

Psalm 4

(c) Albert Pietersma, March 2002

Synopsis:

The psalmist, recalling that in time past God has listened to his appeal and given him room to breath (as a testimony to his [the psalmist's] righteousness), requests compassionate attentiveness to his present prayer (2). His fellow humans are then lectured on being dimwitted and inclined to vanity and falsehood, and are reminded that the Lord is on his side to continue to listen to his cry for help (3-4). They are advised to curb their vehemence lest they keep on sinning, privately to contemplate their wrongdoing, then to offer sacrifice, and to hope in the Lord (5). Though many of the psalmist's acquaintances doubt that prosperity will prevail, the psalmist points out that the Lord has been favourably disposed toward both him and them. In a concluding address to God, he acknowledges that God has given mirth to him and sustenance(?) to them. In peace, says he, he will go to sleep, because it is the Lord alone who has made him live in hope.

Psalm 4 as a whole:

Ps 4 has traditionally been called an "individual lament," a type of psalm that has been labeled the backbone of the Psalter since almost one third of all psalms belong to this genre (cf. Day 19). With recent commentators, however, the term has fallen into some disfavour. Kraus prefers to call Ps 4 simply a "prayer song" (146), and Craigie opts for a "psalm of confidence," since the psalmist "rises above the grounds of lamentation with sure trust in God" (79). As is typical for "individual laments," Ps 4 in MT opens with a plea to God, but in the LXX the initial invocation becomes a statement of past experience. In similar vein, not all of the repeated words and phrases, noted by Craigie as a feature of (Hebrew) poetic structure, survive into the Greek, though some compensation for such loss can be registered. Due to G's decision to follow his source text very closely, whether or not he understood it, the Greek is difficult to grasp in places. On the question

whether perhaps Ps 4, as an Evening Prayer, was deliberately made to follow Ps 3, often called a Morning Prayer, the Greek Psalter gives no evidence apart from MT.

Commentary: v. 1

Hebrew Text

לִּמְנַצַּח בִּנְגִינֹת מְזֻמֹּר לְדָוִד

Greek Text

Εἰς τὸ τέλος, ἐν ψαλμοῖς· ὥδῃ τῷ Δαυίδ.

NETS Translation

Regarding fulfillment. Among psalms. An Ode. Pertaining to Daudid.

Εἰς τὸ τέλος. Since G glosses לִּמְנַצַּח with the relatively common Greek adverbial εἰς τέλος ("completely"/"totally"), it is only logical that he would represent לִּמְנַצַּח by εἰς τὸ τέλος. While the מ prefix is not an article, G rather cleverly maintains an isomorphic relationship to the source text (for a similar example see his treatment of שְׁשָׁנִים in the superscripts of 45[44]; 60[59]; 69[68]; 80[79]). That the temporal dimension of לִּמְנַצַּח is not represented by τέλος is clear in the Psalms from G's representation of עַד לְנֶצַח by ἕως αἰῶνος in 49(48).20, and further from Esa 13.20; 28.28; 33.20; 34.10; 57.16; Ier 27(50).39; Iob 34.36. Though reception history typically read τέλος as an eschatological term (see e.g., 1Pet 4.7 and Asterius the Sophist on Ps 9.1), such a meaning is rare in the Septuagint and in Hellenistic Greek generally. It is also quite unnecessary for the Psalter (contra Rösel "Psalmenüberschriften" 137-39; see further Pietersma "Superscriptions"). NETS glosses the phrase εἰς τὸ τέλος as "Regarding fulfillment" in line with the standard semantic range of τέλος, but with no eschatological connotation. It perhaps usefully

signals the exegetical *potential* G inadvertently embeds in his text and which was *realized* extensively in the Greek Psalter's history of interpretation.

ἐν ψαλμοῖς· ὥδῃ. As Gregory of Nyssa (5.74) explains "ψαλμός means the making of music with a musical instrument, whereas ὥδῃ refers to the locution of the melody through the mouth by means of words" (ψαλμός μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ διὰ τοῦ ὄργάνου τοῦ μουσικοῦ μελωδία, ὥδῃ δὲ ἡ διὰ στόματος γινομένη τοῦ μέλους μετὰ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκφώνησις). For readers of the Greek psalms it may come as some surprise that ψαλμός here translates מְנַחֵם, since the latter is elsewhere rendered by ὕμνος (see the superscriptions of 6; 53; 54; 60; 66; 75) and, further, that ὥδῃ here has מְנַחֵם as counterpart, since the latter almost without exception is glossed by ψαλμός (but see 38.1, and 47.1 which may be explained as due to transposition in either Hebrew or Greek transmission). It might therefore be tempting to reject Rahlfs' lemma in favour of the variant ἐν ὕμνοις ψαλμός, furnished by circa half of manuscripts for the Byzantine text: L^dHe 55. A number of considerations, however, are in order. I begin with the meaning of Hebrew מְנַחֵם. According to the lexica it has to do with music on strings, and that meaning is confirmed by Ps 32.3; 67.26; 68.13 where it is translated by ψάλλω "to pluck" on a stringed instrument, not only a ψαλτήριον ("harp") (cf. Ps 32.2), which was plucked exclusively, but also instruments of the lyre family such as the well known κίθαρα ("lyre"), which could be plucked with the fingers, strummed with a plektron, or struck with the plektron (MS 63-64). Similarly, a ψαλμός was first and foremost a performance on a stringed instrument, as the literature of the period indicates and as Muraoka rightly states (note especially his reference to Am 5.23). Semantically, therefore, the equation G here makes is appropriate, in fact strictly speaking more so than what he does in later superscriptions, since ὕμνος ("hymn") is a term used for vocal music (OCD sub 'Hymns'). Secondly, if ἐν ψαλμοῖς is secondary, where could it have come from? As a Hebraizing correction it is not feasible (note e.g. that the Gallican Psalter, which constitutes our most complete witness to the hexaplaric recension, supports the variant),

and ἐν ψαλμοῖς as a Psalter phrase appears only in 94.2, but in a radically different context. Thus it appears more likely that in 4.1 some mss were influenced by ἐν ὕμνοις in six other superscriptions. It may thus be that G was influenced by his use of ψαλμός in 3.1 and was as yet not set in his Greek-Hebrew equivalency, or that he thought that ἐν ψαλμοῖς was somehow more appropriate, seeing that the parent text made reference to instrumental rather than vocal music. That the parent text of G differed from MT is possible, to be sure, but we lack extant support for this conclusion. Yet it is not without interest that—as will be noted presently—G interprets his text minimally. Rösel (129) sees a deliberate avoidance of a double ψαλμός but that could only explain the subsequent pairing of מִזְמוֹר with ᾠδή (contrary to G's standard rendering). Once having opted for ἐν ψαλμοῖς it was virtually a foregone conclusion that G would not opt for ψαλμός to render מִזְמוֹר. In other words, the two deviations from G's standard equations should be viewed together. For G ᾠδή ("song") and ἄδω ("to sing") equate with שִׁיר with nearly as much consistency as ψαλμός with מִזְמוֹר and זֶמֶר. That is to say, for the noun we find 36 occurrences and for the verb 24. But again the equation is not a closed one. So on the nominal side we find two instances in which ᾠδή has מִזְמוֹר as counterpart (see above) and two instances in which שִׁיר is used to gloss ψαλμός (45.1; 47.1), though as noted above 47.1 may be due to transposition. While in 38.1 and 47.1 there is contrary evidence, it fails to convince, with the result that, as in 4.1, we are there as well as in 45.1 dealing with what for G are unusual renderings, unless perchance a parent text different from MT is responsible, but in the only instance where evidence from Qumran is available, 47.1, 4QPs^j sides with MT (Flint 122).

ᾠδή. Like ὕμνος this is a term that pertains in the first instance to vocal music, though singing was of course typically accompanied by some instrument. An ancient Greek ᾠδεῖον (derived from the same root) was therefore not unexpectedly a hall or theater for the performance of poetry and music, vocal but also instrumental. Greek ᾠδή, however,

was not just any ditty but a formal song celebrating athletic achievements (see e.g. Pindar's Epinician Odes) or other celebratory accomplishments. Furthermore, choral odes (i.e. odes acted out in dance) played an important role in drama, separating the action and commenting on the events of the plot. Since the primary accompanying instrument for the ode was the lyre, the juxtaposition in 4.1 of ψαλμός and ᾠδή is not inappropriate. Thus the contents of this superscription are not inconsistent with a bard publicly singing a formal song and accompanying himself on the lyre (or harp). When all is said and done, however, one must admit that G's level of interpretation of his source is minimal. Though the terms he uses are compatible, they scarcely add up to a coherent portrayal. Yet such would easily have been possible had our translator been less source oriented.

In light of the distinctive connotation of Greek ᾠδή and since "ode" has a comparable sense in English, NETS has simply transcribed the term. This is the more appropriate seeing that G himself, when translating Hebrew שִׁיר ("song"), differentiates between ᾠδή (36x) and ᾠσμα (5x). Since as a verbal noun from ᾄδω ("to sing") the latter might simply mean "something sung," it is perhaps not surprising that in Greek usage it connotes a composition more general than an ᾠδή (see Plato Protag. 343c where ᾠσμα is used to refer to a poem of Simonides). Within the Psalms it is accompanied on all five occasions (32.3; 39.4; 95.1; 97.1; 149.1) by καινόν (new). It is therefore possible that for G the chief difference between the two terms lay in a traditional song (ᾠδή) in distinction from a new and possibly impromptu composition (ᾠσμα). That this may not, however, have been the sole distinction is suggested by 143.9 which speaks of a "new ode" (ᾠδὴν καινήν). A further distinction, though not applicable to Psalms, seemingly was that whereas an ᾠδή had an exclusively positive sense, ᾠσμα might be used in a negative sense as well. So within biblical literature one also reads of an "ᾠσμα of fools" (Ekk1 7.5) and an "ᾠσμα of a courtesan or prostitute" (Esa 23.15).

τῷ Δαυίδ. That this phrase serves to indicate Davidic authorship, whatever its Hebrew counterpart may be thought to mean, is most unlikely (cf. Pietersma "Exegesis" 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: "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" (εἰς τὸν Δαυίδ ὁ ψαλμὸς λέγεται· ἄλλο γὰρ ἔστιν τοῦ Δαυίδ εἶναι καὶ ἄλλο τῷ Δαυίδ. τοῦ Δαυίδ λέγεται, ὅταν ἦ αὐτὸς αὐτὸν πεποιηκῶς ἢ ψάλλον. αὐτῷ δὲ λέγεται, ὅταν εἰς αὐτὸν φέρεται). A similar point is made by G himself when he indicates the closing psalm (Ps 151) as εἰς Δαυίδ ("pertaining to Daudid") but also as 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. Rather interestingly Eusebius seeks to circumvent the clear meaning of τῷ Δαυίδ by noting that although the LXX has τῷ Δαυίδ in reference to the prophesy spoken by David himself, "the remaining translators" have τοῦ Δαυίδ. Hence the LXX should be interpreted in the light of "the rest." (εἴρηται δέ, τῷ Δαυίδ, ἢ προφητεία, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λεχθεῖσα. Διὸ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐρμηνευταῖς, τοῦ Δαυίδ, ἐπιγέγραπται. Καὶ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν ὡς ἄρα αὐτὸς ὁ Δαυίδ, προφήσας τό [Ps 51.10a-b]) (*Commentaria in Psalmos* 23.453).

v. 2

Hebrew Text

בְּקִרְאֵי עֲנֵנִי אֱלֹהֵי צְדָקָי

בְּצַר הִרְחַבְתָּ לִּי

חנני ושמע תפילתי

Greek Text

Ἐν τῷ ἐπικαλεῖσθαί με εἰσήκουσέν μου ὁ θεὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης μου·
 ἐν θλίψει ἐπλάτυνάς μοι·
 οἰκτίρησόν με καὶ εἰσάκουσον τῆς προσευχῆς μου.

NETS Translation

When I would call, the God of my righteousness listened to me!
 You gave me room when I was in distress.
 Have compassion on me, and listen to my prayer.

Ἐν τῷ ἐπικαλεῖσθαί με. Not surprisingly in view of Hebrew **קָרָא**, G differentiates between "to call upon" (ἐπικαλέω 30x [+ καλέω 3x]) and "to cry out" (κράζω 22x), and in fact does so in this psalm. As a result, while in MT 4bβ can simply be read as a reiteration of 2a, in the Greek we have an explicit intensification. Of some interest in the clause in question is that the infinitive is durative, thereby explicitly signaling the psalmist's repeated appeal to God.

εἰσήκουσεν. MT is pointed as a suffixed imperative, but G construed it as a suffixed 3 s perfect, reading it therefore as a fact (in past time) rather than as a projection, even though both verbs in 2c are, with MT, construed as imperatives. Consequently, while in MT 2a and 2c are in the form of a plea, with 2b supplying background information, in the Greek both 2a and 2b supply information about divine action in past time, as a warrant for continued support. Hebrew **עָנָה** ("answer") in reference to God, is glossed in the Psalter by either εἰσακούω (as, e.g., here) or by ἐπακούω (as, e.g., in 3.5b.). Thus G trades on the close relationship between hearing and responding, but routinely tips the text in favour of the former. It is 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 that shift may well pre-date the Psalter (cf. MM §1873). G perhaps opts for εἰσακούω in favour of ἐπακούω in anticipation of εἰσακούω for שמע in both 2c and 4b

ἐπλάτυνας. MT reads a perfect, which G predictably renders as an aorist. The latter then also may have suggested to G an aorist in 2a (see above). Commentators on MT, however, are divided on how to construe the Hebrew perfect. So, for example, Craigie reads it as a so-called precative perfect and accordingly glosses it as an imperative ("give me room!"), thus including all four finite verbs in v. 2 in the invocation or plea, while Kraus treats the clause in question as parenthetical ("—in [my] distress you created room for me—"). G sides with Kraus, but beyond that reads both 2a and 2b as background information for 2c.

οἰκτίρησον. Though G more often than not translates ינן by ἐλέεω (21x), οἰκτίρω is also well attested (9x). (For δέομαι see 29.9 and 141.2.) Since οἰκτίρω more than ἐλέεω seems to highlight sensitivity (see L&N 88.76, 80), it is possible that that is the reason for G's choice here, but ἐλέησόν με καὶ εἰσάκουσόν μου in 26.7 for similar Hebrew urges caution for such deliberateness on the part of G (see further 29.11).

vv. 3-4

Hebrew Text

בני אִישׁ עַד מָה^a כִּבְדִּי לִב
 לַמֶּדָּה^a תֵּאָהֱבוּן רִיק וְתִבְקָשׁוּ^b כִּזְבֵּן סֵלָה
 וְדַעוּ כִּי הַפֶּלֶה יִהְיֶה חֲסִיד לֹ
 יִהְיֶה יִשְׁמַע בְּקִרְאֵי אֱלֹהֵי

אמל ל כל דיי ל כבודי ל כלל MT בישקבט MT

Greek Text

υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἕως πότε βαρυκάρδιοι;
ἵνα τί ἀγαπᾶτε ματαιότητα καὶ ζητεῖτε ψεῦδος;

διάψαλμα.

καὶ γινώτε ὅτι ἐθαυμάστωσεν κύριος τὸν ὄσιον αὐτοῦ·
κύριος εἰσακούσεταιί μου ἐν τῷ κεκραγένοι με πρὸς αὐτόν.

NETS Translation

How long, you humans, will you be dull-witted?^a

Why do you love vanity, and seek after falsehood?

Interlude on strings

But know that the Lord made marvelous his devout one;
the Lord will listen to me when I cry to him.

^aOr *heavy-hearted*

υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων. If the Hebrew phrase refers to prominent people in distinction from the common folk, the בְּנֵי אֱדָם, (e.g. Briggs 30, Kraus 148, Craigie 80), G gives no evidence of it. Though the Greek phrase is Hebraic, there can be no doubt that it refers to people in general. Note that in 61(62).10 בְּנֵי אֱדָם and בְּנֵי שֵׁשׁ are rendered identically by G (οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων), although in 48(49).3 a distinction of a different kind is made between οἱ γηγενεῖς (בְּנֵי אֱדָם) ("the earthborn") and οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (בְּנֵי אֱדָם) ("humans"). As a result, whatever explicit distinction may exist in MT between the enemies of v. 3 and the doubters of v. 7 has become purely contextual in the Greek.

βαρυκάρδιοι ἵνα τί. G presupposes כבודי לכלמה in place of MT's כבודי לכלמה.

Two considerations suggest that the variant text (based on a confusion of כ and ב) was inherited by G from his source (so, e.g., Briggs and Craigie): (1) G clearly knows the meaning of כלמה, which he regularly (6x) renders by ἐντροπή.

("embarrassment"/"disgrace"), and (2) if his source read כבודי, like MT, the infixed ו would have warned him against reading what he did. In any case, while in MT the entire phrase in question refers to the psalmist's reputed fate at the hands of his adversaries, in the Greek βαρυκάρδιοι = כלמה describes his adversaries, and ἵνα τί = לכלמה renders the following clause explicitly interrogative. Since βαρυκάρδιος is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX and we have no attestation for it prior to this verse, it is possible that G coined it (so Munnich 366-68). The word is well formed, however, and other –κάρδιος compounds are well attested both within and without the LXX from Classical times onwards. Similarly Greek compounds of the βαρυκάρδιος variety for Hebrew bound constructions are well known in the LXX, including in Psalms. So, for example, one finds γη–γενής—בני אדם (48[49].3, μακρό–θυμος—ארך אפיים (7.12+), πολυ–έλεος—רב חסד (85[86].5+); and ἀνθρωπάρεσκος (a hapax) for a single Hebrew term in 52(53).6 (see further Tov).

ματαιότητα. Though G renders קרי more often than not by forms of κενός ("empty"/"without content") (2.1; 7.5; 24.3), here he opts for a Greek root he elsewhere uses for הבל ("vanity") (61.10, 93.11), הרה ("ruin") (5.10; 37.13; 51.9) and שוא ("emptiness") (16x), possibly because "falsehood" in 3bβ suggests something more negative.

καὶ^{1°}. The conjunction should be seen as part of the variant text. That is to say, once a second interrogative marker (ἵνα τί = לכלמה) had been introduced into the series, either a third interrogative or a coordinating conjunction would have to follow.

διάψαλμα. The meaning and function of its Hebrew counterpart (הַלְלוּ), 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 form of 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 source 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 הַלְלוּ. 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 rhetorical questions posed to humankind, and the second the point of transition from self-directed censure and restraint to positive overt action. 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 102) (see also μεσαύλιον). Interestingly, a scholion on Aristophanes (1263bis 1) notes: "someone blows a διαύλιον, so called just like the διάψαλμα" (διαύλιον προσαυλεῖ τις ὥπερ τὸ διάψαλμα λέγεται, οὕτω καὶ τοῦτο) (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.

ἐθαυμάστωσεν. That G read פלא ("be marvelous") in place of MT's פלה ("be distinguished") with many Hebrew mss (see BHS), as a number of commentators suggest (Craigie), is possible though by no means certain. Since in all three occurrences of פלה in the Psalter (4.4; 16.7; 138.14) G glosses with the same verb he otherwise uses for פלא, it would seem more likely that he simply equated the two roots, the more readily no doubt because of their semantic overlap.

τὸν ὄσιον αὐτοῦ. Though Kraus considers MT to be in error and suggests emending לוֹ חסיד in light of 30(31).21, LXX clearly agreed with MT. As he does from time to time, G read לוֹ here read as a possessive.

μου. Since it is attested by all witnesses, μου is likely original but may have been added by G. Qumran provides no evidence.

vv. 5-6

Hebrew Text

רגזו ואל תחטאו

אמרו בלבבכם

ועל משכבכם דמוי סלה

זבחו זבחי צדק ובטחו אל יהוה

על MT דמוי MT

Greek Text

ὀργίξεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε·

λέγετε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν

καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς κοίταις ὑμῶν κατανύγητε.

διάψαλμα.

θύσατε θυσίαν δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ κύριον.

NETS Translation

Be angry, but do not sin;
 speak in your hearts
 and on your beds be pricked^b.

Interlude on strings

Offer a sacrifice of righteousness, and hope in the Lord.

^bPossibly *stunned into silence* or *feel compunction*

ὀργίξεσθε . . . ἀμαρτάνετε . . . λέγετε. Though the Hebrew-Greek lexical equations here are predictable and hence of little interpretive consequence, the durative aspect is not. As a result G portrays a projection in progress. For 5a see Eph 4.26.

ὀργίξεσθε. Since this translates $\sqrt{117}$ Flashar (259³) suggests a case of phonetic transcription (see also 98.1). This is, however, not borne out by the evidence, since G uses three other verbs as well for the same Hebrew (ταράσσω 17.8; 76.17; σαλεύω 76.19; ἀπορρίπτω 30.23).

λέγετε. Though the vast majority of witnesses—all but La^G and Cyprian—read ᾶ λέγετε, thus construing the verb as indicative rather than imperative, there is no doubt about the correctness of Rahlfs' choice. Not only is it supported by MT, but it is readily apparent that the variant text is based on a confusion (and hence dittography) of Greek alpha (Α) and lambda (Λ). As a result of this apparently early mistake in transmission

history the following καί (see further below) became redundant and was dropped in most traditions.

καὶ^{2°}. As Rahlfs notes, MT has a conjunction before the final verb of this verse. The result of the transposition in the Greek is that 5b and 5c form a chiasm and, further, that the phrase "on your beds" modifies "be pricked" rather than "speak," as in MT. Whether the adjustment in 5b and 5c was introduced by G is not clear. Though slipping in an extra conjunctive is within G's *modus operandi*, as we noted, the present case is not simply one of addition. Furthermore, according to BHS both the Peshitta and a Targum ms support G's reading of a conjunction at the head of 5c.

κατανύγητε. As Mozley intimates (7), there is no obvious semantic connection between Greek κατανύσσω ("to stab, gouge") and Hebrew נָחַם ("be silent"[I] and "wail"[II]). Nor can a kinship be established on the basis of נָחַם ("be like"[I] and "cease"[II]). Though it is possible that the equation of κατανύσσω and נָחַם in the Psalter (4.4; 29.13; 34.15) stems from Leu 10.3 (so Mozley), there is no reason for positing a Hebraized meaning (cf. MM §2661). Both the simplex and compound forms of the root have to do with "piercing," "stabbing," or "stinging," and metaphorically (in the passive) extended to "being seized with compunction." The sense of Ps 4.5 would seem to be that while anger and indignation are permissible, to sin as a result of impetuosity and lack of sober reflection is culpable.

διάψαλμα. See v.3. The Greek word, like its Hebrew counterpart, marks the transition from the psalmist's negative advice to his adversaries to his positive, religious directives.

θυσίαν δικαιοσύνης. Though it may well be that the Hebrew in the first instance refers to correct or proper sacrifices (cf. Briggs 35), the Greek would more easily be construed as a symbolic sacrifice, i.e. one consisting of righteous conduct. Perhaps for that very

reason G construed the Hebrew plural as a collective. I have in any case assumed that the switch to the singular was introduced by G.

v. 7

Hebrew Text

רבים אמרים מי יראנו טוב
נסה עלינו אור פניך יהוה

Greek Text

πολλοὶ λέγουσιν Τίς δείξει ἡμῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ;
ἐσημειώθη ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου, κύριε.

NETS Translation

Many are saying, "Who will show us good things!

The light of your face was ^cmade a sign^c upon us, O Lord!"

^cPossibly *stamped*

πολλοὶ. Interestingly, if G had in any way wanted υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων of 3a to be understood as the upper crust of society, all he needed to have done here was to make πολλοὶ; arthrous (οἱ πολλοὶ, i.e. the common people). That he does not do so perhaps underscores his general understanding of בְּנֵי אָדָם in v.3. Consequently, the "many" are probably to be included in "humans."

Τίς δείξει. Though the corresponding Hebrew idiom can express a fond wish ("Oh that . . ." [so e.g. Briggs and NRSV]), through literal rendering into Greek this becomes

inevitably a simple question or, more likely in context, an expression of doubt or even despair ("Who will . . .?!").

ἐσημειώθη. Hebrew הִשָּׂא is commonly analyzed as qal imperative of שָׂא ("to lift up"). G evidently read it as niph'al perfect of $\text{סָמַן} < \text{סֵמֶן}$ ("sign," "standard"), a noun which in 59(60).6 he renders by $\text{σημείωσις} < \text{σημειόω}$ ("to make a sign"). G's etymologizing and isolate approach results in a text that is difficult to interpret. As the NETS note suggests, it is possible to construe it as indicating a claim of ownership. Perhaps not surprisingly reception history read this line as a being marked with the divine seal (κατασφραγίζομαι) (e.g. Cyril, *Expositio in Psalmos* 69.740). Flashar (175) labels G's reading a Verlegenheitsübersetzung and sagely cautions against extracting a contextually suitable meaning from it.

v. 8

Hebrew Text

נתת שמחה בלבי

מעת דגנם ותירושם ויצהרם^d רבו

^dO_m MT

Greek Text

ἔδωκας εὐφροσύνην εἰς τὴν καρδίαν μου·

ἀπὸ καιροῦ σίτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ἐλαίου αὐτῶν ἐπληθύνθησαν.

NETS Translation

You did put gladness in my heart;

from^d the season of their grain and wine and oil they multiplied.

^dOr *as a result of*

ἀπὸ . . . ἐπληθύνθησαν. MT's counterpart to this line is commonly understood as comparative with 8a. So, for example, NRSV translates: "You have put gladness in my heart *more than* (emphasis AP) when their grain and wine abound." G construed it instead as a statement indicating "source" or "cause." The subject of the verb can best be understood as the "many" (πολλοὶ) of 7a. The sense would then be that the doubters of 7a not only had been the recipients of "the light of the Lord's face" (7b), but that they had flourished as well, as a result of an abundant harvest of food and drink (8b). Hence, why and wherefore their doubt and cynicism?

καίρου. All but La (= La^G + La^R) support καρποῦ ("fruit," "harvest"). Thus as in v. 5 the mistake that occurred in Greek transmission history appears to have been made at an early stage. A combination of palaeographical similarity between iota rho (ΙΡ) and rho pi (ΡΠ) and contextual sense evidently produced the variant text. That Rahlfs' lemma is correct is clear from Hebrew עֵת ("time"), regularly glossed by G as καίρος (16x).

οἴνου. The MT counterpart, תִּירָשׁ (BDB "must," "fresh" or "new wine") occurs only here in Psalms. But neither G nor any other Septuagint translator distinguished it from ἴϛ ("wine"), or for that matter from שִׁכָּר ("strong drink," possibly "beer") in 69(68).13.

καὶ ἐλαίου. G's source text here read with Peshitta (contra BHS Peter Flint [private correspondence] knows of no support from Qumran for this plus). Note that αὐτῶν is made to do triple duty. Even though 8b as a whole is not a model of semantic transparency, G does show a measure of stylistic sensitivity. Not only would the line have become exceedingly long with a triple occurrence of the possessive, but exceedingly repetitive as well.

Hebrew Text

בשלוֹם יִחַדוּ אֲשַׁכְּבָה וְאִישָׁן
כִּי אַתָּה יְהוָה לִבְדָּד לַבֹּטֶחַ תּוֹשִׁיבֵנִי

Greek Text

ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κοιμηθήσομαι καὶ ὑπνώσω,
ὅτι σύ, κύριε, κατὰ μόνας ἐπ' ἐλπίδι κατώκισάσμε.

NETS Translation

I will both lie down and sleep in peace;
for you alone, O Lord, made me dwell in hope.

ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ. Though NETS (=NRSV) might suggest a correlative conjunction ("both . . . and"), the grammatical function of the phrase is more nearly adverbial (e.g. "at the same time").

κατὰ μόνας. It is possible to read the Greek text as indicating that the Lord settled the psalmist apart, or in seclusion. For other instances of this phrase see 32.15 and 140.10. The same interpretation has been suggested for the Hebrew (e.g. BDB 95, Baethgen 11, Briggs 29, Delitzsch 118, cf. Kraus 144). Such a reading might explain why G only here glosses לַבֹּטֶחַ by κατὰ μόνας rather than by μόνος (50.6; 70.16; 71.18; 82.19; 85.10; 135.4).

κατώκισας. Even though in MT all three verbs in this verse are imperfect, the first two of which G predictably translates with futures, here he opts for an aorist instead, hence making the causal clause refer to the past. The effect is that the psalmist can go to sleep

because of what the Lord has already done. Since this Hebrew-Greek aspect/tense equation is not predictable, G evidently performed an exegetical move.

In sum, the differences between MT and LXX are on a number of occasions due to differences in parent text. Exegetical moves on the part of G do exist but are few in number and do not obviously cohere.