

The imprecations of the Psalter belong to four historic situations: (1) The persecutions of Jeremiah and his associates by those who were pushing the national religion to destruction, Ps. 52¹ sq., cf. Je. 11¹⁸ sq. 15¹⁵ sq. 17¹⁸ 18¹⁹ sq. 20¹¹ sq. (2) The brutal cruelty of Edom and Moab toward the Jews at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians, Ps. 137, cf. Ob.¹⁰ sq. (3) The treachery of Sanballat and Tobiah, Ne. 2-6, which threatened the very existence of the congregation of the Restoration. The imprecations of Ne. 4⁴⁻⁵ 6¹⁴ 13²⁹ are in accord with those of Pss. 9²¹⁻²¹ 10¹⁵ 69²³⁻²⁹ 83¹⁰⁻¹⁸. (4) The persecution of Antiochus, which aimed at the extermination of the worshippers of Yahweh. To this period the majority of the imprecations belong, many of them glosses in older Pss. At that time, if ever, imprecations were appropriate, cf. Pss. 79^{10, 12} 109^{6-15, 19-20, 28-29}. Thus all the imprecations of the Pss. are upon just such treacherous hypocrites, traitors, and bloodthirsty enemies of the kingdom of God, as Jesus himself pronounces imprecations upon, who aim at nothing else than the wilful destruction of the true religion. It is the form and general character of these imprecations which are most obnoxious to the modern mind, especially the physical sufferings that are invoked, the dishonouring of wives and daughters, and the slaughter of babes, even of the unborn. This is from the point of view of the solidarity of interest in the family, tribe, and nation; and especially from the ancient principle of the duty of revenge which was inherited by sons and kinsmen; so that the only way to avoid future peril of revenge was the extermination of all who would be likely in the future to undertake it.

D. THE INTERPRETATION OF THE PSALTER.

§ 47. *Jesus and his apostles interpreted the Psalter usually in accordance with the methods of their time, literally or allegorically, as they had need. But they chiefly used it either for practical exhortation, for dogmatic or ethical instruction, or for prophetic anticipations of the life and work of Jesus and his Church.*

(1) Jesus used the Psalter more than any other part of the OT. He used it to describe his own state of mind: Ps. 6⁴ in Jn. 12²⁷, Ps. 22² in Mt. 27⁴⁶ = Mk. 15³⁴, Ps. 31⁶ in Lk. 23⁴⁶, Ps. 35¹⁹ (= 69⁵) in Jn. 15²⁵, Ps. 42⁵ in Mt. 26³⁸ = Mk. 14³⁴; his actions, Ps. 6⁹ in Mt. 7²³ = Lk. 13²⁷; and the actions of others in his time, Ps. 8³ in Mt. 21¹⁶, Ps. 41¹⁰ in Jn. 13¹⁸. He also used it for authoritative teaching, Ps. 37¹¹ in Mt. 5⁵, Ps. 48³ in Mt. 5³⁵, and for historical reference, Ps. 78²⁴ in Jn. 6³¹. He used Ps. 82⁶ in argument with the Pharisees after the Halacha method in Jn. 10³⁴, arguing from less to greater. He used Ps. 110¹ in Mt. 22⁴⁴ = Mk. 12³⁶ = Lk. 20^{42, 43}, in argument with the Pharisees, to show that the Messianic son of David must be at the same time his Lord; cf. 1 Cor. 15²⁵ Eph. 1²⁰ Col. 3¹ Heb. 1³ 8¹ 12² 1 Pet. 3²². He also

applied Ps. 118²²⁻²³ to himself as the headstone of the spiritual temple, Mt. 21⁴² = Mk. 12^{10, 11} = Lk. 20¹⁷ (cf. Acts 4¹¹ 1 Pet. 2⁴⁻⁷).

(2) The Gospels use the Pss. freely, applying them to Jesus and his work: (a) to his entrance into the world. Ps. 91¹¹⁻¹² is cited by the devil Mt. 4⁶ = Lk. 4^{10, 11}; (b) to his experience in life Ps. 69¹⁰ in Jn. 2¹⁷, his teaching Ps. 78² in Mt. 13³⁵, his entrance into Jerusalem Ps. 118²⁵⁻²⁶ in Mt. 21⁹ 23³⁹ Mk. 11⁹ Lk. 13³⁵ 19³⁸ Jn. 12¹³; (c) to his passion Pss. 22^{8-9, 19} Jn. 19²⁴, cf. Mt. 27^{35, 39, 48} = Mk. 15^{24, 29} = Lk. 23³⁴⁻³⁵, Ps. 34²¹ in Jn. 19³⁶, Ps. 69²² in Mt. 27^{34, 48} = Mk. 15³⁶ = Lk. 23³⁶ = Jn. 19²⁸⁻²⁹, Ps. 109²⁵ in Mt. 27³⁹. The canticles Lk. 1 are also chiefly mosaics of the Pss. (3) *In the book of Acts*: (a) Ps. 89²⁰ is cited by Paul in Acts 13²² in historical reference, so Ps. 132⁵ by Stephen Acts 7⁴⁶; (b) Ps. 2^{1, 2} in Acts 4²⁵⁻²⁶ is applied to the persecution of Christ in his disciples, Ps. 69²⁶ 109⁸ in Acts 1²⁰ as fulfilled in Judas; Ps. 2⁷ is applied in Acts 13³³ to the resurrection of Jesus; so Ps. 16⁸⁻¹¹ in Acts 2²⁵⁻³² 13³⁵, and Ps. 110¹ in Acts 2³⁴⁻³⁵, Ps. 132¹¹ in Acts 2³⁰ to his reign; (c) in liturgical use Ps. 146⁶ in Acts 4²⁴, cf. 14¹⁵. (4) *In the epistles of Peter*: (a) as practical exhortation Ps. 34¹³⁻¹⁷ in 1 Pet. 3¹⁰⁻¹², Ps. 55²³ in 1 Pet. 5⁷; as realised in Christian experience, Ps. 34⁹ in 1 Pet. 2³; (b) as authoritative doctrine Ps. 90⁴ in 2 Pet. 3⁸.

(5) St. Paul uses the Psalter freely: (a) as practical exhortation Ps. 4⁵ in Eph. 4²⁶, Ps. 112⁹ in 2 Cor. 9⁹, Ps. 116¹⁰ in 2 Cor. 4¹³; (b) as authoritative teaching Ps. 24¹ in 1 Cor. 10²⁶ (28), Ps. 32¹⁻² in Rom. 4⁷⁻⁸, Ps. 51⁶ in Rom. 3⁴, Ps. 94¹¹ in 1 Cor. 3²⁰. Pss. 5¹⁰ 10⁷ 14¹⁻³ (= 53²⁻⁴) 36² 140⁴ are cited as descriptive of the utter wickedness of mankind, in Rom. 3¹⁰⁻¹⁸; (c) Ps. 44²³ is cited Rom. 8³⁶ as realised in Christian experience; (d) Ps. 69¹⁰ is cited Rom. 15³ and applied to the humiliation of Christ. Ps. 8⁷ is cited in 1 Cor. 15²⁷ Eph. 1²² and applied to the resurrection and reign of Christ; so Ps. 68¹⁹ in Eph. 4⁸. Ps. 69²³⁻²⁴ is cited Rom. 11⁹⁻¹⁰ and applied to the fall of Israel. Pss. 18⁵⁰ 117¹ are cited Rom. 15⁹⁻¹¹ and applied to the conversion of the Gentiles. Ps. 19⁵ in Rom. 10¹⁸ is applied to the preaching of the Gospel. (6) The epistle to the Hebrews makes great use of the Pss.: (a) as practical exhortation Ps. 95⁷⁻¹¹ in Heb. 3⁷ sq., Ps. 118⁶ in Heb. 13⁶; (b) as authoritative teaching Ps. 104⁴ in Heb. 1⁷; Ps. 135¹⁴ in Heb. 10³⁰; (c) Ps. 2⁷ is applied to the resurrection and reign of Christ Heb. 1⁵ 5⁵; so Ps. 8⁵⁻⁷ in Heb. 2⁶⁻⁸, Ps. 97⁷ in Heb. 1⁶, Ps. 45⁷⁻⁸ 102²⁶⁻²⁸ in Heb. 1⁸⁻¹³, Ps. 110⁴ in Heb. 5⁶ 6²⁰ 7^{17, 21}. Ps. 18³ 22²³ are applied to his redemptive work in Heb. 2¹²⁻¹³; so Ps. 40⁷⁻⁹ in Heb. 10⁵⁻⁷. In Heb. 4¹⁻¹¹ Ps. 95⁷⁻¹¹ is interpreted at length in an allegorical way. (7) *In the Apocalypse*: the Psalter is often used in hymns and incidental allusions. Besides these it is cited as predictive of the reign of Christ, Ps. 2⁸⁻⁹ in Rev. 2²⁶⁻²⁷ 12⁵ 19¹⁵.

§ 48. *In the ancient Catholic Church the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists used the Psalter for practical purposes. The School of Alexandria emphasized the allegorical method of interpretation, the School of Antioch the typical method.*

The Christian writers of the second Christian century followed the example of the apostles in using the Psalter for practical purposes. Nothing at all resembling a Commentary, so far as we know, was composed by any of them. The citations of the Pss. in the Apostolic Fathers, Apologists, and early Fathers, Tertullian, Irenaeus, Cyprian, and others, are similar to those in the New Testament, using the same methods of interpretation, with a more decided tendency to the allegorical method and less restraint from its exaggeration. The School of Alexandria was established by Pantaeus, c. 200, and made famous by the great teachers and theologians, Clement and Origen. Pantaeus is said to have composed the first Commentary (Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* 5¹⁰). Clement distinguished between the body and soul of Scripture, and called attention to its fourfold use. Origen made a Commentary on the Psalms, using the allegorical method of Philo, which he worked out in a Christian form and became its father in the Church. He distinguished a threefold sense, body, soul, and spirit, and used thirteen of Philo's rules (*v. Br.*^{SHS. 448-449}). The School of Antioch was established by Lucian and Dorotheus at the close of the third century. Its fundamental principles of interpretation were: (1) Every passage has its literal meaning and only one meaning; (2) alongside of the literal sense is the typical sense which arises out of the relation of the Old Covenant to the New (Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia*, s. 29). The most of the Commentators on the Pss. in the Greek Church were from writers of this school. Jerome occupied an intermediate and not altogether consistent position. He strives for historical and grammatical exposition, yet it is easy to see that at the bottom he is more inclined to the allegorical method. Thus there grew up in the ancient Church three exegetical tendencies, the literal and traditional, the allegorical and mystical, the historical and ethical, and these became gradually interwoven in the writings of the Fathers, and in all sorts of abnormal forms of exegesis in others (*v. Br.*^{SHS. 453}).

Corderius (*Expositio Patrum Graecorum in Psalmos*, 3 Tom. 1643) uses the following Greek Commentators: Athanasius, Ammonius, *Anonymous*, Apollinarius, Asterius, *Basilius*, Gennadius, Geo. Alexandrinus, *Gregorius Nazianzenus*, Gregorius Nyssenus, *Didymus*, Dionysius Areopag., *Eusebius Caesariensis*, Hesychius, *Theodoretus*, *Theodorus Antiochenus*, Theodorus

Heracleota, Isidorus, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Maximus, Pachymera, *Chrysostomus*, Psellus, *Origines*. I have italicised those most frequently cited. Jerome (*ep. ad August.* cxii.) mentions the following Greek interpreters of the Psalter up to his time: Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodore of Heraklea (the Anonymous of Corderius), Astelios of Skythopolis, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Didymos of Alexandria. All of these interpretations of the Psalter, so far as preserved, are given by Migne in his Greek Patrology. For additional information we may refer to Pitra, *Analecta Sacra*, Bâthgen, *ZATW.*, 1886, Lietzmann, *Der Psalmencommentar Theodore von Mopsuestia*, 1902. The work of the great Syrian scholar, Gregory Bar Hebraeus († 1286, given by Lagarde, *Praetermissorum*, 1879), must be added here as the noblest representation of the late Syrian School. The work of Jerome on the Pss. is given in his Epistles, XX., XXVIII., XXX., XXXIV., LXV., CVI., CXL. (Migne, XXII.), and his commentary (edited by Morin, *Anecdota Maredsolana*, III., 1895).

§ 49. *In the Latin Church the allegorical method of interpreting the Psalter prevailed, chiefly through the influence of Ambrose and Augustine, although Junilius and Cassiodorus exerted a modifying influence in the use of the principles of the Antiochan School.*

Ambrose may be regarded as the father of the interpretation of the Psalter in the Western Church; but Augustine, his pupil, was the one who dominated all subsequent times. He distinguishes four kinds of exegesis, — the historical, aetiological, analogical, and allegorical, — and laid down the principle that whatever cannot be referred to good conduct or truth of faith must be regarded as figurative. Junilius, and still more Cassiodorus, exerted a wholesome influence by the introduction into the West of the principles of the Schools of Antioch and Nisibis. He urged the comparison of Scripture with Scriptures, and points out that frequent and intense meditation is the way to a true understanding of them (*v. Br.*^{SHS. 449-453}).

Jerome (*ep. ad August.* cxii.) mentions the following Latin interpreters of the Pss.: (1) Hilary of Poitiers, based on Origen and Eusebius; (2) Eusebius of Vercelli, who translated the Commentary of Eusebius of Caesarea; (3) Ambrose. Ambrose († 397) is the only one who was independent and original. Ambrose was a practical prelate, possessed of the true Roman spirit, and he gave the allegorical method a Western practical turn. His *Enarrationes* have had great influence on the Church. Augustine († 430) built his *Enarrationes* on those of Ambrose, and became the basal authority for all subsequent writers. The most wholesome commentary of the times is that of Cassiodorus († 563). Other early Western writers on the Psalter were Hippolytus († 235), Arnobius

(† c. 406), Asterius († 410), Gregory of Tours († 594), Gregory the Great († 604), Prudentius (eighth century). All of these are given by Migne in his Latin Patrology.

§ 50. *In the Middle Ages the Commentaries were chiefly compilations of the earlier writers, called Epitomes, Glosses, Postilles, Chains, which appeared in great numbers, all under the domination of the allegorical principles of Augustine, often in exaggerated forms.*

The compilers of the Oriental Church were Euthymius Zigabenus († 1118, v. Pitra, *Analecta*, IV.); Nicephorus, thirteenth century (given by Migne). A host of writers on the Pss. appear in the West: *Beda* († 735); *Alcuin* († 804); *Walafrid Strabo* († 849); *Haymo* († 853); *Rhabamus Maurus* († 856); *Paschasius Radbertus* († 866); *Hincmar* († 882); *Remigius* (ninth century); *Bruno Herb.* († 1045); *Romualdus* († 1027); *Anselm* († 1109); *Bruno Carth.* († 1101); *Richard St. Victor* († 1173); *Innocentius III.* († 1216); *Hugo S. Caro, Postillae* († 1263) (commentaries 1496 attributed wrongly to Alexander Hales, † 1245); *Antonius Patavinus* († 1231, *Sermones in Pss.*, 1757); *Thomas Aquinas* († 1274, *In Psalmos Expositio*, 1876); *Albertus Magnus* († 1280, *Comm. on Pss.*, Col. 1536); *Ayguanus* († 1396, *Com. on Ps.*, 1524 +); *Nicolaus de Lyra* († 1340, *Postillae*, Rom. 1471; *Biblia cum glossa ordinaria*, 6 v., Basel, 1506); *Herenthal* († 1400, *Catena*, Col. 1483); *Turrecremata* († 1468, *Expositio*, 1474). Those italicised are found in Migne's Patrology.

§ 51. *In the Middle Ages Jewish Commentators distinguished themselves as compared with the Christian by a fuller use of the literal and historical methods of interpretation, although no less dependent on Rabbinical tradition than Christian scholars were on Christian tradition.*

The earliest important interpreter of the Pss. whose writings have been preserved was Saadia († 942), author of the Arabic translation of the OT. His Commentary was published in Cracow in 1660. Raschi's Commentary (R. Solomon Isaaki, † 1105) was published in the Rabbinical Bibles, also a Latin translation by Breithaupt, 1710. Aben Ezra's Commentary († 1167) was published in the Rabbinical Bibles. His Commentary on the first ten Pss. was published in Latin and Hebrew by P. Fagius, 1542. David Kimchi's Commentary († 1235) was published, Naples, 1487; Venice, 1518; Isny, 1541; Amsterdam, 1765; Latin translation by Janvier, 1566. The first book of Psalms was published according to the text of the Cambridge Ms. Bible with the larger Commentary of R. David Kimchi, critically edited from nineteen

Mss. and early editions by Schiller Sziessy, Cambridge, 1883. The most important of later commentaries was by Obadiah Sforzo, teacher of Reuchlin, Venice, 1586; Amsterdam, 1724.

§ 52. *The Reformation involved a great revival of Biblical study, and especially of the Psalter, the chief book of the OT. The allegorical method was pushed in the background by the Humanists in the interests of the grammatical sense, and so by Roman Catholics as well, and Protestants who were influenced by them. The chief difference was that the Protestants resorted to the Hebrew text as the original supreme authority, the Roman Catholics based themselves on the Vulgate Version, and interpreted it in submission to the authority of the Church and the Fathers. The successors of the Reformers fell back into pedantic and dogmatic methods.*

The Humanists revived the study of the ancient languages and the ancient literatures, and thus the grammatical and literary study of the original texts was employed over against the allegorical method. Lyra and the Jewish Commentators were used more than the Christian Commentators of the Middle Ages. The Protestant Reformers were great exegetes. Luther began his academic lectures with an exposition of the Psalter in 1513. These lectures were published by Seidemann in 1876, under the title, *Dr. Martin Luther's erste und älteste Vorlesungen über die Psalmen aus den Jahren 1513-1516 nach der eigenhändigen lateinischen Handschrift Luthers auf der Königlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden*. Reuchlin published his *Auslegung der sieben Psalmi poenitentiales*, 1512; Bugenhagen, his *in lib. Psalmorum*, 1524; Bucer (Aretius), *Psalmorum libri 5*, 1526. Calvin's *Commentary on the Psalms*, 1564, was by far the best up to his own time. Other commentators of the time of the Reformation were Pellican, 1532; Münster, 1534-1535; Musculus, 1550; Castalio, 1551 +; Marloratus, 1562. The Moravian Rüdinger also issued a valuable Commentary in 1580-1581. The Protestants of the next generation fell back from the vital principle of the Reformers and became dependent on Protestant rules of faith, and were dogmatic and pedantic in their Commentaries. In the following lists, I give, so far as I know, the first edition; when there were subsequent editions, it is indicated by +. The works of Selnecker, 1581; Moller, 1573; Menzel, 1594; Gesner, 1609; Piscator, 1646 +; Quistorp, 1648; Amyraldus, 1662; Bakius, 1664 +; Geier, 1668 +; Carlov, 1672 +, though with valuable and useful material are reactionary and of no permanent value. The Roman Catholics vied with the Protestants in the sixteenth century in their work on the Psalter: Clarius, 1542 +; Vatablus, 1545; Palisse, 1548; Cajetan, 1530; Campensis, 1533 +; Flaminius, 1558; Gennebradus, 1577 +; Jansenius, 1586. In the early seventeenth century R. C. exegetes employed better

methods, and were more able and fruitful than Protestants, as is evident in Agellius, 1606 + ; Faber Stapulensis, 1609 ; Lorinus, 1612 + ; Bellarmin, 1611 + ; Mariana, 1619 + ; Torinus, 1632 + ; Muis, 1636 + ; Corderius, 1643 + ; Drexelius, 1643 ; Hulsius, 1650 ; Hesper. 1654 +.

§ 53. *In the middle of the seventeenth century the English Puritans emphasized grammatical and practical exegesis ; Grotius, Hammond and the Arminians, the historical method ; Cocceius and the Federalists, the allegorical. The dogmatic method still prevailed to some extent.*

Ainsworth is the prince of Puritan Commentators. His Commentary on the Pss., issued in 1626, is a monument of learning. He was too much influenced by Rabbinical subtleties, but he employed the grammatical method with great practical skill. Thomas Smith, Thomas Pierson, and especially William Gouge issued practical commentaries introducing a long and valuable series in Great Britain. Hugo Grotius in Holland and Henry Hammond in England revived the Humanistic spirit and laid stress on the literal and historical sense. The Commentaries on the Pss. of Grotius, 1645, and of Hammond, 1653, especially the latter, introduce a new epoch in the interpretation of the Psalter. Cocceius, the founder of the Federal School of Holland, 1660, revived the allegorical method, but with sobriety and practical sense. The *Criticorum Sacrorum*, 1660, sums up the chief material of previous authors, using Munster, Vatablus, Castalio, Clarius, Drusius, and Grotius. This was followed by Poole's *Synopsis Criticorum*, 1669, which uses Muis, Geier, Ainsworth, Hammond, Rivetus, Cocceius, Genebradus, Calovius. The *Biblia Magna*, 1643, and the *Biblia Maxima*, Paris, 1660, both by John de la Haye, are a magnificent summing up of R. C. exegesis, embracing a thorough study of texts and Vrss., and the expositions of Nic. de Lyra, Gagnae, Estii, Menochii, and Tirini. Vol. VI. of the latter contains the Psalter. There was then a lull in work on the Pss. which continued for a century. We may mention, however, the R. C., Le Blanc, 1682 + ; Ferrandus, 1683 ; Bossuet, 1691 ; Berthier, 1788 + ; Calmet, 1791 + ; Camponi, 1692 + ; the Protestants, Bythner, 1664 ; J. H. Michaelis, 1720 ; Clericus, 1731 ; Venema, 1762.

§ 54. *The study of the Psalter was enriched through the work of Kennicott upon the text and of Hare and Lowth upon Hebrew poetry, connected in all these with original work upon the Psalter which influenced all subsequent scholars.*

I have already called attention to the work of Hare, Lowth, and Kennicott on the text and Hebrew Poetry. These scholars carried on the grammatical and historical exegesis of Grotius and Hammond. Lowth in his notes

attached to Merrick's Version, 1768, supported also by an Anonymous, made contributions which were often original and of great value. Kennicott, in his notes on the Psalms, 1772, also greatly advanced the study of the Psalter. All this material was used by Street, 1790, with independent and excellent judgment, resulting in the best Commentary on the Psalms of the eighteenth century. Bishop Horsley, 1815 (posthumous), inherited their spirit. These scholars are the real fathers of a large number of emendations of the text and of new interpretations for which later scholars, especially Germans, have received the credit. Many practical commentaries of great value appeared in this period, such as Henry, 1710; Horne, 1771; Gill, 1774-1776. The Commentaries of Dathe, 1787, and especially Rosenmüller, 1798-1804, represented this period in Germany.

§ 55. *The study of the Psalter has been improved in the last century by a more comprehensive and thoroughgoing study of all the material by Textual Criticism, Higher Criticism, Historical Criticism, and Biblical Theology, with a just estimate of Exegesis in its different phases.*

De Wette, 1811+, began this most fruitful period, and was followed by Ewald, 1836+, both with remarkable critical sagacity and profound historical sense. Hitzig, 1836+, and Olshausen, 1853+, opened wide the field of Textual Criticism; Hupfeld, 1855+, and Böttcher, 1864, grammatical and lexicographical exegesis. Delitzsch, 1859+, shows a deep spiritual sense and a thorough understanding of the genius of the ancient Hebrew people. Hengstenberg, 1842+, is the father of the reactionaries. On these princes of modern German exegesis a great number of scholars build. Among these we may mention on the continent of Europe: Tholuck, 1843+; Köster, 1837; Vaihinger, 1845; Reuss, 1879+; Grätz, 1882-1883; Hirsch, 1882; Moll, 1884+; Schultz, 1888+; Bachmann, 1891; Bähgen, 1892+; Wellhausen, 1895; Duhm, 1899; Valetton, 1903. Among R. C. scholars, we may mention Alioli, 1832+; Aigner, 1850; Schegg, 1857²; Crelier, 1858; Rohling, 1871; Thalsofer, 1889⁵. Migne, *Cursus Completus*, 1841, and Cornely, Knabenbauer, and Hammelauer in *Cursus Completus*, 1885, give a thesaurus of interpretation of many scholars, ancient and modern. Many British and American interpreters of the Pss. have been reactionary in the spirit of Hengstenberg, such as Phillips, 1846; Neale, 1860; Wordsworth, 1867; Alexander, 1868+; Murphy, 1875; Cowles, 1872. The Puritan spirit was inherited in Spurgeon, 1870, and Barnes, 1871. Perowne, 1864+, deserves the credit for the introduction into the English-speaking world of the modern spirit, which indeed is only a rebuilding on the work of the older English scholars of the eighteenth century. The following Commentators deserve mention: *The Psalms Chronologically arranged by Four Friends*, 1867; Kay, 1871; Cook, 1873; Jennings and Low, 1875; Burgess, 1879; Aglen, 1884; Cheyne, 1888+;

Maclaren, 1893-1894 + ; Montefiore, 1901 ; Kirkpatrick, 1903 ; W. T. Davidson, 1903 + ; Ehrlich, 1904. Cheyne and Kirkpatrick are preëminent, the former for his brave investigation of the most difficult problems and his generous recognition of the work of other scholars, the latter for his sound judgment and excellent exegetical method. These scholars easily outrank all their predecessors. Their occasional faults and failures are cordially overlooked in view of their magnificent contributions to Biblical Science.

§ 56. *English Versions of the Psalms began with Wycliffe in 1382. The Version of Coverdale of 1535, revised for the great Bible of 1539, has been used since as the Version of the Book of Common Prayer. The Version of 1611 was made from the Hebrew, with a limited study of other versions. It supplanted all other English Versions except that of PBV. The Version of 1885 was a revision of that of 1611, in closer conformity to the Massoretic text. The R. C. Version is that of Douay.*

John Wycliffe made the first English translation of the Bible from the Vulgate Version, 1382. It was revised by John Purvey in 1388 (*v.* Forshall and Madden's text, 4 v., 1850; Skeats, reprint of Purvey's revision in 1879). Coverdale published a translation of the whole Bible in 1535. His translation of the Psalter was taken up into Matthew's Bible in 1537, and into the Great Bible in 1539-1541. Coverdale, in his dedicatory Epistle to the King and in Prologue, states that he had followed largely five sundry interpreters; to judge from internal evidence, the Vulgate, Luther, the Zurich Version, Pagninus, and Tyndale, the latter not giving the Psalter. The Zurich Version was completed in 1529 by Zwingli, Pellican, Leo Juda, and others. Pagninus' version was a translation of the Psalter into Latin (1527). The Psalter of the PBV. is from the last revision of the Great Bible of 1540 (*v.* Westcott, *The Paragraph Psalter*; Earle, *The Psalter of 1539 a Landmark in English Literature*, 1892; Driver, *The Parallel Psalter*, Int. 1904²; Fry, *Description of the Great Psalter*, 1865). The Genevan Version of 1560 was translated into English and used by the Puritans from that time onward. The Bishop's Bible of 1568 was used in the scriptural readings in the Church of England, but not in the recitations of the Psalter. In 1611 the Authorized Version was made by a select company of scholars under the authority of the crown. It displaced all other Vrss. for Protestants in the public and private reading of the Scripture: but did not succeed in displacing the Vrs. of the Great Bible in the recitation of the Psalter. The Roman Catholics continued to adhere to the Douay Version, which was a literal translation of the Vulgate, whereas the AV. was translated from the Hebrew. The AV. has maintained its hold on the English Protestant world until the present time. The RV. of 1885, prepared by a joint British and American Committee, under the authority

of the convocation of Canterbury, has thus far been unable to replace it. The RV. is a more accurate rendering of the Hebrew text of Ben Asher ; but it is literalistic and pedantic. It was prepared in a period of transition of Hebrew scholarship and does not satisfy the present conditions of OT. scholarship or the needs of the Church or people. Furthermore, it does not sufficiently consider the Ancient Vrss., and is not based on a revision of the Hebrew text. The margin of the RV. gives the most important part of the work of the Revisers and is of great value. Several independent versions have been made in recent times : John De Witt, 1884 ; T. K. Cheyne, 1888 ; Furness, 1898 ; S. R. Driver, *The Parallel Psalter*, 1904² (an important and valuable revision of PBV.). The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1903, gave a new and excellent translation from the Massoretic text. There is no sound reason why Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews should not unite and agree in a Version far better than any that has yet been made.

Many metrical versions of the Psalter have been made for use in Christian worship in the service of song, the chief of which are those of Sternhold and Hopkins, and Tate and Brady, used in England ; Rouse, used in Scotland ; and Watts, used by the Nonconformists of England and their children in America. From a literary point of view the most valuable paraphrase is still that of Merrick, 1765. The fault of all these versions is that they are based either upon English Versions or the Massoretic text. None of them were made with any knowledge whatever of the measures of Hebrew poetry. It is now quite possible to reproduce the poetry of the Psalms in essentially the same measures in English poetry. Scholars who have the poetic gift should undertake this task, which when accomplished will greatly enlarge the use of the Psalter for English-speaking peoples, and enrich their devotion, public and private, with a finer literary flavour.