

Psalm 3

(c) Albert Pietersma, March 2002

Synopsis:

The psalmist, alarmed at his present opposition (2-3) but conscious of divine help in the past (5, 8b-c), expresses his confidence in God's continued support (4, 6b-7, 9) which he urgently requests (8a) at the start of a new day (6a-6b α).

Psalm 3 as a whole:

Based on v. 6, this psalm is commonly described as a morning prayer (e.g. Briggs, Weiser, Craigie), a characterization perhaps underlined by G's past tense in 6a-b α . For G, if not for the original poet, the superscription would have assigned the psalm to a particular episode in the life of King Daudid. Within that episode he might have thought of the fortuitously rejected advice of Achitophel to pursue Daudid by night (2 Rgns 17.1; cf. 16).

Because of G's frequent pairing of the Hebrew perfect with the Greek aorist, the Greek psalm takes on a decidedly more historical slant, i.e. it underscores the psalmist's past experience. So in 2a we are told what occurred in time past (evidently with present effect), and this is even extended to the Hebrew imperfect verbs of 5a, although G regularly glosses these with a future. Whatever the precise reason, the Greek text reads more like a description of a past incident than does MT.

Commentary: v. 1

Hebrew Text

מזמור לדוד בברחו מפני
אבשלום בנו

Greek Text

Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυίδ, ὅποτε ἀπεδίδρασκεν ἀπὸ προσώπου
Ἀβεσσαλώμ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

NETS Translation

A Psalm. Pertaining to Daudid. When he was running away
from his son Abessalom.

Since MT features the same superscription, there is good reason to assume that it belonged to G's parent text and that therefore any kind of perceived linkage between King Daudid and the psalm proper should be sought in the Hebrew.

Ψαλμὸς. As is clear both from its formation and its use in Classical Greek sources, this word referred initially to the activity of making music (or any comparable sound) rather than to a piece of music in set form. That it continued to have this sense in later literature is clear from such passages as Am 5.23, which speaks of the "psalming" of instruments (see below). Also of interest is that Josephus consistently so uses it (*Ant.* 6.214; 7.80; 9.35; 12.323), and Philo never uses it at all, preferring the common Greek ὕμνος instead. A more concrete meaning ("psalm") is, however, attested and could therefore be what G intended in the Psalter (cf. e.g. Esa 66.20; Zach 6.14 where it appears without warrant in MT; Ps 151.1). In any case, there is little doubt that it developed this meaning based on its appearance in the Greek Psalter. As is clear from its cognates, ψάλλω "to pluck" and ψαλτήριον "harp" or "psalter," its primary reference was to instrumental in distinction from vocal activity, in others words, to playing rather than to singing. That it still had this instrumental sense in our period is suggested by the fact that in several references it stands in parallel to musical instruments (Iob 21.12, 30.31, Idt 16.1) and it furthermore is regularly used to translate Hebrew instrumental terms, for example in Iob עוגב, a flute of some description. The phrase ψαλμὸς ὀργάνων ("plucking of instruments") in contrast to ἦχος ῥόδων ("sound of songs") in Am 5.23 gives further confirmation (see Muraoka *sub* ψαλμὸς). NETS uses a transcription of the Greek with initial capital in agreement with NRSV, though not with the suggestion that its sense in the Greek Psalter fully equates with its use in modern English.

τῷ Δαυίδ. That this phrase serves to indicate Davidic authorship, whatever its Hebrew counterpart may be thought to mean, is most unlikely (cf. Pietersma 103). In spite of the recognized intimate bond between Daudid and the Psalms, Greek exegetical tradition did not uniformly construe it as a *nota auctoris*, and neither did the translator himself. So Didymus the Blind in comment on Ps 24.1 writes: εἰς τὸν Δαυίδ ὁ ψαλμὸς λέγεται· ἄλλο γὰρ ἐστὶν τοῦ Δαυίδ εἶναι καὶ ἄλλο τῷ Δαυίδ. τοῦ Δαυίδ λέγεται, ὅταν ἦ αὐτὸς αὐτὸν πεποιηκῶς ἢ ψάλλον. αὐτῷ δὲ λέγεται, ὅταν εἰς αὐτὸν φέρηται ("the psalm is said to have reference to Daudid. For 'of Daudid' and 'to Daudid' mean different things; 'of Daudid' is used when he himself composed it or played it, whereas 'to him' is used when it refers to him). A similar point is made by G himself when he labels the closing psalm (151) as εἰς Δαυίδ ("pertaining to Daudid") but also ἰδιόγραφος, i.e. "written by Daudid himself" in contrast to all the psalms that precede. Interestingly, Didymus' criterion for authorship, namely composition or performance, are uniquely combined in Ps 151, since the first person account of Daudid's early life includes in v. 3 a direct reference to his performing on the harp: "My hands made an instrument;/ my fingers tuned a harp" (NETS). Didymus' other conclusion, namely, that the dative indicated that the psalm in question "pertained to Daudid," left ample room for typological and messianic interpretation, as is clear from his own commentary on Psalms.

ὅποτε ἀπεδίδρασκεν. G uses this grammatical construction exclusively in superscriptions, though it appears only when MT has a counterpart. That could reflect a more overtly historical stance on the part of G. The relatively rare conjunction ὅποτε (only 10x in the LXX) often has iterative force and as such tends to be followed by verbs that are durative in aspect. Xenophon *Anabasis* 4.2.25-28 supplies an interesting series of examples. G, however, in all instances (3.1; 33.1; 55.1; 58.1; 59.2), except the present one, employs it with the aorist indicative. That may possibly indicate that after having used ὅποτε + impf indicative to express repeated action in 3.1, G simply stuck with the conjunction when later prompted by the same Hebrew construction (but contrast 56.1; 62.1; 141.1 where he makes use of ἐν + infinitive, which simply marks general (rather than specifically temporal) circumstance). The exclusive use of ὅποτε in the superscriptions may further indicate what the earliest Greek manuscripts show in any

case, namely, that the superscriptions were regarded as entities quite distinct from the psalm per se. In any case, the durative aspect of the verb in 3.1 explicitly portrays David's flight as a withdrawal in progress. As for the specific verb in our phrase—it is of interest that in both 3.1 and 55.1 G uses it to gloss בָּרַח ("to flee") while in 138.7 he opts for φεύγω ("to flee"). Both Hebrew-Greek equations, however, appear *ca.* 25x each in the LXX. (Note that the identical Hebrew construction, with David as subject, is glossed in 3Rgns 2.7 as ἐν τῷ με ἀποδιδράσκειν ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἀβεσσαλωμ.)

vv. 2-3

Hebrew Text

יהוה מה רבו צרי
 רבים קמים עלי
 רבים אמרים לנפשי
 אין ישועתה לו באלהיו^a סלה

א^a באלהים MT

Greek Text

Κύριε, τί ἐπληθύνθησαν οἱ θλίβοντές με;
 πολλοὶ ἐπανάστανται ἐπ' ἐμέ·
 πολλοὶ λέγουσιν τῇ ψυχῇ μου
 Οὐκ ἔστιν σωτηρία αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ.

διάψαλμα.

NETS Translation

O Lord, why did those who afflict me multiply?
 Many are rising against me;
 many are saying to me,
 "There is no salvation for him in his God."

Interlude on strings

τί ἐπληθύνθησαν. Since the verb is intransitive, τί must be adverbial. Rahlfs read 2a as a question, though MT is commonly read as an exclamation (e.g. NRSV, Kraus, Craigie, Dahood, Weiser). Since adverbial τί regularly has the sense of "why" rather than "how," there is good reason to read this opening line of the psalm not as the psalmist's bewildered cry about his present plight but as an agonized question as to why it is that he has landed in his current predicament. Had he wanted to express the former he would likely have used ὥς (see e.g. 65.3). Consequently, the placement of Ps 3.2 under 3.b. by AGD is not justified. G's choice detracts somewhat from 2-3 as a complaint per se.

τῆ ψυχῆ μου. The grammatical role of the phrase is as ambiguous in the Greek as it is in MT, but given the fact that, in both, the direct speech that follows is couched in the third person, one might construe the dative as indicating general reference ("with respect to") rather than as an indirect object. NETS follows NRSV since there is insufficient reason to demur. Yet the possibility of general reference cannot be precluded.

αὐτοῦ. As Kraus notes, G's pronoun heightens the mocking tone of the psalmist's opponents, and perhaps for that very reason it was added, though the change is more likely to have occurred in the parent text than in the process of translation. It is also true that a third person reference has those that afflict the psalmist talk behind his back (so Craigie).

διάψαλμα. The meaning and function of its Hebrew counterpart (פָּסֵל), were apparently as unfamiliar to G as they are to modern commentators. The Greek term, however, is reasonably transparent, since it is derived from διαψάλλω, an intensive from ψάλλω (see Munnich 72-75). Literalistically it would therefore have to mean something like "plucked/played through," as a result of which it is commonly glossed as "musical interlude" (e.g. LSJ, Muraoka). Muraoka sensibly describes it as occurring "between two contiguous passages of a poem." Since the musical interlude, by virtue of the Greek root ψαλ-, can be further specified as an interlude on a stringed instrument, NETS has added this further specification. Though the word is common in Psalms, it also appears in Hab 3.3, 9, 13 in both the Septuagint and the so-called Venetus text (see Ziegler, *Duodecim*

prophetae), but apparently never in extra-biblical Greek apart from dependent literature. In all likelihood, then, it is a neologism in Psalms (so Munnich). If that is indeed the case, G shows here a surprising level of creativity, since the link he forges between ψάλλω/ψαλμός and διάψαλμα finds no support in his parent text. In formal terms it was evidently thought to signal a pause in the singing while the music continued, and as such would have had a questionable role to play at the end of an entire piece. Presumably for that reason it was not placed by G at the close of 3.9; 23.10 and 45.12, even though in all three instances MT features לַלֵּל. As interlude it makes good sense after both v. 3 and v. 5, since both points mark a break in the sense of the psalm, the first being the close of the statement of complaint, and the second the midpoint of the statement of trust in the Lord, marking a transition from confession to confidence. The perceived function of διάψαλμα was evidently like that of a διαύλιον in drama, an interlude played on the flute (αὐλός) between choruses (cf. Keil-Delitzsch) (see also μεσαύλιον). Interestingly, a scholion on Aristophanes (1263bis 1) notes: "someone blows a διαύλιον, so called just like the διάψαλμα" (διαύλιον προσαυλεῖ τις. ὥσπερ τὸ διάψαλμα λέγεται, οὕτω καὶ τούτο) (TLG). It is thus possible that if G was the first to use διάψαλμα he patterned it after (δια)ψάλλω/ψαλμός, prompted by the flute interlude of Greek drama.

vv. 4-5

Hebrew Text

וַאֲתָהּ יְהוָה מִגֵּן בְּעַדִּי
 כְּבוֹדִי וּמְרִים רֵאשִׁי
 קוֹלִי אֶל יְהוָה אֶקְרָא
 וַיַּעֲנֵנִי מִהַר קִדְשׁוֹ סֶלֶה

Greek Text

σὺ δέ, κύριε, ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου εἶ,
 δόξα μου καὶ ὑψῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν μου.
 φωνῆ μου πρὸς κύριον ἐκέκραξα,

καὶ ἐπήκουσέν μου ἐξ ὄρους ἁγίου αὐτοῦ.

διάψαλμα.

NETS Translation

But you, O Lord, are my supporter,
my glory, and the one who lifts up my head.
I cried with my voice to the Lord,
and he hearkened to me from his holy mountain.

Interlude on strings

δὲ. Even though G normally represents Hebrew ו ("and") by conjunctive καί, other conjunctions appear from time to time when the context strongly suggests them. So here the Psalmist's own expression of faith in God is counter posed to the doubt voiced by his opponents. MT is not explicitly so marked.

ἀντιλήπτωρ μου εἶ. Kraus wonders whether G read יַעֲרֹם in place of MT's מַגֵּן בְּעָרְוִי ("a shield around me"). There is little to support this. While it is true that G typically dissolves the "shield" metaphor—most often when it refers to God but also in most other instances (7.11 βοήθεια ["help"]; 17.36 ὑπερασπισμός ["protection"]; 46.10 κραταῖος ["strong"]; 83.12 ἀλήθεια ["truth"]; 88.19 ἀντίληψις ["support"])—it is equally true that he uses several epithets in its place. The most common of these is ὑπερασπιστής ("protector"; 10x), but here as well as in 118.114 he uses ἀντιλήπτωρ (cf. also 88.19 *supra*). Furthermore, if Kraus took his cue from the equation of ἀντιλαμβάνομαι - יַעֲרֹם in 17.36 and 19.3, it should be noted as well that this Hebrew verb is glossed by βοηθέω ("help" 40.4; 93.18; 118.117) and στηρίζω ("sustain" 103.15). Once G had decided to pair מַגֵּן with ἀντιλήπτωρ, יַעֲרֹם would have had to follow suit. Though the reason for G's option in 3.4 and 118.114 is not certain, it is of interest that the cognate verb ἀντιλαμβάνομαι reappears in 3.6 and 118.116, where Hebrew תָּמַךְ is uniquely so translated. Thus in both cases G has a verbal echo which MT lacks. G has an obvious liking for the concept of giving support, since the verb (ἀντιλαμβάνομαι) translates six

Hebrew roots, the verbal noun (ἀντίληψις) five and the agent noun (ἀντιλήμπτωρ) seven. Montevocchi identified it as being at home in Graeco-Roman petitions and MM §482 gives some good examples. (For ἀντιλήμπτωρ see further BGU 4. 1139, 1182, 1200; CPR 7.1; PMich 3.174; POslo 3.27; POxy 50.3555, in most of which it appears with σωτήρ.) It is clearly appropriate in Ps 3, and as a consequence of G's choice of ἀντιλήμπτωρ for Hebrew יָגֹן, instead of ὑπερασπιστής ("protector", "one who shields"), his default in the rest of the book, the military image has been replaced by one of rendering help to a petitioner. Flashar (165) maintains that ἀντιλήμπτωρ, like σωτήρ ("savior") is a divine epithet, and indeed UPZ 14 (158 BCE) lends support to that.

εἶ. Though the verb "to be" has no explicit warrant in MT, it is nonetheless not infrequently supplied by G when the context strongly suggests it. So here, without the equative verb the preceding phrase might inadvertently be construed as vocative, appositional to "Lord" and parallel to the two vocatives that follow in 4b.

ἐπήκουσεν. As Cox has shown, Hebrew עָנָה ("answer") is always translated in Psalms by either ἐπακούω or εἰσακούω when God is the grammatical subject. While Barr has argued that ἐπακούω can indeed mean "answer" and while it is true that עָנָה and –ακούω can have a certain semantic overlap, seeing that already in Classical ὑπακούω regularly means "to answer/counter," it is nonetheless of interest that G employs ἀποκρίνομαι when God is not perceived to be the subject (87.1; 101.24; 118.42). As a result, Cox is justified in seeing an interpretive shift in Psalms from an answering God to a heeding or listening God, even though this shift may well pre-date the Psalter (cf. MM §1873). Of interest again is that the verb is in the past tense, hence descriptive of what happened on a previous occasion.

vv. 6-7

Hebrew Text

אֲנִי שִׁכַּחְתִּי וְאִשְׁנָה

הַקִּיצוֹתַי כִּי יְהוָה יִסְמְכֵנִי
 לֹא אִירָא מִרַבּוֹת עַם
 אֲשֶׁר סָבִיב שְׂתוֹ עָלַי

Greek Text

ἐγὼ ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ὕπνωσα·
 ἐξηγέρθην, ὅτι κύριος ἀντιλήμψεταιί μου.
 οὐ φοβηθήσομαι ἀπὸ μυριάδων λαοῦ
 τῶν κύκλῳ συνεπιτιθεμένων μοι.

NETS Translation

I lay down and slept;
 I woke again, for the Lord will support me.
 I shall not be afraid of ten thousands of people
 who are setting themselves against me all around.

ἀντιλήμψεταιί. As already noted, G links 6bβ to 4aβ, with the result that the psalmist's earlier confession in v. 4 is explicitly cited as his motivation in 6. Whereas the final verb of v. 6 in MT (יִסְמְכֵנִי) is commonly glossed by an English present (e.g. NRSV, Craigie, Kraus, Weiser) or a durative past (e.g. Briggs) and God's sustenance is thus taken to be the cause of the psalmist's making it through the night, the future verb of the Greek suggests instead that it is the psalmist's motivation for starting a new day. In other words, had it not been for his faith in God's continued support, he might have stayed in bed.

φοβηθήσομαι ἀπὸ. The grammatical construction here is an isomorphic representation of the Hebrew. Regularly in Psalms it mimics the Hebrew construction (but see 26.1 and 32.8, though in the latter the Hebrew preposition is represented by the Greek article); consequently, here –כּ gives rise to ἀπὸ/(Thackeray 47; MM § 5399). As in the Hebrew so in the Greek, the prepositional phrase functions as an adverbial (not a direct object), a

usage known from extra-biblical literature as well. Not surprisingly we also find it in LXXIob 5.21, 22, a book not known for its Hebraisms.

συνεπιτιθεμένων. G opts for a durative participle and thus portrays what the psalmist's besiegers keep doing to him, underscoring also gang-style action by the συν– prefix. This doubly prefixed verb appears only here in Psalms.

μυριάδων λαοῦ. Though Greek μυριάς can have the numerical value of ten-thousand, here no doubt, like Hebrew רבבות, it simply refers to a very large number. Thus the Greek matches the Hebrew idiom for idiom.

v. 8

Hebrew Text

קומה יהוה הושיעני אל הי
כי הכית את כל איבי לחי
שני רשעים שברת

Greek Text

ἀνάστα, κύριε, σῶσόν με, ὁ θεός μου,
ὅτι σὺ ἐπάταξας πάντας τοὺς ἐχθραίνοντάς μοι ματαίως,
ὀδόντας ἀμαρτωλῶν συνέτριψας.

NETS Translation

Rise up, O Lord! Save me, O my God!
For you are the one who struck all who are hostile to me for nothing;
you shattered the teeth of sinners.

ἀνάστα. Though G uses predominantly the older imperative ἀνάστηθι (< ἀνίστημι) (7x), the later form ἀνάστα (< ἀνιστάω) also appears (43.27; 73.22; 81.8), and both are

virtually uncontested. Not unexpectedly, the distinction in form has no warrant in the Hebrew.

ὁ θεός μου. Though this is appropriately glossed in English as direct address, in Greek it is more strictly an arthrous nominative in apposition to a vocative (see Smyth §1287, Robertson §465). That we have here a Semitism is unlikely for two reasons: (a) in Psalms Hebrew **אֱלֹהִים** is never arthrous as vocative, and (b) Hebrew suffixed nouns are never arthrous.

σὺ. Strictly speaking MT has no equivalent, though it is not without interest that it features the so-called *nota accusativi* after the first verb. Thus it is not unlikely that G's parent text was identical to MT, but that G construed **אָנֹכִי** as **אַתָּה** (for this form see e.g. Ps 6.4) 2 sg m pronoun ("you"), as does Dahood but without reference to the Greek. In 144.16 G does the same thing, though MT has a preceding participle and 11QPs^a reads **אָנֹכִי** followed by **אָנֹכִי** + participle (Flint), and in 39.6 both MT and LXX feature finite verb + pronoun. Of further interest is 75.5 where G represents MT's participle + pronoun by finite verb + pronoun. Though in biblical Hebrew the pronoun is commonly placed before rather than after the finite verb, the latter is common in Qoheleth and may thus be characteristic of late biblical Hebrew (see Gesenius-Kautzsch §135.1). Whether such instances be labeled emphatic or pleonastic (*ibid.*) is not important for Ps 3.8. Not improbably G was responsible for the switch in word order (note that in 55.9 he splits up the same sequence of fin verb + pronoun between 9a and 9b). Since the context in any case lends itself to emphasis, it is not difficult to see why G did what he did.

ἐπάταξας . . . συνέτριψας. MT has a perfect in both cases, and as a result Kraus writes that the meaning of the Hebrew verse depends on how one interprets the tenses. That is to say, should 8b and c be read as an expression of unshakable certainty of being heard (so J. Botterweck) or as a statement of what has already happened to the psalmist (so H. Schmidt)? Kraus decides in favor of the latter, as do Briggs and Weiser. The NRSV, on the other hand, by rendering the verbs as presents opts for the former interpretation.

Different from both of these Craigie, following Dahood, renders both verbs as fond wishes ("Oh, that you would . . ."). In formal terms the aorists of the Greek place it with Kraus though, since the aorist is G's default for the Hebrew perfect, this may be more a matter of inadvertence than of deliberate interpretation. For the reader of the psalm the past verbs nonetheless raise the question of the opponents' identity. While in MT they may simply be identified with the afflicters of 2-3, in the Greek the latter appear to constitute a second wave of opposition.

τοὺς ἐχθραίνοντάς μοι. Only here and in 34.19a, a line not unlike the present one, does G use the verbal form ἐχθραίνω ("be hostile") to gloss עֹיֵב ("enemy"), which otherwise virtually exclusively gives rise to ἐχθρός (71x). Similarly in 2a G opts for θλίβω to render אָדָוֶר ("adversary"), even though the latter is slightly more often glossed as ἐχθρός (14/12). Together with disappearance of MT's military metaphor in 4a, this has the effect of, on the one hand, softening the portrayal of God as warrior and, on the other hand, of weakening the impression that the psalmist opponents are *ipso facto* God's enemies.

ματαίως. That this equates with מַחֲסֵה, as BHS suggests (cf. also Mozley), is unlikely since the latter is routinely translated by δωρεάν (34.7, 19; 68.5; 108.3; 118.161), with the sole exception of the second occurrence in 34.7 where μάτην is used, presumably to avoid δωρεάν in consecutive lines. ματαίως, on the other hand, glosses קִרְיָ (72.13) and שׁוֹשׁ (88.48). Given the fact that the latter is most often translated by (εἰς) μάτην (40.7; 126.1[2x], 2), קִרְיָ would be a better conjecture for the parent text. One may note further that in 4.2 קִרְיָ is rendered as ματαιότης ("vanity"). There is, however, no good reason to posit a reading different from MT. Since אֶבֶר ("jaw") does not occur elsewhere in Psalms, G may not have been familiar with it. More likely, however, G's choice flows from his having construed עֹיֵב as a verbal. Consequently, the adverbial is read with the participle (ἐχθραίνοντάς) as an adverb of manner, rather than as an adverb of place with the preceding finite verb (ἐπάταξας). Whatever the precise reason, any overt reference to the opponents' mouth (so Dahood; cf. v. 3) is obscured in the Greek.

ὀδόντας. . . συνέτριψας. The identical metaphor reappears in 57.7, though there MT uses a different verb (סרס "to break").

ἄμαρτωλῶν. G's default for both √שע and √סח is ἄμαρτ– (66x and 31x respectively). That being the case, it is scarcely surprising that the "wicked" of MT have become the "sinners" in the Greek. Yet whereas in the Hebrew the focus is primarily on these people as opponents of the psalmist himself and only secondarily as being at odds with God (3b), that latter characterization is underscored by G's word choice in 8c.

v. 9

Hebrew Text

לִיהוּהָ הַיְשׁוּעָה וְעַל־^a וְעַמְךָ בְּרַכְתֶּךָ סֵלֶה

^aעל MT

Greek Text

τοῦ κυρίου ἡ σωτηρία, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν σου ἡ εὐλογία σου.

NETS Translation

Salvation is the Lord's, and may your blessing be on your people!

τοῦ κυρίου. Though the Hebrew construction of לִיהוּהָ here and of לִדָּוִד in the superscription is the same, G treats them differently, with interesting results. Greek grammars are well aware that the genitive and the dative cases, although they have a measure of semantic overlap, nevertheless typically mark distinct relationships. So Smyth in discussing the genitive of possession in contrast to what he terms the dative of the possessor remarks that whereas the dative "denotes that something is at the disposal of a person or has fallen to his share temporarily" (§1480) or "the person for whom a thing exists" (§1476), the genitive, on the other hand, "lays stress on the *person* who

owns something" (§1480) or "denotes ownership, possession, or belonging" (§1297). Due to this difference in denotation, a $\text{—}\text{ֿ}$ construction in Hebrew might demand differentiation along these lines. Thus if the text was perceived to indicate ownership or possession a Greek-speaker would likely opt for a genitive; but if the Hebrew was thought to refer to an entity at someone's disposal, that same Greek-speaker would likely favor the dative. Not surprisingly, therefore, when a Hebrew $\text{—}\text{ֿ}$ construction was perceived to convey divine possession, G typically used an arthrous genitive: "kingdom" (3.9; 21.29); "the earth" (23.1); "the strong of the earth" (46.10); "escape from death" (67.21); "might" (61.13); "support" (88.19); "king" (88.19); "gate" (117.20).

ἡ εὐλογία σου. Whether the closing line of the psalm is to be read as a benediction (so e.g. NRSV, Kraus, Weiser, Broyles) or as a declaration (e.g. Craigie) is as uncertain from the Greek as it is from MT. While in general terms it is true that the unmarked form of "to be" (ἔσται) is more easily left implicit (see 9a) than the marked form (including the subjunctive and optative), the latter is nevertheless often enough left out. Thus only context can decide. Craigie reads 9b with 9a as an expression of supreme confidence and the Greek does not prohibit that, though the conjunction (καὶ) perhaps makes 9b more distinct than it is in MT.

Conclusion.

Textually, it is quite clear, there is virtually no evidence in Ps 3 that its parent text was different from MT's consonantal text. On the interpretive level, it is difficult not to conclude that Ps 3, with few possible exceptions, offers little evidence of what might be termed deliberate exegesis. Most of the interpretation that does occur is either by virtue of the fact that all translation is perforce interpretation or due to the fact that G opted for certain Hebrew-Greek equations and then tended to stick with them. Exegesis in Ps 3 is not unlike its Greek poetics: features of what Hugh Lloyd-Jones¹ calls 'formal prose' do occur but seem more inadvertent than deliberate. When all is said and done, what did emerge, however, nevertheless created a certain potential for future understanding.

¹ Greek Metre. Oxford, Clarendon: 1962 , 2. The German original of this work by Paul Maas speaks of Kunstprosa.