

Did the New Testament Authors Read the Psalter as a Book?

JAMES M. HAMILTON, JR.

James M. Hamilton, Jr. is Professor of Biblical Theology at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and Senior Pastor at Kenwood Baptist Church at Victory Memorial, both in Louisville, Kentucky, where he lives with his wife and their five children. In addition to his biblical theology, *God's Glory in Salvation through Judgment* (Crossway, 2010), Dr. Hamilton has recently published a two volume work on *Psalms* (EBTC, Lexham, 2021) and *Typology—Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns* (Zondervan Academic, 2022). With Alex Duke and Sam Emadi, he is also part of the BibleTalk podcast team.

Gerald Wilson usually receives credit for jumpstarting the modern discussion of the Psalter as a Book.¹ In the wake of Wilson, scholars have begun to notice that approaching the Psalter as a unified whole was not unheard of prior to Wilson. David Gundersen had drawn my attention to a statement by Augustine showing his interest in the topic,² and from statements made by Gregory of Nyssa, we can see that he too sought to read the Psalms in light of their order and arrangement in the Psalter.³ Steffen Jenkins has recently demonstrated “The Antiquity of Psalter Shape Efforts.”⁴ David Mitchell and Adam Hensley have likewise pointed to evidence that the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the early church fathers, and the rabbis understood the Psalter as a purposefully shaped collection.⁵ This essay seeks to contribute to the discussion by answering the question posed in its title: is there evidence in the New Testament (NT) that its authors read the Psalter as a book?

Biblical theology is the attempt to understand and embrace the interpretive perspective of the biblical authors.⁶ Among other things, this means that if the NT authors read the Psalter as a book, those attempting to do biblical

theology would want to imitate them in that practice.

We begin with a brief summary of evidence for the idea that the Psalter was intended by its authors and compilers to be read as a book. From there we will briefly consider indications that the whole of the Old Testament (OT) was intended and received as a book, before looking at NT evidence that the Psalter was read as a unified book with a coherent message.

THE PSALTER AS A BOOK

This section seeks to summarize the internal indicators that the book of Psalms is not a loose collection of disconnected and discrete poems but rather an intentionally arranged collage of related poems that have an architectural structure designed to create a symphonic whole communicating a discernible, though impressionistic, story.⁷ I think this started with David himself. As an analogy, consider the way that the architect Antoni Gaudi designed the Sagrada Familia Basilica, on which construction began in 1882 and continues to the present. Though Gaudi died in 1926, and though the project was only a quarter complete at that point, down to this day it is considered his work. So also with the Psalter: David was the creative genius who initiated the project, and others who contributed to and completed it understood his design and fit their work into it.

The indicators of purposeful arrangement within the Psalter include the doxologies, the changes in authorship at the beginning of each of the Psalter's five books, the distribution of both Davidic and historical superscriptions, the note at Psalm 72:20, the introductory character of Psalms 1 and 2, and the link words that join one psalm to another throughout. The scope of this discussion allows only a brief explanation of each of these features.

We begin with the doxologies. The Psalter has been divided into five books, and the first four books conclude with doxologies that contain four common elements: (1) *blessed*, (2) *be Yahweh*, (3) *forever* (4) *amen* (Pss 41:13; 72:18–19; 89:52; 106:48).⁸ The explosion of praise in Psalms 146–150 functions as a concluding celebration of praise.

At each of these “seams” between the five books of the Psalter we also find a change in ascription of authorship. In Book 1, 37/41 psalms are attributed to David, making the shift at the beginning of Book 2 surprising. The only psalms in Book 1 not attributed to David have no superscription at all (Pss

1, 2, 10, and 33). At Psalm 42 we meet the first of a series of psalms “of the Sons of Korah” (Pss 42–49). Still, 18/31 psalms of Book 2 are attributed to David. Book 3 then opens with a series of psalms “of Asaph” at Psalm 73, and the fact that so many psalms were attributed to David in Books 1 and 2 (55/72) makes the near absence of David noticeable in Book 3, where we find only one psalm attributed to him (Ps 86). Book 4 again opens with a new author, Psalm 90 being “a prayer of Moses,” and here we have only two psalms of David (Pss 101, 103). Book 5, like Book 1, opens with a psalm that has no superscription (Ps 107), so that there is a change in ascription at the beginning of each of the Psalter’s Five Books. In Book 5 we have a return to Davidic Psalms, with 15/44 attributed to David. All told, 73/150 psalms are attributed to David, with most of those attributions standing in Books 1 and 2 (55/73).

Books 1 and 2, then, are largely Davidic, while Book 3 has only one psalm of David and Book 4 has only two. This distribution of Davidic psalms joins two similar features that make David heavily present in Books 1 and 2 then almost entirely absent in Books 3 and 4. First, consider the distribution of what are often referred to as “historical superscriptions.” These are notices like the one in the superscription of Psalm 3 (“A Psalm of David, when he fled from Absalom his son”), which enable readers to align a psalm with something from relevant biblical narratives, usually Samuel or Chronicles. There are thirteen of these historical superscriptions in the Psalter, and twelve of the thirteen are in Books 1 and 2 (Pss 3, 7, 18, 34, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, and 63).⁹ The only historical superscription outside Books 1 and 2 is the relatively nondescript one at Psalm 142 (“Of David, when he was in the cave”).

The second feature that joins with the shift away from Davidic psalms and historical superscriptions after Book 2 is that Book’s concluding line, Psalm 72:20, which reads, “The prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended.” These three features (the predominance of David in the superscriptions of Books 1 and 2, the concentration of historical superscriptions in Books 1 and 2, and the notice at the end of Book 2 that David’s prayers are ended) create the impression that Books 1 and 2 deal with the historical David. In Book 3 we meet psalms that reflect the kind of invasion of the temple accomplished by enemies described in 1 Kings 14:25 (cf. 2 Chron 12:1–12) at Psalms 74 and 79. The last psalm of Book 3, Psalm 89, reads as though the city has been

destroyed with its people and king exiled (see esp. Ps 89:38–45), creating the impression that the psalms of Book 3 cover the period from the beginning of Solomon’s reign to the nation’s exile from the land. Book 4 concludes with a prayer calling on the Lord to gather his people from all the places to which he had scattered them (Ps 106:47), indicating that the psalms of Book 4 respond to Israel’s exile from the land. The opening words of Book 5 (Ps 107:2–3) read as though the prayer at the end of Book 4 (106:47) has been answered, suggesting that Book 5 is presented from the perspective of those who have experienced the anticipated future salvation.

Along with the doxologies, the new author at the beginning of each book, the distribution of Davidic psalms and historical superscriptions, and the note at the end of Book 2, we can observe that Psalms 1 and 2 serve as “the gateway to the Psalter,”¹⁰ introducing the whole. These two psalms begin with a description of the blessed man, who like Joshua (cf. Josh 1:8) meditates on Torah day and night and prospers (Ps 1:1–3). The blessed man of Psalm 1 sounds like the Torah observant king of Deuteronomy 17:14–20, and that identification is confirmed by Psalm 2 (see esp. 2:1, 6, 7–12).¹¹

Psalms 1 and 2 are bound together by link words and thematic points of contact, setting the Psalter’s audience up to see more of the same throughout the work: the first word of Psalm 1, “Blessed,” is the first word of the last line of Psalm 2, “Blessed” (Ps 1:1; 2:12). The term used to describe the blessed man “meditating” on the Torah in 1:2 is the same term used to describe the peoples “plotting” in 2:1. The blessed man in Psalm 1:1 does not “sit” in the seat of “scoffers,” and Yahweh “sits” in the heavens “laughing” at those rebelling against him in 2:4. The “way of the wicked will perish” in 1:6, and the kings are warned to submit to the Son lest they “perish in the way” in 2:12.

These link words continue from Psalms 1–2 through the rest of the Psalter, creating the impression that David typifies the blessed king to come, meditating on Torah (Ps 1) and praying in response to Yahweh’s promises (Ps 2:7–12). Thus he speaks of Yahweh answering him from his “holy hill” (likely referring to Yahweh’s heavenly temple) in Psalm 3:4, and this links back to 2:6, where Yahweh asserted that he had installed his king on Zion, his “holy hill.”

These features of the Psalter that establish its own internal coherence and purposeful arrangement indicate that it was designed and completed as an integrated work of art with a unified message. At its most basic level, that

message points to a future king from David's line who will meditate on the Scriptures even as those who rebel against God plot against him. That future king, as Psalm 110 indicates, will ultimately triumph.

The kind of evidence that has been surveyed in this section does not necessarily need to be consciously recognized to do its work. For those who meditatively read the Psalms in sequence, or for those who memorize the Psalms in sequence, this kind of evidence does its work whether the audience realizes it or not. The sense of cohesion, of unfolding storyline, of interconnectedness, all naturally arises out of the reading, or recitation, of the Psalter in sequence.

THE UNITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Though I am not entirely satisfied with all of his conclusions, I am in agreement with John Sailhamer on the big idea that Moses and those who followed him understood themselves to be presenting a coherent set of documents with an overarching main point.¹² Stephen Dempster has convincingly argued that the OT is a book not a ragbag,¹³ and he has pointed to evidence that the whole of the OT canon was strategically organized to create literary beauty that communicates harmony, unity, and cohesion.¹⁴

Casey Croy has demonstrated that the books of the OT contain indications that their authors intended them to be read in the context of the growing canonical collection.¹⁵ Others have labored in this field of evidence that the Law, Prophets, and Writings were conceived by the canonizer as a unified book,¹⁶ and I have entered into their labor.¹⁷ There is an important point here about authorial intent: I am suggesting that the OT authors intended what they wrote as contributions to a wider project, and that those involved in finishing the canonical form of the whole saw it the same way. If the NT authors read the OT as a unified whole, this would be in keeping with the intentions of the OT authors. In this section I want to highlight briefly a few indications that the authors of the NT read the OT as a book.

The research for this essay included examination of the places where the Psalms are quoted in the NT. As I looked through the NT at these instances, I was watching for places where several psalms are quoted in close proximity to one another. My attention had been drawn to this phenomenon when I noticed the way that Paul quotes Psalm 110:1 in Ephesians 1:20, then

quotes Psalm 8:6 in Ephesians 1:22. This will be discussed further below, but it seemed apparent to me that Paul assumed that Psalms 8 and 110 were talking about the same thing, or better the same person, Christ.

My contention in this essay is that these instances point to the NT authors assuming that the Psalter is a unified book with a coherent message. I cannot help but observe, however, that it is not just the Psalter that is treated this way. The entirety of the OT is treated as a unified book with a unified message.

Matthew presents Jesus claiming that he came to fulfill the law and the prophets (Matt 5:17). Luke presents him saying that “everything written about me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and Psalms must be fulfilled” (Luke 24:47). John presents Jesus asserting that “the Scriptures ... bear witness about me” (John 5:39), and that “Moses ... wrote of me” (5:46). In addition to these wide-angle comments that summarize the thrust of the whole of the OT, consider the logic of Hebrews 3-4. The author of Hebrews expositis Psalm 95 (Heb 3:7-15) in light of the narratives concerning *both* the wilderness wanderings of Israel (3:8-4:2) *and* the creation of the world (4:3-7), narratives found in Exodus, Numbers, and Genesis, respectively. The author of Hebrews continues in the same vein with the book of Joshua (4:8). Hebrews reads these texts from Psalms, the Pentateuch, and Joshua in light of one another, as though they all belong to a unified covenantal whole, which is in fact how the books of the OT were received by most people until the so-called Enlightenment.¹⁸

The argument of Hebrews 7 similarly depends on the assumption that the OT is a coherent book with a unified message. Thus the author makes an argument about Melchizedek, who first appears in Genesis 14, in light of requirements concerning the Levitical priesthood from other books like Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, in light of assertions made in Psalm 110 and promises made about the Davidic king from the line of Judah in passages such as Genesis 49 and 2 Samuel 7.

The point here is that if the author of Hebrews read the whole of the OT as a book, and he seems to have done just that, is it not likely that he also read the Psalter as a book? We could point to similar evidence from across the NT, whose authors routinely quote the OT as Scripture. And again I ask: if the NT authors read the collection of books we recognize as the OT as a unified whole, is it not likely that they also read the collection of psalms in the Psalter as a book? We turn to evidence that points to the conclusion that they did just that.

NT EVIDENCE THAT THE PSALTER WAS READ AS A BOOK

Years ago when I first began to work through the Psalter in Hebrew (2003-2005), I had also acquired an audio version of the Hebrew Bible. Once I had worked through the first psalm, I would listen to it, trying to keep up with the reading. As I worked through successive Psalms, through Book 1, when listening I would begin at Psalm 1 and follow along in the text as the audio version took me through as many psalms as I had worked through. I began to sense a strong continuity between the psalms, as the person praying was the same (David), the enemies were the same (those persecuting him), and it seemed that the Psalter was responding to the same promises from earlier Scripture (chiefly 1 Sam 16 and 2 Sam 7 in Ps 2) and building on the same patterns (mainly from the lives of Joseph and Moses). This experience made me receptive to the scholarly approaches to the Psalter as a book, of which I later became aware (ca. 2006). Scholars were studying and naming what I had sensed from reading the Psalms in Hebrew in sequence. All of this was solidified for me when I had the opportunity to preach through the Psalms (2015–2018) and write a commentary on the book (published in 2021).

Once I had completed the commentary, as I was working on my book on typology,¹⁹ I noticed the way that Paul alludes to Psalm 110:1 in Ephesians 1:20, then immediately alludes to Psalm 8:6 in Ephesians 1:22. My own conclusions about the coherent message of the Psalter made Paul's juxtapositions of these psalms natural and obvious. Scholars in the past have proposed that the NT authors may have used a collection of statements from the OT that were compiled in a testimony book.²⁰ It seems far more plausible to me that the testimony book is the whole of the OT, understood in context.

In the discussion that follows we will examine seven instances in the NT where different psalms are quoted in close proximity to one another. We will begin with the one just mentioned, the reference to Psalms 110 and 8 in Ephesians 1:20 and 22. From there we will work through similar cases, asking this question throughout: do these NT authors' use of the Psalter indicate that they understood it as a unified book with a coherent message?

The following seven contexts, two from Paul, three from Hebrews, and two from Luke in Acts, present these three biblical authors (and implicitly also Peter, whom Luke presents as the speaker in both instances discussed here), citing various texts from the Psalter side by side to communicate

their message. Throughout this discussion my claim is that the message of the NT authors is strengthened and enriched if the Psalter is understood in sequence as a book.

Psalms 110 and 8 in Ephesians 1:20–22

Consider Paul’s statements in Ephesians 1:20 and 22 in side-by-side comparison with Psalms 110 and Psalm 8 in Greek, with an accompanying English translation:

EPHESIANS	PSALMS (LXX)
<p>Eph 1:20, “Ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις</p> <p>“that he worked in Christ when he raised him from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly places” (ESV)</p>	<p>Ps 110:1 (109:1), εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου</p> <p>“The Lord said to my lord, ‘Sit on my right until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet.’” (NETS)</p>
<p>Eph 1:22, καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ,</p> <p>“And he put all things under his feet and gave him as head over all things to the church” (ESV)</p>	<p>Ps 8:6, καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ</p> <p>“You set him over the works of your hands; you subjected all under his feet” (NETS)</p>

In Ephesians 1:20–22, Paul indicates that Jesus is both David’s Psalm 110 Lord and the Psalm 8 son of man, under whose feet God has placed all things. Which of the following possibilities is the more likely scenario: first, we could imagine that Paul read the Psalter as many do today, seeing neither Psalm 8 nor Psalm 110 as contributions to a unified Psalter, but rather as stand-alone, disconnected statements, in which he found language that he could appropriate for his own purposes to speak of Christ. Alternatively, we could imagine that Paul was likely exposed to the Psalter in sequence, that perhaps he had repeatedly sung or chanted the Psalms in sequence. Gordon Wenham observes, “In several passages Paul mentions the practice of singing the psalms” (referencing 1 Cor 14:26, Eph 5:19, Col 3:16, and noting Acts 16:25).²¹ Paul may have grown up doing this himself, to the point that he

would have been able to sing or chant the Psalter by memory.²²

The memorization of books among Jews in antiquity was apparently so frequent that the author of Maccabees could write, “we have aimed to please those who wish to read, to make it easy for those who are inclined to memorize, and to profit all those who happen to read this” (2 Macc 2:25, NETS). David Carr writes that in the ancient world “memorization and recitation of standard texts shaped the minds of students.”²³ Carr later explains,

Within the early synagogues and nonsynagogal schools students learned to recite and understand biblical texts, learning Hebrew and memorizing the Torah, Psalms, and portions of the prophets. Such practices of reading, learning, and memorization of the Bible continue up to the present in many traditional Jewish communities.²⁴

Did Paul learn the Psalms in sequence, and was he repeatedly exposed to them that way? This would seem likely given his first-class education in Jerusalem “at the feet of Gamaliel according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers” (Acts 22:3). What seems unlikely is that someone like Paul, or any other educated Jew of his time, might be exposed to the Psalms in a more disconnected way, learning one here, one there, along the lines of the way poems in a modern anthology might be studied, out of order and without relationship to one another. In her “cognitive-linguistic approach” to *The Verb and the Paragraph in Biblical Hebrew*, Elizabeth Robar describes “the Gestalt effect” as “the constant quest of the human mind to impose meaningful organization on the input provided, even when significant portions must be provided by the mind because they are absent to the perception.”²⁵

Given the way human minds seek coherence and fill in gaps in information,²⁶ if Paul and other NT authors did memorize the Psalter and pray it in sequence, the likelihood seems to be increased that they would have understood Psalm 8 and Psalm 110 to be speaking of the same person, flowing out of the way that Psalms 1 and 2 introduce the Psalter and the many link words throughout the psalms create coherence and maintain their train of thought. I contend this is exactly what we see Paul, the author of Hebrews, and Luke (presenting Peter) doing in the instances discussed in this essay.

I want to be quick to acknowledge that Paul’s adaptation of Psalm 110:1

and 8:6 in Ephesians 1:20 and 22 does not explicitly declare that he read the Psalter as a book in sequence. I also maintain, however, that the Psalter itself conditions its readers to treat it that way, and that such a reading—as a book in sequence—makes natural sense of Paul setting these statements side by side.

In summary, the idea that Paul read the Psalter in sequence as a book comports with his historical context and provides a natural explanation for his reference to Psalm 110 right next to his reference to Psalm 8. Read in context of the Psalter, the one under whose feet God put all things in Psalm 8:6 is the one invited to sit at Yahweh's right hand until his enemies become his footstool in Psalm 110:1. This understanding would also buttress the idea that, read in context, Psalm 8 speaks not so much of humanity in general as of the new Adam king from David's line in particular (on which see further below).

When we consider the point Paul is making through the references to Psalms 110 and 8 in Ephesians 1:20–22, he is speaking of the immeasurable greatness of God's power toward those who believe (1:19), which he prays believers will have the eyes of their hearts enlightened to know (1:15–18). Paul prays that believers will know the power God worked when, among other things, he established in Christ what was spoken of in Psalms 110:1 and 8:6. It is noteworthy that Paul is not setting out to exposit these psalms but rather using his understanding of them to speak of God's power. This indicates that Paul's interpretation of Psalm 8 and Psalm 110 speaking of the same person was a settled conviction in his mind, on which he could instinctively draw, as we also see him do in 1 Corinthians 15.

Psalms 110 and 8 in 1 Corinthians 15:25–27

Paul also reads Psalms 110 and 8 together in 1 Corinthians 15:25 and 27. Again we begin with the Greek texts:

I CORINTHIANS	PSALMS (LXX)
<p>1 Cor 15:25, δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὗ θῆῃ πάντα τοὺς ἐχθρούς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.</p> <p>“For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet.” (ESV)</p>	<p>Ps 110:1 (109:1), εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου</p> <p>“The Lord said to my lord, ‘Sit on my right until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet.’” (NETS)</p>
<p>1 Cor 15:27, πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ ὅτι πάντα ὑποτέτακται, ὄφλον ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.</p> <p>“For ‘God has put all things in subjection under his feet.’ But when it says, ‘all things are put in subjection,’ it is plain that he is excepted who put all things in subjection under him.” (ESV)</p>	<p>Ps 8:6, καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ</p> <p>“You set him over the works of your hands; you subjected all under his feet” (NETS)</p>

The keyword connection in the reference to the “feet” of the ruler, under which God puts “all things” and “your enemies” in Psalm 8:6 and 110:1, already exists in the original Hebrew text, and this keyword connection is of a piece with all the others that create coherence in the Psalter’s message. Paul has noticed a feature of the Psalter and asserts that Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of what David described in Psalms 8 and 110, in keeping with the wider message of the whole book of Psalms.

As in Ephesians 1, so in 1 Corinthians 15: when we open ourselves up to the possibility that Paul read the Psalter in sequence as a book, the declaration of dominion in Psalm 8:6 and the invitation to sit until all enemies are put in subjection in Psalm 110:1 take on contextual fullness that comports with Paul’s message. Whereas in Ephesians 1 the broader point Paul was making had to do with praying that the believers would know God’s power, in 1 Corinthians 15 Paul argues for the resurrection, and in 15:20–28 he speaks of the order of events pertaining to the resurrection.

Christ has been raised from the dead as the firstfruits (1 Cor 15:20), and Paul compares the way that death came by Adam and resurrection comes

by Christ (15:21–22), explaining that Christ was raised first, and when he returns those who belong to him will be raised (15:23). Paul then speaks of how at the end Christ will deliver the kingdom to the Father (15:24), quoting Psalm 110:1 on the point that Christ reigns until all enemies are underfoot (1 Cor 15:25). The last enemy will be death itself (15:26, which seems to align with the two resurrections in Rev 20:4–6), because God did make the Psalm 8:6 promise to Christ that all would be put under his feet (1 Cor 15:27). So whereas the point in Ephesians 1 is about God's power, the point of quoting Psalms 110:1 and 8:6 in 1 Corinthians 15:25–27 has to do with what they indicate about the sequence of the events of the end.

As with Ephesians 1:20–22, however, so here: Paul's words reflect the settled interpretive conclusion that both Psalm 8 and Psalm 110 are fulfilled in Christ. This essay maintains that the most natural way of interpreting the Psalter to arrive at that conclusion would be to read (or memorize and pray) it in sequence as a book.

Psalms 2 and 110 in Hebrews 5:5–6

One of the arguments C. H. Dodd made against Rendell Harris's testimony book proposal was the observation that though the same OT texts are often quoted in the New, different verses are called up from oft-quoted OT chapters, indicating that the NT authors appeal not to isolated statements but to whole contexts. The treatment of Psalm 110 by the author of Hebrews shows Dodd's point. Whereas Hebrews regularly engages Psalm 110:1 (e.g., Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1), the author cites Psalm 110:4 in Hebrews 5:6, showing his understanding of and interest in the whole psalm. If we are to imagine a testimony book, the evidence points to it being the whole of the OT.

Of interest for this study is the way the author of Hebrews quotes Psalm 110:4 right after having cited Psalm 2:7. Here are the Greek texts with English translations:

HEBREWS	PSALMS (LXX)
<p>Heb 5:5, οὕτως και ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτόν· υἱὸς μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.</p> <p>“So also Christ did not exalt himself to be made a high priest, but was appointed by him who said to him, ‘You are my Son, today I have begotten you’;” (ESV)</p>	<p>Ps 2:7, διαγγέλλων τὸ πρόσταγμα κυρίου κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με υἱὸς μου εἶ σύ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε</p> <p>“by proclaiming the Lord’s ordinance: The Lord said to me, ‘My son you are; today I have begotten you.’” (NETS)</p>
<p>Heb 5:6, καθὼς και ἐν ἐτέρῳ λέγει· σύ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδεκ</p> <p>“as he says also in another place, ‘You are a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek.’” (ESV)</p>	<p>Ps 110:4 (109:4), ὤμοσεν κύριος και οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται σύ εἶ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδεκ</p> <p>“The Lord swore and will not change his mind, ‘You are a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek.’” (NETS)</p>

The author of Hebrews drives home the point that Christ was appointed to the high priesthood by selecting two passages from the Psalms in which Yahweh speaks to the future king from David’s line. Psalm 2 reformulates the 2 Samuel 7 promises that Yahweh made concerning David’s seed, presenting Yahweh speaking directly to that seed of David whose throne he promised to establish. Psalm 110 likewise presents Yahweh speaking to David’s Lord, the king who would arise from his line. The flow of thought in the Psalter, when read in sequence as a book, only strengthens the exegetical connections between Psalms 2 and 110:

- in both psalms there are enemies (Ps 2:1–3; 110:1);
- in both Yahweh sits enthroned in the heavens (2:4; 110:1);
- in both Yahweh speaks directly to his king (2:7–9; 110:1, 4);
- in both Yahweh’s king has allies—the blessed who take refuge in him (2:12), and those who make themselves freewill offerings on the day of his power (110:3);
- in both the enemies are broken (2:9; 110:5–6);
- and in both we find references to “the way” (2:12; 110:7; cf. 1:6).

Read in the context of the Psalter, Psalm 110 prophesies the accomplishment of what was promised in Psalm 2, and the two psalms deal with the same cast of characters enacting a united and unfolding storyline. The more familiar we are with the Psalter as a book in sequence, the more sense the author of Hebrews' treatment of the Psalter makes. For instance, given the use of Psalm 45:6–7 in Hebrews 1:8–9 (on which see below), it is worth noting that Psalm 45:3–5 calls upon Yahweh's king to achieve the military conquest promised in Psalm 2:8–9 and prophesied in 110:5–7. The Psalter is profoundly coherent, and those who memorize it and pray it in sequence instinctively recognize its integral wholeness.

Why does the author of Hebrews quote Psalm 2:7 when speaking of the way Christ was appointed high priest (Heb 2:5a)? I would propose that the key to the linkage has to do with the way that Yahweh's decree, "You are my Son; today I have begotten you" (Ps 2:7), establishes the seed of David as the new Adam son of God. Adam was God's son (Gen 5:1, 3; Luke 3:38) with a priestly role (Gen 2:15; cf. Num 3:8) and royal responsibilities (Gen 1:26, 28) in the garden. Then the nation of Israel became the son of God (Exod 4:22–23) with a priestly role and royal responsibilities in the land of promise (Exod 19:6).

For the seed of David to be named son of God (cf. 2 Sam 7:14) is for him to be given a priestly role with royal responsibilities as a new Adam representative head of Israel. He does not descend, however, from the tribe of Levi, so if he is to be a priest, he must belong to some other priestly order associated with some covenant other than the Mosaic one made at Sinai. This is exactly what the author of Hebrews argues (Heb 7:11–28). The author of Hebrews puts these ideas together when he quotes Psalm 2:7 with Psalm 110:4 in Hebrews 5:5–6, in anticipation of the longer explanation and argument he will provide in chapter 7.

For this study, again we see that a NT author understands the figure introduced in Psalm 2 as the one spoken of much later in the Psalter in Psalm 110. When we read the Psalter as a book in sequence, this conclusion is reinforced and ratified by a myriad of ties that bind the psalms to one another.

The author of Hebrews primarily cites the Greek translation of the Psalter, and it would seem that he was likely immersed in a culture where the Psalms were read and or chanted/sung in sequence, so that large portions, if not the whole book, were cemented in memory. Joachim Schaper has written,

The Hebrew Psalter has rightly been described as the ‘hymn-book’ of post-exilic Judaism ... The *Greek* Psalms were to be of no lesser importance to Jewish life in the Diaspora than their Hebrew equivalents had been and still were to Palestinian Judaism. To take just one example: we find liturgical dedications in the Greek version (e.g. the superscriptions of the psalms assigning them to the days of the week) which form an addition to the original and were necessitated by changing liturgical needs in a new environment, by the ever-growing importance of synagogal worship.²⁷

Psalms 2, 45, 97, 102, 104, and 110 in Hebrews 1:5–13

The collection of quotations, mainly from Psalms, in Hebrews 1:5–13 supports the conclusion that the author of Hebrews read the Psalter as a book in sequence. To demonstrate this to be the case, we must see the chiasmic structure the author presents. I will include references to the texts our author cites in bold within brackets in the chiasm, and here I present the ESV:

The Chiasmic Structure of Hebrews 1:5–13

⁵ For to which of the angels did God ever say,

“You are my Son, today I have begotten you”? [**Ps 2:7**]

Or again,

“I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son”? [**2 Sam 7:14**]

⁶ And again, when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says,

“Let all God’s angels worship him.” [**Ps 97:7 {96:7}**]

⁷ Of the angels he says, [**Ps 104:4**]

“He makes his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire.”

⁸ But of the Son he says, [**Ps 45:6–7**]

“Your throne, O God, is forever and ever, the scepter of uprightness is the scepter of your kingdom. ⁹ You have loved righteousness and hated wickedness; therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness beyond your companions.”

¹⁰ And, [**Ps 102:25–27**]

“You, Lord, laid the foundation of the earth in the beginning, and the heavens are the work of your hands; ¹¹ they will perish, but you remain; they will all wear out like a garment, ¹² like a robe you will roll them up, like a garment

they will be changed. But you are the same, and your years will have no end.”

¹³ And to which of the angels has he ever said, [Ps 110:1]

“Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet”?

Allow me to highlight the structural, grammatical, and syntactical parallels that this chiasm reflects. Note that the first and last Scriptural quotations, in verses 5 and 13, are prefaced by questions that ask, “to which of the angels did God ever say?”

1:5, Τίτι γὰρ εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων

1:13, πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἶρηκέν ποτε

We saw above that the author of Hebrews quotes Psalm 2:7 next to Psalm 110:4 in Hebrews 5:5–6, and in the chiasmic structure of 1:5–13 he places the quotation of Psalm 2:7 in Hebrews 1:5 across from the quotation of Psalm 110:1 in Hebrews 1:13.

In the second (Heb 1:6) and second to last (1:10–12) elements of the chiasm, Jesus is referred to as “the firstborn” (1:6) and as “Lord” active at “the beginning” (1:10). Whereas the other psalms passages cited in this chiasm are addressed to the king in their original context, the passages cited in this “slot” speak of Yahweh in their original context. Psalm 97:4 speaks of the mountains melting like wax before Yahweh, and then a few verses later the *elohim* (translated into Greek as *angeloi*, angels) are commanded to worship him. Similarly, Psalm 102:25–27 is preceded by references to “the name of Yahweh” at 102:21 and the vocative address, “O my God” in 102:24. By citing these two passages across from one another, the author of Hebrews acts on the assertion he made in 1:3, “He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of his nature.” This being the case, the author of Hebrews indicates that what could be said of Yahweh in the OT can be said of Jesus in the New.

The central statements of the chiasmic structure in Hebrews 1:5–13 are also introduced with parallel expressions at 1:7 and 1:8. Together they form a *men ... de* construction,²⁸ contrasting what God said of the angels with what he said of the Son:

1:7, καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει

1:8, πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν

The author of Hebrews seems to read the statements of Psalm 45, quoted in Hebrews 1:8–9, as developing the ideas he has cited from Psalm 2 and 2 Samuel 7 (Heb 1:5, note again the unity of not only the Psalter but the whole of the OT). These in turn build on the reference to the Son being seated “at the right hand of the Majesty on high” in Hebrews 1:3, as the author anticipates his frequent citation of Psalm 110.

To reflect the meaning of the chiasmic structure of Hebrews 1:5–13, consider an interpretive summary:

- 1:5, Psalm 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14 Not Spoken to Angels: Superiority of the Son
- 1:6, Angels Called to Worship the Firstborn
- 1:7, The Angels are Servants
- 1:8–9, The Son is King Forever
- 1:10–12, The Son Identified as Lord Creator and New Creator
- 1:13, Psalm 110 Not Spoke to Angels: Superiority of the Son

In view of the way that the author of Hebrews will say that the OT was “declared by angels” (Heb 2:3), the string of quotations in 1:5–13 develops the gravity of the letter’s opening statement—whereas in the past God spoke to the fathers by the prophets (1:1; through the angels, 2:3), now God has spoken by his Son (1:2). The superior being, status, and role of the Son are highlighted in 1:5–13, and the author employs the string of quotations from the OT to make that point.

I submit that the reading strategy that would most naturally lead to the perspective reflected in the statements made by the author of Hebrews in 1:5–13 is the one that takes the Psalter as a book in sequence. Thereby we see the intrinsic connections between Yahweh’s anointed king in Psalm 2 (Heb 1:6) and the one whose wedding is celebrated in Psalm 45 (Heb 1:8–9), the firstborn whom the angels were to worship in Psalm 97 (Heb 1:6), who made and will remake the world in Psalm 102 (Heb 1:10–12), and who sits at God’s right hand in Psalm 110 (Heb 1:13).

Psalms 8 and 22 in Hebrews 2:6–12

The author of Hebrews highlights the superiority of the last days revelation God has made in his Son (Heb 1:1–4), the superior being, status, and role of the Son (1:5–13), and then he presses the point that if people received

just punishment for disregarding the revelation made by angels, those who disregard the revelation made in the Son will certainly not escape (2:1–4).

The two big ideas the author communicates in Hebrews 2:5–18 are that (1) God has subjected the world to come to Christ (2:5–9), and (2) that Christ stands in solidarity with his people (2:10–18). In keeping with the purpose of this study, our main interest is in the way that the author of Hebrews has juxtaposed a quotation from Psalm 8 with a quotation from Psalm 22, both of which he sees fulfilled in Christ.

We first consider Psalm 8, and here are the relevant statements in Greek with English translation:

HEBREWS	PSALMS (LXX)
<p>Heb 2:6b–8a, τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὅτι μνησθήσεται αὐτοῦ, ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὅτι ἐπισκέπτεται αὐτόν; ⁷ ἡλάττωσας αὐτόν βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν, ⁸ πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.</p> <p>“What is man, that you are mindful of him, or the son of man, that you care for him? ⁷ You made him for a little while lower than the angels; you have crowned him with glory and honor, ⁸ putting everything in subjection under his feet.” (ESV)</p>	<p>Psalm 8:4–6 (8:5–7), τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὅτι μνησθήσεται αὐτοῦ ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὅτι ἐπισκέπτεται αὐτόν ⁶ ἡλάττωσας αὐτόν βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν ⁷ καὶ κατέστησας αὐτόν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ</p> <p>“What is man that you are mindful of him or son of man that you attend to him? ⁵ You diminished him a little in comparison with angels; with glory and honor you crowned him. ⁶ And you set him over the works of your hands; you subjected all under his feet” (NETS)</p>

I have argued that in context, Psalm 8 should be understood as David’s understanding that both he himself and the future king from his line stand as new Adams in God’s world, exercising God’s dominion over God’s creation as God’s king.²⁹ Psalm 8 does not ask a question about mankind in general, but rather about Adam, even about Seth (the *ben Adam*, “son of Adam”), and Seth’s son Enosh. My view is that David understood the promise of the seed of the woman (Gen 3:15) as being preserved through this line of descent, a line in which he knew himself to stand as a descendant of Judah (cf. Gen 49:8–12). As David wrote Psalm 8, then, he was presenting himself, and the seed God promised to raise up from his line, as the new Adam king of God’s creation (cf. Ps 2:7). The author of

Hebrews asserts that the words of Psalm 8 are fulfilled in Jesus, the promised king from the line of David, to whom the world to come will be subjected (Heb 2:5).

The author of Hebrews then turns his attention to the solidarity between Jesus and his people, and for this he quotes from both Psalm 22 and Isaiah 8 (whole OT as a book again). I have discussed both Isaiah 8 and Psalm 22 in my recent book on typology, allowing me to be brief here while referring readers who want more to that discussion.³⁰ With regard to Isaiah 8, note that Isaiah speaks of his children. In the context of Isaiah 7–8, those children are named, and they stand with Isaiah against the unbelieving establishment surrounding King Ahaz, who rejects Isaiah and his message. The author of Hebrews quotes the passage not because the statements *predict* something about the messiah but because Isaiah and his persecuted children *typify* Jesus and his persecuted disciples. And so it is with the quotation from Psalm 22. Here are the Greek texts with English translations:

HEBREWS	PSALMS (LXX)
<p>Heb 2:12, ἀπαγγεῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε</p> <p>“I will tell of your name to my brothers; in the midst of the congregation I will sing your praise.” (ESV)</p>	<p>Psalm 22:22 (21:23), διηγῆσομαι τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε</p> <p>“I will tell of your name to my kindred; in the midst of an assembly I will sing a hymn to you” (NETS)</p>

Psalm 22 begins with the cry of dereliction, which Jesus famously quoted on the cross (“My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” Matt 27:46). In this psalm David describes an actual near-death period of difficulty, out of which the Lord rescued him.³¹ My view is that David understood his own suffering as an installment in the pattern of the kind of suffering endured by the likes of Joseph and Moses, and that when he himself went through difficulties similar to theirs, he began to expect that the future king God promised to raise up from his line would fulfill these patterns.³² Whereas David’s near-death experience of divine dereliction (“why have you forsaken me?” Ps 22:1) typified that of the messiah, the Lord Jesus actually died. Whereas David’s deliverance was almost like being raised from the dead (cf. Ps 22:21), Jesus actually was resurrected. When David was delivered, he praised God with those loyal to him, as articulated in the words of Psalm

22:22, quoted in Hebrews 2:12. The author of Hebrews quotes Psalm 22:22 to call upon this wider typological fulfillment of the experience of David in the salvation accomplished through the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus, making the point here that just as David stood in solidarity with his brothers and the congregation over against those trying to kill him, so also Jesus stands in solidarity with his disciples against those persecuting them. Notably, the “congregation” in which David says he will sing God’s praise in Psalm 22:22 is synonymous with the “congregation of the righteous” mentioned in Psalm 1:5 (in this case the theme is not articulated with the exact same terminology but with synonyms, עַדָּהָּ in Ps 1:5, לְקָהָל in 22:22, both rendered “congregation” by ESV).

Much more could of course be said about Psalms 8 and 22 and the argument of Hebrews 2. For the purposes of this study, I note that in the same way David typifies Jesus as he stands as a new Adam king over creation in Psalm 8, so also he typifies Jesus as the persecuted but delivered true king, against whom God’s enemies rage (cf. Ps 2:1–3), around whom God’s people rally. Once again, the approach to the interpretation of the Psalter that leads most naturally to the conclusions articulated by the author of Hebrews is the one that reads, memorizes, and prays it as a book in sequence.

Psalms 69 and 109 in Acts 1:20

Gordon Wenham and others have persuasively argued that whereas Books 1 and 2 of the Psalter deal with the historical David, the David in Book 5 refers to the future king from his line, along the lines of the way that Ezekiel 34:23, “my servant David,” points not to the historical David but to the future Davidic king.³³ Psalms 108, 109, and 110 all carry “of David” in their superscriptions. In Psalm 110 David speaks of his Lord, and the NT everywhere sees Jesus as the fulfillment of that Psalm. With 110 being so obviously concerned with the one to come, and with the relative scarcity of Davidic psalms in Books 3 and 4 (only 1 in Book 3 and 2 in Book 4), and with Book 2 indicating that “the prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended” (Ps 72:20), Psalms 108–110 seem to speak of the conquest of the future David.

Meanwhile, the statements of the historical David in Psalm 69 speak both to his own situation and were intended by him to typify the one to come.³⁴ The typological understanding is even more prominent in Psalm 109. Luke presents Peter quoting both Psalms 69 and 109 together in Acts 1:20 to

denounce Judas. On this kind of interpretation, Mitchell notes “that Kimhi, for instance, interprets historical Ps. 52 messianically, by regarding David’s adversities as typological of messiah’s.”³⁵

Consider the Greek texts (with English translations) of Acts 1:20 and the statements quoted there from Psalms 69 and 109:

ACTS	PSALMS (LXX)
<p>Acts 1:20a, γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βιβλῳ ψαλμῶν· γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ ἔρημος καὶ μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ</p> <p>“For it is written in the Book of Psalms, ‘May his camp become desolate, and let there be no one to dwell in it’ (ESV)</p>	<p>Ps 69:25 (68:26), γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτῶν ἡρημωμένη καὶ ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμασιν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν</p> <p>“May their camp become desolate, and in their tents let there be no one to dwell” (my trans.)</p>
<p>Acts 1:20b, καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λαβέτω ἕτερος.</p> <p>“and ‘Let another take his office.’” (ESV)</p>	<p>Ps 109:8 (108:8), γενηθήτωσαν αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ ὀλίγαι καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λάβοι ἕτερος</p> <p>“Let his days be few, and let another take his office” (my trans.)</p>

Psalm 108 consists of the latter half of Psalm 57 combined with the latter half of Psalm 60, both of which carry historical superscriptions. It seems that Psalm 108 projects David’s historical experiences in Psalms 57 and 60 into the eschatological future.³⁶ Then Psalm 109 prays an imprecation first against enemies in the plural (Ps 109:1–5) before narrowing in on one enemy in particular (109:6–19). I am inclined to think that David composed Psalm 109 in anticipation of the enemies, and *the* traitor, with whom he expected his descendant would have to deal. I see the quotation of Psalm 69 next to 109 in Acts 1:20 as substantiating these interpretive conclusions.

Here again, David’s difficulties in Psalm 69 are read in continuity with the difficulties in Psalm 109, which points in the direction of the Psalter being read in sequence as a book.

Psalms 16 and 110 in Acts 2:25–35

The idea that the Psalter was read as a book held together by link words and common themes would also seem to be substantiated by the way Luke

presents Peter quoting Psalms 16 and 110 together in Acts 2. When Luke presents Peter quoting Psalms 16 and 110 together in Acts 2, both Peter and Luke take it for granted that David spoke of himself in Psalm 16 (Acts 2:25, 29–30). Peter argues, however, that David's own death shows that he himself does not completely live out Psalm 16 (2:29). In other words, David himself does not experience the fulfillment of Psalm 16. Luke presents Peter reasoning that David, therefore, under the influence of the Spirit's prophetic inspiration, and knowing God's promises, spoke of the resurrection of Christ (2:30–32). He then proceeds to argue that Christ has ascended to the Father's right hand and poured out the Spirit (2:33), explaining that David spoke of this very thing in Psalm 110:1 (Acts 2:34–35).

As with the quotations of Psalms 69 and 109 in Acts 1:20, so in the quotations of Psalm 16 and 110 in Acts 2:25–35—texts that pertain to the historical David but typify the one to come (Pss 16 and 69) are set next to texts that project David's historical experience into the eschatological future (Pss 109 and 110), and fulfillment is claimed in Christ.

Is there a reading strategy that would warrant these conclusions? I submit that reading the Psalter in sequence as a book will lead to these conclusions and others like what we find elsewhere in the NT, whereby different Psalms are quoted side by side as though they speak of the same thing.³⁷

CONCLUSION

The contemporary scholarly interest in understanding the Psalter as a book aligns with the way the Psalter would have been learned and conceived of in antiquity. The practices of memorizing and meditating, praying and chanting the Psalter would have led to the psalms being understood in sequence as a book. Indeed, the authors of the NT seem to have understood the OT canon as a coherent book with a unified message. Surely that understanding was applied to the Psalter as well.

Having briefly summarized some features of both the Psalter and the OT that point to the conclusion that those who wrote these documents intended them to be understood as coherent wholes, we turned our attention to seven NT contexts where different Psalms are quoted next to one another. My claim throughout has been that the way the NT authors would have learned and used the Psalter—memorizing, praying, singing the psalms—joins with

the Psalter's built-in cohesive features to bring about an understanding of the Psalter as having a unified cast of characters good and evil engaged in a discernible, though impressionistic, conflict as a narrative plotline unfolds that culminates in the conquest of the future king from David's line, promised in Psalm 2, jeopardized in Psalm 22, cheered on in Psalm 45, nearly dead in Psalm 89, resurrected through Mosaic intercession in Psalms 90 and 106, prophesied in Psalm 110, celebrated in Psalms 146-150.

Like the central NT context in this presentation (the catena of citations in Heb 1:5-13), the organization of these seven NT contexts has its own chiasmic structure:

- God's Power to Establish His King (Eph 1:20-22, citing Pss 110 and 8)
- The Events of the End (1 Cor 15:25-27, citing Pss 110 and 8)
- The New Adam Priest-King (Heb 5:5-6, citing Pss 2 and 110)
- The Son's Being, Status, and Role (Heb 1:5-13, citing Pss 2, 45, 97, 104, and 110)
- The Son's Adamic Dominion and Solidarity with His People (Heb 2:6-12, citing Pss 8 and 22)
- Imprecations against the Traitor (Acts 1:20, citing Pss 69 and 109)
- The Resurrected and Enthroned Son (Acts 2:25-35, citing Pss 16 and 110)

Biblical theology is the attempt to understand and embrace the interpretive perspective of the biblical authors. It seems that the NT authors read the Psalter as a book in sequence, a practice that, if we are to imitate their interpretive perspective, we do well to embrace. May the word of the Lord dwell as richly in us as it so obviously did in them.

-
1. Gerald Henry Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (Chico: Scholars, 1985).
 2. David Alexander Gundersen, "Davidic Hope in Book IV of the Psalter (Psalms 90-106)" (PhD Dissertation, Louisville, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2015), 11.
 3. Gregory of Nyssa, *Gregory of Nyssa's Treatise on the Inscriptions of the Psalms*, trans. Ronald E. Heine (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 83, 87, 95; For discussion, see James M. Hamilton, *Psalms Volume I: Psalms 1-72* (Evangelical Biblical Theology Commentary; Bellingham: Lexham Academic, 2021), 3-5.
 4. Steffen Jenkins, "The Antiquity of Psalter Shape Efforts," *Tyndale Bulletin* 71, no. 2 (2020): 161-80.
 5. David C. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 21, 29, 33-36; Adam D. Hensley, *Covenant Relationships and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, Library of Hebrew

- Bible/Old Testament Studies (New York: T&T Clark, 2018), 20–22.
6. James M. Hamilton Jr., *What Is Biblical Theology?* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2014).
 7. See the discussions of “The Psalms in the Canon,” “The Canonical Shape of the Psalter,” and “The Literary Structure and Meaning of the Psalter” in the introduction to Hamilton, *Psalms 1–72*, 1–64.
 8. The numbering of the verses of the Psalter in English translations does not match that of Hebrew Bibles because in the Hebrew the superscriptions are counted as verse 1, whereas English translations do not number the superscriptions. In this essay I give the verse numbers as they are found in English translations. Also, unless otherwise noted, citations from the Bible in English are ESV. There is also discrepancy between the numbering of the Psalms in the Hebrew original and the Greek translation. Where necessary I will provide the numbers of chapters and verses as found in Greek translation.
 9. For the reasons I exclude Psalm 30 from this count, see Hamilton, *Psalms 1–72*, 41 n. 67, cf. 27–40.
 10. See esp. Robert L. Cole, *Psalms 1–2: Gateway to the Psalter* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2013).
 11. Cf. Jamie A. Grant, *The King As Exemplar: The Function of Deuteronomy’s Kingship Law in the Shaping of the Book of Psalms*, *Academia Biblica* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004).
 12. See esp. John H. Sailhamer, *The Meaning of the Pentateuch: Revelation, Composition and Interpretation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2009). For my concerns with Sailhamer’s approach, see James M. Hamilton Jr., “John Sailhamer’s The Meaning of the Pentateuch: A Review Essay,” *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 14, no. 2 (2010): 62–76. For an attempt to establish the biblical authors’ unity on the center of biblical theology, see James M. Hamilton Jr., *God’s Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010).
 13. Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Biblical Theology of the Hebrew Bible*, *New Studies in Biblical Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 15–43.
 14. See Stephen Dempster, “An ‘Extraordinary Fact’: Torah and Temple and the Contours of the Hebrew Canon, Part 1,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 48 (1997): 23–56; Stephen Dempster, “An ‘Extraordinary Fact’: Torah and Temple and the Contours of the Hebrew Canon: Part 2,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 48 (1997): 191–218.
 15. Casey K. Croy, *Sequencing the Hebrew Bible: The Order of the Books*, *Hebrew Bible Monographs* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2021). “ISBN”: “978-1-910928-88-2”, “language”: “English”, “number-of-pages”: “264”, “publisher”: “Sheffield Phoenix”, “publisher-place”: “Sheffield”, “source”: “Amazon”, “title”: “Sequencing the Hebrew Bible: The Order of the Books”, “title-short”: “Sequencing the Hebrew Bible”, “author”: “[“family”: “Croy”, “given”: “Casey K.”]”, “issued”: {“date-parts”: [“2021”]}], “schema”: “https://github.com/citation-style-language/schema/raw/master/csl-citation.json”
 16. For the term “canonicler,” see John H. Sailhamer, *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995).
 17. James M. Hamilton Jr., “Canonical Biblical Theology,” in *God’s Glory Revealed in Christ: Essays in Honor of Tom Schreiner*, ed. Denny Burk, James M. Hamilton Jr., and Brian J. Vickers (Nashville: B&H, 2019), 59–73.
 18. For an important analysis of the history of biblical interpretation, see Craig A. Carter, *Interpreting Scripture with the Great Tradition: Recovering the Genius of Premodern Exegesis* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2018), 3–126.
 19. James M. Hamilton, *Typology—Understanding the Bible’s Promise-Shaped Patterns: How Old Testament Expectations Are Fulfilled in Christ* (Zondervan, 2022). have you ever noticed parallels between certain people, events, and institutions? Should we understand Noah as a kind of new Adam, and if so, does that somehow point us to the second Adam? How are we to interpret these similarities? In *Typology—Understanding the Bible’s Promise-Shaped Patterns*, author James M. Hamilton Jr. shows that the similarities we find in the Bible are based on genuine historical correspondence and demonstrates how we recognize them in the repetition of words and phrases, the parallels between patterns of events, and key thematic equivalences. When read in light of God’s promises, these historical correspondences spotlight further repetitions that snowball on one another to build escalating significance. This book stimulates fresh thinking on the relationship between the Old and New Testaments and will help pastors, preachers, and students better understand the dynamics of inner-biblical interpretation. It explores several of the “promise-shaped patterns” we see in the Old Testament including: Adam and New Adam, Prophets, Priests, and Kings, The Righteous Sufferer, Creation, Exodus, and New Exodus, Marriage. Hamilton shows that the prophets and sages of Israel learned to interpret Scripture from Moses and his writings. And by tracing the organic development of subsequent biblical patterns, he explains how these patterns created expectations that are fulfilled in Christ. Jesus himself taught his followers to understand the Old Testament in this way (Luke 24:45).
 20. J. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, vols. 1 and 2 (1916; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). See the excellent summary of Harris and the response of C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952), in Paul William Lamicela, “Remember

- the Predictions of the Holy Prophets: 2 Peter's Prophetic Use of the Old Testament" (PhD Dissertation, Louisville, KY, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2022), 3–5.
21. Gordon J. Wenham, *Psalms as Torah: Reading Biblical Song Ethically* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 19–20.
 22. See chapter 3 of Wenham's *Psalms as Torah*, which is entitled, "The Psalter as an Anthology to be Memorized," 41–56.
 23. David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 9. My attention was drawn to Carr by Wenham.
 24. Carr, 111.
 25. Elizabeth Robar, *The Verb and the Paragraph in Biblical Hebrew: A Cognitive-Linguistic Approach*, Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics (Boston: Brill, 2015), 3.
 26. On the way the Psalter encourages its audience to fill in gaps, see Wenham, *Psalms as Torah*, 62.
 27. Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995), 3.
 28. On which, see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 658, 672.
 29. Hamilton, *Psalms 1–72*, 145–58.
 30. Hamilton, *Typology*, 140–46, 191–94. have you ever noticed parallels between certain people, events, and institutions? Should we understand Noah as a kind of new Adam, and if so, does that somehow point us to the second Adam? How are we to interpret these similarities? In *Typology--Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns*, author James M. Hamilton Jr. shows that the similarities we find in the Bible are based on genuine historical correspondence and demonstrates how we recognize them in the repetition of words and phrases, the parallels between patterns of events, and key thematic equivalences. When read in light of God's promises, these historical correspondences spotlight further repetitions that snowball on one another to build escalating significance. This book stimulates fresh thinking on the relationship between the Old and New Testaments and will help pastors, preachers, and students better understand the dynamics of inner-biblical interpretation. It explores several of the "promise-shaped patterns" we see in the Old Testament including: Adam and New Adam, Prophets, Priests, and Kings, The Righteous Sufferer, Creation, Exodus, and New Exodus, Marriage. Hamilton shows that the prophets and sages of Israel learned to interpret Scripture from Moses and his writings. And by tracing the organic development of subsequent biblical patterns, he explains how these patterns created expectations that are fulfilled in Christ. Jesus himself taught his followers to understand the Old Testament in this way (Luke 24:45).
 31. See Hamilton, *Psalms 1–72*, 277–92.
 32. See James M. Hamilton Jr., "David's Biblical Theology and Typology in the Psalms: Authorial Intent and Patterns of the Seed of Promise," in *The Psalms: Exploring Theological Themes* (ed. David M. Howard and Andrew J. Schmutzer; Bellingham: Lexham, forthcoming).
 33. See Wenham, *Psalms as Torah*, 36–37. Wenham cites Martin Kleer, *Der liebliche Sanger Psalmen Israels: Untersuchungen zu David als Dichter und Beter der Psalmen*, BBB 108 (Bodenheim: Philo, 1996), 116–23. Cf. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 86, and Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 3: A Commentary on Psalms 101-150* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 3.
 34. For discussion of Psalm 69 as quoted in John 2:17, Rom 15:3, Matt 27:34, 48, Mark 15:23, Luke 23:36, and John 19:29, see Hamilton, *Typology*, 195–200. have you ever noticed parallels between certain people, events, and institutions? Should we understand Noah as a kind of new Adam, and if so, does that somehow point us to the second Adam? How are we to interpret these similarities? In *Typology--Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns*, author James M. Hamilton Jr. shows that the similarities we find in the Bible are based on genuine historical correspondence and demonstrates how we recognize them in the repetition of words and phrases, the parallels between patterns of events, and key thematic equivalences. When read in light of God's promises, these historical correspondences spotlight further repetitions that snowball on one another to build escalating significance. This book stimulates fresh thinking on the relationship between the Old and New Testaments and will help pastors, preachers, and students better understand the dynamics of inner-biblical interpretation. It explores several of the "promise-shaped patterns" we see in the Old Testament including: Adam and New Adam, Prophets, Priests, and Kings, The Righteous Sufferer, Creation, Exodus, and New Exodus, Marriage. Hamilton shows that the prophets and sages of Israel learned to interpret Scripture from Moses and his writings. And by tracing the organic development of subsequent biblical patterns, he explains how these patterns created expectations that are fulfilled in Christ. Jesus himself taught his followers to understand the Old Testament in this way (Luke 24:45).
 35. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 85.

36. See James M. Hamilton, *Psalms Volume II: Psalms 73–150* (Evangelical Biblical Theology Commentary; Bellingham: Lexham Academic, 2021), 276–82.
37. The scope of this discussion does not allow consideration of the following similar instances: Ps 118:25–26 in Matt 21:9 and 15 with Ps 8:2 in Matt 21:16 and Ps 118:22–23 in Matt 21:42; the several psalms quoted adjacently in Luke 1:68–72; Ps 41:9 in John 13:18 with Ps 80:8 in John 15:1 and Ps 35:19 or 69:4 in John 15:25; Ps 22:18 in John 19:24 with Ps 69:21 in John 19:28 and Ps 34:20 in John 19:36; Ps 118:22 in Acts 4:11 with Ps 2:1–2 in Acts 4:25–26 (cf. also the several Psalms referenced in Acts 4:24); Ps 2:7 in Acts 13:33 and Ps 16:10 in Acts 13:35; Ps 34:13 and 8 in 1 Pet 2:1 and 3 with Ps 118:22 in 1 Pet 2:7.