PISQAH BE’EMSA’ PASUQ AND 11QPs

SHEMARYAhu TALMON

I

In early 1962 J. A. Sanders published a preliminary report on a new scroll of psalms which had been discovered in Cave 11 at Qumran.¹ He followed up this announcement with two articles in which he published some extra-canonical compositions contained in that scroll.² It is to Sanders’ credit that he made available to us a complete edition of the scroll barely four years after its discovery, with facsimiles and transcriptions, an exhaustive introduction and commentary.³

The scroll is written in the square script by a skilled scribe. On the strength of epigraphic criteria, Sanders dates the manuscript in the Herodian period. After the unrolling of the Scroll there came to light, in their entirety or in part, thirty-three canonical psalms. Portions of four other psalms were discovered upon parchment fragments (A, B, C, D) found in the same cave. These obviously are from the same scroll but had been separated from it, probably already in antiquity. To these now can be added a fifth fragment (E) which contains Pss. 118 (incomplete), 104 and 107 (complete), and the opening lines of Ps. 105 which is continued on col. I of Sanders’ scroll. The new fragment is published in the present volume by Y. Yadin⁴ who tends to assign it a date at the beginning of the Christian era, which is about a century lower than that proposed by Sanders. However, this controversy in no way does affect the argument presented in this paper since both scholars date the MS at the end of the Second Temple period.

All the psalms that have been preserved are from the fourth and fifth books of the Psalter, the first being Ps. 93. They appear in an order which differs from that of the MT and the ancient VSS: 101–103,⁵ 109, 118, 104, 147,

² J. A. Sanders, “Ps. 151 in 11QPps”, ZAW 75 (1963) 73–86; id., “Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPps³”, ib. 76 (1964) 57–75.
³ J. A. Sanders, The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPps³), DJD IV (Oxford 1965).
⁴ Y. Yadin, “Another Fragment (E) of the Psalms Scroll From Qumran Cave 11 (11QPps³)” Textus 5 (1966) 1–10.
⁵ The last line of Frag. C II certainly represents Ps. 103:1, since Ps. 104 is contained in
105:1–12 (from the fragments), 105:25–45, 146, 148, 121–123, 124–127, 128–131, 132, 119, 135–136, 118, 145, 139, 137–138, 93, 141, 133, 144, 142–143, 149–150, 140, 134 (from the scroll). An apocryphal psalm (Ps. 151) which is not extant in the MT completes the series. Translations of this psalm are known from G and V in which it also concludes the Psalter. A Syriac translation of it is contained in the Ketābā de-Durrāsā by the Nestorian bishop Elija of Anbar (early tenth ctry.)

Scattered among the canonical psalms are eight compositions none of which is found in any of the textual traditions in which the Book of Psalms has been preserved. One of these interpolations of which only the final line is left (col. xxvii), appears to be a copy of the Last Words of David (2 Sam. 23). Another (col. xxi) seems to have its source in apocryphal literature such as the Wisdom of Ben-Sira (51:13–30). Two further extra-canonical psalms (cols. xviii, xxiv) until now had been known only in Syriac translation, again from Elija of Anbar’s work. In addition to these, four altogether new compositions are found in the Scroll.

The discussion of this important new discovery is bound to branch off into various fields of inquiry. The question of the relationship of 11QPs to the history of the Hebrew Bible text is certain to receive particular attention. Yet, already at this stage, I consider it safe to state that we are not at all concerned with a copy of the canonical Psalter, as both Sanders and Yadin appear to assume. The numerous non-canonical interpolations in the MS, a feature which distinguishes 11QPs from all other Psalter-texts found at Qumran, on Masada, and in Nahal Ḥever, even more than the unorthodox arrangement of the canonical psalms, clearly indicate that we are dealing with a collection of liturgical compositions which the sect used for its sacred service. The Scroll therefore will shed welcome light on the canon of prayer to which the Judaean Covenanters adhered, and which may have been similar to that adopted, by normative Jewry presumably somewhat later, during the period of the Second Temple.

Frag. E. Yadin correctly states: “Sanders’ cautious indication ‘103 (? 104)’ can now be eliminated” (ib., p. 5).

6 Sanders’ editio princeps of Ps. 151 already has been discussed by various scholars. The present author deals with the text of Ps. 151, and its literary genre in: יומריים ציונים אברכים פָּסָלהּ, תורב 35 (1966) 214–228.


9 In this definition of 11QPs, the author’s opinion fully concurs with the view put forward by M. Goshen-Gottstein in the present volume (pp. 22–33).

In fact, the description of 11QPs as a liturgical compilation readily explains the otherwise surprising inclusion in it of a prose piece (col. xxvii, 2–11) which states the exact number of poems which King David allegedly had composed. The author credits David with three thousand and six hundred psalms (המנת) and four hundred and fifty songs (המענה).

11 This latter category clearly represents a type of prayer-chant to be intoned before the altar (לשרר לחי והמועה) at the appointed times of sacrifice throughout the year. Their sum total of four hundred and fifty is broken down into three hundred and sixty-four for the daily ‘olat hat-tamid, fifty-two for the Sabbaths qorban, and thirty for the qorban of the New Moons, the festivals and the Day of Atonement. The remaining four songs — רישăm ליטא שלמה אברעג — appear to pertain to the ‘four leaders at the head of the months’ which are peculiar to the sectarian solar calendar, and have no standing in the normative Jewish lunar year. It is for this reason that their special prayers are enumerated separately from the preceding ones. The designation הממענה is derived from עננים ‘intercede’ (e.g. Gen. 23:8; Is. 47:3; 53:12; Jer. 36:20; Ruth 1:16; and especially Jer. 7:16; 27:18), and refers to an intercessory prayer. 13 The above itemized account of ordained prayers 14 is completely out of context in a copy of the canonical Book of Psalms, but it admirably fits a synagogue Psalter, an incipient prayer-book.

II

There is nothing intrinsically sectarian in the content or form of most of the extra-canonical compositions in 11QPs nor in their interpolation among

11 It follows that David exceeded Solomon as a poet since, according to the tradition embedded in MT 1 Ki. 5:12, Solomon wrote three thousand proverbs and one thousand and five songs, i.e. four thousand and five compositions in all. We may perhaps assume that this Biblical tradition was extant at Qumran in a textual variant that read: הָיוּ צְדָקֵי הַגַּבֵּהֶת instead of MT’s הָיוּ צְדָקֵי הַגַּבֵּהֶת which is supported by G’s mistranslation πνευματικὴ ὑματία. From this deviant reading, the Qumran author presumably could have derived the total of David’s songs, by simply equalizing it with that of Solomon’s.

12 In view of these numbers there can remain no doubt as to the identity of the Qumran calendar with that of Enoch and Jubilees. See: A. Jaubert, “Le Calendrier des Jubilés et de la Secte de Qumran”, VT 3 (1953) 250–264; S. Talmon, “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect From the Judean Desert”, Scripta Hierosolymitana 4 (1958) 162–199.

13 These songs hardly can be taken as incantations against demons, “music over the stricken”, as Sanders would have it (op. cit. 91–93), basing himself on the connotation of שֶׁפֶן in Rabbinic literature (Jer. Tal. Shabbat vi, 2 8b; Erubin x, 1 26c; Bab. Tal. Shebu’ot 16b; Mird. Tektillim to Ps. 91).

14 Cp. 1QS X, 1–8, and see my paper mentioned in note 9.
canonical psalms. Therefore the new scroll is bound to illuminate the process by which Biblical literature was interlaced with extra-Biblical compilations to meet the cultic needs not only of dissenting groups but also of normative Jewry in the time of the Second Temple. Viewed thus, the extra-canonical compositions in 11QPs, and foremost Ps. 151 and the opening lines of another psalm which follow upon it, may supply the basis for a fresh approach to a tributary problem in the transmission of the Bible text which has not yet been resolved, namely the question of the pisqah be’emsâ’ pasuq (henceforth: p.b.p.). The history of the research into this issue recently has been surveyed in an illuminating and amply documented article by P. Sandler which makes it unnecessary for us to present it here in detail.\textsuperscript{15}

In the discussion of the matter on hand scholars are divided into two camps. On the one hand we have the monists who posit one key-explanation only for all instances of the p.b.p. On the other hand there are the pluralists, in whose opinion the phenomenon is not of one cloth, and is assumed to fulfill diverse functions in the transmission of the MT. Another division of opinion concerns the very nature of the p.b.p. Some students would define it as a Massoretic note which is meant to draw attention to textual matters pure and proper. It is taken to reveal the Massoretes’ doubts about passages which, assumedly, in their opinion had suffered textual corruption, or in which words and even whole text units had been faultily omitted. Some of these missing components at times yet have been preserved for us in one of the VSS, above all in G.

As against this, other scholars insist on the integrity of the MT, and reject completely the very suggestion that the p.b.p. was meant to indicate textual flaws, not to speak of omissions of complete textual units in the MT which were still known to its early tradents. M. H. Segal, \textit{e.g.}, claims that the p.b.p. exclusively pertains to the external form of the text, “indicating the end of one section and the beginning of another”, and representing a text division which deviates from the system that underlies the main Massoretic tradition. Thus the p.b.p. gives evidence to a dispute between various schools of Massoretes with regard to the exact delineation of sections.\textsuperscript{16}

Segal’s argument is invalidated by the fact that to all appearances, the p.b.p. does not pertain to a system of sections but rather concerns the verse division. This is clearly indicated by those cases in which the word before the p.b.p. carries a double accent: the mid-sentence caesura 	extit{etnay}, and the sentence divider \textit{silluq}, as \textit{e.g.} in Gen. 35:22: \textit{יתלכ בראות Mayer שולא}; Ex. 20:14:


This doubling points to a fusion of two traditions, comparable to the practice of grafting the vowels of the Qeré upon the consonants of the Kethib. In the same manner one can explain the p.b.p. which appears in the middle of some other verses without a preceding double accent, as fulfilling the function of the sof pasuq, and as substituting for it, e.g. in 1 Sam. 4:1; 2 Sam. 7:4; 10:17; 16:13; 24:10, 23 etc. This contention is strengthened by five instances in the Aleppo Codex (A) in which we can still discern traces of the colon, the symbol by which the scribe customarily marks the end of a verse, in the space left blank to indicate a p.b.p. (2 Sam. 21:6; 24:10; 11:23; 1 Chron. 17:7). As against this, no consistent relationship between the p.b.p. and the parashah system can be established. The p.b.p. does not necessarily appear near the end of a parashah, indicating, as it were, a section-division which deviated from the norm. True, in many MSS the p.b.p. is marked by the letters ◣ and ◥. But this practice derived from the custom of so designating the end of a parashah, which itself is a late convention, and is not to be found in superior MSS, such as A. However, once the custom of placing the letters ◣ or ◥ between sections became prevalent, copyists, by force of habit, at times placed or rather misplaced these sigla also in the blank spaces indicating a p.b.p. although originally they do not belong there.

In attempting a clarification of the issue on hand, we are faced with the great difficulty that neither the location of the individual p.b.p. nor their sum total in the MT are in any way fixed in MSS or in the Massorah. Only a few examples have received general recognition. The Massorah Parva on Gen. 4:18 enumerates twenty-eight cases of p.b.p., while the M.P. to Gen. 32:22 expressly corrects this statement to set their number at thirty-one. M.H. Segal lists thirty certain instances: three in the Pentateuch (Gen. 35:22; Num. 27:1; Deut. 2:8); one each in Josh. (8:24); Jud. (2:1); 1Ki. (13:26); Ez. (3:17); and twenty-three in Samuel. A. Or includes in his exhaustive list “all cases on which we have any tradition of some value”. Combining the instances of a p.b.p. recorded in BH with additional information culled from Ginsburg’s edition, Or arrives at the sum total of seventy-two p.b.p., of which not less than forty are found in the Book of Samuel.

Since, as stated, the Massoretes obviously did not consolidate one clearly defined system of p.b.p. notations, it is best to base our discussion upon one authoritative MS. For this purpose the Aleppo Codex was chosen. An

17 In three cases the p.b.p. is not preceded by an 'etnah but by another pausal accent, zaqef qatan (2 Sam. 7:5; 2 Chr. 14:7) or rebis' (1 Chr. 17:7).
19 Or, ib., p. 37.
examination of A revealed forty-two or forty-three cases of p.b.p. However, in view of the fragmentary state of this MS, we cannot ascertain whether in it were marked the six occurrences of a p.b.p. which Or enumerates in the Pentateuch and the four of the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. This means that of the sixty-two cases which Or culled from the Biblical books that are yet preserved in A, as against twenty-seven in Segal’s list, A attests to forty-two (or forty-three), of which twenty-seven (or eight) are found in the Book of Samuel. Eighteen (or nineteen) occurrences listed by Or, one in the Book of Joshua, two in Judges, eleven (or twelve) in Samuel, and four in Chronicles, for certain are not represented in A.

On one point all students of the issue under review are agreed: The comparatively large percentage of p.b.p. in the Book of Samuel: some 15% according to Segal, almost 60% of Or’s list, about 64% in A, “despite the fact that the Book of Samuel only makes up approximately 1/13 (i.e. less than 8%) of the text of the Bible”, requires an explanation. It seems that the plethora of p.b.p. in the Book of Samuel, as is the case with the relatively large number of Qère and Kethib found in it, attests to the instability of the textual tradition of this book.

This instability further becomes apparent in the numerous deviations of the Greek text from the MT, and is now corroborated by fragments of the Book of Samuel from Qumran, whose text is closer to that of G than to the MT.

Attention also must be given to the puzzling uneven distribution of the p.b.p. over the various categories of Biblical literature. Not a single case of p.b.p. is found either in Wisdom literature or in the Psalms. In the list given by Or, only one p.b.p. occurs in legal literature, and even this is not included among the certain instances listed by Segal, Deut. 23:8: لا يَتَّخِذُونَ هُدَى الْمَأَشِيَّةِ [p.b.p.] ولا يَتَّخِذُونَ هُدَى الْمَأَشِيَّةِ وهذا. It results that the p.b.p. is found exclusively in a narrative context. The majority of p.b.p. is concentrated in the historiographical literature which is narrative by its very nature: twenty-six instances out of thirty according to Segal, thirty-seven (or eight) out of forty-two (or three) in A, and sixty out of seventy-two by Or’s count.

One must also examine the distribution of the p.b.p. by the criterion of chronology. All cases adduced by Segal occur in pre-exilic books, the latest

20 In 2 Sam. 17:13 it cannot be decided whether there is a blank space in the middle of the verse or not.
21 Or, op. cit., p. 30.
citation being Ez. 3:17. However, in Or’s fuller list there are found thirteen instances from post-exilic books (Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles). In A we find five occurrences in Chronicles. However, on closer examination the authenticity of most of these must be held in doubt since they either are noted only in isolated MSS, or else are suspect of having been inserted into the text of Chronicles in imitation of the parallel passages in the Former Prophets.\(^{24}\)

Only three of the four p.b.p. in post-exilic books hold their own: Ezra 2:19 = Neh. 7:71; Ezra 3:1; Neh. 11:4 = 2 Chron. 14:7 (?); 2 Chron. 34:27. One concludes per force that the p.b.p. is a phenomenon which originally pertains to the historiographical books of the Pent.: Gen., Ex., Num., and to the Former Prophets. The concentration of p.b.p. in the Book of Samuel, in particular in episodes connected with the life of David, accordingly cannot be satisfactorily explained as a mere matter of chance, but rather must be considered integral to the very nature and function of this Massoretic notation. Therefore, methodological considerations require us to base our discussion of the p.b.p. primarily upon the Book of Samuel, and to apply our findings subsequently to the other books of the Bible. It also should be clear from the preceding deliberations that the p.b.p. indeed is not of one cloth, but that it most probably fulfills more than one function of textual notation. It follows that the conclusions to be proffered do not necessarily apply to each and every occurrence of a p.b.p., but only to a certain definite type, or types.

Several scholars who have dealt with the problem of the p.b.p. explained it as being evidence of a textual deficiency at junctures so singled out, indicating the loss of supplementary text units. It is then held that these supplementary elements were omitted from the Bible text either unintentionally through the fault of scribes, or else were consciously removed by some early Massoretes who felt “that there are many things in the Scriptures which should not be revealed publicly... and who left for us, by way of tradition, a special symbol to indicate the omission, which is the p.b.p.”\(^{25}\) However this surmise is rather doubtful. Nearer the mark is the explanation offered by Chatzkes, which also is based upon the premise that the p.b.p. hints to the absence of text elements in places so marked, namely that it attests to “many secrets which remained in (extra-Biblical) scrolls, and for which the divinely inspired scribes found no room in the Holy Writ”.\(^{26}\) That is to say, the p.b.p. does not at all point to matters in the transmission of the text, to textual corruption or to any

\(^{24}\) In several cases the p.b.p. is noted in Chronicles, even when it is absent from the parallel passages in the Former Prophets, e.g. 2 Chr. 10:18 — 2 Ki. 12:18; 2 Chr. 34:27 — 2 Ki. 22:18.

\(^{25}\) D. Cahana, מסורה טיהו למקרא (Vienna 1882) 114.

\(^{26}\) M. A. Chatzkes, שמות התורה מסוף, Knesset Hagedolah vol. 2 (Warsaw 1847) 114.
omissions which might have occurred. Its basic purpose is entirely extra-textual, as Segal correctly stated. However, in our opinion, the p.b.p. does not indicate a parashah division which differs from the one that has taken root in the main stream of the Massoretic tradition, but rather alludes to literary expansions of the sections in question for liturgical and homiletic purposes. And indeed, the p.b.p. very often appears in a context in which the author obviously left many things untold, and the reader or expositor requires further information on facts, or on the reactions of the Biblical figures concerned.

We may divide the literary expansions which are the raison d'être of the p.b.p. into two main categories: (1) intra-Biblical, and (2) extra-Biblical supplements. From the point of view of their literary nature these supplements may be further classified as: (A) additional factual information derived from parallel accounts and formulated in the style and language of the sources; (B) poetical paraphrases in the style of the Psalms. Here are some examples of these categories:

(1A) The p.b.p. which appears in the Reuben-Bilhah episode as told in Gen. 35:22: [p.b.p.] according to our theory directs the reader’s attention to the additional information which is recorded in 1 Chron. 5:1 to the effect that in punishment of this transgression the rights of the first-born were divested from Reuben and transferred to Joseph: "וּמָנוּ רוֹמְאֵן בֶּנֶךָ שֶּׁאֶרְאָל כְּחֶםְוּ בִּכְהָלָלָל וְעַל דיֵי תַּתָּה בָּכֹרֵה לְבוֹם יִרְשָׁאֵל אַל לְחָתוֹס לְבָכֹרֵה".27

(1B) a. More often the p.b.p. aims at supplementary exhortations which are not of a historiographical nature but rather are poetical paraphrases on historical events, such as are found in the Book of Psalms. When revealing his desire to build a house for the God of Israel, David’s speech to Nathan ends with the words (2 Sam. 7:4): "וַיָּרֶד בְּבֵיתוֹ הָאָדָם, וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל נַעֲנֵה הָאָדָם הָאָדָם שֵּׁלָה לְדוּתִיתֵם עַל חָתוֹס לַכְּבֹרֵה כֹּל הָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁh...
b. In a like manner we may explain the p.b.p. which follows David’s words of remorse to Nathan after the Bat-Sheba incident: ‘אמר דוד מענתו עליה (2 Sam. 12:12), as calling our attention to Ps. 51: ממען ידה, הכוה אלי תנה עתה כהה, which contains a confession of sin, and a petition for forgiveness.

c. Similarly, the p.b.p. in 2 Sam. 16:13 יהלך דוד ואשתו בתו, probably is meant to remind the reader of Ps. 3: אמר דוד בכרות מפתי עבשלום. This p.b.p. is set in the story about Shim‘i ben Gera‘ who went out to curse the fugitive David, when he was pursued by Absalom. Such a situation appears to be reflected in the Psalmist’s words (v. 2): ‘ה מת רבי אם רבי קמי עליה. (2B) a. And now to Ps. 151. A detailed exegesis shows that by subject matter and language this psalm is intimately related to the story of David’s election by Samuel as told in 1 Sam. chap. 16. Actually, Ps. 151 can be defined as a paraphrastic expansion of 1 Sam. 16:7–13, in the style of an autobiographical ode. Now, in that narrative unit in the Book of Samuel we again have a p.b.p.: אמר שמעתי עליך שמלת וחקית כלא נבך צי אשה (12) רחשה ויריהו והא ואחרים עמי יושב ערה ושם ראי [p.b.p.] אמרือ ד. קם משתחו ירייה高清 והיאוה.

The p.b.p. severed the connection between the preparations for David’s anointing and the portrayal of his person from the description of the very act of his anointing by Samuel, giving David, as it were, a timely opening to praise his Creator, and the reader an opportunity to meditate upon the greatness of the Lord’s deeds. The p.b.p. here seems to serve a purpose which the Midrash ascribes to the division between sections: “What is the object of the section-divisions? To give Moses an opportunity for reflection between one parashah and another, and between one subject matter and another. Now, if one who hears God directly, and himself speaks by divine inspiration (Moses) must reflect between one parashah and another, and between different subject matters, how much more should an ordinary human being do so” (Sifra Wayiqa‘a I, a).

This pause for reflection between the section dealing with matters preceding David’s election and the one concerning his anointing, was seized upon by the author of Ps. 151.28

1 הלילית הלידים בן יש
2 קוס היית מץ אתי
3 עטרים מבני אה
4 משה ברוחה
5 יי ישע עותב
6 אבצנות ייי בכר
7 אסתרת לייב העיר

28 See note 6.
We surmise that to this or a similar composition, the p.b.p. in 1 Sam. 16: 13 draws the reader’s attention.

b. Adjoining Ps. 151 in 11QPs\(^a\) we find another piece of poetry (Ps. 151\(^a\)) of which only the opening lines are preserved:

1. תהלת בgłחא (לדריא晟שוחא אל suburban)
2. אא [שם] [ophobic] פלשמתי מתחי מגרעך ישראלי

The superscription and the beginning of this psalm show it to be a poetical paraphrase of David’s battle with Goliath. We tend to assume that to this composition or the like of it, alludes the p.b.p. which is recorded in 1 Sam. 17: 37: ראמר דוד ה’ אשמ התצלאלMid תור מתים תודב הוה יתוכל מרד הפוצות התו [p.b.p.]. This same p.b.p. possibly may be associated with two further extra-canonical psalms which, for the present, have been preserved in Syriac translation only.\(^{29}\) Their common theme is David’s rescue from the lion and the bear, and their composition again is attributed to David:

(Ps. 154) אמירה והוה הלדריא晟שוחא אל חתי דנה Draws את ארא אחלא התו (Ps. 155)

The juxtaposition of David’s anointment by Samuel (1 Sam. 16: 1–13) with the episode of his battle against Goliath (ib. 17: 1–54) in Psalms 151 and 151\(^a\) of 11QPs\(^a\), and the insertion of elements from Ps. 151\(^a\) into the Greek translation of Ps. 151, call for an explanation. In directly conjoining these two episodes, the poet skipped over an event in David’s life which in the basic Biblical account is interpolated between them, and which, rather surprisingly,

\(^{29}\) See note 7.

\(^{30}\) The graphic and/or phonetic similarity caused the poet, or the copyist, to substitute (א)ב for יב (יב) which the Bible employs in the basic story (1 Sam. 17: 34). Cp. M. Noth, op. cit., p. 22 note 2. The same interchange occurs in Ben Sira 47: 3, again in a context pertaining to David. There the Hebrew אדמו לידביס is rendered דרכא ב ידב in the Syriac translation. Further instances of a such substitution are found in Midrashic literature, e.g. in Gen. Rab. 99 (ed. Theodor-Albeck, p. 1273); ib. 77 (p. 1225); Lev. Rab. on Lev. 13: 5 (ed. Margulies, p. 288); Ber. Rabbati (ed. Albeck, p. 253).
he failed to use as a basis for a poetical elaboration and expolation. We refer to the story of the first encounter of David, the young musician, with King Saul whose soul was troubled by evil spirits (1 Sam. 16: 14–23). This passage is commonly held to be a parallel version of matters related in another and more suitable context. David's presentation to Saul as "cunning in playing, and a mighty man of valour, and a man of war, and prudent in speech, and a comely person" (ib. 5:18), clearly clashes with a subsequent story in which we are told that neither Saul nor Abner knew the youth who went to do battle with Goliath (ib. 17:55): "And when Saul saw David go forth against the Philistine, he said unto Abner, the captain of the host, Abner, whose son is this youth? And Abner said, As thy soul liveth, o King, I cannot tell. And the King said, Inquire thou whose son the stripling is".

The passing over the episode of David's playing before Saul, by the author of Ps. 151, even though this theme almost begs to be developed by him, yet achieves one important result: it smooths out the difficulties in the present arrangement of the Bible text. This same revised order by which David's anointing is followed immediately by the story of his battle against the defamer of Israel's armies appears to underly also Josephus Flavius' report of David's deeds, as given in his Antiquities of the Jews (6,165). After Samuel had anointed David, "He also exhorted him to be righteous and obedient to his commandments, for so would the kingship long continue to be his, and his house would become splendid and renowned; He would subdue the Philistine and ... he would in his lifetime attain glorious fame and bequeath it to his posterity". Only then does Josephus tell us that the divine spirit was taken from Saul and given to David, who was brought before Saul to calm his stormy spirit with his music (ib. 166–169). It seems to follow that in joining Ps. 151 which portrays David's anointing by Samuel, with Ps. 151a that extols David's victory over the Philistine, the author or the scribe of 11QPs a followed a Biblical text tradition which differed from the section arrangement preserved in the MT and in the ancient Versions of the Book of Samuel.

In concluding we wish to stress that there can be no doubt that the men who introduced the p.b.p. into the MT never considered the extraneous expansions to which they point as integral components of the Bible. They were intended to remain outside the authoritative canon, as some kind of appendices to the original Scripture version. It is this relationship of basic text and paraphrase, with the concomitant relationship of primary and supplementary, which causes that the p.b.p., as a notation alluding to literary expansion, should be prevalent especially in the OT books that originated in the First Temple Period, namely the historiographies which head the Canon, the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets.