

PSALMS 149 AND 150

us to the Divinely imposed restriction of this unique commission to *such* men—to *these* men—and to *no others*. "A stateliness": a quite unusual and significant word, whose peculiar value the psalms have recently taught us. As "glory" is an attribute of "majesty," so is "stateliness" an attribute of the "glory" of "majesty" (Ps. 145:5). Such "stateliness"—such "magnificence," as the Sep. in some places has it—has Jehovah in reserve for "his men of kindness." Some day a relieved world will wake up to discover how Jehovah himself has displayed his own kindness in thus forcibly sweeping away centuries of oppression and wrong. Let all tyrants beware!

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. This is a most interesting psalm, at least the sometimes tragic use made of it is of real interest, Rotherham feels it has been very much misused. What is the basic mistake?
2. "There is not Church in the Old Testament". How is this thought to be understood. Discuss.
3. Rotherham evidently believed the physical nation of Israel was to (will) be used by God. How? When? Why? Where?
4. Who are "His men of kindness"? What is their work?
5. In the analysis of this psalm we learn of a new song for Israel. When will they sing it? For what reason? Is there another way of interpreting this psalm? Discuss.

PSALM 150

DESCRIPTIVE TITLE

An Expansion and Enforcement of the "Public Reader's Invitation" to the People to Join in the Responses in the Temple-Worship.

ANALYSIS

1. "The Public Reader's Invitation"—*Hallelu-yah*, "Praise ye Yah," is first given in the Usual Way at the Head of the Psalm. 2. Then follow Ten Lines of Expansion: consisting of (a) a Ten-fold Repetition of the Invitation *hallelu*, "praise ye"; (b) a Ten-fold Statement of the Object of Praise—once by the familiar Divine Name EL, "the Mighty One," and nine

STUDIES IN PSALMS

times by the use of the pronoun "him," referring back to "El" and virtually repeating it; (c) a Ten-fold use of the Hebrew preposition *beth*, "in" or "with"—employed four times to denote GROUNDS OR REASONS for praise, and six times to bring in ACCOMPANIMENTS of praise. 3. These ten steps thus lead up to the Eleventh Line, which constitutes THE CLIMAX OR GRAND IMPERATIVE OF THE PSALM; and consists of another form of the verb *ballel*, "to praise" (namely, the third person feminine imperfect or incipient) agreeing with the feminine noun *neshamah* (literally "breath," more freely "breather"), which—with its qualifying word "all" or "every"—should be rendered, "Every one who hath breath," "Let EVERY ONE WHO HATH BREATH [the 'subject' emphatically preplaced for emphasis] praise Yah. 4. The Twelfth Line of the psalm—whether, with M.T., consisting of one occurrence of the phrase *ballelu-yah*, or, after Briggs' conjecture, of three occurrences, to fill out the line—being, as it is, a bare Repetition of the Primary Invitation, makes no further demand on Exposition, as it can only enhance the General Effect. It is only by close adherence to the true character of (i) the Primary Invitation, and (ii) the Expanded Commentary thereon, that this twelfth line, in either form, is saved from being Superfluous.

(P.R.I.) Praise ye Yah¹

- 1 Praise ye GOD for² his holiness,³
Praise ye him for the spreading out⁴ of his strength,
- 2 Praise ye him for his heroic deeds,
Praise ye him for the abundance of his greatness;
- 3 Praise ye him with⁵ the blast of the horn,
Praise ye him with lute and lyre;
- 4 Praise ye him with timbrel and dance,
Praise ye him with strings and pipe;⁶
- 5 Praise ye him with cymbals of clear tone,
Praise ye him with cymbals of loud clang;
- 6 Let every one who hath breath praise Yah.
Praise ye Yah. [Praise ye Yah. Praise ye Yah.]⁷

(Nm.)

1. Apparently doubled. See Exposition of 147.

2. N.B.: "in view of"="for."

3. So P.B.V. "Sanctity"—Br.

4. So Br.

5. N.B.: "In and through the accompaniment of"="with."

6. Or: "flute"; or "organ" in the simple sense of a collection of reeds.

See Exposition.

7. "Should be thrice repeated for measure"—Br.

PSALM 150
PARAPHRASE
PSALM 150

Hallelujah! Yes, praise the Lord! Praise Him in His Temple, and in the heavens He made with mighty power.¹

2 Praise Him for His mighty works. Praise His unequalled greatness.

3 Praise Him with the trumpet and with lute and harp.

4 Praise Him with the timbrels and processional. Praise Him with stringed instruments and horns.

5 Praise Him with the cymbals, yes, loud clanging cymbals.

6 Let everything alive give praises to the Lord! *You* praise Him!

* * * * *

Hallelujah!

EXPOSITION

As this psalm is unique and makes urgent demands on exegesis, the reader will not be surprised if this endeavour to interpret it extend beyond the length which the brevity of the psalm may have led him to anticipate. For clearness, and to enable MORE *and* LESS critical readers respectively to find their own, it will be convenient to divide the Exposition into two parts: I. A Critical Defence of the Title, Text and Translation; and II. A Practical Interpretation of the psalm as thus presented.

I. A CRITICAL DEFENCE OF THE TITLE,
TEXT AND TRANSLATION.

1. As to the TITLE here presented, it is respectfully submitted: That this psalm is *not* a "Doxology," and that the continued classification of it as such diverts attention from its true character. As this conclusion rests mainly on Dr. Ginsburg's opinion that the phrase *hallelu-yah* was, originally, not one word but two, which together constituted the "Public Reader's Invitation" to the People to join in the Responses in Temple Worship (Ginsburg's Intro., pp. 375-381), it is necessary that this Expert Opinion be well kept in mind; since it is only when that opinion is accepted as sufficiently valid to form a basis of reasoning, that the character of this psalm as an Expansion and Enforcement of that Invitation can be expected to disclose itself. The thoroughness with which, on that assumption, it does

1. Literally, "in the firmament of His power."

STUDIES IN PSALMS

vindicate itself, is the sufficient justification of the ultimate conclusion reached as to the character of this psalm.

2. Next, as to TEXT, it is necessary to say: That the extraordinary symmetry of this psalm, coupled with the notorious confusion into which the Hebrew letters *beth* and *kaph* are known from the ancient versions to have not infrequently fallen, through infirmities incident to copying, conducts to the assured conviction that the NINE occurrences of the preposition *beth* in this psalm must have been originally TEN, and that the Syriac version is right in having preserved the ten intact. This strong conviction is similar to that of which a critic of modern hymns becomes conscious, when, in examining a new hymn-book, he observes a hymn, otherwise perfect in its rhymes, utterly breaking down in one particular verse. As he would exclaim, "Impossible and Incredible!" so any one with a fair amount of sensitiveness to symmetry of form and a passing acquaintance with the incidents of textual transmission, becomes irresistibly possessed by the persuasion that the one straggling *kaph* in this psalm is neither more nor less than a clerical error, however ancient, and the more so, that the irregularity serves no good purpose whatever, seeing that the difference between "in view of," "for" and "according to" cannot in the circumstances be made evident to the common mind.

3. In respect of TRANSLATION, two points claim attention: the rendering of the ten *beths*; and, that of the word *neshamah* in the climax of the psalm.

(a) Manifestly, the ten *beths* should be rendered as uniformly as possible: which at once throws out the "upon" (of A.V. and R.V.) before the two classes of "cymbals," as a perfectly gratuitous variation; seeing that Jehovah may be praised "with" as well as "upon" any musical instrument. Unfortunately we cannot have a perfectly uniform rendering of *beth*, simply because this Hebrew preposition is broader than our "with," easily looking in such two directions as "in view of" = "for" and "with" (the help or accompaniment of), but beyond these two meanings there is, in this psalm, no need to go; as will be seen as soon as we are prepared to deal vigorously with lines one and two, and (with Briggs), *without change of consonants*, say: *for his holiness, for the spreading out of his strength*. We shall then have four good, strong, uniform lines:

Praise ye GOD for his holiness,
Praise ye him for the spreading out of his strength,

PSALM 150

Praise ye him for his heroic acts,
Praise ye him for his abundant greatness.

Against the introduction—with many translations—of *place* in the first line, may be urged: that it is first, needless; secondly, feeble; thirdly, puzzling: Needless, inasmuch as the extension of Jehovah's praise through space (and place) is fully and grandly wrought out in Ps. 148; feeble, because, if we merely say "in his sanctuary," no mention is made of the beings who dwell in that sanctuary; and puzzling, because we are left in doubt *which* sanctuary is intended, the earthly or the heavenly, as to which expositors are very uncertain—at least they come to diverse conclusions. But by accepting the four lines as a four-fold reference to the attributes and activities of the Mighty One, an obviously stable foundation is laid on which His praise may rest. *Praise him in view of=for*—all these.

(b) As to the important noun *neshamah*, in the climax of the psalm, which—preceded by the little qualifying word *kol*, "the totality of," "the whole of," "all," or "every"—is literally "every breath," more freely "every breather": the one important question is, Does it mean "Every ONE who hath breath," or "Every THING that hath breath? In other words, Does it (poetically) include animals; or is it strictly and properly confined to mankind? It will probably become evident that it does include all mankind, and is not limited to Hebrew worshippers, even though Temple worship is all the time in view. If we conclude that it is confined to mankind, it will still be left over to ask, in the second part of our Exposition, WHY this peculiar phrase is employed to denote mankind, rather than simply "all nations," "all men," or "all flesh." In answer to the primary question here submitted, it may be said, with confidence: That the word under consideration is here confined to mankind—for the following reasons: (i) it stands alone, and is not one of a *series* which conceivably might leave this term over to mean animals; (ii) the whole context is charged to the full with the notion of human personality. *Praise ye!* eleven times repeated (including the Public Reader's Invitation), so that, if the eleven-fold appeal of the *ye* be to MEN, then the climax, which is the emphasised sum of all that has gone before, must still mean MEN, and cannot be poetically lavished on animals; (iii) other examples may be found in which "every breath" or "every breather" is limited to human kind; as for example Deu. 20:16, 18; Josh. 11:11, 14,

STUDIES IN PSALMS

confirmed by Isa. 57:16, wherein *neshahmoth*, the plural of the term before us, is clearly synonymous with the "souls" of men (not animals). We may, then safely rest in the translation: *Let every ONE who hath breath praise Yah.*

II. A PRACTICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE PSALM AS THUS PRESENTED.

We at once find ourselves in a practical atmosphere, if we resume where just now we left off. Frankly admitting—as we have already admitted—that we are (metaphorically) within the Temple area, that we have just heard the "Public Reader" in the Temple Courts give the "Invitation" *Praise ye Yah*; and that we are now (in all probability) listening to a Levitical or Orchestral *prolongation* of the Reader's Invitation,—granting all this, we are constrained nevertheless to maintain that we have been brought under no restrictive influences which can rightfully cramp the terms "Every one who hath breath," so that they shall mean no more than "Every Hebrew."

In support of this protest we offer the following reasons:—
(a) The psalmist avoids all the many current designations by which he could have restricted his appeal to Hebrews; such as "Men of Israel," "Sons of Zion," "Seed of Jacob," and the like: instead of which he says, simply and broadly, "Every one who hath breath." (b) Previous psalms have already familiarised us with a class of worshippers outside Hebrews; as where (Ps. 115:9-11, 135:19, 20)—after exhaustively classifying all Israel—we are taken outside Israel by the familiar New Testament designation, "Ye that revere God." (c) Other psalms, unquestionably prophetic (and therefore probably carrying us beyond the present Church dispensation into the coming age of the Kingdom) have thrown open the Temple Courts to all nations, or all the earth; and invited them to enter and bow down (Ps. 100:1-4; see "Exposition."). (d) The prophetic word from Isaiah's hands (56:7) distinctly predicts that "My house, a house of prayer shall be called, for all the peoples" (cp. Isa. 66:18-23). For these reasons it is plainly not permissible to restrict the description "Every one who hath breath" to any narrower limits than ALL MANKIND.

But why should this peculiar description have been selected, and not one of the more obvious phrases, such as "All nations," "All men," or "All flesh"? This we now proceed to indicate by submitting the following proposition: *The praises of Jehovah*

PSALM 150

primarily call for Song; and for the production of song Breath is essential; hence the inherent fitness of couching the Invitation in these terms rather than any others.

The primary appeal made by the songs of Israel is to the Human Voice, to articulate them. They are not mere sounds, but senses; they celebrate, among other things, the doings and perfections of Jehovah; they appeal to the mind of the listener through his ear. No artificial sounds can articulate them. *Song is essential to the praise of Jehovah; and Breath is essential to song.*

The present psalm, which may be described as the magnified appeal of Hebrew praise, is absolutely true to this master-thought. The Public Reader's appeal is not to musical instruments, but to musical men. He does, indeed, call for "music," because he calls for "praise" in Song; and mere brute sound is not Song; is not, cannot be, intelligent, simultaneous, harmonious, melodious Song. Therefore he appeals to men with minds, men capable of adoring purpose. But MEN standing first and foremost, first and last, in his call. He calls on them for "tuneful" *breath*. But they must *have* breath; and therefore the Orchestral Amplification rises to its climax on that clear note. Eleven times "Praise ye, (O men)": never once, "Praise ye (O instruments)"!

And this reduces all instrumentation to its right dimensions: in rendering the praises of Israel, instrumentation is always, everywhere, evermore secondary and subservient. To guide, prolong, sustain the HUMAN VOICE, is its only place here.

But in this, its legitimate, subservient relation to the human voice, instrumentation is not only permitted but *invited!*—Divinely invited. And there is this further to be said in passing: That no musical instrument can play itself, nor play at all until a human soul moves it to its subservient end.

According to this Divine Ideal of Sacred Song, it is Man who is sounding the high praises of Jehovah all the while: Man *with* the instrument, Man *in* the instrument. All good instrumental music throbs and thrills with human intelligence.

There is something unspeakably pathetic, and immeasurably instructive, in this final appeal to "Every one who hath breath." When a man's "breath" departs, his power of song in this world is at an end. When, amid the advancing infirmities of old age, his "breath" for song fails him, and he is compelled to excuse himself from complying with this Invitation, by pleading: "I

STUDIES IN PSALMS

would fain, O Divine Master, respond to thy call; but alas, I have no available breath,"—may we not believe that his excuse will be accepted? If he is compelled to lean on OTHERS, but still puts his own mind into the song which he has to leave others to sing,—will he not be accepted? If he has a HARP, and his right hand has not yet lost its cunning, and he throws his soul into the strings and by them climbs to Jehovah's throne in adoration,—will he not be accepted? The very pathos of old age illustrates and accentuates the principle. He who is aged and infirm is, with others, invited to sing; but, if he cannot, what then? He is invited to play; but if he cannot, what then? Is there in the Divine Code no such thing as a "Law of Liberty"? Happily, "to his own Master he standeth or falleth." Meanwhile, and all the while, the gracious Invitation goes on resounding through the ages, and to earth's remotest bounds,—*Let every one who hath breath praise Yah!*

Before we close, a particularisation of the "accompaniments" of praise here enumerated may be acceptable:—

- 1.—Horn, Heb. *shophar*: the curved horn, prob. at first a ram's horn, which "was used by watchmen, warriors, etc., as well as priests"—O.G., 348. To be distinguished from the straight silver trumpets for the use of the priests (Num. 10:1-10, the only instance of which in the Psalms is 98:6). It is remarkable that this is the only instrument still in use which goes back to Mosaic times.
- 2.—Lute, Heb. *nebhel*: prob. smaller than the lyre, and occasionally more elaborate (33:2, 144:9). In O.G. named also "portable harp, guitar." For uniformity of rendering, see under next word.
- 3.—Lyre, Heb. *kinnor*: prob. larger than the lute, and fitted by its deeper and louder tones to accompany the bass voices in the Temple worship (I Ch. 15:21). "Lyre" is the only name given it in O.G. Hence, throughout this translation of the Psalm, this distinction has been uniformly observed—"lute" for *nebhel* and "lyre" for *kinnor*.
- 4.—Timbrel, Heb. *toph*: the well-known tambourine or hand-drum, chiefly used as an accompaniment to

PSALM 150

“dancing”; and, therefore, favouring that translation of the next word.

- 5.—Dance, Heb. *mahol*: “dance” is the only meaning given in Fuerst, T.G., and O.G.: in the last of which it is followed by the words—“accompanied by Timbrel (*toph*) and sometimes other instruments.” Stainer inclines to “flute” (*Bible Educator*, ii., 70): in favour of whose opinion it may be said—that thereby absolute uniformity is secured for all six lines; and, if EIGHT of the items specified are instruments, and not mere accompaniments, why not the NINTH?

- 6.—Strings, Heb. *minnim*: so O.G.; regarded by Stainer as a generic name for stringed instruments (*Bible Educator*, ii., 72).

- 7.—Pipe, Heb. *‘ugabh*: in O.G., “reed pipe or flute,” or “a Pan’s-pipe” or “organ”—“made up of several reeds together.” Stainer evidently concludes that, although the *‘ugabh* may have been originally a simple collection of reeds, a syrinx, or Pan’s-pipe, yet it afterwards was developed into the parent of our modern organ, and was identical with the *magrepha* mentioned in the Talmud. “This organ,” says Steiner, “for it is entitled to the name . . . was capable of producing 100 sounds. These were brought under the control of the player by means of a *clavier* or key-board. Its tones were said to be audible at a very great distance” (*Bible Educator*, ii., 73).

- 8.—Cymbals of clear tone, Heb. *zilzelei-shama’*.

- 9.—Cymbals of loud clang, Heb. *zilzelei-teru’ah*: There is a general agreement among scholars in favour of substantially the above distinction. It is quite conceivable that the “clanging” cymbals may have found their place in Temple worship by serving to drown and overpower all other noises, and so secure universal silence throughout the Temple courts; in which case the “clear-sounding” cymbals could be appropriated to the service of beating time, and possibly of making other concerted signals.

STUDIES IN PSALMS

If the main position respecting the foregoing psalm is correct, several corollaries follow from it; one of them is this—*That we must look elsewhere than here for the actual response of the people.* The more sure we are that this psalm is none of it of the nature of a response, but all of it of the nature of a continued appeal for a response, the more urgently it becomes us to indicate the kind of thing which would constitute such a response—in other words, which would serve as an appropriate answer to this appeal. Fortunately, we have not to look far to discover what we seek. The refrain of Ps. 136 is just what we want. On the face of it, that refrain is a people's response. It is in itself, not a call for praise, but praise: what is therein said is evidently uttered in Jehovah's praise, and appears in no other light. Its brevity renders it adapted to a people's lips. Every one, having heard it, could remember it. Its frequent repetition indelibly engraved it on every recollection. Being known to all, and perfectly familiar, it was available on any occasion, at a moment's notice. All could join in it. Infant voices could lisp it; feeble voices could utter it; faltering voices could sustain it; uncultured voices could pronounce it. Calling only for faith and gratitude, and of course the pure intention of obedience to Jehovah's claims—it called for no more, as a condition for the appropriation of its God honouring sentiment. It was heart-searching enough to test the deeply tried, who would have to draw upon all their faith and patience and hopefulness, before they could sincerely affirm it; and at the same time it was comprehensive and emphatic enough to suit the bounding hearts and hopes of such as realised that they were laden with mercies.

How popular and general it became in the praises of Israel is evident from a comparison of such passages as I Ch. 16:24, 41, 2 Ch. 5:13, 7:3, 6, 20:21, Ezr. 3:11, Pss. 106:1, 107:1, 118:1-4, 29, 135:3-4, 136 throughout, Jer. 33:11. Some of these passages suggest that the Levites led the people in the rendering of this response, and nothing is inherently more likely. The people would need some signal as to the precise time when their reply should be given; and, it may be, the indication of some note on which they might pitch their voices. Moreover, this hypothesis—that the people's responses were led by the Levites—at once very simply disposes of a difficulty which might otherwise be raised as an objection to the general view of this psalm here given. But for this explanation, it might have been asked

PSALM 150

—“How can this psalm be a continued appeal to the people? If so, then the people are invited to play the various instruments of music: is not that very unlikely?” The sufficient answer is ready: “They are invited to do this by the hands of the Levites—their Divinely appointed Representatives and Helpers”: which explanation falls into line with the general teaching of the Psalms throughout—that the Levites were the tribal embodiment of the Ideal Israel. But none of these considerations would alter the character of the popular response itself: it would be and remain brief—direct—comprehensive—fundamental.

Perhaps Israel had other popular responses, worded differently—a little expanded or a little contracted; and it is quite possible that out of the Psalms themselves examples of such other responses may be discriminated and commended to our attention. Meanwhile, the above well-sustained example (from Ps. 136) may settle beyond reasonable question the difference between an Appeal for a Response—whether said or sung, whether coming from one or many voices; and the Reply to that Appeal in the form of the Response itself.

Another thing that follows from our main position respecting the character of this last psalm is this: that *instead of being considered as fixed here by way of a doxology*—a character we have seen it does not bear—*it should be regarded as well placed here, indeed, for convenience having to appear somewhere,—but as being by original intention MOVABLE, adapted to be lifted into any other position where its presence might be desired.* So that, whenever and wherever the Public Reader might give his Invitation, then and there, by means of this short psalm, A SINGER, A CHOIR, OR THE WHOLE ORCHESTRA MIGHT ENFORCE HIS INVITATION.

This alone would account for the twofold appearance of the original compound hallelujah in connection with these last five psalms; which critics have classified as, so to speak, Double HALLELUJAH PSALMS. The so-called “Double Hallelujah” may be taken either as a mistaken repetition or more probably as a double putting forth of one and the same Invitation; first to be said, and then to be sung; first to be uttered by one voice, and then to be uttered by many voices—without change of destination or alteration of significance, its destination being, both ways, *to the people*, and its significance being, both times, that of an Appeal—a Call—an Invitation for a Response. This dis-

STUDIES IN PSALMS

poses of all the "doublings" of the phrase *halleluyah* in this part of the psalter.

In fine, the peculiar character of the last psalm is alone sufficient to account for the appearance of *halleluyah* at the end of that psalm as well as at its beginning. The psalm itself being nothing else than an Invitation, though Expanded, there could be no possible reason to hinder the repetition of it in brief. It would still remain for the people to respond and say:—

For he is good,
For to the ages is his kindness.

With the disappearance of the Hebrew compound word *hallelu-yah* from the end of this psalm, and from all the previous places where it occurs, and the setting down in its stead of its exact English equivalent, is completed a process of thoroughness in translation in behalf of which a good defence can be made. No one doubts that *proper names* should be *transferred* in the process of translation; and therefore it is admittedly right—as indeed it is absolutely necessary—to pass on into English the abbreviated Divine Name *Yah*, a shortened form of *Yahweh* (commonly pronounced *Jehovah*); but when this is done, there is no more reason for reproducing the Hebrew word *hallelu* twice in this psalm than in the remaining nine (practically ten) times of its occurrence. Now as no one dreams of saying, in ver. 1, "*Hallelu* God," and then "*Hallelu* him" for nine times more in succession,—the inconsistency of retaining *Hallelu* at all becomes evident,—that is to say, becomes evident the moment it is admitted that *hallelu-yah* is a phrase and not a word, a phrase with a meaning, a meaning intended to serve a practical purpose. Not *then* to TRANSLATE it, is to convert it into a flourish, which may mean anything or nothing according to the fancy of the reader; and meanwhile it is to miss, one knows not how much guidance to the knowledge of the ancient Temple worship. If the foregoing Exposition of this mis-named "Doxology" has served its purpose, it has already corrected and safeguarded several phrases in the psalm itself; and has probably further opened the way to valuable conclusions which cannot at present be foreseen. For one thing, it has—even within the compass of this short psalm—emphasised the subserviency of accompaniments of worship, as towards worship proper, to a degree which could not have been attained in any other way. It is only when

PSALM 150

we know what the Public Reader's Invitation *means*, that we can see how his *meaning* is caught up, repeated, and emphasised by all that follows. Practically the appeal of the psalm might almost as well have been addressed to musical instruments, instead of being addressed mainly and sustainedly, throughout, to worshipful and musical men.

In this particular instance, as in so many others, fidelity may appear to entail loss; but let us rest assured that in all such cases, temporary loss means permanent gain. We may lose our blessed word "Hallelu-jah"; and, after it, several other idols may have gradually to disappear; but lasting advantage will more than compensate for any sacrifice, if we thereby learn more thoroughly than ever how all aids to public devotion may be transformed and uplifted by the devout intelligence and intentions of worshipful men.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. At the opening of several of the psalms is a little phrase addressed to the "Public Reader". Who is this person? Why address him?
2. If this psalm is *not* a doxology, what is it?
3. There seems to be some question as to the proper translation, or transmission of the text. What is it?
4. How much importance is there (i.e. to the average reader) in the technical discussion of the use of the Hebrew words? Discuss.
5. To the practical use and understanding of this psalm, we ask; "When was this psalm used? Where? If in the Hebrew Temple are all mankind," called upon to praise God?
6. There is a strong discussion of the use of the human voice in singing. How shall we understand the sentence; "all good instrumental music throbs and thrills with human intelligence."
7. What of the aged man who can neither sing nor play his praise to Jehovah?
8. There are eight (or seven) musical instruments defined by Rotherham—in one definition we have a justification for our present organ. Do you agree? Discuss.
9. What possible response was given to this psalm? How was it given?
10. What suggestion was made as to the possible frequent use of this psalm? How can we use it today?