" 'The old Scottish Psalms' are English!"

IS THIS TRUE?

THE Oxford University Press recently published *The Oxford Companion to Music*, edited by Dr Percy Scholes. The aim was to produce in it " a handy one-volume book of reference on music, which should be at once complete, accurate, scholarly, and thoroughly readable, not by the professional musician only, but by any intelligent reader who feels an interest in music and wants to know more about it ". In these respects an astonishing degree of success has been achieved.

But accuracy has not everywhere been attained. Dr Scholes has little acquaintance with Scotland, as previous works of his have shown. As a safeguard against mistakes he got experts to read the principal articles. For those on Scottish subjects he enlisted, first, Professor Sanford Terry of Aberdeen. There could have been no better choice, for Terry was not a historian only but a distinguished authority on music. He was, however, a Southron and an Anglican, and in consequence was not without blind spots in his mind where Scottish Church matters were concerned. Unhappily, he had not proceeded far with the work assigned to him when death brought his part in it to an end. His responsibility was then transferred to Mr Harry Willsher of Dundee. This also was an excellent choice, for Mr Willsher has highly specialised knowledge of Scottish music ; he has himself retrieved much lost treasure from the Panmure MSS., and has been a leading spirit in the formation of the Scottish Music Society, which aims at the recovery and reproduction of early music of Scottish origin which has long been forgotten or lost.(1)

It would appear, however, that he is not intimately acquainted with general Scottish Church history. He permits, for instance, a statement that the Presbyterian Church in Scotland is in its origin a branch of the Church of Calvin—which is, to say the least of it, a historical in-

(1) He has recently been appointed Honorary Lecturer in Scottish Music in the University of St Andrews.

exactitude. He also allows to pass as accurate a curious statement, that "the many metrical psalms that are to be found in Scottish hymnbooks to-day come from Francis Rous's version; that is"—and this is added in brackets, with a chuckle of ironic amusement, indicated by an exclamation mark—"that is, 'the old Scottish psalms' are English!" We may well ask, with astonishment, Is this true?

In point of fact, it would be difficult to compass more inaccuracy within a single sentence. One mistake is so manifest at the outset that we may well be suspicious as to the main assertion. There are in our hymnbooks, it is true, a number of psalm-versions; but without exception they are taken from other sources than the one named. The writer of the article and the reviser—if they are not the same person—are apparently not aware that the metrical Psalter of 1650 retains its separate identity, and, quite apart from our hymnbooks, remains in honoured use throughout the land. And they are under a complete misapprehension in supposing that any psalm in Rous's version is in modern use in Scotland, or indeed anywhere else.

The error into which they have fallen, however, is by no means singular. Even a Professor of Scottish History[1] could say categorically that "the version of the Psalms, intertwined with the most sacred feelings of the Scottish people . . . . came from the Westminster Assembly"; and when such a lapse on the part of an authority can happen, misunderstandings on the part of people who are not experts are not surprising. Let us enquire what are the facts.

The first of the two Psalters authorised for use in Scotland—that of 1564—certainly had its origin in England; begun there, it was continued in Geneva and finally, with much travail, completed in Scotland. Of the nine contributors three were Scotsmen—William Kethe with twenty-six versions, John Craig with fifteen, and Robert Pont with six. The contributions of the first two were notable, Kethe giving us the familiar version of the 100th Psalm, and Craig the second versions (subsequently improved) of the 136th, the 143rd, and the 145th. The Scottish contribution accounted for almost a third of the book, so that even of that

[1] Hume Brown: *History of Scotland*, ii. 341. Historians of the Westminster Assembly itself have contributed to the general ignorance of this particular episode. Hetherington ignores it completely, and Prof. A. F. Mitchell dismisses it in a few casual lines which show that he had made no inquiry into it.

version it would have been incorrect to say, compendiously, " The old Scottish Psalms are English ".

The 1564 version cannot at any time have had more than a very restricted use. The fact that the versification was atrociously bad would not then be thought so serious a disqualification as it is by us ; we get no proper measure for contemporary judgment of it by applying the standards of to-day. But the metres used were too various, and many of them were not simple enough to make memorising easy for what was still, largely, an unlettered people. The music, too, noble though much of it is, was to a great extent beyond the capacity of the people.(1) Rous, in the Preface to the 1646 edition of his version, justifying the use of measures " fitted to such tunes as have been found by experience to be of most generall use ", says : " True it is, that in a former edition Psalms have been set forth in measures fitted for more difficult tunes, which are still to be seen ; but it was objected by very good judgements, that if such difficult tunes were allowed, some man willing to make use (if not shew) of his skill, might begin a Psalm in a tune wherein the Congregation might be put to a losse. For they might either not follow him at all or follow him in a discord, in stead of a harmony. And indeed it is very suitable to charity, that those that have skill should condescend to them that have none, and not by that skill hinder edification of the unskilfull ". Here we have the distillation of much experience of the earlier book, which was, for Scotland, musically, far ahead of its time.

It is true that the author—supposed to be Calderwood—of a remarkable array of arguments against the public use of King James's " Metaphrase " of the Psalms, used this among his objections : " The people ar well acquainted with the old metaphrase more than any book in scripture, zea, some can sing all, or the most pairt without buik, and some that can not read can sing some psalmes ". He says also : " Both pastors and people be long custome, ar so acquanted with the psalmes and tunes thereof ; that as the pastors ar able to direct a psalme to be sung agrieable to the doctrine to be delyvered, so he that taketh vp the psalme is able to sing anie tune, and the people for the most pairt to

(1) It was foreign to the people. So far as is known, not one of the tunes was of Scottish composition. It may be added that on the literary side, this Psalter was in a measure foreign also. When causes of the decay of the Scots tongue as a literary language are looked for, not the least of them will be found in this, that the first Bible and the first Psalm-book put into the Scottish people's hands were in the language current on the other side of the Border, not in their own.

follow him."[1] This, however, it should be remembered, was written in an endeavour to make the best of a doubtful case, in order to countervail a determined effort to impose an entirely obnoxious alternative version upon the Church. The weight of it is much diminished by the incontrovertible fact that by the time when the new version of 1650 was ready, psalm-singing had ceased in churches within the metropolitan area. It is significant also that, so far as is known, not a single word of regret was said when the old version was dismissed from use.

Dissatisfaction with the 1564 book would no doubt have come to a head more quickly if King James had not barred the way to an impartial consideration of any alternative version but his own. He made himself the chief sponsor of the case for a better version. At the Assembly which met at Burntisland in 1601 he appeared in person and delivered an address, in the course of which he recited whole verses of the existing version, "shewing both the faults of the metre and the discrepance from the text".[2] The performance, the record says, "bred not little admiration in the whole assembly". The Assembly took no effective action. But James was not the man to let the matter rest. "The good-natured, conceited, garrulous King, wise in learning, but a poor judge of men", to use Trevelyan's characterisation of him, in nothing showed his conceit more ridiculously than in thinking himself the man to show the way to the production of a more poetical version. "The revising of the Psalms he made his own labour, and at such hours as he might spare from the public cares, went through a number of them, commending the rest to a faithful and learned servant, who hath therein answered his Majesty's expectation."

This ambition of the King cleared the field of overt competition. Many others were working privately at versions of their own; but a letter, in 1620, from the faithful and learned servant referred to—who was Sir William Alexander of Menstrie, afterwards Secretary of State for Scotland and latterly Earl of Stirling—shows how hopeless it was to expect consideration for any of them. Writing to Drummond of Hawthornden, he says: "Brother, I received your last letter, with the Psalm you sent, which I think very well done: I had done the same long before it came; but He (King James) prefers his own to all else;

(1) Bannatyne Miscellany, i. 227.

(2) Spottiswood, *History*, iii. 98.

tho' perchance when you see it, you will think it the worst of the Three. No Man must meddle with that Subject, and therefore I advise you to take no more Pains therein."

During James's lifetime his design was successfully baulked. A serious situation arose, however, when Charles succeeded to the throne. He made it a matter of filial duty to see his father's purpose carried into effect. He instructed Alexander " to consider and revew the meeter and poesie " of the Royal version ; and in 1631 the result appeared in a version so different from James's that everybody believed it to be in the main Alexander's : it was commonly called " the Menstrie Psalms ". Archbishop Spottiswoode of St Andrews was required to get some of the most learned Divines in the country to certify the fidelity of this version to the original text ; and, like good courtiers, they found themselves able to say that it was " exactly and truely done ", and fit to be sung in all the churches of the three kingdoms.

Thereupon, in order that it might become " a perpetual monument to the blessed memory of his beloved father ", Charles issued an edict that it should be received in schools and sung in all the churches. Scotland was to have the honour of being the first to introduce it, as being the country in which the Royal Author was born. No further copies of the old version were to be printed or sold, under pain of censure, fine, or imprisonment.

In spite of the apparent finality of this action, the King's wish was not to be gratified. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud) took no effective steps ; he was sufficiently embroiled in other troubles to realise the wisdom of shirking this new one. His Grace of St. Andrews, more complaisant, instructed his clergy to obtemper the King's edict, but wisely did nothing to ensure that the instruction was carried out. The Presbyteries were consulted, but realised that masterly inaction was the proper strategy : as Row says, " that matter was laid asyde for a while ". That indignation seethed in many breasts and did not lack expression is shown, however, in the formidable barrage of reasons against its use(1), brought anonymously into play, by Calderwood or another, in the document already referred to.

(1) Among the things specifically objected to are : " heathenish libertie and poeticall conceats," " harsh phrases," " words which have need of a dictionarie " (many specimens given) ; and the general argument is used that " another metaphrase is nevir convenient, bot prejudiciall to that which is used in the Kirk, and serveth onlie to mak people glaik."

While all this was going on, any attempt to bring another version into the field would have been resented, and probably proceeded against, as tantamount to *lèse majesté*. Numerous alternatives, however, as has already been said, had been in preparation. Among them was one by Francis Rous. A scholar and a gentleman, he was an influential member of the Puritan party in England. He was made Provost of Eton College. His political importance may be measured by the fact that he became Speaker of the Barebones Parliament, a member of Cromwell's Council of State, and in 1657, a peer of the realm. He had his version ready when, in 1638, it became evident that the Royal Psalter had no chance of acceptance anywhere, and that an acceptable alternative would have to be found. He determined to take time by the forelock, and to manoeuvre to get his version into a commanding strategic position as against any rival, by securing Parliamentary sanction for it as soon as the way was clear. He had it printed in Rotterdam, without his name, and brought over to England for distribution—not, it is surmised, indiscriminately, but only among members of Parliament. This venture was well timed. Portentous events were rapidly following one another. In February the National League and Covenant was signed in Scotland ; in September a Royal Proclamation revoked the Scottish Service-book and summoned meetings of a free General Assembly and a free Parliament ; and in November, the Glasgow Assembly " swept away the whole ecclesiastical edifice which had been reared with such expenditure of time and pains by Charles and his father ". In that summary clearance, the Liturgy and the Royal Psalter which was bound up with it were decisively banished from Scottish use.[1] In England also the situation was steadily worsening for the King and his designs. In 1640 Laud was sent to the Tower, Strafford was impeached and in May, 1641, was executed, the Long Parliament was in session, and the wreck of the royal system was begun.

Rous made up his mind that his opportunity had come. In 1641 he published his second edition, this time with his name on the title-page, and intensified his efforts to get Parliamentary sanction for it. His prospects of success were good. His own influence with the Commons was

[1] Apparently the Psalter had actually been to some extent in use. In the Reasons against it already referred to, this occurs : " For have not some alreadie vsed this metaphrase when the congregation wer singing the old. A door sould not be opened to such light heads and prophane hearts."

great, and his friends were assiduous in lobbying for him. There is no reason to question his own disinterestedness, but Baillie says that one consideration with which his supporters made effective play was " the great private advantages which could by this book come to their friend ". Many in the House were unimpressed ; they thought the work not done well enough to deserve support. But Rous's friends prevailed over the opposition, and in April, 1643, the Committee on Printing was instructed to print the book for general use.

That act was not final, however. In June the Assembly of Divines, convened by " Ordinance " of both Houses of Parliament, met at Westminster to devise ways and means of securing uniformity of Church doctrine, discipline, organisation and worship throughout the three kingdoms ; and in November the Commons requested it to advise whether it might not be useful and profitable to the Church that Rous's book should be issued, with an injunction that its contents should be publicly sung. The Assembly refused to be rushed into any hasty decision. It referred the book for examination to three Committees, each of which was to revise fifty of the psalms. They conferred with Rous himself. One of them was anxious that a select Committee of " Hebricians " should be called into council, to ensure what they called the solidity of the work, but the idea was not acted upon. Next, it was resolved that the whole version, as revised, should be read openly in the full Assembly, no debate to be then allowed, but suggestions of amendment to be afterwards sent to the Committee.

Among the Commissioners to the Assembly, those from Scotland[1] were the most difficult to satisfy. They were strongly in favour of uniformity, and were agreed that a common Psalter would be an almost essential contribution towards that end ; but they exhibited native caution in their attitude to the new version proposed for this honour. They insisted that the Kirk of Scotland should be " well advised " as to what was happening, and saw that Rous's psalms were sent north in instalments to receive what they called " animadversions ". " We earnestlie intreat you ",

(1) The Scottish Commissioners were : *Ministers*—Alexander Henderson, Robert Douglas (never sat), Samuel Rutherford, Robert Baillie, George Gillespie, and (later, but probably never sat) Robert Blair ; *Elders*—John, Earl of Cassillis (never sat), John, Lord Maitland, afterwards Earl of Lauderdale, Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston, and (later) John, Earl of Loudon, Sir Charles Erskine, John, Lord Balmerino, Archibald, Marquis of Argyll, and George Winram of Libberton.

they wrote, "to mind seriouslie the review of them, what words or lines you think ought to be amended", and expressed anxiety that "the Psalter might at this time be put in such a frame that we need not be troubled hereafter with any new translation thereof". We can sympathise with that anxiety. "These lines", Baillie wrote, "are likely to go up to God from millions of tongues for many generations: It were a pity but all possible diligence were used to have them framed so well as might be."

Individuals like Mure of Rowallan and Zachary Boyd, both authors of versions of their own, were appealed to for assistance; but the chief work of revision was done by Committees of the Church. It is unfortunate that the minutes of the Committee of the Commission of Assembly between 1643 and 1646 are lost, so that details of the procedure followed are unknown; but it is clear that the opportunity given was fully taken advantage of. Many animadversions were sent up to Westminster by the Scottish critics. These were favourably received, and almost all of them were followed; Mr Rous himself, says Baillie, and all the Committee proved very tractable. So the matter moved to a conclusion. At last, on November 25th, 1645, Baillie writes: "The Psalmes are perfyted: the best without doubt that ever yet were extant".

Now observe what had happened. Rous's version had undergone drastic alteration, first at the hands of the Westminster Assembly, then at those of the Kirk of Scotland. The result was so great a change in it that Rous ceased to make any claim to authorship. His Preface disappeared; inevitably so, for the version that emerged from the hands of the Divines was very different from that for which it was written. Though his name continued to be used in connection with it, such a use is inaccurate: the new version should be distinguished from his by being called the Westminster Version.

What then was its fate? Its difficulties did not end when the Assembly of Divines set their imprimatur upon it. It had still to run the gauntlet of both Houses of Parliament. Its course there was far from easy. Some people demanded "a libertie to take what psalter they will". The ministers of London preferred the version of William Barton, as being more poetical, and the House of Lords asked the Assembly of Divines to certify why Barton's Psalms should not be sung in churches, as well as other translations, by

such as wanted to use them. That, of course, would have ended all hope of uniformity. The result was a deadlock. The Lords never approved the Westminster Version. The Commons refused to countenance Barton. Baillie[1] throws a little light on the difficulties that delayed proceedings. " The too great accuracy of some in the Assembly, sticking too hard to the original text, made the last edition more concise and obscure than the former. With this the commission of our church was not so well pleased ; but we have got all those obscurities helped ; so I think it shall pass." Apparently, also, Zachary Boyd caused trouble by his efforts to get his own version preferred. " Our good friend Zachary Boyd ", says Baillie in the same letter, " has put himself to a great deal of pains and charges to make a psalter, but I ever warned him his hopes were groundless to get it received in our churches ; yet the flatteries of his unadvised neighbours makes him insist in his fruitless design."

Probably the strain between the two Houses of Parliament was aggravated, if not caused, by the growing jealousy with which the Lords were watching the assumption of leadership by the Commons. In this case the deadlock was ended by the Lower House taking independent action. In April, 1646, it issued instructions that from 1st January, 1647, the Westminster Version and none other should be used in all churches and chapels in England, Wales, and Berwick-on-Tweed.

This bold action, however, proved nugatory. The reception of the new version south of the Border was uniformly unfavourable : it nowhere displaced the old one. One reason for its unpopularity is said to have been the extent to which the Scots had pressed their animadversions and so set too distinctive a Scottish mark upon it.

From this it might be expected that north of the Border a cordial welcome would await it. The contrary proved the case. The Commissioners who had represented the Kirk at Westminster did their best for it. They assured their countrymen that the new translation would be " found as neir the originall as any Paraphrase in meeter can readily be, and much nearer than other works of that kind ; which is ", they added, " a good compensation to mak up the want of that Poeticall liberty and sweet pleasant running

(1) Robert Baillie's *Letters and Journals* are a chief source of information on this subject.

which some desire". But they failed to carry conviction, and the deathblow to all hopes of Scottish acceptance was dealt when the General Assembly flatly refused to receive the version as a symbol of Presbyterian uniformity, and resolved to submit it to further revision. We are thus moving farther and farther away from poor Rous's original.

The Assembly used no half measures in the steps it took. It is, indeed, amusing to see how thorough-going they were. Actually, there were six several revisions before the final result was reached, and the time spent in the process extended to two years and four months.

I. The first step was taken on 8th July, 1647, when the Assembly "recommended to Mr John Adamsone to revise Rous's Paraphrase of the Psalmes, and Mr John Rowe's observations thereupon, and to have his opinion thereof ready for the next Assembly".

II. The Assembly met on August 28th in the same year, and appointed a Committee of four interesting and influential men to prosecute the work more thoroughly. The most prominent was John Adamson, just named, who was Principal of the University of Edinburgh. The others were: Thomas Crawford, Professor of Mathematics and Regent in Philosophy in the same University; John Row, named above, who was second son of the historian, minister of St Nicholas, Aberdeen, and subsequently Principal of Marischal College and University, then of King's, in that city; and John Nevay, an extremist in his views, who was ultimately banished to Holland and died there. Adamson was instructed to deal with the first group of forty psalms, Crawford was assigned the next forty, Row the third, and Nevay the last thirty.[1] The instructions given them were: (1) not only to observe what they thought needed to be amended, but also "to set down their own essay for correcting thereof"; (2) to make use of the 'Travels' (travails, labours) of Mure of Rowallan, Zachary Boyd, or any other, and to have special regard to the old version, appropriating whatever they found that was better in any of these; and (3) to make use of the animadversions sent from Presbyteries. They interpreted in the largest sense the instruction to consult and borrow from other existing versions. Internal

[1] Though Nevay's allotment was the smallest, he drew more largely than any of his colleagues upon the old version. To him also we owe the inclusion of Craig's three second versions, albeit there was little chance of their being sung, for by this time only the Common Tunes were in use, and Psalms not in Common Metre—even the 100th and the 124th—fell out of use for over 100 years.

evidence shows that they drew upon no fewer than ten other versions besides the old Scottish one and the Westminster version.

III. In April, 1648, they reported to the Commission of Assembly. The ministers of Edinburgh, or any three of them, were thereupon appointed to revise the work of these revisers. It looks as if they had proved reluctant or dilatory, for, six days later, another Committee of seven was appointed in their place. What happened to dissatisfy the Commission with that Committee does not appear, but only eleven days afterwards, still another, of six members, was appointed to revise further what had been done, and to report their opinion.

IV. On July 12th the Assembly met, received the report, and instructed that the revised version should be sent down to Presbyteries for their corrections. Not till January of the following year were the copies for this purpose (costing 'a merk the peece', the record says) sent down. The Presbyteries duly exercised diligence in the matter, and in June, 1649, the corrected copies returned by them were remitted to Adamson for his consideration against next meeting of the Assembly. Presumably, all he had to do was to co-ordinate the returns and prepare a report upon them.

V. When the Assembly met, in August, it remitted Adamson's report to a new Committee of six members, with instructions to report *their* travels to the next following Commission.

VI. In November, 1649, the Commission met and spent five of its diets on the work of still further revision. On the 23rd they concluded that task, and as power had been given them to proceed to publication, they ordered the version thus finally adjusted to be printed and published for use as the only Paraphrase of the Psalms to be sung in the Kirk of Scotland, and at the same time discharged the old paraphrase and any other from use in any family or congregation as from May 1st, 1650. On January 8th, 1650, the Committee of Estates, on their part as the civil authority, approved and authorised this course. Thus the version of the Psalms which we still use became the authorised Psalter of the Church of Scotland. So it has remained for nearly 300 years.

Where now does Rous stand in relation to this version? One radical revision of his version was carried out, with active Scottish participation, at Westminster, leaving only fragments of his work remaining. And on the resultant

Westminster version, six separate Scottish revisions were carried out before the work was done. From this the inference is inevitable that not much of Rous would be left in the version which people persist in calling by his name. What are the facts ?

Take a concrete example. Compare with the authorised version of Psalm I. (in our present Psalter) Rous's final form, of 1646.

That man hath perfect blessedness
who walketh not astray
In counsel of ungodly men,
nor stands in sinners' way,
Nor sitteth in the scorner's chair :
but placeth his delight
Upon God's law, and meditates
on his law day and night.

He shall be like a tree that grows
near planted by a river,
Which in his season yields his
fruit,
and his leaf fadeth never.
And all he doth shall prosper well.
The wicked are not so ;
But like they are unto the chaff,
which wind drives to and fro.

In judgment therefore shall not
stand
such as ungodly are ;
Nor in th' assembly of the just
shall wicked men appear.
For why ? the way of godly men
unto the Lord is known :
Whereas the way of wicked men
shall quite be overthrown.

The man is blest that in th' advice
of those that wicked are
Walks not, nor stands in sinner's
path
nor sits in scorner's chaire
But in God's law delights, on's law
both day and night doth think ;
He shall be like unto a tree
set by the river's brink,

Whose fruit's in season, leaf fades
not :
all that he doth shall thrive :
Not so the wicked ; but like chaffe
which wind away doth drive.
In judgment therefore wicked men
shall not stand justify'd ;
Nor in the assembly of the just,
the sinners shall abide.

Because the way of righteous men
the Lord with favour knowes,
Whereas the way of wicked men
unto destruction goes.

Only two lines of Rous, it will be observed, are preserved in the Scottish version. As to the merits of the two versions there cannot be two opinions.

Apply another test. The late Dr W. P. Rorison of Dalserf,(1) with incredible patience and particularity, carried out a detailed comparison of the Scottish version with ten others, in order to trace every line, so far as might be possible, to its source. There are 8947 lines in all in our present version. Of these, Dr Rorison traced the following to their sources :—

(1) A typescript copy of his work may be consulted in the Assembly Library, Edinburgh.

Old (1564) version	338	lines
Henry Dod (1620)	266	
King James (1631-36)	516	
George Wither (1632) [1]	52	
Mure of Rowallan	49	
The Bay Psalter (1640) [2] ...	269	
William Barton (1644) [3] ...	136	
Zachary Boyd (1644-48)	754	
Westminster Version (1647) ...	1588	
Francis Rous (1638-46)	878	
	4846	

This list of sources is not exhaustive. There is evidence that the revisers had before them, and used, the versions of George Sandys (1636) and Richard Brathwaite (1638), but the extent to which they drew from these has not been examined in detail.

It will be observed that over 4000 lines are not accounted for—nearly half the whole. These may be taken to represent in a large degree the " travels " of the various companies of Scottish revisers.

The following indication of the sources of the 23rd Psalm will illustrate how much of a mosaic our version is.

The Lord's my shepherd, I'll not want.	*Boyd*
He makes me down to lie	*Rous*
In pastures green : he leadeth me	*Boyd (modified)*
the quiet waters by.	,,
My soul he doth restore again ;	*Westminster*
and me to walk doth make	,,
Within the paths of righteousness,	,, (*mod.*)
ev'n for his own name's sake.	*Whittingham (Old Version)*
Yea, though I walk in death's dark vale,	*Westminster*
yet will I fear none ill :	*Sternhold*
For thou art with me ; and thy rod	*Westminster (mod.)*
and staff me comfort still.	*Mure*
My table thou hast furnished	*Westminster*
in presence of my foes ;	*Mure*
My head thou dost with oil anoint,	*Westminster (mod.)*
and my cup overflows.	*Mure*
Goodness and mercy all my life	*Boyd*
shall surely follow me :	*King James*
And in God's house for evermore	*Westminster*
my dwelling-place shall be.	*Sternhold*

[1] Our chief debt to Wither is for the splendid second version of Psalm 148.

[2] *The Bay Psalter*, later called *The New England Version of the Psalms* (1640) was the first book printed in New England.

[3] Though Barton was relatively so little drawn upon, he complained bitterly of " the piracies committed by the Scots."

All this is conclusive evidence of the composite nature of our Psalter. Dr Rorison quotes with approval a description of it as "the Prince of Versions", holding that it deserves this primacy because "it contains the cream of all the best Psalters in existence prior to 1650". With this we may or may not agree; but at least we may hold it proved beyond controversy that to ascribe it either to Rous or to Westminster is completely unjustified. It is the product in the main of prolonged and devoted Scottish labour, and bears deeply upon it the imprint of Scottish care and piety. We shall therefore still, with full consciousness of right, continue to call it "The *Scottish* Psalter".

MILLAR PATRICK.