without the accompaniment. The accompaniment is there for the sake of the tune. In the temple singing of Israel, as in all oriental music, it was the business of the instruments first of all to mark the time.[21] And the singing itself was rather more in the nature of a recitation than of tunes in a modern sense.[22] We do not know on what kind of musical system ancient oriental music was built up; to all appearance it was not at any rate on the octave scales.[23] The 'tunes' to which they would sing were very simple and primitive, probably only covering a single line from the poem and consisting of a couple of notes, perhaps the same note over and over again with a rise or a fall on the last word or syllable of the line. If we are to judge from primitive music elsewhere, we may imagine that what we might call the tune may have consisted in the repetition of the same series of notes, say three times, whereas the fourth line, and thus the close of the 'stanza' or 'tune', was marked by a rise or a fall towards the end.

[21] See above, Chap. I. 4, and the references in n. 36 to Chap I.
[22] See Eerdmans, *Hebr. Book of Pss.* (*OTS* IV), pp. 51ff.
[23] See below, n. 16 to Chap. XXIII. At any rate the contrary opinion cannot be based on the two terms in the psalm headings '*al-*'*ālāmôth* and '*al-haššĕmînîth* (against König, *Die Psalmen*, pp. 26f. and Keet, *Liturg. Study of the Psalter*, pp. 48ff.); for this interpretation takes for granted what has to be proved. '*Al-haššĕmînîth* 'over the eighth' cannot indicate a scale based on eight notes, but must indicate one definite 'thing' or action among several others.

CHAPTER XV

The Psalmists

I

It is among the temple singers that we must look for the authors of the psalms. But we must leave on one side, to begin with, the supposed names of authors in the psalm headings. We shall return to them below and realize that, rightly understood, they do contain information about the authors, but in a way different from that of popular belief.

The original cultic psalmography obviously developed at the temples. This is the case everywhere.[1] So also with the psalmography of Israel, as was suggested above (Chap. I.5; II.1). This conclusion as it applies to psalmography in general and to the origin of the psalm types is generally acknowledged at the present time. On this point the researches and the arguments of Gunkel have prevailed. The same applies to the unquestionably cultic psalms of the Psalter.

On the other hand, scholars partly disagree with regard to the individual psalms handed down to us: are they, or the greater part of them, real cultic psalms, or private imitations of the style and the forms of the ancient cultic poetry, which came into being in surroundings other than those of the temple circles?

When speaking of the different kinds of psalms, we have several times mentioned that Gunkel himself looked upon a great number of the psalms as private imitations; especially was this so as regards laments in the I-form and to a great extent also personal thanksgiving psalms. But we have seen that this conception does not hold good; it is not consistent with the congeniality to the psalmists of cultic piety and its expression in the temple service. And we have also seen that it does not hold good either to maintain, as has been done, that since the psalms often value psalm-singing higher than sacrifice and sometimes seem to manifest aversion to sacrifice, this indicates that we are dealing with the private poetical compositions of laymen.

But the question recurs when we come to speak of the milieu of psalmography and the psalmists. In what circles did the now extant psalms come into being?

The earlier critical view, on the basis of a rather narrow and rigid

[1] See for instance Heiler, *Das Gebet*,[4] pp. 165f.

conception of the process of evolution of Israelite religion, maintained that broadly speaking the psalms derive from the age of Judaism, it also supposed them to have developed within certain definite groups of pious laymen and to reflect the division of the congregation into 'the pious' (strictly adhering to the law) and 'the ungodly' (worldly-minded, less strict), known to us from the last two centuries B.C. The terms 'pious' (*ḥăsîdhîm*, properly, 'faithful to the covenant'), 'righteous' (*ṣaddîqîm*), and so on, were supposed to indicate the 'party' of the pious, later on developing into the 'party' of the Pharisees.[2] This view of the religious and cultic history of Israel is altogether untenable. The 'faithful to the covenant', the 'righteous' of the psalms, actually indicate the whole congregation—'Israel' as contrasted with the 'pagans' and the downright 'apostates'.

Gunkel also maintained—in conformity with the earlier critical conception—that even if psalmography as such did develop at the temples, and even if there are many actually cultic psalms in the Psalter, still most of them were composed in the conventicle-like circles of pious laymen from the lower classes, 'the poor', 'the quiet in the land', those who suffered most from the oppression of the rich and mighty worldlings or 'ungodly' higher classes. A simple piety is supposed to have existed here, largely detached from the piety of Temple and cult, the people having their own edifying meetings, apart from the synagogues; here they were supposed to deliver the laments and thanksgiving psalms they had composed in illness and distress after having experienced healing and salvation.

It is beyond all doubt that this conception is in fact modern and not at all ancient, and based on a transference from the pietistic 'conventicles' and from the prayer meetings of Christian revivals outside the church in modern times. But this picture applies neither to ancient Israel nor to Judaism.

The very facts, demonstrated above, that the worshipping 'I' of the psalms in many cases must be a leading representative of the congregation and people, and that even in the I-psalms the enemies are not infrequently national and political enemies, and not social oppressors, and that as a rule the state of distress is of a political and national, not of a social nature, knock the ground from under Gunkel's and Begrich's view of the psalmists. After all, the idea of such private, conventicle-like prayer meetings and a 'cult-free' piety in the Judaism of that day is an artificial construction without any basis whatever in the sources. There is no evidence that the divisions within the Jewish congregation resulted in separate private prayer meetings, nor that 'the pious' are simply to be equated with 'the poor' and people of small means. We find separate cultic meetings with sacred meals and rites and rejection of the sacrificial cult only among a definitely sectarian group like the Essenes of the time

[2] This is the opinion not only of Rahlfs, Causse, Gelin (see Additional Note XXIX and all the older critical commentaries), but even of one of the latest 'introductions' to the O.T., Pfeiffer's *Introduction*; cf. Additional Notes XXXIV, XXXV. See further above, pp. 243ff.; II.59ff.

of Christ,[3] and their predecessors, the 'sectarians' of the newly-found 'Dead Sea scrolls' and the 'Damascus Document', but never among those who wanted to be loyal to the inherited temple cult order. Among these 'Proto-essenes' there certainly did exist psalmography, as is demonstrated by the new documents; but this psalmography is totally epigonous in relation to the biblical, and has all the marks of the disintegration of the old style mentioned above (Chap. XIV.3); it belongs clearly to the post-biblical 'learned psalmography', of which we shall speak in the following chapter. 'The quiet in the land'—an expression occurring only once in the Old Testament, in Ps. 35.20—does not mean a special social milieu, nor a special pious tendency or pious milieu, but is a poetical term for the congregation or people itself, which wants to live in peace with its neighbours and oppressors, and is not guilty of any such ungodly and arrogant 'noise' as marks its enemies among the pagans and their scheming and rebellious associates.

To support his theory about private conventicles and meetings of pious groups Gunkel quotes the term 'great assembly', to which the psalmists often allude; but this term clearly indicates the regular, or casual, cultic assemblies of the congregation in the Temple. The existence of private assemblies is just an assumption made by Gunkel and others on the basis of their view of the psalms as being essentially private compositions; the sources do not provide any evidence for this assumption. Within orthodox Judaism we know nothing whatever about other religious, 'edifying' meetings apart from the temple and synagogue services. The religious meetings that may have occurred belonged to *sects* which had purposely detached themselves from the main congregation and had their own cultic assemblies, like the Essenes, but then these were themselves in turn real cultic assemblies for the denominational congregation, and no private meetings. But it is completely out of the question that the greater part of the psalms should have come into being or that the collection of the Psalter should have taken place among such a sect. The psalmists testify to their attachment to the Temple, the ancestors and the law in a way much too obvious for that—apart from the fact that it would make it impossible to understand how the psalms could ever have been accepted for use in the temple service of the community itself. This last argument would also apply to the psalms if they were private compositions. The cult was far too bound up with tradition to adopt such poetry; it would have to be consecrated by time in order to be used there.

Certainly, as we shall see below, a private psalmography did finally come into being, namely in the 'wisdom schools' which were closely connected with the Temple, and a few of these poems are also included in the Psalter. But this does not explain the origin of the greater part of the psalms, and still less does it agree with the fact that so many of the psalms were actually used in the cult. The private psalmography known to us as the

[3] See Mosbech, *Essaeismen*, pp. 263ff.

'Psalms of Solomon' from the first century B.C. was never used in the official cult.[4]

Psalm-*singing* certainly did occur more privately. Here we cannot, however, adduce the use of the 'Hallel', i.e. Pss. 113–118 at the paschal repast; after all the paschal repast was something in the nature of cult, and, singing on that occasion was not limited to certain pious groups but prevailed among all Jews, even among the 'wordly-minded'. And it is beyond doubt that the custom of singing these very psalms on that occasion has been adopted from the temple service, and that some of them at any rate were originally really cultic psalms. As to the use of private psalms for recitation in smaller groups, we can only with some probability infer that the productions of the 'learned psalmography' were recited within the 'wisdom school'. However, that is something very different from Gunkel's groups of psalm-singing pious laymen among the lower classes.

When the editors of the sagas and the authors of the later legends time and again make their characters recite a psalm: 'then so-and-so sang this psalm to the Lord'—for instance the so-called Song of Hannah in 1 Sam. 2, or the thanksgiving psalm of king Hezekiah in Isa. 38.9ff.—they certainly mean that this took place on the cultic occasion to which the author was referring or which he had read about in the stories: Hannah's public visit to the Temple after the birth of her son, or that of Hezekiah after having been healed. We cannot even feel sure that the psalm-singing, to which James 5.13 alludes, refers to private singing at home; probably the author has in mind the singing of the congregational assembly after some joyful experience.[5]

Sooner or later the psalms of the Psalter came to be used in the service of the synagogues also, but not as a book of songs nor for singing; they were used as parts of the Holy Scripture, of the authorized and inspired canon, for reading, just like the other biblical books, which were read in the synagogues as holy words of God. From New Testament times we have evidence of their being used as Holy Writ in theological arguments and in lectures and sermons.[6] This does not prove anything about the origin of psalmography and the Psalter or about psalm-singing in the synagogue.[7] It is as Holy Scripture also that the psalms from the second century B.C. have influenced the prayers of the synagogue and the daily prayers prescribed for the pious.[8] But none of the psalms have been purposely composed for singing, or for any other use, in the synagogue.

[4] Therefore it is wholly without reason that Kittel thinks that the Psalms of Solomon were used at the service of the synagogues (see Kautzsch, *APAT* II, p. 130). The diapsalma = selah, occurring twice in the manuscripts is no proof of the assertion. In the synagogue there was no singing.

[5] Cf. 1 Cor. 14.26; Ephes. 5.19; Col. 3.16, and see Weizsäcker, *Apostol. Zeitalter*,[3] pp. 557ff. (E.T., *The Apostolic Age*, II, 259ff.). His interpretation of the lyrical sections of the N.T. is nearer to reality than that of Gunkel in *Die Lieder in der Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu*.

[6] Matth. 21.42; 22.41ff.; Mark 12.35f.; Luke 20.41f.; Acts 13.33; *et al.*

[7] Against Quell, *Kult. Probl. d. Pss.*, p. 5.

[8] Mentioned for the first time by the Tannaite Joseph bar Halafta, see Elbogen, *Jüd. Gottesdienst*, p. 82.

2

But if it is true that the great majority of the psalms handed down to us are clearly cultic psalms—and the preceding examination of the species and their settings ought to have proved that much—then the question as to the circles in which these psalms have come into being will find a much simpler answer. For then it is *a priori* most natural to suppose that they also were composed of people who had something to do with the service of the Temple—or, in earlier times, of the temples.

Equally, if indications exist in the psalms that the authors were closely connected with the Temple and temple service, this fact supports the statement that they are really cultic psalms.

What is to be found about this in the psalms themselves?

There can hardly be any doubt that they contain some features showing that most of them were composed at the Temple of Jerusalem—even if there are also some North-Israelite psalms which were probably used at one of the North-Israelite temples, for instance Bethel.

As we have seen,[9] the psalmists time and time again speak of their internal and external relations with the Temple and its orderings and the service there. They are living in the Temple, they are thinking and expressing themselves in the notions of Temple and cult. Very often we are told about the Temple of Zion[10] and the temple mountain,[11] about the temple courts and the holy city,[12] about the altar[13] and about the sacrifices.[14] All these things are mentioned with a feeling of awe, in venerating and rejoicing words, as objects of love and confidence, pride and joy.[15] Through the cult at the sanctuary they have an experience of God, from which flows whatever belongs to the true values of life;[16] there they 'seek Yahweh' in order to 'make their refuge in the shadow of his wings';[17] there flows 'the fountain of life' (36.10) and 'all their springs' are there (87.7). In the Temple the author of Ps. 63 beholds God; to the author of Ps. 73 the problem of life and of the justice of the world order of God is solved there.[18]

[9] See Chap. I. 3–4. Cf. n. 14 to Chap. XIV.

[10] Pss. 5.8; 23.6; 24.7ff.; 26.8; 27.4; 28.2; 29.9; 36.9; 42/43; 55.15; 65.5; 66.13; 69.10; 73.17; 74.3ff.; 76.2; 79.1; 84; 92.14; 100.4; 101.7; 114.2; 116.19; 118.19; 122; 132.7; 134; 135.2; 150.1; *et al.*

[11] Pss. 3.5; 15.1; 24.3; 27.5; 48.3, 12f.

[12] Pss. 31.22; 46.5; 48.2, 3, 9; 50.2; 87.3; 97.8; 101.8; 102; 125; 132.13; 135.21; 137; *et al.*

[13] Pss. 26.6; 43.4; 51.21; 84.4; 118.27; *et al.*

[14] Sacrifice: Pss. 4.6; 27.6; 116.17. Burnt offerings: Pss. 20.4; 52.21; 66.13, 15; 107.22; together with 'full offerings' 66.13. Sacrificial gift: 20.4; 141.2. Performing of vows: 22.26; 50.14; 56.13; 61.9; 65.2; 66.13; 76.12; 116.14. Voluntary sacrifice: 54.8. Thanksgiving sacrifice: 50.14, 23; 56.13; 116.17. Incense offerings: 66.15; 141.2.

[15] Cf. Jacob in *ZATW* 17, 1897, pp. 264–273; Quell, *Kult. Probl. d. Pss.*, pp. 152f. ((*o*) and (*p*)).

[16] Pss. 63.10; 73.17; 84.8; 21.7; 26.8; 27.8; *et al.* Cf. *Ps.St.* II, pp. 19–35, 79f., 130–145, 146–148.

[17] Pss. 17.8; 36.8; 57.2; 61.5; 63.8; 91.4.

[18] This close connexion of the psalmists with the Temple has been rightly claimed and demonstrated by Jacob in *ZATW* 17, 1897, and by Matthes, ibid., 22, 1902, pp. 68ff.; see also Wheeler Robinson in *The Psalmists*, pp. 48ff.

The authors, moreover, even have their daily home in the sacred place. They make the congregation 'visiting' the sanctuary speak as if they were living there, even 'for ever', because it was natural for themselves to use such expressions. If they are to give a concrete picture of the greatest happiness, they do not speak of visiting the Temple, but of staying there for ever. Through good and evil times the longing of the psalmists is for the Temple.[19] Again and again they disclose their knowledge of the cultic life that went on at the Temple, and not infrequently they allude directly to the different ritual functions taking place there.[20]

Broadly speaking the psalms came into being at the Temple, and all the preceding chapters have shown that they were composed for use at the regularly or irregularly recurring cultic functions and situations there, to be recited by or on behalf of persons of such standing that psalms were to be sung for them. That is why they have the uniform and general character to which an analysis of species (types) and style forms testifies.

3

It might therefore be natural to think of the priests as authors of the psalms.[21] If 'the priesthood' is taken in the comprehensive sense as referring to the entire cultic personnel, we are justified in saying that cultic psalmography, broadly speaking, everywhere had its origin among them. But this does not apply to the specialized hierarchy of the Temple of Jerusalem on the one hand, and the extant psalms to be found in the Old Testament on the other.

Very early on, the temple priesthood of Israel—very probably under Canaanite influence—had become primarily sacrificers, to whom the sacrifice and its rituals had become the chief point of the temple service (cf. Chap. XII. 1). The psalmists, too, know that sacrifice is a matter of course and necessary,[22] and yet they put a higher value on the psalm-singing, the lament and the thanksgiving psalm; as a rule these are explicitly mentioned in the vow to Yahweh,[23] even if the sacrifice is tacitly implied, as can be seen for instance from 22.23–27, or happens to be explicitly mentioned alongside the thanksgiving psalm.[24] And sometimes we are told in plain words that Yahweh puts more value on the psalm

[19] 'Visit': Pss. 15.1; 61.5; 122; cf. Isa. 33.14. 'Abide': 15.1; 24.4; 84.5. 'For ever': 23.6; 27.4; 84.5, 11; cf. 52.10; 92.13f. Highest bliss: 84.11; 36.9. Longing: 26.8; 27.4, 8; 42.3; 43.3f.; 61.5, 8; 63.2f.; 84.3; 122.1f.

[20] See Quell, *Kult. Probl. d. Pss.*, pp. 150f.; further *Ps.St.* I, pp. 140ff.; II, pp. 94–130; III, pp. 30–105; V, pp. 33ff.; 82ff.; VI.

[21] So, for instance, Gunkel-Begrich, *Einl.*, p. 30. Bentzen has tried to prove that Ps. 73 was composed by a 'Levite' (see *Jahves Gaest*, pp. 52ff.): at least his arguments show that the author was connected with the Temple and cult.

[22] Pss. 4.6; 20.4; 22 26; 27.6; 50.14, 23; 52.21; 54.8; 56.13; 61.9; 65.2; 66.13, 15; 76.12; 96.8; 107.23; 116.14, 17; 147.2.

[23] Pss. 7.18; 13.6; 26.12; 27.6; 31.8f.; 35.9f., 27f.; 42.6f.; 43.4f.; 51.15–17; 54.8; 56.13; 57.8f.; 59.17f.; 61.9; 63.3, 6; 69.31ff.; 71.8, 14–18; 86.12; 109.30; 119.7; 140.14; 142.8. Cf. 21.14; Jer. 20.13; Sir. 51.11.

[24] Pss. 27.6; 54.8; 56.13f.; 61.9.

singing and the humble or grateful heart of which it is an expression than on the sacrifice of animals.[25] The latter cannot in itself win the pleasure of Yahweh (see Chap. VIII. 11). Much oftener the temple music and the singing are emphasized as something with which the poets are quite familiar.[26]

All this seems to indicate that we have to look for the psalmists among the temple singers.[27]

Other facts seem to point in the same direction: first the expressed sympathy of the psalmists for the poor, the propertyless and those of low social standing.[28] As we have seen above, the 'Levites', and with them the singers, belonged to this class. The attitude of the psalms evidently agrees with this social standing on the part of the singers.

We must admit, however, that this fact was much exaggerated by the older critical investigators of the psalms. Wherever the 'suffering', the 'oppressed', the 'poor', the 'wretched', the 'lowly' (*'ănîyyîm*, *'ănāwîm*, *'ebhyōnîm*, etc.) were mentioned, they were taken to refer to social and religious parties within the Jewish congregation itself, and considered to testify to the theory that the psalms had sprung into being among pious but mostly oppressed laymen in the lower strata of society.[29] This conception, however, is not correct. These terms do not indicate 'parties'. As a rule they refer to 'Israel', the people and the congregation themselves, who are 'weak' and 'helpless', and 'poor' and 'wretched' and actually 'suffering' in relation to powerful pagan enemies and oppressors; sometimes the term implies the 'humble', who are patiently waiting for the help of Yahweh.[30] But sometimes the position is that the foreign oppressors have been joined by traitors from within the people and congregation itself, and in some cases these were evidently to be found among the rich and mighty in the land.

Now, as a rule, the adherence of the psalmists to the 'lowly' is not based on social and political but on national and religious grounds. Yet their sympathy for the 'poor' and 'lowly' also shows through. From Ps. 22.27 we can see that the psalmists take an interest in seeing that the poor have their share of the sacrificial meal; references to this may perhaps be found in both 69.33 and 34.3. And in some of the psalms the relation between rich and poor obviously plays a part;[31] the rich are the lofty and ungodly, the poor are the humble and pious having recourse to the Temple.

This social point of view is not just based upon the economic interests of a 'class' but is also an expression of two important religious factors. In

[25] Pss. 40.7; 50.8ff., 23; 51.18f.; 69.31f.—See above, Chap. VI. 3; VIII. 11.

[26] Pss. 49 5; 33.2; 81.3f.; 98.5f.; 147.7; 150; and many other places, see n. 23 to Chap. XIV.

[27] For further details see *Ps.St.* VI.

[28] See *Ps.St.* VI, pp. 59ff.

[29] The classical exposition of this interpretation is Rahlfs, *'Ani und 'Anaw in den Psalmen*; see Additional Note XXIX.

[30] See Birkeland, *'Ani und 'Anaw in den Pss.*; id., *Feinde des Indiv.*, pp. 317ff.

[31] Pss. 37; 49; 52; 62; 73. See Munch in *ZATW* 55, 1937, pp. 36ff. (Cf. Additional Note XXIX.)

the first place the men employed in the cult by virtue of their offices would come to know the pious as being distressed, sick or unclean or suffering from some kind of 'violence'; it was just when the pious person was 'oppressed' or 'suffering' in some way or other that he would have recourse to the Temple in order to receive the help of Yahweh through the sacramental institutions of the cult; such groups of 'suffering ones' we have met in Ps. 107 (Chap. X.3). It would therefore be natural for the cultic officials to write the 'texts' for the liturgies and generally to speak and think from the point of view of these 'oppressed' and 'distressed' people. But, in the second place, we need to be aware that the religious experience, of which the cult was a medium to those who took part in it and lived their lives in it, must also sometimes become such a personal experience of God as the holy, judging and overwhelming one, that a man would become small and humble and 'brought low'. We can see how the prophets, themselves belonging to the common people, would sometimes have such an experience of God through the cult itself; this is evidently the case with the inaugural vision which Isaiah had (Isa. 6); and similarly with Jeremiah (17.12). Holding this point of view, the pious will instinctively react against whatever may be proud and lofty and rich and mighty and self-sufficient; God only is great.[32] The psalmists merged these religious elements connected with the cult with their antagonism to the rich and mighty, and this resulted in a relative evaluation of poverty and riches which tells us something about the circles from which these authors came.

The antagonism based on social position and religious estimation which the attitude of the psalmists to the sacrificial cult (Chap. VIII.11) has proved did exist between themselves and the priests, and their growing self-consciousness in relation to the priests, have also, as we have seen, found expression in legend and tradition (Chap. XIV.1).

Here, too, a truly religious element makes itself felt. The high estimate of temple singing and the psalm, which the authors cherish, is at the same time the outcome of a religious experience, of being 'gripped' by the Holy One, for this feeling will instinctively find expression in rhythm, singing and rejoicings and winged words, but also in the contrite heart and the humble spirit, in the 'lowliness' for which the psalms display such great sympathy.

In this connexion we must also draw attention to the spiritual and personal relationship between psalmists and temple prophets, mentioned above (Chap. XII.1). With the organized guild of temple prophets, the psalmists had a certain spiritual fellowship. In ancient Israel poetry itself was considered to be inspired (see below); the ancient Hebrews as well as Arabs and Hellenes looked upon it as an outcome of divine inspiration, of 'holy excitation';[33] that is why both the songs of the seers and the words

[32] Cf. Isa. 2.9–17, and see *Ps.St.* VI, p. 97.
[33] Cf. Goldziher in *ZDMG* 45, 1891, p. 685; Wellhausen, *Reste arab. Heidentums*,[2] p. 35; van der Leeuw, *Phänomenologie*, §28.1, p. 209. [E.T., *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*, pp. 227f.]

of the prophets appear as poetical works in verse.[34] The prophetesses Miriam and Deborah were also regarded as poetesses in Israel.[35] Just as the prophet who has had his eyes and ears 'opened' beholds visions and hears mysterious divine voices,[36] so the poet hears the adoration of the heavens, which is 'without speech and language, not heard' by normal human ears (19.2–5). Like the prophet (1 Sam. 10.5; 2 Kgs. 3.15) so also the poet (Ps. 49.4f.) is put into a state of inspiration by means of music. In this state he will 'incline his ear to a secret' and have 'wisdom' 'pour forth from his mouth', just like the prophet (49.4f.; 45.2; 78.2). The psalmist too has been listening to the voice of the deity (81.6); through him also 'Yahweh is speaking' (85.9). The poets have seen Yahweh in his heavenly council, turning the leaves of his book—like any other wise scholar—and they have heard him speak of his pious ones and of Zion, or burst into laughter at the idea of the kings of this earth wanting to frustrate his plan (87.6; 2.4). They preach 'revelation' ('instruction' 'guidance', *tôrâ*), which Yahweh himself has 'whispered to them' (78.1; 110.1; cf. Isa. 8.16; 42.4). They have seen him looking down from his heaven, and they know what counsel he has taken (14.2ff.). They have heard the accusation and the doom he has pronounced against the other gods at his enthronement, and are able to tell the congregation about it (82). They have also seen him 'shining out of Zion' and heard the words of reproof he is going to pronounce to his congregation on a similar occasion because of the sins prevailing in their midst (50.1ff.). Just as the 'heart' of the prophet is able to tell him of things far off and unknown, so the 'heart' of the psalmist speaks divine counsels to him (27.8; cf. 2 Kgs. 5.26).

Reciprocally the temple prophets Nahum and Habakkuk were also psalmists (Nah. 1; Hab. 3). The prophecies of both Habakkuk and Joel give evidence of strong influences from the forms of psalm and cultic liturgy.[37] The same thing applies to Jeremiah[38] and Deutero-Isaiah.[39]

In this way the prophetic element in the psalms, discussed above in a wider context (Chap. XII), also provides evidence that the psalms are derived from the temple singers, who were so closely linked with the temple prophets[40] that the latter were finally organized as belonging to the guilds and 'families' of the singers, as we can see from the Chronicler.

[34] Num. 22–24; Gen. 49; Deut. 33. Cf. Lindblom, *Profetismen*, p. 602.
[35] Ex. 15.20; Jdg. 5.1. Cf. Gunkel in *RGG*[1] II, col. 1641.
[36] Num. 24.3f., 15; 1 Sam. 9.15; Isa. 22.14.
[37] Cf. Mowinckel, *Jesajadisiplene*, pp. 133f., 145ff., and for the 'psalms of lamentation' of the prophets, ibid., pp. 62ff., 129. Cf. also Humbert, *Livre d'Habacuc*, pp. 31ff., 37ff., 280ff., 290ff. See introduction to the book of Joel in *GTMMM* III; cf. Baumgartner in *Festschrift für Budde*, pp. 10ff.—The cultic element to be found in the conceptions and metaphors of Joel is also strongly emphasized—sometimes much too strongly—by Kapelrud in *Joel Studies*, and, in a more cautious and methodical way in *StTh* IV, pp. 5ff.
[38] Baumgartner, *Klagegedichte d. Jeremia*; cf. Mowinckel in *Edda* XXVI, pp. 276ff.
[39] Cf. Gressmann in *ZATW* 34, 1914, pp. 283ff.; Köhler, *Deuterojesaja*, pp. 120ff.; see also *Ps.St.* II, pp. 195ff.
[40] For the above, see *Ps.St.* VI, pp. 48ff.

On the face of it it is only natural that the temple singers themselves should have the deepest interest in giving expression to the ideas and experiences of the cult through singing, and that it would be their job to provide the psalms needed for the liturgy.

The singers did not recite or sing in the Temple 'at sight'. They had to know the psalms by heart and teach them to their sons. The psalms became the inheritance of the singer families.

It goes almost without saying, therefore, that the singers had the responsibility for copying out the psalms and handing them down. Probably the way they started learning the art of poetry was by copying and studying the old psalms. In other words the singers also had to be 'scribes' or 'sages', and the 'wise scribes' were actually at that time the real 'literary men' and poets. Jesus Ben Sira, for instance, was such a 'sage' and psalmist and, as we shall see, the eponymous ancestors of the singer families were supposed to have been such sages and poets in their day.[41] It is rather suggestive that the best metaphor one of the psalmists can find for his volubility and enthusiastic eulogy is 'the pen of the quick scribe' (45.2); and likewise, that most reflective and rationalistic author of the 'wisdom' and problem psalm, Ps. 49, is able to say,

> My mouth shall now speak words of wisdom,
> and what my heart has thought is insight;
> I incline my ear to dark parables,
> and solve my riddle on the lyre. (49.4f.)

He thus suggests that his wisdom has been received in a state of inspired rapture like the one called forth in the prophets by means of dancing and playing on instruments. The word *maskîl* means a song sprung out of and containing supra-normal insight and effect; it is a term used for a certain kind of psalm (Chap. XXIII.5), and testifies to the connexion between the psalmists and 'wisdom'.

We shall see in the following chapter that in late Jewish times psalmography was taken over by 'wise men' of just the same type as Ben Sira, and also that the poetry of these late authors was included in the Psalter. Evidently the later learned men have taken over an old inheritance from earlier 'wise singers'.

So the production as well as the handing down of the psalms was the business of the 'wise' singers.

Against this view of the psalms as cultic psalms, composed by the professional singers and poets of the Temple, it has been objected that such an interpretation does not agree with the impression of personal emotion and experience brought out so vividly in many of the psalms. In a later chapter (XVII) we shall see that this contrast is unreal; the professional and the

[41] 1 Kgs. 5.9–13. The context shows that the ancient sages mentioned are also supposed to be composers of songs and 'stanzas of wisdom'.

personal do not exclude each other any more than the institutional and the charismatic did, according to the Old Testament way of thinking.

Nor is the fact that the Psalter does contain a few psalms which to all appearance have not been composed for use in the cult, nor by people from the circle of the temple personnel (see Chap. XVI), any objection to the view that the great majority of psalms are derived from the Temple and the temple personnel. For as we shall see below (Chap. XXII), the actual collection of the Psalter is finally the work of 'the wise'; after all, it would be a great deal more strange if some few psalms from their own circle had not been included in the collection.

4

But what about the names of authors given in the headings of the psalms? Do not these headings seem to name actual persons, in particular David?

The answer is that in those cases where the statements contain true tradition they support the view that these psalms have come into being among the temple singers. The secret is to understand them properly, as they were meant by the original tradition.

The headings mention the following names of supposed authors: David, Asaph, 'the sons of Korah', Heman 'the Ezrahite', Ethan 'the Ezrahite', Moses, Solomon. But the term 'Jeduthun', occurring in three headings, is not the name of an author nor even the name of a person, but a liturgical technical term.[42]

In so far as we are here dealing with historical individuals, Solomon is the latest according to the opinion of the later Jewish tradition. The book of the Chronicles dates the others—with the exception of Moses—in the age of David. Accordingly the psalms were supposed to be composed by David and his contemporaries. We shall return below to David and Solomon and Moses, and first discuss some of the headings which do contain real tradition and in a certain sense give real names of authors, namely Asaph, Heman, Ethan and the sons of Korah.

They certainly do not tell us anything about the individual authors of the individual psalms. Pss. 50; 73; 74; 79; and 80 are all ascribed to Asaph. But Ps. 81 is derived from the northern kingdom and can hardly be later than the year 722, when this state was destroyed; in all probability Pss. 74 and 79 were composed after the fall of Jerusalem in 587, whereas Pss. 50 and 73 were composed somewhat later according to their theological attitude and way of setting the problems. So these five psalms cannot possibly have been composed by the same person.

[42] David: Pss. 3–9/10; 11–32; 34–41; 51–65; 68–70; 86; 101; 103; 108–110; 122; 124; 131; 133; 138–145, in all, 73 psalms. See further below, n. 52.—Asaph: 50; 73–83; in all, 12 psalms.—Sons of Korah: 42/43; 44–49; 84; 87; 88; in all, 11 psalms.—Heman: Ps. 88 (together with the 'sons of Korah').—Ethan: 89.—Moses: 90.—Solomon: 72 and 127; in the latter it is wanting in G.—Jeduthun: 39 and 62 (together with David), 77 (together with Asaph).—See *Ps.St.* IV, pp. 16f.; Gunkel-Begrich, *Einl.*, p. 458.

But the above-mentioned headings do contain a dependable tradition concerning the circles in which these psalms came into being. What therefore, do these names of authors tell us? In the first place it should be noted that they are the names of such persons—historical or legendary—as were supposed to be the ancestors of the guilds of temple singers.

In the census list in Ezra 2—from about 400 B.C.[43]—Asaph is supposed to be the ancestor of all singers. Granted that he was a historical person, he probably belonged to the temple personnel after the restoration under Zerubbabel, or perhaps in late pre-exilic times.[44] At the time of the list the singers were not yet considered to belong to the 'Levites' but ranked below them, among the lower temple personnel. At the time of the Chronicler, 'Asaph' had become one of the three 'Levitical' families of singers, and the Chronicler makes him a contemporary of David. But this conclusion as to the date is no real historical tradition, it is a later theologico-historical theory; in the opinion of the Chronicler all the orderings of the temple were instituted by David.

In ancient times both Heman (88) and Ethan (89) like Chalcol and Darda', were considered to be famous 'wise men' and veteran authors of 'wisdom', to whom the writer of the saga compares Solomon; they are traditional figures—something like the Æsop of the Greeks or the Bidpai of the Arabs; cf., among the Israelites the wise Daniel and the 'wise man' Agur and 'king Lemuel' as authors of wise proverbs (Prov. 30.1; 31.1). Ethan and Heman were considered to be 'Ezrahites', i.e. 'natives' (Canaanites)[45] as distinguished from the Israelites; this means, in fact, that they are Canaanite representatives of the international, oriental tradition of wisdom and its exponents.[46] But in the tradition these wise men of the past are explicitly identified with the 'guild' of temple musicians; for they are called 'sons of *māḥōl*', which does not mean that they are own sons of a person called Mahol, as it has been misinterpreted until quite lately; *māḥōl* is a collective designation, meaning something like 'dance', 'orchestra'; just as 'sons of the ointments' or 'sons of the goldsmiths' indicate 'members of the guilds of ointment makers' or 'goldsmiths', so 'sons of the orchestra' indicates, as Albright has seen, that they are members of the (temple) guild of musicians.[47] Judging from the type of name, we are here dealing with traditions older than the monarchy in Israel. Such men of the past were considered by the wisdom 'scribes' to be their spiritual—and physical—ancestors. But 'wisdom' and 'prophecy' and 'poetry' and singing all belonged to the same set-up in the ancient orient. We can therefore well understand that the temple musicians and singers and poets also reckoned them as belonging to their circle. In later

[43] See Mowinckel in *NTT*, 1915, pp. 123ff.
[44] The proper name Asaph occurs in the later monarchic period (2 Kgs. 18.18, 37 = Isa. 36.3, 22), and in early Persian times (Neh. 2.8).
[45] See Albright, *ARI*, p. 210, n. 95, and above, n. 9 to Chap. XIV.
[46] 1 Kgs. 5.11 shows that 'the sage' must be more strongly emphasized than is done by Albright; only the younger tradition makes them musicians and singers.
[47] See Albright, op. cit., p. 127.

tradition, therefore, they were considered to be Levites and ancestors of a greater or smaller section of the temple singers. Yet, like poetry, wisdom, too, was considered to be something supernaturally inspired,[48] expressing itself in poetry such as the book of Proverbs, Job or Ps. 49.

According to Ps. 88.1 it is the *sons of Korah* who regarded Heman as one of their great men in days of old; and as Ethan, like Heman, according to Ps. 89.1 was considered an Ezrahite, probably Ethan too was supposed to belong to the sons of Korah. When the headings attribute a good many psalms to the latter, this obviously does not mean that the individual psalm is 'by' the sons of Korah—it could not very well be composed by a whole guild—but it means that this psalm and others with the same heading are 'for' Korah, belong to them, and form part of their repertoire. For Korah also is the name of a 'Levitical family' from the period after the restoration of the Temple. According to Ezra 2.42 the sons of Korah were at that time still door-keepers and so were not yet classed among the real 'Levites';[49] later on they rose to be singers, and were finally, like the latter, classed among the Levites. Like all the other temple families they would then date their pedigree from the time of David and Solomon and include Heman and Ethan among their ancestors. That a psalm belongs to the sons of Korah means that it came into being within this guild and had one of the sons of Korah for its author. In the age of the Chronicler himself (about 300 B.C. or later) the term 'sons of Korah' was no longer used; he speaks of three families of singers, Asaph, Heman and Ethan, each representing the three great Levitical families Gershon, Kohath and Merari—a mixing of tradition and artificial construction, the details of which are rather obscure.

The headings of the psalms represent a somewhat earlier conception than that of the Chronicler. They know but two families of singers, Asaph and the sons of Korah; among the latter we find two wise men of antiquity, Heman and Ethan.

According to the tradition among the collectors of the psalms these three ancestors of the singers were the authors of a great many psalms. Of course this tradition contains a historical kernel, in so far as these psalms—and still others—were composed by members of the guilds of singers. To the members of these guilds of singers it was, in fact, an obvious thing that the old time-honoured and effective songs of the cult should be derived from ancient 'wise men' and ancestors. To whom else could such valuable spiritual inheritance in family and class possibly be attributed? It is therefore a matter of course that the authorship of psalms belonging to the particular official repertoire of individual families would be attributed to one of the ancestors of that family.

[48] 1 Chron. 6.18, 22; 15.5, 19, etc.; Ps. 49.4f.; 1 Kgs. 3.4ff.; Prov. 8.22ff.; Job 32.8, 18; 4.12ff.; Dan. 1.17.
[49] For Ezra 2.42 cf. 1 Chron. 9.19ff., and other passages in the book of Chronicles, in which the sons of Korah are not yet 'Levites'.

5

What, then, about '*David*' in the headings of the psalms? We have seen above (Chap. III.6) that the original sense of this note was that the psalm in question was destined and used in the cult 'for David', i.e. for the reigning king. But no doubt also, the collectors and editors of the Psalter understood it to be a bit of information about the author, and no doubt such a note was often added to a psalm on this basis. The question arises therefore whether this is historically possible and correct; the argument implied in the cultic nature of the royal psalms and in the sense of the term *dâwîd* must be supported by an examination of the actual psalms in question.

We then arrive at the result that many, perhaps most of the psalms bearing the name of David must be later than his time. The historical allusions to be found as well as the supposed social and religious conditions, and arguments pertaining to the history of the language, prove that this must be so.[50]

In some of them, for instance, the worshipper clearly is a descendant of David, not David himself (18.51; 89.4, 20, 40, 50; 132.10). Others presuppose that the Temple on Zion, which was built by David's son Solomon, has been erected and stands there 'from of old' (24.7, 9).

In other cases the social conditions reflected in the psalms call for a later dating. Early Israel considered riches, welfare, prosperity and power to be sure evidence of piety, righteousness and the goodwill of God. From one point of view we may look upon the whole of the religious history of Israel in later times as a constant struggle about this problem. Scarcely before the middle and later monarchy did the social displacement occur which, in addition to the priestly and prophetic reaction against Canaanite culture and the disastrous experiences in foreign policy, could lead to a way of thinking like the one we find in Pss. 49; 73; 34; 37; 52 and 62, in which 'rich' and 'mighty' are on the point of being identified with 'violator', 'oppressor', 'sinner'.

The low estimate of the sacrifice of animals mentioned above does not agree with the type of piety we find at the time of David and even later with its perfectly positive view of the sacrifice.[51]

And to add an argument from the history of the language; the marked aramaisms in Ps. 139 or the late Hebrew use of the relative particle *še* and the circumlocution of the genitive construction by means of this particle and the preposition *lĕ* in Pss. 122 and 146, for instance, prove that in spite of the heading 'by David' in Ps. 122 they must belong to the latest psalms and be dated from a period long after the Exile.

Something similar is the case with a great many psalms.

So this corroborates the view that the 'David' of the headings was not originally meant to indicate the name of the author, but refers to the

[50] Cf. Buhl, *Psalmerne*,[2] pp. XVIIff.; and *Ps.St.* VI, pp. 2f.

[51] See Chap. VIII. 11; X. 2. Cf., for instance, 1 Sam. 26.19; 2 Sam. 6.13, 18; 21.9; 24.18–25.

cultic use of the psalms in the king's Temple, that it was later understood, however, to indicate the author, and by mistake was added to many psalms which cannot be so old. In other words it contains no true information or tradition about the psalmists, but is a result of a later interpretation and theory. We can therefore say nothing about the age and author of a psalm on the basis of this note.

On closer text-critical examination we shall find that in many cases the heading 'David' is merely a later addition.[52] It was added in accordance with the *theory* that the psalms were composed by David if nothing was said to the contrary; there is no question here of real tradition. By Jewish scholars 'David' was interpreted as the name of the author, and according to this interpretation the word was added to a great many psalms where it was not originally to be found.

However, if the note 'for David' was understood to mean '(composed) by David', there must be a reason for it. The traditions about the ancestor Asaph, and others, as the authors of the treasured psalms of the guilds of singers, prove that learned men among the later authors and preservers of psalms at a certain point of time began to be interested in this question. Thus it became natural for them to attribute to David the authorship of such psalms as of old used to be called the 'psalms of David', that is psalms composed 'for (and by) David' that is, for and by the king. That David himself had used such a psalm on important occasions of his life and thereby obtained the goodwill and help of Yahweh would naturally mean a strong recommendation for the psalm in question. And in proportion as David was considered the founder of the whole cultic ordering and particularly of the temple singing of Jerusalem (1 Chron. 25), it would also become natural to look upon him as the author of the psalms to which his name was attached. The earlier tradition already considered David a poet and attributed to him for instance the ancient dirge on Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. 1.17ff.; 3.38f.; cf. 23.1ff.).

In this way a learned interest in the authorship grew into being in the circles in which the psalms were handed down. They began to ask who might have composed such and such a psalm. As a rule they would know nothing about it; it is a characteristic feature of cultic poetry all the world over that it is anonymous. But 'the learned' might 'investigate'—*dāraš*—and draw conclusions. And as David began to be considered the great founder, it would be a ready 'conclusion' that David had composed most of the psalms about which nothing was known to the contrary. In this way

[52] Of the 73 passages in which 'David' occurs in the heading (see above, n. 42) the word is lacking in several manuscripts or translations: Pss. 122 (2 MSS), 124 (3 MSS; Gh), 127 (G), 131 (G, H), 133 (2 MSS, G, T), 138 (Aq, Sexta); in 108 some MSS have *lĕ'āsāph*. The note is lacking in MT, but has been added in G or other translations: Pss. 33; 67; 91; 96; 98; 104; 137. This proves at any rate that in many cases it does not represent old tradition, but secondary theory. Cf. n. 1 to Chap. VII1. From this, as well as from the distribution of the headings among the 5 books of the Psalter (see above, n. 42) we may conclude that the headings of Pss. 90–150 have on the whole been added later and gradually, and that the last two books of the Psalter were originally anonymous in the tradition. Nor does 'of Moses' in Ps. 90 represent an old tradition; see below, §6.

the typical Jewish Midrash or learned legend about David as the author of the psalms came into being. The learned also tried to find things in the psalms which might be interpreted as allusions to experiences and happenings in the life of David. We can see that this was a gradual process; the heading 'by David' occurs several times in the Hebrew text, while wanting in some manuscripts or in the Greek 'Septuagint' or other old translations, and this is certainly not because it was left out by these other witnesses, but because it was not yet to be found in the manuscripts from which they were translated. On the other hand the original of the Septuagint has 'by David' in some cases in which we do not find it in the Hebrew text.[53]

It is due to the same learned interest that several of the headings purport to give information about the situation by referring the psalm in question to a definite incident in the life of David.[54] They do not represent any real tradition, but only later 'learning'. The 'interpretation' of each one is based on particular wordings in the psalm in question, in the usual manner of a true Jewish scholar; they are just typical 'midrash', literally 'investigation', i.e. a learned forming of legends as the result of an 'investigation', which is actually an unhistorical, speculative exegesis of disconnected details. They take the theory for granted that David is the author, and on this basis they try to assign these psalms: a few examples will show how it was done.

According to the heading, Ps. 18 is composed 'by David, who spake it unto Yahweh in the day that Yahweh delivered him from all his enemies and from Saul'. The last words 'and from Saul' may be a later addition, as can be seen from their awkward position in the clause. The heading makes special reference to external enemies, from whom Yahweh has now delivered him. This is evidently based on the words of the psalm about 'peoples' having been conquered by the thanksgiving king, and about the 'enemies' from whom Yahweh has delivered him. 'Accordingly' the psalm must be a recapitulating retrospect over a long chain of conflicts, and must be spoken by a king who had carried on many wars and many kinds of wars, consequently David, and it must be derived from the later part of his life; it must be a thanksgiving psalm for experiences of salvation through a longish period! Actually this psalm is a 'casual' thanksgiving psalm, speaking of an actual incident, a great battle against many foreign enemies ('strangers'), where the king had been in great danger but from which Yahweh had successfully saved him. And the king is not David, but one of David's descendants, as we are explicitly told at the end (v. 50b).

Judging from v. 3, Ps. 63 was used for prayer in the Temple, by a king (v. 12); so when in v. 2 the worshipper says that his 'flesh longeth for God in a dry and thirsty land', this must be meant metaphorically: his distress and danger and thirst for the help of God is like the state of the wayfarer

[53] See above, n. 52.
[54] For the situations given in the headings see *Ps.St.* VI, pp. 84ff.

in the desert, where he is on the point of perishing from thirst. This becomes still more obvious if the reading of v. 2 in some manuscripts and the Syriac translation is correct; instead of saying 'in a dry land' they put 'like a dry land'. But the learned scribes interpreted the term literally; they asked themselves, when was David in great danger in a desert, and decided that it must refer to the time 'when David was in the wilderness of Judah' (v. 1) on his flight from Saul, and that the psalm was composed 'by David' on that occasion.

According to the heading, Ps. 52 was composed 'by David, when Doeg the Edomite came and told Saul that David had come to the house of Abimelech'. This is an allusion to the story in 1 Sam. 21.1–8; 22.6–19. But the psalm presupposes the existence of the Temple and must therefore be later than the age of David. Besides, the heading is inaccurate, for 'when Doeg came to Saul' and told him about David and Abimelech, David was already far away in the desert; so that it would need to run: 'when David heard that Doeg had come to Saul'. Nor does the heading agree with the condition of the worshipper in the psalm: the poem complains of 'lying' and 'deceitful words'; but what Doeg told Saul was objective truth: that David had come to Abimelech, who had helped him to escape by giving him food and weapons. In addition to this the psalm only speaks of the evil which 'the man with the tongue' has inflicted on the worshipper *himself*, in this case David; but the evil results of Doeg's denunciations did not fall on David but on Abimelech and his family. How then did the learned men conduct their 'investigation'? They took for granted that 'David' was the name of the author; in the first line they would find that the psalm was directed against a *gibbôr*—which means 'hero', 'giant', and is used, for instance, as the technical term for the guards of the king, but may also imply 'tyrant'; from 1 Sam. 21.8 and 22.17ff. they would see that Doeg belonged to the 'runners' who made up part of the *gibbôrîm*, 'the giants', i.e. the bodyguard of the king. So when 'David' in this psalm complains of a *gibbôr*, it could be no other than Doeg!

6

The last two authors' names, 'Moses' and 'Solomon' are in turn 'interpreted' out of the psalms themselves according to the same 'learned' methods.

Almost unanimously interpreters agree that Ps. 90, attributed to Moses, cannot possibly be so old. The emotions and conditions of the Exodus do not find expression here, nor the primitive collective outlook of those ancient times. It is not a young nation of wandering conquerors speaking here, but a community that knows itself to be under the constant pressure of the wrath of God; a whole people knowing that it has deserved to be punished for its sins, and which no longer asks for political eminence, but only for the simple happiness of being allowed to enjoy in peace the

work of their hands; undisturbed, that is, by greedy tax-collectors and moneylenders and armies on the march, and the like. As a motivation for a turning of the destiny the prayer does not plead the promises given to the *people*, as was usual in the earlier national psalms of lamentation, nor a regard for the existence of the people, but suggests the following quite individualistic considerations: since 'we', the generation of individuals living now, cannot reckon with more than seventy years of life at most—exceptionally perhaps eighty—and as we have hitherto experienced only disaster and oppression, therefore we now pray for good fortune, the reward of our sufferings, to come before it is too late for *us* who live now! Those of really ancient times, including Moses, would never have been able to speak in that way. To them the people was everything, the individual by himself nothing. In Ps. 90 individuals appear with their several personal claims for happiness in life, indeed so much so that society recedes into the shade. Obviously the psalm derives from Jewish times, not from the earliest period.

But it is not difficult to see how the learned men were led to think of Moses. In the worshippers whose days and years were passing away in the wrath of God they saw the generation wandering in the desert on account of the judgments of God; these had left Egypt at the age of manhood, and after wandering for forty years they are now facing the end of their lives. The psalm, it will be remembered, complains that the normal limit of human life is seventy years, and one feature of the lament is that this limit is approaching. Thus the learned men have put two and two together: the average age of a generation, the normal age of manhood, is thirty years; thirty plus forty years of roaming in the desert make seventy; the psalm must have been composed by a representative of the people wandering in the desert, i.e. by Moses himself! And in v. 16 they would find the confirmation of this 'result of their investigation' It says here: 'Let thy work appear unto thy servants and thy glory unto their sons'. According to the usual rules of the 'thought rhyme' in Hebrew poetry (Chap. XIX.7) there is no question here of two different things, as if 'thy servants', i.e. the worshippers of Yahweh, may see his 'work', but 'their sons' see his 'glory'; the two parts express the same thought: let thy servants and their sons see thy work and thy glory, i.e. thy glorious work of salvation; let the present, as well as the coming generation, experience thy grace and thy salvation. But the learned men, busy with literal interpretation, found that Yahweh's 'work' and his 'glory' were two different revelations of the breaking-in of Yahweh, and that the sons alone expect to see the 'glory' of Yahweh; this would have to imply that the generation of those wandering in the desert must die there, whereas only the sons of the emigrants would see the promised land and thus experience the glory of Yahweh!

The same is the case with the headings of Pss. 72 and 127, 'by Solomon'. This ascription is lacking in several manuscripts and old translations, and

consequently is sure to belong to the latest additions to the psalm texts. In Ps. 72 we hear of a glorious and mighty king, who will rule over many foreign nations and to whom shall be given of the 'gold of Sheba'! He is called both 'the king' and 'the king's son', so he cannot be David—and on this point the learned men are right. But then, so their argument would run, it can be nobody else but Solomon, known for his riches in gold and his close connexion with the queen of Sheba! The result of this deduction may not be completely out of the question; but the heading is not based on any real, original tradition; it is just a theory, which *may* happen to be right.

We cannot say the same about the heading 'by Solomon' in Ps. 127. This psalm really consists of two 'words of wisdom', pronouncing in general phrases that he who builds a 'house' without Yahweh shall build in vain, for all happiness depends on the blessing of God. These two sayings were used as a psalm for the harvest festival with a view to the consecration of the Temple, which in earlier times used to be celebrated at that season. Judging from all the other cases of influence from 'wisdom poetry', this psalm must belong to a rather late period. None the less the collectors later 'found out' that this psalm about the building of the 'house' must be due to the temple builder Solomon, and so the heading was added—but only in the Massoretic (Hebrew) text.

The headings 'by David', 'by Moses', 'by Solomon' tell us nothing, therefore, of the real authors. The heading 'by David', however, confirms that in days of old the psalms were destined to be used by the *king* when he was representing the community in the cult or taking part in it in some other way (see above, pp. 76f.).