֵהוֹת, a favourite word, especially in the Book of Job), which clear them out of the way. It is with them as with a dream, after (מ) as in 1Ch. 8: 8) one is awake. One forgets the vision on account of its nothingness (Job. 20: 8). So the evil-doers who boast themselves μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας (Act. 25:23) are before God a צלם, a phantom or unsubstantial shadow. When He, the sovereign Lord, shall awake, i.e., arouse Himself to judgment after He has looked on with forbearance, then He will despise their shadowy image, will cast it contemptuously from Him. Luther renders, *So machstu Herr jr Bilde in der Stad verschmecht* (So dost Thou, Lord, make their image despised in the city). But neither has the *Kal* בָּהָה this double transitive signification, “to give over to contempt,” nor is the mention of the city in place here. In Hos. 11: 9 also בְּעִיר in the signification *in urbem* gives no right sense; it signifies heat of anger or fury, as in Jer. 15: 8, heat of anguish, and Schröder maintains the former signification (vid., on Psa. 139:20), *in fervore (irae)*, here also; but the pointing בְּעִיר is against it. Therefore בְּעִיר is to be regarded, with the Targum, as syncopated from בְּהֵעִיר (cf. לְבִיא, Jer. 39: 7, 2Ch. 31:10; בְּבִשְׁלוֹ, Pro. 24:17, and the like); not, however, to be explained, “when they awake,” viz., from the sleep of death (Targum <sup>f259</sup>), or after Psa. 78:38, “when Thou awakest them,” viz., out of their sleep of security (De Wette, Kurtz), but after Psa. 35:23, “when Thou awakest,” viz., to sit in judgment.

Thus far we have the divine answer, which is reproduced by the poet after the manner of prayer. Hengstenberg now goes on by rendering it, “for my heart was incensed;” but we cannot take יתחמץ according to the sequence of tenses as an imperfect, nor understand כִּי as a particle expression the reason. On the contrary, the poet, from the standpoint of the explanation he has received, speaks of a possible return (כִּי *seq. fut.* = εἰς) of his temptation, and condemns it beforehand: *si exacerbaretur animus meus atque in renibus meis pungerer.* יתחמץ, to become sour, bitter, passionate; השתונן, with the more exactly defining accusative בְּלִיּוֹתִי, to be pricked, piqued, irritated. With וְאֲנִי begins the apodosis: then should I be... I should have become (perfect as in v. 15, according to Ges. § 126, 5). Concerning לֹא יָדַע, *non sapere*, vid., Psa. 14: 4. בְּהֵמוֹת can be taken as *compar. decurtata* for בְּבַהֲמוֹת; nevertheless, as apparently follows from Job. 40:15, the poet surely has the *p-ehe-mou*, the water ox, i.e., the hippopotamus, in his mind, which being Hebraized is בְּהֵמוֹת, <sup>f260</sup> and, as a plump colossus of flesh, is at once an emblem of colossal stupidity (Maurer, Hitzig). The meaning of the poet is, that he would not be a

man in relation to God, over against God (עַם, as in Psa. 78:37, Job. 9: 2, cf. Arab. *ma'a*, in comparison with), if he should again give way to the same doubts, but would be like the most stupid animal, which stands before God incapable of such knowledge as He willingly imparts to earnestly inquiring man.

*Psa. 73:23-26.* But he does not thus deeply degrade himself: after God has once taken him by the right hand and rescued him from the danger of falling (v. 2), he clings all the more firmly to Him, and will not suffer his perpetual fellowship with Him to be again broken through by such seizures which estrange him from God. confidently does he yield up himself to the divine guidance, though he may not see through the mystery of the plan (עֲצָה) of this guidance. He knows that afterwards (אַחַר with *Mugrash*: adverb as in Psa. 68:26), i.e., after this dark way of faith, God will כָּבוֹד receive him, i.e., take him to Himself, and take him from all suffering (לְקַח as in Psa. 49:16, and of Enoch, Gen. 5:24). The comparison of Zec. 2:12 [8] is misleading; there אַחַר is rightly accented as a preposition: after glory hath He sent me forth (vid., Köhler), and here as an adverb; for although the adverbial sense of אַחַר would more readily lead one to look for the arrangement of the words כָּבוֹד אַחַר, still “to receive after glory” (cf. the reverse Isa. 58: 8) is an awkward thought. כָּבוֹד, which as an adjective “glorious” (Hofmann) is alien to the language, is either accusative of the goal (Hupfeld), or, which yields a form of expression that is more like the style of the Old Testament, accusative of the manner (Luther, “with honour”). In אַחַר the poet comprehends in one summary view what he looks for at the goal of the present divine guidance. The future is dark to him, but lighted up by the one hope that the end of his earthly existence will be a glorious solution of the riddle. Here, as elsewhere, it is faith which breaks through not only the darkness of this present life, but also the night of Hades. At that time there was as yet no divine utterance concerning any heavenly triumph of the church, militant in the present world, but to faith the Jahve-Name had already a transparent depth which penetrated beyond Hades into an eternal life. The heaven of blessedness and glory also is nothing without God; but he who can in love call God his, possesses heaven upon earth, and he who cannot in love call God his, would possess not heaven, but hell, in the midst of heaven. In this sense the poet says in v. 25: whom have I in heaven? i.e., who there without Thee would be the object of my desire, the stilling of my longing? without Thee heaven with all its glory is a vast waste and void, which makes me indifferent to everything, and with Thee, i.e., possessing Thee, I have no delight in the earth, because to call Thee mine infinitely surpasses every possession and every desire of earth. If we take

בְּאֶרֶץ still more exactly as parallel to בְּשָׁמַיִם, without making it dependent upon חֲפֵצְתִי: and possessing Thee I have no desire upon the earth, then the sense remains essentially the same; but if we allow בְּאֶרֶץ to be governed by חֲפֵצְתִי in accordance with the general usage of the language, we arrive at this meaning by the most natural way. Heaven and earth, together with angels and men, afford him no satisfaction — his only friend, his sole desire and love, is God. The love for God which David expresses in 16: 2 in the brief utterance, “Thou art my Lord, Thou art my highest good,” is here expanded with incomparable mystical profoundness and beauty. Luther’s version shows his master-hand. The church follows it in its “*Herzlich lieb hab’ ich dich*” when it sings —

*“The whole wide world delights me not,  
For heaven and earth, Lord, care I not,  
If I may but have Thee;”*

and following it, goes on in perfect harmony with the text of our Psalm —

*“Yea, though my heart be like to break,  
Thou art my trust that nought can shake;”* <sup>f261</sup>

or with Paul Gerhard, [in his Passion-hymn “Ein Lämmlein geht und trägt die Schuld der Welt und ihrer Kinder,” ]

*“Light of my heart, that shalt Thou be;  
And when my heart in pieces breaks,  
Thou shalt my heart remain.”*

For the hypothetical perfect בְּלֵאָה expresses something in spite of which he upon whom it may come calls God his God: *licet defecerit*. Though his outward and inward man perish, nevertheless God remains ever the rock of his heart as the firm ground upon which he, with his *ego*, remains standing when everything else totters; He remains his portion, i.e., the possession that cannot be taken from him, if he loses all, even his spirit-life pertaining to the body, — and God remains to him this portion לְעֵלָם, he survives with the life which he has in God the death of the old life. The poet supposes an extreme case, — one, that is, it is true, impossible, but yet conceivable, — that his outward and inward being should sink away; even then with the *merus actus* of his *ego* he will continue to cling to God. In the midst of the natural life of perishableness and of sin, a new, individual life which is resigned to God has begun within him, and in this he has the pledge that he cannot perish, so truly as God, with whom it is closely united, cannot perish. It is just this that is also the nerve of the proof of the resurrection of the dead which Jesus advances in opposition to the Sadducees (Mat. 22:32).

*Psa. 73:27, 28.* The poet here once more gives expression to the great opposites into which good fortune and misfortune are seemingly, but only seemingly, divided in a manner so contradictory to the divine justice. The central point of the confirmation that is introduced with כִּי lies in v. 28. “Thy far removing ones” was to be expressed with רָחַק, which is distinct from רָחוֹק. נָזַח has מִן instead of מִתַּחַת or מֵאַחֲרַי after it. Those who remove themselves far from the primary fountain of life fall a prey to ruin; those who faithlessly abandon God, and choose the world with its idols rather than His love, fall a prey to destruction. Not so the poet; the nearness of God, i.e., a state of union with God, is good to him, i.e., (cf. *Psa. 119:71 f.*) he regards as his good fortune. קִרְבָּה is *nom. act.* after the form יִקְרָה, Arab. *waqhat*, obedience, and נִצְרָה, a watch, *Psa. 141: 3*, and of essentially the same signification with *kurba* (קִרְבָּה), the Arabic designation of the *unio mystica*; cf. *Jam. 4: 8*, ἔγγισατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἔγγισι ὑμῖν. Just as קִרְבַּת אֱלֹהִים stands in antithesis to רָחַקוּךָ, so לֵי טוֹב stands in antithesis to יֵאָבְדוּ and הִצְמַתָּה. To the former their alienation from God brings destruction; he finds in fellowship with God that which is good to him for the present time and for the future. Putting his confidence (מַחְסֵי, not מַחְסֵי) in Him, he will declare, and will one day be able to declare, all His מְלֵאכּוֹת, i.e., the manifestations or achievements of His righteous, gracious, and wise government. The language of assertion is quickly changed into that of address. The Psalm closes with an upward look of grateful adoration to God beforehand, who leads His own people, oftentimes wondrously indeed, but always happily, viz., through suffering to glory.

## Psalm 74

### APPEAL TO GOD AGAINST RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION, IN WHICH THE TEMPLE IS VIOLATED

*74: 1 WHY, Elohim, hast Thou cast off for ever,  
Why doth Thine anger smoke against the flock of Thy pasture?*

*74: 2 Remember Thy congregation which Thou hast purchased of old,  
Which Thou hast ransomed for the tribe of Thy possession —  
Of Mount Zion whereon Thou dwellest.*

*74: 3 Oh lift up Thy footsteps unto the perpetual ruins,  
Everything hath the enemy destroyed in the sanctuary.*

*74: 4 Thine adversaries roared in the midst of Thy place of assembly,  
They set up their signs as signs.*



*74: 5 It looked as when one lifteth up on high  
Axes in the thicket of the wood:*

*74: 6 And now — at its carved work altogether  
With hatchet and mattocks they hewed right and left;*

*74: 7 They have set on fire Thy Temple,  
To the earth they have defiled the dwelling-place of Thy name;*

*74: 8 They said in their hearts: we will crush them altogether;  
They have burnt up all the houses of God in the land.*

*74: 9 Our signs we see not.  
There is no longer any prophet,  
And among us there is no one who knoweth: until when? —*

*74:10 How long, Elohim, shall the oppressor blaspheme?  
Shall the enemy scoff at Thy name for ever?*

*74:11 Why dost Thou draw back Thy hand and Thy right hand?  
Out of the midst of Thy bosom bring it forth, destroy! —*

*74:12 And yet Elohim is my King from the days of old,  
Working deliverances in the midst of the earth.*

*74:13 THOU hast divided the sea by Thy power,  
Thou hast broken the heads of the dragons upon the waters.*

*74:14 THOU hast broken in pieces the heads of leviathan,  
Thou gavest him as food to a people: to the creatures of the desert.*

*74:15 THOU hast cleft fountains and brooks,  
THOU hast dried up never-failing rivers.*

*74:16 Thine is the day, also Thine the night,  
THOU hast prepared the star of night and the sun.*

*74:17 THOU hast established all the borders of the earth,  
Summer and winter hast THOU formed.*

*74:18 Remember this: the enemy revileth Jahve,  
And a foolish people scoffeth at Thy name.*

*74:19 Give not over to the wild beast the soul of Thy turtle-dove,  
Thy poor creatures forget not for ever.*

*74:20 Look upon the covenant,  
For the corners of the land are full of the habitations of violence.*

*74:21 Let not the disheartened turn back ashamed,  
Let the afflicted and the needy praise Thy name.*

***74:22 Arise, Elohim, fight out Thy cause,  
Remember Thy reproach from the foolish continually!***

***74:23 Forget not the cry of Thine adversaries,  
The tumult of those who rise up against Thee which ascendeth ever!!***

*Psalm 74.* The **מזמור** 73 is here followed by a *Maskil* (vid., Psa. 32: 1) which, in common with the former, has the prominent, rare word **מְשׂוֹאוֹת** (Psa. 74: 3; 73:18), but also the old Asaphic impress. We here meet with the favourite Asaphic contemplation of Israel as a flock, and the predilection of the Asaphic Psalms for retrospective references to Israel's early history (Psa. 74:13-15). We also find the former of these two characteristic features in Psalm 79, which reflects the same circumstances of the times.

Moreover Jeremiah stands in the same relationship to both Psalms. In Jer. 10:25, Psa. 79: 6 f. is repeated almost word for word. And one is reminded of Psalm 74 by Lam. 2: 2 (cf. Psa. 74: 7), 2: 7 (cf. Psa. 74: 4), and other passages. The lament "there is no prophet any more" (Psa. 74: 9) sounds very much like Lam. 2: 9. In connection with Jeremiah's reproductive manner, and his habit of allowing himself to be prompted to new thoughts by the original passages by means of the association of ideas (cf. **בְּיוֹם מוֹעֵד**, Lam. 2: 7, with **בְּקֶרֶב מוֹעֵדֶךָ** of the Psalm), it is natural to assign the priority in age to the two Asaphic national lamentation Psalms.

But the substance of both Psalms, which apparently brings us down not merely into the Chaldaean, but even into the Maccabaeian age, rises up in opposition to it. After his return from the second Egyptian expedition (170 B.C.) Antiochus Epiphanes chastised Jerusalem, which had been led into revolt by Jason, in the most cruel manner, entered the Temple accompanied by the court high priest Menalaus, and carried away the most costly vessels, and even the gold of the walls and doors, with him. Myriads of the Jews were at that time massacred or sold as slaves. Then during the fourth Egyptian expedition (168) of Antiochus, when a party favourably disposed towards the Ptolemies again arose in Jerusalem, he sent Apollonius to punish the offenders (167), and his troops laid the city waste with fire and sword, destroyed houses and walls, burnt down several of the Temple-gates and razed many of its apartments. Also on this occasion thousands were slain and led away captive. Then began the attempt of Antiochus to Hellenize the Jewish nation. An aged Athenian was entrusted with the carrying out of this measure. Force was used to compel the Jews to accept the heathen religion, and in fact to serve Olympian Zeus (Jupiter): on the 15th of Chislew a smaller altar was erected upon the altar of burnt-offering in the Temple, and on the 25th of Chislew the first sacrifice was offered to Olympian Zeus in the Temple of Jahve, now dedicated to him. Such was the

position of affairs when a band of faithful confessors rallied around the Asmonaeon (Hasmonaeon) priest Mattathias.

How strikingly does much in both Psalms, more particularly in Psalm 74, harmonize with this position of affairs! At that time it was felt more painfully than ever that prophecy had become dumb, 1 Macc. 4:46; 9:27; 14:41. The confessors and martyrs who bravely declared themselves were called, as in Psa. 79: 2, **אֲשֵׁר רָאוּ**, **Ἀσιδαῖοι**. At that time “they saw,” as 1 Macc. 4:38 says, “the sanctuary desolate, and the altar profaned, and the gates burnt up, and shrubs growing in the courts as in a forest, or as in one of the mountains, yea, and the priests’ chambers pulled down.” the doors of the Temple-gates were burned to ashes (cf. 2 Macc. 8:33; 1: 8). The religious **אֲוֹתוֹת** (Psa. 74: 4) of the heathen filled the place where Jahve was wont to reveal Himself. Upon the altar of the court stood the **βδέλυγμα ἑρημώσεως**; in the courts they had planted trees, and likewise the “signs” of heathendom; and the **לְשֹׁכֹת** (**παστοφόρια**) lay in ruins. When later on, under Demetrius Stoer (161), Alcimus (an apostate whom Antiochus had appointed high priest) and Bacchides advanced with promises of peace, but with an army at the same time, a band of scribes, the foremost of the **Ἀσιδαῖοι** of Israel, went forth to meet them to intercede for their nation. Alcimus, however, seized sixty of them, slaughtered them in one day, and that, as it is added in 1 Macc. 7:16 f., “according to the word which he wrote: The flesh of Thy saints and their blood have they shed round about Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them.” The formula of citation **κατὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν (τοὺς λόγους οὗτος) ἔγραψε**, and more particularly the **ἔγραψε**, — which as being the aorist cannot have the Scripture (**ἡ γραφή**), and, since the citation is a prayer to god, not God, but only the anonymous psalmist, as its subject (vid., however, the various readings in Grimm on this passage), — sounds as though the historian were himself conscious that he was quoting a portion of Scripture that had taken its rise among the calamities of that time. In fact, no age could be regarded as better warranted in incorporating some of its songs in the Psalter than the Maccabaeon, the sixty-third week predicted by Daniel, the week of suffering bearing in itself the character of the time of the end, this strictly martyr age of the Old Covenant, to which the Book of Daniel awards a high typical significance in relation to the history of redemption.

But unbiassed as we are in the presence of the question whether there are Maccabaeon Psalms, still there is, on the other hand, much, too, that is against the referring of the two Psalms to the Maccabaeon age. In Psalm 79 there is nothing that militates against referring it to the Chaldaean age, and Psa. 79:11 (cf. Psa. 102:21; 69:34) is even favourable to this. And in Psalm 74, in which vv. 4b, 8b, 9b are the most satisfactorily explained from the Maccabaeon age,

there are, again, other parts which are better explained from the Chaldaean. For what is said in v. 7a, “*they have set Thy Temple on fire,*” applies just as unconditionally as it runs to the Chaldaeans, but not to the Syrians. And the cry of prayer, Psa. 74: 3, “*lift up Thy footsteps to the eternal ruins,*” appears to assume a laying waste that has taken place within the last few years at least, such as the Maccabean age cannot exhibit, although at the exaltation of the Maccabees Jerusalem was ἀολκήτος ὡς ἔρημος (1 Macc. 3:45). Hitzig, it is true, renders: *raise Thy footsteps for sudden attacks without end*; but both the passages in which משואות occurs mutually secure to this word the signification “desolations” (Targum, Symmachus, Jerome, and Saadia). If, however, the Chaldaean catastrophe were meant, then the author of both Psalms, on the ground of Ezr. 2:41, Neh. 7:44 (cf. 11:22), might be regarded as an Asaphite of the time of the Exile, although they might also be composed by any one in the Asaphic style. And as regards their relation to Jeremiah, we ought to be contented with the fact that Jeremiah, whose peculiarity as a writer is otherwise so thoroughly reproductive, is, notwithstanding, also reproduced by later writers, and in this instance by the psalmist.

Nothing is more certain than that the physiognomy of these Psalms does not correspond to any national misfortune prior to the Chaldaean catastrophe. Vaihinger’s attempt to comprehend them from the time of Athaliah’s reign of terror, is at issue with itself. In the history of Israel instances of the sacking of Jerusalem and of the Temple are not unknown even prior to the time of Zedekiah, as in the reign of Jehoram, but there is no instance of the city being reduced to ashes. Since even the profanation of the Temple by the Persian general Bagoses (Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 7), to which Ewald formerly referred this Psalm, was not accompanied by any injury of the building itself, much less its reduction to ashes, there remains only the choice between the laying waste of Jerusalem and of the Temple in the year 588 and in the year 167. We have reserved to ourselves the liberty of acknowledging some insertions from the time of the Maccabees in the Psalter; *supra*, pp. 6-8. Now since in both Psalms, apart from the משואות נצה, everything accords with the Maccabean age, whilst when we refer them to the Chaldaean period the scientific conscience is oppressed by many difficulties (more especially in connection with Psa. 74: 4, 8, 9; 79: 2, 3), we yield to the force of the impression and base both Psalms upon the situation of the Jewish nation under Antiochus and Demetrius. Their contents coincide with the prayer of Judas Maccabaeus in 2 Macc. 8: 1-4.

*Psa. 74: 1-3.* The poet begins with the earnest prayer that God would again have compassion upon His church, upon which His judgment of anger has fallen, and would again set up the ruins of Zion. Why for ever (v. 10, Psa. 79: 5; 89:47, cf. 13: 2)? is equivalent to, why so continually and, as it seems, without end? The preterite denotes the act of casting off, the future, v.

1*b*, that lasting condition of this casting off. למה, when the initial of the following word is a guttural, and particularly if it has a merely half-vowel (although in other instances also, Gen. 12:19; 27:45, Son. 1: 7), is deprived of its *Dagesh* and accented on the *ultima*, in order (as Mose ha-Nakdan expressly observes) to guard against the swallowing up of the *ah*; cf. on Psa. 10: 1. Concerning the smoking of anger, vid., Psa. 18: 9. The characteristically Asaphic expression צֶאֱן מְרַעִיתוֹ is not less Jeremianic, Jer. 23: 1. In v. 2 God is reminded of what He has once done for the congregation of His people. קָדַם, as in Psa. 44: 2, points back into the Mosaic time of old, to the redemption out of Egypt, which is represented in קָנָה (Exo. 15:17) as a purchasing, and in גָּאָל (Psa. 77:16; 78:35, Exo. 15:13) as a ransoming (*redemptio*). שִׁבְמֵי נַחֲלָתָךְ is a factitive object; שִׁבְמֵי is the name given to the whole nation in its distinctness of race from other peoples, as in Jer. 10:16; 51:19, cf. Isa. 63:17. זָה (v. 2*b*) is rightly separated from הַר־צִיּוֹן (*Mugrash*); it stands directly for אֲשֶׁר, as in Psa. 104: 8, 26, Pro. 23:22, Job. 15:17 (Ges. § 122, 2). The congregation of the people and its central abode are, as though forgotten of God, in a condition which sadly contrasts with their election. נִצָּח מִשְׁאוֹת are ruins (vid., Psa. 73:18) in a state of such total destruction, that all hope of their restoration vanishes before it; נִצָּח here looks forward, just as עָלַם (חרבות), Isa. 63:12; 61: 4, looks backwards. May God then lift His feet up high (פְּעָמַיִם) poetical for רַגְלָיִם, cf. Psa. 58:11 with Psa. 68:24), i.e., with long hurried steps, without stopping, move towards His dwelling-lace that now lies in ruins, that by virtue of His interposition it may rise again. Hath the enemy made merciless havoc — he hath ill-treated (הָרַע, as in Psa. 44: 3) everything (כָּל, as in Psa. 8: 7, Zep. 1: 2, for הָכֹל or אֶת־כָּל) in the sanctuary — how is it possible that this sacrilegious vandalism should remain unpunished!

*Psa. 74: 4-8.* The poet now more minutely describes how the enemy has gone on. Since קָדַשׁ in v. 3 is the Temple, מוֹעֲדֶיךָ in v. 4 ought likewise to mean the Temple with reference to the several courts; but the plural would here (cf. v. 8*b*) be misleading, and is, too, only a various reading. Baer has rightly decided in favour of מוֹעֲדֶךָ; <sup>f262</sup> מוֹעֵד, as in Lam. 2: 6 f., is the instituted (Num. 17:19 [4]) place of God's intercourse with His congregation (cf. Arab. *mī'ād*, a rendezvous). What Jeremiah says in Lam. 2: 7 (cf. שֹׁאֵן, Jer. 2:15) is here more briefly expressed. By אוֹתָתָם (v. 4*b*) we must not understand military insignia; the scene of the Temple and the supplanting of the Israelitish national insignia to be found there, by the substitution of other insignia, requires that the word should have the religious reference in which it

is used of circumcision and of the Sabbath (Exo. 31:13); such heathen אַתּוֹת, which were thrust upon the Temple and the congregation of Jahve as henceforth the lawful ones, were those which are set forth in 1 Macc. 1:45-49, and more particularly the so-called abomination of desolation mentioned in v. 54 of the same chapter. With יוֹדֵעַ (v. 5) the terrible scene which was at that time taking place before their eyes (Psa. 79:10) is introduced. כַּמְבִּיאַ is the subject; it became visible, tangible, noticeable, i.e., it looked, and one experienced it, as if a man caused the axe to enter into the thicket of the wood, i.e., struck into or at it right and left. The plural קַרְדָּמוֹת forces itself into the simile because it is the many heathen warriors who are, as in Jer. 46:22 f., likened to these hewers of wood. Norzi calls the Kametz of כַּמְבִּיאַ Kametz *chatuph*; the combining form would then be a contraction of סִבָּךְ (Ewald, Olshausen), for the long ā of סִבָּךְ does not admit of any contraction. According to another view it is to be read *bī-sbāch-etz*, as in Est. 4: 8 *k<sup>c</sup>thāb-hadāth* with counter-tone *Metheg* beside the long vowel, as e.g., עֵץ-הָדָן, Gen. 2:16). The poet follows the work of destruction up to the destroying stroke, which is introduced by the וַעַת (perhaps וַעַת, *Kerī* וַאֲתָהּ), which arrests one's attention. In v. 5 the usual, unbroken quiet is depicted, as is the heavy Cyclopean labour in the Virgilian *illi inter sese*, etc.; in *jahalomûn*, v. 6b (now and then pointed *jahlomûn*), we hear the stroke of the uplifted axes, which break in pieces the costly carved work of the Temple. The suffix of פְּתוּחֵיהָ (the carved works thereof) refers, according to the sense, to מוֹעֵדְךָ. The LXX, favouring the Maccabaeian interpretation, renders: ἔξέκοψαν τὰς θύρας ἀντής (פְּתוּחֵיהָ). This shattering of the panelling is followed in v. 7 by the burning, first of all, as we may suppose, of this panelling itself so far as it consists of wood. The guaranteed reading here is מִקְדָּשֶׁךָ, not מִקְדָּשֶׁיךָ. פִּאֵשׁ מִקְדָּשֶׁךָ signifies to set on fire, *immittere igni*, differing from שָׂלַח אֵשׁ בְּ, to set fire to, *immittere ignem*. On לְאָרְץ חָלְלוּ, cf. Lam. 2: 2, Jer. 19:13. Hitzig, following the LXX, Targum, and Jerome, derives the exclamation of the enemies נִינִים from נִין: their whole generation (viz., we will root out)! But נִין is posterity, descendants; why therefore only the young and not the aged? And why is it an expression of the object and not rather of the action, the object of which would be self-evident? נִינִים is *fut. Kal* of יָנָה, here = *Hiph.* הִנָּה, to force, oppress, tyrannize over, and like אָנַם, to compel by violence, in later Hebrew. נִינִים (from יָנָה, like יִפָּה) is changed in pause into נִינִים; cf. the future forms in Num. 21:30, Exo. 34:19, and also in Psa. 118:10-12. Now, after mention has been made of the burning of the Temple framework, מוֹעֵד־יְהוָה cannot denote the place of the divine manifestation after its divisions (Hengstenberg), still less the festive assemblies (Böttcher), which the enemy

could only have burnt up by setting fire to the Temple over their heads, and כל does not at all suit this. The expression apparently has reference to synagogues (and this ought not to be disputed), as Aquila and Symmachus render the word. For there is no room for thinking of the separate services conducted by the prophets in the northern kingdom (2Ki. 4:23), because this kingdom no longer existed at the time this Psalm was written; nor of the בַּמֹּת, the burning down of which no pious Israelite would have bewailed; nor of the sacred places memorable from the early history of Israel, which are nowhere called מוֹעֲדִים, and after the founding of the central sanctuary appear only as the seats of false religious rites. The expression points (like בַּיַּת וְאֵד, Sota ix. 15) to places of assembly for religious purposes, to houses for prayer and teaching, that is to say, to synagogues — a weighty instance in favour of the Maccabean origin of the Psalm.

*Psa. 74: 9-11.* The worst thing the poet has to complain of is that God has not acknowledged His people during this time of suffering as at other times. “Our signs” is the direct antithesis to “their sings” (v. 4), hence they are not to be understood, after Psa. 86:17, as signs which God works. The suffix demands, besides, something of a perpetual character; they are the instituted ordinances of divine worship by means of which God is pleased to stand in fellowship with His people, and which are now no longer to be seen because the enemies have set them aside. The complaint “there is not prophet any more” would seem strange in the period immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, for Jeremiah’s term of active service lasted beyond this. Moreover, a year before (in the tenth year of Zedekiah’s reign) he had predicted that the Babylonian domination, and relatively the Exile, would last seventy years; besides, six years before the destruction Ezekiel appeared, who was in communication with those who remained behind in the land. The reference to Lam. 2: 9 (cf. Eze. 7:26) does not satisfy one; for there it is assumed that there were prophets, a fact which is here denied. Only perhaps as a voice coming out of the Exile, the middle of which (cf. Hos. 3: 4, 2Ch. 15: 3, and besides *Canticum trium puerorum*, v. 14: καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ ἄρχων καὶ προφήτης καὶ ἡγοούμενος) was truly thus devoid of signs or miracles, and devoid of the prophetic word of consolation, can v. 9 be comprehended. The seventy years of Jeremiah were then still a riddle without any generally known solution (Daniel 9). If, however, synagogues are meant in v. 8b, v. 9 now too accords with the like-sounding lament in the calamitous times of Antiochus (1 Macc. 4:46; 9:27; 14:41). In v. 10 the poet turns to God Himself with the question “How long?” how long is this (apparently) endless blaspheming of the enemy to last? Why dost Thou draw back (viz., מִמֶּנּוּ, from us, not עֲלֵינוּ, Psa. 81:15) Thy hand and Thy right hand? The conjunction of synonyms “Thy hand and Thy right hand” is, as in Psa. 44: 4, Sirach 33: 7, a fuller expression

for God's omnipotent energy. This is now at rest; v. 11b calls upon it to give help by an act of judgment. "Out of the midst of Thy bosom, destroy," is a pregnant expression for, "drawing forth out of Thy bosom the hand that rests inactive there, do Thou destroy." The *Chethib* חוקק has perhaps the same meaning; for חוק, Arab. *ḥawq*, signifies, like חיק, Arab. *ḥayq*, the act of encompassing, then that which encompasses. Instead of מַחִיקָה (Exo. 4: 7) the expression is מַקְרֵב חִיקָה, because there, within the realm of the bosom, the punitive justice of God for a time as it were slumbers. On the כְּלֵה, which outwardly is without any object, cf. Ps. 59:14.

*Psa. 74:12-17.* With this prayer for the destruction of the enemies by God's interposition closes the first half of the Psalm, which has for its subject-matter the crying contradiction between the present state of things and God's relationship to Israel. The poet now draws comfort by looking back into the time when God as Israel's King unfolded the rich fulness of His salvation everywhere upon the earth, where Israel's existence was imperilled. הַאָרֶץ בְּקִרְבָּה, not only within the circumference of the Holy Land, but, e.g., also within that of Egypt (Exo. 8:18 [22]). The poet has Egypt directly in his mind, for there now follows first of all a glance at the historical (vv. 13-15), and then at the natural displays of God's power (vv. 16, 17). Hengstenberg is of opinion that vv. 13-15 also are to be understood in the latter sense, and appeals to Job. 26:11-13. But just as Isaiah (Isa. 51: 9, cf. 27: 1) transfers these emblems of the omnipotence of God in the natural world to His proofs of power in connection with the history of redemption which were exhibited in the case of a worldly power, so does the poet here also in vv. 13-15. The תַּנִּינִן (the extended saurian) is in Isaiah, as in Ezekiel (הַתַּנִּינִים, Eze. 29: 3; 32: 2), an emblem of Pharaoh and of his kingdom; in like manner here the *leviathan* is the proper natural wonder of Egypt. As a water-snake or a crocodile, when it comes up with its head above the water, is killed by a powerful stroke, did God break the heads of the Egyptians, so that the sea cast up their dead bodies (Exo. 14:30). The צִיִּים, the dwellers in the steppe, to whom these became food, are not the Aethiopians (LXX, Jerome), or rather the Ichthyophagi (Bocahrt, Hengstenberg), who according to Agatharcides fed ἐκ τῶν ἐκριπτομένων εἰς τὴν χέρσον κητῶν, but were no cannibals, but the wild beasts of the desert, which are called עֵם, as in Pro. 30:25 f. the ants and the rock-badgers. לְצִיִּים is a permutative of the notion לעם, which was not completed: to a (singular) people, viz., to the wild animals of the steppe. V. 15 also still refers not to miracles of creation, but to miracles wrought in the course of the history of redemption; v. 15a refers to the giving of water out of the rock (Psa. 78:15), and v. 15b to the passage through the Jordan, which was



miraculously dried up (הִבְשַׁתָּהּ, as in Jos. 2:10; 4:23; 5: 1). The object וַיִּנְחַל מֵעַיִן is intended as referring to the result: so that the water flowed out of the cleft after the manner of a fountain and a brook. נְהָרוֹת are the several streams of the one Jordan; the attributive genitive אֵיתָן describe them as streams having an abundance that does not dry up, streams of perennial fulness. The God of Israel who has thus marvellously made Himself known in history is, however, the Creator and Lord of all created things. Day and night and the stars alike are His creatures. In close connection with the night, which is mentioned second, the moon, the מָאוֹר of the night, precedes the sun; cf. Psa. 8: 4, where כּוֹנֵן is the same as הַכִּיִּן in this passage. It is an error to render thus: bodies of light, and more particularly the sun; which would have made one expect מְאוֹרוֹת before the specializing Waw. גְּבוּלוֹת are not merely the bounds of the land towards the sea, Jer. 5:22, but, according to Deu. 32: 8, Act. 17:26, even the boundaries of the land in themselves, that is to say, the natural boundaries of the inland country. קִיץ וְחֶרֶף are the two halves of the year: summer including spring (אָבִיב), which begins in Nisan, the spring-month, about the time of the vernal equinox, and autumn including winter (סֶתֶר), after the termination of which the strictly spring vegetation begins (Son. 2:11). The seasons are personified, and are called God's formations or works, as it were the angels of summer and of winter.

*Psa. 74:18-23.* The poet, after he has thus consoled himself by the contemplation of the power of God which He has displayed for His people's good as their Redeemer, and for the good of the whole of mankind as the Creator, rises anew to prayer, but all the more cheerfully and boldly. Since ever present facts of creation have been referred to just now, and the historical mighty deeds of God only further back, זֹאת refers rather forwards to the blaspheming of the enemies which He suffers now to go on unpunished, as though He took no cognizance of it. חֶרֶף has *Pasek* after it in order to separate the word, which signifies reviling, from the most holy Name. The epithet אִם-נִבֵּל reminds one of Deu. 32:21. In v. 19a according to the accents חַיֵּית is the absolute state (the primary form of חַיָּה, vid., on Psa. 61: 1): give not over, abandon not to the wild beast (beasts), the soul of Thy turtle-dove. This is probably correct, since לַחַיֵּית נֶפֶשׁ, "to the eager wild beast," this inversion of the well-known expression נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, which on the contrary yields the sense of *vita animae*, is an improbable and exampleless expression. If נֶפֶשׁ were intended to be thus understood, the poet might have written לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה תוֹרֵךְ אֶל-תֵּתֵן, "give not Thy turtle-dove over to the desire of the wild beast." Hupfeld thinks that the "old, stupid reading" may be set right at one stroke,

inasmuch as he reads **אל תתן לנפש חית תורד**, and renders it “give not to rage the life Thy turtle-dove;” but where is any support to be found for this **לנפש**, “to rage,” or rather (*Psychology*, S. 202; tr. p. 239) “to eager desire?” The word cannot signify this in such an isolated position. Israel, which is also compared to a dove in Psa. 68:14, is called a turtle-dove (**תורד**). In v. 19**ב** **חַיַּית** has the same signification as in v. 19**א**, and the same sense as Psa. 68:11 (cf. Psa. 69:37): the creatures of Thy miserable ones, i.e., Thy poor, miserable creatures — a figurative designation of the *ecclesia pressa*. The church, which it is the custom of the Asaphic Psalms to designate with emblematical names taken from the animal world, finds itself now like sheep among wolves, and seems to itself as if it were forgotten by God. The cry of prayer **הִבַּט לְבָרִית** comes forth out of circumstances such as were those of the Maccabaeen age. **בְּרִית** is the covenant of circumcision (Genesis 17); the persecution of the age of the Seleucidae put faith to the severe test, that circumcision, this sign which was the pledge to Israel of God’s gracious protection, became just the sign by which the Syrians knew their victims. In the Book of Daniel, Dan. 11:28, 30, cf. Psa. 22:32, **בְּרִית** is used directly of the religion of Israel and its band of confessors. The confirmatory clause v. 20**ב** also corresponds to the Maccabaeen age, when the persecuted confessors hid themselves far away in the mountains (1 Macc. 2:26 ff., 2 Macc. 6:11), but were tracked by the enemy and slain, — at that time the hiding-places (**κρύφιοι**, 1 Macc. 1:53) of the land were in reality full of the habitations of violence. The combination **נְאוֹת הָמָס** is like **נְאוֹת הַשְּׁלוֹם**, Jer. 25:37, cf. Gen. 6:11. From this point the Psalm draws to a close in more familiar Psalm-strains. **אֶל-יְיָ**, v. 21, viz., from drawing near to Thee with their supplications. “The reproach of the foolish all the day” is that which incessantly goes forth from them. **עֲלֶה תָמִיד**, “going up (1Sa. 5:12, not: increasing, 1Ki. 22:35) perpetually,” although without the article, is not a predicate, but attributive (vid., on Psa. 57: 3). The tone of the prayer is throughout temperate; this the ground upon which it bases itself is therefore all the more forcible.

## Psalm 75

### THE NEARNESS OF THE JUDGE WITH THE CUP OF WRATH

*75: 2 WE give thanks unto Thee, Elohim, we give thanks,  
And near is Thy Name:  
Men declare Thy wondrous works.*

*75: 3 For “I will seize the moment,  
I, in uprightness will I judge.*

*75: 4 If the earth and all its inhabitants are dissolving —  
I, even I set up its pillars.” (Sela)*

*75: 5 “I say to the boastful: Boast not!  
And to the evil-doers: Lift not up the horn!*

*75: 6 Lift not up on high your horn,  
Speak not impudence with a stiff neck!”*

*75: 7 For not from the rising and not from the setting,  
And not from the desert of the mountain-heights —*

*75: 8 Nay, Elohim judgeth the cause,  
He putteth down one, and setteth up another.*

*75: 9 For a cup is in the hand of Jahve,  
And it foameth with wine, it is full of mixture;  
And He poureth out from it, yea the dregs thereof  
Must all the wicked of the earth sip, drink up.*

*75:10 And I, even I will proclaim for ever,  
I will sing praises to the God of Jacob;*

*75:11 And all the horns of the wicked will I smite down,  
The horns of the righteous shall be exalted.*

*Psalm 75.* That for which Psalm 74 prays: *Arise, Jahve, plead Thine own cause* (vv. 22 f.), Psalm 75 beholds; the judgment of God upon the proud sinners becomes a source of praise and of a triumphant spirit to the psalmist. The prophetic picture stands upon a lyrical groundwork of gold; it emerges out of the depth of feeling, and it is drawn back again into it. The inscription: *To the Precentor, (after the measure:) Destroy not* (vid., on Ps. 57: 1), *a Psalm by Asaph, a Song*, is fully borne out. The *Sela* shows that the Psalm, as שִׁיר מְזוֹמֵר says, is appointed to be sung with musical accompaniment; and to the לְאָסָף corresponds its thoroughly Asaphic character, which calls Psalm 50 to mind with especial force. But from this Psalm Psalm 75 differs, however, in this particular, viz., that a more clearly defined situation of affairs manifests itself through the hope of the judicial interposition of God which is expressed in it with prophetic certainty. According to appearances it is the time of the judgment of the nations in the person of Assyria; not, however, the time immediately following the great catastrophe, but prior to this, when Isaiah’s prophecy concerning the shattering of the Assyrian power against Jerusalem had gone forth, just as Hengstenberg also regards this Psalm as the lyrical companion of the prophecies which Isaiah uttered in the presence of the ruin which threatened from Assyria, and as a testimony to the living faith with which the church at that time received the word of God. Hitzig, however, assigns both Psalm 75 and 76 to Judas Maccabaeus, who celebrates the victory

over Apollonius in the one, and the victory over Seron in the other: “we may imagine that he utters the words of Psa. 75:11 whilst he brandishes the captured sword of the fallen Apollonius.” But the probability that it refers to the Assyrian period is at least equally balanced with the probability that it refers to the Maccabaeen (vid., Psa. 75: 7; 76: 5-7); and if the time of Hezekiah were to be given up, then we might sooner go back to the time of Jehoshaphat, for both songs are too original to appear as echoes and not much rather as models of the later prophecy. The only influence that is noticeable in Psalm 75 is that of the Song of Hannah.

*Psa. 75: 2-6.* The church in anticipation gives thanks for the judicial revelation of its God, the near approach of which He Himself asserts to it. The connection with י in וְקָרוֹב שְׁמֶךָ presents a difficulty. Neither here nor anywhere else is it to be supposed that י is synonymous with כִּי; but at any rate even כִּי might stand instead of it. For Hupfeld’s attempt to explain it: and “near is Thy name” Thy wonders have declared; and Hitzig’s: and Thou whose Name is near, they declare Thy wondrous works, — are past remedy. Such a personification of wonders does not belong to the spirit of Hebrew poetry, and such a relative clause lies altogether beyond the bounds of syntax. If we would, however, take וְקָרוֹב שְׁמֶךָ, after Psa. 50:23, as a result of the thanksgiving (Campensis), then that for which thanks are rendered would remain undefined; neither will it do to take קָרוֹב as referring to the being inwardly present (Hengstenberg), since this, according to Jer. 12: 2 (cf. Deu. 30:14), would require some addition, which should give to the nearness this reference to the mouth or to the heart. Thus, therefore, nothing remains for us but to connect the nearness of the Name of God as an outward fact with the earnest giving of thanks. The church has received the promise of an approaching judicial, redemptive revelation of God, and now says, “We give Thee thanks, we give thanks and near is Thy Name;” it welcomes the future act of God with heartfelt thanksgiving, all those who belong to it declare beforehand the wonders of God. Such was really the position of matters when in Hezekiah’s time the oppression of the Assyrians had reached its highest point — Isaiah’s promises of a miraculous divine deliverance were at that time before them, and the believing ones saluted beforehand, with thanksgiving, the “coming Name of Jahve” (Isa. 30:27). The כִּי which was to be expected after הוֹדִינוּ (cf. e.g., Psa. 100: 4 f.) does not follow until v. 3. God Himself undertakes the confirmation of the forthcoming thanksgiving and praise by a direct announcement of the help that is hailed and near at hand (Psa. 85:10). It is not to be rendered, “when I shall seize,” etc., for v. 3b has not the structure of an apodosis. כִּי is confirmatory, and whatever interpretation we may give to it, the words of the church suddenly change into the words of God. מוֹעֵד in the

language of prophecy, more especially of the apocalyptic character, is a standing expression fore the appointed time of the final judgment (vid., on Hab. 2: 3). When this moment or juncture in the lapse of time shall have arrived, then God will seize or take possession of it (לָקַח in the unweakened original sense of taking hold of with energy, cf. Ps. 18:17, Gen. 2:15): He Himself will then interpose and hold judgment according to the strictly observed rule of right (מִישְׁרִים, adverbial accusative, cf. בְּמִישְׁרִים, Ps. 9: 9, and frequently). If it even should come to pass that the earth and all its inhabitants are melting away (cf. Isa. 14:31, Exo. 15:15, Jos. 2: 9), i.e., under the pressure of injustice (as is to be inferred from v. 3b), are disheartened, scattered asunder, and are as it were in the act of dissolution, then He (the absolute I, אֲנֹכִי) will restrain this melting away: He setteth in their places the pillars, i.e., the internal shafts (Job. 9: 6), of the earth, or without any figure: He again asserts the laws which lie at the foundation of its stability. תִּבְנִיתִי is a mood of certainty, and v. 4a is a circumstantial clause placed first, after the manner of the Latin ablative absolute. Hitzig appropriately compares Pro. 29: 9; Isa. 23:15 may also be understood according to this bearing of the case.

The utterance of God is also continued after the *Sela*. It is not the people of God who turn to the enemies with the language of warning on the ground of the divine promise (Hengstenberg); the poet would then have said אֲמַרְנֵנוּ, or must at least have said אֶל־כֶּן אֲמַרְתִּי. God Himself speaks, and His words are not yet peremptorily condemning, as in Ps. 50:16 ff., cf. 46:11, but admonitory and threatening, because it is not He who has already appeared for the final judgment who speaks, but He who announces His appearing. With אֲמַרְתִּי He tells the braggarts who are captivated with the madness of supposed greatness, and the evil-doers who lift up the horn or the head, <sup>r263</sup> what He will have once for all said to them, and what they are to suffer to be said to them for the short space of time till the judgment. The poet, if we have assigned the right date to the Psalm, has Rabshakeh and his colleagues before his mind, cf. Isa. 37:23. The לָ, as in that passage, and like אֶל in Zec. 2: 4 (vid., Köhler), has the idea of a hostile tendency. אֶל rules also over v. 6b: “speak not insolence with a raised neck.” It is not to be construed עֲתָק בְּצִנּוֹר, with a stiff neck. Parallel passages like Ps. 31:19; 94: 4, and more especially the primary passage 1Sa. 5: 3, show that עֲתָק is an object-notion, and that בְּצִנּוֹר by itself (with which, too, the accentuation harmonizes, since *Munach* here is the *vicarius* of a distinctive), according to Job. 15:26, has the sense of τραχηλιῶτες or ὑπεραυχοῦντες.

*Psa. 75: 7-9.* The church here takes up the words of God, again beginning with the כִּי of v. 3 (cf. the כִּי in 1Sa. 2: 3). A passage of the Midrash says מִזֶּה חוּץ כָּל הָרִים שֶׁבְּמִקְרָא הָרִים חוּץ (everywhere where *harim* is found in Scripture it signifies *harim*, mountains, with the exception of this passage), and accordingly it is explained by Rashi, Kimchi, *Alshêch*, and others, that man, whithersoever he may turn, cannot by strength and skill attain great exaltation and prosperity. <sup>f264</sup>

Thus it is according to the reading מִמִּדְבָּר, although Kimchi maintains that it can also be so explained with the reading מִמְּרָמָם, by pointing to מְרָמָם (Isa. 10: 6) and the like. It is, however, difficult to see why, in order to express the idea “from anywhere,” three quarters of the heavens should be used and the north left out. These three quarters of the heavens which are said to represent the earthly sources of power (Hupfeld), are a frame without the picture, and the thought, “from no side (viz., of the earth) cometh promotion” — in itself whimsical in expression — offers a wrong confirmation for the dissuasive that has gone before. That, however, which the church longs for is first of all not promotion, but redemption. On the other hand, the LXX, Targum, Syriac, and Vulgate render: *a deserto montium (desertis montibus)*; and even Aben-Ezra rightly takes it as a Palestinian designation of the south, when he supplements the aposiopesis by means of מִי שְׁוֹשִׁיעַם (more biblically יָבֵא עֲזָרְנוּ, cf. Psa. 121: 1 f.). The fact that the north is not mentioned at all shows that it is a northern power which arrogantly, even to blasphemy, threatens the small Israelitish nation with destruction, and against which it looks for help neither from the east and west, nor from the reed-staff of Egypt (Isa. 36: 6) beyond the desert of the mountains of Arabia Petraea, but from Jahve alone, according to the watchword of Isaiah: הִ' שֶׁפִּטְנוּ (Isa. 33:22). The negative thought is left unfinished, the discourse hurrying on to the opposite affirmative thought. The close connection of the two thoughts is strikingly expressed by the rhymes הָרִים and יָרִים. The כִּי of v. 8 gives the confirmation of the negation from the opposite, that which is denied; the כִּי of v. 9 confirms this confirmation. If it were to be rendered, “and the wine foams,” it would then have been הִיָּין; מִסֵּךְ, which is undoubtedly accusative, also shows that יָיִן is also not considered as anything else: and it (the cup) foams (חָמַר like Arab. *'chtmr*, to ferment, effervesce) with wine, is full of mixture. According to the ancient usage of the language, which is also followed by the Arabic, this is wine mixed with water in distinction from *merum*, Arabic *chamr memzûg* <sup>e</sup>. Wine was mixed with water not merely to dilute it, but also to make it more pleasant; hence מִסֵּךְ signifies directly as much as to pour out (vid., Hitzig on Isa. 5:22). It is therefore unnecessary to understand spiced wine (Talmudic קוֹנֵדִיטוֹן,

*conditum*), since the collateral idea of weakening is also not necessarily associated with the admixture of water. מִזֶּה refers to כּוֹס, which is used as masculine, as in Jer. 25:15; the word is feminine elsewhere, and changes its gender even here in שִׁמְרֵיהָ (cf. Eze. 23:34). In the *fut. consec.* יִיגֵר the historical signification of the consecutive is softened down, as is frequently the case. אִשׁ affirms the whole assertion that follows. The dregs of the cup — a *dira necessitas* — all the wicked of the earth shall be compelled to sip (Isa. 51:17), to drink out: they shall not be allowed to drink and make a pause, but, compelled by Jahve, who has appeared as Judge, they shall be obliged to drink it out with involuntary eagerness even to the very last (Eze. 23:34). We have here the primary passage of a figure, which has been already hinted at in Psa. 60: 5, and is filled in on a more and more magnificent and terrible scale in the prophets. Whilst Obadiah (Oba. 1:16, cf. Job. 21:20) contents himself with a mere outline sketch, it is found again, in manifold applications, in Isaiah, Habakkuk, and Ezekiel, and most frequently in Jeremiah (Jer. 25:27 f., 48:26; 49:12), where in Jer. 25:15 ff. it is embodied into a symbolical act. Jahve's cup of intoxication (inasmuch as חֶמֶר and חֶמְרָה, the burning of anger and intoxicating, fiery wine, are put on an equality) is the judgment of wrath which is meted out to sinners and given them to endure to the end.

*Psa. 75:10, 11.* The poet now turns back thankfully and cheerfully from the prophetically presented future to his own actual present. With אֲנִי he contrasts himself as a member of the now still oppressed church with its proud oppressors: he will be a perpetual herald of the ever memorable deed of redemption. לְעַלְמַי, says he, for, when he gives himself up so entirely to God the Redeemer, for him there is no dying. If he is a member of the *ecclesia pressa*, then he will also be a member of the *ecclesia triumphans*; for εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν (2Ti. 2:12). In the certainty of this συμβασιλεύειν, and in the strength of God, which is even now mighty in the weak one, he measures himself in v. 11 by the standard of what he expresses in v. 8 as God's own work. On the figure compare Deu. 33:17, Lam. 2: 3, and more especially the four horns in the second vision of Zechariah, Zec. 2: 1 f. [1:18 f.]. The plural is both קַרְנֹת and קַרְנֵי, because horns that do not consist of horn are meant. Horns are powers for offence and defence. The spiritual horns maintain the sovereignty over the natural. The Psalm closes as subjectively as it began. The prophetic picture is set in a lyric frame.

## Psalm 76

### PRAISE OF GOD AFTER HIS JUDGMENT HAS GONE FORTH

*76: 2 IN Judah is Elohim become known,  
In Israel is His name great.*

*76: 3 He pitched His tabernacle in Salem,  
And His dwelling-place in Zion.*

*76: 4 There brake He the lightnings of the bow,  
Shield and sword and weapons of war. (Sela)*

*76: 5 Brilliant art Thou, glorious before the mountains of prey!*

*76: 6 Spoiled were the stout-hearted;  
They fell asleep in their sleep,  
And none of the valiant ones found their hands.*

*76: 7 Before Thy rebuke, O God of Jacob,  
Both chariot and horse became deeply stupefied.*

*76: 8 Thou, terrible art Thou,  
And who can stand before Thee when Thy wrath beginneth?*

*76: 9 From heaven didst Thou cause judgment to sound forth —  
The earth feared and became silent,*

*76:10 At the rising of Elohim to judgment,  
To save all the afflicted of the land. (Sela)*

*76:11 For the wrath of man is to Thee as praise,  
Seeing Thou with the remainder of the fulness of wrath dost gird Thyself.*

*76:12 Vow and pay unto Jahve, your God,  
Let all who are round about Him bring offerings to the terrible One.*

*76:13 He cutteth down the snorting of despots,  
He is terrible to the kings of the earth.*

*Psalm 76.* No Psalm has a greater right to follow Psalm 75 than this, which is inscribed *To the Precentor, with accompaniment of stringed instruments* (vid., Psa. 4: 1), *a Psalm by Asaph, a song*. Similar expressions (*God of Jacob*, Psa. 75:10; 76: 7; *saints, wicked of the earth*, Psa. 75: 9; 76:10) and the same impress throughout speak in favour of unity of authorship. In other respects, too, they form a pair: Psalm 75 prepares the way for the divine deed of judgment as imminent, which Psalm 76 celebrates as having taken place. For it is hardly possible for there to be a Psalm the contents of which so exactly coincide with an historical situation of which more is known from other sources, as the contents of this Psalm confessedly (LXX πρὸς τὸν Ἀσάφριον)



does with the overthrow of the army of Assyria before Jerusalem and its results. The Psalter contains very similar Psalms which refer to a similar event in the reign of Jehoshaphat, viz., to the defeat at that time of the allied neighbouring peoples by a mutual massacre, which was predicted by the Asaphite Jahaziel (vid., on Psalm 46 and 83). Moreover in Psalm 76 the “mountains of prey,” understood of the mountains of Seir with their mounted robbers, would point to this incident. But just as in Psalm 75 the reference to the catastrophe of Assyria in the reign of Hezekiah was indicated by the absence of any mention of the north, so in Psalm 76 both the **שָׁמָּה** in v. 4 and the description of the catastrophe itself make this reference and no other natural. The points of contact with Isaiah, and in part with Hosea (cf. v. 4 with Hos. 2:20) and Nahum, are explicable from the fact that the lyric went hand in hand with the prophecy of that period, as Isaiah predicts for the time when Jahve shall discharge His fury over Assyria, Isa. 30:29, “*Your song shall re-echo as in the night, in which the feast is celebrated.*”

The Psalm is hexastichic, and a model of symmetrical strophe-structure.

**Psa. 76: 2-4.** In all Israel, and more especially in Judah, is Elohim known (here, according to v. 2b, participle, whereas in 9:17 it is the finite verb), inasmuch as He has made Himself known (cf. **דָּעוּ**, Isa. 33:13). His Name is great in Israel, inasmuch as He has proved Himself to be a great One and is praised as a great One. In Judah more especially, for in Jerusalem, and that upon Zion, the citadel with the primeval gates (Psa. 24: 7), He has His dwelling-place upon earth within the borders of Israel. **שָׁלֵם** is the ancient name of Jerusalem; for the Salem of Melchizedek is one and the same city with the Jerusalem of Adonizedek, Jos. 10: 1. In this primeval Salem God has **סוּכּוֹ**, His tabernacle (= **שֹׁכֵנוֹ**, Lam. 2: 6, = **סֹכְתוֹ**, as in Psa. 27: 5), there **מִעֲוֹנָתוֹ**, His dwelling-place, — a word elsewhere used of the lair of the lion (Psa. 104:22, Amo. 3: 4); cf. on the choice of words, Isa. 31: 9. The future of the result **יִיְהִי** is an expression of the fact which is evident from God’s being known in Judah and His Name great in Israel. V. 4 tells what it is by which He has made Himself known and glorified His Name. **שָׁמָּה**, thitherwards, in that same place (as in fact the accusative, in general, is used both in answer to the question where? and whither?), is only a fuller form for **שָׁם**, as in Isa. 22:18; 65: 9, 2Ki. 23: 8, and frequently; Arab. *tamma* (*tumma*) and **תָּמָן** (from **תָּמָה**) confirm the accusative value of the *ah.* **רֶשֶׁפֵי־קִשְׁתֶּךָ** (with *Phe raphatum*, cf. on the other hand, Son. 8: 6 <sup>f265</sup>) are the arrows swift as lightning that go forth (Job. 41:20 [28]) from the bow; side by side with these, two other weapons are also mentioned, and finally everything that pertains to war is gathered up in the word **מִלְחָמָה** (cf. Hos. 2:20 [18]). God has broken in pieces the weapons of

the worldly power directed against Judah, and therewith this power itself (Isa. 14:25), and consequently (in accordance with the prediction Hos. 1: 7, and Isa. 10, 14, 17, 29, 31, 33, 37, and more particularly 31: 8) has rescued His people by direct interposition, without their doing anything in the matter.

**Psa. 76: 5-7.** The “mountains of prey,” for which the LXX has ὀρέων ἀίωνων (אֲרָצוֹת?), is an emblematical appellation for the haughty possessors of power who also plunder every one that comes near them, <sup>f266</sup> or the proud and despoiling worldly powers. Far aloft beyond these towers the glory of God. He is אֲרָצוֹת, *illustris*, prop. illumined; said of God: light-encircled, fortified in light, in the sense of Dan. 2:22, 1Ti. 6:16. He is the אֲרָצוֹת, to whom the Lebanon of the hostile army of the nations must succumb (Isa. 10:34). According to Solinus (*ed. Mommsen*, p. 124) the Moors call Atlas *Addirim*. This succumbing is described in vv. 6 f. The strong of heart or stout-hearted, the lion-hearted, have been despoiled, disarmed, *exuti*; אֲשֶׁתוֹלְלוּ <sup>f267</sup> is an Aramaizing *praet. Hithpo.* (like אֲתַחֲבַר, 2Ch. 20:35, cf. Dan. 4:16, Isa. 63: 3) with a passive signification. From v. 6ac we see that the beginning of the catastrophe is described, and therefore נָמוּ (perhaps on that account accented on the *ult.*) is meant inchoatively: they have fallen into their sleep, viz., the eternal sleep (Jer. 51:39, 57), as Nah. says (Nah. 3:18): *thy shepherds sleep, O king of Assyria, thy valiant ones rest*. In v. 6c we see them lying in the last throes of death, and making a last effort to spring up again. But they cannot find their hands, which they have lifted up threateningly against Jerusalem: these are lamed, motionless, rigid and dead; cf. the phrases in Jos. 8:20, 2Sa. 7:27, and the Talmudic phrase, “he did not find his hands and feet in the school-house,” i.e., he was entirely disconcerted and stupefied. <sup>f268</sup>

This field of corpses is the effect of the omnipotent energy of the word of the God of Jacob; cf. אֲרָצוֹת בּוֹ, Isa. 17:13. Before His threatening both war-chariot and horse (אֶרֶב — אֶרֶב) are sunk into motionlessness and unconsciousness — an allusion to Exodus 15, as in Isa. 43:17: *who bringeth out chariot and horse, army and heroes — together they faint away, they shall never rise; they have flickered out, like a wick they are extinguished*.

**Psa. 76: 8-10.** Nah. also (Nah. 1: 6) draws the same inference from the defeat of Sennacherib as the psalmist does in v. 8. אֲרָצוֹת אֲרָצוֹת (cf. Rut. 2: 7, Jer. 44:18), from the decisive turning-point onwards, from the אֲרָצוֹת in 2: 5, when Thine anger breaks forth. God sent forth His judiciary word from heaven into the midst of the din of war of the hostile world: immediately (cf. on the sequence of the tenses Psa. 48: 6, and on Hab. 3:10) it was silenced, the earth was seized with fear, and its tumult was obliged to cease, when, namely, God

arose on behalf of His disquieted, suffering people, when He spoke as we read in Isa. 33:10, and fulfilled the prayer offered in extreme need in Isa. 33: 2.

*Psa. 76:11-13.* The fact that has just been experienced is substantiated in v. 11 from a universal truth, which has therein become outwardly manifest. The rage of men shall praise Thee, i.e., must ultimately redound to Thy glory, inasmuch as to Thee, namely (v. 1*b* as to syntax like 73: 3*b*), there always remains a **שְׂאֲרִית**, i.e., a still unexhausted remainder, and that not merely of **חֶמֶה**, but of **חֶמַת**, with which Thou canst gird, i.e., arm, Thyself against such human rage, in order to quench it. **שְׂאֲרִית חֶמַת** is the infinite store of wrath still available to God after human rage has done its utmost. Or perhaps still better, and more fully answering to the notion of **שְׂאֲרִית**: it is the store of the infinite fulness of wrath which still remains on the side of God after human rage (**חֶמֶה**) has spent itself, when God calmly, and laughing (Psa. 2: 4), allows the Titans to do as they please, and which is now being poured out. In connection with the interpretation: with the remainder of the fury (of hostile men) wilt Thou gird Thyself, i.e., it serves Thee only as an ornament (Hupfeld), the alternation of **חֶמֶה** and **חֶמַת** is left unexplained, and **תְּחַגְּרֵה** is alienated from its martial sense (Isa. 59:17; 51: 9, Wisd. 5:21 [20]), which is required by the context. Ewald, like the LXX, reads **תְּחַגְּרֵה**, ἑορτάσει σοι, in connection with which, apart from the high-sounding expression, **שְׂאֲרִית חֶמַת** (εγκατάλειμμα ἐνθυμίου) must denote the remainder of malignity that is suddenly converted into its opposite; and one does not see why what v. 11*a* says concerning rage is here limited to its remainder. Such an inexhaustiveness in the divine wrath-power has been shown in what has just recently been experienced. Thus, then, are those who belong to the people of God to vow and pay, i.e., (inasmuch as the preponderance falls upon the second imperative) to pay their vows; and all who are round about Him, i.e., all the peoples dwelling round about Him and His people (**בְּלִסְבִּיבָיו**), the subject to what follows, in accordance with which it is also accented), are to bring offerings (Psa. 68:30) to God, who is **מְזַרְא**, i.e., the sum of all that is awe-inspiring. Thus is He called in Isa. 8:13; the summons accords with Isaiah's prediction, according to which, in consequence of Jahve's deed of judgment upon Assyria, Aethiopia presents himself to Him as an offering (Psalm 18), and with the fulfilment in 2Ch. 32:23. Just so does v. 13*a* resemble the language of Isaiah; cf. Isa. 25: 1-15; 33: 1; 18: 5: God treats the snorting of the princes, i.e., despots, as the vine-dresser does the wild shoots or branches of the vine-stock: He lops it, He cuts it off, so that it is altogether ineffectual. It is the figure that is sketched by Joe. 4 [3]:13, then filled in by Isaiah, and embodied as a vision in Rev. 14:17-20, which is here indicated. God puts an end to the defiant, arrogant bearing of

the tyrants of the earth, and becomes at last the feared of all the kings of the earth — all kingdoms finally becomes God's and His Christ's.

## **Psalm 77**

### **COMFORT DERIVED FROM THE HISTORY OF THE PAST DURING YEARS OF AFFLICTION**

*77: 2 I CALL unto Elohim, and will cry,  
I call unto Elohim, that He may hearken unto me.*

*77: 3 In the day of my distress do I seek the Lord;  
My hand is stretched out in the night without ceasing,  
My soul refuseth to be comforted.*

*77: 4 If I remember Elohim, I must groan;  
If I muse, my spirit languisheth. (Sela)*

*77: 5 Thou holdest mine eyelids open,  
I am tossed to and fro, and I am speechless.*

*77: 6 I consider the days of old,  
The years of ancient times;*

*77: 7 I will remember my music in the night,  
I will commune with my own heart, and my spirit maketh diligent search.*

*77: 8 Will the Lord cast off for ever,  
And will He be favourable no more?*

*77: 9 Is, then, His mercy passed away for ever,  
Is it at an end with His promise to all generations?*

*77:10 Hath God forgotten to be gracious,  
Or hath He drawn in in anger His tender mercies?! (Sela)*

*77:11 Thereupon say I to myself: my decree of affliction is this,  
The years of the right hand of the Most High.*

*77:12 With praise do I remember the deeds of Jāh,  
Yea, I will call to mind Thy wondrous doing from olden times,*

*77:13 And meditate on all Thy work,  
And will muse over Thy doings.*

*77:14 Elohim, in holiness is Thy way:  
Where is there a God, great as Elohim?*

*77:15 Thou art God alone, doing wonders,  
Thou hast revealed Thy might among the peoples.*

*77:16 Thou hast with uplifted arm redeemed Thy people,  
The sons of Jacob and Joseph. (Sela)*

*77:17 The waters saw Thee, Elohim,  
The waters saw Thee, they writhed,  
The depths also trembled.*

*77:18 The clouds poured out waters,  
The skies rumbled,  
Thine arrows also went to and fro.*

*77:19 Thy thunder resounded in the whirlwind,  
The lightnings lightened the world,  
The earth trembled and shook.*

*77:20 In the sea was Thy way,  
And Thy path in great waters,  
And Thy footsteps were not to be discerned.*

*77:21 Thou hast led Thy people like a flock  
By the hand of Moses and Aaron.*

*Psalm 77.* "The earth feared and became still," says Psa. 76: 9; *the earth trembled and shook*, says Psa. 77:19: this common thought is the string on which these two Psalms are strung. In a general way it may be said of Psalm 77, that the poet flees from the sorrowful present away into the memory of the years of olden times, and consoles himself more especially with the deliverance out of Egypt, so rich in wonders. As to the rest, however, it remains obscure what kind of national affliction it is which drives him to find his refuge from the God who is now hidden in the God who was formerly manifest. At any rate it is not a purely personal affliction, but, as is shown by the consolation sought in the earlier revelations of power and mercy in connection with the national history, an affliction shared in company with the whole of his people. In the midst of this hymnic retrospect the Psalm suddenly breaks off, so that Olshausen is of opinion that it is mutilated, and Tholuck that the author never completed it. But as Psalm 77 and 81 show, it is the Asaphic manner thus to close with an historical picture without the line of thought recurring to its commencement. Where our Psalm leaves off, Habakkuk 3 goes on, taking it up from that point like a continuation. For the prophet begins with the prayer to revive that deed of redemption of the Mosaic days of old, and in the midst of wrath to remember mercy; and in expression and figures which are borrowed from our Psalm, he then beholds a fresh deed of redemption by which that of old is eclipsed. Thus much, at least, is therefore very clear, that Psalm 77 is older than Habakkuk. Hitzig certainly calls the psalmist the reader and imitator of Habakkuk 3; and Philipponson considers even the mutual relationship to be accidental and confined to a general similarity of certain

expressions. We, however, believe that we have proved in our *Commentary on Habakkuk* (1843), S. 118-125, that the mutual relationship is one that is deeply grounded in the prophetic type of Habakkuk, and that the Psalm is heard to re-echo in Habakkuk, not Habakkuk in the language of the psalmist; just as in general the Asaphic Psalms are full of boldly sketched outlines to be filled in by later prophetic writers. We also now further put this question: how was it possible for the gloomy complaint of Psalm 77, which is turned back to the history of the past, to mould itself after Habakkuk 3, that joyous looking forward into a bright and blessed future? Is not the prospect in Habakkuk 3 rather the result of that retrospect in Psalm 77, the confidence in being heard which is kindled by this Psalm, the realizing as present, in the certainty of being heard, of a new deed of God in which the deliverances in the days of Moses are antitypically revived?

More than this, viz., that the Psalm is older than Habakkuk, who entered upon public life in the reign of Josiah, or even as early as in the reign of Manasseh, cannot be maintained. For it cannot be inferred from v. 16 and v. 3, compared with Gen. 37:35, that one chief matter of pain to the psalmist was the fall of the kingdom of the ten tribes which took place in his time. Nothing more, perhaps, than the division of the kingdom which had already taken place seems to be indicated in these passages. The bringing of the tribes of Joseph prominently forward is, however, peculiar to the Asaphic circle of songs.

The task of the precentor is assigned by the inscription to Jeduthun (*Chethib*: Jeduthun), for ל (Psa. 39: 1) alternates with על (Psa. 62: 1); and the idea that דוֹתָן denotes the whole of the Jeduthunites (“overseer over...”) might be possible, but is without example.

The strophe schema of the Psalm is 7. 12. 12. 12. 2. The first three strophes or groups of stichs close with *Sela*.

*Psa. 77: 2-4.* The poet is resolved to pray without intermission, and he prays; fore his soul is comfortless and sorely tempted by the vast distance between the former days and the present times. According to the pointing, הַשְׁמִיךְ appears to be meant to be imperative after the form הַקְטִיל, which occurs instead of הַקְטִיל and הַקְטִילָה, cf. Psa. 94: 1, Isa. 43: 8, Jer. 17:18, and the mode of writing הַקְטִיל, Psa. 142: 5, 2Ki. 8: 6, and frequently; therefore *et audi = ut audias* (cf. 2Sa. 21: 3). But such an isolated form of address is not to be tolerated; הַשְׁמִיךְ has been regarded as *perf. consec.* in the sense of *ut audiat*, although this modification of הַשְׁמִיךְ into הַשְׁמִיךְ in connection with the appearing of the *Waw consec.* cannot be supported in any other instance (Ew. § 234, e), and Kimchi on this account tries to persuade himself to that which is

impossible, viz., that **וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה** in respect of sound stands for **וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה**. The preterites in v. 3 express that which has commenced and which will go on. The poet labours in his present time of affliction to press forward to the Lord, who has withdrawn from him; his hand is diffused, i.e., stretched out (not: poured out, for the radical meaning of **נָגַג**, as the Syriac shows, is *protrahere*), in the night-time without wearying and leaving off; it is fixedly and stedfastly (**אֲמוֹנָה**, as it is expressed in Exo. 17:12) stretched out towards heaven. His soul is comfortless, and all comfort up to the present rebounds as it were from it (cf. Gen. 37:35, Jer. 31:15). If he remembers God, who was once near to him, then he is compelled to groan (cf. Psa. 55:18, 3; and on the cohortative form of a *Lamed He* verb, cf. Ges. § 75, 6), because He has hidden Himself from him; if he muses, in order to find Him again, then his spirit veils itself, i.e., it sinks into night and feebleness (**הִתְאַמְרָה** as in Psa. 107: 5; 142: 4; 143: 4). Each of the two members of v. 4 are protasis and apodosis; concerning this emotional kind of structure of a sentence, vid., Ewald, § 357, *b*.

*Psa. 77: 5-10.* He calls his eyelids the “guards of my eyes.” He who holds these so that they remain open when they want to shut together for sleep, is God; for his looking up to Him keeps the poet awake in spite of all overstraining of his powers. Hupfeld and others render thus: “Thou hast held, i.e., caused to last, the night-watches of mine eyes,” — which is affected in thought and expression. The preterites state what has been hitherto and has not yet come to a close. He still endures, as formerly, such thumps and blows within him, as though he lay upon an anvil (**פִּיִּם**), and his voice fails him. Then silent soliloquy takes the place of audible prayer; he throws himself back in thought to the days of old (Psa. 143: 5), the years of past periods (Isa. 51: 9), which were so rich in the proofs of the power and loving-kindness of the God who was then manifest, but is now hidden. He remembers the happier past of his people and his own, inasmuch as he now in the night purposely calls back to himself in his mind the time when joyful thankfulness impelled him to the song of praise accompanied by the music of the harp (**בְּלִילָה** belongs according to the accents to the verb, not to **נִגְיִנְתִּי**, although that construction certainly is strongly commended by parallel passages like Psa. 16: 7; 42: 9; 92: 3, cf. Job. 35:10), in place of which, crying and sighing and gloomy silence have now entered. He gives himself up to musing “with his heart,” i.e., in the retirement of his inmost nature, inasmuch as he allows his thoughts incessantly to hover to and fro between the present and the former days, and in consequence of this (*fut. consec.* as in Psa. 42: 6) his spirit betakes itself to scrupulizing (what the LXX reproduces with **σκάλλειν**, Aquila with **σκαλεύειν**) — his conflict of temptation grows fiercer. Now follow the two doubting questions of the tempted one: he asks in different applications, vv. 8-

10 (cf. Psa. 85: 6), whether it is then all at an end with God's loving-kindness and promise, at the same time saying to himself, that this nevertheless is at variance with the unchangeableness of His nature (Mal. 3: 6) and the inviolability of His covenant. אָפֵס (only occurring as a 3. *praet.*) alternates with נָמַר (Psa. 12: 2). חֲנוּת is an infinitive construct formed after the manner of the *Lamed He* verbs, which, however, does also occur as infinitive absolute (שְׁמוֹת, Eze. 36: 3, cf. on 17: 3); Gesenius and Olshausen (who doubts this infinitive form, § 245, *f*) explain it, as do Aben-Ezra and Kimchi, as the plural of a substantive חָנָה, but in the passage cited from Ezekiel (*vid.*, Hitzig) such a substantival plural is syntactically impossible. קָפַץ רַחֲמִים is to draw together or contract and draw back one's compassion, so that it does not manifest itself outwardly, just as he who will not give shuts (יִקְפֹּץ) his hand (Deu. 15: 7; cf. *supra*, 17:10).

*Psa. 77:11-16.* With וְאָמַר the poet introduces the self-encouragement with which he has hitherto calmed himself when such questions of temptation were wont to intrude themselves upon him, and with which he still soothes himself. In the rendering of חֲלוּתִי (with the tone regularly drawn back before the following monosyllable) even the Targum wavers between מְרַעוּתִי (my affliction) and בְּעוּתִי (my supplication); and just in the same way, in the rendering of v. 11*b*, between אֲשַׁתַּנִּי (have changed) and שְׁנֵינִי (years). שְׁנוֹת cannot possibly signify "change" in an active sense, as Luther renders: "The right hand of the Most High can change everything," but only a having become different (LXX and the *Quinta* ἀλλοίωσις, Symmachus ἐπιδευτέρωσις), after which Maurer, Hupfeld, and Hitzig render thus: my affliction is this, that the right hand of the Most High has changed. But after we have read שְׁנוֹת in v. 6 as a poetical plural of שָׁנָה, a year, we have first of all to see whether it may not have the same signification here. And many possible interpretations present themselves. It can be interpreted: "my supplication is this: years of the right hand of the Most High" (*viz.*, that years like to the former ones may be renewed); but this thought is not suited to the introduction with וְאָמַר. We must either interpret it: my sickness, *viz.*, from the side of God, *i.e.*, the temptation which befalls me from Him, the affliction ordained by Him for me (Aquila ἀρρώστια μου), is this (cf. Jer. 10:19); or, since in this case the unambiguous חֲלוּתִי would have been used instead of the *Piel*: my being pierced, my wounding, my sorrow is this (Symmachus τρωσίς μου, *inf. Kal* from חָלַל, Psa. 109:22, after the form חֲנוּת from חָנַן) — they are years of the right hand of the Most High, *i.e.*, those which God's mighty hand, under which I have to humble myself (1Pe. 5: 6), has formed and measured out to me. In connection with this way of taking v. 11*b*, v. 12*a* is now suitably and easily



attached to what has gone before. The poet says to himself that the affliction allotted to him has its time, and will not last for ever. Therein lies a hope which makes the retrospective glance into the happier past a source of consolation to him. In v. 12a the *Chethîb* **אֲזַכִּיר** is to be retained, for the **כִּי** in v. 12b is thus best explained: “I bring to remembrance, i.e., make known with praise or celebrate (Isa. 63: 7), the deeds of *Jāh*, for I will remember Thy wondrous doing from days of old.” His sorrow over the distance between the present and the past is now mitigated by the hope that God’s right hand, which now casts down, will also again in His own time raise up. Therefore he will now, as the advance from the indicative to the cohortative (cf. Psa. 17:15) imports, thoroughly console and refresh himself with God’s work of salvation in all its miraculous manifestations from the earliest times. **יְהוָה** is the most concise and comprehensive appellation for the God of the history of redemption, who, as Habakkuk prays, will revive His work of redemption in the midst of the years to come, and bring it to a glorious issue. To Him who then was and who will yet come the poet now brings praise and celebration. The way of God is His historical rule, and more especially, as in Hab. 3: 6, **הַלִּיכֹת**, His redemptive rule. The primary passage Exo. 15:11 (cf. Psa. 68:25) shows that **בְּקֹדֶשׁ** is not to be rendered “in the sanctuary” (LXX **ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ**), but “in holiness” (Symmachus **ἐν ἁγιασμῶ**). Holy and glorious in love and in anger. God goes through history, and shows Himself there as the incomparable One, with whose greatness no being, and least of all any one of the beingless gods, can be measured. He is **הָאֵל**, the God, God absolutely and exclusively, a miracle-working (**עֲשֵׂה פִלְאָ**, not **עֲשֵׂה פִלְאָ** cf. Gen. 1:11 <sup>f269</sup>) God, and a God who by these very means reveals Himself as the living and supra-mundane God. He has made His omnipotence known among the peoples, viz., as v. 16 says, by the redemption of His people, the tribes of Jacob and the double tribe of Joseph, out of Egypt, — a deed of His arm, i.e., the work of His own might, by which He has proved Himself to all peoples and to the whole earth to be the Lord of the world and the God of salvation (Exo. 9:16; 15:14). **בְּרֹאֵ**, *brachio* scil. *extenso* (Exo. 6: 6, Deu. 4:34, and frequently), just as in 75: 6, **בְּצִנָּאָר**, *collo* scil. *erecto*. The music here strikes in; the whole strophe is an overture to the following hymn in celebration of God, the Redeemer out of Egypt.

*Psa. 77:17-20.* When He directed His lance towards the Red Sea, which stood in the way of His redeemed, the waters immediately fell as it were into pangs of travail (**נִחִילוּ**, as in Hab. 3:10, not **וַיִּחִילוּ**), also the billows of the deep trembled; for before the omnipotence of God the Redeemer, which creates a new thing in the midst of the old creation, the rules of the ordinary course of nature become unhinged. There now follow in vv. 18, 19 lines taken from the picture of a thunder-storm. The poet wishes to describe how all the

powers of nature became the servants of the majestic revelation of Jahve, when He executed judgment on Egypt and delivered Israel. זָרַם, *Poel* of זָרַם (cognate זָרַב, זָרַף, Aethiopic זָנַם, to rain), signifies intensively: to stream forth in full torrents. Instead of this line, Habakkuk, with a change of the letters of the primary passage, which is usual in Jeremiah more especially, has עָבַר זָרַם מִיָּם. The rumbling which the שָׁחֲקִים<sup>1270</sup> cause to sound forth (נִתְנִיזוּ, cf. Psa. 68:34) is the thunder. The arrows of God (חֲצִצְיִיד, in Habakkuk חֲצִייד) are the lightnings. The *Hithpa.* (instead of which Habakkuk has יִהְלֹכוּ) depicts their busy darting hither and thither in the service of the omnipotence that sends them forth. It is open to question whether גָּלְגַל denotes the roll of the thunder (Aben-Ezra, Maurer, Böttcher): the sound of Thy thunder went rolling forth (cf. Psa. 29: 4), — or the whirlwind accompanying the thunder-storm (Hitzig); the usage of the language (Psa. 83:14, also Eze. 10:13, Syriac *golgolo*) is in favour of the latter. On v. 19<sup>bc</sup> cf. the echo in Psa. 97: 4. Amidst such commotions in nature above and below Jahve strode along through the sea, and made a passage for His redeemed. His person and His working were invisible, but the result which attested His active presence was visible. He took His way through the sea, and cut His path (*Chethîb* plural, שְׁבִילֵיךָ, as in Jer. 18:15) through great waters (or, according to Habakkuk, caused His horses to go through), without the footprints (עֲקֵבוֹתַי with *Dag. dirimens*) of Him who passes and passed through being left behind to show it.

*Psa. 77:21.* If we have divided the strophes correctly, then this is the refrain-like close. Like a flock God led His people by Moses and Aaron (Num. 33: 1) to the promised goal. At this favourite figure, which is as it were the monogram of the Psalms of Asaph and of his school, the poet stops, losing himself in the old history of redemption, which affords him comfort in abundance, and is to him a prophecy of the future lying behind the afflictive years of the present.

## Psalm 78

### THE WARNING-MIRROR OF HISTORY FROM MOSES TO DAVID

*78: 1 GIVE ear, O my people, to my teaching,  
Incline your ear to the utterances of my mouth.*

*78: 2 I will open my mouth with a parable,  
I will pour forth riddles out of the days of old.*

*78: 3 What we have heard, and become conscious of,  
And our fathers have told us,*

*78: 4 We will not hide from their children;  
Telling to the generation to come the glorious deeds of Jahve,  
And His proof of power and His wonders, which He hath done.*

*78: 5 He hath established a testimony in Jacob  
And laid down a law in Israel,  
Which He hath commanded our fathers  
To make it known unto their children;*

*78: 6 In order that the generation to come might know it,  
the children born afterwards,  
That they might arise and tell it again to their children,*

*78: 7 And might place their confidence in Elohim,  
And might not forget the deeds of God,  
And might keep His commandments —*

*78: 8 And might not become as their fathers a stubborn and rebellious generation,  
A generation that set not its heart aright,  
And whose spirit was not faithful towards God.*

*78: 9 The sons of Ephraim, the bow-equipped archers,  
Turned back in the day of battle.*

*78:10 They kept not the covenant of Elohim,  
And in His law they refused to walk.*

*78:11 And they forgot His works  
And His wonders, which He showed them.*

*78:12 In the sight of their fathers He proved Himself to be a miracle-worker,  
In the land of Egypt, in the field of Zoan.*

*78:13 He divided the sea, and led them through,  
And piled the waters up as a heap;*

*78:14 And led them in the cloud by day,  
And the whole night in a fiery light.*

*78:15 He clave rocks in the desert,  
And gave them as it were the floods of the sea to drink abundantly,*

*78:16 And brought forth streams out of the rock,  
And caused the waters to flow down like rivers.*

*78:17 They, however, continued further to sin against Him,  
To act rebelliously towards the Most High in a parched land.*

*78:18 They tempted God in their heart  
To desire food for their soul,*

*78:19 And spake against Elohim, they said:  
“Will God be able to prepare a table in the desert?*

*78:20 Behold He smote rock, and waters gushed out,  
And streams dashed along —  
Will He also be able to give bread,  
Or to provide flesh for His people?”*

*78:21 Therefore, hearing this, Jahve was wroth,  
And fire kindled in Jacob,  
And anger also ascended against Israel*

*78:22 For they believed not in Elohim,  
And trusted not in His salvation.*

*78:23 Nevertheless He commanded the clouds above,  
And the doors of heaven He opened;*

*78:24 He rained upon them manna to eat,  
And corn of heaven gave He unto them.*

*78:25 Bread of angels did man eat,  
Meat He sent them in superabundance.*

*78:26 He caused the east wind to blow in the heaven,  
And by His power brought on the south wind,*

*78:27 And rained flesh upon them like the dust,  
And winged fowls as the sand of the seas.*

*78:28 And it fell within the circuit of its camp,  
Round about its tents.*

*78:29 Then they did eat and were well filled,  
And their desire He fulfilled to them.*

*78:30 Still they were not estranged from their desire,  
The food was still in their mouth,*

*78:31 Then the anger of Elohim went up against them,  
And slew among their fat ones,  
And smote down the young men of Israel.*

*78:32 For all this they sinned still more,  
And believed not in His wonders.*

*78:33 Then He made their days vanish in a breath,  
And their years in sudden haste.*

*78:34 When He slew them, they inquired after Him,  
They turned back and sought God diligently,*

*78:35 And remembered that Elohim was their rock,  
And God the Most High their Redeemer.*

*78:36 They appeased Him with their mouth,  
And with their tongue they lied unto Him;*

*78:37 But their heart was not stedfast with Him,  
And they did not prove faithful in His covenant.*

*78:38 Nevertheless He is full of compassion —  
He forgiveth iniquity and doth not destroy,  
And hath oftentimes restrained His anger,  
And stirred not up all His fury.*

*78:39 He remembered that they were flesh,  
A breath of wind that passeth by and returneth not.*

*78:40 How oft did they provoke Him in the desert,  
Did they grieve Him in the wilderness!*

*78:41 And again and again they sought God,  
And vexed the Holy One of Israel.*

*78:42 They remembered not His hand,  
The day when He delivered them from the oppressor,*

*78:43 When He set His signs in Egypt  
And His remarkable deeds in the field of Zoan.*

*78:44 He turned their Niles into blood,  
And their running waters they could not drink.*

*78:45 He sent gad-flies against them, which devoured them,  
And frogs, which brought destruction upon them.*

*78:46 He gave the fruit of their field to the cricket,  
And their labour to the locust;*

*78:47 He smote down their vine with hail,  
And their sycamore-trees with hail-stones;*

*78:48 And He gave over their cattle to the hail,  
And their flocks to the lightnings.*

*78:49 He let loose upon them the burning of His anger,  
Indignation and fury and distress,  
An embassy of angels of misfortune;*

*78:50 He made plain a way for His anger,  
He spared not their soul from death,  
And their life He gave over to the pestilence.*

*78:51 He smote all the first-born in Egypt,  
The firstlings of manly strength in the tents of Ham.*

*78:52 Then He made His own people to go forth like sheep,  
And guided them like a flock in the desert;*

*78:53 And He led them safely without fear,  
But their enemies the sea covered.*

*78:54 He brought them to His holy border,  
To the mountain, which His right hand had acquired;*

*78:55 He drove out nations before them,  
And allotted them as a marked out inheritance,  
And settled the tribes of Israel in their tents.*

*78:56 Nevertheless they tempted and provoked Elohim the Most High,  
And His testimonies they kept not.*

*78:57 They turned back and fell away like their fathers,  
They turned aside like a deceitful bow.*

*78:58 They incensed Him by their high places,  
And by their idols they excited His jealousy.*

*78:59 Elohim heard and was wroth,  
And became greatly wearied with Israel.*

*78:60 Then He cast off the tabernacle of Shiloh,  
The tent which He had pitched among men;*

*78:61 He gave His might into captivity,  
And His glory into the oppressor's hand.*

*78:62 He gave over His people to the sword,  
And was wroth concerning His inheritance.*

*78:63 Their young men fire devoured,  
And for their maidens they sang no bridal song.*

*78:64 Their priests, by the sword they fell,  
And their widows could not mourn.*

*78:65 Then the Lord awaked as one sleeping,  
As a hero, shouting from wine,*

*78:66 And smote their oppressors behind,  
Eternal reproach did He put upon them —*

*78:67 And He despised the tent of Joseph,  
And the tribe of Ephraim He chose not.*

*78:68 He chose the tribe of Judah,  
The mount Zion, which He hath loved.*

*78:69 And He built, as the heights of heaven, His sanctuary,  
Like the earth which He hath founded for ever.*

*78:70 And He chose David His servant,  
And took him from the sheep-folds;*

*78:71 Following the ewes that gave suck He took him away  
To pasture Jacob His people,  
And Israel His inheritance.*

*78:72 And he pastured them according to the integrity of his heart,  
And with judicious hands he led them.*

*Psalm 78.* In the last verse of Psalm 77 Israel appears as a flock which is led by Moses and Aaron; in the last verse of Psalm 78 as a flock which is led by David, of a pure heart, with judicious hands. Both Psalms also meet in thoughts and expressions, just as the **לְאִסְתָּוּתָא** of both leads one to expect.

Psalm 78 is called *Maskîl*, a meditation. The word would also be appropriate here in the signification “a didactic poem.” For the history of Israel is recapitulated here from the leading forth out of Egypt through the time of the Judges down to David, and that with the practical application for the present age that they should cleave faithfully to Jahve, more faithfully than the rebellious generation of the fathers. After the manner of the Psalms of Asaph the Ephraimites are made specially prominent out of the whole body of the people, their disobedience as well as the rejection of Shiloh and the election of David, by which it was for ever at an end with the supremacy of Ephraim and also of his brother-tribe of Benjamin.

The old Asaphic origin of the Psalm has been contested: —

(1) Because v. 9 may be referred to the apostasy of Ephraim and of the other tribes, that is to say, to the division of the kingdom. But this reference is capriciously imagined to be read in v. 9.

(2) Because the Psalm betrays a malice, indeed a national hatred against Ephraim, such as is only explicable after the apostasy of the ten tribes. But the alienation and jealousy between Ephraim and Judah is older than the rupture of the kingdom. The northern tribes, in consequence of their position, which was more exposed to contact with the heathen world, had already assumed a different character from that of Judah living in patriarchal seclusion. They could boast of a more excited, more martial history, one richer in exploit; in the time of the Judges especially, there is scarcely any mention of Judah. Hence Judah was little thought of by them, especially by powerful Ephraim,

which regarded itself as the foremost tribe of all the tribes. From the beginning of Saul's persecution of David, however, when the stricter principle of the south came first of all into decisive conflict for the mastery with the more lax principle of the Ephraimites, until the rebellion of Jeroboam against Solomon, there runs through the history of Israel a series of acts which reveal a deep rift between Judah and the other tribes, more especially Benjamin and Ephraim. Though, therefore, it were true that a tone hostile to Ephraim is expressed in the Psalm, this would not be any evidence against its old Asaphic origin, since the psalmist rests upon facts, and, without basing the preference of Judah upon merit, he everywhere contemplates the sin of Ephraim, without any Judaeen boasting, in a connection with the sin of the whole nation, which involves all in the responsibility. Nor is v. 69 against Asaph the contemporary of David; for Asaph may certainly have seen the building of the Temple of Solomon as it towered upwards to the skies, and Caspari in his *Essay on the Holy One of Israel* (*Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1844, 3) has shown that even the divine name **קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל** does not militate against him. We have seen in connection with Psalm 76 how deeply imbued Isaiah's language is with that of the Psalms of Asaph. It cannot surprise us if Asaph is Isaiah's predecessor in the use of the name "the Holy One of Israel." The fact, however, that the writer of the Psalm takes the words and colours of his narration from all five books of the Pentateuch, with the exception of Leviticus, is not opposed to our view of the origin of the Pentateuch, but favourable to it. The author of the Book of Job, with whom in v. 64 he verbally coincides, is regarded by us as younger; and the points of contact with other Psalms inscribed "by David," "by the sons of Korah," and "by Asaph," do not admit of being employed for ascertaining his time, since the poet is by no means an unimportant imitator.

The manner of representation which characterizes the Psalm becomes epical in its extension, but is at the same time concise after the sententious style. The separate historical statements have a gnome-like finish, and a gem-like elegance. The whole falls into two principal parts, vv. 1-37, 38-72; the second part passes over from the God-tempting unthankfulness of the Israel of the desert to that of the Israel of Canaan. Every three strophes form one group.

*Psa. 78: 1-11.* The poet begins very similarly to the poet of Psalm 49. He comes forward among the people as a preacher, and demands for his *tōra* a willing, attentive hearing. **תְּנַרְרָה** is the word for every human doctrine or instruction, especially for the prophetic discourse which sets forth and propagates the substance of the divine teaching. Asaph is a prophet, hence v. 2 is quoted in Mat. 13:34 f. as **ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου**.<sup>f271</sup>

He here recounts to the people their history **מִנִּי־קֶדֶם**, from that Egyptaeo-Sinaitic age of yore to which Israel's national independence and specific



position in relation to the rest of the world goes back. It is not, however, with the external aspect of the history that he has to do, but with its internal teachings. מִשְׁלַּל is an allegory or parable, παραβολή, more particularly the apophthegm as the characteristic species of poetry belonging to the *Chokma*, and then in general a discourse of an elevated style, full of figures, thoughtful, pithy, and rounded. הִתְדַּבֵּר is that which is entangled, knotted, involved, *perlexe dictum*. The poet, however, does not mean to say that he will literally discourse gnomic sentences and propound riddles, but that he will set forth the history of the fathers after the manner of a parable and riddle, so that it may become as a parable, i.e., a didactic history, and its events as marks of interrogation and nota-bene's to the present age. The LXX renders thus: ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, φθέγγομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. Instead of this the Gospel by Matthew has: ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς (κόσμου), and recognises in this language of the Psalm a prophecy of Christ; because it is moulded so appropriately for the mouth of Him who is the Fulfiller not only of the Law and of Prophecy, but also of the vocation of the prophet. It is the object-clause to נִכְחַד, and not a relative clause belonging to the “riddles out of the age of yore,” that follows in v. 3 with שִׁשָּׁשׁ, for that which has been heard only becomes riddles by the appropriation and turn the poet gives to it. V. 3 begins a new period (cf. Psa. 69:27, Jer. 14: 1, and frequently): What we have heard, and in consequence thereof known, and what our fathers have told us (word for word, like Psa. 44: 2, Jud. 6:13), that will we not hide from their children (cf. Job. 15:18). The accentuation is perfectly correct. The *Rebîa* by מְבַנִּיחַם has a greater distinctive force than the *Rebîa* by אֶחָרָוֹן (לְדוֹר); it is therefore to be rendered: telling to the later generation (which is just what is intended by the offspring of the fathers) the glorious deeds of Jahve, etc. The *fut. consec.* יִקְרָא joins on to אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה. Glorious deeds, proofs of power, miracles hath He wrought, and in connection therewith set up an admonition in Jacob, and laid down an order in Israel, which He commanded our fathers, viz., to propagate by tradition the remembrance of those mighty deeds (Exo. 13: 8, 14, Deu. 4: 9, and other passages). לְהוֹדִיעֵם has the same object as וְהוֹדִיעֵתֶם in Deu. 4: 9, Jos. 4:22. The matter in question is not the giving of the Law in general, as the purpose of which, the keeping of the laws, ought then to have been mentioned before anything else, but a precept, the purpose of which was the further proclamation of the *magnalia Dei*, and indirectly the promotion of trust in god and fidelity to the Law; cf. Psa. 81: 5 f., where the special precept concerning the celebration of the Feast of the Passover is described as a עֲדוּת laid down in Joseph. The following generation, the children, which shall be born in the course of the ages, were to know concerning His deeds, and also themselves to

rise up (יָקוּמוּ), not: come into being, like the יָבֵאוּ of the older model-passage Psa. 22:32) and to tell them further to their children, in order that these might place their confidence in god (שִׁים בְּסֵל, like שִׁית מַחֲסֶה in Psa. 73:28), and might not forget the mighty deeds of God (Psa. 87:12), and might keep His commandments, being warned by the disobedience of the fathers. The generation of the latter is called סוֹרֵר וּמֶרֶה, just as the degenerate son that is to be stoned is called in Deu. 21:18. הָכִין לִבּוֹ, to direct one's heart, i.e., to give it the right direction or tendency, to put it into the right state, is to be understood after v. 37, 2Ch. 20:33, Sir. 2:17.

*Psa. 78: 9.* Ver. 9, which comes in now in the midst of this description, is awkward and unintelligible. The supposition that “the sons of Ephraim” is an appellation for the whole of Israel is refuted by vv. 67 f. The rejection of Ephraim and the election of Judah is the point into which the historical retrospect runs out; how then can “the sons of Ephraim” denote Israel as a whole? And yet what is here said of the Ephraimites also holds good of the Israelites in general, as v. 57 shows. The fact, however, that the Ephraimites are made specially conspicuous out of the “generation” of all Israel, is intelligible from the special interest which the Psalms of Asaph take in the tribes of Joseph, and here particularly from the purpose of practically preparing the way for the rejection of Shiloh and Ephraim related further on. In vv. 10 and 11 the Ephraimites are also still spoken of; and it is not until v. 12, with the words “in sight of their fathers,” that we come back again to the nation at large. The Ephraimites are called נוֹשְׂקֵי רוּמֵי־קֶשֶׁת in the sense of נוֹשְׂקֵי קֶשֶׁת רוּמֵי קֶשֶׁת; the two participial construct forms do not stand in subordination but in co-ordination, as in Jer. 46: 9, Deu. 33:19, 2Sa. 20:19, just as in other instances also two substantives, of which one is the explanation of the other, are combined by means of the construct, Job. 20:17, cf. 2Ki. 17:13 *Kerî*. It is therefore: those who prepare the bow, i.e., those arming themselves therewith (נָשַׁק as in 1Ch. 12: 2, 2Ch. 17:17), those who cast the vow, i.e., those shooting arrows from the bow (Jer. 4:29), cf. Böttcher, § 728. What is predicated of them, viz., “they turned round” (הִפְּךָ as in Jud. 20:39, 41), stands in contrast with this their ability to bear arms and to defend themselves, as a disappointed expectation. Is what is meant thereby, that the powerful warlike tribe of Ephraim grew weary in the work of the conquest of Canaan (Jud. 1), and did not render the services which might have been expected from it? Since the historical retrospect does not enter into details until v. 12 onwards, this especial historical reference would come too early here; the statement consequently must be understood more generally and, according to v. 57, figuratively: Ephraim proved itself unstable and faint-hearted in defending and in conducting the cause of God, it gave it up, it abandoned it.

They did not act as the covenant of God required of them, they refused to walk (לָלַכְתָּ, cf. לָלַכְתָּ, Ecc. 1: 7) within the limit and track of His *Tôra*, and forgot the deeds of God of which they had been eye-witnesses under Moses and under Joshua, their comrades of the same family.

*Psa. 78:12-25.* It is now related how wonderfully God led the fathers of these Ephraimites, who behaved themselves so badly as the leading tribe of Israel, in the desert; how they again and again ever indulged sinful murmuring, and still He continued to give proofs of His power and of His loving-kindness. The (according to Num. 13:22) very ancient *Zoan (Tanis)*, ancient Egyptian *Zane*, Coptic *G'ane*, on the east bank of the Tanitic arm of the Nile, so called therefrom — according to the researches to which the Turin Papyrus No. 112 has led, identical with *Avaris* (vid., on Isa. 19:11) <sup>f272</sup> — was the seat of the Hyksos dynasties that ruled in the eastern Delta, where after their overthrow Rameses II, the Pharaoh of the bondage, in order to propitiate the enraged mass of the Semitic population of Lower Egypt, embraced the worship of Baal instituted by King Apophis. The colossal sitting figure of Rameses II in the pillared court of the Royal Museum in Berlin, says Brugsch (*Aus dem Orient* ii. 45), is the figure which Rameses himself dedicated to the temple of Baal in Tanis and set up before its entrance. This mighty colossus is a contemporary of Moses, who certainly once looked upon this monument, when, as Psalm 78 says, he “wrought wonders in the land of Egypt, in the field of Zoan.” The psalmist, moreover, keeps very close to the *Tôra* in his reproduction of the history of the Exodus, and in fact so close that he must have had it before him in the entirety of its several parts, the Deuteronomic, Elohimistic, and Jehovistic. Concerning the rule by which it is appointed *‘a sa phéle*, vid., on Psa. 52: 5. The primary passage to v. 13b (cf. נוֹזְלִים v. 16) is Exo. 15: 8. נִר is a pile, i.e., a piled up heap or mass, as in 33: 7. And v. 14 is the abbreviation of Exo. 13:21. In vv. 15 f. the writer condenses into one the two instances of the giving of water from the rock, in the first year of the Exodus (Exodus 17) and in the fortieth year (Numbers 20). The *Piel* יִבְקַע and the plural צָרִים correspond to this compression. רָבָה is not an adjective (after the analogy of רָבָה תְּהוֹם), but an adverb as in Psa. 62: 3; for the giving to drink needs a qualificative, but תְּהוֹמוֹת does not need any enhancement. יִוָּצֵא has *î* instead of *ē* as in Psa. 105:43.

The fact that the subject is continued in v. 17 with יִוָּסִיפוּ without mention having been made of any sinning on the part of the generation of the desert, is explicable from the consideration that the remembrance of that murmuring is closely connected with the giving of water from the rock to which the names *Massah u-Meribah* and *Meribath-Kadesh* (cf. Num. 20:13 with 27:14,

Deu. 32:51) point back: they went on (עוד) winning against Him, in spite of the miracles they experienced. לַמְרוֹת is syncopated from לְהִמְרוֹת as in Isa. 3: 8. The poet in v. 18 condenses the account of the manifestations of discontent which preceded the giving of the quails and manna (Exodus 16), and the second giving of quails (Num. 11), as he has done the two cases of the giving of water from the rock in v. 15. They tempted God by unbelievably and defiantly demanding (לְשׂאֵל, *postulando*, Ew. § 280, *d*) instead of trustfully hoping and praying. בְּלִבָּבָם points to the evil fountain of the heart, and לְנַפְשָׁם describes their longing as a sensual eagerness, a lusting after it. Instead of allowing the miracles hitherto wrought to work faith in them, they made the miracles themselves the starting-point of fresh doubts. The poet here clothes what we read in Exo. 16: 3, Num. 11: 4 ff., 21: 5, in a poetic dress. In לְאָמוֹר the unbelief reaches its climax, it sounds like self-irony. On the co-ordinating construction “therefore Jahve heard it and was wroth,” cf. Isa. 5: 4; 12: 1; 50: 2, Rom. 6:17. The allusion is to the wrath-burning at Taberah (*Tab ʿera*), Num. 11: 1-3, which preceded the giving of the quails in the second year of the Exodus. For it is obvious that v. 21 and Num. 11: 1 coincide, וַיִּתְעַבֵּר וַאֲשׁ here being suggested by the וַתִּבְעַר-בָּם אֵשׁ of that passage, and אַף עלֹדָה being the opposite of וַתִּשְׁקַע הָאֵשׁ in v. 2. A conflagration broke out at that time in the camp, at the same time, however, with the breaking out of God’s anger. The nexus between the anger and the fire is here an outward one, whereas in Num. 11: 1 it is an internal one. The ground upon which the wrathful decree is based, which is only hinted at there, is here more minutely given in v. 22: they believed not in Elohim (vid., Num. 14:11), i.e., did not rest with believing confidence in Him, and trusted not in His salvation, viz., that which they had experienced in the redemption out of Egypt (Exo. 14:13; 15: 2), and which was thereby guaranteed for time to come. Now, however, when Taberah is here followed first by the giving of the manna, vv. 23-25, then by the giving of the quails, vv. 26-29, the course of the events is deranged, since the giving of the manna had preceded that burning, and it was only the giving of the quails that followed it. This putting together of the two givings out of order was rendered necessary by the preceding condensation (in vv. 18-20) of the clamorous desire for a more abundant supply of food before each of these events. Notwithstanding Israel’s unbelief, He still remained faithful: He caused manna to rain down out of the opened gates of heaven (cf. “the windows of heaven,” Gen. 7:11, 2Ki. 7: 2, Mal. 3:10), that is to say, in richest abundance. The manna is called corn (as in 105:40, after Exo. 16: 4, it is called bread) of heaven, because it descended in the form of grains of corn, and supplied the place of bread-corn during the forty years. לֶחֶם אֲבִירִים the LXX correctly renders ἄρτον ἀγγέλων (אֲבִירִים = אֲבִירֵי כֶחֶם, 103:20). The

manna is called “bread of angels” (Wisd. 16:20) as being bread from heaven (v. 24, 105:40), the dwelling-place of angels, as being *mann es-semâ*, heaven’s gift, its Arabic name, — a name which also belongs to the vegetable manna which flows out of the *Tamarix mannifera* in consequence of the puncture of the *Coccus manniparus*, and is even at the present day invaluable to the inhabitants of the desert of Sinai. אִשׁ is the antithesis to אֲבִירִים; for if it signified “every one,” אֶכְלוּ would have been said (Hitzig). צִדָּה as in Exo. 12:39; לְשֹׁבֵעַ as in Exo. 16: 3, cf. 8.

*Psa. 78:26-37.* Passing over to the giving of the quails, the poet is thinking chiefly of the first occasion mentioned in Exodus 16, which directly preceded the giving of the manna. But the description follows the second: יָסַע (He caused to depart, set out) after Num. 11:31. “East” and “south” belong together: it was a south-east wind from the Aelanitic Gulf. “To rain down” is a figurative expression for a plentiful giving of dispensing from above. “Its camp, its tents,” are those of Israel, Num. 11:31, cf. Exo. 16:13. The תַּאֲוָה, occurring twice, vv. 29, 30 (of the object of strong desire, as in 21: 3), points to *Kibroth-hattaavah*, the scene of this carnal lusting; הִבִּיאַהּ is the transitive of the בִּואַהּ in Pro. 13:12. In vv. 30, 31 even in the construction the poet closely follows Num. 11:33 (cf. also לָזַרְא with זָרַו, aversion, loathing, Num. 11:20). The *Waw* unites what takes place simultaneously; a construction which presents the advantage of being able to give special prominence to the subject. The wrath of God consisted in the breaking out of a sickness which was the result of immoderate indulgence, and to which even the best-nourished and most youthfully vigorous fell a prey. When the poet goes on in v. 32 to say that in spite of these visitations (בְּכִלְזֹאתָה) they went on sinning, he has chiefly before his mind the outbreak of “fat” rebelliousness after the return of the spies, cf. v. 32*b* with Num. 14:11. And v. 33 refers to the judgment of death in the wilderness threatened at that time to all who had come out of Egypt from twenty years old and upward (Num. 14:28-34). Their life devoted to death vanished from that time onwards בְּהִבָּל, in breath-like instability, and בְּבִהָלָה, in undurable precipitancy; the mode of expression in 31:11, Job. 36: 1 suggests to the poet an expressive play of words. When now a special judgment suddenly and violently thinned the generation that otherwise was dying off, as in Num. 21: 6 ff., then they inquired after Him, they again sought His favour, those who were still preserved in the midst of this dying again remembered the God who had proved Himself to be a “Rock” (Deu. 32:15, 18, 37) and to be a “Redeemer” (Gen. 48:16) to them. And what next? Vv. 36,<sup>f273</sup> 37 tell us what effect they gave to this disposition to return to God. They appeased Him with their mouth, is meant to say: they sought to win Him over

to themselves by fair speeches, inasmuch as they thus anthropopathically conceived of God, and with their tongue they played the hypocrite to Him; their heart, however, was not sincere towards Him (עם like אַתָּה in v. 8), i.e., not directed straight towards Him, and they proved themselves not steadfast (πιστοί, or properly βέβαιοι) in their covenant-relationship to Him.

*Psa. 78:38-48.* The second part of the Psalm now begins. God, notwithstanding, in His compassion restrains His anger; but Israel's God-tempting conduct was continued, even after the journey through the desert, in Canaan, and the miracles of judgment amidst the deliverance out of Egypt had been effected were forgotten. With אַתָּה in v. 38 <sup>f274</sup> begins an adversative clause, which is of universal import as far as אַתָּה, and then becomes historical. V. 38b expands what lies in אַתָּה: He expiates iniquity and, by letting mercy instead of right take its course, arrests the destruction of the sinner. With אַתָּה (Ges. § § 142, 2) this universal truth is supported out of the history of Israel. As this history shows, He has many a time called back His anger, i.e., checked it in its course, and not stirred up all His blowing anger (cf. Isa. 42:13), i.e., His anger in all its fulness and intensity. We see that v. 38cd refers to His conduct towards Israel, then v. 39 follows with the ground of the determination, and that in the form of an inference drawn from such conduct towards Israel. He moderated His anger against Israel, and consequently took human frailty and perishableness into consideration. The fact that man is flesh (which not merely affirms his physical fragility, but also his moral weakness, Gen. 6: 3, cf. 8:21), and that, after a short life, he falls a prey to death, determines God to be long-suffering and kind; it was in fact sensuous desire and loathing by which Israel was beguiled time after time. The exclamation "how oft!" v. 40, calls attention to the praiseworthiness of this undeserved forbearance.

But with v. 41 the record of sins begins anew. There is nothing by which any reference of this v. 41 to the last example of insubordination recorded in the Pentateuch, Num. 35: 1-9 (Hitzig), is indicated. The poet comes back one more to the provocations of God by the Israel of the wilderness in order to expose the impious ingratitude which revealed itself in this conduct. אַתָּה is the causative of אַתָּה = Syriac *t<sup>e</sup>wā*, אַתָּה, to repent, to be grieved, LXX *παρώξυναν*. The miracles of the tie of redemption are now brought before the mind in detail, *ad exaggerandum crimen tentationis Deu cum summa ingratitude conjunctum* (Venema). The time of redemption is called יום, as in Gen. 2: 4 the hexahemeron. אַתָּה (synon. אַתָּה) is used as in Exo. 10: 2. We have already met with אַתָּה in Psa. 44:11. The first of the plagues of Egypt (Exo. 7:14-25), the turning of the waters into blood, forms

the beginning in v. 44. From this the poet takes a leap over to the fourth plague, the עֲרֹב (LXX κυνόμυια), a grievous and destructive species of fly (Exo. 8:16-28 [20-32]), and combines with it the frogs, the second plague (Exo. 7:26 [8: 1]-8:11 [15]). צִפְרִדָּא is the lesser Egyptian frog, *Rana Mosaica*, which is even now called Arab. *ḏfd*, *ḏofda*. Next in v. 46 he comes to the eighth plague, the locusts, חֲסִיל (a more select name of the migratory locusts than אֲרֵבָה), Exo. 10: 1-20; the third plague, the gnats and midges, בְּנִים, is left unmentioned in addition to the fourth, which is of a similar kind. For the chastisement by means of destructive living things is now closed, and in v. 47 follows the smiting with hail, the seventh plague, Exo. 9:13-35. חֲנַמֶּל (with pausal , not *ā*, cf. in Eze. 8: 2 the similarly formed הַחֲשֵׁמֶלֶה) in the signification hoar-frost (πάγχη, LXX, Vulgate, Saadia, and *Abulwalīd*), or locusts (Targum פְּרוּזֹבָא = חֲנַב), or ants (J. D. Michaelis), does not harmonize with the history; also the hoar-frost is called כַּפּוּר, the ant נְמֶלֶה (collective in Arabic *neml*). Although only conjecturing from the context, we understand it, with Parchon and Kimchi, of hailstones or hail. With thick lumpy pieces of ice He smote down vines and sycamore-trees (*Fayum* was called in ancient Egyptian “the district of the sycamore”). הֲרֵג proceeds from the Biblical conception that the plant has a life of its own. The description of this plague is continued in v. 48. Two MSS present לִדְבָר instead of לַבָּרָד; but even supposing that רְשָׁפִים might signify the fever-burnings of the pestilence (vid., on Hab. 3: 5), the mention of the pestilence follows in v. 50, and the devastation which, according to Exo. 9:19-22, the hail caused among the cattle of the Egyptians is in its right place here. Moreover it is expressly said in Exo. 9:24 that there was conglomerate fire among the hail; רְשָׁפִים are therefore flaming, blazing lightnings.

**Psa. 78:49-59.** When these plagues rose to the highest pitch, Israel became free, and removed, being led by its God, into the Land of Promise; but it continued still to behave there just as it had done in the desert. The poet in vv. 49-51 brings the fifth Egyptian plague, the pestilence (Exo. 9: 1-7), and the tenth and last, the smiting of the first-born (מִמַּת בְּכֹרוֹת), Exo. 11, 12, together. V. 49a sounds like Job. 20:23 (cf. below v. 64). מַלְאֲכֵי רָעִים are not wicked angels, against which view Hengstenberg refers to the scriptural thesis of Jacobus Ode in his work *De Angelis, Deum ad puniendos malos homines mittere bonos angelos et ad castigandos pios usurpare malos*, but angels that bring misfortune. The mode of construction belongs to the chapter of the genitival subordination of the adjective to the substantive, like אֲשֶׁת רָע, Pro. 6:24, cf. 1Sa. 28: 7, Num. 5:18, 24, 1Ki. 10:15, Jer. 24: 2, and the Arabic

*msjdu l-jâm* , the mosque of the assembling one, i.e., the assembling (congregational) mosque, therefore: angels (not of the wicked ones = wicked angels, which it might signify elsewhere, but) of the evil ones = evil, misfortune-bringing angels (Ew. § 287, *a*). The poet thus paraphrases the **הַמְּשַׁחֲיָה** that is collectively conceived in Exo. 12:13, 23, Heb. 11:28. In v. 50*a* the anger is conceived of as a stream of fire, in v. 50*b* death as an executioner, and in 50*c* the pestilence as a foe. **רֵאשִׁית אוֹנִיִּים** (Gen. 49: 3, Deu. 21:17) is that which had sprung for the first time from manly vigour (*plur. intensivus*). Egypt is called **חַם** as in Psalm 105 and 111 according to Gen. 10: 6, and is also called by themselves in ancient Egyptian *Kemi*, Coptic *Chêmi*, *Kême* (vid., Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, Psalm 33). When now these plagues which softened their Pharaoh went forth upon the Egyptians, God procured for His people a free departure, He guided flock-like (**כְּעֶדְרָה** like **בְּעֶדְרָה**, Jer. 31:24, with *Dag. implicitum*), i.e., as a shepherd, the flock of His people (the favourite figure of the Psalms of Asaph) through the desert, — He led them safely, removing all terrors out of the way and drowning their enemies in the Red Sea, to His holy territory, to the mountain which (**יְהָ**) His right hand had acquired, or according to the accents (cf. *supra*, p. 104): to the mountain there (**יְהָ**), which, etc. It is not Zion that is meant, but, as in the primary passage Exo. 15:16 f., in accordance with the parallelism (although this is not imperative) and the usage of the language, which according to Isa. 11: 9; 57:13, is incontrovertible, the whole of the Holy Land with its mountains and valleys (cf. Deu. 11:11). **בְּחֶבֶל נִחְלָה** is the poetical equivalent to **בְּנִחְלָה**, Num. 34: 2; 36: 2, and frequently. The *Beth* is *Beth essentiae* (here in the same syntactical position as in Isa. 48:10, Eze. 20:41, and also Job. 22:24 surely): He made them (the heathen, viz., as in Jos. 23: 4 their territories) fall to them (viz., as the expression implies, by lot, **בְּגוֹרָל**) as a line of inheritance, i.e., (as in 105:11) as a portion measured out as an inheritance. It is only in v. 56 (and not so early as v. 41) that the narration passes over to the apostate conduct of the children of the generation of the desert, that is to say, of the Israel of Canaan. Instead of **עֲדוֹתַי** from **עֲדוֹת**, the word here is **עֲדוֹתַי** from **עָדָה** (a derivative of **עוֹד**, not **יָאֵד**). Since the apostasy did not gain ground until after the death of Joshua and Eleazar, it is the Israel of the period of the Judges that we are to think of here. **קִשְׁתַּת רְמִיָּה**, v. 57, is not: a bow of slackness, but: a bow of deceit; for the point of comparison, according to Hos. 7:16, is its missing the mark: a bow that discharges its arrow in a wrong direction, that makes no sure shot. The verb **רָמָה** signifies not only to allow to hang down slack (cogn. **רָפָה**), but also, according to a similar conception to *spe dejicere*, to disappoint, deny. In the very act of turning



towards God, or at least being inclined towards Him by His tokens of power and loving-kindness, they turned (Jer. 2:21) like a vow that misses the mark and disappoints both aim and expectation. The expression in v. 58 is like Deu. 32:16, 21. שָׁמַע refers to their prayer to the *Ba'alim* (Jud. 2:11). The word הִתְאַבֵּר, which occurs three times in this Psalm, is a word belonging to Deuteronomy (Deu. 3:26). V. 59 is purposely worded exactly like v. 21. The divine purpose of love spurned by the children just as by the fathers, was obliged in this case, as in the former, to pass over into angry provocation.

*Psa. 78:60-72.* The rejection of Shiloh and of the people worshipping there, but later on, when the God of Israel is again overwhelmed by compassion, the election of Judah, and of Mount Zion, and of David, the king after His own heart. In the time of the Judges the Tabernacle was set up in Shiloh (Jos. 18: 1); there, consequently, was the central sanctuary of the whole people, — in the time of Eli and Samuel, as follows from 1Sa. 1-3, it had become a fixed temple building. When this building was destroyed is not known; according to Jud. 18:30 f., cf. Jer. 7:12-15, it was probably not until the Assyrian period. The rejection of Shiloh, however, preceded the destruction, and practically took place simultaneously with the removal of the central sanctuary to Zion; and was, moreover, even previously decided by the fact that the Ark of the covenant, when given up again by the Philistines, was not brought back to Shiloh, but set down in Kirjath *Jearim* (1Sa. 7: 2). The attributive clause שָׁבַן בְּאֶדָם uses שָׁבַן as הִשְׁבִּין is used in Jos. 18: 1. The pointing is correct, for the words do not suffice to signify “where He dwelleth among men” (Hitzig); consequently שָׁבַן is the causative of the *Kal*, Lev. 16:16, Jos. 22:19. In v. 61 the Ark of the covenant is called the might and glory of God (אֲרוֹן עֲזוֹ, 132: 8, cf. כְּבוֹד, 1Sa. 4:21 f.), as being the place of their presence in Israel and the medium of their revelation. Nevertheless, in the battle with the Philistines between Eben-ezer and Aphek, Jahve gave the Ark, which they had fetched out of Shiloh, into the hands of the foe in order to visit on the high-priesthood of the sons of Ithamar the desecration of His ordinances, and there fell in that battle 30,000 footmen, and among them the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, the priests (1 Samuel 4). The fire in v. 63 is the fire of war, as in Num. 21:28, and frequently. The incident mentioned in 1Sa. 6:19 is reasonably (vid., Keil) left out of consideration. By לֹא הִגְלָלוּ (LXX erroneously, οὐκ ἐπένησαν = הִגְלָלוּ = הִיָּלִילוּ) are meant the marriage-songs (cf. Talmudic הַלּוּלָא, the nuptial tent, and בֵּית הַלּוּלָא the marriage-house). “Its widows (of the people, in fact, of the slain) weep not” (word for word as in Job. 27:15) is meant of the celebration of the customary ceremony of mourning (Gen. 23: 2): they survive their husbands (which, with the exception of such a case as that recorded in 1Sa. 14:19-22, is presupposed), but

without being able to show them the last signs of honour, because the terrors of the war (Jer. 15: 8) prevent them.

With v. 65 the song takes a new turn. After the punitive judgment has sifted and purified Israel, God receives His people to Himself afresh, but in such a manner that He transfers the precedence of Ephraim to the tribe of Judah. He awakes as it were from a long sleep (Psa. 44:24, cf. 73:20); for He seemed to sleep whilst Israel had become a servant to the heathen; He aroused Himself, like a hero exulting by reason of wine, i.e., like a hero whose courage is heightened by the strengthening and exhilarating influence of wine (Hengstenberg). **הִתְרוֹנֵן** is not the *Hithpal.* of **רוֹן** in the Arabic signification, which is alien to the Hebrew, to conquer, a meaning which we do not need here, and which is also not adapted to the reflexive form (Hitzig, without any precedent, renders thus: who allows himself to be conquered by wine), but *Hithpo.* of **רָנַן**: to shout most heartily, after the analogy of the reflexives **הִתְרוֹעַע**, **הִתְנוּדַד**, **הִתְאִוֵּן**. The most recent defeat of the enemy which the poet has before his mind is that of the Philistines. The form of expression in v. 66 is moulded after 1Sa. 5: 6 ff. God smote the Philistines most literally *in posteriora* (LXX, Vulgate, and Luther). Nevertheless v. 66 embraces all the victories under Samuel, Saul, and David, from 1 Samuel 5 and onwards. Now, when they were able to bring the Ark, which had been brought down to the battle against the Philistines, to a settled resting-place again, God no longer chose Shiloh of Ephraim, but Judah and the mountain of Zion, which He had loved (Psa. 47: 5), of Benjamitish-Judaeans (Jos. 15:63, Jud. 1: 8, 21) — but according to the promise (Deu. 33:12) and according to the distribution of the country (vid., on Psa. 68:28) Benjamitish — Jerusalem. <sup>f275</sup>

There God built His Temple **בְּמִזְבְּחֵי רָמִים**. Hitzig proposes instead of this to read **בְּמַרְוֵמִים**; but if **נְעִימִים**, Psa. 16: 6, signifies *amaena*, then **רָמִים** may signify *excelsa* (cf. Isa. 45: 2 **הַדְּוָרִים**, Jer. 17: 6 **הַרְרִים**) and be poetically equivalent to **מַרְוֵמִים**: lasting as the heights of heaven, firm as the earth, which He hath founded for ever. Since the eternal duration of heaven and of the earth is quite consistent with a radical change in the manner of its duration, and that not less in the sense of the Old Testament than of the New (vid., e.g., Isa. 65:17), so the **לְעֹלָם** applies not to the stone building, but rather to the place where Jahve reveals Himself, and to the promise that He will have such a dwelling-place in Israel, and in fact in Judah. Regarded spiritually, i.e., essentially, apart from the accidental mode of appearing, the Temple upon Zion is as eternal as the kingship upon Zion with which the Psalm closes. The election of David gives its impress to the history of salvation even on into eternity. It is genuinely Asaphic that it is so designedly portrayed how the shepherd of the flock of Jesse (Isai) became the shepherd of the flock of Jahve,

who was not to pasture old and young in Israel with the same care and tenderness as the ewe-lambs after which he went (עֲלוֹת) as in Gen. 33:13, and רָעָה בְּ, cf. 1Sa. 16:11; 17:34, like מִשַּׁל בְּ and the like). The poet is also able already to glory that he has fulfilled this vocation with a pure heart and with an intelligent mastery. And with this he closes.

From the decease of David lyric and prophecy are retrospectively and prospectively turned towards David.

## Psalm 79

### SUPPLICATORY PRAYER IN A TIME OF DEVASTATION, OF BLOODSHED, AND OF DERISION

*79: 1 ELOHIM, the heathen have pressed into Thine inheritance,  
They have defiled Thy holy Temple,  
They have turned Jerusalem into a heap of stones.*

*79: 2 They have given the dead bodies of Thy servants  
for food to the birds of the heaven,  
The flesh of Thy saints to the beasts of the land;*

*79: 3 They have poured out their blood like water  
Round about Jerusalem, and no one burieth them.*

*79: 4 We are become a reproach to our neighbours,  
A mockery and derision to those who are round about us.*

*79: 5 How long, Jahve, wilt Thou be angry for ever,  
Shall Thy jealousy burn like fire?!*

*79: 6 Pour out Thy fury upon the heathen who know Thee not,  
And over the kingdoms, which call not upon Thy name!*

*79: 7 For they devour Jacob,  
And have laid waste his dwelling-place.*

*79: 8 Remember not against us the iniquities of the forefathers;  
Speedily let Thy tender mercies come to meet us,  
For we are brought very low.*

*79: 9 Help us, O God of our salvation, for the glory of Thy Name,  
And deliver us, and expiate our sins for Thy Name's sake!*

*79:10 Wherefore shall the heathen say: where is now their God? —  
Let there be made known among the heathen before our eyes  
The avenging of the blood of Thy servants, which is shed.*

*79:11 Let the sighing of the prisoners come before Thee,  
According to the greatness of Thine arm spare the children of death.*

*79:12 And render unto our neighbours sevenfold into their bosom  
Their reproach, wherewith they have reproached Thee, O Lord!*

*79:13 And we, Thy people and the flock of Thy pasture,  
We will give Thee thanks for ever,  
In all generations will we tell forth Thy praise.*

*Psalm 79.* This Psalm is in every respect the pendant of Psalm 74. The points of contact are not merely matters of style (cf. Psa. 79: 5, *how long for ever?* with Psa. 74: 1, 10; 79:10, **וְיָדַע**, with Psa. 74: 5; 79: 2, the giving over to the wild beasts, with Psa. 74:19, 14; 79:13, the conception of Israel as of a flock, in which respect Psalm 79 is judiciously appended to Psa. 78:70-72, with Psa. 74: 1, and also with Psa. 74:19). But the mutual relationships lie still deeper. Both Psalms have the same Asaphic stamp, both stand in the same relation to Jeremiah, and both send forth their complaint out of the same circumstances of the time, concerning a destruction of the Temple and of Jerusalem, such as only the age of the Seleucidae (1 Macc. 1:31; 3:45, 2 Macc. 8: 3) together with the Chaldaean period <sup>i276</sup> can exhibit, and in conjunction with a defiling of the Temple and a massacre of the servants of God, of the *Chasîdim* (1 Macc. 7:13, 2 Macc. 14: 6), such as the age of the Seleucidae exclusively can exhibit. The work of the destruction of the Temple which was in progress in Psalm 74, appears in Psalm 79 as completed, and here, as in the former Psalm, one receives the impression of the outrages, not of some war, but of some persecution: it is straightway the religion of Israel for the sake of which the sanctuaries are destroyed and the faithful are massacred.

Apart from other striking accords, vv. 6, 7 are repeated verbatim in Jer. 10:25. It is in itself far more probable that Jeremiah here takes up the earlier language of the Psalm than that the reverse is the true relation; and, as Hengstenberg has correctly observed, this is also favoured by the fact that the words immediately before viz., Jer. 10:24, originate out of Psa. 6: 2, and that the connection in the Psalm is a far closer one. But since there is no era of pre-Maccabaeon history corresponding to the complaints of the Psalm, <sup>i277</sup>

Jeremiah is to be regarded in this instance as the example of the psalmist; and in point of fact the borrower is betrayed in vv. 6, 7 of the Psalm by the fact that the correct **אֵל** of Jeremiah is changed into **אֱלֹהִים**, the more elegant **מִשְׁפָּחוֹת** into **מַמְלָכוֹת**, and the plural **אֲכָלוּ** into **אָכַל**, and the soaring exuberance of Jeremiah's expression is impaired by the omission of some of the words.

*Psa. 79: 1-4.* The Psalm begins with a plaintive description, and in fact one that makes complaint to God. Its opening sounds like Lam. 1:10. The defiling does not exclude the reducing to ashes, it is rather spontaneously suggested in Psa. 74: 7 in company with wilful incendiarism. The complaint in v. 1c

reminds one of the prophecy of Micah, Mic. 3:12, which in its time excited so much vexation (Jer. 26:18); and v. 2, Deu. 28:26. עֲבָדֶיךָ confers upon those who were massacred the honour of martyrdom. The LXX renders לעיים by εἰς ὄπωροφυλάκιον, a flourish taken from Isa. 1: 8. Concerning the quotation from memory in 1 Macc. 7:16 f., vid., the introduction to Psalm 74. The translator of the originally Hebrew First Book of the Maccabees even in other instances betrays an acquaintance with the Greek Psalter (cf. 1 Macc. 1:37, καὶ ἐξέχεαν αἷμα ἄθῶον κύκλω τοῦ ἁγιάσματος). “As water,” i.e., (cf. Deu. 15:23) without setting any value upon it and without any scruple about it. Psal. 44:14 is repeated in v. 4. At the time of the Chaldaean catastrophe this applied more particularly to the Edomites.

*Psa. 79: 5-8.* Out of the plaintive question how long? and whether endlessly God would be angry and cause His jealousy to continue to burn like a fire (Deu. 32:22), grows up the prayer (v. 6) that He would turn His anger against the heathen who are estranged from the hostile towards Him, and of whom He is now making use as a rod of anger against His people. The taking over of vv. 6 and 7 from Jer. 10:25 is not betrayed by the looseness of the connection of thought; but in themselves these four lines sound much more original in Jeremiah, and the style is exactly that of this prophet, cf. Jer. 6:11; 2: 3, and frequently, Jer. 49:20. The אֵל, instead of אֱלֹהִים, which follows שָׁפַךְ is incorrect; the singular אֱלֹהִים gathers all up as in one mass, as in Isa. 5:26; 17:13. The fact that such power over Israel is given to the heathen world has its ground in the sins of Israel. From v. 8 it may be inferred that the apostasy which raged earlier is now checked. ראשנים is not an adjective (Job. 31:28, Isa. 59: 2), which would have been expressed by עונותינו הראשנים, but a genitive: the iniquities of the forefathers (Lev. 26:14, cf. 39). On v. 8c of Jud. 6: 6. As is evident from v. 9, the poet does not mean that the present generation, itself guiltless, has to expiate the guilt of the fathers (on the contrary, Deu. 24:16, 2Ki. 14: 6, Eze. 18:20); he prays as one of those who have turned away from the sins of the fathers, and who can now no longer consider themselves as placed under wrath, but under sin-pardoning and redeeming grace.

*Psa. 79: 9-12.* The victory of the world is indeed not God’s aim; therefore His own honour does not suffer that the world of which He has made use in order to chasten His people should for ever haughtily triumph. שָׁמַךְ is repeated with emphasis at the end of the petition in v. 9, according to the figure epanaphora. אֵל-דָּבָר = לְמַאן, as in Psa. 45: 5, cf. 7: 1, is a usage even of the language of the Pentateuch. Also the motive, “wherefore shall they say?” occurs even in the Tōra (Exo. 32:12, cf. Num. 14:13-17, Deu. 9:28). Here (cf. Psa. 115: 2) it originates out of Joe. 2:17. The wish expressed in v. 10bc is

based upon Deu. 32:43. The poet wishes in company with his contemporaries, as eye-witnesses, to experience what God has promised in the early times, viz., that He will avenge the blood of His servants. The petition in v. 11 runs like Psa. 102:21, cf. 18: 7. אֲסִיר individualizingly is those who are carried away captive and incarcerated; בְּנֵי תְמוּתָהּ are those who, if God does not preserve them by virtue of the greatness (גָּדֹל, cf. גָּדֹל Exo. 15:16) of His arm, i.e., of His far-reaching omnipotence, succumb to the power of death as to a *patria potestas*.<sup>f278</sup>

That the petition in v. 12 recurs to the neighbouring peoples is explained by the fact, that these, who might most readily come to the knowledge of the God of Israel as the one living and true God, have the greatest degree of guilt on account of their reviling of God. The bosom is mentioned as that in which one takes up and holds that which is handed to him (Luk. 6:38); אֶל (אֵל) חֵיקָי (שְׁלֵם), as in Isa. 65: 7, 6, Jer. 32:18. A sevenfold requital (cf. Gen. 4:15, 24) is a requital that is fully carried out as a criminal sentence, for seven is the number of a completed process.

*Psa. 79:13.* If we have thus far correctly hit upon the parts of which the Psalm is composed (9. 9. 9), then the lamentation closes with this tristichic vow of thanksgiving.

## Psalm 80

### PRAYER FOR JAHVE'S VINE

*80: 2 SHEPHERD of Israel, Oh give ear,  
Thou who ledest Joseph like a flock,  
Who sittest enthroned above the cherubim, Oh appear!*

*80: 3 Before Ephraim and Benjamin and Manasseh  
Stir up Thy warrior-strength,  
And come to our help!*

*80: 4 Elohim, restore us,  
And cause Thy face to shine, then shall we be helped!*

*80: 5 Jahve Elohim Tsebaôth,  
How long wilt Thou be angry when Thy people pray?!*

*80: 6 Thou gavest them to eat bread of tears,  
And gavest them to drink tears in great measure.*

*80: 7 Thou madest us a strife to our neighbours,  
And our enemies carry on their mockery.*

*80: 8 Elohim Tsebaôth, restore us,  
And cause Thy face to shine, then shall we be helped!*

*80: 9 Thou broughtest a vine out of Egypt,  
Thou didst drive out nations and plant it;*

*80:10 Thou hast made a space before it,  
And it struck roots and filled the earth.*

*80:11 Mountains were covered by its shadow,  
And by its boughs, the cedars of God.*

*80:12 It spread its branches unto the sea,  
And towards the river its young shoots.*

*80:13 Why hast Thou broken down its hedges,  
That all who pass by the way do pluck it?*

*80:14 The boar out of the forest doth devour it,  
And that which roameth the field doth feed upon it.*

*80:15 Elohim Tsebaôth, Oh look again from heaven and behold,  
And accept this vine!*

*80:16 And be the protection of that which Thy right hand hath planted,  
And over the son, whom Thou hast firmly chosen for Thyself.*

*80:17 Burnt with fire, swept away,  
Before the threatening of Thy countenance they perish.*

*80:18 Oh hold Thy hand over the man of Thy right hand,  
Over the son of man whom Thou hast chosen for Thyself;*

*80:19 And we will not go back from Thee —  
Quicken us, and we will celebrate Thy Name.*

*80:20 Jahve Elohim Tsebaôth, restore us,  
Cause Thy face to shine, then shall we be helped!*

*Psalm 80.* With the words *We are Thy people and the flock of Thy pasture*, Psalm 79 closes; and Psalm 80 begins with a cry to the Shepherd of Israel. Concerning the inscription of the Psalm: *To be practised after the “Lilies, the testimony...,”* by Asaph, a Psalm, vid., on Psa. 45: 1, *supra*, p. 45 f. The LXX renders, *εἰς τὸ τέλος* (unto the end), *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων* (which is unintelligible and ungrammatical = אֱלֹהִים־שֶׁנִּי), *μαρτύριον τῷ Ἀσάφ* (as the accentuation also unites these words closely by *Tarcha*), *ψαλμὸς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου* (cf. Psa. 76: 1), perhaps a translation of אֱלֹהִים־שֶׁנִּי, an inscribed note which took the “boar out of the forest” as an emblem of Assyria. This hint is important. It solves the riddle why Joseph represents all Israel in v. 2, and why the tribes of Joseph in particular are mentioned in v. 3, and why in the

midst of these Benjamin, whom like descent from Rachel and chagrin, never entirely overcome, on account of the loss of the kingship drew towards the brother-tribes of Joseph. Moreover the tribe of Benjamin had only partially remained to the house of David since the division of the kingdom,<sup>f279</sup> so that this triad is to be regarded as an expansion of the “Joseph” (v. 20. After the northern kingdom had exhausted its resources in endless feuds with Damascene Syria, it succumbed to the world-wide dominion of Assyria in the sixth year of Hezekiah, in consequence of the heavy visitations which are closely associated with the names of the Assyrian kings Pul, Tiglath-pileser, and Shalmaneser. The psalmist, as it seems, prays in a time in which the oppression of Assyria rested heavily upon the kingdom of Ephraim, and Judah saw itself threatened with ruin when this bulwark should have fallen. We must not, however, let it pass without notice that our Psalm has this designation of the nation according to the tribes of Joseph in common with other pre-exilic Psalms of Asaph (Psa. 77:16; 78: 9; 81: 6). It is a characteristic belonging in common to this whole group of Psalms. Was Asaph, the founder of this circle of songs, a native, perhaps, of one of the Levite cities of the province of the tribe of Ephraim or Manasseh?

The Psalm consists of five eight-line strophes, of which the first, second, and fifth close with the refrain, “Elohim, restore us, let Thy countenance shine forth, then shall we be helped!” This prayer grows in earnestness. The refrain begins the first time with *Elohim*, the second time with *Elohim Tsebaôth*, and the third time with a threefold *Jahve Elohim Tsebaôth*, with which the second strophe (v. 5) also opens.

*Psa. 80: 2-4.* The first strophe contains nothing but petition. First of all the nation is called *Israel* as springing from Jacob; then, as in Psa. 81: 6, *Joseph*, which, where it is distinct from *Jacob* or *Judah*, is the name of the kingdom of the ten tribes (vid., Caspari on Oba. 1:18), or at least of the northern tribes (Psa. 77:16; 78:67 f.). V. 3 shows that it is also these that are pre-eminently intended here. The fact that in the blessing of Joseph, Jacob calls God a Shepherd (רֹעֶה), Gen. 48:15; 49:24, perhaps has somewhat to do with the choice of the first two names. In the third, the sitting enthroned in the sanctuary here below and in the heaven above blend together; for the Old Testament is conscious of a mutual relationship between the earthly and the heavenly temple (הַיְכָל) until the one merges entirely in the other. The *cherûbim*, which God enthrones, i.e., upon which He sits enthroned, are the bearers of the chariot (מַרְכָּבָה) of the Ruler of the world (vid., Psa. 18:11). With הוֹפִיעָה (from יָפַע, Arab. *yf*, *eminere*, *emicare*, as in the Asaph Psa. 50: 2) the poet prays that He would appear in His splendour of light, i.e., in His fiery bright, judging, and rescuing doxa, whether as directly visible, or



even as only recognisable by its operation. Both the comparison, “after the manner of a flock” and the verb **נָהַג** are Asaphic, Psa. 78:52, cf. 26. Just so also the names given to the nation. The designation of Israel after the tribes of *Ephraim* and *Manasseh* attaches itself to the name *Joseph*; and the two take the brother after the flesh into their midst, of whom the beloved Rachel was the mother as well as of Joseph, the father of Ephraim and Manasseh. In Numbers ch. 2 also, these three are not separated, but have their camp on the west side of the Tabernacle. May God again put into activity — which is the meaning of **עוֹרֵר** (*excitare*) in distinction from **הַעִיר** (*expergefacere*) — His **גְבוּרָה**, the need for the energetic intervention of which now makes itself felt, before these three tribes, i.e., by becoming their victorious leader. **לָכֵה** is a summoning imperative. <sup>f280</sup>

Concerning **יִשְׁעָתָהּ** vid., on Psa. 3: 3; the construction with *Lamed* says as little against the accusative adverbial rendering of the *ah* set forth there as does the *Beth* of **בַּחֲרֻשָּׁה** (in the wood) in 1Sa. 23:15, vid., Böttcher’s *Neue Aehrenlese*, Nos. 221, 384, 449. It is not a bringing back out of the Exile that is prayed for by **הַשִּׁיבֵנוּ**, for, according to the whole impression conveyed by the Psalm, the people are still on the soil of their fatherland; but in their present feebleness they are no longer like themselves, they stand in need of divine intervention in order again to attain a condition that is in harmony with the promises, in order to become themselves again. May God then cause His long hidden countenance to brighten and shine upon them, then shall they be helped as they desire (**וְנִשְׁעָתָהּ**).

*Psa. 80: 5-8.* In the second strophe there issues forth bitter complaint concerning the form of wrath which the present assumes, and, thus confirmed, the petition rises anew. The transferring of the smoking (**עִשָּׁן**) of God’s nostrils = the hard breathing of anger (Psa. 74: 1, Deu. 29:19 [20]), to God Himself is bold, but in keeping with the spirit of the Biblical view of the wrath of God (vid., on 18: 9), so that there is no need to avoid the expression by calling in the aid of the Syriac word **עִשָּׁן**, to be strong, powerful (why art Thou hard, why dost Thou harden Thyself...). The perfect after **אֶדְרֹמְתִי** has the sense of a present with a retrospective glance, as in Exo. 10: 3, cf. **אֶדְרֹמְתִי**, to be understood after the analogy of **הִקְרָה בְּ** (to kindle = to be angry against any one), for the prayer of the people is not an object of wrath, but only not a means of turning it aside. While the prayer is being presented, God veils Himself in the smoke of wrath, through which it is not able to penetrate. The LXX translators have read **בתפלת עבדיך**, for they render **ἐπὶ τὴν προσευχὴν τῶν δούλων σου** (for which the common reading is **τοῦ δούλου σου**). Bread of

tears is, according to Psa. 42: 4, bread consisting of tears; tears, running down in streams upon the lips of the praying and fasting one, are his meat and his drink. הַשָּׂקָה with an accusative signifies to give something to drink, and followed by *Beth*, to give to drink by means of something, but it is not to be translated: *potitandum das eis cum lacrymis trientem* (De Dieu, von Ortenberg, and Hitzig). שְׁלִישׁ (Talmudic, a third part) is the accusative of more precise definition (Vatablus, Gesenius, Olshausen, and Hupfeld): by thirds (LXX ἐν μέρτω, Symmachus μέτρω); for a third of an ephah is certainly a very small measure for the dust of the earth (Isa. 40:12), but a large one for tears. The neighbours are the neighbouring nations, to whom Israel is become מְדוּן, an object, a butt of contention. In לָמוּ is expressed the pleasure which the mocking gives them.

*Psa. 80: 9-20.* The complaint now assumes a detailing character in this strophe, inasmuch as it contrasts the former days with the present; and the ever more and more importunate prayer moulds itself in accordance therewith. The retrospective description begins, as is rarely the case, with the second *modus*, inasmuch as “the speaker thinks more of the bare nature of the act than of the time” (Ew. § 136, *b*). As in the blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49:22) Joseph is compared to the layer (בֵּן) of a fruitful growth (פְּרִיָה), whose shoots (בְּנוֹת) climb over the wall: so here Israel is compared to a vine (Gen. 49:22; פְּרִיָה בֵּן, 128: 3), which has become great in Egypt and been transplanted thence into the Land of Promise. הַסִּיא, LXX μεταίρειν, as in Job. 19:10, perhaps with an allusion to the מסעים of the people journeying to Canaan (Psa. 78:52). <sup>f281</sup>

Here God made His vine a way and a place (פְּנָה, to clear, from פָּנָה, to turn, turn aside, Arabic *fanija*, to disappear, pass away; root פָּן, to urge forward), and after He had secured to it a free soil and unchecked possibility of extension, it (the vine) rooted its roots, i.e., struck them ever deeper and wider, and filled the earth round about (cf. the antitype in the final days, Isa. 27: 6). The Israelitish kingdom of God extended itself on every side in accordance with the promise. תְּשֻׁלָּה (cf. Eze. 17: 6, and vegetable שְׁלָח, a shoot) also has the vine as its subject, like תִּשְׂרֵשׁ. Vv. 11 and 12 state this in a continued allegory, by the “mountains” pointing to the southern boundary, by the “cedars” to the northern, by the “sea” to the western, and by the “river” (Euphrates) to the eastern boundary of the country (vid., Deu. 11:24 and other passages). עֲנַפְיָהּ and צִלָּהּ are accusatives of the so-called more remote object (Ges. § 143, 1). קָצִיר is a cutting = a branch; יוֹנְקָת, a (vegetable) sucker = a young, tender shoot; אֲרֵזֵי־אֵל, the cedars of Lebanon as being living

monuments of the creative might of God. The allegory exceeds the measure of the reality of nature, inasmuch as this is obliged to be extended according to the reality of that which is typified and historical. But how unlike to the former times is the present! The poet asks “wherefore?” for the present state of things is a riddle to him. The surroundings of the vine are torn down; all who come in contact with it pluck it (אָרָה, to pick off, pluck off, Talmudic of the gathering of figs); the boar out of the wood (עין תלויה מיער, *Ajin* <sup>f282</sup>) cuts it off (בָּרַס, formed out of פָּסַם = גָּזַם <sup>f283</sup>), viz., with its tusks; and that which moves about the fields (vid., concerning זִי, Psa. 50:11), i.e., the untractable, lively wild beast, devours it. Without doubt the poet associates a distinct nation with the wild boar in his mind; for animals are also in other instances the emblems of nations, as e.g., the leviathan, the water-serpent, the behemoth (Isa. 30: 6), and flies (Isa. 7:18) are emblems of Egypt. The Midrash interprets it of *Seir-Edom*, and זִי שָׂדֵי, according to Gen. 16:12, of the nomadic Arabs.

In v. 15 the prayer begins for the third time with threefold urgency, supplicating for the vine renewed divine providence, and a renewal of the care of divine grace. We have divided the verse differently from the accentuation, since שׁוֹבֵנָא הַבַּט is to be understood according to Ges. § 142. The junction by means of ׀ is at once opposed to the supposition that וּבְפִנֵּה in v. 16 signifies a slip or plant, *plantam* (Targum, Syriac, Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, and others), and that consequently the whole of v. 16 is governed by וּבְפִקֵּד. Nor can it mean its (the vine’s) stand or base, בֵּן (Böttcher), since one does not plant a “stand.” The LXX renders וּכְנָה: καὶ κατάρτισαι, which is *imper. aor. 1. med.*, therefore in the sense of בּוֹנְנָה. <sup>f284</sup>

But the alternation of אַל (cf. Pro. 2:11, and Arab. *jn lā*, to cover over) with the accusative of the object makes it more natural to derive כְּנָה, not from פִּנֵּן = פִּינֵן, but from פִּנֵּן Arab. *kanna* = גָּנַן, to cover, conceal, protect (whence Arab. *kinn*, a covering, shelter, hiding-place): and protect him whom...or: protect what Thy right hand has planted. The pointing certainly seems to take כְּנָה as the feminine of כָּנַן (LXX, Dan. 11: 7, φυτόν); for an *imperat. paragog. Kal* of the form כְּנָה does not occur elsewhere, although it might have been regarded by the punctuists as possible from the form נָל, *volve*, Psa. 119:22. If it is regarded as impossible, then one might read כְּנָה. At any rate the word is imperative, as the following אֲשֶׁר, *eum quem*, also shows, instead of which, if כְּנָה were a substantive, one would expect to find a relative clause without אֲשֶׁר, as in v. 16b. Moreover v. 16b requires this, since פִּקֵּד אַל can only be used of visiting with punishment. And who then would the slip (branch) and

the son of man be in distinction from the vine? If we take בנה as imperative, then, as one might expect, the vine and the son of man are both the people of God. The Targum renders v. 16b thus: “and upon the King Messiah, whom Thou hast established for Thyself,” after Psalm ch. 2 and Dan. 7:13; but, as in the latter passage, it is not the Christ Himself, but the nation out of which He is to proceed, that is meant. אָמַץ has the sense of firm appropriation, as in Isa. 44:14, inasmuch as the notion of making fast passes over into that of laying firm hold of, of seizure. Rosenmüller well renders it: *quem adoptatum tot nexibus tibi adstrinxisti*.

The figure of the vine, which rules all the language here, is also still continued in v. 17; for the *partt. fem.* refer to גָּפֶן, — the verb, however, may take the plural form, because those of Israel are this “vine,” which *combusta igne, succisa* (as in Isa. 33:12; Aramaic, be cut off, tear off, in v. 13 the Targum word for אָרָה; Arabic, *ksh*, to clear away, peel off), is just perishing, or hangs in danger of destruction (יִאֲבֹד) before the threatening of the wrathful countenance of God. The absence of anything to denote the subject, and the form of expression, which still keeps within the circle of the figure of the vine, forbid us to understand this v. 17 of the extirpation of the foes. According to the sense תְּהַיִּיךְ אֵל <sup>f285</sup> coincides with the supplicatory כִּנָּה עַל . It is Israel that is called בֶּן in v. 16, as being the son whom Jahve has called into being in Egypt, and then called out of Egypt to Himself and solemnly declared to be His son on Sinai (Exo. 4:22, Hos. 11: 1), and who is now, with a play upon the name of Benjamin in v. 3 (cf. v. 16), called אִישׁ יְמִינֶךָ, as being the people which Jahve has preferred before others, and has placed at His right hand <sup>f286</sup> for the carrying out of His work of salvation; who is called, however, at the same time בֶּן־אָדָם, because belonging to a humanity that is feeble in itself, and thoroughly conditioned and dependent. It is not the more precise designation of the “son of man” that is carried forward by וְלֹא־נִסָּג, “and who has not drawn back from Thee” (Hupfeld, Hitzig, and others), but it is, as the same relation which is repeated in v. 19b shows, the apodosis of the preceding petition: then shall we never depart from Thee; נִסָּג being not a participle, as in 44:19, but a *plene* written voluntative: *recedamus*, vowing new obedience as thanksgiving of the divine preservation. To the prayer in v. 18 corresponds, then, the prayer תְּהַיִּיךְ, which is expressed as future (which can rarely be avoided, Ew. § 229), with a vow of thanksgiving likewise following: then will we call with Thy name, i.e., make it the medium and matter of solemn proclamation. In v. 20 the refrain of this Psalm, which is laid out as a trilogy, is repeated for the third time. The name of God is here threefold.

# Psalm 81

## EASTER FESTIVAL SALUTATION AND DISCOURSE

*81: 2 CAUSE shouts of joy to resound unto Elohim, our safe retreat,  
Make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob.*

*81: 3 Raise a song and sound the timbrel,  
The pleasant cithern together with the harp.*

*81: 4 Blow the horn at the new moon,  
At the full moon, in honour of the day of our feast.*

*81: 5 For a statute for Israel is it,  
And ordinance of the God of Jacob.*

*81: 6 A testimony hath He laid it down in Joseph,  
When He went forth over the land of Egypt —  
A language of one not known did I hear.*

*81: 7 I have removed his back from the burden,  
His hands were freed from the task-basket.*

*81: 8 In distress didst thou cry, and I delivered thee,  
I answered thee in a covering of thunder,  
I proved thee at the waters of Meribah. (Sela)*

*81: 9 Hear, O my people, and I will testify unto thee;  
Israel, Oh that thou wouldst hearken unto Me! —*

*81:10 Let there be among thee no strange god,  
And do not thou worship a god of a foreign country.*

*81:11 I, I am Jahve thy God,  
Who led thee up out of the land of Egypt —  
Open wide thy mouth, and I will fill it.*

*81:12 But My people hearkened not unto My voice,  
And Israel did not obey Me.*

*81:13 Then I cast them forth to the hardness of their heart,  
They went on in their own counsels.*

*81:14 Oh that My people would be obedient unto Me,  
That Israel would walk in My ways!*

*81:15 Suddenly would I humble their enemies,  
And against their oppressors turn My hand.*

*81:16 The haters of Jahve should submit themselves to Him,  
And their time should endure for ever.*

*81:17 He fed them with the fat of wheat,  
And with honey out of the rock did I satisfy thee.*

*Psalm 81.* Psalm 80, which looks back into the time of the leading forth out of Egypt, is followed by another with the very same Asaphic thoroughly characteristic feature of a retrospective glance at Israel's early history (cf. More particularly Psa. 81:11 with 80: 9). In Psalm 81 the lyric element of Psalm 77 is combined with the didactic element of Psalm 78. The unity of these Psalms is indubitable. All three have towards the close the appearance of being fragmentary. Fro the author delights to ascend to the height of his subject and to go down into the depth of it, without returning to the point from which he started. In Psalm 77 Israel as a whole was called "the sons of Jacob and Joseph;" in Psalm 78 we read "the sons of Ephraim" instead of the whole nation; here it is briefly called "Joseph." This also indicates the one author. Then Psalm 81, exactly like 79, is based upon the Pentateuchal history in Exodus and Deuteronomy. Jahve Himself speaks through the mouth of the poet, as He did once through the mouth of Moses — Asaph is *κατ' ἑξοχήν* the prophet (אֲשָפֵחַ) among the psalmists. The transition from one form of speech to another which accompanies the rapid alternation of feelings, what the Arabs call *talwīn el-chītab*, "a colouring of a speech by a change of the persons," is also characteristic of him, as later on of Micah (e.g., 6:15 f.).

This Psalm 81 is according to ancient custom the Jewish New Year's Psalm, the Psalm of the Feast of Trumpets (Num. 29: 1), therefore the Psalm of the first (and second) of Tishri; it is, however, a question whether the blowing of the horn (*shophar*) at the new moon, which it calls upon them to do, does not rather apply to the first of Nisan, to the ecclesiastical New Year. In the weekly liturgy of the Temple it was the Psalm for the Thursday.

The poet calls upon them to give a jubilant welcome to the approaching festive season, and in vv. 7 ff. Jahve Himself makes Himself heard as the Preacher of the festival. He reminds those now living of His loving-kindness towards ancient Israel, and admonishes them not to incur the guilt of like unfaithfulness, in order that they may not lose the like tokens of His loving-kindness. What festive season is it? Either the Feast of the Passover or the Feast of Tabernacles; for it must be one of these two feasts which begin on the day of the full moon. Because it is one having reference to the redemption of Israel out of Egypt, the Targum, Talmud (more particularly *Rosh ha-Shana*, where this Psalm is much discussed), Midrash, and Sohar understand the Feast of Tabernacles; because vv. 2-4a seem to refer to the new moon of the seventh month, which is celebrated before the other new moons (Num. 10:10), as *יום התרועה* (Num. 29: 1, cf. Lev. 23:24), i.e., to the first of Tishri, the civil New Year; and the blowing of horns at the New Year, is, certainly not

according to Scripture, but yet according to tradition (vid., Maimonides, *Hilchoth Shophar* 1: 2), a very ancient arrangement. Nevertheless we must give up this reference of the Psalm to the first of Tishri and to the Feast of Tabernacles, which begins with the fifteenth of Tishri: —

(1) Because between the high feast-day of the first of Tishri and the Feast of Tabernacles on the fifteenth to the twenty-first (twenty-second) of Tishri lies the great day of Atonement on the tenth of Tishri, which would be ignored, by greeting the festive season with a joyful noise from the first of Tishri forthwith to the fifteenth.

(2) Because the remembrance of the redemption of Israel clings far more characteristically to the Feast of the Passover than to the Feast of Tabernacles. This latter appears in the oldest law-giving (Exo. 23:16; 34:22) as **חג האסיף**, i.e., as a feast of the ingathering of the autumn fruits, and therefore as the closing festival of the whole harvest; it does not receive the historical reference to the journey through the desert, and therewith its character of a feast of booths or arbours, until the addition in Lev. 23:39-44, having reference to the carrying out of the celebration of the feasts in Canaan; whereas the feast which begins with the full moon of Nisan has, it is true, not been entirely free of all reference to agriculture, but from the very beginning bears the historical names **חג המצות** and **פסח**.

(3) Because in the Psalm itself, viz., in v. 6*b*, allusion is made to the fact which the Passover commemorates.

Concerning **אל־הגתית** vid., on Psa. 8: 1. The symmetrical, stichic plan of the Psalm is clear: the schema is 11. 12. 12.

*Psa. 81: 2-6.* The summons in v. 2 is addressed to the whole congregation, inasmuch as **הַרְעוּ** is not intended of the clanging of the trumpets, but as in Ezr. 3:11, and frequently. The summons in v. 3 is addressed to the Levites, the appointed singers and musicians in connection with the divine services, 2Ch. 5:12, and frequently. The summons in v. 4 is addressed to the priests, to whom was committed not only the blowing of the two (later on a hundred and twenty, vid., 2Ch. 5:12) silver trumpets, but who appear also in Jos. 6: 4 and elsewhere (cf. 47: 6 with 2Ch. 20:28) as the blowers of the shophar. The Talmud observes that since the destruction of the Temple the names of instruments **שׁוֹפָרָא** and **הַצֹּצְרָתָא** are wont to be confounded one for the other (*B. Sabbath* 36*a*, *Succa* 34*a*), and, itself confounding them, infers from Num. 10:10 the duty and significance of the blowing of the shophar (*B. Erachin* 3*b*). The LXX also renders both by **σάλπιγξ**; but the Biblical language mentions **שׁוֹפָר** and **הַצֹּצְרָה**, a horn (more especially a ram's horn) and a

(metal) trumpet, side by side in Psa. 98: 6, 1Ch. 15:28, and is therefore conscious of a difference between them. The *Tôra* says nothing of the employment of the shophar in connection with divine service, except that the commencement of every fiftieth year, which on this very account is called **שְׁנַת הַיְבֵל**, *annus buccinae*, is to be made known by the horn signal throughout all the land (Lev. 25: 9). But just as tradition by means of an inference from analogy derives the blowing of the shophar on the first of Tishri, the beginning of the common year, from this precept, so on the ground of the passage of the Psalm before us, assuming that **בְּחֹדֶשׁ**, LXX *ἐν νεομηνίᾳ*, refers not to the first of Tishri but to the first of Nisan, we may suppose that the beginning of every month, but, in particular, the beginning of the month which was at the same time the beginning of the ecclesiastical year, was celebrated by a blowing of the shophar, as, according to Josephus, *Bell.* iv. 9, 12, the beginning and close of the Sabbath was announced from the top of the Temple by a priest with the salpinx. The poet means to say that the Feast of the Passover is to be saluted by the congregation with shouts of joy, by the Levites with music, and even beginning from the new moon (*neomenia*) of the Passover month with blowing of shophars, and that this is to be continued at the Feast of the Passover itself. The Feast of the Passover, for which Hupfeld devises a gloomy physiognomy, <sup>f287</sup> was a joyous festival, the Old Testament Christmas. 2Ch. 30:21 testifies to the exultation of the people and the boisterous music of the Levite priests, with which it was celebrated. According to Num. 10:10, the trumpeting of the priests was connected with the sacrifices; and that the slaying of the paschal lambs took place amidst the *Tantaratan* of the priests (long-drawn notes interspersed with sharp shrill ones, **וּתְקִיעַה וּתְקִיעַה תְּרוּעָה**), is expressly related of the post-exilic service at least. <sup>f288</sup>

The phrase **נָתַן תִּקְוָה** proceeds from the phrase **נָתַן קוֹל**, according to which **נָתַן** directly means: to attune, strike up, cause to be heard. Concerning **בְּסָה** (Pro. 7:20 **בְּסָה**) tradition is uncertain. The Talmudic interpretation (*B. Rosh ha-Shana* 8b, *Betza* 16a, and the Targum which is taken from it), according to which it is the day of the new moon (the first of the month), on which the moon hides itself, i.e., is not to be seen at all in the morning, and in the evening only for a short time immediately after sunset, and the interpretation that is adopted by a still more imposing array of authorities (LXX, Vulgate, Menahem, Rashi, Jacob Tam, Aben-Ezra, Parchon, and others), according to which a time fixed by computation (from **בְּסָה** = **בְּסָם**, *computare*) is so named in general, are outweighed by the usage of the Syriac, in which *Keso* denotes the full moon as the moon with covered, i.e., filled-up orb, and therefore the fifteenth of the month, but also the time from that point onwards, perhaps because then the moon covers itself, inasmuch as its shining surface



appears each day less large (cf. the *Peshito*, 1Ki. 12:32 of the fifteenth day of the eighth month, 2Ch. 7:10 of the twenty-third day of the seventh month, in both instances of the Feast of Tabernacles), after which, too, in the passage before us it is rendered *wa-b-kese*, which a Syro-Arabic glossary (in Rosenmüller) explains *festā quae sunt in medio mensis*. The *Peshito* here, like the Targum, proceeds from the reading **הַיְיָנוּ**, which, following the LXX and the best texts, is to be rejected in comparison with the singular **הַיְיָ**. If, however, it is to be read **הַגְּנִי**, and **פֶּסַח** (according to Kimchi with *Segol* not merely in the second syllable, but with double *Segol* **פֶּסַח**, after the form **מִנָּא** = **מִנָּא**) signifies not *interlunium*, but *plenilunium* (instead of which also Jerome has *in medio mense*, and in Pro. 7:20, *in die plenae lunae*, Aquila **ἡμέρα πανσελήνου**), then what is meant is either the Feast of Tabernacles, which is called absolutely **הַחַג** in 1Ki. 8: 2 (2Ch. 5: 3) and elsewhere, or the Passover, which is also so called in Isa. 30:29 and elsewhere. Here, as v. 5 will convince us, the latter is intended, the Feast of unleavened bread, the porch of which, so to speak, is **עַרְבַּ פֶּסַח** together with the **לַיְל שְׁמֵרִים** (Exo. 12:42), the night from the fourteenth to the fifteenth of Nisan. In vv. 2, 3 they are called upon to give a welcome to this feast. The blowing of the shophar is to announce the commencement of the Passover month, and at the commencement of the Passover day which opens the Feast of unleavened bread it is to be renewed. The **לְ** of **לַיּוֹם** is not meant temporally, as perhaps in Job. 21:30: at the day = on the day; for why was it not **בַּיּוֹם**? It is rather: towards the day, but **בַּכֶּסֶה** assumes that the day has already arrived; it is the same *Lamed* as in v. 2, the blowing of the shophar is to concern this feast-day, it is to sound in honour of it.

*Psa. 81: 5, 6.* Vv. 5 and 6 now tell whence the feast which is to be met with singing and music has acquired such a high significance: it is a divine institution coming from the time of the redemption by the hand of Moses. It is called **חֹק** as being a legally sanctioned decree, **מִשְׁפָּט** as being a lawfully binding appointment, and **עֲדוּת** as being a positive declaration of the divine will. The **לְ** in **לְיִשְׂרָאֵל** characterizes Israel as the receiver, in **לְאֱלֹהֵי** the God of Israel as the owner, i.e., Author and Lawgiver. By **בַּצִּאתוֹ** the establishing of the statute is dated back to the time of the Exodus; but the statement of the time of its being established, “when He went out over the land of Egypt,” cannot be understood of the exodus of the people out of Egypt, natural as this may be here, where Israel has just been called **יְהוֹסֵף** (pathetic for **יֹוסֵף**), by a comparison with Gen. 41:45, where Joseph is spoken of in the same words. For this expression does not describe the going forth out of a country, perhaps in the sight of its inhabitants, Num. 33: 3, cf. Exo. 14: 8 (Hengstenberg), but the

going out over a country. Elohim is the subject, and **צאת** is to be understood according to Exo. 11: 4 (Kimchi, De Dieu, Dathe, Rosenmüller, and others): when He went out for judgment over the land of Egypt (cf. Mic. 1: 3). This statement of the time of itself at once decides the reference of the Psalm to the Passover, which commemorates the sparing of Israel at that time (Exo. 12:27), and which was instituted on that very night of judgment. The accentuation divides the verse correctly. According to this, **שִׁפְתַי לֹא־דַעְתִּי אֲשַׁמַּע** is not a relative clause to **מִצְרַיִם**: where I heard a language that I understood not (Psa. 114: 1). Certainly **יָדַע שִׁפְהָ**, “to understand a language,” is an expression that is in itself not inadmissible (cf. **יָדַע סֵפֶר**, to understand writing, to be able to read, Isa. 29:11 f.), the selection of which instead of the more customary phrase **שָׁמַע לְשׁוֹן** (Deu. 28:49, Isa. 33:19, Jer. 5:15) might be easily intelligible here beside **אֲשַׁמַּע**; but the omission of the **שֵׁם** (**אֲשֶׁר**) is harsh, the thought it here purposeless, and excluded with our way of taking **בְּצֵאתוֹ**. From the speech of God that follows it is evident that the clause is intended to serve as an introduction of this divine speech, whether it now be rendered *sermonem quem non novi* (cf. Psa. 18:44, *populus quem non novi*), or *alicujus, quem non novi* (Ges. § 123, rem. 1), both of which are admissible. It is not in some way an introduction to the following speech of God as one which it has been suddenly given to the psalmist to hear: “An unknown language, or the language of one unknown, do I hear?” Thus Döderlein explains it: *Subitanea et digna poetico impetu digressio, cum vates sese divino adflatu subito percussus sentit et oraculum audire sibi persuadet*; and in the same way De Wette, Olshausen, Hupfeld, and others. But the oracle of God cannot appear so strange to the Israelitish poet and seer as the spirit-voice to Eliphaz (Job. 4:16); and moreover **אֲשַׁמַּע** after the foregoing historical predicates has the presumption of the imperfect signification in its favour. Thus, then, it will have to be interpreted according to Exo. 6: 2 f. It was the language of a known, but still also unknown God, which Israel heard in the redemption of that period. It was the God who had been made manifest as **יְהוָה** only, so to speak, by way of prelude hitherto, who now appeared at this juncture of the patriarchal history, which had been all along kept in view, in the marvellous and new light of the judgment which was executed upon Egypt, and of the protection, redemption, and election of Israel, as being One hitherto unknown, as the history of salvation actually then, having arrived at Sinai, receives an entirely new form, inasmuch as from this time onwards the congregation or church is a nation, and Jahve the King of a nation, and the bond of union between them a national law educating it for the real, vital salvation that is to come. The words of Jahve that follow are now not the words heard then in the time of the Exodus. The remembrance of the words

heard forms only a transition to those that now make themselves heard. For when the poet remembers the language which He who reveals Himself in a manner never before seen and heard of spoke to His people at that time, the Ever-living One Himself, who is yesterday and to-day the same One, speaks in order to remind His people of what He was to them then, and of what He spoke to them then.

*Psa. 81: 7-11.* It is a gentle but profoundly earnest festival discourse which God the Redeemer addresses to His redeemed people. It begins, as one would expect in a Passover speech, with a reference to the סבלות of Egypt (Exo. 1:11-14; 5: 4; 6: 6 f.), and to the דוד, the task-basket for the transport of the clay and of the bricks (Exo. 1:14; 5: 7 f.). <sup>f289</sup>

Out of such distress did He free the poor people who cried for deliverance (Exo. 2:23-25); He answered them בַּסֶּתֶר אֲשֶׁר, i.e., not (according to 22:22, Isa. 32: 2): affording them protection against the storm, but (according to Psa. 18:12; 77:17 ff.): out of the thunder-clouds in which He at the same time revealed and veiled Himself, casting down the enemies of Israel with His lightnings, which is intended to refer pre-eminently to the passage through the Red Sea (vid., Psa. 77:19); and He proved them אֲבָחֶנְךָ, with *ō* contracted from *ō*, cf. on Job. 35: 6) at the waters of *Meribah*, viz., whether they would trust Him further on after such glorious tokens of His power and loving-kindness. The name “*Waters of Meribah*,” which properly is borne only by *Meribath Kadesh*, the place of the giving of water in the fortieth year (Num. 20:13; 27:14, Deu. 32:51; 33: 8), is here transferred to the place of the giving of water in the first year, which was named *Massah u-Meribah* (Exo. 17: 7), as the remembrances of these two miracles, which took place under similar circumstances, in general blend together (vid., on Psa. 95: 8 f.). It is not now said that Israel did not act in response to the expectation of God, who had so wondrously verified Himself; the music, as *Seal* imports, here rises, and makes a long and forcible pause in what is being said. What now follows further, are, as the further progress of v. 12 shows, the words of God addressed to the Israel of the desert, which at the same time with its faithfulness are brought to the remembrance of the Israel of the present. הָעֵיד, as in Psa. 50: 7, Deu. 8:19, to bear testimony that concerns him against any one. אִם (according to the sense, *o si*, as in Psalm 95 v. 7, which is in many ways akin to this Psalm) properly opens a searching question which wishes that the thing asked may come about (whether thou wilt indeed give me a willing hearing?!). In v. 10 the key-note of the revelation of the Law from Sinai is struck: the fundamental command which opens the decalogue demanded fidelity to Jahve and forbade idol-worship as the sin of sins. אֱלֹהִים

is an idol in opposition to the God of Israel as the true God; and אֱלֹהֵי נֹכַח, a strange god in opposition to the true God as the God of Israel. To this one God Israel ought to yield itself all the more undividedly and heartily as it was more manifestly indebted entirely to Him, who in His condescension had chosen it, and in His wonder-working might had redeemed it (הַמְאֲלִיךְ, *part. Hiph.* with the *eh* elided, like הַפְּדִיךְ, Deu. 13: 6, and אֲכַלְךָ, from כָּלָה, Exo. 33: 3); and how easy this submission ought to have been to it, since He desired nothing in return for the rich abundance of His good gifts, which satisfy and quicken body and soul, but only a wide-opened mouth, i.e., a believing longing, hungering for mercy and eager for salvation (Psa. 119:131)!

*Psa. 81:12-17.* The Passover discourse now takes a sorrowful and awful turn: Israel's disobedience and self-will frustrated the gracious purpose of the commandments and promises of its God. "My people" and "Israel" alternate as in the complaint in Isa. 1: 3. לֹא-אֶזְכְּרָה followed by the dative, as in Deu. 13: 9 ([8], οὐ συνθελήσεις αὐτῷ). Then God [made their sin their punishment, by giving them over judicially (שָׁלַח as in Job. 8: 4) into the obduracy of their heart, which rudely shuts itself up against His mercy (from שָׁרַר, Aramaic שָׂרַר, Arabic *sarra*, to make firm = to cheer, make glad), so that they went on (cf. on the sequence of tense, Psa. 61: 8) in *their*, i.e., their own, egotistical, God-estranged determinations; the suffix is thus accented, as e.g., in Isa. 65: 2, cf. the borrowed passage Jer. 7:24, and the same phrase in Mic. 6:16. And now, because this state of unfaithfulness in comparison with God's faithfulness has remained essentially the same even to to-day, the exalted Orator of the festival passes over forthwith to the generation of the present, and that, as is in accordance with the cheerful character of the feast, in a charmingly alluring manner. Whether we take לוּ in the signification of *si* (followed by the participle, as in 2Sa. 18:12), or like אִם above in v. 9 as expressing a wish, *o si* (if but!), vv. 15 ff. at any rate have the relation of the apodosis to it. From כִּמְאֵם (for a little, easily) it may be conjectured that the relation of Israel at that time to the nations did not correspond to the dignity of the nation of God which is called to subdue and rule the world in the strength of God. הָשִׁיב signifies in this passage only to turn, not: to again lay upon. The meaning is, that He would turn the hand which is now chastening His people against those by whom He is chastening them (cf. on the usual meaning of the phrase, Isa. 1:25, Amo. 1: 8, Jer. 6: 9, Eze. 38:12). The promise in v. 16 relates to Israel and all the members of the nation. The haters of Jahve would be compelled reluctantly to submit themselves to Him, and their time would endure for ever. "Time" is equivalent to duration, and in this instance with the collateral notion of Prosperity, as elsewhere (Isa. 13:22) of the term of

punishment. One now expects that it should continue with **וַיִּאֲכִלְהוּ**, in the tone of a promise. The Psalm, however, closes with an historical statement. For **וַיִּאֲכִלְהוּ** cannot signify *et cibaret eum*; it ought to be pronounced **וַיִּאֲכִלְהוּ**. The pointing, like the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate, takes v. 17a (cf. Deu. 32:13 f.) as a retrospect, and apparently rightly so. For even the Asaphic Psalms 77 and 78 break off with historical pictures. V. 17b is, accordingly, also to be taken as retrospective. The words of the poet in conclusion once more change into the words of God. The closing word runs **אֲשַׁבֵּיטְךָ**, as in Psa. 50: 8, Deu. 4:31, and (with the exception of the *futt. Hiph.* of *Lamed He* verbs ending with *ekka*) usually. The Babylonian system of pointing nowhere recognises the suffix-form *ekka*. If the Israel of the present would hearken to the Lawgiver of Sinai, says v. 17, then would He renew to it the miraculous gifts of the time of the redemption under Moses.

## Psalm 82

### GOD'S JUDGMENT UPON THE GODS OF THE EARTH

*82: 1 ELOHIM standeth in the congregation of God,  
Among the elohim doth He judge.*

*82: 2 "How long will ye judge unjustly,  
And take the side of the wicked? (Sela)*

*82: 3 Do justice to the destitute and fatherless,  
Acquit the afflicted and the poor!*

*82: 4 Deliver the destitute and needy,  
Rescue out of the hand of the wicked!" —*

*82: 5 "They know not, and understand not,  
In darkness they walk to and fro;  
All the foundations of the land totter.*

*82: 6 I have said: Ye are elohim,  
And sons of the Most High are ye all.*

*82: 7 Yet as men shall ye die,  
And as one of the princes shall ye fall."*

*82: 8 Arise, Elohim, oh judge the earth,  
For Thou hast a claim upon all nations.*

*Psalm 82.* As in Psalm 81, so also in this Psalm (according to the Talmud the Tuesday Psalm of the Temple liturgy) God is introduced as speaking after the manner of the prophets. Psalm 58 and 94 are similar, but more especially Isa. 3:13-15. Asaph the seer beholds how God, reproving, correcting, and

threatening, appears against the chiefs of the congregation of His people, who have perverted the splendour of majesty which He has put upon them into tyranny. It is perfectly characteristic of Asaph (Psalm 50, 75, 81) to plunge himself into the contemplation of the divine judgment, and to introduce God as speaking. There is nothing to militate against the Psalm being written by Asaph, David's contemporary, except the determination not to allow to the **לַאֲסָפִי** of the inscription its most natural sense. Hupfeld, understanding "angels" by the *elohim*, as Bleek has done before him, inscribes the Psalm: "God's judgment upon unjust judges in heaven and upon earth." But the angels as such are nowhere called *elohim* in the Old Testament, although they might be so called; and their being judged here on account of unjust judging, Hupfeld himself says, is "an obscure point that is still to be cleared up." An interpretation which, like this, abandons the usage of the language in order to bring into existence a riddle that it cannot solve, condemns itself. At the same time the assertion of Hupfeld (of Knobel, Graf, and others), that in Exo. 21: 5; 22: 7 f., 27, <sup>1290</sup> **אֱלֹהִים** denotes God Himself, and not directly the authorities of the nation as being His earthly representatives, finds its most forcible refutation in the so-called and mortal *elohim* of this Psalm (cf. also Psa. 45: 7; 58: 2).

By reference to this Psalm Jesus proves to the Jews (Joh. 10:34-36) that when He calls Himself the Son of God, He does not blaspheme God, by an *argumentatio a minori ad majus*. If the Law, so He argues, calls even those gods who are officially invested with this name by a declaration of the divine will promulgated in time (and the Scripture cannot surely, as in general, so also in this instance, be made invalid), then it cannot surely be blasphemy if He calls Himself the Son of God, whom not merely a divine utterance in this present time has called to this or to that worldly office after the image of God, but who with His whole life is ministering to the accomplishment of a work to which the Father had already sanctified Him when He came into the world. In connection with **ἡγίασε** one is reminded of the fact that those who are called *elohim* in the Psalm are censured on account of the unholiness of their conduct. The name does not originally belong to them, nor do they show themselves to be morally worthy of it. With **ἡγίασε καὶ ἀπέστειλεν** Jesus contrasts His divine sonship, prior to time, with theirs, which began only in this present time.

**Psa. 82: 1-4.** God comes forward and makes Himself heard first of all as censuring and admonishing. The "congregation of God" is, as in Num. 27:17; 31:16, Jos. 22:16 f., "the congregation of (the sons of) Israel," which God has purchased from among the nations (Psa. 74: 2), and upon which as its Lawgiver He has set His divine impress. The psalmist and seer sees Elohim standing in this congregation of God. The *part. Niph.* (as in Isa. 3:13) denotes not so much the suddenness and unpreparedness, as, rather, the statue-like

immobility and terrifying designfulness of His appearance. Within the range of the congregation of God this holds good of the *elohim*. The right over life and death, with which the administration of justice cannot dispense, is a prerogative of God. From the time of Gen. 9: 6, however, He has transferred the execution of this prerogative to mankind, and instituted in mankind an office wielding the sword of justice, which also exists in His theocratic congregation, but here has His positive law as the basis of its continuance and as the rule of its action. Everywhere among men, but here pre-eminently, those in authority are God's delegates and the bearers of His image, and therefore as His representatives are also themselves called *elohim*, "gods" (which the LXX in Exo. 21: 6 renders τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, and the Targums here, as in Exo. 22: 7, 8, 27 uniformly, אֱלֹהִים). The God who has conferred this exercise of power upon these subordinate *elohim*, without their resigning it of themselves, now sits in judgment in their midst. שָׁפֵט of that which takes place before the mind's eye of the psalmist. How long, He asks, will ye judge unjustly? עָשָׂה עוֹל בְּמִשְׁפָּט שָׁפֵט עוֹל is equivalent to שָׁפֵט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל, Lev. 19:15, 35 (the opposite is שָׁפֵט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל, Psa. 58: 2). How long will ye accept the countenance of the wicked, i.e., incline to accept, regard, favour the person of the wicked? The music, which here becomes *forte*, gives intensity to the terrible sternness (*das Niederdonnernde*) of the divine question, which seeks to bring the "gods" of the earth to their right mind. Then follow admonitions to do that which they have hitherto left undone. They are to cause the benefit of the administration of justice to tend to the advantage of the defenceless, of the destitute, and of the helpless, upon whom God the Lawgiver especially keeps His eye. The word רָשָׁע (רָשָׁע), of which there is no evidence until within the time of David and Solomon, is synonymous with אָבִיוֹן דָּל with וְיָתוֹם is pointed דָּל, and with וְאָבִיוֹן, on account of the closer notional union, דָּל (as in Psa. 72:13). They are words which are frequently repeated in the prophets, foremost in Isaiah (Isa. 1:17), with which is enjoined upon those invested with the dignity of the law, and with jurisdiction, justice towards those who cannot and will not themselves obtain their rights by violence.

*Psa. 82: 5-7.* What now follows in v. 5 is not a parenthetical assertion of the inefficiency with which the divine correction rebounds from the judges and rulers. In connection with this way of taking v. 5, the manner in which the divine language is continued in v. 6 is harsh and unadjusted. God Himself speaks in v. 5 of the judges, but reluctantly alienated from them; and confident of the futility of all attempts to make them better, He tells them their sentence in vv. 6 f. The verbs in v. 5a are designedly without any object: complaint of the widest compass is made over their want of reason and understanding; and

דָּעוּ takes the perfect form in like manner to ἔγνωκασι, *noverunt*, cf. 14: 1, Isa. 44:18. Thus, then, no result is to be expected from the divine admonition: they still go their ways in this state of mental darkness, and that, as the *Hithpa.* implies, stalking on in carnal security and self-complacency. The commands, however, which they transgress are the foundations (cf. 11: 3), as it were the shafts and pillars (Psa. 75: 4, cf. Pro. 29: 4), upon which rests the permanence of all earthly relationships with are appointed by creation and regulated by the *Tôra*. Their transgression makes the land, the earth, to totter physically and morally, and is the prelude of its overthrow. When the celestial Lord of the domain thinks upon this destruction which injustice and tyranny are bringing upon the earth, His wrath kindles, and He reminds the judges and rulers that it is His own free declaratory act which has clothed them with the god-like dignity which they bear. They are actually *elohim*, but not possessed of the right of self-government; there is a Most High (עֲלִיּוֹן) to whom they as sons are responsible. The idea that the appellation *elohim*, which they have given to themselves, is only sarcastically given back to them in v. 1 (Ewald, Olshausen), is refuted by v. 6, according to which they are really *elohim* by the grace of God. But if their practice is not an Amen to this name, then they shall be divested of the majesty which they have forfeited; they shall be divested of the prerogative of Israel, whose vocation and destiny they have belied. They shall die off כַּאֲדָם, like common men not rising in any degree above the mass (cf. בְּנֵי אָדָם, *opp.* בְּנֵי אִישׁ, Psa. 4: 3; 49: 3); they shall fall like any one (Jud. 16: 7, Oba. 1:11) of the princes who in the course of history have been cast down by the judgment of God (Hos. 7: 7). Their divine office will not protect them. For although *justitia civilis* is far from being the righteousness that avails before God, yet *injustitia civilis* is in His sight the vilest abomination.

*Psa. 82: 8.* The poet closes with the prayer for the realization of that which he has beheld in spirit. He implored God Himself to sit in judgment (שִׁפְטָה) as in Lam. 3:59), since judgment is so badly exercised upon the earth. All peoples are indeed His נַחֲלָה, He has an hereditary and proprietary right among (LXX and Vulgate according to Num. 18:20, and frequently), or rather in (בַּ as in בְּ מִשְׁלַל, instead of the accusative of the object, Zec. 2:16), all nations (ἔθνη) — may He then be pleased to maintain it judicially. The inference drawn from this point backwards, that the Psalm is directed against the possessors of power among the Gentiles, is erroneous. Israel itself, in so far as it acts inconsistently with its theocratic character, belies its sanctified nationality, is a גֵּרִי like the גֵּוִים, and is put into the same category with these. The judgment over the world is also a judgment over the Israel that is become conformed to the world, and its God-estranged chiefs.



## Psalm 83

### BATTLE-CRY TO GOD AGAINST ALLIED PEOPLES

83: 2 *ELOHIM, let there be no repose to Thee,  
Be not silent and rest not, O God!*

83: 3 *For lo Thine enemies make a tumult,  
And Thy haters carry the head high.*

83: 4 *Against Thy people they meditate a crafty design,  
And take counsel together against Thy protegés.*

83: 5 *They say: "Up! we will destroy them from among the peoples,  
And the name of Israel shall not be remembered any more!"*

83: 6 *For they take counsel together with one mind,  
Against Thee they make a covenant:*

83: 7 *The tents of Edom and of the Ishmaelites,  
Moab and the Hagarenes;*

83: 8 *Gebâl and Ammon and Amalek,  
Philistia, with the inhabitants of Tyre;*

83: 9 *Also Asshur hath joined itself to them,  
They lend their arm to the sons of Lot. (Sela)*

83:10 *Do unto them as unto Midian,  
As unto Sisera, as unto Jabin at the brook Kishon!*

83:11 *They were destroyed at Endor,  
They became as dung for the land;*

83:12 *Make them, their nobles, like Oreb and Zeeb,  
And like Zebach and Zalmunna all their princes,*

83:13 *Who said:  
"Let us take possession of the habitations of Elohim!"*

83:14 *My God, make them like the whirlwind,  
As stubble before the wind!*

83:15 *As fire, burning a forest,  
And as flame, singeing mountains:*

83:16 *Thus do Thou pursue them with Thy tempest,  
And with Thy hurricane overthrow them!*

83:17 *Fill their face with shame,  
That they may seek Thy name, Jahve!*

*83:18 Let them be ashamed and overthrown for ever,  
And let them be confounded and perish;*

*83:19 And let them know that Thou, Thy Name, Jahve, Thou alone,  
Art the Most High over all the earth.*

*Psalm 83.* The close of this Psalm is in accord with the close of the preceding Psalm. It is the last of the twelve Psalms of Asaph of the Psalter. The poet supplicates help against the many nations which have allied themselves with the descendants of Lot, i.e., Moab and Ammon, to entirely root out Israel as a nation. Those who are fond of Maccabaeian Psalms (Hitzig and Olshausen), after the precedent of van Til and von Bengel, find the circumstances of the time of the Psalm in 1 Macc. 5, and Grimm is also inclined to regard this as correct; and in point of fact the deadly hostility of the *ἔθνη κυκλόθεν* which we there see breaking forth on all sides, <sup>f291</sup>

as it were at a given signal, against the Jewish people, who have become again independent, and after the dedication of the Temple doubly self-conscious, is far better suited to explain the Psalm than the hostile efforts of Sanballat, Tobiah, and others to hinder the rebuilding of Jerusalem, in the time of Nehemiah (Vaihinger, Ewald, and Dillmann). There is, however, still another incident beside that recorded in 1 Macc. 5 to which the Psalm may be referred, viz., the confederation of the nations for the extinction of Judah in the time of Jehoshaphat (2 Chronicles 20), and, as it seems to us, with comparatively speaking less constraint. For the Psalm speaks of a real league, whilst in 1 Macc. 5 the several nations made the attack without being allied and not jointly; then, as the Psalm assumes in v. 9, the sons of Lot, i.e., the Moabites and Ammonites, actually were at the head at that time, whilst in 1 Macc. 5 the sons of Esau occupy the most prominent place; and thirdly, at that time, in the time of Jehoshaphat, as is recorded, an Asaphite, viz., Jahaziël, did actually interpose in the course of events, a circumstance which coincides remarkably with the *לאסף*. The league of that period consisted, according to 2Ch. 20: 1, of Moabites, Ammonites, and a part of the *מעונים* (as it is to be read after the LXX). But v. 2 (where without any doubt *מאדם* is to be read instead of *מאדם*) adds the Edomites to their number, for it is expressly stated further on (vv. 10, 22, 23) that the inhabitants of Mount Seir were with them. Also, supposing of course that the “Ishmaelites” and “Hagarenes” of the Psalm may be regarded as an unfolding of the *מעונים*, which is confirmed by Josephus, *Antiq.* ix. 1. 2; and that Gebäl is to be understood by the Mount Seir of the chronicler, which is confirmed by the Arab. *jibâl* still in use at the present day, there always remains a difficulty in the fact that the Psalm also names *Amalek*, *Philistia*, *Tyre*, and *Asshur*, of which we find no mention there in the reign of Jehoshaphat. But these difficulties are counter-balanced by others that beset

the reference to 1 Macc. 5, viz., that in the time of the Seleucidae the Amalekites no longer existed, and consequently, as might be expected, are not mentioned at all in 1 Macc. 5; further, that there the Moabites, too, are no longer spoken of, although some formerly Moabitish cities of Gileaditis are mentioned; and thirdly, that אַשּׁוּר = Syria (a certainly possible usage of the word) appears in a subordinate position, whereas it was, however, the dominant power. On the other hand, the mention of Amalek is intelligible in connection with the reference to 2 Chronicles 20, and the absence of its express mention in the chronicler does not make itself particularly felt in consideration of Gen. 36:12. Philistia, Tyre, and Asshur, however, stand at the end in the Psalm, and might also even be mentioned with the others if they rendered aid to the confederates of the south-east without taking part with them in the campaign, as being a succour to the actual leaders of the enterprise, the sons of Lot. We therefore agree with the reference of Psalm 83 (as also of Psalm 48) to the alliance of the neighbouring nations against Judah in the reign of Jehoshaphat, which has been already recognised by Kimchi and allowed by Keil, Hengstenberg, and Movers.

*Psa. 83: 2-5.* The poet prays, may God not remain an inactive looker-on in connection with the danger of destruction that threatens His people. דָּמִי (with which יָהּ is to be supplied) is the opposite of alertness; חָרַשׁ the opposite of speaking (in connection with which it is assumed that God's word is at the same time deed); שָׁקַט the opposite of being agitated and activity. The energetic future *jehemajûn* gives outward emphasis to the confirmation of the petition, and the fact that Israel's foes are the foes of God gives inward emphasis to it. On נִשְׂא רֹאשׁ, cf. Psa. 110: 7. סוּד is here a secret agreement; and יַעֲרִימוּ, elsewhere to deal craftily, here signifies to craftily plot, devise, bring a thing about. צַפּוֹנִיךָ is to be understood according to Psa. 27: 5; 31:21. The *Hithpa.* הִתְנַעַץ alternates here with the more ancient *Niph.* (v. 6). The design of the enemies in this instance has reference to the total extirpation of Israel, of the separatist-people who exclude themselves from the life of the world and condemn it. מִגּוֹי, from being a people = so that it may no longer be a people or nation, as in Isa. 7: 8; 17: 1; 25: 2, Jer. 48:42. In the borrowed passage, Jer. 48: 2, by an interchange of a letter it is נִבְרִיתָהּ. This Asaph Psalm is to be discerned in not a few passages of the prophets; cf. Isa. 62: 6 f. with v. 2, Isa. 17:12 with v. 3.

*Psa. 83: 6-9.* Instead of לֵב אֶחָד, 1Ch. 12:38, it is *deliberant corde unâ*, inasmuch as יִחְדוּ on the one hand gives intensity to the reciprocal signification of the verb, and on the other lends the adjectival notion to לֵב. Of

the confederate peoples the chronicler (2 Chronicles 20) mentions the Moabites, the Ammonites, the inhabitants of Mount Seir, and the Me'unim, instead of which Josephus, *Antiq.* ix. 1. 2, says: a great body of Arabians. This crowd of peoples comes from the other side of the Dead Sea, מְאָרָם (as it is to be read in v. 2 in the chronicler instead of מְאָרָם, cf. on Psa. 60: 2); the territory of Edom, which is mentioned first by the poet, was therefore the rendezvous. The tents of Edom and of the Ishmaelites are (cf. Arab. *ahl*, people) the people themselves who live in tents. Moreover, too, the poet ranges the hostile nations according to their geographical position. The seven first named from Edom to Amalek, which still existed at the time of the psalmist (for the final destruction of the Amalekites by the Simeonites, 1Ch. 4:42 f., falls at an indeterminate period prior to the Exile), are those out of the regions east and south-east of the Dead Sea. According to Gen. 25:18, the Ishmaelites had spread from *Higâz* through the peninsula of Sinai beyond the eastern and southern deserts as far up as the countries under the dominion of Assyria. The Hagarenes dwelt in tents from the Persian Gulf as far as the east of Gilead (1Ch. 5:10) towards the Euphrates. גְּבַל, Arab. *jbâl*, is the name of the people inhabiting the mountains situated in the south of the Dead Sea, that is to say, the northern Seiritish mountains. Both *Gebâl* and also, as it appears, the Amalek intended here according to Gen. 36:12 (cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* ii. 1. 2: Ἀμαληκίτις, a part of Idumaea), belong to the wide circuit of *Edom*. Then follow the Philistines and Phoenicians, the two nations of the coast of the Mediterranean, which also appear in Amo. 1 (cf. Joe. 4 [3]) as making common cause with the Edomites against Israel. Finally Asshur, the nation of the distant north-east, here not as yet appearing as a principal power, but strengthening (vid., concerning זְרוּא, an arm = assistance, succour, Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 433b) the sons of Lot, i.e., the Moabites and Ammonites, with whom the enterprise started, and forming a powerful reserve for them. The music bursts forth angrily at the close of this enumeration, and imprecations discharge themselves in the following strophe.

*Psa. 83:10-13.* With כְּמִדְיָן reference is made to Gideon's victory over the Midianites, which belongs to the most glorious recollections of Israel, and to which in other instances, too, national hopes are attached, Isa. 9: 3 [4], 10:26, cf. Hab. 3: 7; and with the asyndeton בְּסִיסְרָא בְּסִיסְרָא כִּיבִין, as Norzi states, who does not rightly understand the placing of the *Metheg*) to the victory of Barak and Deborah over Sisera and the Canaanitish king Jabin, whose general he was. The *Beth* of בְּנַחַל is like the *Beth* of בְּנַחַל in 110: 7: according to Jud. 5:21 the Kishon carried away the corpses of the slain army. *Endôr*, near Tabor, and therefore situated not far distant from Taanach and Megiddo (Jud. 5:19), belonged to the battle-field. אֶדְמָה, starting from the

radical notion of that which flatly covers anything, which lies in **דָּם**, signifying the covering of earth lying flat over the globe, therefore *humus* (like **אֲרֶץ**, *terra*, and **תֵּבֵל**, *tellus*), is here (cf. 2Ki. 9:37) in accord with **דָּמָן** (from **דָּמַן**), which is in substance akin to it. In v. 12 we have a retrospective glance at Gideon's victory. 'Oreb and Zeēb were **שָׂרִים** of the Midianites, Jud. 7:25; Zebach and Tsalmunna', their kings, Jud. 8: 5 ff. <sup>f292</sup>

The pronoun precedes the word itself in **שִׁתְמוּ**, as in Exo. 2: 6; the heaped-up suffixes *ēmo* (*êmo*) give to the imprecation a rhythm and sound as of rolling thunder. Concerning **נָסִיד**, vid., on Psa. 2: 6. So far as the matter is concerned, 2Ch. 20:11 harmonizes with v. 13. Canaan, the land which is God's and which He has given to His people, is called **נְאוֹת אֱלֹהִים** (cf. Psa. 74:20).

*Psa. 83:14-17.* With the **אֱלֹהֵי**, which constrains God in faith, the "thundering down" begins afresh. **גִּלְגַּל** signifies a wheel and a whirling motion, such as usually arises when the wind changes suddenly, then also whatever is driven about in the whirling, Isa. 17:13. <sup>f293</sup>

**קֶשֶׁת** (from **קָשַׁשׁ**, Arab. *qšš*, *aridum esse*) is the cry corn-talks, whether as left standing or, as in this instance, as straw upon the threshing-floor or upon the field. Like a fire that spreads rapidly, laying hold of everything, which burns up the forest and singes off the wooded mountain so that only a bare cone is left standing, so is God to drive them before Him in the raging tempest of His wrath and take them unawares. The figure in v. 15 is fully worked up by Isaiah, Isa. 10:16-19; **לֹהֵט** as in Deu. 32:22. In the apodosis, v. 16, the figure is changed into a kindred one: wrath is a glowing heat (**חֲרוֹן**) and a breath (**נִשְׁמָה**, Isa. 30:33) at the same time. In v. 17b it becomes clear what is the final purpose towards which this language of cursing tends: to the end that all, whether willingly or reluctantly, may give the glory to the God of revelation. Directed towards this end the earnest prayer is repeated once more in the tetrastichic closing strain.

*Psa. 83:18, 19.* The aim of the wish is that they in the midst of their downfall may lay hold upon the mercy of Jahve as their only deliverance: first they must come to nought, and only by giving Jahve the glory will they not be utterly destroyed. Side by side with **אֶתְהָ**, v. 19a, is placed **שִׁמְךָ** as a second subject (cf. Psa. 44: 3; 69:11). In view of v. 17b **וַיִּדְעוּ** (as in Psa. 59:14) has not merely the sense of perceiving so far as the justice of the punishment is concerned; the knowledge which is unto salvation is not excluded. The end of the matter which the poet wishes to see brought about is this, that Jahve, that

the God of revelation (שֹׁמֵר), may become the All-exalted One in the consciousness of the nations.

## Excursus by J. G. Wetzstein

### *I — The Symbolical Meaning of the Wash-Pot and of the Shoe On Psa. 60:10* (pp. 411 f.)

The most natural interpretation of the words *Moab is my wash-pot, and upon Edom I cast my shoe*, seems to me, according to the conception in Syria at the present day, to be: Moab is the vessel in which I wash my face and hands clean, i.e., the country and people in which I acquire to myself (by its conquest) splendour and renown, and Edom I degrade to the place whither I throw my cast-off shoes, <sup>f294</sup> i.e., I cause Edom to endure the most humiliating treatment, that of a helot. The idea is still the same, if the poet conceived of Edom as a person at whom he casts his shoe as an insult. It is surely not to be doubted that these first two members of the verse — according to the apprehension of the whole Psalm — refer to a conquest of the two nations either as already completed or as near at hand, since the third member of the verse, having reference to the Philistines, speaks with certainty of such a conquest; הַתְּרוּעָה may be understood of a battle-cry (when the fight is at hand) or a cry for vengeance (after the conquest).

The pregnant language of poetry is satisfied with the mention of the wash-pot in order to bring before the mind the figure so familiar to the Semite of “washing one’s self white,” i.e., to acquire a reputation. In the Arabian poets the metaphor not unfrequently is “to wash one’s self white in the blood of the enemies” (Arab. *bayyad wajhah b-dm l-idâ*). In the language of common life Arab. *bayâd l-wjh* (*candor faciei*) is a broad notion, for everything good and beautiful that a man does or receives makes his face white (Arab. *yubayyid wjhh*). Now, since the one or the other is often taking place, one also very frequently hears the expression made use of. We see from Isa. 1:16-18, Job. 9:30, and Pro. 30:12, that among the Hebrews too the figurative phrase of washing one’s self white had a far more extended application than it might seem according to Psa. 51: 9; and a conquest of the Moabites must have furnished an Israelitish king with the Arab. *byâd l-wjh* before his people. The opposite is the Arab. *sawâd l-wjh* (*nigror faciei*), which is brought about by everything bad and ugly that one does or suffers. Since the denying of a request, unsuccessful mediation between disputants, the non-acceptance of a present, and the not returning of a greeting blackens the face (Arab. *yusawwid wjhh*) of the petitioner, of the mediator, of the giver, and of him who greets, it comes to pass that in a Syrian town one almost daily meets with the expression, as with the “blackened” individual himself; cf. Burckhardt, *Arabic*

*Proverbs*, pp. 48 f.; Freytag, *Pro. Arab.* iii. p. 239 (No. 1435 and No. 1436), <sup>f295</sup> and p. 534.

As to the second member of the verse, the shoe, as being the commonest part of one's clothing, is the figure of vileness and despicableness; and one would no more think of mentioning the shoe than the indecent word *charâ*, "dung," without saving one's self in the presence of the hearer by the addition of the words *agellak Allâh*, "may God glorify thee!" The proverb *adhall min en-na<sup>al</sup>*, "more common than the shoe," is found in Freytag, *Pro. Arab.* i. 514; the same in meaning with this is *adhall min el-ḥidhâ*, *ibid.* p. 516. On the first *Mediânî* quotes two verses of poetry. The one runs thus: "The cheek of the *Kulêbites* more easily undergoes the disgracing touch than the shoe" (which the feet tread in the dirt); the other is: "Accustomed to many years' disgrace, they accommodate themselves more easily to the footsteps than does the shoe." Here belongs, too, *jâ ḥabbadhâ el-munta 'limûna ḳiâmâ* (in Freytag, iii. 513) — "Oh what a nice thing it is to draw on one's shoes standing!" i.e., to associate with the common people without making one's self common. <sup>f296</sup>

If it is a disgrace to be compared to the shoe, it is a still greater disgrace to be struck with one. Being warned of the presence of a foe, the Arab, in order to express the greatest possible contempt of this foe, cries: *bâbûgî 'alâ ra<sup>suh</sup>*, <sup>f297</sup> "my shoe upon his head," i.e., it only requires a few blows with my shoe to be rid of him. A discharged bad servant sends to ask his master to take him on again, and the master answers the intermediary: *jegî wa-ja<sup>s</sup> chodh surmeiatî 'alâ ḳafâh*, "he may come if he wishes to have my shoe upon his head," i.e., I would drive him away again in the most disgraceful manner. The Khaliph Muetwekkil sent to the *Imâm Aḥmed* (Ibn *Ḥanbal*) to ask him to pray for one of the maidens of his palace who had epilepsy: the *imâm* took off his shoe (*na<sup>al</sup>*), gave it to the messenger, and said: Go, place it at the bed-head of the maiden and say, "Aḥmed sends to ask whether thou wilt depart from the maiden or have seventy counted out with this shoe?" The messenger did as he was told, and the evil spirit (*el-mârid*) answered through the mouth of the maiden: "I obey! If Aḥmed had commanded me to leave the *Irâḳ*, I would do it." And he came out of her and fled, and the maiden was made whole, etc. (MSS in the Royal Library in Berlin, Section Wetzstein, ii. No. 355, folio 113a). In Damascus they say of a cunning, wicked man, proverbially: *ḳarab esh-Shêtân alf bâbûga*, "he struck Satan a thousand times with his shoe," i.e., Satan was his disciple, but was such a bungler in comparison with his master that he treated him in the most contemptible manner, and sought to discipline him by means of the vilest kind of punishment. Another Damascene proverb runs: *el-gehennam bân el-bawâbig*, "Hell is among the shoes." The reception-room of houses in the city is divided into two parts; the very much larger part is furnished with carpets and divans, and here the guests sit; the lesser part,

called *'ataba*, is from one to three steps lower, and here the attendants, slaves, and all contemptible people who do not dare to go up higher, stand. Here, too, stand the over-shoes of those who sit in the upper part. The proverb therefore signifies, that the feeling of being unhonoured and condemned, of being obliged to stand in the place where the others set their shoes, resembles the pains of hell. <sup>f298</sup>

This proverb seems to me to illustrate the *first* of the two interpretations of Psa. 60:10 *b* indicated above as possible; whilst in support of the *second* we may call to mind that enactment of *El-Hâkim bi'amr-Allah*, according to which in Syria and Egypt the Christians were compelled to hang wooden crosses and the Jews wooden shoes about their necks, which they were not allowed to take off even in the bath. That this was designed solely as a mark of *disgrace*, is clear from the further points of that enactment, viz., that both parties were allowed to wear only black turbans; not to ride upon horses, but only upon donkeys without saddle-cloths; not to have any Moslem servants, etc. (MSS in the Royal Library in Berlin, Section Wetzstein, ii. No. 351, fol. 167r).

The supposition of many expositors, that the taking possession of Edom is to be understood by the casting of the shoe upon it, I hold to be incorrect. In his work on the Psalms (ii. 33) Hitzig observes in its favour:

“The shoe may be regarded as the symbol of a thing that has a master, for one says of a divorced woman, ‘she was my slipper, and I have cast her off’ (Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins*, 1831, p. 113);

to take it off may therefore mean to give up a property, according to Deu. 25: 9, Rut. 4: 7 f., and to cast it upon or at something may mean to take possession of it.” Here I must first show that the quotation from Burckhardt is a phrase of which variations are to be met with. The figure of the shoe as symbolizing rejection is used only by the common people, and only by these when any one is aroused by offensive reproaches, or when filled with hatred against the divorced or her family. The dweller in *Haurân* in this case says in opposition to the reproach: *thôbî wa-shalahtuh*, “it was *my* shirt, and I have taken it off.” A father or a brother who (and this is a custom of the country) has slain his daughter or sister that has, as a virgin, been seduced, turns aside the reproaches of strangers with the standing phrase: *işb î wa-ḳata tuh*, “it was my own finger, and I have cut it off,” or: *işba î wa-âb, kata tuh*, “it was my own finger, and it became unsound, so I cut it off,” i.e., it was my own flesh and blood, not that of a stranger, what right have you therefore to call me to account? But the two Scripture passages only favour that interpretation in a very slight degree. In Deu. 25: 9, where the despised widow takes off the shoe of her brother-in-law and spits into his face, she means simply to *disgrace* him. If the right of determining for one’s self were transferred to her together with



the shoe, then the act of taking off the shoe ought not to have been performed by her, but by him, since she cannot herself take this right upon herself. And when the man was called “barefoot” from this time forth, this epithet would no longer be a stigma upon him, which it is evidently intended to be, but would signify nothing more than “the possessionless one,” which would have no meaning. The taking off of the shoe is, however, here designed to say: As thou despisest thy deceased brother and his widow, so shalt thou be like those despised and destitute ones who have not the meanest article of clothing, the shoe, and who are obliged to walk barefooted upon the sharp and hot stones, and in snow, in rain, and in dirt.

Rut. 4: 7, 8 is very different from this passage. Here one man delivers his shoe to another man certainly as the sign of the transfer of a right, yet without the unclean shoe as such being in general the symbol of ownership or property. For this no authenticated evidence is to be found. It is rather that his handing over the shoe is only the visible sign of the act of delivering up and taking possession (of the *teslīm* and *tesellum*), by means of which a sale, exchange, renunciation, or presentation becomes an established fact (לְקַיֵּם בְּלִ-דָּבָר). If an article of clothing be chosen for this purpose, because thereby one would seemingly part with an actual possession, then it might also be some other article. If, however, we may argue from the simple clothing of the inhabitants of *Haurân* at the present day, and of the whole of the country east of the Jordan, concerning the clothing of the ancient Scripture times, then there would frequently, especially in the country, only be the mantle besides the shoe at one’s disposal: and even this a person would not always have with him in the hot season. This is apart from the consideration that the choice of the shoe was favoured by its meanness, which would say that one lightly parted with the object given up, and gave it heartily to the other.

*II — Concerning the ὕιοι Βαϊάν in 1 Macc. 5: 4 On Psalm 83 (p. 552, note).*

The ὕιοι Βαϊάν were a small tribe, by name בְּנֵי בַיָּן . In the Arabian genealogies the word Arab. *bayyân* not unfrequently occurs, as a name of men; even the *Ḳāmûs* under Arab. *byn* has an *abû lā bn bayyân*. Its appellative signification is that of the proper names Arab. *fârûq* and *faysal*, viz., *discernens seu ratione seu gladio*. With respect to the abode of the *Benî Bakjân*, from the fact that Judas found it to be the best opportunity of inflicting upon them the appointed chastisement for highway robberies when he had surprised and smitten the Edomites in the valley of the ‘Araba, it may be inferred that they took up their abode in the neighbourhood of much-frequented highroads in the valley of the ‘Araba. An important junction of the roads of that district is the *Ghamr* -well (Arab. ‘*l-gmr*), <sup>f299</sup> which has an abundant supply of water, and is

frequently mentioned in the annals of Islam. It is situated on the western side of the 'Araba, distant two caravan marches north of Aila, and the same distance from the ruins of *Şoghar* in the south-west of the Dead Sea. For here the main road leading from Aila to Hebron and Jerusalem intersects the road which led from Egypt to Petra and farther east. The caravans going from Aila to *Ghazza* certainly did not touch at Ghamr, since, as at the present day, they used to take the more westerly direction farther south, but they were always obliged to halt at the drinking-places of the *Wādī el-Lahjâna*, which lie scarcely ten hours south-west of Ghamr. They therefore likewise remained within the range of the robbers, if these inhabited the mountains which lie between Ghamr and that *wādī*. This mountain range is, however, called *Gebel el-Bajjâna* (Arab. *jbl 'l-bayyânat*), which is synonymous with *Gebel Benî Bajjân*; for ever since the Arabic language has given up the use of the plural in *ûn* and *în* for gentile nouns, Arab. *'l-bayyânnâ*, "the *Bajjânite*," takes the form Arab. *'l-bayyânat*, "the *Bajjânites*."<sup>1300</sup>

Burckhardt (*Travels in Syria and the Holy Land*, London 1822, 4to. p. 444), setting out from 'Ain *es-Sâdika* at the northern end of *Gebel Sherâh* towards Egypt, crossed the 'Araba south of Ghamr. His language in reference to the matter in hand is as follows: "We were one hour and a half in crossing the Araba, direction W. by N. In some places the sand is very deep, but it is firm, and the camels walk over it without sinking... There is not the slightest appearance of a road or of any other work of human art in this part of the valley. On the other side we ascended the western chain of mountains. The mountain opposite to us appeared to be the highest point of the whole chain, as far as I could see N. and S.; it is called *Djebel Beyane* (Arab. *jbl byyânh*); the height of this chain, however, is not half that of the eastern mountains. It is intersected by numerous broad Wadys in which the *Talh* tree grows; the rock is entirely silicious, of the same species as that of the desert which extends from hence to Suez.... After an hour and a half of gentle ascent we arrived at the summit of the hills...." The article is wanting before *Beyâne* in Bruckhardt; perhaps the name given to the mountain to him by some of his attendants was *G. Beyân*, "mountain of the (*Benî*) *Bajjân*," and by others *G. el-Beyâne*, "mountain of the *Bajjânites*," so that he regarded the absence of the article in the one and the form of the other as the more correct. One of those "broad wadys," — perhaps the one on which was situated the fortress destroyed by Judas, — is called, according to Robinson (*Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 2nd edition, i. 182, 1st ed. i. 269, etc.), the "*Wādī* of the *Bajjânites*" [*"el-Beyâneh"*] (Arab. *wādī 'l-bayyânt*). Here also belongs a statement in the Geographical Lexicon of *Abû 'Obeid el-Bekrî* (died 487 of the Higrâ), which Juynboll unfortunately gives incompletely in his edition of Arab. *ktâb 'l-mrâşd* (vol. iv. p. 416), as follows: Arab. *bayyân b- 'l-fih w- 'l-tšdid mwq' mjâwr 'l-gamr 'Ich*, "*Bajjân* with double *a* and a doubled *Jod* is a locality in the

neighbourhood of *Ghamr*, etc.” Probably in the original text used by *Bekrî* it stood Arab. *chrbt byyân* or *jbl byyân* (the ruins of *Bajjân*, or the mountain of *Bajjân*). *Bekrî*, however, imagining that in Arab. *byyân* he had the proper name not of a people but of a locality, substituted for the Arab. *chrbt* or *jbl* standing before it the word Arab. *mawđi*<sup>c</sup>, which had at one time become stereotyped, and by which those compilers described everything when possible.

## **Psalm 84**

### **LONGING FOR THE HOUSE OF GOD, AND FOR THE HAPPINESS OF DWELLING THERE**

*84: 2 HOW lovely are Thy dwelling-places, Jahve of Hosts!*

*84: 3 My soul longeth, yea fainteth, for the courts of Jahve,  
My heart and my flesh sing for joy towards the living God.*

*84: 4 Yea, the sparrow hath found a house,  
And the swallow a nest for herself,  
Where she hath sheltered her young —  
Thine altars, Jahve of Hosts,  
My King and my God.*

*84: 5 Blessed are they who dwell in Thy house,  
They shall still praise Thee. (Sela)*

*84: 6 Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee —  
The pilgrims' ways are in their heart.*

*84: 7 Passing through the valley of Baca,  
They make it a place of springs,  
The rain also enshroudeth it in blessings.*

*84: 8 They go from strength to strength,  
There stand they before Elohim in Zion:*

*84: 9 “Jahve Elohim of Hosts,  
Oh hear my prayer,  
Give ear, O God of Jacob!” (Sela)*

*84:10 Thou our Shield, look into it, Elohim,  
And look upon the face of Thine anointed!*

*84:11 For better is a day in Thy courts than a thousand;  
I had rather lie upon the threshold in the house of my God,  
Than dwell in the tents of wickedness.*

*84:12 For a sun and shield is Jahve Elohim.  
Grace and glory doth Jahve dispense,  
He doth not withhold any good thing from those who walk in uprightness.*

*84:13 Jahve of Hosts,  
Blessed is the man who trusteth in Thee.*

*Psalm 84.* With Psalm 83 the circle of the Asaphic songs is closed (twelve Psalms, viz., one in the Second Book and eleven in the Third), and with Psalm 84 begins the other half of the Korahitic circle of songs, opened by the last of the Korahitic Elohim-Psalms. True, Hengstenberg (transl. vol. iii. Appendix. p. xlv) says that no one would, with my *Symbolae*, p. 22, regard this Psalm 84 as an Elohimic Psalm; but the marks of the Elohimic style are obvious. Not only that the poet uses *Elohim* twice, and that in v. 8, where a non-Elohimic Psalm ought to have said *Jahve*; it also delights in compound names of God, which are so heaped up that *Jahve Tsebaoth* occurs three times, and the specifically Elohimic *Jahve Elohim Tsebaoth* once.

The origin of this Psalm has been treated of already in connection with its counterpart, Psalm 42-43. It is a thoroughly heartfelt and intelligent expression of the love to the sanctuary of Jahve which yearns towards it out of the distance, and calls all those happy who have the like good fortune to have their home there. The prayer takes the form of an intercession for God's anointed; for the poet is among the followers of David, the banished one. <sup>f301</sup>

He does not pray, as it were, out of his soul (Hengstenberg, Tholuck, von Gerlach), but for him; for loving Jahve of Hosts, the heavenly King, he also loves His inviolably chosen one. And wherefore should he not do so, since with him a new era for the neglected sanctuary had dawned, and the delightful services of the Lord had taken a new start, and one so rich in song? With him he shares both joy and grief. With his future he indissolubly unites his own.

*To the Precentor upon the Gittith*, the inscription runs, by *Benê-Korah*, a Psalm. Concerning אֲלֹהֵי הַגִּיטִית, vid., on 8: 1. The structure of the Psalm is artistic. It consists of two halves with a distichic *ashrê*-conclusion. The schema is 3. 5. 2 | 5. 5. 5. 3. 2.

*Psa. 84: 2-5.* How loved and lovely (יְדִידוֹת) is the sacred dwelling-place (*plur.* as in 43: 3) of the all-commanding, redemptive God, viz., His dwelling-place here below upon Zion! Thither the poet is drawn by the deeply inward yearning of love, which makes him pale (נִבְסַר from בָּסַר, to grow pale, Psa. 17:12) and consumes him (בָּלָה as in Job. 19:27). His heart and flesh joyfully salute the living God dwelling there, who, as a never-failing spring, quenches the thirst of the soul (Psa. 42: 3); the joy that he feels when he throws himself back in spirit into the long-denied delight takes possession even of his bodily nature, the bitter-sweet pain of longing completely fills him (Psa. 63: 2). The mention of the "courts" (with the exception of the Davidic Psa. 65: 5, occurring only in the anonymous Psalms) does not preclude the reference of

the Psalm to the tent-temple on Zion. The Tabernacle certainly had only one **הַצֵּדָה**; the arrangement of the Davidic tent-temple, however, is indeed unknown to us, and, according to reliable traces,<sup>f302</sup> it may be well assumed that it was more gorgeous and more spacious than the old Tabernacle which remained in Gibeon. In v. 4 the preference must be given to that explanation which makes **אֶת־מִזְבְּחֹתַי** dependent upon **מִצְאָה**, without being obliged to supply an intermediate thought like **בֵּית** (with hardening *Dagesh* like **בֵּן**, Gen. 19:38, vid., the rule at Psa. 52: 5) and **קַן** as a more definite statement of the object which the poet has in view. The altars, therefore, or (what this is meant to say without any need for taking **אֶת** as a preposition) the realm, province of the altars of Jahve — this is the house, this the nest which sparrow and swallow have found for themselves and their young. The poet thereby only indirectly says, that birds have built themselves nests on the Temple-house, without giving any occasion for the discussion whether this has taken place in reality. By the bird that has found a comfortable snug home on the place of the altars of Jahve in the Temple-court and in the Temple-house, he means himself. **צִפּוֹר** (from **צִפְּר**) is a general name for whistling, twittering birds, like the finch<sup>f303</sup> and the sparrow, just as the LXX here renders it. **דְּרוֹר** is not the turtle-dove (LXX, Targum, and Syriac), but the swallow, which is frequently called even in the Talmud **צִפּוֹר דְּרוֹר** (= **סְנוּנִית**), and appears to take its name from its straightforward darting, as it were, radiating flight (cf. Arabic *jadurru* of the horse: it darts straight forward). Saadia renders *dūrīje*, which is the name of the sparrow in Palestine and Syria (vid., Wetzstein's Excursus I at p. 860). After the poet has said that his whole longing goes forth towards the sanctuary, he adds that it could not possibly be otherwise (**נָא** standing at the head of the clause and belonging to the whole sentence, as e.g., in Isa. 30:33; Ewald, § 352, *b*): he, the sparrow, the swallow, has found a house, a nest, viz., the altars of Jahve of Hosts, his King and his God (Psa. 44: 5; 45: 7), who gloriously and inaccessibly protects him, and to whom he unites himself with most heartfelt and believing love. The addition “where (**אֲשֶׁר** as in Psa. 95: 9, Num. 20:13) she layeth her young,” is not without its significance. One is here reminded of the fact, that at the time of the second Temple the sons of the priests were called **פְּרָחֵי כַהֲנָה**, and the Levite poet means himself together with his family; God's altars secure to them shelter and sustenance. How happy, blessed, therefore, are those who enjoy this good fortune, which he now longs for again with pain in a strange country, viz., to be able to make his home in the house of such an adorable and gracious God! **עוֹד** here signifies, not “constantly” (Gen. 46:29), for which **תָּמִיד** would have been used, but “yet,” as in Psa. 42: 6. The relation of v. 5*b* to 5*a* is therefore like Psa. 41: 2. The present is dark, but it will come to pass even yet that the inmates of God's

house (οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, Eph. 2:10) will praise Him as their Helper. The music here strikes in, anticipating this praise.

*Psa. 84: 6-13.* This second half takes up the “blessed” of the distichic epode (επωδός) of the first, and consequently joins member to member chain-like on to it. Many hindrances must be cleared away if the poet is to get back to Zion, his true home; but his longing carries the surety within itself of its fulfilment: blessed, yea in himself blessed, is the man, who has his strength (עוֹן only here *plene*) in God, so that, consequently, the strength of Him to whom all things are possible is mighty in his weakness. What is said in v. 6b is less adapted to be the object of the being called blessed than the result of that blessed relationship to God. What follows shows that the “high-roads” are not to be understood according to Isa. 40: 3 f., or any other passage, as an ethical, notional figure (Venema, Hengstenberg, Hitzig, and others), but according to Isa. 33: 8 (cf. Jer. 31:21), with Aben-Ezra, Vatablus, and the majority of expositors, of the roads leading towards Zion; not, however, as referring to the return from the Exile, but to the going up to a festival: the pilgrim-high-roads with their separate halting-places (stations) were constantly present to the mind of such persons. And though they may be driven never so far away from them, they will nevertheless reach the goal of their longing. The most gloomy present becomes bright to them: passing through even a terrible wilderness, they turn it (יְשִׁיתָהּ) into a place of springs, their joyous hope and the infinite beauty of the goal, which is worth any amount of toil and trouble, afford them enlivening comfort, refreshing strengthening in the midst of the arid steppe. עֵמֶק הַבָּכָא does not signify the “Valley of weeping,” as Hupfeld at last renders it (LXX κοιλάδα τοῦ κλαυθμῶνος), although Burckhardt found a [Arab.] *wādī 'I-bk* (Valley of weeping) in the neighbourhood of Sinai. In Hebrew “weeping” is בָּכָה, בָּכָה, בָּכָה, not בָּכָא, Rénan, in the fourth chapter of his *Vie de Jésus*, understands the expression to mean the last station of those who journey from northern Palestine on this side of the Jordan towards Jerusalem, viz., *Ain el-Haramije*, in a narrow and gloomy valley where a black stream of water flows out of the rocks in which graves are dug, so that consequently עֵמֶק הַבָּכָא signifies Valley of tears or of trickling waters. But such trickling out of the rock is also called בָּכָה, Job. 28:11, and not בָּכָא. This latter is the singular to בָּכָאִים in 2Sa. 5:24 (cf. בָּכָאִים, 103:21), the name of a tree, and, according to the old Jewish lexicographers, of the mulberry-tree (Talmudic תִּוּת, Arab. *tūt*); but according to the designation, of a tree from which some kind of fluid flows, and such a tree is the Arab. *baka'un*, resembling the balsam-tree, which is very common in the arid valley of Mecca, and therefore might also have given its name to some arid valley of the Holy Land (vid., Winer's *Realwörterbuch*, s.v. *Bacha*), and, according to 2Sa. 5:22-25, to one

belonging, as it would appear, to the line of valley which leads from the coasts of the Philistines to Jerusalem. What is spoken of in passages like Isa. 35: 7; 41:18, as being wrought by the omnipotence of God, who brings His people home to Zion, appears here as the result of the power of faith in those who, keeping the same end of their journeyings in view, pass through the unfruitful sterile valley. That other side, however, also does not remain unexpressed. Not only does their faith bring forth water out of the sand and rock of the desert, but God also on His part lovingly anticipates their love, and rewardingly anticipates their faithfulness: a gentle rain, like that which refreshes the sown fields in the autumn, descends from above and enwraps it (viz., the Valley of Baca) in a fulness of blessing (יַעֲטֶהָ, *Hiphil* with two accusatives, of which one is to be supplied: cf. on the figure, Psa. 65:14). The arid steppe becomes resplendent with a flowery festive garment (Isa. 35: 1 f.), not to outward appearance, but to them spiritually, in a manner none the less true and real. And whereas under ordinary circumstances the strength of the traveller diminishes in proportion as he has traversed more and more of his toilsome road, with them it is the very reverse; they go from strength to strength (cf. on the expression, Jer. 9: 2; 12: 2), i.e., they receive strength for strength (cf. on the subject-matter, Isa. 40:31, Joh. 1:16), and that an ever increasing strength, the nearer they come to the desired goal, which also they cannot fail to reach. The pilgrim-band (this is the subject to יִרְאֶה), going on from strength to (אֵל) strength, at last reaches, attains to (אֵל instead of the אֵל-פָּנֵי used in other instances) Elohim in Zion. Having reached this final goal, the pilgrim-band pours forth its heart in the language of prayer such as we have in v. 9, and the music here strikes up and blends its sympathetic tones with this converse of the church with its God.

The poet, however, who in spirit accompanies them on their pilgrimage, is now all the more painfully conscious of being at the present time far removed from this goal, and in the next strophe prays for relief. He calls God מַגִּנֵּנוּ (as in Psa. 59:12), for without His protection David's cause is lost. May He then behold (יִרְאֶה), used just as absolutely as in 2Ch. 24:22, cf. Lam. 3:50), and look upon the face of His anointed, which looks up to Him out of the depth of its reproach. The position of the words shows that מַגִּנֵּנוּ is not to be regarded as the object to יִרְאֶה, according to Psa. 89:19 (cf. Psa. 47:10) and in opposition to the accentuation, for why should it not then have been אֱלֹהִים רֹאֵה מַגִּנֵּנוּ ? The confirmation (v. 11) puts the fact that we have before us a Psalm belonging to the time of David's persecution by Absalom beyond all doubt. Manifestly, when his king prevails, the poet will at the same time (cf. David's language, 2Sa. 15:25) be restored to the sanctuary. A single day of his life in the courts of God is accounted by him as better than a thousand other days

(מִאֲלֶרֶף with *Olewejored* and preceded by *Rebia parvum*). He would rather lie down on the threshold (concerning the significance of this הַסְתַּוְיָפֶר in the mouth of a Korahite, vid., *supra*, p. 311) in the house of his God than dwell within in the tents of ungodliness (not “palaces,” as one might have expected, if the house of God had at that time been a palace). For how worthless is the pleasure and concealment to be had there, when compared with the salvation and protection which Jahve Elohim affords to His saints! This is the only instance in which God is directly called a sun (שֶׁמֶשׁ) in the sacred writings (cf. Sir. 42:16). He is called a shield as protecting those who flee to Him and rendering them inaccessible to their foes, and a sun as the Being who dwells in an unapproachable light, which, going forth from Him in love towards men, is particularized as הַן and כְּבוֹד, as the gentle and overpowering light of the grace and glory (χάρις and δόξα) of the Father of Lights. The highest good is self-communicative (*communicativum sui*). The God of salvation does not refuse any good thing to those who walk בְּתַמִּים (בְּדֶרֶךְ תַּמִּים, Psa. 101: 6; cf. on Psa. 15: 2). Upon all receptive ones, i.e., all those who are desirous and capable of receiving His blessings, He freely bestows them out of the abundance of His good things. Strophe and anti-strophe are doubled in this second half of the song. The epode closely resembles that which follows the first half. And this closing *ashrê* is not followed by any *Sela*. The music is hushed. The song dies away with an iambic cadence into a waiting expectant stillness.

## Psalm 85

### PETITION OF THE HITHERTO FAVOURED PEOPLE FOR A RESTORATION OF FAVOUR

85: 2 *THOU hast been favourable, Jahve, unto Thy land,  
Thou hast turned the captivity of Jacob;*

85: 3 *Thou hast taken away the iniquity of Thy people,  
Thou hast covered all their sin — (Sela)*

85: 4 *Thou hast drawn in all Thy wrath,  
Thou hast turned from the heat of Thine anger.*

85: 5 *Turn unto us again, O God of our salvation,  
And cause Thine indignation against us to cease.*

85: 6 *Wilt Thou for ever be angry with us,  
Wilt Thou draw out Thine anger to all generations?*

85: 7 *Wilt Thou not quicken us again,  
That Thy people may rejoice in Thee?*



*85: 8 Cause us to see, Jahve, Thy loving-kindness,  
And grant us Thy salvation.*

*85: 9 I will hear what God Jahve will speak — —  
Yea, He speaketh peace to His people and to His saints;  
Only let them not again fall into folly!*

*85:10 Yea, nigh unto those who fear Him is His salvation,  
That glory may again dwell in our land.*

*85:11 Loving-kindness and truth shall meet together,  
Righteousness and peace shall kiss each other.*

*85:12 Truth shall spring out of the earth,  
And righteousness shall look down from heaven.*

*85:13 Jahve shall give every good thing,  
And our land shall again yield its increase.*

*85:14 Righteousness shall go before Him  
And attend unto the way of His steps.*

*Psalm 85.* The second part of the Book of Isaiah is written for the Israel of the Exile. It was the incidents of the Exile that first unsealed this great and indivisible prophecy, which in its compass is without any parallel. And after it had been unsealed there sprang up out of it those numerous songs of the Psalm-collection which remind us of their common model, partly by their allegorizing figurative language, partly by their lofty prophetic thoughts of consolation. This first Korahitic Jahve-Psalm (in v. 13 coming into contact with Psalm 84, cf. *Psa. 84:12*), which more particularly by its allegorizing figurative language points to *Isa. 40-66*, belongs to the number of these so-called deutero-Isaianic Psalms.

The reference of Psalm 85 to the period after the Exile and to the restoration of the state, says Dursch, is clearly expressed in the Psalm. On the other hand, Hengstenberg maintains that “the Psalm does not admit of any historical interpretation,” and is sure only of this one fact, that vv. 2-4 do not relate to the deliverance out of the Exile. Even this Psalm, however, is not a formulary belonging to no express period, but has a special historical basis; and vv. 2-4 certainly sound as though they came from the lips of a people restored to their fatherland.

*Psa. 85: 2-4.* The poet first of all looks back into the past, so rich in tokens of favour. The six perfects are a remembrance of former events, since nothing precedes to modify them. Certainly that which has just been experienced might also be intended; but then, as Hitzig supposes, vv. 5-8 would be the petition that preceded it, and v. 9 would go back to the turning-point of the answering

of the request — a retrograde movement which is less probable than that in **שׁוּבְנוּ**, v. 5, we have a transition to the petition for a renewal of previously manifested favour. (**שְׁבוּתָהּ**) **שָׁב** **שְׁבוּתָהּ** (שְׁבוּתָהּ), here said of a cessation of a national judgment, seems to be meant literally, not figuratively (vid., Psa. 14: 7). **רָצָה**, with the accusative, to have and to show pleasure in any one, as in the likewise Korahitic lamentation-Psa. 44: 4, cf. Psa. 147:11. In v. 3a sin is conceived of as a burden of the conscience; in v. 3b as a blood-stain. The music strikes up in the middle of the strophe in the sense of the “blessed” in Psa. 32: 1. In v. 4a God’s **עֲבָרָה** (i.e., unrestrained wrath) appears as an emanation; He draws it back to Himself (**אָסַף** as in Joe. 4 [3]:15, Psa. 104:29, 1Sa. 14:19) when He ceases to be angry; in v. 4b, on the other hand, the fierce anger is conceived of as an active manifestation on the part of God which ceases when He turns round (**הִשִּׁיב**, *Hiph.* as inwardly transitive as in Eze. 14: 6; 31:35; cf. the *Kal* in Exo. 32:12), i.e., gives the opposite turn to His manifestation.

*Psa. 85: 5-8.* The poet now prays God to manifest anew the loving-kindness He has shown formerly. In the sense of “restore us again,” **שׁוּבְנוּ** does not form any bond of connection between this and the preceding strophe; but it does it, according to Ges. § 121, 4, it is intended in the sense of (**אֵלֵינוּ**) **לְנוּ** **שׁוּב**, turn again to us. The poet prays that God would manifest Himself anew to His people as He has done in former days. Thus the transition from the retrospective perfects to the petition is, in the presence of the existing extremity, adequately brought about. Assuming the post-exilic origin of the Psalm, we see from this strophe that it was composed at a period in which the distance between the temporal and spiritual condition of Israel and the national restoration, promised together with the termination of the Exile, made itself distinctly felt. On **עִמָּנוּ** (in relation to and bearing towards us) beside **בְּאִסְדָּךְ**, cf. Job. 10:17, and also on **הִפַּר**, Psa. 89:34. In the question in v. 6 reminding God of His love and of His promise, **מִשְׁךְ** has the signification of constant endless continuing or pursuing, as in Psa. 36:11. The expression in v. 7a is like Psa. 71:20, cf. Psa. 80:19; **שׁוּב** is here the representative of *rursus*, Ges. § 142. **יִשְׁעֶךָ** from **יִשַׁע**, like **קִצְפֶּךָ** in Psa. 38: 2, has *ē* (cf. the inflexion of **פָּרִי** and **חֶק**) instead of the *ī* in **אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעֵנוּ**. Here at the close of the strophe the prayer turns back inferentially to this attribute of God.

*Psa. 85: 9-11.* The prayer is followed by attention to the divine answer, and by the answer itself. The poet stirs himself up to give ear to the words of God, like Habakkuk, Hab. 2: 1. Beside **אִשְׁמְעָה** we find the reading **אִשְׁמָעָה**, vid., on Psa. 39:13. The construction of **הָאֵל הַזֶּה** is appositional, like **הַמֶּלֶךְ הַזֶּה**,

Ges. § 113. כִּי neither introduces the divine answer in express words, nor states the ground on which he hearkens, but rather supports the fact that God speaks from that which He has to speak. Peace is the substance of that which He speaks to His people, and that (the particularizing *Waw*) to His saints; but with the addition of an admonition. אַל is dehortative. It is not to be assumed in connection with this ethical notion that the *ah* of לְכִסְלָה is the locative *ah* as in לְשִׂאנְלָה, Psa. 9:18. בְּכִסְלָה is related to כָּסַל like foolery to folly. The present misfortune, as is indicated here, is the merited consequence of foolish behaviour (playing the fool). In vv. 10 ff. the poet unfolds the promise of peace which he has heard, just as he has heard it. What is meant by יִשְׁעוּ is particularized first by the infinitive, and then in perfects of actual fact. The possessions that make a people truly happy and prosperous are mentioned under a charming allegory exactly after Isaiah's manner, ch. Psa. 32:16 f., 45: 8; 59:14 f. The glory that has been far removed again takes up its abode in the land. Mercy or loving-kindness walks along the streets of Jerusalem, and there meets fidelity, like one guardian angel meeting the other. Righteousness and peace or prosperity, these two inseparable brothers, kiss each other there, and fall lovingly into each other's arms. <sup>f304</sup>

*Psa. 85:12-14.* The poet pursues this charming picture of the future further. After God's אֱמֶת, i.e., faithfulness to the promises, has descended like dew, אֱמֶת, i.e., faithfulness to the covenant, springs up out of the land, the fruit of that fertilizing influence. And צִדְקָה, gracious justice, looks down from heaven, smiling favour and dispensing blessing. נָם in v. 13 places these two prospects in reciprocal relation to one another (cf. Psa. 84: 7); it is found once instead of twice. Jahve gives הַטּוֹב, everything that is only and always good and that imparts true happiness, and the land, corresponding to it, yields יְבוּלָה, the increase which might be expected from a land so richly blessed (cf. Psa. 67: 7 and the promise in Lev. 26: 4). Jahve Himself is present in the land: righteousness walks before Him majestically as His herald, and righteousness יֵשֶׁם לְדַרְךָ פְּעָמָיו, sets (viz., its footsteps) upon the way of His footsteps, that is to say, follows Him inseparably. פְּעָמָיו stands once instead of twice; the construct is to a certain extent attractional, as in Psa. 65:12, Gen. 9: 6. Since the expression is neither דָּרַךְ (Psa. 50:23, Isa. 51:10) nor לְדַרְךָ (Isa. 49:11), it is natural to interpret the expression thus, and it gives moreover (cf. Isa. 58: 8; 52:12) an excellent sense. But if, which we prefer, שִׁים is taken in the sense of שִׁים לָב (as e.g., in Job. 4:20) with the following לְ, to give special heed to anything (Deu. 32:46, Eze. 40: 4; 44: 5), to be anxiously concerned about it (1Sa. 9:20), then we avoid the supplying in thought of a second

**פַּעַמִּי**, which is always objectionable, and the thought obtained by the other interpretation is brought clearly before the mind: righteousness goes before Jahve, who dwells and walks abroad in Israel, and gives heed to the way of His steps, that is to say, follows carefully in His footsteps.

## **Psalm 86**

### **PRAYER OF A PERSECUTED SAINT**

*86: 1 BOW down, Jahve, Thine ear, answer me,  
For I am needy and poor.*

*86: 2 Preserve my soul, for I am pious;  
Help Thy servant, O Thou my God,  
Who cleaveth confidingly to Thee.*

*86: 3 Be merciful unto me, Lord,  
For unto Thee do I cry all the day.*

*86: 4 Rejoice the soul of Thy servant,  
For unto Thee, Lord, do I lift up my soul.*

*86: 5 For Thou, Lord, art good and ready to forgive,  
And plenteous in mercy unto all who call upon Thee.*

*86: 6 Give ear, Jahve, to my prayer,  
And hearken to the cry of my importunate supplications.*

*86: 7 In the day of my distress do I call unto Thee,  
For Thou wilt answer me.*

*86: 8 There is none like unto Thee among the gods, O Lord,  
And Thy works have not their equal.*

*86: 9 All nations which Thou hast made shall come  
and worship before Thee, Lord,  
And give glory to Thy name.*

*86:10 For Thou art great and doest wondrous things,  
Thou, Thou art God alone.*

*86:11 Teach me, Jahve, Thy way,  
I desire to walk in Thy truth;  
Unite my heart to fear Thy Name.*

*86:12 I will give thanks to Thee, O Lord my God, with all my heart,  
And will glorify Thy Name for ever,*

*86:13 That Thy mercy has been great over me,  
And Thou hast rescued my soul out of the deep hell.*

*86:14 Elohim, the proud are risen against me,  
And an assembly of violent men seek my soul,  
And have not set Thee before their eyes.*

*86:15 But Thou, Lord, art a God compassionate and gracious,  
Long-suffering and plenteous in mercy and truth.*

*86:16 Turn unto me and be gracious to me,  
O give strength unto Thy servant  
And save the son of Thy handmaid.*

*86:17 Show me a token for good,  
That those who hate me may see it and be ashamed,  
That Thou, Jahve, hast helped me and comforted me.*

*Psalm 86.* A Psalm “by David” which has points of contact with Psalm 85 (cf. Psa. 86: 2, **חֲסִיד**, with Psa. 85: 9; 86:15, **חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת**, with Psa. 85:11) is here inserted between Korahitic Psalms: it can only be called a Psalm by David as having grown out of Davidic and other model passages. The writer cannot be compared for poetical capability either with David or with the authors of such Psalms as Psalm 116 and 130. His Psalm is more liturgic than purely poetic, and it is also only entitled **תְּפִלָּה**, without bearing in itself any sign of musical designation. It possesses this characteristic, that the divine name **אֲדֹנָי** occurs seven times, <sup>f305</sup> just as it occurs three times in Psalm 130, forming the start for a later, Adonajic style in imitation of the Elohimic.

*Psa. 86: 1-5.* The prayer to be heard runs like Psa. 55: 3; and the statement of the ground on which it is based, v. 1*b*, word for word like Psa. 40:18. It is then particularly expressed as a prayer for preservation (**שְׁמֹרָה**), as in Psa. 119:167, although imperative, to be read *shām {+pe}rah*; cf. Psa. 30: 4 **מִיָּדַי**, 38:21 **רָדַפְי** or **רָדַפְי**, and what we have already observed on Psa. 16: 1 (**שְׁמֹרְנִי**); for he is not only in need of God’s help, but also because **חֲסִיד** (Psa. 4: 4; 16:10), i.e., united to Him in the bond of affection (**חֶסֶד**), Hos. 6: 4, Jer. 2: 2), not unworthy of it. In v. 2 we hear the strains of Psa. 25:20; 31: 7; in v. 3, of 57: 2 f.: the confirmation in v. 4*b* is taken verbally from Psa. 25: 1, cf. also Psa. 130: 6. Here, what is said in v. 4 of this shorter Adonajic Psalm 130, is abbreviated in the **ἄπαξ γεγραμ. ἁλ. ἁλ.** (root **חל, סל**, to allow to hang loose, **χαλᾶν**, to give up, *remittere*). The Lord is good (**טוֹב**), i.e., altogether love, and for this very reason also ready to forgive, and great and rich in mercy for all who call upon Him as such. The beginning of the following group also accords with Psalm 130 in v. 2.

*Psa. 86: 6-13.* Here, too, almost everything is an echo of earlier language of the Psalms and of the Law; viz., v. 7 follows Psa. 17: 6 and other passages; v.

8a is taken from Exo. 15:11, cf. Psa. 89: 9, where, however, אלהים, gods, is avoided; v. 8b follows Deu. 3:24; v. 9 follows 22:28; v. 11a is taken from 27:11; v. 11b from 26: 3; v. 13, שאול תחתיה from Deu. 32:22, where instead of this it is תחתית, just as in 130: 2 תחנוני (supplicatory prayer) instead of תחנונותי (importunate supplications); and also v. 10 (cf. Psa. 72:18) is a doxological formula that was already in existence. The construction הקשיב ב is the same as in Psa. 66:19. But although for the most part flowing on only in the language of prayer borrowed from earlier periods, this Psalm is, moreover, not without remarkable significance and beauty. With the confession of the incomparableness of the Lord is combined the prospect of the recognition of the incomparable One throughout the nations of the earth. This clear unallegorical prediction of the conversion of the heathen is the principal parallel to Rev. 15: 4. “All nations, which Thou hast made” — they have their being from Thee; and although they have forgotten it (vid., Psa. 9:18), they will nevertheless at last come to recognise it. בל-גוים, since the article is wanting, are nations of all tribes (countries and nationalities); cf. Jer. 16:16 with Psa. 22:18; Tobit 13:11, ἔθνη πολλά, with *ibid.* 14: 6, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. And how weightily brief and charming is the petition in v. 11: *uni cor meum, ut timeat nomen tuum!* Luther has rightly departed from the renderings of the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate: *laetetur* (יחד from תדך). The meaning, however, is not so much “keep my heart near to the only thing,” as “direct all its powers and concentrate them on the one thing.” The following group shows us what is the meaning of the deliverance out of the hell beneath (שאול תחתיה), like ארץ תחתית, the earth beneath, the inner parts of the earth, Eze. 31:14 ff.), for which the poet promises beforehand to manifest his thankfulness (ב, v. 13, as in Psa. 56:14).

**Psa. 86:14-17.** The situation is like that in the Psalms of the time of Saul. The writer is a persecuted one, and in constant peril of his life. He has taken v. 14ab out of the Elohimic Psalm 54 v. 5, and retained the *Elohim* as a proper name of God (cf. on the other hand vv. 8, 10); he has, however, altered זרים to זרים, which here, as in Isa. 13:11 (cf. however, *ibid.* 25: 5), is the alternating word to ערצים. In v. 15 he supports his petition that follows by Jahve’s testimony concerning Himself in Exo. 34: 6. The appellation given to himself by the poet in v. 16 recurs in Psa. 116:16 (cf. Wisd. 9: 5). The poet calls himself “the son of Thy handmaid” as having been born into the relation to Him of servant; it is a relationship that has come to him by birth. How beautifully does the *Adonaj* come in here for the seventh time! He is even from his mother’s womb the servant of the sovereign Lord, from whose omnipotence he can therefore also look for a miraculous interposition on his

behalf. A “token for good” is a special dispensation, from which it becomes evident to him that God is kindly disposed towards him. לְטוֹבָה as in the mouth of Nehemiah, Neh. 5:19; 13:31; of Ezra, Ezr. 8:22; and also even in Jeremiah and earlier. יְיָ־בִשׁוּ is just as parenthetical as in Isa. 26:11.

## Psalm 87

### THE CITY OF THE NEW BIRTH OF THE NATIONS

*87: 1 HIS founded [city] upon the holy mountains —*

*87: 2 Jahve loveth the gates of Zion  
More than all the dwellings of Jacob.*

*87: 3 Glorious things are spoken of thee, thou city of God! (Sela)*

*87: 4 “I will proclaim Rahab and Babylon as My intimates;  
Behold Philistia and Tyre, together with Aethiopia —  
That one is born there.”*

*87: 5 And to Zion it shall one day be said:  
Each and every one is born in her,  
And He, the Highest, doth establish her.*

*87: 6 Jahve shall reckon in the list of the nations:  
That one is born there. (Sela)*

*87: 7 And singing as well as dancing (they say):  
All my fountains are in thee!*

*Psalm 87.* The mission thought in Psa. 86: 9 becomes the ruling thought in this Korahitic Psalm. It is a prophetic Psalm in the style, boldly and expressively concise even to obscurity (Eusebius, σφόδρα ἀνιγματοῦδος καὶ σκοτεινῶς ἐξηρημένος), in which the first three oracles of the tetralogy Isa. 21-22:14, and the passage Isa. 30: 6, 7 — a passage designed to be as it were a memorial exhibition — are also written. It also resembles these oracles in this respect, that v. 1*b* opens the whole arsis-like by a solemn statement of its subject, like the emblematical inscriptions there. As to the rest, Isa. 44: 5 is the key to its meaning. The threefold לְרֵאשִׁית here corresponds to the threefold הַיְיָ in that passage.

Since Rahab and Babylon as the foremost worldly powers are mentioned first among the peoples who come into the congregation of Jahve, and since the prospect of the poet has moulded itself according to a present rich in promise and carrying such a future in its bosom, it is natural (with Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Vaihinger, Keil, and others) to suppose that the Psalm was composed when, in consequence of the destruction of the Assyrian army

before Jerusalem, offerings and presents were brought from many quarters for Jahve and the king of Judah (2Ch. 32:23), and the admiration of Hezekiah, the favoured one of God, had spread as far as Babylon. Just as Micah (Mic. 4:10) mentions Babylon as the place of the chastisement and of the redemption of his nation, and as Isaiah, about the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, predicts to the king a carrying away of his treasures and his posterity to Babylon, so here Egypt and Babylon, the inheritress of Assyria, stand most prominent among the worldly powers that shall be obliged one day to bow themselves to the God of Israel. In a similar connection Isaiah (Isaiah 19) does not as yet mention Babylon side by side with Egypt, but Assyria.

*Psa. 87: 1-4.* The poet is absorbed in the contemplation of the glory of a matter which he begins to celebrate, without naming it. Whether we render it: His founded, or (since **מִסָּד** and **מִסָּד** are both used elsewhere as *part. pass.*): His foundation (after the form **מְלוּכָה**, poetically for **יְסוּד**, a founding, then that which is set fast = a foundation), the meaning remains the same; but the more definite statement of the object with **שְׁעָרֵי צִיּוֹן** is more easily connected with what precedes by regarding it as a participle. The suffix refers to Jahve, and it is Zion, whose praise is a favourite theme of the Korahitic songs, that is intended. We cannot tell by looking to the accents whether the clause is to be taken as a substantival clause (His founded [city] is upon the holy mountains) or not. Since, however, the expression is not **בְּהַר־יְקָדֵשׁ** **יְסוּדְתוֹ בְּהַר־יְקָדֵשׁ**, is an object placed first in advance (which the antithesis to the other dwellings of Jacob would admit of), and in v. 2a a new synonymous object is subordinated to **יְסוּדָהּ** by a similar turn of the discourse to Jer. 13:27; 6: 2 (Hitzig). By altering the division of the verses as Hupfeld and Hofmann do (His foundation or founded [city] upon the holy mountains doth Jahve love), v. 2 is decapitated. Even now the God-founded city (surrounded on three sides by deep valleys), whose firm and visible foundation is the outward manifestation of its imperishable inner nature, rises aloft above all the other dwelling-places of Israel. Jahve stands in a lasting, faithful, loving relationship (**יְסוּדָהּ**, not 3 *praet.* **יְסוּדָהּ**) to the gates of Zion. These gates are named as a periphrasis for Zion, because they bound the circuit of the city, and any one who loves a city delights to go frequently through its gates; and they are perhaps mentioned in prospect of the fulness of the heathen that shall enter into them. In v. 3 the LXX correctly, and at the same time in harmony with the syntax, renders: *Δεδοξασμένα ἑλαλήθη περὶ σοῦ*. The construction of a plural subject with a singular predicate is a syntax common in other instances also, whether the subject is conceived of as a unity in the form of the plural (e.g., Psa. 66: 3; 119:137, Isa. 16: 8), or is individualized in the pursuance of the thought (as is the case most likely in Gen. 27:29, cf. 12: 3);



here the glorious things are conceived of as the sum-total of such. The operation of the construction of the active (Ew. § 295, *b*) is not probable here in connection with the participle. **ב** beside **דִּבֶּר** may signify the place or the instrument, substance and object of the speech (e.g., Psa. 119:46), but also the person against whom the words are spoken (e.g., Psa. 50:20), or concerning whom they are uttered (as the words of the suitor to the father or the relatives of the maiden, 1Sa. 25:39, Son. 8: 8; cf. on the construction, 1Sa. 19: 3). The poet, without doubt, here refers to the words of promise concerning the eternal continuance and future glory of Jerusalem: Glorious things are spoken, i.e., exist as spoken, in reference to thee, O thou city of God, city of His choice and of His love.

The glorious contents of the promise are now unfolded, and that with the most vivid directness: Jahve Himself takes up the discourse, and declares the gracious, glorious, world-wide mission of His chosen and beloved city: it shall become the birth-place of all nations. *Rahab* is Egypt, as in Psa. 89:11, Isa. 30: 7; 51: 9, the southern worldly power, and *Babylon* the northern. **הַזְכִּיר**, as frequently, of loud (Jer. 4:16) and honourable public mention or commemoration, Psa. 45:18. It does not signify “to record or register in writing;” for the official name **מְזַכֵּר**, which is cited in support of this meaning, designates the historian of the empire as one who keeps in remembrance the memorable events of the history of his time. It is therefore impossible, with Hofmann, to render: I will add Rahab and Babylon to those who know me. In general **לְ** is not used to point out to whom the addition is made as belonging to them, but for what purpose, or as what (cf. 2Sa. 5: 3, Isa. 4: 3), these kingdoms, hitherto hostile towards God and His people, shall be declared: Jahve completes what He Himself has brought about, inasmuch as He publicly and solemnly declares them to be those who know Him, i.e., those who experimentally (vid., Psa. 36:11) know Him as their God. Accordingly, it is clear that **זֶה יָלֵד־שָׁם** is also meant to refer to the conversion of the other three nations to whom the finger of God points with **הַזֵּה**, viz., the war-loving Philistia, the rich and proud Tyre, and the adventurous and powerful Ethiopia (Isaiah 18). **זֶה** does not refer to the individuals, nor to the sum-total of these nations, but to nation after nation (cf. **זֶה הָעַם**, Isa. 23:13), by fixing the eye upon each one separately. And **שָׁם** refers to Zion. The words of Jahve, which come in without any intermediary preparation, stand in the closest connection with the language of the poet and seer. Zion appears elsewhere as the mother who brings forth Israel again as a numerous people (Isa. 66: 7; 54: 1-3): it is the children of the dispersion (*diaspora*) which Zion regains in Isa. 60: 4 f.; here, however, it is the nations which are born in Zion. The poet does not combine with it the idea of being born again in the depth of its New Testament

meaning; he means, however, that the nations will attain a right of citizenship in Zion (πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, Eph. 2:12) as in their second mother=city, that they will therefore at any rate experience a spiritual change which, regarded from the New Testament point of view, is the new birth out of water and the Spirit.

*Psa. 87: 5-7.* Inasmuch now as the nations come thus into the church (or congregation) of the children of God and of the children of Abraham, Zion becomes by degrees a church immeasurably great. To Zion, however, or of Zion (לְ of reference to), shall it be said אִישׁ וְאִישׁ יֵלְדָהּ בָּהּ. Zion, the one city, stands in contrast to all the countries, the one city of God in contrast to the kingdoms of the world, and אִישׁ וְאִישׁ in contrast to זֶה. This contrast, upon the correct apprehension of which depends the understanding of the whole Psalm, is missed when it is said, “whilst in relation to other countries it is always only the whole nation that comes under consideration, Zion is not reckoned up as a nation, but by persons” (Hofmann). With this rendering the יֵלְדָהּ retires into the background; in that case this giving of prominence to the value of the individual exceeds the ancient range of conception, and it is also an inadmissible appraisal that in Zion each individual is as important as a nation as a whole. Elsewhere אִישׁ אִישׁ, Lev. 17:10, 13, or אִישׁ וְאִישׁ, Est. 1: 8, signifies each and every one; accordingly here אִישׁ וְאִישׁ (individual and, or after, individual) affirms a *progressus in infinitum*, where one is ever added to another. Of an immeasurable multitude, and of each individual in this multitude in particular, it is said that he was born in Zion. Now, too, עֲלִיוֹן יְהוָה יְבוֹנֵנָה has a significant connection with what precedes. Whilst from among foreign peoples more and more are continually acquiring the right of natives in Zion, and thus are entering into a new national alliance, so that a breach of their original national friendships is taking place, He Himself (cf. 1Sa. 20: 9), the Most High, will uphold Zion (Psa. 48: 9), so that under His protection and blessing it shall become ever greater and more glorious. V. 6 tells us what will be the result of such a progressive incorporation in the church of Zion of those who have hitherto been far removed, viz., Jahve will reckon when He writeth down (בְּתוֹב as in Jos. 18: 8) the nations; or better, — since this would more readily be expressed by בְּבְתָבוֹ, and the book of the living (Isa. 4: 3) is one already existing from time immemorial, — He will reckon in the list (בְּתָב = בְּקוֹדֶר, חֲלוֹף, חֲלוֹם after the form בְּתָב, Eze. 13: 9) of the nations, i.e., when He goes over the nations that are written down there and chosen for the coming salvation, “this one was born there;” He will therefore acknowledge them one after another as those born in Zion. The end of all history is that Zion shall become the metropolis of all nations. When the fulness of the Gentiles is thus come in, then shall all and each one as well

singing as dancing say (supply **יֹאמְרוּ**): All my fountains are in thee. Among the old translators the rendering of Aquila is the best: **καὶ ἄδοντες ὡς χοροί: πᾶσαι πηγαὶ ἐν σοί**, which Jerome follows, *et cantores quasi in choris: omnes fontes mei in te*. One would rather render **הַלְלִים**, “flute-players” (LXX **ὡς ἐν αὐλοῖς**); but to pipe or play the flute is **הָלַל** (a denominative from **הִלִּיל**), 1Ki. 1:40, whereas to dance is **הָלַל** (*Pilel* of **חָוַל**); it is therefore = **מְחַלְלִים**, like **לְצַצִּים**, Hos. 7: 5. But it must not moreover be rendered, “And singers as well as dancers (will say);” for “singers” is **מְשַׁרְרִים**, not **שָׁרִים**, which signifies *cantantes*, not *cantores*. Singing as dancing, i.e., making known their festive joy as well by the one as by the other, shall the men of all nations incorporated in Zion say: All my fountains, i.e., fountains of salvation (after Isa. 12: 3), are in thee (O city of God). It has also been interpreted: my looks (i.e., the object on which my eye is fixed, or the delight of my eyes), or: my thoughts (after the modern Hebrew **עֵין** of spiritual meditation); but both are incongruous. The conjecture, too, of Böttcher, and even before him of Schnurrer (*Dissertationes*, p. 150), **כָּל-מְעִינִי**, all who take up their abode (instead of which Hupfeld conjectures **מְעִינִי**, all my near-dwellers, i.e., those who dwell with me under the same roof <sup>f306</sup>), is not Hebrew, and deprives us of the thought which corresponds to the aim of the whole, that Jerusalem shall be universally regarded as the place where the water of life springs for the whole of mankind, and shall be universally praised as this place of fountains.

## Psalm 88

### PLAINTIVE PRAYER OF A PATIENT SUFFERER LIKE JOB

**88: 2** *JAHVE, God of my salvation,  
In the time when I cry in the night before Thee,*

**88: 3** *Let my prayer come before Thy face,  
Incline Thine ear to my crying.*

**88: 4** *For satiated with sufferings is my soul,  
And my life is come nigh unto Hades.*

**88: 5** *I am accounted as those who go down to the pit,  
I am become as a man that hath no strength —*

**88: 6** *A freed one among the dead,  
Like the slain, those buried in the grave,  
Whom Thou rememberest no more,  
And they are cut off from Thy hand.*

**88: 7** *Thou hast laid me in the pit of the abysses,  
In darknesses, in the depths of the sea.*

*88: 8 Upon me Thy fierce anger lieth hard,  
And all Thy waves dost Thou bend down. (Sela)*

*88: 9 Thou hast removed my familiar friends from me,  
Thou hast made me an abomination to them,  
Who am shut up and cannot come forth.*

*88:10 Mine eye languisheth by reason of affliction,  
I call upon Thee, Jahve, every day,  
I stretch out my hands unto Thee.*

*88:11 Wilt Thou do wonders unto the dead,  
Or shall the shades arise to give thanks unto Thee? (Sela)*

*88:12 Shall Thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave,  
Thy faithfulness in the place of destruction?*

*88:13 Shall Thy wonder-working power be made known in the darkness,  
And Thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?*

*88:14 And as for me — to Thee, Jahve, do I cry,  
Even in the morning my prayer cometh to meet Thee.*

*88:15 Wherefore, Jahve, dost Thou cast off my soul,  
Dost Thou hide Thy face from me?*

*88:16 Needy am I and ready to die from my youth up,  
I bear Thy terrors, I am utterly helpless.*

*88:17 Over me Thy fierce anger hath passed,  
Thy terrors have destroyed me.*

*88:18 They have surrounded me like waters all the day,  
They compassed me about altogether.*

*88:19 Thou hast removed far from me lover and friend,  
My familiar friends are darkness.*

*Psalm 88.* Psalm 88 is as gloomy as Psalm 87 is cheerful; they stand near one another as contrasts. Not Psalm 77, as the old expositors answer to the question *quaenam ode omnium tristissima*, but this Psalm 88 is the darkest, gloomiest, of all the plaintive Psalms; for it is true the name “God of my salvation,” with which the praying one calls upon God, and his praying itself, show that the spark of faith within him is not utterly extinguished; but as to the rest, it is all one pouring forth of deep lament in the midst of the severest conflict of temptation in the presence of death, the gloom of melancholy does not brighten up to become a hope, the Psalm dies away in Job-like lamentation. Herein we discern echoes of the Korahitic Psalm 42 and of Davidic Psalms: compare v. 3 with Psa. 18: 7; v. 5 with Psa. 28: 1; v. 6 with Psa. 31:23; v. 18 with Psa. 22:17;f. 19 (although differently applied) with Psa. 31:12; and more

particularly the questions in vv. 11-13 with Psa. 6: 6, of which they are as it were only the amplification. But these Psalm-echoes are outweighed by the still more striking points of contact with the Book of Job, both as regards linguistic usage (דָּאֵב, v. 10, Job. 41:14; רָפְאִים, v. 11, Job. 26: 5; אֲבָדוֹן, v. 12, Job. 26: 6; 28:22; נָאֵר, v. 16a, Job. 33:25; 36:14; אֲמִים, v. 16b, Job. 20:25; בְּעוֹתִים, v. 17, Job. 6: 4) and single thoughts (cf. v. 5 with Job. 14:10; v. 9 with Job. 30:10; v. 19 with Job. 17: 9; 19:14), and also the suffering condition of the poet and the whole manner in which this finds expression. For the poet finds himself in the midst of the same temptation as Job not merely so far as his mind and spirit are concerned; but his outward affliction is, according to the tenor of his complaints, the same, viz., the leprosy (v. 9), which, the disposition to which being born with him, has been his inheritance from his youth up (v. 16). Now, since the Book of Job is a Chokma-work of the Salomonic age, and the two Ezrahites belonged to the wise men of the first rank at the court of Solomon (1Ki. 5:11 [4:31]), it is natural to suppose that the Book of Job has sprung out of this very Chokma-company, and that perhaps this very Heman the Ezrahite who is the author of Psalm 88 has made a passage of his own life, suffering, and conflict of soul, a subject of dramatic treatment.

The inscription of the Psalm runs: *A Psalm-song by the Korahites; to the Precentor, to be recited* (lit., *to be pressed down*, not after Isa. 27: 2: *to be sung*, which expresses nothing, nor: *to be sung alternately*, which is contrary to the character of the Psalm) *after a sad manner* (cf. Psa. 53: 1) *with muffled voice, a meditation by Heman the Ezrahite*. This is a double inscription, the two halves of which are contradictory. The bare להימן side by side with לבני-קרח would be perfectly in order, since the precentor Heman is a Korahite according to 1Ch. 6:18-23 [33-38]; but הימן האזרחי is the name of one of the four great Israelitish sages in 1Ki. 5:11 [4:31], who, according to 1Ch. 2: 6, is a direct descendant of Zerah, and therefore is not of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah. The suppositions that Heman the Korahite had been adopted into the family of Zerah, or that Heman the Ezrahite had been admitted among the Levites, are miserable attempts to get over the difficulty. At the head of the Psalm there stand two different statements respecting its origin side by side, which are irreconcilable. The assumption that the title of the Psalm originally was either merely שיר מזמור לבני-קרח, or merely וגו' למנצח, is warranted by the fact that only in this one Psalm למנצח does not occupy the first place in the inscriptions. But which of the two statements is the more reliable one? Most assuredly the latter; for שיר מזמור לבני-קרח is only a recurrent repetition of the inscription of Psalm 87. The second statement, on the other hand, by its precise designation of the melody, and by

the designation of the author, which corresponds to the Psalm that follows, gives evidence of its antiquity and its historical character.

*Psa. 88: 2-8.* The poet finds himself in the midst of circumstances gloomy in the extreme, but he does not despair; he still turns towards Jahve with his complaints, and calls Him the God of his salvation. This *actus directus* of fleeing in prayer to the God of salvation, which urges its way through all that is dark and gloomy, is the fundamental characteristic of all true faith. V. 2a is not to be rendered, as a clause of itself: “by day I cry unto Thee, in the night before Thee” (LXX and Targum), which ought to have been יְנַמֵּם, but (as it is also pointed, especially in Baer’s text): by day, i.e., in the time (Psa. 56: 4; 78:42, cf. 18: 1), when I cry before Thee in the night, let my prayer come... (Hitzig). In v. 3b he calls his piercing lamentation, his wailing supplication, רַנְתִּי, as in Psa. 17: 1; Psa. 61: 2. הַמָּה as in Psa. 86: 1, for which we find הַמָּה in Psa. 17: 6. The *Beth* of בְּרַעוֹת, as in Psa. 65: 5, Lam. 3:15, 30, denotes that of which his soul has already had abundantly sufficient. On v. 4b, cf. as to the syntax Psa. 31:11. אֵיךְ (ἄπαξ λεγομ. like אֵיךְ, Psa. 22:20) signifies succinctness, compactness, vigorousness (ἀδρότης): he is like a man from whom all vital freshness and vigour is gone, therefore now only like the shadow of a man, in fact like one already dead. חֶפְשִׁי, in v. 6a, the LXX renders ἐν νεκροῖς ἐλεύθερος (Symmachus, ἀφείξ ἐλεύθερος); and in like manner the Targum, and the Talmud which follows it in formulating the proposition that a deceased person is חֶפְשִׁי מִן הַמִּצְוֹת, free from the fulfilling of the precepts of the Law (cf. Rom. 6: 7). Hitzig, Ewald, Köster, and Böttcher, on the contrary, explain it according to Eze. 27:20 (where חֶפְשִׁי signifies *stragulum*): among the dead is my couch (‘יצועי’ = חֶפְשִׁי, Job. 17:13). But in respect of Job. 3:19 the adjectival rendering is the more probable; “one set free among the dead” (LXX) is equivalent to one released from the bond of life (Job. 39: 5), somewhat as in Latin a dead person is called *defunctus*. God does not remember the dead, i.e., practically, inasmuch as, devoid of any progressive history, their condition remains always the same; they are in fact cut away (נִגְזָר) as in Psa. 31:23, Lam. 3:54, Isa. 53: 8) from the hand, viz., from the guiding and helping hand, of God. Their dwelling-place is the pit of the places lying deep beneath (cf. on תַּחְתִּיּוֹת, Psa. 63:10; 86:13, Eze. 26:20, and more particularly Lam. 3:55), the dark regions (מַחְשְׁבִים) as in Psa. 143: 3, Lam. 3: 6), the submarine depths (בְּמַצְלוֹת; LXX, Symmachus, the Syriac, etc.: ἐν σκιᾷ θανάτου = בצלמות, according to Job. 10:21 and frequently, but contrary to Lam. 3:54), whose open abyss is the grave for each one. On v. 8b cf. 42: 8. The *Mugrash* by כֹּל-מִשְׁבְּרִיךְ stamps it as an adverbial accusative (Targum), or more correctly, since the expression is not עֲנִיתִנִּי, as the object

placed in advance. Only those who are not conversant with the subject (as Hupfeld in this instance) imagine that the accentuation marks עֲנִיתָ as a relative clause (cf. on the contrary 8: 7b, 21: 3b, etc.). עֲנָה, to bow down, press down; here used of the turning or directing downwards (LXX ἐπιήγαγες) of the waves, which burst like a cataract over the afflicted one.

*Psa. 88: 9-13.* The octastichs are now followed by hexastichs which belong together in pairs. The complaint concerning the alienation of his nearest relations sounds like Job. 19:13 ff., but the same strain is also frequently heard in the earlier Psalms written in times of suffering, e.g., Psa. 31: 9. He is forsaken by all his familiar friends (not: acquaintances, for מִיָּדַע signifies more than that), he is alone in the dungeon of wretchedness, where no one comes near him, and whence he cannot make his escape. This sounds, according to Leviticus 13, very much like the complaint of a leper. The Book of Leviticus there passes over from the uncleanness attending the beginning of human life to the uncleanness of the most terrible disease. Disease is the middle stage between birth and death, and, according to the Eastern notion, leprosy is the worst of all diseases, it is death itself clinging to the still living man (Num. 12:12), and more than all other evils a stroke of the chastening hand of God (נָנַע), a scourge of God (צָרָאֵת). The man suspected of having leprosy was to be subjected to a seven days' quarantine until the determination of the priest's diagnosis; and if the leprosy was confirmed, he was to dwell apart outside the camp (Lev. 13:46), where, though not imprisoned, he was nevertheless separated from his dwelling and his family (cf. Job, at 19:19), and if a man of position, would feel himself condemned to a state of involuntary retirement. It is natural to refer the בָּלָא, which is closely connected with שָׁתַּנִּי, to this separation. עֵינַי, v. 10, instead of עֵינַי, as in Psa. 6: 8; 31:10: his eye has languished, vanished away (בָּאָסָה of the same root as *tābescere*, cognate with the root of דִּוְנַג, Psa. 68: 3), in consequence of (his) affliction. He calls and calls upon Jahve, stretches out (שָׁטַח, *expandere*, according to the Arabic, more especially after the manner of a roof) his hands (*palmas*) towards Him, in order to shield himself from His wrath and to lead Him compassionately to give ear to him. In vv. 11-13 he bases his cry for help upon a twofold wish, viz., to become an object of the miraculous help of God, and to be able to praise Him for it. Neither of these wishes would be realized if he were to die; for that which lies beyond this life is uniform darkness, devoid of any progressive history. With מְתִים alternates רַפָּאִים (sing. רָפָא), the relaxed ones, i.e., shades (σκιαί) of the nether world. With reference to יוֹדוּ instead of לְהוֹדוֹת, vid., Ewald, § 337, b. Beside חֲשָׁךְ (Job. 10:21 f.) stands אֶרֶץ נִשְׁיָה, the land of forgetfulness (λήθη), where there is an end of all thinking, feeling,

and acting (Ecc. 9: 5, 6, 10), and where the monotony of death, devoid of thought and recollection, reigns. Such is the representation given in the Old Testament of the state beyond the present, even in Ecclesiastes, and in the Apocrypha (Sir. 17:27 f. after Isa. 38:18 f.; Baruch 2:17 f.); and it was obliged to be thus represented, for in the New Testament not merely the conception of the state after death, but this state itself, is become a different one.

*Psa. 88:14-19.* He who complains thus without knowing any comfort, and yet without despairing, gathers himself up afresh for prayer. With אָנִי he contrasts himself with the dead who are separated from God's manifestation of love. Being still in life, although under wrath that apparently has no end, he strains every nerve to struggle through in prayer until he shall reach God's love. His complaints are petitions, for they are complaints that are poured forth before God. The destiny under which for a long time he has been more like one dying than living, reaches back even into his youth. מִנְּאָר (since נָאֵר is everywhere undeclined) is equivalent to מִנְּעָרָה. The ἐξηγορήθη of the LXX is the right indicator for the understanding of the ἀπαξ λεγ. אָפְנָה. Aben-Ezra and Kimchi derive it from פָּן, like עָלָה from אָל, <sup>f307</sup> and assign to it the signification of *dubitare*. But it may be more safely explained after the Arabic words Arab. *afāna, afīna, ma fūn* (root 'f, to urge forwards, push), in which the fundamental notion of driving back, narrowing and exhausting, is transferred to a weakening or weakness of the intellect. We might also compare פָּנָה, Arab. *faniya*, "to disappear, vanish, pass away;" but the ἐξηγορήθη of the LXX favours the kinship with that Arab. *afīna, infirma mente et consilii inops fuit*, <sup>f308</sup>

which has been already compared by Castell. The aorist of the LXX, however, is just as erroneous in this instance as in Psa. 42: 5; 55: 3; 57: 5. In all these instances the cohortative denotes the inward result following from an outward compulsion, as they say in Hebrew: I lay hold of trembling (Isa. 13: 8, Job. 18:20; 21: 6) or joy (Isa. 35:10; 51:11), when the force of circumstances drive one into such states of mind. Labouring under the burden of divine dispensations of a terrifying character, he finds himself in a state of mental weakness and exhaustion, or of insensible (senseless) fright; over him as their destined goal before many others go God's burnings of wrath (*plur.* only in this instance), His terrible decrees (vid., concerning בַּעַת on 18: 5) have almost annihilated him. צַמְתָּוּנִי is not an impossible form (Olshausen, § 251, a), but an intensive form of צַמְתָּוּ, the last part of the already inflected verb being repeated, as in אָהַבּוּ הַבּוּ, Hos. 4:18 (cf. in the department of the noun, פִּיפִיּוֹת, edge-edges = many edges, Psa. 149: 6), perhaps under the influence of the derivative. <sup>f309</sup>



The corrections צַמַּתְתִּי (from צַמַּת) or צַמַּתְתִּי (from צַמַּת) are simple enough; but it is more prudent to let tradition judge of that which is possible in the usage of the language. In v. 18 the burnings become floods; the wrath of God can be compared to every destroying and overthrowing element. The billows threaten to swallow him up, without any helping hand being stretched out to him on the part of any of his lovers and friends. In v. 19a to be now explained according to Job. 16:14, viz., My familiar friends are gloomy darkness; i.e., instead of those who were hitherto my familiars (Job. 19:14), darkness is become my familiar friend? One would have thought that it ought then to have been מִדְּעִי (Schnurrer), or, according to Pro. 7: 4, מִדְּעִי, and that, in connection with this sense of the noun, מַחֲשָׁךְ ought as subject to have the precedence, that consequently מִדְּעִי is subject and מַחֲשָׁךְ predicate: my familiar friends have lost themselves in darkness, are become absolutely invisible (Hitzig at last). But the regular position of the words is kept to if it is interpreted: my familiar friends are reduced to gloomy darkness as my familiar friend, and the plural is justified by Job. 19:14: *Mother and sister (do I call) the worm.* With this complaint the harp falls from the poet's hands. He is silent, and waits on God, that He may solve this riddle of affliction. From the Book of Job we might infer that He also actually appeared to him. He is more faithful than men. No soul that in the midst of wrath lays hold upon His love, whether with a firm or with a trembling hand, is suffered to be lost.

## Psalm 89

### PRAYER FOR A RENEWAL OF THE MERCIES OF DAVID

*89: 2 OF the loving-kindnesses of Jahve for ever will I sing,  
To remote generations will I make known Thy faithfulness with my mouth.*

*89: 3 For I say: For ever is mercy being built up,  
In the heavens — there dost Thou establish Thy faithfulness.*

*89: 4 "I have made a covenant with My chosen,  
I have sworn unto David My servant:*

*89: 5 For ever will I establish thy seed,  
And build up thy throne to remote generations." (Sela)*

*89: 6 And the heavens praise Thy wondrousness, Jahve,  
Thy faithfulness also in the assembly of the holy ones.*

*89: 7 For who in the sky can be compared to Jahve,  
Who among the sons of the gods is like unto Jahve?*

*89: 8 A God terrible in the great council of the holy ones,  
And fearful above all those who are round about Him.*

*89: 9 Jahve, God of hosts, who is as Thou?!*  
*A mighty One, Jāh, and Thy faithfulness is round about Thee.*

*89:10 Thou art He who restraineth the pride of the sea;*  
*When its waves arise, Thou stillest them.*

*89:11 THOU hast crushed Rahab as one that is slain,*  
*By the arm of Thy might hast Thou scattered Thy foes.*

*89:12 Thine are the heavens, Thine also is the earth;*  
*The earth and that which filleth it hast THOU founded.*

*89:13 North and south, THOU hast created them;*  
*Tabor and Hermon shout for joy at Thy name.*

*89:14 Thine is an arm with heroic strength,*  
*Strong is Thy hand, exalted is Thy right hand.*

*89:15 Righteousness and right is the foundation of Thy throne,*  
*Mercy and truth stand waiting before Thee.*

*89:16 Blessed are the people who know the joyful sound,*  
*Who walk, O Jahve, in the light of Thy countenance!*

*89:17 In Thy name do they rejoice continually,*  
*And through Thy righteousness are they exalted.*

*89:18 For the glory of their mightiness art Thou,*  
*And through Thy favour is our horn exalted.*

*89:19 For to Jahve belongeth our shield,*  
*And to the Holy One of Israel our king.*

*89:20 Once Thou spakest in vision to Thy familiar one, and saidst:*  
*“I have granted help to a mighty one,*  
*I have raised a stripling out of the people.*

*89:21 I have found David My servant,*  
*With My holy oil have I anointed him;*

*89:22 With whom My hand shall be stedfast,*  
*My arm also shall strengthen him.*

*89:23 An enemy shall not ensnare him,*  
*And the son of wantonness shall not oppress him.*

*89:24 I will break in pieces his oppressors before him,*  
*And I will smite those who hate him.*

*89:25 And My faithfulness and My mercy are with him,*  
*And in My Name shall his horn be exalted.*

*89:26 I will set his hand upon the sea,  
And his right hand upon the rivers.*

*89:27 He shall cry unto Me: My Father art Thou,  
My God, and the Rock of my salvation!*

*89:28 In return I will make him My first-born,  
The highest with respect to the kings of the earth.*

*89:29 For ever will I preserve to him My mercy,  
And My covenant shall be inviolable with him.*

*89:30 I will make his seed to endure for ever,  
And his throne like the days of heaven.*

*89:31 If his children shall forsake My law  
And walk not in My judgments;*

*89:32 If they profane My statutes  
And keep not My commandments:*

*89:33 Then will I visit their transgression with the rod,  
And their iniquity with stripes;*

*89:34 Nevertheless My loving-kindness will I not break off from him,  
And will not belie My faithfulness —*

*89:35 I will not profane My covenant  
Nor alter the vow of My lips.*

*89:36 One thing have I sworn by My holiness;  
Verily I will not deceive David:*

*89:37 His seed shall endure to eternity,  
And his throne as the sun before Me.*

*89:38 As the moon shall it continue for ever —  
And the witness in the sky is faithful!" (Sela)*

*89:39 And Thou Thyself hast rejected and despised,  
Thou hast been wroth with Thine anointed;*

*89:40 Thou hast shaken off from Thee the covenant of Thy servant,  
Thou hast profaned his diadem to the earth.*

*89:41 Thou hast broken down all his hedges,  
Thou hast laid his strongholds in ruins.*

*89:42 All who pass by the way spoil him,  
He is become a reproach to his neighbours.*

*89:43 Thou hast exalted the right hand of his oppressors,  
Thou hast made all his enemies to rejoice.*

*89:44 Thou didst also turn back the edge of his sword,  
And didst not hold him erect in the battle.*

*89:45 Thou hast caused him to lose his splendour,  
And hast cast his throne down to the ground.*

*89:46 Thou hast shortened the days of his youth,  
Thou hast covered him round with shame. (Sela)*

*89:47 How long, Jahve, wilt Thou hide Thyself for ever,  
Shall Thy wrath burn like fire?*

*89:48 Remember: I — how utterly perishable!  
For what vanity hast Thou created all the children of men!*

*89:49 Who is the man that should live and not see death,  
That should be able to secure his soul against the nether world? (Sela)*

*89:50 Where are Thy former loving-kindnesses, Lord,  
Which Thou hast sworn to David in Thy faithfulness?*

*89:51 Remember, Lord, the reproach of Thy servants,  
That I carry in my bosom the reproach of many peoples,*

*89:52 Which reproach — Thine enemies, Jahve! —  
Which reproach the footsteps of Thine anointed.*

*89:53 BLESSED BE JAHVE FOR EVERMORE!  
AMEN, AND AMEN.*

*Psalm 89.* After having recognised the fact that the double inscription of Psalm 88 places two irreconcilable statements concerning the origin of that Psalm side by side, we renounce the artifices by which Ethan (אֶתָן<sup>f310</sup>) the Ezrahite, of the tribe of Judah (1Ki. 5:11 [4:31], 1Ch. 2: 6), is made to be one and the same person with Ethan (Jeduthun) the son of Kushaiah the Merarite, of the tribe of Levi (1Ch. 15:17; 6:29-32 [44-47]), the master of the music together with Asaph and Heman, and the chief of the six classes of musicians over whom his six sons were placed as sub-directors (1 Chronicles 25).

The collector has placed the Psalms of the two Ezrahites together. Without this relationship of the authors the juxtaposition would also be justified by the reciprocal relation in which the two Psalms stand to one another by their common, striking coincidences with the Book of Job. As to the rest, however, Psalm 88 is a purely individual, and Psalm 89 a thoroughly nationally Psalm. Both the poetical character and the situation of the two Psalms are distinct.

The circumstances in which the writer of Psalm 89 finds himself are in most striking contradiction to the promises given to the house of David. He revels in the contents of these promises, and in the majesty and faithfulness of God, and

then he pours forth his intense feeling of the great distance between these and the present circumstances in complaints over the afflicted lot of the anointed of God, and prays God to be mindful of His promises, and on the other hand, of the reproach by which at this time His anointed and His people are overwhelmed. The anointed one is not the nation itself (Hitzig), but he who at that time wears the crown. The crown of the king is defiled to the ground; his throne is cast down to the earth; he is become grey-headed before his time, for all the fences of his land are broken through, his fortresses fallen, and his enemies have driven him out of the field, so that reproach and scorn follow him at every step.

There was no occasion for such complaints in the reign of Solomon; but surely in the time of Rehoboam, into the first decade of whose reign Ethan the Ezrahite may have survived king Solomon, who died at the age of sixty. In the fifth year of Rehoboam, Shishak (שִׁשַׁק = Σέσωγξς = *Shishonk I*), the first Pharaoh of the twenty-second (Bubastic) dynasty, marched against Jerusalem with a large army gathered together out of many nations, conquered the fortified cities of Judah, and spoiled the Temple and Palace, even carrying away with him the golden shields of Solomon — a circumstance which the history bewails in a very especial manner. At that time Shemaiah preached repentance, in the time of the greatest calamity of war; king and princes humbled themselves; and in the midst of judgment Jerusalem accordingly experienced the gracious forbearance of God, and was spared. God did not complete his destruction, and there also again went forth דְּבָרִים טוֹבִים, i.e., (cf. Jos. 23:14, Zec. 1:13) kindly comforting words from God, in Judah. Such is the narrative in the Book of Kings (1Ki. 14:25-28) and as supplemented by the chronicler (2Ch. 12: 1-12).

During this very period Psalm 89 took its rise. The young Davidic king, whom loss and disgrace make prematurely old, is Rehoboam, that man of Jewish appearance whom Pharaoh Sheshonk is bringing among other captives before the god Amun in the monumental picture of Karnak, and who bears before him in his embattled ring the words *Judhmelek* (King of Judah) — one of the finest and most reliable discoveries of Champollion, and one of the greatest triumphs of his system of hieroglyphics. <sup>f311</sup>

Psalm 89 stands in kindred relationship not only to Psalm 74, but besides Psalm 79, also to Psalm 77, 78, all of which glance back to the earliest times in the history of Israel. They are all Asaphic Psalms, partly old Asaphic (77, 78), partly later ones (74, 79). From this fact we see that the Psalms of Asaph were the favourite models in that school of the four wise men to which the two Ezrahites belong.

*Psa. 89: 2-5.* The poet, who, as one soon observes, is a חכם (for the very beginning of the Psalm is remarkable and ingenious), begins with the confession of the inviolability of the mercies promised to the house of David, i.e., of the חסדֵי דוד הנאמנים, Isa. 55: 3. <sup>f312</sup>

God's faithful love towards the house of David, a love faithful to His promises, will he sing without ceasing, and make it known with his mouth, i.e., audibly and publicly (cf. Job. 19:16), to the distant posterity. Instead of חסדֵי, we find here, and also in Lam. 3:22, חסֵדֵי with a not merely slightly closed syllable. The *Lamed* of לדרֵדֵר is, according to Psa. 103: 7; 145:12, the datival *Lamed*. With בִּי־אִמְרָתִי (LXX, Jerome, contrary to v. 3b, ὅτι εἶπας) the poet bases his resolve upon his conviction. נִבְנָה means not so much to be upheld in building, as to be in the course of continuous building (e.g., Job. 22:23, Mal. 3:15, of an increasingly prosperous condition). Loving-kindness is for ever (accusative of duration) in the course of continuous building, viz., upon the unshakeable foundation of the promise of grace, inasmuch as it is fulfilled in accordance therewith. It is a building with a most solid foundation, which will not only not fall into ruins, but, adding one stone of fulfilment upon another, will rise ever higher and higher. שְׁמִים then stands first as *casus absol.*, and בָּהֶם is, as in Psa. 19: 5, a pronoun having a backward reference to it. In the heavens, which are exalted above the rise and fall of things here below, God establishes His faithfulness, so that it stands fast as the sun above the earth, although the condition of things here below seems sometimes to contradict it (cf. Psa. 119:89). Now follow in vv. 4, 5 the direct words of God, the sum of the promises given to David and to his seed in 2 Samuel 7, at which the poet arrives more naturally in vv. 20 ff. Here they are strikingly devoid of connection. It is the special substance of the promises that is associated in thought with the "loving-kindness" and "truth" of v. 3, which is expanded as it were appositionally therein. Hence also אֲכִין and תִּכֶן, וּבְנִיתִי and בְּנָה correspond to one another. David's seed, by virtue of divine faithfulness, has an eternally sure existence; Jahve builds up David's throne "into generation and generation," inasmuch as He causes it to rise ever fresh and vigorous, never as that which is growing old and feeble.

*Psa. 89: 6-9.* At the close of the promises in vv. 4, 5 the music is to become *forte*. And יוֹדוּ attaches itself to this jubilant *Sela*. In vv. 6-19 there follows a hymnic description of the exalted majesty of God, more especially of His omnipotence and faithfulness, because the value of the promise is measured by the character of the person who promises. The God of the promise is He who is praised by the heavens and the holy ones above. His way of acting is פְּלֵא, of a transcendent, paradoxical, wondrous order, and as such the heavens praise it; it

is praised (יָדוּר), according to Ges. § 137, 3) in the assembly of the holy ones, i.e., of the spirits in the other world, the angels (as in Job. 5: 1; 15:15, cf. Deu. 33: 2), for He is peerlessly exalted above the heavens and the angels. שֶׁחֶק, poetic singular instead of שְׁחֻקִים (vid., *supra* on Psa. 77:18), which is in itself already poetical; and עָרַךְ, not, as e.g., in Isa. 40:18, in the signification to co-ordinate, but in the medial sense: to rank with, be equal to. Concerning בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, vid., on Psa. 29: 1. In the great council (concerning סוּד, of both genders, perhaps like כּוֹס, vid., on Psa. 25:14) of the holy ones also, Jahve is terrible; He towers above all who are about Him (1Ki. 22:19, cf. Dan. 7:10) in terrible majesty. רָבָה might, according to Psa. 62: 3; 78:15, be an adverb, but according to the order of the words it may more appropriately be regarded as an adjective; cf. Job. 31:34, כִּי אֶעֱרַךְ הַמּוֹן רָבָה, “when I feared the great multitude.” In v. 9 He is apostrophized with אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת as being the One exalted above the heavens and the angels. The question “Who is as Thou?” takes its origin from Exo. 15:11. חֲסִין is not the construct form, but the principal form, like עוֹלִל, יָדִיד, גְּבִיר, and is a Syriasm; for the verbal stem Syr. *hṣan* is native to the Aramaic, in which Syr. *haṣīnā* = שִׁדִּי. In יָהּ, what God is is reduced to the briefest possible expression (vid., Psa. 68:19). In the words, “Thy faithfulness compasseth Thee round about,” the primary thought of the poet again breaks through. Such a God it is who has the faithfulness with which He fulfils all His promises, and the promises given to the house of David also, as His constant surrounding. His glory would only strike one with terror; but the faithfulness which encompasses Him softens the sunlike brilliancy of His glory, and awakens trust in so majestic a Ruler.

*Psa. 89:10-15.* At the time of the poet the nation of the house of David was threatened with assault from violent foes; and this fact gives occasion for this picture of God’s power in the kingdom of nature. He who rules the raging of the sea, also rules the raging of the sea of the peoples, Psa. 65: 8. גָּאֹהַת, a proud rising, here of the sea, like גָּאֹהַת in Psa. 46: 4. Instead of בְּשׂוֹא, Hitzig pleasantly enough reads בְּשׂוֹא = בְּשִׂאוּ from שָׂאָה; but שׂוֹא is also possible so far as language is concerned, either as an infinitive = נִשְׂוֹא, 28: 2, Isa. 1:14 (instead of שִׂאָת), or as an infinitival noun, like שִׂיא, loftiness, Job. 20: 6, with a likewise rejected *Nun*. The formation of the clause favours our taking it as a verb: when its waves rise, Thou stillest them. From the natural sea the poet comes to the sea of the peoples; and in the doings of God at the Red Sea a miraculous subjugation of both seas took place at one and the same time. It is clear from Psa. 74:13-17, Isa. 51: 9, that Egypt is to be understood by *Rahab* in this passage as in Psa. 87: 4. The word signifies first of all impetuosity, violence, then a monster, like “the wild beast of the reed,” Psa. 68:31, i.e., the

leviathan or the dragon. **דַּבְּאָתָּה** is conjugated after the manner of the *Lamed He* verbs, as in Psa. 44:20. **בְּחָלָל** is to be understood as describing the event or issue (vid., 18:43): so that in its fall the proudly defiant kingdom is like one fatally smitten. Thereupon in vv. 12-15 again follows in the same coordination first the praise of God drawn from nature, then from history. Jahve's are the heavens and the earth. He is the Creator, and for that very reason the absolute owner, of both. The north and the right hand, i.e., the south, represent the earth in its entire compass from one region of the heavens to the other. Tabor on this side of the Jordan represents the west (cf. Hos. 5: 1), and Hermon opposite the east of the Holy Land. Both exult by reason of the name of God; by their fresh, cheerful look they give the impression of joy at the glorious revelation of the divine creative might manifest in themselves. In v. 14 the praise again enters upon the province of history. "An arm with (**עַם**) heroic strength," says the poet, inasmuch as he distinguishes between the attribute inherent in God and the medium of its manifestation in history. His throne has as its **מְכוּן**, i.e., its immovable foundation (Pro. 16:12; 25: 5), righteousness of action and right, by which all action is regulated, and which is unceasingly realized by means of the action. And mercy and truth wait upon Him. **קָדַם פָּנָיו** is not; to go before any one (**הִלֵּךְ לְפָנָיו**), Psa. 85:14), but anticipatively to present one's self to any one, Psa. 88:14; 95: 2, Mic. 6: 6. Mercy and truth, these two genii of sacred history (Psa. 43: 3), stand before His face like waiting servants watching upon His nod.

**Psa. 89:16-19.** The poet has now described what kind of God He is upon whose promise the royal house in Israel depends. Blessed, then, is the people that walks in the light of His countenance. **הִלֵּךְ** of a self-assured, stately walk. The words **יְדַעֵי תְרוּעָה** are the statement of the ground of the blessing interwoven into the blessing itself: such a people has abundant cause and matter for exultation (cf. Psa. 84: 5). **תְרוּעָה** is the festive sound of joy of the mouth (Num. 23:21), and of trumpets or sackbuts (Psa. 27: 6). This confirmation of the blessing is expanded in vv. 17-19. Jahve's **שֵׁם**, i.e., revelation or manifestation, becomes to them a ground and object of unceasing joy; by His **צַדִּיקָה**, i.e., the rigour with which He binds Himself to the relationship He has entered upon with His people and maintains it, they are exalted above abjectness and insecurity. He is **תְּפִאֶרֶת עֲזָמוֹ**, the ornament of their strength, i.e., their strength which really becomes an ornament to them. In v. 18<sup>b</sup> the poet declares Israel to be this happy people. Pinsker's conjecture, **קָרְנָם** (following the Targum), destroys the transition to v. 19, which is formed by v. 18<sup>b</sup>. The plural reading of Kimchi and of older editions (e.g., Bomberg's), **קָרְנֵינוּ**, is incompatible with the figure; but it is immaterial



whether we read תְּרִים with the *Chethib* (Targum, Jerome), or with the *Keri* (LXX, Syriac) תְּרִים. <sup>13</sup> מְגִנְנִי and מְלִכְנִי in v. 19 are parallel designations of the human king of Israel; מְגִן as in Psa. 47:10, but not in Psa. 84:10. For we are not compelled, with a total disregard of the limits to the possibilities of style (Ew. § 310, *a*), to render v. 19*b*: and the Holy One of Israel, (as to Him, He) is our King (Hitzig), since we do not bring down the Psalm beyond the time of the kings. Israel's shield, Israel's king, the poet says in the holy defiant confidence of faith, is Jahve's, belongs to the Holy One of Israel, i.e., he stands as His own possession under the protection of Jahve, the Holy One, who has taken Israel to Himself for a possession; it is therefore impossible that the Davidic throne should become a prey to any worldly power.

*Psa. 89:20-23.* Having thus again come to refer to the king of Israel, the poet now still further unfolds the promise given to the house of David. The present circumstances are a contradiction to it. The prayer to Jahve, for which the way is thus prepared, is for the removal of this contradiction. A long line, extending beyond the measure of the preceding lines, introduces the promises given to David. With אִזָּה the respective period of the past is distinctly defined. The intimate friend of Jahve (חֲסִיד) is Nathan (1Ch. 17:15) or David, according as we translate בְּחִזּוֹן “in a vision” or “by means of a vision.” But side by side with the לחֲסִידֶיךָ we also find the preferable reading לחֲסִידֶיךָ, which is followed in the renderings of the LXX, Syriac, Vulgate, Targum, Aquila, Symmachus, and the Quarta, and is adopted by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, and others, and taken up by Heidenheim and Baer. The plural refers to Samuel and Nathan, for the statement brings together what was revealed to these two prophets concerning David. עֵזֶר is assistance as a gift, and that, as the designation of the person succoured by it (שָׁנָה אֵל) as in Psa. 21: 6) with גְּבוּרָה shows, aid in battle. בְּחֹרֶר (from בָּחַר = בָּגַר in the Mishna: to ripen, to be manly or of marriageable age, distinct from בָּחִיר in v. 4) is a young man, *adolescens*: while yet a young man David was raised out of his humble lowly condition (Psa. 78:71) high above the people. When he received the promise (2 Samuel 7) he had been anointed and had attained to the lordship over all Israel. Hence the preterites in vv. 20, 21, which are followed by promissory futures from v. 22 onwards. תִּבְּוֶן is *fut. Niph.*, to be established, to prove one's self to be firm, unchangeable (Psa. 78:37), a stronger expression than תִּקְוֶה, 1Sa. 18:12, 14, 2Sa. 3:10. The *Hiph.* הִשִּׂיא, derived from נָשָׂא = נָשָׂא, to credit (vid., on Isa. 24: 2; Gesenius, Hengstenberg), does not give any suitable sense; it therefore signifies here as elsewhere, “to impose upon, surprise,” with בָּ, as in Psa. 55:16 with אֵל. V. 23*b* is the echo of 2Sa. 7:10.

*Psa. 89:24-30.* What is promised in v. 26 is a world-wide dominion, not merely dominion within the compass promised in the primeval times (Gen. 15:18, 2Ch. 9:26), in which case it ought to have been said **וּבְנֵהָר** (of the Euphrates). Nor does the promise, however, sound so definite and boundless here as in Psa. 72: 8, but it is indefinite and universal, without any need for our asking what rivers are intended by **בְּנְהָרוֹת**, like **שְׁלַח** (in Isa. 11:14, of a giving and taking possession. With **אָרְפָּאֲנִי** (with retreated tone, as in Psa. 119:63, 125) God tells with what He will answer David's filial love. Him who is the latest-born among the sons of Jesse, God makes the first-born (**בְּכוֹר** from **בָּכַר**, to be early, *opp.* **לָקַשׁ**, to be late, *vid.*, Job, 2:21), and therefore the most favoured of the "sons of the Most High," Psa. 82: 6. And as, according to Deu. 28: 1, Israel is to be high (**עֲלִיוֹן**) above all nations of the earth, so David, Israel's king, in whom Israel's national glory realizes itself, is made as the high one (**עֲלִיוֹן**) with respect to the kings, i.e., above the kings, of the earth. In the person of David his seed is included; and it is that position of honour which, after having been only prelusively realized in David and Solomon, must go on being fulfilled in his seed exactly as the promise runs. The covenant with David is, according to v. 29, one that shall stand for ever. David is therefore, as v. 30 affirms, eternal in his seed; God will make David's seed and throne **לְאָדָם**, into eternal, i.e., into such as will abide for ever, like the days of heaven, everlasting. This description of eternal duration is, as also in Sir. 45:15, Bar. 1:11, Taken from Deu. 11:21; the whole of v. 30 is a poetic reproduction of 2Sa. 7:16.

*Psa. 89:31-38.* Now follows the paraphrase of 2Sa. 7:14, that the faithlessness of David's line in relation to the covenant shall not interfere with (annul) the faithfulness of God — a thought with which one might very naturally console one's self in the reign of Rehoboam. Because God has placed the house of David in a filial relationship to Himself, He will chastise the apostate members as a father chastises his son; cf. Pro. 23:13 f. In 1Ch. 17:13 the chronicler omits the words of 2Sa. 7:14 which there provide against perverted action (**הַעֲוֹרָה**) on the part of the seed of David; our Psalm proves their originality. But even if, as history shows, this means of chastisement should be ineffectual in the case of individuals, the house of David as such will nevertheless remain ever in a state of favour with Him. In v. 34 **מֵעַמּוֹ** **וְחִסְדֵי לֹא־אֶפֶר** corresponds to **וְחִסְדֵי לֹא־יִסּוּר מִמֶּנּוּ** in 2Sa. 7:15 (LXX, Targum): the *fut. Hiph.* of **פָּרַר** is otherwise always **אֶפֶר**; the conjecture **אִסִּיר** is therefore natural, yet even the LXX translators (**ὄσ ἡ μὴ διασκαεδάσω**) had **אֶפֶר** before them. **בְּ שִׁקְרָב** as in Psa. 44:18. The covenant with David is sacred with God: He will not profane it (**חָלַל**, to loose the bonds of sanctity).

He will fulfil what has gone forth from His lips, i.e., His vow, according to Deu. 23:24 [23], cf. Num. 30: 3 [2]. One thing hath He sworn to David; not: once = once for all (LXX), for what is introduced by v. 36 (cf. Psa. 27: 4) and follows in vv. 37, 38, is in reality one thing (as in Psa. 62:12, two). He hath sworn it *per sanctitatem suam*. Thus, and not *in sanctuario meo*, בְּקִרְשֵׁי in this passage and Amo. 4: 2 (cf. on Psa. 60: 8) is to be rendered, for elsewhere the expression is בִּי, Gen. 22:16, Isa. 45:23, or בְּנִפְשׁוֹ, Amo. 6: 8, Jer. 51:14, or בְּשִׁמְי, Jer. 44:26, or בְּיַמֵּינוּ, Isa. 62: 8. It is true we do not read any set form of oath in 2Sa. 7, 1 Chronicles 17, but just as Isaiah, Isa. 54: 9, takes the divine promise in Gen. 8:21 as an oath, so the promise so earnestly and most solemnly pledged to David may be accounted by Psalm-poesy (here and in Psa. 132:11), which reproduces the historical matter of fact, as a promise attested with an oath. With אֵן in v. 36b God asserts that He will not disappoint David in reference to this one thing, viz., the perpetuity of his throne. This shall stand for ever as the sun and moon; for these, though they may one day undergo a change (Psa. 102:27), shall nevertheless never be destroyed. In the presence of 2Sa. 7:16 it looks as if v. 38b ought to be rendered: and as the witness in the clouds shall it (David's throne) be faithful (perpetual). By the witness in the clouds one would then have to understand the rainbow as the celestial memorial and sign of an everlasting covenant. Thus Luther, Geier, Schmid, and others. But neither this rendering, nor the more natural one, "and as the perpetual, faithful witness in the clouds," is admissible in connection with the absence of the בְּ of comparison.

Accordingly Hengstenberg, following the example of Jewish expositors, renders: "and the witness in the clouds is perpetual," viz., the moon, so that the continuance of the Davidic line would be associated with the moon, just as the continuance of the condemned earth is with the rainbow. But in what sense would the moon have the name, without example elsewhere, of witness? Just as the Book of Job was the key to the conclusion of Psalm 88, so it is the key to this ambiguous verse of the Psalm before us. It has to be explained according to Job. 16:19, where Job says: "*Behold in heaven is my witness, and my surety in the heights.*" Jahve, the אֵל נֶאֱמָן (Deu. 7: 9), seals His sworn promise with the words, "and the witness in the sky (ethereal heights) is faithful" (cf. concerning this *Waw* in connection with asseverations, Ew. § 340, c). Hengstenberg's objection, that Jahve cannot be called His own witness, is disposed of by the fact that עֵד frequently signifies the person who testifies anything concerning himself; in this sense, in fact, the whole *Tôra* is called אֵת עֵדוּת (the testimony of Jahve).

*Psa. 89:39-46.* Now after the poet has turned his thoughts towards the beginnings of the house of David which were so rich in promise, in order that

he might find comfort under the sorrowful present, the contrast of the two periods is become all the more sensible to him. With **וְאַתָּה** in v. 39 (And Thou — the same who hast promised and affirmed this with an oath) his Psalm takes a new turn, for which reason it might even have been **וְנָח וְאַתָּה**. **וְנָח** is used just as absolutely here as in Psa. 44:24; 74: 1; 77: 8, so that it does not require any object to be supplied out of v. 39b. **וְאַתָּה** in v. 40 the LXX renders **κατέστρεψας**; it is better rendered in Lam. 2: 7 **ἀπετίναξε**; for **וְנָח** is synonymous with **נָעַר**, to shake off, push away, cf. Arabic *el-menâ'ir*, the thrusters (with the lance). **וְאַתָּה** is a vocational name of the king as such. His crown is sacred as being the insignia of a God-bestowed office. God has therefore made the sacred thing vile by casting it to the ground (**חָלַל לְאָרֶץ**, as in Psa. 74:17, to cast profaningly to the ground). The primary passage to vv. 41, 42, is Psa. 80:13. “His hedges” are all the boundary and protecting fences which the land of the king has; and **מִבְצָרוֹ** “the fortresses” of his land (in both instances without **כָּל**, because matters have not yet come to such a pass).

314

In **וְשָׂהוּ** the notions of the king and of the land blend together. **עֲבָרֵי־דָרֶךְ** are the hordes of the peoples passing through the land. **שְׂכֵנָיו** are the neighbouring peoples that are otherwise liable to pay tribute to the house of David, who sought to take every possible advantage of that weakening of the Davidic kingdom. In v. 44 we are neither to translate “rock of his sword” (Hengstenberg), nor “O rock” (Olshausen). **צוּר** does not merely signify *rupes*, but also from another root (**צוּר**, Arab. *ṣâr*, originally of the grating or shrill noise produced by pressing and squeezing, then more particularly to cut or cut off with pressure, with a sharply set knife or the like) a knife or a blade (cf. English knife, and German *kneifen*, to nip): God has decreed it that the edge or blade of the sword of the king has been turned back by the enemy, that he has not been able to maintain his ground in battle (**הִקְמַתוֹ** with *ē* instead of *î*, as also when the tone is not moved forward, Mic. 5: 4). In v. 45 the *Mem* of **מִטְהָרוֹ**, after the analogy of Eze. 16:41; 34:10, and other passages, is a preposition: *cessare fecisti eum a splendore suo*. A noun **מִטְהָרָה** = **מִטְהָרָה** with *Dag. dirimens*,<sup>315</sup> like **מִקְדָּשׁ** Exo. 15:17, **מִנְּרָה** Nah. 3:17 (*Abulwalid*, Aben-Ezra, Parchon, Kimchi, and others), in itself improbable in the signification required here, is not found either in post-biblical or in biblical Hebrew. **טְהָרָה**, like **צְהָרָה**, signifies first of all not purity, but brilliancy. Still the form **טְהָרָה** does not lie at the basis of it in this instance; for the reading found here just happens not to be **טְהָרוֹ**, but **מִטְהָרוֹ**; and the reading adopted by Norzi, Heidenheim, and Baer, as also by Nissel and others, so far as form is

concerned is not distinct from it, viz., **מִטְהָרוֹ** (*mittōharō*), the character of the *Shebâ* being determined by the analogy of the *â* following (cf. **בִּסְעָרָה**, 2Ki. 2: 1), which presupposes the principal form **טְהָרַ** (Böttcher, § 386, cf. *supra*, 2:31, note). The personal tenor of v. 46*a* requires that it should be referred to the then reigning Davidic king, but not as dying before his time (Olshausen), but as becoming prematurely old by reason of the sorrowful experiences of his reign. The larger half of the kingdom has been wrested from him; Egypt and the neighbouring nations also threaten the half that remains to him; and instead of the kingly robe, shame completely covers him.

**Psa. 89:47-52.** After this statement of the present condition of things the psalmist begins to pray for the removal of all that is thus contradictory to the promise. The plaintive question, v. 47, with the exception of one word, is *verbatim* the same as Psa. 79: 5. The wrath to which *quousque* refers, makes itself to be felt, as the intensifying (vid., Psa. 13: 2) **לְנֹצָה** implies, in the intensity and duration of everlasting wrath. **חֵלֶד** is this temporal life which glides past secretly and unnoticed (Psa. 17:14); and **זָכַר-אֲנִי** is not equivalent to **זָכַרְנִי** (instead of which by way of emphasis only **זָכַרְנִי אֲנִי** can be said), but **אֲנִי מֵהֶ-חֵלֶד** stands for **אֲנִי מֵהֶ-חֵלֶד** — according to the sense equivalent to **אֲנִי מֵהֶ-חֵדַל**, Psa. 39: 5, cf. 6. The conjecture of Houbigant and modern expositors, **זָכַר אֲדָנִי** (cf. v. 51), is not needed, since the inverted position of the words is just the same as in Psa. 39: 5. In v. 48*b* it is not pointed **אֵל-מָה שָׂוֵא**, “wherefore (Job. 10: 2; 13:14) hast Thou in vain (Psa. 127: 1) created?” (Hengstenberg), but **אֵל-מָה-שָׂוֵא**, on account of or for what a nothing (**מָה-שָׂוֵא** belonging together as adjective and substantive, as in Psa. 30:10, Job. 26:14) hast Thou created all the children of men? (De Wette, Hupfeld, and Hitzig). **אֵל**, of the ground of a matter and direct motive, which is better suited to the question in v. 49 than the other way of taking it: the life of all men passes on into death and Hades; why then might not God, within this brief space of time, this handbreadth, manifest Himself to His creatures as the merciful and kind, and not as the always angry God? The music strikes in here, and how can it do so otherwise than in elegiac *mesto*? If God’s justice tarries and fails in this present world, then the Old Testament faith becomes sorely tempted and tried, because it is not able to find consolation in the life beyond. Thus it is with the faith of the poet in the present juncture of affairs, the outward appearance of which is in such perplexing contradiction to the loving-kindness sworn to David and also hitherto vouchsafed. **חֲסִדִים** has not the sense in this passage of the promises of favour, as in 2Ch. 6:42, but proofs of favour; **חֲרָאֲשָׁנִים** glances back at the long period of the reigns of David and of Solomon. <sup>f316</sup>

The Asaph Psalm 77 and the Tephilla Isaiah 63 contain similar complaints, just as in connection with v. 51a one is reminded of the Asaph Psa. 79: 2, 10, and in connection with v. 52 of Psa. 79:12. The phrase **נָשָׂא בְּחִיקוֹ** is used in other instances of loving nurture, Num. 11:12, Isa. 40:11. In this passage it must have a sense akin to **חֲרַפְתָּ עֲבָדֶיךָ**. It is impossible on syntactic grounds to regard **כָּל-רַבִּים אַמִּים** as still dependent upon **חֲרַפְתָּ** (Ewald) or, as Hupfeld is fond of calling it, as a “post-limiliar” genitive. Can it be that the **כָּל** is perhaps a mutilation of **כָּל־מַת**, after Eze. 36:15, as Böttcher suggests? We do not need this conjecture. For

(1) to carry any one in one’s bosom, if he is an enemy, may signify: to be obliged to cherish him with the vexation proceeding from him (Jer. 15:15), without being able to get rid of him;

(2) there is no doubt that **רַבִּים** can, after the manner of numerals, be placed before the substantive to which it belongs, Psa. 32:10, Pro. 31:29, 1Ch. 28: 5, Neh. 9:28; cf. the other position, e.g., Jer. 16:16;

(3) consequently **כָּל-רַבִּים אַמִּים** may signify the “totality of many peoples” just as well as **כָּל גּוֹיִם רַבִּים** in Eze. 31: 6. The poet complains as a member of the nation, as a citizen of the empire, that he is obliged to foster many nations in his bosom, inasmuch as the land of Israel was overwhelmed by the Egyptians and their allies, the Libyans, Troglodytes, and Ethiopians. The **אֲשֶׁר** which follows in v. 52 cannot now be referred back over v. 51b to **חֲרַפְתָּ** (*quâ calumniâ*), and yet the relative sense, not the confirmatory (because, *quoniam*), is at issue. We therefore refer it to **עַמִּים**, and take **אוֹיְבֶיךָ** as an apposition, as in 139:20: who reproach Thee, (as) Thine enemies, Jahve, who reproach the footsteps (**עֲקֵבוֹת**) as in 77:20 with *Dag. dirimens*, which gives it an emotional turn) of Thine anointed, i.e., they follow him everywhere, wheresoever he may go, and whatsoever he may do. With these significant words, **עֲקֵבוֹת מְשִׁיחְךָ**, the Third Book of the Psalms dies away.

*Psa. 89:53.* The closing doxology of the Third Book.

# Fourth Book of the Psalter

## PSALMS 90-106

### Psalm 90

#### TAKING REFUGE IN THE LOVING-KINDNESS OF THE ETERNAL ONE UNDER THE WRATHFUL JUDGMENT OF DEATH

*90: 1 O LORD, THOU hast been a place of refuge for us in all generations!*

*90: 2 Before the mountains were brought forth,  
And Thou gavest birth to the earth and the world,  
And from on to on Thou art God!*

*90: 3 Thou turnest mortal man to dust,  
And sayest: Return, ye children of men.*

*90: 4 For a thousand years in Thine eyes  
Are as yesterday when it passeth,  
And a watch in the night.*

*90: 5 Thou carriest them away as with a flood, they become a sleep,  
In the morning they are as grass springing up again.*

*90: 6 In the morning it flourisheth and springeth up again,  
In the evening it is cut down and it drieth up.*

*90: 7 For we are consumed by Thine anger,  
And by Thy fierce anger are we scared away.*

*90: 8 Thou hast set our iniquities before Thee,  
Our most secret matter in the light of Thy countenance.*

*90: 9 For all our days are passed away in Thy wrath;  
We have spent our years as a whisper.*

*90:10 The days of our years — their sum is seventy years,  
And, if very many, eighty years;  
And their pride is labour and vanity,  
For it passed swiftly and we fled away.*

*90:11 Who knoweth the power of Thine anger  
And the fear of Thee according to Thy wrath?*

*90:12 Teach us rightly to number our days,  
That we may gain a wise heart!*

*90:13 Turn, Jahve — how long?! —  
And have compassion upon Thy servants.*

*90:14 Satisfy us at morning-dawn with Thy mercy,  
Then will we joy and rejoice all our days.*

*90:15 Make us glad according to the days in which Thou hast humbled us,  
The years wherein we have seen evil.*

*90:16 Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants,  
And Thy glory upon their children.*

*90:17 And let the graciousness of the Lord our God be upon us,  
And the work of our hands do Thou establish upon us,  
Yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it!*

*Psalm 90.* The Fourth Book of the Psalms, corresponding to the **במדבר ספר** of the Pentateuch, begins with a *Prayer of Moses the man of God*, which comes out of the midst of the dying off of the older generation during the march through the wilderness. To the name, which could not be allowed to remain so bald, because next to Abraham he is the greatest man known to the Old Testament history of redemption, is added the title of honour **הַאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר** (as in Deu. 33: 1, Jos. 14: 6), an ancient name of the prophets which expresses the close relationship of fellowship with God, just as “servant of Jahve” expresses the relationship of service, in accordance with the special office and in relation to the history of redemption, into which Jahve has taken the man and into which he himself has entered. There is scarcely any written memorial of antiquity which so brilliantly justifies the testimony of tradition concerning its origin as does this Psalm, which may have been preserved in some one or other of the older works, perhaps the “Book of Jashar” (Jos. 10:13, 2Sa. 1:18), until the time of the final redaction of the Psalter. Not alone with respect to its contents, but also with reference to the form of its language, it is perfectly suitable to Moses. Even Hitzig can bring nothing of importance against this view, for the objection that the author in v. 1 glances back upon past generations, whilst Israel was only born in the time of Moses, is removed by the consideration that the existence of Israel reaches back into the patriarchal times; and there is as little truth in the assertion that the *Piel* **שָׁבַענו** in v. 14 instead of the *Hiphil* brings the Psalm down into very late times, as in the idea that the *Hiphil* **וְהִשְׁבַּחְתָּ** in Psa. 143:12 instead of the *Piel* carries this Psalm 143 back into very early times. These trifling points dwindle down to nothing in comparison with the fact that Psalm 90 bears within itself distinct traces of the same origin as the song **הֲאֵיננו** (Deu. 32), the blessing of Moses (Deu. 33), the discourses in Deuteronomy, and in general the directly Mosaic portions of the Pentateuch. The Book of the Covenant, together with the Decalogue (Exo. 19-24) and Deuteronomy (with the exception of its supplement), are regarded by us, on very good grounds, as the largest



originally Mosaic constituent parts of the Pentateuch. The Book of Deuteronomy is תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה in a pre-eminent sense.

*Psa. 90: 1-4.* The poet begins with the confession that the Lord has proved Himself to His own, in all periods of human history, as that which He was before the world was and will be for evermore. God is designedly appealed to by the name אֲדֹנָי, which frequently occurs in the mouth of Moses in the middle books of the Pentateuch, and also in the Song at the Sea, Exo. 15:17 and in Deu. 3:24. He is so named here as the Lord ruling over human history with an exaltation ever the same. Human history runs on in דֶּרֶךְ דָּר, so that one period (περίοδος) with the men living contemporaneous with it goes and another comes; the expression is deuteronomic (Deu. 32: 7). Such a course of generations lies behind the poet; and in them all the Lord has been מְעוֹן to His church, out of the heart of which the poet discourses. This expression too is Deuteronomic (Deu. 33:27). מְעוֹן signifies a habitation, dwelling-place (vid., on 26: 8), more especially God's heavenly and earthly dwelling-place, then the dwelling-place which God Himself is to His saints, inasmuch as He takes up to Himself, conceals and protects, those who flee to Him from the wicked one and from evil, and turn in to Him (Psa. 71: 3; 91: 9). In order to express *fuisti* הָיִיתָ was indispensable; but just as *fuisti* comes from *fuo*, φύω, הָיָה (הָיָה) signifies not a closed, shut up being, but a being that discloses itself, consequently it is *fuisti* in the sense of *te exhibuisti*. This historical self-manifestation of god is based upon the fact that He is אֵל, i.e., might absolutely, or the absolutely Mighty One; and He was this, as v. 2 says, even before the beginning of the history of the present world, and will be in the distant ages of the future as of the past. The foundation of this world's history is the creation. The combination אֲרָץ וְתַבַּל shows that this is intended to be taken as the object. וְתַחֲלִל (with *Metheg* beside the *ē* of the final syllable, which is deprived of its accent, vid., on Psa. 18:20) is the language of address (Rashi): that which is created is in a certain sense born from God (יָלַד), and He brings it forth out of Himself; and this is here expressed by חוֹלֵל (as in Deu. 32:18, cf. Isa. 51: 2), creation being compared to travail which takes place amidst pains (*Psychology*, S. 114; tr. p. 137). If, after the example of the LXX and Targum, one reads as passive וְתַחֲלִל (Böttcher, Olshausen, Hitzig) from the *Pulal* חוֹלֵל, Pro. 8:24, — and this commends itself, since the pre-existence of God can be better dated back beyond facts than beyond the acts of God Himself, — then the conception remains essentially the same, since the Eternal and Absolute One is still to be thought of as מְחַלֵּל. The fact that the mountains are mentioned first of all, harmonizes with Deu. 33:15. The *modus consecutivus* is intended to say: before the mountains were brought forth and

Thou wast in labour therewith.... The forming of the mountains consequently coincides with the creation of the earth, which is here as a body or mass called אֶרֶץ, and as a continent with the relief of mountains and lowlands is called תְּבֵל (cf. תְּבֵל אֶרֶץ, Pro. 8:31, Job. 37:12). To the double clause with מָרַם *seq. praet.* (cf. on the other hand *seq. fut.* Deu. 31:21) is appended וּמֵעוֹלָם as a second definition of time: before the creation of the world, and from eternity to eternity. The Lord was God before the world was — that is the first assertion of v. 2; His divine existence reaches out of the unlimited past into the unlimited future — this is the second. אֵל is not vocative, which it sometimes, though rarely, is in the Psalms; it is a predicate, as e.g., in Deu. 3:24.

This is also to be seen from vv. 3, 4, when v. 3 now more definitely affirms the omnipotence of God, and v. 4 the supra-temporality of God or the omnipresence of God in time. The LXX misses the meaning when it brings over אֵל from v. 2, and reads אֵל-תֵּשֵׁב. The shorter future form תֵּשֵׁב for תֵּשִׁיב stands poetically instead of the longer, as e.g., in Psa. 11: 6; 26: 9; cf. the same thing in the *inf. constr.* in Deu. 26:12, and both instances together in Deu. 32: 8. The poet intentionally calls the generation that is dying away אָנוּשׁ, which denotes man from the side of his frailty or perishableness; and the new generation בְּנֵי-אָדָם, with which is combined the idea of entrance upon life. It is clear that הַיּוֹשֵׁב אֶדְ-דְּבָא is intended to be understood according to Gen. 3:19; but it is a question whether דְּבָא is conceived of as an adjective (with mutable *ā*), as in Psa. 34:19, Isa. 57:15: Thou puttest men back into the condition of crushed ones (cf. on the construction Num. 24:24), or whether as a neutral feminine from דָּבָה (= דְּבָה): Thou changest them into that which is crushed = dust, or whether as an abstract substantive like דְּבָה, or according to another reading (cf. Psa. 127: 2) דְּבָא, in Deu. 23: 2: to crushing. This last is the simplest way of taking it, but it comes to one and the same thing with the second, since דְּבָא signifies crushing in the neuter sense. A *fut. consec.* follows. The fact that God causes one generation to die off has as its consequence that He calls another into being (cf. the Arabic epithet of God *el-mu'id* = הַמְּשִׁיב, the Resuscitator). Hofmann and Hitzig take תֵּשֵׁב as imperfect on account of the following וַתֵּאמֶר: Thou didst decree mortality for men; but the *fut. consec.* frequently only expresses the sequence of the thoughts or the connection of the matter, e.g., after a future that refers to that which is constantly taking place, Job. 14:10. God causes men to die without letting them die out; for — so it continues in v. 4 — a thousand years is to Him a very short period, not to be at all taken into account. What now is the connection between that which confirms and that which is confirmed here? It is not so much v. 3 that is confirmed as v. 2, to which the former serves for explanation,

viz., this, that God as the Almighty (אל), in the midst of this change of generations, which is His work, remains Himself eternally the same. This ever the same, absolute existence has its ground herein, that time, although God fills it up with His working, is no limitation to Him. A thousand years, which would make any man who might live through them weary of life, are to Him like a vanishing point. The proposition, as 2Pe. 3: 8 shows, is also true when reversed: “One day is with the Lord as a thousand years.” He is however exalted above all time, inasmuch as the longest period appears to Him very short, and in the shortest period the greatest work can be executed by Him. The standpoint of the first comparison, “as yesterday,” is taken towards the end of the thousand of years. A whole millennium appears to God, when He glances over it, just as the yesterday does to us when (כי) it is passing by (יעבר), and we, standing on the border of the opening day, look back upon the day that is gone. The second comparison is an advance upon the first, and an advance also in form, from the fact that the *Caph similitudinis* is wanting: a thousand years are to God a watch in the night. אשמורה is a night-watch, of which the Israelites reckoned three, viz., the first, the middle, and the morning watch (vid., Winer’s *Realwörterbuch* s. v. *Nachtwache*). It is certainly not without design that the poet says אשמורת הלילה instead of אשמורה בלילה. The night-time is the time for sleep; a watch in the night is one that is slept away, or at any rate passed in a sort of half-sleep. A day that is past, as we stand on the end of it, still produces upon us the impression of a course of time by reason of the events which we can recall; but a night passed in sleep, and now even a fragment of the night, is devoid of all trace to us, and is therefore as it were timeless. Thus is it to God with a thousand years: they do not last long to Him; they do not affect Him; at the close of them, as at the beginning, He is the Absolute One (אל). Time is as nothing to Him, the Eternal One. The changes of time are to Him no barrier restraining the realization of His counsel — a truth which has a terrible and a consolatory side. The poet dwells upon the fear which it produces.

*Psa. 90: 5-8.* Vv. 5, 6 tell us how great is the distance between men and this eternal selfsameness of God. The suffix of זרמתם, referred to the thousand years, produces a synallage (since שנה is feminine), which is to be avoided whenever it is possible to do so; the reference to בני־אדם, as being the principal object pointed to in what has gone before, is the more natural, to say the very least. In connection with both ways of applying it, זרם does not signify: to cause to rattle down like sudden heavy showers of rain; for the figure that God makes years, or that He makes men (Hitzig: the germs of their coming into being), to rain down from above, is fanciful and strange. זרם may also mean to sweep or wash away as with heavy rains, *abripere instar nimbi*,

as the old expositors take it. So too Luther at one time: *Du reyssest sie dahyn* (Thou carriest them away), for which he substituted later: *Du lesserst sie dahin faren wie einen Strom* (Thou causdest them to pass away as a river); but **יָרַם** always signifies rain pouring down from above. As a sudden and heavy shower of rain, becoming a flood, washes everything away, so God's omnipotence sweeps men away. There is now no transition to another alien figure when the poet continues: **שָׁנָה יְהִיּוּ**. What is meant is the sleep of death, Psa. 76: 6, **שָׁנָה עֲלָם**, Jer. 51:39, 57, cf. **יָשָׁן** 13: 4. He whom a flood carries away is actually brought into a state of unconsciousness, he goes entirely to sleep, i.e., he dies.

From this point the poet certainly does pass on to another figure. The one generation is carried away as by a flood in the night season, and in the morning another grows up. Men are the subject of **יַחֲלֶף**, as of **יְהִיּוּ**. The collective singular alternates with the plural, just as in v. 3 the collective **אָנוּשׁ** alternates with **בְּנֵי־אָדָם**. The two members of v. 5 stand in contrast. The poet describes the succession of the generations. One generation perishes as it were in a flood, and another grows up, and this also passes on to the same fate. The meaning in both verses of the **חֲלַף**, which has been for the most part, after the LXX, Vulgate, and Luther, erroneously taken to be *praeterire = interire*, is determined in accordance with this idea. The general signification of this verb, which corresponds to the Arabic *chlf*, is "to follow or move after, to go into the place of another, and in general, of passing over from one place or state into another." Accordingly the *Hiphil* signifies to put into a new condition, 102:27, to set a new thing on the place of an old one, Isa. 9: 9 [10], to gain new strength, to take fresh courage, Isa. 40:31; 41: 1; and of plants: to send forth new shoots, Job. 14: 7; consequently the *Kal*, which frequently furnishes the perfect for the future *Hiphil* (Ew. § 127, *b*, and Hitzig on this passage), of plants signifies: to gain new shoots, not: to sprout (Targum, Syriac), but to sprout again or afresh, *regerminare*; cf. Arab. *chilf*, an aftergrowth, new wood. Perishing humanity renews its youth in ever new generations. V. 6a again takes up this thought: in the morning it grows up and shoots afresh, viz., the grass to which men are likened (a figure appropriated by Isaiah 40), in the evening it is cut down and it dries up. Others translate **מוֹלֵל** to wither (root **מל**, properly to be long and lax, to allow to hang down long, cf. **אָמַל**, **אֲמַלֵּל** with Arab. 'ml, to hope, i.e., to look forth into the distance); but (1) this *Pilel* of **מוֹלֵל** or *Poēl* of **מָלַל** is not favourable to this intransitive way of taking it; (2) the reflexive in Psa. 58: 8 proves that **מוֹלֵל** signifies to cut off in the front or above, after which perhaps even Psa. 37: 2, Job. 14: 2; 18:16, by comparison with Job. 24:24, are to be explained. In the last passage it runs: *as the top of*

the stalk they are cut off (fut. Niph. of מָלַל). Such a cut or plucked ear of corn is called in Deu. 23:26 מְלִילָה, a Deuteronomic hapaxlegomenon which favours our way of taking the יְמוּלֵל (with a most general subject = יְמוּלֵל). Thus, too, וַיְבֹשׁ is better attached to what precedes: the cut grass becomes parched hay. Just such an alternation of morning springing froth and evening drying up is the alternation of the generations of men.

The poet substantiates this in vv. 7 f. from the experience of those amongst whom he comprehended himself in the לָנוּ of v. 1. Hengstenberg takes v. 7 to be a statement of the cause of the transitoriness set forth: its cause is the wrath of God; but the poet does not begin כִּי כָלֵינוּ but כִּי בְאִפֶּךְ. The chief emphasis therefore lies upon the perishing, and כִּי is not argumentative but explicative. If the subject of כָּלֵינוּ were men in general (Olshausen), then it would be elucidating *idem per idem*. But, according to v. 1, those who speak here are those whose refuge the Eternal One is. The poet therefore speaks in the name of the church, and confirms the lot of men from that which his people have experienced even down to the present time. Israel is able out of its own experience to corroborate what all men pass through; it has to pass through the very same experience as a special decree of God's wrath on account of its sins. Therefore in vv. 7, 8 we stand altogether upon historical ground. The testimony of the inscription is here verified in the contents of the Psalm. The older generation that came out of Egypt fell a prey to the sentence of punishment, that they should gradually die off during the forty years' journey through the desert; and even Moses and Aaron, Joshua and Caleb only excepted, were included in this punishment on special grounds, Num. 14:26 ff., Deu. 1:34-39. This it is over which Moses here laments. God's wrath is here called אַף and חֶמָה; just as the Book of Deuteronomy (in distinction from the other books of the Pentateuch) is fond of combining these two synonyms (Deu. 9:19; 29:22, 27, cf. Gen. 27:44 f.). The breaking forth of the infinitely great opposition of the holy nature of God against sin has swept away the church in the person of its members, even down to the present moment; נִבְהַל as in Psa. 104:29, cf. בְּהִלָּה, Lev. 26:16. It is the consequence of their sins. עֲוֹן signifies sin as the perversion of the right standing and conduct; עָלוּם, that which is veiled in distinction from manifest sins, is the sum-total of hidden moral, and that sinful, conduct. There is no necessity to regard עֲלֻמֵּנוּ as a defective plural; עֲלֻמִּים signifies youth (from a radically distinct word, עָלַם); secret sins would therefore be called עֲלָמוֹת according to Psa. 19:13. God sets transgressions before Him when, because the measure is full and forgiveness is inadmissible, He makes them an object of punishment. שָׂתָה (*Kerî*, as in

Psa. 8: 7: **שְׁתֵּה**, cf. Psa. 6: 4 **וְאֵת**, Psa. 74: 6 **וְאֵת**) has the accent upon the *ultima* before an initial guttural. The parallel to **לְנִגְדֵךְ** is **לְמֵאֹר פְּנִיךָ**. **עֹר** is light, and **מֵאֹר** is either a body of light, as the sun and moon, or, as in this passage, the circle of light which the light forms. The countenance of God (**ה'**) (**פְּנִי**) is God's nature in its inclination towards the world, and **מֵאֹר פְּנִי ה'** is the doxa of His nature that is turned towards the world, which penetrates everything that is conformed to God as a gracious light (Num. 6:25), and makes manifest to the bottom everything that is opposed to God and consumes it as a wrathful fire.

*Psa. 90: 9-12.* After the transitoriness of men has now been confirmed in vv. 6 f. out of the special experience of Israel, the fact that this particular experience has its ground in a divine decree of wrath is more definitely confirmed from the facts of this experience, which, as vv. 11 f. complain, unfortunately have done so little to urge them on to the fear of God, which is the condition and the beginning of wisdom. In v. 9 we distinctly hear the Israel of the desert speaking. That was a generation that fell a prey to the wrath of God (**דֹר עֲבָרְתוֹ**, Jer. 7:29). **עֲבָרָה** is wrath that passes over, breaks through the bounds of subjectivity. All their days (cf. Psa. 103:15) are passed away (**פָּנָה**, to turn one's self, to turn, e.g., Deu. 1:24) in such wrath, i.e., thoroughly pervaded by it. They have spent their years like a sound (**כְּמוֹ-הִנָּה**), which has hardly gone forth before it has passed away, leaving no trace behind it; the noun signifies a gentle dull sound, whether a murmur (Job. 37: 2) or a groan (Eze. 2:10). With **בָּהֶם** in v. 10 the sum is stated: there are comprehended therein seventy years; they include, run up to so many. Hitzig renders: the days wherein (**בהם**) our years consist are seventy years; but **שְׁנוֹתֵינוּ** side by side with **מִי** must be regarded as its more minute genitival definition, and the accentuation cannot be objected to. Beside the plural **שָׁנִים** the poetic plural **שְׁנוֹת** appears here, and it also occurs in Deu. 32: 7 (and nowhere else in the Pentateuch). That of which the sum is to be stated stands first of all as a *casus absol.* Luther's rendering: *Siebenzig Jar, wens hoch kompt so sinds achtzig* (seventy years, or at the furthest eighty years), as Symmachus also meant by his **ἐν παραδόξῳ** (in Chrysostom), is confirmed by the Talmudic **לְגַבּוּרוֹת** **הַגֵּיעַ**, "to attain to extreme old age" (*B. Moëd katan*, 28a), and rightly approved of by Hitzig and Olshausen. **גְּבוּרָה** signifies in Psa. 71:16 full strength, here full measure. Seventy, or at most eighty years, were the average sum of the extreme term of life to which the generation dying out in the wilderness attained. **וְרָהֲבִים** the LXX renders **τὸ πλεῖον αὐτῶν**, but **וְרָהֲבִים** is not equivalent to **רָבִים**. The verb **רָהֲבַ** signifies to behave violently, e.g., of

importunate entreaty, Pro. 6: 3, of insolent treatment, Isa. 3: 5, whence רָהַב (here רָהַב), violence, impetuosity, and more especially a boastful vaunting appearance or coming forward, Job. 9:13, Isa. 30: 7. The poet means to say that everything of which our life is proud (riches, outward appearance, luxury, beauty, etc.), when regarded in the right light, is after all only עֲמָל, inasmuch as it causes us trouble and toil, and אָוֶן, because without any true intrinsic merit and worth. To this second predicate is appended the confirmatory clause. חַיֵּשׁ is *infin. adverb.* from חוֹשׁ, חַיֵּשׁ, Deu. 32:35: speedily, swiftly (Symmachus, the Quinta, and Jerome). The verb גָּזַז signifies *transire* in all the Semitic dialects; and following this signification, which is applied transitively in Num. 11:31, the Jewish expositors and Schultens correctly render: *nam transit velocissime*. Following upon the perfect גָּזַז, the *modus consecutivus* וַנִּעְפָּה maintains its retrospective signification. The strengthening of this mood by means of the intentional *ah* is more usual with the 1st pers. sing., e.g., Gen. 32: 6, than with the 1st pers. plur., as here and in Gen. 41:11; Ew. § 232, g. The poet glances back from the end of life to the course of life. And life, with all of which it had been proud, appears as an empty burden; for it passed swiftly by and we fled away, we were borne away with rapid flight upon the wings of the past.

Such experience as this ought to urge one on to the fear of God; but how rarely does this happen! and yet the fear of God is the condition (stipulation) and the beginning of wisdom. The verb יָדַע in v. 11a, just as it in general denotes not merely notional but practically living and efficient knowledge, is here used of a knowledge which makes that which is known conduce to salvation. The meaning of וּבִירְאָתְךָ is determined in accordance with this. The suffix is here either *gen. subj.*: according to Thy fearfulness (יָרָאָה) as in Eze. 1:18), or *gen. obj.*: according to the fear that is due to Thee, which in itself is at once (cf. 5: 8, Exo. 20:20, Deu. 2:25) more natural, and here designates the knowledge which is so rarely found, as that which is determined by the fear of God, as a truly religious knowledge. Such knowledge Moses supplicates for himself and for Israel: to number our days teach us rightly to understand. 1Sa. 23:17, where יָדָא בֵּן signifies “he does not know it to be otherwise, he is well aware of it,” shows how בֵּן is meant. Hitzig, contrary to the accentuation, draws it to מִיָּנוּ לַמְנוּת; but “to number our days” is in itself equivalent to “hourly to contemplate the fleeting character and brevity of our lifetime;” and בֵּן הַיּוֹדַע prays for a true qualification for this, and one that accords with experience. The future that follows is well adapted to the call, as frequently aim and result. But הִבִּיא is not to be taken, with Ewald and Hitzig, in the signification of bringing as an offering, a meaning this verb cannot have of itself alone (why

should it not have been **וַיִּקְרֵיב**?). Böttcher also erroneously renders it after the analogy of Pro. 2:10: “that we may bring wisdom into the heart,” which ought to be **בַּלֵּב .הֵבִיא**, deriving its meaning from agriculture, signifies “to carry off, obtain, gain, prop. to bring in,” viz., into the barn, 2Sa. 9:10, Hag. 1: 6; the produce of the field, and in a general way gain or profit, is hence called **תְּבוּאָה**. A wise heart is the fruit which one reaps or garners in from such numbering of the days, the gain which one carries off from so constantly reminding one’s self of the end. **לֵבָב חֲכָמָה** is a poetically intensified expression for **לֵב חָכָם**, just as **לֵב מְרִפָּא** in Pro. 14:30 signifies a calm easy heart.

**Psa. 90:13-17.** The prayer for a salutary knowledge, or discernment, of the appointment of divine wrath is now followed by the prayer for the return of favour, and the wish that God would carry out His work of salvation and bless Israel’s undertakings to that end. We here recognise the well-known language of prayer of Moses in Exo. 32:12, according to which **שׁוּבוּבָה** is not intended as a prayer for God’s return to Israel, but for the turning away of His anger; and the sigh **אֶדְ-מָתִי** that is blended with it asks how long this being angry, which threatens to blot Israel out, is still to last. **וְהִנָּחַם** is explained according to this same parallel passage: May God feel remorse or sorrow (which in this case coincide) concerning His servants, i.e., concerning the affliction appointed to them. The naming of the church by **עֲבָדָיךָ** (as in Deu. 9:27, cf. Exo. 32:13 of the patriarchs) reminds one of Deu. 32:36: *concerning His servants He shall feel compassion (Hithpa. instead of the Niphal)*. The prayer for the turning of wrath is followed in v. 14 by the prayer for the turning towards them of favour. In **בַּבֶּקֶר** there lies the thought that it has been night hitherto in Israel. “Morning” is therefore the beginning of a new season of favour. In **שְׁבִיעֵנוּ** (to which **חֲסִדֶּךָ** is a second accusative of the object) is implied the thought that Israel whilst under wrath has been hungering after favour; cf. the adjective **שָׁבֵא** in the same tropical signification in Deu. 33:23. The supplicatory imperatives are followed by two moods expressive of intention: then will we, or: in order that we may rejoice and be glad; for futures like these set forth the intention of attaining something as a result or aim of what has been expressed just before: Ew. § 325, *a*. **בְּכָל-יְמֵינוּ** is not governed by the verbs of rejoicing (Psa. 118:24), in which case it would have been **בְּחַיֵּינוּ**, but is an adverbial definition of time (Psa. 145: 2, Jer. 35: 8): within the term of life allotted to us. We see from v. 15 that the season of affliction has already lasted for a long time. The duration of the forty years of wrath, which in the midst of their course seemed to them as an eternity, is made the measure of the reviving again that is earnestly sought. The plural **יָמוֹת** instead



of **יָמַי** is common only to our Psalm and Deu. 32: 7; it is not known elsewhere to Biblical Hebrew. And the poetical **שְׁנוֹת** instead of **שָׁנַי**, which also occurs elsewhere, appears for the first time in Deu. 32: 7. The meaning of **עֲנִיתָנוּ**, in which **יְמוֹת** is specialized after the manner of a genitive, is explained from Deu. 8: 2 ff., according to which the forty years' wandering in the wilderness was designed to humble (**אָנַחְתָּ**) and to prove Israel through suffering. At the close of these forty years Israel stands on the threshold of the Promise Land. To Israel all final hopes were closely united with the taking possession of this land. We learn from Genesis 49 that it is the horizon of Jacob's prophetic benediction. This Psalm too, in vv. 16, 17, terminates in the prayer for the attainment of this goal. The psalmist has begun in v. 1 his adoration with the majestic divine name **אֲדֹנָי**; in v. 13 he began his prayer with the gracious divine name **יְהוָה**; and now, where he mentions God for the third time, he gives to Him the twofold name, so full of faith, **אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲדֹנָי**. **אֱלֹ** used once alternates with the thrice repeated **אֱלֹ**: salvation is not Israel's own work, but the work of Jahve; it therefore comes from above, it comes and meets Israel. It is worthy of remark that the noun **פֶּאֱל** occurs only in Deuteronomy in the whole *Tôra*, and that here also of the gracious rule of Jahve, Deu. 32: 4, cf. 33:11. The church calls the work of the Lord **מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵינוּ** in so far as He executes it through them. This expression **מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵים** as a designation of human undertakings runs through the whole of the Book of Deuteronomy: Deu. 2: 7; 4:28; 11: 7; 14:29; 16:15; 24:19; 27:15; 28:12; 30: 9. In the work of the Lord the bright side of His glory unveils itself, hence it is called **הַדָּר**; this too is a word not alien at least to the language of Deuteronomy, Deu. 33:17. Therein is made manifest **ה' נֶאֱמָה**, His graciousness and condescension — an expression which David has borrowed from Moses in Psa. 27: 4. **יְהִי וַיְרֶאֱה** and **יְהִי וַיִּבְנֶה** are optatives. **בּוֹנֵה** is an urgent request, *imperat. obsecrantis* as the old expositors say. With *Waw* the same thought is expressed over again (cf. Isa. 55: 1, **וַיָּבֹאוּ**, yea come) — a simple, childlike anadiplosis which vividly reminds us of the Book of Deuteronomy, which revolves in thoughts that are ever the same, and by that very means speaks deeply to the heart. Thus the Deuteronomic impression of this Psalm accompanies us from beginning to end, from **מֵעוֹן** to **מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵים**. Nor will it now be merely accidental that the fondness for comparisons, which is a peculiarity of the Book of Deuteronomy (Deu. 1:31, 44; 8: 5; 28:29, 49, cf. 28:13, 44; 29:17, 18), is found again in this Psalm.

# Psalm 91

## TALISMANIC SONG IN TIME OF WAR AND PESTILENCE

### *FIRST VOICE:*

*91: 1 HE who sitteth in the protection of the Most High,  
Who abideth in the shadow of the Almighty —*

### *SECOND VOICE:*

*91: 2 I say to Jahve: My refuge and my fortress,  
My God in whom I trust.*

### *FIRST VOICE:*

*91: 3 For HE shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler,  
from the destroying pestilence.*

*91: 4 With His feathers shall He defend thee,  
And under His wings art thou hidden;  
A shield and buckler is His truth.*

*91: 5 Thou shalt not be afraid for any nightly terror,  
For the arrow that flieth by day,*

*91: 6 For the pestilence that walketh in the darkness,  
For the sickness that wasteth at noon-day.*

*91: 7 A thousand may fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand,  
It shall not come nigh thee —*

*91: 8 Nay, with thine own eyes shalt thou look on  
And see the recompense of the wicked.*

### *SECOND VOICE:*

*91: 9 For Thou, O Jahve, art my refuge!*

### *FIRST VOICE:*

*The Most High hast thou made thy habitation.*

*91:10 The range of misfortune toucheth thee not,  
And the plague doth not come nigh thy tent.*

*91:11 For His angels hath He given charge over thee,  
To keep thee in all thy ways.*

*91:12 On their hands shall they bear thee up,  
That thou dost not dash thy foot against a stone.*

*91:13 Over lions and adders shalt thou walk,  
Thou shalt trample lions and dragons under thy feet.*

**THIRD (DIVINE) VOICE:**

*91:14 For he loveth Me, therefore will I deliver him,  
I will set him on high, for he knoweth My Name.*

*91:15 If he shall call upon Me, I will answer him,  
I will be with him in trouble;  
I will rescue him and bring him to honour.*

*91:16 With length of life will I satisfy him,  
And cause him to delight himself in My salvation.*

*Psalm 91.* The primeval song is followed by an anonymous song (inscribed by the LXX without any warrant τῷ Δαυ(δ), the time of whose composition cannot be determined; and it is only placed in this order because the last verse accords with the last verse but one of Psalm 90. There the revelation of Jahve's work is prayed for, and here Jahve promises: *I will grant him to see My salvation*; the "work of Jahve" is His realized "salvation." The two Psalms also have other points of contact, e.g., in the מְעוֹן referred to God (vid., *Symbolae*, p. 60).

In this Psalm, the Invocavit Psalm of the church, which praises the protecting and rescuing grace which he who believingly takes refuge in God experiences in all times of danger and distress,<sup>1317</sup> the relation of v. 2 to v. 1 meets us at the very beginning as a perplexing riddle. If we take v. 1 as a clause complete in itself, then it is tautological. If we take אָמַר in v. 2 as a participle (Jerome, *dicens*) instead of אָמַר, ending with *Pathach* because a construct from (cf. Psa. 94: 9; 136: 6), then the participial subject would have a participial predicate: "He who sitteth is saying," which is inelegant and also improbable, since אָמַר in other instances is always the *1st pers. fut.* If we take אָמַר as *1st pers. fut.* and v. 1 as an apposition of the subject expressed in advance: as such an one who sitteth.... I say, then we stumble against יִתְלַוְנֵנּוּ; this transition of the participle to the finite verb, especially without the copula (וּבְצֵל), is confusing. If, however, we go on and read further into the Psalm, we find that the same difficulty as to the change of person recurs several times later on, just as in the opening. Olshausen, Hupfeld, and Hitzig get rid of this difficulty by all sorts of conjectures. But a reason for this abrupt change of the person is that dramatic arrangement recognised even in the Targum, although awkwardly indicated, which, however, as first of all clearly discerned by J. D. Michaelis

and Maurer. There are, to wit, two voices that speak (as in Psalm 121), and at last the voice of Jahve comes in as a third. His closing utterance, rich in promise, forms, perhaps not unaccidentally, a seven-line strophe. Whether the Psalm came also to be executed in liturgical use thus with several voices, perhaps by three choirs, we cannot tell; but the poet certainly laid it out dramatically, as the translation represents it. In spite of the many echoes of earlier models, it is one of the freshest and most beautiful Psalms, resembling the second part of Isaiah in its light-winged, richly coloured, and transparent diction.

*Psa. 91: 1, 2.* As the concealing One, God is called **עֲלִיּוֹן**, the inaccessible high One; and as the shadowing One **שֹׁדֵד**, the invincibly almighty One. Faith, however, calls Him by His covenant name (*Heilsname*) **יְהוָה** and, with the suffix of appropriation, **אֱלֹהֵי** (*my God*). In connection with v. 1 we are reminded of the expressions of the Book of Job, Job. 39:28, concerning the eagle's building its nest in its eyrie. According to the accentuation, v. 2a ought to be rendered with Geier, "*Dicit: in Domino meo (or Domini) latibulum, etc.*" But the combination **אָמַר לֵהּ** is more natural, since the language of address follows in both halves of the verse.

*Psa. 91: 3-9a.* **יְקוּשׁ**, as in Pro. 6: 5, Jer. 5:26, is the dullest toned from for **יְקוּשׁ** or **יֹקֵשׁ**, Psa. 124: 7. What is meant is death, or "he who has the power of death," Heb. 2:14, cf. 2Ti. 2:26. "The snare of the fowler" is a figure for the peril of one's life, Ecc. 9:12. In connection with v. 4 we have to call to mind Deu. 32:11: God protects His own as an eagle with its large strong wing. **אֲבָרָה** is *nom. unitatis*, a pinion, to **אָבַר**, Isa. 40:31; and the *Hiph.* **הִסְבֵּךְ**, from **סָבַךְ**, with the dative of the object, like the *Kal* in Psa. 140: 8, signifies to afford covering, protection. The *ἄπαξ λεγ.* **סִחְרָה**, according to its stem-word, is that which encompasses anything round about, and here beside **צָנָה**, a weapon of defence surrounding the body on all sides; therefore not corresponding to the Syriac *shārtā*<sup>c</sup>, a stronghold (**סְהַרַת**, **מְסִגְרַת**), but to Syriac *sabrā*<sup>c</sup>, a shield. The Targum translates **צָנָה** with **פְּרִיסָא**, *θυρεός*, and **סִחְרָה** with **עֲגִילָא**, which points to the round *parma*. **אֱמֶתוֹ** is the truth of the divine promises. This is an impregnable defence (*a*) in war-times, v. 5, against nightly surprises, and in the battle by day; (*b*) in times of pestilence, v. 6, when the destroying angel, who passes through and destroys the people (Exo. 11: 4), can do no harm to him who has taken refuge in God, either in the midnight or the noontide hours. The future **יִהְלֵךְ** is a more rhythmical and, in the signification to rage (as of disease) and to vanish away, a more usual form instead of **יָלַךְ**. The LXX, Aquila, and Symmachus erroneously associate the demon name **שֵׁד**

with **יָשׁוּד**. It is a metaplastic (as if formed from **שׁוּד**) future for **יָשׁוּד**, cf. Pro. 29: 6, **יָרִיץ**, and Isa. 42: 4, **יָרִיץ**, *frangetur*. V. 7a a hypothetical protasis: *si cadant*; the preterite would signify *cediderint*, Ew. § 357, b. With **רַק** that which will solely and exclusively take place is introduced. Burk correctly renders: *nullam cum peste rem habebis, nisi ut videas*. Only a spectator shalt thou be, and that with thine own eyes, being they self inaccessible and left to survive, conscious that thou thyself art a living one in contrast with those who are dying. And thou shalt behold, like Israel on the night of the Passover, the just retribution to which the evil-doers fall a prey. **שְׁלֵמָה**, recompense, retribution, is a hapaxlegomenon, cf. **שְׁלָמִים**, Isa. 34: 8. Ascribing the glory to God, the second voice confirms or ratifies these promises.

**Psa. 91: 9-16**. The first voice continues this ratification, and goes on weaving these promises still further: thou hast made the Most High thy dwelling-place (**מְעוֹן**); there shall not touch thee.... The promises rise ever higher and higher and sound more glorious. The *Pual* **הִנָּח**, prop. to be turned towards, is equivalent to “to befall one,” as in Pro. 12:21; Aquila well renders: *οὐ μεταχθήσεται πρὸς σὲ κακία*. **לֹא-יִקְרַב** reminds one of Isa. 54:14, where **לֹא** follows; here it is **ב**, as in Jud. 19:13. The angel guardianship which is apportioned to him who trusts in God appears in vv. 11, 12 as a universal fact, not as a solitary fact and occurring only in extraordinary instances. *Haec est vera miraculorum ratio*, observes Brentius on this passage, *quod semel aut iterum manifeste revelent ea quae Deus semper abscondite operatur*. In **שְׁאוּנָה** the suffix has been combined with the full form of the future. The LXX correctly renders v. 12b: *μήποτε προσκόψης πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου*, for **נָגַף** everywhere else, and therefore surely here too and in Pro. 3:23, has a transitive signification, not an intransitive (Aquila, Jerome, Symmachus), cf. Jer. 13:16. V. 13 tells what he who trusts in God has power to do by virtue of this divine succour through the medium of angels. The promise calls to mind Mar. 16:18, *ὄφεις ἄροῦσι*, they shall take up serpents, but still more Luke 10:19: Behold, I give you power to tread *ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἔχθροῦ*. They are all kinds of destructive powers belonging to nature, and particularly to the spirit-world, that are meant. They are called lions and fierce lions from the side of their open power, which threatens destruction, and adders and dragons from the side of their venomous secret malice. In v. 13a it is promised that the man who trusts in God shall walk on over these monsters, these malignant foes, proud in God and unharmed; in v. 13b, that he shall tread them to the ground (cf. Rom. 16:20). That which the divine voice of promise now says at the close of the Psalm is, so far as the form is concerned, an echo taken from Psalm 50. Vv. 15 and 23 of

that Psalm sound almost word for word the same. Gen. 46: 4, and more especially Isa. 63: 9, are to be compared on v. 15*b*. In *B. Taanith* 16*a* it is inferred from this passage that God compassionates the suffering ones whom He is compelled by reason of His holiness to chasten and prove. The “salvation of Jahve,” as in 50:23, is the full reality of the divine purpose (or counsel) of mercy. To live to see the final glory was the rapturous thought of the Old Testament hope, and in the apostolic age, of the New Testament hope also.

## Psalm 92

### SABBATH THOUGHTS

*92: 2 IT is good to give thanks unto Jahve,  
And to harp unto Thy Name, O Most High —*

*92: 3 To show forth in the morning Thy loving-kindness,  
And Thy faithfulness in the nights,*

*92: 4 Upon a ten-stringed instrument and upon the nabla,  
In skilful playing with the cithern.*

*92: 5 For Thou makest me glad, Jahve, through Thy rule,  
Because of the works of Thy hands can I exult.*

*92: 6 How great are Thy works, Jahve!  
Very deep are Thy thoughts.*

*92: 7 A brutish man remains unconscious,  
And a fool doth not discern this.*

*92: 8 When the ungodly sprang up as the green herb  
And all the workers of evil flourished,  
It came to pass that they were absolutely destroyed.*

*92: 9 And Thou art exaltation for ever, Jahve!*

*92:10 For lo Thine enemies, Jahve —  
For lo Thine enemies shall perish,  
All the workers of evil shall melt away.*

*92:11 And Thou exaltest, as an antelope, my horn,  
I am anointed with refreshing oil.*

*92:12 And mine eye feasteth upon those that lie in wait for me,  
Mine ears see their desire upon those who maliciously rose up against me.*

*92:13 The righteous shall sprout forth as the palm,  
As a cedar on Lebanon shall he grow up.*

*92:14 Planted in the house of Jahve,  
They shall blossom in the courts of our God.*

*92:15 They shall be still vigorous in old age,  
Full of sap and green shall they remain,*

*92:16 To make known that Jahve is upright,  
My rock, and there is no unrighteousness in Him.*

*Psalm 92.* This *Song-Psalm for the Sabbath-day* was the Sabbath-Psalm among the week's Psalms of the post-exilic service (cf. pp. 18, 211); and was sung in the morning at the drink-offering of the first *Tamid* lamb, just as at the accompanying Sabbath-musaph-offering (Num. 28: 9 f.) a part of the song Deuteronomy 32 (divided into six parts) was sung, and at the service connected with the Mincha or evening sacrifice one of the three pieces, Exo. 15: 1-10, 11-19, Num. 21:17-20 (*B. Rosh ha-Shana* 31a). 1 Macc. 9:23 is a reminiscence from Psalm 92 deviating but little from the LXX version, just as 1 Macc. 7:17 is a quotation taken from Psalm 89. With respect to the sabbatical character of the Psalm, it is a disputed question even in the Talmud whether it relates to the Sabbath of the Creation (R. Nehemiah, as it is taken by the Targum) or to the final Sabbath of the world's history (R. Akiba: the day that is altogether Sabbath; cf. Athanasius: ἀνεῖ ἐκέλευν τὴν γενησομένην ἀνάπαυσιν). The latter is relatively more correct. It praises God, the Creator of the world, as the Ruler of the world, whose rule is pure loving-kindness and faithfulness, and calms itself, in the face of the flourishing condition of the evil-doers, with the prospect of the final issue, which will brilliantly vindicate the righteousness of God, that was at that time imperceptible to superficial observation, and will change the congregation of the righteous into a flourishing grove of palms and cedars upon holy ground. In this prospect *Psa. 92:12* and *Psa. 91: 8* coincide, just as God is also called "the Most High" at the beginning of these two Psalms. But that the *tetragrammaton* occurs seven times in both Psalms, as Hengstenberg says, does not turn out to be correct. Only the Sabbath-Psalm (and not Psalm 91) repeats the most sacred Name seven times. And certainly the unmistakable strophe-schema too, 6. 6. 7. 6. 6, is not without significance. The middle of the Psalm bears the stamp of the sabbatic number. It is also worthy of remark that the poet gains the number seven by means of an anadiplosis in v. 10. Such an emphatic climax by means of repetition is common to our Psalm with *Psa. 93: 3; 94: 3; 96:13.*

*Psa. 92: 2-4.* The Sabbath is the day that God has hallowed, and that is to be consecrated to God by our turning away from the business pursuits of the working days (Isa. 58:13 f.) and applying ourselves to the praise and adoration of God, which is the most proper, blessed Sabbath employment. It is good, i.e., not merely good in the eyes of God, but also good for man, beneficial to the heart, pleasant and blessed. Loving-kindness is designedly connected with the dawn of the morning, for it is morning light itself, which breaks through the night (*Psa. 30: 6; 59:17*), and faithfulness with the nights, for in the perils of

the loneliness of the night it is the best companion, and nights of affliction are the “foil of its verification.” עֶשׂוֹר beside נָבֵל (נֶבֶל) is equivalent to עֶשׂוֹר נָבֵל in Psa. 33: 2; 144: 9: the ten-stringed harp or lyre. הַנְּיוֹן is the music of stringed instruments (vid., on Psa. 9:17), and that, since הַגָּה in itself is not a suitable word for the rustling (*strepitus*) of the strings, the impromptu or phantasia playing (in Amo. 6: 5, scornfully, פָּרַט), which suits both 9:17 (where it is appended to the *forte* of the interlude) and the construction with *Beth instrumenti*.

**Psa. 92: 5-7.** Statement of the ground of this commendation of the praise of God. Whilst פָּאֵל is the usual word for God’s historical rule (Psa. 44: 2; 64:10; 90:16, etc.), מַעֲשֵׂי יְדִיָּה denotes the works of the Creator of the world, although not to the exclusion of those of the Ruler of the world (Psa. 143: 5). To be able to rejoice over the revelation of God in creation and the revelation of God in general is a gift from above, which the poet thankfully confesses that he has received. The Vulgate begins v. 5 *Quia delectasti me*, and Dante in his *Purgatorio*, xxviii. 80, accordingly calls the Psalm *il Salmo Delectasti*; a smiling female form, which represents the life of Paradise, says, as she gathers flowers, she is so happy because, with the Psalm *Delectasti*, she takes a delight in the glory of God’s works. The works of God are transcendently great; very deep are His thoughts, which mould human history and themselves gain from in it (cf. Psa. 40: 6; 139:17 f., where infinite fulness is ascribed to them, and Isa. 55: 8, where infinite height is ascribed to them). Man can neither measure the greatness of the divine works nor fathom the depth of the divine thoughts; he who is enlightened, however, perceives the immeasurableness of the one and the unfathomableness of the other, whilst a אִישׁ-בְּאָר, a man of animal nature, *homo brutus* (vid., Psa. 73:22), does not come to the knowledge (יָדַע לֹא, used absolutely as in Psa. 14: 4), and בְּסִיל, a blockhead, or one dull in mind, whose carnal nature outweighs his intellectual and spiritual nature, does not discern אֶת-זֹאת (cf. 2Sa. 13:17), *id ipsum*, viz., how unsearchable are God’s judgments and untrackable His ways (Rom. 11:33).

**Psa. 92: 8-10.** Upon closer examination the prosperity of the ungodly is only a semblance that lasts for a time. The infinitive construction in v. 8 is continued in the historic tense, and it may also be rendered as historical. הִיָּתָה זֹאת (Saadia: Arab. *fānnh*) is to be supplied in thought before לְהַשְׁמַדֵם, as in Job. 27:14. What is spoken of is an historical occurrence which, in its beginning, course, and end, has been frequently repeated even down to the present day, and ever confirmed afresh. And thus, too, in time to come and once finally shall the ungodly succumb to a peremptory, decisive (עֲדִי-אֵד)



judgment of destruction. Jahve is מְרוֹם לְעֶלְיָם, by His nature and by His rule He is “a height for ever;” i.e., in relation to the creature and all that goes on here below He has a nature beyond and above all this (*Jenseitigkeit*), ever the same and absolute; He is absolutely inaccessible to the God-opposed one here below who vaunts himself in stupid pride and rebelliously exalts himself as a titan, and only suffers it to last until the term of his barren blossoming is run out. Thus the present course of history will and must in fact end in a final victory of good over evil: for lo Thine enemies, Jahve — for lo Thine enemies.... הִנֵּה points as it were with the finger to the inevitable end; and the emotional anadiplosis breathes forth a zealous love for the cause of God as if it were his own. God’s enemies shall perish, all the workers of evil shall be disjointed, scattered, יִתְפָּרְדּוּ (cf. Job. 4:11). Now they form a compact mass, which shall however fall to pieces, when one day the intermingling of good and evil has an end.

*Psa. 92:11-13.* The hitherto oppressed church then stands forth vindicated and glorious. The *futt. consec.* as preterites of the ideal past, pass over further on into the pure expression of future time. The LXX renders: καὶ ὑψωθήσεται (וַיִּתְרָם) ὡς μονόκερωτος τὸ κέρας μου. By רִאִים (incorrect for רִאִים, primary form רִאִים), μονόκερος, is surely to be understood the *oryx*, one-horned according to Aristotle and the Talmud (vid., on Psa. 29: 6, Job. 39: 9-12). This animal is called in Talmudic קרשׁ (perhaps abbreviated from μονόκερος); the Talmud also makes use of ארזיילא (the gazelle) as synonymous with רִאִים (Aramaic definitive or emphatic state רִאִים<sup>f318</sup>).

The primary passages for figures taken from animal life are Num. 23:22, Deu. 33:17. The horn is an emblem of defensive power and at the same time of stately grace; and the fresh, green oil an emblem of the pleasant feeling and enthusiasm, joyous in the prospect of victory, by which the church is then pervaded (Act. 3:19). The LXX erroneously takes בְּלוֹתִי as *infin. Piel*, τὸ γῆράς μου, my being grown old, a signification which the *Piel* cannot have. It is *1st praet. Kal* from בָּלַל, *perfusus sum* (cf. Arabic *balla*, to be moist, *ballah* and *bullah*, moistness, good health, the freshness of youth), and the *ultima* - accentuation, which also occurs in this form of double *Ajin* verbs without *Waw convers.* (vid., on Job. 19:17), ought not to mislead. In the expression רַעֲנַן שֶׁמֶן, the adjective used in other instances only of the olive-tree itself is transferred to the oil, which contains the strength of its succulent verdure as an essence. The *ecclesia pressa* is then *triumphans*. The eye, which was wont to look timidly and tearfully upon the persecutors, the ears, upon which even their name and the tidings of their approach were wont to produce terror, now

see their desire upon them as they are blotted out. שָׁמַע בּ (found only here) follows the sense of רָאָה בּ, cf. Arab. *nḡr fi*, to lose one's self in the contemplation of anything. גּוֹר, בּוֹז, שׁוֹרֵי is either a substantive after the form גּוֹר, בּוֹז, שׁוֹרֵי, or a participle in the signification "those who regarded me with hostility, those who lay in wait for me," like נוֹס, fled, Num. 35:32, סוֹר, having removed themselves to a distance, Jer. 17:13, שׁוֹב, turned back, Mic. 2: 8; for this participial form has not only a passive signification (like מוּל, circumcised), but sometimes too, a deponent perfect signification; and חוֹשׁ in Num. 32:17, if it belongs here, may signify hurried = in haste. In שׁוֹרֵי, however, no such passive colouring of the meaning is conceivable; it is therefore: *insidiati* (Luzatto, *Grammatica*, § 518: *coloro che mi guatavano*). There is no need for regarding the word, with Böttcher and Olshausen, as distorted from שָׁרַרִי (the apocopated participle *Pilel* of the same verb); one might more readily regard it as a softening of that word as to the sound (Ewald, Hitzig). In v. 12b it is not to be rendered: upon the wicked doers (villains) who rise up against me. The placing of the adjective thus before its substantive must (with the exception of בּר when used after the manner of a numeral) be accounted impossible in Hebrew, even in the face of the passages brought forward by Hitzig, viz., 1Ch. 27: 5, 1Sa. 31: 3; <sup>f319</sup>

it is therefore: upon those who as villains rise up against. The circumstance that the poet now in v. 13 passes from himself to speak of the righteous, is brought about by the fact that it is the congregation of the righteous in general, i.e., of those who regulate their life according to the divine order of salvation, into whose future he here takes a glance. When the prosperity [lit. the blossoming] of the ungodly comes to an end, the springing up and growth of the righteous only then rightly has its beginning. The richness of the inflorescence of date-palm (תְּמָר) is clear from the fact, that when it has attained its full size, it bears from three to four, and in some instances even as many as six, hundred pounds of fruit. And there is no more charming and majestic sight than the palm of the oasis, this prince among the trees of the plain, with its proudly raised diadem of leaves, its attitude peering forth into the distance and gazing full into the face of the sun, its perennial verdure, and its vital force, which constantly renews itself from the root — a picture of life in the midst of the world of death. The likening of the righteous to the palm, to the "blessed tree," to this "sister of man," as the Arabs call it, offers points of comparison in abundance. Side by side with the palm is the cedar, the prince of the trees of the mountain, and in particular of Mount Lebanon. The most natural point of comparison, as יִשְׁגָּה (cf. Job. 8:11) states, is its graceful lofty growth, then in general τὸ δασὺ καὶ θερμὸν καὶ θρέψιμον (Theodoret), i.e., the

intensity of its vegetative strength, but also the perpetual verdure of its foliage and the perfume (Hos. 14: 7) which it exhales.

*Psa. 92:14-16.* The soil in which the righteous are planted or (if it is not rendered with the LXX *πεφυτευμένοι*, but with the other Greek versions *μεταφυτευθέντες*) into which they are transplanted, and where they take root, a planting of the Lord, for His praise, is His holy Temple, the centre of a family fellowship with God that is brought about from that point as its starting-point and is unlimited by time and space. There they stand as in sacred ground and air, which impart to them ever new powers of life; they put forth buds (*הַפְּרִיחַ*) as in Job. 14: 9) and preserve a verdant freshness and marrowy vitality (like the olive, Psa. 52:10, Jud. 9: 9) even into their old age (*נוֹב*) of a productive force for putting out shoots; vid., with reference to the root *נב*, *Genesis*, S. 635 f.), cf. Isa. 65:22: *like the duration of the trees is the duration of my people*; they live long in unbroken strength, in order, in looking back upon a life rich in experiences of divine acts of righteousness and loving-kindness, to confirm the confession which Moses, in Deu. 32: 4, places at the head of his great song. There the expression is *אֵין עֹלָה*, here it is *אֵין עֹלְתָהּ בּוֹ*. This *‘olātha*, softened from *‘awlātha* — So the *Kerī* — with a transition from the *aw*, *au* into *ô*, is also found in Job. 5:16 (cf. *עֹלָה* = *אֹלָה* Psa. 58: 3; 64: 7, Isa. 61: 8), and is certainly original in this Psalm, which also has many other points of coincidence with the Book of Job (like Psalm 107, which, however, in v. 42 transposes *עֹלְתָהּ* into *אֹלָה*).

## Psalm 93

### THE ROYAL THRONE ABOVE THE SEA OF THE PEOPLES

*93: 1 JAHVE now is King, He hath clothed Himself with majesty;  
Jahve hath clothed Himself, He hath girded Himself with might:  
Therefore the world standeth fast without tottering.*

*93: 2 Thy throne standeth fast from of old,  
From everlasting art THOU.*

*93: 3 The floods have lifted up, Jahve,  
The floods have lifted up their roaring,  
The floods lift up their noise.*

*93: 4 More than the rumblings of great waters,  
Of the glorious, of the breakers of the sea,  
Is Jahve glorious in the height.*

*93: 5 Thy testimonies are inviolable,  
Holiness becometh Thy house,  
Jahve, unto length of days.*

*Psalm 93.* Side by side with those Psalms which behold in anticipation the Messianic future, whether it be prophetically or only typically, or typically and prophetically at the same time, as the kingship of Jahve's Anointed which overcomes and blesses the world, there are others in which the perfected theocracy as such is beheld beforehand, not, however, as an appearing (*parusia*) of a human king, but as the appearing of Jahve Himself, as the kingdom of God manifest in all its glory. These theocratic Psalms form, together with the christocratic, two series of prophecy referring to the last time which run parallel with one another. The one has for its goal the Anointed of Jahve, who rules out of Zion over all peoples; the other, Jahve sitting above the cherubim, to whom the whole world does homage. The two series, it is true, converge in the Old Testament, but do not meet; it is the history that fulfils these types and prophecies which first of all makes clear that which flashes forth in the Old Testament only in certain climaxes of prophecy and of lyric too (vid., on 45: 1), viz., that the *parusia* of the Anointed One and the *parusia* of Jahve is one and the same.

Theocracy is an expression coined by Josephus. In contrast with the monarchical, oligarchical, and democratic form of government of other nations, he calls the Mosaic form **θεοκρατία**, but he does so somewhat timidly, **ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι βιασάμενος τὸν λόγον** [*c. Apion.* ii. 17]. The coining of the expression is thankworthy; only one has to free one's self from the false conception that the theocracy is a particular constitution. The alternating forms of government were only various modes of its adjustment. The theocracy itself is a reciprocal relationship between God and men, exalted above these intermediary forms, which had its first manifest beginning when Jahve became Israel's King (Deu. 33: 5, cf. Exo. 15:18), and which will be finally perfected by its breaking through this national self-limitation when the King of Israel becomes King of the whole world, that is overcome both outwardly and spiritually. Hence the theocracy is an object of prediction and of hope. And the word **מֶלֶךְ** is used with reference to Jahve not merely of the first beginning of His imperial dominion, and of the manifestation of the same in facts in the most prominent points of the redemptive history, but also of the commencement of the imperial dominion in its perfected glory. We find the word used in this lofty sense, and in relation to the last time, e.g., in Isa. 24:23; 52: 7, and most unmistakably in Rev. 11:17; 19: 6. And in this sense **מֶלֶךְ** **יְהוָה** is the watchword of the theocratic Psalms. Thus it is used even in Psa. 47: 9; but the first of the Psalms beginning with this watchword is Psalm 93. They are all post-exilic. The prominent point from which this

eschatological perspective opens out is the time of the new-born freedom and of the newly restored state.

Hitzig pertinently says: “This Psalm is already contained *in nuce* in v. 9 of the preceding Psalm, which surely comes from the same author. This is at once manifest from the jerking start of the discourse in v. 3 (cf. *Psa.* 92:10), which resolves the thought into two members, of which the first subsides into the vocative יהוה.” The LXX (*Codd. Vat. and Sin.*) inscribes it: *Εἰς τὴν ἡμέρην τοῦ προσαββάτου, ὅτε κατώκισται ἡ γῆ, αἴνος ὠδήσ τῷ Δαυίδ.* The third part of this inscription is worthless. The first part (for which *Cod. Alex.* erroneously has: *τοῦ σαββάτου*) is corroborated by the Talmudic tradition. Psalm 93 was really the Friday Psalm, and that, as is said in *Rosh ha-shana* 31a, עליהן ומלך (בי) ומלך, *על שם שגמר מלאכתו (בי) ומלך*, because God then (on the sixth day) had completed His creative work and began to reign over them (His creatures); and that *ὅτε κατώκισται* (*al. κατώκιστο*) is to be explained in accordance therewith: when the earth had been peopled (with creatures, and more especially with men).

*Psa.* 93: 1, 2. The sense of מְלֶךְ (with *ā* beside *Zinnor* or *Sarka* as in *Psa.* 97: 1; 99: 1 beside *Dechi*<sup>f320</sup>) is historical, and it stands in the middle between the present הַמֶּלֶךְ and the future הַיְמֻלְכֶךָ : Jahve has entered upon the kingship and now reigns. Jahve’s rule heretofore, since He has given up the use of His omnipotence, has been self-abasement and self-renunciation: how, however, He shows Himself in all His majesty, which rises aloft above everything; He has put this on like a garment; He is King, and now too shows Himself to the world in the royal robe. The first לְבַשׁ has *Olewejored*; then the accentuation takes הַלְבַשׁ together by means of *Dechi*, and עַוְהַתְאָזֵר together by means of *Athnach*. עַוְהַתְאָזֵר, as in Psalm 29, points to the enemies; what is so named is God’s invincibly triumphant omnipotence. This He has put on (*Isa.* 51: 9), with this He has girded Himself — a military word (*Isa.* 8: 9): Jahve makes war against everything in antagonism to Himself, and casts it to the ground with the weapons of His wrathful judgments. We find a further and fuller description of this עַוְהַתְאָזֵר in *Isa.* 59:17; 63: 1 f., cf. *Dan.* 7: 9.<sup>f321</sup>

That which cannot fail to take place in connection with the coming of this accession of Jahve to the kingdom is introduced with אָרָץ. The world, as being the place of the kingdom of Jahve, shall stand without tottering in opposition to all hostile powers (*Psa.* 96:10). Hitherto hostility towards God and its principal bulwark, the kingdom of the world, have disturbed the equilibrium and threatened all God-appointed relationships with dissolution; Jahve’s interposition, however, when He finally brings into effect all the abundant might of His royal government, will secure immoveableness to the shaken

earth (cf. Psa. 75: 4). His throne stands, exalted above all commotion, מַאֲז; it reaches back into the most distant past. Jahve is מַעֲוֹלָם; His being loses itself in the immemorial and the immeasurable. The throne and nature of Jahve are not incipient in time, and therefore too are not perishable; but as without beginning, so also they are endless, infinite in duration.

*Psa. 93: 3-5.* All the raging of the world, therefore, will not be able to hinder the progress of the kingdom of God and its final breaking through to the glory of victory. The sea with its mighty mass of waters, with the constant unrest of its waves, with its ceaseless pressing against the solid land and foaming against the rocks, is an emblem of the Gentile world alienated from and at enmity with God; and the rivers (floods) are emblems of worldly kingdoms, as the Nile of the Egyptian (Jer. 44: 7 f.), the Euphrates of the Assyrian (Isa. 8: 7 f.), or more exactly, the Tigris, swift as an arrow, of the Assyrian, and the tortuous Euphrates of the Babylonian empire (Isa. 27: 1). These rivers, as the poet says whilst he raises a plaintive but comforted look upwards to Jahve, have lifted up, have lifted up their murmur, the rivers lift up their roaring. The thought is unfolded in a so-called “parallelism with reservation.” The perfects affirm what has taken place, the future that which even now as yet is taking place. The ἀπαξ λεγ. דָּבַךְ signifies a striking against (*collisio*), and a noise, a din. One now in v. 4 looks for the thought that Jahve is exalted above this roaring of the waves. מִן will therefore be the *min* of comparison, not of the cause: “by reason of the roar of great waters are the breakers of the sea glorious” (Starck, Geier), — which, to say nothing more, is a tautological sentence. But if מִן is comparative, then it is impossible to get on with the accentuation of אֲדִירִים, whether it be with *Mercha* (Ben-Asher) or *Dechi* (Ben-Naphtali). For to render: More than the roar of great waters are the breakers of the sea glorious (Mendelssohn), is impracticable, since מִים רַבִּים are nothing less than יָם (Isa. 17:12 f.), and we are prohibited from taking אֲדִירִים מִשְׁבְּרֵי יָם as a parenthesis (Köster), by the fact that it is just this clause that is exceeded by ה' אֲדִיר בְּמָרוֹם. Consequently אֲדִירִים has to be looked upon as a second attributive to מִים brought in afterwards, and מִשְׁבְּרֵי יָם (the waves of the sea breaking upon the rocks, or even only breaking upon one another) as a more minute designation of these great and magnificent waters (אֲדִירִים, according to Exo. 15:10 <sup>f322</sup>), and it should have been accented: אֲדִירִים מִשְׁבְּרֵי יָם מִקְלוֹת | מִים רַבִּים. Jahve's celestial majesty towers far above all the noisy majesties here below, whose waves, though lashed never so high, can still never reach His throne. He is King of His people, Lord of His church, which preserves His revelation and worships in His temple. This revelation, by virtue of His unapproachable, all-overpowering kingship, is inviolable; His

testimonies, which minister to the establishment of His kingdom and promise its future manifestation in glory, are **λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί**, Rev. 19: 9; 22: 6. And holiness becometh His temple (**שְׁבִיבֵי־הַיְיָ**, 3rd praet. Pilel, or according to the better attested reading of Heidenheim and Baer, **הַיְיָ**; <sup>f323</sup> therefore the feminine of the adjective with a more loosened syllable next to the tone, like **יְהִי־שְׁבִיבֵי** in 40:18), that is to say, it is inviolable (sacrosanct), and when it is profaned, shall ever be vindicated again in its holiness. This clause, formulated after the manner of a prayer, is at the same time a petition that Jahve in all time to come would be pleased to thoroughly secure the place where His honour dwells here below against profanation.

## Psalm 94

### THE CONSOLATION OF PRAYER UNDER THE OPPRESSION OF TYRANTS

*94: 1 O GOD of vengeance, Jahve,  
O God of vengeance, shine forth!*

*94: 2 Lift up Thyself, Judge of earth,  
Render recompense unto the haughty!*

*94: 3 How long shall evil-doers, Jahve,  
How long shall evil-doers triumph?*

*94: 4 They gush over, they speak arrogant things,  
They boast themselves, all the workers of evil.*

*94: 5 Thy people, Jahve, they break in pieces,  
And they oppress Thine inheritance.*

*94: 6 The widow and stranger they slay,  
And they murder the fatherless;*

*94: 7 And say as they do it: "Jāh seeth not,  
And the God of Jacob hath no knowledge."*

*94: 8 Be sensible, ye senseless among the people!  
And ye fools, when will ye become wise?*

*94: 9 He who hath planted the ear, ought He not to hear?  
Or He who formed the eye, ought He not to see?*

*94:10 He who chastiseth the nations, ought He not to reprove,  
He who teacheth men knowledge?*

*94:11 Jahve knoweth the thoughts of men  
That they are vanity.*

*94:12 Blessed is the man whom Thou chastenest, Jah,  
And teachest out of Thy Law;*

*94:13 To give him rest from the days of adversity,  
Until the pit be digged for the evil-doer.*

*94:14 For Jahve doth not thrust away His people,  
And He doth not forsake His inheritance.*

*94:15 But right must turn unto righteousness,  
And all the upright in heart shall follow it.*

*94:16 Who would rise up for me against the evil-doers?  
Who would stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?*

*94:17 If Jahve had not been my help,  
My soul would quickly have dwelt in the silence of death.*

*94:18 If I say: My foot tottereth,  
Then, Jahve, thy loving-kindness upholdeth me.*

*94:19 In the multitude of my cares within me  
Thy comforts delight my soul.*

*94:20 Hath the judgment-seat of corruption fellowship with Thee,  
Which frameth trouble by decree?*

*94:21 They press in upon the soul of the righteous,  
And condemn innocent blood.*

*94:22 But Jahve is a fortress for me,  
And my God is the high rock of my refuge.*

*94:23 He turneth back upon them their iniquity,  
And for their wickedness He will destroy them,  
Jahve our God will destroy them.*

*Psalm 94.* This Psalm, akin to Psalm 92 and 93 by the community of the anadiplosis, bears the inscription  $\Psi\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\delta\eta\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta\acute{\iota},\ \tau\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\ \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon$  in the LXX. It is also a Talmudic tradition<sup>f324</sup> that it was the Wednesday song in the Temple liturgy ( $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\ \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon = \text{ברביעי בשבת}$ ). Athanasius explains it by a reference to the fourth month (Jer. 39: 2). The  $\tau\acute{\omega}\ \Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta\acute{\iota}$ , however, is worthless. It is a post-Davidic Psalm; for, although it comes out of one mould, we still meet throughout with reminiscences of older Davidic and Asaphic models. The enemies against whom it supplicates the appearing of the God of righteous retribution are, as follows from a comparison of vv. 5, 8, 10, 12, non-Israelites, who despise the God of Israel and fear not His vengeance, v. 7; whose barbarous doings, however, call forth, even among the oppressed people themselves, foolish doubts concerning Jahve's omniscient beholding and



judicial interposition. Accordingly the Psalm is one of the latest, but not necessarily a Maccabaeian Psalm. The later Persian age, in which the Book of Ecclesiastes was written, could also exhibit circumstances and moods such as these.

*Psa. 94: 1-3.* The first strophe prays that God would at length put a judicial restraint upon the arrogance of ungodliness. Instead of הַפִּיֵא (a less frequent form of the imperative for הוֹפֵא, Ges. § 53, rem. 3) it was perhaps originally written הוֹפִיעָה (Psa. 80: 2), the *He* of which has been lost owing to the *He* that follows. The plural נִקְמוֹת signifies not merely single instances of taking vengeance (Eze. 25:17, cf. *supra* 18:48), but also intensively complete revenge or recompense (Jud. 11:36, 2Sa. 4: 8). The designation of God is similar to אֵל גְּמֵלוֹת in Jer. 51:56, and the anadiplosis is like vv. 3, 23, Psa. 93: 1, 3. גָּמֹל, lift Thyself up, arise, viz., in judicial majesty, calls to mind 7: 7. הַנִּשָּׂא הַשִּׁיב is construed with אֵל (cf. לְ, Psa. 28: 4, Isa. 59:18) as in Joe. 4:4. With אֵימִים accidentally accord ἀγαύς and κούδει γάων in the epic poets.

*Psa. 94: 4-7.* The second strophe describes those over whom the first prays that the judgment of God may come. הַבִּיא (cf. הַטִּיף) is a tropical phrase used of that kind of speech that results from strong inward impulse and flows forth in rich abundance. The poet himself explains how it is here (cf. Psa. 59: 8) intended: they speak עֲתָק, that which is unrestrained, unbridled, insolent (vid., Psa. 31:19). The *Hithpa.* הִתְאַמַּר Schultens interprets *ut Emiri* (Arab. *mîr*, a commander) *se gerunt*; but אֲמַר signifies in Hebrew the top of a tree (vid., on Isa. 17: 9); and from the primary signification to tower aloft, whence too אֲמַר, to speak, prop. *effere = effari*, הִתְאַמַּר, like הִתְנַמַּר in Isa. 61: 6, directly signifies to exalt one's self, to carry one's self high, to strut. On יִדְבְּאוּ cf. Pro. 22:22, Isa. 3:15; and on their atheistical principle which נִיאֲמָרוּ places in closest connection with their mode of action, cf. Psa. 10:11; 59: 8 *extrem.* The *Dagesh* in הָ, distinct from the *Dag.* in the same word in v. 12, Psa. 118: 5, 18, is the *Dag. forte conjunct.* according to the rule of the so-called רֵחִיק (p. 516, note).

*Psa. 94: 8-11.* The third strophe now turns from those bloodthirsty, blasphemous oppressors of the people of God whose conduct calls forth the vengeance of Jahve, to those among the people themselves, who have been puzzled about the omniscience and indirectly about the righteousness of God by the fact that this vengeance is delayed. They are called בְּעָרִים and כְּסִילִים in the sense of Psa. 73:21 f. Those hitherto described against whom God's

vengeance is supplicated are this also; but this appellation would be too one-sided for them, and **בָּעַם** refers the address expressly to a class of men among the people whom those oppress and slay. It is absurd that God, the planter of the ear (**הַנִּמְטֵעַ**, like **שֹׁסַע** in Lev. 11: 7, with an accented *ultima*, because the *præet. Kal* does not follow the rule for the drawing back of the accent called **נִסּוּג אַחֲוֹר**) and the former of the eye (cf. *Psa.* 40: 7, *Exo.* 4:11), should not be able to hear and to see; everything that is excellent in the creature, God must indeed possess in original, absolute perfection. <sup>f325</sup>

The poet then points to the extra-Israelitish world and calls God **יִסְר גּוֹיִם**, which cannot be made to refer to a warning by means of the voice of conscience; **יִסְר** used thus without any closer definition does not signify “warning,” but “chastening” (*Pro.* 9: 7). Taking his stand upon facts like those in *Job.* 12:23, the poet assumes the punitive judicial rule of God among the heathen to be an undeniable fact, and presents for consideration the question, whether He who chasteneth nations cannot and will not also punish the oppressors of His church (cf. *Gen.* 18:25), He who teacheth men knowledge, i.e., He who nevertheless must be the omnipotent One, since all knowledge comes originally from Him? Jahve, — thus does the course of argument close in v. 11, — sees through (**יָדָע** of penetrative perceiving or knowing that goes to the very root of a matter) the thoughts of men that they are vanity. Thus it is to be interpreted, and not: for they (men) are vanity; for this ought to have been **כִּי הִבֵּל הֵמָּה**, whereas in the dependent clause, when the predicate is not intended to be rendered especially prominent, as in 9:21, the pronominal subject may precede, *Isa.* 61: 9, *Jer.* 46: 5 (Hitzig). The rendering of the LXX (*1Co.* 3:20), **ὅτι εἰσὶ μάταιοι** (Jerome, *quoniam vanae sunt*), is therefore correct; **הֵמָּה**, with the customary want of exactness, stands for **הִנֵּה**. It is true men themselves are **הִבֵּל**; it is not, however, on this account that He who sees through all things sees through their thoughts, but He sees through them in their sinful vanity.

**Psa. 94:12-15.** The fourth strophe praises the pious sufferer, whose good cause God will at length aid in obtaining its right. The “blessed” reminds one of *Psa.* 34: 9; 40: 5, and more especially of *Job.* 5:17, cf. *Pro.* 3:11 f. Here what are meant are sufferings like those bewailed in vv. 5 f., which are however, after all, the well-meant dispensations of God. Concerning the aim and fruit of purifying and testing afflictions God teaches the sufferer out of His Law (cf. e.g., *Deu.* 8: 5 f.), in order to procure him rest, viz., inward rest (cf. *Jer.* 49:23 with *Isa.* 30:15), i.e., not to suffer him to be disheartened and tempted by days of wickedness, i.e., wicked, calamitous days (*Ew.* § 287, *b*), until (and it will inevitably come to pass) the pit is finished being dug into which the ungodly

falls headlong (cf. Psa. 112: 7 f.). **הָ** has the emphatic *Dagesh*, which properly does not double, and still less unite, but requires an emphatic pronunciation of the letter, which might easily become inaudible. The initial *Jod* of the divine name might easily lose its consonantal value here in connection with the preceding toneless *u*, <sup>f326</sup> and the *Dag.* guards against this: cf. Psa. 118: 5, 18. The certainty of the issue that is set in prospect by **אֵל** is then confirmed with **כִּי**. It is impossible that God can desert His church — He cannot do this, because in general right must finally come to His right, or, as it is here expressed, **מִשְׁפָּט** must turn to **צֶדֶק**, i.e., the right that is now subdued must at length be again strictly maintained and justly administered, and “after it then all who are upright in heart,” i.e., all such will side with it, joyously greeting that which has been long missed and yearned after. **מִשְׁפָּט** is fundamental right, which is at all times consistent with itself and raised above the casual circumstances of the time, and **צֶדֶק**, like **אֱמֶת** in Isa. 42: 3, is righteousness (justice), which converts this right into a practical truth and reality.

**Psa. 94:16-19.** In the fifth strophe the poet celebrates the praise of the Lord as his sole, but also trusty and most consolatory help. The meaning of the question in v. 16 is, that there is no man who would rise and succour him in the conflict with the evil-doers; **לֹ** as in Exo. 14:25, Jud. 6:31, and **עַם** (without **נֶלְחָם** or the like) in the sense of *contra*, as in Psa. 55:19, cf. 2Ch. 20: 6. God alone is his help. He alone has rescued him from death. **הִיָּה** is to be supplied to **לוֹלִי**: if He had not been, or: if He were not; and the apodosis is: then very little would have been wanting, then it would soon have come to this, that his soul would have taken up its abode, etc.; cf. on the construction Psa. 119:92; 124: 1-5, Isa. 1: 9, and on **כַּמְעַט** with the *praet.* 73: 2; 119:87, Gen. 26:10 (on the other hand with the *fut.* Psa. 81:15). **דְּוָמָה** is, as in Psa. 115:17, the silence of the grave and of Hades; here it is the object to **שָׁכְנָה**, as in Psa. 37: 3, Pro. 8:12, and frequently. When he appears to himself already as one that has fallen, God’s mercy holds him up. And when thoughts, viz., sad and fearful thoughts, are multiplied within him, God’s comforts delight him, viz., the encouragement of His word and the inward utterances of His Spirit. **שְׂרָאִפִּים**, as in 139:23, is equivalent to **שְׂעָפִים**, from **שָׂאֵף, שָׂאָף**, Arab. *š‘b*, to split, branch off (*Psychology*, S. 181; tr. p. 214). The plural form **יִשְׂאֲשְׁעוּ**, like the plural of the imperative in Isa. 29: 9, has two *Pathachs*, the second of which is the “independentification” of the *Chateph* of **שְׂעָשְׁעוּ**.

**Psa. 94:20-23.** In the sixth strophe the poet confidently expects the inevitable divine retribution for which he has earnestly prayed in the

introduction. **יְחַבְּרֵךְ** is erroneously accounted by many (and by Gesenius too) as *fut. Pual* = **יְחַבְּרֵךְ** = **יְחַבֵּר עִמָּךְ**, a vocal contraction together with a giving up of the reduplication in favour of which no example can be advanced. It is *fut. Kal* = **יְחַבְּרֵךְ**, from **יְחַבֵּר** = **יְחַבֵּר**, with the same regression of the modification of the vowel <sup>f327</sup> as in **יְחַנֵּךְ** = **יְחַנֵּךְ** in Gen. 43:29, Isa. 30:19 (Hupfeld), but as in verbs *primae gutturalis*, so also in **פְּתַבֵּם**, **פְּתַבֵּם**, inflected from **פְּתַב**, Ew. § 251, *d*. It might be more readily regarded as *Poel* than as *Pual* (like **תִּפְּאֵלְנוּ**, Job. 20:26), but the *Kal* too already signifies to enter into fellowship (Gen. 14: 3, Hos. 4:17), therefore (similarly to **יִגְרֵךְ**, 5: 5) it is: *num consociabitur tecum*. **כִּסֵּא** is here the judgment-seat, just as the Arabic *cursi* directly denotes the tribunal of God (in distinction from Arab. *ʿ-ʿars*, the throne of His majesty). With reference to **הַיּוֹת** vid., on 5:10.

Assuming that **חֶק** is a divine statute, we obtain this meaning for **עַל־יְחַבְּרֵךְ**: which frameth (i.e., plots and executes) trouble, by making the written divine right into a rightful title for unrighteous conduct, by means of which the innocent are plunged into misfortune. Hitzig renders: contrary to order, after Pro. 17:26, where, however, **אֶל-יֵשֶׁר** is intended like *ἐνεκεν δικαιοσύνης*, Mat. 5:10. Olshausen proposes to read **יִגְוֵרֵךְ** (Psa. 56: 7; 59: 4) instead of **יִגְוֵדֵךְ**, just as conversely Aben-Ezra in Psa. 56: 7 reads **יִגְוֵדֵךְ**. But **גֹּדַד**, **גֹּדַד**, has the secured signification of *scindere, incidere* (cf. Arab. *jdd*, but also *chd*, *supra*, p. 255), from which the signification *invadere* can be easily derived (whence **גֹּדַד**, a breaking in, invasion, an invading host). With reference to **דָּם נֶקֶץ** vid., *Psychology*, S. 243 (tr. p. 286): because the blood is the soul, that is said of the blood which applies properly to the person. The subject to **יִגְוֵדֵךְ** are the seat of corruption (by which a high council consisting of many may be meant, just as much as a princely throne) and its accomplices. Prophetic certainty is expressed in **וַיְהִי** and **וַיֵּשֶׁב**. The figure of God as **מִשְׁנֵב** is Davidic and Korahitic. **צוּר מַחְסֵי** is explained from 18: 2. Since **הַשֵּׁיב** designates the retribution as a return of guilt incurred in the form of actual punishment, it might be rendered “requite” just as well as “cause to return;” **עַל־יָהֵם**, however, instead of **לָהֵם** (Psa. 54: 7) makes the idea expressed in 7:17 more natural. On **בְּרַעְתָּם** Hitzig correctly compares 2Sa. 14: 7; 3:27. The Psalm closes with an anadiplosis, just as it began with one; and **אֶל־הֵינוּ** affirms that the destruction of the persecutor will follow as surely as the church is able to call Jahve its God.

## Psalm 95

### CALL TO THE WORSHIP OF GOD AND TO OBEDIENCE TO HIS WORD

*95: 1 COME, let us exult unto Jahve,  
Let us make a joyful noise to the Rock of our salvation!*

*95: 2 Let us come before His face with thanksgiving,  
Let us make a joyful noise unto Him in songs!*

*95: 3 For a great God is Jahve,  
And a great King above all gods;*

*95: 4 He, in whose hand are the deep places of the earth,  
And to whom belong the tops of the mountains;*

*95: 5 To whom belongeth the sea, and HE hath made it,  
And His hands have formed the dry land.*

*95: 6 Come, let us worship and bow down,  
Let us kneel before Jahve our Maker!*

*95: 7 For He is our God,  
And we are the people of His pasture and the flock of His hand.  
To-day if ye will but hearken to His voice!*

*95: 8 Harden not your hearts as at Meribah,  
As on the day of Massah in the wilderness,*

*95: 9 When your fathers tempted Me,  
Proved me, although they saw My work.*

*95:10 Forty years was I vexed with a generation,  
And said: "They are a people that do err in their heart."  
But they knew not My ways,*

*95:11 So that I swear in My wrath:  
"Verily they shall not enter into My rest!"*

*Psalm 95.* v. 1, 2. Jahve is called the Rock of our salvation (as in Psa. 89:27, cf. Psa. 94:22) as being its firm and sure ground. Visiting the house of God, one comes before God's face; קָדַם פָּנָי, *praeoccupare faciem*, is equivalent to *visere* (*visitare*). תְּוֹדָה is not *confessio peccati*, but *laudis*. The *Beth* before תְּוֹדָה is the *Beth* of accompaniment, as in Mic. 6: 6; that before זְמֵרוֹת (according to 2Sa. 23: 1 a name for psalms, whilst זְמִירָה can only be used as a technical expression) is the *Beth* of the medium.

*Psa. 95: 3-7 b.* The adorableness of God receives a threefold confirmation: He is exalted above all gods as King, above all things as Creator, and above His people as Shepherd and Leader. אֱלֹהִים (gods) here, as in Psa. 96: 4 f., 97: 7, 9, and frequently, are the powers of the natural world and of the world of men, which the Gentiles deify and call kings (as Moloch [Molech], the deified fire), which, however, all stand under the lordship of Jahve, who is infinitely exalted above everything that is otherwise called god (Psa. 96: 4; 97: 9). The supposition that תועפות הרים denotes the pit-works (μέταλλα) of the mountains (Böttcher), is at once improbable, because to all appearance it is intended to be the antithesis to מַחְקְרֵי אֲרֶזֶן, the shafts of the earth. The derivation from נָאֵף (נָאֵף), κάμνειν, κοπιᾶν, also does not suit תועפות in Num. 23:22; 24: 8, for “fatigues” and “indefatigableness” are notions that lie very wide apart. The כֶּסֶף תועפות of Job. 22:25 might more readily be explained according to this “silver of fatigues,” i.e., silver that the fatiguing labour of mining brings to light, and תועפות הרים in the passage before us, with Gussetius, Geier, and Hengstenberg: *cacumina montium quia defatigantur qui eo ascendunt*, prop. ascendings = summits of the mountains, after which כֶּסֶף תועפות, Job. 22:25, might also signify “silver of the mountain-heights.” But the LXX, which renders δόξα in the passages in Numbers and τὰ ὕψη τῶν ὄρεων in the passage before us, leads one to a more correct track. The verb נָאֵף (נָאֵף), transposed from יפֵע (ופֵע), goes back to the root יָף, יָרָף, to stand forth, tower above, to be high, according to which תועפות = תופעות signifies *eminentiae*, i.e., towerings = summits, or prominences = high (the highest) perfection (vid., on Job. 22:25). In the passage before us it is a synonym of the Arabic *mīfan, mīfātun, pars terrae eminens* (from Arab. *wfā* = יפֵע, prop. instrumentally: a means of rising above, viz., by climbing), and of the names of eminences derived from Arab. *yf* (after which Hitzig renders: the teeth of the mountains). By reason of the fact that Jahve is the Owner (cf. 1Sa. 2: 8), because the Creator of all things, the call to worship, which concerns no one so nearly as it does Israel, the people, which before other peoples is Jahve’s creation, viz., the creation of His miraculously mighty grace, is repeated. In the call or invitation, השתחנה signifies to stretch one’s self out full length upon the ground, the proper attitude of adoration; כָּרַע, to curtsy, to totter; and בָּרַךְ, Arabic *baraka*, starting from the radical signification *flectere*, to kneel down, *in genua* (πρόχυσ, *pronum = procnum*) *procumbere*, 2Ch. 6:13 (cf. Hölemann, *Bibelstudien*, i. 135 f.). Beside מְרֵעִיתוֹ אֵם, people of His pasture, צֹאן יְדוֹ is not the flock formed by His creating hand (Augustine: *ipse gratiâ suâ nos oves fecit*), but, after Gen. 30:35, the flock under His protection, the flock led and defended by His skilful, powerful hand.

Böttcher renders: flock of His charge; but **רֶבֶץ** in this sense (Jer. 6: 3) signifies only a place, and “flock of His place” would be poetry and prose in one figure.

*Psa. 95: 7-11.* The second decastich begins in the midst of the Masoretic v. 7. Up to this point the church stirs itself up to a worshipping appearing before its God; now the voice of God (Heb. 4: 7), earnestly admonishing, meets it, resounding from out of the sanctuary. Since **שָׁמַע בְּ** signifies not merely to hear, but to hear obediently, v. 7c cannot be a conditioning protasis to what follows. Hengstenberg wishes to supply the apodosis: “then will He bless you, His people;” but **אִם** in other instances too (Psa. 81: 9; 139:19, Pro. 24:11), like **לֵאמֹר**, has an optative signification, which it certainly has gained by a suppression of a promissory apodosis, but yet without the genius of the language having any such in mind in every instance. The word **הַיּוֹם** placed first gives prominence to the present, in which this call to obedience goes forth, as a decisive turning-point. The divine voice warningly calls to mind the self-hardening of Israel, which came to light at *Meribah*, on the day of Massah. What is referred to, as also in Psa. 81: 8, is the tempting of God in the second year of the Exodus on account of the failing of water in the neighbourhood of Horeb, at the place which is for this reason called *Massah u-Meribah* (Exo. 17: 1-7); from which is to be distinguished the tempting of God in the fortieth year of the Exodus at *Meribah*, viz., at the waters of contention near Kadesh (written fully *Mê-Meribah Kadesh*, or more briefly *Mê-Meribah*), Num. 20: 2-13 (cf. on Psa. 78:20). Strictly **כַּמְרִיבָה** signifies nothing but *instar Meribae*, as in Psa. 83:10 *instar Midianitarum*; but according to the sense, **בְּ** is equivalent to **בְּאֵל**. Psa. 106:32, just as **בְּיוֹם** is equivalent to **בְּבְיוֹם**. On **אֲשֶׁר**, *quum*, cf. Deu. 11: 6. The meaning of **גַּם-רָאוּ פְעָלָי** is not they also (**גַּם** as in 52: 7) saw His work; for the reference to the giving of water out of the rock would give a thought that is devoid of purpose here, and the assertion is too indefinite for it to be understood of the judgment upon those who tempted God (Hupfeld and Hitzig). It is therefore rather to be rendered: notwithstanding (**ὅμως**, Ew. § 354, *a*) they had (= although they had, cf. **גַּם** in Isa. 49:15) seen His work (His wondrous guiding and governing), and might therefore be sure that He would not suffer them to be destroyed. The verb **קִיַּם** coincides with **κόττω**, **κότος**. **בְּדוֹר**, for which the LXX has **τῆ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ**, is anarthrous in order that the notion may be conceived of more qualitatively than relatively: with a (whole) generation. With **אֲמַר** Jahve calls to mind the repeated declarations of His vexation concerning their heart, which was always inclined towards error which leads to destruction — declarations, however, which bore no fruit. Just this ineffectiveness of His indignation had as its result that (**אֲשֶׁר**, not **ὅτι** but **ὥστε**, as in Gen. 13:16, Deu. 28:27, 51, 2Ki. 9:37, and

frequently) He sware, etc. (אִנּוֹ = verily not, Gesen. § 155, 2, *f*, with the emphatic future form in *ûn* which follows). It is the oath in Num. 14:27 ff. that is meant. The older generation died in the desert, and therefore lost the entering into the rest of God, by reason of their disobedience. If now, many centuries after Moses, they are invited in the Davidic Psalter to submissive adoration of Jahve, with the significant call: “To-day if ye will hearken to His voice!” and with a reference to the warning example of the fathers, the obedience of faith, now as formerly, has therefore to look forward to the gracious reward of entering into God’s rest, which the disobedient at that time lost; and the taking possession of Canaan was, therefore, not as yet the final מְנוּחָה (Deu. 12: 9). This is the connection of the wider train of thought which to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Heb. 3, 4, follows from this text of the Psalm.

## Psalm 96

### A GREETING OF THE COMING KINGDOM OF GOD

*96: 1 SING unto Jahve a new song,  
Sing unto Jahve, all lands.*

*96: 2 Sing unto Jahve, bless His Name,  
Cheerfully proclaim His salvation from day to day.*

*96: 3 Declare His glory among the heathen,  
His wonders among all peoples.*

*96: 4 For great is Jahve and worthy to be praised exceedingly,  
Terrible is He above all gods.*

*96: 5 For all the gods of the peoples are idols,  
But Jahve hath made the heavens.*

*96: 6 Brightness and splendour are before Him,  
Might and beauty are in His sanctuary.*

*96: 7 Give unto Jahve, O ye races of the peoples,  
Give unto Jahve glory and might.*

*96: 8 Give unto Jahve the honour of His Name,  
Take offerings and come into His courts.*

*96: 9 Worship Jahve in holy attire,  
Tremble before Him, all lands.*

*96:10 Say among the heathen: “Jahve is now King,  
Therefore the world will stand without tottering,  
He will govern the peoples in uprightness.”*



*96:11 The heavens shall rejoice  
And the earth be glad,  
The sea shall roar and its fulness.*

*96:12 The field shall exult and all that is therein,  
Then shall all the trees of the wood shout for joy —*

*96:13 Before Jahve, for He cometh,  
For He cometh to judge the earth —  
He shall judge the world in righteousness  
And the peoples in His faithfulness.*

*Psalm 96.* What Psa. 95: 3 says: “A great God is Jahve, and a great King above all gods,” is repeated in Psalm 96. The LXX inscribes it (1) ὠδῆ τῷ Δαβίδ, and the chronicler has really taken it up almost entire in the song which was sung on the day when the Ark was brought in (1Ch. 16:23-33); but, as the coarse seams between vv. 22 and 23, 33 and 34 show, he there strings together familiar reminiscences of the Psalms (vid., on Psalm 105) as a sort of mosaic, in order approximately to express the festive mood and festive strains of that day. And (2) ὅτε ὁ οἶκος ᾠκοδομεῖτο (*Cod. Vat. ᾠκοδόμηται*) μετὰ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν. By this the LXX correctly interprets the Psalm as a post-exilic song: and the Psalm corresponds throughout to the advance which the mind of Israel has experienced in the Exile concerning its mission in the world. The fact that the religion of Jahve is destined for mankind at large, here receives the most triumphantly joyous, lyrical expression. And so far as this is concerned, the key-note of the Psalm is even deuterо-Isaianic. For it is one chief aim of Isaiah 40-66 to declare the pinnacle of glory of the Messianic apostolic mission on to which Israel is being raised through the depth of affliction of the Exile. All these post-exilic songs come much nearer to the spirit of the New Testament than the pre-exilic; for the New Testament, which is the intrinsic character of the Old Testament freed from its barriers and limitations, is in process of coming into being (*im Werden begriffen*) throughout the Old Testament, and the Exile was one of the most important crises in this progressive process.

Psalm 96-98 are more Messianic than many in the strict sense of the word Messianic; for the central (gravitating) point of the Old Testament gospel (*Heilsverkündigung*) lies not in the Messiah, but in the appearing (parusia) of Jahve — a fact which is explained by the circumstance that the mystery of the incarnation still lies beyond the Old Testament knowledge or perception of salvation. All human intervention in the matter of salvation accordingly appears as purely human, and still more, it preserves a national and therefore outward and natural impress by virtue of the national limit within which the revelation of salvation has entered. If the ideal Davidic king who is expected even does anything superhuman, he is nevertheless only a man — a man of

God, it is true, without his equal, but not the God-man. The mystery of the incarnation does, it is true, the nearer it comes to actual revelation, cast rays of its dawning upon prophecy, but the sun itself remains below the horizon: redemption is looked for as Jahve's own act, and "Jahve cometh" is also still the watchword of the last prophet (Mal. 3: 1).

The five six-line strophes of the Psalm before us are not to be mistaken. The chronicler has done away with five lines, and thereby disorganized the strophic structure; and one line (v. 10a) he has removed from its position. The originality of the Psalm in the Psalter, too, is revealed thereby, and the non-independence of the chronicler, who treats the Psalm as an historian.

*Psa. 96: 1-3.* Call to the nation of Jahve to sing praise to its God and to evangelize the heathen. שִׁירָו is repeated three times. The new song assumes a new form of things, and the call thereto, a present which appeared to be a beginning that furnished a guarantee of this new state of things, a beginning viz., of the recognition of Jahve throughout the whole world of nations, and of His accession to the lordship over the whole earth. The new song is an echo of the approaching revelation of salvation and of glory, and this is also the inexhaustible material of the joyful tidings that go forth from day to day (לְיוֹם מִיּוֹם as in Est. 3: 7, whereas in the Chronicles it is מִיּוֹם אֶל-יוֹם as in Num. 30:15). We read v. 1a verbally the same in Isa. 42:10; v. 2 calls to mind Isa. 52: 7; 60: 6; and v. 3a, Isa. 66:19.

*Psa. 96: 4-6.* Confirmation of the call from the glory of Jahve that is now become manifest. The clause v. 4a, as also Psa. 145: 3, is taken out of 48: 2. כָּל-אֱלֹהִים is the plural of כָּל-אֱלֹהִים, every god, 2Ch. 32:15; the article may stand here or be omitted (Psa. 95: 3, cf. 113: 4). All the elohim, i.e., gods, of the peoples are אֱלִילִים (from the negative אֵל), nothings and good-for-nothings, unreal and useless. The LXX renders δαιμόνια, as though the expression were שְׂדֵיִם (cf. 1Co. 10:20), more correctly εἰδωλα in Rev. 9:20. What v. 5 says is wrought out in Isaiah 40, 44, and elsewhere; אֱלִילִים is a name of idols that occurs nowhere more frequently than in Isaiah. The sanctuary (v. 6) is here the earthly sanctuary. From Jerusalem, over which the light arises first of all (Isaiah 60), Jahve's superterrestrial doxa now reveals itself in the world. הוֹדֵוּ וְהִדְבָּר is the usual pair of words for royal glory. The chronicler reads v. 6b עֹז וְחֵדָּה בְּמַקְמוֹ, might and joy are in His place (חֵדָּה a late word, like אֶחָדָה, brotherhood, brotherly affection, from an old root, Exo. 18: 9). With the place of God one might associate the thought of the celestial place of God transcending space; the chronicler may, however, have

altered **במקדשו** into **במקמו** because when the Ark was brought in, the Temple (**בית המקדש**) was not yet built.

*Psa. 96: 7-9.* Call to the families of the peoples to worship God, the One, living, and glorious God. **הבו** is repeated three times here as Psalm 29, of which the whole strophe is an echo. Isaiah (Isaiah 60) sees them coming in with the gifts which they are admonished to bring with them into the courts of Jahve (in Chron. only: **לְפָנָיו**). Instead of **בְּהֵרְתָּ קֹדֶשׁ** here and in the chronicler, the LXX brings the courts (**חצרות**) in once more; but the dependence of the strophe upon Psalm 29 furnishes a guarantee for the “holy attire,” similar to the wedding garment in the New Testament parable. Instead of **מִפְּנָיו**, v. 9b, the chronicler has **מִלְּפָנָיו**, just as he also alternates with both forms, 2Ch. 32: 7, cf. 1Ch. 19:18.

*Psa. 96:10, 11.* That which is to be said among the peoples is the joyous evangel of the kingdom of heaven which is now come and realized. The watchword is “Jahve is King,” as in Isa. 52: 7. The LXX correctly renders: **ὁ κύριος ἔβασίλευσε**, <sup>f328</sup> for **מֶלֶךְ** is intended historically (Rev. 11:17). **אֵל**, as in Psa. 93: 1, introduces that which results from this fact, and therefore to a certain extent goes beyond it. The world below, hitherto shaken by war and anarchy, now stands upon foundations that cannot be shaken in time to come, under Jahve’s righteous and gentle sway. This is the joyful tidings of the new era which the poet predicts from out of his own times, when he depicts the joy that will then pervade the whole creation; in connection with which it is hardly intentional that v. 11a and 11b acrostically contain the divine names **יהוה** and **יהו**. This joining of all creatures in the joy at Jahve’s appearing is a characteristic feature of Isaiah 40-62. These cords are already struck in Isa. 35: 1 f. “The sea and its fulness” as in Isa. 42:10. In the chronicler v. 10a (**וַיֹּאמְרוּ** instead of **אָמְרוּ**) stands between v. 11b and 11c, — according to Hitzig, who uses all his ingenuity here in favour of that other recension of the text, by an oversight of the copyist.

*Psa. 96:12, 13.* The chronicler changes **שָׂדֵי** into the prosaic **הַשָּׂדֵה**, and **כָּל-עֲצֵי-יַעַר** with the omission of the **כָּל** into **עֲצֵי הַיַּעַר**. The psalmist on his part follows the model of Isaiah, who makes the trees of the wood exult and clap their hands, Isa. 55:12; 44:23. The **אֵל**, which points into this festive time of all creatures which begins with Jahve’s coming, is as in Isa. 35: 5 f. Instead of **לְפָנָיו**, “before,” the chronicler has the **מִלְּפָנָיו** so familiar to him, by which the joy is denoted as being occasioned by Jahve’s appearing. The lines v. 13bc sound very much like Psa. 9: 9. The chronicler has abridged v. 13, by hurrying

on to the mosaic-work portion taken from Psalm 105. The poet at the close glances from the ideal past into the future. The twofold **שׁוּב** is a participle, Ew. § 200. Being come to judgment, after He has judged and sifted, executing punishment, Jahve will govern in the righteousness of mercy and in faithfulness to the promises.

## **Psalm 97**

### **THE BREAKING THROUGH OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD, THE JUDGE AND SAVIOUR**

*97: 1 JAHVE is now King, the earth shouteth for joy,  
Many islands rejoice.*

*97: 2 Clouds and darkness are round about Him,  
Righteousness and judgment are the pillars of His throne.*

*97: 3 Fire goeth before Him  
And burneth up His enemies round about.*

*97: 4 His lightnings lighten the world;  
The earth seeth it, and trembleth because of it.*

*97: 5 Mountains melt like wax before Jahve,  
Before the Lord of the whole earth.*

*97: 6 The heavens declare His righteousness,  
And all the peoples see His glory.*

*97: 7 Confounded are all those who serve graven images,  
Who boast themselves of idols;  
All the gods cast themselves down to Him.*

*97: 8 Zion heareth it and rejoiceth thereat,  
And the daughters of Judah shout for joy —  
Because of Thy judgments, Jahve!*

*97: 9 For Thou, Jahve, art the Most High over all the earth,  
Thou art highly exalted above all gods.*

*97:10 Ye who love Jahve, hate evil:  
He who guardeth the souls of His saints,  
Out of the hand of the evil-doer will He rescue them.*

*97:11 Light is sown for the righteous,  
And for the upright-minded joy.*

*97:12 Rejoice, ye righteous, in Jahve,  
And sing praise unto His holy Name.*

*Psalm 97.* This Psalm, too, has the coming of Jahve, who enters upon His kingdom through judgment, as its theme, and the watchword “Jahve is King” as its key-note. The LXX inscribes it: *τῷ Δαυίδ, ὅτε ἡ γῆ αὐτοῦ καθίσταται, καθίστατο*); Jerome: *quando terra ejus restituta est*. The *τῷ Δαυίδ* is worthless; the time of restoration, from which it takes its rise, is the post-exilic, for it is composed, as mosaic-work, out of the earlier original passages of Davidic and Asaphic Psalms and of the prophets, more especially of Isaiah, and is entirely an expression of the religious consciousness which resulted from the Exile.

*Psa. 97: 1-3.* We have here nothing but echoes of the older literature: v. 1, cf. Isa. 42:10-12; 51: 5; v. 2*a*, cf. 18:10, 12; v. 2*b* = 89:15; v. 3*a*, cf. 50: 3; 18: 9; v. 3*b*, cf. Isa. 42:25. Beginning with the visible coming of the kingdom of God in the present, with *ה' מֶלֶךְ* the poet takes his stand upon the standpoint of the kingdom which is come. With it also comes rich material for universal joy. *תִּגַּל* is indicative, as in Psa. 96:11 and frequently. *רַבִּים* are all, for all of them are in fact many (cf. Isa. 52:15). The description of the theophany, for which the way is preparing in v. 2, also reminds one of Hab. 3. God's enshrouding Himself in darkness bears witness to His judicial earnestness. Because He comes as Judge, the basis of His royal throne and of His judgment-seat is also called to mind. His harbinger is fire, which consumes His adversaries on every side, as that which broke forth out of the pillar of cloud once consumed the Egyptians.

*Psa. 97: 4-6.* Again we have nothing but echoes of the older literature: v. 4*a* = 77:19; v. 4*b*, cf. 77:17; v. 5*a*, cf. Mic. 1: 4; v. 5*b*, cf. Mic. 4:13; v. 6*a* = 50: 6; v. 6*b*, cf. Isa. 35: 2; 40: 5; 52:10; 66:18. The poet goes on to describe that which is future with historical certainty. That which 77:19 says of the manifestation of God in the earlier times he transfers to the revelation of God in the last time. The earth sees it, and begins to tremble in consequence of it. The reading *וַתַּחַל*, according to Hitzig (cf. Ew. § 232, *b*) traditional, is, however, only an error of pointing that has been propagated; the correct reading is the reading of Heidenheim and Baer, restored according to MSS, *וַתַּחַל* (cf. 1Sa. 31: 3), like *וַתָּבֵן*, *וַתִּקֶּם*, *וַתִּרְם*, and *וַתִּשֶׁם*. The figure of the wax is found even in Psa. 68: 3; and Jahve is also called “Lord of the whole earth” in Zec. 4:14; 6: 5. The proclamation of the heavens is an expression of joy, Psa. 96:11. They proclaim the judicial strictness with which Jahve, in accordance with His promises, carries out His plan of salvation, the realization of which has reached its goal in the fact that all men see the glory of God.

*Psa. 97: 7, 8.* When the glory of Jahve becomes manifest, everything that is opposed to it will be punished and consumed by its light. Those who serve

idols will become conscious of their delusion with shame and terror, Isa. 42:17, Jer. 10:14. The superhuman powers (LXX ἄγγελοι), deified by the heathen, then bow down to Him who alone is *Elohim* in absolute personality. **הַשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ** is not imperative (LXX, Syriac), for as a command this clause would be abrupt and inconsequential, but the perfect of that which actually takes place. The quotation in Heb. 1: 6 is taken from Deu. 32:43, LXX. In v. 8 (after Psa. 48:12) the survey of the poet again comes back to his own nation. When Zion hears that Jahve has appeared, and all the world and all the powers bow down to Him, she rejoices; for it is in fact her God whose kingship has come to the acknowledge. And all the daughter-churches of the Jewish land exult together with the mother-church over the salvation which dawns through judgments.

*Psa. 97: 9.* This distichic epiphonema (v. 9a = Psa. 83:19; v. 9b, cf. 47: 3, 10) might close the Psalm; there follows still, however, a hortatory strophe (which was perhaps not added till later on).

*Psa. 97:10-12.* It is true v. 12a is = 32:11, v. 12b = 30: 5, and the promise in v. 10 is the same as in Psa. 37:28; 34:21; but as to the rest, particularly v. 11, this strophe is original. It is an encouraging admonition to fidelity in an age in which an effeminate spirit of looking longingly towards [lit. ogling] heathenism was rife, and stedfast adherence to Jahve was threatened with loss of life. Those who are faithful in their confession, as in the Maccabaeian age (**Ἀσιδαῖοι**), are called **יְסִידֵי יְהוָה**. The beautiful figure in v. 11 is misapprehended by the ancient versions, inasmuch as they read **זָרַע** (Psa. 112: 4) instead of **זָרַע זָרָא**. **זָרַע** does not here signify sown = strewn into the earth, but strewn along his life's way, so that he, the righteous one, advances step by step in the light. Hitzig rightly compares **κίδναται**, **σκίδναται**, used of the dawn and of the sun. Of the former Virgil also says, *Et jam prima novo spargebat lumine terras.*

## Psalm 98

### GREETING TO HIM WHO IS BECOME KNOWN IN RIGHTEOUSNESS AND SALVATION

*98: 1 SING unto Jahve a new song,  
For He hath done marvellous things,  
His right hand and His holy arm helped Him.*

*98: 2 Jahve hath made known His salvation,  
He hath revealed His righteousness before the eyes of the nations.*

*98: 3 He remembered His loving-kindness  
and His faithfulness to the house of Israel,  
All the ends of the earth saw the salvation of our God.*

*98: 4 Make a joyful noise unto Jahve, all ye lands,  
Break forth into rejoicing and play —*

*98: 5 Play unto Jahve with the cithern,  
With the cithern and the voice of song.*

*98: 6 With trumpets and the sound of the horn,  
Make a joyful noise before the King Jahve!*

*98: 7 Let the sea roar, and that which filleth it,  
The world, and those who dwell therein.*

*98: 8 Let the rivers clap their hands,  
Together let the mountains rejoice*

*98: 9 Before Jahve, for He cometh to judge the earth —  
He shall judge the world with righteousness,  
And the peoples with uprightness.*

*Psalm 98.* This is the only Psalm which is inscribed **מְזֹמֵר** without further addition, whence it is called in *B. Aboda Zara*, 24b, **מְזֹמֵרָא יְתוּמָא** (the orphan Psalm). The *Peshîto* Syriac inscribes it *De redemptione populi ex Aegypto*; the “new song,” however, is not the song of Moses, but the counterpart of this, cf. Rev. 15: 3. There “the Lord reigneth” resounded for the first time, at the sea; here the completion of the beginning there commenced is sung, viz., the final glory of the divine kingdom, which through judgment breaks through to its full reality. The beginning and end are taken from Psalm 96. Almost all that lies between is taken from the second part of Isaiah. This book of consolation for the exiles is become as it were a Castalian spring for the religious lyric.

*Psa. 98: 1-3.* V. 1*ab* we have already read in *Psa. 96: 1*. What follows in v. 1*c* -3 is taken from *Isa. 52:10*; 63: 5, cf. 7, 59:16, cf. 40:10. The primary passage, *Isa. 52:10*, shows that the *Athnach* of v. 2 is correctly placed. **לְעֵינַי** is the opposite of hearsay (cf. Arab. *l-l-’yn*, from one’s own observation, *opp.* Arab. *l-l-chbr*, from the narrative of another person). The dative **לְבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל** depends upon **וַיִּזְכֹּר**, according to *Psa. 106:45*, cf. *Luke 1:54* f.

*Psa. 98: 4-6.* The call in v. 4 demands some joyful manifestation of the mouth, which can be done in many ways; in v. 5 the union of song and the music of stringed instruments, as of the Levites; and in v. 6 the sound of wind instruments, as of the priests. On v. 4 cf. *Isa. 44:23*; 49:13; 52: 9, together with

Psa. 14: 7 (inasmuch as פָּצְחוּ וְרִנְנוּ is equivalent to פָּצְחוּ רִנָּה). קוֹל זְמֵרָה is found also in Isa. 51: 3.

*Psa. 98: 7-9.* Here, too, it is all an echo of the earlier language of Psalms and prophets: v. 7a = 96:11; v. 7b like 24: 1; v. 8 after Isa. 55:12 (where we find מְחֵא כַר instead of the otherwise customary תִּקַּע כַּר, Psa. 47: 2; or הִבֵּה כַר, 2Ki. 11:12, is said of the trees of the field); v. 9 - Psa. 97:13, cf. 10. In the bringing in of nature to participate in the joy of mankind, the clapping rivers (נְהַרְוֹת) are original to this Psalm: the rivers cast up high waves, which flow into one another like clapping hands; <sup>f329</sup> cf. Hab. 3:10, where the abyss of the sea lifts up its hands on high, i.e., causes its waves to run mountain-high.

## Psalm 99

### SONG OF PRAISE IN HONOUR OF THE THRICE HOLY ONE

*99: 1 JAHVE reigneth, the peoples tremble;  
He sitteth upon the cherubim, the earth tottereth.*

*99: 2 Jahve in Zion is great,  
And HE is exalted above all the peoples.*

*99: 3 They shall praise Thy great and fearful name —  
Holy is HE.*

*99: 4 And the might of a king who loveth the right  
Hast THOU established in righteousness;  
Right and righteousness hast THOU executed in Jacob.*

*99: 5 Exalt ye Jahve our God,  
And prostrate yourselves at His footstool —  
Holy is HE.*

*99: 6 Moses and Aaron among His priests,  
And Samuel among those who call upon His name —  
They called unto Jahve and HE answered them;*

*99: 7 In a pillar of cloud He spoke to them;  
They kept His testimonies,  
And the law which He gave them.*

*99: 8 Jahve our God, THOU hast answered them;  
A forgiving God wast Thou unto them,  
And one taking vengeance of their deeds.*

*99: 9 Exalt ye Jahve our God,  
And prostrate yourselves at His holy mountain,  
For holy is Jahve our God.*



*Psalm 99.* This is the third of the Psalms (93, 97, 99) which begin with the watchword **ה' מֶלֶךְ**. It falls into three parts, of which the first (vv. 1-3) closes with **קָדוֹשׁ הוּא**, the second (vv. 4, 5) with **קָדוֹשׁ הוּא**, and the third, more full-toned, with **קָדוֹשׁ הוּא אֱלֹהֵנוּ** — an earthly echo of the trisagion of the seraphim. The first two Sanctuses are two hexastichs; and two hexastichs form the third, according to the very same law by which the third and the sixth days of creation each consists of two creative works. This artistic form bears witness against Olshausen in favour of the integrity of the text; but the clare-obscure of the language and expression makes no small demands upon the reader.

Bengel has seen deepest into the internal character of this Psalm. He says, “The 99th Psalm has three parts, in which the Lord is celebrated as He who is to come, as He who is, and as He who was, and each part is closed with the ascription of praise: He is holy.” The Psalm is laid out accordingly by Oettinger, Burk, and C. H. Rieger.

*Psa. 99: 1-3.* The three futures express facts of the time to come, which are the inevitable result of Jahve’s kingly dominion bearing sway from heaven, and here below from Zion, over the world; they therefore declare what must and will happen. The participle *insidens cherubis* (Psa. 80: 2, cf. 18:11) is a definition of the manner (Olshausen): He reigns, sitting enthroned above the cherubim. **נֹוֹט**, like Arab. *nwd*, is a further formation of the root *na*, **נ**, to bend, nod. What is meant is not a trembling that is the absolute opposite of joy, but a trembling that leads on to salvation. The *Breviarium in Psalterium*, which bears the name of Jerome, observes: *Terra quamdiu immota fuerit, sanari non potest; quando vero mota fuerit et intremuerit, tunc recipiet sanitatem*. In v. 3a declaration passes over into invocation. One can feel how the hope that the “great and fearful Name” (Deu. 10:17) will be universally acknowledged, and therefore that the religion of Israel will become the religion of the world, moves and elates the poet. The fact that the expression notwithstanding is not **קָדוֹשׁ אֱתָהּ**, but **קָדוֹשׁ הוּא**, is explained from the close connection with the seraphic trisagion in Isa. 6: 3. **הוּא** refers to Jahve; He and His Name are notions that easily glide over into one another.

*Psa. 99: 4, 5.* The second *Sanctus* celebrates Jahve with respect to His continuous righteous rule in Israel. The majority of expositors construe it: “And (they shall praise) the might of the king, who loves right;” but this joining of the clause on to **יִזְדֹּר** over the refrain that stands in the way is hazardous. Neither can **וְעַז מֶלֶךְ מִשְׁפַּט אֱהָב**, however, be an independent clause, since **אֱהָב** cannot be said of **עַז**, but only of its possessor. And the

dividing of the verse at אהב, adopted by the LXX, will therefore not hold good. משפט אהב is an attributive clause to מלך in the same position as in Psa. 11: 7; and עז, with what appertains to it, is the object to כוננת placed first, which has the king's throne as its object elsewhere (Psa. 9: 8, 2Sa. 7:13, 1Ch. 17:12), just as it here has the might of the king, which, however, here at the same time in מִשְׁרִים takes another and permutative object (cf. the permutative subject in Psa. 72:17), as Hitzig observes; or rather, since מִשְׁרִים is most generally used as an adverbial notion, this מִשְׁרִים (Psa. 58: 2; 75: 3; 9: 9, and frequently), usually as a definition of the mode of the judging and reigning, is subordinated: and the might of a king who loves the right, i.e., of one who governs not according to dynastic caprice but moral precepts, hast Thou established in spirit and aim (directed to righteousness and equity). What is meant is the theocratic kingship, and v. 4c says what Jahve has constantly accomplished by means of this kingship: He has thus maintained right and righteousness (cf. e.g., 2Sa. 8:15, 1Ch. 18:14, 1Ki. 10: 9, Isa. 16: 5) among His people. Out of this manifestation of God's righteousness, which is more conspicuous, and can be better estimated, within the nation of the history of redemption than elsewhere, grows the call to highly exalt Jahve the God of Israel, and to bow one's self very low at His footstool. לְהַדִּים רַגְלָיו, as in Psa. 132: 7, is not a statement of the object (for Isa. 45:14 is of another kind), but (like אֵל in other instances) of the place in which, or of the direction (cf. 7:14) in which the προσκύνησις is to take place. The temple is called Jahve's footstool (1Ch. 28: 2, cf. Lam. 2: 1, Isa. 60:13) with reference to the ark, the capporeth of which corresponds to the transparent sapphire (Exo. 24:10) and to the crystal-like firmament of the mercaba (Eze. 1:22, cf. 1Ch. 28:18).

*Psa. 99: 6-9.* The vision of the third *Sanctus* looks into the history of the olden time prior to the kings. In support of the statement that Jahve is a living God, and a God who proves Himself in mercy and in judgment, the poet appeals to three heroes of the olden time, and the events recorded of them. The expression certainly sounds as though it had reference to something belonging to the present time; and Hitzig therefore believes that it must be explained of the three as heavenly intercessors, after the manner of Onias and Jeremiah in the vision 2 Macc. 15:12-14. But apart from this presupposing an active manifestation of life on the part of those who have fallen happily asleep, which is at variance with the ideas of the latest as well as of the earliest Psalms concerning the other world, this interpretation founders upon v. 7a, according to which a celestial discourse of God with the three "in the pillar of cloud" ought also to be supposed. The substantival clauses v. 6ab bear sufficient evident in themselves of being a retrospect, by which the futures that follow are stamped as being the expression of the contemporaneous past. The

distribution of the predicates to the three is well conceived. Moses was also a mighty man in prayer, for with his hands uplifted for prayer he obtained the victory for his people over Amalek (Exo. 17:11 f.), and on another occasion placed himself in the breach, and rescued them from the wrath of God and from destruction (Psa. 106:23, Exo. 32:30-32; cf. also Num. 12:13); and Samuel, it is true, is only a Levite by descent, but by office in a time of urgent need a priest (*cohen*), for he sacrifices independently in places where, by reason of the absence of the holy tabernacle with the ark of the covenant, it was not lawful, according to the letter of the law, to offer sacrifices, he builds an altar in Ramah, his residence as judge, and has, in connection with the divine services on the high place (*Bama*) there, a more than high-priestly position, inasmuch as the people do not begin the sacrificial repasts before he has blessed the sacrifice (1Sa. 9:13). But the character of a mighty man in prayer is outweighed in the case of Moses by the character of the priest; for he is, so to speak, the proto-priest of Israel, inasmuch as he twice performed priestly acts which laid as it were a foundation for all times to come, viz., the sprinkling of the blood at the ratification of the covenant under Sinai (Exodus 24), and the whole ritual which was a model for the consecrated priesthood, at the consecration of the priests (Lev. 8). It was he, too, who performed the service in the sanctuary prior to the consecration of the priests: he set the shew-bread in order, prepared the candlestick, and burnt incense upon the golden altar (Exo. 40:22-27). In the case of Samuel, on the other hand, the character of the mediator in the religious services is outweighed by that of the man mighty in prayer: by prayer he obtained Israel the victory of Ebenezer over the Philistines (1Sa. 7: 8 f.), and confirmed his words of warning with the miraculous sign, that at his calling upon God it would thunder and rain in the midst of a cloudless season (1Sa. 12:16, cf. Sir. 46:16 f.).

The poet designedly says: Moses and Aaron were among His priests, and Samuel among His praying ones. This third twelve-line strophe holds good, not only of the three in particular, but of the twelve-tribe nation of priests and praying ones to which they belong. For v. 7a cannot be meant of the three, since, with the exception of a single instance (Num. 12: 5), it is always Moses only, not Aaron, much less Samuel, with whom God negotiates in such a manner. אֱלֹהִים refers to the whole people, which is proved by their interest in the divine revelation given by the hand of Moses out of the cloudy pillar (Exo. 33: 7 f.). Nor can v. 6c therefore be understood of the three exclusively, since there is nothing to indicate the transition from them to the people: crying (קְרָאִים, syncopated like הִטְאִים, 1Sa. 24:33) to Jahve, i.e., as often as they (these priests and praying ones, to whom a Moses, Aaron, and Samuel belong) cried unto Jahve, He answered them — He revealed Himself to this people

who had such leaders (*choragi*), in the cloudy pillar, to those who kept His testimonies and the law which He gave them. A glance at v. 8 shows that in Israel itself the good and the bad, good and evil, are distinguished. God answered those who could pray to Him with a claim to be answered. V. 7bc, is, virtually at least, a relative clause, declaring the prerequisite of a prayer that may be granted. In v. 8 is added the thought that the history of Israel, in the time of its redemption out of Egypt, is not less a mirror of the righteousness of God than of the pardoning grace of God. If vv. 7, 8 are referred entirely to the three, then עֲלִילוֹת and נִקְמָה, referred to their sins of infirmity, appear to be too strong expressions. But to take the suffix of עֲלִילוֹתֵם objectively (*ea quae in eos sunt moliti Core et socii ejus*), with Symmachus (καὶ ἔκδικος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐπιηρείαις αὐτῶν) and Kimchi, as the *ulciscens in omnes adinventiones eorum* of the Vulgate is interpreted, <sup>f330</sup>

is to do violence to it. The reference to the people explains it all without any constraint, and even the flight of prayer that comes in here (cf. Mic. 7:18). The calling to mind of the generation of the desert, which fell short of the promise, is an earnest admonition for the generation of the present time. The God of Israel is holy in love and in wrath, as He Himself unfolds His Name in Exo. 34: 6, 7. Hence the poet calls upon his fellow-countrymen to exalt this God, whom they may with pride call their own, i.e., to acknowledge and confess His majesty, and to fall down and worship at (הָ cf. אֵל, 5: 8) the mountain of His holiness, the place of His choice and of His presence.

## Psalm 100

### CALL OF ALL THE WORLD TO THE SERVICE OF THE TRUE GOD

*100: 1 MAKE a joyful noise unto Jahve, all ye lands!*

*100: 2 Serve Jahve with gladness,  
Come before Him with rejoicing.*

*100: 3 Know ye that Jahve is God:  
HE hath made us, and His we are,  
His people, and the flock of His pasture.*

*100: 4 Come into His gates with thanksgiving,  
Into His courts with praise.  
Give thanks unto Him, bless His name.*

*100: 5 For Jahve is good,  
His mercy is everlasting,  
And to generation and generation His faithfulness.*

*Psalm 100.* This Psalm closes the series of deutero-Isaianic Psalms, which began with Psalm 91. There is common to all of them that mild sublimity, sunny cheerfulness, unsorrowful spiritual character, and New Testament expandedness, which we wonder at in the second part of the Book of Isaiah; and besides all this, they are also linked together by the figure anadiplosis, and manifold consonances and accords.

The arrangement, too, at least from Psalm 93 onwards, is Isaianic: it is parallel with the relation of Isaiah 24-27 to Psalm ch. 13-23. Just as the former cycle of prophecies closes that concerning the nations, after the manner of a musical finale, so the Psalms celebrating the dominion of God, from Psalm 93 onwards, which vividly portray the unfolded glory of the kingship of Jahve, have *Jubilate* and *Cantate* Psalms in succession.

From the fact that this last Jubilate is entirely the echo of the first, viz., of the first half of Psalm 95, we see how ingenious the arrangement is. There we find all the thoughts which recur here. There it is said in v. 7, *He is our God, and we are the people of His pasture and the flock of His hand.* And in v. 2, *Let us come before His face with thanksgiving (בְּתוֹדָה), let us make a joyful noise unto Him in songs!*

This תּוֹדָה is found here in the title of the Psalm, מְזֻמֵּר לְתוֹדָה. Taken in the sense of a “Psalm for thanksgiving,” it would say but little. We may take לְתוֹדָה in a liturgical sense (with the Targum, Mendelssohn, Ewald, and Hitzig), like לְיוֹם הַשְּׁבֵת, Psa. 92: 1, in this series, and like לְהִזְכִּיר in Psa. 38: 1; 70: 1. What is intended is not merely the *tôda* of the heart, but the *shelamîm-tôda*, זָבַח תּוֹדָה, Psa. 107:22; 116:17, which is also called absolutely תּוֹדָה in Psa. 56:13, 2Ch. 29:31. That kind of *shelamîm* is thus called which is presented עַל-תּוֹדָה, i.e., as thankful praise for divine benefits received, more particularly marvellous protection and deliverance (vid., Psalm 107).

*Psa. 100: 1-3.* The call in v. 1 sounds like Psa. 98: 4; 66: 1. בְּלִדְהָאָרֶץ are all lands, or rather all men belonging to the earth’s population. The first verse, without any parallelism and in so far monostichic, is like the signal for a blowing of the trumpets. Instead of “serve Jahve with gladness (בְּשִׂמְחָה),” it is expressed in 2:11, “serve Jahve with fear (בִּירְאָה).” Fear and joy do not exclude one another. Fear becomes the exalted Lord, and the holy gravity of His requirements; joy becomes the gracious Lord, and His blessed service. The summons to manifest this joy in a religious, festive manner springs up out of an all-hopeful, world-embracing love, and this love is the spontaneous result of living faith in the promise that all tribes of the earth shall be blessed in the seed

of Abraham, and in the prophecies in which this promise is unfolded. **יְהוָה** (as in Ps. 4: 4) Theodoret well interprets **δι' αὐτῶν μάθετε τῶν πραγμάτων**. They are to know from facts of outward and inward experience that Jahve is God: *He hath made us, and not we ourselves*. Thus runs the *Chethib*, which the LXX follows, **αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ οὐχ ἡμεῖς** (as also the Syriac and Vulgate); but Symmachus (like Rashi), contrary to all possibilities of language, renders **αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὄντας**. Even the Midrash (*Bereshith Rabba*, ch. c. *init.*) finds in this confession the reverse of the arrogant words in the mouth of Pharaoh: “I myself have made myself” (Eze. 29: 3). The *Kerî*, on the other hand, reads **לִי**,<sup>†331</sup> which the Targum, Jerome, and Saadia follow and render: *et ipsius nos sumus*. Hengstenberg calls this *Kerî* quite unsuitable and bad; and Hupfeld, on the other hand, calls the *Chethib* an “unspeakable insipidity.” But in reality both readings accord with the context, and it is clear that they are both in harmony with Scripture. Many a one has drawn balsamic consolation from the words *ipse fecit nos et non ipsi nos*; e.g., Melancthon when disconsolately sorrowful over the body of his son in Dresden on the 12th July 1559. But in *ipse fecit nos et ipsius nos sumus* there is also a rich mine of comfort and of admonition, for the Creator of also the Owner, His heart clings to His creature, and the creature owes itself entirely to Him, without whom it would not have had a being, and would not continue in being. Since, however, the parallel passage, Ps. 95: 7, favours **וְלִי** rather than **וְלֵא**; since, further, **וְלֵא** is the easier reading, inasmuch as **וְלֵא הוּא** leads one to expect that an antithesis will follow (Hitzig); and since the “His people and the sheep of His pasture” that follows is a more natural continuation of a preceding **וְלִי אֲנַחְנוּ** than that it should be attached as a predicative object to **עָשָׂנוּ** over a parenthetical **וְלֵא אֲנַחְנוּ**: the *Kerî* decidedly maintains the preference. In connection with both readings, **עָשָׂנוּ** has a sense related to the history of redemption, as in 1Sa. 12: 6. Israel is Jahve’s work (**מַעֲשֵׂהוּ**), Isa. 29:23; 60:21, cf. Deu. 32: 6, 15, not merely as a people, but as the people of God, who were kept in view even in the calling of Abram.

**Psa. 100: 4, 5.** Therefore shall the men of all nations enter with thanksgiving into the gates of His Temple and into the courts of His Temple with praise (Psa. 96: 8), in order to join themselves in worship to His church, which — a creation of Jahve for the good of the whole earth — is congregated about this Temple and has it as the place of its worship. The pilgrimage of all peoples to the holy mountain is an Old Testament dress of the hope for the conversion of all peoples to the God of revelation, and the close union of all with the people of this God. His Temple is open to them all. They may enter, and when they enter they have to look for great things. For the God of revelation (Psa. 52:11; 54: 8) is “good” (Psa. 25: 8; 34: 9), and His loving-kindness and faithfulness

endure for ever — the thought that recurs frequently in the later Hallelujah and Hodu Psalms and is become a liturgical formula (Jer. 33:11). The mercy of loving-kindness of God is the generosity, and His faithfulness the constancy, of His love.

## **Psalm 101**

### **THE VOWS OF A KING**

*101: 1 OF mercy and right will I sing, To Thee, Jahve, will I harp,*

*101: 2 I will give heed to the way of uprightness*

*— When wilt Thou come unto me?!*

*I will walk in the innocence of my heart within my house,*

*101: 3 I will not set before mine eyes a worthless action;*

*The commission of excesses I hate, nothing shall cleave to me.*

*101: 4 A false heart shall keep far from me, I will not cherish an evil thing.*

*101: 5 Whoso secretly slandereth his neighbour, him will I destroy;*

*Whoso hath a high look and puffed-up heart, him will I not suffer.*

*101: 6 Mine eyes are upon the faithful of the land,*

*that they may be round about me;*

*Whoso walketh in the way of uprightness, he shall serve me.*

*101: 7 He shall not sit within my house who practiseth deceit;*

*He who speaketh lies shall not continue before mine eyes.*

*101: 8 Every morning will I destroy all the wicked of the earth,*

*That I may root out of Jahve's city all workers of iniquity.*

*Psalm 101.* This is the “prince’s Psalm,” <sup>f332</sup> or as it is inscribed in Luther’s version, “David’s mirror of a monarch.” Can there be any more appropriate motto for it than what is said of Jahve’s government in Psa. 99: 4? In respect of this passage of Psalm 99, to which Psalm 100 is the finale, Psalm 101 seems to be appended as an echo out of the heart of David. The appropriateness of the words **לְדוֹר מְזִמּוֹר** (the position of the words is as in Psalm 24, 40, 109, 110, 139) is corroborated by the form and contents. Probably the great historical work from which the chronicler has taken excerpts furnished the post-exilic collector with a further gleaning of Davidic songs, or at least songs that were ascribed to David. The Psalm before us belongs to the time during which the Ark was in the house of Obed-Edom, where David had left it behind through terror at the misfortune of Uzzah. David said at that time: “*How shall the Ark of Jahve come to me (the unholy one)?*” 2Sa. 6: 8. He did not venture to bring the Ark of the Fearful and Holy One within the range of his own house. In our

Psalm, however, he gives utterance to his determination as king to give earnest heed to the sanctity of his walk, of his rule, and of his house; and this resolve he brings before Jahve as a vow, to whom, in regard to the rich blessing which the Ark of God diffuses around it (2Sa. 6:11 f.), he longingly sighs: “*When wilt Thou come to me?!*” This contemporaneous reference has been recognised by Hammond and Venema. From the fact that Jahve comes to David, Jerusalem becomes “the city of Jahve,” v. 8; and to defend the holiness of this the city of His habitation in all faithfulness, and with all his might, is the thing to which David here pledges himself.

The contents of the first verse refer not merely to the Psalm that follows as an announcement of its theme, but to David’s whole life: graciousness and right, the self-manifestations united ideally and, for the king who governs His people, typically in Jahve, shall be the subject of his song. Jahve, the primal source of graciousness and of right, it shall be, to whom he consecrates his poetic talent, as also his playing upon the harp. **חֶסֶד** is condescension which flows from the principle of free love, and **מִשְׁפָּט** legality which binds itself impartially and uncapriciously to the rule (norm) of that which is right and good. They are two modes of conduct, mutually tempering each other, which God requires of every man (Mic. 6: 8, cf. Mat. 23:23: **τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸν ἔλεον**), and more especially of a king. Further, he has resolved to give heed, thoughtfully and with an endeavour to pursue it (**בְּהַשְׁבִּיל בְּ** as in Dan. 9:13), unto the way of that which is perfect, i.e., blameless. What is further said might now be rendered as a relative clause: when Thou comest to me. But not until then?! Hitzig renders it differently: I will take up the lot of the just when it comes to me, i.e., as often as it is brought to my knowledge. But if this had been the meaning, **בְּדַבַּר** would have been said instead of **בְּדַרְךָ** (Exo. 18:16, 19, 2Sa. 19:12 [11]); for, according to both its parts, the expression **תָּמִים דָּרְךָ** is an ethical notion, and is therefore not used in a different sense from that in v. 6. Moreover, the relative use of the interrogative **מָתַי** in Hebrew cannot be supported, with the exception, perhaps, of Pro. 23:35. Athanasius correctly interprets: **ποθῶ σου τὴν παρουσίαν, ὃ δέσποτα, ἰμείρομαι σου τῆς ἐπιφανείας, ἀλλὰ δὸς τὸ ποθοῦμενον**. It is a question of strong yearning: when wilt Thou come to me? is the time near at hand when Thou wilt erect Thy throne near to me? If his longing should be fulfilled, David is resolved to, and will then, behave himself as he further sets forth in the vows he makes. He pledges himself to walk within his house, i.e., his palace, in the innocence or simplicity of his heart (Psa. 78:72, Pro. 20: 7), without allowing himself to be led away from this frame of mind which has become his through grace. He will not set before his eyes, viz., as a proposition or purpose (Deu. 15: 9, Exo. 10:10, 1Sa. 29:10, LXX), any morally worthless or vile matter



whatsoever (Psa. 41: 9, cf. concerning בְּלִיאָל, 18: 5). The commission of excesses he hates: עֲשָׂה is *infin. constr.* instead of עֲשׂוֹת as in Gen. 31:28; 50:20, Pro. 21: 3, cf. רָאָה Gen. 48:11, שָׂתוּ Pro. 31: 4. סָמִים (like שְׂמִים in Hos. 5: 2), as the object of עֲשָׂה, has not a personal (Kimchi, Ewald) signification (cf. on the other hand 40: 5), but material signification: (*facta declinantia* (like זָדִים, Psa. 19:14, *insolentia*; חֲבָלִים, Zec. 11: 7, *vincientia*); all temptations and incitements of this sort he shakes off from himself, so that nothing of the kind cleaves to him. The confessions in v. 4 refer to his own inward nature: לֵב עֲקָשׁ (not עֲקָשׁ-לֵב, Pro. 17:20), a false heart that is not faithful in its intentions either to God or to men, shall remain far from him; wickedness (רָע) as in Psa. 36: 5) he does not wish to know, i.e., does not wish to foster and nurture within him. Whoso secretly slanders his neighbour, him will he destroy; it will therefore be so little possible for any to curry favour with him by uncharitable perfidious tale-bearing, of the wiliness of which David himself had had abundant experience in his relation to Saul, that it will rather call forth his anger upon him (Pro. 30:10). Instead of the regularly pointed מְלוֹשְׁנִי the *Kerī* reads מְלֹשְׁנִי, *m<sup>l</sup>ōshnī*, a *Poel* (לָשִׁן *lingua petere*, like עֵין *oculo petere*, elsewhere הִלְשִׁין, Pro. 30:10) with *ō* instead of *ō* (*vid.*, on 109:10; 62: 4) and with *Chirek compaginis* (*vid.*, on Psalm 113). The “lofty of eyes,” i.e., supercilious, haughty, and the “broad of heart,” i.e., boastful, puffed up, self-conceited (Pro. 28:25, cf. 21: 4), him he cannot endure (אוֹכֵל, properly *fut. Hoph.*, I am incapable of, viz., לִשְׂאֵת, which is to be supplied as in Isa. 1:13, after Pro. 30:21, Jer. 44:22). <sup>f333</sup>

On the other hand, his eyes rest upon the faithful of the land, with the view, viz., of drawing them into his vicinity. Whoso walks in the way of uprightness, he shall serve him (שָׂרַת, *θεραπεύειν*, akin to עָבַד, *δουλεύειν*). He who practises deceit shall not stay within his house; he who speaks lies shall have no continuance (יָבוֹן is more than equivalent to נָכוֹן) before (under) his eyes. Every morning (לְבִקְרִים as in Psa. 73:14, Isa. 33: 2, Lam. 3:23, and לְבִקְרִים, Job. 7:18), when Jahve shall have taken up His abode in Jerusalem, will he destroy all evil-doers (רָשָׁעִי as in Psa. 119:119), i.e., incorrigibly wicked ones, wherever he may meet them upon the earth, in order that all workers of evil may be rooted out of the royal city, which is now become the city of Jahve.

## Psalm 102

### PRAYER OF A PATIENT SUFFERER FOR HIMSELF AND FOR THE JERUSALEM THAT LIES IN RUINS

*102: 2 O JAHVE, hear my prayer,  
And let my cry come unto Thee.*

*102: 3 Hide not Thy face from me in the day that I am in trouble,  
Incline Thine ear unto me,  
In the day that I call answer me speedily.*

*102: 4 For my days are vanished in smoke,  
And my bones are heated through as a hearth.*

*102: 5 Smitten like a green herb and dried up is my heart,  
For I have forgotten to eat my bread,*

*102: 6 Because of my loud crying my bones cleave to my flesh.*

*102: 7 I am like a pelican of the wilderness,  
I am become as an owl of the ruins.*

*102: 8 Keeping watch I am as a lonely bird on the house-top.*

*102: 9 All the day mine enemies reproach me;  
Those who are mad against me swear by me.*

*102:10 For I have eaten ashes like bread,  
And mingled my drink with weeping,*

*102:11 Because of Thine indignation and Thy raging,  
That Thou hast lifted me up and cast me down.*

*102:12 My days are like a lengthened shadow,  
And I myself am dried up like the green herb.*

*102:13 But THOU, Jahve, sittest enthroned for ever,  
And Thy remembrance endureth into all generations.*

*102:14 THOU wilt arise, have mercy upon Zion,  
For it is time to favour her, yea the time is come —*

*102:15 For Thy servants cling lovingly to her stones,  
And they cry sore over her dust.*

*102:16 And the heathen shall fear the Name of Jahve,  
And all the kings of the earth Thy glory,*

*102:17 Because Jahve hath rebuilt Zion,  
He hath appeared in His glory,*

*102:18 He hath turned to the prayer of the destitute,  
And not despised their prayer.*

*102:19 It shall be written for the generation to come,  
And a people yet to be created shall praise Jah,*

*102:20 That He hath looked down from His holy height,  
From heaven unto earth hath Jahve looked,*

*102:21 To hear the sighing of the prisoner,  
To set at liberty those who are appointed to death,*

*102:22 That they may declare in Zion the Name of Jahve,  
And His praise in Jerusalem,*

*102:23 When the peoples are gathered together,  
And the kingdoms, to serve Jahve.*

*102:24 He hath bowed down my strength in the way,  
He hath shortened my days.*

*102:25 I said, My God, take me not away in the midst of my days —  
Into all generations Thy years endure.*

*102:26 Of old hast Thou founded the earth,  
And the heavens are the work of Thy hands.*

*102:27 Those shall perish, but Thou remainest,  
They all shall wax old like a garment,  
As a vesture dost Thou change them and they change —*

*102:28 But THOU art the same and Thy years have no end!*

*102:29 The children of Thy servants shall dwell,  
And their seed shall continue before Thee.*

*Psalm 102.* Psalm 101 utters the sigh: *When wilt Thou come to me?* and Psalm 102 with the inscription: *Prayer for an afflicted one when he pineth away and poureth forth his complaint before Jahve,* prays, *Let my prayer come unto Thee.* It is to be taken, too, just as personally as it sounds, and the person is not to be construed into a nation. The song of the עֲנִי is, however, certainly a national song; the poet is a servant of Jahve, who shares the calamity that has befallen Jerusalem and its homeless people, both in outward circumstances and in the very depth of his soul. עָמַר signifies to pine away, languish, as in 61: 3, Isa. 57:16; and שִׁפְךָ שִׁיחוֹ to pour out one's thoughts and complaints, one's anxious care, as in Psa. 142: 3, cf. 1Sa. 1:15 f.

As in the case already with many of the preceding Psalms, the deutero-Isaianic impression accompanies us in connection with this Psalm also, even to the end;

and the further we get in it the more marked does the echo of its prophetic prototype become. The poet also allies himself with earlier Psalms, such as 22, 69, and 79, although himself capable of lofty poetic flight, in return for which he makes us feel the absence of any safely progressive unfolding of the thoughts.

**Psa. 102: 2, 3.** The Psalm opens with familiar expressions of prayer, such as rise in the heart and mouth of the praying one without his feeling that they are of foreign origin; cf. more especially Psa. 39:13; 18: 7; 88: 3; and on v. 3: 27: 9 (*Hide not Thy face from me*); Psa. 59:17 (**ביום צר לי**); Psa. 31: 3 and frequently (*Incline Thine ear unto me*); Psa. 56:10 (**ביום אקרא**); Psa. 69: 8; 143: 7 (**מִהָרַעַנִּי**).

**Psa. 102: 4-6.** From this point onward the Psalm becomes original. Concerning the *Beth* in **בַּעֲשָׁן**, vid., on Psa. 37:20. The reading **בְּמוֹ קֶד** (in the Karaite Ben-Jerucham) enriches the lexicon in the same sense with a word which has scarcely had any existence. **מוֹקֶד** (Arabic *mauqid*) signifies here, as in other instances, a hearth. **נִחְרוּ** is, as in Psa. 69: 4, *Niphal*: my bones are heated through with a fever-heat, as a hearth with the smouldering fire that is on it. **הוֹפָה** (cf. **גִּדְדוּ**, Psa. 94:21) is used exactly as in Hos. 9:16, cf. Psa. 121: 5. The heart is said to dry up when the life's blood, of which it is the reservoir, fails. The verb **שָׁכַח** is followed by **מִן** of dislike. On the cleaving of the bones to the flesh from being baked, i.e., to the skin (Arabic *bašar*, in accordance with the radical signification, the surface of the body = the skin, from **בָּחַר**, to brush along, rub, scrape, scratch on the surface), cf. Job. 19:20, Lam. 4: 8. **לֵא** (**אֵל**) with **דָּבַק** is used just like **בָּ**. It is unnecessary, with Böttcher, to draw **מִקּוֹל אֲנַחְתִּי** to v. 5. Continuous straining of the voice, especially in connection with persevering prayer arising from inward conflict, does really make the body waste away.

**Psa. 102: 7-9.** **קָאֵת** (construct of **קָאֵת** or **קָאֵת** from **קָאָה**, vid., *Isaiah*, at 34:11-12), according to the LXX, is the pelican, and **בוֹס** is the night-raven or the little horned-owl. <sup>f334</sup> **דָּמָה** obtains the signification to be like, equal (*aequalem esse*), from the radical signification to be flat, even, and to spread out flat (as the Dutch have already recognised). They are both unclean creatures, which are fond of the loneliness of the desert and ruined places. To such a wilderness, that of the exile, is the poet unwillingly transported. He passes the nights without sleep (**שָׁקֵד**, to watch during the time for sleep), and is therefore like a bird sitting lonesome (**בוֹדֵד**, Syriac erroneously **נוֹדֵד**) upon the roof whilst all in the house beneath are sleeping. The *Athnach* in v. 8

separates that which is come to be from the ground of the “becoming” and the “becoming” itself. His grief is that his enemies reproach him as one forsaken of God. **מֵהִנָּל**, *part. Poal*, is one made or become mad, Ecc. 2: 2: my mad ones = those who are mad against me. These swear by him, inasmuch as they say when they want to curse: “God do unto thee as unto this man,” which is to be explained according to Isa. 65:15, Jer. 29:22.

*Psa. 102:10-12.* Ashes are his bread (cf. Lam. 3:16), inasmuch as he, a mourner, sits in ashes, and has thrown ashes all over himself, Job. 2: 8, Eze. 27:30. The infected **שָׁקוּ** has **שָׁקוּ = שָׁקוּ** for its principal form, instead of which it is **שָׁקוּ** in Hos. 2: 7. “That Thou hast lifted me up and cast me down” is to be understood according to Job. 30:22. First of all God has taken away the firm ground from under his feet, then from aloft He has cast him to the ground — an emblem of the lot of Israel, which is removed from its fatherland and cast into exile, i.e., into a strange land. In that passage the days of his life are **כַּצֵּל נְטוּי**, like a lengthened shadow, which grows longer and longer until it is entirely lost in darkness, Psa. 109:23. Another figure follows: he there becomes like an (uprooted) plant which dries up.

*Psa. 102:13-15.* When the church in its individual members dies off on a foreign soil, still its God, the unchangeable One, remains, and therein the promise has the guarantee of its fulfilment. Faith lays hold upon this guarantee as in Psalm 90. It becomes clear from Psa. 9: 8 and Lam. 5:19 how **תֵּשֵׁב** is to be understood. The Name which Jahve makes Himself by self-attestation never falls a prey to the dead past, it is His ever-living memorial (**זִכָּר**, Exo. 3:15). Thus, too, will He restore Jerusalem; the limit, or appointed time, to which the promise points is, as his longing tells the poet, now come. **מוֹעֵד**, according to Psa. 75: 3, Hab. 2: 3, is the juncture, when the redemption by means of the judgment on the enemies of Israel shall dawn. **לְחַנְּנָה**, from the infinitive **חָנַן**, has *ě*, flattened from *ǎ*, in an entirely closed syllable. **רָצָה** *seq. acc.* signifies to have pleasure in anything, to cling to it with delight; and **חֲנִין**, according to Pro. 14:21, affirms a compassionate, tender love of the object. The servants of God do not feel at home in Babylon, but their loving yearning lingers over the ruins, the stones and the heaps of the rubbish (Neh. 3:34 [4: 2]), of Jerusalem.

*Psa. 102:16-18.* With **יִירָאוּ** we are told what will take place when that which is expected in v. 14 comes to pass, and at the same time the fulfilment of that which is longed for is thereby urged home upon God: Jahve’s own honour depends upon it, since the restoration of Jerusalem will become the means of the conversion of the world — a fundamental thought of Isaiah 40-56 (cf. more particularly Psa. 59:19; 60: 2), which is also called to mind in the expression of

this strophe. This prophetic prospect (Isa. 40: 1-5) that the restoration of Jerusalem will take place simultaneously with the glorious parusia of Jahve re-echoes here in a lyric form. כִּי, v. 17, states the ground of the reverence, just as v. 20 the ground of the praise. The people of the Exile are called in v. 18 הָאֲרָעָה, from עָרָה, to be naked: homeless, powerless, honourless, and in the eyes of men, prospectless. The LXX renders this word in Jer. 17: 6 ἄγροιστοῦρα, and its plural, formed by an internal change of vowel, עָרוֹעָר, in Jer. 48: 6 ὄνος ἄγρος, which are only particularizations of the primary notion of that which is stark naked, neglected, wild. V. 18b is an echo off Psa. 22:25. In the mirror of this and of other Psalms written in times of affliction the Israel of the Exile saw itself reflected.

*Psa. 102:19-23.* The poet goes on advancing motives to Jahve for the fulfilment of his desire, by holding up to Him what will take place when He shall have restored Zion. The evangel of God's redemptive deed will be written down for succeeding generations, and a new, created people, i.e., a people coming into existence, the church of the future, shall praise God the Redeemer for it. דֹּר אַחֲרָיו as in Psa. 48:14; 78: 4. אִם נִלְדָּה like אִם נִלְדָּה 22:32, perhaps with reference to deutero-Isaianic passages like Isa. 43:17. On v. 20, cf. Isa. 63:15; in v. 21 (cf. Isa. 42: 7; 61: 1) the deutero-Isaianic colouring is very evident. And v. 21 rests still more verbally upon Psa. 79:11. The people of the Exile are as it were in prison and chains (אֲסִיר), and are advancing towards their destruction (בְּנֵי תְמוּתָהּ), if God does not interpose. Those who have returned home are the subject to לְסִפּוּר in v. 23 introduces that which takes place simultaneously: with the release of Israel from servitude is united the conversion of the world. נִקְבְּץ occurs in the same connection as in Isa. 60: 4. After having thus revelled in the glory of the time of redemption the poet comes back to himself and gives form to his prayer on his own behalf.

*Psa. 102:24-29.* On the way (בַּ as in Psa. 110: 7) — not “by means of the way” (בְּ as in Psa. 105:18), in connection with which one would expect of find some attributive minuter definition of the way — God hath bowed down his strength (cf. Deu. 8: 2); it was therefore a troublous, toilsome way which he has been led, together with his people. He has shortened his days, so that he only drags on wearily, and has only a short distance still before him before he is entirely overcome. The *Chethib* כַּחַו (LXX ἡσυχύος αὐτοῦ) may be understood of God's irresistible might, as in Job. 23: 6; 30:18, but in connection with it the designation of the object is felt to be wanting. The introductory אָמַר (cf. Job. 10: 2), which announces a definite moulding of the utterance, serves to give prominence to the petition that follows. In the

expression אֶל־תַּעֲלֵנִי life is conceived of as a line the length of which accords with nature; to die before one's time is a being taken up out of this course, so that the second half of the line is not lived through (Psa. 55:24, Isa. 38:10). The prayer not to sweep him away before his time, the poet supports not by the eternity of God in itself, but by the work of the rejuvenation of the world and of the restoration of Israel that is to be looked for, which He can and will bring to an accomplishment, because He is the ever-living One. The longing to see this new time is the final ground of the poet's prayer for the prolonging of his life. The confession of God the Creator in v. 26 reminds one in its form of Isa. 48:13, cf. 44:24. הָמָּה in v. 27 refers to the two great divisions of the universe. The fact that God will create heaven and earth anew is a revelation that is indicated even in Isa. 34: 4, but is first of all expressed more fully and in many ways in the second part of the Book of Isaiah, viz., Isa. 51: 6, 16; 65:17; 66:22. It is clear from the agreement in the figure of the garment (Isa. 51: 6, cf. 50: 9) and in the expression (עֲמַד, *perstare*, as in Isa. 66:22) that the poet has gained this knowledge from the prophet. The expressive אַתָּה הוּא, Thou art He, i.e., unalterably the same One, is also taken from the mouth of the prophet, Isa. 41: 4; 43:10; 46: 4; 48:12; הוּא is a predicate, and denotes the identity (sameness) of Jahve (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 63). In v. 29 also, in which the prayer for a lengthening of life tapers off to a point, we hear Isa. 65: 2; 66:22 re-echoed. And from the fact that in the mind of the poet as of the prophet the post-exilic Jerusalem and the final new Jerusalem upon the new earth under a new heaven blend together, it is evident that not merely in the time of Hezekiah or of Manasseh (assuming that Isa. 40-66 are by the old Isaiah), but also even in the second half of the Exile, such a perspectively foreshortened view was possible. When, moreover, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews at once refers vv. 26-28 to Christ, this is justified by the fact that the God whom the poet confesses as the unchangeable One is Jahve who is to come.

## Psalm 103

### HYMN IN HONOUR OF GOD THE ALL-COMPASSIONATE ONE

*103: 1 BLESS, O my soul, Jahve,  
And all that is within me, His holy Name.*

*103: 2 Bless, O my soul, Jahve,  
And forget not all His benefits —*

*103: 3 Who forgiveth all thine iniquity,  
Who healeth all thine infirmities,*

*103: 4 Who redeemeth thy life from the pit,  
Who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies,*

*103: 5 Who satisfieth thy mouth with good,  
So that thy youth renews itself like the eagle.*

*103: 6 Deeds of righteousness doth Jahve perform,  
And judgments on behalf of all that are oppressed.*

*103: 7 He made known His ways unto Moses,  
To the children of Israel His mighty acts.*

*103: 8 Merciful and gracious is Jahve,  
Slow to anger and plenteous in mercy.*

*103: 9 Not always doth He contend,  
And not for ever doth He keep anger.*

*103:10 He doth not deal with us after our sins,  
Nor recompense us after our iniquities.*

*103:11 For as the heaven is high above the earth,  
So mighty is His mercy upon those who fear Him.*

*103:12 As far as the east is from the west,  
So far doth He remove our transgressions from us.*

*103:13 Like as a father pitieth his children,  
So Jahve pitieth those who fear Him.*

*103:14 For He knoweth our nature,  
He is mindful, that we are dust.*

*103:15 A mortal man — his days are as grass,  
As a flower of the field, so he flourisheth.*

*103:16 If the wind passeth over him, he is not,  
And his place knoweth him no more.*

*103:17 But the mercy of Jahve is from everlasting  
to everlasting upon those who fear Him,  
And His righteousness is manifested to children's children,*

*103:18 To those who keep His covenant  
And are mindful of His statutes to do them.*

*103:19 Jahve hath established His throne in the heavens,  
And His kingdom ruleth over all.*

*103:20 Bless Jahve, ye His angels,  
Ye strong heroes doing His word,  
Harkening to the call of His word.*



*103:21 Bless Jahve, all ye His hosts,  
His servants doing His pleasure.*

*103:22 Bless Jahve, all ye His works,  
In all places of His dominion.  
Bless, O my soul, Jahve!*

*Psalm 103.* To the “*Thou wilt have compassion upon Zion*” of Psa. 102:14 is appended Psalm 103, which has this as its substance throughout; but in other respects the two Psalms stand in contrast to one another. The inscription לָדוֹד is also found thus by itself without any further addition even before Psalms of the First Book (26-28, 35, 37). It undoubtedly does not rest merely on conjecture, but upon tradition. For no internal grounds which might have given rise to the annotation לָדוֹד can be traced. The form of the language does not favour it. This pensive song, so powerful in its tone, has an Aramaic colouring like Psalm 116, 124, 129. In the heaping up of Aramaizing suffix-forms it has its equal only in the story of Elisha, 2Ki. 4: 1-7, where, moreover, the *Keri* throughout substitutes the usual forms, whilst here, where these suffix-forms are intentional ornaments of the expression, the *Chethib* rightly remains unaltered. The forms are 2<sup>nd</sup> sing. fem. *ēchi* for *ēch*, and 2<sup>nd</sup> sing. plur. *ājchi* for *ajich*. The *i* without the tone which is added here is just the one with which originally the pronunciation was אַחִי instead of אֶחֶי and לְבִי for לֵב. Out of the Psalter (here and Psa. 116: 7, 19) these suffix-forms *echi* and *ajchi* occur only in Jer. 11:15, and in the North-Palestinian history of the prophet in the Book of Kings.

The groups or strophes into which the Psalm falls are vv. 1-5, 6-10, 11-14, 15-18, 19-22. If we count their lines we obtain the schema 10. 10. 8. 8. 10. The coptic version accordingly reckons 46 CTYXOC, i.e., στυχοι.

*Psa. 103: 1-5.* In the strophe vv. 1-5 the poet calls upon his soul to arise to praiseful gratitude for God’s justifying, redeeming, and renewing grace. In such soliloquies it is the Ego that speaks, gathering itself up with the spirit, the stronger, more manly part of man (*Psychology*, S. 104 f.; tr. p. 126), or even, because the soul as the spiritual medium of the spirit and of the body represents the whole person of man (*Psychology*, S. 203; tr. p. 240), the Ego rendering objective in the soul the whole of its own personality. So here in vv. 3-5 the soul, which is addressed, represents the whole man. The קַרְבִּים which occurs here is a more choice expression for מַעִים (מַאִים): the heart, which is called קַרְבַּי κατ’ ἐξοχῆν, the reins, the liver, etc.; for according to the scriptural conception (*Psychology*, S. 266; tr. p. 313) these organs of the cavities of the breast and abdomen serve not merely for the bodily life, but also the psycho-spiritual life. The summoning בְּרַבִּי is repeated *per anaphoram*. There is

nothing the soul of man is so prone to forget as to render thanks that are due, and more especially thanks that are due to God. It therefore needs to be expressly aroused in order that it may not leave the blessing with which God blesses it unacknowledged, and may not forget all His acts performed (גַּמְלָה = גַּמְרָה) on it (גַּמְלוֹל, ῥήμα μέσον, e.g., in Psa. 137: 8), which are purely deeds of loving-kindness), which is the primal condition and the foundation of all the others, viz., sin-pardoning mercy. The verbs סָלַח and רָפָא with a dative of the object denote the bestowment of that which is expressed by the verbal notion. תַּחֲלוּאִים (taken from Deu. 29:21, cf. 1Ch. 21:19, from אָחַז = חָלַח, root חָל, *solutum, laxum esse*) are not merely bodily diseases, but all kinds of inward and outward sufferings. מִשְׁחָת the LXX renders ἐκ φθορᾶς (from שָׁחַת, as in Job. 17:14); but in this antithesis to life it is more natural to render the “pit” (from שוּחַ) as a name of Hades, as in Psa. 16:10. Just as the soul owes its deliverance from guilt and distress and death to God, so also does it owe to God that with which it is endowed out of the riches of divine love. The verb עָטַר, without any such addition as in Psa. 5:13, is “to crown,” cf. Psa. 8: 6. As is usually the case, it is construed with a double accusative; the crown is as it were woven out of loving-kindness and compassion. The *Beth* of בָּטוֹב in v. 5 instead of the accusative (Psa. 104:28) denotes the means of satisfaction, which is at the same time that which satisfies. עֲדִיךָ the Targum renders: *dies senectutis tuae*, whereas in Psa. 32: 9 it is *ornatus ejus*; the *Peshîto* renders: *corpus tuum*, and in Psa. 32: 9 inversely, *juventus eorum*. These significations, “old age” or “youth,” are pure inventions. And since the words are addressed to the soul, עֲדִי cannot also, like כְּבוֹד in other instances, be a name of the soul itself (Aben-Ezra, Mendelssohn, Philippsohn, Hengstenberg, and others). We, therefore, with Hitzig, fall back upon the sense of the word in 32: 9, where the LXX renders τὰς σιαγόνας αὐτῶν, but here more freely, apparently starting from the primary notion of עֲדִי = Arabic *chadd*, the cheek: τὸν ἐμπιπλῶντα ἐν ἀγαθοῖς τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν σου (whereas Saadia’s *victim tuum* is based upon a comparison of the Arabic *gdâ*, to nourish). The poet tells the soul (i.e., his own person, himself) that God satisfies it with good, so that it as it were gets its cheeks full of it (cf. Psa. 81:11). The comparison בְּנִשְׂר is, as in Mic. 1:16 (cf. Isa. 40:31), to be referred to the annual moulting of the eagle. Its renewing of its plumage is an emblem of the renovation of his youth by grace. The predicate to נְעוּרָיִכִי (plural of extension in relation to time) stands first regularly in the *sing. fem.*

**Psa. 103: 6-10.** His range of vision being widened from himself, the poet now in vv. 6-18 describes God’s gracious and fatherly conduct towards sinful and perishing men, and that as it shines forth from the history of Israel and is

known and recognised in the light of revelation. What v. 6 says is a commonplace drawn from the history of Israel. מִשְׁפָּטִים is an accusative governed by the עֲשֵׂה that is to be borrowed out of עֲשֵׂה (so Baer after the Masora). And because v. 6 is the result of an historical retrospect and survey, יוֹדִיא in v. 7 can affirm that which happened in the past (cf. Psa. 96: 6 f.); for the supposition of Hengstenberg and Hitzig, that *Moses* here represents Israel like *Jacob, Isaac, and Joseph* in other instances, is without example in the whole Israelitish literature. It becomes clear from v. 8 in what sense the making of His ways known is meant. The poet has in his mind Moses' prayer: "make known to me now Thy way" (Exo. 33:13), which Jahve fulfilled by passing by him as he stood in the cleft of the rock and making Himself visible to him as he looked after Him, amidst the proclamation of His attributes. The ways of Jahve are therefore in this passage not those in which men are to walk in accordance with His precepts (Psa. 25: 4), but those which He Himself follows in the course of His redemptive history (Psa. 67: 3). The confession drawn from Exo. 34: 6 f. is become a formula of the Israelitish faith (Psa. 86:15; 145: 8, Joe. 2:13, Neh. 9:17, and frequently). In vv. 9 ff. the fourth attribute (וְרַב־חֶסֶד) is made the object of further praise. He is not only long (אָרָךְ from אָרַךְ, like פָּכַד from פָּכַד) in anger, i.e., waiting a long time before He lets His anger loose, but when He contends, i.e., interposes judicially, this too is not carried to the full extent (Psa. 78:38), He is not angry for ever (נָמַר, to keep, viz., anger, Amo. 1:11; cf. the parallels, both as to matter and words, Jer. 3: 5, Isa. 57:16). The procedure of His righteousness is regulated not according to our sins, but according to His purpose of mercy. The prefects in v. 10 state that which God has constantly not done, and the futures in v. 9 what He continually will not do.

*Psa. 103:11-14.* The ingenious figures in vv. 11 f. (cf. Psa. 36: 6; 57:11) illustrate the infinite power and complete unreservedness of mercy (loving-kindness). הַרְחִיק has *Gaja* (as have also הִשְׁחִיתוּ and הִתְעִיבוּ, Psa. 14: 1; 53: 2, in exact texts), in order to render possible the distinct pronunciation of the guttural in the combination רַח. V. 13 sounds just as much like the spirit of the New Testament as vv. 11, 12. The relationship to Jahve in which those stand who fear Him is a filial relationship based upon free reciprocity (Mal. 3:11). His Fatherly compassion is (v. 14) based upon the frailty and perishableness of man, which are known to God, much the same as God's promise after the Flood not to decree a like judgment again (Gen. 8:21). According to this passage and Deu. 31:21, יִצְרָנִי appears to be intended of the moral nature; but according to v. 14b, one is obliged to think rather of the natural form which man possesses from God the Creator (וַיִּצְרָה, Gen. 2: 7) than of the form of heart which he has by his own choice and, so far as its

groundwork is concerned, by inheritance (Psa. 51: 7). In זָכוֹר, mindful, the passive, according to Böttcher's correct apprehension of it, expresses a passive state after an action that is completed by the person himself, as in יָדוּא, בָּטוּחַ, and the like. In its form v. 14a reminds one of the Book of Job. 11:11; 28:23, and v. 14b as to subject-matter recalls Job. 7: 7, and other passages (cf. Psa. 78:39; 89:48); but the following figurative representation of human frailty, with which the poet contrasts the eternal nature of the divine mercy as the sure stay of all God-fearing ones in the midst of the rise and decay of things here below, still more strongly recalls that book.

*Psa. 103:15-18.* The figure of the grass recalls Psa. 90: 5 f., cf. Isa. 40: 6-8; 51:12; that of the flower, Job. 14: 2. אֲנוּשׁ is man as a mortal being; his life's duration is likened to that of a blade of grass, and his beauty and glory to a flower of the field, whose fullest bloom is also the beginning of its fading. In v. 16 בּוֹ (the same as in Isa. 40: 7 f.) refers to man, who is compared to grass and flowers. בּוֹ is אֲנוּשׁ with a hypothetical perfect; and the wind that scorches up the plants, referred to man, is an emblem of every form of peril that threatens life: often enough it is really a breath of wind which snaps off a man's life. The bold designation of vanishing away without leaving any trace, "and his place knoweth him no more," is taken from Job. 7:10, cf. *ibid.* 8:18; 20: 9. In the midst of this plant-like, frail destiny, there is, however, one strong ground of comfort. There is an everlasting power, which raises all those who link themselves with it above the transitoriness involved in nature's laws, and makes them eternal like itself. This power is the mercy of God, which spans itself above (אֵל) all those who fear Him like an eternal heaven. This is God's righteousness, which rewards faithful adherence to His covenant and conscientious fulfilment of His precepts in accordance with the order of redemption, and shows itself even to (לְ) children's children, according to Exo. 20: 6; 34: 7, Deu. 7: 9: on into a thousand generations, i.e., into infinity.

*Psa. 103:19-22.* He is able to show Himself thus gracious to His own, for He is the supra-mundane, all-ruling King. With this thought the poet draws on to the close of his song of praise. The heavens in opposition to the earth, as in Psa. 115: 3, Ecc. 5: 1 [2], is the unchangeable realm above the rise and fall of things here below. On v. 19b cf. 1Ch. 29:12. כֹּל refers to everything created without exception, the universe of created things. In connection with the heavens of glory the poet cannot but call to mind the angels. His call to these to join in the praise of Jahve has its parallel only in Psalm 29 and 148. It arises from the consciousness of the church on earth that it stands in living like-minded fellowship with the angels of God, and that it possesses a dignity which rises above all created things, even the angels which are appointed to

serve it (Psa. 91:11). They are called **גְּבֵרִים** as in Joe. 4 [3]:11, and in fact **כַּח גְּבִירִי**, as the strong to whom belongs strength unequalled. Their life endowed with heroic strength is spent entirely — an example for mortals — in an obedient execution of the word of God. **לְשִׁמָּה** is a definition not of the purpose, but of the manner: *obediendo* (as in Gen. 2: 3 *perficiendo*). Hearing the call of His word, they also forthwith put it into execution. the hosts (**צְבָאוֹת**), as **מְשֻׁרְתָיו** shows, are the celestial spirits gathered around the angels of a higher rank (cf. Luke 2:13), the innumerable *λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα* (Psa. 104: 4, Dan. 7:10, Heb. 1:14), for there is a *hierarchia caelestis*. From the archangels the poet comes to the myriads of the heavenly hosts, and from these to all creatures, that they, wheresoever they may be throughout Jahve's wide domain, may join in the song of praise that is to be struck up; and from this point he comes back to his own soul, which he modestly includes among the creatures mentioned in the third passage. A threefold **בְּרַכֵּי יְפֹשֵׁי** now corresponds to the threefold **בְּרַכּוֹ**; and inasmuch as the poet thus comes back to his own soul, his Psalm also turns back into itself and assumes the form of a converging circle.

## Psalm 104

### HYMN IN HONOUR OF THE GOD OF THE SEVEN DAYS

*104: 1 BLESS, O my soul, Jahve!  
 Jahve, my God, Thou art very great,  
 In splendour and glory hast Thou clothed Thyself;*

*104: 2 Enwrapping Thyself in light as a garment,  
 Spreading out the heavens like a tent-cloth,*

*104: 3 Who layeth the beams of His chambers in the waters,  
 Who maketh the clouds His chariot,  
 Who walketh upon the wings of the wind,*

*104: 4 Making His messengers out of the winds,  
 His servants out of flaming fire.*

*104: 5 He hath founded the earth upon its pillars,  
 That it may not totter for ever and ever.*

*104: 6 The deep as a garment didst Thou cover over it,  
 Upon the mountains stood the waters.*

*104: 7 At Thy rebuke they fled,  
 At the voice of Thy thunder they hasted away —*

*104: 8 The mountains rose, the valleys sank —  
To the place which Thou hast founded for them.*

*104: 9 A bound hast Thou set, they may not pass over,  
They may not turn back to cover the earth.*

*104:10 Who sendeth forth springs in the bottoms of the valleys,  
Between the mountains they take their course.*

*104:11 They give drink to all the beasts of the field,  
The wild asses quench their thirst.*

*104:12 Upon them the birds of the heaven have their habitation,  
From among the branches they raise their voice.*

*104:13 He watereth the mountains out of His chambers —  
With the fruit of Thy works is the earth satisfied.*

*104:14 He causeth grass to grow for the cattle,  
And herb for the service of man —  
To bring forth bread out of the earth,*

*104:15 And that wine may make glad the heart of mortal man,  
To make his face shining from oil,  
And that bread may support the heart of mortal man.*

*104:16 The trees of Jahve are satisfied,  
The cedars of Lebanon, which He hath planted;*

*104:17 Where the birds make their nests,  
The stork which hath its house upon the cypresses.*

*104:18 Mountains, the high ones, are for the wild goats,  
The rocks are a refuge for the rock-badgers.*

*104:19 He hath made the moon for a measuring of the times,  
The sun knoweth its going down.*

*104:20 Thou makest darkness, and it is night,  
Wherein all the beasts of the forest do move.*

*104:21 The young lions roar after their prey,  
And seek from God their food.*

*104:22 The sun ariseth, they retreat  
And lay themselves down in their dens.*

*104:23 Man goeth forth to his work,  
And to his labour, until the evening.*

*104:24 How manifold are Thy works, Jahve,  
With wisdom hast Thou executed them altogether,  
The earth is full of Thy creatures!*

*104:25 Yonder sea, great and far extended —  
There it teems with life, innumerable,  
Small beasts together with great.*

*104:26 There the ships move along,  
The leviathan which Thou hast formed to sport therein.*

*104:27 They all wait upon Thee,  
That Thou mayest give them their food in its season.*

*104:28 Thou givest it to them, they gather it up;  
Thou openest Thy hand, they are satisfied with good.*

*104:29 Thou hidest Thy face, they are troubled;  
Thou takest back their breath, they expire,  
And return to their dust.*

*104:30 Thou sendest forth Thy breath, they are created,  
And Thou renewest the face of the ground.*

*104:31 Let the glory of Jahve endure for ever,  
Let Jahve rejoice in His works;*

*104:32 He, who looketh on the earth and it trembleth,  
He toucheth the mountains and they smoke.*

*104:33 I will sing unto Jahve as long as I live,  
I will harp unto my God as long as I have my being.*

*104:34 May my meditation be acceptable to Him,  
I, even I will rejoice in Jahve.*

*104:35 Let the sinful disappear from the earth,  
And evil-doers be no more —  
Bless, O my soul, Jahve,  
Hallelujah.*

*Psalm 104.* With *Bless, O my soul, Jahve*, as Psalm 103, begins this anonymous Psalm 104 also, in which God's rule in the kingdom of nature, as there in the kingdom of grace, is the theme of praise, and as there the angels are associated with it. The poet sings the God-ordained present condition of the world with respect to the creative beginnings recorded in Gen. 1: 1-2: 3; and closes with the wish that evil may be expelled from this good creation, which so thoroughly and fully reveals God's power, and wisdom, and goodness. It is a Psalm of nature, but such as not poet among the Gentiles could have written. The Israelitish poet stands free and unfettered in the presence of nature as his

object, and all things appear to him as brought forth and sustained by the creative might of the one God, brought into being and preserved in existence on purpose that He, the self-sufficient One, may impart Himself in free condescending love — as the creatures and orders of the Holy One, in themselves good and pure, but spotted and disorganized only by the self-corruption of man in sin and wickedness, which self-corruption must be turned out in order that the joy of God in His works and the joy of these works in their Creator may be perfected. The Psalm is altogether an echo of the heptahemeron (or history of the seven days of creation) in Gen. 1: 1-2: 3.

Corresponding to the seven days it falls into seven groups, in which the **מֵאֵד הַנְּהִיטוּב** of Gen. 1:31 is expanded. It is not, however, so worked out that each single group celebrates the work of a day of creation; the Psalm has the commingling whole of the finished creation as its standpoint, and is therefore not so conformed to any plan. Nevertheless it begins with the light and closes with an allusion to the divine Sabbath. When it is considered that v. 8a is only with violence accommodated to the context, that v. 18 is forced in without any connection and contrary to any plan, and that v. 32 can only be made intelligible in that position by means of an artificial combination of the thoughts, then the supposition of Hitzig, ingeniously wrought out by him in his own way, is forced upon one, viz., that this glorious hymn has decoyed some later poet-hand into enlarging upon it.

*Psa. 104: 1-4.* The first decastich begins the celebration with work of the first and second days. **הוֹד וְהָדָר** here is not the doxa belonging to God **πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος** (Jude 25), but the doxa which He has put on (Job. 40:10) since He created the world, over against which He stands in kingly glory, or rather in which He is immanent, and which reflects this kingly glory in various gradations, yea, to a certain extent is this glory itself. For inasmuch as God began the work of creation with the creation of light, He has covered Himself with this created light itself as with a garment. That which once happened in connection with the creation may, as in Amos 4:13, Isaiah 44:24; 45: 7, Jeremiah 10:12, and frequently, be expressed by participles of the present, because the original setting is continued in the preservation of the world; and determinate participles alternate with participles without the article, as in Isaiah 44:24-28, with no other difference than that the former are more predicative and the latter more attributive. With v. 2b the poet comes upon the work of the second day: the creation of the expanse (**רַקִּיעַ**) which divides between the waters. God has spread this out (cf. Isaiah 40:22) like a tent-cloth (Isa. 54: 2), of such light and of such fine transparent work; **נִיטָה** here rhymes with **עֵטָה**. In those waters which the “expanse” holds aloft over the earth God lays the beams of His upper chambers (**עֲלִיּוֹתָיו**), instead of which we find



מַעְלֹתָיו in Amo. 9: 6, from עֲלִיָּה, ascent, elevation, then an upper story, an upper chamber, which would be more accurately עֲלִיָּה after the Aramaic and Arabic); but not as though the waters were the material for them, they are only the place for them, that is exalted above the earth, and are able to be this because to the Immaterial One even that which is fluid is solid, and that which is dense is transparent. The reservoirs of the upper waters, the clouds, God makes, as the lightning, thunder, and rain indicate, into His chariot (רֶכֶב), upon which he rides along in order to make His power felt below upon the earth judicially (Isa. 19: 1), or in rescuing and blessing men. רֶכֶב (only here) accords in sound with פָּרוּב, 18:11. For v. 3c also recalls this primary passage, where the wings of the wind take the place of the cloud-chariot. In v. 4 the LXX (Heb. 1: 7) makes the first substantive into an accusative of the object, and the second into an accusative of the predicate: Ο ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα. It is usually translated the reverse way: making the winds into His angels, etc. This rendering is possible so far as the language is concerned (cf. Ps. 100: 3 *Chethîb*, and on the position of the worlds, Amo. 4:13 with 5: 8), and the plural מַשְׂרָתָיו is explicable in connection with this rendering from the force of the parallelism, and the singular שֵׁשׁ from the fact that this word has no plural.

Since, however, עָשָׂה with two accusatives usually signifies to produce something out of something, so that the second accusative (viz., the accusative of the predicate, which is logically the second, but according to the position of the words may just as well be the first, Exo. 25:39; 30:25, as the second, Exo. 37:23; 38: 3, Gen. 2: 7, 2Ch. 4:18-22) denotes the *materia ex qua*, it may with equal right at least be interpreted: Who makes His messengers out of the winds, His servants out of the flaming or consuming (vid., on Ps. 57: 5) fire (שֵׁשׁ, as in Jer. 48:45, *masc.*). And this may affirm either that God makes use of wind and fire for special missions (cf. Ps. 148: 8), or (cf. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 325 f.) that He gives wind and fire to His angels for the purpose of His operations in the world which are effected through their agency, as the materials of their outward manifestation, and as it were of their self-embodiment,<sup>f355</sup> as then in Ps. 18:11 wind and cherub are both to be associated together in thought as the vehicle of the divine activity in the world, and in 35: 5 the angel of Jahve represents the energy of the wind.

*Psa. 104: 5-9.* In a second decastich the poet speaks of the restraining of the lower waters and the establishing of the land standing out of the water. The suffix, referring back to אָרֶץ, is intended to say that the earth hanging free in space (Job. 26: 7) has its internal supports. Its eternal stability is preserved even amidst the judgment predicted in Isa. 24:16 f., since it comes forth out of it, unremoved from its former station, as a transformed, glorified earth. The

deep (תְּהוֹם) with which God covers it is that primordial mass of water in which it lay first of all as it were in embryo, for it came into being ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος (2Pe. 3: 5). כַּסִּיתוֹ does not refer to תְּהוֹם (*masc.* as in Job. 28:14), because then עֲלֶיהָ would be required, but to אֶרֶץ, and the masculine is to be explained either by attraction) according to the model of 1Sa. 2: 4a), or by a reversion to the masculine ground-form as the discourse proceeds (cf. the same thing with עִיר 2Sa. 17:13, צִעֲקָה Exo. 11: 6, יָד Eze. 2: 9). According to v. 6b, the earth thus overflowed with water was already mountainous; the primal formation of the mountains is therefore just as old as the תְּהוֹם mentioned in direct succession to the תְּהוֹ וּבְהוֹ. After this, vv. 7-9 describe the subduing of the primordial waters by raising up the dry land and the confining of these waters in basins surrounded by banks. Terrified by the despotic command of God, they started asunder, and mountains rose aloft, the dry land with its heights and its low grounds appeared. The rendering that the waters, thrown into wild excitement, rose up the mountains and descended again (Hengstenberg), does not harmonize with the fact that they are represented in v. 6 as standing above the mountains. Accordingly, too, it is not to be interpreted after Psa. 107:26: they (the waters) rose mountain-high, they sunk down like valleys. The reference of the description to the coming forth of the dry land on the third day of creation requires that הָרִים should be taken as subject to יַעֲלוּ. But then, too, the בְּקַעוֹת are the subject to יִרְדּוּ, as Hilary of Poitiers renders it in his *Genesis*, 5:97, etc.: *subsidunt valles*, and not the waters as subsiding into the valleys. Hupfeld is correct; v. 8a is a parenthesis which affirms that, inasmuch as the waters retreating laid the solid land bare, mountains and valleys as such came forth visibly; cf. Ovid, *Metam.* i. 344:

*Flumina subsidunt, montes exire videntur.*

*Psa. 104: 8.* V. 8 continues with the words אֶל-מְקוֹם (cf. Gen. 1: 9, אָחַד אֶל-מְקוֹם): the waters retreat to the place which (זֶה, cf. v. 26, for אֲשֶׁר, Gen. 39:20) God has assigned to them as that which should contain them. He hath set a bound (גְּבוּל, synon. חֶק, Pro. 8:29, Jer. 5:22) for them beyond which they may not flow forth again to cover the earth, as the primordial waters of chaos have done.

*Psa. 104:10-14b.* The third decastich, passing on to the third day of creation, sings the benefit which the shore-surrounded waters are to the animal creation and the growth of the plants out of the earth, which is irrigated from below and moistened from above. God, the blessed One, being the principal subject of the Psalm, the poet (in v. 10 and further on) is able to go on in

attributive and predicative participles: Who sendeth springs בְּנַחֲלִים, into the *wadis* (not: בְּנַחֲלִים, as brooks). נַחַל, as v. 10*b* shows, is here a synonym of בְּקַעֲתָה, and there is no need for saying that, flowing on in the plains, they grow into rivers. The LXX has ἐν φάραγγιν. חִיתוֹ שְׂדֵי is doubly poetic for הַשְּׂדֵה חַיִּת. God has also provided for all the beasts that roam far from men; and the wild ass, swift as an arrow, difficult to be hunted, and living in troops (פָּרָא, Arabic *ferâ*, root פָּר, Arab. *fr*, to move quickly, to whiz, to flee; the wild ass, the *onager*, Arabic *himâr el-wahs*, whose home is on the steppes), is made prominent by way of example. The phrase “to break the thirst” occurs only here. עֲלִיָּהֶם, v. 12*a*, refers to the מַעְיָנִים, which are also still the subject in v. 11*a*. The pointing עֲפָאִים needlessly creates a hybrid form in addition to עֲפָאִים (like לִבְאִים) and עֲפָיִים. From the tangled branches by the springs the poet insensibly reaches the second half of the third day. The vegetable kingdom at the same time reminds him of the rain which, descending out of the upper chambers of the heavens, waters the waterless mountain-tops. Like the Talmud (*B. Ta’anith*, 10*a*), by the “fruit of Thy work” (מַעֲשֵׂךְ as singular) Hitzig understands the rain; but rain is rather that which fertilizes; and why might not the fruit be meant which God’s works (מַעֲשֵׂךְ, plural) here below (v. 24), viz., the vegetable creations, bear, and from which the earth, i.e., its population, is satisfied, inasmuch as vegetable food springs up as much for the beasts as for man? In connection with עֵשֶׂב the poet is thinking of cultivated plants, more especially wheat; לְעַבְדָּתָה, however, does not signify: *for cultivation by man*, since, according to Hitzig’s correct remonstrance, they do not say עַבְדַּת הָעֵשֶׂב, and לְהוֹצִיא has not man, but rather God, as its subject, but as in 1Ch. 26:30, *for the service (use) of man*.

*Psa. 104:14-18.* In the fourth decastich the poet goes further among the creatures of the field and of the forest. The subject to לְהוֹצִיא is מַצְמִיחַ. The clause expressing the purpose, which twice begins with an infinitive, is continued in both instances, as in Isa. 13: 9, but with a change of subject (cf. e.g., Amo. 1:11; 2: 4), in the finite verb. On what is said of wine we may compare Ecc. 10:19, sir. 40:20, and more especially Isaiah, who frequently mentions wine as a representative of all the natural sources of joy. The assertion that מִשְׁמָן signifies “before oil = brighter than oil,” is an error that is rightly combated by Böttcher in his *Proben* and two of his “Gleanings,”<sup>f336</sup> which imputes to the poet a mention of oil that is contrary to his purpose in this connection and inappropriate. Corn, wine, and oil are mentioned as the three chief products of the vegetable kingdom (Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Dathe, and Hupfeld), and are assumed under עֵשֶׂב in v. 14*b*, as is also the case in

other instances where distinction would be superfluous, e.g., in Exo. 9:22. With oil God makes the countenance shining, or bright and cheerful, not by means of anointing, — since it was not the face but the head that was anointed (Mat. 6:17), — but by the fact of its increasing the savouriness and nutritiveness of the food. **לְהַצְהִיל** is chosen with reference to **יִצְהָר**. In v. 15c **לִבְב־אֲנוֹשׁ** does not stand after, as in v. 15a (where it is **לִבְב־** with *Gaja* on account of the distinctive), but before the verb, because **לִבְב** as that which is inward stands in antithesis to **פְּנִים** as that which is outside. Since the fertilization of the earth by the rain is the chief subject of the predication in vv. 13-15, v. 16 is naturally attached to what precedes without arousing critical suspicion. That which satisfies is here the rain itself, and not, as in v. 13b, that which the rain matures. The “trees of Jahve” are those which before all others proclaim the greatness of their Creator. **אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם** refers to these trees, of which the cedars and then the cypresses (**בְּרוֹשִׁים**, root **בר**, to cut) are mentioned. They are places where small and large birds build their nests and lodge, more particularly the stork, which is called the **חֲסִידָה** as being **πτηνῶν εὐσεβέστατον ζῶον** (Barbrius, *Fab.* xiii.), as *avis pia* (*pietaticultrix* in Petronius, lv. 6), i.e., on account of its love of family life, on account of which it is also regarded as bringing good fortune to a house. <sup>f337</sup>

The care of God for the lodging of His creatures leads the poet from the trees to the heights of the mountains and the hiding-places of the rocks, in a manner that is certainly abrupt and that disturbs the sketch taken from the account of the creation. **הַגְּבֹהִים** is an apposition. **יַעַל** (Arabic *wa'il*) is the steinboc, wild-goat, as being an inhabitant of **יַאֲל** (*wa'l, wa'la*), i.e., the high places of the rocks, as **יַעַן**, Lam. 4: 3, according to Wetzstein, is the ostrich as being an inhabitant of the *wa'na*, i.e., the sterile desert; and **שָׁפָן** is the rock-badger, which dwells in the clefts of the rocks (Pro. 30:26), and resembles the marmot — South Arabic Arab. *tufun*, *Hyrax Syriacus* (distinct from the African). By **שָׁפָן** the Jewish tradition understand the coney, after which the *Peshîto* here renders it **לְחֻגְסָא** (**חֻגְסָא**, *cuniculus*). Both animals, the coney and the rock-badger, may be meant in Lev. 11: 5, Deu. 14: 7; for the sign of the cloven hoof (**פְּרָסָה שְׂסוּעָה**) is wanting in both. The coney has four toes, and the *hyrax* has a peculiar formation of hoof, not cloven, but divided into several parts.

*Psa. 104:19-23.* The fifth decastich, in which the poet passes over from the third to the fourth day, shows that he has the order of the days of creation before his mind. The moon is mentioned first of all, because the poet wishes to make the picture of the day follow that of the night. He describes it in v. 19 as the calendrical principal star. **מוֹעֲדִים** are points and divisions of time

(epochs), and the principal measurer of these for civil and ecclesiastical life is the moon (cf. Sir. 43: 7, ἀπὸ σελήνης σημεῖον ἑορτῆς), just as the sun, knowing when he is to set, is the infallible measurer of the day. In v. 20 the description, which throughout is drawn in the presence of God in His honour, passes over into direct address: jussives (תִּשָּׂא, תִּדְרֹךְ) stand in the hypothetical protasis and in its apodosis (EW. § 357, b). It depends upon God's willing only, and it is night, and the wakeful life of the wild beasts begins to be astir. The young lions then roar after their prey, and *flagitaturi sunt a Deo cibum suum*. The infinitive with *Lamed* is an elliptical expression of a *conjugatio periphrastica* (vid., on Hab. 1:17), and becomes a varying expression of the future in general in the later language in approximation to the Aramaic. The roar of the lions and their going forth in quest of prey is an asking of God which He Himself has implanted in their nature. With the rising of the sun the aspect of things becomes very different. שָׁמֶשׁ is feminine here, where the poet drops the personification (cf. Psalm 19). The day which dawns with sunrise is the time for man. Both as to matter and style, vv. 21-23 call to mind Job. 24: 5; 37: 8; 38:40.

*Psa. 104:24-30.* Fixing his eye upon the sea with its small and great creatures, and the care of God for all self-living beings, the poet passes over to the fifth and sixth days of creation. The rich contents of this sixth group flow over and exceed the decastich. With מִהֲרַבִּי (not מִהֲגִדְלוֹ, Psa. 92: 6) the poet expresses his wonder at the great number of God's works, each one at the same time having its adjustment in accordance with its design, and all, mutually serving one another, co-operating one with another. קִנְיָן, which signifies both bringing forth and acquiring, has the former meaning here according to the predicate: full of creatures, which bear in themselves the traces of the Name of their Creator (קִנְיָה). Beside קִנְיָנֶיךָ, however, we also find the reading קִנְיָנֶיךָ, which is adopted by Norzi, Heidenheim, and Baer, represented by the versions (LXX, Vulgate, and Jerome), by expositors (Rashi: קִנְיֵן שְׂדֵךְ), by the majority of the MSS (according to Norzi) and old printed copies, which would signify τῆς κτίσεώς σου, or according to the Latin versions κτήσεώς σου (*possessione tua*, Luther "they possessions"), but is inferior to the plural κτισμάτων σου, as an accusative of the object to מְלֵאָה. The sea more particularly is a world of moving creatures innumerable (Psa. 69:35). הַיָּם הַזֶּה does not properly signify this sea, but that sea, yonder sea (cf. Psa. 68: 9, Isa. 23:13, Jos. 9:13). The attributes follow in an appositional relation, the looseness of which admits of the non-determination (cf. Psa. 68:28, Jer. 2:21, Gen. 43:14, and the reverse case above in v. 18a). אֲנִי

in relation to אֵלֶּיךָ is a *nomen unitatis* (the single ship). It is an old word, which is also Egyptian in the form *hani* and *ana*.<sup>f338</sup>

*Leviathan*, in the Book of Job, the crocodile, is in this passage the name of the whale (vid., Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmuds*, § § 178-180, 505). Ewald and Hitzig, with the Jewish tradition, understand בּוֹ in v. 26 according to Job. 40:29 [41: 5]: in order to play with him, which, however, gives no idea that is worthy of God. It may be taken as an alternative word for שָׁמַיִם (cf. בּוֹ in v. 20, Job. 40:20): to play therein, viz., in the sea (Saadia). In בְּלֵלִים, v. 27, the range of vision is widened from the creatures of the sea to all the living things of the earth; cf. the borrowed passages Psa. 145:15 f., 147: 9. בְּלֵלִים, by an obliteration of the suffix, signifies directly “altogether,” and בְּעֵתוֹ (cf. Job. 38:32): when it is time for it. With reference to the change of the subject in the principal and in the infinitival clause, vid., Ew. § 338, *a*. The existence, passing away, and origin of all beings is conditioned by God. His hand provides everything; the turning of His countenance towards them upholds everything; and His breath, the creative breath, animates and renews all things. The spirit of life of every creature is the disposing of the divine Spirit, which hovered over the primordial waters and transformed the chaos into the cosmos. תִּסְרַף in v. 29 is equivalent to תִּאֲסַף, as in 1Sa. 15: 6, and frequently. The full future forms accented on the *ultima*, from v. 27 onwards, give emphasis to the statements. Job. 34:14 f. may be compared with v. 29.

*Psa. 104:31-35*. The poet has now come to an end with the review of the wonders of the creation, and closes in this seventh group, which is again substantially decastichic, with a sabbatic meditation, inasmuch as he wishes that the glory of God, which He has put upon His creatures, and which is reflected and echoed back by them to Him, may continue for ever, and that His works may ever be so constituted that He who was satisfied at the completion of His six days' work may be able to rejoice in them. For if they cease to give Him pleasure, He can indeed blot them out as He did at the time of the Flood, since He is always able by a look to put the earth in a tremble, and by a touch to set the mountains on fire (וַתִּרְעַד) of the result of the looking, as in Amo. 5: 8; 9: 6, and וַיַּעֲשֵׂנוּ of that which takes place simultaneously with the touching, as in Psa. 144: 5, Zec. 9: 5, cf. on Hab. 3:10). The poet, however, on his part, will not suffer there to be any lack of the glorifying of Jahve, inasmuch as he makes it his life's work to praise his God with music and song (בְּחִיָּה as in Psa. 63: 5, cf. Bar. 4:20, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις μου). Oh that this his quiet and his audible meditation upon the honour of God may be pleasing to Him (אֵלֶּיךָ synonymous with אֵלֶּיךָ, but also שִׁפְרֵי אֵלֶּיךָ, 16: 6)! Oh that Jahve may be able to rejoice in him, as he himself will rejoice in his God! Between “I

will rejoice,” v. 34, and “He shall rejoice,” v. 31, there exists a reciprocal relation, as between the Sabbath of the creature in God and the Sabbath of God in the creature. When the Psalmist wishes that God may have joy in His works of creation, and seeks on his part to please God and to have his joy in God, he is also warranted in wishing that those who take pleasure in wickedness, and instead of giving God joy excite His wrath, may be removed from the earth (וַתִּמְחוּ, cf. Num. 14:35); for they are contrary to the purpose of the good creation of God, they imperil its continuance, and mar the joy of His creatures. The expression is not: may sins (חַטָּאִים), as it is meant to be read in *B. Berachoth*, 10a, and as some editions, e.g., Bomberg’s of 1521, actually have it), but: may sinners, be no more, for there is no other existence of sin than the personal one.

With the words *Bless, O my soul, Jahve*, the Psalm recurs to its introduction, and to this call upon himself is appended the *Hallelujah* which summons all creatures to the praise of God — a call of devotion which occurs nowhere out of the Psalter, and within the Psalter is found here for the first time, and consequently was only coined in the alter age. In modern printed copies it is sometimes written הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה, sometimes הַלְלוּ יְהוָה, but in the earlier copies (e.g., Venice 1521, Wittenberg 1566) mostly as one word הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה.<sup>f339</sup>

In the majority of MSS it is also found thus as one word,<sup>f340</sup> and that always with הַ, except the first הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה which occurs here at the end of Psalm 104, which has הַ raphe in good MSS and old printed copies. This mode of writing is that attested by the Masora (vid., Baer’s *Psalterium*, p. 132). The Talmud and Midrash observe this first Hallelujah is connected in a significant manner with the prospect of the final overthrow of the wicked. Ben-Pazzi (*B. Berachoth* 10a) counts 103 פְּרָשׁוֹת up to this Hallelujah, reckoning Psalm 1 and 2 as one פְּרָשָׁה.

## Psalm 105

### THANKSGIVING HYMN IN HONOUR OF GOD WHO IS ATTESTED IN THE EARLIEST HISTORY OF ISRAEL

*105: 1 GIVE thanks unto Jahve, publish His Name,  
Make known among the peoples His deeds.*

*105: 2 Sing unto Him, harp unto Him,  
Speak of all His wondrous works.*

*105: 3 Glory ye in His holy Name,  
Let the heart of those rejoice who seek Jahve.*

*105: 4 Follow after Jahve and His strength,  
Seek ye His face evermore.*

*105: 5 Remember His wondrous works which He hath done,  
His rare deeds and the decisions of His mouth,*

*105: 6 O seed of Abraham His servant,  
Ye sons of Jacob, His chosen ones.*

*105: 7 He, Jahve, is our God,  
His judgments go forth over all lands.*

*105: 8 He remembereth for ever His covenant,  
The word which He hath established to a thousand generations,*

*105: 9 Which He made with Abraham,  
And His oath unto Isaac.*

*105:10 And He hath established it for Jacob as a statute,  
For Israel as an everlasting covenant,*

*105:11 Saying: "Unto thee do I give the land of Canaan  
As the line of your inheritance."*

*105:12 When they were a countable people,  
Very small, and sojourning therein,*

*105:13 And went to and fro from nation to nation,  
From one kingdom to another people:*

*105:14 He suffered no man to oppress them,  
And He reprov'd kings for their sakes:*

*105:15 "Touch not Mine anointed ones,  
And to My prophets do no harm!"*

*105:16 Then He called up a famine over the land,  
Every staff of bread He brake.*

*105:17 He sent before them a man,  
As a slave was Joseph sold.*

*105:18 They hurt his feet with fetters,  
Iron came upon his soul,*

*105:19 Until the time that his word came,  
The word of Jahve had proved him.*

*105:20 The king sent and loosed him,  
The ruler of the peoples, and let him go free;*

*105:21 He made him lord of his house,  
And ruler over all his possession,*



*105:22 To bind his princes at his will,  
And to make his elders wiser.*

*105:23 Thus Israel came to Egypt,  
And Jacob sojourned in the land of Ham.*

*105:24 And He made His people fruitful exceedingly,  
And made them more powerful than their enemies.*

*105:25 He turned their heart to hate His people,  
To practise cunning on His servants;*

*105:26 He sent Moses His servant,  
Aaron, whom He had chosen.*

*105:27 They performed upon them facts of His signs,  
And strange things in the land of Ham.*

*105:28 He sent darkness and made it dark,  
And they rebelled not against His words;*

*105:29 He turned their waters into blood,  
And thus killed their fish.*

*105:30 Their land swarmed forth frogs  
In the chambers of their kings.*

*105:31 He spake, and the gad-fly came,  
Gnats in all their border.*

*105:32 He gave them as rain hail,  
Flaming fire in their land,*

*105:33 And He smote down their vines and fig-trees,  
And brake the trees of their border.*

*105:34 He spake, and the locusts came,  
And the grasshopper without number,*

*105:35 And devoured all the green herb in their land,  
And devoured the fruit of their ground.*

*105:36 Then He smote all the first-born in their land,  
The firstlings of all their strength,*

*105:37 And led them forth with silver and gold,  
And there was no stumbling one among His tribes.*

*105:38 Egypt rejoiced at their departure,  
For dread of them had fallen upon them.*

*105:39 He spread a cloud for a covering,  
And fire to lighten the night;*

*105:40 They desired, and He brought quails,  
And satisfied them with the bread of heaven;*

*105:41 He opened a rock, and waters gushed out,  
They flowed through the steppes as a river.*

*105:42 For He remembered His holy word,  
Abraham His servant;*

*105:43 And He led forth His people with gladness,  
And with exulting His chosen ones;*

*105:44 And He gave them the lands of the heathen,  
And that gained by the labour of the nations they inherited;*

*105:45 That they might observe His laws  
And keep His instructions.  
Hallelujah!*

*Psalm 105.* We have here another Psalm closing with *Hallelujah*, which opens the series of the *Hodu* -Psalms. Such is the name we give only to Psalms which begin with הודו (105, 107, 118, 136), just as we call those which begin with הללויה (106, 111-113, 117, 135, 146-150) *Hallelujah* -Psalms (*alleluiatici*). The expression לְהַלֵּל וְלְהוֹדוֹת, which frequently occurs in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, points to these two kinds of Psalms, or at least to their key-notes.

The festival song which David, according to 1Ch. 16: 7, handed over to Asaph and his brethren for musical execution at the setting down of the Ark and the opening of divine service on Zion, is, so far as its first part is concerned (1Ch. 16: 8-22), taken from our Psalm (vv. 1-15), which is then followed by Psalm 96 as a second part, and is closed with Psa. 106: 1, 47, 48. Hitzig regards the festival song in the chronicler as the original, and the respective parallels in the Psalms as “layers or shoots.” “The chronicler,” says he, “there produces with labour, and therefore himself seeking foreign aid, a song for a past that is dead.” But the transition from v. 22 to v. 23 and from v. 33 to v. 34, so devoid of connection, the taking over of the verse out of Psalm 106 referring to the Babylonian exile into v. 35, and even of the doxology of the Fourth Book, regarded as an integral part of the Psalm, into v. 36, refute that perversion of the right relation which has been attempted in the interest of the Maccabean Psalms. That festival song in the chronicler, as has been shown again very recently by Riehm and Köhler, is a compilation of parts of songs already at hand, arranged for a definite purpose. Starting on the assumption that the Psalms as a whole are Davidic (just as all the Proverbs are Salomonic), because David called the poetry of the Psalms used in religious worship into

existence, the attempt is made in that festival song to represent the opening of the worship on Zion, at that time in strains belonging to the Davidic Psalms.

So far as the subject-matter is concerned, Psalm 105 attaches itself to the Asaph Psalm 78, which recapitulates the history of Israel. The recapitulation here, however, is made not with any didactic purpose, but with the purpose of forming a hymn, and does not come down beyond the time of Moses and Joshua. Its source is likewise the *Tôra* as it now lies before us. The poet epitomizes what the *Tôra* narrates, and clothes it in a poetic garb.

*Psa. 105: 1-6.* Invitation to the praise — praise that resounds far and wide among the peoples — of the God who has become manifest wondrously in the deeds and words connected with the history of the founding of Israel. **לְהַלְלוּ**, as in *Psa.* 33: 2; 75: 2, of a praising and thankful confession offered to God; **קְרָא בְשֵׁם ה'**, to call with the name of Jahve, i.e., to call upon it, of an audible, solemn attestation of God in prayer and in discourse (Symmachus, **κηρύσσετε**). The joy of heart <sup>f341</sup> that is desired is the condition of a joyous opening of the mouth and Israel's own steadfast turning towards Jahve, the condition of all salutary result; for it is only His "strength" that breaks through all dangers, and His "face" that lightens up all darkness. **מִשְׁפָּטֵי פִּי**, as v. 7 teaches, are God's judicial utterances, which have been executed without any hindrance, more particularly in the case of the Egyptians, their Pharaoh, and their gods. The chronicler has **פִּיהוּ** and **זֶרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל**, which is so far unsuitable as one does not know whether **עֲבָדוֹ** is to be referred to "Israel" the patriarch, or to the "seed of Israel," the nation; the latter reference would be deutero-Isaianic. In both texts the LXX reads **עֲבָדָיו** (ye His servants).

*Psa. 105: 7-11.* The poet now begins himself to do that to which he encourages Israel. Jahve is Israel's God: His righteous rule extends over the whole earth, whilst His people experience His inviolable faithfulness to His covenant. **יְהוָה** in v. 7a is in apposition to **הוּא**, for the God who bears this name is as a matter of course the object of the song of praise. **זָכַר** is the perfect of practically pledges certainty (cf. *Psa.* 111: 5, where we find instead the future of confident prospect). The chronicler has **זָכְרוּ** instead (LXX again something different: **μνημονεύωμεν**); but the object is not the demanding but the promissory side of the covenant, so that consequently it is not Israel's remembering but God's that is spoken of. He remembers His covenant in all time to come, so that exile and want of independence as a state are only temporary, exceptional conditions. **צָנָה** has its radical signification here, to establish, institute, *Psa.* 111: 9. **לְאֵלֶיךָ דָּוָר** (in which expression **דָּוָר** is a specifying accusative) is taken from *Deu.* 7: 9. And since **דָּבָר** is the covenant

word of promise, it can be continued **אֲשֶׁר בָּרַת** ; and Hag. 2: 5 (vid., Köhler thereon) shows that **אֲשֶׁר** is not joined to **בְּרִיתוֹ** over v. 8b. **וַיִּשְׁבְּעֵתוּ**, however, is a second object to **זָכַר** (since **דָּבַר** with what belongs to it as an apposition is out of the question). It is the oath on Moriah (Gen. 22:16) that is meant, which applied to Abraham and his seed. **לְיִשְׁחָק** (chronicler **לְיִצְחָק**), as in Amo. 7: 9, Jer. 33:26. To **זָכַר** is appended **וַיַּעֲמִידָהּ**; the suffix, intended as neuter, points to what follows, viz., this, that Canaan shall be Israel's hereditary land. From Abraham and Isaac we come to Jacob-Israel, who as being the father of the twelve is the twelve-tribe nation itself that is coming into existence; hence the plural can alternate with the singular in v. 11. **בְּנֵאֲנָן** **אֶת-אֶרֶץ** (chronicler, without the **אֶת**) is an accusative of the object, and **חֶבְלֵי נִחְלָתְכֶם** accusative of the predicate: the land of Canaan as the province of your own hereditary possession measured out with a measuring line (Psa. 78:55).

*Psa. 105:12-15.* The poet now celebrates the divine preservation which had sway over the small beginnings of Israel, when it made the patriarchs proof against harm on their wanderings. "Men of number" are such as can be easily counted, vid., the confessions in Gen. 34:30, Deu. 26: 5; **וַיִּתְהַלְכוּ** places the claim upon the hospitality at one time of this people and at another time of that people in the connection with it of cause and effect. **בְּמֵאֵט**, as a small number, only such a small number, signifies, as being virtually an adjective: inconsiderable, insignificant, worthless (Pro. 10:20). **בְּהָ** refers to Canaan. In v. 13 the way in which the words **גֹּיִם** and **אִם** alternate is instructive: the former signifies the nation, bound together by a common origin, language, country, and descent; the latter the people, bound together by unity of government. <sup>f342</sup>

The apodosis does not begin until v. 14. It is different in connection with **בְּהַיּוֹתְכֶם** in the text of the chronicler, and in this passage in the Psalter of the Syriac version, according to which v. 12 ought to be jointed to the preceding group. The variation **וּמִמְלִיכָה** instead of **מִמְלִיכָה** is of no consequence; but **לְאִישׁ** (to any one whomsoever) instead of **אִשְׁדָּם**, in connection with **הַנִּיחָה**, restores the current mode of expression (Ecc. 5:11, 2Sa. 16:11, Hos. 4:17) instead of one which is without support elsewhere, but which follows the model of **נִתַּן, נָטַשׁ**, Gen. 31:28 (cf. *supra* p. 171); whilst on the other hand **וּבְנֵי-אִי** instead of **וּלְבָנֵי-אִי** substitutes an expression that cannot be supported for the current one (Gen. 19: 9, Rut. 1:21). In v. 14 the poet has the three histories of the preservation of the wives of the patriarchs in his mind, viz., of Sarah in Egypt (Gen. 12), and of Sarah and of Rebekah both in Philistia (Psalm 20, 26, cf. especially Psa. 26:11). In the second instance God declares

the patriarch to be a “prophet” (Psa. 20: 7). The one mention has reference to this and the other to Gen. 17, where Abram is set apart to be the father of peoples and kings, and Sarai to be a princess. They are called **מְשִׁיחִים** (a passive form) as being God-chosen princes, and **נְבִיאִים** (an intensive active form, from **נָבֵא**, root **נב**, to divulge), not as being inspired ones (Hupfeld), but as being God’s spokesmen (cf. Exo. 7: 1 f. with 4:15 f.), therefore as being the recipients and mediators of a divine revelation.

*Psa. 105:16-24.* “To call up a famine” is also a prose expression in 2Ki. 8: 1. *To break the staff of bread* (i.e., the staff which bread is to man) is a very old metaphor, Lev. 26:26. That the selling of Joseph was, providentially regarded, a “sending before,” he himself says in Gen. 45: 5. Psa. 102:24 throws light upon the meaning of **עָנָה בְּ**. The *Keri* **רָגְלוֹ** is just as much without any occasion to justify it as **עֵינָיו** in Ecc. 4: 8 (for **עֵינָיו**). The statement that iron came upon his soul is intended to say that he had to endure in iron fetters sufferings that threatened his life. Most expositors take **בְּרִזְלֵךְ** as equivalent to **בְּבְרִזְלֵךְ**, but Hitzig rightly takes **נַפְשׁוֹ** as an object, following the Targum; for **בְּרִזְלֵךְ** as a name of an iron fetter <sup>f343</sup> can change its gender, as do, e.g., **צָפוֹן** as a name of the north wind, and **כְּבוֹד** as a name of the soul. The imprisonment (so harsh at the commencement) lasted over ten years, until at last Joseph’s word came to pass, viz., the word concerning this exaltation which had been revealed to him in dreams (Gen. 42: 9). According to Psa. 107:20, **דָּבְרוּ** appears to be the word of Jahve, but then one would expect from v. 19b a more parallel turn of expression. What is meant is Joseph’s open-hearted word concerning his visions, and **אִמְרַת ה'** is the revelation of God conveying His promises, which came to him in the same form, which had to try, to prove, and to purify him (**צָרַרְךָ** as in Psa. 17: 3, and frequently), inasmuch as he was not to be raised to honour without having in a state of deep abasement proved a faithfulness that wavered not, and a confidence that knew no despair. The divine “word” is conceived of as a living effectual power, as in Psa. 119:50. The representation of the exaltation begins, according to Gen. 41:14, with **שְׁלַח-מַלְאָךְ** <sup>f344</sup> and follows Gen. 41:39-41, 44, very closely as to the rest, according to which **בְּנַפְשׁוֹ** is a collateral definition to **לְאִסְרֵךְ** (with an orthophonic *Dag.*) in the sense of **בְּרִצְוֹנוֹ**: by his soul, i.e., by virtue of his will (vid., *Psychology*, S. 202; tr. p. 239). In consequence of this exaltation of Joseph, Jacob-Israel came then into Egypt, and sojourned there as in a protecting house of shelter (concerning **גֹּר**, vid., *supra*, p. 414). Egypt is called (vv. 23, 27) the land of *Chām*, as in 78:51; according to Plutarch, in the vernacular the black land, from the dark ashy grey colouring which the

deposited mud of the Nile gives to the ground. There Israel became a powerful, numerous people (Exo. 1: 7, Deu. 26: 5), greater than their oppressors.

*Psa. 105:25-38.* Narration of the exodus out of Egypt after the plagues that went forth over that land. V. 25 tells how the Egyptians became their “oppressors.” It was indirectly God’s work, inasmuch as He gave increasing might to His people, which excited their jealousy. The craft reached its highest pitch in the weakening of the Israelites that was aimed at by killing all the male children that were born. **דְּבָרָיִךְ** signifies facts, instances, as in Psa. 65: 4; 145: 5. Here, too, as in Psalm 78, the miraculous judgments of the ten plagues do not stand in exactly historical order. The poet begins with the ninth, which was the most distinct self-representation of divine wrath, viz., the darkness (Exo. 10:21-29): *shā‘lach chō‘shech*. The former word (**שְׁלַח**) has an orthophonic *Gaja* by the final syllable, which warns the reader audibly to utter the guttural of the toneless final syllable, which might here be easily slurred over. The *Hiph.* **הִחֲשִׁיךְ** has its causative signification here, as also in Jer. 13:16; the contracted mode of writing with *i* instead of *î* may be occasioned by the *Waw convers.* V. 28*b* cannot be referred to the Egyptians; for the expression would be a mistaken one for the final compliance, which was wrung from them, and the interrogative way of taking it: *nonne rebellarunt*, is forced: the cancelling of the **לֹא**, however (LXX and Syriac), makes the thought halting. Hitzig proposes **וְלֹא שָׁמְרוּ**: they observed not His words; but this, too, sounds flat and awkward when said of the Egyptians. The subject will therefore be the same as the subject of **שָׁמְרוּ**; and of Moses and Aaron, in contrast to the behaviour at *Mê-Merîbah* (Num. 20:24; 27:14; cf. 1Ki. 13:21, 26), it is said that this time they rebelled not against the words (*Kerî*, without any ground: the word) of God, but executed the terrible commands accurately and willingly. From the ninth plague the poet in v. 29 passes over to the first (Exo. 7:14-25), viz., the red blood is appended to the black darkness. The second plague follows, viz., the frogs (Exo. 7:26-8:11 [8: 1-15]); v. 20*b* looks as though it were stunted, but neither has the LXX read any **וַיֵּבֵאוּ** (**וַיַּעֲלֵוּ**), Exo. 7:28. In v. 31 he next briefly touches upon the fourth plague, viz., the gad-fly, **עָרָב**, LXX **κυστόμυα** (Exo. 8:16-28 [20-32], vid., on 78:45), and the third (Exo. 8:12-15 [16-19]), viz., the gnats, which are passed over in Psalm 78. From the third plague the poet in vv. 32, 33 takes a leap over to the seventh, viz., the hail (Exo. 9:13-35). In v. 32 he has Exo. 9:24 before his mind, according to which masses of fire descended with the hail; and in v. 33 (as in 78:47) he fills in the details of Exo. 9:25. The seventh plague is followed by the eighth in vv. 34, 35, viz., the locust (Exo. 10: 1-20), to which **יֶלֶק** (the grasshopper) is the parallel word here, just as **חֲסִיל** (the cricket) is in 78:46. The expression of innumerableness is the same as in 104:25. The fifth

plague, viz., the pestilence, murrain (Exo. 9: 1-7), and the sixth, viz., שָׁחִין, boils (Exo. 9: 8-12), are left unmentioned; and the tenth plague closes, viz., the smiting of the first-born (Exo. 11: 1 ff.), which v. 36 expresses in the Asaphic language of Psalms 78:51. Without any mention of the institution of the Passover, the tenth plague is followed by the departure with the vessels of silver and gold asked for from the Egyptians (Exo. 12:35; 11: 2; 3:22). The Egyptians were glad to get rid of the people whose detention threatened them with total destruction (Exo. 12:33). The poet here draws from Isaiah 5:27; 14:31; 63:13, and Exo. 15:16. The suffix of שְׁבִטָיו refers to the chief subject of the assertion, viz., to God, according to Psalm 122: 4, although manifestly enough the reference to Israel is also possible (Num. 24: 2).

*Psa. 105:39-45.* Now follows the miraculous guidance through the desert to the taking possession of Canaan. The fact that the cloud (עָנָן, root עָנ, to meet, to present itself to view, whence the Arabic *ʿanān*, the visible outward side of the vault of heaven) by day, and becoming like fire by night, was their guide (Exo. 13:21), is left out of consideration in v. 39a. With לְמִסְדָּךְ we are not to associate the idea of a covering against foes, Exo. 14:19 f., but of a covering from the smiting sun, for פָּרֶשֶׁת (Exo. 40:19), as in Isaiah 4: 5 f., points to the idea of a canopy. In connection with the sending of the quails the tempting character of the desire is only momentarily dwelt upon, the greater emphasis is laid on the omnipotence of the divine goodness which responded to תִּי. שְׁאֵלוֹ is to be read instead of שְׁאֵל, the ו before ו having been overlooked; and the *Kerī* writes and points שְׁלִיו (like סְתִיו, עֲנִיו) in order to secure the correct pronunciation, after the analogy of the plural termination יִי. The bread of heaven (Psalms 78:24 f.) is the manna. In v. 41 the giving of water out of the rock at Rephidim and at Kadesh are brought together; the expression corresponds better to the former instance (Exo. 17: 6, cf. Num. 20:11). הַלְכּוֹ refers to the waters, and נָהָר for בְּנְהָרוֹת, Psalms 78:16, is, as in 22:14, an equation instead of a comparison. In this miraculous escort the patriarchal promise moves on towards its fulfilment; the holy word of promise, and the steadfast, proved faith of Abraham — these were the two motives. The second אֵת is, like the first, a sign of the object, not a preposition (LXX, Targum), in connection with which v. 42b would be a continuation of v. 42a, dragging on without any parallelism. Joy and exulting are mentioned as the mood of the redeemed ones with reference to the festive joy displayed at the Red Sea and at Sinai. By v. 43 one is reminded of the same descriptions of the antitype in Isaiah, Isaiah 35:10; 51:11; 55:12, just as v. 41 recalls Isaiah 48:21. “The lands of the heathen” are the territories of the tribes of Canaan. עֲמָל is equivalent to נִיֵּא in Isaiah 45:14: the cultivated ground, the habitable cities, and the accumulated treasures. Israel

entered upon the inheritance of these peoples in every direction. As an independent people upon ground that is theirs by inheritance, keeping the revealed law of their God, was Israel to exhibit the pattern of a holy nation moulded after the divine will; and, as the beginning of the Psalm shows, to unite the peoples to themselves and their God, the God of redemption, by the proclamation of the redemption which has fallen to their own lot.

## **Psalm 106**

### **ISRAEL'S UNFAITHFULNESS FROM EGYPT ONWARDS, AND GOD'S FAITHFULNESS DOWN TO THE PRESENT TIME**

#### ***HALLELUJAH!***

*106: 1 GIVE thanks unto Jahve, for He is good,  
For His graciousness endureth for ever.*

*106: 2 Who can utter the mighty acts of Jahve,  
[Who] make all His praise to be heard?*

*106: 3 Blessed are they who keep the right,  
He who doeth righteousness at all times.*

*106: 4 Remember me, Jahve, at the favouring of Thy people,  
Visit me with Thy help,*

*106: 5 That I too may see the prosperity of Thy chosen ones,  
That I too may be glad at the gladness of Thy people,  
That I too may glory with Thine inheritance.*

*106: 6 We have sinned like unto our fathers,  
We have committed iniquity, we have done wickedly.*

*106: 7 Our fathers in Egypt heeded not Thy wonders,  
They remembered not the abundance of Thy loving-kindnesses,  
And were rebellious at the sea, at the Red Sea.*

*106: 8 Yet He saved them for His Name's sake,  
To make His strength known.*

*106: 9 He rebuked the Red Sea, and it dried up,  
And led them through the floods as upon a plain;*

*106:10 And He saved them out of the hand of the hater,  
And redeemed them out of the hand of the enemy.*

*106:11 The waters covered their oppressors,  
Not one of them was left —*

*106:12 Then they believed His words,  
They sang His praise.*



*106:13 They quickly forgot His works,  
They waited not for His counsel.*

*106:14 They lusted greedily in the desert,  
And tempted God in the wilderness.*

*106:15 Then He gave them their desire,  
And sent consumption into their soul.*

*106:16 They manifested envy against Moses in the camp,  
Against Aaron, the holy one of Jahve —*

*106:17 The earth opened and swallowed up Dathan,  
And covered the band of Abiram;*

*106:18 And fire seized upon their band,  
A flame consumed the evil-doers.*

*106:19 They made a calf in Horeb,  
Then they worshipped the molten image,*

*106:20 And they bartered their glory  
For the likeness of an ox that eateth grass.*

*106:21 They had forgotten God their Saviour,  
Who did great deeds in Egypt,*

*106:22 Wondrous works in the land of Ham,  
Terrible deeds at the Red Sea.*

*106:23 Then He thought to exterminate them,  
Had not Moses His chosen one  
Stepped into the breach before Him  
To calm His wrath, that He should not destroy.*

*106:24 They despised the pleasant land,  
They believed not His word.*

*106:25 They murmured in their tents,  
They hearkened not to the voice of Jahve.*

*106:26 Then He lifted up His hand against them  
To cast them down in the desert,*

*106:27 And to disperse their seed among the heathen,  
And to scatter them in the lands.*

*106:28 They joined themselves unto Baal-Peôr,  
And ate the sacrifices for the dead,*

*106:29 And excited provocation by their doings;  
And the plague brake in among them.*

*106:30 Then stood up Phinehas and arranged,  
And the plague was stayed.*

*106:31 And it was counted unto him for righteousness  
Unto all generations for ever.*

*106:32 Then they excited displeasure at the waters of strife,  
And it went ill with Moses for their sakes.*

*106:33 For they rebelled against God's Spirit,  
And he erred with his lips.*

*106:34 They did not exterminate the peoples  
Which Jahve had said to them;*

*106:35 But mixed themselves among the heathen,  
And learned their works.*

*106:36 They served their idols,  
And they became to them a snare.*

*106:37 They sacrificed their sons and their daughters to demons,*

*106:38 And shed innocent blood,  
The blood of their sons and their daughters,  
Whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan,  
So that the land was polluted by blood-guiltiness.*

*106:39 They became impure by their works,  
And became fornicators by their doings.*

*106:40 Then was the wrath of Jahve kindled against His people,  
And He abhorred His own inheritance.*

*106:41 He gave them over into the hand of the heathen,  
And their haters became their oppressors.*

*106:42 Their enemies oppressed them,  
And they were obliged to bow down under their hand.*

*106:43 Many times did He rescue them,  
Yet they rebelled in their self-will —  
Then they perished in their iniquity.*

*106:44 But He saw how hard it went with them,  
When He heard their cry of grief.*

*106:45 He remembered for them His covenant,  
And had compassion according to the abundance of His mercies.*

*106:46 And He caused them to be compassionated  
In the presence of all who carried them into captivity.*

*106:47 Save us, Jahve our God,  
And bring us together out of the heathen,  
To give thanks unto Thy holy Name,  
And to glory in Thy praise.*

***106:48 BLESSED BE JAHVE THE GOD OF ISRAEL FROM EVERLASTING  
TO EVERLASTING, AND LET ALL PEOPLE SAY AMEN!  
HALLELUJAH!!***

*Psalm 106.* With this anonymous Psalm begins the series of the strictly Hallelujah-Psalms, i.e., those Psalms which have הללויה for their arsis-like beginning and for their inscription (106, 111-113, 117, 135, 146-150). The chronicler in his cento, 1Ch. 16: 8 ff., and in fact in ch. 16:34-36, puts the first and last verses of this Psalm (vv. 1, 47), together with the *Beracha* (v. 48) which closes the Fourth Book of the Psalms, into the mouth of David, from which it is to be inferred that this Psalm is no more Maccabaeian than Psalm 96 and 105 (which see), and that the Psalter was divided into five books which were marked off by the doxologies even in the time of the chronicler. The *Beracha*, v. 48, appears even at that period to have been read as an integral part of the Psalm, according to liturgical usage. The Hallelujah Psalm 106, like the Hodu Psalm 105 and the Asaph Psalm 78, recapitulates the history of the olden times of the Israelitish nation. But the purpose and mode of the recapitulation differ in each of these three Psalms. In Psalm 78 it is didactic; in Psalm 105 hymnic; and here in Psalm 106 penitential. It is a penitential Psalm, or Psalm of confession, a ודין (from התנודה to confess, Lev. 16:21). The oldest types of such liturgical prayers are the two formularies at the offering of the first-fruits, Deu. 26, and Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple, 1Ki. 8. And to this kind of *tephilla*, the *Vidduj*, belong, beyond the range of the Psalter, the prayer of Daniel, Daniel 9 (vid., the way in which it is introduced in v. 4), and the prayer (Neh. 9: 5-10: 1 [9:38]) which eight Levites uttered in the name of the people at the celebration of the fast-day on the twenty-fourth of Tishri. It is true Psalm 106 is distinguished from these prayers of confession in the prose style as being a Psalm; but it has three points in common with them and with the liturgical *tephilla* in general, viz., (1) the fondness for inflexional rhyming, i.e., for rhyming terminations of the same suffixes; (2) the heaping up of synonyms; and (3) the unfolding of the thoughts in a continuous line. These three peculiarities are found not only in the liturgical border, vv. 1-6, 47, but also in the middle historical portion, which forms the bulk of the Psalm. The law of parallelism, is, it is true, still observed; but apart from these distichic wave-like ridges of the thoughts, it is all one direct, straight-line flow without technical division.

*Psa. 106: 1-5.* The Psalm begins with the liturgical call, which has not coined for the first time in the Maccabaeian age (1 Macc. 4:24), but was already in use in Jeremiah's time (Psa. 33:11). The LXX appropriately renders טוב by *γαρηστός*, for God is called "good" not so much in respect of His nature as of the revelation of His nature. The fulness of this revelation, says v. 2 (like Psa. 40: 6), is inexhaustible. גְּבוּרוֹת are the manifestations of His all-conquering power which makes everything subservient to His redemptive purposes (Psa. 20: 7); and תְּהִלָּה is the glory (praise or celebration) of His self-attestation in history. The proclaiming of these on the part of man can never be an exhaustive echo of them. In v. 3 the poet tells what is the character of those who experience such manifestations of God; and to the assertion of the blessedness of these men he appends the petition in v. 4, that God would grant him a share in the experiences of the whole nation which is the object of these manifestations. אֶמֶךְ beside בְּרִצּוֹן is a genitive of the object: with the pleasure which Thou turnest towards Thy people, i.e., when Thou again (cf. v. 47) showest Thyself gracious unto them. On פָּקֵד cf. Psa. 8: 5; 80:15, and on בְּרִצּוֹן, Jer. 29:32; a similar *Beth* is that beside לְשִׁמְחָה (at, on account of, not: in connection with), Psa. 21: 2; 122: 1. God's "inheritance" is His people; the name for them is varied four times, and thereby גּוֹי is also exceptionally brought into use, as in Zep. 2: 9.

*Psa. 106: 6-12.* The key-note of the *vidduj*, which is a settled expression since 1Ki. 8:47 (Dan. 9: 5, cf. Bar. 2:12), makes itself heard here in v. 6; Israel is bearing at this time the punishment of its sins, by which it has made itself like its forefathers. In this needy and helpless condition the poet, who all along speaks as a member of the assembly, takes the way of the confession of sin, which leads to the forgiveness of sin and to the removal of the punishment of sin. רָשַׁע, 1Ki. 8:47, signifies to be, and the *Hiph.* to prove one's self to be, a רָשַׁע. עַם in v. 6 is equivalent to *aeque ac*, as in Ecc. 2:16, Job. 9:26. With v. 7 the retrospect begins. The fathers contended with Moses and Aaron in Egypt (Exo. 5:21), and gave no heed to the prospect of redemption (Exo. 6: 9). The miraculous judgments which Moses executed (Exo. 3:20) had no more effect in bringing them to a right state of mind, and the abundant tokens of loving-kindness (Isa. 63: 7) amidst which God redeemed them made so little impression on their memories that they began to despair and to murmur even at the Red Sea (Exo. 14:11 f.). With אֵל, v. 7b, alternates בְּ (as in Eze. 10:15, בְּנִדְחָה); cf. the alternation of prepositions in Joe. 4: 8b. When they behaved thus, Jahve might have left their redemption unaccomplished, but out of unmerited mercy He nevertheless redeemed them. Vv. 8-11 are closely dependent upon Exo. 14. V. 11b is a transposition (Psa. 34:21, Isa. 34:16) from

Exo. 14:28. On the other hand, v. 9b is taken out of Isa. 63:13 (cf. Wisd. 19: 9); Isa. 63: 7-64 is a prayer for redemption which has a similar ground-colouring. The sea through which they passed is called, as in the *Tôra*, **יַם־סוּף**, which seems, according to Exo. 2: 3, Isa. 19: 3, to signify the sea of reed or sedge, although the sedge does not grow in the Red Sea itself, but only on the marshy places of the coast; but it can also signify the sea of sea-weed, *mare algosum*, after the Egyptian *sippe*, wool and sea-weed (just as Arab. *šūf* also signifies both these). The word is certainly Egyptian, whether it is to be referred back to the Egyptian word *sippe* (sea-weed) or *sēbe* (sedge), and is therefore used after the manner of a proper name; so that the inference drawn by Knobel on Exo. 8:18 from the absence of the article, that **יַם־סוּף** is the name of a town on the northern point of the gulf, is groundless. The miracle at the sea of sedge or sea-weed — as v. 12 says — also was not without effect. Exo. 14:31 tells us that they believed on Jahve and Moses His servant, and the song which they sang follows in Exo. 15. But they then only too quickly added sins of ingratitude.

*Psa. 106:13-23.* The first of the principal sins on the other side of the Red Sea was the unthankful, impatient, unbelieving murmuring about their meat and drink, vv. 13-15. For what v. 13 places foremost was the root of the whole evil, that, falling away from faith in God's promise, they forgot the works of God which had been wrought in confirmation of it, and did not wait for the carrying out of His counsel. The poet has before his eye the murmuring for water on the third day after the miraculous deliverance (Exo. 15:22-24) and in Rephidim (Exo. 17: 2). Then the murmuring for flesh in the first and second years of the exodus which was followed by the sending of the quails (Exodus 16 and Numbers 11), together with the wrathful judgment by which the murmuring for the second time was punished (*Kibrôth ha-Ta'avah*, Num. 11:33-35). This dispensation of wrath the poet calls **רִזּוֹן** (LXX, Vulgate, and Syriac erroneously *πλησμονήν*, perhaps **רִזּוֹן**, nourishment), inasmuch as he interprets Num. 11:33-35 of a wasting disease, which swept away the people in consequence of eating inordinately of the flesh, and in the expression (cf. Psa. 78:31) he closely follows Isa. 10:16. The "counsel" of God for which they would not wait, is His plan with respect to the time and manner of the help. **הַכָּה**, root Arab. *hk*, a weaker power of Arab. *hq*, whence also Arab. *hkl*, p. 111, *hkm*, p. 49 note 1, signifies prop. to make firm, e.g., a knot (cf. on Psa. 33:20), and starting from this (without the intervention of the metaphor *moras nectere*, as Schultens thinks) is transferred to a firm bent of mind, and the tension of long expectation. The epigrammatic expression **וַיִּתְאַוּ תַאֲוָה** (plural of **תַאֲוָה**, Psa. 45:12, for which codices, as also in Pro. 23: 3, 6; 24: 1,

the Complutensian, Venetian 1521, Elias Levita, and Baer have **ויהאן** without the tonic lengthening) is taken from Num. 11: 4.

The second principal sin was the insurrection against their superiors, vv. 16-18. The poet has Numbers 16-17 in his eye. The rebellious ones were swallowed up by the earth, and their two hundred and fifty noble, non-Levite partisans consumed by fire. The fact that the poet does not mention Korah among those who were swallowed up is in perfect harmony with Num. 16:25 ff., Deu. 11: 6; cf. however Num. 26:10. The elliptical **תַּפְתָּח** in v. 17 is explained from Num. 16:32; 26:10.

The third principal sin was the worship of the calf, vv. 19-23. The poet here glances back at Exodus 32, but not without at the same time having Deu. 9: 8-12 in his mind; for the expression “in Horeb” is Deuteronomic, e.g., Deu. 4:15; 5: 2, and frequently. V. 20 is also based upon the Book of Deuteronomy: they exchanged their glory, i.e., the God who was their distinction before all peoples according to Deu. 4: 6-8; 10:21 (cf. also Jer. 2:11), for the likeness (**תַּבְנִית**) of a plough-ox (for this is pre-eminently called **שׂוֹר**, in the dialects **תּוֹר**), contrary to the prohibition in Deu. 4:17. On v. 21a cf. the warning in Deu. 6:12. “Land of Cham” = Egypt, as in Psa. 78:51; 105:23, 27. With **וַיֵּאמֶר** in v. 23 the expression becomes again Deuteronomic: Deu. 9:25, cf. Exo. 32:10. God made and also expressed the resolve to destroy Israel. Then Moses stepped into the gap (before the gap), i.e., as it were covered the breach, inasmuch as he placed himself in it and exposed his own life; cf. on the fact, besides Exodus 32, also Deu. 9:18 f., 10:10, and on the expression, Eze. 22:30 and also Jer. 18:20.

*Psa. 106:24-33.* The fact to which the poet refers in v. 24, viz., the rebellion in consequence of the report of the spies, which he brings forward as the fourth principal sin, is narrated in Numbers 13, 14. The appellation **אֶרֶץ הַמִּדְבָּה** is also found in Jer. 3:19, Zec. 7:14. As to the rest, the expression is altogether Pentateuchal. “They despised the land,” after Num. 14:31; “they murmured in their tents,” after Deu. 1:27; “to lift up the land” = to swear, after Exo. 6: 8, Deu. 32:40; the threat **לְהַפִּיל**, to make them fall down, fall away, after Num. 14:29, 32. The threat of exile is founded upon the two great threatening chapters, Leviticus 26, Deuteronomy 28; cf. more particularly Lev. 26:33 (together with the echoes in Eze. 5:12; 12:14, etc.), Deu. 28:64 (together with the echoes in Jer. 9:15, Eze. 22:15, etc.). Eze. 20:23 stands in a not accidental relationship to v. 26 f.; and according to that passage, **וְלֹהֲפִיל** is an error of the copyist for **וְלֹהֲפִיץ** (Hitzig).

Now follows in vv. 28-31 the fifth of the principal sins, viz., the taking part in the Moabitish worship of Baal. The verb **נָצַמְךָ** (to be bound or chained), taken from Num. 25: 3, 5, points to the prostitution with which Baal *Peôr*, this Moabitish Priapus, was worshipped. The sacrificial feasting in which, according to Num. 25: 2, they took part, are called eating the sacrifices of the dead, because the idols are dead beings (*νεκροί*, Wisd. 13:10-18) as opposed to God, the living One. The catena on Rev. 2:14 correctly interprets: *τὰ τοῖς εἰδώλοις τελεσθέντα κρέα.* <sup>f345</sup>

The object of “they made angry” is omitted; the author is fond of this, cf. vv. 7 and 32. The expression in v. 29b is like Exo. 19:24. The verb **מָצַבְךָ** is chosen with reference to Num. 17:13 [16:48]. The result is expressed in v. 30b after Num. 25: 8, 18 f., 17:13 [16:48]. With **בָּלַלְךָ**, to adjust, to judge adjustingly (LXX, Vulgate, correctly according to the sense, *ἐξιλάσατο*), the poet associates the thought of the satisfaction due to divine right, which Phinehas executed with the javelin. This act of zeal for Jahve, which compensated for Israel’s unfaithfulness, was accounted unto him for righteousness, by his being rewarded for it with the priesthood unto everlasting ages, Num. 25:10-13. This accounting of a work for righteousness is only apparently contradictory to Gen. 15: 5 f.: it was indeed an act which sprang from a constancy in faith, and one which obtained for him the acceptance of a righteous man for the sake of this upon which it was based, by proving him to be such.

In vv. 32, 33 follows the sixth of the principal sins, viz., the insurrection against Moses and Aaron at the waters of strife in the fortieth year, in connection with which Moses forfeited the entrance with them into the Land of Promise (Num. 20:11 f., Deu. 1:37; 32:51), since he suffered himself to be carried away by the persevering obstinacy of the people against the Spirit of God (**הִמָּרְדָה** mostly providing the future for **מָרְדָה** as in vv. 7, 43, 78:17, 40, 56, of obstinacy against God; on **אֶת־רִיבְךָ** cf. Isa. 63:10) into uttering the words addressed to the people, Num. 20:10, in which, as the smiting of the rock which was twice repeated shows, is expressed impatience together with a tinge of unbelief. The poet distinguishes, as does the narrative in Numbers 20, between the obstinacy of the people and the transgression of Moses, which is there designated, according to that which lay at the root of it, as unbelief. The retrospective reference to Num. 27:14 needs adjustment accordingly.

*Psa. 106:34-43.* The sins in Canaan: the failing to exterminate the idolatrous peoples and sharing in their idolatry. In v. 34 the poet appeals to the command, frequently enjoined upon them from Exo. 23:32 f. onwards, to extirpate the inhabitants of Canaan. Since they did not execute this command (vid., Jud. 1-3: 6), that which it was intended to prevent came to pass: the heathen became

to them a snare (מוֹקֵשׁ), Exo. 23:33; 34:12, Deu. 7:16. They intermarried with them, and fell into the Canaanitish custom in which the abominations of heathenism culminate, viz., the human sacrifice, which Jahve abhorreth (Deu. 12:31), and only the demons (שְׂדִים, Deu. 32:17) delight in. Thus then the land was defiled by blood-guiltiness (חַנְּף, Num. 25:33, cf. Isa. 24: 5; 26:21), and they themselves became unclean (Eze. 20:43) by the whoredom of idolatry. In vv. 40-43 the poet (as in Neh. 9:26 ff.) sketches the alternation of apostasy, captivity, redemption, and relapse which followed upon the possession of Canaan, and more especially that which characterized the period of the judges. God's "counsel" was to make Israel free and glorious, but they leaned upon themselves, following their own intentions (בַּעֲצָתָם); wherefore they perished in their sins. The poet uses מִבְּךָ (to sink down, fall away) instead of the נִמְךָ (to moulder, rot) of the primary passage, Lev. 26:39, retained in Eze. 24:23; 33:10, which is no blunder (Hitzig), but a deliberate change.

*Psa. 106:44-46.* The poet's range of vision here widens from the time of the judges to the history of the whole of the succeeding age down to the present; for the whole history of Israel has essentially the same fundamental character, viz., that Israel's unfaithfulness does not annul God's faithfulness. That verifies itself even now. That which Solomon in 1Ki. 8:50 prays for on behalf of his people when they may be betrayed into the hands of the enemy, has been fulfilled in the case of the dispersion of Israel in all countries (Psa. 107: 3), Babylonia, Egypt, etc.: God has turned the hearts of their oppressors towards them. On רָאָה בְּ, to regard compassionately, cf. Gen. 29:32, 1Sa. 1:11. לָהֶם בְּצַר belong together, as in Psa. 107: 6, and frequently. רִנָּה is a cry of lamentation, as in 1Ki. 8:28 in Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple. From this source comes v. 6, and also from this source v. 46, cf. 1Ki. 8:50 together with Neh. 1:11. In וַיִּנְחֵם the drawing back of the tone does not take place, as in Gen. 24:67. חֲסֵדוֹ beside כְּרֹב is not pointed by the *Keri* חֲסֵדוֹ, as in Psa. 5: 8; 69:14, but as in Lam. 3:32, according to v. 7, Isa. 63: 7, חֲסֵדוֹ: in accordance with the fulness (riches) of His manifold mercy or loving-kindness. The expression in v. 46 is like Gen. 43:14. Although the condition of the poet's fellow-countrymen in the dispersion may have been tolerable in itself, yet this involuntary scattering of the members of the nation is always a state of punishment. The poet prays in v. 47 that God may be pleased to put an end to this.

*Psa. 106:47.* He has now reached the goal, to which his whole Psalm struggles forth, by the way of self-accusation and the praise of the faithfulness



of God. הַשְׁתַּבַּח (found only here) is the reflexive of the *Piel*, to account happy, Ecc. 4: 2, therefore: in order that we may esteem ourselves happy to be able to praise Thee. In this reflexive (and also passive) sense הַשְׁתַּבַּח is customary in Aramaic and post-biblical Hebrew.

*Psa. 106:48.* The closing doxology of the Fourth Book. The chronicler has וַיֹּאמְרוּ before v. 47 (which with him differs only very slightly), an indispensable rivet, so to speak, in the fitting together of Psa. 106: 1 (Psa. 107: 1) and Psa. 106:47. The means this historian, who joins passages together like mosaic-work, calls to his aid are palpable enough. He has also taken over v. 48 by transforming *and let all the people say Amen, Hallelujah!* in accordance with his style (cf. 1Ch. 25: 3, 2Ch. 5:13, and frequently, Ezr. 3:11), into an historical clause: וַיֹּאמְרוּ כָּל־הָעָם אָמֵן וְהַלֵּל לַיהוָה . Hitzig, by regarding the echoes of the Psalms in the chronicler as the originals of the corresponding Psalms in the Psalter, and consequently 1Ch. 16:36 as the original of the *Beracha* placed after our Psalm, reverses the true relation; vid., with reference to this point, Riehm in the *Theolog. Literat. Blatt*, 1866, No. 30, and Köhler in the *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1867, S. 297 ff. The priority of Psalm 106 is clear from the fact that v. 1 gives a liturgical key-note that was in use even in Jeremiah's time (Psa. 33:11), and that v. 47 reverts to the tephilla-style of the introit, vv. 4 f. And the priority of v. 48 as a concluding formula of the Fourth Book is clear from the fact that it has been fashioned, like that of the Second Book (Psa. 72:18 f.), under the influence of the foregoing Psalm. The *Hallelujah* is an echo of the Hallelujah-Psalms, just as there the *Jahve Elohim* is an echo of the Elohim-Psalms. And "let all the people say Amen" is the same closing thought as in v. 6 of Psalm 150, which is made into the closing doxology of the whole Psalter. Ἀμήν ἀλληλοῦσια together (Rev. 19: 4) is a laudatory confirmation.

## Fifth Book of the Psalter

### PSALMS 107-150

#### Psalm 107

#### AN ADMONITION TO FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN TO RENDER THANKS ON ACCOUNT OF HAVING GOT THE BETTER OF CALAMITIES

*107: 1 "GIVE thanks unto Jahve, for He is good,  
For His loving-kindness endureth for ever,"*

*107: 2 Let the redeemed of Jahve say,  
Whom He hath redeemed out of the hand of oppression*

*107: 3 And gathered out of the lands,  
From the east and from the west, from the north and from the sea.*

*107: 4 They wandered in the desert in a waste of a way,  
They found not a city of habitation.*

*107: 5 Under hunger and thirst  
Their soul fainted in them.*

*107: 6 Then they cried unto Jahve in their trouble —  
Out of their distresses He delivered them,*

*107: 7 And led them by a right way  
To arrive at a city of habitation. —*

*107: 8 Let them praise to Jahve His loving-kindness,  
And His wonders to the children of men,*

*107: 9 That He hath satisfied the thirsty soul,  
And filled the hungry soul with good.*

*107:10 Those who dwelt in darkness and the shadow of death,  
Being bound in torture and iron,*

*107:11 Because they rebelled against the words of God  
And derided the counsel of the Most High,*

*107:12 And He humbled their heart by labour,  
They fell down, and there was none to help.*

*107:13 Then they cried unto Jahve in their trouble —  
Out of their distresses He saved them;*

*107:14 He led them forth out of darkness and the shadow of death,  
And burst their bonds asunder.*

*107:15 Let them praise to Jahve His goodness,  
And His wonders to the children of men,*

*107:16 That He hath broken in pieces the brazen doors  
And smitten down the iron bars.*

*107:17 The foolish, on account of the way of their transgression,  
And on account of their iniquity, had to suffer.*

*107:18 All food their soul abhorred,  
And they drew near to the gates of death.*

*107:19 Then they cried unto Jahve in their trouble —  
Out of their distresses He saved them.*

*107:20 He sent His word and healed them,  
And caused them to escape out of their pit-falls.*

*107:21 Let them praise to Jahve His goodness,  
And His wonders to the children of men,*

*107:22 And let them sacrifice sacrifices of thanksgiving  
And declare His works with a shout of joy.*

*107:23 Those who go down to the sea in ships,  
Who do business in great waters —*

*107:24 These have seen the works of Jahve,  
And His wonders in the deep.*

*107:25 He spake and raised a stormy wind,  
Which forced up its waves on high.*

*107:26 They went up towards heaven, they went down into the depths,  
Their soul was melted in trouble.*

*107:27 They whirled and staggered like a drunken man,  
And all their wisdom came of itself to nought.*

*107:28 Then they cried unto Jahve in their trouble,  
And out of their distresses He brought them forth.*

*107:29 He changed the storm into a gentle breeze,  
And their waves were still.*

*107:30 Then were they glad that they were abated,  
And He led them to the haven of their desire.*

*107:31 Let them praise to Jahve His goodness,  
And His wonders to the children of men,*

*107:32 And let them exalt Him in the congregation of the people,  
And praise Him in the council of the elders.*

*107:33 He changed rivers into a desert  
And water-springs into drought,*

*107:34 A fruitful land into a salt-plain,  
Because of the wickedness of those who dwelt therein.*

*107:35 He changed the desert into a pool of water,  
And the dry land into water-springs;*

*107:36 And made the hungry to dwell there,  
And they built a city of habitation.*

*107:37 They sowed fields and planted vineyards,  
And obtained profitable fruit.*

*107:38 He blessed them and they multiplied greatly,  
And their cattle He made into not a few.*

*107:39 Then they became few and were reduced  
By the pressure of misfortune and sorrow —*

*107:40 He who poureth contempt on princes  
And causeth them to wander in the pathless waste:*

*107:41 He removed the needy out of the way of affliction,  
And made the families like a flock.*

*107:42 The upright see it and rejoice,  
And all knavery stoppeth its mouth.*

\* \* \*

*107:43 Whoso is wise let him observe these things,  
And let them consider the loving-kindnesses of Jahve!*

*Psalm 107.* With this Psalm begins the Fifth Book, the Book **אלה הדברים** of the Psalter. With Psalm 106 closed the Fourth Book, or the Book **במדבר**, the first Psalm of which, Psalm 90, bewailed the manifestation of God's wrath in the case of the generation of the desert, and in the presence of the prevailing death took refuge in God the eternal and unchangeable One. Psalm 106, which closes the book has **בְּמִדְבָּר** (vv. 14, 26) as its favourite word, and makes confession of the sins of Israel on the way to Canaan. Now, just as at the beginning of the Book of Deuteronomy Israel stands on the threshold of the Land of Promise, after the two tribes and a half have already established themselves on the other side of the Jordan, so at the beginning of this Fifth Book of the Psalter we see Israel restored to the soil of its fatherland. There it is the Israel redeemed out of Egypt, here it is the Israel redeemed out of the lands of the Exile. There the lawgiver once more admonishes Israel to yield the obedience of love to the Law of Jahve, here the psalmist calls upon Israel to show gratitude towards Him, who has redeemed it from exile and distress and death.

We must not therefore be surprised if Psalm 106 and 107 are closely connected, in spite of the fact that the boundary of the two Books lies between them. "Psalm 107 stands in close relationship to Psalm 106. The similarity of the beginning at once points back to this Psalm. Thanks are here given in v. 3 for what was there desired in v. 47. The praise of the Lord which was promised in Psa. 106:47 in the case of redemption being vouchsafed, is here presented to Him after redemption vouchsafed." This observation of Hengstenberg is fully confirmed. The Psalm 104-107 really to a certain extent from a tetralogy. Psalm 104 derives its material from the history of the creation, Psalm 105 from the history of Israel in Egypt, in the desert, and in the Land of Promise down to

the Exile, and Psalm 107 from the time of the restoration. Nevertheless the connection of Psalm 104 with 105-107 is by far not so close as that of these three Psalms among themselves. These three anonymous Psalms form a trilogy in the strictest sense; they are a tripartite whole from the hand of one author. The observation is an old one. The *Harpffe Davids mit Teutschen Saiten bespannet* (Harp of David strung with German Strings), a translation of the Psalms which appeared in Augsburg in the year 1659, begins Psalm 106 with the words: "For the third time already am I now come, and I make bold to spread abroad, with grateful acknowledgment, Thy great kindnesses." God's wondrous deeds of loving-kindness and compassion towards Israel from the time of their forefathers down to the redemption out of Egypt according to the promise, and giving them possession of Canaan, are the theme of Psalm 105. The theme of Psalm 106 is the sinful conduct of Israel from Egypt onwards during the journey through the desert, and then in the Land of Promise, by which they brought about the fulfilment of the threat of exile (v. 27); but even there God's mercy was not suffered to go unattested (v. 46). The theme of Psalm 107, finally, is the sacrifice of praise that is due to Him who redeemed them out of exile and all kinds of destruction. We may compare Psa. 105:44, *He gave them the lands (אֲרָצוֹת) of the heathen*; 106:27, *(He threatened) to cast forth their seed among the heathen and to scatter them in the lands (בְּאֲרָצוֹת)*; and Psa. 107: 3, *out of the lands (מֵאֲרָצוֹת) hath He brought them together, out of east and west, out of north and south*. The designed similarity of the expression, the internal connection, and the progression in accordance with a definite plan, are not to be mistaken here. In other respects, too, these three Psalms are intimately interwoven. In them Egypt is called "the land of Ham" (Psa. 105:23, 27; 106:22), and Israel "the chosen ones of Jahve" (Psa. 105: 6, 43; 106: 5, cf. 23). They are fond of the interrogative form of exclamation (Psa. 106: 2; 107:43). There is an approach in them to the hypostatic conception of the Word (דְּבַר, Psa. 105:19; 106:20). Compare also יְשִׁימוֹן Psa. 106:14; 107: 4; and the *Hithpa.* הִתְהַלֵּל Psa. 105: 3; 106: 5, הִשְׁתַּבַּח, Psa. 106:47, הִתְבַּלֵּא Psa. 107:27. In all three the poet shows himself to be especially familiar with Isaiah 40-66, and also with the Book of Job. Psalm 107 is the fullest in reminiscences taken from both these Books, and in this Psalm the movement of the poet is more free without recapitulating history that has been committed to writing. Everything therefore favours the assertion that Psalm 105, 106, and 107 are a "trefoil" (*trifolium*), — two Hodu-Psalms, and a Hallalujah-Psalms in the middle.

Psalm 107 consists of six groups with an introit, vv. 1-3, and an epiphonem, v. 43. The poet unrolls before the dispersion of Israel that has again attained to the possession of its native land the pictures of divine deliverances in which human history, and more especially the history of the exiles, is so rich. The

epiphonem at the same time stamps the hymn as a consolatory Psalm; for those who were gathered again out of the lands of the heathen nevertheless still looked for the final redemption under the now milder, now more despotic sceptre of the secular power.

*Psa. 107: 1-3.* The introit, with the call upon them to grateful praise, is addressed to the returned exiles. The Psalm carries the marks of its deutero-Isaianic character on the very front of it, viz.: “the redeemed of Jahve,” taken from Isa. 62:12, cf. 63: 4; 35: 9 f.; קִבְּצוּ as in Isa. 56: 8, and frequently; “from the north and from the sea,” as in Isa. 49:12: “the sea” (יָם) here (as perhaps there also), side by side with east, west, and north, is the south, or rather (since יָם is an established *usus loquendi* for the west) the south-west, viz., the southern portion of the Mediterranean washing the shores of Egypt. With this the poet associates the thought of the exiles of Egypt, as with וּמִמְעָרָב the exiles of the islands, i.e., of Asia Minor and Europe; he is therefore writing at a period in which the Jewish state newly founded by the release of the Babylonian exiles had induced the scattered fellow-countrymen in all countries to return home. Calling upon the redeemed ones to give thanks to God the Redeemer in order that the work of the restoration of Israel may be gloriously perfected amidst the thanksgiving of the redeemed ones, he forthwith formulates the thanksgiving by putting the language of thanksgiving of the ancient liturgy (Jer. 33:11) into their mouth. The nation, now again established upon the soil of the fatherland, has, until it had acquired this again, seen destruction in every form in a strange land, and can tell of the most manifold divine deliverances. The call to sacrifice the sacrifices of thanksgiving is expanded accordingly into several pictures portraying the dangers of the strange land, which are not so much allegorical, personifying the Exile, as rather exemplificative.

*Psa. 107: 4-9.* It has actually come to pass, the first strophe tells us, that they wandered in a strange land through deserts and wastes, and seemed likely to have to succumb to death from hunger. According to v. 40 and Isa. 43:19, it appears that v. 4a ought to be read לְאֶדְרָךְ (Olshausen, Baur, and Thenius); but the line is thereby lengthened inelegantly. The two words, joined by *Munach*, stand in the construct state, like פְּרֵא אָדָם, Gen. 16:12: a waste of a way = ἔρημος ὁδός, Act. 8:26 (Ewald, Hitzig), which is better suited to the poetical style than that דְרֶךְ, as in מְשֻׁנְה־פְסָף, and the like, should be an accusative of nearer definition (Hengstenberg). In connection with עִיר מְנוּשָׁב the poet, who is fond of this combination (vv. 7, 36, cf. בֵּית־מְנוּשָׁב, Lev. 25:29), means any city whatever which might afford the homeless ones a habitable, hospitable reception. With the perfects, which describe what has

been experienced, alternates in v. 5b the imperfect, which shifts to the way in which anything comes about: their soul in them enveloped itself (vid., 61: 3), i.e., was nigh upon extinction. With the *fut. consec.* then follows in v. 6 the fact which gave the turn to the change in their misfortune. Their cry for help, as the imperfect **צִיִּלִּם** implies, was accompanied by their deliverance, the fact of which is expressed by the following *fut. consec.* **יִדְרִיבֶם**. Those who have experienced such things are to confess to the Lord, with thanksgiving, His loving-kindness and His wonderful works to the children of men. It is not to be rendered: His wonders (supply **אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה**) towards the children of men (Luther, Olshausen, and others). The two **לְ** coincide: their thankful confession of the divine loving-kindness and wondrous acts is not to be addressed alone to Jahve Himself, but also to men, in order that out of what they have experienced a wholesome fruit may spring forth for the multitude. **נִפְשׁ שׁוֹקֵקָה** (*part. Polel*, the *ē* of which is retained as a pre-tonic vowel in pause, cf. 68:26 and on Job. 20:27, Ew. § 188, *b*) is, as in Isa. 29: 9, the thirsting soul (from **שׁוֹק**, Arab. *sâq*, to urge forward, of the impulse and drawing of the emotions, in Hebrew to desire ardently). The preterites are here an expression of that which has been experienced, and therefore of that which has become a fact of experience. In superabundant measure does God uphold the languishing soul that is in imminent danger of languishing away.

**Psa. 107:10-16.** Others suffered imprisonment and bonds; but through Him who had decreed this as punishment for them, they also again reached the light of freedom. Just as in the first strophe, here, too, as far as **יְדוּ** in v. 15, is all a compound subject; and in view of this the poet begins with participles. “Darkness and the shadow of death” (vid., Psa. 23: 4) is an Isaianic expression, Isa. 9: 1 (where **תְּשִׁבִי** is construed with **בְּ**), Psa. 42: 7 (where **תְּשִׁבִי** is construed as here, cf. Gen. 4:20, Zec. 2:11), just as “bound in torture and iron” takes its rise from Job. 36: 8. The old expositors call it a hendiadys for “torturing iron” (after Psa. 105:18); but it is more correct to take the one as the general term and the other as the particular: bound in all sorts of affliction from which they could not break away, and more particularly in iron bonds (**בְּרִזְלִים**, like the Arabic *firzil*, an iron fetter, vid., on Psa. 105:18). In v. 11, which calls to mind Isa. 5:19, and with respect to v. 12, Isa. 3: 8, the double play upon the sound of the words is unmistakable. By **עֲצָה** is meant the plan in accordance with which God governs, more particularly His final purpose, which lies at the basis of His leadings of Israel. Not only had they nullified this purpose of mercy by defiant resistance (**הִמָּרְדָה**) against God’s commandments (**אִמְרֵי**, Arabic *awâmir, âmireh*) on their part, but they had even blasphemed it; **נִאָּץ**, Deu. 32:19, and frequently, or **נִאָּץ** (prop. to pierce, then to treat roughly), is an

old Mosaic designation of blasphemy, Deu. 31:20, Num. 14:11, 23; 16:30. Therefore God thoroughly humbled them by afflictive labour, and caused them to stumble (בַּשָּׁל). But when they were driven to it, and prayed importunately to Him, He helped them out of their straits. The refrain varies according to recognised custom. Twice the expression is וַיִּזְעַקוּ, twice וַיִּזְעַקוּ; once יִצִּילֵם, then twice יוֹשִׁיעֵם, and last of all יוֹצִיאֵם, which follows here in v. 14 as an alliteration. The summary condensation of the deliverance experienced (v. 16) is moulded after Isa. 45: 2. The Exile, too, may be regarded as such like a large jail (vid., e.g., Isa. 42: 7, 22); but the descriptions of the poet are not pictures, but examples.

*Psa. 107:17-22.* Others were brought to the brink of the grave by severe sickness; but when they draw nigh in earnest prayer to Him who appointed that they should suffer thus on account of their sins, He became their Saviour. אֱלֹהִים (cf. e.g., Job. 5: 3), like נָבֵל (vid., 14: 1), is also an ethical notion, and not confined to the idea of defective intellect merely. It is one who insanely lives only for the passing hour, and ruins health, calling, family, and in short himself and everything belonging to him. Those who were thus minded, the poet begins by saying, were obliged to suffer by reason of (in consequence of) their wicked course of life. The cause of their days of pain and sorrow is placed first by way of emphasis; and because it has a meaning that is related to the past יִתְאַזְּנוּ thereby comes all the more easily to express that which took place simultaneously in the past. The *Hithpa.* in 1Ki. 2:26 signifies to suffer willingly or intentionally; here: to be obliged to submit to suffering against one's will. Hengstenberg, for example, construes it differently: "Fools because of their walk in transgression (more than 'because of their transgression'), and those who because of their iniquities were afflicted — all food," etc. But יִתְאַזְּנוּ beside יִתְאַזְּנוּ has the assumption in its favour of being an affirmation of the cause of the affliction. In v. 18 the poet has the Book of Job (Job. 33:20, 22) before his eye. And in connection with v. 20, ἀπέστειλεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἴασατο αὐτούς (LXX), no passage of the Old Testament is more vividly recalled to one's mind than Psa. 105:19, even more than Psa. 147:18; because here, as in Psa. 105:19, it treats of the intervention of divine acts within the sphere of human history, and not of the intervention of divine operations within the sphere of the natural world. In the natural world and in history the word (רַב־בֵּר) is God's messenger (Psa. 105:19, cf. Isa. 55:10 f.), and appears here as a mediator of the divine healing. Here, as in Job. 33:23 f., the fundamental fact of the New Testament is announced, which Theodoret on this passage expresses in words: Ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἐνανθρωπήσας καὶ ἀποσταλεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος τὰ παντοδαπὰ τῶν ψυχῶν ἴασατο τραύματα καὶ τοὺς διαφθαρέντας ἀνέβρωσε λογισμούς. The LXX goes on to render it: καὶ ἐβῆρυσάτο αὐτούς ἐκ



τῶν διαφθορῶν αὐτῶν, inasmuch as the translators derive שְׁחִיתוֹתָם from שְׁחִיתָהּ (Dan. 6: 5), and this, as שָׁחַת elsewhere (vid., 16:10), from שָׁחַת, διαφθεῖρειν, which is approved by Hitzig. But Lam. 4:20 is against this. From שָׁחַת is formed a noun שְׁחִיתָהּ (שְׁחִיתָהּ) in the signification a hollow place (Pro. 28:10), the collateral form of which, שְׁחִיתָהּ (שְׁחִיתָהּ), is inflected like חֲנִית, plur. חֲנִיתוֹת with a retention of the substantival termination. The “pits” are the deep afflictions into which they were plunged, and out of which God caused them to escape. The suffix of וַיִּרְפָּאם avails also for יִמְלֹט, as in Gen. 27: 5; 30:31, Psa. 139: 1, Isa. 46: 5.

*Psa. 107:23-32.* Others have returned to tell of the perils of the sea. Without any allegory (Hengstenberg) it speaks of those who by reason of their calling traverse (which is expressed by יָרַד because the surface of the sea lies below the dry land which slopes off towards the coast) the sea in ships (read *boönijoth* without the article), and that not as fishermen, but (as Luther has correctly understood the choice of the word) in commercial enterprises. These have seen the works and wonders of God in the eddying deep, i.e., they have seen with their own eyes what God can do when in His anger He calls up the powers of nature, and on the other hand when He compassionately orders them back into their bounds. God’s mandate (וַיִּצְוֶה) as in Psa. 105:31, 34) brought it to pass that a stormy wind arose (cf. עָמַד, Psa. 33: 9), and it drove its (the sea’s) waves on high, so that the seafarers at one time were tossed up to the sky and then hurled down again into deep abysses, and their soul melted בִּרְעָה, in an evil, anxious mood, i.e., lost all its firmness. They turned about in a circle (יָחֻגּוּ from חָגַג = חוּג) and reeled after the manner of a drunken man; all their wisdom swallowed itself up, i.e., consumed itself within itself, came of itself to nought, just as Ovid, *Trist.* i. 1, says in connection with a similar description of a storm at sea: *ambiguus ars stupet ipsa malis*. The poet here writes under the influence of Isa. 19: 3, cf. 14. But at their importunate supplication God led them forth out of their distresses (Psa. 25:17). He turned the raging storm into a gentle blowing (= הִמָּחַה הַקָּה, 1Ki. 19:12). הַקִּים construed with לְ here has the sense of transporting (carrying over) into another condition or state, as Apollinaris renders: ἀντίκα δ’ εἰς αὐρην προτέρην μετέθηκε θύελλαν. The suffix of גַּלְיָהֶם cannot refer to the מִים רַבִּים in v. 23, which is so far removed; “their waves” are those with which they had to battle. These to their joy became calm (שָׁחַת) and were still (שָׁתָהּ as in Jon. 1:11), and God guided them ἐπὶ λιμένα θελήματος αὐτῶν (LXX). מְחוּזוֹ, a hapax-legomenon, from Arab. *ḥâz* (*ḥwz*), to shut in on all sides and to draw to one’s self (root Arab. *ḥw*, *gyravīt, in gyrum egīt*), signifies a place enclosed round,

therefore a haven, and first of all perhaps a creek, to use a northern word, a fiord. The verb **שָׁתַק** in relation to **הָשָׁה** is the stronger word, like **יָבֵשׁ** in relation to **יָרַם** in the history of the Flood. Those who have been thus marvellously rescued are then called upon thankfully to praise God their Deliverer in the place where the national church assembles, and where the chiefs of the nation sit in council; therefore, as it seems, in the Temple and in the Forum. <sup>f346</sup>

Now follow two more groups without the two beautiful and impressive refrains with which the four preceding groups are interspersed. The structure is less artistic, and the transitions here and there abrupt and awkward. One might say that these two groups are inferior to the rest, much as the speeches of Elihu are inferior to the rest of the Book of Job. That they are, however, nevertheless from the hand of the very same poet is at once seen from the continued dependence upon the Book of Job and Isaiah. Hengstenberg sees in vv. 33-42 “the song with which they exalt the Lord in the assembly of the people and upon the seat of the elders.” but the *materia laudis* is altogether different from that which is to be expected according to the preceding calls to praise. Nor is it any the more clear to us that vv. 33 f. refer to the overthrow of Babylon, and vv. 35 ff. to the happy turn of affairs that took place simultaneously for Israel; v. 35 does not suit Canaan, and the expressions in vv. 36 f. would be understood in too low a sense. No, the poet goes on further to illustrate the helpful government of God the just and gracious One, inasmuch as he has experiences in his mind in connection therewith, of which the dispersion of Israel in all places can sing and speak.

*Psa. 107:33-38.* Since in v. 36 the historical narration is still continued, a meaning relating to the contemporaneous past is also retrospectively given to the two correlative **יָשָׁם**. It now goes on to tell what those who have now returned have observed and experienced in their own case. V. 33a sounds like Isa. 50: 2b; v. 33b like Isa. 35: 7a; and v. 35 takes its rise from Isa. 41:18b. The juxtaposition of **מִן־צִיָּאִי** and **צִמְצוֹן**, since Deu. 8:15, belongs to the favourite antithetical alliterations, e.g., Isa. 61: 3. **מִלַּחָה**, that which is salty (LXX cf. Sir. 39:23: ἄλμη), is, as in Job. 39: 6, the name for the uncultivated, barren steppe. A land that has been laid waste for the punishment of its inhabitants has very often been changed into flourishing fruitful fields under the hands of a poor and grateful generation; and very often a land that has hitherto lain uncultivated and to all appearance absolutely unprofitable has developed an unexpected fertility. The exiles to whom Jeremiah writes, Jer. 29: 5: *Build ye houses and settle down, and plant gardens and eat their fruit*, may frequently have experienced this divine blessing. Their industry and their knowledge also did their part, but looked at in a right light, it was not

their own work but God's work that their settlement prospered, and that they continually spread themselves wider and possessed a not small, i.e., (cf. 2Ki. 4: 3) a very large, stock of cattle.

*Psa. 107:39-43.* But is also came to pass that it went ill with them, inasmuch as their flourishing prosperous condition drew down upon them the envy of the powerful and tyrannical; nevertheless God put an end to tyranny, and always brought His people again to honour and strength. Hitzig is of opinion that v. 39 goes back into the time when things were different with those who, according to vv. 36-38, had thriven. The *modus consecutivus* is sometimes used thus retrospectively (vid., Isa. 37: 5); here, however, the symmetry of the continuation from vv. 36-38, and the change which is expressed in v. 39a in comparison with v. 38b, require an actual consecution in that which is narrated. They became few and came down, were reduced (שָׁחָה, cf. Pro. 14:19: to come to ruin, or to be overthrown), a *coarctatione malitiae et maeroris*. עָצַר is the restraint of despotic rule, רָעָה the evil they had to suffer under such restraint, and יָגוֹן sorrow, which consumed their life. מַעְצָר has *Tarcha* and רָעָה *Munach* (instead of *Mercha* and *Mugrash*, vid., *Accentuationssystem*, xviii. 2). There is no reason for departing from this interpunction and rendering: "through tyranny, evil, and sorrow." What is stiff and awkward in the progress of the description arises from the fact that v. 40 is borrowed from Job. 12:21, 24, and that the poet is not willing to make any change in these sublime words. The version shows how we think the relation of the clauses is to be apprehended. Whilst He pours out His wrath upon tyrants in the contempt of men that comes upon them, and makes them fugitives who lose themselves in the terrible waste, He raises the needy and those hitherto despised and ill-treated on high out of the depth of their affliction, and makes families like a flock, i.e., makes their families so increase, that they come to have the appearance of a merrily gamboling and numerous flock. Just as this figure points back to Job. 21:11, so v. 42 is made up out of Job. 22:19; 5:16. The sight of this act of recognition on the part of God of those who have been wrongfully oppressed gives joy to the upright, and all roguery (אֲנָלָה, vid., 92:16) has its mouth closed, i.e., its boastful insolence is once for all put to silence. In v. 43 the poet makes the strains of his Psalm die away after the example of Hosea, Hos. 14:10 [9], in the *nota bene* expressed after the manner of a question: Who is wise — he will or let him keep this, i.e., bear it well in mind. The transition to the justice together with a change of number is rendered natural by the fact that מִי הַחֶכֶם, as in Hos. *loc. cit.* (cf. Jer. 9:11, Est. 5: 6, and without *Waw apod.* Jud. 7: 3, Pro. 9: 4, 16), is equivalent to *quisquis sapeins est*. הַחֶסֶדִי (חֶסֶדִי ה') are the manifestations of mercy or loving-kindness in which God's ever-enduring mercy unfolds itself in

history. He who is wise has a good memory for and a clear understanding of this.

## **Psalm 108**

### **TWO ELOHIMIC FRAGMENTS BROUGHT TOGETHER**

*108: 2 CONFIDENT is my heart, Elohim,  
I will sing and play upon the harp,  
Yea, this shall my glory do.*

*108: 3 Awake up, O harp and cithern,  
I will awake the morning dawn!*

*108: 4 I will praise Thee among the peoples, Jahve,  
And praise Thee upon the harp among the nations.*

*108: 5 For great beyond the heavens is Thy mercy, Elohim,  
And unto the clouds Thy truth.*

*108: 6 Oh show Thyself exalted above the heavens, Elohim,  
And above the whole earth Thy glory!*

*108: 7 In order that Thy beloved may be delivered —  
Save now with Thy right hand and answer me!*

*108: 8 Elohim hath promised in His holiness:  
I shall rejoice, I shall portion out Shechem,  
And measure out the valley of Succoth.*

*108: 9 Mine is Gilead, mine Manasseh,  
And Ephraim is the helm of my head,  
Judah is my sceptre,*

*108:10 Moab is my wash-pot,  
Upon Edom I cast my shoe,  
Over Philistia I shout for joy.*

*108:11 Who will conduct me to the fortified city,  
Who will bring me to Edom?!*

*108:12 Hast not Thou, Elohim, cast us off,  
And goest not forth, Elohim, with our armies? —*

*108:13 Grant us deliverance from the oppressor,  
Yea, vain is the help of man.*

*108:14 In Elohim shall we obtain the victory,  
And HE will tread down our oppressors.*

*Psalm 108.* The אִוְדָהּ in v. 4 and the whole contents of this Psalm is the echo to the הוֹדוּ of the preceding Psalm. It is inscribed a *Psalm-song by David*, but only because it is compiled out of ancient Davidic materials. The fact of the absence of the לִמְנִצָּה makes it natural to suppose that it is of later origin. Two Davidic Psalm-pieces in the Elohimic style are here, with trifling variations, just put together, not soldered together, and taken out of their original historical connection. That a poet like David would thus compile a third out of two of his own songs (Hengstenberg) is not conceivable.

*Psa. 108: 2-6.* This first half is taken from Psa. 57: 8-12. The repetition of *confident is my heart* in Psalm 57 is here omitted; and in place of it the “my glory” of the exclamation, *awake my glory*, is taken up to “I will sing and will harp” as a more minute definition of the subject (vid., on 3: 5): He will do it, yea, his soul with all its godlike powers shall do it. *Jahve* in v. 4 is transformed out of the *Adonaj*; and *Waw copul.* is inserted both before v. 4*b* and v. 6*b*, contrary to Psalm 57. מֵאֵל, v. 5*a* (as in Est. 3: 1), would be a pleasing change for אֵד if v. 5*a* followed 5*b* and the definition of magnitude did not retrograde instead of heightening. Moreover Psa. 36: 6, Jer. 51: 9 (cf. עַל in Psa. 113: 4; 148:13) favour עַד in opposition to מֵעַל.

*Psa. 108: 7-14.* Psa. 60: 7-14 forms this second half. The clause expressing the purpose with לְמַאֵן, as in its original, has the following הוֹשִׁיעָה for its principal clause upon which it depends. Instead of וַעֲנֵנוּ, which one might have expected, the expression used here is וַעֲנֵנִי without any interchange of the mode of writing and of reading it; many printed copies have וַעֲנֵנוּ here also; Baer, following Norzi, correctly has וַעֲנֵנִי. Instead of לִי ... וְלִי, Psa. 60: 9, we here read לִי ... לִי, which is less soaring. And instead of *Cry aloud concerning me, O Philistia do I shout for joy* (the triumphant cry of the victor); in accordance with which Hupfeld wishes to take הִתְרוֹעְעֵי in the former as infinitive: “over (עָלִי instead of עָלֵי) Philistia is my shouting for joy” (הִתְרוֹעְעֵי instead of הִתְרוֹעְעֵי, since the infinitive does not admit of this pausal form of the imperative). For עֵיר מְצוֹר we have here the more usual form of expression עֵיר מְבָצָר. V. 12*a* is weakened by the omission of the אָתָּה (הֵלֵא).

## Psalm 109

### IMPRECATION UPON THE CURSER WHO PREFERS THE CURSE TO THE BLESSING

*109: 1 GOD of my praise, be not silent!*

*109: 2 For a wicked mouth and a deceitful mouth have they opened against me,  
They have spoken against me with a lying tongue,*

*109: 3 And with animosities have they surrounded me  
And fought against me without cause.*

*109: 4 For my love they make themselves hostile to me,  
Whilst I am all prayer;*

*109: 5 And have requited me with evil for good,  
And with hatred for my love.*

*109: 6 Set Thou a wicked man over him,  
And let Satan stand at his right hand;*

*109: 7 If he is judged, let him come off as a wicked man,  
And let his prayer become sin.*

*109: 8 Let his days be few,  
His office let another take.*

*109: 9 Let his children become orphans,  
And his wife a widow,*

*109:10 And let his children wander to and fro begging,  
And let them entreat far from their ruins.*

*109:11 Let the creditor surround with snares all that he hath,  
And let strangers spoil what his labour hath gained.*

*109:12 Let there be no one to continue kindness to him,  
And let no one bestow [anything] upon his orphans.*

*109:13 Let his posterity be rooted out,  
In the next generation let their name be blotted out.*

*109:14 Let the guilt of his fathers be remembered with Jahve,  
And let the sin of his mother not be blotted out,*

*109:15 Let them be always before Jahve,  
And may He cut off their memory from the earth.*

*109:16 Because he hath not remembered to show kindness,  
And hath persecuted a man wretched and poor,  
And terrified of heart, to put him to death.*

*109:17 he hath loved the curse, and it hath come upon him;  
And he delighted not in blessing, and it remained far from him.*

*109:18 He clothed himself in cursing as his garment,  
And it pressed like water into his bowels,  
And like oil into his bones.*

*109:19 So let it become unto him as a coat in which he covereth himself,  
And as a girdle which he continually putteth on.*

*109:20 This is the reward of mine adversaries from Jahve,  
And of those who speak evil concerning my soul.*

*109:21 But do THOU, Jahve Lord, act for me for Thy Name's sake;  
Because Thy loving-kindness is good, deliver Thou me!*

*109:22 For I am wretched and poor,  
And my heart is pierced within me.*

*109:23 As a shadow, when it lengtheneth, am I gone,  
I am scared away as a locust.*

*109:24 My knees knock together through fasting,  
And my flesh is fallen away from fatness.*

*109:25 And I am become a reproach to them,  
They see me, they shake their head.*

*109:26 Succour me, Jahve my God,  
Help me according to Thy loving-kindness,*

*109:27 That they may know that this is Thy hand,  
Thou, Jahve, hast done it.*

*109:28 They curse, but THOU blessest;  
They arise and are ashamed, and Thy servant is glad.*

*109:29 Mine adversaries shall clothe themselves with reproach,  
And envelope themselves as with a mantle with their own shame.*

*109:30 I will give thanks greatly unto Jahve with my mouth,  
And in the midst of many will I praise Him,*

*109:31 That He placeth Himself at the right hand of the poor,  
To help him against the judges of his soul.*

*Psalm 109.* The **קִנְיָן**, corresponding like an echo to the **קִנְיָן** of Psalm 107, is also found here in v. 30. But Psalm 109 is most closely related to Psalm 69. Anger concerning the ungodly who requite love with ingratitude, who persecute innocence and desire the curse instead of the blessing, has here reached its utmost bound. The imprecations are not, however, directed against

a multitude as in Psalm 69, but their whole current is turned against one person. Is this Doeg the Edomite, or Cush the Benjamite? We do not know. The marks of Jeremiah's hand, which raised a doubt about the לָדָד of Psalm 69, are wanting here; and if the development of the thoughts appears too diffuse and overloaded to be suited to David, and also many expressions (as the inflected מֵאֵם in v. 8, the נִכְסָה, which is explained by the Syriac, in v. 16, and the half-passive לָלַל in v. 22) look as though they belong to the later period of the language, yet we feel on the other hand the absence of any certain echoes of older models. For in the parallels v. 6, cf. Zec. 3: 1, and vv. 18, 29b, cf. Isa. 59:17, it is surely not the mutual relationship but the priority that is doubtful; v. 22, however, in relation to Psa. 55: 5 (cf. v. 4 with 55: 5) is a variation such as is also allowable in one and the same poet (e.g., in the refrains). The anathemas that are here poured forth more extensively than anywhere else speak in favour of David, or at least of his situation. They are explained by the depth of David's consciousness that he is the anointed of Jahve, and by his contemplation of himself in Christ. The persecution of David was a sin not only against David himself, but also against the Christ in him; and because Christ is in David, the outbursts of the Old Testament wrathful spirit take the prophetic form, so that this Psalm also, like Psalm 22 and 69, is a typically prophetic Psalm, inasmuch as the utterance of the type concerning himself is carried by the Spirit of prophecy beyond himself, and thus the ἀρά is raised to the προφητεία ἐν εἰδει ἀρᾶς (Chrysostom). These imprecations are not, however, appropriate in the mouth of the suffering Saviour. It is not the spirit of Zion but of Sinai which here speaks out of the mouth of David; the spirit of Elias, which, according to Luke 9:55, is not the spirit of the New Testament. This wrathful spirit is overpowered in the New Testament by the spirit of love. But these anathemas are still not on this account so many beatings of the air. There is in them a divine energy, as in the blessing and cursing of every man who is united to God, and more especially of a man whose temper of mind is such as David's. They possess the same power as the prophetic threatenings, and in this sense they are regarded in the New Testament as fulfilled in the son of perdition (Joh. 17:12). To the generation of the time of Jesus they were a deterrent warning not to offend against the Holy One of God, and this *Psalmus Ischarioticus* (Act. 1:20) will ever be such a mirror of warning to the enemies and persecutors of Christ and His Church.

*Psa. 109: 1-5.* A sign for help and complaints of ungrateful persecutors form the beginning of the Psalm. "God of my praise" is equivalent to God, who art my praise, Jer. 17:14, cf. Deu. 10:21. The God whom the Psalmist has hitherto had reason to praise will also now show Himself to him as worthy to be praised. Upon this faith he bases the prayer: be not silent (Psa. 28: 1; 35:22)! A mouth such as belongs to the "wicked," a mouth out of which comes "deceit,"



have they opened against him; they have spoken with him a tongue (accusative, vid., on Psa. 64: 6), i.e., a language, of falsehood. רַבְרַבִּי of things and utterances as in Psa. 35:20. It would be capricious to take the suffix of אֲהַבְתִּי in v. 4 as *genit. object.* (love which they owe me), and in v. 5 as *genit. subject.*; from Psa. 38:21 it may be seen that the love which he has shown to them is also meant in v. 4. The assertion that he is “prayer” is intended to say that he, repudiating all revenges of himself, takes refuge in God in prayer and commits his cause into His hands. They have loaded him with evil for good, and hatred for the love he has shown to them. Twice he lays emphasis on the fact that it is love which they have requited to him with its opposite. Perfects alternate with aorists: it is no enmity of yesterday; the imprecations that follow presuppose an inflexible obduracy on the side of the enemies.

*Psa. 109: 6-10.* The writer now turns to one among the many, and in the angry zealous fervour of despised love calls down God’s judgment upon him. To call down a higher power, more particularly for punishment, upon any one is expressed by פָּקֵד (הַפְקִיד) אֵל, Jer. 15: 3, Lev. 26:16. The tormentor of innocence shall find a superior executor who will bring him before the tribunal (which is expressed in Latin by *legis actio per manus injectionem*). The judgment scene in vv. 6b, 7a shows that this is what is intended in v. 6a: At the right hand is the place of the accuser, who in this instance will not rest before the *damnatus es* has been pronounced. He is called שָׂטָן, which is not to be understood here after 1Sa. 29: 4, 2Sa. 19:23 [22], but after Zec. 3: 1, 1Ch. 21: 1, if not directly of Satan, still of a superhuman (cf. Num. 22:22) being which opposes him, by appearing before God as his κατήγορος; for according to v. 7a the שָׂטָן is to be thought of as accuser, and according to 7b God as Judge. שָׁעַר has the sense of *reus*, and אֲצַיֵּן refers to the publication of the sentence. V. 7b wishes that his prayer, viz., that by which he would wish to avert the divine sentence of condemnation, may become לְחַטָּאת, not: a missing of the mark, i.e., ineffectual (Thenius), but, according to the usual signification of the word: a sin, viz., because it proceeds from despair, not from true penitence. In v. 8 the incorrigible one is wished an untimely death (מֵאֲטִימָא as in one other instance, only, Ecc. 5: 1) and the loss of his office. The LXX renders: τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λάβοι ἕτερος. הַדָּקָה really signifies the office of overseer, oversight, office, and the one individual must have held a prominent position among the enemies of the psalmist. Having died off from this position before his time, he shall leave behind him a family deeply reduced in circumstances, whose former dwelling-place — he was therefore wealthy — becomes “ruins.” His children wander up and down far from these ruins (יָדָא as e.g., in Jud. 5:11, Job. 28: 4) and beg (שָׁרַדָּה, like προσαιτεῖν, ἐπαιτεῖν, Sir.

40:28 = בַּקֵּשׁ לָחֵם (37:25). Instead of וְדָרְשׁוּ the reading וְדָרְשׁוּ is also found. A *Poel* is now and then formed from the strong verbs also, <sup>f347</sup> in the inflexion of which the *Cholem* is sometimes shortened to *Kametz chatuph*; vid., the forms of לָשַׁן, to slander, in 101: 5, תָּאָר, to sketch, mark out in outline, Isa. 44:13, cf. also Job. 20:26 (תִּאֲבֵלְהוּ) and Isa. 62: 9 (according to the reading מֵאֲסָפִי). To read the *Kametz* in these instances as *ā*, and to regard these forms as resolved *Piels*, is, in connection with the absence of the *Metheg*, contrary to the meaning of the pointing; on purpose to guard against this way of reading it, correct codices have וְדָרְשׁוּ (cf. Psa. 69:19), which Baer has adopted.

*Psa. 109:11-15.* The *Piel* נִקְּשׁ properly signifies to catch in snares; here, like the Arabic Arab. *nqš*, II, IV, corresponding to the Latin *obligare* (as referring to the creditor's right of claim); נִשָּׂה is the name of the creditor as he who gives time for payment, gives credit (vid., Isa. 24: 2). In v. 12 מִשְׁדַּךְ חֶסֶד, to draw out mercy, is equivalent to causing it to continue and last, Psa. 36:11, cf. Jer. 31: 3. אֲחֵרֵיתוֹ, v. 13a, does not signify his future, but as v. 13b (cf. 37:38) shows: his posterity. יְהִי לְהִכְרִית is not merely *excindatur*, but *excindenda sit* (Eze. 30:16, cf. Jos. 2: 6), just as in other instances לְהִיָּה corresponds to the active *fut. periphrasticum*, e.g., Gen. 15:12, Isa. 37:26. With reference to יָמָה instead of יָמָה (contracted from יָמָהָה), vid., Ges. § 75, rem. 8. A Jewish acrostic interpretation of the name יִשׁוּ runs: יָמָה שָׁמוֹ וְזָכְרוּ . This curse shall overtake the family of the υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας. All the sins of his parents and ancestors shall remain indelible above before God the Judge, and here below the race, equally guilty, shall be rooted out even to its memory, i.e., to the last trace of it.

*Psa. 109:16-20.* He whom he persecuted with a thirst for blood, was, apart from this, a great sufferer, bowed down and poor and נִכְאָה לִבָּב, of terrified, confounded heart. LXX κατανευγμένον (Jerome, *compunctum*); but the stem-word is not נִכָּה (נִכָּה), root נָךְ (p. 272), but כָּאָה, Syriac *bā'ā'*, cogn. כָּהָה, to cause to come near, to meet. The verb, and more especially in *Niph.*, is proved to be Hebrew by Dan. 11:30. Such an one who without anything else is of a terrified heart, inasmuch as he has been made to feel the wrath of God most keenly, this man has persecuted with a deadly hatred. He had experienced kindness (חֶסֶד) in a high degree, but he blotted out of his memory that which he had experienced, not for an instant imagining that he too on his part had to exercise חֶסֶד. The *Poel* מוֹתֵת instead of הַמִּית points to the agonizing death (Isa. 53: 9, cf. Eze. 28:10 מוֹתֵי) to which he exposes God's anointed. The fate

of the shedder of blood is not expressed after the manner of a wish in vv. 16-18, but in the historical form, as being the result that followed of inward necessity from the matter of fact of the course which he had himself determined upon. The verb **בּוֹא** *seq. acc.* signifies to surprise, suddenly attack any one, as in Isa. 41:25. The three figures in v. 18 are climactic: he has clothed himself in cursing, he has drunk it in like water (Job. 15:16; 34: 7), it has penetrated even to the marrow of his bones, like the oily preparations which are rubbed in and penetrate to the bones. In v. 19 the emphasis rests upon **יַעֲטָה** and upon **תָּמִיד**. The summarizing v. 20 is the close of a strophe. **פְּעֻלָּה**, an earned reward, here punishment incurred, is especially frequent in Isa. 40-56, e.g., 49: 4; 40:10; it also occurs once even in the *Tôra*, Lev. 19:13. Those who answer the loving acts of the righteous with such malevolence in word and in deed commit a satanic sin for which there is no forgiveness. The curse is the fruit of their own choice and deed. Arnobius: *Nota ex arbitrio evenisse ut nollet, propter haeresim, quae dicit Deum alios praedestinasse ad benedictionem, alios ad maledictionem.*

**Psa. 109:21-25.** The thunder and lightning are now as it were followed by a shower of tears of deep sorrowful complaint. Psalm 109 here just as strikingly accords with Psalm 69, as Psalm 69 does with Psalm 22 in the last strophe but one. The twofold name *Jahve Adonaj* (vid., *Symbolae*, p. 16) corresponds to the deep-breathed complaint. **עֲשֵׂה אִתִּי**, deal with me, i.e., succouring me, does not greatly differ from **לִי** in 1Sa. 14: 6. The confirmation, v. 21*b*, runs like Psa. 69:17: Thy loving-kindness is **טוֹב**, absolutely good, the ground of everything that is good and the end of all evil. Hitzig conjectures, as in Psa. 69:17, **בְּטוֹב חֶסֶדְךָ**, “according to the goodness of Thy loving-kindness;” but this formula is without example: “for Thy loving-kindness is good” is a statement of the motive placed first and corresponding to the “for thy Name’s sake.” In v. 22 (a variation of Psa. 55: 5) **חָלַל**, not **חָלָה**, is traditional; this **חָלַל**, as being *verb. denom.* from **חָלַל**, signifies to be pierced, and is therefore equivalent to **חוּלַל** (cf. Luke 2:35). The metaphor of the shadow in v. 23 is as in Psa. 102:12. When the day declines, the shadow lengthens, it becomes longer and longer (Virgil, *majoresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae*), till it vanishes in the universal darkness. Thus does the life of the sufferer pass away. The poet intentionally uses the *Niph.* **נִהְלַכְתִּי** (another reading is **נִהְלַכְתִּי**); it is a power rushing upon him from without that drives him away thus after the manner of a shadow into the night. The locust or grasshopper (apart from the plague of the locusts) is proverbial as being a defenceless, inoffensive little creature that is soon driven away, Job. 39:20. **נִנְאָר**, to be shaken out or off (cf. Arabic *na ūra*, a water-wheel that fills its clay-vessels in the river and empties

them out above, and **הִנָּסַר**, Zec. 11:16, where Hitzig wishes to read **הִנָּעַר**, *dispulsio = dispulsi*). The fasting in v. 24 is the result of the loathing of all food which sets in with deep grief. **בָּחַשׁ מִשֶּׁמֶן** signifies to waste away so that there is no more fat left. <sup>f348</sup>

In v. 25 **אֲנִי** is designedly rendered prominent: in this the form of his affliction he is the butt of their reproaching, and they shake their heads doubtfully, looking upon him as one who is punished of God beyond all hope, and giving him up for lost. It is to be interpreted thus after Psa. 69:11 f.

**Psa. 109:26-31.** The cry for help is renewed in the closing strophe, and the Psalm draws to a close very similarly to Psalm 69 and 22, with a joyful prospect of the end of the affliction. In v. 27 the hand of God stands in contrast to accident, the work of men, and his own efforts. All and each one will undeniably perceive, when God at length interposes, that it is His hand which here does that which was impossible in the eyes of men, and that it is His work which has been accomplished in this affliction and in the issue of it. He blesses him whom men curse: they arise without attaining their object, whereas His servant can rejoice in the end of his affliction. The futures in v. 29 are not now again imprecations, but an expression of believably confident hope. In correct texts **בְּמַעַל** has *Mem raphatum*. The “many” are the “congregation” (vid., Psa. 22:23). In the case of the marvellous deliverance of this sufferer the congregation or church has the pledge of its own deliverance, and a bright mirror of the loving-kindness of its God. The sum of the praise and thanksgiving follows in v. 31, where **כִּי** signifies *quod*, and is therefore allied to the **ὅτι** *recitativum* (cf. Psa. 22:25). The three Good Friday Psalms all sum up the comfort that springs from David’s affliction for all suffering ones in just such a pithy sentence (Psa. 22:25; 69:34). Jahve comes forward at the right hand of the poor, contending for him (cf. Psa. 110: 5), to save (him) from those who judge (Psa. 37:33), i.e., condemn, his soul. The contrast between this closing thought and vv. 6 f. is unmistakeable. At the right hand of the tormentor stands Satan as an accuser, at the right hand of the tormented one stands God as his vindicator; he who delivered him over to human judges is condemned, and he who was delivered up is “taken away out of distress and from judgment” (Isa. 53: 8) by the Judge of the judges, in order that, as we now hear in the following Psalm, he may sit at the right hand of the heavenly King. **Εδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι ... ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ!** (1Ti. 3:16).

## Psalm 110

### TO THE PRIEST-KING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD

*110: 1 THE oracle of Jahve unto my Lord:*

*“Sit thou at My right hand,  
Until I make thine enemies  
The stool of thy feet.”*

*110: 2 The sceptre of thy might*

*Will Jahve stretch forth out of Zion:  
“Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies!”*

\*

*110: 3 Thy people are most willing on thy field-day;*

*In holy festive garments,  
Out of the womb of the morning’s dawn  
Cometh the dew of thy young men.*

*110: 4 Jahve hath sworn and will not repent:*

*“Thou shalt be a priest for ever  
After the manner of Melchizedek.”*

\* \*

*110: 5 The Lord at thy right hand*

*Dasheth kings in pieces in the day of His wrath,*

*110: 6 He shall judge among the nations,*

*It becometh full of corpses.  
He dasheth in pieces a head upon a broad country;*

*110: 7 Of the brook in the way shall he drink,*

*Therefore shall he lift up the head on high.*

\* \* \*

*Psalm 110.* While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them: What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He? They say unto Him: David’s. He saith unto them: How then doth David in the spirit call Him Lord, saying: “The Lord hath said unto my Lord: Sit Thou on My right hand until I make Thine enemies the stool of Thy feet?” If David then calls Him Lord, how is He his Son? And no man was able to answer Him a word, neither durst any one from that day forth question Him further.

So we read in Mat. 22:41-46, Mar. 12:35-37, Luk. 20:41-44. The inference which it is left for the Pharisees to draw rests upon the two premises, which are granted, that Psalm 110 is Davidic, and that it is prophetic-Messianic, i.e., that in it the future Messiah stands objectively before the mind of David. For if those who were interrogated had been able to reply that David does not there

speak of the future Messiah, but puts into the mouth of the people words concerning himself, or, as Hofmann has now modified the view he formerly held (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, 496-500), concerning the Davidic king in a general way, <sup>f249</sup> then the question would lack the background of cogency as an argument. Since, however, the prophetic-Messianic character of the Psalm was acknowledged at that time (even as the later synagogue, in spite of the dilemma into which this Psalm brought it in opposition to the church, has never been able entirely to avoid this confession), the conclusion to be drawn from this Psalm must have been felt by the Pharisees themselves, that the Messiah, because the Son of David and Lord at the same time, was of human and at the same time of superhuman nature; that it was therefore in accordance with Scripture if this Jesus, who represented Himself to be the predicted Christ, should as such profess to be the Son of God and of divine nature.

The New Testament also assumes elsewhere that David in this Psalm speaks not of himself, but directly of Him, in whom the Davidic kingship should finally and for ever fulfil that of which the promise speaks. For v. 1 is regarded elsewhere too as a prophecy of the exaltation of Christ at the right hand of the Father, and of His final victory over all His enemies: Act. 2:34 f., 1Co. 15:25, Heb. 1:13; 10:13; and the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 5: 6; 7:17, 21) bases its demonstration of the abrogation of the Levitical priesthood by the Melchizedek priesthood of Jesus Christ upon v. 4. But if even David, who raised the Levitical priesthood to the pinnacle of splendour that had never existed before, was a priest after the manner of Melchizedek, it is not intelligible how the priesthood of Jesus Christ after the manner of Melchizedek is meant to be a proof in favour of the termination of the Levitical priesthood, and to absolutely preclude its continuance.

We will not therefore deceive ourselves concerning the apprehension of the Psalm which is presented to us in the New Testament Scriptures. According to the New Testament Scriptures, David speaks in Psalm 110 not merely of Christ in so far as the Spirit of God has directed him to speak of the Anointed of Jahve in a typical form, but directly and objectively in a prophetic representation of the Future One. And would this be impossible? Certainly there is no other Psalm in which David distinguishes between himself and the Messiah, and has the latter before him: the other Messianic Psalms of David are reflections of his radical, ideal contemplation of himself, reflected images of his own typical history; they contain prophetic elements, because David there too speaks *ἐν πνεύματι*, but elements that are not solved by the person of David. Nevertheless the last words of David in 2Sa. 23: 1-7 prove to us that we need not be surprised to find even a directly Messianic Psalm coming from his lips. After the splendour of all that pertained to David individually had almost entirely expired in his own eyes and in the eyes of those about him, he must

have been still more strongly conscious of the distance between what had been realized in himself and the idea of the Anointed of God, as he lay on his death-bed, as his sun was going down. Since, however, all the glory with which God has favoured him comes up once more before his soul, he feels himself, to the glory of God, to be “the man raised up on high, the anointed of God of Jacob, the sweet singer of Israel,” and the instrument of the Spirit of Jahve. This he has been, and he, who as such contemplated himself as the immortal one, must now die: then in dying he seizes the pillars of the divine promise, he lets go the ground of his own present, and looks as a prophet into the future of his seed:

*The God of Israel hath said, to me hath the Rock of Israel spoken: “A ruler of men, a just one, a ruler in the fear of God; and as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, a cloudless morning, when after sunshine, after rain it becomes green out of the earth.”*

For not little (לֵא-בֵן) to be explained according to Job. 9:35, cf. Num. 13:33, Isa. 51: 6) is my house with God, but an everlasting covenant hath He made with me, one ordered in all things and sure, for all my salvation and all my favour — ought He not to cause it to sprout? The idea of the Messiah shall notwithstanding be realized, in accordance with the promise, within his own house. The vision of the future which passes before his soul is none other than the picture of the Messiah detached from its subjectivity. And if so there, why may it not also have been so even in Psalm 110?

The fact that Psalm 110 has points of connection with contemporaneous history is notwithstanding the less to be denied, as its position in the Fifth Book leads one to suppose that it is taken out of its contemporary annalistic connection. The first of these connecting links is the bringing of the Ark home to Zion. Girded with the linen ephod of the priest, David had accompanied the Ark up to Zion with signs of rejoicing. There upon Zion Jahve, whose earthly throne is the Ark, now took His place at the side of David; but, spiritually considered, the matter stood properly thus, that Jahve, when He established Himself upon Zion, granted to David to sit henceforth enthroned at His side. The second connecting link is the victorious termination of the Syro-Ammonitish war, and also of the Edomitish war that came in between. The war with the Ammonites and their allies, the greatest, longest, and most glorious of David's wars, ended in the second year, when David himself joined the army, with the conquest of Rabbah. These two contemporary connecting links are to be recognised, but they only furnish the Psalm with the typical ground-colour for its prophetic contents.

In this Psalm David looks forth from the height upon which Jahve has raised him by the victory over Ammon into the future of his seed, and there He who carries forward the work begun by him to the highest pitch is his Lord. Over

against this King of the future, David is not king, but subject. He calls him, as one out of the people, “my Lord.” This is the situation of the prophetic-kingly poet. He has received new revelations concerning the future of his seed. He has come down from his throne and the height of his power, and looks up to the Future One. He too sits enthroned on Zion. He too is victorious from thence. But His fellowship with God is the most intimate imaginable, and the last enemy is also laid at His feet. And He is not merely king, who as a priest provides for the salvation of His people, He is an eternal Priest by virtue of a sworn promise. The Psalm therefore relates to the history of the future upon a typical ground-work. It is also explicable why the triumph in the case of Ammon and the Messianic image have been thus to David’s mind disconnected from himself. In the midst of that war comes the sin of David, which cast a shadow of sorrow over the whole of his future life and reduced its typical glory to ashes. Out of these ashes the phoenix of Messianic prophecy here arises. The type, come back to the conscious of himself, here lays down his crown at the feet of the Antitype.

Psalm 110 consists of three sevens, a tetrastich together with a tristich following three times upon one another. The *Rebia magnum* in v. 2 is a security for this stichic division, and in like manner the *Olewejored* by חִילָה in v. 3, and in general the interpunction required by the sense. And vv. 1 and 2 show decisively that it is to be thus divided into 4 + 3 lines; for v. 1 with its rhyming inflexions makes itself known as a tetrastich, and to take it together with v. 2 as a heptastich is opposed by the new turn which the Psalm takes in v. 2. It is also just the same with v. 4 in relation to v. 3: these seven stichs stand in just the same organic relation to the second divine utterance as the preceding seven to the first utterance. And since vv. 1-4 give twice 4 + 3 lines, vv. 5-7 also will be organized accordingly. There are really seven lines, of which the fifth, contrary to the Masoretic division of the verse, forms with v. 7 the final tristich.

The Psalm therefore bears the threefold impress of the number seven, which is the number of an oath and of a covenant. Its impress, then, is thoroughly prophetic. Two divine utterances are introduced, and that not such as are familiar to us from the history of David and only reproduced here in a poetic form, as with Psalm 89 and 132, but utterances of which nothing is known from the history of David, and such as we hear for the first time here. The divine name *Jahve* occurs three times. God is designedly called *Adonaj* the fourth time. The Psalm is consequently prophetic; and in order to bring the inviolable and mysterious nature even of its contents into comparison with the contemplation of its outward character, it has been organized as a threefold septiad, which is sealed with the thrice recurring tetragamma.



*Psa. 110: 1, 2.* In Psalm 20 and 21 we see at once in the openings that what we have before us is the language of the people concerning their king. Here לַאֲדֹנָי in v. 1 does not favour this, and אֲנִי is decidedly against it. The former does not favour it, for it is indeed correct that the subject calls his king “my lord,” e.g., 1Sa. 22:12, although the more exact form of address is “my lord the king,” e.g., 1Sa. 24: 9 [8]; but if the people are speaking here, what is the object of the title of honour being expressed as if coming from the mouth of an individual, and why not rather, as in Psalm 20, 21, לַמֶּלֶךְ or לַמִּשְׁיָחוֹ? אֲנִי is, however, decisive against the supposition that it is an Israelite who here expresses himself concerning the relation of his king to Jahve. For it is absurd to suppose that an Israelite speaking in the name of the people would begin in the manner of the prophets with אֲנִי, more particularly since this אֲנִי ה' placed thus at the head of the discourse is without any perfectly analogous example (1Sa. 2:30, Isa. 1:24 are only similar) elsewhere, and is therefore extremely important. In general this opening position of אֲנִי, even in cases where other genitives that יהוה follow, is very rare; אֲנִי Num. 24: 3 f., 15 f., of David in 2Sa. 23: 1, of Agur in Pro. 30: 1, and always (even in Psa. 36: 2) in an oracular signification. Moreover, if one from among the people were speaking, the declaration ought to be a retrospective glance at a past utterance of God. But, first, the history knows nothing of any such divine utterance; and secondly, אֲנִי ה' always introduces God as actually speaking, to which even the passage cited by Hofmann to the contrary, Num. 14:28, forms no exception. Thus it will consequently not be a past utterance of God to which the poet glances back here, but one which David has just now heard ἐν πνεύματι (Mat. 22:43), and is therefore not a declaration of the people concerning David, but of David concerning Christ. The unique character of the declaration confirms this. Of the king of Israel it is said that he sits on the throne of Jahve (1Ch. 29:23), viz., as visible representative of the invisible King (1Ch. 28: 5); Jahve, however, commands the person here addressed to take his place at His right hand. The right hand of a king is the highest place of honour, 1Ki. 2:19. <sup>f350</sup>

Here the sitting at the right hand signifies not merely an idle honour, but reception into the fellowship of God as regards dignity and dominion, exaltation to a participation in God’s reigning (βασιλεύειν, 1Co. 15:25). Just as Jahve sits enthroned in the heavens and laughs at the rebels here below, so shall he who is exalted henceforth share this blessed calm with Him, until He subdues all enemies to him, and therefore makes him the unlimited, universally acknowledged ruler. אֲנִי as in Hos. 10:12, for אֲדֹנָי or אֲדֹנָי, does not exclude the time that lies beyond, but as in Psa. 112: 8, Gen. 49:10, includes it, and in fact so that it at any rate marks the final subjugation of the enemies as a

turning-point with which something else comes about (vid., Act. 3:21, 1Co. 15:28). **הָדָם** is an accusative of the predicate. The enemies shall come to lie under his feet (1Ki. 5:17 [3]), his feet tread upon the necks of the vanquished (Jos. 10:24), so that the resistance that is overcome becomes as it were the dark ground upon which the glory of his victorious rule arises. For the history of time ends with the triumph of good over evil, — not, however, with the annihilation of evil, but with its subjugation. This is the issue, inasmuch as absolute omnipotence is effectual on behalf of and through the exalted Christ. In v. 2, springing from the utterance of Jahve, follow words expressing a prophetic prospect. Zion is the imperial abode of the great future King (Psa. 2: 6). **מִטָּה עֵזָב** (cf. Jer. 48:17, Eze. 19:11-14) signifies “the sceptre (as insignia and the medium of exercise) of the authority delegated to thee” (1Sa. 2:10, Mic. 5: 3 [4]). Jahve will stretch this sceptre far forth from Zion: no goal is mentioned up to which it shall extend, but passages like Zec. 9:10 show how the prophets understand such Psalms. In v. 2b follow the words with which Jahve accompanies this extension of the dominion of the exalted One. Jahve will lay all his enemies at his feet, but not in such a manner that he himself remains idle in the matter. Thus, then, having come into the midst of the sphere (**בְּקֶרֶב**) of his enemies, shall he reign, forcing them to submission and holding them down. We read this **רָדָה** in a Messianic connection in 72: 8. So even in the prophecy of Balaam (Num. 24:19), where the sceptre (ch. 24:17) is an emblem of the Messiah Himself.

*Psa. 110: 3, 4.* In order that he may rule thus victoriously, it is necessary that there should be a people and an army. In accordance with this union of the thoughts which v. 3a anticipates, **בְּיוֹם חֵילֶךָ** signifies in the day of thy arriere ban, i.e., when thou callest up thy “power of an army” (2Ch. 26:13) to muster and go forth to battle. In this day are the people of the king willingneses (**נִדְבָּת**), i.e., entirely cheerful readiness; ready for any sacrifices, they bring themselves with all that they are and have to meet him. There is no need of any compulsory, lengthy proclamation calling them out: it is no army of mercenaries, but willingly and quickly they present themselves from inward impulse (**מִתְנַדֵּב**, Jud. 5: 2, 9). The punctuation, which makes the principal caesura at **חֵילֶךָ** with *Olewejored*, makes the parallelism of **חֵילֶךָ** and **יְלֻדוֹתֶיךָ** distinctly prominent. Just as the former does not signify *roboris tui*, so now too the latter does not, according to Ecc. 11: 9, signify **παιδιότητός σου** (Aquila), and not, as Hofmann interprets, the dew-like freshness of youthful vigour, which the morning of the great day sheds over the king. Just as **גְּלוּת** signifies both exile and the exiled ones, so **יְלֻדוֹת**, like **νεότης**, *juventus*, *juventa*, signifies both the time and age of youth, youthfulness, and youthful, young men (the youth). Moreover one does not, after v. 3a, look for any further

declaration concerning the nature of the king, but of his people who place themselves at his service. The young men are likened to dew which gently descends upon the king out of the womb (*uterus*) of the morning-red. <sup>f351</sup>  
 מִשְׁחָר is related to שָׁחַר just as מִחְשָׁךְ is to חִשָּׁךְ; the notion of שָׁחַר and חִשָּׁךְ appears to be more sharply defined, and as it were apprehended more massively, in מִשְׁחָר and מִחְשָׁךְ. The host of young men is likened to the dew both on account of its vigorousness and its multitude, which are like the freshness of the mountain dew and the immense number of its drops, 2Sa. 17:12 (cf. Num. 23:10), and on account of the silent concealment out of which it wondrously and suddenly comes to light, Mic. 5: 6 [7]. After not having understood “thy youth” of the youthfulness of the king, we shall now also not, with Hofmann, refer בְּהַרְרֵי־קִדְשׁ to the king, the holy attire of his armour. הַרְרַת־קִדְשׁ is the vestment of the priest for performing divine service: the Levite singers went forth before the army in “holy attire” in 2Ch. 20:21; here, however, the people without distinction wear holy festive garments. Thus they surround the divine king as dew that is born out of the womb of the morning-red. It is a priestly people which he leads forth to holy battle, just as in Rev. 19:14 heavenly armies follow the Logos of God upon white horses, ἐνδεδυμένοι βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρὸν — a new generation, wonderful as if born out of heavenly light, numerous, fresh, and vigorous like the dew-drops, the offspring of the dawn. The thought that it is a priestly people leads over to v. 4. The king who leads this priestly people is, as we hear in v. 4, himself a priest (*cohen*). As has been shown by Hupfeld and Fleischer, the priest is so called as one who stands (from כָּהֵן = כּוּן in an intransitive signification), viz., before God (Deu. 10: 8, cf. Ps. 134: 1, Heb. 10:11), like נְבִיא the spokesman, viz., of God. <sup>f352</sup>

To stand before God is the same as to serve Him, viz., as priest. The ruler whom the Psalm celebrates is a priest who intervenes in the reciprocal dealings between God and His people within the province of divine worship the priestly character of the people who suffer themselves to be led forth to battle and victory by him, stands in causal connection with the priestly character of this their king. He is a priest by virtue of the promise of God confirmed by an oath. The oath is not merely a pledge of the fulfilment of the promise, but also a seal of the high significance of its purport. God the absolutely truthful One (Num. 13:19) swears — this is the highest enhancement of the נֶאֱמַר ה' of which prophecy is capable (Amo. 6: 8).

He appoints the person addressed as a priest for ever “after the manner of Melchizedek” in this most solemn manner. The *i* of דְּבַרְתִּי is the same ancient connecting vowel as in the מַלְכִי of the name Melchizedek; and it has the tone,

which it loses when, as in Lam. 1: 1, a tone-syllable follows. The wide-meaning אֲלֵךְ־בְּכֶרֶת, “in respect to, on account of,” Ecc. 3:18; 7:14; 8: 2, is here specialized to the signification “after the manner, measure of,” LXX κατὰ τὴν τάξιν. The priesthood is to be united with the kingship in him who rules out of Zion, just as it was in Melchizedek, king of Salem, and that for ever. According to De Wette, Ewald, and Hofmann, it is not any special priesthood that is meant here, but that which was bestowed directly with the kingship, consisting in the fact that the king of Israel, by reason of his office, commended his people in prayer to God and blessed them in the name of God, and also had the ordering of Jahve’s sanctuary and service. Now it is true all Israel is a “kingdom of priests” (Exo. 19: 6, cf. Num. 16: 3, Isa. 61: 6), and the kingly vocation in Israel must therefore also be regarded as in its way a priestly vocation. But this spiritual priesthood, and, if one will, this princely oversight of sacred things, needed not to come to David first of all by solemn promise; and that of Melchizedek, after which the relationship is here defined, is incongruous to him; for the king of Salem was, according to Canaanitish custom, which admitted of the union of the kingship and priesthood, really a high priest, and therefore, regarded from an Israelitish point of view, united in his own person the offices of David and of Aaron. How could David be called a priest after the manner of Melchizedek, he who had no claim upon the tithes of priests like Melchizedek, and to whom was denied the authority to offer sacrifice <sup>f353</sup> inseparable from the idea of the priesthood in the Old Testament? (cf. 2Ch. 26:20). If David were the person addressed, the declaration would stand in antagonism with the right of Melchizedek as priest recorded in Genesis 14, which, according to the indisputable representation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, was equal in compass to the Levitico-Aaronic right, and, since “after the manner of” requires a coincident reciprocal relation, in antagonism to itself also. <sup>f354</sup>

One might get on more easily with v. 4 by referring the Psalm to one of the Maccabean priest-princes (Hitzig, von Lengerke, and Olshausen); and we should then prefer to the reference to Jonathan who put on the holy *stola*, 1 Macc. 10:21 (so Hitzig formerly), or Alexander Jannaeus who actually bore the title king (so Hitzig now), the reference to Simon, whom the people appointed to “be their governor and high priest for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet” (1 Macc. 14:41), after the death of Jonathan his brother — a union of the two offices which, although an irregularity, was not one, however, that was absolutely illegal. But the priesthood, which the Maccabaeans, however, possessed originally as being priests born, is promised to the person addressed here in v. 4; and even supposing that in v. 4 the emphasis lay not on a union of the priesthood with the kingship, but of the kingship with the priesthood, then the retrospective reference to it in Zechariah

forbids our removing the Psalm to a so much later period. Why should we not rather be guided in our understanding of this divine utterance, which is unique in the Old Testament, by this prophet, whose prophecy in v. 6:12 f. is the key to it? Zechariah removes the fulfilment of the Psalm out of the Old Testament present, with its blunt separation between the monarchical and hierarchical dignity, into the domain of the future, and refers it to Jahve's Branch (צֶמַח) that is to come. He, who will build the true temple of God, satisfactorily unites in his one person the priestly with the kingly office, which were at that time assigned to Joshua the high priest and Zerubbabel the prince. Thus this Psalm was understood by the later prophecy; and in what other sense could the post-Davidic church have appropriated it as a prayer and hymn, than in the eschatological Messianic sense? but this sense is also verified as the original. David here hears that the king of the future exalted at the right hand of God, and whom he calls his Lord, is at the same time an eternal priest. And because he is both these his battle itself is a priestly royal work, and just on this account his people fighting with him also wear priestly garments.

*Psa. 110: 5-7.* Just as in v. 2 after v. 1, so now here too after the divine utterance, the poet continues in a reflective strain. The Lord, says v. 5, dashes in pieces kings at the right hand of this priest-king, in the day when His wrath is kindled (Psa. 2:12, cf. 21:10). אֲדֹנָי is rightly accented as subject. The fact that the victorious work of the person addressed is not his own work, but the work of Jahve on his behalf and through him, harmonizes with v. 1b. The sitting of the exalted one at the right hand of Jahve denotes his uniform participation in His high dignity and dominion. But in the fact that the Lord, standing at his right hand (cf. the counterpart in Psa. 109: 6), helps him to victory, that unchangeable relationship is shown in its historical working. The right hand of the exalted one is at the same time not inactive (see Num. 24:17, cf. v. 8), and the Lord does not fail him when he is obliged to use his arm against his foes. The subject to יָדָיו and to the two מַחֲזִיק is the Lord as acting through him. "He shall judge among the peoples" is an eschatological hope, Psa. 7: 9; 9: 9; 96:10, cf. 1Sa. 2:10. What the result of this judgment of the peoples is, is stated by the neutrally used verb מָלֵא with its accusative גִּירוֹת (cf. on the construction Psa. 65:10, Deu. 34: 9): it there becomes full of corpses, there is there a multitude of corpses covering everything. This is the same thought as in Isa. 66:24, and wrought out in closely related connection in Rev. 19:17; 18:21. Like the first מַחֲזִיק, the second (v. 6c) is also a perfect of the idea past. Accordingly אֶרֶץ רַבָּה seems to signify the earth or a country (cf. אֶרֶץ רַבָּה, Exo. 3: 8, Neh. 9:35) broad and wide, like תְּהוֹם רַבָּה the great far-stretching deep. But it might also be understood the "land of Rabbah," as they say the "land of Jazer" (Num. 32: 1), the "country of Goshen"

(Jos. 10:41), and the like; therefore the land of the Ammonites, whose chief city is Rabbah. It is also questionable whether ראש אל-ארץ רבה is to be taken like κεφαλήν ὑπὲρ πάντα, Eph. 1:22 (Hormann), or whether רבה על-ארץ belongs to מחץ as a designation of the battle-field. The parallels as to the word and the thing itself, Psa. 68:22, Hab. 3:13 f., speak for ראש signifying not the chief, but the head; not, however, in a collective sense (LXX, Targum), but the head of the רשע κατ' ἐξοχήν (vid., Isa. 11: 4). If this is the case, and the construction ראש על is accordingly to be given up, neither is it now to be rendered: He breaks in pieces a head upon the land of Rabbah, but upon a great (broad) land; in connection with which, however, this designation of the place of battle takes its rise from the fact that the head of the ruler over this great territory is intended, and the choice of the word may have been determined by an allusion to David's Ammonitish war. The subject of v. 7 is now not that arch-fiend, as he who in the course of history renews his youth, that shall rise up again (as we explained it formerly), but he whom the Psalm, which is thus rounded off with unity of plan, celebrates. V. 7a expresses the toil of his battle, and v. 7b the reward of undertaking the toil. אל-בן is therefore equivalent to ἀντὶ τούτου. בדרך, however, although it might belong to מנחל (of the brook by the wayside, Psa. 83:10; 106: 7), is correctly drawn to ישתה by the accentuation: he shall on his arduous way, the way of his mission (cf. 102:24), be satisfied with a drink from the brook. He will stand still only for a short time to refresh himself, and in order then to fight afresh; he will unceasingly pursue his work of victory without giving himself any time for rest and sojourn, and therefore (as the reward for it) it shall come to pass that he may lift his head on high as victor; and this, understood in a christological sense, harmonizes essentially with Php. 2: 8 f., Heb. 12: 2, Rev. 5: 9 f.

## Psalm 111

### ALPHABETICAL SONG IN PRAISE OF GOD

#### 111 HALLELUJAH.

- 1 § I WILL give thanks unto Jahve with the whole heart,  
 □ In the council of the upright and the congregation.  
 2 ג Great are the deeds of Jahve,  
 ¶ Worthy of being sought after in all their purposes.  
 3 □ Glory and splendour is His work,  
 ¶ And His righteousness endureth for ever.  
 4 ¶ A memorial of His wonderful works hath He founded,  
 □ Gracious and compassionate is Jahve.

5 מ Meat hath He given to those who fear Him,  
׳ He remembereth His covenant for ever.

6 ך He hath made known to His people the power of His works,  
ל Giving to them the heritage of the heathen.

7 מ The works of His hands are truth and right,  
נ Faithful are all His statutes,

8 ס Firm for ever and ever,

ע Established according to truth, and upright.

9 פ He hath sent redemption unto His people,

צ He hath pledged His covenant for ever —

ק Holy and reverend is His Name.

10 ר The beginning of wisdom is the fear of Jahve,

ש A good understanding have all dutiful ones;

ת He shall have eternal praise.

*Psalm 111.* With Psalm 111 begins a trilogy of Hallelujah-Psalms. It may be appended to Psalm 110, because it places the “for ever” of Psa. 110: 4 in broader light in relation to the history of redemption, by stringing praise upon praise of the deeds of Jahve and of His appointments. It stands in the closest relationship to Psalm 112. Whilst Psalm 111, as Hitzig correctly says, celebrates the glory, might, and loving-kindness of Jahve in the circle of the “upright,” Psalm 112 celebrates the glory flowing therefrom and the happiness of the “upright” themselves, of those who fear Jahve. The two Psalms are twin in form as in contents. They are a mixture of materials taken from older Psalms and gnomic utterances; both are sententious, and both alphabetical. Each consists of twenty-two lines with the twenty-two letters of the alphabet at the beginning, <sup>f355</sup> and every line for the most part consists of three words. Both songs are only chains of acrostic lines without any strophic grouping, and therefore cannot be divided out. The analogous accentuation shows how strong is the impression of the close relationship of this twin pair; and both Psalms also close, in vv. 9 and 10, with two verses of three members, being up to this point divided into verses of two members.

That which the poet purposes doing in v. 1, he puts into execution from v. 2 onwards. וְעַדָּהּ, according to Psa. 64: 7; 118:14, is equivalent to וְעַדָּהֶם. According to v. 10b, חֲפִצֵיהֶם in v. 2b apparently signifies those who find pleasure in them (the works of God); but חֲפִצֵי = חֲפִצֵי (like שְׂמַחֵי, Isa. 24: 7 = שְׂמַחֵי) is less natural than that it should be the construct form of the plural of חֲפִץ, that occurs in three instances, and there was no need for saying that those who make the works of God the object of their research are such as interest themselves in them. We are led to the right meaning by לְכָל-חֲפִצֵּו in

1Ki. 9:11 in comparison with Isa. 44:28; 46:10, cf. 53:10, where **חִפְּזָי** signifies God's purpose in accordance with His counsel: constantly searched into, and therefore a worthy object of research (**דַּרְשׁ**, root **דַּר**, to seek to know by rubbing, and in general experimentally, cf. Arab. *drâ* of knowledge empirically acquired) according to all their aims, i.e., in all phases of that which they have in view. In v. 4 **זִכָּר** points to the festival which propagates the remembrance of the deeds of God in the Mosaic age; **מִנְחָה**, v. 5, therefore points to the food provided for the Exodus, and to the Passover meal, together with the feast of unleavened bread, this memorial (**זִכְרוֹן**, Exo. 12:14) of the exemption in faithfulness to the covenant which was experienced in Egypt. This Psalm, says Luther, looks to me as though it had been composed for the festival of Easter. Even from the time of Theodoret and Augustine the thought of the Eucharist has been connected with v. 5 in the New Testament mind; and it is not without good reason that Psalm 111 has become the Psalm of the church at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. In connection with **הַגִּיד** one is reminded of the Pesach-Haggada. The deed of redemption which it relates has a power that continues in operation; for to the church of Jahve is assigned the victory not only over the peoples of Canaan, but over the whole world. The power of Jahve's deeds, which He has made known to His people, and which they tell over again among themselves, aims at giving them the inheritance of the peoples. The works of His hands are truth and right, for they are the realization of that which is true and which lasts and verifies itself, and of that which is right, that triumphantly maintains its ground. His ordinances are **נְאֻמָּיִם** (occasionally pointed **נְאֻמָּיִם**), established, attested, in themselves and in their results authorizing a firm confidence in their salutariness (cf. *Psa.* 19: 8). **סְמוּכִים**, supported, stayed, viz., not outwardly, but in themselves, therefore imperturbable (cf. **סְמוּךְ** used of the state of mind, 112: 8, *Isa.* 26: 3). **עֲשׂוּיִם**, moulded, arranged, viz., on the part of God, "in truth, and upright;" **יֵשֶׁר** is accusative of the predicate (cf. *Psa.* 119:37), but without its being clear why it is not pointed **וַיֵּשֶׁר**. If we have understood vv. 4-6 correctly, then **פְּדוּת** glances back at the deliverance out of Egypt. Upon this followed the ratification of the covenant on Sinai, which still remains inviolable down to the present time of the poet, and has the holiness and terribleness of the divine Name for a guarantee of its inviolability. The fear of Jahve, this holy and terrible God, is the beginning of wisdom — the motto of the *Chokma* in *Job* (*Job.* 28:28) and *Proverbs* (*Pro.* 1: 7; 9:10), the Books of the *Chokma*. V. 10b goes on in this *Proverbs*-like strain: the fear of God, which manifests itself in obedience, is to those who practise them (the divine precepts, **טוֹב (פְּקוּדִים) שֶׁכָּל** (*Pro.* 13:15; 3: 4, cf. *2Ch.* 30:22), a fine sagacity, praiseworthy discernment — such a (dutiful) one partakes of everlasting praise. It is true, in



glancing back to v. 3b, יהוה־לְהוֹרֹאֵהוּ seems to refer to God, but a glance forward to 112: 3b shows that the praise of him who fears God is meant. The old observation therefore holds good: *ubi haec ode desinit, sequens incipit* (Bakius).

## Psalm 112

### ALPHABETICAL SONG IN PRAISE OF THOSE WHO FEAR GOD

#### 112 HALLELUJAH

- 1 **Ⲛ** *BLESSED is the man who feareth Jahve,*  
Ⲓ *Who delighteth greatly in His commandments!*  
2 **ⲗ** *His seed shall become mighty upon earth,*  
ⲓ *The generation of the upright is blessed.*  
3 **ⲛ** *Wealth and riches are in his house,*  
ⲓ *And his righteousness standeth for ever.*  
4 **ⲓ** *There ariseth in darkness for the upright a light,*  
ⲛ *Gracious and compassionate and righteous.*  
5 **ⲙ** *Blessed is he who giveth and lendeth,*  
ⲓ *In the judgment doth he maintain his cause.*  
6 **ⲓ** *He tottereth not for ever,*  
ⲗ *The righteous is had in everlasting remembrance.*  
7 **ⲙ** *By evil tidings he is not affrighted,*  
ⲗ *His heart is stedfast, confident in Jahve.*  
8 **Ⲕ** *His heart is firm, it doth not fear;*  
ⲙ *Until he see his desire upon his adversaries.*  
9 **ⲛ** *Freely doth he give to the needy,*  
ⲗ *His righteousness standeth for ever.*  
ⲛ *His horn groweth up into honour,*  
10 **ⲓ** *The wicked seeth it, and is vexed,*  
ⲛ *Gnashing his teeth and melting away —*  
ⲓ *The desire of the wicked shall perish.*

*Psalm 112.* The alphabetical Hallelujah Psalm 111, which celebrated the government of God, is now followed by another coinciding with it in structure (CTYXOC KB, i.e., 22 **ⲥⲧⲓⲭⲟⲓ**, as the Coptic version correctly counts), which celebrates the men whose conduct is ordered after the divine pattern.

As in the preceding Psalm. v. 1 here also sets forth the theme of that which follows. What is there said in v. 3 concerning the righteousness of God, v. 3 here says of the righteousness of him who fears God: this also standeth fast for ever, it is indeed the copy of the divine, it is the work and gift of God

(Psa. 24: 5), inasmuch as God's salutary action and behaviour, laid hold of in faith, works a like form of action and behaviour to it in man, which, as v. 9 says, is, according to its nature, love. The promise in v. 4 sounds like Isa. 60: 2. Hengstenberg renders: "There ariseth in the darkness light to the upright who is gracious and compassionate and just." But this is impossible as a matter of style. The three adjectives (as in Psa. 111: 4, pointing back to Exo. 34: 6, cf. Psa. 145: 8; 116: 5) are a mention of God according to His attributes. **חַנוּן** and **רַחוּם** never take the article in Biblical Hebrew, and **צַדִּיק** follows their examples here (cf. on the contrary, Exo. 9:27). God Himself is the light which arises in darkness for those who are sincere in their dealings with Him; He is the Sun of righteousness with wings of rays dispensing "grace" and "tender mercies," Mal. 3:20 [4: 2]. The fact that He arises for those who are compassionate as He is compassionate, is evident from v. 5. **טוֹב** being, as in Isa. 3:10, Jer. 44:17, intended of well-being, prosperity, **טוֹב אִישׁ** is here equivalent to **טוֹבִיָּה דְגַבְרָא**, which is rendered **אֲשֶׁרֵי אִישׁ** in Targumic phrase. **חֲוִיָּן** signifies, as in Psa. 37:26, 21, one who charitably dispenses his gifts around. V. 5b is not an extension of the picture of virtue, but, as in Psa. 127: 5 c, a promissory prospect: he will uphold in integrity (**בְּמִשְׁפָּט**, Psa. 72: 2, Isa. 9: 6 [7], and frequently), or rather (= **בְּמִשְׁפָּט**) in the cause (Psa. 143: 2, Pro. 24:23, and frequently), the things which depend upon him, or with which he has to do; for **כַּלְכַּל**, *sustinere*, signifies to sustain, i.e., to nourish, to sustain, i.e., endure, and also to support, maintain, i.e., carry through. This is explanatorily confirmed in v. 6: he stands, as a general thing, imperturbably fast. And when he dies he becomes the object of everlasting remembrance, his name is still blessed (Pro. 10: 7). Because he has a cheerful conscience, his heart too is not disconcerted by any evil tidings (Jer. 49:23): it remains **נִכְוֹן**, erect, straight and firm, without suffering itself to bend or warp; **בְּטַח בְּה'**, full of confidence (passive, "in the sense of a passive state after a completed action of the person himself," like **זָכוּר**, Psa. 103:14); **סְמוּד**, stayed in itself and established. The last two designations are taken from Isa. 26: 3, where it is the church of the last times that is spoken of. Psa. 91: 8 gives us information with reference to the meaning of **רָאָה בְצַרְיָו**; **אֵד**, as in Psa. 94:13, of the inevitable goal, on this side of which he remains undismayed. 2Co. 9: 9, where Paul makes use of v. 9 of the Psalm before us as an encouragement to Christiana beneficence, shows how little the assertion "his righteousness standeth for ever" is opposed to the New Testament consciousness. **פִּזַּר** of giving away liberally and in manifold ways, as in Pro. 11:24. **רוּם**, v. 9c, stands in opposition to the egoistical **הָרִים** in Psa. 75: 5 as a vegetative sprouting up (Psa. 132:17). The evil-doer must see this, and confounded, vex himself over it; he gnashes his teeth with the rage of envy and

chagrin, and melts away, i.e., loses consistency, becomes unhinged, dies off (נִמַּץ, 3d praet. Niph. as in Exo. 16:21, pausal form of נִמַּץ = נִמַּץ). How often has he desired the ruin of him whom he must now see in honour! The tables are turned; this and his ungodly desire in general come to nought, inasmuch as the opposite is realized. On יִרְשָׁה, with its self-evident object, cf. Mic. 7:10. Concerning the pausal form וְכִעֵם, vid., Psa. 93: 1. Hupfeld wishes to read תִּקְוֶה after Psa. 9:19, Pro. 10:28. In defence of the traditional reading, Hitzig rightly points to Pro. 10:24 together with v. 28.

## Psalm 113

### HALLELUJAH TO HIM WHO RAISETH OUT OF LOW ESTATE

#### HALLELUJAH

- 1 PRAISE, ye servants of Jahve,  
Praise the Name of Jahve!
- 2 Blessed be the Name of Jahve  
From this time forth and for evermore!
- 3 From the rising of the sun unto its going down  
Is the Name of Jahve to be praised.
- 4 Exalted above all peoples is Jahve,  
Above the heavens His glory.
- 5 Who is like Jahve our God,  
He who sitteth enthroned on high,
- 6 He who looketh far below  
In heaven and upon earth?
- 7 Who raiseth up the lowly out of the dust,  
Who lifteth the poor from the heap of ashes,
- 8 To set him with nobles,  
With the nobles of His people.
- 9 Who maketh the barren woman to keep house,  
As a joyful mother of the sons,  
Hallelujah.

*Psalm 113.* With this Psalm begins the *Hallel*, which is recited at the three great feasts, at the feast of the Dedication (*Chanucca*) and at the new moons, and not on New Year's day and the day of Atonement, because a cheerful song of praise does not harmonize with the mournful solemnity of these days. And they are recited only in fragments during the last days of the Passover, for "my creatures, saith the Holy One, blessed be He, were drowned in the sea, and ought ye to break out into songs of rejoicing?" In the family celebration of the Passover night it is divided into two parts, the one half, Psalm 113, 114, being sung before the repast, before the emptying of the second festal cup, and the other half, Psalm 115-118, after the repast, after the filling of the fourth cup, to

which the ὑμνήσαντες (Mat. 26:30, Mar. 14:26) after the institution of the Lord's Supper, which was connected with the fourth festal cup, may refer. Paulus Burgensis styles Psalm 113-118 *Alleluja Judaeorum magnum*. This designation is also frequently found elsewhere. But according to the prevailing custom, Psalm 113-118, and more particularly Psalm 115-118, are called only *Hallel*, and Psalm 136, with its "for His mercy endureth for ever" repeated twenty-six times, bears the name of "*the Great Hallel*" (הַלֵּל הַגָּדוֹל<sup>f356</sup>).

A heaping up, without example elsewhere, of the so-called *Chirek compaginis* is peculiar to Psalm 113. Gesenius and others call the connecting vowels *i* and *o* (in proper names also *u*) the remains of old case terminations; with the former the Arabic genitive termination is compared, and with the latter the Arabic nominative termination. But in opposition to this it has been rightly observed, that this *i* and *o* are not attached to the dependent word (the genitive), but to the governing word. According to the more probable view of Ewald, § 211, *i* and *o* are equivalent connecting vowels which mark the relation of the genitive case, and are to be explained from the original oneness of the Semitic and Indo-Germanic languages.

The *i* is found most frequently appended to the first member of the *stat. constr.*, and both to the *masc.*, viz., in Deu. 33:16, Zec. 11:17 (perhaps twice, vid., Köhler *in loc.*), and to the *femin.*, viz., in Gen. 31:39, Psa. 110: 4, Isa. 1:21. Lev. 26:42, Psa. 116: 1 hardly belong here. Then this *i* is also frequently found when the second member of the *stat. constr.* has a preposition, and this preposition is consequently in process of being resolved: Gen. 49:11, Exo. 15: 6, Oba. 1: 3 (Jer. 49:16), Hos. 10:11, Lam. 1: 1, Psa. 123: 1, and perhaps Son. 1: 9. Also in the *Chethib*, Jer. 22:23; 51:13, Eze. 27: 3. Thirdly, where a word stands between the two notions that belong together according to the genitival relation, and the *stat. construct.* is consequently really resolved: Psa. 101: 5, Isa. 22:16, Mic. 7:14. It is the same *i* which is found in a great many proper names, both Israelitish, e.g., *Gamaliel* (benefit of God), and Phoenician, e.g., *Melchizedek*, *Hanniba'al* (the favour of Baal), and is also added to many Hebrew prepositions, like בְּלִי (where the *i* however can, according to the context, also be a pronominal suffix), זִלְתִּי (where *i* can likewise be a suffix), מִנִּי (poetical). In אֶפְסִי, on the other hand, the *i* is always a suffix. The tone of the *i* only retreats in accordance with rhythmical rule (vid., Psa. 110: 4), otherwise *i* is always accented. V. 8 shows how our Psalm 113 in particular delights in this ancient *i*, where it is even affixed to the infinitive as an ornament, a thing which occurs nowhere else, so that להושיבִי excites the suspicion of being written in error for להושיבו.

Among those things which make God worthy to be praised the Psalm gives prominence to the condescension of the infinitely exalted One towards the

lowly one. It is the lowliness of God lowering itself from the exaltation of the lowly which performs its utmost in the work of redemption. Thus it becomes explicable that Mary in her *Magnificat* breaks forth into the same strain with the song of Hannah (1 Samuel 2) and this Psalm.

*Psa. 113: 1-3.* The call, not limited by any addition as in Psa. 134: 1, or even after the manner of Psa. 103:20 f., extended over the earth, is given to the whole of the true Israel that corresponds to its election by grace and is faithful to its mission; and its designation by “servants of Jahve” (Psa. 69:37, cf. 34:23), or even “servant of Jahve” (Psa. 136:22), has come into vogue more especially through the second part of Isaiah. This Israel is called upon to praise Jahve; for the praise and celebration of His Name, i.e., of His nature, which is disclosed by means of its manifestation, is a principal element, yea, the proper ground and aim, of the service, and shall finally become that which fills all time and all space. מְהִלֵּל *laudatum (est)*, is equivalent to ἀνετόν, *laudabile* (LXX, Vulgate), and this does not differ greatly from *laudetur*. The predictive interpretation *laudabitur* is opposed to the context (cf. moreover Köhler on Mal. 1:11).

*Psa. 113: 4-6.* This praiseworthiness is now confirmed. The opening reminds one of Psa. 99: 2. *Pasek* stands between גוֹיִם and יְהוָה in order to keep them apart. The totality of the nations is great, but Jahve is raised above it; the heavens are glorious, but Jahve’s glory is exalted above them. It is not to be explained according to Psa. 148:13; but according to Psa. 57: 6, 12, רָם belongs to v. 4b too as predicate. He is the incomparable One who has set up His throne in the height, but at the same time directs His gaze deep downwards (expression according to Ges. § 142, rem. 1) in the heavens and upon earth, i.e., nothing in all the realm of the creatures that are beneath Him escapes His sight, and nothing is so low that it remains unnoticed by Him; on the contrary, it is just that which is lowly, as the following strophe presents to us in a series of portraits so to speak, that is the special object of His regard. The structure of vv. 5, 6 militates against the construction of “in the heavens and upon the earth” with the interrogatory “who is like unto Jahve our God?” after Deu. 3:24.

*Psa. 113: 7-9.* The thoughts of vv. 7a and 8a are transplanted from the song of Hannah. עָפָר, according to 1Ki. 16: 2, cf. 14: 7, is an emblem of lowly estate (Hitzig), and אֲשָׁפֶת (from שָׁפַת) an emblem of the deepest poverty and desertion; for in Syria and Palestine the man who is shut out from society lies upon the *mezbele* (the dunghill or heap of ashes), by day calling upon the passers-by for alms, and by night hiding himself in the ashes that have been warmed by the sun (*Job*, ii. 152). The movement of the thoughts in v. 8, as in

v. 1, follows the model of the epizeuxis. Together with the song of Hannah the poet has before his eye Hannah's exaltation out of sorrow and reproach. He does not, however, repeat the words of her song which have reference to this (1Sa. 2: 5), but clothes his generalization of her experience in his own language. If he intended that עֲקָרָה should be understood out of the genitival relation after the form עֲמָרָה, why did he not write מוֹשִׁיבֵי הַבַּיִת עֲקָרָה ? הַבַּיִת would then be equivalent to בֵּיתָהּ, Psa. 68: 7. עֲקָרָה הַבַּיִת is the expression for a woman who is a wife, and therefore housewife, הַבַּיִת (בְּעֵלָתָּהּ), but yet not a mother. Such an one has no settled position in the house of the husband, the firm bond is wanting in her relationship to her husband. If God gives her children, He thereby makes her then thoroughly at home and rooted-in in her position. In the predicate notion אִם הַבָּנִים שְׂמָחָה the definiteness attaches to the second member of the string of words, as in Gen. 48:19, 2Sa. 12:30 (cf. the reverse instance in Jer. 23:26, נְבִאֵי הַשִּׁקָּר, those prophesying that which is false), therefore: a mother of the children. The poet brings the matter so vividly before him, that he points as it were with his finger to the children with which God blesses her.

## Psalm 114

### COMMOTION OF NATURE BEFORE GOD THE REDEEMER OUT OF EGYPT

*114: 1 WHEN Israel went forth out of Egypt,  
The house of Jacob out of a people of strange language,*

*114: 2 Then Judah became His sanctuary,  
Israel His dominion.*

*114: 3 The sea saw it, and fled,  
Jordan turned backwards,*

*114: 4 The mountains skipped like rams,  
The hills like young sheep.*

*114: 5 What aileth thee, O sea, that thou fleest?  
O Jordan, that thou turnest backwards?*

*114: 6 Ye mountains, that ye skip like rams?  
Ye hills, like young sheep? —*

*114: 7 Before the face of the Lord tremble, O earth,  
Before the face of the God of Jacob,*

*114: 8 Who changeth the rock into a pool of water,  
The flinty rock into water-springs!*

*Psalm 114.* To the side of the general Hallelujah Psalm 113 comes an historical one, which is likewise adorned in v. 8 with the *Chirek compaginis*, and still further with *Cholem compaginis*, and is the festival Psalm of the eighth Passover day in the Jewish ritual. The deeds of God at the time of the Exodus are here brought together to form a picture in miniature which is as majestic as it is charming. There are four tetrastichs, which pass by with the swiftness of a bird as it were with four flappings of its wings. The church sings this Psalm in a *tonus peregrinus* distinct from the eight Psalm-tones.

*Psa. 114: 1-4.* Egypt is called אֱשֶׁר לִעֵז (from לָאָז, cogn. לָאָז, לָעָה), because the people spoke a language unintelligible to Israel (Psa. 81: 6), and as it were a stammering language. The LXX, and just so the Targum, renders ἐκ λαοῦ βαρβάρου (from the Sanscrit *barbaras*, just as onomatopoeic as *balbus*, cf. Fleischer in Levy's *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, i. 420). The redeemed nation is called *Judah*, inasmuch as God made it His sanctuary (קִדְשׁ) by setting up His sanctuary (מִקְדָּשׁ, Exo. 15:17) in the midst of it, for Jerusalem (*el kuds*) as Benjamitish Judaeon, and from the time of David was accounted directly as Judaeon. In so far, however, as He made this people His kingdom (מַמְשְׁלוּתוֹ), an amplificative plural with *Mem pathachatum*), by placing Himself in the relation of King (Deu. 33: 5) to the people of possession which by a revealed law He established characteristically as His own, it is called *Israel*. 1 The predicate takes the form יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, for peoples together with country and city are represented as feminine (cf. Jer. 8: 5). The foundation of that new beginning in connection with the history of redemption was laid amidst majestic wonders, inasmuch as nature was brought into service, co-operating and sympathizing in the work (cf. Psa. 77:15 ff.). The dividing of the sea opens, and the dividing of the Jordan closes, the journey through the desert to Canaan. The sea stood aside, Jordan halted and was dammed up on the north in order that the redeemed people might pass through. And in the middle, between these great wonders of the exodus from Egypt and the entrance into Canaan, arises the not less mighty wonder of the giving of the Law: the skipping of the mountains like rams, of the hills like בני־צֹאן, i.e., lambs (Wisd. 19: 9), depicts the quaking of Sinai and its environs (Exo. 19:18, cf. *supra* Psa. 68: 9, and on the figure Psa. 29: 6).

*Psa. 114: 5-8.* The poet, when he asks, "What aileth thee, O sea, that thou fleest...?" lives and moves in this olden time as a contemporary, or the present and the olden time as it were flow together to his mind; hence the answer he himself gives to the question propounded takes the form of a triumphant mandate. The Lord, the God of Jacob, thus mighty in wondrous works, it is before whom the earth must tremble. אֲדֹנָי does not take the article because it

finds its completion in the following **עֲקֹב (אֲלוֹהַּ)**; it is the same *epizeuxis* as in Psa. 113: 8; 94: 3; 96: 7, 13. **הַהֶפְכִי** has the constructive *î* out of the genitival relation; and in **לְמַעַיְנוּ** in this relation we have the constructive *ô*, which as a rule occurs only in the genitival combination, with the exception of this passage and **בְּנוֹ בְעַר**, Num. 24: 3, 15 (not, however, in Pro. 13: 4, “his, the sluggard’s, soul”), found only in the name for wild animals **חֵיתוֹ-אֶרֶץ**, which occurs frequently, and first of all in Gen. 1:24. The expression calls to mind Psa. 107:35. **הַצִּוּר** is taken from Exo. 17: 6; and **קָלְמִישׁ** (LXX **τήν ἄκρότομον**, that which is rugged, abrupt) <sup>f357</sup>

stands, according to Deu. 8:15, poetically for **סֶלַע**, Num. 20:11, for it is these two histories of the giving of water to which the poet points back. But why to these in particular? The causing of water to gush forth out of the flinty rock is a practical proof of unlimited omnipotence and of the grace which converts death into life. Let the earth then tremble before the Lord, the God of Jacob. It has already trembled before Him, and before Him let it tremble. For that which He has been He still ever is; and as He came once, He will come again.

## Psalm 115

### CALL TO THE GOD OF ISRAEL, THE LIVING GOD, TO RESCUE THE HONOUR OF HIS NAME

*115: 1 NOT unto us, Jahve, not unto us,  
But unto Thy Name give glory,  
Because of Thy loving-kindness, because of Thy truth.*

*115: 2 Wherefore shall the heathen say:  
“Where is now their God?”*

*115: 3 And our God is in the heavens,  
Whatsoever He willeth He carrieth out.*

*115: 4 Their gods, however, are silver and gold,  
The work of men’s hands.*

*115: 5 They have a mouth and speak not,  
They have eyes and see not,*

*115: 6 They have ears and hear not,  
They have a nose and smell not.*

*115: 7 Their hands, with which they handle not,  
Their feet, with which they walk not,  
They speak not with their throat.*



*115: 8 Like unto them do those who make them become,  
Every one who trusteth in them.*

*115: 9 Israel, trust thou in Jahve,  
Their help and their shield is He.*

*115:10 O house of Aaron, trust ye in Jahve,  
Their help and their shield is He.*

*115:11 Ye who fear Jahve, trust in Jahve,  
Their help and their shield is He.*

*115:12 Jahve hath been mindful of us, He will bless —  
He will bless the house of Israel,  
He will bless the house of Aaron,*

*115:13 He will bless those who fear Jahve,  
The small together with the great.*

*115:14 Jahve will add to you,  
To you and your children.*

*115:15 Blessed be ye of Jahve,  
The Creator of heaven and earth.*

*115:16 The heavens are heavens for Jahve,  
And the earth hath He given to the children of men.*

*115:17 The dead praise not Jāh,  
Nor all those who go down into the silence of death;*

*115:18 We, however, we will bless Jāh  
From henceforth and for evermore,  
Hallelujah.*

*Psalm 115.* This Psalm, which has scarcely anything in common with the preceding Psalm except that the expression “house of Jacob,” 114: 1, is here broken up into its several members in vv. 12 f., is found joined with it, making one Psalm, in the LXX, Syriac, Arabic and Aethiopic versions, just as on the other hand Psalm 116 is split up into two. This arbitrary arrangement condemns itself. Nevertheless Kimchi favours it, and it has found admission into not a few Hebrew manuscripts.

It is a prayer of Israel for God’s aid, probably in the presence of an expedition against heathen enemies. The two middle strophes of the four are of the same compass. Ewald’s conjecture, that whilst the Psalm was being sung the sacrifice was proceeded with, and that in v. 12 the voice of a priest proclaims the gracious acceptance of the sacrifice, is pleasing. But the change of voices begins even with v. 9, as Olshausen also supposes.

*Psa. 115: 1, 2.* It has to do not so much with the honour of Israel, which is not worthy of the honour (Eze. 36:22 f.) and has to recognise in its reproach a well-merited chastisement, as with the honour of Him who cannot suffer the reproaching of His holy name to continue long. He willeth that His name should be sanctified. In the consciousness of his oneness with this will, the poet bases his petition, in so far as it is at the same time a petition on behalf of Israel, upon God's *χάρις* and *ἀλήθεια* as upon two columns. The second *לֵאלֹהֵינוּ*, according to an express note of the Masora, has no *Waw* before it, although the LXX and Targum insert one. The thought in v. 2 is moulded after Psa. 79:10, or after Joe. 2:17, cf. Psa. 42: 4, Mic. 7:10. *לֵאלֹהֵינוּ* is the same style as *לֵאלֹהֵינוּ* in Psa. 116:18, cf. in the older language *לֵאלֹהֵינוּ*, *לֵאלֹהֵינוּ*, and the like.

*Psa. 115: 3-8.* The poet, with “And our God,” in the name of Israel opposes the scornful question of the heathen by the believably joyous confession of the exaltation of Jahve above the false gods. Israel's God is in the heavens, and is therefore supramundane in nature and life, and the absolutely unlimited One, who is able to do all things with a freedom that is conditioned only by Himself: *quod vult, valet* (v. 3b = Psa. 135: 6, Wisd. 12:18, and frequently). The carved gods (*עֲצָבִים*, from *עָצַב*, cogn. *קָצַב*, *קָצַב*) of the heathen, on the contrary, are dead images, which are devoid of all life, even of the sensuous life the outward organs of which are imagined upon them. It cannot be proved with Ecc. 5:16 that *יְדֵיהֶם* and *רַגְלֵיהֶם* are equivalent to *יָדַיִם לָהֶם*, *רַגְלַיִם*. They are either subjects which the *Waw apodosis* cf. Gen. 22:24, Pro. 23:24, Hab. 2: 5) renders prominent, or *casus absoluti* (Ges. § 145, 2), since both verbs have the idols themselves as their subjects less on account of their gender (*יָד* and *רַגֵל* are feminine, but the Hebrew usage of genders is very free and not carried out uniformly) as in respect of v. 7c: with reference to their hands, etc. *יִמְשֹׁן* is the energetic future form, which goes over from *מָשַׁח* into *מוֹשַׁח*, for *יִמְשֹׁן*. It is said once again in v. 7c that speech is wanting to them; for the other negations only deny life to them, this at the same time denies all personality. The author might know from his own experience how little was the distinction made by the heathen worship between the symbol and the thing symbolized. Accordingly the worship of idols seems to him, as to the later prophets, to be the extreme of self-stupefaction and of the destruction of human consciousness; and the final destiny of the worshippers of false gods, as he says in v. 8, is, that they become like to their idols, that is to say, being deprived of their consciousness, life, and existence, they come to nothing, like those their nothingnesses (Isa. 44: 9). This whole section of the Psalm is repeated in Psalm 135 (vv. 6, 15-18).

*Psa. 115: 9-14.* After this confession of Israel there now arises a voice that addresses itself to Israel. The threefold division into Israel, the house of Aaron, and those who fear Jahve is the same as in Psa. 118: 2-4. In Psalm 135 the “house of Levi” is further added to the house of Aaron. Those who fear Jahve, who also stand in the last passage, are probably the proselytes (in the Acts of the Apostles *σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν*, or merely *σεβόμενοι*<sup>f358</sup>); at any rate these are included even if Israel in v. 9 is meant to signify the laity, for the notion of “those who fear Jahve” extends beyond Israel. The fact that the threefold refrain of the summons does not run, as in Psa. 33:20, *our help and shield is He*, is to be explained from its being an antiphonal song. In so far, however, as the Psalm supplicates God’s protection and help in a campaign the declaration of confident hope, *their help and shield is He*, may, with Hitzig, be referred to the army that is gone or is going forth. It is the same voice which bids Israel to be of good courage and announces to the people the well-pleased acceptance of the sacrifice with the words “Jahve hath been mindful of us” (*הָיָה זְכוֹרָנוּ*, cf. *אֲתָהּ יְדַעְתִּי*, Psa. 20: 7), perhaps simultaneously with the presentation of the memorial portion (*אֲזַכְרָהּ*) of the meat-offering (Psa. 38: 1). The *יְבָרֵךְ* placed at the head is particularized threefold, corresponding to the threefold summons. The special promise of blessing which is added in v. 14 is an echo of Deu. 1:11, as in 2Sa. 24: 3. The contracted future *יִסַּף* we take in a consolatory sense; for as an optative it would be too isolated here. In spite of all oppression on the part of the heathen, God will make His people ever more numerous, more capable of offering resistance, and more awe-inspiring.

*Psa. 115:15-18.* The voice of consolation is continued in v. 15, but it becomes the voice of hope by being blended with the newly strengthened believing tone of the congregation. Jahve is here called the Creator of heaven and earth because the worth and magnitude of His blessing are measured thereby. He has reserved the heavens to Himself, but given the earth to men. This separation of heaven and earth is a fundamental characteristic of the post-diluvian history. The throne of God is in the heavens, and the promise, which is given to the patriarchs on behalf of all mankind, does not refer to heaven, but to the possession of the earth (Psa. 37:22). The promise is as yet limited to this present world, whereas in the New Testament this limitation is removed and the *κληρονομία* embraces heaven and earth. This Old Testament limitedness finds further expression in v. 17, where *הַיְמִינָהּ*, as in Psa. 94:17, signifies the silent land of Hades. The Old Testament knows nothing of a heavenly *ecclesia* that praises God without intermission, consisting not merely of angels, but also of the spirits of all men who die in the faith. Nevertheless there are not wanting hints that point upwards which were even better understood by the post-exilic than by the pre-exilic church. The New

Testament morn began to dawn even upon the post-exilic church. We must not therefore be astonished to find the tone of Psa. 6: 6; 30:10; 88:11-13, struck up here, although the echo of those earlier Psalms here is only the dark foil of the confession which the church makes in v. 18 concerning its immortality. The church of Jahve as such does not die. That it also does not remain among the dead, in whatever degree it may die off in its existing members, the psalmist might know from Isa. 26:19; 25: 8. But the close of the Psalm shows that such predictions which light up the life beyond only gradually became elements of the church's consciousness, and, so to speak, dogmas.

## **Psalm 116**

### **THANKSGIVING SONG OF ONE WHO HAS ESCAPED FROM DEATH**

*116: 1 I LOVE, for Jahve heareth  
My cry, my heartfelt supplication.*

*116: 2 For He hath inclined His ear unto me,  
Therefore will I call as long as I live.*

*116: 3 The cords of death compassed me,  
And the straitnesses of Hades came upon me,  
Distress and sorrow did I experience.*

*116: 4 Then upon the name of Jahve did I call:  
O Jahve, deliver my soul.*

*116: 5 Gracious is Jahve and righteous,  
And our God a compassionate One.*

*116: 6 A Guardian of the simple is Jahve;  
I was brought low, and He helped me.*

*116: 7 Turn in, my soul, unto thy rest,  
For Jahve dealeth bountifully with thee.*

*116: 8 Yea, Thou hast delivered my soul from death,  
Mine eyes from tears,  
My feet from falling.*

*116: 9 I will walk before Jahve  
In the lands of the living.*

*116:10 I believe now, when I must speak:  
"I, I am afflicted very greatly."*

*116:11 I have said to myself in my despair:  
"All men are liars."*

*116:12 How can I repay Jahve  
All His benefits toward me?*

*116:13 The cup of salvation will I raise,  
And proclaim the Name of Jahve.*

*116:14 My vows will I pay unto Jahve,  
I will do it in the presence of all His people.*

*116:15 Precious in the eyes of Jahve  
Is the death of His saints.*

*116:16 Yea, O Jahve, for I am Thy servant,  
I am Thy servant, the son of Thy handmaid,  
Thou hast loosed my bonds.*

*116:17 Unto Thee will I sacrifice a sacrifice of thanksgiving  
And proclaim the Name of Jahve.*

*116:18 My vows will I pay unto Jahve,  
I will do it in the presence of all His people,*

*116:19 In the courts of Jahve's house,  
In the midst of thee, O Jerusalem!  
Hallelujah.*

*Psalm 116.* We have here another anonymous Psalm closing with *Hallelujah*. It is not a supplicatory song with a hopeful prospect before it like Psalm 115, but a thanksgiving song with a fresh recollection of some deadly peril that has just been got the better of; and is not, like Psalm 115, from the mouth of the church, but from the lips of an individual who distinguishes himself from the church. It is an individual that has been delivered who here praises the loving-kindness he has experienced in the language of the tenderest affection. The LXX has divided this deeply fervent song into two parts, Psa. 116: 1-9, 10-19, and made two Hallelujah-Psalms out of it; whereas it unites Psalm 114 and 115 into one. The four sections or strophes, the beginnings of which correspond to one another (vv. 1 and 10, 5 and 15), are distinctly separate. The words אֲקַרְאֶה וּבְשֵׁם ה' are repeated three times. In the first instance they are retrospective, but then swell into an always more full-toned vow of thanksgiving. The late period of its composition makes itself known not only in the strong Aramaic colouring of the form of the language, which adopts all kinds of embellishments, but also in many passages borrowed from the pre-exilic Psalms. The very opening, and still more so the progress, of the first strophe reminds one of Psalm 18, and becomes an important hint for the exposition of the Psalm.

*Psa. 116: 1-4.* Not only is אֶהְבֶּתִי כִי “I love (like, am well pleased) that,” like ἀγαπῶ ὅτι, Thucydides vi. 36, contrary to the usage of the language, but the thought, “I love that Jahve answereth me,” is also tame and flat, and inappropriate to the continuation in v. 2. Since vv. 3, 4 have come from Psa. 18: 5-17, אֶהְבֶּתִי is to be understood according to אֶרְחֶמְךָ in Psa. 18: 2, so that it has the following יְהוָה as its object, not it is true grammatically, but logically. The poet is fond of this pregnant use of the verb without an expressed object, cf. אֶקְרָא in v. 2, and הֶאֱמַנְתִּי in v. 10. The *Pasek* after יִשְׁמַע is intended to guard against the blending of the final *a* with the initial ‘*a*’ of אֲדַנִּי (cf. Psa. 56:18; 5: 2, in Baer). In v. 1*b* the accentuation prevents the rendering *vocem orationis meae* (Vulgate, LXX) by means of *Mugrash*. The *î* of קוֹלִי will therefore no more be the archaic connecting vowel (Ew. § 211, *b*) than in Lev. 26:42; the poet has varied the genitival construction of Psa. 28: 6 to the permutative. The second כִּי, following close upon the first, makes the continuation of the confirmation retrospective. “In my days” is, as in Isa. 39: 8, Bar. 4:20, cf. בְּחַיִּי in 63: 5, and frequently, equivalent to “so long as I live.” We even here hear the tone of Psalm 18 (v. 2), which is continued in vv. 3, 4 as a freely borrowed passage. Instead of the “bands” (of Hades) there, the expression here is מְצָרִים, *angustiae*, plural of מְצָר, after the form מִסָּב in Psa. 118: 5, Lam. 1: 3 (Böttcher, *De inferis*, § 423); the straitnesses of Hades are deadly perils which can scarcely be escaped. The futures אֶמְצָא and אֶקְרָא, by virtue of the connection, refer to the contemporaneous past. אָנָּה (viz., בְּלִישׁוֹן בְּקִשָּׁה, i.e., in a suppliant sense) is written with *He* instead of *Aleph* here and in five other instances, as the Masora observes. It has its fixed *Metheg* in the first syllable, in accordance with which it is to be pronounced *āna* (like בְּתִים, *bāttim*), and has an accented *ultima* not merely on account of the following יְהוָה = אֲדַנִּי (vid., on 3: 8), but in every instance; for even where (the *Metheg* having been changed into a conjunctive) it is supplied with two different accents, as in Gen. 50:17, Exo. 32:31, the second indicates the tone-syllable. <sup>f359</sup>

Instead now of repeating “and Jahve answered me,” the poet indulges in a laudatory confession of general truths which have been brought vividly to his mind by the answering of his prayer that he has experienced.

*Psa. 116: 5-9.* With “gracious” and “compassionate” is here associated, as in Psa. 112: 4, the term “righteous,” which comprehends within itself everything that Jahve asserts concerning Himself in Exo. 34: 6 f. from the words “and abundant in goodness and truth” onwards. His love is turned especially toward the simple (LXX τὰ νηπία, cf. Mat. 11:25), who stand in need of His

protection and give themselves over to it. **פְּתָאִים**, as in Pro. 9: 6, is a mode of writing blended out of **פְּתָאִים** and **פְּתִיִם**. The poet also has experienced this love in a time of impotent need. **דְּלוֹתִי** is accented on the *ultima* here, and not as in Psa. 142: 7 on the *penult*. The accentuation is regulated by some phonetic or rhythmical law that has not yet been made clear (vid., on Job. 19:17).<sup>1360</sup> **הוֹשִׁיעַ** is a resolved *Hiphil* form, the use of which became common in the later period of the language, but is not alien to the earlier period, especially in poetry (Psa. 45:18, cf. 81: 6, 1Sa. 17:47, Isa. 52: 5). In v. 7 we hear the form of soliloquy which has become familiar to us from Psalm 42, 43, 103. **שׁוּבִי** is *Milra* here, as also in two other instances. The plural **מְנוּחִים** signifies full, complete rest, as it is found only in God; and the suffix in the address to the soul is *ajchi* for *ajich*, as in Psa. 103: 3-5. The perfect **נָמַל** states that which is a matter of actual experience, and is corroborated in v. 8 in retrospective perfects. In vv. 8, 9 we hear Psa. 56:14 again amplified; and if we add Psa. 27:13, then we see as it were to the bottom of the origin of the poet's thoughts. **מִן־דָּמְעָה** belongs still more decidedly than **הוֹשִׁיעַ** to the resolved forms which multiply in the later period of the language. In v. 9 the poet declares the result of the divine deliverance. The *Hithpa.* **אֶתְהַלֵּךְ** denotes a free and contented going to and fro; and instead of "the land of the living," Psa. 27:13, the expression here is "the lands (**אֶרְצוֹת**), i.e., the broad land, of the living." There he walks forth, with nothing to hinder his feet or limit his view, in the presence of Jahve, i.e., having his Deliverer from death ever before his eyes.

*Psa. 116:10-14.* Since **כִּי אֶדְבֵר** does not introduce anything that could become an object of belief, **הָאֱמִין** is absolute here: to have faith, just as in Job. 24:22; 29:24, with **לֹא** it signifies "to be without faith, i.e., to despair." But how does it now proceed? The LXX renders **ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα**, which the apostle makes use of in 2Co. 4:13, without our being therefore obliged with Luther to render: *I believe, therefore I speak*; **כִּי** does not signify **διὸ**. Nevertheless **כִּי** might according to the sense be used for **לְכִן**, if it had to be rendered with Hengstenberg: "I believed, therefore I spake, but I was very much plagued." But this assertion does not suit this connection, and has, moreover, no support in the syntax. It might more readily be rendered: "I have believed that I should yet speak, i.e., that I should once more have a deliverance of God to celebrate;" but the connection of the parallel members, which is then only lax, is opposed to this. Hitzig's attempted interpretation, "I trust, when (**כִּי** as in Jer. 12: 1) I should speak: I am greatly afflicted," i.e., "I have henceforth confidence, so that I shall not suffer myself to be drawn away into the expression of despondency," does not commend itself, since v. 10*b* is a

complaining, but not therefore as yet a desponding assertion of the reality. Assuming that **הֶאֱמַנְתִּי** and **אֶמְרָתִי** in v. 11a stand on the same line in point of time, it seems that it must be interpreted *I had faith, for I spake* (was obliged to speak); but **אֶדְבַר**, separated from **הֶאֱמַנְתִּי** by **כִּי**, is opposed to the colouring relating to the contemporaneous past. Thus v. 10 will consequently contain the issue of that which has been hitherto experienced: *I have gathered up faith and believe henceforth, when I speak* (have to speak, must speak): *I am deeply afflicted* (**עָנָה**) as in Psa. 119:67, cf. Arab. *nâ*, to be bowed down, more particularly in captivity, whence Arab. *ʿl-nât*, those who are bowed down). On the other hand, v. 11 is manifestly a retrospect. He believes now, for he is thoroughly weaned from putting trust in men: *I said in my despair* (taken from 31:23), the result of my deeply bowed down condition: *All men are liars* (**πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης**, Rom. 3: 4). Forsaken by all the men from whom he expected succour and help, he experienced the truth and faithfulness of God. Striding away over this thought, he asks in v. 12 how he is to give thanks to God for all His benefits. **מָה** is an adverbial accusative for **בְּמָה**, as in Gen. 44:16, and the substantive **תַּגְמוּלוֹ**, in itself a later formation, has besides the Chaldaic plural suffix *ôhi*, which is without example elsewhere in Hebrew. The poet says in v. 13 how alone he can and will give thanks to his Deliverer, by using a figure taken from the Passover (Mat. 26:27), the memorial repast in celebration of the redemption out of Egypt. The cup of salvation is that which is raised aloft and drunk amidst thanksgiving for the manifold and abundant salvation (**יְשׁוּעוֹת**) experienced. **קָרָא בְּשֵׁם ה'** is the usual expression for a solemn and public calling upon and proclamation of the Name of God. In v. 14 this thanksgiving is more minutely designated as **שְׁלָמֵי נֶדָר**, which the poet now discharges. A common and joyous eating and drinking in the presence of God was associated with the *shelamim*. **נָא** (vid., Psa. 115: 2) in the freest application gives a more animated tone to the word with which it stands. Because he is impelled frankly and freely to give thanks before the whole congregation, **נָא** stands beside **נִגְדָה**, and **נִגְדָה**, moreover, has the intentional *ah*.

**Psa. 116:15-19.** From what he has experienced the poet infers that the saints of Jahve are under His most especial providence. Instead of **הַמִּנֹּת** the poet, who is fond of such embellishments, chooses the pathetic form **הַמְּנֹתָה**, and consequently, instead of the genitival construct state (**מוֹת**), the construction with the *Lamed* of “belonging to.” It ought properly to be “soul” or “blood,” as in the primary passage Psa. 72:14. But the observation of Grotius: *quae pretiosa sunt, non facile largimur*, applies also to the expression “death.” The death of His saints is no trifling matter with God; He does not lightly suffer it



to come about; He does not suffer His own to be torn away from Him by death.

1361

After this the poet goes on beseechingly: *ānnáh Adonaj*. The prayer itself is not contained in **פְּתַחַת לְמוֹסְרֵי**, — for he is already rescued, and the perfect as a precative is limited to such utterances spoken in the tone of an exclamation as we find in Job. 21:16, — but remains unexpressed; it lies wrapped up as it were in this heartfelt *ānnáh*: Oh remain still so gracious to me as Thou hast already proved Thyself to me. The poet rejoices in and is proud of the fact that he may call himself the servant of God. With **אִמְתָּךְ** he is mindful of his pious mother (cf. Psa. 86:16). The Hebrew does not form a feminine, **עֲבָדָה**; Arab. *amata* signifies a maid, who is not, as such, also Arab. ‘*abdat*, a slave. The dative of the object, **לְמוֹסְרֵי** (from **מוֹסְרִים** for the more usual **מוֹסְרוֹת**), is used with **פְּתַחַת** instead of the accusative after the Aramaic manner, but it does also occur in the older Hebrew (e.g., Job. 19: 3, Isa. 53:11). The purpose of publicly giving thanks to the Gracious One is now more full-toned here at the close. Since such emphasis is laid on the Temple and the congregation, what is meant is literal thank-offerings in payment of vows. In **בְּתוֹכָכִי** (as in Psa. 135: 9) we have in the suffix the ancient and Aramaic *i* (cf. v. 7) for the third time. With **נְאֻם** the poet clings to Jahve, with **נְגִידֵהֶ־נָּא** to the congregation, and with **בְּתוֹכָכִי** to the holy city. The one thought that fills his whole soul, and in which the song which breathes forth his soul dies away, is *Hallelujah*.

## Psalm 117

### INVITATION TO THE PEOPLES TO COME INTO THE KINGDOM OF GOD

*117: 1 PRAISE Jahve, all peoples,  
Praise Him, all ye nations!*

*117: 2 For mighty over us is His loving-kindness,  
And the truth of Jahve endureth for ever,  
Hallelujah!*

*Psalm 117.* The thanksgiving Psalm ending in *Hallelujah* is followed by this shortest of all the Psalms, a *Hallelujah* addressed to the heathen world. In its very brevity it is one of the grandest witnesses of the might with which, in the midst of the Old Testament, the world-wide mission of the religion of revelation struck against or undermined the national limitation. It is stamped by the apostle in Rom. 15:11 as a *locus classicus* for the fore-ordained

(*gnadenrathschlussmässig*) participation of the heathen in the promised salvation of Israel.

Even this shortest Psalm has its peculiarities in point of language. אַמִּים (Aramaic אַמִּי, Arabic *umam*) is otherwise alien to Old Testament Hebrew. The Old Testament Hebrew is acquainted only with אַמִּוֹת as an appellation of Ismaelitish or Midianitish tribes. כָּל-גּוֹיִם are, as in Psa. 72:11, 17, all peoples without distinction, and כָּל-הָאֻמִּים all nations without exception. The call is confirmed from the might of the mercy or loving-kindness of Jahve, which proves itself mighty over Israel, i.e., by its intensity and fulness superabundantly covering (גָּבַר as in Psa. 103:11; cf. ὑπερεπερίσσευσε, Rom. 5:20, ὑπερεπλέονασε, 1Ti. 1:14) human sin and infirmity; and from His truth, by virtue of which history on into eternity ends in a verifying of His promises. Mercy and truth are the two divine powers which shall one day be perfectly developed and displayed in Israel, and going forth from Israel, shall conquer the world.

## Psalm 118

### FESTIVAL PSALM AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW TEMPLE

*118: 1 GIVE thanks unto Jahve, for He is good,  
Yea, His mercy endureth for ever.*

*118: 2 Let Israel say:  
“Yea, His mercy endureth for ever.”*

*118: 3 Let the house of Aaron say:  
“Yea, His mercy endureth for ever.”*

*118: 4 Let those who fear Jahve say:  
“Yea, His mercy endureth for ever.”*

*(ON THE WAY.)*

*118: 5 Out of straitness I cried unto Jah,  
Jah answered me upon a broad plain.*

*118: 6 Jahve is for me — I do not fear,  
What can men do unto me?*

*118: 7 Jahve is for me as my help,  
Therefore shall I see my desire upon those who hate me.*

*118: 8 It is better to hide one’s self in Jahve  
Than to put confidence in men.*

*118: 9 It is better to take refuge in Jahve  
Than to put confidence in princes.*

*118:10 Let all the heathen compass me about —  
In the name of Jahve will I verily cut them in pieces.*

*118:11 Let them compass me about on all sides —  
In the name of Jahve will I verily cut them in pieces.*

*118:12 Let them compass me about like bees —  
They are extinguished like a fire of thorns,  
In the name of Jahve will I verily cut them in pieces.*

*118:13 Thou gavest me indeed a thrust that I might fall,  
But Jahve hath helped me.*

*118:14 My pride and my song is Jah,  
And He became my salvation.*

*118:15 The cry of exultation and of salvation  
resoundeth in the tents of the righteous:  
The right hand of Jahve getteth the victory.*

*118:16 The right hand of Jahve is highly exalted,  
The right hand of Jahve getteth the victory.*

*118:17 I shall not die, nay I shall live,  
And declare the deeds of Jah.*

*118:18 Jah hath chastened me sore,  
But hath not given me over unto death.*

**(AT THE GOING IN.)**

*118:19 Open to me the gates of righteousness,  
That I may enter into them, that I may give thanks to Jah!*

**(THOSE WHO RECEIVE THE FESTAL PROCESSION.)**

*118:20 This is the gate of Jahve,  
The righteous may enter there.*

*118:21 I give thanks unto Thee, for Thou hast answered me,  
And art become my salvation.*

*118:22 The stone, which the builders despised,  
Is become the corner and head stone.*

*118:23 From Jahve is this come to pass,  
It is marvellous in our eyes.*

*118:24 This is the day which Jahve hath made,  
Let us exult and rejoice at it!*

*118:25 O Jahve, save I beseech Thee,  
O Jahve, grant I beseech Thee prosperity!!*

*118:26 Blessed be he who cometh in the name of Jahve,  
We bless you from the house of Jahve.*

*118:27 God is Jahve and hath given us light —  
Bind the festive sacrifice with cords  
Even up to the horns of the altar!*

**(ANSWER OF THOSE WHO HAVE ARRIVED.)**

*118:28 My God art Thou, therefore will I give Thee thanks,  
My Deity, I will exalt Thee.*

**(ALL TOGETHER.)**

*118:29 Give thanks unto Jahve, for He is good,  
Yea, His mercy endureth for ever.*

*Psalm 118.* What the close of Psalm 117 says of God's truth, viz., that it endureth for ever, the beginning of Psalm 118 says of its sister, His mercy or loving-kindness. It is the closing Psalm of the *Hallel*, which begins with Psalm 113, and the third *Hodu* (vid., on Psalm 105). It was Luther's favourite Psalm: his beautiful *Confitemini*, which "had helped him out of troubles out of which neither emperor nor king, nor any other man on earth, could have helped him." With the exposition of this his noblest jewel, his defence and his treasure, he occupied himself in the solitude of his Patmos.

It is without any doubt a post-exilic song. Here too Hupfeld sweeps away everything into vague generality; but the history of the period after the Exile, without any necessity for our coming down to the Maccabean period, as do De Wette and Hitzig, presents three occasions which might have given birth to it; viz.,

**(1)** The first celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles in the seventh month of the first year of the Return, when there was only a plain altar as yet erected on the holy place, Ezr. 3: 1-4 (to be distinguished from a later celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles on a large scale and in exact accordance with the directions of the Law, Neh. 8). So Ewald.

**(2)** The laying of the foundation-stone of the Temple in the second month of the second year, Ezr. 3: 8 ff. So Hengstenberg.

(3) The dedication of the completed temple in the twelfth month of the sixth year of Darius, Ezr. 6:15 ff. So Stier. These references to contemporary history have all three more or less in their favour. The first is favoured more especially by the fact, that at the time of the second Temple v. 25 was the festal cry amidst which the altar of burnt-offering was solemnly compassed on the first six days of the Feast of Tabernacles once, and on the seventh day seven times. This seventh day was called the great Hosanna (*Hosanna rabba*), and not only the prayers for the Feast of Tabernacles, but even the branches of willow trees (including the myrtles) which are bound to the palm-branch (*lulab*), were called *Hosannas* (הושענוה, Aramaic הושעני<sup>f362</sup>). The second historical reference is favoured by the fact, that the narrative appears to point directly to our Psalm when it says: *And the builders laid the foundation of the Temple of Jahve, and the priests were drawn up there in official robes with trumpets, and the Levites the descendants of Asaph with cymbals, to praise Jahve after the direction of David king of Israel, and they sang בִּיְהוָה חֲסִדוֹ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לִיהוָה כִּי טוֹב בָּהֶלֶל וּבַהוֹדָת לִיהוָה כִּי טוֹב בָּהֶלֶל*; and all the people raised a great shout לִיהוָה לִיהוָה, because the house of Jahve was founded. But both of these derivations of the Psalm are opposed by the fact that vv. 19 and 20 assume that the Temple-building is already finished; whereas the unmistakable allusions to the events that transpired during the building of the Temple, viz., the intrigues of the Samaritans, the hostility of the neighbouring peoples, and the capriciousness of the Persian kings, favour the third. In connection with this reference of the Psalm to the post-exilic dedication of the Temple, vv. 19, 20, too, now present no difficulty. V. 22 is better understood as spoken in the presence of the now upreared Temple-building, than as spoken in the presence of the foundation-stone; and the words “unto the horns of the altar” in v. 27, interpreted in many different ways, come into the light of Ezr. 6:17.

The Psalm falls into two divisions. The first division (vv. 1-19) is sung by the festive procession brought up by the priests and Levites, which is ascending to the Temple with the animals for sacrifice. With v. 19 the procession stands at the entrance. The second part (vv. 20-27) is sung by the body of Levites who receive the festive procession. Then v. 28 is the answer of those who have arrived, and v. 29 the concluding song of all of them. This antiphonal arrangement is recognised even by the Talmud (*B. Pesachim* 119a) and Midrash. The whole Psalm, too, has moreover a peculiar formation. It resembles the *Mashal* Psalms, for each verse has of itself its completed sense, its own scent and hue; one thought is joined to another as branch to branch and flower to flower.

*Psa. 118: 1-18.* The Hodu-cry is addressed first of all and every one; then the whole body of the laity of Israel and the priests, and at last (as it appears)

the proselytes (vid., on Psa. 115: 9-11) who fear the God of revelation, are urgently admonished to echo it back; for “yea, His mercy endureth for ever,” is the required hypophon. In v. 5, Israel too then begins as one man to praise the ever-gracious goodness of God. יה, the *Jod* of which might easily become inaudible after קְרָאתֵי, has an emphatic *Dagesh* as in v. 18a, and הַמִּצֵּר has the orthophonetic stroke beside צַר (the so-called מַקְל), which points to the correct tone-syllable of the word that has *Dechî*.<sup>f363</sup>

Instead of עֲנִי it is here pointed עֲנִי, which also occurs in other instances not only with distinctive, but also (though not uniformly) with conjunctive accents.<sup>f364</sup> The construction is a pregnant one (as in Psa. 22:22; 28: 1; 74: 7, 2Sa. 18:19, Ezr. 2:62, 2Ch. 32: 1): He answered me by removing me to a free space (Psa. 18:20). Both lines end with יה; nevertheless the reading בְּמִרְחֹבָיָהּ is attested by the Masora (vid., Baer's *Psalterium*, pp. 132 f.), instead of יה בְּמִרְחֹב. It has its advocates even in the Talmud (*B. Pesachim* 117a), and signifies a boundless extent, יי expressing the highest degree of comparison, like מְאִיפְלִיָּהּ in Jer. 2:31, the deepest darkness. Even the LXX appears to have read מִרְחֹבָיָהּ thus as one word (εἰς πλατυσμόν, Symmachus εἰς εὐρυχωρίαν). The Targum and Jerome, however, render it as we do; it is highly improbable that in one and the same verse the divine name should not be intended to be used in the same force of meaning. Psalm 56 (vv. 10; 5, 12) echoes in v. 6; and in v. 7 Psalm 54 (v. 6) is in the mind of the later poet. In that passage it is still more clear than in the passage before us that by the *Beth* of בְּעֲנִי Jahve is not meant to be designated as *unus e multis*, but as a helper who outweighs the greatest multitude of helpers. The Jewish people had experienced this helpful succour of Jahve in opposition to the persecutions of the Samaritans and the satraps during the building of the Temple; and had at the same time learned what is expressed in vv. 7, 8 (cf. Psa. 146: 3), that trust in Jahve (for which בְּחֶסֶד is the proper word) proves true, and trust in men, on the contrary, and especially in princes, is deceptive; for under Pseudo-Smerdis the work, begun under Cyrus, and represented as open to suspicion even in the reign of Cambyses, was interdicted. But in the reign of Darius it again became free: Jahve showed that He disposes events and the hearts of men in favour of His people, so that out of this has grown up in the minds of His people the confident expectation of a world-subduing supremacy expressed in v. 10.

The clauses vv. 10a, 11a, and 12a, expressed in the perfect form, are intended more hypothetically than as describing facts. The perfect is here set out in relief as a hypothetical tense by the following future. בְּכָל-גּוֹיִם signifies, as in Psa. 117: 1, the heathen of every kind. דְּבָרִים (in the Aramaic and Arabic

with י) are both bees and wasps, which make themselves especially troublesome in harvest time. The suffix of אֲמִילִם (from מָלַל = מוֹל, to hew down, cut in pieces) is the same as in Exo. 29:30; 2:17, and also beside a conjunctive accent in 74: 8. Yet the reading אֲמִילִם, like יְחִיתֶן Hab. 2:17, is here the better supported (vid., Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude*, S. 177), and it has been adopted by Norzi, Heidenheim, and Baer. The כִּי is that which states the ground or reason, and then becomes directly confirmatory and assuring (Psa. 128: 2, 4), which here, after the “in the name of Jahve” that precedes it, is applied and placed just as in the oath in 1Sa. 14:44. And in general, as Redslob has demonstrated, כִּי has not originally a relative, but a positive (determining) signification, כִּי being just as much a demonstrative sound as דָּ, וְ, שֶׁ, and תָּ (cf. ἔκει, ἔκεινος, κείνος, *ecce, hic, illic*, with the Doric τηναί, τηνος). The notion of compassing round about is heightened in v. 11a by the juxtaposition of two forms of the same verb (Ges. § 67, rem. 10), as in Hos. 4:18, Hab. 1: 5, Zep. 2: 1, and frequently. The figure of the bees is taken from Deu. 1:44. The perfect דָּעֲבוּ (cf. Isa. 43:17) describes their destruction, which takes place instantly and unexpectedly. The *Pual* points to the punishing power that comes upon them: they are extinguished (*extinguuntur*) like a fire of thorns, the crackling flame of which expires as quickly as it has blazed up (Psa. 58:10). In v. 13 the language of Israel is addressed to the hostile worldly power, as the antithesis shows. It thrust, yea thrust (*inf. intens.*) Israel, that it might fall (לִנְפֹל; with reference to the pointing, vid., on Psa. 40:15); but Jahve’s help would not suffer it to come to that pass. Therefore the song at the Red Sea is revived in the heart and mouth of Israel. V. 14 (like Isa. 12: 2) is taken from Exo. 15: 2. עֲנִי (in MSS also written עֲנִי) is a collateral form of עָנִי (Ew. § 255, a), and here signifies the lofty self-consciousness which is united with the possession of power: pride and its expression an exclamation of joy. Concerning זְמֶרֶת vid., on 16: 6. As at that time, the cry of exultation and of salvation (i.e., of deliverance and of victory) is in the tabernacles of the righteous: the right hand of Jahve — they sing — עֲשֵׂה חַיִּל (Num. 24:18), practises valour, proves itself energetic, gains (maintains) the victory. רוֹמְמָה is *Milra*, and therefore an adjective: *victoriosa* (Ew. § 120 d), from רָמַם = רוֹם like שׁוֹמֵם from שָׁמַם. It is not the *part. Pil.* (cf. Hos. 11: 7), since the rejection of the participial *Mem* occurs in connection with *Poal* and *Pual*, but not elsewhere with *Pilel* (רוֹמֵם = מְרוֹמֵם from רוֹם). The word yields a simpler sense, too, as *adject. participle Kal*; *romēmāh* is only the fuller form for *ramāh*, Exo. 14: 8 (cf. *rāmāh*, Isa. 26:11). It is not its own strength that avails for Israel’s exultation of victory, but the energy of the right hand of Jahve. Being come to the brink of the abyss, Israel is become anew sure of its

immortality through Him. God has, it is true, most severely chastened it (יִסְרֵנִי) with the suffix *anni* as in Gen. 30: 6, and הִתְּ with the emphatic *Dagesh*, which neither reduplicates nor connects, cf. v. 5, 94:12), but still with moderation (Isa. 27: 7 f.). He has not suffered Israel to fall a prey to death, but reserved it for its high vocation, that it may see the mighty deeds of God and proclaim them to all the world. Amidst such celebration of Jahve the festive procession of the dedication of the Temple has arrived at the enclosure wall of the Temple.

*Psa. 118:19-29.* The gates of the Temple are called gates of righteousness because they are the entrance to the place of the mutual intercourse between God and His church in accordance with the order of salvation. First the “gates” are spoken of, and then the one “gate,” the principal entrance. Those entering in must be “righteous ones;” only conformity with a divine loving will gives the right to enter. With reference to the formation of the conclusion v. 19b, *vid.*, Ew. § 347, *b*. In the Temple-building Israel has before it a reflection of that which, being freed from the punishment it had had to endure, it is become through the mercy of its God. With the exultation of the multitude over the happy beginning of the rebuilding there was mingled, at the laying of the foundation-stone, the loud weeping of many of the grey-headed priests, Levites, and heads of the tribes who had also seen the first Temple (Ezr. 3:12 f.). It was the troublous character of the present which made them thus sad in spirit; the consideration of the depressing circumstances of the time, the incongruity of which weighed so heavily upon their soul in connection with the remembrance of the former Temple, that memorably glorious monument of the royal power of David and Solomon. <sup>f365</sup>

And even further on there towered aloft before Zerubbabel, the leader of the building, a great mountain; gigantic difficulties and hindrances arose between the powerlessness of the present position of Zerubbabel and the completion of the building of the Temple, which had it is true been begun, but was impeded. This mountain God has made into a plain, and qualified Zerubbabel to bring forth the top and key-stone (הָאֶבֶן הָרִאשׁוֹנָה) out of its past concealment, and thus to complete the building, which is now consecrated amidst a loud outburst of incessant shouts of joy (Zec. 4: 7). V. 22 points back to that disheartened disdain of the small troubles beginning which was at work among the builders (Ezr. 3:10) at the laying of the foundation-stone, and then further at the interruption of the building. That rejected (disdained) corner-stone is nevertheless become רִאשׁוֹן פֶּנֶה, i.e., the head-stone of the corner (Job. 38: 6), which being laid upon the corner, supports and protects the stately edifice — an emblem of the power and dignity to which Israel has attained in the midst of the peoples out of deep humiliation.



In connection with this only indirect reference of the assertion to Israel we avoid the question, — perplexing in connection with the direct reference to the people despised by the heathen, — how can the heathen be called “the builders?” Kurtz answers: “For the building which the heathen world considers it to be its life’s mission and its mission in history to rear, viz., the Babel-tower of worldly power and worldly glory, they have neither been able nor willing to make use of Israel...” But this conjunction of ideas is devoid of scriptural support and without historical reality; for the empire of the world has set just as much value, according to political relations, upon the incorporation of Israel as upon that of every other people. Further, if what is meant is Israel’s own despising of the small beginning of a new ear that is dawning, it is then better explained as in connection with the reference of the declaration to Jesus the Christ in Mat. 21:42-44, Mar. 12:10 f., Act. 4:11 (ὑφ’ ἑμῶν τῶν οἰκοδομούντων), 1Pe. 2: 7, the builders are the chiefs and members of Israel itself, and not the heathen. From 1Pe. 2: 6, Rom. 9:33, we see how this reference to Christ is brought about, viz., by means of Isa. 28:16, where Jahve says: *Behold I am He who hath laid in Zion a stone, a stone of trial, a precious corner-stone of well-founded founding — whoever believeth shall not totter.* In the light of this Messianic prophecy of Isa. 5:22 of our Psalm also comes to have a Messianic meaning, which is warranted by the fact, that the history of Israel is recapitulated and culminates in the history of Christ; or, according to Joh. 2:19-21 (cf. Zec. 6:12 f.), still more accurately by the fact, that He who in His state of humiliation is the despised and rejected One is become in His state of glorification the eternal glorious Temple in which dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and is united with humanity which has been once for all atoned for. In the joy of the church at the Temple of the body of Christ which arose after the three days of burial, the joy which is here typically expressed in the words: “From with Jahve, i.e., by the might which dwells with Him, is this come to pass, wonderful is it become (has it been carried out) in our eyes,” therefore received its fulfilment. It is not **נְפִלְאוֹת** but **נִפְלְאוֹת**, like **הַבְּאוֹת** in Gen. 33:11, **קְרָאוֹת** from **קָרָא** = **קָרָה** in Deu. 31:29, Jer. 44:23, **קְרָאוֹת** from **קָרָא**, to call, Isa. 7:14. We can hear Isa. 25: 9 sounding through this passage, as above in vv. 19 f., Isa. 26: 1 f. The God of Israel has given this turn, so full of glory for His people, to the history. <sup>f366</sup>

He is able now to plead for more distant salvation and prosperity with all the more fervent confidence. **אֲנִי** (six times **אֲנִי**) is, as in every other instance (vid., on 116: 4), *Milra*. **הוֹשִׁיעָה** is accented regularly on the *penult.*, and draws the following **אֲנִי** towards itself by means of *Dag. forte conj.*; **הַצְלִיחָה** on the other hand is *Milra* according to the Masora and other ancient testimonies, and **אֲנִי** is not dageshed, without Norzi being able to state any

reason for this different accentuation. After this watchword of prayer of the thanksgiving feast, in v. 26 those who receive them bless those who are coming (סבִּיחַ with *Dechi*) in the name of Jahve, i.e., bid them welcome in His name.

The expression “from the house of Jahve,” like “from the fountain of Israel” in Psa. 68:27, is equivalent to, ye who belong to His house and to the church congregated around it. In the mouth of the people welcoming Jesus as the Messiah, Ωσαννά was a “God save the king” (vid., on Psa. 20:10); they scattered palm branches at the same time, like the *lulabs* at the joyous cry of the Feast of Tabernacles, and saluted Him with the cry, “Blessed is He who cometh in the name of the Lord,” as being the longed-for guest of the Feast (Mat. 21: 9). According to the Midrash, in v. 26 it is the people of Jerusalem who thus greet the pilgrims. In the original sense of the Psalm, however, it is the body of Levites and priests above on the Temple-hill who thus receive the congregation that has come up. The many animals for sacrifice which they brought with them are enumerated in Ezz. 6:17. On the ground of the fact that Jahve has proved Himself to be אֵל, the absolutely mighty One, by having granted light to His people, viz., loving-kindness, liberty, and joy, there then issues forth the ejaculation, “Bind the sacrifice,” etc. The LXX renders συστήσασθε ἑορτήν ἐν τοῖς πυκάλουσι, which is reproduced by the *Psalterium Romanum: constituite diem solemnem in confrequentationibus*, as Eusebius, Theodoret, and Chrysostom (although the last waveringly) also interpret it; on the other hand, it is rendered by the *psalterium Gallicum: in condensis*, as Apollinaris and Jerome (*in frondosis*) also understand it. But much as Luther’s version, which follows the latter interpretation, “Adorn the feast with green branches even to the horns of the altar,” accords with our German taste, it is still untenable; for אָסֵף cannot signify to encircle with garlands and the like, nor would it be altogether suited to אָסֵף in this signification. <sup>f367</sup>

Thus then in this instance A. Lobwasser renders it comparatively more correctly, although devoid of taste: “The Lord is great and mighty of strength who lighteneth us all; *fasten your bullocks to the horns beside the altar.*” To the horns?! So even Hitzig and others render it. But such a “binding to” is unheard of. And can אָסֵף אָסֵף possibly signify to bind on to anything? And what would be the object of binding them to the horns of the altar? In order that they might not run away?! Hengstenberg and von Lengerke at least disconnect the words “unto the horns of the altar” from any relation to this precautionary measure, by interpreting: until it (the animal for the festal sacrifice) is raised upon the horns of the altar and sacrificed. But how much is then imputed to these words! No indeed, אָסֵף denotes the animals for the feast-

offering, and there was so vast a number of these (according to Ezra *loc. cit.* seven hundred and twelve) that the whole space of the court of the priests was full of them, and the binding of them consequently had to go on as far as to the horns of the altar. Ainsworth (1627) correctly renders: “unto the hornes, that is, all the Court over, untill you come even to the hornes of the altar, intending hereby many sacrifices or boughs.” The meaning of the call is therefore: Bring your hecatombs and make them ready for sacrifice. <sup>f368</sup>

The words “unto (as far as) the horns of the altar” have the principal accent. In v. 28 (cf. Exo. 15: 2) the festal procession replies in accordance with the character of the feast, and then the Psalm closes, in correspondence with its beginning, with a *Hodu* in which all voices join.

## **Psalm 119**

### **A TWENTY-TWO-FOLD STRING OF APHORISMS BY ONE WHO IS PERSECUTED FOR THE SAKE OF HIS FAITH**

#### **ALEPH.**

*119: 1 BLESSED are those whose ways are blameless,  
Who walk in the law of Jahve!*

*119: 2 Blessed are those who keep His testimonies,  
Who seek Him with the whole heart,*

*119: 3 They also do no unrighteousness —  
They walk in His ways.*

*119: 4 THOU hast enjoined Thy precepts  
To keep them diligently.*

*119: 5 Oh that my ways were directed  
To keep Thy statutes!*

*119: 6 Then shall I not be ashamed,  
When I have respect unto all Thy commandments.*

*119: 7 I will give thanks to Thee with an upright heart,  
When I learn the judgments of Thy righteousness.*

*119: 8 I will keep Thy statutes:  
Forsake me not utterly.*

#### **BETH.**

*119: 9 Wherewithal shall a young man keep his way pure?  
If he taketh heed according to Thy word.*

*119:10 With the whole heart have I sought Thee:  
Let me not wander from Thy commandments.*

*119:11 In my heart do I treasure up Thy word,  
That I may not sin against Thee.*

*119:12 Blessed art Thou, Jahve,  
Teach me Thy statutes.*

*119:13 With my lips do I recount  
All the judgments of Thy mouth.*

*119:14 In the way of Thy testimonies do I rejoice,  
As in all manner of possession.*

*119:15 I will meditate in Thy precepts,  
And have respect unto Thy paths.*

*119:16 In Thy statutes do I delight myself,  
I will not forget Thy word.*

### **GIMEL.**

*119:17 Deal bountifully with Thy servant, that I may live,  
So will I keep Thy word.*

*119:18 Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold  
Wondrous things out of Thy law.*

*119:19 I am a stranger in the earth:  
Hide not Thy commandments from me*

*119:20 My soul is crushed with longing  
After Thy judgments at all times.*

*119:21 Thou hast rebuked the proud;  
Cursed are those who do err from Thy commandments.*

*119:22 Remove from me reproach and contempt;  
For I keep Thy testimonies.*

*119:23 Though princes sit and deliberate against me,  
Thy servant doth meditate in Thy statutes.*

*119:24 Nevertheless Thy testimonies are my delight,  
The men of my counsel.*

### **DALETH.**

*119:25 My soul cleaveth unto the dust:  
Quicken Thou me according to Thy word.*

*119:26 I declared my ways, and Thou heardest me:  
Teach me Thy statutes.*

*119:27 Make me to understand the way of Thy precepts:  
So will I meditate on Thy wondrous works.*

*119:28 My soul melteth for heaviness:  
Strengthen Thou me according to Thy word.*

*119:29 Remove from me the way of lying,  
And with Thy law be gracious unto me.*

*119:30 The way of truth I have chosen:  
Thy judgments have I set before me.*

*119:31 I have given myself up to Thy testimonies:  
Jahve, put me not to shame.*

*119:32 I run the way of Thy commandments,  
For Thou dost enlarge my heart.*

**HE.**

*119:33 Teach me, Jahve, the way of Thy statutes,  
That I may keep it unto the end.*

*119:34 Give me understanding, that I may keep Thy instruction,  
And observe it with the whole heart.*

*119:35 Make me to walk in the path of Thy commandments;  
For therein do I delight.*

*119:36 Incline my heart unto Thy testimonies,  
And not to covetousness.*

*119:37 Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity;  
In Thy way quicken Thou me.*

*119:38 Stablish Thy word unto Thy servant,  
As that which makes them fear Thee.*

*119:39 Take away my reproach which I fear;  
For Thy judgments are good.*

*119:40 Behold, I long after Thy precepts:  
Quicken me in Thy righteousness.*

**VAV.**

*119:41 And let Thy mercies come unto me, Jahve,  
Thy salvation, according to Thy word,*

*119:42 And I will answer him who reproacheth me;  
For I trust in Thy word.*

*119:43 And take not the word of truth utterly out of my mouth;  
For I hope in Thy judgments.*

*119:44 And I will keep Thy law continually,  
For ever and ever,*

*119:45 And I will walk at liberty;  
For I seek Thy precepts.*

*119:46 And I will speak of Thy testimonies before kings,  
And will not be ashamed.*

*119:47 And I will delight myself in Thy commandments,  
Which I love.*

*119:48 And my hands will I lift up unto Thy commandments which I love,  
And I will meditate in Thy statutes.*

### **ZAJIN.**

*119:49 Remember the word unto Thy servant,  
Because Thou hast caused me to hope.*

*119:50 This is my comfort in my affliction,  
That Thy word hath quickened me.*

*119:51 The proud have had me greatly in derision —  
I have not declined from Thy law.*

*119:52 I remembered Thy judgments of old, Jahve,  
And comforted myself.*

*119:53 Indignation hath taken hold upon me because of the wicked,  
Who forsake Thy law.*

*119:54 Thy statutes are my songs  
In the house of my pilgrimage.*

*119:55 I have remembered Thy name, Jahve, in the night,  
And I have kept Thy law.*

*119:56 This is appointed to me,  
That I should keep Thy precepts.*

### **HÅETH.**

*119:57 Thou art my portion, Jahve:  
I have said that I would keep Thy words.*

*119:58 I entreated Thee with the whole heart:  
Be merciful unto me according to Thy word.*

*119:59 I thought on my ways,  
And turned my feet unto Thy testimonies.*

*119:60 I make haste, and delay not  
To keep Thy commandments.*

*119:61 The cords of the wicked are round about me —  
I do not forget Thy law.*

*119:62 At midnight I will rise to give thanks unto Thee  
Because of the judgments of Thy righteousness.*

*119:63 I am a companion of all those who fear Thee,  
And of those who keep Thy precepts.*

*119:64 The earth, Jahve, is full of Thy mercy:  
Teach me Thy statutes.*

### **TETH.**

*119:65 Thou hast dealt well with Thy servant,  
Jahve, according unto Thy word.*

*119:66 Teach me good judgment and knowledge,  
For I believe in Thy commandments.*

*119:67 Before I was afflicted I went astray,  
And now I keep Thy word.*

*119:68 Thou art good, and doest good;  
Teach me Thy statutes.*

*119:69 The proud have forged a lie against me —  
I will keep Thy precepts with the whole heart.*

*119:70 Their heart is as fat as grease —  
I delight in Thy law.*

*119:71 It was good for me that I was afflicted,  
That I might learn Thy statutes.*

*119:72 The law of Thy mouth is better unto me  
Than thousands of gold and silver.*

### **JOD.**

*119:73 Thy hands have made me and fashioned me:  
Give me understanding, that I may learn Thy commandments.*

*119:74 Let those who fear Thee be glad when they see me;  
For I hope in Thy word.*

*119:75 I know, Jahve, that righteousness are Thy judgments,  
And that Thou in faithfulness hast afflicted me.*

*119:76 Let Thy merciful kindness be for my comfort,  
According to Thy promise unto Thy servant.*

*119:77 Let Thy tender mercies come unto me, that I may live;  
For Thy law is my delight.*

*119:78 Let the proud be ashamed that they dealt falsely with me —  
But I meditate on Thy precepts.*

*119:79 Let those who fear Thee turn unto me,  
And those who know Thy testimonies.*

*119:80 Let my heart be sound in Thy statutes,  
That I be not ashamed.*

#### **KAPH.**

*119:81 My soul fainteth for Thy salvation:  
I hope in Thy word.*

*119:82 Mine eyes fail with longing for Thy word,  
Saying, When wilt Thou comfort me? —*

*119:83 Verily, though I am become like a bottle in the smoke,  
Do I not forget Thy statutes.*

*119:84 Short indeed are the days of Thy servant,  
When wilt Thou execute judgment on those who persecute me?*

*119:85 The proud have digged pits for me,  
They who are not after Thy law.*

*119:86 All Thy commandments are faithful:  
They persecute me wrongfully; help Thou me!*

*119:87 They had almost consumed me in the land;  
Yet do I not forsake Thy precepts.*

*119:88 Quicken me after Thy loving-kindness,  
So will I keep the testimony of Thy mouth.*

#### **LAMED.**

*119:89 For ever, Jahve,  
Thy word is settled in heaven.*



*119:90 Thy faithfulness is unto all generations:  
Thou hast established the earth, and it abideth.*

*119:91 They continue this day according to Thy judgments;  
For all beings are Thy servants.*

*119:92 Unless Thy law had been my delight,  
I should then have perished in mine affliction.*

*119:93 I will never forget Thy precepts;  
For with them Thou hast quickened me.*

*119:94 I am Thine, save me;  
For I seek Thy precepts.*

*119:95 If the wicked lie in wait for me to destroy me —  
I consider Thy testimonies.*

*119:96 To all perfection, as I have seen, there is an end,  
Yet Thy commandment is without any limits.*

**MEM.**

*119:97 O how love I Thy law!  
It is my meditation all the day.*

*119:98 Thy commandments make me wiser than mine enemies;  
For they are ever my portion.*

*119:99 I have more understanding than all my teachers;  
For Thy testimonies are my meditation.*

*119:100 I understand more than aged men;  
For I keep Thy precepts.*

*119:101 I refrain my feet from every evil way,  
That I may keep Thy word.*

*119:102 I have not departed from Thy judgments;  
For Thou hast taught me.*

*119:103 How sweet are Thy words unto my taste,  
Sweeter than honey to my mouth!*

*119:104 From Thy precepts I get understanding:  
Therefore I hate every false way.*

**NUN.**

*119:105 Thy word is a lamp unto my feet,  
And a light unto my path.*

*119:106 I have sworn, and I will perform it,  
That I will keep Thy righteous judgments.*

*119:107 I am afflicted very much —  
Quicken me, Jahve, according unto Thy word!*

*119:108 Accept the freewill offerings of my mouth, Jahve,  
And teach me Thy judgments.*

*119:109 My soul is continually in my hand:  
Yet do I not forget Thy law.*

*119:110 The wicked have laid a snare for me:  
Yet do I not err from Thy precepts.*

*119:111 Thy testimonies have I taken as a heritage for ever;  
For they are the rejoicing of my heart.*

*119:112 I have inclined mine heart to perform Thy statutes  
For ever, even unto the end.*

#### **SAMECH.**

*119:113 I hate the double-minded,  
And Thy law do I love.*

*119:114 My hiding-place and my shield art Thou:  
I hope in Thy word.*

*119:115 Depart from me, ye evil-doers —  
I will keep the commandments of my God.*

*119:116 Uphold me according unto Thy word, and I shall live,  
And let me not be ashamed of my hope.*

*119:117 Hold Thou me up, and I shall be safe,  
And I will have respect unto Thy statutes continually.*

*119:118 Thou hast trodden down all them that err from Thy statutes;  
For their intrigue is falsehood.*

*119:119 Thou puttest away all the wicked of the earth like dross:  
Therefore I love Thy testimonies.*

*119:120 My flesh is rigid for terror of Thee,  
And I am afraid of Thy judgments.*

#### **AJIN.**

*119:121 I have done judgment and righteousness:  
Thou wilt not leave me to mine oppressors.*

*119:122 Be surety for Thy servant for good:  
Let not the proud oppress me.*

*119:123 Mine eyes fail for Thy salvation,  
And for the word of Thy righteousness.*

*119:124 Deal with Thy servant according unto Thy mercy,  
And teach me Thy statutes.*

*119:125 Thy servant am I, give me understanding,  
That I may know Thy testimonies.*

*119:126 It is time to interpose for Jahve:  
They have made void Thy law.*

*119:127 Therefore I love Thy commandments  
More than gold, and than fine gold.*

*119:128 Therefore I esteem all precepts concerning all things to be right;  
I hate every false way.*

***PHE (PE ).***

*119:129 Wonderful are Thy testimonies:  
Therefore doth my soul keep them.*

*119:130 The unfolding of Thy words giveth light;  
Giving understanding unto the simple.*

*119:131 I opened my mouth, and panted;  
For I long for Thy commandments.*

*119:132 Look Thou upon me, and be merciful unto me,  
As is right towards those who love Thy name.*

*119:133 Establish my steps by Thy word,  
And let not any iniquity have dominion over me.*

*119:134 Deliver me from the oppression of man,  
And I will keep Thy precepts.*

*119:135 Make Thy face to shine upon Thy servant,  
And teach me Thy statutes.*

*119:136 Mine eyes run down rivers of waters,  
Because they keep not Thy law.*

***TSADE.***

*119:137 Righteous art Thou, Jahve,  
And upright are Thy judgments.*

*119:138 Thou hast commanded Thy testimonies in righteousness,  
And in very faithfulness.*

*119:139 My zeal consumeth me,  
For mine adversaries have forgotten Thy words.*

*119:140 Thy word is very pure,  
And Thy servant loveth it.*

*119:141 I am young and despised:  
Yet do not I forget Thy precepts.*

*119:142 Thy righteousness is that which is right for ever,  
And Thy law truth.*

*119:143 Trouble and anguish have taken hold on me:  
Yet thy commandments are my delight.*

*119:144 Thy testimonies are that which is right for ever:  
Give me understanding that I may live.*

### ***KOPH.***

*119:145 I call with the whole heart — answer me;  
Jahve, Thy statutes will I keep!*

*119:146 When I cry unto Thee, save me,  
And I will keep Thy testimonies!*

*119:147 Early, even before the dawning of the morning, did I make supplication:  
I hoped in Thy word.*

*119:148 Mine eyes anticipate the night-watches,  
To meditate on Thy word.*

*119:149 Hear my voice according unto Thy loving-kindness;  
Jahve, quicken me according to Thy judgments.*

*119:150 They draw nigh who follow after mischief,  
Who are far from Thy law:*

*119:151 Thou comest all the nearer, O Jahve,  
And all Thy commandments are truth.*

*119:152 From Thy testimonies I have known for a long time  
That Thou hast founded them for ever.*

### ***RESH.***

*119:153 Look upon mine affliction, and deliver me;  
For I do not forget Thy law.*

*119:154 Plead my cause and deliver me,  
Quicken me according to Thy word.*

*119:155 Salvation is far from the wicked,  
For they seek not Thy statutes.*

*119:156 Abundant are Thy tender mercies, Jahve;  
Quicken me according to Thy judgments.*

*119:157 Many are my persecutors and mine oppressors;  
I decline not from Thy testimonies.*

*119:158 I beheld the transgressors, and was grieved,  
Because they kept not Thy word.*

*119:159 Consider that I love Thy precepts:  
Quicken me, Jahve, according to Thy loving-kindness.*

*119:160 The sum of Thy word is truth,  
And every one of the judgments of Thy righteousness is for ever.*

### **SIN, SHIN.**

*119:161 Princes have persecuted me without a cause,  
But my heart standeth in awe of Thy words.*

*119:162 I rejoice over Thy word,  
As one that findeth great spoil.*

*119:163 Pretended faith I hate, and I abhor it:  
Thy law do I love.*

*119:164 Seven times a day do I praise Thee  
Because of the judgments of Thy righteousness.*

*119:165 Great peace have they who love Thy law,  
And nothing causeth them to stumble.*

*119:166 Jahve, I hope for Thy salvation,  
And do Thy commandments.*

*119:167 My soul keepeth Thy testimonies,  
And I love them exceedingly.*

*119:168 I keep Thy precepts and Thy testimonies,  
For all my ways are before Thee.*

### **THAV (TAV).**

*119:169 Let my cry come up before Thee, Jahve;  
Give me understanding according to Thy word.*

*119:170 Let my supplication come up before Thee,  
Deliver me according to Thy promise.*

*119:171 My lips shall utter praise,  
That Thou dost teach me Thy statutes.*

*119:172 My tongue doth speak of Thy word,  
For all Thy commandments are righteousness.*

*119:173 Let Thy hand be a help unto me,  
For I have chosen Thy precepts.*

*119:174 I have longed for Thy salvation, Jahve,  
And Thy law is my delight.*

*119:175 Let my soul live and praise Thee,  
And let Thy judgments help me.*

*119:176 If I should go astray — as a lost sheep seek Thy servant,  
For I do not forget Thy commandments.*

*Psalm 119.* To the *Hodu* Psalm 118, written in gnome-like, wreathed style, is appended the throughout gnomico-didactic Psalm 119, consisting of one hundred and seventy-six Masoretic verses, or regarded in relation to the strophe, distichs, which according to the twenty-two letters of the alphabet fall into twenty-two groups (called by the old expositors the  $\beta\gamma\delta\theta\delta\delta\epsilon\zeta$  or *octonarii* of this *Psalmus literatus s. alphabetites*); for each group contains eight verses (distichs), each of which begins with the same consecutive letter ( $8 \times 22 = 176$ ). The Latin Psalters (as the *Psalterium Veronense*, and originally perhaps all the old Greek Psalters) have the name of the letter before each group; the Syriac has the signs of the letters; and in the Complutensian Bible, as also elsewhere, a new line begins with each group. The Talmud, *B. Berachoth*, says of this Psalm: “it consists of eight *Alephs*,” etc.; the Masora styles it  $\text{רבא ביתא אלפא ביתא}$ ; the Midrash on it is called  $\text{מדרש אלפא ביתא}$ , and the Pesikta  $\text{פסיקתא דתמניא אפי}$ . In our German version it has the appropriate inscription, “The Christian’s golden A B C of the praise, love, power, and use of the word of God;” for here we have set forth in inexhaustible fulness what the word of God is to a man, and how a man is to behave himself in relation to it. The Masora observes that the Psalm contains only the one verse 122, in which some reference or other to the word of revelation is not found as in all the 175 others <sup>f369</sup> — a many-linked chain of synonyms which runs through the whole Psalm. In connection with this ingenious arrangement, so artfully devised and carried out, it may also not be merely accidental that the address *Jahve* occurs twenty-two times, as Bengel has observed: *bis et vicesies pro numero octonariorum*.

All kinds of erroneous views have, however, been put forth concerning this Psalm. Köster, von Gerlach, Hengstenberg, and Hupfeld renounce all attempts to show that there is any accordance whatever with a set plan, and find here a series of maxims without any internal progression and connection. Ewald begins at once with the error, that we have before us the long prayer of an old experienced teacher. But from vv. 9 f. it is clear that the poet himself is a “young man,” a fact that is also corroborated by vv. 99 and 100. The poet is a young man, who finds himself in a situation which is clearly described: he is derided, oppressed, persecuted, and that by those who despise the divine word (for apostasy encompasses him round about), and more particularly by a government hostile to the true religion, vv. 23 46, 161. He is lying in bonds (v. 61, cf. 83), expecting death (v. 109), and recognises in his affliction, it is true, God’s salutary humbling, and in the midst of it God’s word is his comfort and his wisdom, but he also yearns for help, and earnestly prays for it. — The whole Psalm is a prayer for stedfastness in the midst of an ungodly, degenerate race, and in the midst of great trouble, which is heightened by the pain he feels at the prevailing apostasy, and a prayer for ultimate deliverance which rises in group *Kaph* to an urgent *how long!* If this sharply-defined physiognomy of the Psalm is recognised, then the internal progression will not fail to be discerned.

After the poet has praised fidelity to the word of God (*Aleph*), and described it as the virtue of all virtues which is of service to the young man and to which he devotes himself (*Beth*), he prays, in the midst of the scoffing and persecuting persons that surround him, for the grace of enlightenment (*Gimel*), of strengthening (*Daleth*), of preservation (*He*), of suitable and joyful confession (*Vav*); God’s word is all his thought and pursuit (*Zajin*), he cleaves to those who fear God (*Heth*), and recognises the salutary element of His humbling (*Teth*), but is in need of comfort (*Jod*) and signs: how long! (*Kaph*). Without the eternal, sure, mighty word of God he would despair (*Lamed*); this is his wisdom in difficult circumstances (*Mem*); he has sworn fidelity to it, and maintains his fidelity as being one who is persecuted (*Nun*), and abhors and despises the apostates (*Samech*). He is oppressed, but God will not suffer him to be crushed (*Ajin*); He will not suffer the doings of the ungodly, which wring from him floods of tears, to prevail over him (*Phe*) — over him, the small (still youthful) and despised one whom zeal concerning the prevailing godlessness is consuming away (*Tsade*). Oh that God would hear his crying by day and by night (*Koph*), would revive him speedily with His helpful pity (*Resh*) — him, viz., who being persecuted by princes clings fast to Him (*Shin*), and would seek him the isolated and so sorely imperilled sheep! (*Tav*). This outline does not exhaust the fundamental thoughts of the separate ogdoades, and they might surely be still more aptly reproduced, but this is sufficient to show that the Psalm is not wanting in coherence and progressive movement, and that it is not an ideal situation and mood, but a situation and mood based upon public

relationships, from which this manifold celebration of the divine word, as a fruit of its teaching, has sprung.

It is natural to suppose that the composition of the Psalm falls in those times of the Greek domination in which the government was hostile, and a large party from among the Jews themselves, that was friendly towards the government, persecuted all decided confessors of the *Tôra*. Hitzig says, “It can be safely maintained that the Psalm was written in the Maccabaeian age by a renowned Israelite who was in imprisonment under Gentile authorities.” It is at least probable that the plaited work of so long a Psalm, which, in connection with all that is artificial about it, from beginning to end gives a glimpse of the subdued afflicted mien of a confessor, is the work of one in prison, who whiled away his time with this plaiting together of his complaints and his consolatory thoughts.

*Psa. 119: 1-8.* The eightfold *Aleph*. Blessed are those who act according to the word of God; the poet wishes to be one of these. The alphabetical Psalm on the largest scale begins appropriately, not merely with a simple (Psa. 112: 1), but with a twofold *ashrê*. It refers principally to those *integri viae (vitae)*. In v. 3 the description of those who are accounted blessed is carried further. Perfects, a s denoting that which is habitual, alternate with futures used as presents. In v. 4 לְשֹׂמֵר expresses the purpose of the enjoining, as in v. 5 the goal of the directing. אֲחֵלִי (whence אֲחֵלִי, 2Ki. 5: 3) is compounded of אָחַץ (vid., *supra*, p. 273) and לִי (לִי), and consequently signifies *o si*. On יִכְנוּ cf. Pro. 4:26 (LXX καταστυνθησιν). The retrospective אָחַץ is expanded anew in v. 6b: then, when I namely. “Judgment of Thy righteousness” are the decisions concerning right and wrong which give expression to and put in execution the righteousness of God. <sup>f370</sup> בְּלִמְדֵי refers to Scripture in comparison with history.

*Psa. 119: 9-16.* The eightfold *Beth*. Acting in accordance with the word of God, a young man walks blamelessly; the poet desires this, and supplicates God’s gracious assistance in order to it. To purify or cleanse one’s way or walk (זָכַה, cf. 73:13, Pro. 20: 9) signifies to maintain it pure (זָכַה, root זָכַה, Arab. *zk*, to prick, to strike the eye, *nitere*; <sup>f371</sup> vid., Fleischer in Levy’s *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, i. 424) from the spotting of sin, or to free it from it. V. 9b is the answer to the question in v. 9a; לְשֹׂמֵר signifies *custodiendo semetipsum*, for שָׂמֵר can also signify “to be on one’s guard” without נִפְשׁוֹ (Jos. 6:18). The old classic (e.g., Psa. 18:31) אֲמַרְתֶּךָ alternates throughout with דְּבַרְךָ; both are intended collectively. One is said to hide (צָפַן) the word in one’s heart when one has it continually present with him, not merely as an outward precept, but



as an inward motive power in opposition to selfish action (Job. 23:12). In v. 12 the poet makes his way through adoration to petition. סִפְרָתִי in v. 13 does not mean enumeration, but recounting, as in Deu. 6: 7. עֲדוֹת is the plural to עֲדוּת; עֲדוֹת, on the contrary, in v. 138 is the plural to עֲדָה: both are used of God's attestation of Himself and of His will in the word of revelation. כְּאֵל signifies, according to v. 162, "as over" (short for כְּאֲשֶׁר אֵל), not: as it were more than (Olshausen); the כֵּ would only be troublesome in connection with this interpretation. With reference to הוֹן, which has occurred already in Psalms 44:13; 112: 3 (from הוֹן, Arab. *hawn*, to be light, *levem*), *aisance*, ease, opulence, and concrete, goods, property, vid., Fleischer in Levy's *Chald. Wörterb.* i. 423 f. אֲרַחֲתִידָה, v. 15, are the paths traced out in the word of God; these he will studiously keep in his eye.

*Psa. 119:17-24.* The eightfold *Gimel*. This is his life's aim: he will do it under fear of the curse of apostasy; he will do it also though he suffer persecution on account of it. In v. 17 the expression is only אֲחִיָּה as Psalms 118:19, not וְאֲחִיָּה as in vv. 77, 116, 144: the *apodosis imper.* only begins with וְאֲשַׁמְרָה, whereas אֲחִיָּה is the good itself for the bestowment of which the poet prays. גַּל in v. 18a is *imper. apoc. Piel* for גָּלָה, like נָס in Dan. 1:12. נִפְלְאוֹת is the expression for everything supernatural and mysterious which is incomprehensible to the ordinary understanding and is left to the perception of faith. The *Tôra* beneath the surface of its letter contains an abundance of such "wondrous things," into which only eyes from which God has removed the covering of natural short-sightedness penetrate; hence the prayer in v. 18. Upon earth we have no abiding resting-place, we sojourn here as in a strange land (v. 19, 39:13, 1Ch. 29:15). Hence the poet prays in v. 19 that God would keep His commandments, these rules of conduct for the journey of life, in living consciousness for him. Towards this, according to v. 20, his longing tends. גָּרַס (*Hiph.* in Lam. 3:16) signifies to crush in pieces, Arab. *jr̄s*, and here, like the Aramaic גָּרַס, גָּרַס, to be crushed, broken in pieces. לְתַאֲבָה (from תַּאֲבָה, vv. 40, 174, a secondary form of אֲבָה) states the bias of mind in or at which the soul feels itself thus overpowered even to being crushed: it is crushing form longing after God's judgment, viz., after a more and more thorough knowledge of them. In v. 21 the LXX has probably caught the meaning of the poet better than the pointing has done, inasmuch as it draws ἐπικατάρατοι to v. 21b, so that v. 21a consists of two words, just like vv. 59a, 89a; and Kamphausen also follows this in his rendering. For אֲרֻרִים as an attribute is unpoetical, and as an accusative of the predicate far-fetched; whereas it comes in naturally as a predicate before הַשְּׁגִים מִמְצוֹתַיָּךְ : cursed

(חָרַר = Arab. *harra*, *detestari*), viz., by God. Instead of גָּל, “roll” (from גָּלַל, Jos. 5: 9), it is pointed in v. 22 (מַעַל) גָּל, “uncover” = גָּלָה, as in v. 18, reproach being conceived of as a covering or veil (as e.g., in Psa. 69: 8), cf. Isa. 22: 8 (perhaps also Lam. 2:14; 4:22, if אָל גָּלָה there signifies “to remove the covering upon anything”). גַּם in v. 23a, as in Jer. 36:25, has the sense of גַּם־כִּי, *etiamsi*; and גַּם in v. 24a the sense of nevertheless, ὅμως, Ew. § 354, a. On נִדְבָר בְּ (reciprocal), cf. Eze. 33:30. As in a criminal tribunal, princes sit and deliberate how they may be able to render him harmless.

**Psa. 119:25-32.** The eightfold *Daleth*. He is in deep trouble, and prays for consolation and strengthening by means of God’s word, to which he resigns himself. His soul is fixed to the dust (Psa. 44:26) in connection with such non-recognition and proscription, and is incapable of raising itself. In v. 25b he implores new strength and spirits (חַיָּה as in Psa. 71:20; 85: 7) from God, in conformity with and by reason of His word. He has rehearsed his walk in every detail to God, and has not been left without an answer, which has assured him of His good pleasure: may He then be pleased to advance him ever further and further in the understanding of His word, in order that, though men are against him, he may nevertheless have God on his side, vv. 26, 27. The complaint and request expressed in v. 25 are renewed in v. 28. דָּלַף refers to the soul, which is as it were melting away in the trickling down of tears; קַיִם is a *Piel* of Aramaic formation belonging to the later language. In vv. 29, 30 the way of lies or of treachery, and the way of faithfulness or of perseverance in the truth, stand in opposition to one another. חִנּוּן is construed with a double accusative, inasmuch as תּוֹרָה has not the rigid notion of a fixed teaching, but of living empirical instruction. שָׁהָה (short for שׁוּהָה לְפָנָי, 16: 8) signifies to put or set, viz., as a *norma normans* that stands before one’s eyes. He cleaves to the testimonies of God; may Jahve not disappoint the hope which to him springs up out of them, according to the promise, v. 31. He runs, i.e., walks vigorously and cheerfully, in the way of God’s commandments, for He has widened his heart, by granting and preserving to the persecuted one the joyfulness of confession and the confidence of hope.

**Psa. 119:33-40.** The eightfold *He*. He further prays for instruction and guidance that he may escape the by-paths of selfishness and of disavowal. The noun עֲקָב, used also elsewhere as an *accus. adverb.*, in the signification *ad extremum* (vv. 33 and 112) is peculiar to our poet. אֲצַרְנָה (with a *Shebâ* which takes a colouring in accordance with the principal form) refers back to דָּרַךְ. In the petition “give me understanding” (which occurs six times in this Psalm) הִבִּינִי is causative, as in Job. 32: 8, and frequently in the post-exilic writings.

בַּצַּע (from בָּצַע, *abscindere*, as κέρδος accords in sound with κείρειν) signifies gain and acquisition by means of the damage which one does to his neighbour by depreciating his property, by robbery, deceit, and extortion (1Sa. 8: 3), and as a name of a vice, covetousness, and in general selfishness. שֵׁוֹא is that which is without real, i.e., without divine, contents or intrinsic worth, — God-opposed teaching and life. בְּדַרְכֵי <sup>f372</sup> is a defective plural; cf. חֲסִדֵי, v. 41, וּמִשְׁפָּטַי, v. 43, and frequently. Establishing, in v. 38, is equivalent to a realizing of the divine word or promise. The relative clause אֲשֶׁר לִירֵאָתֶךָ is not to be referred to לְאֲבֹדֶךָ according to v. 85 (where the expression is different), but to אֲמַרְתֶּךָ: fulfil to Thy servant Thy word or promise, as that which (*quippe quae*) aims at men attaining the fear of Thee and increasing therein (cf. *Psa.* 130: 4; 40: 4). The reproach which the poet fears in v. 39 is not the reproach of confessing, but of denying God. Accordingly מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ are not God's judgments [i.e., acts of judgment], but revealed decisions or judgments: these are good, inasmuch as it is well with him who keeps them. He can appeal before God to the fact that he is set upon the knowledge and experience of these with longing of heart; and he bases his request upon the fact that God by virtue of His righteousness, i.e., the stringency with which He maintains His order of grace, both as to its promises and its duties, would quicken him, who is at present as it were dead with sorrow and weariness.

*Psa.* 119:41-48. The eightfold *Vav*. He prays for the grace of true and fearlessly joyous confession. The LXX renders v. 41a: *καὶ ἔλθοι ἐπ' ἐμέ' τὸ ἔλεός σου*; but the Targum and Jerome rightly (cf. v. 77, *Isa.* 63: 7) have the plural: God's proofs of loving-kindness in accordance with His promises will put him in the position that he will not be obliged to be dumb in the presence of him who reproaches him (חֲרֹף, prop. a plucker, cf. Arab. *charûf*, a lamb = a plucker of leaves or grass), but will be able to answer him on the ground of his own experience. The verb עָנָה, which in itself has many meanings, acquires the signification "to give an answer" through the word, דָּבַר, that is added (synon. הִשִּׁיב דָּבַר). V. 43 also refers to the duty of confessing God. The meaning of the prayer is, that God may not suffer him to come to such a pass that he will be utterly unable to witness for the truth; for language dies away in the mouth of him who is unworthy of its before God. The writer has no fear of this for himself, for his hope is set towards God's judgments (לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ, defective plural, as also in v. 149; in proof of which, compare vv. 156 and 175), his confidence takes its stand upon them. The futures which follow from vv. 44 to 48 declare that what he would willingly do by the grace of God, and strives to do, is to walk בְּרֹחַב, in a broad space (elsewhere בְּמִרְחָב),

therefore unstrained, which in this instance is not equivalent to happily, but courageously and unconstrainedly, without allowing myself to be intimidated, and said of inward freedom which makes itself known outwardly. In v. 46 the Vulgate renders: *Et loquebar de (in) testimoniis tuis in conspectu regum et non confundebam* — the motto of the Augsburg Confession, to which it was adapted especially in connection with this historical interpretation of the two verbs, which does not correspond to the original text. The lifting up of the hands in v. 48 is an expression of fervent longing desire, as in connection with prayer, Psa. 28: 2; 63: 5; 134: 2; 141: 2, and frequently. The second **אֶהְבֵּתִי אֲשֶׁר** is open to the suspicion of being an inadvertent repetition. **שִׁיחַ בְּ** (synon. **הִגָּה בְּ**) signifies a still or audible meditating that is absorbed in the object.

*Psa. 119:49-56.* The eightfold *Zajin*. God's word is his hope and his trust amidst all derision; and when he burns with indignation at the apostates, God's word is his solace. Since in v. 49 the expression is not **דְּבָרְךָ** but **דְּבָר**, it is not to be interpreted according to Psa. 98: 3; 106:45, but: remember the word addressed to Thy servant, because Thou hast made me hope (*Piel causat.* as e.g., **נָשָׂה**, to cause to forget, Gen. 41:51), i.e., hast comforted me by promising me a blessed issue, and hast directed my expectation thereunto. This is his comfort in his dejected condition, that God's promissory declaration has quickened him and proved its reviving power in his case. In **הִלְיוֹנִי** (**הִלְיוֹנִי**), *ludificantur*, it is implied that the **וְדוֹמִים** are just **לְצִיִּים**, frivolous persons, libertines, free-thinkers (Pro. 21:24). **מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ**, v. 52, are the valid, verified decisions (judgments) of God revealed from the veriest olden times. In the remembrance of these, which determine the lot of a man according to the relation he holds towards them, the poet found comfort. It can be rendered: then I comforted myself; or according to a later usage of the *Hithpa.*: I was comforted. Concerning **וְלֵעָפָה**, *aestus*, vid., 11: 6, and on the subject-matter, vv. 21, 104. The poet calls his earthly life "the house of his pilgrimage;" for it is true the earth is man's (Psa. 115:16), but he has no abiding resting-place there (1Ch. 29:15), his **בֵּית עוֹלָם** (Ecc. 12: 5) is elsewhere (vid., *supra*, v. 19, 39:13). God's statutes are here his "songs," which give him spiritual refreshing, sweeten the hardships of the pilgrimage, and measure and hasten his steps. The Name of God has been in his mind hitherto, not merely by day, but also by night; and in consequence of this he has kept God's law (**וְאִשְׁמְרָה**), as five times besides in this Psalm, cf. Psa. 3: 6, and to be distinguished from **וְאִשְׁמְרָה**, v. 44). Just this, that he keeps (*observat*) God's precepts, has fallen to his lot. To others something else is allotted (Psa. 4: 8), to him this one most needful thing.

*Psa. 119:57-64.* The eightfold *Heth*. To understand and to keep God's word is his portion, the object of his incessant praying and thanksgiving, the highest grace or favour that can come to him. According to Psa. 16: 5; 73:26, the words חֶלְקֵי ה' belong together. V. 57b is an inference drawn from it (אָמַר ל') as in Exo. 2:14, and frequently), and the existing division of the verse is verified. חֶלְהָ פִּי, as in Psa. 45:13, is an expression of caressing, flattering entreaty; in Latin, *caput mulcere (demulcere)*. His turning to the word of God the poet describes in v. 59 as a result of a careful trying of his actions. After that he quickly and cheerfully, v. 60, determined to keep it without any long deliberation with flesh and blood, although the snares of wicked men surround him. The meaning of חֶבְלֵי is determined according to v. 110: the pointing does not distinguish so sharply as one might have expected between חֶבְלֵי, ὠδῖνας, and חֶבְלֵי, snares, bonds (vid., 18: 5 f.); but the plural nowhere, according to the usage of the language as we now have it, signifies bands (companies), from the singular in 1Sa. 10: 5 (Böttcher, § 800). Thankfulness urges him to get up at midnight (*acc. temp.* as in Job. 34:20) to prostrate himself before God and to pray. Accordingly he is on friendly terms with, he is closely connected with (Pro. 28:24), all who fear God. Out of the fulness of the loving-kindness of God, which is nowhere unattested upon earth (v. 64a = 33: 5), he implores for himself the inward teaching concerning His word as the highest and most cherished of mercies.

*Psa. 119:65-72.* The eightfold *Teth*. The good word of the gracious God is the fountain of all good; and it is learned in the way of lowliness. He reviews his life, and sees in everything that has befallen him the good and well-meaning appointment of the God of salvation in accordance with the plan and order of salvation of His word. The form אֶבְרָךְ, which is the form out of pause, is retained in v. 65a beside *Athnach*, although not preceded by *Olewejored* (cf. Psa. 35:19; 48:11, Pro. 30:21). Clinging believingly to the commandments of God, he is able confidently to pray that He would teach him “good discernment” and “knowledge.” טָאֵם is ethically the capacity of distinguishing between good and evil, and of discovering the latter as it were by touch; טוֹב טָאֵם, good discernment, is a coupling of words like טוֹב לֵב, a happy disposition, cheerfulness. God has brought him into this relationship to His word by humbling him, and thus setting him right out of his having gone astray. אֶמְרָה in v. 67b, as in v. 11, is not God's utterance conveying a promise, but imposing a duty. God is called טוֹב as He who is graciously disposed towards man, and מְטִיב as He who acts out this disposition; this loving and gracious God he implores to become his Teacher. In his fidelity to God's word he does not allow himself to be led astray by any of the lies which

the proud try to impose upon him (Böttcher), or better absolutely (cf. Job. 13: 4): to patch together over him, making the true nature unrecognisable as it were by means of false plaster or whitewash (מַטְפֵּל, to smear over, bedaub, as the Targumic, Talmudic, and Syriac show). If the heart of these men, who by slander make him into a caricature of himself, is covered as it were with thick fat (a figure of insensibility and obduracy, 17:10; 73: 7, Isa. 6:10, LXX ἐτυρώθη, Aquila ἐλιπάνθη, Symmachus ἐμυαλώθη) against all the impressions of the word of God, he, on the other hand, has his delight in the law of God (שִׂשְׁשׁוּ with an accusative of the object, not of that which is delighted, 94:19, but of that which delights). How beneficial has the school of affliction through which he has attained to this, been to him! The word proceeding from the mouth of God is now more precious to him than the greatest earthly riches.

*Psa. 119:73-80.* The eightfold *Jod*. God humbles, but He also exalts again according to His word; for this the poet prays in order that he may be a consolatory example to the God-fearing, to the confusion of his enemies. It is impossible that God should forsake man, who is His creature, and deny to him that which makes him truly happy, viz., the understanding and knowledge of His word. For this spiritual gift the poet prays in v. 73 (cf. on 73a, Deu. 32: 6, Job. 10: 8; 31:15); and he wishes in v. 74 that all who fear God may see in him with joy an example of the way in which trust in the word of God is rewarded (cf. Psa. 34: 3; 35:27; 69:33; 107:42, and other passages). He knows that God's acts of judgment are pure righteousness, i.e., regulated by God's holiness, out of which they spring, and by the salvation of men, at which they aim; and he knows that God has humbled him אִמְנָה (accus. adverb. for בְּאִמְנָה), being faithful in His intentions towards him; for it is just in the school of affliction that one first learns rightly to estimate the worth of His word, and comes to feel its power. But trouble, though sweetened by an insight into God's salutary design, is nevertheless always bitter; hence the well-justified prayer of v. 76, that God's mercy may notwithstanding be bestowed upon him for his consolation, in accordance with the promise which is become his (לְּ as in 49a), His servant's. עֲוֹת, v. 78, instead of being construed with the accusative of the right, or of the cause, that is perverted, is construed with the accusative of the person upon whom such perversion of right, such oppression by means of misrepresentation, is inflicted, as in Job. 19: 6, Lam. 3:36. Chajug' reads עֲוֹדוֹנִי as in v. 61. The wish expressed in v. 79 is to be understood according to Psa. 73:10, Jer. 15:19, cf. Pro. 9: 4, 16. If instead of וְיִדְעֵי (which is favoured by v. 63), we read according to the *Chethib* וְיִדְעוּ (cf. v. 125), then what is meant by יָשׁוּבוּ לִי is a turning towards him for the purpose of learning: may their knowledge be enriched from his experience. For himself, however, in v. 80 he desires unreserved, faultless, unwavering adherence to

God's word, for only thus is he secure against being ignominiously undeceived.

*Psa. 119:81-88.* The eightfold *Kaph*. This strengthening according to God's promise is his earnest desire (בְּפָאָה) now, when within a very little his enemies have compassed his ruin (בְּפִלְאָה). His soul and eyes languish (בְּפִלְאָה as in Psa. 69: 4; 84: 3, cf. Job. 19:27) for God's salvation, that it may be unto him according to God's word or promise, that this word may be fulfilled. In v. 83 פִּי is hypothetical, as in 21:12 and frequently; here, as perhaps also in Psa. 27:10, in the sense of "although" (Ew. § 362, *b*). He does not suffer anything to drive God's word out of his mind, although he is already become like a leathern bottle blackened and shrivelled up in the smoke. The custom of the ancients of placing jars with wine over the smoke in order to make the wine prematurely old, i.e., to mellow it (vid., Rosenmüller), does not yield anything towards the understanding of this passage: the skin-bottle that is not intended for present use is hung up on high; and the fact that it had to withstand the upward ascending smoke is intelligible, notwithstanding the absence of any mention of the chimney. The point of comparison, in which we agree for the most part with Hitzig, is the removal of him who in his dungeon is continually exposed to the drudgery of his persecutors. בְּפִמָּה in v. 84 is equivalent to "how few." Our life here below is short, so also is the period within which the divine righteousness can reveal itself. שִׁחֹת (instead of which the LXX erroneously reads שִׁחֹת), pits, is an old word, Psa. 57: 7. The relative clause, v. 85*b*, describes the "proud" as being a contradiction to the revealed law; for there was no necessity for saying that to dig a pit for others is not in accordance with this law. All God's commandments are an emanation of His faithfulness, and therefore too demand faithfulness; but it is just this faithfulness that makes the poet an object of deadly hatred. They have already almost destroyed him "in the land." It is generally rendered "on earth;" but "in heaven" at the beginning of the following octonary is too far removed to be an antithesis to it, nor does it sound like one (cf. on the other hand ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, Mat. 5:12). It is therefore: in the land (cf. Psa. 58: 3; 73: 9), where they think they are the only ones who have any right there, they have almost destroyed him, without shaking the constancy of his faith. But he stands in need of fresh grace in order that he may not, however, at last succumb.

*Psa. 119:89-96.* The eightfold *Lamed*. Eternal and imperishable in the constant verifying of itself is the vigorous and consolatory word of God, to which the poet will ever cling. It has heaven as its standing-place, and therefore it also has the qualities of heaven, and before all others, heaven-like stability. Psalm 89 (v. 3) uses similar language in reference to God's faithfulness, of which here v. 90 says that it endureth into all generations. The

earth hath He creatively set up, and it standeth, viz., as a practical proof and as a scene of His infinite, unchangeable faithfulness. Heaven and earth are not the subjects of v. 91 (Hupfeld), for only the earth is previously mentioned; the reference to the heavens in v. 89 is of a very different character. Hitzig and others see the subject in **לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ**: with respect to Thy judgments, they stand fast unto this day; but the **עֲבָדֶיךָ** which follows requires another meaning to be assigned to **עֲמָדוֹ**: either of taking up one's place ready for service, or, since **עַמְד לְמִשְׁפָּט** is a current phrase in Num. 35:12, Jos. 20: 6, Eze. 44:24, of placing one's self ready to obey (Böttcher). The subject of **עֲמָדוֹ**, as the following **הַכֹּל** shows, is meant to be thought of in the most general sense (cf. Job. 38:14): all beings are God's servants (subjects), and have accordingly to be obedient and humble before His judicial decisions — **הַיּוֹם**, "even to this day," the poet adds, for these judicial decisions are those which are formulated beforehand in the *Tōra*. Joy in this ever sure, all-conditioning word has upheld the poet in his affliction, v. 92. He who has been persecuted and cast down as it were to death, owes his reviving to it, v. 93. From Him whose possession or property he is in faith and love he also further looks for his salvation, v. 94. Let evil-doers lie in wait for him (**קָוֶה** in a hostile sense, as in Psa. 56: 7, **קָנָה**, cf. **חָבָה**, going back to **קָנָה**, Arab. *qawiya*, with the broad primary signification, to be tight, firm, strong) to destroy him, he meditates on God's testimonies. He knows from experience that all (earthly) perfection (**תְּכֵלֵה**) has an end (inasmuch as, having reached its height, it changes into its opposite); God's commandment (singular as in Deu. 11:22), on the contrary, is exceeding broad (cf. Job. 11: 9), unlimited in its duration and verification.

*Psa. 119:97-104.* The eightfold *Mem*. The poet praises the practical wisdom which the word of God, on this very account so sweet to him, teaches. God's precious law, with which he unceasingly occupies himself, makes him superior in wisdom (Deu. 4: 6), intelligence, and judgment to his enemies, his teachers, and the aged (Job. 12:20). There were therefore at that time teachers and elders (**πρεσβύτεροι**), who (like the Hellenizing Sadducees) were not far from apostasy in their laxness, and hostilely persecuted the young and strenuous zealot for God's law. The construction of v. 98*a* is like Joe. 1:20, Isa. 59:12, and frequently. **הָאֵלֹהִים** refers to the commandments in their unity: he has taken possession of them for ever (cf. v. 111*a*). The Mishna (*Aboth* iv. 1) erroneously interprets: from all my teachers do I acquire understanding. All three **מִן** in vv. 98-100 signify *prae* (LXX **ὑπέρ**). In **בְּלֹאֲתִי**, v. 101*a*, from the mode of writing we see the verb *Lamed Aleph* passing over into the verb *Lamed He*. **הוֹרְתֵנִי** is, as in Pro. 4:11 (cf. Exo. 4:15), a defective mode of writing for **נִמְלָצוּ הוֹרֵיתֵנִי**, v. 103*a*, is not equivalent to **נִמְרָצוּ**, Job. 6:25



(vid., *Job*, at 6:25; 16: 2-5), but signifies, in consequence of the dative of the object **לְחֶבְרֵי**, that which easily enters, or that which tastes good (LXX ὡς γλυκέα); therefore surely from **מִלֵּךְ = מִלֵּט**, to be smooth: how smooth, entering easily (Pro. 23:31), are Thy words (promises) to my palate or taste! The collective singular **אֲמֵרֶתֶךָ** is construed with a plural of the predicate (cf. Exo. 1:10). He has no taste for the God-estranged present, but all the stronger taste for God's promised future. From God's laws he acquires the capacity for proving the spirits, therefore he hates every path of falsehood (= v. 128*b*), i.e., all the heterodox tendencies which agree with the spirit of the age.

*Psa. 119:105-112.* The eightfold *Nun*. The word of God is his constant guide, to which he has entrusted himself for ever. The way here below is a way through darkness, and leads close past abysses: in this danger of falling and of going astray the word of God is a lamp to his feet, i.e., to his course, and a light to his path (Pro. 6:23); his lamp or torch and his sun. That which he has sworn, viz., to keep God's righteous requirements, he has also set up, i.e., brought to fulfilment, but not without being bowed down under heavy afflictions in confessing God; wherefore he prays (as in v. 25) that God would revive him in accordance with His word, which promises life to those who keep it. The confessions of prayer coming from the inmost impulse of his whole heart, in which he owns his indebtedness and gives himself up entirely to God's mercy, he calls the free-will offerings of his mouth in v. 108 (cf. Psa. 50:14; 19:15). He bases the prayer for a gracious acceptance of these upon the fact of his being reduced to extremity. "To have one's soul in one's hand" is the same as to be in conscious peril of one's life, just as "to take one's soul into one's hand" (Jud. 12: 3, 1Sa. 19: 5; 28:21, Job. 13:14) is the same as to be ready to give one's life for it, to risk one's life. <sup>373</sup>

Although his life is threatened (v. 87), yet he does not waver and depart from God's word; he has taken and obtained possession of God's testimonies for ever (cf. v. 98); they are his "heritage," for which he willingly gives up everything else, for they (**הַמָּה** inexactly for **הַנָּה**) it is which bless and entrance him in his inmost soul. In v. 112 it is not to be interpreted after Psa. 19:12: eternal is the reward (of the carrying out of Thy precepts), but in v. 33 **עֲקֹב** is equivalent to **לֵאד**, and v. 44 proves that v. 112*b* need not be a thought that is complete in itself.

*Psa. 119:113-120.* The eightfold *Samech*. His hope rests on God's word, without allowing itself to be led astray by doubters and apostates. **סַעֲפִים** (the form of nouns which indicate defects or failings) are those inwardly divided, halting between two opinions (**סַעֲפִים**), 1Ki. 18:21, who do homage partly to the worship of Jahve, partly to heathenism, and therefore are trying to combine

faith and naturalism. In contrast to such, the poet's love, faith, and hope are devoted entirely to the God of revelation; and to all those who are desirous of drawing him away he addresses in v. 115 (cf. 6: 9) an indignant "depart." He, however, stands in need of grace in order to persevere and to conquer. For this he prays in vv. 116, 117. The **מן** in **משברִי** is the same as in **בוש מן**. The *ah* of **ואַשְׁעָה** is the intentional *ah* (Ew. § 228, c), as in Isa. 41:23. The statement of the ground of the **סְלִית**, *vilipendis*, does not mean: unsuccessful is their deceit (Hengstenberg, Olshausen), but falsehood without the consistency of truth is their self-deceptive and seductive tendency. The LXX and Syriac read **תַּרְעִיתָם**, "their sentiment;" but this is an Aramaic word that is unintelligible in Hebrew, which the old translators have conjured into the text only on account of an apparent tautology. The reading **חֲשַׁבְתָּ** or **חֲשַׁבְתָּ** (Aquila, Symmachus, and Jerome; LXX **ἔλογισάμην**, therefore **חֲשַׁבְתִּי**) instead of **חֲשַׁבְתָּ** might more readily be justified in v. 119a; but the former gives too narrow a meaning, and the reading rests on a mistaking of the construction of **הַשְׁבִּית** with an accusative of the object and of the effect: all the wicked, as many of them as are on the earth, dost Thou put away as dross (**סְגִים**). Accordingly **משפּטֶיךָ** in v. 120 are God's punitive judgments, or rather (cf. v. 91) God's laws (judgments) according to which He judges. What is meant are sentences of punishment, as in Leviticus 26, Deuteronomy 28. Of these the poet is afraid, for omnipotence can change words into deeds forthwith. In fear of the God who has attested Himself in Exo. 34: 7 and elsewhere, his skin shudders and his hair stands on end.

**Psa. 119:121-128.** The eightfold *Ajin*. In the present time of apostasy and persecution he keeps all the more strictly to the direction of the divine word, and commends himself to the protection and teaching of God. In the consciousness of his godly behaviour (elsewhere always **צַדִּיק וּמִשְׁפָּט**, here in one instance **משפּט וְצַדִּיק**) the poet hopes that God will surely not (**בִּל**) leave him to the arbitrary disposal of his oppressors. This hope does not, however, raise him above the necessity and duty of constant prayer that Jahve would place Himself between him and his enemies. **עָרַב** *seq. acc.* signifies to stand in any one's place as furnishing a guarantee, and in general as a mediator, Job. 17: 3, Isa. 38:14; **לְטוֹב** similar to **לְטֹבָה**, Psa. 86:17, Neh. 5:19: in my behalf, for my real advantage. The expression of longing after redemption in v. 123 sounds like vv. 81 f. "The word of Thy righteousness" is the promise which proceeds from God's "righteousness," and as surely as He is "righteous" cannot remain unfulfilled. The one chief petition of the poet, however, to which he comes back in vv. 124 f., has reference to the ever deeper knowledge of the word of God; for this knowledge is in itself at once life and blessedness,

and the present calls most urgently for it. For the great multitude (which is the subject to **הַפְּרוּ**) practically and fundamentally break God's law; it is therefore time to act for Jahve (**עֲשֵׂה לְ** as in Gen. 30:30, Isa. 64: 3 [4], Eze. 29:20), and just in order to this there is need of well-grounded, reliable knowledge. Therefore the poet attaches himself with all his love to God's commandments; to him they are above gold and fine gold (Psa. 19:11), which he might perhaps gain by a disavowal of them. Therefore he is as strict as he possibly can be with God's word, inasmuch as he acknowledges and observes all precepts of all things (**כָּל-פְּקוּדֵי כָל**), i.e., all divine precepts, let them have reference to whatsoever they will, as **יִשְׂרָיִם**, right (**יִשְׂרָ**, to declare both in avowal and deed to be right); and every false (lying) tendency, all pseudo-Judaism, he hates. It is true v. 126a may be also explained: it is time that Jahve should act, i.e., interpose judicially; but this thought is foreign to the context, and affords no equally close union for **עַל-כֵּן**; moreover it ought then to have been accented **עַתָּה לַעֲשׂוֹת לַיהוָה**. On **כָּל-פְּקוּדֵי כָל**, "all commands of every purport," cf. Isa. 29:11, and more as to form, Num. 8:16, Eze. 44:30. The expression is purposely thus heightened; and the correction **כָּל-פְּקוּדֵיךָ** (Ewald, Olshausen, and Hupfeld) is also superfluous, because the reference of what is said to the God of revelation is self-evident in this connection.

*Psa. 119:129-136.* The eightfold *Phe*. The deeper his depression of spirit concerning those who despise the word of God, the more ardently does he yearn after the light and food of that word. The testimonies of God are **פְּלִאוֹת**, wonderful and strange (paradoxical) things, exalted above every-day life and the common understanding. In this connection of the thoughts **נִצְרָתָם** is not intended of careful observance, but of attentive contemplation that is prolonged until a clear penetrating understanding of the matter is attained. The opening, disclosure (**פְּתִיחָה**, *apertio*, with *Tsere* in distinction from **פְּתָחָה**, *porta*) of God's word giveth light, inasmuch as it makes the simple (**פְּתִיִים**) as in Pro. 22: 3) wise or sagacious; in connection with which it is assumed that it is God Himself who unfolds the mysteries of His word to those who are anxious to learn. Such an one, anxious to learn, is the poet: he pants with open mouth, viz., for the heavenly fare of such disclosures (**פָּאֵר פָּה** like **פָּאֵר** in Job. 29:23, cf. Psa. 81:11). **אֵב** is a hapaxlegomenon, just as **תֵּאֵב** is also exclusively peculiar to the Psalm before us; both are secondary forms of **אָבָה**. Love to God cannot indeed remain unresponded to. The experience of helping grace is a right belonging to those who love the God of revelation; love in return for love, salvation in return for the longing for salvation, is their prerogative. On the ground of this reciprocal relation the petitions in vv. 133-135 are then put up, coming back at last to the one chief prayer "teach me."

**אמרה**, v. 133, is not merely a “promise” in this instance, but the declared will of God in general. **כָּל-אֵוֶן** refers pre-eminently to all sin of disavowal (denying God), into which he might fall under outward and inward pressure (**עֲשָׂק**). For he has round about him those who do not keep God’s law. On account of these apostates (**אֵל לֹא** as in Isa. 53: 9, equivalent to **עַל-אֲשֶׁר לֹא**) his eyes run down rivers of water (**יָרַד** as in Lam. 3:48, with an accusative of the object). His mood is not that of unfeeling self-glorying, but of sorrow like that of Jeremiah, because of the contempt of Jahve, and the self-destruction of those who contemn Him.

*Psa. 119:137-144.* The eightfold *Tsade*. God rules righteously and faithfully according to His word, for which the poet is accordingly zealous, although young and despised. The predicate **יָשַׁר** in v. 137b precedes its subject **מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ** (God’s decisions in word and in deed) in the primary form (after the model of the verbal clause Psa. 124: 5), just as in German [and English] the predicative adjective remains undeclined. The accusatives **צְדָקָה** and **אֱמוּנָה** in v. 138 are not predicative (Hitzig), to which the former (“as righteousness”) — not the latter however — is not suited, but adverbial accusatives (in righteousness, in faithfulness), and **מֵאֵד** according to its position is subordinate to **ואמונה** as a virtual adjective (cf. Isa. 47: 9): the requirements of the revealed law proceed from a disposition towards and mode of dealing with men which is strictly determined by His holiness (**צְדָקָה**), and beyond measure faithfully and honestly designs the well-being of men (**מֵאֵד אֱמוּנָה**). To see this good law of God despised by his persecutors stirs the poet up with a zeal, which brings him, from their side, to the brink of extreme destruction (Psa. 69:10, cf. **צְמִתָּה**, Psa. 88:17). God’s own utterance is indeed without spot, and therefore not to be carped at; it is pure, fire-proved, noblest metal (Psa. 18:31; 12: 7), therefore he loves it, and does not, though young (LXX *νεώτερος*, Vulgate *adolescentulus*) and lightly esteemed, care for the remonstrances of his proud opponents who are old and more learned than himself (the organization of v. 141 is like v. 95, and frequently). The righteousness (**צְדָקָה**) of the God of revelation becomes eternal righteousness (**צְדָקָה**), and His law remains eternal truth (**אֱמֶת**). **צְדָקָה** is here the name of the attribute and of the action that is conditioned in accordance with it; **צְדָקָה** the name of the state that thoroughly accords with the idea of that which is right. So too in v. 144: **צְדָקָה** are Jahve’s testimonies for ever, so that all creatures must give glory to their harmony with that which is absolutely right. To look ever deeper and deeper into this their perfection is the growing life of the spirit. The poet prays for this vivifying insight.

*Psa. 119:145-152.* The eightfold *Kaph*. Fidelity to God' word, and deliverance according to His promise, is the purport of his unceasing prayer. Even in the morning twilight (נֶשֶׁף) he was awake praying. It is not הַנֶּשֶׁף, I anticipated the twilight; nor is קִדְמָתִי, according to Psa. 84:14, equivalent to קִדְמָתִיךָ, but וְאֲשִׁנָּא ... קִדְמָתִי is the resolution of the otherwise customary construction קִדְמָתִי לְשִׁנָּא, Jon. 4: 2, inasmuch as קִדְמָה may signify "to go before" (Psa. 68:26), and also "to make haste (with anything):" even early before the morning's dawn I cried. Instead of לְדַבְרֶיךָ the *Kerî* (Targum, Syriac, Jerome) more appropriately reads לְדַבְרֶיךָ after vv. 74, 81, 114. But his eyes also anticipated the night-watches, inasmuch as they did not allow themselves to be caught not sleeping by any of them at their beginning (cf. לְרֵאשִׁית, Lam. 2:19). אֲמָרָה is here, as in vv. 140, 158, and frequently, the whole word of God, whether in its requirements or its promises. In v. 149 כְּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ is a defective plural as in v. 43 (vid., on v. 37), according to v. 156, although according to v. 132 the singular (LXX, Targum, Jerome) would also be admissible: what is meant is God's order of salvation, or His appointments that relate thereto. The correlative relation of vv. 150 and 151 is rendered natural by the position of the words. With קָרָבִי (cf. קָרַב) is associated the idea of rushing upon him with hostile purpose, and with קָרוֹב, as in Psa. 69:19, Isa. 58: 2, of hastening to his succour. זְמָה is infamy that is branded by the law: they go forth purposing this, but God's law is altogether self-verifying truth. And the poet has long gained the knowledge from it that it does not aim at merely temporary recompense. The sophisms of the apostates cannot therefore lead him astray. וְיִסְדָּתֵךְ for יִסְדָּתֵךְ, like הֶמָּה in v. 111.

*Psa. 119:153-160.* The eightfold *Resh*. Because God cannot suffer those who are faithful to His word to succumb, he supplicates His help against his persecutors. רִיבָה is *Milra* before the initial (half-guttural) *Resh*, as in Psa. 43: 1; 74:22. The *Lamed* of לְאֲמָרָתֶךָ is the *Lamed* of reference (with respect to Thine utterance), whether the reference be normative (= כְּאֲמָרָתֶךָ, v. 58), as in Isa. 11: 3, or causal, 25: 2, Isa. 55: 5, Job. 42: 5. The predicate רָחוֹק, like יָשָׁר in v. 137, stands first in the primary, as yet indefinite form. Concerning v. 156b vid., on v. 149. At the sight of the faithless he felt a profound disgust; וְאֲתַקְנִי מִטָּה, pausal aorist, supply בָּהֶם, Psa. 139:21. It is all the same in the end whether we render אֲשֶׁר *quippe qui* or *siquidem*. רֵאשִׁית in v. 160 signifies the head-number of sum. If he reckons up the word of God in its separate parts and as a whole, truth is the denominator of the whole, truth is the sum-total. This supplicatory אֲיִנִּי is repeated three times in this group. The nearer it draws towards its end the more importunate does the Psalm become.

*Psa. 119:161-168.* The eightfold **ש** (both *Shin* and *Sin* <sup>f374</sup>). In the midst of persecution God's word was still his fear, his joy, and his love, the object of his thanksgiving, and the ground of his hope. Princes persecute him without adequate cause, but his heart does not fear before them, but before God's words (the *Kerî* likes the singular, as in v. 147), to deny which would be to him the greatest possible evil. It is, however, a fear that is associated with heartfelt joy (v. 111). It is the joy of a conflict that is rewarded by rich spoil (Jud. 5:30, Isa. 9: 2 [3]). Not merely morning and evening, not merely three times a day (Psa. 55:18), but seven times (**שִׁבְעַ** as in Lev. 26:18, Pro. 24:16), i.e., ever again and again, availing himself of every prayerful impulse, he gives thanks to God for His word, which so righteously decides and so correctly guides, is a source of transcendent peace to all who love it, and beside which one is not exposed to any danger of stumbling (**מִכְשׁוֹל**, LXX **σκάνδαλον**, cf. 1Jo. 2:10) without some effectual counter-working. In v. 166*a* he speaks like Jacob in Gen. 49:18, and can speak thus, inasmuch as he has followed earnestly and untiringly after sanctification. He endeavours to keep God's law most conscientiously, in proof of which he is able to appeal to God the Omniscient One. **שְׁמֵרָה** is here the 3*rd praet.*, whereas in 86: 2 it is *imperat.* The future of **אֶהְיֶה** is both **אֶהְיֶה** and **אֶהְיֶה**, just as of **אֶחָזֵק** both **אֶחָזֵק** and **אֶחָזֵק**.

*Psa. 119:169-176.* The eightfold *Tav*. May God answer this his supplication as He has heard his praise, and interest Himself on behalf of His servant, the sheep that is exposed to great danger. The petitions "give me understanding" and "deliver me" go hand-in-hand, because the poet is one who is persecuted for the sake of his faith, and is just as much in need of the fortifying of his faith as of deliverance from the outward restraint that is put upon him. **רְנָה** is a shrill audible prayer; **תְּחַנֵּנָה**, a fervent and urgent prayer. **עֲנֵנָה**, prop. to answer, signifies in v. 172 to begin, strike up, attune (as does **ἀποκρίνεσθαι** also sometimes). According to the rule in Psa. 50:23 the poet bases his petition for help upon the purpose of thankful praise of God and of His word. Knowing how to value rightly what he possesses, he is warranted in further supplicating and hoping for the good that he does not as yet possess. The "salvation" for which he longs (**תְּשׁוּבָה** as in vv. 40, 20) is redemption from the evil world, in which the life of his own soul is imperilled. May then God's judgments (defective plural, as in vv. 43, 149, which the Syriac only takes a singular) succour him (**יְעֲזָרֵנִי**, not **יֵאֲזָרֵנִי**). God's hand, v. 173, and God's word afford him succour; the two are involved in one another, the word is the medium of His hand. After this relationship of the poet to God's word, which is attested a hundredfold in the Psalm, it may seem strange that he can say of himself **אֶבְדָּה** **תְּעִיתִי בְּשֵׁה**; and perhaps the accentuation is correct when it does not allow

itself to be determined by Isa. 53: 6, but interprets: If I have gone astray — seek Thou like a lost sheep Thy servant. שֶׁה אֶבֶד is a sheep that is lost (cf. אֶבְדִים as an appellation of the dispersion, Isa. 27:13) and in imminent danger of total destruction (cf. Psa. 31:13 with Lev. 26:38). In connection with that interpretation which is followed by the interpunction, v. 176b is also more easily connected with what precedes: his going astray is no apostasy; his home, to which he longs to return when he has been betrayed into by-ways, is beside the Lord.

## The Fifteen Songs of Degrees, or Gradual Psalms

### PSALM 120-134

*Psalm 120-134.* These songs are all inscribed שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת. The LXX, according to the most natural signification of the word, renders: ὠδὴ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν; the Italic and Vulgate, *canticum graduum* (whence the liturgical term “gradual Psalms”). The meaning at the same time remains obscure. When, however, Theodotion renders ἄσμα τῶν ἀναβάσεων, Aquila and Symmachus ὠδὴ εἰς τὰς ἀναβάσεις (as though it were absolutely לַמַּעֲלוֹת, as in Psa. 121: 1), it looks even like an explanation. The fathers, more particularly Theodoret, and in general the Syria church, associate with it the idea of ἡ ἀπὸ Βαβυλῶνος ἐπάνοδος. Ewald has long advocated this view. In his Introduction to *Die poetischen Bücher des Alten Bundes* (1839), and elsewhere, he translated it “Songs of the Pilgrim caravans” or “of the homeward marches,” and explained these fifteen Psalms as old and new travelling songs of those returning from the Exile. The verb עָלָה certainly is the usual word for journeying to Palestine out of the Babylonian low country, as out of the country of the Egyptian Nile Valley. And the fact that the Return from the Exile is called הַמַּעֲלָה מִבָּבֶל in Ezr. 7: 9 is enticing. Some of these Psalms, as 121, 123-125, 129, 130, 132, 133, are also suited to this situation, or can at least be adapted to it. But Psalm 120, if it is to be referred to the Exile, is a song that comes out of the midst of it; Psalm 126 might, so far as its first half is concerned, be a travelling song of those returning, but according to its second half it is a prayer of those who have returned for the restoration of the whole of Israel, based upon thanksgiving; and Psalm 122 assumes the existence and frequenting of the Temple and of the holy city, and Psalm 134 the full exercise of the Temple-service. It is also inconvenient that מַעֲלָה, which in itself only expresses a journey up, not a journey homewards, is without any closer definition; and more particularly since, in connection with this form of the word, the signification of a something (a step, a sun-dial, rising thoughts. Eze. 11: 5) is at least just as natural as that of an action. שִׁיר הָעֲלִים

would have been at once palpable. And what is meant by the plural? The interpretation of the plural of the different caravans or companies in which the exiles returned, assumes a *usus loquendi* with which we are altogether unacquainted.

Relatively more probable is the reference to the pilgrimage-journeys at the three great feasts, — according to a later Hebrew expression, the **שְׁלֹשׁ רִגְלִים**. This going up to Jerusalem required by the Law is also usually called **עֲלָה**. So Agellius (1606), Herder, Eichhorn, Maurer, Hengstenberg, Keil, and others, and so now even Ewald in the second edition (1866) of the Introduction to *Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, so Kamphausen, and Reuss in his treatise *Chants de Pèlerinage ou petit Psautier des Pèlerins du second temple* (in the *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie*, i. 273-311), and Liebusch in the Quedlinburg Easter Programm, 1866: “The pilgrim songs in the Fifth Book of the Psalter.” But **מַעְלָה** in this signification is without precedent; and when Hupfeld says in opposition to this, “the fact that a noun accidentally does not occur in the Old Testament does not matter, since here at any rate it is a question of the interpretation of a later usage of the language,” we may reply that neither does the whole range of the post-biblical Hebrew exhibit any trace of this usage. Thenius accordingly tries another way of doing justice to the word. He understands **מַעְלוֹת** of the different stations, i.e., stages of the journey up, that are to be found in connection with the festive journeys to high-lying Jerusalem. But the right name for “stations” would be **מַסְעוֹת** or **מַעְמָדוֹת**; and besides, the notion borrowed from the processions to Mount Calvary is without historical support in the religious observances of Israel. Thus, then, the needful ground in language and custom for referring this title of the Psalms to the journeyings up to the feasts is taken from under us; and the consideration that the first three and the last three songs are suited to the hymn-book of a festal pilgrimage, and that they all bear in them, as Liebusch has demonstrated, the characteristic features of the spiritual national song, is not able to decide the doubtful meaning of **מַעְלוֹת**.

We will now put the later Jewish interpretation to the proof. According to *Middoth* ii. 5, *Succa* 15b, a semi-circular staircase with fifteen steps led out of the court of the Israelitish men (**עֲזֶרֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל**) down into the court of the women (**עֲזֶרֶת נָשִׁים**), and upon these fifteen steps, which correspond to the fifteen gradual Psalms, the Levites played musical instruments on the evening of the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles in connection with the joyful celebration of the water-drawing, <sup>f375</sup> and above them in the portal (upon the threshold of the Nicanor-gate or Agrippa-gate <sup>f376</sup>) stood two priests with trumpets. It has been said that this is a Talmudic fable invented on behalf of



the inscription **שיר המעלות**, and that the fifteen steps are not out of Eze. 40:26, 31 by reading the two verses together. This aspersion is founded on ignorance. For the Talmud does not say in that passage that the fifteen Psalms have taken their name from the fifteen steps; it does not once say that these Psalms in particular were read aloud upon the fifteen steps, but it only places the fifteen steps on a parallel with the fifteen Psalms; and, moreover, interprets the name **שיר המעלות** quite differently, viz., from a legend concerning David and Ahithophel, *Succa 53a, Maccoth 11a* (differently rendered in the section *Chelek* of the tractate *Sanhedrin* in the Jerusalem Talmud). This legend to which the Targum inscription relates (vid., Buxtorf, *Lex. Talmud. s.v. קפא*) is absurd enough, but it has nothing to do with the fifteen steps. It is not until a later period that Jewish expositors say that the fifteen Psalms had their name from the fifteen steps. <sup>1377</sup>

Even Hippolytus must have heard something similar when he says (p. 190, *ed. Lagarde*): **πάλιν τε αὐτοῦ εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν ὧδαί, τὸν ἀριθμὸν πεντεκαίδεκα, ὅσοι καὶ οἱ ἀναβαθμοὶ τοῦ ναοῦ, τάχα δελοῦσαι τὰς ἀναβάσεις περιέχεσθαι ἐν τῷ ἑβδόμῳ καὶ ὄγδῳ ἀριθμῷ**, upon which Hilary relies: *esse autem in templo gradus quindecim historia nobis locuta est*; viz., 15 (7 + 8) steps leading out of the court of the priests into the Holy of holies. In this, then, the allegory in which the interpretation of the church delighted for a long time seemed naturally at hand, viz., as Otmar Nachtgal explains, “Song of the steps or ascents, which indicate the spirit of those who ascend from earthly things to God.” The furtmaier Codex in Maihingen accordingly inscribes them “Psalm of the first step” (*Psalm der ersten staffeln*), and so on. If we leave this *sensus anagogicus* to itself, then the title, referred to the fifteen steps, would indeed not be inappropriate in itself (cf. *Graduale* or *Gradale* in the service of the Romish Church), but is of an external character such as we find nowhere else. <sup>1378</sup>

Gesenius has the merit of having first discerned the true meaning of the questioned inscription, inasmuch as first in 1812 (*Hallische Lit. Zeitschrift*, 1812, Nr. 205), and frequently since that time, he has taught that the fifteen songs have their name from their step-like progressive rhythm of the thoughts, and that consequently the name, like the triolet (roundelay) in Western poetry, does not refer to the liturgical usage, but to the technical structure. The correctness of this view has been duly appraised more particularly by De Wette, who adduces this rhythm of steps or degrees, too, among the more artificial rhythms. The songs are called Songs of degrees or Gradual Psalms as being songs that move onward towards a climax, and that by means of **πλοκή**, **ἐπιπλοκή**, i.e., a taking up again of the immediately preceding word by way of giving intensity to the expression; and they are placed together on account of this common characteristic, just like the *Michtammim*, which bear that name

from a similar characteristic. The fact, as Liebusch objects, that there is no trace of מעלות in this figurative signification elsewhere, is of no consequence, since in the inscriptions of the Psalms in general we become acquainted with a technical language which (apart from a few echoes in the Chronicles) is without example elsewhere, in relation to poetical and musical technology. Neither are we refuted by the fact that this as it were climbing movement of the thoughts which plants upon a preceding word, and thus carried itself forward, is not without example even outside the range of these fifteen songs in the Psalter itself (e.g., 93, 96), as also elsewhere (Isa. 17:12 f., 26: 5 f., and more particularly in the song of Deborah, Jud. 5: 3, 5, 6, etc.), and that it is not always carried out in the same manner in the fifteen Psalms. It is quite sufficient that the parallelism retires into the background here as nowhere else in fifteen songs that are linked together (even in 125, 127, 128, 132); and the onward course is represented with decided preference as a gradation or advance step by step, that which follows being based upon what goes before, and from that point advancing and ascending still higher.

## **Psalm 120**

### **CRY OF DISTRESS WHEN SURROUNDED BY CONTENTIOUS MEN**

*120: 1 TO Jahve in my distress  
Do I cry, and He answereth me.*

*120: 2 O Jahve, deliver my soul from a lying lip,  
From a crafty tongue!*

*120: 3 What shall He give to thee, and what shall He further give to thee,  
Thou crafty tongue?*

*120: 4 Arrows of a mighty one, sharpened,  
Together with coals of broom.*

*120: 5 Woe is me that I sojourn in Meshech,  
That I dwell beside the tents of Kedar!*

*120: 6 Long enough hath my soul dwelt  
With those who hate peace.*

*120: 7 I am peace; yet when I speak,  
They are for war.*

*Psalm 120.* This first song of degrees attaches itself to Psa. 119:187. The writer of Psalm 119, surrounded on all sides by apostasy and persecution, compares himself to a sheep that is easily lost, which the shepherd has to seek and bring home if it is not to perish; and the writer of Psalm 120 is also “as a sheep in the midst of wolves.” The period at which he lived is uncertain, and it

is consequently also uncertain whether he had to endure such endless malignant attacks from foreign barbarians or from his own worldly-minded fellow-countrymen. E. Tilling has sought to establish a third possible occasion in his *Disquisitio de ratione inscript. XV Pss. grad.* (1765). He derives this and the following songs of degrees from the time immediately succeeding the Return from the Exile, when the secret and open hostility of the Samaritans and other neighbouring peoples (Neh. 2:10, 19; 4: 1 [7], 6: 1) sought to keep down the rise of the young colony.

*Psa. 120: 1-4.* According to the pointing **וַיַּעֲנֵנִי**, the poet appears to base his present petition, which from v. 2 onwards is the substance of the whole Psalm, upon the fact of a previous answering of his prayers. For the petition in v. 2 manifestly arises out of his deplorable situation, which is described in vv. 5 ff. Nevertheless there are also other instances in which **וַיַּעֲנֵנִי** might have been expected, where the pointing is **וַיַּעֲנֵנִי** (Psa. 3: 5, Jon. 2: 3), so that consequently **וַיַּעֲנֵנִי** may, without any prejudice to the pointing, be taken as a believing expression of the result (cf. the future of the consequence in Job. 9:16) of the present cry for help. **צָרָתָהּ**, according to the original signification, is a form of the definition of a state or condition, as in Psa. 3: 3; 44:27; 63: 8, Jon. 2:10, Hos. 8: 7, and **בַּצָּרָתָהּ לִי** = **בַּצָּר־לִי**, Psa. 18: 7, is based upon the customary expression **צָר לִי**. In v. 2 follows the petition which the poet sends up to Jahve in the certainty of being answered. **רַמְיָהּ** beside **לְשׁוֹן**, although there is no *masc.* **רַמִּי** (cf. however the Aramaic **רַמִּי**, **רַמְיָא**), is taken as an adjective after the form **מַרְיָהּ**, **עֲנִיָּה**, which it is also perhaps in Mic. 6:12. The parallelism would make **לְשׁוֹן** natural, like **מַרְמָה** **לְשׁוֹן** in Psa. 52: 6; the pointing, which nevertheless disregarded this, will therefore rest upon tradition. The apostrophe in v. 3 is addressed to the crafty tongue. **לְשׁוֹן** is certainly feminine as a rule; but whilst the tongue as such is feminine, the **לְשׁוֹן רַמְיָהּ** of the address, as in Psa. 52: 6, refers to him who has such a kind of tongue (cf. Hitzig on Pro. 12:27), and thereby the **לָךְ** is justified; whereas the rendering, “what does it bring to thee, and what does it profit thee?” or, “of what use to thee and what advancement to thee is the crafty tongue?” is indeed possible so far as concerns the syntax (Ges. § 147, e), but is unlikely as being ambiguous and confusing in expression. It is also to be inferred from the correspondence between **מַה־יִּתֵּן לָךְ וּמַה־יִּסֹּף לָךְ** and the formula of an oath **כִּי יַעֲשֶׂה־לְךָ אֱלֹהִים וְכִי יוֹסִיף**, 1Sa. 3:17; 20:13; 25:22, 2Sa. 3:35, Rut. 1:17, that God is to be thought of as the subject of **יִתֵּן** and **יִסֹּף**: “what will,” or rather, in accordance with the otherwise precative use of the formula and with the petition that here precedes: “what shall He (is He to)

give to thee (תָּתַן as in Hos. 9:14), and what shall He add to thee, thou crafty tongue?” The reciprocal relation of v. 4a to מַה־יִתֵּן, and of. v. 4b with the superadding עַם to מַה־יִסִּיף, shows that v. 4 is not now a characterizing of the tongue that continues the apostrophe to it, as Ewald supposes. Consequently v. 4 gives the answer to v. 3 with the twofold punishment which Jahve will cause the false tongue to feel. The question which the poet, sure of the answering of his cry for help, puts to the false tongue is designed to let the person addressed hear by a flight of sarcasm what he has to expect. The evil tongue is a sharp sword (Psa. 57: 5), a pointed arrow (Jer. 9: 7 [8]), and it is like a fire kindled of hell (Jam. 3: 6). The punishment, too, corresponds to this its nature and conduct (Psa. 64: 4). The “mighty one” (LXX δυνατός) is God Himself, as it is observed in *B. Erachin 15b* with a reference to Isa. 42:13: “There is none mighty by the Holy One, blessed is He.” He requites the evil tongue like with like. Arrows and coals (Psa. 140:11) appear also in other instances among His means of punishment. It, which shot piercing arrows, is pierced by the sharpened arrows of an irresistibly mighty One; it, which set its neighbour in a fever of anguish, must endure the lasting, sure, and torturingly consuming heat of broom-coals. The LXX renders it in a general sense, σὺν τοῖς ἀνθραξι τοῖς ἐρημικοῖς; Aquila, following Jewish tradition, ἀρκευθίνας; but תַּבְּרָה, Arabic *ratam, ratem*, is the broom-shrub (e.g., uncommonly frequent in the *Belka*).

*Psa. 120: 5-7.* Since arrows and broom-fire, with which the evil tongue is requited, even now proceed from the tongue itself, the poet goes on with the deep heaving אֲנִיָּה (only found here). נָגַר with the accusative of that beside which one sojourns, as in Psa. 5: 5, Isa. 33:14, Jud. 5:17. The Moschi (מֹשֶׁךְ, the name of which the LXX takes as an appellative in the signification of long continuance; cf. the reverse instance in Isa. 66:19 LXX) dwelt between the Black and the Caspian Seas, and it is impossible to dwell among them and the inhabitants of Kedar (vid., Psa. 83: 7) at one and the same time. Accordingly both these names of peoples are to be understood emblematically, with Saadia, Calvin, Amyraldus, and others, of *homines similes ejusmodi barbaris et truculentis nationibus.* <sup>f379</sup>

Meshech is reckoned to Magog in Eze. 38: 2, and the Kedarites are possessed by the lust of possession (Gen. 16:12) of the *bellum omnium contra omnes*. These rough and quarrelsome characters have surrounded the poet (and his fellow-countrymen, with whom he perhaps comprehends himself) too long already. רָבַת, abundantly (vid., Psa. 65:10), appears, more particularly in 2Ch. 30:17 f., as a later prose word. The לָהּ, which throws the action back upon the subject, gives a pleasant, lively colouring to the declaration, as in Psa. 122: 3; 123: 4. He on his part is peace (cf. Mic. 5: 4 [5], Psa. 119: 4;

110: 3), inasmuch as the love of peace, willingness to be at peace, and a desire for peace fill his sou; but if he only opens his mouth, they are for war, they are abroad intent on war, their mood and their behaviour become forthwith hostile. Ewald (§ 362, *b*) construes it (following Saadia): and I — although I speak peace; but if כִּי (like אֵד, Psa. 141:10) might even have this position in the clause, yet וְכִי cannot. שְׁלוֹם is not on any account to be supplied in thought to אֲדַבֵּר, as Hitzig suggests (after Psa. 122: 8; 28: 3; 35:20). With the shrill dissonance of שְׁלוֹם and מִלְחָמָה the Psalm closes; and the cry for help with which it opens hovers over it, earnestly desiring its removal.

## Psalm 121

### THE CONSOLATION OF DIVINE PROTECTION

*121: 1 I LIFT up mine eyes unto the mountains:  
Whence shall come my help?*

*121: 2 My help cometh from Jahve,  
The Creator of heaven and earth.*

*121: 3 He will not indeed suffer thy foot to totter,  
Thy Keeper will not slumber.*

*121: 4 Behold slumbereth not and sleepeth not  
The Keeper of Israel.*

*121: 5 Jahve is thy Keeper,  
Jahve is thy shade upon thy right hand:*

*121: 6 By day the sun shall not smite thee,  
And the moon in the night.*

*121: 7 Jahve shall keep thee from all evil,  
He shall keep thy soul.*

*121: 8 Jahve shall keep thy going out and thy coming in  
From this time forth and for evermore.*

*Psalm 121.* This song of degrees is the only one that is inscribed למעלות שִׁיר and not שִׁיר המעלות. The LXX, Targum, and Jerome render it as in the other instances; Aquila and Symmachus, on the contrary, ὠδὴ (ἄσμα) εἰς τὰς ἀναβάσεις, as the Midrash *Sifri* also mystically interprets it: Song upon the steps, upon which God leads the righteous up into the other world. Those who explain המעלות of the homeward caravans or of the pilgrimages rightly regard this למעלות, occurring only once, as favouring their explanation. But the *Lamed* is that of the rule or standard. The most prominent distinguishing

mark of Psalm 121 is the step-like movement of the thoughts: it is formed **לְמַעַלְלֹת**, after the manner of steps. The view that we have a pilgrim song before us is opposed by the beginning, which leads one to infer a firmly limited range of vision, and therefore a fixed place of abode and far removed from his native mountains. The tetrastichic arrangement of the Psalm is unmistakable.

*Psa. 121: 1-4.* Apollinaris renders as meaninglessly as possible: **ῥήματα δένδροκόμων ὀρέων ὑπερεξετάνησσα** — with a reproduction of the misapprehended **ἦρα** of the LXX. The expression in fact is **שָׁשָׁשׁ**, and not **נְשִׁאָה**. And the mountains towards which the psalmist raises his eyes are not any mountains whatsoever. In Ezekiel the designation of his native land from the standpoint of the Mesopotamian plain is “the mountains of Israel.” His longing gaze is directed towards the district of these mountains, they are his *kibla*, i.e., the sight-point of his prayer, as of Daniel’s, Dan. 6:11 [10]. To render “from which my help cometh” (Luther) is inadmissible. **מִי** is an interrogative even in Jos. 2: 4, where the question is an indirect one. The poet looks up to the mountains, the mountains of his native land, the holy mountains (Psa. 133: 3; 137: 1; 125: 2), when he longingly asks: whence will my help come? and to this question his longing desire itself returns the answer, that his help comes from no other quarter than from Jahve, the Maker of heaven and earth, from His who sits enthroned behind and upon these mountains, whose helpful power reaches to the remotest ends and corners of His creation, and with (**עִמּוֹ**) whom is help, i.e., both the willingness and the power to help, so that therefore help comes from nowhere but from (**מִי**) Him alone. In v. 1b the poet has propounded a question, and in v. 2 replies to this question himself. In v. 3 and further the answering one goes on speaking to the questioner. The poet is himself become objective, and his Ego, calm in God, promises him comfort, by unfolding to him the joyful prospects contained in that hope in Jahve. The subjective **לֹא** expresses a negative in both cases with an emotional rejection of that which is absolutely impossible. The poet says to himself: He will, indeed, surely not abandon thy foot to the tottering (**לְמוֹט**, as in Psa. 66: 9, cf. 55:23), thy Keeper will surely not slumber; and then confirms the assertion that this shall not come to pass by heightening the expression in accordance with the step-like character of the Psalm: Behold the Keeper of Israel slumbereth not and sleepeth not, i.e., He does not fall into slumber from weariness, and His life is not an alternate waking and sleeping. The eyes of His providence are ever open over Israel.

*Psa. 121: 5-8.* That which holds good of “the Keeper of Israel” the poet applies believingly to himself, the individual among God’s people, in v. 5 after

Gen. 28:15. Jahve is his Keeper, He is his shade upon his right hand (יְמִינֵי as in Jud. 20:16, 2Sa. 20: 9, and frequently; the construct state instead of an apposition, cf. e.g., Arab. *jānbu l-grbīyi*, the side of the western = the western side), which protecting him and keeping him fresh and cool, covers him from the sun's burning heat. אֶס, as in Psa. 109: 6; 110: 5, with the idea of an overshadowing that screens and spreads itself out over anything (cf. Num. 14: 9). To the figure of the shadow is appended the consolation in v. 6. הַבֶּה of the sun signifies to smite injuriously (Isa. 49:10), plants, so that they wither (Psa. 102: 5), and the head (Jon. 4: 8), so that symptoms of sun-stroke (2Ki. 4:19, Judith 8: 2 f.) appears. The transferring of the word of the moon is not zeugmatic. Even the moon's rays may become insupportable, may affect the eyes injuriously, and (more particularly in the equatorial regions) produce fatal inflammation of the brain. <sup>f380</sup>

From the hurtful influences of nature that are round about him the promise extends in vv. 7, 8 in every direction. Jahve, says the poet to himself, will keep (guard) thee against all evil, of whatever kind it may be and whencesoever it may threaten; He will keep thy soul, and therefore thy life both inwardly and outwardly; He will keep (שָׁמַרְתִּי, cf. on the other hand שָׁפַטְתִּי in Psa. 9: 9) thy going out and coming in, i.e., all thy business and intercourse of life (Deu. 28: 6, and frequently); for, as Chrysostom observes, ἐν τούτοις ὁ βίος ἅπας, ἐν εἰσοδοῖς καὶ ἐξοδοῖς, therefore: everywhere and at all times; and that from this time forth even for ever. In connection with this the thought is natural, that the life of him who stands under the so universal and unbounded protection of eternal love can suffer no injury.

## Psalm 122

### A WELL-WISHING GLANCE BACK AT THE PILGRIMS' CITY

*122: 1 I REJOICED in those who said to me:  
"Let us go into the house of Jahve!"*

*122: 2 Our feet stood still  
Within thy gates, O Jerusalem,*

*122: 3 Jerusalem, thou that art built up again  
As a city which is compact in itself!*

*122: 4 Whither the tribes went up,  
The tribes of Jāh —  
A precept for Israel —  
To give thanks unto the Name of Jahve.*

*122: 5 For there were set thrones for judgment,  
Thrones for the house of David.*

*122: 6 Wish ye Jerusalem peace:  
May it be well with those who love thee!*

*122: 7 Peace be within thy walls,  
Prosperity within thy palaces!*

*122: 8 For my brethren and my friends' sakes  
Will I speak peace concerning thee.*

*122: 9 For the sake of the house of Jahve, our God,  
Will I seek thy good.*

*Psalm 122.* If by “the mountains” in Psa. 121: 1 the mountains of the Holy Land are to be understood, it is also clear for what reason the collector placed this Song of degrees, which begins with the expression of joy at the pilgrimage to the house of Jahve, and therefore to the holy mountain, immediately after the preceding song. By its peace-breathing (שלום) contents it also, however, touches closely upon Psalm 120. The poet utters aloud his hearty benedictory salutation to the holy city in remembrance of the delightful time during which he sojourned there as a visitor at the feast, and enjoyed its inspiring aspect. If in respect of the לְדָוִד the Psalm were to be regarded as an old Davidic Psalm, it would belong to the series of those Psalms of the time of the persecution by Absalom, which cast a yearning look back towards home, the house of God (23, 26, 55:15, 61, and more particularly 63). But the לְדָוִד is wanting in the LXX, *Codd. Alex.* and *Vat.*; and the *Cod Sinait.*, which has ΤΩ ΔΑΔ, puts this before Psalm 124, εἰ’ μὴ ὅτι κύριος, κ.τ.λ., also, contrary to *Codd. Alex.* and *Vat.* Here it is occasioned by v. 5, but without any critical discernment. The measures adopted by Jeroboam I show, moreover, that the pilgrimages to the feasts were customary even in the time of David and Solomon. The images of calves in Dan and Bethel, and the changing of the Feast of Tabernacles to another month, were intended to strengthen the political rupture, by breaking up the religious unity of the people and weaning them from visiting Jerusalem. The poet of the Psalm before us, however, lived much later. He lived, as is to be inferred with Hupfeld from v. 3, in the time of the post-exilic Jerusalem which rose again out of its ruins. Thither he had been at one of the great feasts, and here, still quite full of the inspiring memory, he looks back towards the holy city; for, in spite of Reuss, Hupfeld, and Hitzig, vv. 1 f., so far as the style is concerned, are manifestly a retrospect.

*Psa. 122: 1-3.* The preterite שִׂמְחָתִי may signify: I rejoice (1Sa. 2: 1), just as much as: I rejoiced. Here in comparison with v. 2a it is a retrospect; for הִיָּתָהּ with the participle has for the most part a retrospective signification,



Gen. 39:22, Deu. 9:22, 24, Jud. 1: 7, Job. 1:14. True, עֲמָדוֹת הָיוּ might also signify: they have been standing and still stand (as in Ps. 10:14, Isa. 59: 2; 30:20); but then why was it not more briefly expressed by עָמְדוּ (Psa. 26:12)? The LXX correctly renders: ἐνφράνθην and ἔστῶτες ἦσαν. The poet, now again on the journey homewards, or having returned home, calls to mind the joy with which the cry for setting out, “Let us go up to the house of Jahve!” filled him. When he and the other visitors to the feast had reached the goal of their pilgrimage, their feet came to a stand-still, as if spell-bound by the overpowering, glorious sight. <sup>f381</sup>

Reviving this memory, he exclaims: Jerusalem, O thou who art built up again — true, בָּנָה in itself only signifies “to build,” but here, where, if there is nothing to the contrary, a closed sense is to be assumed for the line of the verse, and in the midst of songs which reflect the joy and sorrow of the post-exilic restoration period, it obtains the same meaning as in Ps. 102:17; 147: 2, and frequently (Gesenius: *O Hierosolyma restituta*). The parallel member, v. 3b, does not indeed require this sense, but is at least favourable to it. Luther’s earlier rendering, “as a city which is compacted together,” was happier than his later rendering, “a city where they shall come together,” which requires a *Niph.* or *Hithpa.* instead of the passive. הִבְרָה signifies, as in Exo. 28: 7, to be joined together, to be united into a whole; and הִתְקַדְּוּ strengthens the idea of that which is harmoniously, perfectly, and snugly closed up (cf. Ps. 133: 1). The *Kaph* of בָּעִיר is the so-called *Kaph veritatis*: Jerusalem has risen again out of its ruined and razed condition, the breaches and gaps are done away with (Isa. 58:12), it stands there as a closely compacted city, in which house joins on to house. Thus has the poet seen it, and the recollection fills him with rapture. <sup>f382</sup>

*Psa. 122: 4, 5.* The imposing character of the impression was still greatly enhanced by the consideration, that this is the city where at all times the twelve tribes of God’s nation (which were still distinguished as its elements even after the Exile, Rom. 11: 1, Luk. 2:36, Jam. 1: 1) came together at the three great feasts. The use of the שׁ twice as equivalent to אֲשֶׁר is (as in Canticles) appropriate to the ornamental, happy, miniature-like manner of these Songs of degrees. In שָׁשׁ the שׁ is, as in Ecc. 1: 7, equivalent to שָׂמָּה, which on the other hand in v. 5 is no more than an emphatic שָׁם (cf. Ps. 76: 4; 68: 7). עָלוּ affirms a habit (cf. Job. 1: 4) of the past, which extends into the present. עֲדוֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל is not an accusative of the definition or destination (Ew. § 300, c), but an apposition to the previous clause, as e.g., in Lev. 23:14, 21, 31 (Hitzig), referring to the appointing in Exo. 23:17; 34:23, Deu. 16:16. The custom, which arose thus, is confirmed in v. 5 from the fact, that Jerusalem,

the city of the one national sanctuary, was at the same time the city of the Davidic kingship. The phrase **יָשֵׁב לְמִשְׁפַּט** is here transferred from the judicial persons (cf. 29:10 with 9: 5, Isa. 28: 6), who sit in judgment, to the seats (thrones) which are set down and stand there for judgment (cf. Psa. 125: 1, and **θρόνος** **ἔκειτο**, Rev. 4: 2). The Targum is thinking of seats in the Temple, viz., the raised (in the second Temple resting upon pillars) seat of the king in the court of the Israelitish men near the **שַׁעַר הָעֲלִיּוֹן**, but **לְמִשְׁפַּט** points to the palace, 1Ki. 7: 7. In the flourishing age of the Davidic kingship this was also the highest court of judgment of the land; the king was the chief judge (2Sa. 15: 2, 1Ki. 3:16), and the sons, brothers, or kinsmen of the king were his assessors and advisers. In the time of the poet it is different; but the attractiveness of Jerusalem, not only as the city of Jahve, but also as the city of David, remains the same for all times.

**Psa. 122: 6-9.** When the poet thus calls up the picture of his country's "city of peace" before his mind, the picture of the glory which it still ever possesses, and of the greater glory which it had formerly, he spreads out his hands over it in the distance, blessing it in the kindling of his love, and calls upon all his fellow-countrymen round about and in all places: *apprecamini salutem Hierosolymis*. So Gesenius correctly (*Thesaurus*, p. 1347); for just as **לְשָׁלוֹם** **שָׁאַל לוֹ** signifies to inquire after any one's well-being, and to greet him with the question: **הַשְּׁלוֹם לְךָ** (Jer. 15: 5), so **שָׁאַל שְׁלוֹם** signifies to find out any one's prosperity by asking, to gladly know and gladly see that it is well with him, and therefore to be animated by the wish that he may prosper; Syriac, **ܕ** **ܫܠܡܐ** directly: to salute any one; for the interrogatory **הַשְּׁלוֹם לְךָ** and the well-wishing **שְׁלוֹם לְךָ**, **εὐχήνη σοί** (Luke 10: 5, Joh. 20:19 ff.), have both of them the same source and meaning. The reading **אַהֲלִיךָ**, commended by Ewald, is a recollection of Job. 12: 6 that is violently brought in here. The loving ones are comprehended with the beloved one, the children with the mother. **שָׁלָה** forms an alliteration with **שְׁלוֹם**; the emphatic form **יִשְׁלִי** occurs even in other instances out of pause (e.g., 57: 2). In v. 7 the alliteration of **שְׁלוֹם** and **שְׁלֹנָה** is again taken up, and both accord with the name of Jerusalem. *Ad elegantiam facit*, as Venema observes, *perpetua vocum ad se invicem et omnium ad nomen Hierosolymae alliteratio*. Both together mark the Song of degrees as such. Happiness, cries out the poet to the holy city from afar, be within thy bulwarks, prosperity within thy palaces, i.e., without and within. **חֵיל**, ramparts, circumvallation (from **חָוַל**, to surround, Arabic *hawl*, round about, equally correct whether written **חֵיל** or **חָל**), and **אַרְמְנוֹת** as the parallel word, as in Psa. 48:14. The twofold motive of such an earnest wish for peace is love for the brethren and love for the house of God. For the sake of the

brethren is he cheerfully resolved to speak peace (τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην αὐτῆς, Luke Psa. 19:42) concerning (דְּבַר בָּ, as in Psa. 87: 3, Deu. 6: 7, LXX περι σοῦ; cf. שְׁלוֹם דְּבַר שְׁלוֹם with אֵל and לְ, to speak peace to, Psa. 85: 9, Est. 10: 3) Jerusalem, for the sake of the house of Jahve will he strive after good (i.e., that which tends to her well-being) to her (like בְּקֶשׁ מְנוּבָה לְ in Neh. 2:10, cf. שְׁלוֹם דְּרַשׁ, Deu. 23: 7 [6], Jer. 29: 7). For although he is now again far from Jerusalem after the visit that is over, he still remains united in love to the holy city as being the goal of his longing, and to those who dwell there as being his brethren and friends. Jerusalem is and will remain the heart of all Israel as surely as Jahve who has His house there, is the God of all Israel.

## Psalm 123

### UPWARD GLANCE TO THE LORD IN TIMES OF CONTEMPT

*123: 1 TO Thee do I lift up mine eyes, Thou who art enthroned in the heavens!*

*123: 2 Behold, as the eyes of servants unto the hand of their master,  
As the eyes of a maid unto the hand of her mistress:  
So our eyes are unto Jahve our God, until He be gracious unto us.*

*123: 3 Be gracious unto us, Jahve, be gracious unto us,  
for of contempt are we full enough.*

*123: 4 Full enough is our soul  
With the scorn of the haughty, the contempt of despots.*

*Psalm 123.* This Psalm is joined to the preceding Psalm by the community of the divine name *Jahve our God*. Alsted (died 1638) gives it the brief, ingenious inscription *oculus sperans*. It is an upward glance of waiting faith to Jahve under tyrannical oppression. The fact that this Psalm appears in a rhyming form, “as scarcely any other piece in the Old Testament” (Reuss), comes only from those inflexional rhymes which creep in of themselves in the tephilla style.

*Psa. 123: 1, 2.* The destinies of all men, and in particular of the church, are in the hand of the King who sits enthroned in the unapproachable glory of the heavens and rules over all things, and of the Judge who decides all things. Up to Him the poet raises his eyes, and to Him the church, together with which he may call Him “Jahve our God,” just as the eyes of servants are directed towards the hand of their lord, the eyes of a maid towards the hand of her mistress; for this hand regulates the whole house, and they wait upon their winks and signs with most eager attention. Those of Israel are Jahve’s servants, Israel the church is Jahve’s maid. In His hand lies its future. At length He will take compassion on His own. Therefore its longing gaze goes forth

towards Him, without being wearied, until He shall graciously turn its distress. With reference to the *i* of הַיְשִׁבִי, vid., on 113, 114. אֲדוֹנֵיהֶם is their common lord; for since in the antitype the sovereign Lord is meant, it will be conceived of as *plur. excellentiae*, just as in general it occurs only rarely (Gen. 19: 2, 18, Jer. 27: 4) as an actual plural.

*Psa. 123: 3, 4.* The second strophe takes up the “be gracious unto us” as it were in echo. It begins with a *Kyrie eleison*, which is confirmed in a *crescendo* manner after the form of steps. The church is already abundantly satiated with ignominy. רַב is an abstract “much,” and רַבָּה, Psa. 62: 3, something great (vid., Böttcher, *Lehrbuch*, § 624). The subjectivizing, intensive לָהּ accords with Psa. 120: 6 — probably an indication of one and the same author. בְּיָדוֹ is strengthened by לֵאנֹכְךָ, like בְּיָדוֹ in Eze. 36: 4. The article of הַלְאָנֹכְךָ is retrospectively demonstrative: full of such scorn of the haughty (Ew. § 290, *d*). הַבְּבוּר is also retrospectively demonstrative; but since a repetition of the article for the fourth time would have been inelegant, the poet here says לְגֵאוֹנוֹנִים with the *Lamed*, which serves as a circumlocution of the genitive. The Masora reckons this word among the fifteen “words that are written as one and are to be read as two.” The *Kerî* runs viz., לְגֵאוֹ יוֹנִים, *superbis oppressorum* (יוֹנִים, *part. Kal*, like הַיְיֹנָה Zep. 3: 1, and frequently). But apart from the consideration that instead of גֵּאוֹ, from the unknown גֵּאוֹה, it might more readily be pointed גֵּאוֹ, from גֵּאוֹה (a form of nouns indicating defects, contracted גֵּאוֹ), this genitival construction appears to be far-fetched, and, inasmuch as it makes a distinction among the oppressors, inappropriate. The poet surely meant לְגֵאוֹנוֹנִים or לְגֵאוֹנוֹנִים. This word גֵּאוֹנוֹנוֹ (after the form עֲלִיוֹן, אֲבִיוֹן, רַעְיוֹן Saadia interprets it after the Talmudic לְגִינוֹן, *legio*; but how could one expect to find such a Grecized Latin word (λεγεών) in the Psalter! dunash ben-Labrat (about 960) regards גֵּאוֹנוֹנוֹ as a compound word in the signification of הַיְיֹנָה הַגֵּאוֹנוֹנוֹ. In fact the poet may have chosen the otherwise unused adjectival form גֵּאוֹנוֹנוֹ because it reminds one of יוֹנִים, although it is not a compound word like הַבְּבוּרוֹנוֹ. If the Psalm is a Maccabean Psalm, it is natural to find in לְגֵאוֹנוֹנוֹ an allusion to the despotic domination of the יוֹנִים.

## Psalm 124

### THE DELIVERER FROM DEATH IN WATERS AND IN A SNARE

*124: 1 HAD not Jahve been for us,  
Let Israel say —*

*124: 2 Had not Jahve been for us,  
When men rose up against us:*

*124: 3 Then had they swallowed us up alive,  
When their anger was kindled against us —*

*124: 4 Then had the waters overwhelmed us,  
The stream had gone over our soul —*

*124: 5 Then had gone over our soul  
The proudly swelling waters.*

*124: 6 Blessed be Jahve, who hath not abandoned us  
A prey to their teeth!*

*124: 7 Our soul, like a bird hath it escaped  
Out of the snare of the fowlers:  
The snare was broken  
And we — we escaped.*

*124: 8 Our help is in the Name of Jahve,  
The Creator of heaven and earth.*

*Psalm 124.* The statement “the stream had gone over our soul” of this fifth Son of degrees, coincides with the statement “our soul is full enough” of the fourth; the two Psalms also meet in the synonymous new formations **נְאוֹנִים** and **וְדוֹנִים**, which also look very much as though they were formed in allusion to contemporary history. The **לְדוֹד** is wanting in the LXX, *Codd. Alex. and Vat.*, here as in Psalm 122, and with the exception of the Targum is wanting in general in the ancient versions, and therefore is not so much as established as a point of textual criticism. It is a Psalm in the manner of the Davidic Psalms, to which it is closely allied in the metaphors of the overwhelming waters, Psa. 18: 5, 17 (cf. Psa. 144: 7), Psa. 69: 2 f., and of the little bird; cf. also on **לִוְלִי** Psa. 27:13, on **אֲדָם** used of hostile men Psa. 56:12, on **בְּלַע חַיִּים** Psa. 55:16, on **בְּרוּךְ ה'** Psa. 28: 6; 31:22. This beautiful song makes its modern origin known by its Aramaizing character, and by the delight, after the manner of the later poetry, in all kinds of embellishments of language. The art of the form consists less in strophic symmetry than in this, that in order to take one step forward it always goes back half a step. Luther's imitation (1524), “Were God not with us at this time” (*Wäre Gott nicht mit uns diese Zeit*), bears the inscription “The true believers' safeguard.”

*Psa. 124: 1-5.* It is commonly rendered, “If it had not been Jahve who was for us.” But, notwithstanding the subject that is placed first (cf. Gen. 23:13), the **שׁ** belongs to the **לִוְלִי**; since in the Aramaizing Hebrew (cf. on the other

hand Gen. 31:42) לֹאֲלִי שׁ (cf. Arab. *lawlā an*) signifies *nisi* (prop. *nisi quod*), as in the Aramaic שׁ (לֹאֲלִי) (ד), *o si* (prop. *o si quod*). The אָנִי, peculiar to this Psalm in the Old Testament, instead of אָנִי follows the model of the dialectic אָדִין, Arab. *i dan*, Syr. *hāden* (הָדִין, הִידִין). In order to begin the apodosis of לֹאֲלִי (לֹאֲלִי) emphatically the older language makes use of the confirmatory כִּי, Gen. 31:42; 43:10; here we have אָנִי (well rendered by the LXX ἄρα), as in Psa. 119:92. The *Lamed* of הָיָה לָנוּ is *raphe* in both instances, according to the rule discussed above, p. 373. When men (אָדָם) rose up against Israel and their anger was kindled against them, they who were feeble in themselves over against the hostile world would have been swallowed up alive if they had not had Jahve for them, if they had not had Him on their side. This “swallowing up alive” is said elsewhere of Hades, which suddenly and forcibly snatches away its victims, Psa. 55:16, Pro. 1:12; here, however, as v. 6 shows, it is said of the enemies, who are represented as wild beasts. In v. 4 the hostile power which rolls over them is likened to an overflowing stream, as in Isa. 8: 7 f., the Assyrian. נַחֲלָה, a stream or river, is *Milel*; it is first of all accusative: towards the stream (Num. 34: 5); then, however, it is also used as a nominative, like הַמַּוְתָה לַיָּלָה, and the like (cf. common Greek ἡ φύχθα, ἡ νεόντητα); so that הַיָּלָה is related to הַיָּלָה (הַיָּלָה) as הַיָּלָה, מוֹ to הַיָּלָה and הַיָּלָה (Böttcher, § 615). These latest Psalms are fond of such embellishments by means of adorned forms and Aramaic or Aramaizing words. יְדוֹנִים is a word which is indeed not unhebraic in its formation, but is more indigenous to Chaldee; it is the Targum word for יְדִים in Psa. 86:14; 119:51, 78 (also in Psa. 54: 5 for זָרִים), although according to Levy the MSS do not present יְדוֹנִין but יְדִנִין. In the passage before us the Targum renders: the king who is like to the proud waters (לְמוֹי יְדוֹנִיָא) of the sea (Antiochus Epiphanes? — a Scholium explains οἱ ὑπερήφανοι). With reference to עָבַר before a plural subject, vid., Ges. § 147.

*Psa. 124: 6-8.* After the fact of the divine succour has been expressed, in v. 6 follows the thanksgiving for it, and in v. 7 the joyful shout of the rescued one. In v. 6 the enemies are conceived of as beasts of prey on account of their bloodthirstiness, just as the worldly empires are in the Book of Daniel; in v. 7 as “fowlers” on account of their cunning. According to the punctuation it is not to be rendered: Our soul is like a bird that is escaped, in which case it would have been accented נַפְשֵׁנוּ כַצְפוֹר, but: our soul (subject with *Rebia magnum*) is as a bird (כַצְפוֹר as in Hos. 11:11, Pro. 23:32, Job. 14: 2, instead of the syntactically more usual כַצְפוֹר) escaped out of the snare of him who lays

snares (יִקְוֶשׁ, elsewhere יְקוֹשׁ, יְקוֹשׁ, a fowler, Psa. 91: 3). נִשְׁבֵּר (with *ā* beside *Rebia*) is 3rd praet.: the snare was burst, and we — we became free. In v. 8 (cf. Psa. 121: 2; 134: 3) the universal, and here pertinent thought, viz., the help of Israel is in the name of Jahve, the Creator of the world, i.e., in Him who is manifest as such and is continually verifying Himself, forms the epiphonematic close. Whether the power of the world seeks to make the church of Jahve like to itself or to annihilate it, it is not a disavowal of its God, but a faithful confession, stedfast even to death, that leads to its deliverance.

## Psalm 125

### ISRAEL'S BULWARK AGAINST TEMPTATION TO APOSTASY

*125: 1 THEY who trust in Jahve are as Mount Zion,  
Which doth not totter, it standeth fast for ever.*

*125: 2 As for Jerusalem — mountains are round about her,  
And Jahve is round about His people  
From this time and for evermore.*

*125: 3 For the sceptre of wickedness shall not rest  
Upon the lot of the righteous,  
Lest the righteous stretch out  
Their hands unto iniquity.*

*125: 4 O show Thyself good, Jahve, unto the good  
And to those who are upright in their hearts.*

*125: 5 But those who turn aside their crooked paths —  
Jahve cause them to pass away with the workers of iniquity.  
Peace be upon Israel!*

*Psalm 125.* The favourite word *Israel* furnished the outward occasion for annexing this Psalm to the preceding. The situation is like that in Psalm 123 and 124. The people are under foreign dominion. In this lies the seductive inducement to apostasy. The pious and the apostate ones are already separated. Those who have remained faithful shall not, however, always remain enslaved. Round about Jerusalem are mountains, but more important still: Jahve, of rocks the firmest, Jahve encompasses His people.

That this Psalm is one of the latest, appears from the circumstantial expression “the upright in their hearts,” instead of the old one, “the upright of heart,” from פִּעְלֵי אֵוֶן instead of the former פִּעְלֵי אֵוֶן, and also from לְמֵאן לֹא (beside this passage occurring only in Psa. 119:11, 80, Eze. 19: 9; 26:20, Zec. 12: 7) instead of לְמֵעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא or בֶּן.

*Psa. 125: 1, 2.* The steadfastness which those who trust in Jahve prove in the midst of every kind of temptation and assault is likened to Mount Zion, because the God to whom they believably cling is He who sits enthroned on Zion. The future יָשֵׁב signifies: He sits and will sit, that is to say, He continues to sit, cf. Psa. 9: 8; 122: 5. Older expositors are of opinion that the heavenly Zion must be understood on account of the Chaldaean and the Roman catastrophes; but these, in fact, only came upon the buildings on the mountain, not upon the mountain itself, which in itself and according to its appointed destiny (vid., Mic. 3:12; 4: 1) remained unshaken. in v. 2 also it is none other than the earthly Jerusalem that is meant. The holy city has a natural circumvallation of mountains, and the holy nation that dwells and worships therein has a still infinitely higher defence in Jahve, who encompasses it round (vid., on Psa. 34: 8), as perhaps a wall of fire (Zec. 2: 9 [5]), or an impassably broad and mighty river (Isa. 33:21); a statement which is also now confirmed, for, etc. Instead of inferring from the clause v. 2 that which is to be expected with לָבֹן, the poet confirms it with כִּי by that which is surely to be expected.

*Psa. 125: 3.* The pressure of the worldly power, which now lies heavily upon the holy land, will not last for ever; the duration of the calamity is exactly proportioned to the power of resistance of the righteous, whom God proves and purifies by calamity, but not without at the same time graciously preserving them. “The rod of wickedness” is the heathen sceptre, and “the righteous” are the Israelites who hold fast to the religion of their fathers. The holy land, whose sole entitled inheritors are these righteous, is called their “lot” (גֹּרֶל, κληρος = κληρονομία). נָיִן signifies to alight or settle down anywhere, and having alighted, to lean upon or rest (cf. Isa. 11: 2 with Joh. 1:32, ξμεινεν). The LXX renders οὐκ ἀφήσει, i.e., לֹא יָנִי (cf. on the other hand יָנִי, He shall let down, cause to come down, in Isa. 30:32). Not for a continuance shall the sceptre of heathen tyranny rest upon the holy land, God will not suffer that: in order that the righteous may not at length, by virtue of the power which pressure and use exercises over men, also participate in the prevailing ungodly doings. שָׁלַח with *Beth*: to seize upon anything wrongfully, or even only (as in Job. 28: 9) to lay one’s hand upon anything (frequently with אָל). As here in the case of אֶן־לָתֵהָ, in Psa. 80: 3 too the form that is the same as the locative is combined with a preposition.

*Psa. 125: 4, 5.* On the ground of the strong faith in vv. 1 f. and of the confident hope in v. 3, the petition now arises that Jahve would speedily bestow the earnestly desired blessing of freedom upon the faithful ones, and on the other hand remove the cowardly [lit. those afraid to confess God] and those who have fellowship with apostasy, together with the declared wicked ones,



out of the way. For such is the meaning of vv. 4 f. **טוֹבִים** (in Proverbs alternating with the “righteous,” Pro. 2:20, the opposite being the “wicked,” **רשעים**, Pro. 14:19) are here those who truly believe and rightly act in accordance with the good will of God, <sup>f383</sup> or, as the parallel member of the verse explains (where **לִישָׂרִים** did not require the article on account of the addition), those who in the bottom of their heart are uprightly disposed, as God desires to have it. The poet supplicates good for them, viz., preservation against denying God and deliverance out of slavery; for those, on the contrary, who bend (**הִטּוּ**) their crooked paths, i.e., turn aside their paths in a crooked direction from the right way (**עָקַבְתֶּם לְקִלְתָּם**, cf. Jud. 5: 6, no less than in Amo. 2: 7, Pro. 17:23, an accusative of the object, which is more natural than that it is the accusative of the direction, after Num. 22:23 *extrem.*, cf. Job. 23:11, Isa. 30:11) — for these he wishes that Jahve would clear them away (**הוֹלִידֵם** like Arab. *ahlk, perire facere = perdere*) together with the workers of evil, i.e., the open, manifest sinners, to whom these lukewarm and sly, false and equivocal ones are in no way inferior as a source of danger to the church. LXX correctly: **τοὺς δὲ ἐκκλίνοντας εἰς τὰς στραγαλιάς** (Aquila **διαπλοκάς**, Symmachus **σκολιότηας**, Theodotion **διστραμμένα**) **ἄπαξει κύριος μετὰ, κ.τ.λ.** Finally, the poet, stretching out his hand over Israel as if pronouncing the benediction of the priest, gathers up all his hopes, prayers, and wishes into the one prayer: “Peace be upon Israel.” He means “the Israel of God,” Gal. 6:16. Upon this Israel he calls down peace from above. Peace is the end of tyranny, hostility, dismemberment, unrest, and terror; peace is freedom and harmony and unity and security and blessedness.

## Psalm 126

### THE HARVEST OF JOY AFTER THE SOWING OF TEARS

*126: 1 WHEN Jahve brought back the returning ones of Zion,  
We were as those who dream.*

*126: 2 Then laughter filled our mouth, And our tongue a shout of joy.  
Then said they among the heathen: “Great things hath Jahve done for them” —*

*126: 3 Great things hath Jahve done for us, We became glad.*

*126: 4 Oh lead back, Jahve, our captive ones, As streams in the south country!*

*126: 5 Those who sow with tears, Shall reap with a shout of joy.*

*126: 6 He goeth to and fro amidst weeping, Bearing the scattering of the seed —  
He cometh along with a shout of joy, Bearing his sheaves.*

*Psalm 126.* It is with this Psalm, which the favourite word *Zion* connects with the preceding Psalm, exactly as with Psalm 85, which also gives thanks for the restoration of the captive ones of Israel on the one hand, and on the other hand has to complain of the wrath that is still not entirely removed, and prays for a national restoration. There are expositors indeed who also transfer the grateful retrospect with which this Song of degrees (vv. 1-3), like that Korahitic Psalm (vv. 2-4), begins, into the future (among the translators Luther is at least more consistent than the earlier ones); but they do this for reasons which are refuted by Psalm 85, and which are at once silenced when brought face to face with the requirements of the syntax.

*Psa. 126: 1-3.* When passages like Isa. 1: 9, Gen. 47:25, or others where **וְהָיָנוּ** is *perf. consec.*, are appealed to in order to prove that **הָיָנוּ בְּחַלְמִים** may signify *erimus quasi somniantes*, they are instances that are different in point of syntax. Any other rendering than that of the LXX is here impossible, viz.: *Ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέψαι κύριον τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν Σιών ἐγενήθημεν ὡς παρακεκλημένοι* (**בְּנִחְמִים**) — Jerome correctly, *quasi somniantes*). It is, however, just as erroneous when Jerome goes on to render: *tunc implebitur risu os nostrum*; for it is true the future after **יִשָּׁ** has a future signification in passages where the context relates to matters of future history, as in Psa. 96:12, Zep. 3: 9, but it always has the signification of the imperfect after the key-note of the historical past has once been struck, Exo. 15: 1, Jos. 8:30; 10:12, 1Ki. 11: 7; 16:21, 2Ki. 15:16, Job. 38:21; it is therefore, *tunc implebatur*. It is the exiles at home again upon the soil of their fatherland who here cast back a glance into the happy time when their destiny suddenly took another turn, by the God of Israel disposing the heart of the conqueror of Babylon to set them at liberty, and to send them to their native land in an honourable manner. **שִׁיבָת** is not equivalent to **שְׁבִיתָ**, nor is there any necessity to read it thus (Olshausen, Böttcher, and Hupfeld). **שִׁיבָה** (from **שׁוּב**, like **בִּיאָה**, **קִיָּמָה**) signifies the return, and then those returning; it is, certainly, an innovation of this very late poet. When Jahve brought home the homeward-bound ones of Zion — the poet means to say — we were as dreamers. Does he mean by this that the long seventy years' term of affliction lay behind us like a vanished dream (Joseph Kimchi), or that the redemption that broke upon us so suddenly seemed to us at first not to be a reality but a beautiful dream? The tenor of the language favours the latter: as those not really passing through such circumstances, but only dreaming. Then — the poet goes on to say — our mouth was filled with laughter (Job. 8:21) and our tongue with a shout of joy, inasmuch, namely, as the impression of the good fortune which contrasted so strongly with our trouble hitherto, compelled us to open our mouth wide in order that our joy might break forth in a full stream, and our jubilant mood impelled our tongue

to utter shouts of joy, which knew no limit because of the inexhaustible matter of our rejoicing. And how awe-inspiring was Israel's position at that time among the peoples! and what astonishment the marvellous change of Israel's lot produced upon them! Even the heathen confessed that it was Jahve's work, and that He had done great things for them (Joe. 2:20 f., 1Sa. 12:24) — the glorious predictions of Isaiah, as in Isa. 45:14; 52:10, and elsewhere, were being fulfilled. The church on its part seals that confession coming from the mouth of the heathen. This it is that made them so joyful, that God had acknowledged them by such a mighty deed.

*Psa. 126: 4-6.* But still the work so mightily and graciously begun is not completed. Those who up to the present time have returned, out of whose heart this Psalm is, as it were, composed, are only like a small vanguard in relation to the whole nation. Instead of שְׁבוּתָנוּ the *Kerî* here reads שְׁבִיתָנוּ, from שְׁבִית, Num. 21:29, after the form בְּבִית in Gen. 50: 4. As we read elsewhere that Jerusalem yearns after her children, and Jahve solemnly assures her, “thou shalt put them all on as jewels and gird thyself like a bride” (Isa. 49:18), so here the poet proceeds from the idea that the holy land yearns after an abundant, reanimating influx of population, as the *Negeb* (i.e., the Judaeen south country, Gen. 20: 1, and in general the south country lying towards the desert of Sinai) thirsts for the rain-water streams, which disappear in the summer season and regularly return in the winter season. Concerning אֶפְיִק, “a water-holding channel,” vid., on Psa. 18:16. If we translate *converte captivitatem nostram* (as Jerome does, following the LXX), we shall not know what to do with the figure, whereas in connection with the rendering *reduc captivos nostros* it is just as beautifully adapted to the object as to the governing verb. If we have rightly referred *negeb* not to the land of the Exile but to the Land of Promise, whose appearance at this time is still so unlike the promise, we shall now also understand by those who sow in tears not the exiles, but those who have already returned home, who are again sowing the old soil of their native land, and that with tears, because the ground is so parched that there is little hope of the seed springing up. But this tearful sowing will be followed by a joyful harvest. One is reminded here of the drought and failure of the crops with which the new colony was visited in the time of Haggai, and of the coming blessing promised by the prophet with a view to the work of the building of the Temple being vigorously carried forward. Here, however, the tearful sowing is only an emblem of the new foundation-laying, which really took place not without many tears (Ezr. 3:12), amidst sorrowful and depressed circumstances; but in its general sense the language of the Psalm coincides with the language of the Preacher on the Mount, Mat. 5: 4: Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted. The subject to v. 6 is the husbandman, and without a figure, every member of

the *ecclesia pressa*. The gerundial construction in v. 6a (as in 2Sa. 3:16, Jer. 50: 4, cf. the more Indo-Germanic style of expression in 2Sa. 15:30) depicts the continual passing along, here the going to and fro of the sorrowfully pensive man; and v. 6b the undoubted coming and sure appearing of him who is highly blessed beyond expectation. The former bears **הִזְרַע מִשֶׂדָּה**, the seed-draught, i.e., the handful of seed taken from the rest for casting out (for **הִזְרַע מִשֶׂדָּה** in Amo. 9:13 signifies to cast forth the seed along the furrows); the latter his sheaves, the produce (**הַבְּנוֹשָׂה**), such as puts him to the blush, of his, as it appeared to him, forlorn sowing. As by the sowing we are to understand everything that each individual contributes towards the building up of the kingdom of God, so by the sheaves, the wholesome fruit which, by God bestowing His blessing upon it beyond our prayer and comprehension, springs up from it.

## Psalm 127

### EVERYTHING DEPENDS UPON THE BLESSING OF GOD <sup>384</sup>

*127: 1 IF Jahve build not the house,  
They labour in vain thereon who build it.  
If Jahve watch not over the city,  
In vain doth he keep awake who watcheth over it.*

*127: 2 In vain is it that ye rise up early  
And only sit down late,  
Eating the bread of sorrowful labour  
Even so He giveth to His beloved in sleep.*

*127: 3 Behold a heritage of Jahve are sons,  
A reward is the fruit of the womb.*

*127: 4 As arrows in the hand of a mighty man,  
So are sons of the youth.*

*127: 5 Blessed is the man  
Who hath his quiver full of them:  
They shall not be ashamed,  
When they speak with enemies in the gate.*

*Psalm 127.* The inscribed **לְשִׁלְמָה** is only added to this Song of degrees because there was found in v. 2 not only an allusion to the name *Jedidiah*, which Solomon received from Nathan (2Sa. 12:25), but also to his being endowed with wisdom and riches in the dream at Gibeon (1Ki. 3: 5 ff.). And to these is still to be added the Proverbs-like form of the Psalm; for, like the proverb-song, the extended form of the *Mashal*, it consists of a double string of proverbs, the expression of which reminds one in many ways of the Book of

Proverbs (עֲצָבִים in v. 2, toilsome efforts, as in Pro. 5:10; מֵאֲחָרַי, as in Pro. 23:30; בְּנֵי הַנְּעוּרִים in v. 4, sons begotten in one's youth; בְּשֹׂאֵר in v. 5, as in Pro. 22:22; 24: 7), and which together are like the unfolding of the proverb, ch. Psa. 10:22: *The blessing of Jahve, it maketh rich, and labour addeth nothing beside it.* Even Theodoret observes, on the natural assumption that v. 1 points to the building of the Temple, how much better the Psalm suits the time of Zerubbabel and Joshua, when the building of the Temple was imperilled by the hostile neighbouring peoples; and in connection with the relatively small number of those who had returned home out of the Exile, a numerous family, and more especially many sons, must have seemed to be a doubly and threefoldly precious blessing from God.

*Psa. 127: 1, 2.* The poet proves that everything depends upon the blessing of God from examples taken from the God-ordained life of the family and of the state. The rearing of the house which affords us protection, and the stability of the city in which we securely and peaceably dwell, the acquisition of possessions that maintain and adorn life, the begetting and rearing of sons that may contribute substantial support to the father as he grows old — all these are things which depend upon the blessing of God without natural preliminary conditions being able to guarantee them, well-devised arrangements to ensure them, unwearied labours to obtain them by force, or impatient care and murmuring to get them by defiance. Many a man builds himself a house, but he is not able to carry out the building of it, or he dies before he is able to take possession of it, or the building fails through unforeseen misfortunes, or, if it succeeds, becomes a prey to violent destruction: if God Himself do not build it, they labour thereon (עָמַל בְּ, Jon. 4:10, Ecc. 2:21) in vain who build it. Many a city is well-ordered, and seems to be secured by wise precautions against every misfortune, against fire and sudden attack; but if God Himself do not guard it, it is in vain that those to whom its protection is entrusted give themselves no sleep and perform (שָׁקַד, a word that has only come into frequent use since the literature of the Salomonic age) the duties of their office with the utmost devotion. The perfect in the apodosis affirms what has been done on the part of man to be ineffectual if the former is not done on God's part; cf. Num. 32:23. Many rise up early in order to get to their work, and delay the sitting down as long as possible; i.e., not: the lying down (Hupfeld), for that is שָׁכַב, not יָשַׁב; but to take a seat in order to rest a little, and, as what follows shows, to eat (Hitzig). קוּם and שָׁבַת stand opposed to one another: the latter cannot therefore mean to remain sitting at one's work, in favour of which Isa. 5:11 (where בִּנְשָׁא and בִּנְשָׂא form an antithesis) cannot be properly compared. 1Sa. 20:24 shows that prior to the incursion of the Grecian custom they did not take their meals lying or reclining (ἀνα- or κατακείμενος), but sitting. It is vain

for you — the poet exclaims to them — it will not after all bring that you think to be able to acquire; in so doing you eat only the bread of sorrow, i.e., bread that is procured with toil and trouble (cf. Gen. 3:17, **בַּעֲצָבוֹן**): **בֵּן**, in like manner, i.e., the same as you are able to procure only by toilsome and anxious efforts, God gives to His beloved (Psa. 60: 7, Deu. 33:12) **שָׁנָא** (= **שָׁנָה**), in sleep (an adverbial accusative like **עָרַב, לַיְלָה, בְּקָר**), i.e., without restless self-activity, in a state of self-forgetful renunciation, and modest, calm surrender to Him: “God bestows His gifts during the night,” says a German proverb, and a Greek proverb even says: **εὐδοντι κύρτος ἀίρει**. Böttcher takes **בֵּן** in the sense of “so = without anything further;” and **כֵּן** certainly has this meaning sometimes (vid., introduction to Psalm 110), but not in this passage, where, as referring back, it stands at the head of the clause, and where what this mimic **כֵּן** would import lies in the word **שָׁנָא**.

*Psa. 127: 3-5.* With **הִנֵּה** it goes on to refer to a specially striking example in support of the maxim that everything depends upon God’s blessing. **פְּרֵי הַבֶּטֶן** (Gen. 30: 2, Deu. 7:13) beside **בָּנִים** also admits of the including of daughters. It is with **שָׂכָר** (recalling Gen. 30:18) just as with **נַחֲלַת**. Just as the latter in this passage denotes an inheritance not according to hereditary right, but in accordance with the free-will of the giver, so the former denotes not a reward that is paid out as in duty bound, but a recompense that is bestowed according to one’s free judgment, and in fact looked for in accordance with a promise given, but cannot by any means be demanded. Sons are a blessed gift from above. They are — especially when they are the offspring of a youthful marriage (*opp.* **בְּרִיָּקָנִים**, Gen. 37: 3; 44:20), and accordingly themselves strong and hearty (Gen. 49: 3), and at the time that the father is growing old are in the bloom of their years — like arrows in the hand of a warrior. This is a comparison which the circumstances of his time made natural to the poet, in which the sword was carried side by side with the trowel, and the work of national restoration had to be defended step by step against open enemies, envious neighbours, and false brethren. It was not sufficient then to have arrows in the quiver; one was obligated to have them not merely at hand, but in the hand (**בְּיָד**), in order to be able to discharge them and defend one’s self. What a treasure, in such a time when it was needful to be constantly ready for fighting, defensive or offensive, was that which youthful sons afforded to the elderly father and weaker members of the family! Happy is the man — the poet exclaims — who has his quiver, i.e., his house, full of such arrows, in order to be able to deal out to the enemies as many arrows as may be needed. The father and such a host of sons surrounding him (this is the complex notion of the subject) form a phalanx not to be broken through. If they have to speak with enemies in the gate — i.e., candidly to upbraid them with their wrong, or

to ward off their unjust accusation — they shall not be ashamed, i.e., not be overawed, disheartened, or disarmed. Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*, as Ibn-Jachja has already done, takes דָּבַר here in the signification “to destroy;” but in Gen. 34:13 this *Piel* signifies to deal behind one’s back (deceitfully), and in 2Ch. 22:10 to get rid of by assassination. This shade of the notion, which proceeds from Arab. *dbr, pone esse* (vid., Psa. 18:48; 28: 2), does not suit the passage before us, and the expression לֹא-יִבְשׁוּ is favourable to the idea of the gate as being the forum, which arises from taking דְּבַר in its ordinary signification. Unjust judges, malicious accusers, and false witnesses retire shy and faint-hearted before a family so capable of defending itself. We read the opposite of this in Job. 5: 4 of sons upon whom the curse of their fathers rests.

## Psalm 128

### THE FAMILY PROSPERITY OF THE GOD-FEARING MAN

*128: 1 HAPPY is every one who feareth Jahve,  
Who walketh in His ways.*

*128: 2 The labour of thy hands shalt thou surely eat,  
Happy art thou, and it is well with thee.*

*128: 3 Thy wife, like a fruitful vine is she,  
In the inner part of thy house;  
Thy children are like shoots of olive-trees  
Round about thy table.*

*128: 4 Behold, surely thus is the man blessed  
Who feareth Jahve.*

*128: 5 Jahve bless thee out of Zion,  
And see thou the prosperity of Jerusalem  
All the days of thy life,*

*128: 6 And see thou thy children’s children —  
Peace be upon Israel!*

*Psalm 128.* Just as Psalm 127 is appended to Psalm 126 because the fact that Israel was so surprised by the redemption out of exile that they thought they were dreaming, finds its interpretation in the universal truth that God bestows upon him whom He loves, in sleep, that which others are not able to acquire by toiling and moiling day and night: so Psalm 128 follows Psalm 127 for the same reason as Psalm ch. 2 follows Psalm ch. 1. In both instances they are Psalms placed together, of which one begins with *ashrê* and one ends with *ashrê*. In other respects Psalm 128 and 127 supplement one another. They are related to one another much as the New Testament parables of the treasure in

the field and the one pearl are related. That which makes man happy is represented in Psalm 127 as a gift coming as a blessing, and in Psalm 128 as a reward coming as a blessing, that which is briefly indicated in the word שָׂכָר in Psa. 127: 3 being here expanded and unfolded. There it appears as a gift of grace in contrast to the God-estranged self-activity of man, here as a fruit of the *ora et labora*. Ewald considers this and the preceding Psalm to be songs to be sung at table. But they are ill-suited for this purpose; for they contain personal mirrorings instead of petitions, and instead of benedictions of those who are about to partake of the food provided.

*Psa. 128: 1-3.* The כִּי in v. 2 signifies neither “for” (Aquila, κόπον τῶν καρπῶν σου ὅτι φάγεσαι), nor “when” (Symmachus, κόπον χειρῶν σου ἐσθίων); it is the directly affirmative כִּי, which is sometimes thus placed after other words in a clause (Psa. 118:10-12, Gen. 18:20; 41:32). The proof in favour of this asseverating כִּי is the very usual אִתָּהּ כִּי in the apodoses of hypothetical protases, or even אִתָּהּ כִּי in Job. 11:15, or also only כִּי in Isa. 7: 9, 1Sa. 14:39: “surely then;” the transition from the confirmative to the affirmative signification is evident from v. 4 of the Psalm before us. To support one’s self by one’s own labour is a duty which even a Paul did not wish to avoid (Act. 20:34), and so it is a great good fortune (טוֹב לְךָ as in Psa. 119:71) to eat the produce of the labour of one’s own hands (LXX τοὺς καρποὺς τῶν πόνων, or according to an original reading, τοὺς πόνους τῶν καρπῶν<sup>1385</sup>); for he who can make himself useful to others and still is also independent of them, he eats the bread of blessing which God gives, which is sweeter than the bread of charity which men give. In close connection with this is the prosperity of a house that is at peace and contented within itself, of an amiable and tranquil and hopeful (rich in hope) family life. “Thy wife (אִשְׁתֶּךָ, found only here, for אִשְׁתֶּךָ) is as a fruit-producing vine.” פְּרִיָהּ for פְּרָהּ, from פְּרָהּ = פְּרִי, with the *Jod* of the root retained, like בּוֹכֵיָהּ, Lam. 1:16. The figure of the vine is admirably suited to the wife, who is a shoot or sprig of the husband, and stands in need of the man’s support as the vine needs a stick or the wall of a house (*pergula*). בֵּיתִי בִּתְּךָ does not belong to the figure, as Kimchi is of opinion, who thinks of a vine starting out of the room and climbing up in the open air outside. What is meant is the angle, corner, or nook (בֵּיתִי, in relation to things and artificial, equivalent to the natural בֵּיתִי), i.e., the background, the privacy of the house, where the housewife, who is not to be seen much out of doors, leads a quiet life, entirely devoted to the happiness of her husband and her family. The children springing from such a noble vine, planted around the family table, are like olive shoots or cuttings; cf. in Euripides, *Medea*, 1098: τέκνων ἐν οἴκοις γλυκερὸν βλάστημα, and *Herc. Fur.*



839: καλλίπαις στέφανος. Thus fresh as young layered small olive-trees and thus promising are they.

*Psa. 128: 4-6.* Pointing back to this charming picture of family life, the poet goes on to say: behold, for thus = behold, thus is the man actually blessed who fears Jahve. בֵּי confirms the reality of the matter of fact to which the דִּנְהָה points. The promissory future in v. 5a is followed by imperatives which call upon the God-fearing man at once to do that which, in accordance with the promises, stands before him as certain. לְבָנֶיךָ as in Psa. 134: 3; 20: 3. בְּנֵי בְנֵי instead of בְּנֵי בְנֵי gives a designed indefiniteness to the first member of the combination. Every blessing the individual enjoys comes from the God of salvation, who has taken up His abode in Zion, and is perfected in participation in the prosperity of the holy city and of the whole church, of which it is the centre. A New Testament song would here open up the prospect of the heavenly Jerusalem. But the character of limitation to this present world that is stamped upon the Old Testament does not admit of this. The promise refers only to a present participation in the well-being of Jerusalem (Zec. 8:15) and to long life prolonged in one's children's children; and in this sense calls down intercessorily peace upon Israel in all its members, and in all places and all ages.

## Psalm 129

### THE END OF THE OPPRESSORS OF ZION

*129: 1 ENOUGH have they oppressed me from my youth up,  
Let Israel say —*

*129: 2 Enough have they oppressed me from my youth up,  
Nevertheless they have not prevailed against me.*

*129: 3 Upon my back the ploughers ploughed,  
They made long their furrow-strip.*

*129: 4 Jahve is righteous:  
He hath cut asunder the cords of the wicked.*

*129: 5 They must be ashamed and turn back,  
All who hate Zion.*

*129: 6 They must become as grass of the house-tops,  
Which, ere it shooteth up, withereth —*

*129: 7 Wherewith the reaper filleth not his hand,  
Nor he who bindeth sheaves his bosom,*

*129: 8 Neither do they who pass by say:  
The blessing of Jahve be upon you!  
“We bless you in the name of Jahve!!”*

*Psalm 129.* Just as Psalm 124 with the words “*let Israel say*” was followed by Psalm 125 with “*peace be upon Israel,*” so Psalm 128 with “*peace be upon Israel*” is followed by Psalm 129 with “*let Israel say.*” This Psalm 129 has not only the call “*let Israel say,*” but also the situation of a deliverance that has been experienced (cf. v. 4 with Psa. 124: 6 f.), from which point it looks gratefully back and confidently forward into the future, and an Aramaic tinge that is noticeable here and there by the side of all other classical character of form, in common with Psalm 124.

*Psa. 129: 1, 2.* Israel is gratefully to confess that, however much and sorely it was oppressed, it still has not succumbed. רַבָּהּ, together with רַבַּת, has occurred already in Psa. 65:10; 62: 3, and it becomes usual in the post-exilic language, Psa. 120: 6; 123: 4, 2Ch. 30:18; Syriac *rebath*. The expression “from my youth” glances back to the time of the Egyptian bondage; for the time of the sojourn in Egypt was the time of Israel’s youth (Hos. 2:17 [15], 11: 1, Jer. 2: 2, Eze. 23: 3). The protasis v. 1a is repeated in an interlinked, chain-like conjunction in order to complete the thought; for v. 2b is the turning-point, where אֲנִי, having reference to the whole negative clause, signifies “also” in the sense of “nevertheless,” ὁμως (synon. בְּכַל-זֹאת), as in Eze. 16:28, Ecc. 6: 7, cf. above, 119:24: although they oppressed me much and sore, yet have they not overpowered me (the construction is like Num. 13:30, and frequently).

*Psa. 129: 3-5.* Elsewhere it is said that the enemies have driven over Israel (Psa. 66:12), or have gone over its back (Isa. 51:23); here the customary figurative language חָרַשׁ אֲנִי in Job. 4: 8 (cf. Hos. 10:13) is extended to another figure of hostile dealing: without compassion and without consideration they ill-treated the stretched-forth back of the people who were held in subjection, as though it were arable land, and, without restraining their ferocity and setting a limit to their spoiling of the enslaved people and country, they drew their furrow-strip (מֵעֲנִיתָם, according to the *Keri* מֵעֲנֹתָם) long. But מֵעֲנָה does not signify (as Keil on 1Sa. 14:14 is of opinion, although explaining the passage more correctly than Thenius) the furrow (= תֵּלָם, גְּדֹר), but, like Arab. *ma nât*, a strip of arable land which the ploughman takes in hand at one time, at both ends of which consequently the ploughing team (צֶמֶד) always comes to a stand, turns round, and ploughs a new furrow; from עָנָה, to bend, turn (vid., Wetzstein’s Excursus II p. 861). It is therefore: they drew their furrow-turning long (dative of the object instead of the accusative

with *Hiph.*, as e.g., in Isa. 29: 2, cf. with *Piel* in Psa. 34: 4; Psa. 116:16, and *Kal* Psa. 69: 6, after the Aramaic style, although it is not unhebraic). Righteous is Jahve — this is an universal truth, which has been verified in the present circumstances; — He hath cut asunder the cords of the wicked (עֲבוֹת) as in 2: 3; here, however, it is suggested by the metaphor in v. 3, cf. Job. 39:10; LXX ἀυχένας, i.e., עֲנוּק), with which they held Israel bound. From that which has just been experienced Israel derives the hope that *all* Zion's haters (a newly coined name for the enemies of the religion of Israel) will be obliged to retreat with shame and confusion.

*Psa. 129: 6-8.* The poet illustrates the fate that overtakes them by means of a picture borrowed from Isaiah and worked up (Isa. 37:27): they become like “grass of the housetops,” etc. שׁ is a relative to יָבֵשׁ (*quod exarescit*), and קָדַמַּת, *priusquam*, is Hebraized after מִן־קָדַמַּת דָּנָה in Dan. 6:11, or דָּנָה מִקְדַּמַּת in Ezer. 5:11. שׁלֵף elsewhere has the signification “to draw forth” of a sword, shoe, or arrow, which is followed by the LXX, Theodotion, and the Quinta: πρὸ τοῦ ἔκσπασθῆναι, before it is plucked. But side by side with the ἔκσπασθῆναι of the LXX we also find the reading ἐξανθῆσαι; and in this sense Jerome renders (*statim ut*) *viruerit*, Symmachus ἐκκαυλῆσαι (to shoot into a stalk), Aquila ἀνέθαλεν, the Sexta ἐκστερεῶσαι (to attain to full solidity). The Targum paraphrases שׁלֵף in both senses: to shoot up and to pluck off. The former signification, after which Venema interprets: *antequam se evaginet vel evaginetur*, i.e., *antequam e vaginulis suis se evolvat et succrescat*, is also advocated by Parchon, Kimchi, and Aben-Ezra. In the same sense von Ortenberg conjectures שׁחֵלֵף. Since the grass of the house-tops or roofs, if one wishes to pull it up, can be pulled up just as well when it is withered as when it is green, and since it is the most natural thing to take חֲצִיר as the subject to שׁלֵף, we decide in favour of the intransitive signification, “to put itself forth, to develope, shoot forth into ear.” The roof-grass withers before it has put forth ears of blossoms, just because it has no deep root, and therefore cannot stand against the heat of the sun. <sup>f386</sup>

The poet pursues the figure of the grass of the house-tops still further. The encompassing lap or bosom (κόλπος) is called elsewhere חֲצִין (Isa. 49:22, Neh. 5:13); here it is חֲצִין, like the Arabic *ḥiḍn* (diminutive *ḥoḍein*), of the same root with מַחֲוֹז, a creek, in Psa. 107:30. The enemies of Israel are as grass upon the house-tops, which is not garnered in; their life closes with sure destruction, the germ of which they (without any need for any rooting out) carry within themselves. The observation of Knapp, that any Western poet would have left off with v. 6, is based upon the error that vv. 7, 8 are an idle embellishment. The greeting addressed to the reapers in v. 8 is taken from life;

it is not denied even to heathen reapers. Similarly Boaz (Rut. 2: 4) greets them with “Jahve be with you,” and receives the counter-salutation, “Jahve bless thee.” Here it is the passers-by who call out to those who are harvesting: *The blessing* (בְּרַכְתָּהּ) *of Jahve happen to you* (אֲלֵיכֶם, <sup>1387</sup>

as in the Aaronitish blessing), and (since “we bless you in the name of Jahve” would be a purposeless excess of politeness in the mouth of the same speakers) receive in their turn the counter-salutation: *We bless you in the name of Jahve*. As a contrast it follows that there is before the righteous a garnering in of that which they have sown amidst the exchange of joyful benedictory greetings.

## Psalm 130

### DE PROFUNDIS

*130: 1 OUT of the depths do I call unto Thee, Jahve.*

*130: 2 Lord, O hearken to my voice,  
Let Thine ears be attentive  
To the voice of my supplication!*

*130: 3 If Thou keepst iniquities, Jāh —  
Lord, who can stand?!*

*130: 4 Yet with Thee is the forgiveness,  
That Thou mayest be feared.*

*130: 5 I hope in Jahve, my soul hopeth,  
And upon His word do I wait.*

*130: 6 My soul waiteth for the Lord,  
More than the night-watchers for the morning,  
The night-watchers for the morning.*

*130: 7 Wait, Israel, for Jahve,  
For with Jahve is the mercy,  
And abundantly is there with Him redemption.*

*130: 8 And HE will redeem Israel  
From all its iniquities.*

*Psalm 130.* Luther, being once asked which were the best Psalms, replied, *Psalmi Paulini*; and when his companions at table pressed him to say which these were, he answered: Psalm 32, 51, 130, and 143. In fact in Psalm 130 the condemnability of the natural man, the freeness of mercy, and the spiritual nature of redemption are expressed in a manner thoroughly Pauline. It is the sixth among the seven *Psalmi poenitentiales* (6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143).

Even the chronicler had this Psalm before him in the present classification, which puts it near to Psalm 132; for the independent addition with which he enriches Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple, 2Ch. 6:40-42, is compiled out of passages of Psalm 130 (v. 2, cf. the divine response, 2Ch. 7:15) and Psalm 132 (vv. 8, 16, 10).

The mutual relation of Psalm 130 to Psalm 86 has been already noticed there. The two Psalms are first attempts at adding a third, Adonajic style to the Jehovic and Elohimic Psalm-style. There *Adonaj* is repeated seven times, and three times in this Psalm. There are also other indications that the writer of Psalm 130 was acquainted with that Psalm 86 (compare v. 2a, שְׁמַעָה בְּקוֹלִי, with Psa. 86: 6, וְהִקְשִׁיבָה בְּקוֹל, ; v. 2b, לְקוֹל תַּחֲנוּנָי, with Psa. 86: 6, בְּקוֹל תַּחֲנוּנֹתַי ; v. 4, עֲמַד הַסְּלִיחָה, with Psa. 86: 5, וְסִלַּח, ; v. 8, הִי יִחַסֵּד, with 86: 5, 15, רַב־יִחַסֵּד). The fact that קָשׁוּב (after the form שְׁכִיב), occurs besides only in those dependent passages of the chronicler, and קָשׁוּב only in Neh. 1: 6, 11, as סְלִיחָה besides only in Dan. 9: 9, Neh. 9:17, brings our Psalm down into a later period of the language; and moreover Psalm 86 is not Davidic.

*Psa. 130: 1-4.* The depths (מַעְמָקִים) are not the depths of the soul, but the deep outward and inward distress in which the poet is sunk as in deep waters (Psa. 69: 3, 15). Out of these depths he cries to the God of salvation, and importunately prays Him who rules all things and can do all things to grant him a compliant hearing (שָׁמַע בְּ, Gen. 21:12; 26:13; 30: 6, and other passages). God heard indeed even in Himself, as being the omniscient One, the softest and most secret as well as the loudest utterance; but, as Hilary observes, *fides officium suum exsequitur, ut Dei auditionem roget, ut qui per naturam suam audit per orantis precem dignetur audire.* In this sense the poet prays that His ears may be turned קָשׁוּבָה (duller collateral form of קָשׁוּב, to be in the condition of *arrectae aures*), with strained attention, to his loud and urgent petition (Psa. 28: 2). His life hangs upon the thread of the divine compassion. If God preserves iniquities, who can stand before Him?! He preserves them (שָׁמַר) when He puts them down to one (Psa. 32: 2) and keeps them in remembrance (Gen. 37:11), or, as it is figuratively expressed in Job. 14:17, sealed up as it were in custody in order to punish them when the measure is full. The inevitable consequence of this is the destruction of the sinner, for nothing can stand against the punitive justice of God (Nah. 1: 6, Mal. 3: 2, Ezr. 9:15). If God should show Himself as *Jāh*,<sup>f388</sup> no creature would be able to stand before Him, who is *Adonaj*, and can therefore carry out His judicial will or purpose (Isa. 51:16). He does not, however, act thus. He does not proceed according to the legal stringency of recompensative justice. This thought,

which fills up the pause after the question, but is not directly expressed, is confirmed by the following **כִּי**, which therefore, as in Job. 22: 2; 31:18; 39:14, Isa. 28:28 (cf. Ecc. 5: 6), introduces the opposite. With the Lord is the willingness to forgive (**הַסְּלִיחָה**), in order that He may be feared; i.e., He forgives, as it is expressed elsewhere (e.g., Psa. 79: 9), for His Name's sake: He seeks therein the glorifying of His Name. He will, as the sole Author of our salvation, who, putting all vain-glorifying to shame, causes mercy instead of justice to take its course with us (cf. Psa. 51: 6), be revered; and gives the sinner occasion, ground, and material for reverential thanksgiving and praise by bestowing "forgiveness" upon him in the plenitude of absolutely free grace.

**Psa. 130: 5-8.** Therefore the sinner need not, therefore too the poet will not, despair. He hopes in Jahve (*acc. obj.* as in Psa. 25: 5, 21; 40: 2), his soul hopes; hoping in and waiting upon God is the mood of his inmost and of his whole being. He waits upon God's word, the word of His salvation (Psa. 119:81), which, if it penetrates into the soul and cleaves there, calms all unrest, and by the appropriated consolation of forgiveness transforms and enlightens for it everything in it and outside of it. His soul is **לְאֲדֹנָי**, i.e., steadfastly and continually directed towards Him; as Chr. A. Crusius when on his death-bed, with hands and eyes uplifted to heaven, joyfully exclaimed: "My soul is full of the mercy of Jesus Christ. *My whole soul is towards God.*" The meaning of **לְאֲדֹנָי** becomes at once clear in itself from Psa. 143: 6, and is defined moreover, without supplying **שְׁמֵרָת** (Hitzig), according to the following **לְבַקֵּר**. Towards the Lord he is expectantly turned, like those who in the night-time wait for the morning. The repetition of the expression "those who watch for the morning" (cf. Isa. 21:11) gives the impression of protracted, painful waiting. The wrath, in the sphere of which the poet now finds himself, is a nightly darkness, out of which he wishes to be removed into the sunny realm of love (Mal. 3:20 [4: 2]); not he alone, however, but at the same time all Israel, whose need is the same, and for whom therefore believing waiting is likewise the way to salvation. With Jahve, and with Him exclusively, with Him, however, also in all its fulness, is **הַחֶסֶד** (contrary to Psa. 62:13, without any pausal change in accordance with the varying of the segolates), the mercy, which removes the guilt of sin and its consequences, and puts freedom, peace, and joy into the heart. And plenteous (**הַרְבֵּה**, an adverbial *infin. absol.*, used here, as in Eze. 21:20, as an adjective) is with Him redemption; i.e., He possesses in the richest measure the willingness, the power, and the wisdom, which are needed to procure redemption, which rises up as a wall of partition (Exo. 8:19) between destruction and those imperilled. To Him, therefore, must the individual, if he will obtain mercy, to Him must His people, look up hopefully; and this hope directed to Him shall not be put to shame: He, in the

fulness of the might of His free grace (Isa. 43:25), will redeem Israel from all its iniquities, by forgiving them and removing their unhappy inward and outward consequences. With this promise (cf. 25:22) the poet comforts himself. He means complete and final redemption, above all, in the genuinely New Testament manner, spiritual redemption.

## Psalm 131

### CHILD-LIKE RESIGNATION TO GOD

*131: 1 JAHVE, my heart is not haughty, and mine eyes are not lofty,  
Neither have I to do with great things  
And extraordinary which are beyond me.*

*131: 2 Verily I have smoothed down and calmed my soul;  
Like a child that is weaned beside its mother,  
Like the child that is weaned is my soul beside me.*

*131: 3 Wait, Israel, upon Jahve  
From henceforth and for ever.*

*Psalm 131.* This little song is inscribed לְדָוִד because it is like an echo of the answer (2Sa. 6:21 f.) with which David repelled the mocking observation of Michal when he danced before the Ark in a linen ephod, and therefore not in kingly attire, but in the common raiment of the priests: *I esteem myself still less than I now show it, and I appear base in mine own eyes.* In general David is the model of the state of mind which the poet expresses here. He did not push himself forward, but suffered himself to be drawn forth out of seclusion. He did not take possession of the throne violently, but after Samuel has anointed him he willingly and patiently traverses the long, thorny, circuitous way of deep abasement, until he receives from God's hand that which God's promise had assured to him. The persecution by Saul lasted about ten years, and his kingship in Hebron, at first only incipient, seven years and a half. He left it entirely to God to remove Saul and Ishbosheth. He let Shimei curse. He left Jerusalem before Absalom. Submission to God's guidance, resignation to His dispensations, contentment with that which was allotted to him, are the distinguishing traits of his noble character, which the poet of this Psalm indirectly holds up to himself and to his contemporaries as a mirror, viz., to the Israel of the period after the Exile, which, in connection with small beginnings under difficult circumstances, had been taught humbly contented and calm waiting.

With לֹא-גִבָּה לְבִי the poet repudiates pride as being the state of his soul; with לֹא-רָמוּ עֵינָי (*lo-ramū* as in Pro. 30:13, and before *Ajin*, e.g., also in Gen. 26:10, Isa. 11: 2, in accordance with which the erroneous placing of the

accent in Baer's text is to be corrected), pride of countenance and bearing; and with **וְלֹא־הִלְכֹתִי**, pride of endeavour and mode of action. Pride has its seat in the heart, in the eyes especially it finds its expression, and great things are its sphere in which it diligently exercises itself. The opposite of "great things" (Jer. 23: 3; 45: 5) is not that which is little, mean, but that which is small; and the opposite of "things too wonderful for me" (Gen. 18:14) is not that which is trivial, but that which is attainable.

**אִם־לֹא** does not open a conditional protasis, for where is the indication of the apodosis to be found? Nor does it signify "but," a meaning it also has not in Gen. 24:38, Eze. 3: 6. In these passages too, as in the passage before us, it is asseverating, being derived from the usual formula of an oath: verily I have, etc. **שָׁוָה** signifies (Isa. 28:25) to level the surface of a field by ploughing it up, and has an ethical sense here, like **יָשַׁר** with its opposites **עָקַב** and **עָפַל**. The *Poel* **דִּוְמַם** is to be understood according to **דִּוְמָה** in Psa. 62: 2, and **דִּוְמַם** in Lam. 3:26. He has levelled or made smooth his soul, so that humility is its entire and uniform state; he has calmed it so that it is silent and at rest, and lets God speak and work in it and for it: it is like an even surface, and like the calm surface of a lake. Ewald and Hupfeld's rendering: "as a weaned child on its mother, so my soul, being weaned, lies on me," is refuted by the consideration that it ought at least to be **בְּגִמּוּלָה**, but more correctly **בֵּין גִּמּוּלָה**; but it is also besides opposed by the article which is swallowed up in **בְּגִמּוּל**, according to which it is to be rendered: like one weaned beside its mother (here **בְּגִמּוּל** on account of the determinative collateral definition), like the weaned one (here **בְּגִמּוּל** because without any collateral definition: cf. with Hitzig, Deu. 32: 2, and the like; moreover, also, because referring back to the first **גִּמּוּל**, cf. Hab. 3: 8), is my soul beside me (Hitzig, Hengstenberg, and most expositors). As a weaned child — viz. not one that is only just begun to be weaned, but an actually weaned child (**גִּמּוּל**, cognate **גָּמַר**, to bring to an end, more particularly to bring suckling to an end, to wean) — lies upon its mother without crying impatiently and craving for its mother's breast, but contented with the fact that it has its mother — like such a weaned child is his soul upon him, i.e., in relation to his Ego (which is conceived of in **עָלַי** as having the soul upon itself, cf. 42: 7, Jer. 8:18; *Psychology*, S. 151 f., tr. p. 180): his soul, which is by nature restless and craving, is stilled; it does not long after earthly enjoyment and earthly good that God should give these to it, but it is satisfied in the fellowship of God, it finds full satisfaction in Him, it is satisfied (satiated) in Him.

By the closing strain, v. 3, the individual language of the Psalm comes to have a reference to the congregation at large. Israel is to renounce all self-boasting



and all self-activity, and to wait in lowliness and quietness upon its God from now and for evermore. For He resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble.

## **Psalm 132**

### **PRAYER FOR THE HOUSE OF GOD AND THE HOUSE OF DAVID**

*132: 1 REMEMBER, Jahve, to DAVID  
All the trouble endured by him,*

*132: 2 Him who hath sworn unto Jahve,  
Hath vowed unto the Mighty One of Jacob:*

*132: 3 “I will not enter into the tent of my house,  
I will not go up to the bed of my couch;*

*132: 4 I will not give sleep to mine eyes,  
Slumber to mine eyelids,*

*132: 5 Until I find a place for Jahve,  
A dwelling-tent for the Mighty One of Jacob! “*

*132: 6 Behold it was, we heard it, in Ephrâthah,  
We found it in the fields of Ja’ar.*

*132: 7 So let us go into His dwelling-tent,  
Let us prostrate ourselves before His footstool.*

*132: 8 Arise, Jahve, to Thy rest,  
Thou and the Ark of Thy majesty!*

*132: 9 Let Thy priests clothe themselves with righteousness,  
And Thy saints shout for joy.*

*132:10 For the sake of DAVID Thy servant  
Turn not back the face of Thine anointed!*

*132:11 Jahve hath sworn to DAVID  
In truth that which He will not recall:  
“Of the fruit of thy body  
Do I appoint a possessor of thy throne.*

*132:12 If thy children keep My covenant  
And My testimony, which I teach them:  
Their children also shall for ever  
Sit upon thy throne.”*

*132:13 For Jahve hath chosen Zion,  
He hath desired it as an abode for Himself.*

*132:14 “This is my rest for ever,  
Here will I dwell, for I have desired it. “*

*132:15 Her provision will I bless abundantly,  
Her poor will I satisfy with bread,*

*132:16 And her priests will I clothe with salvation,  
And her saints shall shout aloud for joy.*

*132:17 There will I make a horn to shoot forth for DAVID,  
I will prepare a lamp for mine anointed.*

*132:18 His enemies will I clothe with shame,  
And upon himself shall his crown blossom.*

*Psalm 132.* Psalm 131 designedly precedes Psalm 132. The former has grown out of the memory of an utterance of David when he brought home the Ark, and the latter begins with the remembrance of David’s humbly zealous endeavour to obtain a settled and worthy abode for the God who sits enthroned above the Ark among His people. It is the only Psalm in which the sacred Ark is mentioned. The chronicler put vv. 8-10 into the mouth of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple (2Ch. 6:41 f.). After a passage borrowed from Psa. 130: 2 which is attached by אֲתָהּ to Solomon’s Temple-dedication prayer, he appends further borrowed passages out of Psalm 132 with וְאֲתָהּ. The variations in these verses of the Psalms, which are annexed by him with a free hand and from memory (*Jahve Elohim* for *Jahve*, לְמִנְחָתֶךָ for לְנוֹחָךָ, אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ לְשֹׁמְרֵי הַבְּרִית for אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ לְשֹׁמְרֵי הַבְּרִית), just as much prove that he has altered the Psalm, and not reversely (as Hitzig persistently maintains), that the psalmist has borrowed from the Chronicles. It is even still distinctly to be seen how the memory of Isa. 55: 3 has influenced the close of v. 42 in the chronicler, just as the memory of Isa. 55: 2 has perhaps also influenced the close of v. 41.

The psalmist supplicates the divine favour for the anointed of Jahve for David’s sake. In this connection this anointed one is neither the high priest, nor Israel, which is never so named (vid., Hab. 3:13), nor David himself, who “in all the necessities of his race and people stands before God,” as Hengstenberg asserts, in order to be able to assign this Son of degrees, as others, likewise to the post-exilic time of the new colony. Zerubbabel might more readily be understood (Baur), with whom, according to the closing prophecy of the Book of Haggai, a new period of the Davidic dominion is said to begin. But even Zerubbabel, the פֶּתַח יְהוּדָה, could not be called מְשִׁיחַ, for this he was not. The chronicler applies the Psalm in accordance with its contents. It is suited to the mouth of Solomon. The view that it was composed by Solomon himself when the Ark of the covenant was removed out of the tent-temple on Zion into

the Temple- building (Amyraldus, De Wette, Tholuck, and others), is favoured by the relation of the circumstances, as they are narrated in 2Ch. 5: 5 ff., to the desires of the Psalm, and a close kinship of the Psalm with Psalm 72 in breadth, repetitions of words, and a laboured forward movement which is here and there a somewhat uncertain advance. At all events it belongs to a time in which the Davidic throne was still standing and the sacred Ark was not as yet irrecoverably lost. That which, according to 2Sa. 6, 7, David did for the glory of Jahve, and on the other hand is promised to him by Jahve, is here made by a post-Davidic poet into the foundation of a hopeful intercessory prayer for the kingship and priesthood of Zion and the church presided over by both.

The Psalm consists of four ten-line strophes. Only in connection with the first could any objection be raised, and the strophe be looked upon as only consisting of nine lines. But the other strophes decide the question of its measure; and the breaking up of the weighty v. 1 into two lines follows the accentuation, which divides it into two parts and places **פָּנֵי** by itself as being **פָּנֵי** (according to *Accentsystem*, xviii. 2, with *Mugrash*). Each strophe is adorned once with the name of *David*; and moreover the step-like progress which comes back to what has been said, and takes up the thread and carries it forward, cannot fail to be recognised.

*Psa. 132: 1-5.* One is said to remember anything to another when he requites him something that he has done for him, or when he does for him what he has promised him. It is the post-Davidic church which here reminds Jahve of the hereinafter mentioned promises (of the “mercies of David,” 2Ch. 6:42, cf. Isa. 55: 3) with which He has responded to David’s **עָנֹת**. By this verbal substantive of the *Pual* is meant all the care and trouble which David had in order to procure a worthy abode for the sanctuary of Jahve. **בָּ עָנָה** signifies to trouble or harass one’s self about anything, *afflictari* (as frequently in the Book of Ecclesiastes); the *Pual* here denotes the self-imposed trouble, or even that imposed by outward circumstances, such as the tedious wars, of long, unsuccessful, and yet never relaxed endeavours (1Ki. 5:17 [3]). For he had vowed unto God that he would give himself absolutely no rest until he had obtained a fixed abode for Jahve. What he said to Nathan (2Sa. 7: 2) is an indication of this vowed resolve, which was now in a time of triumphant peace, as it seemed, ready for being carried out, after the first step towards it had already been taken in the removal of the Ark of the covenant to Zion (2 Samuel 6); for 2 Samuel 7 is appended to 2 Samuel 6 out of its chronological order and only on account of the internal connection. After the bringing home of the Ark, which had been long yearned for (Psa. 101: 2), and did not take place without difficulties and terrors, was accomplished, a series of years again passed over, during which David always carried about with him

the thought of erecting God a Temple-building. And when he had received the tidings through Nathan that he should not build God a house, but that it should be done by his son and successor, he nevertheless did as much towards the carrying out of the desire of his heart as was possible in connection with this declaration of the will of Jahve. He consecrated the site of the future Temple, he procured the necessary means and materials for the building of it, he made all the necessary arrangements for the future Temple-service, he inspirited the people for the gigantic work of building that was before them, and handed over to his son the model for it, as it is all related to us in detail by the chronicler. The divine name “the mighty One of Jacob” is taken from Gen. 49:24, as in Isa. 1:24; 49:26; 60:16. The Philistines with their Dagon had been made to feel this mighty Rock of Jacob when they took the sacred Ark along with them (1 Samuel 5). With אֵשׁ David solemnly declares what he is resolved not to do. The meaning of the hyperbolically expressed vow in the form of an oath is that for so long he will not rejoice at his own dwelling-house, nor give himself up to sleep that is free from anxiety; in fine, for so long he will not rest. The genitives after אֵשׁ and עָרַשׁ are appositional genitives; Psalm 44 delights in similar combinations of synonyms. צִוְעִי (Latin *strata mea*) is a poetical plural, as also is מִשְׁכְּנֹתַי. With תְּנוּמָה (which is always said of the eyelids, Gen. 31:40, Pro. 6: 4, Ecc. 8:16, not of the eyes) alternates שְׁנָתַי (according to another reading שְׁנַתַּי) for שְׁנָה. The *āth* is the same as in נִחַלְתָּ in Psa. 16: 6, cf. 60:13, Exo. 15: 2, and frequently. This Aramaizing rejection of the syllable before the tone is, however, without example elsewhere. The LXX adds to v. 4, καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν τοῖς κροτάφοις μου (וּמְנוּחָה לְרִקְקוֹתַי), but this is a disagreeable overloading of the verse.

*Psa. 132: 6-10.* In v. 6 begins the language of the church, which in this Psalm reminds Jahve of His promises and comforts itself with them. Olshausen regards this v. 6 as altogether inexplicable. The interpretation nevertheless has some safe starting-points.

(1) Since the subject spoken of is the founding of a fixed sanctuary, and one worthy of Jahve, the suffix of שְׁמֵעֲנֵנָה (with *Chateph* as in Hos. 8: 2, Ew. § 60, *a*) and מִצְאֲנוּנָהּ refers to the Ark of the covenant, which is *fem.* also in other instances (1Sa. 4:17, 2Ch. 8:11).

(2) The Ark of the covenant, fetched up out of Shiloh by the Israelites to the battle at Ebenezer, fell into the hands of the victors, and remained, having been again given up by them, for twenty years in Kirjath-Jearim (1Sa. 7: 1 f.), until David removed it out of this Judaeian district to Zion (2Sa. 6: 2-4; cf. 2Ch. 1: 4). What is then more natural than that שְׁדִי־אֵר (שְׁדִי־אֵר) is a poetical

appellation of Kirjath-Jearim (cf. “the field of Zoan” in 78:12)? Kirjath-Jearim has, as a general thing, very varying names. It is also called *Kirjath-ha-jearim* in Jer. 26:20 (*Kirjath-’arim* in Ezr. 2:25, cf. Jos. 18:28), *Kirjath-ba’al* in Jos. 16:50, *Ba’alah* in Jos. 15: 9, 1Ch. 13: 6 (cf. *Har-ha-ba’alah*, Jos. 15:11, with *Har-Jearim* in Jos. 15:10), and, as it seems, even *Ba’alê Jehudah* in 2Sa. 6: 2. Why should it not also have been called *Ja’ar* side by side with *Kirjath-Jearim*, and more especially if the mountainous district, to which the mention of a hill and mountain of *Jearim* points, was, as the name “city of the wood” implies, at the same time a wooded district? We therefore fall in with Kühnöl’s (1799) rendering: we found it in the meadows of Jaar, and with his remark: “Jaar is a shortened name of the city of Kirjath-Jearim.”

The question now further arises as to what *Ephrathah* is intended to mean. This is an ancient name of Bethlehem; but the Ark of the covenant never was in Bethlehem. Accordingly Hengstenberg interprets, “We knew of it in Bethlehem (where David had spent his youth) only by hearsay, no one had seen it; we found it in Kirjath-Jearim, yonder in the wooded environs of the city, where it was as it were buried in darkness and solitude.” So even Anton Hulsius (1650): *Ipse David loquitur, qui dicit illam ipsam arcam, de qua quum adhuc Bethlehemi versaretur inaudivisset, postea a se (vel majroibus suis ipso adhuc minorenni) inventam fuisse in campis Jaar. But*

- (1) the supposition that David’s words are continued here does not harmonize with the way in which they are introduced in v. 2, according to which they cannot possibly extend beyond the vow that follows.
- (2) If the church is speaking, one does not see why Bethlehem is mentioned in particular as the place of the hearsay.
- (3) *We heard it in Ephrathah* cannot well mean anything else than, *per antiptosin* (as in Gen. 1: 4, but without אֶרֶץ), we heard that it was in Ephrathah.

But the Ark was before Kirjath-Jearim in Shiloh. The former lay in the tribe of Judah close to the western borders of Benjamin, the latter in the midst of the tribe of Ephraim. Now since אֶרֶץ quite as often means an Ephraimite as it does a Bethlehemite, it may be asked whether *Ephrathah* is not intended of the Ephraimitish territory (Kühnöl, Gesenius, Maurer, Tholuck, and others). The meaning would then be: we had heard that the sacred Ark was in Shiloh, but we found it not there, but in Kirjath-Jearim. And we can easily understand why the poet has mentioned the two places just in this way. *Ephrath*, according to its etymon, is fruitful fields, with which are contrasted the fields of the wood — the sacred Ark had fallen from its original, more worthy abode, as it were, into the wilderness. But is it probable, more especially in view of Mic. 5: 1,

that in a connection in which the memory of David is the ruling idea, *Ephrathah* signifies the land of Ephraim? No, *Ephrathah* is the name of the district in which Kirjath-Jearim lay. Caleb had, for instance, by Ephrath, his third wife, a son named *Hûr* (*Chûr*), 1Ch. 2:19, This *Hûr*, the first-born of Ephrathah, is the father of the population of Bethlehem (1Ch. 4: 4), and Shobal, a son of this *Hûr*, is father of the population of Kirjath-Jearim (1Ch. 2:50). Kirjath-Jearim is therefore, so to speak, the daughter of Bethlehem. This was called Ephrathah in ancient times, and this name of Bethlehem became the name of its district (Mic. 5: 1). Kirjath-Jearim belonged to *Caleb-Ephrathah* (1Ch. 2:24), as the northern part of this district seems to have been called in distinction from *Negeb-Caleb* (1Sa. 30:14).

But **מִשְׁכַּנְתִּי** in v. 7 is now neither a designation of the house of Abinadab in Kirjath-Jearim, for the expression would be too grand, and in relation to v. 5 even confusing, nor a designation of the Salomonic Temple-building, for the expression standing thus by itself is not enough alone to designate it. What is meant will therefore be the tent-temple erected by David for the Ark when removed to Zion (2Sa. 7: 2, **יְרִיעָה**). The church arouses itself to enter this, and to prostrate itself in adoration towards (vid., Psa. 99: 5) the footstool of Jahve, i.e., the Ark; and to what purpose? The ark of the covenant is now to have a place more worthy of it; the **מִנְוָחָה**, i.e., the **בֵּית מְנוּחָה**, 1Ch. 28: 2, in which David's endeavours have through Solomon reached their goal, is erected: let Jahve and the Ark of His sovereign power, that may not be touched (see the examples of its inviolable character in 1Sa. 5, 6, 2Sa. 6: 6 f.), now enter this fixed abode! Let His priests who are to serve Him there clothe themselves in "righteousness," i.e., in conduct that is according to His will and pleasure; let His saints, who shall there seek and find mercy, shout for joy! More especially, however, let Jahve for David's sake, His servant, to whose restless longing this place of rest owes its origin, not turn back the face of His anointed one, i.e., not reject his face which there turns towards Him in the attitude of prayer (cf. Psa. 84:10). The chronicler has understood v. 10 as an intercession on behalf of Solomon, and the situation into which we are introduced by vv. 6-8 seems to require this. It is, however, possible that a more recent poet here, in vv. 7, 8, reproduces words taken from the heart of the church in Solomon's time, and blends petitions of the church of the present with them. The subject all through is the church, which is ever identical although changing in the persons of its members. The Israel that brought the sacred Ark out of Kirjath-Jearim to Zion and accompanied it thence to the Temple-hill, and now worships in the sanctuary raised by David's zeal for the glory of Jahve, is one and the same. The prayer for the priests, for all the saints, and more especially for the reigning king, that then resounded at the dedication of the Temple, is continued so long as the history of Israel lasts, even in a time when Israel has

no king, but has all the stronger longing for the fulfilment of the Messianic promise.

*Psa. 132:11-13.* The “for the sake of David” is here set forth in detail. אָמַת in v. 11a is not the accusative of the object, but an adverbial accusative. The first member of the verse closes with לְדָוִד, which has the distinctive *Pazer*, which is preceded by *Legarmeh* as a sub-distinctive; then follows at the head of the second member אָמַת with *Zinnor*, then לְאֵי-יָשׁוּב מִמְּנָה with *Olewejored* and its conjunctive *Galgal*, which regularly precedes after the sub-distinctive *Zinnor*. The suffix of מִמְּנָה refers to that which was affirmed by oath, as in Jer. 4:28. Lineal descendants of David will Jahve place on the throne (לְכִסֵּא like לְרֵאשִׁי in Psa. 21: 4) to him, i.e., so that they shall follow his as possessors of the throne. David’s children shall for ever (which has been finally fulfilled in Christ) sit לְכִסֵּא to him (cf. Psa. 9: 5, Job. 36: 7). Thus has Jahve promised, and expects in return from the sons of David the observance of His Law. Instead of עֲדָתִי זֶה it is pointed עֲדָתִי זֶה. In Hahn’s edition עֲדָתִי has *Mercha* in the *penult.* (cf. the retreat of the tone in אֲדַנִּי זֶה, Dan. 10:17), and in Baer’s edition the still better attested reading *Mahpach* instead of the counter-tone *Metheg*, and *Mercha* on the *ultima*. It is not plural with a singular suffix (cf. Deu. 28:59, Ges. § 91, 3), but, as זֶה = זֹאת indicates, the singular for עֲדוּתִי, like פְּחֻנּוֹתִי for פְּחֻנּוֹתִי in 2Ki. 6: 8; and signifies the revelation of God as an attestation of His will. אֶלְמָדָם has *Mercha mahpach.*, זֶה *Rebia parvum*, and עֲדָתִי *Mercha*; and according to the interpunction it would have to be rendered: “and My self-attestation there” (vid., on Psa. 9:16), but זֶה is relative: My self-attestation (revelation), which I teach them. The divine words extend to the end of v. 12. The hypotheses with אֶם, as the fulfilment in history shows, were conditions of the continuity of the Davidic succession; not, however, — because human unfaithfulness does not annul the faithfulness of God, — of the endlessness of the Davidic throne. In v. 13 the poet states the ground of such promissory mercy. It is based on the universal mercy of the election of Jerusalem. אָנָּה has *He mappic.* like עֲנָה in Deu. 22:29, or the stroke of *Raphe* (Ew. § 247, *d*), although the suffix is not absolutely necessary. In the following strophe the purport of the election of Jerusalem is also unfolded in Jahve’s own words.

*Psa. 132:14-18.* Shiloh has been rejected (Psa. 78:60), for a time only was the sacred Ark in Bethel (Jud. 20:27) and Mizpah (Jud. 21: 5), only somewhat over twenty years was it sheltered by the house of Abinadab in Kirjath-Jearim (1Sa. 7: 2), only three months by the house of Obed-Edom in Perez-Uzzah (2Sa. 6:11) — but Zion is Jahve’s abiding dwelling-place, His own proper

settlement, **מְנוּחָה** (as in Isa. 11:10; 66: 1, and besides 1Ch. 28: 2). In Zion, His chosen and beloved dwelling-place, Jahve blesses everything that belongs to her temporal need (**צִידָה** for **יִדְתָּהּ**, vid., on 27: 5, note); so that her poor do not suffer want, for divine love loves the poor most especially. His second blessing refers to the priests, for by means of these He will keep up His intercourse with His people. He makes the priesthood of Zion a real institution of salvation: He clothes her priests with salvation, so that they do not merely bring it about instrumentally, but personally possess it, and their whole outward appearance is one which proclaims salvation. And to all her saints He gives cause and matter for high and lasting joy, by making Himself known also to the church, in which He has taken up His abode, in deeds of mercy (loving-kindness or grace). There (**שֶׁם**, 133: 3) in Zion is indeed the kingship of promise, which cannot fail of fulfilment. He will cause a horn to shoot forth, He will prepare a lamp, for the house of David, which David here represents as being its ancestor and the anointed one of God reigning at that time; and all who hostilely rise up against David in his seed, He will cover with shame as with a garment (Job. 8:22), and the crown consecrated by promise, which the seed of David wears, shall blossom like an unfading wreath. The horn is an emblem of defensive might and victorious dominion, and the lamp (**נֵר**, 2Sa. 21:17, cf. **נֵר**, 2Ch. 21: 7, LXX **λύχνον**) an emblem of brilliant dignity and joyfulness. In view of Eze. 29:21, of the predictions concerning the Branch (*zemach*) in Isa. 4: 2, Jer. 23: 5; 33:15, Zec. 3: 8; 6:12 (cf. Heb. 7:14), and of the fifteenth Beracha of the *Shemone-ESre* (the daily Jewish prayer consisting of eighteen benedictions): “make the branch (*zemach*) of David Thy servant to shoot forth speedily, and let his horn rise high by virtue of Thy salvation,” — it is hardly to be doubted that the poet attached a Messianic meaning to this promise. With reference to our Psalm, Zacharias, the father of Joh. the Baptist, changes that supplicatory beracha of his nation (Luke 1:68-70) into a praiseful one, joyfully anticipating the fulfilment that is at hand in Jesus.

## Psalm 133

### PRAISE OF BROTHERLY FELLOWSHIP

*133: 1 BEHOLD how good it is, and how delightful,  
That brethren also dwell together!*

*133: 2 Like the fine oil upon the head,  
Flowing gently down upon the beard, the beard of Aaron,  
Which flows gently down upon the hem of his garments —*



*133: 3 Like the dew of Hermon,  
which flows gently down upon the mountains of Zion,  
For there hath Jahve commanded the blessing,  
Life, for evermore.*

*Psalm 133.* In this Psalm, says Hengstenberg, “David brings to the consciousness of the church the glory of the fellowship of the saints, that had so long been wanting, the restoration of which had begun with the setting up of the Ark in Zion.” The Psalm, in fact, does not speak of the termination of the dispersion, but of the uniting of the people of all parts of the land for the purpose of divine worship in the one place of the sanctuary; and, as in the case of Psalm 122, its counterpart, occasions can be found in the history of David adapted to the **לְדוֹד** of the inscription. But the language witnesses against David; for the construction of **שׁ** with the participle, as **שִׁירֵד**, *qui descendit* (cf. Psa. 135: 2, **שְׁעִמְדִים**, *qui stant*), is unknown in the usage of the language prior to the Exile. Moreover the inscription **לְדוֹד** is wanting in the LXX *Cod. Vat.* and the Targum; and the Psalm may only have been so inscribed because it entirely breathes David’s spirit, and is as though it had sprung out of his love for Jonathan.

With **אֶבְרָתָם** the assertion passes on from the community of nature and sentiment which the word “brethren” expresses to the outward active manifestation and realization that correspond to it: good and delightful (Psa. 135: 3) it is when brethren united by blood and heart also (corresponding to this their brotherly nature) dwell together — a blessed joy which Israel has enjoyed during the three great Feasts, although only for a brief period (vid., Psalm 122). Because the high priest, in whom the priestly mediatorial office culminates, is the chief personage in the celebration of the feast, the nature and value of that local reunion is first of all expressed by a metaphor taken from him. **שֶׁמֶן הַטּוֹב** is the oil for anointing described in Exo. 30:22-33, which consisted of a mixture of oil and aromatic spices strictly forbidden to be used in common life. The sons of Aaron were only sprinkled with this anointing oil; but Aaron was expressly anointed with it, inasmuch as Moses poured it upon his head; hence he is called *par excellence* “the anointed priest” (**הַכֹּהֵן הַמְּשִׁיחַ**), whilst the other priests are only “anointed” (**מְשֻׁחִים**, Num. 3: 3) in so far as their garments, like Aaron’s, were also sprinkled with the oil (together with the blood of the ram of consecration), Lev. 8:12, 30. In the time of the second Temple, to which the holy oil of anointing was wanting, the installation into the office of high priest took place by his being invested in the pontifical robes. The poet, however, when he calls the high priest as such *Aaron*, has the high-priesthood in all the fulness of its divine consecration (Lev. 21:10) before his eyes. Two drops of the holy oil of anointing, says a Haggada, remained for

ever hanging on the beard of Aaron like two pearls, as an emblem of atonement and of peace. In the act of the anointing itself the precious oil freely poured out ran gently down upon his beard, which in accordance with Lev. 21: 5 was unshortened.

In that part of the *Tôra* which describes the robe of the high priest, שׂוּלֵי is its hems, פִּי רֵאשׁוֹ, or even absolutely פֶּה, the opening for the head, or the collar, by means of which the sleeveless garment was put on, and שְׂפָה the binding, the embroidery, the border of this collar (vid., Exo. 28:32; 39:23; cf. Job. 30:18, פִּי כִתְנֹתַי, the collar of my shirt). פִּי must apparently be understood according to these passages of the *Tôra*, as also the appellation מְדוֹת (only here for מַדְיִים, מַדְיָם), beginning with Lev. 6: 3, denotes the whole vestment of the high priest, yet without more exact distinction. But the Targum translates פִּי with אִמְרָא (*ora = fimbria*) — a word which is related to אִמְרָא, *agnus*, like ὄα to οἶς. This ὄα is used both of the upper and lower edge of a garment. Accordingly Appolinaris and the Latin versions understand the ἐπὶ τὴν ὄαν of the LXX of the hem (*in oram vestimenti*); Theodoret, on the other hand, understands it to mean the upper edging: ὄαν ἐκάλεσεν ὁ καλοῦμεν περιτραχήλιον, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀκύλας στόμα ἐνδυμάτων εἶρηκε. So also De Sacy: *sur le bord de son vêtement, c'est-à-dire, sur le haut de ses habits pontificaux*. The decision of the question depends upon the aim of this and the following figure in v. 3. If we compare the two figures, we find that the point of the comparison is the uniting power of brotherly feeling, as that which unites in heart and soul those who are most distant from one another locally, and also brings them together in outward circumstance. If this is the point of the comparison, then Aaron's beard and the hem of his garments stand just as diametrically opposed to one another as the dew of Hermon and the mountains of Zion. פִּי is not the collar above, which gives no advance, much less the antithesis of two extremes, but the hem at the bottom (cf. שְׂפָה, Exo. 26: 4, of the edge of a curtain). It is also clear that שִׁירָד cannot now refer to the beard of Aaron, either as flowing down over the upper border of his robe, or as flowing down upon its hem; it must refer to the oil, for peaceable love that brings the most widely separated together is likened to the oil. This reference is also more appropriate to the style of the onward movement of the gradual Psalms, and is confirmed by v. 3, where it refers to the dew, which takes the place of the oil in the other metaphor. When brethren united in harmonious love also meet together in one place, as is the case in Israel at the great Feasts, it is as when the holy, precious chrism, breathing forth the blended odour of many spices, upon the head of Aaron trickles down upon his beard, and from thence to the extreme end of his vestment. It becomes thoroughly perceptible,

and also outwardly visible, that Israel, far and near, is pervaded by one spirit and bound together in unity of spirit.

This uniting spirit of brotherly love is now symbolised also by the dew of Hermon, which descends in drops upon the mountains of Zion. “What we read in the 133rd Psalm of the dew of Hermon descending upon the mountains of Zion,” says Van de Velde in his *Travels* (Bd. i. S. 97),

“is now become quite clear to me. Here, as I sat at the foot of Hermon, I understood how the water-drops which rose from its forest-mantled heights, and out of the highest ravines, which are filled the whole year round with snow, after the sun’s rays have attenuated them and moistened the atmosphere with them, descend at evening-time as a heavy dew upon the lower mountains which lie round about as its spurs. One ought to have seen Hermon with its white-golden crown glistening aloft in the blue sky, in order to be able rightly to understand the figure. Nowhere in the whole country is so heavy a dew perceptible as in the districts near to Hermon.”

To this dew the poet likens brotherly love. This is as the dew of Hermon: of such pristine freshness and thus refreshing, possessing such pristine power and thus quickening, thus born from above (Psa. 110: 3), and in fact like the dew of Hermon which comes down upon the mountains of Zion — a feature in the picture which is taken from the natural reality; for an abundant dew, when warm days have preceded, might very well be diverted to Jerusalem by the operation of the cold current of air sweeping down from the north over Hermon. We know, indeed, from our own experience how far off a cold air coming from the Alps is perceptible and produces its effects. The figure of the poet is therefore as true to nature as it is beautiful. When brethren bound together in love also meet together in one place, and in fact when brethren out of the north unite with brethren in the south in Jerusalem, the city which is the mother of all, at the great Feasts, it is as when the dew of Mount Hermon, which is covered with deep, almost eternal snow, <sup>f389</sup> descends upon the bare, unfruitful — and therefore longing for such quickening — mountains round about Zion. In Jerusalem must love and all that is good meet. For there (שֶׁמַיִם as in Psa. 132:17) hath Jahve commanded (צִוָּה as in Lev. 25:21, cf. Psa. 42: 9; 68:29) the blessing, i.e., there allotted to the blessing its rendezvous and its place of issue. אֶת־הַבְּרָכָה is appositionally explained by חַיִּים: life is the substance and goal of the blessing, the possession of all possessions, the blessing of all blessings. The closing words אֶת־הָעוֹלָם (cf. Psa. 28: 9) belong to צִוָּה: such is God’s inviolable, ever-enduring order.

## Psalm 134

### NIGHT-WATCH GREETING AND COUNTER-GREETING

#### THE CALL.

*134: 1 BEHOLD, bless ye Jahve, all ye servants of Jahve,  
Who serve in the house of Jahve by night!*

*134: 2 Lift up your hands to the sanctuary  
And bless ye Jahve!*

#### THE ANSWER.

*134: 3 Jahve bless thee out of Zion,  
The Creator of heaven and earth!*

*Psalm 134.* This Psalm consists of a greeting, vv. 1, 2, and the reply thereto. The greeting is addressed to those priests and Levites who have the night-watch in the Temple; and this antiphon is purposely placed at the end of the collection of Songs of degrees in order to take the place of a final beracha. In this sense Luther styles this Psalm *epiphonema superiorum*. It is also in other respects (vid., *Symbolae*, p. 66) an appropriate finale.

*Psa. 134: 1, 2.* The Psalm begins, like its predecessor, with הַנְּהִי; there is direct attention to an attractive phenomenon, here to a duty which springs from the office. For that it is not the persons frequenting the Temple who are addressed is at once clear from the fact that the tarrying of these in the Temple through the night, when such a thing did actually occur (Luk. 2:37), was only an exception. And then, however, from the fact that עֲמַד is the customary word for the service of the priests and Levites, Deu. 10: 8; 18: 7, 1Ch. 23:30, 2Ch. 29:11 (cf. on Isa. 61:10, and Psa. 110: 4), which is also continued in the night, 1Ch. 9:33. Even the Targum refers v. 1b to the Temple-watch. In the second Temple the matter was arranged thus. After midnight the chief over the gate-keepers took the keys of the inner Temple and went with some of the priests through the little wicket of the Fire Gate (שַׁעַר בֵּית הַמּוֹקֵד). In the inner court this patrol divided into two companies, each with a burning torch; one company turned west, the other east, and so they compassed the court to see whether everything was in readiness for the service of the dawning day. At the bakers' chamber, in which the *Mincha* of the high priest was baked (לְשֹׁכֵת עֵשִׂי הַבֵּיתוֹן), they met with the cry: All is well. In the meanwhile the rest of the priests also arose, bathed, and put on their garments. Then they went into the stone chamber (one half of which was the place of session of the Sanhedrim), where, under the superintendence of the chief over the drawing of

the lots and of a judge, around whom stood all the priests in their robes of office, the functions of the priests in the service of the coming day were assigned to them by lot (Luk. 1: 9). Accordingly Tholuck, with Köster, regards vv. 1 f. and 3 as the antiphon of the Temple-watch going off duty and those coming on. It might also be the call and counter-call with which the watchmen greeted one another when they met. But according to the general keeping of the Psalm, vv. 1 f. have rather to be regarded as a call to devotion and intercession, which the congregation addresses to the priests and Levites entrusted with the night-service in the Temple. It is an error to suppose that “in the nights” can be equivalent to “early and late.” If the Psalter contains Morning Psalms (3, 63) and Evening Psalms (4, 141), why should it then not contain a vigil Psalm? On this very ground Venema’s idea too, that בְּלִילוֹת is syncopated from בְּהַלְלִילוֹת, “with *Hallels*, i.e., praises,” is useless. Nor is there any reason for drawing ἐν ταῖς νυξίν, as the LXX does, to v. 2, <sup>1390</sup> or, what would be more natural, to the בְּרַכּוֹ that opens the Psalm, since it is surely not strange that, so long as the sanctuary was standing, a portion of the servants of God who ministered in it had to remain up at night to guard it, and to see to it that nothing was wanting in the preparations for the early service. That this ministering watching should be combined with devotional praying is the purport of the admonition in v. 2. Raising suppliant hands (יְדָכֶם, negligently written for יְדֵיכֶם) towards the Most Holy Place (τὰ ἅγια), they are to bless Jahve. קִדְּשׁ (according to *B. Sota 39a*, the accusative of definition: in holiness, i.e., after washing of hands), in view of Psa. 28: 2; 5: 8; 138: 2 (cf. רוֹם in Hab. 3:10), has to be regarded as the accusative of the direction.

*Psa. 134: 3.* Calling thus up to the Temple-hill, the church receives from above the benedictory counter-greeting: Jahve bless thee out of Zion (as in Psa. 128: 5), the Creator of heaven and earth (as in Psa. 115:15; 121: 2; 124: 8). From the time of Num. 6:24 *jebaréchja* is the ground-form of the priestly benediction. It is addressed to the church as one person, and to each individual in this united, unit-like church.

## Psalm 135

### FOUR-VOICED HALLELUJAH TO THE GOD OF ISRAEL, THE GOD OF GODS

#### HALLELUJAH.

*135: 1 PRAISE ye the Name of Jahve,  
Praise ye, O ye servants of Jahve,*

*135: 2 Who stand in the house of Jahve,  
In the courts of the house of our God!*

*135: 3 Praise ye Jāh, for Jahve is good;  
Harp unto His Name, for it is lovely;*

*135: 4 For Jacob hath Jāh chosen for Himself,  
Israel as His possession.*

*135: 5 For I know that Jahve is great  
And our Lord above all gods.*

*135: 6 All that Jahve willeth He carrieth out  
In heaven and upon earth,  
In the seas and in all the depths;*

*135: 7 Who bringeth the vapours up from the end of the earth,  
He maketh lightnings for the rain,  
Who bringeth forth wind out of His treasures.*

*135: 8 Who smote the first-born of Egypt  
From man down to the cattle,*

*135: 9 Sent signs and wonders  
Into the midst of thee, O Egypt,  
Against Pharaoh and all his servants!*

*135:10 Who smote great nations  
And slew mighty kings,*

*135:11 Sihon, king of the Amorites,  
And Og, king of Bashan,  
And all the kingdoms of Canaan;*

*135:12 And gave over their land as a heritage,  
As a heritage to Israel His people.*

*135:13 Jahve, Thy Name endureth for ever,  
Thy memorial, Jahve, unto all generations.*

*135:14 For Jahve will render justice to His people,  
And repent Himself concerning His servants.*

*135:15 The idols of the heathen are silver and gold,  
The work of men's hands.*

*135:16 A mouth have they and cannot speak,  
Eyes have they and cannot see,*

*135:17 Ears have they and cannot hear,  
Nor is there any breath at all in their mouth.*

*135:18 Like unto them must they who made them become,  
Every one who trusted in them.*

*135:19 O house of Israel, bless ye Jahve!  
O house of Aaron, bless ye Jahve!*

*135:20 O house of Levi, bless ye Jahve!  
Ye who fear Jahve, bless Jahve! —*

*135:21 Blessed be Jahve out of Zion,  
Who dwelleth in Jerusalem,  
Hallelujah!*

*Psalms 135.* Psalm 135 is here and there (vid., *Tôsefôth Pesachim* 117a) taken together with Psalm 134 as one Psalm. The combining of Psalm 115 with 114 is a misapprehension caused by the inscriptionless character of Psalm 115, whereas Psalm 135 and 134 certainly stand in connection with one another. For the Hallelujah Psalm 135 is, as the mutual relation between the beginning and close of Psalm 134 shows, a Psalm-song expanded out of this shorter hymn, that is in part drawn from Psalm 115.

It is a Psalm in the mosaic style. Even the Latin poet Lucilius transfers the figure of mosaic-work to style, when he says: *quam lepide lexeis compostae ut tesserulae omnes...* In the case of Psalm 135 it is not the first time that we have met with this kind of style. We have already had a glimpse of it in Psalm 97 and 98. These Psalms were composed more especially of deutero-Isaianic passages, whereas Psalm 135 takes its *tesserulae* out of the Law, Prophets, and Psalms.

*Psa. 135: 1-4.* The beginning is taken from Psa. 134: 1; v. 2*b* recalls Psa. 116:19 (cf. Psa. 92:14); and v. 4 is an echo of Deu. 7: 6. The servants of Jahve to whom the summons is addressed, are not, as in Psa. 134: 1 f., His official servants in particular, but according to v. 2*b*, where the courts, in the plural, are allotted to them as their standing-place, and according to vv. 19, 20, those who fear Him as a body. The threefold *Jahve* at the beginning is then repeated in *Jāh* (הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה), cf. note 1 to Psa. 104:35), *Jahve*, and *Jāh*. The subject of בְּיָהוָה נַעֲמִים is by no means Jahve (Hupfeld), whom they did not dare to call נַעֲמִים in the Old Testament, but either the Name, according to Psa. 54: 8 (Luther, Hitzig), or, which is favoured by Psa. 147: 1 (cf. Pro. 22:18), the praising of His Name (Appolinaris: ἐπεὶ τόδε καλὸν αἰεῖδεν): His Name to praise is a delightful employ, which is incumbent on Israel as the people of His choice and of His possession.

*Psa. 135: 5-7.* The praise itself now begins. בְּיָהוָה in v. 4*a* set forth the ground of the pleasant duty, and the הַלְלוּ that begins this strophe confirms that which

warrants the summons out of the riches of the material existing for such a hymn of praise. Worthy is He to be praised, for Israel knows full well that He who hath chosen it is the God of gods. The beginning is taken from Psa. 115: 3, and v. 7 from Jer. 10:13 (Jer. 51:16). Heaven, earth, and water are the three kingdoms of created things, as in Exo. 20: 4. **נָשִׂיא** signifies that which is lifted up, ascended; here, as in Jeremiah, a cloud. The meaning of **בְּרָקִים לְמָטָר עֲשֶׂה** is not: He makes lightnings into rain, i.e., resolves them as it were into rain, which is unnatural; but either according to Zec. 10: 1: He produces lightnings in behalf of rain, in order that the rain may pour down in consequence of the thunder and lightning, or poetically: He makes lightnings for the rain, so that the rain is announced (Apollinaris) and accompanied by them. Instead of **מוֹצֵא** (cf. Psa. 78:16; 105:43), which does not admit of the retreating of the tone, the expression is **מוֹצֵא**, the ground-form of the *part. Hiph.* for plurals like **מַחְצְרִים**, **מַחְלָמִים**, **מַעֲזָרִים**, perhaps not without being influenced by the **וַיּוֹצֵא** in Jeremiah, for it is not **מוֹצֵא** from **מוֹצֵא** that signifies “producing,” but **מוֹצֵא** = **מַפְיֵק**. The metaphor of the treasures is like Job. 38:22. What is intended is the fulness of divine power, in which lie the grounds of the origin and the impulses of all things in nature.

**Psa. 135: 8, 9.** Worthy is He to be praised, for He is the Redeemer out of Egypt. **בְּתוֹכָבִי** as in Psa. 116:19, cf. 105:27.

**Psa. 135:10-12.** Worthy is He to be praised, for He is the Conqueror of the Land of Promise. in connection with v. 10 one is reminded of Deu. 4:38; 7: 1; 9: 1; 11:23, Jos. 23: 9. **גִּוּוֹם רַבִּים** are here not many, but great peoples (cf. **גְּדָלִים** in Psa. 136:17), since the parallel word **עֲצוּמִים** is by no means intended of a powerful number, but of powerful might (cf. Isa. 53:12). As to the rest also, the poet follows the Book of Deuteronomy: viz., **לְכָל מַמְלָכוֹת** as in Deu. 3:21, and **נָתַן נַחֲלָה** as in Deu. 4:38 and other passages. It is all Deuteronomic with the exception of the **ש**, and the **ל** in v. 11 as the *nota accus.* (as in Psa. 136:19 f., cf. 69: 6; 116:16; 129: 3); the construction of **הַרְג** is just as Aramaizing in Job. 5: 2, 2Sa. 3:30 (where vv. 30, 31, like vv. 36, 37, are a later explanatory addition). The **הַרְג** alternating with **הָבֵה** is, next to the two kings, also referred to the kingdoms of Canaan, viz., their inhabitants. Og was also an Amoritish king, Deu. 3: 8.

**Psa. 135:13, 14.** This God who rules so praiseworthily in the universe and in the history of Israel is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever. Just as v. 13 (cf. 102:13) is taken from Exo. 3:15, so v. 14 is taken from Deu. 32:36, cf. Psa. 90:13, and vid., on Heb. 10:30, 31 (p. 406).



*Psa. 135:15-18.* For the good of His proved church He ever proves Himself to be the Living God, whereas idols and idol-worshippers are vain — throughout following Psa. 115: 4-8, but with some abridgments. Here only the אָס used as a particle recalls what is said there of the organ of smell (אָר) of the idols that smells not, just as the רִיחַ which is here (as in Jer. 10:14) denied to the idols recalls the רִיחַהֶם denied to them there. It is to be rendered: also there is not a being of breath, i.e., there is no breath at all, not a trace thereof, in their mouth. It is different in 1Sa. 21: 9, where אֵין יָשׁ (not אֵין) is meant to be equivalent to the Aramaic אֵין אֵיתָ, *num (an) est*; אֵין is North-Palestinian, and equivalent to the interrogatory אֵין (after which the Targum renders אֵיתָ אֵלוּ).

*Psa. 135:19-21.* A call to the praise of Jahve, who is exalted above the gods of the nations, addressed to Israel as a whole, rounds off the Psalm by recurring to its beginning. The threefold call in Psa. 115: 9-11; 118: 2-4, is rendered fourfold here by the introduction of the house of the Levites, and the wishing of a blessing in Psa. 134: 3 is turned into an ascription of praise. Zion, whence Jahve's self-attestation, so rich in power and loving-kindness, is spread abroad, is also to be the place whence His glorious attestation by the mouth of men is spread abroad. History has realized this.

## Psalm 136

### O GIVE THANKS UNTO THE LORD, FOR HE IS GOOD

*136: 1 GIVE thanks unto Jahve, for He is good,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*

*136: 2 Give thanks unto the God of gods,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*

*136: 3 Give thanks unto the Lord of lords —  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*

*136: 4 To Him who alone doeth great wonders,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*

*136: 5 To Him who by wisdom made the heavens,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*

*136: 6 To Him who stretched out the earth above the waters —  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*

*136: 7 To Him who made great lights,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*

- 136: 8 The sun for dominion by day,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136: 9 The moon and stars for dominions by night —  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:10 To Him who smote the Egyptians in their first-born,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:11 And brought forth Israel out of their midst,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:12 With a strong hand and a stretched-out arm —  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:13 To Him who divided the Red Sea into parts,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:14 And made Israel to pass through in the midst of it,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:15 And overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea —  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:16 To Him who led His people in the desert,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:17 To Him who smote great kings,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:18 And slew glorious kings —  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:19 Sihon, king of the Amorites,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:20 And Og, king of Bashan,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:21 And gave their land as a heritage,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:22 As a heritage to Israel His servant —  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:23 Who in our low estate remembered us,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:24 And redeemed us from our adversaries,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*
- 136:25 Giving bread to all flesh —  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*

*136:26 Give thanks unto the God of heaven,  
For His goodness endureth for ever.*

*Psalm 136.* The cry Psa. 135: 3, *Praise ye Jāh, for good is Jahve*, is here followed by a *Hodu*, the last of the collection, with “for His goodness endureth for ever” repeated twenty-six times as a *versus intercalaris*. In the liturgical language this Psalm is called *par excellence* the great Hallel, for according to its broadest compass the great Hallel comprehends Psalm 120 to 136, <sup>f391</sup>

whilst the Hallel which is absolutely so called extends from Psalm 113 to 118. Down to v. 18 the song and counter-song organize themselves into hexastichic groups or strophes, which, however, from v. 19 (and therefore from the point where the dependence on Psalm 135, already begun with v. 17, becomes a borrowing, onwards) pass over into octastichs. In Heidenheim’s Psalter the Psalm appears (after Norzi) in two columns (like Deu. 32), which it is true has neither tradition (vid., Psalm 18) nor MSS precedent in its favour, but really corresponds to its structure.

*Psa. 136: 1-9.* Like the preceding Psalm, this Psalm allies itself to the Book of Deuteronomy. Vv. 2a and 3a (*God of gods and Lord of lords*) are taken from Deu. 10:17; v. 12a (*with a strong hand and stretched-out arm*) from Deu. 4:34; 5:15, and frequently (cf. Jer. 32:21); v. 16a like Deu. 8:15 (cf. Jer. 2: 6). With reference to the Deuteronomic colouring of vv. 19-22, vid., on Psa. 135:10-12; also the expression “Israel His servant” recalls Deu. 32:36 (cf. Psa. 135:14; 90:13), and still more Isa. 40-66, where the comprehension of Israel under the unity of this notion has its own proper place. In other respects, too, the Psalm is an echo of earlier model passages. *Who alone doeth great wonders* sounds like Psa. 72:18 (Psa. 86:10); and the adjective “great” that is added to “wonders” shows that the poet found the formula already in existence. In connection with v. 5a he has Pro. 3:19 or Jer. 10:12 in his mind; **תְּבוּנָה**, like **חֵכְמָה**, is the demiurgic wisdom. V. 6a calls to mind Isa. 42: 5; 44:24; the expression is “above the waters,” as in 34: 2 “upon the seas,” because the water is partly visible and partly invisible **מִתַּחַת לְאֲרֶזַן** (Exo. 20: 4). The plural **אוֹרִים**, *lucēs*, instead of **מְאֹרוֹת**, *lumina* (cf. Eze. 32: 8, **מְאֹרֵי אוֹר**), is without precedent. It is a controverted point whether **אוֹרֵת** in Isa. 26:19 signifies lights (cf. **אוֹנָה**, Psa. 139:12) or herbs (2Ki. 4:39). The plural **מִמְשָׁלוֹת** is also rare (occurring only besides in Psa. 114: 2): it here denotes the dominion of the moon on the one hand, and (going beyond Gen. 1:16) of the stars on the other. **בְּלֵילָה**, like **בְּיוֹם**, is the second member of the *stat. construct*.

*Psa. 136:10-26.* Up to this point it is God the absolute in general, the Creator of all things, to the celebration of whose praise they are summoned; and from this point onwards the God of the history of salvation. In v. 13a **יָנַר** (instead of **בָּקַעַ**, 78:13, Exo. 14:21, Neh. 9:11) of the dividing of the Red Sea is peculiar; **יָנַרִים** (Gen. 15:17, side by side with **בְּתָרִים**) are the pieces or parts of a thing that is cut up into pieces. **נֵעַר** is a favourite word taken from Exo. 14:27. With reference to the name of the Egyptian ruler *Pharaoh* (Herodotus also, ii. 111, calls the Pharaoh of the Exodus the son of Sesostris-Rameses Miumun, not **Μενόφθαξ**, as he is properly called, but absolutely **Φερῶν**), vid., on Psa. 73:22. After the God to whom the praise is to be ascribed has been introduced with **לְ** by always fresh attributes, the **לְ** before the names of Sihon and of Og is perplexing. The words are taken over, as are the six lines of vv. 17a -22a in the main, from Psa. 135:10-12, with only a slight alteration in the expression. In v. 23 the continued influence of the construction **הוֹדוּ לְ** is at an end. The connection by means of **שׁוּ** (cf. Psa. 135: 8, 10) therefore has reference to the preceding “for His goodness endureth for ever.” The language here has the stamp of the latest period. It is true **יָבַר** with *Lamed* of the object is used even in the earliest Hebrew, but **יִשְׁפַּל** is only authenticated by Ecc. 10: 6, and **פָּרַק**, to break loose = to rescue (the customary Aramaic word for redemption), by Lam. 5: 8, just as in the closing verse, which recurs to the beginning, “God of heaven” is a name for God belonging to the latest literature, Neh. 1: 4; 2: 4. In v. 23 the praise changes suddenly to that which has been experienced very recently. The attribute in v. 25a (cf. Psa. 147: 9; 145:15) leads one to look back to a time in which famine befell them together with slavery.

## **Psalm 137**

### **BY THE RIVERS OF BABYLON**

*137: 1 BY the rivers of Babylon, there we sat and wept,  
When we remembered Zion.*

*137: 2 Upon the willows in the midst thereof  
We hung our citherns.*

*137: 3 For there our oppressors asked of us  
The words of songs,  
And our tormentors joy:  
Sing us a song of Zion!*

*137: 4 How are we to sing Jahve's songs  
Upon strange soil?!*

*137: 5 If I forget thee, O Jerusalem,  
Let my right hand become lame!*

*137: 6 Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,  
If I do not remember thee,  
If I do not set Jerusalem  
Above all my joys!*

*137: 7 Remember, Jahve, the children of Edom  
In the day of Jerusalem,  
Who said: Raze, raze it  
Even to the foundation!*

*137: 8 O daughter of Babylon, thou wasted one,  
blessed is he who giveth thee thy reward,  
Which thou hast merited for us!*

*137: 9 Blessed is he who taketh and dasheth thy little ones  
Against the rock!*

*Psalms 137.* The Hallelujah Psalm 135 and the Hodu Psalm 136 are followed by a Psalm which glances back into the time of the Exile, when such cheerful songs as they once sang to the accompaniment of the music of the Levites at the worship of God on Mount Zion were obliged to be silent. It is anonymous. The inscription Τῷ Δαυίδ (διὰ) Ἱερεμίου found in codices of the LXX, which is meant to say that it is a Davidic song coming from the heart of Jeremiah, <sup>f392</sup> is all the more erroneous as Jeremiah never was one of the Babylonian exiles.

The **שׁ**, which is repeated three times in v. 8 f., corresponds to the time of the composition of the Psalm which is required by its contents. It is just the same with the paragogic *i* in the future in v. 6. But in other respects the language is classic; and the rhythm, at the beginning softly elegiac, then more and more excited, and abounding in guttural and sibilant sounds, is so expressive that scarcely any Psalm is so easily impressed on the memory as this, which is so pictorial even in sound.

The metre resembles the elegiac as it appears in the so-called caesura schema of the Lamentations and in the cadence of Isa. 16: 9, 10, which is like the Sapphic strophe. Every second line corresponds to the pentameter of the elegiac metre.

*Psa. 137: 1-6.* Beginning with perfects, the Psalm has the appearance of being a Psalm not belonging to the Exile, but written in memory of the Exile. The bank of a river, like the seashore, is a favourite place of sojourn of those whom deep grief drives forth from the bustle of men into solitude. The boundary line of the river gives to solitude a safe back; the monotonous splashing of the waves keeps up the dull, melancholy alternation of thoughts

and feelings; and at the same time the sight of the cool, fresh water exercises a soothing influence upon the consuming fever within the heart. The rivers of Babylon are here those of the Babylonian empire: not merely the Euphrates with its canals, and the Tigris, but also the Chaboras (*Chebar*) and Eulaeos (*'Ulai*), on whose lonesome banks Ezekiel (Eze. 1: 3) and Daniel (Dan. 8: 2) beheld divine visions. The **שָׁמַיִם** is important: there, in a strange land, as captives under the dominion of the power of the world. And **יָשָׁב** is purposely chosen instead of **יָשָׁב**: with the sitting down in the solitude of the river's banks weeping immediately came on; when the natural scenery around contrasted so strongly with that of their native land, the remembrance of Zion only forced itself upon them all the more powerfully, and the pain at the isolation from their home would have all the freer course where no hostilely observant eyes were present to suppress it. The willow (**צִפְצָפָה**) and viburnum, those trees which are associated with flowing water in hot low-lying districts, are indigenous in the richly watered lowlands of Babylonia. **עֲרָבָה** (**עֲרָבָה**), if one and the same with Arab. *grb*, is not the willow, least of all the weeping-willow, which is called *šafsāf mustahî* in Arabic, "the bending-down willow," but the viburnum with dentate leaves, described by Wetzstein on Isa. 44: 4. The Talmud even distinguishes between *tsaph-tsapha* and *'araba*, but without our being able to obtain any sure botanic picture from it. The **עֲרָבָה**, whose branches belong to the constituents of the *lulab* of the Feast of Tabernacles (Lev. 23:40), is understood of the crack-willow [*Salix fragilis*], and even in the passage before us is surely not distinguished with such botanical precision but that the *gharab* and willow together with the weeping-willow (*Salix Babylonica*) might be comprehended under the word **עֲרָבָה**. On these trees of the country abounding in streams the exiles hung their citherns. The time to take delight in music was past, for **μουσικὰ ἐν πένθει ἄκαιρος διήγησις**, Sir. 22: 6. Joyous songs, as the word **שִׁיר** designates them, were ill suited to their situation.

In order to understand the **כִּי** in v. 3, vv. 3 and 4 must be taken together. They hung up their citherns; for though their lords called upon them to sing in order that they might divert themselves with their national songs, they did not feel themselves in the mind for singing songs as they once resounded at the divine services of their native land. The LXX, Targum, and Syriac take **תְּגַלְלֵנוּ** as a synonym of **שׁוֹבֵינוּ**, synonymous with **שְׁגַלְלֵנוּ**, and so, in fact, that it signifies not, like **שְׁגַלְלֵנוּ**, the spoiled and captive one, but the spoiler and he who takes other prisoners. But there is no Aramaic **תְּגַלְלֵנוּ = שְׁגַלְלֵנוּ**. It might more readily be referred back to a *Poel* **תְּגַלְלֵנוּ (= תְּגַלְלֵנוּ)**, to disappoint, deride (Hitzig); but the usage of the language does not favour this, and a stronger meaning for the word would be welcome. Either **תְּגַלְלֵנוּ = תְּגַלְלֵנוּ**, like **מְהַלְלֵנוּ**, Psa. 102: 9,

signifies the raving one, i.e., a bloodthirsty man or a tyrant, or from יָלַל, *ejulare*, one who causes the cry of woe or a tormentor, — a signification which commends itself in view of the words תִּנְשֵׁב and תִּלְמִיד, which are likewise formed with the preformative ת. According to the sense the word ranks itself with an *Hiph.* הוֹלִיל, like תִּנְעֵלֶת, תּוֹכַחַה, with הוֹעִיל and הוֹכִיחַ, in a mainly abstract signification (Dietrich, *Abhandlungen*, S. 160 f.). The דְּבָרִי beside שִׁיר is used as in Psa. 35:20; 65: 4; 105:27; 145: 5, viz., partitively, dividing up the genitival notion of the species: words of songs as being parts or fragments of the national treasury of song, similar to מְשִׁיר a little further on, on which Rosenmüller correctly says: *sacrum aliquod carmen ex veteribus illis suis Sionicis*. With the expression “song of Zion” alternates in v. 4 “song of Jahve,” which, as in 2Ch. 29:27, cf. 1Ch. 25: 7, denotes sacred or liturgical songs, that is to say, songs belonging to Psalm poesy (including the *Cantica*).

Before v. 4 we have to imagine that they answered the request of the Babylonians at that time in the language that follows, or thought thus within themselves when they withdrew themselves from them. The meaning of the interrogatory exclamation is not that the singing of sacred songs in a foreign land (חֻצָּה לְאֶרֶץ) is contrary to the law, for the Psalms continued to be sung even during the Exile, and were also enriched by new ones. But the *shir* had an end during the Exile, in so far as that it was obliged to retire from publicity into the quiet of the family worship and of the houses of prayer, in order that that which is holy might not be profaned; and since it was not, as at home, accompanied by the trumpets of the priests and the music of the Levites, it became more recitative than singing properly so called, and therefore could not afford any idea of the singing of their native land in connection with the worship of God on Zion. From the striking contrast between the present and the former times the people of the Exile had in fact to come to the knowledge of their sins, in order that they might get back by the way of penitence and earnest longing to that which they had lost. Penitence and home-sickness were at that time inseparable; for all those in whom the remembrance of Zion was lost gave themselves over to heathenism and were excluded from the redemption. The poet, translated into the situation of the exiles, and arming himself against the temptation to apostasy and the danger of denying God, therefore says: If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, תִּשְׁכַּח יְמִינִי. *תִּשְׁכַּח* has been taken as an address to Jahve: *obliviscaris dexteræ meæ* (e.g., Wolfgang Dachstein in his song “*An Wasserflüssen Babylon*”), but it is far from natural that Jerusalem and Jahve should be addressed in one clause. Others take יְמִינִי as the subject and *תִּשְׁכַּח* transitively: *obliviscatur dextera mea, scil. artem psallendi* (Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Pagninus, Grotius, Hengstenberg, and others);

but this ellipsis is arbitrary, and the interpolation of מִנִּי after מִיְמֵי (von Ortenberg, following Olshausen) produces an inelegant cadence. Others again assign a passive sense to תִּשְׁכַּח: *oblivioni detur* (LXX, Italic, Vulgate, and Luther), or a half-passive sense, *in oblivione sit* (Jerome); but the thought: let my right hand be forgotten, is awkward and tame. *Obliviscatur me* (Syriac, Saadia, and the Psalterium Romanum) comes nearer to the true meaning. תִּשְׁכַּח is to be taken reflexively: *obliviscatur sui ipsius*, let it forget itself, or its service (Amyraldus, Schultens, Ewald, and Hitzig), which is equivalent to let it refuse or fail, become lame, become benumbed, much the same as we say of the arms of legs that they “go to sleep,” and just as the Arabic *nasiya* signifies both to forget and to become lame (cf. Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 921b). La Harpe correctly renders: *O Jerusalem! si je t’oublie jamais, que ma main oublie aussi le mouvement!* Thus there is a correspondence between vv. 5 and 6: My tongue shall cleave to my palate if I do not remember thee, if I do not raise Jerusalem above the sum of my joy. אֲזַכְּרֶיךָ has the affixed *Chirek*, with which these later Psalms are so fond of adorning themselves. רֵאשׁ is apparently used as in *Psa. 119:160: supra summam (the totality) laetitiae meae*, as Coccejus explains, *h.e. supra omnem laetitiam meam*. But why not then more simply אֵל כָּל, above the totality? רֵאשׁ here signifies not κεφάλαιον, but κεφαλή: if I do not place Jerusalem upon the summit of my joy, i.e., my highest joy; therefore, if I do not cause Jerusalem to be my very highest joy. His spiritual joy over the city of God is to soar above all earthly joys.

*Psa. 137: 7-9.* The second part of the Psalm supplicates vengeance upon Edom and Babylon. We see from Obadiah’s prophecy, which is taken up again by Jeremiah, how shamefully the Edomites, that brother-people related by descent to Israel and yet pre-eminently hostile to it, behaved in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans as their malignant, rapacious, and inhuman helpers. The repeated *imper. Piel עָרוּ*, from עָרָה (not *imper. Kal* from עָרַר, which would be עָרוּ), ought to have been accented on the *ult.*; it is, however, in both cases accented on the first syllable, the pausal עָרוּ (cf. כָּלוּ in *Psa. 37:20*, and also הָסוּ, *Neh. 8:11*) giving rise to the same accentuation of the other (in order that two tone-syllables might not come together). The *Pasek* also stands between the two repeated words in order that they may be duly separated, and secures, moreover, to the guttural initial of the second עָרוּ its distinct pronunciation (cf. *Gen. 26:28*, *Num. 35:16*). It is to be construed: lay bare, lay bare (as in *Hab. 3:13*, cf. נָגְלָה in *Mic. 1: 6*) in it (*Beth* of the place), of in respect of it (*Beth* of the object), even to the foundation, i.e., raze it even to the ground, leave not one stone upon another. From the



false brethren the imprecation turns to Babylon, the city of the imperial power of the world. The daughter, i.e., the population, of Babylon is addressed as **הַשָּׂדֵד וְהַבָּתוּלָה**. It certainly seems the most natural to take this epithet as a designation of its doings which cry for vengeance. But it cannot in any case be translated: thou plunderer (Syriac like the Targum: *bozuzto*; Symmachus **ἡ ληστρίς**), for **שָׂדֵד** does not mean to rob and plunder, but to offer violence and to devastate. Therefore: thou devastator; but the word so pointed as we have it before us cannot have this signification: it ought to be **הַשָּׂדֵד וְהַבָּתוּלָה**, like **בְּגִדְהָ** in Jer. 3: 7, 10, or **הַשָּׂדֵד וְהַבָּתוּלָה** (with an unchangeable *ā*), corresponding to the Syriac active intensive form *ālūšo*, oppressor, *gōdūfō*, slanderer, and the Arabic likewise active intensive form Arab. *fāʿūl*, e.g., *fāshūs*, a boaster, and also as an adjective: *géôz fāshūs*, empty nuts, cf. **יְקוּשׁ = יְקוּשׁ**, a fowler, like **נֹאטוּר** (**נֹאטוּר**), a field-watcher. The form as it stands is *part. pass.*, and signifies **προνενομευμένη** (Aquila), *vastata* (Jerome). It is possible that this may be said in the sense of *vastanda*, although in this sense of a *part. fut. pass.* the participles of the *Niphal* (e.g., Psa. 22:32; 102:19) and of the *Pual* (Psa. 18: 4) are more commonly used. It cannot at any rate signify *vastata* in an historical sense, with reference to the destruction of Babylon by Darius Hystaspes (Hengstenberg); for v. 7 only prays that the retribution may come: it cannot therefore as yet have been executed; but if **הַשָּׂדֵד וְהַבָּתוּלָה** signified the already devastated one, it must (at least in the main) have been executed already. It might be more readily understood as a prophetic representation of the executed judgment of devastation; but this prophetic rendering coincides with the imprecative: the imagination of the Semite when he utters a curse sees the future as a realized fact. “Didst thou see the smitten one (*maḏrûb*),“ i.e., he whom God must smite? Thus the Arab inquires for a person who is detested. “Pursue him who is seized (*ilḥaḳ el-ma ʿchûdh*),“ i.e., him whom God must allow thee to seize! Thy speak thus inasmuch as the imagination at once anticipates the seizure at the same time with the pursuit. Just as here both *maḏrûb* and *ma ʿchûdh* are participles of *Kasl*, so therefore **הַשָּׂדֵד וְהַבָּתוּלָה** may also have the sense of *vastanda* (which must be laid waste!). That which is then further desired for Babylon is the requital of that which it has done to Israel, Isa. 47: 6. It is the same penal destiny, comprehending the children also, which is predicted against it in Isa. 13:16-18, as that which was to be executed by the Medes. The young children (with reference to **עוֹלָל, עוֹלָל**, vid., on 8: 3) are to be dashed to pieces in order that a new generation may not raise up again the world-wide dominion that has been overthrown, Isa. 14:21 f. It is zeal for God that puts such harsh words into the mouth of the poet. “That which is Israel’s excellency and special good fortune the believing Israelite desires to have bestowed upon the whole world, but for this very reason he desires to see the hostility of the present world of nations against the church of God broken”

(Hofmann). On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the “blessed” of this Psalm is not suited to the mouth of the New Testament church. In the Old Testament the church as yet had the form of a nation, and the longing for the revelation of divine righteousness clothed itself accordingly in a warlike garb.

## Psalm 138

### THE MEDIATOR AND PERFECTER

*138: 1 I WILL give thanks unto Thee with my whole heart,  
Before the gods will I harp unto Thee.*

*138: 2 I will worship towards Thy holy Temple,  
And give thanks unto Thy Name because of Thy mercy and Thy truth,  
That Thou hast magnified Thy promise above all Thy Name.*

*138: 3 In the day that I called Thou didst answer me,  
Thou didst inspire me with courage — a lofty feeling pervaded my soul.*

*138: 4 All the kings of the earth shall give thanks unto Thee, Jahve,  
When they have heard the utterances of Thy mouth;*

*138: 5 And they shall sing of the ways of Jahve,  
That great is the glory of Jahve:*

*138: 6 For exalted is Jahve and He seeth the lowly,  
And the proud He knoweth well afar off.*

*138: 7 If I walk in the midst of trouble, Thou dost revive me,  
Over the wrath of mine enemies dost Thou stretch forth Thy hand,  
And Thy right hand saveth me.*

*138: 8 Jahve will perfect for me;  
Jahve, Thy mercy endureth for ever,  
The work of Thy hands — Thou wilt not forsake it.*

*Psalm 138.* There will come a time when the praise of Jahve, which according to Psa. 137: 3 was obliged to be dumb in the presence of the heathen, will, according to Psa. 138: 5, be sung by the kings of the heathen themselves. In the LXX Psalm 137 side by side with *τῷ Δαυίδ* also has the inscription *Ἱερεμίου*, and Psalm 138 has *Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου*. Perhaps these statements are meant to refer back the existing recension of the text of the respective Psalms to the prophets named (vid., Köhler, *Haggai*, S. 33). From the fact that these names of psalmodists added by the LXX do not come down beyond Malachi, it follows that the Psalm-collection in the mind of the LXX was made not later than in the time of Nehemiah.

The speaker in Psalm 138, to follow the lofty expectation expressed in v. 4, is himself a king, and according to the inscription, David. There is, however, nothing to favour his being the author; the Psalm is, in respect for the Davidic Psalms, composed as it were out of the soul of David — an echo of 2 Samuel 7 (1 Chronicles 17). The superabundant promise which made the throne of David and of his seed an eternal throne is here gratefully glorified. The Psalm can at any rate be understood, if with Hengstenberg we suppose that it expresses the lofty self-consciousness to which David was raised after victorious battles, when he humbly ascribed the glory to God and resolved to build Him a Temple in place of the tent upon Zion.

*Psa. 138: 1, 2.* The poet will give thanks to Him, whom he means without mentioning Him by name, for His mercy, i.e., His anticipating, condescending love, and for His truth, i.e., truthfulness and faithfulness, and more definitely for having magnified His promise (אִמְרָה) above all His Name, i.e., that He has given a promise which infinitely surpasses everything by which He has hitherto established a name and memorial for Himself (אֵל-כָּל-שֵׁמֶךָ, with *ō* instead of *ō̄*, an anomaly that is noted by the Masora, vid., Baer's *Psalterium*, p. 133). If the promise by the mouth of Nathan (2 Samuel 7) is meant, then we may compare 2Sa. 7:21. גָּדֹל, גְּדוֹל, גְּדָלָה are repeated in that promise and its echo coming from the heart of David so frequently, that this הִגְדַּלְתָּ seems like a hint pointing to that history, which is one of the most important crises in the history of salvation. The expression נִגַד אֱלֹהִים also becomes intelligible from this history. Ewald renders it: “in the presence of God!” which is surely meant to say: in the holy place (De Wette, Olshausen). But “before God will I sing praise to Thee (O God!)” — what a jumble! The LXX renders ἐναντίον ἀγγέλων, which is in itself admissible and full of meaning,<sup>f393</sup>

but without coherence in the context of the Psalm, and also is to be rejected because it is on the whole very questionable whether the Old Testament language uses אֱלֹהִים thus, without anything further to define it, in the sense of “angels.” It might be more readily rendered “in the presence of the gods,” viz., of the gods of the peoples (Hengstenberg, Hupfeld, and Hitzig); but in order to be understood of gods which are only seemingly such, it would require some addition. Whereas אֱלֹהִים can without any addition denote the magisterial possessors of the dignity that is the type of the divine, as follows from Psa. 82: 1 (cf. Psa. 45: 7) in spite of Knobel, Graf, and Hupfeld; and thus, too (cf. נִגַד מַלְאָכִים in Psa. 119:46), we understand it here, with Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Falminius, Bucer, Clericus, and others. What is meant are “the great who are in the earth,” 2Sa. 7: 9, with whom David, inasmuch as he became king from being a shepherd, is ranked, and above whom he has been

lifted up by the promise of an eternal kingship. Before these earthly “gods” will David praise the God of the promise; they shall hear for their salutary confusion, for their willing rendering of homage, that God hath made him “the highest with respect to the kings of the earth” (Psa. 89:28).

*Psa. 138: 3-6.* There are two things for which the poet gives thanks to God: He has answered him in the days of trouble connected with his persecution by Saul and in all distresses; and by raising him to the throne, and granting him victory upon victory, and promising him the everlasting possession of the throne, He has filled him with a proud courage, so that lofty feeling has taken up its abode in his soul, which was formerly fearful about help. Just as **רהב** signifies impetuosity, vehemence, and then also a monster, so **הרהיב** signifies both to break in upon one violently and overpoweringly (Son. 6: 5; cf. Syriac *arheb*, Arabic *arhaba*, to terrify), and to make any one courageous, bold, and confident of victory. **בנפשי עז** forms a corollary to the verb that is marked by *Mugrash* or *Dechi*: so that in my soul there was **עז**, i.e., power, viz., a consciousness of power (cf. Jud. 5:21). The thanksgiving, which he, the king of the promise, offers to God on account of this, will be transmitted to all the kings of the earth when they shall hear (**שמעו** in the sense of a *fut. exactum*) the words of His mouth, i.e., the divine **אמרה**, and they shall sing of (**שיר** with **ב**, like **דבר ב** in Psa. 87: 3, **שיר ב** in Psa. 105: 2 and frequently, **הלל ב** in Psa. 44: 9, **הזכיר ב** in Psa. 20: 8, and the like) the ways of the God of the history of salvation, they shall sing that great is the glory of Jahve. V. 6 tells us by what means He has so super-gloriously manifested Himself in His leadings of David. He has shown Himself to be the Exalted One who is His all-embracing rule does not leave the lowly (cf. David’s confessions in Psa. 131: 1, 2Sa. 6:22) unnoticed (Psa. 113: 6), but on the contrary makes him the especial object of His regard; and on the other hand even from afar (cf. Psa. 139: 2) He sees through (**ידע** as in Psa. 94:11, Jer. 29:23) the lofty one who thinks himself unobserved and conducts himself as if he were answerable to no higher being (Psa. 10: 4). In correct texts **וגבה** has *Mugrash*, and **ממרחק** *Mercha*. The form of the *fut. Kal* **ידע** is formed after the analogy of the *Hiphil* forms **יגליל** in Isa. 16: 7, and frequently, and **יטיב** in Job. 24:21; probably the word is intended to be all the more emphatic, inasmuch as the first radical, which disappears in **ידע**, is thus in a certain measure restored. <sup>f394</sup>

*Psa. 138: 7, 8.* Out of these experiences — so important for all mankind — of David, who has been exalted by passing through humiliation, there arise from him confident hopes concerning the future. The beginning of this strophe calls Psa. 23: 4 to mind. Though his way may lead through the midst of heart-

oppressing trouble, Jahve will loose these bands of death and quicken him afresh (יָחַד as in Psa. 30: 4; 71:20, and frequently). Though his enemies may rage, Jahve will stretch forth His hand threateningly and tranquillizingly over their wrath, and His right hand will save him. יְמִינֶךָ is the subject according to Psa. 139:10 and other passages, and not (for why should it be supposed to be this?) *accus. instrumenti* (vid., Psa. 60: 7). In v. 8 יְגַמְרֶנּוּ is intended just as in Psa. 57: 3: the word begun He will carry out, ἐπιτελεῖν (Php. 1: 6); and בְּעֲדֵי (according to its meaning, properly: covering me) is the same as עָלַי in that passage (cf. Psa. 13: 6; 142: 8). The pledge of this completion is Jahve's everlasting mercy, which will not rest until the promise is become perfect truth and reality. Thus, therefore, He will not leave, forsake the works of His hands (vid., Psa. 90:16 f.), i.e., as Hengstenberg correctly explains, everything that He has hitherto accomplished for David, from his deliverance out of the hands of Saul down to the bestowment of the promise — He will not let one of His works stand still, and least of all one that has been so gloriously begun. הִרְפָּה (whence הִרְפָּךְ) signifies to slacken, to leave slack, i.e., leave uncarried out, to leave to itself, as in Neh. 6: 3. אֵל expresses a negation with a measure of inward excitement.

## Psalm 139

### ADORATION OF THE OMNISCIENT AND OMNIPRESENT ONE

*139: 1 JAHVE, Thou searchest and knowest me!*

*139: 2 THOU knowest my sitting down and my rising up,  
Thou understandest my thought afar off.*

*139: 3 My path and my lying down Thou searchest,  
And with all my ways art Thou familiar.*

*139: 4 For there is not a word on my tongue —  
Lo, Thou, O Jahve, knowest it altogether.*

*139: 5 Behind and before dost Thou surround me,  
And hast laid Thy hand upon me.*

*139: 6 Incomprehensible to me is such knowledge,  
It is too high, I have not grown up to it.*

*139: 7 Whither could I go from Thy Spirit,  
And whither could I flee from Thy presence?!*

*139: 8 If I should ascend to heaven, there art THOU;  
And if I should make Hades my resting-place, here art Thou also.*

*139: 9 If I should raise the wings of the morning,  
If I should settle down at the extremity of the sea —*

*139:10 There also Thy hand would guide me,  
And Thy right hand lay hold of me.*

*139:11 And if I should say: Let nothing but darkness enwrap me,  
And let the light round about me become night —*

*139:12 Even the darkness would not be too dark for Thee,  
And the night would be to Thee bright as the day;  
Darkness and light are alike to Thee.*

*139:13 For THOU hast brought forth my reins,  
Thou didst interweave me in my mother's womb.*

*139:14 I give Thee thanks that I am fearfully, wonderfully made;  
Wonderful are Thy works,  
And my soul knoweth it right well.*

*139:15 My bones were not hidden from Thee,  
I who was wrought in secret,  
Curiously wrought in the depths of the earth.*

*139:16 When an embryo Thine eyes saw me,  
And in Thy book were they all written:  
Days which were already sketched out,  
And for it one among them.*

*139:17 And how precious are Thy thoughts unto me, O God,  
How mighty is their sum!*

*139:18 If I would count them, they are more than the sand;  
I awake and I am still with Thee.*

*139:19 Oh that Thou wouldest slay the wicked, Eloah;  
And ye men of blood-guiltiness, depart from me!*

*139:20 They who mention Thee craftily,  
Speak out deceitfully — Thine adversaries.*

*139:21 Should I not hate those who hate Thee, Jahve,  
And be indignant at those who rise up against Thee?!*

*139:22 With the utmost hatred do I hate them,  
They are to me as mine own enemies.*

*139:23 Search me, O God, and know my heart,  
Prove me and know my thoughts,*

*139:24 And see whether there is in me any way of pain,  
And lead me in the everlasting way!*

*Psalm 139.* In this Aramaizing Psalm what the preceding Psalm says in v. 6 comes to be carried into effect, viz.: *for Jahve is exalted and He seeth the lowly, and the proud He knoweth from afar.* This Psalm has manifold points of contact with its predecessor. From a theological point of view it is one of the most instructive of the Psalms, and both as regards its contents and poetic character in every way worthy of David. But it is only inscribed לָדוֹד because it is composed after the Davidic model, and is a counterpart to such Psalms as Psalm 19 and to other Davidic didactic Psalms. For the addition לַמְנוּחָה neither proves its ancient Davidic origin, nor in a general way its origin in the period prior to the Exile, as Psalm 74 for example shows, which was at any rate not composed prior to the time of the Chaldaean catastrophe.

The Psalm falls into three parts: vv. 1b-12, 13-18, 19-24; the strophic arrangement is not clear. The first part celebrates the Omniscient and Omnipresent One. The poet knows that he is surrounded on all sides by God's knowledge and His presence; His Spirit is everywhere and cannot be avoided; and His countenance is turned in every direction and inevitably, in wrath or in love. In the second part the poet continues this celebration with reference to the origin of man; and in the third part he turns in profound vexation of spirit towards the enemies of such a God, and supplicates for himself His proving and guidance. In vv. 1 and 4 God is called *Jahve*, in v. 17 *El*, in v. 19 *Eloha*, in v. 21 again *Jahve*, and in v. 23 again *El*. Strongly as this Psalm is marked by the depth and pristine freshness of its ideas and feeling, the form of its language is still such as is without precedent in the Davidic age. To all appearance it is the Aramaeo-Hebrew idiom of the post-exilic period pressed into the service of poetry. The Psalm apparently belongs to those Psalms which, in connection with a thoroughly classical character of form, bear marks of the influence which the Aramaic language of the Babylonian kingdom exerted over the exiles. This influence affected the popular dialect in the first instance, but the written language also did not escape it, as the Books of Daniel and Ezra show; and even the poetry of the Psalms is not without traces of this retrograde movement of the language of Israel towards the language of the patriarchal ancestral house. In the *Cod. Alex.* Ζαχαρίου is added to the τῷ Δαυίδ ψαλμός, and by a second hand ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, which Origen also met with "in some copies."

*Psa. 139: 1-7.* The Aramaic forms in this strophe are the ἄπαξ λεγομ. רָא (ground-form רָעַי) in vv. 2 and 17, endeavour, desire, thinking, like רָעוּת and רָעוּן in the post-exilic books, from רָעָה (רָעָא), *cupere, cogitare*; and the ἄπ. λεγ. רָבַע in v. 3, equivalent to רָבַץ, a lying down, if רָבַעִי be not rather an infinitive like בָּלַעִי in Job. 7:19, since אָרַחִי is undoubtedly not inflected from

אָרַח, but, as being infinitive, like עָבַר in Deu. 4:21, from אָרַח; and the verb אָרַח also, with the exception of this passage, only occurs in the speeches of Elihu (Job. 34: 8), which are almost more strongly Aramaizing than the Book of Job itself. Further, as an Aramaizing feature we have the objective relation marked by *Lamed* in the expression בִּנְתָה לְרַעִי, Thou understandest my thinking, as in Psa. 116:16; 129: 3; 135:11; 136:19 f. The monostichic opening is after the Davidic style, e.g., Psa. 23: 1 *b*. Among the prophets, Isaiah in particular is fond of such thematic introductions as we have here in v. 1*b*. On וַתֵּדַע instead of וַתִּדְעֵנִי vid., on Psa. 107:20; the pronominal object stands once beside the first verb, or even beside the second (2Ki. 9:25), instead of twice (Hitzig). The “me” is then expanded: sitting down, rising up, walking and lying, are the sum of human conditions or states. רַעִי is the totality or sum of the life of the spirit and soul of man, and דְּרָבִי the sum of human action. The divine knowledge, as וַתֵּדַע says, is the result of the scrutiny of man. The poet, however, in vv. 2 and 3 uses the perfect throughout as a mood of that which is practically existing, because that scrutiny is a scrutiny that is never unexecuted, and the knowledge is consequently an ever-present knowledge. מְרַחֵק is meant to say that He sees into not merely the thought that is fully fashioned and matured, but even that which is being evolved. וְרִיָּה from וָרַח is combined by Luther (with Azulai and others) with וָר, a wreath (from וָרַח, *constringere, cingere*), inasmuch as he renders: whether I walk or lie down, Thou art round about me (*Ich gehe oder lige, so bistu umb mich*). וָרַח ought to have the same meaning here, if with Wetzstein one were to compare the Arabic, and more particularly Beduin, *drâ, dherrâ*, to protect; the notion of affording protection does not accord with this train of thought, which has reference to God’s omniscience: what ought therefore to be meant is a hedging round which secures its object to the knowledge, or even a protecting that places it in security against any exchanging, which will not suffer the object to escape it. <sup>1395</sup>

The Arabic *drâ*, to know, which is far removed in sound, is by no means to be compared; it is related to Arab. *dr’*, to push, urge forward, and denotes knowledge that is gained by testing and experimenting. But we also have no need of that Arab. *drâ*, to protect, since we can remain within the range of the guaranteed Hebrew usage, inasmuch as וָרַח, to winnow, i.e., to spread out that which has been threshed and expose it to the current of the wind, in Arabic likewise *drâ* (whence מְזַרְהַת, *midhrâ*, a winnowing-fork, like רַחַת, *racht*, a winnowing-shovel), gives an appropriate metaphor. Here it is equivalent to: to investigate and search out to the very bottom; LXX, Symmachus, and Theodotion, ἐξῆλκυίσαας, after which the Italic renders *investigasti*, and Jerome



*eventilasti*. **הַסְבִּין** with the accusative, as in Job. 22:21 with **עַם**: to enter into neighbourly, close, familiar relationship, or to stand in such relationship, with any one; cogn. **שָׁבַן**, Arab. *skn*. God is acquainted with all our ways not only superficially, but closely and thoroughly, as that to which He is accustomed.

In v. 4 this omniscience of God is illustratively corroborated with **כִּי**; v. 4b has the value of a relative clause, which, however, takes the form of an independent clause. **מְלָה** (pronounced by Jerome in his letter to Sunnia and Fretela, § 82, *MALA*) is an Aramaic word that has been already incorporated in the poetry of the Davidico-Salomonic age. **כְּלָה** signifies both all of it and every one. In v. 5 Luther has been misled by the LXX and Vulgate, which take **צוּר** in the signification *formare* (whence **צוּרָה**, *forma*); it signifies, as the definition “behind and before” shows, to surround, encompass. God is acquainted with man, for He holds him surrounded on all sides, and man can do nothing, if God, whose confining hand he has lying upon him (Job. 9:23), does not allow him the requisite freedom of motion. Instead of **דַּעְתָּךְ** (XX **ἡ γνῶσις σου**) the poet purposely says in v. 6a merely **דָּאָת**: a knowledge, so all-penetrating, all-comprehensive as God’s knowledge. The *Kerî* reads **פְּלִיאָה**, but the *Chethîb* **פְּלִיאָה** is supported by the *Chethîb* **פְּלִיאִ** in Jud. 13:18, the *Kerî* of which there is not **פְּלִיאָה**, but **פְּלִי** (the pausal form of an adjective **פְּלִי**, the feminine of which would be **פְּלִיָּה**). With **מִמְּנִי** the transcendence, with **נִשְׁגָּבָה** the unattainableness, and with **לֹא-אֵיכָבֵל לָהּ** the incomprehensibility of the fact of the omniscience of God is expressed, and with this, to the mind of the poet, coincides God’s omnipresence; for true, not merely phenomenal, knowledge is not possible without the immanence of the knowing one in the thing known. God, however, is omnipresent, sustaining the life of all things by His Spirit, and revealing Himself either in love or in wrath, — what the poet styles His countenance. To flee from this omnipresence (**מִן**, away from), as the sinner and he who is conscious of his guilt would gladly do, is impossible. Concerning the first **אֲנָהּ**, which is here accented on the *ultima*, vid., on Psa. 116: 4.

*Psa. 139: 8-12*. The future form **אֲסַק**, customary in the Aramaic, may be derived just as well from **סָלַק** (**סִלַּק**), by means of the same mode of assimilation as in **יֹסֵב** = **יֹסֵבֵב**, as from **נִסַּק** (**נִסַּק**), which latter is certainly only insecurely established by Dan. 6:24, **לְהִנְסָקָהּ** (cf. **לְהִנְנִיקָתָהּ**, Ezr. 4:22; **הִנְפִּיקָהּ**, Dan. 5: 2), since the *Nun*, as in **לְהִנְעֵלָהּ**, Dan. 4: 3, can also be a compensation for the resolved doubling (vid., Bernstein in the *Lexicon Chrestom. Kirschianae*, and Levy s.v. **נִסַּק**). **אִם** with the simple future is

followed by cohortatives (vid., on 73:16) with the equivalent **נָשָׂא** among them: *et si stratum facerem (mihi) infernum* (accusative of the object as in Isa. 58: 5), etc. In other passages the wings of the sun (Mal. 3:20 [4: 2]) and of the wind (Psa. 18:11) are mentioned, here we have the wings of the morning's dawn. *Pennae aurorae*, Eugubinus observes (1548), *est velocissimus aurorae per omnem mundum decursus*. It is therefore to be rendered: If I should lift wings (**נָשָׂא כְּנָפַיִם** as in Eze. 10:16, and frequently) such as the dawn of the morning has, i.e., could I fly with the swiftness with which the dawn of the morning spreads itself over the eastern sky, towards the extreme west and alight there. Heaven and Hades, as being that which is superterrestrial and subterrestrial, and the east and west are set over against one another. **יָם אַחֲרֵיתוֹ** is the extreme end of the sea (of the Mediterranean with the “isles of the Gentiles”). In v. 10 follows the apodosis: nowhere is the hand of God, which governs everything, to be escaped, for *dextera Dei ubique est*. **וְאִמַּר** (not **וְאָמַר**, Eze. 13:15), “therefore I spake,” also has the value of a hypothetical protasis: *quodsi dixerim*. **אֶדְחֶשֶׁד** and **חֹשֶׁךְ** belongs together: *merae tenebrae* (vid: Psa. 39: 6 f.); but **יְשׁוּפְנִי** is obscure. The signification secured to it of *conterere, contundere*, in Gen. 3:15, Job. 9:17, which is followed by the LXX (Vulgate) *καταπατήσει*, is inappropriate to darkness. The signification *inhiare*, which may be deduced as possible from **שָׂאָה**, suits relatively better, yet not thoroughly well (why should it not have been **יְבַלְעֵנִי**?). The signification *obvelare*, however, which one expects to find, and after which the Targum, Symmachus, Jerome, Saadia, and others render it, seems only to be guessed at from the connection, since **שׁוּף** has not this signification in any other instance, and in favour of it we cannot appeal either to **נָשָׂא** — whence **נָשָׂא**, which belongs together with **נָשָׂא**, **נָשָׂא**, and **נָשָׂא** — or to **עָמַר**, the root of which is **עַמַּ** (**עָמַר**), or to **צָאָר**, whence **צָעַר**, which does not signify to cover, veil, but according to Arab. *d'f*, to fold, fold together, to double. We must therefore either assign to **יְשׁוּפְנִי** the signification *operiat me* without being able to prove it, or we must put a verb of this signification in its place, viz., **יְשׁוּבְנִי** (Ewald) or **יְעוּפְנִי** (Böttcher), which latter is the more commendable here, where darkness (**חֹשֶׁךְ**, synon. **עִיפָה**, **מְעוּרָה**) is the subject: and if I should say, let nothing but darkness cover me, and as night (the predicate placed first, as in Amo. 4:13) let the light become about me, i.e., let the light become night that shall surround and cover me (**בְּעֵדְנִי**, poetic for **בְּעֵדִי**, like **תַּחְתְּנִי** in 2 Samuel 22) — the darkness would spread abroad no obscurity (Psa. 105:28) that should extend beyond (**מִן**) Thy piercing eye and remove me from Thee. In the word **יְאִיר**, too, the *Hiphil* signification is not

lost: the night would give out light from itself, as if it were the day; for the distinction of day and night has no conditioning influence upon God, who is above and superior to all created things (*der Uebercreatürliche*), who is light in Himself. The two כ are correlative, as e.g., in 1Ki. 22: 4. חֲשִׁיכָה (with a superfluous *Jod*) is an old word, but אֲנֶרֶה (cf. Aramaic אֲנֶרְתָא) is a later one.

*Psa. 139:13-18.* The fact that man is manifest to God even to the very bottom of his nature, and in every place, is now confirmed from the origin of man. The development of the child in the womb was looked upon by the Israelitish Chokma as one of the greatest mysteries, Ecc. 11: 5; and here the poet praises this coming into being as a marvellous work of the omniscient and omnipresent omnipotence of God. קָנָה here signifies *condere*; and סָבַךְ not: to cover, protect, as in Psa. 140: 8, Job. 40:22, prop. to cover with network, to hedge in, but: to plait, interweave, viz., with bones, sinews, and veins, like שָׂבַךְ in Job. 10:11. The reins are made specially prominent in order to mark the, the seat of the tenderest, most secret emotions, as the work of Him who trieth the heart and the reins. The προσευχή becomes in v. 14 the εὐχαριστία: I give thanks unto Thee that I have wonderfully come into being under fearful circumstances, i.e., circumstances exciting a shudder, viz., of astonishment (נִרְאוֹת as in Psa. 65: 6). נִפְלְאָה (= נִפְלָא) is the passive to הִפְלֵא, 4: 4; 17: 7. Hitzig regards נִפְלִיתָה (Thou hast shown Thyself wonderful), after the LXX, Syriac, Vulgate, and Jerome, as the only correct reading; but the thought which is thereby gained comes indeed to be expressed in the following line, v. 14b, which sinks down into tautology in connection with this reading. עֲצָם (collectively equivalent to עֲצָמִים, Ecc. 11: 5) is the bones, the skeleton, and, starting from that idea, more generally the state of being as a sum-total of elements of being. אֲשֶׁר, without being necessarily a conjunction (Ew. § 333, a), attaches itself to the suffix of עֲצָמִים. רָקֵם, “to be worked in different colours, or also embroidered,” of the system of veins ramifying the body, and of the variegated colouring of its individual members, more particularly of the inward parts; perhaps, however, more generally with a retrospective conception of the colours of the outline following the undeveloped beginning, and of the forming of the members and of the organism in general. <sup>f396</sup>

The mother's womb is here called not merely סֶתֶר (cf. Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, 665: ἐν σκότοις τριπλοῦς τεθραμμένη, and the designation of the place where the foetus is formed as “a threefold darkness” in the Koran, *Sur.* xxxix. 8), the ē of which is retained here in pause (vid., Böttcher, *Lehrbuch*, § 298), but by a bolder appellation תַּחְתִּיּוֹת אֲרֶץ, the lowest parts of the earth, i.e., the interior of the earth (vid., on Psa. 63:10) as being the secret laboratory of the earthly origin, with the same retrospective reference to the first formation of the

human body out of the dust of the earth, as when Job says, Job. 1:21: “naked came I out of my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return thither” — **שָׁמָּה**, viz., **εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν μητέρα πάντων**, Sir. 40: 1. The interior of Hades is also called **בְּטֵן שְׂאוּל** in Jon. 2: 3 [2], Sir. 51: 5. According to the view of Scripture the mode of Adam’s creation is repeated in the formation of every man, Job. 33: 6, cf. 4. The earth was the mother’s womb of Adam, and the mother’s womb out of which the child of Adam comes forth is the earth out of which it is taken. (V. 16.) The embryo folded up in the shape of an egg is here called **גִּלְמָה**, from **גָּלַם**, to roll or wrap together (cf. *glomus*, a ball), in the Talmud said of any kind of unshapen mass (LXX **ἀκατέργαστον**, Symmachus **ἀμόρφωτον**) and raw material, e.g., of the wood or metal that is to be formed into a vessel (*Chullin 25a*, to which Saadia has already referred). <sup>f397</sup>

As to the rest, compare similar retrospective glances into the embryonic state in Job. 10: 8-12, 2 Macc. 7:22 f. (*Psychology*, S. 209 ff., tr. pp. 247 f.). On the words *in libro tuo* Bellarmine makes the following correct observation: *quia habes apud te exemplaria sive ideas omnium, quomodo pictor vel sculptor scit ex informi materia quid futurum sit, quia videt exemplar*. The signification of the future **יִבְרָאוּ** is regulated by **וְיָרְאוּ**, and becomes, as relating to the synchronous past, *scribebantur*. The days **יָצְרוּ**, which were already formed, are the subject. It is usually rendered: “the days which had first to be formed.” If **יִבְרָאוּ** could be equivalent to **יִצְרָאוּ**, it would be to be preferred; but this rejection of the *praeform. fut.* is only allowed in the *fut. Piel* of the verbs *Pe Jod*, and that after a *Waw convertens*, e.g., **וַיִּבְשׁוּ** = **וַיִּבְשׁוּ**, Nah. 1: 4 (cf. Caspari on Oba. 1:11). <sup>f398</sup>

Accordingly, assuming the original character of the **לֹא** in a negative signification, it is to be rendered: The days which were (already) formed, and there was not one among them, i.e., when none among them had as yet become a reality. The suffix of **כָּלֵם** points to the succeeding **יָמִים**, to which **יָצְרוּ** is appended as an attributive clause; **וְלֹא אֶחָד בָּהֶם** is subordinated to this **יָצְרוּ**: *cum non* or *nondum* (Job. 22:16) *unus inter eos = unus eorum* (Exo. 14:28) *esset*. But the expression (instead of **וְעוֹד לֹא הָיָה** or **מִצֵּרֵם יֵהְיֶה**) remains doubtful, and it becomes a question whether the *Kerî* **וְלוֹ** (vid., on Psa. 100: 3), which stands side by side with the *Chethîb* **וְלֹא** (which the LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the Targum, Syriac, Jerome, and Saadia follow), is not to be preferred. This **וְלוֹ**, referred to **גִּלְמֵי**, gives the acceptable meaning: and for it (viz., its birth) one among them (these days), without our needing to make any change in the proposed exposition down to **יָצְרוּ**. We decide in favour of this, because this **וְלוֹ אֶחָד בָּהֶם** does not, as **וְלֹא אֶחָד בָּהֶם**, make

one feel to miss any **הִיָּה**, and because the **וְגַלְי** which begins v. 17 connects itself to it by way of continuation. The accentuation has failed to discern the reference of **כֹּלֵם** to the following **יָמַיִם**, inasmuch as it places *Olewejored* against **יִכְתְּבוּ**. Hupfeld follows this accentuation, referring **כֹּלֵם** back to **גַּלְמִי** as a coil of days of one's life; and Hitzig does the same, referring it to the embryos. But the precedence of the relative pronoun occurs in other instances also, <sup>f399</sup> and is devoid of all harshness, especially in connection with **כָּלֵם**, which directly signifies altogether (e.g., Isa. 43:14).

It is the confession of the omniscience that is united with the omnipotence of God, which the poet here gives utterance to with reference to himself, just as Jahve says with reference to Jeremiah, Jer. 1: 5. Among the days which were preformed in the idea of God (cf. on **יִצְרָר**, Isa. 22:11; 37:26) there was also one, says the poet, for the embryonic beginning of my life. The divine knowledge embraces the beginning, development, and completion of all things (*Psychology*, S. 37 ff., tr. pp. 46 ff.). The knowledge of the thoughts of God which are written in the book of creation and revelation is the poet's cherished possession, and to ponder over them is his favourite pursuit: they are precious to him, **יִקְרֶוּ** (after Psa. 36: 8), not: difficult of comprehension (*schwerbegreiflich*, Maurer, Olshausen), after Dan. 2:11, which would surely have been expressed by **עֲמֻקּוֹ** (Psa. 92: 6), more readily: very weighty (*schwergewichtig*, Hitzig), but better according to the prevailing Hebrew usage: highly valued (*schwergewerthet*), *cara*. <sup>f400</sup>

“Their sums” are powerful, prodigious (Psa. 40: 6), and cannot be brought to a *summa summarum*. If he desires to count them (*fut. hypothet.* as in Psa. 91: 7, Job. 20:24), they prove themselves to be more than the sand with its grains, that is to say, innumerable. He falls asleep over the pondering upon them, wearied out; and when he wakes up, he is still with God, i.e., still ever absorbed in the contemplation of the Unsearchable One, which even the sleep of fatigue could not entirely interrupt. Ewald explains it somewhat differently: if I am lost in the stream of thoughts and images, and recover myself from this state of reverie, yet I am still ever with Thee, without coming to an end. But it could only perhaps be interpreted thus if it were **הַתְּעוֹרְרָתִי** or **הַעִירוֹתִי**.

Hofmann's interpretation is altogether different: I will count them, the more numerous than the sand, when I awake and am continually with Thee, viz., in the other world, after the awaking from the sleep of death. This is at once impossible, because **הַקִּיּוּצָתִי** cannot here, according to its position, be a *perf. hypotheticum*. Also in connection with this interpretation **עוֹד** would be an inappropriate expression for “continually,” since the word only has the sense of the continual duration of an action or a state already existing; here of one

that has not even been closed and broken off by sleep. He has not done; waking and dreaming and waking up, he is carried away by that endless, and yet also endlessly attractive, pursuit, the most fitting occupation of one who is awake, and the sweetest (cf. Jer. 31:26) of one who is asleep and dreaming.

*Psa. 139:19-21.* And this God is by many not only not believed in and loved, but even hated and blasphemed! The poet now turns towards these enemies of God in profound vexation of spirit. The **אם**, which is conditional in v. 8, here is an optative *o si*, as in Psa. 81: 9; 95: 7. The expression **אלוה תקטל** reminds one of the Book of Job, for, with the exception of our Psalm, this is the only book that uses the verb **קטל**, which is more Aramaic than Hebrew, and the divine name *Eloah* occurs more frequently in it than anywhere else. The transition from the optative to the imperative **סורו** is difficult; it would have been less so if the *Waw copul.* had been left out: cf. the easier expression in Psa. 6: 9; 119:115. But we may not on this account seek to read **יסורו**, as Olshausen does. Everything here is remarkable; the whole Psalm has a characteristic form in respect to the language. **מני** is the ground-form of the overloaded **ממני**, and is also like the Book of Job, Job. 21:16, cf. **מנהו** Job. 4:12, Psa. 68:24. The mode of writing **ימרוד** (instead of which, however, the Babylonian texts had **יאמרוד**) is the same as in 2Sa. 19:15, cf. in 2Sa. 20: 9 the same melting away of the *Aleph* into the preceding vowel in connection with **אחו**, in 2Sa. 22:40 in connection with **אזר**, and in Isa. 13:20 with **אהל**. Construed with the accusative of the person, **אמר** here signifies to declare any one, *profiteri*, a meaning which, we confess, does not occur elsewhere. But **למזמה** (cf. **למרמה**, 24: 4; the Targum: who swear by Thy name for wantonness) and the parallel member of the verse, which as it runs is moulded after Exo. 20: 7, show that it has not to be read **ימרוד** (Quinta: **παρεπικρανάν σε**). The form **נשוא**, with *Aleph otians*, is also remarkable; it ought at least to have been written **נשאו** (cf. **נרפוא**, Eze. 47: 8) instead of the customary **נשאו**; yet the same mode of writing is found in the *Niphal* in Jer. 10: 5, **ינשוא**, it assumes a ground-form **נשה** (Psa. 32: 1) = **נשא**, and is to be judged of according to **אבוא** in Isa. 28:12 [Ges. § 23, 3, rem. 3]. Also one feels the absence of the object to **נשוא לשוא**. It is meant to be supplied according to the decalogue, Exo. 20: 7, which certainly makes the alteration **שמד** (Böttcher, Olsh.) or **זכרד** (Hitzig on Isa. 26:13), instead of **עריד**, natural. But the text as we now have it is also intelligible: the object to **נשוא** is derived from **ימרוד**, and the following **עריד** is an explanation of the subject intended in **נשוא** that is introduced subsequently. Psa. 89:52 proves the

possibility of this structure of a clause. It is correctly rendered by Aquila ἀντιζηλοῖ σου, and Symmachus οἱ ἐναντιοὶ σου. עֵר, an enemy, prop. one who is zealous, a zealot (from עוּר, or rather עִיר, = Arab. *gār, med. Je, ζηλοῦν*, whence עִיר, Arab. *gayrat* = קִנְאָה), is a word that is guaranteed by 1Sa. 28:16, Dan. 4:16, and as being an Aramaism is appropriate to this Psalm. The form תְּקוּמָה for מִתְקוּמָה has cast away the preformative *Mem* (cf. שִׁפְתָּיִם and מִשְׁפְּתָיִם, מִקְרָה in Deu. 23:11 for (מִ)מִּקְרָה); the suffix is to be understood according to Psal. 17: 7. *Pasek* stands between יְהוָה and אֲשֶׁנָּא in order that the two words may not be read together (cf. Job. 27:13, and above Psal. 10: 3). הַתְּקוּמָה as in the recent Psal. 119:158. The emphasis in v. 22b lies on לִי; the poet regards the adversaries of God as enemies of his own. תְּכַלִּית takes the place of the adjective: *extremo (odio) odi eos*. Such is the relation of the poet to the enemies of God, but without indulging any self-glorying.

*Psal. 139:23, 24.* He sees in them the danger which threatens himself, and prays God not to give him over to the judgment of self-delusion, but to lay bare the true state of his soul. The fact “Thou hast searched me,” which the beginning of the Psalm confesses, is here turned into a petitioning “search me.” Instead of רְעִים in v. 17, the poet here says שְׂרָאפִים, which signifies branches (Eze. 31: 5) and branchings of the act of thinking (thoughts and cares, 94:19). The *Resh* is epenthetic, for the first form is שְׁעָפִים, Job. 4:13; 20: 2. The poet thus sets the very ground and life of his heart, with all its outward manifestations, in the light of the divine omniscience. And in v. 24 he prays that God would see whether any דְּרֵךְ-עֶצֶב cleaves to him (בִּי as in 1Sa. 25:24), by which is not meant “a way of idols” (Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and Maurer), after Isa. 48: 5, since an inclination towards, or even apostasy to, heathenism cannot be an unknown sin; nor to a man like the writer of this Psalm is heathenism any power of temptation. דְּרֵךְ בְּצֵעַ (Grätz) might more readily be admissible, but דְּרֵךְ עֶצֶב is a more comprehensive notion, and one more in accordance with this closing petition. The poet gives this name to the way that leads to the pain, torture, viz., of the inward and outward punishments of sin; and, on the other hand, the way along which he wishes to be guided he calls דְּרֵךְ עוֹלָם, the way of endless continuance (LXX, Vulgate, Luther), not the way of the former times, after Jer. 6:16 (Maurer, Olshausen), which thus by itself is ambiguous (as becomes evident from Job. 22:15, Jer. 18:15), and also does not furnish any direct antithesis. The “everlasting way” is the way of God (Psal. 27:11), the way of the righteous, which stands fast for ever and shall not “perish” (Psal. 1: 6).

## Psalm 140

### PRAYER FOR PROTECTION AGAINST WICKED, CRAFTY MEN

*140: 2 DELIVER me, Jahve, from wicked men,  
From the violent man preserve me,*

*140: 3 Who plot wickedness in the heart,  
Daily do they stir up wars.*

*140: 4 They sharpen their tongue like a serpent,  
Adder's poison is under their lips. (Sela)*

*140: 5 Keep me, Jahve, from the hands of the wicked,  
From the violent man preserve me,  
Who purpose to thrust aside my footsteps.*

*140: 6 The proud hide snares for me and cords,  
They spread nets close by the path,  
They set traps for me. (Sela)*

*140: 7 I say to Jahve: My God art Thou,  
Oh give ear, Jahve, to the cry of my supplication.*

*140: 8 Jahve the Lord is the stronghold of my salvation,  
Thou coverest my head in the day of equipment.*

*140: 9 Grant not, Jahve, the desires of the wicked;  
Let not his device prosper, that they may not be lifted up. (Sela)*

*140:10 The head of those who compass me about —  
let the trouble of their lips cover them!*

*140:11 Let burning coals be cast down upon them, let them be cast into the fire,  
Into abysses out of which they may never rise up!*

*140:12 Let not the man of the tongue be established on the earth,  
The man of violence — let wickedness hunt him in violent haste!*

*140:13 I know that Jahve will carry through the cause of the afflicted,  
The right of the poor.*

*140:14 Yea, the righteous shall give thanks unto Thy Name,  
The upright shall dwell beside Thy countenance.*

*Psalm 140.* The close of the preceding Psalm is the key to David's position and mood in the presence of his enemies which find expression in this Psalm. He complains here of serpent-like, crafty, slanderous adversaries, who are preparing themselves for war against him, and with whom he will at length have to fight in open battle. The Psalm, in its form more bold than beautiful,



justifies its **לָדוּד** in so far as it is Davidic in thoughts and figures, and may be explained from the circumstances of the rebellion of Absalom, to which as an outbreak of Ephraimitish jealousy the rebellion of Sheba ben Bichri the Benjamite attached itself. Psalm 58 and 64 are very similar. The close of all three Psalms sounds much alike, they agree in the use of rare forms of expression, and their language becomes fearfully obscure in style and sound where they are directed against the enemies.

*Psa. 140: 2-4.* The assimilation of the *Nun* of the verb **נָצַר** is given up, as in Psa. 61: 8; 78: 7, and frequently, in order to make the form more full-toned. The relative clause shows that **אִישׁ הַמָּסִים** (vid., p. 173) is not intended to be understood exclusively of one person. **בִּלְבַב** strengthens the notion of that which is deeply concealed and premeditated. It is doubtful whether **יַגְרוּ** signifies to form into troops or to stir up. But from the fact that **גִּיר** in Psa. 56: 7; 59: 4, Isa. 54:15, signifies not *congregare* but *se congregare*, it is to be inferred that **גִּיר** in the passage before us, like **גָּרָה** (or **הַתְּגָרָה** in Deu. 2: 9, 24), in Syriac and Targumic **גָּרַג**, signifies *concitare*, to excite (cf. **שׂוּר** together with **שָׂרָה**, Hos. 12: 4 f.). In v. 4 the Psalm coincides with Psa. 64: 4; 58: 5. They sharpen their tongue, so that it inflicts a fatal sting like the tongue of a serpent, and under their lips, shooting out from thence, is the poison of the adder (cf. Son. 4:11). **אֶכְשׁוּב** is a *ἄπαξ λεγομ.* not from **פָּשַׁב** (*Jesurun*, p. 207), but from **עָכַשׁ**, Arab. *'ks* and *kš*, root *'k* (vid., Fleischer on Isa. 59: 5, **אֶכְבִּישׁ**), both of which have the significations of bending, turning, and coiling after the manner of a serpent; the *Beth* is an organic addition modifying the meaning of the root. <sup>f401</sup>

*Psa. 140: 5, 6.* The course of this second strophe is exactly parallel with the first. The perfects describe their conduct hitherto, as a comparison of v. 3*b* with 3*a* shows. **פְּעָמִים** is poetically equivalent to **רַגְלִים**, and signifies both the foot that steps (Psa. 57: 5; 58:11) and the step that is made by the foot (Psa. 85:14; 119:133), and here the two senses are undistinguishable. They are called **גֵּאִים** on account of the inordinate ambition that infatuates them. The metaphors taken from the life of the hunter (Psa. 141: 9; 142: 4) are here brought together as it were into a body of synonyms. The meaning of **לִיד־מַעְגָּל** becomes explicable from Psa. 142: 4; **לִיד**, at hand, is equivalent to “immediately beside” (1Ch. 18:17, Neh. 11:24). Close by the path along which he has to pass, lie gins ready to spring together and ensnare him when he appears.

*Psa. 140: 7-9.* Such is the conduct of his enemies; he, however, prays to his God and gets his weapons from beside Him. The day of equipment is the day of the crisis when the battle is fought in full array. The perfect **סִבְיָתָהּ** states what will then take place on the part of God: He protects the head of His anointed against the deadly blow. Both v. 8a and 8b point to the helmet as being **מִעוֹר רֹאשׁ**, 60: 9; cf. the expression “the helmet of salvation” in Isa. 59:17. Beside **מֵאַנִּי**, from the *ἄπ. λεγ. מֵאַוּדָה*, there is also the reading **מֵאַנִּי**, which *Abulwalid* found in his Jerusalem codex (in Saragossa). The regular form would be **מֵאַנִּי**, and the boldly irregular *ma‘awajjê* follows the example of **מִחֲמַדִּי**, **מִחֲשִׁבִי**, and the like, in a manner that is without example elsewhere. **זָמְמוֹ** for **מִזְמָתוֹ** is also a hapaxlegomenon; according to Gesenius the principal form is **זָמַם**, but surely ore correctly **זָמַם** (like **קָרַב**), which in Aramaic signifies a bridle, and here a plan, device. The *Hiph.* **הִפְיִק** (root **פִּק**, whence **נִפְק**, Arab. *nfq*) signifies *educere* in the sense of *reportare*, Pro. 3:13; 8:35; 12: 2; 18:22, and of *porrigere*, Psa. 144:13, Isa. 58:10. A reaching forth of the plan is equivalent to the reaching forth of that which is projected. The choice of the words used in this Psalm coincides here, as already in **מִמְעַל**, with Proverbs and Isaiah. The future **יִרְוּמוּ** expresses the consequence (cf. 61: 8) against which the poet wishes to guard.

*Psa. 140:10-12.* The strophic symmetry is now at an end. The longer the poet lingers over the contemplation of the rebels the more lofty and dignified does his language become, the more particular the choice of the expressions, and the more difficult and unmanageable the construction. The *Hiph.* **הִסֵּב** signifies, causatively, to cause to go round about (Exo. 13:18), and to raise round about (2Ch. 14: 6); here, after Jos. 6:11, where with an accusative following it signifies to go round about: to make the circuit of anything, as enemies who surround a city on all sides and seek the most favourable point for assault; **מִמְסְבִי** from the participle **מִסֵּב**. Even when derived from the substantive **מִסֵּב** (Hupfeld), “my surroundings” is equivalent to **סְבִיבוֹתַי** **אֵיבֵי** in Psa. 27: 6. Hitzig, on the other hand, renders it: the head of my slanderers, from **סִבַּב**, to go round about, Arabic to tell tales of any one, defame; but the Arabic *sbb*, fut. *u*, to abuse, the IV form (*Hiphil*) of which moreover is not used either in the ancient or in the modern language, has nothing to do with the Hebrew **סִבַּב**, but signifies originally to cut off round about, then to clip (injure) any one’s honour and good name. <sup>f402</sup>

The fact that the enemies who surround the psalmist on every side are just such calumniators, is intimated here in the word **שִׁפְתֵימוֹ**. He wishes that the trouble

which the enemies' slanderous lips occasion him may fall back upon their own head. ראש is head in the first and literal sense according to Psa. 7:17; and יבסימו (with the *Jod* of the groundform כסי, as in Deu. 32:26, 1Ki. 20:35; *Chethib* יבסומו<sup>f403</sup>, after the attractional schema, 2Sa. 2: 4, Isa. 2:11, and frequently; cf. on the masculine form, Pro. 5: 2; 10:21) refers back to ראש, which is meant of the heads of all persons individually. In v. 11 ימיטו (with an indefinite subject of the higher punitive powers, Ges. § 137, note), in the signification to cause to descend, has a support in 55: 4, whereas the *Niph.* נמוט, fut. ימט, which is preferred by the *Keri*, in the signification to be made to descend, is contrary to the usage of the language. The ἄπ. λεγ. מהמורות has been combined by Parchon and others with the Arabic *hmr*, which, together with other significations (to strike, stamp, cast down, and the like), also has the signification to flow (whence e.g., in the Koran, *mā' munhamir*, flowing water). "Fire" and "water" are emblems of perils that cannot be escaped, 66:12, and the mention of fire is therefore appropriately succeeded by places of flowing water, pits of water. The signification "pits" is attested by the Targum, Symmachus, Jerome, and the quotation in Kimchi: "first of all they buried them in מהמורות; when the flesh was consumed they collected the bones and buried them in coffins." On בלי יקומו cf. Isa. 26:14. Like vv. 10, 11, v. 12 is also not to be taken as a general maxim, but as expressing a wish in accordance with the excited tone of this strophe. איש לשון is not a great talker, i.e., boaster, but an idle talker, i.e., slanderer (LXX ἀνήρ γλωσσώδης, cf. Sir. 8: 4). According to the accents, איש חמס רע is the parallel; but what would be the object of this designation of violence as worse or more malignant? With Sommer, Olshausen, and others, we take רע as the subject to יצודנו: let evil, i.e., the punishment which arises out of evil, hunt him; cf. Pro. 13:21, חטאים תרדף רעה, and the opposite in Psa. 23: 6. It would have to be accented, according to this our construction of the words, למדחפת לנו . The ἄπ. λεγ. למדחפת we do not render, with Hengstenberg, Olshausen, and others: push upon push, with repeated pushes, which, to say nothing more, is not suited to the figure of hunting, but, since דחף always has the signification of precipitate hastening: by hastenings, that is to say, forced marches.

*Psa. 140:13, 14.* With v. 13 the mood and language now again become cheerful, the rage has spent itself; therefore the style and tone are now changed, and the Psalm trips along merrily as it were to the close. With reference to ידעת for ידעתי (as in Job. 42: 2), vid., 16: 2. That which David in Psa. 9: 5 confidently expects on his own behalf is here generalized into the

certain prospect of the triumph of the good cause in the person of all its representatives at that time oppressed. אַס, like אֲדַעְתִּי, is an expression of certainty. After seeming abandonment God again makes Himself known to His own, and those whom they wanted to sweep away out of the land of the living have an ever sure dwelling-place with His joyful countenance (Psa. 16:11).

## Psalm 141

### EVENING PSALM IN THE TIMES OF ABSALOM

*141: 1 JAHVE, I call upon Thee, Oh haste Thee unto me;  
Oh hearken to my voice, when I call upon Thee!*

*141: 2 Let my prayer be accounted as incense before Thee,  
The lifting up of my hands as the evening meat-offering.*

*141: 3 Oh set a watch, Jahve, upon my mouth,  
A protection upon the door of my lips.*

*141: 4 Incline not my heart to an evil matter,  
To practise knavish things in iniquity  
With the lords who rule wickedly,  
And let me not taste their dainties.*

*141: 5 Let a righteous man smite me lovingly and rebuke me,  
Such oil upon the head let not my head refuse,  
For still do I meet their wickedness only with prayer.*

*141: 6 Hurlled down upon the sides of the rock are their judges,  
And they hear my words as welcome.*

*141: 7 As when one furroweth and breaketh up the earth,  
Are our bones sowed at the gate of Hades.*

*141: 8 For unto Thee, Jahve Lord! do mine eyes look,  
In Thee do I hide, pour not my soul out!*

*141: 9 Keep me from the hands of the snare of those who lay snares for me,  
And from the traps of those who rule wickedly.*

*141:10 Let the wicked fall into their own net,  
Whilst I altogether escape.*

*Psalm 141.* The four Psalm 140, 141, 142, and 143, are interwoven with one another in many ways (*Symbolae*, pp. 67 f.). The following passages are very similar, viz., Psa. 140: 7; 141: 1; 142: 2, and 143: 1. Just as the poet complains in Psa. 142: 4, “when my spirit veils itself within me,” so too in Psa. 143: 4; as he prays in Psa. 142: 8, “Oh bring my soul out of prison,” so in Psa. 143:11, “bring my soul out of distress,” where אַרְרָה takes the place of the metaphorical

מסגֵר. Besides these, compare Psa. 140: 5, 6 with Psa. 141: 9; 142: 7 with Psa. 143: 9; 140: 3 with Psa. 141: 5, רעות; Psa. 140:14 with Psa. 142: 8; Psa. 142: 4 with Psa. 143: 8.

The right understanding of the Psalm depends upon the right understanding of the situation. Since it is inscribed לָרֹדֶד, it is presumably a situation corresponding to the history of David, out of the midst of which the Psalm is composed, either by David himself or by some one else who desired to give expression in Davidic strains to David's mood when in this situation. For the gleanings of Davidic Psalms which we find in the last two Books of the Psalter is for the most part derived from historical works in which these Psalms, in some instances only free reproductions of the feelings of David with respect to old Davidic models, adorned the historic narrative. The Psalm before us adorned the history of the time of the persecution by Absalom. At that time David was driven out of Jerusalem, and consequently cut off from the sacrificial worship of God upon Zion; and our Psalm is an evening hymn of one of those troublous days. The ancient church, even prior to the time of Gregory (*Constitutiones Apostolicae*, ii. 59), had chosen it for its evening hymn, just as it had chosen Psalm 63 for its morning hymn. Just as Psalm 63 was called ὁ ὀρθρινός (*ibid.* Psa. 8:37), so this Psalm, as being the Vesper Psalm, was called ὁ ἐπιλυχνίος (*vid.*, Psa. 8:35).

*Psa. 141: 1, 2.* The very beginning of Psalm 141 is more after the manner of David than really Davidic; for instead of *haste thee to me*, David always says, *haste thee for my help*, Psa. 22:20; 38:23; 40:14. The לָךְ that is added to בְּקִרְאִי (as in Psa. 4: 2) is to be explained, as in Psa. 57: 3: when I call to Thee, i.e., when I call Thee, who art now far from me, to me. The general cry for help is followed in v. 2 by a petition for the answering of his prayer. Luther has given an excellent rendering: Let my prayer avail to Thee as an offering of incense; the lifting up of my hands, as an evening sacrifice (*Mein Gebet müsse für dir tügen wie ein Rauchopfer, Meine Hende auffheben, wie ein Abendopfer*). תָּבֹן is the *fut. Niph.* of בָּנָה, and signifies properly to be set up, and to be established, or reflexive: to place and arrange or prepare one's self, Amo. 4:12; then to continue, e.g., Psa. 101: 7; therefore, either let it place itself, let it appear, *sistat se*, or better: let it stand, continue, i.e., let my prayer find acceptance, recognition with Thee קַטְרֶת, and the lifting up of my hands מִנְחַת־עֶרֶב. Expositors say that this in both instances is the *comparatio decurtata*, as in Psa. 11: 1 and elsewhere: as an incense-offering, as an evening *mincha*. But the poet purposely omits the בָּ of the comparison. He wishes that God may be pleased to regard his prayer as sweet-smelling smoke or as incense, just as this was added to the *azcara* of the meal-offering, and gave it,

in its ascending perfume, the direction upward to God, <sup>f404</sup> and that He may be pleased to regard the lifting up of his hands (מִשָּׂאתָ, the construct with the reduplication given up, from מִשָּׂאתָ, or even, after the form מִתְנַתָּ, from מִשָּׂאתָ, here not *oblatio*, but according to the phrase נָשָׂא כַּפַּיִם יְדָיִם, *elevatio*, Jud. 20:38, 40, cf. Psa. 28: 2, and frequently) as an evening *mincha*, just as it was added to the evening *tamid* according to Exo. 29:38-42, and concluded the work of the service of the day. <sup>f405</sup>

*Psa. 141: 3, 4.* The prayer now begins to be particularized, and that in the first instance as a petition fore the grace of silence, calling to mind old Davidic passages like Psa. 39: 2; 34:14. The situation of David, the betrayed one, requires caution in speaking; and the consciousness of having sinned, not indeed against the rebels, but against God, who would not visit him thus without his deserving it, stood in the way of any outspoken self-vindication. In *pone custodiam ori meo* שְׁמֹרָה is ἄπ. λεγ., after the infinitive form דְּבַקָּה, עֲצֻמָּה, עֲצֻמָּה. In v. 3b דַּל is ἄπ. λεγ. for דְּלָתָה; cf. “doors of the mouth” in Mic. 7: 5, and πύλαι στόματος in Euripides. נִצְרָה might be *imper. Kal*: keep I pray, with *Dag. dirimens* as in Pro. 4:13. But נִצַּר אֵל is not in use; and also as the parallel word to שְׁמֹרָה, which likewise has the appearance of being imperative, נִצְרָה is explicable as regards its pointing by a comparison of יִקְהָה in Gen. 49:10, דְּבַרָּה in Deu. 33: 3, and קִרְבָּה in Psa. 73:28. The prayer for the grace of silence is followed in v. 4 by a prayer for the breaking off of all fellowship with the existing rulers. By a flight of irony they are called אֲשֵׁים, lords, in the sense of בְּנֵי אִישׁ, Psa. 4: 3 (cf. the Spanish *hidalgos* = *hijos d’algo*, sons of somebody). The evil thing (רָעָה | דְּבַרָּה, with *Pasek* between the two ר, as in Num. 7:13, Deu. 7: 1 between the two ׀, and in 1Ch. 22: 3 between the two ל), to which Jahve may be pleased never to incline his heart (תַּטַּ, *fut. apoc. Hiph.* as in 27: 9), is forthwith more particularly designated: *perpetrare facinora maligne cum dominis, etc.* עֲלָלוֹת of great achievements in the sense of infamous deeds, also occurs in Psa. 14: 1; 99: 8. Here, however, we have the *Hithpo.* הִתְעַלֵּל, which, with the accusative of the object עֲלָלוֹת, signifies: wilfully to make such actions the object of one’s acting (cf. Arab. *ta‘allala b- l-š*, to meddle with any matter, to amuse, entertain one’s self with a thing). The expression is made to express disgust as strongly as possible; this poet is fond of glaring colouring in his language. In the dependent passage *neve eorum vescar cupediis*, לָחַם is used poetically for אָכַל, and בֵּ is the partitive *Beth*, as in Job. 21:25. מִנְאֲמִים is another hapaxlegomenon, but as being a designation of dainties (from נָאֵם, to be mild, tender, pleasant), it may not have been an unusual word. It is a well-known

thing that usurpers revel in the *cuisine* and cellars of those whom they have driven away.

*Psa. 141: 5-7.* Thus far the Psalm is comparatively easy of exposition; but now it becomes difficult, yet not hopelessly so. David, thoroughly conscious of his sins against God and of his imperfection as a monarch, says, in opposition to the abuse which he is now suffering, that he would gladly accept any friendly reproof: “let a righteous man smite in kindness and reprove me — head-oil (i.e., oil upon the head, to which such reproof is likened) shall my head not refuse.” So we render it, following the accents, and not as Hupfeld, Kurtz, and Hitzig do: “if a righteous man smites me, it is love; if he reproves me, an anointing of the head is it unto me;” in connection with which the designation of the subject with **צַדִּיק** would be twice wanting, which is more than is admissible. **צַדִּיק** stands here as an abstract substantive: the righteous man, whoever he may be, in antithesis, namely, to the rebels and to the people who have joined them. Amyraldus, Maurer, and Hengstenberg understand it of God; but it only occurs of God as an attribute, and never as a direct appellation. **בְּחַסְדּוֹ**, as in Jer. 31: 3, is equivalent to **בְּחַסְדּוֹ**, *cum benignitate = benigne*. What is meant is, as in Job. 6:14, what Paul (Gal. 6: 1) styles *πνεῦμα πραύτητος*, and **לִבְרָה**, *tundere*, is used of the strokes of earnest but well-meant reproof, which is called “the blows of a friend” in Pro. 27: 6. Such reproof shall be to him as head-oil (Psa. 23: 5; 133: 2), which his head does not despise. **נִי**, written defectively for **נִיָּא**, like **נִשׁ**, in Psa. 55:16, **נִבִּי**, 1Ki. 21:29 and frequently; **נִיָּא** (root **נָא**, Arab. *n'*, with the nasal *n*, which also expresses the negation in the Indo-Germanic languages) here signifies to deny, as in Psa. 33:10 to bring to nought, to destroy. On the other hand, the LXX renders *μη λιπανάτω την κεφαλήν μου*, which is also followed by the Syriac and Jerome, perhaps after the Arabic *nawiya*, to become or to be fat, which is, however, altogether foreign to the Aramaic, and is, moreover, only used of fatness of the body, and in fact of camels. The meaning of the figure is this: well-meant reproof shall be acceptable and spiritually useful to him. The confirmation **כִּי־עוֹד וְגו'** follows, which is enigmatical both in meaning and expression. This **עוֹד** is the cipher of a whole clause, and the following **ו** is related to this **עוֹד** as the *Waw* that introduces the apodosis, not to **כִּי** as in 2Ch. 24:20, since no progression and connection is discernible if **כִּי** is taken as a subordinating *quia*. We interpret thus: *for it is still so* (the matter still stands thus), that my prayer is against their wickednesses; i.e., that I use no weapon but that of prayer against these, therefore let me always be in that spiritual state of mind which is alive to well-meant reproof. Mendelssohn's rendering is similar: I still pray, whilst they practise infamy. On **ו עוֹד** cf. Zec. 8:20 **אֲשֶׁר**

עֹד (vid., Köhler), and Pro. 24:27 אִשָּׁרָן . He who has prayed God in v. 3 to set a watch upon his mouth is dumb in the presence of those who now have dominion, and seeks to keep himself clear of their sinful doings, whereas he willingly allows himself to be chastened by the righteous; and the more silent he is towards the world (see Amo. 5:13), the more constant is he in his intercourse with God. But there will come a time when those who now behave as lords shall fall a prey to the revenge of the people who have been misled by them; and on the other hand, the confession of the salvation, and of the order of the salvation, of God, that has hitherto been put to silence, will again be able to make itself freely heard, and find a ready hearing.

As. v. 6 says, the new rulers fall a prey to the indignation of the people and are thrown down the precipices, whilst the people, having again come to their right mind, obey the words of David and find them pleasant and beneficial (vid., Pro. 15:26; 16:24). נְשַׁמְטוּ is to be explained according to 2Ki. 9:33. The casting of persons down from the rock was not an unusual mode of execution (2Ch. 25:12). אֲדֵי־סִלְעַת are the sides (Psa. 140: 6, Jud. 11:26) of the rock, after which the expression ἐχόμενα πέτρας of the LXX, which has been misunderstood by Jerome, is intended to be understood; <sup>f406</sup> they are therefore the sides of the rock conceived of as it were as the hands of the body of rock, if we are not rather with Böttcher to compare the expressions בִּידֵי and אֲלֵי־יָדַי construed with verbs of abandoning and casting down, Lam. 1:14, Job. 16:11, and frequently. In v. 7 there follows a further statement of the issue on the side of David and his followers: *instar findentis et secantis terram* (בְּקַעַת with Beth, elsewhere in the hostile signification of *irrupere*) *dispersa sunt ossa nostra ad ostium* (לְפִי as in Pro. 8: 3) *orci*; Symmachus: ὡςπερ γεωργὸς ὅταν ῥήσση τὴν τῆν, οὕτως ἔσκορπίσθη τὰ ὀστᾶ ἡμῶν εἰς στόμα ἄδου; Quinta: ὡς καλλιερῶν καὶ σκάπτων ἐν τῇ γῆ, κ.τ.λ. Assuming the very extreme, it is a look of hope into the future: should his bones and the bones of his followers be even scattered about the mouth of *Sheôl* (cf. the Syrian picture of *Sheôl*: “the dust upon its threshold ‘al-escûfteh,” *Deutsche Morgenlnd. Zeitschrift*, xx. 513), their soul below, their bones above — it would nevertheless be only as when on in ploughing cleaves the earth; i.e., they do not lie there in order that they may continue lying, but that they may rise up anew, as the seed that is sown sprouts up out of the upturned earth. LXX *Codd. Vat. et Sinait.* τὰ ὀστᾶ ἡμῶν, beside which, however, is found the reading αὐτῶν (*Cod. Alex.* by a second hand, and the Syriac, Arabic, and Aethiopic versions), as Böttcher also, *pro ineptissimo utcunque*, thinks עצמינו must be read, understanding this, according to 2Ch. 25:12 *extrem.*, of the mangled bodies of those cast down from the rock. We here discern the hope of a resurrection, if not directly, at least (cf. Oehler in Herzog’s *Real-Encyclopädie*, concluding volume, S. 422)



as an emblem of victory in spite of having succumbed. That which authorizes this interpretation lies in the figure of the husbandman, and in the conditional clause (v. 8), which leads to the true point of the comparison; for as a complaint concerning a defeat that had been suffered: “so are our bones scattered for the mouth of the grave (in order to be swallowed up by it),” v. 7, would be alien and isolated with respect to what precedes and what follows.

*Psa. 141: 8-10.* If v. 7 is not merely an expression of the complaint, but at the same time of hope, we now have no need to give the כִּי the adversative sense of *imo*, but we may leave it its most natural confirmatory signification *namque*. From this point the Psalm gradually dies away in strains comparatively easy to be understood and in perfect keeping with the situation. In connection with v. 8 one is reminded of Psa. 25:15; 31: 2; with vv. 9 f., of Psa. 7:16; 69:23, and other passages. In “pour not out (תִּזְרַק with sharpened vowel instead of תִּתְעַר, Ges. § 75, rem. 8) my soul,” עֲרָה, *Piel*, is equivalent to the *Hiph.* הִעֲרָה in Isa. 53:12. יְדֵי פַח are as it were the hands of the seizing and capturing snare; and יִקְשׁוּ לִי is virtually a genitive: *qui insidias tendunt mihi*, since one cannot say יִקְשׁוּ פַח, *ponere laqueum*. מְכַמְרִים, nets, in v. 10 is another hapaxlegomenon; the *enallage numeri* is as in Psa. 62: 5, Isa. 2: 8; 5:23, — the singular that slips in refers what is said of the many to each individual in particular. The plural מְקַשְׂוֹת for מְקַשְׂוִים, Psa. 18: 6; 64: 6, also occurs only here. יַחַד is to be explained as in Psa. 4: 9: it is intended to express the coincidence of the overthrow of the enemies and the going forth free of the persecuted one. With יַחַד אֲנֹכִי the poet gives prominence to his simultaneous, distinct destiny: *simul ego dum* (אִד as in Job. 8:21, cf. 1:18) *praetereo h.e. evado*. The inverted position of the כִּי in Psa. 18:10-12 may be compared; with Psa. 120: 7 and 2Ki. 2:14, however (where instead of אֶרְי־הוּא it is with Thenius to be read אֶפֹּא), the case is different.

## Psalm 142

### CRY SENT FORTH FROM THE PRISON TO THE BEST OF FRIENDS

*142: 2 WITH my voice to Jahve do I cry,  
With my voice to Jahve do I make supplication,*

*142: 3 I pour forth before Him my complaint,  
My trouble do I make known before Him.*

*142: 4 When my spirit veils itself within me,  
Thou indeed art acquainted with my way.  
On the path along which I must go, they hide a trap for me.*

*142: 5 Look to the right and see, no friend appeareth for me;  
All refuge hath failed me, no one careth for my soul.*

*142: 6 I cry unto Thee, Jahve,  
I say: THOU art my refuge,  
My portion in the land of the living.*

*142: 7 Oh hearken to my cry of woe, for I am very weak;  
Deliver me from my persecutors, for they are too strong for me.*

*142: 8 Oh lead my soul out of imprisonment, to praise Thy Name —  
In me shall the righteous glory: that Thou dealest bountifully with me.*

*Psalms 142.* This the last of the eight Davidic Psalms, which are derived by their inscriptions from the time of the persecution by Saul (vid., on Psalm 34), is inscribed: *A Meditation by David, when he was in the cave, a Prayer.* Of these eight Psalms, Psalm 52 and 54 also bear the name of *Maskîl* (vid., on Psalm 32); and in this instance **הַפְּלֵאָה** (which occurs besides as an inscription only in Psa. 90: 1; 102: 1, Hab. 3: 1) is further added, which looks like an explanation of the word *maskîl* (not in use out of the range of Psalm-poetry). The article of **בְּמַעְרָה**, as in 57: 1, points to the cave of Adullam (1 Samuel 22) or the cave of Engedi (1 Samuel 24), which latter, starting from a narrow concealed entrance, forms such a labyrinthine maze of passages and vaults that the torches and lines of explorers have not to the present time been able to reach the extremities of it.

The Psalm does not contain any sure signs of a post-Davidic age; still it appears throughout to be an imitation of older models, and pre-eminently by means of vv. 2 f. (cf. Psa. 77: 2 f.) and v. 4 (cf. Psa. 77: 4) it comes into a relation of dependence to Psalm 77, which is also noticeable in Psalm 143 (cf. v. 5 with Psa. 77:12 f.). The referring back of the two Psalms to David comes under one and the same judgment.

*Psa. 142: 2-4a.* The emphasis of the first two lines rests upon **אֱלֹהִים**. Forsaken by all created beings, he confides in Jahve. He turns to Him in pathetic and importunate prayer (**אָרַב**, the parallel word being **הִתְחַנֵּן**, as in Psa. 30: 9), and that not merely inwardly (Exo. 14:15), but with his voice (vid., on Psa. 3: 5) — for audible prayer reacts soothingly, strengtheningly, and sanctifyingly upon the praying one — he pours out before Him his trouble which distracts his thoughts (**שִׁפְךָ שִׁיחַ**) as in Psa. 102: 1, cf. 62: 9; 64: 2, 1Sa. 1:16), he lays open before Him everything that burdens and distresses him. Not as though He did not also know it without all this; on the contrary, when his spirit (**רוּחִי** as in Psa. 143: 4; 77: 4, cf. **נַפְשִׁי** Jon. 2: 8 [7], Psa. 107: 5, **לְבִי** Psa. 61: 3) within him (**עָלַי**, see Psa. 42: 5) is enshrouded and

languishes, just this is his consolation, that Jahve is intimately acquainted with his way together with the dangers that threaten him at every step, and therefore also understands how to estimate the title (right) and meaning of his complaints. The *Waw* of וְאִתָּהּ is the same as in 1Ki. 8:36, cf. 35. Instead of saying: then I comfort myself with the fact that, etc., he at once declares the fact with which he comforts himself. Supposing this to be the case, there is no need for any alteration of the text in order to get over that which is apparently incongruous in the relation of v. 4b to 4a.

*Psa. 142: 4-6.* The prayer of the poet now becomes deep-breathed and excited, inasmuch as he goes more minutely into the details of his straitened situation. Everywhere, whithersoever he has to go (cf. on Psa. 143: 8), the snares of craftily calculating foes threaten him. Even God's all-seeing eye will not discover any one who would right faithfully and carefully interest himself in him. הִבֵּיט, look! is a graphic hybrid form of הִבַּט and הִבִּיט, the usual and the rare imperative form; cf. הִבֵּיא 1Sa. 20:40 (cf. Jer. 17:18), and the same modes of writing the *inf. absol.* in Jud. 1:28, Amo. 9: 8, and the *fut. conv.* in Eze. 40: 3. מִבִּיר is, as in Rut. 2:19, cf. 10, one who looks kindly upon any one, a considerate (cf. the phrase הַבִּיר פְּנִים) well-wisher and friend. Such an one, if he had one, would be עֹמֵד אֶל-יְמִינוֹ or מִיְמִינוֹ (Psa. 16: 8), for an open attack is directed to the arms-bearing right side (Psa. 109: 6), and there too the helper in battle (Psa. 110: 5) and the defender or advocate (Psa. 109:31) takes his place in order to cover him who is imperilled (Psa. 121: 5). But then if God looks in that direction, He will find him, who is praying to Him, unprotected. Instead of וְאִין one would certainly have sooner expected אֲשֶׁר or כִּי as the form of introducing the condition in which he is found; but Hitzig's conjecture, הִבֵּיט יָמִין וְרָאָה, "looking for days and seeing," gives us in the place of this difficulty a confusing half-Aramaism in יָמִין = יוֹמִין in the sense of יָמִים in Dan. 8:27, Neh. 1: 4. Ewald's rendering is better: "though I look to the right hand and see (וְרָאָה), yet no friend appears for me;" but this use of the *inf. absol.* with an adversative apodosis is without example. Thus therefore the pointing appears to have lighted upon the correct idea, inasmuch as it recognises here the current formula הִבַּט וְרָאָה, e.g., Job. 35: 5, Lam. 5: 1. The fact that David, although surrounded by a band of loyal subjects, confesses to having no true fiend, is to be understood similarly to the language of Paul when he says in Php. 2:20: "I have no man like-minded." All human love, since sin has taken possession of humanity, is more or less selfish, and all fellowship of faith and of love imperfect; and there are circumstances in life in which these dark sides make themselves felt overpoweringly, so that a man seems to himself to be perfectly isolated and turns all the more urgently to

God, who alone is able to supply the soul's want of some object to love, whose love is absolutely unselfish, and unchangeable, and unobscured, to whom the soul can confide without reserve whatever burdens it, and who not only honestly desires its good, but is able also to compass it in spite of every obstacle. Surrounded by bloodthirsty enemies, and misunderstood, or at least not thoroughly understood, by his friends, David feels himself broken off from all created beings. On this earth every kind of refuge is for him lost (the expression is like Job. 11:20). There is no one there who should ask after or care for his soul, and should right earnestly exert himself for its deliverance. Thus, then, despairing of all visible things, he cries to the Invisible One. He is his "refuge" (Psa. 91: 9) and his "portion" (Psa. 16: 5; 73:26), i.e., the share in a possession that satisfies him. To be allowed to call Him his God — this it is which suffices him and outweighs everything. For Jahve is the Living One, and he who possesses Him as his own finds himself thereby "in the land of the living" (Psa. 27:13; 52: 7). He cannot die, he cannot perish.

*Psa. 142: 7, 8.* His request now ascends all the more confident of being answered, and becomes calm, being well-grounded in his feebleness and the superiority of his enemies, and aiming at the glorifying of the divine Name. In v. 7 **רָנַתִּי** calls to mind Psa. 17: 1; the first confirmation, Psa. 79: 8, and the second, Psa. 18:18. But this is the only passage in the whole Psalter where the poet designates the "distress" in which he finds himself as a prison (**מַסְגֵּר**). V. 8b brings the whole congregation of the righteous in in the praising of the divine Name. The poet therefore does not after all find himself so absolutely alone, as it might seem according to v. 5. He is far from regarding himself as the only righteous person. He is only a member of a community or church whose destiny is interwoven with his own, and which will glory in his deliverance as its own; for "if one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it" (1Co. 12:26). We understand the differently interpreted **יִבְתִּירוּ** after this "rejoicing with" (**συγχαίρει**). The LXX, Syriac, and Aquilaz render: the righteous wait for me; but to wait is **בָּתַר** and not **הִבְתִּיר**. The modern versions, on the other hand, almost universally, like Luther after Felix Pratensis, render: the righteous shall surround me (flock about me), in connection with which, as Hengstenberg observes, **בִּי** denotes the tender sympathy they felt with him: crowding closely upon me. But there is no instance of a verb of surrounding (**אָפַף**, **סָבַב**, **סָבַב**, **עוּד**, **עָטַר**, **הִקִּיף**) taking **בִּי**; the accusative stands with **הִבְתִּיר** in Hab. 1: 4, and **בָּתַר** in 22:13, in the signification *cingere*. Symmachus (although erroneously rendering: **τὸ ὄνομά σου στεφανώσονται δίκαιοι**), Jerome (*in me coronabuntur justi*), Parchon, Aben-Ezra, Coccejus, and others, rightly take **יִבְתִּירוּ** as a denominative from **בָּתַר**, to put on a crown or to crown (cf. Pro. 14:18): on account of me the

righteous shall adorn themselves as with crowns, i.e., shall triumph, that Thou dealest bountifully with me (an echo of Psa. 13: 6). According to passages like Psa. 64:11; 40:17, one might have expected **יָצַד** instead of **יָצַח**. But the close of Psalm 22 (vv. 23 ff.), cf. Psa. 140:12 f., shows that **יָצַח** is also admissible. The very fact that David contemplates his own destiny and the destiny of his foes in a not merely ideal but foreordainedly causal connection with the general end of the two powers that stand opposed to one another in the world, belongs to the characteristic impress of the Psalms of David that come from the time of Saul's persecution.

## **Psalm 143**

### **LONGING AFTER MERCY IN THE MIDST OF DARK IMPRISONMENT**

*143: 1 JAHVE, hear my prayer, oh give ear to my supplication;  
In Thy faithfulness answer me, in Thy righteousness.*

*143: 2 And enter not into judgment with Thy servant,  
For before Thee no man living is righteous.*

*143: 3 For the enemy hath persecuted my soul,  
He hath crushed my life to the ground,  
He hath made me to lie down in terrible darkness,  
like those for ever dead.*

*143: 4 And my spirit languisheth within me,  
In my inward part my heart is benumbed.*

*143: 5 I remember the days of old,  
I meditate upon all Thy doing,  
I muse upon the work of Thy hands.*

*143: 6 I stretch forth my hands unto Thee,  
My soul is as a thirsty land unto Thee! (Sela)*

*143: 7 Answer me speedily, Jahve, my spirit yearneth:  
Hide not Thy face from me,  
I should become like those who go down to the pit.*

*143: 8 Let me hear Thy loving-kindness with the dawn of the morning,  
For I trust in Thee.  
Make known to me the way in which I am to go,  
For unto Thee do I lift up my soul.*

*143: 9 Deliver me from mine enemies, Jahve!  
I have hidden myself with Thee.*

*143:10 Teach me to do Thy will,  
For Thou art my God;  
Let Thy good Spirit lead me in an even land.*

*143:11 For Thy Name's sake, Jahve, quicken me again,  
In Thy righteousness be pleased to bring my soul out of trouble,*

*143:12 And in Thy loving-kindness cut off mine enemies,  
And destroy all the oppressors of my soul,  
For I am Thy servant.*

*Psalms 143.* In some codices of the LXX this Psalm (as Euthymius also bears witness) has no inscription at all; in others, however, it has the inscription: *Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυεὶδ ὅτε αὐτὸν ἐδίωκεν Ἀβεσσαλώμ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ (Cod. Sinait. οτε αυτον ο υς καταδιωκει)*. Perhaps by the same poet as Psalm 142, with which it accords in vv. 4, 8, 11 (cf. *Psa.* 142: 4, 8), it is like this a modern offshoot of the Davidic Psalm-poetry, and is certainly composed as coming out of the situation of him who was persecuted by Absalom. The Psalms of this time of persecution are distinguished from those of the time of the persecution by Saul by the deep melancholy into which the mourning of the dethroned king was turned by blending with the penitential sorrowfulness of one conscious of his own guilt. On account of this fundamental feature the church has chosen Psalm 143 for the last of its seven *Psalmi poenitentiales*. The *Sela* at the close of v. 6 divides the Psalm into two halves.

*Psa. 143: 1-6.* The poet pleads two motives for the answering of his prayer which are to be found in God Himself, viz., God's אֱמִנָה, truthfulness, with which He verifies the truth of His promises, that is to say, His faithfulness to His promises; and His צְדָקָה, righteousness, not in a recompensative legal sense, but in an evangelical sense, in accordance with His counsel, i.e., the strictness and earnestness with which He maintains the order of salvation established by His holy love, both against the ungratefully disobedient and against those who insolently despise Him. Having entered into this order of salvation, and within the sphere of it serving Jahve as his God and Lord, the poet is the servant of Jahve. And because the conduct of the God of salvation, ruled by this order of salvation, or His "righteousness" according to its fundamental manifestation, consists in His justifying the sinful man who has no righteousness that he can show corresponding to the divine holiness, but penitently confesses this disorganized relationship, and, eager for salvation, longs for it to be set right again, — because of all this, the poet prays that He would not also enter into judgment (בּוֹא בַּמִּשְׁפָּט as in *Job.* 9:32; 22: 4; 14: 3) with him, that He therefore would let mercy instead of justice have its course with him. For, apart from the fact that even the holiness of the good spirits does not coincide with God's absolute holiness, and that this defect must still

be very far greater in the case of spirit-corporeal man, who has earthiness as the basis of his origin, — yea, according to 51: 7, man is conceived in sin, so that he is sinful from the point at which he begins to live onward, — his life is indissolubly interwoven with sin, no living man possesses a righteousness that avails before God (Job. 4:17; 9: 2; 14: 3 f., 15:14, and frequently).<sup>f407</sup>

With כִּי (v. 3) the poet introduces the ground of his petition for an answer, and more particularly for the forgiveness of his guilt. He is persecuted by deadly foes and is already nigh unto death, and that not without transgression of his own, so that consequently his deliverance depends upon the forgiveness of his sins, and will coincide with this. “The enemy persecuteth my soul” is a variation of language taken from Psa. 7: 6 (חַיִּים for חַיָּה, as in Psa. 78:50, and frequently in the Book of Job, more particularly in the speeches of Elihu). V. 3c also recalls 7: 6, but as to the words it sounds like Lam. 3: 6 (cf. 88: 7). מֵתֵי עוֹלָם (LXX νεκρὸς αἰῶνος) are either those for ever dead (the Syriac), after שְׁנַת עוֹלָם in Jer. 51:39, cf. בֵּית עוֹלָמוֹ in Ecc. 12: 5, or those dead time out of mind (Jerome), after אִם עוֹלָם in Eze. 26:20. The genitive construction admits both senses; the former, however, is rendered more natural by the consideration that הוֹשִׁיבֵנִי glances back to the beginning that seems to have no end: the poet seems to himself like one who is buried alive for ever. In consequence of this hostility which aims at his destruction, the poet feels his spirit within him, and consequently his inmost life, veil itself (the expression is the same as Psa. 142: 4; 77: 4); and in his inward part his heart falls into a state of disturbance (שִׁתּוֹמָם, a *Hithpo.* peculiar to the later language), so that it almost ceases to beat. He calls to mind the former days, in which Jahve was manifestly with him; he reflects upon the great redemptive work of God, with all the deeds of might and mercy in which it has hitherto been unfolded; he meditates upon the doing (בְּמַעֲשֵׂה, Ben-Naphtali בְּמַעֲשֵׂה) of His hands, i.e., the hitherto so wondrously moulded history of himself and of his people. They are echoes out of Psa. 77: 4-7, 12 f. The contrast which presents itself to the Psalmist in connection with this comparison of his present circumstances with the past opens his wounds still deeper, and makes his prayer for help all the more urgent. He stretches forth his hands to God that He may protect and assist him (vid., Hölemann, *Bibelstudien*, i. 150 f.). Like parched land is his soul turned towards Him, — language in which we recognise a bending round of the primary passage Psa. 63: 2. Instead of לָךְ it would be לְךָ, if סָלָה (Targum לְעֵלְמִין) were not, as it always is, taken up and included in the sequence of the accents.

*Psa. 143: 7-12.* In this second half the Psalm seems still more like a reproduction of the thoughts of earlier Psalms. The prayer, “answer me

speedily, hide not Thy face from me,” sounds like Psa. 69:18; 27: 9, cf. 102: 3. The expression of languishing longing, **בְּלִתָּה רוּחִי**, is like Psa. 84: 3. And the apodosis, “else I should become like those who go down into the pit,” agrees word for word with Psa. 28: 1, cf. Psa. 88: 5. In connection with the words, “cause me to hear Thy loving-kindness in the early morning,” one is reminded of the similar prayer of Moses in Psa. 90:14, and with the confirmatory “for in Thee do I trust” of Psa. 25: 2, and frequently. With the prayer that the night of affliction may have an end with the next morning’s dawn, and that God’s helping loving-kindness may make itself felt by him, is joined the prayer that God would be pleased to grant him to know the way that he has to go in order to escape the destruction into which they are anxious to ensnare him. This last prayer has its type in Exo. 33:13, and in the Psalter in 25: 4 (cf. Psa. 142: 4); and its confirmation: for to Thee have I lifted up my soul, viz., in a craving after salvation and in the confidence of faith, has its type in Psa. 25: 1; 86: 4. But the words **אֲלֶיךָ כִסִּיתִי**, which are added to the petition “deliver me from mine enemies” (Psa. 59: 2; 31:16), are peculiar, and in their expression without example. The Syriac version leaves them untranslated. The LXX renders: **ὄτι πρὸς σὲ κατέφυγον**, by which the defective mode of writing **כִסִּיתִי** is indirectly attested, instead of which the translators read **נִסִּיתִי** (cf. **נִוִּס אֵל** in Isa. 10: 3); for elsewhere not **חָסָה** but **נִוִּס** is reproduced with **καταφυγεῖν**. The Targum renders it **מִיִּמְרָךְ מִנִּיתִי לְפָרִיק**, Thy Logos do I account as (my) Redeemer (i.e., regard it as such), as if the Hebrew words were to be rendered: upon Thee do I reckon or count, **בִּסִּיתִי = בִּסְתִי**, Exo. 12: 4. Luther closely follows the LXX: “to Thee have I fled for refuge.” Jerome, however, inasmuch as he renders: *ad te protectus sum*, has pointed **כִּסִּיתִי (כְּסִיתִי)**. Hitzig (on the passage before us and Pro. 7:20) reads **כִּסִּיתִי** from **כִּסָּא = סָכָא**, to look (“towards Thee do I look”). But the Hebrew contains no trace of that verb; the full moon is called **כִּסָּא (כִּסָּה)**, not as being “a sight or vision, *species*,” but from its covered orb (pp. 543 f.).

The **כִּסִּיתִי** before us only admits of two interpretations:

(1) *Ad (apud) te texi* = to Thee have I secretly confided it (Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Coccejus, J. H. Michaelis, J. D. Michalis, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and De Wette). But such a *constructio praeagnans*, in connection with which **כִּסָּה** would veer round from the signification to veil (cf. **כִּסָּה מִן**, Gen. 18:17) into its opposite, and the clause have the meaning of **בִּי אֲלֶיךָ גִּלִּיתִי**, Jer. 11:20; 20:12, is hardly conceivable.

(2) *Ad (apud) te abscondidi*, scil. *me* (Saadia, Calvin, Maurer, Ewald, and Hengstenberg), in favour of which we decide; for it is evident from



Gen. 38:14, Deu. 22:12, cf. Jon. 3: 6, that **כָּסָה** can express the act of covering as an act that is referred to the person himself who covers, and so can obtain a reflexive meaning. Therefore: towards Thee, with Thee have I made a hiding = hidden myself, which according to the sense is equivalent to **חָסִיתִי** (vid., p. 58), as Hupfeld (with a few MSS) wishes to read; but *Abulwalid* has already remarked that the same goal is reached with **כָּסִיתִי**. Jahve, with whom he hides himself, is alone able to make known to him what is right and beneficial in the position in which he finds himself, in which he is exposed to temporal and spiritual dangers, and is able to teach him to carry out the recognised will of God (“the will of God, good and well-pleasing and perfect,” Rom. 12: 2); and this it is for which he prays to Him in v. 10 (**רְצוֹנְךָ**; another reading, **רְצוֹנְךָ**). For Jahve is indeed his God, who cannot leave him, who is assailed and tempted without and within, in error; may His good Spirit then (**רוּחַךְ טוֹבָה**) for **הַטּוֹבָה**, Neh. 9:20<sup>f408</sup>) lead him in a level country, for, as it is said in Isaiah, Isa. 26: 7, in looking up to Jahve, “the path which the righteous man takes is smoothness; Thou makest the course of the righteous smooth.” The geographical term **אֶרֶץ מִישׁוֹר**, Deu. 4:43, Jer. 48:21, is here applied spiritually. Here, too, reminiscences of Psalms already read meet us everywhere: cf. on “to do Thy will,” Psa. 40: 9; on “for Thou art my God,” Psa. 40: 6, and frequently; on “Thy good Spirit,” Psa. 51:14; on “a level country,” and the whole petition, Psa. 27:11 (where the expression is “a level path”), together with Psa. 5: 9; 25: 4 f., 31: 4. And the Psalm also further unrolls itself in such now well-known thoughts of the Psalms: For Thy Name’s sake, Jahve (Psa. 24:11), quicken me again (Psa. 71:20, and frequently); by virtue of Thy righteousness be pleased to bring my soul out of distress (Psa. 142: 8; 25:17, and frequently); and by virtue of Thy loving-kindness cut off mine enemies (Psa. 54: 7). As in v. 1 faithfulness and righteousness, here loving-kindness (mercy) and righteousness, are coupled together; and that so that mercy is not named beside **הַצְדִּיקָה**, nor righteousness beside **הַחַסְדִּים**, but the reverse (vid., on v. 1). It is impossible that God should suffer him who has hidden himself in Him to die and perish, and should suffer his enemies on the other hand to triumph. Therefore the poet confirms the prayer for the cutting off (**הַצְמִיתֵהוּ** as in Psa. 94:23) of his enemies and the destruction (**הַאֲבִידֵהוּ**, elsewhere **אָבַד**) of the oppressors of his soul (elsewhere **צָרְרֵי**) with the words: *for I am Thy servant*.

## Psalm 144

### TAKING COURAGE IN GOD BEFORE A DECISIVE COMBAT

#### *THE BLESSED CONDITION OF GOD'S PEOPLE.*

*144: 1 BLESSED be Jahve my Rock,  
Who traineth my hands for the fight,  
My fingers for the war —*

*144: 2 My loving-kindness and my fortress,  
My high tower and my deliverer for me,  
My shield and He in whom I hide,  
Who subdueth my people under me!*

*144: 3 Jahve, what is man that Thou takest knowledge of him,  
The child of mortal man that Thou heedest him!*

*144: 4 As for man, he is like a breath,  
His days are as a shadow that vanisheth away.*

*144: 5 Jahve, bow Thy heavens and come down,  
Touch the mountains that they smoke.*

*144: 6 Cast forth lightnings to scatter them;  
Send forth Thine arrows to destroy them.*

*144: 7 Send Thy hands from above,  
Rescue me and deliver me out of great waters:  
Out of the hand of the sons of the strange land,*

*144: 8 Whose mouth speaketh vanity,  
And whose right hand is a right hand of falsehood.*

*144: 9 Elohim, a new song will I sing unto Thee,  
Upon a ten-stringed nablá will I play unto Thee,*

*144:10 Who giveth salvation unto kings,  
Who rescueth David His servant from the evil sword,*

*144:11 Rescue and deliver me out of the hand of the sons of the strange land,  
Whose mouth speaketh vanity,  
Whose right hand is a right hand of falsehood.*

*144:12 Because our sons are as high-reared plants in their youthful vigour,  
Our daughters as adorned corners after the mode of structure of a palace;*

*144:13 Our garners full, affording every kind of store;  
Our sheep bringing forth by thousands,  
multiplying by tens of thousands in our pastures;*

*144:14 Our kine bearing without mishap and without loss,  
And no lamentation in our streets.*

*144:15 Blessed is the people that is in such a case,  
Blessed is the people whose God is Jahve!*

*Psalm 144.* Praised be Jahve who teacheth me to fight and conquer (vv. 1, 2), me the feeble mortal, who am strong only in Him, vv. 3, 4. May Jahve then be pleased to grant a victory this time also over the boastful, lying enemies, vv. 5-8; so will I sing new songs of thanksgiving unto Him, the bestower of victory, vv. 9, 10. May He be pleased to deliver me out of the hand of the barbarians who envy us our prosperity, which is the result of our having Jahve as our God, vv. 11-15. A glance at this course of the thought commends the additional inscription of the LXX (according to Origen only “in a few copies”), *πρὸς τὸν Γολιάδ*, and the Targumist’s reference of the “evil sword” in v. 10 to the sword of Goliath (after the example of the Midrash). Read 1Sa. 17:47. The Psalm has grown out of this utterance of David. In one of the old histories, just as several of these lie at the foundation of our Books of Samuel as sources of information that are still recognisable, it was intended to express the feelings with which David entered upon the single-handed combat with Goliath and decided the victory of Israel over the Philistines. At that time he had already been anointed by Samuel, as both the narratives which have been worked up together in the First Book of Samuel assume: see 1Sa. 16:13; 10: 1. And this victory was for him a gigantic stride to the throne.

If אָשֶׁר in v. 12a is taken as *eo quod*, so that envy is brought under consideration as a motive for the causeless (אֲשׁוּר), lyingly treacherous rising (יָמִין שָׁקֵר) of the neighbouring peoples, then the passage vv. 12-15 can at any rate be comprehended as a part of the form of the whole. But only thus, and not otherwise; for אָשֶׁר cannot be intended as a statement of the aim or purpose: in order that they may be...(Jerome, De Wette, Hengstenberg, and others), since nothing but illustrative substantival clauses follow; nor do these clauses admit of an optative sense: We, whose sons, may they be...(Maurer); and אָשֶׁר never has an assuring sense (Vaihinger). It is also evident that we cannot, with Saadia, go back to v. 9 for the interpretation of the אָשֶׁר (Arab. *asbḥ lâ mâ*). But that junction by means of *eo quod* is hazardous, since envy or ill-will (קִנְאָה) is not previously mentioned, and וַיְמִינֵם יָמִין שָׁקֵר expresses a fact, and not an action. If it is further considered that nothing is wanting in the way of finish to the Psalm if it closes with v. 11, it becomes all the more doubtful whether vv. 12-15 belonged originally to the Psalm. And yet we cannot discover any Psalm in its immediate neighbourhood to which this piece might be attached. It might the most readily, as Hitzig correctly judges, be inserted

between vv. 13 and 14 of Psalm 147. But the rhythm and style differ from this Psalm, and we must therefore rest satisfied with the fact that a fragment of another Psalm is here added to Psalm 144, which of necessity may be accounted as an integral part of it; but in spite of the fact that the whole Psalm is built up on a gigantic scale, this was not its original corner-stone, just as one does not indeed look for anything further after the refrain, together with the mention of David in vv. 10 f., cf. 18:51.

*Psa. 144: 1, 2.* The whole of this first strophe is an imitation of David's great song of thanksgiving, Psalm 18. Hence the calling of Jahve "my rock," Psa. 18: 3, 47; hence the heaping up of other appellations in v. 2a, in which 18: 3 is echoed; but **וּמִבְּלִט־לִי** (with Lamed deprived of the *Dagesh*) follows the model of 2Sa. 22: 2. The naming of Jahve with **חֲסִדִי** is a bold abbreviation of **אֱלֹהֵי חֲסִדִי** in Psa. 59:11, 18, as also in Jon. 2: 9 [8] the God whom the idolatrous ones forsake is called **חֲסִדִים**. Instead of **מִלְחָמָה** the Davidic Psalms also poetically say **קָרָב**, Psa. 55:22, cf. Psa. 78: 9. The expression "who traineth my hands for the fight" we have already read in Psa. 18:35. The last words of the strophe, too, are after Psa. 18:48; but instead of **וַיִּדְבֶר** this poet says **הִרְוֹד**, from **רָדָה = רָדָה** (cf. Isa. 45: 1; 41: 2), perhaps under the influence of **וּמְרִיד** in 2Sa. 22:48. In Psa. 18:48 we however read **אֲמִים**, and the Masora has enumerated Psa. 144: 2, together with 2Sa. 22:44, Lam. 3:14, as the three passages in which it is written **עֲמִי**, whilst one expects **עֲמִים** (**גַּי דְּסַבִּירִין עֲמִים**), as the Targum, Syriac, and Jerome (yet not the LXX) in fact render it. But neither from the language of the books nor from the popular dialect can it be reasonably expected that they would say **אֲמִי** for **אֲמִים** in such an ambiguous connection. Either, therefore, we have to read **עֲמִים**,<sup>f409</sup> or we must fall in with the strong expression, and this is possible: there is, indeed, no necessity for the subduing to be intended of the use of despotic power, it can also be intended to God-given power, and of subjugating authority. David, the anointed one, but not having as yet ascended the throne, here gives expression to the hope that Jahve will grant him deeds of victory which will compel Israel to submit to him, whether willingly or reluctantly.

*Psa. 144: 3, 4.* It is evident that v. 3 is a variation of Psa. 8: 5 with the use of other verbs. **יִדַע** in the sense of loving intimacy; **חָשַׁב**, properly to count, compute, here *rationem habere*. Instead of **כִּי** followed by the future there are consecutive futures here, and **בֶּן-אָדָם** is aramaizingly (**בֶּר אָנָשׁ**) metamorphosed into **בֶּן-אָנוּשׁ**. V. 4 is just such another imitation, like a miniature of Psa. 39: 6 f., 11, cf. 62:10. The figure of the shadow is the same

as in Psa. 102:12, cf. 109:23. The connection of the third stanza with the second is still more disrupt than that of the second with the first.

*Psa. 144: 5-8.* The deeds of God which Psalm 18 celebrates are here made an object of prayer. We see from Psa. 18:10 that **וַתִּרְרַד**, v. 5a, has Jahve and not the heavens as its subject; and from Psa. 18:15 that the suffix *em* in v. 6 is meant in both instances to be referred to the enemies. The enemies are called sons of a foreign country, i.e., barbarians, as in Psa. 18:45 f. The fact that Jahve stretches forth His hand out of the heavens and rescues David out of great waters, is taken verbatim from Psa. 18:17; and the poet has added the interpretation to the figure here. On v. 8a cf. Psa. 12: 3; 41: 7. The combination of words “right hand of falsehood” is the same as in Psa. 109: 2. But our poet, although so great an imitator, has, however, much also that is peculiar to himself. The verb **בָּרַק**, “to send forth lightning;” the verb **פָּצָה** in the Aramaeo-Arabic signification “to tear out of, rescue,” which in David always only signifies “to tear open, open wide” (one’s mouth), Psa. 22:14; 66:14; and the combination “the right hand of falsehood” (like “the tongue of falsehood” in Psa. 109: 2), i.e., the hand raised for a false oath, are only found here. The figure of Omnipotence, “He toucheth the mountains and they smoke,” is, as in Psa. 104:32, taken from the mountains that smoked at the giving of the Law, Exo. 19:18; 20:15. The mountains, as in Psa. 68:17 (cf. Psa. 76: 5), point to the worldly powers. God only needs to touch these as with the tip of His finger, and the inward fire, which will consume them, at once makes itself known by the smoke, which ascends from them. The prayer for victory is followed by a vow of thanksgiving for that which is to be bestowed.

*Psa. 144: 9-11.* With the exception of Psalm 108, which is composed of two Davidic Elohim-Psalms, the *Elohim* in v. 9 of this strophe is the only one in the last two Books of the Psalter, and is therefore a feeble attempt also to reproduce the Davidic Elohimic style. The “new song” calls to mind Psa. 33: 3; 40: 4; and **נָבַל עֲשׂוֹר** also recalls Psa. 33: 2 (which see). The fact that David mentions himself by name in his own song comes about in imitation of Psa. 18:51. From the eminence of thanksgiving the song finally descends again to petition, vv. 7c, 8, being repeated as a refrain. The petition develops itself afresh out of the attributes of the Being invoked (v. 10), and these are a pledge of its fulfilment. For how could the God to whom all victorious kings owe their victory (Psa. 33:16, cf. 2Ki. 5: 1, 1Sa. 17:47) possibly suffer His servant David to succumb to the sword of the enemy! **חֶרֶב רָעָה** is the sword that is engaged in the service of evil.

*Psa. 144:12-15.* With reference to the relation of this passage to the preceding, vid., the introduction. **אֲשֶׁר** (it is uncertain whether this is a word

belonging originally to this piece or one added by the person who appended it as a sort of clasp or rivet) signifies here *quoniam*, as in Jud. 9:17, Jer. 16:13, and frequently. LXX **ὅτι ὅτι** (**אֲשֶׁר בְּנִיהֶם**); so that the temporal prosperity of the enemies is pictured here, and in v. 15 the spiritual possession of Israel is contrasted with it. The union becomes satisfactorily close in connection with this reading, but the reference of the description, so designedly set forth, to the enemies is improbable. In vv. 12-14 we hear a language that is altogether peculiar, without any assignable earlier model. Instead of **נְטָעִים** we read **נְטָעִים** elsewhere; “in their youth” belongs to “our sons.” **מְזוּנֵינוּ**, our garner or treasuries, from a singular **מְזוּן** or **מְזוּן** (apparently from a verb **מָזַה**, but contracted out of **מְזוּהָ**), is a hapaxlegomenon; the older language has the words **אָסַם**, **אֹצֵר**, **מִמְנוּרָה** instead of it. In like manner **זָן**, *genus* (vid., Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, S. 380), is a later word (found besides only in 2Ch. 16:14, where **זָנִים** signifies *et varia quidem*, Syriac *z̄nonoje*, or directly spices from *species*); the older language has **מִין** for this word. Instead of **אֱלֹפִים**, kine, which signifies “princes” in the older language, the older language says **אֱלָפִים** in Psa. 8: 8. The *plena scriptio* **צֹאנֵינוּ**, in which the *Waw* is even inaccurate, corresponds to the later period; and to this corresponds **שׁ** = **אֲשֶׁר** in v. 15, cf. on the other hand Psa. 33:12. Also **מַסְבָּלִים**, laden = bearing, like the Latin *forda* from *ferre* (cf. **מַעֲבֵר** in Job. 21:10), is not found elsewhere. **צֹאן** is (contrary to Gen. 30:39) treated as a feminine collective, and **אֱלֹפִי** (cf. **שׁוֹר** in Job. 21:10) as a *nomen epicaenum*. Contrary to the usage of the word, Maurer, Köster, Von Lengerke, and Fürst render it: our princes are set up (after Ezr. 6: 3); also, after the mention of animals of the fold upon the meadows out-of-doors, one does not expect the mention of princes, but of horned cattle that are to be found in the stalls. **זוֹיֵת** elsewhere signifies a corner, and here, according to the prevailing view, the corner-pillars; so that the elegant slender daughters are likened to tastefully sculptured Caryatides — not to sculptured projections (Luther). For

(1) **זוֹיֵת** does not signify a projection, but a corner, an angle, Arabic Arab.

*zâwyt, zâwîa* (in the terminology of the stone-mason the square-stone = **פְּנֵה אֲבֵן**, in the terminology of the carpenter the square), from Arab. *zwâ, abdere* (cf. e.g., the proverb: *fi l zawâjâ chabâjâ*, in the corners are treasures).

(2) The upstanding pillar is better adapted to the comparison than the overhanging projection. But that other prevailing interpretation is also doubtful. The architecture of Syria and Palestine — the ancient, so far as it can be known to us from its remains, and the new — exhibits nothing in connection with which one would be led to think of “corner-pillars.” Nor is

there any trace of that signification to be found in the Semitic **נְיִית**. On the other hand, the corners of large rooms in the houses of persons of position are ornamented with carved work even in the present day, and since this ornamentation is variegated, it may be asked whether **מְחַטְבוֹת** does here signify “sculptured,” and not rather “striped in colours, variegated,” which we prefer, since **חַטֵּב** (cogn. **חָצֵב**) signifies nothing more than to hew firewood; <sup>f410</sup> and on the other side, the signification of the Arabic *chatiba*, to be striped, many-coloured (IV to become green-striped, of the *coloquintida*), is also secured to the verb **חַטֵּב** side by side with that signification by Pro. 7:16. It is therefore to be rendered: our daughters are as corners adorned in varied colours after the architecture of palaces. <sup>f411</sup>

The words **הָאֲלֵפִי**, to bring forth by thousands, and **מֵרֶבֶב** (denominative from **רָבַב**), which surpasses it, multiplied by tens of thousands, are freely formed. Concerning **חוֹצוֹת**, meadows, vid., on Job. 18:17. **פְּרִץ**, in a martial sense a defeat, *clades*, e.g., in Jud. 21:15, is here any violent misfortune whatever, as murrain, which causes a breach, and **יוֹצֵאת** any head of cattle which goes off by a single misfortune. The lamentation in the streets is intended as in Jer. 14: 2. **שִׁבְכָה** is also found in Son. 5: 9; nor does the poet, however, hesitate to blend this **ש** with the tetragrammaton into one word. The *Jod* is not dageshed (cf. Psa. 123: 2), because it is to be read **שִׁבְכָה**, cf. **מִיְהוָה** = **מֵאֲדָנִי** in Gen. 18:14. Luther takes v. 15a and 15a as contrasts: Blessed is the people that is in such a case, But blessed is the people whose God is the Lord. There is, however, no antithesis intended, but only an exceeding of the first declaration by the second. For to be allowed to call the God from whom every blessing comes his God, is still infinitely more than the richest abundance of material blessing. The pinnacle of Israel’s good fortune consists in being, by the election of grace, the people of the Lord (Psa. 32:12).

## Psalm 145

### HYMN IN PRAISE OF THE ALL-BOUNTIFUL KING

*145: 1 א 145: I will extol Thee, my God O King,  
And I will bless Thy Name for ever and ever.*

*145: 2 ב Every day will I bless Thee,  
And I will glorify Thy Name for ever and ever.*

*145: 3 ג Great is Jahve, and greatly worthy to be praised,  
And His greatness is unsearchable.*

145: 4 ¶ *One generation to another praiseth Thy works,  
And they declare Thy mighty deeds.*

145: 5 ¶ *On the glorious honour of Thy majesty  
And on Thy wondrous works will I meditate.*

145: 6 ¶ *And they shall speak forth thy mightily terrible deeds,  
And Thy mighty acts will I declare.*

145: 7 ¶ *The praise of Thy great goodness shall they abundantly utter,  
And sing aloud of Thy righteousness.*

145: 8 ¶ *Gracious and full of compassion is Jahve,  
Long-suffering and great in goodness.*

145: 9 ¶ *Good is Jahve unto all,  
And His tender mercies are over all His works.*

145:10 ¶ *All Thy works praise Thee, Jahve,  
And Thy saints do bless Thee.*

145:11 ¶ *They talk of the glory of Thy kingship,  
And confess Thy might —*

145:12 ¶ *To make known to the sons of men His mighty acts,  
And the stately glory of His kingship.*

145:13 ¶ *Thy kingship is a kingship for all ages,  
And Thy dominion endureth into all generations.*

145:14 ¶ *Jahve upholdeth all those who fall,  
And raiseth up all those who are bowed down.*

145:15 ¶ *The eyes of all wait upon Thee,  
And Thou givest them their food in due season;*

145:16 ¶ *Thou openest out Thine abundance,  
And satisfiest every living thing with delight.*

145:17 ¶ *Jahve is righteous in all His ways,  
And gracious in all His works.*

145:18 ¶ *Jahve is nigh unto all those who call upon Him,  
To all who call upon Him in truth;*

145:19 ¶ *He fulfilleth the desire of those who fear Him,  
And He heareth their cry and delivereth them.*



145:20 **ו** *Jahve preserveth all those who love Him,  
And all the wicked doth He destroy.*

145:21 **ה** *Let my mouth then speak the praise of Jahve,  
And let all flesh bless His holy Name for ever and ever!*

*Psalm 145.* With Psalm 144 the collection draws doxologically towards its close. This Psalm, which begins in the form of the *beracha* (ברוך ה), is followed by another in which *benedicam* (vv. 1, 2) and *benedicat* (v. 21) is the favourite word. It is the only Psalm that bears the title תהלה, whose plural תהלים is become the collective name of the Psalms. In *B. Berachoth 4b* it is distinguished by the apophthegm: “Every one who repeats the תהלה לדוד three times a day may be sure that he is a child of the world to come (הבן העולם).” And why? Not merely because this Psalm, as the Gemara says, אֲתִיא בְּאַלְפֵי בֵית, i.e., follows the course of the alphabet (for Psalm 119 is in fact also alphabetical, and that in an eightfold degree), and not merely because it celebrates God’s care for all creatures (for this the Great Hallel also does, Psa. 136:25), but because it unites both these prominent qualities in itself (משום דאית ביה תרתן). In fact, Psa. 145:16 is a celebration of the goodness of God which embraces every living thing, with which only Psa. 136:25, and not Psa. 111: 5, can be compared. *Valde sententiosus hic Psalmus est*, says Bakius; and do we not find in this Psalm our favourite *Benedicite* and *Oculi omnium* which our children repeat before a meal? It is the ancient church’s Psalm for the noon-day repast (vid., Armknecht, *Die heilige Psalmodie*, 1855, S. 54); v. 15 was also used at the holy communion, hence Chrysostom says it contains τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, ἅπερ οἱ μεμνημένοι συνεχῶς ὑποβάλλουσι λέγοντες: Οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ πάντων εἰς σὲ ἐλπίζουσιν καὶ σὺ δίδως τὴν τροφήν αὐτῶν ἐν εὐκαιρίᾳ.

*Katὰ στοιχεῖον*, observes Theodoret, καὶ οὗτος ὁ ὕμνος σύγκειται. The Psalm is distichic, and every first line of the distich has the ordinal letter; but the distich *Nun* is wanting. The Talmud (*loc cit.*) is of opinion that it is because the fatal נפלה (Amo. 5: 2), which David, going on at once with ה לכל-הנפלים סומך, skips over, begins with *Nun*. On the other hand, Ewald, Vaihinger, and Sommer, like Grotius, think that the *Nun*-strophe has been lost. The LXX (but not Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, nor Jerome in his translation after the original text) gives such a strophe, perhaps out of a MS (like the Dublin *Cod. Kennicot*, 142) in which it was supplied: Πιστὸς (נאמן) as in 111: 7) κύριος ἐν (πάσι) τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁσιος ἐν πάσι τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ (according with v. 17, with the change only of two words of this distich). Hitzig is of opinion that the original *Nun*-strophe has been welded into Psalm 141; but only his

clairvoyant-like historical discernment is able to amalgamate v. 6 of this Psalm with our Psalm 145. We are contented to see in the omission of the *Nun* - strophe an example of that freedom with which the Old Testament poets are wont to handle this kind of forms. Likewise there is no reason apparent for there fact that Jeremiah has chosen in ch. 2, 3, and 4 of the Lamentations to make the *Ajin* -strophe follow the *Pe* -strophe three times, whilst in ch. 1 it precedes it.

*Psa. 145: 1-7.* The strains with which this hymn opens are familiar Psalm-strains. We are reminded of Psa. 30: 2, and the likewise alphabetical song of praise and thanksgiving Psa. 34: 2. The *plena scriptio* אֱלֹהֵי in Psa. 143:10; 98: 6. The language of address “my God the King,” which sounds harsh in comparison with the otherwise usual “my King and my God” (Psa. 5: 3; 84: 4), purposely calls God with unrelated generality, that is to say in the most absolute manner, the King. If the poet is himself a king, the occasion for this appellation of God is all the more natural and the signification all the more pertinent. But even in the mouth of any other person it is significant. Whosoever calls God by such a name acknowledges His royal prerogative, and at the same time does homage to Him and binds himself to allegiance; and it is just this confessory act of exalting Him who in Himself is the absolutely lofty One that is here called רֹמֵם. But who can the poet express the purpose of praising God’s Name *for ever*? Because the praise of God is a need of his inmost nature, he has a perfect right to forget his own mortality when engaged upon this devotion to the ever-living King. Clinging adoringly to the Eternal One, he must seem to himself to be eternal; and if there is a practical proof for a life after death, it is just this ardent desire of the soul, wrought of God Himself, after the praise of the God of its life (lit., its origin) which affords it the highest, noblest delight. The idea of the silent Hades, which forces itself forward elsewhere, as in Psa. 6: 6, where the mind of the poet is beclouded by sin, is here entirely removed, inasmuch as here the mind of the poet is the undimmed mirror of the divine glory. Therefore v. 2 also does not concede the possibility of any interruption of the praise: the poet will daily (Psa. 68:20) bless God, be they days of prosperity or of sorrow, uninterruptedly in all eternity will he glorify His Name (אֲהַלֵּל as in Psa. 69:31). There is no worthier and more exhaustless object of praise (v. 3): Jahve is great, and greatly to be praised (מְהִלָּל, taken from Psa. 48: 2, as in Psa. 96: 4, cf. Psa. 18: 4), and of His “greatness” (cf. 1Ch. 29:11, where this attribute precedes all others) there is no searching out, i.e., it is so abysmally deep that no searching can reach its bottom (as in Isa. 40:28, Job. 11: 7 f.). It has, however, been revealed, and is being revealed continually, and is for this very reason thus celebrated in v. 4: one generation propagates to the next the growing praise of the works that He has wrought out (עֲשֵׂה מַעֲשִׂים), and men

are able to relate all manner of proofs of His victorious power which prevails over everything, and makes everything subject to itself (גְּבוּרָתוֹ as in Psa. 20: 7, and frequently). This historically manifest and traditional divine doxa and the facts (דְּבָרָיו as in Psa. 105:27) of the divine wonders the poet will devoutly consider. הַדָּר stands in attributive relation to כְּבוֹד, as this on its part does to הַזֹּדֶךְ. Thy brilliantly gloriously (kingly) majesty (cf. Jer. 22:18, Dan. 11:21). The poet does not say גַּם אֲנִי, nor may we insert it, either here in v. 5, or in v. 6, where the same sequence of thoughts recurs, more briefly expressed. The emphasis lies on the objects. The mightiness (עֲזוּת as in Psa. 78: 4, and in Isa. 42:25, where it signifies violence) of His terrible acts shall pass from mouth to mouth (אָמַר with a substantival object as in Psa. 40:11), and His mighty acts (גְּדֻלוֹת, *magnalia*, as in 1Ch. 17:19, 21) — according to the *Kerî* (which is determined by the suffix of אֲסַפְּרָנָה; cf. however, 2Sa. 22:23, 2Ki. 3: 3; 10:26, and frequently): His greatness (גְּדֻלָּה) — will he also on his part make the matter of his narrating. It is, however, not alone the awe-inspiring majesty of God which is revealed in history, but also the greatness (רַב used as a substantive as in Psa. 31:20, Isa. 63: 7; 21: 7, whereas רַבִּים in Psa. 32:10; 89:51 is an adjective placed before the noun after the manner of a numeral), i.e., the abundant measure, of His goodness and His righteousness, i.e., His acting in inviolable correspondence with His counsel and order of salvation. The memory of the transcendent goodness of God is the object of universal, overflowing acknowledgement and the righteousness of God is the object of universal exultation (רִנָּן with the accusative as in Psa. 51:16; 59:17). After the poet has sung the glorious self-attestation of God according to both its sides, the fiery and the light sides, he lingers by the light side, the front side of the Name of Jahve unfolded in Exo. 34: 6.

*Psa. 145: 8-13.* This memorable utterance of Jahve concerning Himself the writer of Psalm 103, which is of kindred import, also interweaves into his celebration of the revelation of divine love in v. 8. Instead of רַב־חֶסֶד the expression here, however, is וּגְדוֹל חֶסֶד (*Kerî*, as in Nah. 1: 3, cf. Psa. 89:29, with *Makkeph* וּגְדֻלָּה). The real will of God tends towards favour, which gladly giving stoops to give (חַנּוּן), and towards compassion, which interests itself on behalf of the sinner for his help and comfort (רַחוּם). Wrath is only the background of His nature, which He reluctantly and only after long waiting (אָרַךְ אַפַּיִם) lets loose against those who spurn His great mercy. For His goodness embraces, as v. 9 says, all; His tender mercies are over all His works, they hover over and encompass all His creatures. Therefore, too, all His works praise Him: they are all together loud-speaking witnesses of that sympathetic

all-embracing love of His, which excludes no one who does not exclude himself; and His saints, who live in God's love, bless Him (יְבָרְכוּהוּ written as in 1Ki. 18:44): their mouth overflows with the declaration (אֲמָרוּ) of the glory of the kingdom of this loving God, and in speaking (יְדַבְּרוּ) of the sovereign power with which He maintains and extends this kingdom. This confession they make their employ, in order that the knowledge of the mighty acts of God and the glorious majesty of His kingdom may at length become the general possession of mankind. When the poet in v. 12 sets forth the purpose of the proclamation, he drops the form of address. God's kingdom is a kingdom of all aeons, and His dominion is manifested without exception and continually in all periods or generations (בְּכָל־דּוֹר וָדּוֹר as in Psa. 45:18, Est. 9:28, a pleonastic strengthening of the expression בְּדָר וָדָר, Psa. 90: 1). It is the eternal circumference of the history of time, but at the same time its eternal substance, which more and more unfolds and achieves itself in the succession of the periods that mark its course. For that all things in heaven and on earth shall be gathered up together (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, Eph. 1:10) in the all-embracing kingdom of God in His Christ, is the goal of all history, and therefore the substance of history which is working itself out. With v. 13 (cf. Dan. 3:33 [4: 3], 4:31 [34], according to Hitzig the primary passages) another paragraph is brought to a close.

*Psa. 145:14-21.* The poet now celebrates in detail the deeds of the gracious King. The words with ל are pure datives, cf. the accusative expression in Psa. 146: 8. He in person is the support which holds fast the falling ones (נוֹפְלִים, here not the fallen ones, see Psa. 28: 1) in the midst of falling (Nicephorus: τοὺς καταπεσεῖν μέλλοντας ἔδραιοῖ, ὥστε μὴ καταπεσεῖν), and the stay by which those who are bowed together raise themselves. He is the Provider for all beings, the Father of the house, to whom in the great house of the world the eyes (עֵינַי with the second ê toneless, Ew. § 100, b) of all beings, endowed with reason and irrational, are directed with calm confidence (Mat. 6:26), and who gives them their food in its, i.e., in due season. The language of Psa. 104:27 is very similar, and it proceeds here, too, as there in v. 28 (cf. Sir. 40:14). He opens His hand, which is ever full, much as a man who feeds the doves in his court does, and gives רַצוֹן, pleasure, i.e., that which is good, which is the fulfilling of their desire, in sufficient fulness to all living things (and therefore those in need of support for the body and the life). Thus it is to be interpreted, according to Deu. 33:23 (after which here in the LXX the reading varies between εὐδοκίας and εὐλογίας), cf. Act. 14:17, ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς καὶ εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׂבֹּג is construed with a dative and accusative of the object instead of with two accusatives of the object (Ges.

§ 139. 1, 2). The usage of the language is unacquainted with רצון as an adverb in the sense of “willingly” (Hitzig), which would rather be ברצונך. In all the ways that Jahve takes in His historical rule He is “righteous,” i.e., He keeps strictly to the rule (norm) of His holy love; and in all His works which He accomplishes in the course of history He is merciful (חסיד), i.e., He practises mercy (חסד, see Psa. 12: 2); for during the present time of mercy the primary essence of His active manifestation is free preventing mercy, condescending love. True, He remains at a distance from the hypocrites, just as their heart remains far from Him (Isa. 29:13); but as for the rest, with impartial equality He is nigh (קרוב) as in Psa. 34:19) to all who call upon Him באמת, in firmness, certainty, truth, i.e., so that the prayer comes from their heart and is holy fervour (cf. Isa. 10:20; 48: 1). What is meant is true and real prayer in opposition to the νεκρὸν ἔργον, as is also meant in the main in Joh. 4:23 f. To such true praying ones Jahve is present, viz., in mercy (for in respect of His power He is everywhere); He makes the desire of those who fear Him a reality, their will being also His; and He grants them the salvation (σωτηρία) prayed for. Those who are called in v. 19 those who fear Him, are called in v. 20 those who love Him. Fear and love of God belong inseparably together; for fear without love is an unfree, servile disposition, and love without fear, bold-faced familiarity: the one dishonours the all-gracious One, and the other the all-exalted One. But all who love and fear Him He preserves, and on the other hand exterminates all wanton sinners. Having reached the *Tav*, the hymn of praise, which has traversed all the elements of the language, is at an end. The poet does not, however, close without saying that praising God shall be his everlasting employment (פִּדְבֵר פִּדְבֵר with *Olewejored*, the *Mahpach* or rather *Jethib* sign of which above represents the *Makkeph*), and without wishing that all flesh, i.e., all men, who are σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, בְּשָׂר וָדָם, may bless God’s holy Name to all eternity. The realization of this wish is the final goal of history. It will then have reached v. 43 of the great song in Deuteronomy 32 — Jahve one and His Name one (Zec. 14: 9), Israel praising God ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας, and the Gentiles ὑπὲρ ἐλέους (Rom. 15: 8 f.).

## Psalm 146

### HALLELUJAH TO GOD THE ONE TRUE HELPER

#### HALLELUJAH.

*146: 1 PRAISE, O my soul, Jahve!*

*146: 2 I will praise Jahve as long as I live,  
I will harp unto my God as long as I have any being.*

*146: 3 Trust not in princes,  
In the son of man, who is not capable of help!*

*146: 4 If his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his clod —  
In that day his devices perish.*

*146: 5 Happy is he whose help is the God of Jacob,  
Whose confidence is in Jahve his God,*

*146: 6 The Creator of heaven and earth,  
Of the sea and all that is therein —  
Who keepeth truth for ever,*

*146: 7 Obtaining judgment for the oppressed,  
Giving bread to the hungry.  
Jahve looseth those who are bound,*

*146: 8 Jahve maketh the blind to see,  
Jahve raiseth up those who are bowed down,  
Jahve loveth the righteous,*

*146: 9 Jahve preserveth the strangers,  
He helpeth up the orphan and widow,  
And the way of the wicked He turneth down.*

*146:10 Jahve reigneth as King for ever,  
Thy God, O Zion, unto all generations —  
Hallelujah.*

*Psalm 146.* The Psalter now draws to a close with five Hallelujah Psalms. This first closing Hallelujah has many points of coincidence with the foregoing alphabetical hymn (compare אֱלֹהֵי לֵלָה in v. 2 with Psa. 145: 2; שִׁבְרוּ in v. 5 with Psa. 145:15; “who giveth bread to the hungry” in v. 7 with Psa. 145:15 f.; “who maketh the blind to see” in v. 8 with Psa. 145:14; “Jahve reigneth, etc.,” in v. 10 with Psa. 145:13) — the same range of thought betrays one author. In the LXX Psalm 146-148 (according to its enumeration four Psalms, viz., 145-148, Psalm 147 being split up into two) have the inscription *Ἀλληλουΐα Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου*, which is repeated four times. These Psalms appear to have formed a separate Hallel, which is referred back to these prophets, in the old liturgy of the second Temple. Later on they became, together with Psalm 149, 150, an integral part of the daily morning prayer, and in fact of the פְּסוּקֵי דְזִמְרָה, i.e., of the mosaic-work of Psalms and other poetical pieces that was incorporated in the morning prayer, and are called even in *Shabbath 118b Hallel*,<sup>f412</sup> but expressly distinguished from the Hallel to be recited at the Passover and other feasts, which is called “the Egyptian Hallel.” In distinction from this, Krochmal calls these five Psalms the Greek Hallel. But there is nothing to oblige us to come down beyond the time of Ezra and Nehemiah.

The agreement between 1 Macc. 2:63 (ἔστρεψεν εἰς τὸν χοῦν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ διαλογισμὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπώλετο) and v. 4 of our Psalm, which Hitzig has turned to good account, does not decide anything concerning the age of the Psalm, but only shows that it was in existence at the time of the author of the First Book of Maccabees, — a point in favour of which we were not in need of any proof. But there was just as much ground for dissuading against putting confidence in princes in the time of the Persians as in that of the Grecian domination.

*Psa. 146: 1-4.* Instead of “bless,” as in Psa. 103: 1; 104: 1, the poet of this Psalm says “praise.” When he attunes his soul to the praise of God, he puts himself personally into this mood of mind, and therefore goes on to say “I will praise.” He will, however, not only praise God in the song which he is beginning, but בְּחַיִּי (vid., on Psa. 63: 5), filling up his life with it, or בְּעוֹדִי (prop. “in my yet-being,” with the suffix of the noun, whereas עוֹדֵנִי with the verbal suffix is “I still am”), so that his continued life is also a constant continued praising, viz., (and this is in the mind of the poet here, even at the commencement of the Psalm) of the God and Kings who, as being the Almighty, Eternal, and unchangeably Faithful One, is the true ground of confidence. The warning against putting trust in princes calls to mind Psa. 118: 8 f. The clause: the son of man, who has no help that he could afford, is to be understood according to Psa. 60:13. The following לְאִדְמָתוֹ shows that the poet by the expression בֶּן-אָדָם combines the thoughts of Gen. 2: 7 and 3:19. If his breath goes forth, he says, basing the untrustworthiness and feebleness of the son of Adam upon the inevitable final destiny of the son of Adam taken out of the ground, then he returns to his earth, i.e., the earth of his first beginning; cf. the more exact expression אֶל-עֶפְרָם, after which the εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ of the LXX is exchanged for εἰς τὸν χοῦν αὐτοῦ in 1 Macc. 2:63: On the hypothetical relation of the first future clause to the second, cf. Psa. 139: 8-10, 18; Ew. § 357, *b*. In that day, the inevitable day of death, the projects or plans of man are at once and for ever at an end. The ἅπ. λεγ. עֲשָׂתָנָה describes these with the collateral notion of subtleness and magnitude.

*Psa. 146: 5-7a.* Man’s help is of no avail; blessed is he (this is the last of the twenty-five אֲשֶׁרִי of the Psalter), on the contrary, who has the God of Jacob (אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל like שִׁיְהוּדָה in Psa. 144:15) as Him in whom is his succour (בְּעִזְרוֹ with *Beth essentiae*, vid., on Psa. 35: 2), — he, whose confidence (שִׁבְרָה as in Psa. 119:116) rests on Jahve, whom he can by faith call his God. Men often are not able to give help although they might be willing to do so: He, however, is the Almighty, the Creator of the heavens, the earth, and the sea, and of all living things that fill these three (cf. Neh. 9: 6). Men easily change their mind and do not keep their word: He, however, is He who keepeth truth or

faithfulness, inasmuch as He unchangeably adheres to the fulfilling of His promises. שָׁמַר אֱמֶת is in form equivalent substantially to שָׁמַר חֶסֶד and שָׁמַר הַבְּרִית . And that which He is able to do as being the Almighty, and cannot as being the Truthful One leave undone, is also really His mode of active manifestation made evident in practical proofs: He obtains right for the oppressed, gives bread to the hungry, and consequently proves Himself to be the succour of those who suffer wrong without doing wrong, and as the provider for those who look for their daily bread from His gracious hand. With הַשְּׁמַר , the only determinate participle, the faithfulness of God to His promises is made especially prominent.

*Psa. 146: 7-10.* The five lines beginning with *Jahve* belong together. Each consists of three words, which in the main is also the favourite measure of the lines in the Book of Job. The expression is as brief as possible. הַתִּיר is transferred from the yoke and chains to the person himself who is bound, and פָּקַח is transferred from the eyes of the blind to the person himself. The five lines celebrate the God of the five-divisioned *Tôra*, which furnishes abundant examples for these celebrations, and is directed with most considerate tenderness towards the strangers, orphans, and widows in particular. The orphan and the widow, says the sixth line, doth He recover, strengthen (with reference to עוֹדֵד see Psa. 20: 9; 31:12). *Valde gratus mihi est hic Psalmus*, Bakius observes, *ob Trifolium illud Dei: Advenas, Pupillos, et Viduas, versu uno luculentissime depictum, id quod in toto Psalterio nullibi fit.* Whilst *Jahve*, however, makes the manifold sorrows of His saints to have a blessed issue, He bends (יִאֲוֶה) the way of the wicked, so that it leads into error and ends in the abyss (Psa. 1: 6). This judicial manifestation of *Jahve* has only one line devoted to it. For He rules in love and in wrath, but delights most of all to rule in love. *Jahve* is, however, the God of Zion. The eternal duration of His kingdom is also the guarantee for its future glorious completion, for the victory of love. Hallelujah!

## Psalm 147

### HALLELUJAH TO THE SUSTAINER OF ALL THINGS, THE RESTORER OF JERUSALEM

#### 147: 1 HALLELUJAH,

*For it is good to celebrate our God in song,  
For it is lovely, comely is a hymn of praise.*

*147: 2 The builder up of Jerusalem is Jahve,  
The outcasts of Israel He gathereth together;*



*147: 3 He healeth the broken in heart,  
And bindeth up their wounds;*

*147: 4 Telling the number of the stars,  
He calleth them all by names.*

*147: 5 Great is our Lord and rich in strength,  
To His understanding there is no number.*

*147: 6 Jahve helpeth up the afflicted,  
He casteth the wicked down to the ground.*

*147: 7 Sing unto Jahve a thanksgiving song,  
Play unto our God upon the cithern!*

*147: 8 Who covereth the heaven with clouds,  
Who prepareth rain for the earth,  
Who maketh the mountains shoot forth grass;*

*147: 9 Giving to the beast its food,  
To the young ravens which call.*

*147:10 Not in the strength of the horse doth He delight,  
Not in the legs of a man doth He take pleasure —*

*147:11 Jahve hath pleasure in those who fear Him,  
In those who hope in His mercy.*

*147:12 Celebrate, O Jerusalem, Jahve,  
Praise Thy God, O Zion!*

*147:13 For He hath made the bolts of thy gates fast,  
He hath blessed thy children in the midst of thee —*

*147:14 He it is who giveth thy border peace,  
He satisfieth thee with the fat of wheat;*

*147:15 Who sendeth forth His commandment to the earth,  
His word runneth very swiftly;*

*147:16 Who giveth snow like wool,  
He scattereth hoar-frost like ashes,*

*147:17 He casteth down His ice like morsels —  
Before His cold, who can stand?!*

*147:18 He sendeth forth His word and causeth everything to melt,  
He causeth His wind to blow, forthwith the waters flow.*

*147:19 He made known His word unto Jacob,  
His statutes and His judgments unto Israel.*

*147:20 He hath not dealt so with any nation;  
And as for His judgments — they do not know them,  
Hallelujah.*

*Psalm 147.* It is the tone of the restoration-period of Ezra and Nehemiah that meets us sounding forth out of this and the two following Psalms, even more distinctly and recognisably than out of the nearly related preceding Psalm (cf. v. 6 with *Psa. 146: 9*). In *Psalm 147* thanksgiving is rendered to God for the restoration of Jerusalem, which is now once more a city with walls and gates; in *Psalm 148* for the restoration of the national independence; and in *Psalm 149* for the restoration of the capacity of joyously and triumphantly defending themselves to the people so long rendered defenceless and so ignominiously enslaved.

In the seventh year of Artachshasta (Artaxerxes I Longimanus) Ezra the priest entered Jerusalem, after a journey of five months, with about two thousand exiles, mostly out of the families of the Levites (458 B.C.). In the twentieth year of this same clement king, that is to say, thirteen years later (445 B.C.), came Nehemiah, his cup-bearer, in the capacity of a *Tirshâtha* (vid., *Isaiah*, p. 4). Whilst Ezra did everything for introducing the Mosaic Law again into the mind and commonwealth of the nation, Nehemiah furthered the building of the city, and more particularly of the walls and gates. We hear from his own mouth, in *Nehemiah 2-7* of the Book that is extracted from his memoirs, how indefatigably and cautiously he laboured to accomplish this work. *Psa. 12:27-45* is closely connected with these notes of Nehemiah's own hand. After having been again in the meanwhile in Susa, and there neutralized the slanderous reports that had reached the court of Persia, he appointed, at his second stay in Jerusalem, a feast in dedication of the walls. The Levite musicians, who had settled down fore the most part round about Jerusalem, were summoned to appear in Jerusalem. Then the priests and Levites were purified; and they purified the people, the gates, and the walls, the bones of the dead (as we must with Herzfeld picture this to ourselves) being taken out of all the tombs within the city and buried before the city; and then came that sprinkling, according to the Law, with the sacred lye of the red heifer, which is said (*Para iii. 5*) to have been introduced again by Ezra for the first time after the Exile. Next the princes of Judah, the priests, and Levite musicians were placed in the west of the city in two great choirs (תּוֹרֵה <sup>f413</sup>) and processions (תְּהַלְכֹת). The one festal choir, which was led by the one half of the princes, and among the priests of which Ezra went on in front, marched round the right half of the city, and the other round the left, whilst the people looked down from the walls and towers. The two processions met on the east side of the city and drew up in the Temple, where the festive sacrifices were offered amidst music and shouts of joy.

The supposition that Psalm 147-150 were all sung at this dedication of the walls under Nehemiah (Hengstenberg) cannot be supported; but as regards Psalm 147, the composition of which in the time of Nehemiah is acknowledged by the most diverse parties (Keil, Ewald, Dillmann, Zunz), the reference to the Feast of the Dedication of the walls is very probable. The Psalm falls into two parts, vv. 1-11, 12-20, which exhibit a progression both in respect of the building of the walls (vv. 2, 13), and in respect of the circumstances of the weather, from which the poet takes occasion to sing the praise of God (vv. 8 f., 16-18). It is a double Psalm, the first part of which seems to have been composed, as Hitzig suggests, on the appearing of the November rain, and the second in the midst of the rainy part of the winter, when the mild spring breezes and a thaw were already in prospect.

*Psa. 147: 1-6.* The Hallelujah, as in Psa. 135: 3, is based upon the fact, that to sing of our God, or to celebrate our God in song (זָמַר with an accusative of the object, as in Psa. 30:13, and frequently), is a discharge of duty that reacts healthfully and beneficially upon ourselves: “comely is a hymn of praise” (taken from Psa. 33: 1), both in respect of the worthiness of God to be praised, and of the gratitude that is due to Him. Instead of זָמַר or לְזַמֵּר, Psa. 92: 2, the expression is זָמְרָה, a form of the *infin. Piel*, which at least can still be proved to be possible by לְזַמְרָה in Lev. 26:18. The two פִּי are co-ordinate, and בִּינְעִים no more refers to God here than in Psa. 135: 3, as Hitzig supposes when he alters v. 1 so that it reads: “Praise ye Jah because He is good, play unto our God because He is lovely.” Psa. 92: 2 shows that בִּיטוֹב can refer to God; but נְעִים said of God is contrary to the custom and spirit of the Old Testament, whereas טוֹב and נְעִים are also in Psa. 133: 1 neuter predicates of a subject that is set forth in the infinitive form. In v. 2 the praise begins, and at the same time the confirmation of the delightful duty. Jahve is the builder up of Jerusalem, He brings together (בָּנָס as in Ezekiel, the later word for אָסַף and קָבַץ) the outcasts of Israel (as in Isa. 11:12; 56: 8); the building of Jerusalem is therefore intended of the rebuilding up, and to the dispersion of Israel corresponds the holy city laid in ruins. Jahve healeth the heart-broken, as He has shown in the case of the exiles, and bindeth up their pains (Psa. 16: 4), i.e., smarting wounds; רָפָא, which is here followed by חִבַּשׁ, also takes to itself a dative object in other instances, both in an active and (Isa. 6:10) an impersonal application; but for נִשְׁבְּרֵי לֵב the older language says לֵב נִשְׁבְּרֵי לֵב, 34:19, Isa. 61: 1. The connection of the thoughts, which the poet now brings to the stars, becomes clear from the primary passage, Isa. 40:26, cf. 27. To be acquainted with human woe and to relieve it is an easy and small matter to Him who allots a number to the stars, that are to man innumerable

(Gen. 15: 5), i.e., who has called them into being by His creative power in whatever number He has pleased, and yet a number known to Him (מְנַה, the *part. praes.*, which occurs frequently in descriptions of the Creator), and calls to them all names, i.e., names them all by names which are the expression of their true nature, which is well known to Him, the Creator. What Isaiah says (Isa. 40:26) with the words, “because of the greatness of might, and as being strong in power,” and (v. 28) “His understanding is unsearchable,” is here asserted in v. 5 (cf. Psa. 145: 3): great is our Lord, and capable of much (as in Job. 37:23, שְׁגִיָּא כַּח, and to His understanding there is no number, i.e., in its depth and fulness it cannot be defined by any number. What a comfort for the church as it traverses its ways, that are often so labyrinthine and entangled! Its Lord is the Omniscient as well as the Almighty One. Its history, like the universe, is a work of God’s infinitely profound and rich understanding. It is a mirror of gracious love and righteous anger. The patient sufferers (עֲנוּיִם) He strengthens (מְעוֹדֵד as in Psa. 146: 9); malevolent sinners (רְשָׁעִים), on the other hand, He casts down to the earth (עֲדִי-אָרֶץ, cf. Isa. 26: 5), casting deep down to the ground those who exalt themselves to the skies.

*Psa. 147: 7-11.* With v. 7 the song takes a new flight. עָנָה לְ signifies to strike up or sing in honour of any one, Num. 21:27, Isa. 27: 2. The object of the action is conceived of in בְּתוֹדָה as the medium of it (cf. e.g., Job. 16: 4). The participles in vv. 8 f. are attributive clauses that are attached in a free manner to לְאֱלֹהֵינוּ הַכִּיָּן. לְאֱלֹהֵינוּ signifies to prepare, procure, as e.g., in Job. 38:41 — a passage which the psalmist has had in his mind in connection with v. 9. מְצַמֵּיחַ, as being the causative of a *verb. crescendi*, is construed with a double accusative: “making mountains (whither human agriculture does not reach) to bring forth grass;” and the advance to the thought that God gives to the cattle the bread that they need is occasioned by the “He causeth grass to grow for the cattle” of the model passage Psa. 104:14, just as the only hinting אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָאוּ, which is said of the young of the raven (which are forsaken and cast off by their mothers very early), is explained from יִלְדוּ אֶל-אֵל יִשְׁעוּ in Job *loc. cit.* The verb קָרָא, κράζειν (cf. κράζειν), is still more expressive for the cry of the raven, κόραξ, Sanscrit *kârava*, than that שָׁן; κοράττειν and κορακεύεσθαι signify directly to implore incessantly, without taking any refusal. Towards Him, the gracious Sustainer of all beings, are the ravens croaking for their food pointed (cf. Luk. 12:24, “Consider the ravens”), just like the earth that thirsts for rain. He is the all-conditioning One. Man, who is able to know that which the irrational creature unconsciously acknowledges, is in the feeling of his dependence to trust in Him and not in himself. In all those things to which the God-estranged self-confidence of man so readily clings, God has no delight

(יִחַדְּפֵי, pausal form like יִחַדְּפֵשׁ) and no pleasure, neither in the strength of the horse, whose rider imagines himself invincible, and, if he is obliged to flee, that he cannot be overtaken, nor in the legs of a man, upon which he imagines himself so firm that he cannot be thrown down, and which, when he is pursued, will presumptively carry him far enough away into safety. שׂוֹק, Arab. *sâq*, is the leg from the knee to the foot, from Arab. *sâqa*, root *sq*, to drive, urge forward, more particularly to urge on to a gallop (like *curs*, according to Pott, from the root *car*, to go). What is meant here is, not that the strength of the horse and muscular power are of no avail when God wills to destroy a man (Psa. 33:16 f., Amo. 2:14 f.), but only that God has no pleasure in the warrior's horse and in athletic strength. Those who fear Him, i.e., with a knowledge of the impotency of all power possessed by the creature in itself, and in humble trust feel themselves dependent upon His omnipotence — these are they in whom He takes pleasure (רָצָה with the accusative), those who, renouncing all carnal defiance and self-confident self-working, hope in His mercy.

*Psa. 147:12-20.* In the LXX this strophe is a Psalm (*Lauda Jerusalem*) of itself. The call goes forth to the church again on the soil of the land of promise assembled round about Jerusalem. The holy city has again risen out of its ruins; it now once more has gates which can stand open in the broad daylight, and can be closed and bolted when the darkness comes on for the security of the municipality that is only just growing into power (Neh. 7: 1-4). The blessing of God again rests upon the children of the sacred metropolis. Its territory, which has experienced all the sufferings of war, and formerly resounded with the tumult of arms and cries of woe and destruction, God has now, from being an arena of conflict, made into peace (the accusative of the effect, and therefore different from Isa. 60:17); and since the land can now again be cultivated in peace, the ancient promise (Psa. 81:17) is fulfilled, that God would feed His people, if they would only obey Him, with the fat of wheat. The God of Israel is the almighty Governor of nature. It is He who sends His fiat (אִמְרָתוֹ after the manner of the וַיֹּאמֶר of the history of creation, cf. Psa. 33: 9) earthwards (אֲרָץ, the accusative of the direction). The word is His messenger (vid., on Psa. 107:20), אֲדָמָה־רָחֵק, i.e., it runs as swiftly as possible, viz., in order to execute the errand on which it is sent. He it is who sends down snow-flakes like flocks of wool, so that the fields are covered with snow as with a white-woollen warming covering. <sup>f414</sup>

He scatters hoar-frost (כַּפּוֹר from כָּפַר, to cover over with the fine frozen dew or mist as though they were powdered with ashes that the wind had blown about. Another time He casts His ice <sup>f415</sup> (קָרָה from קָרַח; or according to another reading, קָרָה from קָרַח) down like morsels, fragments, כַּבְּתִים, viz.,

as hail-stones, or as sleet. The question: before His cold — who can stand? is formed as in Nah. 1: 6, cf. Psa. 130: 3. It further comes to pass that God sends forth His word and causes them (snow, hoar-frost, and ice) to melt away: He makes His thawing wind blow, waters flow; i.e., as soon as the one comes about, the other also takes place forthwith. This God now, who rules all things by His word and moulds all things according to His will, is the God of the revelation pertaining to the history of salvation, which is come to Israel, and as the bearer of which Israel takes the place of honour among the nations, Deu. 4: 7 f., 32-34. Since the poet says מְנִיד and not הִנִּיד, he is thinking not only of the *Tôra*, but also of prophecy as the continuous self-attestation of God, the Lawgiver. The *Keri* דְּבָרָיו, occasioned by the plurals of the parallel member of the verse, gives an unlimited indistinct idea. We must keep to דְּבָרָיו, with the LXX, Aquila, Theodotion, the Quinta, Sexta, and Jerome. The word, which is the medium of God's cosmical rule, is gone forth as a word of salvation to Israel, and, unfolding itself in statutes and judgments, has raised Israel to a legal state founded upon a positive divine law or judgment such as no Gentile nation possesses. The Hallelujah does not exult over the fact that these other nations are not acquainted with any such positive divine law, but (cf. Deu. 4: 7 f., Baruch 4: 4) over the fact that Israel is put into possession of such a law. It is frequently attested elsewhere that this possession of Israel is only meant to be a means of making salvation a common property of the world at large.

## Psalm 148

### HALLELUJAH OF ALL HEAVENLY AND EARTHLY BEINGS

#### HALLELUJAH.

*148: 1 PRAISE ye Jahve from the heavens,  
Praise ye Him in the heights.*

*148: 2 Praise ye Him, all His angels,  
Praise ye Him, all His host.*

*148: 3 Praise ye Him, sun and moon,  
Praise Him all ye stars of light.*

*148: 4 Praise Him ye heavens of heavens,  
And ye waters that are above the heavens.*

*148: 5 Let them praise the Name of Jahve,  
For HE commanded and they were created,*

*148: 6 And He set them there for ever and ever;  
He gave a law, and not one transgresseth it.*

*148: 7 Praise ye Jahve from the earth,  
Sea-monsters and all deeps;*

*148: 8 Fire and hail, snow and vapour,  
Stormy wind fulfilling His word;*

*148: 9 Ye mountains and all hills,  
Fruit-trees and all cedars;*

*148:10 Ye wild beasts and all cattle,  
Creeping things and winged birds;*

*148:11Ki. of the earth and all tribes,  
Princes and all judges of the earth;*

*148:12 Young men and also maidens,  
Old men together with youths —*

*148:13 Let them praise the Name of Jahve,  
For His Name is highly exalted, He alone,  
His glory is above earth and heaven.*

*148:14 And He hath raised a horn for His people,  
For a praise for all His saints,  
For the children of Israel, for the people near unto Him  
Hallelujah.*

*Psalm 148.* After the Psalmist in the foregoing Hallelujah has made the gracious self- attestation of Jahve in the case of the people of revelation, in connection with the general government of the almighty and all-benevolent One in the world, the theme of his praise, he calls upon all creatures in heaven and on earth, and more especially mankind of all peoples and classes and races and ages, to join in concert in praise of the Name of Jahve, and that on the ground of the might and honour which He has bestowed upon His people, i.e., has bestowed upon them once more now when they are gathered together again out of exile and Jerusalem has risen again out of the ruins of its overthrow. The hymn of the three in the fiery furnace, which has been interpolated in ch. 3 of the Book of Daniel in the LXX, is for the most part an imitation of this Psalm. In the language of the liturgy this Psalm has the special name of *Laudes* among the twenty *Psalmi alleluistici*, and all the three Psalm 148-150 which close the Psalter are called *ἀἴνοι*, Syriac *shabchûh* (praise ye Him).

In this Psalm the loftiest consciousness of faith is united with the grandest contemplation of the world. The church appears here as the choir-leader of the universe. It knows that its experiences have a central and universal significance for the whole life of creation; that the loving-kindness which has fallen to its lot is worthy to excite joy among all beings in heaven and on earth. And it calls not only upon everything in heaven and on earth that stands in

fellowship of thought, of word, and of freedom with it to praise God, but also the sun, moon, and stars, water, earth, fire, and air, mountains, trees, and beasts, yea even such natural phenomena as hail, snow, and mist. How is this to be explained? The easiest way of explaining is to say that it is a figure of speech (Hupfeld); but this explanation explains nothing. Does the invitation in the exuberance of feeling, without any clearness of conception, here overstep the boundary of that which is possible? Or does the poet, when he calls upon these lifeless and unconscious things to praise God, mean that we are to praise God on their behalf — ἀφορᾶν εἰς ταῦτα, as Theodoret says, καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν σοφίαν καταμανθάνειν καὶ διὰ πάντων αὐτῶ πλέκειν τὴν ὑμνωδίαν? Or does the “praise ye” in its reference to these things of nature proceed on the assumption that they praise God when they redound to the praise of God, and find its justification in the fact that the human will enters into this matter of fact which relates to things, and is devoid of any will, and seizes it and drags it into the concert of angels and men? All these explanations are unsatisfactory. The call to praise proceeds rather from the wish that all creatures, by becoming after their own manner an echo and reflection of the divine glory, may participate in the joy at the glory which God has bestowed upon His people after their deep humiliation. This wish, however, after all rests upon the great truth, that the way through suffering to glory which the church is traversing, has not only the glorifying of God in itself, but by means of this glorifying, the glorifying of God in all creatures and by all creatures, too, as its final aim, and that these, finally transformed (glorified) in the likeness of transformed (glorified) humanity, will become the bright mirror of the divine doxa and an embodied hymn of a thousand voices. The calls also in Isa. 44:23; 49:13, cf. 52: 9, and the descriptions in Isa. 35: 1 f., 41:19; 55:12 f., proceed from the view to which Paul gives clear expression from the stand-point of the New Testament in Rom. 8:18 ff.

*Psa. 148: 1-6.* The call does not rise step by step from below upwards, but begins forthwith from above in the highest and outermost spheres of creation. The place whence, before all others, the praise is to resound is the heavens; it is to resound in the heights, viz., the heights of heaven (Job. 16:19; 25: 2; 31: 2). The מַן might, it is true, also denote the birth or origin: ye of the heavens, i.e., ye celestial beings (cf. Psa. 68:27), but the parallel בְּמַרוֹמִים renders the immediate construction with הַלְלוּ more natural. Vv. 2-4 tell who are to praise Jahve there: first of all, all His angels, the messengers of the Ruler of the world — all His host, i.e., angels and stars, for צְבָאוֹ (*Chethîb*) or צְבָאוֹת (*Kerî* as in Psa. 103:21) is the name of the heavenly host armed with light which God Tsebaoth commands (vid., on Gen. 2: 1), — a name including both stars (e.g., in Deu. 4:19) and angels (e.g., in Jos. 5:14 f., 1Ki. 22:19); angels and stars are also united in the Scriptures in other instances (e.g.,



Job. 38: 7). When the psalmist calls upon these beings of light to praise Jahve, he does not merely express his delight in that which they do under any circumstances (Hengstenberg), but comprehends the heavenly world with the earthly, the church above with the church here below (vid., on Psalm 29, 103), and gives a special turn to the praise of the former, making it into an echo of the praise of the latter, and blending both harmoniously together. The heavens of heavens are, as in Deu. 10:14, 1Ki. 8:27, Sir. 16:18, and frequently, those which lie beyond the heavens of the earth which were created on the fourth day, therefore they are the outermost and highest spheres. The waters which are above the heavens are, according to Hupfeld, “a product of the fancy, like the upper heavens and the whole of the inhabitants of heaven.” But if in general the other world is not a notion to which there is no corresponding entity, this notion may also have things for its substance which lie beyond our knowledge of nature. The Scriptures, from the first page to the last, acknowledge the existence of celestial waters, to which the rain-waters stand in the relation as it were of a finger-post pointing upwards (see Gen. 1: 7). All these beings belonging to the superterrestrial world are to praise the Name of Jahve, for He, the God of Israel, it is by whose fiat (צִוָּה, like אָמַר in Psa. 33: 9 <sup>f416</sup>) the heavens and all their host are created (Psa. 33: 6). He has set them, which did not previously exist, up (הָעֲמִידָה as e.g., in Neh. 6: 7, the causative to עָמַד in Psa. 33: 9, cf. Psa. 119:91), and that for ever and ever (Psa. 111: 8), i.e., in order for ever to maintain the position in the whole of creation which He has assigned to them. He hath given a law (חָק) by which its distinctive characteristic is stamped upon each of these heavenly beings, and a fixed bound is set to the nature and activity of each in its mutual relation to all, and not one transgresses (the individualizing singular) this law given to it. Thus וְלֹא יַעֲבֹר is to be understood, according to Job. 14: 5, cf. Jer. 5:22, Job. 38:10, Psa. 104: 9. Hitzig makes the Creator Himself the subject; but then the poet would have at least been obliged to say חָק־נָתַן לָמוֹ, and moreover it may be clearly seen from Jer. 31:36; 33:20, how the thought that God inviolably keeps the orders of nature in check is expressed θεοπρεπῶς. Jer. 5:22, by way of example, shows that the law itself is not, with Ewald, Maurer, and others, following the LXX, Syriac, Italic, Jerome, and Kimchi, to be made the subject: a law hath He given, and it passes not away (an imperishable one). In combination with חָק, עָבַר always signifies “to pass over, transgress.”

*Psa. 148: 7-14.* The call to the praise of Jahve is now turned, in the second group of verses, to the earth and everything belonging to it in the widest extent. Here too מִן־הָאָרֶץ, like מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם, v. 1, is intended of the place whence the praise is to resound, and not according to Psa. 10:18 of earthly

beings. The call is addressed in the first instance to the sea-monsters or dragons (Psa. 74:13), i.e., as Pindar (*Nem.* iii. 23 f.) expresses it, θῆρας ἐν πελάγει ὑπερόχους, and to the surging mass of waters (תְּהוֹמוֹת) above and within the earth. Then to four phenomena of nature, coming down from heaven and ascending heavenwards, which are so arranged in v. 8a, after the model of the chiasmus (crosswise position), that fire and smoke (קִיטוֹר), more especially of the mountains (Exo. 19:18), hail and snow stand in reciprocal relation; and to the storm-wind (רוּחַ סְעָרָה, an appositional construction, as in Psa. 107:25), which, beside a seeming freeness and untractableness, performs God's word. What is said of this last applies also to the fire, etc.; all these phenomena of nature are messengers and servants of God, Psa. 104: 4, cf. 103:20. When the poet wishes that they all may join in concert with the rest of the creatures to the praise of God, he excepts the fact that they frequently become destructive powers executing judicial punishment, and only has before his mind their (more especially to the inhabitant of Palestine, to whom the opportunity of seeing hail, snow, and ice was more rare than with us, imposing) grandeur and their relatedness to the whole of creation, which is destined to glorify God and to be itself glorified. He next passes over to the mountains towering towards the skies and to all the heights of earth; to the fruit-trees, and to the cedars, the kings among the trees of the forest; to the wild beasts, which are called הַחַיָּה because they represent the most active and powerful life in the animal world, and to all quadrupeds, which, more particularly the four-footed domestic animals, are called בְּהֵמָה; to the creeping things (רֶמֶשׂ) which cleave to the ground as they move along; and to the birds, which are named with the descriptive epithet winged (צְפוּרֵי כַנָּף as in Deu. 4:17, cf. Gen. 7:14, Eze. 39:17, instead of עוֹף כַּנָּף, Gen. 1:21). And just as the call in Psalm 103 finds its centre of gravity, so to speak, at last in the soul of man, so here it is addressed finally to humanity, and that, because mankind lives in nations and is comprehended under the law of a state commonwealth, in the first instance to its heads: the kings of the earth, i.e., those who rule over the earth by countries, to the princes and all who have the administration of justice and are possessed of supreme power on the earth, then to men of both sexes and of every age.

All the beings mentioned from v. 1 onwards are to praise the Name of Jahve; for His Name, He (the God of this Name) alone (Isa. 2:11, Psa. 72:18) is נִשְׁגָּב, so high that no name reaches up to Him, not even from afar; His glory (His glorious self-attestation) extends over earth and heaven (vid., 8: 2). כִּי, without our being able and obliged to decide which, introduces the matter and the ground of the praise; and the fact that the desire of the poet comprehends in יְהוָה all the beings mentioned is seen from his saying “earth and heaven,” as

he glances back from the nearer things mentioned to those mentioned farther off (cf. Gen. 2: 4). In v. 14 the statement of the object and of the ground of the praise is continued. The motive from which the call to all creatures to Hallelujah proceeds, viz., the new mercy which God has shown towards His people, is also the final ground of the Hallelujah which is to sound forth; for the church of God on earth is the central-point of the universe, the aim of the history of the world, and the glorifying of this church is the turning-point for the transformation of the world. It is not to be rendered: He hath exalted the horn of His people, any more than in Psa. 132:17: I will make the horn of David to shoot forth. The horn in both instances is one such as the person named does not already possess, but which is given him (different from Psa. 89:18, 25; 92:11, and frequently). The Israel of the Exile had lost its horn, i.e., its comeliness and its defensive and offensive power. God has now given it a horn again, and that a high one, i.e., has helped Israel to attain again an independence among the nations that commands respect. In Psalm 132, where the horn is an object of the promise, we might directly understand by it the Branch (*Zemach*). Here, where the poet speaks out of his own present age, this is at least not the meaning which he associates with the words. What now follows is an apposition to **וַיָּרֶם קֶרֶן לְאַמּוֹ**: He has raised up a horn for His people — praise (we say: to the praise of; cf. the New Testament εἰς ἔπαινον) to all His saints, the children of Israel, the people who stand near Him. Others, as Hengstenberg, take **תְּהִלָּה** as a second object, but we cannot say **תְּהִלָּה תְּהִלָּה הַרִים**. Israel is called **אֵם קְרֵבּוֹ**, the people of His near = of His nearness or vicinity (Köster), as Jerusalem is called in Ecc. 8:10 **מְקוֹם קְדוֹשׁ** instead of **מְקוֹם קָדֵשׁ** (Ew. § 287, *a, b*). It might also be said, according to Lev. 10: 3, **אֵם קְרֵבּוֹ**, the nation of those who are near to Him (as the Targum renders it). In both instances **אֵם** is the governing noun, as, too, surely **עַמִּיתִי** is in **וַיְבָרֵךְ גִּבּוֹר**, Zec. 13: 7, which need not signify, by going back to the abstract primary signification of **עַמִּית**, a man of my near fellowship, but can also signify a man of my neighbour, i.e., my nearest man, according to Ew. *loc. cit.* (cf. above on Psa. 143:10; 128:49). As a rule, the principal form of **עַם** is pointed **עָם**; and it is all the more unnecessary, with Olshausen and Hupfeld, to take the construction as adjectival for **עַם קְרֵבּוֹ לּוֹ**. It might, with Hitzig after Aben-Ezra, be more readily regarded as appositional (to a people, His near, i.e., standing near to Him). We have here an example of the genitival subordination, which is very extensive in Hebrew, instead of an appositional co-ordination: *populo propinqui sui*, in connection with which *propinqui* may be referred back to *propinquum* = *propinquitas*, but also to *propinquus* (literally: a people of the kind of one that is near to Him). Thus is Israel styled in Deu. 4: 7. In the consciousness of the dignity which lies in this name, the

nation of the God of the history of salvation comes forward in this Psalm as the leader (*choragus*) of all creatures, and strikes up a Hallelujah that is to be followed by heaven and earth.

## Psalm 149

### HALLELUJAH TO THE GOD OF VICTORY OF HIS PEOPLE

#### *HALLELUJAH.*

*149: 1 SING unto Jahve a new song,  
His praise in the congregation of the saints.*

*149: 2 Let Israel rejoice in its Maker,  
Let the children of Zion be joyful in their King*

*149: 3 Let them praise His Name with dance,  
With timbrel and cithern let them play unto Him*

*149: 4 For Jahve taketh pleasure in His people,  
He adorneth the humble with salvation.*

*149: 5 Let the saints exult in glory,  
Let them shout aloud upon their beds.*

*149: 6 Hymns of God fill their throats,  
And a two-edged sword is in their hand,*

*149: 7 To execute vengeance among the nations,  
Punishments among the peoples;*

*149: 8 To bind their kings with chains  
And their nobles with iron fetters,*

*149: 9 To execute upon them the written judgment —  
It is glory for all His saints,  
Hallelujah.*

*Psalm 149.* This Psalm is also explained, as we have already seen on Psalm 147, from the time of the restoration under Ezra and Nehemiah. The new song to which it summons has the supreme power which Israel has attained over the world of nations for its substance. As in Psa. 148:14 the fact that Jahve has raised up a horn for His people is called **תְּהַלֵּה לְכַל־חַסְדָּיו**, so here in Psa. 149: 9 the fact that Israel takes vengeance upon the nations and their rulers is called **הִדָּר לְכַל־חַסְדָּיו**. The writer of the two Psalms is one and the same. The fathers are of opinion that it is the wars and victories of the Maccabees that are here prophetically spoken of. But the Psalm is sufficiently explicable from the newly strengthened national self-consciousness of the

period after Cyrus. The stand-point is somewhere about the stand-point of the Book of Esther. The New Testament spiritual church cannot pray as the Old Testament national church here prays. Under the illusion that it might be used as a prayer without any spiritual transmutation, Psalm 149 has become the watchword of the most horrible errors. It was by means of this Psalm that Caspar Scloppius in his *Classicum Belli Sacri*, which, as Bakius says, is written not with ink, but with blood, inflamed the Roman Catholic princes to the Thirty Years' religious War. And in the Protestant Church Thomas Münzer stirred up the War of the Peasants by means of this Psalm. We see that the Christian cannot make such a Psalm directly his own without disavowing the apostolic warning, "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal" (2Co. 10: 4). The praying Christian must there transpose the letter of this Psalm into the spirit of the New Covenant; the Christian expositor, however, has to ascertain the literal meaning of this portion of the Scriptures of the Old Testament in its relation to contemporary history.

*Psa. 149: 1-5.* A period, in which the church is renewing its youth and drawing nearer to the form it is finally to assume, also of inward necessity puts forth new songs. Such a new era has now dawned for the church of the saints, the Israel that has remained faithful to its God and the faith of its fathers. The Creator of Israel (עֲשֵׂי, plural, with the plural suffix, like עֲשֵׂי in Job. 35:10, עֲשֵׂי in Isa. 54: 5, cf. עֲשֵׂי in Job. 40:19; according to Hupfeld and Hitzig, cf. Ew. § 256, b, Ges. § 93, 9, singular; but *aj*, *ajich*, *aw*, are always really plural suffixes) has shown that He is also Israel's Preserver and the King of Zion, that He cannot leave the children of Zion for any length of time under foreign dominion, and has heard the sighing of the exiles (Isa. 63:19; 26:13). Therefore the church newly appropriated by its God and King is to celebrate Him, whose Name shines forth anew out of its history, with festive dance, timbrel, and cithern. For (as the occasion, hitherto only hinted at, is now expressly stated) Jahve takes a pleasure in His people; His wrath in comparison with His mercy is only like a swiftly passing moment (Isa. 54: 7 f.). The futures that follow state that which is going on at the present time. עֲנִיִּים is, as frequently, a designation of the *ecclesia pressa*, which has hitherto, amidst patient endurance of suffering, waited for God's own act of redemption. He now adorns them with יְשׁוּעָה, help against the victory over the hostile world; now the saints, hitherto enslaved and contemned, exult בְּכִבוֹד, in honour, or on account of the honour which vindicates them before the world and is anew bestowed upon them (כִּי of the reason, or, which is more probable in connection with the boldness of the expression, of the state and mood <sup>f417</sup>); they shout for joy upon their beds, upon which they have hitherto poured forth their complaints over the present (cf. Hos. 7:14), and ardently longed for a better

future (Isa. 26: 8); for the bed is the place of soliloquy (Psa. 4: 5), and the tears shed there (Psa. 6: 7) are turned into shouts of joy in the case of Israel.

*Psa. 149: 6-9.* The glance is here directed to the future. The people of the present have again, in their God, attained to a lofty self-consciousness, the consciousness of their destiny, viz., to subjugate the whole world of nations to the God of Israel. In the presence of the re-exaltation which they have experienced their throat is full of words and songs exalting Jahve (רוֹמְמוֹת, plural of רוֹמֵם, or, according to another reading, רוֹמֵם, Psa. 56:17), and as servants of this God, the rightful Lord of all the heathen (Psa. 82: 8), they hold in their hand a many-mouthed, i.e., many edged sword (vid., *supra*, p. 580), in order to take the field on behalf of the true religion, as the Maccabees actually did, not long after: ταῖς μὲν χερσὶν ἀγωνιζόμενοι, ταῖς δὲ καρδίαις πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐβλόχοντο (2 Macc. 15:27). The meaning of v. 9a becomes a different one, according as we take this line as co-ordinate or subordinate to what goes before. Subordinated, it would imply the execution of a penal jurisdiction over those whom they carried away, and פְּתוּבֵי would refer to prescriptive facts such as are recorded in Num. 31: 8, 1Sa. 15:32 f. (Hitzig). But it would become the religious lyric poet least of all to entertain such an unconditional prospect of the execution of the conquered worldly rulers. There is just as little ground for thinking of the judgment of extermination pronounced upon the nations of Canaan, which was pronounced upon them for an especial reason. If v. 9a is taken as co-ordinate, the “written judgment” (*Recht*) consists in the complete carrying out of the subjugation; and this is commended by the perfectly valid parallel, Isa. 45:14. The poet, however, in connection with the expression “written,” has neither this nor that passage of Scripture in his mind, but the testimony of the Law and of prophecy in general, that all kingdoms shall become God’s and His Christ’s. Subjugation (and certainly not without bloodshed) is the scriptural מִשְׁפָּט for the execution of which Jahve makes use of His own nation. Because the God who thus vindicates Himself is Israel’s God, this subjugation of the world is הַדָּר, splendour and glory, to all who are in love devoted to Him. The glorifying of Jahve is also the glorifying of Israel.

## Psalm 150

### THE FINAL HALLELUJAH

*150: 1 HALLELUJAH,  
PRAISE YE GOD IN HIS SANCTUARY,  
PRAISE HIM IN HIS STRONG FIRMAMENT!*

*150: 2 PRAISE HIM IN HIS MIGHTY ACTS,  
PRAISE HIM ACCORDING TO THE ABUNDANCE OF HIS GREATNESS!*

**150: 3 PRAISE HIM WITH THE SOUND OF HORNS,  
PRAISE HIM WITH HARP AND CITHERN!**

**150: 4 PRAISE HIM WITH TIMBREL AND DANCE,  
PRAISE HIM WITH STRINGS AND SHALM!**

**150: 5 PRAISE HIM WITH CLEAR CYMBALS,  
PRAISE HIM WITH CLASHING CYMBALS!**

**150: 6 LET EVERYTHING THAT HATH BREATH PRAISE JAH,  
HALLELUJAH.**

*Psalms 150.* The call to praise Jahve “with dance and with timbrel” in 149: 3 is put forth here anew in v. 4, but with the introduction of all the instruments; and is addressed not merely to Israel, but to every individual soul.

*Psa. 150: 1-5.* The Synagogue reckons up thirteen divine attributes according to ex. Psa. 34: 6 f. (שֵׁשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה מִדּוֹת), to which, according to an observation of Kimchi, correspond the thirteen הַלֵּל of this Psalm. It is, however, more probable that in the mind of the poet the tenfold הַלְלוּ encompassed by Hallelujah’s is significant; for ten is the number of rounding off, completeness, exclusiveness, and of the extreme of exhaustibleness. The local definitions in v. 1 are related attributively to God, and designate that which is heavenly, belonging to the other world, as an object of praise. קִדְשׁוֹ (the possible local meaning of which is proved by the קִדְשׁ and קְדָשִׁים of the Tabernacle and of the Temple) is in this passage the heavenly הַיְכָל; and רָקִיעַ עֶזְו is the firmament spread out by God’s omnipotence and testifying of God’s omnipotence (Psa. 68:35), not according to its front side, which is turned towards the earth, but according to the reverse or inner side, which is turned towards the celestial world, and which marks it off from the earthly world. The third and fourth הַלְלוּ give as the object of the praise that which is at the same time the ground of the praise: the tokens of His גְּבוּרָה, i.e., of His all-subduing strength, and the plenitude of His greatness (גְּדֻלּוֹ = גְּדֻלוֹ), i.e., His absolute, infinite greatness. The fifth and sixth הַלְלוּ bring into the concert in praise of God the ram’s horn, שֹׁפָר, the name of which came to be improperly used as the name also of the metallic הַצְּצָרָה (vid., on Psa. 81: 4), and the two kinds of stringed instruments (vid., Psa. 33: 2), viz., the naba (i.e., the harp and lyre) and the kinnor (the cithern), the ψαλτήριον and the κιθάρα (κινύρα). The seventh הַלְלוּ invites to the festive dance, of which the chief instrumental accompaniment is the תֵּרָה (Arabic *duff*, Spanish *adufe*, derived from the Moorish) or tambourine. The eighth הַלְלוּ brings on the stringed instruments in their widest compass, מְנִיִּם (cf. Psa. 45: 9) from מֵן, Syriac

*menîn*, and the shepherd's pipe, עֲנָב (with the *Gimel raphe* = עֲנָב); and the ninth and tenth, the two kinds of castanets (צִלְצִלִים, construct form of צִלְצִל, singular צִלְצִל), viz., the smaller clear-sounding, and the larger deeper-toned, more noisy kinds (cf. κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον, 1Co. 13: 1), as צִלְצִלֵי שִׁמְע (pausal form of שִׁמְע = שִׁמְע, like סִתָּר in Deu. 27:15, and frequently, from סִתָּר = סִתָּר) and צִלְצִלֵי תְרוּעָה are, with Schlultens, Pfeifer, Burk, Köster, and others, to be distinguished.

*Psa. 150: 6.* The call to praise has thus far been addressed to persons not mentioned by name, but, as the names of instruments thus heaped up show, to Israel especially. It is now generalized to “the totality of breath,” i.e., all the beings who are endowed by God with the breath of life (נְשִׁמַת חַיִּים), i.e., to all mankind.

With this full-toned Finale the Psalter closes. Having risen as it were by five steps, in this closing Psalm it hovers over the blissful summit of the end, where, as Gregory of Nyssa says, all creatures, after the disunion and disorder caused by sin have been removed, are harmoniously united for one choral dance (εἰς μίαν χοροστασίαν), and the chorus of mankind concerting with the angel chorus are become one cymbal of divine praise, and the final song of victory shall salute God, the triumphant Conqueror (τῷ τροπαιούχῳ), with shouts of joy. There is now no need for any special closing *beracha*. This whole closing Psalm is such. Nor is there any need even of an *Amen* (Psa. 106:48, cf. 1Ch. 16:36). The *Hallelujah* includes it within itself and exceeds it.

## Excursus by J. G. Wetzstein

### I. — Concerning דָּרוֹר, *The Name Of A Bird* On Psa. 84: 4 (Pp. 562 F.)

Saadia Gaon explains דָּרוֹר by the Arabic *dwrîyt*, a word the correctness of which has been doubted. It is, however, perfectly correct; for in Syria and Palestine the common sparrow is called Arab. *dûrîy*, *dûrî*, whence the *nomen unitatis* Arab. *dûrîyat*. The word is to be traced back to Arab. *dûr*, the plural of *dârun*, the “farmyard one,” and signifies properly “that which is found or dwells in the farm-yards;” thus the *Ḳamûş* (s.v. Arab. *dâr*) cites the phrase Arab. *mâ bih dûrîy* (used of a desolated locality), “there is no being that dwells in farm-yards therein,” where we should say: “no living soul.” In this phrase it is exchanged at pleasure for the synonyms Arab. *dârîy*, *dayyâr*, and *dayyûr*, which are likewise denominatives of Arab. *dârun*.



The word *dûrî* is a thoroughly characteristic appellation for the sparrow, which inhabits the villages in immense flocks, where the standing corn and the corn lying on the threshing-floors in the open fields feed it for one half of the year, whilst it finds its food during the other half in the courts of the houses. It builds its nest in the walls by digging out the mortar between the air-dried bricks. These holes are stopped up once a year, because they injure the walls; and the birds that are then taken out always furnish an abundant repast, the only one of the kind, moreover, in the year, for no one takes the trouble to make a sport of shooting sparrows.

It is another question, whether the *derôr*, also, really corresponds to the *dûrî*? This would be impossible if the *šippôr*, which is connected with *derôr* in Psa. 84: 4 and Pro. 26: 2, as is supposed, signifies the sparrow. Saadia is consequently obliged to interpret צפור differently. But is צפור then the sparrow? Is it possible for a word which the Bible uses to designate almost all kinds of birds to be the name of a particular species? Its comparison with the Arabic *šfûr*, from which it certainly differs only dialectically, does not support that supposition; for this word is a collective name for the whole bulk of the small chirping and singing birds, side by side with which the separate species must also have its special name. The fact that in Syria one rarely sees and hears anything of any other *šfûr* than the sparrow, arises from the fact that the sparrow has multiplied so excessively there, whilst the land, that has been deprived of its woods and is overrun with birds of prey, is very poor in singing birds of all kinds. But if the *šippôr* corresponds to the *šfûr* in this sense, then the *derôr* might well be the *dûrî*. The *swallow*, which one usually thinks of, has its own name; and the *wood-pigeon*, which others suppose to be the *derôr*, does not suit Pro. 26: 2.

The etymology of the word *derôr* is obscure. If it signifies the sparrow, it will be a so-called primitive; at least it is then more natural to regard the Syro-Arabic *dûrî* as a *derôr* that has been corrupted by a later supposition of a more transparent etymology, than to regard *derôr* as a defectively written and hence erroneously pointed פֶּעֲלוֹר form (perhaps like פֶּרוֹר) from the root דוּר.

## II. — Concerning the Signification of the Word מַעֲנָה in Its Application to Agriculture On Psa. 129: 3 (p. 775), cf. on Psa. 65:11 (p. 433).

The word מַעֲנָה, Arabic *ma'ânâ*, signifies a strip of arable land which the ploughman takes in hand at one time, at both ends of which consequently the ploughing-team always comes to a stand, turns round, and begins a new furrow. The length of the *ma'ânâ* is of course the same as the length of the

furrows. Since the ordinary ox of Palestine is smaller and weaker than ours, and easily becomes tired under the yoke, which presses heavily on the nape of its neck and confines its neck, they are obliged to give it time to recover its strength by frequent resting. This always takes place at the termination of a furrow, when the peasant raises the unwieldy plough out of the earth, and turns it over, when he is obliged to clear off the moist earth with the *jâbût* (יָאֲבוּת), a small iron shovel at the lower end of the oxen-stick or goad) and to hammer the loosened wedges and rings tight again, during which time the team is able to recover itself by resting. Hence, too, they do not make the furrows a great length. If the field is under two hundred feet long, it forms only one *ma nâh*; but when in level districts the long parcels of ground (*sihâm* from the singular שִׁהָם) of the separate peasant farmers of a village frequently extend to the distance of a mile and a half, the ploughman is compelled to divide his parcel of ground into several Arab. *ma âny* (מַעֲנוֹת), each of which is ploughed by itself. The furrows, that is to say, cannot be made breadthwise, because the small plots are mostly far too narrow, and because the fields of his neighbours on either side that might be already tilled would be injured by it; for the boundaries of the fields (*ḥudûd* from the singular חֹד) are not formed, as with us, by rows, i.e., by broad strips of green sward, but only by isolated heaps of stones, of which two larger ones lie between every two fields, and are called *amâmî* (from the singular אִמְיָה, “mother ridge, i.e., main ridge”), and a number of smaller ones called *ka âkîr* (from the singular קַעְקוֹר). Moreover cross-ploughing would be rendered difficult by these boundary stones, and the plough would often be seriously injured. In my collection of Haraunitish peasants’ proverbs and maxims the following is to be found: “One ox is as much use to thee as two, and the shortness of the *ma nâh* as much as its length” (Arab. *yugnîk ‘n tûrîn tûr w-ygnîk ‘n tûl ‘l-m âny qṣrhâ*), on which I have recorded the following original interpretation: If it does not make any difference to the produce of the field whether the *ma nâh* be greater or less, but in connection with the former the ploughing oxen are exhausted even after half a day’s work, whereas in connection with the latter they remain fit for work the whole day, it is more profitable to the peasant to make his *ma nâh* as short as practicable.

The word *מענה* only occurs besides in 1Sa. 14:14, where it is said that Jonathan with his armour-bearer, in connection with an attack upon one of the posts of the enemy, slew twenty men, and that within the short space of about half a *מענה*, i.e., not during a long pursuit and by degrees, but in a brief hot battle on an arena of about a hundred paces. In the passage in the Psalm the back is conceived of as a field which is divided into several long *מענות*. To our taste the plural is certainly disturbing; the comparison of the back to one

long-extended **מענה**, which may indeed have a hundred furrows, is simpler, and the impression produced by it more forcible; hence the *Kerî* supposes the singular **מענית**, which must be regarded as an Aramaizing collateral form of the singular **מענה**, for the difference in forms like Arab. *mṣfāt*, *mṣfāyat*, *mṣfiyat*, *mṣfiyyat*, and *mṣfit* in connection with *Lamed He* stems is for the most part only idiomatic.

According to its derivation, **מענה** (with local *Mem*) is perhaps the portion of a field taken in hand by the ploughman, from **ענה**, to work; or with reference to the two ends, within the limit of which the ploughing is done, the furrow-turning, **στροφή**, from **ענה**, to turn; or a tract or space of a certain length, from **ענה**, to strive after, to seek to attain, whence the well-known Arabic word *ma'nâ* (masculine of **מענה**), that which is striven after, the desired object, then specially that which is aimed at by the language, the drift (the meaning and sense).

The Arabic *m'nât*, together with the greater part of the agrarian terminology, is not found in the original lexicons, because it was not regarded as purely Arabic, but as belonging to the Nabataean and Syrian dialects. The terms must therefore still be collected among the peasants. I found a good many in the *Mergé*-country, where I had my country estate; but the most interesting were in the *Haurân*, where, too, Arab. *m'nât* still belongs to the living language.

## Footnotes

- <sup>ft1</sup> Also from 2 Macc. 2:13, where τὰ τοῦ Δαυΐδ appears to be the designation of the כתובים according to their beginning; and from Philo, *De vita contempl.* (*opp.* II 475 *ed. Mangey*), where he makes the following distinction νόμους καὶ λόγια θεσπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν καὶ ὕμνους καὶ τὰ ἄλλα οἷς ἐπιστήμη καὶ εὐσέβεια συναύξονται καὶ τελειοῦνται.
- <sup>ft2</sup> In all the Masoretic lists the twenty four books are arranged in the following order: 1) בראשית; 2) ואלה שמות; 3) ויקרא; 4) וידבר (also במדבר); 5) אלה הדברים; 6) יהושע; 7) שופטים; 8) שמואל; 9) מלכים; 10) ישעיה; 11) ירמיה; 12) יחזקאל; 13) תרי עשר; 14) דברי הימים; 15) קהלת; 16) איוב; 17) משלי; 18) רות; 19) שיר השירים; 20) קהלת; 21) קינות (איכה); 22) אחשורוש (מגלה); 23) דניאל; 24) עזרא. The Masoretic abbreviation for the three pre-eminently poetical books is accordingly, not א"מת but (in agreement with their Talmudic order) ת"אם (as also in Chajug'), *vid.*, Elia Levita, *Masoreth ha-Masoreth* p. 19. 73 (*ed. Ven.* 1538) [*ed. Ginsburg*, 1867, p. 120, 248].
- <sup>ft3</sup> In Eusebius, vi. 25: Σέφηρ Θιλλήν; Jerome (in the Preface to his translation of the Psalms *juxta Hebraicam veritatem*) points it still differently: *SEPHAR THALLIM quod interpretatur volumen hymnorum*. Accordingly at the end of the *Psalterium ex Hebraeo*, *Cod.* 19 in the Convent Library of St. Gall we find the subscription: *Sephar Tallim Quod interpretatur volumen Ymnorum explicit.*
- <sup>ft4</sup> It is an erroneous opinion of Buxtorf in his *Tiberias* and also of Jewish Masoretes, that the Masora calls the Psalter הלילא (*hallêla*). It is only the so-called *Hallel*, Psalm 113-119, that bears this name, for in the Masora on 2Sa. 22: 5, Psa. 116: 3 *a* is called הברו דהלילא (the similar passage in the Hallel) in relation to Psa. 18: 5 *a*.
- <sup>ft5</sup> Νάβλα — say Eusebius and others of the Greek Fathers — παρ' Ἑβραίοις λέγεται τὸ ψαλτήριον, ὃ δὴ μόνον τῶν μουσικῶν ὀργάνων ὀρθότατον καὶ μὴ συνεργούμενον εἰς ἤχον ἐκ τῶν κατωτάτω μερῶν, ἀλλ' ἄνωθεν ἔχων τὸν ὑψηλοῦντα χαλκόν. Augustine describes this instrument still more clearly in *Psalm 42* and elsewhere: *Psalterium istud organum dicitur quod de superiore parte habet testudinem, illud scilicet tympanum et concavum lignum cui chordae innitentes resonant, cithara vero id ipsum lignum cavum et sonorum ex inferiore parte habet*. In the cithern the strings pass over the sound-board, in the harp and lyre the vibrating body runs round the strings which are left free (without a bridge) and is either curved or

angular as in the case of the harp, or encompasses the strings as in the lyre. Harps with an upper sounding body (whether of metal or wood, viz., *lignum concavum* i.e., with a hollow and hence sonorous wood, which protects the strings like a *testudo* and serves as *tympanum*) are found both on Egyptian and on Assyrian monuments. By the *psalterium* described by Augustine, Casiodorus and Isidorus understand the *trigonum*, which is in the form of an inverted sharp-cornered triangle; but it cannot be this that is intended because the horizontal strings of this instrument are surrounded by a three-sided sounding body, so that it must be a triangular lyre. Moreover there is also a trigon belonging to the Macedonian era which is formed like a harp (vid., Weiss' *Kostümkunde*, Fig. 347) and this further tends to support our view.

- <sup>ft6</sup> I tended, says David in the Greek Psalter, at the close of Psalm 150, my father's sheep, my hands made pipes (ὄργανον = עֲוֹגָב) and my fingers put together (or: tuned) harps (ψαλτήριον = נָבֵל) cf. *Numeri Rabba* c. xv. (f. 264a) and the Targum on Amo. 6: 5.
- <sup>ft7</sup> With regard to the time of Jehoshaphat even Nic. Nonne has acknowledged this in his *Diss. de Tzippor et Deror* (Bremen 1741, 4to.) which has reference to Psa. 84: 4.
- <sup>ft8</sup> In Barhebraeus on Job and in his *Chronikon* several traditions are referred to "Asaph the Hebrew priest, the brother of Ezra the writer of the Scriptures."
- <sup>ft9</sup> In the early phraseology of the Eastern and Western churches the Psalter is simply called *David*, e.g., in Chrysostom: ἐκμαθόντες ὄλον τὸν Δαβίδ, and at the close of the Ethiopic Psalter: "David is ended."
- <sup>ft10</sup> First made known by De la Cerda in his *Adversaria sacra* (1626) and afterwards incorporated by Fabricius in his *Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T.* pp. 914ff. (1713).
- <sup>ft11</sup> The Karaite Jerocham (about 950 A.D.) says מגלות (rolls) instead of ספרים.
- <sup>ft12</sup> The Karaite Jefeth ben Eli calls them ספר אשׁרׁי , סׁ כאיל etc.
- <sup>ft13</sup> The right view has been long since perceived by Eusebius, who in his exposition of Psa. 63 (LXX 62), among other things expresses himself thus: ἐγὼ δὲ ἠγοῦμαι τῆς τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων διανοίας ἕνεκεν ἐφεξῆς ἀλλήλων τοὺς ψαλμοὺς κείσθαι κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον, οὕτως ἐν πολλοῖς ἐπιτηρήσας καὶ εὐρών, διὸ καὶ συνήφθαι αὐτοὺς ὥσανει συγγένειαν ἔχοντας καὶ ἀκολουθίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους: ἔνθεν μὴ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἐμφέρεσθαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τῆς διανοίας ἀκολουθίαν (in Montfaucon's *Collectio Nova*, t. i. p. 300). This ἀκολουθία διανοίας is however not always central and deep. The attempts of Luther (Walch, iv. col. 646ff.)

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

<sup>ft14</sup> *Opp. ed. Paris*, (1638) t. i. p. 288.

<sup>ft15</sup> Thus especially Stähelin, *Zur Einleitung in die Psalmen*, 1859, 4to.

<sup>ft16</sup> The LXX, like our Hebrew text, reckons 150 psalms, but with variations in separate instances, by making Psalm 9 and Psalm 10, and Psalm 114 and Psalm 115 into one, and in place of these, dividing Psalm 116 and Psalm 147 each into two. The combination of Psalm 9 and Psalm 10, of Psalm 114 and Psalm 115 into one has also been adopted by others; Psalm 134 and Psalm 135, but especially 1 and 2, appear here and there as one psalm. Kimchi reckons Psalm 149 by making Psalm 114 and Psalm 115 into one. The ancient Syriac version combines Psalm 114 and Psalm 115 as one, but reckons Psalm 150 by dividing Psalm 147.

<sup>ft17</sup> This is Ewald's view (which is also supported by Riehm in *Stud. u. Kirt.* 1857 S. 168). A closer insight into the characteristic peculiarity of the Elohim-psalms, which is manifest in other respects also, proves it to be superficial and erroneous.

<sup>ft18</sup> Vid., Zingerle in the *Deutsch. Morgenländ. Zeitschrift*. X. 110ff.

<sup>ft19</sup> Bellermann's *Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer* (1813) is comparatively the best on this subject even down to the present time; for Saalschütz (*Von der Form der hebr. Poesie*, 1825, and elsewhere) proceeds on the erroneous assumption that the present system of accentuation does not indicate the actual strong toned syllable of the words — by following the pronunciation of the German and Polish Jews he perceives, almost throughout, a spondaeo-dactylic rhythm (e.g., Jud. 14:18 *lûle charáshtem beegláthi*). But the traditional accentuation is proved to be a faithful continuation of the ancient proper pronunciation of the Hebrew; the trochaic pronunciation is more Syrian, and the tendency to draw the accent from the final syllable to the penult, regardless of the conditions originally governing it, is a phenomenon which belongs only to the alter period of the language (vid., Hupfeld in the *Deutsch. Morgenl. Zeitschr.* vi. 187).

<sup>ft20</sup> Abenezra calls it כפּוּל *duplicatum*, and Kimchi עֲנֵן בְּמִלּוֹת שְׁנוֹת , *duplicatio sententiae verbis variatis*; both regard it as an elegant form of expression (דֶּרֶךְ צְחוּת). Even the punctuation does not proceed from a real understanding of the rhythmical relation of the members of the verse to one another, and when it divides every verse that is marked off by *Silluk* wherever it is possible into two parts, it must not be inferred that this rhythmical relation is actually always one consisting of two members merely, although (as Hupfeld has shown in his admirable treatise on the

twofold law of the rhythm and accent, in the *D. M. Z.* 1852), wherever it exists it always consists of at least two members.

<sup>ft21</sup> Even the older critics now and then supposed that we were to make these Psa. the starting point of our enquiries. For instance, Serpilius says: “It may perhaps strike some one whether an opinion as to some of the modes of the Davidic species of verse and poetry might not be formed from his, so-to-speak, alphabetical psalms.”

<sup>ft22</sup> Even if, and this is what Hupfeld and Riehm (*Luth. Zeitschr.* 1866, S. 300) advance, the Old Testament books were divided into verses, פסוקים, even before the time of the Masoretes, still the division into verses, as we now have it and especially that of the three poetical books, is Masoretic.

<sup>ft23</sup> It was these stichs, of which the Talmud (*B. Kiddushin* 30 a) counts eight more in the Psalter than in the *Thôra*, viz., 5896, which were originally called פסוקים. Also in Augustine we find *versus* thus used like στίχος. With him the words *Populus ejus et oves pascuae ejus* are one *versus*. There is no Hebrew MS which could have formed the basis of the arrangement of the Psalms in stichs; those which we possess only break the Masoretic verse, (if the space of the line admits of it) for ease of writing into the two halves, without even regarding the general injunction in c. xiv. of the tractate *Sofrim* and that of Ben-Bileam in his *Horajoth ha-Kore*, that the breaks are to be regulated by the beginnings of the verses and the two great pausal accents. Nowhere in the MSS, which divide and break up the words most capriciously, is there to be seen any trace of the recognition of those old פסוקים being preserved. These were not merely lines determined by the space, as were chiefly also the στίχοι or ἔπη according to the number of which, the compass of Greek works was recorded, but liens determined by the sense, κῶλα (Suidas: κῶλον ὁ ἀπηρτισμένην ἔννοιαν ἔχων στίχος), as Jerome wrote his Latin translation of the Old Testament after the model of the Greek and Roman orators (e.g., the MSS of Demosthenes), *per cola et commata* i.e., in lines breaking off according to the sense.

<sup>ft24</sup> For instance Meier in his *Geschichte der poetischen Nationalliteratur der Hebräer*, S. 67, who maintains that strophes of unequal length are opposed to the simplest laws of the lyric song and melody. But the demands which melody imposes on the formation of the verse and the strophe were not so stringent among the ancients as now, and moreover — is not the sonnet a lyric poem?

<sup>ft25</sup> Vid., Zingerle in the *Dm. M. Z.* x. 123, 124.

<sup>ft26</sup> Vid., Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*, S. 92-94.

- ft27 Talmudic צֶלְצֵל. The usual Levitic orchestra of the temple of Herod consisted of 2 Nabla players, 9 Cithern players and one who struck the *Zelazal*, viz., Ben-Arza (*Erachin* 10 a, etc.; *Tamid* vii. 3), who also had the oversight of the *duchan* (*Tosiphta* to *Shekalim* ii).
- ft28 Comp. Mattheson's "*Erläutertes Selah*" 1745: Selah is a word marking a prelude, interlude, or after-piece with instruments, a sign indicating the places where the instruments play alone, in short a so-called *ritornello*.
- ft29 According to the maxim אֵין אומר שירה אלא על היין, "no one singeth except over the wine."
- ft30 *B. Rosh ha-Shana*, 31a. *Tamid* vii. 3, comp. the introduction to Psa. 24, 92 and 94.
- ft31 According to *B. Erachin* 10a the following were the customary accompaniments of the daily service: 1) 21 trumpet blasts, to as many as 48; (2) 2 nablas, to 6 at most; 2 flutes (חלילין), to 12 at most. Blowing the flute is called striking the flute, הִפָּה הַחֲלִיל. On 12 days of the year the flute was played before the altar: on the 14th of Nisan at the slaying of the Passover (at which the *Hallel* was sung), on the 14th of Ijar at the slaying of the little Passover, on the 1st and 7th days of the Passover and on the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles. The mouth-piece (אָבוּב according to the explanation of Maimonides) was not of metal but a reed (comp. Arab. *anbûb*, the blade of the reed), because it sounds more melodious. And it was never more than one flute (אָבוּב יְחִידִי, playing a solo), which continued at the end of a strain and closed it, because this produces the finest close (חֲלוּק). On the 12 days mentioned, the *Hallel* was sung with flute accompaniment. On other days, the Psalm appointed for the day was accompanied by nablas, cymbals and citherns. This passage of the treatise *Erachin* also tells who were the flute-players. On the flute-playing at the festival of water-drawing, vid., my *Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie* S. 195. In the Temple of Herod, according to *Erachin* 10b, there was also an organ. This was however not a water-organ (הַדְּרוּלִים, *hydraulis*), but a wind-organ (מִגְרָפָה) with a hundred different tones (מִיני זמר), whose thunder-like sound, according to Jerome (*Opp. ed. Mart.* v. 191), was heard *ab Jerusalem usque ad montem Oliveti et amplius*, vid., Saalschütz, *Archäol.* i. 281-284.
- ft32 This is the view of Maimonides, who distributes the 9 trumpet-blasts by which the morning sacrifice, according to *Succa* 53b, was accompanied, over the 3 pauses of the song. The hymn *Haazinu*, Deu. 32, which is called שִׁירַת הַלוֹים *par excellence*, was sung at the Sabbath *Musaph* -sacrifice — each Sabbath a division of the hymn, which was divided into six parts —



so that it began anew on every seventh Sabbath, vid., *J. Megilla*, sect. iii, *ad fin.*

<sup>ft33</sup> Vid., *B. Joma 38b* and *J. Shekalim* v. 3, comp. *Canticum Rabba* on Canticles 3: 6.

<sup>ft34</sup> Vid., *Friedr. Hommel's Psalter nach der deutschen Uebersetzung D. M. Luthers für den Gesang eingerichtet*, 1859. The Psalms are there arranged in stichs, rightly assuming it to be the original mode and the most appropriate, that antiphonal song ought to alternate not according to the verses, as at the present day in the Romish and English church, but according to the two members of the verse.

<sup>ft35</sup> Vid., *Saalschütz, Geschichte und Würdigung der Musik bei den Hebräern*, 1829, S. 121, and *Otto Strauss, Geschichtliche Betrachtung über den Psalter als Gesang- und Gebetbuch*, 1859.

<sup>ft36</sup> Vid., *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 4th years, col. 541.

<sup>ft37</sup> *Steinschneider, Jewish Literature* p. 336f.

<sup>ft38</sup> *Petermann, Ueber die Musik der Armenier* in the *Deutsche Morgenl. Zeitschrift* v. 368f.

<sup>ft39</sup> *Zunz, Synagogale Poesie*, S. 115.

<sup>ft40</sup> To this period belong 1) the *Psalterium Veronense* published by Blanchini 1740, the Greek text in Roman characters with the Italic at the side belonging to the 5th or 6th century (vid., Tischendorf's edition of the LXX, 1856, *Prolegg.* p. lviii.f.); 2) the *Psalterium Turicense purpureum* described by Breitingen 1748, Greek Text likewise of the 5th or 6th century (vid., *ibid.* p. lix.f.); 3) *Palmorum Fragmenta papyracea Londinensia* (in the British Museum), *Psa.* 10: 2-18: 6, 20:14-34: 6, of the 4th century, given in Tischendorf's *Monumenta Sacra Inedita. Nova Collectio* t. i.; 4) *Fragmenta Psalmorum Tischendorfiana* *Psa.* 141(2):7-8, 142(3):1-3, 144(5):7-13, of the 5th or 4th century in the *Monumenta* t. ii. There still remain unused to the present time 1) the *Psalterium Graeco-Latinum* of the library at St. Gall, *Cod.* 17 in 4to, Greek text in uncial characters with the Latin at the side; 2) *Psalterium Gallico-Romano-Hebraico-Graecum* of the year 909, *Cod.* 230 in the public library at Bamberg (vid., a description of this MS by Schönfelder in the *Serapeum*, 1865, No. 21) written by Solomon, abbot of St. Gall and bishop of Constance (d. 920), and brought to Bamberg by the emperor Henry II (d. 1024), who had received it as a gift when in St. Gall; as regards the criticism of the text of the LXX it is of like importance with the *Veronense* which it resembles.

<sup>ft41</sup> Vid., *Tosefta* to *Sabb.* xvi. *Jer. Sabb.* xiv. § 1, *Bab. Sabb.* 115a, *Sofrim* v., 15.

- <sup>ft42</sup> Vid., Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, S. 166f.
- <sup>ft43</sup> Although more recently we are told, Hai Gaon (in Babylonia) when he came upon a difficult passage in his Academical lectures on the Psalms enquired of the patriarch of the Eastern church how he interpreted it, vid., Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 125f.
- <sup>ft44</sup> The fragments of the translation of the Ps., which are cited under the name ὁ Σύρος, Dathe has also there collected in his preface.
- <sup>ft45</sup> Thus e.g., Montfaucon was only able to make use of the Psalter-MS *Cod. Vat.* 754 for 16 Psalms; Adler has compared it to the end and found in it valuable Hexapla fragments (vid., *Repert. für Bibl. u. Morgenl. Lit.* xiv. S. 183f.). The Psalm-commentary of Barhebraeus and the *Psalterium Mediolanense* have also been begun to be worked with this object; but as yet, not the Syriac Psalter of the Medici library mentioned by Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum* i. 240 and supposed to be based upon the *Quinta*.
- <sup>ft46</sup> Comp. the Athanasian synopsis in Montfaucon, *Hexapla* t. 1 p. 59 and the contribution from a Syriac MS in the *Repertorium für Bibl. u. Morgenl. Lit.* *ib.* (1784) S. 48f.
- <sup>ft47</sup> *Illud breviter admoneo* — says Jerome, Ep. cvi. *ad Sunniam et Fretelam — ut sciatis, aliam esse editionem, quam Origenes et Caesareensis Eusebius omnesque Graeciae tractatores Κοινήν, id est, Communem appellant atque Vulgatam et a plerisque nunc Λουκιανός dicitur; aliam Septuaginta Interpretum, quae in Ἐξαπλοῖς codicibus reperitur et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est et Hierosolymae atque in Orientis ecclesiis decantatur.*
- <sup>ft48</sup> The following Greek expositors of the Psalms are mentioned there: 1) Origen, 2) Eusebius of Caesarea, 3) Theodore of Heraclea (the *Anonymus* in Corderius' *Catena*), 4) Asterius of Scythopolis, 5) Apollinaris (Apolinarios) of Laodicea, 6) Didymus of Alexandria. Then the following Latin expositors: 1) Hilary of Poitiers, who translated or rather remodelled Origen's Homilies on the Psalms (Jerome himself says of him, *Ep.* lvii. *ad Pammach.: captivos sensus in suam linguam victoris jure transposuit*), 2) Eusebius of Vercelli, translator of the commentary of Eusebius of Caesarea, and 3) Ambrose, who was partly dependent upon Origen. Of Apollinaris the elder, we have a *Μετάφρασις τοῦ ψαλτῆρος διὰ στίχων ἠρωϊκῶν* preserved to us. He has also translated the Pentateuch and other Old Testament books into heroic verse.
- <sup>ft49</sup> Vid., the characteristics of this commentary in Reinkens, *Hilarius von Poitiers* (1864) S. 291-308.

- <sup>ft50</sup> In the Talmud R. Meir, *Pesachim* 117 *a*, adopts the view that David is the author of all the Ps.: כל תשבחות שבספר תהלים כולן דוד אמרן , which in *Bathra* 14*b* ten authors are supposed: על ידי ערשה זקנים , דוד כתב ספר תהלים , vid., on this Midrash to Cant. 4: 4 and Eccl. 7:19. In the former passage לתלפיות is explained as an emblematic name of the Psalter: ספר שאמרוהו לו פיות הרבה , the book of David, to which the mouths of many have contributed. And there are two modern commentaries, viz., by Klauss, 1832, and Randegger, 1841, which are written with the design of proving all the Psalms to be Davidic.
- <sup>ft51</sup> This information is found in the modern Greek edition of Euthemius' Commentary on the *Psa.* by Nicodemos the Agiorite (2 vols. Constantinople 1819-21), which also contains extracts from this catena of Nicetas Serronius.
- <sup>ft52</sup> Vid., besides the essay by Otto Strauss, already mentioned: Armknecht, *Die heilige Psalmodie oder der psalmodirende König David und die singende Urkirche*, 1855; and W. von Gülick, *Das Psalterium nach seinem Hauptinhalte in seiner wissenschaftlichen und praktischen Bedeutung* (a Catholic prize essay) 1858; partly also Rudelbach's *Hymnologische Studien* in the *Luther. Zeitschrift* 1855, 4, 1856, 2. and especially no penitential psalm-singing Zöckler's *Geschichte der Askese* (1863) S. 256-264.
- <sup>ft53</sup> It is to be found in MS partly in Paris, partly in St. Petersburg: the former having been brought thither from Egypt by Munk in 1841 and the latter by Tischendorf in 1853.
- <sup>ft54</sup> But on some parts of the Talmud, e.g., the tractate *Maccoth*, we have not any commentary by Rashi.
- <sup>ft55</sup> The Swedish hymns taken from the Psalms have been recently remodelled for congregational use and augmented by Runeberg (Oerebro 1858).
- <sup>ft56</sup> Vid., Félix Bovet, Les Psaumes de Marot et de Bèze, in the Lausanne magazine, *Le Chrétien Evangélique*, 1866, No. 4.
- <sup>ft57</sup> Vid., examples in Bonnet's life of Olympia Morata. Germ. transl. by Merschmann 1860 S. 131-135.
- <sup>ft58</sup> Vid., Wilhelm Thilo, *Melanchthon im Dienste an heil. Schrift* (Berlin, 1859), S. 28.
- <sup>ft59</sup> His Psalms (to which Veit Dietrich wrote notes) passed through forty editions in seventy years.
- <sup>ft60</sup> Vid., his Life by Heinr. Jerz (1863), 111-117.

- <sup>ft61</sup> Cf. Kurtz, *Zur Theologie der Psalmen, III: The self-righteousness of the psalmists*, in the *Dorpater Zeitschrift* 1865 S. 352-358: “The Old Testament righteousness of faith, represented by the *evangelium visibile* of the sacrificial worship, had not as yet the fundamental and primary, helpful position assigned to it, especially by Paul, in the New Testament, but only a more secondary position; justification is conceived not as a condition of the sanctification which is to be striven after, but as a supplementing of that which is wanting in the sanctification thus defectively striven after.
- <sup>ft62</sup> Cf. Kurtz, *ibid.* IV: *The imprecatory Psalms*, *ibid.* S. 359-372 and our discussions in the introductions to *Psa.* 35 and 109, which belong to this class.
- <sup>ft63</sup> *Vid.*, Kurtz, *ibid.* II: *The doctrine of retribution in the Psalms*, *ibid.* S. 316-352.
- <sup>ft64</sup> *Vid.*, Zeuss, *Grammatica Celtica* (1853) ii. 1065. The Commentary of Columba on the Psalms, with Irish explanations, and coming from the monastery of Bobbio, is among the treasures of the Ambrosiana.
- <sup>ft65</sup> Nevertheless we have not to compare רעש, רגש, רעש, but the Arabic in the two roots Arab. *rs'* and *rsg* shows for רשע the primary notion to be slack, loose, in opposition to Arab. *ṣdq*, צדק to be hard, firm, tight; as Arab. *rumḥun ṣadqun*, i.e., according to the *Kamus Arab. rmḥ ṣlb mūn mstwin*, a hard, firm and straight spear. We too transfer the idea of being lax and loose to the province of ethics: the difference is only one of degree. The same two primary notions are also opposed to one another in speaking of the intellect: Arab. *ḥakuma*, wise, prop. thick, firm, stout, solid, and Arab. *sachufa*, foolish, simple, prop. thin, loose, without stay, like a bad piece of weaving, *vid.*, Fleischer's translation of Samachschari's *Golden Necklace* pp. 26 and 27 Anm. 76. Thus רשע means the loose man and indeed as a moral-religious notion loose from God, godless [comp. *Bibl. Psychol.* p. 189. transl.].
- <sup>ft66</sup> By the *Shebâ* stands *Metheg* (*Gaja*), as it does wherever a word, with *Shebâ* in the first syllable, has *Olewejored*, *Rebia magnum*, or *Dechî* without a conjunctive preceding, in case at least one vowel and no *Metheg* — except perhaps that standing before *Shebâ compos.* — lies between the *Shebâ* and the tone, e.g., נְנִיקָה (with *Dechî*) *Psa.* 2: 3, וְאֶעֱנֶהוּ *Psa.* 91:15 and the like. The intonation of the accent is said in these instances to begin, by anticipation, with the fugitive *ě*.
- <sup>ft67</sup> Even the *Jalkut* on the Psalms, § 620, wavers in the explanation of נִסְכָּתִי between אֲמַשְׁחֶתִּיהָ I have anointed him, (after *Dan.* 10: 3), אֲתִיכָתִיהָ (I have cast him (after *Exo.* 32: 4 and freq.), and גִּדְלָתִיו I have made him

great (after Mic. 5: 4). Aquila, by rendering it *καὶ ἑδίασάμην* (from *διάζεσθαι* = *ὑφαίνειν*), adds a fourth possible rendering. A fifth is *נָסַךְ* to purify, consecrate (Hitz.), which does not exist, for the Arabic *nasaka* obtains this meaning from the primary signification of cleansing by flooding with water (e.g., washing away the briny elements of a field). Also in Pro. 8:23 *נִסְכַּחְתִּי* means I am cast = placed.

<sup>ft68</sup> We may observe here, in general, that this *Gaja* (*Metheg*) which draws the *Shebâ* into the intonation is placed even beside words with the lesser distinctives *Zinnor* and *Rebia parvum* only by the Masorete *Ben-Naphtali*, not by *Ben-Asher* (both about 950 A.D.). This is a point which has not been observed throughout even in Baer's edition of the Psalter so that consequently e.g., in Psa. 5:11 it is to be written *אֱלֹהִים*; in Psa. 6: 2 on the other hand (with *Dechi*) *יְהוָה*, not *יְהוֹה*.

<sup>ft69</sup> Even in pause here *אֶתָּה* remains without a lengthened *ā* (*Psalter* ii. 468), but the word is become *Milel*, while out of pause, according to Ben-Asher, it is *Milra*; but even out of pause (as in Psa. 89:10, 12; 90: 2) it is accented on the *penult.* by Ben-Naphtali. The *Athnach* of the books *הַאֵם* (Ps., Job, Prov.), corresponding to the *Zakeph* of the 21 other books, has only a half pausal power, and as a rule none at all where it follows *Olewejored*, cf. Psa. 9: 7; 14: 4; 25: 7; 27: 4; 31:14; 35:15, etc. (Baer, *Thorath Emeth* p. 37).

<sup>ft70</sup> The changeable *i* goes back either to a primary form *יָרַשׁ, יָרַשׁ, שָׂאֵל*, or it originates directly from *Pathach*; forms like *יְרִשׁוּהָ* and *שָׂאֵלָהּ* favour the former, *ē* in a closed syllable generally going over into *Segol* favours the latter.

<sup>ft71</sup> Apart from the fact of *בַּר* not having the article, its indefiniteness comes under the point of view of that which, because it combines with it the idea of the majestic, great, and terrible, is called by the Arabian grammarians Arab. *I-tnkîr It ġim* or *ltkîr* or *lthwîl*; by the boundlessness which lies in it it challenges the imagination to magnify the notion which it thus expresses. An Arabic expositor would here (as in v. 7 above) render it "Kiss a son and such a son!" (vid., *Ibn Hishâm* in De Sacy's *Anthol. Grammat.* p. 85, where it is to be translated *hic est vir, qualis vir!*). Examples which support this doctrine are *בְּיַד* Isa. 28: 2 by a hand, viz., God's almighty hand which is the hand of hands, and Isa. 31: 8 *מִפְּנֵי־חֶרֶב* before a sword, viz., the divine sword which brooks no opposing weapon.

<sup>ft72</sup> On this vid., Scacchi *Myrothecium*, to. iii. (1637) c. 35.

- <sup>ft73</sup> On old names of towns, which show this ancient **חֶסֶן**. Wetzstein's remark on Job. 24: 8 [*Comm. on Job*, en loc.]. The Arabic still has *hsy* in the reference of the primary meaning to water which, sucked in and hidden, flows under the sand and only comes to sight on digging. The rocky bottom on which it collects beneath the surface of the sand and by which it is prevented from oozing away or drying up is called Arab. *ḥasâ* or *ḥisâ* a hiding-place or place of protection, and a fountain dug there is called Arab. *ḥyn 'l-ḥy*.
- <sup>ft74</sup> On the explanations of **διάψαλμα** in the Fathers and the old lexicographers. Vid., Suicer's *Thes. Eccl.* and Augusti's *Christl. Archäologie*, Th. ii.
- <sup>ft75</sup> Böttcher, *Collectanea* pp. 166f., also adopts the view, that **קוּלִי**, **פִּי**, **נַפְשִׁי** are each *appositum vicarium subjecti* and therefore *nomin.* in such passages. But 1) the fact that **אֵל** never stands beside them is explained by the consideration that it is not suited to an adverbial collateral definition. And 2) that elsewhere the same notions appear as direct subjects, just as 3) that elsewhere they alternate with the verbal subject-notion in the parallel member of the verse (Psa. 130: 5, Pro. 8: 4) — these last two admit of no inference. The controverted question of the syntax is, moreover, an old one and has been treated of at length by Kimchi in his *Book of Roots* s. r. **אוּדָה**.
- <sup>ft76</sup> Vid., Redslob in his treatise: *Die Integrität der Stelle Hos.* vii. 4-10 in *Frage gestellt* S. 7.
- <sup>ft77</sup> Referred to the other David, v. 6 has become an Easter-morning call, vid., Val. Herberger's *Paradies-Blümlein aus dem Lustgarten der Psalmen* (Neue Ausg. 1857) S. 25.
- <sup>ft78</sup> This is the traditional reason of the accentuation *shub h*, *ḵûm h*, *shith h* before **יְהוָה**: it is intended to prevent the one or other of the two gutturals being swallowed up (**שְׁלֹא יבולעו**) by too rapid speaking. Hence it is that the same thing takes place even when another word, not the name of God, follows, if it begins with **א** or the like, and is closely connected with it by meaning and accentuation: e.g., Jud. 4:18 **סוּרְדָה** twice *Milra* before **א**; Psa. 57: 9 **עוֹרָה**, *Milra* before **ה**; **לְמָה**, *Milra* before **ה**; Exo. 5:22; **נָחָה** Isa. 11: 2, and **הִבְאֵתָה** Gen. 26:10, *Milra* before **ע**; and the following fact favours it, viz., that for a similar reason *Pasek* is placed where two ׀ would come together, e.g., Gen. 21:14 *Adonaj jir'eh* with the stroke of separation between the two words, cf. Exo. 15:18, Pro. 8:21. The fact that in Jer. 40: 5, **יִשְׁבָּה** remains *Milel*, is accounted for by its being separated from the following **אֶל-גְּדֹלְיָהוּ** by *Pazer*; a real exception, however (*Michlol* 112 b), — and not as Norzi from misapprehension observes, a

controverted one, — is **שְׁבָה**, *Milel* before **הַעִיר** 2Sa. 15:27, but it is by no means sufficient to oppose the purely orthophonic (not rhythmical) ground of this *ultima* -accentuation. Even the semi-guttural **ר** sometimes has a like influence over the tone: *rîbáh rîbî* 43: 1; Psa. 119:154.

<sup>ft79</sup> Thus e.g., Eusebius: εἰς τὸ τέλος ὡς ἂν μακροῖς ὕστερον χρόνοις ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος μελλόντων πληροῦσθαι, and Theodoret: σημαίνει τὸ εἰς τὸ τέλος ὅτι μακροῖς ὕστερον χρόνοις πληρωθήσεται τὰ προφητευόμενα, with which accords *Pesachim* 117a **ונגון לעתיד לבא** **ניצוה**, i.e., Psalms with **למנצח** and **בנגינות** refer to the last days. Gregory of Nyssa combines the different translations by rendering: εἰς τέλος, ὅπερ ἔστιν ἡ νίκη. Ewald's view, that **τέλος** in this formula means consecration, celebration, worship, is improbable; in this signification it is not a Septuagint word.

<sup>ft80</sup> The *Metheg* which stands in the second syllable before the tone stands by the *Shebâ*, in the metrical books, if this syllable is the first in a word marked with a greater distinctive without any conjunctive preceding it, and beginning with *Shebâ*; it is, therefore, not **נסה-עלינו** but **נסה-עלינו**, cf. Psa. 51: 2 **בבוא**, Psa. 69:28 **תנה**, Psa. 81: 3 **שאור**, Psa. 116:17 **לך**, Psa. 119:175 **תחי**. The reason and object are the same as stated in note p. \*84 *supra*.

<sup>ft81</sup> On the use of the flute in the second Temple, vid., Introduction p. 19.

<sup>ft81a</sup> On the rule, according to which here, as in **שֹׁרְרִי** v. 9 and the like, a simple *Shebâ mobile* goes over into *Chateph pathach* with *Gaja* preceding it, vid., the observations on giving a faithful representation of the O.T. text according to the Masora in the *Luther Zeitschr.* 1863. S. 411. The Babylonian Ben-Naphtali (about 940) prefers the simple *Shebâ* in such cases, as also in others; Ben-Asher of the school of Tiberias, whom the Masora follows, and whom consequently our Masoretic text ought to follow, prefers the *Chateph*, vid., *Psalter* ii. 460-467.

<sup>ft82</sup> Thus, in particular, Stähelin, *Zur Kritik der Psalmen* in the *Deutsch. Morgenl. Zeitschr.* vi. (1852) S. 108 and *Zur Einleitung in die Psalmen*. An academical programme, 1859. 4to.

<sup>ft83</sup> Vid., C. H. Graf, *Commentation de templo Silonensi ad illustrandum locum Jud.* xviii. 30, 31, (1855, 4to.), in which he seeks to prove that the sanctuary in Shilo was a temple to Jahve that lasted until the dissolution of the kingdom of Israel.

<sup>ft84</sup> The Turkish *Kamus* says: “[Arab.] *byt* is a house (Turk. *ew*) in the signification of *châne* (Persic the same), whether it be made of hair, therefore a tent, or built of stone and tiles.” And further on: “*Beit* originally

signified a place specially designed for persons to retire to at night [from Arab. *bâta* he has passed the night, if it does not perhaps come from the בּוֹא, Arab. *bayya*, which stands next to it in this passage, vid., *Job* at 29:15-17]; but later on the meaning was extended and the special reference to the night time was lost.” Even at the present day the Beduin does not call his tent *ahl*, but always *bêt* and in fact *bêt sha‘r* (בֵּית שְׂעָר), the modern expression for the older *bêt wabar* (hair-house).

- <sup>ft85</sup> Provided he is the author of *I sette Salmi Penitenziali trasportati alla volgar poesia*, vid., Dante Alighieri’s Lyric poems, translated and annotated by Kannegiesser and Witte (1842) i. 203f., ii. 208f.
- <sup>ft86</sup> We have translated Dr. Delitzsch’s word *erschrecht* literally — the *vexed* of the Authorized Version seems hardly equal to the meaning.
- <sup>ft87</sup> The form corresponds to the Arabic form *fī ‘âlun*, which, though originally a verbal abstract, has carried over the passive meaning into the province of the concrete, e.g., *kitâb* = *maktûb* and *ilâh*, אֱלֹהִים = *ma‘lûh* = *ma‘bûd* (the feared, revered One).
- <sup>ft88</sup> An adumbration of this relationship of Christianity to the religion of the Old Testament is the relationship of Islam to the religion of the Arab wandering tribes, which is called the “religion of Abraham” (*Din Ibrâhim*), and knows no life after death; while Islam has taken from the later Judaism and from Christianity the hope of a resurrection and heavenly blessedness.
- <sup>ft89</sup> Reuchlin in his grammatical analysis of the seven Penitential Psalms, which he published in 1512 after his *Ll. III de Rudimentis Hebraicis* (1506), explains it thus: עֲשָׂשָׁה *Verminavit. Sic a vermibus dictum qui turbant res claras puras et nitidas*, and in the *Rudim.* p. 412: *Turbatus est a furore oculus meus, corrosus et obfuscatus, quasi vitro laternae obductus*.
- <sup>ft90</sup> In Arabic צִיר is the word for a step-mother as the oppressor of the step-children; and צַרָּר a concubine as the oppressor of her rival.
- <sup>ft91</sup> Viz. 7, 59, 56, 34, 52, 57, 142, 54 (belonging to the time of the persecution under Saul), 3, 63 (to the persecution under Absalom), 51 (David’s adultery), 60 (the Syro-Ammonitish war).
- <sup>ft92</sup> The *Dag.* is of the same kind as the *Dag.* in נְמָלִים among nouns; Arabic popular dialect *f<sup>2</sup>rassî* (my horse), vid., Wetzstein’s *Inschriften* S. 366.
- <sup>ft93</sup> Pinsker’s view, that the pointing יְרֵדִי is designed to leave the reader at liberty to choose between the reading יְרֵדִי and יִרְדֵּי, cannot be supported. There are no safe examples for the supposition that the variations of tradition found expression in this way.
- <sup>ft94</sup> Cf. *Oehler’s art. Name* in Herzog’s *Real-Encyclopädie*.



- ft95 In the first Sidonian inscription אָדִיר occurs as a by-name of the heavens (שָׁמַם אָדָרִים).
- ft96 According to this derivation עולל (cf. Beduin עאלול, *‘âlûl* a young ox) is related to תַּעֲלוּל; whereas עול as a synonym of יונק signifies one who is supported, sustained. For the radical signification of עיל according to the Arabic *‘âl, fut. o.* is “to weigh heavy, to be heavy, to lie upon; to have anything incumbent upon one’s self, to carry, support, preserve,” whence *‘ajjil* the maintained child of the house, and *‘ajjila* (Damascene *‘êla*) he who is dependent upon one for support and the family depending upon the paterfamilias for sustenance. Neither Arab. *‘âl, fut. o.*, nor *gâl, fut. i.* usually applied to a pregnant woman who still suckles, has the direct signification to suckle. Moreover, the demon *Ghul* does not receive its name from swallowing up or sucking out (Ges.), but from destroying (Arab. *gâl, fut. o.*).
- ft97 This observation is due to Pastor Frohnmeyer of Württemberg.
- ft98 The *Psalterium Brunonis* (ed. by Cochleus, 1533) overlooks Ps. 9, 10, reckoning only seven alphabetical Psalms.
- ft99 Also Pro. 8:16 is probably to be read כָּל-שִׁפְטֵי צְדָקָה, with Norzi, according to the Targum, Syriac version, and old Codices; at any rate this is an old various reading, and one in accordance with the sense, side by side with כָּל-שִׁפְטֵי אֲרָץ.
- ft100 According to the Masora לָמָה without *Dag.* is always *Milra* with the single exception of Job. 7:20, and יָמָה with *Dag.* is *Milel*; but, when the following closely connected word begins with one of the letters אהע it becomes *Milra*, with five exceptions, viz., Ps. 49: 6, 1Sa. 28:15, 2Sa. 14:31 (three instances in which the guttural of the second word has the vowel *i*), and 2Sa. 2:22, and Jer. 15:18. In the Babylonian system of pointing, לָמָה is always written without *Dag.* and with the accent on the penultimate, vid., Pinsker, *Einleitung in das Babylonisch-hebräischce Punktationssystem*, S. 182-184.
- ft101 *Pasek* stands between נֶאֱסָר and יְהוָה, because to blaspheme God is a terrible thought and not to be spoken of without hesitancy, cf. the *Pasek* in Ps. 74:18; 89:52, Isa. 37:24 (2Ki. 19:23).
- ft102 Cf. Samachschari’s *Golden Necklaces*, Proverb 67, which Fleischer translates: “Which is blacker: the plumage of the raven, which is black as coal, or thy life, O stranger among strangers?” The word “blacker” is here expressed by Arab. *aḥlaku*, just as the verb Arab. *ḥalika*, with its infinitives *ḥalak* or *ḥulkat* and its derivatives is applied to sorrow and misery.

- ft103 *B. Berachoth* 31a: the man who prays must direct his heart steadfastly towards God (יִכּוֹן לְבוֹ לַשָּׁמַיִם).
- ft104 *Zeitschrift für Allgem. Erdkunde* xviii. (1865) 1, S. 30.
- ft105 According to the above rendering: “Flee ye to your mountain, a bird” it would require to be accented נודו הרכם צפּוּ (as a transformation from נודו הרכם צפּוּר vid., Baer’s *Accentssystem* XVIII. 2). The interpunction as we have it, נודו הרכם צפּוּר, harmonises with the interpretation of Varenius as of Löb Spira (*Pentateuch-Comm.* 1815): *Fugite (o socii Davidis), mons vester (h. e. praesidium vestrum, Psa. 30: 8, cui innitimini) est avis errans.*
- ft106 The Aryan root *man* to remain, abide (Neo-Persic *mānden*), also takes a similar course, signifying usually “to continue in any course, wait, hope.” So the old Persic *man*, Zend *upaman*, cf. μένειν with its derivatives which are applied in several ways in the New Testament to characterise πιστις.
- ft107 On this word with reference to this passage of the Psalm vid., Steinschneider’s *Hebr. Bibliographie* 1861, S. 83.
- ft108 Cf. Plüschke’s Monograph on the Milanese *Psalterium Syriacum*, 1835, p. 28-39.
- ft109 In *the Arabic jām ‘Illh* is “one under the protection of God, dwelling as it were in the fortress of God” vid., Fleischer’s *Samachschari*, S. 1, Anm. 1.
- ft110 Vid., the rule for this orthophonic *Dag.* in the *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1863, S. 413.
- ft111 *The usual accentuation בעיניו נמאס / נבּוּה forcibly separates בעיניו from נבּוּה to which according to its position it belongs. And Heidenheim’s accentuation נמאס בעיניו נבּוּה is to be rejected on accentuological grounds, because of two like distinctives the second has always a less distinctive value than the first. We are consequently only left to the one given above. The MSS vary.*
- ft112 In modern Jewish poetry מכתם is actually the name for the epigram.
- ft113 The Masora observes בִּי גִרְשֵׁין בַּסְפָּרָא, i.e., twice in the Psalter שְׁמֵרָה is in the imperative, the *ō* being displaced by *Gaja* (*Metheg*) and changed into *ā*, vid., Baer, *Torath Emeth* p. 22f. In spite of this the grammarians are not agreed as to the pronunciation of the imperative and infinitive forms when so pointed. Luzzatto, like Lonzano, reads it *shōm<sup>ē</sup>reni*.
- ft114 Pinsker’s view (*Einleit.* S. 100-102), who considers פִּאֲלָתָּהּ to have sprung from פִּלְלָתָּהּ as the primary form of the 1 pers. sing., from which then came

פּאַלְתִּי and later still פּאַלְתִּי, is untenable according to the history of the language.

- ft115 Approved by Kamphausen and by the critic in the *Liter. Blatt* of the *Allgem. Kirchen-Zeitung* 1864 S. 107.
- ft116 The Arabic Lexicographers are only acquainted with a noun *wamka*, breadth (*amplitudo*), but not with the verb. And even the noun does not belong to the universal and classical language. But at the present day Arab. 'l-wamk (pronounced *wumk*), breadth, and *wamik* are in common use in Damascus; and it is only the verb that is shunned in the better conversational style. — Wetzstein.
- ft117 It is scarcely possible for two words to be more nearly identical than גְּזָרָה and κληρος. The latter, usually derived from κλάω (a piece broken off), is derived from κέλεσθαι (a determining of the divine will) in Döderlein's *Homer. Glossar*, iii. 124. But perhaps it is one word with גּוֹרָר. Moreover κληρος signifies 1) the sign by which anything whatever falls to one among a number of persons in conformity with the decision of chance or of the divine will, a pebble, potsherd, or the like. So in Homer, *Il.* iii. 316, vii. 175, xxiii. 351, *Od.* x. 206, where casting lots is described with the expression κληρος. 2) The object that falls to any one by lot, *patrimonium*, e.g., *Od.* xiv. 64, *Il.* xv. 498, οἶκος καὶ κληρος, especially of lands. 3) an inheritance without the notion of the lot, and even without any thought of inheriting, absolutely: a settled, landed property. It is the regular expression for the allotments of land assigned to colonists (κληροῦχοι).
- ft118 Most MSS and the best, which have no distinction of *Kerî* and *Chethîb* here, read קְרִיבָה, as also the *Biblia Ven.* 1521, the Spanish Polyglott and other older printed copies. Those MSS which give קְרִיבָה (without any *Kerî*), on the other hand, scarcely come under consideration.
- ft119 The word is pointed אֲנִי, in correct texts, as אֲנִי always is when it has *Munach* and *Dechî* follows, e.g., also 116:16. This *Gaja* demands an emphatic intonation of the secondary word in its relation to the principal word (which here is קְרִיבָה).
- ft120 Cognate in meaning to חֹסֶה בּ are Arab. 'sttr b and tadarrâ b, e.g., Arab. tḍrâ b- l-ḥâṭ mn l-rîḥ he shelters (hides) himself by the wall from the wind, or Arab. bâl ḍât mn l-brd, by a fire against the cold, and Arab. âḍ, which is often applied in like manner to God's protection. Thus, e.g., (according to *Bochârî's Sunna*) a woman, whom Muhammed wanted to seize, cried out: Arab. a ûdu b- llh mnk, I place myself under God's protection against thee, and he replied: Arab. uḍti bi-ma âḍin, thou hast taken refuge in an (inaccessible) *asylum* (cf. *Job*, i. 310 n. and ii. 22 n. 2).

<sup>ft121</sup> Vid., Geiger, *Urschrift und Ueberstezungen der Bibel*, S. 324.

<sup>ft122</sup> To this Hofmann, *loc. cit.* S. 496, replies as follows: “We do not find that faith indulges in such boldness elsewhere, or that the believing ones cherish hopes which are based on such insecure grounds.” But the word of God is surely no insecure ground, and to draw bold conclusions from that which is intimated only from afar, was indeed, even in many other respects (for instance, respecting the incarnation, and respecting the abrogation of the ceremonial law), the province of the Old Testament faith.

<sup>ft123</sup> *Neshwân* defines thus: Arab. ‘*l-sal*’ is a cutting in a mountain after the manner of a gorge; and *Jâkût*, who cites a number of places that are so called: a wide plain (Arab. *fđ*) enclosed by steep rocks, which is reached through a narrow pass (Arab. *šāb*), but can only be descended on foot. Accordingly, in סַלְעִי the idea of a safe (and comfortable) hiding-place preponderates; in צוֹרִי that of firm ground and inaccessibility. The one figure calls to mind the (well-watered) Edomitish סַלְע surrounded with precipitous rocks, Isa. 16: 1; 42:11, the Πέτρα described by Strabo, xvi. 4, 21; the other calls to mind the Phoenician rocky island צוֹר, *Šûr* (Tyre), the refuge in the sea.

<sup>ft124</sup> In Arabic *maşâdun* signifies (1) a high hill (a signification that is wanting in Freytag), (2) the summit of a mountain, and according to the original lexicons it belongs to the root Arab. *maşada*, which in outward appearance is supported by the synonymous forms Arab. *maşadun* and *maşdun*, as also by their plurals Arab. *amşidatun* and *muşdânun*, wince these can only be properly formed from those singulars on the assumption of the *m* being part of the root. Nevertheless, since the meanings of Arab. *maşada* all distinctly point to its being formed from the root Arab. *mş* contained in the reduplicated stem Arab. *maşşa*, to suck, but the meanings of Arab. *maşâdun*, *maşadun*, and *maşdun* do not admit of their being referred to it, and moreover there are instances in which original *nn. loci* from *vv. med.* Arab. *w* and *y* admit of the prefixed *m* being treated as the first radical through forgetfulness or disregard of their derivation, and with the retention of its from secondary roots (as Arab. *makana*, *madana*, *maşşara*), it is highly probable that in *maşâd*, *maşad* and *maşd* we have an original מֶצֶד, מְצוֹדָה, מְצוֹדָה. These Hebrew words, however, are to be referred to a צוֹר in the signification to look out, therefore properly *specula*. — Fleischer.

<sup>ft125</sup> Rab Dimi, *B. Taanith* 10a, for the elucidation of the passage quotes a Palestine proverb: נהור ענני זעירין מוהי חשוך ענני סגייין מוהי i.e., if the clouds are transparent they will yield but little water, if they are dark they will yield a quantity.

- ft<sup>126</sup> In like manner *Metheg* is placed beside the  $\bar{e}$  of the final closed syllable that has lost the tone in  $\text{חָפֵץ}$  Psa. 22: 9,  $\text{וְתַחֲלִיל}$  Psa. 90: 2, vid., *Isaiah* S. 594 note.
- ft<sup>127</sup> In the language of the Beduins  $\text{ḵôm}$  is war, feud, and  $\text{ḵômānî}$  (denominative from  $\text{ḵôm}$ ) my enemy (*hostis*);  $\text{ḵôm}$  also has the signification of a collective of  $\text{ḵômānî}$ , and one can equally well say: *entum wajjânâ ḵôm*, you and we are enemies, and: *bênâtnâ ḵôm*, there is war between us.
- ft<sup>128</sup> Vid., Baer's *Accentsystem* xv., and *Thorath Emeth* iii. 2 together with S. 44, Anm.
- ft<sup>129</sup> Midrash and Talmud explain it according to the Aramaic "a straining of the clouds," inasmuch as the clouds, like a sieve, let the drops trickle down to the earth, falling close upon each other and yet separately (*B. Taanîth* 9b:  $\text{מַחְשְׁרוֹת מִים עַל-גְּבִי קִרְקַע}$ ). Kimchi combines  $\text{חֶשֶׁר}$  with  $\text{קֶשֶׁר}$ . But the ancient Arabic  $\text{ḥšr}$  is the right key to the word. The root of  $\text{חֶשֶׁר}$  and  $\text{חֶשְׁבָּה}$  is perhaps the same (cf. Exo. 10:21).
- ft<sup>130</sup> In the present instance  $\text{מֵעוֹז חִילִי}$ , like  $\text{מִחֶסֶה עֲוִי}$  in 71: 7 (cf. Eze. 16:27; 18: 7, and perhaps Hab. 3: 8) would not be inadmissible, although in the other mode of expression greater prominence is given to the fact of its being provided and granted by God. But in cases like the following it would be absolutely inadmissible to append the suffix to the *nom. rectum*, viz.,  $\text{שְׁנֵאֵי שְׂקָר}$ , Psa. 38:20;  $\text{בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב}$  my covenant with Jacob, Lev. 26:42;  $\text{מִדּוֹ בֵד}$  his garment of linen, Lev. 6: 3;  $\text{בְּתָבָם הַמְתִּיחִים}$  their ancestral register, Ezr. 2:62; and it is probable that this transference of the pronominal suffix to the *nom. regens* originated in instances like these, where it was a logical necessary and then became transferred to the *syntax ornata*. At the same time it is clear from this, that in cases like  $\text{שְׁנֵאֵי שְׂקָר}$ , and consequently also  $\text{שְׁנֵאֵי חָנֶם}$ , the second notion is not conceived as an accusative of more precise definition, but as a governed genitive.
- ft<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.* S. 133, Z. 13 is, with Fleischer, to be rendered: ye have made (Arab. *trktm*) my milk camels restless, i.e., caused them to be such, by having stolen them and driven them away so that they now yearn after home and their young ones.
- ft<sup>132</sup> In the Arab proverb, "no sin which is persisted in is small, no sin great for which forgiveness is sought of God," Arab. *sgîrt*, directly means a little and Arab. *kbîrt*, a great sin, vid., *Allgem. Literar. Zeitschr.* 1844, No. 46, p. 363.

- ft133 The *Gaja* with **מִפְשַׁע רַב** is intended in this instance, where **מִפְשַׁע רַב** are to be read in close connection, to secure distinctness of pronunciation for the unaccented **ע**, as e.g., is also the case in Psa. 78:13, **בָּקַע יָם** (*bāqa ʿjām*).
- ft134 This, though not occurring in the Old Testament, is the principal form of the plural, which, as even David Kimchi recognises in his *Lexicon*, points to a verb **מָנַח** (just as **שְׂפָחוֹת**, **גְּבַעוֹת**, **שְׂמֵלוֹת** point to **שָׂמַל**, **גְּבַע**, **שָׂפַח**); whereas other old grammarians supposed **נָחַח** to be the root, and were puzzled with the traditional pronunciation *m<sup>e</sup>nachôth*, but without reason.
- ft135 There is a determination of the time to this effect, which is found both in the Jerusalem and in the Babylonian Talmud “from the hind of the morning’s dawn till the east is lighted up.” In *Jer. Berachoth, ad init.*, it is explained: **כַּמִּין תַּרְתִּי קַרְנֵי דְנְהוּרָא סַלְקִין מִמְדִּינְחָא וּמְנַהֲרִין לְעֵלְמָא** , **אִילַת הַשְּׁחַר** , “like two horns of light, rising from the east and filling the world with light.”
- ft136 Eusebius observes on v. 2 of this Psalm, **δικαιοσύνης υπάρχων πηγὴ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀμαρτίαν ἀνέλαβε καὶ εὐλογίας ὧν πέλαγος τὴν ἐπικειμένην ἡμῖν ἐδέξατο κατάραν**, and: **τὴν ὠρισμένην ἡμῖν παιδείαν ὑπέηλθεν ἑκῶν, παιδεία γὰρ εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν, ἣ φησὶν ὁ προφήτης.**
- ft137 Vid., Jerome’s *Ep. ad Pammachium de optimo genere interpretandi*, where he cries out to his critics, sticklers for tradition, *Reddant rationem, cur septuaginta translatōres interposuerunt “respice in me!”*
- ft138 The *Hoph.* has *o*, not *u*, perhaps in a more neuter sense, more closely approximating the reflexive (cf. Eze. 32:19 with 32:32), rather than a purely passive. Such is apparently the feeling of the language, vid., *B. Megilla 13a* (and also the explanation in *Tosefoth*).
- ft139 Vid., Boethor, *Dict. franç.-arabe*, s. v. *Etendre* and *Déployer*.
- ft140 Hupfeld suspects this Masoretic remark (**בְּאָרֵי בִּי קִמְצִין בְּתַרֵּי לִישְׁנֵי**) as a Christian interpolation, but it occurs in the alphabetical *Masōreth* register **בִּי בִּי וְתַרְוִיהוּן בְּתַרֵּי לִישְׁנֵי** . Even Elias Levita speaks of it with astonishment (in his *מסרת המסרת* [ed. Ginsburg, p. 253]) without doubting its genuineness, which must therefore have been confirmed, to his mind, by MS authority. Heidenheim also cites it in his edition of the Pentateuch, **מֵאֹר עֵינַיִם** , on Num. 24: 9; and down to the present time no suspicion has been expressed on the part of Jewish critics, although all kinds of unsatisfactory attempts have been made to explain this Masoretic remark (e.g., in the periodical *Biccure ha-’Ittim*).
- ft141 The authenticity of this statement of the Masora **כִּאֲרו כְּתִיב יְדֵי וּרְגְלֵי כִּאֲרו** may be disputed, especially since Jacob ben Chajim became a

convert to Christianity, and other Masoretic testimonies do not mention a **כָּאֲרִי** to **קָרִי וְכַתִּיב**; nevertheless, in this instance, it would be premature to say that this statement is interpolated. Ant. Hulsius in his edition of the Psalter (1650) has written **כָּאֲרִי** in the margin according to the text of the Complutensis.

<sup>ft142</sup> Also in Jerome's independent translation the reading *vinxerunt* is found by the side of *fixerunt*, just as Abraham of Zante paraphrases it in his paraphrase of the Psalter in rhyme **גַּם כְּאֲרִי יָדַי וְרַגְלֵי אֶסְרוּ**. The want of a verb is too perceptible. Saadia supplies it in a different way "they compass me as a lion, to crush my hands and feet."

<sup>ft143</sup> On such fulfilments of prophecy, literal beyond all expectation, vid., *Saat auf Hoffnung* iii., 3, 47-51.

<sup>ft144</sup> Thrupp in his *Emendations on the Psalms (Journal of Classic and Sacred Philology, 1860)* suggests **עֲנִיּוֹת**, my poverty (my poor soul), instead of **עֲנִיתָנִי**.

<sup>ft145</sup> Augustin *De trinitate* xiv. 13, *Non igitur sic erant oblita istae gentes Deum, ut ejus nec commemoratae recordarentur.*

<sup>ft146</sup> In the mouth of the New Testament saint, especially on the *dies viridium*, it is the table of the Lord's supper, as Apollinaris also hints when he applied to it the epithet **ἰσχυρανῶν βριθουσῶν**, *horrendorum onustam*.

<sup>ft147</sup> The London Papyrus fragments, in Tischendorf *Monum.* i. 247, read **TH MIA ΤΩΝ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ**. In the Hexaplarian text, this addition to the inscription was wanting.

<sup>ft148</sup> In 1Co. 10:26, Paul founds on this verse (cf. 50:12) the doctrine that a Christian (apart from a charitable regard for the weak) may eat whatever is sold in the shambles, without troubling himself to enquire whether it has been offered to idols or not. A Talmudic teacher, *B. Berachoth* 35a, infers from this passage the duty of prayer before meat: He who eats without giving thanks is like one who lays hands upon **קִדְשֵׁי שָׁמַיִם** (the sacred things of God); the right to eat is only obtained by prayer.

<sup>ft149</sup> The reading **נַפְשִׁי** is adopted by Saadia (in *Enumoth* ii., where **נַפְשִׁי** is equivalent to **שָׁמַיִ**), Juda ha-Levi (*Cuzari* iii. 27), Abulwalid (*Rikma* p. 180), Rashi, Kimchi, the Sohar, the Codices (and among others by that of the year 1294) and most editions (among which, the *Complutensis* has **נַפְשִׁי** in the text). Nor does Aben-Ezra, whom Norzi has misunderstood, by any means reverse the relation of the *Chethib* and *Keri*; to him **נַפְשִׁי** is the *Keri*, and he explains it as a metaphor (an anthropomorphism): **דֶּרֶךְ כְּנוֹי דְּרַחֲמֵי נַפְשִׁי**. Elias Levita is the only one who rejects the *Keri* **נַפְשִׁי**; but

he does so though misunderstanding a Masora (vid., Baer's *Psalterium* p. 130) and not without admitting Masoretic testimony in favour of it (וכן ראיתי ברוב נוסחאות המסורת). He is the only textual critic who rejects it. For Jacob b. Chajim is merely astonished that נִפְשׁוּ is not to be found in the Masoreth register of words written with *Waw* and to be read with *Jod*. And even Norzi does not reject this *Kerī*, which he is obliged to admit has greatly preponderating testimony in its favour, and he would only too gladly get rid of it.

ft150 On the *Munach* instead of *Metheg* in וְהִנְשִׂאוּ, vid., Baer's *Accentsystem* vii. 2.

ft151 Hupfeld thinks the accentuation inappropriate; the first half of the verse, however, really extends to יִשְׁעִי, and consists of two parts, of which the second is the confirmation of the first: the second half contains a relatively new thought. The sequence of the accents: *Rebia magnum*, *Athnach*, therefore fully accords with the matter.

ft152 The verb *ver-eri*, which signifies "to guard one's self, defend one's self from anything" according to its radical notion, has nothing to do with יָרָא (וְיָרָא).

ft153 The first labial of the combination בַּפּ, בִּמְ, when the preceding word ends with a vowel and the two words are closely connected, receives the *Dagesh* contrary to the general rule; on this orthophonic *Dag. lene*, vid., *Luth. Zeitschr.*, 1863, S. 414.

ft154 Just in like manner they say in poetic style צִידָה, 132:15; פְּנָה, Pro. 7: 8; מָדָה, Job. 11: 9; גָּלָה, Zec. 4: 2; and perhaps even נָצָה, Gen. 40:10; for צִידָתָה, פְּנָתָה, מָדָתָה, גָּלָתָה, and נָצָתָה; as, in general, shorter forms are sometimes found in the inflexion, which do not occur in the corresponding principal form, e.g., צוּרָם, Psa. 49:15, for צוּרְתָם; מְגוּרָם, Psa. 55:16, for מְגוּרְתָם; בְּעַרְמָם, Job. 5:13, for בְּעַרְמְתָם; בַּתְּבוּנָם, Hos. 13: 2, for בַּתְּבוּנְתָם; פָּחָם, Neh. 5:14, for פָּחְתָם; cf. Hitzig on Hos. 13: 2, and Böttcher's *Neue Aehrenlese*, No. 693.

ft155 The ך has not any point above it, because it might be easily mistaken for a *Cholem*, vid., Baer's *Psalterium* p. 130.

ft156 Aben-Ezra (*Moznajim* 36b) explains the perfect accented on the *penult.* in Pro. 30: 9 from the conformity of sound, and Kimchi (*Michlol* 6b) simply records the phenomenon.



- <sup>ft157</sup> This repetition, at the end, of a significant word that has been used at the beginning of a verse, is a favourite custom of Isaiah's (*Comment. S.* 387; transl. ii. 134).
- <sup>ft158</sup> There is a play of words and an alliteration in this sentence which we cannot fully reproduce in the English. — Tr.
- <sup>ft159</sup> The **שִׁיר** of the Temple liturgy of the *Shemini Azereth* is not stated in the Talmud (vid., *Tosefoth* to *B. Succa* 47a, where, according to *Sofrim* xix. § 2 and a statement of the Jerusalem Talmud, Psalm ch. 6, or 12, it guessed at). We only know, that Psalm ch. 29 belongs to the Psalm-portions for the intervening days of the feast of tabernacles, which are comprehended in the *vox memorialis* **הוֹמ"ב דְּהַי** (*Succa* 55a, cf. Rashi on *Joma* 3a), viz., Psalm 29 (**הַי**); *Psa.* 50:16 (**וַי**); *Psa.* 94:16 (**וַי**); *Psa.* 94: 8 (**וַי**); *Psa.* 81: 7 (**הַי**); *Psa.* 82: 5 b (**וַי**). Besides this the treatise *Sofrim* xviii. § 3 mentions Psalm 29 as the Psalm for the festival of Pentecost and the tradition of the synagogue which prevails even at the present day recognises it only as a festival Psalm of the first day of Shabuoth [Pentecost]; the Psalm for *Shemini Azereth* is the 65th. The only confirmation of the statement of the LXX is to be found in the *Sohar*; for there (section **ז**) Psalm 29 is referred to the pouring forth of the water on the seventh day of the feast of the tabernacles (*Hosianna rabba*), since it is said, that by means of the seven **קולות** (corresponding to the seven compassings of the altar) seven of the *Sephiroth* open the flood-gates of heaven.
- <sup>ft160</sup> The reading proposed in *B. Berachoth* 30b **בְּחִרְדָּת** (with holy trembling) has never been a various reading; nor has **בְּחִצְרָת**, after which the LXX renders it *ἐν ἀλλῇ ἁγίᾳ αὐτοῦ*.
- <sup>ft161</sup> The simple rendering of **קול** by “voice” has been retained in the text of the Psalm, as in the Authorised Version. The word, however, which Dr. Delitzsch uses is *Gedröhn*, the best English equivalent of which is a “rumbling.” — Tr.
- <sup>ft162</sup> On Arab. *r'm* vid., Seetzen's *Reisen* iii. 339 and also iv. 496.
- <sup>ft163</sup> By **רֶאָם** Ludolf in opposition to Bochart understands the rhinoceros; but this animal, belonging to the swine tribe, is certainly not meant, or even merely associated with it. Moreover, the rhinoceros [Germ. nose-horn] is called in Egypt *charnin* (from Arab. *chn* = *qrn*), but the unicorn, *charnit*. “In the year 1862 the French archaeologist, M. Waddington, was with me in Damascus when an antiquary brought me an ancient vessel on which a number of animals were engraved, their names being written on their bellies. Among the well known animals there was also an unicorn, exactly like a zebra or a horse, but with a long horn standing out upon its forehead;

on its body was the word Arab. *chrnît*. M. Waddington wished to have the vessel and I gave it up to him; and he took it with him to Paris. We talked a good deal about this unicorn, and felt obliged to come to the conclusion that the form of the fabulous animal might have become known to the Arabs at the time of the crusades, when the English coat of arms came to Syria.” — Wetzstein.

<sup>ft164</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He — says the Mishna, *Uksin* iii. 12, with reference to this passage in the Psalms — has not found any other vessel (כלי) to hold the blessing specially allotted to Israel but peace.

<sup>ft165</sup> The Masora does not place the word under יִתְרִין וְיִי וְחֹטְפִין קִמְצִין אֵלֶּיךָ תִּיבּוֹתָא (Introduction 28b), as one would expect to find it if it were to be read *mijordi*, and proceeds on the assumption that *mijārdi* is infinitive like עֲמַדָּה (read *amādcha*) Oba. 1:11, not participle (Ewald, S. 533).

<sup>ft166</sup> It can hardly be doubted, that, in opposition to the pointing as we have it, which only recognises one מְעוֹ (מַעַ) from עָזַז, to be strong, there are two different substantives having this principal form, viz., מְעוֹ a fortress, secure place, bulwark, which according to its derivation is inflected מְעוֹי, etc., and מְעוֹ equivalent to the Arabic *ma‘ādha*, a hiding-place, defence, refuge, which ought to have been declined מְעוֹי or מְעוֹי like the synonymous מְנוֹסִי (Olshausen § 201, 202). Moreover עוֹ, Arab. *‘ād*, like חָסָה, of which it is the parallel word in Isa. 30: 2, means to hide one’s self anywhere (*Piel* and *Hiph.*, Hebrew הֶעִיז, according to the *Kamus*, *Zamachshari* and *Neshwân*: to hide any one, e.g., Koran 3:31); hence Arab. *‘ād*, a plant that grows among bushes (*bên esh-shôk* according to the *Kamus*) or in the crevices of the rocks (*fī-l-ḥazn* according to *Neshwân*) and is thus inaccessible to the herds; Arab. *‘wwad*, gazelles that are invisible, i.e., keep hidden, for seven days after giving birth, also used of pieces of flesh of which part is hidden among the bones; Arab. *‘ūdat*, an amulet with which a man covers himself (*protegit*), and so forth. — Wetzstein.

Consequently מְעוֹ (formed like Arab. *m‘ād*, according to *Neshwân* equivalent to Arab. *ma‘wad*) is *prop. a place in which to hide one’s self*, synonymous with מְחָסָה, מְנוֹסִי, Arab. *mlād*, *malja‘*, and the like. True, the two substantives from עָזַז and עוֹ meet in their meanings like *praesidium* and *asylum*, and according to passages like Jer. 16:19 appear to be blended in the genius of the language, but they are radically distinct.

<sup>ft167</sup> But these Arabic words do not pass over into the signification “insolent.”

- <sup>ft168</sup> We have adopted the word “praiseworthiness” for the sake of conciseness of expression, in order to avoid an awkward periphrasis, in the sense of being worthy to be praised. — Tr.
- <sup>ft169</sup> On account of this v. 9, Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε, κ.τ.λ., Psalm 33 (34) was the Communion Psalm of the early church, *Constit. Apost.* viii. 13, Cyril, *Catech. Myst.* v. 17.
- <sup>ft170</sup> The Hebrew *Beth essentiae* is used much more freely and extensively than the Arabic, which is joined exclusively to the predicate of a simple clause, where in our language the verb is “to be,” and as a rule only to the predicate of negative clauses: *laisa bi-ḥakimim*, he is not wise, or *laisa bi-l-ḥakimi*, he is not the wise man. The predicate can accordingly be indeterminate or determinate. Moreover, in Hebrew, where this ב is found with the predicate, with the complement of the subject, or even, though only as a solecism (vid., Gesenius’ Thesaurus p. 175), with the subject itself, the word to which it is prefixed may be determinate, whether as an attribute determined by itself (Exo. 6: 3, בְּאֵל שַׁדַּי), by a suffix (as above, Psa. 35: 2, cf. Psa. 146: 5, Exo. 18: 4, Pro. 3:26), or even by the article. At all events no syntactic objection can be brought against the interpretations of בְּעֵשֶׁן, “in the quality of smoke,” Psa. 37:20; cf. בְּדָבָר, Psa. 78:33, and of בְּנַפְשׁוֹ, “in the character of the soul,” Lev. 17:11.
- <sup>ft171</sup> Probably one and the same word with the Armenian *sakr*, to which are assigned the (Italian) meanings *mannaja*, *scure*, *brando ferro*, in Ciakciak’s Armenian Lexicon; cf. Lagarde’s *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1866, S. 203.
- <sup>ft172</sup> According to the old Babylonian reading (belonging to a period when *Pathach* and *Segol* were as yet not distinguished from one another), בְּאֵבֶל (with the sign of *Pathach* and the stroke for *Raphe* below = ä); vid., Pinsker, *Zur Geschichte des Karaismus*, S. 141, and *Einleitung*, S. 118.
- <sup>ft173</sup> The Talmudic עגה (לְשׁוֹן), *B. Sanhedrin* 101b, which is said to mean “a jesting way of speaking,” has all the less place here, as the reading wavers between עגה (עגא) and אגא.
- <sup>ft174</sup> The various reading וַיִּנְקְשׁוּ in Norzi rests upon a misapprehended passage of *Abulwalid* (*Rikma*, p. 166).
- <sup>ft175</sup> The passages brought forward by Hupfeld in support of the use of ב as a conjunction, viz., Psa. 90: 5; 125: 1, Isa. 53: 7; 61:11, are invalid; the passage that seems most to favour it is Oba. 1:16, but in this instance the expression is elliptical, בְּלֹא being equivalent to כִּאֲשֶׁר לֹא, like לֹא לֹא, Isa. 65: 1, = לֹא לֹא. It is only כְּמוֹ (Arab. *kmā*) that can be used as a

conjunction; but כִּי (Arab. *k*) is always a preposition in ancient Hebrew just as in Syriac and Arabic (vid., Fleischer in the *Hallische Allgem. Lit. Zeitschr.* 1843, Bd. iv. S. 117ff.). It is not until the mediaeval synagogal poetry (vid., Zunz, *Synagogal-poesie des Mittelalters*, S. 121, 381f.) that it is admissible to use it as a conjunction (e.g., כִּימָצָא, when he had found), just as it also occurs in Himjaritic, according to Osiander's deciphering of the inscriptions. The verbal clause appended to the word to which this כִּי, *instar*, is prefixed is for the most part an attributive clause as above, but sometimes even a circumstantial clause (Arab. *ḥâl*), as in 38:14; cf. *Sur.* lxii. 5: "as the likeness of an ass carrying books."

<sup>ft176</sup> The following are the constructions of כִּי when a clause of ore than one member follows it: (1) *fut.* and *perf.*, the latter with the tone of the *perf. consec.*, e.g., Exo. 34:15f., or without it, e.g., Psa. 28: 1 (which see); (2) *fut.* and *fut.* as in Psa. 2:12, Jer. 51:46. This construction is indispensable where it is intended to give special prominence to the subject notion or a secondary notion of the clause, e.g., Deu. 20: 6. In one instance כִּי is even followed (3) by the *perf.* and *fut. consec.*, viz., 2Ki. 2:10.

<sup>ft177</sup> As *perf. consec.* the following have the accent on the *ultima*: — וַחֲתוּ, Isa. 20: 5, Oba. 1: 9, and וַרְבּוּ, Isa. 66:16; perhaps also וַקְּלוּ, וַחֲדוּ, Hab. 1: 8, and וַרְבּוּ (*perf. hypoth.*), Job. 32:15. But there is no special reason for the *ultima* -accentuation of וַרְבּוּ, Psa. 55:22; וַרְבּוּ, Psa. 69: 5; וַדְּלוּ, Isa. 38:14; וַקְּלוּ, Jer. 4:13; וַשְּׁחוּ, Pro. 14:19, Hab. 3: 6; וַחֲתוּ, Job. 32:15; וַצְּחוּ, Lam. 4: 7.

<sup>ft178</sup> In the Greek and Latin texts, likewise in all the Aethiopic and several Arabic texts, and in the Syriac *Psalterium Medilanense*, the following addition is found after v. 21: *Ce aperripsan me ton agapeton osi necron ebdelygmenon, Et projecerunt me dilectum tanquam mortuum abominatum* (so the *Psalt. Veronense*). Theodoret refers it to Absalom's relation to David. The words ὥσει νεκρὸν ἐβδελυγμένον are taken from Isa. 14:19.

<sup>ft179</sup> So Heidenheim and Baer, following *Abulwalid*, Efodi, and Mose ha-Nakdan. The Masoretic observation לִית קַמֶּץ חֲטָף, "only here with *Kametz chateph*," is found appended in codices. This *Chateph kametz* is euphonic, as in וַלְקַחָהּ, Gen. 2:23, and in many other instances that are obliterated in our editions, vid., *Abulwalid*, ס' חֲרַקְמָה, p. 198, where even מַטְהָרוּ = מַטְהָרוּ, Psa. 89:45, is cited among these examples (Ges. § 10, 2 rem.).

<sup>ft180</sup> There is a similar expression in the Tamul Kural, Graul's translation, S. 63, No. 418: "An ear, that was not hollowed out by hearing, has, even if

hearing, the manner of not hearing.” The “hollowing out” meaning in this passage an opening of the inward sense of hearing by instruction.

ft181 After ל the aspirate usually disappears, as here and in Psa. 118:13; but there are exceptions, as לְתוֹשׁ וְלְתוֹן , Jer. 1:10, and frequently, לְשֹׁד , *ib.* Psa. 57: 4. After ב and כ it usually remains, as in Psa. 87: 6, Job. 4:13; 33:15, 2Sa. 3:34, 1Ki. 1:21, Ecc. 5:10; but again there are exceptions, as בְּשֹׁן , Gen. 35:22, בְּזֹכֵר , Jer. 17: 2. In Gen. 23: 2 it is pointed לְבִכְתָּהּ according to the rule, and in my *Comment.* S. 423 it is to be read “with a Dagesh.”

ft182 Even an old Hebrew MS directs attention to the erroneousess of the *Soph pasuk* here; vid., Pinsker, *Einleitung*, S. 133 l.

ft183 So Disraeli in his romance of *Alroy* (1845).

ft184 So even Kurtz in the *Dorpater Zeitschrift* for 1865, S. 1-24.

ft185 In Deborah’s song (Jud. 5:30) probably שָׁגַל is to be read instead of שָׁלַל לְצִוְאָרִי .

ft186 This name is also ancient Egyptian, vid., the *Book of the Dead*, lxxxii. 2: *nuk seshni pir am t.ah-en-Phrā*, i.e., I am a lily, sprung from the fields of the sun-god.

ft187 Vide C. Jessen, On the lily of the Bible, in Hugo von Mohl’s *Botanische Zeitung*, 1861, No. 12. Thrupp in his *Introduction* (1860) also understands שֹׁשְׁנִים to mean cymbals in the form of a lily.

ft188 The point of comparison, then, to adopt the language of Gregory of Nyssa, is τὸ λαμπρόν τε καὶ χιονῶδες εἶδος of the lily.

ft189 It is not יַפְלוּ; for the pause falls upon שְׁנֵנִים, and the *Athnach* of יַפְלוּ stands merely in the place of *Zekaph* (Num. 6:12). The *Athnach* after *Olewejored* does not produce any pausal effect; vid., Psa. 50:23; 68: 9, 14; 69: 4; 129: 1, and cf. *supra*, p. 56, note 2.

ft190 The view that the *Munach* is here *vicarius Tiphchae anterioris* (Dachselt in his *Biblia Accentuata*) is erroneous, vid., *Accentuationssystem*, xviii. § 4. It is the conjunctive to אֶלְהֵיךָ, which, in Heidenheim and Baer, on the authority of the Codices, has *Tiphcha anterior*, not *Athnach* as in the editions heretofore published. The proper place for the *Athnach* would at first be by שְׁשׁוֹן; but according to *Accentuationssystem*, xix. § 6, it cannot stand there.

ft191 It is the reading of Ben-Naphtali that has here, as an exception, become the *receptus*; whereas Ben-Asher reads בְּיִקְרָוֹתֶיךָ. Saadia, Rashi, Simson ha-Nakdan and others, who derive the word from בִּיקָר (to visit, wait on),

follow the *receptus*, comparing מְשִׁיפָה, Isa. 42:24, in support of the form of writing. Also in לִיקְנָהָה, Pro. 30:17; וַיִּלְלָהָ, Jer. 25:36; בִּיתְרוֹן, Ecc. 2:13, the otherwise rejected orthography of Ben-Naphtali (who pointed וַיַּחֲלוּ, Job. 29:21, וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל, and the like) is retained, as quite an exception, in the *textus receptus*. Vide S. D. Luzzatto, *Prolegomeni*, § cxcix., and *Grammatica della Lingua Ebraica*, § 193.

<sup>ft192</sup> Bar-Ali says that in Babylonia Venus is called שַׁגֵּל וּדְלַפַּת, vid., Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandl.* S. 17. Windischmann (*Zoroastrische Studien*, S. 161) erroneously compares *céagar* (pronounced *tshagar*) as a name of one of the two wives of Zarathustra; but it happens that this is not the name of the wife who holds the first rank (Neo-Persic *padishâh-zen*), but of the second (*céakir-zen*, bond-woman).

<sup>ft193</sup> In Babylonia these words, according to *B. Jebamoth 77a*, are cited in favour of domesticity as a female virtue; in Palestine (בַּמְעַרְבָא), more appropriately, Gen. 18: 9. The LXX *Codd. Vat. et Sinait.* has Ευσεβών (Eusebius), which is meaningless; *Cod. Alex.* correctly, ἔσωθεν (Italic, Jerome, Syriac, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Apollinaris).

<sup>ft194</sup> “*Ein feste Burg is unser Gott.*”

<sup>ft195</sup> The Mishna, *Erachin 13b*, expressly informs us, that whilst the Levites sang to the accompanying play of the nabras and citherns, their youths, standing at their feet below the pulpit, sang with them in order to give to the singing the harmony of high and deep voices (תְּבַל, *condimentum*). These Levite youths are called צַעֲרֵי or סוּעֲדֵי הַלְוִיִּים, *parvuli* (although the Gemara explains it otherwise) or *adjutores Levitarum*.

<sup>ft196</sup> Nevertheless מַפְעֵלוֹת אֱלֹהִים is also found here as a various reading that goes back to the time of the Talmud. The oldest Hebrew Psalter of 1477 reads thus, vide *Repertorium für Bibl. und Morgenländ. Liter.* v. (1779), 148. Norzi decides in favour of it, and Biesenthal has also adopted it in his edition of the Psalter (1837), which in other respects is a reproduction of Heidenheim's text.

<sup>ft197</sup> In connection with which, עָלָה then is intended to point to the fact that, when the sound of the trumpets of Israel begins, God rises from the throne of justice and takes His seat upon the throne of mercy: vid., Buxtorf, *Lex. Talmud.* col. 2505.

<sup>ft198</sup> It is also accented accordingly, viz., נֶאֱסַפּוּ with *Rebia magnum*, which (and in this respect it is distinguished from *Mugrash*) makes a pause; and this is then followed by the supplementing clause with *Zinnor, Galgal, and Olewejored*.

- ft199 Luther with Jerome (departing from the LXX and Vulgate) renders it: “Mount Zion is like a beautiful branch,” after the Mishna-Talmudic **נוף**, a branch, *Maccoth* 12a, which is compared also by Saadia and Dunash. The latter renders it “beautiful in branches,” and refers it to the Mount of Olives.
- ft200 Vid., Spiegel, *Erân*, S. 287f.
- ft201 Vide Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, ii. 847.
- ft202 LXX: **ἐν ταῖς βάρεσιν αὐτῆς**, on which Gregory of Nyssa remarks (*Opera*, Ed. Paris, t. i. p. 333): **βάρεις λέγει τὰς τῶν οἰκοδομημάτων περιγραφεῖς ἐν τετραγώνῳ τῷ σχήματι**.
- ft203 This might be avoided if it were possible for **עון עקבי** to mean “the sin that follows my heels, that follows me at the heels;” but apart from **עון** being unsuitable with this interpretation, an impossible meaning is thereby extorted from the genitive construction. This, however, is perhaps what is meant by the expression of the LXX, **ἡ ἀνομία τῆς πτέρνης μου**, so much spoken of in the Greek Church down to the present day.
- ft204 In the fragments of a commentary to his translation of Psalms, contributed by David Friedländer.
- ft205 In a fugitive paper of the so-called Amen Congregation, which now unhappily exists no longer, in München-Gladbach.
- ft206 In Vedic *jag*’, old Bactrian *jaz* (whence *jag’jas*, the primitive word of **ἄγιος**), the notions of offering and of praising lie one within the other.
- ft207 Cf. the following forms, chosen on account of their accord: — **נְשׁוּי**, Psa. 32: 1; **הַנְּדָף**, Psa. 68: 3; **צִאֲנִיָּה**, Son. 3:11; **שְׁתוּת**, Isa. 22:13; **מִמְחִים**, *ib.* Psa. 25: 6; **הַלּוּט**, *ib.* Psa. 25: 7.
- ft208 The Talmud finds a significance in the plural **זְבָחֵי**. Joshua ben Levi (*B. Sanhedrin* 43b) says: At the time when the temple was standing, whoever brought a burnt-offering received the reward of it, and whoever brought a meat-offering, the reward of it; but the lowly was accounted by the Scriptures as one who offered every kind of sacrifice at once (**כּוֹלֵךְ כְּאִילוֹ הַקְּרִיב כָּל הַקְּרִבָּנוֹת**). In Irenaeus, iv. 17, 2, and Clemens Alexandrinus, *Paedag.* iii. 12, is found to **θυσία τῷ Θεῷ καρδία συντετριμμένη** the addition: **ὁσμη εὐωδίας τῷ Θεῷ καρδία δοξάζουσα τὸν πεπλακότα αὐτήν**.
- ft209 **אֲתֵי מְרַחֵק** is the name by which the national grammarians designate a group of two words, of which the first, ending with Kametz or Segol, has the accent on the penult., and of which the second is a monosyllable, or

likewise is accented on the *penult*. The initial consonant of the second word in this case receives a *Dagesh*, in order that it may not, in consequence of the first *ictus* of the group of words “coming out of the distance,” i.e., being far removed, be too feebly and indistinctly uttered. This dageshing, however, only takes place when the first word is already of itself *Milel*, or at least, as e.g., מְצַאָה בֵּית , had a half-accented *penult*., and not when it is from the very first *Milra* and is only become *Milel* by means of the retreating of the accent, as עָשָׂה פֶּלֶא , Psa. 78:12, cf.

Deu. 24: 1. The penultima-accent has a greater lengthening force in the former case than in the latter; the following syllables are therefore uttered more rapidly in the first case, and the *Dagesh* is intended to guard against the third syllable being too hastily combined with the second. Concerning the rule, vid., Baer’s *Thorath Emeth*, p. 29f.

<sup>ft210</sup> So it has been explained by Menachem; whereas Dunash wrongly takes the ך of חִנֵּךְ as part of the root, overlooking the fact that with the suffix it ought rather to have been חִנֵּךְ instead of חִנֵּךְ. It is true that within the province of the verb *âch* does occur as a pausal masculine suffix instead of *écha*, with the preterite (Deu. 6:17, Isa. 30:19; 55: 5, and even out of pause in Jer. 23:37), and with the infinitive (Deu. 28:24, Eze. 28:15), but only in the passage before us with the participle. Attached to the participle this masculine suffix closely approximates to the Aramaic; with proper substantives there are no examples of it found in Hebrew. Simson ha-Nakdan, in his חִבּוּר הַקּוּנִיּוֹת (a MS in Leipzig University Library, fol. 29b) correctly observes that forms like עִמְךָ שְׂמֵךְ , are not biblical Hebrew, but Aramaic, and are only found in the language of the Talmud, formed by a mingling of the Hebrew and Aramaic.

<sup>ft211</sup> That beautiful old song of the church concerning Jesus has grown out of this strophe: —

*Ecquis binas columbinas  
Alas dabit animae?  
Et in almam crucis palmam  
Evolat citissime, etc.*

<sup>ft212</sup> Kimchi observes that the dove, when she becomes tired, draws in one wing and flies with the other, and thus the more surely escapes. Aben-Ezra finds an allusion here to the carrier-pigeon.

<sup>ft213</sup> Certain exceptions, however, exist, inasmuch as ך sometimes remains even in connection with a disjunctive accent, Isa. 49: 4, Jer. 40:10; 41:16; and it is pointed ך in connection with a conjunctive in Gen. 45:23; 46:12, Lev. 9: 3, Mic. 2:11, Job. 4:16, Ecc. 4: 8.



ft214 The Syriac version reckons only 29 **στίχοι** (*fetgome*); vid., the Hexaplarian version of this Psalm taken from Cod. 14,434 (*Add. MSS*) in the British Museum, in Heidenheim's *Vierteljahrsschrift*, No. 2 (1861).

ft215 Cf. Sir. 25:15, in the Hebrew: **מעל ראש פתן ואין חמה מעל חמה אויב** (no poison exceeds the poison of the serpent, and no wrath exceeds the wrath of an enemy).

ft216 With reference to the above passage in the Psalms, the Talmud, *B. Berachoth 3b*, says, "A cithern used to hang above David's bed; and when midnight came, the north wind blew among the strings, so that they sounded of themselves; and forthwith he arose and busied himself with the *Tôra* until the pillar of the dawn (**עמוד השחר**) ascended." Rashi observes, "The dawn awakes the other kings; but I, said David, will awake the dawn (**אני מעורר את השחר**)."

ft217 In the Phoenician, the Cyprian copper mine **Ταμασσός** appears to have taken its name from **תמס**, *liquefactio* (Levy, *Phönizische Studien*, iii. 7).

ft218 "God has created nothing without its use," says the Talmud, *B. Shabbath 77b*; "He has created the snail (**שבלול לכתית**) to heal bruises by laying it upon them:" cf. *Genesis Rabba*, Psa. 51 *init.*, where **שבלול** is explained by **לימצא, סיליי, כיליי, κογχύλη, σέσιλος, limax**. Abraham b. David of Fez, the contemporary of Saadia, has explained it in his Arabico-Hebrew Lexicon by **אלחלזון**, the slug. Nevertheless this is properly the name of the snail with a house (**נרתיק**), Talmudic **חלזון**, and even at the present day in Syria and Palestine Arab. *hlzûn* (which is pronounced *halezôn*); whereas **שבלול**, in conformity with the etymon and with the figure, is the naked snail or slug. The ancient versions perhaps failed to recognise this, because the slug is not very often to be seen in hot eastern countries; but **שבלול** in this signification can be looked upon as traditional. The rendering "a rain-brook or mountain-torrent (Arabic *seil sâbil*) which running runs away," would, to say nothing more, give us, as Rosenmüller has already observed, a figure that has been made use of already in v. 8.

ft219 The mole, which was thought to have no eyes, is actually called in post-biblical Hebrew **אשת**, plur. **אישות** (vid., *Kelim* xxi. 3).

ft220 *This expression well illustrates the power of the German language in coining words, so that the language critically dealt with may be exactly reproduced to the German mind. The meaning will at once be clear when we inform our readers that Panier is a banner of standard; the reflexive denominative, therefore, in imitation of the Hebrew, sich aufpanieren signifies to "up-standard one's self," to raise one's self up after the manner*

of a standard, which being “done into English” may mean to rally (as around a standard). We have done our best above faithfully to convey the meaning of the German text, and we leave our readers to infer from this illustration the difficulties with which translators have not unfrequently to contend. — Tr.

- ft221 A royal attendant, the *tasht-dâr*, cup- or wash-basin-bearer, carried the wash-basin for the Persian king both when in battle and on a journey (vid., Spiegel, *Avesta* ii. LXIX). Moab, says the Psalmist, not merely waits upon him with the wash-basin, but himself serves as such to him.
- ft222 The sandal or the shoe, I as an *object* of Arab. *wṭʿ*, of treading down, oppressing, signifies metaphorically, (1) a man that is weak and incapable of defending himself against oppression, since one says, *ma kuntu naʿlan*, I am no shoe, i.e., no man that one can tread under his feet; (2) a wife (*quae subjicitur*), since one says, *gʿalaaʿ naʿlahu*, he has taken off his shoe, i.e., cast off his wife (cf. Lane under Arab. *ḥidaʿâ*, which even signifies a shoe and a wife). II As an *instrument* of Arab. *wṭʿ*, tropically of the act of oppressing and of reducing to submission, the Arab. *waʿl* serves as a symbol of subjugation to the dominion of another. Rosenmüller (*Das alte und neue Morgenland*, No. 483) shows that the Abyssinian kings, at least, cast a shoe upon anything as a sign of taking forcible possession. Even supposing this usage is based upon the above passage of the Psalms, it proves, however, that a people thinking and speaking after the Oriental type associated this meaning with the casting of a shoe upon anything. — Fleischer. Cf. Wetzstein’s Excursus at the end of this volume.
- ft223 Just as in Num. 32:29f. the country east of Jordan is excluded from the name “the land of Canaan” in the stricter sense, so by the Jewish mind it was regarded from the earliest time to a certain extent as a foreign country (חוצה לארץ), although inhabited by the two tribes and a half; so that not only is it said of Moses that he died in a foreign land, but even of Saul that he is buried in a foreign land (*Numeri Rabba*, ch. viii. and elsewhere).
- ft224 *Neshwân* and the *Kâmûs* say: “*hawwata* and *hajjata bi-fulân-in* signifies to call out to any one in order to put him in terror (Arab. *ṣāḥ bh*);” “but in Syria,” as Wetzstein goes on to say, “the verb does not occur as *med. Jod*, nor is *hawwata* there construed with Arab. *b*, but only with *ʿlâ*. A very ready phrase with the street boys in Damascus is Arab. *l-yy ṣʿ thwwt ʿî*, ‘why dost thou threaten me?’”
- ft225 The reading of Ben-Asher תַּרְצָהוּ is followed by Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, and others, taking this form (which could not possibly be anything else) as *Pual*. The reading of Ben-Naphtali תַּרְצָחוּ is already assumed in *B. Sanhedrin* 119a. Besides these the reading תַּרְצָחוּ without *Dag.*) is also

found, which cannot be taken as a resolved *Piel*, since the *Metheg* is wanting, but is to be read *terotzchu*, and is to be taken (as also the reading **וַיִּשְׁלַח**, Psa. 101: 5, and **וַיִּלְחַק**, 1Ch. 23: 6, 24: 3) as *Poal* (vid., on Psa. 94:20, 109:10).

<sup>ft226</sup> *Constitutiones Apostolicae*, ii. 59: Ἐκάστης ἡμέρας συναθροίζεσθε ὄρθρου καὶ ἑσπέρας ψάλλοντες καὶ προσευχόμενοι ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς: ὄρθρου μὲν λέγοντες ψαλμὸν τὸν ξβ' (63), ἑσπέρας δὲ τὸν ρμ' (141). Athanasius says just the same in his *De virginitate*: πρὸς ὄρθρον τὸν ψαλμὸν τοῦτον λέγετε, κ.τ.λ. Hence Psa. 63 is called directly ὁ ὄρθρινός (the morning hymn) in *Constit. Apostol.* viii. 37. Eusebius alludes to the fact of its being so in *Psa. 91* (92), p. 608, ed. Montfaucon. In the Syrian order of service it is likewise the morning Psalm **κατ' ἑξοχὴν**, vid., Dietrich, *De psalterii usu publico et divione in Ecclesia Syriaca*, p. 3. The LXX renders **ךַרְחַשׁ** in v. 2, **πρὸς σὲ ὀρθρίχῳ**, and **בַּשְּׂמֵרֹת** in v. 7, **ἐν τοῖς ὄρθροις** (*in matutinis*).

<sup>ft227</sup> In this passage in Isaiah are meant the depths of the earth (LXX **θεμέλια τῆς γῆς**), the earth down to its inmost part, with its caverns, abysses, and subterranean passages. The apostle, however, in Eph. 4: 9 by **τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς** means exactly the same as what in our passage is called in the LXX **τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς**: the interior of the earth = the under world, just as it is understood by all the Greek fathers (so far as my knowledge extends); the comparative **κατώτερος** is used just like **ἐνέρτερος**.

<sup>ft228</sup> **תַּמְנִי** in Baer's *Psalterium* is an error that has been carried over from Heidenheim's.

<sup>ft229</sup> Fürst erroneously explains **תַּלְתָּ** as a bed or strip of ground between two deep furrows, in distinction from **מַעְנָה** or **מַעְנִיָּה** (vid., on Psa. 129: 3), a furrow. Beds such as we have in our potato fields are unknown to Syrian agriculture. There is a mode which may be approximately compared with it called *ketif* (**כַּתִּיף**), another far wider called *meskeba* (**מִשְׁכַּבָּה**). The Arabic *tilm* (**تِلْم**, Hebrew **תַּלְתָּ** = *talm*), according to the *Ḳamûs* (as actually in Magrebinish Arabic) *talam* (**تِلْم**), corresponds exact to our furrow, i.e., (as the Turkish *Ḳamûs* explains) a ditch-like fissure which the iron of the plough cuts into the field. *Neshwân* (i. 491) says: "The verb *talam*, fut. *jatlum* and *jatlim*, signifies in Jemen and in the *Ghôr* (the land on the shore of the Red Sea) the crevices (Arab. *ʾl-šūqûq*) which the ploughman forms, and *tilm*, collective plural *tilâm*, is, in the countries mentioned, a furrow of the corn-field. Some persons pronounce the word even *thilm*, collective plural *thilâm*." Thus it is at the present day universally in *Haurân*; in *Edre* ʿat I heard the water-furrow of a corn-field

called *thilm el-kanâh* (Arab. *tîlm ʿl-qnât*). But this pronunciation with Arab. *ṭ* is certainly not the original one, but has arisen through a substitution of the cognate and more familiar verbal stem Arab. *tîlm*, cf. *šrm*, to slit (*shurēm*, a harelip). In other parts of Syria and Palestine, also where the distinction between the sounds Arab. *t* and *ṭ* is carefully observed, I have only heard the pronunciation *tîlm*. — Wetzstein.

ft230 If it were meant to be rendered *canticum psalmus* (not *psalmi*) it would surely have been accented לְמִנְצָח שִׁיר מְזֻמֹּר (for לְמִנְצָח שִׁיר מְזֻמֹּר , according to section xviii. of the *Accentuationssystem*).

ft231 Kimchi (Michlol 146a) and Parchon (under רָמַם) read רֹמָם with *Pathach*; and Heidenheim and Baer have adopted it.

ft232 Vid., Sonntag's *Tituli Psalmorum* (1687), where it is on this account laid out as the Rogate Psalm.

ft233 “*Hausehre*,” says he, is the housewife or matron as being the adornment of the house; vid., F. Dietrich, *Frau und Dame*, a lecture bearing upon the history of language (1864), S. 13.

ft234 Ewald remarks, “Arabian poets also call the dove Arab. *ʿl-wṛq â*, the greenish yellow, golden gleaming one, vid., Kosegarten, *Chrestom.* p. 156, 5.” But this Arabic poetical word for the dove signifies rather the ash-green, whity blackish one. Nevertheless the signification greenish for the Hebrew יִרְקָרֵק is established. Bartenoro, on *Negaim* xi. 4, calls the colour of the wings of the peacock יִרְקָרֵק; and I am here reminded of what Wetzstein once told me, that, according to an Arab proverb, the surface of good coffee ought to be “like the neck of the dove,” i.e., so oily that it gleams like the eye of a peacock. A way for the transition from green to grey in *aurak* as the name of a colour is already, however, opened up in post-biblical Hebrew, when to frighten any one is expressed by פָּנִים הוֹרִיק , *Genesis Rabba*, 47a. The intermediate notions that of fawn colour, i.e., yellowish grey. In the Talmud the plumage of the full-grown dove is called זָהוּב and צָהוּב , *Chullin*, 22b.

ft235 In *Tosifta Para*, ch. viii., a river of the name of יוֹרְדַת הַצְּלָמוֹן is mentioned, the waters of which might not be used in preparing the water of expiation (מֵי הַמָּאֵרָה), because they were dried up at the time of the war, and thereby hastened the defeat of Israel (viz., the overthrow of Barcochba). Grätz “*Geschichte der Juden*, iv. 157, 459f.) sees in it the *Nahar Arsuf*, which flows down the mountains of Ephraim past Bethar into the Mediterranean. The village of *Zalmon* occurs in the Mishna, *Jebamoth* xvi. 6, and frequently. The Jerusalem Gemara (*Maaseroth* i. 1) gives pre-

eminence to the carob-trees of Zalmona side by side with those of Shitta and Gadara.

ft236 Wetzstein gives a different explanation (*Reise in den beiden Trachonen und um das Haurângebirge* in the *Zeitschrift für allgem. Erdkunde*, 1859, S. 198). “Then fell snow on Zalmon, i.e., the mountain clothed itself in a bright garment of light in celebration of this joyous event. Any one who has been in Palestine knows how very refreshing is the spectacle of the distant mountain-top capped with snow. The beauty of this poetical figure is enhanced by the fact that Zalmon (Arab. *ḏlmân*), according to its etymology, signifies a mountain range dark and dusky, either from shade, forest, or black rock. The last would well suit the mountains of *Haurân*, among which Ptolemaeus (p. 365 and 370, *Ed. Wilberg*) mentions a mountain (according to one of the various readings) *Ἀσαλμάνος*.”

ft237 This is all the more probable as Semitism has no proper word for basalt; in Syria it is called *ḥagéar aswad*, “black stone.”

ft238 Tradition (Targum, Saadia, and *Abulwalid*) takes *תְּנַשׁ* forthwith as a synonym of *מַלְאָךְ*, an angel. So also the LXX (Jerome): *χιλιάδες εὐθηνούντων* (*תְּנַשׁ = תְּנַשׁ*), and Symmachus, *χιλιάδες ἡχούντων* (from *תְּנַשׁ*?). The stem-word is, however, *תְּנַשׁ*, just as *תְּנַשׁ*, Arabic *thinân*, *ithnân*, is also formed from a singular that is to be assumed, viz., *תְּשׁ*, Arab. *tinun* (*itnun*), and this from *תְּנַשׁ*, Arab. *tnâ* (cf. *תְּנַשׁ* from *תְּנַשׁ*, Arab. *banâ*).

ft239 This is one of the three passages (the others being Isa. 34:11, Eze. 23:42; cf. Ew. § 93, *b*) in which the dageshing of the opening mute of the following word is given up after a soft final consonant, when the words are connected by a conjunctive accent or *Makkeph*.

ft240 Cf. the epigram in Sadi's *Garden of Roses*, “Of all mountains Sinai is the smallest, and yet the greatest in rank and worth in the estimation of God,” etc. On the words *תְּנַשׁ בְּקֶדֶשׁ* which follow we may to a certain extent compare the name of honour given to it in Arabic, *tûr m'ana*, “Sinai of Pensiveness” (Pertsch, *Die persischen Handschriften der Gothaer Bibliothek*, 1859, S. 24).

ft241 In this respect Psa. 68 is the most appropriate Psalm for the *Dominica Pentecostes*, just as it is also, in the Jewish ritual, the Psalm of the second Shabuoth day.

ft242 Just so Hölemann in the second division of his *Bibelstudien* (1861); whereas to Hormann (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. 482ff.) the New Testament application of the citation from the Psalm is differently brought about, because he refers neither *ἡχμαλώτευσεν ἀιχμαλωσίαν* nor *κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς* to the descent of the Lord into Hades.

- ft243 Just so that portion of the Gospel of Nicodemus that treats of Christ's descent into Hades; *vis.* Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocryph.* (1853), p. 307.
- ft244 According to the customary accentuation the second יום has *Mercha* or *Olewejored*, and יַעֲמֹס־לָנוּ, *Mugrash*. But this *Mugrash* has the position of the accents of the *Silluk* -member against it; for although it does exceptionally occur that two conjunctives follow *Mugrash* (*Accentsystem*, xvii. § 5), yet these cannot in any case be *Mahpach sarkatum* and *Illui*.
- ft245 So also the Targum, which understands the promise to refer to the restoration of the righteous who have been eaten by wild beasts and drowned in the sea (Midrash: מְבִיחַ שְׁנֵי אַרְיוֹת = מְבִיחַ); cf. also the things related from the time of the Khaliphs in Jost's *Geschichte des Judenthums*, ii. 399, and Grätz' *Gesch. der Juden*, v. 347.
- ft246 The *Gaja* of the first closed syllable warns one to make a proper pause upon it, in order that the guttural of the second, so apt to be slurred over, may be distinctly pronounced; cf. תִּבְחַר, Psa. 65: 5; הִרְחִיק, Psa. 103:12. So also with the sibilants at the beginning of the second syllable, e.g., תִּדְשֵׁא, Gen. 1:11, in accordance with which, in Psa. 14: 1; 53: 2, we must write הַשְׁתִּיתוּ וְהַתְּעִיבוּ .
- ft247 This אַחַר, according to *B. Nedarim 37b*, is a so-called עֲטוּר סוֹפְרִים (*ablatio scribarum*), the sopherim (sofrim) who watched over the faithful preservation of the text having removed the reading וְאַחַר, so natural according to the sense, here as in Gen. 18: 5; 24:55, Num. 31: 2, and marked it as not genuine.
- ft248 Tertullian calls the Apostle Paul, with reference to his name and his Benjamitish origin, *parvus Benjamin*, just as Augustine calls the poetess of the *Magnificat*, *nostra tympanistria*.
- ft249 The accentuation does not decide; it admits of our taking it in both ways. Cf. Psa. 14: 5; 41: 2; 58: 7; 68:28, Pro. 13:22; 27: 1.
- ft250 The *Munach* of בָּצוּם is a transformation of *Dechî* (just as the *Munach* of לַחֲרָפוֹת is a transformation of *Mugrash*), in connection with which נִקְשֵׁי might certainly be conceived of even as object (cf. 26: 6a); but this after וְאַבְכָּה (not וְאַבְכָּה), and as being without example, could hardly have entered the minds of the punctuists.
- ft251 Originally ׀ was the sign for every kind of *ō*, hence the Masora includes the חֲטוּף also under the name קְמִיץ חֲטוּף ; vid., *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1863, S. 412,f., cf. Wright, *Genesis*, p. xxix.

- ft252 Both נִפְשִׁי and אִיבִי, contrary to logical interpunction, are marked with *Munach*; the former ought properly to have *Dechî*, and the latter *Mugrash*. But since neither the *Athnach* -word nor the *Silluk* -word has two syllables preceding the tone syllable, the accents are transformed according to *Accentuationssystem*, xviii. § 2, 4.
- ft253 The LXX renders οὐκ ἔγνων πραγματείας; the Psalterium Romanum, *non cognovi negotiationes*; Psalt. Gallicum (Vulgate), *non cognovi literaturam* (instead of which the Psalt. Hebr., *literaturas*). According to Böttcher, the poet really means that he did not understand the art of writing.
- ft254 Heidenheim reads תִּרְנְנָה with *Segol*, following the statement of Ibn-Bil'am in his טעמי המקרא and of Mose ha-Nakdan in his דרכי הנקוד, that *Segol* always precedes the ending נָה, with the exception only of הִנָּה and הִאֲנִינָה. Baer, on the other hand, reads תִּרְנִינָה, following Aben-Ezra and Kimchi (*Michlol* 66b).
- ft255 Pronounce *wejithbārchu*, because the tone rests on the first letter of the root; whereas in v. 15 it is *jebār<sup>a</sup>chenu* with *Chateph. vid.*, the rule in the *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1863, S. 412.
- ft256 Hitzig calls to mind οὐλῶς, “corporeal;” but this word is Ionic and equivalent to ὄλος, *solidus*, the ground-word of which is the Sanscrit *sarvas*, whole, complete.
- ft257 On the other hand, Redslob (*Deutsch. Morgenländ. Zeitschr.* 1860, S. 675) interprets it thus: they run over the fencings of the heart, from שָׁכָה in the signification to put or stick through, to stick into (*infigere*), by comparing קִירוֹת לְבִי, Jer. 4:19, and ἔρκος ὀδόντων. He regards מִשְׁכִּית and mosaic as one word, just as the Italian *ricamare* (to stitch) and רִקֵּם is one word. Certainly the root זָךְ, Arab. *zk*, *ak*, has the primary notion of piercing (cf. זָכַר), and also the notion of purity, which it obtains, proceeds from the idea of the brilliance which pierces into the eye; but the primary notion of שָׁכָה is that of cutting through (whence שָׁכִין, like מַחֲלָף, a knife, from חָלַף, Jud. 5:26).
- ft258 In general שׁוּב does not necessarily signify to turn back, but, like the Arabic *âda*, Persic *gashten*, to enter into a new (active or passive) state.
- ft259 The Targum version is, “As the dream of a drunken man, who awakes out of his sleep, wilt Thou, O Lord, on the day of the great judgment, when they awake out of their graves, in wrath abandon their image to contempt.” The text of our editions is to be thus corrected according to Bechai (on Deu. 33:29) and Nachmani (in his treatise שְׁעַר הַגְּמוּל).

ft260 The Egyptian *p* frequently passes over into the Hebrew *b*, and *vice versâ*, as in the name *Aperiu* = עבריים; *p*, however, is retained in פֶּרֶעָה = *phar-aa*, grand-house (οἶκος μέγας in Horapollo), the name of the Egyptian rulers, which begins with the sign of the plan of a house = *p*.

ft261 [Miss Winkworth's translation.]

ft262 The reading מעודיך is received, e.g., by Elias Hutter and Nissel; the Targum translates it, Kimchi follows it in his interpretation, and Abraham of Zante follows it in his paraphrase; it is tolerably widely known, but, according to the LXX and Syriac versions and MSS, it is to be rejected.

ft263 The head is called in Sanscrit *çiras*, in Zend *çaranh*, = κάρα; the horn in Sanscrit, *çrīṅga*, i.e., (according to Burnlout, *Etudes*, p. 19) that which proceeds from and projects out of the head (*çiras*), Zend *çrva* = κέρως, קֶרֶן (*ḵarn*).

ft264 E.g., *Bamidbar Rabba* ch. xxii.; whereas according to *Berêshîth Rabba* ch. lii. קֶרֶן is equivalent to קָרוֹם.

ft265 The pointing is here just as inconsistent as in יְלֻדוֹת, and on the contrary מְרֻדוֹת.

ft266 One verse of a beautiful poem of the *Muḥammel* which *Ibn Dûchî*, the phylarch of the *Beni Zumeir*, an honoured poet of the steppe, dictated to Consul Wetzstein runs thus: The noble are like a very lofty hill-side upon which, when thou comest to it, thou findest an evening meal and protection (Arab. *l-š' w-dry*).

ft267 With orthophonic *Gaja*, vid., Baer's *Metheg-Setzung*, § 45.

ft268 Dukes, *Rabbinische Blumenlese*, S. 191.

ft269 The joining of the second word, accented on the first syllable and closely allied in sense, on to the first, which is accented on the *ultima* (the tone of which, under certain circumstances, retreats to the *penult.*, נסוג אחר, or monosyllabic, by means of the hardening *Dagesh* (the so-called דחיק), only takes place when that first word ends in הֶּ or הֵּ, not when it ends in הִּ.

ft270 We have indicated on Psa. 18:12; 36: 6, that the שחקים are so called from their thinness, but passages like Psa. 18:12 and the one before us do not favour this idea. One would think that we have more likely to go back to Arab. *shq*, to be distant (whence *subḵ*, distance; *sahîk*, distant), and that שחקים signifies the distances, like שמים, the heights, from שחק = *subḵ*, in distinction from שחק, an atom (Wetzstein). But the Hebrew affords no trace of this verbal stem, whereas שחק, Arab. *shq*, *contundere*,



*comminuere* (*Neshwân*: to pound to dust, used e.g., of the apothecary's drugs), is just as much Hebrew as Arabic. And the word is actually associated with this verb by the Arabic mind, inasmuch as Arab. *saḥâbun saḥqun* (*nubes tenues, nubila tenuia*) is explained by Arab. *shâb rîqîq*. Accordingly שֶׁחֶקֶם, according to its primary notion, signifies that which spreads itself out thin and fine over a wide surface, and according to the usage of the language, in contrast with the thick and heavy פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ, the uppermost stratum of the atmosphere, and then the clouds, as also Arab. *a nân*, and the collective 'anan and 'anân (vid., *Isaiah*, at 4: 5, note), is not first of all the clouds, but the surface of the sky that is turned to us (Fleischer).

ft271 The reading διὰ Ησαίου τοῦ προφήτου is, although erroneous, nevertheless ancient; since even the Clementine Homilies introduce this passage as the language of Isaiah.

ft272 The identity of Avaris and Tanis is in the meanwhile again become doubtful. *Tanis* was the Hyksos city, but *Pelusium* = *Avaris* the Hyksos fortress; vid., Petermann's *Mittheilungen*, 1866, S. 296-298.

ft273 According to the reckoning of the Masora this v. 36 is the middle verse of the 2527 verses of the Psalter (Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, 1620, p. 133).

ft274 According to *B. Kiddushin* 30a, this v. 38 is the middle one of the 5896 פְּסוּקֵי סֵפֶר שְׁמֹרַת, of the Psalter. According to *B. Maccoth* 22b, Psa. 78:38, and previously Deu. 28:58, 59; 29: 8 [9], were recited when the forty strokes of the lash save one, which according to 2Co. 11:24 Paul received five times, were being counted out to the culprit.

ft275 According to *B. Menachoth* 53b, Jedidiah (Solomon, 2Sa. 12:25) built the Temple in the province of Jedidiah (of Benjamin, Deu. 33:12).

ft276 According to *Sofrim* xviii. § 3, Psalm 79 and Psalm 137 are the Psalms for the *Kīnoth-day*, i.e., the 9th day of Ab, the day commemorative of the Chaldaean and Roman destruction of Jerusalem.

ft277 Cassiodorus and Bruno observe: *deplorat Antiochi persecutionem tempore Machabeorum factam, tunc futuram*. And Notker adds: To those who have read the First Book of the Maccabees it (viz., the destruction bewailed in the Psalm) is familiar.

ft278 The Arabic has just this notion in an active application, viz., *benî el-môt* = the heroes (destroyers) in the battle.

ft279 It is true we read that Benjamin stood on the side of Rehoboam with Judah after the division of the kingdom (1Ki. 12:21), Judah and Benjamin appear as parts of the kingdom of Judah (2Ch. 11: 3, 23; 15: 8f., and frequently); but if, according to 1Ki. 11:13, 32, 36, only שְׁבַט אֶחָד remains to the

house of David, this is Judah, inasmuch as Benjamin did not remain entirely under the Davidic sceptre, and Simeon is to be left out of account (cf. *Genesis*, S. 603); the Benjamitish cities of Bethel, Gilgal, and Jericho belonged to the northern kingdom, but, as in the case of Rama (1Ki. 15:21f.), not without being contested (cf. e.g., 2Ch. 13:19); the boundaries were therefore fluctuating, vid., Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (3rd ed.), S. 439-441.

ft280 Not a pronoun: to Thee it belongs to be for salvation for us, as the Talmud, Midrash, and Masora (vid., Norzi) take it; wherefore in *J. Succa* 54c it is straightway written לך. Such a לכה = לך is called in the language of the Masora, and even in the Midrash (*Exod. Rabba*, fol. 121), לכה וראית (vid., Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, p. 245).

ft281 *Exod. Rabba*, Psalm 44, with reference to this passage, says: “When husbandmen seek to improve a vine, what do they do? They root (עוקרין) it out of its place and plant (שותלין) it in another.” And *Levit. Rabba*, Psalm 36, says: “As one does not plant a vine in a place where there are great, rough stones, but examines the ground and then plants it, so didst Thou drive out peoples and didst plant it,” etc.

ft282 According to *Kiddushin*, 30a, because this *Ajin* is the middle letter of the Psalter as the *Waw* of גהון, Lev. 11:42, is the middle letter of the *Tôra*. One would hardly like to be at the pains of proving the correctness of this statement; nevertheless in the seventeenth century there lived one Laymarius, a clergyman, who was not afraid of this trouble, and found the calculations of the Masora (e.g., that אדני ה' occurs 222 times) in part inaccurate; vid., *Monatliche Unterredungen*, 1691, S. 467, and besides, Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, S. 258f.

ft283 Saadia appropriately renders it Arab. *yqrđhâ*, by referring, as does Dunash also, to the Talmudic קרסם, which occurs of ants, like Arab. *qrđ*, of rodents. So *Peah* ii. § 7, *Menachoth* 71b, on which Rashi observes, “the locust (הגב) is accustomed to eat from above, the ant tears off the corn-stalk from below.” Elsewhere קרסם denotes the breaking off of dry branches from the tree, as ורד the removal of green branches.

ft284 Perhaps the *Caph majusculum* is the result of an erasure that required to be made, vid., Geiger, *Urschrift*, S. 295. Accordingly the *Ajin suspensum* might also be the result of a later inserted correction, for there is a Phoenician inscription that has ר (wood, forest); vid., Levy, *Phönizisches Wörterbuch*, S. 22.

ft285 The **תהי** has *Gaja*, like **שְׁאוֹזְמֵרָה** (Psa. 81: 3), **בְּנֵי־נֹכַר** (Psa. 144: 7), and the like. This *Gaja* beside the *Shebâ* (instead of beside the following vowel) belongs to the peculiarities of the metrical books, which in general, on account of their more melodious mode of delivery, have many such a *Gaja* beside *Shebâ*, which does not occur in the prose books. Thus, e.g., **יְהוָה** and **אֱלֹהִים** always have *Gaja* beside the *Shebâ* when they have *Rebia magnum* without a conjunctive, probably because *Rebia* and *Dechî* had such a fulness of tone that a first stroke fell even upon the *Shebâ*-letters.

ft286 Pinsker punctuates thus: Let Thy hand be upon the man, Thy right hand upon the son of man, whom, etc.; but the impression that **לְךָ** and **אֲמַצְתָּה** coincide is so strong, that no one of the old interpreters (from the LXX and Targum onwards) has been able to free himself from it.

ft287 In the first of his *Commentationes de primitiva et vera festorum apud Hebraeos ratione*, 1851, 4to.

ft288 Vid., my essay on the Passover rites during the time of the second Temple in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1855; and cf. Armknecht, *Die heilige Psalmidoe* (1855), S. 5.

ft289 In the *Papyrus Leydensis* i. 346 the Israelites are called the “*Aperiu* (**עֲבָרִים**), who dragged along the stones for the great watch-tower of the city of Rameses,” and in the *Pap. Leyd.* i. 349, according to Lauth, the “*Aperiu*, who dragged along the stones for the storehouse of the city of Rameses.”

ft290 In the English authorized version, Exo. 21: 6; 22: 8f. (“judges”), 28 (“gods,” margin “judges”). — Tr.

ft291 Concerning the **בְּנֵי בַּיְיָאֵן** (*Benî Bajjân*), 1 Macc. 5: 4, the difficulty respecting which is to the present time unsolved, vid., Wetzstein’s *Excursus* II, pp. 559f..

ft292 The Syriac Hexapla has (Hos. 10:14) **צִלְמַנֵּע** instead of **שְׁלֹמֹן**, a substitution which is accepted by Geiger, *Deutsch. Morgenländ. Zeitschr.* 1862, S. 729f. Concerning the signification of the above names of Midianitish princes, vid., Nöldeke, *Ueber die Amalekiter*, S. 9.

ft293 Saadia, who renders the **גְּלִיגָל** in Psa. 77:19 as an astronomical expression with Arab. *l-frk*, the sphere of the heavens, here has professedly Arab. *kâlgrâblt*, which would be a plural from expanded out of Arab. *grâbîl*, “sieves” or “tambourines;” it is, however, to be read, as in Isa. 17:13, *Codex Oxon.*, Arab. *kâlgirbâlt*. The verb Arab. *garbala*, “to sift,” is transferred to the wind, e.g., in *Mutanabbi* (edited with Wahidi’s commentary by Dieterici), p. 29, l. 5 and 6: “it is as though the dust of this

region, when the winds chase one another therein, were sifted,” Arab. *mugarbalu* (i.e., caught up and whirled round); and with other notional and constructional applications in *Makkarî*, i. p. 102, l. 18: “it is as though its soil had been cleansed from dust by sifting,” Arab. *gurbilat* (i.e., the dust thereof swept away by a whirlwind). Accordingly Arab. *gîrbâlat* signifies first, as a *nom. vicis*, a whirling about (of dust by the wind), then in a concrete sense a whirlwind, as Saadia uses it, inasmuch as he makes use of it twice for גַּלְגַּל. So Fleischer in opposition to Ewald, who renders “like the sweepings or rubbish.”

ft294 In the old Arabic نَعَلَ is both singular and collective; and so, too, it will be in Hebrew, and the occurrence of the dual is not opposed to this. The modern language still has the *nomen unitatis* نَعْلًا, but the Beduins are very glad to avoid both words on account of their accord with لَعْنًا, “a curse,” a terrible word to them; still they use the former when they intend the latter, and say *‘alêh en-na<sup>‘a</sup>la*, “the shoe upon him!” (or the horse-shoe, for *na<sup>‘a</sup>*, also has this meaning) in the sense of “the curse upon him!” Upon this, too, is based the proverb: *el-weled el-charâ jegîb li-ah<sup>‘a</sup>luh en-na<sup>‘a</sup>la*, “the dirty child bring to his [family] the shoe,” i.e., a bad child brings a curse upon his [family] (cf. Tantawi’s *Traité*, p. 119). The word *na<sup>‘a</sup>* is still found now-a-days, but almost exclusively among the nomads and the *ḡarâwîna* (the inhabitants of the villages of the desert). The shoe together with the latches or thongs is cut out of the raw hide of a slaughtered or fallen camel, and while moist fitted on to the foot, in order that in drying it may receive the shape of the foot. The Syrian peasantry in the present day wear the red or yellow *gezma* a handbreadth high, a kind of boot; and the poorer inhabitants of the towns the red *surmeia* reaching to the ankle, a real shoe; whilst the more prosperous wear a yellow undershoe (*ḡalshîn*) and a red over-shoe (*bâbûga*, collective *bâgûg* and *bawâbîg*). These four foreign words lead one to infer that the thing itself is of foreign origin; yet the simple *surmeia*, which is also called *merkûb* (מַרְכוּב), is very old in the cities of Syria and of Palestine. According to Amo. 2: 6; 8: 6, it is scarcely to be doubted that the real leathern shoe was also understood among the Hebrews by the word נַעַל.

ft295 Freytag has here erroneously translated the word *sawâd* by *opes*. The proverb is: misfortune upon misfortune makes the heart blind, i.e., breaks the spirit and energy. In Damascus they say Arab. *‘l-tafâr y<sup>‘</sup>mmî ‘l-qlb*, “poverty makes the heart blind.”

ft296 The anecdote given on this proverb by *Meidânî* is one of those bad jokes such as the Arabs have on a great many of their proverbs.

- ft297 Instead of *bâgûgî* they also say *surmeiatî*, and in the country always *gezmatî*. This swaggering phrase is very frequent among the common people; I have, however, never seen it put into practice.
- ft298 As is well known, the Arabs are not so sensitive to anything as they are to outward distinctions; and the words of the poet *Abû Farrâs: lanâ eş-şadr au el-ķabr*, “we desire the seat of honour or the grave,” are uttered by every Arab from the very soul.
- ft299 Usually called *Ghamr el- Arabât* in distinction from another watering-place and highroad- station of the same name between *Ma ân* and *Têmâ*.
- ft300 For the most part, as one will be aware, the gentile noun is fond of the broken plural, e.g., Arab. *ʾI-jwâbrt* (from the singular *jâbrâ*), “the *Benî Gâbir*” (Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 405); Arab/ *ʾI-şwâlht* (from the singular *şâlihayy*), “the *Benî Şâliḥ*” (vid., p. 489); compare besides, Arab. *ʾI-maqâdisat*, *ʾI-bawâlitat*, *ʾI-anâḥikt*, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, of *Beirût*, of Antioch. By analogy one would expect to meet with a plural Arab. *ʾI-bayâ inat* from *ʾI-bayyânny*; but such a plural is not possible on phonetic grounds, and therefore, too, the Arab. *banî sayyâl* (a tribe in the Trachonitis) is called only Arab. *ʾI-sayyâlat*, and not *ʾI-sayâ ʾIt*. Also from a plural Arab. *byâ nt* one could not with certainty infer a singular Arab. *bayyânny*, since the *n* of the final syllable in the *pluralis fractus* of *gentilia* is very frequently a servile letter, e.g., in Arab. *ʾI-layâtinat* (from the singular *ʾI-laytyy*), the *Benî Leith* (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 420), Arab. *ʾI-gwârnt* (from the singular *ʾI-gawryy*), “the dwellers in the *Ghor*” (Burckhardt, *ibid.* p. 391); cf. besides, Arab. *ʾI-ḥamâşinat* and *ʾI-şawârinat* (from the singular *ʾI-ḥimşyy* and *ʾI-şûryy*), “the inhabitants of *Emesa* and *Tyre*.” Since the form Arab. *fâ ʾâlat* if become a very favourite collective of Arab. *fâ ʾâl* (cf. *ḥassâda*, the mowers; *reggâda*, the reapers; *derrâsa*, the threshers; *kejîjâla*, the measurers of the corn; *tarrâba*, the tillers of the ground; *lebbâna*, the trickmakers, etc.), it is natural simply to foist the name of ancestor of the tribe *Bajjân* on the collective *Bajjâna* as the singular. This supposition is, however, unnecessary, since in connection with other word-formations too the Arab. *yy* of the nisba disappears in the collective; cf. Arab. *ʾI-anazat*, *ʾI-ḥasanat*, *ʾI-saba ʾat*, *ʾI-fârajat*, all of which are names of nomadic tribes, the singulars of which are Arab. *ʾunayzyy*, *ḥusaynyy*, *subay ʾyy*, *furayjiyy*.
- ft301 Nic. Nonnen takes a different view in his *Dissertatio de Tzippor et Deror*, etc., 1741. He considers one of the Ephraimites who were brought back to the fellowship of the true worship of God in the reign of Jehoshaphat (2Ch. 19: 4) to be the subject of the Psalm.
- ft302 Vid., Knobel on Exodus, S. 253-257, especially S. 255.
- ft303 Vid., Tobler, *Denkblätter aus Jerusalem*, 1853, S. 117.

- ft304 Concerning St. Bernard's beautiful parable of the reconciliation of the inviolability of divine threatening and of justice with mercy and peace in the work of redemption, which has grown out of this passage of the Psalms, *Misericordia et veritas obviaverunt sibi, justitia et pax osculatae sunt*, and has been transferred to the painting, poetry, and drama of the middle ages, vid., Piper's *Evangelischer Kalender*, 1859, S. 24-34, and the beautiful miniature representing the ἄσπασμός of δικαιοσύνη and εἰρήνη of a Greek Psalter, 1867, S. 63.
- ft305 For the genuine reading in v. 4 (where Heidenheim reads יהוה) and in v. 5 (where Nissel reads יהוה) is also אֱלֹהֵי (Bomberg, Hutter, etc.). Both the divine names in vv. 4 and 5 belong to the 134 אֱלֹהֵי. The divine name אֱלֹהֵי, which is written and is not merely substituted for יהוה, is called in the language of the Masora אֱלֹהֵי (the true and real one).
- ft306 Hupfeld cites Rashi as having thus explained it; but his gloss is to be rendered: my whole inmost part (after the Aramaic = אִמִּי) is with thee, i.e., they salvation.
- ft307 The derivation is not contrary to the genius of the language; the supplementing productive force of the language displayed in the liturgical poetry of the synagogue, also changes particles into verbs: vid., Zunz, *Die synagogaie Poesie des Mittelalters*, S. 421.
- ft308 *Abulwalid* also explains אֱלֹהֵי after the Arabic, but in a way that cannot be accepted, viz., "for a long time onwards," from the Arabic *iffân* (*ibbân, iff, afâf, ifâf, ta'ffâh*), time, period — time conceived of in the onward rush, the constant succession of its moments.
- ft309 Heidenheim interprets: Thy terrors are become to me as צַמְתָּת (Lev. 25:23), i.e., inalienably my own.
- ft310 This name אֵיתָן is also Phoenician in the form יתן, *Itan*, Ἰτανός; ליתן, *litan*, is Phoenician, and equivalent to לעלם.
- ft311 Vid., Blau, *Sisags Zug gegen Juda*, illustrated from the monument in Karnak, *Deutsche Morgenländ. Zeitschr.* xv. 233-250.
- ft312 The Vulgate renders: *Misericordias Domini in aeternum cantabo*. The second Sunday after Easter takes its name from this rendering.
- ft313 *Zur Geschichte des Karaismus*, pp. קפב and קפא, according to which, reversely, in Jos. 5: 1 עברנו is to be read instead of עברם, and Isa. 33: 2 זרענו instead of זרעם, Psa. 12: 8 תשמרנו instead of תשמרם, Mic. 7:19 חמאתנו instead of חמאתם, Job. 32: 8 תביננו instead of תבינם, Pro. 25:27

כבודנו instead of כבוד (the limiting of our honour brings honour, — an unlikely interpretation of the חקר).

ft314 In the list of the nations and cities conquered by King Sheshonk I are found even cities of the tribe of Issachar, e.g., *Shen-ma-an*, Sunem; vid., Brugsch, *Reiseberichte*, S. 141-145, and Blau as referred to above.

ft315 The view of Pinsker (*Einleitung*, S. 69), that this *Dag* is not a sign of the doubling of the letter, but a diacritic point (that preceded the invention of the system of vowel-points), which indicated that the respective letter was to be pronounced with a *Chateph* vowel (e.g., *mijōhar*), is incorrect. The doubling *Dag* renders the *Shebâ* audible, and having once become audible it readily receives this or that colouring according to the nature of its consonant and of the neighbouring vowel.

ft316 The *Pasek* between הראשנים and אדני is not designed merely to remove the limited predicate from the Lord, who is indeed the First and the Last, but also to secure its pronunciation to the guttural *Aleph*, which might be easily passed over after *Mem*; cf. Gen. 1:27; 21:17; 30:20; 42:21, and frequently.

ft317 Hence in *J. Shabbath* 8, col. 2, and *Midrash Shocher tob* on Psa. 91: 1 and elsewhere, it is called, together with Psalm 3, שיר פגועין (פגעים), a song of occurrences, i.e., a protective (or talismanic) song in times of dangers that may befall one, just as Sebald Heyden's Psalm-song, "He who is in the protection of the Most High and resigns himself to God," is inscribed "Preservative against the pestilence."

ft318 Vid., Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmud*, § § 146 and 174.

ft319 In the former passage כהן ראש is taken as one notion (chief priest), and in the latter אנשים בקשת (men with the bow) is, with Keil, to be regarded as an apposition.

ft320 It is well known that his pausal form of the 3rd masc. praet. occurs in connection with *Zakeph*; but it is also found with *Rebia* in 112:10 (the reading וְכָעַם), Lev. 5:23 (גָּזַל), Jos. 10:13 (עָמַד), Lam. 2:17 (זָמַם); but not in Deu. 19:19, Zec. 1: 6, which passages Kimchi counts up with them in his grammar *Michlol*); with *Tarcha* in Isa. 14:27 (יָעִץ), Hos. 6: 1 (מָרָף), Amo. 3: 8 (שָׂאָג); with *Tebîr* in Lev. 5:18 (שָׂגַג); and even with *Munach* in 1Sa. 7:17 (שָׁפַט), and according to *Abulwalid* with *Mercha* in 1Ki. 11: 2 (דָּבַק).

ft321 These passages, together with Psa. 93: 1; 104: 1, are cited in *Cant. Rabba* 26b (cf. *Debarim Rabba* 29d), where it is said that the Holy One calls

Israel כלה (bride) ten times in the Scriptures, and that Israel on the other hand ten times assigns kingly judicial robes to Him.

ft322 A Talmudic enigmatical utterance of R. Azaria runs: מאדירים באדירים , Let the glorious One (Jahve, Psa. 93: 4, cf. Isa. 10:34; 33:21) come and maintain the right of the glorious ones (Israel, Psa. 16: 3) against the glorious ones (the Egyptians, Exo. 15:10 according to the construction of the Talmud) in the glorious ones (the waves of the sea, Psa. 93: 4).

ft323 The Masora on Psa. 147 reckons four נאָה, one וְנאָה, and one נאָה, and therefore our נאֹה is one of the יז מלין דמפקין אלף וכל חד ליה מפיק (cf. Frensdorf's *Ochla we-Ochla*, p. 123), i.e., one of the seventeen words whose *Aleph* is audible, whilst it is otherwise always quiescent; e.g., מוצאת, otherwise במוצאת.

ft324 According to *B. Erachin 11a*, at the time of the Chaldaean destruction of Jerusalem the Levites on their pulpits were singing this 94th Psalm, and as they came to the words “and He turneth back upon them their iniquity” (v. 23), the enemies pressed into the Temple, so that they were not able to sing the closing words, “Jahve, our God, will destroy them.” To the scruple that Psalm 94 is a Wednesday, not a Sunday, Psalm (that fatal day, however, was a Sunday, מוצאי שבת), it is replied, it may have been a lamentation song that had just been put into their mouths by the circumstances of that time (אליא בעלמא דנפל להו בפומייהו).

ft325 The questions are not: ought He to have no ear, etc.; as Jerome pertinently observes in opposition to the anthropomorphites, *membra tulit, efficientias dedit*.

ft326 If it is correct that, as Aben-Ezra and Parchon testify, the ו, as being compounded of *o* (*u*) + *i*, was pronounced *ü* [like the *u* in the French word *pur*] by the inhabitants of Palestine, then this *Dagesh*, in accordance with its orthophonic function, is the more intelligible in cases like תיסרנו יה and קראתי יה, cf. Pinsker, *Einleitung*, S. 153, and Geiger, *Urschrift*, S. 277. In קומו צאו, Gen. 19:14, Exo. 12:31, קומו סעו, Deu. 2:24, *Tsade* and *Samech* have this *Dagesh* for the same reason as the *Sin* in שאור תשביטו, Exo. 12:15 (vid., Heidenheim on that passage), viz., because there is a danger in all these cases of slurring over the sharp sibilant. Even Chajug' (vid., Ewald and Dukes' *Beiträge*, iii. 23) confuses this *Dag. orthophonicum* with the *Dag. forte conjunctivum*.

ft327 By means of a similar transposition of the vowel as is to be assumed in תאָהבו, Pro. 1:22, it also appears that מוסבין = מסובין (lying upon the



table, ἀνακε(μενοι) of the Pesach-Haggada has to be explained, which Joseph Kimchi finds so inexplicable that he regards it as a clerical error that has become traditional.

- ft328 In the *Psalterium Veronense* with the addition *apo xylu*, Cod. 156, Latinizing ἀπὸ τῷ ξύλῳ; in the Latin Psalters (the Vulgate excepted) *a ligno*, undoubtedly an addition by an early Christian hand, upon which, however, great value is set by Justin and all the early Latin Fathers.
- ft329 Luther renders: “the water-floods exult” (*frohlocken*); and Eychman’s *Vocabularius predicantium* explains *plaudere* by “to exult (*frohlocken*) for joy, to smite the hands together *prae gaudio*;” cf. Luther’s version of Eze. 21:17.
- ft330 Vid., Raemdonck in his *David propheta cet.* 1800: *in omnes injurias ipsas illatas, uti patuit in Core cet.*
- ft331 According to the reckoning of the Masora, there are fifteen passages in the Old Testament in which שׁל is written and לו is read, viz., Exo. 21: 8, Lev. 11:21; 25:30, 1Sa. 2: 3, 2Sa. 16:18, 2Ki. 8:10, Isa. 9: 2; 63: 9, Psal. 100: 3; 139:16, Job. 13:15 [cf. the note there], 41: 4, Pro. 19: 7; 26: 2, Ezr. 4: 2. Because doubtful, Isa. 49: 5, 1Ch. 11:20 are not reckoned with these.
- ft332 Eyring, in his *Vita* of Ernest the Pious [Duke of Saxe-Gotha, v. 1601, d. 1675], relates that he sent an unfaithful minister a copy of the 101st Psalm, and that it became a proverb in the country, when an official had done anything wrong: He will certainly soon receive the prince’s Psalm to read.
- ft333 In both instances the Masora writes אִוְתָו (*plene*), but the Talmud, *B. Erachin* 15b, had אִוְתָשׁ before it when it says: “Of the slanderer God says: I and he cannot dwell together in the world, I cannot bear it any longer with him (אִוְתָשׁ).”
- ft334 The LXX renders it: I am like a pelican of the desert, I am become as a night-raven upon a ruined place (οἰκοπέδῳ). In harmony with the LXX, Saadia (as also the Arabic version edited by Erpenius, the Samaritan Arabic, and *Abulwalid*) renders קִשָּׁת by Arab. *qûq* (here and in Lev. 11:18, Deu. 14:17, Isa. 34:17), and כּוּס by Arab. *bûm*; the latter (*bum*) is an onomatopoeic name of the owl, and the former (*kuk*) does not even signify the owl or horned-owl (although the small horned-owl is called *um kuéik* in Egypt, and in Africa *abu kuéik*; vid., the dictionaries of Boethor and Marcel s.v. *chouette*), but the pelican, the “long-necked water-bird” (Damiri after the lexicon *el-‘Obâb* of Hasan ben-Mohammed el-Saghani). The Graeco-Veneta also renders קִשָּׁת with *πελεκάν*, — the Peshito, however, with Syr. *qâqâ*<sup>c</sup>. What Ephrem on Deu. 14:17 and the

*Physiologus Syrus* (ed. Tychsen, p. 13, cf. pp. 110 f). say of Syr. *qāqā*<sup>ς</sup>, viz., that it is a marsh-bird, is very fond of its young ones, dwells in desolate places, and is incessantly noisy, likewise points to the pelican, although the Syrian lexicographers vary. Cf. also Oedmann, *Vermischte Sammlungen*, Heft 3, Cap. 6. (Fleischer after a communication from Rodiger.)

- ft335 It is a Talmudic view that God really makes the angels out of fire, *B. Chagiga*, 14a (cf. *Koran*, xxxviii. 77): Day by day are the angels of the service created out of the stream of fire (נְהַר דִּינִינֹר), and sing their song of praise and perish.
- ft336 *Proben*, i.e., *Specimens* of Old Testament interpretation, Leipzig 1833, and *Aehrenlese* (Gleanings), referred to in the preface of these volumes. — Tr.
- ft337 In the *Mergé* district, where the stork is not called *leklek* as it is elsewhere, but *charnuḳ* on account of its bill like a long horn (Arab. *chrn*) standing out in front, the women and children call it Arab. *bū sa'd*, “bringer of good luck.” Like the חֲסִידָה, the long-legged carrion-vulture (*Vultur percnopterus*) or mountain-stork, ὄρειπελαργός, is called רְחֵם (Arab. *rḥm*) on account of its סְטוֹרָגָה.
- ft338 Vide Chabas, *Le papyrus magique Harris*, p. 246, No. 826: HANI (אֲנִי), *vaisseau*, *navire*, and the *Book of the Dead* 1. 10, where *hani* occurs with the determinative picture of a ship. As to the form *ana*, vid., Chabas *loc. cit.* p. 33.
- ft339 More accurately הַלְלוּנִיהַ with *Chateph*, as Jekuthiël ha-Nakdan expressly demands. Moreover the mode of writing it as one word is the rule, since the Masora notes the הַלְלוּנִיהַ, occurring only once, in Psa. 135: 3, with לִית בְּמַעַם as being the only instance of the kind.
- ft340 Yet even in the Talmud (*J. Megilla* i. 9, *Sofrim* v. 10) it is a matter of controversy concerning the mode of writing this word, whether it is to be separate or combined; and in *B. Pesachim* 117a Rab appeals to a Psalter of the school of Chabibi (תִּילֵי דְבֵי חַבִּיבִי) that he has seen, in which הַלְלוּ stood in one line and יה in the other. In the same place Rab Chasda appeals to a תִּילֵי דְבֵי רַב חַנִּין that he has seen, in which the *Hallelujah* standing between two Psalms, which might be regarded as the close of the Psalm preceding it or as the beginning of the Psalm following it, as written in the middle between the two (בְּאַמְצַע פִּירְקָא). In the הַלְלוּיָהַ written as one word, יה is not regarded as strictly the divine name, only as an addition strengthening the notion of the הַלְלוּ, as in בְּמַרְחַבֵּיהַ Psa. 118: 5; with reference to this, vide Geiger, *Urschrift*, S. 275.

- ft341 The *Mugrash* of **יְשַׁמַּח** with the following *Legarme* seems here to be of equal value with *Zakeph*, 1Ch. 16:10.
- ft342 For this reason a king says **אָמִי**, not **גִּוִּי**; and **גִּוִּי** only occurs twice with a suffix, which refers to Jahve (Psa. 106: 5, Zep. 2: 9); for this reason **גִּוִּי**, frequently side by side with **אָם**, is the nobler word, e.g., in Deu. 32:21, Jer. 2:11; for this reason **אָם** is frequently added to **גִּוִּי** as a dignitative predicate, Exo. 33:13, Deu. 4: 6; and for this reason **גִּוִּיִּם** and **ה' אָם** are used antithetically.
- ft343 Also in ancient Arabic *firzil* (after the Aramaic **פְּרוּזְלָא**) directly signifies an iron fetter (and the large smith's shears for cutting the iron), whence the *verb. denom. Arab. farzala, c. acc. pers.*, to put any one into iron chains. Iron is called **בְּרוּזָל** from **בָּרוּז**, to pierce, like the Arabic *ḥdid*, as being the material of which pointed tools are made.
- ft344 Here **שְׁלַח** is united by *Makkeph* with the following word, to which it hurries on, whereas in v. 28 it has its own accent, a circumstance to which the Masora has directed attention in the apophthegm: **דַּחְשׁוּבָא מְתִינִין שְׁלוּחֵי דְמַלְכָא זְרִיזִין שְׁלוּחֵי דְחֹשְׁכָא** (the emissaries of the king are in haste, those of darkness are tardy); vid., Baer, *Thorath Emeth*, p. 22.
- ft345 In the second section of *Aboda zara*, on the words of the Mishna: "The flesh which is intended to be offered first of all to idols is allowed, but that which comes out of the temple is forbidden, because it is like sacrifices of the dead," it is observed, fol. 32b: "Whence, said R. Jehuda ben *Bethêra*, do I know that that which is offered to idols (**תְּקִרְוַת לְעִבּוּדָא זְרָה**) pollutes like a dead body? From Psa. 106:28. As the dead body pollutes everything that is under the same roof with it, so also does everything that is offered to idols." The Apostle Paul declares the objectivity of this pollution to be vain, cf. more particularly 1Co. 10:28f.
- ft346 In exact editions like Norzi, Heidenheim, and Baer's, before vv. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 40 there stand reversed *Nuns* (**נּוּנִין הַפּוּכִיִן**), in the language of the Masora (**נּוּנִין מְנוּזְרוֹת**), as before Num. 10:35 and between 10:36 and 11: 1 (nine in all). Their signification is unknown.
- ft347 In connection with the strong verb it frequently represents the *Piel* which does not occur, as with **לָשֵׁן**, **דָּרַשׁ**, **שָׁפַט**, or even represents the *Piel* which, as in the case of **שָׁרַשׁ**, is already made use of in another signification (*Piel*, to root out; *Poel*, to take root).
- ft348 The verbal group **כַּחַד**, **כַּחַשׁ**, Arab. *ḥajda, kaḥṣa*, etc. has the primary signification of withdrawal and taking away or decrease; to deny is the

same as to withdraw from agreement, and he becomes thin from whom the fat withdraws, goes away. Saadia compares on this passage (פרדה) כחֹשֶׁה , a lean cow, *Berachoth* 32a. In like manner Targum II renders Gen. 41:27 תִּזְרָתָא כַּחֲשֵׁתָא , the lean kine.

<sup>ft349</sup> Vid., the refutation of this modified view in Kurtz, *Zur Theologie der Psalmen*, in the *Dorpater Zeitschrift* for the year 1861, S. 516.

*Supplementary Note.* — Von Hofmann now interprets Psalm 110 as prophetic-Messianic. We are glad to be able to give it in his own words. “As the utterance of a prophet who speaks the word of God to the person addressed, the Psalm begins, and this it is then all through, even where it does not, as in v. 4, expressly make known to the person addressed what God swears to him. God intends to finally subdue his foes to him. Until then, until his day of victory is come, he shall have a dominion in the midst of them, the sceptre of which shall be mighty through the succour of God. His final triumph is, however, pledged to him by the word of God, which appoints him, as another Melchizedek, to an eternal priesthood, that excludes the priesthood of Aaron, and by the victory which God has already given him in the day of His wrath.

“This is a picture of a king on Zion who still looks forward to that which in *Psa.* 72: 8 ff. has already taken place, — of a victorious, mighty king, who however is still ruling in the midst of foes, — therefore of a king such as Jesus now is, to whom God has given the victory over heathen Rome, and to whom He will subdue all his enemies when he shall again reveal himself in the world; meanwhile he is the kingly priest and the priestly king of the people of God. The prophet who utters this is David, He whom he addresses as Lord is the king who is appointed to become spoken according to *2Sa.* 23: 3. David beholds him in a moment of his ruling to which the moment in his own ruling in which we find him in *2Sa.* 11: 1 is typically parallel.”

<sup>ft350</sup> Cf. the custom of the old Arabian kings to have their viceroy (*ridf*) sitting at their right hand, *Monumenta antiquiss. hist. Arabum*, ed. Eichhorn, p. 220.

<sup>ft351</sup> The LXX renders it: ἐν ταῖς λαμπρότησι τῶν ἁγίων σου (belonging to the preceding clause), ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε (*Psalt. Veron. exegetica se*; Bamberg. *gegennica se*). The Vulgate, following the Italic closely: *in splendoribus sanctorum; ex utero ante luciferum genui te*. The Fathers in some cases interpret it of the birth of the Lord at Christmas, but most of them of His antemundane birth, and accordingly Apollinaris paraphrases: γαστρὸς καρπὸς ἑμῆς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου αὐτὸς ἐτύχθης. In his own independent translation Jerome reads בְּהַרְרִי (as in 87: 1), *in*

*montibus sanctis quasi de vulva orietur tibi ros adolescentiae tuae*, as Symmachus *ἐν ὄρεσιν ἁγίοις*, — elsewhere, however, *ἐν δόξῃ ἁγίων*. The substitution is not unmeaning, since the ideas of dew and of mountains (Psa. 133: 3) are easily united; but it was more important to give prominence to the holiness of the equipment than to that of the place of meeting.

<sup>ft352</sup> The Arabic lexicographers explain Arab. *kâhin* by *mn yqûm b-ʿmr ʿl-rjl w-ys ʿâ fi hâjth*, “he who stands and does any one’s business and manageth his affair.” That Arab. *qâm*, קום, and Arab. *mtl*, משל, side by side with עמד are synonyms of בהן in this sense of standing ready for service and in an official capacity.

<sup>ft353</sup> G. Enjedin the Socinian (died 1597) accordingly, in referring this Psalm to David, started from the assumption that priestly functions have been granted exceptionally by God to this king as to no other, vid., the literature of the controversy to which this gave rise in Serpilius, *Personalia Davidis*, S. 268-274.

<sup>ft354</sup> Just so Kurtz, *Zur Theologie der Psalmen*, loc. cit. S. 523.

<sup>ft355</sup> Böttcher transposes the verses in Psa. 111, and in 112: 5 corrects יכלכל into וכלכל; in the warmth of his critical zeal he runs against the boundary-posts of the letters marking the order, without observing it.

<sup>ft356</sup> Vid., the tractate *Sofrim*, xviii. §2. Apart from the new moons at which the recitation of the *Hallel* κατ ἐξοχήν i.e., Psa. 113-118, is only according to custom (מנהג), not according to the law, the *Hallel* was recited eighteen times a year during the continuance of the Temple (and in Palestine even in the present day), viz., once at the Passover, once at Shabuoth, eight times at Succoth, eight times at Chanucca (the feast of the Dedication); and now in the Exile twenty-one times, because the Passover and Succoth have received two feast-days and Shabuoth one as an addition, viz., twice at the Passover, twice at Shabuoth, nine times at Succoth. Instead of *Hallel* absolutely we also find the appellation “the Egyptian Hallel” (המצרי הלל) for Psa. 113-118. The ancient ritual only makes a distinction between this (Egyptian) Hallel and the Great Hallel, Psa. 136 (see there).

<sup>ft357</sup> One usually compares Arab. *chlnbûs*, *chalnabûs* [the Karaite lexicographer Abraham ben David writes הלמבוס]; but this obsolete word, as a compound from Arab. *chls*, to be black-grey, and Arab. *chnbs*, to be hard, may originally signify a hard black-grey stone, whereas הלמיש looks like a mingling of the verbal stems Arab. *hms*, to be hard, and Arab. *hls*, to be black-brown (as Arab. *jlmûd*, a detached block of rock, is of the verbal stems Arab. *jld*, to be hard, and Arab. *jmd*, to be massive). In Hauran the

doors of the houses and the window-shutters are called Arab. *ħalāsāt* when they consist of a massive slab of dolerite, probably from their blackish hue. Perhaps חלמיש is the ancient name for basalt; and in connection with the hardness of this form of rock, which resembles a mass of cast metal, the breaking through of springs is a great miracle. — Wetzstein. For other views vid., on Isa. 49:21; 50: 7.

ft358 The appellation φοβούμενοι does not however occur, if we do not bring Act. 10: 2 in here; but in Latin inscriptions in Orelli-Hentzen No. 2523, and in Auer in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 1852, S. 80, the proselyte (*religionis Judaicae*) is called *metuens*.

ft359 Kimchi, mistaking the vocation of the *Metheg*, regards מִלְלָה (מִלְלָה) as *Milel*. But the Palestinian and the Babylonian systems of pointing coincide in this, that the beseeching מִלְרָה (מִלְרָה) is *Milra*, and the interrogatory מִלְרָה *Milel* (with only two exceptions in our text, which is fixed according to the Palestinian Masora, viz., Psa. 139: 7, Deu. 1:28, where the following word begins with *Aleph*), and these modes of accenting accord with the origin of the two particles. Pinsker (*Einleitung*, S. xiii.) insinuates against the Palestinian system, that in the cases where מִלְרָה has two accents the pointing was not certain of the correct accentuation, only from a deficient knowledge of the bearings of the case.

ft360 The national grammarians, so far as we are acquainted with them, furnish no explanation. De Balmis believes that these *Milra* forms מִלְרָה, מִלְרָה, and the like, must be regarded as infinitives, but at the same time confirms the difference of views existing on this point.

ft361 The Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 30) commend the singing of these and other words of the Psalms at the funerals of those who have departed in the faith (cf. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, ix. 563). In the reign of the Emperor Decius, Babylas Bishop of Antioch, full of blessed hope, met death singing these words.

ft362 Vid., my Talmudic Studies, vi. (*Der Hosianna-Ruf*), in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1855, S. 653-656.

ft363 Vid., Baer's *Thorath Emeth*, p. 7 note, and p. 21, end of note 1.

ft364 Hitzig on Pro. 8:22 considers the pointing מִלְרָה to be occasioned by *Dechî*, and in fact מִלְרָה in the passage before us has *Tarcha*, and in 1Sa. 28:15 *Munach*; but in the passage before us, if we read מִלְרָה as one word according to the Masora, מִלְרָה is rather to be accented with *Mugrash*; and in 1Sa. 28:15 the reading מִלְרָה is found side by side with מִלְרָה (e.g., in *Bibl. Bomberg*. 1521). Nevertheless מִלְרָה Psa. 17: 3, and מִלְרָה Job. 30:19

(according to Kimchi's *Michlol*, 30a), beside *Mercha*, show that the pointing beside conjunctive as beside disjunctive accents wavers between *á* and *ā*, although *ā* is properly only justified beside disjunctive accents, and **וְנִצַּח** also really only occurs in pause.

- ft365 Kurtz, in combating our interpretation, reduces the number of the weeping ones to “some few,” but the narrative says the very opposite.
- ft366 The verse, “This is the day which the Lord hath made,” etc., was, according to Chrysostom, an ancient hypophon of the church. It has a glorious history.
- ft367 Symmachus has felt this, for instead of **συστήσασθε ἑορτήν ἐν τοῖς πυκάζουσιν** (*in condensis*) of the LXX, he renders it, transposing the notions, **συνδήσατε ἐν πανηγύρει πυκάσματα**. Chrysostom interprets this: **στεφανώματα καὶ κλάδους ἀνάψατε τῷ ναῶ**, for Montfaucon, who regards this as the version of the *Sexta*, is in error.
- ft368 In the language of the Jewish ritual *Isru-chag* is become the name of the after-feast day which follows the last day of the feast. Psa. 118 is the customary Psalm for the *Isru-chag* of all **מוֹעֲדִים**.
- ft369 “In every verse,” this is the observation of the Masora on v. 122, “v. 122 only excepted, we find one of the ten (pointing to the ten fundamental words or decalogue of the Sinaitic Law) expressions: *word, saying, testimonies, way, judgment, precept, commandment* (**צוֹוֹי**), *law, statute, truth*” (according to another reading, *righteousness*).
- ft370 The word “judgments” of our English authorized version is retained in the text as being the most convenient word; it must, however, be borne in mind that in this Psalm it belongs to the “chain of synonyms,” and does not mean God’s acts of judgment, its more usual meaning in the Old Testament Scriptures, but is used as defined above, and is the equivalent here of the German *Rechte*, not *Gerichte*. — Tr.
- ft371 The word receives the meaning of **νικᾶν** (*vid.*, *supra*, p. 367), like Arab. *ḏhr* and *bhr*, from the signification of outshining = overpowering.
- ft372 Heidenheim and Baer erroneously have **בְּדַרְכֵיךָ** with *Jod. plural.*, contrary to the Masora.
- ft373 Cf. *B. Taanîth* 8a: “The prayer of a man is not answered **מְשִׁים נַפְשׁוֹ בַּכֶּפֶר** **כִּן אֵלֹהִים אִם כִּן**, i.e., if he is not ready to sacrifice his life.”
- ft374 Whilst even in the oldest alphabetical *Pijutim* the *Sin* perhaps represents the *Samech* as well, but never the *Shin*, it is the reverse in the Biblical alphabetical pieces. Here *Sin* and *Shin* coincide, and *Samech* is specially represented.

ft375 Vid., my *Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*, S. 193f.

ft376 It was called the Nicanor-gate in the Temple of Zerubbabel, and the Agrippa-gate in the Temple of Herod: in both of them they ascended to its threshold by fifteen steps; vid., Unruh, *Das alte Jerusalem und seine Bauwerke* (1861), S. 137, cf. 194.

ft377 Lyra in his *Postillae*, and Jacob Leonitius in his Hebrew *Libellus effigiei templi Salomonis* (Amsterdam 1650, 4to), even say that the Levites sang one of the fifteen songs of degrees on each step. Luther has again generalized this view; for his rendering “a song in the higher choir” is intended to say, *cantores harum odarum stetisse in loco eminentiori* (Bakius).

ft378 Hitzig, in his Commentary (1865), has attempted a new combination of these Psalms, in regard to the number of verses of 120 and 121 (7 + 8) and their total number, with the steps of the temple.

ft379 If the Psalm were a Maccabaeian Psalm, one might think מִשְׁךְ, from מִשְׁךָ, σύρειν, alluded to the Syrians or even to the Jewish apostates with reference to מִשְׁךְ עֲרָלָה , ἐπισπᾶσθαι τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν (1Co. 7:18).

ft380 Many expositors, nevertheless, understand the destructive influence of the moon meant here of the nightly cold, which is mentioned elsewhere in the same antithesis. Gen. 31:40, Jer. 36:30. De Sacy observes also: *On dit quelquefois d'un grand froid, comme d'un grand chaud, qu'il est brûlant*. The Arabs also say of snow and of cold as of fire: *jahrik*, it burns.

ft381 So also Veith in his, in many points, beautiful Lectures on twelve gradual Psalms (Vienna 1863), S. 72, “They arrested their steps, in order to give time to the amazement with which the sight of the Temple, the citadel of the king, and the magnificent city filled them.”

ft382 In the synagogue and church it is become customary to interpret v. 3 of the parallelism of the heavenly and earthly Jerusalem.

ft383 The Midrash here calls to mind a Talmudic riddle: There came a good one (Moses, Exo. 2: 2) and received a good thing (the *Tôra*, Pro. 4: 2) from the good One (God, Psa. 145: 9) for the good ones (Israel, Psa. 125: 4).

ft384 *An Gottes Segen ist alles gelegen.*

ft385 The fact that the τῶν καρπῶν of the LXX here, as in Pro. 31:20, is intended to refer to the hands is noted by Theodoret and also by Didymus (in Rosenmüller): καρπούς φησὶ νῦν ὡς ἀπὸ μέρους τὰς χεῖρας (i.e., *per synecdochen partis pro toto*), τουτέστι τῶν πρακτικῶν σου δυνάμεων φάγεσαι τοὺς πόνους.

ft386 So, too, Geiger in the *Deutsche Morgenländische Zeitschrift*, xiv. 278f., according to whom Arab. *slf* (*šlf*) occurs in Saadia and Abu-Said in the



signification “to be in the first maturity, to blossom,” — a sense שלף may also have here; cf. the Talmudic שלופפי used of unripe dates that are still in blossom.

ft387 Here and there עליכם is found as an error of the copyist. The *Hebrew Psalter*, Basel 1547, 12mo, notes it as a various reading.

ft388 Eusebius on Psa. 68 (67):5 observes that the Logos is called Ἰα as μορφὴν δούλον λαβὼν καὶ τὰς ἀκτῖνας τῆς ἑαυτοῦ θεότητος συστείλας καὶ ὥσπερ καταδύς ἐν τῷ σώματι. There is a similar passage in Vicentius Ciconia (1567), which we introduced into our larger Commentary on the Psalms (1859-60).

ft389 A Haraunitish poem in Wetzstein’s *Lieder-Sammlungen* begins: Arab. — — *ʿI-bâriḥat habbat ʿIynâ | šarârt mn ʿâliya ʿI-tlj*, “Yesterday there blew across to me a spark | from the lofty snow-mountain (the Hermon),” on which the commentator dictated to him the remark, that Arab. *šrârt*, the glowing spark, is either the snow-capped summit of the mountain glowing in the morning sun or a burning cold breath of air, for one says in everyday life Arab. *ʿI-šaqā ʿyahriq*, the frost burns [*vid.* note to 121: 6].

ft390 The LXX adjusts the shortening of v. 1*b* arising from this, by reading העמדים בבית ה' בחצרות בית אלהינו after 135: 2.

ft391 There are three opinions in the Talmud and Midrash concerning the compass of the “Great Hallel,” viz., (1) Psalm 136, (2) Psa. 135: 4-136, (3) Psalm 120-136.

ft392 Reversely Ellies du Pin (in the preface of his *Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques*) says: *Le Pseaume 136 porte le nom de David et de Jeremie, ce qu'il faut apparemment entendre ainsi: Pseaume de Jeremie fait à l'imitation de David.*

ft393 Bellarmine: *Scio me psallentem tibi ab angelis, qui tibi assistunt, videri et attendi et ideo ita considerate me geram in psallendo, ut qui intelligam, in quo theatro consistam.*

ft394 The Greek imperfects with the double (syllabic and temporal) augment, as ἑώρων, ἀνέωγον, are similar. *Chajugé* also regards the first *Jod* in these forms as the preformative and the second as the radical, whereas *Abulwafid*, *Gramm.* ch. xxvi. p. 170, explains the first as a prosthesis and the second as the preformative. According to the view of others, e.g., of Kimchi, יִדַע might be *fut. Hiph.* weakened from יִדְעֵה (יִדְעֵה), which, apart from the unsuitable meaning, assumes a change of consonants that is all the more inadmissible as ידע itself springs from ודע. Nor is it to be

supposed that **יִדַע** is modified from **יָדַע** (Luzzatto, § 197), because it is nowhere written **יָדַע**.

ft395 This *Verb. tert.* Arab. *w et y* is old, and the derivative *dherâ*, protection, is an elegant word; with reference to another derivative, *dherwe*, a wall of rock protecting one from the winds, vid., *Job*, at 24: 7, note. The II form (*Piel*) signifies to protect in the widest possible sense, e.g., (in *Neshwân*, ii. 343b), “[Arab.] *drâ l-šâh*, he protected the sheep (against being exchanged) by leaving a lock of wool upon their backs when they were shorn, by which they might be recognised among other sheep.”

ft396 In the Talmud the egg of a bird or of a reptile is called **מַרְקָמָה**, when the outlines of the developed embryo are visible in it; and likewise the mole (*mola*), when traces of human organization can be discerned in it.

ft397 Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. § 31, says the Hebrew **גֹּלְמֵה** signifies the peeled grains of spelt or wheat before they are mixed up and backed, the still raw (only bruised) flour-grains — a signification that can now no longer be supported by examples.

ft398 But outside the Old Testament it also occurs in the *Pual*, though as a wrong use of the word; vide my *Anekdotä* (1841), S. 372f.

ft399 The Hebrew poet, says Gesenius (*Lehrgebäude*, S. 739f.), sometimes uses the pronoun before the thing to which it referred has even been spoken of. This phenomenon belongs to the Hebrew style generally, vid., my *Anekdotä* (1841), S. 382.

ft400 It should be noted that the radical idea of the verb, viz., being heavy (German *schwer*), is retained in all these renderings. — Tr.

ft401 According to the original Lexicons Arab. '*ks* signifies to bend one's self, to wriggle, to creep sideways like the roots of the vine, in the V form to move one's self like an adder (according to the *Ḳamûs*) and to walk like a drunken man (according to *Neshwân*); but Arab. '*kš* signifies to be intertwined, knit or closely united together, said of hairs and of the branches of trees, in the V form to fight hand to hand and to get in among the crowd. The root is apparently expanded into **עִכְשׁוּב** by an added *Beth* which serves as a notional speciality, as in Arab. '*rqûb* the convex bend of the steep side of a rock, or in the case of the knee of the hind-legs of animals, and in Arab. *charnûb* (in the dialect of the country along the coast of Palestine, where the tree is plentiful, in *Neshwân churnûb*), the horn-like curved pod of the carob-tree (*Ceratonia Siliqua*), syncopated Arab. *charrûb*, *charrûb* (not *charûb*), from Arab. *charn*, cogn. *qarn*, a horn, cf. Arab. *chrnâyt*, the beak of a bird of prey, Arab. *chrnûq*, the stork [vid. on

Psa. 104:17], Arab. *chrîn*, the rhinoceros [vid. on Psa. 29: 6], Arab. *chrîṭ*, the unicorn [vid. *ibid.* ]. — Wetzstein.

<sup>ft402</sup> The lexicographer *Neshwân* says, i. 279b: Arab. *ʿl-sbb ʿl-satm w-qîl an aṣl ʿl-sbb ʿl-qatʿ tm ṣâr ʿl-štm*, “*sebb* is to abuse; still, the more original signification of cutting off is said to lie at the foundation of this signification.” That Arab. *qtʿ* is synonymous with it, e.g., Arab. *lîṣ tqʿ finâ*, why dost thou cut into us? i.e., why dost thou insult our honour? — Wetzstein.

<sup>ft403</sup> Which is favoured by Exo. 15: 5, *j<sup>e</sup>chasjûmû* with *mû* instead of *mô*, which is otherwise without example.

<sup>ft404</sup> It is not the priestly **קְטֹרֶת תְּמִיד**, i.e., the daily morning and evening incense-offering upon the golden altar of the holy place, Exo. 30: 8, that is meant (since it is a non-priest who is speaking, according to Hitzig, of course Joh. Hyrcanus), but rather, as also in Isa. 1:13, the incense of the *azcara* of the meal-offering which the priest burnt (**הַקְטִיר**) upon the altar; the incense (Isa. 66: 3) was entirely consumed, and not merely a handful taken from it.

<sup>ft405</sup> The reason of it is this, that the evening *mincha* is oftener mentioned than the morning *mincha* (see, however, 2Ki. 3:20). The whole burnt-offering of the morning and the meat-offering of the evening (2Ki. 16:15, 1Ki. 18:29, 36) are the beginning and close of the daily principal service; whence, according to the example of the *usus loquendi* in Dan. 9:21, Ezr. 9: 4f., later on *mincha* directly signifies the afternoon or evening.

<sup>ft406</sup> Beda Pieringer in his *Psalterium Romana Lyra Radditum* (Ratisbonae 1859) interprets **κατεπόθησαν ἐχόμενα πέτρας οἱ κραταιοὶ τῦτῶν**, *absorpti*, i.e., *operti sunt loco ad petram pertinente signiferi turpis consilii eorum*.

<sup>ft407</sup> Gerson observes on this point (vid., Thomasius, *Dogmatik*, iv. 251): I desire the righteousness of pity, which Thou bestowest in the present life, not the judgment of that righteousness which Thou wilt put into operation in the future life — the righteousness which justifies the repentant one.

<sup>ft408</sup> Properly, “Thy Spirit, a good one,” so that **תְּנוּבָה** is an adjectival apposition; as we can also say **רוּחַ הַתְּנוּבָה**, a spirit, the good one, although such irregularities may also be a negligent usage of the language, like the Arabic *msjd ʿl-jâm*, the chief mosque, which many grammarians regard as a construct relationship, others as an ellipsis (inasmuch as they supply Arab. *ʿl-mkân* between the words); the former is confirmed from the Hebrew, vid., Ewald, § 287, a.

<sup>ft409</sup> Rashi is acquainted with an otherwise unknown note of the Masora: **קרי תחתיו**; but this *Kerî* is imaginary.

ft410 In every instance where חטב (cogn. חצב) occurs, frequently side by side with שאב מים (to draw water), it signifies to hew wood for kindling; wherefore in Arabic, in which the verb has been lost, Arab. *ḥatab* signifies firewood (in distinction from Arab. *chšb*, wood for building, timber), and not merely this, but fuel in the widest sense, e.g., in villages where wood is scarce, cow-dung (vid., *Job*, at 20: 6-11, note), and the hemp-stalk, or stalk of the maize, in the desert the Arab. *b'rt*, i.e., camel-dung (which blazes up with a blue flame), and the perennial steppe-plant or its root. In relation to Arab. *ḥatab*, *aḥṭb* signifies lopped, pruned, robbed of its branches (of a tree), and Arab. *ḥrb ḥaṭb* a pruning war, which devastates a country, just as the wood-gathering women of a settlement (styled Arab. *ʿI-ḥaṭbât* or *ʿI-ḥwâtt*) with their small hatchet (Arab. *miḥtab*) lay a district covered with tall plants bare in a few days. In the villages of the *Merg'* the little girls who collect the dry cow-dung upon the pastures are called Arab. *bnât ḥaṭbât*, בנות חטבות. — Wetzstein.

ft411 Corners with variegated carved work are found even in the present day in Damascus in every reception-room (the so-called Arab. *qâ'î*) or respectable houses [cf. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, Introduction]. An architectural ornament composed with much good taste and laborious art out of wood carvings, and glittering with gold and brilliant colours, covers the upper part of the corners, of which a *ḵâ'a* may have as many as sixteen, since three wings frequently abut upon the *bêt el-baḥāra*, i.e., the square with its marble basin. This decoration, which has a most pleasing effect to the eye, is a great advantage to saloons from two to three storeys high, and is evidently designed to get rid of the darker corners above on the ceiling, comes down from the ceiling in the corners of the room for the length of six to nine feet, gradually becoming narrower as it descends. It is the broadest above, so that it there also covers the ends of the horizontal corners formed by the walls and the ceiling. If this crowning of the corners, the technical designation of which, if I remember rightly, is Arab. *ʿI-qrnyṭ*, *ḵornîa*, might be said to go back into Biblical antiquity, the Psalmist would have used it as a simile to mark the beauty, gorgeous dress, and rich adornment of women. Perhaps, too, because they are not only modest and chaste (cf. Arabic *mesturât*, a veiled woman, in opposition to *memshushât*, one shone on by the sun), but also, like the children of respectable families, hidden from the eyes of strangers; for the Arabic proverb quoted above says, “treasures are hidden in the corners,” and the superscription of a letter addressed to a lady of position runs: “May it kiss the hand of the protected lady and of the hidden jewel.” — Wetzstein.

ft412 Rashi, however, understands only Psalm 148 and 150 by פסוקי דזמרה in that passage.

- <sup>ft413</sup> The word has been so understood by Menahem, Juda ben Koreish, and *Abulwafid*; whereas Herzfeld is thinking of hecatombs for a thank-offering, which might have formed the beginning of both festive processions.
- <sup>ft414</sup> Bochart in his *Hierozoicon* on this passage compares an observation of Eustathius on Dionysius Periegetes: *τὴν χιόνα ἐριώδες ὕδωρ ἀστείως οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐκάλουν*.
- <sup>ft415</sup> LXX (Italic, Vulgate) *κρύσταλλον*, i.e., ice, from the root *κρυ*, to freeze, to congeal (Jerome *glaciem*). *Quid est crystallum?* asks Augustine, and replies: *Nix est glacie durata per multos annos ita ut a sole vel igne acile dissolvi non possit*.
- <sup>ft416</sup> The interpolated parallel member, *αὐτὸς εἶπε καὶ ἐγενήθησαν*, here in the LXX is taken over from that passage.
- <sup>ft417</sup> Such, too (with pomp, not “with an army”), is the meaning of *μετὰ δόξης* in 1 Macc. 10:60; 14: 4, 5, vid., Grimm *in loc*.