

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR,

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LIX.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1927

702ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 30TH, 1927,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. CHARLES GARDNER, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the Election of the following as Associates:—Herbert Brand John, Esq., and the Rev. Canon A. R. H. Grant, D.D., C.V.O.

In the absence of Professor R. Dick Wilson, D.D., his paper on "The Radical Criticism of the Psalter" was read by the HON. SECRETARY.

THE RADICAL CRITICISM OF THE PSALTER.

By PROFESSOR R. DICK WILSON, D.D.,
Princeton Theological Seminary, U.S.A.

BY the radical criticism of the Psalter, I mean such criticism as has been devoted to the overthrow of the traditional view of the date and authorship of the Psalms, individually and collectively. In this short paper, I shall confine myself to a consideration of the attack of the critics upon the *prima facie* evidence of the Psalter as represented in the headings.

This is the most important and far-reaching of the attacks that have been made upon the historical character of the Psalter. If, as many critics assert, it is a fact that the headings are absolutely untrustworthy, it follows that the dates and occasions of the Psalms as well as the purpose for which they were composed are also, in large measure, purely conjectural. For no one can

deny that upon the face of them about two-thirds of the Psalms claim in the headings to have been written by certain persons or schools, and that many of them give further information about the occasion or purpose of the composition and about other matters of importance. What, then, is the evidence for and against these *prima facie* claims of the headings?

In answering this question, I shall present first the arguments from analogy based upon (1) extra-Biblical literature, and (2) the prose and poetical literature of the Old Testament outside the Psalter; then I shall proceed to consider (3) whether these headings can have been written at or near the time which the *prima facie* evidence indicates, (4) whether there is any inconsistency between the headings and the contents of the Psalms to which they are a superscription, and (5) whether the headings of the Psalms can have been handed down from the time indicated in the headings and what probability there is that they have been handed down accurately.

I.—HEADINGS IN ORIENTAL LITERATURE IN GENERAL.

(A) It is an almost universal custom in Sumerian, Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian to give a superscription or subscription, stating the author, purpose, and often the date and source of the document:

1. In Sumerian royal inscriptions, *e.g.* "To Ningirsu the powerful champion of Inlil, Urbau the patesi of Lagash," and "In the house of Ningirsu, his king, the statue of Gudea the patesi of Lagash."*

2. In the Babylonian royal inscriptions, *e.g.* "I, Hammurabi, the mighty king, king of Babylon . . . when Anu and Bel gave me the rule over Shumer and Accad . . . dug the Hammurabi canal,"† etc. Of the legal inscriptions from the time of Hammurabi, it may be said that in general they give the object of sale, the names of the contracting parties of the business, the agreements, the oath, the names of the witnesses and the

* Jensen in *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* (abbreviated as *KB*), III, 1, 19, 27. Thureau-Dangin, *Die Sumerischen und Akkadischen Königsinschriften*. So, also, in the numerous contract and other inscriptions written in Sumerian (Thureau-Dangin, *id.*).

† *KB*, III, 1, 123.

date of the contract.* The Babylonian letters always give the name of the writer and of the addressee.†

3. In the Assyrian royal inscriptions, *e.g.* "I, Ramman-nirari, the illustrious prince . . . when the sirlala (?) of the temple of Ashur . . . was fallen . . . built it anew . . . Month Muhur-ilani, day 20, the archonate of Shalmaneser."‡ Compare the following from Ashurbanipal: "In the first year of my reign grasped I the *sissiktu* of the great god (Marduk) . . . and prayed to his godhead: Remember Babylon,"§ etc. For the headings in the Assyrian contracts, *see* Johns, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents*; and for the Assyrian letters, *see* Harper's *Assyrian Letters*.

4. In Egyptian, we have royal, biographical and contractual documents from as early as Senefru of the IIIrd dynasty.|| Thus Khufu of the IVth dynasty begins one of his inscriptions: "Life of Horus: Mager, king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Khufu, found the house of Isis and built his pyramid beside the temple."¶ From the reign of Senefru comes the biography of Methen, the earliest of that long and numerous series of biographies, which were doubtless the prototype from a literary point of view of the biographies of Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph. The earliest longer biography is that of Uni under Pepi I of the VIth dynasty. He begins his inscription by saying that he was Uni, chamber-attendant under the majesty of Teti and prophet under Pepi, afterwards becoming judge and general-in-chief.** Nekonekh, a steward of the palace during the Vth dynasty, made a testament in favour of his children, in which he endowed them with two pieces of land which King Menkure had conveyed to him.††

The adding of a date to documents begins as early, at least, as the time of Khafre of the IVth dynasty. Thus, the will of Nekure, the king's son, is dated: "1 year of the twelfth (occurrence) of the numbering,"‡‡ etc. Again in the Vth dynasty one of the Sinai inscriptions of King Dedkere is dated in the "year after the fourth occurrence of the numbering."§§

For Egyptian letters, *see* the Tel-Amarna tablets as edited

* Schorr, *Altbabylonische Rechtskunde*, XXXI.

† King, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*.

‡ *KB*, I, 4-9.

§ Streck, *Assurbanipal*, II, 265.

|| *See* Breasted, *Egypt*, I, p. 75 f.

¶ *Id.*, p. 85.

** *Id.*, pp. 135-44.

†† *Id.* p. 101.

‡‡ *Id.*, p. 89.

§§ *Id.*, p. 120; *see also* p. 137.

by Winckler or by Knudtzon, and the letters of Pepi II of the VIth dynasty* and of Sesostriis III,† and of many others.‡

(B) Now that these ascriptions of authorship were not confined to royal decrees, to contracts, and to letters, but were given to poetical compositions, also, is evident from the following testimonies :—

The teaching of Amenemhet I (2000–1970 B.C., according to Breasted, *Egypt*, I, p. 222) has the heading : “ Beginning with the teaching, which the majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt; Sehetepibre, son of Re: Amenemhet triumphant, composed : “ He saith for his son.”§ Of this composition, Breasted says : “ There is no serious reason why it should not be attributed to the old king, whose ‘ teaching ’ the introduction distinctly states it is.” Further, he adds, “ there seems to be no chronological order . . . in the historical statements,” and says that “ there is no reason to doubt their truth.”

The Tale of Sinuhe is “ a piece of fine writing in poetical form, which breathes an air of reality.” The only date in the poem is the year 30, second month of the first season, on the 7th day when Amenemhet I “ ascended to heaven.” The tale begins with the heading : “ Hereditary prince, count, wearer of the royal seal, sole companion, judge, local governor, king (among) the Beddwin, real confident of the king, his beloved, the attendant, Sinuhe, saith,” etc.||

The list of the good works of Sesostriis II is contained in a poem with the heading : “ Year 3, third month of the first season, day —, under the majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkere, son of Re, Sesostriis triumphant,” etc.¶

The hereditary prince, Sehetepibre, wrote a poem in the reign of Sesostriis III, which is preceded by an enumeration of the prince’s titles and honours, followed by the heading : “ The beginning of the teaching which he (*i.e.* the prince) composed for his children.”**

The hymn of Thutmose I, also, begins with a heading giving the date and the title of the king, and the hymn itself narrates his principal wars.††

* See Breasted, *Egypt*, I, p. 350.

† *Id.*, V, p. 140.

|| *Id.*, p. 233.

** *Id.*, p. 326.

† *Id.*, p. 363 f.

§ *Id.*, I, p. 230.

¶ *Id.*, p. 242.

†† *Id.*, II, p. 29.

The hymn of victory of Thutmose III has the heading : " Utterance of Amon-Re, lord of Thebes ; Thou comest to me, thou excellest, seeing my beauty, O my son, my avenger, Menkheperre (*i.e.* Thutmose III), living forever."* This hymn refers to all of the principal campaigns of this great king.

The hymn of Amon begins : " Utterance of Amon, king of gods : My son, of my body, my beloved, Nibmare (*i.e.* Amen-hotep III),"† etc.

Compare the heading in the Utterance of Amon-Re, lord of Thebes to Menmare (Seti I),‡ and the Utterance of Ramses II to Osiris, and especially the poem which the scribe Pentewere (Pentaur) made, or copied, from a writing in the " year 9 ; second month of the third season, day —, of Ramses II."§

The celebrated hymn of Merneptah is headed " year 5, third month of the third season, third day . . . of Merneptah," and concludes with the strophe :

" The kings are overthrown, saying ' salam ! '
 Not one holds up his head among the nine bows.
 Wasted is Tehenu,
 Kheta is pacified,
 Plundered is the Canaan, with every evil
 Carried off is Askalon,
 Seized upon is Gezer.
 Yenoam is made as a thing not existing,
 Israel is desolated,
 His seed is not ;
 Palestine has become a widow for Egypt
 All lands are united, they are pacified ;
 Every one that is turbulent is bound by King
 Merneptah, given up like Re, every day."||

In the psalms used in the Babylonian temple services, some of them going back to 3000 B.C., we find two, at least bearing the name of the author.¶ These psalms frequently have subscriptions (corresponding to the superscriptions of the Hebrew Psalter) giving the name of the god addressed, the instruments

* See Breasted, *Egypt*, II, p. 263. † *Id.*, II, p. 361.

‡ *Id.*, III, p. 56 f.

§ *Id.*, p. 142.

|| *Id.*, III, pp. 259-64.

¶ Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, VIII, pp. 286, 317.

of music employed, the character of the psalm, and the name of the copyist, and the date when the copy was made.*

The hymn of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, made about 650 B.C., contains in the heading the name of the god, the occasion of the hymn, the author's name.†

The poems of Homer, whenever written, were probably composed as early as the year 1000 B.C. (the time of David and Solomon), and, as far as we have information, were always and rightly ascribed to Homer. So, also, with the poems of Hesiod and Tyrtæus, all from about the time of Isaiah.‡

It is vain to appeal to the anonymous character of many of the Arabic poems collected in the *Hamasa* or Anthology of Abu Tamman in the ninth century A.D. All admit that fifty, or more, of the Hebrew Psalms are anonymous. The question is, could some of them, or half or more of them, have been correctly ascribed to David, Solomon, Moses and others? The fact that many, or even most, of the early Arabic poems are anonymous, does not prove that the poems ascribed by Abu Tamman to Nabigha, Antara, Tarafa, Labid, and other pre-Islamic poets, were not rightly so ascribed. So, also, that some of the authors of some of the Syriac and Greek poems are unknown does not show that it was not the usage of the poets who wrote in these languages to affix their names to their compositions. It is not fair to argue from the fact that the Psalms of Solomon have headings, and that it was the custom of the times immediately preceding or following the birth of Christ to use them, that the headings of the Psalms of David must have been invented then. For, first, since the headings are nearly all found in the Septuagint in a substantially literal version, there can be no reasonable doubt that the Psalms of David and their headings, however late, come earlier than the Psalms of Solomon. Secondly, the Syriac version of the Psalms of Solomon omits the headings. Thirdly, the Odes of Solomon, at least in the only copies we have of them, have no headings. Fourthly, there is a uniformity in the headings of the Psalms of Solomon which indicates a single author of all of them; whereas, there are forty-nine different varieties of the headings of the

* Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, VIII, *passim in loc.*

† *Id.*, p. 176.

‡ Munro and Allen, in the article "Homer," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

Psalms of David.* Fifthly, the Psalms of Solomon in Greek employ the dative of the article uniformly before Solomon, whereas the best Greek MSS. of the Septuagint use the genitive. Lastly, a great number of the hymns in the hymn-books of all of our churches are anonymous; but, nevertheless, no one doubts that most of them are correctly ascribed to such authors as Bonar, Dix, Doddridge, Faber, Havergal, Kelly, Longfellow, Lynch, Montgomery, Palmer, Toplady, Watts, the Wesleys, Winkworth, Wordsworth, and others.

II.—THE ANALOGY OF THE REST OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Moreover, the analogy of the Hebrew literature of the Old Testament would lead us to expect that the poetry would have headings. Nearly all of the books have headings; and even chapters have frequently a special heading. There are at least ten special headings in Genesis; every one of the twenty separate legal documents of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy has a superscription or subscription expressly attributing it to Moses, and in many instances specifying time and place; † the longer books of the prophets have headings with names and dates, and chapters often have statements of the subject-matter of the following section frequently accompanied with data concerning the time and place of the delivery. ‡

That, according to the *prima facie* evidence, headings of Psalms were common in all ages of Hebrew poetry is evident from the following instances recorded in the Scriptures:—§

1. The blessing of Jacob, recorded in Gen. xlix, begins: "And Jacob called unto him his sons," etc.; Amenemhet I begins

* See *The Princeton Theological Review (P.T.R.)*, 1926, p. 34.

† See further, my *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, p. 41 f.

‡ There is a remarkable similarity between the datings of the early Biblical documents and of those of Babylon and Egypt. For example, in Gen. ix, 28, and x, 32, we find the phrase "after the flood." Compare this with the dating of the years of the reign of Sumuilu (the second king of the dynasty of which Hammurabi was the sixth), "the year in which the city of Kish was destroyed," "the year after that in which the city of Kish was destroyed," and so on to "the fourth year after that in which the city of Kish was destroyed." (King, *op. cit.*, p. 217.) Compare the three similar datings of the years of Samsu-iluna, the successor of Hammurabi (*id.*, p. 247).

§ See *P.T.R.*, 1926, p. 33.

with the words: "He saith . . . for his son"; and Sesostris III begins his poem: "The teaching which he composed for his children."

2. Exod. xv, 1, begins: "Moses and the children of Israel sang this song to Jehovah."

3. In Num. xxiii, 7, we read that Balaam "took up his parable and said, Balak the king of Moab hath brought me from Aram," etc. (Cp. Num. xxiii, 18; xxiv, 3).

4. In Deut. xxxi, 30, we read: "Moses spake" the words of chap. xxxii.

5. In Deut. xxxiii, 1, it is said: "This is the blessing with which Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death."

6. In Judges v, 1, it is said: "Then sang Deborah and Barak."

7. In 1 Sam. ii, 1, it is said: "Hannah prayed and said"; then follows the poetical prayer.

8. In 2 Sam. it is said: "David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and Jonathan."

9. In 2 Sam. xxii, 1, it is said: "David spake the words of this song in the day that the Lord delivered him," etc.

10. According to Jonah ii, 2, Jonah prayed and said in poetry verses 3-10.

11. In Habakkuk iii, 1, the superscription reads: "The prayer of Habakkuk, the prophet, upon Shigionoth."

12. The Book of Proverbs begins with the title: "The proverbs of Solomon the son of David, king of Israel." Chap. x has the heading: "The proverbs of Solomon." Chap. xxv begins: "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out." Chaps. xxx and xxxi also have special headings.

13. The Song of Songs begins: "The Song of Songs which is Solomon's."

14. In 1 Chron. xvi, 7, we read: "Then in that day (*i.e.* the day when, according to v. 1, they brought the ark of God and set it in the midst of the tent), David delivered first *this psalm* to thank the Lord into the hand of Asaph and his brethren."

15. In 1 Chron. xxix, 10, we read: "David blessed the Lord before all the congregation: and David said, Blessed be thou," etc.

16. Isa. v begins: "I will sing now to my well beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard."

17. Isa. xii begins: "And thou shalt say in that day: I will praise thee, O Lord," etc.

18. Isa. xxxviii, 9, says: "The writing of Hezekiah king of Judah, when he had been sick and was recovered of his sickness."

III.—THE DATES OF THE PSALM HEADINGS.

Having thus shown by analogy that headings for some at least of the Psalms are to be expected, it is proper to inquire, first, whether there is anything in the headings found in the Hebrew Psalter that shows that these headings cannot have been original or true? Having already shown by the analogy of the Egyptian and Babylonian hymns that headings of such literature were in vogue long before the time of Moses, and that the Scriptures outside the Psalter ascribe poetical writings to Jacob, Moses, Deborah, David, and others, it is only necessary to show further that there is no indication in the language of the headings, or of the Psalms headed by them, that will controvert the *prima facie* evidence of the headings themselves. The treatment of the headings may for purposes of investigation be divided into a consideration of the authors, aims, dates, and occasions, kinds of psalms, musical instruments, directions to the choir, and references of various kinds. Owing to the limitation of time and space allowed in this paper, I shall confine myself to the seventy-three psalms ascribed in our *Textus Receptus* to David.

1. Probably, no one who knows anything about the history of Israel and the rise of kingdoms will deny that there was a David; nor does there seem to be any sufficient reason for denying that he lived the life described in the Books of Samuel. The Jews and Christian scholars of all ages have seen no incongruity between the life and the Psalms. Since most of the commentators become eloquent with praise of the lament over Saul and Jonathan (which they commonly assign to his

authorship), it must be admitted that he ranked high as a poet, even if that lament had been his only production.

2. The aim of all the Psalms is to give glory to God, the Shepherd and King, the Help and Comforter, the Hope in life and in death of all who trust in Him. Such aims are timeless. Moses, Isaiah, David, may have had them in their time as well as any of the heroes of Maccabean or later times.*

3. It is alleged as an objection to the genuineness of the titles that they frequently agree with statements made in the Books of Samuel. This is certainly no proof against their genuineness. But suppose the opposite were the case, that the occasions stated in the headings disagreed with the events recorded in Samuel? How quickly the critics would seize upon the discrepancies as evidence against the titles.†

4. That musical instruments are mentioned in the headings is in harmony with what we find in the subscriptions of the Sumerian psalms.‡

5. Since many kinds of psalms were recognized by the Sumerians as early as the time of Abraham, there is no reason for doubting that the songs of Israel, also, may have been designated by more specific terms such as *maskil*, *miktam*, etc., as early as the time of David.§

6. The fact that the directions to the choir and various other notes were not understood, even at the time when the Septuagint-translation was made, testifies to the probability that these directions and notes were so ancient that their exact meaning had already, as early as the second century B.C., passed from the memory of the Jews. The further fact that many of the most important of the words in these notes and directions do not occur in the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, the Zadokite Fragments, or of the Talmud, adds conclusiveness to the supposition that they were not of late origin.

Some words, it would appear, had already ceased to convey an assured sense to the Jewish translators of the Septuagint, and of the later versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the

* *P.T.R.*, 1926, p. 368.

† *Id.*, 1926, p. 391 f.

‡ See Langdon, *op. cit.*, and *P.T.R.*, 1926, p. 360.

§ *P.T.R.*, 1926, p. 353.

Syriac Peshitto, and the Latin of Jerome. This would not have been the case with so many words, if the headings had been added to the Psalms only a short time before they were translated into Greek, nor if they had been directions intended for the singers of the Second Temple whose ministrations had been continuous from the times of Zerubbabel, or Ezra, or Simon I. It is a most extraordinary fact that most of these words are not found in use in the Hebrew of the Talmud, and that some of them are pointed differently in the *Textus Receptus* from the way they were read by the early translators. Ancient technical terms in use in the service of the First Temple may have ceased to convey a meaning; but how could these technical terms have been added after the Captivity and the knowledge of their meaning had passed completely out of the minds of men before the time of the Maccabees? Are we to suppose that the alleged editors of the Psalms who inserted the headings had so little common sense as to put in a lot of words and phrases and notes that no one understood? These are questions for the radical critics to answer. As for us, in view of the proved general accuracy of the Old Testament records where they can be tested, it seems that the only proper conclusion as to the headings is that they were in the time-honoured standard copies of Psalms which had been handed down from before the destruction of the First Temple, and that the learned Jews who made the early translations were already ignorant of their meaning; but, recognizing them as an integral part of the copies before them, did their best to render them. The ignorance of the translators is no argument against the accuracy of the records preserved in the headings; much less is it a reason why we to-day should reject the headings as late, un-historical and valueless. So far as any one *knows*, they are original, historical, and true.

IV.—THE HEADINGS AND THE CONTENTS OF THE PSALMS.

There is said to be an inconsistency between the headings and the contents of the Psalms which follow. This assertion is based upon (1) the alleged character of the vocabulary which is assumed to contain Aramaic and Hebrew words, especially words for God, that could not have been used in Hebrew documents as early as the headings indicate; and (2) upon psychological or philological considerations, or æsthetic judgments, which are derived from the presumption that David or some other

writer would not, or could not, have written such a composition, at least on such an occasion as that mentioned in the heading.

1. As to the first of these assertions, I have attempted to show in my article on Aramaisms in the Old Testament* that Aramaisms may have been employed in a Hebrew document as early as the time of David, and that most of the words called Aramaisms are not Aramaisms at all;† and as to the allegedly late Hebrew words (which, being found also in the Talmud, are supposed to point to a late date of an Old Testament document containing them), I have shown by my collection of such words that they occur in every book of the Old Testament and in all parts, except *mirabile dictu* in Isa. xxiv–xxvii, Prov. xxx, 1–9, Zech. iii, and the Asaph Ps. lxxix, all of which are supposed by the critics to be among the latest parts of the books to which they belong! In fact, aside from manifestly and demonstrably foreign words, it is impossible, with our present knowledge of the history of the Hebrew language, to determine the date or authorship of any Hebrew document upon the basis of the vocabulary contained in it.‡ These statements about the vocabulary are most fallacious when they are based upon the use of the words for the deity that are found in Old Testament documents. In a series of articles published in the *Princeton Theological Review* for 1919–21, I have collected all the names of God from the Koran, the New Testament, the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical works of the Jews, and from the Old Testament. In an article in the same *Review* for January, 1927, I have applied the results of my collection to the Psalms, with the conclusion that not one of the numerous statements made with regard to the date of the Psalms is true, in so far as it is based upon the use of any particular name for God. The worst of all the illusions on this subject are those put forth by Professor Cheyne in his Bampton Lectures for 1889. There is absolutely no foundation in literature for his statements that such words or phrases as “the Name,” “the Holy One,” “Jah” (or “Yah”), “Elyon,” and “Shaddai” are signs of lateness, much less of Maccabean times; and his statements as to the words for “Lord” and “God” are mostly absurd and groundless assumptions.

* *P.T.R.* for April, 1925.

† *Id.* for January, 1926.

‡ *Id.*, 1926, p. 22.

2. The allusions in the Psalms do not favour a late origin. Of the seventy-three proper names of countries, rivers, cities, mountains, and persons, occurring in the body of the Psalms, there is not one which could not have been used by David.* None of the kings later than Solomon are mentioned and none of the prophets later than Samuel. Persia and Greece are passed by in silence. The kings of Assyria, Babylon, Persia, the names of Alexander and his successors, are ignored, as well as those of Hezekiah, Josiah, and the Maccabees. It has been assumed from the use in it of *mo'ed*, to denote a "place of meeting," that Ps. lxxiv is Maccabean. Since this word does not occur in any other place in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, it is difficult to determine when it may have been used first. The word does not occur in this sense in any other language, dialect, or place, but always in the sense of a set time or festival. That there were such places of assembly at an early date seems evident from Joshua xviii, 1; xxii, 12, where the people were gathered together at Shiloh, and Num. xvi, 42, where the congregation was gathered together. Of course, the place where they were gathered might be called a *mo'ed*, a "place of assembly," the *edah* being called together at the *mo'ed*.

The allusion to a "captivity" in the Psalms is no evidence of origin later than the capture of Jerusalem. For, first, of the two words used in Hebrew to denote the idea of "captivity," *gala* and its derivatives are never found in the Psalter; *shava*, also, is never found in the Psalter, and *shevuth*, the only one of its derivatives which is found, occurs only in xiv, 7; (liii, 7); lxxxv, 2; cxxvi, 4. This word is found also in Hos. vi, 11; Amos ix, 14; Zeph. ii, 7; iii, 20; Deut. xxx, 3. Evidently, there were numerous captives and captivities before the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

Again, whereas king and Pharaoh are mentioned, why do we never find *pahath*, *sagan*, or *satrap*, or any Greek title of ruler? Why, also, is there no mention of phalanx or elephant, nor of Rome or Sparta, words which characterize the book of First Maccabees; nor any direct and certain trace of any knowledge of the great wars of freedom fought by the noble sons of Mattathias? And why is no High Priest ever alluded to by name? Josephus gives the names of fifteen High Priests from

* *P.T.R.*, January, 1926, pp. 11-13.

Jeshua to the year 150 B.C., and Ben Sira eulogizes at length one of the Simons; but the Psalms refer only to Aaron (nine times) and to Phinehas (twice).

Finally, the things for which men fought and died, from Zerubbabal to the days of Judas Maccabæus, are scarcely noticed in the Psalms. The Sabbath is never mentioned, except in the heading of Ps. lxii. The Passover, Tabernacles, and Purim are never referred to, and the pilgrim festivals (*haggim*) but twice. The *korban*, the heave-offering, and wave-offering, and the fire-offering do not occur; and the word for law (outside of cxix) never is found in Books II and V. Besides, the common word for singer (*meshorer*), used twenty-eight times in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, is never employed in the Psalter, but in its stead, *sharim*, a word found also in 2 Sam. xix, 35; 1 Kings x, 12.

V.—THE TEXT OF THE HEADINGS.

Lastly, let us consider whether the headings have been, or may have been, handed down from the time that the *prima facie* evidence indicates.

1. It is a noteworthy fact that there can be no doubt about the accuracy with which the text of the headings of the Psalms has been transmitted to us from the time when the earliest translation known to us was made about 200 B.C. As far as the Hebrew manuscripts and editions up to A.D. 1526 are concerned, we find that Kennicott and De Rossi give for about four hundred of them the collations of variants from the *Textus Receptus*. These collations show that the phrase "by David" occurring in the heading of seventy-three Psalms is probably in all cases correct. The phrase is omitted eleven times in MS. 133; ten times in MSS. 93, 111; five times in MS. 171; twice each in MSS. 173, 180, 238; and once each in MSS. 89, 117, 148, 214 of Kennicott, and MSS. 554, 640, 645, 680 and 874 of De Rossi; and it is added once in MSS. 30, 128, 219, 253 of Kennicott, and in MS. 551 of De Rossi. Altogether, there is an omission of the phrase in any MS. only in twenty-one of the Psalms and an addition in only two. There is one omission, or more, in only fifteen of Kennicott's MSS., and in five additional ones collated by De Rossi; and additions in four of Kennicott's and one of De Rossi's, making a variation, or more, in only twenty-five out of four hundred MSS.

Again, since "by David" should occur at the head of seventy-three Psalms in each one of the MSS., it follows that we ought to have the phrase 400 times 73, or 29,200 times in all. It appears to have been omitted fifty-one times altogether; or once in 582 times.

Further, if we judge of the value of the testimony by the age of the MSS., we find that the only MSS. dated by Kennicott before A.D. 1200 that have any omission are No. 180, which omits "by David" in Pss. cxxii and cxxiv; No. 89, which omits it in Ps. lxvii; and No. 214, which omits it in Ps. lxvii. Since Nos. 89 and 214 are among the poorest of the MSS. with regard to general accuracy, it is obvious that their testimony is comparatively valueless. So that it appears that the witness of the Hebrew manuscripts of the Psalter, so far as the authorship by David of seventy-three Psalms is concerned, is overwhelmingly and in most cases unanimously in favour of the text of the received Hebrew Bible. In almost all, if not all, cases, MS. Kennicott 222 seems to have omitted the headings. It is a wonder that more of the Psalters have not done so, especially since they no longer convey a clear meaning and afford little aid in the singing of the Psalms.

In the primary versions, we find:—

(1) In the Aramaic Targum, "David" is omitted in the texts of Walton and Lagarde, though found in that of the Paris edition, from Pss. cxxii, cxxxi, and cxxxiii.

(2) Jerome's version is the same as the Hebrew, except that in some MSS. of Ps. xxii "of David" is omitted.

(3) The fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotian agree with the Hebrew, except that Aquila and Symmachus omit David in Ps. cxxxvii (cxxxviii).

(4) As to the authors of the Psalms as given in the Peshitto-Syriac version, the following may be said:—

(a) The Ambrosian Codex and the Sachau MS. ascribe all the Psalms to David.

(b) The Ooroomiah Psalter ascribes twenty-four Psalms to David, and the Mosul edition twenty-six.

(c) The Paris and London Polyglotts omit "David" in five Psalms and add it in seventeen (thirteen of them being found also in the LXX). The condition and history of the

Peshitto text are such as to make it impossible to use the present editions as witnesses of the original Hebrew text of the headings of the Psalter.*

(5) The Greek Septuagint omits one author given in the Hebrew (*i.e.* Solomion) in Ps. cxxvi (cxxvii); and one MS. or another adds the author in about twenty cases. Most of this testimony as to the variation of the LXX from the Hebrew is rendered doubtful by the fact that one or more of the ancient versions from the LXX are found in almost every case to agree with the Hebrew as against the Greek.

2. It being certain, then, that the headings of the Psalms have been handed down with substantial correctness from 200 B.C. to the present time, the further question arises: Is it probable that headings written in the time of David, or even of Jacob and Moses, may have transmitted without material changes down to the time when the Greek Septuagint was made? We think that it is for the following reasons:—

(a) Parts of the classics have been handed down from pre-Christian times with almost absolute agreement with the best texts of our best editors.

(b) There are Babylonian documents still existing in two copies made at 1,500 years apart, in which the variations are few and unimportant.

(c) Parts of the Egyptian Book of the Dead, though we have five independent copies written from 3000 B.C. to the time of the Ptolemies, are found to be exactly the same in all the copies.†

(d) It is certain that the spelling of proper names of the Old Testament agrees absolutely in almost every case with the spelling of the words in contemporaneous documents outside the Bible.

(e) Lastly, as an *ad hominem* argument, let me say that there never has been a critic who did not proceed on the assumption that every word and even letter of the Old

* *P.T.R.*, July, 1926.

† *A Scientific Investigation, etc.*, p. 93 *f.*

Testament text as found in our *Textus Receptus* is correct, whenever it suits the critic so to do. This affords a presumption in favour of the Hebrew text in common use, which the radical and destructive critics have striven in vain to overcome. The question of the trustworthiness of the headings of the Psalms is bound up inextricably with that of the headings of all prose and of all the other poetical works of the Old Testament. To maintain successfully that these headings are in general false is to fly in the face of the *prima facie* evidence of all the literature of the Bible, and of all the analogies of nearly all the literature of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Persia, Greece, Rome, Arabia and Syria. Let us rest the case upon the facts and the evidence.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS.

The CHAIRMAN said that the paper was for experts, and he would like to hear a body of experts debating on it. He could not claim to be an expert himself on the Psalms. His studies in criticism had led him more into the New Testament, and after years of study he had reached certain conclusions.

One conclusion was, that the critics almost always approached the Scriptures with a pre-supposition in their minds. For this reason, very much of the criticism might be met, not by going outside the Bible, but by letting the Bible tell its own story and illuminate its own dark places by its central light. The moment one is willing to admit the supernatural, the Bible is seen to have a wonderful unity of its own.

Dr. Dick Wilson's paper shows what a great amount of internal evidence there is. His way of dealing with the headings of the Psalms shows real wit, and his criticism of the critics is witty in the best sense of the word. There was not time to point out all the good things, but it was certainly very striking that there should be no anachronisms in the Psalms and their headings. This was more than a negative argument; it amounted to a strong positive argument for their traditional place.

The Chairman proposed a warm vote of thanks to Dr. Dick Wilson for his paper and the light it threw on a subject that very few, outside of experts, knew anything about.

THE MUSICAL TITLES OF THE PSALMS.

Dr. THIRTLE, as an invited speaker, followed with an address, in which he said: The subject before us is one of great importance in Biblical criticism, and one which for long years has exercised many minds. In his paper, Dr. Dick Wilson has placed before us facts not generally known, and not duly recognized, regarding the ancient practice of supplying documents with titles; and with comparative ease he has proceeded to show that a like feature is distinctive in regard to constituent sections—some long, some short—of the Old Testament Scriptures. In particular, he has brought before us the inscriptions standing over the Psalms; a feature of the Psalter which only too frequently has been treated as possessing little or no authority; in fact, expositors have shown a disposition to pass by the inscriptions altogether, as though they have no claim for consideration. In conclusion, Dr. Dick Wilson has argued that as the inscriptions stand in the text, they must be received.

It does not appear that, in some particulars, the inscriptions make a well-defined appeal to the Lecturer's mind, for his paper, while clear in its treatment of the literary titles, makes no contribution to an understanding of the problems involved in what are known as the Musical Titles, associated with the formula "To the Chief Musician." Notwithstanding this apparent neglect, however, Dr. Dick Wilson finds no difficulty in urging the implicit acceptance of the inscriptions upon those to whom, in essential details, they bring no cogent message. For example, words that, in days gone by, were "explained" to mean musical instruments, to be symbolical of choir-masters, to stand for the names of tunes, and to serve as catchwords of old songs, and are still the sport of lexicographers and commentators, come to us with little help offered on the part of Dr. Dick Wilson.

While, after the manner of the Lecturer, conservative scholars have urged acceptance of the titles without distinction, and, what is more, without exception, notwithstanding unsolved questions, it has seemed to be inevitable that others should follow a different course. A generation ago, after a minute examination of Jewish thought on the subject, a distinguished Jewish scholar, Adolph Neubauer, dealing in particular with the Musical Titles, declared that their meaning was "early lost"; and with this the great

Franz Delitzsch agreed: "The key to their comprehension must have been lost very early." Neubauer proceeded to add that the Septuagint and the other early Greek and Latin translators offered no satisfactory explanation of most of the titles; and herein he was right, as the gatherings given to us in the paper just read abundantly show. While it is clear that Dr. Dick Wilson knows of the existence of the Musical Titles, yet he gives us no sort of lead as to an understanding of them. Were he present to-day, I would ask him some questions, for the reason that his paper, as I must repeat, offers no solution of the problem as a whole, and in a manner that can appeal with strength and candour to the inquiring mind. In brief, he says: "The analogies of other literatures show that the inscriptions are proper; and as the inscriptions are in the sacred text, although they may lack meaning, we must accept them, approve them!"

DISCRIMINATION OF INSCRIPTIONS.

For myself, I can say nothing of the kind. Because certain terms, admittedly technical in character, coming from ancient times, have proved a source of confusion among scholars, who have reached no agreement as to their meaning or application, I, for my part, see no reason for a quiet contentment in face of ignorance, admitted and declared. My disposition to-day is the same as it was when, over twenty years ago, I gave to this problem a treatment as elaborate as that furnished by Dr. Dick Wilson, and, what is more, I brought to the consideration of the subject facts and observations regarding literary composition and book transmission in by-gone days, which seem to have received little attention at the hands of Dr. Dick Wilson.

I may not now, in discussing his paper and not submitting a paper myself, go into details beyond saying that, in the matter of the Psalms inscriptions, I discovered an element of confusion in the Hebrew text as it has come down to us, and I demonstrated the fact to the satisfaction of a host of scholars in many lands. Let me explain: I found that certain words, introduced by the clause "To the Chief Musician," which originally followed individual Psalms, had, in the course of time, been amalgamated with other words which rightly stood over the Psalms which immediately followed them. The result was a fault in the transmission of the

text. A typical case may be instanced :—At the top of Ps. lv we read : “ Maschil of David,” a literary description of the Psalm which followed. That inscription is in its right place. At the close of that Psalm, that is, Ps. lv, there should have stood : “ To the Chief Musician, on Jonath elem rehokim ”—“ the dove of the distant terebinths.” This latter formula, however, in the Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, and in translations of the Psalter based thereon, stands over Ps. lvi, another Psalm of David. Is there any sort of response to this Musical Title with its dove catchword in Ps. lvi ? None whatever ! But look again at Ps. lv, and find “ the dove of the distant terebinths ” specifically mentioned in v. 6 : “ Oh, that I had wings like a dove, for then would I fly away and be at rest : then would I wander far off,” etc. ; and in v. 17, as though enriching the figure, we meet with the “ cooing ” of the dove.

Here, then, we have one of many Psalms in which the constituent features of a Temple Psalm—with *superscription* as to author and *subscription* as to musical use—are completely vindicated ; and if we go back to days when the Psalms followed one another in unbroken succession, with nothing between but the inscriptions—no numbering being expressed—we can easily realize how it was that the *subscription* lines became amalgamated with the *superscript* lines, with complete and persistent confusion as the result. With this form of things in mind, I scrutinized the entire Psalter, and was satisfied that the Chief Musician note, in many cases with some appended name or catchword, *e.g.* Shoshannim, Gittith, etc., always and of right belongs as a *subscription* to the Psalm preceding that over which it has stood for two thousand years !

If argument is required to show that the Psalter in its origin must be traced back to the time of the Israelitish kingdom—and cannot have come into being in the Greek period—that proof is supplied by the fact that, when the Septuagint translation was made, say, in the second century B.C., the normal features of a Temple Psalm had passed out of knowledge ; and so it comes about that already, in the Septuagint version, the inscriptional material had become amalgamated, with results tending to deplorable misunderstanding.

Let the emergent facts be borne in mind—the formula “ To the Chief Musician,” and so forth, should appear, and in every case, as appended to the Psalm preceding that over which it actually

stands. The other titles—those that are literary, *e.g.* Psalm, Song, Prayer, Maschil, etc., often with descriptive clauses, are in their right place, and describe the Psalms over which they are found. Let it be understood, however, that the case is not one of lines being shifted, but simply one of inscriptional material having become amalgamated, instead of being discriminated. Words that should have followed a Psalm have been divided off in a mistaken way, and combined with words which belong as headings to the Psalm which succeeded. This, of course, means that the numbering figures of the successive Psalms are in their wrong place. The words attached to the musical note, as in Ps. lv—which often throw light upon the Psalm which precedes—serve no conceivable purpose when attached to the Psalm that follows. In the resultant confusion, simple words have lost their meaning, and been subjected to unprofitable speculation for long centuries.

If we would know as a fact beyond doubt and controversy the true form and features of a Hebrew Psalm, duly assigned for Temple use, we have such a Psalm within our reach, standing alone, or apart from other Psalms, and consequently so placed that it cannot have taken anything from a preceding composition nor have yielded anything to one following. I refer to the third chapter of the Prophecy of Habakkuk, which begins, *A Prayer of Habakkuk the Prophet upon Shigionoth*—this last form being a word which appears in the singular over Ps. vii—*Shiggaion*; and then this Psalm ends with words that correspond with those found so frequently in the Psalter: *To the Chief Musician on my Stringed Instruments*. Here we have the features already specified, given with clearness, because the Psalm stood alone by itself. And this harmonizes with Oriental practice in ancient times, for in the prayer-forms and songs of Assyria, as found in tablets and cylinders unearthed during recent years, there have been discovered inscriptions at the close, as well as at the beginning, of poems, and those at the close frequently bring in catchwords corresponding with those met with in the Psalms of David. I am thankful to observe that Dr. Dick Wilson makes this point clear in his paper.

Once more, let us make an inference that is obvious beyond dispute, and which tells strongly for the antiquity of the Psalter. If, in the time of the Massoretic interpreters and their predecessors, with the help of a tradition that was marvellously vital, as well as in the time

of the Septuagint translation already mentioned—and going back to the second century B.C.—there had been anything like an intimate knowledge of Israelitish practice in the matter of Temple Psalms, confusion, such as we have found and described, could not have crept into the material. How certain it thus becomes that the Psalms as compositions belong to times long anterior to the Greek period, indeed, before the time of the Exile with its synagogue religion, and go right back to the days of ancient Temple worship, the glory and simplicity of which were never recovered by the returned captives !

THE POET-KING DAVID.

I may not carry further these words of explanation. Suffice it to say that my book, *The Titles of the Psalms*, by following the clues described, furnished traces of an Israelitish Calendar and much beside in our familiar Psalter, and beyond all question secured David, the poet-king, in his proper place as the sweet singer of Israel. The book to which I refer came out in its second edition over twenty years ago, was described in numberless papers, magazines, and reviews ; was included in lists of works of research and learning, both Jewish and Christian ; was reckoned with in books of Scripture Introduction and in Bible Dictionaries—these so numerous that I have lost count of them ; and further, the positions maintained have been embodied in translations of the Psalter and of the Holy Bible, not only in Great Britain, but in Continental Europe, Central Africa, and Islands of the South Seas ; and yet, in this late day, Dr. Dick Wilson seems to be unaware that a straightforward and reasoned attack has been made on the critical position as a result of research designed to set forth the meaning of the Musical Titles, and to do so in a manner which goes far to demonstrate the authority of the inscriptions as a whole ; for the discovery of the fault makes for strength, not weakness, and, consequent upon that discovery, nothing is lost from the text.

The reasoned attack to which I refer still awaits reply. It was my privilege to unfold and maintain a point of view which has commanded the attention of scholars of world-wide fame, and it is my pleasure in this connection to recall the words of a Jewish Rabbi whose name is one to conjure with throughout the world. He wrote me to say that, in the discovery which I made, " God had

given me some of His own wisdom." That discovery, I may add, overflowed into another volume, also to be found in the library of the Victoria Institute, *Old Testament Problems*, a book which likewise, in part, deals with the Psalter, and was also issued twenty years ago.

Vindicated and explained, shown to be not only ancient but understandable, the inscriptions of the Psalter, after due discrimination, may be accepted with confidence, and commended to others for a like place in a well-balanced mind. They take us back to the days of the Judæan kingdom, and throw light—at once national and religious—upon the Psalms with which they are connected. I am all the while with Dr. Dick Wilson in demanding respect for every title, whether literary or musical. The misunderstanding of the Musical Titles, however, has made it difficult for the more simple literary titles to be accepted; but, with the former explained, there can be less reason for the perverse to regard the latter with suspicion. With due understanding of the Musical Note, radical criticism meets its reply.

Why do I trouble the Institute with affairs that seem to be my own while discussing the paper before us? I do so, not merely to expound views that demand attention, but to show, first, how easy it is for a scholar to be one-sided in his outlook, as in this case Dr. Dick Wilson seems to have been, failing to see that work has been done in a direction that deeply concerns his own convictions; and, secondly, to show with what surprise I found, in a paper which set out with promise, no single word by which scholars could, with mental self-respect, be encouraged to accept the inscriptions of the Psalms as a whole. Surely, to receive the titles, or some of them, as dumb and unmeaning words—recall the statement of Neubauer and Delitzsch, that the key was "lost very early"—is not to occupy strong ground, either from the point of view of literary fact or of respect for Holy Scripture in its text and context.

I thank God that reckless critics have not had it all to themselves, and that Dr. Dick Wilson's failure to make substantial contribution to the problem does not mean that the case of the Psalter stands where it did so recently as twenty-five years ago. In regard to the view I have set forth, I said the first word—but not the last. It may be for Dr. Dick Wilson and others to carry to a still greater point of conviction the solutions to which I gave years of research.

In conclusion, Dr. Thirtle seconded the motion that the thanks of the Institute be given to Dr. Dick Wilson for his paper, and the same was carried unanimously.

The Rev. A. H. FINN said : We shall all, I feel sure, recognize the large amount of research, patience, and skill displayed in this paper. A great quantity of details drawn from many sources—some of them recondite enough, such as hieroglyphic, cuneiform, early Arabian, and so on—have been worked into a closely reasoned chain of argument. Yet I must own to feeling a little disappointed on finding that the paper deals chiefly with the Titles to the Psalms. Apart from these, arguments against the critical assertions may be drawn from the contents of the Psalms themselves. Thus, in Ps. li, there are indications which go far to establish the Davidic authorship, while the few points on which the critics rely to prove a late date can be shown to tell in the opposite direction. My remarks are intended to supplement, rather than criticize, Professor Dick Wilson's arguments.

The fact that so many of them are anonymous is fair reason for concluding that the Psalms have not been assigned arbitrarily or at haphazard. The fact that many Psalms are given to authors of no special distinction—Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, and the sons of Korah—points in the same direction. The critical view takes it for granted that the titles were added in later times, but this is sheer assumption ; there is nothing to show that they were not penned by the author himself. Unlike our English versions, both Hebrew and Greek treat the title as an integral part of the Psalm. Thus, the heading to Ps. l, "A Psalm to Asaph," is taken as part of v. 1, while the lengthy headings of Pss. li, lii and liv are actually numbered vv. 1 and 2.

Nor is there reason for asserting that Psalms have been assigned to a particular author or occasion because of a supposed appropriateness in the contents. What is there in Ps. vii to indicate that "Cush the Benjamite" was the enemy denounced? It would apply equally well to any enemy of David or any one else. Still, more markedly, there is not a word in Ps. xxx to suggest or fit in with "the Dedication of the House," while the alternation of depression and exultation fits in exactly with David's state of mind when he

dedicated Araunah's threshing-floor for the place for the House (1 Chron. xxii, 1).

On p. 266 of the paper there are some remarks on the words "mo'ed" and "captivity." "Mo'ed," in Ps. lxxiv, 8, has been rendered "synagogues" (A.V., R.V.) or "places of assembly" (R.V.m), though LXX has "festivals" (*heortas*). So it is nowadays the fashion to insist that "Ohel Mo'ed" must mean "the Tent of Meeting." Yet, not only is the word the recognized term for "set feasts" (Lev. xxiii, 2), but, in Gen. xxi, 2, it is used of "the set time of which God had spoken," where the idea of meeting is quite unsuitable. May not the word be derived from the root *Ya'ad*, to appoint or fix? Then the "Ohel Mo'ed" could be the *appointed* place, and that could also give a suitable meaning to Exod. xxv, 22, and kindred passages, "I will appoint to thee there" (Greek has *gnōsthēsomai*, but in Exod. xxix, 43, *taxomai*). The idea of meeting persons is usually expressed by a different word, *Likrath*.

That "captivity" does not always refer to Babylonian captivity is clear from Judges xviii, where "until the day of the captivity of the land" (v. 30) is equated to "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (v. 31). That captivity (of the land, not the people), then, was the one in which Shiloh was destroyed.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

The Rev. J. J. B. COLES, M.A. : In Appendix 65 of the Companion Bible on the Psalm-Titles will be found valuable information for all who see the importance of this special study, and in a footnote the Editor adds : "These facts have been discovered and admirably set forth by Dr. J. W. Thirtle in his two works on this subject, viz., *The Titles of the Psalms : their Nature and Meaning Explained* (1904), and *Old Testament Problems* (1907)." The value of the Companion Bible is greatly enhanced by its treatment of the Psalms.

Colonel H. BIDDULPH, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., writes : One of the strongest arguments in favour of the contemporary dates of the headings of the Hebrew Psalter appears to me to be that which is brought forward in para. 6, p. 263. When the LXX translation was made it is obvious that the Jewish translators were in many cases ignorant of the meanings of the headings, and had not even tradition

to guide them aright ; for some words are merely transliterated, and others translated wrongly, in all probability. Further, it is conceded by all that many of these headings embody liturgical directions. Now, nobody invents directions which convey no meaning to himself or to others, and the only antecedent event in Jewish history which accounts for this ignorance, and complete break in liturgical tradition, is the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, and deportation of the inhabitants to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar.

Further, when a remnant returned two generations later, we learn from Nehemiah and Ezra how poverty-stricken they were, and under what adverse circumstances they began to try and rebuild their national life at Jerusalem. In fact, history explains this ignorance and break in traditional knowledge, and the inference is irresistible that the Hebrew Psalter titles concerned carry us back to the worship and liturgy in Solomon's temple, and that some are contemporaneous descriptive headings, and others liturgical directions. The fact that the LXX Psalter includes intelligible titles and liturgical directions not contained in the Hebrew is a further confirmation ; for the additional directions refer doubtless to post-exilic temple worship ; and the additional titles reflect later tradition or opinion, which was not founded on documentary evidence.

Finally, I would say that I have used the words "Headings" and "Titles" in a general manner, and not to the prejudice of Dr. Thirtle's opinions as to "subscripts," with which I am in agreement.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS writes : The list of the analogies of the Old Testament might, I think, be much expanded, at any rate, it might include Hezekiah (Isa. xxxvii, xxxviii), Jeremiah (xxxii, and parts of Lamentations). Also in the New Testament, Zacharias (Luke i, 68, 79) and Mary (Luke i, 46, 55). Another fruitful field of investigation might be the analogies of Psalms with Psalms (*e.g.* one of the Passover Psalms (cxvi)). I think one can say that the "Jewish" people were not only a Psalm-singing nation, but also a Psalm-making people. Yet how few Psalms there are, and how few are called David's ! There is only one to which the name of Moses is attached (xc)—possibly xci is also from his pen. How many have no names at all ! What restraint ! 150 Psalms in 1,000 years—say fifteen a century, or one about every seven years.

What is a Psalm ? Praise ? Prayer ? Exhortation ? Prophecy ? Consecration ?—yes all that, and more also. I have a definition. It is : “ Communion with God.” Thus the soul speaks with God, and God speaks to the soul. Out of many I instance Pss. l, 15 ; xlvi, 10 ; xci, 14, 16.

MR. PERCY O. RUOFF : The traditions of Princeton have been amply maintained in this learned paper, the chief value of which, so it seems to me, is that its argument is susceptible of expansion. Professor Wilson has made out a case which shows that if the “ radical critics ” are pressed with regard to their specialized attacks on the Psalms and their headings, they will find themselves inextricably involved in a much larger problem, viz. they will have to face and answer the question of the entire organic literature of the Old Testament. The paper shows how strong is the argument for the true historicity of the Psalms and headings, judged, not only by the positive features recorded, but also on the negative side by the notable absence of certain historical allusions. After all, the crucial evidence is the internal evidence, as the Chairman has forcibly pointed out. The Psalms, and at least many of their headings, can, without question, be supported by collateral historical references. I am grateful to the American professor for his well-reasoned paper.