

# PSALMS IN THE DAILY OFFICE

By MARY COLLINS

SOME YEARS AGO, WHEN I BEGAN WORKING on a psalm project with a group of Catholic academics who were also church professionals I was startled by the outburst of one colleague: 'I hate psalms'. His sentiment was so foreign to my own that I was stunned into silence, wondering how that could be. I had been a psalm user since I discovered the section 'Penitential Psalms' in my *St Andrew's daily missal* in early adolescence. In my college days we had prayed Compline nightly, and I had learned a few more psalms then. When I met the whole Psalter in Latin in the daily office as a young Benedictine, I learned to discriminate a bit, liking some psalms more than others. But what was there to hate?

My colleague's dislike, so I learned, was at least twofold. He was alienated by the violent images and metaphors that resonated dangerously in the ambient culture of violence in the US. He also disliked the English translation used in the office book he was mandated to pray daily. The first involved a 'certain psychological difficulty', a matter to be returned to later. The second objection was equally serious. He found the overall idiom pious 'church-talk'. The poetry lacked power to reveal the mystery of God in the midst of life. He was himself a published poet and cared about how words can create worlds to dwell in. The psalms as he knew them failed to mediate the divine presence to him.

Subsequently I met a young musician whose university thesis project involved composing settings of selected psalms from the then-in-progress ICEL translation of the liturgical Psalter. How did a modern twenty-year-old get interested in the psalms in the first place, I asked. He identified himself as the child of a former priest and a former nun, and then explained, 'We prayed the psalms at home'. He had learned this biblical poetry in his childhood and was eager to set a new translation for a new generation to sing.

More recently I met a book artist, a woman who finds power in the beautiful meeting of ink and paper, and mystery as well, when beauty is put at the service of the biblical word. She had just lent her artistry to a book of psalms and to an arrangement of psalms for a daily office. The

beauty of her presentation has made the psalms newly attractive for the daily prayer of tens of thousands of people.<sup>1</sup>

What have poets, musicians and artists to do with psalms in the daily office? The answer is simple: the daily office is a liturgy of the Church. And one of liturgy's traditional strategies is the seductive use of beauty to mediate our meeting with the living God. Too few Christians associate the daily office with the pleasure of seduction; too many associate it with obligation – a number of texts to be dispatched. The psalms of the daily office can only be understood as part of a liturgical event, no matter how truncated, how deprived of beauty that event becomes in particular situations. One must hope that those who pray an office daily under deprived conditions have memories of dwelling at some time in sonorous, fragrant, mobile, iconically rich, metaphorically powerful celebrations of this office. For beauty or its absence affects the Church's engagement with the psalms.

### *The whole Psalter in the daily office*

The subject here is psalms in the daily office. The first thing to be acknowledged is that there are multiple forms of daily office – the Roman certainly, but also the Byzantine, the Anglican, the Benedictine, for a start – and there are different traditions of practice when it comes to the matter of the using the biblical Book of Psalms for daily prayer. At issue is the question how to draw on the Psalter as an appropriate text for the Church's prayer. Both Eastern and Western traditions have distributed the 150 psalms plus biblical canticles over the course of a week's offices, because both of them have early monastic influences behind their commitment to the whole Psalter. But the truth is that outside of monastic communities both traditions have generally found this much psalter indigestible.

The Eastern Church's solution has been to maintain the commitment to the whole Psalter each week, but to interpret the commitment symbolically, especially in those pastoral settings where large numbers of non-monastics are likely to be at prayer. So psalms are often sung in an abbreviated form, with selected verses used for the whole, in order to make room for more popular elements like a litany of intercessions and doctrinal or devotional hymns and responsories. But the whole Psalter has stayed on the books for the record.<sup>2</sup>

The Western commitment has been more literal – at least from the sixth century to the late twentieth. The sixth century is the earliest period for which the content of the official office for the city of Rome can be established; it was the daily office prayed in the great basilicas

built under imperial patronage and professionally staffed by 'urban monastics'. Their practice of praying the whole Psalter in its entirety each week set the norm for all subsequent Roman liturgical practice, inside the city of Rome and beyond.<sup>3</sup>

Benedict of Nursia, a witness to sixth-century monastic practice beyond the environs of Rome, knew what the Romans did and generally confirmed that contemporary norm in his own Rule. To encourage his monks to carry that weekly load Benedict even claimed – on the basis of hearsay evidence – that energetic monks before his time said the whole Psalter in a single day!<sup>4</sup> Benedict would have been familiar with other, better documented, early monastic norms, for example the one called 'the rule of the Angel'.<sup>5</sup> In this practice, Egyptian monks said twelve 'prayers' during the day hours and another twelve in the night, symbolically honouring in the course of twenty-four hours the Pauline injunction to 'pray without ceasing'. But were these twelve prayers actual psalms? Or were they, as seems more likely, twelve silent prayers said after reflection on twelve portions of Scripture, possibly psalms among them? Scholars cannot say for certain; but there are records of daily offices built on practices other than the one that would become 'the tradition' in Rome.

The official Roman practice of reading the whole Psalter in the course of the week eventually set the standard for the Western Church, regardless of pastoral circumstances. The 150 psalms were distributed over the eight prayer times scheduled during each day. For the next fifteen centuries, official Roman efforts at pastoral amelioration – and there were several – left unexamined the literal commitment to pray the whole Psalter in the course of a week. The strain caused by this commitment left various other elements of the Roman office more vulnerable to the attempts at reform over the centuries. Litanic prayers of intercession suffered most, a fact best illustrated by comparison with the Byzantine office. Even in Benedict's arrangement for the office, intentions for intercession were no longer being named. A whole litany of priestly intercession with Christ for the well-being of the world was reduced to a truncated *Kyrie . . . Christe . . . Kyrie eleison . . .*

An official norm for the use of psalms is one thing; actual practice in the local churches is another. While it is not pertinent to recount the complex story of the psalms in daily prayer in the Christian East and West, it is important to recall that even in the West there have been 'unofficial' symbolic reinterpretations of the official norm. For example, a Book of Hours containing selected psalmody for the daily prayer of the laity was a popular genre among the literate classes in the

medieval West.<sup>6</sup> The unlettered among the baptized transposed the 150 psalms to recitations of the Lord's Prayer or the Hail Mary recited throughout the day – or they prayed fifteen 'tens' or decades of a rosary while meditating on the mysteries of salvation. In short, a comprehensive reading of the tradition of the 'daily office' shows that while commitment to reciting literally 'the whole Psalter' has been consistently honoured, that commitment has also been often expressed in a less taxing, symbolic fashion, even in the Roman West.

It was the churches of the Reformation which first broke with literal observance of the 'whole Psalter' norm in the West, initially with a view to making space for other biblical reading in the daily office.<sup>7</sup> With the 1971 reform of the Liturgy of the Hours the Roman tradition has set aside its literal commitment to 'the whole Psalter each week' as the central text for the daily offices. The 150 psalms are now distributed over the course of four weeks. More surprising, perhaps, was the decision to omit three psalms altogether from the daily office, on the grounds that the sensibilities these psalms expressed were not pastorally appropriate. The remaining 147 psalms of the Roman office now stand symbolically for the whole Psalter.<sup>8</sup>

*Psalms as prophecy become texts for prayer*

The apostolic generations read the Psalms of David primarily as a book of prophecy, not as a prayer book. They 'searched the Scriptures' together under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and found Jesus foreshadowed even in the Psalter. In Jewish Christian circles particularly, passages from the psalms had been so helpful for interpreting what God had been doing in Jesus that reading the psalms as prophecy was already 'traditional' by the time the evangelists wrote their Gospels. So Matthew cites verses generously from Psalm 22 as he narrates Jesus' crucifixion: how the soldiers divided Jesus' clothes among them by casting lots (22:18); how people insulted him, scornfully tossing their heads at him (22:7); how they mocked his reliance on God to save him (22:8); how he lamented his God-forsakenness (22:1). The Matthaean community found in Psalm 69 presage of the vinegary wine offered to the dying Jesus (69:21). Jesus' interiority at the moment of his dying could be given voice in the words of Psalm 31: 'Into your hand I commit my spirit' (31:5).

So also the Church supported its memory of Peter's bold preaching of Christ crucified with the affirmation of Psalm 118: 'The stone that the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone' (118:22). How could Peter explain to the Jerusalem crowds at Pentecost the present

whereabouts of the one God had freed from death, the one God had made both Lord and Messiah (Acts 2:22–36)? Here, too, psalms provided the vehicle for disclosure of the mystery. Jesus of Nazareth is the one whose ‘body rests secure,’ whose ‘soul rejoices, who has not been given up to Sheol, who has come into God’s presence where there is fullness of joy’ (Ps 16:8–11). This living and reigning Jesus is the one God intended in speaking the divine oracle to David a thousand years earlier: ‘sit at my right hand’ (Ps 110: 1; Acts 2:22–36).

This inspired use of the psalms to interpret the story of Jesus within the apostolic Church lies behind the subsequent identification of some psalms as overtly messianic. It also provides the foundation for the subsequent ‘christological’ readings of the whole Psalter. The success of this Christian strategy for uncovering the ‘spiritual sense’ of the biblical Book of Psalms has involved discerning distinct voices in the text: the whole Christ, head and members (or Christ Jesus alone) could be heard addressing the Father, interceding, giving thanks, expressing trust and hope. The voice of God could be heard speaking to the whole Christ, head and members (or to Christ Jesus alone), welcoming, commissioning, judging, forgiving, pledging fidelity.

Origen, Jerome and Augustine were prominent among the bishops and teachers who prepared christologically oriented psalm commentaries to guide preaching on the psalms in the liturgical assembly.<sup>9</sup> A modern reader will discover in their commentaries many spiritual insights into the mystery of Christ. But even at the pens of skilled teachers, this traditional and authoritative style of interpretation can founder when pressed beyond its limits. Whereas the New Testament readings may be attributed to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the patristic efforts require the Church to discern between spirits.

We know little about the actual content for times of prayer in the first three Christian centuries, whether in households or in publicly gathered Christian communities. So any conjecture that these communities, which understood the psalms as prophecy, also prayed the psalms daily and prayed them christologically, is no more than conjecture. But the fourth-century pilgrim Egeria, writing in her journal about daily prayer at the recently restored holy places in Jerusalem, shows her readers a local church where psalms were being well used in the daily office.

Egeria reports that the monastics, male and female, read ‘hymns, psalms and antiphons’ at some length in a pre-dawn office. Devout laity joined them. At the end of each unit, ordained clerics assigned according to a rota prayed a prayer.<sup>10</sup> Then Egeria comments on a second way the Jerusalem church used psalms in the daily office.

What I found most impressive . . . was that the psalms and antiphons they use are always appropriate, whether at night, in the early morning, at the day prayer at midday or three o'clock, or at *Lucernare* [evening lamp lighting].

She concludes, 'Everything is suitable, appropriate, and relevant to what is being done'.<sup>11</sup> Liturgical historians commonly read these remarks as witness to how the churches early on selected certain psalms for use at particular times because of the literal content of a psalm, or at least of some of its verses. So it is well-documented that Psalm 141 ('Let my prayer be counted as incense before you, and the lifting up of my hands as an evening sacrifice') was the evening psalm in many places. Psalm 63 (' . . . I think of you on my bed and meditate on you in the watches of the night . . .') and Psalm 51 ('O Lord, open my lips, and my mouth will declare your praise . . .') were morning psalms, and Psalms 148—150 were the morning praises.

Because Egeria fails to elaborate on her comment, we as well as the liturgical historians are left to imagine what else she might have found so pleasing. Whatever it is, she is writing in her diary about something unfamiliar in her home region. Might the use of the psalms in fourth-century Jerusalem have impressed Egeria not only because psalms were used in a 'timely' way but also because they suddenly had new 'christological' density for her? Was some of Egeria's delight with 'appropriateness' in the selection of psalms tied to her own recognition of how certain texts fitted the unique 'geography' of the Jerusalem church? Would Psalm 22 and Psalm 118 have resonated even more deeply with the mystery of Christ now that Egeria had heard one read on Friday at 'Golgotha' and the other on the Lord's Day at the Anastasis, the church of the Resurrection?

Other related questions then arise. What was the content of the prayers the clergy were praying at intervals during the course of the pre-dawn monastic psalmody, and at the other hours, too? Were the clergy evoking in an explicit way the name of Christ, who was believed to be prophetically present in every psalm? Perhaps; perhaps not. No liturgical texts are extant, and Egeria is silent on the matter, so we have no way of knowing. Yet three sets of christologically oriented psalm prayers, one from late fifth-century North Africa, a second from sixth-century Rome, and a third from seventh-century Spain, witness to the fact that such texts were being formally composed in the West in subsequent generations.<sup>12</sup>

Every christological reading of the psalms – beginning with those readings embedded in the New Testament writings, and extending to

the later expansive readings found in patristic commentaries on the Book of Psalms and in the early medieval series of psalm prayers – is an expression of the christological horizon within which the Church was living at the time. Wherever the tradition of reading the psalms as prophecy has flourished, it has flourished as a gift of the Holy Spirit, but not in isolation from the liturgical assembly. Every assembly of the baptized gathered for prayer is Spirit-filled – as monastic communities routinely take note when they bow to one another at the beginning and end of each liturgical gathering.

The liturgical assembly is uniquely porous to the working of the Holy Spirit in its midst. This is liturgy's genius. It disposes the whole person and each community to spiritual receptivity before a word is said. Every assembly is 'timely'. It happens at designated hours each day within each season; it is communally understood as *anamnesis* of the mystery of Christ. All liturgical space is defined with the cross or icons; it is filled with the fragrance of flaming beeswax or smouldering incense. The opened book of Scripture waits to be given voice. The body of worshippers inscribe their own baptized and chrismated bodies with the sign of the cross several times in the course of the hour of prayer. In this christologically marked setting, Christians today are as likely to recognize aspects of the mystery of Christ within psalm texts chanted or sung as were Augustine and Egeria.

The prophetic reading of the psalms as disclosures of the mystery of Christ is a tradition that has always been mediated through faith-filled communities at prayer. This point is worth underscoring. In the late twentieth century arguments have begun about the relative reliability of different English-language translations, and one ostensible concern has been the maintenance of conditions for christological interpretation of the psalms. The debate seems to locate the conditions for such spiritual interpretation within the biblical texts themselves, apart from the settings in which they are used. From a liturgical viewpoint, such text-defined debate betrays a misunderstanding of how the tradition of christological interpretation is an ecclesial phenomenon.

Christological insight arises not from psalms studied exegetically and interpreted doctrinally or dogmatically, but from psalms sung in the heart of the Spirit-filled Church and from the preaching of pastors grounded in such ecclesial prayer.<sup>13</sup> In the long centuries when monastic choirs sang psalms in Latin, even after Latin's currency as the language of the monastery had declined, the christological horizon was nevertheless sustained, if not by access to textual knowledge then by the christological valence of the celebration. The tradition of christological reading of the psalms has become weakened in the late

twentieth-century Western Church. If it is to be retrieved, history suggests to me that the recovery will come through people of faith learning the psalms by heart as a result of communal liturgical singing in their own languages.

Nevertheless, it remains standard practice, even after the liturgical reform of Vatican II, for many to 'read the breviary' alone, apart from any liturgical celebration. Anticipating this, reformers introduced the textual convention of paired 'psalm titles' in order to fix a christological horizon for solitary readers of the 1971 Roman Liturgy of the Hours.<sup>14</sup> The first item in each pair is descriptive of the psalm content, generally at a literal level. The second item is explicitly christological; some of these christological 'titles' are New Testament citations, while others are patristic.

For example, Psalm 22 is printed for the daytime hour on Friday in the third week of the psalm cycle. The title 'God hears the suffering of his Holy One', is followed by the New Testament citation of the psalm: "*Jesus cried with a loud voice, My God, My God, why have you forsaken me?*" (Mt 27:46). Psalm 118 appears every Sunday, at either the morning or daytime hour. It is introduced in the text with the double superscription 'Song of joy for salvation' and "*This Jesus is the stone which, rejected by your builders, has become the chief stone supporting all the rest*" (Acts 4:11). For Psalm 57, assigned as a Thursday morning psalm in week one, the superscribed lines read 'Morning prayer in affliction' and '*This psalm tells of our Lord's passion* (St Augustine)'. On Wednesday morning, week two, Psalm 97 is introduced with the titles 'The glory of the Lord in his decrees for the world' and '*This psalm foretells a world-wide salvation and that peoples of all nations will believe in Christ* (St Athanasius)'.

Theologian Rosemary Haughton's observation comes to mind. In the scriptural and the patristic 'titles', the words of those already transformed through the mystery of Christ are being handed on to us for our spiritual transformation.<sup>15</sup> Printed as they are in a liturgical book, these titles provide an official or normative meaning for each psalm. Yet the christological meaning once gathered by earlier believers and now inscribed over psalm texts must still await the stirring of the Holy Spirit if it is to become transformative meaning for those who read the texts in the daily office. Without that stirring, psalm titles in a liturgical book can suggest that christological insight was an apostolic or patristic prerogative, a lesson to be learned by later generations who are not comparably gifted by the Holy Spirit. I have argued, rather, that the gathering of christological insight while using the Psalter in the office



depends on the ongoing action of the Holy Spirit in the liturgical celebrations of faith-filled communities in the present. Conviction about the importance of such liturgical participation was at the centre of the recent liturgical reform.

The lone reader of a daily office is often dependent on texts alone to mediate faith. Fortunately, even in mind-over-matter settings, solitary Christians can and do draw on the density of religious imagination that has been built up through prior liturgical participation. Accordingly, Christian communities who celebrate the daily office in common (monasteries, seminaries, religious houses, specific communities) might consider whether good liturgical celebration is not their most important ministry to the rest of the Church and their most important work of evangelization in a secular world. If in the past it seemed enough for gathered communities to say that they 'prayed *for* the Church' (meaning both 'instead of' and 'on behalf of'), the Catholic people's need for formation in faith through prayer now requires something different. So communities could well consider whether their daily office, with its complement of designated psalms, ought to be celebrated not in haste and for their own convenience but with a view to the full liturgical engagement of whoever is able to join them.

*Psalms: prayer or prophetic horizon for prayer?*

The whole Psalter read in the liturgical assembly has long been heard as prophetic disclosure of God's deed in Christ. But psalms have also been used as the prayers of Christians in the literal sense invoked by the first of the paired psalm-titles, that is, as songs of joy, cries of the suffering and so on. Something further needs to be said about the literal sense of the psalms found in the daily office. For it is at this literal level that both beginners and seasoned psalm-users chafe with the routine lack of fit between their personal religious sensibilities and those of the assigned psalms of the day. The tension is compounded when the daily office, an essentially ecclesial act, becomes also the personal and devotional prayer of the solitary reader. Furthermore, it is at this level that the decision seems intelligible to omit certain psalm verses and even whole psalms from the reformed Liturgy of the Hours.<sup>16</sup>

The excised texts are filled with sentiments that are intemperate, vengeful and hateful. Such texts would seem to be hopeless for either christological disclosure or the spiritual formation and transformation of the Catholic people. But a second look at these angry texts is in order, if only for the monastics and other Christian communities who continue to use them in their particular psalm arrangements, and for

preachers who might want to preach on psalms that seem – inspired by the Holy Spirit or not! – to be without redeeming value for the praying Church.

What voices are these, if not the voices of people whose suffering inspired no human effort to relieve them? Such voices still rage on every continent, and around the corner of every monastery and parish. Cries for vengeance and divine vindication can hardly come as a surprise to anyone still capable of feeling horror at the end of the twentieth century. Pope Paul VI's mid-century cry 'No more war. War never again!' has been replaced by the nightly newscaster's 'Here we go again' in Bosnia and Chechnya, Burundi and Liberia, Guatemala and Tibet, Northern Ireland and the Middle East, and all the rural and urban killing fields around the world. The list could go on: political prisoners; abused children, women and elders; young conscripts for prostitution, their lives debased by institutionalized exploitation. Why should people in humanly hopeless circumstances not curse their enemies, not lament their fate, not berate God's evident indifference to them? People have to have reason to hope. The living God listens to such cries of human anguish day and night, even as the third Christian millennium approaches. Can the Church of Jesus Christ do less than let cries of human anguish sound in its christologically inscribed liturgical celebrations?

Two related theological matters can be broached here. First, buried in official pastoral judgements about what texts are appropriate for public prayer may be unexamined class issues, which are also ecclesiological issues. A liturgy fitted for refined middle-class religious sensibilities, a liturgy where voices are not to be raised in anger, may not be catholic enough for the Church of Jesus Christ. The gospel of Christ crucified and rescued by God was first announced as good news for people who needed rescue themselves. A Church that represses during prayer the voice reminiscent of its own origins, the voices inviting divine response to human pain and suffering, is risking its authenticity and its credibility.<sup>17</sup>

Second, the prophetic evocation of human pain in the psalms raises questions about our responsibilities before God. A quarter of a century ago, at the 1971 Synod on Justice in the World, an assembly of bishops solemnly taught that action on behalf of justice is a constitutive dimension of the Church, essential to its being and well-being. But formal teaching needs to be received, and this is accomplished not simply in class-rooms but through the work done in the liturgical assembly. If the Holy Spirit is to stir local churches to concrete acts of

justice, the cries of the suffering must be heard as prophetic summons and not as social nuisance. To that end, the so-called imprecatory psalms may be a timely gift of the Spirit rather than an embarrassment in the Church. For the suffering among us, saying these psalms publicly confirms the legitimacy of approaching God even with hearts hardened by despair. And intemperate words put on the pious lips of most of us who pray a daily office forces us to taste not only how good the Lord is but also how despair can define a human life. They can move us beyond judgement to wisdom, to heartfelt intercession in Christ's name, and even to a change of our ways.

Lately there has been some idle talk about whether the reformed Roman liturgy in English translation is 'semi-pelagian', on the ground that some of the prayer texts ask God to 'help us' to accomplish good works. Whereas all Christian traditions believe that it is God who saves, the Catholic tradition emphasizes that God requires our co-operation in this action. Indeed is it not rather the case that the mystery of Pentecost, the Matthaean judgement narrative, and the cries of the wretched require of the Church nothing less than prophetic works of divine justice that are signs of the reign of God? If we doubt our role, our disbelief impedes us, causing us to deny that we have either the power, the ability or the responsibility to embody the way of salvation. Our disbelief leaves the wretched without hope. In that case, publicly voicing the harsh but Spirit-inspired words of anguish and rage may be power for ecclesial transformation as this most violent of centuries lurches toward the new millennium.

This essay began with concern for beauty in the presentation of the psalms for daily prayer. It ends on a note of advocacy, arguing the value of admitting into the daily prayer of the Church psalm texts that are literally threatening, even repulsive. My point: disclosure of the mystery of salvation in Christ lies in the meeting of beauty and pain, even in the Liturgy of the Hours.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See Linda Ekstrom's art and Kerry Perlmutter's book design in *Psalms for morning and evening prayer* (Chicago: Liturgical Training Publications, 1995) and in *The Psalter* (Chicago: LTP, 1995).

<sup>2</sup> In *The festal Menaion* (trans Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware; London: Faber and Faber, 1977 edition) the instruction reads, 'The Psalter is read in its entirety once in a week, and during Lent twice a week . . .'; but an editor's note comments, 'In smaller monasteries, and in almost all parish churches, the prescribed readings of the Psalter are today generally abbreviated . . .' (p 532).

- <sup>3</sup> Stanislaus Campbell, *From Breviary to Liturgy of the Hours* (Collegeville Mn: Liturgical Press, 1995), pp 1–15.
- <sup>4</sup> *Rule of Benedict* 18:25. See *The Rule of Benedict*, ed Timothy Fry (Collegeville Mn: Liturgical Press, 1981).
- <sup>5</sup> Nathan Mitchell, 'The liturgical code in the Rule of Benedict' (Fry [ed], *Rule*), summarizes early monastic practices, pp 384–389.
- <sup>6</sup> George Guiver, *The company of voices* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1988), gives a brief history of lay offices, books of Hours, and primers; pp 107–110; 123ff; 132–137.
- <sup>7</sup> G. J. Cumming, 'The Office in the Church of England' in Cheslyn Jones et al., *The study of liturgy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp 390–393.
- <sup>8</sup> The 1971 'General Instruction on the Liturgy of the Hours', 131, explains the omission of psalms 58, 83 and 109. See also, Campbell, *From Breviary*, pp 68–72 and pp 151–154.
- <sup>9</sup> William Holladay, *The Psalms through three thousand years* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), discusses New Testament and patristic strategies for interpreting the Psalter, pp 113–133 and 161–174.
- <sup>10</sup> John Wilkinson (trans), *Egeria's travels* (London: SPCK, 1971), 24.1, 24.10, 24.12.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.5.
- <sup>12</sup> J. Evenou relates the ancient practice of psalm prayers to contemporary efforts at retrieval in 'Les oraisons psalmiques', *La Maison Dieu* 135 (1978), pp 158–174. Also Campbell, *From Breviary*, pp 163, 168, and 322, no 300.
- <sup>13</sup> Joseph Gelineau, 'Les Psaumes à l'Époque patristique', *La Maison Dieu* 135 (1978), pp 103–06.
- <sup>14</sup> Pierre Salmon's 'De l'interprétation des psaumes dans la liturgie aux origines de l'Office divine', *La Maison Dieu* 33 (1953), pp 21–55 discusses the variety of Christian psalm titles in medieval psalter manuscripts; this medieval practice provides one of the foundations for the retrieval of psalm titles in the 1971 Liturgy of the Hours; also Salmon, *The Breviary through the centuries* (Collegeville Mn: Liturgical Press, 1962), pp 50–55, translation of *L'Office Divin*, *Lex Orandi* series, no 27, (Paris, L'Édition du Cerf, 1959).
- <sup>15</sup> Rosemary Haughton, *The transformation of man* (New York: Paulist Press, 1967), pp 242–280, esp. pp 268–270.
- <sup>16</sup> Holladay, *The Psalms through three thousand years*, identifies the verses omitted from the nineteen additional psalms on p 305.
- <sup>17</sup> Walter Brueggeman, *Israel's praise* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988), explores theologically the danger of divine praise becoming ideological when praise becomes disconnected from the memory of God's action in the face of suffering.