

# Psalm 151 from 11QPSa, Qumran and its relation to the LXX version

A translation of a paper written in Hebrew

מזמור קנא במגילה 11QPs<sup>a</sup>

מקומראן

וייחסיו לנוסח הסיפטואגינטה

Paper presented within the Seminar over the  
Interpretation of the Bible at Qumran  
under the supervision of Prof. E. Tov  
Hebrew University, Jerusalem

1982-07-03

Per-Olof Hermansson

Student ID: 22211120 44

**This is a preliminary translated version from 1996  
presented at the Qumran Seminar  
lead by Doc. Bo Isaksson  
The Institute of Afro-Asiatic Languages  
Uppsala University**

# Prologue

This paper was originally written during the spring of 1982, while I studied at the Hebrew University, under a scholarship given by the Foreign Department of the Israeli Government.

I participated in various courses, in the areas of Bible, Hebrew language and Jewish Studies (Talmud, Midrash, Aggadda, Exegesis at Qumran, Mishnaic Hebrew, Ben Sira, and Modern Hebrew).

I started studying Hebrew in 1976, while during my army service I found a Hebrew primer, based on the Book of Psalms. The second half of 1976 I worked as a volunteer at Kibbutz Ein Dor, next to Har Tabor, in the valley of Yizreel, and learned to read and speak simple Ivrit, (Ulpan Aleph Beth).

Coming back to Sweden I started my academic studies at the Semitic Institute of Uppsala University, with biblical Hebrew under Dr Tryggve Kronholm. After my exams (BA and BD) I received a scholarship to study at Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

After Israel I started to work in the computer industry in the early eighties, and during all these years, I have felt an urge to go back to Biblical and Hebrew studies, and my participation in the Qumran seminar in 1997 was an attempt. Regrettfully life and all of its responsibilities and limitations kept me from continuing. It has not been possible.

In essence it is only a direct translation of part of the Hebrew original. I have had to refrain from writing many of the citations from the Bible. From lack of time I have also refrained from translating the comments on verses 6-8 and psalm 151b, concentrating instead on the more interesting and problematic issues of the psalm.

To all my engaging teachers I owe a great thanks, especially Prof. Tryggve Kronholm, ה"ר, Prof. Emanuel Tov and Prof. Avi Hurvitz.

# Introduction

The subject of this paper is psalm 151, which was found in the Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) and its relation with the Greek version of the psalm found in the Septuagint.

The psalm tells in a poetic form the tale of David which we find in I Sam 16:1-13 and 17:20 and the following.

I start of with a short description of the scroll and thereafter I give a general overview of the history of the psalm in its different versions.

Because of the difficulties in understanding how to interpret the Hebrew version it then seems to me worthwhile to first look at the Greek version in an attempt to avoid being confused by all the different alternatives that are possible to find in the Hebrew text of Qumran.

In this way we get our first impression by seeing in which way the translator understood the Hebrew text (Vorlage) <sup>1</sup>that was in front of him as he translated it to Greek. This will be an important point later on in my later reasoning.

Next I give a linguistic analysis in order to look at the linguistic, biblical background of the psalm. This is followed by a comparison between the Hebrew version and the Septuagint, Greek version.

Towards the end of the paper I will discuss the style of psalm 151, and its relation to the Bible. I will also discuss the question of orphism and the question of un-biblicallity in the psalm and I will draw some conclusions.

As an appendix I will discuss the contribution of the psalm towards solving the problem of פסוק באמצע פסקא באמצע

---

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion of Vorlage, the Hebrew text in front of the translator, see E Tov, "The text-critical use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research", Jerusalem, 1981, pp 40 ff

# A The Scroll

In the year 1956 the scroll was found by the Bedouins in cave number 11 of the so-called Qumran caves.<sup>2</sup>

The scroll was opened five years later. J A Sanders published the scroll in DJD volume IV 1965.

In the actual scroll 33 psalms appear, but in the cave a number of pieces were found that undoubtedly once were part of the scroll. These pieces are now called A, B, C, D and E. In them 8 additional psalms are found, some of them only in part.<sup>3</sup>

All the psalms that are in the scroll belong to the fourth and the fifth book in the biblical Psalter. In comparison to the masoretic tradition they come in a somewhat different order.

As a consequence of the difference in the order, Goshen Gottstein<sup>4</sup> and Talmon<sup>5</sup> drew the conclusion that the scroll was not a Book of Psalms with a different order in the arrangement of the psalms, but rather a liturgical collection i.e. an early form of a prayer book (סידור תפילה) used by the sect of Qumran. Talmon defined it as a kind of prayer book of poetic prayers.

There are additional arguments to this conclusion. In the scroll are found 8 compositions, which do not appear in the masoretic text of the Book of Psalms. They are four psalms, a piece from Ben Sira and a psalm to Zion. The eighth composition is prose composition that tells that King David wrote 4050 psalms.

This composition can be seen as a clue to prove that the sect of Qumran saw David as a great poet, who even composed more than the great Salomon, who composed only 4005 proverbs and

---

<sup>2</sup> J A Sanders, The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11Q Ps<sup>a</sup>), (Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan, IV), Oxford, 1965, especially p 3-14

<sup>3</sup> Talmon, Shemaryahu, מזמורים היצוניים בלשון העברית מקומראן, "מזמור קנא, תרביץ

שנה ל"ה, תשכ"ו, עמ' 214

<sup>4</sup> Goshen-Gottstein, M H: "The Psalms Scroll (11QPS<sup>a</sup>), A Problem of Canon and Text", Textus, Vol. V, 1966, pp 22-33, especially p 24

<sup>5</sup> Talmon, Shemaryahu, p 215

psalms (see I Kings 5:12). It also gives a hint of their belief that David was the writer of the psalms in the scroll.

The form of Ps 118, 119 and 145 in the scroll also alludes that this is a prayer collection, since their form in the scroll is different from the form in the Masoretic Text <sup>6</sup>.

A proof that the scroll was a collection of the sect is also possible to find in the fact that the prose text presupposes the same calendar of the year as that adhered to by the sect of Qumran, ie the solar calendar <sup>7</sup>.

The upper parts of the scroll are beautifully preserved, and even the lower part of the rows.

The script is Assyrian, (“square”) and the handwriting and letters are strong. Sanders attributes the writing of the scroll to the Herodian period <sup>8</sup>.

The scriptor did not always distinguish well between yod, and waw. The head of the yod is a bit broader than the head of the waw, and the foot of the yod is shorter than the foot of the waw. This issue, the distinction between yod and waw, has a strong impact on the question on how to read this psalm.

Usually the scriptor signifies Cholem, Qibbutz, and Shureq with matre lectionis, waw, always for example in the words לוֹא, כּוֹל. Once in Ps 151 he signifies a Qamets-Chatuf with waw:

לְמוֹשַׁחֲנִי in verse 6

All the compositions in the scroll are separated from one and other by a space, even if in most cases it is small. In some cases the space is large, even larger than one row. This is the case between our psalm 151a and the psalm that comes before, psalm 134. Also between every paragraph in psalm 119 there is such a space.

---

<sup>6</sup> Goshen Gottstein, MH, “The Psalms Scroll”, 1966, pp 29-30. See also especially Ps 145 where בְּרוּךְ ה' וּבְרוּךְ שְׁמוֹ לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד is added after each verse,

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p 28

<sup>8</sup> Sanders “The Psalms Scroll”, 1965, p 7

# B Psalm 151

## 1 The history of the psalm

Psalm 151 exists in LXX (Septuagint), the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible. There it comes after psalm 150, and as a result of this, we call our psalm found in the scroll, psalm 151, even though in the scroll it is actually two psalms.

The psalm is found in the scroll in column 28, in the rows 3-12, psalm 151a in rows 3-10, and psalm 151b in rows 11-12, being the beginning of the next psalm in the scroll.

In LXX they were combined to one psalm.

From the LXX-version came other translations, the Latin Vetus Latina, and later the Vulgate, and also the Aramaic, the Ethiopian and more over the Syriac translation.<sup>9</sup>

The Syriac version<sup>10</sup> is interesting to our point of study and we can find it in the Syro-Hexapla, the codex Ambrosianus, in the Peshitta, and also in the book of Bishop Eliah from al-Anbar (tenth century), the Book of Discipline. In his book is also found a further four apocryphal psalms. Already Martin Noth held the opinion in 1930 that they were translations from a Hebrew source (except from psalm 151), and he even retranslated three of them back into Hebrew in an effort to reconstruct them.<sup>11</sup> And now it is really amazing that we find three of these five Syriac psalms in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>. These are no I, II and III according to the numeration of W. Wright in the last

---

<sup>9</sup> John Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and the Transmission of the Apocryphal Psalms 151, 154 (=Syr II) and 155 (=Syr III), Harvar Theological Review, 1966, no 59, pp 265-266

Also Avi Horowitz, "לשונו וזמנו של מזמור קנ"א מקומראן" ספר א.ל. סוקניק,

ארץ ישראל, תשכ"ז, book VIII, Jerusalem, p 82

<sup>10</sup> J A Sanders, The Psalms Scroll..., 1965, p 53

see also J Strugnell, "Notes on the Text...", 1966, pp 259-260

<sup>11</sup> M Noth, "Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen, Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 48, 1930, pp 1-23

century. These are the ones that we can call psalm 151, and 154 and 155 according to J Strugnell's system of reference <sup>12</sup>.

It seems that Noth was correct in his assumption.

As a result of detailed research J Strugnell holds the opinion that the Syriac psalms 152-155 are translations from the Hebrew, while the Syriac psalm 151 is a translation from the Greek, the Septuagint version. <sup>13</sup>

There is also a possibility that also the Hebrew psalms 152 and 153 were present in the scroll 11QPs<sup>a</sup> but about this we cannot know for certain because the scroll is not preserved in its entirety.

## 2 The LXX version

In the following page I show psalm 151 in the Greek on the left and English translation on the right.

(In the original paper the LXX was translated into a verbal Hebrew version, which to some extent may be more relevant to the discussion. This was of course not an attempt of to reconstruct the Hebrew original that the translator had before him, but a help to those in the class that did not read Greek. It is also interesting to compare these two Hebrew versions.)

In the third verse there appear two important alternative readings (*variae lectionis*) that we will discuss in the passage below where we will compare the LXX. One is from the Alexandrian manuscript and the second is from of the Sinaiticus.

With the letters **A** and **B**, with a line in between I have indicated the two portions with a break in between corresponding to the two psalms 151a and 151b.

The underlined words denote words that do not appear at all, or appear with a different meaning in the Hebrew text.

---

<sup>12</sup> J Strugnell, "Notes on the Text...", 1966, p 257, note 1

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., pp 259, 265

The LXX version

οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυιδ  
καὶ ἕξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν  
τῷ Γολιαθ

Translation

Here is the psalm which was written by David's own  
hand, and which stands out of the numbers, when he  
fought in single combat with Goliath.

**A** 1 μικρὸς ἤμην ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου  
καὶ νεώτερος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρός μου  
ἐποίμαινον τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρός μου

I was the smallest among my brothers  
And the youngest in the house of my father  
I tended my father's sheep.

2 αἱ χεῖρές μου ἐποίησαν ὄργανον  
οἱ δάκτυλοί μου ἤρμωσαν ψαλτήριον

My hands made a musical instrument  
My fingers tuned a psaltery

3 καὶ τίς ἀναγγελεῖ τῷ κυρίῳ μου  
αὐτὸς κύριος αὐτὸς <sup>14</sup> εἰσακούει <sup>15</sup>

But who will tell my Lord?  
The Lord himself, he is the one who hears.

4 αὐτὸς ἐξαπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ  
καὶ ἦρέν με ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τοῦ πατρός μου  
καὶ ἔχρισέν με ἐν τῷ ἐλαίῳ τῆς χρίσεως αὐτοῦ

He sent his angel  
and took me from my father's sheep  
and anointed me with the oil of his unction

5 οἱ ἀδελφοί μου καλοὶ καὶ μεγάλοι  
καὶ οὐκ εὐδόκησεν ἐν αὐτοῖς κύριος

My brothers were tall and handsome  
but the Lord took no delight in them

-----

**B** 6 ἐξῆλθον εἰς συνάντησιν τῷ ἄλλοφύλῳ  
καὶ ἐπικατηράσατό με ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτοῦ

I went out to meet the foreigner  
and he cursed me by his idols.

7 ἐγὼ δὲ σπασάμενος τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ μάχαιραν  
ἀπεκεφάλισα αὐτὸν καὶ ἦρα ὄνειδος ἐξ υἱῶν  
Ἰσραηλ

But I drew his own sword  
Beheaded him and removed reproach from the sons  
of Israel

---

<sup>14</sup> Sin: αὐτὸς πάντων εἰσακούει

<sup>15</sup> Alex: εἰσακούσεται μου

### 3 The Scroll Version

Here I record the Hebrew version of the scroll in accordance with the most reasonable form, verse and hemistich partitioning in my opinion.

If this is the original form is of course difficult to prove, all the same it is a very reasonable, possible alternative and is therefore the starting point of our discussion.

#### הללויה לדויד בן ישי

1IA קטן הייתי מן אחי וישמני רועה לצונו  
וצעיר מבני אבי ומושל בגדיותיו

ידי עשו עוגב ואצבעותי כנור

2

ואשימה ליהוה כבוד

3II אמרתי אני בנפשי וההרים לוא יעידו לי  
העצים את דברי והגבעות לוא יגידו עלי  
והצואן את מעשי

4 כי מי יגיד ומי ידבר

ומי יספר את מעשי

5III ארון הכול ראה והוא האזין  
אלוה הכול הוא שמע

6 שלח נביאו למושחני      את שמואל לגרלני  
יצאו אחי לקראתו      יפי התור ויפי המראה

7 הגבהים בקומתם      היפים בשערם  
לא בחר יהוה אלוהים במ

8 וישלח ויקחני מאחר הצואן      וישמחני בשמן הקודש  
וישימני נגיד לעמו      ומושל בבני בריתו

**B** תחלת גב[ו]רה ל ד[ו]יד משמשחו נביא אלוהים

אזי רא[י]תי פלשתי מחרף מזו[ערכות פלשתים]

Again the underlined words denote words that do not appear at all, or appear with a different meaning in the Greek Septuagint text.

The vertical line in the margin of verse 2b and 3 indicate that these lines are totally missing in the LXX.

## 4 Comparison between LXX and the Qumran version

### Psalm A

#### Verse 1

In the first verse the two version are similar, except that the hemistich “and a ruler among his kids” is totally missing in LXX, and there is no verb equivalent to “and he made/put”. This indicates that the translator did not translate in a literal way.

The expression ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ, is the equivalent<sup>16</sup> but not a literal equal to מִבְּנֵי. Also the preposition in the first hemistich מִן is translated with ἐν. Regarding the first phrase maybe this is an influence from Jud 6:15, where we find the exact phrase הַצֶּעִיר בְּבֵית אָבִי, in LXX ἐν οἴκῳ πατρὸς μου, or maybe this was what the translator had before him. Regarding the preposition it might be a reading error, reading באהי instead of מאהי.<sup>17</sup>

In the LXX the last hemistich repeats τοῦ πατρὸς μου with no equivalent in the Hebrew, perhaps under influence of the preceding sentence.<sup>18</sup>

#### Verse 2-3

In LXX v 2: The difference in the second verse is the additional verb, ἤρμωσαν, and also that the conjunction is missing.

Hebrew, v 2b-3: the third hemistich in the Hebrew, and all of verse three is totally missing in LXX. This is the greatest difference between the two psalms (plus the mixture of two psalms in the Greek)

---

<sup>16</sup> E Tov, “The text-critical use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research, Jerusalem Biblical Studies, 1981, p 74

<sup>17</sup> J Strugnell, “Notes on the Text...”, 1966, p 267

<sup>18</sup> Ibid

Verse 4-5 (3 in LXX)

Out of two verses (4 and 5) the translator has made one (v 3) in that he concentrated them into two hemistiches only.

A point in our discussion is the phrase in the LXX, καὶ τίς ἀναγγελεῖ τῷ κυρίῳ μου ,”and who will tell my Lord? My Lord is a direct object (dative). This is a very clear indication that the translator understood the Hebrew before him to mean that David made musical instruments, and wanted someone to tell the Lord about him. And this is exactly what the Hebrew verse 3 tells us, that there was none who told (ie told the Lord) about him.

The one who mixed the two psalms into one, took out verse 3 but added “to the Lord”, in order to make the meaning clearer. This is an indication that this recomposition was done in the Hebrew, before the translation, as it otherwise could have been translated in its entirety.

This might also be a sign that we in verse 3 shall read לוא יעידו לו, ie “to him (the Lord) about me”.

At least this is clear in LXX: the request “who shall tell the Lord” is concerning David and what he did. This shows us that verse 4 in the Hebrew ought to be read “who shall tell about my songs/compositions”, and not “who shall tell about his deeds (ie the Lords). This strengthens our position.

It is interesting that all the verses in the Bible that we brought forth in the matter of understanding the expression מִי יגיד as an expression of wish or request, they are translated in LXX with τίς (see above p 18) 2 Sam 23:15, 2 Sam 15:4, Ps 4:7, Ps 60:11. In the Greek these verses are an expression of wish and also so in our psalm.

In the second hemistich there is an interesting and important alternative reading that supports our understanding of the psalm. It is found in the Alexandrian manuscript: ἐισακούσεται μου, he will listen to me. And this is as I understand the Hebrew version: David made musical instruments, wrote psalms, gave the Lord glory, but the hills did not tell the Lord about him or his deeds/songs. Therefore David worried and thought: “O, that someone will tell about me, and recount to the Lord my deeds”. But there is no need, because the Lord has already seen, and heard...

There is yet another alternative reading from Sinaiticus, αὐτὸς πάντως εἰσακούει. Strugnell<sup>19</sup> thinks that πάντως is the original version of the LXX, equivalent to the Hebrew הכול (in his understanding an object of "he heard").

He explains the verse 3 in LXX that the two הוא are translated with two αὐτὸς the שמע ... הכול is translated with πάντως εἰσακούει and the rest האזין that is not at all equivalent to the Greek κύριος he explains as a mistake or that the translator read הואה ארון, or that already in the Hebrew version in front of him this mistake had been made. Later the order was changed and the expression αὐτὸς κύριος was moved to the beginning of the hemistich (or already in the Hebrew), ie the translator understood or read: שמע הכל הוא שמע הואה ארון or שמע הכל הוא הואה ארון with a change of word order.

To me these conjectures seem to me far fetched, too much needs explaining.

To me another explanation is preferable: To the translator the text was הוא שמע והוא האזין הכול but he did not understand the phrase "God of all" (ought to be translated κύριος πάντως) so he translated הכול as an object .

The other option is that he understood and translated correctly: αὐτὸς κύριος πάντως, αὐτὸς εἰσακούει which is equivalent and a literal translation of the Hebrew הוא והוא האזין הכול, in which case the שמע has been lost. If this is the case then the original Greek version contains the phrase κύριος πάντως, which is the Hellenistic equivalent of הכול אלוה, and ארון הכול<sup>20</sup> One only needs to suppose that at some time the order of words was changed and πάντως changed from a noun to an object.

---

<sup>19</sup> J Strugnell, "Notes on the Text...", 1966, p 264

<sup>20</sup> A Horowitz,, ה"תשכ"ה, תרביץ, "...תבתימקראי", year 34, p 226-225

Verse 6, 8 (4 in LXX)

In verse 4 in LXX there is a mixture of parts of verse 6 and parts of verse 8 from the Hebrew. The translator, or if this happened already in the Hebrew the recomposer, changed the order, and shortened verse 6. The equivalent of prophet he choose was angel, a free translation. He added “my father’s”, as he did in verse 1. The holy oil, became the oil of unction. Strugnell mentions that the Ethiopian version has “holy oil”, reflecting an original LXX with these words, changed under the influence of the many instances in the LXX where the words “oil of unction” is used.

There are two other cases where LXX has the expression “holy oil of unction”, which contains both words.

Verse 7 (5 in LXX)

In verse 5 in LXX there is a description *καλοί* , a translation of **יפי תור** in Hebrew verse 6, the translator or composer taking this notion to the next verse which contains other notions of beauty. Verse 7 was also shortened.

Psalm B (Verse 6, 7 in LXX)

(Not translated)

The end of the Greek psalm is difficult to compare with the Hebrew, since large parts are missing. Suffice is to say that the translator (composer) changed a lot, and added, at least if we compare with what we know of the psalm 151b from the edition of Sanders.

## C Philological analysis: The biblical background and a comparison with the LXX translation

### 1 The orthography

The orthography of the scroll is a bit different from one place to another. Plene spelling is found for example in verse 1: **ומושל**, **רועה** (as also attested in the masoretic text, (= MT), although infrequently); in verse 3: **לוא** (occurs in MT), **והצואן** (not found in MT); in verse

5: הכּוּל (once in MT?), אֱלוֹהַּ (regular in MT); in verse 6: לְמוֹשֶׁה־נִי (NB Qametz Chatuf).

To the words לוֹא and צוֹאֵן there are two letters to one vowel.

The name of David is written with plene yod: דָּוִיד.

Defective spelling is found in verse 7: הַגְּבֹהִים (in MT always with waw except in Ps 138:6:

וּגְבֹהַּ). There are even examples of defective spelling of א in verse 1: לְצוֹנֵנוּ and in verse 6:

הַתּוֹר יְפִי, where aleph belongs to the root.

In the third row the original script has מֵאֲחִי, and somebody has added a nun from above:

מֵאֲחִי, intending to read מִן אֲחִי.

Also in row 11 the word וּמוֹשֶׁל was added above the row it self: בְּרִיתוֹ

וּמוֹשֶׁל  
וּיְשִׁימֵנִי נִגִיד לְעַמּוֹ בְּבִנֵי

In row 7 before the word אֱלוֹהַּ one can see a rest of an inscription which seems to be a waw (conjunctive) which has been erased. This shows us that the writer of the scroll understood that אֱלוֹהַּ did not belong to the words before, but to the words following. The inutterable name of God is written in Paleo-Hebrew script (row 3 and 8).

## 2 The superscription

The Greek superscription is much longer than the Hebrew. In the Vetus Latina version and the Syriac version it is similar to the Greek, except that in the book of Eliah from al-Anbar it is short and similar to the superscription of the scroll.

The expression הַלְלִיָּהּ occurs in the Book of Psalms as heading to psalms 146 to 150.

Strugnell <sup>21</sup> suggest that the word in the heading of psalm 151 comes from psalm 150, where

---

<sup>21</sup> J Strugnell, "Notes on the Text...", 1966, p 267

הללויה appears as the last word, and that some copyist at some time by mistake wrote it in the heading of the following psalm.

This could only have happened if psalm 151 truly at some time was part of the collection of Psalms (canonical collection) ie ordered according to the masoretic order and this is not understood by itself.

In the actual scroll the psalm immediately before our psalm was psalm 134.

It is interesting to note that the form of the heading, a noun followed by ל and the name of David is common in the headings of the Psalms. שגיון לדוד (Ps 7), מכתב לדוד (Ps 60), תפילה לדוד (Ps 86), שיר מזמור לדוד (Ps 108), שיר המעלות לדוד (Ps 133), משכיל לדוד (Ps 142), תהלה לדוד (Ps 145). There are also other formations such as מזמור שיר־חנכת הבית לדוד (Ps 30).<sup>22</sup>

It seems to me that there was a tradition to name the psalms in this manner.

Since the content of the psalm is not in accordance with the heading, it not being a psalm of praise, it might that the heading is not original. It is possible that this is a reflection of somebody after some time thinking that if they put a similar heading on this psalm as those in the Book of Psalms it would be seen as a Davidic psalm<sup>23</sup>.

The words בן ישי does not appear in any headings in the Book of Psalms, only as closing words, at the end of the second book, in Ps 72, v 20: כלו תפלות דוד בן ישי.

---

<sup>22</sup> Of course there is also לדוד by itself without a noun

In the Greek there is a word ἰδιογράφος ie written by David himself. It is possible <sup>24</sup>that this indicates that at some time there was a doubt if this was really a work of David, and that this was added to impress the fact that it was.

On the other hand, the words ἐξῶθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ, out of the numbers, indicate that the heading is late, since it is evident that it was added after the Canon was closed or that the Greek heading is from the time of the translation of the psalm, in which case the translation is late.

It is also evident that the Greek heading was written for a psalm that had been combined from 151a and 151b. This is clear from the mentioning of Goliath and the battle between him and David. The battle is described in the scroll only in the second psalm, 151b which comes after psalm 151a

It is clear that the Qumran sect believed that David was the author of the scroll. In the column before our column there is a citation from 2 Sam 23:7, part of the last words of David, and also a prose text that reminds us of the authorship of David, being in total 4050 compositions. As a consequence it is clear that also psalm 151 in the eyes of the writer of the scroll, and in the eyes of the sect, was of David, and the Hebrew heading is additional proof of this belief.

### 3 Psalm 151 A

At this point we will look at the Hebrew version, its linguistic and biblical background and afterwards we will try to make a comparison with LXX.

#### *Verse 1*

The Hebrew Bible recounts that David was the smallest of the Jesse brothers. (1 Sam 16:11. קטן שאר הקטן, and in 1 Sam 17:14: ודוד הוא הקטן. (cf also 1 Sam 15:17).

The word קטן contains several meanings. Small in stature, small of age, and small in importance, and of course all these elements are connected to one and other. Salomon stated his youth and inexperience in the words: **וּאֲנֹכִי נֶעַר קָטָן לֹא אֲדַע צִוְּתָהּ וּבֵא** (1 King

---

<sup>24</sup> J A Sanders, The Scrolls Psalm ..., 1965, p 58

3:7). In our verse there is essentially the meaning of unimportance and even the parallel word of the second hemistich: **וצעיר** can have the same meaning cf **ונבוזה** and **צעיר אנכי** (Ps 119:141), **הנה אלפי הדל במנשה ואנכי הצעיר בבית אבי** (Jud 6:15).

The word does not appear in the Bible in reference to David, and it is possible that the composer of the psalm was influenced by Isaiah (60:22)

**הקטן יהיה לאלף ותצעיר לגוי עצום** and also by Micah 5:1

**ואתה בית-לחם אפרתה צעיר להיות באלפי יהודה**

**ממך לי יצא להיות מושל בישראל**

Some other interesting examples in connection with “smaller than my brothers”: **הקטן**

**אחותך הקטנה ממך** (Hez 16:46), **אחי כלב הקטן ממני** (Gen 44:26), **אחי כלב הקטן ממך** (Jud 1:12,13), **אחינו** (Hez 16:46).

Regarding **בני אבי**, cf **בני אביך** (Gen 49:8) etc.

David was a shepherd to his fathers sheep, cf 1 Sam 16:11. **עוד שאר הקטן**

**רעה היה עבדך לאביו בצא** 1 Sam 17:34, **והנה רעה בצאן**

There is a difference in the meaning of **שים** with **ל** or **על**. (Many examples but not translated in this paper).

## *Verse 2*

In the two hemistiches: **ידי עשו עוגב** **אצבעותי כנור** there is a very beautiful parallelism: both **אצבעותי** // **ידי** and **כנור** // **עוגב** are very common in the Bible.

In my opinion the third hemistich: **ואשימה ליהוה כבוד** is connected to the first two. It comes as a consequence: I made musical instruments and I then gave the Lord glory: ie **ואשימה** is inverted future. This is also a fixed expression in the Bible.

### Verse 3

This is a verse we will discuss in detail. It is totally missing in LXX. Several scholars have connected the hemistich **אמרתי אני בנפשי** to the previous verse, e.g. Sanders.<sup>25</sup>

But the corresponding expression in the Bible: **אמרתי אני בלבי** (4 times in Eccl) always comes before what the writer thinks. The expression used in Isaiah 14:13 is used in the same manner.

The root **אמר** in the meaning of to think is common in the Bible. **אמר בנפשו** does not appear in the Bible, but it does appear in Christian Aramaic, in the New Testament, e.g. Math 9:3, and Luke 16:3.<sup>26</sup>

There are several ways to divide and to interpret this verse. Sanders interpreted and divided it as follows:<sup>27</sup>

2 ואשימה ליהוה כבוד אמרתי אני בנפשי

3 ההרים לוא יעידו לו והגבעות לוא יגידו

עלו העצים את דברי והצואן את מעשי

4 כי מי יגיד ומי ידבר ומי יספר את מעשי אדון

**עלו** he understands as Piel, meaning cherished, ie that the leaves meditated, pondered on my words (said David). In this way Sanders find a kind of Orpheus figure in the Psalm. We will deliberate on this further down but it's difficult to buy his ideas.

---

<sup>25</sup> J A Sanders, The Psalms Scroll..., 1965, p 55

<sup>26</sup> A Hurwitz, "לשונו וחמנו...", תשכ"ז, pp 84-85

<sup>27</sup> J A Sanders, The Psalms Scroll..., 1965, p 55, 57

Sanders mentions Jastrows dictionary, p 1081, and CD iii 2 and v 5, as proof, but to this Rabinowitz<sup>28</sup> objects with strength. He says that in CD it is not Piel at all, but Kal in the meaning be accounted, be reckoned, and it is doubtful if the idea to hold words dear in the Rabbinical Hebrew would be expressed by עלה in Piel.

Even more so the interpretation of Sanders does not give a good syntax to the verse. If the meaning is “The trees cherished my words”, then the second part is kind of a negation to the first, and this would have demanded an adversative particle eg אולם עלו, or אפס כי עלו, or at least an adversative waw. If Sanders is right then it ought to read for example והעצים עלו.

Skeihan<sup>29</sup> reads as Sanders but he reads עלי העצים את דברי and an supposed verb is taken from the preceding hemistich. He does not find an orphic figure in the psalm.

Also Talmon reads עלי but he divides the hemistiches in an other way, and he consistently reads third person suffix מעשו and דברו, ie defective of מעשיו and דבריו, instead of the first.person suffix<sup>30</sup>

Thus:

3 (4) אמרתי אני בנפשי ההרים לוא יעידו לו והגבעות

לוא יגידו עלי העצים את דברו והצואן את מעשו

4(5) כי מי יגיד ומי ידבר ומי יספר את מעשו

---

<sup>28</sup> I Rabinowitz, “The alleged Orphism of 11QPSa, Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 76, 1964, p 198

<sup>29</sup> P W Skeihan, “The Apocryphal Psalm 151”, The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, no 25, 1963, p 48

<sup>30</sup> S Talmon, “...מזמורים הצוניים”, תשכ”ו, p 219

Opposing this Rabinowitz <sup>31</sup> consistently reads first person suffix in verses 3 and 4 in that he reads לִי in stead of לוֹ and עָלַי in stead of עָלוֹ or עָלִי. He partitions the hemistiches as follows:

3 אמרתי אני בנפשי (3)

ההרים לוא יעידו לי

והגבעות

לוא יגידו עָלַי העצים את דברי

והצואן את מעשי

כי מי יגיד

ומי ידבר

ומי יספר את מעשי

According to Talmon the writer of the psalm says that nature cannot extol the creator of the world or praise his deeds <sup>32</sup>. If this is the case then the psalm is not biblical, since according to the Bible, nature surely can praise and exalt the Lord <sup>33</sup>, cf Ps 148:9-10, and also express joy etc.

F M Cross proposed a new solution in his article <sup>34</sup> a few years ago:

---

<sup>31</sup> I Rabinowitz, "The Alleged orpheism...", 1964, p 195

<sup>32</sup> S Talmon, "תשכ"ו, "...מזמורים חצוניים", p 222

<sup>33</sup> Cf also on p x in this paper on the un-biblicallity of the psalm

<sup>34</sup> F M Cross, "David, Orpheus, and Ps 151:3-4", Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research, no 231, Oct 1978, pp 69-71

3      ההרים לוא יעידו לו      והגבעות לוא יגידו עליו

העצים את דברו      והצואן את מעשו

4      כי מי יגיד ומי ידבר      ומי יספר את מעשו

He reads consistently the third person suffix in opposition to Rabinowitz, but he has the reading לוא as an exclamation of longing or wish (O, that...). As proof he offers Gen 23: 13. In the Bible there are three instances of לוא with א, but not with the meaning of a wish, rather *if*.

ל without א in the meaning of a wish occurs some seven times. The solution he proposes is possible. The problem is that in the Bible ל always comes in the beginning of the sentence (except Gen 23:13). In our verse ל comes after the noun ההרים.

Now I would like to propose my choice of partitioning, and my choice of reading, with arguments. My understanding is closest to Rabinowitz from the point of reading and interpretation, but to Cross from the point of partitioning the hemistiches.

I read first person suffix in all places like Rabinowitz, but with the difference that he reads לוא יעידו לי והגבעות where לוא יעידו לי also serves as verbal phrase for the noun והגבעות. I think this is awkward. Regarding עליו we agree.

Regarding the verse and hemistich partitioning I agree with Cross.

Regarding the third person suffix it is true that in Qumran it is often written in connection with a plural noun without yod, e g 4Q175 Testimonia, row 16, בנו = בניו, row 19 ידיו=ידו. Nevertheless in our psalm the writer already wrote a suffix with a yod in verse 1 בגדיותיו, which is an important point against the reading of Cross.

More important, we now turn to the orthography, meaning the shape of the letters in the scroll. The photo is very clear, and it is possible to see the form of the letters, ie the length and width of yod and waw.

If we start with לִי in row 6, this is found next to a conjunctive waw and it is possible to clearly distinguish between them. The yod is both broader at its head, and the foot is shorter. Also the yod of עָלִי in row 6 is as short and the head as broad as all the yods in the psalm where there is no disagreement, eg the yod of יִגִּידוּ just before. And especially the yod of עָלִי is shorter and broader than the waws in the psalms.

The yod of דְּבַרִּי in row 6 is very short and broad, and the yod of מַעֲשֵׂי has a very big head without any doubt. Also the yod of the second מַעֲשֵׂי in row 7 is shorter and has a clear, broad head as the rest of all the indisputable yods.

To train the eye to distinguish between the yods and waw, look at certain words, eg בְּגִדֵי־וְתֵיב in row 3, where it is clear, and also נְבִיאָא in row 8.

Furthermore there is to the yod a more distinct inclination which can be seen in the words נִפְשֵׁי, row 5 where there is no disagreement יַעֲיִדוּ, row 5, and compare with the words under discussion.

As we have seen every letter has important attributes that distinguish them as yods, and my conclusion is that the scribe really understood them as such.

In truth there is also a problem with my reading, one must suppose that the verb יִגִּידוּ also serves the הַעֲצִים אֶת דְּבַרִּי and also וְהִצִּיאֵן אֶת מַעֲשֵׂי and not only the verb but also the negation! That the verb can serve several hemistiches occurs regularly in the Bible (cf also verse 2), but I have not found that the negation does.

The verb is not the problem, even more so because all the verbs in verses 3 and 4 are verbs of similar meaning, to tell, recount, etc

The reason I read עָלִי is that the symmetry is even with a parallelism between עָלִי and לִי in the previous hemistich.

The result is a beautifully structured verse with three words in each hemistich of the next line, with a nice rhythm.

The phrase **ל העיד** is not attested from the Bible, but exists in Ben Sira 4:11.

But in the Bible there are many instances of **ל** with other verbs, **ספר**, **דבר**, **צוה**, **אמר**, **שאל**, **דרש**, **שמע** (se BDB p 514a) with the meaning of *concerning, about* which is the meaning of our verse.

In addition to this there is also **ל** with a meaning of *on behalf of, for* with verbs such as **דבר**, **שאל**, **נלחם** (BDB 515b).

Both these meanings are possible in connection to our verse if we read **לי**.

**ל הגיד** occurs four times in the Bible. **על** also occurs with some of the verbs mentioned above, and with the same meanings *concerning, about, and on behalf of, for* (BDB 754b) similarly to **לי**?

**עלי עין** occurs twice, in the same verse, Neh 8:15.

The parallelism **גבעה הר** // **הר** occurs frequently in the Bible.

The word **מעשה** in the meaning poem or song is found in Ps 45:2 and here also we find the word **דבר** in the parallel hemistich as in our psalm!

#### Verse 4

The question *Who will tell?*, Talmon finds to be rhetorical with the supposed answer *if not me*<sup>35</sup>, but according to Rabinowitz it is an utterance of exclamation, a wish: O, That somebody would tell.

---

<sup>35</sup> S Talmon, "תשכ"ו, ...מזמורים הצוניים", p 222

The Bible has frequent examples of **מִי יִתֵּן** (BDB 566b), always in the imperfect as in our verse. Also interestingly **מִי יִשְׁמַע שׁוֹפֵט** (2 Sam 15:4). There are other verbs also with **מִי**. (Examples not translated.)

Sanders understands the question as a real one, Who can tell? <sup>36</sup>

In Rabinowitz's proposition the **כִּי** comes after a negation and therefore its meaning is *but*.

This is also the understanding of Skehan <sup>37</sup> who takes it as a word of emphasis: "really, who can tell" (cf BDB 472b). I agree with this but would like to interpret it as an utterance of a wish, "O, that somebody really would tell".

### Verse 5

In my opinion here comes the answer to the wish, or request in the previous verse. The answer is that there is no need that somebody shall tell the Lord about the words of David and about his songs (or deeds) because the Lord himself has seen, and he has heard what David has done.

The phrase **אֲדוֹן הַכּוֹל** does not exist in the Bible. Sanders separates the two and takes **אֲדוֹן** to the previous verse. **הַכּוֹל** he sees as the object of the verbs **רָאָה** and **שָׁמַע**.

Horowitz has done a study on the phrase and shows that is really a true phrase <sup>38</sup> in Christian Aramaic texts and in the Talmud Bab. Also Rabinowitz supports the reading **אֲדוֹן הַכּוֹל** <sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> I Rabinowitz, "The alleged Orphism of 11QPSa, Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 76, 1964, p 198

<sup>36</sup> J A Sanders, The Psalms Scroll..., 1965, p 56

<sup>37</sup> P W Skehan, "The Apocryphal Psalm..." 1963, p 409

<sup>38</sup> A Horowitz, התואר הבתר-מקראי "אדון הכל" - והופעתו במזמור קנא מקומראן, תרביץ, year 34, p 224-227

If the writer of the psalm wanted to say **אֲדוֹן מַעֲשֵׂי** he probably would not say it with the simple **אֲדוֹן**, but with the paleo-Hebrew equivalent of **יְהוָה**.

To the phrase **הַכֹּל אֱלֹהֵי** there is a parallel twice in Ben Sira 33: 1, and 45:23.

**אֱלֹהֵי** by itself exists in the Bible Ps 114:6-7, but also in Dan 11:39.

Certainly the phrase **אֲדוֹן הַכֹּל** is late as are the phrases **אֲדוֹן כּוֹל הָעוֹלָם** which we find in Talm Bab Brech 50:2, but already in the Bible there is a start: **אֲדוֹן כּוֹל הָאָרֶץ** in Ps 97:5, et al <sup>40</sup>

To the fact that the Lord has seen, this is based on the chapter where God chooses David (1 Sam 16:7): **וַיַּהוָה יִרְאֶה לְלֵבָב**.

### *Verse 6, 7, 8*

From verse 6 and forward much of the language is taken from 1 Sam 16:1-3.

(Many small interesting comparisons can be drawn to different text in the Bible, but from lack of time I will not translate these pages for this preliminary paper)

## Psalm B

(Not translated)

## Summary of philological study

As we have seen there are many expressions from the Bible in the psalm and the writer was certainly influenced by its language.

---

<sup>39</sup> Rabinowitz, "The Alleged Orphism ...", 1964, p 194

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p 226

But there are also several expressions that are not found in the Bible but are found in later literature. Horowitz draws the conclusion that it is a late psalm in the meaning being from the time of the second temple <sup>41</sup>

## D The mixed composition in LXX

According to what we saw above at some time psalm 151a and 151b were mixed, recomposed, into a new psalm composition, and while recomposing the new psalm he also changed the parts, the order, shortened verses, and added.

Now we must deliberate on the issue, if the recomposing happened on the Hebrew level, before the translation, or at the time of the translation, ie was the translator and the composer the same person, or two different people?

Sanders is convinced that LXX is not a direct translation from the Qumran Hebrew of 151a and b, but he does not discuss the matter in detail, even though he poses the question. His conclusion is that psalm 151 of the scroll is the Original Psalm <sup>42</sup> and that the recomposing of the two into a new psalm was done before translation, but outside of the Qumran sect. <sup>43</sup>

Strugnell tries to answer the question in short. <sup>44</sup> He mentions a passage from Pseudo-Phile (written originally in Hebrew) and he claims that it is a kind of quotation from the Hebrew version our psalm, but in the form that is equal to the LXX: “Minimus inter fratres meos et pascens oves (patris) fui”, which is exactly what we have in the Greek of LXX and not equal to the version of the 11QPs<sup>a</sup> scroll. There is only some doubt if patris is original or not. Therefore also Strugnell claims that the psalm was recomposed in Hebrew, equivalent to the Greek, and this was the source original for the translation.

---

<sup>41</sup> A Hurwitz, “...לשונו וחמנו”, תשכ”ז, p 83

<sup>42</sup> J Sanders, The Psalms Scroll, 1965, p 60

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, p 63

<sup>44</sup> J Strugnell, “Notes on the Text...”, 1966, p 269

This conclusion rests on the assumption that since Pseudo-Philo was originally written in Hebrew, the writer also quoted from a Hebrew version. But it is possible that he quoted from a Greek version that was known to him. It is also possible that when Pseudo-Philo was translated to Latin, the translator changed the quotation which had been in a form equivalent to psalm 151 of the scroll, changing it to a form equivalent to the Greek version known to him.

As we mentioned above, and we will see below, p 28 ff, I have also come to the conclusion that the recomposition was done in Hebrew before translation, but from an entirely different arguments.

## E The contents and style of Ps 151 A

We have seen from our analysis that the psalm is based on the story of David, which we find in 1 Sam 16-17 and a great part of the language of the psalm is the language of the Bible.

The expressions, phrases are quotations, excerpts from the Bible, especially from the narratives of David, but also from the psalms, and the poetic language. This does not mean to say that the author actually quoted from the Bible, but that the same language was common to his mouth and ears.

We also saw that the extra-biblical language puts a stamp on the psalm, (examples). This shows that the psalm is late, even though it is earlier than the rest of the writings of Qumran. According to Hurwitz it can be placed at the period of the second temple.<sup>45</sup>

The psalm is written in an autobiographical form, in the first person. The beginning of the psalm, verse 1-2, and the end, verses 5-8, is a kind of autobiographical framework, and in between there are two verses, 3-4, that are a sort of poem by David at the time when he was a shepherd, made a lyre, and praised the Lord.<sup>46</sup>

It is an original composition by itself. There is no direct textual background to it in the Bible, and even verse 2 is not taken from any text which talks about David. Nevertheless this is a

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid, p 87

<sup>46</sup> S Talmon, "תשכ"ו, ...מזמורים הצוניים", p 224-226

very reasonable passage, since David was a man that knew how to play an instrument (1 Sam 16:16, 18 יודע מנגן כנור, and at that time would know how to make an instrument, and praise the Lord with them.

Regarding the praise of the Lord, there is a clear background in the Book of Psalms in connection with David.

The first part, v 1-2, tells of David that he is the least, youngest in his family, and his task is not important, being the shepherd of his fathers sheep. At this time he makes musical instruments, and praises the Lord with them.

In the second part, verses 3-4, comes the poem, containing David's thoughts. He worries that the Lord will not know about him, and his deeds and his praise.

In the third part, verses 5-8, we are told that he need not worry because God has already seen and heard, and as a result he sent his prophet Samuel to anoint him with oil to be king, even though he is small, and his brothers are tall and beautiful.

The end of the story is that David who once tended the sheep of his father, becomes the shepherd of God's people.

In the Book of Psalms there is no Psalm like it, in regards to the autobiographical style, a psalm based on a historical story. The Psalms that can be called autobiographical e g Ps 106, are not historical, rather ritual prayers.<sup>47</sup> In the headings of certain psalms there is a reminiscence of the historical background to the psalms (Ps 3:1).

This autobiographical form is something new.

---

<sup>47</sup> S Talmon, "תשכ"ו, "...מזמורים הצוניים", p 225

## F The Existence of Orphism in the Psalm

(not translated)

## G The un-biblicallity of our Psalm and the question of Censorship

According to Rabinowitz <sup>48</sup> psalm 151 is a kind of midrash, wherein David is used as an example to the readers. Consequently all the ideas are taken from the Bible, and there is nothing foreign to the Bible in it. I agree with his opinion.

Against this several scholars (Sanders, Meyer, Baumgarten, and Talmon) claim that there is un-biblical content in the psalm. From one part it is the question of Orphism (Sanders, Meyer<sup>49</sup>) and from the other part it is the verses 3-4, interpreted as saying that the mountains do not exalt the Lord and the sheep can not tell of his deeds.

Regarding the second claim it is totally clear that in the Bible the nature can praise the Lord, express joy etc.(examples)

This brings us to the question of censorship. To this question there are two possible answers.

1. Sanders contends that at Jabne this psalm was withdrawn from the Canon because of the inherent Hellenism, which the Rabbinical leadership remembered.<sup>50</sup>
2. Meyer proposes that it was the question of Orphism that caused the censorship<sup>51</sup>

In the question of Canon there is doubt if the Canon already was fixed before Jabne, and since the psalm is late the question is if psalm 151 at some time was part of the Canon at all. If not then it could not of course be censored or withdrawn.

---

<sup>48</sup> I Rabinowitz, "The Alleged Orphism...", 1964, p 199-200

<sup>49</sup> R Meyer, "Die Septuaginta Fassung von Psalm 151:1-5 als Ergebnis einer dogmatischen korrektur", Beiheft zum Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, no 105, 1967, p 170-171

<sup>50</sup> J A Sanders, The Psalms Scroll..., 1965, p 63

<sup>51</sup> R Meyer "Die Septuaginta Fassung...", 1967, p 170-172

If, as I claim, there is no Orphism or Hellenism in the psalm, how come that it was withdrawn from canon (supposing it started in)?

To answer this question we will look at the views of some scholars that have found texts that are some kind of reaction against psalm 151, from the literature much later than our psalm.

Strugnell brings forth an Arabic anti-hymn: <sup>52</sup>

David, if not the hills praise me,  
Truthfully, I will tear them up  
If not the trees praise me  
Truthfully, I will lessen their fruit  
There is none that praise me a lot  
Or bless me much  
Do this O, people, because I see all.

Later Baumgartner found a text from Perek Shira, <sup>53</sup>

“It is said about him, about David, King of Israel, peace be upon him, that at the time when he closed the Psalms his pride rose. He said before him (God): Lord of eternity, there is no creation in the world that say songs/poems (אוֹמֵר שִׁירָה) more than me.

At the same time by chance a frog came upon him and told him: David, don't be arrogant, since I say songs more than you, and not only that, in every case I say a song, I make a proverb out of it, 3.000 proverbs, as it is said: And he said 3.000 proverbs, and his songs where 1000 and five.

These two texts are negative towards David's attitude, and the first mentioned text also to David's claim that the mountains, the trees and animals do not praise the Lord.

---

<sup>52</sup> J Strugnell, “Notes on the Text...”, 1966, p 280

<sup>53</sup> J M Baumgartner, Perek Shira, an Early Response to Psalm 151, Revue de Qumran, no 36, 1978, p 576

They prove that the authors knew of psalm 151 and understood verse 3 thus:

אמרתי אני בנפשי

3      ההרים לוא יעידו לו      והגבעות לוא יגידו עליו

העצים את דברו      והצואן את מעשו

4      כי מי יגיד ומי ידבר      ומי יספר את מעשו

This is exactly as Cross and Talmon understands the psalm.

Now we have a stronger and more serious reason why the recomposer censored the psalm: it was not biblical in his opinion.

Now why do I not the accept their readings?

The reason is that I still think that the original version, written in the scroll, is with yods. My arguments are:

1 Qumran was a sect full of great biblical interpreters, they believed that the Bible was the word of the Lord, and it seems to me that they would not accept a psalm in the midst of their prayer book that contained clearly un-biblical thoughts

2 The alternative with yod is more logical and makes more common sense in conjunction with the order of ideas of the whole psalm as against the alternative with waw. In verse 5 there is an answer to David's question in verse 3-4. If we read with waw verse 5 does not follow as a logic continuation and there is no answer to the question.

3 The translator (or recomposer) understood it as I do when he in LXX wrote: "And who will tell my Lord (O, that someone would tell my Lord), ie "about my deeds/songs" (David's) and not "about his songs" (the Lord's). He even understands it so that the sentence "The Lord himself" is an answer and logical continuation.

Now how do you explain the censorship?

In my opinion it is almost certain that at some time in the history of the psalm there was a censorship process and verses 2b and 3 were taken out of the psalm.

The reason for this is that the people who did it, maybe the **החכמים**, the rabbinical sages, thought that the psalm was too imprecise in the form that was in front of them (like the scroll version).

It *could* be read it in an un-biblical manner. There was a risk or danger that people by mistake would do this in reading and in copying the text. This would be enough to argue for a censorship and an expulsion from Canon.

It is also possible that some sages already read it so, and therefore declared it to be un-biblical.

From this we can see that the censorship, and the recomposition was done in the Hebrew before the translation, because the mistake in reading can only be done in Hebrew.

Somebody decided that the psalm must be changed, but he kept the meaning:

“I (David) made a lyre ... O, that someone would tell the Lord” but there is no need: “The Lord has already heard and sent his ...”. This is what later was translated into Greek.

Therefore the Arabic hymn, (and the piece from Perek Shira) are very near to being definite proof that there were people that read the psalm wrongly, and therefore created a report about David that was not true.

## H Word in summary

We have read a very interesting psalm, but still have not cleared all the questions, and not the subject matter in all its possible depths.

We have seen that there is no need to read the psalm in a manner that would imply unbiblicallity, and certainly not orpheic connotation.

On the contrary, it is almost certain that in the form we find it in Qumran they read with consistency עֲלֵי, לִי etc

We have also seen that it was possible (and is) to read it wrongly, and that this might be the cause of censorship.

The content of the psalm has been taken directly from the Bible. The language was influenced from the language of the Bible and the story is a kind extended exegesis or midrash of the story of David, ie that they added details which are not explicitly stated in the Bible, but are possible and makes sense.

The psalm was thought of as a true Davidic psalm and placed in a collection of psalms of David, in a kind of prayer book. In this collection it server as ritual, and midrashic material, and David who is portrayed there serves as an example, showing the people of the sect that the Lord *sees*, not to the looks or stature, but to the words, and deeds/songs, and to whether they praise the Lord or not.

## Appendix A Pisqah b'emtsa pasuq

Talmon<sup>54</sup> proposes in an article that psalm 151a and 151b can help us to solve a problem found in the masoretic Bible, that the scholars haven't come to a conclusion about yet.

The problem is with *pisqah b'emtsa pasuq* (*pbp*). *Pbp* is an empty space left between two parts of the text, like a section division (פרשה) but in the middle of a verse.

There are scholars who contend that *pbp* was put there to show that there is some confusion of the text, or some missing words, or sentences. Others, e.g. M Segal, say that is a kind of division of verses, different from the masoretic. According to Tov it signifies<sup>55</sup> a real break in content. Tov however seems to agree with Talmon's proposed solution.

It is interesting to note that *pbp* does not appear in the poetic texts of the Bible, but only in the other texts, in texts of law only once (Deut 23:8). The conclusion is that *pbp* only comes in texts of prose, most of them in the historiographical books. In the Aleppo codex 64 % of them are found in 1 & 2 Samuel, and in this book they are concentrated especially to the story of David.

Talmon's proposition is that *pbp* reflects a system of cross-reference, the *pbp* pointing to a textual expansion and addition of the verses in question, to a homiletic Midrash, or to a prayer. It was a way of completing the story, either by reference within the Bible or to something outside.

Most of the cases refer to a paraphrastic or poetic completion of the text in a hymnal language. For example in 2 Sam 7:4 there is a *pbp* referring to Psalm 133 or in 2 Sam 12:12 after the account of Bat Sheva referring to Ps 51.

Now concerning 151a there are *pbp* in 1 Sam 16:1-13, in verse 12:

---

<sup>54</sup> S Talmon, "מזמורים חזוניים", תשכ"ו, p 228-233, from where the whole Appendix is summarized

<sup>55</sup> E Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Minneapolis, 1992, p 54

V 11 And Samuel said unto Jesse, Are here all *thy* children? And he said, There remaineth yet the youngest, and, behold, he keepeth the sheep. And Samuel said unto Jesse, Send and fetch him: for we will not sit down till he come hither

V 12 And he sent, and brought him in. Now he *was* ruddy, *and* withal of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to. [*pbp*] And the LORD said, Arise, anoint him: for this *is* he.

The *pbp* lets the reader contemplate (as Moses needed to do between the sections of the text cf Sifra 1:9).

Such contemplation is found in psalm 151a.

Rabinowitz <sup>56</sup> concurs that our psalm is a kind of Midrash and that David is set as an example to the readers. It is this example that the *pbp* wants to reference to the readers.

This conclusion also fits well to the fact that psalm 151a is found in a scroll which was some kind of prayer book used in some liturgical way in Qumran.

Also regarding 151b, which is a kind a poetic paraphrase, there is a *pbp* reference in 1 Sam 17:37.

---

<sup>56</sup> Rabinowitz, "The Alleged Orphism..." 1964, p 199

## Bibliography

- Baumgarten, Josef. "Perek Shira, an Early Response to Psalm 151." *Revue de Qumran*.36 (1978): 575–578.
- Brown, Francis, S. R Driver, and Charles A Briggs. *A Hebrew and English lexicon of the Old Testament, with an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Cross, Frank Moor. "David, Orpheus and Ps 151:3-4." *BASOR*:231 (1978): 69–71.
- Even-Shoshan, Abraham. *קונקורדנציה חדשה לתורה, נביאים וכתובים*. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1977.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. *Jewish symbols in the Greco-Roman period Vol. 9-11, Symbolism in the Dura synagogue*. New York [etc.]: Pantheon Books, 1964.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe Henry. "The Psalms Scroll (11QPSa), A Problem of Canon and Text." *Textus V* (1966): 22–33.
- Hurwitz, Avi. "התואר הבתר־מקראי אדון הכל – והופעתו במזמור קנא מקומראן." *Tarbiz*.34 (1964): 224–227.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "לשוננו וזמנו של קנא מקומראן." *Erets-Yis a'el - Sefer E L Sukenik VIII* (1967): 82–87.
- Meyer, Rudolf. "Die Septuaginta-Fassung von Psalm 151:1-5 als Ergebnis einer dogmatischen Korrektur." In *Das Ferne und nahe Wort. Festschrift Leonhard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 30. November 1966 gewidmet.*, 164–172. Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Beiheft 105. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967.
- Noth, Martin. "Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 48 (1930): 1–23.
- Sanders, James A., American Schools of Oriental Research., and Palestine Archaeological Museum. *Qumrân Cave 11. The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 -11QPs[SUPa] - Discoveries in the Judaeen desert, 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Siegel, J P. "Final mem in a medial position and medial mem in a final position in 11QPSa, Some observations." *Revue de Qumran*.25 (1969): 125–130.
- Skehan, Patrick. "The Apocryphal Psalm 151." *The Catholic Biblical quarterly*. 25 (1963): 407–409.
- Strugnell, John. "Notes on the Text and the Transmission of the Apocryphal Psalms 151, 154 (=Syr II) and 155 (=Syr III)." *The Harvard theological review*. 59 (1966): 257–281.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "מזמורים חיצוניים בלשון העברית מקומרא - ממזמור קנא." *Tarbiz*.35 (1966): 214–234.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis ;Assen/Maastricht: Fortress Press;;Van Gorcum, 1992.
- Rabinowitz, Isaac. "The Alleged Orphism of 11PSa, 28:3-12." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 76 (1964): 193–200.

**LXX Ps 151**

1. Here is the psalm which was written by David's own hand, and which stands out of the numbers, when he fought in single combat with Goliath.

I was the smallest among my brothers  
And the youngest in the house of my father  
I tended my father's sheep.

2. My hands made a musical instrument  
My fingers tuned a psaltery

3. But who will tell my Lord?  
The Lord himself, he is the one who hears.

4. He sent his angel  
and took me from my father's sheep  
and anointed me with the oil of his unction

5. My brothers were tall and handsome  
but the Lord took no delight in them

6. I went out to meet the foreigner  
and he cursed me by his idols.

7. But I drew his own sword  
Beheaded him and removed reproach from the sons of Israel

Different interpretations of the central parts of the psalm by different scholars:

J. A. Sanders

2 ... ואשימה ליהוה כבוד אמרתי אני בנפשי  
3 ההרימ לוא יעידו לו והגבעות לוא יגידו  
עלו העצימ את דברי והצואן את מעשי  
4 כי מי יגיד ומי ידבר ומי יספר את מעשי אדון

Patrick Skehan

3 אמרתי אני בנפשי (3)  
ההרימ לוא יעידו לו  
והגבעות לוא יגידו  
עלי העצימ את דברי  
4 והצואן את מעשי  
... מעשי אדון

S. Talmon

3 אמרתי אני בנפשי ההרימ לוא יעידו לו והנבעוח (4)  
לוא יגידו עלי העצימ את דברו והצואן ארן מעשו  
4 כי מי יגיד ומי ידבר ומי יספר את מעשו (5)

Rabinowitz

3 אמרתי אני בנפשי (3)  
ההרימ לוא יעידו לי  
והגבעות  
לוא יגידו עלי העצימ את דברי  
והצואן את מעשי  
כי מי יגיד  
ומי ידבר  
ומי יספר את מעשי

Frank Moore Cross

3 ההרים לוא יעידו לו והגבעות לוא יגידו עלו  
העצימ את דברו והצואן את מעשו  
4 כי מי יגיד ומי ידבר ומי יספר את מעשו

Per-Olof Hermansson

3 אמרתי אני בנפשי  
ההרימ לוא יעידו לי  
והגבעות לוא יגידו עלי  
והצואן את מעשי

4 כי מי יניד  
ומי יספר את מעשי  
ומי ידבר

The numbers in parenthesis are verse numbering of the scholars if they differ, my numbering is without parenthesis for the sake of comparison..