

# THE TITLES OF THE PSALMS A RENEWED INVESTIGATION OF AN OLD PROBLEM

Bathja Bayer, *Jerusalem*

## Contents

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1. SOURCES AND ACCESSORY INFORMATION

- 1.1 Titles in the Psalter.
- 1.2 The Judean Desert manuscripts: variants and invariants.
- 1.3 Titles in other books of the Bible.
- 1.4 Titles and genre-terms in post-biblical sources.
- 1.5 The neighbouring cultures.
- 1.6 Titling and the scribal medium: superscript, adscript, subscript.

#### 2. THE CHAIN OF INTERPRETATION

#### 3. TITLES AND TITLING-TERMS: IN QUEST OF AN APPROACH

#### 4. FIRST ANALYSIS: DISTRIBUTIONS AND STRUCTURES

- 4.1 The distribution of titles and titling-terms in the corpus.
- 4.2 Structural constants in the titles.
- 4.3 The five titling parameters.
- 4.4 From width to depth: the parameters as strata.

#### 5. SECOND ANALYSIS: TITLE AND TEXT

#### 6. A TENTATIVE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE TITLING PROCESS

- 6.1 The early stages: [a] ... על and its congeners  
[b] לבני קרח  
[c] למנצח
- 6.2 The middle stage: [a] לאסף  
[b] מזמור, מכתם, משכיל  
[c] לדוד
- 6.3 The late stages: [a] שיר  
[b] שיר המעלות  
[c] Situational ascriptions to David
- 6.4 The sporadic terms.

Appendix – a sample statistical test: לדוד/למנצח

### *References quoted*

*Tables:* I Count and distribution of titling-terms (in §4. 1). II Analytical table of the psalm-titles (laid-in, back cover)

## INTRODUCTION\*

The most salutary contribution to the study of the psalm-titles<sup>1</sup> is the historical survey of that study itself, comprised within Dieter Wohlenberg's Hamburg dissertation of 1967 *Kultmusik in Israel – eine forschungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Its scope is from about the beginning of the 18th century to ca. 1965. His concluding assessment on our subject (p. 560-61) hinges on a brief sentence: "*Das Problem der Psalmenüberschriften ist vorerst ungelöst.*" The cause is the same which Wohlenberg proposes for the rather disappointing level of achievement in most of the other areas as well. It is the interdisciplinary gap, especially the one between Biblical studies and musicology – "*eine Situation, die...sich als geradezu tragischer Grundzug durch die Epochen verfolgen lässt*"<sup>2</sup>. His judgment is well founded since he himself was bi-disciplinary, having taken Biblical studies under H. J. Kraus and musicology under H. Hickmann<sup>3</sup>.

The present author's disciplinary home base is musicology. Nevertheless, this is not a "study of the musical terms in the psalm-titles". A premise would have been implicit: that the "musical" terms have already been identified or at least that the main effort can now be devoted to explication rather than identification. Wohlenberg's survey demonstrates that this was not yet feasible fifteen years ago; and the situation has not changed since then. Our aim here will be to explore the phenomenon of the titles in its entirety. Music will be one of the concerns because (to put it as neutrally as possible) some of the overt data point in this direction. Musicology thus comes in as one tool among others.

Both the musicological and the "bibliological" reader will sometimes find the exposition dwelling on matters that would be taken for granted in the respective monodisciplinary environment. Indulgence is asked for this very imperfect way of coping with an obvious problem – which is the other side of the coin of interdisciplinarity or, as I would prefer to call it, trans-disciplinarity.

\* I would like to express my whole-hearted thanks to Lea Shalem without whose invaluable help my article could not have been completed in time for inclusion in this volume.

1. *Title* chosen instead of *heading* or *superscript(ion)*, since the matter of em-  
placement is itself under enquiry here.

2. P. 420, on the period 1900-1940. Similarly in the other period-chapter sum-  
maries and in the concluding statement pp. 588-589.

3. Both of them supervised the dissertation. It apparently had some influence  
on Kraus' latest revision of his commentary on the Psalter (1978<sup>5</sup>).

This paper sets out the first stage of an ongoing research project. Subsequent expansions are envisaged mainly with regard to two tasks. One is the more thorough evaluation of the Psalter texts and cognate materials in the Judean Desert manuscript finds (see §1.2). The second task is the full utilization of the toolchest of statistical analysis. What has been done here is hardly more than a testing of feasibilities, even though the first results can already be put forward with reasonable confidence.

## 1. SOURCES AND ACCESSORY INFORMATION

### 1.1 The titles in the Psalter

In the Masoretic Text (MT) of the Psalter, 117 of the 150 psalms are headed by titling-statements. These vary in extent from a single term, most often *le-dawid*, to sequences of four or more terms, resp. components. An inventory of the titles is given in Table II (laid-in, back cover). Ten components recur with some frequency: *le-dawid* (73 times); *mizmôr* (56); *LMNZĤ* (54); *šîr* (30, incl. 15 times as *šîr ham-ma'alôt*); the group of *al-X* and similar expressions (29); *maskîl* (13); situational ascriptions referring to David (13); *le-asaf* (12); *li-venê qorah* (11); *miḵtam* (6). Eight others occur from one to three times only. For an overview of the distribution see Table I (in §4.1).

The manuscript tradition of MT, which now goes back to the Judean Desert finds, clearly places the title as a heading (superscription) by various expedients of relative spacing (further on this see §1.6). It has already been noticed, though, that some psalms seem to show remnants of a subscript titling. Ps. 16 ends with the obscure *N<sup>c</sup>YMWT BYMYNK NZĤ* (= *LMNZĤ*?). Ps. 48 ends with an equally obscure *L-MWT* (cf. titles 9 and 46). Ps. 88 is headed by an agglomeration of titling-components, one or several of which might have "dropped" from an original placement at the end of the preceding psalm (or another that preceded Ps. 88 in an earlier collection). The only instances of titling outside the Psalter that are stylistically similar to the psalm-titles – also show remnants of subscripts. These are: the "split" title of Habakkuk ch. 3, itself most probably a text very much older than the Book of Habakkuk itself, i.e. chs. 1-2; and somewhat less clearly, the ending of the "Letter of Hezekiah" inserted in the Book of Isaiah as ch. 38:9-20 (see both at the end of Table II).

One could argue that the subscript of Habakkuk 3 could just as well be the remnant of a superscript, of a text that came after this poem in some collection and was lost. But the possibility of subscript titling must still be weighed: subscription and not superscription was the more common practice in the ancient Near East (see §1.6 below). And traces of a “subscript relationship” seem to be discernible in another way as well, in some places in the Psalter: sometimes an element in a title looks as if it could be connected with the preceding psalm. There are about six such cases.

### *Titles*

- 30 (*šîr*) *ḥanukkat hab-bayit*. Ps. 29? (originally without its doxology?).
- 36 *le-ʿeved-YHWH* (*le-dawid*). Ps. 35:29 *ʿavdô*.
- 42 *maskîl*. Ps. 41:2 *ašrê maskîl el-dal* (even though Ps. 41-42 separated by doxology); cf. *maskîl* in Ps. 53:3, and in title 53 and 54.
- 56 *ʿal-YWNT ʿLM RHQYM* (= *ʿL-MRHQYM*?). cf. Ps. 55:7-8  
מי-יתן-לי אבר כיונה אעופה ואשכנה: הנה ארחיק נדר אלן במדבר (סלה):
- 81 *ʿal-HGTYT*: If related to *GT*=winepress, consider the vine image dominant in Ps. 80; but see counterexample below.
- 88 *ʿal-MHLT LʿNWT* (in agglomeration of titles). cf. Ps. 87:7 (end)  
ושרים כחללים כל-מעייני כך:

Note: Ps. 87 obscure, text badly preserved.

For titles 56, 81, and 88 the argument would seem to depend on “etymologizing”, the method which this study tries to avoid. But the *ʿal-X* expressions may denote the use of poetic-melodic prototypes, and in such cases one often finds a reflection of the old text in the new (more on the *ʿal-X* expressions, see §6.1 [a] below). Other arguments could also be brought forward against these proposals. Thus, for instance, Ps. 17 has *tefillah le-dawid* as title, *haʿazînah tefillatî* in v. 1. Ps. 22 has *ayyelet haš-šahar* in the title, and the obscure *eyalûtî* in v. 20. Ps. 32 has *le-dawid maskîl* as title, *askîleḳa* in v. 8. “Gittit” also appears in titles 8 and 84, but there is no vine or winepress image in the textual environment there. An alternative explanation is sometimes offered for the apparent retro-associations: that Ps. 56, for instance, was placed with its “dove” title after Ps. 55 that mentions a dove, because an editor thought that this would provide a logical link.



A well-known case with peculiarities of its own is *hallelûyah*, though this is not considered to have a titling function<sup>4</sup>. It appears in Pss. 106, 111-113, 115-117, 135 and 146-150, and its placement is sometimes at the head of the psalm, sometimes at the end, and in seven psalms at the head and at the end. A claim could be put forward for *hallelûyah* as a title, but this must be left for another occasion.

At this point notice must be taken of Thirtle's Theory. In 1904 (1905<sup>2</sup>) James William Thirtle published his book on the psalm-titles, in which he developed the idea that all the titles had originally been subscripts. The diverse "relics" mentioned above seemed to point to this, and the subscript colophons of the cuneiform documents from Mesopotamia offered what could be taken as visible evidence from a related culture. Each title has thus to be shifted backwards, to the end of the preceding psalm. The "key to the titles" is thereby found, and the proofs are given in detail, for title after title. Not unexpectedly the proofs turn out to depend wholly on etymologizing and the enchainment of inferences. A specimen: *šôšannîm* = lilies, *gittîr* = *gattôt* = winepresses; lilies = spring = Passover, winepresses = autumn = Feast of Tabernacles; the psalms that have the (shifted) *gittîr* and *šôšannîm* titles have motives that "belong" to Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles, respectively – *quod erat demonstrandum* et voilà!

Thirtle's Theory was thenceforth mentioned occasionally in the literature, but apparently no effort was made to test the idea of subscript placement again, more carefully. In the present study the subscript hypothesis plays an important role, but neither the approach nor the proposed results are similar to Thirtle's.

4. Throughout this study הללויָהּ is consistently written as one word and transliterated *hallelûyah*. In the *Biblia Hebraica* ed. Kittel and also in its new edition (BH *Stuttgartensis*, Psalms fasc. 1968), all *h.* appear as two words, with or without *maqfēf*. The *Stuttgartensis* has more reminders in the apparatus that the manuscripts are not at all uniform in this matter. In the Koren edition all *h.* appear as one word. Nöldeke (1918) presents the historical information on the controversy whether *h.* is one or two words. Further information is now available in Yeivin's study of the punctuation and accentuation of the Aleppo Codex (1968): see pp. 43, 80-81, 346 and note 5 there. See also Yeivin 1969, pp. 77, 78, 89, 91-92, 95, 96, 97. The vocalization *hallelûyah* (with *šewā*) is also problematical, against *hallalû-* (with *ḥataf-pataḥ* in the two-word forms); see Yeivin 1968:43. Nöldeke discusses the implications of the Greek transliteration *allelouia*. Note: Nöldeke's Arabic-based etymologies for *hallelûyah* re-appear in many later commentaries, encyclopedia articles etc. If his data are to be of any use nowadays (not for "etymologizing" but at least for comparative research) they must be thoroughly re-checked.

The move of subscripts to a superscript position has now been proposed again by Gevaryahu in his 1975 and 1981 studies of "Biblical colophons" (generalized). In his opinion, certain colophonic elements came to be transferred to the head of the text, while others remained at its end; the ones that were usually transferred were "musical, ritual, liturgical notes and names of persons as well as historical events" (1975:58); the titles of the psalms are comprised within this definition. Gevaryahu's theory is thus quite different from Thirtle's. If the title did not drop down to the beginning of the next psalm, but was only transferred upwards to the beginning of its own psalm, then the change was merely topographical: restoring the "original" placement will not restore any lost information about the functional meaning of the titling-terms.

The main reason why the present writer cannot agree with Gevaryahu's theory about the psalm-titles is, that it depends on what he deduces from a variety of "colophon" phenomena outside the Psalter. The generic resemblances are too few, and the specific functions and textual environments are clearly different (except in the two "strays" – the Letter of Hezekiah, and Habakkuk ch. 3).

## 1.2 The Judean Desert manuscripts: variants and invariants

The manuscript remnants of psalm-texts from the Qumran caves and elsewhere in the Judean desert span, roughly, the century before and after the turn of the Common Era. They range from minute textual fragments to the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>), which survived to a length of about 4 metres. The latter is also not intact: the lower third of its height (originally ca. 25 cm.) has rotted away and the beginning and end of the scroll are lost as well. The totality of the finds has raised problems which must also affect the enquiry on the psalm-titles, far beyond the simple matter of variant readings. There is the matter of canonical *content*: extra-canonical compositions sometimes appear together with the canonical psalms, or with one canonical psalm, in the same scroll. There is also the matter of canonical *sequence*: in some of the psalm manuscripts the sequence is partly or wholly different from that of MT. The two problems overlap, as seen most clearly in the longest surviving specimen, the Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>): the sequence there is partly the canonical one and partly divergent; and towards the end of the scroll groups of canonical psalms (in sequence or not ...) are interspersed with "extraneous" texts. Moreover, in some of the specimens that do have the canonical sequence one or more

psalms are sometimes skipped. Sanders' 1965 manuscript-by-manuscript overview ("catalogue") presents the situation in all its bewildering variety.

The following conspectus of these "anomalies" is provisional. Some of the psalm manuscripts, especially the larger part of those from Cave 4 (the repository of the "main library"?), are not yet available in full publication.

4QPs<sup>a</sup>, present extent Ps. 5:9 to Ps. 69:19. Skips from Ps. 31 to Ps. 33. After Ps. 38 comes Ps. 71, then Ps. 47 and perhaps some other "anomalies" before the extant sequence resumes with Ps. 53.

4QPs<sup>b</sup>, present extent Ps. 91:5 to the end (problematic!) of Ps. 118. Skips from Ps. 103 to Ps. 112.

4QPs<sup>d</sup>, present extent and sequence Ps. 146(?), Ps. 147, Ps. 104.

4QPs<sup>f</sup>, present extent and sequence Ps. 22, gap, Ps. 107, gap, Ps. 109, gap, "Apostrophe to Zion" (also known from 11QPs<sup>a</sup>), "Eschatological Hymn", "Apostrophe to Judah".

4QPs<sup>g</sup>, present extent Ps. 31:25 (=end) to Ps. 35, but skips Ps. 32.

11QPs<sup>a</sup>, the Psalms Scroll (incl. fragments A-E). Present extent from Ps. 101 onwards. The full tabulation of divergent sequences need not be reproduced here, since it is conveniently available in DJD IV, apart from Sanders 1965. In DJD IV Sanders also notes where, in the missing lower third of the scroll, the next psalm of the canonical sequence presumably followed (these proposals have not been included in his two survey-tables). Here we shall only note the insertions of extra-canonical material, which appear from col. 18 onwards (there are 28 columns all told). After Ps. 145 comes Ps. II of the five apocryphal psalms (previously known only from a Syriac version), and "Plea for Deliverance" (also found in 11QPs<sup>d</sup>). Then Pss. 139, 137, 138 (continuous). Then Sirach 51, "Apostrophe to Zion" (also in 4QPs<sup>f</sup>), Ps. 93 (continuous) and a further group of psalms, Ps. III apocr., another group of psalms, "Hymn to the Creator", a remnant of "David's last song" (II Sam. 23:1-7, not in the MT of Psalms!), the "List of David's Compositions" (see in the present paper §1.4), Ps. 140, Ps. 134, and the apocryphal Ps. I (151) – here as two units.

11QPs<sup>d</sup>, containing Ps. 141:10, followed by Ps. 133, followed by "Plea for Deliverance" (also in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>).

11QPsAp<sup>a</sup>, containing a number of extra-canonical compositions, followed by Ps. 91 with an unclear ending that does not correspond with MT.

*Note:* Of the three known non-Qumran finds, the one from Nahal Hever has Ps. 15 integral followed by Ps. 16:1 (see Yadin 1961:40). One from Masada has Pss. 81-85 in sequence (see Yadin 1965:79-81, 103, 104). Another fragment from Masada only shows Ps. 150 (reported, not yet published).

Next, *and not to be viewed in isolation*, comes the matter of variant readings in those titles and titling-loci that have survived. Again only a provisional list will be given here. The first survey of the variants was published by Ouellette (1969), but subsequent publications of several texts augment the list and also furnish some corrections.

Ps. 33. MT: no title. 4QPs<sup>a</sup>: *le-dawîd šîr mizmôr*. Publication: Milik 1957 (245-255). Both here and in 4QPs<sup>a</sup> (not yet published), Ps. 33 follows upon Ps. 31. Milik notes that several strands of the Versions attest *le-dawid mizmôr*, others at least *le-dawid*.

Ps. 57. In 1QpPs57, a *pešer* on the psalm, the title has *mil-lifenê ša'ûl*, against MT *mip-penê ša'ûl*. Publication: DJD I (81-82).

Ps. 71. MT: no title. In 4QPs<sup>a</sup>, the psalm follows Ps. 38 and is written in continuation as though this were one unit. Report and attempt at explanation: Skehan 1957 (154).

Ps. 93. MT: no title. 11QPs<sup>a</sup>: *hallelûyah*. Publication: DJD IV (43). Note that the psalm appears there after Sirach 51 and the "Apostrophe to Zion".

Ps. 104. MT: no title. 11QPs<sup>a</sup>, fragment E: *le-dawîd*. Publication: Yadin 1966 (6-8). Note that the psalm appears there after Ps. 118. Initium needs to be checked in 4QPs<sup>d</sup> and 4QPs<sup>e</sup>, as yet unpublished. 4QPs<sup>b</sup> apparently omits Pss. 104-111 (see Skehan 1964:313). The Greek traditions variously evince *le-dawid*, *mizmôr le-dawid* or *hallelûyah*.

Ps. 121. MT: *šîr lam-ma'alôt*, the subsequent psalms all having *šîr ham-ma'alôt*. 11QPs<sup>a</sup>: *šîr ham-ma'alôt*. Publication: DJD IV (24).

Ps. 123. MT: *šîr ham-ma'alôt*. 11QPs<sup>a</sup>: JDWYD LM<sup>c</sup>LT. Publication: DJD IV (24), where Sanders proposes restoration LDWYD LM<sup>c</sup>LWT.

Ps. 144. MT: *le-dawid*. 11QPs<sup>a</sup>: no title. Publication: DJD IV (44). For 11QPs<sup>b</sup>, which has a lacuna at the initium of this psalm, van der Ploeg (1967:411) suggests that the space allows *le-dawid* as in MT. Sanders questions this, presumably because of the situation in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> (Sanders 1968:287, note 7).

Ps. 145. MT: *tehillah le-dawid*. 11QPs<sup>a</sup>: *tefillah le-dawid*. Publication: DJD IV (37-38). If *tefillah* is not accidental (*pē* for *hē*), it is still somewhat puzzling because it is less suitable than *tehillah* for the character of the psalm. The psalm has *tehillah* at its conclusion (*tehillat YHWH yedaber-pî*); moreover, it appears here with the refrain ("lost" in MT), implying a composition conceived for singing. Further on this psalm see below, in the discussion of "refrains".

Ps. 147. MT: *hallelûyah*. Situation in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> fragment E – disputed (see Yadin 1966:8).

Ps. 148. MT: *hallelûyah*. 11QPs<sup>a</sup>: none. Publication: DJD IV (23). Note divergence of beginnings:

MT הללויה הללו את־יהוה מן־השמים  
11QPs<sup>a</sup> הללו יהוה משמים

Ps. 150. MT: *hallelûyah*. 11QPs<sup>a</sup>: none. Publication: DJD IV (47). A fragment with Ps. 150 was also found at Masada but has not yet been published.

The Qumranic variants in the matter of *refrains* are also important for our concerns, since refrains are an indication of genre. Before listing the variants, however, a remark about the terminology is needed. In the literature, one generally finds "refrain" used for every kind of recurring phrase or passage, and sometimes even for non-recurring call-like interjections. A more precise terminology would be very useful. "Refrain" would then apply only where there are distinct stanzas, as seems to be the case in Pss. 57, 67

and 107. "Response" is suitable for *kî le-<sup>c</sup>ôlam ḥasdô* ("complementary response" or "hemistich-response" is even more precise). It could be applied not only to Ps. 136 where the phrase is written out in each verse but, with reservations, to cases such as Ps. 118 where it appears only in verses 1-4 and in the final v. 29.

Ps. 105. MT: no title. Greek: mostly *hallelûyah* ("dropped" from Ps. 104?). 11QPs<sup>a</sup> fragment E, where this psalm follows after Ps. 147, begins differently from MT, with the *hôdû... kî le-<sup>c</sup>ôlam ḥasdô* invocation-and-response. Publication: Yadin 1966 (9-10).

MT הודו ליהוה קראו בשמו הודיעו בעמים עלילותיו:  
Fragm. E הודו ליהוה כי טוב כי [לעולם חסדו הודו ליהוה קראו] בשמו הודיעו  
[ etc. עליו ]לוחיו

Ps. 118. Previously surmised to appear in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> (main scroll) col. XVI in a "deviant" form (see DJD IV: 37). Fragment E, which belongs at the beginning of the scroll, was published later and seen to contain Ps. 118 in the regular form; at least this is evident for the surviving verses (25-29). Publication: Yadin 1966 (6-7). The "deviant" in col. XVI of the main scroll, which looks like a jumbling of verses from Ps. 118, is obviously important for any attempt to get at the performance reality behind Ps. 118. To this must be added the remnant (two incomplete verses) of the "deviant" apparently found in 11QPs<sup>b</sup> as well (van der Ploeg 1967:412), and the regular Ps. 118 which appears in 4QPs<sup>b</sup> (Skehan 1964:320-321). Further on the "deviant" see Sanders 1968:40-41.

Ps. 135. MT: *hallelûyah*, not in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> (DJD IV: 35). The text there has several divergences, including a response-like addition in verse 1 (הללו יה ורוממו יה) and a response or *acclamatio*-like addition in verse 6. Details see in the publication; a remnant of the addition in verse 6 is also reported there for 4QPs<sup>a</sup>; see also Sanders 1968:289-290.

Ps. 145. Its title *tefillah le-dawîd* in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>, for MT *tehillah le-dawîd*, has already been mentioned. The location in the scroll is immediately after the "deviant Psalm 118" discussed above (DJD IV: 37-38). Here Ps. 145 has a response after each verse, not found in MT:

ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד:

In the scroll, the *nûn*-verse of the acrostical sequence, missing in MT, is also present. At the end, after the last response, the line ends with two words not found here in MT, nor elsewhere in the scroll or in MT of the Psalter: וואתנא ליכרון. The next line is illegible: here begins the lost lower third of the scroll's height. The next column (col. XVIII) begins with v. 3 of "Ps. 154" (no. II of the so-called 'Syriac' apocryphal psalms, for three of which the scroll now supplies the presumably original Hebrew text). The lost lower third of the preceding column must therefore have contained an additional textual unit, after Ps. 145 and before the beginning of "Ps. 154".

A detailed discussion of all the divergences is not necessary (some points will be brought up further on), except for the case of Ps. 145. Sanders remarked on *zôt le-zikkarôn* (apparatus *ad loc.*) "a subscription on the use of the psalm?". Skehan (1973) proposed that this is a rubric which establishes the entire group of preceding psalms in the scroll as a "liturgical complex". He mentions (p.195, note 6) having been reminded that the synagogal liturgy for Rosh Hashanah includes a category of prayers termed *zikhronôt*, but it is difficult to see the relevance. The present writer also has strong doubts about Skehan's thesis in its entirety. That thesis depends very much on Skehan's interpretation of *zôt le-zikkarôn*: a different and at least equally plausible interpretation will be offered below.

Sanders (1968:290-291) voiced the hesitation – apparently still current today – whether the added response is an original part of Ps. 145. In the writer's opinion the response is an organic complement to the verses of the acrostic, twelve of which indeed have explicit verbal "pointers" with respect to the response (including the first two verses and the last one). Sanders rightly remarks that the case of *kî le-ôlam hasdô* in Ps. 136 is different: "*the refrain in Ps. 136 is integral to the scansion of the psalm in a way not the case with Ps. 145, or with any other psalm for which we might posit an ancient refrain*" (1968:291). One could thus conclude that MT retains what a written text must have as a *written text*, irrespective of the liturgical function that a certain psalm might also have. MT thus depends on a parallel medium of storage – the collective professional memory of those who are responsible for the transmission of performance practice – to take care of the responses. For Ps. 145 it was apparently considered enough that the second hemistichs of v. 1 and 2 are a strong "reminder" of the unwritten response (v. 1: וואברכה שמך לעולם ועד; v. 2: וואהללה שמך לעולם ועד). Ps. 145 is definitely a postexilic composition

(see Hurvitz 1972:70-106), and Pss. 145-150 entered the synagogal liturgy as the daily *pesûqê de-zimrah*. But the collective memory did not retain the response for Ps. 145 long enough for it to enter the written compendia of prayers; nor even, apparently, has a hint survived in the information on the early synagogal liturgy that can be extracted from Talmudic sources. In parentheses: the discussion of the *pesûqê de-zimrah* in Elbogen 1972<sup>4</sup>, §11 (plus the footnotes and the editors' datings there), re-read with the Qumran version of Ps. 145 in view, raises some interesting thoughts on this problem; but these need not be set out here.

What should be kept in view as well is another psalmodic composition that entered neither MT nor the Jewish liturgy – the Song of the Three Children found in the Greek tradition of the Book of Daniel, together with a “Prayer of Azariah”, after ch. 3:23 (see CharlesAp: 625ff.). The text has three responses, two alternating in the first part of the song and a third repeated from v. 35 onwards, all written out (*hôdû... kî le-ôlam ḥasdô* comes in at the end as well). Its closest relative in MT is Ps. 148. Perhaps the complexity of the responses was what prevented the transmitters of this text from trusting the “collective memory” here; the matter of diasporal conditions must also be kept in mind. But this leads us back to Qumran again (including the well-known hypothesis that the Community might have had a diasporal past). Since one should not assume automatically that all the scrolls found at Qumran were written there (cf. Talmon 1975:325-326), the writing-out of responses in the Psalms Scroll and elsewhere might indicate that these manuscripts are rooted in a milieu that for some reason could not take the “collective memory” of performance practice for granted. The mysterious *zôt le-zikkarôn* after the last response of Ps. 145 could thus be explained much more simply: “This is *pro memoria* for the sung response”. Even then, though, such an annotation does not yet prove the scroll itself or part of it to be a liturgical collection.

In parentheses: MacKenzie (1970) has an interesting suggestion about the conclusion of Ps. 148 (verse 14bc)

(וירם קרן לעמו) תהלה לכל-חסידיו לבני ישראל עם קרבו הללויה :

He sees the *tehillah*-etc. clause as the remnant of a rubric, which must be earlier than the stage at which *hallelûyah* was placed at the ends, resp. beginnings of the psalms of this group. If one accepts MacKenzie's suggestion this would furnish an approximate parallel to *zôt le-zikkarôn* – and in MT to boot. The *tehillah*-etc. clause is indeed unusual as a



parallelism for *qeren le-<sup>c</sup>ammô*, but not actually implausible. This weakens the hypothesis considerably.

The titling terminology and genre-terms of the apocryphal and sectarian literature from Qumran will be discussed later on, in §1.4, since §1.3 will help to put them in better perspective. For the present the aim is to give only a first indication of what the Judean Desert manuscripts have to offer – even though they clearly offer not new solutions but new problems.

These finds obviously add more informational noise to the already noisy situation of MT. It must be noted, though, that most of the variant phenomena (sequence, titling, “refrains”) occur in the latter part of the Psalter (Books Four and Five, i.e. after Ps. 90). The analyses and conclusions set out here in §4-§6, which are mainly based on MT, are actually not vitiated – and sometimes even supported – by the Qumran data. Only the matter of “refrains” seems to pose a danger. This will be avoided by omitting “refrains” from the list of textual features tested for associations with the titling-terms (§5). Since a wholly mechanistic analysis has been eschewed here in any case, the Qumran finds only lend further support to this policy.

As concerns the *sequences* that do not accord with MT: the question of what stood after what, when and where – is obviously important with respect to the titles. Whenever two or more titled units become gathered into a collection, the title becomes an interface phenomenon, and is the first to be affected when further acts of compilation, redaction, selection, etc. etc. carry the texts along their historical trajectory. Since we assume, however, that little of any “original” sequence has remained intact in MT, the question of non-MT sequences in the Qumran finds becomes much less disturbing.

At the present writing the drift of opinion is to see the Psalter at Qumran as still “open-ended”, and as witness to a similar situation outside Qumran (discussion see Sanders 1974:95-99). It has even become clear that “open-ended Psalter” still implies too much, since it implies some concept of a “Psalter”. In the envisaged further stages of the present venture, this matter might play a greater role. In the stage set out here our analyses are hardly dependent on it.

### 1.3 Titles in other books of the Bible

It has already been remarked that only two *loci* outside the Psalter have titling-statements that bear a resemblance to the psalm-titles (Isaiah 38:9-

20; Habakkuk 3). The often adduced description of the Temple singers in I Chron. 15:20-21 which mentions *‘al-‘alamôt* and *‘al-haš-šemînî* is not a title; moreover, it is almost certainly a curious kind of literary fabrication (see §6.1[a] below). The introductory formula to the poem II Sam. 22 is also not a title proper, but a specimen of the “splicing” formulation used in various books of the Bible to introduce poetic compositions into a narrative<sup>5</sup>. Its metamorphosis into a psalm-title can be observed since the poem was re-edited as Ps. 18 (further on this see §6.3[c] below). Practically, therefore, the style of the psalm-titles must be defined as being peculiar to the Psalter. An instructive differential analysis can be made by comparison with the short titles of prophetic units that begin with *massā*. The semi-resemblance of *šîr haš-šîrîm ašer li-šelomoh* to a psalm-title (such as title 127 *šîr ham-ma‘alôt li-šelomoh*, or in its neighbours... *le-dawid*) is tantalizing: *ašer* is not a component in the psalm-titles, but it is a component in the prophetic “titles”. No firm conclusions are available as yet on the provenience and redaction of the Song of Songs. In any case we notice that here an entire book is thus titled, while the Psalter itself has no title. Another aspect of the titling phenomenon is provided by the genre of colophons and summarizing passages<sup>6</sup>. Except for the “ended are the *tefillôt* ...” notice after Ps. 72, the Psalter does not contain anything similar. The colophons and summarizing passages are instructive, however, on two counts: as witnesses to the growth of the explicating tendency in the post-exilic period, and as the most obvious instance of placing the explication as a subscript.

#### 1.4 Titles and genre-terms in postbiblical sources

The poetic texts that belong to the “postbiblical period” (Hellenistic to Roman) have either been tradited without titles or show titling-terms not identical with those found in the Psalter. The exception are the Psalms of Solomon, a pseudepigraphic collection of eighteen poems attributed to the middle of the first century BCE. The historical situation reflected (with slight camouflage) in the texts is the invasion of the country by Pompeius in 63 BCE, his assault on Jerusalem and his death in 48 BCE. A Hebrew

5. See Childs 1971. The genre-terms used in these “splices” are not the ones used in the Psalter: note especially that *šîrah* in the title of Ps. 18 is a take-over from II Sam. 22.

6. See Gevaryahu 1975, 1978, 1981, already mentioned. On summarizing passages (semi-colophons, so to speak), see Fishbane 1974 and 1980; Fishbane himself calls them colophons.

original is clearly discernible behind the surviving Greek version (a Syriac version has also been found but seems to have been translated from the Greek); but that original itself has not yet been recovered. The titles are a not quite perfect imitation of the psalm-titles, though now the "author" is Solomon (of whom, conveniently for the real author, I Kings 5:12 reports that he "spake three thousand parables and his songs were – *wayhî sîrô* – five-and-thousand"). In poems 17 and 18 there is even a *selah* (*diapsalma*). A more thorough study of these titles would make it clear what their author assumed about the functional meaning of the titling-terms in the Psalter; but this will not be undertaken here. For the present we need only list some of the more "psalmic" ones (after Viteau 1911 and Gray 1913; discussion of the titles see Viteau, p. 101 ff). The Hebrew retroversion is mostly easy to make, with the help of LXX.

1. למנצח. — 2. מזמור לשלמה על ירושלים. — 5. מזמור לשלמה. — 7. לשלמה למנצח. — 8. לשלמה למנצח. — 17. מזמור לשלמה כנגינות למלך.

The information from Ben Sira (fl. ca. 190 BCE) is important for the genre terminology which he employs. In the Praise of the Fathers the ancient sages are said to have been חקרי מזמור על קו, and David instituted נגינות שיר. At the subsequent description of the Temple liturgy in the time of Simon the High Priest – evidently the writer's own time – the onset of the singing after the priest's trumpeting is termed ויתן השיר קולו.<sup>7</sup>

A similar terminology is found later in the Mishnah:

*Tamîd* 7:4 השיר שהיו הלויים אומרים במקדש

*Šeqalîm* 5:1 הוגרס בן לוי על השיר

*Bikkûrîm* 3:4, *Tamîd* 7:3 ורברו הלויים בשיר

etc., but note

*Sukkah* 5:4 שעליהן לויים עומדים בכלי שיר ואומרים שירה

7. Note: The page references given here will obviate the complications of chapter and verse. The Masada scroll of B.S. is now decisive for חקרי מזמור על קו (see Yadin 1965<sup>a</sup>: English part p. 36, Hebrew part p. 36). In the second hemistich the parallel noun is either משל (Yadin, *ibid.*) or משא. The section on David is missing in the Masada scroll, and the Genizah ms. only allows the clear reading of נגינות שיר. Either the Greek version or the Genizah one is problematic here. Segal's restitution (Segal 1958<sup>2</sup>:324, 326) does not seem likely to the present writer. For the liturgical scene with its ויתן השיר קולו see Segal, *ibid.*: 342. The second hemistich of the verse is still obscure.

against

*Middôt* 2:5 שְׁעִלִּיחַן הַלּוּיִם עוֹמְדִים בְּשִׁיר<sup>8</sup>

note also the distinction of para-liturgical (and secular?) song as *šîrah*

*Sukkah* 5:4 ואומרים לפניהם דברי שירות ותשבחות

*Kelîm* 15:6 נבלי השירה תמאים ונבלי בני לוי טהורים

The *šîr* here should not be understood as “psalm” or “psalms” in the general literary sense, but rather as “altar-service hymns”. That sections of certain psalms were performed is attested by *Tamîd* 7:4ff (see the discussion in Büchler 1900:97-114, also Liebreich 1954). Much is still unclear here, especially the crucial term *pereq* that appears in the description of the daily liturgy *Tamîd* 7 and in the censure of Hograš ben Levi in *Yômā* 3:11. What *šîr* meant at that time is defined even more clearly in the passage about David’s compositions found in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran (11QP<sup>s</sup>, col. XXVII; DJD IV: 48, 91-92) –

... ויתן לו יהוה רוח נבונה ואורה ויכתוב תהלים שלושת אלפים ושש מאות ושיר לשורר לפני המזבח על עולת התמיד לכול יום ויום לכול ימי השנה ארבעה וששים ושלוש מאות ולקורבן השבתות שנים וחמשים שיר ולקורבן ראשי החודשים ולכול ימי המועדות ולי(ו)ם הכפורים שלושים שיר ויהי כול השיר אשר דבר ששה וא(ר)בעים וארבע מאות ושיר לנגן על הפגועים ארבעה ...

What is astonishing here is the separation of *tehillîm* from the liturgical context. Could *tehillîm* have meant “devotional poems for private use”?<sup>9</sup>

*Šîrîm* appears again in the “Document about Melchizedek” (11QM<sup>elch</sup>, line 9-10; Carmignac 1969:350) –

כאשר כתוב עליו בשירי דוד אשר אמר אלהים נצב בעדת אל ...

Unfortunately the complications are increased rather than solved by this find. The quoted text is Ps. 82, titled *mizmôr le-asaf*. After it comes Ps. 83 that does have *šîr* in its title – *šîr mizmôr le-asaf*: the problem superscript/subscript seems to raise its head here, at least for the component *šîr*. Ps. 82 is a Temple psalm, for the Tamid offering on Tuesday, as declared by *Tamîd* 7:4; but there are problems galore here as well (see Büchler 1900:97-114, and our discussion here in §6.3[a] in connection with *le-asaf*).

8. Discussion of this problematic passage, see in §6.3 (b) below, anent *šîr ham-ma'alôt*.

9. *pace* Sarna 1971: col. 1305 “*tehillim*. . . in the Qumran Scroll. . . in the simple sense of liturgical compositions.” This is the earliest appearance of the term known so far, together with a cognate term from the “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice” on which see further on.

What is sure at least, and no wonder, is that the Qumran community had a rich vocabulary of genre-terms for liturgical and devotional poetry. We cannot classify them as musical terms, since that implies the substantiation of the musical aspect as against the textual and ideological ones. The musicologist knows that in traditional cultures such a distinction is not made in the case of vocal music. For the present enquiry it does not seem necessary to discuss the Qumranic terminology in detail, only to list the most interesting cases<sup>10</sup>.

4Q Testimonia (4Q175) (DJD V: 58)

בעת אשר כלה ישוע [= יהושע] להלל ולהודות בתהלותיו ...

4QDibHam (olim 4QBt3) the "*divrê ham-me'ôrôt*" (Baillet 1961:212).

Fragmentary ending *amen*, then blank line, then:

הודות ביום השבת' הודו ... את שם קודשו ...

Separate fragment 3 (*ibid.* p. 233 and plate XXVIII), larger letters, presumed title: רברי המארות.

4QS1 39-40 (4QSirSab) the *Serek šîrôt 'ôlat haš-šabbat*, not yet published in full.

Strugnell (1960:320) reports that beginnings of sections run typically

למשכיל שירת עולת השבת ...

Milik (1956:61) reports initium מדרש למשכיל על אנשי התורה המתנרבים

He also reports a small scroll beginning

[דברני] משכיל אשר דבר לכול בני שחר: האוינו ...

A fragment of the same text was also found at Masada (Yadin 1965:105-108), with a similar initium, though badly preserved,

[למשכיל שיר]ת עולת השבת הששית בתשעה לחודש [השני]

The same fragment has a passage which Yadin describes as to be recited by the 7 archangels, here called [נשיאי רוש]; commas must be added to make it comprehensible –

... זמר עת לאלוהי קודש, תהלי רום, הודות נפלאותיו, זמירות קודשו ...

10. Only one study seems to deal with this subject: S. Scorza, "Praise and music in the Qumran community; a study of terminology", *The Reformed Review* (Holland, Mich.) 11 (1958):32-36. The present writer must confess to not yet having read it. In any case a study based on what was available in 1958 is now outdated.

All terminological resources are mobilized here including *tehillîm*. Since Cave 4 apparently held four manuscripts of this work, a more complete text, and more terms, will perhaps become available when the material is published. But here we are already outside of the prosaic practice of titling and inside the pleonastic wonderland of the mystics and their *Hêkalôt* visions<sup>11</sup>.

What these contribute to our enquiry is good evidence on terminological change and growth in the two centuries before the fall of Qumran (68 CE) – i.e. the so-called Late Second Temple period. The Qumranic evidence on *šîr* will contribute something to our specific discussion of *šîr* (§6.3[a] below). The appearance of *LMSKYL* is more problematical (see §6.3 [b] below). The scribal devices for the distinction of title and text, evident from the Qumran manuscripts, will be discussed briefly in §1.6.

By way of a postscript the title of the apocryphal “Psalm 151” should also be noted since its Hebrew text was found in the Psalms Scroll (see DJD IV: 49, 54-64). The psalm appears in the last preserved column of the scroll (col. XXVIII), and its title is הללויה לדוד בן ישי. Its text is followed by another, close to the edge where the scroll is no longer preserved, with a title reading (according to Sanders)

תחלת גבן [לה לן] יד משמשחו נביא אלהים

For reasons explained *ad loc.* the first text is now numbered Ps. 151A and the second Ps. 151B. As in the Psalms of Solomon, the titles here are “semi-traditional”. In the second, one could think of תהלת instead of תחלת, but the *het* seems to be indisputable in the manuscript. In the first unit, *hallelûyah* appears as a genre-term. Since Ps. 150 ends with *hallelûyah* there is some possibility of a drop-down. But in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> the two texts are not adjacent: Ps. 150 appears in col. XXVI, and “Ps. 151” in col. XXVIII.

### 1.5 The neighbouring cultures

The contribution of Ugaritic literature to research on the Psalter has been considerable, and hopes were entertained that a fortunate find would also shed light on the psalm-titles. These hopes have not yet been realized,

11. The most recent study that takes the Qumran material into account is Gruenwald 1980. Section 2 there (pp. 466-469) deals with vocal and instrumental music in the heavens. Gruenwald’s argument hinges on *ʿArakîn* 2:6, supposed to mean that the Levites mainly sang without using instruments (ולא היו אומרים בנבל). But the context, partly quoted in the footnote there (p. 467, note 41) indicates that this refers to the צוערי הלויים, the young apprentice singers.

at least as regards the literature of Ugarit itself, i.e. texts written in the local Western Semitic language. Three finds are indeed adduced frequently – one could say obligatorily: the epic (?) poems about 'QHT ("Aqhat"), DN'L ("Dan'el") and KRT ("Keret"), whose tablets bear the respective superscripts L'QHT, LDN'L and LKRT. Since the texts recount the deeds of those personages, the one-word superscripts must mean "[this is a story] about X". The proposed connection with the *le-dawid* of the psalm-titles is therefore illusory, and their *le-* remains the *lamed auctoris* (in the intention of the editor who placed *le-dawid* where he did)<sup>12</sup>. It should be remarked that for proper comparability we need a textual find which would be in the nature of a prayer or hymn, or even better – a collection of such items (overtly belonging to the genre, not argued into it by a chain of syllogisms!). As far as the present writer has been able to ascertain, no such text(s) in the Ugaritic idiom can as yet be identified among the hundreds of tablets and fragments. Another kind of text from Ugarit, though not in Ugaritic, will be mentioned presently.

Mesopotamia has yielded a large and varied amount of rubrics added to liturgical texts. Direct terminological parallels to our psalm-titles do not appear there, however, except for the Sumerian term *šir* which seems to have had the general meaning of song or hymn (particulars see in §6.3 [a] below). Still quoted in the literature are the interpretations of several titling-terms, especially *miḫtam*, as names of instruments, derived by Langdon (1921) from a set of Akkadian terms which appears in the great Song Catalogue found at Assur. Since 1965 the correct identification of these terms has been available. They are the names of musical modes (conceived as octave-species, i.e. scale types); but the textual environment of *miḫtam* makes it certain that this is not a musical term<sup>13</sup>.

The importance of the Mesopotamian data lies not in their lexical "meanings", but in the contextual-functional information which they yield in abundance<sup>14</sup>. All rubrics and colophons on the tablets are written as *subscripts*. The colophons do not seem to include the assignment of rendition to a specific instrument: this too weighs against the old interpre-

12. Kraus 1978<sup>5</sup>: 16-17 summarizes the various interpretations that have been put on *le-dawid*, with a salutary critique.

13. On the identification see Kilmer 1971 and previous researches described there, also Bayer (in print).

14. The following summary is based mainly on: Cohen (M.E.) 1972; Hartmann 1960; Hunger 1968; Lambert 1962.



tations of our titling-terms as instruments<sup>15</sup>. Certain terms appear as internal rubrics for a chanted or partially chanted liturgical complex. Thus the *kirugu* (=“obeisance”??) is part of a *balag*; there is also a larger unit combining *balag* and *eršemma* (the terms are Sumerian, but continued in use even when Sumerian was no longer spoken in daily use). Such *balag*, *eršemma*, etc. units were frequently gathered in separate “books”, i.e. series of tablets. Thanks to other writings, such as descriptions of rituals and various kinds of catalogues, one can still reconstruct the actual sequences and their internal and external boundaries. The term *selah* (not discussed in the present study) may be such an internal rubric, marking the insertion of some other performance-unit.

The closest analogues to the psalm-titles discovered until now are the subscripts of the “musical scores” from Ugarit, which came under research only in the 1970’s<sup>16</sup>. This is a group of tablets, mostly shattered into fragments, with hymnic or ritual texts in Hurrian; they date around the 14th century BCE. The upper register of each tablet bears the poetic text; the lower register bears the notation of its melody by a quasi-solfège method (no conclusive decipherment is as yet available). After the notation comes a subscript, in “hurrianized” Akkadian. All the subscripts of the set were apparently formulated on the same pattern, demonstrated by the following reconstructed specimen:

*annû zammarû ša nidqibli zaluzi ŠA DINGIR<sup>meš</sup> TA <sup>m</sup>Urḫiya ŠU <sup>m</sup>Ipšali*

Approximately translated: “This is a song/thus the music, in *nidqibli* (mode), a *zaluzi* (hymn genre) for/to the gods, by *Urḫiya*; (copied) by *Ipšali*.”<sup>17</sup>

A detailed comparison with the structures and components of the psalm-titles shows several differences which should not be glossed over. For the present, the Ugarit “titles” must remain *approximate* analogues;

15. See §2 below on the mediaeval exegetical tradition, and note 53 below on recourse to the assyriological dictionaries.

16. Bibliography via Kilmer 1971, and Bayer (in print).

17. Fragments compared to reconstruct subscript formula, Laroche 1968:486 (reads *zamašša*, declared inexplicable, for what was later recognized as *zammarû ša*). See also Kilmer 1971:142 (translates plurally “these are the songs”, rectified in her subsequent publications). The fragments have *nidqibli* thrice and *nadqabli* twice; both are hurrianizations of akkadian *nīd qabli*. The *zaluzi* is probably a Hurrian genre-term, but it has not yet been located elsewhere. Three additional authors’ names that survive in the fragments are *Puḫiya*, *Ammiya(na)* and *Tapši-ḫuni*. An additional scribe’s name is *Ammurapi*. Laroche remarks that the author’s names are all Hurrian ones, while the scribes’ names are “akkadien ou sémitique”.



especially since the analyses carried out here indicate that the longer psalm-titles are not long original formulations, but rather the result of accretions over hundreds of years, due to several distinct titling (= editorial) actions.

The evidence from Egypt again supplies no terminological analogues. Since the medium there is not clay tablets but papyrus scrolls, this leads us to a more general examination of the message-and-medium aspect.

#### 1.6 Titling and the scribal medium: superscript, adscript, subscript

There are several ways of studying the relative position of title (or colophon) versus text versus the general visual frame. Traditional palaeography is one of them, and its concern is with the technology as such. For the Hebrew text of the Bible the masoretic scribal regulations must also be taken into account. In many of the manuscripts from Qumran and elsewhere in the Judean Desert, these regulations seem to be already incipient. An overall study must wait until all the material has been published, or re-published, within the uniform format of DJD. Title and text interacting within a visual frame are a subject for proxemics – thus coming within the purview of general semiotics. Content and function enter in various ways, and so does the historical development of the artefactual genre (tablet/scroll/codex). For the present it is not necessary to go into these considerations in detail. They already inform much of what has been said in this chapter and what will be presented in the following. A few more specific concerns will be set out here.

(a) A general concept of “labels for texts” is necessary. Below this, however, distinctions and sub-distinctions must be made – steering a middle course between over-classification and under-classification. Gevar-yahu’s studies (1975, 1978, 1981) of what he generalizes as “colophons” point the way; but they are still open to revision, especially as concerns the psalm-titles (cf. remarks at the end of §1.1 above).

(b) The specific comparison of psalm-titles with the Mesopotamian material must be carried out with much more rigour than has been done hitherto. Scribal colophons, liturgical rubrics, and catalogue entries of literary works are three different categories, and even the liturgical rubrics are not wholly similar to the Hebrew psalm-titles. It should be noted that in the matter of “musical” rubrics (or better musico-poetico-liturgical ones) too many of the recent studies adduce terminological and functional

meanings that are no longer valid (these often go back to Langdon 1921). The uncritical use of the Assyriological dictionaries has also had a deleterious effect (see note 53 below).

Three of the more recent studies are open to criticism on these points, even though their general thrust is highly instructive. Sawyer (1968) compares psalm-titles and Mesopotamian colophons, finds that most of the parameters of the colophons are not represented in the psalm-titles, but still declares the two phenomena to be similar. Childs (1976:383-384) refers to Sawyer's study and declares that it proves "a striking continuity with Akkadian parallels". It is also puzzling to read Gevaryahu's hypothesis that psalm-titles could have been derived from entries in catalogues of psalms (1975:47ff. and 50; stimulated by Lambert 1962 and by Albright's hypothesis that Ps. 68 is a catalogue of incipits). As far as the present writer can judge from the historical conspectus, the procedure is rather the other way around. Before the modern period, catalogue entries are generally re-definitions that do not depend much on the actual title of the object, and strive for minimal bother (and hence yield minimal information), to the grief of modern researchers.

(c) The Mesopotamian and cognate traditions are important, for obvious reasons of cultural influence. But even in Mesopotamia, and especially in the later periods that parallel the "Biblical" period proper – the first millennium BCE – writing was also done on scrolls. Here the evidence from Pharaonic and Hellenistic Egypt must be brought in as well. Although subscript titling, subscript colophons, etc., are again found to be the general rule in ancient scrolls, the proxemics of the title-text picture there are often significantly different. The scroll of leather (later – vellum) or papyrus is at least as important for considerations of the physical history of the psalm-titles as is the clay tablet. An eventual change from tablet to scroll during the period of the Monarchy ought also to be considered – with all that this could imply for the fate of the older titles, or rather titling-components, of the older psalms. For the Hellenistic period, some extremely stimulating insights can be gained from the examples featured in the introductions to Greek papyrology (Turner 1968 and 1971 does not discuss titles much, but Schubart 1921<sup>2</sup> does so extensively – see pp. 98-104). Especially noticeable are the occasional confluences of subscript and superscript titles(!), and a third phenomenon that has also not been considered hitherto: the *adscript* title, placed in the space between

columns. The way from adscript to gloss is short, and this too is a factor that must be considered.

## 2. THE CHAIN OF INTERPRETATION

In the literature one often finds it said that the Versions prove that "the psalm-titles" were no longer understood in the translators' time; thus they must be considerably older than even the "Ur-Septuagint" of the Psalter, presumed to have been made in the early second century BCE.

Such a statement is too loose but it cannot be tightened much, the source-constraints being what they are. In any case the Versions are no more than witnesses for their respective authors and environments<sup>18</sup>. The "Ur-Septuagint", i.e. whatever can be surmised about it, can tell us nothing about what was known or not known among the Temple personnel and musicians in Jerusalem at that time. That most of the titling-actions took place before the Hellenistic period – will result from our analysis in any case. The Versions will also give some aid in dealing with the vexed *LMNZH* and perhaps also for *miḳtam* and *šîr* (see §6), but the main argument will not be dependent on this. The mainstream Greek tradition (LXX in the following, for short and *grosso modo*) supplies another kind of interesting information, precisely where it does not coincide with MT. There are a number of additional titling-notes over and above MT (shown in brackets in our Analytical Table). Where they can be retroverted to *le-dawid* and *mizmôr*, it seems that in most cases this is not necessarily the restitution of a loss in MT but a late mopping-up operation, to leave no psalm untitled. Of the following terms or groups, no more is found in LXX than in MT: *LMNZH* (except for title 30 – evidence of a loss?); the 'al-X (and congeners) group; *li-venê qorah*; *le-asaf* (a few mss. have *le-dawid* instead, in title 82, and a few have *le-asaf* instead of *le-dawid* in title 108); *maskil*; *miḳtam*; *tefillah*; *šiggayôn* (*psalmos* always!), and the attributions to Heman, Ethan, Moses and Solomon. *Šîr* (*ōdē*) is added in two ways: as *ainos ōdēs* (*tehillat šîr?*) to Psalms 91, 93, and 95, untitled in MT; and in the long title to Ps. 96, also untitled in MT (see below). We can therefore

18. Staerk's inventory (1892) is still useful, and his critical remarks remain in force. His hexaplaric material was taken from Field's edition (publ. 1875-76), since the Milan palimpsest was announced only in 1895 (and its full facsimile published only in 1958; details see bibliography s.v. Hex-Mercati). For a recent thorough clarification of "David in the Greek psalms" see Pietersma 1980. See also in Delekat 1964, remarks on various aspects of the manuscript tradition.

venture the suggestion that the terms and categories where LXX and MT correspond – were the ones that had already acquired the status of “fossils”<sup>19</sup>.

Of the Songs of the Day, MT only assigns Ps. 92 as *mizmôr šîr le-yôm haš-šabbat*. LXX further signals the songs for Monday (Ps. 48), Friday (Ps. 93), and Wednesday (Ps. 94). These are the same as reported in the Mishnah, *Tamîd* 7:4, which also assigns Ps. 82 to Tuesday and Ps. 81 to Thursday – both not signalled in LXX. Sarna (1962:156) suggests that hence these six psalms “became part of the *tamîd* service after the Book of Psalms had achieved its present form”. This conclusion must now be revised (but how?), since the “present form” is apparently not yet in evidence even at Qumran (which fell in 68 CE, two years before the fall of Jerusalem. At least this holds for the last third of the canonical set. True, no Daily Psalm is found in the Fifth Book, but three of them are in the Fourth (92, 93, 94). There is also the problem of the Thursday psalm which speaks of a New Moon (*keseh*??) liturgy, and of why the LXX does not mention Thursday and Tuesday. Büchler (1900) has a thorough discussion of the matter, and there are several later studies as well about the *tamîd* offering (not checked for the present paper). Since we are not concerned here with the problem of the liturgical use of the psalms, we need not pursue the matter any further for the present.

The LXX also features some additions to the inventory of circumstantial attributions to David: at Ps. 27 – “before he was anointed”, at Ps. 143 – “when his son pursued him”, and at Ps. 144 – “about Goliath”. Quite obscure are the additions at Ps. 31 *extaseōs*; at Ps. 38 “about the Sabbath”, and at Ps. 97 “when his land is established(?)”. On the *exodiou skēnēs* at Ps. 29 (“solemn assembly of the tabernacle”??) see Gehman 1966:131 and previously Büchler 1900:99.

All these additions do not continue directly, in style or content, what was already in the Hebrew text (except for the Daily Psalms); but they do not clash with it either<sup>20</sup>. A direct clash, however, is brought about by a further group of additions – and it concerns the very ideology of the Hebrew

19. Eissfeldt/Ackroyd 1965:451 states that LXX “lacks many notes of MT, but also has many others”. The first part of the statement is not true.

20. An illuminating definition is offered by the way in which Clarke (1968:320) specifies his use of the term *congruence* – ostensibly for a quite different matter: “. . . no dislocation would arise from their coupling; their variety is mutually new, alternative, or redundant but not contradictive.”

titles. There, no historical personage later than David and Solomon is adduced. The singers Asaph, Heman, Ethan and the Korahites also belong – in the Chronicler's description – to the early Monarchy. In the LXX one finds the following: at Pss. 76, 77, 80 – added "about the Assyrian"; at Ps. 71 – added "of the sons of Ionadab and the first of those that were taken captive"; at Ps. 96 – "When the House (= Temple) was built after the captivity, *ōdē (šîr)* of David" (!); at Ps. 137 "by Jeremiah"; at Ps. 138 "by Zechariah"; at Ps. 139 "by Zechariah in the diaspora"; and at Pss. 146-149 "by Haggai and Zechariah" (147:12-20 as separate psalm, also titled thus).

These references are to the immediate pre-exilic, exilic and post-exilic period, with "about the Assyrian" perhaps referring to the fall of the Northern Kingdom (Asaph psalms!). The important fact is not so much what the LXX says here, but that nowhere does MT say anything similar. One could relate this phenomenon somehow to the hypothesis of local recensions of the Hebrew text – Palestinian, Babylonian, Egyptian – but this seems too speculative<sup>21</sup>. At any rate, LXX puts into stronger focus how sedulously MT fosters the image of high antiquity. More will be said about this when we come to discuss *le-asaf* and *le-dawid* in §6.

From the exegesis of the psalm by means of the MT or LXX title, to the exegesis of the title itself – is but a short step. The Targum (Aramaic) does so by midrashic expansions within the titles, though not in all of them. The Pešitta (Syriac) discards the MT titles altogether and replaces them by midrashic titlings suitable to its own environment<sup>22</sup>. The step to an external-separate exegesis was indeed already taken much earlier. Before the Qumran discoveries, the earliest known midrash on a title was the eschatological one on *mizmôr šîr le-yôm haš-šabbat*, placed at the end of *Tamîd* 7:4 – right after the historically-intended report on the Psalms of the Day in the Temple. Now we have the *pešarîm* on various psalms from Qumran, where the titles themselves are expounded as presages for the sect's particular concerns and history<sup>23</sup>. The tradition continues through

21. See Cross 1975 – not undisputed, as the footnotes indicate.

22. On the titles in Targum and Midrash see Preuss 1959; on the midrashic tradition and the commentaries also Neubauer 1890. Pešitta see Vosté 1944.

23. That *pešer* is not a "commentary" in the simple sense was demonstrated by Rabinowitz (1972). See also Horgan 1979.

the Talmud and Midrashim on the one hand, and the Church Fathers on the other, and into the Middle Ages and beyond<sup>24</sup>.

Much of what appears in the literature of the 19th and 20th century turns out to be re-traceable to the exegetical tradition. Apart from the many specific explanations, what becomes even more evident is the method itself – etymologizing. That this is not the way to find out the *functional* meaning of the obscure terms was only rarely recognized. It is difficult to trace these voices-calling-in-the-desert in Wohlenberg's survey, since he mentions their warnings somewhat à propos. A more explicit reference is featured once (p. 305):

*“Rudolf Abramowski (1900-1945) bemerkt mit gewissem Recht [sic!] dass uns die blosse Übersetzung von Worten wie “Sonate” und “Motette” auch nicht über Form und Inhalt dieser musikalischen Gattungen unterrichtet”* [reference follows].

Presumably it was Wohlenberg's thesis that led Kraus to put a warning into the latest edition of his commentary (1978<sup>5</sup>:14), but he courteously calls etymologizing “problematisch”. How “problematisch” it indeed is for our subject, will be explored in detail in the following section (§3) – as a cardinal consideration in our quest for a different approach.

### 3 TITLES AND TITLING-TERMS: IN QUEST OF AN APPROACH

If one agrees that the situation is anomalous, or even only that an impasse has been reached, it becomes necessary to pause in the search for *answers* and to begin searching for *questions*. In other words: if the puzzles refuse to be solved, it may be that something is wrong with the *paradigms*<sup>25</sup>.

24. Useful for an overview of the Jewish material, in addition to Neubauer and Preuss (see above) is Kimhi *ed. Darom*. Shmueli (1968) also surveyed some of the mediaeval commentaries, and remarked on the different approach of the Northerners and the Southerners to the *‘al-X* terms. Wohlenberg (1967:637, note 26) refers to an earlier recognition that the “instrumental” explanations of *‘al-X* derive from Rashi, whilst the “melody” explanations derive from Ibn Ezra (Hans Kessler, *Die Psalmen*, München 1899). It has not been noticed so far that the dichotomy is easy to explain. North of the Pyrenees *‘al-upon/on* automatically recalls *jouer sur un instrument, auf... spielen, play on/ upon*. Where Arabic is spoken and the Arab musical tradition prevails, *‘al-upon* refers to a melodic or melodico-poetic “recipe”. Playing an instrument is *zammar bi'l-X*, not *zammar ‘al/‘ala-X*.

25. “Paradigm” and “puzzle” as used by Thomas Kuhn (see Kuhn 1970). To keep a sense of proportion: what we attempt to do here is certainly no “revolution”. The general paradigms of Biblical research remain entirely valid and so do those of the other disciplines called-upon. What is questioned is in fact the exemption from those paradigms, which has hitherto been granted to psalm-title studies.

Recurrent in the literature is the lexicological or piecemeal approach. Here the tradition of Commentary seems to have caused a kind of logical loop. The *outcome* of an investigation, or a summary of past investigations, must certainly be presented in the form of itemized paragraphs, one to a term. Footnotes to the Psalter (heirs to the gloss) must produce explanations as the terms come up. In the "Introductions" some authors discuss the terms in alphabetical order, others group them first by "functional categories" – with or without a last category of unassignables. But all this does not necessarily mean that the *investigation itself* also has to proceed by breaking up the subject in any similar manner. Etymologizing is the inevitable next step, and it leads to no solution. Presently we shall try to find out why.

Although many sober scholars have decided that the problem cannot be solved, for lack of contributory data within the Bible itself, it would be well to ask if the situation is indeed thus. The psalm-titles constitute a specific corpus of textual data, though not in the usual form: by dint of the titling function this corpus is interdigitated within a larger corpus – the Psalter. If we look on the matter as a deciphering problem, *mutatis mutandis*, an assessment can be made as to how much information the corpus is capable of yielding. The assessment will have to be concerned not only with quantity: variety and redundancy also come in. The functional interdigitation of our corpus within the Psalter also holds a potential of information – again with respect to the quantity, variety and redundancies of the relationship. Putting the question thus opens the way to the exploitation of a *structural* analysis.

The search for verbal "meanings" is thus seen as one dimension of the enquiry, but not the only one. And the analogy (or more than an analogy) of a decipherment-situation prompts us to ask here as well: what *kind of text* is it that we are dealing with?

The most trivial answer is the most significant one: this is a set of titles. And hence we obtain the most non-trivial question of all: *what is a title?* It seems as if this is the root of the trouble. The titles have been treated as if they were more-or-less normal "texts", i.e. sentences, that just happen to be irritatingly elliptic.

A title is not a "text": a title is a formulaic label attached to a text. The function of this label is to set up a relationship between the text, the user of the text, and a specific conceptual domain. The label is a constraining device, intended to block other options which the author of the label



envisages to be available for the “realization” of the text by the user (i.e. that user whom the labeller has in mind). For the labels and texts with which we are concerned here, we have enough information to set up a list of categories of “realization” to be expected.

- Assigning the rendition (spoken/sung) to a specific circumstance (liturgical or otherwise);
- Predefining the musical rendition, at some level of specificity;
- Relating the text to a literary genre, technical and/or conceptual;
- Providing prestige to an author, by virtue of the text assigned to him;
- Providing prestige to a text, by virtue of the author assigned to it;
- Imposing a specific ideological orientation on the text.

It may be trivial to note that a titling action can be concerned either with a single category, or with several. It is not trivial, however, to remind ourselves that titles have a life of their own, more often quite independent of their text. Authors betitle, or do not. Editors betitle, subtract, add, and change. *Habent sua fata tituli* and not always for the better.

Now if a title is a label-for-a-text, and not a text in itself, its linguistic mode of behaviour cannot be expected to be the same as that of a text. On the contrary: it must be clearly distinct from its text, otherwise it cannot perform its function. (Mere *visual* distinction is not enough.) Since the philological tools with which we have been provided were created for dealing with “texts”, they cannot help – and may engender misdirections! – when we apply them to the verbal phenomenon “titles”. Titles have a ‘grammar’ and a ‘syntax’ of their own, which we still need to discover<sup>26</sup>.

As regards the terminology used in titles, one notices a considerable overlap with the domain of the *terminus technicus* (which may of course also appear within a “text” proper). A titling-term is drawn from the available lexical store at a certain moment. But at that same moment the new functional constraints cause a necessary parting of the ways, and the term embarks on a historical trajectory of its own, as a titling-term. This trajectory can only be re-traced in a forward direction, and even then very little extrapolation is allowed. As we know from properly documented cases (e.g. for many but not all the *termini* of European art music), such a

26. The distinction does not come under the concept of “register”, since “register” applies to modes of discourse in different contexts and a titling statement is not a discourse. The linguistics of titles would seem to come within the purview of the emerging branch of Text Grammar.



trajectory can often be seen to have passed through a considerable number of branching-points. At each point an option has been exercised; and its grounds are not always clear<sup>27</sup>. "Etymologizing" such a term is a senseless undertaking<sup>28</sup>. The original *functional meaning* of a titling-term cannot be reached by constructing a reverse trajectory from a lexical-cum-etymological point of entry. Deterrent specimens are easy to find: *tragoidia* (goat's song??), *symphony* (sounding-together), the German, French, etc. *Roman*, or the *Ballade* (not danced) and *Sonnet* (not "sounded")<sup>29</sup>.

#### 4. FIRST ANALYSIS: DISTRIBUTIONS AND STRUCTURES

##### 4.1 The distribution of titles and titling-terms in the corpus

In the canonical Psalter, 117 of the 150 psalms have a title (not counting *hallelûyah* whose titling function is a moot point). This count is not affected by the slight differences in the delimitations of the psalm-units, attested in the Greek tradition, and by the various reckonings given by Talmudic and post-Talmudic sources (see Sarna 1971: col.1306-1307)<sup>30</sup>. All such differences naturally occur with regard to psalms or sequences of psalms where MT has no title to mark and preserve a boundary. For the present task these matters have only to be noted; they do not affect what we might need to do in the way of numerical calculation.

What is far more important here are the joins, splits, and recombinations of passages, noticeable in the psalms themselves, and the one case of a unit doublet. The doublet is Ps. 14 and Ps. 53, noticeable not only for the

27. See Eggebrecht 1955 (*Studien zur musikalischen Terminologie*), practically throughout. For subsequent literature see via RILM abstracts (*Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale*) 1967 ff., cumulative index 1967-1971 and annual indexes since then, s.v. *terminology*.

28. Barr (1974) divides etymological analysis into six classes (A to F) and adds a section on "Popular Etymology". For the interpretations of the psalm-titles current in the literature it does not seem possible to find a place within Barr's A-to-F classification, and they must therefore be classed under "Popular Etymology" (which Barr does not treat pejoratively, by the way). On the continuation of ancient etymological approaches in modern research on Biblical language see there, pp. 27-28. Mowinkel's explanations of the titling-terms (1921) are a prime example.

29. It may be noted that such recent terms as Calypso and even Jazz are still obscure, and so are Madrigal and Concerto. Opinions still vary, for lack of decisive data, about the meanings of the terms in that context out of which they were taken to serve as musical specifics, and as to when, where and how the choice was made.

30. Sarna's survey here gives details, with regard to the information from Talmudic and post-Talmudic sources, that cannot be found in the standard introductions and commentaries.

textual differences (especially: Ps. 14=J, Ps. 53=E) but for the difference in titling: Ps. 14 has the title *למנוח לרור*, and Ps. 53 *למנוח על-מחלת משכיל לרור*. Both psalms have as their last verse an evident addition closely connected with the Return. Overt joins, resp. splits, are the following: Ps. 31:2-4<sup>a</sup>=Ps. 71:1-3; Ps. 40:14-18=Ps. 70; Ps. 57:6, 8-12=Ps. 108:2-6; Ps. 60:8-11=Ps. 108:7-14. The best known disputed case is Ps. 19, where almost every year still sees the appearance of another study proving/disproving that it was composed as a unit. Doubts have also been raised about Pss. 9 and 10, ostensibly one continuous alphabetical acrostic and hence counted as one in the Greek tradition, since the theme of Ps. 9:2-13 (national triumph) is not the same as that of vss. 14-21, continued in Ps. 10 (plaint of the individual; but see again there v. 16 and surroundings). Thematic shifts appear in many other psalms as well. In the literature these are generally explained as a stylistic phenomenon, for which a cultic or theological background is often adduced. Outright interpolations, mostly of passages connected with the Return or with the Davidic royal heritage, are nevertheless recognized. Our concern with the title must make us look very closely at any kind of break in the continuity of a psalm-text, even at the breaks that have been explained as being no more than stylistic devices. Especially where there is a long sequence of titled psalms, each title now seals off whatever happened previously above and below the present titling locus. The possibilities which this offers for relative datings of titles or titling components are obvious. Our Analytical Table of the titles (laid-in, back cover) notes all presumable splits, joins and doublets, and some of the interpolations; many of them already play a role in the present investigation.

An overview of the titles (see the Analytical Table) shows a fairly even distribution throughout the Psalter. In the Fourth and Fifth Books there are relatively more untitled psalms, and the titled ones more often bear the single *le-dawid* (sometimes with *mizmôr*). The division into "Books" is of course not to be taken as implying something that the editor of the canonical collection found ready-made (see Sarna 1971: cols. 1307-1309; Gese 1972; Kraus 1978<sup>5</sup>: 8ff.). We can use it as an indication of the present "ostensible structure" of the Psalter. Since the Second and Third Books have the concentration of Korahite and Asaphite psalms, this at least sets off the First Book. The Qumran finds (see §1.2 above) show that the division between the Fourth and Fifth Books should be re-assessed, though

a pat answer cannot be expected (a complicated situation cannot be given a simple explanation).

The distribution of the titling *terms*, i.e. the single components of the titles, is an important datum. In Table I we shall set it out in the order of their relative frequency.

We can be sure that the corpus of psalms and its interdigitated corpus of titles are the result of a complicated process (or better – of a manifold of trajectories). If the titles, especially the (presumed) earlier and earliest ones, have been seriously affected by the later redactionary activities, they might no longer be “representative of themselves”. Similar surmises can be put forward for the psalm-texts. But these can preserve the traces of deliberate and accidental disturbance much more clearly than a title could, for obvious reasons (obvious when one remembers the peculiar nature of titles). Disturbances have certainly occurred in the titling-terms of the *‘al*-*X* group (see in the above table). The reason is most probably the Tooth of Time, and hence the relatively high age of this group. It should be noted, by the way, that the alternation of *‘al* and *el* is held to be a common occurrence (on one of its aspects see Cohen [A.] 1970; general clarification see Hurvitz 1972:22, note 25).

That our corpus is the outcome of many selections is clear from the very fact that there are many psalm-like texts elsewhere in the Bible, which do not appear in the Psalter<sup>31</sup>. The corpus is a “sample” in the statistical sense, and there is a risk that it may not be a representative one<sup>32</sup>.

One can set up the frequencies of the titling-terms so as to form a distribution curve. *Le-dawid* emplaces itself in the middle (73 times overall, 60 without the titles that also have the situational ascription). *Mizmôr* (56) and *LMNZH* (54) could be placed to flank it right and left, and so on. But distributing the frequencies mechanically, some to tail off towards the left after *LMNZH*, and others to tail off towards the right after *mizmôr*, is meaningless. Distributing them by the proposed reconstruction of the history of the titling process (see further on) is illicit, as a

31. That the “last words of David” (II Sam. 23:1-7) are not in the Psalter, whilst the preceding ch. 22 re-appears as Ps. 18, was always a puzzle. Now the “last words” have turned up in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran (see DJD IV:48). On the “pseudo-Asaphite” psalms in I Chron. 16, which are directly relevant to our enquiry, see in §6.2(a).

32. The discussion that follows is strongly indebted to Barber 1974, especially ch. 13. Specific page-references for each and every detail are therefore not needed (access: via index. s.v. *representativeness* and *Zipf's Law*).

TABLE I: COUNT AND DISTRIBUTION OF TITLING-TERMS

	Total	First Book Ps. 1-41	Second Book Ps. 42-72	Third Book Ps. 73-89	Fourth Book Ps. 90-106	Fifth Book Ps. 107-150
<i>le-dawid</i>	73	37	18	1	2	15
(overall count, incl. 13 with situational ascriptions)		3-9, 11-32, 34-37	51-65, 68-72	86	101, 103	108-110, 138-146, and in the š. <i>ham-ma'alôt</i> 122, 124, 131, 133
<i>mizmôr</i>	56	21	12	12	4	7
		3-6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20-24, 29-31, 38-40, 41	47-51, 62-68	73, 75-77, 79, 80, 82-85	92, 98, 100, 101	108-110, 139-141, 143
<i>LMNZH</i>	54	18	25	8		3
		4-6, 8-14, 18-22, 31, 36, 39-41	42, 44-47, 51-62, 64-70	75-77, 80, 81, 84, 85, and in conflation 88		109, 139, 140
<i>šîr</i>	30	1	7	5	1	1+15
		30 <i>mizm. š. han.</i> <i>hab-bayit</i>	45, 46, 48, 65-68 (in 45 as <i>šîr</i> <i>YDYDT</i> )	75, 76, 83, 87, 88; in 87 note text!	92 <i>mizm. š.</i> <i>le-yôm</i> <i>haš-šabbat</i>	108 <i>šîr mizmôr</i> ; 120-134 š. <i>ham-</i> <i>ma'alôt</i> ; in 121 <i>lamma'alôt</i>

TABLE I: COUNT AND DISTRIBUTION OF TITLING-TERMS (Cont.)

Total	First Book Ps. 1-41	Second Book Ps. 42-72	Third Book Ps. 73-89	Fourth Book Ps. 90-106	Fifth Book Ps. 107-150
<i>al-X</i> and congeners	8	14 Details see supplementary table below	7		
situational ascriptions added to <i>le-dawid</i> , counted by themselves	4 3, 7, 18, 34 (18 cf. II Sam. 22)	8 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63; note "ended are..." subscript after Ps. 72		1 142	
<i>maskil</i>	1 32	7 42, 44, 45, 52-55; note <i>ומרו משכיל</i> Ps. 47:8	4 74, 78, 88, 89	1 142	
<i>le-asaf</i>		1 50 (at end of Korahite group)	11 73-83		
<i>li-vené qorah</i>		7 42 (43 cont.?), 44-49	4 84, 85, 87, and in conflation 88		

TABLE I: COUNT AND DISTRIBUTION OF TITLING-TERMS (Cont.)

	Total	First Book Ps. 1-41	Second Book Ps. 42-72	Third Book Ps. 73-89	Fourth Book Ps. 90-106	Fifth Book Ps. 107-150
<i>miḳtam</i>	6	1 16 m. <i>le-dawid</i>	5 56-59 <i>le-dawid</i> m., 60 m. <i>le-dawid</i>			
sporadic		7 <i>šiggayôn</i> ; 38 <i>le-hazkîr</i>	60, <i>le-tammed</i> ; 70 <i>le-hazkîr</i> ; 72 <i>li-šelomoh</i>	86 <i>tefillah</i> ; 88 <i>le-hêman</i> <i>ha-ezrahî</i> ; 89 <i>le-êtan</i> <i>ha-ezrahî</i>	90 <i>tefillah</i> <i>le-mošeh</i> etc.; 100 <i>le-tôdah</i> ; 102 <i>tefillah</i> <i>le-ʿanî</i> etc.; 106 <i>hallelûyah</i>	127 <i>li-šelomoh</i> ; 142 <i>tefillah</i> ; 145 <i>tehillah</i> ; <i>hallelûyah</i> ; 111-113, 135, 146-150

## SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE FOR 'al-X AND CONGENERS

First Book (1-41)	Second Book (42-72)	Third Book (73-89)
על־הגתית 8		על־הגתית 84, 81
עלמות לבן 9	על־עלמות 46 Ps. 48:15] דוא ינהגו עלמות]	
אל־הנהליות 5		
	על־מחלת 53	על־מחלת/ 88 על־מחלת לענות
	על־שושנים 69, 45 על־שושן עדות/ 60 על־שושן: עדות... 62	על־שושנים עדות/ 80 על־שושנים: עדות... 80
ל־דיתון 39	על־דיתון 62	על־דיתון 77
על־אילת השחר 22		
	על־יונת אלם רחקים 57	
על־השמנית 12		
בנגינת על־השמנית 6	על־בנגינות 61	בנגינת 76
בנגינת 4	בנגינת 57, 55, 54	
	על־השחית (מכרת) 59, 58, 57	על־השחית (ממור) 75

foregone conclusion. By the way: the graph would also have to include the 33 zero-titles: these would come after *mizmôr* (56) and before *šîr* (15 *šîr* only, separate from 15 *šîr ham-ma'alôt*). Another foregone conclusion would also have to be brought in: the hypothesis that the titles of the Fifth Book (except for *šîr ham-ma'alôt*) are largely or wholly a “renaissance phenomenon” and not remnants of the original titling action for their class. All in all, there seem to be strong cautions against doing more with the facts of frequency-distribution than has already been done in the tables given above.

A different approach, with no foregone conclusions built-in, is offered by Zipf's Law. As formulated by Barber (p. 202):

*“The rank of a word (e.g. second most common, fiftieth most common) is approximately the inverse of its frequency in a large – that is, representative – sample. Later observations have shown that Zipf's simple curve needs some adjustment, particularly at the two ends [references given], but nonetheless a standard remains from which to measure any significant deviation in a given small corpus. If one or more words fall far from the curve, they may be suspected as being out of their normal places; any general bumps or dips in the curve, too large to be attributed to the slight scattering normal to that size of sample, are also to be suspected.”*

For our own corpus, the test must apparently be made in several ways: for a corpus of 150 titles (including 33 “zero-titles”); for the corpus of 117 actual titles; and for the First to Third Books alone (again with and without the “zero-titles”). Our trial runs have yielded the following conclusions:

(a) The corpus (generalized) is well-representative for *le-dawid*, *mizmôr*, *LMNZH*, “zero-title”, the *‘al-X* group (generalized) and *šîr* (generalized).

(b) At this point there occurs a cut-off, with the onset of significant deviations from the expected frequency/rank fit. This affects *maskîl*, the situational Davidic ascriptions, *le-asaf*, *li-venê qorah*, *hallelûyah* and *miḳtam*.

The components that here emplace themselves below the cut-off for “representativeness” are indeed those that turn out to be problematic by several other criteria as well.



## 4.2 Structural constants in the titles

If one begins by assigning a "meaning" to each titling-term, concurrently assuming that the entire title is a sentence or a paragraph (though formulated elliptically), the result is a foregone conclusion<sup>33</sup>. Here we shall treat the titles as if they were in an unknown language, and try to see what can be learned from a comparative structural analysis unprejudiced by "meanings". The preliminary assumptions that seem justified, but need to be declared, are as follows:

(a) This is a corpus of titles for poetic texts. A reminder: usually a title does not behave like a "text".

(b) The external boundaries of each title, as such, are certain in most cases.

(c) The boundaries between single words are certain, in most cases.

(d) The situational ascriptions to David, *šîr ham-ma'alôt*, *le-yôm haš-šabbat*, and *hanukkat hab-bayit* are just what they seem to be, grammatically. The same is assumed for the various pre-positional forms (*li-venê qorah*, *al-X*, *el-X*). The situational ascriptions are clauses, but this does not entail that the entire title represents a normal sentence or paragraph.

A comparison of the first three titles already sets up the outline of an analytical matrix:

מזמור לדוד בברחו מפני ...	3
מזמור לדוד      בנגינות      למנצח	4
מזמור לדוד      אל-הנחילות      למנצח	5

So far we have five "slots" or columns, but title 6 raises a problem with בנגינות על-השמינית. To resolve it one must work forwards, to see whether an additional slot is needed. Result: in the total of twenty-nine structures of this kind, this is the only case where the two forms occur together. Hence we can assume that a perturbation, *alias* jumble, has occurred at this point in title 6.

The apparent regularity of the sequence of components will continue until we reach title 24. There the sequence is: *le-dawid mizmôr* (though the Versions are not unanimous on this; see, *grosso modo*, Staerk 1892: 101). Similar sequences will also appear occasionally later on. With title 30 comes the first occurrence of *šîr*, here adjacent to *mizmôr* in the sequence [למנצח] מזמור שיר-חנכת הבית לדוד. To see how we should deal with the

33. See, e.g. Kraus 1978<sup>5</sup>:27. His only reservation is that if *LMNZH* means "Dem Chormeister", then the title means thus-and-thus.

co-occurrence of *mizmôr* and *šîr*, we must work forward for quite a long stretch: the last co-occurrence will be in title 108.

After title 41 (Ps. 41 concludes the First Book) the entry of the “Korahite collection” seems to upset our well-laid scheme. Until now, *le-dawid* emplaced itself mostly in the sixth slot, and occasionally in the fifth. Now *li-venê qorah* appears, in most cases, in sequences that are significantly different from the preceding.

למנצח משכיל לבני־קרח	42
למנצח לבני־קרח משכיל	44*
למנצח על־ששנים לבני־קרח משכיל שיר יִדִּידת	45
למנצח לבני־קרח על־עלמות שיר	46
למנצח לבני־קרח מזמור	47
שיר מזמור לבני־קרח	48
למנצח לבני־קרח מזמור	49

The same holds for the second “Korahite” group, which appears in the Third Book:

למנצח על־הגתית לבני־קרח מזמור	84
למנצח לבני־קרח מזמור	85
לבני־קרח מזמור שיר (יִסֻּדְתּוֹ בְּהִרְרִי־קֶדֶשׁ)	87**
שיר מזמור לבני־קרח למנצח על־מחלת לענות משכיל להימן האזרחי	88***

\* Ps. 43 untitled, has “refrain” in common with Ps. 42, and is conjoint with it in LXX.

\*\* Title 86 *tefillah le-dawid*; Ps. 86 is extremely late, practically *hôdayôt*-like!

\*\*\* An agglomeration of two or more titles.

The Asaphite group (titles 50 and 73-83) shows no perturbations of this kind, even though it is not perfectly regular either (especially for the relative placement of *šîr*). All the rest can again be fitted into the scheme established by the titles in the First Book, with occasional changes between adjacent emplacements.

An overall perspective of the situation is given in our Analytical Table II. Its graphic arrangement distinguishes five slots or columns, which turn out to be the maximum needed. The additional components found in the mainstream Greek tradition (LXX) have also been included there, in square brackets. They are seen to be later additions, fitted into the Hebrew

*Vorlage.* The Versions' translations of what is found in the Hebrew text confirm the "regular" and "divergent" sequences we have just observed. Minor discrepancies can be laid to the account of vagaries in the manuscript traditions (Pietersma 1980 on "David in the Greek Psalms" demonstrates the difficulties of an attempt to deal even with a single term). As for the evidence from Qumran: the only surprise until now comes from 4QPs<sup>a</sup> where Ps. 33, untitled in MT, has the title *le-dawîd šîr mizmôr*. This sequence has no exact parallel elsewhere<sup>34</sup>. But the surprise diminishes when we notice that most of the titles featuring *šîr* are in some way "irregular" (see below).

The five columns of the Analytical Table have been set up according to the pattern established by the majority of titles in the First, Fourth and Fifth Books. An empty cell (marked by a long dash) signalizes that the "expected" category of component is not represented in that particular title; if it does appear in the Greek tradition, it is noted within square brackets. As already remarked, the titles in the Second and Third Books diverge from the pattern; *but they do not show a truly consistent pattern of their own*. Some divergences also appear in the Fourth and Fifth Books, but there it is mostly a matter of *mizmôr le-dawîd* versus *le-dawîd mizmôr* in a title that has no other components. All told there are 26 titles that cannot be fitted automatically into the given sequence of columns. Such a title has been fitted in by transposition; the actual sequence of its components is indicated by an arrow. It thus becomes easy to see whether, and how far, a consistent pattern or several patterns exist in the corpus of titles. The data must still be processed for significance, since the optical impression or even simple counts may be misleading. This has already been done, but only at a low level of statistical sophistication. For the present a discursive description of the more immediately striking results is all that is needed.

(1) *LMNZH* consistently occupies the first place. It never appears alone. Although it occurs 54 times, i.e. in almost half of the titles, there is a high variability in what follows after *LMNZH*. The situation does *not* fit what one could expect if *LMNZH* were the opening term of a longer formulaic expression (as we find assumed almost constantly in the literature).

34. Ps. 32 has not yet been found in the Qumran material. Ps. 33:1-12 also appears in 4QPs<sup>a</sup>, following upon Ps. 31, but the manuscript has not yet been published. The information is taken from Sanders 1965.

(2) 29 titles have  ${}^c al-X$  or one of its congeners together with  $LMN\bar{Z}H$ , mostly adjacent. (That “ ${}^c al-X$  and congeners” are allo-functional, i.e. variables of one parameter, will be shown in detail in §4.3). However, in 25 other titles  $LMN\bar{Z}H$  is not co-incident with any member of this group.  $LMN\bar{Z}H$  and the “ ${}^c al-X$  group” were apparently not connected at all: the 29 co-incidences turn out to be below significance.

Already we may note that the sub-group of 7 x  $BNGYNT$  (in 61,  ${}^c L-NGYNT$ ) never appears in the 11 titles that feature *li-venê qorah*, and only appears once in the 12 titles that feature *le-asaf* (in 76). The  ${}^c al-X$  expression proper appears four times among the eleven Korahite titles (45, 46, 84, ?88). Among the twelve Asaphite titles, three have members of the  ${}^c al-X$  group of the “divergent” class (75  $'L-T\check{S}HT$ , 77  ${}^c L-YDYTWN$ , 80  $'L-\check{S}\check{S}NYM$  or  $'L-\check{S}\check{S}NYM {}^c DWT$ ), and only one has a “normal” form – 81  ${}^c L-HGTYT$ .

(3) *Mizmôr*, *maskîl* and *miḳtam*, plus a few sporadic terms, form another allo-functional group. A significant association is only observable with respect to *le-dawid*. *Miḳtam* slightly tends to appear after and not before the “author’s name”.

(4) *Le-dawid* tends to appear at the end of the title. In 13 titles this is followed by a circumstantial ascription from the Davidic biography, leaving 60 *le-dawid* without it.

(5) *Šîr* occurs in two distinct ways.

(a) The compound *šîr ham-ma ${}^c$ alôt* occurs fifteen times, in titles 120-134 *en bloc*. The four additions of *le-dawid* here (not in contiguous psalms) and the one of *li-šelomoh* must be evaluated within the general analysis of this group (see §6.3[b] below). They are probably later than the main title, i.e. *šîr ham-ma ${}^c$ alôt* as such.

(b) The remaining fifteen titles that feature *šîr* are extremely heterogeneous. *Le-dawid* only occurs there four times (of its 73 occurrences all told). For the eleven Korahite titles the co-incident with *šîr* is much higher – five times. It is somewhat less marked for the twelve Asaphite titles – three times. The expected strong association with the group of 29  ${}^c al-X$  and congeners does not materialize: there are only five co-incidences. We also notice that in these (45, 46, 67, 75, 76) *šîr* does not appear adjacent to the  ${}^c al-X$  component. Two of them are Korahite (45, 46) and two are Asaphite (75, 76, with  $'L-T\check{S}HT$  and  $BNGYNT$  respectively). In eight of

the fifteen cases *šîr* stands at the end of the title but in the rest no other regularity of emplacement seems discernible.

The expected strong association between *šîr* and *mizmôr* does not materialize. The 56 occurrences of *mizmôr* and 30 occurrences of *šîr* coincide only in 13 titles. Within these 13 titles, the sequence *mizmôr*—*šîr* occurs five times, *šîr*—*mizmôr* five times, and three times a name intervenes (65 *m. le-dawid* š.; 75 and 76 *m. le-asaf* š.). Nor is there an association between *šîr* and *LMNZH*; of the 54 titles that have *LMNZH*, only 8 also have *šîr* (adding title 30, where some of the versions indicate *LMNZH*, does not improve the situation). Further conclusions about *šîr* will be attempted in §5 (relationship between titling-term and psalm text). For the present we see already that there is no *significant association* between *šîr* and most of the other terms within its title<sup>35</sup>.

Indeed, the number of truly significant associations and presumable correlations seems to be surprisingly low. Irrespective of the ostensible numbers of incidence and co-incidence, the statistical analysis gives a high probability of significance only to the following: *mizmôr* and *le-dawid*; *mizmôr* and *le-asaf*; similarly *maskîl*..., *miḳtam*...; and 'L-TŠHT and *miḳtam*.

The relative positions of the components within the title are fixed as concerns *LMNZH* (first), the 'al-X and-congeners group (second), and the situational ascriptions to David (last). Within the three remaining "slots" there are vacillations, especially after the end of the First Book. The fact that the titles vary considerably in the number of components has sometimes been remarked, and now becomes more easily observable with the help of our Table. How far they vary in content – can obviously not be assessed just by computing the number of verbally different components against the number of titles. Two factors intervene: allo-functional terms (with varying constraints for each class), and the relationship between titling-components and psalm genres<sup>36</sup>.

35. A conclusion which the Jewish reader will find difficult to stomach, being habituated to *mizmôr šîr le-yôm haš-šabbat*.

36. Gunkel's *Gattungen* are decidedly not usable for such a task, at least not as in Gunkel's original scheme – first of all because his category of "mixture genre" is too large. The new approach outlined by Kraus (1978<sup>5</sup>:36 ff) seems much more realistic. On computations of this kind see Barber 1974; page references can hardly be given, since the entire book informs the present discussion throughout.

Since the Psalter is not a one-time production and not even a one-time collection, it stands to reason that the titles, too, are the outcome of several titling-actions on distinct collections. We can envisage a variety of situations, including changes in the functional meaning of a titling term. But none of the comparable bodies of material and/or traditions (from ancient Mesopotamia to recent Europe) seems to show a truly similar picture. Such an alternation of rigidity and variability, both in the contents of the titles and in the sequences of their components, also does not comport with any of the currently accepted hypotheses about the “growth of the Psalter”. It does not do so even if we take into account that the “growth” is not linear but only a trajectory which we draw by hindsight (and in faint outline); that even the collections discernible in the First to Third Books have later interpolations; and that the Fourth and Fifth Books were apparently “open ended” (and not “Books” proper) until shortly before the canonization of the present Psalter in the first century CE<sup>37</sup>. There is an anomaly here, and in §4.4 a hypothesis will be put forward to explain it.

### 4.3 The five titling parameters

The Analytical Table has been set up by aligning the components of the titles, taking care to have the irregularities show as clearly as the regularities. In this way we obtain five columns, i.e. five parameters of the titling phenomenon (numbered I-V in the Table). The titles of the First Book establish a certain sequence of parameters which turns out to be valid for most of the titles, with the set of Korahite titles a clear exception.

The definitions of “cause/purpose of the composition” emplace themselves constantly in parameter V, at the end of the title. Within this parameter, the group of thirteen situational ascriptions to David stands out, and within this group itself – the eleven ascriptions formulated by an identical pattern: this parameter has variables, and one of them has sub-variables. Parameter IV, “personal name”, is similar. Its variables are: a) the *le-dawid* group, *le-asaf* group, a few *li-šēlomoh* and *le-mošeh*, one *hēman* and one *ētan*, all falling more-or-less regularly in the fourth place of the sequence; b) the group *li-venē qorah* that tends to fall in the third place. The compound expressions with *yedūtūn* (or similar) do not emplace

37. A comparison with the “cultural phylogenetic trees” pictured in Clarke 1968:147 (and the surrounding discussion) is instructive here, not the least because of the *dissimilarities* with our own situation.

themselves in this category (see titles 39, 62, 77): they fall in the second place. Sub-variables are not noticeable here, except if we consider *le-<sup>c</sup>eved YHWH le-dawid* as being of this kind (titles 18 and 36). Parameter III has to comprise the “genre terms” *mizmôr*, *miḳtam*, *maskîl*, *šîr*, etc. They are the variables here, and appear either singly or in pairs with *šîr*, in no clear internal order. Parameter II is established by the 29 occurrences of *‘al-X* and what are now seen to be its “allo-forms”, i.e. presumably forms that have a similar function<sup>38</sup>. The *‘al-X* expressions are a sub-variable with their own sub-(sub) variables; the forms with  $\sqrt{NGN}$  are another sub-variable, but their internal variations are apparently corrupteles. *’L-TŠHT* is still another group, with no internal variation. The picture of an identical distribution is clear: the one exception in title 6 (*BNGYNWT ’L-HŠMYNYT*), is recognizable as an anomaly<sup>39</sup>.

Parameter I is the exceptional one: it is occupied by *LMNṢH* only, always in the first place and with no other term emplaceable here. This parameter has no variables, i.e. the class of *LMNṢH* is a unit-class. There are no possibilities of specifying various “kinds of *LMNṢH*”, and hence the term must belong to a different conceptual field than all the others.

The outcome of this analysis of titling-parameters and their variables should be compatible with the other analyses, and all of them together should be compatible with the picture of a normal corpus of titles – even if we assume that these titles were not composed at one time and may reflect various “fashions”. But a disturbing conclusion now begins to emerge: in most cases the only relationship between the titling-components is that of internal sequence. There is a large measure of order in the way the kinds of components (“parameters”) follow upon each other in the titles; but there is hardly any significant correlation between them. The exceptions, as already mentioned, are *le-dawid/mizmôr* (resp. *miḳtam* or *maskîl*), and *le-asaf/mizmôr* (similarly). A specimen analysis for testing *le-dawid-LMNṢH* is given here in the Appendix, after §6.4; its outcome is that the two terms have no significant correlation. The same holds for the group of *‘al-X* and congeners, with respect to *LMNṢH* and to everything else

38. The term “allo-forms” is taken from Barber 1974, ch. X ‘Alternation and co-occurrence’, especially p. 146. Our scrutiny of the sequence of terms in the titles, and the columnar tabulation, corresponds to the search of the “environment” described there. Our task is not a decipherment of an unknown language and/or script, but the problems are basically similar.

39. On complementary, identical, inclusive and overlapping distributions, see Barber 1974:57-59.

(except for some signs of a correlation with *li-venê qorah*). Equally puzzling is the picture of our table of distributions within the corpus (see in §4.1) when this is set against the situation we have just defined.

The possibility should be weighed that the method of analysis adopted here is unsuitable, or that it is suitable but has not been carried out correctly. But there is another possibility as well: that some premise which has hitherto been unquestioned might in fact be wrong. The first two possibilities do not seem to weigh too gravely. But there is a premise here that has not been questioned, and looks too self-evident to be questioned at all: the premise that such a title is a normal title, i.e. a coherent titling-statement (not exactly “statement”) formulated for a psalm, with such components as the author or editor chose for reasons of function and fashion. The outcomes of our analyses do not fit this premise, and it must be asked – strange as it seems – whether some other situation is conceivable that could have yielded what we find here.

#### 4.4 From width to depth: the parameters as strata

A high measure of sequential regularity, together with a low measure of significant relationships between the sequenced phenomena is typical when the sequence is due to *historical stratification*. What we observe in the titles seems to be analogous to a conspectus of the *tells* in a region with a long and variegated history of settlement, such as one finds throughout the Near East. Not every *tell* will have all the period-strata represented: early abandonment or late settlement curtail the expected sequence at the outer edges of the possible range, and there can also be occupation-gaps in the middle.

This image of a layer-cake is never perfectly realized in an actual *tell*. Nor do we find it in the titles: the Korahite titles are analogous to a “disturbed stratum” (and also to the limited settlement of a population with very peculiar characteristics). In sum: what now looks like one (horizontal) settlement – the complex title as we see it – is in most cases an accumulation of diverse settlement-strata, i.e. titling actions, over a considerable length of time. The difference between a *tell* and a title is that a *tell* grows only in one direction, upwards, so that the general result is “the lower – the earlier”. In a title, just as in any tradited text (written or oral) additions can be made anywhere. The various analyses carried out previously, and the one that will be attempted in §5 (relationships between titling-components and psalm texts), seem to indicate that *LMNZH* was an addition



“at the bottom”, i.e. at the beginning of the existing title. The other components accrued more-or-less in the order of their present sequence, with the situational Davidic ascriptions (parameter V) as the last titling-action before the onset of textual canonization.

Our hypothesis assumes, then, that later titling actions were imposed on existing psalms-with-titles as well as on new psalms. Whether a certain category of titling-component, or several such categories, were removed at a subsequent editorial stage is not discernible now. The only category that one could think of here is that of the scribe's signature (cf. the titles of the Ugarit scores, and the Mesopotamian colophons) on an archival copy.

What has been proposed here as a hypothesis is of course directly visible in the LXX: the Greek tradition adds further titling-components to the ones that already existed in the Hebrew. This is not proper proof that the same practice has been observed again and again in earlier periods; the true proof would be a lucky find of a collection of psalm-texts from, say, the 8th century BCE. The present writer dares not prophesy what the chances are of finding it: they seem rather low.

## 5. SECOND ANALYSIS: TITLE AND TEXT

For the functional meaning of each titling-component we have as yet hardly more information than what can be extracted from the psalm-texts themselves. The hypothesis that certain titling-components were originally subscripts, demands that we test for title-text correlations “backwards” as well as “forwards”. However, since we must assume that the sequences of the psalm-units have been disturbed (perhaps several times), a mechanical backwards-test is also not to be depended on. The matter of doublets, joins, splits, and interpolations makes for further complications. It is therefore no wonder that the attempt by Thirtle (1905<sup>2</sup>) to apply the subscript-hypothesis mechanically did not yield a convincing solution. In the end he himself justified his results by etymologizing in the old exegetical tradition. Sawyer (1968) rightly emphasized that the titles must be related to the psalm-texts, but his comparisons of “context” and titling-term again rest too much on etymologizations.

Our analytical experiment here has been carried out in a different way, not only by avoiding etymologization *a priori* or *a posteriori* but also by going beyond the making of lists and card-indexes. The computer does not yet come in at this point, however. Those readers who have already had

some contact with this domain will remember the famous acronymic adage GIGO (Garbage In – Garbage Out). What will be described in the following was planned as a precursor procedure. The actual computerization will be done in the second stage of the project, to refine what is now seen in outline. In accordance with the demand that experiments be repeatable, the procedure will be described in detail.

The data-vehicle was a set of feature-cards, ruled in 1 cm squares. As in the peek-a-boo system, each square is numbered and represents a correspondingly numbered unit in the corpus, here the Psalter. All known or suspected breaks in the continuity of a present psalm-unit were uniformly entered as “splits”: the count of (synthetic) units comes to 168. Thus, e.g., two adjacent squares were assigned to Ps. 19 (“The heavens declare”), and numbered 19A and 19B. The large squares made it possible to add written information, such as to mark clearly that 40B=70, that 14=53 (conversely 53=14), and that 108A=50B, 108B=60B (see also in the Analytical Table). Margins between the rows of squares retain this information even if a square is cut out. The division into “basic units” did not consider minor interpolations. The boundaries of the Books were also marked on the cards. Each feature to be tested was assigned one such card (“feature card”), and its occurrence marked by cutting out the appropriate squares.

For each of the titling-components two cards were made, one for the superscript position and one for the subscript position – inevitably by mechanical shiftback. Thus, for the superscript position the first *LMNZH* comes at square 3, but for the subscript position it is marked as square 2 (“titling Ps. 2”). Cards were prepared for the *‘al-X* group as a whole, and for each of its sub-groups separately, again two ways each time. Feature-cards were made separately for *šîr* and *šîr ham-ma‘alôt*, as well as for both together (differentiated by the shape of the cut-out, see below). The “zero-titles” i.e. untitled psalms were also reckoned as a titling feature.

For the psalm-texts themselves a list of significant features was made, and these too were given cards and marked by cut-outs. Here the large format made it possible to assign one card to a general feature but make the cut-outs in different shapes for the variables. An example is the feature “bodies of water” with different cut-out shapes for *yam*, *yammîm*, *nahar*, *neharôt*, *naḥal*; alternatively – *yam* and *yammim* only, with a different shape for “in context of the Exodus” (explicit!). For the titling-components, and for *selah*, a different shape indicated LXX occurrence only. The

method has several obvious advantages over edge-notched or internally slotted cards selected by passing-through a needle, and also over the usual peek-a-boo card with tiny holes that read-out no more than the binary information present/absent.

The text features tested were as follows:

- J/E; *elyôn* separately; *šem*; Divinity as king;
- Four generalized periods, from “very old” to “very late”, pseudo-archaisms and presumed later redactions marked;
- Complaint in first person singular;
- “High Festivity” (generally with exordium calling to praise);
- *Selah*; *šîr ḥadaš*; *šîr*;  $\sqrt{ZMR}$  (in text);  $\sqrt{HLL}$  in text;
- Musical instruments (mainly *kinnôr* and *nevel*);
- Earthly king/anointment;
- Terms for sanctuary and sacrifice (differentiated);
- Jerusalem/Zion (interpolations marked);
- Sacred mountain (separately!); sea, sing. & plural, other bodies of water (explicit references to Exodus – separate);
- “Northern” features (topographical/Joseph, Jacob, Israel, Ephraim; note for Ps. 78 ‘against Ephraim’);
- destruction; exile; return;
- “Davidica” in text;
- *Po‘alê awen/awen* alone;
- *Ḥasîd/ḥasîdim*;
- Alphabetical acrostics;
- Psalm-of-the-Day (weekdays by LXX and Mishna, and the Sabbath-Psalm 92);
- For the Asaphite psalms especially: the word *erez*.

The feature-cards of the titling-components were also compared among themselves. As explained above, each such component had to have two cards, one registering it as a superscript, and the other – as the subscript of the preceding unit. For any pair of titling-components, three tests had thus to be made: X-super against Y-super; X-super against Y-sub; X-sub against Y-super. (X-sub : Y-sub is redundant). A few tests with more than two apposed features were also made. All co-incidences, and also the apparent mutual exclusions, were evaluated statistically for significance.

As already stated, this “manual” testing of the data was originally intended to prepare them for computerization. The reader who might blench at the effort described should remember that this was necessary in any case: nothing would have been achieved by pouring the 150 given psalm units and the dozens of criteria (titling-terms and text features) into the computer’s maw without a thorough preliminary processing.

For reasons of space it is not possible to set out the results in detail here. They have been incorporated into the synthesis that will be presented in the following and last chapter, thus concluding the first stage of the project.

## 6. A TENTATIVE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE TITLING PROCESS

Some cautions must be prefaced to what follows, especially in view of the neat sequence of nine strata ostensibly propounded by the paper’s table of contents. The discussion itself will show again and again that our model claims only a limited liability. The grouping into three overall stages is fairly secure, especially at the boundaries: *‘al-X* is apparently the very oldest element, *LMNZH* “seals” the early stage, *le-dawid* the middle stage, and the situational ascriptions to David – the last stage (as concerns MT). Within each stage the elements are discussed in a certain order; but the situation is shown to be more complex than a mechanical sequence of “strata”. Some titling actions may well be contemporary and not successive; this is especially noticeable in the last stage: *šîr* and *šîr ham-ma<sup>c</sup>alôt* stand together against the entirely different purpose of the situational Davidic ascriptions, and may be contemporary with them. If there are no indications in favour of a simple situation – a one-time titling action with an exclusive term (as in *šîr ham-ma<sup>c</sup>alôt*) – we must assume the more natural complex situation, as known from better-documented historical cases. There will be the precursors (emerging as such by hindsight), sporadic and loosely structured. Then comes the central cluster, pre-eminent in quantity, tightly structured, and highly homogeneous. Last comes the tapering-off period, with the appearance of epigones and imitations that obey the letter but not the spirit of the phenomenon when it was in its heyday. The same also holds for a possible fourth stage: that of “renaissance” and fabrication (differing in intent but not in outcome...). By its very nature, this needs a considerable passage of time after the original *floruit* (including its tapering-off period), and a significant gap in cultural

The reconstructed chronology of the titling-process is largely a relative one. There are not enough clear indications to furnish the pegs that could make the chronology absolute. At the most there are a few patches that can coincide with an area on the historical map. The earliest of these coinciding patches centers on the fall of the Northern Kingdom (722/21 BCE). The next comprises the last period of the Judean monarchy (with the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah), ending formally with the fall of Jerusalem (587 BCE). The third is that stage of consolidation after the Return (fifth-fourth centuries BCE) into which the work of the Chronicler can be placed. All these furnish some terminus relevant to a group, sub-group or class of titling-components. The application will have to be doubly cautious, since changes could have occurred in the placement of a title by the rearrangement and re-copying of a titled group of psalms within some later editorial effort. Indeed, "editing the Psalter" is an illusory formulation: the present MT Psalter is the outcome of a complex trajectory of events in time and place which, for the most part, were never really linear.

## 6.1 The early stages

About thirty components form this subgroup, by their location within the present conspectus of titles. It seems that they fall into two secondary categories.

(1) על-הגתית (8, 81, 84). – על-השמינית (12, and conglomerated with (80), אל-ששנים ערות, (69), על-ששנים (45), על-ששנים (6). in בנגינת (60) though possibly ערות is a component by itself. – על-עלמות (46), עלמות לכן (9, possibly with ל-כן as a relic of some personal attribution) and perhaps also the על-מות at the end of Ps. 48 as the relic of a subscript. – על-מחלת לענות, (53) על-מחלת (88, in a conglomerate). – Presumably also על-הנחילות (5). – על-יונת אלם רחקים (56). – לידינות (39) and על-ידינות (77), על-ידינות (62), על-אילת השחר (22). – על-אילת השחר (22), in spite of the designation of 'יירות' as one of the Davidic singers in Chronicles and Nehemia (I Chron. 9:16; 16:38-41; 25:1-6. II Chron. 5:12;

29:14; 33:15. Neh. 11:17). – Presumably also אֶל-הַשָּׁחַת (57, 58, 59, 75), if אֶל here is of the same kind as that in אֶל-הַנְּחִילֹת.

(2) בְּנִינֹת (4), בְּנִינָה (54, 55, 67, 76); also in the conglomerate בְּנִינֹת עַל-הַשְּׁמִינִית (6); and עַל-נִינָה (61) which may be a corruptele in itself or the relic of a conglomerate.

The overall impression is that of a considerably damaged state. It is even difficult to discern which forms are the intact ones and which have undergone corruption. The external sources are in the same state. In Habakkuk 3 there is לַמִּנְצָה בְּנִינֹת at the end, and עַל-שְׁנִינֹת as part of the present heading. At the end of the "Letter of Hezekiah" (מִכְתָּב) in Isaiah 38, וְנִינֹת raises the suspicion of a subscript-relic because of the highly unclear form of the verse (consult the added section in the Analytical Table, featuring the Habakkuk and Isaiah quotations).

Two terms from the first category-grouping also appear in Chronicles, in the Temple *agenda* which the writer declares to have already been ordained by David:

I Chron. 15:20-21

זֹכְרִיהָ וְעִזְיָאֵל וְשִׁמְרֹמוֹת . . . בְּנִבְלִים עַל-עֲלֻמוֹת: וּמִתְחִיָּהּ וְאֵלִיפֶלֶהּ וּמִקְנִיָּהּ  
וְעֶבֶד אָדָם . . . בְּכִנּוּרֹת עַל-הַשְּׁמִינִית לַנִּצָּח:

Such a combination of titling-terms with the names of instruments never appears in the titles themselves, nor in the psalm-texts themselves (where the instrument *kinnôr* and *nevel* do appear), nor anywhere else in the Bible. The phenomenon is highly suspect, not as a corruptele but as its obverse: the choice of a term which was already obscure in the Chronicler's time, to furnish the convincing patina of High Antiquity. The assumption that this sub-group of expressions ('*al-X* etc.) is indeed the oldest stratum of the titling process, fortunately does not depend on the *locus* in Chronicles, since this would lead us into a circular argument (old because misunderstood/misunderstood because old). One consideration of high age has already been offered: the damaged state of these expressions in the psalm-titles themselves. Further considerations will come up as we continue to search for other characteristics.

The sub-group of categories (1) and (2) appears within the present conspectus of titles in the second position (second titling-parameter), after לַמִּנְצָה. It is found only in the First, Second and Third Books, and there, too, not in the opening and closing psalms of the book. There seem to be strong indications that the original placement of these expressions was at

the end of the textual unit, i.e. that they were subscripts. Habakkuk 3 features a member of this class as a presumable subscript. Further subscript-placements are suggested by the endings of Ps. 48 and of the "Letter of Hezekiah", and by the appearance of a member of the group in the conglomerate now found at the head of Ps. 88. If this is assumed, *עלמות לכן* might be removed from the present heading of Ps. 9 and assigned as the subscript of a preceding psalm (Ps. 8?). The result is that now all the acrostical psalms (late!) either remain untitled or are left with titling-components which we consider as very late – *le-dawid*, *mizmôr*, *tehillah* (and *hallelûyah*). Similarly *על-שונים* (למנוצח) would now detach itself from Ps. 69, which is a relatively late textual composite, and could be re-attached as a subscript to Ps. 68 which is unquestionably archaic. When we have at least two consecutive psalms with such titling-components, the experiment of an overall back-shift can be tried. This yields a group of psalms which indeed does not contain any that are considered as late ones. Because of the presumable discontinuities in the present sequence of the texts it is preferable to leave this as a suggestion. A tabulated "demonstration" would imply a greater certainty than what the situation allows.

The entire class has a strong positive correlation with the textual category of "Elohistic" psalms. In the present configuration of the title a member of this class is always preceded by *למנוצח*. However, *למנוצח* appears in 26 titles without being followed by such an expression. This is one of the considerations for taking *למנוצח* to belong to a somewhat later stage of the titling process; the full discussion of this term will be carried out in §6.1[c].

Another characteristic is the ending in *גנינת, אילת, יונת, נחילות: ת* and perhaps also *עדות* and *תשחת*. The compounds *מחלת, עלמות* and *אילת השחר* and *יונת אלם* might therefore not be the simple genitives which we habitually take them to be. Even for *אל תשחת* the ostensive *al-as-negation* begins to weaken<sup>40</sup>. There is a distinct linguistic and hence cultural feature in the *ת*-ending, and it seems to point to a northern provenience. Consequently this class of expressions could be proposed as originating prior to the fall of the Northern Kingdom, i.e. at the latest near the end of the 8th century BCE<sup>41</sup>. The misuse of the terminology in

40. On the alternation of *על/אל*, see Hurvitz 1972:22, note 25, and Cohen (A.) 1970, already mentioned in §4.1 above.

41. Caution is demanded here. Perhaps the most cautious definition would be "at any rate not late Jerusalemite".



I Chron. 15 (by “the Chronicler” or by “the Chronicler’s editor”) thus becomes understandable. Whether the writer/editor was a descendant of a pre-exilic clan of singers or of a group that constituted itself in Jerusalem after the Return – he could not be expected to know precisely what these expressions had meant so long ago. At least one can hardly presume that he knew but his readers did not; this would mean a very peculiar kind of literary imposture<sup>42</sup>.

What, then, is the meaning of this class of terms? Curt Sachs (1940: 126-127) already suggested that the obscure and seemingly poetical formulation of the ‘*al*-X expressions had an analogue: the names of the melodic “recipes” current in the Near and Middle East to this day, of the type called *maqām* in Arabic, *dastgah* in Persian, and *raga* in Indian usage. The subscripts of the newly discovered notations from Ugarit and their Mesopotamian prototypes (see above, §1.4) also offer an analogue: the prefixed term ŠA seems to have a function quite similar to ‘*al* (“of the”/“pertaining to”).

A reservation must however be made. In all the cases just mentioned, the collections of texts that are to be sung according to the “recipe” are arranged in an orderly sequence by sub-groups with a common specific *maqām* (or its analogue), often as full *maqām* cycles. We can term this the *diwān* principle. In the present collection of the Psalms it is not possible to discern even faint traces of such an arrangement in the conspectus of titles that have the ‘*al*-X expression. A total re-shuffling, whether deliberate or accidental, can hardly be assumed. The more simple conclusion is that an orderly sequence never existed. It is therefore preferable to look for analogues in a musical culture whose level of musico-theoretical sophistication is somewhat lower than that of the “maqāmic society”. When Gustaf Dalman collected the ethnopoehty of the Arabic-speaking peasantry in (the present) Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Israel, he found there a store of terms for standard poetical-cum-musical forms, which he proposed as analogues to the psalm-titles. It is best to quote him literally (Dalman 1901:XVII-XVIII). Dalman’s page-references to the specimens featured in his anthology are here replaced by dotted gaps.

“Gewisse Reimworte der Refrainverse sind typisch geworden, und haben den danach gedichteten Liedern den Namen gegeben. Man redet deshalb von Liedern “auf [= ‘*ala*] Me‘anna’..., ‘auf Mēgāna’..., ‘auf Hnaijena’..., ‘auf

42. “Pseudepigraphy” is not appropriate (see note 55).



*Mūlaija'...., 'auf Māni'...., 'auf Zenu'...., 'auf Jā Hwedeli'.... Das sind nicht Liedgattungen, sondern Dichtungen nach dem Modell eines bestimmten Liedes, dessen Melodie und Liedreim dabei übernommen wurde, sodass 'auf Mūlaija' Musterlied und Melodie gleichzeitig bezeichnet<sup>1</sup>.*

[footnote 1] Diese doppelte Bedeutung haben gewiss auch die Psalmenüberschriften, soweit sie nicht Angaben des Autors oder des Begleitinstruments enthalten. Der Wortsinn wird dabei ebenso gleichgültig sein wie bei den arabischen Bezeichnungen, deren Sinn den orientalischen Sängern oft dunkel und stets gleichgültig ist. Es genügt ihnen, dass sie wissen, was für eine Dichtungsart durch 'Atāba, Mauwāl, 'Ala Mūlaija oder Bardu bezeichnet wird.

Dalman's observations have only rarely been cited in the subsequent literature on the psalm-titles, nor has the subject been followed up for its intrinsic musical interest until very recently<sup>43</sup>.

The structural information yielded by our Analytical Table makes it probable that *bi-neginot* is equi-functional with the 'al-*X* expressions. By the many appearances of  $\sqrt{\text{NGN}}$  in the Psalms and elsewhere in the Bible, we may conclude that this is a musical term. It should be noted that the contexts of these appearances do *not* confirm  $\sqrt{\text{NGN}}$  as referring to the playing of an instrument but to *singing*; further on this, see in §6.2[b] below, anent *mizmôr*.

The overall conclusion is thus that the (now) second parameter of the titles, comprising 'al-*X* and *bi-neginot*, is directly connected with the musical rendition of the psalm-text. *Bi-neginot* might be a less constrained technical term, perhaps even a simpler substitute for the technical 'al-*X* expression. More than this cannot be ascertained at present. In the Analytical Table there are indications where the verbal content of a psalm seems to show some relationship to the verbal meaning of the second term of the 'al-*X* expression (as already mentioned in §1.1 above). But here we come too dangerously close to etymologizing, and it is preferable to leave the matter thus, as no more than a suggestion.

43. Wohlenberg discusses Dalman (pp. 389-391) but does not trace subsequent references to his suggestion. Shiloah (1974) compared Dalman's inventory of genres with his own fieldwork observations. Only two of the 'al/'ala terms, resp. genres, re-appear in his list (pp. 271-278). He has now informed me that the 1974 comparison should not be taken to mean that the missing genres have disappeared. As emphasized in the study as well, the subject needs to be explored by further field-work.

## [b] לבני קרח

The “sons of Korah” appear in eleven titles, divided into two groups. In the Second Book the Korahite group follows upon Ps. 50 titled *le-asaf*, and comprises seven titles: 42, 44-49. Ps. 43 is untitled and probably continuous with Ps. 42 (see the double refrains). In the Third Book the Korahite group appears after eleven *le-asaf* titles (73-83). Here it comprises four titles: 84, 85, 87, 88. Title 86 is *le-dawid*, and title 88 is an agglomeration of two or three titles, one of which mentions Heman the Ezrahite (title 89 has Ethan the Ezrahite). We notice that the structures of the Korahite titles are somehow divergent from the general scheme (see the Analytical Table). They do not show a consistent scheme of their own, except for the fact that *li-venê qorah* tends to appear in the fourth “slot”, unlike *le-dawid* and also *le-asaf* (!) whose place is generally in the fifth “slot”. The correlation with *šîr* seems significant, and becomes even higher if we take only Books Two and Three as the corpus. The correlation with *‘al-X* (specifically) stands on the boundary between plausible and probable. At any rate none of the *b.q.* titles has *BNGYNT/‘L-NGYNT*.

As for the psalm-texts themselves. The first Korahite group is “Elohistic”, the second is “Yahwistic”. There is a strong thematic consistency in the overall group. This becomes even stronger if we assume the Korahite designation to have been a *subscript* originally. Ps. 42 (plus 43) is situated at an interface (after the doxology that closes Book One). Its title *LMNZĤ maskîl l-b.q.* is “too normal” in comparison with the others. It could have been a later normalizing doubling of title 44 *LMNZĤ l-b.q. maskîl*. (Note: Ps. 41 begins *ašrê maskîl el-dal*!) At the end of the group, title 49 now heads a sapiental homily quite outside the thematics and language of the Korahite group. (Note: the *kinnôr* in Ps. 49:5 might be a corruptele!) If we assign title 49 to Ps. 48 – which ends with the enigmatic *‘L-MWT* – the discrepancy vanishes. *Mizmôr* there is probably a later addition (see §6.2[b] below). Ps. 49 is again at an interface, sharing it with the complex *asaf*-psalm 50. In the second group, the situation is less certain for the first title (84). But we notice that Ps. 85 is a Psalm of the Return – and the Korahites were *not* among the returnees (note the late idioms in the text, especially v. 6 *le-dor wa-dor*; cf. Hurvitz 1972:73). The following Ps. 86 shows that a second interface situation exists here (title *tefillah le-dawid*; text very late, practically in *hôdayôt* style). Hence title 87 is again problematic. Ps. 87 is comprehensible with difficulty; its ending is incomprehensible, and title 88 is a jumble. We notice that the ending of Ps. 87

contains *KHLLYM* and *M<sup>c</sup>YNY*, and that the second part of title 88 is *‘L-MHLT L<sup>c</sup>NWT*. The thematics of the “Korahite psalms” are set out by Buss (1963) and need not be repeated here (Wanke’s postulation of a formal “Zionstheologie” [1966] is generally not accepted, nor is his late dating of the Korahite psalms).

A thorough discussion of the Korahite titles must involve the “Korahite problem” in its entirety (see Liver 1968, via index; Miller 1970; concise survey Loewenstamm 1976). Since the Korahites do not appear as singers after the Return, one must ask where they were and what they were doing in the earlier period. That a sizable part was settled in the South appears from the list of Levitic cities (Joshua 21, approximately similar I Chron. 6; the “Kehatites” apparently include the Korahites). Concrete evidence now comes from the excavation of the sanctuary at Arad which yielded a list of names on an ostrakon, including *BNY QRH*. Several other names on the ostrakon are also relatable to known priestly, Levitic (singers/others) and Nethinitic names. The ostrakon comes from a building of stratum VIII, close to the entrance of the sanctuary; it dates from near the end of the 8th century BCE, a few generations before the Josianic reform in ca. 621 BCE closed the Arad sanctuary (a perfectly legitimate one, during the time it was allowed to function!)<sup>44</sup>.

It stands to reason that in an extra-Jerusalemite sanctuary, wherever there were Korahite singers, their repertoire would not have had to be designated thus explicitly as “of the Korahites”. The Korahite psalms often have a Jerusalemite emphasis – though not always, and not always for certain in the core-text. Some of them might be new compositions, perfervid in their praise of Jerusalem, made by Korahites after they had found employment there. Others might have been from the old repertoire, with suitable adaptations. A cautious dating can be attempted, for *li-venê qorah* alone or perhaps together with *šîr*: during or slightly after the reign of Josiah (ca. 640-609 BCE) but then surely before the fall of Jerusalem in 587 BCE. When the priests “from Geva to Beersheba” came to the sanctuary at Jerusalem (II Kings 23:8-9), the singers could have come with them and found employment there (not being “priests”; cf. II Kings 23:9).

44. Publication of the ostrakon Aharoni 1975:82-85 (inscription 49). To the parallels listed by Aharoni add: *BNY KNYHW* – cf. *KNNYHW* the “chief singer” (a Yizharite, i.e. Korahite), I Chron. 15:22, etc.; *BN GLGL* – cf. *GLL* (a Yedutunite), I Chron. 9:15-16 and Neh. 11:17, *‘BDYHW* – cf. *‘BD*, grandson of *GLL*, *ibid.*; *YHW<sup>c</sup>Z* – cf. *YW<sup>c</sup>ZR* the Korahite who joined David at Ziklag, I Chron. 12:7; *PDYH*, Levite, Neh. 13:13; *BNY ‘H* – cf. *‘HYH*, Levite, I Chron. 26:20.

Geva, in the Benjaminite area, is included in the list of Kehatite (= Korahite) Levitic cities. The alternative, for the Northern part of the Korahites' settlements, is not very much earlier: Samaria fell in 722/1 BCE. After the Return the Korahites reappear as gatekeepers, lorded over by the Asaphite singers (at least as reported by the Chronicler).

[Note: re Sarna 1979 see Postscript after Appendix]

[c] למנצח

The term *LMNZH* (in the following abbreviated *LM*.) now appears in 54 titles of the extant 117, close to 50%. Such a frequency is rivalled only by *mizmôr* (56 now) and surpassed only by *le-dawid* (73 all told, 60 without the added situational ascriptions). Its distribution can be seen in detail in Table I (§4.1 above). Macroscopically, it extends all over the First to Third Books, is absent in the Fourth Book, and makes only three sporadic appearances in the Fifth. Microscopically, the main stretch is seen not to be wholly continuous. The gaps are significant; they do not fall on psalms which have been designated as "pre-exilic" or at least as having a "pre-exilic" core-text. However: this negative correlation with "post-exilic" holds only, if we assume *LM*. to have been emplaced originally as a *subscript*. We also have to assume the three cases in Book Five as late imitations and superscripts (cf. the Psalms of Solomon mentioned in §1.4 above). If *LM*. is assumed as a superscript, for the main stretch, no correlation whatever appears for any of the elements tested, including the relative-approximative dating of the text. Some traces of a subscript position indeed seem to be still visible; these have already been discussed in §1.1 and §1.6 (end of Habakkuk 3 and end of Ps. 16).

A mechanical backshifting of each and every present *LM*. to the end of the preceding psalm would of course be futile; each case has to be investigated on its own, and in its own environment as it ultimately came to be. Thus, for instance, *LM. BNGYNWT* can be replaced, with caution, as the subscript to Ps. 3 (but not the later components *mizmôr le-dawid*). The entire present title of Ps. 3 also seems to be a subscript, though of a different provenience and date (see §6.3[c] below). At Ps. 4 there is a difficulty, since its backwards acrostic reads *BNR ZRWBBL* (a phenomenon long recognized). But the psalm has a divergent internal layer in verses 6-8 (after a *selah*!), a kind of harvest thanks-giving: the acrostic may be due to chance, (or contrived?); our presumed subscript, now at the head of Ps. 5

(*LM*. 'L-HNHYLWT) may be a relic from the earlier stage. At Ps. 9, if *LM*. °*LMWT LBN* is detached (not necessarily re-attached to the sapiental Ps. 8), this now leaves *all* the alphabetical acrostics (late!) without *LM*. in their headings. In title 30, the Hexapla adds *LM*. throughout (see Hex-Mercati I:31 and II:95; cf. remarks in Staerk 1892:102). This is strong evidence for the restitution of an early loss. But here *LM*., and perhaps also *mizmôr šîr hanukkat hab-bayit*, do not fit Ps. 30 as well as the preceding Ps. 29 with its Canaanite core-text or *Vorlage*; the *benê elîm* "scene" seems relatable to the Assembly of the Gods when the Ugaritic "elyôn"-Baal inaugurates his new palace<sup>45</sup>.

The 54 cases of *LM*. are spread over "musical" and "non-musical" psalm-texts alike. As stated, no overt correlation is discernible. But shifted back, as a subscript, *LMNZH* correlates with "pre-exilic". In §4.2 we have already mentioned that all the 29 °*al-X* terms (and congeners) are preceded by *LM*., but that this still leaves 26 cases of *LM*. that are not succeeded by such a term, and hence a phrase-linkage is not indicated. *LMNZH* stands alone, and was evidently imposed at one time *en bloc* on a corpus of at least 54 textual units of a great variety in genre. The conspectus renders it highly improbable that *LMNZH* meant "to the choir-master" or "to the chief singer", as conventionally held. But what does it mean?

The mysterious "choirmaster" is derived from the reading *la-menazzeah* put together with √*NZH*=to direct, as found in Ezra and Chronicles. Especially influential were the following statements:

... מאלה (=הלוים) לנצח על-מלאכת בית-יהוה I Chron. 23:4

ועליהם מפקדים ... הלוים מן-בני מררי וזכריה ומשלם מן-בני  
הקהתים לנצח והלוים כל-מבין בכלי-שיר:

45. Core-text: v. 1<sup>b</sup>-10; later addition ("national benediction"): v.11, with v. 10<sup>b</sup> perhaps modified as interface. Baal's palace: translations of the texts see ANET<sup>2</sup>-Ginsberg, especially pp. 133 col. 2-135. More recent: van Zijl 1972, mainly philological (ch. III "Texts including the house-building motif"). Selected Bibliography on Ps. 29 from 1900 onwards: Gradl 1979 (add Kraus 1978<sup>5</sup> *ad loc.*), Mittmann 1978, Cooke 1964 (the latter on *benê elîm*). The present writer was rather astonished to find, upon checking the literature, that the discussions of the Canaanite background of the psalm do not seem to consider the "palace inauguration" possibility. Since the titles of the psalms are so often declared to be "late additions", and the title with which we are concerned here is ostensibly that of Ps. 30, a scholar who takes up Ps. 29 will generally not look at Ps. 30, including its title. On the "strand" of psalmodic compositions beginning with Ps. 29 see Ginsberg (1969); this has not been evaluated here as fully as it could have been, for possible bearings on the titling problem.

and presumably most influential of all:

ומתחיהו ואליפלהו . . . בכנרות על-השמינית לנצח: I Chron. 15:21

The reading *la-menazzeah* is attested by the Masoretic vocalization and also by the transcription-column of the Hexapla which has *lamanassē*. In the sense *menazzeah*=victor it is reflected by Hieronymus *victori* in PIH (not used throughout there – see below). Aquila also reflects it, as *tō nikopoiō* (discussion see Hex-Mercati II:95).

LXX, however, has *eis to telos*, presumably “with respect to the end” (*nezah* understood thus), though *telos* has many other meanings as well. Symmachus has *epinikios*, which Hieronymus apparently follows when he uses *pro victoria* ten or eleven times in PIH (see ConcVulg: col. 5554). Theodotion has *eis to nikos* (see Hex-Mercati, as above). In the Psalterium Gallicanum Hieronymus translates *eis to telos* as *in finem*. The Targum has לשבחא ; in view of the hypothesis which will be proposed here this is the most curious phenomenon of all. At any rate (even excluding PG as secondary) these attest a strong tradition of pronouncing *LMNZH* as something like *le-minzah*, i.e. taking *MNZH* as an abstract noun. That those who pronounced it thus also knew what it meant in the titles – is highly doubtful; but the pronunciation itself is what is important here. We must therefore say: ask not “who is the *menazzeah*?” but “what is *minzah*?”

A slight clue might be furnished from the Aramaic in Daniel 6:4, where Daniel הוה מתנצח על-סרכיא ואחשררפניא , meaning that he gained a position of prestige over and above these high functionaries. Trying to go by the *mifal*-form of *minzah* for the assumption of an aramaism is risky at the moment. So is the association with a large group of cultic and administrative terms: above all *miqdaš*, *mizbeah*, *MRZH*, *mišpat*, *mišmar*, etc., etc.

What seems a stronger clue is here proposed as a hypothesis. There is an Accadian scribal term *nishu*, meaning “selection” or “extract”, often also “choice section selected for copying”. For the contexts see *AHw* s.v. *nishatu(m)*, and more clearly in the dozens of cases presented in Hunger’s study of the Mesopotamian colophons (1968). Another use of *nishu*, not unrelated, seems to be as a term for sub-units in complex ritual hymns of the *balag* type (see Cohen 1972). Our hypothesis is therefore that *LMNZH* is somehow related to *nishu*, and might mean “Belonging to the Selection”. At any rate it is clearly pre-exilic, and by its quantity seals off a historical

stratum. Compared with the *‘al-X* group, and the *benê qorah* titles, it comes out as perhaps slightly later. All the rest of the components, beginning with *le-asaf* (see our table of contents) come out as post-exilic. The Josianic reform (around 621 BCE), or perhaps the period of Zedekiah (597-587 BCE) might be suitable, as the occasion for the selection of a “canonic” body of psalms, to be marked as *LMNZH*. If the psalm already had a title, the stamp of approbation was prefaced to that title.

A sample statistical analysis is given in the Appendix (after §6.4), for the relationship between *LMNZH* and *le-dawid*. As far as the technique avails, the statistical tool confirms in a most interesting way what could already be discerned by a conspectus of the Analytical Table.

## 6.2 The middle stage

A group of five terms appears in an intermediate chronological position, between “pre-exilic” and “late post-exilic”: *le-asaf*, *mizmôr / maskîl / miḳtam*, and *le-dawid*. There are strong correlations between the genre terms and the authorship terms; we separate them in the discussion only to help set out clearly what the analysis seems to have brought to light here.

The upper limit for this period is the Edict of Cyrus in 538 BCE and the coming of the Asaphite singers to Jerusalem shortly afterwards. The lower limit is the onset of our “late stages”, not many generations before the beginning of the Hellenistic period (whose formal opening here is Alexander’s conquest of Erez Israel in 332 BCE). To narrow down this stretch of two hundred years we shall have to become involved with the shadowy figure of the Chronicler, and the still more shadowy figure of his presumed editor, but success is hardly assured.

The early stages ended with the titling action that placed *LMNZH* at the beginning of some dozens of existing titles (themselves, as we contend, subscripts and not superscripts). The five terms that we have assigned to the middle stage appear sometimes in conjunction with *LMNZH* and sometimes without it. But the tests for correlation show that, again, what actually happened is not what our habituation to the “complete” titles makes us see in them. Where *le-asaf / le-dawid*, mostly together with *mizmôr* or an alternate genre-term, are not prefaced by *LMNZH* – these are new titles; where prefaced by *LMNZH* – these are *additions to an old title*, and hence new assignments of authorship to an existing text. We are in an environment that could be defined as semi-renaissance, in which both redaction and new creation (*šîr ḥadaš!*) are more important than the outright



production of pseudepigrapha. That will set in during the Hellenistic period proper. This view is more differentiating than what has already been said about "renaissances" in §3, but there is no real contradiction here<sup>46</sup>.

[a] לאסף

Twelve titles have *le-asaf*: 50 and 73-83. Title 50 appears after a Korahite group and titles 73-83 precede a Korahite group. In structure the Asaphite titles are similar to the ones that have *le-dawid* rather than to the Korahite ones.

מזמור לאסף	50
מזמור לאסף	73
משכיל לאסף	74
מזמור לאסף שיר	למנצח אל-תשחת 75
מזמור לאסף שיר	למנצח בנגינות 76
לאסף מזמור	למנצח על-ידי־תון 77
משכיל לאסף	78
מזמור לאסף	79
לאסף מזמור	למנצח אל-ששנים עדות 80
לאסף	למנצח על-הגתית 81
מזמור לאסף	82
מזמור לאסף	83

The correlation between *le-asaf* and *mizmôr* resp. *maskîl* is strong and indicates that both are due to a single titling-action. For all the other components the correlation with *le-asaf* is weak. One notes the extreme heterogeneity of the components in the <sup>c</sup>*al-X* parameter here. As far as the analysis can be trusted, *le-asaf* and *mizmôr* / *maskîl* are superscripts.

The Asaphite psalms have been investigated as a group by Buss (1963), who also compared them with the Korahite group and found significant differences: the Asaphite group evinces a higher literary quality and a strongly didactic tone. Buss also notes the relative frequency of historical recitals centering on the Exodus and the wanderings in the desert. Illmann (1976) investigated the Asaphite psalms by themselves, declaredly stimulated by Wanke's attempt to search out the ideological foundations of the Korahite psalms (1966). Illmann opposes many of Buss' conclusions, especially the claim that the Asaphite group is pervaded by sapiential

46. More on this see in §6.2(c) below, anent *le-dawid*.



elements. Only one element is, in his opinion, common to all the twelve psalms – the motive of conflict and punishment.

One need not expect a group of twelve psalms to repeat the same motives again and again, even if they have a common provenience – be it one author or one “Tradentenkreis” (see Illmann’s interesting quotation on the latter, p. 68 note 49). On the other hand it does stand to reason that if the divergences are strong then the ostensible common provenience (“Asaph”) must be questioned. Simple head-counts do not help. A feature-pair that appears in eleven out of the twelve psalms may actually have a high probability of chance coincidence; a feature-pair that appears only three times may turn out to be highly significant. Although the size of the “population” here is not large enough to make the outcome of a statistical assessment truly decisive (even then this is a matter of probabilities and not certainties!), such an assessment is obviously useful. Since both Buss and Illmann base their claims only on head-counts their dispute remains unresolved.

There is a general agreement in the literature that “Northern” elements are prominent in several of the Asaphite psalms, and that some of the scenes of national calamity may refer to the fall of the Northern Kingdom. A short inventory of the prominent motives, or other peculiarities, brings out the problematic nature of the group which its editor thought fit to assign to one personage – Asaph the chief singer appointed by David, as the Chronicler makes such an effort to persuade us.

– Ps. 50. Composite? personal rebuke in part B (v. 16ff.), opposition to hypocritical sacrifices in part A, perhaps part A itself a composite (v. 1-6 theophany). Mention of “Zion” in v. 2 intercalated? Sapiential elements in the preceding Ps. 49. Ps. 50 opens with use of term *erez*.

– Ps. 73. Rebuke of wicked, *erez*, pseudo-archaisms? (v. 4-5 *ênemô*, *‘ana-qatmô*, *lamô*), mention of *miqdešê-el* (v. 17).

– Ps. 74. Prominence of *erez*. Mention of Mt. Zion in v. 2 *extra metrum*. Lament on destruction of a sanctuary. Reminiscence of cosmic fight (*yam*, *tannînîm*) and establishment of order (v. 13-17); emphasis on seas and rivers.

– Ps. 75. *Erez*. Cosmic order. Cup of Wrath image. God of Jacob.

– Ps. 76. Archaic, or archaic core-text? Judah and Israel, God of Jacob. Recurrence of *erez*.

– Ps. 77. Lament, “Sons of Jacob and Joseph” redeemed in former times,

ends with theophany, concluding verse ties into Exodus (Moses and Aaron). *Erez* in v. 19.

– Ps. 78. Didactic exhortation on Exodus; v. 9-11 against “treachery of Ephraimites”; v. 54 Holy Mountain; v. 59ff: God’s wrath against the sanctuary of Shilo, linked with national calamity, spurning of Joseph and Ephraim, choice of Judah and Mt. Zion, choice of David “to govern Jacob His people and Israel His inheritance”.

– Ps. 79. National lament; calamity; Jerusalem mentioned twice; v. 6-7 (“Pour out Thy wrath”) also in Jeremiah 10:25; Jacob; people reviled by Gentiles. *Erez* only in compound *haytô-erez* (v. 2).

– Ps. 80. God of Israel, Joseph, Ephraim, Benjamin and Manasseh invoked in national calamity. Exodus reminiscence, vine as metaphoric image of people. *Erez* in v. 10.

– Ps. 81. Festive hymn for monthly celebration (*hodes̄, kesh̄*?), instrumental exordium – *šofar* intrinsic to the liturgy, others *tôf, kinnôr, nevel*, voices of *rinnah* and *terû’ah*; Feast celebrates Exodus?; Jacob and Joseph; ends with didactic rebuke on decalogue reminiscence. In list of Daily Psalms (*Tamîd* 7:4) Ps. 81 is assigned to Thursday (no heading to that effect in MT or LXX; use in New Moon celebration – see Büchler 1900).

Note: *erez* only as *e.-mizrayim*.

– Ps. 82. “Congregation of Gods” motive; *elyôn*. Psalm assigned to Tuesday in *Tamîd* 7:4 (no heading to that effect in MT or LXX; see Büchler).

– Ps. 83. Lament for national calamity, Israel, recalling defeat of Sisera, archaisms (*-mo* ending in vv. 12-14); *elyôn*. Coalition of Edom, Ismaelites, Moab, Philistia, Assur, etc. (a-historicity often remarked) .

The prevalence of *erez* in the Asaphite group turns out to be statistically significant, even though the term of course appears in other psalms as well. Here we only note the datum, without offering an interpretation.

Illmann (p. 9) quotes Delitzsch who opined that “der alte Asaph” (Davidic or Solomonic, at any rate early) certainly could not have written the entire collection. That a guild of singers existed in the early post-exilic period, who traced their pedigree to an ancient temple-musician named Asaph, is clear at any rate. Ezra 2:41 and Nehemiah 7:44 state that these were the only singers that could be persuaded to return from Babylon to Jerusalem. Their genealogy is not quite straightforward (attempts at

disentanglement see Liver 1968, via index; also Gese 1963). The “Northern” elements in several of the Asaphite psalms are statistically significant, and do seem to indicate that the corpus originated among a group of “Northern” poets. Although the Southern boundary of the concept of “Northern” is not unequivocal, one can generalize it as non-Jerusalemite and north of Jerusalem (from Gibeon onwards). Even if not all the Asaphites were already taken to Babylon with the first exile, after the fall of Samaria in 722/1 BCE, they were a distinct group in Babylon two hundred years later and had to be fetched from there. The peculiarly “Northern” psalms could have been clan heirlooms, placed in the Jerusalem repertoire (or at least the singers’ archives) after the Return. One could thus divide the texts into several categories: pre-exilic heirlooms (with/without retouches), exilic compositions by an Asaphite poet or poets in Babylon (with/without retouches), compositions after the Return. The assignment of the texts or their cores to these categories needs a deeper analysis, but is obviously a risky undertaking<sup>47</sup>.

Psalms 137 (“By the rivers of Babylon”) comes to mind in this connection, and we note that it is untitled. Obviously, if the Asaphites needed to title their collection *le-asaf* and not *li-venê asaf*, it was not possible to give it a title. It should be noted that the captors’ request to hear *miš-šîr zîyyôn*, and the singers’ refusal, need not be explained simply as a poetical image. There is ample documentation for the habit of the later Assyrian kings and their Babylonian successors to have “original exotic music” at their courts. The foreign musicians were obtained from client-kings as part of their tribute, or taken as a special kind of living booty when a kingdom was conquered<sup>48</sup>. Ps. 137 (or its first part, vv. 1-6) can thus be seen as a reminiscent declaration, in the name of a group of returned singers (Asaphites?) that their ancestors refused to perform their sacred repertory (??) for the entertainment of the Assyrian or Babylonian court. This text will be taken up again when we come to the matter of *šîr* (§6.3[a] below).

If Ps. 137 raises the question of the title *le-asaf* as against *li-venê asaf*, a further group of psalms renders the problem of the Asaphite designation,

47. A seal with the legend *le-asaf* was found at Megiddo in Schumacher’s excavations at the beginning of the century (see Schumacher/Watzinger 1929:64-67; drawing also in Loewenstamm 1950:col.483). The seal is datable to the 8th or 7th century BCE.

48. Since the writer hopes to be able to publish a detailed study on this subject in the near future, the evidence need not be set out here.

as such, more acute. This is the psalmodic potpourri that appears in I Chron. 16:8-36. The context is the description of the arrangements supposedly made by David for the Asaphites to serve at the Tent of the Ark which he sets up in Jerusalem (the priests are pointedly given a secondary place). In the hymnic text one recognizes Ps. 105:1-15, Ps. 96 almost complete, an interposed *הודו... כי לעולם חסדו*, and a doxological conclusion approximately similar to Ps. 106:47-48. That this was intended to represent what "Asaph and his brethren" would sing – must be deduced from the context, which is fairly clear even though it is disturbingly agglomerative (over-edited? under-edited?). There is no proper transitional statement before the hymnic text, of the kind that usually serves to tie-in such poetic insertions with the narrative context (cf. Childs 1971). These psalms, then, are assigned to "Asaph and his brethren", *but in the Psalter itself they do not have an Asaphite heading*. One notes that all of them are in what is now set apart by doxologies as the Fourth Book – Pss. 90 to 106; that Pss. 105-106 stand at the outer boundaries, and that Ps. 108 close by is a composite: Ps. 57A plus Ps. 60B (on whether the doxology in I Chron. was taken from an existing collection of psalms, or put into the Psalter because it appears in I Chron., see Gese 1972:61-62, who decides to leave the question undecided). The dating of the Chronicler (or his editor), thus has a bearing on the dating of the Asaphite titling action. Since this is a rather crucial point for our general hypothesis and the proposed chronological sequence, the matter must be discussed in some detail.

One notices that the beginning of Ps. 96, which mentions *šîr ḥadaš*, is left out of the potpourri in Chronicles. The second hemistichs of verses 96:1-2 appear in I Chron. 16:23 as a conflation.

שירו ליהוה כל-הארץ:	1 שירו ליהוה שיר חדש	Ps. 96
בשרו מיום-ליום ישועתו:	2 שירו ליהוה ברכו שמו	
בכל-העמים נפלאותיו:	3 ספרו בגוים כבודו	
בשרו מיום-אל-יום ישועתו:	23 שירו ליהוה כל-הארץ	I Chron. 16
בכל-העמים נפלאותיו:	24 ספרו בגוים את-כבודו	

There are cogent poetical-stylistic reasons for not assuming Ps. 96:1-2 as an expansion. No external reason comes to mind for the omission of *šîr ḥadaš* in Chronicles: the context there would have permitted *šîr ḥadaš* – if

the writer had no reason of his own to leave it out. And that reason could be the fact that *šîr hadaš* is the clear mark of the songs written in the euphoric stage of the Return<sup>49</sup>. We leave this matter for the moment, and turn to another omission in the potpourri, which is of a different kind.

In her monograph on the Chronicler's ideology (1977) Sarah Japhet remarks (p. 324) that Ps. 105 appears in the potpourri only up to v. 15. The recital of the nation's history thus breaks off before the mention of famine and the deeds of Joseph in Egypt (which are followed in the psalm by the enslavement and the Exodus). This is seen as a deliberate omission, since a general lack of reference to the Exodus tradition is noticeable throughout the Chronicler's work. As Japhet explains it (p. 327) the Chronicler's view of history assumes a continuity of the nation's presence in its land, disregarding any break in the distant past (Egypt – Exodus) and thus also in the recent present (Babylonia – Return). A minute change in the wording of what he does take from Ps. 105 is therefore also instructive, as noted by Japhet (p. 329, note 427, with other examples):<sup>50</sup>

Ps. 105:12      בְּהִיוֹתָם מִתִּי מִסַּפֵּר כְּמַעַט וְגֵרִים בָּהּ :

I Chron. 16:19      בְּהִיוֹתָם כֶּם . . .

The Chronicler addresses his readers in the present, while the psalm refers to the ancestors in the distant past.

Now several of the Asaph-psalms do emphasize the Exodus very much, and thus a close relationship between the Asaphite *texts* and the Chronicler (who de-emphasizes the Exodus) is not plausible. On the other hand, though, the Chronicler constantly brings Asaph and the Asaphites to the fore; and he does so with an emphasis out of all proportion to what he is ostensibly concerned with – the recapitulation and interpretation of the nation's history. The most plausible reason would seem to be that he himself was an Asaphite, and that there must have been some pressing need to bolster the Asaphite singers' prestige (not just the prestige of the singers in general). If the original Chronicler's work had an editor, as has been surmised, he must have belonged to the same circles (the "editorial

49. LXX has a title for Ps. 96: "When the House was built after the Captivity". The Chronicler's choice also connects this psalm symbolically with the Temple, by featuring it in the Davidic inauguration of the Tent of the Ark in Jerusalem. Further on the historical remarks added in the LXX, in general, see §2 above. On the historical remarks added to the Asaph-titles, see below.

50. Correct the accident in Japhet's quotation, which has מִתִּי מִסַּפֵּר כְּמַעַט twice.

problem" of this passage, and several other aspects, are discussed by Butler (1978).

To draw all this together we now need a well-founded dating hypothesis for the Chronicler's work, and this is not easily available. There is a noticeable tendency in the literature to assign a common authorship to Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah (cf. Eissfeldt's particularly emphatic defence of this thesis, Eissfeldt/Ackroyd 1965:530-531). As Japhet demonstrated in a separate study (1968), by confrontations of linguistic features as well as others, the supposed common authorship is actually implausible. Tentatively then, one could take Ezra-Nehemiah, or at least the Memoirs of Nehemiah, as having been written some time after the last date available in Nehemiah: his stay in Babylon during the year 433/2 BCE<sup>51</sup>. Nor could the Chronicler have been a contemporary of Nehemiah, for several reasons (one of which will be adduced further on). The lowest limit is, as Japhet argues (1977:285 note 244), the final rift with the Samaritans; in Chronicles the "Samaritan Schism" is not yet seen as inevitable. The Schism proper was finalized by the building of the Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim, and this can now be dated between 336-330 BCE<sup>52</sup>. For the Chronicler the range is thus "after 433/2 and before 336 BCE".

For the dating of the Asaphite "titling action", the following considerations can now be marshalled.

- (1) The Asaphite psalms range from pre-exilic Northern to exilic to early post-exilic Jerusalemite: Ps. 76 emphasizes Jerusalem, while Ps. 78 is explicitly against "Shiloh" and "the Tent of Joseph" (originally? strong interpolations?). Their titling *le-asaf* comports with the ideology of the Chronicler, but their content does not.
- (2) In the period immediately after the Return, the Asaphites had an actual or virtual monopoly of cultic singing in Jerusalem, and had no need for a status conflict *vis à vis* other singers' clans or guilds (for an outline of the problems, see Gese 1963, but also Liver 1968). The Chronicler would not have emphasized the primacy of Asaph and the Asaphites if the situation was still thus.

51. Nehemiah 13:6 – the absence "in the year 32 of Artaxerxes" = Artaxerxes II, hence the date.

52. During the reign of Darius III, the last Persian king, defeated by Alexander. The earlier literature is no longer useful on this point, because of the "Sanballat problem"; this was solved by the discovery of the Samaritan papyri in the Wadi Daliyeh in 1962.

(3) The Chronicler is most probably an Asaphite himself. He or his editor (still pre-Hellenistic) also tries to assign further psalms to the Asaphite canon (again a sign of conflict?)

(4) If we are allowed to put the Chronicler's *floruit* near the end of this period span (slightly before 336 BCE, that is), the Asaphite titling-action could thus be set somewhat earlier, around the middle of that span – when the “quarrels of the singers” (late Korahites? others?) were already incipient.

The hypothesis constructed here is admittedly not founded on solid rock, but at least it cannot be far from reality. Here it should also be noted that the LXX adds “on/about the Assyrian” to several of the Asaphite titles. If this is not an apologetic countermeasure (cf. our hypothesis about the Davidic “historical” ascriptions, §6.3[c] below), it might reflect a true tradition of provenience. But a combination of “tradition” and critical annotations in the best manner of the Alexandrian Museon is also no less plausible.

A question that still remains pending is why two Asaphite psalms should have been included in the list of Psalms of the Day (Pss. 81 and 82) and why these particular psalms are *not* given a Psalm of the Day heading in LXX. The establishment of the Tamid sacrifice is itself a disputed matter; “late post-exilic” cannot help us any further here.

[Note: re Sarna 1979 see Postscript after Appendix]

[b] מִזְמוֹר, מִכְתָּב, מִשְׁכִּיל

As indicated at the beginning of this paragraph (see before §6.2[a] above), these three genre-terms have a high positive correlation with both *le-dawid* and *le-asaf*.

*Mizmôr* appears in fifty-six titles, and LXX adds its equivalent, *psalmos*, in about ten more. The root *ZMR*, as it appears in clearly musical contexts, refers mainly to the activation of a musical instrument. Whether it was also used (in the same environment at the same period) as a general term for “to make music” seems plausible but needs further research. The use of *ZMR* in the other Semitic languages also needs a thorough examination with musicological tools<sup>53</sup>. In §1.5 we have already mentioned

53. What AHW or the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary feature at the head of an entry is a résumé, derived from what is listed in the body of the entry. And what is listed there are the translations that were published with the relevant documents, i.e. the respective translators' decisions. This is a matter of declared policy, for practical reasons, but often not remembered by those who expect the dictionaries to give the “true meaning” of a term. For musical terms the danger here is obvious.



its appearance in the colophons of the “scores” from Ugarit; its specific meaning there is not wholly clear. It should be noted that in modern Arabic *zammar* seems to be used exclusively for the instrumental domain.

At any rate the overall evidence, ancient and contemporary, does not allow us to assign  $\sqrt{ZMR}$  to the domain of vocal music exclusively. Where this has been done, it was always contingent on the interpretation of  $\sqrt{NGN}$  as an instrumental term; and that hinges on just one Biblical locus: the declaration that David *niggen be-yadô* before Saul (I Sam. 16 and 18). If that locus is left out, the other occurrences of  $\sqrt{NGN}$  are all seen to point clearly to vocal music. David’s *niggen be-yadô* therefore needs to be reexamined, in the light of the many meanings of *YD* (incl. “power” and “mediation”). To return to  $\sqrt{ZMR}$ : we note that LXX translates *mizmôr* as *psalmos* (*psallein* = pluck, here strings); and that *mizmôr* itself, i.e. the *mifal* form, appears nowhere else but in the psalm-titles.

It would thus stand to reason that *mizmôr* is a “musical term”, and classifies certain psalms as having been rendered in musical performance. Yet our correlational analyses yield a very puzzling outcome. *Mizmôr* has a high positive correlation with *le-dawid* and *le-asaf*. But it does not correlate with the texts that mention instruments and/or can be classed as festive hymns. The term also appears in the titles of 19 “plaints of the individual” (if mechanically tested for subscript placement – in 17). In fact, no positive correlation can be found for the fifty-six appearances of *mizmôr* with any feature in the texts. There is one negative-indirect correlation: where the “musical assignment” of a text would lead to a truly patent absurdity – the genre-term in the title is *maskîl* or *miḵtam*. The fifty-six appearances of *mizmôr* must therefore be understood as having been imposed wholly or largely in a single titling-action, similar to *LMNZH* (and *le-dawid*, as we shall see), by a criterion that was not derived from an actual “musical” use of the texts.

In Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles David is represented not only as having ordained the singing, but occasionally even their instruments are “Davidic”: see Ezra 3:10 (not unequivocal); Nehemiah 12:36; I Chron. 15:16 (David ordains the chief singers to ordain the instrumentalists); II Chron. 7:6 “the instruments... that King David made”!, II Chron. 29:20, 25 (note *be-yad* there!) and 27. In the additamentum to the Davidic chronicle, the two hymns in II Sam. 22 and 23, David is called *ne’îm zemîrôt yisra’el*. Amos 6:5 also seems to link David with the invention of instruments (discussion see Bayer 1968:92-95). But only the Chronicler sets



up the triple linkage of David, the composition of ritual hymns (musico-poetical "composition", presumably), and the performance of these hymns with prominent instrumental roles and indeed with a string-orchestra.

It thus seems that *mizmôr* could well have been a proper genre-term for accompanied song, originally (even though we have not yet encountered it in its natural habitat). In the psalm-titles, though, *mizmôr le-david/le-asaf* is *not* an "objective" term, to be taken at face value. Here it is used deliberately to recall and re-inforce the Davidic image, and that of Asaph as well. The titling with *mizmôr* was done simultaneously with the imposition of *le-asaf* and also, as we shall see, of *le-david*.

\*

Six titles have *miḳtam*. One is in the First Book, the rest in the Second Book as a consecutive group (after a *maskil* group). For the analysis the sequence will be changed.

58 למנצח אל-תשחת

לדוד מכתם.

האמנם אלם צדק תדברון מישרים תשפטו בני אדם ...

56 למנצח על-יונת אלם רחקים

לדוד מכתם באחו אותו פלשתים בגת.

חנני אלהים כִּי־שאפני אנוש ...

57 למנצח אל-תשחת

לדוד מכתם בברחו מפני־שאול במערה.

חנני אלהים חנני כי בך חסיה נפשי ...

Ps. 108A = Ps. 57B

59 למנצח אל-תשחת

לדוד מכתם בשלח שאול וישמרו את־הבית להמיתו.

הצילני מאיבי אלהי ממתקוממי תשגבני ...

16 מכתם לדוד.

שמרני אל כִּי־חסיתי בך ... (16:11 נעמות בימינך־נצח).

60 למנצח על־שושן עדות

מכתם דוד ללמד: בהצותו את ארם נהרים ואת־ארם צובה וישב יואב ויך

את־אדום בגיא־מלח שנים עשר אלף.

אלהים זנחתנו פרצתנו ...

Ps. 108B = Ps. 60B

Pss. 56, 57A and 59 have the greatest number of features in common: sequence *le-dawid miḵtam*, situational Davidic ascription on same pattern, plaint of an individual who sees himself persecuted by evildoers, refrain-like repeats in the text, and no signs of high antiquity in vocabulary and style. Note also the similar pattern of the beginning of the text. The other three psalms do not show a consistent pattern in their divergences from this scheme. The most peculiar are the war song Ps. 60 (composite? note also the presumable intercalation of Judah in v. 9), and Ps. 58. If the אלים at the beginning of the latter is what would be spelled *plene* אלים, then this recalls Ps. 82. Apparently *miḵtam* was imposed together with *le-dawid* (as superscript) on a group of older psalms that already had *LMNZH* and *‘al-X* titles (subscripts?), and Ps. 16 was added to the group as well because its beginning recalls the pattern of the beginning of Pss. 56, 57 and 59.

The literature offers a choice of etymologizing-exegetical explanations, none of which seem to be convincing. Those that adduce an Accadian *kitmu* “covered” often go back to Langdon (1921) and his proposal of a “covered” instrument. But the *kitmu* which he found in the Song Catalogue from Assur now turns out to be the name of a musical mode (see Kilmer 1971; Bayer *in print*). Nevertheless the *miḵtam* psalms as a group do not seem to fit the normal circumstances of song-text composition. Since LXX translates *miḵtam* as *eis stelographian* (“referring to writing on a stele”) and the Targum as גליפא תריצא (well-shaped/straight engraving) it has been surmised that the texts were originally monumental inscriptions. *Al tašhet* therefore seemed to be the appropriate attached warning. But the contents of the texts do not fit this hypothesis either, and *al tašhet* may not mean what the punctuation of the Masoretic text makes it. Nor can the *miḵtav* of Hezekiah (Isaiah 38:9-20) support the “royal inscription” hypothesis for *miḵtam*, since it apparently is a *miḵtav*, a letter: the Assyrian tradition has such “letters to the God” (see Grayson 1980, and Hallo 1981). One epigraphic find has been noted – a funerary stele in Latin and Punic found not far from Annaba (formerly Bone) in Tunis (Février 1954). It is not a proper bilingual text, the Punic part being much longer than the Latin, and apparently still largely obscure. Février reads a KTM or KTMM there in line 4 and suggests this as a possible solution to the LXX *stelographia* (p. 42) This might indeed explain the *stelographia* of

the LXX – but not necessarily the *miḳtam* itself<sup>54</sup>. For the present, the term remains obscure.

\*

*Maskil* appears in 13 titles: 32 (First Book); 42, 44, 45, 52-55 (Second Book); 74, 78, 88, 89 (Third Book); 142 (Fifth Book). At Ps. 47:8 there is also an enigmatic *zammerû maskil*. Apparently there is an earlier connection with the *benê qoraḥ* here, and later imitation in the Asaphite and Davidic titles. It also seems that *maskil* was applied in the Asaphite and David titles where neither *mizmôr* nor *miḳtam* seemed suitable.

A connection with the usual meaning of  $\sqrt{SKL}$  “understanding” might be acceptable, as proposed so often. The Greek tradition has some evidence of *eis synesin* (“for/with regard to sagacity”), apart from *syneseōs* (“sagacious”). This could be taken, like the *eis stelographian* = *miḳtam*, as of no particular informative value. However, what looks like its Hebrew equivalent, למשכיל, is now known from several texts of Cave 4 at Qumran. The texts have only been “reported” so far and not fully published. We have already quoted them in §1.4 (see p. 45 above). Strugnell (1960) translates למשכיל variously as “By a sage” or “composed by a *maskil*”. The present writer has some doubts whether this is the only translation possible. If *eis synesin* is taken as להשכיל, though, we are no wiser than before.

[c] לרור

David appears in 73 titles, more than any other titling component (distribution see the Table in §4.1 above). In thirteen titles this is followed by a situational ascription to some particular time of trouble in the life of David; but these ascriptions will have to be discussed separately (see §6.3[c] below). That *le-dawid* declares “(authored) by David” has often been questioned (summary see Kraus 1978<sup>5</sup>:16-17); the proof/disproof of actual Davidic authorship was thought to be intrinsically connected with *le-dawid* in the title. However, if one makes an effort to separate these two aspects,

54. On *stelographia* = *miḳtam*, see also Ginsberg 1945:169-171. To his note on *miḳtamûm/miḳtavûm* in the Tosefta (there, p. 170 note 38) add now the remarks of Liberman (1962:300, note 12), who also mentions a possible confusion of *epistolai/stēlai*.

this virtually becomes a non-problem (at least as regards the titles). And they must be separated: the frequency and the indiscriminate distribution of *le-dawid* show that it was imposed by an external decision in which the matter of authentic Davidic authorship was wholly irrelevant. *Le-dawid* spreads over almost everything outside the Korahite and Asaphite groups, and its only significant correlation is with *mizmôr*, *maskîl* and *miḳtam* (see above). Presumably, most of it was imposed in a single titling action; the First Book seems to show this quite clearly. In the Fourth and Fifth Books the precedent was taken up again, and what the Hebrew text still left out was later on completed by the Greek tradition. Obviously, such a global Davidization obscured any trace of more authentic Davidic titling annotations that might have been preserved in earlier documents<sup>55</sup>.

By comparison with our hypothesis about the Asaphite titles it can be concluded that the Davidic and Asaphite titles are mutually supporting, so to speak. The Asaphites' claims rested on Asaph the Davidic musician, and Asaph's legitimation was dependent on David. As the Chronicler describes the situation, David himself is dependent on the musicians to carry out his ordinances for an effective liturgy. The main titling-action of *le-dawid* is thus probably contemporary with that of *le-asaf*: around the beginning of the 4th century BCE.

A sample statistical test for *le-dawid* versus *LMNZH* is presented in our Appendix, after §6.4.

### 6.3 The late stages

The term *šîr*, the group of fifteen *šîr ham-ma'alôt* titles, and the situational Davidic ascriptions, represent the last stages of the historical process of titling. As we have tried to demonstrate in all the foregoing, a new titling-component can be assigned to a new psalm, or to an old untitled psalm (or one whose title is not deemed copy-able for some reason), or added to an old and already titled psalm. This also happens at

55. While this paper was going into print the writer encountered the highly interesting discussions on Pseudepigraphy, presented in EAC 18. Directly relevant to our subject are the contributions by Syme, Smith, Hengel and Speyer there (see bibliography). Syme remarks (p. 15) that literary fraud can only be conceived of when "books and authorship and a reading public" are common; and that "the spurious presupposes the genuine". The Davidization (and Asaphization) of certain psalms would seem to belong to another conceptual domain; still, the matter clearly needs to be weighed against what is said in these studies, and the discussions published with them.

the final stage, after which the proto-Psalter enters upon its proto-canonical stage and new titles for old psalms may no longer be devised. The approximate date-range for the final titling actions is from around the threshold of the Hellenistic period to the Maccabean period.

[a] שיר

The term *šîr* appears in thirty titles all told, fifteen of them being the compound *šîr ham-ma'alôt* (discussed separately in §6.3[b] below). Some compounds also appear in what we call the *šîr*-proper group. These are:

שיר חנכת הבית 30

שיר ידירת 45

שיר ליום השבת 92

שיר יסודתו בהררי־קדש ?? 87??

The distribution peaks in the Second and Third Books, with only a single appearance in the First and Fourth Book. There is also a single *šîr* (as *šîr mizmôr*) in the Fifth Book (title 108, to a composite psalm), apart from the *šîr ham-ma'alôt* group there.

The term also appears frequently within the psalm-texts, and elsewhere in the Bible. Its contextual meaning is the musical voicing of a text, with associations of joy and festivity – sacred and secular both. In the post-exilic sources it seems that the general meaning of “glad song” is now drawn-in to a more restricted range, and *šîr* becomes a specific genre-term. The functional and technical import is precisely the one reflected in the term that the LXX chooses as its Greek representative – *ōdē*. The Greek ode is a poem intended for a public ceremony of both high festive degree and strict organization; the content of the ode is exaltatory; its musical rendition is choral; the form is free and additive, with sections in diverse metric schemes.

The postbiblical uses of *šîr* in this sense have already been set out in §1.4 above. Within the Bible and outside the Psalter, the *šîr* of the Temple sacrifice or of the festive procession is reflected in II Chron. 29:27-28 and earlier in Isaiah 30:29–

II Chron. ובעת החל העולה החל שיר־יהוה ... והשיר משורר ...

Isaiah השיר יהיה לכם כליל התקדש־חג ...

The Temple singers are *melummedê-šîr* (I Chron. 25:7), and their instruments are *kelê-šîr* (I Chron. 15:16 etc.). It should be noted, though, that

among the Psalms of the Day only two, Ps. 92 (Sabbath) and Ps. 48 (Monday), have *šîr* in their title. Ps. 45 (*šîr YDYDT*) is a royal epithalamium. In Ps. 83, for instance, (*šîr mizmôr le-asaf*) this interpretation of *šîr* does not seem suitable; but the exceptions prove the rule, and the statistical examination favours it. Because of the stylistic connection between Ps. 45 and the Song of Songs, it might be possible that *šîr haš-šîrîm* has a similar intent: to assign to this collection (or parts of it) the function, structure and performance conventions of a complex ode (presumably for a wedding celebration). But the title is not explicit enough, and its form is peculiar, so that this suggestion cannot decide the problem of the Song of Songs. There may be an earlier stage of *šîr* designations, connected with the Korahites: in the Korahite titles the coincidence of *šîr* is rather significant, statistically. On *šîr zîyyôn* in Ps. 137 see above, p. 91.

A term that is probably the same as our *šîr* is already attested in Sumerian although its provenience is held to be Semitic. Compounds appear frequently there, such as *šîr.gal* "big song", and *šîr. nam.en.na* "song of governance" (see Kilmer 1971:141-142).

In the *šîr*-titles of the Psalter there is no significant correlation with *mizmôr*. Since we have already analyzed *mizmôr* by itself, the results there have already prepared us for such an outcome here. The exegetical tradition has made much of the proximity of the two terms (see via Neubauer 1890 and Preuss 1959). Actually they co-incide only in nine out of the fifteen titles outside *šîr ham-ma'alôt*. One is the agglomeration of title 88; and as for title 108 the unity of the psalm itself is doubtful.

#### [b] שיר המעלות

*Šîr ham-ma'alôt* appears as a succession of fifteen titles (120-134) in what is now the Fifth Book, and only there. The uniformity is not total in MT, and the Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) has some divergences of its own. The material from Cave 4 has not yet been entirely published. For the present, then, the divergences from simple *š. ham.* are as follows:

121 MT *šîr lam-ma'alôt*, but 11QPs<sup>a</sup> *šîr ham-ma'alôt*

122 MT *š. ham. le-dawid*

123 MT *š. ham.*, but 11QPs<sup>a</sup> ]*dawid lam-ma'alôt* (on the edge-lacuna see in §1.2 above)

124 MT *š. ham. le-dawid*

127 MT *š. ham. li-šēlomoh*

131 and 133 *š. ham. le-dawid*

Not all of the titling-loci in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> have been preserved. Ps. (120?) 121-132 appear *en bloc* there, followed by Ps. 119, followed by Ps. 136 (all these in cols. III-XVI). Ps. 133 appears in col. XXII and Ps. 134 in col. XXVIII. In MT the *š. ham.* collection stands *after* Ps. 119 (the eight-fold alphabetical acrostic). Sanders and others, who have consulted with the editors of the Cave 4 material, are of the opinion that the *en bloc* collection of Pss. 120-134 was made in the last century BCE, even though in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> the last two psalms, 133 and 134, appear separately (see DJD IV, *via index*).

Liebreich (1955) saw a strong linkage between key-terms in the fifteen psalms and in the Priestly Blessing. This seems plausible though not completely decisive. The performance-scenario which he derives from this linkage seems far less plausible. There is no external evidence for it, and this weighs heavily because of the relatively explicit descriptions that we do have in the Mishnah; cf. also what Büchler has to say on the Priestly Blessing in the Temple liturgy (1900:106-107 incl. the footnote). More important for us here is Seybold's recent study (1979) which further develops some previous enquiries on the redaction of the texts. Many redactional overlays can be demonstrated, and they show a "Zionization" of earlier text-cores. These cores might be earlier pilgrimage-songs, some of them not necessarily for the Jerusalem sanctuary. Seybold deduces that the titling was done at the ultimate redaction of the group, *en bloc*. He does not assign a date more precise than "postexilic".

The divergences from total uniformity in MT plus the Qumranica (only 11QPs<sup>a</sup> fully accessible so far) make the hypothesis of a uniform titling action less secure. *Le-david* and *li-šalomoh* might be subsequent "exegeses". But the *LM<sup>c</sup>LWT* variants must give us pause. The external resemblance to the *-T* endings so prevalent in the group of *al-X* (and congeners) might be accidental; but the *LM<sup>c</sup>LWT* form might also be a barely discernible relic of the period before the above-mentioned ultimate redaction.

In this connection it should also be noted that three psalms of the group are attested to have been used in a context quite different from that of the Pilgrimage Feasts: Ps. 120 (= no. 1), 121 (= no. 2) and 130 (= no. 11), together with Ps. 102, were recited or sung at the public fast decreed when there was some calamity such as a drought (see *Ta'anit* 2:3). One of these, Ps. 121, has the divergent *šir lam-ma'alôt* title in MT (but not in the Psalms Scroll. . .). At any rate we might suggest that the lack of complete uniformity in the titles allows us not to push the redaction too far towards the last period of the Second Temple. The redaction and titling (resp.

adaptation of a smaller group of *LM<sup>c</sup>LWT* titles?) do not necessarily have to be connected with the final shaping of the three Jerusalemite Pilgrimage Feasts – even if the set of psalms contains a number of pilgrims' songs.

The *šîr* element in *šîr ham-ma'alôt* might have the same function here as the one we have adduced for *šîr* as a non-compound term (see §6.2[a] above): an ode-like composition of several parts. In the present set, though, no unit has the necessary extent and alternation of forms, except if we join the last psalm – Ps. 134 – to the subsequent *hallelûyah*-text of Ps. 135. Some of the present short units may have been parts of an earlier complex. The compound *šîr HM<sup>c</sup>LWT/LM<sup>c</sup>LWT* has three interesting relatives: *šîr ḥanukkat hab-bayit* (30) and *šîr YDYDT* (45) in the Psalter, and *šîr haš-šîrîm* (*ašer li-šelomoh*) at the head of the Song of Songs. Here we shall not pursue this line of enquiry any further. At any rate it seems that the functional intent of *HM<sup>c</sup>LWT/LM<sup>c</sup>LWT* is not clear at all, and that we have no decisive clue to it. Etymologizing, whether with a view to realia (Temple stairs) or to several other possibilities, is just as useless here as elsewhere.

Something can be noted here, however, about the often adduced two passages in the Mishnah that connect *šîr ham-ma'alôt* with the fifteen stairs between the Men's Court and the Women's Court in the Temple (*Sukkah* 5:4, *Middôt* 2:5). Both have the same formulation, that the stairs are כנגד ט"ו שיר המעלות שבתהלים. A conspectus of *ke-neged* in the Mishnah shows that it has quite a diversity of uses. Here it probably means the same as in the famous כנגד ארבעה בנים דברה תורה in the Passover Haggadah – a linking mechanism for a midrash (on the Haggadah passage see Goldschmidt 1960:22-29). It proves nothing about what the Levites sang on the steps. It even proves, by its very formulation, that whatever they sang at this "sacred entertainment" could not have been the *šîrê ham-ma'alôt* themselves (if the writer had any knowledge of what was sung). What it does provide is an early indication of the use of the term *tehillîm* for the Psalter as a corpus, and of the inclusion of the *š. ham.*-set therein.

#### [c] Situational ascriptions to David

Thirteen titles include a statement ascribing the psalm to a specific situation in David's life. These are: 3, 7, 18, 34, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 142. Eleven have the same pattern:

3 מזמור לדוד בברחו /... 34 לדוד בשנותו את טעמו /... 51 למנצח מזמור  
לדוד בבוא אליו נתן /... 52 למנצח משכיל לדוד בבוא דואג האדמי /...



54 למנצח בנגינת משכיל לדוד בבוא הזיפים /... 56 למנצח על־יונת אלם רחקים  
 לדוד מכתם באחו אתו /... 57 למנצח אל־תשחת לדוד מכתם בברחו /...  
 59 למנצח אל־תשחת לדוד מכתם בשלח שאול /... 60 למנצח על־שושן עדות  
 מכתם לדוד ללמד: בהצותו את ארם נהרים /... 63 מזמור לדוד בהיותו במדבר  
 יהודה. / 142 משכיל לדוד בהיותו במערה תפלה.

This also appears in the title of the "Letter of Hezekiah", Isaiah 38:9 –  
 מכתב לחזקיהו מלך־יהודה בחלותו ויחי מחליו.

A different pattern appears in the two remaining situational ascriptions, those of titles 7 and 18. The latter is a re-working of the "splicing" passage that introduces the same poem as it appears in II Sam. 22 (on linguistic evidence the version in II Sam. is the earlier one).

7 שגיון לדוד אשר־שר ליהוה על־דברי־כוש בן־ימיני.  
 18 למנצח לעבר יהוה לדוד אשר דבר ליהוה את־דברי השירה הזאת ביום  
 הציל־יהוה אותו מכף־כל־איביו ומיד שאול: ויאמר ארחמך יהוה חזקי: יהוה  
 סלעי ומצודתי ...

II Sam. 22:1 ff. וידבר דוד ליהוה את־דברי השירה הזאת ביום הציל יהוה אתו  
 מכף כל־איביו ומכף שאול: ויאמר יהוה סלעי ומצודתי ...

The *ašer*-pattern is reminiscent of many introductions in the prophetic books, and also of the "midway" formulation of *šîr haš-šîrîm ašer li-šelomoh* as compared with *šîr ham-ma'alôt* (... *li-šelomoh* in title 127); see §1.2 above. Here we shall not try to work out a dating hypothesis for these ascriptions, but concentrate on the eleven others that have the *be*-pattern.

It is well known that the "historical" references of the ascriptions are problematical in themselves: there are discrepancies with respect to the Davidic history as set out in the Books of Samuel. The *kûš ben-yemînî* of title 7 is not attested elsewhere. A connection might at most be seen with the *kûšî* (ethnic) who announced Absalom's death to David (II Sam. 18:19-32). In title 34 the king of Gath before whom David feigned madness is *avîmelek*, but the story in I Sam. 21:11-16 has *akîš*. For title 56 there is no corresponding story in I Sam. of the Philistines actually "seizing" David in Gath. Title 60 does not comport properly with the account of the war in II Sam. 8. It could also be said that title 63 is curiously imprecise, since David fled to the Wilderness of Judah on several occasions. This problem seems to remain unsolved for the present.

The second problem is that of the linkage between the ascriptions and their psalms. Given that the ascriptions are of midrashic intent, two questions must still be posed. To quote: "*How is one to understand the movement towards historicisation involved in those instances in which events in the life of David are offered as the setting for the composition of a Psalm? Again, what exegetical rules, if any, were at work in the choice of an appropriate historical incident?*" (Childs 1971:137). Childs does offer a description of the "movement", which is seen to continue in the Greek and subsequent versions, and also offers some suggestions for a source-environment ("pietistic circles", see p. 149). He notes there, however, that the ascriptions function in a way which is different from the *pešer*-type exegesis of Qumran (no actualization of the past), and also from the midrashim of the Pharisaic circles (no legitimization, by means of a midrash, of later religious institutions). As to the exegetical rules, then, no firm conclusion is offered. Slomovic (1979) proposes one by adducing the later method of what he terms the connective midrash, as demonstrated by Midrash Tehillim. His conclusions (p. 355) are: a) the connection is stimulated by linguistic and thematic analogies as well as a "congruity of images"; b) the procedure is *selective*, not troubling itself at all with securing a "complete harmony between the psalm and the connected unit", i.e. the figure such as David or Abraham. There is thus no need to ask why one psalm was chosen and not another that could fit the declared situation equally well – or just as loosely. Childs and Slomovic thus take slightly different tacks, though their basic concepts are identical. The considerations set out in the following take a third tack, admittedly as a very tentative hypothesis.

The point of departure is the question: why were only thirteen psalms (or for the *be*-pattern, only eleven) furnished with such ascriptions? Also, if the ascriptions are doubtlessly late, why are they mostly found in the First and especially the Second Book? Such a quasi-pseudepigraphic procedure is more expected with regard to the Fourth and Fifth Books which were themselves the latest to be taken into the collection(s) before canonization. The simple answer to the first question could follow the views of Childs and Slomovic that here we have the beginning of a process. Canonization would have stopped it for the Hebrew text, and the continuations in the Greek text would also have had to stop at some time. The first question does not seem to have been explicitly posed until now, though the distribution itself has of course been noted. Moreover, the eleven *be*-pat-

tern ascriptions look as if all or most of them are the result of a single titling-action.

In view of the foregoing analyses of the other titling-components, it becomes highly probable that the ascriptions were added to existing titles – themselves already in most cases evincing several successive accretions. The preceding titling action had already added *le-dawid*. One could therefore consider whether these still more specific ascriptions might have been intended to reinforce the Davidic pedigree of a psalm (as proposed above, by a single deliberate titling-action). Herewith we also return to what was already noted by Childs: that the ascriptions do not actualize the past like a Qumranic *pešer*, nor do they come to legitimize some institution of the Second Temple period. But the midrashic activity of that period is not of the kind that would seem to be postulated by Slomovic – midrash for its own sake: it actualizes, or legitimizes, or in other ways offers an ideological solution to a specific contemporary problem. What problem, then, do these eleven (or all thirteen) reinforcing ascriptions offer to solve?

If the ascriptions were made by a single titling-action, there should be some distinctive common element in the eleven (or all thirteen) psalms to which they were added. At first sight the way seems to be blocked: nothing appears that would set these psalms off from many others of the same genres. However, even though the ascriptions are agreed to be late, one still has to test these as well against the hypothesis of a subscript emplacement – or an eventual adscript between columns. Since the ascriptions are mostly in Books One and Two, which would presumably already have stood as more-or-less stable collections, one may attempt a simple upwards shift and in each case look at the preceding psalm.

Ps. 2 inveighs against the heathen rulers; God's anointed king is promised the conquest of their domains. Ps. 6 offers a relatively better case than Ps. 7 for the identification of *kûš ben-yemînî* with the *kûšî* of II Sam. 18 and thus with the Absalom story: note the elaboration of the weeping motif (v. 7, also at the end of v. 9). Ps. 17 does not furnish any suitable hint for title 18. But Ps. 18 is in any case an insertion *in toto*, with a re-worked title (and a re-worked text) of II Sam. 22. The second part of the poem (in the Psalter and in II Sam.), from v. 35 onwards, is a royal pae-an of warfare against other nations. Ps. 34 is completely unsuitable to its heading (David feigning madness and escaping from the king of Gath): it is a pious sermon. The fact that it is also an alphabetical acrostic only points to its lateness. The preceding Ps. 33 is an exhortation to communal

thanksgiving, also a *šîr ḥadaš* (= postexilic). Verses 8-10 assert God's rule over all the nations; verses 16-17 emphasize that the king is not saved by the power of his soldiers and horses. Ps. 51 (the Miserere) can of course be explained as the prayer of the contrite David after his adultery with Bathsheba. But it is the second half of Ps. 50 that offers a stronger association. It begins abruptly at v. 16 and inveighs against a *raša*<sup>c</sup> who is a hypocrite; in v. 19-20 he lies and calumniates his brother; in v. 18 he associates with thieves and – “thy portion is with adulterers.” If title 51 belongs to Ps. 50B, then Ps. 51 is untitled. Title 52 has to be a superscript, identifying the wicked *gibbôr* of Ps. 52 with the informer Doeg. For Ps. 54 it is again possible to associate the heading with the patriotic assertions that conclude Ps. 53 (v. 5-7, including a clear reference to a Return – though emphasizing *elohîm*, *yaʿaqov* and *yisraʿel*). For Ps. 56 the association of *על-ינות אלם רחקים* with the “dove” motif in Ps. 55:7 has already been noted. The ascription to David being held captive in Gath also links with the dove-plus-escape motif. Moreover, Ps. 55:10-12 describes a city of evildoers and internal conflicts. For Ps. 56, a composite (vv. 8-12 = Ps. 108:2-6), the heading is equally approximative here and for the preceding psalm. Ps. 59 mentions *gôyim* as enemies (and hence its ascription to David's conflict with Saul perpetrates a curious absurdity). The preceding psalm has a vision of bloody vengeance near its end (v. 11). The war-story ascription of Ps. 60 accords with the psalm itself, more precisely with vv. 7-14 (repeated as the second half of Ps. 108). Moab and Edom are expressly vilified, and the triumph is that of the Northern Kingdom. Ps. 63 ends with the justification of a king, and the ascription does seem to hang on the desert-and-thirst motif in v. 2. For Ps. 142 no distinctive indication is visible either here or in Ps. 141. One notes that Ps. 144 (to v. 11) is also a war paeon and has no title except *le-dawid*. But v. 10 expressly mentions *הנותן תשועה למלכים הפוצה את-ידוד עבדו מחרב רעה* so that a superscript (or subscript) “alibi” is not necessary. The LXX, though, adds an ascription “about Goliath”. It may also be noted that Pss. 146-148, with their tone of a national triumph, have no ascription-titles in MT; but LXX does supply them, assigning the psalms to Haggai and Zechariah. The even more triumphant Ps. 149 has no ascription in MT or in LXX.

The overall picture set out here stands somewhere between the plausible and the probable. For a Jewish society under some foreign government, at home or abroad, these psalms seem to invite accusations of disloyalty or actual incitement to rebellion. The heading of Ps. 51 (here proposed as the

subscript of Ps. 50B) could be seen as a lightning-rod, to prevent some actual association with a ruler notorious for deceit and adultery. One notes, by the way, that none of the thirteen psalms with "historical" ascriptions is attested as having been used in the liturgy of the Second Temple (for the data see Büchler 1899/1900). It is not difficult to choose some historical situation to fit our hypothesis, from the Persian period onwards, in Erez Israel or in any other country of the primary diaspora. The problem of the discrepancies within the ascriptions as such, versus the Davidic *historia* in MT, could also be joined to this hypothesis: they must have arisen, or been transmitted for some time, in an environment that could sustain a variant tradition<sup>56</sup>.

As stated at the beginning, the hypothesis proposed here is extremely tentative and still needs external proofs. At any rate it may be deduced that the situational-"historical" ascriptions arose either concurrently with or later than the *šîr ham-ma'alôt* group of titles. As such, they constitute the very latest stratum of the lengthy development of the Hebrew titles. The LXX clearly continues the trend, but in its own ways.

#### 6.4 The sporadic terms

A number of terms occur sporadically and are hard to place within the "stratification". To complete the survey they will be commented upon here. Their order is according to the first appearance of the term in the present arrangement of the Psalter.

[a] *ŠGYWN* (vocalized *šiggayôn*). In title 7 only, followed by *le-dawid* plus a circumstantial ascription of singular form (see §6.3[c] above). Titles 6 and 8 have both *LMNZH* and *ʿal-X* (resp. *el-X* in title 6). Title 7 lacks these, though the ascription has *ʿal-divrê*. . . Ps. 7 is a conventional prayer of the individual, interrupted by a different element: vv. 7-9a are the remnants of a battle-epiphany hymn, archaic in style (cf. Ps. 68) and apparently much corrupted. The same style and thematics appear in the poem that now stands as ch. 3 of Habakkuk, there superscribed תפלה לחבקוק הנביא על-שגינות. (its subscript *LMNZH bi-negînotay* has been discussed in §6.1[a] and 6.1[c] above). *ŠGYWN* and *ʿal-ŠGYNWT* are

56. In view of Cross' proposal (1975) that MT represents a "Babylonian" tradition, the matter becomes even more interesting. Do the discrepancies in the titles testify to a variant current outside Erez Israel, or – on the contrary – to a local tradition that became "submerged"?

For accusations against the Jews see in Stern 1974. A recent relevant study is Daniel 1979, though he does not emphasize the political aspect.

evidently related and could be archaic. Was the superscript ŠGYWN originally attached to the fragment that is now “stuck” in the middle of Ps. 7? It is difficult to see how the montage could have come about. ŠGYWN has long been linked with an Accadian word *šegû* assumed to mean ‘lament’. *AHw* features three suitable terms: *šegû* and *šigû* centering on lamentation, and *šegû* centering on ‘to be wildly angry’<sup>57</sup>. Neither of these is documented as a titling term proper, i.e. as the name of a recognized genre, in Mesopotamia itself.

[b] *Tefillah*. Titles 17 (David), 86 (David), 90 (Moses), 102 (an afflicted person), 142 (David). Note that Ps. 17 immediately precedes Ps. 18 = II Sam. 22 and that title 90 opens the Fourth Book (after the “little” doxology placed as Ps. 89:53). The other psalms are also located at boundary-regions of the redactionary – or rather anthologizing – process. So is, of course, the subscript כלו תפלות דוד בן ישי at Ps. 72:20, placed after a large doxology and thus sealing off the Second Book. In the Qumran Psalms Scroll, the *tehillah* which MT has in title 145 appears as *tefillah*<sup>58</sup>. Note: *tefillah* also appears at the beginning of the heading in Habakkuk 3.

[c] *Le-hazkîr*. In titles 38 and 70. Note that Ps. 70 = Ps. 40:14-18. In both titles the sequence is *le-dawid le-hazkîr*; the term might thus have been added later than *le-dawid*. The term has been linked to the *azkarah* offering (summary see Kraus 1978<sup>5</sup>:25). It is difficult to see, though, either Ps. 38 or Ps. 70 as texts accompanying a sacrificial ceremony. In the Psalms Scroll from Qumran (11QPs<sup>a</sup>), Ps. 145 has *zô’t* [!] *le-zikkarôn* at the end of its last line. The present writer doubts whether this offers any help with regard to *le-hazkîr* (see above, p. 39).

[d] *Le-lammed*. Only in title 60. Note its position there, between *le-dawid* and the long circumstantial ascription. The current explanations do not seem to offer anything decisive.

[e] *Li-šelomoh*. In title 72 as the only term, and in 127 added to *šîr ham-ma‘alôt*. Title 72 is the more interesting case. The psalm itself is pre-exilic (Northern?) and has assonances with Ps. 45; both have assonances with the Song of Songs (itself also credited to Solomon); and the psalm is placed at the end of the Second Book – followed by a long doxology and the general subscript כלו תפלות דוד בן ישי. Its “Solomonization” was easy, and in fact necessary since it speaks of a king who is the son of a king. One

57. Not surprisingly, an explanation that combines both is already in the literature: Gössmann (1968) concludes that *šigayyôn* is “erregtes Klagelied”.

58. Col. XVII (DJD IV, pl. XI and transcription p. 38).

can hardly say, though, whether this was done together with the addition of *li-šēlomoh* to the heading of Ps. 127. The latter has *li-šēlomoh* in the Qumran Psalms Scroll, but not in the main old witnesses to the Greek tradition (see Staerk 1892:128). It is therefore possible to suggest that *li-šēlomoh* in title 127 was added very late, after the inclusion (or titling) of the *šîr ham-ma'alôt* group as such. One might then see it as a harbinger of the onset of Solomonic pseudepigrapha that were to end with the actual creation of "Psalms of Solomon" around the middle of the first century BCE.

[f] Heman (title 88) and Ethan (title 89), both called *ha-ezrahî*. Both titles also feature *maskîl*. Title 88 is an agglomeration of three titles, resp. remnants. Ps. 89 is itself a compound of four units; it is followed by the "little" doxology closing the Third Book. Gese (1972:60-61) postulates a term around 300 BCE for these headings. They are taken as reflecting a change in status of the three singers' groups, deduced from various indications in Chronicles (details in Gese 1963). The Asaphites retreat and the Hemanites come to the fore, together with the Ethanites. Since the singers' genealogies are a Gordian knot, the matter cannot be considered as fully settled. At any rate the Ethan and Heman titles are seen to stand in a boundary-area. Whether they are superscripts or subscripts has been discussed in §6.1[b] above.

[g] *Le-tôdah*. Only in title 100 *mizmôr le-tôdah*. The conventional proposal of an association with the *tôdah*-offering can neither be proved nor disproved.

[h] *Tehillah*. Only in title 145 *tehillah le-dawid*. As already noted above, this appears in the Qumran Psalms Scroll as *tefillah le-dawîd*, in col. XVI. Eleven columns later (col. XXVII), in the "List of David's compositions", he is credited with having written 3,600 *tehillîm*, and other compositions that are all termed *šîr* (see §6.3[a] above).

## POSTSCRIPT

N. M. Sarna's "The psalm superscriptions and the guilds" (1979 – see bibliography) only became available to me while this study was already going to press. Sarna's study explores many aspects that have also been explored here and often reaches the same conclusion by a slightly different path. The status of the singers and the place of music in the Israelite cult are discussed at length; the place of music is in fact one of the core-concerns of Sarna's investigation. These aspects have not been taken up here, since it seemed possible to deal with our own core-concern – the titles themselves – without involving them as well, at least at this stage. On some of Sarna's conclusions in matters of detail, I would have liked to offer animadversions or at least pose questions. All this could obviously not be integrated with the discourse by simply adding "see also" references.

## APPENDIX

## A SAMPLE STATISTICAL TEST: לדרור/למנצח

## 1. Test for Book I to III only

Count of terms by overt appearance in MT, and by MT unit boundaries.  
Number of cases: 89 (including zero-titles). Z=LMNZH, D=le-dawid.

	+Z	–Z
+D	36	21
–D	16	16

$X^2 / 1 \text{ df} = 1.33$ ;  $P < .30$ ;  $N = 89$

## 2. Check: test for all five Books

Count as above. Number of cases: 150 (including zero-titles).

	+Z	–Z
+D	39	34
–D	16	61

$X^2 / 1 \text{ df} = 15.29$ ;  $P < .001$ ;  $N = 150$

For the first test the premise was that only in Books I – III were Z and D imposed by systematic titling-actions on extensive collections of psalms. The three cases of Z in Book V were held to be wholly or largely later imitations. In Books I – III, the frequency of Z as such is 52 and of D as such is



57. The test indicates that the probability of +Z+D in one title having occurred by chance is more than 30%: *there is no significant correlation between the two terms*. If we conclude, from our other analyses, that the titling-action of D was later than that of Z, the result of the first test is: a) the functional meaning of *LMNZH*, irrespective of whether it was properly known to the later editor, was *not* a factor in the decision to impose *le-dawid* on certain psalms; hence – b) even if the later editor did not know the functional meaning of *LMNZH*, at any rate he could not have understood it as having any connections with David.

The outcome of the second test is *practically the opposite of the first!* In the entire Psalter, the frequency of Z as such is 55 times and of D as such 73 times. Here the probability of +Z+D in one title having occurred by chance is about 0.1%; hence there is a significant correlation between the terms. Since the quantities involved in the first test were not very small, the contrasting outcome is puzzling. We therefore try still another check.

3. Check: test for Books IV-V only.

Count as above. Number of Cases: 61 (including zero-titles).

	+Z	-Z
+D	3	13
-D	0	45

A procedure based on  $X^2$  cannot be used when the expected (i.e. chance) frequency for any cell is less than 5. We make a simpler calculation, multiplying the percentage of occurrences of Z as such with that of D as such. The probability of +Z+D having occurred by chance comes out as 1.2%. This is about ten times larger than the minute probability yielded by the second test, but still insignificant. The most reasonable interpretation is that in Books IV–V, the three cases of +Z+D are all or mostly *imitations*. *LMNZH le-dawid* was imposed as one title (probably together with *mizmôr* as well). This is supported by the conclusions which we have drawn from the three cases without a statistical analysis, so-to-speak freehand. The outcome of the second test (entire Psalter) can thus be understood as being due to an external factor or factors affecting the data as they stand now (a conclusion which is well supported by the current opinions on the “last third of the Psalter”) . A general conclusion is also well supported by this experiment of the three tests: that a mechanical

processing of all the 150 resp. 117 titles will most probably yield a wholly misleading result.

It should be emphasized that the test shown here, and all the others undertaken at this stage of the investigation, are preliminary, simple, and by no means exhaustive.

# REFERENCES QUOTED

## Abbreviations for periodicals

BuAr	Bulletin Archéologique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques	JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly	LA	Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus
FRCS	Folklore Research Center Studies (Jerusalem)	PAPS	Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual	RB	Revue Biblique
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal	RQ	Revue de Qumrân
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature	TGUOS	Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies	VT	Vetus Testamentum
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society	ZAW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Aharoni, Y.

1975 י. אהרני, כתובות ערר, ירושלים

AHw

Akkadisches Handwörterbuch (eds. W. von Soden *et al.*). Wiesbaden 1959—

Altmann Fs. 1979

Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History, presented to Alexander Altmann on the occasion of his seventieth birthday (eds. S. Stein, R. Loewe). University of Alabama 1979

ANET<sup>2</sup>-Ginsberg

Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (ed. J. R. Pritchard). 2nd ed. Princeton N.J. 1955. "Ugaritic Myths, Epics and Legends", tr. and comm. by H.L. Ginsberg: 129-155

Baillet, M.

1961 "Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, Grotte 4: 'Les paroles des luminaires'", RB 68 (1961):195-250

Barber, E. J. W.

1974 Archaeological Decipherment; a handbook. Princeton N.J. 1974

Barr, J.

1974 "Etymology and the Old Testament", Outdtestamentische Studiën 19(1974):1-28

Baudissin Fs. 1918

Abhandlungen zur Semitischen Religionskunde und Sprachwissenschaft, W.W. Grafen von Baudissin... überreicht (eds. W. Franken-berg, F. Küchler). Giessen 1918 (Beihefte zur ZAW, 33)

- Bayer, B.  
 1968 "The Biblical Nebel", Yuval 1 (1968):89-161  
 — The Mesopotamian Theory of Music and the Notations from Ugarit; a re-examination. Jerusalem (Yuval Monograph Series, 8) [in print]
- Büchler, A.  
 1899/1900 "Zur Geschichte der Tempelmusik und der Tempelsalmen", ZAW 19(1899):96-133, 329-344; 20(1900):97-135
- Buss, M.J.  
 1963 "The psalms of Asaph and Korah", JBL 82 (1963):382-392
- Butler, T.C.  
 1978 "A forgotten passage from a forgotten era (I Chr. XVI 8-36)", VT 28 (1978):142-150
- Carmignac, J.  
 1969 "Le document sur Melkisédeq", RQ 7 (1969):343-378
- CharlesAp/Psep  
 The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in English; edited in conjunction with many scholars by R.H. Charles. Vol. I: Apocrypha. Vol. II: Pseudepigrapha. Oxford 1913
- Childs, B.S.  
 1971 "Psalm titles and midrashic exegesis", JSS 16 (1971):137-150  
 1976 "Reflections on the modern study of the Psalms", Wright Mem. 1976:377-388
- Clarke, D.L.  
 1968 Analytical Archaeology. London 1968
- Cohen, A.  
 1970 א. כהן, "על במקום אל", בית מקרא 15(1970):207-206
- Cohen, M.E.  
 1972 An analysis of the *balag*-compositions to the god Enlil copied during the Seleucid period. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania 1972 [*reprod.* via University Microfilms, Ann Arbor Mich.]
- ConcVulg  
 Novae concordantiae Bibliorum Sacrorum iuxta vulgatam versionem critice editam. . . (ed. B. Fischer). Tomus V: S-Z. Stuttgart/Bad Cannstatt 1977
- CongJSt  
 4, 2 דברי הקונגרס העולמי הרביעי למדעי היהדות, ירושלים תשכ"ה/1965. כרך 2. ירושלים 1968  
 7, Bible דברי הקונגרס העולמי השביעי למדעי היהדות, ירושלים תשל"ז/1977. מחקרים במקרא ובמזרח הקדמון. ירושלים 1981
- Cooke, G.  
 1964 "The Sons of (The) God(s)", ZAW 76(1964):22-47
- Cross, F.M.  
 1975 "The evolution of a theory of Local Texts", QumHistBT: 306-35
- Dalman, G.H.  
 1901 Palästinischer Diwan. Leipzig 1901

Daniel, J.L.

1979 "Anti-Semitism in the Hellenistic and Roman Period", *JBL* 98(1979): 45-65

Delekat, L.

1964 "Probleme der Psalmenüberschriften", *ZAW* 35(1964):280-297

DJD I

D. Barthélemy, J.T. Milik: *Qumrân Cave 1*. Oxford 1955 (Discoveries in the Judean Desert... I)

DJD IV

J.A. Sanders: *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)*. Oxford 1965 (Discoveries in the Judean Desert... IV)

DJD V

J.M. Allegro (collab. A.A. Anderson) : *Qumrân Cave 4*, [vol.] I (4Q 158-4Q 186). Oxford 1968 (Discoveries in the Judean Desert... V) [consulted together with reviews: Strugnell 1970, Weiss 1969]

EAC 18

Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 18: *Pseudepigrapha I*; Vandoeuvres-Genève 1971 (ed. O. Reverdin). Genève 1972

Eggebrecht, H. H.

1955 *Studien zur musikalischen Terminologie*. Wiesbaden/Mainz 1955 (Akad. der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhdlgn. der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftl. Klasse, Jhrg. 1955, Nr. 10)

Eissfeldt, O./Ackroyd P.R.

1965 *The Old Testament – An Introduction*. Oxford 1965 [Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Tübingen 1964, tr. and augm. by P.R. Ackroyd in collab. with the author]

EJ

*Encyclopedia Judaica*. Jerusalem 1971/72

Elbogen, I.

1972<sup>4</sup> י.מ. אלבוגן, התפילה בישראל בהתפתחותה ההסטורית. תרגם על-פי המהדורה השלישית [1935] י. עמיר; ערך והשלים י. היינמן (בהשתתפות י. ארלר, א. נגב, י. פטוחובסקי, ח. שירמן). תל-אביב 1972

EnMiq

אנציקלופדיה מקראית. ירושלים

Février, J.G.

1954 "La bilingue de Guelaa bou Sba", *BuAr* 1951-1952 (publ. 1954): 38-43

Fishbane, M.

1974 "Accusations of adultery: a study of law and scribal practice in Numbers 5:11-31", *HUCA* 45(1974):25-45

1980 "Biblical colophons, textual criticism and legal analogies", *CBQ* 42 (1980):438-449

Gehman, H. S.

1966 "Adventures in Septuagint lexicography", *Textus* 5 (1966):125-132

Gese, H.

1963 "Zur Geschichte der Kultsänger am zweiten Tempel", *Michel Fs.* 1963:222-234

- 1972 "Die Entstehung der Büchereinteilung des Psalters", Ziegler Fs. 1972,2:56-64
- Gevaryahu, H.M.I.
- 1975 "Biblical colophons: a source for the 'biography' of authors, texts and books", Congress Volume Edinburgh 1974: 42-59 (Supplements to VT, 28; Leiden 1975)
- 1978 ח.מ.י. גבריהו, "קולופונים בספר משלי, איוב וקהלת", Loewenstamm Fs. 1978: 107-137
- 1981 "לחקר התופעה של העברת חומר קולופוני מסיומי טקסטים לפתיחתם", CongJSt 7, Bible: Hebrew Section 37-48
- Ginsberg, H.L.
- 1945 "Psalms and inscriptions of petition and acknowledgement", Ginzberg Fs. 1945:159-171
- 1969 "A strand in the cord of Hebraic hymnody", Eretz Israel 9 = Albright Volume (1969):45-50
- Ginzberg Fs. 1945  
Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. English section (eds. A. Marx *et al.*). New York 1945
- Gössmann, F.
- 1968 "Der šiggājōn", Augustinianum 8 (1968):367-381
- Goldschmidt, D.
- 1960 ד. גולדשמידט, הגדה של פסח; מקורותיה ותולדותיה... ירושלים 1960
- Gradl, F. W.
- 1971 "Abermals Ueberlegungen zu Struktur und Finalitaet von Ps. 29", LA 29 (1979):90-110
- Gray, G.B.
- 1913 The Psalms of Solomon, in CharlesPsep: 625-652
- Grayson, A. K.
- 1980 "Assyria and Babylonia", Orientalia 49 (1980):140-194 [in project "Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East", dir. by J.W. Wevers; see preface *ibid.*: 137-139]
- Gruenwald, I.
- 1980 א. גרינוולד, "שירת המלאכים, הקדושה ובעיית חיבורה של ספרות ההיכלות", Schalit Mem. 1980:459-481; English abstract: xxvi-xxviii
- Hallo, W.W.
- 1981 "Letters, prayers and letter-prayers", CongJSt 7, Bible: English section 17-27
- Hartmann, H.
- 1960 Die Musik der Sumerischen Kultur. Frankfurt a/M 1960. Ph.D. diss., Frankfurt Univ.
- Hengel, M.
- 1972 "Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und 'literarische Fälschung' in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur", EAC 18:231-308
- Hex-Mercati I/II  
Psalterii hexapli reliquiae, cura et studio Ioannis Card. Mercati... editae. [I] Pars prima: Codex rescriptus bibliothecae Ambrosianae O 39 SVP, phototypice expressus et transcriptus. Roma 1958. — [II] Pars

prima "Osservazioni" – Commento critico al testo dei frammenti esaplatari. Roma 1965 [later editor G.R. Castellino]

Horgan, M.P.

1979 Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books. Washington D.C. 1979 (CBQ Monograph Series, 8)

Hunger, M.

1968 Babylonische und Assyrische Kolophone. Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968 (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 2) [consulted together with reviews and supplements: R. Borger, Welt des Orients 5 (1970) : 165-171 ; W. Lambert, *ibid.*: 290-291]

Hurvitz, A.

1972 א. הורביץ, בין לשון ללשון; לתולדות לשון המקרא בימי בית שני. ירושלים

Illmann, K.-J.

1976 "Thema und Tradition in den Asaf-Psalmen. Åbo 1976 (Publications of the Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation, 13)

Japhet, S.

1968 "The supposed common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemia investigated anew", VT 18 (1968):330-371

1977 ש. יפת, אמונות ודעות בספר דברי-הימים ומקומן בעולם המחשבה המקראית. ירושלים 1977

Kilmer, A. D.

1971 "The discovery of an ancient Mesopotamian theory of Music", PAPS 115 (1971):131-149

Kimhi ed. Darom

ר' דוד קמחי (רד"ק), הפירוש השלם על תהלים, יוצא לאור . . .  
על ידי אברהם דרום. ירושלים תשל"ד/1974 [ההקדמה: תשכ"ז]

Kraus, H.J.

1978<sup>5</sup> Psalmen. 5. grundlegend überarbeitete und veränderte Aufl. Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978 (Biblischer Kommentar–Altes Testament, XV) [3 vols; all specific references are to vol. 1]

Kuhn, Th. S.

1970<sup>2</sup> The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. 2nd ed. Chicago 1970

Lambert, W. G.

1962 "A catalogue of texts and authors", JCS 16 (1962):59-77

Langdon, S.

1921 "Babylonian and Hebrew musical terms", JRAS 1921:109-191

Laroche, E.

1968 "Textes hourrites en cunéiformes syllabiques", Ug V: 447-544

Liberman, S.

1962 ש. ליברמן, יוונית ויוונית בארץ ישראל . . . בתקופת המשנה והתלמוד.  
ירושלים תשכ"ג

Liebreich, L. J.

1954 י.א. ליברייך, "מומורי הלויים לימי השבוע", ארץ-ישראל ג' = ספר  
קאסוטו (1954): 170-173

1955 "The Songs of Ascent and the Priestly Blessing", JBL 74 (1955):33-36

Liver, Y.

1968 י. ליור, פרקים בתולדות הכהונה והלווייה. ירושלים תשכ"ט

Loewenstamm, S.E.

1950 EnMiq 1 (1950): cols. 482-483 ש.א. ליוניטס, ערך "אסף",

1976 — ערכים "קרח בן עשו"; "הקרחים, קרח, בני קרח"; "קרח, רתן ואבירם",  
EnMiq 7 (1976): cols. 255-262

Loewenstamm Fs. 1978

LXX מחקרים במקרא ובמזרח הקדמון, מוגשים לשמואל א. ליוניטס במלאת לו  
שבעים שנה (עורכים: י. אבישור, י. בלאו). ירושלים 1978

edition used: Psalmi cum odis, edidit A. Rahlfs. 2. durchgesehene Aufl.  
Göttingen 1970 (Septuaginta; Vetus Testamentum Graecum, X)  
[1931<sup>1</sup>]

MacKenzie, R.A.F.

1970 "Ps. 148, 14bc: conclusion or title?", Biblica 51 (1970):221-224

Michel Fs. 1963

Abraham unser Vater – Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die  
Bibel; Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag (eds. O. Betz, M.  
Hengel, P. Schmidt). Leiden 1963

Milik, J.T.

1956 report in "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân",  
RB 63 (1956):49-67

1957 "Deux documents inédits du Désert de Juda", Biblica 38  
(1957):245-268

Miller, J.M.

1970 "The Korahites of Southern Judah", CBQ 32 (1970):58-68

Mittmann, S.

1978 "Komposition und Redaktion von Psalm XXIX", VT 28  
(1978): 172-194

Mowinkel, S.

1921 Psalmenstudien I-VI. Oslo 1921-1924. IV(1921): Die Technischen Ter-  
mini in den Psalmenüberschriften

Neubauer, A.

1890 "The authorship and the titles of the psalms according to early Jewish  
authorities", Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica 2 (1890):1-58

Nida Fs. 1974

On Language, Culture and Religion: in honor of Eugene A. Nida (eds.  
M. Black, W.A. Smalley). The Hague-Paris 1974

Nöldeke, Th.

1918 "Hallelujah", Baudissin Fs. 1918:375-380

Ouellette, J.

1969 "Variantes qumrâniennes du livre des psaumes", RQ 7 (1969):105-123

Pietersma, A.

1980 "David in the Greek Psalms", VT 30 (1980):213-226

PIH

Psalterium iuxta hebraeos



van der Ploeg, J.

1967 "Fragments d'un manuscrit de psaumes de Qumran (11QPs<sup>b</sup>)", RB 44 (1967):408-412

Preuss, H. D.

1959 "Die Psalmenüberschriften in Targum und Midrasch", ZAW 71 (1959): 44-54

QumHistBT

Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text (eds. F.M. Cross, Sh. Talmon). Cambridge Mass. 1975

Rabinowitz, I.

1972 "Pēsher/pittārōn; its Biblical meaning and its significance in the Qumran literature", RQ 8 (1972):220-232

Sachs, C.

1940 The History of Musical Instruments. New York 1940

Sanders, J.A.

1965 "Pre-masoretic Psalter texts"; CBQ 27(1965):114-123. Also in Sanders 1967:143-149 (= Appendix II)

1965<sup>a</sup> see DJD IV

1967 The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll. Ithaca N.Y. 1967

1968 "Cave 11 surprises and the question of canon", McCormick Quarterly 21(1968): 284-298. Reprinted in New Directions in Biblical Archaeology (eds. D.N. Freedman, J.C. Greenfield). Garden City N.Y. 1969 (Anchor paperback edition 1971). Also in The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible – an introductory reader (ed. S.Z. Leiman). New York 1974

1974 "The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) reviewed", Nida Fs. 1974:81-99

Sarna, N.M.

1962 "The Psalm for the Sabbath Day (Ps. 92)", JBL 81(1962): 155-168

1971 art. "Psalms", EJ 13: cols. 1303-1322

1979 "The psalm superscriptions and the guilds", Altmann Fs. 1979: 281-300

Sawyer, J.F.A.

1968 "An analysis of the context and meanings of the Psalm-headings", TGUOS 22(1968): 26-38

Schalit Mem. 1980

פרקים בתולדות ירושלים בימי בית שני – ספר זכרון לאברהם שליט  
(עורכים: א. אופנהיימר, א. רפפורט, מ. שטרן). ירושלים תשמ"א/1980

Schubart, W.

1921<sup>2</sup> Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern. 2. Aufl. Berlin 1921 (Handbücher der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin)

Schumacher, G. /Watzinger, C.

1929 Tell el Mutesellim [Bd.] II (bearb. von. C. Watzinger). Leipzig 1929

Segal, M. Z.

1958<sup>2</sup> מ.צ. סגל, ספר בן-סירא השלם. מהדורה שניה. ירושלים תשי"ט

Seybold, K.

1979 "Die Redaktion der Wallfahrtspsalmen", ZAW 91(1979): 247-268

Shiloah, A.

- 1974 "A group of Arabic wedding songs from the village of Deyr el-Asad",  
FRCS 4 = Studies in Marriage Customs (1974): 267-296

Shmueli, H.

- 1968 "פרשני ימי הביניים על המוסיקה בתנ"ך",  
CongJSt 4, 2: Hebrew section 409-412

Skehan, P. W.

- 1957 "The Qumran manuscripts and textual criticism", Congress Volume  
Strasbourg 1956: 148-160 (Supplements to VT, 4; Leiden 1957)  
1964 "A Psalm manuscript from Qumran (4QPs<sup>b</sup>)", CBQ 26(1964): 313-322  
1973 "A liturgical complex in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>", CBQ 35(1973): 195-205

Slomovic, E.

- 1979 "Toward an understanding of the formation of historical titles in the  
Book of Psalms", ZAW 91(1979): 350-380

Smith, M.

- 1972 "Pseudepigraphy in the Israelite literary tradition", EAC 18: 191-215

Speyer, W.

- 1972 "Fälschung, pseudepigraphische freie Erfindung und 'echte religiöse  
Pseudepigraphie'", EAC 18: 333-336

Staerk, W.

- 1892 "Zur Kritik der Psalmenüberschriften", ZAW 12(1892): 91-151

Stern, M.

- 1974 Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism. Vol. 1: From Herodo-  
tus to Plutarch. Jerusalem 1974

Strugnell, J.

- 1960 "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumrân – 4Q Serek širôt 'ôlat haššabât",  
Congress Volume Oxford 1959: 318-345 (Supplements to VT, 6; Leiden  
1960)  
1970 "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judean Desert of  
Jordan'", RQ 7(1970): 163-276

Syme, R.

- 1972 "Fraud and Imposture", EAC 18: 1-21

Talmon, Sh.

- 1975 "The textual study of the Bible – a new outlook", QumHistBT:  
321-400

Thirtle, J. W.

- 1905<sup>2</sup> The Titles of the Psalms. 2nd edition. London 1905 [1904<sup>1</sup>]

Turner, E. G.

- 1968 Greek Papyri; an introduction. Oxford 1968  
1971 Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World. Princeton N.J. 1971

Ug V

Ugaritica V: nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des  
archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit (eds. J. Nougayrol et al.).  
Paris 1968 (Mission de Ras Shamra, 16)

Viteau, J.

- 1911 Les Psaumes de Salomon; introduction, texte grec et traduction; avec les principales variantes de la version syriaque, par Fr. Martin. Paris 1911

Vosté, J.-M.

- 1944 "Sur les titres des psaumes dans la pešitta, surtout d'après la recension orientale", *Biblica* 25(1944): 210-235

Wanke, G

- 1966 Die Zionstheologie der Korachiten. Giessen 1966 (Beihefte zur ZAW, 97)

Weiss, R.

- 1969 *review of* DJD V, *Kirjath Sepher* 45(1969): 64-63 [in Hebrew]

Wohlenberg, D.

- 1967 Kultmusik in Israel: eine forschungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Hamburg 1967. Theol.D. diss., Hamburg Univ.

Wright, Mem. 1976

Magnalia Dei – The Mighty Acts of God; essays on the Bible and Archaeology in memory of G. Ernest Wright (eds. F.M. Cross, W.E. Lemke, P.D. Miller Jr.). Garden City N.Y. 1976

Yadin, Y.

- 1961 "The expedition to the Judean Desert, 1960. Expedition D", *IEJ* 11(1961): 36-52  
 1965 "The excavation of Masada, 1963/64; preliminary report", *IEJ* 15(1965): 1-20  
 1965<sup>a</sup> The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada. Jerusalem 1965/ מגילת בן-סירה ממצודה [Hebrew/English, with parallel paginations]  
 1966 "Another fragment (E) of the Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11 (11-QPs<sup>a</sup>)", *Textus* 5(1966): 1-10

Yeivin, I.

- 1968 י. ייבין, כתר ארם-צובה: ניקודו וטעמיו. ירושלים תשל"ט/1968 (כתבי מפעל המקרא של האוניברסיטה העברית, ג)  
 1969 "The division into sections in the Book of Psalms", *Textus* 7(1969): 76-102

Ziegler Fs. 1972, 2

Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch; Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler (ed. J. Schreiner). Bd. 2: Beiträge zu Psalmen und Propheten. Würzburg 1972 (Forschungen zur Bibel, 2)

van Zijl, P.J.

- 1972 Baal; a Study of Texts in Connexion with Baal in the Ugaritic Epics. Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972 (*Alter Orient und Altes Testament*, 10)

Bathja Bayer: The Titles of the Psalms

**Table II:**

**Analytical Table of  
the Psalm Titles**

Each title is set out in the actual order of its components. The spacing establishes five columns, corresponding to the proposed five titling-parameters. Blanks have been put for the “unfilled slots”. The order of the parameters (columns/slots) is the one established by the actual sequence of components in about 80% of the titles. In the remainder, components have been transposed to fit into the scheme but the actual sequences are indicated by arrows.

Symbols	References and remarks
→ actual sequence of components, e.g. מזמור → לדוד = מזמור לדוד	... 12 verse 12 quoted, with no particular qualifications
● title has component that might be subscript of preceding psalm (details given in remarks)	// ... 12 verse quoted is final one of psalm, by MT division
○ present end of psalm shows presumable remnant of a subscript (details given in remarks)	A 2–6 presumed or arguable sections of different provenience, resp. stylistic break; indication made when a section is also a doublet (example see Pss. 31 and 71)
( ) title of doublet text elsewhere in the Psalter, placed beneath for comparison.	B 7–15
[ ] LXX, most manuscripts	IV component referred-to is located in col. IV of the table, i.e. belongs to parameter IV.
[[ ]] LXX, a few manuscripts (information given here is not exhaustive!)	E and J “Elohistic” (E) and “Yahwistic” (J) formulation, indicated only for special cases.

					FIR
				1	
				2	
	לדוד	מזמור		● 3	
/adscript Ps. 2?	בברחו מפני אבשלום בנו				
	לדוד	מזמור	בנגינות	למנצח	4 A2-B6-
Ps. 4A harvest song?	לדוד	מזמור	אל-הנחילות	● למנצח	5
n	לדוד	מזמור	בנגינות על-השמינית	למנצח	6
/adscript Ps. 6?	לדוד אשר-שר ליהוה על-דברי-כוש בן-ימיני	שגיון		●	7 A2-B7-
	לדוד	מזמור	על-הגתית	למנצח	8
	לדוד	מזמור	עלמות לבן	למנצח	9 Alph
				10	comp
	לדוד	[psalmos]		למנצח	11
	לדוד	מזמור	על-השמינית	למנצח	12
	לדוד	מזמור		למנצח	13
2 לרא	לדוד (לדוד)	[psalmos] משכיל	על-מחלת	למנצח למנצח	14 Ps. Ps.
	לדוד	מזמור			15
11 נעמות	לדוד	מכתם		○	16
1	לדוד	תפלה			17
	לעבד-יהוה לדוד			למנצח	18 = D A2-B35
אשר דבר ליהוה את-דברי השירה הזאת ביום הציל-יהוה אותנו מכף כל-איביו ומיד שאול: ויאמר ארחמך ...					

19	A2-B8-	למנצח	מזמור	לדוד
20		למנצח	מזמור	לדוד
21		למנצח	מזמור	לדוד
22	A2-B23-	למנצח	מזמור	לדוד
23			מזמור	לדוד
24			מזמור	לדוד
25	alph		[psalmos]	לדוד
26				לדוד
27	A1b-B7-			לדוד
28				לדוד
29	11 =		מזמור	לדוד
30		[eis to telos]	מזמור שיר חנכת הבית	לדוד
31	A2-4 = P B4b	למנצח	מזמור	לדוד
32			משכיל	לדוד
33				[tō David]
34	alph			לדוד
35			[[psalmos]]	לדוד

Each title is set out in the actual order of its components. The spacing establishes five columns, corresponding to the proposed five titling-parameters. Blanks have been put for the “unfilled slots”. The order of the parameters (columns/slots) is the one established by the actual sequence of components in about 80% of the titles. In the remainder, components have been transposed to fit into the scheme but the actual sequences are indicated by arrows.

Symbols	References and remarks
→ actual sequence of components, e.g. מזמור → לדוד = מזמור לדוד	... 12 verse 12 quoted, with no particular qualifications
● title has component that might be subscript of preceding psalm (details given in remarks)	// ... 12 verse quoted is final one of psalm, by MT division
○ present end of psalm shows presumable remnant of a subscript (details given in remarks)	A 2–6 presumed or arguable sections of different provenience, resp. stylistic break; indication made when a section is also a doublet (example see Pss. 31 and 71)
( ) title of doublet text elsewhere in the Psalter, placed beneath for comparison.	B 7–15
[ ] LXX, most manuscripts	IV component referred-to is located in col. IV of the table, i.e. belongs to parameter IV.
[[ ]] LXX, a few manuscripts (information given here is not exhaustive!)	E and J “Elohistic” (E) and “Yahwistic” (J) formulation, indicated only for special cases.

IV III II I

ipt Ps. 35 ex "עברו"?	לעבר יהוה לדור				למנצח	36	
	לדור					37	alph
th <i>azkarah-</i> abbath? 24:7-8)	[peri sabbatou] להזכיר	לדור	מזמור			38	
(= ?"שיר")		לדור	מזמור	ליריתון	למנצח	39	
		לדור	מזמור		למנצח	40	A2- B14 Ps.
	להזכיר	לדור			למנצח	70)	
2 אשרי		לדור	מזמור		למנצח	41	
							SECON
	לבני־קרח	משכיל			למנצח	42	{ 43
LXX "לבנ	לבני־קרח	משכיל			למנצח	44	
amium?	לבני־קרח	משכיל	על־ששנים		למנצח	45	
		שיר ידית					
(= ?"מזמור")	לבני־קרח	שיר	על־עלמות		למנצח	46	
ut 8	לבני־קרח	מזמור			למנצח	47	
LXX ... הוא ינה	[deutera sabbatou]	לבני־קרח	שיר מזמור			48	
		לבני־קרח	מזמור		למנצח	49	
18 ועם	לאסף [[to David]]	מזמור				50	A1k B10

adscr.	לדוד	מזמור		למנצח	51	●
	בבוא־אליו נתן הנביא כאשר־בא אל־בת־שבע					
a wicked <i>gibbôr</i>	לדוד	משכיל		למנצח	52	
	בבוא דואג האדמי ויגד לשאול ויאמר לו בא דוד אל־בית אחימלך					
	לדוד (לדוד)	משכיל [psalmos]	על־מחלת	למנצח למנצח	53 14)	Ps. Ps.
	לדוד	משכיל	בנגינת	למנצח	54	
	בבוא הזיפים ויאמרו לשאול הלא דוד מסתתר עמנו					
8-7 מִיִּיתֵן־לִי	לדוד	משכיל	בנגינת	למנצח	55	
11-10 חנּס און ועמל						
ot Ps. 55? bscr./adscr. Ps. 55?	לדוד	על־יונת אלם רחקים מכתם	→	למנצח	56	●
	באחז אתו פלשתים בגת					
	לדוד	מכתם	→	למנצח	57	A2- B6- Ps.
	בברחו מפני־שאול במערה	שיר מזמור (לדוד)			108)	
	לדוד	מכתם	→	למנצח	58	
	לדוד	מכתם	→	למנצח	59	
	בשלח שאול וישמרו את־הבית להמיתו					
3[c]	ללמד : בהצותו את ארם נהרים ואת ארם צובה וישב יואב ויך את־אדום ...	מכתם	על־שושן עדות	למנצח	60	A3- B8- Ps.
7 ימים על־	לדוד		על־נגינת	למנצח	61	
	לדוד	מזמור	על־ידותון	למנצח	62	
2 בארץ ציון wilderness	לדוד	מזמור			63	
	בהיותו במדבר יהודה					





Each title is set out in the actual order of its components. The spacing establishes five columns, corresponding to the proposed five titling-parameters. Blanks have been put for the “unfilled slots”. The order of the parameters (columns/slots) is the one established by the actual sequence of components in about 80% of the titles. In the remainder, components have been transposed to fit into the scheme but the actual sequences are indicated by arrows.

Symbols	References and remarks
→ actual sequence of components, e.g. מזמור → לדוד = מזמור לדוד	... 12 verse 12 quoted, with no particular qualifications
● title has component that might be subscript of preceding psalm (details given in remarks)	// ... 12 verse quoted is final one of psalm, by MT division
○ present end of psalm shows presumable remnant of a subscript (details given in remarks)	A 2–6 presumed or arguable sections of different provenience, resp. stylistic break; indication made when a section is also a doublet (example see Pss. 31 and 71)
( ) title of doublet text elsewhere in the Psalter, placed beneath for comparison.	B 7–15
[ ] LXX, most manuscripts	IV component referred-to is located in col. IV of the table, i.e. belongs to parameter IV.
[ ] LXX, a few manuscripts (information given here is not exhaustive!)	E and J “Elohistic” (E) and “Yahwistic” (J) formulation, indicated only for special cases.

translation	ליום השבת	מזמור שיר		92	
day of pre-Sabbath (= Friday) when the earth = creation of land animals and Man)", ainos ṓdēs tō David				93	
ṓdēs/ainos ṓdēs tō David, tetradi sabbatōn = Wednesday				94	
	[tō David] ← [ainos ṓdēs]			95	
the house was built after the captivity", ṓde tō David; not in II Chr. 16 quotation, see study §6.2[a]; 5 כי בל־אלהי				96	1 2
, when his land is established", apologetic for ot/subscript)?				97	Cor
es MT loss?		מזמור		98	
	[tō David]			99	
	[tō David] ← [psalmos]			100	
בא 4	לתורה	מזמור		101	
	לדוד →	מזמור		102	A2 B1
individual; B = national ayer	לעני כי־יעטף ולפני יהוה ישפך שיחו	תפלה		103	A1 B1
		לדוד		104	
creation of similar, see ed.		[tō David]		105	1-1 I C
hallelūyah. MT end: hallelūyah				106	1?, I C
(cf. I Chr. hallelūyah.	הללויה				

		FIFT	
hallelûyah, from end of Ps. 106?		107	
	שיר מזמור	108	A 2 B 7
ה?	לדור → מזמור	109	למנצח
	לדור → מזמור	110	
	הללויה	111	Alp
	הללויה	112	Alp
	הללויה	113	
= MT 114; 9-26 = MT115)		114	
it: hallelûyah		115	
		116	
MT 116: 1-9, incipit: hallelûyah)		117	
a. LXX incipit: hallelûyah		118	?
ponsorial "cantata"? LXX incipit: hallelûyah		119	Eig
hallelûyah[!], from (lost) end-hallelûyah of MT Ps. 118?		120	
and li-shelomoh unstable in ms. tradition	שיר המעלות	121	
	שיר למעלות	122	
	לדור שיר המעלות	123	
	שיר המעלות	124	
	לדור שיר המעלות	125	
	שיר המעלות	126	
	שיר המעלות	127	



Each title is set out in the actual order of its components. The spacing establishes five columns, corresponding to the proposed five titling-parameters. Blanks have been put for the “unfilled slots”. The order of the parameters (columns/slots) is the one established by the actual sequence of components in about 80% of the titles. In the remainder, components have been transposed to fit into the scheme but the actual sequences are indicated by arrows.

Symbols	References and remarks
→ actual sequence of components, e.g. מזמור → לדוד = מזמור לדוד	... 12 verse 12 quoted, with no particular qualifications
● title has component that might be subscript of preceding psalm (details given in remarks)	// ... 12 verse quoted is final one of psalm, by MT division
○ present end of psalm shows presumable remnant of a subscript (details given in remarks)	A 2–6 presumed or arguable sections of different provenience, resp. stylistic break; indication made when a section is also a doublet (example see Pss. 31 and 71)
( ) title of doublet text elsewhere in the Psalter, placed beneath for comparison.	B 7–15
[ ] LXX, most manuscripts	IV component referred-to is located in col. IV of the table, i.e. belongs to parameter IV.
[[ ]] LXX, a few manuscripts (information given here is not exhaustive!)	E and J “Elohistic” (E) and “Yahwistic” (J) formulation, indicated only for special cases.

		IV	III	II	I	
	שיר המעלות					128
	שיר המעלות					129
	שיר המעלות					130
לדוד	שיר המעלות					131
	שיר המעלות					132
לדוד	שיר המעלות					133
	שיר המעלות					134
הללויה	הללויה					135
End: hallelūyah.						136
LXX incipit: hallelūyah						137
Greek variously tō David, tō David dia Ieremiou (“through Jeremiah”) etc.						138
LXX add. or only: “of Zechariah”	לדוד					139
LXX: “of Zechariah in the diaspora”	לדוד	→	מזמור		למנצח	140
	לדוד		מזמור		למנצח	141
	לדוד		מזמור			142
8 הוציאה ממסגר נפשי //	בהיותו במערה תפלה	לדוד	משכיל			143
LXX add.: “When his son pursued him”	לדוד		מזמור			144
LXX adds: “About Goliath”; 9 שיר חרש						145
Response-verse in 11QPs <sup>a</sup> see study §1.2	לדוד		תהלה			146
LXX add. “of Haggai and Zechariah”. MT end: hallelūyah	הללויה					147
LXX add.: “Of Haggai and Zechariah”. MT end: hallelūyah (147:11-20 separate psalm LXX)	הללויה					148
LXX add.: “Of Haggai and Zachariah”. MT end: hallelūyah	הללויה					

LXX add.: "Of Haggai and Zachariah". MT ends hallelūyah	הללויה	149
MT end: hallelūyah, not LXX	הללויה	150
1 תפלה לחבקוק הנביא על שגינות: 19 יהוה אדני חילי וישם רגלי כאילות ועל במותי ידריכני ל מנצח בנגינותי:	Habakkuk 3	
9 מכתב לחזקיהו מלך יהודה בחלתו ויחי מחליו: 20 יהוה להושיעני ונגינותי ננגן כלימי חיינו על-בית יהוה:	Isaiah 38	

# YUVAL

STUDIES OF  
THE JEWISH MUSIC RESEARCH CENTRE

*Edited by*  
ISRAEL ADLER and BATHJA BAYER  
in collaboration with Lea Shalem

VOLUME IV

JERUSALEM, 1982  
THE MAGNES PRESS, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY

## ABBREVIATIONS

## קיצורים

אדלר, כתבים עבריים      ראה Adler, *HWCM*  
 מתכ"י      המכון לתצלומי כתבי יד, בית הספרים הלאומי  
                     והאוניברסיטאי בירושלים  
 ריס"מ      ראה *RISM*

Adler, <i>HWCM</i>	I. Adler, Hebrew Writings Concerning Music in Manuscripts and Printed Books, from Geonic Times up to 1800, München, 1975
Cat. Margoliouth	Margoliouth, G., Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum
Cat. Neubauer	Neubauer, A. Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library
Cu	Cambridge University Library
<i>ET</i> <sup>2</sup>	The Encyclopaedia of Islam, new ed. Leiden, 1960-
<i>EJ</i> <sup>2</sup>	Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, 1971-72
Erlanger	Erlanger, R. d', La musique arabe, Paris, 1930-1939
<i>HUCA</i>	Hebrew Union College Annual
IMHM	Institute of Microfilms of Hebrew Manuscripts, Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem
<i>JA</i>	Journal asiatique
<i>JJS</i>	Journal of Jewish Studies
<i>JMRS</i>	Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies, ed. A. Altmann, Cambridge, Mass., 1967
JNUL	The Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem
<i>JQR</i>	Jewish Quarterly Review
<i>JRAS</i>	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
<i>KS</i>	Kiryat Sefer; Bibliographical Quarterly of the JNUL
Lbm	London, The British Library

<b>Mbs</b>	München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek
<b><i>MGWJ</i></b>	Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums
<b>Mus. pass.</b>	Passage(s) concerning music
<b>Njts</b>	New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America
<b>Ob</b>	Oxford, Bodleian Library
<b>Pn</b>	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale
<b><i>REJ</i></b>	Revue des études juives
<b><i>RISM</i></b>	Répertoire international des sources musicales
<b><i>Tb</i></b>	The Babylonian Talmud