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In this dissertation is examined the question of the compilation of the Psalter: are the Psalms placed in a systematic order, or are they put together accidentally? Chapter I gives a survey of the various opinions since about 1800 (Eichhorn). These are divided into four groups:

a) those in which a systematic order is defended;

b) those in which only a partial systematic order is accepted;

c) those in which the problem is left aside;

d) those in which a system order is opposed.

After that in chapter II we try to determine the collections of Psalms from which the Psalter has arisen. Firstly we examine the younger part of the Psalter, Ps. 90-150. The only collection here appears to be Ps. 120-134. In the first half of the Psalter it is possible to distinguish as original collection the Psalms of Asaph, 50. 73-83. Concerning the Psalms of Korah, 42-49. 84. 85. 87. 88, it can only be said that they perhaps began to constitute a collection. Finally the Davidic Psalter must have existed as a separate book, Ps. 3-41. 51-72. To demonstrate the unity of this collection, the questions of the doxology, the duplicates and the Elohist Psalter are discussed:

1) The doxology was used nowhere in the O.T. as the closing formula of a collection. Originally every Psalm may have ended in a doxology for ritual purposes, but only in Ps. 41:14. 72:18. 19. 89:53. 106:48 the doxology has been maintained. Ps. 41:14 has not the function of a caesura, in order to distinguish Ps. 1-41 as a separate collection apart from Ps. 42-72.

2) Ps. 14 and 53 are no duplicates. It appears that there are so many differences of version and tenor that it is acceptable that one editor has inserted both Psalms into one collection.

3) The Elohist Psalter, Elohim, is not a subcollection of the Psalter. E. Lohr horn and the so-called Elohist poets who preferred the name of Yahweh to El or Elohim, existed with regard to the Psalter joined together imply an independent collection.

In chapter III the question of the O.T. is investigated. Here the other principles seem to exist with regard to some scholars maintaining.

In the Kuran the lead the Sura's. But in the other principles seem to exist with regard to the O.T.

With regard to the O.T. are discussed.

In the Book of the Covenant, Prov. 25-29 the books have been used as single books.

Neither in the Psalms of the Covenant, Prov. 25-29 do all the principles consistently been maintained through them. No principle.

In the O.T. it is possible of compilation: chronology, similar form, size and all.

In chapter IV first the order with in chapter I, order of Ps. 1-150 (Del and Del). Other opinions seem to...
question of the compilation was placed in a systematic order? 

As opinions since about 100 AD have divided into four groups:

- Delitzsch is defendet;
- an systematic order is accepted;
- Snaith is opposed.

It appears that there are analogies do exist with regard to the systematic order of the Psalter, as some scholars maintain.

It appears, that in the Talmud only the Mišna is to be investigated. Here the order mainly seems to be established according to material principles.

In chapter III the question is traced how far analogies do exist with regard to the systematic order of the Psalter, as some scholars maintain.

It appears, that in the Talmud only the Mišna is to be investigated. Here the order mainly seems to be established according to material principles.

In the Kurān the leading principle is probably the size of the Sura's. But in the Mišna as well as in the Kurān some other principles seem to have been used.

With regard to the O.T. besides the Psalter, three collections are discussed.

In the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 21-23, the main principle of compilation is the material connection.

In Proverbs 25-29 the proverbs are placed together, according to the number of lines, the parallelismus membrorum, catchwords and the contents.

In Dodekapropheton the chronology and the size of the books have been used as principles for the sequence of the single books.

Neither in the Talmud and Kurān nor in the Book of the Covenant, Prov. 25-29 or Dodekapropheton have these principles consistently been maintained, and other principles break through them. No principle was followed up consistently.

In the O.T. it is possible to classify the following principles of compilation: chronology, catchwords, material consonance, similar form, size and alliteration.

In chapter IV first the various opinions, we made acquaintance with in chapter I, are criticized. A strict systematic order of Ps. 1-150 (Delitzsch, Hallo, Dahse, Snaith and De Liagre Böhl) is rejected.

Other opinions seem to have some foundation: partial sy-
stematic order on the basis of catchwords, the data in the headings of the Psalms (chronology, authorship and sort of Psalm), the names of God and material consonance.

In the second part of the chapter we investigate how far the principles of compilation in the book of the Covenant, Prov. 25—29 and Dodekapropheton have been used in the Psalter. Adding to them the results of the former part, we can set up the following classification of principles: authors' names, names of God, sort of Psalm, catchwords, material consonance, similar form, size and alliteration.

The conclusion of this investigation of the Psalter is: On the whole the compilation seems to be according to the names of the authors, after that the Psalms of David are divided into two parts. One group uses predominantly the word Yahweh as the name of God (3—41), the other group prefers Elohim (51—72).

The Psalms of the sons of Korah and the Psalms of Asaph became attached to the latter group, respectively at its beginning and closing.

Within the limits of these groups a systematic order is perceptible according to the sort of Psalm (mizmôrizmîlasmîl). Here and there Psalms have been placed together according to material characteristics and catchwords.