

Dr. Bruce Waltke, Psalms, Lecture 6

© 2024 Bruce Waltke and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Bruce Waltke in his teaching on the book of Psalms. This is session number six, Form Critical Approach and Hymn Motifs.

Prayer: We ask for strength from you. Incline our hearts toward you. Help us to combine spiritual words with spiritual truth. You promise to be with us. Our sufficiency is certainly not of ourselves. Our sufficiency is of you in Christ's name. Amen.

In this course, we've been looking at various approaches to the Psalms. To help us understand our focus has not been primarily on the theology of the Psalms or the spiritual life of the Psalms, but so that we ourselves can understand the Psalms and interpret them in an authentic way appropriate to the Psalms themselves. Of course, we are trying different approaches to the Psalms.

One of which is the historical approach that we looked at yesterday. Our method is to give a broad viewpoint of things and then narrow it down to a psalm or two. In my judgment, that's the best part when we're actually in the text.

So, we looked at the historical approach and we noticed that the subject is basically the king. You could think of the Psalms, I think, originally as a royal hymn book with all the people of God gathered in the king at the temple. He represents the peoples and himself.

The Old Testament is a metaphor of the New. It's concrete, physical. So, the earthly temple is a picture of the spiritual temple.

The king at his God's right hand with the judgment hall in the earthly temple and hall of judgment is a picture. So, we can better understand Christ at the father's right hand. He's the judge at the right hand.

We make a transition from the metaphorical to the spiritual and we have the metaphorical so that we can understand the spiritual. So, the Old Testament is kind of like a picture book. So, we saw the king and he's a picture of the greater king.

Israel, who is our, they are our fathers. 1 Corinthians 10 speaks to them as our fathers. Abraham is said to be our father.

Galatians 3.29, you are the seed of Abraham. We are identified as the people of God today, that is the church. And so, we looked at it broadly, and then we looked more narrowly at Psalm 4. Then we approached it more from a literary viewpoint.

We dealt with poetry in general. How do you read poetry? How do you approach the psalm? Because it's all in poetry. How do you read poetry? We noticed that all poetry has a certain form of parallelism.

You say something, but it's not, and then you say it again, but it's not just a restatement. It's a related statement and that's quite different. As you read the lines and you see how they're related, you're also, you're asking two questions.

How are they related? And how are they different? And you cut it with a very sharp knife and you begin to read it the way the poet thought. What we're trying to do is enter back into the mind of the poet. How is he thinking? So, we can be authentic in our interpretation.

That's why we engage in this sort of work. The gifted poet, David, who was well-spoken, because he was aware of the literature of that world and how the poetry works. Now we come to another approach, which is called the form-critical approach.

Then in the next, what I originally allocated as two lectures, we're going to look at it very broadly as an approach. Then we will narrow it again and we'll look at a particular psalm and do it in more detail, more refined. So, that's kind of the way we're going at the course.

So, we're at the form critical approach and I've divided it into two parts on page 50. I think it is, if you know it's part one, by way of introduction. Then one form, there are basically five different kinds of psalms, or the minimum five forms.

We're going to concentrate on the one, which is the hymn, the praise psalms. It's in this kind of psalm that we get theology in spades. We're hearing Israel itself giving testimony to what they believe or what God has put in their hearts about God.

So, their words to God, a praise becomes God's word to us and through their lips, not now through the lips of Moses or through the lips of a prophet, but now through the king and his people, we are being taught about God. It's a different form of revelation that we get in the Psalms. It's another way of looking at God.

These are the hymns of praise and that's what we're going to be looking at. So, we have to look at it broadly. There's a lot of material here and it's easy to get drowned in the material.

This can be a very difficult lecture for that reason because it covers a mass of material, but I feel it's needed to get a total feel for the book of Psalms. If we stay with just a few psalms, we don't get a feel for the total book. You don't see the total scene of things.

So, we need to, we need to see it totally. We need to see it individually and more narrowly. So, in this particular one, we're going to be looking at the Psalms from a form critical approach.

We're going to be classifying them according to whether they're hymns or laments or songs of trust or instruction and different kinds of psalms. So that's how we're going to look at it, group them together. So, by way of introduction, I give a survey of the academic approaches to the Psalms prior to form-criticism.

Then I think we'll talk about that and by way of introduction, what is the next survey? Survey of academic approaches. Well, that's Roman Numeral I. Then we're going to go into Psalms of Praise in particular on page 55. So I really didn't have a Roman Numeral II.

So that's not the best thing, but anyway, that's what I have. Under academic approaches, we begin with prior to form criticism, we have the traditional approach, which is you depend upon the superscripts and you date them back to David and earlier in Israel's history. The one thing we, by that approach that wasn't traditional is to emphasize the concept of the king.

That is not normal in the literature. I think it's right, but it's become more of a focus in more recent literature. So that's a traditional approach.

We talked about that. There's a gapping approach in between that and the form-critical. That is what we might call the literary analytical approach.

You may be asking yourselves, why does academia reject Davidic authorship? What's the argument? Why are they skeptical? We need a bit of background to understand where academia is and why most seminarians are taught not to trust the superscripts. We need to go back to the literary analytical approach. Now I've already talked about presuppositions and the presuppositions, as I said, you put reason above revelation.

You don't trust revelation. You trust your reason above it. From reason, you begin with skepticism about the Bible to begin with.

You don't believe in divine intervention. The scientific method has no place for really miracles or God intervening. It's just the scientific method doesn't know how to handle that.

It's just not subject to scientific investigation. So anywhere, because they have a lens that you can't see the spirit, they can't see God and they end up with just material. That's oversimplified, but I think that's about what it amounts to.

The real skepticism began with the Pentateuch and came to a climax with a German scholar by the name of Julius Wellhausen. In about 1869, 1870, he came out with a magnum opus that just toppled the academic world called the Prolegomenon to the Pentateuch. Now there had been suspicions before or evidence before that, that the Pentateuch consisted of documents and they isolated the documents by certain literary criteria.

That's why I call it the literary analytical approach. They isolated documents by means of literature, and literary analysis. So, it was observed that in some cases God is referred to as Yahweh, which with German, they don't have a Y they have a J. So, you spell Yahweh with a J. So, they isolated the literary critics.

They isolated the document that belonged to the German language. It's a kind of a joke in our field that the first Semitic language is German because all the scientific work is done in German. They just seem to have some scientific minds.

So, everything's very analytical and very precise and scientific. Well, anyway, so that's a J document. The other documents don't use that name for God.

They use the other name for God, which is Elohim. And they isolated texts by literary criteria, the use of vocabulary, and other words. They identified there were two documents and they called the one document E because it used Elohim.

The other document that used Elohim, the content of it was mostly dealing with the book of Leviticus and priestly material. So, they called that the priestly document. So now you have three documents.

You have a Yahwistic document, you have an Elohist document, and you have a priestly document. So, you have a J document, an E document, and a P document. But there's yet another document that differs again, and that is Deuteronomy.

It was a different kind of a book as that's called, as you might expect, the D document. So now you've got what is known as the JEDP theory. The question was, which came first? It's interesting.

You could see why it's a very plausible theory. I have a lot to commend it in my judgment. For example, in the J document, when do men begin, people begin to call upon the name of Yahweh? And in the J document, it begins with Genesis 4, with the birth of Seth and Seth had Enosh.

And when Enosh was born, that's when men began to call on the name of Yahweh. So according to the J document, the name of Yahweh began with Enosh and that fits. So then in the E document, and they had already isolated Exodus 3, Moses has asked,

what's your name? And according to the E document, the name Yahweh is revealed when God calls Moses at the burning bush.

So, you have a different origin for God in the name of God Yahweh in the E document. And in the P document, that's Exodus 6, God says to Moses, heretofore, I was not known by the name Yahweh. So, what do you do with that? Abraham was called upon the name of Yahweh.

And we're told in the J document that then men began to call the name of Yahweh. According to the E document, Moses has to ask for his name. But now in Exodus 6, it's as though he didn't know his name.

I did not make myself known by that name. So that's the P document. I think you could see that's very plausible that we have distinct documents that give us different origins for the name of God.

And they contradict one another. And that's what's behind this whole documentary hypothesis. And what capstone it was, well, Wellhausen's work, and he could demonstrate the sequence.

That the sequence was the earliest document was J. The next document was the Elohim. So, he dated J. basically to about the time of David and Solomon about 950. He dated the E document to 850.

And he dated the D document to the reform of Josiah at 620. The reason is that they discovered the Book of the Law in the temple, which was attributed to Moses. The question was asked, how could the book of the law be lost in the temple? Everybody agrees in academia that basically the book of Deuteronomy is a forgery.

It's a pseudograph. It's not by Moses. It was composed during the reign of Josiah in order to justify his reform of removing all the high places.

So that's what Josiah did. And there is a complete reform at that time. You can demonstrate it in archaeology that during the reign of Josiah, they just destroyed the high places.

But obviously, the high places existed before that. So therefore, the D document is firmly dated from the academic viewpoint at 620 BC. And the P document is dated to the exile or to the after the exile.

And it's stated late. So, what has happened is the whole Bible is turned on its head. So, what we thought was early by Moses is now late.

So, all the priestly material like Leviticus and material in Exodus that we thought was Mosaic is now turned upside down. And it's the last thing. And so, this is what happened in academia.

And it creates a whole attitude that you can't trust the Bible's own claims to itself because it says Moses wrote it, but we all know Moses didn't write it. So, therefore, this is secondary and it can't be trusted. So if you don't trust Moses, why do you trust David? So what you have to do, well, this is a whole separate course, obviously, in seminary and introduction where you must answer these hard questions.

You must address them. And you can see why when I was teaching introduction, I presented Wellhausen straight out with no apologies. And the students went away thinking our Bible is destroyed.

But then you come back and you have to rethink these arguments. And basically, the arguments are based upon the presuppositions that God never intervenes and there's no real prophecy. And the day document is dated really by Jacob's blessing in Genesis 49 and particularly what the tribes would be, but there's no real prophecy.

So, everything that we call prophetic has to be an anachronism, which means from the time of the event. And when I stood talking about Exodus chapter six and the origin of it. So how do you understand that? How do you explain it? When I stood my defense, oral defense, I was asked that question knowing that I'm conservative and I really trust Scripture.

How do you answer the question of Exodus chapter six? Now I knew the conservative answers, but I didn't think they were any good. I couldn't buy into them. And I simply said I think the documentary hypothesis is extremely plausible.

And at this point, I don't have an answer to it. But there are a lot of things I don't have an answer to. And if I have to depend upon it, I have to have an answer to everything.

Then the only conclusion I can draw is I have to be agnostic. I can never commit myself because my finite mind can never come to infinite truth. So I don't have to have answers to everything in order to believe.

If I had to do that, I would never believe because you still have questions I don't answer. I don't have answers to it. It was about 30 years later that I read an article that helped me to understand what was going on in Exodus six, but I didn't have an answer for 30 years.

But I live with ambiguity. We all live with ambiguity. And so, I read an article in 1995 that I thought was very convincing.

It was dealing with this formula. You did not know that I am Yahweh. The writer showed clearly that this is a recognition formula that you did not recognize who I am.

That is, I am who I am. You didn't experience it. You didn't know it.

There was prior to the Exodus, God never demonstrated his power. They never knew who he was until he destroyed Egypt with the plagues. That was totally new, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

They knew the name, but they never knew what that name meant. They never felt the power of that name. And so that's called the recognition formula.

And when you get the recognition formula, you will know that it's in the book of Exodus and the Old Testament. It's in war. But then when God puts the people into captivity and it looks like the king has lost his mountain, God has lost his temple.

The king's crown is rolling in the dust. Then you come along with amazing prophecies in Ezekiel. Again, you get this whole cluster.

When you see these prophecies fulfilled, then you will know that I am Yahweh. And now it's the fulfillment of God's word that you will know that I am Yahweh. So it's a recognition formula and they never experienced God.

They never knew God. Abraham calling upon the name of God is not the same as knowing God's full power. Those are different things.

They seem the same thing when you first hear it, but it's not the same thing. So now it's a new understanding of it. And so far as Deuteronomy is concerned, the eternal evidence is prior to the monarchy.

They are anticipating the king. There's no reference to Jerusalem in the book. It has not become the local central sanctuary, but that's a whole discussion on Deuteronomy.

I'm trying to give a background of the skepticism toward the authorship of David and the attitude toward the book of Psalms and why academia has rejected the superscripts. So, you have to understand that background to understand where Gunkel is coming from because Gunkel comes out of this academic way of thinking. It's out of that context that we get the form-critical approach and why very many conservatives are very hesitant to enter into the form-critical approach because it comes out of this soil of criticism behind it.

So far as Deuteronomy is becoming a formula in the book of Deuteronomy, I would suggest you read McConville's commentary on Deuteronomy. I think it's one of the superb commentary in the Apollo series. If you want more on the dating of Deuteronomy, you should read McConville.

I just have a word about Deuteronomy. I think conservatives have made a big mistake. They've equated the book of Deuteronomy with the Book of the Law.

I myself have drawn the conclusion that the book of Deuteronomy was written during the exile. That's the book. But what the book is about is the writing of the Book of the Law by Moses.

It's a history of the book of the law. The book of the law is by Moses, but the book of Deuteronomy is not by Moses. That's why you can get the obituary of Moses at the end of the book of Deuteronomy because he didn't write the book.

He wrote the book of the law and he put that in the tabernacle next to the ark. That's what I would hold Moses wrote. But there are 59 verses in my judgment in the book of Deuteronomy that Moses didn't write.

So I think we've made some errors in overstepping and saying more than what the Bible was saying. It never said Moses wrote the Book of the Law. It said, Moses delivered the book of the law.

He wrote the Book of the Law. So, we have to be a bit more sophisticated, I'm suggesting in our discussion when we discuss these matters. Well, that's the background.

As far as the dating of an anecdote, when I was teaching at Dallas, a president of a class at Southern Methodist Highland Baptist Church, the Southern Methodist Church, Southern Methodist Church that's affiliated with Southern Methodist University. This one class was, I gather, very liberal. The president of the class called me up knowing that I'm even evangelical.

He said I'd like you to come and instruct our class on what is an evangelical. So we know what you believe and where you're coming from. I said, sure, I'd be glad to do that.

I have one requirement. Everybody comes with a Bible because you don't understand who I am until you have a Bible and you have to look at the Bible. That's fundamental.

If you're willing that everybody will come, you're all great. You're going to have a Bible. I'm willing to come and teach, but if not, I'm not coming.

Sure, we'll have a Bible. Everybody has a Bible. When I got there, nobody had a Bible, not one, not even the president.

So, I said, take out your Bible, nothing. I turned to the president and I said, look, we had

an agreement that I would teach only if everybody had a Bible, but nobody has a Bible. So, I'm not teaching and I'm going to leave.

Well, you can imagine what that did. He had built up this class and everybody was waiting for it. Now I'm going to walk out.

But I thought, well, let's have a good visual object lesson here. Evangelicals believe the Bible and we trust the word of God. So, you have to understand that.

If you don't get that, I'm leaving. Well, when he saw the class was going to go to pieces, he said, well, where do we have Bibles? They finally decided their janitor would know where the old pew Bibles were. So, they got the janitor and the janitor, I think they had three basements.

We went down to the third basement and a back closet. There were the old pew Bibles from the church. The Bible was lost in the church.

It was an incredible anecdote. No one there would have problems with my saying, yes, the book of law could be lost in the temple during the reign of Manasseh and his apostasies. It was a highly, that's anecdotal, obviously.

And as a scholarly viewpoint, we need something more than that. But it illustrates what I'm saying that what seems on the surface incredible, it's really not all that incredible. So that's the background to form criticism.

So, we really need a bit of that. That's a separate course though, as you could see. But it's out of that background that we get a man like Gunkel.

He's been trained through the Wellhausian approach. And what happened, the Wellhausian approach toppled all these Christian seminars. Wellhausen himself said that he was teaching in a Lutheran seminary.

He said I'm destroying the faith of my students. I'm going to go and teach in the university. Whereupon the theologians picked up Wellhausen and taught it in the seminaries and killed the church.

For all practical purposes. And that's part of our whole problem today. It goes back about a hundred years or so to this basic liberalism really.

And I'm not there, as you can hear. All right. So, the literary analytical approach I divided into who are the men we're primarily talking about and the background to it as Wellhausen is the beginning of it.

Then you had Briggs. He was an American Presbyterian scholar and later was a priest in the Protestant Episcopal Church. The fact is he was defrocked by the Presbyterians because of his views.

T.K. Cheney was the English divine and Bernard Duhem was the German. They introduced this, propagated this new approach, or were influential toward it. Almost all the academic literature prior to Wellhausen would be more traditional, and more conservative.

From about 1870, the time of Wellhausen to Gunkel, say 1920, all academic literature was based upon a Wellhausen view of source documents and that sort of a thing. Beginning with 1920, the crucial scholar here is a fellow by the name of Hermann Gunkel. He wrote his first work in 1904.

He wrote a commentary, I think in 1920 or 1924. His final work, his massive work is called the, it's all German. I'd like to, well, anyway, Introduction to the Book of Psalms or something, Israel's religious literature.

He died in 1932 and his student, Joachim Beurig, finished the work posthumously in 1933. It's a massive, it's typically Germanic. It's massive detail, very scientific.

It was translated not until 1998. You can get it from Mercer Press, which is associated, I think, Wellhausen was Macon, Georgia, or something like that. But Mercer Press has published it in translation.

If you're willing to shell out \$550, you can buy it, but that's what it cost. I'm going to give you a lot of stuff free, maybe more than you want. But at any rate, I just scanned certain things out of it.

There's so much detail, I wasn't going to type it all up. So, I just scanned it. So, I took the book and I put it in electronic form.

So, I could scan it and work with it that way. So what's the method of the form critic? Well, first of all, he buys into historical criticism, for example, skepticism, coherence, and analogy. That's the foundation of those presuppositions.

I talked about that. They dismiss the superscripts because the Bible and its own authorship is not credible. They claim the superscripts are not part of the Psalm, even though every psalm or hymn outside of the book of Psalms has a superscript as I showed you.

I said, Exodus 15, Judges 5, so forth, 2nd Samuel 22, and whatnot. But it's assumed it's secondary. What's troubling, even in the TA and IV study Bible, it's not clear, not firm on

some of this stuff.

The old NIV study Bible is great. He's a great scholar, but it's not as firm as I am, would like it to be. So, we believe in the grammatical-historical method that words have meaning within historical context.

Now we've done away with David. What is the historical concept? Where did this material originate? You can see without David, without the superscript, we're really at sea. We don't know for sure where it comes from or where it originated.

There's a lot of speculation about this. So that's what, by form criticism, Gunkel was trying to decide the historical context out of which the Psalms originated, because the superscript was dismissed. We're trying to find it to give us a historical context.

And by so-called scientific typologies, they dated it, the book, most of the material, all the material, not to the first temple, which Solomon built, but to the second temple that was built during the days of Haggai and Zechariah. Of course, this is an advanced course that assumes biblical foundations behind it. Okay.

So, the way they dated it, therefore, was by so-called scientific typologies, namely by they thought they could trace the evolution of language. What was early Hebrew? What was late Hebrew? And they thought they could trace not only the evolution of language, but they could trace the evolution of religion. A kind of a phrase of view from animism to polytheism, to henotheism, to monotheism.

And as dated it by the philosophy of religious development, the Psalms are highly, highly spiritual. And so, they would be very late at the end of the spectrum. Those were the reasons for dating it.

My critical appraisal of it, of course, I disagree with the basic historical criticism because it loggerheads with the Bible itself, which presents me with a God who answers prayer and dynamically intervenes. What happened since then that has shattered the scientific language bed is the discovery of the Ugaritic text in 1929 published in 1940. There in these texts that come from Ras Shamra, if you can think about the map of Syria, Palestine, Lebanon, and you know, you have Cyprus, the island of Cyprus off there.

And Cyprus is shaped like a feather. If you took the tip of the feather and you went directly to the coast, there is Ugarit, modern-day Ras Shamra. And it was there that these tablets were discovered.

These tablets give us really what Canaanite religion was. They're the worship of Baal. They're for the temples of Baal.

They're poems and praise of Baal. They're in parallelism, just like the Hebrew psalm, everything in poetry is in parallelism in the ancient Near East. The same words are being found.

So therefore, we could scientifically, we could no longer date it linguistically to the late temple period. So that the language showed it could be earlier. The whole idea of the evolution of religion has since been called into question and it's not that simplistic.

So, the basic foundations have been eroded from it. But that's my criticism of it. I think it's destructive too, to the interpretation of the Psalms.

And from my viewpoint, I'm talking about the literary analytical approach, and all these, I have no, I find no exegetical value in them. So, if you don't find an exegetical value, I'm not going to find much theological or spiritual value either. So, it goes together.

Well, that brings me up then to the form-critical approach. That's the background. I've been talking about the literary analytical approach, and my criticism of it.

And now I'm up to the form-critical approach. And that would be basically I put here 1900, but it's because his original work was 1904. But basically from 1900 to the present, all scholarly literature is influenced by form criticism.

And you'll notice when I begin my commentary by way of background, I'm asking the question, what form of literature is this? What kind of hymn is this? That's a fundamental question that we have to ask. That's the strength of the approach because it makes us aware of different kinds of Psalms and different kinds of hymns. And we can think of them quite differently as being hymns or as petitions or instructions and so forth.

I say by way of the man who was influential here that throughout the church's history, some commentators recognized that Psalms fell into various types, such as penitential Psalms like Psalm 51. And that they met differing emotional needs of the church from joy to pain, to protest, to anguish. And the Psalms will address every emotion we experience.

And so, they recognize these different kinds of Psalms, but they never did it really in a scientific way. The big change came with the German scholar, Gunkel, that he was the great champion of form criticism. He scientifically refined form criticism.

And there I gave you his bibliography. Middle of the paragraph, after his work in 1933, footnote 33, he accepted the conclusions of the literary analytical approach but modified it significantly. He's a product of his day and his age in the university, which has been impacted by Wellhausen.

And by form criticism, he sought to establish the historical settings of the Psalms. Now here's where he went off base and here is rejected. He concluded that the forms originated in the era of the first temple, not David, but at least pre-exilic.

But the extant Psalms, which imitated these early forms belong to the period of the second temple. So you can see he's a product of his age. All of academia said it's second temple.

His dad is telling him it's like the first temple. So, therefore, what does he do to put it together? Well, the form originated in the first temple, but the psalm itself comes from the second temple. He has to satisfy that political correctness, if you please.

And he believed that. So, it imitated the first temple and he's a man of his age, like all the psalms. So, what was his method? Twofold.

His first method was what's called, and everything, as I say, the first Semitic language is German, is *sitz im leben*. And that means what was the setting in life where this psalm originated? So, the Proverbs are not by Solomon, but where did they originate? Well, they originated in the courtyard or they originated in the home, but they did not originate with Solomon.

So, you get a setting in life where it originated. Where did the Psalms of David originate? Well, some of them originated in the temple and other psalms originated in private prayers or whatever they may be. So, you try to get the setting in life where they originated.

So, in every psalm, you try to get the *sitz im leben*, the setting in life where this psalm operated. Now you can see from the historical approach, what I did in Psalm 4, I'm trying to get the historical context, but I'm not asking where did it originate in contrast to David? I'm asking a different question. I'm asking, what is the historical situation that prompted that prayer? That is not the same thing.

The form of criticism is asking, where does it originate? And where is it disseminated? Where was it circulated? Where was the tradition passed down? And it's thought it was passed down. It originated more orally. Now forget about David and originated orally and prayers they were passed down orally.

Well, that's the first part, trying to set the *sitz im leben*, the setting in life. The second is called the *Legatum*. This is a German word for the genre or the form.

And this is, you notice that certain psalms have certain moods like a man. The psalms have certain vocabulary. They have different motifs, different outlines.

So, I say, they categorize, this approach categorizes the psalms by their common treasure of words, moods, ideas, motifs, and other literary criteria. And the approach gained support from analogies with ancient Near Eastern hymns that belong to similar categories as those of the Psalter. So at this point, scholarship is now aware due to archeology.

They're now aware of the Sumerian and Akkadian literature. They now have hymns from Sumer. They now have hymns from the Mesopotamian era.

They now have hymns from Egypt and they also are of similar form. So this kind of analogy with the ancient Near East confirmed that we have distinct kinds of forms of literature. And that was at his disposal.

What he didn't have at his disposal in 1930, he didn't have the Ugaritic texts had not yet been published. They're going to be published 10 years after him. They only showed that the material was much earlier because they're dating from anywhere from 1400 to 1200 BC.

So, it showed the material was much earlier than anybody really dreamed. So, his conclusion then after looking at common words, motifs, ideas, moods, and so forth on page 52, top of the page, he concluded there were five principal types of psalms. There were hymns of praise.

Well, then he has royal psalms, but that actually gets concluded under hymns of praise. In other words, they're praise of the hymn, the king. There were individual laments, communal laments, and Thanksgiving psalms.

So those are his principal types, hymns of praise, and royal psalms. Now he ended up with 10 royal psalms because these psalms mentioned the king and these would be Psalms 2. I've set my king on Zion, my holy hill. We looked at Psalm 20, where they pray for the king as he goes out to battle.

We looked at Psalm 21, where the king comes back from battle. Psalm 45 is the marriage of the king and sings the song, talks about his splendor and the beauty of his Gentile bride that's being brought to him. So, it's a marriage of the king.

Psalm 72 is really by Solomon. It is again about the king. We're going to see how important that is for the editing of the Psalter because Psalm 2 about the king is the introduction.

Psalm 72 is the end of book two, which is about the king. It's talking about the king's universal rule in space over all nations and in time for all of history. That's 72.

89, I guess it doesn't mention the king. 101 is more difficult from this viewpoint, but 101 is often thought to be a mirror for princes, for Luther's term. It's for the leadership and what they should be like.

110, of course, is the famous psalm. The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand and you are a king after the order of Melchizedek. And that's Psalm 110.

Psalm 132 mentions David bringing up of the ark and 144 again mentions the king. So these are the 10 royal psalms. What I've done in the preceding lecture is I've extended with John Eaton.

So, it extends beyond just these 10 psalms, which are just scattered throughout the Psalter. There's no rhyme or reason to it. 2 and 20 and 21 and 45.

72 makes them where it is, but it keeps the focus on the king. It's much more extensive than these 10 psalms. But Gunkel is the first one formally to identify royal psalms, which is a strength.

Then we have individual laments and Gunkel included psalms of trust like Psalm 27 here in our favorite psalms, like Psalm 91, Song of Trust. A thousand will fall at your side, 10,000 at your right hand. These are songs of trust.

There are communal laments when they go down into feet or like a drought. Then there are Thanksgiving psalms. There is a difference between, and there's a work that I really like.

It's the work by Klaus Westermann. He really distinguished between hymns and songs of grateful praise. So, I would make it.

So, it's right. We have to distinguish hymns. There are two kinds of songs of praise.

You have hymns and they celebrate God generally. They talk about God as creator and they talk about God as the champion of Israel's history. So they talk mainly about creation and Israel's history.

Those are the hymns. Songs of grateful praise are the opposite of lament. That is, God has answered the prayer specifically and you're giving God thanks specifically for the answer to your prayer.

Okay. So, these are the five dominant types. Okay.

So, I'm going to do a critical appraisal of it. I'm a little bit too negative on the *sitz im leben*. I believe the hymns and grateful songs were composed for the temple.

That's why they were originally composed for the people of God to sing. I believe the grateful songs were sung in conjunction with offering up the sacrifice of Thanksgiving that went together with it. But overall, I'm skeptical that we can decide where David's psalms originated other than himself.

More positively, even David's songs that may have originated individually, they were given over to the director of music to be used in the temple. They didn't originate in the temple, but they became to be used in the temple. There's some distinction there, but my thinking between them.

And number four, I'd say it's rather speculative. There's really not a complete consensus about the original setting in life. I'm not going to get into all the different viewpoints.

It's just too detailed for us. I give you a brief smattering of what Brueggemann and what Gottwald and some of these other fellows say. What about the *Gattung*? Do they really fall into these distinct types? I believe the Chronicler would agree with Gunkel that there are these three distinct types.

Here we have 1 Chronicles 16.4. I guess I didn't translate. Yes, I did. I give the Hebrew there for advanced students.

And then I translate it. Then he appointed some of the Levites as ministers before the ark of the Lord. And it names three types to invoke, to give thanks, and to praise.

Those are three of the five types Gunkel identified. Gunkel, I think, made a mistake in singling out the Royal Psalms because I think it's more extensive than just these 10 Psalms. So now I have three of the five.

I remember when I first read this, when I was going through it, I just familiarizing myself with Gunkel. I said, yeah, I think that makes sense. I read Chronicles and I fell off my chair almost literally.

Here it was, the Chronicle had already told us there were three types. The difficult one is I don't agree with the NIV translation here. Namely, notice how the ESV, I think rightly says, then he appointed some of the Levites as ministers before the ark of the Lord to invoke.

Notice what happens in the NIV, to extol. So instead of petitioning, it's saying the same thing to extol, thank, and praise. There are all three kinds of praise psalms in the NIV.

So, the issue is the Hebrew at stake here is the Hebrew word is *lamnatzeah*. So which is the right one? And originally Glosses, I think, well, *lamnatzeah*, which is translated here, extol is translated by petition in Psalm 20, the superscript where you have *lamnatzeah* and the NIV has of David a petition. So, it's translated by petition.

So why not translate a petition in 1 Chronicles 16.4. The other one is public praise of confessing what God did for you, hodot and praise, haleel. And the haleel deals more with who God is and the hodot, thanksgiving is more about what God did specifically. So , I hope I didn't overwhelm you here, but I'm suggesting there, according to the Chronicle, David appointed the Levites to petition God, to give God specific thanks for what he has done, and to praise God in general.

We have three kinds of psalms, three out of, and he had distinguished, and I think basically look at Gunkel's five types, you can pretty much boil them down to those three types where you have hymns of praise, going back to page 52, hymns of praise. Royal Psalms is not by mood and it's by word. You have individual laments versus communal laments.

Well, these would be individual petition versus communal petition. There's some validity to that. But if you understand it's the king, it's hard to make the distinction between the king and the people.

He doesn't extend the royal concept to these other psalms. So he has two kinds of lament or petition. Are you with me? So we ended up with basically one of the two.

And the last one is thanksgiving, either of the individual or community. And that's the hodot. So basically by his own analysis of the content, mood, or words, he ended up with three fundamental types of psalms, which is exactly what the Chronicle said David did.

Yeah, Phil. I heard someone define praise as the declaration of who God is and what he has done. So that definition actually falls on two of the three.

You don't like that definition? No, I like that definition. Yeah, I think that's adequate. I think that's good.

Yeah. And we'll see that. I think that it can't be that defined.

So, I think it's a good definition. Yeah. So, there we have, this is in my critical appraisal that the Chronicle told us there were three kinds.

And in essence, Gunkel had given us three types. He's missing one category and that is instruction psalms. And that's not much in the Chronicle either, because the instruction psalms are like Psalm 1. It's neither petition, nor it's praise.

It's instruction that's leading you into the Psalter and it's not said to be by David. So, I'm sorry, the three types are confirmed empirically. I think the distinction between individual and community is somewhat flawed by the failure to recognize the extensive royal interpretation.

That is the individual is the king and the we is the people. I argue the royal is not a distinct type. It's not a form, but a topic.

There are minor types that fall within this. There would be the Songs of Zion. It's another form of praise.

I would say that's a distinct type. And when they went into captivity, the Babylonians tormented them and said, sing us one of the Songs of Zion, which suggests that they understood that was a distinct type of psalm. Indeed, there are distinct Psalms of Zion.

At the end of this lecture, I point them out. This may have significant hermeneutic, exegetical, and literary values to recognize you have different kinds of literature. It can affect the way you interpret words and understand words.

The word, for example, ball on the social page is a totally different word from ball on the sports page. Then it depends on what sport, what the word ball means, football, baseball, basketball, and so forth. So the same thing's true.

The word *peti*, which is often translated simple, it basically means to be open. In the book of Proverbs, they're part of the fools because they're open, never having made a commitment. So it's negative.

In the book of Psalms, the *peti* is a description of the righteous because they are open to God. The same word means very different things in the book of Proverbs and the book of Psalms. So, if you want to study words, you have to be conscious of what kind of literature you're dealing with.

You can't simply go through a concordance and find all these different meanings because they vary from point to point. It's not only valuable for form. It's also valuable for the way we interpret say poetry or apocalyptic literature.

You can't read all the literature as though it's prose and literal. So it's helpful to understand you have different kinds of literature and that can be helpful. For

example, it is commonly said that David rejected, well, in Psalm 51, rejected the sacrificial system because he said, he said, sacrifices.

Well, let's get it to my Bible. Psalm 51 at the end of it. Oh, thank you.

Right. This is a lament Psalm. It has all the marks of the lament Psalm and where he is, where we are in the lament Psalm, in Psalm 51, we're in the praise section.

We'll look at Psalm 51, but this now is the praise. It begins at 14. Save me from blood guilt, O God, the God who saves me.

And my tongue will sing of your righteousness that you establish right order. O Lord, open my lips and my mouth will declare your praise. Here it is.

You do not delight in sacrifice or I would bring it. You do not take pleasure in burnt offerings. The sacrifices of God are broken spirit.

He seems to be rejecting the sacrificial system, but this is a total Psalm and it has distinct motifs. We're in the praise section. What he's talking about, I'm not going to bring an animal sacrifice.

We're here celebrating your forgiveness and he has murdered a man. There's a pregnant wife. This is not the time for a big celebration.

What we can feed upon is a broken spirit, but it seemed appropriate to David that God would not want a big meal, everybody eating, celebrating. He said, what we can feed upon is my broken spirit. He's not rejecting wholesale.

He is saying, this is not appropriate now. I'm not going to bring that today. You don't want an animal, which would normally go that the total, the Thanksgiving always included word and animal sacrifice.

He's talked about the word. I would declare your righteousness. He praised God in word, but he said, I'm not going to offer up an animal.

But he hasn't rejected it because at the end of the Psalm, after he's forgiven and in time to come, verse 19, there will be righteous sacrifices, whole burnt offerings to delight you. Then bowls will be offered on your altar. He's not rejecting the sacrificial system.

He's just simply saying that can't be part of my testimony of praise to you. It's inappropriate. That makes sense to me, but it's all taken out of it.

This is just normal in academic literature to take it out of context. They say, David, this is part of the advanced theology of this altar. It rejects the sacrificial system.

It's just too simplistic. Thank you, darling. So I'm on page 54 and I'm saying this has hermeneutical, exegetical, literary values.

I said it helps us in word studies. It helps us in understanding whether it's prose or poetry or symbolic or literal. It's also helpful to interpret that there are different motifs.

When we enter these motifs, that's part one of an introduction to form criticism, but we've covered a lot of ground. I mean, we've got the whole background of the literary analytical approach. I hope you have some idea of the context out of which form criticism is emerging and why it takes the shape that it does.

Now we come to part two. We're going to limit ourselves to praise psalms. Basically there are two types.

There's a praise of God in general for creation and salvation history. And then there is thanksgiving, grateful praise for specific answers to prayer. I'm suggesting here following Westermann and his Praise and Lament in the Psalms.

I think it was a good word. He argues there is no word for thanksgiving or basically there is no word for thanksgiving in German and in English. I remember I read a dissertation that made this case.

There is no thanksgiving in the Old Testament. I thought that's wild. What he meant was that in the Old Testament, you never said to God, thank you.

You did something different. You made the word to give thanks means to confess. It can be to confess sin, but also it is to confess God, you did this for me.

So, it is public praise, public confession. You're telling everybody, you're praising God for what he did for you. When I grew up as a kid in my church, we had prayer and testimony on Wednesday night.

We begin the hour in prayer and we end the hour in praise. We would tell each other what God is doing in our lives. We were singing to one another in Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.

I think that's what it's all about. So, you have, so it's not, we don't say to God, thank you. We tell everybody else what God is doing in my life.

And nowadays we have that. What's God doing in your life? We share with one another what God is doing in our lives at the present moment. We're all in a growth process with one another.

The hymns are now the next part of this. After the two types, I talk about the hymns. Then on page 72, I won't get to songs of grateful praise until page 72 in Roman numeral three, songs of grateful praise.

There are 15 of them. Okay. Let's begin then going back.

These are the three parts of this lecture. There are two types. Therefore, I talk about the hymn and I talk about songs of grateful praise.

The great bulk of this material is on the hymn and analyzing the hymn. First of all, I talk about the motifs of the hymn. What are the elements of it? How is it structured? I'm a little uneasy with this because I feel a little bit like a botanist that I'm tearing a flower all apart.

When you're all finished, you don't have a flower anymore. And what I'm doing is I'm tearing the psalms all apart. And when I'm done, we may end up without the beauty and the fragrance of the psalm itself.

But I'm also saying there's a value to the botanist who analyzes the stem and the leaves and the roots and what it all is. And that's what we're doing here. We're really tearing the flower apart to see how it's composed.

But then at the end, we've got to put it together again so we can smell it and enjoy it. So right now I'm in the analysis stage of a botanist. I always do better scientifically.

I do better analyzing music than listening to music, but I do enjoy music. I'm typically too tonic. Okay.

So, I'm talking about the motifs. Then the next thing I'll be talking about are the performance. This will be on, where is that? No, what happened is on page 64 and performance, I say, see liturgical approach.

That's why I couldn't remember it. Okay. So I'm going to talk, going back to page 55.

So, we can see where we're going. And don't get lost. I'm talking first of all, about motifs.

Then I'm talking about performance. And then I'm going to be talking about theology. What exactly are they celebrating? And that's really the heart of the matter.

So, we want to talk about the theology. That's on page 64. And then my outlining got wrong.

I realized at this point, and that's not too unusual for me. And on page 71, we're going to look, I'm going to just simply mention Songs of Zion. And there you get all the Songs of Zion and that should be D. So A is motifs, B is performance, C is theology, D is Songs of Zion.

And then finally, the last one, which should be E, but F is here in page 72 Enthronement Psalms. Okay. So that's the outline of what we're doing with the hymns.

We're going to talk about their motifs. We're going to talk about who performed them. We're going to talk about what do they celebrate? What's their theology? And then we'll just briefly mention two minor types of praise, Songs of Zion and Enthronement Psalms, where they celebrate God as King.

Okay. We're together with me where we're going or are we still lost? Okay. Let's start with motifs, the elements.

It's very simple. There are three parts, a call to praise and the main body is the cause for praise. That's where we get the theology.

And then we have a conclusion, a renewed call to praise. So, you can see we have at the top of page 56, we have the conclusion of often it's a renewed call to praise. Take the shortest Psalm 117.

It's only two verses, but there you have all three elements. Praise the Lord, the call to praise, the performance of all your nations, extol him, all your peoples. Why? Here's the cause, the body.

For great is his love toward us and the faithfulness of the Lord endures forever. That's the quintessence of it. And then comes the renewed call to praise, praise the Lord.

Very simple. That's a complete Psalm. It has all three motifs.

I couldn't get a shorter one where you could see it. Now that may seem simplistic. It certainly is, but it's worth reflecting on it.

And we will reflect on it. Now Psalm 33, I thought that was too short. So, I gave all of Psalm 33 and here you get the full orb.

And our time is short. I put this in here because the danger in this course is you don't get into the Psalm itself. You get all this analysis and I like to hear the Psalms.

So let's read it. Sing joyfully to the Lord, you righteous. It is fitting for the upright to praise him.

Praise the Lord with the harp, make music to him on this ten-stringed lyre. Sing to him a new song. What they mean by that, the old song is the Song of the Sea of Exodus 15, of the Exodus.

So they're saying sing a new song. He's done more than the Exodus. He's constantly at work in our lives.

So they're saying, sing a new song beside the Exodus song is the way I understand it. Play skillfully and shout for joy. Now the reason for, for the word of the Lord is right.

And it's true. He is faithful in all he does. The Lord loves righteousness and justice.

The earth is full of his unfailing love. Now he goes back to the word that you can depend upon it. By the word of the Lord, the heavens were made, the starry host by the breath of his mouth.

He gathers the waters of the sea into jars. He puts the deep into storehouses. Notice the poetry, the imagery, and the figurative language are part of poetry.

Let all the earth fear the Lord. Let all the peoples of the world revere him. For he spoke and it came to pass.

He commanded and it stood firm. Now he talks about God's justice in history. The Lord foils the plans of the nations.

He thwarts the purposes of the people, but the plans of the Lord stand firm forever. The purposes of the heart through all generations, blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, the people who chose for his inhabitants. From heaven, the Lord looks down and sees all mankind.

From his dwelling place, he watches over all who live on earth. He who forms the hearts of all, who considers everything they do. No king can be saved by the size of his army.

No warrior escapes by his great strength. The horses of Aden hope for deliverance despite all its great strength. They cannot save, but the eyes of the Lord are on those who fear him, on those who hope in his unfailing love to deliver them from death and keep them alive in famine.

We wait in hope for the Lord. He is our help and our shield. In him, our hearts rejoice for we trust in his holy name.

May your unfailing love be with us, O Lord, even as we put our hope in you." Well, that's a typical praise psalm. It's wonderful and much better than our feeble analysis of it and tearing it apart. But let's go back.

We're now going to under the first part, which is the call to praise. This is number one. We're going to now deal with that more fully.

This is on page 57. The introduction is the call to praise. Here I'm going to make with Gunkel several comments.

First of all, we should notice it's an imperative mood. It's a command to praise the Lord. And we'll talk about that.

On page 59, we notice the mood is one of enthusiasm. It's not tepid. God does not like lukewarmness.

It's like lukewarm coffee to him and he spits it out of his mouth. He wants fervor. He wants enthusiasm, not formality is what I get there.

Under C, I discuss who performs it. Who does the singing of these psalms? And I analyze that. I think that takes us through those are the three things I'm going to discuss by way of the introduction, the imperative mood, the mood of enthusiasm, and who sings it, who performs it.

Okay. First of all, then the imperative mood is typical German. Everything gets analyzed.

He gets it, what's in second person, you, what's known as a just of may the people, and then what's known as a cohortative where let us. So he looks at you do this. May others do this and I'm going to do it.

And he analyzes everything. And all of this is documented in his introduction. It's an amazing piece of work.

He doesn't have a computer. Nor could you do this with a computer. I don't know that you could, but anyway, he's the whole.

So you really, when you read the intro, you really understand what's in the Psalms, but you miss the Spirit. He analyzes it, but he himself, I don't sense any enthusiasm or faith. It's amazing.

But looking at that introduction where we're called to praise God, that's troubling. At least it was for C.S. Lewis. And if you think about it, is God narcissistic? Is he insecure? Does he have to have us tell him how great you are? I would never ask you to praise me.

There'd be something wrong with me. You'd look down and rightly so. What do you make with this? This is an honest question.

God's telling you, praise me. And that offended Lewis and I can understand it. So that's what he's grappling with.

It takes an honest question. How could God tell me to praise him? Is that not narcissistic, self-centered, self-absorbed? So, this is typical C.S. Lewis. He's going to reflect upon it.

He's going to think about, well, now what do we praise? And he's going to take a piece of art and we praise a piece of art. And he shows why it's totally appropriate to praise the piece of art. And it would be totally wrong not to praise it.

And if he could praise a piece of art, and that's the right thing to do, then isn't it the right thing to do for someone so much greater than a piece of art? That is the right thing to do. As the psalmist says, it is right and fitting in our liturgy, in our little Anglican church, every Sunday we say, it is right and fitting to praise the Lord. And it is right and fitting.

That's what Lewis is grappling with. By the way, he was made a canon in the Anglican church. There's a whole Sunday now devoted to C.S. Lewis in the Anglican church.

Well, let me read Lewis in his own words. What do we mean when we say that a picture is admirable? The sense in which the picture, we mean, the sense in which the picture deserves or demands admiration is this, that admiration is the correct, adequate, or appropriate response to it. That if paid admiration will not be thrown away.

And if we do not admire, we shall be stupid, insensible, and great losers. That if you don't admire something that's truly admirable, you are the loser. And you're not really participating fully in all the beauty that could be yours.

So he now appropriates that to God, page 58. Lewis then moves from the demand to admire objects in art and nature to the demand to praise God. He is the object to admire, which if you like, to appreciate, which is simply to be awake, to have entered the real world.

Not to appreciate, which is to have lost the greatest experience. And in the end, to have lost all you haven't really lived. The incomplete and crippled lives of those who are tone deaf, who had never been in love, never known true friendship, never cared for a book, never enjoyed the feeling of the morning air on the cheeks or a faint image of someone who has never experienced the wonder of God and could praise him and admire him.

I think that's beautiful on Lewis' part and why it's for our good. He calls on us. It's right.

It's fitting. This is admirable. I don't even know the Hollywood stars, the adulterers, the fornicators.

They're not the people I talk about. They're not the people I admire. They're the ones that I really don't identify with.

I admire God. I talk about him to the world. It's boring, but to the saint, it's the joy of our lives.

So it's worthwhile reflecting on these details of the imperative. And I add here from Psalm 95, we're to praise him in all circumstances. You could see that.

Come, let us sing for joy to the Lord. Let us shout aloud to the rock of our salvation. Let us come before him with thanksgiving and extol him with music and song.

For the Lord is a great God, the great King above all gods. In his hands are the depths of the earth and the mountain peaks belong to him. The sea is his for he has made it and his hands form the dry land.

Come, let us bow down and worship. Let us kneel before the Lord our maker for he is our God and we are the people of his pasture, the flock under his care. But today, if you would only hear his voice and the danger is they're in conflict.

They're in danger. It's like they're at Meribah of Massah and they're in danger of doubting God. Do not harden your hearts as you did at Meribah, as you did in the days of Massah in the wilderness, where your ancestors tested me.

They tried me though they had seen what I did. For 40 years, I was angry with that generation. I said, there are people whose hearts go astray.

They have not known my ways. So, I declared an oath in my anger, they shall never enter my rest. In other words, it seems to me they're at a place of Meribah or Massah or difficulty.

They're in danger of complaining and bitterness and not praising the Lord. Don't harden your hearts. So now the call to praise takes on new meaning.

That's why I understand Psalm 95, we praise him at all times in all circumstances. That's instructive. And so in Psalm 22, when he says, my God, why have you forsaken me? That's in the context of Psalm 22, in the assembly, I will praise you, and so forth.

As I said, you never get lament without praise. And we're commanded to praise. It's not optional.

We're dead if we don't. And I think this is a good place to end is the introduction to these hymns of praise. This is Dr. Bruce Waltke in his teaching on the book of Psalms.

This is session number six, on the form critical approach and hymn motifs.