

Studies in the Diction of the Psalter

Second Article

WALDO S. PRATT

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SUCH statistical inductions as are attempted in these Studies have validity and value only when derived from considerable masses of data. When drawn from too small an area, they may be inconclusive or misleading; but if the number of items regarded is somewhat large, the method may be expected to yield something substantial. It is clear, however, that the results also depend upon how the materials for analysis are selected, since a casual heap of unrelated data may be examined without any useful result whatever.

In the analysis reported in our first article the data were secured by using the "rare-word test," which, it was assumed, in a collection like the Psalter should help us to separate the relatively peculiar or individual poems or passages on the one hand from those that are relatively conventional or commonplace on the other. It was assumed that among these latter passages are to be found that which is most characteristic of the completed collection—whatever served as the "connective tissue" to include and envelope the diverse or peculiar elements that were gathered together. Whether the type of material in this "connective tissue" is relatively early or late, and whether it belongs to the whole process of psalm-production or represents a final phase in it (or some other limited phase), were not questions to be pressed at the outset. In the primary reasoning it was simply essential to bring together that which probably had some internal connection. In this instance the effort was made to detect mechanically materials that must have such

connection because of their intrinsic character, regardless of whether or not there were any external marks to identify them.

In the analysis now to be attempted the materials are secured by a different process. We propose here to examine the poems the titles of which refer to "David." Here is a group that has an ostensible literary unity. Whether this is a real unity, and what kind of a unity it is, are not primary questions. In the older commentation the titles were held to indicate actual authorship. In most recent commentation these titles are supposed to refer to antecedent books, bearing some name like "The Prayers of David" (see 72:20). But opinions differ widely as to whether all the poems with these titles belong to a single real group, even an editorial one. Hence one of the objects of analysis is to determine whether the ostensible group is fairly homogeneous or not, while also trying to distinguish the characteristics of its main nucleus. Furthermore, since the present distribution of these "David" titles may not be as wide as it was originally, another object is to identify poems, now without such titles, that probably belong with the "David" series. Inasmuch as the "David" poems, as they stand, make up about one-half of the whole Psalter, any fresh study of the facts has obvious importance.

In the present study we assume at the outset that the "David" series includes seventy-five poems, including, that is, all that bear the "David" title in the received Hebrew text, *plus* 10 and 33, which are imbedded in the otherwise continuous series of Bk. I. These poems fall into three subgroups, namely, D¹, 3-41; D², 51-65, 68-70; D³, 86, 101, 103, 108-110, 122, 124, 131, 133, 138-145.

In the LXX "David" titles appear also with 33, 43, 67, 71, 93-99, 104, 137. How this fact is valued depends much upon general assumptions about the history of the Psalter. For example, Briggs in 1906 called all these Greek titles "conjectures of later editors," though, of course, in 1872 he regarded them differently.

The text-length of the D subgroups, as compared with the total text of the Psalter, is as follows: D¹, 25%; D², 12%; D³, 10%—a total of 47%.

Following, now, the plan used in our first article, we proceed

to isolate statistically the vocabulary specially characteristic of the "David" poems. In this case the process is puzzling, since we cannot be sure that the three subgroups are upon an equal footing. If they are of equal significance, the subgroups may be disregarded and the whole body of poems handled as a unit. But if not, differences between the subgroups must be considered. In the process here used it is assumed that D¹ is the most characteristic subgroup (as it is much the longest), and that D² stands next in importance.

As before, the test-list is made up by noting those "common" words that seem to "prefer" D poems, that is, that show in those poems a larger proportion of all their occurrences (in the Psalter) than the size of the D group or subgroups would warrant (the normal percentages being D¹, 25 0/0; D², 12 0/0; D³, 10 0/0 — D entire, 47 0/0).

The following test-list is drawn, like that used in the first article, from the 235 "common" words (those that occur in more than twelve poems). It includes primarily those words that are decidedly above normal in D¹ (that is, the percentage of whose occurrences there, as compared with their total occurrences in the Psalter, is much above 25). To these are added other words that are much above normal in D² or D³, or both. In each case the percentages of the word's occurrences are given, both in the three subgroups and in the entire D group:

Test-List Derived from "David" Poems.

| | D ¹ | D ² | D ³ | D | | D ¹ | D ² | D ³ | D | | D ¹ | D ² | D ³ | D |
|---------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----|--------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----|
| אבר | 38 | 4 | 8 | 50 | גיל v. | 47 | 11 | 0 | 58 | ישע | 36 | 13 | 13 | 62 |
| ארני | 21 | 26 | 21 | 68 | דָּבַר | 29 | 13 | 16 | 58 | ישע | 45 | 20 | 0 | 65 |
| אָוֹן | 35 | 24 | 10 | 69 | רם | 24 | 24 | 5 | 53 | ישר | 44 | 4 | 4 | 52 |
| אָוֹן | 20 | 13 | 27 | 60 | רש | 46 | 8 | 8 | 62 | כבוד | 37 | 10 | 12 | 59 |
| איב | 38 | 17 | 10 | 65 | הם | 36 | 18 | 4 | 58 | כין | 25 | 20 | 10 | 55 |
| אין | 46 | 12 | 15 | 73 | חנן | 39 | 15 | 12 | 66 | לב | 42 | 13 | 7 | 62 |
| איש | 37 | 10 | 16 | 63 | חסה | 56 | 16 | 8 | 80 | לשון | 34 | 23 | 11 | 68 |
| אל | 38 | 16 | 11 | 65 | חפץ v. | 35 | 24 | 6 | 65 | מנן | 42 | 5 | 5 | 52 |
| אנוש | 26 | 21 | 16 | 63 | חָרַב | 28 | 22 | 6 | 56 | מוט v. | 33 | 21 | 4 | 58 |
| את prp. | 33 | 0 | 21 | 59 | חשב | 44 | 6 | 17 | 67 | קזת | 36 | 18 | 0 | 54 |
| בוש | 44 | 9 | 6 | 59 | טוב adj. | 29 | 13 | 15 | 57 | מי | 45 | 14 | 5 | 64 |
| בטח | 43 | 17 | 4 | 64 | יהוה | 39 | 2 | 11 | 52 | מען | 31 | 13 | 16 | 60 |
| בל | 56 | 3 | 9 | 68 | יחר | 37 | 11 | 11 | 59 | מרכה | 57 | 21 | 7 | 85 |
| בקש | 48 | 19 | 7 | 74 | ירא adj. | 38 | 7 | 15 | 55 | נגד | 47 | 11 | 14 | 72 |
| בָּשָׂר | 25 | 19 | 13 | 57 | ירר | 25 | 17 | 21 | 63 | נפל | 41 | 10 | 10 | 61 |
| נָרַל | 44 | 19 | 13 | 76 | ישב | 28 | 15 | 13 | 56 | נפש | 29 | 13 | 17 | 59 |

| | D ¹ | D ² | D ³ | | D ¹ | D ² | D ³ | | D ¹ | D ² | D ³ | | | |
|--------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----|----|----|
| נצל | 39 | 18 | 14 | 71 | פעל | 39 | 19 | 12 | 70 | שנא | 34 | 10 | 12 | 56 |
| נשא | 35 | 6 | 8 | 49 | צריק | 48 | 13 | 8 | 69 | שמה | 39 | 18 | 11 | 68 |
| סבב | 36 | 14 | 5 | 55 | צרה | 42 | 4 | 17 | 63 | שאול | 38 | 6 | 19 | 63 |
| קתר | 50 | 18 | 5 | 73 | קום | 41 | 6 | 10 | 57 | שבר | 38 | 14 | 5 | 57 |
| עין | 36 | 23 | 10 | 69 | קרב | 11 | 26 | 26 | 63 | שית v. | 37 | 3 | 17 | 57 |
| עו | 18 | 27 | 9 | 54 | ראש | 33 | 9 | 30 | 72 | שכן | 26 | 26 | 4 | 56 |
| עוב | 59 | 0 | 0 | 59 | רב | 40 | 9 | 12 | 61 | שלום | 37 | 11 | 11 | 59 |
| עין | 36 | 6 | 12 | 54 | רנל | 39 | 6 | 7 | 52 | שלם | 41 | 24 | 0 | 65 |
| ענה I. | 33 | 18 | 15 | 66 | רדף | 45 | 5 | 15 | 65 | שמע | 34 | 15 | 8 | 57 |
| עני | 53 | 10 | 13 | 76 | רע | 44 | 13 | 14 | 71 | שקר | 29 | 14 | 14 | 57 |
| עצם | 53 | 13 | 13 | 79 | רעע II. | 47 | 7 | 0 | 54 | תחת | 45 | 0 | 23 | 68 |
| עת | 46 | 9 | 5 | 60 | רשע | 45 | 5 | 11 | 61 | תולה | 19 | 19 | 23 | 61 |
| פה | 29 | 15 | 14 | 58 | שמה | 33 | 13 | 6 | 52 | | | | | |

Although the great majority of the above 86 words are obviously eligible because of some marked "preference" for D poems, some are open to question. Thus *אכר* and *נשא* show small total percentages; 6 are below normal in D¹; 34 are below normal in D²; and 33 are below normal in D³. But in each of these cases there is some reason for inclusion. Certainly these words have a markedly greater proclivity for the D poems than other "common" words.

In using the list it is wise to omit *יהוה*, since its distribution is confused by the Elohimism of 42-83.

The remaining 85 words occur about 3150 times in the whole Psalter. Of these, 1950 are in D poems (62%)—1165 in D¹ (37%), 425 in D² (13 + %), 360 in D³ (11 + %). In all, the 85 words constitute about 17% of the whole Psalter text.

It will be noted that 15 words here were also given in the "liturgical" test-list used in our first article, viz.: *אני*, *את*, *ארני*, *במח*, *בקש*, *בשר*, *גיל*, *חסה*, *גיל*, *חסה*, *גיל*, *בשר*, *בקש*, *במח*, *את*, *אני*. This fact suggests that considerable L material occurs in the D poems, though the usages emphasized in L are not always the same as those emphasized in D.

Before taking up the particular meanings of these words that are most frequent in D, we may well note how the total occurrences of the words are distributed through the whole Psalter, since this will give a hint as to cases where, apparently, non-D poems are included in the D series, as well as of other cases where, perhaps, D poems have lost the D title. The following table shows the percentage of the total text-length of each poem occupied by the above 85 words (omitting *יהוה*):

| % | I. | II. | III. | IV. | V. |
|----|------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 37 | 34 | — | — | — | — |
| 36 | — | — | — | — | 141 |
| 34 | 38 | 54 | — | — | 120 |
| 32 | — | — | — | — | 140 |
| 31 | 36 | — | — | — | 123 |
| 30 | 7, 10, 24 | — | — | — | — |
| 29 | 37 | — | — | — | — |
| 28 | 17 | — | — | — | — |
| 27 | 4, 6, 12, 21, 35 | 55 | 86 | — | 133 |
| 26 | 3, 16 | 62, 64 | — | — | — |
| 25 | 11, 13, 31, 41 | — | — | — | 109, 112, 125, 143 |
| 24 | 9, 14, 25, 27 | 63 | — | 101 | — |
| 23 | 15, 32 | — | — | — | — |
| 22 | 5, 26 | 49, 51, 53, 59, 70 | — | — | — |
| 21 | 28 | 57, 66, 69, 71 | — | — | — |
| 20 | 22, 39 | 52 | — | 93, 97 | 122 |
| 19 | 40 | — | — | — | 130, 138 |
| 18 | 23, 30 | — | — | 92, 94 | — |
| 17 | 1, 19 | 56 | 85 | — | 110, 142 |
| 16 | 18, 20 | 61 | 88 | — | 116 |
| 15 | 33 | — | 73, 74, 82, 84 | — | 119 |
| 14 | 29 | 50, 65, 68, 72 | — | — | 118, 144 |
| 13 | — | 44, 48, 58 | 81, 83 | 102 | 115, 121, 131, 145 |
| 12 | 8 | — | 75 | 91 | 107, 126, 129, 147 |
| 11 | — | 46 | 76 | 106 | 108, 124, 128 |
| 10 | — | 60 | 79 | 90, 96, 103, 104 | 113, 139 |
| 9 | — | 43, 45 | 77, 78, 89 | 99, 105 | 127, 146 |
| 8 | — | 42 | 87 | 98 | 132, 135 |
| 7 | 2 | 47 | — | — | — |
| 6 | — | 67 | 80 | — | 111, 149 |
| 5 | — | — | — | 95 | 137 |
| 4 | — | — | — | — | 114, 134 |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | 150 |
| 2 | — | — | — | 100 | 136 |
| 1 | — | — | — | — | 148 |
| 0 | — | — | — | — | 117 |

So far as this table is significant, it indicates that the most doubtful D poems are 8, 29, 33, 58, 60, 65, 68, 103, 108, 124, 131, 139, 144, 145, and, on the other hand, that 49, 66, 71, 92, 93, 94, 97, 112, 120, 123, 125, 130, at least, are lexically cognate with D. Note, also, the following points: the contrast in position between 1 and 2 (the prefatory poems of the completed collection), between 49 and all other "Korah" poems, between 67 and its neighbors, between 111 and 112 (in spite of their likeness in outward form), etc.

The utility of such a test-list as that before us lies in its helping us to designate the main lines of thought that characterize the body of poems from which the list is derived. To reach results we may either regard the words and their usages one by one, or we may make an inductive summary of the contents

of such poems as have a large proportion of these words. Data secured in either of these ways may need to be checked up somewhat by other data, but in general they prove decidedly significant.

It will be found that the dominant class of conceptions brought to the front by using this test-list relates to the antithesis or opposition between "the righteous" and "the wicked", regarded from the standpoint of the former, which, being that of the speakers, is naturally assumed to be correct and ideal. Though this general antithesis is common in religious expression that deals with personality and conduct, in this instance it appears with remarkable peculiarities of sentiment, implying that the occasion of the utterances is exceptional. Besides the natural condemnation of what is regarded as abstractly wrong, there is a bitter protest against the concrete injuries that "the godly" suffer at the hands of "the ungodly." Hence there is a pervasive tone of exasperation, passing into commination or imprecation. The historical implications of this will be discussed later. It is first in order to give some summaries of the lexical facts in detail.¹

At least two-thirds of the 85 words in the test-list (omitting יהה) are wholly or partially applied to "the wicked" (or the rebellious). As a rule, these usages occur much more often in D than elsewhere. The full force of the facts can be felt only by examining the passages one by one. But the general drift of the evidence is shown by the following condensed summary, in which in each case the figure given first is that of the number of times in D, and the second figure the number in non-D:

רשע, all cases, 50/32; פעל (usually ptc. with און), of the wicked, 14/5; אין, all, 20/9; רע and רעה, all, 45/19; רעע, against the righteous, 7/5 (3 cases of a "union" of "evil-doers", all D); יחר, of evil combination, 8/5; דם, of violence, murder, 7/0; פרוסה, all, 12/2; שקר, all (exc. 33:17), 11/9; דבר, of evil speech, 20/7; חרב, of evil power or speech, 7/3; שלם, "rendering" evil, 3/0; איש, of the bad, 12/4; אנוש, do., 9/1; הם, do., 10/3; איב, toward the speaker, the righteous, or God, 43/11; so, also, שגא, 15/12; קום, 15/5; רדף, 8/6; סבב, 8/6; חשב, 9/0; שיה, 3/0;

¹ Here, as in all such cases, it is difficult to devise ways of presenting the data without occupying an inordinate amount of space. Yet the effort is worth making to give some idea of the usages that are statistically so much more frequent in D poems as presumably to be characteristic of them.

יֵשׁב, 7/5; שָׁכַן, 1/0; כֹּון, 7/2; נִשְׂא, 2/1; בִּקֵּשׁ, 9/2; דָּרַשׁ, 1/0; גִּירָל, 4/0; שָׁמַח, 5/1; גִּירָל, 1/0; נִפְלָא, 6/2, and punitively, 9/5; so, also punitively, בֹּשֵׁשׁ, 11/7; שָׁבַר, 5/4; אָבַר, 9/9; יִירָד, 3/0; רָדַף, 2/1; שָׁאוּל, for the wicked, 3/2. לֵב, of the wicked, 13/10; so, also, קָרַב, 8/1; לִשְׁוֹן, 14/5; מָה, 16/6; שָׁמַח, 9/2; עֵין, 9/3; רָאשׁ, 6/2; עֵצִים, 2/0; רִגְלֵי, 4/1. מִי, in questions by the wicked, 5/0; מִטֵּן, "because of" enemies, 6/0; נִגַּד, "in the face of", enemies, 4/0; רִב, of multiplied hostility or evil, 12/5; תַּחַת, evil "instead of" good, 6/1. Taking all these together, with a few others that are either uncertain or (in four cases) balanced against D, the above list covers 800 references, of which 69% are in D. There can be no question, then, about the validity of the inference that the test-list shows a strong tendency in D to characterize the purposes and deeds of "the wicked."

The usages relating to "the righteous" are equally numerous and striking, often being other applications of the same words:

צַדִּיק, of men, 30/15; יֵשׁר, of men, 10/4; מַעַל, of the good, 2/1; טוֹב, of well-doing, 12/1; אֵישׁ, of the good, 6/4; הֵם, do., 2/0; יַחַד, of good combination, 3/2; יָרָא, of godliness, 15/12; רָדַף, with good as object, 3/0; מוֹט, of stability, 10/2; כֹּון, of fidelity, 5/3; שְׁלוֹם, of welfare or in greeting, 13/9; שָׁלֵם, "at peace" 1/0; יֵשׁב, of good act or state, 13/8; שָׁכַן, do., 8/1; שָׁנָא, toward evil, 6/5; קוֹם, of the righteous, 6/4; שִׁית, do., 4/3; חֲסִיד, of devotion, 2/3; חֲמִילָה, with "my", 13/6; גִּירָל, toward God, 5/1; גִּירָל, do., 10/8; שָׁלֵם, in vows, 4/5; סִבֵּב, of ritual acts, 2/0; נִשְׂא, do., 6/6; דִּבֵּר, of good utterance, including prayer, 8/8; בִּקֵּשׁ, toward God, 9/3; so, also, דָּרַשׁ, 8/9; חָנַן, Hthp., 2/0; בִּטַּח, 27/9; חָסָה, 20/5; שָׁמַח, in indignation, 2/0. עֵנִי, of a class, often including the speaker, 23/7; עוֹן, subjective, 13/2; שִׁבְרֵי, of the "broken" heart, 4/1; בּוֹשׁ, of chastening, 9/7; נִשְׂא, do., 3/3; רָעַע, reflexive, 1/0; עוֹב, of commitment to God, 1/0, or of God's withdrawal, 8/5; סָתַר, of God's withdrawal, 7/6, or of His protection or forgiveness, 6/0; צָרָה, all cases, 15/7; עַת, with "trouble", 5/0; יִירָד, to death, 7/3; מוֹת, of the righteous, 11/4; שָׁאוּל, for the righteous, 6/3. נִפְלָא, of righteous personality, 81/50; בֹּשֵׁשׁ, figure for self, 3/1; לֵב, of the righteous, 47/28; so, also, קָרַב, 5/1?; לִשְׁוֹן, 7/4; מָה, 13/14; שָׁמַח, 8/4; עֵין, 15/18; רָאשׁ, 8/1; רִגְלֵי, 9/9; עֵצִים, 10/3. רַב, absolute (plur.), 8/3, and of "the great assembly," 5/0. מִי, in questions by the righteous, 22/15, and as an interjection, 3/0; נִגַּד, "in the face of" the righteous, 12/4; תַּחַת, of supremacy, 6/4. Here may be noted the stylistic use of negatives, as אֵין, 49/18; אַל, deprecatorily, 64/28; בַּל, 20/10; אַת, still further, 14/9. The sum of these usages is about 1900 cases, of which 67% are in D. The characterization of "the righteous", then, seems to be another of the strong tendencies of D.

Besides these, we have many words and usages regarding the personality or acts of God, especially as applied to "the righteous", such as שָׁמַע, 29/12; אָוִן, 9/3; עֲנָה, 26/10; חָשַׁב, 3/0; דִּבֵּר, 4/7; מִטֵּן, in prayers,

appealing to God's attributes, 7/5; יֵשׁב, of His regality, 9/8; שָׁכַן, 2/3; אָשַׁע, 33/18; אָשַׁע, 18/7; נָצַל, 29/9; נִשְׂמָה, help or forgiveness, 7/3; כָּחַן, 14/18; פָּחַן, 10/7; חָרַב, 2/0; חָנַן, 17/9; חָסַף, 7/3; סָבַב, 2/1; קָם, 8/10; מָעַל, 2/2; שִׁית, in blessing, 5/1, or punitively, 5/6; דָּרַשׁ, "require" or "inquire into", 4/0; שָׁנָא, toward evil, 2/0; רָעַע, punitively, 0/2; שָׁלַם, do., 3/1; צָדִיק, of His personality, 4/3; יֵשׁר, do., 3/3; עָו, of His attributes or works, 24/20; רָב, do., 6/4; רִנַּל, 3/2; נָגַד, "in the face of" God, 8/5; the name אֲרִי, 36/18; כָּבַד, in praise, 26/15. The sum of these usages is about 575 cases, of which 63% are in D. Certain forms of expression toward God, with certain attitudes toward Him, are also characteristic of D.

If space were available, many details might be added to these bare summaries. For example, in the cases of both רָשַׁע and צָדִיק D prefers the singular, while non-D prefers the plural; similar phenomena appear with other words for persons. Neither of these critical words occurs in the "Korah" poems, and others are either wanting or very rare in both "Korah" and "Asaph" poems.

There are some interesting points in the style of D. One that is apparent from the above lists is the frequency of phrases that refer to some bodily organ or member. Another is the frequency of certain negatives, among which, however, we do not find לֹא, which is more frequent in non-D (152/185).

The above statements are rigidly confined to a particular test-list of "common" words. They might be greatly extended by adding certain usages of many other "common" words, which, because of the distribution of their total occurrences, did not happen to be included in the test-list; and also by taking up a large number of synonyms and other terms from the hundreds of "rare" words. These are but hints of further evidence that might be adduced.

However much opinions may differ as to some details in the collation of data indicated in the foregoing summary, it is impossible to escape the general fact that in the D poems there is a remarkable emphasis upon the antithesis between "the righteous" and "the wicked", an emphasis that is not paralleled in extent or intensity in the rest of the Psalter, taken as a whole. Furthermore, as has been already suggested, this antithesis is viewed in a special way, due, apparently, to some conditions that made it poignantly felt. As one studies the poems or passages in which the test-words are most abundant, he cannot escape the sense in them of a vehement protestation, in-

dignant or dejected, on the part of "the righteous." The occasion of this seems to be an extensive experience of detraction and abuse, apparently reaching to personal violence. Hence the sentiments expressed are those of personal outrage, mingled with jealousy over indignity done to the righteous cause which the speakers represent. If there were but few such poems and passages, they would offer no large problem; but their number and interrelations have always provoked inquiry.

In the older commentation, the problem was regarded chiefly as one requiring moral justification or apology, since this "imprecatory" spirit seems contrary to the ideal or Christian spirit. When the Davidic authorship was posited, the apology sought to amplify the details of the personal history of David and his typical place as the establisher of the Chosen People in their historic eminence and the forerunner of Him who should more fully display the divine righteousness and justice. And, whether or not the Davidic authorship was assumed, there was usually an effort so to connect the expression with the ideal mission of Israel as to make it represent the normal attitude of the godly to the general power of evil in the world. It is in some such sense as this, of course, that these poems have been universally adopted by the Christian Church for constant liturgical use.

In the newer commentation, the emphasis of attention has shifted. Usually the moral aspect is lost sight of in the discussion of the antecedent question as to the historical situation implied. It is clear, at all events, that we are in no position to deal fairly with the moral question involved until we have some true notion of the circumstances. But here, as in so much Psalter criticism, we find no well-defined consensus among scholars as to what period and what circumstances are to be supposed. Some critics are apt to discuss each poem or passage largely by itself, often with much subjective impulsiveness.

The facts here presented have to do with this question of historic situation. They seem to indicate that we should not neglect the possibility that the many poems of complaint which largely constitute the D section of the Psalter express primarily the sentiments of a particular class within the Jewish community.

It is not necessary to make much of any theory that "the praying I" is not the individual who writes, but the group or cause that he represents. Every poem must have had an individual author, or be made up of parts so composed, and so must be held to give voice to personal views and feelings. But the fact that such a mass of poems was accumulated, and was so preserved in respect and usage as eventually to become part of the accepted Scriptures, forces the conclusion that in some way they express the convictions of a considerable body of persons, so that they were felt to have utility for permanent liturgical iteration. The actual point of view may play back and forth between what is personal and what is collective. But the critical phenomenon of these numerous poems, connected by many links of thought and expression, and massed together in a canonical collection, is one for which no merely individual or personal explanation will suffice. Some historical inquiry must be made as to their occasion and the conditions that they represent.

There is no doubt that the more characteristic D poems are controversial and polemic. Probably no one would seriously contend that they deal with a purely ideal or abstract situation, or that they are open to an allegorical interpretation. What occasions them is rather real and concrete. Hence we ask, Is the controversy that of godly Israel against the heathen world, or that of one class within the circle of Israel against another class? Many considerations may be suggested in favor of the latter view. We are here concerned with those points that are emphasized by vocabulary statistics. Although such statistics seldom supply really demonstrative proof, they may tend to establish a strong presumption that cannot be ignored.

(a) The D poems contain very few clear references to Israel as a *nation* among other nations, or to its national history. Here they are in strong contrast with some other parts of the Psalter, especially with K and A, as well as many poems elsewhere.

The word **יִשְׂרָאֵל**, clearly applied to Israel as the Chosen People, is relatively rare in D (14 times, as against 46 elsewhere). So with **יִשְׂרָאֵל** (4/17), "Israel" (17/42), "Jacob" (6/28). **יִשְׂרָאֵל**, used figuratively, does not occur in D.

Passages displaying a historic consciousness are extremely few in D, even when liberally estimated, and those that occur are mostly in poems uncharacteristic of D. The Exodus may lie back of the theophany-passage in 18=144, as well as of passages in 33, 68, 103 and 124; and the entrance into Canaan is implied in 9, 10, 110 and 143. The only other clear touches of national experience are those in 60=108 and perhaps at the close of 51. When the amount and vividness of these are compared with what is found in the long historical poems (78, 105, 106), or with the rather numerous allusions in both K and A, in the Songs of Ascents, etc., the historic poverty of D is obvious.

It should be admitted, however, that among the poems that have a large proportion of D words—those in the table on p. 163 whose percentage is (say) twenty or more—there are some that may be given a national interpretation without great difficulty. In particular, among them is 21, one of the "royal" poems. But the amount of such material is small, and the necessity of a national meaning is not clear.

(b) On the other hand, in the D poems generally the arena of conflict seems to be a narrow one. The strife is continual and persistent. It is interlocked with the relations and occupations of ordinary social life. The attacks most often specified are those of derision, slander and malignant innuendo, inspired by motives of settled hatred and oppressive cruelty. There are hardly any expressions that can be construed as referring to either military assault or political subjugation. In several cases the cleavage that is lamented is one between neighbors and friends, those normally so knit together that their rupture brings peculiar sorrow and evil.

It is not necessary to cite the evidence *in extenso*. One has but to read the poems and passages in which D words are most frequent to see that statements like the above are well supported. When these utterances are massed together they give a striking impression of a social and moral situation of great intensity. And, on the whole, the picture presented is fairly consistent with itself.

Without dwelling upon minute points that might be mentioned, it is well to call attention to certain passages that strongly imply that the attrition complained of is within the community. The chief of these are in 10, 12, 15, 17, 26, 31, 35, 37, 38, 41, 55, 59, 64, 69, 101, 109, 141.

If, then, it is the local community which is in view, what are we to suppose was the situation that provoked these passionate outcries? We may assume either one when Judaism was divided

against itself into an orthodox or conservative party and a lax or radical one, or one when the faithful Jewish nucleus was invaded and overrun by an aggressive alien population that derided the austerity and exclusiveness of all Jewish practice. Both of these hypotheses may be defended. But the weight of evidence leans toward the first, as at least the primary occasion of the distress expressed. The strict followers of Yahweh and observers of the traditions stand in opposition to those of their compatriots who have fallen away into worldly habits and who have begun to scorn and attack the faithful. At the same time we may reasonably suppose that such defection is likely only when there was a large infiltration of foreign influences, especially such as came with the Greek domination. The contest would then be not only between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, but between Judaism and Hellenism.

It is conceivable that the situation might be pushed back into the Exile, when the captive people were subjected to strong alien influences in the East, and were slowly being sifted into the two classes implied in the accounts of the Return—the faithful minority and the renegade majority. The objections to this are the total absence, in the D poems, of all touches of "local color" that favor this hypothesis, and the many clear hints that the national sanctuary is at hand.

It is much less conceivable that the situation might be carried back into the time before the Exile. Against this are the lack of references showing temptation to idolatry or distinct national self-consciousness.

It is more than likely that strong partisanship and even the habit of "imprecation" began in the Exile, making its later intensification easy. But in the Exile the question was as to loyalty to Israel as against submergence in an outside heathen world, while later, in the Greek period, it was as to loyalty to the rigid Jewish ideal, at its own center, as against a gradual weakening of that ideal into something else without losing its name or its sense of continuity. The first was essential treason and apostasy; the second might be regarded as merely progressive liberalism.

Just here another notable fact requires attention. In the D poems the godly class is not represented as actually in power. Rather it is in dire distress, in fear, in want, often on the verge of despair—at least such is the implication of the language. In eighteen of these poems occur terms like עֵינִי, עֵינֶיךָ and אֲבִיִּן, all used as if they were well-known designations. These words

may mean either of two things, or both together— either that the class in view was *voluntarily* poor, or that their piety amid unfavorable conditions resulted in their being *involuntarily* poor. In the one case we catch the hint of an ascetic ideal; in the other, of social persecution and ostracism. Though we may hesitate to press the former hypothesis, it cannot be wholly ignored. Poverty seems to be at least one of the badges of piety. On the other hand, it is implied that material and social power is in the hands of the well-to-do, who, as a class, are religiously lax, if not irreligious, and who, besides, are not only oppressive, but contemptuous of their neighbors.

In the D poems there are few exceptions to this general picture.

One notable case, however, is the passage 37:21-26, with which is closely associated the whole topic of 112 (nominally non-D). Both of these are acrostic poems of the moralizing class, the purpose of which is more homiletic than descriptive.

As we consider the situation thus suggested, we may surmise that the time in view is that when the opportunities for commercial relations with the outside world began to disturb and corrupt the social life of Judaism. The question is not between Judaism and idolatry, but between piety and worldliness. It is difficult to suppose that the prosperous class is "the people of the land" in the early Persian period, standing against the zealots who would restore the old order. It is much easier to believe that here we have a clear indication of the growing commercialism of the Greek period, during which Jerusalem was able to advance toward the dignity and wealth that could ultimately tempt the cupidity of an Antiochus.

Without further elaborating this point, we should now note the fact that the D poems, though giving a massive impression such as has been emphasized, are by no means all of the same kind. What is here being magnified is more characteristic of D¹ than of D², very much more so than of D³. It is uncertain what is the bearing of the colophon in 72:20 upon the question of an antecedent collection. Apparently there was such a collection, known as "The Prayers of David," which ended with 72, but we have no sign as to where it began or just what it contained. If all or most of the poems now marked "David" were

in it, why are some of them inserted in the Psalter at later points, and why are the two groups in Bks. I-II so widely separated? And what is the explanation of the doublets that occur, especially 14 = 53, 40b = 70, and 57 + 60 = 108? Why, also, is one group Elohistie while the others are Yahwistic?

It seems that the way out of this tangle must lie in assuming that the earlier collection ending with 72 was not large, containing not more than the D poems of Bk. II. This collection came to the editors in an Elohistie form, and was retained by them substantially in that form. But, besides, they seem to have had other materials bearing the name of "David" that were Yahwistic, and among them a few doublets, which they utilized as they stood. If there be value in this contention, a special interest attaches to the relation of D² to the "Korah" poems that immediately precede, and which are Elohistie, as well as to the "Asaph" poems, also Elohistie, that follow in Bk. III.

It is usually assumed that because Bk. I precedes Bk. II it was editorially earlier, and that the other Books follow in progressive sequence. With this goes the further assumption that the D poems in Bk. I form part of the early collection of which 72:20 is the colophon. But both assumptions may be wrong. A serious objection to the second is the phenomenon of doublets between Books I and II. And there is no essential necessity of the first. It is perfectly conceivable that Bk. II may have been arranged and in use before Bk. I was collected, and that Bk. I was *prefixed* in the final Psalter for special reasons. The purpose of what follows is to emphasize reasons for holding that this is the probable fact. The two topics of importance are the relation in age between D on the one hand and K and A on the other, and the whole question of Elohistie. The latter will be dealt with by itself after the former has been discussed.

When we consider the poems of K¹ (42-49) in detail, it is fairly clear that they have to do mostly with national conditions, past or present. Of the D spirit of reaction against social or community injury there are only microscopic touches (in 43 and 49, neither of which may be original parts of the series). Much the same can be said of the poems of K² (84-85, 87-88), though the point is not so clear or so well sustained there. The facts

that the two K subgroups are separated, and that one is Elo-histic and the other not, raises a question about their original unity, or, at least, about how they come to appear as they do.

42 is a poem of longing for the Temple privileges. The double emphasis on the taunt, "Where is thy God?", with the geographical hints of v. 7, suggests distance from the homeland, rather than exposure to contumely there. If we lay aside v. 9, which is a plain interpolation, and the refrains, which seem to be liturgical antiphons, we have a compact, intense cry of distress, such as fits well into Captivity conditions. Wellhausen's reading of v. 7 increases the vividness of this.

43, at first sight, is only a part of 42, and is so counted by most commentators. In the Hebrew it bears no title, as if belonging to 42. But in the LXX 43 is marked "A Psalm of David." If originally the third strophe of 42, how did it become separated, and how did it acquire this title? Lexically, it differs much from 42, and its tone is different. Hence—in spite of incurring so scornful a remark as Hupfeld made about Venema in this connection—we may venture to call 43 a later addendum to 42, but still probably exilic, or, if postexilic, adapted to its predecessor.

44 has two features foreign to the style of D—the studied reference to ancient history, and the stress on national disgrace. The protestation about apostasy (vv. 18-22) is also to be noted. Laying aside vv. 5-9 and 24-27, which are not surely of the same texture as the rest, leaves a well-formed poem of national depression, which it is natural to connect in some way with 74 and 79. If we suppose 43 to be a later inset, the K series would then open with two effective poems of the same general type.

45 is the first of four poems that not only differ from their neighbors, but in some respects are unique. As I have elsewhere argued (JBL 1900), 45 seems to be highly composite, using some materials belonging to an actual royal situation, but with imposed expansions adapting it to a Messianic application. We simply observe here that it, like its companion poems, implies a vivid sense of preexilic times. The passage addressed to the "daughter" is cognate with passages in II Is. that refer to the personified genius of Israel. All this implies a situation different from that in the D poems.

46, 47 and 48 have a common spirit of triumph, implying a fresh memory of national deliverances. Touches about the stability of Jerusalem suggest an assurance that belongs with preexilic conditions. Specific cases of divine intervention seem to be in mind—whether or not the discomfiture of Sennacherib is immaterial. Probably all have been reworked considerably, but the original themes and spirit are still fairly clear.

49 is in strong contrast with all these. It is a didactic poem, dealing with the problem of riches and poverty. It has not much to connect it with the atmosphere of persecution in D, although lexically it is by far the closest of the K poems to the usage of D. Standing at the end of the subgroup, it may well be a late addition. If really a part of K, it is an example of the moralizing movement of which there are many examples imbedded in D.

The subgroup K² is a miscellany. It is broken in two by 86, a rather nondescript specimen of D. At the end stands 89, which we may consider as somehow connected with the preceding poems.

84 differs from 42, which superficially it resembles, in that it does not imply removal from religious privileges. Its spasmodic structure suggests that it may be a cento, of which parts remind one of the Songs of Ascents. If the speaker be collective Israel, it may be a meditation on the Restoration.

85 implies that a national disaster has occurred, but that it is being repaired. It closes with a peculiarly lovely passage.

87 is a unique burst of patriotism, centering in the thought of the Holy City. If 86 is interpolated, then the juxtaposition of 85 and 87 may help the interpretation of both. It is notable that the terms Rahab, Cush and Philistia occur elsewhere in the Psalter only in 45, 60 = 108, 68, 83—all in the Elohist section.

88 returns to the dejection of 42 and 44. Lexically, it has many links with the D poems, though here the humiliation is the act of God, a visitation very different from exasperating persecution. If 88 and 89 are related, as the titles perhaps imply, the evident national quality of 89 explains the sense of 88.

As to K in general, note (a) that it contains but one "royal" poem, 45, which seems to be an old ode reworked for a new purpose; (b) that it has no acrostic poem, and only one didactic poem, 49, which stands apart from the rest, and no references to the Law or its strict observance; (c) that it has no allusions to sacrifice, except the slight implications of 43:4 and 84:4; (d) that liturgical expressions are few, and all these have the look of interpolations; (e) that there is a general lyric freshness that cannot be missed, including touches of style that in D are found only in the poems that seem most alien to the general tone of that group.

Of the D test-words, note that many are wholly wanting in K, viz.: אָנָה, אָנוּשׁ, אָוֶן, עֵת, עֵנָה, בָּנָל, מִי, חֶפֶץ, חֶסֶד, חֶנּוּן, דָּרַשׁ, דָּם, גִּדּוּל, בָּקַשׁ, (prep.), אֵת, אָנוּשׁ, אָוֶן, יָדָא, בָּשָׂר, אֵין, viz.: שָׁלוֹם, שָׁלֵם, רָשָׁע, רָדָף, (adj.), יִשָּׁע, גִּשָּׂא, עֵין, עֵנִי, שָׁכַן, עֵנִי, יִשָּׁע. Many more occur but once. Since K is so small a group, there is less assurance about a test-list for it analogous to that drawn up for D. About 35 "common" words are at least twice as frequent as the size of the group would warrant. Of these, only 8 are at all frequent in D (none important in the latter),

while at least 15 are very infrequent or wanting in D (including, for example, צבא, עיר, אב, יעקב, צאן, ציון, הר, עֶבֶר, etc.). Lexically, then, there is a striking difference between K and D, though the difference is greater between K¹ and D¹ than between other subgroups.

The Asaph group is larger than K, and more varied in character. Between A and K there is a considerable general affiliation in lexical features, but A has other affiliations as well. If there is any sort of homogeneity in A, special attention is due to the unparalleled poems of national catastrophe, 74 and 79, and also to 78, the longest of the "historical" poems. There is no doubt that the tone of D is heard at several points in A, but not enough to be characteristic.

50, though marked "Asaph," stands detached, between K¹ and D². It opens with a theophany (somewhat as in 18, but with Zion as the place), and proceeds to an assize before God of the חַסִּידִים and the רָשָׁע (sing.). The former, who are "My people" and "Israel," receive a remarkable instruction about animal sacrifice, and the latter is rebuked for social iniquities like collusion with theft, adultery, lying and slander. Both sections close with a call to "offer sacrifices of תודה," which is appropriate to neither, if תודה means a material offering. (Probably this call is later than the rest of the poem, and very likely תודה means vocal praise.) The only parallels to the sacrifice-passage are in 40 and 51 (both in D). The teaching about evil-doing also recalls D. Lexically, 50, like 49, is considerably related to D. Hence we infer that it is either (a) a composite of two fragments in the style of D, with liturgical antiphons added, or (b) a liturgical poem with an inserted passage about "the wicked." In any case, it stands apart from the rest of A in substance and style.

73 is also concerned with "the wicked" (here plur.), and the problem of their prosperity. The emphasis on riches and then on death recalls 49, and the references to violence and scoffing recall D. Nothing decisively prevents holding that it was originally an exilic meditation over the riddle of the national disaster (not even v. 17, which cannot be taken to prove that the Temple is standing), or that, as with 49, it represents the reflections of the Wise, such as might occur at any period.

74 and 79 arouse special inquiry, since they concern an extraordinary national calamity. If pertaining to the same event, they supplement each other—74 depicting the destruction of the Temple, 79 the massacre of the people and the degradation of the nation. 44b is usually connected with these. If rightly so, it is more cognate with 79 than with 74, and is less vivid than either, though equally passionate. But

44, like 74, embodies an appeal to ancient history. At the end of 79 is an antiphon that is obviously incongruous.

Is the topic the sack of the city by Nebuchadnezzar or that by Antiochus? The facts cited might belong to either, and the feeling would be natural in both cases. Correspondences may be traced either with II Kgs. 24-25 and Lam., or with I Mac. 1. Great weight has been attached to 74: 8-9 as supporting a Maccabaeian date; but the argument from the allusions here is not conclusive (for instance, we are in no position to say that in the 6th century *a. c.* there was nothing to which מורד could be applied, and on the absence of prophets see Lam. 2: 9). The case cannot be settled so summarily, as the whole Psalter comes into the question. The difficulty lies in the fact that making these poems Maccabaeian involves not only making most of the Psalter similarly late, but then providing time for its growth and gradual codification—all prior to the LXX. The Psalter seems to have owed its canonic place to settled liturgical use. For this time must be allowed. Here it differs from a history or a prophecy. This external peculiarity demands fullest weight in framing a historical hypothesis. The Maccabaeian theory, then, is to be accepted only as a last resort, not because essentially objectionable, but because of its historical difficulties.¹

Many lexical remarks suggest themselves regarding 79, 74 and 44, but space fails for them here. The three poems have several verbal links. Specially notable are מרה and מרה, of national disgrace, coupled with defiance of God, as in the stories of Goliath and Sennacherib, and in Neh., Jer., Ezk., &c.; the same sense occurs in 89 and probably in 42, but 18 other cases in the Psalter are all personal. Another interesting word is נצץ, 50% of whose occurrences are in K + A (with this cf. ט, only 18%, and שלם, only 17%). Still another is סאכל, which is found only here.

75 has probably been very much reworked. Its nucleus is a forceful passage on the supreme rulership of God (vv. 3-9).

76 has an exultant reference to divine interpositions in the national history, probably events like those celebrated in 46-48.

77 is a pensive, but trustful, comparison of the dark present of national humiliation with the past, especially with the memory of the Exodus. It is probably composite, vv. 17-21 being apparently an appendix.

78 is the longest and most striking of the "historical" poems. It represents one strain of the national consciousness, dwelling on selected events from the records and handling them homiletically. It exhibits a didactic spirit, but, in spite of the earlier verses, not clearly one that much magnifies the Law. Analysis raises many questions, as, for

¹ Most recent critics argue for the Maccabaeian date, but on the other side are Kessler (1899), Kirkpatrick (1902), Briggs (1906-7).

example, whether two narratives have not been fused together, and also what interpretation is to be put upon the references to "Ephraim" (vv. 9, 67).

80, like 77, dwells on the contrast between a distressed present and a past when divine favor rested on the nation. It centers in a beautiful metaphor of the "vine" transplanted from Egypt and spreading from "the sea" to "the River" (cf. Ezk. 17). At the opening note the stress on Joseph, Ephraim, Benjamin and Manasseh—a sense of the tribes rare in the Psalter (never in D, except 60 = 108 and 68).

81, while like 80 in general tone, is peculiar in emphasizing allegiance to God as against "strange gods," and in its reference to the trumpets of the new moon. The former links it with 44b and 50. Though not a lament, its monitory purpose implies a national need of rebuke.

82, like 75, dwells on the supremacy of God among "the gods," but the train of thought is obscure. Perhaps the conception is of a world whose ruling forces, though really under the empire of the true God, are in rebellion and disorder. Hence the final call to God to resume His sway. (vv. 3-4 may not be original.)

83 is obviously national, both in occasion and in citation. It may be the concrete expression of what 82 veiled in abstraction. Israel is attacked by a miscellaneous league, for which the only Psalter parallels are in 60 = 108, 87 and 137. On the whole, these cannot be made to yield much for the Maccabaeau hypothesis. They rather confirm the impression that the background here, as in the preceding poems, is that of the Exile.

As to A in general, note (a) that it contains no "royal" poem; (b) that it has no acrostic poem, or anything like the moralizing poems of Bk. I, except, possibly, 73; (c) that it contains no reference to sacrifice, except in 50—a doubtful member of the group; (d) that liturgical passages are few and all probably interpolations; (e) that the handling of national history, past and present, is extremely definite, implying, in the case of 74 and 79, that the facts are not far distant in time. Hence, like K, it presents much general contrast to D.

Of the D test-words, note that many are wanting here, viz.: און, נרל, ניל, חסה, ירא (adj.), ישר, סבב, סחר, עוב, עזם, שטח, שאול; and 21 more are found only once (notably צדיק), several of them in places where possibly interpolation from D may be suspected. A is rather larger than K (A, 10% of the Psalter, K, 7%), but still too small to yield a large special vocabulary. About 30 "common" words are at least twice as frequent as would be expected. Of these, none is specially frequent in D, while 15 are infrequent there (including צאן, ברית, אהל, יעקב, נחלה, ישראל, אב, יעקב, &c.). Note, too, that 3 A words are not found in K (אכל v. אור, ישראל, and that the number emphasized in both A and K is rather small (צאן, עלין, נצח, עזר, יעקב, אב, עבר).

If the whole vocabulary of K and A is considered, we find that the

two together use about 1000 words (K, 536; A, 751; common to both, 291), and that about 310 of these are not found in D (12% of K, 17% of A). These non-D words are distributed fairly evenly among the poems, with two notable exceptions—82 has none of them, and 43 only one (quoted from 42). Of the rest, 46, 49, 50, 77 are rather weak, while 45, 48, 76, 80, 81, 83 are notably strong. The words that appear in this list are extremely interesting, as they emphasize the pronounced difference in literary texture and thought-range between these groups and the whole of D. For example, the number of words referring to natural objects and to implements is significantly large.

In view of these considerations, with perhaps others that might be developed, we conclude that K and A, as groups, are so different from D in texture, spirit and allusion that different conditions must be assumed for their origin. Furthermore, K and A present enough apparent connections with the Exile to favor the view that, as groups, they belong to that period. In comparison with them, D seems to be later, since the nationalistic tone of K and A is replaced in D by one that we may call "orthodoxic," and the resentment once felt toward aliens for invasion and oppression gives place to resentment against those within the community who desert and deride the faithful.

Three questions at once emerge as to the validity of these inferences—(1) Why is it inferred that internal strife is later than external? (2) What does it signify that D² lies between K and A, and, like them, is Elohist? (3) What is to be said about the poems in D¹ that are out of harmony with the general tone of the group?

As to the first question. Israel lost its autonomous government and distinct political existence with the Exile. The overthrow by Nebuchadnezzar was so drastic that no full return to the ancient national feeling was ever possible, not even in the Maccabean outbreak, except in the minds of a relatively small class. But the disaster did not obliterate the national loyalty, as the spirit of the Return abundantly demonstrated. It changed its quality. The old intensely political ambition took on more of the religious hope that gathered force as Judaism advanced. The Psalter preserves signs of these varying phases. In Bks. II-III especially are vestiges of the sense of Israel as an independent state, crushed, but vividly recalling its past glory. In the D

poems is the depiction of the internal conflict of ideas and practices that goes with a changing social order, with but slight outlook upon the world at large. But in the "royal" poems and in some of the liturgical ones are marks of the rise of a new ideal, more or less nationalistic in terms, but religious in essence—the epochmaking conception of Israel as the Messiah.

This line of argument regarding the sequence of things might be considered *à priori* in nature, resting on prejudice or pre-supposition. But it is strikingly supported by lexical evidence, and, in fact, has fixed itself in the writer's mind as the direct result of inductive investigation of the lexical facts, with the necessity of finding reasonable explanations for them.

In the writer's mind the probability that K and A are in general earlier than most of D and also than the pervasive "liturgical" material (L) was first suggested by the fact that in both K and A are verses in either the D or the L style that seem incongruous with their context and are so situated that they may readily be considered interpolations. If a chart of all the verses in the Psalter is prepared and on it are noted the occurrences of the L and D test-words (in their most characteristic usages), it proves that in most of the K and A poems these words are relatively few and much scattered, except in certain spots. The implication is that these spots are those where interpolation has taken place, sometimes by the insertion of whole verses, sometimes, perhaps, by the remodeling of parts of verses. In most cases one can see reasons why the interpolation was made, if the original poems had been preserved from a time when conditions were different from those when, presumably, the last stages of Psalter-formation were in progress. Without entering upon the extensive discussion of details, we simply give a list of the verses in K and A among which probably are to be found examples of this general phenomenon, viz.: 42: 9, 6 = 12 = 43: 5; 44: 5, 8, 9; 45: 18 (and probably many details in the body of the poem); 46: 11, 8 = 12; 47: 2, 7, 8; 48: 2, 9-12; 49: 6, 15-16; 50: 6, 14, 16-22; 73: 25, 28; 74: 8-9?, 19, 21; 75: 2, 10, 11; 76: 8-10; 77: 14; 78: 4; 79: 9, 13; 80: 8, 15, 19-20; 82: 3-4; 83: 17, 18, 19; 84: 5, 9, 13; 85: 7-8. (In this list possible L and D interpolations are combined, since all that is in view is to indicate the priority of K and A to both L and D.) It is impossible to show, *per contra*, any similar list of passages in D that have the appearance of being interpolated from K and A.

Another line of lexical argument has already been hinted at. The D poems, except in those cases that are plainly uncharacteristic of the group, contain relatively very few references to objects in the world of nature, such as features of the earth's surface, vegetation, animals,

the heavens and their phenomena, and also relatively few references to the constructions and implements that man makes and uses. The K and A poems, on the other hand, like some other groups in the Psalter, make abundant mention of these things. Whether this literary opulence is due to a freer contact with nature and with the activities of life, or to a different use of literature, is a large question. For our purposes here it is enough to observe that the richer style is surely more likely to be the earlier. It may also imply a different habitat or habit of life.

As to the second question. It must be frankly admitted that there is a real difficulty for the theory here advocated in the fact that D² is closely associated with K and A by position and also by its Elohimism. If, as will be urged at length in the next article of these Studies, the Elohimism of Bks. II-III belongs to an earlier period than the pronounced Yahwism of Bk. I, and yet if in Bk. II is a large group of D poems, with much of the plaintive quality that we are here connecting with social friction and reaction, then the argument as to the sequence of things seems to fall to the ground.

To meet this objection, we may urge that there is every probability that internal conflict between the strict and the lax existed in every period, and doubtless found verbal and literary expression. Indeed, the whole range of the prophetic writings illustrates this. Accordingly, there is nothing surprising in the appearance of strong poems of distress and imprecation from what we are calling the exilic stage of the development. Yet, if thus we suppose that D² is relatively early, why do we suppose that D¹, which superficially resembles it, is considerably later? And what shall be done with the poems that have been classed as D³? It seems to the writer that the evidence of vocabulary points to the probability that both Bk. II and Bk. III were progressively built out to their present dimensions—that D², with 49 and 50, is subsequent to K¹, and that K², with 86 and 89, is subsequent to A. But D², though akin in general sentiment to D¹, differs from it in texture and contents in such a way that it is probably earlier, representing a time when the stress of class conflict had not become so fully established. D³ represents either the same stage as D¹ or one still later.

In general, we may assume that the three great constituents

of the Psalter literature—liturgical, plaintive and didactic—were all in evidence throughout its whole evolution, however long that evolution may have been. But careful study seems to show that in each of them there were successive stages, distinguishable and even contrasted. It is the great problem of Psalter criticism to attempt the definition of these stages in their probable chronological order. What is here in view is to suggest that the great plaintive strain presents several distinct aspects, and that the aspect most characteristic of D¹ differs from, and seems to be subsequent to, those aspects that appear in Bks. II-III generally, except in passages that may be influenced by D¹.

Probably the most difficult passages for our theory are ones like 55:10-16, 21-22; 59:7-8, 15-16; 64:2-7; 69:2-13; 70; etc. It is not impossible that some or all of these are examples of accretion upon material that was originally less personally vivid. Discussion of this question will be more convenient at a later point, since it turns largely upon the intrusion of Yahwistic matter into the Elohist section.

There can be no doubt about the presence in D² of much material that is so peculiar that it stands vividly in contrast with the comparative conventionality of most of D¹. 51 is unique in its way (in spite of some partial analogies with 32); 52, in its most characteristic thought, is matched only by the little 120; 53, with its inexact doublet, 14, stands out in some isolation from its surroundings; 55:2-9 is lyrically singular; 58 is one of the most peculiar of all the poems; 60, and its partial doublet, 108b, stands alone in reference to some historic event or situation; 65b is without much parallel; 68 is notorious for the difficulty of many passages and of its plan. The presence of such passages predisposes one to believe that D² is representative of a freer literary stage than D¹. But it must be admitted that there is also much that links Bk. II with Bk. I. It seems possible to argue that D¹ presupposes the existence of D², and also that the final editing of D² was under influences related to the formation of D¹.

It may be significant that the doxology at the end of Bk. II is by far the most elaborate of the series, though we need not assume that it is as old as the Book. It is also more closely related to the poem that precedes than any other.

Probably phenomena in the titles of Bk. II are also significant, such as the terms מַסְכִּים and מַשְׁכִּיל, and the historic occasions named in 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63.

The poems arbitrarily grouped as D³ vary much in quality. With D² may perhaps be associated the four Songs of Ascents (122, 124, 131, 133) if they have any claim to be counted with D at all. With D¹ may be ranked 86, 101, 109, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144a. 110, 139

(exc. vv. 19-22, which recall D¹), 144b are each unique in its own way, and stand apart. 103, 145 are cases of the incorporation into D of material that properly belongs to L.

As to the third question. The D groups are not homogenous. Within them are specimens of writing different from that which is most characteristic of D. Some of these appear like isolated vestiges of styles not otherwise well represented, as for example, 8, 29 (main part), 65b, 68 (parts), 110, 139, 144b. All the acrostic poems are within the D circle except 111, 112, 119—of which 112 appears rather clearly to belong to the D family. The affiliations of these poems show that they are not far removed in time from D proper, if at all. The fact that the first of the prefatory poems prefixed to the completed collection is closely related to 119 in thought and diction suggests that the monitory style that usually marks the acrostics was prominent at the latest stage of Psalter development. Of the poems usually called "royal," 18, 20, 21, 61, 63, 110 are in D, and 72, 89 may represent stages of progress leading toward D. Here, again, the fact that the second of the prefatory poems in the completed Psalter belongs to this class suggests that the complicated thought that played to and fro between the historic David and the ideal of Israel was prominent at the close of the evolution. The frequent juxtaposition in D of "liturgical" poems or passages with others of extreme complaint seems to show that one of the last influences upon the collection was that of those who sought to render all its contents suitable for use in public worship and to give them a tone that should not seem unduly pessimistic.

It is surprising to observe that almost all the stronger references to "sin" and "guilt" are in D. So with the more definite references to sacrifice and even to the Temple. As already noted, D has very few passages dealing with natural objects or phenomena, and what there are seem like relics of older literature.

Regarding these facts some rapid remarks may be hazarded. Didactic writing probably began in the Exile, at first standing in some relation to that called "prophetic" (which was essentially didactic in nature). But it tended more and more to ethical moralizing, and finally paid special attention to legalistic regularity (after the fashion of the still later Rabbinism). Its ultimate

tendency in the Psalter is illustrated by 1 and 119. The "royal" poems represent a gradually developing line of thought, rooted in certain passages in the histories and prophecies. David, as Israel's first king, came to be eponymic, and his story was viewed symbolically. Ultimately, "David" came to mean the faithful nucleus of the nation, or its personified genius, the term being applied collectively, like "Israel" or "Jacob." In popular fancy the historic stories of David became typical of the history of the faithful, and so to certain poems were prefixed captions recalling those stories (or, perhaps, suggesting the lessons in which those stories were given). In the poems themselves the realistic and idealistic points of view often appear together, fused and confused. The calling of one or more collections of poems by the name of "David" is naturally explained by supposing that they were associated with the experience and sentiments of the faithful.

In spite of the references in D to things pertaining to the Temple, we may query whether these poems represent the official point of view of the sanctuary. This latter is much better connected with the "liturgical" matter generally, most of which lies outside of D. Rather may we refer what is most characteristic of D to the earnest laity, and hence may suspect that it is an evidence of the movement of thought and sentiment that ultimately expressed itself in the institution of the Synagogue. If this be in any degree true, we may suppose that in the final editing of the Psalter there was the uniting of more than one line of effort, so that the completed collection contained elements derived partly from the embryonic Synagogue, partly from the Temple, and partly, perhaps, from a school of moral teachers somewhat distinct from both.¹

¹ Certain questions about the relation of the above argument to facts in the O. T. Apocrypha and to the warfare of parties in the latest period of Judaism will be discussed in the last division of these Studies.