

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1917

THE NEW TESTAMENT TERMINOLOGY OF "REDEMPTION"

The most direct, but not the exclusive,¹ vehicle in the Greek of the New Testament of the idea which we commonly express in our current speech by the term "redeem" and its derivatives, is provided by a group of words built up upon the Greek term *λύτρον*, "ransom."² The exact implications of this group of words as employed by the writers of the New Testament have been brought into dispute.³ It seems desirable therefore to look afresh into their origin and usage sufficiently to become clear as to the matter, and the inquiry may perhaps be thought to possess enough in-

¹ Compare, for example, the use of *ἀγοράζω* 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, 2 Pet., ii. 1, Rev. v. 9, xiv. 3, 4; *ἐξαγοράζω* Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5; *περιποιόομαι* Acts xx. 28.

² *λύτρον* Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45; *ἀντίλυτρον* 1 Tim. ii. 6; *λυτροῦσθαι* Lk. xxiv. 2, Tit. ii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 18; *λύτρωσις* Lk. i. 68, ii. 38, Heb. ix. 12; *ἀπολύτρωσις* Lk. xxi. 28, Rom. iii. 24, viii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 30, Eph. 1, 7, 14, iv. 30, Col. 1, 14, Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35; [*λυτρωτής*] Acts vii. 35.

³ Cf. what Johannes Weiss says in his comment on 1 Cor. i. 30b (Meyer series): "Whereas heretofore the notion of *ἀπολύτρωσις* has been carefully investigated with reference to its shade of meaning (whether it is to be taken simply generally as = 'Deliverance,' or—because of the *λυτρο*—as = 'Ransoming') and also with reference to the particular relations of the notion (Who was the former owner? What is the ransom price? Who pays it? Why is it of so great value?), the tendency of the day is to push all these questions aside as wrongly put: Paul uses here a common *terminus technicus*, as a piece of current coin, with regard to which he reckons on a ready understanding; it is approximately = *σωτηρία*; accordingly it is translated simply 'Deliverance,' and no questions are asked with respect to a more exact explanation. This is generally right." . . . Weiss himself conceives the term to be used primarily of the eschatological salvation, but to have received (like others of the kind) a certain pre-dating and not to have lost entirely the idea of ransoming, though laying the stress on the effects rather than the means.

THE BEARING OF ARCHAEOLOGY UPON THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PSALMS.¹

ARTICLE I.

Modern scientific investigation, notwithstanding the tendency toward specialization, which has been the inevitable consequence of intricate and highly technical research along many and varied lines, has constantly emphasized and illustrated afresh the vital relation which exists of necessity between all departments of knowledge, however slight may seem at times to be the connection between them. Because of this it has frequently become necessary to test and revise the conclusions reached in one department of science by those arrived at independently in another. For however satisfactorily a theory may account for the data lying in its immediate field, however logically consistent and seemingly self-evident it may be, if it conflicts with other facts or factors, clearly established by independent research, it must be modified or rejected. And this must take place even when the conflicting data seem to have little relevancy and scarcely any bearing upon the theory itself. In other words, the external problem is hardly less important than the internal in estimating the correctness and adequacy of any given theory or hypothesis.

These two problems, the internal and the external, as we may call them, enter very prominently into that theory regarding the literature and history of Israel which to many is synonymous with the term, "higher criticism." At the start the internal problem was the more important and fundamental, and such being the case it is well to remember that it has been long in the solving, and that an interval of exactly one hundred years lies between the publication of

¹ At the Session of the "Summer School of Theology" held at Princeton Theological Seminary, May 29—June 9, 1916, the writer delivered two lectures on the announced subject: The Psalms in their Relation to Archaeology. These articles cover substantially the same ground.

Eichhorn's *Einleitung* and Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*. In 1782 the document theory suggested by Astruc "was adopted and elaborated with great learning and ingenuity by Eichhorn," who has consequently been called "the founder of modern Old Testament Criticism." But it was not until nearly a century later, when Wellhausen restated it in terms of evolution that a "thorough-going theory," the "development hypothesis" entered upon "a course of uninterrupted triumph."² This hypothesis has been for some years, and is still the dominant one in critical circles. Although it cannot be said that criticism reached its goal or completed its task with the triumph of the Wellhausen hypothesis, since the last few years have been years of great productivity on the part of the critics, and many problems still await solution, it is at least true that no fundamental changes have been made or accepted by members of the school, in the hypothesis itself. In its main outlines it has clearly become, as Prof. James Robertson nearly twenty years ago declared it was then fast becoming, "traditional" in many circles. Hence we may say that from the critical standpoint the internal problem found its solution in large measure in the development hypothesis ably advocated by Wellhausen.

And it is especially since Wellhausen's solution of the internal problem gained wide acceptance that the external problem has become prominent. For the theory of evolution, which furnished the critics with a "thorough-going theory" also stimulated research and critical investigation along many other lines. Among others it gave a great impulse to archaeological research,³ which had already been

² Wellhausen's *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. I, which formed "the greater part" of the *Prolegomena* appeared in 1878. He did not claim absolute originality for his hypothesis, but connected his work with that of Graf, George, Vatke and Reuss. Consequently it is often called the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. But it was "mainly through the impression produced by Wellhausen's book" that this theory became popular.

³ Archaeological research owed its start largely to its bearing upon

brought prominently before the public eye, in the explorations, excavations and researches of Champollion, Lepsius, Botta, Layard, Rawlinson, George Smith and many others. And despite the fact that it is the claim of the critics that "higher criticism" has brought and alone can bring the study of the Bible into harmony with modern science, the results of the archaeological discoveries of recent years have been so remarkable and in many respects revolutionary that the question has often been asked, and is being asked with growing insistence, do the conclusions of the higher critics agree or do they conflict with the new light which archaeology has thrown upon the history and development of the ancient world?

The answers to this question are so contradictory that they may well puzzle the thoughtful student of the Old Testament. Prominent archaeologists—notably Prof. Sayce of Oxford—have asserted repeatedly that archaeology has undermined the very foundations of the critical hypothesis. "The really strong point in favor of it," says Prof. Sayce, "was the assumption that the Mosaic age was illiterate."⁴ This assumption has, he contends, long since been conclusively disproved by archaeology.⁵ Prof. A. T. Clay makes the statement: "Episodes which have been

the Bible—the discoveries of Layard and George Smith, for example, aroused the greatest interest among Bible students in Great Britain and America—and the interest in archaeology shown by Bible students has never abated. At the same time it must be admitted that much of the archaeological investigation carried on at present is in the hands of men whose chief interest is archaeological and not Biblical in character, and who are concerned rather to vindicate the evolutionary or critical hypothesis than the Old Testament Scriptures.

⁴ *Early History of the Hebrews* (1899), p. 121.

⁵ Quite recently Prof. Sayce is said to have made the following emphatic statement: "Since the discovery of the Tel Amarna tablets until now great things have been brought out by archaeology and every one of them has been in harmony with the Bible, while nearly every one of them has been dead against the assertions of the destructive critics." (*The Presbyterian* of Dec. 7, 1916, p. 3.) Cf. Hommel, *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, pp. 26, 27; also James Orr, *The Bible on Trial*, Ed. 2, pp. 121-143.

affirmed to belong wholly to the realm of fiction, or which have been regarded as mythical or legendary in character, are now proved to be historical, beyond doubt. Many theories, even those put forth by careful and conservative students, have been modified, and many supposed inconsistencies have been satisfactorily explained."⁶

On the other hand, the critics are no less positive that archaeology and criticism are in entire or essential harmony. Dr. Driver, writing on "Hebrew Authority,"⁷ in 1899 replied at considerable length to the attacks of the archaeologists, notably Sayce and Hommel. We quote the following:

"Now while, as need hardly be said, there are many points on which, as between what may be termed the traditional and the critical view of the Old Testament, the verdict of archaeology is neutral, on all other points the facts of archaeology, so far as they are at present known, harmonize entirely with the positions generally adopted by critics. The contrary is, indeed, often asserted: it is said, for example, that the discoveries of Oriental archaeology are daily refuting the chief conclusions reached by critics, and proving them one after another to be untenable: but if the grounds on which these statements rest are examined in detail, it will be found that they depend almost uniformly on misapprehension: either the critics have not held the opinions imputed to them, or the opinions rightly imputed to them have not been overthrown by the discoveries of archaeology.⁸ And in cases belonging to the latter category, the principal ground of the misapprehension lies in the neglect of the distinction between the direct and indirect testimony of archaeology which has been explained above."⁹

⁶ *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, 2nd ed., p. 3.

⁷ *Authority and Archaeology, Sacred and Profane*, (1899). Edited by D. G. Hogarth, pp. 1-152. The following citation is from pp. 145-6.

⁸ "Examples of both these misapprehensions abound, unhappily, in Professor Sayce's writings."

⁹ The reference is to the preceding paragraph, which is here quoted in full: "In considering these questions there is a distinction which

The conclusions reached by critics have been opposed not to statements made directly in the inscriptions, but to questionable and even illogical inferences deduced from them."

That this continued to be Dr. Driver's opinion is clear from a number of statements in the later editions of his

it is important to bear in mind—the distinction, *viz.*, between the testimony of archaeology which is *direct*; and that which is *indirect*. Where the testimony of archaeology is direct, it is of the highest possible value, and, as a rule, determines a question decisively; even where it is indirect, if it is sufficiently circumstantial and precise, it may make a settlement highly probable: it often happens, however, that its testimony is indirect and at the same time not circumstantial, and then, especially if besides it should conflict with more direct evidence supplied from other sources, it possesses little or no cogency. Examples of the direct testimony of archaeology have been furnished by the Books of Kings, though, as it happens, these have related mostly to points on which there has been no controversy, and on which the Biblical statements have not been questioned. It would be an example of the other kind of archaeological testimony, if, to take an imaginary case, the Book of Genesis had described the patriarchs as visiting various places inhabited by tribes to which there were no references in later books of the Old Testament, but which the evidence of the monuments had now shewn to be correctly located: under such circumstances the agreement with the facts would be strong evidence that the narrator drew his information from trustworthy sources. In cases of the third kind of archaeological testimony, if its value is to be estimated aright, attention must be paid to the circumstances of the individual case. In the abstract, for instance, there is no difficulty in the statement that Manasseh was taken captive to Babylon, that he repented, and was afterwards released: the difficulty (as has been explained above) arises solely from the circumstances under which the statement occurs in the Old Testament, and from its apparent conflict with statements made by earlier and nearly contemporary writers; and no amount of evidence respecting other kings taken captive to Babylon and afterwards released can neutralize the special difficulties attaching to the particular case of Manasseh. In the abstract, again, there is no reason why Hebrew names of a particular type should not have been found at an early period: but if an induction from materials supplied by the Old Testament itself renders the fact doubtful, the circumstance that other Semitic nations framed names of this kind at an early period does not prove that the Hebrews did the same. Analogies drawn from what may have happened under different circumstances cannot neutralize the force of positive and particular reasons arising out of the circumstances of an individual

"Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,"¹⁰ and this view is even more emphatically expressed by others.¹¹

Since this is a very important question, and one regarding which opinions vary so radically, we will do well to consider first, though as briefly as possible, the general question of the bearing of archaeology upon the critical theory, as a whole, before passing on to the specific subject of its bearing upon the criticism of the Book of Psalms.

The "opinions generally adopted by critics" have been variously stated by different members of the Wellhausen school. Dr. James Orr¹² accepted "as a general summary of the results of the movement which it is thought 'the future is not likely to reverse,'"¹³ the following statement from Prof. A. S. Peake's "Manchester Inaugural":

case. Similarly, other indirect testimony, of the kind, for instance, frequently adduced by Professor Hommel, and consisting not in the actual statements found in the inscriptions, but in hypothetical and often precarious inferences drawn from them, is entirely destitute of logical cogency. The distinction between the direct and the indirect testimony of archaeology is one which must be carefully borne in mind, if false conclusions are to be avoided."

¹⁰ Cf. especially Pref. to 8th Ed., pp. xviii, xix.

¹¹ E. g. Kent, *Beginnings of Heb. History*, pp. 28, 29.

¹² *The Bible Under Trial*, pp. 74, 75. Also article "Criticism of the Bible," in the *Internat. Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, p. 752 a.

¹³ The danger in speaking of "assured results" has frequently been pointed out. (Cf. the chapter on "Settled Results in Criticism," in Dr. James Orr's *Bible on Trial*.) There are at present several influential critical schools—as well as individual scholars—opposed to the Wellhausen position (cf. Sellin *Einleitung*, s. 3, 17 f). Thus the "historical-critical" school of Winckler or as it may also be called the "mythological" school has broken very largely with the Wellhausen Hypothesis. The "textual" school of Klostermann, Dahse, Wiener, etc., has made, to quote König (*Der Moderne Pentateuchkritik u. ihre neueste Bekämpfung*, Vorwort), a "general assault" upon the critical position. The "Law-Prophets" school of Havet and Vernes, which accepts the late dating of the Pentateuch advocated by the critics and then places the Prophets still later—though argued with all seriousness, it is really the *reductio ad absurdum* of criticism—has shown new activity. It was never accepted by Dillmann, who still has influential followers, notably von Baudissin at Berlin and Kittel at Leipzig. It has been definitely repudiated by Eerdmans, a former

“The analysis of the Pentateuch into four main documents, the identification of the law on which Josiah’s reformation was based with some form of the Deuteronomic code, the compilation of that code in the reign of Manasseh at the earliest, the fixing of the Priestly code to a date later than Ezekiel, the highly composite character of some parts of the prophetic literature, especially the Book of Isaiah, the post-exilian origin of most of the Psalms, and a large part of the Book of Proverbs, the composition of Job not earlier than the exile, and probably later, the Maccabean date of Daniel, and the slightly earlier date of Ecclesiastes.”

Examining these “results” for a moment and contrasting them first with the traditional view, and then with the general results of archaeology, it appears that the most noticeable thing is the tendency towards a *late dating* of the Old Testament documents. On the traditional view it has always been maintained that the patriarchal period was historical in the fullest sense of the term,¹⁴ and that the literary documents of the Pentateuch were products of the Mosaic period (c 1500 B. C.). The critic tells us that of the “four main documents” into which they have analyzed these five books the third, Deuteronomy, or at least the code which it contains, was compiled “in the reign of Manasseh at the earliest,” and that the document P. which is much the largest of the remaining three is “later than Ezekiel.” Of

Wellhausen and an extreme radical.—The Conservatives, the “traditional” school as they are often called, do not, it need hardly be remarked, regard these results as assured or convincing. On the contrary they regard nearly all of them as irreconcilable with the plain statements of the Scriptures themselves.

¹⁴ We begin at this point because for the earlier period the chronology is too uncertain to admit of comparison. That the Old Testament account of the antiquity of man is not in conflict with the facts of archaeology has been argued at length by Prof. Wm. Henry Green of Princeton in his study of “Primitive Chronology” published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of 1890, and republished in extenso by its editor, Dr. Geo. F. Wright, in his “*Origin and Antiquity of Man*,” pp. 443-466. Cf. also the article “On the Antiquity and the Unity of the Human Race,” by Prof. B. B. Warfield, in the *Princeton Theological Review* for January, 1911, pp. 1-25.

the other documents, J and E, nothing is said regarding their dates, since this is regarded as less certain than that of P and D. The general opinion is that they are at least post-Davidic.¹⁵ Except for occasional songs or other fragments of lore, law or legend imbedded in them, the books of the Pentateuch range, therefore, from c 900—450 B. C., This makes them from five hundred to a thousand years younger than the period with which they are chiefly concerned, and with which they were for centuries supposed to be practically contemporaneous. While such words as these: "The highly composite character of some parts of the prophetic literature, . . . the post-exilian origin of most of the Psalms," etc., give considerable warrant for the statement that "critical analysis of the Hebrew Scriptures has resolved them, for the most part, into a stratification of pseudepigraphical documents,"¹⁶ which are, it may be added, assigned uniformly to a far later date—in some cases many centuries later—than that generally accepted by the conservatives.

This late dating of the documents of the Old Testament has naturally brought the question of their trustworthiness to the forefront of discussion. About this there is great diversity of opinion and the tendency is to regard at least the Patriarchal and Mosaic periods as epochs in the history of Israel of which we can claim to know very little. Thus Prof. H. P. Smith, to quote a recent writer, tells us: "All that we can with probability conclude from this stream of tradition [the reference seems to be to the Pentateuch in general] is that a man named Moses had a marked influence on the religious development of early Israel. That he was not a legislator in the later sense of the words seems obvious."¹⁷

¹⁵ There is now a marked tendency to place these documents considerably earlier (viz. E. 1200 B. C., J. 1000 B. C.) than is generally admitted by the Wellhausen school, or at least to admit that the elements in the Pentateuchal documents which come from very ancient times are much greater than was formerly supposed (cf. Sellin, *Einleitung*, s. 17).

¹⁶ Thos. Whittaker, *Origins of Christianity* (1904), opening sentence.

¹⁷ *The Religion of Israel*, 1914, p. 46.

The words, myth, legend, tradition, etc., are frequently used of the narratives of early Israel. Indeed so marked has been the tendency to treat as unhistorical these documents which the critic has disentangled with such painful effort, that as has been frequently pointed out, the question of their date has come to be a subordinate matter as compared with the prior question whether they are true and reliable. To quote Prof. Strack:

“The state of the scientific struggle is at present so serious, that the question, whether Moses himself wrote any part of the Pentateuch, or, if this be admitted, how much, must at present be regarded as secondary. Much more important is the question, whether we can derive from P, by comparing it with the other documentary sources, an essentially correct idea of the Mosaic age or not.”¹⁸ The view of Wellhausen is that we cannot. Thus at the close of the chapter on “Priests and Levites” he tells us: “To any one who knows anything about history, it is not necessary to prove that the so-called Mosaic theocracy, which nowhere suits the circumstances of the earlier periods, and of which the prophets in their most ideal delineations of the Israelite state as it ought to be, have not the faintest shadow of an idea, is, so to speak, a perfect fit for post-exilic Judaism and had its actuality only there.”¹⁹ Similarly he speaks in another place of the Priestly Code’s “shaping the patriarchal history” in the effort “to carry out with uniformity in history the *semper ubique et ab omnibus* of the legal unity of worship.”²⁰ In short, the Old Testament records bearing upon the early history of Israel are not only late, but they give a distorted and often false picture, which the critic must endeavor to correct and re-

¹⁸ Strack *Einleitung*, Aufl. VI, pp. 57-8. This passage is quoted by Wace: *The Bible and Modern Investigation*, p. 24. Wace points out that it was on this ground especially that Dillmann, “by universal consent one of the two or three greatest names in Old Testament criticism,” rejected and vigorously opposed the Wellhausen hypothesis.

¹⁹ *Prolegomena*, Eng. Transl., pp. 150 f.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 38.

store as best he may. And the conclusion is unavoidable that the history of this early period is both very meagre and very uncertain.

On the other hand nothing is more remarkable than the way in which since the beginning of the nineteenth century, that is, during the very period in which Old Testament criticism has flourished and especially in the years since the alleged triumph of the Wellhausen hypothesis, archaeology has reversed many theories which had gained wide acceptance. It has done this largely by expanding the horizon and deepening the perspective of that very historic period, which as far at least as Israel is concerned, criticism has done so much to limit and contract.

When through the efforts of Eichhorn, de Wette, and others, criticism of the Old Testament began to assume shape and seriously to challenge the correctness of the traditional view of the Old Testament, archaeology was in its infancy. Our information bearing on the history of the ancient civilizations came almost exclusively from the Bible and from relatively late and meagre Greek sources, some of which are now more or less discredited. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was seriously questioned because on this view it was so much more ancient than the oldest Greek records—centuries earlier than even an ultra conservative classicist would have placed Homer—and the question whether writing was known at that early date was very seriously debated.

The deciphering of the Rosetta-Stone and of the Old-Persian inscriptions at Persepolis and Behistun marked the commencement of philological studies which have made languages and literatures long forgotten, the ancient Egyptian, the Assyrio-Babylonian, the Sumerian, the Elamite, the Sabaean and in a measure even the Hittite accessible to the modern student of history. The spade of the archaeologist has more than kept pace with—it has kept far ahead of the interpreter, and many of our museums are well supplied with monuments, papyri, clay tablets and

antiquities of all sorts, some of which have been partly or fully interpreted, others of which have still to be studied.

Thus in Egypt the tombs of kings of the First Dynasty have been discovered at Abydos and probably that of Menes, the founder of the Old Kingdom. The hieroglyphic writing can be traced back into the pre-dynastic period and shown to have developed rapidly during the First Dynasty, reaching its highest development in the Middle Kingdom, centuries before the time of Moses.²¹ The opening of the Pyramids of the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties gave us access to extensive literary remains, the so-called Pyramid Texts, inscriptions carved on the walls, columns, pylons, etc., of these gigantic tombs. Breasted says of them: "These texts . . . form the oldest body of literature surviving from the ancient world and disclose to us the earliest chapter in the intellectual history of man as preserved to modern times."²²

The discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna letters in 1888 showed the extent to which Babylonian culture had exerted its influence upon Palestine and the neighboring countries as early as the middle of the second millennium B. C. and threw welcome light upon the history of that period. The recovery of the Code of Hammurapi in 1901 had an equally important bearing upon the Babylonia of the time of Abraham, its laws, customs and civilization. Many other discoveries have supplied us with inscriptions in Semitic and Sumerian and antiquities of various kinds dating from a much earlier period—from Gudea, Naram-Sin, Manishtusu, Lugalzaggisi, and many others,—which carry the historic cultural period in Babylonia back at least into the fourth millennium B. C. and probably very much earlier.

From the Code we know that Assur and Nineveh were in existence at the time of Hammurapi and the recent excavations conducted by the Germans at Assur have thrown

²¹ Cf. G. A. Reisner, *The Early Dynastic Cemeteries of Naga-ed-Dêr*, Part I, p. 123 f. Breasted gives 3400 B. C. as the date of Menes. Petrie puts him as early as c 5550 B. C.

²² *Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, p. vii.

welcome light on the early history of Assyria and added many names to our list of the kings who ruled in Assur Kaleh and Nineveh.

The antiquity of the Hittite civilization cannot be definitely determined as yet. But we know from the statement of an ancient chronicle that early in the first half of the second millennium B. C. the Hittite power was mighty enough to overthrow the First or Hammurapi Dynasty of Babylon. While the excavations carried on in recent years at Boghaz-Keui and other sites in the ancient Hittite country have uncovered massive remains, which enable us to gain some conception at first hand of the Hittite palaces, which had been known to us hitherto only through the references to them in the inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian kings, especially Sargon, who admired them and imitated them in their own buildings.

No less remarkable have been the results of discoveries in the sphere of Greek archaeology during the decades since Schliemann first interested himself in the Homeric question. In answering the question, When does Greek history begin? E. W. Walker makes the following striking statement:

“Whatever may be the answer that is given to this question, it will be widely different from any that could have been proposed a generation ago. Then the question was, How late does Greek history begin? To-day the question is, How early does it begin? The suggestion made by Grote that the first Olympiad (776 B. C.) should be taken as the starting-point of the history of Greece, in the proper sense of the term ‘history,’ seemed likely, not so many years ago, to win general acceptance. At the present moment the tendency would seem to be to go back as far as the third or fourth millennium B. C., in order to reach a starting point. It is to the results of archaeological research during the last thirty years that we must attribute so startling a change in the attitude of historical science to this problem.”²³

²³ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Ed., Article “Greece,” 2. History, p. 440 b.

In Crete the excavations at Cnossos have gone far toward establishing the age of Minos as a historic age. Early Minoan civilization goes back, according to Evans, at least to the beginning of the third millennium. And the middle Minoan, or as it is frequently termed, the Mycenaean period, begins somewhat earlier than the time of Abraham. Walker says again: "Perhaps the most surprising result of the excavations in Crete is the discovery that Minoan art is on a higher level than Mycenaean art." That is to say, the golden age in Crete lies back of the time of Abraham.

Even the Minotaur has come to be regarded as in a sense historical. "It is abundantly evident," Evans assures us, "that whatever mythical elements may have been interwoven with the old traditions of the spot, they have a solid substratum of reality. With such remains before us, it is no longer sufficient to relegate Minos to the region of sun-myths."²⁴

What a rare paradox it is that while radical critics have been relegating the Patriarchs and Samson to the realm of myth—Samson is considered a first-rate specimen of a sun-myth,²⁵ and "it is now considered a distinguishing mark of modern scholarship to regard Abraham as a moon-god,"²⁶—the Egyptologists have found for us perhaps the very tomb of Menes and a classical archaeologist of the first rank should assure us that there is "a solid substratum of reality" in the old legend of Minos and the Minotaur.²⁷

It is of course obvious that all this evidence is indirect, and we recall that Dr. Driver claimed that the "principal ground of the misapprehension" underlying the assertions

²⁴ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Article "Crete," p. 422 b.

²⁵ E. g. by Paul Carus. *The Story of Samson* (1907). Gunkel's conception of Samson as the type of the "sturdy child of nature," (*der kraftvolle Naturmensch*) who combatted the superior civilization of the Philistines, makes him just as unhistorical, although he denies that any of the many *motifs* which enter into the composite picture "are mythological in origin" (*Reden u Aufsätze*, S. 64).

²⁶ Kittel, *The Babylonian Excavations and early Bible History* (1904), p. 31.

²⁷ Cf. Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament*, pp. 418, 532.

that archaeology has disproved the conclusions of criticism lay "in the neglect of the distinction between the direct and indirect testimony of archaeology," and "in hypothetical and often precarious inferences"²⁸ drawn from the statements of the inscriptions. But though this evidence is indirect, we believe the inference is necessary and unavoidable, and not hypothetical and precarious, that in their *general tendencies* and *main results* archaeology and criticism have worked in exactly opposite directions.

The general tendency of archaeology both oriental and classical has been reconstructive and restorative. It has steadily rolled back the mist and removed the curtain of night from periods and peoples of a long-forgotten past. Amraphel (Hammurapi), Menes and Minos, Sargon and Sardanapalus, cease to be men of myth, mystery or oblivion, and assume the lineaments of flesh and blood.²⁹ Sumerian and Minoan and Hittite must be added to the list of the great civilizations of the past. Long before Abraham's day Babylonian conquerors had led their armies to the western (Mediterranean) sea, and made a name for themselves among the world conquerors.

Criticism, on the other hand, has been extremely iconoclastic. It has reversed the process. It has given over to myth and legend "men of flesh and blood" like Abraham. It has made Moses a question mark and his activities negligible. It has shrouded in mystery and treated as largely prehistoric a presumably historic period of a thousand years, from Abraham to David. Clearly then in their general tendencies and results criticism and archaeology are not in harmony. They are no more in harmony than are the traditional and the critical views regarding the Old Testament. And with regard to these Prof. Hommel has truly remarked, "No nation of early times has had two such

²⁸ Cf. above p. 280 f.

²⁹ Similarly the historical character of Semiramis has recently been defended by Lehmann-Haupt (*Die historische Semiramis und ihre Zeit*, 1910) and a stele bearing her name has been discovered at Assur Andrae, *Die Stelenreihen in Assur* (1913).

widely different versions of its history presented to modern readers as that of Israel."³⁰ And however much the critics may seek to minimize these differences, the claim of the French Evangelicals remains true, "*Ce n'est pas un peu autrement; c'est tout autrement.*" Yet it is here, in these general results, if anywhere, that we should expect archaeology and criticism to agree. And such a fundamental divergence is far more serious than would be an occasional flat contradiction in the sphere of the direct evidence. And even could the critics prove that this is not a serious or conclusive objection to their construction of the history of Israel and that it is more than counterbalanced by other evidence which they can adduce in support of their view, it would still be true that the general trend of archaeological discovery runs counter to their theory. On their view Israel must be regarded as a striking exception to the general verdict of archaeology that the beginning of the historic period is earlier than was formerly supposed, and not later.

Turning now to our special problem, the Psalms, we will point out first the difference between the view of the critics and the so-called traditional view, and then proceed to test them both in the light of archaeology. It may be said in general that critical discussion of the date and authorship of the Psalms has concerned itself primarily with two great questions, the *terminus ad quem*, or the question of Maccabean psalms, and the *terminus a quo*, or the question of Davidic psalms. The fact that about one half of the Psalms are assigned by their titles to David,³¹ that this ascription finds strong general confirmation in the testimony of the Old Testament historical books to the prominent, or better, preeminent, place of David in the religious poetry of Israel, and that in the New Testament the name of David is practically synonymous with Psalter, led the Church Fathers to

³⁰ *The Early Hebrew Tradition* (1897), p. 1.

³¹ Namely 73, according to the Hebrew text. The *LXX* assigns about a dozen more to him.

the conclusion that all the Psalms were written by him.³² This view is regarded by modern scholars of all schools as an unnecessary and unwarrantable inference from the statements of Scripture. Calvin is given the credit of being the first to admit the possibility that a few Psalms might be of actual Maccabean origin, as against the widely current view advocated by Eusebius of Caesarea and other members of the Alexandrian school,³³ that in these Psalms David spoke prophetically of the happenings of this later period. Since Calvin's time many scholars, and among them some conservatives, have either positively affirmed or treated as at least possible the Maccabean dating of certain Psalms, notably Psalms 44, 74, 79, 83. In 1836 Hitzig advanced the view that practically the entire second half of the Psalter was Maccabean in origin. Since his day other scholars, e. g. Stade, Reuss and Duhm, have gone far beyond him in the late dating of the Psalms.

It is with the other problem—the Davidic psalmody—that we are primarily concerned. In some respects it is a much less complicated problem than that of the existence of Maccabean Psalms, since it does not involve the question of the closing of the Canon, nor is the question of the closing of the Psalter important in deciding it. It is, however, by no means a simple problem, and the question of the admission of Davidic Psalms is, as we shall see, one which presents peculiar difficulties to the members of the critical school.

As regards the *terminus a quo*, the tendency to exaggerate

³² This view seems to have been very widely current, since it is found not only in the Talmud, but even in the Koran, where the expression, "and we gave David a book" (i. e. the Psalms), Sura 4, 161; 17, 57, seems to justify this inference.

³³ Goossens, *Die Frage nach makkabäischen Psalmen* (1914), S. 1. According to Goossens, the controversy over this point has followed the lines laid down about a century ago by Gesenius, and can be divided into three periods in which the problems most debated have been (1) the closing of the Canon, (2) the completion of the Psalter, (3) the possibility of the interpolation of Maccabean Psalms into the completed Psalter.

the Davidic elements in the Psalter still showed itself early in the last century, and the view was widely advocated that Samuel's prophetic school had an important influence upon the cultivation of Psalmody.³⁴ And although Eichhorn questioned the Davidic authorship of some of the Psalms assigned to David by the Hebrew Text, he was inclined to regard the attributing to him of certain others by the LXX as correct.³⁵ Still the "Davidic tradition" had been questioned long before his day. Rudinger, the erratic pupil of Calvin, had assigned four Davidic Psalms to the time of the Maccabees, and of those which Venema referred to that period three are Davidic according to their titles. And scepticism regarding the correctness of the titles was sufficiently widespread to enable de Wette (1811) to speak of "the best commentators, such as Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Bauer, Jahn, etc.," as rejecting the Davidic authorship of certain Psalms (Ps. 14, 69, 103, 122 and other of the Songs of Ascents, Ps. 139, etc.) because of reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, the exile and similar late events, and because of the presence of Chaldaisms, i. e. Aramaisms. And he continues: "But the genuineness of all remaining Davidic Psalms is thereby, according to my critical principles, rendered problematical; it is not enough, if contents and character merely do not oppose; positive indications of probability must remove the suspicion which attaches itself to the title."³⁶

With these words de Wette laid the burden of proof upon the shoulders of the defender of the "Davidic tradition" and asserted in the face of all the evidence in favor of the existence of Davidic Psalms that in the case of all the Psalms ascribed to David the presumption was against and not in favor of Davidic authorship, i. e. against the correctness of the title. This "negative attitude" soon became general among the critics. Thus Ewald (1835) and Hitzig

³⁴ Cf. de Wette, *Die Psalmen* (1811), Einleitung, S. 7.

³⁵ He even accepted Ps. 90 as Mosaic.

³⁶ *Die Psalmen* (1811), Einl., S. 20.

(1835) conceded only a little over a dozen Psalms to David; while von Lengerke (1847), Olshausen (1853) and Hupfeld (1855) denied him to be the author of any. Hupfeld remarks: "Although it is impossible that David had no part in this treasury of song, at the same time, no Psalms can be assigned to him with certainty."³⁷ Graetz (1882) would concede at best only Ps. 18 to David and is doubtful even about it. Baethgen (1892) claims that "only in the case of extremely few Psalms can the Davidic authorship be defended with any degree of probability and that even in the case of such Psalms the admission that they have been revised in later times can hardly be avoided." Driver in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* says: "If Davidic Psalms are preserved in the Psalter we may safely say that they are to be found among those which Ewald has selected." And again: "It may be affirmed for instance with tolerable confidence, that very few of the Psalms are earlier than the 7th century B. C." Reuss claims to have been the first to deny the Davidic authorship of any of the Psalms. While Wellhausen (1898) tells us: "It is not a question whether there be any post-exilic Psalms, but rather whether the Psalms contain any poems written before the Exile,"³⁸

³⁷ This method of cutting the Gordian knot of the Davidic tradition by affirming more or less emphatically that David must have had some part, perhaps a very considerable one, in the development of Hebrew psalmody, while at the same time contending that we cannot be sure that any of his compositions have actually been preserved in the Psalter, is one which is quite popular with the critics. It gives the appearance of doing credit to the historic tradition but as a matter of fact leads to no result. Thus Kautzsch tells us: "It is not at the outset inadmissible that a part of the Psalms come from David; on account of the strength of the tradition this may be regarded as probable: but a *scientific* demonstration can be furnished neither for nor against it" (*Die Poesie und die poetischen Bücher*, S. 37). Similarly Steuernagel (*Einleitung*, 1912) argues even more strongly that it is impossible that David should have had no part in the composition of the Psalter, but none the less reaches the conclusion that it is not necessary to posit him as the author of a single one of the Psalms, not even of Ps. 18.

³⁸ Cornill (*Introduction*, Eng. Trans. 1907, p. 399) affirms that with these words Wellhausen has defined the problem quite correctly.

and Duhm (1899)³⁹ considers it "childish" even to raise the question of pre-exilic psalms and assigns practically all to the Greek and Maccabean period. Briggs (1906) assigns twenty-four psalms and parts of six others to the pre-exilic period. Of these he treats five entire psalms and portions of two others as belonging to the early monarchy. Kittel (1914) regards most of the Psalms as of post-exilic origin. His view and that of Gunkel will be considered later.

Duhm not only carries this negative criticism to an extreme but also, as we have just indicated, states it in a most uncompromising form. In his Commentary (1899) he tells us: "The last effect (*Nachwirkung*) of the apparently ineradicable faith in tradition shows itself in this, that even now in the case of every Psalm, the question is raised, whether it is pre-exilic or post-exilic. What use is there in such a general question? A literary criticism of this kind is stalled in the most childish beginning. . . . Scientific literary criticism not only may but must entirely ignore a tradition of such an illegitimate kind." The allusion is of course to the titles and other evidence in favor of Davidic authorship.

In view of the extreme position which he takes it should be noticed that he finds only a single external witness for this theory of the Psalms. "We possess," he tells us, "out of the pre-Christian period only a single external witness regarding the completion of a Psalm": Ps. 79, 2 is quoted in Macc. 7, 17 and connected with the time of Alcimus, probably correctly, perhaps indeed on the basis of actual tradition. In addition to this, Ps. 146, 4 is used by the same author in 1 Macc. 2, 63. Hence these two Psalms were known to an author, who probably was still writing

To the members of the Wellhausen school, as to de Wette, the Davidic authorship of a psalm is something which must be rejected unless proved, and not something that must be accepted unless disproved.

³⁹ Cheyne (1904) is no less radical in his attitude toward the question of early date. But he has so complicated the issue by arbitrary alteration of the text in favor of his North Arabian theory, that his views have gained little favor with the advocates of late date.

under the Hasmonean Rule. Since we are with this exception thrown back (*angewiesen*) upon the poems themselves, it is to be regretted that most of the Psalmists, even when they referred to perfectly definite persons, conditions and events, expressed themselves in a way which was probably intelligible to their first hearers (*Publikum*) but not to us.⁴⁰

This statement is significant, because it shows Duhm's attitude to the historic books of the Old Testament. Rejecting both the direct and indirect testimony of the books of Samuel, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah,⁴¹ and the witness of the titles, he tells us that except for a citation of Ps. 79, 2 (really vs. 2 and 3)—it is to be noted that it is an inaccurate and condensed quotation—and an allusion to Ps. 146, 4⁴² we are entirely dependent on the internal evi-

⁴⁰ *Die Psalmen*, s. xviii.

⁴¹ Cf. e. g. Robertson's summary of the evidence in *Poetry and Religion of the Psalms*, p. 89 f.

⁴² In I Macc. 7, 17 we read: Σάρκας ὀσίων σου καὶ αἵματα αὐτῶν ἐξέχεαν κύκλῳ Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁ θάπτων.

The LXX, which gives an accurate rendering of the Massoretic Text reads as follows:

ἔθεντο τα θνησιμαῖα τῶν δούλων σου βρώματα τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,

τὰς σάρκας τῶν ὀσίων σου τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς·

ἐξέχεαν τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν ὡς ὕδωρ κύκλῳ Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ θάπτων.

A comparison of the two shows that the verse in I Macc. 7, 17 is at the best a free adaptation.—Delitzsch's phrase "quotation from memory" seems hardly to be applicable—of the words of the Psalm and one might almost question whether this passage is really specifically referred to.

Similarly I Macc. 2, 63

σήμερον ἐπαρθήρεται, καὶ οὐ μὴ εὐρεθῆ, ὅτι ἐπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν χοῦν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ διαλογισμὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπώλετο.

contains an even less clear and accurate citation of Ps. 146, 4 where we read:

Ἐξελεύσεται τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ

καὶ ἐπιστρέψει εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ·

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀπολοῦνται πάντες οἱ διαλογισμοὶ αὐτῶν.

That Duhm should prefer these meagre and inaccurate citations (he does not follow Delitzsch in connecting I Macc. 9, 23 with Ps. 92, 8) in the First Book of Maccabees to the testimony of II Sam. 22 and I Chron. 16 shows how little value he assigns to definite statements of the Old Testament when they conflict with his ideas as to what must have been the course of Hebrew history, and in this respect his attitude is hardly more extreme than that of many other members of the critical school.

dence of the Psalms themselves for information regarding the date of their composition. The witness of the historical books he considers so unreliable—how unreliable is shown by the fact that he regards Ps. 137, “By the rivers of Babylon,” as probably the oldest—that he casts it all aside and turns to the book of Maccabees for trustworthy information. Negative criticism of the Old Testament could hardly be carried further.

It is thus apparent that to the critics, the “Davidic tradition” is of little or no value, and the Psalter is the “Praise-Book of the Second Temple.” Instead of the bulk of the Psalms belonging to the time of the monarchy (c 1000 B. C.) most or all of them are post-exilic and, even according to certain influential critics, Maccabean in origin. Thus we notice the same *downward tendency* in the criticism of the Psalms as in the criticism of the Pentateuch. Everything must be late, later, latest. One is almost tempted to wonder that some critic does not raise the cry, “The Psalter is the Praise-Book of Herod’s Temple.” Duhm thinks the Psalter was not completed until about 70 B. C. If so late, why not a little later? Why not regard David as a reflection backward of Herod the Great?

Yet the fact remains that the Old Testament treats the Psalter as in large measure the “Praise-Book of the First Temple.” According to the titles, the majority of the Psalms were written before the building of Solomon’s Temple. This is plainly in accord with the much despised Chronicler and it finds confirmation elsewhere in the Old Testament. Why is this view, which for centuries was accepted without question, so doubtful that it is “childish” even to consider it? If Solomon’s Temple with its elaborate ritual was only a “reflection backward of Zerubbabel’s Temple,” if David was only a “rude warrior,” and if Israel even in his day was only just emerging from a state of semi-barbarism, these conclusions are certainly natural. But that is not the account which the Old Testament itself gives of David and Solomon, and it is our purpose to test

these conclusions of the critics regarding the date of the Biblical Psalms by the results of archaeology.

Assuming that the Psalms by implication, and in some cases explicitly presuppose the Temple, an elaborate ritual, etc.—if David made as elaborate preparation on the spiritual side as we are told that he did in material things for the Temple which he so desired to build, this would be most proper and natural—let us consider the bearing of archaeology upon the question of Davidic psalmody.

The Temple of Solomon may occasion the critics certain difficulties in view of their theories regarding the development of culture and institutions in Israel. But to the archaeologist it is the expected thing. The course of the Nile from the Delta to the First Cataract—not to mention Abu Simbel and Meroë in Nubia—is marked by the ruins of ancient cities with their imposing temples and tombs. The Pyramids are a most impressive witness to the piety of the Old Kingdom. In the Delta near Goshen massive remains of temples of the 12th Dynasty have been found, and the remains of the temples of the older historical period, although scanty, are sufficient according to Erman to give us a “correct idea of them” and to show that “they already had essentially the same appearance as the great buildings which later replaced them.”⁴³ We are all more or less familiar with the pictures of the imposing ruins of the temples built by the Theban kings at Karnak and Luxor. Breasted tells us that Thutmose III made a yearly tour of inspection at the time of the feast of Opet (October), in the course of which “he had opportunity of observing the progress of the noble temples which he was erecting, restoring or adorning at over thirty different places of which we know, and many more which have perished.”⁴⁴

In Babylonia and Assyria the ruins of great temples have been found, which go back to an early age. Hammurapi, who called himself “the restorer of the shrines of

⁴³ Erman, *“Aegyptische Religion,”* Aufl. I, S. 43.

⁴⁴ *History of Egypt*, p. 309.

the great gods,"⁴⁵ mentions in the Preface to the Code nearly two dozen temples in different cities, of which he had been the benefactor, e. g. Nippur and its temple, Êkur, Eridu and Êapzu, Babylon and Êsagila, Ur and Êkissirgal, etc. Many of these temples can be proved, either by documentary evidence or as a result of excavation, to have been in existence centuries before this period, and that these were only a few of the many temples can easily be shown.⁴⁶

The oldest and the most imposing buildings of antiquity are always either temples or palaces, and magnificent as the Temple of Solomon is described as being, it was in many respects far surpassed by the wonders of Karnak, on which Moses may well have often feasted his eyes. Recent excavations at Babylon and Assur have greatly increased our knowledge regarding the temples in these ancient centres of Babylonian and Assyrian culture.⁴⁷

The size and magnificence of many of these ancient temples—the Egyptian are better preserved, but the Babylonian and Assyrian, to judge from the remains which have been uncovered, must have been very imposing structures—give us a clear indication of the number and influence of the priests who tended them. The power of the priests in Egypt

⁴⁵ King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, Vol. III, pp. 180, 184.

⁴⁶ Thus Dungi of the Dynasty of Ur, who lived about three centuries before Hammurapi, was a patron of some of the shrines mentioned by Hammurapi, and also of temples in cities not mentioned by Hammurapi (e. g. Susa) and of other temples in the same cities (e. g. the temple Êsassisigara in Ur). A century or more earlier Gudea devoted himself to the enrichment of his temples at Lagash (Tello) and he tells us in one of his inscriptions that Ningirsu his god "opened the way for him from the upper to the lower sea," enabling him to bring cedar from Lebanon, and stone and wood from other distant regions (cf. Gudea, Statue B. Col V. 21 f. Thureau-Dangin, *Akkad. Sumerische Königsinschriften*). Several centuries earlier Manishtusu (c. 2700 B. C.) in the cruciform inscription, one of the longest of early Semitic inscriptions, gives an account of his gifts to the sun temple Êbarra at Sippar.

⁴⁷ Koldewey, *Die Tempeln von Babylon und Borsippa* (1911); *Das wiedererstehende Babylon* (1913, Eng. Trans. 1915); Andrae, *Der Anu-Adad-Tempel in Assur* (1909).

in the second half of the second millennium B. C. is well known. Breasted conjectures that "probably one-fourth of all the persons buried in the great and sacred cemetery of Abydos at this period [the Empire] were priests."⁴⁸ In the early period in Egypt many of the priests were laymen, who were on duty at the temple only during certain periods. But under the Empire they came to constitute an official class, whose power and influence increased so rapidly that finally the high priest of Amon became so powerful that he overthrew the Ramessids. In ancient Babylonia the influence of the Temples must have been enormous if we can judge by the quantities of "temple records," dealing with the income, etc., of these temples, which have been discovered, and which corroborate to a very considerable degree statements of Hammurapi, Gudea, Urukagina and others, which sound and are of course to a certain extent exaggerated and extreme. And we know that the overthrow of Nabunaid and the downfall of the Babylonian Empire was due in part at least to the hostility of the priests.

In speaking of the Egyptian priests, Erman mentions the "*cherheb* whose duty it seems to have been to read the old liturgies (*Sprüche*) in connection with the ceremonies, and whose secondary title 'writer of the sacred book (*Gottesbuch*)' probably designates them as learned students of the ancient sacred Literature,"⁴⁹ and he states that "it belongs also to the regular duties of the priests, as well in the daily cultus as on the feast-day to glorify the god with songs." Though he adds that the contents of these songs as a rule is not very poetic, and that music did not have a large part in it.⁵⁰

The Babylonian priests are divided by Zimmern into three main groups, one of which is composed of the *sammeru* or singers, whose characteristic function was the singing of hymns.⁵¹ "Liturgical services," says Langdon,

⁴⁸ Breasted, *Hist.*, pp. 247, 521.

⁴⁹ Erman, *Aegypt. Religion*, S. 58.

⁵⁰ *Op. cit.*, S. 50, 51.

⁵¹ Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis d. Bab. Religion*, S. 93.

“originated among the Sumerians. Although we have no texts of this kind from the pre-Sargonic period [prior to 2900 B. C.], yet we meet here with the technical name for the ‘psalmist’ who always officiated at these services.”

In both Egypt and Babylonia a great deal was made of *feast* and *festival days*. We know more about them in the later periods. In Egypt during the 18th Dynasty, “The religious feasts of the seventh month were celebrated with such opulent splendour that the month quickly gained the epithet, ‘That of Amenhotep,’ a designation which clung to it until it became the usual name for it in later ages.”⁵² The lavishness of the provision for such occasions is indicated by a list in the Harris Papyrus according to which 90,250 loaves were given out to the common people—aside from the provision made for the upper classes—during the many days of the feast.⁵³ These feasts were great occasions and were celebrated with processions in honor of the god or gods, and with music, singing and dancing.

In Babylonia the great feast was the feast of the New Year⁵⁴ which in Babylon was the feast of Marduk. It was at this time that, according to the priests, the gods in solemn conclave determined the events of the coming year. The images of the gods were carried in solemn procession. Something of the splendor of this occasion can be gathered from the magnificence of the great procession street of Marduk in Babylon, which Nebuchadnezzar the Great adorned and extended, and a considerable part of which has been recently uncovered by the German expedition. The Assyrian kings celebrated their victories by elaborate gifts to the gods and by feasts and festive processions which were certainly partly of a religious character.

In the religious worship in Babylonia and Egypt *music*

⁵² Breasted, *History of Egypt*, p. 350.

⁵³ Erman, *Aegypt. Religion*, S. 50.

⁵⁴ This feast of the New Year is a very ancient one. It is referred to by Gudea, and by him connected with the worship of the goddess Bau. Manishtusu in one of his inscriptions refers to the “feast (?) of Shamash” (*naptan Shamash*).

figured to a greater or less degree—more especially in connection with the feasts. It is now generally conceded that music and musical instruments go back to a very remote antiquity. No one will question that the three kinds of musical instruments—stringed, wind and percussion—which are mentioned in the Old Testament as in use at or before the time of David, were all known in one form or another in Babylonia and Egypt long before the time of the Hebrew Monarchy. Langdon⁵⁵ gives a list of fourteen different musical instruments, which were in use in Babylonia in and probably long before the time of Abraham. The lute, the harp, the sistrum and the flute were the most common musical instruments in Egypt.⁵⁶ The evidence, literary and monumental, for the antiquity of musical instruments is now so extensive and has been so often and adequately treated⁵⁷ that it is not necessary to discuss it in detail. It should be remembered, however, that this fact has been denied in the past, and that as late as 1863 Hitzig ventured to make the assertion:

“The song of Deborah, the genuineness of which is established, was undoubtedly adapted to the accompaniment of a stringed instrument. Still we are merely informed that she sang it, vss. 1, 3, 12, and who will venture to assert

⁵⁵ *Babylonian Liturgies*, pp. xxxii, xxxiii.

⁵⁶ Erman, *Aegypten u. Aegyptisches Leben*, p. 345.

Breasted, *History*, pp. 109, 349. The fact that already in the inscriptions of the Old Kingdom the representation of the “lute” (*nfr*) is used as a hieroglyph (cf. e. g. Sethe, *Pyr. Texte*, S. xii and 189; also M. A. Murray, *Index of Names and Titles of the Old Kingdom* (1908), where this hieroglyph occurs frequently) proves that it must have been in general use at a very remote period. Whether there is any connection between the Hebrew *nēbēl* “harp” and the Egyptian *nfr* is hard to determine. The Egyptian word for harp is *bn-t*. Even if they are the same etymologically it would not necessarily prove that the *nēbēl* was originally a “lute” since it is notorious that foreign words are often used inexactly and even incorrectly by the foreigner, or by degrees develop different usages.

⁵⁷ Cf. E. g. J. Millar. Article “Music.” *Internat. Standard Bib. Encyclopaedia*; Cornill, *The Culture of Ancient Israel*, p. 101 ff.; Wellhausen, *The Book of the Psalms* (1898), Appendix, p. 217 f.

that the Israel of that period was acquainted with a stringed instrument?"⁵⁸ We may now without hesitation change the "who will venture to assert" into "who will venture to deny." And speaking generally it may be said that archaeology has confirmed the statements of the Old Testament regarding music to a very marked degree. It shows that there is no reason to question the intimation (Exodus 15, 20) that music was known to the Israelites and used in religious festivals in the time of Moses and also regarded by them as of extreme antiquity (Genesis 4, 21), while at the same time making it all the more difficult to account for the attributing of the great development in its use to David instead of to Moses, unless it be admitted to be simply the record of actual fact.⁵⁹

Thus it is clear that several important considerations point to the development of a temple ritual, or liturgy, and to the use of psalms and hymns in Babylonia and Egypt at a, relatively speaking, very early period. And such facts as have been adduced are not without considerable significance for the problem which we are considering. But we are not restricted to mere general indications in support of such an assumption. There is definite evidence that this is actually the case.

Reference has already been made to the "Pyramid Texts," which are "preserved in the Fifth and Sixth Dynasty Pyramids at Sakkara," and according to Breasted "form the oldest body of literature surviving from this ancient world." Of the contents of these Pyramid Texts, he says: "It may be said to be in the main sixfold:

1. A funerary ritual and a ritual of mortuary offerings at the tomb.
2. Magical charms.
3. Very ancient ritual of worship.
4. Ancient religious hymns.
5. Fragments of old myths.

⁵⁸ *Die Psalmen*, S. xiii.

⁵⁹ Robertson, *Religion and Poetry of the Psalms*, p. 105.

6. Prayers and petitions on behalf of the dead king.⁶⁰

Of the religious hymns Breasted asserts that they are "among the oldest literary fragments in the collection."

Let us turn to Babylonia. Professor Zimmern of Leipzig, the highest authority in this special field, has published several series of Babylonian hymns, psalms, etc.⁶¹ He makes this statement: "The hymns and prayers to the god were from the 3rd Millennium B. C. down to the latest times, when Babylonian literature was still written, that is until shortly before the beginning of our Christian Era, handed down almost without change."⁶² This statement was made in 1905 when only a few of the early religious poems had been published. Since then the publication of a number of texts belonging to about the Abrahamic period has confirmed this statement. These poems were originally written in Sumerian, and they are frequently found in bi-lingual form, i. e. with Babylonian or Assyrian translation.

In 1912-1913 Professor Zimmern published a series of texts of the early period, and in the preface to the first series made the following statement:

"How great the significance which belongs to texts of this kind is in particular for our knowledge and estimation of the Babylonian religion, follows at once from the single fact that through these texts it becomes ever more clearly apparent that the bi-lingual hymn and incantation texts from the later period, i. e. from the Library of Assurbanipal and from Neo-Babylonian and Perso-Grecian times, as a matter of fact in their Sumerian form, apart from minor changes in form (*unwesentlichen formellen Abweichungen*) and a few later additions and alterations, merely represent accurate copies of the Sumerian religious

⁶⁰ Breasted, "Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt," pp. vii, 93.

⁶¹ *Babylonische Busspsalmen* (1885); *Babylonische Hymnen und Gebete in Auswahl* (1905—*Der Alte Orient*, VII, 3)); *Zweite Auswahl* (1911—*Der alte Orient*, XIII, 1); *Sumerische Kultlieder aus altbabylonischer Zeit. Erste Reihe* (1912); *Zweite Reihe* (1913).

⁶² *Baby. Hymnen u. Gebete in Auswahl* (1905), S. 4.

texts of that very Old-Babylonian period, and that they consequently must not be regarded as an intellectual product of the later period, but of that very same older period itself."⁶³

The discovery of this extensive Psalm literature in Babylonia and of a similar though less extensive one in Egypt has given considerable impetus to the comparative study of Old Testament psalmody, and general and particular similarities and correspondences have been pointed out by critic and archaeologist.

Zimmern speaks of it as a "valuable (*reichhaltige*) literature . . . which shows in part an elevated poetical movement (*Schwung*) and on the other hand deep religious fervor, and which in matter as in form approaches closely to the Old Testament Psalm-Literature."⁶⁴ And he adds: "It is a matter for careful consideration, whether it is not likely that actual historical connections and influences are present. Still it is scarcely possible owing to the nature of the subject to furnish definite proof."⁶⁵ Gunkel goes even further:

"At present the time has not yet arrived, but it will come some day, when we will explain the Hebrew Psalms in connection with the Egyptian and Babylonian. But in the meantime there is hardly a more urgent task in the sphere of Old Testament science, than that of a scientific comparison of the Babylonian and Hebrew religious lyrics."⁶⁶

Some indication of the increase in the amount of the material recently made available for such a comparison may be gathered from the fact that in the German edition of his "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (1898)," completed in 1914, Professor Jastrow devotes nearly three hundred pages to a discussion of these texts, a relatively large part being taken up with translations of the poems

⁶³ *Sumerische Kultlieder aus altbab. Zeit.* Erste Reihe S. v.

⁶⁴ *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 3te Aufl. S. 607.

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.*, in *loco*.

⁶⁶ *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, (1911), S. viii.

themselves. This is nearly ten times the space given to them in the previous edition. And this work and the similar ones by Sayce and Rogers together with the more specialized studies of Zimmern, Langdon⁶⁷ and others, as well as the general publications of Harper and Weber and the archaeological handbooks to the Old Testament, published recently by Gressmann, Rogers and Barton⁶⁸ and the introduction of these parallels even into Commentaries on the Psalms,⁶⁹ have all contributed to make the Babylonian religious lyrics readily accessible and consequently increasingly familiar to students of the Old Testament. The Egyptian parallels are less extensive and their bearing upon the Old Testament has in the main been less emphatically asserted. But certain of them are quoted in practically every study of the Egyptian religion, cf. those of Sayce, Erman, Steindorff, Wiedemann, Breasted⁷⁰ and also the handbooks of Gressmann and Barton and the commentary of Kittel just referred to.

As might have been expected on general grounds there are certain marked resemblances between this ancient religious literature and the Old Testament Psalms. Some

⁶⁷ Sayce, *The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia* (1903), Rogers, *The Religion of Babylou and Assyria* (1908), Zimmern, cf. especially the works mentioned in footnote 61 and also *Keilinschriften u. das Alte Testaument* 3te Aufl. (1902) Zweiter Teil, Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms* (1909), *Babylonian Liturgies* (1913), *Tammuz and Ishtar* (1914).

⁶⁸ R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonia Literature*, Selected Translations (1901) pp. 420-444, Weber, *Literature der Babylonier und Assyrer* (1907). S. 114-147. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament* (1909, the translations from the Babylonian are by Ungnad, those from the Egyptian by Ranke), Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament* (1912), Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible* (1916).

⁶⁹ Kittel, *Die Psalmen* (1914) Anhang B., gives nearly ten pages of translations from Babylonian and Egyptian parallels. While Gunkel (*Op. cit.*) quotes from them frequently.

⁷⁰ Sayce, *The Religion of Ancient Egypt* (1913), Erman, *Die aegyptische Religion* (1905), Steindorff, *The Religion of the Ancient Egyptians* (1905), Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians* (1897), Breasted, *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (1912).

of these have been frequently pointed out. Thus the main varieties of the Psalms, the hymn of praise or thanksgiving and the prayer—both the prayer of the penitent⁷¹ and that of the innocent sufferer, the righteous man⁷²—are paralleled more or less closely in the Babylonian and Egyptian. Hymns in praise of the god, e.g. Ellil or Bel, Shamash, Sin, Ishtar, Tammuz, Ninib, Nergal, etc., have been found in considerable numbers in Babylonia and Assyria. Similarly in Egyptian, hymns to Osiris, to Osiris as the Nile, to the Sun-God and to other divinities are found in the Pyramid Texts and similar hymns are found in the Book of the Dead, e.g. the adoration of Re in Chapter XV. While a hymn in praise of Amon Re, from the time of Amenophis III, Ikhnaton's famous hymn to Aton, Meneptah's hymn to the Nile and certain others have been frequently quoted.

In Babylonian the prayers and litanies (*Klagelieder*) are fairly numerous and have been carefully studied. It has become evident that they are of two kinds, those intended for private personal use and those of a more general character, a fact to which Gunkel alludes as opposing the view that in Psalm 22, 22 the "I" must be taken as a personification of Israel and not in its proper individualistic sense. Jastrow divides the penitential psalm into three parts, invocation, complaint and confession, and after stating that these elements, though less strongly marked, are also characteristic of the Biblical Psalms, he cites fifty-three verses taken from twenty-two different Psalms as proof of this and remarks: "Most of these correspondences in the Biblical and Babylonian Psalms are certainly to be attributed to identity of mental process and not to direct borrowing. There remains however none the less a residuum, which can serve as a proof of the influence—in the main clearly indirect—of

⁷¹ E.g. Rogers, *Parallels*, p. 183 f. and Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, p. 39 f. *et passim*.

⁷² E.g. Rogers, p. 158; cf. Hezekiah's Prayer, Isa. 38, 14 f.

the Babylonian viewpoint upon a people as receptive as were the Hebrews.⁷³

In some of these poems the historical element figures to a certain extent,⁷⁴ but the Babylonian poems, which most closely resemble the Old Testament Psalms in this particular, differ from them in this important respect, that they are frequently pseudo-historical or mythological—e.g. the Hymn to Ninib in memory of his creating the canals and supplying the earth with irrigation⁷⁵—and not really historical like the Psalms. Examples of historical poems in the Egyptian are the hymns in praise of Thutmose III and Menephtah, both of which, however, celebrate the deeds of the king, and not of the gods which was quite natural in view of the practical deification of the king by his subjects. Didactic poems also are found in both the Babylonian and the Egyptian religious poetry.

Some of the Babylonian religious poems can be definitely connected with forms or ceremonies in the ritual of worship, e.g. with the processions of the gods, notably at the feast of the New Year, with special feasts such as the wailings for Tammuz, with sacrifice and with incantation and exorcism.⁷⁶ It may be noted in passing that the distinction between some of these poems and the magical texts is by no means a clear one. On the contrary, Zimmern points out that the great majority of the hymns form part of a ritual of incantation and exorcism. Elements of gross superstition and sensuality, enter at times into the best of them, and physical ills are in many instances very clearly the ground for and incentive to the petition. While in the Book of the Dead the magical element is so prominent that it may be looked upon as largely a book of magical eschatology.

Kittel⁷⁷ points to certain of the Old Testament Psalms,

⁷³ *Religion*, II. I. S. 137.

⁷⁴ *Op. cit.*, II. I, S. 21 f.

⁷⁵ Langdon, *Babylonian Liturgies*, p. 7 f.

⁷⁶ Cf. Schrank, *Babylonische Sühnrüten* (1908).

⁷⁷ *Die Psalmen*, S. xxxv.

e.g. 24, 95, 100, 118, 134, as poems which can in like manner be connected with definite occasions or elements in the ritual of worship. This is true. But on the other hand it is generally recognized that the Psalms have in the main very little to identify them with any special event or occasion.

Similarities in the *form* and *style* of the Babylonian and Egyptian religious poems as compared with the Old Testament Psalms have been pointed out. The most outstanding feature is, of course the *parallelismus membrorum*. This feature is very marked in the Babylonian hymns and prayers, as is apparent to the most cursory reader, and is of course very ancient. It is also characteristic of the Egyptian. The religious hymns of the Pyramid Texts "exhibit an early poetic form, that of couplets displaying parallelism in arrangement of words and thought—the form which is familiar to all in the Hebrew psalms as 'parallelism of members.' It is carried back by its employment in the Pyramid Texts into the fourth millenium B. C., by far earlier than its appearance anywhere else."⁷⁸

In commenting on the 103rd Psalm, Gunkel calls attention to the five relative—in the Hebrew, participial—clauses, which occur in the opening verses: "*who* forgiveth all thine iniquities, *who* healeth all thy diseases," etc., and remarks: "It is very noteworthy that such recounting of the deeds and characteristics of the deity also in the very form of participles or attributives is found in Babylonian and Egyptian hymns."⁷⁹ The rules governing the hymn

⁷⁸ Breasted, *Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, p. 97. The "Poem of Pentaur," describing the "Battle of Kadesh," belongs to 19th Dynasty. Prof. James Robertson (*Early Religion of Israel*, vol. 2, 261) says of it: "It is interesting to note that it exhibits the system of parallelism which is so characteristic of Hebrew poetry, and has other resemblances to the lyrical and prophetic style of the Old Testament."

⁷⁹ E.g., the long "he who knows" series in Langdon *Bab. Liturgies*, p. 49. This construction which Gunkel and Erman regard as especially characteristic of the "Hymn" is not nearly so prominent in the Old Testament as in Babylonian where the tendency to a

had assumed shape in the oriental world long before Israel began to employ them."⁸⁰ Again in commenting on Psalm 22, 22 f., where the litany or prayer of intercession passes over into a hymn of praise, in which the singer invites all men to join, Gunkel points to similar expressions in the Babylonian psalms, e.g. the closing lines of a prayer to Ishtar:

So will I bow myself before thy greatness, I will glorify thy divinity,

And the people of my city will praise thy power.⁸¹ and adds: "It is customary for the suppliant to utter a vow at the close of the litany; such a vow is, as is appropriate for a poet, properly a psalm."⁸²

Other features of the Psalms, such as strophical arrangement, acrostics, dialogue-structure, can be paralleled to a greater or less degree in this ancient psalmody. The tendency to repetition or the use of refrain or intercalation, appears occasionally in Old Testament psalmody, being most marked in Psalm 136 where the intercalary verse occurs regularly (cf. Psalm 107). It is a very noticeable feature in the Babylonian lyric,—especially in the penitential psalms where it is carried to an extreme—the second half-verse being not infrequently repeated a number of times without change, and the first consisting often of little more than a string of titles.

It is also quite easy to point out minor and occasional points of resemblance between the Psalms and these related

wearisome and tautological repetition of phrases is very noticeable. In the Psalms the best examples are Ps. 104, 147, cf. 146, 145. Cf. also Job 5, 9 f.; 12, 17 f.; 26, 7 f. It is also found in the Prophets, cf. e.g. Amos 4:13. The best example is Isaiah 44:24-28, where a series of nine participial clauses occurs (cf. the present writer's article, *The Transcendence of Jehovah, God of Israel in Biblical & Theological Studies*, 1912).

⁸⁰ *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, S. 196, 326, where examples are given. Gunkel cites Erman as his authority for the statement that this is "the usual form of the hymns in honor of the god in Egyptian."

⁸¹ Rogers, *Parallels*, p. 186.

⁸² *Op. cit.*, S. 304.

literatures. Thus there are quite a number of psalms in the Babylonian, which speak repeatedly of the "word" of this or that deity in a way which somewhat resembles the 29th Psalm.⁸³ Jeremias compares Psalm 44, 23 with a Babylonian hymn where the deity is said to sleep.⁸⁴ The figurative use of the word "Shepherd" (Psalms 23, 80 and 121) is a familiar one in Babylonian. We find also the expression "moan like a dove", as expressive of grief or suffering; "hide the face",⁸⁵ used of the offended or unresponsive deity. The plaintive use of the words "how long?" has been pointed out and other examples might be cited.

The situation is summed up by Jeremias with the words: "There exists a close relationship between the poetic form of the Biblical and the Babylonian songs."⁸⁶ And there are those who say the same thing regarding their contents. Thus Prof. Prince of Columbia University, in writing of the "Assyro-Babylonian idea of God,"⁸⁷ cites five brief passages from this religious poetry and tells us that "any one of them reads like a Biblical Psalm." The marked resemblance between Ikhnaton's "Hymn to Aton" and parts of the 104th Psalm has been frequently pointed out. Breasted regards vs. 20-26 as so closely parallel to certain verses in Ikhnaton's Hymn that he places them in parallel columns.⁸⁸ And in another place after pointing out that it is in its "recognition of the fatherly solicitude of Aton for all

⁸³ Cf. also Ps., 76, 6; 107, 20; 119, 89; 147, 15 f. and Zimmern, *Bab Hymnen u. Gebete, 2te Auswahl*, S. 21. In *Keilschriften u. das Alte Testament, Aufl. III*, S. 608 he argues that "word" is here personified but we agree with Jastrow that there seems to be no sufficient ground for this contention.

⁸⁴ *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, Trans. from 2nd German Ed. Vol. II., p. 261. He adds, however, very properly, "The reverse of the idea is not conceivable in Babylonian; 'Shepherd of Israel, who neither slumbers nor sleeps,' Ps. 121, 4."

⁸⁵ On the other hand it is of interest to note that in Babylonian the usual expression seems to be "turn away the neck."

⁸⁶ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 261.

⁸⁷ Hastings, *Dictionary of Religion & Ethics*, article "God," Vol. II, p. 261.

⁸⁸ *History of Egypt*, p. 371 f.

creatures" that the chief excellence of Ikhnaton's movement lies he declares, "all this discloses a discernment of the presence of God in nature and an appreciation of the revelation of God in the visible world such as we find a thousand years later⁸⁹ in the Hebrew psalms and in our own poets of nature since Wordsworth."⁹⁰

Kittel, in his Commentary⁹¹ gives quite an interesting sketch of the religious poetry of Babylonia and Egypt, in which he emphasizes the points of similarity between it and that of Israel, and concludes: "One thing follows with the greatest degree of probability from these points of contact, when we allow them to weigh with us, in connection with the entire historical development of Canaan and Israel, the *high antiquity* of Israelitish Psalm poetry, as regards its probable beginnings, and along with this the untenability of all theories which even recently were advanced with so much assurance regarding the youthfulness of this poetry in all its forms. It may be, on the contrary, as old indeed as the nation itself and has probably existed from its earliest beginnings, and accompanied the nation during all the centuries of its existence. Unless indeed there should appear in the history of Israel itself and of its poetry perfectly conclusive objections to the above stated assumption, it is highly probable that it will maintain itself. Should however, positive grounds also be found in Israel itself in support of this assumption, the demonstration, which would raise the high probability to actual certainty, would thus be clearly completed."⁹²

Then Prof. Kittel goes on to consider these "positive grounds" e.g. Ps. 137, 2 Sam. 6, 5, 14, Judges 5, 4 f, 31, etc., and the close relation between psalmody and the ritual of worship, and without laying any stress or placing any

⁸⁹ Since he places Ikhnaton 1375 B.C., this assigns the Psalms to the post-exilic period.

⁹⁰ *Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, p. 334.

⁹¹ *Die Psalmen*, (1914).

⁹² *Op. cit.*, S. xxxiii.

great reliance upon the "Davidic tradition," he finds apparently what he considers the necessary evidence to make the probability that psalmody existed from very early times, a certainty. Consequently he asserts that "the information regarding David's poetical talent and activity is so well accredited by the older record, that one has no right to doubt it."⁹³

⁹³ *Op. cit.*, S. xliiii. In a somewhat similar manner Gunkel disputes the correctness of the conclusions reached by the advocates of late date. Writing on the Psalms, (*Reden u. Aufsätze*, 1913) after discussing briefly the evidence from Babylon and Egypt which bears upon them, he says, (p. 97); "And already through these first beginnings the critical problems appear in a new light. For it may be difficult enough to assign the Psalms of the Psalter to a definite period. But for the psalm-like poems outside the Psalter we possess in part at least very definite indications. We know that to Israel the Egyptian and Babylonian Psalms were prehistoric. We are able to date a number of Psalms composed by the *Prophets*, some of them to the very year. And we are especially well acquainted with the post-canonical poetry of the Apocrypha and of the "Psalms" or "Odes of Solomon." Consequently we are already able to say this with entire safety, that the conjecture, which is expressed now and then afresh that psalm composition arose in Israel first during the Babylonian exile, is entirely incorrect. This follows first of all from the existence of Egyptian and Babylonian lyric, which flourished long before Israel and which must have some kind of a connection with the Israelites. And all doubt regarding the antiquity of Israelitish psalm composition must be silenced, when we look at the Old Testament itself. The oldest Israelitish poems which we possess speak already a language which resembles the Psalms. The song of Miriam is in its form a "Hymn," of a character which we meet frequently in the Psalms; the Deborah song at least starts with the form of a hymn; and the song of the seraphs in Isaiah also follows completely a definite hymnic form. The conjecture also, which has frequently been advanced, that many or at least some of the Psalms, come from the Maccabean period can now be tested as regards its correctness. For we now possess in the poems from the later period which have been preserved, a sure standard, and are therefore in a position to compare them. The result of this test may be stated right here in advance; it is that the songs, which certainly come from the Late-Jewish period are entirely different from those in the Psalter, which have been regarded as Maccabean, i.e. much more artificial (*reflektierter*) and weaker, and that consequently the widely accepted assertion [that these Old Testament Psalms are Maccabean] cannot in the main be regarded as having justified itself."

Yet after this elaborate and careful discussion of the evidence for pre-exilian and early psalmody, Prof. Kittel concludes: "But on the other hand there can be no question that the main body of the songs which have come down to us comes from the time after the Exile, especially from the centuries of close contact with heathenism, particularly in its Greek form."⁹⁴

This statement seems to mark such an evident anti-climax to the strong and convincing argument developed by Prof. Kittel in favor of the antiquity of lyric poetry in Israel that it comes as a decided disappointment to the conservative scholar, who recognizing that Prof. Kittel, to quote his own words, "has always emphatically asserted the high antiquity of Israel's religious lyric, as against the numerous opponents, and at the same time shown that this can be proved from the Old Testament itself without the help of external sources,"⁹⁵ might be pardoned for expecting him to concede less to the "Wellhausen tradition," and to do fuller justice to the "Davidic."

It is thus a rather peculiar state of affairs which confronts us in the sphere of the critical study of the Psalms. The two tendencies which are most noticeable seem to run strongly counter the one to the other. On the one hand we have the tendency to emphasize the close connection between the Book of Psalms and the religious poetry of the Babylonians and the Egyptians; on the other the tendency to insist that they are widely separated in date, that the one is very late and the other very early. Such an attitude seems inconsistent. For it is clear that the more the resemblance between these literatures is emphasized, the stronger will be the tendency to bring them into close relation and the more obvious and insistent will become the question, why is the one so markedly later than the other? If the Babylonian and Egyptian Psalms are very ancient and can be traced back to a very early

⁹⁴ *Die Psalmen*, S. xliv.

⁹⁵ *Die Psalmen*, S. xxv.

period in their national history, is it not probable, arguing from analogy, that the Old Testament religious poetry is also ancient? And if the Old Testament Psalms resemble those of these neighboring pagan religions as strongly as some of the statements already quoted would seem to imply is not the argument for their early date greatly strengthened thereby? And does it not seem clear that the attitude of the advocates of the late date of the Psalms involves an inconsistency and that Professor Kittel is merely quibbling when he asserts that Israelitish psalmody is old, very old, but that the Psalms are late and in the main postexilic?

It requires of course but a moment's reflection to realize that the position of the advocates of late date is not necessarily as inconsistent as at first sight might seem to be the case. A position often seems to be inconsistent simply because it is more complex than we had supposed and we have ignored certain elements which have a vital connection with it. In the present instance there are two factors especially which must be reckoned with. We must bear in mind in the first place that, as Dr. Driver points out, nations are as different as are individuals. Differences of race, location, form of government, religion, environment, etc., have an important bearing upon their development and their attainments. One begins its national life at a time when another is declining; one develops rapidly, another slowly; one makes important contributions to the sum of the world's wisdom, another is at best a learner and slow at that to accept the assistance of its neighbors. It is therefore dangerous to argue *à priori* from conditions in one nation that conditions in another must have been exactly or even closely analogous. And in the second place it is to be observed that while there are marked similarities between the Psalms and the related literatures of these neighboring nations, there are also, as we shall see presently, very evident differences. And it need hardly be said that if these differences are of such a character, that they can only be accounted for by assuming a long process of develop-

ment, or if they clearly bear the stamp of a later age, the element of inconsistency in the position of the advocates of the late date of the Psalms will at once disappear. And it is certain that it is not from any desire to quibble, but because of his sincere conviction, that the majority of the Psalms presuppose the conditions of the post-exilic period that Professor Kittel argues that they are late, while at the same time claiming to be an ardent believer in the high antiquity of psalmody in Israel.

But while, as has just been indicated, it may be possible to avoid the apparent inconsistency between the general verdict of archaeology and the contentions of the critics, it by no means follows that there is real harmony between them. For the fact that psalmody as a factor in religious worship was very ancient in Babylonia and Egypt cannot but be regarded as a strong confirmation of the statements of the Old Testament regarding its antiquity in Israel. This is as we have just seen the position of Professor Kittel. But this is the same as saying that in the absence of evidence to the contrary archaeology supports the Davidic as against the Wellhausen tradition. It is important to observe this fact. For the critics have long maintained that despite the initial presumption in its favor furnished by the titles, etc., the probability is so strongly against the Davidic authorship that the burden of proof properly rests upon the one who seeks to defend it. But if archaeology has any bearing upon the subject at all, it certainly shows that the general presumption, from the standpoint of archaeology as well as of the Bible is in favor of the early as against the late dating of the Psalms. There is therefore a double presumption in support of the thesis that the Psalms should be assigned to the earliest possible date. In the face of this double presumption in support of the early date, the burden of proof certainly rests with the critics to prove the late date and not with the conservatives to establish the early date. And the element of inconsistency in a position such as that of Professor Kittel cannot be gotten rid of unless it can be con-

clusively shown that, despite the strong presumption to the contrary, the majority of the Psalms can only be satisfactorily explained on the assumption that they are late.

In arguing thus it is not necessary for us to accept nor do we accept the standpoint of the derivationist and admit the dependence of Israel and especially of the religion of Israel upon Babylon and Egypt; on the contrary we believe the testimony of Moses and the Prophets to the essential uniqueness of the religion of Israel cannot and must not be ignored. For we are not arguing that psalmody must have been an ancient institution in Israel because this was the case in Babylonia and Egypt, but merely that the facts which have come to light regarding the great antiquity of the religious lyrics of Babylon and Egypt strongly support the claim of the Old Testament itself that psalmody developed early in Israel and that the time of David and not the post-exilian period was its golden age. And since the "Davidic tradition" is taught in the Old Testament itself and cannot be rejected without rejecting positive and unequivocal statements contained in it, the fact that Babylon and Egypt had their "service of song", centuries before Israel became a nation is certainly significant. While the fact that Abraham in Chaldean Ur must have often heard the *zammeru* singing and chanting his hymns in praise of Nannar, the Moon-god, and that Moses must have been familiar with the songs sung by the *cherteb* in praise of Osiris and Amon-Re, certainly strengthens the general presumption in favor of the early as against the late dating of the Psalms.

The question then reduces itself to this. Admitting that archaeology supports strongly even though indirectly the claims of the Old Testament regarding the early beginnings of psalmody and the prominent part which David had in its development, are the differences, which are clearly apparent between the Old Testament Psalms on the one hand and the Babylonian and Egyptian on the other, of such a character that they can only be explained and consequently must be explained on the assumption that most of the

former are very late. On any view they must be admitted to be very much younger than the earliest of the Babylonian and Egyptian lyrics. But do these differences require us to place them five hundred years at least later than the period to which the titles and other data assign many of them and to which they have for centuries been supposed to belong?

Let us look at these differences for a moment, before attempting an answer to the problem just stated. The most noticeable difference between the Hebrew Psalms and these pagan lyrics appears in the fact that the one are pronouncedly and emphatically monotheistic,⁹⁷ while the other are no less markedly polytheistic. And in connection with the polytheism of the latter we find a crass and sensual anthropomorphism, which is both foreign and abhorrent to the

⁹⁶ When for example *Schroeder* (*Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1914, S. 69 f.) finds in the metaphorical use of the word "bridegroom" in Ps. 19 evidence that the first part of this Psalm was originally a Sun-hymn, since the Babylonian god Shamash had a consort A-a, who was frequently called *kallatu* "bride" he is plainly forcing the figure and using it to support a theory, which is contrary to the entire spirit of the Psalms which is undeniably monotheistic. Gunkel seems to recognize this clearly, despite the fact that as we have seen he regards the study of these heathen lyrics as of the utmost importance for a proper understanding of the Psalms. Comparing the first part of Psalm 19 with a Babylonian Sun-hymn he remarks: "The mighty difference between the heathen songs, whose *motif* the Israelitish poet takes up here and the Psalm is this, that the heathen sing the song to the Sun itself; but Israel's poet sings his song—the beginning of the poem shows this most plainly—to the God, who created the Sun." (*Ausgewählte Psalmen*, S. 27 f.) And again, in contrasting Psalm 104 with Ikhnoton's hymn and the Babylonian hymns to Marduk, while admitting that these latter closely approximate to the Psalm in their conception of the deity, he nevertheless concludes: "That in which the nature Psalms of Israel differ from those of the foreigner—it is the chief factor in the religion—is this, that the Egyptian god is the Sun itself, while the Hebrew God has created it; the Egyptian god is bound up (*verflochten*) with Nature, the Hebrew God stands above and outside of it" (*Op. cit.* S. 215 f.). Thus Gunkel apparently agrees with these words of the elder Delitzsch, who says of Ps. 104: "It is a nature Psalm; but such an one as was possible to no heathen poet."

entire spirit of the Old Testament religion. In the second place it is apparent that the Old Testament Psalms stand upon a very much higher plane ethically than the Babylonian. While the latter savor of magic and incantation⁹⁷ and show an inadequate conception of the sinfulness of sin, the Biblical Psalms are singularly spiritual, even assuming at times an attitude toward the externalities of religion, which seems to some almost if not quite incompatible with belief in the validity, not to say necessity of "whole burnt offering and sacrifice." They are also so searching in their analysis of the 'thoughts and intents of the heart' that Calvin could speak of them as an "anatomy of all parts of the soul" affirming that "there is not an emotion of which anyone can be conscious that is not here represented as in a mirror." No one could say this of the Babylonian or Egyptian Psalms. For while Hehn⁹⁸ asserts that the Babylonian penitential psalms show that consciousness of sin was "extraordinarily lively" among the Babylonians, this statement loses the greater part of its significance, when we take it in connection with another, "Sickness and sin are scarcely distinguished." While as Caspari points out the phrase "the sin which I have committed, I know it not," is the direct opposite of the familiar words of the 51st Psalm, "For I know mine iniquity and my sin is ever before me." A third difference is found in the fact that while the Babylonian and Egyptian psalms are char-

⁹⁷ Caspari (*Die Religion in den assyrisch-babylonischen Busspsalmen*) takes issue with Orelli for classing the penitential psalms and the incantations together, and argues that there is a fundamental difference between them, since in the former—and in them he believes the Babylonian religion found its highest and purest expression—the individual assumes toward the deity the attitude of suppliant, while in the latter he seeks by means of some magic spell or incantation to gain control over the deity and bend him to his will. Yet Caspari finds himself forced to admit that the Babylonians themselves did not clearly observe this distinction, since magical elements enter into these litanies at times and these texts were classed with the magical texts and sometimes designated by the same name "incantation" (*shiptu*).

⁹⁸ *Sünde und Erlösung nach Biblischer und babylonischer Anschauung* (1903), S. 61, cf. S. 14.

acterized by a monotonous "sameness of phrase," a wearisome heaping up of metaphor and high sounding epithet, and abound in "vain repetitions" being the words of men "seeking to be heard for their much speaking," the Psalms of the Hebrew Scriptures show a simplicity, a naturalness and spontaneity, a depth of emotion and spiritual fervor which raises them far above their pagan counterparts.

How then are these differences to be accounted for? The natural tendency in the case of the advocates of late date seems to be, as has been indicated, to appeal to the very long interval of time which from their standpoint is assumed to lie, between these similar and yet diverse literatures. Thus some years ago Zimmern⁹⁹ felt it necessary to utter a word of caution to those who, in his opinion were inclined to overemphasize the resemblances between the Biblical and the Babylonian Psalms. And he argued that since it was becoming increasingly evident that the Babylonian psalms had been handed down with very little change during a period of three thousand years, they must be looked upon as representative of the Old- and not of the Late-Babylonian religion, and that consequently we should expect to find marked differences between them and the Biblical Psalms. In this way he sought apparently to explain the fact that the Babylonian poems are so colorless and conventional as compared with what he calls the "religious individualism" of the Old Testament Psalms.

But while there is considerable force in this argument and it may be welcomed as a protest against the methods of those who attempt to minimize all differences and draw hasty inferences which cannot be regarded as warranted by the facts, we fail to see that this time factor would be able to account for the differences, which, minimize or magnify them as we may, advocates of the late date of the Psalms, as well as defenders of the early date must recognize in comparing the Babylonian and the Biblical Psalms. For Professor Zimmern tells us that the Babylonian Psalms

⁹⁹ *Bab. Hymnen u. Gebete* (1905), S. 4 f.

remained practically unchanged for a period of three thousand years. They are strongly polytheistic. Hence the religion, in whose ritual they continued to be used even down to the latest times, must have remained polytheistic also, whatever minor changes it may have undergone. Otherwise they would not have continued to be used. Not only this. The whole character of the Babylonian religion is against the idea of development. Its fact is set toward the past and not toward the future. The most pious kings were antiquarians, not innovators, traditionalists, not apostles of the new thought. They rebuilt the temples which their predecessors had made and called down curses upon anyone who should attempt to destroy their work. Nabunaid (550 B.C.) was just as certainly a polytheist and just as much bound by the spell of the past as was Gudea (cir. 2500 B.C.) How long then, to speak only of this one, though outstanding, difference, would it have taken the Babylonian Psalms to develop into Old Testament Psalms? How long would it have taken the Egyptian Psalms to develop into Old Testament Psalms? Herodotus' account of the Egyptian religion of his day certainly does not favor the inference that advance toward Monotheism had been very marked. It is clear then that other factors than the mere element of time must enter into the problem of the Old Testament Psalms.

Ikhnaton's Hymn to Aton has frequently been referred to as one of the noblest if not the noblest of Egyptian religious lyrics and it has been compared with the 104th Psalm. Breasted for example not merely compares them in a general way but even, as we have already pointed out, arranges certain verses in parallel columns. Yet he does not hesitate to place the Psalm a thousand years later than Ikhnaton's Hymn. Now Ikhnaton was a heretic; he attempted to introduce a new religion, to substitute monotheism as represented in the worship of the Sun, or, better perhaps, "pantheistic monotheism" for the pronounced polytheism, which had held sway in Egypt for centuries.

His cult did not appeal to his subjects and, when he died, it perished with him. It is interesting to note what Prof. Breasted says of him. He speaks of him as "the first individual in history" and as a "God-intoxicated man."¹⁰⁰ And even while we regard this view of Ikhnaton as extreme, is it too much to assert that if Prof. Breasted and other scholars, who agree with him that Ikhnaton's hymn "discloses a discernment of the presence of God in nature and an appreciation of the revelation of God in the visible world" comparable to that shown in "the Hebrew Psalms and in our poets of nature since Wordsworth" were willing to admit that the writer of the 104th Psalm was also an "individual" and a "God-intoxicated man" it would not be necessary to presuppose an interval of a thousand years between them? Nay, more, if it were admitted that Moses and David were also "individuals" and really "God-intoxicated men" it might be possible to admit that Moses wrote the 90th Psalm and that David occupied the exalted place in Israel's Psalmody, which history and tradition assign to him.

The differences between the Biblical Psalms and the sacred lyrics of these other nations clearly cannot be satisfactorily explained on the basis of this time interval. In some respects, indeed, time is the least important of all the factors which enter into the problem. Israel's Psalmody took the form that it did and developed and endured because it was the intense expression of Israel's religion. The Psalmody of Egypt and Babylon failed to develop

¹⁰⁰ Breasted apparently has formed a considerably higher estimate of the personal force and original genius of Ikhnaton (or Khu-n-Aten) than either Sayce (*Religion of Ancient Egypt*, p. 92 f.) or Steindorff (*Blütezeit des Pharaonenreichs*, S. 140 f.). He recognizes of course the influence exerted upon him by the Heliopolitan School, but does not seem to attach as much significance to it. He also seems to ignore that pantheistic tendency in the doctrine, which according to Prof. Sayce clearly distinguishes it from Mosaic monotheism. Even at the best it is of course a materialistic monotheism, a worship of the Sun as god and not of the God, who himself created the Sun.

to any marked degree, failed ever to reach the plane upon which Israel's began and their Psalms are now but "dead remains," because they were the expression of the spirit of these religions, which have long since ceased to be. Consequently in the study of the Psalms a far more important problem is that of religion. And our attitude toward the question of the date of the Psalms will be largely determined by our view regarding this more fundamental problem. The man who is persuaded that not only Moses, but Abraham also was a monotheist, that idolatry was prohibited at Mount Sinai and that Samuel taught plainly that "to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams", will take of necessity a totally different attitude toward the problem of Davidic Psalmody, than will the critic, who regards Abraham as a myth, Moses as "certainly not a lawgiver in the modern sense of the word," and who believes that ethical monotheism practically had its rise with the teachings of the Prophets.

It is this fact which more than anything else complicates and obscures the issues involved in the study of the Psalms. The dictum of Reuss that the Psalms are later than both Prophets and Law and the assertion of Wellhausen that the question is not whether there are any post-exilian but whether there are any pre-exilian Psalms, have long been regarded as axiomatic by their followers; as has also the belief that the literary era in Israel did not begin much before the time of the Writing Prophets. Consequently to admit that all or even a majority of the Psalms assigned to David were really written by him, would mean to the critics the admission that a body of literature perhaps half as extensive as the JE document and speaking the language of a lofty ethical monotheism, which is scarcely surpassed by anything in the Prophetic literature, comes from a somewhat earlier date than that to which most of them would venture to assign the JE document itself. It is evident then how difficult how almost impossible it is for the convinced adherent of the Wellhausen school even to give a patient

hearing to arguments in support of the Davidic authorship. For it is not too much to assert that the acceptance of this view of the Psalms, together with the necessary implications, which would result from such an acceptance, would make unavoidable some very radical changes in that hypothesis and might prove disastrous to more than one of the assured results. Small wonder then that the critics have been slow to admit that archaeology has very materially strengthened the position of the advocates of early date and made it necessary for them to reopen and reconsider the question of pre-exilic and Davidic psalmody.

The critics have contended again and again for the late date of the Psalms. With them the problem is: How late must they be? or: How late can they be? Our contention is as stated above that the analogy of the ancient psalmody of Babylon and Egypt so strongly confirms the Davidic tradition that even those who attach little significance to this tradition, when standing alone, should be willing to admit that the problem is not: How late are the Psalms? but on the contrary: How early are they? and that instead of making them as late as possible they should seek to assign them to the earliest possible date. That the acceptance of this thesis makes possible the solution of many of the difficulties which centre about the Book of the Psalms and especially about the problem of Davidic Psalmody, we hope to show in a subsequent article.

Princeton

OSWALD T. ALLIS.