

◆THE◆HEBREW◆STUDENT◆

VOL. II.

MAY, 1883.

No. 9.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FIFTY-FIRST PSALM.

BY REV. P. A. NORDELL,

New London, Conn.

The Davidic authorship of the 51st Psalm is denied by modern rationalistic criticism. Ewald places it among "the songs of the dispersion of the people, and the destruction of the Kingdom." Hitzig ascribes it to the unknown writer of Isaiah XL-LXVI. DeWette assigns it to an unknown Exilian prophet, and Prof. W. Robertson Smith inclines to the same view. Olshausen and v. Lengerke sweep it into the Maccabæan period. All agree that David did not write it.

The superscription is, as we know, historical. It refers the Psalm to David, and to a well-known incident in his life. Its historical trustworthiness was accepted by the Jews from the earliest times. The reasons for denying its trustworthiness are both general and specific. Of the former the following are urged:

1. The Psalm does not allude to the affair of Bathsheba, nor to the specific sin of adultery. True, nor is it necessary that it should. Every one in the Kingdom knew what David's heinous sin, *עשׂוּת אֲבֹלֹת* *absolute wickedness*, was. As it is, every penitent heart can read its own sin into David's tearful confession.

2. A lack of conformity between the Psalm and the narrative in 2 Sam. XII. According to the latter, David is aroused from his sinful security by Nathan's coming. David confesses his sin, and is at once assured of God's forgiveness; but in the Psalm he is represented as imploring it most earnestly. This objection loses sight of the differ-

consciousness of guilt. This power grows out of the essential identity of personal experience in all ages. But if the Psalm is not founded on the Psalmist's own experience, if it is not a voice crying from the abyss into which he sees himself plunged by sin, if it is only a lamentation over the idolatries of a sinful nation, it cannot, without perversion of thought, voice our consciousness of personal guilt.

If this Psalm does not come from the hand and heart of David, if it does not bear the unmistakable stamp of his genius, if it does not correspond with the known facts of his life, it is safe to say that one of David's Psalms is yet to be found.

THE LITTLE BOOK OF THE COVENANT.

BY PROF. C. A. BRIGGS, D. D.,
Union Theological Seminary, New York.

The book which Moses was commanded to write as the basis of the Covenant (Ex. xxxiv., 27), is called the little book of the Covenant, to distinguish it from the book which Moses wrote as the basis of the original Covenant at Sinai (Ex. xxiv., 4) which is called the greater book of the Covenant on account of its much greater extent. The latter embraces the section Ex. xx., 22,-xxiii., the former the section Ex. xxxiv., 11-26. This little book of the Covenant is scarcely larger than the tables of the Covenant (Ex. xx., 1-17). Indeed it is now the common opinion of critics that we have here another decalogue. It is true the critics differ in their arrangement of these commands, but as there have always been differences in the synagogue and the church as to the arrangement of the "Ten Commandments of the tables" such differences of opinion as to the arrangement cannot destroy the consensus as to their number in either case. There are some critics who hold that this decalogue was written upon the tables (Ex. xxxiv., 28), on account of "the words of the covenant", which seem to go back upon "write thou these words, for upon the basis of these words do I conclude a covenant with thee and with Israel" (v. 27); and also on account of the verb **וַיִּכְתֹּב** which has no subject expressed and where the most natural interpretation finds the subject in Moses, the subject of the verbs which immediately precede. This would then be the execution of the command given in v. 27. This would then force us to the conclusion that these tables contained the decalogue of vs. 11-26.

and not the decalogue of Ex. xx., 2-17. If the section Ex. xxxiv., 11-28 stood by itself we could not escape this conclusion; but if we go back to Ex. xxxiv., 1, we find the promise that Jehovah will write upon these tables the same commands that were upon the former tables destroyed by Moses, and these were certainly the ten words of Ex. xx., 2-17. This forces us to supply the subject Jehovah to **וִיכְתֹב** in thought or to take the verb as having an indefinite subject and then render it as a passive. "The words of the covenant, ten words *were written* upon the tables." The chief critics of this decalogue of the little book of the Covenant have been: Hitzig: *Ostern und Pfingsten*, 1838, p. 42; Bertheau: *Die sieben Gruppen Mosaischer Gesetze*, 1840, p. 92; Wellhausen: *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, in the *Fahrh. f. Deutsche Theologie*, 1876, p. 554. These agree in the main in their results, and show a decided progress in their study of the subject. Others have expressed their views, e. g., Ewald in his *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 3te Ausg., II. p. 238, but even this prince of exegetes has given no reasons for his arrangement. So far as he differs from the others he stands by himself and has no followers, so far as we know. Kayser, in his *Vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels*, 1874, p. 58, agrees entirely with Hitzig. We present in a table the arrangement of the three chief authorities:

	<i>Hitzig.</i>	<i>Bertheau.</i>	<i>Wellhausen.</i>
1st Command,	vs. 12-16.	v. 18.	vs. 14-16.
2d "	17.	19-20	17.
3d "	18.	21.	18.
4th "	19-20.	22a.	19-20.
5th "	21.	22b.	21.
6th "	22.	23-24.	23-24.
7th "	23-24.	25a.	25a.
8th "	25.	25b.	25b.
9th "	26a.	26a.	26a.
10th "	26b.	26b.	26b.

Hitzig's arrangement is accepted by Bertheau for six of the commands. Bertheau improves upon Hitzig by distinguishing two commands in v. 25, which has been accepted by Wellhausen and is correct. He also distinguished two commands in v. 22, which verse is thrown out by Wellhausen as a later interpolation. Bertheau's mistake was in regarding vs. 11-17 as the Introduction of exhortation to this decalogue. Wellhausen has improved upon Bertheau by making 14-16 the first command, and v. 17 the second command, falling back on the

arrangement of Hitzig, save that he properly throws vs. 11-12 into the Introduction. We agree with Bertheau in regarding v. 22a as a separate command, but we differ from him by combining v. 22b with vs. 23-24 as a single command. We differ from all in taking vs. 18-20 as a single command.

We present the following scheme as the one most satisfactory to ourselves:

The Introduction, Verses 11-13.

"Keep thou that which I am commanding thee to-day. Behold I am about to drive out before thee the Amorite and the Canaanite, and the Hittite and the Perizzite and the Hivite and the Jebusite. Take heed to thyself lest thou conclude a covenant with the inhabitants of the land upon which thou art about to come, lest it become a snare in thy midst. Nay their altars ye shall tear down and their *Mazzeboth* ye shall break down and their *Asherim* ye shall cut in pieces."

This introduction mentions the six chief nations of Canaan, the same as those given in the larger book of the Covenant (xxiii., 23) and also in the Deuteronomic code (Deut. xx., 17), but in each case they are in a different order. The altars were the places of sacrifice to other gods. They were unfit for the sacrifices to Jehovah. The *Mazzeboth* were stone pillars used in the worship of *Baal* the Sun god. The *Asherim* were evergreens, or pillars of evergreen wood, used in the worship of *Ashera*, the goddess of life and fertility. These were to be destroyed by tearing down, breaking down, cutting in pieces.

First Command, Verses 14-16.

"Surely ye shall not worship another God (*אל אחר*), for Jehovah, his name is zeal (*קנא*). The zealous God (*אל קנא*) is He. (Take heed) lest thou conclude a covenant with the inhabitants of the land and when they go whoring after their gods and sacrifice unto their gods, they invite thee and thou eat of their peace-offerings (*זבח*), and thou take some of their daughters for thy sons and when their daughters go whoring after their gods they make thy sons go whoring after their gods."

This command corresponds with the first of the tables of the covenant (Ex. xx., 3): "Thou shalt have no other gods (*אלהים אחרים*) before me." This command in the table has no reason attached as is the case with our first command. The reason assigned in our first command corresponds however with the reason given in the table to the

second command (Ex. xx., 5): "For I, Jehovah, thy God am a zealous God (אל קנא)" And our command uses also the word for worship (השתחיה) used in the second command of the tables (Ex. xx., 5). This favors the view that the reasons assigned in Ex. xx., 5, really belong to the first and second commands of the tables, these two being thus grouped. The view that the two were really one is opposed by the fact that our second command which follows without reasons, corresponds with the second command of the tables.

The verses of exhortation (15-16) simply unfold the meaning of קנא. As Jehovah is the husband of Israel he demands the exclusive affection and allegiance of his people. Any worship of other gods, is as a wife going away from her husband after other lovers. Any participation in their peace-offerings, or communion meals (זבח) is committing whoredom with them. It may be questioned whether the exhortation was written in the little book of the Covenant itself and whether it may not be an exhortation of Moses in connection with the delivery of the commands to the people.

Second Command, Verse 17.

"Molten gods (אלהי מסכה) thou shalt not make thee."

This corresponds with the second command of the tables (xx., 4), but without the reasons, which are here associated with the previous command, as we have seen. The second command of the tables is "Thou shalt not make thee any graven image (פסל) or any form (תמונה) of anything," &c. There we have the specification of the graven or carved image of wood, here we have the molten image of metal. Neither mention the image of stone. But in neither case are we to conclude that other images were allowed than those specified. It is in accordance with the concrete character of these early laws, that they mention a specimen of a class and do not generalize.

Third Command, Verses 18-20.

"The feast of *Mazzoth* thou shalt keep. Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread as I commanded thee, at the season of the month *Abib*; for in the month *Abib* thou didst go out from Egypt. All firstlings of the womb are mine and all thy male possessions, the firstlings of the cattle and sheep. And the firstlings of the ass thou shalt redeem with a sheep. And if thou canst not redeem it thou shalt break its neck. All the first-born of thy sons thou shalt redeem, and thou shalt not appear in my presence empty." This third command is dis-

puted as to its extent. The critics agree, so far as we know, in limiting it to v. 18, and making vs. 19-20 an additional command with reference to the first-born. We combine for these reasons: (1) There is a reference back to the institution of the feast of unleavened bread (מצות) at the Exodus. The law of the first-born is associated with that institution in the Jehovistic narrative Ex. XIII., 12 sq. as here, and there is a remarkable verbal correspondence between the two passages. Indeed this little book of the Covenant is the code of the Jehovist. It is best therefore in both cases to attach the two things together as one institution and one command. (2) There is a certain correspondence between the two decalogues as far as it goes. We have noted this in the first and second commands already considered. The next command in our series is the Sabbath law. It seems to us best to regard this command as the fourth in both decalogues. (3) The most of those who separate here two commands, combine the two great feasts of v. 22 in one command, which seems to us improper. The feasts of *Asiph* and *Shabu'oth* are as distinct from one another as the *Mazzoth* is from both of them, and the three ought to appear in three separate commands. Looking now at the command itself, we observe that it is the *Mazzoth* feast rather than the Passover that is brought into view. This is in accordance with the Jehovistic narrative (XIII., 3-10), which also lays stress on the feast of unleavened bread. The month אביב is the month of green ears, called by the Elohist the first month (XII., 18), and after the exile *Nisan*. The expression תזכר is doubtless a copyist mistake for הזכר as we rightly have it in the Jehovistic narrative (XIII., 12). The command "They shall not appear in my presence empty" is regarded by Ewald as a distinct command, but without sufficient reason. This is also found in the greater book of the Covenant (XXIII., 15) in connection with the feast of unleavened bread; but in the Deuteronomic code (Deut. XVI., 16) is extended to all the feasts. It is therefore a subordinate feature of the feasts which might appear here or elsewhere without much difference.

Fourth Command, Verse 21.

"Six days shalt thou work and on the seventh thou shalt keep Sabbath. In ploughing and reaping thou shalt keep Sabbath."

This fourth command is much briefer than the fourth of the tables. The elaborate reasons given in Ex. XX., 11, in reference to the creation of the world and in Deut. V., 14-15, with reference to the deliverance

from Egyptian bondage, are here omitted and we have no reasons at all. We note also that our command does not correspond with the first section of the fourth command in the tables. "Remember the Sabbath day to sanctify it" (Ex. xx., 8). "Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it" (Deut. v., 12), but with the following section "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of Jehovah thy God" in which both versions of the tables agree, only our fourth command even shortens that. We prefer to render שבת "to keep Sabbath" not only to correspond with the noun שבת of the tables, but also because it is more proper in itself than "rest." Our command gives an additional feature in the last sentence "In ploughing and reaping," that is in the busiest seasons of the year, when the temptation to work would be strongest, they were yet to observe the Sabbath.

Fifth Command, Verse 22a.

"And the feast of the *Shabu'oth* thou shalt observe at the first fruits of the wheat harvest."

Bertheau is the only critic, so far as we know, who makes this a separate command, and yet we do not hesitate to follow him, on account of the inherent propriety of distinguishing the three great feasts as three separate commands, and the impropriety of associating two in one command and a single one in another. This feast is called here the *Shabu'oth*, or feast of weeks, although it is mentioned as a harvest feast at the time of the first fruits of the wheat harvest. The greater book of the Covenant calls it the חג הקציר—the feast of the harvest (xxiii., 16). The Deuteronomic code (xv., 10) calls it the feast of weeks, as here.

Sixth Command, Verses 22b—24.

"And the feast of *'Asiph* at the circuit of the year (thou shalt observe). Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the face of the lord Jehovah, the God of Israel. For I will dispossess nations from thy presence, and I will make thy boundary broad in order that no one may desire thy land when thou goest up to appear in the presence of Jehovah thy God three times in the year."

The most of the critics find a new command in the summons to appear thrice a year in Jehovah's presence, but we cannot consent to this, for this command is really as much an appendix to these feasts as the command "they shall not appear in my presence empty" is an ap-

pendix to the feast of unleavened bread. In the greater book of the Covenant, the commands with reference to the three feasts are embraced in the opening: "Three times thou shalt keep feast unto me, in the year" (XXIII., 14) and the closing "Three times in the year all thy males shall appear in the presence of the lord Jehovah" XXIII., 17). Indeed the reason assigned in v. 24 as well as the command of v. 23 both belong to the three feasts, and combine the four commands respecting sacred times in a group, just as in the decalogue of the tables the first and second commands make up a group with a common reason. The third feast is called 'Asiph, =Ingathering. So also in the greater book of the Covenant (XXIII., 16). In the Deuteronomic code (XVI., 13) it is called חג הקִּבְּוֹת =feast of tabernacles. So also in the priest code (Lev. XXIII., 35). The time here specified is תְּקִיפַת הַשָּׁנָה. In the larger book of the Covenant it is בְּצֵאת הַשָּׁנָה (XXIII) in the going forth of the year.

Seventh Command, Verse 25a.

"Thou shalt not slaughter with leavened bread (חֻמֵּץ) the blood of my peace-offering (זֶבַח)."

Eighth Command, Verse 25b.

"And the peace-offering (זֶבַח) of the feast of the Passover shall not remain until morning."

These are separate commands as Bértheau and Wellhausen rightly decide. If they were one we would expect the qualification "feast of the Passover" to be attached to the first use of זֶבַח and not the second, where it is. The combination would favor the reference of both commands to the Passover-offering; but really the first זֶבַח is unqualified and is general, and refers to all peace-offerings. The unleavened bread of the seventh command is not the unleavened bread of the *Mazzoth* feast but the unleavened bread of the *Mincha* (מִנְחָה) which accompanies the זֶבַח in accordance with Lev. II., 11. "No *Mincha* which ye bring to Jehovah shall be offered leavened (חֻמֵּץ); and again Lev. VII., 12, sq.: "Ye shall bring with the זֶבַח of the thank-offering perforated cakes unleavened (מִצוֹת) mingled with oil and wafers unleavened, anointed with oil," &c. The זֶבַח is the peace-offering for which the fuller expression is זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים. For the verb שָׁחַט, slaughter for sacrifice, the larger book of the Covenant has זָבַח offer as a sacrifice, a verb cognate to the noun זֶבַח (XXIII., 18).

The פסח of the eighth command is the Passover feast which is here incidentally referred to under the offering peculiar to the feast. The Passover sacrifice was indeed a special kind of זבח. The command here corresponds with that of the Elohist narrative, Ex. XII., 10. only the phraseology is entirely different. Thus the Elohist gives us לא תותירו ממנו עד בקר. "Ye shall not leave any of it over until morning" where our Jehovistic code has: לא ילין לבקר זבח חג הפסח. "The peace-offering of the feast of the passover shall not abide till morning." The term: זבח חג הפסח indeed corresponds with the phrase peculiar to the Jehovistic narrative, Ex. XII., 27. זבח פסח. The larger book of the Covenant (XXIII., 18) has: לא ילין חלב-חגי עד בקר differing from both especially in the phrase "fat of my feast" which would not confine it to the Passover זבח.

Ninth Command, Verse 26a.

"The first of the first fruits of thy land thou shalt bring to the house of Jehovah, thy God." This is the law of first fruits. Our phrase is ראשית בכורי ארמתי. The greater book of the Covenant has exactly the same expression (XXIII., 19); but the Deuteronomic code (XXVI., 2) מראשית כל-פרי הארמה. Here there was to be selection of the first and choicest, and these were to be brought to the house of Jehovah, that is not the temple or tabernacle necessarily, but before these were erected, any place of an altar of Jehovah, in accordance with the greater book of the Covenant (XX., 24) where the name of Jehovah was recorded, or in accordance with the Deuteronomic code (XII., 13) in the place chosen by Jehovah in one of the tribes.

Tenth Command, Verse 26b.

"Thou shalt not scethe a kid (which is still) with its mother's milk."

This last command is most difficult of all. The older Protestant interpreters, Luther, Calvin, Piscator, *et al.*, thought of a limitation of the age of an animal for purposes of sacrifice. This is most suited to the context, for we have had three laws of offerings prior to it. But the Rabbinical interpretation that it is a dietary law against eating a kid in the milk of its mother has been followed by most moderns, even the A. V. The Deuteronomic code (XIV., 21) is thought to favor the latter view from the fact that it is there preceded by the command not to eat anything that dies of itself. But on the other hand, it is followed by the law of tithes and first fruits, and it may rather go with these laws

there, as it is associated with the law of first fruits here. We do not hesitate to follow the former interpretation and class this law with the three preceding as laws of offerings. **נשל** is used for cooking the portions of the animal victim that was eaten by the offerers in the communion meal of the **זבח** Ex. XXIX., 31. This then would forbid the sacrifice of suckling animals. It is true that in the larger book of the Covenant (Ex. XXII., 29) first born of animals were to be given to Jehovah on the eighth day, notwithstanding the law in Ex. XXIII., 19, corresponding exactly with ours. It is also true that in the priest code (Lev. XXII., 27) we have the more explicit statement "From the eighth day and upward it shall be accepted for an *gorban* (**קרבן**) an offering by fire unto Jehovah (**אֵשׁה**)," but notwithstanding the consensus of Rabbinical interpretation we are not sure that this amounts to any more than that as the male child was circumcised on the eighth day, so the animal on the eighth day was taken from its mother to the divine presence. It may then have been kept in the flocks and herds of the altar for subsequent use at the proper age. Indeed the **וְהָאָהָה** = "and upward," favors our view. But even if the ordinary view is taken as to the age of animals suitable for offerings, we have still to bear in mind that the various codes differ not infrequently in their prescriptions. The only mention of the sacrifice of a suckling animal, that we have observed, is in the case of Samuel (1. Sam. VII., 9). This may have been exceptional in those disorderly times. The offerings are generally of animals a year old or more, in the specifications of age that are not infrequently made.

Thus in this little book of the Covenant we have a decalogue. Three of the commands, I., II. and IV. correspond with the commands of the tables. The others are commands respecting sacred days and offerings. They may be divided into three groups (a) I.-II., the two laws of worship in general, (b) III.-VI., the laws of holy days, and (c) VI.-X., the laws of offerings. It is therefore a decalogue of worship as compared with the decalogue of the tables which is a decalogue of Holy conduct. They may well have been each in its way at the root of the Covenant of Jehovah with Israel. The one was written by Jehovah himself upon two tables as the tables of the Covenant, the other was written by Moses in a writing as a book of the Covenant.