Ordo psalmorum, qui mihi magni sacramenti videtur continere secretum, nondum mihi fuerit revelatus.

Augustine,
Enarrationes in Psalmos 150.i

כל הנביאים כשלן לא נתנבאו אלא לימות המשיח:

b. Ber. 34b; *b. San.* 99a

Chapter 1

A Review of Psalms Interpretation

This book is a contribution to the contemporary debate on the purpose and message of the Psalter. It maintains that the Hebrew Psalter was designed by its redactors as a purposefully ordered arrangement of lyrics with an eschatological message. This message, as in many other Jewish documents of second temple times, consists of a predicted sequence of eschatological events. These include Israel in exile, the appearing of a messianic superhero, the ingathering of Israel, the attack of the nations, the hero's suffering, the scattering of Israel in the wilderness, their ingathering and further imperilment, the appearance of a superhero from the heavens to rescue them, the establishment of his *malkut* from Zion, the prosperity of Israel and the homage of the nations.

However, before discussing this proposed event-sequence in the Psalter, the general plausibility of regarding the Psalter as an eschatologico-predictive book must be demonstrated. This involves two distinct but related issues: arrangement and purpose. The Psalter may be regarded as a book, rather than an *ad hoc* collection, if it bears evidence of careful arrangement. It may be regarded as intentionally attempting to predict future events, if the book appears to have been designed by its redactors to refer to such events. In order to demonstrate these two points it is necessary to examine the evidence for redactional structuring and eschatological orientation in the Psalter. This shall be done in two stages. First, in this chapter, I shall review the history of Psalms interpretation with particular reference to the Psalter's purpose and arrangement, including the significance of the psalm-headings and doxological book divisions that form its clearest structural markers. Thereafter, in the next chapter, I shall investigate the Psalter itself to see what evidence it displays to prove or disprove the interpreters' opinions.

This chapter, then, is a historical retrospective of Psalms interpretation. Yet the point at which to begin such a retrospective is hard to know, for the distinction between text and interpetation is not absolute. Psalm headings might be considered interpretation rather than text, for, although ancient, each one dates at some remove from the time of its psalm's composition. Those headings, for instance, that claim their psalms were composed by David in a particular situation, clearly come from a later hand than their lyrics, for they refer to the psalmist in the third person. Similarly, the doxological subscripts that separate the five books of the Psalter seem, with the possible exception of 106.48, to have been added to their preceding lyrics by a later redactor.[1] However, as my intention is to investigate the final form of the Masoretic Psalter, I shall regard its headings and subscripts as text rather than interpretation and begin the retrospective proper with the ancient translations.

1. *The Ancient Translations*

The ancient translations all endorse the same sequence of lyrics as the Hebrew Psalter. The LXX Psalter, dating probably from the early second century BCE,[2] contains the 150 psalms of the Masoretic Text (MT), in the same sequence, together with an appended Psalm 151. Of course, there are differences in the division of the lyrics. MT Psalms 9–10 are one psalm in LXX, as are MT 114–15, while MT 116 and 147

1. Mowinckel (1962: II, 196) suggests, on the basis of 1 Chron. 16.36, that this doxology was already attached to Ps. 106 when in use in temple service and may be 'original'.

2. The prologue to Ben Sira relates that when the author's grandson came to Egypt in the 38th year of Euergetes (132 BCE), not only the Law and the Prophets, but also 'the rest of the books' were already translated into Greek. This surely included the Psalms, whether they were subsumed under 'the rest of the books', meaning, as Sarna maintains, the Hagiographa (1971: 1311), or within the Prophets, as Barton (1986: 47-48) would have it. Thus Haran (1993: 194) states that the LXX Psalter dates from 'no later than the first half of the second century BCE'. However, the LXX Psalter may be older still. Sarna suggests that 'the known fact that this version was made in response to the needs of the synagogue worship makes it virtually certain that the Psalms were turned into the vernacular in Alexandria even before much of the prophets' (1971: 1311). Likewise their acknowledged importance as a group in their own right beside the Law and Prophets may have ensured early translation (See 2 Macc. 2.13; Philo, *Vit. Cont.* 25; Lk. 24.44).

each become two. This leads to divergence in enumeration.[3] But still LXX reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* with the same sequence of psalms as MT. As Haran comments, '...despite the slight differences between the Masoretic Text and the LXX when it comes to the conjunction of chapters, the two versions are essentially the same in their arrangement of the actual material.'[4] LXX also contains the first statement that this sequence is in some sense definitive, for the heading to its Psalm 151 describes this lyric as supernumerary (ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ), suggesting that the translators regarded it as extraneous to the foregoing 150 psalms. The Targum, which may date from before the turn of the era,[5] has the same number, sequence and enumeration of lyrics as the MT. The Peshitta Psalter is a fairly free translation that seems to be dependent not only on MT but also on LXX and Targum.[6] It has the same sequence of lyrics as MT, but, like LXX, has additional psalms suffixed to the standard sequence. These are usually five in number, beginning with a Syriac version of LXX Psalm 151. Like LXX, the Peshitta comprises MT 114 and 115 in one psalm, and MT 147 in two, giving an enumeration one behind MT throughout the intervening psalms.

The ancient translations endorse virtually all the internal structural markers, that is, the headings and doxologies, of the Hebrew Psalter. The LXX headings contain everything in their MT counterparts, except the לדוד ascriptions in Psalms 122 and 124. LXX sometimes supplements MT headings: 13 LXX psalms have Davidic ascriptions absent in

3. Enumeration is concurrent until Ps. 9, where LXX Ps. 9 comprises MT Pss. 9 and 10. Thereafter LXX enumeration is one behind MT until LXX Ps. 113, which comprises MT Pss. 114 and 115. Then MT Ps. 116 comprises LXX Pss. 114 and 115. Thereafter LXX enumeration is again one behind MT until MT Ps. 147, which comprises LXX Pss. 146 and 147. Pss. 148–50 concur.

4. Haran 1993: 194.

5. As regards dating, Grossfeld (1984) comments, 'Another common feature of these two Targums (Job and Psalms) is the fact that between them they contain about a hundred variants in vowels and even consonants from MT, a feature not found with such frequency in the other Targums. Since a number of these same variants also occur in the Peshitta and Septuagint, they offer adequate proof of an early date of composition for these two Targums... A Targum to Job was among the many finds discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947.' Grossfeld notes further evidence for the early date of *T. Pss.* in its partly allegorical and partly literal nature, the allegorical parts appearing to have been added to an older more literal targum. Delitzsch (1887: I, 52) also notes that the more literal character of *T. Pss.* suggests its composition prior to other targums, which tend to be more allegorical.

6. Weitzman 1982: 283-84; 1985: 354.

MT and 22 of the 24 psalms that have no heading in MT gain one in LXX, leaving only Psalms 1 and 2 untitled.[7] But these are additions, not alterations. The headings are essentially those of the Hebrew. The doxological subscripts equal those of MT, with two expansions (LXX 71.19; 105.48). The second of these emends MT's single אמן to γένοιτο γένοιτο. Whether LXX is an expansion, or MT a contraction, of an earlier *Vorlage* is unclear. But the greater resemblance of the four subscripts in LXX suggests that they were regarded as functionally similar structural markers early on, and that this is not an idea that developed in rabbinic times. The Targum headings and subscripts follow MT very closely: 'The Targum has a superscription only at those psalms at which the Masoretic Text also has one. The 34 psalms which have no superscription in the Masoretic Text are without superscription in the Targum also.'[8]

The Peshitta, like LXX, expands the headings found in the MT. Its headings are often particularly expansive where MT has none, and commonly provide a short message to the reader as well as a historical statement about the psalm.[9] Nonetheless, although it adds to the Hebrew headings, it omits little. Thus the ancient translations generally render MT's structural markers in full, a fact that is even more striking than their adopting unaltered the Hebrew sequence of psalms. For later redactors might well have wished to reunite psalms that share common headings—the psalms of David, Asaph and Korah—and are divided in the MT Psalter. Yet despite good reason to change the received sequence, either by altering the headings or rearranging the lyrics, they adhered to the MT-type sequence with all its peculiarities. They apparently regarded this arrangement as more than fortuitous.

The ancient translations also bear evidence that their translators regarded the Psalms as future-predictive. LXX has rightly been called

7. Pss. 1, 2, 10, 33, 43, 71, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 104, 105, 107, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 136 and 137 are unheaded in MT, if the הללו־יה of Pss. 106, 111, 112 113, 135, 146, 147, 148, 149 and 150 is regarded as a heading. If it is not, then the unheaded psalms are 34 in number, as Preuss tallies them below.

8. Author's translation. 'Das Targum hat nur bei den Psalmen eine Überschrift, bei denen der Masoretische Text (M) ebenfalls eine bietet. Die 34 Psalmen, welche in M ohne überschrift sind, werden auch in Targum (T) nicht damit versehen' (Preuss 1959: 44).

9. See Vosté 1944: 210-35. He lists variant headings on pp. 215-19.

the 'the first monument of Jewish exegesis', for, although it contains no commentary as such, it exhibits interpretation predating the earliest commentaries.[10] Its tendency to eschatological interpretation is widely recognized. Barton comments, 'The thrust of the whole collection is strongly eschatological.'[11] In the LXX Psalter, this tendency is most readily discernible in its interpretation of headings. The best example is the rendering of the Hebrew term למנצח.[12] The simplest understanding of this term is as a piel participle of נצח, *to shine, excel, be preeminent.* Thus it refers to a pre-eminent individual, a leader. The only use of that piel verb in the Bible is at 1 Chron. 15.21, where it describes the work of those leading cultic worship. Therefore the participle מנצח could indicate a chief musician, precentor, or *hazzan.* But it could be understood in other ways. The *leader* could mean Messiah, especially in the post-exilic period, when נצח is attested as having the meaning *conquer.*[13] Yet another possible meaning might be *For eternity.*[14] Now, although the cultic meaning is the one best supported by the internal evidence of the MT, LXX adopts a phrase that disregards it, but captures something of the two latter meanings: Εἰς τὸ τέλος. This might be taken as meaning *For the ruler*[15] or *For the end* or *consummation* [*of the cosmos*]. Thus LXX, when faced with a choice between cultic or eschatological interpretation, adopts the latter, suggesting its translators interpreted Psalms eschatologically.[16]

LXX interprets other psalm headings in an eschatological vein. For instance, על־ששנים עדות (MT 45, 69), על־ששנים (MT 80), and על־שושן עדות (MT 60) become ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων (LXX 44, 68, 79) and τοῖς ἀλλοιωθησομένοις ἔτι (LXX 59). At first glance this seems to be no translation at all. But there is an underlying idea that links

10. S. Daniel 1971: 855.

11. Barton 1986: 22.

12. The term occurs in 55 MT psalm headings.

13. BDB: 663. See the LXX rendering of Hab. 3.19, where למנצח becomes τοῦ νικῆσαι, *Concerning conquering.*

14. That is, taking the term as לְמִנָּצָח, a substantive of נֵצַח, which commonly signifies *eternity* in BH (BDB: 664).

15. Possible meanings of the term include *the highest station, the possession of full power, magistracy* (LSJ: 697).

16. Schwartz also notes that Εἰς τὸ τέλος 'allows for an eschatological explanation' (Schwartz 1993: 320 n.).

lilies[17] and *the transformation (of the year)*—the idea of springtime, when lilies bloom. So this may be an interpretation rather than a departure from the Hebrew. And there may be eschatological implications. For the idea of the transformation of the earth in spring connotes the image-complex of Passover, new creation and resurrection, for which lilies are an ancient symbol. Another example is the rendering of the heading על־הגתית (MT 8, 81, 84) as ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν, *Concerning the winepresses* (LXX 8, 80, 83). The translators might presumably have chosen other interpretations of this term, like the Targum, which takes it as a kind of *Gath-harp* that David brought from that city. But they chose *winepresses.* The context of these psalm headings, following Psalms 7, 80, and 83, which refer to the judgment of the earth, suggests that the LXX translators wished to evoke the winepress of God's wrath, as in the eschatological judgment of Isa. 63.1-6. Another example might be the rendering of על־עלמות (MT 46). Whatever the original meaning of the Hebrew,[18] the LXX takes it as deriving from the root עלם and renders it ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων, *Concerning the things concealed* (LXX Ps. 45.1).

Likewise the Targum interprets the Psalms as future-predictive. It generally does this by inserting interpretive comments in the headings, rather than by using terms with eschatological overtones, as does LXX. It regards David as a prophet: 'In the spirit of prophecy, by David' (14.1); 'By David, a prophetic word' (103.1). Certain Davidic psalms are interpreted messianically: 'For on account of the miracle and redemption that you have wrought for your Messiah...all the peoples, nations, and tongues shall praise' (18.32); 'King Messiah shall rejoice in your strength, O Lord' (21.2); 'For King Messiah trusts in the Lord' (21.8); 'You will prolong the days of King Messiah... Therefore I will glorify your name for ever in the day of the redemption of Israel, and in the day that King Messiah is anointed to rule' (61.7, 9). Non-Davidic psalms are likewise interpreted as future-predictive: 'As was said in prophecy by the hand of the sons of Korah... Your beauty, King Messiah, is superior to that of the sons of men' (45.1, 3); 'By the hand of the sons of Korah, in the spirit of prophecy at the time their father had hidden them; they were delivered and spoke the

17. See Feliks 1971: 1364-68 (esp. 1367) for the probable identification of ששנים with the white lily, *lilium candidum.*

18. The generally accepted view is that it designated women's voices or, more generally, high voices or a high pitch (Craigie 1983b: 342; Delitzsch 1846: II, 109).

canticle' (46.1); 'By the hands of Solomon it was said in prophecy, "O God, give King Messiah the precepts of your judgments"' (72.1; cf. also v. 17); 'And upon the King Messiah whom you made strong for yourself' (80.16); 'With which they have scoffed at the delay of the footsteps of your Messiah, O Lord' (89.52); 'Prophetic psalm' (98.1).

Likewise the Peshitta interprets Psalms eschatologically, particularly in its renderings of the headings. A few examples will suffice. Psalm 22: 'Spoken by David when his pursuers were taunting him, and a prophecy of all the suffering of the Messiah.'[19] Psalm 45: 'Prophesied about Messiah our Lord: and about the raising up of the church.'[20] Psalm 72: 'A Psalm of David, when he had made Solomon king, and a prophecy concerning the advent of the Messiah and the calling of the Gentiles.'[21] Psalm 110: 'Prophesied about the dispensing of the deliverances of the Messiah: and knowledge for us also about the separation of nature.'[22] Some of these interpretations are of Christian origin; others are probably pre-Christian Jewish; it is impossible to say more, as virtually every assertion regarding the authorship and origin of the Peshitta is a matter of controversy, and the widely varying textual traditions show that later scribes felt free to expand and alter as they wished.[23] Nonetheless, the Peshitta adds its testimony to that of LXX and Targum to show that eschatological interpretation of the Psalms was widespread wherever they were known in the ancient world.

2. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*

The writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls would probably have regarded the canonical Psalter as a purposefully shaped collection. This is evident not so much from their endorsing the MT-type sequence, although they probably did, but also, conversely, from their practice of producing alternative purposefully shaped psalms collections. This suggests that they, and presumably their contemporaries, did not compile psalms

19. *'mr ldwid kd mmyqyn hww bh rdwpwhy wnbywt' kl ḫš' dmšyḫ'.*

20. *mtnb' 'l mšyḫ' mrn : w'l qwym' d'dt'.*

21. Cited by Kirkpatrick 1902: 416.

22. *mtnb' 'l mdbrnwth dprwqn mšyḫ' : wmwd' ln 'p 'l pwršn' dkyn'.*

23. For an outline of the various positions regarding the origin and development of the Peshitta see the anonymous article, 'Bible: Syriac: Peshitta and other Versions', *EncJud*: IV, 858-60.

collections in an *ad hoc* manner. They produced, and expected others to produce, purposefully ordered collections. And this may suggest that the earlier MT-type Psalter was produced with similar expectations in mind.

There seem to have been several different collections or part-collections of biblical Psalms in existence at Qumran.

First, there is 11QPs^a. This, the best known of the Qumran Psalms manuscripts, is dated on palaeographic and archaeological grounds to the second half of the first century CE.[24] It contains a number of biblical psalms in a different sequence from MT, and also contains non-biblical material. Its contents are as follows:

> Psalm 101 → 102 → 103; 118 → 104 → 147 → 105 → 146 → 148 (+ 120) + 121 → 122 → 123 → 124 → 125 → 126 → 127 → 128 → 129 → 130 → 131 → 132 → 119 → 135 → 136 → Catena → 145; 154 + Plea for Deliverance → 139 → 137 → 138 → Sirach 51.13-30 → Apostrophe to Zion → Psalm 93 → 141 → 133 → 144 → 155 → 142 → 143 → 149 → 150 → Hymn to the Creator → David's Last Words (2 Sam. 23.[1]-7) → David's Compositions → Psalm 140 → 134 → 151A, B → blank column [end of scroll].[25]

J. van der Ploeg has demonstrated that 11QPs^b appears to show the same sequence, as can be seen from its containing the 'Plea for Deliverance' and the sequence Pss. 141 → 133 → 144.[26] Flint suggests the same may be true of 4QPs^e.[27] Thus several copies of this arrangement may have existed at Qumran.

Secondly, the MT-type arrangement was almost certainly known at Qumran. According to Skehan, some 17 fragments agree with MT, and demonstrate the sectarians' familiarity with it.[28] Haran agrees, commenting, 'in the Qumran scrolls, the chapters of Psalms generally follow the order of the Masoretic Text and LXX', and 'all these scrolls are dependent on the canonical book of Psalms'.[29] Flint, on the other hand, states that there is no manuscript from Qumran 'whose arrangement *unambiguously* supports the Received Psalter against the 11QPs^a arrangement'.[30] This position derives from his adopting Sanders's hypothesis that the missing first two-thirds of 11QPs^a were similar to MT. As a result he does not recognize the many manuscripts that agree with the first two-thirds of MT, but do not *disagree* with 11QPs^a, as they feature psalms, in particular Psalms 1–100, absent from 11QPs^a. If Sanders's theory is accepted, Flint would be correct in saying that there is no unambiguous evidence for the MT at Qumran. But the theory is speculative, and even if it were not, it would still be unwise to conclude that the MT arrangement was not recognized at Qumran. For it was the chosen version for synagogue worship as far afield as Alexandria some 250 years before 11QPs^a. It was also known at nearby Masada at about the time when 11QPs^a was written: MasPs^b features Ps. 150.1-6 followed by a blank column, an arrangement known only in MT and disagreeing with 11QPs^a.

Thirdly, 4QPs^a and 4QPs^q feature Psalm 31 followed by Psalm 33. If this is not an earlier section of the sequence partly preserved in 11QPs^a, which it might or might not be, then it would appear to be the remains of another non-MT psalms collection that existed in more than one copy at Qumran.

Fourthly, 4QPs^f contains Psalms 107–109 followed by 'Apostrophe to Zion' and two otherwise unknown lyrics, 'Eschatological Hymn' and 'Apostrophe to Judah'. As 'Apostrophe to Zion' is therefore in quite a different context from the one it has in 11QPs^a, Flint suggests that 4QPs^f is part of yet another psalms collection divergent from both 11QPs^a and MT.[31]

Fifthly, van der Ploeg has plausibly suggested that 11QPsAp^a is yet another purposefully designed collection, possibly intended for exorcism and to be identified with the 'psalms for making music over the stricken' mentioned in 11QPs^a col. xxvii.[32]

Finally, other minor fragments contain sequences that disagree with all the above. 4QPs^d contains Pss. 106(?) → 147 → 104. 4QPs^k contains Pss. 135.6-16 and 99.1-5. 4QPs^n contains Ps. 135.6-12 followed by Ps. 136.22.

24. Sanders 1966: 6-10; Flint 1994: 33.
25. From Flint 1994: 52. The sigla are Flint's. An arrow indicates that a passage is continuous with the one listed before it. The plus sign indicates that a passage follows the one listed before it, even though some of the relevant text is no longer extant.
26. Van der Ploeg 1967: 408-12.
27. Flint 1994: 40, 43, 47.
28. Skehan 1978: 165-69, esp. 167.
29. Haran 1993: 193, 194.
30. Flint 1994: 41; Flint's italics.
31. Flint 1994: 45-47.
32. Van der Ploeg 1971. This suggestion has been widely received. See e.g. Puech 1990.

All this suggests that a number of psalm arrangements were in circulation at Qumran. Moreover, some of the non-MT arrangements appear to have been arranged for specific purposes, or there was little reason for their existing in several copies. This suggests that psalters were not arbitrarily arranged in second temple times, and supports the likelihood of the MT-type Psalter having been purposefully arranged by its own redactors.

The Qumran interpreters further endorse the MT-type Psalter by their adherence to its literary structural markers, the headings and doxologies. 11QPs[a] has eleven legible psalm headings. Eleven of these are identical to MT;[33] three others lack minor parts of the MT heading;[34] four more show variants without any omission.[35] Only one, Psalm 144 without לדוד ascription, lacks any indication of the MT heading. In general, then, the headings of 11QPs[a] are closer to MT than even those of LXX. Given the general wide divergence of 11QPs[a] from MT, the similarity is striking, and seems to suggest that the lyrics in 11QPs[a] had their source in something like the MT Psalter. It is also noteworthy that the Qumran interpreters regarded the heading as an intrinsic part of a psalm, worthy of commentary like the body of the lyric, as in the *pesher* 4Q171.

> *For the leader: according to [lili]es. [Of the sons of Korah. Maskil. A love song.* Th]ey are the seven divisions of the penitents of Is[rael...][36]

Some Qumran interpreters may also have regarded the four doxologies as dividing the Psalter into five 'books', as can be seen from the fragment 1Q30.2-6:

33. The headings are identical to MT in Pss. 121, 122, 126, 127 (partially legible), 129 (partially legible), 130, 133, 137 (i.e. no heading like MT), 138, 140, and 143.

34. Pss. 148 and 150 lack the הללויה heading of MT. The significance of this is lessened by the preceding psalms, 146 and 149 respectively, which end with הללויה as in MT. This may be due to scribal error or to a notion that only one occurrence of the phrase was sufficient, as in LXX, which never has more than one occurrence of the phrase between two consecutive psalms.

35. Ps. 93 is preceded by הללויה. Ps. 123 bears the addition לדויד and, like MT Ps. 121, has למעלות instead of המעלות. Ps. 145 reads תפלה לדויד instead of תהלה לדויד. The three opening phrases of Ps. 135, including the הללויה heading, are in retrograde order from that of MT.

36. למנצח על [שוש]נים [לבני קרח משכיל שיר ידידת...ה]מה שבע מחלקוח ...שבי יש]ראל (DJD: V, 45).

> מ]שיח הקדוש [
> ב]שלישית את כול [
> ס]פרים חומשים [
>]ויותר על ארבעה [
>] ופשריהם לפי [][37]

The term (ים)חומש, designating fivefold divisions, commonly refers in a later period to the five books of the Pentateuch, Psalms, or *Megillot*.[38] The editors suggest that in this case the reference is to the Psalms, although they give no reason for the suggestion.[39] It may be due to the fact that the Psalms appear to have been more popular at Qumran than any other biblical book.[40] Or it may be because the fragment's reference to *Messiah* makes most sense in relation to the Psalms, which, as shall be seen below, were interpreted messianically at Qumran.

The authors of the Qumran literature seem to have regarded the Psalms as future-predictive. The prose insert in 11QPs[a] describes all David's psalms, presumably including the immediately preceding psalm from 2 Sam. 23.1-7, as composed by means of a divine prophetic endowment.

> And David ben Jesse was wise... and he wrote 3,600 psalms... and all the songs that he composed were 446, and songs for making music over the stricken, four. And the total was 4,050. All these he composed through prophecy which was given him before the Most High.[41]

The Qumran scribes juxtapose biblical psalms with eschatological texts. The 'Apostrophe to Zion', in 11QPs[a] and 4QPs[f], claims itself to be prophetic (v. 17), refers to the eschatological glory of Zion, and foretells the coming of its longed-for deliverance (v. 2). 4QPs[f]

37. 'Holy [Me]ssiah... [in] third all the... [... b]ooks of the Pentateuch/ Psalter... and the rest on/at four... and their interpretations according to...' (DJD: I, 32).

38. See Jastrow 1950: I, 436. חומשים designates the Pentateuch at *Sot.* 36b; *Hag.* 14a; *y. Meg.* 3.1 (74a top). It designates the Psalter at *Kid.* 33a (...שני חומשים בספר תהלים) and *Midr. Pss.* 1.2 (cited later in this chapter). At *y. Meg.* 2.4 (72a bottom) it refers to the five *megillot.*

39. 'Si la lecture ספרים est exacte il s'agirait des livres חומשים, c.-à-d. du Pentateuque ou plutôt du Psautier' (DJD: I, 133).

40. Sanders comments, 'There were undoubtedly more copies of Psalms in the Qumran library than of any other biblical writings' (1974: 9).

41. 11QPs[a], col. 27, lines 1-11. The text is at Sanders 1974: 136.

contains biblical psalms juxtaposed with the lyrics 'Eschatological Hymn' and 'Apostrophe to Judah', the former speaking of Yhwh's coming in judgment, the destruction of the wicked and the end-time fertility of the earth, and the latter of the rejoicing of Judah after the eschatological destruction of her enemies. Other texts interpret biblical psalms eschatologically. 11QMelch. refers Psalm 82 to the superhero Melchizedek and the battle with Belial and his hosts.[42] 4Q174.1 (Florilegium) interprets Psalm 2 as applying to the kings of the nations who shall rage against Israel in the last days.[43] 4Q171 interprets Psalms 37 and 45 eschatologically, as does 4Q173 for Psalm 128.[44]

3. *The New Testament*

The New Testament seems to regard the MT-type Psalter as definitive. The reference in Acts 1.20 to ὁ βίβλος ψαλμῶν suggests the writer of Acts, in the first century, regarded one particular collection as '*the* Book of Psalms'. Several things suggest that this βίβλος ψαλμῶν featured the MT-type arrangement of lyrics. First, the known prominence of that arrangement, as demonstrated in its being selected as the basis for all the translations, would make it likely. Secondly, the majority of New Testament quotes from Psalms come verbatim from LXX, which, of course, has the MT-type sequence. Thirdly, all New Testament citations from 'psalms' are found in the MT-type Psalter; the term is not used of non-biblical lyrics, such as those in 11QPs^a. Fourthly, Acts 13.33 cites from Psalm 2 and refers to its being written ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ...τῷ δευτέρῳ. The only known arrangement of psalms that has this particular second psalm is the standard Psalter. Fifthly, no other arrangement of Psalms has passed into Christian tradition. This suggests that for the writer of Acts, and probably for the early Christian community at large, the collection regarded as '*the* Book of Psalms' was an MT-type Psalter.

42. The text is in Woude 1965; Jonge and Woude 1966; Milik 1972. There is an English translation in Jonge and Woude 1966: 303.

43. The text is in DJD: V, 53-57. There is an English translation in Vermes 1987: 293-94.

44. The text is in DJD: V, 42-53. There is an English translation in Vermes 1987: 290-92.

The New Testament writers also regard the Psalms as future-predictive. David is described as a prophet, through whom the Holy Spirit spoke (Mt. 22.43; Mk 12.36; Acts 2.30; 4.25). Those psalms ascribed to him are reckoned to foretell messianic events after their date of composition (Mt. 22.43-45; Acts 2.25, 31; 4.11). The New Testament as a whole cites passages from the Psalms more than 70 times, more than any other Old Testament book, to endorse Christian messianic claims. A few examples may be given from the gospels alone. Ps. 91.11-12 is taken as referring to Messiah's deliverance from evil (Mt. 4.6; Lk. 4.11). Ps. 118.22, 23 is regarded as foretelling his rejection by the leaders of Israel (Mt. 21.42; Mk 12.10; Lk. 20.17), while 118.25, 26 is associated with his entry to Jerusalem (Mt. 21.9; 23.39; Mk 11.9; Lk. 13.35; 19.38; Jn 12.13). Ps. 22.1, 18 is held to foretell his suffering (Mt. 27.35 [some MSS]; 27.46; Mk 15.34; Jn 19.24). Psalm110 is referred to him as well, presumably in his role as conquering king (Mt. 22.41-46; Mk 12.36; Lk. 20.42-43).

It is worth noting, in passing, that the New Testament's Psalms hermeneutic seems little different from that of their contemporaries in first-century Israel.

(1) There are distinct similarities between the New Testament and Qumran. The New Testament view that David's utterances are predictive is not recognizably different from that of the prose insert describing David's compositions in 11QPs^a, col. 27, cited above. Similarly the New Testament's eschatological interpretation of Psalms is similar to that of 11QMelch.[45] Moreover, the New Testament shows the same general fascination with Psalms as do the Qumran writers. Just as the New Testament cites Psalms more than any other Old Testament book, so, at Qumran, manuscripts of the biblical Psalms outnumber those of any other book.[46]

(2) The New Testament itself represents other Jewish parties sharing its hermeneutic. At Mt. 22.41-46, Mk 12.36 and Lk. 20.42-43 the Pharisees are depicted as tacitly accepting the Davidic authorship of Psalm 110, even though Davidic authorship is the very point on which the Christian *apologia* depends. Diaspora Hebrews in Jerusalem, and others at Pisidian Antioch, are depicted as doing exactly the same thing in regard to Psalms 16 and 110 (Acts 2.25, 29, 34; 13.33-36).

45. The link between the eschatological vision of 11QMelch and Ps. 110 is discussed in Chapter 8.

46. Sanders 1974: 9.

Another passage shows the early Hebrew Christian community citing Psalm 118 as a messianic proof-text in dialogue with the Sanhedrin (Acts 4.10). That the New Testament community did in fact use the Psalms in just this way is confirmed by those New Testament books that are written to convince Jewish readers of Christian messianic claims. The epistle to the Hebrews, in particular, repeatedly cites from the Psalms.[47] So too does John's Gospel,[48] which recent commentators have described as a *Missionsschrift* to Israel.[49] And even if the intended readership of all New Testament books were exclusively Christian, these books must still represent the actual apologetic methods of the early church. For what would their writers gain by instructing their readership in apologetics not practised by the Christian community? So if, then, early Christian Israelites employed Psalms as messianic proof-texts, it follows that their opponents must have acknowledged the messianic referent of these same texts.

(3) Rabbinic traditions further confirm that the New Testament Psalms hermeneutic was essentially the same as that of other first-century Israelites. For the rabbinic movement was the chief heir of the hermeneutic traditions of the Pharisees and Sadducees after 70 CE. These traditions, as shall be seen below, interpret messianically many of the same psalms as the New Testament, including Psalms 22, 110, and 118.

4. *Rabbinic Literature*

Jewish Psalms manuscripts and incunabula endorse the definitiveness of the MT-type arrangement by their conformity to it. They have the same psalms as MT in the same order, apart from accidental omissions due to homoeoteleuton.[50] However, the number and enumeration of

47. Ten different psalms (2, 8, 22, 40, 45, 95, 102, 104, 110, 118) are cited directly (Heb. 1.5, 7, 8-9, 10-12, 13; 2.6-8, 12; 3.7-11, 15; 4.3, 5, 7; 5.5, 6; 7.17-21; 10.5-7; 13.6). There are also allusions to particular psalms. Some of these are noted in the discussion on Ps. 110 in Chapter 8.

48. There are direct citations at Jn 2.17 (Ps. 69.9); Jn 6.31 (Ps. 78.24); Jn 10.34 (Ps. 82.6); Jn 12.13 (Ps. 118.25-26); Jn 13.18 (Ps. 41.9); Jn 15.25 (Ps. 35.19; 69.4); Jn 19.24 (Ps. 22.18).

49. Bornhaüser 1928; Robinson 1960: 117-31; Brooke 1988: 102-12; Carson 1987: 639-51.

50. For a discussion of homoeoteleuton in Hebrew Psalter manuscripts see Ginsburg 1897: 171-82.

lyrics varies as a result of joining or dividing psalms. A Psalter of 147 chapters is mentioned in Amoraic times (*y. Šab.* 16.1, 15c; cf. 16.11; *Midr. Pss.* to 22.4) and exists in manuscripts[51] and in the first edition of the *Yal. Shimoni.*[52] The Leningrad Codex B and the Brescia (1494) and Naples (1491–94) Bibles are all divided into 149 psalms, an arrangement known also to Mishael b. Uzziel and Shmuel ha-Nagid, and present in some manuscripts.[53] Other Psalters feature divisions of 148, 151, 159 and even 170 psalms.[54] Commonly joined together are MT Psalms 1–2, 9–10, 42–43, 53–54, 70–71, 93–94, 104–105, 114–15, 116–17, 117–118.1-4.[55] Psalms 115, 116, 118 and 119 are sometimes divided.[56] However, in every case the variation is not in the content of these Psalters, but only in the division and combination of psalm units. They uniformly display the MT sequence.

There is evidence that the rabbis regarded the Psalter's sequence of lyrics as purposefully arranged. A talmudic *baraitha* (*Ber.* 10a) establishes the validity of contextual interpretation of psalms and comments on the significance of the juxtaposition of Psalms 2 and 3.

> A certain *min* said to R. Abbahu: It is written, *A Psalm of David when he fled from Absalom his son* (Ps. 3.1). And it is also written, *A* mikhtam *of David when he fled from Saul in the cave* (Ps. 57.1). Which event happened first? Did not the event of Saul happen first? Then let him write it first? He replied to him: For you who do not derive interpretations from juxtaposition, there is a difficulty, but for us who do derive interpretations from juxtaposition there is no difficulty. For R. Yohanan said: How do we know from the Torah that juxtaposition counts? Because it says, *They are joined for ever and ever, they are done in truth and uprightness* (Ps. 111.8). Why is the chapter of Absalom juxtaposed to the chapter of Gog and Magog? So that if one should say to you, 'Is it possible that a slave should rebel against his master?', you can reply to him, 'Is it possible that a son should rebel against his father? Yet this happened, and so this too [will happen].'

Midr. Pss. 3.2 expresses the same view of the purposeful arrangement of the Psalms with a similar teaching about Psalms 2 and 3.[57]

51. Ginsburg 1897: 18, 777.

52. Salonica, 1521-26; cf. also Jacob b. Asher, *Ba'al ha-Turim,* Gen. 47.28.

53. Sarna 1971: 1306.

54. Ginsburg 1897: 536-37, 584, 725; Sarna 1971: 1306.

55. Ginsburg 1897: 18, 536, 725, 777, 853, 873. At *t. Peš.* 117a it is said, in reference to Ps. 117, that a two-versed psalm is preposterous.

56. Ginsburg 1897: 536-37, 584, 725-26.

57. 'R. Jacob said in the name of R. Aha: Why is the psalm on Gog and Magog

Thereafter follows the tale of how R. Joshua ben Levi sought to rearrange the Psalms, when a *bat kol* commanded, 'Arouse not the slumberer!' This appears to teach that the present order of Psalms is to be left alone, because it is significant. Similarly *Midr. Pss.* 111.1 refers back to Psalm 110 for an understanding of the context of Psalm 111. Kimhi also remarks on the arrangement of Psalms 1, 2 and 3, noting that, while the arrangement of Psalms cannot be explained according to historical order, yet they were thus arranged by David. Similarly, he notes that Psalm 53 is placed as it is to show that David was threatened by Doeg (52.1) and the Ziphites (54.1), but God made his kingdom stand firm.[58]

Rabbinic commentators also endorse the structural markers, the headings and subscripts, of the MT arrangement, and regard them as important for interpretation. A few examples illustrate this. The Talmud maintains that לדוד מזמור means the *shekhinah* rested on David and then he uttered a song, while מזמור לדוד means he uttered that song and then the *shekhinah* rested upon him (*Pes.* 117a). Midrash Tehillim discusses how the *sons of Korah* psalms relate to the figures of Num. 26.10, and states that the term ששנים (Ps. 45.1) refers to the sons of Korah, who were lilies gathered from among thorns that they might not be consumed. *Midr. Pss.* 84, like LXX, takes על־הגתית as *Concerning the Winepresses,* and relates it to the crushing of the eschatological foe. The mediaeval rabbis also comment at length on headings. Ibn Ezra discusses who Ethan the Ezrahi of Psalm 89 might be.[59] Rashi supposes the Korah psalms to have been composed by the sons of the Korah of the desert rebellion, a supposition central to his interpretation of the psalm.[60] Kimhi thinks likewise, and adds that they then came into David's possession and 'David collected these psalms by the Holy Spirit and gave them to the sons of the sons of Korah, who were singers in his time, to sing them.'[61]

The doxological subscripts were understood as section divisions in talmudic times. The Bavli refers explicitly to the חומשים, or five

(Ps. 2) placed next to the psalm on Absalom (Ps. 3)? To tell you that a wicked son works greater cruelty upon his father than will the wars of Gog and Magog.'

58. Kimhi 1883: 53.

59. Kimhi 1883: 89.1.

60. Rashi 1934.

61. כי דוד חבר אלה המזמורים ברוח הקדש ונתנם לבני בני קרח המשוררים הנמצאים בזמנו לשורר אותם (Commentary on Ps. 42).

divisions, of the book of Psalms (*Kid.* 33a). This dates from about 200 CE, if its attribution to the time of R. Hiyya and the young R. Simeon b. Judah ha-Nasi is correct. The fivefold book division is also mentioned in *Midr. Pss.* 1.2, where it is compared with the five books of the Pentateuch: 'As Moses gave five books of *Torah* to Israel, so David gave five books of psalms to Israel: *Blessed is the man* (Ps. 1), *Blessed is the maskil* (cf. Ps. 42.1), *A Psalm of Asaph* (Ps. 73), *A Prayer of Moses* (Ps. 90), and *Let the Redeemed of the Lord say* (Ps. 106).'[62] No date is given for this saying, but its marked similarity to Hippolytus' statement below suggests the existence of this idea early in the first millennium.

Early Jewish and rabbinic writers commonly regard the Psalms as future-predictive. The daily *Amidah,* dating from the second temple period,[63] views David as an eschatological prophet. Referring probably to 1 Sam. 23.1-7, it states: 'Fulfil in our time the words of your servant David, so that men are again ruled in justice and in the fear of God. Let light dawn in the world in our days, for we wait and work for your salvation.'[64] Josephus regards David as a prophet: καὶ ὁ προφητεύειν ἤρξατο του θείου πνεύματος εἰς αὐτὸν μετοικισαμένου.[65] Aquila renders למנצח as τῷ νικοποιῷ, *For the conqueror,* a phrase that appears to have messianic overtones. The Talmud frequently cites Psalms as referring to messianic and eschatological events. For instance, Ps. 72.17: 'The School of R. Yannai said: His name is Yinnon, for it is written, *His name shall endure for ever: before the sun was, his name is Yinnon*' (San 98b). Numerous other passages might be cited.[66] The Midrash regards Psalms writers, David and the sons of Korah, as prophets (*Midr. Pss.* 2.2; 44.1; 45.4), and interprets many psalms eschatologically. For instance, on Ps. 2.2: 'In

62. משה נתן חמשה חומשי תורה לישראל ודוד נתן חמשה ספרים שבתהלים לישראל אשרי האיש ואשרי משכיל מזמור לאסף תפלה למשה יאמרו גאולי השם (*Midr. Pss.* 1.2).

63. See Heinemann 1971: 838-45. He notes, 'It is almost certain that by the end of the temple period the eighteen benedictions of the weekday *Amidah* had become the general custom' (p. 840). It is referred to in the Mishnah at *Ber.* 4.1-5.7 and *Ta'an.* 2.2.

64. *Forms of Prayer,* 236-37.

65. 'And he began to prophesy when the divine spirit removed [from Saul] to dwell upon him' (*Ant.* 6.166).

66. See also *Ber.* 7b (Ps. 2 of Gog); *Ber.* 10a (Ps. 2 of Messiah); *Peṣ.* 118b (Ps. 68 of Messiah); *Meg.* 18a (Ps. 50.23 of Messiah); *'Arak.* 13b (Pss. 12, 92 of Messiah); *Sanh.* 97a (Ps. 89.52 of Messiah); 99a (Ps. 72.5 of Messiah).

the time to come, Gog and Magog will set themselves against the Lord and his Messiah, only to fall down. David, foreseeing this said: *"Why do the nations rage?"'* (*Midr. Pss.* 2.2). It understands למנצח messianically: 'In the days of the Messiah, however, there will be eight strings to the psaltery, for it is said: *For the leader. Upon the Eighth*' (Ps. 12.1; *Midr. Pss.* 81.3). It interprets other psalms of messiah (2.3, 4, 9, 10; 16.4; 21.2, 4; 60.3; 72.3-6; 87.6), the eschatological conflict (2.2, 4; 11.5; 31.5), and God's *malkut* (2.4). Other *midrashim* interpret similarly.[67] Those psalms commonly interpreted messianically or eschatologically in the New Testament, receive similar treatment in the *midrashim*: Psalm 22 (*Pes. R.* 36.2; 37.1); Psalm 110 (*Otot* 8.4); Psalm 118 (*Pes. K.* 27.5; cf. also 22.2).

The mediaeval rabbis took a similar line. Kimhi proposes theoretical grounds for the prophetic nature of the Psalter, in which he discusses the distinction between the higher order of prophecy, that of the *nevi'im,* and utterance in the Holy Spirit, as manifested in the *ketuvim.* Both, he says, foretell the future, but have different characteristics. Utterance in the Holy Spirit is as follows.

> And he [the human author] speaks what is spoken after the manner of men, except that a higher spirit moves him and reveals the words upon his tongue, words of praise and thanksgiving to his God, or words of wisdom and instruction. He also speaks concerning the future, with the divine assistance in addition to the power of the speaker—with all the powers of those who speak. And in this power the Book of Psalms was uttered.[68]

In accord with this Kimhi interprets the majority of Psalms as speaking prophetically of the future. For instance, Psalms 2, 45, 53, 72 and 89 refer to Messiah, Psalms 46 and 53 to the battle of Gog and Magog, Psalm 47 of the post-conflict messianic reign, Psalm 67 of the eschatological fertility of the latter-day rain; the Songs of Ascents are so named because they will be sung at the final ingathering of Israel, and the true meaning (הנכון) of Psalm 22 is that *ayyelet ha-shahar* refers to Israel in their present exile in which they cry out, *My God, my God, why have you abandoned me?*[69] Ibn Ezra seems more aware

67. See, for instance, the messianic interpretations at *Eccl. R.* 1.9.1 (Ps. 72), *Gen. R.* 97 (Ps. 89); *Song R.* 2.13.4 (Ps. 89); *Pes. K.* 5.10 (Ps. 89).

68. Commentary on the Psalms, Introduction to Book I.

69. For Ps. 89, see the comment on Ps. 53; for the Songs of Ascents, see the comment on Ps. 120; for the rest, see the comments on the respective psalms.

than Kimhi of historical context. Yet he too interprets Psalms prophetically, often giving both historical and eschatological interpretation together. Psalm 2: 'If this is about Messiah, the reference here is to Gog and Magog; if it is about David, the reference is to the nations around Jerusalem who fought against him, like the Arameans, Edom, Philistines, and Amalek.'[70] Psalm 45: 'And this psalm is spoken about David or about the Messiah his son, may his name prosper.' Psalm 72: 'A prophecy of David or one of the [temple] singers about Solomon or about Messiah.' Rashi tends to interpret historically rather than prophetically. However, he acknowledges that messianic interpretation is the established tradition among earlier commentators, and states that his own reason for avoiding it is to discountenance Christian interpreters.[71]

5. *Patristic to Reformation Christian Literature*

The New Testament suggests the Christian community inherited their hermeneutic from Israel through the early Israelite church and its leaders. It is therefore unsurprizing that patristic writers share by and large the same hermeneutical principles as the rabbis with regard to the Psalter.

Early Christian Psalters endorse the MT arrangement. The enumeration of some, like the Vulgate, follows LXX, while others, like Jerome's *Psalterium juxta hebraeos,* have the same enumeration as MT. But all of them evince the same sequence found in the MT. Explicit statements regarding the significance of the Psalter's arrangement are rarer in Christian than rabbinic literature, probably as a result of the New Testament's silence on the subject. (R. Abbahu's view, cited above, that *minim* do not derive interpretations from juxtaposition, may have been correct.) However a few comments on the subject are found. Origen observes that the order of the Psalms cannot be explained chronologically, and notes Jewish traditions that recognize a narrative sequence in the Songs of Ascents and which attribute to Psalms 91–100 the למשה heading of Psalm 90.[72] Augustine believes

70. From the recently discovered fragmentary first commentary of Ibn Ezra on the Psalms. The text is in Simon 1991: 324-25.

71. רבותינו פתרוהו על מלך המשיח ונכון הדבר לפותרו עוד על דוד עצמו להשובת המאנים (Rashi 1934).

72. Origen, *Selecta in Psalmos* (Lommatzsch 1831–48: XI, 370-71; XI,

the sequence of the Psalms is highly significant, yet confesses that he does not understand it: '...the sequence of the Psalms, which seems to me to contain the secret of a mighty mystery, has not yet been revealed to me.'[73] However he recognizes a progression to perfection in the whole arrangement.

> For it seems to me not without significance, that the fiftieth is of penitence, the hundredth of mercy and judgment, the hundred and fiftieth of the praise of God in his saints. For thus do we advance to an everlasting life of happiness, first by condemning our own sins, then by living aright, that having condemned our ill life, and lived a good life, we may attain to everlasting life[74]

In the same place he discusses, as does Origen elsewhere,[75] the symbolism of the different Psalms according to their number in the LXX sequence, a mode of interpretation that, whatever its shortcomings, indicates high regard for the received arrangement of Psalms. Gregory of Nyssa maintains the five books exhibit an upward progression to moral perfection: ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ὑψηλότερον τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπερτιθείς, ἕως ἂν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκρότατον ἀφίκηται τῶν ἀγαθῶν.[76]

Patristic writers, like the rabbis, endorse the structurally important headings and subscripts by discussing their interpretative significance. Hippolytus and Origen comment at length on the titles and authors of the Psalms.[77] Gregory of Nyssa has two lengthy essays on Psalms' headings, Εἰς τὰς Ἐπίγραφας τῶν ψαλμῶν, in which he suggests they play an important part in the overall moral and mystical purpose of the Psalter.[78] Athanasius too, according to Jerome, wrote a commentary,

352-54; XIII, 107). The commentary on the Moses Psalms is cited in Chapter 9, and the one on the Songs of Ascents in Chapter 4, of this book.

73. '...ordo psalmorum, qui mihi magni sacramenti videtur continere secretum, nondum mihi fuerit revelatus' (*Enarrationes* on Ps. 150 §1).

74. 'Non enim frustra mihi videtur quinquagesimus esse de paenitentia, centesimus de misericordia et iudicio, centesimus quinquagesimus de laude Dei in sanctis eius. Sic enim ad aeternam beatamque tendimus vitam, primitus peccata nostra damnando, deinde bene vivendo, ut post condemnatam vitam malam gestamque bonam, mereamur aeternam' (*Enarrationes* on Ps. 150 §3).

75. Origen, *Selecta in Psalmos* (Lommatzsch: XI, 370-71).

76. 'It always tends toward the utmost height of the soul, until it comes to the pinnacle of good' (*In Inscriptiones Psalmorum* I.ix.).

77. So Quasten 1950–86: II, 175. Parts of the introduction to Hippolytus' commentary are in Pitra 1884: II, 418-27. For Origen, see *CPG*: I, 149-50.

78. Quasten 1950–86: III, 265.

now lost, *De psalmorum titulis*.[79] Jerome himself commented on Psalms headings: 'David symbolizes the victory of the believers; Asaph relates to the gathering together with the Lord, and the sons of Core [Korah] pertain to Calvary.'[80] Augustine regards the headings as containing profound truth: 'The scriptures of the Psalms usually place mysteries in the title and adorn the beginning of the psalm with the sublimity of a sacrament', and, 'In the title...mysteries are heaped together.'[81] Apparently the only early Christian writer who did not accept the traditions in the headings was Theodore of Mopsuestia, who asserted that David wrote all the Psalms, those that describe later events being written prophetically by him.[82]

Hippolytus gives the earliest written statement of the idea, later recorded in Midrash Tehillim, that the doxological subscripts were intended to divide the Psalter into five books. He states, Καὶ τοῦτο δέ σε μὴ παρέλθοι...ὅτι καὶ τὸ ψαλτήριον εἰς πέντε διεῖλον βιβλία οἱ Ἑβραῖοι, ὥστε εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸ ἄλλον πεντάτευχον,[83] and cites the psalms contained in each book according to the LXX numbering.[84] If this idea was known to a Roman bishop as a Hebrew idea in the late second or early third century, then it probably existed in Israel some

79. Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 87. This Athanasian work is not the same as *De titulis psalmorum*, with which it is sometimes confused, which is thought to be by Hesychius of Jerusalem (Quasten 1950–86: III, 38).

80. *Comm. on Ps.* 8.1 (CCSL: LXXII, 191).

81. 'Solet scriptura Psalmorum mysteria in titulis ponere et frontem Psalmi sublimitate sacramenti decorare' (*Enarrationes* on Ps. 58); 'In titulum...congesta mysteria' (*Enarrationes* on Ps. 80).

82. Quasten 1950–86: III, 404-405; Ackroyd and Evans 1970: 497-501.

83. Let it not escape your notice,...that the Hebrews divided the Psalter also into five books, so that it too might be another Pentateuch.

84. The text can be found at Lagarde 1858b: 193; *PG*: X, 720B. Migne regards it as spurious, but it is not for that reason to be rejected. The Syriac form of Hippolytus' introduction to the Psalms (Lagarde 1858a: 86) is regarded as genuine (Quasten 1950–86: II, 175; Smith 1892: 194 n.). It speaks of the Psalter being divided into five parts or sections (*menawâthê*). Moreover, Eusebius of Caesarea (263–c. 340) and Epiphanius of Salamis (315–403) attribute such a statement to Hippolytus, using language similar to the above passage (Achelis 1897: 131, 143); cf. Eusebius (*PG*: XXIII, 66C); Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus* c. 5 (*PG*: XLIII, 244D–245A). Epiphanius is generally regarded as an important source for the reconstruction of Hippolytus' works (Quasten 1950–86: III, 384-85). There is therefore good ground to believe that the Greek reflects an authentic statement of Hippolytus.

time before. Moreover its similarity to the above-cited passage from *Midr. Pss.* 1.2, both in comparing Psalms and Pentateuch and in listing the Psalms in each book, confirms the antiquity of the rabbinic tradition. Jerome also knew of the five-book division: 'The third section comprises the Hagiographa. The first begins at Job. The second [book begins] at David, which is comprised in five divisions and in a single volume of Psalms.'[85] It is mentioned also by Augustine and other early Christian writers.[86]

The view that the Psalter was future-predictive was widely held in the early church. However, the fathers often interpret the Psalms as referring to the life of Jesus, rather than to the future redemption of the earth, for they regarded the messianic age as in some sense already come. Yet the basic hermeneutical supposition in each case was the same: the Psalter foretells messianic times. Unfortunately the commentaries that might best have preserved early Jewish exegesis, those of the Hebraists Origen and Jerome, are largely lost. But commentaries by other Christian writers are plentiful. Theodotion, like Aquila, renders למנצח messianically: εἰς τὸ νῖκος, *For the victory.* Hippolytus regards David as an eschatological prophet: καὶ Δαβὶδ προμηνύων τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ κυρίου φησὶν ἀπ' ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἡ ἔξοδος αὐτοῦ, etc. (LXX Ps. 18.7).[87] Justin cites Psalms 2, 3, 19, 22, 24, 68, 72 and 110 as messianic proof-texts.[88] Augustine finds messianic prophecy throughout the Psalter: Psalm 1: 'This is to be understood of our Lord Jesus Christ';[89] Psalm 2: 'This is spoken of our Lord's persecutors, of whom mention is made also in the Acts of the Apostles';[90] Psalm 3: 'The words, *I slept, and took rest, and rose for the Lord will wake me up,* lead us to believe that this psalm is to

85. 'Tertius ordo Hagiographa possidet. Et primus liber incipit a Job. Secundus a David, quem quinque incisionibus et uno Psalmorum volumine comprehendunt', *Prologus Galeatus.*

86. Augustine, *Enarrationes* on Ps. 150 § 2. Kirkpatrick notes, 'The division is referred to by most of the Fathers' (Kirkpatrick 1902: xviii).

87. 'And David foretold the Judgment and the appearing of the Lord, saying, *From the summit of heaven is his going out,*' etc. (Lagarde 1858b: 34).

88. *Dialogue with Trypho,* § 19, 32-34, 69, 88, 97-105, 121-22, 127.

89. '...de Domino nostro Iesu Christo... accipiendum est' (*Enarrationes* on Ps. 1 §1).

90. 'Dicitur hoc enim de persecutoribus Domini, qui et in Actibus Apostolorum commemorantur' (*Enarrationes* on Ps. 2 §1).

be understood as in the Person of Christ';[91] and so on. Athanasius deals with the messianic character of the Psalms in his Psalms commentary and in his *Epistula ad Marcellinum de interpretatione Psalmorum.*[92] Jerome, as noted above, regards the Asaph Psalms as relating to an eschatological gathering, probably of souls, to the Lord, and the Korah Psalms as foretelling Calvary.[93] Similarly, like Theodotion, he makes no attempt to interpret למנצח cultically, but renders it 'Victori', *For the conqueror.*[94] Tertullian regards the immediate sense [praesentis rei sensum] of Psalm 1 as referring to Joseph of Arimathea, and its 'assembly of the wicked' to the Sanhedrin.[95] Even the 'historical-critical' Theodore of Mopsuestia held to the prophetic nature of the Psalter, albeit with a heterodox hermeneutic. He regarded David as a prophet who wrote all the Psalms, but generally limited his prophetic horizon to the Maccabean period. Yet he allows that four psalms, LXX Psalms 2, 8, 44 (MT 45) and 109 (MT 110), see beyond this period and were written prophetically in the character of Christ.[96] Commentaries by Ambrose, Basil, Chrysostom, Theodoret and others also survive, all of whom regard the Psalms as prophetic. Similar views prevailed for centuries to come. Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers in the late sixth century, asserts David's prophetic foreknowledge.

> Impleta sunt quae concinit
> David fideli carmine,
> Dicendo in nationibus
> Regnavit a ligno Deus.[97]

91. 'Hunc psalmum ex persona Christi accipiendum persuadet quod dictum est: Ego dormiui, et somnum cepi, et exsurrexi, quoniam Dominus suscipiet me' (*Enarrationes* on Ps. 3 §1).

92. Quasten 1950–86: III, 37-38.

93. Comm. on Ps. 8.1 (*CCSL*: LXXII, 191).

94. Jerome's varying approaches to this word are particularly interesting. In his Gallican Psalter (Vulgate), based largely on LXX (Berardino and Quasten 1950–86: IV, 223-25), he renders it, 'In finem', *For the end.* This corresponds to the foremost meaning of LXX's Εἰς τὸ τέλος. However, in his later Hebrew Psalter, written after he acquired greater familiarity with the Hebrew text and its traditions (Berardino and Quasten 1950–86: IV, 224-26), he gives instead 'Victori'. Thus, of the two possible eschatological meanings, he regards the more messianic one as correct.

95. *De Spectaculis* 3 (Tertullian, *Writings* 1.11; *Opera* 1.5).

96. Quasten 1950–86: III, 404-405; Ackroyd and Evans 1970: 497-501. The Syriac text of his headings is given in Baethgen 1885: 67-70.

97. From 'Vexilla regis prodeunt' by Venantius Fortunatus (d. 609). Neale and

Likewise, the thirteenth-century author of *Dies irae* regarded David as a prophet like the highly eschatological Sybils.[98]

> Dies irae, dies illa,
> Solvet sæclum in favilla
> Teste David cum Sybilla.[99]

Indeed, the medieval church's emphasis on the prophetic nature of Psalms became such that Abarbanel,[100] in the fifteenth century, objected to their classifying David among the prophets.[101]

The same hermeneutic prevailed in Psalms interpretation throughout the Reformation period. Allegorizing speculations aside, the following words of Luther indicate that he recognized the Psalms' headings as an intrinsic part of the Psalter text, valid for interpretation, and that he regarded the psalmists as future-predictive prophets.

> Filii Chore spiritum propheticum fere semper ad incarnationem Christi habent magis quam ad passionem. Cuius mysteria clarius David in suo spiritu pronunciat. Ita quilibet prophetarum ad unam magis materiam quam ad aliam videtur spiritum habere. Unde raro filii Core de passione, sed fere semper de incarnatione et nuptiis Christi et Ecclesie loquuntur in gaudio: quod et psalmi eorum sunt iucundi et hilaritate pleni. David autem magis de passione et resurrectione et iis, que in virili etate gessit dominus. Asaph autem potissimum de discretione malorum a consortio piorum, de perditione impiorum et desructione synagoge, ut patet per psalmos eius. Et id forte nominum ratio postulat. Quia filii Chore plures sunt: significantes populum fidei novellum, qui de virgine natus sicut Christus, spiritualiter, ex aqua et spiritu sancto. Hec enim est mystica incarnatio Christi, quod nascitur in illis spiritualiter: immo ipsi ex eo nascuntur. Ideo de ista duplici nativitate, scilicet Christi capitis et corporis eius Ecclesie, omnis eorum psalmus resonat. At David 'manu fortis'[102] iam operantem virtutes et crucem sustinentem indicat: ideo et de illis fere semper loquuntur psalmi eius. Asaph tandem 'congregatio' significat,[103] discretum populum et congregatum ex illis, qui relinquuntur et non congregantur.[104]

In his introduction to the Psalter, Luther emphasizes its future-predictive nature: 'And for this reason alone the Psalter should be precious and beloved: because it promises Christ's death and resurrection so clearly and depicts his kingdom and the entire condition and nature of Christendom.'[105]

Littledale (1874) translate it as, 'Fulfilled is now what David told, In true prophetic song of old; Among the nations, Lo, says he, Our God is reigning from the tree' ('The Royal Banners Forward Go'). The reference to God reigning from the tree is from the Old Latin Version of Ps. 96.10, as preserved in the Psalterium Romanum. It contains the reading 'Dominus regnavit a ligno', which is quoted by many Latin writers from Tertullian on as a prophecy of Christ's triumph through death. The only Greek authority for the tradition is Justin Martyr, who regards it as a prophecy of Christ's reign after his crucifixion (*Apol.* 1.41) and charges the Jews with having erased it from the text (*Dialogue with Trypho* 100.73). The charge is probably unjustified. The words are found in only two LXX MSS and in each case have probably been introduced from the Old Latin (Kirkpatrick 1902: 577-78).

98. 'Its author is almost certainly a 13th century Franciscan' ('Dies irae', *ODCC*: 398).

99. 'The day of wrath, that day, shall reduce the world to ashes, as David testifies together with the Sybils.'

100. Leiman 1968: 49 n., argues for the pronunciation 'Abarbanel' rather than the more common 'Abrabanel' or 'Abravanel'.

101. Rosenthal 1937: 36. Leiman 1968: 49-61, notes Abarbanel's general familiarity with Christian interpretation. It is hard to know how widespread Abarbanel's view on this matter might have been among Jews of the period. Certainly, the Talmud (*b. Soṭ.* 48b) classes David among the 'former prophets', although that does not necessarily imply ability to predict the future.

102. Jerome translates *David* as, 'fortis manu sive desiderabilis' (Opp. Paris [1579], III, p. 474).

103. Jerome translates *Asaph* as, 'congregans' (Opp. Paris [1579], III, p. 480).

104. 'The sons of Korah have the prophetic spirit almost always for Christ's incarnation rather than for his passion. David in his spirit speaks of the mysteries of the passion more clearly. Thus any one prophet seems to have the Spirit more for one matter than for another. Hence the sons of Korah rarely speak about the Passion, but almost always speak with joy about Christ's incarnation and his marriage with the church, so that also their psalms are joyful and full of mirth. David, on the contrary, deals more with the Passion and the Resurrection and the things the Lord did in his maturity. Asaph, in turn, talks mostly about the separation of the wicked from the fellowship of the godly, about the destruction of the ungodly and of the synagogue, as is clear from his psalms. And this is perhaps what the significance of the names calls for. The sons of Korah are many, denoting the new people of faith who were born spiritually of water and the Holy Spirit, as Christ was born of the Virgin. This is the mystical incarnation of Christ, that he is born in them spiritually, indeed that they are born of him. Therefore every one of their psalms echoes this twofold birth, namely of Christ the Head and of the church, his body. But David, 'strong of hand', shows Christ now doing miracles and bearing the cross, and therefore his psalms almost always speak about these things. Finally, Asaph means 'gathering,' the people separated and gathered from those who remain and are not gathered' (Luther 1883–1987: IV, 3-4).

105. 'Und allein deshalb sollte der Psalter teuer und lieb sein, weil er von Christi Sterben und Auferstehen so klar verheißt und sein Reich und der ganzen Christenheit Stand und Wesen verbildet'; from the introduction to the Psalter of 1528 and 1545 (Luther 1965: I, 3).

Of the other reformers, Bucer produced the first full commentary on the Psalter, *In Librum Psalmorum Interpretatio* (1524).[106] A capable Hebraist, he was well-acquainted with the commentaries of Rashi, Ibn Ezra and Kimhi, and refers to their opinions on virtually every page. He regards the headings, especially those containing historical information, as relevant to correct interpretation. He gives priority to the historical setting of psalms texts, yet believes they are to be understood typologically as predicting the true David, the Christ. Calvin, aware of the abuses of mystical interpretation, regards authorial intention and historical context as essential to correct interpretation, and dismisses, sometimes too readily, what is not immediately apparent.[107] Nonetheless, he too cautiously espouses the same broad principles observable in his predecessors. As regards arrangement, he comments that the redactor seems to have placed Psalm 1 at the beginning as a preface.[108] He regards the headings as valid for interpretation and thus an intrinsic part of the Psalms text. For instance, he takes לבני־קרח and לאסף to mean that David composed these psalms and gave them to these levitical musicians, and takes account of historical information in the heading when interpreting.[109] As regards eschatological prophecy, he is cautious, but allows that some psalms, such as 2, 21, 22, 45, 67, 72, 110, contain messianic prophecy, often typologically contained in the events of David's life. Coverdale, alone of all the reformers, changed the received text of the Psalter by omitting its headings in his Bible, but his successors did not hesitate to rectify the omission. Subsequent English reformers rectified the omission. Thus, among sixteenth-century Christians, the general hermeneutic of Psalms interpretation differed little from that of the previous two millennia, in the essentials of recognizing the Psalter's literary integrity and future-predictive purpose, although in specifics, such as Luther's 'destructione synagoge', it varies from rabbinic literature. Similar views prevailed until the early nineteenth century.

106. It is discussed by Hobbs 1994: 161-78. See also Hobbs 1971 and Hobbs 1984.

107. See, for instance, his comment on שושן of Ps. 45.1: 'Ego, ut de re non magni momenti, suspendo sententiam' (As this is a matter of no great consequence, I suspend judgment).

108. Comment on Ps. 1.

109. Comments on Pss. 42, 73 and, e.g., Ps. 51.

6. *The Nineteenth Century*

With the intellectual revolution of the Enlightenment, biblical interpretation in the universities of western Europe was loosed from the authority of church and synagogue. This gave rise to forms of interpretation radically different from all that went before, as a result of which biblical interpretation in the nineteenth century was divided between revisionist and conservative viewpoints. Few, of course, subscribed exclusively to one position, but still there was a dividing of tendencies. It therefore becomes necessary from now on to consider conflicting schools of interpretation.

The revisionist approach came to regard psalm headings as additions of such a late date as to contain no significant information about their respective lyrics. In particular, they denied any link between individuals named in ascriptions and the ensuing psalms. Thus De Wette, von Lengerke, Olshausen, Hupfeld, Graetz, Kuenen, Reuss, Stade, Cheyne and Duhm are unwilling to connect any psalms with the individuals named.[110] Ewald and Hitzig are more generous, the former allowing one psalm to David, the latter about thirteen.[111] Cheyne omits all the headings from the text, while others render them in some form or another extraneous.[112] Two points were adduced to support this dismissal of the headings. First, the text of some psalms was said to date from long after the time of the person named in the heading. For instance, the temple seems to be mentioned in some לדוד psalms, and some לדוד and לאסף psalms appear post-exilic (27, 69, 79, 83). It was therefore assumed that these, and all other headings as well, are later pseudepigraphal ascriptions. Olshausen summarizes it thus:

110. De Wette 1811: 12-14; Olshausen 1853: 4-5; Graetz 1882: 16; Cheyne 1888: xvi; Duhm 1899: xvi-xviii. Hupfeld does not discuss them in his introduction, places them in parentheses in his translation, and disputes them in his commentary. The opinion of von Lengerke is noted by Delitzsch (1887: 83). The opinions of Kuenen, Reuss and Stade are noted by Briggs and Briggs (1906–1907: lvii).

111. Ewald 1899: 1-2; Hitzig 1863–65: xv.

112. See Cheyne's first Psalms commentary (1888). Hitzig and Hupfeld put the headings in brackets, while Wellhausen prints them in red and the rest of the psalm in black. Olshausen and Duhm do not cite the headings in their summaries and brief quotes of the psalm text.

> However, by a more exact and somewhat unprejudiced examination the conclusion has long been unavoidable that this tradition, despite its age, is not credible in the great majority of cases, because by far the greater part of these 90 Pss.,[113] according to their content, could not possibly have originated in the time indicated by the tradition. But thereby is their [the headings'] evidential value not merely weakened, but totally and completely invalid, and their statements worthless for criticism, even in those psalms whose composition in the time indicated cannot be ruled out, and which are partially understandable according to the circumstances of that time.[114]

Secondly, LXX additions to the Hebrew headings were thought to indicate an increasing tendency in scribal circles to create headings at all costs. Hence it was surmised that the whole tradition of the headings was itself of late origin. Baethgen summarized it thus:

> At those psalms which have the לדוד superscription, it is chiefly to be noted that at many of these this לדוד is not text-critically established...; it is missing in three cases in the Jerusalem Targum, in one case in the Vulgate and in one case in Aquila Sexta. On the other hand, the fact that the LXX, at a greater number of Psalms, names authors, especially David, where they are absent in the Hebrew text, shows that there is a predominant tendency to give an author also to the nameless Psalms. The lack of לדוד in these five cases is only explainable by saying that these particular five psalms were yet untitled by the Hebrews in the translator's time. But if the statements about the authors are as late as this, then it follows that in these cases they have no critical value. From that conclusion follows further the obligation to investigate also those psalms whose author-ascription is already witnessed by LXX, in order to see whether or not in these cases also the לדוד etc. rests upon the notion of a later reader, or originally had another sense altogether.[115]

113. That is, those having proper names in the heading.

114. 'Einer genaueren, einigermassen vorurtheilsfreien Betrachtung hat es jedoch schon längst nicht entgehn können, dass diese Ueberlieferung, ihres Alters ungeachtet, in den allermeisten Fällen nicht für glaubwürdig gehalten werden darf, indem der bei weitem grösste Theil jener 90 Pss. seinem Inhalte nach unmöglich in den Zeiten entstanden sein kann, auf welche die Ueberlieferung hindeutet. Damit wird aber deren Beweiskraft überhaupt nicht bloss geschwächt, sondern ganz und gar hinfällig und ihre Angaben auch bei solchen Pss. für die Kritik werthlos, deren Abfassung in der bezeichneten Zeit nicht gerade unmöglich genannt werden kann und sich aus den damaligen Verhältnissen einigermassen begreifen liesse' (Olshausen 1853: 4-5).

115. Author's translation of 'Bei den Psalmen, welche die Überschrift לדוד haben, ist zunächst anzumerken, daß bei mehreren derselben dies לדוד textkritisch nicht feststeht...; es fehlt in drei Fällen bei Hier. Targ., in einem Fall bei Hier. und in einem Fall bei Aq. Sexta. Andrerseits zeigt der Umstand, daß die LXX bei einer grösseren Anzahl von Psalmen Verfasser, besonders David, nennen, wo sie im hebräischen Text fehlen, daß die Tendenz herrschte, auch den namenlosen Psalmen einen Verfasser zu geben. Das fehlen von לדוד in jenen fünf Fällen läßt sich daher nur so erklären, daß die betreffenden fünf Psalmen zur Zeit der Übersetzer noch ἀνεπίγραφοι παρ' Ἑβραίους waren. Sind aber die Angaben über die Verfasser so spät, so haben sie zunächst in diesen Fällen keinen kritischen Wert. Daraus folgt dann aber weiter die Pflicht, auch bei den Psalmen, bei welchen die Angabe des Verfassers bereits von LXX bezeugt wird, zu untersuchen, ob nicht etwa auch bei ihnen das לדוד u.s.w. auf einer Vermuthung späterer Leser beruht oder ursprünglich einen anderen Sinn hat' (Baethgen 1897: vi).

The idea that the Psalter was purposefully arranged was also disputed. Indeed, after the headings fell, it was defenceless, for the headings and doxologies, demarcating groups of psalms, had always been the best evidence for internal structure. The Psalter came to be regarded instead as 'only the remains of the lyric poetry of the Israelites' and to suggest they were 'an anthology of lyrics' was 'misleading in the highest degree'.[116] Thus many commentators of the period make no remark on the existence of concatenation or upon the characteristics of heading-defined internal collections, such as the Asaph or Korah Psalms.[117] Ewald rearranged the psalms into what he considered their chronological order (1839).[118] Instead of being purposefully redacted, the Psalter was said to have grown into its present form by a process of accretion whereby groups of psalms were successively suffixed to one another. The rubric at the end of Book II was appealed to as evidence for this, it being said that since Davidic psalms appeared after that point, the statement that the prayers of David were ended must mark the end of an earlier collection.[119] Jahn states it thus:

> In the five books of the Psalms we have before us just as many collections of psalms as were made, and they are arranged in the order in which they followed one another. The first compiler wanted to pass on only songs of David; the second joined his collection to the first, and wanted to give a

116. Author's translation of 'nur die Überreste der lyrischen Poesie der Israeliten... eine lyrische Anthologie... in höchstem Masse irreleitend' (Baethgen 1897: xxxiv). In spite of this, Baethgen comments on the same page on concatenation.

117. See e.g. Olshausen or Baethgen.

118. This is referred to by later commentators; e.g. Cheyne 1904: xvi. I have unfortunately been unable to find a copy of it.

119. See de Wette 1811: 17; Ewald 1866: I, 13; Baethgen 1897: xxix-xxxiv.

> supplement to the Davidic lyrics; yet he did not hesitate to include some other songs as well. The compiler of the third book was no longer concerned at all with the songs of David; and because he wanted to join his collection to the previous one, he placed after Ps. 72 the closural phrase about the end of the songs of David. The fourth compiler confined himself to nameless songs, and therefore he transmitted only one psalm of Moses and two psalms of David. The fifth finally put together all the remaining uncollected sacred songs which were to be found.[120]

The traditional assumption that the Psalms foretold eschatological events was likewise rejected by the revisionist movement. Two factors probably contributed to this. The first was the obfuscation of the Psalter's internal structure following the dismissal of the headings. The second was the prevailing naturalism that led to a denial not only of future-prediction in the Bible, but also of any attempt by biblical writers to foretell the future. Instead a new purpose was proposed for the existence of the Psalter, as Olshausen wrote, the original purpose of the whole collection can have been none other than to serve *the Israelite community as a spiritual songbook.*[121]

Of course, the rejection of the traditional view of the headings also influenced opinion on the dating of the Psalms. Having dispensed with any connection with figures like David or the levitical Korahites and Asaphites, there was no necessary link with the pre-exilic period. Olshausen found it unthinkable that some psalms could still originate

120. 'In den fünf Büchern der Psalmen haben wir eben so viele Sammlungen der Psalmen vor uns, die nach der Ordnung, in welcher sie aufeinander folgen, gemacht worden. Der erste Sammler wollte bloss Lieder Davids liefern; der zweite fügte seine Sammlung der ersten an, und wollte eine Nachlese der davidischen Lieder geben; doch scheute er sich nicht, auch einige andere Gesänge aufzunehmen. Der Sammler des dritten Buchs hatte seine Absicht gar nicht mehr auf die Lieder Davids gerichtet; und da er seine Sammlung der vorigen anschliessen wollte, so setzte er nach dem 72. Ps. die Schlussformel von dem Ende der Lieder Davids hinzu. Der vierte Sammler beschränkte sich auf namenlose Lieder, daher er nun einen Psalm Mose's und zwei Psalmen Davids liefert. Der fünfte endlich nahm alles zusammen, was noch von heiligen Liedern zu finden war' (Jahn [*Einleitung*, II, 718-19] cited by de Wette 1811: 17).

121. Author's translation of 'die ursprüngliche Bestimmung der ganzen Sammlung keine andre gewesen sein kann, als die, *der israelitischen Gemeinde zum geistlichen Gesangbuche* zu dienen' (Olshausen 1853: 4 [Olshausen's emphasis]). The same idea occurs widely in this period. See Baethgen 1897: xxxv.

from the time of the pre-exilic kings.[122] Instead, the way was clear to date the entire corpus in the Maccabean period.

> If a large number of psalms in all parts of the collection belong to the times of the Syrian oppression and the Maccabean wars, as seems to be the case from the events mentioned, then it is to be expected that also many other songs, which are mixed among them, derive from the same time, even though they do not clearly demonstrate any direct relation to the state of the community.[123]

And books IV and V were dated yet later still, to the time of John Hyrcanus.[124] The denial of the traditional dating, although not directly relevant to the interpretation of the Psalter, yet affected the new view of it that was to be proposed.

Thus this period saw the overthrow of all the traditional tenets of Psalms interpretation regarding the headings, the arrangement of lyrics and the eschatologico-predictive nature of the collection. Instead of being predictive scripture, compiled largely from lyrics of Israel's golden age, it had become a haphazard collection of texts dating from post-exilic times and conglomerated piecemeal in the late Maccabean period to be a second temple hymnbook.

However, although the above views were predominant throughout the nineteenth century, a significant minority of commentators continued to maintain traditional tenets of Psalms interpretation. Hengstenberg (1848) maintains that לדוד and some other ascriptions indicate authorship.[125] He discusses the headings and book divisions at length, and finds the Psalter 'has in no respect the character of a work done piecemeal'.[126] He also finds messianic prophecy in individual psalms.[127] Alexander, who owes much to Hengstenberg, shares his view of the

122. Author's translation of 'unbedenklich, daß einige Pss. noch aus der vorexilischen Königszeit herrühren' (Olshausen 1853: 8).

123. Author's translation of 'Wenn eine große Zahl von Psalmen in allen Theilen der Sammlung den Zeiten der syrischen Unterdrückung und der maccabäischen Kämpfe angehört, wie es nach den erwähnten Umständen der Fall zu sein scheint, so lässt sich erwarten, daß auch manche andere Gesänge, die mitten unter jene gemischt sind, ohne daß eine unmittelbare Beziehung auf die Lage der Gemeinde deutlich hervorträte, aus derselben Zeit herstammen...' (Olshausen 1853: 7-8).

124. Olshausen 1853: 8.

125. Hengstenberg 1845–48: Appendix, xvii-xxii.

126. Hengstenberg 1845–48: Appendix, xxxii-liv, xxxix.

127. Hengstenberg 1845–48: Appendix, lxxviii-lxxxi.

headings and discusses the order of lyrics and concatenation.[128] He observes that trilogies and even more extensive systems of individual psalms can be traced, each 'independent of the rest, and yet together forming beautiful and striking combinations, particularly when the nucleus or the basis of the series is an ancient psalm...to which others have been added'.[129] He too holds that some psalms are intentionally predictive.[130] Delitzsch, also influenced by Hengstenberg,[131] achieves perhaps the best balance between criticism and tradition of all nineteenth-century commentators. He generally supports the validity of the headings. He therefore allows 'many' psalms to be by David and suggests that the initial collections behind Psalms 3–72 date from Solomon's time, and that Psalm 90 is by Moses.[132] He notes that the order of the lyrics cannot be explained purely on the basis of chronological evolution, and indicates evidence of editorial activity in the Psalter, noting concatenation in particular.[133] In the light of this he detects 'the impress of one ordering spirit', a compiler whose arrangement displays, on the lesser level, 'the principle of homogeneity',[134] and on the larger level, the same sort of upward progression remarked upon by Gregory of Nyssa: 'The beginning of the Psalter celebrates the blessedness of those who walk in conformity with the redeeming will of God...the end of the Psalter soars to the blessed height of the consummation of all things.'[135] Delitzsch also maintains that a central theme is discernible in the collection, that is, concern with the Davidic covenant and its ultimate fulfilment in a future Messiah.[136] He perceives this eschatological hope not only in the redactor's mind, but also in the mind of individual psalmists. Of Psalm 2 he remarks, 'The poet is transported into the future in which all the nations of the world will rebel against Yahveh and his Christ' (משיח).[137]

128. Alexander 1850: vii-xiv.
129. Alexander 1850: ix-x.
130. Alexander 1850: 8.
131. Delitzsch 1887: 84.
132. Delitzsch 1887: 10, 20, 22-23.
133. Delitzsch 1887: 18-28, esp. 25-26. He discusses concatenation at greater length in the treatise Delitzsch 1846.
134. Delitzsch 1887: 24, 26.
135. Delitzsch 1887: 24-25.
136. Delitzsch 1887: 88-95.
137. Author's translation of 'Der Dichter ist in die Zukunft versetzt, wo die gesamte Völkerwelt sich wieder Jahve und seinen Christus (משיח) erheben wird' (Delitzsch 1890: 107).

Other commentators of this period deal with the arrangement and purpose of the Psalter. One approach was that of de Lagarde (1880). Building on the temple hymnbook theory, he proposed that the five divisions of the Psalter were intended for five different portions of public worship, the requirements of which explained internal repetitions in the collection.[138] This approach was taken up and developed by a number of subsequent commentators. More neglected, yet more original, was the work of Forbes, Professor of Oriental Languages at Aberdeen, whose *Studies in the Book of Psalms* (1888) anticipates much recent scholarship. He realized more clearly than any of his contemporaries that the final arrangement of the Psalter is greater than its parts.

> But whatever may be thought of the original purport of these Psalms, when we look at the place which has been assigned them in the Psalter as now constituted (arranged certainly in its present form a considerable time before the Septuagint version), and to the order and connection in which they stand, it becomes impossible with any fairness to deny that they were intended to excite in the Jewish worshippers an expectation of the Messiah...[139]

His justification for this approach was twofold. First, the retention of the royal psalms after the extinction of the monarchy is explicable only on the grounds of 'an unshaken expectation, still continuing, of a greater king yet to come than either a David or a Solomon'; secondly, the prominent position accorded to these royal psalms in the Psalter shows a high significance was attached to them.[140] And if the remainder of Forbes's theory is less enduring, these introductory remarks anticipate the premisses of recent scholarship on the canonical form of the Psalter. Another original thinker was Bishop King. In the third volume of his commentary on Psalms (1898–1905), he proposes that the Psalter was designed to be read with the triennial lectionary cycle of Torah in the synagogue, and demonstrates striking correspondences between them.[141] Later commentators, who originated similar theories,

138. De Lagarde 1879–80: II, 13-15.
139. Forbes 1888: 3.
140. Forbes 1888: 4.
141. King 1898–1905: III, v-xiv.

apparently independently of King, may be the poorer for not knowing his work.

7. *The Twentieth Century*

The Psalms interpretation of the twentieth century appears, in retrospect, like a process of slow reappraisal of the scepticism of the nineteenth. It can be regarded under four heads: a synthesizing period and three schools. The first of these, the synthesizing period, dominating the first quarter of the century, lacks any dominant disciplines or schools of thought. Its significant commentaries aim for a middle ground somewhere between the traditional and revisionist views. If none is as conservative as Hengstenberg, neither is any as sceptical as Olshausen. The first major commentary of the century is that of Kirkpatrick (1902), which displays a broad mastery of the ancient literature. As regards the arrangement of the Psalter, he notes concatenation and suggests that the temple hymnbook theory is insufficient. He recognizes eschatological and messianic themes, but does not regard them as organizational principles in the compilation of the collection, concluding that the compilers worked with a number of ends in view, both liturgical and devotional.[142] As regards headings, he states:

> While however the titles cannot be accepted as giving trustworthy information in regard to the authorship of the Psalms, they are not to be regarded as entirely worthless... It seems probable that, in many cases at least, they indicate the source from which the Psalms were derived rather than the opinion of the collector as to their authorship.[143]

His view of the five-book division is typically cautious: '...the division of the books in part corresponds to older collections out of which the Psalter was formed, in part is purely artificial, and probably had its origin in the wish to compare the Psalter with the Pentateuch.'[144] Cheyne, unlike Kirkpatrick, was unfettered by circumspection. In his second commentary (1904), he makes bizarre changes without ground or defence to the entire Psalter. The entire heading of Psalm 51, for instance, is 'corrected' to *Deposited. Marked: of 'Arab-ethan. For the*

142. Kirkpatrick 1902: l-li, lxxvi.
143. Kirkpatrick 1902: xxxii-xxxiii.
144. Kirkpatrick 1902: xviii.

Sabbath. Briggs (1906) believes the Psalter was redacted at the end of the second century to be a hymn book suitable for use in both temple and synagogue.[145] He regards the headings as almost entirely spurious and dates the composition of most psalms in the late Persian to Maccabean periods, although he allows that some may be pre-exilic.[146] He seems to regard some psalms (2, 110) as intentionally messianic, and others as perhaps less intentionally so (22, 40, 69, and 'the royal psalms').[147]

Probably the most original thinker of the first quarter of the century was J.P. Peters, whose concern to ascertain the cultic life-setting of the Psalms anticipated the work of Mowinckel.[148] He emphasized the historical setting of psalms collections, rather than individual lyrics; indeed, so important to him were these collections that he rearranged the Psalter to reunite divided collections, such as the Korah Psalms. He made the interesting suggestion that the Elohistic Psalter originated in the Northern Kingdom—the Korah Psalms coming from the Dan cult and the Asaph Psalms from a Josephite shrine.[149] He also published a separate study on the Songs of Ascents.[150] He proposed that the distinctive headings of these collections indicated the cultic traditions from which they came, and gives considerable attention to headings in general.[151] Occasionally he suggests that parts of the Psalter were redacted on literary principles with eschatological aims.

> It [Ps. 72] is not a liturgy for a sacrifice, but an ode, like Ps. 2, to depict the glories of the kingdom of the ideal king of David's line, the Messiah or Christ that was to be, and appears to have been designed for the conclusion of the collection of the Psalms of David, as Ps. 2, a much more militant treatment of the same theme, was for the commencement of that volume.[152]

However, this thought-provoking work appears to have gone largely unnoticed until Goulder developed some of Peters's ideas more than six decades later.

145. Briggs and Briggs 1906–1907: xc-xcii.
146. Briggs and Briggs 1906–1907: lviii, xc-xci.
147. Briggs and Briggs 1906–1907: xcvii.
148. Peters 1922.
149. Peters 1922: 9-10, 273-75.
150. Peters 1894.
151. Peters 1922: 32-50.
152. Peters 1922: 270.

The first two of the three schools of twentieth-century Psalms scholarship were the form critical approaches developed by H. Gunkel and S. Mowinckel respectively. Gunkel, the pioneer of form criticism, attempted to define psalms according to categories of literary genres (*Gattungen*), and to discover the original life-setting (*Sitz im Leben*) of a *Gattung* and its psalms. These *Gattungen* were formulated partly by comparison with the literary forms of other recently discovered ancient oriental literature, but also took into account theme and content, and were therefore useful tools of broad categorization. Gunkel defined several major *Gattungen*: hymns, communal laments, royal psalms, individual laments (and psalms of trust), and individual thanksgiving psalms. He also indicated minor *Gattungen*: communal thanksgiving psalms, pilgrimage psalms and liturgies.[153] This approach, recognizing as it did the Psalms' resemblance to other ancient literature, helped re-establish a more realistic dating. Gunkel allowed that some psalms might have originated in the pre-exilic period. As regards the arrangement of the Psalter, he adopts a middle ground. At the beginning of his last work, *Einleitung in Die Psalmen,* he calls for investigation into inter-psalm links:

> Now it is an inviolable principle of scholarship that nothing can be understood without its context. Accordingly, *it will be the specific task of Psalms research to rediscover the connections between the individual songs.*[154]

However, while acknowledging Delitzsch's work on concatenation, he disagrees with his view that there is an overarching purpose in the Psalter,[155] believing it originated by a process of gradual evolution:

> The discovery that no unifying principle for the received sequence can be found, although various viewpoints can be detected in the juxtaposition of individual psalms... compels the conclusion that the Psalter owes its present condition to an intricate process of development.[156]

153. Gunkel 1926: 1-33. Successive chapters deal with the *Gattungen* individually.

154. Author's translation of 'Nun ist es aber ein unverbrüchliche Grundsatz der Wissenschaft, daß nichts ohne seine Zusammenhang verstanden werden kann. Es wird demnach *die eigentliche Aufgabe der Psalmenforschung sein, die Verbindungen zwischen die einzelnen Liedern wiederauszufinden*' (Gunkel 1926: 4; Gunkel's emphasis).

155. Gunkel 1926: 435.

156. Author's translation of 'Die Ergebnis, daß sich kein einheitliches Prinzip für die überlieferte Aufeinanderfolge erkennen läßt, wohl aber verschiedene Gesichtspunkte bei der Zusammenstellung einzelner Psalmen nachweisbar sind... drängt zu dem Schlusse, daß das Psalmbuch seinen gegenwärtigen Zustand einem verwickelten Entstehungsvorgang verdankt...' (Gunkel and Begrich 1933: 436).

He virtually ignores headings and subscripts. *Einleitung in die Psalmen* has no more than a short supplement on the musical terms, written by his student, Begrich, after Gunkel's death.[157] Yet while he recognizes no overarching purpose in the Psalter, he notes that certain psalms are in a form that shows them to be intentionally eschatological prophecy (9, 46, 47, 48, 68, 76, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 149).[158]

Mowinckel, Gunkel's student, built upon his teacher's *Gattungsgeschichte,* but emphasized the need to understand the Psalms in relation to their cultic function in Israel. For, although Gunkel had already recognized that some psalms were of cultic origin, he thought the majority were spiritualized imitations of earlier psalms, deriving from conventicles of pious laymen.[159] Mowinckel however recognized that the numerous cultic allusions in the Psalms require that the majority of them originated in the cult. In his *Psalmenstudien* (1921–24), he sought not only to define their *Sitz im Leben,* but also to reconstruct the festivals in which they originated. In the second *Psalmenstudien* monograph, *Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie* (1920), he proposed, by analogy with the annual 'enthronement of Marduk' ritual, or *bit akitu,* of the Babylonian autumn new year festival, that ancient Israel had an annual 'enthronement of Yhwh' festival. This celebrated Yhwh's victory, like that of Marduk or Baal, over the creation negating forces of chaos. He proposed that about 40 psalms were connected with this festival.

As regards the editorial purpose behind the Psalter, he rejects the hymnbook idea, considering historical preservation of ancient texts as the redactional impulse behind the collection.[160] He discusses psalm headings at some length.[161] He allows that some Davidic psalms are very ancient, dating even from David's time, but their ascriptions do

157. Gunkel 1926: 455-58.

158. Gunkel and Begrich 1933: 329-81.

159. Cf. also Briggs and Briggs 1906–1907: xcv: 'Many of the Pss. in their original form were composed as an expression of private devotion.'

160. Mowinckel 1962: II, 204.

161. The fourth monograph, *Die Technischen Termini in den Psalmenüberschriften,* investigates the musical and cultic terms in the headings. The sixth monograph, *Die Psalmdichter,* deals with personal names in the headings.

not indicate authorship.[162] Rather, some Psalms of David and Solomon may have been written for the use of these people, 'in whose name was a good omen', and these ascriptions were mistakenly thought by later generations to indicate authorship. From this arose the biblical tradition that David was a musician and a poet.[163] Other ascriptions, such as Asaph, Heman, Ethan and the Sons of Korah, indicate not authorship, but the names of guilds who made these collections.[164] He regards the five-book division as accidental, developing from the doxologies that were carried into the Psalter along with their preceding psalms.[165] He recognizes the prophetic tone of many psalms, and suggests they originated as cultic oracles in answer to contemporary requirements of divine guidance and exhortation.[166] However, he denies there is any intentionally eschatological or messianic reference in the Psalter.[167]

Other commentaries of the time tend to be overshadowed by the work of Gunkel and Mowinckel. Barnes (1931) is moderately conservative. He says little regarding the place of the headings in interpretation, but does not dismiss them, coming 'to the study of the Psalter prepared to find some Davidic compositions there'.[168] He appears to subscribe tacitly to the view that the Psalter is the second temple hymnbook. He regards some psalms (2, 72, 85, 89) as messianic in the sense that they long for the return of Israel's Golden Age under a righteous king. But Psalms 2 and 110 barely make it; apparently they are too warlike to refer to his conception of messiah.[169] Oesterley (1939) states that the headings 'formed no part of the text in its original form' but 'many of them indicate the collection to which the psalm in question belonged before being incorporated in the Psalter'.[170] He

162. Mowinckel 1921–24: VI, 72, 76. Elsewhere Mowinckel states that only a minority of psalms date from the 'late Jewish period' (Preface to *Psalms in Israel's Worship* [1962]).

163. Author's translation of '...in dessen Namen ein gutes Omen lag' (Mowinckel 1921-24: VI, 75, 72-81).

164. Mowinckel 1921–24: VI, 69-71.

165. Mowinckel 1962: II, 197.

166. See *Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen,* the third monograph of *Psalmenstudien.* Also Mowinckel 1962: II, 53-73.

167. Mowinckel 1962: I, 48-49.

168. Barnes 1931: xxviii.

169. Barnes 1931: xlii-xliv.

170. Oesterley 1939: 9.

says little about the date of composition of the lyrics, but rejects Maccabean theories and suggests that some psalms may have originated in ancient dramatic epics like those associated with the cults of Babylon and Ugarit.[171] He finds it likely that the Psalter was compiled for use in the cult and seems to endorse the view that it was compiled piecemeal over a period of time, but does not exclude the possibility of purposeful final redaction.[172] He is emphatic that there is deliberate eschatological prophecy in the Psalter, and comes close to suggesting that the purpose of this redaction may have been to outline an eschatological drama: 'That for the whole picture of the Eschatological Drama as presented in the Psalter the psalmists were indebted to the prophets is as clear as anything could be; the thoughts expressed and the very words used are in almost every detail taken from the prophetical writings.'[173] Yet, strangely, he concludes, 'there is no reference to the Messiah; but this, too, is in accordance with the predominant teaching of the prophets'.[174]

Given the virtually universal acceptance of the temple hymnbook theory, it was natural that other attempts, after de Lagarde and King, should be made to connect the sequence of Psalms with synagogue lectionary cycles. J. Dahse (1927) and N.H. Snaith (1933) suggested that the 150 Psalms correspond to the sabbaths of a three-year period, in line with the triennial lectionary cycle of Torah in the synagogue, a practice current in Palestine in talmudic times (*B. Meg.* 29b).[175] Thus the five books of Psalms would have been read with *sedarim* from the Pentateuch. L. Rabinowitz claimed to find support for this idea in the pentateuchal passages cited in Midrash Tehillim.[176] C.T. Niemeyer countered that the triennial Torah reading was a late development (1950).[177] However A. Guilding (1952) and A. Arens (1961–62) continued to support the hypothesis, the latter providing definite evidence for a three-year Torah cycle in ancient synagogue worship.[178] Much

171. Oesterley 1939: 67-73, 2.

172. Oesterley 1939: 1-4.

173. Oesterley 1939: 93.

174. Oesterley 1939: 93.

175. Dahse, *Das Rätsel des Psalters gelöst*; Snaith 1898.

176. Rabinowitz 1936: 349ff.

177. C.T. Niemeyer, *Het Problem van de rangshikking der Psalmen.*

178. Guilding 1952: 41-55; Arens 1961; 1962: 107-32. Arens cites evidence from Elbogen (1931: 159ff.) for the antiquity of the triennial reading.

in these hypotheses remains cogent, in spite of disclaimers.[179]

The third quarter of the twentieth century continued to be dominated by the form critical approaches developed by Gunkel and Mowinckel. Kissane (1953), Kraus (1978), Westermann (ET 1966) and Jacquet (1976–78) tend to follow Gunkel in classifying psalms according to literary form. Johnson (1955, 1979), Weiser (1959) and Eaton (1967, 1976) follow Mowinckel in their concern with reconstructing the place of the Psalms in ancient Israel's cultus. In general, they make no radical steps out of the form critical moulds established by Gunkel and Mowinckel. They generally discuss psalm headings in detail, yet conclude that they are later additions. Views vary on how much later these additions might be, and on their usefulness for determining origin and interpretation. Kraus is most sceptical:

> לדוד is not a reliable reference to the writer of a psalm. This critical judgment applies also for those psalms which according to the information in the title are to be credited to Solomon, Moses, Asaph, the Korahites, Heman, or Ethan. Originally all of the psalm poetry was transmitted anonymously.[180]

He has nothing to say about the arrangement of the lyrics. Others, however, tend to regard personal ascriptions as denoting the collection from which a particular psalm was taken.[181] There is a general consensus that many psalms originated in pre-exilic times.[182] Most agree in dismissing the Maccabean hypothesis. All subscribe to the view that the Psalter's redaction was piecemeal, that the arrangement of its lyrics reflects only the order in which the various collections were added to one another,[183] and that it was used as a hymnbook for temple or synagogue worship.[184] But opinions vary on how intentional this redaction was. Some think the final collection was deliberately redacted for temple and synagogue worship. Others think there was no actual purpose behind the final collection, but that it resulted only

179. Heinemann 1968; Porter 1963; Day 1990: 110.

180. Kraus 1978: I, 65. Weiser also thinks 'the psalms were originally anonymous and probably remained so for a long time' (1978: 95).

181. Kissane 1953–54: xxii-xxvii; Weiser 1962: 94-95.

182. Eaton 1967: 1; Kissane 1953–54: xi, xxxi-xxxii; Weiser 1962: 91ff.

183. Kraus 1978: I, 18-20; Eaton 1967: 18-19; Kissane 1953–54: ix-x; Weiser 1962: 99.

184. Kraus 1978: I, 18-20; Eaton 1967: 18-19; Kissane 1953–54: ix-x; Weiser 1962: 21.

from a conglomerative tendency inherent in collections of psalms.[185] The dominant theory tends to be that it was formed from three earlier collections: the first Yahwistic collection (3–41), the Elohistic collection (42–83 + 84–89), and the later Yahwistic collection (90–150).[186] Views vary on which collection was earliest.[187]

Views on messianism and eschatology vary. Kraus, in his lengthy section on the theology of the Psalms, makes no comment on eschatological or messianic content in the Psalter, and dismisses such passages as 'against Yhwh and against his messiah' as secondary additions.[188] Eaton likewise has no comment on intentional messianism or eschatology, but does note that Christians have understood the Psalms as referring to Christ.[189] Weiser does not refer specifically to eschatology, although he notes that these ideas existed in Israel at an early period and cannot therefore be used as evidence against the early dating of these psalms.[190] Kissane, however, regards some psalms as intentionally messianic. Their authors, he says, are 'dealing with the ideal king of the future, who reigns for ever and whose kingdom embraces all mankind'.[191] Among such psalms he includes 2, 20, 21, 72 and 110, and, to a lesser extent, 89, 132 and 45. He also calls some psalms, such as 87, 93, 97, 99, messianic, presumably in the sense of eschatological. He does note that some psalms that are applied to Jesus in the New Testament, such as 22 and 31, did not refer in their original context to Messiah. But he apparently does not consider the significance of their later context in the Psalter, or the possibility of an overriding theme in the collection.[192] Form critical approaches have persisted into the last quarter of the twentieth century. A fifth and revised edition of Kraus's commentary was published (1978; ET, 1988), most other modern commentaries contain some discussion of form critical issues, and M.D. Goulder's work, discussed below, is form critical in its suppositions.

185. Kraus 1978: I, 20.

186. Kraus 1978: I, 18-20; Kissane 1953–54: x.

187. For instance, Kraus (1978: I, 18-20) seems to suggest the Elohistic collection was earliest; Kissane (1953–54: xi) thinks the first Yahwistic collection was earliest.

188. Kraus 1978: I, 68-81, 123-24.

189. Eaton 1967: 26-28.

190. Weiser 1962: 92.

191. Kissane 1953–54: xx.

192. Kissane 1953–54; xx, xx-xxii.

The third school of twentieth-century Psalms scholarship focused its attention on the final redacted form of the Psalter, rather than on the origin, literary genre or cultic function of individual psalms. Several forces led to the development of this discipline. One was the general rise of interest, in the 1970s and 1980s, in the literary approach to biblical texts. Another was the related discipline of canon criticism developed at the same time by B.S. Childs, who, more than any other, became responsible for the development of 'final form' studies. However, interest in the purposeful arrangement of psalms was already developing some decades before. During the heyday of form criticism, several Jewish scholars, A. Cohen, S.R. Hirsch and U. Cassuto, noted concatenation, with its attendant implication of purposeful construction of the Psalter. Cassuto comments:

> One of the methods of arrangement that plays an important part in the Bible (in several books it even enjoys precedence) is that of association—not just association of ideas but also, and primarily, association of words and expressions, a technique whose initial purpose was possibly to aid the memory. The importance of this method in comprehending the arrangement of the Biblical books has not yet been adequately recognized in the study of the Scriptures. Although Delitzsch in his day sensed its existence to a certain extent in the Book of Psalms, yet in the course of time his observations on the subject in his commentary on the Psalter were forgotten, and today hardly anyone pays attention to them.[193]

W. Zimmerli also investigated concatenation. In his discussion of what he terms *Zwillingspsalmen* (1972), he identifies 20 psalm-pairs and allows there may be more.[194] Much of this had been recognized before, but Zimmerli's work was valuable in collecting it and bringing it to the fore. However, ten of Zimmerli's pairs overlap to form connected groups of three (73–75, 79–81) or four psalms (30–33, 38–41), and such triplets and quadruplets ought probably to be recognized in their own right. C. Barth also made a study of concatenation in the first book of Psalms, in which he lists 17 principles of concatenation, including exact recurrences of forms, recurrences of roots, recurrences of word-pairs and three- and four-word sequences.[195] Other

193. Cassuto 1973: 1-2. See also Cohen 1945; Hirsch 1960.

194. Zimmerli (1972) identifies as pairs Pss. 1–2; 3–4; 9–10; 30–31; 31–32; 32–33; 38–39; 39–40; 40–41; 43–44; 69–70; 73–74; 74–75; 77–78; 79–80; 80–81; 105–106; 111–12; 127–28.

195. Barth 1976: 30-40.

valuable studies on concatenation have since been made by L.C. Allen, P. Auffret, J.K. Kuntz, and J.L. Mays.[196]

While other commentators were studying the arrangement of small psalm-groups, C. Westermann, in the 1960s and 1970s published studies of the larger literary structure of the Psalter.[197] These owe much to the literary genres of form criticism. Indeed his observations began not with literary aims, but with yet another attempt to describe the diachronic process of the Psalter's compilation. He noted that Psalms 1–90 comprise chiefly laments and Psalms 91–150 chiefly *hodayoth*, or psalms of praise, and suggested that the Psalter was compiled from two collections of different form critical *Gattungen*. He then observed that the Psalter displays an overall pattern of progress from lament to praise, that praise psalms have a closural function in internal collections, and that the royal psalms form part of the framework of the Psalter.[198] These observations, a giant step for a form critic, led from the literary classification of individual psalms to studying their arrangement in the collection.

J.P. Brennan (1976) suggested that a link could be found between the micro and macro structures of the Psalter by allowing internal groups to show the way to the larger literary structure of the whole: '...the Psalter has not developed in a haphazard and arbitrary way, but has been carefully woven together in such a manner that previously independent compositions, or smaller collections of such compositions, now comment upon or respond to one another.'[199] For this reason, he concludes, a proper understanding of the Psalter requires that its parts be studied in relation to one another, 'since all of them together convey more than they do if looked at separately.'[200] In a later article (1980), Brennan moves tentatively toward the question of redactor-intent in the Psalter.[201] He notes the unifying and linking function of the wisdom motif throughout. Psalm 1 sets out two ways, presenting the subsequent collection as a book of wisdom commenting on the struggle between good and evil. Psalm 2 defines the opponents

196. Allen 1986; Auffret 1986; Kuntz 1986; Mays 1987.

197. The earliest article on this theme is 'Zur Sammlung des Psalters'; later work is summarized in Westermann 1981.

198. Westermann 1981: 250-58.

199. Brennan 1976: 126.

200. Brennan 1976: 127.

201. Brennan 1980: 25-29.

as Yhwh's anointed and the heathen. Therefore, although the historical origins of individual psalms were the Jerusalem cult, the Psalter in its final form is a book of wisdom rather than cultic material. Brennan concludes that 'such a reading of the Psalter opens the way to an eschatological and messianic interpretation of many texts which had originally only a limited national and historical setting'.[202]

Childs had already made similar observations (1979), arguing that there is a distinct eschatological thrust in the canonical shaping of the Psalter.[203] He notes that Psalms 1 and 2 form an introduction, creating an eschatological framework for the ensuing collection, and so impose a messianic interpretation even on originally non-messianic psalms.[204] This is confirmed by their being the only untitled psalms in LXX. In the period when the Psalter was redacted, a contemporary understanding of Psalm 2 would have referred it to the coming judgment and kingship of God. For, at that time, when the monarchy had been long destroyed, the term *mashiah* would have been understood only of the eschatological deliverer.[205] In addition, other royal psalms are scattered throughout the Psalter, and, unlike pilgrimage songs, and community and individual complaints, they do not appear as groups. Childs infers from this arrangement that their original *Sitz im Leben* has been disregarded by the redactor, and that they now represent the presence of the messianic hope pervading the whole collection.[206] He remarks,

> ... although the royal psalms arose originally in a peculiar historical setting of ancient Israel which had received its form from a common mythopoetic milieu, they were treasured in the Psalter for a different reason, namely as a witness to the messianic hope which looked for the consummation of God's kingship through his Anointed One.[207]

This eschatological reinterpretation applies not only to the royal psalms, but to the entire Psalter:

> However one explains it, the final form of the Psalter is highly eschatological in nature. It looks toward to [sic] the future and passionately yearns for its arrival. Even when the psalmist turns briefly to reflect on the past in praise of the 'great things Yahweh has done', invariably the movement shifts and again the hope of salvation is projected into the future (Ps. 126.6). The perspective of Israel's worship in the Psalter is eschatologically oriented. As a result, the Psalter in its canonical form, far from being different in kind from the prophetic message, joins with the prophets in announcing God's coming kingship. When the New Testament heard in the Psalms eschatological notes, its writers were standing in the context of the Jewish canon in which the community of faith worshipped and waited.[208]

202. Brennan 1980: 29.
203. Childs 1979: 511-18.
204. Childs 1979: 511-13.
205. Childs 1979: 516.
206. Childs 1979: 515-16.
207. Childs 1979: 517.

J. Reindl (1981) regards the editors of the Psalter as belonging to the wisdom tradition, and sees Psalm 1 as a *proœmium* for the reader, setting out two ways. The finished Psalter is thus a wisdom document, in which the words *in his Torah he meditates day and night* may be applied to the Psalter itself. For this reason the original cultic *Sitz im Leben* of individual psalms becomes insignificant in the face of the new *Sitz im Leben* that the Psalter has received.[209]

The publication of several studies dealing specifically with literary aspects of heading-defined psalm groups, such as the Asaph, Korah or Ascents collections, also highlighted the question of the Psalter's literary structure. In one sense such studies had long been around.[210] However, the dominance of antipathetic hermeneutics throughout the previous 150 years, which denied any interpretational value to the headings, had limited their influence. As Mannati noted, these groups of psalms required to be treated in their own right, free from the dominance of theories that virtually denied their existence.

> To admit the existence within the biblical Psalter of a genre, 'Songs of Ascents', provides a principle of analysis for those which remain unclear without it... and increases the intelligibility of others... The case of the Ascents obliges us to relax Gunkel's theory about psalm genres. For the Ascents, it is not the structure of each text which is the specific element, but the curve, very clear and chronologically rigorous (the order cannot be modified, even if the phases are lacking).[211]

208. Childs 1979: 518.
209. Reindl 1981: 340.
210. See Armfield 1874; Kopfstein 1881; Cox 1885; King 1890; Kessler 1889; Peters 1894; Watts 1965; Wanke 1966; Keet 1969. Note the hiatus between 1894 and the mid-1960s, when scepticism as to the purposeful character of the Psalms collection was at its peak.
211. Author's translation of 'Admettre l'existence à l'intérieur du psautier biblique du genre « psaumes graduels » donne un principe d'explication pour ceux

M.D. Goulder tried to ascertain the original cultic *Sitz im Leben* of certain psalm-groups before their redaction into the Psalter. In 'The Fourth Book of the Psalter' (1975) he detects repetition of material among odd and even numbered psalms in Book IV, and suggests this reflects a pattern of morning and evening prayer connected with the Feast of Tabernacles; he then proposes a detailed liturgy based on these psalms. In *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah* (1982) he proposes that the Korah collection originally formed the liturgy for the Feast of Tabernacles at the Dan shrine, and entered the Psalter through the Jerusalem cult, which received it from the Dan priests, probably after the loss of Dan and Naphtali in 730 BCE.[212] In *The Prayers of David* (1990) Goulder proposes that Psalms 51–72 were written by 'a court poet, a priest, probably one of David's sons, "for David"', and that they 'were chanted liturgically in a procession one day in the autumn festival at Jerusalem'.[213] K.-J. Illman (1976) and H.P. Nasuti (1988) seek to identify the particular tradition-groups which lie behind the Asaph Psalms, and, in so doing, provide valuable literary analysis of this collection.[214] Y. Bazak (1990–91) has produced literary analyses of the Hallel Psalms.[215] K. Seybold (1978–79), E. Beaucamp (1979), M. Mannati (1979) and D. Grossberg (1989) have published studies of the Songs of Ascents containing various degrees of literary analysis.[216] P. Auffret (1982) offers detailed literary-structural studies of three psalm collections (Pss. 15–24, 120–34, 135–38).

This scholarship of the 1970s and early 1980s was seminal work. Several principles emerged from it to guide subsequent investigation. First, a literary rationale is responsible for the final form of the Psalter. Secondly, this rationale reflects a non-liturgical *Sitz im Leben.* Thirdly, wisdom motifs play some part in the scheme.[217] Others, building on this foundational work, have tried to ascertain the details

des psaumes qui sans lui restaient peu clairs, et augmente l'intelligibilité des autres... Le cas des graduels oblige à assouplir la théorie gunkélienne des genres des psaumes. Pour eux, ce n'est pas la structure de chaque texte qui est l'élément spécifique, mais la courbe, très nette et chronologiquement rigoureuse (l'ordre ne peut être modifié, même si des phases manquent)' (Mannati 1979: 99).

212. Goulder 1982: 16-19.
213. Goulder 1990: 24, 28.
214. Illman 1976; Nasuti 1988.
215. Bazak 1990, 1991.
216. Seybold 1978; Seybold 1979; Mannati 1975; Grossberg 1989.

of the Psalter's redactional agenda more precisely. The most influential is G.H. Wilson, a student of Childs. In *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (1985) his twofold purpose is to demonstrate that purposeful editorial activity lies behind the Psalter, and to identify the agenda that guided the redaction. As regards the first of these, he does a thorough job. Having examined the use of headings and colophons in other ancient Near Eastern collections of hymnic lyrics, the Sumerian Temple Hymns, the Mesopotamian Hymnic Incipits, and the Qumran Psalms manuscripts, he notes that purposeful redaction is evident in all these texts. He then examines internal evidence for editorial activity in the Psalter and identifies both 'explicit' indicators, such as psalm headings and Ps. 72.20, and 'tacit' indicators, such as the grouping of *hallelu-yah* psalms (104–106, 111–17, 135, 146–50) at the end of segments.[218] He concludes:

> I have been able to show (1) that the 'book' divisions of the Psalter are real, editorially induced divisions and not accidentally introduced; (2) the 'separating' and 'binding' functions of author and genre groupings; (3) the lack of a s/s [superscription] as an indication of a tradition of combination; (4) the use of *hllwyh* pss to indicate the conclusion of segments; (5) the use of *hwdw* pss to introduce segments; (6) the existence of thematic correspondences between the beginning and ending pss in some books. All of these findings demonstrate the presence of editorial activity at work in the arrangement of the pss.[219]

As regards his second objective, to identify the editorial agenda behind the Psalter's redaction, Wilson notes that royal psalms are found at a number of 'seams' in Books I–III (i.e. Pss. 2, 72, 89).[220] He suggests these show 'an interesting progression in thought regarding kingship and the Davidic covenant'.[221] On the basis of this perceived progression he suggests that the purpose of the Psalter is to address the apparent failure of the Davidic covenant in the light of the exile and diaspora. Book I represents the institution of the covenant with David (Ps. 2). Book II represents its transmission to his descendants

218. Wilson 1985a: 9-10, 182-97.
219. Wilson 1985a: 199.
220. Wilson 1985a: 209-214. He initially suggested that Ps. 41 may also have been a royal psalm (1985a: 209-210). But later appears to abandon the idea, suggesting that Books I and II form a unit and therefore no royal psalm is required at the end of Book I [s].
221. Wilson 1985a: 209

(Ps. 72). Book III represents its failure (Ps. 89).[222] Book IV, he suggests, is the editorial crux of the collection, responding to the failure of the covenant as represented in Psalm 89. Its message is that Yhwh was Israel's king in the past and will be in the future, and that those who trust him are blessed.[223] It ends with a plea for restoration from exile (106.47).[224] Book V shows that this plea will be answered if the people trust in God alone (Ps. 107), just as David did (Pss. 108–10), by obedience to his law (Ps. 119), and by recognizing him as the only king worthy of human trust.[225] Thus, for Wilson, the Psalter is a historical retrospective (Books I–III) followed by an exhortation directing Israel's future hope to theocracy unmediated by a Davidic king. The redactor's narrative standpoint is somewhere in the middle of Book IV.

J.H. Walton, building to some extent on Wilson's work, also seeks the editorial agenda behind the Psalter's arrangement, but bases his analysis more on psalm content than title or genre. He suggests the Psalter is a 'cantata' about the Davidic covenant.[226] Book I represents David's conflict with Saul; Book II represents David's reign; Book III represents the Assyrian crisis; Book IV is a post-exilic introspection on the destruction of the temple and the exile; Book V is praise for the return of the exiles.[227] Thus, for Walton, the Psalter is a post-exilic retrospective of Israel's history, the redactor's narrative standpoint being somewhere after the close of Book V.

Other commentators have remarked on the broad structure of the Psalter in terms that are in keeping with these principles. T. Collins suggests the Psalter is an integrated system in which the final work 'has something to say quite independent of the intention of the authors of individual psalms, the collectors of groups of psalms or the editors of the psalter'.[228] He sees in it the story of every just person, progressing through trials to triumph, and even recognizes its distinct eschatological drift. However his scepticism about author and even redactor intent sets his work apart from the majority of contemporary

222. Wilson 1985a: 213.
223. Wilson 1985a: 214-15.
224. Wilson 1985a: 219.
225. Wilson 1985a: 227-28
226. Walton 1991: 23.
227. Walton 1991: 24.
228. Collins 1987: 41

commentators. W. Brueggemann notes the spiritual progression in the Psalter from simple obedience, through the trial of faith, to selfless praise. Psalm 1 calls the believer to a life of obedience with rewards of blessing; Psalm 73, the Psalter's theological centre, faces the crisis of belief when God's חסד is thrown in doubt; Psalm 150 represents faith's triumph, where God is praised not for his rewards, but for his being.[229]

In recent years increasing interest in the arrangement of Psalms has produced a substantial volume of literature. M.E. Tate's commentary on Psalms 51–100 deals in detail with issues of Psalms arrangement, noting overarching themes in the collection, and also inter-psalm links (1990a). A.R. Ceresko (1990) has published a survey of the sage in the Psalms, noting three aspects: first, the Psalms represent the sage as one who observes Torah; second, the sages wrote several psalms; third, the formation of the Psalter itself is a product of wisdom circles. He deals with this last point at length, emphasizing that there was a deliberate authorial activity in the redaction process that produced 'a unity intentionally greater than its parts'.[230] J.L. Mays (1991) notes that in the hermeneutical context of the Psalter several of the royal and Davidic psalms should be interpreted messianically.[231] The 1992 issue of *Interpretation* is devoted to Psalms studies, and contains three essays, by Wilson, J.C. McCann and G.T. Sheppard, on the subject of editorial activity in the Psalter.[232] A recent JSOT volume is devoted exclusively to the issue of the arrangement of the Psalms, and contains nine essays on the subject.[233] The first four are by Mays, R.E. Murphy, Brueggemann and Wilson, who agree, with various caveats, that contextual interpretation is a valuable discipline for understanding the Psalms.[234] The fifth essay is an update of D.M. Howard's review of the recent development of interest in editorial activity in the Psalter.[235] Two more essays, by Wilson and McCann, deal with the larger

229. Brueggemann 1991.
230. Ceresko 1990: 230.
231. Mays 1991. He considers Pss. 1–3, 18, 72, 89, 110, 132.
232. Wilson 1992; McCann 1993; Sheppard 1992.
233. McCann 1993.
234. The essays are: Mays 1993: 14-20; Murphy 1993: 21-28; Brueggemann 1993: 29-41; Wilson 1993: 42-51.
235. Howard 1989: 52-71. The earlier version of this article appeared in *Word and World* 9 (1989): 274-85.

shaping of the Psalter.[236] And two more, by P.D. Miller and Howard, deal with lesser scale inter-psalm links.[237] Other recent articles elsewhere comment on concatenation[238] and messianism[239] in the Psalter.

8. *Summary*

Several facts emerge from the preceding investigation. First, the great majority of interpreters, historically speaking, endorse the MT-type arrangement of Psalms, either tacitly, by transmitting it, or explicitly, by explaining or defending it. They recognize its rubrics, the headings and doxologies, as an intrinsic part of the text. The headings are regarded as having a bearing on interpretation, and the doxologies as indicating a fivefold 'book' division. Secondly, the great majority of interpreters, historically speaking, regard the Psalms as foretelling eschatological events, interpreting them of Messiah, eschatological war, the ingathering of Israel, and so on. The great exception to the general dominance of these two views is the period c. 1820–1970, when a number of influential commentators advanced quite opposite views. They denied that any purposeful redaction lay behind the MT-type arrangement, making it out to be essentially an *ad hoc* collection that had evolved piecemeal, either a temple hymnbook or simply a collection of cultic remains. The headings and doxologies were said to have been added sporadically to this already disordered collection at a later date, producing a finished product that was the result of evolutionary chance rather than purposeful redaction. The possibility of there being intentionally eschatological prophecy in the collection was tacitly denied by silence on the subject. Or it was mentioned, to be dismissed on the ground that eschatological belief was a late development. These views dominated the consensus of scholarly opinion for a century and a half, despite notable voices of dissent.

Such views continue to the present time. However, in the last two decades, some commentators, operating on the hermeneutical basis of

236. Wilson 1993: 72-82; McCann 1993: 93-107.

237. Miller 1993: 83-92; Howard 1993: 108-23.

238. Lohfink (1992a; 1992b; 1992c) suggests one editorial purpose of concatenation was to facilitate memorization. Vermeylen (1992) notes links between Pss. 50 and 51.

239. Füglister (1992) points out that the Psalter was regarded as messianic prophecy in the time of Jesus. Mosis (1992) and Wahl (1992) find eschatological implications in Pss. 51 and 67 respectively.

redactor intention, have returned to views not dissimilar to the pre-nineteenth-century one. They recognize purposeful redaction in the MT Psalter, with the headings and doxologies as structural markers. Some recognize eschatological concerns in the collection, either in particular psalms, or in the redactional agenda that lies behind the finished Psalter, or both. A few have tried to identify what the details of the redactor's message might be, yet so far no consensus has been reached.

Thus a historical perspective at the end of the twentieth century seems to suggest that western scholarship from c. 1820–1970 is, in some respects, a hiatus in Psalms interpretation, during which scholarly opinion diverged sharply from what must be considered, historically speaking, the dominant views. These traditional interpretational norms deserve reconsideration for several reasons. First, they are ancient, occurring in LXX and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Such antiquity carries the recommendation that its writers lived soon enough after the Psalter's completion to be in receipt of traditions regarding its redactional agenda. And even if they received no actual traditions, still they lived in a time and culture not distant from the final redaction, and might be expected to have understood better than a modern reader what ideas influenced the redactors. Moreover, these interpretational norms persisted virtually unchallenged until the nineteenth century. No doubt every age thinks itself wiser than its predecessors, but, in this case, the sheer consensus of opinion behind the traditional views invites enquiry as to whether there were not grounds for these beliefs, and whether clues to the Psalter's agenda might not be gleaned from those who did not share post-Enlightenment presuppositions. It is therefore appropriate to enquire whether the traditional view that the Psalter is a purposeful arrangement with an eschatological orientation might not be confirmed by internal evidence in the Hebrew Psalter itself. This shall be done in the following chapter.