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ABSTRACT

The focus of this paper is on the Davidic figure as presented in the Psalters—the MT Psalter, LXX Psalter and 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter. David of the MT Psalter is the same figure we encounter in the LXX Psalter and 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter; however, it is David as he is remembered uniquely in each of the Editorial Variant Texts. The MT Psalter is compared with the LXX Psalter and 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter. Contra Wilson, who argues that the MT Psalter deemphasises David when compared to the other textual witnesses, I argue that the MT Psalter is also susceptible to be read as a highly Davidic book. David is an important character in the Psalter and is the last of Israel’s legendary figures mentioned within the bodies of the psalms. In the final analysis, the MT Psalter concludes with David, the sweet psalmist of Israel, remembered for directing Israel in the worship of Yahweh through unconditional praise, a praise resounding from every corner of the cosmos, Yahweh’s temple.

A INTRODUCTION

Psalms scholarship has shifted from being preoccupied with form-critical issues to attempts to understand the Psalter as a whole by focusing on issues such as the literary shape and theological orientation of the Psalter. Wilson argues that the Masoretic Psalter (MT Psalter) in its final form has been shaped in such a way that in Psalms 90–100 focus is deflected away from the earthly Davidic kingdom to the kingship of Yahweh thereby deemphasising the significance of the Davidic figure/dynasty.\(^1\) The question addressed in this paper is whether the MT Psalter in its final form may be regarded as deflecting attention away from the Davidic figure when compared to other textual witnesses such as the Septuagint Psalter (LXX Psalter) and the Psalms Manuscripts from Qumran, specifically 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter.\(^2\) This paper is not so much a response to Wilson’s

---

\(^1\) Gerald H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico: Scholars Press, 1985).

\(^2\) In this study no preference is given to either of these textual witnesses, the MT Psalter, LXX Psalter, or 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter. Unlike textual criticism, which intends to get back to the original text, the view that is held here is that these are “Editorial Variant Texts.” As Clines states it, “there is no reason to imagine that the Masoretic text was determined upon some kind of text-critical process, and so that it necessarily
claim, although it was inspired by his writings as it is an attempt to understand
the MT Psalter against the Second Temple environment which possibly gave
rise to it in its final form. Speculation regarding the time of the finalisation of
the MT Psalter will not influence my findings. 3

Reading of the MT Psalter in comparison to the other textual witnesses
should be viewed as an attempt to understand this poetic book narratively. 4 The
narratival readings of the Psalter are an attempt to understand the intention and
achievement of the final redactor(s). 5 Narratival readings take seriously the

represents a better text than those of other manuscript traditions that it superseded or
supplanted” (David J. A. Clines, “What Remains of the Old Testament? Its Text and
Language in a Postmodern Age,” Stud Theol 56/1 (2002): 76–95, 82. Tov also ado-
vocates an open approach that allows for the large-scale differences between Masoretic
Text, Syriac Bible, Targum, Vulgate (MT STV) as compared with other textual wit-
nesses such as the LXX and the Hebrew biblical texts from Qumran as it can be
shown that there are a number of differences which preceded the MT edition (Em-
manuel Tov, “The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT
STV, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources,” in The Earliest Text of the
Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of
the Septuagint Reconsidered [ed. Adrian Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Society of
Biblical Literature, 2003], 121–144) This is true unless we are willing to uncritically
follow Gunkel in assuming that the shorter MT Psalter is the more pristine, which
may land us in all sorts of complex issues when comparing these textual witnesses.

For example, Sanders, following the discoveries of the Psalms Manuscripts from
Qumran, argues that the MT Psalter in its finalised form is as late as the first half of
the first century B.C. (James A. Sanders, “Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of
Canon,” McQ 21 [1968]: 1–15; reprinted in New Directions in Biblical Archaeology
[ed. David Noel Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield; Garden City: Doubleday, 1969],
101–116, 115). Wilson dates the final redaction of the MT Psalter as late as the
middle of the first century A.D. (Wilson, Editing of the Hebrew Psalter, 72–73).

Vincent in his “The Shape of the Psalter: An Eschatological Dimension?” asks the
question: Do the five books have a story to tell? (Milton A. Vincent, “The Shape of
the Psalter: An Eschatological Dimension?” in New Heaven and New Earth:
Prophecy and the Millennium in Honour of Anthony Gelston [ed. Peter J. Harland and
C. T. Robert. Hayward; VTSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 61–82).

This is evident from some of the main proponents of this approach. Childs argues:
“The need for taking seriously the canonical form of the Psalter would greatly aid in
making use of the Psalms in the life of the Christian Church. Such a move would not
disregard the historical dimension of the Psalter, but would attempt to profit from the
shaping which the final redactors gave the older material in order to transform tradi-
tional poetry into Sacred Scripture for the later generations of the faithful” (Brevard
Childs, “Reflections on the Modern Study of the Psalms” in Magnalia Dei. The
Mighty Acts of God: Essays in Memory of G. Ernest Wright [ed. Frank M. Cross,
canonical form of the Psalter by paying attention to the textual clues—linguistic, arrangement, plot, motifs, tensions and resolutions, groups of Psalms according to their authors, etcetera.\textsuperscript{6} I am convinced that the Psalter as a book can breathe significances beyond those of the human authors, or final redactors. The 150 individual psalms or the five individual books which form one whole are capable of generating significances which an individual psalm or individual book cannot generate when read independent of the others. It is also in the interest of the canonical form to look specifically at the Davidic figure in the book and attempt to determine his importance.\textsuperscript{7}

**B MT PSALTER VERSUS LXX PSALTER**

The MT Psalter and the LXX Psalter share significant similarities and also significant differences. This, of course, should be expected, as the LXX Psalter is a translation of the Hebrew manuscripts and is also an important witness of the transmission of tradition.\textsuperscript{8} The similarities and differences between these two

---


\textsuperscript{7} James L. Mays, “The David of the Psalms,” \textit{Int} 40.2 [1986], 143 points out that an interest in such a subject “assumes that it is legitimate and useful to be interested in this figure who exists as a literary reality—and may have never existed in any other way.”

\textsuperscript{8} I am deliberately avoiding terming the Hebrew manuscripts on which the LXX translation was based “proto-Masoretic” because scholars are realising more and more that the LXX Psalter preserves redactionally different material relevant to the literary analysis of the Bible, often earlier than the MT (Tov, “Differences between the LXX and MT S T V,” 121). As Müller points out, “instead of considering the importance of the Septuagint as exhausted in its capacity as a source for the underlying Hebrew Urtext, we might also consider it as a witness to the process of transmitting tradition” (Mogens Müller, \textit{The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint} (JSOTSup 206; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996], 99). Many, as Tov points out, are
textual variants also come out in their presentation of the Davidic figure. It will become evident that in the LXX Psalter there is conceivably more emphasis on the Davidic figure than in the MT Psalter.

1 David within the bodies of the Psalms

The bodies of the psalms, an area where commonality is to be most expected serve as a starting point. David’s name appears in seven psalms outside of the psalm-headings (Pss 18:50; 72:20; 78:70; 89:3, 20, 35, 49; 122:5; 132:10, 11, 17; 144:10), thus once in Book I, once in the postscript in Book II, five times in Book III, none in Book IV and six times in Book V. In this regard, there is a general agreement content-wise between the MT Psalter and the LXX Psalter. Therefore it is important to examine the way the Davidic figure is presented in these psalms.

1a David, the Messiah

The concept of the מֶשֶׁחַ (messiah) directly linked to the name of David occurs six times in Pss 18:50; 89:20, 38, 51; 132:10, 17. The concept of the messiah, as will duly be noted, appears in the context where Yahweh is invoked to deliver and remain faithful to his messiah, David. In Psalm 18, David, as Yahweh’s messiah, is a recipient of Yahweh’s בֵּית אִשָּׁה (hesed), that is, Yahweh’s covenantal faithfulness, and he is given heroic victories over his enemies. In this psalm, it is David himself, invoking his own status as a messiah when he finds himself in a situation in which he requires Yahweh’s deliverance. As Mays notes, the superscription of this psalm and the context in 2 Sam 22


9 This is to avoid the pitfall of connecting every appearance of the concept of messiah with the ruling Davidic king in the book of Psalms.
connects it with David’s escape from Saul and victories attained against Israel’s other enemies.10

The theme of Yahweh’s hesed is reiterated in Ps 89, where the status of David as Yahweh’s messiah is once again affirmed (v. 20); however, in this case the psalmist laments the rejection and anger showed toward the Lord’s messiah, a subsequent Davidic king (vv. 38, 49–52).11 As Wallace observes, this Korahite psalm rather than set hope on things such as Zion or the temple, it ties hope with David and the Davidic dynasty by building a case for the inviolability of the covenant between Yahweh and David.12 It should also be noted that the hesed theme pervades the rest of the Psalter, appearing even to a greater extent in Book IV and V, culminating in Ps 136.13 Thus, Book IV and V continue to affirm Yahweh’s hesed for David or the Davidic dynasty (Pss 132; 138; 143; 144). Pss 138, 143, and 144, like Ps 18, are הֶסֶד psalms, thus making David the one invoking Yahweh’s hesed.

In Psalm 132 the pilgrims beseech Yahweh to remain in the place that David, his messiah, established for him as his dwelling place; and also, they plead with Yahweh to remain faithful to the promise he made to David, his messiah, for the sake of the continuity of the Davidic dynasty.14 In Pss 89 and 132, it is subsequent generations invoking the Davidic messiahship. For later generations, David as the Lord’s anointed was viewed as a representative head—the promises made to David were also theirs. Later generations when

11 As Goldingay notes, “Psalm 89 has often been reckoned to reflect the fall of Jerusalem in 587, the individual king in the psalm then being Jehoiachin (notwithstanding his having already been exiled in 597). But it has also been read against the earlier background of events in the reigns of Rehoboam, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, or of Josiah’s death and the later background of the ongoing suspension of the monarchy after the fall of Babylon or its continuing suspension in the Persian period (let alone the Greek period).” Cf. John Goldingay, Psalms, Volume 2: Psalms 42–89 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 665–66.
13 The noun הֶסֶד appears 41 times in Books I-III (Pss 5:8; 6:5; 17:7; 18:51; 25:10; 26:3; 31:22; 32:10; 33:5; 22; 36:6; 8, 11; 40:11; 12; 42:9 44:27; 48:10; 52:3; 57:4, 11; 59:11, 17, 18; 61:8; 62:13; 63:4; 69:14, 17; 77:9; 85:8, 11; 86:5, 15, 13; 88:12; 89:2, 3, 15, 29, 50) compared to 61 times in Books IV and V (Pss 90:14; 92:3; 94:18; 98:3; 100:5; 101:1; 103:4, 8, 11; 106:1, 7, 45; 107:1, 8, 15, 21, 31, 43; 108:5; 109:12, 16, 21; 115:1; 117:2; 118:1, 2, 3, 4, 29; 119:41, 64, 76; 136:1–26 [26 times]; 138:2, 8; 141:5; 143:8; 144:2; 145:8).
faced with danger could also plead with Yahweh to remain faithful to the Davidic covenant promises. Thus, Yahweh is presented as having a covenantal obligation toward his messiah—David, his line, his descendants, the Davidic dynasty.15

The Psalters envision perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty through Davidic descendants. Pomykala argues that this image of David as progenitor of the messiah with the exception of the New Testament’s frequent designation of Jesus as messiah is attested during the Second Temple period “in only three provenances—in the Psalms of Solomon [ch. 17], at Qumran [4QpGena, 4QFlor, 4QpIsa, 4Q285], and in 4 Ezra [ch. 12];” therefore, making it “one of the least frequent images of David in early Jewish texts.”16 In all these instances hope for the rise of a Davidic messiah is generated by the desire for God to restore Israel’s dominion.17 In the Psalters, hope for continuity of the Davidic dynasty through the messiah rests solely on Yahweh’s covenantal faithfulness. In Ps 89:39, a later generation pleads with Yahweh from the dust, a state of humility, when they cry out, “you have renounced your covenant with your servant; you have defiled his crown in the dust.” Understood against the background of the Second Temple period, this was a time when Israel was literally in the dust under the dominion of foreign rulers, yet there was hope that Yahweh will again show his faithfulness by raising them from the dust to kingship through his messiah, David.18 The idea of the rise of a Davidic king in the eschatological future was a result of “the association of the future king with the image of David as a great king from the past, the founding father of Judea.”19

1b David, the Legend

In Psalm 78, in the retelling of Israel’s history, David is chronologically the last legendary figure of Israel. In the context of the whole Psalter (apart from the superscripts), in both the MT Psalter and LXX Psalter, with the exclusion of names mentioned in the superscripts, David is chronologically the last of the

17 Pomykala, “Images of David in Early Judaism,” 34.
18 For further discussion on the motif of dust and kingship, see Walter Brueggemann, “From Dust to Kingship,” ZAW 84 (1972): 1–18.

Legends mentioned by name following the ranks of Abraham, Melchizedek, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Phinehas, and Samuel.

In the Psalters, Israel’s history climaxes with David and consequently finds its continuity through David. In Ps 132 where David’s name is mentioned in the body of the psalm, Yahweh is pleaded with to remain faithful to David by keeping the “sure oath” he made to David that “One of your descendants I will place on your throne. If your sons keep my covenant and the statutes I teach them, then their sons will sit on your throne forever and ever” (vv. 11–12). It is surprising that Wilson regards this psalm as deflecting attention away from David, when just after affirming Yahweh’s kingship, it concludes with a positive anticipation of God to keep his promise to “make a horn grow for David and set up a lamp for my anointed one” (v. 17). The eschatological promise in this verse affirms the “sure oath” for continuity of the Davidic dynasty that Yahweh made to David. What we have in Ps 132:17 is an unambiguous declaration of continuity of the Davidic dynasty. Psalm 132 should also be understood as “a community’s plea for its well being.” As Steussy

---

20 Pss 47:9; 105:5, 9, 42.
21 Ps 110:4.
22 Ps 105:9.
23 God is often called “the God of Jacob:” Pss 20:1; 24:6; 46:7, 11; 75:9; 76:6; 81:1, 4; 94:7; 114:7; 146:5. The name Jacob is also used to refer to the people of Israel, Pss 14:7; 22:23; 46:7, etc.
24 Ps 77:15; 78:67; 80:1, 5; 80:1, 5; 105:17.
25 Ps 77:20; 90:1; 99:6; 103; 103:7; 105:26; 106:16, 23, 32.
26 Ps 77:20; 99:6; 105:26; 106:16; 115:10, 12; 118:3; 133:2; 135:19.
27 Ps 106:30.
30 This verse should be viewed as a resumption of the “sure oath” in vv. 11–12 of this psalm. In this psalm, as Fokkelman points out, “the proper names ‘David’ and ‘Yahweh’ are circling each other as it were, and the repetition of the keyword ‘swear/oath’ is significant. We have landed in the middle of a generosity contest: David wants to honor Yahweh with a temple—a spatial entity, a concrete object—but God outstrips David by making his favorite king the founder of a veritable dynasty—a concept belonging to the more abstract dimension of time” (Jan P. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry: An Introduction Guide* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001], 156).
notes, this psalm “assumes interdependence between the community’s well-being and the anointed’s.” In the Psalters continuity of a nation is intertwined with the destiny of the Davidic line. Continuity of the Davidic dynasty guarantees the continuity of Israel. Israel’s hope for her survival was set on Yahweh’s covenantal faithfulness to David.

**1c David in Book V of the Psalters**

Within the bodies of the psalms, David’s name is mentioned the most in Book V of the Psalter. David is explicitly mentioned in Ps 122, appearing once, Ps 132, appearing three times, and Ps 144, appearing once; thus, contrary to Wilson’s claim that Book V deemphasizes the Davidic figure, Book V arguably puts emphasis on the Davidic king not just coming from one or two psalms, but three.

Psalm 122 and 132 share common themes: 1) election of Jerusalem; 2) Jerusalem as David’s royal seat. Psalm 132, as Anderson points out, follows after the psalm of God’s enthronement as “a restatement of the tenets of Davidic Theology.” Psalm 144 continues the theme of “steadfast love,” which in this case is evident in the victories that Yahweh has given to David, rescuing him from the deadly sword. The difference between the MT Psalter and the other textual variants, the LXX Psalter and 11QPs Psalter, as will be evident below, is perhaps that the latter go a step further in emphasizing the Davidic figure.

**2 Davidic Superscripts**

The Davidic superscripts have been subject to debate, especially from a text critical perspective with regard to both the MT Psalter and the LXX Psalter. The hermeneutical significance of the superscripts is an issue of debate as some regard them as later additions not worth of consideration, whereas others, although acknowledging that these superscripts were not part of the original composition, find them to be hermeneutically significant in understanding the psalms. The psalms’ superscripts whether added later or not, are no less essential in understanding the Psalter in its final form.

---

32 Steussy, *David*, 145.
35 For the different views regarding the superscripts see, James H. Fraser, “The Authenticity of the Psalm Titles” (Ph.D. diss., Grace Theological Seminary, 1984), 4–9.
The LXX Psalter, unlike the MT Psalter, contains superscripts for almost all the psalms except for Psalms 1 and 2. The MT Psalter contains 24 untitled psalms, thus excluding the הַתָּנִית הַפְּסָלִים. The LXX Psalter twice lacks the Davidic superscripts where they are present in the MT Psalter (Pss 121[122] and 123[124]). Thirteen psalms, Pss 32, 42, 70, 90, 92–98, 103, 136, in the LXX Psalter have Davidic superscripts that are absent in the MT Psalter. In all thirteen cases τῶν Δαυίδ, which is the predominant equivalent of הַתָּנִית, is used, thus setting them in harmony with most of the Davidic superscripts. The relation of David to the psalms in the LXX Psalter might be viewed as having a deeper significance that goes beyond that of the MT Psalter.

In Book I, the MT Psalter in addition to Psalms 1 and 2, Psalms 10 and 33 do not have superscripts, whereas in the LXX Psalter Psalms 9 and 10 are one psalm with a Davidic superscript. In the case of Psalm 32 [MT 33], the LXX Psalter agrees with 4QPsq in ascribing the psalm to David. It is probable that for the redactors of the LXX Psalter, Book I was supposed to be viewed as a fully Davidic composition, perhaps to set David apart as Israel’s psalmist par excellence.

In Book II, the two psalms in the MT Psalter (Pss 43; 71) that lack superscription receive Davidic ascription in the LXX Psalter. In Book III, the MT Psalter and LXX Psalter are generally in agreement with both containing only one Davidic psalm (Ps 86). In Book IV ten psalms are without superscripts in the MT Psalter (Pss 91; 93–99; 104; 105), whereas nine of these are ascribed to David in the LXX Psalter (Pss 90[91]; 92–98[93–99]; 103[104]). The LXX Psalter agrees with 11QPs in attributing Psalm 103[104] to David. According to Pietersma, “we can perhaps with some confidence assume that τῶν Δαυίδ had a Hebrew Vorlage different from the MT.” The LXX Psalter Ps 104[105] receives an αλληλουϊα (alleluia) superscript, thereby blending it with the concluding Psalm 105[106] of Book IV. It is in this book where we find a

---

37 Pss 106, 111, 112, 113, 135, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150
39 4QPs has לַוזִּיד שֵׁר מְמוּר whereas the LXX Psalter only has τῶν Δαυίδ.
major difference in the distribution of the Davidic superscripts between these two textual witnesses. In the LXX Psalter, David is set alongside Moses (Pss 89 and 90 [MT Pss 90 and 91]) in declaring Yahweh as a tent of hope for those who trust in him.\textsuperscript{41} It is in the MT Psalter, where the kingship of Yahweh is emphasized by introducing the \textit{Yahweh Mālak} psalms (Ps 93, 96–99).\textsuperscript{42} The LXX Psalter, unlike the MT Psalter, ascribes these psalms to David.

For Wilson the lesser attribution of the psalms to David, especially the \textit{Yahweh Mālak} psalms, is evidence of the downplaying of the Davidic significance in the MT Psalter. The problem with Wilson’s conclusion is that it has to presuppose that MT Psalter redactors were eliminating the Davidic superscripts by replacing them with \textit{Yahweh Mālak} superscripts. In Book V, the LXX Psalter lacks Davidic superscripts where they are present in the MT Psalter (Pss 121[122] and 123 [124]), and on the other hand, the LXX Psalter has a Davidic superscript for Ps 136[137] and also contains Ps 151, which is a Davidic psalm; thus Book V in both the Psalters contains 15 Davidic psalms.\textsuperscript{43}

Considering that where there is a lack of superscripts in the MT Psalter the LXX Psalter inserts Davidic superscripts rather than attribute such psalms to other psalmists or some other legend of the past such as Moses, Asaph, the sons of Korah or even Solomon, this express the high esteem that David had as a psalmist of Israel. The Davidisation of psalms that is reflected in the LXX Psalter is indicative of the increasing emphasis on the tradition of Davidic authorship during the Second Temple Period.\textsuperscript{44} It is highly unlikely that the redactors of the MT Psalter would have chosen to downplay the significance of David in their Psalter by removing the Davidic attribution where they were previously.

\textsuperscript{41} As Henze points out, “Pss 90 and 91, too, have several elements in common: they both are reminiscent of the wisdom tradition, and both affirm God’s protective powers. Ps 91 continues the theme of God’s faithfulness already voiced in Ps 90. Particularly striking in this respect is the final promise in 91:16 of human longevity (v. 16a, “With a long life I will satisfy him”), in contrast to the meditation on the ephemerality of life in Ps 90:4–6 and 9–10.” Matthias Henze, “Psalm 91 in Pre-modern Interpretation and at Qumran,” in \textit{Biblical Interpretation at Qumran} (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 168–193, 176, footnote 31.


\textsuperscript{43} MT Psalter: Pss 108; 109; 110; 122; 124; 131; 133; 138–145; LXX Psalter: Pss 107, 108, 109, 130, 132, 136, 137–144, 151.

\textsuperscript{44} Marvin E. Tate, “Psalms,” in \textit{Mercer Commentary on the Bible, vol. 3: (Wisdom) Writings} (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2001), 41–192, 44.
It should also be noted that many of the Davidic superscripts contain the phrase לְכָּנַתִּים (Pss 4–6; 8–9; 11–14; 18–22; 30–31; 36; 39–42; 51–62; 64–65; 68–70; 88; 109; 139–140),
which the LXX Psalter renders as εἰς τὸ τέλος
translated variously as “for the end” (LXX English Translation [LXE]),
“Regarding Fulfillment” (the New English Translation of the Septuagint
[NETS]), and “to the end.” This rendering by the LXX Psalter is regarded
by some as indicative of the eschatological orientation of the translators/redactors.
However, not everyone is convinced that the LXX rendering is
necessarily an indicator of eschatological interest on the part of the translators.
If indeed, there is an eschatological dimension to εἰς τὸ τέλος, that
dimension is perhaps textually realised within the LXX Psalter. The telos
anticipated is realized at “the end” of the Psalter in Ps 151, that is, in the
Davidic deliverance. For the LXX redactors there is no better place to end the
Psalter than in the last of Israel’s legends. Outside the text, the LXX Psalter
redactors were probably hoping for a replay of the Davidic deliverance in their
own political situation. The redactors of the LXX Psalter were drawing their

45 The exact meaning of this Hebrew phrase still remains uncertain. Our English
translations variously translate it as “to the chief musician” (KJV), “for the director of
music” (NIV), “to the choir master” (RSV), “to the leader” (NRSV). For extensive
discussion on this Hebrew phrase, see Hans Ausloos, “לְכָּנַתִּים in the Psalms Headings
and its Equivalent in LXX,” in XII Congress of the International Organization for
Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden, 2004 (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; Atlanta:
46 Lancelot C. L. Brenton, The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English
(London: Bagster, 1851).
47 Albert Pietersma, A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek
Translations Traditionally Included under That Title: The Psalms (Oxford: Oxford
University Press, 2000).
48 Johan. Lust, Erik. Eynikel, and Katrin. Hauspie, A Greek-English Lexicon of the
49 See David C. Mitchell, The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Pro-
gramme in the Book of Psalms (JSOTSup 252; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press,
Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte (ed. Erich Zenger;
50 Ausloos, “לְכָּנַתִּים in the Psalms Headings and its Equivalent in LXX,” 134–39;
Holger Gzella, Lebenszeit und Ewigkeit: Studien zur Eschatologie und Anthropologie
confidence and encouragement from historical events in the hope of seeing history repeat itself.\textsuperscript{51}

\textbf{2a\quad Expanded Davidic Superscripts}

In both the MT Psalter and LXX Psalter we find expanded Davidic superscriptions. The following Davidic psalms exemplify this:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [a.] Psalm 3 – flight from Absalom (2 Sam 15:17ff)
  \item [b.] Psalm 7 – counsel of Hushai (2 Sam 17:5ff)
  \item [c.] Psalm 17\[18\] – rescue from Saul and all his enemies (2 Sam 22:1)
  \item [d.] Psalms 33\[34\], 55\[56\] – feigned madness in Gath (1 Sam 22:13ff)
  \item [e.] Psalm 50\[51\] – Nathan’s visit over Bathsheba (2 Sam 12:1ff)
  \item [f.] Psalm 51\[52\] – the betrayal of Doeg the Edomite (1 Sam 22:9f)
  \item [g.] Psalm 53\[54\] – the Ziphites’ betrayal of David to Saul (1 Sam 23:19f)
  \item [h.] Psalm 56\[57\] – flight from Saul into the cave (1 Sam 22:1; cf. 24:1–7)
  \item [i.] Psalm 58\[59\] – Saul’s watch on David’s house (1 Sam 19:11ff)
  \item [j.] Psalm 59\[60\] – Military victories over the Aramaeans (1 Sam 8:3–5)
  \item [k.] Psalm 62\[63\] – David in the Judaean desert (1 Sam 23?).
\end{itemize}

In addition to the above, the LXX Psalter testifies uniquely to an additional five (Ps 26, 96, 142, 143, 151):\textsuperscript{52}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [a.] Psalm 26 (esp. v. 5) – David’s stopover at the tabernacle at Nob (1 Sam 21)
  \item [b.] Psalm 96 τῷ Δαυὶδ ὀτε ή γῆ αὐτοῦ καθίσταται (“Pertaining to David, when his land was set in order) – David’s coronation as king over Israel (2 Sam 5:1–6)
  \item [c.] Psalm 142 (ψαλμός τῷ Δαυὶδ) ὀτε αὐτὸν ὁ υἱὸς καταδιώκει (“A Psalm. Pertaining to David when his son was pursuing him”)\textsuperscript{53} – Absalom’s pursuit of David (2 Sam 15:13ff)
  \item [d.] Psalm 143 (τῷ Δαυὶδ) πρὸς τὸν Γολιαθ (“Pertaining to David, concerning Goliath”) – David’s battle with Goliath (1 Sam 17).
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{53} The first half of this title is found in the MT and 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} but not the second part.
e. Psalm 151 οὕτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυίδ καὶ ἐξώθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιαθ (“This psalm is autobiographical. Regarding David and outside the number. When he fought Goliath in single combat”) – David’s battle with Goliath (1 Sam 17).

The expanded Davidic superscriptions in both the MT Psalter and LXX Psalter should be regarded as examples of inner biblical interpretation. In addition, historical situations described in the expanded headings may also reflect on the political situation of the redactors. According to Childs, there are “general parallels between the situation described in the Psalm and some incident in the life of David.” Furthermore, as Gillmayr-Bucher argues:

[A] canonical relecture of the psalms initiated by the psalm headings is not restricted to an inner-biblical re-reading process, but it links the situation of the readers with the texts and thus enables them to find answers to their most urgent questions as well as a new perspective on their own life.

It is noteworthy that whereas the expanded common superscripts in the MT Psalter and LXX Psalter concentrate on David’s conflict with Saul (Pss, 17[18]; 33[34]; 51[52]; 53[54]; 55[56]; 56[57]; 58[59]; 62[63]), David’s conflict with Absalom (Pss 3; 7), external conflicts (Ps 59[60]), and social issues (50[51]), the additional superscripts from the LXX Psalter concentrates on events surrounding David’s victory over Goliath (Pss 26; 143; 151), David’s golden years (Ps 96), and David’s conflict with Absalom (Ps 142). As Rendtorff points out, the expanded Davidic superscriptions “provide insight into a way that David’s personality was viewed by later generations of readers and writers of biblical texts.” The expanded superscripts presents to us with the David remembered.

The David remembered is not an idealised king, rather a warrior whose rise to kingship was fraught with conflict with Saul, Israel’s first king, and whose life as king of Israel was far from perfection due to his sin Bathsheba and the rebellion of his son Absalom. This is unlike the idealised character and rule of David that we encounter early in the Second Temple period in Chronicles. The Chronicler does not include David’s struggle with Saul and the

---

54 Midrash, as Bloch argues, is a phenomenon that is rooted in the biblical period itself—later biblical writers made use of earlier Scriptures, and there are examples of midrashic texts within the Old Testament (Renée Bloch, “Midrash,” in Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice [ed. William S. Green; BJS 1; Missoula: Scholars, 1978], 29‒50).


blemishes in David’s character—David’s sin with Bathsheba and his murder of Uriah, and the rebellions in his house by Absalom and Sheba. For the redactors of both the MT Psalter and the LXX Psalter the events surrounding David’s life prior to his ascension to the throne receive significant attention. For the redactors of the LXX Psalter the lasting memory that they probably wanted their audience to have is of the young David who through the aid of Yahweh defeated Israel’s giant enemy, Goliath.

3 Praise versus the Glorious Beginning

The LXX Psalter does not end on the same note as the MT Psalter, not because it excludes what we find in the MT Psalter, but because it includes Psalm 151. The MT Psalter’s end point is the anonymous hallel psalms (Pss 146–50). For Brueggemann the MT Psalter begins with obedience and ends with praise. Brueggemann observes in the MT Psalter a purposeful sequence, as evident from the opening Psalm 1, which “asserts that the Psalter is intended for and intends to evoke and authorize a community of trusting, joyous obedience” and concludes with Psalm 150 “in glad, unconditional praise, completely, and without embarrassment or distraction, focused on God.” However, for Brueggemann Psalm 73 is the focal point of the Psalter, enacting the theological move from the obedience of Psalm 1 to the doxology of Psalm 150. My own reading regarding the way the MT Psalter is concluded will follow.

The LXX Psalter concludes by pointing the reader back to the glorious beginnings of the Davidic dynasty. The superscript of Psalm 151 in the LXX Psalter, however, gives this psalm away as “outside the number” (εξωθεν του ἀριθμοῦ), although it is unclear what this is supposed to mean. This psalm might not have been part of the Hebrew Vorlage on which the LXX Psalter translators based their translation, but authoritative enough for the translators and the redactors to include within the Bible; or the translators of the LXX Psalter might have been following another textual witness that was credible to them at the time. Psalm 151, as 11QPs witnesses, was originally written in Hebrew and was part of the Qumranian Psalter.

58 The idealisation of David’s character and rule is also found in several other texts during the Second Temple period (Sir 47:2; 11; 48:22; 49:4; 1 Macc 2:57; 4Q504 frag. 1-2 4.6-8; 4QMMT; 4Q398 frag. 14-17 2.25-26; Josephus, Ant. 6 158; 6:160; Acts 13:22). For further discussion on these texts, see Pomykala, “Images of David in Early Judaism,” 36–37; Louis Feldman, “Josephus’ Portrait of David,” HUCA 60 (1989): 129–74.
60 Brueggemann, “Bounded by Obedience and Praise,” 66, 68.
Psalm 151 is also thematically tied with other psalms within the Psalter. The language of “anointing with oil” parallels what we find in Psalms 18:50; 89:21; 132:10. The superscript of Psalm 151 οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ιδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυὶδ καὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἁρτίμου ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιᾶδ (“This psalm is autobiographical. Regarding David and outside the number. When he fought Goliath in single combat”) is thematically related to LXX Psalm 143, which has the heading τῷ Δαυὶδ πρὸς τὸν Γολιᾶδ (“Pertaining to David. Referring to Goliath”). Thus, in the LXX Psalter we have two psalms at the end of the Psalter both pointing back to David’s victory over Goliath.

Psalm 151 is a remembrance of the Lord’s anointed one not so much as king but as savior of a disgraced nation. The same idea is also found in Sirach 47:2–4, which states,

As the fat is set apart from the offering of well-being, so David was set apart from the Israelites. … In his youth did he not kill a giant, and take away the people’s disgrace, when he whirled the stone in the sling and struck down the boasting Goliath?

David’s victory over Goliath was interpreted on the basis of David’s words in 2 Sam 17:26, “What shall be done for the man who kills this Philistine, and takes away the reproach from Israel? For who is this uncircumcised Philistine that he should defy the armies of the living God?” Psalm 151 continues the biblical tradition in interpreting the victory over Goliath as taking away the disgrace of God’s people. It should also be noted that the LXX Psalter attributes Pss 146–48 to two postexilic prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, unlike the MT Psalter which keeps them anonymous. Therefore, Psalm 151 directs attention from the postexilic era back to the beginning of Israel’s glorious age, which dawned with the anointing of David and his victory over Goliath. However, this invocation of the glorious past was probably due to a longing for God to act again at a time when Israel was in a state of disgrace under the power of foreign nations—to act by raising a king like David to deliver God’s people from their current giant enemy.

**C MT PSALTER VERSUS 11QPS**

The Qumran Psalms’ scrolls, as Flint points out, “are our most ancient witnesses to the text of the Book of Psalms;” and when compared with the MT Psalter diverges in terms of the order, the presence of nine additional psalms, and several instances where this collection share distinctive readings with the

LXX Psalter in contrast to MT Psalter. A total of thirty-nine Psalm scrolls and seven other relevant manuscripts were discovered—eight of these came from Cave 1 and the minor caves, twenty-three from Cave 4, five from Cave 11. These Psalms scrolls are not entirely extant, as they are badly damaged, and those with the greatest number of verses are: 11QPs\textsuperscript{a}, 4QPs\textsuperscript{a}, 5/6Hev-Se4 Ps, 4QPs\textsuperscript{b}, 4QPs\textsuperscript{c}, 4QPs\textsuperscript{e}. These scrolls, and especially 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter, on which we will focus, present further insights regarding the Davidic figure and his unique contribution to Israel’s psalms and songs. Apart from what can be gleaned from the Qumran Psalms scrolls there are other references to David in non-biblical scrolls that give insights as to how the covenanters of Qumran viewed David; however, I will not pursue them in this paper.

The Qumran Psalms’ scrolls have generated much debate regarding their relationship with the MT Psalter concerning the arrangement and stabilization of the Psalter. Important to note is that all parties tend to agree that there is a

---

64 1QPs\textsuperscript{a} (1Q10), 1QPs\textsuperscript{b} (1Q11), 1QPs\textsuperscript{c} (1Q12), 2QPs (2Q14), 3QPs (3Q2), 5QPs (5Q5), pap6QPs (pap6Q5), 8QPs (8Q2).
65 4QPs\textsuperscript{a} (4Q83), 4QPs\textsuperscript{b} (4Q84), 4QPs\textsuperscript{c} (4Q85), 4QPs\textsuperscript{d} (4Q86), 4QPs\textsuperscript{e} (4Q87), 4QPs\textsuperscript{f} (4Q88), 4QPs\textsuperscript{g} (4Q89), 4QPs\textsuperscript{h} (4Q90), 4QPs\textsuperscript{i} (4Q91), 4QPs\textsuperscript{j} (4Q92), 4QPs\textsuperscript{k} (4Q93), 4QPs\textsuperscript{l} (4Q95), 4QPs\textsuperscript{m} (4Q95), 4QPs\textsuperscript{n} (4Q96), 4QPs\textsuperscript{o} (4Q97), 4QPs\textsuperscript{p} (4Q98), 4QPs\textsuperscript{q} (4Q98a), 4QPs\textsuperscript{r} (4Q98b), 4QPs\textsuperscript{s} (4Q98c), 4QPs\textsuperscript{t} (4Q98d), 4QPs\textsuperscript{u} (4Q98e), 4QPs89 (4Q236), “Work with Place Names” (4Q522).
66 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} (11Q5), 11QPs\textsuperscript{b} (11Q6), 11QPs\textsuperscript{c} (11Q7), 11QPs\textsuperscript{d} (11Q8), 11QPsAp\textsuperscript{a} or 11QApPs\textsuperscript{a} (11Q11).
67 In addition to the scrolls discovered at Qumran, there were other scrolls discovered in other locations in the Judean desert from Nahal Hever (5/6Hev-Se4 Ps) and Masada (MasPs\textsuperscript{a} or Masle [M1039-160], MasPs\textsuperscript{b} or Mas 1f [M1103-1742]).
68 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter commences with Ps 101 and concludes with Ps 155, and it preserves 49 (or 50) compositions of which 39 appear in Books IV and V of the MT Psalter ranging from Ps 93 (col. XXII) to Ps 150 (col. XXVI); however, there are variations in terms of the order as compared to the MT Psalter (See Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* [STDJ XVII; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 39–41).
69 For how David was perceived in Qumran non biblical scrolls, see Craig A. Evans, “David in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup 26; eds. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 183–97.
strong Davidic emphasis in 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter. 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter contains nine additional psalms, four of which were already known to scholars (Pss 151A and 151B, 154, 155,\textsuperscript{71} David’s Last Words (= 2 Sam 23:1–7),\textsuperscript{72} and Sirach 51:13–30), whereas the other four were unknown (Plea of Deliverance [col. xix], Apostrophe of Zion [col. xxii], Hymn to the Creator [col. xxvi], David’s Compositions). Four of these additional psalms are Davidic: David’s Last Words, David’s Compositions, Ps 151A, and Ps 151B.

These compositions, as will be argued, bring about an even stronger Davidic emphasis into the Psalter that is unmatched by either the MT Psalter or the LXX Psalter. The incorporation of David’s Last Words into the Psalter, and immediately following it David’s Compositions, which, as Walchoder argues, is a type of pesher to David’s Last Words.\textsuperscript{73} The climatic position occupied by Psalm 151A and 151B as the conclusion of the Psalter, and the presence of Davidic superscripts to Psalms 104 and 123 (absent in the MT Psalter) enhance the Davidic character of 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter. With these compositions, Sanders’ argument that the compiler of 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter regarded David as the original author of the Psalter appears appropriate.\textsuperscript{74}

1 David in 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter

In order to highlight the Davidic emphasis in 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter, attention is given to the following five aspects: 1) David as Israel’s greatest psalmist, 2) the liturgical function of the Psalter, 3) David as a prophet, 4) the arrangement of 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter, and 5) the climatic ending of 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter—a return to the glorious beginnings. However, before proceeding, David’s Composition is reproduced below, as it will be referred to often:

---

\textsuperscript{71} Ps 151A, Ps 151B and Sirach were known from other ancient translations in Greek, Syriac, and Latin. Pss 154 and 155 were known in Syriac.

\textsuperscript{72} Only six words of verse 7 are preserved in 11QPs\textsuperscript{a}.

\textsuperscript{73} Walchoder, “David’s Eschatological Psalter,” 32.

2. And David, the son of Jesse, was wise, and a light like the light of the sun, and literate,
3. and discerning and perfect in all his ways before God and men. And the Lord gave
4. him a discerning and enlightened spirit. And he wrote
5. 3,600 psalms; and songs to sing before the altar over the whole-burnt
6. perpetual offering every day, for all the days of the year, 364;
7. and for the offering of the Sabbaths, 52 songs; and for the offering of the New
8. Moons and for all the Solemn Assemblies and for the Day of Atonement, 30 songs.
9. And all the songs that he spoke were 446, and songs
10. for making music over the stricken, 4. And the total was 4,050.
11. All these he composed through prophecy which was given him from before the Most High.75

1a David as the Sweet Psalmist of Israel

David’s Last Word, which is the same as 2 Sam 23:1–7, and David’s Composition draw on each other to highlight, *inter alia*, David as Israel’s greatest psalmist. In David’s Last Words, David is esteemed as נָעַם הָיוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (; “the sweet psalmist of Israel”), whereas in David’s Composition, the total compositions attributed to David appear to be an attempt to idealise David as Israel’s greatest psalmist.

The idealisation of David appears to position him as even greater than Solomon his son, who excelled in wisdom.76 According to David’s Compositions, “David, the son of Jesse, was wise, and a light like the light of the sun, and literate, and discerning and perfect in all his ways before God and men. And the Lord gave him a discerning and enlightened spirit.” The difference between David and Solomon is found in their literary activity; according to 1 Kings 4:32, Solomon composed 3000 proverbs and 1005 songs, thus making a total of his compositions 4005, whereas David, according to David’s Compositions, composed:

76 1 Kgs 4:29–31 states, “God gave Solomon very great wisdom, discernment, and breadth of understanding as vast as the sand on the seashore, so that Solomon’s wisdom surpassed the wisdom of all the people of the east, and all the wisdom of Egypt. He was wiser than anyone else, wiser than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, Calcol, and Darda, children of Mahol; his fame spread throughout all the surrounding nations.”
From this comparison, it could be observed that there are areas of some overlap. Yet there is no competition in their specific areas of specialization: David did not compose proverbs (*mašal*), whereas Solomon did not compose psalms (*tehillim*). The only area of overlap is with the songs, and here Solomon comes out on top with 1005 songs, with David only having 450 songs. In terms of the grand total, David clearly comes out on top with 4050 compositions, whereas Solomon has 4005. However, according to the LXX Psalter of 1 Kings 4:39, Solomon wrote 5000 songs, bringing his total compositions to 8000. The MT Psalter contains only two psalms of Solomon; the same may probably be said for the Qumran scrolls. The LXX (Codex Alexandrinus), however, also contains the book “Psalms of Solomon,” which contains eighteen Solomonic psalms in total. Apparently there were different literary traditions regarding the compositions of these two important figures. It cannot be said for sure that David’s Composition was meant to idealise David at the expense of his son Solomon. However, one thing seems certain, for the Qumran community David was esteemed as the greatest psalmist.

David’s Composition and other Qumran texts also attest to a growing tradition of regarding David as the author. In 4QMT, a Halakhic Letter from Qumran, the recipients are exhorted to “understand the book of Moses [and the words of the] prophets and of David [and all the annals of each]h generation” (4Q398 frag. 7–8: 10–11). This text has also generated much debate regarding the division of the canon as the reference to David is taken by some as sup-

---

77 Sanders, The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll, 134.
78 If this line of thinking is taken it is bound to break down at some point. David’s compositions that have been preserved are those in Former Prophets and Psalms, whereas with Solomon we have Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom of Solomon, and Psalms of Solomon all claiming his authority; thus making it a total of five books. This would be in line with the Five Books Tradition—Moses composed five (Pentateuch), David supposedly composed the five books of the Psalter, and Solomon the five books that claim his authority.
porting a tripartite division of the canon.\textsuperscript{80} Of interest is that this text seems to suggest a Davidic authorship of a book, which may well refer to a collection of books including the Psalm or to a Davidic collection such as 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter.\textsuperscript{81} This tradition perhaps finds its full expression in 2 Macc 2:13 where mention is made of “the writings of David,” which were collected by Nehemiah along with other “books about the kings and prophets.” Several other texts also refer to David as an author of psalms (4 Macc. 18:15; Philo, De Plant. 29; De Conf. Ling. 149; Josephus, Ant. 7.305).\textsuperscript{82} The move to regard David as an author rather than just as a composer and singer of the psalms, as Pomykala suggests, was perhaps due to the fact that David was also viewed as the founder of the temple cult.\textsuperscript{83}

1b Liturgical Function

The numbers in David’s Compositions appear to have had another function, a liturgical one. The numbers, 364, 52, 30, seem to suggest that David composed the songs following a 364 day solar calendar system, which is known to us through 1 Enoch 72–82 and Jubilees.\textsuperscript{84} This calendar contrasts with the lunisolar calendar of 354 days, which some claim was the traditional calendar, as preserved in rabbinic tradition. According to Flint, 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} thus originally contained 52 Psalms plus 4 pieces that assert Davidic authorship. This has clear calendaric implications, since the basic collection comprised 52 pieces in accordance with the weeks in the solar year. … For our purposes the numerical connection with the solar year is sufficient evidence to show that the structure of 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} is in some way related to the solar calendar.\textsuperscript{85}

David’s Compositions probably wants David to be viewed as the founder of temple music. The same tradition is also found in other Jewish traditions as well. According to Sirach 47:8–10,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{82} Pomykala, “Images of David in Early Judaism,” 39.
  \item \textsuperscript{83} Pomykala, “Images of David in Early Judaism,” 39.
  \item \textsuperscript{84} See Chyutin, “Redaction of Psalms as Calendar,” 367–95; Skehan, “A Liturgical Complex,” 195–205.
  \item \textsuperscript{85} Flint, Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls, 193. For Flint it is 52 psalms, if Ps 151A and 152B are not counted strictly as part of the collection but as asserting Davidic authorship.
\end{itemize}
In all that he [David] did he gave thanks to the Holy One, the Most High, proclaiming his glory; he sang praise with all his heart, and he loved his Maker. He placed singers before the altar, to make sweet melody with their voices. He gave beauty to the festivals, and arranged their times throughout the year, while they praised God’s holy name, and the sanctuary resounded from early morning.

Similarly Josephus states,

And now David being freed from wars and dangers, and enjoying for the future a profound peace, composed songs and hymns to God, of several sorts of meter; some of those which he made were trimeters, and some were pentameters. He also made instruments of music, and taught the Levites to sing hymns to God, both on that called the sabbath day, and on other festivals (Ant. 7.12.3[305]).

Judah’s cult, as Sarna points out, had two foundations: 1) sacrifice and all else done by the Aaronic priest based on the ordinance of Moses and 2) temple music based on the order of David. The tradition of David as the founder of temple music has its roots in biblical times. As Mays notes, “the circles responsible for the tradition recorded in Chronicles thought of the psalms only as cultic music and saw David’s connection with them in terms of the institution and history of public worship in Jerusalem.” According to the Chronicle, David appointed singers and musicians (1 Chron 16). He was also responsible for the instruments used (1 Chron 23:5; 2 Chron 7:6; 29:26), and the liturgical occasions for the use of music (1 Chron 23:30). It is not surprising, to find at Qumran, David being admired as having composed psalms and songs for the various occasions prescribed by Moses in the Torah.

**1c David as a Prophet**

David’s Last Words and David’s Compositions both do not directly call David a prophet (świadczenie or הַלְּדוֹן or הבורא). As Flint notes, David’s Compositions “falls shy of actually calling David a prophet, but implies this by his use of the word ‘prophecy.’” However, in David’s Last Words, David’s words are regarded as

---

88 Mays, “The David of the Psalms,” 149.
an “oracle” (נביא), and he [David] claims to be inspired by the Spirit of the Lord and speaks in this psalm as a prophet who speaks on behalf of God.

The link between prophecy and psalmody is also found early on in Chronicles. The Chronicler regards temple music as a prophetic activity. This is evidenced by his use of prophetic terms, נבוש and נביא, to describe the activity of temple musicians (2 Chron 25:1, 2, 5; 29:30; 35:15). While the Chronicler does not directly call David a prophet or a seer as it does with the triad chief musicians, Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, it does set David as the head chief of the triad—it is under his direction that the chief musicians prophesied and supervised others (1 Chron 25:1–2; cf. 2 Chron 29:25). The Chronicler’s ascription of the musical activity to be “prophetic” in nature was most probably because he considered the writing and singing of psalms as requiring inspiration. Moreover, as Schniedewind observes, in Chronicles there is a legitimatising of psalms by virtue of associating them with David and Asaph (2 Chron 29:30).

As Schniedewind argues, “The legitimating of music by association with David, ‘the psalmist of Israel’ (2 Sam. 23:1), compares with the legitimating of the Jerusalem cult via its association with David, ‘the man of God’ (2 Chron 8.13–15).” David’s Composition shares similar views with the Chronicler. On the one hand, the composition of psalms and songs by David is regarded as a prophetic activity; while on the other hand, the association of 11QPsa with David legitimises it as an authoritative Psalter.

Kugel also notes that the claim to prophecy that we find in David’s Compositions is not so much predictive as it has to do more with the need to guarantee the special nature of the Psalms with which David was so intimately associated. However, there is also evidence from the Psalms Pesharim (1QpPs [1Q16], 4QpPs[a] [4Q171], 4QpPs[b] [4Q173]) that psalms were interpreted predictively to refer to some issues in the life of the Qumran community, especially concerning the Teacher of Righteousness, the Wicked Priest and the Man of the Lie.

---

94 Flint, “The Prophet David at Qumran,” 165. See, for example, 4QPs[a] (4Q171), a commentary on Psalm 37, which exhorts the righteous to keep faith amidst the persecution from the wicked.
The connection between David and prophecy is also known from other Jewish interpretive traditions, such as, Philo, Josephus, the New Testament, Psalms Targum and later Rabbinic tradition. For ancient interpreters, “David’s prophetic status allows him to compose texts not only for himself (and for the community of his own time) but also for the whole Israelite community throughout history.”

1d The arrangement of the 11QPs Psalter

Flint argues that the Davidic emphasis is evident in 11QPs Psalter from the structure of the document. He offers three basic arguments for this:

i. The deployment of a Davidic psalm such as Psalm 133 and 134 to reinforce the Davidic character of another cluster of group, irrespective of form and genre. Psalm 133 has been redeployed to form part of another Davidic cluster (see below), whereas Psalm 134 is placed in the middle of the final Davidic cluster: David’s Compositions → 140 → 134 → 151A → 151B.

ii. Davidic character to an entire block of compositions of the same genre:

Five Hymns of praise: 104 (Davidic superscript) → 147 → 105 → 146 → 148

Three Hymns of praise: 135 → 136 (with Catena) → 145 (Davidic superscript)

---

95 Kugel notes that Philo of Alexandria makes a passing reference to the author of Ps 84, presumably David, as ‘a certain prophetic man’ (“David the Prophet,” 54).
96 Josephus, Ant. 6.8.2 (166); 8.4.2 (109–110).
98 Tg. Ps 45:3; 49:16.
99 In b. Pes 117a we find in an attempt to explain the different psalm titles. Important for us is the conception that Qimhi sees David as composing psalms that reflect events in his own lifetime, relating directly to his life, or relating to Israel as a whole also speaking of events after his time. See also Midr. Teh. 24.3; 4.1 and 18.1; b. Soṭa 48b.
iii. Untitled psalms attached to the “Davidic psalms”:

101 (royal psalm, Davidic superscript) → 102 (supplication) → 103 (Hymn of praise, Davidic superscript) → 109 (Individual lament, Davidic superscript) → [110] (Royal Psalm, Davidic superscript)

141 (supplication, Davidic superscript) → 133 (Wisdom, Davidic superscript) → 144 (supplication, Davidic superscript) → 155 (supplication, Davidic superscript) → 143 (supplication, Davidic superscript)

149 (hymn) → 150 (hymn) → Hymn to the Creator → David’s Last Words (Wisdom [?], extended Davidic epilogue).101

The order of the 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter psalms is drastically different from that of the MT Psalter and the LXX Psalter. If Flint is correct and these are not just mere coincidence, then it may be agreed that 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter does indeed have a stronger Davidic emphasis when compared to the other textual witnesses.

For Wilson, the MT Psalter tells a different story from that of 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter. He argues that 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter excludes: 1) the *Yahweh Mālak* psalms (94–100), which is one of the most dominant headings in the MT Psalter, 2) Psalms 90–92, which are linked to Moses and the pre-monarchical period of direct rulership of Yahweh, and 3) Psalms 106–108, which recognises the failure of the Davidic kingship of the exile.102 For Wilson, 11QPs\(^a\) Psalter focuses on the lamentable situation of Jerusalem and the need for divine deliverance. The hope of deliverance, however, is one that is based on a Davidic king, as evident from the concluding psalms, which focuses on David as divinely elected and gifted. The MT Psalter, on the other hand, downplays David’s role by deflecting attention away from human kingship to the enduring kingship and kingdom of Yahweh. Thus, the shaping of the Psalter for Wilson also entails discernment of the ideology of the final redactors.

Wilson’s argument, despite the subjective nature of the whole enterprise of the shape and shaping of the Psalter, is not without its own problems. Wilson’s approach assumes that the MT Psalter redactors were operating in a reductionist fashion against other textual witnesses in an attempt to support

---

101 Flint, Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls, 193–95.
their ideology, which was against messianism. Wilson’s theory is also weakened by the evidence of the LXX Psalter, which comprise all the psalms contained in the MT Psalter despite their variations. As Nasuti points out, scholars like Wilson, who see a meaning sequence in the Psalter, tend to see some theological development of its readers depending on the psalms the scholar select as being meaningful.

2 The Climatic Ending—A Return to the Glorious Beginnings

11QPs Psalter, in addition to David’s Last Words and David’s Compositions, is concluded by Psalm 151A and 151B, which are similar with LXX Psalter Ps 151. It is thought that the LXX Psalter translators amalgamated the two psalms, which were originally separate, into one. The LXX Psalter Ps 151’s focus is on David as the Lord’s anointed one and his defeat of Goliath before his coronation. In 11QPs Psalter Ps 151A, which is longer than the LXX Psalter version, excludes David’s battle with Goliath. Psalm 151B, although not extant in its entirety, is a reflection on David’s rise to power and especially his first battle with the Philistines.

The picture of David that we get from Psalms 151A and B is of David as a shepherd, musician, the Lord’s anointed one, king, warrior and saviour. The LXX Psalter and 11QPs Psalter both conclude basically on a similar note by directing attention back to the glorious beginnings of the Davidic dynasty, as opposed to the MT Psalter, which does not contain this psalm. These two textual witnesses are likely witnesses to a common and widespread tradition of the Psalter to come to a crescendo by pointing back to Israel’s founder of the Davidic dynasty; however, 11QPs Psalter goes a step further by regarding David as a prophet and the founder of temple music.

D THE HIGHLY DAVIDIC MT PSALTER

In the MT Psalter, as well as the LXX Psalter and 11QPs Psalter, David is the favorite figure to whom psalms are ascribed. More than half of the 150 Psalms
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103 For Wilson, the final redaction of the MT Psalter happened at the wake of the second Temple’s destruction in A.D. 70 following the activities of Johanan ben Zakkai and the Academy of Yavneh. This was a period, according to Wilson, in which messianism came to assume a more peripheral place in the rabbinic literature and the human messianic claimants were received with suspicion (Wilson, “A First Century C.E. Date for the Closing of the Book of Psalms?” 102–110).
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in the MT Psalter are connected with David; the number is even more in the LXX Psalter and 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter. However, this should not be understood to suggest that the MT Psalter is less interested in the Davidic figure. It may be provisionally agreed that we do find a greater emphasis on the Davidic figure in the other textual witnesses; however, this does not necessarily imply that the MT Psalter was deemphasising or downplaying the significance of David.

It is arguable that the MT Psalter also concludes on a highly Davidic note. In the MT Psalter, Pss 138 through to 145 all have Davidic superscripts; it has a cluster of eight uninterrupted psalms proceeding from David, leading to the conclusion of the Psalter on a note of praise. As many have observed, Psalm 145 and Psalm 1 both end on a similar note (compare Ps 1:5–6 and Ps 145:20) by making a distinction between the fate of the righteous and that of the unrighteous, thereby forming an *inclusio* for the Psalter.\textsuperscript{106} Thus, Psalms 146–50 may be properly viewed as forming a conclusion of the Psalter as a whole. However, there is no evidence that Psalms 146–50 were originally written to form a conclusion to the MT Psalter.

In 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} Psalter these *hallel* psalms are distributed throughout the Psalter, whereas in the LXX Psalter as already noted Psalms 146–48 are attributed to Haggai and Zechariah. Thus it can be said with some confidence that the final redactors of the MT Psalter, by arranging Psalms 146–50 together to form a conclusion to the Psalter, attribute to them a different significance from what we find in the other textual witnesses.

There are clear indications that Psalm 145 already anticipates the concluding *hallel* psalms. The superscript of Psalm 145 “praise of David” (יְדִידַת דוֹעִית יִשְׂרָאֵל) provides a link between this psalm and the *hallel* psalms that follow. The final verse of Psalm 145 also point toward the *hallel* psalms that follows:

\begin{quote}
The praise of Yahweh my mouth will speak; And may all flesh bless his holy name forever. (Ps 145:21)
\end{quote}

Another aspect to be noted is that the second colon of Psalm 145:21 points to the last *hallel* psalm (Ps 150), which makes use of the same idea in its final verse to form an *inclusio*:\textsuperscript{107}

\begin{quote}
Let everything that has breath praise Yahweh. (Ps 150:6)
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{107} Wilson, *Editing*, 193–194.
Thus, it may be said that for the MT Psalter redactors David’s intention to praise Yahweh in Psalm 145:21 is carried out in Psalms 146–150. In Psalm 146, he directs his people to look beyond earthly kings to Yahweh the eternal King, the God of Zion. In Psalm 147, David’s praise is continued; and this time he invites the Jerusalem community to join in the praise. In Psalm 148 the invitation to join in the praise is extended to all creation. Psalm 149, then again, narrows down the focus to God’s chosen people, the Israelites. Psalm 150 narrows the focus even further, to the sanctuary, that is, to the heavenly throne room. In turn praise proceeds from within the heavenly sanctuary and extends to become praise from all that have breath. It is reasonable to think that the final redactors of the MT Psalter probably regarded the hallel psalms (Pss 146-50), which conclude the MT Psalter, as part of the Davidic cluster that precedes them. It is not impossible to imagine that such hymns of praise proceeded from the sweet psalmist of Israel calling upon God’s people, all living beings, and all of creation to praise Yahweh. David is presented as the archetypal singer of praise.

The tradition of David as archetypal singer of praise is found early in the Second Temple period. In Chronicles David is not only credited for organizing temple music by appointing singers and charging them under the leadership of Asaph, Heman and Jeduthun (1 Chron 6:33–47; 15:16–22; 25:1–31), and for making of musical instruments (2 Chron 7:6), but also for being an archetypal singer of praise. For the Chronicler, by the time of Hezekiah, David, along with Asaph, is regarded as a model singer of praise: “Hezekiah and the princes commanded the Levites to sing praises to the Lord with the words of David and of Asaph the seer. They sang praises with gladness, and they bowed down and worshiped” (2 Chron 29:30). Ben Sira in his presentation of Israel’s legends states regarding David, “In all that he did he gave thanks to the Holy One, the most High, with ascriptions of glory; he sang praise with all his heart, and he loved his Maker” (Sir 47:8).

In what sense could the singing of praise have offered confidence and encouragement during the Second Temple period? Jewish hope during the Second Temple period was not merely expressed through messianism, that is, the eschatological hope in the rise of the Davidic king who will redeem Israel from foreign oppressors and again establish Israel’s kingdom. Jewish hope was also expressed by directing attention to Yahweh’s heavenly sanctuary. The MT Psalter Ps 150 as the concluding psalm does just that. In verse 1, “in his sanctuary” (הֵיכָן) is parallel to “in his mighty heaven” (בָּרָקִים נִיטָּה); thus, necessitating that we equate the sanctuary with the heavenly realm. During the Second Temple period, there was a growing fascination with the heavenly sanctuary.

108 Compare with Sir 47:9.
not just as a result of the dissatisfaction with Zerubbabel’s temple (Hag 2:3) or Herod’s temple; rather, as a means of providing hope at a time when the Holy of Holies was empty. The emptiness of the Holy of Holies in the Jerusalem temple during this period did not imply that Yahweh’s heavenly dwelling was vacant; rather, Yahweh’s heavenly dwelling continues to be functional.\(^{109}\) The hope for a rise of a future Davidic king rested on the covenantal faithfulness of the heavenly king, Yahweh. Israel’s hope was also expressed through temple-cosmology theology. This resonates with the words of an anonymous psalmist in a psalm that indubitably affirms Yahweh’s covenantal faithfulness: “Give thanks to the God of heaven, for his steadfast love endures forever” (Ps 136:26). Thus, for the MT Psalter redactors Yahweh’s messiah, the psalmist-king David, directs Israel, all living beings and all of creation to praise Yahweh, the eternal King.

E CONCLUSION

The problem with Wilson’s argument and others who tend to see a deemphasising of David in the MT Psalter is that they tend to presuppose that the MT Psalter redactors were operating in a reductionist fashion—reducing the emphasis which was previously there. The MT Psalter like other textual witnesses lends itself to be read as a highly Davidic book. The three textual witnesses—the MT Psalter, the LXX Psalter, and 11QPs\(^{a}\) Psalter—all uniquely emphasise the Davidic figure.

In the MT Psalter tradition, David is at the end remembered for directing Israel in the worship of Yahweh through unconditional praise, a praise resounding from every corner of the cosmos, Yahweh’s macro-temple. In the LXX Psalter, David is at the end remembered as Israel’s musician, anointed one, and savior king. In 11QPs\(^{a}\) Psalter, David is remembered for his major achievement in leaving for Israel a prophetic hymnal for all times, for being Israel’s great psalmist, for being the anointed one of Yahweh and saviour king.
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