NEW IDIOMS WITHIN OLD

POETRY AND PARALLELISM IN
THE NON-MASORETIC POEMS OF 11Q5(=11QPS^A)

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature

Early Judaism and Its Literature

Judith H. Newman,
Series Editor

Number 31

NEW IDIOMS WITHIN OLD

Poetry and Parallelism in
the Non-Masoretic Poems of 11Q5(=11QPsᴬ)

NEW IDIOMS WITHIN OLD

POETRY AND PARALLELISM IN THE NON-MASORETIC POEMS OF 11Q5(=11QPs[a])

Eric D. Reymond

NEW IDIOMS WITHIN OLD

POETRY AND PARALLELISM IN

THE NON-MASORETIC POEMS OF 11Q5(=11QPsᴬ)

∞

For Robin

פיה פתחה בחכמה
ותורת־חסד על־לשונה

Her mouth she opens with wisdom,
and kind teaching (is) upon her tongue.
—Proverbs 31:26

Contents

Acknowledgments

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *Hebrew Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906.
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
*BHS*³	Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1987.
Bib	*Biblica*
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DCH	Clines, D. J. H. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 6 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993–2007.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DNWSI	Hoftijzer, J., and K. Jongeling. *Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1995
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
DSSSE	*The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, 1998.
ErIsr	*Eretz Israel*
EstBib	*Estudios bíblicos*
GKC	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1910.
HALOT	Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by M. E. J. Richardson. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.

HAR	*Hebrew Annual Review*
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
Jastrow	Jastrow, M. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature.* 2nd ed. 2 vols. New York: Pardes, 1903.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JSSSup	Journal of Semitic Studies Supplements
JTS n.s.	*Journal of Theological Studies, new series*
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OLA	Orientalia lovaniensia analecta
OTL	Old Testament Library
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
OTP	*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985.
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RBL	*Review of Biblical Literature*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RSO	*Revista degli studi orientali*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
Sem	*Semitica*
SSN	Studia semitica neerlandica
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAH	*Zeitschrift für die Althebräistik*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Introduction and Preliminary Matters

The present study grows out of my continued interest in the poetry of the postbiblical era, when the idioms and language inherited from the Bible still influenced writers but were being altered and changed by them. This study of the seven non-Masoretic poems preserved in the Dead Sea Scroll labeled 11QPsalms[a] or, more tersely, 11Q5, attempts to identify the characteristics of these poems, especially the linguistic and literary idioms and structures that might reveal a common poetic strategy or underlying theology. Often it is the case that the non-Masoretic poems contain phrases adapted from biblical passages, sometimes almost word for word from the Bible, but many times these phrases have new meanings and significances in their new contexts. These subtle variations represent not only the flexibility of Scripture and its interpretation during the Second Temple period but also the creative and poetic imagination of Hebrew writers who, coming after the majority of the Bible had been written, had to express new ideas while still affirming the relevance and truth of the Scripture they had inherited. The interest of these poems for contemporary readers is, in large measure, due to their place in history at the dawn of what would become early Judaism and Christianity. But the poems are of interest also because of their imaginative use of received texts; their creative adaptation of biblical themes, metaphors, and language; and, especially, their unique structures and ideas.

The analysis of the poetic structures and language of these seven poems seeks not only to illuminate these structures but also to investigate the poems' individual meanings and integrity. Many of the poems have inspired varying interpretations from critics in the past; a careful study of each poem helps to resolve some of the points of contention revealed in these different interpretations. Furthermore, portions of the poems, especially Pss 151A, 154, and 155, have often been viewed as later interpolations; the present analysis of their poetic structure reveals that, if a later editor did interpolate certain verses, this was always done with an eye to mimicking the existing structure of the poem. This suggests a degree of sensitivity on the part of the later author/editor and also that the patterns revealed in this study were perceived also by the poems' early readers.

The Scroll

The scroll in which the seven poems of this study are found was discovered in 1956 and was first published by James A. Sanders as the fourth volume of the series Discoveries in the Judaean Desert.[1] This edition of the scroll was followed a few years after its publication by another, more popular edition of the same scroll, called *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*.[2] Although it largely reproduces the text, translation, and comments in the DJD edition, some alterations were made. In the years following, Sanders also published some independent studies of individual poems and eventually also collaborated with James H. Charlesworth to produce another translation of some of the poems in the two-volume collection *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by Charlesworth and published in 1983–1985.[3] Approximately twenty years later, these two scholars were assisted by H. W. L. Rietz, in their publication of the "Non-Masoretic Psalms" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations,* vol. 4A, *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*, part of the series The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project.[4] In both of these later publications, Sanders's original translations and interpretations are usually preserved. However, slight changes have been made, and these are, when relevant, noted in my exegesis. In these various publications, Sanders has usually offered succinct and very helpful comments on individual verses, and often very short descriptions and evaluations of whole poems. My presentation and reading of the Hebrew text of the poems usually follow those of Sanders in his various publications, though I do sometimes offer new ways of organizing the text, especially as pertains to specific lines and verses. In order to facilitate comparison between my work and the more widely available editions of Sanders, I follow whenever possible the verse numbers used by Sanders, even when my lineation of the poem differs from his. This sometimes results in some unexpected verse numbers, but these are far less inconvenient than introducing a new set of verse numbers. My translation and interpretation of verses and poems regularly differ from that of Sanders. My explanation of expressions, metaphors, and the literary structure

---

1. James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPsᵃ)* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965).

2. James A. Sanders, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1967).

3. James H. Charlesworth and James A. Sanders, "More Psalms of David," *OTP* 2:609–24.

4. For this edition, Sanders's translation was used, while Charlesworth and Rietz worked on the Hebrew text and its presentation. James A. Sanders, with James H. Charlesworth and H. W. L. Rietz, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations,* vol. 4A, *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (ed. James H. Charlesworth et al.; The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 155–215.

of the poems, as well as the underlying themes of the individual works, goes far beyond anything in these previous editions of the scroll.

The scroll contains, in addition to the seven poems studied here, versions of the biblical psalms, specifically portions of the following: Pss 93, 101–5, 109, 118, 119, 121–50, and 2 Sam 23:1–7 ("The Last Words of David").[5] In addition to these poetic texts, the scroll also preserves a prose description of David's literary production, a text that is titled, according to Sanders, "David's Compositions." The following translation is my own.

<div dir="rtl">

ויהי דויד בן ישי חכם ואור כאור השמש וסופר

ונבון ותמים בכול דרכיו לפני אל ואנשים ויתן

לו יהוה רוח נבונה ואורה ויכתוב תהלים

שלושת אלפים ושש מאות ושיר לשורר לפני המזבח על עולת

התמיד לכול יום ויום לכול ימי השנה ארבעה וששים ושלוש

מאות ולקורבן השבתות שנים וחמשים שיר ולקורבן ראשי

החודשים ולכול ימי המועדות ולי<ו>ם הכפורים שלושים שיר

ויהי כול השיר אשר דבר ששה וארבעים וארבע מאות ושיר

לנגן על הפגועים ארבעה ויהי הכול ארבעת אלפים וחמשים

כול אלה דבר בנבואה אשר נתן לו מלפני העליון6.

</div>

Now David, son of Jesse, was a wise man, a light like the light of the sun, and a scribe, discerning and perfect in all his ways before God and humans. The Lord gave him a discerning and enlightened spirit and he wrote 3,600 psalms (in addition to) songs for singing before the altar, over the perpetual whole burnt-offerings, for each day, for all the days of the year, 364; for the offering of the Sabbaths, 52 songs; for the offering of the New Moons, the festivals, and the Day of Atonement, 30 songs. All the songs he spoke were 446, (in addition to) songs for playing over the afflicted, 4. All (together their number) was 4,050. All these he spoke through prophecy, which was given to him before the Most High.

The text holds interest for scholars for several reasons: First, it suggests that the entire scroll and its contents were thought, at least by the author of the above text, to be the work of David; second, it implies that the author was following a solar calendar of 364 days; third, it reflects the fact that poetic composition was thought to emerge "through prophecy" (בנבואה), and ultimately to derive from God. This idea, that poetry derives from God, is expressed in some biblical texts, for example, Ps 40:4, but is more frequent among postbiblical writings such as the

---

5. For a convenient summary of the contents of this scroll, as well as all the other Psalms scrolls, see Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STJD 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 255–64 (Appendix 4).

6. Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 214. For more on this text, one can consult James C. VanderKam, "Studies on 'David's Compositions' (11QPsᵃ 27:2–11)," *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 212*–220*.

Hodayot (1QH[a] IX, 29–33) and the *Odes of Solomon*, and is even implicit in some of the texts studied here. The above passage also implies that the creation of literary texts had an oral and written component; David writes (כתב) the psalms and songs and also speaks them (דבר), or, as Sanders translates, "composes" them. This perhaps has significance for the history of poetic production, which is often assumed to be (in the ancient world) not a written activity. It may be that the association of these two acts results from the process employed by scribes who created poems through writing.

The scroll is dated, based on its Herodian script, to "the first half of the first century C.E."[7] Some of the non-Masoretic poems within it, however, are found in other scrolls, with scripts from earlier periods of time. For example, the "Apostrophe to Zion" is found also in 4Q88, which is dated, based again on script, to the first century B.C.E., as is 4Q448, which attests a portion of Ps 154. Peter W. Flint has argued that, although the scroll might have been copied at Qumran by those who wrote other texts such as the *Community Rule,* the collection of psalms (and even the prose composition) probably has its origins in a larger group who believed in a 364-day calendar, like those from whose midst *Enoch* and *Jubilees* emerged.[8] As for the dates of the specific poems themselves, usually scholars state a general time period: the Persian and Hellenistic periods. In fact, Robert Polzin studied the language of most of the psalms and suggested a date in the late Persian or Hellenistic periods.[9] Certainly, given the presence of what I will argue is a portion of the Wisdom of Ben Sira, or Sirach, among these poems, this dating seems reasonable.

A particular problem that impedes the understanding of several words and verses is the similarity throughout the scroll of *wāw*s and *yôd*s. Sanders has commented on this similarity, writing "*waw* and *yod* are distinguished in the scribe's mind, not always by his pen."[10] In addition, the scroll is not written stichometrically, and, therefore, where verses and cola divide is not exactly clear. In several

---

7. Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 156.

8. Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 201. By contrast, Sanders poses the possibility that the scroll originated outside the community and was brought there by an initiate ("Psalm 154 Revisited," in *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel: Für Norbert Lohfink, S.J.* [ed. Georg Braulik, Walter Gross, and Sean McEvenue; Freiburg: Herder, 1993], 301). Writing specifically in relation to Psalm 154, Sanders addresses the issue of the provenience of the entire scroll: "the evidence cannot prove that the Psalm was composed at Qumran. . . . The Psalm may predate the exodus from the Temple to Qumran" ("Non-Masoretic Poems," 156).

9. Robert Polzin, "Notes on the Dating of the Non-Massoretic Psalms of 11QPs[a]," *HTR* 60 (1967): 475.

10. Sanders, DJD 4:7. He notes that a distinction between *wāw* and *yôd* is especially not noticeable in ligatured forms (ibid., 7). He also notes that of the 135 times that the two letters occur side by side, the *yôd* is shorter in 109 instances, longer in nine instances, and the same length in seventeen (ibid., 9). The orthography of the scroll is characterized by Emanuel Tov as of the same kind as that found in 1QH[a] and 1QIsa[a], among others (E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 108-109).

poems, the division of the text into verses and cola presents significant problems and is a matter of debate among scholars. In general, I assume that each colon of a verse is approximately the same length as that of its mate(s). That said, sometimes one verse (or, bicolon) is substantially longer than the next. (The consistent length of cola within individual verses and the occasional discrepancy in line length between separate verses are two characteristics common to the non-Masoretic material in 11Q5.)

The scroll has been studied many times over the years, especially as a single entity, reflecting, according to different interpretations, the lack of canonization in the book of Psalms before the Common Era or a liturgical selection of the already canonical Masoretic psalms, with some additions.[11] Although the present study does not address these larger concerns in relation to 11Q5, it is important to note that some of the theological ideas and some of the language expressed in the seven non-Masoretic poems do have precedents in the biblical psalms preserved in 11Q5.

Preceding Studies of Individual Poems

The study of the individual non-Masoretic poems in 11Q5, as well as their literary structure, has itself been done in a piecemeal fashion by numerous scholars, including Jean Magne, Jean Carmignac, and especially Pierre Auffret.[12] This latter scholar especially has contributed to our understanding of the complexity of individual poems' structures, especially Pss 151A, 154, and 155. Characteristic of his method, Auffret has separately analyzed the psalms and illustrated in depth the structure of individual verses, groups of verses, and poems. All the same, Auffret's analyses have not exhausted what can be said about these poems' structures, and, his literary criticism is not without its own problems. For example, his analysis of structure, although careful and insightful, does not always take into account a reader's perceptibility, that is, how a reader would approach a text.

---

11. For a summary of the various theories about this scroll up to the mid-1990s, see Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 202–27; more recent assessments include those by Ulrich Dahmen, who holds that the messianic David is "*der entscheidende Träger und Inhalt der Komposition*" (*Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur, und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPsᵃ aus Qumran* [STDJ 49; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 317).

12. Jean Magne, "Orphisme, pythagorisme, essénisme dans le texte hébreu du Psaume 151?" *RevQ* 8 (1975): 508–45; idem, "Le Psaume 154," *RevQ* 9 (1977): 95–102; idem, "Le Psaume 155," *RevQ* 9 (1977): 103–11; Jean Carmignac, "La Forme poétique du Psaume 151 de la grotte 11," *RevQ* 4 (1963): 371–78; idem, "Précisions sur la forme poétique du Psaume 151," *RevQ* 5 (1965): 249–52; idem, "Nouvelles Précisions sur le Psaume 151," *RevQ* 8 (1975): 593–97; Pierre Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151 de la grotte 11 de Qumran," *RevQ* 8 (1977): 163–89; idem, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 154 de la grotte 11 de Qumran," *RevQ* 9 (1978): 513–45; idem, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155 de la Grotte 11 de Qumran," *RevQ* 9 (1978): 323–56; idem, "Structure littérarie de l'hymn à Sion de 11QPsᵃ XXII, 1-15," *RevQ* 10 (1980): 203–11.

Often, the correspondences between words or structures in a poem are so subtle it is hard to believe any reader would have perceived them or that they would have affected the reading of a text in a significant way. Furthermore, no scholar has attempted a description of the structure of all the non-Masoretic psalms as a group. Thus, for example, Auffret's studies appear in various issues of the journal *Revue de Qumran,* but they do not link together to suggest any commonalities shared among these poems' structures, or to suggest what they reveal about the development of Hebrew poetry. Much the same is the work done by other scholars from the 1960s to the present day. As will become apparent in the individual chapters of this study, although other scholars have addressed these same poems, their observations and comments still leave some room for improvements. Often I have found that, although a poem has been analyzed by several different scholars, the significance of the poem, that is, its theological and/or structural innovations, have not been commented on in detail. Thus, although the present study goes over ground already covered in the past, it offers fresh insights that will, I hope, prove useful to other readers in the future.

Goals of the Present Study

The goals of this study can be broken down into two general categories: a better understanding of the interpretation and structure of the individual poems; and a better understanding of the development of Hebrew poetry in the later part of the Second Temple period. Specific questions and points of interest addressed in relation to each poem include the following:

Sirach 51:13–33. Questions surround two main points of the poem: first, the authorship of the text (whether Ben Sira actually wrote it, or whether it was composed by another writer), and, second, the poem's vocabulary (whether or not it should be construed as sexual or erotic). Both questions pertain to the poem's form, since the typical structure of Sirach poetry has been studied in the past and reveals a relatively consistent basis for comparison.

Psalm 151A. The poem reveals a number of interpretational difficulties, concentrated at the poem's center. These include the simple problem of distinguishing *wāw* from *yôd*, and more complex issues like the question of the authenticity of vv. 3–4, and whether these verses complement or detract from the poem's theme.

Psalm 154. A shorter version of this same text is preserved in another scroll, 4Q448. The question is whether this poem began as a shorter text and was later expanded, or whether it began longer and was whittled down to the form it has in 4Q448. Although an answer to this question remains elusive, something can be said about the way these verses fit into the structure and the larger theme of the poem as a whole, and whether or not they contribute to the text's coherency.

Psalm 155. The poem presents difficulties in terms of its basic lineation, that is, its division into bicola or verses, as well as questions of its integrity. Many

scholars who have treated this poem in the past view it as containing significant interpolations, if not, in fact, being the result of a combination of two originally independent works.

Apostrophe to Zion. The poem's interpretation offers fewer points of contention than the preceding, but it is of interest owing to the curious address of Zion in language more typical of that used to address God. The poem is often assumed to express rather generic ideas about Zion, though the present analysis questions these assumptions by revealing a way that Zion is reconceptualized in the text.

Plea for Deliverance. The poem's beginning and ending are lost. As with the preceding poem, there is less scholarly debate about this text's interpretation. Scholars have noticed parallels to apotropaic prayers in other Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as parallels to passages from the Bible. One of the questions the present study attempts to address is the function of these allusions within the poem.

Hymn to the Creator. The shortest of the texts studied, this poem (even more than the preceding two compositions) relies heavily on biblical language. Nevertheless, some question surrounds the perceptibility of these allusions and their significance for the hymn itself and the ideas it seeks to communicate. Specifically, the analysis presented below investigates the connection between this text and Isaiah 6.

In the present study, I also looks at these poems for what they reveal about the poetry of the latter part of the Second Temple period and attempt to assess how the structure of each poem (especially the deployment of parallelism) relates to that of the other non-Masoretic poems of 11Q5. In addition, I compare these structures to those of texts from the Bible and Sirach. As part of this analysis, I explore the manner in which biblical texts and motifs are adopted and alluded to in these poems. Finally, I examine the new theological ideas expressed in the poems, especially those that are complemented by the structures and literary peculiarities of the texts.

Presentation and Analysis of the Poems

Each chapter begins with an introduction to the interpretational difficulties presented by a single poem. Next, the text is presented together with a chart detailing, in summary fashion, its parallelistic structures. A translation follows that is, in turn, followed by philological notes; then an explanation of the poem's theme and how this relates to its structure; and finally a summary of the poem's line length, its most significant parallelistic patterns, and its allusions to or echoes of Scripture.

I present the poems according to their (hypothetical) verse divisions. Determination of verses and cola is based primarily on the sense of individual sentences and clauses, but also on the assumption that cola of a verse have approximately the same length. The verse and colon division of the text is explained in the philo-

logical analysis and usually also takes into account the larger message and struc-
ture of the individual poem.

The philological analysis usually addresses each verse individually. Occa-
sionally, however, in order to make my argument more coherent, I have intro-
duced separate sections that treat specific blocks of texts or exegetical problems.
The explanation of individual words and phrases seeks to make the translation of
the poem sensible for the subsequent poetic and thematic analysis.

Analysis of Line Length

As is commonly observed, ancient Hebrew poetry does not contain a recogniz-
able meter.[13] Nevertheless, the verses reflect an approximate consistency in their
length, from colon to colon (or, half-line to half-line). There is greater inconsis-
tency, however, from one verse to the next. How do we measure such (in)consis-
tency? Various methods have been proposed, and in my analysis I try an eclectic
mix, counting the number of consonants (including *matres lectiones*), syllables,
and words (not including particles) for every colon.[14] However, such evaluation
must remain approximate not only because of the very imprecise nature of the
measurements but also because of the hypothetical division of the text into verses
and cola, the reconstructed and hypothetical words, and the uncertainty pertain-
ing to the pronunciation of the words themselves, an uncertainty engendered by,
among other things, the non-Masoretic orthography (e.g., Sir 51:13: אדורשנה).[15]

---

13. See, e.g., David L. Petersen and Kent H. Richards, *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry* (Guides
to Biblical Scholarship, Old Testament Series; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 42.

14. The specific method I employ is based on the model of Dennis Pardee, though similar
methods have been applied to Hebrew and Ugaritic by other scholars. Pardee has used a vari-
ety of methods in a series of publications for analyzing line length (*Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic
Parallelism: A Trial Cut ('nt and Proverbs 2* [VTSup 39; Leiden: Brill, 1988]; idem, "Struc-
ture and Meaning in Hebrew Poetry: The Example of Psalm 23," *Maarav* 5–6 [1990]: 239–80).
Oswald Loretz applied the counting of syllables to Hebrew and Ugaritic poems ("Die Analyse
der ugaritischen und hebräischen Poesie mittels Stichometrie und Konsonantenzählung," *UF*
7 [1975]: 265–69; see also Oswald Loretz and Ingo Kottsieper, *Colometry in Ugaritic and Bibli-
cal Poetry* [Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur 5; Altenberge, Germany: CIS, 1987], 26). David Noel
Freedman uses syllable counting ("Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy," *JBL* 96 [1977]: 5–26). One
obvious problem of counting syllables here is that the vocalization for this dialect of Hebrew
is not known. The counting of syllables offers only a relative way of measuring approximate
line length.

15. As a matter of convention, I will follow the Masoretic vocalization method, including
for the tetragrammaton, for which the pronunciation of אדוני is presumed. This pronunciation
for the tetragrammaton is conjectural, but is encouraged by the fact that some Dead Sea Scrolls
(including 11Q5) have אדוני where the MT has יהוה, while other scrolls have יהוה where MT
has אדוני. For this observation, see Martin Rösel, "Names of God," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead
Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford
University Press, 2000), 2:601; see also Hartmut Stegemann, "Religionsgeschichtliche Erwä-
gungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten," in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie*

Analysis of Parallelism

Many individual studies of Hebrew poetry seem to make the mistake of asserting that the kind of poetic analysis offered in them provides a better key to understanding the poetry than any other kind of analysis. Often, it seems to me, a scholar will insinuate that the method she or he adopts is more true to the original poetry, reveals the mastery of the poems, the true structure and inherent beauty of the poems, more so than any other kind of analysis done by others. I am more cautious as to the method I use. The kind of poetic analysis applied to the poems in this study is only one among several ways of describing the poetry written in ancient Hebrew. My preference for this kind of analysis is based on its orientation toward description. It does not create a system of prosody that is consistent throughout postbiblical Hebrew poetry, or biblical poetry. It is my impression that the study of the poetry of the Bible and that of later texts, at least that which is written in Hebrew, does not benefit from the superimposition of a system onto it. Authors of biblical and postbiblical Hebrew books preferred, apparently, certain structures, but there are no clear rules that they follow consistently. Any treatment of biblical or postbiblical poetry that attempts to form prescriptive rules for what should constitute a verse, a strophe, or a stanza will recognize the many inconsistencies that such a prescriptive method produces, will force the poetry to fit their schemes through many emendations, or will simply sweep inconsistencies under the rug and pretend they do not exist. Furthermore, my study of these poems is not an attempt to demonstrate the brilliant artistry of these poems or the masterly skill of their poets.[16] I will attempt to demonstrate the way that the poems can be read as coherent, meaningful units, despite the possibility of some verses being interpolations. The method of analysis employed in this study is useful also because it does not depend on classifications and jargon borrowed from ancient Greek or Latin poetry; such jargon often impedes the efficient description of poetic structures and sometimes implies a

---

et son milieu (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, 1978), 195–217 (esp. 204); and Patrick W. Skehan, "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada-Scroll, and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980): 14–44.

16. Such claims are made, for example, not only by early- and mid-twentieth-century scholars, but also by contemporary scholars such as Jan P. Fokkelman, who says, for example, "the Hebrew poet is a master of proportions. At every position in the poem, and at every level—whether we are dealing with sounds and words, or whether we are looking at half-verses or verses, strophes or stanzas—he always adapts himself to the proper dimensions of his material" (*Reading Biblical Poetry: An Introductory Guide* [trans. Ineke Smit; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001], 12). At the very least, such statements do not take into account the work of editors and scribes across the ages, whose work either complements the original writer's ideas or sabotages them, intentionally or accidentally.

connection between ancient classical forms and the devices and structures found in Hebrew poems.

The manner in which parallelism is identified in the present study follows the methodology of a number of biblical and Near Eastern scholars, including Adele Berlin and Dennis Pardee.[17] In the work of these scholars, parallelism is broken down into different types and distributions based on linguistic criteria. This manner of categorization, be it noted, does not presume to identify the effects of these structures; it simply aims at a descriptive analysis of the parallelistic patterns. There are four types of parallelism and an equal number of distributions. The types include repetitive, grammatical, semantic, and phonetic and occur within a colon, between cola of a verse (i.e., a bicolon or tricolon), between adjacent verses, or between verses separated by one or more verses. Repetitive parallelism comprises essentially the repetition of a particular root. Semantic parallelism between individual words must be distinguished from semantic parallelism between whole phrases or idioms. Semantic parallelism in the narrower sense encompasses a range of different relationships between words, including synonymous or antonymous relationships and part–whole/whole–part relationships.[18] It is this narrower form of semantic parallelism that will be described in the poetic analysis. Grammatical parallelism has two components: syntactic and morphological. But, in the present study, more attention will be paid to the patterns created by the repetition of major syntactic units (subject, nominal predicate, finite verb, modifier phrase, object); grammatical parallelism will exist if two or more units occur in the same order (or in a chiastic pattern within a bounded unit).[19] Phonetic parallelism usually involves the repetition of consonants, especially a given set of consonants; although the repetition of vowels was also a significant feature of this poetry, its identification is partially inhibited by the difficulties of the text's representation (with limited and sometimes unexpected use of *matres lectiones*).

Of course, no single poem contains just one type of parallelism or one distribution; there is a tremendous amount of overlap and complexity. Listing all of these types and distributions, although helpful for the critic involved in this study, will quickly exhaust the reader unfamiliar or only partially familiar with this methodology. The linguistic approach to parallelism, nevertheless, is helpful

---

17. See Adele Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985); and Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism*; idem, "Structure and Meaning in Hebrew Poetry," 239–80; idem, "Acrostics and Parallelism: the Parallelistic Structure of Psalm 111," *Maarav* 8 (1992): 117–38. The importance of distinguishing between type and proximity is emphasized by Pardee (*Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism*, 7 n. 13).

18. For more on the variety of relationships between words in terms of semantics, one may consult, e.g., John Lyons, *Semantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 270–335.

19. In addition, I will notice, where relevant, the morphological similarities and dissimilarities between words.

in enabling critics to speak more precisely about certain structures that are significant to certain poems or passages. In the pages that follow I will limit myself to describing the most significant and striking examples of parallelism, though the reader should be cognizant that the analysis is not exhaustive.

To make the precise nature of the taxonomy of parallelism clearer, I offer some examples of the different types and distributions. Repetitive parallelism between verses separated by a verse or more is found with the root נער in Sir 51:13–15:

ובקשתיה	בטרם תעיתי	אני נער
ועד סופה אדורשנה	באה לי בתרה
ענבים ישמחו לב	גם גרע נץ בבשול
כי מנעורי ידעתיה	דרכה רגלי במישור

(When) I (was) a **boy**,
    before I had wandered around,
    I sought her.
She came to me in her beauty,
    and until the end I will (continue to) seek her.
While the blossom withers in the ripening,
    grapes gladden (the) heart.
My foot treads a flat plain
    for from my **youth** I knew her.

It will be noticed that repetitive parallelism depends on a word's root, not on specific words, morphological forms, or syntactic functions.

Semantic parallelism between adjacent verses is found between Sir 51:15c-d and 16:

כי מנעורי ידעתיה	דרכה רגלי במישור
והרבה מצאתי לקח	הטיתי כמעט אוזני

My foot treads a flat plain
    for from my youth I **knew** her.
I stretched my ear a little
    and much **learning** did I find.

Here again, the relationship between the words is not connected to their morphological forms or syntactic functions; the parallelism between them is based on the fact that both words are connected with knowledge. The kinds of semantic relationships between words are quite complex and are not limited to words (or roots) with similar meanings; notice the antonymic relationship between מעט and הרבה in v. 16 (in this case it is a semantic parallel between cola of a verse).

Grammatical parallelism between cola of a verse is found in v. 14, cited

above, which follows a chiastic pattern: Finite Verb + Modifier Phrase + Modifier Phrase // Modifier Phrase + Finite Verb.

Phonetic parallelism, for the present study, will be associated especially with the repetition of consonants. For this reason, usually (but not always) phonetic parallelism is a feature connected with the repetition of a root or word. It is found, for example, in the repetition of *dālet*s and *rêš*s in the third verse of the Apostrophe to Zion:

<div dir="rtl">

דור ודור ידורו בך

</div>

Generation after generation will dwell in you.

The above examples also suggest the relative boundaries of perceptibility for each of these types of parallelism. In other words, the repetition of a word or root (since it often duplicates not only semantics but also morphology and sound) is the easiest for a reader to perceive, even across a couple of verses. Semantic and grammatical parallelisms seem to operate most perceptibly between adjacent verses and within individual verses. Phonetic parallelism is easiest to perceive within a colon or bicolon, occasionally beyond the verse boundary. Recognition of these limits is important since it offers a control to the too gross assertion of supposed connections within a poem.[20]

In the analyses that follow, beside each transcribed verse of poetry is a summarized chart of the relevant grammatical and repetitive/semantic parallels for that verse. As an example, here are verses Sir 51:24–28:

24	[ונפשכם צמאה מאד]	[עד מתי תחסרו מאילו]	MVM//SVM	ab//cde
25	[קנו לכם בלוא כסף]	[פתחתי פי ודברתי בה]	VOVM//VMM	a$^{(x+y)}$a'//cd
26a-b	[ותשא נפשכם משה]	[צואריכם הביאו בעלה]	OVM//VSO	abc//ded
26c-c'	[ונותן נפשו מצא אתה]	[קרובה היא למבקשיה]	PSM//S$^{2(V+O)}$V	abc//def
27	[ראו בעיניכם] [כי מעט עמלתי]	[ומצאתי הרבה]	VM//MV//VM	ab//cd//ef$^{(\neq c)}$
28	[וכסף וזהב תקנה בה]	[שמעו מוסר כמעט]	VOM// O^{2}VM	abc//dd'e

The grammatical analysis describes the syntactic relationship between words of a single verse wherein M = modifier phrase, O = object, P = nominal predicate, S = subject, V = verb.[21] The superscript indication in S$^{2(V+O)}$ of v. 26c-c' indicates that the subject is made up of two words, one of which has a verbal function, the other of which is an object. A superscript indication, e.g., O^2, can also indicate that a

---

20. For criticisms, e.g., of the excesses of Roman Jakobson's observations on structure in terms of their lack of perceptibility, one may consult Paul Werth, "Roman Jakobson's Verbal Analysis of Poetry," *Journal of Linguistics* 12 (1976): 21–73.

21. Terence Collins was the first to employ this kind of analysis (*Line Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A Grammatical Approach to the Stylistic Study of the Hebrew Prophets* [Studia Pohl, Series Maior 7; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978]).

given syntactic element contains two nouns in construct, in coordination, or in apposition. The semantic analysis takes account of semantic parallelism between words of a single verse, including independent pronouns, but not including other particles or prepositions. The same letter repeated represents repetitive parallelism, the same letter with an apostrophe marks semantic parallelism. The superscript (x+y) in v. 25 indicates that the letter "a" represents two words, in this case פתח and פה, which together are semantically similar to דבר. In other contexts, a superscript (x+y) is sometimes used to indicate elements of a construct chain when that construct chain as a whole is parallel to another single word in the verse, though neither word in the chain individually is semantically close to this word. In most cases, however, a construct relationship between words is indicated in the semantic analysis through a "+"; e.g., "a+b" would indicate that the first two words of a verse constituted a construct chain. Finally, antonymic relationships between words are indicated in a superscript parenthetical ≠, as in v. 27. This summarized kind of semantic analysis cannot, of course, reflect the numerous subtleties between all words. So, for example, the semantic analysis for v. 24 does not represent the weak semantic connection between חסר ("lacking") and צמא ("thirsting").

Strophes and Stanzas

In recent years the analysis of larger units of text, their division into units called strophes and stanzas, has become more and more popular.[22] Although I recognize the importance of locating and identifying larger units within a poem, this cannot be done with the kind of exactness that is often claimed. Furthermore, I do not deny that there is a hierarchy of units within a single poem; that is, I accept the concept that a poem might be divided into two larger units and within each large unit there might be smaller subdivisions, perhaps each subdivision containing several verses. However, there is no sure method for determining where such units begin and end. Jan P. Fokkelman, who has worked on identifying strophes and stanzas in Hebrew poetry, suggests a series of criteria that provide the "inter-

---

22. See Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor, eds., *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTSup 74; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988); Pieter van der Lugt, *Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job* (*OtSt* 32; Leiden: Brill, 1995); Jan P. Fokkelman, *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible: At the Interface of Hermeneutics and Structural Analysis* (4 vols.; SSN 37, 41, 43, 47; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2004), vol. 1, *Ex. 15, Deut. 32, and Job 3;* vol. 2, *85 Psalms and Job 4–14;* vol. 3, *The Remaining 65 Psalms;* vol. 4, *Job 15–42;* and Marjo C. A. Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor, *The Structure of Classical Hebrew Poetry: Isaiah 40–55* (*OtSt* 41; Leiden: Brill, 1998). For reviews and criticisms of this general method, see David W. Cotter, *A Study of Job 4-5 in the Light of Contemporary Literary Theory* (SBLDS 124; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 90–96; and Petersen and Richards, *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry*, 60–63.

nal cohesion" of one of these larger units that may contain several verses, what he calls a strophe:

> The strophe may:
>> constitute one syntactic unit, for instance, one compound sentence or a sentence extended in a different way,
>> formulate or explain one thought,
>> present its cola as a clear series,
>> be an embedded speech, for instance a quotation,
>> present or work out a metaphor or simile,
>> demarcate itself by means of inclusio.[23]

I agree that these features often complement the coherency of larger units of verses, what I will call verse paragraphs.[24] My analysis, however, begins with the premise that verse paragraphs are identifiable primarily through their topics and the topics of the adjacent paragraphs. Since the interpretation of ancient texts is sometimes ambiguous, it is expected that the division of a text into paragraphs is not absolute and one might well argue that other divisions (based on the sense of a passage) are possible or even more likely. Although I will remark on some of the features listed above by Fokkelman in my analysis of individual poems and paragraphs, my study does not follow his methodology, since, in my opinion, the assertions he makes for his system of analysis are too sweeping and self-assured, and because the other criteria that he says should mark a strophe do not always fall in line with the division of the text based on the elements listed above.

In his book *Reading Hebrew Poetry*, Fokkelman describes Biblical Hebrew poems existing among a hierarchy of different subunits, from the colon, to the verse (bicolon or tricolon), to the strophe (consisting of one verse or as many as four), to the stanza (the larger grouping of one or more strophes). There is an obvious overlap here that Fokkelman himself recognizes: occasionally a verse will also be a strophe, and sometimes a single strophe will also be a stanza. Such overlap indicates the difficulty in trying to apply a coherent taxonomy to larger-level units within Hebrew poems. (In my analysis, "verse paragraph" can apply to a short unit or a long one. This means that there is inconsistency or ambiguity in my own vocabulary, since one large, grand verse paragraph might contain several smaller ones within it.)

---

23. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 89.

24. The use of the term "verse paragraph" follows the usage under this entry in the *New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (ed. Alex Preminger and T. V. F. Brogan; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), s.v. The use of terms "strophe" and "stanza" to distinguish units of one to five verses and units of one or more strophes might at first seem useful, but it is misleading since it implies that there are clear ways to distinguish between these two types of large verse groupings; furthermore, it implies that they are inherent parts of the poetic system of ancient Hebrew, for which there is no clear evidence.

What seems even more inconsistent to me in Fokkelman's analysis is the criteria that supposedly distinguish the strophes from each other. The above list marks how a strophe achieves its "internal cohesion." Fokkelman gives another list of features that can be used to distinguish one strophe from surrounding strophes and calls these "properties of external cohesion."[25] He writes:

> We enter a new strophe if there is a change in
>   the characters who populate the unit;
>   verb tense;
>   the mode of the sentences (do they report or describe?; are they wishes or commands?)
>   grammatical person;
>   language: from verbal (reporting or desiring action) to nominal (static, describing properties) language;
>   subject matter;
>   tone or genre.[26]

Although I can affirm the fact that often larger units of verse within Hebrew poems do sometimes contain a shift in verb tense or grammatical person or mood of the verb (from indicative verbs to imperatives), these factors by themselves do not indicate the beginning or ending of a larger unit of verse. To characterize this list as an easy key to finding "strophes" is disingenuous—but perhaps easy to ignore as part of a flamboyant rhetoric. However, Fokkelman goes beyond this and suggests that the result of applying his methodology is utter transparency of structure.[27] He asserts that those who might deny such methods are a "dying-out breed."[28] And he suggests that his supposedly coherent system is able to find Hebrew poetry's "prescribed proportions."[29] At the end of his book, he appeals to open-mindedness on the part of the reader of the Bible and refers to "an insidious form of delusion" that derives from "the spectacles we are ourselves are wearing."[30] Given the self-assured attitude in other parts of the book, such

---

25. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 99.

26. Ibid.

27. He writes in the first chapter: "But however diverse the poems, they have a number of powerful rules and literary conventions in common; and after we have learned to recognize and apply these, the texts are generally self-explanatory: this is the subject of the rest of this book" (Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 13). Since his book often focuses on strophic analysis, it can be assumed that the rules that we are supposed to learn from the book are the rules for determining strophes.

28. He writes: "It is a great pity that our Bible translations achieve precious little in the way of indicating strophes. People just did not realize they existed, in the old days, and then of course nowadays there is the dying-out breed of scholars who do not wish to know" (Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 40).

29. He writes: "A poem is the result of . . . applying prescribed proportions to all levels of the text" (Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 35).

30. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 208.

statements at its end give the impression that the author would tolerate any honest reading of a biblical poem, so long as it agreed with his own.[31]

Nevertheless, we can see the inconsistency of this kind of strophic analysis within Fokkelman's own study of individual poems. For example, he represents the following passage from Isaiah (1:15-18) as broken into three strophes, parts of two larger stanzas. I reproduce the translation from his book:

(15) "And when you lift up your hands,   Stanza VI; Strophe 13
        I will turn my eyes away from you;
even when you pray harder,
        I will not listen.
Your hands are stained with blood!"

(16) "Wash yourselves, clean yourselves,   Stanza VI; Strophe 14
        put your evil doings
        away from my sight!
Cease to do evil,
        (17) learn to do good,
                devote ourselves [*sic*] to justice!
Aid the wronged,
        uphold the rights of the orphan,
                defend the cause of the widow!"

(18) "Let us go, let us have a tribunal,"   Stanza VII; Strophe 15
        Yahweh says.
Be your sins like crimson,
        they will turn snow-white;
be they red as purple,
        white as fleece they will become.[32]

Note not only the shift in strophe between v. 17 and v. 18, but also the shift in stanza; vv. 15–17 are not only individual strophes, but they are also part of Stanza VI, while v. 18 marks the beginning of Stanza VII. Note also that Fokkelman has broken up v. 17 so that the first colon of v. 17 is actually the second colon of a tricolon. Now, although I can understand Fokkelman's division of the poem here into larger semantic categories, I do not believe that this division should be char-

---

31. Francis Landy, in his review of Fokkelman's book, is a good deal more charitable, though he too finds inconsistencies: "Fokkelman is indeed intolerant of structural ambiguity. However, biblical poems often exhibit ambiguous or competing structures; their meaning depends on their indeterminancy" (Landy, review of *Reading Biblical Poetry*, by Jan P. Fokkelman, *RBL* 7 [2003]: http://www.bookreviews.org).

32. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 104–6.

acterized as patently obvious, nor that the text itself, either in its references or in its surface features of grammar and syntax, make this division obvious.

First, it seems that a division of the poem strictly according to the subject matter and what the verses describe might result in the single sentence of v. 15e being joined not with what precedes it but with the verses that follow it, vv. 16–17, since it is an expression of guilt, something that is referred to in vv. 16–17, but not in v. 15a-d. The inclusion of v. 15e with what follows is even supported by the representation of this passage in *BHS*[3]. The problem with such a division, I imagine, is that it means that strophe 14 is not made up exclusively of imperatival expressions.[33] But then, the reason for including v. 15e with the rest of v. 15a-d cannot be that compelling on grammatical grounds, since the cola of v. 15a-d contain either nominal predicates or imperfect verbs, but never a perfect intransitive verb, as appears in v. 15e. Fokkelman asserts that there is a chiastic alignment in this verse, made up in part by "hands" in v. 15a and "hands" in v. 15e; technically it is not a repetition of a single word, but a semantic pair between כף in v. 15a and יד in v. 15e.[34] But if repetition of a semantically parallel word warrants inclusion of this colon as part of the same strophe, then might we then assume that strophe 14 should consist not of v. 15 exclusively, but rather should extend to v. 16c, which ends literally "from before my eyes," producing a nice repetitive link, not to mention grammatical match, with the final phrase from v. 15b "my eyes from you"?

In addition, it seems inconsistent that Fokkelman suggests that not only a new strophe but a new stanza (Stanza VII) should begin at v. 18a-b, since this bicolon marks the end of God's speech (at least according to Fokkelman's punctuation), and a quotation is one of those features that marks internal cohesion in a strophe—and surely it must also mark the internal cohesion for a stanza. Not only does v. 18a-b internally cohere with what comes before in Stanza VI, but it also externally coheres with strophe 15, since it includes two volitive verbal phrases in its first colon. It makes more sense for a new stanza and a new strophe to begin after the end of the quotation and after the series of volitive verbs has finished. Note also that v. 18c-f concerns a new subject, the sin of the audience. I illustrate these alternative divisions of the poem to point out that what Fokkelman presents as obvious and incontrovertible is, in fact, quite controvertible and in no way patently obvious.

In short, I agree with those features that Fokkelman argues mark internal cohesion with a larger group of verses, but I disagree with the assertion that such

---

33. Fokkelman writes: "Strophe 14 is marked by the change to new linguistic forms. . . . God bursts into a chain of commands that occupies three times three cola" (*Reading Biblical Poetry*, 106).

34. Fokkelman writes: "The unity of strophe 13 is already suggested by a new AB-A'B' design. Two compound sentences neatly coincide with the two verses, and their components exactly cover the half-verses. This arrangement is varied by a chiasm, hands-seeing / hearing-hands. Furthermore, there is a surplus: line 15e about the hands being stained with blood, an extremely incriminating monocolon, is the final blow" (*Reading Biblical Poetry*, 105).

larger divisions of the poem are patently obvious or consistent; I also disagree with the idea that the features that mark external cohesion are at all consistent with the divisions suggested by the marks of internal cohesion.[35]

ALLUSIONS TO AND ECHOES OF SCRIPTURE

Another methodological concern involves the identification and interpretation of language, idioms, and imagery that appear in the poems and that seem to derive from specific passages of the Bible. As Moshe Bernstein has written, even when we can recognize biblical language in a Dead Sea Scroll, it is not certain that such was meant to be an allusion to or an echo of a specific biblical passage; it might simply be the result of the writer's fluency with biblical idioms.[36] Although this is the case, there is still a need to identify and comment on the use of Scripture in these poems, since it forms a fundamental aspect of this literature and of the literature from the Second Temple period in general. This study will follow a simplified version of the model used by Benjamin D. Sommer in his study of Isaiah 40–66.[37] In his study, Sommer distinguishes between allusions and echoes,

---

35. Despite what has been said above, let me add that these criticisms of his strophic analysis should not distract from the fact that Fokkelman's analyses of individual poems often are revealing and insightful.

36. Bernstein writes: "Since the authors of the Qumran scrolls were so manifestly fluent in the Hebrew scriptures, it is at times unclear whether biblical language found in Qumran compositions, when not accompanied by a 'citation formula,' is a conscious or unconscious employment of the biblical text" ("Scriptures: Quotation and Use," in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:839).

37. Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Contraversions; Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998). For the study of biblical allusion in texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, one may consult Esther Chazon's recent study of the *Words of the Luminaries*, in which she discriminates between different forms of borrowing text (quotation, allusion, and free use) and different modes of composition (modeling, *florilegium*, *pastiche*, and free composition) ("Scripture and Prayer in 'The Words of the Luminaries,'" in *Prayers That Cite Scripture: Biblical Quotations in Jewish Prayers from Antiquity through the Middle Ages* [ed. James L. Kugel; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006], 25–41). Another model is that offered by Julia A. Hughes, which distinguishes between quotation, allusion, and idiom (*Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* [STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006], 42-48). Although these categories suit the study of the prayers and the *Hodayot*, they are not as useful among the poems studied here. For example, the category of quotation as defined by Hughes (a phrase "explicitly or implicitly . . . referring to the words of a speaker who is not the implied speaker of the composition" [p. 44]) does not occur in the 11Q5 non-Masoretic poems. For more on allusion, see also Bonnie Pedrotti Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary* (SBLDS 50; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981), 48–55; Devorah Dimant, "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. Martin J. Mulder; CRINT, Section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud 1; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988), 379–419; and Daniel K. Falk, "Biblical Adaptation in 4Q392 *Works of God* and 4Q393 *Communal Confession*," in *The Provo*

though he recognizes that the line that divides them is usually blurry.[38] Echoes are essentially cases where "elements of an earlier text reappear in a later one, but the meaning of the marked sign in the source has little effect on a reading of the sign with the marker in the alluding text."[39] For the present study, the "earlier text" will refer to one or more specific biblical passages, though in other contexts an "earlier text" might constitute an event, a colloquial phrase, or something else. A reader may be aware of the source or may not be. An allusion, by contrast, is more complex; it also comprises the use of language and imagery from an earlier text in a later one, but it does have significance for the meaning of the later text and it does depend on a reader being able to recognize the source.[40] The reused text has meaning in a twofold way; it has significance as a constituent of the "new" context in which it appears, and as it relates to its source.[41] Furthermore, an allusion can interact with the source text in one of two ways: an allusion may point to a specific element of the source text that has resonance with a similar element in the alluding text, or an allusion may evoke the source text in a more holistic way, such that "certain properties of the source text outside of the marked sign may prove relevant for the alluding text."[42] In other words, the context of the source, even though it is not directly referred to in the later text, may have significance for the understanding and idea of the later text.

For both echoes and allusions, a clear link with the source must exist. Identifying echoes and allusions from the reuse of common language is not simple or straightforward. In part, it relies on the likelihood that the readers and writers

---

International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues (ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 126–46.

38. The distinction between allusion and echo is one that Sommer notes is similar to distinctions made by other scholars; for example, Z. Ben-Porat distinguishes between allusions and borrowings ("The Poetics of Literary Allusion," *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 [1976]: 106 n. 3, cited in Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 211); Dan Pagis distinguishes three kinds of borrowings: neutral, meaningful, and those "whose contents shed new light on the content of the poem" (*Change and Tradition in the Secular Poetry: Spain and Italy* [in Hebrew; Jerusalem: Keter, 1976], 70-71, quoted and cited in Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 211). Sommer notes that the "distinction between cases of allusion and echo is rarely clear-cut" (*Prophet Reads Scripture*, 17).

39. Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 16.

40. Sommer's description of allusion depends heavily on Ben-Porat's (see Ben-Porat, "Poetics of Literary Allusion," 105–208).

41. On this idea, see also C. Perri, "On Alluding," *Poetics* 7 (1978): 295–96. Hughes summarizes this idea: "Thus the words have a non-allusive meaning within the text as well as referring allusively to one or more other texts" (*Scriptural Allusions*, 44).

42. Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 13. Esther Chazon has also commented on how a text accesses another text holistically through allusion ("The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms from Qumran," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* [ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 85–96).

of the 11Q5 non-Masoretic poems were thoroughly familiar with the majority of what we call the Hebrew Bible, something that most, if not all, critics agree they were. The factors that contribute to the identification of an echo or allusion include the following (based, in part, on the similar list offered by Julia A. Hughes): the use of a rare word, especially a *hapax legomenon*, in a common context; identical vocabulary or synonymous words set in a common context, often in an identical (or very similar) syntactic order; common reference to a specific event or situation described in a single biblical passage.[43] Where the poems use language that seems to hint at other biblical passages (especially through vocabulary and/or syntax), but which one cannot assume a reader fluent in the Bible would identify as allusions, I will refer to as "reminiscent of" a given biblical text. These too are important to note since they help to clarify idioms and give the reader a better idea of the more general dependency of these poems on the Bible.

The function of literary echoes is, according to Sommer, primarily the creation of pleasure for the reader when he or she is able to recognize the source and make the link between texts in his or her head.[44] The functions of allusion in reading are multiple, but can be broken down into two simple varieties. Either the source text complements the ideas in the alluding text, or it creates dissonance with the alluding text where the latter comments on, alters, or reinterprets the source.[45] Since the line between echo and allusion is itself blurry, the functions also fall in a range. While an echo may not significantly affect the meaning of the later poem within which it is situated, it might contribute to giving the poem greater authority or reveal a connection between genres.[46] In addition, although Sommer does not mention this, one can imagine how an echo affects the literary work in which it occurs in other ways too; for example, it might create a resonance with a certain motif, which, although not directly related to the context of the poem, might be expected to create a sympathy in the reader; or, an obvious echo might foreshadow the use of true and more subtle allusions later in the same literary work. Given the almost infinite variety of ways that echoes and allusions can function, I will treat each instance according to the context in which it arises.

---

43. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 53.

44. Sommer mentions this effect in relation to both echoes and allusions (*Prophet Reads Scripture*, 19, 31).

45. The term "dissonance," is taken from Adele Berlin's study of this phenomenon ("Qumran Laments and the Study of Lament Literature," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000* [ed. Esther G. Chazon, with the collaboration of Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 1–17).

46. Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 31.

Sɪʀᴀᴄʜ 51:13–30 (11Q5 XXI, 11–XXII, 1)

Iɴᴛʀᴏᴅᴜᴄᴛɪᴏɴ[1]

The poem that concludes the Wisdom of Ben Sira, also known as Sirach, which is preserved in columns XXI and XXII of 11Q5, offers a convenient starting place for the study of the non-Masoretic poems of this scroll, since the structure of Sirach poetry has already been studied and described.[2] Study of this text will permit a review of the features that distinguish Sirach poetry from biblical poems and will provide a backdrop against which to compare the other compositions in 11Q5. In this way, some of the characteristics of these non-Masoretic poems will be thrown into sharper relief and, as a result, the commonalities and discrepancies among the non-Masoretic poems will be made clearer.

The disadvantage in starting with Sir 51:13–30 is that only half of the poem is preserved in the scroll. Reconstruction of it is facilitated by its existence in other Hebrew manuscripts and in other translations. It should be recognized, however, that 11Q5's version of Sir 51:13–30 seems closer to the original Hebrew than the versions preserved in other manuscripts and translations.[3]

Connected to the elucidation of the text's language and poetic structure are two interrelated issues that will be discussed at length in what follows: the question of the poem's authorship and its sexually allusive language. The philological and poetic analysis presented below demonstrates how the poem's content and

---

1. This chapter is based on research already published in "Sirach 51:13–30 and 11Q5 (= 11QPsᵃ) 21.11–22.1," *RevQ* 23 (2007): 207–31.

2. See Eric D. Reymond, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry: Parallelism and the Poems of Sirach* (Studies in Biblical Literature 9; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

3. This opinion is shared by most critics who comment on the scroll, including Sanders, DJD 4:79; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 187; M. Delcor, "Le Texte hébreu du cantique de Siracide LI, 13 et ss. et les anciennes versions," *Textus* 6 (1968): 39; John G. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 260; T. Muraoka, "Sir. 51, 13–30: An Erotic Hymn to Wisdom," *JSJ* 10 (1979): 166–67; and Florentino García Martínez, "Salmos Apócrifos en Qumran," *EstBib* 40 (1982): 208. It may also be noted at the beginning of this chapter that because older Sirach scholars like Norbert Peters and Rudolf Smend knew nothing of 11Q5, their observations are often not pertinent to our discussion.

form are similar to the content and form of Ben Sira's other poems and, therefore, encourages the view that this poem was authored by the Jerusalemite sage Jesus Ben Sira. The poem, although sometimes labeled "erotic," is better described as containing erotic language; its allusion to libidinous experience is not in order to celebrate or bemoan sexual desire or consummation, but rather to encourage the more sober goal of pursuing wisdom. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that, although Sirach as a whole contains few sexual innuendos, this poem's use of sexualized language and imagery can be demonstrated to have precedents in other poems authored by Ben Sira.

Most critics of the past forty years have affirmed that the poem really was written by Ben Sira.[4] All the same, James A. Sanders, the first editor of 11Q5, still tentatively suggests (together with a few other scholars) that, since it appears outside of Ben Sira's book (in a more pristine form), the poem was perhaps not authored by the famous sage.[5] Some scholars, for example, Celia

---

4. These include Isaac Rabinowitz, "The Qumran Hebrew Original of Ben Sira's Concluding Acrostic on Wisdom," *HUCA* 42 (1971): 173; Otto Rickenbacher, *Weisheitsperikopen bei Ben Sira* (OBO 1; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 200; Muraoka, "Sir. 51, 1330," 166; M. R. Lehmann, "11 Q Ps and Ben Sira," *RevQ* 11 (1982): 239–51; Alexander A. Di Lella in Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1987), 576; Johannes Marböck, "Structure and Redaction History of the Book of Ben Sira: Review and Prospects," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference 28–31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands* (ed. Pancratius C. Beentjes; BZAW 255; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1997), 78; idem, *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira* (BZAW 272; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 124; and Otto Mulder, "Three Psalms or Two Prayers in Sirach 51? The End of Ben Sira's Book of Wisdom," in *Prayer from Tobit to Qumran: Inaugural Conference of the ISDCL at Salzburg, Austria, 5–9 July 2003* (ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel and Jeremy Corley; Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2004; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2004), 196.

5. In the *editio princeps,* Sanders seems certain that it was not authored by Sirach: "11QPs^a proves that the canticle was originally independent of Sirach and adapted to the latter only at great expense to the original poem" (DJD 4:85). In that same book he goes on to imply that because it is included in the 11Q5 scroll (which itself attributes various poetic texts to David), the person (or people) who included it in the 11Q5 scroll must have felt that David had composed the poem (ibid., 92). A couple of years later, when he offered a more popular presentation of the same text, he seems somewhat equivocal when he writes: "One's feeling might well be that if Ben Sira did not pen it as a closing lecture for a graduating class then at least he should have used it, or one like it" (*Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 113). In a more recent publication, he writes of the fact that the same text appears both in the 11Q5 scroll and at the end of Sirach and that this "would indicate that perhaps the original canticle was independent of both David and Sirach" ("Non-Masoretic Psalms," 187). Peter W. Flint also affirms that "this piece was originally an independent poem" ("Psalms, Book of: Apocryphal Psalms" in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:709), as does Ben Zion Wacholder ("David's Eschatological Psalter: 11Q Psalms^a," *HUCA* 59 [1988]: 69).

Deutsch, are not willing to affirm or deny his authorship conclusively.[6] Still others, for example, Silvana Manfredi, suggest that, although the poem is "an integral part of the book," it is based on material from a preexisting text that was "softened by the pen of Sirach."[7] As for the poem's so-called eroticism, most commentators consider desire to be the subject of some verses. Some wish to emphasize this aspect in their translations and commentary, while others present a more reserved consideration of this aspect of the poem. Those affirming and emphasizing the sexual dimension in recent years include Sanders, T. Muraoka, and M. Delcor.[8] Patrick W. Skehan, Deutsch, Florentino García Martínez, and Otto Mulder seem to take a middle ground; Skehan remarks that vv. 18–19 take as their theme "desire and pursuit of wisdom, not possession," while Mulder emphasizes the ambiguity of the language.[9] Alexander A. Di Lella and John G. Snaith do not directly comment on the poem's representation of desire, but they both prefer the nonsexual interpretation of all the words.[10]

---

6. Celia Deutsch, although making many connections between the poem and the rest of Sirach, still hesitates to affirm conclusively Ben Sira's authorship ("The Sirach 51 Acrostic: Confession and Exhortation," *ZAW* 94 [1982]: 401 n. 5). In a similar vein, John J. Collins writes: "it is not certain that it was composed by Ben Sira. Nonetheless, it has several points of contact with the rest of Sirach's book. . . . It must at least be regarded as representative of the kind of wisdom circles in which Sirach moved" (*Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* [OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997], 53).

7. Silvana Manfredi, "The True Sage or the Servant of the Lord (Sir 51:13-30 Gr)," in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology* (ed. Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia; Deuteronocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2008), 173–74.

8. Sanders, DJD 4:81–82; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 113–17; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 187–91; Muraoka, "Sir. 51, 13–30," 166–78; Delcor, "Le Texte hébreu du cantique de Siracide LI, 13 et ss.," 35–37. Similarly, Bodil Ejrnaes describes the main idea of the poem as the love between two people ("David and His Two Women: An Analysis of Two Poems in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran [11Q5]," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* [ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008], 578–80).

9. Patrick W. Skehan, "The Acrostic Poem in Sirach 51:13–30," *HTR* 64 (1971): 394. Deutsch comments that Ben Sira "uses erotic language to describe his response to her [i.e., Wisdom]," ("Sirach 51 Acrostic," 406). García Martínez notes the existence of erotic terms but emphasizes that it is, at base, a hymn to Wisdom ("Salmos Apócrifos en Qumran," 209). Mulder comments, "While the Hebrew terminology can be interpreted in an erotic sense as Sanders proposed, the ambiguity also points to the general context of wisdom in the house of learning. In my opinion both sides should be recognized" ("Three Psalms or Two Prayers in Sirach 51?" 193); Mulder also concludes that "the ambiguity of the language of praise of the beauty of Lady Wisdom allowed such students to engage in an erotic interpretation in their song" (ibid., 197).

10. Di Lella, review of James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs)*, *CBQ* 28 (1966): 93–94; idem in Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 577–78; and Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus*, 259–62. In his commentary on this verse, Di Lella acknowledges the existence

Isaac Rabinowitz is the only one to argue explicitly that no erotic allusions should be found in the poem at all.[11]

The question of authorship is related first to the placement of the poem within the book of Sirach itself, then to its existence in 11Q5, amid other psalms attributed to or connected with David, and then tangentially connected with the question of the poem's sexual language. This poem is, as already stated, the concluding poem of Sirach. The poem occurs in the Hebrew Genizah B manuscript after three other "texts": (1) a "postscript" in which Ben Sira identifies himself in 50:27–29 as the author of the whole work; (2) a "prayer" attributed to Ben Sira and occupying 51:1–12; and (3) a "hymn of praise." This last composition is found only in the Genizah B manuscript; it does not appear in the Greek, Syriac, or Latin translations and is commonly viewed as a later interpolation.[12] The Genizah Ms. B text and the Syriac translation contain, after the poem we are discussing, a second postscript identifying Ben Sira again as the author of the whole work. In the Greek translation, ch. 51 is explicitly tied to Ben Sira by the title it supplies to this chapter: "Prayer of Jesus, Son of Sirach."

As is commonly recognized, 11Q5 is closely associated with David; this is seen, first, in the psalms contained in the scroll that are attributed to David, such as Pss 103, 109, and so on (though some, like Ps 119, are not labeled "Davidic" in the Masoretic Text), but also through some of the non-Masoretic psalms (e.g., Pss 151A and B) where David is the speaker. In addition, the passage of 11Q5 labeled "David's Compositions" by Sanders describes in detail David's literary activity. Thus, since the poem is placed in Sirach after an initial "postscript," just after another poem (the hymn of praise) that is likely a later interpolation, and since it appears among the other "Davidic" psalms of 11Q5, in a context where David seems to be the presumed author, scholars have some justification in questioning its tie to Ben Sira. Nevertheless, there is a substantial amount of evidence that points to Ben Sira as the author.

The evidence for Ben Sira's authorship concerns, in part, the poem's poetic style, especially its realization of parallelism, since, as has been demonstrated elsewhere, Ben Sira uses parallelism in a particular way, different from how the authors of Proverbs and Psalms typically use it.[13] Although Sirach poetry is almost always composed in bicola, or pairs of lines, and although the poetry exhibits regular grammatical patterns between these respective lines, there is relatively less semantic connection between the two lines of a single verse; fewer common word pairs are employed; and there are few instances where the verb is elided or "gapped" in the second line of a bicolon. These absences are surprising,

---

of the erotic interpretations of Sanders without attempting to debunk them, instead referring the reader to the study by Deutsch.

11. Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 173–84.

12. For an alternative interpretation, see Mulder, "Three Psalms or Two Prayers in Sirach 51?"

13. Reymond, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry*, 85–112.

since these features are some of the most obvious characteristics of poetry from the Hebrew Bible, especially wisdom poetry. In Sirach, it is more common to find these particular relationships between adjacent verses, rather than between cola of a single verse. This can be demonstrated by the following passages, from Prov 24:19–20; Ps 37:1–2; and Sir 9:11–12, which all treat the problem encountered with seeing the success of wicked people.

<div dir="rtl">

אל־תתחר במרעים   אל־תקנא ברשעים

כי לא־תהיה אחרית לרע   נר רשעים ידעך

</div>

> Do not be vexed at *evildoers*;
>> do not envy the *wicked*,
> because there is no afterward for the *evil*;
>> the lamp of the *wicked* will be extinguished. (Prov 24:19-20)

<div dir="rtl">

אל־תתחר במרעים   אל־תקנא בעשי עולה

כי כחציר מהרה ימלו   וכירק דשא יבולון

</div>

> Do not be vexed at *evildoers*;
>> do not envy the *doers of iniquity*,
> because like *grass* they will quickly *wither*,
>> and like *green grass* fade. (Ps 37:1-2)

<div dir="rtl">

[אל] תקנא באיש רשע   כי לא [י]דע מה יומו

אל [תקנא] בזדון מצליח   זכר כי עת מות לא ינקה

</div>

> Do [not] envy a wicked man
>> because he does not [k]now when is his day.
> [Do] not [envy] the arrogance of the successful;
>> remember that at the time of (his) death he will not be innocent.
>>>> (Sir 9:11-12; Ms A)[14]

While the passages from Proverbs and Psalms exhibit the typical semantic word pairs between the lines of a single verse, the Sirach passage witnesses little of this kind of connection between lines. Rather, where semantically similar words appear, these are not typically the common word pairs found in the Hebrew Bible and these words occur in adjacent verses.[15] For example, in Prov 24:19 the words "evil" and "wicked" are an often-occurring pair of words and

---

14. For the Hebrew text, see Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 33.

15. I might note in passing that it is also common for Ben Sira's maxims to be more specific than those in Proverbs, as seen above.

appear here between the two cola of a bicolon, whereas in the Sirach passage the words "wicked" and "arrogance," although semantically related, are not common synonyms of each other and here occur not between cola of a bicolon, but rather between adjacent bicola.[16] As will be demonstrated in what follows, the infrequency of clear repetitive/semantic parallels between cola of a verse, together with the regularity of grammatical parallelism and common line length in this same distribution, contribute to the idea that Ben Sira was the author of this poem.

The question of the poem's sexual innuendo has been generated primarily from the version of the poem in the Dead Sea Scroll, since this version contains words that are clearly part of the sexual vocabulary of ancient Hebrew, in contrast to the other versions and translations, which do not contain such language. Among the words that have possible sexual connotations, Sanders posits an erotic interpretation for the following: טוב, שחק, לקח, ידע, מישור, רגל, יד, נפש, טרתי נפשי, מערמים, words whose erotic meaning he indicates either in his translation ("pleasure" for טוב, "ardor" for נפש, and "bestirred my desire" for טרתי נפשי), or in footnotes (יד and רגל "may also refer to the phallus," מישור to "smoothness," ידע to "sexual intimacy," לקח to "seductive speech," and מערמים to "nakedness").[17] To these Muraoka adds an erotic interpretation of וברומיה לוא אשלה, "in the moments of her exaltation [i.e., orgasm], I will not let up" and of כפי הברותי, his interpretation of which implies the translation "polishing my genitals," though he is too modest actually to provide this translation.[18]

The presentation of Wisdom as a female to be courted and/or wed is not without precedent, of course. Wisdom is portrayed as someone who offers food and drink in Prov 9:1–6, in other words a kind of tavern keeper, in contrast to the portrait of flesh-and-blood prostitutes/tavern girls in Prov 7. In addition, Wisdom is characterized as a nubile girl in Sir 14:23–24; 15:2; and in Wis 8:1, a characterization that implies some analogy between the earnest pursuit of Wisdom and the youthful, sexually eager desire for a wife.[19]

Those who de-emphasize the poem's sexual language recognize the poem's appeal to the existing analogies between Wisdom and desired females, but do not go so far as to assert the relevance of the sexual nuances of all the words listed above. Rabinowitz, representing the extreme view, asserts in the conclusion of his

16. Note that "wicked" (רע) and "arrogance" (זדון) are used together in 1 Sam 17:28 (in prose).

17. Sanders, DJD 4:81–82; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 114–16; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 188–89. He comments that the verb שחק "calls to mind sexual dalliance" ("Non-Masoretic Psalms," 189).

18. Muraoka writes concerning the last passage, "What physical activity the phrase as a whole could possibly denote I leave to the reader's imagination to work out" ("Sir. 51, 13–30," 172).

19. See Sanders, DJD 4:84; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 117.

article that the poem's expression, although "witty" and "forceful," is "without recourse, as has been supposed, to erotically ambiguous language."[20] As will be explained below, the language of the poem contains indisputable sexual innuendo. My discussion of the poem's structure seeks to put this sexual language and imagery in its context.

The presentation of the poem below is based on the text from 11Q5. Most of the second half of the poem is not found in the Dead Sea Scroll, but is reconstructed based on the other versions of the poem. For the most part, I have followed the reconstructions suggested by Patrick W. Skehan.[21] Despite the fragmentary nature of the scroll, we do have an idea of how the poem ended, since the last two words are preserved in 11Q5.

TEXT AND ANALYSIS OF THE POEM:

	Hebrew	Grammatical Analysis	Semantic Analysis
51:13	ובקשתיה בטרם תעיתי /¹¹אני נער	SP//V//V	ab//c//d
14	ועד ¹²/ סופה אדורשנה באה לי בתרה	VMM//MV	ab//cd
15a-b	ענבים ישמחו לב גם גרע נץ בבשול	VSM//SVO	abc//def
15c-d	כי מנעורי ידעתיה ¹³/ דרכה רגלי במישור	VSM//MV	abc//de
16	והרבה מצאתי לקח הטיתי כמעט /¹⁴ אוזני	VMO//MVO	abc//d(≠b)ef
17	למלמדי אתן ¹⁵/ הודו ועל<ה> היתה לי	OVM//MVO	ab//cde
18	קנאתי בטוב ולוא אשוב זמותי ואשחקה	VV//VMV	ab//cde
19a-a'[22]	ופני לוא השיבותי חריתי /¹⁶ נפשי בה	VOM//OV	ab//b'c
19a"-b	וברומיה לוא ¹⁷/ אשלה טר<ד>תי נפשי בה	VOM//MV	ab//cd(≠b)
19c-d	[וב]מערמיה אתבונן ידי פתח[ה] שעריה]	SVO//MV	abc//de
20a-b	[בנקיון מצאתיה] כפי הברותי אל[יה]	OVM//MV	ab//cd
20c-d	[בעבור כן לוא אעזבה] [לב קניתי לי מראש]	OVMM//MV	abc//d
21	[בעבור כן קניתי קנין טוב] [מעי נכמרו לבקשה]	SVM//VO	abc//dde

---

20. Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 184. It seems, however, regardless of whether one understands the words to have an erotic meaning here, that some at least do have indisputable sexual connotations. Thus, it is impossible to deny that an ancient reader might pick up on some of these in his or her reading of the poem.

21. As regards Ulrich Dahmen's reconstruction of the scroll in general and, specifically, his argument that the column containing the majority of Sir 51:13–30 had only twenty-five lines (and thus was missing part of the original poem), see the criticisms offered by Émile Puech in his review of this work (Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum,* 243; and Puech, review of Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption,* RevQ 22 [2005]: 280).

22. Although many commentators label this bicolon as 19a–b and subsequent ones c–d and e–f, this presents problems when comparing the Hebrew text with the Greek. I indicate with prime marks those verses not present in the Greek text of Ziegler (Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* [Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 12.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965]). The prime marks in the next verse and in v. 26 have identical purposes.

22	[ובשפתותי אודנו]	[נתן אדני לי לשוני שכר]	VSMOM//MV	abcd//c'e
23	[ולינו בבית מוסר]	[סורו אלי נבלים]	VMvoc//VM	ab//cde
24	[ונפשכם צמאה מאד]	[עד מתי תחסרו מאילון]	MVM//SVM	ab//cde
25	[קנו לכם בלוא כסף]	[פתחתי פי ודברתי בה]	VOVM//VMM	a$^{(x+y)}$a'//cd
26a-b	[ותשא נפשכם משה]	[צואריכם הביאו בעלה]	OVM//VSO	abc//ded
26c-c'	[ונותן נפשו מצא אתה]	[קרובה היא למבקשיה]	PSM//S$^{(part + O)}$V	abc//def
27	[ראו בעיניכם] [כי מעט עמלתי] [ומצאתי הרבה]		VM//MV//VM	ab//cd//ef$^{(\neq c)}$
28	[וכסף וזהב תקנה בה]	[שמעו מוסר כמעט]	VOM//O²VM	abc//dd'e
29	[ואל תבושו בתהלתו]	[תשמח נפשכם בחסדו]	VSM//VM	abc//de
30	[ויתן] ¹ / שכרכם בעתו	[פעלו פעלכם בעתו]	VOM//VOM	aab//cdb

<center>TRANSLATION</center>

13.   (When) I (was) a boy,
         before I had wandered around,
         I sought her.

14.   She came to me in her beauty,
         and until the end I will (continue to) seek her.

15a-b. While the blossom withers in the ripening,
         grapes gladden (the) heart.

15c-d. My foot treads a flat plain
         for from my youth I have known her.

16.   I stretched my ear a little
         and much learning did I find.

17.   She was for me a yoke;
         to my teacher I ascribed his glory.

18.   I devised that I would sing,
         I was excited by goodness and would not turn away.

19a-a'. I, myself, burned for her,
         I did not turn my face away from her.

19a''-b. I wearied myself with her,
         but in her heights I am not lazy.

19c-d. My hand open[ed her gates]
         [that] I could consider her hidden things.

20a-b. I purified my palms (to go) [to her,]
         [and I found her through my innocence.]

20c-d. [I acquired understanding from the first,]
         [for then I would not be abandoned.]

21.   [My inner self burned to pursue her]
         [therefore, I acquired a precious thing.]

22.   [My lord gave me my tongue as wage]
         [and with my lips I praise him:]

23.   [Turn aside to me, fools]
         [and spend the night in the house of instruction.]

24.   [How long will you be lacking because of these things,]
            [your soul thirsting greatly?]
25.   [I opened my mouth and spoke about her:]
            [Acquire (her) for yourselves, without silver.]
26a-b. [Submit your neck to her yoke,]
            [so you will lift her burden.]
26c-c'. [She is near to those who seek her,]
            [the one who devotes his soul (to seeking her), finds her.]
27.   [Look with your eyes]
            [that I have labored little,]
            [but I have discovered plenty.]
28.   [Hear instruction but a little,]
            [and silver and gold you will acquire through her.]
29.   [Let your soul rejoice in his kindness,]
            [and do not be ashamed in his praise.]
30.   [Perform your deed at its time,]
            [so that he will give] your wage in its time.

Notes to the Translation

Sir 53:13 Like Jeremiah (1:6–7) and Solomon (1 Kgs 3:7–9), whose first experiences of the divine take place when they are children, so the poet of this poem begins the pursuit of Wisdom as a child.

The subordinate, temporal nature of the first colon is implicit in the Hebrew but is more explicit in the Greek translation: Ἔτι ὢν νεώτερος.

According to John F. Elwolde, בטרם appears before a perfect verb in the Bible in Ps 90:2 and Prov 8:25, as well as in 1QHᵃ V, 25; VII, 27; IX, 9.[23] This is the rarer construction; the construction with the imperfect is more common, even when the action takes place in the past. The legitimacy of this construction should be stressed, since Di Lella claims that it does not occur in Biblical Hebrew.[24] Presumably the use of the perfect here emphasizes the fact that the poet/sage is no longer "wandering," but implies that he did in fact "wander." If the sense was something like "before I had a chance to stray" then we would expect an imperfect verb. See, for example, Ruth 3:14. Alternatively, בטרם might be followed here not by the perfect but by the infinitive (תעותי), a possibility suggested

---

23. John F. Elwolde, "Some Lexical Structures in 1QH: Towards a Distinction of the Linguistic and the Literary," in *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, Held at Leiden University 15–17 December, 1997* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; STDJ 33; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 93. References to 1QHᵃ follow the column and line numbers as presented in Hartmut Stegemann, Eileen Schuller, Carol Newsom, *1QHodayotᵃ with Incorporation of 1QHodayotᵃ and 4QHodayotᵃ⁻ᶠ* (DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009).

24. Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 574.

by Di Lella and by Elwolde, who notes the appearance of this syntax in one biblical passage, Zeph 2:2, and several Dead Sea Scroll texts, 1QHª IX, 12-13, 21-22, 30; 4Q176 16, 3 (= 4QTanḥ); 4Q215a 1 II, 8 (= 4QTime of Righteousness).[25]

The choice of the word תעה is curious. We do not expect the poet/sage to be the subject of such a verb, since it ordinarily denotes moral straying; it is a verb one might especially expect to find in a wisdom poem describing the simple or wicked. The verb, of course, can also denote aimless travel, as in Gen 20:13; 21:14; 37:17. But these verses (and others) seem to carry the sense that the travel is not only aimless but also difficult and/or treacherous, something one does not choose to do. The word תעה is not simply synonymous with "travel" or "ramble" (as one might assume based on the NRSV translation "before I went on my travels"). In still other cases, the verb subtly alludes to trekking through waste, because of sin; thus, Ps 107:4 uses this verb to describe the wandering in the Sinai desert. I assume that the poet/sage does not intend to suggest that he at one time lived a sinful life; thus, "erred" (Sanders) and "gone astray" (Deutsch) do not seem like accurate translations.[26]

The Hebrew verb תעה in Sir 51:13 is translated by the Greek πλανάω, as it is in other biblical passages (e.g., Gen 21:14). Although this Greek word typically denotes both wandering and sinful behavior, Ben Sira (or, more precisely his grandson, who translated Ben Sira's words into Greek) associates it with learning, experience, and education, as is seen in Sir 34:10–12: "The one who is untested knows little, / but the one who is well-wandered [πεπλανημένος] multiplies cleverness. // Many things I have seen in my wandering (ἀποπλάνησις), / my comprehension (being) beyond my means of expression." The implication throughout Sirach seems to be that Wisdom can be found in or through the texts of other cultures and lands. Skehan translates 51:13 loosely with "when I was . . . innocent."[27] Presumably his translation is based, in part, on the use of πλανάω in this earlier Sirach passage.

The *wāw* that precedes the verb בקש could be a conjunctive *wāw*, connecting the verb בקש to בטרם. (This pertains if the first two words of the verse constitute the main clause, "I was a boy before I wandered and sought her . . . ," or if the entire verse constitutes two temporal phrases, "When I [was] a boy, before I wandered and sought her . . . .") Alternatively, the conjunction could be the *wāw* of apodosis, resulting in a translation such as the following: "When I was a boy, before I had wandered off, I sought her." The *wāw* of apodosis is found prefixed to verbs that follow בטרם clauses in Gen 37:18; Exod 1:19; 1 Sam 2:15; 2 Kgs 6:32; and Isa 66:7b. My choice of translation reflects the sense of the following verse, which explicitly states that the poet pursues Wisdom.

---

25. Ibid., 574; Elwolde, "Some Lexical Structures," 93.

26. Sanders, DJD 4:81; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 115; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 189; Deutsch, "Sirach 51 Acrostic," 401.

27. Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 388.

Although the Greek text contains the explicit mention of *sophia*, neither the Dead Sea Scroll text nor the Syriac translation mentions Wisdom. This absence is important, as it forms one of the motifs of the poem and perhaps reflects the need to continue to seek and pursue Wisdom.

Sir 51:14 The fact that the poet seeks Wisdom only to have her come to him reflects the reciprocal nature of Wisdom, also expressed later in this same poem (v. 26c-c'). This notion is similar to other passages in the Bible where Wisdom claims to have called to the simple and received no response (Prov 1:24) or claims to love those who love her (Prov 8:17). See also Wis 7:7: "the spirit of Wisdom came to me" (ἦλθέν μοι πνεῦμα σοφίας).

The interpretation of the Hebrew letters תר as "beauty" is not universally accepted. The defective writing of this word is reminiscent of the spelling in the Masada manuscript of Ben Sira (43:9, 18) and in 11Q5 XXVIII, 9 (Ps 151A:5c-d), where the word appears spelled without the medial ʾālep, but with the *wāw mater*: תור.[28] The preposition is marking the state in which Wisdom comes to the poet, somewhat similar to the phrases in Prov 28:6 הולך בתמו or the more common יבוא בשלום (e.g., Exod 18:23). (An English precedent for this expression is found in the title of a poem by Lord Byron: "She Walks in Beauty.") Given the orthography here, in Ps 151A, in 4Q426, and in the Ben Sira Masada scroll (and the corresponding assumption that the word was normally pronounced *tōr*), one wonders if wordplay was intended between "her beauty," pronounced *tōrāh*, and "Torah" (something remarked on parenthetically by Mark S. Smith).[29] An association between wisdom/Wisdom and beauty (יפי or κάλλος) is found, for example, in Ezek 28:12 and Wis 8:2. The alternative understanding of these consonants as "in her searches" (from תור), which Sanders attributes to Frank M. Cross, seems less likely and quite unlike the biblical attestations of this verb.[30] Nor does Rabinowitz's suggested reading תרה< י> ב "with her abundance" seem likely on epigraphic or philological grounds.[31]

The *hê* at the end of סוף is the adverbial marker. Skehan notes the use of this marker on the place name Gezer, which follows the preposition עד in 1 Chr 14:16.[32] The use of this word to designate the abstract notion of an end is found in late biblical texts like Qoh 3:11. The translation of Sanders, "finally," and his alternatives, "when finally" and "unto her depths," seem unwarranted, as Deutsch has commented.[33] However, the latter's understanding of this as an Aramaism, based

---

28. The word is spelled similarly in a fragmentary context in 4Q426 1 I, 9.

29. Mark S. Smith, "How to Write a Poem: The Case of Psalm 151A (11QPs 28.3–12)," in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11–14 December, 1995* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 194.

30. Sanders, DJD 4:81.

31. Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 176–77.

32. Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 391–92.

33. Deutsch, "Sirach 51 Acrostic," 401-2.

on Delcor's analysis, does not seem necessary either.[34] As for the translation of the word as definite, GKC notes (in relation to locative ה): "cases like יָ֫מָּה, הֶ֫רָה, בַּ֫יְתָה show that the locative form of itself possessed a defining power."[35]

The final verb of this verse, אדורשנה, could be translated in a more collo-quial way: "continue to attempt to acquire wisdom." The reciprocal nature of Wisdom and its pursuer is again implied in this colon, something complemented by the grammatical chiasm of the verse: VMM//MV. The verbs of motion suggest that the pursuit of Wisdom is an ongoing activity that has no terminus, some-thing suggested also by the imperfect form of the verb.[36] The spelling of the word is unexpected, but Sanders points to similar orthography in the same scroll at 11Q5 III, 5; VI, 12; XIV, 5; XXIII, 15.[37]

Sir 51:15a-b The verb גרע (in the D-stem), according to Jastrow, refers to a stage in the development of grapes. He translates "to form globules, drop." *DCH* defines it as "to drip."[38] I interpret this as a gnomic perfect.[39]

The postbiblical Hebrew word בשול means, according to Jastrow, "ripen-ing, cooking; dish." Although the Greek translation assumes that this word is in construct with the following word, this would form an irregularly long colon and is not necessary for the sense of the preceding colon. The division after בשול is recommended also by Rabinowitz and Deutsch, in contrast to the translations of Sanders, Delcor, and Skehan, who make this verse syntactically dependent on the following verse.[40] Making the first colon dependent on the following colon obscures the meaning of the analogy, in other words, that the benefit of seeking Wisdom in youth is realized in maturity. Such grammatical dependency seems incongruous with the poetic style of this poem and with that of Sirach in general.

---

34. Delcor, "Le Texte hébreu du cantique de Siracide LI, 13 et ss.," 32; and Deutsch, "Sir-ach 51 Acrostic," 401 n 8. Aramaic parallels are also mentioned by Robert Polzin, although he does not suggest that the specific words here are borrowings from Aramaic ("Notes on the Dating of the Non-Massoretic Psalms of 11QPsᵃ," 472).

35. GKC §90.2.a.

36. W. Th. van Peursen notes that this verb is best translated with the future tense, cit-ing the prepositional phrase, the Greek translation (ἐκζητήσω), and the observation made by Otto Rickenbacher concerning Ben Sira's "diametrical way of thinking" (van Peursen, *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira* [Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 41; Leiden: Brill, 2004], 116 and Rickenbacher, *Weisheitsperikopen bei Ben Sira*, 202).

37. Sanders, DJD 4:81.

38. This etymology is suggested also by John Strugnell (in a personal communication to Robert Polzin, cited by the latter scholar in "Notes on the Dating of the Non-Massoretic Psalms of 11QPsᵃ," 472).

39. Van Peursen, on the other hand, thinks that this interpretation is unlikely and understands the verb to refer to the past, describing "in metaphorical language, a further step in the author's quest for Wisdom" (*Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, 117). In part, his resistance to reading a gnomic perfect is due to the other perfects in the initial cola of vv. 14–20, which all refer to the past.

40. Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 175, 177; and Deutsch, "Sirach 51 Acrostic," 402.

Presumably, the metaphor of this bicolon implies something about the benefits of having continually sought Wisdom into old age. This is the understanding also of Rabinowitz.[41] The metaphor is interesting because it is reminiscent of Ben Sira's characterization of himself in relation to the great biblical writers; in 33:16 he characterizes himself as a gleaner coming behind the grape-harvesters.[42]

Sir 51:15c-d The poem up to and including this bicolon treats, explicitly or implicitly through metaphor, the pursuit of Wisdom in youth through old age. In the section that follows, the verses focus more particularly on the pursuit of Wisdom as a youth.

Sir 51:17 Scholars are divided concerning the word represented by the consonants ועלה. Sanders suggests that this is a previously unattested word "nurse," literally, the feminine participle from the verb עול: He is followed by Deutsch and Delcor (who translates "*nourrice*").[43] Rabinowitz prefers עילה ("And for me she has been the reason . . . "), and Skehan, an unattested word ועלה from the root יעל ("Since in this way I have profited . . . ").[44] Conceivably, the letters could also represent the word "yoke" (על) with a dittographically produced *hê* (a reading reflected in the Syriac translation ܢܝܪܗ and the Ms. B text עלה, "her yoke"), or "stairway" (עלה).[45] Sanders's proposal, although it seems plausible, is criticized by Rabinowitz since this verb is used for nursing animals, not humans, for which other words (e.g., ינק) are used.[46] Note, however, that the root provides a word for suckling, עול, which includes suckling human infants (as in Isa 49:15). Sanders supports his reading with references to Wisdom as mother and bride in Sir 15:2–10. In that passage, however, Wisdom does not nurse, nor is she ever portrayed nursing, despite Wisdom's assertion in Sir 24:21, which Sanders cites, that those "drinking of me will remain thirsty." (Wisdom speaks in this passage metaphorically; the metaphor of Wisdom as liquid is presumably meant to resonate with the image of Wisdom as a body of water in Sir 24:25–30.)

My preference for "yoke" is based on the clear meaning of the verse that this produces. This explanation seems simpler than suggesting a new word, or the use of a word (עול) in a new way. In addition, it is consistent with the image found

---

41. Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 177.

42. The verse numbering of chs. 30–36 in Sirach follows that put in parentheses by Ziegler (*Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*); this follows the manner of citation used by Skehan and Di Lella (*Wisdom of Ben Sira*), and the NRSV, among others.

43. Sanders, DJD 4:82; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 114–15 n. 56; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 189 n. 15; Deutsch, "Sirach 51 Acrostic," 402 n. 9; Delcor, "Le Texte hébreu du cantique de Siracide LI, 13 et ss.," 33–34.

44. Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 177–78; Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 393.

45. Mulder has also suggested reading the consonants as the word "yoke," though he prefers the reading in the Ms. B text: עלה היה לי לכבוד, in which the verb "to be" is in the same gender as "yoke," unlike in 11Q5 ("Three Psalms or Two Prayers in Sirach 51?" 190). "Yoke" is the translation offered also by J. A. Goldstein, review of James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, JNES 26 (1967): 307.

46. Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 177–78.

later in the same poem of Wisdom as a yoke (v. 26), where it is associated with Wisdom's "burden" (משאה), and earlier, in Sir 6:31, where the yoke of Wisdom is described as a "garment of glory" (בגדי כבוד). This reading produces the possibility of wordplay with the following colon, where מלמד might be read as the word for goad, found in biblical and postbiblical Hebrew.[47] Finally, a nurse is typically associated with comfort, not instruction (or glory).

The transliteration of the final word of this verse in Hebrew (הודו) follows that of several commentators (Delcor, Skehan, and Rabinowitz), but differs from that of others who read הודי (Sanders and Deutsch).[48] Translations vary. Sanders translates "my ardor" in line with his erotic reading of the poem, citing the similar expression in Prov 5:9, while Skehan and Deutsch believe that "praise" is more accurate. Rabinowitz translates "thanks"; Delcor "*gloire.*" Each of these has its problems. Graphically, to judge from the photograph alone, the reading seems to reflect a final *wāw.* In 11Q5 although *wāw*s and *yôd*s appear in varying lengths—sometimes even with *yôd* longer than an adjacent *wāw* (see במכמריו, 11Q5 XXIII, 6 [Ps 141:10])—*yôd*s that follow *dālet*s are (in my cursory analysis at least) always shorter than the vertical stroke of the *dālet*, while *wāw*s are either longer than or the same length as the *dālet*'s vertical stroke. This argues against the reading of Sanders, since הודו ("his ardor") would not make sense. The word is unlikely to be the infinitive absolute of the H-stem of ידה, as suggested by Rabinowitz, given the expected form הוֹדֵה.[49] The understanding of this word as "praise" is suggested by Skehan, based, in part, on several biblical passages, the most important of which is Hab 3:3. Although the words הוד and תהלה ("praise") are associated together and set in parallel in Hab 3:3, this does not constitute proof that the former word had merged in its semantic range with the latter. Deutsch's citation of other passages wherein הוד connotes "praise" are unconvincing, especially those she cites from Sir 51:1, 12 a-n, since in these passages it is not the noun הוד that appears but H-stem verbal forms from the root ידה. More attractive is Delcor's translation, "*gloire,*" since this reflects the basic meaning of the word as it is found in the Bible. In this it is similar to other words like כבוד. In the Bible, where the noun הוד appears with the verb נתן, a person (or deity) of superior status confers glory/authority on a person (or entity) of inferior status (Num 27:20; Dan 11:21; Ps 8:2; Prov 5:9; 1Chr 29:25). The notion in Sir 51:17 would appear to be similar to the expressions of 1 Sam 6:5 and Jer 13:16 (ונתתם לאלהי ישראל כבוד and הבו ליהוה כבוד שמו) and of Ps 29:2 (תנו ליהוה אלהיכם כבוד "ascribe to the Lord the glory of his name"). If the orthography would allow for the reading of the last letter as a *yôd*, we could reconsider these conclusions (to suggest, e.g., a *plene*

---

47. The translation of מלמד as "goad" is suggested also by Goldstein (review of James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 307).

48. Delcor, "Le Texte hébreu du cantique de Siracide LI, 13 et ss.," 31; Skehan, "The Acrostic Poem," 388; Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 175; Sanders, DJD IV, 80; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 114; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 188; Deutsch, "The Sirach 51 Acrostic," 402.

49. Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 178.

reading הידי, "I give my ringing shout"). However, given the relatively certain reading of a *wāw*, this is not necessary.

The antecedent of the 3rd per. masc. sg. pronoun is presumably the teacher (or goad), מלמד. The gender of this word results in the masculine pronoun. The reference ultimately could be either to Wisdom or to God. Reference to the latter would be implicit and similar to the biblical usage of מלמד in Isa 48:17.[50]

Sir 51:18 The verb זמם in the Bible takes as complement a *lāmed* preposition plus an infinitive construct indicating purpose/result (see, e.g., Gen 11:6; Zech 8:15). Here the verb is complemented by another verbal phrase (ואשחקה), which I interpret as a *wāw* conjunction plus a cohortative, the whole phrase being an object clause to the preceding verb זמותי; for similar uses of *wāw* to mark an object clause, see Gen 30:27 and 47:6.[51]

Although the verb שחק has a number of nuances, the one intended here is not too difficult to deduce. Given the fact that wisdom literature usually associates laughter with folly and foolishness (despite Qohelet's reminder to us that there is an appropriate time for laughter), I assume that the verb is here in the D-stem ("to make sport, sing") and is used in the sense of "to sing," as it is in 1 Sam 18:7; this usage also resonates with the same verb's appearance in the D-stem in Prov 8:31 to describe Wisdom's reaction to the creation of the world and humanity by God. This interpretation of the word fits the context well, particularly given the understanding of the preceding colon.[52] This means that we, unlike Deutsch, do not need to follow Skehan's emendation of ואחשקה בה, his translation of the entire line reading: "I became resolutely devoted to her."[53] Skehan's emendation is based, in part, on his judgment that שחק is "incongruous" and on the reading of Ms. B text: אחשקה נפשי בה, which even he recognizes as "secondary and influenced by Gen 34:8."[54] Rabinowitz and Di Lella, on the other hand, prefer to see here the root שחק, meaning "to tread," rendering the colon respectively "'and I trod her (path) constantly' (lit.: 'and I wore her down by treading')" and

---

50. This last point is noted by Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 393.

51. For this use of *waw*, see J. C. L. Gibson, *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar, Syntax* (4th ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 111. The cohortative is the most common form for the 1st pers. common sg. impf. when preceded by consecutive or conjunctive *waw* (Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986], 44). Lutz Schrader also reads the *waw* as conjunctive, but sees the phrase as a final phrase (*Leiden und Gerechtigkeit: Studien zu Theologie und Textgeschichte des Sirachbuches* [BBET 27; Frankfurt: Lang, 1994], 79). Van Peursen reads the verb as a cohortative (or long imperfect) *wāw*-consecutive form, understanding זמותי as an auxiliary verb, similar to שוב or יסף, though he admits that the verb זמם is not used in this way elsewhere (*Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, 91,100).

52. This is the understanding offered first by Sanders, DJD 4:81–82; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 115 n. 59; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 189 n. 17.

53. Deutsch, "Sirach 51 Acrostic," 402; Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 388.

54. Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 388.

"'I resolved and wore her down (by treading).'"[55] Both Rabinowitz and Di Lella cite the appearance of the same verb in the famous passage of Sir 6:36 about pursuing a teacher and "wearing away his doorstep" as evidence in favor of their interpretation; one should note, however, that the verb in 6:36 is used in a manner consistent with its use in the Bible, where it implies effacing or destroying something, while the idea of effacing or "wearing away" wisdom (explicitly rendered in Di Lella's translation and implied in Rabinowitz's) seems inappropriate to this context, since wearing away wisdom implies its destruction.[56] If one wished to see here the verb שחק, a better understanding of the colon might be to infer the word "path" or "doorstep" and interpret the verb as a "*wāw*-consecutive imperfect with pseudo-cohortative ending," which is Skehan's parsing.[57]

On the verbal rection of קנא + ב, see Deut 32:21; 1 Kgs 14:22, as listed by BDB.

Sir 51:19a-a' I understand the word נפשי to be used in this verse in its reflexive sense. Conceivably it could be construed as meaning "soul" or "passion." The notion expressed seems to be an extension of that in the preceding colon, that is, another assertion of the poet's passion for wisdom. The rection of חרה with *bêt* is, in the Bible, indicative of anger. Presumably the poet does not intend this idea, but rather simply intends to convey his intense emotional experience of wisdom. Note that other verbs of extreme emotion, such as קנא in the preceding verse, sometimes carry both positive and negative associations.

Sir 51:19a''-b It is commonly recognized that טרתי represents the verb טרד either with the *dālet* assimilated in pronunciation to the *tāw* and thus misspelled without the *dālet* or with the *dālet* lost through haplography, the result of the adjacent *rêš* and *dālet* looking so similar in the *Vorlage*. The verb occurs also in the Hebrew of Sir 32:9, which concerns correct behavior before superiors, there spelled correctly.

For the concept of wisdom's heights, see Prov 24:7. Note the mention of gate in that biblical verse and the reference to the same in the following verse here.

Sir 51:19c-d For the first colon, I follow Skehan's and Deutch's interpretations, which follow the Syriac and Ms. B text, where יד is the subject of פתח, in contrast to the Greek translation ("I opened my hands") and the interpretations of Sanders and Delcor.[58] My favoring of the Syriac and Ms. B text readings is due, in part, to the similarity in sense between v. 19d in 11Q5 and the analogous verse in the Syriac and Ms. B text. The Greek of v. 19d reads, "I mourned my ignorance."

This verse refers to Wisdom's "hidden things." Sirach 4:18 refers to Wisdom's

---

55. Rabinowitz "Qumran Original," 178; and Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 575.

56. A similar reasoning is expressed by van Peursen, *Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, 91.

57. Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 394.

58. Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 388–400; Deutsch, "Sirach 51 Acrostic," 402.

secrets, and 14:21 (in Greek) refers to pondering her secrets. Rabinowitz observes that the same phrase that is used in this poem appears in 42:18 with the preposition *bêt*, though in that passage the reference is not to Wisdom's secrets but to the secrets or crafty ways of abyss and deep.[59]

Sir 51:20 a-b Since the verb ברר does not occur with the preposition אל, presumably some verb of motion is to be understood in this colon.

The reconstruction of this and the following lines must be done largely from the Greek and Syriac translations, the Ms. B text being a retranslation of the Syriac.[60] Given the occasional disparity between the translations and the 11Q5 version, we must take any reconstruction with a grain of salt. Much of the reconstructed Hebrew is based on the work of Skehan.[61]

Sir 51:21 For the first two words of v. 21a (מעי נכמרו), I follow Skehan's reconstruction.[62]

I read the verb בקש following these words, rather than Skehan's דרש in part because the former can be construed as "to desire," while דרש cannot. The Greek ἐκζητέω suggests דרש (Exod 18:5; 2Chr 12:14; etc.), though does not rule out בקש (Zech 8:22).

Sir 51:22 Skehan notes the parallel with Isa 50:4 and suggests that this biblical verse should inform word order here.[63]

I assume that the single reference to God in the poem is to support the poet's continued assertions of his own power to encourage his pupils to seek out wisdom. Notice that here the poem shifts attention from the personal experience of the poet/sage, to what God, Wisdom, or the foolish do or should do. Note the wordplay between אדני and אודנו.

Sir 51:23 For the first word of this verse, Skehan reads סור instead of the Ms. B text's פנו.[64] Another possibility, in order to satisfy the acrostic structure, is to front the word סכלים as found in the Ms. B text.[65] Skehan's reading reflects the word order of the Syriac and the Greek. The Hebrew נבלים is preferred to Skehan's פתיים because the Greek ἀπαίδευτος translates נבל in Prov 17:21.

For the second colon of this verse, I follow Skehan.[66] The syntax and association between סור and לון are found in Gen 19:2. Note the harmony between

---

59. Rabinowitz, "Qumran Original," 180.

60. See the more recent study of van Peursen for the evidence of the B text being ultimately derived from a retroversion from the Syriac (W. Th. van Peursen, "Sirach 51:13–30 in Hebrew and Syriac," in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* [ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen; OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003], 357–74).

61. Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 387–400.

62. Ibid., 396–97.

63. Ibid., 397.

64. Ibid.

65. This is proposed, e.g., by M. Z. Segal, *Sepher Ben Sira* (in Hebrew; Jerusalem: Bialik, 1953), 362.

66. Skehan ,"Acrostic Poem," 397.

words of the two cola, סור and מוסר (and the precedent for the association of the roots סור and יסר in Sir 6:22 [Ms. A]); note also the harmony of *lāmed-nûn-bêt* in each colon.

Sir 51:24 Although Skehan reconstructs a hypothetical מאכלה at the end of the first colon of this verse, I follow the Ms. B text's מן אילו, which has a basis not only in the Syriac but also in the Greek.[67] Note the alliteration between *dālet-mêm-tāw* at the beginning and *mêm-dālet* at the end.

Sir 51:25 For the idiom of the first colon, see Deut 6:7. Conceivably, the line might be translated "I spoke by means of her," following the idiom in Num 12:2.

Although the Syriac contains the cognate of חכמה in the second colon (and subsequently the Ms. B text contains חכמה), most commentators assume, following the Greek translation, that the colon does not have the word for wisdom, nor for that matter a pronominal object. As many have observed, the result of this is that nowhere in the poem does the word "wisdom" occur; the subject of the poet's pursuit is implicitly referred to only through pronouns.

For the translation of the verbs פתח and דבר with the English past tense, and their interpretation as perfects not used as part of a performative utterance, see the work on verbs in Sirach by van Peursen and Max Rogland.[68]

Sir 51:26a-b The order of words for this verse follows Skehan's model.[69] The subject could conceivably be נפשכם, "your throat."

Sir 51:26c-c' For the second colon, Skehan notes the similar expressions in 1Chr 22:19; Sir 7:20; 30:21; 38:34.[70]

Sir 51:27 Skehan sees this as a tricolon and follows the Syriac translation.[71]

Sir 51:28 The translation "through her" follows the Greek, while "through me" reflects the Syriac. All things being equal, we might expect the first person, since the first person appears in the preceding verse. Note, of course, that the focus shifts to God in the next lines.

Sir 51:29 For the words "kindness" and "praise," the pronoun is 3rd per. masc. sg. in Greek and 1st common sg. in Syriac. The reference of the Greek is to God, a subtle return to the same subject as the first verse of this paragraph (Sir 51:22). Conceivably, of course, the original composition could have included a feminine pronoun and referred to Wisdom.

Sir 51:30 For *pê* as the concluding letter, see Skehan.[72] He cites Pss 25 and 34 and explains that this is for the purpose of spelling *ʾālep*.

---

67. Ibid.

68. Van Peursen, *Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, 75; and Max Rogland, "Alleged Non-Past Uses of Qatal in Classical Hebrew" (Ph.D. diss., Leiden University, 2001), 114 (cited by van Peursen, 75 n 56).

69. Skehan, "Acrostic Poem," 388.

70. Ibid., 398.

71. Ibid.

72. Ibid., 399 n. 17. See also his article "They shall not be found in parables (Sir 38,33)," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 40.

In the second colon, the implied antecedent of the subject of "will give" is God. This reflects the Greek, while the Syriac avoids the problem of a vague antecedent by including a passive verb. The syntax of an active verb נתן follows that of Gen 30:18.

Reading and Structure of the Poem

We begin with some general points. First, the poem is an alphabetic acrostic; that is, each bicolon begins with another letter of the alphabet, following the typical sequence, with one innovation: the last bicolon does not begin with *tāw*. Instead, after the *tāw* line, the poem has one more verse that begins with *pê*. Skehan has commented on this device and observes that Pss 25 and 34 are similar in this respect and that this results in a sequence wherein the first letters of the poem's first, middle, and final verses spell ʾ*ālep*, the name of the first letter of the alphabet and a verb that means "to teach." It might also be pointed out that, having the entire book end with an acrostic poem that concerns, at least metaphorically, the pursuit of a wife, makes Sirach's conclusion similar to the conclusion of the book of Proverbs, which book finishes with an acrostic poem that focuses on the difficulty of finding a "capable wife." The acrostics at the end of both Proverbs and Sirach help evoke completeness and closure, as this is one of the acrostic's commonly described effects.[73] In particular, the acrostic structure here resonates with the theme of pursuing wisdom from youth to old age.

Second, the poem nowhere mentions wisdom specifically. Although the Greek and Syriac translations do mention *sophia* or *hekmethā*, respectively, it is commonly thought among critics that because the Greek text mentions *sophia* where the Syriac and the Dead Sea Scroll have only a pronoun, and since the Syriac only mentions *hekmethā* where Greek has no reference to *sophia*, the original Hebrew probably had no mention of wisdom at all. This is curious and has a certain similarity with love poetry from more recent times (e.g., Shakespeare's sonnets), where the name of the beloved is typically avoided, perhaps for the sake of the beloved's security, but also functioning, perhaps, as a way of emphasizing the lover's distance from her/his beloved.[74] Here it is conceivable that the absence of a specific mention of wisdom encourages the analogy between the pursuit of wisdom and the pursuit of a bride.

Based on the respective topics of the verses, I divide the poem into three parts, or verse paragraphs. The first, comprising four verses, one tricolon and three bicola (vv. 13–15d), functions as a kind of introduction; it concerns the search for wisdom as a young person, considered from the perspective of an older

---

73. See Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques* (JSOT-Sup 26: Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 198.

74. On the separation of lover from the beloved in poetry, see Jack Goody, *Food and Love: A Cultural History of East and West* (London: Verso, 1998), 122.

person. In each verse there is some reference to youth or aging.[75] This section of the poem introduces the basic idea that one should start the search for wisdom in youth, and it implies that this pursuit continues throughout life. The second paragraph of the poem is more than twice as long as the first, including nine bicola, vv. 16–21. These verses speak of the poet's passion for wisdom when he was a young man and contains the most obvious sexually allusive language. The third paragraph, comprising ten verses (vv. 22–30), is characterized by the poet's plea to the foolish and others to follow his example. As in the first introductory paragraph, the poet speaks from the perspective of experience and age. The last verse functions also as a conclusion to the entire poem.[76] The macro-structure of the poem demonstrates a rhetorical sensitivity, first illustrating personal experience and then exhorting the reader. From a structural perspective, the division of the poem into two larger verse paragraphs, bookended with introductory and concluding verses, is one characteristic shared between this poem and the poetry of Sirach.[77]

We may, now, briefly look a little closer at each of these paragraphs separately. The poem begins with a tricolon. This is somewhat unusual for Sirach, which is dominated by the bicolon. The verse would appear to be, as a whole, the same length as other bicola (as measured by counting its letters, syllables, and words), instead of 33 percent longer, as one might have expected. The tricolon structure is somewhat incongruous because it breaks the relatively obvious pattern that persists through the rest of the verse paragraph, where a *bêt* prepositional phrase concludes each initial colon, the Hebrew preposition conventionally being translated "in" ("in her beauty," בתרה; "in the ripening," בבשול; "(in) a flat plain," במישור). Grouping בטרם, which also begins with the *bêt* preposition, with the verb "I wandered" means that this pattern is broken.[78]

The mention of "boy" (נער) in the first line is important, because it is

---

75. Verses 13 and 15c–d mention youth explicitly (נַעַר, נְעוּרַי), the latter verse specifically referencing the perspective of an older person through the preposition *min,* "from my youth"; v. 14 refers to the search for Wisdom "until the end"; and v. 15a–b describes the maturation of fruit, which seems, in this context, a metaphorical description of aging.

76. My division of the poem into macro-units is quite close to that of Di Lella, though he considers v. 22 part of the middle verse paragraph (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 577). Note that I do not agree with him and Skehan that this division should be described as "marked" by the 3rd per. masc. sg. pronominal suffix.

77. See, e.g., the poem that covers the subject of shame in 41:14a–42:8, which is divided in two parts with introductions and conclusions to each part; the poem on daughters 42:9–14, which breaks into two paragraphs, one covering a father's concerns over a daughter and the other giving instructions for fathers; as well as the prelude to the "Praise of the Ancestors" (44:1–15), which also breaks neatly into two halves, the first addressing those ancestors who achieved fame in their lifetime and the second addressing those who won eternal fame and renown through their piety (Reymond, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry*, 49–60, 78–84).

78. One is tempted to suggest an adverbial usage of בטרם and translate "I was a boy previously, / I wandered around and sought her," though such a use of בטרם is unattested.

mirrored in the final line of the first verse paragraph (v. 15d) by the word "youth" (נעורים); such loose bookending appears also in the third verse paragraph, in the repetition of "give a reward" in vv. 22a and 30b.

The implicit notion of the third verse (51:15a-b) is that the pursuit of wisdom reaches its fulfillment only later in life.[79] It is this idea, further emphasized in the third verse paragraph (especially v. 30), that suggests that the poem's analogy between sexual desire and the desire for wisdom does not extend to the gratification of these desires. The poem does not celebrate the pursuit of wisdom as something that can bring immediate and complete satisfaction, which seems to be one hallmark of the erotic.[80] Instead, although acquaintance with wisdom may occur immediately (accompanied by "much learning" [v. 16b] and "understanding" [v. 20c]), this does not satisfy the true student of wisdom, who continues to pursue her "until the end" (v. 14b). Presumably this is due to a quality of wisdom, represented in Sir 24:21, which leaves those who eat and drink of her still hungry and thirsty.

The particular image of 51:15a-b has certain similarities to other passages from Sirach, including Ben Sira's characterization of himself in relation to the great biblical writers; in 33:16 he characterizes himself as a gleaner coming behind the grape harvesters. In addition, it is reminiscent of the image of wisdom as a grapevine; Wisdom speaks in 24:17: "I sprout favors [χάρις] like a grapevine, / my blossoms (turning to) glorious and abundant fruit."[81] The fact that both the poet (of this poem) and Wisdom (in Sir 24:17) employ similar language is interesting. Later, in 51:23, the poet uses other words that are also commonly found in Wisdom's mouth, specifically urging "fools" to "turn aside" just as Wisdom urges the "simple" to "turn aside" in Prov 9. One wonders what the significance might be of the poet pursuing Wisdom while at the same time using Wisdom's words and images as his own. Curiously, this also has precedents in Sirach, where Ben Sira often adopts the role of Wisdom, or at least adopts the language Wisdom uses to describe her own activity. Di Lella makes this observation in his comments on Sir 16:25:[82] "Ben Sira boldly employs words placed in the mouth of personified Wisdom in Prov 1:23: '*I will pour out* [Heb *ʾabbîʿâ*, same verb as here]

---

79. Similar ideas are expressed in Sir 6:8.

80. My reading differs from that of others, e.g., Snaith. Although Snaith does not recognize the erotic dimension to the poem, he does mention its "emphasis on quick reward (verse 16)," which verse he translates "I had hardly begun to listen when I was rewarded" (*Ecclesiasticus*, 261, 259).

81. Note also that in Ps 128:3 a wife is compared to a fruit-bearing vine. In this way, perhaps, the connection between wife and Wisdom is meant to be further underlined.

82. "I pour out my spirit by measure, / humbly I declare my knowledge" (Ms. A). For the Hebrew, see Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 47.

to you my spirit [rûhî].'"[83] In a similar way, Ben Sira claims in 24:33 that he "pours out" (ἐκχέω) his teachings.[84]

The second section of the poem is formally characterized by the first person pronouns on the first words of each bicolon, whether noun or verb. The verbs, as in the last paragraph, are chiastically aligned toward the beginnings and endings of verses.[85] Usually this chiastic pattern is complemented by other syntactic elements in similar mirror relationships to one another.[86] In addition, a pattern emerges between the verses; six of the nine verses have a second colon that begins with a modifier phrase, the three exceptions being in v. 18b, v. 18d', and v. 21.[87] The general emphasis on the first person reflects the focus of this paragraph, that is, the poet's personal experience pursuing wisdom. That most of the verbs represent actions of the past is implied by the perfect forms of the verbs (especially in the initial cola), by the temporal reference "from the first" (v. 20c) and by the very actions that some of the verbs represent, such as hands opening gates, which is an act that seems generically preliminary to another.

The first verse of the second paragraph is interesting because it exhibits clear semantic parallelism between its two cola, by which I mean the word pair "little" // "much." As mentioned earlier, when these kinds of word pairs appear, they usually complement the sense division of the text, as does the semantic parallelism that appears between the first lines of the third verse paragraph "tongue" // "lips." The sexual language of this paragraph is discussed below.

The third paragraph witnesses a shift to a slightly different register and focus, where the poet directly addresses his audience and begins speaking of God. The tonal and focal shift is marked by the obvious reference to "the Lord," a presence heretofore unmentioned in the poem. The switch between topics is not altogether unprecedented, since the non-Masoretic Ps 154, also from 11Q5, attests a similar shift in that poem from a focus on God to Wisdom. The shift in Sir 51:22–30 is further marked by the fact that the poet takes on the voice of Wisdom herself; the poet urges fools to turn aside to him, similar to how Wisdom urges the simple to turn aside to her in Prov 9. In Prov 9:4 and 9:16 Wisdom speaks: "Whoever is

---

83. Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 280.

84. James H. Charlesworth has called attention to the fact that in the *Odes of Solomon* 12, "the Odist speaks as Wisdom," which notion he connects to Sir 24 ("The Odes of Solomon and the Jewish Wisdom Texts," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* [ed. Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002], 339).

85. Verbs appear as the first word in 51:16, 18, 19a–a', 19a''–b, and as the second word in vv. 17, 19c–d, 20a–b, 20c–d, and 21. Verbs appear as the last word in 51:18, 19a–a', 19a''–b, 19c–d, 20a–b, 20c–d and as the next-to-last word in vv. 16, 17, and 21.

86. For example, objects and/or modifier phrases are organized chiastically in 51:17, 19a–a', 19a''–b, 20a–b, and 20c–d.

87. Note that in vv. 19b–21b these modifier phrases begin with a *bêt* preposition, though four of these cases are reconstructed.

simple [פֶּתִי], may you turn in here [root סור] . . .” and in this Sirach passage, the poet says, “Turn aside [root סור] to me fools [נבלים] and spend the night. . . .”

This section of the poem is more difficult to discuss structurally, given the fact that we do not know its original form in Hebrew. Nevertheless, if we can trust the reconstruction, the paragraph begins with an obvious semantic pair between לשון (tongue) and שפה (lips) as well as a phonetic pair between אדני and אודנו. Like the first verse paragraph, the third paragraph is bracketed by a lexical repetition in its first and last verses, the repetition of the words נתן and שכר.[88] Among the other notable features are the phonetic parallels between סורו // מוסר (a wordplay that, as Skehan and Di Lella note, is at work also in Sir 6:22, where מוסר could be either “discipline” or “thing that is remote”—a *hopʿal* participle from סור)[89] and אלי נבלים // לינו בבית in v. 23; the weak semantic link between cola of a verse in v. 24, between חסר and צמא (be lacking // thirsty); the sequence of verse-initial volitive verbs in vv. 27–30.[90] The poem concludes in v. 30 with strong grammatical parallelism between syntactic elements (Verb-Object-Modifier // Verb-Object-Modifier), as well as the repetition of בעתו at the end of each line.

Sexual Language

As is clear in my translation, I do not endorse the sexual interpretation for all the words that might be so interpreted: words such as ידע, “to know,” in v. 15d. However, it is undeniable that some of the poem's words and phrases are part of the sexual vocabulary and imagery of ancient Hebrew. Of those words and phrases that have been interpreted as sexual innuendoes, those most suggestive of erotic desire are those using imagery or idioms with precedents in Biblical Hebrew; these include the association of fire (and, by extension, heat) with sexual passion (“I, myself, burned for her” [v. 19a], “my inner self burned to pursue her” [v. 21a]), a biblical precedent for which can be found, for example, in Cant 8:6 “‘. . . for love (is) strong like death, / passion [קִנְאָה] relentless as Sheol; // its flames (are) flames of fire, / a powerful flame.’” Note also Sir 9:9: “Love for (a woman) blazes like fire.”[91] The association of “hand” with penis and the association of “opening” with sex itself are other sexual innuendos (“My hand open[ed her gates] [v. 19c]), biblical precedents for which can be found in a single passage, in Cant 5:2-4: Male: “‘Open for me, my sister . . .’” Female: “‘My lover sent his hand through the hole. . . .’”[92] Although other words and phrases have obvious sexual connotations, I do not believe that they point directly to sex or deserve an erotic transla-

---

88. Additionally, there is a semantic link between ידה in v. 22b and תהלה in v. 29b.

89. Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 578.

90. I assume that תשמח is a jussive, as the verb in the next colon is a jussive.

91. See also Skehan's translation of Sir 6:2: “Fall not into the grip of desire / Lest like fire it consume your strength” (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 180).

92. Collins notes the similarities between the Sirach verse (19c) and the Canticles pas-

tion. And this is even more the case with regard to other words such as כף, לקח, רגל, טוב, that is, the words for "teaching," "palm," "foot," "good." Translations and interpretations that too heavily emphasize the sexual dimension of the poem risk obscuring the poem's subtleties, obscuring the sober benefits of Wisdom's pursuit.

A hesitancy to find sexual innuendoes in the poem, or in a part of it, may be due, in part, to the inherent contradiction and paradox that such references produce. One might well ask, for example: Does the author actually wish to encourage chaste, righteous behavior through erotically charged poetry? It might be noted, therefore, that the author of Proverbs characterizes Wisdom as a kind of tavern keeper. And Ben Sira makes a comparison between Wisdom and a young bride in 15:2.

As mentioned earlier, the sexual language also presents some problems with regard to the identification of Ben Sira as author, since his book really does not contain much that one could consider sexual innuendo. For example, even in the same verse (15:2) where Ben Sira compares Wisdom to a bride, he also compares her to a mother. All the same, other passages reveal that the pursuit of Wisdom was to be accomplished through means otherwise forbidden. For example, Ben Sira recommends pursuing Wisdom to her house and "looking into her windows and listening at her doors" (Sir 14:23). This is just what Ben Sira advises against doing in 21:23a–22b in relation to a human female.[93] Skehan translates the latter passage: "A boor peeps through the doorway of a house, / but a tactful person keeps his glance cast down."[94] In short, it seems that, for Sirach, the normal rules of behavior and decorum do not apply when describing Wisdom and her pursuit.

What is the purpose of this characterization? Deutsch suggests that the erotic imagery functions to "engage the audience," while Sanders suggests that it implies that the reader should apply sexual desire and energy to the chaste pursuit of Wisdom.[95] In addition, I think, there is the suggestion that Wisdom provides everything that one would want. In Sir 6:28–31 Wisdom is described as a beautiful throne, a robe of gold, and jewelry, and in Sir 15:2, as a mother and a young wife. In view of these descriptions, Ben Sira seems to be saying in his book that following Wisdom will result in acquiring (by the end of one's life) all the material (and spiritual) benefits one could want, including a mate. As John J. Collins observes, there is no reason to assume, as Sanders does, that the audience or author of this poem was celibate.[96]

In summary, then, the poem does contain sexual or erotic language, but

---

sage and writes (in relation to the Sirach verse): "The erotic element in these verses is undeniable" (*Jewish Wisdom*, 54).

93. Di Lella notes that 14:23 alludes to similar imagery in Cant 2:9 and also connects this with Sir 21:23a–22b (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 264).

94. Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 305.

95. Deutsch, "Sirach 51 Acrostic," 406; and Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 187.

96. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 54.

this is *not* for the purpose of celebrating or bemoaning "carnal" passion. In the end, labeling the entire poem "erotic" seems to me unjustified for this reason—though, of course, the language and imagery may be so labeled.

<div align="center">LINE LENGTH, PARALLELISM, AND ALLUSION TO SCRIPTURE</div>

Consideration of the poem's first ten verses (51:13–19d), consisting of nine bicola and one tricolon, demonstrates that cola of a verse are often of the same or similar length.[97] When there is any discrepancy in line length between cola of a bicolon, it is always the case that the second colon seems to have more syllables and/or consonants.[98] As for their cumulative length, the verses seem relatively consistent; that is, each verse is approximately the same length as all the others, including the tricolon, which has shorter cola than those of the other verses. Comparison to poems in Sirach suggests that the approximate length of this poem's cola corresponds to the length of cola in the poems preserved among Sirach's later chapters.[99] Notice that the other non-Masoretic poetic compositions from 11Q5 seem to express less regularity in relation to the length of their cola; sometimes the first colon is longer, sometimes the second. Also, the cumulative length of verses in these other poems often varies widely.

Parallelism in this poem rarely appears within a single colon (owing to the brevity of individual cola), though repetitive pairs of words occur in this distribution at the end of the second verse paragraph and in the verse that concludes the poem.[100] Even phonetic parallelism plays a relatively minor role in this distribution.

---

97. The tabulation of consonants-syllables-words for the first ten verses is the following: v. 13: 6-4-2 // 9-6-2 // 7-5-1; v. 14: 9-6-3 // 14-8-2; v. 15a–b: 12-7-3 // 12-7-3; v. 15c–d: 14-8-3 // 14-9-2; v. 16: 14-8-3 // 13-8-3; v. 17: 9-6-3 // 13-8-3; v. 18: 11-7-2 // 17-9-3; v. 19a–a': 11-6-3 // 14-8-2; v. 19a''–b: 11-6-3 // 14-8-2; v. 19c–d: 12-9-3 // 14-9-2.

98. Sirach 51:14, 15c–d, 17, 18, 19a–a', 19a''–b. Curiously, sometimes the second colon has fewer words than the first, though the number of syllables suggests that the second colon took longer to pronounce.

99. From an analysis of colon length among the poems preserved in the Ben Sira Masada scroll, it seems that cola in the poems that precede the "Praise of the Ancestors" (Sir 44–50:24) are slightly longer than those in the last chapters (Eric D. Reymond, "Even unto a Spark: An Analysis of the Parallelistic Structure in the Wisdom of Ben Sira 40:11–44:15," [Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1999]). Although space prohibits a thorough analysis of all the details and exceptions, the poems from 40:11–43:33 generally have lines ranging between 13–16 consonants, 7–10 syllables, and 3–4 words, while the poetry from 44:1–15 has lines ranging between 12–14 consonants, 7–9 syllables, and 2–3 words. Significantly, while approximately only one-sixteenth of the cola in 40:11–43:33 contain only 2 words, almost one-third of the cola in 44:1–15 contain only 2 words. This corresponds nicely with 51:13-19, where 8 out of 21 cola contain only 2 words.

100. Repetitive parallels appear in vv. 21b (קנין // קנה), 26b (תשא // משא), and 30a (פעל // פעל); semantic parallels in vv. 25a (פתחתי פי // דברתי) and 28b (כסף // זהב).

Parallelism between cola of individual verses is the dominant distribution in poetry from the Hebrew Bible, where we find semantic, repetitive, grammatical, and phonetic parallelism usually working simultaneously together. Such dominance is also found in most of the non-Masoretic poetry from 11Q5. We have already observed some examples of standard parallelism in the passages quoted from Proverbs and Psalms earlier.[101] Further, most of the non-Masoretic psalms also contain this kind of parallelism. One may see examples of this same kind of parallelism, where word pairs occur between lines of bicola, and where the verb of the second line is gapped, in the non-Masoretic psalms from 11Q5:

> so, he made me the shepherd of his flock,
>> and ruler over his kids.
> My hands made a flute,
>> my fingers a harp,
>> and I rendered glory to the Lord. (Ps 151A:1c–2c)

> From the gates of righteous (people) her voice is heard,
>> and from the congregation of pious (people) her song.
> While they eat in satiety, she is spoken of,
>> while they drink in community together. (Ps 154:12–13)

In Sir 51:13–30, however, there are surprisingly few semantic parallels, especially word pairs, between cola of verses; such parallels do occur, however, at structurally significant parts of this poem, namely, at the beginning of verse paragraphs.[102] Grammatical parallelism, by contrast, occurs frequently between cola of individual verses.[103] This is not so much the case, incidentally, with Ps 119, where frequently the first line will be incomplete grammatically without the second line. Although the predictability of syntactic units within individual verses would allow for the elision or "gapping" of verbs in second lines, this is never encountered, something that can be attributed to the absence of semantic associations between words within the verse.[104] The fact that each verse contains at

---

101. It should be noted that the longest Masoretic psalm in 11Q5, i.e., Ps 119, actually does not contain that many semantic word pairs, though the other Masoretic psalms do.

102. Sirach 51:16 (מעט // הרבה), 22 (לשון // שפה). Semantic parallelism between cola of a verse also appears in v. 19a–b (טרד // שלה) and 27b–c (מעט // הרבה). There is a weak link between סור and לין in v. 23 and חסר and צמא in v. 24.

103. The degree to which grammatical parallelism is present in the reconstructed second part of the poem is difficult to determine, because it is especially hard to predict what the word order of these verses would be. But consistent syntactic parallelism in the parts of the poem that still exist is clear; the chiastic patterns of verbs that appear at the beginning and end of verses is rather consistent in the first two sections of the poem.

104. On gapping and ellipsis in Hebrew poetry, see Cynthia L. Miller, "Ellipsis Involving Negation in Biblical Poetry," in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Ronald L. Troxel et al.;

least two predicates, usually where the syntactic elements of one line are paral-
lel to those in its mate, results in some associations between words that would
otherwise not seem similar, but associations that seem important for the poem's
theme: בוא // דרש (14; coming // seeking), קנה // לא־עזב (20c-d; aquiring // not
being abandoned), ידה // נתן (22; giving // praising).[105] The first pair suggests reci-
procity; the second suggests that the ultimate benefit of acquiring wisdom is not
feeling isolated, and the third pair suggests a connection between what God does
for humanity and what humanity does for God. Phonetic parallelism may appear
in the (reconstructed) repetition of *ʾālep-dālet-nûn* between the cola of v. 22 and
in the repetition of *sāmek-rêš* between cola of v. 23.

As for parallels between adjacent verses, semantic and repetitive parallelism
appears most commonly in this distribution, creating strings of loose associa-
tions between words; especially noticeable are the words for body parts.[106] Gram-
matical parallelism is also of significance in this distribution, since the consistent
patterns between adjacent verses often complement the sense division of the text.
Note, for example, the sequence of prepositional phrases (each beginning with
bêt) that end each first line in vv. 14 through 15c-d, and the appearance of 1st per.
common sg. pronouns "my" and "I" on verse-initial nouns and perfect verbs in
the second verse paragraph. Phonetic parallels appear between the two conso-
nant combinations *qôph-nûn* and *kāp-nûn* between v. 20a and v. 21.

The most important parallels separated by a verse or more are the repetitive
links that bracket the poem or verse paragraphs or that otherwise complement
the sense divisions of the text. Of these, note especially בקש (vv. 13, 21, 26c-d'),
שמח (vv. 15a-b and 29), קנה (vv. 20c-d, 21, 25, 28), נתן (vv. 22, 26c-c', 30), and

---

Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 37-52; eadem, "A Linguistic Approach to Ellipsis in
Biblical Poetry (Or, What to Do When Exegesis of What Is There Depends on What Isn't),"
Bulletin for Biblical Research 13 (2003): 251-70; eadem, "The Syntax of Elliptical Comparative
Construction," *ZAH* 17–20 (2004–7): 136–49.

105. This phenomenon of words related to each other through the grammatical paral-
lelism of a given verse is seen throughout Sirach, as a result of the frequency in this book
of grammatical parallelism and the infrequency of traditional word pairs. However, this lin-
guistic phenomenon is not unique to Sirach or even to ancient Semitic poetry; it is observed
in the writings as diverse as those of Arthur Rimbaud to Dr. Johnson (Susan Wirth Fusco,
*Syntactic Structure in Rimbaud's Illuminations: A Stylistic Approach to the Analysis of Form in
Prose Poetry* [Romance Monographs, Inc. 49; Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1990],
62; William K. Wimsatt, Jr., *The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson* [New Haven and London: Yale
University Press, 1941], 33). Wimsatt writes: "sameness of syntax, sameness of positions of
emphasis in the frame of the syntax, must produce opportunities for likeness of substantial
meaning" (ibid.).

106. Note רגל (v. 15c) // אוזן (v. 16a); נפש - פנים (v. 19a/a') // נפש (v. 19a'') // יד (v. 19c) //
כף (v. 20a) // לב (v. 20c) // מעים (v. 21a) // לשון - שפה (v. 22a/b); and פה (v. 25a) // צואר - נפש
(v. 26a/b) // נפש (v. 26c') // עין (v. 27a). Many of these nouns also share another trait: most carry
the 1st per. common sg. possessive suffix. Notice that several of these word pairs stretch across
the boundaries between verse paragraphs. Among the other words that are linked repetitively
between adjacent verses are שוב (vv. 18b–19a'), נפש (v. 19a–19a''), and קנה (vv. 20c–21b).

שכר (vv. 22, 30) at the beginning and ending of the third verse paragraph. The consistent appearance of some words also gives the poem a sense of coherency; see, for example, מצא (vv. 16, 20a-b, 26c-c', 27), and נפש (vv. 19a-a', 19a''-b, 26a-b, 26c-c', and 29).

These parallelistic structures all have analogues in the poetry of Sirach, though the most significant are those structures that are typical of Sirach and atypical of poetry from the Hebrew Bible, including especially the following: (1) the rarity of repetitive/semantic parallelism between cola of a verse, with the tendency for this type and distribution of parallelism to appear at the beginning and ending of verse paragraphs; (2) the importance of grammatical parallelism between cola of a verse and the resultant creation of associations between otherwise semantically dissimilar words; (3) the absence of verbal ellipsis or gapping; and (4) the important role of semantic and grammatical parallelism between adjacent verses in creating patterns that complement the division of the text into paragraphs.[107] An example of how grammatical patterns between adjacent verses complement the thematic division of a text is found in Ben Sira's "Hymn to the Creator" (42:15–43:33): the first paragraph below treats warm weather precipitation and storms; the second deals with cold weather precipitation and storms:

43:13	ותנצח זיקות משפט	גערתו [תתו]ה ברד
43:14	ויעף עבים כעיט	למענו פרע אוצר
43:15	ותגדע אבני ברד	גבורתו <ת>חזק ענן
43:17a/16a	ובכחו יניף הרים	קול רעמו יחיל ארצו
43:16b/17b	עלעול סופה וסערה	אמרתו תחריף תימן

43:17c-d	וכארבה ישכן רדתו	כרשף יפרח שלגו
43:18	וממטרו יתמיה לבב	תור לבנו יהג עינים
43:19	ויצמח כסנה צצים	[גם] כפור כמלח ישפך
43:20	וכרגב יקפיא מקור	[צנת רוח צפ]ון ישיב
	[וכשרין ילבש מקוה]	[על כל מעמד מים יקרים]

43:13   **His** rebuke [stamps] the hail,
           steering the meteors of (his) judgment.
43:14   For **him**self he unleashes storms
           and sends clouds soaring like birds of prey.
43:15   **His** strength buttresses clouds
           and splinters hailstones.
43:17a/16a   **His** thunderclap brings his earth to writhe,
           shaking mountains with its force.
43:16b/17b   **His** word sharpens the south wind,
           hurricane, storm, and tempest.

---

107. See Reymond, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry*, 1–2, 98–99, 108–10, 137–38.

43:17c-d	**Like** flying fire-bolts is his snow
	like descending locusts is its fall.
43:18	The aspect of its whiteness turns eyes away;
	the mind marvels at his rain.
43:19	Yea, he pours out frost **like** salt,
	making blossoms sprout **like** thorns.
43:20	He makes [the cold north wind] bluster;
	like a clod of earth, he freezes the spring.
	[He spreads (a crust) over all the still water,
	the pool dresses **as though** in armor.][108]

Notice here that the first verse paragraph is characterized by, among other things, the consistent presence of verse-initial words that bear the 3rd per. masc. sg. pronominal suffix ("his" or "him"). In all but one case, this verse-initial word is the grammatical subject of its clause. The second verse paragraph contains numerous comparisons, employing the *kaph* preposition, translated as "like" or "as though." In this paragraph, in contrast to the last, just one verse begins with a grammatical subject.[109]

That the poem of Sir 51:13–30 contains similar kinds of patterns but is also an acrostic is that much more interesting. The acrostic structure, of course, preferences the order of words, as a result of its own demands, as well as the words themselves. When one consults other acrostic poems in the Hebrew Bible, one finds that they are often not organized into clear verse paragraphs based on content, nor do they often employ the kind of paragraph patterns observed above. There are no other acrostics in Ben Sira, though there are plenty of poems that contain twenty-two or twenty-three verses; it is especially important that the book starts with two such poems.[110]

As for this text's reuse of scriptural language and imagery, there are no examples of clear allusion. The language is sufficiently unique so that only a few echoes of specific biblical passages are perceptible. Some of these are within the reconstructed text and so may be a result of the reconstruction being based on the ancient translation. The strongest echo is that between the first colon of v. 22 (נתן אדני לי לשוני שכר) and Isa 50:4 (אדני יהוה נתן לי לשון למודים). There are also more vague parallels, as already noted, between the language of vv. 18–21 and the sexual language of Canticles. In no case does it seem that the text is

---

108. For the text and translation of the entire poem, see Reymond, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry*, 60–69.

109. One can find stretches of biblical poetry that attest a consistency in grammatical structure from verse to verse too, though these are often cases where there is some syntactic dependence from verse to verse (as in Prov 8:27–30 and Isa 2:12–16).

110. Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 74; Di Lella describes the book's beginning and ending with poems of twenty-two to twenty-three lines as an *inclusio* structure.

drawing on a specific biblical passage or context either to reinforce its idea or to reinterpret or comment on the biblical text.

Conclusions

The common ways that parallelism is deployed in this poem are all the more significant since they are, by and large, not shared with the Masoretic or non-Masoretic material from 11Q5. Together with the consistencies between the approximate length of lines in 51:13–19c-d (as attested in the 11Q5 scroll) and the length of lines in the later chapters of Sirach, these common traits suggest that Ben Sira was, in fact, the author of this poem, more specifically, the author of the Hebrew version of this poem as it appears in 11Q5. This finds further confirmation in the division of the poem into two roughly equal halves, with a brief introductory paragraph; in the metaphor of v. 15a-b; in the emphasis on perceiving the benefit of something from old age, or later in life (see 6:34); in the emphasis on the relatively little work involved in benefiting from wisdom's pursuit (6:19); and in the curious manner in which the poet of 51:13–30 adopts the language of wisdom for himself. The single feature that truly seems unlike the rest of Ben Sira's poetry is a surface feature: the use of the tricolon. Even the somewhat ribald language fits with Ben Sira's view that the pursuit of wisdom need not assume the same rules and expectations as the pursuit of a wife. Nevertheless, we are left to wonder why the poem was included in 11Q5 with other poems that are more clearly linked with David. I can offer only a speculative guess, that Sir 51:13–30 was included initially with other poetic works that had to do with wisdom, like Ps 154 and the Hymn to the Creator, and then only at a later time did this collection become exclusively associated with David.

Psalm 151A (11Q5 XXVIII, 3-12)

Introduction

This psalm, versions of which appear also in ancient Greek and Syriac translations of the Hebrew book of Psalms, purports to be a composition by David that recounts his selection by God and his anointing by Samuel, despite his relative physical meekness and his brothers' beauty and stature.[1] Unlike the other poems in this study, it bears a title in 11Q5, הללויה לדויד בן ישי "A Halleluyah of David, Son of Jesse." Although the attribution of a psalm to David is not unique among Hebrew writings, the specific historical context of this poem is.[2] The psalm that originally followed this poem in the 11Q5 manuscript (labeled Psalm 151B) similarly imagined David and his exploits, as known from the Bible, from the first person perspective. Owing to that text's fragmentary nature, I will limit my observations to Ps 151A.

Recent scholars have suggested that the poem Ps 151A, as it appears in 11Q5, was expanded from an originally shorter form.[3] This "new" material, which appears primarily in lines 5–7 (or, according to the verse labeling established in the *editio princeps*, vv. 3–4), is part of an interior monologue. This passage has presented problems to interpreters because of numerous variables and ambiguities in orthography, vocabulary, and syntax. In 1984, just over twenty years after the 11Q5 version of the psalm was first published, Sanders offered a synopsis

---

1. The psalm appears in the Septuagint and in select Syriac manuscripts. For more on the Syriac texts, see W. Baars, "Apocryphal Psalms," in *Canticles or Odes, Prayer of Manasseh, Apocryphal Psalms, Psalms of Solomon, Tobit, 1(3) Esdras* (ed. H. Schneider et al.; The Old Testament in Syriac, Part IV, fascicle 6; Leiden: Brill, 1972) and H. F. van Rooy, *Studies on the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms* (JSSSupp 7; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

2. See S. B. Gurewicz, "Hebrew Apocryphal Psalms from Qumran," *Australian Biblical Review* 15 (1967): 18.

3. This view is held, e.g., by Menahem Haran ("The Two Text-Forms of Psalm 151," *JJS* 39 [1988]: 176–77); Mark S. Smith ("How to Write a Poem," 186); and Hans Debel ("'The Lord Looks at the Heart' (1 Sam 16,7): 11QPsᵃ 151A–B as a 'Variant Literary Edition' of Ps 151 LXX," *RevQ* 23 (2008): 459–73. Most earlier scholars understand the version in 11Q5 as closer to the original poem than the versions in the LXX and in the Peshitta. My analysis does not propose a solution to this question.

of eighteen different interpretations of these lines, testifying, as he observed, to the lack of consensus regarding their interpretation.[4] More recent studies by J. B. Storfjell, Menahem Haran, Mark S. Smith, and others confirm the continued lack of consensus on some major issues.[5] A definitive interpretation of the poem seems difficult, if not impossible, because of the numerous linguistic variables, including ambiguous readings of the pronominal suffixes. As a matter of expediency, I begin with the basic assumption that the passage of vv. 3–4 makes sense thematically with the rest of the poem as it stands in 11Q5, the possibility of some

---

4. The poem was first published by James A. Sanders in "Ps 151 in 11QPsª," *ZAW* 75 (1963): 73-86. His synopsis is found in his article "A Multivalent Text: Psalm 151:3–4 Revisited," *HAR* 8 (1984): 167–84. This is the second article by Sanders that celebrates the original publication of the 11Q5 scroll poems; the first is "The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPsª) Reviewed" in *On Language, Culture, and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida* (ed. M. Black and W. A. Smalley; The Hague: Mouton, 1974), 79–99. The translations cited in his 1984 article include those of the following articles: Sanders, "Ps 151 in 11QPsª," 73–86; Patrick W. Skehan, "The Apocryphal Psalm 151," *CBQ* 25 (1963): 407–9; W. H. Brownlee, "The 11Q Counterpart to Psalm 151:1–5," *RevQ* 4 (1963): 379–87; Carmignac, "La Forme poétique du Psaume 151," 371–78; idem, "Précisions sur la forme poétique du Psaume 151," *RevQ* 5 (1965): 249–52; A. Dupont-Sommer, "Le Psaume cli dans 11QPsª et la problème de son origine essénienne," *Sem* 14 (1964): 25–62; I. Rabinowitz, "The Alleged Orphism of 11QPss 28 3–12," *ZAW* 76 (1964): 193–200; R. Weiss (whose translation is quoted but is not cited in the bibliography to Sanders's 1984 article; it is cited in his preceding article, "Psalms Scroll (11QPsª) Reviewed," 83: "*Herut* of 1 May," *Massa'* 15 [May 1964], n.p.); M. Delcor, "Zum Psalter von Qumran," *BZ* 10 (1966): 15–29; John Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission of the Apocryphal Psalms 151, 154 and 155," *HTR* 59 (1966): 257–81; R. Meyer, "Die Septuaginta-Fassung von Psalm 151:1–5 als Ergebnis einer dogmatischen Korrektur," in *Das Ferne und Nahe Wort: Festschrift Leonard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70 Lebenjahres am 30 November, 1966 gewidmet* (ed. Fritz Maass; BZAW 105; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967), 164–72; Magne, "Orphisme, pythagorisme, essénisme," 508–45; A. S. van der Woude, "Die fünf syrischen Psalmen (einschliesslich Psalm 151)," in *Poetische Schriften,* vol. 1 (*JSHRZ* 4.1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1977), 29–47; Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151," 163–89; Frank M. Cross, "David, Orpheus, and Psalm 151:3-4," *BASOR* 231 (1978): 69–71; J. M. Baumgarten, "*Perek Shirah*, an Early response to Psalm 151," *RevQ* 9 (1978): 575–78; Jean Starcky, "Le Psaume 151 des Septante retrouvé à Qumran," *Le Monde de la Bible* 7 (1979): 8–10; Morton Smith, "Psalm 151, David, Jesus, and Orpheus," *ZAW* 93 (1981): 247–53. The bibliography of Sanders's 1984 article contains many other references.

5. J. B. Storfjell, "The Chiastic Structure of Psalm 151," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25 (1987): 97–106; Haran, "Two Text-Forms," 171–82; Shemaryahu Talmon, "Extra-Canonical Hebrew Psalms from Qumran—Psalm 151," in idem, *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 244–72; R. Mancini, "Note sul Salmo 151," *RSO* 65 (1991): 125–29; Moshe Weinfeld, "The Angelic Song over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 154 n. 108; Martin Kleer, *Der liebliche Sänger der Psalmen Israels: Untersuchungen zu David als Dichter und Beter der Psalmen* (BBB 108; Bodenheim: Philo, 1996), 206–43, esp. 208–10; Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 182–208.

slight emendations to the suffixes notwithstanding.[6] A secondary assumption is that the passage expresses ideas consonant with other representations of David from the Bible and other early Jewish sources.

Like the biblical description in 1 Samuel 16, the poem describes David as a person smaller than his brothers, less physically attractive, and generally less important in order to make the point that God has chosen David for God's own reasons, not due to David's appearance or prestige.[7] The biblical account does not detail why exactly God chose David, but it does specify (in 1 Sam 16:7) that God "sees" something in David's "heart" or "mind" (לבב) that is imperceptible to humans; it seems likely that David exhibited in his heart/mind something close to piety, righteousness, fortitude, and obedience, as Josephus has it.[8] Presumably as part of his piety and righteousness, David expressed humility in relation to his poetic abilities, his successes, his future anointment, even his piety itself, as this is a point brought up in the Bible and elsewhere.[9] Because vv. 3–4 describe what David was thinking before he was anointed king, we expect them to express these same character traits. Several translations of David's interior monologue, however, do not convey this or, at least, present an interpretation that obscures David's piety. Some suggest a vanity to David by interpreting the monologue in such a way that David seems to brag that flora and fauna "cherish" or "extol" his poetry.[10] Others indicate that David is explicitly asserting his superior powers

---

6. This holds true whether or not the passage is an interpolation. If it is an interpolation by a later redactor, I assume that it made sense as an addition with the rest of the poem.

7. This is especially important for David as a successor to Saul, since Saul is characterized several times as tall and physically attractive (1 Sam 9:2).

8. Josephus, *Ant.* 8.1.1 §1. My understanding also implies that there is no explicit causal relationship between David's poetry and his election as king by God (for which suggestion, see Goldstein, review of James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 [11QPsa],*" 305).

9. Piety is seen, e.g., in 1 Sam 17:45, where David makes the point to Goliath that Goliath is better armed than he, but that he, David, comes to fight in the name of Yahweh. See also 1QM XI, 1–2 and Ps.-Philo, *L.A.B.* 59. Humility is described more explicitly with the appointment of other leaders like Moses, Samuel, and Jeremiah (Exod 3:11; 4:10; Num 12:3; 1 Sam 3; Jer 1:6). Humility in relation to David's poetic abilities is expressed in 2 Sam 23:2 ("'The spirit of the Lord spoke through me, / his word was on my tongue'") and is imiplied in "David's Compositions" (11Q5 XXVII, 11: "All these [psalms and songs] he spoke through prophecy which was given to him from before the Most High"). Piety and righteousness as gifts of God are implied in, e.g., Ps 51:10: "Create [ברא] for me, O God, a pure heart (or, mind); / renew a true spirit in my interior," and in Ezek 11:19–21. For more on David and his representation among the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Craig A. Evans, "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 183–97.

10. See Sanders, "Ps 151 in 11QPsᵃ," 75; idem, DJD 4:56; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll,* 89, 97; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 165; followed by Carmignac "La Forme poétique du Psaume 151," 375; Brownlee, "11Q Counterpart to Psalm 151:1–5," 383–84, Dupont-Sommer, "Le Psaume cli dans 11QPsᵃ," 32; and Meyer, "Die Septuaginta-Fassung von Psalm 151:1–5," 165. Such an interpretation for this passage, of course, might explain why these verses are not found in the Greek or Syriac translations, since a later redactor or translator would have

of expression, instead of expressing his humility.[11] Those translations that do render David's monologue as reflective of his piety sometimes rely on a reading of the lines that is syntactically impossible or unlikely.

Some of the questions that this passage has generated come from disagreement over the poem's verse division. The colon and verse division proposed below (2 bicola + 2 tricola + 2 bicola + 1 tricolon + 6 bicola) partially follows that of Skehan and partially that of Carmignac.[12] The approximate measurements of these verses are outlined below in the poetic analysis.

Text and Analysis of the Poem

			Grammatical Analysis	Semantic Analysis
1a-b[13]	וצעיר מבני אבי	קטן הייתי מן אחי	OVM//OM²	abc//a'c'$^{(x+y)}$
1c-d	ומושל בגדיותיו	וישימני [4]/ רועה לצונו	VOM//OM	abc//b'c'
2a-c	ואצבעותי כנור	ידי עשו עוגב	SVO//SO	abc//a'c'
		[5]/ ואשימה ליהוה כבוד	VMO	def
2d-3b	ההרים לוא יעידו [6]/ לי	אמרתי אני בנפשי	VSM// SVM	abc//de
		והגבעות לוא יגידו עלי	SVM	d'e'
3c-d	והצואן את מעשי	העצים את דברי	SO//SO	ab//cb'
4a-b	ומי יספר את מעשי	[7]/ כי מי יגיד ומי ידבר	SVSV//SVO	abab'//ab''c
4c-e	אלוה [8]/ הכול הוא שמע	אדון הכול ראה	S²V//S²SV	a+bc//a'+bdc'
		והוא האזין	SV	dc''
5a-b	את שמואל [9]/ לגדלני	שלח נביאו למושחני	VOM$^{(=V)}$//OM$^{(=V)}$	abc//b'd
5c-d	יפי התור ויפי המראה	יצאו אחי לקראתו	VSM$^{(=V)}$//S²S²	abc//d+ed+e'
6a-b	[10]/ היפים בשערם	הגבהים בקומתם	SM//SM	ab//cd
6c-d	אלוהים בם	לוא בחר יהוה	VS//SM	ab//b'
7a-b	וישלח ויקחני [11]/ מאחר הצואן וימשחני בשמן הקודש		VVM//VM²	abcd//ef+g
7c-d	ומושל בבני [12]/ בריתו	וישימני נגיד לעמו	VOM//OM²	abc//b'c'$^{(x+y)}$

found their representation of David inconsistent with his representation elsewhere, but such an interpretation does not help us understand why they are present in the first place. Assertions of Orphic influence seem strained, as many interpreters have noted since the poem was first published, though see Kleer for a more recent description of the possible Orphic motifs in the text (*Der liebliche Sänger*, 244–52).

11. Talmon suggests that the answer to the question "Who can recount the deeds of (the) lord?" is "David" (*World of Qumran from Within*, 255). Mark Smith also seems to follow this line of interpretation, understanding David to be saying that nature cannot praise God as he can ("How to Write a Poem," 199). Although he does not adopt this interpretation, Smith also muses that colon 4b could be understood "And who will relate my deeds?," this being an indication of David's numerous achievements (ibid., 193–94). These interpretations seem unlikely, as explained below.

12. Skehan, "Apocryphal Psalm 151," 408–9 (2 bicola + 2 tricola + 8 bicola); Carmignac, "Précisions sur la forme poétique du Psaume 151," 250–51 (2 bicola + 1 tricolon + 1 pentacolon + 2 tricola + 1 bicolon + 1 pentacolon + 1 tricolon + 1 bicolon).

13. The verse numbers (1, 2, 3, etc.) follow the numbering by Sanders ("Ps 151 in 11QPsª," 75–76), though I have complemented this system with labels for each colon (a, b, etc.).

Translation

1a-b   Smaller I was than my brothers,
            and younger than the sons of my father,
1c-d   so, he made me the shepherd of his flock,
            and ruler over his kids.

2a-c   My hands made a flute,
            my fingers a harp,
            and I rendered glory to the Lord;
2d-3b   I spoke in my interior:
            "The mountains cannot bear witness for me,
            nor can hills declare (anything) on my behalf,
3c-d   (nor can) the trees (declare on my behalf) my words (of praise),
            (nor) the flock my works (of praise).
4a-b   For who will declare, who speak,
            who recount my works?"

4c-e   The lord of all saw,
            God of all, he heard,
            and gave ear to (my thoughts).
5a-b   He sent his prophet to anoint me,
            Samuel to exalt me;
5c-d   my brothers went forth toward him,
            beautiful of form, beautiful of appearance,
6a-b   exalted in their height,
            beautiful with their hair,
6c-d   (but,) the Lord, God,
            did not choose them.
7a-b   He sent (word) and took me from behind the flock,
            and anointed me with holy oil;
7c-d   and made me leader for his people,
            ruler over the children of the covenant.

Notes to the Translation

151A:1c-d The subject of the verbal phrase וישימני is not perfectly clear. From the immediate context, the grammatical subject of the verb is understood as "my father" (i.e., Jesse). The *wāw* conjunction is translated "so" since, presumably, it was usual for a small/young man to be a shepherd.[14] But, from the context of the

_____

14. This is the assumption also of Auffret ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151," 178).

entire poem, the subject can also be understood as "God," the phrases "shepherd of his flock" and "ruler of his kids" being metaphoric references to David as king of Israel. In this case, the *wāw* conjunction might be translated with a contrastive nuance, "but . . . ," emphasizing the contrast between the physical smallness of David and the magnitude of his future anointment.

151A:2a-c The idea that David made musical instruments depends, no doubt, on such biblical passages as 1 Chr 23:5 ("with instruments that I made for praising"), 2 Chr 7:6 ("with the instruments of song that King David had made for giving thanks to the Lord"), and Amos 6:5, which compares the idle and lazy to David composing songs on his instruments. The fact that David specifies in this verse that he has made these instruments suggests that the praise is effected through his own agency, which assertion, if not qualified, would perhaps imply a presumptuousness on David's part. The suggestion of presumptuousness may, in fact, have been something that the author wished to address in the poem, given the pejorative association between David's music making and the way that the idle and lazy occupy themselves in Amos 6:5. It makes sense, then, that immediately following these references in v. 2a-c David expresses humility by describing his isolation and solitude and implying (as explained below) that his "works" (i.e., his psalms and poems) are not comparable to God's own works of creation.

The verbal phrase ואשימה is considered a "pseudo-cohortative" form with the *wāw* consecutive, a construction that is apparently somewhat common among the Dead Sea Scrolls.[15]

151A:2d-3b Some of the first interpreters of this poem considered the first colon (v. 2d) to apply to what precedes, though Skehan and Dupont-Sommer early on argued that it should apply to what follows.[16] Although Sanders criticizes reading this colon with what follows, saying that, when such phrases precede a quotation, it implies that the following thought is wrong, there are cases where the internal meditation does not express something "wrongly thought."[17] See, for example, Qoh 3:17 and 3:18, which do not presuppose an incorrect assessment on the part of their speaker but rather something that may be better described as pessimistic, akin to the sentiment in vv. 3–4 of Ps 151A.

For the possible metaphoric interpretation of "mountains" and "hills" (as well as "trees" and "flock"), see the extended discussion below.

15. See Bruce Waltke and Michael O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 544, 576–77; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 44.

16. Among the first interpreters who consider v. 2d to be connected with what precedes are Sanders, "Ps 151 in 11QPsᵃ," 75; Brownlee, "11Q Counterpart to Psalm 151:1–5," 380; Carmignac, "La Forme poétique du Psaume 151," 374; Skehan, "Apocryphal Psalm 151," 409; and Dupont-Sommer, "Le Psaume cli dans 11QPsᵃ," 35.

17. Sanders, "Psalms Scroll (11QPsᵃ) Reviewed," 87.

Although B. Ufenheimer, Rabinowitz, and Cross have read the word לוא as a precative particle, this has not been followed by most other scholars.[18]

The verb עוד in the H-stem has the connotation of bearing witness in favor of; the *lamed* preposition (according to the interpretation proposed here) indicates for whom the witnessing is done.

The reading of the *lāmed* preposition's suffix is a matter of some dispute and is related to the problem of distinguishing between *wāw* and *yôd* in this scroll, which creates ambiguities not only for this prepositional phrase, but also for the words - על of v. 3b, - דבר of v. 3c, and - מעש of v. 3d. My interpretation assumes the readings לי, עלי, דברי, and מעשי. These readings follow those of Rabinowitz and others, and are supported by observations made independently by Magne and Puech.[19] Magne compared the combinations of *lāmed* + *yôd* and *lāmed* + *wāw* in the scroll in order to demonstrate that the relevant letters here are *yôd*s.[20] Puech specifically has remarked that the letters subsequent to - דבר and - מעש are *yôd*s.[21] Nevertheless, other scholars have read the letters differently; John Strugnell reads the relevant words of v. 3a-d: לו, עלו, דברו, and מעשו; he is followed in this by Cross and Baumgarten.[22] On the other hand, Skehan reads לו, דברי, עלי, and מעשי, Talmon לו, עלי, דברו, and מעשו, while Brownlee, Mark Smith, and others propose to read the relevant words לו, עלו, דברי, and מעשי.[23] Not all of these are equally likely, however. For example, although the writing of the 3rd per. masc. sg. suffix on masc. pl. nouns as ו- instead of the more com-

---

18. B. Ufenheimer, "Psalm 151 from Qumran" (in Hebrew), *Molad* 22 (1964): 70; Rabinowitz, "Alleged Orphism of 11QPss 28 3–12," 196 (implied in his translation); Cross, "David, Orpheus and Psalm 151:3-4," 69. For an explanation of the problems engendered by these readings and especially their inherent contradictions, see Dalia Amara, "Psalm 151 from Qumran" (in Hebrew), *Textus* 19 (1998): 5–7.

19. Rabinowitz, "Alleged Orphism of 11QPss 28 3–12," 196; Carmignac, "Précisions sur la forme poétique du Psaume 151," 250; idem, "Nouvelles Précisions sur le Psaume 151," *RevQ* 8 (1975): 596; Delcor, "Zum Psalter von Qumran," 20; Magne, "Orphisme, pythagorisme, essénisme," 544; van der Woude, "Die fünf syrischen Psalmen," 39; Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151,"164; and Amara, "Psalm 151 from Qumran," 6–7. Puech is cited, from a personal communication, in Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 191.

20. Magne, "Orphisme, pythagorisme, essénisme," 510–13.

21. He is cited, from a personal communication, in Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 191.

22. Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 280; Cross, "David, Orpheus and Psalm 151:3–4," 69–70; Baumgarten, "*Perek Shirah*," 575. Note that Strugnell reads in v. 4b אדון מעשי, while Cross reads מעשו and Baumgarten מעשי אדון הכול.

23. Skehan, "Apocryphal Psalm 151," 408; Talmon, *World of Qumran from Within*, 251; Brownlee, "11Q Counterpart to Psalm 151:1–5," 380; Carmignac, "La Forme poétique du Psaume 151," 375; Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 188. Morton Smith ("Psalm 151, David, Jesus, and Orpheus," 253) cites Theodor Gaster (personal communication), who observes that the 11Q5 scribe customarily represents the 3rd per. masc. sg. suffix on masc. pl. nouns as יו, and makes the comment, referring specifically to Cross's reading, that the irregular representation of the 3rd per. masc. sg. suffix four times in a row seems unlikely.

mon י- does have precedents among the Dead Sea Scrolls, even in 11Q5, such a mistake four times in a row (which is what Strugnell's reading presupposes), or even twice in a row seems unlikely.[24] Of course, the marks on the scroll can be interpreted in other ways: <ו>דברי> and <ו>מעשי>, but such repeated mistakes also seem improbable.[25]

However, even if the reading of the words could be resolved, it does not resolve their interpretation. Most interpreters consider the word עלי/ו a preposition.[26] Those who read עלו must, of course, make sense of the defective writing; although this explains the marks on the scroll, problems still remain with this interpretation. The combination of נגד and על appears elsewhere in the Bible (e.g., 1 Sam 27:11, translated "tell about"), though the meaning of this construction does not fit here, especially since the entire phrase, negative + verb + prepositional phrase, must be understood to be elided in the following cola (as explained below). Rather, it seems that the preposition should denote direction or interest, as the *lāmed* preposition does in v. 3a. Since על is not found elsewhere indicating direction, we may reject this possibility.[27] The interpretation "for his (i.e., God's)

---

24. Elisha Qimron does not cite Psalm 151A, but does cite the reading אלומתו (for MT אלמתיו) in 11Q5 IV, 15 (= Ps 126:6) as among the evidence for the simplification of the diphthong, usually represented by the letters י- ("The Psalms Scroll from Qumran: A Linguistic Survey" [in Hebrew], *Leshonenu* 35 [1971]: 107; see also idem, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 33). Other scholars affirm that this writing of the suffix reflects a phonological shift in the spoken language of the writers, from /aw/ to /o/ (see Joshua Blau, "A Conservative View of the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* [ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; STDJ 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 24; Shelomo Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Variations," *VT* 38 [1988]: 150, 153; and Zeev Ben-Hayyim, *Studies in the Tradition of the Hebrew Language* [Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, 1954], 79–82). Note also the discrepancy between Ps 154 in 11Q5 and its version in 4Q448: מפראי in the former, מפראו in the latter. Cross, on the other hand, observes that the *yôd* in the 3rd per. masc. sg. suffix on masc. pl. nouns is only "a morpheme marker, probably transferred by analogy from other pronominal forms"; he explains the writing of ו for the 3rd per. masc. sg. suffix on masc. pl. nouns as "archaic style" ("David, Orpheus, and Psalm 151:3–4," 230).

25. In such a reading, two mistakes are reflected. First, the writing of י- for יו- on - דבר might be occasioned by haplography, the scribe missing the final *wāw* on דברי because of the following *wāw* conjunction. The mistake of מעשי for מעשיו could perhaps be explained by confusion with the following מעשי in v. 4b. All these potential mistakes in such a short space must leave one skeptical.

26. Those who interpret the suffix as 1st per. common sg.: Rabinowitz, "Alleged Orphism of 11QPss 28 3–12," 196; Carmignac, "Précisions sur la forme poétique du Psaume 151," 250; idem, "Nouvelles Précisions sur le Psaume 151," 596; Magne, "Orphisme, pythagorisme, essénisme," 544; van der Woude, "Die fünf syrischen Psalmen," 39; and Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151,"164. Those who interpret the suffix as 3rd per. masc. sg.: Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 280; Cross, "David, Orpheus and Psalm 151:3–4," 69; Baumgarten, "*Perek Shirah*," 575; Starcky, "Le Psaume 151," 9; Morton Smith, "Psalm 151, David, Jesus, and Orpheus," 248; and Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 190.

27. The preposition here could perhaps be a variation of אל. The phonetic similarity

benefit" is possible (especially if one reads לו in the preceding colon), though it seems less likely than the graphically more probable עלי, "for my benefit."

Another problem pertaining to this passage and the interpretation of עלי/ו as a preposition is the ellipsis that takes place between vv. 2d-3b and v. 3c-d. Several translations imply that this prepositional phrase is not relevant to the following lines; in other words, scholars translate this passage as if עלי/ו were replaced by the direct objects את־דברי / את־מעשי.[28] The recent analysis of ellipsis by Cynthia L. Miller does not address this particular poem or passage, but suggests that the prepositional complement should be understood as elided in the subsequent cola, just as the verb and negative particle have been elided.[29] Miller observes that in cases where the verb phrase (including a direct object and/or prepositional phrase) is elided, together with the negative particle, the verb phrase should come at the beginning or end of the clause.[30] Thus, if we are to assume that the verb יגידו is understood in the following cola, then we must also assume that any prepositional complement has also been elided; it should be understood in these later clauses too. A similar case of ellipsis of a verb + prepositional complement is suggested by Miller for Ps 115:1.[31] It goes without saying that ellipsis between adjacent bicola is not the standard in the Bible, but it seems less unusual in the context of the grammatical relationship between vv. 5c-d and 6a-b, where v. 6a-b seems to expand on the preceding colon, v. 5d, which in turn depends on v. 5c.

Other proposals for the עלי/ו include Sanders's first proposal to read the letters as עלו and to understand it as a verb; he supplied the translation "cherished," which Brownlee revised to "extolled" and Storfjell to "taken away."[32] The

---

between the two letters *alef* and *ayin*, is suggested from the Ben Sira Masada scroll for Sir 41:2, where הע appears for הא. In addition, there are the examples of "weakened gutturals" listed by Qimron, the most relevant being שש אסר for שש עשר in 4Q327 3 (= 4Q394 1-2, 3 = 4QMMT). Nevertheless, this interpretation seems unlikely.

28. See, e.g., the translations of Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 280; Baumgarten, "*Perek Shirah*," 575; Starcky, "Le Psaume 151," 9; Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 188.

29. Miller, "Ellipsis Involving Negation." 37–52.

30. Ibid., 46.

31. Psalm 115:1 reads, in the Hebrew: לא לנו יהוה לא לנו / כי־לשמך תן כבוד / על־חסדך על־אמתך. Miller writes: "The conjoined prepositional phrases at the end of the verse . . . should probably be understood as part of the preceding clause. In that case, they should be considered to have elided backwards along with the verb and object ('Do not to *us* [give glory on account of your lovingkindness and faithfulness], but rather *to your name* give glory on account of your lovingkindness and faithfulness')" ("Ellipsis Involving Negation," 48 n. 28). In addition, as will be seen below, Ps 154:7–8 attests a similar case of ellipsis, across the bicolon boundary, involving the ellipsis of the verb and its object.

32. Sanders, "Ps 151 in 11QPsª," 75; Brownlee, "11Q Counterpart to Psalm 151:1–5," 383–84; Storfjell, "Chiastic Structure of Psalm 151," 100. Kleer also takes the consonants to be from the root עלה (*Der liebliche Sänger*, 213). For the inherent contradictions in Sanders's reading, see Amara, "Psalm 151 from Qumran," 4–5.

last translation is problematic because it does not make sense of the context of the verse. Sanders's and Brownlee's translations I find problematic because they insinuate a touch of vanity in David, which seems out of keeping with the rest of the text. Perhaps if we could introduce a particle and translate "*Only* the trees cherished/extolled my words . . . ," their readings would be more palatable.[33] All the same, scholars question the evidence Sanders marshals in support of his interpretation.[34] Kleer, like these other scholars, interprets עלי as a verb, but interprets it as a G-stem with the simple meaning "rise, climb."[35]

A final suggestion for the letters עלי is to read them as the plural construct of "leaf" (עלה); this is proposed by Skehan and followed by Delcor, Talmon, and Weinfeld.[36] Although this makes sense of the marks on the scroll, it seems less likely since there is no precedent for leaves of trees praising God or otherwise being described in this way. Usually, where leaves are mentioned they are subordinate parts of a tree and are not portrayed acting independently.[37]

Colon 3b, והגבעות לוא יגידו עלי, offers a variety of other interpretational problems. As for the parsing of the verb, note the disagreement in gender between "hills" and "declare," something unexpected given the word order, but not without parallel.[38] The verb נגד is rather common in the Hebrew Bible, though this does not necessarily make it easier to understand. The sense of this verb is often connected to revealing something previously unknown; in some cases it can be translated "predict."[39] However, this same verb is often used in contexts like this one that mention various elements of the natural world to mean something like "declare." In these cases, the verb is always part of some affirmative statement concerning the declaration of God's might, power, or glory. For example, in Isa 42:12, the inhabitants and cities of the desert are encouraged with the following words:

---

33. See Rabinowitz, "Alleged Orphism of 11QPss 28 3–12," 198.

34. Ibid.; Mancini, "Note sul Salmo 151," 126; Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 190.

35. This results, together with his interpretation of the particle את as a preposition, in the translation for the entire verse: "Es haben sich aufgerichtet die Bäume bei meinen Worten / und das Kleinvieh bei meinen Werken" (*Der liebliche Sänger*, 208, 241).

36. Skehan, "Apocryphal Psalm 151," 407; Delcor, "Zum Psalter von Qumran," 20; Talmon, *World of Qumran from Within*, 255; and Weinfeld, "Angelic Song over the Luminaries," 154 n. 108.

37. Note, however, Sir 14:18, which reads in Ms. B text and Ms. B margin: "Like the sprouting leaves on a flourishing tree, / where this one drops and another bears fruit, // so are the generations of flesh and blood: one expires and another flourishes" (for the Hebrew, see Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 43, and the corrections offered in idem, "Errata et Corrigenda," in *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham-Ushaw College 2001* [ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel; BZAW 321; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002], 376). This metaphor apparently derives from the *Iliad* 6.146–49 (see Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 260).

38. See GKC §145u and the examples cited there, including Isa 49:11; Hos 14:1; etc.

39. F. Garcia-López, " נגד *ngd*," *TDOT* 9:181–82.

ותהלתו באיים יגידו   ישימו ליהוה כבוד

Let them render glory to the Lord,
  and let them declare his praise in the coastlands.

In addition to the use of נגד to mean "declare," notice that the first three words of this Isaiah passage also appear in Ps 151A. In a similar way, Ps 145:4 claims that one generation will declare (נגד) God's mighty deeds (גבורות) to the next. Ps 19:2 illustrates another possible parallel to the use of the verb נגד in Ps 151A:

ומעשה ידיו מגיד הרקיע   השמים מספרים כבוד־אל

The heavens recount the glory of God
  and the work of his hands the firmament declares.

Here too we have many lexical overlaps with Ps 151A, including "recount" (ספר), "glory" (כבוד), "work" (מעשה), and "declare" (נגד). Although a subsequent verse, Ps 19:4, clarifies that the recounting and declaring are done without word or speech and states in reference to heavens, firmament, day, and night that "their voice was not heard," the sense is, nevertheless, that the heavens communicate God's glory; the verb נגד is not negated in Ps 19.[40] Still other passages, such as Pss 50:6 and 97:6, describe the heavens declaring (נגד) God's righteousness.[41]

It seems unlikely, then, that the present verse, 2d–3b, taken as a whole, expresses the idea that mountains and hills do not witness or declare God's glory (such an interpretation presumes the more unlikely readings of the prepositions לו and עלו). An alternative understanding, proposed by Weinfeld—interpreting the verse as expressing the idea that the mountains and hills do not "sufficiently" declare God's glory—also seems unlikely when considered in light of the following verse, 3c-d.[42] One might ask, for example: Why are elements of the natural

---

40. Brownlee ("11Q Counterpart to Psalm 151:1–5," 384–85) tentatively suggests Ps 19:2–5 as a possible biblical precedent for the created world not praising God; citing an observation made by van der Woude in a personal communication to Sanders ("Ps 151 in 11QPsᵃ," 82 n. 21), he suggests that this might act as a complement to the demythologization of mountains and hills. However, the example of Ps 19 is anomalous and seems to express a silent kind of declaration. As observed above, the passage in Ps 19 is not an exact parallel to what we have in Ps 151A. Dupont-Sommer proposes reading this line as a question: "Les montagnes ne Lui rendent-elles pas témoignage? . . . ," thereby eliminating any incongruity with the Bible ("Le Psaume cli dans 11QPsᵃ," 37). His proposal has not been followed by any other scholar, presumably because of the lack of any clear parallel to a negative rhetorical question not beginning with הלא.

41. This is in addition to other passages that call the mountains and hills to praise God, e.g., Ps 148:9.

42. Weinfeld writes: "The problem is one of exhausting the praise and not the mere telling of it: although the mountains etc. praise God . . . , they are not able to recount all His

world only mentioned? Why does David not mention himself explicitly or other humans? Is it really possible that when David says, "The flock (cannot declare sufficiently) my works," a reader might have thought that sheep could partially declare his works? If such an idea is nonsensical, then why include a statement that such a thing is impossible?

Another careful and detailed reading of these lines, which takes into account numerous preceding studies, is offered by Mark S. Smith, who suggests that David is asserting that he has an ability to praise God that nature does not have.[43] Smith translates vv. 3–4:

"The mountains do not witness to Him,
Nor do the hills tell of Him,
Nor the trees, my words,
Nor the sheep, my compositions."

For who can tell and who can express
And who can relate the deeds of the Lord of All?
The God of All has seen.
He has heard and he has listened.[44]

He interprets v. 4 as David asking who is able to appreciate his own devotion, the answer being "only God."[45] But Smith's interpretation has several problems. David's assertion that he has an ability that the natural world does not have seems inconsistent with David's humility, as well as with the claims made elsewhere that he depends on God for his poetry. It is perhaps true that David's ability outstrips nature's, but one does not expect David to express such an idea, nor God to interpret this as an expression of piety. The questions of v. 4 and their assumed allusion to similar biblical phrases seem to suggest that no one can appreciate God fully, not that God is the only one to appreciate David fully.

The most convincing interpretation, in my opinion, is that offered by

---

praises . . ." ("Angelic Song over the Luminaries," 154 n. 108). He draws attention to the similar expressions in Sir 18:4–5 and 42:17: "To no one does he allow the means to declare his works; / who can fathom his great works? // His majestic power, who can quantify? / Who can go on to tell in detail his mercies?" (Sir 18:4–5); "(Even) God's holy ones do not succeed / in (fully) recounting all his wonders" (Sir 42:17) (for the Greek of the first passage, see Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*, 206; for the Hebrew of the second, see Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 118). See also Sir 43:28–33 and Ps 106:1–2.

43. Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 199.

44. Ibid., 188.

45. Smith writes, "Thus, David asks who can appreciate his devotion, and the answer is God. Or, it might be said, 'only God.' . . . Both the question and response witness to David's piety insofar as his words in praise of God are known fully only by God. In turn, God's glory is made manifest by David's unparalleled praise" ("How to Write a Poem," 199).

Auffret.[46] He considers the first bicolon of v. 3 to be expressing the same thing as the second; that is, the object phrases in the second bicolon are understood in the first bicolon. Thus, David is not saying that the mountains and hills do not communicate with God, but rather that they do not communicate to God David's specific words and poetic works (and presumably their sentiments).[47] His specific reading seems unlikely, since it presupposes simultaneous ellipses forwards and backwards (between v. 3a-b and v. 3c-d), which poses too many problems of syntax and sense. But his idea that יגידו of colon 3b has an implied object, namely, praise uttered by David, seems the likeliest, given all the variables.[48]

151A:3c-d For the reading of the pronominal suffixes on דבר and on מעשה, see the above discussion on vv. 2d–3b. According to my interpretation of the psalm, the context (including the parallel with דבר) makes clear that by מעשים is meant verbal compositions, not deeds or physical objects.[49] The word מעשים has a similar connotation in Ps 45:2, where it is also parallel to דבר, as well as perhaps in 4QMMT (4Q394 3–7 I, 4–5 and 4Q398 14–17 II, 2–3), for which see the discussion below under Ps 155:10.

What I interpret as the marker of the direct object here, את, could be construed as a preposition, perhaps indicating what Waltke and O'Connor call "accompaniment . . . for the purpose of helping."[50] All the same, this preposition is more commonly used if the noun governed by the preposition is a person.[51] Furthermore, we expect נגד to be used with a direct object; and, if a notion of instrument were intended, presumably the poet would have used the preposition ב.

151A:4a-b The letters of the form מעשי are interpreted as the same word + suffix as in v. 3d: "my works (of praise)." The alternative interpretation of the letters as the plural construct of משעה seems less likely, given the overall context and the infrequency of the indefinite noun אדון as an appellative of God.[52]

151A:4c-d My interpretation presumes that הכול is part of the expression

---

46. Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151," 169–70.

47. Ibid. Auffret's interpretation of these lines is followed by Amara in her recent article, "Psalm 151 from Qumran," 1–35. Notice that this reading means that David is doubting the ability of the natural world to echo or communicate his ideas to God in heaven; it presumably is not suggesting a limit to God's perception, which is the idea ridiculed in Sir 16:22 (צדק מי יגידנו } מה {מעשה [Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 46], "(Do not say) . . . 'Who will tell him of any just act?'").

48. For the criticism of Auffret's reading, see Kleer, *Der liebliche Sänger*, 212.

49. See Skehan, "Apocryphal Psalm 151," 407.

50. Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 195. Kleer understands the particle to be a preposition: "bei meinen Worten . . . bei meinen Werken" (*Der liebliche Sänger*, 208, 241).

51. Nevertheless, it should be observed that there are cases where the preposition seems to govern a thing (see, e.g., Esth 9:29).

52. Despite the infrequency, there are precedents for the use of the indefinite form of אדון in biblical and postbiblical literature, e.g., Ps 114:7; Sir 10:7 (Ms. A), 35:22 (Ms. B margin); 1QH^a XVIII, 10 (see Skehan, "Apocryphal Psalm 151," 407; and Sanders, DJD 4:57).

"Lord of all," and that the next הכול is part of the expression "God of all"; these interpretations are based, again, on the general context and the infrequency of אדון as an appellative of God.[53] The exact phrase אדון הכול does not occur in the Bible, but it does occur among the Dead Sea Scrolls, in 4Q409 (4QLiturgy) 1 I, 8; phrases similar to this do appear in the Bible.[54] Nevertheless, as noted above, the words can be interpreted as independent of each other; if this is done, הכול is the generic abstract object of the verb.[55] Note the expression in Sir 15:18 βλέπων τὰ πάντα, חוזה כל (Ms. A), חוזה כלם (Ms. B): "He [i.e., God] sees everything."[56] A similar sense is found in Job 13:1: כל ראתה עיני, "my eye sees all (this)" and Qoh 7:15: את־הכל ראיתי, "I have seen everything."[57] In either case, the general idea is the same: God's perspicacity. The verbs of this verse may be translated with an English present tense or a past tense, the former suggesting that David is making a more general statement about God's perspicacity, the latter suggesting that he is commenting on God's perception of his own inner questioning.

151A:6a–6b The Hebrew word גבה, although it can have positive connotations, can also imply negative associations of haughtiness and pride. Note that this bicolon seems to be grammatically dependent on the preceding, which dependence between adjacent verses is similar (though not identical) to the kind of syntactic relationship witnessed above between vv. 2d–3b and 3c–d. In the preceding case, there is a clear "gapping" of the verbal phrase from the dependent verse; here the syntactic dependence is of an appositional kind, similar to other cases among the non-Masoretic poems of 11Q5, as well as biblical psalms such as Ps 144:1–2.

In summary, v. 3a-b imagines David alone in his sheepfold after having rendered God glory through song, with no person having heard his words of praise. The statement that the mountains, hills, trees, and flock will not testify for him or declare his words and works is meant to suggest that they are not able to repeat his songs or psalms, thus ensuring that no one will know of his song's expression of piety and righteousness.[58] The rhetorical questions of v. 4a-b emphasize this

---

53. This follows the interpretation of Rabinowitz ("Alleged Orphism of 11QPss 28 3–12," 196), and others.

54. See Elisha Qimron, "409.4QLiturgical Work A," in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. Esther Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 64. One expression from the Bible אדון־כל־הארץ appears in Josh 3:11, 13; Ps 97:5; Zech 4:14; 6:5. For other similar expressions, see A. Hurvitz, "Adon Hakkol" (in Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 34 (1965): 224–27; idem, "The Language and Date of Psalm 151 from Qumran" (in Hebrew), *ErIsr* 8 (1967): 84.

55. Skehan, "Apocryphal Psalm 151," 407; Sanders, DJD 4:57.

56. Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 45, 52.

57. For this last example, see Sanders, DJD 4:57. There Sanders also notes that LXX ℵ has αὐτὸς πάντων εἰσακούει, which implies a Hebrew text similar to the one proposed above.

58. This is essentially the interpretation of Carmignac ("Précisions sur la forme poétique du Psaume 151," 250–52 and "Nouvelles Précisions sur le Psaume 151," 595–97).

idea. The subsequent verse, 4c-d, counters this by suggesting that God perceived even the praise David offered in solitude. The fact that David mentions the inability of mountains, hills, and the like repeating his words is not meant to imply that he thought they could, but rather to emphasize his circumstances and isolation.

One problem with this interpretation is that it does not seem to take into account the lexically similar phrases and passages quoted above from the Bible. In addition to the passages parallel to v. 3a-d, there are many passages parallel to v. 4a-b that ask rhetorically if it is possible for humans to praise God or his works as he is or as they are.[59] Perhaps the similarities between the verses from Ps 151A and the biblical passages are intended to highlight the contrast between God and David. In other words, the poem indicates, in its most literal reading, that David's "works" are not recounted because of the absence of any nearby humans; the implication is that they could be repeated if David were to be overheard by other people. This contrasts with the idea expressed by the lexically similar biblical phrases, which imply that God's "works" are so grand and magnificent that no one or no thing can accurately depict or recount them.[60]

Of course, other interpretations are possible, with slight variations of the one above. For example, one could follow the reading above and understand v. 4a-b to conclude with "works of (the) lord" or "works of the lord of all," and infer that David is suggesting that, because the landscape cannot repeat David's own song, God's works have not been accurately recounted or described.[61] But the reading and interpretation offered above are the clearest and least difficult.

Mountains, Hills, Trees, and Flock

In the Bible, the pair "mountains" and "hills" represents geographic features of the natural world, often suggesting the entire landscape, even its agricultural produce (Ps 72:3; Isa 40:12; 42:15). Where this pair are described praising God, they usually also carry other associations. On the one hand, inasmuch as they are representative features of the natural world, their praise of God (together with the praise of other representative features like stars, moon, and trees) demonstrates God's power as their creator. On the other hand, mountains and hills were the sites of non-Yahwistic cults and so also can represent idol-worshiping cults, their gods, and, by extension, their worshipers (Ps 114:4; Isa 2:2; Jer 3:23). The description of such features of the landscape praising God in the Hebrew Bible may be meant to suggest that the gods worshiped at these sites do not exist or are subordinate to Yahweh, or, alternatively, that the worshipers of the idol cults

---

59. See, e.g., Ps 106:2; Sir 43:27–28; and 1QH^a IX, 29–33.

60. This interpretation builds on that of Carmignac ("Nouvelles Précisions sur le Psaume 151," 595–97) and Auffret ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151," 170), the latter believing that this contrast is done with a touch of humor on David's part.

61. One could also translate v. 3a-b: "The mountains will not bear witness for him (accurately), / and hills will not declare (his praise) for me. . . ."

have decided to praise Yahweh. Presumably, because of such associations with idol worshipers, the word pair is also used as a metaphor of the powerful and/or arrogant, as in Isa 2:12–14.[62] The connection to arrogance may be attributable also to the salient feature of these things, their height, a characteristic typical of powerful and proud humans.

The association of mountains/hills with arrogant and powerful humans makes sense with Ps 151A's theme and with the scriptural context of 1 Sam 16–17. David is qualified in v. 1a as "small," which distinguishes him from almost every other powerful individual with whom he comes in contact in his early life and career. His brothers are described as tall in this poem and in the Bible (e.g., 1 Sam 16:7), as is Saul (1 Sam 9:2), as is Goliath (1 Sam 17:4). Each of these figures is also associated with pride and arrogant behavior.[63] Saul exhibits his arrogance in different ways, for example, by offering a sacrifice instead of waiting for Samuel to do so (1 Sam 13:9–14). Goliath's arrogance is exhibited in his tauntings of David and the Israelites (1 Sam 17). Eliab, David's eldest brother, upbraids David in a manner that reveals his arrogance (1 Sam 17:28). His brothers are painted as implicitly arrogant, or at least ignorant, in Ps 151A, since they approach Samuel as if they expect to be anointed themselves, leaving David behind with the flock.[64] Furthermore, in Ps.-Philo's account of David's anointing, in *L.A.B.* 59:4, David composes a hymn that compares his relationship with his brothers to Abel's with Cain, another reference to a powerful, arrogant figure.

Secondary associations may also apply to the subsequent words "trees" and "flock." Isaiah 2:13 mentions "cedars" and "oaks" before mountains/hills, and thus here "trees" may also carry connotations of the proud and powerful. However, this makes a poor match with "flock" in v. 3d.[65] More apt is the common association of trees with a group of people, especially the community of the faithful, as in Jer 17:8; Ps 1:3; Prov 11:30; 1QH[a] XVI, 5–XVII, 36.[66] The word "flock" often carries a similar connotation and can be construed as another reference to David's future subjects, the Israelites.

---

62. Isaiah 2:12–14: "For, the Lord of Hosts has a day against the proud and haughty [רם] . . . against all the high [רמים] mountains and exalted hills." See also Isa 41:15 and Ezek 6:3. Asserting that mountains and hills are symbols of arrogance does not necessitate interpreting them simultaneously as symbols of idol worship.

63. See Kleer's similar observations on the prideful dimension of David's brothers (*Der liebliche Sänger*, 269).

64. This is suggested on the basis of the phrasing of the poem. The poem juxtaposes two bicola, the first stating that God sent his prophet for anointing David and the second describing the brothers coming toward Samuel. Although it is made clear in the Bible that the brothers do not know the purpose of Samuel's visit to their home, this poem seems to suggest that they might.

65. Israel might be construed as arrogant at times, but this is not the salient characteristic of Israel in the David narrative, nor specifically in 1 Sam 16.

66. It also seems to indicate "people" in Ezek 31, in contrast to the singular tall tree that represents Pharaoh.

These associations complement the interpretation proposed above. David expresses his doubt that his brothers and his fellow Israelites will help him proclaim God's praise, including the praise composed by David himself, an interpretation that emphasizes David's meekness and isolation before his anointing and that resonates with his encounter with Goliath, when he acts alone, without the help of his brothers or anyone else.

The assertion that these elements should be read as metaphors for people might seem like overreading. Their primary reference to individual elements of David's environment makes perfect sense without any suggestion of supplemental meaning or associations. Simply indicating elements of the natural world, representative elements of God's creation, the images help to express the idea of David's isolation. It should be added, however, that subtle metaphor has already been used, earlier in the poem in v. 1c-d, to signify David's role as shepherd, as well as his future role as king (i.e., with the double-meaning of the words רועה and מושל). Given the double meaning of these phrases, it seems possible that words such as "mountains," "hills," "trees," and "flock" were also intended to be read as metaphors or, at least, that an ancient reader might make sense of them as such. In the end, it is hard to prove decisively whether or not a given word was conceived of metaphorically in an ancient poem. If these words were intended as metaphors, and if it is true, as Haran and Mark Smith have argued, that these verses were added by a later redactor, then by outlining the multiple associations of these four words, we have found one way that the redactor harmonized his own words and images with those he found as part of the *Vorlage* of Ps 151A.[67]

Reading and Structure of the Poem

The poem can be divided into three verse paragraphs on thematic grounds: the first paragraph is an introduction (v. 1); the second addresses David's psalm-making and his interior monologue (vv. 2–4b); the third concerns David's anointing and constitutes the rest of the poem (vv. 4c–7); v. 4c-e acts as a kind of transition from the inner questioning of David to his anointing.[68] The order of syntactic

---

67. Haran, "Two Text-Forms," 176–77; and Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 186. If vv. 3–4 were not interpolated, then the multivalency of this passage reveals the artistry of the original author.

68. My division of the poem into essentially two verse paragraphs is similar to the division made by many other scholars, beginning with Sanders, who breaks the poem between vv. 1–4 and vv. 5–7 (DJD 4:54–55); Carmignac, who breaks the poem between vv. 1–4b and vv. 4c–7 ("La Forme poétique du Psaume 151," 374–76 and "Précisions sur la forme poétique du Psaume 151," 250–52); Rabinowitz, who breaks the poem in the same way as Carmignac ("Alleged Orphism of 11QPss 28 3–12," 196–97); and Storfjell, who breaks the poem between vv. 1–4 and vv. 5–7 ("Chiastic Structure of Psalm 151," 100). These divisions may be compared, then, with those offered by Skehan ("Apocryphal Psalm 151," 408–9) and Kleer (*Der liebliche Sänger,* 225–26), who break the poem into four parts, vv. 1, 2–4b, 4c–6d, 7; and by Talmon, who breaks the poem into three parts, vv. 1–2c, 2d–4b, 4c–7 (*World of Qumran from Within*,

elements in the clauses of the second and third paragraphs further complement
this division; the second paragraph contains verses that overwhelmingly begin
with the subject, while the third paragraph contains verses that overwhelmingly
begin with the verb.

Words connected with verbal communication are concentrated in the sec-
ond paragraph.[69] This paragraph also contains repetitive links between v. 3c-d
and v. 4a-b,[70] though there are no repetitive links between the beginning and
ending of the paragraph. More interesting and striking, it seems to me, is the con-
sistent presence of the syntactic subject as the first word of almost every clause.[71]
This consistency underlines the common denominator between these things; all
are items of the created world: human (i.e., hands and fingers), land (i.e., moun-
tains and hills), and animals and vegetables (i.e., trees and sheep). This paragraph
also exhibits syntactic dependence between vv. 2d–3b and v. 3c-d; in this pair of
verses, the syntactic structure of the preceding cola is expanded in the cola that
follow, something facilitated, in part, through the verbal ellipsis. In other words,
the syntax of v. 3b (SVM) is complemented in v. 3c and 3d by object phrases; thus
3c and 3d exhibit the basic pattern SO, with VM being implied from 3b. This
kind of expansion from one colon to another helps to emphasize the isolation of
David as well as to create coherency within the paragraph. The fact that there is a
syntactic connection between verses in the next paragraph (between vv. 5c-d and
6a-b) implies a relative consistency in structure for the poem.

The third paragraph begins with the transitional v. 4c-e. It is grouped with
the following verses owing to my understanding that it represents the thoughts of
David that are contemporaneous with the next lines; in other words, these lines
do not represent David's inner thoughts after trying to make a song of praise to
God. The paragraph contains fewer strings of semantically related words, but
it does contain parallels between v. 5a-b and v. 7a-b (especially the repetition
of שלח and משח).[72] In most of the verses of this paragraph a verb appears in

---

251–52). Mark S. Smith divides the poem into two larger units (vv. 1–3 and 4–7), each of which
has three smaller subdivisions that mirror each other (vv. 1–3 contain A:1, B:2, C:3; while
vv. 4–7 contain [in this order] C′:4, B′:5–6, A′:7) ("How to Write a Poem," 188–89). Magne
("Orphisme, pythagorisme, essénisme," 521–22) and Auffret ("Structure littéraire et interpré-
tation du Psaume 151," 173–74) divide the poem in similar ways, the latter's division reflecting
a symmetrical relationship where David is the passive object of the actions (v. 1), where David
is subject (vv. 2–4b), where God reacts to David (v. 4c-e), and where God is subject and David
the object of the actions (vv. 5–7).

69. These include נגד, עוד, אמר (vv. 2d–3b), נגד and ספר (v. 4a-b); in addition, there is
also a connection between these verbs and the phrase of v. 2c ואשימה . . . כבוד.

70. These include the repetition of the root דבר (vv. 3c and 4a) and עשה (i.e., מעשה)
(vv. 3d and 4b). Note too the repetition of נגד in vv. 3b and 4a.

71. That is, in vv. 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 4a, and 4b; the exceptions are 2c and 2d, which
both begin with a verb.

72. Note also the repetition of יפה in vv. 5d and 6b and of ראה (in vv. 4c and 5d).

the first syntactic slot,[73] underlining the fact that God is usually the subject of these verbs.[74] Syntactic dependency between v. 5c-d and v. 6a-b allows the poem to further describe David's brothers and thereby emphasize their stature and prominence. The second verse (6a-b) is not only dependent on the preceding but expands on v. 5d's basic structure to build coherency in this paragraph. Colon 5d is made up of two parallel phrases describing David's brothers (יפי התור ויפי המראה); this basic structure is expanded in v. 6a-b so that each phrase describing the brothers occupies its own colon. Notice that v. 6a and v. 6b do not contain construct phrases like those in v. 5d, but instead use prepositional phrases to communicate the relationship between each colon's two words. Aside from these syntactic expansions, the most interesting structures of the poem emerge between the beginning and ending of the text.

As several scholars argue, the entire poem is constructed in an envelope pattern or according to a chiastic design.[75] The most obvious connections are the repetitions of words between the beginning and ending of the poem (צו[א]ן,שום, בן, and מושל) as well as the repetition of grammatical structure between v. 1c-d and v. 7c-d (VOM//OM). Magne and Auffret, in particular, have illustrated other various correspondences in words and word roots between the first and second parts of the poem and within the poem's respective parts.[76] The significance of this envelope structure and the correspondences between the various verse paragraphs depend on the commentator or reader. Magne and Auffret, for example, emphasize how the connections between the beginning and end of the poem

---

73. This takes place in vv. 5a-b, 5c-d, 6c-d, 7a-b, and 7c-d. It does not occur in v. 4c-e or in v. 6a-b.

74. Note that the subject of the verbs of v. 7a-b is not exactly clear; literally the subject should be Samuel, though in the context it may be construed as God, since he is the real author of Samuel's actions.

75. Storfjell, "Chiastic Structure of Psalm 151," 99–102; Talmon, *World of Qumran from Within*, 258; Mark Smith, "How to Write a Poem," 202–3; Kleer, *Der liebliche Sänger*, 221–23.

76. Magne, "Orphisme, pythagorisme, essénisme," 520–21 and esp. 546; Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151," 172–81. In addition to those correspondences mentioned above, I would single out the following as significant: אח (vv. 1a and 5c), קטן vs. גדל (vv. 1a and 5b), עשה (vv. 2a, 3d, 4b), נגד (vv. 3b, 4a, and 7c), דבר (vv. 3c and 4a), ראה (vv. 4c and 5d), שלח (vv. 5a and 7a), and משח (vv. 5a and 7b). Following the nomenclature of the present study, we can divide these between the parallels between adjacent verses— עשה (vv. 3d, 4b), דבר (vv. 3c and 4a)—and the rest of the examples, which appear between verses separated by a verse or more. Among the latter group, the pair שלח and משח (vv. 5a and 7b) reinforce the integrity of the last verse paragraph. One can still find other connections (though their relevance might be questionable); e.g., the correspondence between David's hands and fingers that contributes to his praise of God (v. 2a-c) and his brothers' hair, which seems to be evidence of their vanity (in v. 6b). Mark S. Smith uses the repetition of words to help bolster his own interpretation of the poem's chiasm; in addition to some of those repetitions cited above, he notes the possible "verbal assonance between בגדיותיו in A and נגיד in A'," the repetition of דבר and נגד between the paragraphs he labels C and C', and the possible word play between מעשי and שמע between the same paragraphs ("How to Write a Poem," 202).

emphasize David's transformation. Auffret, in particular, illustrates the many contrasts in the poem. For example, the root קטן appears in v. 1a, and the root גדל appears in v. 5b, illustrating David's becoming (metaphorically) big, something complemented by the repetition of אח in v. 1a (where David is described as smaller than his brothers) and in v. 5c (where the brothers are described as tall).[77] Other repetitions of words and correspondences function similarly not only to illustrate David's transformation but also to emphasize the relationship between Yahweh and David, a relationship wherein David is essentially passive (unable to even sufficiently praise God) and Yahweh is active, rejecting David's brothers in favor of David.[78]

Even more basic, the envelope structure of the poem helps to emphasize the main idea of the poem that David was chosen to be king of all Israel not because of his physical attributes, because he was the firstborn, or because he was an eloquent poet. What strikes me is that the chiastic structure expresses this theme with irony and double entendre. The double entendre involves, first, the word for "ruler" (מושל), discussed above; in v. 1 this word might be interpreted as an idiosyncratic reference to shepherding, but the repetition of the word in v. 7 suggests that "ruler" in v. 1 might also imply kingship, as might "shepherd" (רועה). The word מושל itself calls attention to this double entendre. As Haran notes, this word in v. 1d is not the typical word used to indicate the relationship between shepherds and "kids"; rather, it typically indicates rulership over a people or an area.[79] Although Haran cites מושל in v. 1d as an example of inelegant usage, evidence of the text's "artificial and crude" character, the word's meaning and its deployment in the poem, in fact, point to the double entendre of v. 1c-d and thus reveal an artful and sophisticated literary touch.[80]

---

77. Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151," 177. He does not limit himself to the repetition of words but remarks, e.g., that the list of geographic features and creations in v. 3 corresponds to הכול in v. 4c and 4e, which he translates (together with the words that precede it) "Le Seigneur de l'univers" and "le Dieu de l'univers" (ibid, 165, 178).

78. E.g., Auffret writes: "Dans le même sens la racine NGD sert à marquer au milieu du premier ensemble [i.e., vv. 1–4] l'incapacité des collines (stique 10 [=3b]) et de personne (stique 13 [=4a]) à rapporter les oeuvres de David; à la fin du second ensemble [i.e., vv. 5–7], elle sert à marquer ce que Yahwèh, lui, a su faire de David (stique 29 [= v. 7c]): un Prince" ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151," 179). Note that the vocabulary Auffret uses to refer to his various divisions of the poem is somewhat confusing; the first "ensemble" of the poem is listed in other parts of his article as vv. 1 and 5–7, while the second "ensemble" of the poem consists of vv. 2–4 (see, e.g., ibid., 178 and 180). This grouping obviously does not accord with the division presumed in the above quotation.

Correspondences between words also reveal other relationships, such as like that between Yahweh and David's brothers. Auffret notes that God saw (ראה) David in v. 4c though David did not expect to be seen, while God does not look favorably on his brothers, despite their beautiful appearance (מראה) in v. 5d (ibid., 179).

79. Haran, "Two Text-Forms," 175.

80. Ibid. On the ironic use of משל see Kleer, *Der liebliche Sänger*, 229.

Another double entendre involves the word for "flock" (צו[א]ן). This word occurs in v. 1c at the end of the clause in the very same position in which עם occurs in v. 7c. Since "flock" is also sometimes used in the Bible as a metaphor for the people (especially Israel), it might have been used in this poem as another double entendre, or at least to enhance the double meaning of מושל. The irony, which is present in the biblical story too but is here underlined by the form of the poem, involves the fact that David's diminutive stature seems to be the reason he is made shepherd of his father's flock (since it is something that does not require tremendous physical power), while the reason David is made a metaphorical shepherd (i.e., king) of a metaphorical flock (i.e., Israel) is explicitly not connected to his physical appearance.

Line Length, Parallelism, and Allusion to Scripture

The poem is made up of ten bicola and three tricola. The cola of individual verses are each of approximately the same length.[81] The verses themselves, however, vary in their total length, from 18 consonants, 10 syllables, and 3 words in v. 6c-d to 36 consonants, 24 syllables, and 6 words in the next verse, 7a-b. As with the preceding poem, Sir 51:13–30, the cola of the tricola are often shorter than the cola of bicola (in vv. 2a-c and 4c-e), though this is not always the case (vv. 2d–3b). The individual verses sometimes contain longer initial cola, sometimes longer secondary or tertiary cola.

Repetitive/semantic parallelism, together with grammatical parallelism, appears in individual cola in v. 4a (ידבר // יגיד // מי // מי; תור // יפי // יפי) and v. 5d (מראה //). In each case, the concentration of so many parallels within the colon is part of a larger structure; in v. 4a this pattern continues into the beginning of v. 4b, while the expressions in v. 5d are part of an elaboration of David's brothers begun in v. 5c.

The poem evidences a great deal of repetitive, semantic, and grammatical parallelism between cola of individual verses. The frequency of the former (in all but three verses: 5c-d, 6a-b, 7a-b) is interesting, given the fact that the preceding poem that was discussed, Sir 51:13–30, has relatively little of this type of parallelism represented in the verse.[82] In two of the verses that do not exhibit repetitive/

---

81. The following are the consonants-syllables-words for every verse: v. 1a-b: 13-8-3 // 12-8-3; v. 1c-d: 16-10-3 // 13-7-2; v. 2a-c: 10-6-3 // 12-7-2 // 15-10-3; v. 2d–3b: 13-8-3 // 15-8-2 // 18-10-2; v. 3c-d: 11-7-2 // 12-7-2; v. 4a-b: 15-9-4 // 13-9-3; v. 4c-e: 11-6-3 // 14-8-4 // 9-5-2; v. 5a-b: 15-9-3 // 13-9-2; v. 5c-d: 13-8-2 // 16-10-4; v. 6a-b: 12-8-2 // 10-6-2; v. 6c-d: 10-6-2 // 8-4-1; v. 7a-b: 20-13-3 // 16-11-3; v. 7c-d: 15-10-3 // 14-8-3.

82. Verse 1a-b (קטן // צעיר // אח // אב // בן); v. 1c-d (רועה // מושל , מו(א)ן // צו(א)ן // גדי) // ; v. 2a-c (יד //); דבר-נגד (דבר // מעשה); v. 4a-b (הר // גבעה // עוד ,נגד); v. 3c-d (נגד // ; vv. 2d–3b (כנור // ; אצבע ,עוגב ,ספר // ; v. 4c-e (אלוה // אדן ,כול // כול ,ראה // שמע // אזן); v. 5a-b (נביא // שמואל); v. 6c-d (יהוה // ; אלוהים); v. 7c-d (נגיד // מושל ,עם // ; בני ברית).

semantic parallelism between cola of the verse, repetitive/semantic parallelism appears within a single colon (v. 5d) or between adjacent verses (between v. 5d and v. 6b).[83] Most of these parallels are rather obvious semantic matches with precedents in biblical literature. The straightforward nature of these consistent semantic parallels forms an interesting contrast to the rather subtle double entendre engendered by the repetitive parallel of "ruler" at the beginning and end of the poem.

Along with repetitive/semantic parallelism, grammatical parallelism appears frequently between cola of individual verses, usually where major syntactic elements are repeated in the same order in respective cola. Where this does not occur (in vv. 1c-d, 5c-d, 6c-d), ellipsis of the verb in the second colon still implies a close syntactic connection between the cola. The ellipsis of the verb is perhaps to be associated with the frequency of repetitive, semantic, and grammatical parallelism within individual verses. Along with the cases listed just above, note the other examples of this feature in v. 1a-b (where "I was" [הייתי] is gapped), in v. 1c-d ("he set me" [ישימני]), in v. 2a-c ("they made" [עשו]), in v. 5c-d ("he sent" [שלח]), in v. 6c-d ("choose" [בחר]), and in the last verse, 7c-d ("he set me" [ישימני]). In addition to this type of ellipsis (common from the Bible) there is the ellipsis of the object from the first line and its placement in the second, for example, in v. 4a-b: "For who will declare, who speak, // who recount my works?" In this case, withholding the object of the verb until the end of the second colon increases the dramatic punch of the verse as a whole, especially important because it comes immediately after more complex verses.

Repetitive/semantic parallelism between adjacent verses complements the second verse paragraph of the poem (with many words for verbal communication and, in connection with this, the verbs of perception).[84] Especially striking is the repetition of the phrase את מעשי at the end of two adjacent verses, 3c-d and 4a-b. But perhaps more interesting is the grammatical parallelism between adjacent verses that informs the macro-structure of the poem and that coincides with the syntactic dependency between verses. In the second verse paragraph (vv. 2a–4b), verbs usually do not come first in their respective clauses; rather they are preceded by the subject. By contrast, in the third verse paragraph (vv. 4c–7d), verbs usually do occur first in their clauses. Syntactic dependency occurs between two sets of verses, the adjacent pair vv. 2d–3b and v. 3c-d and the pair v. 5c-d and v. 6a-b, in each case the second verse is essentially an expansion of the preceding colon. Several features of these cases of dependency warrant more comment. First and most obvious is the fact that in vv. 2d–3d the verb is gapped or elided from the entire second bicolon. This is usually never done in the Hebrew

---

83. In v. 5d (יפה // ר, יפה // תו(א)ר // מראה); vv. 5d and 6b (יפה).

84. Among words related to verbal communication, note especially נגד, עוד, אמר (twice), דבר (twice), ספר (in vv. 2d–4e), connected to which in this context should be the verbs of perception שמע and אזן (in v. 4c-e). Another significant repetitive/semantic parallel between adjacent verses is the repetition of שום (in vv. 1c and 2c).

Bible. Ordinarily, the verb appears in the first colon, and the verb is gapped in the second colon of a single verse. The structure here would seem to imply that, in poetry of the postbiblical era, adjacent verses were more likely to be linked to each other than was the case in the era when the poetry of the Hebrew Bible was being written, something that resonates with the increased use of grammatical parallelism between adjacent verses in Sirach.[85] Second, the kind of structural pattern evidenced in both pairs of verses, where the (grammatical/semantic) structure of one colon is expanded in the following verse is also seen in Ps 154.[86]

The most significant repetitive/semantic parallels between verses separated by a verse or more are the repetitions of lexemes between the first and last verses בן (in vv. 1b and 7d), שום (in vv. 1c and 7c), צו(א)ן (in vv. 1c and 7a), and מושל (in vv. 1d and 7d); these parallels, together with grammatical correspondences, emphasize the poem's envelope structure. The only grammatical parallel of significance between verses separated by a verse or more is that between v. 1c-d and v. 7c-d, VOM//OM, which correspondence underlines the semantic and lexical connections between these two verses.

Phonetic parallelism plays a rather limited role in the poem as a whole. However, it does seem to have a part in accenting the end of the poem, in v. 7a-b, where there are four *šin*s and four *ḥêt*s.[87]

Since the poem is an elaboration of an event described in the Bible, it is not surprising that it exhibits more allusions and echoes than did Sir 51:13–30. Most of the allusions are to general ideas and details about David and do not exactly repeat the language of biblical passages. Thus, the allusions that Ps 151A makes are of the most general kind and usually serve the obvious purpose of linking the David of the psalm to the David of Scripture.

As stated above several times, the poem elaborates on the image of David and events involving him found in a variety of different biblical texts, including most obviously the description of David's anointing by Samuel in 1 Sam 16:1–13. More specific connections between the poem and biblical descriptions include the mention of David's youth, inexperience, and former occupation as shepherd for his father in 1 Sam 16:11; 17:15; the description of David's brothers' appearances in 1 Sam 16:7; and the anecdotes about David's creation of musical instruments in 1 Chr 23:5; 2 Chr 7:6; and Amos 6:5. In addition, there would seem to be an allusion in vv. 2d–4b to the rather common statements that the natural/cosmic world praises God (Pss 19:2; 50:6; and 97:6) and rhetorical questions that ask who is able to praise God (e.g., Ps 106:2; Sir 43:27–28). For the most part,

---

85. See Reymond, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry*, 108. Note, however, that one occasionally sees similar expansion between adjacent verses in biblical poetry, e.g., in Prov 2:12–15.

86. For an analysis of a similar kind of expansion from one verse to another in 4QInstruction, see Eric D. Reymond, "The Poetry of 4Q416 2 iii 15-19," *DSD* 13 (2006): 177–93.

87. Note Mark Smith's observation of the possible wordplay between מעשי and שמע between the same paragraphs ("How to Write a Poem," 202), a possible wordplay also found in Ps 155:10.

these biblical texts parallel the message and idea of Ps 151A, though something more complicated may pertain to Amos 6:5 and the various psalmic passages relating to the praise offered by the natural world. Psalm 151A may be attempting to correct the association of David's musical accomplishments with luxuriant living in Amos 6:5 by portraying the biblical hero making music alone in a sheepfold, praising God, humbly assuming that his praises go unnoticed; the relevancy of this interpretation is perhaps limited on account of the disparity in language between Ps 151A and the Amos passage. The contrast between the statements that the mountains/hills will not repeat David's words and the biblical affirmations that such do declare God's glory does have significance for the poem and would be perceptible to a biblically fluent reader. David's statements, in light of the biblical phrases, reveal his recognition of his own humanity and limitations; similarly, the contrast between Ps 151A's implication that David's "works" could be repeated by other humans and the biblical assertions that God's works defy such repetition or summary also illustrates David's humility.

Although the poem draws on these biblical texts for its topic and for some of its details, clear echoes or allusions using biblical language and imagery from specific texts are relatively few. There is a similarity between the description of David's brothers as "beautiful of form and appearance" and the descriptions of Rachel and Joseph (in, respectively, Gen 29:17 and 39:6),though this seems to be just a common idiom. The closest parallel in language is that between v. 6c-d (לוא בחר יהוה / אלוהים בם) and 1 Sam 16:10 (לא בחר יהוה באלה), though again the possibility exists that the connection between texts is more a reflex of common idiom than an explicit allusion to the biblical verse.

CONCLUSIONS

In sum, the fact that vv. 3–4 seem so well integrated into the poem, using a kind of ellipsis between adjacent verses that is similar to that found between v. 5c-d and v. 6a-b, using an order of syntactic elements consistent with v. 2 (where the subject precedes the verb), not to mention the use of repetitive/semantic parallelism in line with that of the rest of the poem, suggests that the author/editor who introduced this material was sensitive to the existing structure of the *Vorlage*. The poem also exhibits a subtle wordplay (especially with the word מושל) that is accented by the lexical repetitions between the beginning and end of the text.

Psalm 154 (11Q5.XVII, ?–XVIII, 16)

Introduction

This psalm, like the preceding Ps 151A and the following Ps 155, is found not only in the 11Q5 manuscript but also in some Syriac manuscripts that also preserve the book of Psalms. Also like Ps 151A, it is conjectured by some to be the result of an editing process by which two originally separate poetic units were fused, or the result of an expansion of an originally shorter text. In the case of Ps 151A, two verses were considered (by many scholars) to be an addition to the original text. For Ps 154, some scholars suggest that only vv. 10–11 are a later addition, while others have concluded that vv. 2, 4–15, 18a, and 19 are secondary.

Martin Noth, for example, working admittedly with just the Syriac version, reasoned that vv. 4c–6 and vv. 10–11 are additions.[1] Magne goes further in this direction and isolates two originally independent poems, A ("Invitation à tous à se joindre aux parfaits pour un culte de louange") encompassing vv. 1–3, 9–11, 16–20, and B ("Poème sapientiel transformé en invitation aux parfaits à enseigner les simples") encompassing vv. 5–8, 12–15.[2] He suggests that v. 4 is a variation on v. 3, created to follow vv. 1–2 and to introduce the sapiential portions when they were subsequently blended into the poem.[3] In part, Magne bases his analysis on the fact that the 3rd per. fem. sg. pronouns referring to wisdom appear in v. 8 and then again in vv. 12–15 and that the word "doors" appears in vv. 8 and 12.[4] In addition, he calls attention to the common vocabulary of the B text.[5] He notes that v. 3 is opposed to v. 4: "le vers 3 invite à se réunir, à s'associer aux bons et aux parfaits pour glorifier le Très-Haut, et le vers 4 à se réunir ensemble, à s'associer pour enseigner la gloire de Dieu à tous les ignorants."[6] Auffret, in an

---

1. Martin Noth, "Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen," *ZAW* 48 (1930): 18–19.

2. Magne, "Le Psaume 154," 96–97, 102.

3. Ibid., 99–100. García Martínez expresses a similar understanding ("Salmos Apócrifos en Qumran," 203).

4. Magne, "Le Psaume 154," 98.

5. Ibid., 100.

6. Ibid., 98–99.

article published just after that of Magne, suggests, in contrast to Magne, that vv. 3 and 4 differ only in relation to the object to whom they address their actions: to God praise is directed, to the ignorant teaching.[7] Auffret, however, does support the view that vv. 10–11 are a later addition to the poem, noticing that there is little linkage between vv. 11 and 12, and what connection that does exist (the word צדיקים occurs in vv. 11c and 12a) is not reflected in the Syriac translation (ܘܙܕ̈ܝܩܐ translates צדיקים in v. 11c and ܟܐܢܐ translates the same Hebrew word in v. 12a).[8]

In the last few years other postulations have emerged as to the development of Ps 154. Because of the attestation of vv. 1, 3, 16–17, 18b-c, 20 in the fragmentary 4Q448 A, 5–10 (= 4QApoc. Psalm and Prayer), Hanan Eshel and Esther Eshel claim that these verses represent the essential kernel of the hymn that was later expanded to a form like that which is found in 11Q5.[9] This implies, of course, that vv. 2, 4–15, 18a, and 19 are all secondary. Menahem Kister, on the other hand, implies the reverse, suggesting that Ps 154 was adumbrated in 4Q448.[10] Determination of the most likely scenario is difficult.[11] On the one hand, that verses of Ps 154 (or some version of it) were picked out and edited into a new text for 4Q448 seems not so different from how verses (apparently) from Ps 118 are

---

7. Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 154," 527.

8. Ibid., 533.

9. Hanan Eshel and Esther Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsaᵃ," *JBL* 119 (2000): 648. On this text, see also Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel, and Ada Yardeni, "A Scroll from Qumran Which Includes Parts of Psalm 154 and a Prayer for King Jonathan and His Kingdom" (in Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 295–324; eidem, "A Qumran Composition Containing Part of Ps. 154 and a Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan and His Kingdom," *IEJ* 42 (1992): 199–229; eidem, "4Q448. 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer," in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetic and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. Esther Eshel et al.; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 403–25. André Lemaire has come to a similar conclusion, suggesting a threefold expansion from an original text comprising vv. 1–4, 16–20, to a longer text containing in addition vv. 5–8 and 12–15, to the final text represented in 11Q5 ("Le Psaume 154: Sagesse et site de Qoumrân," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* [ed. Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006], 195–204).

10. Menahem Kister, "Notes on Some New Texts from Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 290. He is followed by André Lemaire ("Attestation Textuelle et Critique Littéraire: 4Q448 col. A et Psalm 154," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* [ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000], 17) and by Ulrich Dahmen (*Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 238).

11. This difficulty is not unique to psalms from among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Questions still surround the original integrity of many biblical psalms. For example, Ps 40 is often considered a combination of two originally independent texts, a thanksgiving psalm and a lament psalm, though some scholars view the psalm as always having been a single entity (see the brief synopsis of this psalm with accompanying bibliography in Alex Jassen, "Intertextual Readings of the Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: 4Q160 (Samuel Apocryphon) and Psalm 40," *RevQ* 22 [2006]: 414–16, esp. 414 nn. 41, 42).

selected and rearranged to make the "doxology" preserved in 11Q5 XVI, 1–6.[12] Further, other examples of selecting verses to create a new poem are known from the Hebrew Bible.[13] On the other hand, it also seems possible that, if someone began with the passage from 4Q448 and expanded it to a form like that found in 11Q5, such expansion might have resulted in the repetition of lexical items and the repetition and expansion of syntactic units from one verse to the next like that found in the 11Q5 text.

Aside from the question of its origin, this text presents few problems in its interpretations, especially in comparison to the preceding two poems. Scholars agree, for example, that the poem did not originate within the same group (or groups) that produced 1QS, 1QH, and so on. They also agree on its major points of interest: that it mentions Wisdom as an apparent personification, that it switches reference from Wisdom to God, and that it employs words that have special significance in other Dead Sea Scrolls, though this seems only incidental.

As I will endeavor to demonstrate in the analysis that follows, the text's presentation, the psalm is of interest for two other particular reasons. First, it explicitly connects wisdom's purpose with praise of God, a connection that is at best uncommon in the Bible, though it is implicit in Sirach.[14] Second, Wisdom's attributes and characteristics are very much like those of the pious, something that is reminiscent of Sir 51:13–30, where the poet himself almost seems to take on the role and language of Wisdom.

Although the general themes of Ps 154 resonate more with ideas found in Sirach than with those found in Hebrew biblical texts, Ps 154's parallelistic patterns within individual verses share more with biblical psalms than with the poetry in Sirach, and even more with the non-Masoretic psalms of 11Q5 (including the separation of subject or object from the relevant verb by the colon boundary, the regular appearance of semantic parallelism between the cola of a verse, and the expansion of a single colon's syntactic structure into succeeding cola,

---

12. Although, of course, the text of 4Q448 is not a doxology and does not rearrange the verses of Ps 154. "A Doxology" is the name given to the text of 11Q5 XVI, 1–6 by Sanders ("Non-Masoretic Psalms," 158–59). Other scholars view this text as actually a continuation of Ps 136, which precedes it in 11Q5, based, in part, on the fact that there is no intervening space between it and Ps 136 (see Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll and the Book of Psalms*, 191; Michael Chyutin, "The Redaction of the Qumranic and the Traditional Book of Psalms as a Calendar," *RevQ* 16 [1994]: 367–95; Peter R. Ackroyd, "Some Notes on the Psalms," *JTS* n.s. 17 [1966]: 396–99).

13. In a similar way, Ps 108 is essentially a juxtaposition of material from Pss 57 (vv. 8–12) and 60 (vv. 7–14); 1 Chr 16:34–36 is essentially a juxtaposition of language from Ps 106:1 and Ps 106:47-48; and Jonah 2:3–10 is made up of adaptations from various psalmic texts (see Ackroyd, "Some Notes on the Psalms," 398, where he cites his unpublished dissertation, "The Problem of Maccabean Psalms" [Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 1945], 236–44).

14. Dieter Lührmann has already observed that one of the themes of the poem is that Wisdom's purpose is to praise God; Lührmann also discusses the poem's coherency and unity ("Ein Weisheitspsalm aus Qumran (11QPsᵃ XVIII)," *ZAW* 80 [1968]: 91).

which involves the ellipsis of a verb). Second, although it is almost impossible to determine the degree to which the form of Ps 154 in 11Q5 is the result of interpolations, the manner in which the proposed interpolated verses (e.g., vv. 2, 4, 10, and 11) are integrated in the poem's other lines testifies to the skilled work of either an initial writer or a secondary (or, tertiary) author/editor. The integration of vv. 10–11 (if, indeed, the verses were interpolated) further suggests that the complex structure of the previously existing lines was perceptible to this interpolator, which, in turn, lends relevance to the observations offered below on the poem's structure.

Text and Analysis of the Poem

No.	Text	*Grammatical Analysis*	*Semantic Analysis*
1.	[בקול גדול פארו אלוהים] // [בקהל רבים השמיעו תפארתו]	$M^2VO//M^2VO$	a+bcd//e+fgc
2.	[ברוב ישרים פארו שמו] // [ועם אמונים ספרו גדולתו]	$M^2VO//MVO$	a+bcd//b'ef
3.	[חברו] / [1] לטובים נפשתכמה // ולתמימים לפאר עליון	$VMO//MM^{(=V)}O$	abc//b'de
4.	החבירו יחד / [2] להודיע ישעו // ואל תתעצלו להודיע עוזו	$VMM^{(=V)}O//VM^{(=V)}O$	abcd//ecf
	ותפארתו / [3] לכול פותאים	OM^2	gh+i
5.	כי להודיע כבוד יהוה // נתנה חוכמה	$M^{(=V)}O^2//VS$	ab+c//de
6.	ולספר / [4] רוב מעשיו // נודעה לאדם	$M^{(=V)}O^2//VM$	ab+c//de
7.	להודיע לפותאים עוזו // להשכיל / [5] לחסרי לב גדולתו	$M^{(=V)}MO//M^{(=V)}M^2O$	abc//\a'b'$^{(x+y)}$c'
8.	הרחוקים מפתחיה / [6] // הנדחים ממבואיה	$MM//MM$	ab//a'b'
9.	כי עליון הואה אדון / [9] יעקוב // ותפארתו על כול מעשיו	$SSP^2//SM^{2(=P)}$	abc+d//ef+g
10.	ואדם מפאר עליון / [10] // ירצה כמגיש מנחה	$O^{3(SPO)}//VM^{2(VO)}$	abc//def
11.	כמקריב עתודים ובני בקר / [11] // כמדשן מזבח ברוב עולות	$M^{4(VOO)}//M^{4(VOM)}$	abc+b'//def+b"
	כקטורת ניחוח מיד צדיקים	M^2M^2	ghi+j
12.	מפתחי / [12] צדיקים נשמע קולה // ומקהל חסידים / [13] זמרתה	$M^2VS//M^2S$	a+bcd//e+b'd'
13.	על אוכלסה בשבע נאמרה // ועל שתותמה בחבר / [14] יחדיו	$M^{(=V)}MV//M^{(=V)}MM$	abc//a'de
14.	שיחתם בתורת עליון // אמריהמה להודיע עוזו	$SM^{2(=P)}//SM^{(=V)}O$	ab+c//a'de
15.	כמה רחקה מרשעים אמרה // מכול זדים לדעתה / [15]	$M^{(=P)}MS//M^2M^{(=S)}$	abc//d+ef
16.	הנה / [16] עיני יהוה // על טובים תחמל	$MS^2//MV$	a+b//cd
17.	ועל מפאריו יגדל חסדו / [17] // מעת רעה יציל נפש[ם]	$MVO//M^2VO$	abc//d+efg
18.	[ברכו את] יהוה // גואל עני מיד / [18] צר[ים] [ומצי]ל [תמימים מיד רשעים]	$VO//O^{4(VOM)}$ $O^{4(VOM)}$	ab//cde+f c'd'e+f'
19.	[מקים קרן יע]קוב // שופט [עמו ישראל]	$O^{3(VO)}//O^{3(VOM)}$	ab+c//dec'
20.	[מאוה משכנו בציון] // [בוחר לנצח בירושלים]	$O^{3(VOM)}//O^{3(VOM)}$	abc//dec'

Translation

1.   [With a great voice, glorify God;]
          [within the crowded congregation, proclaim his glory]
2.   [In the crowd of upright (people) glorify his name;]
          [and with faithful (people) recount his greatness.]
3.   [Unite] yourselves with any who are good (lit., good ones);
          and with any who are pure (lit., pure ones) in order to glorify
              the Most High.
4.   Join together to declare his salvation;
          and do not be lazy in declaring his strength,
          and his glory to all the simple.

5.   Lo, for declaring the glory of the Lord
              Wisdom is given;
6.   and for recounting his many deeds,
              it is made known to humanity,
7.   for declaring to simple (people) his strength,
              for teaching mindless (people) his greatness,
8.   (for teaching) those far from her gates (his greatness),
              (for teaching) those outcasts from her entrances (his greatness).

9.   For the Most High is Lord of Jacob,
              and his glory (is) over all his deeds.
10.   And a person who glorifies the Most High
              he accepts as one who brings near an offering,
11.   as one who offers he-goats and calves,
              as one who enriches (lit., "fattens") the altar with many burnt offerings,
              like soothing incense from the hand of righteous ones.

12.   From the gates of righteous (people) her voice is heard,
              and from the congregation of pious (people) her song.
13.   While they eat in satiety, she is spoken of,
              while they drink in community together.
14.   Their meditation is in the Torah of the Most High,
              their words are for declaring his strength.
15.   How far from wicked (people) is her word,
              from all insolent (people) (is) knowledge of her (lit., knowing her).

16.   Lo, the eyes of the Lord
              have compassion over good (people),
17.   and over those who praise him he increases his kindness,
              from a wicked time he will rescue [their] soul(s).

18.   [Bless] the Lord,
         the one who redeems the humble from the hand of the enemies,
         [and res]c[ues the pure from the hand of the wicked.]
19.   [who establishes a horn of Ja]cob,
         and judges [his people, Israel,]
20.   [who desires his dwelling in Zion,]
         [and chooses Jerusalem for perpetuity.]

Notes to the Translation

154:1 Reconstruction of the Hebrew is based essentially on the Syriac text. The text presented here is that adapted by Sanders from Noth's back-translation from Syriac into Hebrew (made when the Dead Sea Scrolls text was still lying undisturbed in the desert).[15] This reconstruction of the first verse is followed by most scholars, including Lührmann, Auffret, and Eshel and Eshel.[16] The word order of the Hebrew is, of course, hypothetical, but seems reasonably likely, given the correspondence in word order between Syriac and Hebrew versions in the verses that follow.

The phrase translated "crowded congregation" in v. 1 represents the reconstructed Hebrew phrase קהל רבים. Sanders translates literally "in the congregation of (the) many"[17] and "in the congregation of the many."[18] Delcor, Lührmann, and Eshel and Eshel translate similarly.[19] Magne suggests reading רב instead of רַבִּים and translating "assemblée nombreuse."[20] The Syriac has ܣܓܝܐܐ ܒܓܘ. It is hard to determine with certainty the correct reading, but in the Peshitta the phrase קְהַל רַב is often rendered ܒܓܘ ܟܢܫܐ ܪܒܐ (see, e.g., Pss 22:26; 35:18; 40:10), though sometimes ܣܓܝܐ translates רבים (as in Ezek 38:15). Noth's article does not offer any conclusive reasoning for his reconstruction, which Sanders and most scholars follow.[21] It should be noted that Noth reconstructed הרבים, and Sanders and others reconstruct without the definite article, an important point given that הרבים refers in many Dead Sea Scrolls texts to "a leadership group."[22] Scholars, in general, reject any explicit connec-

---

15. James A. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPsᵃ," *ZAW* 76 (1964): 58; idem, DJD 4:64; Noth, "Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen," 1–23.

16. Lührmann, "Ein Weisheitspsalm," 88–89; Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 154," 516; Eshel and Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154," 648.

17. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 59.

18. Sanders, DJD 4:65; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 105; idem, "Psalm 154 Revisited," 305.

19. Delcor, "Zum Psalter von Qumran," 22; Lührmann, "Ein Weisheitspsalm," 89; and Eshel and Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154," 658.

20. Magne, "Le Psaume 154," 101–2.

21. Noth, "Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen," 1–23.

22. H.-J. Fabry, in H.-J. Fabry, E. Blum, H. Ringgren, " רב," *TDOT* 13, 297; see also Sari-anna Metso, "Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement," in

tion to the Qumran group, though some lingering possibility for a connection is sometimes expressed.[23] I think it unlikely that any specific group is being referred to. My translation is an attempt to render the construct phrase into idiomatic English and avoid any suggestion of a connection to a specific group or subgroup.

154:2 In a similar way, my translation of ישרים as "upright (people)" and similar translations for other words, attempts to emphasize that there are no definite articles on these words and that they should not be construed as specific references to specific ecclesiological groups or subgroups. The indefinite forms of the words are often translated with the English "the" in translations of the Bible, and it is only for the purposes mentioned above that I have refrained from using the English definite article.

I follow Noth's and Sanders's reconstruction of שמו and גדולתו, in contrast to the suggestions of Skehan.[24]

154:3 The verb חבר is here in the D-stem, with the word נפש being used in its reflexive sense as direct object.

Although the word תמימים refers to members of the "Qumran sect" in other texts, there is no reason to think that such is being referred to here.[25]

154:4 The phrase that I translate as "join together" from v. 4 is translated differently by many scholars. Sanders's translation of the verb phrase varies: "form an assembly" to "form a community."[26] Noth, of course, did not have access to the Dead Sea Scrolls for his article, and it is not surprising that he translates the Syriac ܐܟܚܕܐ into Hebrew יחדו and German "gemeinsam."[27] Strugnell also observes that the Syriac presumes that the Hebrew of the scroll, יחד, is an adverb, not a noun.[28] Magne, Lührmann, Skehan, and Auffret all follow him.[29] Delcor

---

The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: vol. 2, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 283–300, esp. 292, 295–96.

23. Charlesworth and Sanders write: "The 'many ones' (or many) of 154:1 . . . may be parallel to 'the many,' a technical term (*Rabbîm*) that defines the fully initiated members of the Qumran community" ("More Psalms of David," 617). They then add in the next sentence: "The 'many,' however, may be only a generic reference, as it is in 155:10 and Isaiah 53:11." Sanders alone comments, "If רבים is a correct reconstruction here then it would seem to be similar in sense to its frequent usage elsewhere in Qumran literature. Contrast Ps. III, v.10" ("Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 60; DJD 4:66). In Ps 155:10, the word appears and has the meaning "many people"; such a meaning for the word is common enough in the Bible too.

24. See Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 60; and idem, DJD 4:66; Skehan suggests הודו and תהלתו (Patrick W. Skehan, "Again the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms," *CBQ* 38 [1976]: 156).

25. See Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 61; idem, DJD 4:66.

26. The first translation is represented in Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 59; idem, DJD 4:65; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 105; the second in Sanders, "Psalm 154 Revisited," 305; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 175.

27. Noth, "Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen," 9, 17.

28. Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 274.

29. Magne, "Le Psaume 154," 97; Lührmann, "Ein Weisheitspsalm," 89; Skehan, "Again

judiciously observes that the Hebrew word here could be either a substantive or an adverb.[30] In his 1993 article, Sanders argues that these scholars do not explain the H-stem of חבר, which, he implies, makes better sense with יחד, being interpreted as a substantive direct object.[31] Also problematic, on the surface at least, is the fact that this psalm uses יחדיו for the adverb in v. 13.

The H-stem of חבר (in Hebrew) occurs only in Job 16:4 (presuming that this is the same verb).[32] Based on the Job passage, one would expect that the H-stem is an "internal H-stem" and that what is joined is marked with a *bêt*-preposition. All the same, this alone cannot demonstrate that the verb in the H-stem never takes a direct object (especially given the debate about the verb in the Job passage). As a comparison, one may consult the same root's appearance in Palmyrene Aramaic, where it occurs as a verb in the H-stem with direct objects.[33]

It so happens that the adverbs יחד and יחדיו (in its more common and defective form: יחדו) do sometimes occur in the same verse (see, e.g., the MT of Isa 22:3). So, the appearance of two forms of essentially the same adverb in the same text is not without precedent.

Finally, we should note that, even if יחד were intended with the meaning "assembly," this does not imply that the writer intended a "Qumran sect" or anything close to it; the word may simply have been used as a synonym of קהל. The word יחד is even used as a substantive in the Bible, as noted by BDB, in 1 Chr 12:18.

Sanders argues in his 1993 article that it is not impossible that a later reader of this text, one familiar with 1QS, etc., would have interpreted יחד as a more specific reference to the specific community referenced in 1QS and similar texts.[34] All the same, an argument for a plainer meaning for this phrase might be suggested by the context of this verse, coming just after v. 3: "unite yourselves."

154:5 Verses 5–7 contain a series of infinitives construct that I understand as purpose phrases, in contrast, for example, to understanding the infinitive phrases as explanatory or epexegetical infinitives, where the action denoted would be more closely associated with the action of the main clause.[35] It remains grammatically ambiguous whether Wisdom or humanity is the subject of the infinitives, that is, whether Wisdom declares God's glory, or humanity does so. The context, however, makes clear that it is humanity; in v. 6 Wisdom is given

---

the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms," 156; and Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 154," 517.

30. Delcor, "Zum Psalter von Qumran," 24.

31. Sanders, "Psalm 154 Revisited," 303.

32. On the problem of the verb's etymology in the Job passage, one may consult *DCH*, s.v., and the literature cited in that dictionary's bibliography.

33. See *DNWSI*, s.v.

34. Sanders, "Psalm 154 Revisited," 303.

35. For the grammatical terms, see Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 608–9.

to humanity, and v. 14 explicitly says that human words declare God's strength, using the same words as the infinitive phrase in v. 7. In short, Wisdom is intended as an aid to humans, not to do their work for them. The syntax here is similar to that of the last words of Ezek 35:12, "'they [the mountains of Israel] are given to us [the mountains of Seir] for devouring.'"

Another ambiguity relates to whether and to what degree Wisdom is personified in the poem. My capitalization makes clear that I feel Wisdom is personified. This has many precedents in the Hebrew Bible, but is here based on the occurrence of "her voice" in v. 12. This is more clearly a case of personification than "her song" in the same verse, which could be interpreted as "a song about her" (with no implicit sense of personification), rather than "the song she sings." Overall, the personification of this poem is not as complete a personification as found, for example, in Prov 9. Note also that God is personified as well, being depicted with eyes. Sanders observes the rarity of Wisdom's personification among nonbiblical Dead Sea Scrolls, but does not call attention to the uniqueness of Wisdom's role in this text as a means to praise God.[36]

I prefer to translate the last verb of this bicolon, נתנה, with the present tense (as Sanders and others do) since the "giving" of wisdom is something that might take place with each person. I assume that the "giving" is to be understood as God's placement of wisdom in the human mind (e.g., Sir 17:8–10). Conceivably, it could be understood in a more mythical sense, as wisdom's creation by God or, alternatively, her placement in or appointment for Israel (as in Sir 24), and translated with the past tense.

154:6 God's "deeds" presumably refers to his acts of salvation (given the mention of salvation in vv. 4a, 17b, 18b, and 18c), though it might also refer to the products of his creative acts (since wisdom is often associated with creation and since Ben Sira implies that wisdom is given to the pious in order to recognize the multitude of God's works and the human inability to perceive them fully).[37]

154:7-8 Note that the translation of v. 8 assumes that the preposition + verb (להשכיל), preposition (ל), and direct object (גדולתו) of v. 7b are understood in v. 8a and 8b.[38] A similar kind of ellipsis is discussed in the notes to Ps 151A:2d–3d. As in that passage, here the ellipsis of words is part of a more complex structure wherein the syntax of one verse is expanded and elaborated in a subsequent verse.

154:9 Phrases similar to that of this verse's second colon are found in Pss 57:11 and 108:6: "your glory (is) over all the earth"; 148:13: "his glory (is) upon

---

36. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 65–66; idem, DJD 4:69.

37. See, e.g., 43:32b-33: ". . . few of his works [מעשיו] have I seen. // Everything has the Lord made, / and to the pious he has given wisdom" (Reymond, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry*, 69). The lines are reconstructed from the Greek translation, following the text of Norbert Peters, *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1902), 404.

38. Alternatively, one could translate v. 8a and b to reflect the ellipsis of the preposition + verb (להודיע), preposition (ל), and direct object (עוזו) of v. 7a.

earth and heaven"; and 145:9: "his compassion (is) over all his works."[39] It would seem, based on the context of the poem and these parallel passages, that מעשיו here connotes what God has created, rather than his acts of salvation.

154:10 This verse's and the next's relationship to the surrounding verses has been commented on by many scholars. These verses' analogy between glorification of God through words and sacrifice to God is noteworthy and finds resonance with some other biblical passages, for example, Ps 141:2, where the speaker pleads that prayer stand for incense. Note how even Sir 35:1–5 identifies the secondary importance of sacrifices; similarly, sacrifices are of secondary significance in Ps 69:31–32. The speaker of Ps 154, of course, does not suggest that God totally rejects sacrifices, as does the speaker of Ps 51.

The imperfect verb ירצה could morphologically be either a G-stem or N-stem. Determination of the stem of this verb, then, also affects the interpretation of the verse's syntax and, in turn, the likelihood of its connection to the preceding verse (or the perception of that likelihood). If the verb is a G-stem, then the first colon is an object of the verb and the subject is God, mentioned just before in v. 9, thus suggesting this verse's integration into the poem (even if it was not part of the psalm initially); this is the interpretation reflected in the translation above. If the verb is an N-stem, then the first colon contains a subject phrase, the verse bears no close connection to what precedes, and it seems more like an interpolation; this interpretation leads to a translation: "a person who glorifies the Most High is accepted. . . ." Given the syntax of v. 16, where the subject appears in the first colon and the second colon contains the predicate verb, we might expect ירצה to be an N-stem.[40] Alternatively, in vv. 5–6 the complement of the verb (a prepositional infinitive phrase) appears in the first colon, while the finite verb appears in the second colon; such might suggest that ירצה is a G-stem and the preceding colon contains the direct object of the verb. Of those scholars who have translated the text or offered observations on it, Sanders, Lührmann, Charlesworth and Sanders, and Eshel and Eshel translate the verb as though they believe it to be a G-stem, while Strugnell, Dupont-Sommer, Magne, and Auffret translate it as a passive verb, indicating they believe it to be an N-stem.[41] In view of the inherent

---

39. The Hebrew of the three phrases reads respectively: הודו על־ארץ; על כל־הארץ כבודך רחמיו על־כל מעשיו; ושמים.

40. A possible analogy to the syntactic structure of this verse is provided by Ps 155:7b–8, where the subject precedes its verb and occupies a colon separate from it. Other curious divisions between syntactic elements exist in the last chapters of Sirach, e.g., 45:23–24, where the subject occurs first with the predicate in the second colon, and where the predicate appears in the first colon and the subject in the second (see Reymond, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry*, 130–31).

41. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 60; idem, DJD 4:65; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 105; idem, "Psalm 154 Revisited," 305; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 177; Charlesworth and Sanders, "More Psalms of David," 619; Lührmann, "Ein Weisheitspsalm," 89; Eshel and Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154," 658; Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 274;

ambiguities of this verse, it is helpful to consider the Syriac translation; it contains the verb ܨܒܐ in the tG-stem followed by the *bêt*-preposition. This construction means "to be well-pleased, to choose," and, in its context, suggests that the Syriac translator understood God to be the subject of the verb.[42] While Strugnell views this as a "standard transposition" of the Hebrew passive into the Syriac active,[43] Sanders points out that Ps 151A:6c-d contains, in the Syriac (Syriac Ps 151A:5), the same verb in the same stem with the *bêt*-preposition (ܐܨܛܒܝ ܒ), where the Hebrew contains the transitive verb בחר ("to choose," complemented with the *bêt*-preposition), and the Greek contains εὐδοκέω + ἐν ("to be content with").[44] Thus, the Syriac phrase can, in fact, represent an active Hebrew verb. Although the respective ancient versions of Ps 151A represent the verse slightly differently, all have God as the subject of the verb. I interpret the verb of the present poem and verse (154:10) as a G-stem verb with God as its subject, in line with its Syriac translation.

154:11 The verb דשן (in the D-stem) seems to mean literally "make fat," though it is more idiomatically translated with the English "enrich." There is a degree of confusion inherent in the Hebrew of this passage, however, since in the Bible (and in postbiblical literature), when the D-stem of דשן takes מזבח as its object it means "clear away the fat ashes," essentially the reverse of what we would expect it to mean here.[45] Some light is shed on this idiom from that portion of Sirach preserved only in translation. The Greek of Sir 35:8 assumes the D-stem of דשן plus the direct object מזבח:[46]

André Dupont-Sommer, "Hébreu et Araméen," *Annuaire du Collège de France* 66 (1966): 359; Magne, "Le Psaume 154," 96; Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 154," 518. The N-stem of רצה regularly has, according to BDB and Jastrow, a passive connotation.

42. The definition comes from J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary: Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith, D.D.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903), s.v; the Latin translation of the Syriac reads, in part, "oblectatus est in, gratum habuit . . . voluit, optavit, probavit" (R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1879–1901], s.v.). Note that one manuscript (12t4mg) contains an alternative that allows for the possible interpretation of the Syriac to imply that the person offering sacrifice is the subject of the verb (see Baars, "Apocryphal Psalms," 3 and van Rooy, *Studies on the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms,* 145).

43. Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 274.

44. This is the reading favored by that text's editor, but other Syriac manuscripts (12t2 and 12t5) contain the G-stem of the verb, as a perfect and participle, respectively (see Baars, "Apocryphal Psalms," 3). The verb in the G-stem, when it occurs with the *bêt*-preposition, can have a very similar sense to the verb in the tG-stem, "to have pleasure in, be pleased with, delight in" (Payne Smith, *Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, s.v.).

45. This meaning is found in Num 4:13 and also in postbiblical Hebrew, in *m. Tamid* 3:1, 9 and *m. Yoma* 2:3.

46. The similarity between the Ps 154 passage and that of Sirach is noted by Lehmann ("11 Q Ps and Ben Sira," 248), though I do not agree with his assertion that vv. 10–11 are a "rendering" of the Sirach passage.

προσφορὰ δικαίου λιπαίνει θυσιαστήριον,
καὶ ἡ εὐωδία αὐτῆς ἔναντι ὑψίστου.[47]

The offering of the righteous enriches the altar,
    and its sweet smell (is) before the Most High.[48]

The Greek verb λιπαίνω reflects some of the nuances of the D-stem of דשׁן; it is translated in LSJ as "to anoint" and "to make fat, enrich" (when referring to rivers).[49]

Sanders notes that in 1QS IX, 4–5 the just person is compared to a "pleasing (scent) of righteousness."[50] A parallel with the thought of Ezek 20:41 is also possible, though perhaps unlikely.[51]

154:12 See the above comment on v. 5 for the ramifications of "her voice" and "her song" for the personification of Wisdom.

154:13 The exact nuance of the preposition על is peculiar. When, in the Hebrew Bible, the preposition is followed by an infinitive construct, it has either a causal nuance ("because," as in Jer 2:35), a concessive nuance ("although," as in Josh 10:7), or it marks a topic ("about," as in Gen 41:32).[52] None of these fits our context particularly well. Most translators imply through their translation that the preposition is communicating a temporal nuance ("when"), something that is observed also in 1QM IX, 11.[53] I translate "while" and assume that this temporal nuance has grown out of the sense of accompaniment that the preposition sometimes expresses or its sense of "in addition to."

The possible connection with an "eschatological meal" suggested by Sanders

---

47. Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*, 287.

48. Segal (*Sefer Ben Sira*, 220) reconstructs:

וְרֵיחַ נִיחוֹחוֹ לִפְנֵי יְיָ   קָרְבַּן צַדִּיק יְדַשֵּׁן מִזְבֵּחַ

Segal also notes the disparity between the meaning of the D-stem verb in Num 4:13 ("to take away the fat ashes"), in Ps 20:4 ("to find acceptable"), and "to make fat" (which, he asserts, is the meaning of the phrase in this verse) (ibid., 222). *DCH* also notes that the verb means "refresh, enrich" in Sir 26:13 and 43:22 (s.v.).

49. The latter translation, "to enrich," appears in Euripides' *Bacchae*, 575 (LSJ, s.v.).

50. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 62; idem, DJD 4:66.

51. Ezekiel 20:41 contains the phrase בריח ניחח ארצה אתכם, which translators often render something like "as a pleasing scent I accept you." Although the initial preposition is *bêt* (not the comparative *kāp*), a sense of comparison is perhaps implied since רצה can take a complement with a direct object or with the *bêt* preposition. Note that this is perhaps the only instance of it taking both complements, and I think it is more likely that the *bêt* in Ezek 20:41 has the sense of accompaniment, as it has at the end of the preceding verse. Thus, Ezek 20:41 could be translated: "with a pleasing scent I accept you."

52. See Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 218, 605.

53. *DCH* lists only the 11Q5 passage under discussion and 1QM IX, 11 as places where the preposition is translated "when." The same preposition is translated "during" in 11Q19 LII, 11 (= *Temple Scroll*) and "on" for 1 Sam 25:8.

is not necessary since, as Lührmann notes, the pursuit of wisdom is associated in the Bible with her providing food and drink (see Prov 9:2–5; Sir 15:3; 24:21); Lührmann also notes that the connection to 1QS VI, 4ff., which concerns the communal eating and study of the law, should not be overemphasized since a similar connection between dining and Torah study is found in Sir 9:14–16.[54]

Strugnell criticizes the reading "satiety" since it presumes a kind of gluttony on the part of the diners, and he further expresses doubt concerning a suggestion by Sanders (made through personal communication) that this passage might be compared with Deut 33:22 (by which is meant 33:23).[55] Two points might be made with regard to the word "satiety" (שבע). First and most important, satiation in Hebrew as in English does not necessarily imply gluttony or overindulgence. See, for example, the use of the verb שבע in 1 Chr 23:1 (where David's life is considered "satisfied") and the use of the abstract noun שבע in Prov 13:25 (where the satisfied appetite of the righteous is contrasted with the hunger of the wicked). Second, it should be recalled that Ben Sira, although cautioning against overindulgence, actually makes accommodation for overindulgence among his readers/students in 31:21: "If perforce you have eaten too much, / once you have emptied your stomach, you will have relief."[56] Thus, if Ben Sira can imagine his student or reader overindulging, his student or reader who is instructed to talk of wisdom at the dinner table (if given a chance), it is not impossible that the author of Ps 154 could imagine the same of his readers. [57]

The subject of נאמרה is presumably Wisdom, though it could also be "her song."

I follow Sanders's translation of the phrase בחבר יחדיו "in community

---

54. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 67; idem, DJD 4:70; Lührmann, "Ein Weisheitspsalm," 92–93.

55. Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 273.

56. Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 384.

57. Lührmann early on pointed to the relevant Sirach passage (9:14–16) ("Ein Weisheitspsalm," 93). The passage reads in the Genizah A manuscript (Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 34):

ועם חכמים הסתייד	כבחך ענה רעך
וכל סודך בינותם	עם נבון יהי חשבונך
וביראת אלהים תפארתך	אנשי צדק בעלי לחמך

According to your ability, respond to your friend;
  and with the wise converse.
Let your conversation be (made) with discernment;
  and all your counsel (with) their understanding;
(let) righteous people be your eating companions,
  and (let) your glory (reside) in the fear of God.

The colon of v. 15b, following the Greek, reads: "and (let) all your discussion [concern] the law of the Most High"; while, following the Syriac, it reads: "and (let) all your discussion [concern] the ways of the Lord."

together."[58] The abstract noun חֶבֶר occurs in Prov 21:9. Alternatively, the phrase might be a temporal infinitive phrase, with *bêt* preposition: "being gathered together," the verb being a G-stem.

154:14 The phrase "Torah of the Most High" appears also in Sir 42:2 and 49:4, but not in biblical literature.[59]

154:15 The preposition plus infinitive combination לדעתה functions as the subject of its clause (as similar phrases do in, e.g., Ps 12:2; Josh 24:15).[60]

154:16 The nonagreement of subject (עינים) and verb (תחמל) in terms of their number might be explained as a result of haplography, the *wāw* at the end of the word having fallen off due to the immediately following *wāw* conjunction.[61] Alternatively, we might explain this as a result of the subject and verb being separated so far from each other in the clause; such nonagreement is not without many parallels, even when the noun comes directly before the verb (e.g., עיניו קמה in 1 Sam 4:15).[62]

154:18 The reading [צר]ים is suggested by the parallel in 4Q448 A, 9, which attests צריׄם, as discussed by Eshel, Eshel, and Yardeni.[63]

154:19 As Lührmann notes, the word "horn" does not necessarily imply an eschatalogical context.[64] Following Lührmann, I reconstruct this verse without the *min* prepositions that are presumed in most other translations and editions of this psalm.[65]

154:20 Reconstruction of this verse follows the analysis of Eshel and Eshel, which is, in turn, based on their reading of 4Q448 A, 10.[66] They reconstruct the D-stem perfect of אוה as the verse-initial word, based on the similarity of this verse in phrasing to Ps 132:13, where the perfect of בחר is matched with

---

58. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 60; idem, DJD 4:65. His translation in a later edition of the same poem is "in fellowship together," (Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 177).

59. See Avi Hurvitz, "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," *RevQ* 5 (1965): 231 n. 13, who cites Moshe Weinfeld for the connection of the reference to Sir 49. The connection to 42:2 is noted by Lehmann ("11 Q Ps and Ben Sira," 249).

60. See Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 605–6.

61. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 63.

62. For more examples, see GKC §145k. As for the representation of the verb in the MT of 1 Sam 4:15, it has a *zaqef parvum* accent mark above the first syllable indicating that the Masoretes read this as a finite (perfect) verb, not a participle (despite the fact that we might expect a perfect to precede its subject); the fact that the verb is a finite verb increases its relevance to the phrase in our text.

63. Eshel, Eshel, and Yardeni, "Scroll from Qumran," 297; eidem, "Qumran Composition," 206; eidem, DJD 11:409; Eshel and Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154," 658.

64. Lührmann, "Ein Weisheitspsalm," 95.

65. Ibid., 97. Auffret ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 154," 517) also follows Lührmann.

66. See Eshel, Eshel, and Yardeni, "Scroll from Qumran," 295–324; eidem, "Qumran Composition," 212–14; eidem, DJD 11:409–10; Eshel and Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154," 658.

the perfect of אוה. For some reason, they do not propose to read the participle of אוה here. Although the perfect of אוה is possible, given the pattern of the preceding verses, I think it more likely that both roots are articulated as participles.

Reading and Structure of the Poem

My analysis and reading of the poem follow two important points that Dieter Lührmann has already made. First, Lührmann demonstrates how the poem can be read as a coherent unit; second, he emphasizes that the poem details how Wisdom serves to praise God.[67] This is a role, as explained above, that is not common to the Hebrew Bible, but more typical of the thought of Ben Sira. In his article on the subject, Lührmann calls attention to Sir 15:1–10, which concludes with the phrase:[68]

ומשל בה ילמדנה   בפה חכם תאמר תהלה

> Praise is uttered by the mouth of the wise;
>> the one that masters it [i.e., the praise] teaches it.
>>> (Sir 15:10; Ms. A)[69]

We may also cite similar expressions in other parts of Sirach that connect praise of God to wisdom or the wise: Sir 17:7–8, 10, 9; 39:6; and 51:21–22:

> ἐπιστήμην συνέσεως ἐνέπλησεν αὐτοὺς
>> καὶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακὰ ὑπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς.
> ἔθηκεν τὸν φόβον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν
>> δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ,
> καὶ ὄνομα ἁγιασμοῦ αἰνέσουσιν,
>> ἵνα διηγῶνται τὰ μεγαλεῖα τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ.

> With understanding knowledge he [i.e., God] fills them [i.e., humans],
>> and good and evil he shows them.

---

67. Lührmann, "Ein Weisheitspsalm," 90–92. Auffret makes a somewhat different conclusion, noting that the poem subordinates Wisdom to praise of God (see "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 154," 545).

68. Lührmann, "Ein Weisheitspsalm," 91–92. On this text and the idea that Ben Sira views praise as the most important outcome of becoming "wise," see Marböck, "Structure and Redaction History of the Book of Ben Sira," 267–76; and Michael Reitemeyer, *Weisheitslehre als Gotteslob: Psalmentheologie im Buch Jesus Sirach* (BBB 127; Berlin: Philo, 2000); and Jan Liesen, "'With All Your Heart': Praise in the Book of Ben Sira," in *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham-Ushaw College 2001* (ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel; BZAW 321; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 199–213.

69. For the Hebrew text, see Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 44.

He puts fear of him in their heart (or, mind),
　　　　to reveal to them the grandeur of his works,
so they will praise his holy name
　　　　in order to declare the grandeur of his works.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Sir 17: 7–8, 10, 9)[70]

ἐὰν κύριος ὁ μέγας θελήσῃ
　　　　πνεύματι συνέσεως ἐμπλησθησεταί
αὐτὸς ἀνομβρήσει ῥήματα σοφίας αὐτοῦ
　　　　καὶ ἐν προσευχῇ ἐξομολογήσεται κυρίῳ.

If the great Lord should wish (it),
　　　　with a spirit of understanding he [i.e., the scribe] will be filled,
he will pour forth his words of wisdom
　　　　and in prayer he will praise the Lord. (Sir 39:6)[71]

[ובשפתותי אודנו]　　　　　　　[נתן אדני לי לשוני שכר]

[וכסף וזהב תקנה בה]　　　　　　[שמעו מוסר כמעט]
[ואל תבושו בתהלתו]　　　　　　[תשמח נפשכם בחסדו]
[ותתן] שכרכם בעתו　　　　　　[פעלו פעלכם בעתו]

[My lord gave me my tongue as wage]
　　　　[and with my lips I praise him:]
. . . .
[Hear instruction but a little,]
　　　　[and silver and gold you will acquire through her.]
[Let your soul rejoice in his kindness,]
　　　　[and do not be ashamed in his praise.]
[Perform your deed at its time,]
　　　　[so that he will give] your wage in its time.
　　　　　　　　　　　(Sir 51:22, 28–30; 11Q5 and
　　　　　　　　　　　reconstructed from the Greek and Syriac)[72]

The Hebrew Bible contains few associations of this kind, the closest being found
in Dan 2:23:

די חכמתא וגבורתא יהבת לי　　　לך אלה אבהתי מהודא ומשבח אנה
די־מלת מלכא הודעתנא　　　וכען הודעתני די־בעינא מנך

---

70. For the Greek text, see Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*, 202. I do not include the
colon v. 8c, from Greek II. For the difficulties presented by this verse and for another possible
way of reading the Greek text, see Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 277, 279.

71. For the Greek text, see Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*, 306.

72. For explanations for the reconstruction, see the preceding chapter on this poem.

"I give thanks and praise you, God of my ancestors,
    because you have given me wisdom and power;
and now you have declared to me [lit., made known to me]
        what we requested of you,
    because you have declared to me [lit., made known to me]
        the matter [lit., word] of the king." (Dan 2:23)[73]

The fact that this passage from Daniel derives from the Second Temple period, perhaps at approximately the same time that Ps 154 was composed and around the same time as Sirach, is significant and points to the possibility that the underlying idea of these passages was common at this time.

Connected with these observations is the fact that the poem is suggesting that it is through the agency of Wisdom that God is praised. In his Hymn to the Creator (Sir 42:15–43:33), Ben Sira suggests that he alone cannot praise God adequately. At the end of that poem he implies that wisdom is given to the pious in order for the pious to perceive the wonders of the physical world and also to perceive the limits to their own perception.

Another connection to Sirach, and especially the poem Sir 51:13–30, is the manner in which the pious (or, the wise) take on the role of Wisdom herself. This is seen in the present psalm, as in Sir 51:13–30, in the lexical reciprocity between Wisdom and the pious that encourages their comparison: Wisdom is made known (N-stem of ידע) in order for humans to literally make known (H-stem of ידע) God's glory (vv. 6–7); the words of the pious are implicitly compared to "her word" (vv. 14–15); and other corresponding attributes suggest their comparison (the doors of wisdom versus the doors of the righteous, in vv. 8 and 12, respectively). That Ps 154 shares this feature with Sir 51:13–30 and also with Sirach in general suggests that this notion, like the association between wisdom and praise of God, was a common idea of this time. It bears mentioning that, although Ps 154 shares many ideas with Sirach, it does not share a common verse structure, as will be described below. Although Ps 154, like Sirach, exhibits patterns between adjacent verses within verse paragraphs, the significance of this for the comparison of Ps 154 and Sirach is diminished, since most of the other non-Masoretic poems of 11Q5 exhibit similar patterns between adjacent verses.

The poem can be divided into five verse paragraphs, which alternate in their focus between Wisdom and God. The first comprises vv. 1–4, where the speaker enjoins the reader to praise God; the second comprises vv. 5–8, which introduce the subject of wisdom by suggesting that Wisdom's purpose is directly related to praising God; the third paragraph comprises vv. 9–11 and focuses more specifically on God; the fourth paragraph comprises vv. 12–15 and addresses how

---

73. To a lesser extent this idea is expressed in Pss 71:17 ("You have taught me, God, from my youth / and still I declare your wonders") and 119:7 ("I praise you with upright heart, / when I learn your righteous judgments").

Wisdom appears among the wise; the last, fifth, paragraph comprises vv. 16–20 and again enjoins the reader to praise God.[74] As Auffret has shown, the poem seems to be concentrically organized, with the beginning and ending of the poem containing imperatives; these paragraphs are also both focused on God, while the second and fourth paragraphs focus on Wisdom and the wise; the third paragraph functions as a kind of pivot, but is focused essentially on God. Each of the verse paragraphs reveals certain structural consistencies, including the repetition of lexemes (פאר in vv. 1–4; ידע in vv. 5–7 [but also in v. 4]), and the repetition of grammatical patterns (*lāmed* + infinitive construct in vv. 5–7; the string of clause-initial participles in vv. 18–20). What seems more peculiar, however, is the consistent presence of verbal gapping (either within the verse or between adjacent verses) that appears at the end of each paragraph. In a loose, approximate way, this pattern complements the poem's structure; where it first occurs a single colon elides a verb (v. 4c), then two cola elide a verb (i.e., a bicolon: v. 8), then three cola (i.e., a tricolon: v. 11), then a single colon (v. 15b), and finally a series of six cola all lack a main verb (vv. 18b–20). This is not the only place where verbal ellipsis occurs, but it is interesting that gapping occurs consistently at these points in the poem.[75] It is worth noting that the possibly interpolated verses, 10–11, fit well into this scheme.

In every verse of the first paragraph repetitive/semantic parallelism occurs between the cola of a verse; in addition, grammatical correspondences between cola of a verse are found in almost every verse.[76] Repetitive and semantic parallels between adjacent verses are also well represented here. Especially obvious is the repetition of words from the root פאר (in every verse of the paragraph), but note also the repetition of גדל and רבב (between vv. 1 and 2) and חבר (between vv. 3 and 4).[77] These repetitions underline the grammatical similarities between

74. This division of the poem into verse paragraphs is the same as that proposed by Sanders ("Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 58-59, 63; DJD 4:64–65, 68; *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 104–8). This is also the division presupposed by the text's division in Eshel and Eshel's essay "4Q448, Psalm 154" (657–58) and the division reflected in Dupont-Sommer's translation ("Hébreu et Araméen," 359–60). Excluding vv. 10–11 from his consideration of structure, Auffret notes a chiastic organization wherein the hymnic verses at the beginning of the psalm (vv. 1–2) are matched by hymnic verses at the psalm's end (vv. 16–20); and, likewise, the sapiential verses occur in two blocks (vv. 5–8 and 12–15) that are organized in a mirror-like fashion around v. 9 (which itself is identified as a hymnic verse) ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 154," 543–45).

75. The following cola also lack predicates and depend on their preceding or following cola: vv. 3b, 10a, and 12b.

76. The repetitive parallels include those of פאר (v. 1) and ידע (v. 4), while the semantic matches include אמון // ישר (v. 2), תמים // טוב (v. 3); in addition a semantic similarity is expressed in v. 1 between the single imperative פארו and השמיעו תפארתו. Although v. 3 contains less syntactic parallelism between their respective cola, the gapping of the verb in the second colon means that the two cola are tightly bound syntactically.

77. Semantic parallels include שמע // ספר (vv. 1–2), אמון // ישר- טוב -תמים (vv. 2–3); in

vv. 1 and 2 (where every colon follows the pattern MVO) and between vv. 3 and 4 (where the main verb usually appears in the first colon and the clause usually contains a modifier phrase with an infinitive construct + object). The two sets of two-verse units also follow a similar rhetorical pattern, wherein the initial verbal phrase (in vv. 1a and 3a-b) encourages the faithful to praise God and the secondary phrase (in vv. 1b, 2a-b, and 4a-c) encourages praise of God's attribute or attributes ("his glory" in v. 1a, "his name" and "his greatness" in v. 2a-b, and "his salvation," "his strength," and "his glory" in v. 4a-c). The fact that the first attribute and the last are the same ("his glory") is noteworthy, but perhaps more interesting is the explicit connection made between God's glory and name and his salvation and strength. Verbal gapping takes place in each of the last two verses; חברו is gapped from the second colon of v. 3, and the entire phrase אל תתעצלו להודיע is elided from v. 4c.

Not only are vv. 3–4 connected through their similar syntactic structure and vocabulary, but they also complement each other in a more complicated manner. The colon v. 3a contains the imperative חברו ("unite") + a modifier phrase indicating the group (the "good") toward whom the verbal action is directed + the object of the imperative (the self-reflexive pronoun נפש). The next colon (v. 3b), where the verb is elided, continues with a modifier phrase again indicating the group (the "pure") toward whom the verbal action is directed + another prepositional phrase, this one including an infinitive construct and its object. The structure of v. 3b is then duplicated in v. 4a, where we find the imperative verb החבירו ("join") + a modifier ("together") + a prepositional phrase, including an infinitive construct and its object. The colon v. 4b contains a very similar sequence of syntactic elements: VM$^{(=V)}$O. The last colon, v. 4c, where we find the elision of a verbal phrase, contains a structure that expands on this structure still further; it begins with an object of the preceding infinitive construct and concludes with a preposition indicating the group (the "simple") toward whom the verbal action is directed. The similarity in structure between the verses suggests a natural and intrinsic relationship between uniting with the good and pure to praise God and declaring God's glory (especially his acts of salvation) to the simple. In addition, the similar placement of the infinitives construct from the roots פאר and ידע in vv. 3b and 4a-b points toward the poem's main theme that Wisdom (associated with knowledge and, therefore, ידע) finds its purpose in helping humans praise God.

The second verse paragraph (vv. 5–8) summarizes the main idea of the poem, as just articulated. It does this by explicit statements in vv. 5–6 which explain that wisdom is given to humanity in order to declare God's glory. This paragraph connects syntactically with what precedes through the conjunction כי, but also through common lexemes, including the repetition of ידע in v. 4a-b and

---

addition, there is a weaker connection between the H-stem of שמע (v. 1), ספר (v. 2), the verb פאר (vv. 1, 2, 3) and the H-stem of ידע (v. 4).

in vv. 5a, 6b, and 7a.[78] In particular, the repetition of this root between v. 6b (in the N-stem, with wisdom as subject) and v. 7a (in the H-stem, with the implied reader as subject) emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between wisdom and the wise; just as God gave wisdom to the wise, so the wise must communicate God's glory to the rest of humanity. This is, essentially, a slight variation on a theme expressed in various places in Sirach, namely, that the wise must share their wisdom.[79] In contrast to the emphasis in these Sirach passages, where the shared wisdom concerns how humans should live their lives, the present poem emphasizes that Wisdom's role among humanity is for the purpose of praising God. The second verse paragraph, like the first, attests a common grammatical structure wherein each verse (with the exception of v. 8, which depends on v. 7) begins with a modifier phrase that contains an infinitive construct + an object phrase. These syntactic parallels between the verses (in addition to the various other parallels) imply a connection between God's "honor," "his many deeds," "his strength," and "his greatness."[80] The syntactic dependence between vv. 7 and 8 is akin to that seen before in Ps 151A, between vv. 2d–3b and vv. 3c-d, where a verb is elided. As is the case in that pair of verses (and also in Ps 151A:5c–6b), the second verse expands and complements the syntactic structure of the first. In the case of Ps 154, the relationship between verses is somewhat more complex, since there is a gradual extension of the syntactic structure from v. 6 to v. 8, as explained below.

As was the case for the first paragraph, here the verses break apart into two sets, vv. 5–6 and vv. 7–8. Verses 5–6 exhibit a similar grammatical pattern, not only in their first cola, but also in their second cola where (in each case) a clause-initial 3rd per. fem. sg. N-stem perfect verb has wisdom as its subject. The close affinity of vv. 7–8 is demonstrated by the idiosyncratic verbal ellipsis that takes place in v. 8 and which makes v. 8 semantically and grammatically dependent on v. 7b. As was the case in vv. 3–4, where the syntactic structure of one verse is gradually expanded into the next verse, so too here. In this case, however, the basic syntactic pattern is expressed in vv. 5–6 and then expanded in the next lines. Vv. 5 and 6 exhibit essentially independent sentences, indicating the purpose of wisdom's gifting to humanity. The combination of *lāmed* preposition + infinitive construct + object that is found in vv. 5a and 6a is the basic model, which is then expanded in the next cola. In vv. 7a and 7b, to these essential components is added another *lāmed* prepositional phrase indicating (as in vv. 3a and 4c) the group toward whom the action of the verb is directed. In v. 7a this group is represented by a single word (פותאים, the "simple"), while in v. 7b it is rep-

---

78. Note the repetition of רוב between v. 2a and v. 6a and of פותא between v. 4c and v. 7a, of עוז between v. 4b and v. 7a, and of גדולה between v. 2b and v. 7b.

79. See, e.g., Sir 18:29; 20:30–31; 41:14b–15.

80. Semantic parallelism also connects the verses of this paragraph together; in particular, note the loose connection between verbs associated with knowledge (in the H-stem: ידע [vv. 5a, 6b, 7a] and שכל [v. 7b]) and the verb of communication ספר (v. 6a).

resented by two words in a construct phrase (חסרי לבב, the "mindless"). The cola of vv. 8a and 8b are, then, expansions of these prepositional phrases, including, in each colon, a definite substantive plus a prepositional phrase modifying this substantive. Thus, what begins as a single word is expanded into a two-word construct phrase, and then develops into a more complex two-word phrase containing a substantive + a modifying prepositional phrase. As is the case in the other passages where syntactic dependency between verses occurs, this structure rhetorically punctuates the point being made—here that God's glory must be communicated to humanity—and contributes more generally to the coherency of the paragraph.

The third paragraph (vv. 9–11) returns to the subject of God and lacks any mention of wisdom. It connects lexically with the preceding first paragraph through the recurrence of the root פאר (in vv. 9b and 10a) and with the second paragraph through the repetition of words such as מעשיו (v. 9b) and אדם (v. 10a).[81] A further correspondence between this paragraph and the two preceding is how it concludes with two verses, the second being syntactically dependent on the first. As was the case for v. 8, v. 11 lacks a verb, which is assumed from the preceding v. 10. Like the preceding vv. 3–4 and 5–8, vv. 10–11 exhibit a gradual expansion of syntactic elements. Verse 10 seems to represent a single clause, with a single main verb (רצה) located in the second colon (v. 10b), complemented by a comparative prepositional phrase. The comparative prepositional phrase in v. 10b is composed of a participle + object. The next colon (v. 11a) contains this same sequence, but with two objects to the clause's participle, the latter of which is composed of a construct chain. The following colon (v. 11b) modifies this sequence slightly with the pattern: participle + object + modifier (composed of a construct chain "with many burnt offerings"). The final colon (v. 11c) departs from this pattern slightly, but seems to again expand further from the preceding colon; thus, it contains not a participle but two nouns in construct ("soothing incense") + a prepositional phrase (composed of another construct chain) modifying the first phrase ("from the hand of righteous ones").

The fourth paragraph (vv. 12–15) returns to the subject of Wisdom and her relationship with the wise. Although there is no consistent syntactic pattern that connects the verses or any pair of them, coherency is suggested through the repetition of the root אמר (in vv. 13a, 14b, 15a) and the semantically related words קול (v. 12a), זמרה (v. 12b), שיחה (v. 14a). In addition, the paragraph uses words and roots most of which have already occurred in the poem.[82] Verbal gapping

---

81. These are not the only lexical and root repetitions between the third paragraph and the preceding two; note also עליון (vv. 9a, 10a), כול (v. 9b), and רוב (v. 11b). Since this paragraph contains many terms associated with sacrificing, it is not surprising that it contains fewer repetitions than the other following paragraphs.

82. The most significant of these are the repetition of מפתח (v. 12a; also v. 8a), צדיקים (v. 12a; also v. 11c), the phonetically similar pair of words קול and קהל (vv. 12a and b, respectively; also a match in vv. 1a and b), the phrase חבר יחדיו (v. 13b; also v. 4a), עוז (v. 14b; also

appears in the first and last verses; in both cases it follows the pattern of gapping found in the Hebrew Bible.

The fifth paragraph (vv. 16–20) returns once more to the subject of God. It begins with an uncommon structure where the subject appears in the first colon and the predicate as the last element of the second colon. (A similar kind of structure, where the predicate occurs in the second colon, is found in vv. 5, 6, and 10, though in these cases the colon boundary does not separate subject from verb.) The paragraph as a whole does not exhibit a consistent grammatical pattern, though there are some lexical consistencies (יהוה [vv. 16a and 18a], נצל [vv. 17b and 18c]). As others have demonstrated in the past, the paragraph has numerous correspondences with the first paragraph. The most obvious include the presence of imperatives in the first paragraph and the reconstructed ברכו in v. 18a and the common words and roots shared between the two paragraphs (טוב, פאר, גדל, נפש, and תמים); note also the concentration of repetitive/semantic and grammatical parallels between cola of individual verses.[83] More curious, however, given the numerous examples of verbal gapping in the preceding paragraphs is the string of participle phrases in vv. 18b–20, which function essentially as appositive descriptions of Yahweh, the object of the verb ברכו in v. 18a. These cola almost all contain the sequence participle + object + modifier phrase (the only exception being v. 19a).

Line Length, Parallelism, and Allusion to Scripture

The poem is predominantly constructed out of bicola, though it contains (within the fifteen verses not requiring substantial reconstruction) two tricola. The cola usually exhibit a common length within individual verses, usually where the two cola do not differ by more than two syllables and one word.[84] When there is a slight disparity, it is sometimes the case that the initial colon is longer, sometimes the case that the second colon is longer. The length of individual verses (excluding tricola) varies, even between adjacent bicola; for example, v. 6 contains 22 consonants, 13 syllables, and 5 words, while v. 7 contains 37 consonants, 21 syllables, and 7 words. In the two tricola, the individual cola mostly exhibit a common length, each of which is approximately the same length as other cola in the

---

vv. 4b and 7a), and רחקה (v. 15a; also v. 8a). Other repetitions include the words עליון (v. 14a), כול (v. 15b) and the root ידע (vv. 14b and 15b).

83. Repetitive/semantic parallels occur in vv. 1–4 and 18–20; grammatical parallels in vv. 1–2, 3, and 17–20.

84. The following notes the consonants-syllables-words for every verse preserved in 11Q5: v. 3: 17-11-3 // 17-9-3; v. 4: 19-10-4 // 19-11-3 // 17-9-3; v. 5: 16-9-3 // 9-5-2; v. 6: 13-7-3 // 9-6-2; v. 7: 17-9-3 // 20-12-4; v. 8: 13-8-2 // 13-7-3; v. 9: 20-10-4 // 17-9-3; v. 10: 13-8-3 // 13-7-3; v. 11: 19-11-4 // 18-9-4 // 20-10-4; v. 12: 19-10-4 // 16-10-3; v. 13: 17-11-3 // 18-11-3; v. 14: 15-8-3 // 17-9-3; v. 15: 17-11-3 // 13-7-3; v. 16: 11-7-3 // 11-5-2; v. 17: 17-11-3 // 14-8-4.

poem.[85] This is in contrast to the tricola of Sir 51:13–30 and Ps 151A, where the individual cola are shorter, in general, than the other cola.

There is only a single example of a repetitive/semantic parallel within a colon, that between בקר and עתוד in v. 11a.

The poem exhibits a strong concentration of repetitive/semantic parallels between cola of individual verses; thirteen out of the twenty verses contain repetitive/semantic parallelism.[86] Most of these parallels are traditional word pairs, or easily associated items. Grammatical parallelism is also frequent between cola of a verse.[87] Like Ps 151A, the poem exhibits verbal ellipsis between cola of a verse, in vv. 3 and 4. Given the concentration of traditional structures, it is interesting that the poem also contains a relatively high number of verses (four verses: 5, 6, 10, and 16) that express a single idea or thought without the repetition of grammatical structure or semantically similar words. These verses, although not exhibiting parallelistic patterns within the verse, do exhibit them with adjacent verses.

This general regularity at the verse level is matched by a relatively predictable pairing of verses into two-verse units, as explained above, where a pair of verses shares common words and grammatical structures, in some cases the latter being exhibited through syntactic dependence and verbal ellipsis.[88] (Especially important to note is the ellipsis that occurs between v. 7 and v. 8.) It is the case that parallels of all kinds between adjacent verses predominate in these two-verse units. In addition, repetitive/semantic parallels are found throughout the poem, especially important being those in particular verse paragraphs (e.g., in the fourth verse paragraph, vv. 12–15, where words related to verbal communication are concentrated).[89] However, sometimes repetitive/semantic parallelism between paragraphs also occurs (e.g., in the semantic pair כבוד // תפארתו between v. 4 and v. 5).

Since the poem alternates in its emphases between God and wisdom, it is not surprising that parallels separated by a verse or more are found between the three paragraphs that focus on God and the two that focus on wisdom. Especially

---

85. Note that vv. 18a and 18b are somewhat shorter than v. 18c, the first two cola being also shorter than most of the poem's other cola.

86. The repetitive parallels include those of פאר (v. 1), ידע (v. 4), while the semantic matches include עוז // ישר (v. 7), חסרי לבב // פותא (v. 7), אמון // ידע (v. 7), תמים // טוב (v. 3), שכל // ידע (v. 7), חסיד // צדיק (v. 8), עולה // עתוד -בקר (v. 11), מבוא // מפתח (v. 8), נדח // רחוק (v. 7), גדולה // ישראל // יעקוב (v. 18), רשע // צר (v. 14), אמר // שיחה (v. 13), שתה // אכל (v. 12), זמרה // קול (v. 12), ירושלים // ציון (v. 20); in addition, a semantic similarity is expressed in v. 1 between the single imperative פארו and השמיעו תפארתו.

87. In vv. 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 18, 19, 20; in addition, vv. 3 and 15 contain verbal ellipsis, which presumes a close syntactic connection between cola.

88. The verses matched in this way include 1–2, 3–4, 5–6, 7–8, 10–11, 18–20 (this last including three verses).

89. These include: דעתה - אמרה // הודיע - אמריהמה - שיחתם // נאמרה // זמרתה - נשמע.

important in this regard are the numerous repetitive/semantic matches between the poem's first and last paragraphs, as already outlined above.

The poem makes relatively little use of allusion or echoing. The verses that bear the closest resemblance to other biblical passages (vv. 9, 14, and 20) are only approximately similar and do not seem to draw on the Bible to expand or complement the poem's meaning or significance. The parallels that exist between Ps 154 and Sirach are primarily in terms of their general ideas, and less in relation to specific language, imagery, or structure. Furthermore, because the relationship between the two texts is not clearly one of dependence, it is harder to make the case for literary allusion to Sirach in Ps 154. Nevertheless, if the text has been expanded from a shorter unit consisting of only vv. 1, 3, 16, 17, 18b-c, and 20, then the secondary material seems to bear the closest resemblance in thought to Sirach and, therefore, suggests either a common time of authorship, a similar theology, or an actual dependence.

Conclusions

If, as has been postulated by many past scholars, vv. 10–11 are an interpolation, then it bears reemphasizing that this sequence of verses seems to fit in well with the preceding verses, especially in how it deploys syntactic dependence. Thus, not only do vv. 10–11 exhibit syntactic dependence (mimicking the structure of vv. 7–8), but they also exhibit the kind of gradual expansion of syntactic structure from colon to colon that is not dissimilar to the expansion of syntactic structures seen between v. 4b and v. 4c and between v. 5 and v. 8.[90] If, as Eshel and Eshel postulate, the original poem contained only vv. 1, 3, 16, 17, 18b-c, and 20, then we have in this psalm evidence for how a simple poem was supplemented to form a more complex unit. In short, it suggests that an author/editor would take the structure of one verse (e.g., v. 1) and duplicate its vocabulary and grammar in a second verse (like v. 2). Such a pattern would explain, for example, the presence of vv. 2, 4, and 19. We may guess that this same author/editor added other verses such as vv. 5 and 7 and that these were, in turn, at a later time, added onto by a secondary (or tertiary) author/editor. Whether or not this is how ancient poems were created (or if this is the history of this particular text) is hard to determine. Any further musings on this manner of textual production remain speculative; but it is worth mentioning that a similar kind of expansion occurs in Ps 151A:2d–4, 5c–6b. All the same, it also seems plausible that the present text, Ps 154, began as a longer unit and was whittled down to the form as found in

---

90. The sequence of syntactic elements in vv. 10b–11 might by summarized as follows: (participle + object // participle + object + object (including a construct chain) / participle + object + modifying prepositional phrase (including a construct chain) / noun phrase (including a construct chain) + modifying prepositional phrase (including a construct chain).

4Q448. This is implied, essentially, from how well the postulated interpolations
fit in with the rest of the text. Notice, for example, how v. 4 mimics so well the
vocabulary, syntactic structure, and ideas of v. 3. All things being equal, I prefer
the interpretation of the psalm proposed by Eshel and Eshel, and the supposition
that the interpolated verses are added in the manner that parallels how authors/
editors added verses to Ps 151A. The addition of this extra material is important,
since through it is articulated the poem's basic thesis that praise of God is effected
through wisdom. Thus, we can see how this idea was interwoven into the poem;
v. 4, which mimics the structure and thought of v. 3, links with vv. 5 and 6 (e.g.,
through the lexical repetition and grammatical parallel of להודיע), in order to
imply an inherent connection between uniting with the good for the purposes
of praising God and declaring to the simple God's glory and acts of salvation.
The fact that the interpolated verses contribute a new theme to the work as a
whole while mimicking the existing structure of the original is a reflection of the
author/editor's literary sensibilities and skill.

Psalm 155 (11Q5 XXIV, 3-17)

Introduction

This poem, like the preceding two, is known also in Syriac; the Syriac text follows closely the Hebrew version attested in 11Q5.[1] Two questions relate to this psalm's interpretation: how the initial lines should be divided and whether the entire poem should be construed as an infelicitous mixture of two originally independent works or as an integrated and coherent whole. The philological and poetic analysis below attempts to offer a reading of the poem that emphasizes its integrity and that proposes a lineation that underscores this unity.

Unlike the preceding texts, the psalm presents significant problems for its lineation. The line breaks proposed by Sanders (which follow the verse numbering of the Syriac translation) result in an awkward initial paragraph (lines 3-6 of col. XXIV), where individual cola are sometimes composed of no more than one word and do not reveal an acrostic pattern in their initial letters.[2] Perhaps owing to the difficulties of understanding how these lines should be divided, some scholars (e.g., Delcor, Seybold, and Vermes) set the text into verses, numbered according to the edition of Sanders, but do not divide these into cola.[3] Their presentation of the Hebrew text, as well as their respective translations, leaves open the question of how (or if) they would divide the individual verses into smaller units. Because the structure proposed by Sanders is especially incongruous with the structure of the poem's following lines, other scholars have attempted slightly different lineations. Skehan first proposed a lineation that allowed the acrostic

---

1. For the various Syriac manuscripts and the subtle distinctions between them and the Hebrew text, see H. F. van Rooy, "Psalm 155: One, Two or Three Texts?," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 109–22.

2. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 67–68; idem, DJD 4:70–71; idem, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 110–11; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 182–83. This is the same lineation found in Charlesworth and Sanders, "More Psalms of David," 622.

3. Delcor, "Zum Psalter von Qumran," 26; Klaus Seybold, *Das Gebet des Kranken im Alten Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bestimmung und Zuordnung der Krankheits- und Heilungspsalmen* (BWANT 99; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973), 186; and Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (rev. ed.; London: Penguin, 2004), 309–10.

pattern to be present for the letters *bêt*, *gîmel*, and *dālet*; according to his interpretation each letter receives two cola of approximately the same length.[4] His lineation requires only one major emendation, as explained below. This lineation was also adopted later by Pierre Auffret.[5] Following after Skehan's publication, A. Hurvitz proposed in several different footnotes ways of breaking up the lines that also preserved the acrostic pattern for the initial letters, though he offered little in the way of explanation.[6] And, several years later, Jean Magne presented another way of dividing up the first lines, as did Florentino García Martínez.[7]

In addition to problems concerning lineation, the psalm (also like the preceding psalms) is of disputed integrity. Martin Noth was the first to recognize that the poem seems to be a mixture of psalmic genres—a thanksgiving hymn, the interior of which contains a complaint hymn.[8] Critics have further nuanced and developed this basic idea, describing the poem as composed of different components; for example, Seybold, while acknowledging that the entire poem functions to praise God, distinguishes between a frame (vv. 1 and 15–21), a prayer of petition, or *Bittgebet* (vv. 1a and 2–7a), and a prayer of repentance, or *Bußgebet* (vv. 8a–14).[9] Other critics emphasize that the poem is the result of an editing process whereby two or more independent works (or fragments of works) have been combined. Magne argued that the present text is a combination of a partial acrostic "*psaume de pénitence*" (vv. 5–15) and a nonacrostic thanksgiving hymn that had been "*artificiellement alphabétisé*" (vv. 1–2, 16–21).[10] For much different reasons, Auffret argued that vv. 1–15 are the original poem, to which had been appended vv. 16–21.[11] On the other hand, scholars such as Sanders, Skehan, and García Martínez view the poem as a coherent whole; Sanders, for example, contends that this mixing of genres is akin to Ps 22.[12]

---

4. Patrick W. Skehan, "A Broken Acrostic and Psalm 9," *CBQ* 27 (1965): 1–5, reprinted in *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (CBQMS 1; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971), 46–51.

5. Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155 de la grotte 11 de Qumran," *RevQ* 9 (1978): 324–25.

6. Hurvitz, "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," 226 n. 3 and 227 n. 6.

7. Magne "Le Psaume 155," 103–11; García Martínez, "Salmos Apócrifos en Qumran," 206.

8. Noth, "Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen," 15.

9. Seybold, *Das Gebet des Kranken im Alten Testament*, 123.

10. Magne "Le Psaume 155," 103–4.

11. Auffret writes, commenting on vv. 1–15 (what he refers to as vv. 1–12): "les vers . . . nous semblent-ils constituer une unité difficilement contestable" ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 344).

12. Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 179; Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 1–5; García Martínez, "Salmos Apócrifos en Qumran," 206.

Text and Analysis of the Poem

		Grammatical Analysis	Semantic Analysis
1-2.[13]	³/ יהוה קראתי אליכה הקשיבה אלי פרשתי כפי / ⁴ למעון קודשכה	vocVMVM// VOM²	abc// def+g
3-4.	הט אוזנכה ותן לי את שאלתי ⁵/ ובקשתי / אל תמנע ממני	VOVMO// OVM	abcd// d'e(≠c)
5-7a.	בנה נפשי ואל תמגרה ואל תפרע לפני / ⁶ רשעים	VOV//VM	abc(≠ a)// c'd
	גמולי הרע ישוב ממני	S²VM	e+d'f
7b-8.	⁷/ אל תשפטני כחטאתי דין האמת יהוה	voc²voc // VM	a(x+y)a'// a"(=x)bc
	כי לוא יצדק לפניכה כול חי	VMS²	d(≠c)e+f
9.	⁸/ הבינני יהוה בתורתכה ואת משפטיכה למדני	VvocM//OV	abc//c'a'
10.	⁹/ וישמעו רבים מעשיכה ועמים יהדרו את כבודכה	VSO//SVO	abc//b'de
11.	¹⁰/ זכורני ואל תשכחני ואל תביאני בקשות ממני	VV//VM	ab(≠a)//cd
12.	¹¹/ חטאת נעורי הרזק ממני ופשעי אל יזכרו לי	O²VM// SVM	a+bc//a'd
13.	¹²/ טהרני יהוה מנגע רע ואל יוסף לשוב אלי	VvocM²// VM(=V)	abc+d// ef
14.	יבש ¹³/ שורשיו ממני ואל ינצו ע[נ]פ[י]ו בי	VOM//VSM	ab//c(≠a)b'
15.	כבוד אתה יהוה ¹⁴/ על כן שאלתי מלפניכה שלמה	PSvoc//SMV	abc//def
16.	למי אזעקה ויתן לי ¹⁵/ ובני אדם מה יוסיף אומ[צם]	MVVM// M²VS	ab// c+def
17.	מלפ[נ]יכה יהוה מבטחי ¹⁶/קראתי <ל>יהוה ויענני	M(=P)vocS// VMV	abc//dbd'
	[וירפא את] שבר לבי	VO²	ef+g
18.	נמתי ¹⁷/ [ואי]שנה חלמתי גם [הקיצותי]	VV//VV	aa'// a"b(≠a,a',a")
19.	[סמכתני יהוה] [ואקרא יהו]ה [מפלטי]	Vvoc//VSP	ab//cba'
20.	[עתה אראה בושתם] [חסיתי בכה לוא אבוש]	MVO//VMV	abc//dc
21.	[פדה את ישראל חסידיכה] [ובית יעקב בחיריכה]	VOO//O²O	abcd// e+b'c'

Translation

1-2. Lord, I called to you: "Heed me!"
   I spread my palms toward your holy abode.

13. The verse numbers follow the verses in the Syriac translation as well as the verse numbers of the Hebrew version in the editions of Sanders; this means that a single verse in the Hebrew sometimes has two (or more) numbers. Although this is unfortunate, this seems preferable to inventing another set of verse numbers as Auffret has already done (such multiple numerations only serving to impede comparisons between scholars); see Auffret "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 324–25.

3-4. "Lend your ear and provide me my request;
             my entreaty do not refuse me.
5-7a. Restore my life (lit., build up my soul), do not throw it down;
             do not neglect (it) before evil (people);
             let the retributions due the wicked turn from me.
7b-8. Judge of truth, Lord,
             do not judge me according to my sins,
             for nothing living can be declared righteous before you.
9. Cause me to understand, Lord, your Law,
             and your judgments teach me
10. so that many may hearken to your orders (lit., works),
             and peoples may honor your glory.
11. Remember me, do not forget me,
             and do not bring me into (judgments) too harsh for me.
12. The sin of my youth keep far from me,
             and bad deeds let them not be remembered to my discredit.
13. Purify me, Lord, from the wicked plague,
             and do not allow (it) to return to me.
14. Wither its roots from within me,
             and let its br[anch]es not blossom inside me."

15. You (are) glory, Lord,
             therefore, my request has been fulfilled before you.
16. To whom (else) could I cry that (my request) be granted to me
                     (lit., that he will grant to me),
             and as for humankind, what (apart from God) could increase
                     their strength?
17. My trust, Lord, (is) before you,
             I called <to> the Lord and he answered me,
             and healed the rupture of my heart.
18. I grew drowsy and I slept,
             I dreamed then [I awoke.]
19. [You supported me, Lord,]
             [when I proclaimed: "The Lor]d (is) [my rescuer."]
20. [Now, I see their shame,]
             [I sought refuge in you and I am not ashamed.]
21. [Deliver Israel, your faithful,]
             [and the house of Jacob, your trustful.]

Notes to the Translation

155:1–2 As noted above, Sanders proposes a division of the lines into extremely short cola; I do not follow his lineation. The division of the text into

cola and bicola for this verse and the following verse (vv. 3–4) is based on the work of Skehan.[14]

The first word, God's name, if pronounced ʾǎdōnāy (אדני) according to tradition, presupposes a word that begins with ʾālep, something that accords with the acrostic pattern attested in the following verses.[15] Alternative solutions to the fact that this bicolon does not begin with ʾālep is a simple rearrangement of words, so that the preposition + pronominal suffix is fronted and the words follow the order they have in Ps 28:1: אליך יהוה אקרא.[16] In a similar way, the words of the following bicolon (155:3–4) could be rearranged (with no damage to its sense) so that אוזנכה precedes הט, the result being that this bicolon would also begin with ʾālep. However one explains these first verses, it is clear that the first letter, ʾālep, is accorded two bicola, though the following letters usually receive just one. The inconsistent deployment of cola for each given letter of the alphabet is not something unique to this text (see the discussion of this below in relation to 155:5–7a). The present word order, which results in the two initial letters (yôd and hê), may be for the purpose of spelling the abbreviated name of God, Yah.[17] The fact that the tetragrammaton is the first word of the poem and occurs at least five other times in the poem would seem to argue in favor of this explanation. Although perhaps only coincidental, it bears mentioning that the first verse of each of the first two chapters of Lamentations begins, after an initial איכה, with a verb that bears an initial yôd; in each chapter, the next bicolon begins with a hê.

The translation of the perfect of קרא in the English past tense, follows my reading of the poem, which sees the first ten verses (verses numbered 1–15) as a quotation of a past prayer. This reading also accords with the tendency in later Hebrew (the Hebrew of Chronicles, Ben Sira, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Mishna) for performative utterances to use participles, not perfect verbs.[18]

The verb פרש could be either in the G-stem (as in Exod 9:29 and Ps 44:21) or in the D-stem (as in Ps 143:6). In view of the other lexical parallels between Ps 155 and Ps 143 (see comments on v. 7b–8), and the fact that Pss 142 and 143 follow this poem in 11Q5, I prefer the D-stem.

---

14. Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 2.

15. See ibid., 1–5. For the pronunciation of the tetragrammaton as אדני, see Rösel, "Names of God," 601. See also Stegemann, "Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten," 195–217, esp. 204; and Skehan, "Divine Name at Qumran," 14–44.

16. Hurvitz suggests for the ʾālep line את שאלתי ובקשתי אל תמנע ממני and cites Ps 119:8 as an example of another acrostic line beginning with ʾālep ("Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," 226 n. 3).

17. Auffret makes a similar observation ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 342).

18. For this tendency, see van Peursen, *Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, 75–76, and the literature cited there.

155:3–4 The word בקשה is characteristic of late Biblical Hebrew and Rabbinic Hebrew, as Hurvitz has demonstrated.[19]

155:5–7a The lineation of this and the following verse (7b–8) offers many problems. Although I follow the lineation proposed by Skehan for the preceding verses, I depart from his scheme here and in the following verse (7b–8).[20] What I read as a third colon to vv. 5–7a, he proposed to read as an initial colon to a bicolon, the second colon of which is restored through emendation; he suggested that the Hebrew phrase corresponding to "for nothing living can be declared righteous before you" should be the second colon of what would be labeled (following the Syriac version), v. 7a/8b.[21] This preserves the regular bicolon structure of the poem, though it results in a somewhat awkward sequence of assertions: a plea that retribution be deflected from the poet, followed by an assertion that implies the sinfulness of all humanity. These verses would be rendered according to my translation in the following manner:

> The retributions of the wicked turn [השיב] from me,
> > for nothing living can be declared righteous before you.
> O judge of truth, O Lord,
> > do not judge me according to my sins.

I do not adopt this lineation for three reasons. First, it requires emendation to the text of 11Q5. Second, this emendation produces an awkward sequence of cola in the first verse; a less strained sequence of assertions is found when the text is not emended. Third, it is not unusual to encounter in acrostics some inconsistencies in the length of verses, presumably as a result of the demands of the alphabetic pattern. For example, in Ps 25, the *ʾālep* line (v. 1) and the *wāw* line (v. 5c) are extremely short—each consists of only four words—while the *ḥêt* line (v. 7) has three cola, and the rest of the letters each receive two full cola, each colon containing at least three words.[22] In Sir 51:13–30, the *ʾālep* and *rêš* lines (vv. 13 and 17, respectively) are tricola (each colon being rather short), though the rest of the poem uses bicola. In Nah 1, the *ʾālep* line (v. 2) contains at least six cola, though the rest of the poem is in bicola. In Ps 9, the *yôd* line (v. 18) is a single bicolon,

---

19. Hurvitz, "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," 226.

20. The lineation that I follow was early on proposed by Hurvitz in a footnote, though without any explanation ("Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," 227 n. 6).

21. Auffret follows Skehan in this emendation and proposes various stages of transformation from an original text that read: גמולי הרע ישיב ממני דין האמת ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 325–27, 334).

22. Note that the lineation of Ps 25:5 is also unclear; I follow *BHS*³ in assuming, based on other versions, that the single colon v. 5c was originally preceded by a *wāw*, though this is not preserved in the MT.

though the other letters (at least *ʾālep* through *ṭêt* and *kāp*) receive two bicola each. Finally, in the Apostrophe to Zion from 11Q5, discussed in detail below, the *ʾālep* and *bêt* lines together occupy a single initial tricolon; the *hê* and *wāw* lines similarly constitute a single bicolon; and, the *rêš*, *šîn*, and *tāw* lines constitute a single tricolon, though the other letters each receive two cola. For Ps 155, my inclusion of the four words of the *gîmel* line with the two preceding cola is based on the fact that Northwest Semitic poetry is typically deployed in bicola or tricola, and, second, on the coherency that such an inclusion produces. The appeal that "the retributions due the wicked" be removed from the poet resonates with the preceding colon's appeal that God not neglect his/her soul while it is confronted by the wicked. It might also be mentioned that the syntactic sequence between cola 5–6 and 7a, where a second person jussive or imperative verb (or verbs) is followed by a third person jussive verb is also found between the two cola of vv. 12, 13, and 14. Finally, although it might be argued that the *gîmel* line of Ps 155 should be isolated by itself (as a monocolon) or grouped with the following verse (since "the retributions due the wicked" is semantically so close to judgment, the topic of vv. 7b–8), it should be pointed out that a similar semantic relationship is found between the third colon of a tricolon and a following verse in vv. 17 and 18, where the "healing" mentioned in v. 17c seems to be elaborated on in v. 18a and b.

The Hebrew expression בנה נפשי (literally, "build my soul" or "build my life") is curious and does not occur in the Bible, among other Dead Sea Scrolls, or in Sirach.[23] Skehan pointed out that the awkwardness of this expression suggests that its choice was due to a writer trying to find a suitable way to begin a line with *bêt*, thus, providing tangential evidence for the poem's acrostic structure in its initial verses.[24] The notion of building in relation to the soul recalls the recently discovered inscription from Samal/Zincerli, in Aramaic, which implies that the soul or being of the deceased was "in" the engraved stele.[25] Also similar are the expressions from the Bible (Zech 12:1) and the Dead Sea Scrolls (e.g., 1QHᵃ IX, 10-11) in which God is described as "fashioning" (יצר) the "spirit" (רוח) of humanity.[26] But perhaps most pertinent is the usage of בנה from similar biblical contexts; for example, Job 22:23 reads: "If you turn back to Shaddai, you will

---

23. Another way of understanding the phrase is represented in the translation: "build me up," taking the word נפשי as the equivalent of a reflexive pronoun. Since the following verb is understood to have a 3rd per. fem. sg. object suffix, it is best to understand the word more literally as "soul," either in its sense as "life" or perhaps as "the centre and transmitter of feelings and perceptions" (*HALOT*, s.v.).

24. Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 3.

25. On this inscription, see Dennis Pardee, "A New Aramaic Inscription from Zincerli," *BASOR* 356 (2009): 51–71.

26. The words נפש and רוח are semantically similar (see Job 7:11 and Isa 26:9), as are the words יצר and בנה, though the former seems to denote the construction of small items (vessels, idols, etc.), while the latter denotes construction of larger things (houses, temples, cities).

be restored (בנה), (if) you remove injustice from your tents."[27] As in Job, the context of this psalm seems to address sins committed in the past and their possible forgiveness.

The verb מגר is in the D-stem and offers a contrast to the literal idea of building up that is implicit in בנה.

The verb פרע is here in the G-stem, used as it is in Prov 1:25; 8:33, to mean "neglect," the word "life" or "soul" being the implicit object. This understanding is supported by the Syriac translation, as Strugnell has noted.[28] The sense of פרע as "to punish" (based on Mishnaic Hebrew) seems unlikely, accompanied as this verb is by the phrase "before the evil."[29]

The reading ישוב, instead of the alternative ישיב, as read by Sanders and others, follows the suggestion of Qimron, who translates the entire line as "let the rewards of evil be removed from me."[30] Qimron's suggestion is preferable to the original reading as well as to the alternative emendation השיב (suggested first by Skehan) for several reasons.[31] First, the mark on the scroll read originally as a yôd (that is, the third letter of the word), seems relatively long especially in comparison to the word's first yôd and so can easily be construed as a wāw.[32] Second, although it is not unusual for biblical poems to shift suddenly from a direct address to God (with volitive verbal forms) to a third-person reference to God (with nominal predicates or finite verbal forms), this is almost always accompanied by the word "God," or one of his epithets; ישיב has no explicit subject in the line.[33] Third, the verb שוב in 155:13 is an infinitive, but, as here, takes an implied subject; in this later verse, the implied subject is נגע רע, which is semantically and grammatically similar to the phrase גמולי הרע in the tricolon of 155:5–7a. Note also that the Hebrew Bible preserves at least one instance where גמול is the

27. Although in the biblical passage the verb is in the N-stem and the subject is the entire person (not just a soul), the parallel in contexts is strong enough to suggest a similar sense to בנה in vv. 5–7a.

28. Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 277. As he also notes, by itself the Hebrew could just as easily be read as an N-stem, with "soul" as subject.

29. For the translation "to punish," see Jonas C. Greenfield, "Two Notes on the Apocryphal Psalms," in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 313–14.

30. Elisha Qimron, "Some Remarks on the Apocryphal Psalm 155 (11QPsᵃ Column 24)," *JSP* 10 (1992): 57–59.

31. See Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 2. Strugnell offers the same emendation ("Notes on the Text and Transmission," 278).

32. The relative size of the mark is noted by Qimron ("Some Remarks on the Apocryphal Psalm 155," 58).

33. The alternation between direct appeals and third-person references happens not only between verses (e.g., Pss 3:4–5; 7:10–11; 28:4–5, 8–9; and passim) but also between cola of a single verse (e.g., Pss 5:7, 7:9, 9:2; and passim). For the Syriac, see Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 278.

subject of the G-stem of שוב—Obad 15.[34] The one problem with reading ישוב is the disagreement in number between the noun and verb, perhaps explainable by the immediately preceding singular noun, הרע.[35]

The third colon's vocabulary is reminiscent of verses from the Bible such as Ps 94:2 ("Rise, O judge of the earth, / turn retribution upon the proud") and, as already mentioned, Obad 15 ("your reward shall return onto your head"). However, "retribution" (גמול) in the Bible is something that typically "turns" (שוב) or "is turned" (השיב) *upon* people, not *from* people. In a similar way, the Dead Sea Scrolls preserve examples only of retribution being visited upon people, not being turned away. The scrolls do provide instances of the word גמול in construct with a word for "evil." For example, 1QM VI, 6 preserves לשלם גמול רעתם, "to render the reward for their evil," while CD VII, 9 and XIX, 6 preserve להשיב גמול רשעים, "to render (the) retribution due (the) wicked."

The poet seems to imply in this verse that he or she is in the presence of the wicked and might suffer the retribution that the wicked too will suffer. A similar motif is found in Ps 28:3 ("Do not judge me with the wicked") and, even more dramatically, among the Hodayot in 1QHᵃ XI, 20–37, especially lines 25–26 ("For I stand in the realm of wickedness / and with the vile is my lot").[36]

155:7b–8 As Hurvitz has observed, the phrase דין האמת does not occur in the Bible but is common in Rabbinic Hebrew, as an epithet for God.[37] Were the word "truth" lacking the definite article, this phrase might be understood as a verbal phrase "judge truly," similar to other biblical phrases such as Prov 31:9: "judge righteously" (שפט־צדק). Although the epithet דין האמת does not occur in the Bible, similar phrases can be found occupying cola separate from the rest of their respective verses. For example, in Ps 31:6 the phrase "the Lord, true God" (יהוה אל אמת) appears as a vocative and, according to the lineation in *BHS*[3], the phrase "God of gods, the Lord" (אל אלהים יהוה) occupies a single colon, separate from the following verb, in Ps 50:1.[38] An alternative reading of this colon and the phrase דין האמת would be to understand it as a nominal expression "the Lord is a true judge." This kind of terse nominal expression is also found below, in colon 15a, for example: "Lord, you (are) glory," as well as in various biblical phrases such as Ps 7:12: "God (is) a righteous judge" (אלהים שופט צדיק). All the

---

34. Note also the *kethib* of Prov 12:14.

35. For similar cases of disagreement between a plural subject and a singular verb, see above, Ps 154:16, as well as 1 Sam 4:15 and GKC §145k.

36. This is the translation of Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 254.

37. Hurvitz, "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," 227.

38. In a similar way, the phrase אדני יהו הצבאות in Ps 69:7 appears as its own colon, as a vocative expression following the preceding line's verb, and the vocative expression צבאות יהוה אלהים stands as a separate colon, preceding the verb in the next line. Other examples are not hard to find.

same, since the combination of the tetragrammaton and an epithet of God is so common as a vocative expression, it seems easiest to understand this phrase as an epithet for God.

The last colon (v. 8b) repeats verbatim the text of Ps 143:2b; the connection to Ps 143 is enhanced through the use of other common words, especially the verb פרש in Ps 155:1–2 and Ps 143:6. This is considered an allusion, since Ps 155, as a whole, seeks to modify the more common association of danger with external threats so that, instead, the threats a person might experience are associated with past sinful behavior of the individual.

155:10 Although the infrequency of words beginning with *wāw* may have influenced the selection of the conjunction at the beginning of this verse, the particle also has a rhetorical function. I interpret the initial verb as a jussive. Since the verb follows a *wāw* conjunction and preceding imperatives, it is possible to understand the phrase וישמעו as indicating purpose/result. In this context this emphasizes that the bestowal of knowledge upon the speaker concerning God's law and judgments will result in a greater obedience of humanity to God's commands and, in turn, more praise of God.[39] This seems to imply that the poet sees him- or herself as a teacher or sage, like the poet of Sir 51:13–30 and Ps 154. As will be explained below, this verse (together with the preceding one) is particularly important for the poem's message, as it implies the reciprocal relationship between humanity and the divine: if God hears the petition of humans, humans will obey (literally "hear") the commandments of God.

The idiom שמע מעשה does not occur elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew or in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, at least not in a clear context. Although one might read the phrase in 155:10 to mean something like "hear of your deeds," this is not necessarily the way it would have been understood; at the very least, the phrase can have an additional meaning, "to obey your commands," based on the syntactic link between this verse and the preceding, and the mention of "your Law" and "your judgments" in 155:9. In the Bible, usually God's deeds (מעשים) are the object of verbs of knowing, seeing, or recounting. They are usually construed as the physical products of God's creative acts or God's participation in history; it is presumably for this reason that מעשים are not "heard." Nevertheless, in other passages similar words such as דבר (describing a physical act) can be "heard," as in 1 Sam 3:11 ("I am about to do a thing [דבר] . . . with the result that all who hear it [שמעו] will . . .).[40] Perhaps, the frequency with which דבר is used to indicate verbal communication encouraged the use of דבר with שמע. The word מעשה, on the other hand, is used only once in the Bible to refer to human verbal composition (specifically, poetry in its spoken or sung form); Ps 45:2 contains the phrase אמר אני מעשי למלך ("I utter my works to the king"),

---

where מעשי is parallel to דבר in the preceding colon.[41] In later Hebrew, from the Dead Sea Scrolls, one finds at least two other cases of a similar usage between דבר and מעשה. One of these occurs in Ps 151A:3c-d, discussed above. The other appears in 4QMMT, specifically between two passages: 4Q394 3–7 I, 4–5 and 4Q398 14–17 II, 2–3.

אלה מקצת דברינו [. . .].ל שהם מ[קצת דברי] / [ה]מעשים שא א[נ]ח[נו . . .

These are some of our regulations . . . which . . . [are some of the regulations of] the commands that we . . .[42]

ואף אנחנו כתבנו אליך / מקצת מעשי התורה שחשבנו לטוב לך

Thus, we have written to you / some of the commands of the Torah that we thought appropriate for you. [43]

The context of the two passages would seem to suggest that the two words דבר and מעשה denote similar things: ordinances, regulations, commands.[44] It should be noticed that in the latter passage מעשה is something (like דבר) that can be "written." Thus, it would seem that not only do מעשה and דבר overlap in their common reference to general acts, deeds, and things, but they are also both used to indicate verbal communication and, in specific contexts, regulations and commands. The idea that the two words had these overlapping senses is further encouraged by parallels between the latter phrase from 4QMMT and similar phrases in Biblical Hebrew. In at least three different passages we see the word דבר in construct with תורה: דברי התורה (Neh 8:9; 2 Chr 34:19) as well as the התורה דברי ספר (2 Kgs 22:11). In these biblical passages, the people "hear" (שמע) the words (or commands) of the law; it seems that the verb שמע is denoting specifically the aural perception of what is spoken. In other contexts,

---

41. BDB defines דבר here as "theme, story," but defines מעשי as "my verses," citing the Greek word ποίημα, which means, of course, both a made thing and also a piece of verbal art, a poem.

42. For the text, see Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 8. They translate this passage on p. 46 and note there that מעשים is a synonym of דברים. They go into further detail on p. 139. Other translators render מעשים with a more neutral "works" (Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 223; *DSSSE*, 791).

43. For the text, see Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10:37. My translation does not follow exactly that of DJD 10 (found on p. 63). Other translators render מעשים as "ordinances" (Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 229) or "works" (*DSSSE*, 803).

44. Qimron and Strugnell discuss מעשים and their understanding of it to mean specifically "the laws or commandments of the Bible" (DJD 10:139), though this interpretation is not followed by the more recent *DCH*, which does not even cite their study in its bibliography. *DCH* defines the word as it occurs here as "event, episode, story."

however, the same verb, with דברים as accusative object, implies obedience (e.g., Josh 1:18).[45] The context of Ps 155:10, with the mention of "your Law" and "your judgments" in the preceding verse, suggests that מעשה here denotes passages or words, specifically ordinances or regulations, and that שמע connotes not only aural perception, but also obedience.

155:11 The first word of this verse contains a *mater* where we would not expect it based on the Masoretic tradition, though this spelling (reflecting a distinct pronunciation) is not uncommon in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls.[46]

In the second colon, the H-stem of בוא is complemented with the 1st per. common sg. suffix and the prepositional phrase בקשות ממני. When the H-stem of בוא occurs in the Bible with a *bêt* preposition, it is sometimes in the context of judgment (e.g., Job 14:3; Qoh 11:9). Since the general context of the preceding verses (5–8), as well as the immediately following verse (12), seems to be a concern with past sins and God's judgment of these, it is likely that קשות is a veiled reference to judgments. This interpretation is encouraged, since the feminine plural of קשה appears in the Bible in contexts of judgment, where it is often translated as "harsh words or language" (e.g., Gen 42:7, 30), and since קשות also seems to connote "difficult situations or dilemmas" in 4Q174 IV, 4 (4QFlor), the purpose of which is said to be persecution, שטם.[47] Of course, a more generic reference is also possible, akin to how גדלות and נפלאות are used in Ps 131:1.

155:12 For the combination of the N-stem of זכר with the *lāmed* preposition, see Ezek 33:16.

155:14 The verb יבש is presumably an imperative in the D-stem. A similar instance of the root יבש (in the G-stem) being used in conjunction with "roots" (שרש) is found in Job 18:16.

The verb נצץ in the H-stem describes the blossoming of a pomegranate (רמון) in Cant 6:11 and 7:13, and of an almond tree (שקד) in Qoh 12:5.

The reconstruction ע[נפ]יו contrasts with that proposed by Sanders: ע[ל]יו.[48] The two reconstructions mean essentially the same thing. My reconstruction follows that of Skehan and Strugnell, the former basing his judgment on the Syriac translation of ענף in Ezek 17:8, 23, the latter basing his judgment on "new photographs."[49] As Skehan pointed out to Strugnell in a personal communication, the two words ענף and שרש appear together at the end of Mal 3:19.

---

45. Note that the same verb sometimes connotes understanding, though in these cases it is typically where the object is a particular language.

46. See Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 53-54.

47. See John M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.I: (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 55–56; and *DSSSE*, 354–55.

48. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 68; idem, DJD 4:71; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 110; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 178, 184.

49. Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 2; and Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission," 281.

155:15 This verse marks a new verse paragraph, according to my reading.[50] Here the poet addresses the crisis referred to implicitly in the preceding lines not from the perspective of someone suffering but from the safety of having been rescued.

Although Qimron suggests that כבוד should be read as a passive participle, the Bible provides at least one example where God identifies himself simply as "glory": Zech 2:9 "'I will be (the) glory in its [i.e., Jerusalem's] midst.'"[51] That the poet of this psalm should do the same does not appear that strange, given this precedent. Another possibility is to assume that the poet meant "my glory," in accord with the similar expression in Ps 3:4. Despite the many lexical affinities between Ps 3 and 155:17–19 (including קרא, ישן, קיץ, סמך), the sense of 155:15 suggests reading simply "glory," since "my glory" might be redundant with "my request" in the next colon.

For the last word of this verse, שלמה, I follow the interpretation presupposed by Sanders's initial translation, that is, as a Dp-stem (*puʿal*) 3rd per. fem. sg. perfect. This accords well with my reading of the whole poem, in addition to the Syriac translation, which renders the Hebrew with an *eštapʿel* participle (or a *šapʿel* passive participle) of ܐܠܬ. This interpretation also aligns with the use of the conjunction על־כן, which, to my knowledge, is always followed by a finite verb, never by an imperative. Idioms similar to the one here are found in the Bible, for example, Ps 65:2: לְךָ יְשֻׁלַּם נֶדֶר, "to you vow(s) will be fulfilled." Alternatively, one could interpret this word as a D-stem imperative and consider this verse part of the preceding paragraph; this interpretation is followed by Charlesworth and Sanders (in their joint translation) and Qimron.[52] As Qimron notes, this fits the context of the other lines, though it does not parallel the Syriac translation. As Hurvitz notes, the combination of the verb שלם with a subject or an accusative object שאלה is not found in the Bible; the usage of this verbal root with synonymous subjects/objects is more at home in Aramaic and Syriac.[53]

The compound preposition מלפני has the simple meaning "before," as it does in 1Chr 16:33, and below in v. 17. Alternatively, the compound preposition could indicate cause: "because of you."

155:16 The H-stem of יסף here has the meaning "increase." Its object, "their strength," can be inferred from the marks still legible on the scroll, from the Syriac translation, and from the similar phrases in Job 17:9 יסיף אמץ, "he will

---

50. Seybold also sees this verse as marking another unit (*Das Gebet des Kranken im Alten Testament*, 123), though Auffret reads it as the last verse of the original poem ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 332).

51. Qimron, "Some Remarks on the Apocryphal Psalm 155," 58.

52. Charlesworth and Sanders, "More Psalms of David," 622; Qimron, "Some Remarks on the Apocryphal Psalm 155," 59. Despite this, Sanders prefers his original translation "fulfilled" in his most recent edition ("Non-Masoretic Psalms," 185).

53. Hurvitz, "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," 229.

increase strength," and in 4Q298 III, 6 (= 4QCryptA): הוסיפו אומץ, "increase strength."

155:17 As stated above, the compound preposition מלפני has in this verse the simple meaning "before."

The emendation of a *lāmed* before the tetragrammaton follows the suggestion made by Skehan, which, in turn, is based on the Syriac translation.[54]

155:18 The reconstruction of the final word is suggested by the Syriac and the similar vocabulary between vv. 18–19 and Ps 3:6; the reconstruction follows Skehan's initial proposal.[55] The reference to sleeping and awakening may be interpreted metaphorically, as a restoration of the poet's health. Although sleeping is sometimes associated with death (e.g., Ps 13:4; Jer 51:39), the awakening from sleep does not imply a reincarnation or rebirth as it does in Dan 12:2. Rather, sleeping here is a metaphor for being at ease, at it is in Job 3:13 and Ps 3:6; it is presumably the result of being healed, not part of the healing process or a metaphor for being sick. The reference to Ps 3:6 is considered an allusion, since Ps 155 evokes the context of Ps 3 (and 143) to emphasize that threats on a person are to be associated with past sinful acts, not primarily with other humans.

The precise meaning of the verb חלם is not immediately apparent. It may imply dreaming, since sleep and dreams are two easily associated phenomena (and are paired, e.g., in Gen 41:5); or the verb may be from the root that BDB identifies as חלם II, "to be healthy, strong," and imply a restoration to health, as Seybold has suggested.[56] Because חלם I, "to dream," is the more common root, I assume that the consonants here represent the verb from this root and that the verse contains essentially four words related to sleep.

155:19 Reconstruction of this verse and those following is based on Skehan's work.[57] For the second colon, note that Sanders has modified Skehan's proposal to fit with the apparent mark(s) on the scroll, which Sanders originally did not see, then read as יהוה (in *paleo* script), and then adjusted to ה[יהו].[58]

---

54. Skehan, further, notes that the switch from the square script to the *paleo* for the tetragrammaton may have preoccupied the scribe with the result that the preposition (which would have been in the square script) was dropped ("Broken Acrostic," 4).

55. Psalm 3:6 reads: אני שכבתי ואישנה הקיצותי כי יהוה יסמכני. Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 2; and idem, "Syriac Apocryphal Psalms," 157.

56. Seybold, *Das Gebet des Kranken im Alten Testament*, 119 n. 11. As Seybold implies, the reference here to incubation seems unlikely. Both roots also occur in postbiblical, Rabbinic Hebrew.

57. Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 2. Sanders here adds the phrase הוכה לבי, "when my heart was smitten," based on the occurrence of a similar phrase in some manuscripts of the Syriac version (DJD 4:71–72). This Syriac reading is not followed by Sanders in later editions ("Non-Masoretic Psalms," 184), nor by Baars in his edition of the Syriac text ("Apocryphal Psalms," 10), and seems, rather, to be a "misplaced gloss" on the Hebrew expression from v. 17c שבר לבי (Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 4).

58. See Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms," 68; idem, DJD 4:71; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 110.

155:20 While Skehan proposes reading בבושתם, I follow Sanders in eliding the preposition, as often happens when the following word begins with *bêt*.[59]

I follow Skehan's reconstruction, however, in not including the tetragrammaton, as this seems to overburden the first colon, does not make sense with the second, and is not present in the Syriac.[60]

Reading and Structure of the Poem

I divide the poem into two verse paragraphs; the first verse paragraph (vv. 1–14) contains ten verses (eight bicola, two tricola), the second paragraph (vv. 15–21) contains seven verses (six bicola, one tricolon).[61] The first paragraph is essentially a quotation of a prayer uttered at a time of crisis, which appeals to God's mercy in judging the poet and in purging the poet of guilt and sin; the second recounts the poet's salvation and presents it as something that has occurred in the past. The purpose of this twofold structure is to demonstrate the effectiveness of appealing directly to God and, more generally, to illustrate God's mercy. This, of course, is not the only way to read the poem. For example, one might read the entire poem as an appeal by an individual still suffering and in distress; the second paragraph would refer to previous acts of salvation, from which the poet draws (in his present circumstances) comfort and hope.[62] While such an understanding is possible, it seems less likely; there are no clear indications that the help afforded by God in vv. 15–21 is not a direct response to the poet's appeal. Furthermore, the adverb "now" in v. 20 seems to stress the present vindication of the poet.

As explained above, the poem's integrity has been questioned by numerous scholars. My reading of the poem as a coherent whole, however, is not unique; even some (e.g., Auffret) who see the present text as an adulteration of an originally more pristine poem have appreciated the way that the poem's final lines reprise the vocabulary and ideas of the preceding verses.[63] Still, there are other structural consistencies between the first paragraph and the second that should be underlined in order to emphasize the coherency of the text.

First, and most obviously, the poem is an alphabetic acrostic. The pattern is more than a mere ornament or memory device; it helps bridge the different parts

---

59. Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 2; Sanders, DJD 4:71; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 110.

60. Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 2. Sanders does include יהוה at the end of the first colon (DJD 4:71; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 110).

61. This contrasts obviously with the division of the text into two separate poems by Magne ("Le Psaume 155"), and less dramatically with the separation of vv. 1–15 from 16–21 by Auffret ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155").

62. This is suggested as a possibility by Seybold (*Das Gebet des Kranken im Alten Testament*, 120).

63. Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 349, 354–55.

of the poem and, thereby, highlights the fulfillment of the poet's plea for salvation and assistance.

Second, the poem exhibits consistent structural characteristics. For example, each paragraph can be divided into smaller two-verse units, each of which contains the tetragrammaton, used as a vocative (with one exception: vv. 11–12); usually the divine name appears in the first colon of the two-verse unit.[64] As will be elaborated on below, the poem exhibits throughout consistent semantic parallelism between cola of individual verses and witnesses a high degree of semantic and grammatical parallelism within individual cola, often in the initial colon of a verse. Moreover, even subtle patterns are shared between the two paragraphs; for example, the pattern, exhibited frequently in the first paragraph, whereby an appeal with an imperative is followed by an appeal with a negative jussive is similar to the parallel phrases of v. 20: "I see their shame . . . I will not be ashamed."

Third, read as a coherent unit, the poem demonstrates certain affinities with the poems already discussed. The shift in temporal perspective in Ps 155 is similar to what we see in relation to Sir 51:13–30, where the first part of the poem concerns the poet's search for wisdom as a young man, while the second is an exhortation, from the perspective of someone older. In Sir 51, the introductory and second paragraphs help demonstrate the authority of the poet for the exhortation that follows. In a similar way, the quotation of a psalm of complaint here helps justify and give authority to the poet as he or she recounts the experience of having a request "fulfilled." As vv. 9–10 seem to indicate, the mercy that God shows the poet is accompanied by his or her teaching and instruction; this, in turn, results in the amplification of God's glory and fame. The purpose of learning and instruction would seem to be, as it is in Ps 154 and in Sirach, not only obedience to God but also God's glorification. As is the case for Ps 151A and Ps 154, it is difficult to discern definitively whether a given text is an artful blending of originally separate material or originally designed as it now stands. Ultimately, a composite origin for this psalm is possible; nevertheless, the reading outlined below suggests how the poem can (and should) be read as an integrated whole.

The first verse paragraph (vv. 1–14) can be broken down into five smaller, two-verse units based on common topics and/or syntactic dependence; it bears mentioning that there are remarkably few repetitive/semantic or grammatical parallelistic patterns between the verses of these smaller units. These two-verse units include, first, a general appeal to be heard (vv. 1–4), an appeal to be rehabilitated from a state of sin (vv. 5–8), an appeal to be taught God's law and judgments (with the implicit notion that the poet will go on to teach these same things) (vv. 9–10), an appeal for past sins to be forgotten (vv. 11–12), and, finally, an appeal for God to abolish evil entirely from within the poet (vv. 13–14). The second and third units focus on judgment, while the fourth and fifth address

---

64. These units are vv. 1–4, 5–8, 9–10, 11–12, 13–14, 15–16, 17–18, 19–20. The last verse falls outside this structure.

especially the purging of sins. Often in this verse paragraph a positive appeal is followed by an appeal with a negative jussive phrase, such that many of the appeals are expressed in two different ways.[65] This produces a repetitiveness, but perhaps one that is purposeful; it suggests the comprehensiveness of each appeal and, more interestingly, underlines the poet's total dependence on God. Given this emphasis, it is not surprising that God is the subject of many verbs that denote dynamic action (giving, withholding, restoring, etc.), usually where the poet is their accusative object, and that the poet, on the other hand, is the subject of verbs that denote little or no action (crying, screaming, sleeping, seeing, being ashamed). Similar dichotomies are found in other psalms, for example, Ps 39 or Ps 51, though the contrast between God and the poet in these biblical psalms is not articulated in quite so obvious a way as it is here.[66]

The first of the smaller two-verse units, vv. 1–4, contains general appeals to God that he hear the poet and respond to the poet's request.[67] As described above, the poem begins with the tetragrammaton, used as a vocative; the pronunciation of the name (ʾădōnāy) helps explain, perhaps, its presence as the first word of the poem. The next verse begins not with ʾālep but with hê, the result being that the first letters of the first two verses (yôd-hê) also spell the divine name, in this case its abbreviated version: Yah. The initial use of the tetragrammaton as a vocative and its possible echo in the first two lines is important, since the poem will repeatedly use this divine name (in five other places), usually in the first colon of a two-verse unit. The first verse of this unit also functions as the poem's introduction, setting the frame for the first paragraph and orienting it in the past: "I called to you . . . I spread my palms toward your holy abode."

The second two-verse unit, vv. 5–8, contains two tricola and has as its central concern the poet's past sinful behavior. In the first colon (v. 5), the poet appeals to God to restore his life and not to toss it aside. Although the exact nuance of the initial Hebrew phrase is unclear, the parallel to Job 22:23 suggests that the poet appeals for rehabilitation, not for a fundamental "construction" or "edification" of a new inner self or soul like that pleaded for in Ps 51:12. The second colon contains another negative jussive phrase, "do not neglect (it) [i.e., the poet's life]." Taken together, the two cola emphasize the comprehensive way the poet feels God should respond: God must act positively ("restore"); he must not act negatively ("throw down") and must not be passive ("neglect"). The second and third cola of vv. 5–7a imply that the poet found him- or herself among the wicked and feared suffering their punishment.[68] This leads, in the next verse (vv. 7b–8), to

---

65. Sometimes these complementary appeals are found in the same colon (as in vv. 5, 11a) and sometimes they are expressed between cola of a verse (as in vv. 3–4, 12, 13, 14).

66. In Ps 39, for example, the poet's complaint, the articulation of dismay, is described as an assertive action.

67. Notice, for instance, the clear semantic links between הקשיבה אלי and הט אוזנכה.

68. These cola are linked not only semantically (רע // רשע) but also phonetically (רשעים // הרע ישוב).

an appeal for fair and just judgment. The second colon of v. 8 alludes to Ps 143:2b; although the language is somewhat generic, it parallels exactly the biblical passage. The significance of this reference is connected to the allusion in vv. 18–19 to Ps 3:6. The sources for these allusions (i.e., Pss 3 and 143) are linked in that they both emphasize threats posed by humans pursuing or threatening the poet; whether the danger is physical or mental is not indicated, though it is portrayed as due to forces exterior to the poet.[69] By contrast, Ps 155 does not mention "enemies" explicitly and presumes that the threats to the poet derive primarily from his or her own sinful behavior. Thus, by alluding to these biblical psalms, Ps 155 qualifies the idea that danger derives primarily from exterior forces and suggests, rather, that it is the result of past sins.

The third unit, vv. 9–10, asks God to teach the poet about his law and judgments, with the implied result that the people will become obedient to God's commands and, in turn, praise him. Although it is not stated explicitly, the syntagmatic connection of vv. 9 and 10 implies that it will be the poet who extends this understanding of the law to the people and facilitates the people's obedience and praise of God. Verse 10 is marked not only by semantic and grammatical parallelism but also by phonetic parallelism, through the repetition of *mêm*s and *ʿayin*s. This repetition seems especially important since it calls attention to the unusual idiom שמע מעשה. This expression is, in turn, important for the poem since it explains one benefit that God receives in response to having mercy on the poet (and on humans in general). Further, the reciprocal nature of the human–divine relationship is underscored by the very word שמע. Just as God listens to humans, so humans "hear," or obey, God's commands.

The fourth unit, vv. 11–12, begins much like the second (vv. 5–8), with an appeal to God to act positively in the poet's behalf ("remember"), not to be passive ("forget"), and not to act negatively ("bring me into [judgments] too difficult for me").[70] Verse 12 then expresses similar ideas, but does so by reversing the perspective on the verbal actions. In other words, while in v. 11a the poet asks that God remember (זכר) him or her, in v. 12b, the poet pleads that his or her sins not be remembered (זכר); while in v. 11b the poet asks that he or she not be led into difficult situations or judgments (הביא), in v. 12a the poet asks that sins be

---

69. Another point that bears mentioning is that the two biblical psalms are linked in being associated with David's flight from Absalom (something indicated in the Hebrew and Greek preface to Ps 3 and in the Greek preface to Ps 143, the latter of which does not mention Absalom by name but whose identity seems reasonably assured: "Psalm of David, when his son pursued him"). The immediate significance of this for Ps 155 is perhaps limited, in part, because the 11Q5 version of Ps 143, like that of the MT, does not preserve any mention of Absalom.

70. Magne ("Le Psaume 155," 106–7) and Auffret ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 333) make similar, but not identical, observations on the similarities between these verses, Auffret, in particular, calls attention to the numerous lexical similarities between the two groups of verses (5–9 and 11–14), including רע, שוב, ממני, and יהוה (p. 337).

removed (הרזק). Thus, a positive action in v. 11a contrasts with a passive one in v. 12b, and the negative action in v. 11b contrasts with a positive one in v. 12a. In relation to v. 12, the distancing and forgetting of sins may be interpreted as the increased life of the poet (sins of youth becoming more and more distant and less and less remembered through time), as well as God's forgiveness of these sins and their removal from the poet's consciousness.

In the fifth two-verse unit, vv. 13–14, the poet appeals for sin to be removed from his or her interior, the implication being that the poet not only must be made distant from past sins that he or she has committed (or that he/she feels responsible for), but also must be cleansed of the sinfulness that is inherent in humanity, something characterized as a plague, which is then compared to a plant. Here the connection between the two verses is implied not only through the common syntax of the two bicola but also through the simple possessive pronoun on "roots," which implies the antecedent "plague." Note, too, the phonetic similarity between the words לשוב and יבש, which further draws the two verses together.[71]

In the second verse paragraph, vv. 15–21, as explained above, the poet describes his or her own salvation, as though it happened in the past. The past time reference is implied not only in the perfect verb forms but also in the contrast between a past healing and the rewards and benefits that the poet experiences in the present. As mentioned above, the explicit description of the poet's healing helps to demonstrate the efficacy of appealing to God, as well as God's mercy. The final appeal in the poem's last line ("Deliver Israel . . .") suggests the text's ultimate purpose of demonstrating God's mercy and forgiveness in relation to Israel. That this should be the goal of the entire text seems implied in the notion, expressed in vv. 9–10, that the poet's instruction will lead to the obedience of the people and their praise of God. Like the preceding paragraph, this one breaks apart into two-verse units (with the exception of the last verse, which stands apart from this structure), based on their respective topics: first the exclusive ability of God to heal (vv. 15–16), second, a description of the healing (vv. 17–18), third, a description of salvation and its reward (vv. 19–20). As Auffret has demonstrated, this paragraph also uses much of the vocabulary seen in the first part of the poem; thus, for example, קראתי appears in vv. 1–2 and 17; כבוד in vv. 10 and 15; and יוסף in vv. 13 and 16.[72]

The first two-verse unit of the second paragraph, vv. 15–16, confirms God's fulfillment of the poet's request and emphasizes that only God could have satisfied it. The first verse begins with a nominal expression ("You [are] glory, Lord"), marking it off clearly from the imperatival expressions of the preceding para-

---

71. Auffret calls attention to the similarity between the sounds of the two words ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 332).

72. Auffret also discusses various "jeux de mots" that link the two parts of the poem ("Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 349, 354–55).

graph and echoing the result of the poet's salvation, as implied above in vv. 9–10, praise of God.[73] The second verse begins with a semantic and grammatical reprise of the structure seen before in the first colon of vv. 3–4, "Lend your ear and provide me my request."[74] Here, however, the verbs are prefix conjugations, instead of imperatives, and are questions, not pleas.

The second two-verse unit of the second paragraph, vv. 17–18, containing a tricolon and a bicolon, illustrates the healing experienced as part of the fulfillment of the poet's appeal. Verse 17 begins, like v. 15, with a nominal expression ("My trust, Lord, [is] before you"). The verse continues with a summation of what has taken place in the poem, echoing the very beginning of the text ("I called <to> the Lord and he answered me") and then explicitly mentioning the poet's "healing." Verse 18 is curious in that it describes the poet's slumber and awakening. Some scholars have pondered the possibility of a reference to incubation, though a metaphoric slumber and awakening seems just as appropriate, if not more so, to this context, evoking the ease and peace experienced by the poet after the plea's answer. This verse, together with the following colon (v. 19a), contains the language and imagery similar to those of Ps 3:6, which also concerns divine rescue. As mentioned above, the present poem qualifies the more common idea expressed in the biblical psalm that threats derive from external forces; the present text stresses that threats derive primarily from an individual's own sinful behavior.

The third two-verse unit of the second paragraph, vv. 19–20, describes the

---

73. As noted above, Auffret's reading of this verse differs from mine. He believes that this verse concludes the thought and expression of vv. 5–14. This is for five reasons: (1) a lack of transition between v. 14 and v. 15; (2) the conclusive nature of the verse, something expressed partially through the mention of כבוד; (3) "la récurrence et l'opposition" of לפניכה in v. 8b in the context of condemnation and מלפניכה in v. 15b in the context of praise; (4) the repetition of שאלתי in vv. 3 and 15b; (5) the fact that the verse begins with *kāp*, which Auffret believes to be a suitable final letter since it, along with *ʾālep*, is one of the letters that begins cola in the preceding lines, specifically cola 8a (*ʾālep*) and 8b (*kāp*) (Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 338). This same evidence, of course, can also be used to argue that this verse is the initial line of a new verse paragraph. For example, the lack of transition between vv. 14 and 15, I would argue, suggests that a new thought is beginning and, thus, a new paragraph. Although Auffret does cite numerous precedents for כבוד coming at the end of a poem (Pss 72:19; 104:31; 57:6, 12), he also cites numerous examples of the same word being used in the introduction to poems (Pss 19:2; 29:1; 66:2; 115:1), suggesting that it is frequent to include this word when starting a new thought. The repetition of the compound preposition and the word "my request" may be not for the purposes of concluding the thought of vv. 5–14, but rather to tie the new paragraph to what precedes. Finally, the appeal to the initial letters of cola 8a and 8b as evidence for *kāp* being the final letter of the original poem seems even less likely than Skehan's suggestion that the initial letters of the cola of the first verse (1a: יהוה = *ʾădōnāy* = *ʾālep* and 1b: *pê*) signaled the "intended framework of the whole composition" (see Skehan, "Broken Acrostic," 3).

74. Note the repetition of ל + נתן + the 1st per. common sg. pronoun, as well as the common context of a petition, and the two verbs in each colon.

poet's salvation and one of its rewards. The first verse, though containing the tetragrammaton as a vocative, does not begin with a nominal expression (like v. 15a and v. 17a). Instead, the second colon contains a nominal expression ("['the Lor]d (is) [my rescuer']"). Here again we are reminded that praise of God is an outgrowth of being rescued and that God responds to those who appeal to him. Verse 20 emphasizes that one reward the poet experiences in the present is the perception of the shame of the wicked, while simultaneously not experiencing any shame him- or herself, an idea reminiscent of the plea in Ps 31:18.[75]

The poem concludes with a somewhat surprising final bicolon. The salvation of the poet has just been described; we do not expect another direct appeal to God. Nevertheless, the poet broadens the focus of the poem; the psalm is not only about a single person's travails. Rather, the poet's experience of God's mercy and generosity is implicitly presented as a model for how Israel as a whole can experience redemption. Notice that in this verse paragraph the idea of a reciprocal relationship between humanity and God (where humanity will listen to God, if God listens to humanity's pleas) is underlined with the description of Israel as חסידים, since this parallels the description of God as a דין האמת in vv. 7b–8.[76] The fact that the poet ends the text here also resonates with the idea implied above in vv. 9–10 that his or her rescue is associated with instruction in God's law, which in turn is to result in the people's greater obedience to God and in his praise. Similarly, the emphasis on past sinful behavior (and its allusive qualification of the idea that threats derive from external forces) complements the broader focus on Israel; this emphasis resonates with the part of the Deuteronomistic theology that seeks to find the reasons for the exile in the behavior of Judah's kings.

Line Length, Parallelism, and Allusion to Scripture

Of the thirteen verses not requiring substantial reconstruction, ten are bicola and three are tricola. The cola of individual verses often contain approximately similar lengths, though some disparity is evidenced in vv. 1–2, 13, and 15.[77] The poem exhibits some discrepancies in the overall length of individual verses; this is not only because some contain more cola than others but also because some verses simply contain longer cola. The first verse, for example, contains between its two cola 42 consonants, 24 syllables, and 7 words, while v. 18 contains 24 consonants,

---

75. "O Lord, do not let me feel ashamed for calling on you; let the wicked be ashamed . . ." (Ps 31:18).

76. This parallel is mentioned by Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 355.

77. The following notes the consonants-syllables-words for every verse fully preserved in 11Q5: vv. 1–2: 23-14-3 // 19-10-4; vv. 3–4: 20-12-4 // 16-11-2; vv. 5–7a: 15-10-3 // 16-9-2 // 16-10-3; vv. 7b-8: 11-8-3 // 14-9-2 // 20-9-3; v. 9: 17-12-3 // 15-10-2; v. 10: 16-10-3 // 18-11-3; v. 11: 15-10-2 // 18-12-2; v. 12: 17-10-3 // 14-10-2; v. 13: 15-11-4 // 14-8-2; v. 14: 13-8-2 // 14-9-2; v. 15: 11-7-3 // 20-13-2; v. 16: 14-9-3 // 19-10-5; v. 17: 16-10-2 // 16-12-3 // 13-9-3; v. 18: 10-6-2 // 14-8-3.

14 syllables, and 5 words. Among all the verses, sometimes the initial colon is longer, and sometimes the second colon is longer. The tricola exhibit cola that are, by and large, of the same length as the cola of the bicola.

The poem exhibits at least six examples of semantic parallelism, matched with grammatical parallelism, within individual cola.[78] This is a relatively high number and is another feature that characterizes both paragraphs of the poem; it is also interesting that the two-verse units usually contain this type and distribution of parallelism in their initial colon. Four of these semantic parallels represent antonymic or reciprocal notions (renew vs. tear down, remember vs. forget, call vs. answer, and dream vs. awake); as outlined above, these pairs help to emphasize the dependence of the poet on God.

Semantic and repetitive parallelism, usually matched with grammatical parallelism, also occurs frequently between cola of individual verses, in twelve out of the poem's seventeen verses, often with more than one pair of words per verse.[79] It is curious that, although Ps 155 contains semantically and grammatically parallel cola, there is only one case of ellipsis, in the last verse; this might be contrasted with Ps 154, where a similar regularity in verse structure results in frequent ellipsis.

Semantic parallels between adjacent verses are comparatively less frequent. All the same, they do occur sometimes within the two-verse units seen throughout the poem, but also across the boundaries of these smaller units.[80] Grammatical parallelism does not seem to function in any typical way within these two-verse units. Nevertheless, as should be obvious, the first verse paragraph reveals a concentration of imperatives in the first cola, and a concentration of negative jussive phrases in the second cola. The absence of consistent grammatical patterns between adjacent verses is consistent with the fact that there is no example of verbal ellipsis across the verse boundary, as there is, for example, in Ps 154.

As mentioned above, repetitive parallelism plays an important role between the first and second verse paragraphs, especially between the beginning of the poem and its end.[81] In addition, grammatical and repetitive parallelism appear

---

78. These are: זכורני // (v. 7b) יהוה // דין האמת // תמגרה (antonymic, colon 5); בנה // הקיצותי // חלמתי (v. 18a); ואישהי // נמתי // קראתי (v. 17b); ויענני // תשכחני (antonymic, v. 11a); (antonymic, v. 18b).

79. These are: שאלתי // בקשתי תן, // תמנע (antonymic, vv. 3–4); תמגרה // תפרע // רשעים (vv. 5–7a); הרע // דין // תשפטני, חטאתי // יצדק (antonymic, vv. 7b–8); הבינני // למדני תורתכה, // משפטיכה // חטאת // פשעי (v. 12); יבש // ינצו (antonymic), שרשיו // רבים // עמים (v. 10); חטאת // פשעי (v. 12); ענפיו // יהוה // נמתי // אישנה // חלמתי // הקיצותי (v. 18); יהוה // יהוה (repetitive, v. 17); (repetitive), סמכתי // מפלטי (v. 19); בושתם // אבוש (v. 20); ישראל // יעקוב (v. 21).

80. Within two-verse units: גמולי // חט) // אוזנכה // הקשיבה (vv. 1–4); חסיתי // מפלטי (vv. 19–20). זכורני // יזכרו (vv. 11–12); תורתכה // מעשיכה (vv. 9–10); Between two-verse units: דין - תשפטני // משפטיכה (vv. 7b–8–9); שוב // הרזק רע, // פשעי- חטאת (vv. 12–13); אזעקה // קראתי - יענני (vv. 16–17); חסיתי // פדה (vv. 20–21).

81. These include: קראתי (vv. 1–2 and 17); תן // יתן (vv. 3–4 and 16); שאלתי (vv. 3–4 and 15); כבודכה // כבוד (vv. 10 and 15), יוסף (vv. 13 and 16).

together in the repetition of the tetragrammaton as a vocative in each of the poem's two-verse units (with one exception, vv. 11–12). Finally, the second verse paragraph contains three nominal predications, in each case in the first verse of a two-verse unit.

Phonetic parallelism is found within verses, and within the two-verse units.[82] Auffret has called attention to the numerous cola in the first verse paragraph ending with the 1st per. common sg. and 2nd per. masc. sg. suffix, as well as the repetitions of various prepositions and particles.[83] These repetitions create a concentration of certain sounds, though these same sounds do not seem to be of greater significance; they do not occur with regularity outside these particles. Although one might expect a concentration of a given letter within the verse that begins with that letter, this is not found in the poem.

The poem alludes to two specific biblical passages. In the most explicit use of a scriptural passage encountered in this study, v. 8b repeats verbatim the text of Ps 143:2b. Although the general idea of the verse is rather generic, the precise use of the same words in the same order makes the identification of the source text relatively clear. This possibility is enhanced further when we consider the use of other common words, especially the verb פרש in Ps 155:1–2 and Ps 143:6. Psalm 155:18–19 also makes an allusion to a biblical text, specifically to Ps 3:6, where (as in 155:18–19) sleeping and awakening appear as a metaphor for being protected.[84] Although the passages (Ps 3:6 and 155:18–19) share a common vocabulary (סמך, קיץ, ישן), they do not overlap entirely, vv. 18–19 having adapted the biblical verbs to the structure of the acrostic (which demands the use of נום instead of שכב and the perfect of סמך instead of the imperfect). Here we see how a biblical verse can be adapted for stylistic purposes, to fit the constraints of the acrostic structure as well as the dominant pattern of semantic and grammatical parallelisms between cola of individual verses. Furthermore, the language of the biblical verse is not even contained in a single two-verse unit, but stretches between two separate two-verse units, according to my reading. This too suggests that the language of the biblical text was plastic, able to be manipulated and changed by the poet as context demanded. Nevertheless, the relationship between the source text and alluding text was not obscured by such alterations, nor (presumably) was the alluding text's qualification of the source text.

---

82. Within verses: אבוש (v. 10); רשעים // הרע ישוב // ישמעו // מעשיכה // עמים (vv. 7b–8); בושתם (v. 20). Within two-verse units: יבש // לשוב (vv. 13//14); תמנע //מעון (vv. 1–2//3–4); זכורני // יזכרו (vv. 11//12). The significance of the phonetic parallels separated by a verse or more noted by Auffret is diminished due to the reduced chance of their perception; he cites, e.g., בנה // הביני (vv. 5//9); קשות // ב + בקשתי (vv. 4//11b); השיב // שוב // יבש // בושתם - אבוש (vv. 7a//13b//14a//20a-b) (Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 337, 340, 352).

83. Auffret, "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155," 330–31, 340.

84. The preceding v. 17 helps prepare the reader for the allusion, in part, through its language, which is reminiscent of that of Ps 3:5.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the fact that Ps 155 is described by some scholars as a mixing of originally distinct parts, the above analysis demonstrates the many ways (in terms of its structure as well as its larger ideas) that the poem can be read as a coherent whole. The theme of God's mercy presented first through the immediacy of the poet's personal crisis and then from a more distant temporal perspective parallels a similar structure and rhetorical strategy in Sir 51:13–30. The two parts of the poem exhibit not only a similar vocabulary but also a common structuring principle (where bicola and tricola are grouped into two-verse units, each of which uses the tetragrammaton once as a vocative, usually in the first colon) and a common tendency for semantic and grammatical parallels to occur within individual cola. Despite this thematic and structural coherency, it is ultimately difficult to decide with certainty whether the poem is a result of an artful editing together of originally separate materials. Without question, however, the poem uses and develops language and imagery from (among other texts) two biblical psalms, Pss 3 and 143. Although the borrowing of vocabulary might be characterized as derivative, in these cases it illustrates how the poets of this era could adapt material for their own purposes. In vv. 18–19, we see the basic syntax of a preexisting text (Ps 3:6) adapted to a new poetic structure, quite different from the original. What begins as a simple bicolon in the Bible is expanded into two verses, the specific words being slightly altered and rearranged to satisfy the constrictions of the alphabetic acrostic pattern; nevertheless, the allusive quality of this text is not diminished by these changes.

Apostrophe to Zion (11Q5 XXII, 1-10)

Introduction

This poem, together with the two others that follow it in this study, is not attested in any version of the Bible. It is found in three Dead Sea Scrolls: 11Q5, 4Q88 (= 4QPs[f]), and 11Q6 (= 11QPs[b]). The version of the poem in 11Q5 is complete; the form of the poem in 4Q88 is only partially preserved and offers minor alternative readings to those in 11Q5, while the version in 11Q6 preserves only parts of two words, both of which are also found in 11Q5.[1] Like Sir 51:13–30 and Ps 155, the Apostrophe to Zion (Ap Zion) is an alphabetic acrostic. The form of the acrostic is like that of Ps 155 and other acrostics from Psalms in that the amount of text devoted to a single letter varies, in the case of Ap Zion from one colon to two. The poem's structure has been given some attention by Pierre Auffret, Stanislav Segert, and Matthew Morgenstern, but, as with the other texts that follow, there is relatively less written about this poem.[2] Although the lineation of the poem is a matter of conjecture, there is relatively less debate about this issue.

The vocabulary of the poem is rather generic, such that the meaning of individual words is clear, though their specific significance for the poem is harder to determine. This is in part due to syntactic ambiguities. The 2nd per. fem. sg. pronominal suffix appended to many of the abstract words may be interpreted

---

1. For the version of the poem in 11Q6 VI, 1-2, see Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, "11QPsalms[b]," in *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-21* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 37–47, esp. 44–45 for Ap Zion. For the version in 4Q88 VII, 14 through VIII, 15, see Jean Starcky, "Psaumes Apocryphes de la Grotte 4 de Qumran (4QPs[f] VII–X)," *RB* 73 (1966): 353–71; and Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Peter W. Flint, "A Scroll Containing 'Biblical' and 'Apocryphal' Psalms: A Preliminary Edition of 4QPs[f] (4Q88)," *CBQ* 60 (1998): 267–82; eidem, "88.4QPs[f]," in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; DJD 16; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 85–106, esp. 96–102 for Ap Zion. 4Q88 is considered older than 11Q5 and 11Q6, by approximately one hundred years (see Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 156; and Skehan, Ulrich, Flint, DJD 16:86).

2. Pierre Auffret, "Structure littérarie de l'hymn à Sion," 203–11; S. Segert, "Parallelism in the Alphabetic Apostrophe to Zion," *Archiv orientální* 64 (1996): 269–77; Matthew Morgenstern, "The Apostrophe to Zion: A Philological and Structural Analysis," *DSD* 14 (2007): 178–98.

either as indicating possession or as the object of an action (e.g., "your praise" may indicate the praise offered by Zion or praise offered to her). I attempt to explain my understanding of these words through my translation and notes, but the provisional nature of my suggestions is underlined by the many qualifiers like "it seems" and "presumably." Furthermore, a certain vagueness seems inherent in the poem's language and idiom.[3] In addition to the grammatical ambiguity just mentioned, the poem avoids specificity in other ways: for example, by not mentioning specific places within Jerusalem and preferring general references ("in your midst"; v. 8a); by referring to traits with the most generic words, such as "deeds" (מעשים; v. 6b) or "glory" (כבוד; vv. 4b, 5a) without any further description; by avoiding extended metaphors for the city, such as those found in Isa 54 and throughout Lamentations; and by a tendency for repetition that leads to, among other things, "Zion" being mentioned six times, without a single occurrence of the name Jerusalem or any other epithet of the city. While these features might be interpreted as reflexes of poor writing or reflexes of the poem being heavily dependent on biblical passages, I believe that they function in a coherent way and communicate a particular idea.

Past studies emphasize that the poem makes use of many biblical phrases; often these phrases derive from the prophetic books of the Bible. Scholars such as Conrad E. L'Heureux and Morgenstern have called attention to this language and how it is sometimes inverted.[4] That is, words and phrases that describe something negative in the prophetic books are applied positively to Zion in this poem, essentially creating dissonance with the biblical passages and their contexts. Thus, for example, the phrase from v. 4a: "those who desire the day of your salvation" alludes to the similar phrase from Amos 5:18, which reads: "Alas, those who desire the day of the Lord." In Amos those who desire the day of the Lord are confused and do not understand that the day of the Lord is the day of their destruction; in v. 4a below, those who desire the day of Zion's salvation are associated with the "generations of the faithful." In more general ways, too, Ap Zion reverses ideas expressed by the biblical writers, for example, the Deuteronomistic insistence that prophets should not rely on dreams (found in Deuteronomy 13, throughout Jeremiah, and even in Sirach). Although the poem is, without question, interacting with these biblical texts, affirming some ideas while qualifying or undermining others, I believe that the most interesting aspect of the poem

---

3. Note Waltke and O'Connor's cautionary statement on attempts at resolving grammatical ambiguity: "often in such cases no simple resolution is possible. Nor is it always desirable; grammatical ambiguity is a genuine and often functional part of language" (*Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 223).

4. Conrad E. L'Heureux, "The Biblical Sources of the 'Apostrophe to Zion,'" *CBQ* 29 (1967): 66; Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 183–87, 197. However, all the connections noted by these scholars are not equally strong or convincing. For example, Morgenstern notes (p. 183) that the opening line of the poem alludes to Prov 10:7 through the idiom זכר . . . לברכה, though this, to me, does not seem likely.

(and one not described by other commentators) is the way that Zion is evoked as a concept, as something that exists in the mind of the pious. In other biblical texts, Jerusalem is imagined in great detail, either metaphorically (e.g., as a woman giving birth) or physically (e.g., as having stones of sapphire). Here, by contrast, the city is associated primarily with memory and cognition, as the object of praise and blessing. The understanding of Jerusalem as something that is independent of the physical city is seen also in Lamentations; while the material city is replaced by a personification in that biblical book, in Ap Zion the city is even more abstract, existing primarily within the praises, remembrances, and blessings of its people. This identity is analogous in some ways to the fame said to be enjoyed by Israel's ancestors in Ben Sira's famous poem "Praise of the Ancestors" (chs. 44–50). That text states specifically that the ancestors live on through the praise offered to them in the assembly (44:15); in this poem, Zion's continuation through remembrance is only implied. More important, however, is the analogy the poem makes between remembering Zion and remembering Moses' commands (and the exodus in general), since in both cases the remembrance provides a link between the past, present, and future.

For the text and analysis of the poem, the version preserved in 11Q5 is presented. The version in 4Q88 contains variant readings in only a few places, the most important being אנוש instead of איש in v. 12b; התפזרו instead of ויתפזרו in v. 13b; מעלה לכול instead of מעל כל in v. 14b; ציון in v. 15a where 11Q5 has no mention of Zion; and, finally, בכול מודי אני אהבתיך instead of בכול לבבי אברכך in v. 15b.[5]

TEXT AND ANALYSIS OF THE POEM

		Grammatical Analysis	Semantic Analysis
1.	בכול מודי ²/ אני אהבתיך אזכורך לברכה ציון	VMvoc//M²SV PMS	abc//d+efg bha
	ברוך לעולמים זכרך		
2.	ושלום ³/ ותוחלת ישועתך לבוא גדולה תקותך ציון	PSvoc//SS²M⁽⁼ᴾ⁾	abc//db'+ef
3.	ודורות חסידים ⁴/ תפארתך דור ודור ידורו בך	S²VM//S²M	aaa//a+bc
4.	וישישו ברוב כבודך המתאוים ליום ישעך	S³⁽ᵛ⁺ᴼ⁾//VM²	ab+c//de+f
5.	וברחובות תפארתך יעכסו זיו ⁵/ כבודך יינקו	O²V//M²V	a+bc//d+b'e
6.	ובמעשי חסידיך תתפארי חסדי נביאיך ⁶/ תזכורי	O²V//M²V	a+bc//d+ae
7.	שקר /⁶ ועול נכרתו ממך טהר חמס מגוך	VOM//SSVM	abc//b'b''d

5. The other variations between 4Q88 and 11Q5 include מי הוא זנה for מי זה in v. 11a; משנאיך for מסנאיך in v. 13b; א[ז]כרך and אזכורך for אזכורך in vv. 1a and 15a; תשיגי for תסיגי in v. 16a; עליך for עליכי in v. 17a; and חלמת for חלמות in v. 17b. Disagreement surrounds the reading of other words, including ד[ו]בׄר or נ[אמר or נ[שמע in 4Q88 for דובר in 11Q5's v. 17a (see, respectively, Hanan Eshel and John Strugnell, "Alphabetical Acrostics in Pre-Tannaitic Hebrew," *CBQ* 62 [2000]: 451; Skehan, Ulrich, Flint, DJD 16:99; Sanders "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 204) and נ[בׄיאׄםׄ תתבעך or נביים תתבעך in 4Q88 for נביאים תתבעך in 11Q5's v. 17b (see Skehan, Ulrich, Flint, DJD 16:99; Sanders "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 204).

8.	וידידיך אליך נלוו יגילו בניך בקרבך	VSM//SMV	abc//b'd
9.	ויתאבלו עליך תמיך ^{8}/ כמה קוו לישועתך	VM//VMS	ab//cd
10.	ולוא תשכח תוחלתך לוא תובד תקותך ^{9}/ ציון	VSvoc//VS	abc//a'b'
11.	או מי זה מלט ^{10}/ בעולו מי זה אבד צדק	SVM//SVM	abc// ad$^{(\neq b)}$e$^{(\neq c)}$
12.	איש כמעשיו ישתלם נבחן אדם כדרכו	VSM//SMV	abc//b'c'd
13.	ויתפזרו כול משנאיך סביב נכרתו ^{11}/ צריך ציון	MVSvoc//VS^2	abcd//b'e+c'
14.	מעלה לכול תבל ^{12}/ ערבה באף תשבחתך ציון	PMSvoc//M^2	abcd//e+f
15.	בכול לבבי אברכך פעמים רבות אזכורך לברכה	M^{2}VM//M^{2}V	abcd//e+fd
16.	וברכות נכבדים תקבלי ^{13}/ צדק עולמים תשיגי	O^{2}V//O^{2}V	a+bc//d+ec'
17.	וחלמות נביאים תתבעך קחי חזון ^{14}/ דובר עליך	VO^2//O^{2}V	ab+c//b'+de
18.	^{15}/ שבחי עליון פודך רומי ורחבי ציון	VVvoc//VO^2	aa'b/cde
	תשמח נפשי בכבודך	VSM	fgh

TRANSLATION

1.   I recall you, O Zion, for (the purpose of) blessing:
     with all my might I love you,
     blessed forever is your memory.
2.   What you hope for, O Zion, (is) great,
     that peace, the deliverance you long for (lit., the expectation of
     your deliverance), will come.
3.   Generation after generation will dwell in you,
     faithful generations (in) your wonder.
4.   Those who desire the day of your salvation
     will rejoice in your great glory.
5.   They will suckle at the nipple of your glory,
     and toddle in your glorious squares.
6.   May you remember the faithful (acts) of your prophets,
     since through the deeds of (or, in the works of) your faithful you
     are glorified.

7.   Purge violence from your midst,
     falsehood and injustice will be cut from you.
8.   Your children will rejoice in your midst,
     your beloved ones (who) are joined to you.
9.   How they have awaited your deliverance,
     (how) your perfect ones have mourned over you!

10.   What you hope for, O Zion, is not destroyed,
     what you long for is not forgotten.
11.   Who is it that is destroyed (through) righteousness?
     Or, who is it that survives through his injustice?
12.   A person is chosen according to his deeds,
     according to his acts, (each) human is rewarded.

13.   Round about your enemies will be cut down, O Zion,
             all those hating you will be scattered.

14.   Your praise, O Zion, is pleasant in the nose,
             (rising) above all the world.
15.   Many times may I recall you for (the purpose of) blessing,
             with all my heart may I bless you.
16.   May you attain eternal righteousness
             and receive the blessings of the honored.
17.   Accept (the) vision spoken to you,
             and may you demand for yourself (the interpretation of the)
                  dreams of (your) prophets.
18.   Be exalted and broad, O Zion;
             praise the Most High, your redeemer;
             may my soul rejoice in your glory.

Notes to the Translation

Ap Zion 1 The irregularity of this psalm's acrostic pattern appears in the second colon. As explained in relation to Ps 155:5–7a, the demands of the acrostic pattern sometimes lead to irregular numbers of cola for each acrostic letter. The grouping of the first three cola as a single verse is based, in part, on my understanding of Hebrew poetry being, by convention, divided into bicola and tricola. In addition, the third colon of this verse completes the intention expressed in the first colon through similar words, arranged in chiastic alignment with those of the first.[6] Also for this reason, I think it makes better sense to understand the third colon as a part of the initial verse, rather than as a monocolon.[7]

The poem opens with a performative statement that does what it describes; in other words, by stating that he or she calls Zion to mind, the poet does just this. The blessing that appears in the 1st per. common is also a performative statement, as most blessings are. Thus, the English present tense is preferred for the translation, in contrast to the future.[8] The verb is read as a G-stem, following the reading in 4Q88.[9] The root זכר is particularly important in the poem, as the related noun

6. See L'Heureux, "Biblical Sources," 67; Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 183.

7. Eshel and Strugnell read the colon beginning with ברוך as a monocolon ("Alphabetical Acrostics," 450). Auffret understands the first verse as a tricolon, based in part on its chiastic structure ("Structure littérarire de l'hymn à Sion," 205). Sanders also reads the first verse as a tricolon, noticing the tricolon at the end of the poem (DJD 4:85).

8. Schiffman translates the verb of v. 1a with a future tense ("Apostrophe to Zion [11Q Psalms Scroll 22:1–15]," in *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* [ed. Mark Kiley; London: Routledge, 1997], 20).

9. Sanders originally read the verb as an H-stem (DJD IV, 86), but then corrected this reading based on the other version in 4Q88 (DJD IV, 86; *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 124-25;

זכר occurs at the end of this same verse, and the verb also appears in vv. 6 and 15. The verb denotes not only remembrance of things past but also a calling to mind of something (whether that thing is of the past, present, or future); H. Eising defines it as "the presence and acceptance of something in the mind . . . an active cognitive occupation with a person or situation."[10] Nevertheless, in this poem, it seems that the verb זכר represents remembering past things. This is based on the interpretation of the present verse, the second colon of which alludes to Deut 6:5, as well as on the interpretation of the entire text, where the past (represented especially through the implicit allusion to prophetic promises of restoration) is linked to hope in the future. It is also worth noting that the use of the same verb in a volitive mood, with God as subject, is a common way of beginning a lament, as in Lam 5:1, where the verb (as here) is best understood as indicating the remembrance of something lost. In other Dead Sea Scrolls (e.g., 4Q504 1-2 II, 11 [= 4QDibHam[a]]), petitions begin in a similar way, asking God to remember past miracles.[11] The use of the cohortative of זכר in Ap Zion 1, thus, would seem to modify the rhetoric common to biblical and postbiblical laments in order to emphasize that hope in the future rests not only on God remembering the covenant and people, but also on humanity remembering the promises made to it.

The noun from this same root, זכר, is found in this verse's third colon. The word denotes more than memory, but something like identity or reputation.[12] This identity, of course, is partially dependent on past events and promises, including the promises made by God concerning Jerusalem's perpetual (and irrevocable) status as the object of his love (see, e.g., Ps 89:3). By contrast, the hope of Zion looks forward to the future. That Zion's restoration is still in the future in this text is based on the simple assumption that the poet hopes for what has not yet happened. This aligns with the other references in the text, including the insistence in v. 17 that Zion "accept (the) vision spoken to you, / and may you demand

---

"Non-Masoretic Psalms," 200). Eshel and Strugnell transliterate the verb in 11Q5 as though it were an H-stem, though because they do not record any variant in 4Q88, I imagine that this is a typo, and a G-stem was intended (Eshel and Strugnell, 450). The verb in 4Q88 is found twice (in verses 1and 15) אז[כר]א and אזכרך, respectively; these are assumed to be in the G-stem since, in 4Q88, the *waw* is frequently not used as an internal *mater* (see Skehan, Ulrich, and Flint, DJD XVI, 96-99).

10. H. Eising, "זכר," *TDOT* 4:65–66. He adds: "In Lam 1:7,9, recollection of the glorious past is a motif accentuating the affliction of the present. . . . The future can also be the subject of the intellectual activity. . . . A man should remember the coming 'days of darkness' (Eccl 11:8)" (ibid., 67).

11. See Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (trans. Jonathan Chipman; STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 90–91. In addition, however, the imperative זכור can also ask God to call to mind the people or other things that are not exclusively part of the past (see, e.g., 4Q501, 1-2; and Berlin, "Qumran Laments and the Study of Lament Literature," 13).

12. See Eising, *TDOT* 4:76. In this way, the noun overlaps in sense with שם (see F. V. Reiterer, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry, " שם," in *TDOT* 15:128–76).

for yourself (the interpretation of the) dreams of (your) prophets," presumably referring to the prophetic promises of a restored Jerusalem (see, e.g., Isa 62).

The *lāmed* preposition in v. 1a is understood to indicate purpose, similar to how the preposition is used in Prov 10:7, with which Ap Zion 1 shares some vocabulary (the root זכר and the word ברכה).[13]

The Zion of the poem refers to at least four partially overlapping entities: the physical city Jerusalem (and/or its temple), the human residents of the city/temple, the personification of the city/temple, and the memory or idea of the city/temple. Although the hoped-for salvation of Zion may be part of the writer's eschatological perspective, the eschatology is not really developed in the poem and exists only implicitly.[14] For more on this word's interpretation, see the discussion below.

The first colon is reminiscent of various biblical passages that insist that Jerusalem be remembered (e.g., Ps 137:5–6). The second colon builds on vocabulary from Deut 6:5, which biblical verse is very important, especially during the Second Temple period, as Morgenstern emphasizes.[15] The blessing that concludes the verse bears similarity to several others, such as those in Prov 10:7 and Sir 46:11, as well as the praise of Judas Maccabeus in 1 Macc 3:7: ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ εἰς εὐλογίαν.[16] All of these, however, contain (or presume) an idiom with the phrase לברכה, not the passive participle found in Ap Zion 1c.[17]

Ap Zion 2 The division of the cola reflects Sanders's proposal. Eshel and Strugnell's proposal to join ושלום with the preceding words and read the phrase as a phonetic spelling of בשלום is not adopted owing to the irregularity of the idiom "hope in (ב)" (ordinarily we would expect the *lāmed* preposition, as in Isa

---

13. See Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 183; and J. Scharbert, "ברך," *TDOT* 2:300: "The mention (*zekher*) of the righteous took place for (the purpose of) blessing (*libhrakhah*)" (זכר צדקים לברכה). Sirach 46:11 can be interpreted similarly: "remembrance of them (i.e., the judges) will be for (the purpose of) blessing" (יהי זכרם לברכה [Ms. B]; see Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 82). Alternatively, these phrases might be understood to mean that the memory of the righteous and/or the judges has become a blessing, that is, something that is blessed, just as the individuals themselves were blessed. In either case, the context of Ap Zion 1 suggests that the *lāmed* indicates purpose.

14. David Flusser, among others, understands this text as an "eschatological psalm" ("Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* [ed. Michael E. Stone; CRINT, Section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud 2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984], 557–58).

15. Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 182.

16. The passage from 1 Maccabees is the only one to contain approximate equivalents for all the words in Ap Zion v. 1c.

17. Sirach 45:1 refers to Moses and has a similar sense: משה זכרו לטובה (Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 79).

26:8).[18] In addition, this reading would violate the common pattern wherein the name "Zion" appears as the final element of an initial colon (in vv. 1a, 10a, 13a, 14, 18a).[19] As Skehan has noted, the phrase ושלום may be an early expansion of the text.[20]

The consonants גדולה may be the adjective or the abstract noun. Although at least two biblical passages are similar to Ap Zion 2, in that each includes the word תקוה and an abstract noun as a nominal predicate (Prov 10:28 and 11:23), the adjective is comparatively more common and often modifies abstractions, such as joy and anger, unlike the noun, which modifies humans and God and indicates (in the plural) God's actions.[21]

The word תקותך, literally "your hope," is translated periphrastically to make the sense of the phrase clearer. The literal translation produces ambiguity as to whether the word represents the faculty of hope as possessed by Zion, the source of hope (i.e., God), the poet's and Jerusalemites' hope for Zion, or the outcome of Zion's hope (i.e., her future salvation). Although the word is ambiguous in itself, the context of the verse suggests that it is the last of these that is especially relevant. In the present poem, it is unlikely that the word "hope" describes an abstract virtue like faith and love, this conception being more particular to Christian texts (see, e.g., 1 Cor 13:13). In Biblical Hebrew, when the word bears a suffix or is otherwise qualified, it usually indicates either the source of hope (usually God) or what is hoped for.[22] When the goal of hope is indicated (that is, the person or thing for whose benefit another hopes), it is usually represented with a *lāmed* preposition, as in Job 5:16; Prov 26:12; and 29:20.[23] Nevertheless, some ambiguity inheres in this phrase, and the confusion so produced may have the goal of subtly blurring the distinction between the metaphorical, personified city and Jerusalem's residents, since what the residents hope for Jerusalem is the same as what the personification of the city would hope for: salvation.

I follow Mathias Delcor and others in understanding the *lāmed* + infinitive expression as a predicate, which often indicates something about to happen.[24]

---

18. Eshel and Strugnell, "Alphabetical Acrostics," 450.

19. L'Heureux's idea to join ושלום to the preceding colon and understand it as a second subject is possible. Nevertheless, it produces a strange sense and violates the colon-final pattern of Zion. For similar reasons, other possibilities, such as reading ושלום as a second nominal predicate ("your hope is a great thing and peace"), seem less likely.

20. This is noted in Skehan, Ulrich, and Flint, DJD 16:98.

21. For the reading of גדולה as the abstract noun, see Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 184.

22. In some cases it comes to imply the future (e.g., Jer 29:11; 31:17) and in Mishnaic Hebrew it implies a span of time (see Jastrow, s.v.). In Ps 62:5 the phrase "my hope (is) from him" seems to be like Ap Zion 2a in being opaque and vague (Hebrew: כי ממנו תקותי), though, as here, the subsequent words suggest that it is salvation that is specifically envisioned.

23. See *HALOT*, s.v.

24. M. Delcor, "L'Hymne à Sion du rouleau des psaumes de la Grotte 11 de Qumran (11QPsa)," *RevQ* 6 (1967): 75. Morgenstern ("Apostrophe to Zion," 184) describes this con-

This is particularly important since the second colon of this verse (as well as the following lines) explains what Zion hopes for.[25] A similar syntax is found in Jer 31:17: ויש־תקוה לאחריתך נאם־יהוה ושבו בנים לגבולם, "There is hope for your future, says the Lord, that your children will return to their territory." The *wāw* conjunction in Ap Zion 2 as well as in Jer 31:17 (where it is part of a *wāw*-consecutive phrase) may be classified as an epexegetical *wāw*, following the terminology of Waltke and O'Connor's grammar.[26]

Ap Zion 3 My interpretation of the second colon follows that of Eshel and Strugnell; not only has the verb been elided, but also the *bêt* preposition.[27] The idea of "dwelling in your wonder" is perhaps an elliptical reference to those who pass through Zion's plazas or "wide places," which are described as wondrous in Ap Zion 5b. Another possibility is of an elliptical reference to the temple. The phrase בית תפארתי appears in Isa 60:7 and the phrase בית תפארתכה appears in 4Q504 1-2 IV, 11-12; in both cases, the phrase seems likely to refer to the temple. The phrase in 4Q504 is especially interesting given the explicit mention of Zion there:

. . . לכבד את עמכה ואת / ציון עיר קודשכה ובית תפארתכה

. . . to honor your people, and / Zion, your holy city and wondrous house.[28]

If, indeed, a reference to the בית תפארתכה is intended in Ap Zion, then this verse is reminiscent of other references to those who dwell in the temple (see, e.g., Ps 23:6; 27:4) and aligns with the use of the verb דור in Ps 84:11, where it indicates inhabiting a structure: dwelling "in tents."[29] Despite these possibilities, the

---

struction and cites Waltke and O'Connor (*Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 610), where the construction is said to indicate what is about to happen. GKC §114h-k makes a similar observation. See, e.g., Isa 38:20 יהוה להושיעני, "the Lord is about to save me." See also Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 70–72; and van Peursen, *Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, 252–55.

25. My understanding of the relationship between the two cola, therefore, parallels that of Sanders (DJD 4:87; *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 125; "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 201), but it differs slightly from that of others who read the second colon as a second assertion (see, e.g., Eshel and Strugnell, "Alphabetical Acrostics," 451; Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 181).

26. Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 652–53.

27. Eshel and Strugnell, "Alphabetical Acrostics," 451. For similar cases of ellipsis, see Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 223; and GKC §119hh, the latter citing Isa 40:19; 48:14. Alternatively, the second colon might be understood as a nominal clause, similar in its expression and vocabulary to Isa 60:19 (Sanders, DJD 4:88).

28. For the Hebrew text, see Maurice Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4, III: (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 144. In similar ways words for beauty or glory seem to refer to the temple in other passages, e.g., in Ps 27:4; 1 Macc 2:12.

29. That is, it seems less likely that people would be described as "dwelling" in Jerusa-

absence of a reference to a concrete structure seems typical of the poem's focus on the abstract character of Jerusalem.

Ap Zion 4 Although this verse, beginning with a definite participle, might be construed with the preceding line as a dependent relative clause, indicating what those who will dwell in Zion do, I prefer to render it as an independent assertion, in part because the poem exhibits no other close syntactic connection between verses.[30] In my understanding, the first colon is essentially a *casus pendens* clause and the *wāw* conjunction at the head of the second colon is an epexegetical *wāw* (i.e., *wāw* of apodosis).[31] As L'Heureux notes, this syntactic understanding of the line is similar to the syntax in Amos 5:18, from which this verse draws its initial words and idea:[32]

<div dir="rtl">

הוי המתאוים את־יום־יהוה למה־זה לכם יום יהוה

</div>

> Alas, you who desire the day of the Lord, why (should you desire) the day of the Lord?

Ap Zion 5 As many have observed, the imagery and vocabulary come from Isa 66:11. It is interesting to note that the most striking imagery (sucking at the breast) and some of the most obscure vocabulary (זיז) have been drawn from the biblical passage, not the more common words (e.g., ענג, שבע).

Various proposals have been offered for the understanding of עכס in the second colon. Given the ambiguities, I prefer the interpretation first proposed by G. R. Driver, "to hop," then adapted for this context by Sanders: "to toddle."[33]

Ap Zion 6 The verb זכר occurs again here; the fact that the poet was the subject of this same verb in v. 1 and again in v. 15 suggests an underlying link and reciprocity between the city and its human residents and proponents: just as the poet calls to mind Zion, so Zion should call to mind the deeds of its inhabitants, the prophets. This also underlines another reciprocal relationship inherent in the image of Zion; the poet as a (former or future) resident of Zion is in some sense also a part of Zion.

I assume that the primary reference in this verse is to the past acts and/or literary products of prophets of Israel and/or Jerusalem, either those who portrayed Jerusalem as the holy place where God dwells (as in Isaiah) or those who are described as working with Ezra and the elders to rebuild the temple (e.g., Haggai and Zechariah son of Iddo in Ezra 5:1; 6:14).[34] The word מעשים, as noted

---

lem's plazas. For the use of דור with the *bêt* preposition indicating a metaphorical dwelling in something, see 4Q252 I, 2 and 4Q418 176, 2.

30. Morgenstern reads the verse as a dependent relative clause ("Apostrophe to Zion," 181).

31. See, e.g., GKC §143d and Jer 33:24.

32. L'Heureux, "Biblical Sources," 66.

33. G. R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes," *VT* 1 (1951): 241; and Sanders, DJD 4:88.

34. In addition, the possibility exists that the conception of "prophet" was rather broad

above in relation to Ps 151A:3d and Ps 155:10, may refer to acts, deeds, stipulations, or even to literary compositions. The context is sufficiently blurry to allow for any one of these. It may even be intended to refer to the construction of the temple, as a similar reference does in 1 Macc 9:54 (which, itself, might refer to Ezra 6:14): "Alcimus ordered the tearing down of the wall of the sanctuary's inner courtyard; he tore down the work of the prophets [τὰ ἔργα τῶν προφητῶν]." Despite this undeniable ambiguity and polyvalency of the word, the clear allusion to two biblical passages from the prophetic books of the Bible (Amos 5:18 and Isa 66:11) in the two preceding verses, together with the reference to prophets in v. 6a, suggests that perhaps מעשים is to be understood primarily as "literary works."

Ap Zion 7 The initial verb Sanders now recognizes as a Dp-stem (puꜤal) perfect.[35] Alternatively, it might be understood as a D-stem infinitive absolute used as an imperative.[36] I prefer the latter interpretation, since I understand the poem to be situated chronologically before Zion's salvation. Assuming that violence has been purged from Zion would make the hope for peace in v. 2 redundant and unnecessary. In addition, although reading the consonants as an infinitive absolute is the syntactically more unexpected interpretation (given the rarity of this usage), the presumed infinitive is in the correct position for an infinitive absolute used as an imperative (asyndetic and at the beginning of its clause).[37] Furthermore, such a reading presumes no defective writing, which the Dp-perfect does.[38] The perfect verb in the next colon, נכרתו, marks the future eradication of lies and injustice as complete and total. The verse marks a shift in focus; the words and imagery (violence, lie, injustice) are negative. These traits are cut *from* Zion; the language contrasts with the language in the preceding paragraph, as well as in the following verse, that emphasizes (through the many *bêt* prepositional phrases) the activities *within* Zion.

Ap Zion 8 The juxtaposition of this verse with the preceding presumably indicates that the rejoicing within the city will be a result of the violence having been purged. My translation assumes that the verb לוה is part of an asyndetic

---

and that poets were also imagined here. The text "David's Compositions" in 11Q5 mentions that David composed poems through prophecy.

35. Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 203 n. 13.

36. This is Sanders's original understanding of the form in DJD 4:88; see also Delcor, "L'Hymne à Sion," 80. This understanding does not even need to presuppose a defective writing, since, as GKC notes, the D-stem infinitive absolute often takes the vowels of the infinitive construct: קַטֵּל (§52o).

37. See Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 593. Note the single occurrence of the infinitive absolute used as a command in Sir 3:17 (Ms. C), noted by van Peursen, *Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, 282. He observes there that, owing to the absence of the vowels, what look to be ordinary imperatives (in the G- or D-stem) may, in fact, be infinitives absolute.

38. The defective writing was the cause of Sanders's initial skepticism over reading a Dp-perfect ("Non-Masoretic Psalms," 203 n. 13).

relative clause. I assume that it is used as it is in Jer 50:4–5 to refer to those who will return to Jerusalem.[39]

Ap Zion 9 The reading of the last word is disputed; I follow the original reading of Sanders, תמיך, and translate "your perfect ones." It is the plural adjective with the 2nd per. fem. sg. pronominal suffix, used as a substantive. The adjective, as a singular substantive, is found numerous times in the Bible, as noted by Sanders and BDB. Others have argued that it should be read תמיד, "continually," the similarity between the *dālet* and *kāp*, as well as the frequency of *kāp* as a word-final letter, having led to this orthographic mistake.[40] This seems less likely to me, especially in the context of נביאיך, חסידיך (v. 6), ידידיך, בניך (v. 8), and נכבדים (v. 16).

Ap Zion 10 Based on the following lines, it may be that the hope of Zion implied here is not salvation, as it is in v. 2 but rather justice. The next three verses all describe the principle that righteousness is rewarded and evil punished.

Ap Zion 11 The rhetorical questions of this verse presumably are part of the reassurance that begins in v. 10. The precise relationship between the words of the first colon is unclear. Various proposals have been made in the past. The most straightforward syntactic understanding produces a somewhat unexpected assertion: "Who is it that has abolished justice?" Alternatives include Eshel and Strugnell's interpretation "Whom has righteousness made to perish"; that of L'Heureux "What just man has ever perished?"; and that of Sanders: "Who has ever perished (in) righteousness?"[41] I prefer the last interpretation because of 4Q88 and its fragmentary alternative to the second colon: [או מי] הוא זנה מלט [בעולו]. It seems reasonable, as the editors assume, that the preceding colon had a similar syntax.[42] If each colon had a similar syntax in 4Q88, then they would be similar in their grammar to Jer 30:21.[43] In the version of the text in 11Q5, the 3rd per. masc. sg. independent pronoun is dropped from each colon, leaving a syntactic form closer to that of Lam 3:37.[44]

The interpretation of מלט as a G-stem meaning "escape" or "survive" is encouraged by the occurrence of the verb in CD VII, 21 in a clear context.[45]

---

39. Delcor, "L'Hymne à Sion," 81. Morgenstern notes that ידיד in Isa 5:1 is understood as "Israel" in the Targum to this passage ("Apostrophe to Zion," 187). L'Heureux cites Isa 56:3, as well as Ps 87:4–5 (where various foreign nations are said to be born in Zion), but he believes that the colon does not refer to proselytes ("Biblical Sources," 68).

40. L'Heureux, "Biblical Sources," 69.

41. Eshel and Strugnell, "Alphabetical Acrostics," 452; L'Heureux, "Biblical Sources," 69; Sanders, DJD 4:87; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 125; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 203.

42. For the text of 4Q88 VIII, 2-4, see Skehan, Ulrich, and Flint, "Scroll Containing 'Biblical' and 'Apocryphal' Psalms," 279; and eidem, DJD 16:99. The only preserved portion of the preceding colon is the uncertain reading of א in the word they reconstruct א[הו].

43. The Hebrew reads: מי הוא זה עבר את־לבו.

44. The Hebrew reads: מי זה אמר.

45. See Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 188. The passage he cites from Ben Sira (Sir 16:12–13) is not sure proof of the G-stem usage, as the verb might also be an N-stem.

Ap Zion 12 Morgenstern's suggestion that this verse combines two biblical verses, Jer 17:10 and Ps 62:13, is possible though not entirely convincing, owing to the disparities between the language of the various texts and their rather common ideas.[46]

Ap Zion 13 The alternative to ויתפזרו in 4Q88, התפזרו, suggests that the word in 11Q5 is a *wāw*-consecutive form, though such usage is rare in later Biblical Hebrew.[47] This suggests also that ויתאבלו in v. 9 is a *wāw*-consecutive. In Ap Zion 13, the perfect נכרתו and the *wāw*-consecutive mentioned above indicate the future deliverance of Zion, not its past deliverance; this is assumed based on the poem's initial lines.

Ap Zion 14 The word "your praise" seems, on the surface at least, ambiguous.[48] Does it refer to praise of Zion or the praise that Zion offers? Either seems possible, since the poet's blessing and remembrance might be considered a kind of praise, while Zion is explicitly enjoined to praise in v. 18. Such an ambiguity is useful in this text since this text plays with the reciprocities among Zion, the poet, and the residents of Jerusalem, as mentioned above.

As Morgenstern notes, the translations offered by Sanders and others for the phrase מעלה ל are unlikely.[49] The phrase is made up of the substantive מַעַל plus an adverbial *hê* and a following *lāmed* preposition.[50] Although etymologically similar expressions are known from the Bible (i.e., מלמעלה, למעלה, מעלה), the biblical words are used not as prepositions but rather always as adverbs. The usage of מעלה ל and similar phrases (i.e., מלמעלה ל, למעלה ל, מעלה ל) in the Dead Sea Scrolls as prepositions seems unique to postbiblical Hebrew.[51] The fre-

---

46. Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 189.

47. Starcky points out that this would reflect an archaizing tendency on the part of the 11Q5 scribe ("Psaumes Apocryphes," 362).

48. The ambiguity is nicely represented in the summary of Sanders's translations. The first translation presupposes that the praise is offered by Zion: "Praise from thee" (DJD 4:87). Though the later translations are more neutral: "Praise of thee" (*Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 127) and "Laud of you" ("Non-Masoretic Poems," 203), the accompanying footnotes make clear that he interprets the phrase as praise offered to Zion by humans.

49. Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 190. The possibility of מעלה being either an adverb or a *hopʿal* participle is mentioned by Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 202 n. 18. One would expect, however, the preposition על to follow the *hopʿal* participle, not ל. A *hipʿil* participle also seems unlikely (although it is mentioned by Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 246), as this would also be followed by the על preposition and would imply that this is an "internal hiphil," translated "rising," which value for the H-stem of עלה is not found, at least not in the Bible. The interpretation of מעלה as an otherwise unattested or unrecognized noun "extolment" is proposed by Mitchell Dahood, review of James A. Sanders, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan, IV: The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, *Bib* 47 (1966): 143.

50. For more on this phrase, see my article "Poetry of the Heavenly Other: Blessing beyond Blessing and Other Paradoxes of Angelic Praise," in the forthcoming Festschrift for John J. Collins (ed. Daniel Harlow et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011).

51. The combination of מעלה with a following *lāmed* preposition occurs in 4Q378 6 II, 5 (4QapocrJosh^a), though the text is fragmentary:] מעלה לראשי[, "above my (or, our) head"

quency of this usage implies that these are not mistakes for other prepositional phrases from the Bible, for example, מִמַּעַל ל. In the parallel text in 4Q88, the relevant phrase מעל ל derives not from the substantive מעל but rather from the compounding of two prepositions: מן + על, vocalized according to the Masoretic tradition מֵעַל. Both phrases מעלה ל and מעל ל indicate not only position "above" but also (among other things) the superiority of one thing over and against another, much the way על is used in the Bible.

The notion of this verse would seem to be that the praise of Zion rises toward heaven like incense.[52] As in many instances, the terse language of poetry depends on inferring a word from context, in this instance, "rising."[53] Alternatively, the word תבל might be interpreted as the Mishnaic Hebrew word for spice, תבל.[54] In this case, the prepositional phrase might indicate not a spatial relationship but a relationship of superiority, the whole verse translated: "Your praise, O Zion, is sweet in the nose, beyond all (other) spice." Morgenstern suggests the possibility of wordplay, given the close proximity in sound between the two words.[55] Morgenstern's assertion that this text is "clearly based" on the words of Mal 3:4 is unconvincing, given the discrepancy in language between the two texts.[56]

(Carol A. Newsom, "Apocryphon of Joshua," in *Qumran Cave 4.XVIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* [ed. George J. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996], 248–49) and in 4Q403 1 I, 28 (*Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*) [ברוך ה[ה]אד[ו]ן מל]ך ה[כול מעלה לכול ברכה ות[שבחות], "Blessed be [the] Lo[r]d, ki[ng] of all, beyond all blessing and p[raise]" (text: Carol A. Newsom, "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat," in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* [ed. Esther Eshel et al.; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998]:257). In addition, 4Q291 1, 5-6 contains another example: [מ]עלה לכל ברכ]ה] / [ ] {אל[} ברוך אתה ו . . . (Bilhah Nitzan, "Works Containing Prayers," in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* [ed. Esther Chazon et al.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 10; and eadem, "Prayers for Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Traditional Jewish Liturgy," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000* [ed. Esther G. Chazon, with the collaboration of Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick; STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 2003]*, 114). Furthermore, there are also two cases where למעלה ל functions as a preposition, 4Q216 V, 13 (4QJub[a]) and 4Q393 3, 6 (4QCommunal Confession), and one sure case where מלמעלה מן functions as a preposition, 11Q19 X, 11 (11QTemple) (see *DCH*, s.v. מעל).

52. Sanders ("Non-Masoretic Psalms, 203 n 17) suggests interpreting the pleasing smell as comparable either to the smell of sacrifice or to "something more general," for which he cites Starcky ("Psaumes Apocryphes," 363), who suggests an allusion to incense, as in Sir 24:15.

53. For similar examples of the terse language requiring the inference of a verb, see Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 223–25.

54. This possibility is suggested by M. Mishor, "Three Lexical Notes" (in Hebrew), *Leshonenu* 50 (1985–86): 123.

55. Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 191–92. Similar wordplay between these two words is found in later rabbinic writings, as Jastrow indicates in his respective definitions of these words.

56. Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 190.

Ap Zion 15 The verbs of recollection and blessing are interpreted as volitives, expressing wishes. This matches my interpretation of the verbs in the following lines. The variant in 4Q88 reads בכול מודי אני [אה]בתיך, which would enhance the parallel with the beginning of the present version of the poem, though it would diminish the allusiveness of the 11Q5 text, which harks back not only to v. 1 but also to Deut 6:5.[57]

Ap Zion 17 The interpretation of the final word in the verse (תתבעך) is difficult. I follow the interpretation first offered hesitantly by Sanders and also adopted by L'Heureux and Morgenstern, that the word derives from the root תבע, attested in postbiblical Hebrew meaning "to ask" in the G-stem and "to be asked" in the N-stem.[58] I interpret the form as a 2nd per. fem. sg. G-stem imperfect with a 2nd per. fem. sg. (reflexive) pronominal suffix.[59] The interpretation of the suffix on this verb as "reflexive" belongs to Polzin, who also cites similar reflexive suffixes in Sir 7:7 (two forms) and 7:16.[60] Van Peursen cites similar constructions with the direct object marker (את) from earlier Hebrew (in Exod 5:19; Ezek 34:2; and Jer 7:19), as well as constructions that use suffixed pronouns (in 1 Sam 2:29; Ezek 29:3).[61]

In the context of the poem, where Zion is implicitly suggested to be righteous and worthy of salvation, the verse seems to imply that Zion should believe the promises of restoration offered by prophets in the past. This is encouraged also by the similarity in vocabulary between this verse and Sir 36:20b ("carry out the vision spoken in your name"), which refers to the fulfillment of past prophecies, not to future ones.[62] The vocabulary of Ap Zion 16–17 is reminiscent of the vocabulary of Dan 9:24, and, therefore, it is not impossible that the present verse refers also to eschatological visions, such as those in Daniel.[63] The association

---

57. For the text of 4Q88 VIII, 10-11, see Skehan, Ulrich, and Flint, "Scroll Containing 'Biblical' and 'Apocryphal' Psalms," 279; and eidem, DJD 16:99.

58. Sanders, DJD 4:89; L'Heureux, "Biblical Sources," 72–73; and Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 193.

59. Alternatively, one could assume the verb to be a 3rd per. fem. pl. imperfect tD-stem from בעה, similar to the same verb's use (in the N-stem) in Obad 6, where it takes as subject the thing that is searched. One would read the present verse: "accept . . . the dreams of prophets (which were) examined for you." Such abbreviated forms of the 3rd per. fem. pl. are found with suffixes in Jer 2:19; Job 19:15; and Cant 1:6 (GKC §60a).

60. Polzin, "Notes on the Dating of the Non-Massoretic Psalms of 11QPsa," 473–74; and idem, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (HSM 12; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 6.

61. Van Peursen, *Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, 54.

62. The verse number follows that in Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 414, though it is sometimes also listed as 36:15b. The Hebrew reads in the Ms. B text: והקם חזון דבר בשמך (Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 62). This poem in Sirach is considered to be a later addition to the book, as Collins describes (*Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 109–11).

63. The Hebrew includes references to צדק עולמים as well as to חזון and נביא.

with Daniel is suggested also by the frequent link in that book between dreams and visions, though this also occurs outside of Daniel.

Ap Zion 18 The call to be high and wide seems to be a play on words.[64] The metaphoric dimension of the first word רום would imply the translation "be exalted," but the second verb is not used in this context and means more straightforwardly "be wide." Possibly a reference is intended to Isa 54:2–3, where Jerusalem, personified as a barren woman, is encouraged to expand her tent.[65]

Zion

As mentioned above, the name Zion refers to four partially overlapping things. It refers, of course, to Jerusalem, the concrete, physical city of David's palace and to Yahweh's temple. Surprisingly, this seems the least important dimension of the name in the poem; the name Jerusalem is not even mentioned in the poem, nor is any physical structure described in any detail, not even the temple. Contrast this with other texts that treat Zion or Jerusalem, including Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, and Ezekiel, as well as the *Temple Scroll* (11Q19 [=11QTᵃ]) and the New Jerusalem text in Aramaic (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 4Q554a, 5Q15, 11Q18). In these texts the gates, walls, and temple are often described in some detail and are sometimes even personified themselves (e.g., Lam 2:18).

Zion is also, presumably, the personification of Jerusalem. Like Wisdom and other cities, it is commonly imagined as a female who can be addressed directly in the second person and who is loved (as here in v. 1b).[66] The personification of Zion in this poem, however, is not nearly as evocative as the similar personification of Wisdom in Sir 51:13–30, or as Zion's personification in Isaiah, Lamentations, or even in other Dead Sea Scrolls, for example, 4Q179 (4QApocryphal Lamentations A). The city is not once called "daughter" or imagined as a widow or as barren or as a young woman to be wed, as it is in the Bible and in 4Q179.[67] The impression that personification is even a possible reading of the word is due, primarily, to the dominance of this motif in the Bible, especially in those portions from which the poem draws much of its language. Also contributing to the reading of Zion as a personification is the fact that the city is the subject of verbs,

---

64.　See Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 194–95.

65.　L'Heureux, "Biblical Sources," 73.

66.　On the personification of Zion, see F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, *Lamentations* (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching; Louisville: John Knox, 2002), 50–53; and idem, *Weep O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible* (BibOr 44; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1993), 87–88.

67.　Jerusalem is referred to as "Daughter Zion" or "Daughter of Zion" in many places, e.g., Ps 9:15; Isa 52:2; 62:11; Lam 1:6; 2:1, sometimes also as a nubile daughter, as in Isa 37:22; Lam 2:13. The city is characterized as a widow in Lam 1:1; as a barren woman in Isa 54:1–4; as a woman cast away in old age in Isa 54:5–6; as a mother in Isa 51:18–20; 66:7–11; and as a young woman to be wed in Isa 62:5.

whose subjects must be an animate being (literally or metaphorically), though the next dimension of the name may also provide the basis for these verbs.

As with all names for cities, Zion can also represent the humans who reside in the city. Thus, the various commands directed at Zion—for her to remember the pious deeds of her prophets, to purge violence from her midst, to accept the prophecies spoken about her—may also be interpreted as commands directed at Jerusalem's population.

Rather than using an extended metaphor (e.g., Zion as a widow, Zion as the footstool or throne of God) to describe the city, the poem portrays Zion as an abstraction (literally, a זכר) associated with the past (חסדי נביאים, זכר, חזון דובר עליך) as well as the future (תקוה). The Zion of the poem, in other words, is a Zion of the mind. It is unlike other imagined Zions in the sense that it is not portrayed according to mythic motifs (as the footstool or throne of God, as in Ps 132:7; Lam 2:1; and Jer 3:17); nor is it imagined as existing in concrete terms in the future (with stones of sapphire, as in Isa 54:11; or laid out in specific measurements, as in Ezekiel or 11Q19). Moreover, although the characterization of Jerusalem as a "joy" (גילה) in Isa 65:18 is similar to how Zion is described in this poem as a "wonder," the Zion in this poem is not a totally new creation, as it is in the biblical passage. Isaiah 65:17, in fact, contains the prediction that the "former things will not be remembered" (לא תזכרנה). It is the opposite in Ap Zion, where the past will be remembered. Zion is, in part, the historical memory of the city, somewhat like the historical memory of Israel's salvation from Egypt, in the sense that its remembrance (or cogitation about it) forms a link between past, present, and future and depends on the words and thoughts of the poet and the city's residents.[68] The absence of Jerusalem as a physical space in the poem makes the necessity of "remembering" her (and blessing her) seem all the more apposite. In addition, the language in the first paragraph is so vague and abstract that it allows the reader to interpret the assertions as referring either to the literal city or to the historical memory of it: "dwelling in . . . your wonder" (v. 3); "rejoice in your great glory" (v. 4); "will suckle the nipple of your glory" (v. 5).[69] Furthermore, the expressions of the poem's first and last verses complement the reading of Zion in the poem as a historical memory needing the active participation of humans in its survival. As explained below in greater detail, the poem's beginning and ending include much language associated with verbal expression and thought, where Zion is the object of the verbs. These verses, among other things, emphasize that Zion is something to be praised, blessed, and remembered—in other words, preserved through words and thoughts. The importance

---

68. See Brevard S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel* (SBT 37; Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1962), 50–65.

69. Although this last phrase derives from Isa 66:11, the biblical passage is part of a longer pericope that develops the metaphor of God as a nurse and is not as difficult to understand as the present passage.

of language, it might be added, is evidenced in the acrostic form as well as in the paronomasia between the many etymologically related words.

The poem links the city's past, present, and future in a number of ways. For example, it juxtaposes זכרך (associated especially with the past and present) and תקותך (associated with the future) in vv. 1c and 2a, a relationship highlighted through the similar syntax of the two cola. Additionally, past, present, and future are all characterized by glory and associated with the prophets: Zion was and is glorious through the work of her pious prophets (v. 6a-b), while in the future, the pious will rejoice in her "glory" (v. 4). While in v. 6 the work of the prophets may refer to the political and religious heroics of prophets such as Haggai or Zechariah, or to literary compositions such as those of Isaiah, the visions and dreams mentioned in v. 17 are likely predictions of a future restoration of Jerusalem.

As should be clear, the four dimensions of "Zion" are interrelated and even overlap with one another; the abstraction of the city and its personification do not exist without its residents, and the residents are such because they live in a specific physical space. Overall, the poem is more concerned, it seems to me, with the conception of the city as having a glorious past and future, as well as the reciprocal relationship between the human population and the memory of the city. This is made most obvious in the poem's verbal repetitions, where what Zion represents shifts, from a memory, to the city's population, from the object of thought and remembrance to the agent of remembering. In v. 1a, the poet says he will remember and bless Zion, and in v. 1c he blesses "her memory"; this suggests that Zion is identified with her reputation, is something passive and noetic. In v. 6, on the other hand, Zion is urged to remember the deeds of her prophets, which presumes that Zion (either the personified city or, more likely, the human residents) is an active agent of remembering. In other ways too, the polyvalency of Zion suggests a reciprocity between city and inhabitants, so that, as mentioned above, "your praise" can refer either to praise offered for Zion (i.e., the material city that its residents remember and hope for) or to the praise offered by Zion (i.e., the residents of the city).

The idea of Zion as a concept, not directly dependent on the physical reality of Jerusalem, is something found also in Lamentations. Dobbs-Allsopp explains the significance of this abstraction in relation to personified Zion.

> If the Judeans remaining in Palestine after 586 cannot rebuild the real temple, cannot literally *reconstruct* the geographical Zion of old, they can reconstitute it imaginatively. . . . She [Zion] is the intermediary who beseeches Yahweh on behalf of the larger community; she is the common voice of suffering and pain and expresses the people's desire for relief and new life. And thus, personified Zion serves the temple-less community as an imaginative surrogate—a *place*-holder, if you will—until such time as a more material temple of mud and brick can be rebuilt; a Zion of the mind and text is substituted (quite literally

before the eyes of the poem's readers) for the Zion of myth and cult that now lies in ruin.[70]

In Ap Zion, Zion is also a conceptualization, but one that is imagined not specifically as a personification, but rather simply as existing within, and dependent on, her population's memory, praise, and blessing. The avoidance of the explicit metaphor of a personified city diminishes the sense that Zion is independent of its population. Unlike in Lamentations, the city here does not speak. The poem argues, by contrast, that Zion and her residents are dependent on each other (not to mention God).[71]

Although my interpretation stresses the abstraction of Zion, one might still wonder which Zion the poet had in mind when composing the poem—that is, the Jerusalem of what period: during the exile, after the collapse of the Persian empire, at the time of the Abomination of Desolation, or during the Maccabean era, or after. The poem is so general that any of these periods, on the surface, would seem possible. Even if the poem does not date to the exile, it might have been composed with the exile in mind. For this reason, the scrolls' hypothesized dates of copy do not help in narrowing these possibilities down. The emphasis on prophetic dreams and visions (reminiscent of Daniel), as well as the similarity in vocabulary to Sirach, would seem to suggest that the text was composed in the era after the Maccabean revolt, though this is only an educated guess and still does not solve the question of the time period envisioned in the text. All things being equal, however, I believe that the text probably refers to the Hasmonean era, when Jerusalem was still inhabited by Jews, though the influence and significance of the traditional priesthood had been marginalized and many had fled to other parts of the world.

Reading and Structure of the Poem

As noted above, the poem's acrostic form is like that of Ps 155 in its irregular distribution of cola for each letter of the alphabet. But Ap Zion is somewhat distinct (among the acrostics of this scroll) in the sense that it uses morphological forms to fulfill the acrostic demands, more so than either Ps 155 or Sir 51:13–30. So, for example, in Ap Zion there are four instances where either the definite article or a pronominal verbal prefix is used for the acrostic letter (א [the 1st per. common sg. imperfect prefix], ה [the definite article], י [the 3rd per. masc. pl. imperfect prefix], and ת [the 3rd per. fem. sg. imperfect prefix]). Contrast this with the

---

70. F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, "R(az/ais)ing Zion in Lamentations 2," in *David and Zion: Biblical Studies in Honor of J. J. M. Roberts* (ed. Bernard Frank Batto and Kathryn L. Roberts; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 65.

71. In Lamentations the city is not totally independent of the poet; the poet and human residents suffer in ways similar to how the personified city suffers, in Lam 1:12, 20, 22; 2:11, 22, as pointed out by Dobbs-Allsopp, "R(az/ais)ing Zion in Lamentations 2," 53, 57.

absence of similar examples in Ps 155 and the single example in Sir 51:13–30 (for the ת verse [the 3rd per. fem. sg. imperfect prefix]). The use of these prefixes is more common for biblical acrostics.[72] (Only Ps 37 is like Ps 155 in not beginning any acrostic letter with one of these prefixes or the article.) In this poem, the acrostic letters do not typically form the basis of alliteration, unless they are part of a word that is repeated, as is the case with דור in v. 3, חסד in v. 6, and מי in v. 11. It is also interesting to note that in two of these cases (vv. 3 and 11) the relevant word is not only at the beginning of the verse but also appears at the beginning of the second colon (though in each case it is preceded by a particle); note also how v. 8 has a *yôd*-initial word as the first word of the verse and as the first word of the second colon (preceded by *wāw*). In only one case does the acrostic letter appear as the first letter of two (etymologically unrelated) words in coordination: רומי ורחבי in v. 18.[73]

The purposes of the acrostic structure in Hebrew poetry have been the subject of some scholarly musings. Usually it is said that the acrostic structure helps to express the completeness of the poem's thought or idea, by moving from the beginning of the alphabet to the end.[74] Here the acrostic form resonates with the poem's playful language, where words from the same root appear in the same colon, the same verse, or in adjacent verses (זכר and ברך in vv. 1a, 1c; דור in v. 3a; פאר in vv. 3b, 5b, 6b; and קוה in vv. 9a, 10a). This, in turn, helps to emphasize the importance of language in retaining the history and memory of Jerusalem's past glory through blessing and praise. In addition, the acrostic structure resonates with the idea that Zion should be expansive and accessible, as implied in the image of Zion's praise being "above all the world" in v. 14 and the insistence that Zion "expand" in v. 18.

The poem as a whole exhibits less in the way of thematic development than what is found in the preceding poems, and this makes its segmentation into paragraphs difficult. In my translation, I have divided the text into four separate paragraphs, though this should be regarded as a preliminary division.[75] The first

---

72. Biblical acrostics often have for the א verse a 1st per. common sg. imperfect prefix (Pss 9:2; 34:2; 111:2; 119:7; 145:1), for the ה verse the definite article (Lam 3:5); for the י verse a 3rd per. masc. sg. or 3rd per. masc. pl., imperfect prefix (Pss 9:18; 25:9; 111:5; 112:5; 119:76–80; 145:10; Lam 3:28–30), for the נ verse a 1st per. common pl. imperfect prefix (Lam 3:40–42); for the ת verse a 3rd per. fem. sg. imperfect prefix (Ps 34:22; 119:169–73, 175; Lam 1:22; 3:64–66).

73. Note, however, the similar sounds in כמה קוו in v. 9.

74. See, e.g., Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 198.

75. Other scholars have divided the poem differently. Sanders (DJD 4:87–88), followed by Schiffman ("Apostrophe to Zion," 20), divided the poem into three paragraphs, vv. 1–6, 7–13, and 14–18. Auffret divided it into two large units, vv. 1–14, and 15–18, the former of which divides into smaller units that correspond with each other, vv. 2–3 with 4–6, and 8–10; v. 7 with 11–13 ("Structure littéraire de l'hymn à Sion," 209–10). Morgenstern sees the poem as built on a chiastic pattern, with vv. 11–12 at the center, v. 1 corresponding to vv. 15–16, v. 2 to v. 10, vv. 3–5 to vv. 8–9 ("Apostrophe to Zion," 195–96).

paragraph (vv. 1–6) introduces the topic of the poem—Zion as a historical memory and object of blessing and praise—and then connects this with the promise of peace, joy, and justice that it represents. The paragraph is consistently positive and describes the variety of ways that those who, in the future, will dwell in Zion will experience her glory. The second paragraph (vv. 7–9) is somewhat more negative in the sense that it mentions purging violence and the people's mourning. The third paragraph (vv. 10–13) describes the principle of justice, whereby individuals are punished or rewarded for their own acts; this paragraph implies Zion's restoration and her enemies' defeat through this principle. The fourth and last paragraph (vv. 14–18) enjoins Zion to accept what has been said and written about her so that she might attain a perpetual righteousness. This last paragraph underlines the poem's theme that Zion exists in and through the praise and blessings offered to and for her.

As mentioned above, words for speech and thought occupy the most important points in the poem, at the beginning and ending; they are also implicitly present in the central paragraph, which mentions rejoicing and praising. The poem begins with two performative statements, the first in v. 1a, "I recall you," and the second in v. 1c, "your memory is blessed." Calling Zion to mind in the first colon is perhaps an obvious way for the poem to begin, but it also lends the poem an immediacy, since the person reading it or hearing it unites with the poet in this mental activity. Both the poet and the audience recall Zion with this phrase. Further, not only is the first colon a performative statement, but the whole poem, in effect, functions to bring Zion into the foreground of the audience's attention.

The second colon too, "with all my might I love you," although seemingly generic, underlines the importance of remembering by alluding to a biblical passage, Deut 6:5, that forms part of the Shema (Deut 6:4–9). This biblical passage famously enjoins Israel to recite Moses' words (or commandments) when at home, on the road, when going to sleep, and when waking up. As Brevard S. Childs explains in relation to another passage from Deuteronomy (8:1–6), the remembrance of the commandments is part of a historical memory of how God has led the Israelites. What Childs says in relation to this passage has relevance for the present context too.

> The commandments are not expressions of abstract law, but are events, a part of God's redemptive history toward Israel. Present Israel stands in an analogous situation with the people of the Exodus. . . . The role of Israel's memory here is not to relive the past, because much of what is remembered is painful, but to emphasize obedience in the future. Memory serves to link the present commandments as events with the covenant history of the past.[76]

---

76. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, 50–51.

In a similar way, in this poem, remembering Zion functions to link the past with the future.

The third colon of the poem (v. 1c) fulfills what the first colon promises, though with a slight twist. Instead of blessing Zion explicitly, the poem blesses Zion's memory/reputation. This twist is important for several reasons. First, it illustrates how the poet connects verbs and nouns of the same root, as mentioned above. Second, by isolating memory/reputation as that which is blessed, the poem evokes Jerusalem's past as the glorious seat of the Davidic kingdom; by implication, it also evokes Jerusalem's destruction and the exile of its population, if not also more recent events such as the Abomination of Desolation.[77] The poem does not linger over the past; it quickly moves on in the next verse to the hope for peace and restoration, linking the past with the future through the juxtaposition of v. 1c with v. 2a, both of which share a similar (but not identical) syntactic pattern: nominal predicate followed by subject.[78] That Zion's hope is specifically for a coming peace accompanied by the experience of Zion's glory is elaborated in the lines that follow.

The significance of blessing, in general, for the poem, is suggested by its connection to memory and recollection. These acts are, of course, linked; one must recollect something before blessing it. But blessing a memory is especially important, as it signifies the acceptance of Zion's past glories as well as past troubles. In addition, throughout the poem, the letters associated with blessing (*bêt*, *rêš*, and *kāp*) are subtly emphasized; they are repeated again and again in different combinations, even where the root ברך does not occur. These same three letters are also given special significance in the acrostic structure: *bêt* is the first letter of two cola; *kāp* is set in the middle of the poem (v. 9 being the last verse of the text's first half); and *rêš* is the first letter of the last verse.[79]

The paragraph contains, within four verses (vv. 3–6) five references to Zion's glory and wonder (using the verb פאר, its cognate תפארת, and כבוד). The repetition contributes to the poem's vagueness and generality and leads the modern reader to wonder in what exactly this wonder consists. Is it a manifestation of God, as in Ezekiel? Or is it something else? Based on the last verse of this paragraph, I would suggest that the glory, although tangentially connected to God, is more specifically to be associated with the thought of Zion and her history, meditation upon that history, or, even more simply, the consciousness of Zion as the place of David's capital, Yahweh's temple, and the epicenter of the religion.

---

77. This presumes, of course, that the poem was composed after this event.

78. In the case of v. 1c, of course, an adverbial phrase comes between the predicate and subject.

79. In ten of the eighteen verses, the letters *bêt*, *rêš*, and either *kāp* or *qôp* appear together in relatively close proximity. This is most obvious when the verse contains a word from the root ברך (in vv. 1a, 1c, 15a, 15b, and 16b), but this also occurs in a variety of other ways: ידורו בך (v. 3a); ברוב כבודך (v. 4b); נביאיך תזכורי (v. 6a); בקרבך (v. 8a); נבחן אדם כדרכו (v. 12a); סביב נכרתו (v. 13a); דובר עליך (v. 17a).

The repetition of words for glory presumably also emphasizes that the future of Zion will partake of this glory, something that would have been on the minds of anyone having experienced one of the city's many traumatic upheavals.

The paragraph closes with an appeal for Zion to call to mind the pious deeds of her prophets. Although this may not be a performative statement, it is like v. 1a in that it involves the reader/listener in the action that Zion is called on to perform; that is, by enjoining the city to remember the past acts of the prophets, the reader/listener calls to mind these same acts. In contrast to v. 1a, however, the reader/listener is not identical with the poet, but rather with the subject, Zion. (Recall that Zion is not only an abstraction, but also a metaphor for Jerusalem's inhabitants.) The pious acts to be recalled are not specified, and the verse is not even explicit about whether these are past acts or future acts. Nevertheless, because the definitive act of the prophet is to prophesy the future and because past prophecies are (I presume) referred to in v. 17 below, it is likely that the reference here is to past prophecies, that the act of remembering is intended to take place in the present. This verse also underlines the reciprocal relationships between the acts of remembering and glorifying. Here again, the repetition of cognate nouns helps to cement the connection that might otherwise not be obvious: the pious deeds (חסדי) of the prophets are the object of Zion's recollection, since it is the deeds of the pious (חסידיך) that make Zion glorious. The poem is again subtly implying that Zion's identity rests in the collective memory of her residents.

The next paragraph (vv. 7–9) begins with the command (the infinitive absolute used as an imperative) for Zion to purge violence from her midst, so that injustice will be wiped out and joy will take their place. The juxtaposition of vv. 7 and 8 helps to take the sting out of this reminder that Jerusalem suffers violence and injustice. Verse 9 continues, however, to dwell on the negative reflexes of this situation by referring to the patience and mourning of the people over Zion. This thought then dovetails into the next verse, which I have included as part of the following paragraph.

Verse 10 marks the beginning of the second half of the poem, in addition to the beginning of a new paragraph (vv. 10–13). The entire verse seems, in one sense, to be a reiteration of the idea expressed in v. 2a ("What you hope for . . . (is) great"), but phrased in the negative. Nevertheless, the context is slightly less straightforward. In the case of v. 2a, hope is associated with Zion's future peace and salvation, which are mentioned in v. 2b. In v. 10, "your hope" may be interpreted, in light of the preceding verse (9), as another reference to salvation, or, in light of what follows (in vv. 11–13), as a reference to justice. The ambiguity, of course, allows for both interpretations. Notice that lexical repetitions link this verse not only to what precedes but also to what follows: תקוה in v. 10 is cognate with קוה in v. 9, while both v. 10 and v. 11 contain the verb אבד.

The third paragraph continues with some proverbial statements of a conventional nature, reiterating the idea that the just survive and the unjust perish. Verse 11 expresses this idea through rhetorical questions, while v. 12 phrases it

as an assertion. Verse 13 then states the obvious result of this principle for Zion's enemies: they will be extracted from around Zion and scattered. The paragraph contains no positive statement concerning how Zion will prosper, unless v. 10 is read as an anticipatory reference to Zion's survival. The final verse of the paragraph, v. 13, reflects the vocabulary and thought of v. 7, the beginning of the second paragraph. From the lexical perspective, both v. 7b and v. 13a contain the verb נכרתו. But the connection between the verses is also reinforced when one considers the place of the "cutting." Verse 7 demands that violence and injustice be extracted from within the city, while in v. 13, the violent oppressors are scattered from around the city. The parallels help to communicate the idea that Zion will be made free from internal as well as external troubles.

Verse 14 marks the beginning of the last paragraph, or conclusion, of the poem (vv. 14–18), where the general ideas about Zion are reiterated. Specifically, the paragraph reemphasizes Zion as an entity praised (v. 14a), thought of/remembered (v. 15a), blessed (vv. 15b, 16b), spoken about in vision and dreams (v. 17)—all actions that are essentially cognitive or verbal. This reiterates the idea, suggested in the first lines, that Zion and her associated glory exist through the blessings and praises of her residents. Verse 15 recycles language from v. 1a-b and makes a second (and more subtle) reference to Deut 6:5, through the phrase "with all my heart." Like v. 6, v. 17 urges Zion to accept or recognize the prophecies spoken to her or about her. It is assumed that these prophecies are those that promise Zion's restoration, though they may also be prophecies that criticized Zion and encouraged her, as the present poem does, to "purge violence" from her midst. Verse 18 is a tricolon, composed of cola that each begin with another acrostic letter, emphasizing, in turn, that Zion should be expansive and should praise God, so that the poet may rejoice.

This paragraph also underlines the reciprocity between the poet (representative of the city's residents) and Zion through the sequence of clauses and verses. In v. 15, the poet (and subsequently the reader too) is the subject of the verb, while in v. 16 Zion is the subject; similarly, in v. 18a-b, Zion is the subject, while in v. 18c it is the poet's soul. The juxtaposition of vv. 15 and 16 suggests that the personal acts of remembering and blessing contribute to the city's eternal righteousness. Finally, through the repetition of שבח (in vv. 14 and 18), the poem suggests that, just as Zion herself is praised (interpreting "your praise" as the human praise of the city), so she should praise God. This repetition, at the beginning and end of the fourth paragraph, is reminiscent of the repetition of זכר between vv. 1 and 6 in the first paragraph, where the poet is the subject of זכר in v. 1 and the city is the subject in v. 6.

The idea of an abstract Zion, one developed through memory and thought, resonates with another motif of this last paragraph, namely, the idea that Zion should be expansive. Verse 14 expresses the idea that praise offered to Zion rises above all the earth like a sweet smell. This seems reminiscent of the metaphors in Sir 24, where Wisdom compares herself to various spices or incense (v. 15) and

to a mist that covered all the earth (v. 3), the latter of which is often understood to mean that Wisdom made herself accessible to all humanity, across the globe. A similar sentiment is perhaps apposite here, where the praise offered to Zion might be imagined as coming from all parts of the Diaspora community. The last verse begins with the double imperative phrase: be tall and broad, playing on the meaning of רום to mean tall, but also, in contexts like this, "exalted." The idea that Zion should be expansive is found also in Isaiah (54:2–3), and commentators have often pointed to this biblical passage to explain the phrase in v. 18a. Nevertheless, the Zion of Isa 54 is not the Zion of this poem. I think more appropriate is the idea that Zion is an element of historical memory, and, as such, it is hoped that it should know no physical (or even political) boundaries.

<div align="center">Line Length, Parallelism, and Allusion to Scripture</div>

The poem, as Sanders first observed, is subdivided into bicola, with tricola at its beginning and end.[80] The poem's cola are overwhelmingly consistent in length, most having three words and between seven and nine syllables.[81] There is some noticeable imbalance in vv. 2 and 14, the former perhaps attributable to the later addition of ושלום. Among the bicola, where there is some slight disparity in length between the cola, there are only two clear cases where the first colon is longer than the second;[82] in most cases it is the second colon that appears slightly longer.[83] The verses themselves (excluding tricola) are generally consistent in length, though some disparity emerges in v. 11 (being shorter than the rest) and in vv. 13 and 14 (both being longer). As in Pss 154 and 155, the cola of the two tricola are of approximately the same length, sometimes exactly the same length.[84]

Repetitive/semantic parallelism within individual cola occurs in only three cases, the first of these (v. 3a) being the more remarkable, as it involves a typical phrase (itself involving repetition), דור ודור, paired with a verb from the same root, ידורו.[85] In addition to phonetic parallelism created from this repetition in

---

80. Sanders, DJD 4:85.

81. The following notes the consonants-syllables-words for every verse: v. 1: 15-8-3 // 17-9-4 // 15-8-3; v. 2: 14-8-3 // 21-13-4; v. 3: 14-7-3 // 18-9-3; v. 4: 15-8-3 // 15-9-3; v. 5: 13-7-3 // 19-11-3; v. 6: 16-9-3 // 18-8-3; v. 7: 10-7-3 // 15-10-3; v. 8: 14-9-3 // 15-9-2; v. 9: 13-8-2 // 15-11-2; v. 10: 16-8-3 // 14-8-2; v. 11: 10-6-3 // 14-8-3; v. 12: 12-7-3 // 14-8-3; v. 13: 17-10-4 // 16-11-3; v. 14: 17-11-4 // 11-7-2; v. 15: 20-12-4 // 13-9-3; v. 16: 14-8-3 // 17-10-3; v. 17: 15-9-3 // 17-10-3; v. 18: 13-7-3 // 13-7-3 // 14-7-3.

82. These are vv. 14a and 15a.

83. These are vv. 2b, 3b, 5b, 9b, 11b, 16b, 17b.

84. In the first tricolon (v. 1), the first and last cola are exactly the same length, while the second colon contains only two additional consonants, one additional syllable and word; in the second tricolon (v. 18), all cola have the same number of syllables and words, the last colon containing only one more consonant than the preceding two.

85. Note also the semantic link between the coordinate elements in v. 7b (שקר and עול) and v. 18a (רחבי and רומי).

v. 3a, the poem exhibits this same type of parallelism in the repetition of the consonants *bêt*, *kāp*, *qôp*, and *rêš* (mentioned above in relation to the possible evocation of the notion of blessing: ברך), as well as the alliteration in v. 10a and 10b (the repetition of *tāw*), in v. 14b (the repetition of *lāmed*), and in v. 15b (the repetition of *bêt*).[86]

By far, the most important distribution of parallelism in the poem is between cola of a verse. The majority of the poem's verses exhibit both repetitive/semantic parallelism and grammatical parallelism between their cola. It is important, in fact, to distinguish semantic from repetitive parallelism in the poem. Repetitive parallelism is the more surprising, given its relative frequency here, appearing five times between cola of a verse, though one of these (in v. 11) involves only the repetition of the pronouns מי זה.[87] Semantic parallelism often involves word pairs that are also found together in the Bible.[88] Words that are not biblical word pairs are relatively few: בן and ידיד (v. 8); צדק and עול (v. 11); יתפזרו and נכרתו (v. 13); and תשיגי and תקבלי (v. 16). It also bears mentioning that even those words that are not considered in this study to be semantically parallel are sometimes semantically related: for example, being chosen (נבחן) and being requited (ישתלם) in v. 12 and righteousness (צדק) and blessings (ברכות) in v. 16.

Grammatical parallelism usually complements all these matches.[89] It sometimes also creates meaningful associations between otherwise dissimilar words, especially important for this poem being the link between remembering Zion (אזכורך) and loving Zion (אהבתיך) in v. 1; remembering (תזכורי) and being glorified (תתפארי) in v. 6; waiting (קוו) and mourning (יתאבלו) in v. 9; and remembering (אזכורך) and blessing (אברכך) in v. 15. Curiously, however, given the consistent parallelism, there are only two cases of verbal ellipsis within the verse (vv. 3 and 8). Moreover, there appear to be at least two cases where the verse does not exhibit the typical repetitive patterning typical of parallelism (vv. 4 and 14).

Phonetic parallelism between cola of a verse is most apparent in the cases

---

86. The repetition of *bêt*, *kāp*, *qôp*, and *rêš* occurs in *vv.* 1a, 1c, 3a, 4b, 6a, 8a, 12a, 13a, 15a, 15b, 16b, and 17a. See above.

87. The other examples include: ידורו -דור // (v. 1); ברוך // ברכה // זכרך // אזכורך (v. 1); דורות // חסדי (v. 3); חסידיך // ברכה (v. 6); אברכך // (v. 15).

88. For example, תקוה and תוחלת (vv. 2, 10) are parallel to each other in Prov 10:28, 11:7; כבוד and תפארת (v. 5) in Isa 4:2 (as well as in coordination with each other in prose: Exod 28:2, 40); חמס and שקר (v. 7) in Mic 6:12; אבד and שצח (v. 10) in Ps 9:19; אבד and מלט (v. 11) in Amos 2:14; אדם and איש (v. 12) in Ps 140:2; דרך and מעשה (v. 12) in Ps 145:17; צר and משנא (v. 13) in Ps 44:8; חזון and חלום (v. 17) in Joel 3:1 (and as coordinate elements in Dan 1:17).

89. Grammatical parallelism coincides with repetitive/semantic parallelism in vv. 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17. Sometimes the repetitive parallelism exists in opposition to the grammatical parallelism; for example, in v. 6, although both חסדי and חסידיך are part of construct phrases, the first is the *nomen regens* and the second the *nomen rectum*. Similarly in vv. 1 and 15, a noun ברכה in the first colon is parallel to a verb, אברכך, or passive participle, ברוך, in the last. Note too how in v. 1, the verb אזכורך in the first colon is parallel to its cognate noun זכר in the last.

of repetitive parallelism, though phonetic similarity seems to exist also in other cases, as in the similarity between שבחי and תשמח in v. 18. It might be reiterated that the particular acrostic letter is not necessarily repeated in its given verse, though this sometimes happens where repetition is also involved (e.g., in vv. 3 and 6).

Repetitive/semantic parallelism also plays a much less important role between adjacent verses. Some examples of this type and distribution of parallelism are found in vv. 3–6 in the words for glory (תפארת and כבוד), and in the more general category associated with verbal communication in vv. 14–18 (שבחי // דובר // ברכות // ברכך - ברכה - אזכורך // תשבחה). Grammatical parallelism does not play a strong role in this distribution.

Repetitive parallelism between verses separated by a verse or more is also an important feature of the poem, as it is used to emphasize the topic, Zion; in addition, it coincides with important points in the poem, at the beginning and end of verse paragraphs: the repetition of זכר in vv. 1 and 6, the repetition of כרת in vv. 7 and 13 (at the beginning of the second paragraph and end of the third), and the repetition of שבח in vv. 14 and 18.

The text, to an extent not witnessed in the previously studied poems, relies heavily on biblical images and language. The clearest examples of allusion are preserved in vv. 1, 4, and 5, which allude, respectively, to Deut 6:5; Amos 5:18; and Isa 66:11. Though the vocabulary and language of the biblical texts are not reproduced exactly in any of these verses, their use of vocabulary and syntax peculiar to each respective biblical passage enables a reader to identify them as sources. In all three cases, Ap Zion draws from the biblical passages not only specific images but also whole contexts. Thus, the allusion to Deut 6:5 draws on the entire Shema, as explained above. This has significance for the entire poem; just as recalling the commandments links the past and future, so too can remembering Zion. Similarly, v. 4 of Ap Zion alludes to the general context of Amos 5:18, inverting the negative prophecy of destruction into a promising one of rejoicing. A similar case of inversion may apply to the use of עכס, which is negatively attributed to Zion's daughters in Isa 3:16, but positively in Ap Zion 5.[90] Such cases of inversion are another way that the poem attempts to reconceptualize Zion and provide hope to the reader concerning Jerusalem's future. Verse 5 also alludes to Isa 66:11 and its context of rejoicing in and promise of Jerusalem's rebirth.

The poem also bears reminiscences of biblical language and expressions. These include the language in v. 1a, which is similar to that of other passages encouraging remembrance of Zion, for example, Ps 137:5–6; the connection in

---

90. See Morgenstern, "Apostrophe to Zion," 186, 197. Note the similar cases where Second Isaiah inverts negative images from Jeremiah (see, e.g., Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 38–39, and his description of this phenomenon on pp. 75–78). The verb occurs only in this passage in the Bible; the chance that this is a true allusion is encouraged by this fact, as well as by the contextual topic of the Isaian passage: Zion.

colon 1c between remembrance and blessing (found, e.g., in Prov 10:7 and Sir 46:11); and in v. 16, the use of vocabulary found also in Dan 9:24.

Conclusions

Ap Zion employs a literary strategy used also by Lamentations, namely, the creation of a Jerusalem not tied to one physical place. While Lamentations makes generous use of extended metaphors through personification and mythic motifs, as well as including many specific details of the city to achieve this end, the present poem attempts to do a similar thing by associating Jerusalem primarily with the memory of it in the past, simply as a memory, and its association with hope in the future. The emphasis on language in the poem suggests that it is through language and thought (especially in blessing and in praise) that Zion survives.

Plea for Deliverance (11Q5 XVIII, ?–XIX, 18)

Introduction

Like the following Hymn to the Creator, the Plea for Deliverance (= Plea) is not complete.[1] In 11Q5, it is found in col. XIX, 1–18. It is attested also in 11Q6 4–5; fragment 4 preserves a portion of the verse preceding the first verse found in 11Q5.[2] The scroll 11Q6 offers no significant variations to the text in 11Q5.

The poem is like the preceding Apostrophe to Zion in that it incorporates much biblical language and imagery into its own idiom. The language of the poem also recalls postbiblical Hebrew, and some of its expressions have their strongest parallels in other texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, including the Aramaic Levi text and the *Hodayot*. In general, however, the poem is most like Ps 155 in mixing the topics of supplication and thanksgiving. This poem has received the least attention from scholars in the past. Sanders has described it as a "prayer for deliverance from sin and Satan with a praise of thanksgiving for past experiences of salvation embedded within the prayer."[3] Esther Eshel and other recent scholars have considered it in light of other apotropaic prayers and incantations.[4] Most

---

1. Sanders (DJD 4:76) and Dahmen (*Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 241) believe that there are approximately five or six verses missing from the beginning of the text.

2. For the text in 11Q5, see Sanders, DJD 4:76–79; idem, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 119–21; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 192–95. For the text in 11Q6, see Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "Psalms Manuscripts from Qumran Cave 11: A Preliminary Edition," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 73–107, esp. 78–80; García Martínez, Tigchelaar, van der Woude, DJD 23:42–44; and Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 196–97.

3. Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 193.

4. Comparison of the Plea to other apotropoaic prayers began with David Flusser's study, "Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194–205. See, more recently, Esther Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000* (ed. Esther G. Chazon, with the collaboration of Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 69–88, esp. 76–77; and Archie T. Wright, *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6.1–4 in Early Jewish Literature* (WUNT 198; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 184–86.

recently, the text has been given a careful examination by Ingo Kottsieper.[5] My analysis attempts to understand the structure of what remains of the poem in 11Q5, and, especially, to illustrate how this structure (including the poem's allusions) emphasizes humanity's dependence on God.

Text and Analysis of the Poem

#	Hebrew Text	Grammatical Analysis	Semantic Analysis
1.[6]	[ודל אנוכי כי]		
2.	¹/כי לוא רמה תודה לכה ולוא תספר חסדכה תולעה	SVM//VOS	ab//cda'
3.	² / חי חי יודה לכה יודו לכה כול מוטטי רגל	$S^2VM//VMS^3$	aab//bc+d+e
4.	בהודיעכה /³ חסדכה להמה וצדקתכה תשכילם	$M^{(=V)}OM//OV$	ab//b'a'
5.	כי בידכה נפש כול /⁴ חי נשמת כול בשר אתה נתתה	$M^{(=P)}S^3//O^3SV$	ab+c+d//b'+c+efg
6.	עשה עמנו יהוה /⁵ כטובכה כרוב רחמיכה וכרוב צדקותיכה	$VMvocM//M^2\ M^2$	abc//d+c'd+c"
7.	שמע /⁶ יהוה בקול אוהבי שמוולוא עזב חסדו מהסה	$VSM^3//VSM$	abc+d+e//fg
8.	⁷ ברוך יהוה עושה צדקות מעטר חסידיו /⁸ חסד ורחמים	$PS^{3(SVO)}//S^{4(VOOO)}$	abcd//ed'd'd"
9.	שאגה נפשי להלל את שמכה להודות ברנה /⁹ חסדיכה	$VSM^{(=V)}O//M^{(=V)}MO$	abcd//c'ef
10.	להגיד אמונתכה לתהלתכה אין חקר	$M^{(=V)}O//MPS$	ab//cd
11.	למות /¹⁰ הייתי בחטאי ועוונותי לשאול מכרוני	MVM//SMV	abc//c'a'd
12.	ותצילני /¹¹ יהוה כרוב רחמיכה וכרוב צדקותיכה	$Vvoc//M^2\ M^2$	ab//c+d c+d'
13.	גם אני את /¹² שמכה אהבתי ובצלכה חסיתי	SOV//MV	abc//de
14.	בזוכרי עוזכה יתקף /¹³ לבי ועל חסדיכה אני נסמכתי	$M^{(=V)}OVS//MSV$	abcd//efg
15.	/¹⁴ סלחה יהוה לחטאתי וטהרני מעווני	VvocM//VM	abc//a'c'
16.	רוח אמונה ודעת חונני אל אתקלה /¹⁵ בעויה	$O^3V//VM$	a+b+cd//ef
17.	אל תשלט בי שטן ורוח טמאה	$VMS//S^2$	ab//b'(x+y)

5. Ingo Kottsieper, "11Q5 (11QpsA) XIX—A Plea of Deliverance?" in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. Florentino García Maratínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 125–50. Kottsieper interprets vv. 6, 10, 13–14, 16b, 18 as additions to an original text, based, in part, on various inconsistencies (e.g., the 1st per. common sg. pronoun in v. 1 and the 1st per. common pl. pronoun in v. 6; the mention of God's strength in v. 14, which is not mentioned before), as well as poetic considerations (e.g., the imbalance in line length bewteen v. 6a and 6b, between v. 13a and 13b) and Aramaic influence (e.g., in v. 16) (ibid., 136, 140, 142).

6. Because the text has no clear beginning or ending, Sanders (in his initial publication as well as in following ones) indicates the verses according to their line numbers in the 11Q5 scroll. I have, therefore, introduced my own verse numbers for the purpose of facilitating references to each verse; the numbering does not presume to identify the beginning of the text. The initial verse is reconstructed based on the text in 11Q6.

18.	אל ירשו בעצמי	מכאוב ויצר ¹⁶/ רע	SS²//VM	abc//de

18.	אל ירשו בעצמי	מכאוב ויצר ¹⁶/ רע	SS²//VM — abc//de
19.	ולכה קויתי ¹⁷/ כול היום	כי אתה יהוה שבחי	SvocP//MVM — abc//de+f
20.	ובית אבי השוממים בחונכה	ישמחו אחי עמי	VSM//S²S²(VM) — ab//c+def
21.	]לם אשמחה בכה	[ ] ¹⁸/	[ ]

Translation

1.
    . . . [I (am) weak, for] . . .

2. For, a maggot cannot give thanks to you,
    nor a worm recount your mercy,

3. (but) only the living can give thanks to you,
    all those whose feet stumble can give thanks to you,

4. because you make known your mercy to them,
    and teach them your righteousness.

5. For, in your hand (is) the life of all the living,
    the breath of all flesh (that) you have given.

6. Do with us, Lord, according to your beneficence,
    according to the abundance of your compassion,
    and according to the abundance of your righteous acts.

7. The Lord hears the voice of those who love his name,
    and his mercy does not depart from them.

8. Blessed is the Lord, doer of righteous acts,
    the one crowning his pious ones (with) mercy and compassion.

9. My soul cries out to praise your name,
    to give thanks with a joyous cry (for) your merciful acts,

10. to declare your faithfulness;
    your praise is unfathomable.

11. I was dead through my sins,
    my iniquities had sold me to Sheol,

12. when you delivered me, O Lord,
    according to the abundance of your compassion,
    and according to the abundance of your righteous acts.

13. I also love your name,
    and I have sought refuge in your shade.

14. When I call to mind your strength, my heart has power,
    and I am supported by your merciful acts.

15. Forgive, O Lord, my sin,
    and purify me from my iniquity.

16. Be gracious to me (in giving me) a spirit of truth and knowledge,
    do not let me stumble in iniquity.

17. Do not let an adversary (lit., a satan) rule over me,
    nor an unclean spirit.

18.   As for pain and evil inclination,
                   may they not take control of my bones.

19.   For, you, O Lord, (are) my praise,
                   and for you I wait every day.
20.   My brothers rejoice with me,
                   and (in) the house of my father they are awestruck
                        by your graciousness.
21.   . . .
                   . . . I will rejoice in you.

Notes to the Translation

   Plea 1 The existence of a verse or more preceding what is preserved in 11Q5
XIX, 1 is based on the existence of text in 11Q6 that has no clear parallel in the
Psalms or in the Bible.[7] The general idea "I am weak" or "poor" is found in Ps
142:7, which uses the verbal form of the root, דלותי, to express the same idea.
   Plea 2 As Sanders remarks, the verse calls to mind the thought of Isa 38:18
as well as Ps 6:6, which both articulate the idea that the dead do not offer praise
or thanksgiving to God, though neither uses the image of "worms" to represent
the dead but rather "Sheol," "those who descend to the pit," or simply "death."[8]
The parallel in thought to these biblical verses, especially Isa 38:18, is encouraged
through the next verse, which mimics the vocabulary and syntax of Isa 38:19. But
there is also a second meaning here, where the "maggots/worms" are a metaphor
not just for the dead but also for abject humanity, similar to the way the same
words (תולעה and רמה) are used in Job 25:6. In contrast to other biblical texts
that describe the inability of the dead to praise God and that insist only the living
can offer such praise (e.g., Isa 38:18; Pss 6:6; 30:10; 88:11–13; 115:17; Sir 17:27–28),
here in the Plea the living are described as literally clumsy (but, more likely, spiri-
tually weak), and their thanksgiving as dependent on God. These two character-
istics imply that human beings are dependent on God's mercy and are, without
this mercy, like helpless worms. If this reading of the verses is correct, then it
also illustrates how this text, like many other texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls,
uses biblical allusions for its own purposes. It alludes to Isa 38:18–19 through its
general idea (an appeal for salvation) as well as through the initial words of v. 3
(the repetition חי חי and the verb ידה), while at the same time alluding to Job
25:6 through the rare word pair רמה and תולעה and, through this, to the abject-
ness of humanity. This double allusion has the effect of associating those who do

---

   7. The words are preserved in 11Q6 frgs. 4-5, line 2 and are presumed to have occu-
pied the bottom of 11Q5 XVIII (see García Martínez and Tigchelaar, "Psalms Manuscripts
from Qumran Cave 11: A Preliminary Edition," 80; and García Martínez, Tigchelaar, van der
Woude, DJD 23:42). Kottsieper conjectures that as many as five bicola are lost ("11Q5," 133).
   8. Sanders, DJD 4:79; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 193.

not experience (or have not yet experienced) God's mercy with the dead. Similar associations between the dead and abject humanity are found in the *Hodayot,* as John J. Collins describes.[9]

Plea 3 The repetition in the phrase חי חי expresses, presumably, emphasis, as it does in Isa 38:19, which biblical verse also contains the verbs ידה and ידע (in the H-stem).

The construct plural participle מוטטי can be parsed as a mistake for מתמוטטי (i.e., the *hitpoᶜlel* participle of מוט) or as a *poᶜlel*-stem participle. In biblical and postbiblical Hebrew, the root מוט appears in the G-, N-, H-, and *hitpoᶜlel* stems; there is no clear evidence of a separate root מטט. If it is a *poᶜlel* participle, which stem presumably indicates a notion similar to the G-stem, then the feet are the subject, as רגל is often the subject of the G-stem of מוט in the Bible. If it is a *hitpoᶜlel* participle, then רגל should be interpreted as an adverbial genitive. In either case, the phrase is to be interpreted metaphorically as a reference to the spiritually weak. That the "living" are set in syntactic parallelism to "those whose feet stumble" implies that this is not a separate class of humanity but represents the general circumstance of all humans.

Plea 4 Notice that when vv. 2–4 are read together, they imply that God supplies what humanity repeats back to him, namely, kindness or mercy. This is akin to the way that Hebrew religious poetry itself derives from God, for God. That some of this text's verses are syntactically subordinate to others, something I argued was not the case in the Apostrophe to Zion, is demonstrated not only in these initial verses, but also between vv. 9 and 10.

Plea 5 The verse alludes to Job 12:10.[10] When the two texts are compared, it is clear that the verse in the Plea incorporates more alliteration than the Job passage by replacing רוח with נשמת, and איש with the phrase אתה נתתה at its end. The presence of the Hebrew נשמה and the phrase "you gave" may also be intended to recall the story of the creation of humanity in Isa 42:5, which, in turn, recalls Gen 2:7. In alluding to Job 12:10, the Plea complements its message that God is all powerful.

The second colon is presumably adding on to the idea of the first colon, through the ellipsis of the prepositional phrase "in your hand." This means that the verbal phrase "you gave" must be interpreted as an asyndetic relative clause. To interpret the verbal phrase as the main predicate of an independent clause makes less sense in the context; the verse is articulating the idea, consistently represented in the poem, that God controls and determines human life, that salvation is a result of God's mercy.

---

9. John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London: Routledge, 1997), 120–21.

10. Sanders notes the connection to Job (DJD 4:79 and "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 193 n. 7). Job 12:10 reads: אשר בידו נפש כל־חי ורוח כל־בשר־איש. Notice that the general context of Job 12:10 also recalls the context of the Plea; both mention animals (beasts and worms, respectively) and knowing (ידע).

Plea 7 A similar rection of the verb עזב and the preposition *min* is found in Jer 18:14, while Ruth 2:20 preserves an idiom similar to the one in this verse, where חסד is the subject of the verb עזב.

Plea 10 The second colon is similar to other expressions from the Bible, for example, Ps 145:3, ולגדלתו אין חקר. However, for the present verse, which lacks a conjunction between the cola, one is tempted to read the phrase לתהלתכה as an object of the preceding infinitive construct הגיד, a structure similar to that found in Ps 102:22. The verb, in fact, takes this object in the Bible, in Ps 51:17 and Isa 42:12. In this interpretation, the *lāmed* preposition would mark the direct object, and the following phrase, אין חקר, would be understood as an asyndetic relative clause.

Plea 11 The phrase למות הייתי does not have a clear analogue in the Bible, while the Dead Sea Scrolls preserve a similar idiom in only one fragmentary context (from 4Q521 7 + 5 II, 5). Sanders understands the first word of v. 11 as the noun "death."[11] Similarly, Puech suggests that the parallel expression in 4Q521 contains the word "death."[12] He cites a variety of other texts that express a similar idea, the closest in terms of the idiom מות + ל + היה is in Ezek 31:14 and Ps 118:18, where we find מות + ל + נתן, in the context of sinners.[13] By itself, however, the idiom in the Dead Sea Scrolls passages would seem to indicate possession, literally, "I belonged to death" or "they belonged to death."[14] It also seems possible that in Plea 11, the word could be construed as an infinitive construct from the verb "to die." The resulting translation would be: "I was about to die." The same kind of construction, where the infinitive construct with the *lāmed* preposition indicates something about to happen is seen also in Ap Zion 2.[15] Similar ideas are expressed in the Bible in different ways, for example, in Gen 25:32 with the verb הלך + ל + the infinitive construct מות. In the end, I prefer the construction with the noun, as this seems to fit the context best; the next colon does not assume that the poet was about to be sold to Sheol, but rather that this selling has already taken place and been completed. Illustrating that God can redeem even the lost soul would seem to be the point of the verse, an idea with precedents in the Bible (e.g., Ps 30:4).

---

11. Sanders's understanding of the word is implied in his translations (DJD 4:78 and "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 195).

12. Émile Puech, *Qumran Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD 25; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 24–25.

13. Note that Puech's citations are sometimes incorrect; for Ps 118:18 he has "Ps 118:8" (DJD 25:25).

14. The Bible reveals no exact parallels to these phrases; where it does contain partially similar expressions, e.g., כן־צדקה לחיים in Prov 11:19, it is perhaps better to assume a verb of movement, as suggested by the parallel to this colon: ומרדף רעה למותו.

15. See Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 610; GKC §114h-k; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 70–72; and van Peursen, *Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, 252–55.

The second colon creates an active statement out of the same idea found in passive constructions in Isa 50:1 (בעונתיכם נמכרתם) and in the Words of the Luminaries (4Q504 1–2 II, 15: ובע]וונותינו נמכרנו). Similar expressions of selling oneself in order to do evil things are found in relation to Ahab in the Bible (1 Kgs 21:20, 25) and the Israelites/Judahites (2 Kgs 17:17).

Plea 12 I assume that the first word of the verse is a *wāw*-consecutive imperfect, though this is not necessarily the case. The fact that this verse begins with the *wāw*-conjunction marks it as distinct from all the other verses; this suggests to me that the syntactic dependence between v. 16 and v. 17 has significance for the understanding of the verse. Presumably, if a direct appeal were intended (as in v. 6), then the verse would not begin with a conjunction.

Plea 14 The verse has its closest parallel in language and in thought with a passage from the *Hodayot:*

<div dir="rtl">

ובזוכרי כוח ידכה עם / המון רחמיכה התעודדתי ואקומה
ורוחי החזיקה במעמד לפני נגע כי נשענתי / בחסדיכה וכהמון רחמיכה

</div>

But, when I thought of the strength of your hand, with the abundance
   of your compassion I was restored and I stood (firm),
my spirit sustained in its position before affliction because I was
   supported through your merciful acts and according to the
   abundance of your compassion. (1QHᵃ XII, 36–38)[16]

The same idea is expressed also in Barkhi Naphshi (4Q437 2 I, 14) in a slightly different way:

<div dir="rtl">

אתך אדוני זכרתי ונסמך לבי ל[פני]ך

</div>

I recall you, O Lord, and my heart is supported before you.[17]

Plea 16 An idiom similar to that in the first colon is found in the Bible, where the verb חנן appears as an imperative with a suffixed 1st per. common sg. object and preceded by another noun (e.g., Ps 119:29: תורתך חנני). Nevertheless, a much closer idea is found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, in the *Hodayot* (1QHᵃ VI, 36–37):

<div dir="rtl">

ואני עבדך חנותני ברוח דעה ל[בחר בא]מת /
[וצדק] ולתעב כול דרך עולה

</div>

As for me, your slave, you showed me favor with a spirit of knowledge in
order to [choose tru]th, / [and righteousness] and to loathe every way of
injustice.[18]

---

16. For the Hebrew text, see Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:158.

17. For the Hebrew text, see Moshe Weinfeld and David Seely, "Barkhi Nafshi," in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. Esther Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 311. See also Ps 63:6–7.

18. For the Hebrew text, see Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:88.

The word אתקלה is interpreted as an N-stem cohortative, from תקל, meaning "to stumble," following the parsing of Polzin, who cites Sir 13:23 and 32:20 as examples where this root occurs in the N-stem.[19]

The verse's final word can be read in one of two ways, as noted by Sanders: either as בעויה, "in iniquity," or as בעווה, "in ruin."[20] Although Sanders allows for either interpretation, the idiom "stumble in iniquity," known from the Bible, where it occurs with different words כשל בעון (Hos 5:5, 14:2; Ps 31:11), suggests that the word here is, in fact, עויה.[21]

Plea 17 As noted first by Flusser, the appeal to be protected from demonic forces appears in the Aramaic Levi text (4Q213a 1 I, 17) with almost the exact words as in Plea 17 (אל תשלט בי כל שטן).[22] Writing in relation first to the Aramaic Levi text, Michael E. Stone and Jonas C. Greenfield note that the word שטן is more likely a generic "type or class of evil spirit," for which they cite several parallels from the Dead Sea Scrolls, where שטן is preceded by the word כל (1QH[a] XXII, 25 and 1QH[a] XXIV, 23; perhaps also 1Q28b I, 8).[23] These scholars, then, infer that the reference to שטן in Plea 17 is also probably to "a class of evil spirit."[24] More recently, Esther Eshel has emphasized that this text, like the Aramaic Levi text, includes traits common to apotropaic texts, such as an appeal for knowledge, protection from evil forces, separation from injustice, as well as praise of God as a means of invoking his power.[25]

The last word of the bicolon is formally ambiguous. It might be an adjective (טְמֵאָה), giving the literal translation "an impure spirit," or it might be the noun "impurity" (טֻמְאָה), giving the translation "a spirit of impurity." The latter phrase is found in the Bible (Zech 13:2, associated with the false prophets) as well as among the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q444 1-4i + 5, 8, in what is considered an incantation), though in both of these cases, the noun is definite: רוח הטמאה. Although one might expect a *plene* spelling of the noun in the scrolls, this happens only

---

19. Polzin, "Notes on the Dating of the Non-Massoretic Psalms of 11QPs[a]," 469. In 32:20, the verb occurs also in the volitive mood. The same etymology is noted by Goldstein, who cites Sir 15:12, where the verb occurs in the H-stem (review of Sanders, *Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11,* 307).

20. Sanders, DJD 4:79; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 195 n. 13.

21. Here, again, I follow Polzin (Notes on the Dating of the Non-Massoretic Psalms of 11QPs[a]," 469). Similar observations are made by Goldstein (review of Sanders, *Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11*, 307) and later by Greenfield ("Two Notes on the Apocryphal Psalms," 310).

22. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers," 196. He connected both passages with the similar wording in Ps 119:133: "do not let any iniquity rule over me."

23. Michael E. Stone and Jonas C. Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," *JBL* 112 (1993): 262. See also their presentation of the same text in "213a: 4QLevi[b]ar," in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. George J. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 28–29. Flusser makes a similar point ("Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers," 197).

24. Stone and Greenfield, "Prayer of Levi," 262 n. 27. The same observation is offered by Greenfield also in "Two Notes on the Apocryphal Psalms," 310.

25. E. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 75, 87.

rarely. Flusser notes that the "spirit of impurity" had become "synonymous with the 'evil spirit,'" and appears in *Jubilees*, the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and in the New Testament.[26] Nevertheless, the phrase is indefinite, as is שטן and the following יצר רע, all of which suggest that all the references are to generic malevolent forces.[27]

Plea 18 In her brief treatment of vv. 15–18, Esther Eshel cites Greenfield, who claimed that the verb ירשו in this text means "take control over," as it does in the Aramaic deeds of the Bar Kokhba era.[28] The root from which the verb derives is not the biblical ירש, but rather one known from Aramaic and postbiblical Hebrew: רשה. The verb occurs not only in deeds of the second century C.E., but also in the Targum and other texts complemented with the preposition *bêt* marking what is controlled or taken over.[29] The verb appears also in the H- and Hp (*hopʕal*) stem in the *Damascus Document* and in Sirach (CD XI, 20; Sir 3:22), where it means, respectively, "to permit" and "be permitted."

Plea 19 An idea similar to that in the first colon is found in Jer 17:14, though with different vocabulary: תהלתי אתה. In Plea 19, as well as in Jeremiah, the suffix marks the agent of an action, and the independent pronoun marks the object of the action; thus, "you are my praise" indicates that God is the thing praised by the poet. Notice, by contrast, how the 2nd per. fem. sg. suffix on תהלה in v. 10 above marks not the agent of the action but the recipient, God.

Reading and Structure of the Poem

The poem preserved in 11Q5 can be divided into four paragraphs, vv. 2–8, vv. 9–14, vv. 15–18, and vv. 19–21.[30] The first paragraph expresses general sentiments and ideas concerning the reciprocal or circular relationship between God and humanity, where humanity praises God through God's own instruction and is otherwise dependent on God's mercy. The second paragraph uses many of the same words as the first to describe the poet's praise of God. The third paragraph is a direct appeal to God for deliverance, which involves forgiveness of sins, the

---

26. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers," 205.

27. This evaluation follows Greenfield's ("Two Notes on the Apocryphal Psalms," 310).

28. E. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 76. See Jonas C. Greenfield in *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri* (ed. Yigael Yadin et al. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002), 99, commenting on *P. Yadin* 7.15. The same point is made by him in "Two Notes on the Apocryphal Psalms," 311–12, as well as by Polzin ("Notes on the Dating of the Non-Massoretic Psalms of 11QPsᵃ," 469–70) and Goldstein (review of Sanders, *Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11,* 307).

29. See Jastrow, s.v. For more on רשה, see Polzin, "Notes on the Dating of the Non-Massoretic Psalms of 11QPsᵃ," 469–470 n. 9.

30. Most scholars do not make explicit their understanding of the division of the poem. Kottsieper ("11Q5," 147) determines what he feels to be the original text and then divides this into three paragraphs, the first comprising vv. 2–4 and 7–8; the second, vv. 9, 11, 12, 15, 16a, 17a, 19; and the third, vv. 20–21.

bestowal of understanding, and protection from inimical spiritual forces. The fourth paragraph (only partially preserved) seems to be more optimistic and describes the rejoicing of the poet and his "brothers." The first two paragraphs of the poem address similar ideas in a consistent sequence: Praise of God is mentioned in vv. 2–3, as it is in vv. 9–10. The poet appeals to God in much the same words in vv. 6 and 12, and the importance of loving "the name of God" is emphasized in vv. 7 and 13. The repetitions in the second paragraph help to demonstrate the truth and relevance of the general ideas expressed in the first paragraph. This is especially important in the apotropaic context of the present poem.

It should also be mentioned that in some instances the paragraphs can be broken down further into two-verse units, based on content, though this is not as consistent as it is in Ps 155. Thus, vv. 2–3 form one unit, as do vv. 4–5, 9–10, 11–12, 17–18. In addition to their content, these units exhibit structural features that encourage their grouping together, as explained below.

The first verses (at least those completely preserved, vv. 2–3) are structurally similar in their syntactic pattern, a pattern that distinguishes them from the following verses. In each verse, the first colon exhibits the pattern SVM, while each second colon begins with a verb and ends with a subject. This structural similarity contributes to the common idea that the verses express. The verses nuance the biblical sentiment that only the living can praise God. In the Bible, similar ideas are usually expressed in appeals to God for assistance (e.g., Isa 38:18; Ps 6:6).[31] The assumption is that God needs living humans in order to receive praise; the relationship presumes a reciprocity between humans and God. While this idea might still be relevant for some Jewish groups in the later part of the Second Temple period, it seems less important to this text itself, which, instead, stresses humanity's utter dependence on God's mercy. The initial verses are not meant to imply that God will lack praise if the poet dies, but rather to emphasize the importance of God's mercy and the despair resulting from its absence. The poet is appealing not simply for life, but for "a spirit of faithfulness and knowledge," which allows him to be confident of God's bestowal of mercy. As described above, humanity's helplessness is implied by the syntactic parallelism between the "living" (חי) and "those whose feet stumble" (מוטטי רגל) in v. 3. In addition, these verses subtly imply that humans are worms. The word pair תולעה // רמה in v. 2 is used as a metaphor for the dead, though the pair also alludes to the characterization of humans as maggots/worms (Job 25:6). The double meaning of "worms" is not a unique association; in Isa 41:14 there is a similar play on words, where תולעת is parallel to the word מתים, which can be interpreted either as "humans" or "dead." Nevertheless, here the double association of "worms" is significant, since it underscores the spiritual dimension to vv. 2–3, which informs the whole poem. This dimension might not otherwise be as apparent, given the more tangi-

---

31. Alternatively this motif is used for encouraging humanity to praise God (e.g, Ps 115:17; Sir 17:27–28).

ble, physical threats that are at issue where similar statements occur in the Bible, as in Ps 6 (grief or illness) and in Isa 38 (illness).

The motif of humanity's helplessness and passivity is amplified in the next verses (4–5), which are linked not only in their content but also through their common syntactic organization. In each verse, the first colon begins with a *bêt*-prepositional phrase (either including a verbal element or used as a predicate), and the second colon begins with an object and ends with a verb. This structure with the predicates at the beginning and ending of the verses is essentially the opposite of that seen in vv. 2–3, where the subjects are in these positions.[32] This two-verse unit, however, helps to qualify the preceding unit by specifying that thanking God is predicated on God's teaching and instruction. Here the relationship between God and humanity is not so much reciprocal as it is circular; God supplies humanity what he wants from humanity. The circularity of the relationship is underlined by lexical repetition between vv. 2 and 4: Recounting God's mercy (חסד) depends on God teaching humanity about his mercy (חסד). On the one hand, this teaching (literally, "causing to know") can be interpreted as a kind of instruction, the result of which is presumably akin to the "spirit of . . . knowledge" the poet asks for in v. 16. On the other hand, the teaching of mercy may also be interpreted as God's actual practice of mercy, that is, salvation or deliverance. Both interpretations are probably valid for the poem; the poet has experienced God's salvation, as described in vv. 11–12, but still wishes for a greater capacity to trust in God's mercy, a "spirit of faithfulness and knowledge." The allusion in v. 5 to Job 12:10 helps to emphasize another point of this paragraph, namely, God's omnipotence.

That power rests with God is implied again in v. 6, where the poet appeals to God to act according to God's beneficence, compassion, and righteous acts; the poet's own righteousness seems not to be at issue. Verses 7–8 continue to describe features of the human–divine relationship and its reciprocity. Verse 7 states that God listens to those who love him, a somewhat obvious idea but one that is important, since it is the one element of human beings that seems to reflect their own volition. In v. 7, the inherent connection between these things is emphasized through the phonetic similarity between "hear," שמע, and "name," שם. The circular and/or reciprocal relationship is again emphasized through the repetition of the root חסד in v. 8, where the pious (חסידים) are crowned with mercy (חסד) by God. Note that the pious do not exhibit mercy or compassion on their own, but rather they receive these things from God.

Verse 9 marks a new part of the poem, as it describes the perspective of the poet. As a living person, the poet praises and gives thanks to God, echoing the language of v. 2 (חסד, ידה). As mentioned above, the shift to the first person helps to illustrate the truth of the preceding paragraph and demonstrates the efficacy of praising and appealing to God. This is illustrated also through the repetition of

---

32. Notice also the phonetic similarity between the verse-initial prepositional phrases.

words. Although the same roots appear in each paragraph, notice the subtle shift between the praise of "your mercy" (חסדכה) in v. 2 and praise of "your merciful acts" (חסדיכה) in v. 9. The plural form of the noun appears also in v. 14, at the end of the second paragraph, paralleling the singular form at the end of the first paragraph (in v. 8). The shift, presumably, complements the idea that God's mercy has an immediate relevance for individuals; God's mercy leads to acts of salvation. The second paragraph continues with other parallels to the first. Similar to how human thanksgiving to God is qualified as dependent on God's instruction in v. 4, in v. 10 praise is qualified as something that has "no searching," that is, it cannot be completely comprehended by humans. In this way, praise of God is not really a human activity, but is a divine attribute, akin to God's faithfulness and beneficence. It exists beyond precise human articulation. This two-verse unit is characterized on the grammatical level by the sequence of infinitives construct in vv. 9a, 9b, and 10a; in addition, each colon from v. 9b to v. 11a begins with a *lāmed*-preposition.

The connection between v. 11 and the immediately preceding verses helps to link offering thanksgiving and God's deliverance of the poet. Although the description of being close to death in v. 11 may be a present circumstance, I prefer interpreting it as a brief description of a past experience. In this way, vv. 11–12 may be understood as part of the same praise that is mentioned in vv. 9–10; it is common in offering thanksgiving to describe a past act of mercy. As mentioned above, the repetition in v. 12 of the same words and syntax from v. 6 offers proof of God's beneficence and even evidence of how an appeal to God is carried out exactly as asked.

As if to confirm the truth of the assertion in v. 7 that only "those who love his name" will be heard, v. 13 states that the poet loves God's name. This love and seeking of protection almost seem to have an effect themselves, as v. 14 explains that the very thought of God's power gives confidence to the poet. This is important, since, as others have suggested, the text might have had an apotropaic function; the utterance of a prayer has power itself just as thinking about God creates a healing effect.

Verse 15 initiates a series of explicit appeals concerning forgiveness of sin, the bestowal of spirits of faithfulness and knowledge, and the protection against various inimical forces. The fact that forgiveness of sins is mentioned first is important because it resonates with the mention of sin leading to death in v. 11. The list of appeals is also interesting because it follows a logical sequence that implies complete protection: the removal of what is bad (i.e., sin), the supplement of what is beneficial (a "spirit of faithfulness and knowledge"), and the prevention of what is harmful (dishonor, possession by a satan, and pain). It is this portion of the poem that has drawn most scholarly attention. The paragraph is unlike the preceding paragraphs because of the relative absence of parallelism between cola of a verse. The only grammatical parallelism is found in v. 15, which, together with v. 17, contains the only examples of semantic parallelism. As is the case

in the first and second paragraphs, here the paragraph contains a smaller two-verse unit, vv. 17–18, which concerns protection from harm. As is the case with the two-verse units above, here the unit is distinguished by similar grammatical structure, a chiastic alignment where an initial jussive verb + *bêt*-prepositional phrase in v. 17a is matched by the same sequence in v. 18b, and where a subject phrase containing two words in v. 17b is matched by a similar pattern in v. 18a.

The last preserved portion of the poem suggests that the praise of God continues and results in rejoicing for the poet and his or her family. Verse 19 associates praise of God with waiting (or, hoping) for his mercy. This underscores the performative aspect of the present text, as an apotropaic prayer whose utterance contributes to the healing of the poet. As v. 14 states itself, the contemplation of God results in the poet's confidence and uplifted spirit. Overall, the poem argues that praising God and offering thanks are linked intimately with the expectation of divine assistance. The connection between praise of God and God's assistance is something found in similar texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls. As Esther Eshel describes, in other apotropaic prayers, specifically 4Q510–511, "the *Maskil* invokes god's powers by means of God's praise."[33] It also bears mentioning that in magic literature it is common to find words having special powers to effect change by themselves. Thus, an appeal for assistance is very much like a direct act of assistance. In the case of the present poem, the efficacy of the appeal is seen in the last verses, where the poet rejoices.

Line Length, Parallelism, and Allusion to Scripture

Among the nineteen preserved verses, the poem predominantly contains bicola; there are only two tricola, vv. 6 and 12. The cola in the first verse paragraph (esp. vv. 2–7) exhibit disparity in their lengths, while the cola in the second and third paragraphs usually have approximately similar numbers of consonants, syllables, and words.[34] The length of bicola varies throughout the poem, again where clear discrepancies are found between adjacent verses; for example, v, 9 contains 34 consonants, 20 syllables, and 7 words, while v. 10 contains 25 consonants, 16 syllables, and 4 words. The two tricola (vv. 6 and 12) as well as vv. 17 and 18 contain cola that are relatively shorter than those of the other verses. One implication of this is that the length of the tricola is similar to the length of surrounding bicola, as is the case in Sir 51:13–30 and Ps 151A. Considering all the verses, sometimes the initial colon is longer and sometimes the second is longer.

---

33. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 87.

34. The following notes the consonants-syllables-words for every preserved verse: v. 2: 15-8-2 // 18-11-3; v. 3: 11-6-3 // 18-10-4; v. 4: 17-11-2 // 13-8-2; v. 5: 15-8-4 // 17-10-5; v. 6: 17-12-3 // 10-6-2 // 13-7-2; v. 7: 19-12-5 // 15-9-2; v. 8: 17-10-4 // 19-12-4; v. 9: 18-11-4 // 16-9-3; v. 10: 12-8-2 // 13-8-2; v. 11: 14-10-3 // 19-11-3; v. 12: 11-8-2 // 10-6-2 // 13-7-2; v. 13: 16-9-3 // 11-8-2; v. 14: 18-11-4 // 18-10-3; v. 15: 14-10-3 // 12-9-2; v. 16: 17-11-4 // 12-8-2; v. 17: 11-6-2 // 8-6-2; v. 18: 11-6-3 // 11-7-2; v. 19: 13-8-3 // 16-9-3; v. 20: 11-7-2 // 20-12-4.

There is relatively little in the way of parallelism within individual cola. However, repetition does occur in v. 3a (חי // חי) and in v. 8b (חסד // חסידיו).

More prominent are the numerous semantic and repetitive parallels that occur between cola of a verse. These are concentrated in the first and second paragraphs. The semantic parallels are far more important than the repetitive parallels and usually involve word pairs that are familiar from the Bible.[35] Where the word pairs are not found in the Bible, they seem to be generic matches, like טוב and רחמים in v. 6. Moreover, the semantic pairs are usually complemented by grammatical parallelism between the cola.[36] The dominance of parallelism within the verse does not extend, however, to the third paragraph, which is considered the core of the apotropaic prayer. What is preserved of the last verses suggests that the absence of parallelism within the verse might have extended into the fourth paragraph. Notice too that the single example of a verse not exhibiting the typical repetition of parallelistic patterning occurs in the third paragraph, in v. 18. The poem exhibits at least seven cases of ellipsis of the predicate or verb (vv. 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, and 17), a very high number. The structure of these verses is often such that the first word or phrase of the verse is gapped and the second colon contains the same basic grammatical structure as the first, minus the predicate and plus an additional few words.

As already described, some of the Plea's verses can be grouped into two-verse units, which exhibit common syntactic patterns between their verses. Repetitive parallelism between adjacent verses also occurs within one of these units, vv. 2–3 (with the repetition of ידה). Curiously, however, the other two-verse units do not attest similar repetitions; where repetitive parallels occur it is usually between unrelated verses, even between verse paragraphs.[37] Semantic parallelism plays only a marginal role in the poem, appearing strongest between vv. 9 and 10, where v. 10 is syntactically dependent on v. 9.

Perhaps most obvious in the poem are the numerous repetitions between verses separated by a verse or more. As already explained, these repetitions help to link the first and second paragraphs and illustrate the practical benefits of praising and appealing to God's mercy. In addition, repetitive parallelism in this distribution also creates a degree of coherency in the poem, where, for example, righteousness or righteous acts are mentioned in vv. 4, 6, 8, and 12.[38]

Phonetic parallelism is most prominent where repetitive parallelism occurs,

---

35. These include: נפש (v. 4); צדקה // חסד // שכל // ידע; ספר // ידה // תולעה // רמה (v. 2); בשר // (v. 5); רחמים -חסד // צדקה (v. 7); הלל // ידה (v. 9); חטא // עון (v. 11); חטאה // עון (v. 15).

36. This occurs in vv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15.

37. These include the parallels between vv. 7 and 8 (חסד // חסדו), between vv. 8 and 9 (עווה // עווני), between vv. 12 and 13 (צלכה // תצילני), between vv. 15 and 16 (חסדיכה // חסד), between vv. 16 and 17 (רוח // רוח), and between vv. 20 and 21 (אשמחה // ישמחו).

38. Note also the repetition of חי between vv. 3 and 5, of ידע between vv. 4 and 16, of עשה between vv. 6 and 8, of שם between vv. 7 and 9, of חטא between vv. 11 and 15, and of חנן between vv. 16 and 20.

especially within the colon or verse. In addition, phonetic parallelism seems to play a role between adjacent verses, specifically between בהודיעכה and בידכה in vv. 4–5 and between שמכה and נסמכתי in vv. 13–14.

Plea, like Apostrophe to Zion, makes relatively frequent use of biblical language and imagery. The second verse's assertions that "worms" and "maggots" do not praise God resonate with many other biblical passages that speak in similar terms about "the dead" and "those who descend to the pit." The verse (together with v. 3) alludes (through the vocabulary and syntax) more specifically, however, to Isa 38:18–19. While in this biblical passage the living are contrasted with the dead in order to encourage God's salvation, in the Plea the significance of the contrast is subtler, something that can be inferred through a secondary allusion made in the same verse. Plea 2 also seems to allude to Job 25:6, where the word pair רמה and תולעה occurs in parallelism, a rare occurrence in the Bible (see Isa 14:11). The Job passage is unlike that from Isaiah 38 in that the reference is not to the dead but rather to the abject state of humanity. The double allusion in Plea 2–3 (to Job 25 and Isa 38) complements the idea expressed in the following verses that humanity, when it lacks God's mercy, is dejected and like the dead, unable to praise him. Another reference to Job appears in Plea 5, which alludes to Job 12:10, mirroring the biblical verse's expression (v. 5a repeats verbatim Job 12:10a) and syntax. Here, the allusion complements the sentiment implied in the preceding verses, that God is all powerful. The Plea alters the words of Job 12:10b so that the text becomes slightly more alliterative and is reminiscent of the language used to describe the creation of humanity in Isa 42:5 and Gen 2:7.

The poem also contains echoes of other biblical passages, for example, the reference in v. 11 to sins selling one to Sheol, which echoes Isa 50:11. More interesting, however, are the several parallel expressions between the Plea and other Dead Sea Scrolls, especially the *Hodayot*. These include, in v. 14, a parallel expression to 1QH[a] XII, 36–38 and 4Q437 2 I, 14; in v. 16, a parallel to 1QH[a] VI, 36–37; and in v. 17 a parallel to 4Q213a 1 I, 17. These are not necessarily cases of allusion in the Plea. If we assume that these verses are part of an original text, then they probably antedate the *Hodayot*. However, it bears mentioning that these same verses that bear similarities to other Dead Sea Scrolls are some of the same that Kottsieper has identified as later additions. If Kottsieper is correct, then these verses may, in fact, contain allusions to or echoes of the above texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls. In either case, the similarity in language reveals at the very least common idioms (like the appeal against satans in v. 17 and 4Q213a) and suggests the possibility that later poetry alluded to and/or echoed the non-Masoretic poems of 11Q5, a supposition that seems borne out by the examination of the last poem in this study, the Hymn to the Creator, whose text is alluded to in other postbiblical texts, including *Jubilees*.

CONCLUSIONS

Although the Plea is often described as exhibiting much biblical language and imagery, the underlying meanings and significance of its metaphors are not typically biblical. Instead, the expressions, like those in the Apostrophe to Zion and in other postbiblical poems, adopt biblical idioms to express a theology that is distinct from the one expressed in the Bible. The present text uses language and imagery common in the Bible to emphasize the dejected state of humanity in general (characterized as inherently sinful and wormlike), and to underline that humanity is saved only through the mercy of God. The helplessness and implied vulnerability of humanity are something that this poem's theology shares with the *Hodayot*, something that is all the more interesting given the parallels in language between the Plea and passages from other Dead Sea Scrolls. The Plea also shares features with apotropaic prayers from the Dead Sea Scrolls, including an association between praise of God and the efficacy of prayer itself. This aligns with observations made in relation to the other poems about the importance of praise and blessing.

Hymn to the Creator (11Q5 XXVI, 9–15)

Introduction

The Hymn to the Creator (= Hymn) is the shortest of the texts scrutinized in this study. It is conventionally described as a wisdom text, similar in this sense to Sir 51:13–30 and Ps 154. The beginning of the text is preserved, though its ending is not. It is often assumed that only a few lines are missing, since the bottom of col. XXVI also presumably contained 2 Sam 23:1–6, based on the existence of 2 Sam 23:7 at the top of col. XXVII.[1] Opinions on the merits of the text's poetry vary widely; Sanders qualifies the poem in his introduction as "rather pedestrian," though Esther Chazon calls it a "beautiful poem."[2] The poem has been discussed especially in relation to its possible allusion to various biblical passages, like the angelic declaration "holy, holy, holy" in Isa 6:3 and the prophecy against idolatry in Jer 10:12–13 (which is repeated in 51:15–16 and a portion of which also appears in Ps 135:7).[3] In addition, the poem is discussed in relation to other texts that apparently echo or allude to it, for example, the description of creation in *Jub.* 2:2–3 and another text from the Dead Sea Scrolls, one that treats the antediluvian era, 4Q370 I, 1.[4] From these two echoes of or allusions to the Hymn in later texts, we may surmise that, although the poem recycles many expressions

---

1. Skehan proposed that only a single verse was missing, the following line having been left blank ("A Liturgical Complex in 11QPsᵃ," *CBQ* 34 [1973]: 202–3); see also García Martínez, "Salmos Apócrifos en Qumran," 215; Klaus Seybold, "Das Hymnusfragment 11QPsᵃ XXVI 9-15," in idem, *Studien zur Psalmenauslegung* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1998), 199 [his study was written in 1986, but first published in this collection of essays]; and Chazon, "Use of the Bible," 91 n. 15. Dahmen expresses caution at any reconstruction (*Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 249).

2. Sanders, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 199; Chazon, "Use of the Bible," 92.

3. See Weinfeld, "Angelic Song over the Luminaries," 131–57; idem, "Traces of *Kedushat Yozer* and *Pesukey de-Zimra* in the Qumran Literature and in Ben Sira" (in Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 45 (1975–76): 15–26; Seybold, "Das Hymnusfragment 11QPsa XXVI 9-15," 199–207, 310–11; and, more recently, R. M. M. Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy: A Study in Their Development in Syria and Palestine from the Qumran Texts to Ephrem the Syrian* (STAC 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 135–36.

4. Patrick W. Skehan, "*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 343–47;

and images from biblical texts, it still was understood to be a significant work in its own right. The present study attempts to investigate the structure of this hymn and how it complements the poem's theme, as well as to suggest a new way that the links between the Hymn and the Bible may be interpreted.

Text and Analysis of the Poem

			Grammatical Analysis	*Semantic Analysis*
1.	קדוש קדשים לדור ודור	/ ^{9} גדול וקדוש יהוה	PPS//P^{2}M^2	abc//b+bdd
2.	ואחריו המון מים רבים	לפניו הדר / ^{10} ילך	MSV//MS^3	ab//c+de
3.	אמת/^{11}ומשפט וצדק מכון כסאו	חסד ואמת סביב פניו	SSM$^{2(=P)}$//SSSP^2	abc+d//ba'a"e+f
4.	שחר הכין בדעת /^{12} לבו	מבדיל אור מאפלה	P$^{3(VOM)}$//OVM^2	abc$^{(\neq b)}$//b'de+f
5.	כי הראם את אשר לוא ידעו	אז ראו כול מלאכיו וירננו	MVS^{2}V//VOV	ab+cd//ae
6.	אוכל טוב לכול חי	/^{13} מעטר הרים תנובות	P$^{3(VOO)}$//O^{2}M^2	abc//c'de+f
7.	מכין תבל בחוכמתו	ברוך עושה /^{14} ארץ בכוחו	PS$^{3(VOM)}$//S$^{3(VOM)}$	ab+cd//b'+c'e
8.	ויוצא ^{15}/ [רוח] מאו[צרותיו]	בתבונתו נטה שמים	MVO//VOM	abc//dec'
9.	ויעל נשיא[ים מ]ק[צה /^{16} [ארץ]	[ברקים למט]ר עשה	OMV//VOM^2	abc//def+g

Translation

1. Great and holy (is) the Lord,
   the holiest of holy ones from generation to generation.
2. Before him goes splendor,
   and after him the roar of many waters.
3. Mercy and faithfulness surround his presence,
   faithfulness, justice, and righteousness (are) his throne's
   foundation.

4. (He is) the one who divided light from darkness,
   dawn he established with the knowledge of his mind.
5. Afterward, all his angels saw and sang out in joy,
   for he showed them what they had not known.

6. (He is) the one who crowned mountains with produce,
   good food for all the living.
7. Blessed be the one who made earth with his strength,
   the one who established the world in his wisdom.

Carol Newsom, "370. 4QAdmonition Based on the Flood," in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (ed. M. Broshi et al.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 85–97, esp. 91–92.

8.   In his understanding he stretched the heavens,
            and brought forth the wind from his storehouses.
9.   He made lightning for rain,
            and made clouds rise from the ends of the earth.

Notes to the Translation

Hymn 1 The declaration of God's greatness occurs in many passages of the Bible, but perhaps most significant are those passages whose larger contexts are alluded to in the last part of the Hymn; these include Ps 135:5 and Jer 10:6, both of which use the word גדול. In Ps 99:3, we see the appearance of both words "great" and "holy" (גדול and קדוש), which are used to qualify God's name, though the two words are technically part of two separate clauses. Similarly, in Isa 12:6 the two words also occur, where God (that is, קדוש ישראל) is called great (גדול). The closest parallel to the initial assertion of Hymn 1 is found, however, in 4Q372 1, 29 (4QNarrative and Poetic Composition[b], also called 4QApocryphon of Joseph[b]), where God (אל) is declared, among other things, "great, holy," in this order.[5]

The repetition of the word "holy" three times in this verse evokes the famous passage of Isa 6:3 where the angels are described calling to one another "Holy! Holy! Holy!" Chazon has also called attention to the fact that the Hymn, like Isaiah 6, contains references to the angels, God's throne, and the singing of the angels.[6] In part on the basis of these similarities, she concludes that the present poem "accesses and carries over the immediate context of Isaiah's throne vision" and harmonizes it with the throne vision of Ezek 1:24.[7] According to her interpretation, this suggests the Hymn's function and significance.

> The Hymn's appropriation of Isa 6:3's angelic *trishagion* and its description of the angelic song imply that by reciting this Hymn, the human worshippers were joining the angels in praising God. It may well be the case that the Hymn, like the angelic song, was recited at dawn.[8]

---

5. For the Hebrew text, see Eileen Schuller and Moshe Bernstein, "372. 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition[b]," in *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh and Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* (ed. Douglas M. Gropp et al.; DJD 28; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 168. Schuller and Bernstein comment that in this passage from 4Q372 the standard phrase of three attributes (גדול, גבור, and נורא) is "expanded by the addition of a 'new' adjective after each of the traditional elements" (ibid., 178).

6. Chazon, "Use of the Bible," 93–94.

7. Ibid., 93. Note that Chazon does not claim that the text is an ancient form of the Qedushah liturgy or that it contains the exact language of the biblical texts.

8. Ibid., 94. The idea that the Hymn is a morning prayer is assumed by Daniel K. Falk (*Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998], 49, 51–52), though the text itself does not contain any of the first five features adopted by Falk himself as criteria for identifying prayers in ancient texts (ibid., 16). These features are drawn from Esther Chazon's study "Prayers from Qumran and Their Historical Implications," *DSD*

I agree with Chazon that Hymn 1 is similar to Isa 6:3. However, I wonder if the repetition of "holy" in two separate phrases and cola should be described as an "appropriation of . . . [the] *trishagion*." In part, my hesitancy is because of the distinction between the present verse and Isa 6:3, but also because the kind of repetition we find here appears also in other texts we have looked at, for example, Apostrophe to Zion 3, where the root דור appears four times, presumably only to demonstrate the inevitability that "generations" (דור ודור) would "dwell" (דור) in Jerusalem in the future. A similar kind of repetition frequently pertains to passages that mention the holiness of God but which do not otherwise directly relate to Isa 6 or to the words of the angels. For example, in Lev 21:8, the reason the priests are holy is explained by God's declaration of his own holiness and of his being the one who makes people holy ("they will be holy for you because I am holy, the Lord who makes you holy"); and, in Isa 5:16 we read: "The holy God shows himself holy with righteousness."[9] In these cases, I assume, the overriding purpose of this root repetition is to underline the inherent holiness of God and the rituals applying to his worship. Furthermore, the present verse seems to be a juxtaposition of idioms pertaining to God ("great and holy" and "holiest of holy ones"), known from the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. This juxtaposition, of course, may (in the mind of the reader) echo the Isaian passage, but it is perhaps too much to say that it "appropriates" the phrase from Isa 6:3.

In addition, I am more cautious than Chazon in believing that we can extrapolate from this verse and its echo of Isa 6:3 that the poem seeks to express a joint human and angelic praise, even if this concept were current at the time when this text was written. This poem does not present God in the same terms as Isa 6. The Isaian passage, as well as the passage from Ezekiel 1 that describes the throne, differs from the Hymn in the sense that the biblical texts represent God and the angels in quite specific, concrete terms, while the Hymn avoids most anthropomorphic language, as well as specific physical descriptions of God or his attributes. Even the image of a throne is abstracted, with its foundation being described as "faithfulness, justice, and righteousness." When the Hymn does employ words associated with the human body, they are either used in their most general sense (פניו = "presence" in Hymn 3a), or are elements of the body that are themselves beyond human perception (לבו in v. 4b). Although the text mentions the angels celebrating in v. 5 and includes a blessing in v. 7, these two events do not seem linked. Contrast this with the common expression for praise in Ps 148, which implies that the created world (including the angels and humanity) praises

---

1 (1994): 273–74; Falk supplements these five characteristics with six other "possible" features, though it is not obvious which characteristics he feels the Hymn contains.

    9. The Hebrew of Lev 21:8 is: קדש יהיה לך כי קדוש אני יהוה מקדשכם . . . , while that of Isa 5:16 is: והאל הקדוש נקדש בצדקה . . . The manner in which the root קדש is repeated in these passages should inspire caution in those wishing to see veiled or hidden references to the *trishagion* in Ps 99 and in 1 Sam 2:1–10 (Song of Hannah) (see Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers,* 141, and the references cited in n. 79).

God in a common way. If the reference to Isa 6:3 is more than a mere echo, then it seems more likely that it attempts to qualify the vision in Isa 6 of God on a throne in a majestic robe, surrounded by angels in deferential postures.

The phrase "holiest of holy ones" (קדוש קדושים) refers to God in at least one other text from the Dead Sea Scrolls, specifically at the beginning of a noncanonical psalm that seems to date, like the Hymn, to the late-Persian/Hellenistic eras: 4Q381 76–77, 7.[10] In addition, a similar expression occurs in Greek, ἅγιε ἐν ἁγίοις, in 3 Macc 2:2, 21, as Schuller notes.[11] Parallel expressions that are used as epithets of God include "king of kings" and "lord of lords" in Deut 10:17; Dan 2:47; and Ps 136:3.[12] Another term, "God of gods" (or, אל אלים), from Dan 11:36 may be even more apposite, since both קדושים and אלים are used to describe angels. The plural form of the same expression in Hymn 1, קדושי קדושים, indicates a group of angels, the angels of the presence, in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.[13] In that same work, one finds other cases where the root קדש is repeated, for example, the phrases [קדושי קודש קודש]ים (4Q400 1 II, 6) and המקדיש בקודעו לכול קדושו (4Q403 1 I, 31), which Newsom translates respectively "the holy ones of holiest holiness" and "who sanctifies by His holiness all His holy ones."[14] In response to the latter passage, Newsom notes the text's "intensive paronomasia in the calls to praise."[15]

Hymn 2 The verse's first colon uses language similar to Ps 85:14, where righteousness is said to go (הלך) before God, though this biblical verse does not mention anything coming "after" God, as v. 2b does. Similarly, Ps 96:6 uses some of the same vocabulary as is found in v. 2 to express a similar idea, "glory and splen-

---

10. On this text, see Eileen Schuller, "381. 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B," in *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. Esther Eshel et al.; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 87–172, esp. 155–58; and eadem, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 215–26.

11. Schuller, DJD 11:157; and eadem, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran*, 220. Although the assertion is made that Weinfeld has produced examples of this phrase from later rabbinic prayers, this is actually not borne out by Weinfeld's own examples, which do not contain the exact superlative expression as found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Where קדוש קדושים does appear (Codex Turin 51, pp. 123–24) it is not an epithet of God (as Weinfeld suggests in "Angelic Song over the Luminaries," 133–35, here 133 n. 8), but rather is the word קדושים, meaning "angels" and the subject of the preceding verb יאמרו, while קדוש is what the angels say, as suggested by the more obvious word order in a Genizah fragment that Weinfeld also cites (frg. no. 6 of Mann's article = T.S. 8H9⁴): ולך יאמרו קדושים קדוש. For the Genizah and Turin Codex 51 text, see Jacob Mann, "Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service," *HUCA* 2 (1925): 305, 335 n. 134. For Turin Codex 51, see also Abraham Berliner, *Gesammelte Schriften: Band I, Italien* (Frankfurt: Kauffmann, 1913), 134.

12. See Schuller, DJD 11:157.

13. Newsom, DJD 11:179.

14. Ibid., 184–85, 269–71. As Newsom notes, the letters in the second passage allow for several different interpretations; she reads בקודעו as a scribal mistake for בקודשו and קדושו as a phonetic variant of the more common קדושיו (ibid., 270, 272).

15. Ibid., 272.

dor [הדר] (are) before him," though without the verb הלך and without mentioning anything coming after God.

The "roar of many waters" (המון מים רבים) is a phrase that has parallels with the phrases "roar of waters" (המון מים) in Jer 10:13 (= 51:16) and "the sound of many waters" (קול מים רבים) in Ezek 1:24 and 43:2. The exact phrase from Hymn 2 is found only in the *Hodayot* (1QHᵃ X, 18) (כקול המון מים רבים), where it seems to be a true harmonization of the two biblical passages; it is used in that passage as a comparison to the mutterings of the "men of deceit" and, in this way, seems closer to the comparison in Isa 17:13: "the nations groan like the groaning [שאון] of many waters." The phrase in Hymn 2 is closer to the biblical texts, since in these texts "many waters" describes the sound of the angels' wings (Ezek 1:24) and God's voice (Jer 10:13). Although the mention of "many waters" may not explicitly reference the waters of chaos and Yahweh's dominance of them, it resonates with these associations since "many waters" are often associated with the sea and destructive water (in, e.g., 2 Sam 22:17 = Ps 18:17; Pss 29:3; 32:6; 77:20; 144:7; Hab 3:15).[16] The precise source of the sound in Hymn 2 is unclear; it is conceivable that it is the result of angels' wings, God's voice (i.e., thunder), or an echo of subdued chaos; more likely, however, the poem does not seek to pinpoint a source, but simply to associate it with the divine presence. As a result of this vagueness, it is hard to determine whether the references to the Bible are echoes or allusions, that is, whether they significantly contribute to the meaning of the Hymn or not.

As a whole, the verse expresses not only a complete perceptual experience of the divine (by describing both vision and sound), but it also succinctly represents the simultaneous majesty and power of God. A similar succinct representation is found in Ezek 43:2:

והנה כבוד אלהי ישראל בא מדרך הקדים
וקולו כקול מים רבים והארץ האירה מכבדו

Lo, the glory of the God of Israel came from the east;
his voice (was) like the sound of many waters and the earth was aglow
from his glory.

Although the two passages are similar, notice again a slight distinction. The Ezekiel passage seems based on the classic association between God and storms; God's voice is a common metaphor for thunder and, although it is not explicit, the mention of the earth aglow suggests lightning, all the more so when we recall Ps 97:4: האירו ברקיו תבל, "his lightening makes the world glow." In Hymn 2, by contrast, the association with storms is not as clear; there is no mention of God's

---

16. The phrase "many waters" also describes life-giving waters (e.g., Num 20:11; 2 Chr 32:4; Ezek 32:13), though not in traditional mythological contexts. For the connection with the Chaos-struggle motif, see Seybold, "Das Hymnusfragment 11QPsᵃ XXVI 9-15," 202.

"voice" and the reference to "splendor" is much less specific than "aglow." Notice also how the Ezekiel passage, in its metaphorical reference to "his voice," includes a personification, which is something avoided in the Hymn (note also the similar absence of any reference to "giving his voice" in vv. 7–9, where one might expect it, given the other parallels to Jer 10:12–13 [= 51:15–16]).

Hymn 3 This verse uses many of the same words as those found in Pss 89:15 and 97:2:

חסד ואמת יקדמו פניך   צדק ומשפט מכון כסאך (Ps 89:15),

צדק ומשפט מכון כסאו   ענן וערפל סביביו (Ps 97:2).

Obviously, the Hymn does not duplicate either text exactly. The Hymn's sequence of cola is similar to Ps 97:2, as is the use of סביב, though instead of "clouds and darkness," Hymn 3 contains the words from Ps 89:15: "mercy and faithfulness." Hymn 2b reverses the order of the words "righteousness" and "justice" and adds אמת as another divine attribute. Given the expressions in Hymn 2, it is interesting to note that in Ps 97:3 a fire is said to go (הלך) before God. Furthermore, the subject of the Hymn is closer to that of Ps 97 than to that of Ps 89. The closeness between Hymn 3 and Ps 97:2 may be interpreted as allusion, since, together with other allusions it contributes to the Hymn's general message of God's transcendence. Given the parallels to these biblical verses, it is surprising that the Hymn uses the word פניו; it is used, presumably, not with its literal meaning "face," but with the meaning "presence." It is conceivable that the preceding verse's לפניו has influenced the choice of this word instead of סביביו.

Hymn 4 The first colon of this verse alludes to Gen 1:4 (and 1:18), though there is a slight discrepancy in language between the Hymn and the biblical text that seems to subtly affect the message; a participle is used instead of the biblical text's finite verb, the preposition מן is preferred to the בין . . . ובין construction, and אפלה is used instead of חשך. The reason that a participle appears here instead of a finite verb is unclear; vv. 6 and 7 also begin with participles. I assume that these participles are like עושה and מכין in v. 7a-b in that they are qualifying God.[17] While the use of the מן preposition may be due to that preposition's general frequency, it does subtly nuance the idea of the biblical text. Instead of separating between light and darkness, God sets light apart from darkness. The idiom in the Bible suggests a complementary relationship between light and darkness, while the idiom of the Hymn suggests that light is something exclusive.[18]

---

17. This also follows the syntax of Jer 10:12–13. Alternatively, the participles of vv. 4a and 6a might be construed as representing continuous actions; note that perfect verbs and *waw*-consecutive imperfects are used to describe most acts of creation (הכין in v. 5b, נטה in v. 8a, ויוצא in v. 8b, עשה in v. 9a, and ויעל in v. 9b).

18. The idiom בדל + בין + ובין (or ל) is used for the separation between waters (Gen 1:6) and day and night (Gen 1:14), while the idiom מן + בדל is used for the separation of Israel from

The second colon contains the first mention in the poem of God's knowledge or wisdom playing a role in creation, something referred to again in vv. 7 and 8. It is this colon, together with the mention of seeing God's work and praising him that suggested to Skehan a parallel to *Jub.* 2:2–3.[19] For the syntactic sequence of a participle in an initial colon followed by a finite verb in a second, see Ps 113:7.

Hymn 5 A parallel to the present verse is found in 1QHᵃ V, 27–28, as Sanders first noted.[20]

בעבור / יספרו כבודך בכול ממשלתך כי הראיתם את אשר לא ר[או]

. . . so that they might recount your glory in all your dominion because you showed them what they had not seen.[21]

The subject of the verb in the *Hodayot* passage is technically unclear; the surrounding context suggests that it is either the angels or all of creation. Although the words and even sentiments are largely similar in both texts, the Hymn uses the words to different effect. This is seen especially with regard to the repetition of the verb ראה. While the repetition in the *Hodayot* passage emphasizes that what was seen was without precedent, the Hymn passage emphasizes God's agency: the angels see because God caused them to see. The present verse also marks a subtle link between seeing, rejoicing, and knowing. What exactly is made known, according to my reading of the text, is not specifically addressed; it seems unlikely to me that it is something as mundane as "good food."[22] Perhaps it is God's supreme power and uniqueness that are made known, in the same way that Israel's deliverance from Egypt (among other things) has "been shown" to Israel so that they "might know" Yahweh is God and unique (see Deut 4:34–35). Note that the angels are particularly associated with knowledge, as seen in the term "spirits of knowledge" (רוחות/ דעת) used to describe them in 1QHᵃ XI, 23–24 and the term אלי דעת in 4Q400 2, 1 and 4Q403 1 I, 31.

Hymn 6 This verse is apparently alluded to in 4Q370 I,1.

ויעטר הרים תנובה ושפך אכל על פניהם
ופרי טוב השביע כלנפש
כל אשר עשה רצוני יוכלו וישבעו

---

other nations (Lev 20:24), of Levites from other tribes (Num 8:14), of foreigners from Israel (Neh 13:3).

19. Skehan, "*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter," 343–47.

20. Sanders, DJD 4:91; idem, "Non-Masoretic Psalms," 199.

21. Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:76. Stegemann and Schuller transliterate the first letter of the last word as *yôd* (what I present above as a *rêš*); nevertheless, they note in their commentary that the letter "might also have been a *reš*" (DJD 40:83). The reconstruction I follow is found in *DSSSE*, 150.

22. Chazon writes: "the angels burst into song at light's creation and at seeing earth's produce" ("Use of the Bible," 93).

[And] he crowned the mountains with pro[duce and] poured out
>   food upon them.
And (with) good fruit he satisfied all.
"Let all who do my will eat and be satisfied."[23]

Newsom observes that the "priority of 11QPsᵃ cannot be independently demonstrated," but it seems that the author of 4Q370 has borrowed the first colon of Hymn 6 verbatim, but then expanded on each of the words of the second colon.

Hymn 7-9 Verse 7 marks the beginning of the clear and obvious allusion to Jer 10:12–13 (= 51:15–16).

עשה ארץ בכחו   מכין תבל בחכמתו   ובתבונתו נטה שמים
לקול תתו המון מים בשמים   ויעלה נשאים מקצה ארץ
ברקים למטר עשה   ויוצא רוח מאצרתיו

(He is) the one who made earth with his strength,
>   who established the world with his wisdom,
>   and in his understanding stretched the heavens.
At his thundering (lit. giving a voice) (there is) a roar of waters in heaven,
>   he makes mists rise at the ends of the earth;
lightning he made for rain,
>   and brought out wind from his storehouses.[24]

The biblical text has been altered in several ways. First, it is prefaced with ברוך, making what follows part of a blessing. Second, the order of elements mentioned has changed, so that instead of the biblical order heavens–thunder–mists–lightning–wind, we have the order heavens–wind–lightning–mists, with no mention of thunder.[25] Third, the tricolon in the biblical text has been split apart so that the text breaks easily into bicola, something facilitated with the elimination of the text corresponding to Jer 10:13a, as well as the elimination of the *wāw* conjunction before בתבונתו in Hymn 8a.[26] Despite these alterations, the text is quite close

---

23. Text and translation are from Newsom, DJD 19:90–91. She discusses the ambiguities of the passage and the possibility of reading the last line not (as in her translation above) as the beginning of God's speech, but rather with the lines that precede. She prefers the translation above, which, if correct, presents another example of how an older text can be broken apart according to the needs of a new text.

24. Jeremiah 51:15–16 is identical, but contains ויעל for ויעלה in 10:13b and ויצא for ויוצא in 10:13d. Psalm 135:7 contains a tricolon with very similar wording:
מעלה נשאים מקצה הארץ   ברקים למטר עשה   מוצא רוח מאצרתיו.

25. Psalm 135:7 and the Septuagint translation of Jer 10:13 also lack reference to thunder or "giving a voice" (see Sanders, DJD 4:91). The Greek translation to Jer 51:16 (LXX Jer 28:16), however, does contain such a reference.

26. See Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 249.

to the biblical texts, so much so that the reconstruction of the missing words in vv. 8–9 is not debated. The verses of the Hymn exhibit clearer patterns of grammatical parallelism between adjacent verses; for example, the perfect verb נטה in v. 8a is parallel to the perfect verb עשה in v. 9a. On the other hand, the semantic parallelism between "wisdom" and "understanding" in Jer 10:12 is broken apart between Hymn 7 and 8. Similarly, the connection between earth and heaven in Jer 10:12 is broken apart into two verses. In the Bible, it is common to find references to God as the "maker of heaven and earth."[27] The separation of these acts of creation fits the structure of the poem, described in greater detail below, where vv. 6–7 concern the creation of vegetation and the human response to this, while vv. 8–9 focus on weather phenomena. The significance of the biblical text for the Hymn is explained in the following description of the poem's structure.

Reading and Structure of the Poem

I divide the poem into four short paragraphs, though other divisions are equally possible. The first (vv. 1–3) describes God's appearance and attributes; the second (vv. 4–5) describes the creation of light and dawn and the angels' subsequent "enlightenment"; the third (vv. 6–7) describes the production of vegetation on earth and contains the blessing of God by the poet; the fourth (vv. 8–9) describes the creation of various weather phenomena.[28] As Seybold has observed, the initial vv. 1–3 contain many nominal expressions, while the following verses are characterized by the frequency of participles.[29] The nominal expressions emphasize the fact that what they describe is perpetual, while the participles in the following verses seek to define God as the creator. The second and third paragraphs also exhibit a pattern whereby an act of creation is stated in the first verse and the second verse describes a response (in v. 5 by angels and in v. 7 by the human poet). This pattern also illustrates the relevance of the creative acts for the angels and humans; angels celebrate knowledge and vision, while humans celebrate vegetation and sustenance.

As described above, the lexical repetition in the first verse implies the inherent holiness and eternity of God. The repetition of the root קדש also recalls Isa 6:3, though the language is not identical to the biblical passage. If the reference is interpreted as an allusion, then it is probably meant as a qualification of Isaiah's description of God with concrete images.[30] The next verses describe God's imme-

---

27. William L. Holladay lists Pss 121:2; 124:8; 134:3; and 146:6 (*Jeremiah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* [2 vols.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986], 1:334).

28. Seybold divides the poem into three units: vv. 1–3, 4–6, and 7–9 ("Das Hymnusfragment 11QPs^a XXVI 9–15," 200–201).

29. Seybold, "Das Hymnusfragment 11QPs^a XXVI 9–15," 202.

30. Such a qualification would not be surprising, given the trend toward non-anthropomorphic language in later texts. Consider Isa 40:18: "To whom would you compare God? /

diate environment, what is in front, behind, around, and beneath him; notice that nothing is described above God, implying what is already obvious, that God is the "most high." This is in contrast, however, to Isa 6:2, which describes angels standing above God, another possible indication that the Hymn seeks to modify the presentation of God found in Isa 6. While the first verse begins with the most general terms ("great and holy"), the second verse describes God's presence in relation to perceptions, first in relation to vision ("splendor") and then in relation to hearing ("roar of many waters").[31] The third verse describes God's moral attributes mercy, faithfulness, and righteousness in language that alludes to Ps 97:2 and its general context, as explained below. In the Bible (esp. Pss 57:4; 85:11; and 89:15), similar attributes of God are represented almost as personifications, having a place outside God. It is curious, given the prominence of wisdom and knowledge in the rest of the poem, that neither of these things is mentioned in the first paragraph, though perhaps this is attributable to the fact that wisdom and knowledge are especially associated with the act of creation.

The second paragraph (vv. 4–5) emphasizes the emergence of light out of darkness and the means through which this was accomplished: the knowledge of God's mind or heart. The slight alteration of the language from Gen 1:4 implies light's exclusivity. The angels' ability to see parallels this creation and underlines the logical connection between light and seeing. This ability to see is associated (as vision conventionally is) with the acquisition of knowledge. In this context, the ability to see and learn is also associated with joy and celebration.

The third verse paragraph (vv. 6–7) begins with a description of the creation of vegetation, which is then followed by the blessing of v. 7. This paragraph follows a pattern similar to that of the second paragraph; the blessing is a human (specifically, the poet's) reaction and corresponds to the angels' rejoicing in vv. 5. This correspondence perhaps is meant to suggest a simultaneous human-angelic praise, though I think it is more likely that it expresses two reactions to two separate acts of creation. The isolation of the various creations is a characteristic of this kind of poem (see, e.g., Sir 42:15–43:33). It would not be surprising, therefore, that humans and angels were characterized as responding separately to individual creations, especially as humans did not exist to see the creation of light and the angels presumably do not ordinarily concern themselves with food. Verse 7 marks the beginning of the allusion to Jer 10:12–13 (= 51:15–16), which is discussed in more detail below. Although it might seem counterintuitive to separate the v. 7 and v. 9 into different paragraphs, this is analogous to how a single verse from Ps 3:6 is divided between two separate verses in Ps 155:18–19.

What likeness would you compare to him?" Furthermore, such qualification would parallel a similar kind of qualification seen between First and Second Isaiah; see Sommer, *Prophet Reads Scripture*, 242, for further examples where Second Isaiah reverses ideas from Isa 6.

31. Skehan has noted that the splendor before God might correspond to his mercy and faithfulness mentioned in v. 3, while the roar of waters might foreshadow the mention of storms in vv. 8–9 ("Liturgical Complex in 11QPsᵃ," 204 n. 30).

The last verse paragraph (vv. 8–9) is dominated not by participles but instead by finite verbs (perfect verbs in the first cola and *wāw*-consecutive imperfects in the second cola). The natural elements mentioned in this paragraph (especially wind, lightning, rain) are connected in the sense that they are often mentioned as expressions of God's power. Based on the pattern of the second and third paragraphs, we might assume there existed after v. 9 some expression of praise by natural elements or the whole world.

More than any other text from among those studied, this text is linked to others, either through allusions or echoes it makes to scriptural passages or through allusions/echoes to it made in other non-Masoretic texts. Like other similar references to the Bible in the *Hodayot*, it is not always immediately clear how we should interpret these links. Certain allusions seem obviously to contribute to the general theme of the poem, for example, Hymn 4a's allusion to Gen 1:4. By contrast, the significance of other echoes/allusions is not as clear. The Hymn consistently uses language from other texts (Ps 96; 97; 135; Jer 10 = 51) that contrast Yahweh as creator with other gods who are not creators but are rather associated with idols and, thus, are portrayed as human creations.[32] If, in fact, the Hymn uses language from these passages (esp. Jer 10 = 51) in order to allude to their general contexts, then the reference to idols and other gods is perhaps to emphasize that Yahweh transcends human representation. This seems the easiest way to account for the Hymn's rather opaque language: the use of participles to define the creator ("the one who divided," "the one who crowned," "the one who made," and "the one who established"); the absence of any concrete attributes or descriptions of God; and, more specifically, the avoidance of language (like the phrase "his voice") that implies a perceptible human attribute for God. This contrasts rather starkly with other texts such as Isa 6 and 4Q286–290 (4QBlessings[a-e]) and suggests that the repetition of the root קדש in Hymn 1 may be an attempt to qualify the description of God in Isa 6.

Line Length, Parallelism, and Allusion to Scripture

The Hymn is composed entirely of bicola. The cola of individual verses are of approximately similar lengths, with slight variations in the total length of verses.[33] These verses are, however, more regular in their length than some of the preceding texts studied. Most verses have a slightly longer second colon, the exceptions being vv. 5–7.

---

32. The words for "idol" differ in the various passages: Ps 96:5 אלילים; 97:7 פסל; 135:15 עצב; Jer 10:14 (= 51:17) פסל and נסך. Also, Jer 10:1–10 describes in detail the idols and their construction, though it does not use a specific word for "idol." These texts do not all necessarily imply that other gods do not exist.

33. The following notes the consonants-syllables-words for every verse: v. 1: 13-8-3 // 18-9-4; v. 2: 11-7-3 // 17-10-4; v. 3: 15-9-4 // 20-12-5; v. 4: 13-7-3 // 14-9-4; v. 5: 20-12-4 // 18-10-2; v. 6: 14-8-3 // 13-6-4; v. 7: 16-9-4 // 14-8-3; v. 8: 14-9-3 // 17-10-3; v. 9: 12-8-3 // 17-10-4.

The poem exhibits repetitive/semantic parallelism within cola in several places, in v. 1b (twice: דור // קדושים, דור // קדוש), in v. 3b (אמת // משפט // צדק), and in v. 4a (an antonymic match: אור // אפלה).

All the verses exhibit some form of repetitive/semantic parallelism between their cola, with two exceptions (vv. 2 and 9).[34] In the case of v. 2, the second colon essentially expresses a complement to the first, though without any specific words in common. Since the poem is essentially a stitching together of biblical phrases and verses, it is not surprising that the word pairs in this distribution are also found in the Bible. All verses except v. 9 exhibit grammatical parallelism between their cola and complement the repetitive/semantic matches. There are three cases of verbal ellipsis in this distribution (in vv. 2, 6, and 7).

Repetitive/semantic parallelism between adjacent verses is relatively rare, though it does occur within and between the verse paragraphs described above, specifically between מכון // נטה // הכין (vv. 3–4), דעת // ידעו (vv. 4–5), and מכון // מכין (vv. 7–8). Grammatical patterns between adjacent verses include the nominal clauses (with participial predicates) in vv. 6–7 and the syntax of vv. 8–9.

Repetitive parallelism separated by a verse or more is also relatively infrequent and is found especially with the root כון in vv. 3, 4, and 7 and the word ארץ in vv. 7 and 9.

Phonetic parallelism is most apparent in v. 1 with the lexical repetitions. Note not only the repetition of *qóp-dālet-šîn*, but also the alliteration produced by גדול and the phrase לדור ודור. Note also the repetition of *mêm*s in the second colon of the next verse (v. 2b): המון מים רבים. There is also an alliterative pattern exhibited by the two modifier clauses in v. 7: בכוחו and בחוכמתו, emphasizing the association between these two divine traits, that might otherwise not be compared. Other alliterative patterns between adjacent verses lend some coherency to the structure of the poem: לדור ודור // הדר (vv. 1b, 2a), פניו // לפניו (vv. 2a, 3a), הכין // מכון (vv. 3b, 4b), כול – אוכל // כול מלאכיו (vv. 5a, 6b), הרים // הראם (vv. 5b, 6a), and ארץ // אוצרותיו // ארץ (vv. 7a, 8b, 9b).

The texts scrutinized in this study have gradually revealed an increasing tendency to allude to, echo, or simply reuse language from the Bible. This pattern culminates in this poem, where every phrase seems to have been recycled from one or two biblical passages; the language of two verses that are exceptions in this regard (vv. 5–6) actually have parallels in other Dead Sea Scrolls. Conceivably, these other texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls echo or allude to the Hymn. These (potential) echoes or allusions are in addition to that which *Jubilees* makes to vv. 4–6.

As explained in detail above, the first verse may allude to or echo Isa 6:3; an

---

34. The repetitive matches include the repetition of קדוש (v. 1), the repetition of אמת (v. 3), and the repetition of כול (v. 5). The semantic parallels include משפט - אמת // אמת - חסד and אוצרותיו // שמים (v. 7), תבל // ארץ and מכין // עושה (v. 6), אוכל // תנובות, שחר // צדק (v. 3), אור // שחר (v. 8).

explicit connection to the biblical text is questionable because of a number of factors, including the discrepancies between Hymn 1 and Isa 6:3, the frequency of root repetition in general among these poems, and the tendency for the root קדש to be repeated even in prose texts. Nevertheless, the *trishagion* of Isa 6:3 is so important and unique that we may assume that a reader could recognize Hymn 1 as a reference to it. If it is an allusion, then the Hymn's alteration of the *trishagion* is best understood not as a complementary description of God and the angels, but rather as an attempt at qualifying Isaiah's more anthropomorphic and literal description of God and his court. The poem's second verse bears resemblances to several biblical texts; the first colon is reminiscent of Ps 85:14, though perhaps, again, the two texts are sufficiently distinct to diminish the likelihood of a per-ceptible echo. The second colon (Hymn 2b) bears affinities to a number of texts; due to the vagueness of the Hymn's language, it is difficult to decide whether these references should be qualified as echoes, allusions, or merely similar to other pas-sages. The phrase "many waters" (מים רבים) is used in the Bible to describe the sound of angels' wings, life-giving waters, as well as the primordial waters of chaos; the Hymn passage could make sense as an allusion to any of these. The phrase "roar of waters" (המון מים) is similar to the phrase from Jer 10:13 that describes the sound of God's voice. While Hymn 2b blends these two phrases, its closest parallel is to a passage from the *Hodayot* where the phrase describes the mutterings of people attacking the poet. Since Hymn 7–9 alludes explicitly to Jer 10:12–13 (= 51:15–16), one might assume that an allusion is being made in v. 2b to this same passage. While this is possible, given the frequency of similar phrases in the Bible, it is difficult to assume that a reader would make such a connection, at least initially; a biblically sensitive reader might just as easily recall Ezek 1:24 or any of the passages using the phrase "many waters" as a reference to the waters of primordial chaos. Certainly, after having read the poem once, a reader could per-ceive the echo to the Jeremiah passage in v. 2b; perhaps the phrase is intended as a foreshadowing of the more explicit allusion that follows at the end of the poem. The next verse (Hymn 3) alludes to Ps 97:2, a text that, like Jer 10 (= 51), criticizes idolatry. Hymn 4a, on the other hand, alludes to Gen 1:4 and its description of the creation of light. As just mentioned, Hymn 7–9 reduplicates language from Jer 10:12–13 (= 51:15–16), as well as Ps 135:7. That this is not merely an echo but an allusion is based on the assumption that the Hymn seeks to emphasize a non-anthropomorphic representation of God through alluding to these (and other) biblical passages that all appear in contexts where idolatry is criticized.

Conclusions

Although a connection to Isa 6 in the first verse of the poem seems clear, the significance of this connection is harder to determine. The Hymn is reminiscent of the biblical passage, with its description of God's throne and accompanying

angels; however, the poem's language, as well as its allusion to other biblical texts (especially those in Jeremiah and Pss 97 and 135), suggests that it is concerned to comment on and to offer qualification to the humanlike representation of Yahweh found in biblical texts such as Isa 6. The poem implies that Yahweh is beyond human description.

Comparisons and Conclusions

Introduction

The study has demonstrated a number of independent points about the seven poems studied as outlined in the previous chapters and in the summaries to each chapter. In general, the poems are distinct from one another in their subjects and their approaches to these subjects. Ben Sira 51:13–30 concerns the pursuit of wisdom and contrasts the perspective of a young man with that of an elder. The poem closest in spirit to this text, Ps 154, emphasizes instead the centrality of wisdom in praising God. Some poems have no parallel among these poems or even among the biblical psalms; Ps 151A unambiguously speaks from the perspective of David, while the Apostrophe to Zion offers an encomium of Zion in language more typical of encomiums of God. The Hymn, too, reveals some unique ideas, including an emphasis on God's creative works and their reception by angels and humans. The two poems that share the most in terms of their genre, tone, and even structure are Ps 155 and the Plea, which mix language of supplication with that of thanksgiving and often break apart into two-verse units. Even here, though, there is some distinction as Ps 155 emphasizes God's answer to the poet's appeal, while the Plea includes language reminiscent of magic and incantations, emphasizing the potency of simply appealing to God. Despite the general differences among all the poems, a comparison of their structures and ideas allows us to make some limited generalizations about poetry during the latter half of the Second Temple period.

It should be stated at the beginning that no claim is being made about the common origin of these poems in place or time. The poems, in all likelihood, derive from different milieus and from different periods of time within the late Persian and Hellenistic eras. The conclusion that Sir 51:13–30 was written by Ben Sira implies the most specific time of authorship for any of the poems, ca. 180 B.C.E. But, it is quite likely that some of the poems, like Ps 151A, derive from an earlier century and others, like the Hymn, come from a slightly later time. In addition, no claim is being made about the uniformity of these texts; as just stated, the poems are not overwhelmingly consistent in their structures or ideas.

The present chapter begins with a summary of how the individual poems relate to one another in terms of their line length, parallelism, allusion to Scrip-

ture, and other features. This is followed by a comparison to biblical poetry. Finally, the salient characteristics of the poems' theological ideas are outlined, especially as these relate to the structural and rhetorical features of the poems.

Comparison of the Poems

Among the seven poems, Sir 51:13-30 exhibits unique structural characteristics most often. This is found in terms of its consistently short line length as well as the infrequency of repetitive/semantic parallelism within the verse. The Apostrophe to Zion is also somewhat unusual in the infrequency of parallels between adjacent verses, something that is exhibited in all the other poems, including in the Sirach poem.

   Ben Sira 51:13–30 is unique in containing cola whose length is consistently short; the cola of this poem, for example, never contain more than nine syllables, in contrast to those of the other poems that frequently reach ten, eleven, or twelve syllables. In addition, the length of individual verses in Sir 51:13–30 is remarkably consistent, even in the case of the initial tricolon. The length of verses in the other poems (especially Pss 151A, 154, 155, and Plea) is less so; in some cases it varies quite dramatically from one verse to the next (e.g., Ps 151A:6c-d and 7a-b; Ps 154:6-7; Plea 9-10). This is true even when the tricola of these poems are excluded from consideration. In some instances this variation may be the result of secondary (or, tertiary) interpolations, though the variance in length of verses cannot be attributed solely to this. Rather, it seems that consistency of verse length was not a major concern of the poets (Ben Sira excluded), something that is interesting, given the fact that the poems often exhibit strong parallelistic patterns between verses. The tricola of Sir 51:13–30, Ps 151A, and Plea are similar in that they contain cola that are shorter than the cola in bicola; the other poems do not exhibit this characteristic. Four out of the seven poems do not exhibit any pattern with regard to the length of the first colon in relation to that of the second (or third) colon; in two poems (Sir 51:13–30 and Apostrophe to Zion), however, the second colon of each verse is almost uniformly longer than the first, while in the Hymn, six out of nine verses contain longer second cola.

   Parallelism within individual cola is a significant component of the structure of only two poems, Ps 155 and the Hymn; in these poems repetitive/semantic parallelism occurs relatively frequently and, especially in the case of Ps 155, complements the macro-structure of the poem as well as its theme. In addition to these two poems, in Apostrophe to Zion phonetic parallelism within individual cola complements the notion of blessing through the repetition of the consonants *bêt*, *kāp*, *qôp*, and *rêš*.

   Ben Sira 51:13–30 contains the fewest number of verses exhibiting repetitive/semantic parallelism between cola of a verse. In Sir 51:13-30, a total of seventeen out of twenty-three verses contain no repetitive/semantic parallels in this distribution (i.e., in approximately 74 percent of the verses). Compare this to Ps 154,

where only seven out of twenty verses contain no such parallels and Ps155, in which six out of seventeen verses contain no parallels of this type and distribution. The Plea is closest to Sir 51:13–30, attesting no repetitive/semantic parallels between cola in nine out of nineteen legible verses. The consistency of repetitive/semantic parallels between cola of a verse is greatest in Apostrophe to Zion and the Hymn; in Apostrophe to Zion, fourteen out of eighteen verses have repetitive/semantic parallels between cola of a verse, while in the Hymn the ratio was seven out of nine verses. In Sir 51:13–30, where repetitive/semantic parallelism between cola does occur, it is usually a verse that stands at the beginning of a new verse paragraph or at the end of the poem. Given the frequency of this type and distribution of parallelism in the other poems, it is interesting to note that the absence of repetitive/semantic parallelism is not typically used for similar effect, to complement the beginning or ending of a paragraph. This is so with one exception; Ps 154 is the only poem where verses at the beginning of paragraphs often do not exhibit repetitive/semantic parallelism between cola. In most cases, the semantic parallelism in all these poems involves traditional word pairs or associations that are especially obvious. Repetitive parallelism appears as an important element in only one poem, Apostrophe to Zion, where it appears five times in eighteen verses. In an overwhelming number of cases, repetitive/semantic parallelism is complemented by strong syntactic and even morphological parallelism between cola. This contributes to the high number of verses that exhibit verbal ellipsis in the second or third cola (especially but not exclusively in Ps 151A, Plea, and Hymn). Where ellipsis does not occur, grammatical parallelism sometimes suggests associations between words that would otherwise seem unrelated. This phenomenon is especially common in Sirach, so it is not surprising that it appears in Sir 51:13–30; but it is also found in Ps 151A and Apostrophe to Zion. Phonetic parallelism plays a significant role primarily in conjunction with repetitive parallelism, in verses such as Ap Zion 3 and Hymn 1. In the acrostic poems (Sir 51:13–30, Ps 155, and Apostrophe to Zion), there are relatively few cases where an acrostic letter is repeated throughout its verse. The frequency of all types of parallelism in this distribution demonstrates that this was still the dominant distribution in many poems during the Second Temple period, even when the works are loosely tied to wisdom, like Ps 154 and the Hymn. This makes the structure of many Sirach poems seem all the more unusual.

Parallelism between adjacent verses is another particularly important distribution among most of the poems studied. In several cases repetitive/semantic parallelism in this distribution complements the thematic divisions in a text. This happens in the shorter two-verse units of Pss 154 and 155, as well as in larger verse paragraphs, for example, in the chain of words related to verbal communication linking adjacent verses in Ps 151A:2-4b (the second verse paragraph). This type and distribution of parallelism also create coherency throughout a text, as in the chain of words related to body parts that stretches throughout much of Sir 51:13–30. In Apostrophe to Zion and the Plea, repetitive/semantic parallelism

between adjacent verses is more uncommon and does not play an important role as a structuring device. In relation to grammatical parallelism (both morphological and syntactic), it is especially interesting to note the many times that it complements the sense division of texts (e.g., the colon-final *bêt* prepositional phrases in Sir 51:14–15d [first verse paragraph]; the 1st per. common sg. suffixes in most initial words of Sir 51:16–21 [second verse paragraph]; the tendency for clause-initial subjects in Ps 151A:2–4b [first verse paragraph]; the tendency for verse-initial verbs in Ps 151A:4c–7 [second verse paragraph]; the many patterns in the two-verse units of Ps 154 and the Plea). Psalm 155 and the Apostrphe to Zion are unusual in exhibiting relatively few grammatical parallels in this distribution. Grammatical parallelism between adjacent verses also appears between groups of verses that are syntactically dependent (e.g., in Ps 151A:5c–6b; Ps 154:10–11, 18–20; Plea 9–10). A peculiar feature found in two psalms (Pss 151A:2b–3d and 154:6–8) is verbal ellipsis between adjacent verses, a structure that in both instances may be attributable to a later author/editor, though it also reflects a sensitivity to the structure of the respective text. In most of these examples of syntactic dependency between verses, the syntax of an initial colon is expanded into subsequent cola. For example, in Ps 151A:5c–6b, colon 5d contains two construct phrases with relatively short words describing David's brothers; colon 6a continues to describe the brothers' physical appearance by using two long words, one of which is part of a prepositional phrase. Although phonetic parallelism does occur in this distribution, it is usually only of minor significance for the structure of the poems, the only exception being in the Hymn, where there is a series of phonetic parallels between adjacent verses.

Parallelism between verses separated by a verse or more is important to the structure of several of the poems. Repetitive parallelism is the most perceptible type of parallelism in this distribution and, consequently, is the most frequently documented. Repetitive parallelism is used at the beginning of sequential two-verse units in Ps 155 (where יהוה is repeated), at the beginning of verse paragraphs in Apostrophe to Zion (where ציון is repeated), in verse paragraphs that share common topics (in Ps 154 and the Plea), as well as in chiastic structures at the beginning and ending of verse paragraphs (the repetition of the verb בקש between Sir 51:13 and 21 [second verse paragraph]; the repetition of נתן + שכר between Sir 51:22 and 30 [third verse paragraph]; the repetition of זכר between Ap Zion 1 and 6 [in the first verse paragraph], the repetition of שבח between Ap Zion 14 and 18 [fourth verse paragraph]), and at the beginning and ending of whole poems (the repetition of בן, שום, צו(א)ן, and מושל between Ps 151A:1 and 7; the repetition of the words ברך, טוב, פאר, גדל, נפש, and תמים between the first and last paragraphs of Ps 154; the repetition of קרא, נתן, and שאל between Ps 155:1–4 and 15–17).

In addition to their line length and parallelism, the poems also exhibit other features in common, including a relatively simple vocabulary and the frequent allusion to or echo of Scripture. Also of note are the characteristics shared among

smaller sets of poems, including the acrostic structure of Sir 51:13–30, Ps 155, and Apostrophe to Zion and the apparent interpolation of verses and/or separate works into a single coherent structure in Pss 151A, 154, 155.

The texts often use a vocabulary that is extremely common to the Bible and to biblical poetry. This is true especially for Pss 151A, 154, 155, Apostrophe to Zion, and the Hymn, but less so for Sir 51:13–30. Going along with this preference for common words and vocabulary is a tendency for the poems to repeat the most common words (e.g., words from the roots צדק, חסד, כבד, זכר, ברך, עשה, ישע). These features, although perhaps diminishing the interest of the texts for the philologically inclined, might have contributed to the facility of these texts being used in liturgical settings, one characteristic of liturgical texts being their simpler expressions and predictable vocabulary.[1] In addition, the common words and their repetition emphasize a relationship between divinity and humanity that I have characterized above as circular. That is, in repeating almost formulaic expressions, the poet (and/or the congregation reciting these texts) suggests that the words are not his or her own, that they derive from God, for the general purpose of his praise.

Like many biblical and extrabiblical texts, the poems incorporate language from the Hebrew Scriptures and do so in a number of ways, sometimes explicitly through the repetition of vocabulary and/or syntax, sometimes obliquely through a common topic. The clearest example of the latter kind of reference is seen in Ps 151A, which elaborates on Samuel's anointing of David, described in 1 Sam 16:1–13, though it does not use much of the specific language found in this biblical passage. Even Sir 51:13–30 seems to make subtle reference to other parts of Sirach, in the manner one should pursue wisdom and in other images (like the image of grapes on the vine).

The greatest number of allusions and echoes are found in the last four texts of this study (Ps 155, Apostrophe to Zion, Plea, and Hymn). Clear allusions to specific biblical passages occur in at least fourteen verses among these four poems (two verses in Ps 155, three in Apostrophe to Zion, three in Plea, and six in the Hymn).[2] Most of these allusions are used to reference the wider context from which they derive and to comment on the topic of these respective contexts. In some cases this is to qualify or alter an idea found in the biblical source text. For example, Ps 155 alludes to Pss 3 and 143 to emphasize that an individual is threatened primarily by his or her own sinful behavior rather than by exterior forces, while Apostrophe to Zion alludes to Amos 5:18 in order to invert its prophecy of doom into one of promise. In other cases, the context of the source

---

1. On this point, see Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, 351; and Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers,* 46.

2. Note also the possible allusion in Ps 151A:2d–4b to common assertions about the natural world praising God and to rhetorical questions about who has the ability to praise God. As with the many other allusions among the non-Masoretic poems of 11Q5, the apparent allusions in Ps 151A comment on and qualify their sources.

of the allusion complements the idea of the poem. For example, Apostrophe to Zion alludes to Deut 6:5 and Isa 66:11 to emphasize the importance of remembrance and its relevance for linking the past with the future and to emphasize the celebration associated with Jerusalem's rebirth, while the Hymn alludes to Jer 10:12–13 (= 51:15–16; and, to a lesser extent Ps 135:7) in order to emphasize its non-anthropomorphic representation of God. The most complex case of allusion appears in Plea 2–3; these verses allude clearly and obviously to Isa 38:19 and somewhat less obviously (through the word pair רמה and תולעה) to Job 25:6. The verses from Plea adopt the general meaning of the Isaiah passage, that only the living can praise God, though they nuance this idea by implying that even the living are weak and "stumbling." The pair of words "maggots/worms" functions as a metaphor for the dead, on the one hand (drawing on the context of Isa 38:19 and similar biblical passages), but also as a metaphor for abject humanity (drawing from the context of Job 25:10). Thus, what is offered in Isa 38 (and in other biblical texts) as assurance of God's salvation, becomes a statement on humanity's abjectness (worms in death and stumbling while alive) and its dependence on God.

The poems studied also include many echoes of biblical passages. Examples include the echo of Dan 9:24 in Ap Zion 16 and of Isa 50:11 in Plea 11. These contribute texture to the poems, providing subtle links to the wider context of Scripture. In some cases it is hard to determine whether a given verse is an echo or an allusion, that is, whether the reference to a biblical passage has significance for the new poem. This occurs especially in the Hymn, which seems somewhat vague in its language. For example, it is unclear how the phrase "many waters" (in Hymn 2b) should be interpreted, given the vague reference to it coming after God and its connections in the Bible to the sound of God's voice, the sound of the angels, and primordial chaos, each of which seems relevant to Hymn 2b. A similar difficulty pertains to Hymn 1 and its connection to Isa 6:3.

In those poems that use biblical language most explicitly (whether as an allusion or echo), many times the text is altered in order to fit the new poetic structure. For example, in Ps 155:18–19, the author/editor draws on the idea, structure, and vocabulary of Ps 3:6, adapting the biblical text so that it fits the acrostic form of vv. 18–19 (the *nûn* line and *sāmek* line). Thus, שכבתי ("I lie down") of Ps 3:6 becomes נמתי ("I grew drowsy") in Ps 155:18 and the last word of Ps 3:6b, יסמכני ("he [God] will support me"), becomes a perfect 2nd per. masc. sg. form at the very beginning of Ps 155:19, סמכתני ("you supported me"). A similar case of adaptation of a biblical text appears in Plea 5, where the author/editor alters the text of Job 12:10 to make the text more alliterative (נפש כל־חי ורוח כל־בשר־איש in Job vs. נפש כול חי נשמת כול בשר אתה נתתה in Plea), as well as perhaps to make the connection to Isa 42:5 and Gen 2:7 more obvious.

There are also shared characteristics among smaller groupings of poems. Three poems, Sir 51:13–30, Ps 155, and Apostrophe to Zion, are alphabetic acrostics. In all three cases the pattern is irregular. In Sir 51:13–30, the poem ends

after the *tāw* line with a verse beginning with *pê*. In Ps 155, the first verse begins not with an *ʾālep* but rather with the tetragrammaton, and the poem ends with the letter *pê* (and does not contain cola or verses for the letters *ṣādê*, *qôp*, *rêš*, *sîn/šîn*, or *tāw*). In both Ps 155 and Apostrophe to Zion, instead of each verse consistently beginning with a different letter of the alphabet, a new letter sometimes appears at the beginning of a verse, sometimes at the beginning of a second or third colon. The function of this device in the three poems is the same, to evoke completeness and comprehensiveness, though this emphasis has different significances for each poem: for Sir 51 the acrostic structure resonates with the theme of pursuing wisdom from youth to old age; for Ps 155, it emphasizes the fulfillment of the poet's pleas; and for Apostrophe to Zion it implies the expansiveness and accessibility of Zion. Although only three of the seven poems studied are acrostics, this is an important structure given the relative infrequency of acrostics in the Bible. This frequency may suggest a greater attention to language and a growing awareness of such linguistic and writerly devices during the Second Temple period.[3]

A common thread among the individual interpretations of Pss 151A, 154, and 155 is the apparent interpolation of verses into these poems and/or the possibility that they are the result of originally independent works having been blended or combined together. The philological study of the poems has demonstrated good reasons for viewing each poem as a coherently constructed text, despite the possibility of their not originating as a single composition. In part, what allows us to understand each of these interpolations as part of a coherent whole is the manner in which they reflect the structure of the surrounding verses. For example, the interpolation of vv. 3–4 in Ps 151A, although incorporating ellipsis in an unusual way, exhibits parallelistic patterns on par with those of the poem's other verses (e.g., semantic and syntactic parallelism between cola and adjacent verses, where a second verse is dependent on a preceding one). Often it seems that the verses labeled interpolations have a structure that expands a syntactic structure from one verse to the next, as mentioned above in the section summarizing parallelistic patterns. The fact that interpolated verses appear to share structural characteristics with the noninterpolated verses implies the sensitivity of the author/editor who added the secondary material. The juxtaposition of material that addresses separate topics (God and wisdom in Ps 154) is paralleled also by similar juxtapositions in Sir 51:13–30, whose Hebrew form in 11Q5 is not thought to be the result of significant interpolation.

---

3. This seems corroborated by the numerous self-conscious wordplays in Sirach, many of them calling attention to themselves explicitly through the phrase "like his (her, or its) name" (in Sir 2:18 [ܐܠ‎ ܝ‎ ܟܬܒ‎; not in the Greek]; 6:22 [Ms. A: כשמה‎]; 43:8 [Mas and Ms. Bmg: כשמו‎]; 46:1 [κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα; not in Hebrew]); compare the single instance of this phrase in the Bible, in 1 Sam 25:25.

Comparison to Biblical Poetry

Many of the characteristics outlined above (including the parallelistic patterns) are not unique to the non-Masoretic poems of 11Q5 but are features found also in biblical psalms, especially in the texts of the latter third of the book of Psalms (Pss 100–150), which is perhaps significant since it is throughout this portion of the biblical book that the non-Masoretic poems are scattered. More specifically, the repetition of words (in all distributions) and the common vocabulary of the poems are features found, for example, in Pss 113–115, as well as in many of those psalms preserved in 11Q5 (e.g., Pss 120–130). Semantic parallelism (between cola of verses and between adjacent verses) also predominates in this biblical poetry, as does grammatical parallelism, whose patterns also sometimes coincide with the sense divisions of texts (e.g., Pss 115, 118). Sometimes one also finds the grad-ual expansion of a syntactic unit from one colon to the next across verse bound-aries (e.g., Ps 113:5–8). In addition, we find examples among the 11Q5 biblical texts of verses of one poem being extracted, rearranged, and used for their own composition or as a complement to another (specifically the verses from Ps 118 being used either as a "doxology" or as a complement to Ps 136). This is in addi-tion to the biblical examples of a similar phenomenon in Ps 108, which combines material from Pss 57 and 60.

All these common traits imply that the non-Masoretic poems fit in well with biblical psalms in general and with those in 11Q5 specifically. But, one also wonders if and how the structures of the non-Masoretic poems differ from those of biblical poems, especially from those found in the book of Psalms. The most peculiar feature among these texts has already been described, the verbal ellipsis between verses in Pss 151A:2d–3d and 154:6–8. When syntactic depen-dence occurs between verses in psalms, for example, it does not involve verbal ellipsis, but usually a series of appositional phrases (Pss 144:1–2; 148:7–12); or a dependent clause (often marked by a particle), like the apodosis of a conditional clause (Ps 124:3–5) or a relative clause (Ps 129:7), even a comparative expres-sion (Ps 133:2); in each of the last three cases involving dependent clauses, the verse explicitly expresses some predication. The fact that two examples of verbal ellipsis between verses appear within a relatively small corpus of texts in 11Q5 is surprising; it implies that the author/editor viewed parallelism between adjacent verses as analogous to parallelism between cola of a verse, where verbal ellipsis occurs in the overwhelming number of cases. This is partially corroborated by the many other parallels between adjacent verses throughout the poems (though, the biblical psalms also exhibit parallels in this distribution). Despite such admit-tedly slight distinctions between the structures of the Masoretic and non-Maso-retic poems, still something can be said about the differences between these two corpora, especially when the texts are viewed holistically, in terms of their indi-vidual structures and themes. The unique thematic aspects of these texts have

already been outlined in this chapter's first paragraph; what marks the poems as distinct from each other also marks them as distinct from the majority of psalms and wisdom poems from the Bible. Some of these distinct ideas are elaborated on in what follows.

<div align="center">Theological Ideas of the Poems</div>

In addition to sharing certain structural similarities, the poems also share certain features of their underlying theologies. The most important to document here are the emphasis on wisdom, the connection of wisdom with praise of God in the poems, and the apparent passivity of the poet as a worshiper.

The importance of wisdom in the Second Temple period is reflected in the three texts that are often labeled "wisdom texts" and which incorporate "Wisdom" or "wisdom," namely, Sir 51:13–30, Ps 154, and the Hymn. This emphasis on wisdom finds accord with the growing importance of this genre in the Second Temple period, as reflected in its appearance in various works, Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon, and 4QInstruction, among others. In many cases in the 11Q5 poems, it seems that wisdom is to be associated with praise. This is seen in all three of the non-Masoretic wisdom texts from 11Q5, while in the Plea and Ps 155 learning is associated with thanksgiving and praise of God's glory. In Sir 51:13–30, the idea is expressed, in part, by juxtaposing the mention of praise of God in v. 22 ("My lord gave me my tongue as wage / and with my lips I praise him") with the benefits of acquiring wisdom in the following verses. The connection between wisdom and praise of God is one that, as explained above, resonates with other parts of Sirach in general. It is conceivable, though not provable, that this idea originates with Ben Sira and that it is then adopted by the writers of the other texts. In Ps 154, the connection between God's praise and wisdom is made explicit in v. 5 ("Lo, for declaring the glory of the Lord / Wisdom is given"), but also in that poem's alternation between paragraphs addressing Wisdom and God. In the Hymn, the connection is much less obvious; in v. 7 God is blessed and called "the one who established the world in his wisdom." In Plea 3–4, humanity's thanksgiving is said to be possible because God teaches humanity his own mercy and righteousness. In Ps 155:9–10, God's instruction of the poet in matters of the law results in the poet teaching God's "orders" (מעשים) and, in turn, the people honoring (הדר) God's glory.

Another feature shared between Sir 51:13–30 and Ps 154 is the similar language used to describe what the pious do and what wisdom does, implying that the pious sages are the vehicles through which wisdom is communicated to humanity. This idea is explicitly stated in Ps 154:6–7, while in Sir 51:13–30 the notion is conveyed through the poet's adoption of words and language normally associated with wisdom.

The implicit link in these poems between wisdom and praise of God also implies that praise should be an integral part of a worshiper's life. This is reflected

in other texts among the 11Q5 non-Masoretic poems. In Ps 151A, it is David's praise of God alone in a sheepfold that initiates a series of verses that illustrate the fact that God sees all and knows all. In the Plea, the praise of God functions like a magical formula, activating the poet's confidence on its own. Furthermore, praise is compared with sacrifice in two places (Ps 154:10-11; Ap Zion 14), suggesting the importance of praise and the poetic text that expresses it in this theology.

Going along with this emphasis on praise is a stress on the verbal and cognitive dimensions of worship; the poet is active primarily in speaking, believing, and trusting, essentially in expressing praise and piety (e.g., in Pss 151A, 154, 155, Apostrophe to Zion, Plea, and Hymn). As mentioned above at several points, some of the poems (especially Ps 155 and the Plea) imply the passivity of the poet; at times they suggest a relationship between God and humanity that seems circular: the human worshiper, especially the poet, is conceived of as a passive channel through which flow God's words, which words praise God himself. This passivity is implied both through the content of the poems and through their structure and literary features.

In the Plea, the poet's passivity is most obvious; the poet's own statements imply his powerlessness and God's corresponding dominance (in Plea 2–6). Verse 10b asserts that praise of God is beyond human understanding, an assertion that implies its derivation from God, Plea 10b: "your praise is unfathomable." Sometimes, however, the grammar of a passage suggests a passive role for the poet, for example, where the poet is the accusative object of verbs and God their subject (e.g., in Ps 151A:4c–7d and Ps 155:1–14). In Ps 155:11, the comprehensiveness of God's power is emphasized through the appeal for God to do something positive (remember), not to remain neutral (forget), and not to do something negative (drag the poet into judgments).

The various literary characteristics outlined above also contribute to this impression in a subtle way. The redundancy and common vocabulary found throughout the poems, together with the reuse of scriptural language and verses and the traditional deployment of semantic and grammatical parallelism, all mean that each poem is drawing heavily on traditional forms and expressions. This, in turn, gives the impression to the reader that each poem is drawn from a common source and does not originate in a single author's innovative language. I am not suggesting, however, that the literary features are passively executed, only that they create the impression of the poet being a passive channel through which flow God's words.[4]

The relative passivity of the poet or praise-giver is also presumed in the context in which the poems appear, as part of 11Q5. In "David's Compositions,"

---

4. Daniel K. Falk has even suggested in relation to 4Q392 and 4Q393 that there was perhaps "a lack of confidence in creative composition," on the part of people, though the adaptation of Scripture, he recognizes, demonstrates its own creativity ("Biblical Adaptation in 4Q392 *Works of God* and 4Q393 *Communal Confession*," 146).

David is presented less as an innovative and clever psalmist than as a solemn mouthpiece for God, who composes psalms "through prophecy."[5] The passive role of the poet also reflects the role played by the ancient audience itself, who read and/or orally repeated the texts. This is all the more true if, as some think, 11Q5 (or the poems in it) had a liturgical use.

Finally, the passive role of the poet or person offering praise also fits in with the wider context of Second Temple texts. In the biblical psalms, God is depicted only rarely as the author of his own praises.[6] For example, biblical poets sometimes make statements that indicate that God provides their words, as in Ps 40:4a-b:[7]

ויתן בפי שיר חדש   תהלה לאלהינו

He [i.e., Yahweh] set a new song in my mouth,
    praise for our God.[8]

---

5. On the dual identity of David as poet and prophet, one may consult James L. Kugel's introductory chapter "Poets and Prophets: An Overview," in *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition* (ed. James L. Kugel; Ithaca, N.Y./London: Cornell University Press, 1990), 1–25, and his more specific contribution to this same volume "David the Prophet," 45-55. See also Susan Gillingham, "From Liturgy to Prophecy: The Use of Psalmody in Second Temple Judaism," *CBQ* 64 (2002): 470–89. On the idea that prophets are not the authors of their own words, but that God is, I cite some of the passages described by Kugel: Num 22:38; Amos 3:8; Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.65 ("Poets and Prophets," 6, 16). As Kugel demonstrates, these same passages often also imply the opposite idea, that the prophets used their own agency to craft the words.

6. The potential for God to render himself glory through humans is expressed succinctly in Ps 115:1: "Not to us, Yahweh, not to us, but to your own name render glory," although in this psalm the glory that God renders is the prosperity and security of the Israelites.

7. Although on the surface such expressions might not seem dissimilar from appeals to the muses by Greek poets and Romantic poets, or the appeal to "inspiration" by contemporary poets, the fact that God is the source and subject of the praise offers a counterintuitive twist to this trope. Similarly, although the prophets claim that they speak with the words of God (e.g., Jer 1:9), they normally do not use these words to praise God. The fact that God supplied the words for his own praise was apparently not troubling to the ancients, as the numerous texts that reflect this idea demonstrate. It was, however, problematic to the scholars of the Middle Ages, who invented numerous explanations, as described by Uriel Simon (*Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra* [trans. Lenn J. Schramm; Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991; first published in Hebrew in 1982], 8, 44 n. 15, 189). For example, Saadiah Gaon suggests that "human language in this book [i.e., Psalms] is merely an external garb, intended to facilitate human comprehension of divine speech" (ibid., 189), while Maimonides characterized "the nature of the prophetic inspiration under which the psalms were composed as the second degree of prophecy" (ibid., 44 n. 15).

8. Note, too, the expression of a similar idea in Ps 51:17 אדני תפתח שפתי / ופי יגיד תהלתך; "Lord, open my lips / and my mouth will declare your praise." Though the preceding verse states, "My tongue will celebrate your righteousness." An inverse appeal is expressed in Ps 141:3: שיתה יהוה שמרה לפי / נצרה על־דל שפתי; "Set a guard, O Lord, over my mouth, / keep watch upon the door of my lips."

Although God provides the poem of praise, this, curiously, does not presume that the poet will praise God or his attributes exactly as he is, or as they are. This is implied, for example, in a line that follows the one quoted just above:

<div dir="rtl" align="center">

עצמו מספר   אגידה ואדברה

</div>

Could I declare and speak (your many wonders and thoughts),
      they would be too numerous to enumerate. (Ps 40:6e-f)[9]

More explicit assertions that poetic words derive from God are found in later texts, especially from the later part of the Second Temple period, in the period just after when the poems of 11Q5 are thought to have been composed. For example, in the *Hodayot*, the poet is conceived as almost pathologically passive.[10]

<div dir="rtl" align="center">

ותדע דבריה	אתה בראתה / רוח בלשון
בטרם היותם	ותכן פרי שפתים
ומבע רוח שפתים במדה /	ותשם דברים על קו
ומבעי רוחות לחשבונם	ותוצא קוים לרזיהם
ולספר נפלאותיכה	להודיע / כבודכה
ומ[ש]פ[ט]י צדקכה	בכול מעשי אמתכה
בפה כול יודעיכה /	ולהלל שמכה
לעולמי ע[ולמי]ם	לפי שכלם יברכוכה

</div>

You created breath on the tongue,
      and know its words.
You determined the fruits of lips
      before they were.
You set words in verse,[11]

---

9. The verse would seem to say "if I could declare your wonders, I could not declare them." A similar paradoxical statement is found in *Odes of Solomon* 26:8, "Who is it that can write the odes of the Lord, / or read them?"

10. The Hebrew text follows Stegemann, Schuller, Newsom, DJD 40:119. The stichometric layout of the verses is, of course, not found in the Dead Sea text but is my own, based on the general principle that cola of a verse have approximately the same length. There are, it should be noted, many complexities involved in dividing the *Hodayot* into cola or verses since these poems do not exhibit the kind of predictable structures we are familiar with from the Bible and other non-Masoretic poems.

11. R. Bergmeier and H. Pabst argue that the words in the following lines do not refer to poetic terms ("Ein Lied von der Erschaffung der Sprach: Sinn and Aufbau von 1Q Hodayot I, 27-31," *RevQ* 5 [1965]: 309–16). Nevertheless, most scholars understand these words as referring to poetic terms (see, most recently, Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space,* 227–28; Angela Y. Kim "Authorizing Interpretation in Poetic Compositions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Later Jewish and Christian Traditions," *DSD* 10 (2003): 36; and John F. Elwolde, "Interrogatives in the Hodayot: Some Preliminary Remarks," in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Pre-*

> so lips' breath flows in a measured way.
> You elicit verses according to their mysteries,
>> and breath's fluency according to its design,
> to declare your glory,
>> recount your miracles,
> with all your honest deeds,
>> your just [verdicts,]
> to praise your name
>> through every mouth of those who know you;
> according to their insight
>> they bless you forever [and ever] (1QHᵃ IX, 29–33).[12]

This idea is found in even later literature, for example, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and the *Odes of Solomon*.[13] These various examples demonstrate that the idea of

---

sented to Professor T. Muraoka on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday [ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. T. van Peursen; OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003], 131–47).

12. In this particular verse paragraph, the creation of poetry parallels the control God wields over the cosmos; in the lines preceding these, he is extolled for his creation of the world, sun, lightning, etc. Furthermore, God's words on the poet's tongue are contrasted with the poet's own limited words; the speaker asks in 1QHᵃ IX, 25 "How can I speak what is not [already] known?" As with *Odes of Solomon* 26, here the world and poetry are linked. Newsom writes of 1QHᵃ IX, 29–33: "Only as the speaker rejects any claim of autonomous speech does his discourse receive value. He has standing to speak, not because he can demonstrate his righteousness but because of God's gift of speech" (*Self as Symbolic Space*, 228). On the interpretation of this poetic passage, see also Elwolde, "Interrogatives in the Hodayot," 147.

Examples of similar expressions from the Dead Sea Scrolls are found in 4Q504 2 V, 15-17: "[Be]cause you poured the spirit of your holiness over us, / [to br]ing to us your blessings so we might seek you in our distress, / [and to wh]isper (a prayer) in our affliction . . ." (for the reconstruction, see Dennis T. Olson, "Words of the Lights (4Q504–506 = 4QDibHamᵃ⁻ᶜ)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations,* vol. 4a, *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* [ed. James H. Charlesworth et al.; Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997], 132–33); as well as in 4Q434 1 I, 9–10 (= 4QBarkhi Nafshiᵃ): ". . . [he set] / their spirit by measure; their words by a scale he apportioned, and their uprightness (tuned) like flutes" (for the Hebrew text, see Weinfeld and Seely, DJD 29:270; my understanding of the passage follows the translation in *DSSSE*, 911, not that provided in DJD 29:272).

13. In the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (from the first or second century C.E.), an angel is recorded praising God in these words: "Accept my prayer and delight in it, / and (accept) also the sacrifice which you yourself made / to yourself through me as I searched you" (trans. R. Rubinkiewicz in *OTP* 1:697). From approximately the same time there emerges another implicit expression of the poet's role as a vehicle for God's words, this from the *Odes of Solomon* 26:8 (already quoted above) and 10–11: "Who is (so) at ease concerning the Most High, / that he speaks from his own mouth? / Who is able to translate the wonders of the Lord? / For he who translates melts away, / but what (would be) translated survives."

From a slightly later time (the 300s C.E.) are the references from the poetry of Ephrem. Andrew Palmer has commented in reference to Ephrem's *Hymns on Faith*: "The poet himself

the poet as a passive channel of God's own praise is not unique to a particular group of texts or a religious sect. Although this idea is not represented in the 11Q5 poems as explicitly as it is in these other texts, one can see how this idea was implicit in the poems' theologies and in their very structure. It is not hard to see how this implicit idea develops and becomes more pronounced in later Jewish and Christian literature.

---

is but a vocal channel for the Spirit which engenders his faith. Inasmuch as this faith is his life and very self (*Faith* 80:1), he is carried by the divine Word, in the same way as sound carries affirmation (*Faith* 20:7)" ("'A Lyre without a Voice': The Poetics and the Politics of Ephrem the Syrian," *ARAM* 5 [1993]: 372). In this article, to demonstrate the precedence of Ephrem's image of the pious person as a lyre, Palmer cites Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr, the first of whom claims that the mouth is like a lyre struck by the Spirit and the latter of whom claims that the entire person is a lyre played by the Spirit (ibid., 380, 382).

Bibliography

Abegg, Martin G., ed., with James E. Bowley and Edward M. Cook, in consultation with Emanuel Tov. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance.* 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003–10.

Ackroyd, Peter R. "The Problem of Maccabean Psalms." Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 1945.

———. "Some Notes on the Psalms." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 17 (1966): 392–99.

Allegro, John M. *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186).* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Amara, Dalia. "Psalm 151 from Qumran" (in Hebrew). *Textus* 19 (1998): 1–35.

Auffret, Pierre. "Structure littéraire de l'hymn à Sion de 11QPsᵃ XXII, 1-15." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1980): 203–11.

———. "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 151 de la grotte 11 de Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1977): 163–89.

———. "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 154 de la grotte 11 de Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1978): 513–45.

———. "Structure littéraire et interprétation du Psaume 155 de la Grotte 11 de Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1978): 323–56.

Baars, W. "Apocryphal Psalms." Pages 1–12 in *Canticles or Odes, Prayer of Manasseh, Apocryphal Psalms, Psalms of Solomon, Tobie, 1(3) Esdras.* Edited by H. Schneider et al. The Old Testament in Syriac, Part 4, Fascicle 6. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Baillet, Maurice. *Qumran Grotte 4, III: (4Q482–4Q520).* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 7. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

Baumgarten, J. M. "*Perek Shirah*, an Early Response to Psalm 151." *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1978): 575–78.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. "Errata et Corrigenda." Pages 375–77 in *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham-Ushaw College 2001.* Edited by Renate Egger-Wenzel. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 321. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.

Ben-Hayyim, Zeev. *The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary.* Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language. Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1973.

———. *Studies in the Tradition of the Hebrew Language*. Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, 1954.

Ben-Porat, Z. "The Poetics of Literary Allusion." *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976): 105–28.

Bergmeier, R., and H. Pabst. "Ein Lied von der Erschaffung der Sprach: Sinn and Aufbau von 1Q Hodayot I, 27–31." *Revue de Qumran* 5 (1965): 309–16.

Berlin, Adele. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985.

———. "Qumran Laments and the Study of Lament Literature." Pages 1–17 in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000.* Edited by Esther G. Chazon, with the collaboration of Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 48. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Berliner, Abraham. *Gesammelte Schriften.* Band 1, *Italien*. Frankfurt: Kauffmann, 1913.

Bernstein, Moshe. "Scripture: Quotation and Use." Pages 839–42 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Blau, Joshua. "A Conservative View of the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 20–25 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by John T. Willis and David E. Green. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.

Brownlee, W. H. "The 11Q Counterpart to Psalm 151:1–5." *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963): 379–87.

Calduch-Benages, N., J. Ferrer, and J. Liesen. *La Sabiduría del Escriba / The Wisdom of the Scribe*. Biblioteca Midrásica 1. Estella: Verbo Divino, 2003.

Carmignac, Jean. "La Forme poétique du Psaume 151 de la grotte 11." *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963): 371–78.

———. "Nouvelles Précisions sur le Psaume 151." *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1975): 593–97.

———. "Précisions sur la forme poétique du Psaume 151." *Revue de Qumran* 5 (1965): 249–52.

Charlesworth, James H. "The Odes of Solomon and the Jewish Wisdom Texts." Pages 323–49 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 159. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.

Charlesworth, James H., and James A. Sanders. "More Psalms of David." In Pages 609–24 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 2, *Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

Chazon, Esther. "Prayers from Qumran and Their Historical Implications." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 265–84.

———. "Scripture and Prayer in 'The Words of the Luminaries.'" Pages 25–41 in *Prayers That Cite Scripture*. Edited by James L. Kugel. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.

———. "The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms from Qumran." Pages 85–96 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S. M. Paul et al. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Childs, Brevard S. *Memory and Tradition in Israel*. Studies in Biblical Theology 37. Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1962.

Chyutin, Michael. "The Redaction of the Qumranic and the Traditional Book of Psalms as a Calendar." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1994): 367–95.

Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 1997.

———. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Collins, Terence. *Line Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A Grammatical Approach to the Stylistic Study of the Hebrew Prophets*. Studia Pohl, Series Maior 7. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978.

Cotter, David W. *A Study of Job 4–5 in Light of Contemporary Literary Theory*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 124. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Cross, Frank M. "David, Orpheus, and Psalm 151:3–4." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 231 (1978): 69–71.

Dahmen, Ulrich. *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur, and Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs^a aus Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 49. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Dahood, Mitchell. Review of James A. Sanders, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan, IV: The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*." *Biblica* 47 (1966): 141–44.

Debel, Hans. "'The Lord Looks at the Heart' (1 Sam 16,7): 11QPs^a 151A-B as a 'Variant Literary Edition' of Ps 151 LXX." *Revue de Qumran* 23 (2008): 459-473.

Delcor, M. "L'Hymne à Sion du rouleau des psaumes de la Grotte 11 de Qumran (11QPsa)." *Revue de Qumran* 6 (1967): 71–88.

———. "Le Texte hébreu du cantique de Siracide LI, 13 et ss. et les anciennes versions." *Textus* 6 (1968): 27–47.

———. "Zum Psalter von Qumran." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 10 (1966): 15–29.

Deutsch, Celia. "The Sirach 51 Acrostic: Confession and Exhortation." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982): 400–409.

Di Lella, Alexander A. Review of James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs)*." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 28 (1966): 93–94.

Dimant, Devorah. "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." Pages 379–419 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin J. Mulder. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Series 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud 1. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988.

Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W. *Lamentations*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox, 2002.

———. "R(az/ais)ing Zion in Lamentations 2." Pages 21–68 in *David and Zion: Biblical Studies in Honor of J. J. M. Roberts*. Edited by Bernard Frank Batto and Kathryn L. Roberts. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

———. *Weep O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible*. Biblica et orientaliar 44. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1993.

Driver, G. R. "Hebrew Notes." *Vetus Testamentum* 1 (1951): 241–50.

Dupont-Sommer, A. "Hébreu et Araméen." *Annuaire du Collège de France* 66 (1966): 347–72.

———. "Le Psaume cli dans 11QPsᵃ et la problème de son origine essénienne." *Semitica* 14 (1964): 25–62.

Eising, H. Eising, "זכר," *TDOT* 4:65–66.

Ejrnaes, Bodil. "David and His Two Women: An Analysis of Two Poems in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran (11Q5)." Pages 575–89 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Elwolde, John F. "Interrogatives in the Hodayot: Some Preliminary Remarks." Pages 131–47 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by M. F. J. Baasten and W. T. van Peursen. Orientalia lovaniensia analecta 118. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

———. "Some Lexical Structures in 1QH: Towards a Distinction of the Linguistic and the Literary." Pages 77–116 in *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University 15–17 December, 1997*. Edited by T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 33. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Eshel, Esther. "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period." Pages 69–88 in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, with the collaboration of Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 48. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Eshel, Esther, Hanan Eshel, and Ada Yardeni. "4Q448. 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer." Pages 403–25 in *Qumran Cave 4, VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Esther Eshel et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 11. Oxford; Clarendon, 1998.

———. "A Qumran Composition Containing Part of Ps. 154 and a Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan and His Kingdom." *Israel Exploration Journal* 42 (1992): 199–229.

———. "A Scroll from Qumran Which Includes Parts of Psalm 154 and a Prayer for King Jonathan and His Kingdom" (in Hebrew). *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 295–324.

Eshel, Hanan, and Esther Eshel. "4Q448, Psalm 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4QpISA[a]." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119 (2000): 645–59.

Eshel, Hanan, and John Strugnell. "Alphabetical Acrostics in Pre-Tannaitic Hebrew." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62 (2000): 441–58.

Evans, Craig A. "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 183–97 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Fabry, H.J. In H. J. Fabry, E. Blum, and H. Ringgren. "רב." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.

Falk, Daniel K. "Biblical Adaptation in 4Q392 *Works of God* and 4Q393 *Communal Confession*." Pages 126–46 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 27. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Fernández Marcos, N. "David the Adolescent: On Psalm 151." Pages 205–17 in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by R. J. V. Hiebert et al. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.

Flint, P. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 17. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. "Psalms, Book of: Apocryphal Psalms." Pages 708–10 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Flusser, David. "Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers." Pages 551–77 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*: *Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectar-*

ian Writings, Philo, Josephus. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud 2. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.

———. "Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers." *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966): 194–205.

Fokkelman, Jan P. *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible: At the Interface of Hermeneutics and Structural Analysis*. Vol. 1, *Ex. 15, Deut. 32, and Job 3*. Studia semitica neerlandica 37. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1998.

———. *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible: At the Interface of Prosody and Structural Analysis*. Vol. 2, *85 Psalms and Job 4–14*. Studia semitica neerlandica 41. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000.

———. *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible: At the Interface of Prosody and Structural Analysis*. Vol. 3, *The Remaining 65 Psalms*. Studia semitica neerlandica 43. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003.

———. *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible: At the Interface of Prosody and Structural Analysis*. Vol. 4, *Job 15–42*. Studia semitica neerlandica 47. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2004.

———. *Reading Biblical Poetry: An Introductory Guide*. Translated by Ineke Smit. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Freedman, David Noel. "Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977): 5–26.

Fusco, Susan Wirth. *Syntactic Structure in Rimbaud's Illuminations: A Stylistic Approach to the Analysis of Form in Prose Poetry*. Romance Monographs, Inc. 49. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1990.

García Martínez, Florentino. "Salmos Apócrifos en Qumran." *Estudios bíblicos* 40 (1982): 197–220.

García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. "Psalms Manuscripts from Qumran Cave 11: A Preliminary Edition." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 73–107.

García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude. "11QPsalms[b]." Pages 37–47 in *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–21*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 23. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Gibson, J. C. L. *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar, Syntax*. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

Gillingham, S. "From Liturgy to Prophecy: The Use of Psalmody in Second Temple Judaism." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (2002): 470–89.

Goldstein, J. A. Review of James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 26 (1967): 302–9.

Goody, Jack. *Food and Love: A Cultural History of East and West*. London: Verso, 1998.

Greenfield, Jonas C. "Two Notes on the Apocryphal Psalms." Pages 309–14 in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East*

Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon. Edited by Michael Fishbane et al. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

Gurewicz, S. B. "Hebrew Apocryphal Psalms from Qumran." *Australian Biblical Review* 15 (1967): 13–20.

Haran, Menahem. "The Two Text-Forms of Psalm 151." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 39 (1988): 171–82.

Harrington, Daniel J. *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Hughes, Julia A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Hurvitz, A. "Adon Hakkol" (in Hebrew). *Tarbiz* 34 (1965): 224–27.

———. "The Language and Date of Psalm 151 from Qumran (= 11QPs. I)" (in Hebrew). *Eretz Israel* 8 (1967): 82–87.

———. "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 5 (1965): 225–32.

Jassen, Alex. "Intertextual Readings of the Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: 4Q160 (Samuel Apocryphon) and Psalm 40." *Revue de Qumran* 22 (2006): 403–30.

Kim, Angela Y. "Authorizing Interpretation in Poetic Compositions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Later Jewish and Christian Traditions." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 26–58.

Kister, Menahem. "Notes on Some New Texts from Qumran." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993): 280–90.

Kittel, Bonnie Pedrotti. *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 50. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981.

Kleer, Martin. *Der liebliche Sänger der Psalmen Israels: Untersuchungen zu David als Dichter und Beter der Psalmen*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 108. Bodenheim: Philo, 1996.

Korpel, Marjo C. A., and Johannes C. de Moor. *The Structure of Classical Hebrew Poetry: Isaiah 40–55*. Oudtestamentische Studiën 41. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Kottsieper, Ingo. "11Q5 (11QpsA) XIX—A Plea of Deliverance?" Pages 125–50 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 61. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Kugel, James L. "David the Prophet." Pages 45–55 in *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*. Edited by James L. Kugel. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990.

———. "Poets and Prophets: An Overview." Pages 1–25 in *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*. Edited by James L. Kugel. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Landy, Francis. "Review of Jan P. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry*. *Review of Biblical Literature* 7 (2003): http://www.bookreviews.org.

Lehmann, M. R. "11 Q Ps and Ben Sira." *Revue de Qumran* 11 (1982): 239–51.

Lemaire, André. "Attestation Textuelle et Critique Littéraire: 4Q448 col. A et Psalm 154." Pages 12–18 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997.* Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman et al. Jeruslaem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.

———. "Le Psaume 154: Sagesse et site de Qoumrân." Pages 195–204 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech.* Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 61. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

L'Heureux, Conrad E. "The Biblical Sources of the 'Apostrophe to Zion.'" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 60–74.

Liesen, Jan. "'With All Your Heart': Praise in the Book of Ben Sira." Pages 199–213 in *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham-Ushaw College 2001.* Edited by Renate Egger-Wenzel. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 321. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.

Loretz, Oswald. "Die Analyse der ugaritischen und hebräischen Poesie mittels Stichometrie und Konsonantenzählung." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 7 (1975): 265–69.

Loretz, Oswald, and Ingo Kottsieper. *Colometry in Ugaritic and Biblical Poetry.* Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur 5. Altenberge, Germany: CIS, 1987.

Lugt, Pieter van der. *Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job.* Oudtestamentische Studiën 32. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Lührmann, Dieter. "Ein Weisheitspsalm aus Qumran (11QPs[a] XVIII)." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 80 (1968): 87–98.

Lyons, John. *Semantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Magne, Jean. "Orphisme, pythagorisme, essénisme dans le texte hébreu du Psaume 151?" *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1975): 508–45.

———. "Le Psaume 154." *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1977): 95–102.

———. "Le Psaume 155. " *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1977): 103–11.

Mancini, R. "Note sul Salmo 151." *Revista degli studi orientali* 65 (1991): 125–29.

Manfredi, Silvana. "The True Sage or the Servant of the Lord (Sir 51:13-30 Gr)." Pages 173–95 in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology.* Edited by Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia. Deuteronocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Mann, Jacob. "Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 2 (1925): 269–338.

Marböck, Johannes. "Structure and Redaction History of the Book of Ben Sira: Review and Prospects." Pages 61–79 in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference 28–31 July 1996 Soesterberg, Netherlands.* Edited by P. C. Beentjes. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlight Wissenschaft 255. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.

———. *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 272. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.

Meer, Willem van der, and Johannes C. de Moor, eds. *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 74. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

Metso, Sarianna. "Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement." Pages 283–300 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 2, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco. Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. "The Name and the Glory: The Zion-Sabaoth Theology and Its Exilic Successors." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 24 (1998): 1–24.

Meyer, R. "Die Septuaginta-Fassung von Psalm 151:1–5 als Ergebnis einer dogmatischen Korrektur." Pages 164–72 in *Das Ferne und Nahe Wort: Festschrift Leonard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70 Lebenjahres am 30 November, 1966 gewidmet*. Edited by Fritz Maass. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 105; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967.

Miller, Cynthia L. "Ellipsis Involving Negation in Biblical Poetry." Pages 37–52 in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Ronald L. Troxel et al. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

———. "A Linguistic Approach to Ellipsis in Biblical Poetry (Or, What to Do When Exegesis of What Is There Depends on What Isn't)." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 13 (2003): 251–70.

———. "The Syntax of Elliptical Comparative Construction." *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 17–20 (2004–7): 136–49.

Mishor, M. "Three Lexical Notes" (in Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 50 (1985–86): 122–23.

Morag, Shelomo. "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations." *Vetus Testamentum* 38 (1988): 148–64.

Morgenstern, Matthew. "The Apostrophe to Zion: A Philological and Structural Analysis." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14 (2007): 178–98.

Mulder, Otto. "Three Psalms or Two Prayers in Sirach 51? The End of Ben Sira's Book of Wisdom." Pages 171–202 in *Prayer from Tobit to Qumran: Inaugural Conference of the ISDCL at Salzburg, Austria, 5–9 July 2003*. Edited by Renate Egger-Wenzel and Jeremy Corley. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2004. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.

Muraoka, T. "Sir. 51, 13–30: An Erotic Hymn to Wisdom." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 10 (1979): 166–78.

New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics. Edited by Alex Preminger and T. V. F. Brogan. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Newsom, Carol A. "370. 4QAdmonition Based on the Flood." Pages 85–97 in

Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2. Edited by M. Broshi et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 19. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

———. "378–379. 4QApocryphon of Joshua." Pages 241–88 in *Qumran Cave 4.XVIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Edited by George J. Brooke et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 22. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

———. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

———. "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat." Pages 173–401 in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Esther Eshel et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Nitzan, Bilhah. "Prayers for Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Traditional Jewish Liturgy." Pages 113–32 in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, with the collaboration of Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 48. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

———. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. Translated by J. Chipman. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 12. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

———. "Works Containing Prayers." Pages 9–22 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by Esther Chazon et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

Noth, Martin. "Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 48 (1930): 1–23.

Olson, Dennis T. "Words of the Lights (4Q504–506 = 4QDibHam^a-c)." Pages 132–33 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Vol. 4a, *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth et al. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 4a. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Pagis, Dan. *Change and Tradition in the Secular Poetry: Spain and Italy*. In Hebrew. Jerusalem: Keter, 1976.

Palmer, Andrew. "'A Lyre without a Voice': The Poetics and the Politics of Ephrem the Syrian." *ARAM* 5 (1993): 372–99.

Pardee, Dennis. "Acrostics and Parallelism: The Parallelistic Structure of Psalm 111." *Maarav* 8 (1992): 117–38.

———. "A New Aramaic Inscription from Zincerli." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 356 (2009): 51–71.

———. "Structure and Meaning in Hebrew Poetry: The Example of Psalm 23." *Maarav* 5–6 (1990): 239–80.

———. *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 39. Leiden: Brill, 1988.

Payne Smith, J. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary: Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith, D.D.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1903.

Payne Smith, R. *Thesaurus Syriacus.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1879–1901.

Perri, C. "On Alluding." *Poetics* 7 (1978): 289–307.

Peters, Norbert. *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus.* Freiburg: Herder, 1902.

Petersen, David L., and Kent H. Richards. *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry.* Guides to Biblical Scholarship, Old Testament Series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Peursen, W. Th. van. "Sirach 51:13–30 in Hebrew and Syriac." Pages 357–74 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday.* Edited by M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen. Orientalia lovaniensia analecta 118. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

———. *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira.* Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 41. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Polzin, Robert. *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 12. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976.

———. "Notes on the Dating of the Non-Massoretic Psalms of 11QPs^a." *Harvard Theological Review* 60 (1967): 468–76.

Puech, Émile. *Qumran Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579).* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 35. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

———. Review of Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruction, Textbestand, Struktur, and Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs^a aus Qumran.* *Revue de Qumran* 22 (2005): 279–81.

Qimron, Elisha. "409.4QLiturgical Work A." Pages 63–67 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2.* Edited by Esther Chazon et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

———. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Harvard Semitic Studies 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

———. "The Psalms Scroll from Qumran: A Linguistic Survey" (in Hebrew). *Leshonenu* 35 (1971): 99–116.

———. "Some Remarks on the Apocryphal Psalm 155 (11QPsa Column 24)." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 10 (1992): 57–59.

Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Maʿase Ha-Torah.* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 10. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Rabinowitz, Isaac. "The Alleged Orphism of 11QPss 28 3–12." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 76 (1964): 193–200.

———. "The Qumran Hebrew Original of Ben Sira's Concluding Acrostic on Wisdom." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 42 (1971): 173–84.

Reitmeyer, M. *Weisheitslehre als Gotteslob: Psalmentheologie im Buch Jesus Sirach.* Bonner biblische Beiträge 127. Berlin: Philo, 2000.

Reymond, Eric D. "Even unto a Spark: An Analysis of the Parallelistic Structure in the Wisdom of Ben Sira 40:11–44:15." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1999.

———. *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry: Parallelism and the Poems of Sirach*. Studies in Biblical Literature 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature; Leiden: Brill, 2004.

———. "The Poetry of 4Q416 2 iii 15–19." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13 (2006): 177–93.

———. "Poetry of the Heavenly Other: Blessing beyond Blessing and Other Paradoxes of Angelic Praise." In *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*. Edited by Daniel Harlow, et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

———. "Sirach 51:13–30 and 11Q5 (=11QPsᵃ) 21.11–22.1." *Revue de Qumran* 23 (2007): 207–31.

Rickenbacher, Otto. *Weisheitsperikopen bei Ben Sira*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 1. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973.

Rogland, Max. "Alleged Non-Past Uses of Qatal in Classical Hebrew." Ph.D. diss., Leiden University, 2001.

Rooy, H. F. van. "Psalm 155: One, Two or Three Texts?" *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993): 109–22.

———. *Studies on the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms*. Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement 7. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Rösel, Martin. "Names of God." Pages 600–602 in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Rubinkiewicz, R., trans. "Apocalypse of Abraham." Pages 681–705 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1, *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Sanders, James A. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1967.

———. "A Multivalent Text: Psalm 151:3–4 Revisited." *Hebrew Annual Review* 8 (1984): 167–84.

———. "Ps 151 in 11QPsᵃ." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75 (1963): 73–86.

———. "Psalm 154 Revisited." Pages 296–306 in *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel: Für Norbert Lohfink, S.J.* Edited by Georg Braulik, Walter Gross, and Sean McEvenue. Freiburg: Herder, 1993.

———. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPsᵃ)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 4. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

———. "The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPsᵃ) Reviewed." Pages 79–99 in *On Language, Culture, and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida*. Edited by M. Black and W. A. Smalley. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

———. "Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPsᵃ." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 76 (1964): 57–75.

Sanders, James A., with James H. Charlesworth and H. W. L. Rietz. "Non-

Masoretic Psalms." Pages 155–215 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations.* Vol. 4a, *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth et al. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 4a. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Apostrophe to Zion (11Q Psalms Scroll 22:1–15)." Pages 18–22 in *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology.* Edited by Mark Kiley. London: Routledge, 1997.

Schiffman, Lawrence H., and James C. VanderKam, eds. *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Schrader, Lutz. *Leiden und Gerechtigkeit: Studien zu Theologie und Textgeschichte des Sirachbuches*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 27. Frankfurt: Lang, 1994.

Schuller, Eileen. "381. 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B." Pages 87–172 in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by E. Eshel et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

———. *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection*. Harvard Semitic Studies 28. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Schuller, Eileen, and Moshe Bernstein. "372. 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition[b]." Pages 165–97 in *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh and Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*. Edited by Douglas M. Gropp et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 28. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.

Segal, M. Z. *Sefer Ben Sira*. In Hebrew. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1953.

Segert, S. "Parallelism in the Alphabetic Apostrophe to Zion." *Archiv orientální* 64 (1996): 269–77.

Seybold, Klaus. *Das Gebet des Kranken im Alten Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bestimmung und Zuordnung der Krankheits- und Heilungspsalmen*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament 99. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973.

———. "Das Hymnusfragment 11QPs[a] XXVI 9–15." Pages 199–207 and 310–11 in *Studien zur Psalmenauslegung*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1998.

Simon, Uriel. *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra*. Translated by Lenn J. Schramm. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991. First published in Hebrew in 1982.

Skehan, Patrick W. "The Acrostic Poem in Sirach 51:13–30." *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971): 387–400.

———. "Again the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1977): 142–58.

———. "The Apocryphal Psalm 151." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 25 (1963): 407–9.

———. "A Broken Acrostic and Psalm 9." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 27 (1965): 1–5. Reprinted in idem, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (Catholic

Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 1; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971), 46–51.

———. "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada-Scroll, and in the Septuagint." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 13 (1980): 14–44.

———. "*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 343–47.

———. "A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs[a]." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 34 (1973): 195–205.

———. *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 1. Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971.

———. "They Shall Not Be Found in Parables (Sir 38,33)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23 (1961): 40.

Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes.* Anchor Bible 39. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1987.

Skehan, Patrick W., Eugene Ulrich, and Peter W. Flint. "88. 4QPs[f]." Pages 85–106 in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Edited by E. Ulrich et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 16. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

———. "A Scroll Containing 'Biblical' and 'Apocryphal' Psalms: A Preliminary Edition of 4QPs[f] (4Q88)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60 (1998): 267–82.

Smith, Mark S. "How to Write a Poem: The Case of Psalm 151A (11QPs 28.3–12)." Pages 182–208 in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11–14 December, 1995*. Edited by T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 26. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Smith, Morton. "Psalm 151, David, Jesus, and Orpheus." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93 (1981): 247–53.

Snaith, John G. *Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach.* Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Sommer, Benjamin D. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*. Contraversions. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Starcky, Jean. "Le Psaume 151 des Septante retrouvé à Qumran." *Le Monde de la Bible* 7 (1979): 8–10.

———. "Psaumes Apocryphes de la Grotte 4 de Qumran (4QPs[f] VII–X)." *Revue biblique* 73 (1966): 353–71.

Stegemann, Hartmut. "Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten." Pages 195–217 in *Qumran: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 46. Paris: Duculot, 1978.

Stegemann, Hartmut, Eileen Schuller, and Carol Newsom. *1QHodayot[a] with Incorporation of 1QHodayot[a] and 4QHodayot[a-f]*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 40. Oxford: Clarendon, 2009.

Stone, Michael C., and Jonas C. Greenfield. "213a. 4QLevi^bar." Pages 25–36 in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Edited by George J. Brooke et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 22. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

———. "The Prayer of Levi." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 247–66.

Storfjell, J. B. "The Chiastic Structure of Psalm 151." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25 (1987): 97–106.

Strugnell, John. "Notes on the Text and Transmission of the Apocryphal Psalms 151, 154 and 155." *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966): 257–281.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Extra-Canonical Hebrew Psalms from Qumran —Psalm 151." Pages 244-72 in idem, *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes; Leiden: Brill, 1989.

Tournay, R. "Recension de The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 par J. A. Sanders." *Revue biblique* 73 (1966): 258–65.

Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Tuschling, R. M. M. *Angels and Orthodoxy: A Study in Their Development in Syria and Palestine from the Qumran Texts to Ephrem the Syrian*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Ufenheimer, B. "Psalm 151 from Qumran" (in Hebrew). *Molad* 22 (1964): 69–81.

VanderKam, James C. "Studies on 'David's Compositions' (11QPs^a 27:2–11)." *Eretz Israel* 26 (1999): 212*–220*.

Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Rev. ed. London: Penguin, 2004.

Wacholder, Ben Zion. "David's Eschatological Psalter: 11Q Psalms^a." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 59 (1988): 23–72.

Waltke, Bruce, and Michael O'Connor. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Watson, Wilfred G. E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 26. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.

Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Angelic Song over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts." Pages 131–57 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

———. "Traces of *Kedushat Yozer* and *Pesukey de-Zimra* in the Qumran Literature and in Ben Sira" (in Hebrew). *Tarbiz* 45 (1975–76): 15–26.

Weinfeld, Moshe, and David Seely. "Barkhi Nafshi." Pages 255–334 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by Esther Chazon et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

Weiss, R. "*Herut* of 1 May." *Massa'* 15 (May 1964): n.p. Cited in Sanders, "The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a) Reviewed," 83.

Werth, Paul. "Roman Jakobson's Verbal Analysis of Poetry." *Journal of Linguistics* 12 (1976): 21–73.

Wimsatt, William K., Jr. *The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1941.

Woude, A. S. van der. "Die fünf syrischen Psalmen (einschliesslich Psalm 151)." Pages 29–47 in *Poetische Schriften,* vol. 1. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 4.1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1977.

Wright, Archie T. *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6.1–4 in Early Jewish Literature*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 198. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Yadin, Yigael, et al., eds. *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 12.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.

Index of Modern Authors

Index of Passages from Ancient Texts