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ABSTRACT

This article examines the use of the Psalms within the Psalms, where intratextual lexical recursion arguably indicates instances of formulaic expression, allusion, rewriting, and even quotation. Several examples from the Hebrew (MT) Psalms illustrate this phenomenon with comparisons from two ancient Jewish translations, the Septuagint and Psalm Targum. From the few examples examined in this article, the translations do not appear to replicate the same intratextual references as those of the MT. Evidence for intentional intratextual connections in the Psalms warrants a more systematic investigation, as this has implications for both form-critical assumptions and studies concerned with the final form of the text.

INTRODUCTION

In the Hebrew Psalter scriptural allusions and quotations to other passages are well known.1 In the course of the compilation of the תהלים, intertextual references were well known.1 In the course of the compilation of the תהלים, intertextual references were

1 For example Ps 95:7-11 refers to the well-known incident at Meribah and Massah (Numbers 20:1-13. Ps 72:17 partially alludes to Gen 12:3 (the Septuagint version [LXX-Ps 71:17] further contains additive ‘plus’ material, making the link to LXX-Gen 12:3 even more explicit than the Hebrew version). Of course, it is a matter of debate whether these instances in the Psalms (a) reference/quote other texts, or (b) are derivative of (unknown) external source material. For additional possible examples see: (1) Ps 7:15b (ינני עぅתי שלך) cf. Is 59:4c, Job 15:35b; (2) Ps 39:13b (נין זך למען ח %-כפכפכינך) cf. 1Chr 29:15a; (3) Ps 54:2 (הנייך אomite לכל אלהים לשהללא هل באֲהלמאֲל) cf. Num 10:35b; (5) Ps 77:17-19 (allusion?), cf. Hab 3:10-11; (6) Ps 79:6-7, cf. Jer 10:25; (7) Ps 86:15 (אתה נגיה נמך ונתן אוד) cf. Num 14:18, Ex 34:6-7; (8) Ps 103:9 (לא נגיה יִAnimationFrame נַּעַלך) cf. Is 57:16, Jer 3:12 (?); (9) Ps 106:6: (הטנהו בְאֲבֹתָנוּ יוֹם חָשָׁה) cf. 1 Kg 8:47c, Dan 9:5; (10) Ps 111:10a (אֲשֶׁר בִּנְנֵהּ לְהָֽיוּ) cf. Prov 1:7a, 9:10a; (11) Ps 113:7 (לָמֶה יָֽאִיר) cf. 1 Sam 2:8a; (12) Ps 115:2 (לָֽמֶה יָֽאִיר) cf. Joel 2:7c; (13) Ps 118:14 (תְּנוֹת אֱלֹהִים).
ences extending across virtually the whole of canonical scripture no doubt served to inculcate theological lessons within ancient Israel’s liturgical cycle. But the use of Psalms within the Psalms themselves has been under-emphasised in modern scholarship, perhaps in part because of the dominant force of form-critical approaches during the twentieth century, which have often blurred, with generalizing strokes, the ‘individual, personal, and unique features of the particular pericope’ (Muilenburg 1969:5), i.e. the unique rhetorical, literary and theological dimensions of the text. Instead, form criticism has in its view other developmental dimensions aimed primarily at reconstructing Israel’s history. Hermann Gunkel (1933), for example, classified individual psalms in terms of Gattungen, i.e. types, genres or ‘forms’ that were historically modified and adapted to various occasions. Ostensibly, the form could then reveal something about the underlying socio-religious occasion to which it related, and in particular, its Sitz im Leben.

Thus ‘literary’ connections among psalms have been, generally speaking, explained in terms of codified socio-religious expression that was ultimately a derivative of the liturgical life of Israel, and in Sigmund Mowinckel’s terms, a function of the cult. For Erhard Gerstenberger, the language and forms of the Psalms had already been ‘formalized’ from the earliest times of Israel’s history, or even prehistory, that is, long before the compilation of anything reminiscent of a canonical ‘Book’ of Psalms.

Related to the above issue of the ‘origins’ of the Psalms is the pronounced difficulty of dating. The commentaries proffer endless possibilities regarding the origin of individual psalms, but more often than not with little or no consensus. Albert Anderson (1988:64) concluded his discussion on the use of the Old Testament in the Psalms with the discouraged realization that ‘it is an almost impossible task to establish the precise nature of these interrelationships. Perhaps in many instances the explanation will be found in the shared common traditions.’

However, without necessarily contravening form-critical assumptions, it is possible to look at the aspect of intratextuality in the Psalms in terms of lite-


2 Included among the form-critical approaches is what has been called the cult-functional approach; see Mowinckel (1962:1:1-41).

3 Both Gerstenberger (1988:27) and Kraus (1960:xvii) argue for a compilation of the Psalms as a ‘book’ or collection somewhere between 500 and 200 B.C.E.
rary and lexical concerns. Psalms with a ‘double transmission’ (e.g. Ps 14/53) notwithstanding, there are numerous examples in which psalms may themselves have played an influential role in the literary landscape of other psalms; whether one can determine which psalm (or tradition) started off the influence must remain a separate matter.

Barring similarities that are purely thematic, we shall take particular interest in instances of intratextual lexical recursion, namely, instances in which, based on lexical evidence, psalms arguably draw from, reference, rewrite, or even quote other psalms or portions of psalms. Whether intratextual connections can be attributed to something like a ‘quotation,’ or whether they are merely the product of formulaic language (or, of course, of some other alternative such as fixed expressions, frozen forms, etc.), lexical recursion within the psalms nevertheless offers the most concrete instances of intratextuality. Thus, while originating factors in the language of a psalm may be deemed ‘stock’ or formulaic language, there is no reason why the same form-critically recognized influences at play behind one psalm would not lead to the referencing, or drawing upon of other similar expressions in other psalms, for precisely the same purpose.

To illustrate this phenomenon we shall briefly consider a number of examples from the Hebrew Psalter. As a point of comparison, we shall also consider if/how intra-psalm referencing may have been conceived of and/or achieved in the early history of interpretation, if at all, primarily by examining two independent Jewish translations: the Septuagint and the Targum, in addition to considering extant Qumran material and available Rabbinic sources.

---

4 Brevard Childs (1976:377-388) has made a more deliberate break from Psalms studies in their inchoate forms to studies interested in the ‘final’ form for the purpose of theological interpretation.

5 Kraus (1960:x) includes the following psalms as having a ‘double transmission’: Ps 18 = 2 Sam 22; Ps 14 = Ps 53; Ps 70 = Ps 40:12-16; Ps 108 = 57:7-11, Ps 60:5-12. In addition to these we might also include various psalm sections that comprise 1 Chr 16:1-36, namely, 1 Chr 16:8-22 = Ps 105:1-15 (see also Is 12:4); 1 Chr 16:23-33 = Ps 96:1-13 (see also 98:7); 1 Chr 16:34-36 = Ps 106:1, 47-48. Even a double transmission of a Psalm shows a reworking of known Psalm material. Psalm studies that emphasize the final form of the text are better able to make sense of a reworked or re-transmitted psalm within a canonical whole. For a lengthy article on Psalms in Chronicles, see especially Beentjes (2007:9-44).

6 Understanding the use of the Psalms within the Psalms should be of interest in both form-critical investigation as well as to those engaged in current trends in macro-level Psalms study.

7 The Greek text used throughout is based on Psaltium cum Odise (Rahlfs 1931).

8 The Aramaic text used throughout is based on Lager (1873 [1967]). For a critical English Translation see Stec (2004). See also Edward Cook’s translation online at http://targum.info/?page_id=11.
roughly contemporaneous with the Targum and tradition.9

B EXAMPLES

Certainly there are many instances of formulaic language throughout the Psalter, for example in the closing doxologies (יהוה ברוך/ואמן אמן,10 fixed forms (יהוה הללו),11 and commonly recurring language (e.g. כי טוב ולעלום TextBox).12 In other cases though, where parallels are less pervasive but nevertheless replicate other psalm material, intentional intratextual referencing may be a more appro-

9 While many texts could be compared with interesting results, the Septuagint version and Psalm Targum are two independent translations that represent, in translation, important witnesses antedating (though possibly overlapping with, in the case of the Targum?) the Masoretic text/tradition. On a continuum representing early Jewish history of interpretation – albeit not a monolithic one – the LXX version of the Psalms sits on one end as an important pre-Rabbinic witness. A tentative date for the Old Greek (or original Greek) Psalter may be located in the mid second century B.C.E. (Williams 2001:248-276). Schaper (1995:74) argues for a date in the second half of the 2nd century B.C.E.

The other end of our continuum could have been situated in a number of ways and need not reflect a hard distinction in Jewish literature. Rather, having too often received short shrift in the scholarly literature, the Psalm Targum is an important (and potentially late) witnesses to the Rabbinic tradition in which it arose. Rabbinic commentary, then, falls within this framework. A date for the Psalm Targum (Tg Ps) is far less certain. Stec (2004:2) tentatively dates the Tg Ps some time between the 4th and 6th centuries C.E., though with a potentially much older tradition preceding it, whereas Briggs (1906:xxxi) locates Tg Ps in the 9th century, conceding that the ‘Targum on the Psalter represents a traditional oral translation, used in the services of the synagogue from the first century AD.’ Unlike the Greek Psalter, the Psalm Targum ‘possesses signs of not coming from a single hand,’ even though it ‘belongs, as a unity, to the traditions of Jewish Aramaic translations of the Bible’ (Bernstein 1994:326).

Note, throughout the abbreviation Tg Ps is a reference to the Psalm Targum as a whole document (i.e. the ‘book’ of Psalms), or to multiple psalms, whereas Tg Ps represents an individual psalm.

11 Ps 102:19; 104:35; 105:45-106:1; 106:48; 111:1; 112:1; 113:1, 9; 115:17-18; 116:2; 117:2; 135:1, 3, 21; 146:1, 10-147:1; 147:20-148:1; 148:14-149:1; 149:9-150:1; 150:6. At times, however, the LXX translates יִדְוַלְוָה with αἰνέσει τον κύριον (LXX-Ps 101:19), while transliterating it with αλληλουία in other instances (LXX-Ps 111:1), though typically αλληλουία is reserved for the superscriptions (though cf. 150:6). The LXX convention appears to be true of Tg Ps as well, albeit inconsistently so (cf. Tg Ps 102:19 יִדְוַלְוָה; יִדְוַלְוָה; though cf. 104:35).
12 Ps 100:5; 106:1; 107:1; 118:1-4, 29; 136:1-26; see also Jer 33:11; Ezra 3:11; 1Chr 16:34, 41; 2Chr 5:13; 7:3, 6. The Greek Psalms treat this uniformly (ὅτι ἀγαθός ὅτι εἰς τον αἰῶνα τό ἔλεος αὐτοῦ) as does Tg Ps (בָּרְכַּא אֲדֹ הַוָּו כְּמוֹ הָיוֹ ק). See also הללְוָה in Ps 113:1; 134:1; 135:1.
appropriate explanation than a purely formulaic usage. Consider Ps 2:4 and 59(58):9.\(^{13}\)

**Ps 2:4 with 59(58):9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>2:4 לומ对孩子 שהב פלח ואלה מנה</th>
<th>59(58):9 האוה התוחמל למלות לכל גוים</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11Q7</td>
<td>עותי הנים התוחמל למלות כל גוים</td>
<td>לשכת היושב בשמים שוכך את כל מנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tg</td>
<td>דיתיב בשמיא וחךיג מימרן חך</td>
<td>ואת הנותח חך תשלך כל עמלך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἐκγελάσεται αὐτοῦς, καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐκμυκτηρεῖ αὐτοὺς</td>
<td>καὶ σὺ, κύριε, ἐκγελάσῃ αὐτοῖς, ἐξουδενώσεις πάντα τὰ έθνη.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2:4 He who sits in the heavens laughs; the Lord mocks them.\(^{14}\) 59:8 But you, O’ YHWH, laugh at them; you mock all the nations.

**MT:** Ps 2:4 is potentially referenced in 59:9 (or vice versa).\(^{15}\) In 2:4, the antecedent of לומ对孩子 is מנה, (nations and peoples) in 2:1, a subset of which are theملכיה (2:2).\(^{16}\) In 59:9 גוים appears in a verse that parallels 2:4, even though in Ps 2 גוים appears three verses earlier.\(^{17}\) In Ps 59 גוים appears for the first time in verse 9, clearly in reference to מאיבי (my enemies) in verse 1. That YHWH ‘laughs’ ( שםך; 2:4, 59:9) at his opponents is not unique to these verses (cf. Ps 37:13), but the convergence of לומ对孩子, with, גוים, and מאיבי, strengthens the argument for intratextual alignment.

**Versions:** The versions betray slight adjustments from the MT. From the comparative chart below we can see that the verbal forms in both Tg Ps and

---

13 Verse references in parentheses, e.g. 59(58):9, refer to the MT and (LXX) versification differences.
14 English translations are my own and render the MT, following the Standard English Bible versification.
15 Dahood (1966:8; 1968:70) dates both Ps 2 and 59 to the tenth century because of their strong similarities between these verses. Other commentators, however, are far less certain and theories abound (e.g. see Tate 1990:413-18).
16 On the expression ‘ארץ לכו, Dahood (1966:8) remarks, ‘By the time of the composition of this psalm … they had become stock literary figures who belong to the genre of royal psalms.’ It is this type of form-critical suggestion that has strongly discouraged the notion of intentional intratextual connections in the Psalms in the past. For Dahood, the quest for what lies ‘behind’ the text, its Ancient Near Eastern and Ugaritic connections, and ‘archaic forms,’ becomes of predominantly methodological importance. Thus the presence of kings or such characters in either psalm is merely a product of the genre in any case.
17 Tate (1990:94-95) raises the possibility thatガיים was originally גאים ‘proud ones’ prior to its redaction, though he concedes that the text as it reads is sensible if the speaker is understood as a king.
LXX commonly deviate from the MT in 59:9 (לעב, ἐξουδενώω) as compared to 2:4.\(^\text{18}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT 2:1</th>
<th>11Q7 2:1</th>
<th>Tg 2:1</th>
<th>LXX 2:1</th>
<th>MT 2:4</th>
<th>11Q7 2:4</th>
<th>Tg 2:4</th>
<th>LXX 2:4</th>
<th>MT 59:9</th>
<th>11Q7 59:9</th>
<th>Tg 59:9</th>
<th>LXX 59:9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>עלם</td>
<td>עם אומת</td>
<td>נאם</td>
<td>ἔθνην λαοῖ</td>
<td>שחק לנד</td>
<td>לנד ---</td>
<td>ננד דחד</td>
<td>ἕκλειδῶ ἐκμυκτηρίζω</td>
<td>שחק לנד נגי</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Tg Ps trades גוים (LXX ἔθνη) for עַמִּים in 59:9, the renderings are consistent in Greek and Aramaic for both verses. Significantly גוים (11Q7) in 2:4 becomes הוהי in 59:9.\(^\text{19}\) However, the Greek and Aramaic render קְצִינוֹס/הוהי in both instances. Tg Ps 2:4 shows that the action of יהוה is mediated by his מִמְרָא ‘Memra’\(^\text{20}\) or ‘word’ (cf. 18:15), a characteristically (periphrastic) rendering in the Targum,\(^\text{21}\) though it is hardly observed consistently as it is absent in 59:9. If anything, Tg Pss has more in common with the LXX than the MT on this point.\(^\text{22}\) It remains unclear that a connection in the

---

\(^{18}\) Interestingly, however, Tg Ps opts for לנד ‘to deride,’ an orthographically close synonym to the Hebrew לנד.

\(^{19}\) Several Hebrew manuscripts also read יהוה in 2:4.

\(^{20}\) Michael Klein (1981:162-77, especially 172) argues that Memra in the Targumim is ‘not a personification or a hypostasis, but rather a nominal substitute. … In the targumim memra appears as the subject of sentences in place of God’s name or pronoun, in almost every type of context.’ Thus Klein is of the opinion, contrary to many scholars, that the Targumim do not attempt to slight anthropomorphisms, which were not of theological significance anyway.


\(^{22}\) Without a doubt much more could be said about possible intertextual and intratextual links in this Psalm or in any other discussed in this paper. For Psalm 2, see espe-
Hebrew between 2:4 and 59:9 was interpreted as such in either translation, though *Mek Shir* 7.64, a Rabbinic midrash on Exodus 15:9-10, does in fact juxtapose Ps 2:4 and 59:9. 23

Ps 89:15 with 97:2-3

Ps 89:15 and 97:2-3 may offer an example where material from one psalm is reworked in another, thereby causing a dramatic shift in the literary-theological trajectory.

89(88):15

MT

דרק וימים מכסה תחתיו אמרת קדימה פניך

Tg

דרקא ודינה מכרס יכרד טבר ו祢וש

LXX

dikaiosúnhe kai kríma etoumíasia tou thronou sou éléos kai álìtheia prosporeúntai pòs prosoóto sou

88:14 Righteousness and judgement are the foundation of your throne; steadfast love and faithfulness go before you.

97(96):2-3

עונ יבрут ספרות עדק וימים מכסה ומונות פניך

MT:

Ps 89 begins with the proclamation of the certainty of the Davidic covenant. 24 More immediately, MT 89:12-19 amplifies a confession about YHWH’s power and strength. Verse 15 falls in the centre of this pericope by emphasizing what is characteristic of YHWH’s kingship, namely זורק וימים (righteousness and justice). This phrase serves as a metonymy for his ‘rule.’ 25 Steadfast love and truth (ואמת חסד) are said to be in his presence (פניך). Whereas Ps 89:15 extols the blessing of YHWH’s rule, Ps 97:2-3 sharply con-

23 See Lauterbach 1935. For discussion concerning the relationship between Targum and Midrash and the *Sitz im Leben* of the Targumim, see Alexander 1985:14-28.

24 Dahood (1968:311) dates Ps 89 to the post-Davidic monarchic period.

25 Dahood (1968:422) connects this verse with a Canaanite tradition (cf. 85:11). Tate (1990:422), however, links both verses (89:15 & 97:2) to similar concepts in Egyptian literature.
trasts with theophonic language of judgement on enemies. Following the ele-
mental language in 97:2a (וערפל ענן, כಸאוuggyועי,ומשפט צדק) of 97:2b is identical to
89:15a. Yet in 97:3, החרד לא are not ‘in the presence’ of YHWH (לפניו) as in
89:15, but גשא. Ps 89:15 or 97:2-3 possibly drew from the other by reworking an
existing text with a new application.

Versions: By stripping away shifts in word order and inflection, the fol-
lowing parallels may be seen more clearly, following the direction of the He-
brew:

| MT 89:15 | פנה משמש מון כسبة תсад אמרת קדש | LXX 88:15 | πρόσωπον προπορεύομαι ἔλεος αλήθεια ἐτοιμασία θρόνος κρίμα δικαιοσύνη |
| MT 97:2-3 | פנה משמש מון כسبة אש הלל | LXX 96:2-3 | ἑναντίον προπορεύομαι πῦρ κατόρθωσις θρόνος κρίμα δικαιοσύνη |
| Tg 89:15 | זדקה יד ממור בורסי יקרתי תשים כשתא קדש | LXX 89:15 | αἴφα κἂν γίνεται κρίμα ועתה מפורש |
| Tg 97:2-3 | זדקה יד אﺷא די ממון אשא הלל קדש | LXX 97:2-3 | קمهر אורה מ嫚 ממרשא קדש הלל |

The Greek translation utilizes a number of common glosses typical of
the present MT counterparts: Material in the Dead Sea Scrolls is lacking alto-
tgether. Since ממן (place, site, support for, foundation) is uncommon in the
Hebrew Psalms, occurring only four times, its Greek equivalent is of particular
interest. In each instance the Greek renders ממן differently:

33(32):14 - ἑτοιμος - prepared, ready, (Tg Ps מזר) 97(96):2 - κατόρθωσις - setting up, preservation, (Tg Ps מ嫚 ‘to follow direction’?)
89(88):15 - ἐτοιμασία - (cognate), preparation, foundation, base, (Tg Ps מזר)
104(103):5 - ἀσφάλεια - security, steadfastness, stability (Tg Ps базיס ‘base)

26 Mid Teh for Ps 97 juxtaposes Ps 97:2-3 and 89:15 in the context of the ‘fourth ex-
ile,’ or the occupation of Rome. See Braude 1959:2:500.
27 Material in the Dead Sea Scrolls is lacking altogether.
28 In the Greek Psalms ממן prefixed with ג is typically rendered by ἑναντίον + geni-
tive, whereas other prefixed and nonprefixed instances are typically rendered by πρόσωπον + genitive. Thus the ‘difference’ between the two verses here merely
follows a convention.
29 All glosses come from The Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint (LEH) unless
specified otherwise.
A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS) renders the verses with similar diversity: LXX-88:15 ‘righteousness and judgment are a provision of your throne’ (though ‘foundation, base’ LEH 1:184); LXX-96:2 ‘righteousness and judgment keep his throne straight.’ The LXX translator seems to have missed the intratextual linkage, or has at least obscured it in translation, but this could just as well be a result of not understanding the Hebrew clearly, since מקטיב was evidently a cause of confusion among the translations. Like Tg Ps in 97:2, the LXX may have understood a form of לְבָטְךָ. In any case the Greek does not appear to be self-referential in the process of translation and thus it is unlikely that an intratextual link is present.

Though the Psalm Targum is generally regarded as a ‘literal’ translation of the Hebrew,31 it occasionally interjects various interpretive pluses, which are suggestive of biblical rewriting. Tg Ps 89:15 glosses the Hebrew מבט יבשא (foundation of your throne) with מון והרס וכורסיה (the dwelling place of the throne of your glory), and in 97:2 righteousness and justice are ארח יבשא ומכות (the place to which his throne is directed), euphemisms that remove the offensive concreteness of the original. Further, the global language found in MT 97 is to some degree localized to the נמשחה (assembly) of Zion (Tg Ps 97:8). Could the שוגגיכך ירא (the cloud of glory) reference the Shekinah glory32

30 NETS appears to have been more influenced by Liddell & Scott on this point by rendering κατορθόω as ‘to keep straight’ (cf. ὀρθόω). In other instances outside of the Psalms, מקטיב is rendered: ἐτοιμός (ready, prepared - Ex 15:17; 1 Kings 8:13, 43, 49; 2 Chr 6:2, 30, 33, 39); τόπος (place - Is 4:5; Dan 8:11); πόλις (city, town - Is 18:4); and ἔτοιμασία (preparation, foundation, base - Ezra 2:68). Indeed, מקטיב is not an easily translatable word. Psalms cum Odis offers no variants for this verse. In Tg Ps 97:2 (מקטיב passive participium from מקטיב) may have been confused with Hebrew מקטיב (to prepare; establish). The same confusion may explain the seemingly odd rendering in the Greek as well (cf. מקטיב a proper name confused with מקטיב? cf. 2 Chr 3:17). The many variations in translational choices in Tg Ps, including this one where מקטיב appears to be understood in one context but is misunderstood in another, may suggest that the Psalm Targum was composed by more than one translator. On the contrary, the LXX Psalter is more unified in certain translational tendencies, which suggests that there was, more likely, a single translator.


32 Though שוגגיכך (clouds) is in the masculine plural construct from שוגגיכך, Stec’s translation opts for the singular, citing several witnesses in its support.

33 However, see the introduction to David Stec’s translation. Stec (2004:12) regards the many references to ‘Memra, Shekinah, and Glory’ throughout the Tg Ps, including this one where מקטיב appears to be understood in one context but is misunderstood in another, may suggest that the Psalm Targum was composed by more than one translator. On the contrary, the LXX Psalter is more unified in certain translational tendencies, which suggests that there was, more likely, a single translator.
revealed to his devout people (97:10) who do not worship idols (97:7 cf. Tg Ps 81:10)? Tg Ps 89, contra MT, is anchored in the Abrahamic promise (Tg Ps 89:1, 4) and even references the deliverance from Pharaoh (v.11). Thus it would appear that the Targum radically recontextualizes both psalms, thereby losing a clear intratextual reference. By contrast, the Rabbinic Mek Shab 1.123 (cf. Ex 31:17) had no trouble conflating Ps 89:15 and 97:2 for a new purpose, this time in reference to creation and rest on the Sabbath.

Ps 18:15 with 144:6

In at least one instance items from one psalm are reworked in the reverse order of the same items in another psalm. Although Mek cites Ps 18:15 as a midrashic explanation for Ex 14:9-14, where God delivered Moses and the people of Israel from Pharaoh, the superscription of MT-Ps 18 and LXX-17 connects it to David’s deliverance from Saul. No doubt the parallel psalm in 2 Sam 22 stands behind the superscriptions of the Psalms (or vice versa).34 It is reasonable to suppose that Ps 144:6 drew from Ps 18 or (2 Sam 22), since Ps 18:15 and 2 Sam 22:15 witness the same order of items, other differences notwithstanding.

| MT | ינשלה חץ ופיצם ברקים וברקמ | בורק ברק שיינש לחץ והימים |
| Tg | שלד מפורים חץ ומריא וברקמ | Abirch ברקמ בדרין |
| LXX | καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν βέλη καὶ ἀστραπὰς ἐσκόρπισεν αὐτοὺς | Αμύνες γίγας αὐτοὺς ἐξαπόστειλον τὰ βέλη σου |

18:14 And he sent his arrows, and dispersed them; and many lightening flashes, and confused them.

144:6 Flash forth lightening and disperse them; send out your arrows and confuse them.

MT: Whereas MT-Ps 18:15 moves from יָשָׁר (his arrows) in the first stich to בְּרֵקִים (lightening) in the second, Ps 144:6 reverses the order. Here is a key example where ‘stock’ language in the Psalms, e.g. יָש (cf. Ps 7:14; 11:2; 18:15; 38:3; 45:6; 57:5; 58:8; 64:4, 8; 77:18; 91:5; 120:4; 127:4) could be de-

77:17; 78:60; 80:2; 81:8; 82:1; 84:8; 88:6; 89:47; 90:1; 91:1, 4, 9; 98:1; 99:1; 102:3; 104:29; 108:8, 12; 110:5; 115:16; 122:4; 132:14; 135:21; 143:7.

34 Since there are numerous works that investigate the relationship between Ps 18 and 2 Sam 22 – what Kraus has called a double transmission (see note 5) – we shall not further engage that issue here.
rivative of another, for by retaining key terms throughout\(^{35}\) (שלח, חץ, פוץ, ברק, המם), Ps 18:15 and 144:6 show similarities that extend beyond mere coincidence. As mentioned above, 144:6 was more likely a derivative of 18:15, though admitting that 2 Sam 22 is a possibility. In this sense Ps 144 not only contributes theologically to the divine warrior motif (cf. Hab 3:4), but actualizes Ps 18 by citing it indirectly. The retelling of David’s escape from Saul, if we follow the superscription of Ps 18, is recast in the imperative in 144 (also Davidic by superscription in the MT) as a reason for praise.

Versions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tg</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:15</td>
<td>שלח מם ברק פוץ חץ</td>
<td>שרד ניר בדר בכור</td>
<td>συνταρασσω αστραπη σκορπιζω βελος εξαποστελλω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144:6</td>
<td>שלח מם ברק פוץ חץ</td>
<td>שרד ניר בדר בכור</td>
<td>συνταρασσω αστραπη σκορπιζω βελος εξαποστελλω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LXX-Ps 17:5 follows the MT in its major formal features, likewise retaining the lexemes in both versions. The Greek Psalms (17/143) seem to reference each other rather than 2 Kgdm, since in 2 Kgdm 22:15 we find ἀποστέλλω and ἐξίστημι, not ἐξαποστέλλω and συνταρασσω.\(^{36}\) While this could suggest that an intratextual connection was enforced by the LXX translator, the plus in the Tg Ps obscures the issue. Although the retelling in Tg Ps 144:6 retains all five lexemes in each verse, the common Targum addition מימרי (Memra) becomes the divine weapon in Tg Ps 18:15 (i.e. ‘he sent his Memra like\(^{37}\) arrows’), which does not transfer in 144:6.

---

\(^{35}\) DSS material is lacking for these verses.

\(^{36}\) The superscription to LXX-143 adds προς τον Γολιαδ (NETS referring to Goliad [Goliath]; cf. 1 Kgdm 17:42; 22:10; 151:1) following τῷ Δαυιד (cf. לדוד in the MT) and so does not follow the tradition of David’s deliverance from Saul (cf. 2 Sam 22).

\(^{37}\) Bernstein (1994:336) maintains that indicative of the Psalm Targum’s translation technique is the conversion of a Hebrew metaphor into a simile using היך (like) quite apart from a Vorlage reading utilizing כ״.
Another intratextual example occurs in Ps 38:22-23 and 71:12. Here the parallel material begins in 38:22b following the *soph pasuq* and extends into a new Hebrew line (v.23a), whereas 71:12 captures both ideas in one line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>38(37):22-23</th>
<th>71(70):12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>אל תעזبني יהוה אל תרחיק לי ממני תחפוך אלי</td>
<td>לא אלהים אל תחפוך לי ממני תחפוך אלי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QPs</td>
<td>אל תרחיק לי ממני תחפוך אלי</td>
<td>ל מ אלהים אל תחפוך לי ממני תחפוך אלי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tg</td>
<td>אל השבוקני יהוה אל תרחיק מי יד</td>
<td>אלא אלהים מתחריק מני לפשיד זרה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς με κύριε ὁ θεός μου</td>
<td>ο θεός μὴ μακρύνῃς ἀπ᾿ ἐμοῦ ο θεός μιου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μὴ ἄποστῃς ἀπ᾿ ἐμοῦ 23 πρόσχες εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν</td>
<td>με ἐν τήν βοήθειάν μου πρόσχες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μου τῆς σωτηρίας μου κύριε</td>
<td>μου εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου πρόσχες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38:21-22 Do not forsake me,</td>
<td>70:12 O God, do not be far from me;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YHWH my God, do not be far away from me;</td>
<td>22 hurry to help me, my Lord, my salvation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MT:** Ps 71:12 appears to streamline material from Ps 38:22-23, which is at any rate an expansive pseudo-acrostic psalm. That Ps 71 draws from 38, rather than the reverse, finds support in 4QPs where the order of psalms progresses from Ps 38:16-23 immediately to 71:1-14. While there can be little doubt that the Qumran scrolls witness an intratextual connection in these verses, perhaps for liturgical purposes, little can be said regarding its *raison d’être*, be it literary or formulaic. Incontestable, however, is the fact that the parallel line appears in both verses, whereas in other instances only ṣתריח ממני of 38:22a is found (e.g. Ps 22:12; 35:22). Clearly lengthier and more specific examples of lexical recursion invite a literary explanation over a purely formulaic one.

---

38 Craigie (1983:305) describes the language in these verses as ‘the overtones of the liturgical psalm of sickness’ characteristic of Ps 22 (cf. 22:2,12, 20). Tate (1990:214) likewise references Ps 22 as a close parallel.

39 Even in the MT the *qere* vocalization of the *qal* imperative ḫוּשָה (38:23) is identical to that of 38:23 (_months), and so the Masoretic reading tradition in 71:12 matches that of 38:23 (though see also in 1Sam 20:38; 60:22; Ps 22:20; 40:14; 70:2, 6).

40 Kraus (1960:490) remarks of the intratextuality in Ps 71 as follows: ‘Man hat in Ps 71 eine Sammlung von Zitaten sehen wollen. Auffällend ist fraglos, wie häufig in Ps 71 einzelne Stücke anderer Psalmen auftreten. Auf Ps 22 und 31 wird vor allem Bezug genommen … Aber alle diese Beobachtungen zeigen nur, daß der Dichter in der Psalmentradition lebt und aus dem Reichtum des Vorgegebenen schöpft.’
Versions:

| MT 38:22-23 | +ל עזרה +י помощи +ו רחק | +ל עזרה +י помощ +ו | +ל עזרה +י помощ +ו |
| MT 71:12    | +ל עזרה +י помощ +ו רחק | +ל עזרה +י помощ +ו | +ל עזרה +י помощ +ו |
| 4QPs$a$ 38:22-23 | +ל עזרה +י помощью +ו | +ל עזרה +י помощью +ו | +ל עזרה +י的帮助下 +ו |
| 4QPs$a$ 71:12 | +ל עזרה +י的帮助下 +ו | [ ] | [ ] |
| Tg 38:22-23  | +ל עזרה +י的帮助下 +ו | +ל עזרה +י的帮助下 +ו | +ל עזרה +י的帮助下 +ו |
| Tg 71:12    | +ל עזרה +י的帮助下 +ו | [ ] | [ ] |
| LXX 37:22-23 | εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου προσέχω ἀπέ- ἐμοῦ μὴ αφίστημι | εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου προσέχω ἀπέ- ἐμοῦ μὴ αφίστημι | εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου προσέχω ἀπέ- ἐμοῦ μὴ αφίστημι |
| LXX 70:12   | εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου προσέχω ἀπέ- ἐμοῦ μὴ μακρύνω | εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου προσέχω ἀπέ- ἐμοῦ μὴ μακρύνω | εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου προσέχω ἀπέ- ἐμοῦ μὴ μακρύνω |

Where 4QPs$a$ is available, it follows the MT identically. The Greek, however, deviates only in the prohibitive subjunctives (μη αποστῆς ‘do not depart, withdraw,’ μη μακρύνης ‘do not delay’). The underlying Hebrew (רחוק) ‘distant, remote, far away from’ occurs 13x in the Psalms. The negated jussive_presence construction, which occurs five times and exclusively in Pss 1-72 (Books 1-2), is rendered every time with either αφίστημι or μακρύνω: Ps 22(21):12 μη αποστῆς, 20 μη μακρύνης; 35(34):22 μη αποστῆς; 38(37):22 μη αποστῆς; 71(70):12 μη μακρύνης.$^{41}$ Given the semantic overlap between αφίστημι and μακρύνω in this regard,$^{42}$ the presence of each in these verses offers little by way of semantic significance. Nevertheless, if anything, the shift works against the notion of intentional intertextuality in the LXX version. Further, the stilted translation of the prepositional phrase (εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου) more likely shadows the formal features of +ל עזרה +י, while inserting the article for style.

The Targum does not present any addition of interest. Further, jussive prohibition in the MT (אָרַחיק in Aramaic), remains consistent throughout, appearing only in the Aphel and Ithpeel stems of רחק (to be far, distant):

**Aphel,** 38:22 (לא תרחיק), 71:12 (לא תרחיק)

**Ithpeel,** 22:12 (לא תרחיק), 20 (לא תרחיק), 35:22 (לא תרחיק)

Nevertheless, where there is lexical deviation – even where terms are synonymous – the argument for a demonstrable link between 38:22-23 and 71:12 is weakened.$^{43}$

---

$^{41}$ The non-negated jussive form occurs in 55(54):8 as a cohortative אָרַחיק and is nevertheless rendered by μακρύνω.

$^{42}$ Cf. LXX-Ps 21:12, 20 where the two are found in the same psalm.

$^{43}$ Tg Ps 38:23 reads עִשָּׁה (hasten to my help), whereas 71:12, though synonymous, reads עֵשָּׁה (hasten to my aid).
Ps 9:9 with 96:13 & 98:9

Our final example illustrates intratextuality in the MT across three different psalms. It would appear that, intentionally or not, MT-Ps 96:13b and 98:9b more fully develop Ps 9:9.44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>9:9</th>
<th>96(95):13</th>
<th>98(97):9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ידין בצדק תבל ישפט והוא</td>
<td>לפל יוהי כא בא באayarין יכשמ בצלק</td>
<td>לפל יוהי כא בא באayarין יכשמ בצלק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>במרות באם</td>
<td>בצלק עומס אמות</td>
<td>עומס بمושימ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>במרות באם</td>
<td>בצלק עומס אמות</td>
<td>עומס بمושימ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tg</td>
<td>ירחא יד נע ארטעה בךจำหน יד עסמה בחרצתא</td>
<td>קדם יוהי ארט ארט ארט עש ארט יד גולא</td>
<td>קדם יוהי ארט ארט ארט עש ארט יד גולא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בךจำหน יד עסמה בחרצתא</td>
<td>בךจำหน יד עסמה בחרצתא</td>
<td>בךจำหน יד עסמה בחרצתא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>και αυτος κρινει την οικουμενην εν δικαιοσυνη κρινει λαιους εν ευθυτητι</td>
<td>πο δροσυπου κυριου οτι ερχεται οτι ερξεται κρινει την γην κρινει την οικουμενην εν δικαιοσυνη και λαιους εν τη αληθεια αυτου</td>
<td>οτι εχει κριναι την γην κρινει την οικουμενην εν δικαιοσυνη και λαιους εν ευθυτητι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9:8 He will judge the world with righteousness; he will execute judgement for the people with fairness.

96:13 before YHWH; for he is coming, for he is coming to judge the earth. He will judge the world with righteousness, and the peoples with his trustworthiness.

98:9 before YHWH, for he is coming to judge the earth. He will judge the world with righteousness, and the peoples with fairness.

**MT:** In the MT, of the three verses it is clear that 96:13 and 98:9 share the greatest similarities (cf. 99:4); their juxtaposition as eternal kingship psalms likewise is appropriate to the lexical similarities within that collection.45 On a text-critical note, we might question whether the second appearance of כי בא in the first stich of 96:13 is dittographic,46 or if perhaps it was omitted in 98:9.

---

44 Other alternative possibilities include: (1) 96:13 may quote 98:9, (2) the reverse could be true, (3) 9:9 may have been derived from either of the other two psalms, and (4) as always, an older tradition could have been responsible for all three or any combination. It could in fact be that 9:9 is itself the older 'source' from which the others grew.

45 For an example of lexical juxtaposition in psalm collections, see especially Howard (1986). Of Ps 98:7-9, Tate (1990:525) remarks, ‘These verses are similar to 96:11-13 and function in a similar way in this psalm.’

46 Several Hebrew manuscripts omit יב. The BHS editors likewise seek to harmonize this text with 1 Chr 16:33, along with 98:9.
Further, in LXX-97:9 is a minus, which could signify scribal harmonization of the Hebrew. But barring an emendation either way, the remainder of both Hebrew verses beginning with is replicated verbatim until the final bound form, (with his truth), and (with equity - so NRSV), respectively. The variation of lexemes in these verses hints towards common couplets used in poetic speech. Evidently the gnomic enthronement motif of Ps 9:8 (, ‘But the LORD sits enthroned forever, he has established his throne for judgment’ - NRSV) was an interpretive impetus for the later enthronement, or eternal kingship Psalms to quote, or rework 9:9 into an eschatological setting, that is, if we understand to be a futurum instans participle in 96:13 and 98:9. Thus we might propose that Ps 98:9 quotes 9:9 for its theological contribution. Ps 96:13 may then have adapted to 98:9.

Versions: From the outset we can see that both the LXX and Tg Ps, as translations, remain formally close to the Hebrew.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT 9:9</th>
<th>MT 96:13</th>
<th>MT 98:9</th>
<th>Tg 9:9</th>
<th>Tg 96:13</th>
<th>Tg 98:9</th>
<th>LXX 9:9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>שפט תבל ב + עזר דיר ל + שם</td>
<td>שפט תבל ב + עם דיר +  שפט</td>
<td>שפט תבל ב + עם דיר +  שפט</td>
<td>דו' עם ארם ב + ומי דו' עם</td>
<td>דו' תבל ב + עזר + ודריש</td>
<td>דו' תבל ב + עזר + ודריש</td>
<td>ἐν + εὐθύτητι λαός κρίνω ἐν + δικαιοσύνη οἰκουμένη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 Qumran is lacking in these verses.
48 is found in other psalms (Ps 89:34, 50; 96:13; 143:1). The juxtaposition of with other common terms is suggestive of formulaic speech (cf. 89:34, 50; 96:13; 143:1, ), though the verses in question offer more than these common elements.
49 Pesiq Rab 12.9 uses 9:8-9 as a midrash of judgement against the ‘seed of Amalek’ in Ex. 17:16. Pesiq Rab 40.3/4, however, indicates that the Lord will judge Israel (and declare them acquitted, but the heathen nations will be judged). Pesiq Rab 51.6 uses Ps 96:13 to explain that God will judge all people, both faithful Israel and the unbelieving people. In preparation of the lulab offering during the Feast of Tabernacles, the four plants of the lulab cluster are used metaphorically to describe Israel.
50 The BHS editors propose the inclusion of the verb preceding, perhaps based on the precedent of 9:9.
Only in 9:9 does a verb appear again in the second stich (vably [Aph imp]; κρινεῖ [fut]), though a few Hebrew manuscripts omit it (Craigie 1983:115). Beginning the second stich, the LXX and Tg Pss are unified in their formal adherence to the Hebrew in 96(95):13 and 98(87):9, in which καὶ λαοὺς and ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ render εἴσοδος. Whereas the LXX is consistent with the Hebrew with respect to the final forms in these later psalms: ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ αὐτοῦ (MT-96:13 = באמונתו; MT-96:13 = במשרתו, which ultimately comes from 9:9), the Tg Pss are varied in all three instances: 9:9 יריעה (honesty); 96:13 יריעה (uprightness); 98:9 יריעה (uprightness).

However, that Tg Ps 96:13 and 98:9 opt for a pe’al infinitive (ויתם) and imperfect (ויתם) (cf. the Aphel of 9:9) could suggest that the later two verses were held in common, whereas 9:9 was all but forgotten in terms of intratextual connections. Additionally, Tg Ps 9:9 trades עמה אדם (the people of the earth) for עמה (world; LXX = οἰκουμένη (inhabited world)). The Hebrew metonymy ‘המה’ is traded in Tg Ps for what it represents, the people who inhabit it. Thus, in seeking to clarify the meaning of 9:9, as well as the fact that it probably comes from multiple hands, Tg Ps once again obscures the intratextual reference. Since the Greek on the other hand remains closer to the Hebrew, i.e. it does not appear to reference itself it may or may not witness an understood intratextual connection.

C CONCLUSION

In the present study we have only considered a few examples of intratextuality within the Psalms, leaving many others for further investigation, including:

Ps 6:2; 38:2, 3, 9
Ps 8:4; 144:1-3, 10, 11, 12
Ps 33:2-3; 144:9 (cf. Is 42:10)
Ps 34:15; 37:27
Ps 35:4, 26; 71:13
Ps 36:6; 57:11, 12
Ps 39:13; 102:2
Ps 42:6, 12; 43:5
Ps 44:14; 79:4
Ps 48:12; 97:8
Ps 50:7; 81:9
Ps 54:5, 86:14
Ps 56:14; 116:8-9
Other extended intratextual references worthy of note include:

Ps 15:1-3; 24:3-5
Ps 31:2-4; 71:1-3
Ps 40: 12-16; 70
Ps 57:8-11; 108:2-5 (cf. 36:6)
Ps 60:8-14; 108:7-14
Ps 115:4-13; 135:15-20
Ps 135:8-12; 136:10, 17-22

If nothing else, clearly a more systematic treatment is justified. In many instances it would appear that inner Psalm referencing may pay tribute through formulaic replication, quotation, the rewriting of (portions of) Psalms, actualization, etcetera. It is not difficult to imagine a range of possibilities. Additionally, some evidence from Qumran material (cf. 4 QPs² Ps 38:22-23 > 71:12) as well as other rabbinic sources also appear to recognize instances of intratextuality in the Psalms as in the MT. With respect to the translated versions, from the few examples considered we may conclude that the LXX may have recognized intratextual references (e.g. LXX 9:9; 95:13; 97:9), but more likely did not. Likewise, the Targum more often than not obscures lexical recursion with plus material for the sake of clarifying a local interpretation (e.g. Tg Ps 9:9). None of this suggests that intratextuality was ignored in the versions. While our present goal has been a comparative one, with the MT as the controlling text, there is evidence that both the LXX and Tg Pss formulate intratextual references differently from the MT (e.g. LXX 70:17 & Gen 12:3; Tg Pss 2:2 & 48:5). Nevertheless, with the MT in view, it appears that where an intratextual reference may have played a formative role in a new Psalm, the translations as examined do not seem to follow suit.⁵¹
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