

Psalm 1

(c) Albert Pietersma, November 1999

Synopsis:

A didactic Nomos psalm which functions as an introduction to the Psalter as a whole. In two antithetical sections it contrasts the happiness of the righteous man (1-3) with the ultimate ruin of the impious (4-6). The two ways of life are compared to the felicitous existence of a fruit-tree planted by a stream in contrast to dust blown by the wind from off the land (3-4). The righteous life consists in a shunning of sinners (1) and a devotion to the study of God's Law (2). The end of the righteous is affirmation by God, but the impious is left to perish (6).

Psalm 1 as a whole:

The introductory role to the Psalter, traditionally ascribed to the first psalm, cannot be said to have been materially affected by its having been translated into Greek. Though it might be argued that **תורה** encompasses "instruction" as well as "law" within its semantic range, in distinction from νόμος, which may be said to focus more narrowly on the latter aspect, it is more than likely that Psalm 1—whether specifically composed as a proem to the Psalter or not—already uses **תורה** in its more restricted, legal sense (Flashar p. 166). Thus both in the Hebrew and in the Greek Psalters, Psalm 1 counsels the reader of the book to Law-centered living. Since, furthermore, the Greek Psalter was produced by a single effort, which entailed more semantic leveling than differentiation, its linguistic unity, for which Ps 1 may be said to set the tone, is *ipso facto* more pronounced than that of its parent text.

Though in some Jewish (Berakoth 9b) and Christian traditions (cf. Acts 13.33), Psalms 1 and 2 were read as a single psalm (see Craigie 59-60), the OG Psalter cannot be said to support this. While it is true that the closing line of Ps 2 (μακάριοι πάντες οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' αὐτῷ) may be construed to recall the opening line of Ps 1 (μακάριος ἄνθρωπος οὗκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βουλήν ἀσεβῶν), this simply reflects the translator's consistency vis-à-vis the parent text. Some later traditions (Sahidic; 2151, a fourth cent.

CE Chester Beatty fragment, and the Latin witnesses Ga La) add a Davidic title to Ps 2, but these can lay no claim to originality. For Qumran see Flint 46, 148, 221n.

As commentators on the Hebrew text regularly note, there is close conceptual agreement between Psalm 1 and Ier 17.5-8, but there is no evidence that their Greek translations are interdependent. In fact the one relevant vocabulary item, שָׂתַל ("to plant") in Ps 1.3 and Ier 17.8, is rendered quite differently in the Greek, i.e. by φυτεύω and εὐθηνέω respectively.

Specific Bibliography:

Austermann, Frank "'Deshalb werden nicht aufstehen Frevler im Gericht'. Zur Übersetzungsweise und Interpretation im ersten Septuaginta-Psalme." *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*. (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51.) Society of Biblical Literature, 2001, 481-497.

Commentary: v. 1

Hebrew Text

אֲשֶׁר־יֵאֱמָר לֹא הָלַךְ בְּעֵצַת רְשָׁעִים
וּבִדְרֶךְ חַטָּאִים לֹא עָמַד
וּבְמוֹשָׁב לְצִיִּים לֹא יָשָׁב

Greek Text

Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βουλῇ ἀσεβῶν
καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ ἀμαρτωλῶν οὐκ ἔστη
καὶ ἐπὶ καθέδραν λοιμῶν οὐκ ἐκάθισεν,

NETS Translation

Happy the man who did not walk by the counsel of the impious,

or stand in the way of sinners,
 or sit down in the seat of pestiferous people;

Though according to Rahlfs some witnesses (A R^s L^{d[sil]} 55) read ἐπί with the dative, it can lay no serious claim to being original. The difference between the lemma and the variant hinges on whether the governing verb (ἐκάθισεν) is understood to mean "to take a seat" (+motion) or "to sit" (–motion). The latter notion, however, in the Psalter is expressed by ἐπὶ + gen. (9.5, 131.12, 136.1). Of some interest is that Quinta and Sexta are said to read ἐπὶ + dat., whence the variant may thus have come, though the verb there is εὑρέθη ("was found"), hence exclusively –motion.

μακάριος. Already twice in the Greek Pentateuch (Gen 30.13, Deut 33.29) this word was used to render (׀)רשׁן, which Kraus calls "the congratulatory formula." G follows suit in Psalms, which of any book has by far the heaviest concentration of occurrences (25x). Though said to be a collateral form of μάκαρ, the latter never appears in the LXX, not improbably because in general usage it referred primarily to the gods or the dead. Μακάριος, on the other hand, had primary reference to living humans, and like its Hebrew counterpart in the Psalms (and elsewhere in the LXX) is never used for God. To gloss it as "blessed," as e.g. Brenton, VC, HTM and Moore do, is more than can be justified for the OG of Psalms, though not necessarily for later usage. Thomson, however, correctly opted for "happy."

μακάριος ἀνὴρ. Since the number of morphemes in the parent text is typically determinative for the Greek translation, we might expect *a priori* that the same applies to the discrete Hebrew article (א). Thus since Hebrew (especially in poetry) makes relatively little use of the article, though Greek usage favours it, articles in the Greek Psalter are in relatively short supply (see Pietersma "Articulation"). On the other hand, when the parent text did feature a discrete article, it is typically reproduced in the Greek. Against this background, it might come as a surprise that the article in MT's initial phrase, רשׁן אֱלֹהֵי, is not reproduced in the Greek. There is, however, no good reason

to posit a difference in parent text, since in several other occurrences of (virtually) the same phrase the article is not reproduced (33.9, 39.5, 93.12). In fact, whether MT in this phrase reads **וְאִישׁ** (1.1, 111.1), **אִישׁ** (31.2, 83.6, 83.13), or **גִּבּוֹר** (33.9, 39.5, 93.12); whether MT articulates (1.1, 33.9, 39.5, 93.12) or does not articulate (31.2, 83.6, 12,111.1); whether G renders the head term by **ἀνὴρ** (1.1, 31.2, 33.9, 39.9, 83.6) or by **ἄνθρωπος** (83.13, 93.12), no article is used in the Greek. Such is, however, not the case when other nouns are used in the same construction (see τὸ ἔθνος in 32.12 and ὁ λαός in 88.16, 143.15). It is also of some interest that in 93.12 the article was added secondarily (B 1219).

Though the construction N+rel.cl., when read as a restrictive clause, is a stylistic variant of art+N+rel.cl., as N+art+Adv is of art+N+art+Adv, what is of interest here is (a) that, since MT in 1.1 and elsewhere has an article, one might have expected G to prefer the option which would most closely mirror the parent text and (b) that G opts for **μακάριος +N+rel.cl.** only when the head term is **ἀνὴρ** or **ἄνθρωπος**—the same construction one finds in the Greek wisdom texts Job, Proverbs, and Sirach. It might, therefore, be tempting to suggest that G preferred this option because he was familiar with it from Greek (biblical) wisdom literature. That raises problems, however, since the Greek Psalter certainly precedes Proverbs, and likely Job and Sirach as well. If that is so, it would seem to have been the Greek Psalter that set the example for later translators to follow. In sum, then, G in 1.1 (and elsewhere) opts for a stylistic variant even though it deviates from MT in the number of morphemes used. Thus we are led to conclude that G, in spite of his literal and quantitative mode of translation, was not totally insensitive to literary nicety.

A further item of interest is that **וְאִישׁ**, though most frequently translated by **ἄνθρωπος** (26x; 16x by **ἀνὴρ**; 2x by **ἕκαστος**) is here translated by the gender-specific **ἀνὴρ**, as a result of which NETS has followed suit and has made the reference masculine.

Finally, the omission of an equative verb in NETS ("happy *is* the man") is meant to signal to the reader that the Hebrew and Greek texts are, in terms of number of morphemes, not identical.

ἐπορεύθη . . . ἔσθη . . . ἐκάθισεν. Since G commonly renders so-called Hebrew perfects by aorists, the reader encounters a disproportionately large number of past verbs in omni-temporal statements expressing general truths. While it is true that so-called gnomic aorists (cf. Smyth §1931) are well attested in Greek usage, it is equally true that the translator's aim was scarcely to have them so read. Rather, he worked with system of defaults, according to which Hebrew perfect = Greek aorist and Hebrew imperfect = Greek future (cf. Sailhamer p. 44). NETS has sought to reflect the resultant stiltedness of the Greek by consistently rendering the aorist by the English simple past, even though linguistically these cannot be fully equated.

ἐν βουλή ἄσεβων. Twice elsewhere in the LXX do we read of a βουλή ἄσεβων, Iob 10.3 and 22.18, but since the Hebrew there is the same as in Ps 1.1, and the two Hebrew-Greek equations involved are common in the Greek corpus, no influence in either direction can be established.

ἄσεβων. . . ἀμαρτωλῶν. Not only in the case of thematic words such as תורה – νόμος does Ps 1 set the tone for the rest of the book, but the same is true for epithets for wrong-doers. Given the centrality of the Law in the Hebrew of the first psalm and given the fact that elsewhere (5.5, 44.8, 103.35) √שׁע is three times glossed by ἀνομ–, one might conceivably have expected that ἀνομ– would have been G's choice here as well. Such, however, is not the case. Instead of taking a more overtly interpretive tack, G sets the tone for a more linguistically conservative approach, namely, one primarily based on one-to-one Hebrew-Greek equivalency, even though ἀνομία is used as a gloss for 15 different roots. Since for G it is √עו (17.24, 31.5, 35.3, 37.5, 19, 38.12, 39.13, 40.6, 50.4, 7, 11, 58.5, 64.4, 68.28, 28, 78.8, 84.3, 89.8, 102.3, 10, 105.43, 106.17, 108.14, 129.3, 8 = 25x), √אס (5.6, 6.9, 13.4, 35.4, 5, 13, 40.17, 52.5, 54.4, 11, 58.3, 6, 63.3, 91.8, 10, 93.4, 16, 23, 100.8, 118.133, 124.5, 140.4, 9 = 23x), and √שׁעפ (31.1, 5, 35.2, 36.38, 38.9, 50.3, 5, 15, 58.4, 88.33, 102.12, 106.17 = 12x), that are especially associated with the Law and since none of these occurs in Ps 1, G abides by his chosen equivalents.

The only concession he makes is to style. Though his default for both $\sqrt{\text{רשע}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{אס}}$ is $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau-$ (66x and 31x respectively), he opts for $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta-$ (16x), presumably to avoid having to use $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau-$ in parallel lines. Throughout the psalm he sticks with this equation. As a result, the wicked person (רשע) of the Hebrew in Ps 1 becomes the impious person ($\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$) of the Greek—which is not to say that the translator was deliberately recasting the parent text. Clearly, terms like $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$, as well as $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$, were near the tip of his pen.

$\lambda\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$. $\sqrt{\text{ל יי}}$ occurs twice in the Psalms (1.1, 118.51), and only here is it rendered by $\lambda\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, though this equation is also found in Hos 7.5 and with some regularity in Proverbs (19.25, 21.24, 22.10, 24.9, 29.8?). Elsewhere in the LXX the major equations are $\lambda\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ – בל יעל (1Rgns 5x), and $\sqrt{\text{עריי}}$ (Iezek 4x). In light of its standard meaning in extra-biblical Greek as having to do with plague and pestilence, and metaphorically with persons dangerous to the common good (see BAGD s.v.), there is every reason to apply the same meaning in Ps 1.1. If, as Craigie notes, $\sqrt{\text{ל יי}}$ commonly refers to "babbling" or "talking loosely," though in 1.1 is nuanced by the context to yield "scoffers," it might be suggested that the Greek is more explicit. That G was unacquainted with the word, as Austermann holds (p. 7), seems unnecessary and unconvincing. The translation of the verbal form of $\sqrt{\text{ל יי}}$ by παρανομέω in Ps 118.51 further suggests that in translation literature as elsewhere, $\lambda\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ is an epithet typically used for members of the in-group, and as such for G had primary reference to transgression of the Law, the fabric of Jewish society. As such, its use in 1.1 would seem eminently suitable, but does seem to indicate a slight shift from the Hebrew. The "other translations" show considerable variety: $\chi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ("scoffer") Aquila, Theodotion; $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ("plotter") Symmachus; παράνομος ("transgressor") Quinta, Sexta.

v. 2

Hebrew Text

כי אם בתורת יהוה חפצו
ובתורתו יהגה יומם ולילה

Greek Text

ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ μελετήσῃ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός.

NETS Translation

but his will is in the law of the Lord,
and on his law he will meditate day and night.

The three-line statement, which progressively intensifies what the righteous man is to shun (v. 1), is now followed by two lines of what occupies his undivided attention (v. 2).

ἀλλ' ἢ. Said to be colloquial in classical usage (Smyth §2777), it is well attested in the LXX, though less often so than ἀλλά. In Psalms the ratio is 4 to 6. It is not unlikely that in 1.2, 4 G opts for it because of its morphemic equivalence to כִּי אִם. Yet its reappearance in 113.9 (for כִּי) and in 132.1 (without Hebrew counterpart), suggests that G understood it not simply as being adversative ("but") but as antithetical ("rather than") (Cf. Muraoka s. ἀλλά).

κυρίου. Already in the Pentateuch κύριος functions as the standard gloss for the Hebrew divine name יהוה, probably due its being read with the vowels of אֲדֹנָי ("lord").

Similarly, already in the Pentateuch anarthrous κύριος tends to represent יהוה while arthrous κύριος is typically used for אֲדֹנָי both as sacred and secular epithet. Thirdly, prefixed יהוה (e.g. לַיהוה and אֵת יהוה) tends to give rise to arthrous κύριος, as does יהוה when the conjunction is rendered by (postpositive) δέ. Psalms may be said to follow in the footsteps of the Greek Pentateuch, except for a more pronounced insistence on representing pre-fixed occurrences of יהוה by arthrous κύριος, and a tendency to

feature an article when, in a nominal clause, κύριος is the head term and stands in final position. As a result, since both **יְהוָה** and prefixed forms of **יהוה** generated arthrous κύριος, arthrous κύριος appeared aplenty in the OG of Psalms, and in transmission history was on the increase, due to the fact that in common Greek usage the term was an epithet rather than a name.

θέλημα. Since throughout the Psalter G rather mechanically pairs θέλω+cognates with **יָצַח**, he creates a semantic stereotype, that is to say, a word which, due to difference in semantic range from its Hebrew counterpart, does not fit smoothly into all its Greek contexts. Whereas **יָצַח** denotes "delight" as well as "willingness," the same cannot be said of θέλω+. Instead, it focuses more narrowly on an "act of will." Thus the NRSV appropriately translates the Hebrew of 1.2 as "but their [cf. common gender] delight is in the law of the LORD." For the notion of "delight" G, however, forces his reader to look to the context rather than to the specific word. That G did not fully appreciate the range of **יָצַח** is contradicted by 50.21 where he renders it by εὐδοκέω ("to be well-pleased").

ἐν . . . μελετήσῃ. The difference here between the Greek and the Hebrew lies less in meaning, since μελετάω and **יָגַד** have semantic overlap that has to do with "pondering" and "studying," than with style. Though in normal usage **יָגַד** can be used with or without **כִּי**, μελετάω + ἐν is limited to translation literature. Not surprisingly ἐν is present whenever Hebrew features **כִּי** (1.2, 76.13, 113.15, 142.5), but G uses an accusative when the latter is absent (2.1, 34.28, 36.30, 37.13, 70.24, 89.9). Interestingly, G uses εἰς for **כִּי** in 62.7 (ἐν τοῖς ὄρθροις ἐμελέτων εἰς σε), presumably to avoid confusion of object or possibly for the sake of style. The item in question is indicative of the quantitative translation style of Psalms and much of the rest of the LXX, which tends to wreak havoc with idiomatic use of language. A further point to be noted in this connection is that G, for structure words as well as for full lexemes, tends to have his defaults, which then further adds to the problem. Thus in Ps 1 seven of the eight

occurrences of ך are rendered by ἐν, the only exception being in the phrase ἐπὶ καθέδραν (1c), presumably because G wants to use ἐκάθισεν as a verb of motion (see above).

v. 3

Hebrew Text

והיה כעץ שתול על פלגי מים
 אשר פריו יתן בעתו
 ועליו לא יבול
 וכל אשר יעשה יצליח

Greek Text

καὶ ἔσται ὡς τὸ ξύλον τὸ πεφυτευμένον παρὰ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν
 ὑδάτων,
 ὃ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ δώσει ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ
 καὶ τὸ φύλλον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀπορρυήσεται·
 καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἂν ποιῇ, κατευοδωθήσεται.

NETS Translation

He will be like the tree planted by channels of water,
 which will yield its fruit in its season,
 and its leaves will not fall off.

In all that he^a does, he^a will prosper.

^aPossibly *it* (i.e. *the tree*)

Four lines conclude the first section of the psalm, the first three of which are a simile of a tree illustrating the happiness of the righteous man described in v. 2. The fourth and concluding line would seem to be a confident prediction about his continued well-being (but see below). The simile of a person as a tree, is well known in biblical literature, and within the Psalter also occurs in 51.10 and 91.13.

τὸ ξύλον τὸ πεφυτευμένον παρὰ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὑδάτων. What is of interest here is that G, without warrant in the consonantal text of the Hebrew, supplies articulation, thus suggesting that the tree in question is not just any well-planted tree. Briggs (p. 6) has suggested that Gen 2 may have been in the mind of the Hebrew poet. Be that as it may, such an inference is certainly plausible for its Greek translator, though no tell-tale vocabulary makes such a link explicit, nor can it be said that *the* tree of Genesis (2.17) stood beside "channels of water," even though the Garden as a whole was well watered (2.10). Not impossibly the article should be read as generic. A second point of interest concerns the phrase παρὰ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὑδάτων. Though פלג is rendered variously in Psalms (by ὄρημα in 45.5 and ποταμός in 64.10), here G quite appropriately uses διέξοδος, since the focus is clearly on the constant supply of water from its source. In 118.136 G uses the same word again for the pouring of tears from the eyes. See further 106.33, 35.

τὸ φύλλον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀπορρησεται. Though English translations, including the NRSV, commonly translate יבול (√נבל) as "wither," G's choice of ἀπορρέω ("to fall off") also falls comfortably within its semantic range (see BDB and KBL). Moreover, it should be noted as well that ἀπορρέω, in distinction from ἀποπίπτω which G uses for נבל in 36.2, connotes "fading away." There is, therefore, no good reason to believe that G was unacquainted with נבל, as Austermann suggests (p. 8). The Hebrew-Greek verbal match in 1:3 could scarcely have been better. Furthermore, the two notions of "withering" and "dropping off" in any case reflect different stages in the same process, when in dry climates vegetation is not supplied with the necessary water. Thus the difference in meaning between LXX and MT is more apparent than real. Interestingly, Aquila opted for the latter semantic component: ἀποπεσεῖται.

ὅσα ἂν ποιῇ. Since the durative (present) subjunctive in conditional clauses is a marked form in Greek usage, it is, not unexpectedly, relatively rare in Psalms. The other instances are 36.33, 47.4, 48.16, 61.11, 101.3, 126.5. Whatever the subject of the verb (see below)

the durative makes good sense. There is no evidence that G's use was triggered by the parent text.

ποιῆ, κατευοδωθήσεται. Since in Hebrew both **עץ** and **אדם** are masculine in gender and both verbs are accordingly inflected as 3 m s, it is not clear whether G intends τὸ ξύλον ("tree") or ἄνθρωπος ("man") to be the subject, though the context would seem to favor the latter. In that case, the fourth line is not part of the simile.

v. 4

Hebrew Text:

לא כן הרשעים^a לא כן^a

כי אם כמין אשר תדפנו רוח^b מפני הארץ^b

^a ^bOmit MT

Greek Text

οὐχ οὕτως οἱ ἀσεβεῖς, οὐχ οὕτως,

ἀλλ' ἢ ὡς ὁ χνοῦς, ὃν ἐκριπτεῖ ὁ ἄνεμος ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς.

NETS Translation

The impious are not so, not so,

but are like dust that the wind flings from the face of the land.

These lines give the antithesis to 1-2 (and by extension 1-3), though with the added "not so" in the first, the antithesis is doubly strong in the Greek. Since only hexaplaric evidence marks the second οὐχ οὕτως as being extra, the phrase should be regarded not only as original but as resting on a Hebrew base. Like the extra phrase in the next line, ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς, its role is literary rather than exegetical. Perhaps, in the pre-Greek version, both phrases represent an attempt at achieving greater balance with 1-2. Austermann (p. 6 note 15) rightly suggests that in both cases the "addition" in G is best

attributed to the parent text. For similarly emphatic repetitions of a phrase see 13.1c=52.4b, 106.2a.

χνούς. Though both here and in 34.5 this word translates גָּז , there is no reason to believe that χνούς means "chaff" and is thus a calque. Not only does Greek have a perfectly good word for "chaff" (ἄχυρον/ρα), which appears throughout the LXX, but there is no evidence from non-translation literature for χνούς = "chaff." Hos 13.3 merely indicates that a threshing-floor gives rise to clouds of fine dust in addition to chaff (contra Muraoka), and Esa 17.13, by translating גָּז by χνούς ἄχυρου ("chaff-dust") clearly marks a difference (cf. Esa 41.15). This is further underscored by κονιορτός ("cloud of dust") in a scholion on Ps 1.4 (Field). Furthermore, that χνούς and ἄχυρον are not to be equated but nevertheless are similar is underscored by the proverb cited in LSV from an Aristophanes fragment (59): ὄνος εἰς ἄχυρα καὶ χνούων ("a donkey for chaff and dust") i.e. a stroke of good luck. MT's harvest simile thus becomes one of light dust being picked up and flung away by the wind in the open country (see also Austermann p. 8-9).

ἐκριπτέῃ. As the accent indicates, Rahlfs derives this verb from ἐκριπτέω rather than from ἐκρίπτω. According to Thackeray §22.3 already in Classical Greek the forms were interchangeable in the present stem. For support Rahlfs appeals to παραρριπτέῖσθαι in 83.11, which he takes to be original there against S R T-He* A 55. His choice is now confirmed by 2110. Though 2149 with its reading of –τησ– admits of ambiguity, it probably supports the variant instead of the lemma. The choice off ἐκρίπτω/ἐκριπτέω for קָרַח is unique both in Psalms and the rest of the Greek corpus.

ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς. As already noted, this phrase, which MT lacks, like the extra οὐχ οὕτως in the preceding line, would seem to play a stylistic-rhetorical rather than interpretive role in the text. While such a literary move on the part of G cannot be ruled out entirely, the slight incongruity in the Greek (but absent from the parent Hebrew) suggests a pre-Greek origin of the addition. As noted above, only in this verse in the entire Greek corpus, is קָרַח ("to drive") translated by ἐκριπτέω ("to fling, cast"). One

suspects that the heightened sense of the Greek word is triggered by the presence of "from the face of the land" in the parent text. Hence the tension, since χνούς does not mean "soil" or "sand" which might be "flung" by the wind, but instead is light like chaff. Put another way, had the final phrase of the line not already been present in G's parent text, one might have expected him to have used ἐκλείπω, as he does twice in 67.3 (in reference to "smoke"), or in any case a less violent verb.

v. 5

Hebrew Text

על כן לא יקמו רשעים במשפט
וחטאים בעצתם צדיקים

בעדד MT

Greek Text

διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀναστήσονται ἀσεβεῖς ἐν κρίσει
οὐδὲ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐν βουλῇ δικαίων·

NETS Translation

Therefore the impious will not rise up in the judgment,
nor sinners in the council of the righteous;

As in MT so in LXX, the actors of the opening line reappear, but since their role in the psalm is primarily that of foil to the righteous man, no details of their behaviour are supplied.

ἀσεβεῖς. . . ἁμαρτωλοὶ. G no doubt followed the parent text in not articulating. Not surprisingly transmission history supplies articulation respectively (A B S 2130).

ἀναστήσονται. Flashar already toyed with the notion of resurrection here (115-16). He rightly notes that the Greek does not mean simply that they "will endure" (Bestand haben) for which one might expect ὑφίστημι, and then wonders whether G may not have intended to say that the impious will be excluded from the eschatological resurrection. He finds the thought the more appealing not only because the resurrection of the righteous alone is well attested in Jewish literature of the Hellenistic and Roman periods but also since, according to Flashar, G knew Greek Isaiah and may have had Esa 26.19 in mind: ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί. On balance, however, and with a wary eye on Ps 34.11 (ἀναστάντες μάρτυρες ἄδικοι) he agrees that his suggestion must remain only an "Erklärungsmöglichkeit." Without reference to Flashar, Schaper (p. 46f) has recently renewed the interpretation in question and has furthermore claimed Ps 72 (LXX) as the counterpart to Ps 1, since the former allegedly maintains that the wicked are forever confined to Hades, whereas, according to Schaper's reading of the latter, 1.5 claims that only the righteous will rise from the dead (p. 68). However, he completely disregards both 34.11 and other passages (see my review of Schaper's book as well as Austermann p. 9). In point of fact, ἀνίστημι (23x) and ἐπανίστημι (11x) account for 68% of the translations of קָם. Since קָם often indicates a "rising" or "getting up," this is precisely what one would expect. Schaper furthermore patently disregards the fact that if either text was meant to refer to the eschatological judgment, it would more likely be the Hebrew than the Greek, since the Masorettes vocalized כַּמְשַׁפֵּט as being definite, whereas G did not so read it.

There is, consequently, no reason to believe that G had the final judgment in mind. The most that can be said is that his text might subsequently be so construed. Thus Schaper (p. 165) may well be correct in seeing Matt 12.41 and Luke 11.32 as harbouring a citation of Ps 1.5. It is certainly true that e.g. Theodoret (*Interpretatio in Psalmos*) read it along such lines. But it scarcely follows that the NT and Patristic understanding should therefore be superimposed on the Greek psalm.

ἐν βουλήν δικαίων. The reading of OG is not in question, and the phrase is of interest from several perspectives. In view of MT's עֲדָה (√עֲדָה), which NRSV renders by

"congregation," a word which elsewhere in Psalms is glossed consistently by συναγωγή (9x), βουλή comes as a surprise. On the Greek side, the latter is the default for עצה (1.1, 12.3, 13.6, 19.5, 32.11, 72.24, 105.13, 43), twice translates סוד (88.8, 110.1), and once מזמ (20.12). Thus did G perhaps find בעצה in his Hebrew text rather than בעדה? Though one cannot totally exclude the possibility that G saw בעדה but somehow construed it as בעצה, having been primed by the equation of v. 1, such becomes unlikely when one realizes that οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βουλῇ ἀσεβῶν must surely mean that the "happy man" does not live by the *advice* (counsel) of the impious, whereas οὐκ ἀναστήσονται . . . ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἐν βουλῇ δικαίων of v. 5 clearly refers a *body* (council) of people. That the latter image arose from the former, though the same Greek lexeme could be used to express it, fails to convince. More likely is that G's parent text read בעצה. Austermann (p. 6) concludes likewise. If, as Craigie suggests, במשפט implies the *place* of judgment, one will need to conclude that ἐν κρίσει (a strictly verbal noun) (. . . ἐν βουλῇ of the Greek has weakened the parallelism.

v. 6

Hebrew Text

כי יודע יהוה דרך צדיקים
ודרך רשעים תאבד

Greek Text

ὅτι γινώσκει κύριος ὁδὸν δικαίων,
καὶ ὁδὸς ἀσεβῶν ἀπολείται.

NETS Translation

for the Lord knows^b the way of the righteous,
but the way of the impious will perish.

^bPossibly *watches over*

There is no indication that the final destiny of either the righteous or the impious is the result of divine recompense (cf. Craigie). Each is the logical outcome of a choice that was made.

γινώσκει. The stereotypical equivalent of עָדָה qal in the Psalms. Though G most often renders Hebrew participles by Greek participles, regardless of syntactic function, the pres. indic. is also well enough attested. In both texts the durative aspect is being featured. Semantically עָדָה and γινώσκω overlap considerably and the sense "to be acquainted with, due to personal interest" is common to both. Not inappropriately, therefore, NRSV has "to watch over."

κύριος. See comment on v. 2 above.