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PREFACE

The following monograph is mainly concerned with two well-known groups of psalms, (i) the hymns which celebrate the Kingship of Yahweh, and (ii) the so-called royal psalms. Accordingly it may be regarded as one more illustration of the influence which Hermann Gunkel has exercised in the field of Old Testament study by his classification of the psalms according to their literary types and his stress upon the value of discovering, so far as possible, their original Sitz im Leben. By his wide application of the principles of Formgeschichte Gunkel has provided students of the Old Testament with an approach to their subject which, in my opinion, seems likely to lead in varying degrees beyond the simple correlation of obviously related types of literature to ideological syntheses which should enable us to recover more than one lost aspect of the religious thought and practice of ancient Israel. For this reason I have to add that the monograph also owes much to the emphasis which has been laid by Sigmund Mowinckel on the original cultic setting of so many of the psalms, although my conclusions are in many ways markedly different from his; and it is a pleasure to record here again in the preface, as I have already done in the body of the book, my deep sense of indebtedness to this distinguished scholar, whose influence upon the course of Old Testament study during the last forty years has been so profound.

In this monograph I have returned to the theme with which I first ventured into print as a student of the Old Testament just twenty years ago,1 and I have to thank Professor S. H. Hooke, as editor of the volume concerned, and the Reverend F. N. Davey of the Society for Promoting

1 See below, p. 61, n. 1.
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Christian Knowledge, its publishers, for readily granting me permission to employ again some of the language which I used on the former occasion. I indicated at the time that I hoped to return to the subject in due course, but I little suspected that so long a period would elapse before I should feel justified in doing so. The fact is that I could see no hope of doing justice to this question of the cultic role of the king in ancient Israel until I knew more about Israelite ideas concerning God (or the gods) and mankind, and, in particular, the forms of communication which were thought possible between these two orders of being; and I planned a series of monographs for this purpose. Three of these have now appeared, and I had hoped that by this time the number would be doubled. However, the widespread interest in the question of sacral kingship which has been aroused in recent years, particularly as a result of the views put forward by the so-called Uppsala School, has compelled me to return to the subject somewhat earlier than I intended, for I am disturbed to find that views are often attributed to me which I do not hold and, in fact, never have held. It is my earnest hope that this monograph, besides making my own position much clearer, may meet with acceptance as an attempt to deal constructively with this difficult problem, which has engrossed my attention ever since the time when, as a post-graduate student at Oxford nearly a quarter of a century ago, I first realized that its solution must be of the first importance for our understanding of both the Old and the New Testaments.

The text of the monograph reproduces what were substantially the Haskell Lectures, which I had the privilege of delivering before the Graduate School of Theology at Oberlin in the spring of 1951. I am happy to think that at last I am able to place on record in this way my deep appreciation of the honour which the Faculty did me in issuing the invitation and the generous hospitality and kind consideration which my wife and I received from Dean Leonard Stidley and his colleagues throughout the very happy fortnight which we spent in their midst.

Sincere thanks are also due to a number of colleagues and friends, both at home and abroad, whose close interest in my monograph has meant much to me during the past five years. Where so many have been so kind it is difficult for me to make full acknowledgement, but there are several names which must be mentioned. Thus it is typical of the encouragement and the many acts of friendship which I have received from Professor G. R. Driver during more than twenty years that he read the whole of my typescript in its final draft with great care, and made a number of valuable suggestions for its improvement. The same is true of Professor H. H. Rowley, who, in addition to tracing several works which I needed, read through the monograph both in typescript and at the proof stage, and helped me on more than one occasion to choose the right expression for what I had in mind. I must also add a special word of thanks to Professor Otto Eissfeldt, Professor G. Levi Della Vida, and Father F. L. Moriarty, S.J., each of whom came to my aid by supplying me with copies of works which I had been unable to obtain through the normal channels. Finally in this connexion, I have to express my gratitude to the Reverend E. T. Ryder and, indeed, Mrs. Ryder, who kindly undertook the preparation of the indexes; I am greatly indebted to both these friends for the patience and care with which they have performed this most helpful service.

In conclusion, my warm thanks are due to the University of Wales Press for continuing to publish my monographs, and to the Oxford University Press for all the technical skill which has been placed so readily at our disposal once again.

AUBREY R. JOHNSON

Cardiff
August 1955

2 The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God (1942), The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel (1944), The vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel (1949).
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

As with the earlier volumes in this series I have found reason to make only minor changes in the text for the purposes of a second edition; but once again the footnotes have been expanded, occasionally at some length, and in part this is indicative of the persistent and widespread interest in the subject of this monograph. Unfortunately I continue to find that, as I said in my earlier preface, views are often ascribed to me which I do not hold and, indeed, never have held; and occasional reference to such misrepresentation will now be found in the footnotes.¹

In renewing my thanks to all those colleagues and friends who have aided me in the preparation of this work I must now add the names of Professor John Gray, Professor B. J. Roberts, Father James Swetnam, S.J., and the Reverend C. G. Williams who, in addition, has kindly undertaken the task of helping me with the checking of the indexes and the reading of the proofs.

Finally, I must also acknowledge with gratitude my deep sense of indebtedness to the Oxford University Press for all the technical skill so readily made available once more in the preparation of this edition.

AUBREY R. JOHNSON
Cardiff
October 1966

¹ The English reader has recently been offered a simple but glaring example of such misrepresentation in the case of H. J. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, 2nd edit. rev. (1962), pp. 30 f., E.T. by G. Buswell, *Worship in Israel* (1966), p. 18, who cites this monograph, along with the original essay upon which it is based (as above, p. v, n. 2), to illustrate his claim that in the work of some of Mowinckel's followers 'the historical foundations of Israel's worship disappear more and more. Myth covers the whole field.' If anyone unfamiliar with my interpretation of the data will turn to the summary at the end of this volume (pp. 134-44, esp. 136 ff.), it will be a simple matter to determine what value is to be placed upon such a reference to my work. See also p. 90, n. 2.
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.B.</td>
<td>The Interpreter's Bible.</td>
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<td>Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.</td>
<td>Revue Biblique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.H.P.R.</td>
<td>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>The Syriac Version (Peshitta).</td>
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We may begin our study with two incidents of unmistakable authenticity, taken from the lives of the first and last Davidic kings in Jerusalem. In the first case the scene is laid somewhere in the lowlands to the west of Judah, and the date must be towards the beginning of the tenth century B.C. The air is filled with the sound of battle between Israelites and Philistines, and at one point David himself, the Messiah or ‘Anointed’ of Yahweh,’ is hard pressed by a powerful adversary; but, fortunately for him and for his followers, Abishai springs to the rescue and beats the king’s opponent to the ground. Now the noise of battle is over, and the king is safe once more in the comparative security of the camp; but amongst David’s followers there is manifest a strong sense of closely averted tragedy which at length finds expression in words, for, we are told,

David’s men swore unto him, saying, ‘Thou shalt not go out to battle with us again, lest thou quench the lamp of Israel.’

Our second picture brings us to the first half of the sixth century B.C., when the Southern Kingdom, like that of the apostate north, has become a thing of the past. Jerusalem, its capital, is now humbled to the dust. The stones of the holy city litter its streets; and on every hand one may see the horrors of famine in starving and dying children, in the discoloured skin and protuberant bones even of the upper classes, and, worst feature of all, in grim acts of cannibalism on the part of those who not long before had known all the compassion of motherhood. Moreover, the king himself, who should have proved to be the guardian of his people’s welfare, has been driven from his citadel by a powerful adversary; but, fortunately for him and for his followers, Abishai springs to the rescue and beats the king’s opponent to the ground. Now the noise of battle is over, and the king is safe once more in the comparative security of the camp; but amongst David’s followers there is manifest a strong sense of closely averted tragedy which at length finds expression in words, for, we are told.

David’s men swore unto him, saying, ‘Thou shalt not go out to battle with us again, lest thou quench the lamp of Israel.’

Our second picture brings us to the first half of the sixth century B.C., when the Southern Kingdom, like that of the apostate north, has become a thing of the past. Jerusalem, its capital, is now humbled to the dust. The stones of the holy city litter its streets; and on every hand one may see the horrors of famine in starving and dying children, in the discoloured skin and protuberant bones even of the upper classes, and, worst feature of all, in grim acts of cannibalism on the part of those who not long before had known all the compassion of motherhood. Moreover, the king himself, who should have proved to be the guardian of his people’s welfare, has been driven from his citadel by a powerful adversary; but, fortunately for him and for his followers, Abishai springs to the rescue and beats the king’s opponent to the ground. Now the noise of battle is over, and the king is safe once more in the comparative security of the camp; but amongst David’s followers there is manifest a strong sense of closely averted tragedy which at length finds expression in words, for, we are told.

David’s men swore unto him, saying, ‘Thou shalt not go out to battle with us again, lest thou quench the lamp of Israel.’
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and trapped like some poor creature of the wild. In fact, as the poet says who has left us this grim picture,' the breath of our nostrils, the Messiah of Yahweh, was caught in their pits. Of whom we had said, 'In his shadow we shall live (i.e. flourish) amid the nations.'

The import of these two pictures is clear. Four centuries have passed by, but from first to last the king or, to be more precise, the ruling member of the House of David is regarded in some way as the light or life of his people.

To reach anything like a true appreciation of the implications which are wrapped up in this conception of the king's supremely important place in the social order it is necessary to bear in mind that in Israelite thought, as in that of the so-called 'primitive peoples of our own day, there is a vivid sense of what has been called 'corporate personality'.

In other words, the individual is regarded as a centre of power which extends far beyond the contour of the body and mingles with that of the family and the family property, the tribe and the tribal possessions, or the nation and the national inheritance, to form a psychical whole; and, what

1 Lam. iv. 20.
2 For the significance of \(\text{יהוהלך(לי)}\), 'to live', see the writer's monograph The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel (1949), pp. 94 ff., 2nd edit. rev. (1962), pp. 95 ff.
3 i.e. by H. W. Robinson, e.g. in 'Hebrew Psychology', in The People and the Book, ed. A. S. Peake (1925), 353-82, particularly pp. 375 ff.; and 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality', in Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, ed. J. Hempel, B.Z.A.W. 66 (1930), pp. 49-62. For a critical elaboration of this point with reference to the Old and the New Testaments, see now J. de Fraine, Adam et son lignage. Etudes sur la notion de "personnalité corporative" dans la Bible (1959); but, as in the case of the same author's work, L'Aspect religieux de la royauté israélite. L'institution monarchique dans l' Ancien Testament et dans les textes babyloniens, A.B. 3 (1954), the reader should compare carefully what one says with what is attributed to one. Indeed, while I am on this point, a stronger warning of the same kind must be addressed to the reader in connexion with the views ascribed to me by K. H. Bernhardt, Das Problem der altorientalischen Königsideologie im Alten Testament unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Geschichte der Psalmenexegese dargestellt und kritisch gewürdigt, S.V.T. viii (1961).

is more, such a psychical whole has an extension in time as well as space, so that the mystic bond which unites society may be conceived retrospectively as regards its ancestors and prospectively with regard to future generations. The smallest unit, of course, is the family (i.e. in the narrower sense conveyed by the term 'household'), which finds its focus in the father; and, as we learn from the well-known story of Achán, if he should commit an offence against the sanctions of the wider sphere, represented by the tribe or the nation, then his 'household', like a festering sore interfering with the successful function of the social body, may be involved with him in remedial measures. 2 In the same way the royal family finds its temporary focus in the reigning king, who, like Ahaz, may be referred to or addressed quite simply as 'House of David'; so that it is altogether in keeping that the nation as a psychical whole should also be seen to have its focus in the royal house and, at any given time, in the reigning monarch. 3 Thus it is that any violent disturbance of the

1 Cf. J. Pedersen, Israel I-II: Sjæleliv og Samfundslev (1920), 2nd edit. rev. (1955), 3rd edit. (1958), pp. 203 ff., E.T., Israel: its Life and Culture I-II (1932), 2nd edit. (1959), pp. 261 ff.; O. Eissfeldt, Der Gottesknecht bei Deuteronomi (1933), E.T. in E.T. xliv (1932-3), pp. 261-8; S. A. Cook, The Old Testament: A Reinterpretation (1936), pp. 15 ff.; J. Hempel, Das Ethis des Alten Testaments, B.Z.A.W. 67 (1938), 2nd edit. enlarged (1964), pp. 32 ff. Perhaps I should add that J. R. Porter, The Legal Aspects of the Concept of "Corporate Personality" in the Old Testament, V.T. xv (1965), pp. 361-80, arouses afresh in me the doubts which I have long felt with regard to the employment of the terms 'personality' in 'corporate personality' and 'psychical' in 'psychical whole', as there is obviously a danger that the modern reader may find these expressions implying more than is intended. Nevertheless I can think of no more suitable terminology for conveying the significance of the phenomena under consideration. The words 'corporate personality' and 'psychical whole' do suggest, for example, an emotional involvement which is lacking in such expressions as 'social solidarity' or 'corporate whole'. Correspondingly one does not expect these emotional aspects to appear in legal records which are simply concerned with the working out of the implications of such solidarity.

2 Joshua vii (basically JE).
3 Isa. vii. 13 (cf. verse 17).
national life, such as that caused by a prolonged drought or an outbreak of plague, may be attributed to the fact that the king himself has violated the sanctions of the group; and the whole royal house or the very nation itself may be involved with him in the condemnation which follows upon any such trespass. Correspondingly, if the nation is to prosper, the king must act as the embodiment of 'righteousness' (יְרוּשָׁם). That is to say, it is first and foremost his concern to see that the behaviour of society at large is thoroughly 'righteous' (יְרוּשָׁם) and that, to this end, the sanctions of the group, particularly the nation's laws, are uniformly observed throughout the different strata of society; for it is only in this way, when the individual is restrained from doing 'what is right in his own eyes', that the well-being (חיי) of the nation, in fact its life or vitality (חיי), can be assured. Thus the king is the supreme 'ruler' or 'judge' (מלך), to whom one may go in any matter of dispute for a final 'ruling' or 'judgement' (משפט), which, ideally at least, will also be an act of 'justice' (מעון).


The writer hopes that the justification of this and the ensuing statements to the end of the paragraph, although presented in part in the following pages, may ultimately appear in an extended form in a monograph entitled The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel. Cf. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, p. 84, n. 1, and p. 103, n. 2, and edit., p. 82, n. 1, and p. 104, n. 5.

4 For an early illustration of the royal concern with justice, see 2 Sam. xv. 1-6. Cf. Introductory volume, p. 28. The translation and commentary in which, ideally at least, will also be an act of 'justice' (מעון).

5 Kings iii. 4-28; and the tradition underlying the story of the measures taken by Jehoshaphat to deal with the administration of justice in 2 Chron. xix. 5-12 may be paralleled by the interesting parallel afforded by the decree of Hammurabi (c. 1740-1710 B.C.), in which measures were prescribed for the reform of the Egyptian judiciary, as discussed by W. G. Albright, 'The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat', in The Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume, ed. S. Lieberman (1950), pp. 61-82. Note also the repeated comment on the lawless conditions in Israel prior to the monarchy, judges xvii. 6, xxv. 25. For many years the standard illustration of such royal responsibility for justice in the wider sphere of the ancient Near East has been that furnished by the great law-code of Hammurabi (c. 1728-1686 B.C.), e.g.: In summary, the following:

Prologue i. 27 ff.
At that time Anu and Enlil called me by name to promote the welfare of the people, me, Hammurabi, the worshipful, god-fearing prince, to display justice in the land, to destroy the wicked and the evil, to stay the strong from oppressing the weak, to rise like the sun upon the black-headed people, and to shed light over the land.

Prologue v. 15 ff.
When Marduk sent me to give the people justice, to bring order to the land, I established right and justice within the land, promoting the welfare of the people. Epilogue rev. xxiv. 59 ff.
To stay the strong from oppressing the weak, to give justice to the orphan and the widow, in Babylon, the city whose head Anu and Enlil raised on high, in Esagila, the temple whose foundations are firm as heaven and earth, to enact judgement for the land, to effect decrees for the land, to give justice to the oppressed, I inscribed my precious words on my stele, And set them up in the presence of my image 'King of Justice'.


Now, however, with the discovery of the Ras Shamra tablets (fourteenth century b.c.), it is unnecessary to go beyond the borders of Canaan for evidence of a king's responsibility for justice which is far earlier than any afforded by the Israelite monarchy, e.g.:
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The youth Yah departs,
He enters his father’s presence,
He raises his voice and cries.
Hearken, I pray thee, Keret the noble,
Listen, and incline thine ear.
Thou dost not judge the case of the widow,
Or adjudicate in the cause of the wretched,
Or drive away those who oppress the poor;
Thou dost not feed the orphan before thy face
Or the widow behind thy back.
Inasmuch as thou art brother to a sick-bed,
Companion to a bed of pain.
Descend from the kingship that I may be king,
From thy dominion that I may possess it.


Similar evidence is also afforded by the Phoenician epigraphic texts; for the inscription of Yahmilik, king of Byblos, which is at least as early as the tenth century B.C., contains a plea that his days and years may be prolonged on the ground that he is ‘a righteous and upright king’ (אַשְׁרֵי צֶדֶק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל). Cf. M. Dunand, *R.B. xxix* (1930), pp. 321-31; and now KAI. 4, and the translation by F. Rosenthal, in Pritchard, op. cit., 2nd edit., p. 499. This example is particularly interesting because of the close parallel afforded some five centuries later by the well-known inscription of Yahmilik of Byblos, in which a similar plea is based upon the claim that Yahmilik is ‘a righteous king’ (אָשָׁר צֶדֶק). See *N.S.J.* 3, supplemented by M. Dunand, *B.M.B. v* (1941), pp. 57-85; A. Dupont-Sommer, *Semitica* iii (1950), pp. 35-44, and now KAI. 10, and the translation by Rosenthal, op. cit., p. 502.

See also, for a general introduction to the data which need to be examined in order to appreciate the development of this conception within the context of the ancient Semitic world as a whole, W. W. Graf Baudissin, *Kynosals.
that we are here concerned with no simple portrayal of some future eschatological figure (although this is not to say that the psalm is in no way eschatological), but with a prayer for the ruling member of an hereditary line of kings which bears every appearance of having been composed for use on his accession to the throne; and the whole psalm admirably depicts the literally vital role which it was hoped that he might play in the life of the nation. The key words are 'righteousness' (דִּבְרְיָתָם) and 'justice' (בְּשׁוֹפָתָם); and the basic thought throughout is that the king may watch carefully over the rights of his subjects, and so ensure, in particular, that the weaker members of society may enjoy his protection and thus have justice done to them according to their need. What is more, it is clear from the outset that the king is both dependent upon and responsible to Yahweh for the right exercise of his power; for his subjects, whatever their status in society, are one and all Yahweh's people. It is to be observed, too, that the opening lines make passing reference to a basic principle which is expressed at length towards the close of the psalm, i.e. that it is only as the earthly king ensures a sound moral order by means of his righteous rule that one can be sure of a corresponding stability in the realm of nature with all that Bernhardt, *Das Problem der altorientalischen Königslistologie im Alten Testament* (as cited above, p. 2, n. 3); and the more general discussion by E. Lipinski, 'Les Psalms de la royauté de Yahvé dans l’excègée moderne', in *Le Psautier. Ses origines. Ses problèmes littéraires. Son influence*, ed. R. de Lauge, O.B.L. iv (1962), pp. 153–172. See also the present writer’s earlier work in this field, i.e. 'The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus', in *The Labyrinth. Further Studies in the Relation between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World*, ed. S. H. Hooke (1935), pp. 71–111; 'Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship. Divine Kingship and the Old Testament', *E.T. ixii* (1950–1), pp. 36–42; 'The Psalms', in *The Old Testament and Modern Study. A Generation of Discovery and Research*, ed. H. H. Rowley (1951), pp. 162–200; and now (i.e. since the publication of the first edition of this monograph) 'Old Testament Exegesis, Imaginative and Unimaginative', *E. T. ixviii* (1956–7), pp. 178 f.; 'Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship', in *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship. Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*, ed. S. H. Hooke (1958), pp. 204–35, to which the reader may be referred for other studies, notably those of the so-called Uppsala School, which touch on this subject.

See below, Parts V–VI.

this implies for the economic well-being of the people. The first few verses, then, may be rendered as follows:

0 God, give Thy judgements to the king.
And Thy righteousness to this member of the royal line;
May he judge Thy people with righteousness
And Thy humble followers with justice.
Through righteousness let the mountains and hills
Bring welfare (EW. 'peace') to the people.
May he grant justice to the humble among the people,
Saying the children of the needy and crushing the oppressor.
May he also continue's as long as the sun,
And, like the moon, through all generations.
May his rule be like rain upon the crop,
Like showers that water the earth.
May righteousness flourish in his days,
And welfare (EW. 'peace') abound till the moon be no more.

1 v. 1–7. What appears to be the requisite distinction between jussive and indicative forms of the imperfect of the verb has been obscured at different points in M.T.; and the rendering of this psalm offered above in the text is based throughout upon whichever form of the consonantal text seems to be required by the context, the *matres lectionis* being ignored where necessary. Cf. the somewhat similar cases offered by the other readings adopted in verses 5 and 7.

Lit. 'a(ux) the king’s son'.


5 Reading for פָרְאֹת, i.e. a simple case of metathesis prior to the introduction of the *matres lectionis*. Compare the use of the corresponding verb in the Phoenician royal inscriptions with reference to the ‘prolonging’ of the days and years of the reigning king, i.e. in the inscriptions of Yehawmilk (as cited above, p. 4, n. 4), *Ṣaṣṭaba‘al* or *Ṣisṭaba‘al* (as cited below, p. 41, n. 5), and *Elība‘al* (ed. R. Dussaud, *Syria vi* (1925), pp. 101–17), all of which are probably to be dated within the twelfth to the ninth centuries B.C., and that of Yehawmilk (as cited above p. 4, n. 4), which belongs to the fifth or, perhaps, the fourth century B.C.

Lit. 'May he rule', i.e. vocalizing the consonantal text as פְּרָאֹת; cf. verse 8.

7 נָר לָכוֹנֶה appears to have been used, like the corresponding English terms ‘fleece’ and ‘crop’, to denote such animal or vegetable growth either before or after being cut.

8 Reading פְּרָאֹת for פָרְאֹת with three MSS., LXX, S, and Jerome.
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The psalmist then allows his thoughts to reach out beyond the confines of his own land to the world at large, and prays in equally picturesque terms that this earthly king may come to enjoy so complete and so universal a sway that all the kings of the earth may pay him tribute and all the nations submit to his rule.1

May he rule also from sea to sea,
And from 'The River' to the ends of the earth.
May the creatures of the wild bow down before him,
And his enemies lick the dust.
May the kings of Tarshish and the coastal lands render tribute.
May the kings of Sheba and Seba bring their gifts.
Yea, may all kings make obeisance to him,
All nations serve him.

It is commonly thought that the allusion to 'The River' in the first metrical line is a reference to the Euphrates,3 and, as a result, the poet's language has been taken as an indication that he has been influenced by the court style of the Babylonian world.4 Such a view, however, fails to do justice to the central importance which Jerusalem came to enjoy in Hebrew cosmology.5 At a later stage in our discussion we shall see reason to believe that the reference, far from being an allusion to the Euphrates, is really an allusion to the current of the great cosmic sea which nourishes the holy city,1 i.e. that of which the psalmist speaks when he says:2

As for 'The River', its streams make glad the city of God.
The most sacred abode of the Most High.3

Similarly the expression 'from sea to sea', far from denoting, say, the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf,4 is really an allusion in general terms to the all-embracing cosmic sea5 and, taken in conjunction with the expression 'from 'The River' to the ends of the earth', points to the thought of a sovereignty covering the wide circle of the earth.6

This, however, is a matter to which we shall return; and, continuing our reading of the psalm, we have now to note that, after this ambitious vision of a world sovereignty exercised from the citadel on Mount Zion, the poet reverts to the thought of the king as the guardian of the humble and the needy, the weak and the helpless. In fact the anticipated realization of this hope is now offered as the ground for his being permitted such universal dominion.7

For he will deliver the needy when he crieth,
And the humble when he hath no helper.

1 See Isa. viii. 6, 'the waters of Shiloah that go softly'; Ezek. xlvii, i.e. the vision of the stream which issues from beneath the Temple and, gathering volume, becomes a great river flowing with fertilizing power in the direction of the Jordan valley and the Dead Sea. Cf. G. A. Cooke, The Progress of Revelation (1910), pp. 41 f. Note also the important parallel to Ps. lxxii. 8 which is to be found in Zech. ix. 9 f., especially as the latter passage may ultimately be found all the more striking in view of the argument of these pages as a whole.

2 Ps. xlvi. 5 (EW. 4). The omission of the article in the case of 'The River' is to be compared with the similar omission in the passage under discussion, as well as those passages which are cited above, p. io, n. 3 ad fin., where the reference is to the Euphrates.

3 Or, reading נמל as לנה, on the basis of LXX and V, 'Which the Most High hath sanctified as His abode'.


6 Cf. Job xxii. 14; Prov. viii. 27; Isa. xi. 22: also Job xxvi. 10 (following S and T).

7 w. 12-14.
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He will have pity on the lowly and the needy:
Yea, the lives of the needy will he save.
He will protect their life from oppression and violence,
And their blood will be precious in his eyes.

These lines lead in turn to a plea for the economic prosperity which is to be expected as a result of righteous or just government on the part of the king; and this is to be reflected in such rich revenue from abroad and such abundant harvests at home that his name is to be in constant use for all time and amongst all peoples as the pattern of the highest blessing.1

So may he live (i.e. flourish)2 and be given
Of the gold of Sheba.
So may one pray for him continually,
And bless him all the day long.
May there be a wealth of corn in the land
To the tops of the mountains.
May their flower be as plenteous as Lebanon;
May they flower on the summit like the grass of the earth.
May his name endure for ever,
May his name continue as long as the sun;
Yea, may [all the families of the earth]3 bless themselves by him,
May all nations acknowledge his happiness.

1 It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to point out that the use of the plural form of עמי in this line affords no argument for a late date. Cf., for example, 2 Sam. xxiii. 17, which bears every appearance of being an early passage.


3 w. 15–17. The doxology which follows is no part of the original psalm; it simply marks the close of Book II of the Psalter.

Thus the basic principle underlying the thought of this psalm is clear enough; and it is that the national prosperity of Israel is conditioned by the behaviour of society as a whole. That is to say, as we have already observed, the moral realm and the realm of nature are regarded as one and indivisible. What is more, however, such an effective communal life is ultimately dependent upon the character of the king, whose function it is to maintain law and order. Accordingly he must be careful to guarantee justice for all, and thus show a constant concern for the weaker and more helpless members of society. The nation cannot be expected to be righteous and therefore prosperous, if the king does not prove to be righteous; and, as we learn from the opening line of the psalm, he cannot do this in his own strength, but is ultimately dependent upon Yahweh (or 'The Eternal'), who is clearly 'the enduring power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness'.2

The question therefore arises as to what exactly was the relationship between the king and Yahweh; for it is obvious that it must have been regarded as one of a most intimate kind. Indeed this conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the king is not only found leading his people in worship with the offering of sacrifice and prayer on important occasions in the national life, but throughout the four
hundred years of the Davidic dynasty, from the time of David’s active concern for the Ark to that of Josiah’s thorough-going reform, himself superintends the organization of the cultus in all its aspects.1 Some indication of this relationship is to be seen, of course, in the familiar rite of anointing by which the king was installed in office and in virtue of which he enjoyed the title of ‘Messiah’ (דְּמוֹן).2 For, the sacred commission having come in the ultimate from Yahweh and having been communicated by His messenger, whether prophet or priest,3 the king was not merely ‘the
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Messiah’ but ‘the Messiah of Yahweh.’ Indeed it seems clear that, as a result, he was now thought to be a channel for the operation of the divine ‘Spirit’ (רוח); and, being the case, it may well be that for the Israelites the symbolic action was eloquent of the power with which he was to be imbued and which should henceforward govern his behaviour.2 Be that as it may, a special endowment of the Spirit is clearly associated with the rite in question, when it is said of the founder of the Davidic dynasty that, on his being chosen for this high office,3

Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the Spirit of Yahweh burst upon David from that day forward.

Whatever the date of this passage,4 there can be no reasonable doubt that the picture which it gives is in line with popular tradition, for it corresponds so exactly with what we are told in the obviously early stories about the exploits of the great heroes of Israel in the period immediately prior to the foundation of the monarchy and indeed the exploits of David’s predecessor Saul.5 What is more, it should be borne in mind that from the first the activity of the Spirit, which, as an extension of the Personality of Yahweh, was certainly not thought of as an impersonal

and priest as Yahweh’s messengers, see The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, pp. 36 ff., 2nd edit., pp. 32 f.; also The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, pp. 10 f., 48 f., 2nd edit., pp. 8 f., 57 f.

1 Cf., for example, 1 Sam. xxix. 7 ff. (EW. 6, 10); xxviii. 11, 16, 23; 2 Sam. i. 14, 16, xii. 22 (EW. 21).

2 Cf. the language of Isa. xxxix. 29; Joel iii. 1 f. (EW. ii. 28 f.); also Isa. xxii. 15; Zech. xii. 10.

3 Sam. xvi. 13.


5 See esp. (a) Judges xi. 34 ff., xii. 29 ff., xiii. 25, xiv. 6, 19, xv. 14; (b) Sam. x. 6 ff., xii. 6 ff. (cf. xvi. 14).
force,' was by no means restricted to exhibitions of physical prowess, but might include the foresight of an administrator like Joseph and the organizing ability of a potential king such as Gideon. All in all, therefore, it is obvious that David, like the divine 'Angel' or 'Messenger' (7א7א) with whom he could henceforward be compared for his insight, must himself have been regarded as a potent extension of the divine Personality. Accordingly it is little wonder that the king's person should have been regarded as sacrosanct; i.e., as we learn already from the way in which David spared Saul's life, that one should beware of stretching forth one's hand against Yahweh's Messiah, and that the cursing of a king could be brought into line with the cursing of God.

Nevertheless the peculiar bond existing between the Davidic king and Yahweh is also expressed in other terms than this, as one may see from the short poem commonly known as 'The Last Words of David.' It is, of course, a matter of dispute as to whether or not this poem was actually the work of David; and, if it was, one is still left with the question as to whether or not it represents anything like his last words, for it seems to owe its citation in the present passage to its being connected in some way with the poem under discussion.

The language of the introduction, with its repeated reference to the oracular nature of David's words, emphasizes the prophetic character of what follows; and this is in keeping with David's own claim (or the claim made in the name of David) that what he is about to say has come to him directly through the Spirit of Yahweh. This, of course, is in harmony with the tradition which we have already noticed, i.e. that David, in virtue of his being anointed and thus becoming the Messiah of Yahweh, came powerfully under the influence of Yahweh's Spirit. The poem as a whole may be rendered thus:

1 Cf. 0. Procksch, 'Die letzten Worte Davids', in Alttestamentliche Studien Rudolf Kittel zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht, B.W.A.T. 13 (1913), pp. 112-251; also Gunkel-Begriff, Einleitung in die Psalmen, p. 146 (David himself as author); Grassmann, op. cit., pp. 184 ff. (a contemporary of David as author); Kittel, op. cit., p. 488 (probably time of David); A. Causse, Les Plus Vieux Chants de la Bible, E.H.P.R. xiv (1926), pp. 152 ff. (David or a court poet). Cf. now, too, R. de Vaux, S.B. I., 2nd edit. rev. (1961) 61, 60. Happily, however, a decision on this point is not important for our present purpose. It is sufficient to note (a) that the poem is of a piece with the royal psalms, (b) that, like Psalm lxxxiii, it reveals the lofty ideal of righteousness which was associated with the House of David, and (c) that this ideal of a righteous kingship is rooted in a 'covenant' (ןוֹנָבָה), carefully and securely drawn up, between David as the founder of the dynasty and Yahweh as the national God.

Evidence has been advanced for denying the Davidic authorship of at least the body of the poem; for there is not the slightest justification for the view that vocabulary, style, and thought prove it to be of comparatively late date.2 Happily, however, a decision on this point is not important for our present purpose. It is sufficient to note (a) that the poem is of a piece with the royal psalms, (b) that, like Psalm lxxxiii, it reveals the lofty ideal of righteousness which was associated with the House of David, and (c) that this ideal of a righteous kingship is rooted in a 'covenant' (ןוֹנָבָה), carefully and securely drawn up, between David as the founder of the dynasty and Yahweh as the national God.
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Oracle of David, the son of Jesse,
And oracle of the man who was raised on high,
The Messiah of the God of Jacob
And the hero of Israel's psalms.

The Spirit of Yahweh speaketh through me,
And His utterance3 is upon my tongue;
The God of Israel hath said,
To me the Rock of Israel hath spoken.

'A ruler of men must be righteous,
Ruling in the fear of God4
And like the light of morning, at sunrise,
A cloudless morning which maketh the grass
Glistens from the earth after rain.'

Nay, but6 is not that how my house stands with God,
Since He hath granted me an everlasting covenant,

In view of the writer's subsequent argument it would be pleasant to accept the suggestion that הִּיָּה is here a divine name, corresponding to the familiar הָשָּׁק ('Most High'), and that כֹּל should be read as כֹּל, thus securing the rendering:

Oracle of David, the son of Jesse,
And oracle of the man whom the Most High raised up,
The Messiah of the God of Jacob
And the hero of Israel's psalms.

G. R. Driver, E.T. 1 (1938-9), pp. 92 ff. As is pointed out by J. A. Bewer, J.B.L.xli (1942), pp. 47 ff., it may hardly be claimed that this suggestion is confirmed by LXX6; but, even so, it remains a possibility and may well be right. It has not been adopted here, however, as the writer is anxious to avoid using any argument in support of his thesis which, in his opinion, admits the possibility of doubt. See further p. 50, n. 4.
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Set forth in detail with proper safeguard?7
Yea, doth He not bring to growth
My complete salvation8 and every wish?
Whereas evil must be like thistles, all running wild,9
For these are not removed by hand.
But the man who cometh into touch with them
Must be complete with iron and spear-shaft.
And they must be burned with fire on the spot.5

Comment is superfluous; such vivid, pictorial language speaks for itself.

This theme of a covenant between Yahweh and the House of David occurs again in Psalm xxxii, which clearly comes within the category of the royal psalms and, as such, appears to have as its original Sitz im Leben a dramatic commemoration or liturgical re-enactment of the bringing of the Ark to Jerusalem and the consequent foundation of the Jerusalem cultus in close association with the Davidic dynasty.6 It falls clearly into two parts: (a) a hymn beseeching Yahweh's continued favour to the royal house, and (b) a response of an oracular kind in which the worshippers are assured that Yahweh will preserve His covenant with the House of David, i.e. the 'everlasting covenant' to which the preceding poem referred, although this carries with it corresponding obligations on the part of David's

2 I.e. as 'freedom' from whatever interferes with fullness of life. Cf. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, pp. 94 ff., 2nd edit., pp. 95 ff. For the wide range of meaning which גָּדֹל came to admit see Driver, op. cit., pp. 118 f.
3 Lit. 'the whole of them being allowed to wander'. The suffix of בְּגָדֹל refers back to the collective noun כֹּל (i.e. constructio ad sensum).
4 Vocalizing בְּגָדֹל as בְּגָדַל. Cf., for example, Budde, op. cit., in Zoc., although this is not absolutely necessary (cf. Driver, op. cit., in Zoc.).
5 Hebrewがあり is in situ. The writer cannot find the slightest reason for questioning the text; and the removal of the expression on the ground that it has arisen from confusion with the corresponding set of consonants in the next verse (cf., for example, Driver, op. cit., in Zoc.) merely succeeds in robbing the simile of much of its force.
6 2 Sam. vi: cf. Chron. xiii, xv, xvi.
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successors upon the throne. Thus its liturgical character seems clear. The hymn begins with a striking appeal to Yahweh to remember on David’s behalf ‘all his humility’. This is a quality which we find stressed repeatedly in the Psalter as the characteristic attitude which Yahweh requires of all His followers, king and subjects alike: and its use in the present connexion is then explained in terms of David’s reverent concern for the Ark and his untiring determination to find a suitable home for this important cultic object, which was the guarantee of Yahweh’s presence with His people, and was famous in Israelite history as a potent and indeed, even for Yahweh’s own worshippers, a somewhat dangerous extension of the divine Personality. The home in view is obviously the Temple, for which David was primarily responsible even if Solomon was its builder; and, as the Ark is lifted into its place, Yahweh is implored to show favour to His followers, specifically the priests and general assembly of worshippers, and, above all, to be gracious to the reigning king for the sake of his ancestor David.

0 Yahweh, remember for David
All his humility;
How he swore to Yahweh,
How he vowed to the Mighty One of Jacob,
‘I will not enter the tent which is my dwelling,
Nor ascend the couch which is my bed,
I will not give sleep to mine eyes

1 i.e. reading סבר with LXX and S. The vocalization of M.T. (cf. T) is supposed to refer to all the trouble which David underwent in the service of Yahweh, especially in the case of the incident under discussion. Cf., for example, A. F. Kirkpatrick, C.B. (1902), in Zoc. To the present writer, however, this is unlikely for the reason given above in the text.

2 See below, for example, pp. 79 f., 91 ff., and 120 f.

3 Cf. 1 Sam. iv. 6 f.; and see further The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, pp. 23 ff. 2nd edit., pp. 19 ff. See also, for the cultic background to the stories of the Ark in 1 Sam. iv-vii and 2 Sam. vi, L. Rost, Die Überlieferung von der Thronnuchfolge Davids, B.W.A.N.T. 42 (1926), pp. 4-47.

4 See also 1 Chron. vi. 1 f. for a slightly different text in the case of the last three lines (i.e. w. 8 ff.).

Or slumber to mine eyelids,
Until I find a place for Yahweh,
A dwelling for the Mighty One of Jacob.’
Lo, we heard of it in Ephrathah;
We came across it in the countryside of ‘Jair’. Let us enter His dwelling.
Let us make obeisance before His footstool.

1 A.V.: ‘Lo, we heard of it at Ephrathah: we found it in the fields of the wood.’
R.V.: ‘Lo, we heard of it in Ephrathah (mgn. ‘Or Ephraim’): We found it in the field of the wood (mgn. ‘Or Jaar’).’
R.S.V.: ‘Lo, we heard of it in Ephrathah, we found it in the fields of Jaar.’

0. Eissfeldt, ‘Psalm 132’, W.O. ii 5/6(1959), pp. 48-3, like Kirkpatrick, op. cit., follows Franz Delitzsch, Biblischer Kommentar über die Psalmen, 5th edit. rev. by Friedrich Delitzsch (1894), E.T. of the 4th edit. by D. Eaton (1887-9), in holding that the reference in each stichos is to the locating of the Ark at Kiriath-jearim; but, despite such strong support for Delitzsch’s theory, it seems to me that this well-known cruxinterpretum remains unsolved; for the ingenious attempt to prove that in this instance the name Ephrath denotes the district in which Kiriath-jearim lay (cf. 1 Chron. ii. 19, 59 f., iv. 4) is governed by the common but highly questionable assumption that ‘Jaar’ is here employed as a poetical variant of ‘Kiriath-jearim’. The rendering given in the text, which merely involves the vocalizing of סבר as סבר, is offered, therefore, as another attempt at a solution of the problem. This reading is suggested by the theory that David’s original name was ‘Elhanan ben Jaar’ (cf. 1 Sam. xvii, 2 Sam. xxi. 19, and what appears to be the harmonizing gloss in 1 Chron. xx. 5, as referred to below, p. 51, n. 1); and, if this suggestion be sound, the reference in the case of both ‘Ephrathah’ and ‘the countryside of Jaar’ must be to the district of Bethlehem (cf. Ruth iv. 11; 1 Sam. xvii. 22; Mic. v. 1 [E.V. 21]). The suffixes of סבר and סבר may then be taken as having neuter force and referring, not to the Ark (cf. the customary citation of 1 Sam. iv. 17 and 2 Chron. viii. 11 in support of the feminine forms of these suffixes), but to the early evidence for David’s humility as expressed in the foregoing vow, which was first ‘heard of’ (אס Mosul) or ‘come across’ (ואס Mosul) as a piece of oral tradition concerning the creator of the Davidic dynasty which was found current in the district in which Elhanan had been brought up. Finally, if it be objected that there is no evidence to warrant the view that Mosul could be used of ‘finding’ in the sense of ‘lighting upon’ such oral tradition (cf., for example, Gunkel, H.K., in Zoc., with reference to H. Kessler, K.K., 2nd edit. (1899)), it must be said that, if one might use this Hebrew verb of coming across someone when on one’s travels (e.g. Gen. xxxvii. 15 (1); Sam. ix. 1, xxxvii. 12; Kings iv. 29, x. 15) and even of meeting with trouble and sorrow (Ps. cxxv. 3), it is difficult to see why it could not have been used of happening upon a popular local story of the kind suggested, especially when it may be held that the actual meaning of the term in this particular context is already indicated by the use of Mosul in the parallel stichos.
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Rise up now, O Yahweh, to Thy home; 
Thou and Thy powerful Ark. 
Let Thy priests be clothed with righteousness, 
And let Thy votaries rejoice. 
For the sake of David, Thy Servant, 
Turn not back the face of Thy Messiah.

The exact form taken by the oracular response is difficult to determine. It is conceivable, for example, that the whole psalm was sung antiphonally by the Temple choirs. On the other hand, the second half is so clearly a definite response to the prayer offered in the earlier part of the psalm that it seems more reasonable to infer that it was uttered by an appropriate member of the Temple personnel. In that case one may think of a priest or, as this seems a little unlikely in view of the somewhat detached attitude to the priesthood suggested by both parts of the psalm, a cultic prophet of the type which we find associated with the musical side of the Temple worship. For the rest, the wording of the response is so straightforward that little is required in the way of comment, and it may be rendered as follows:

Yahweh hath sworn to David, 
A pledge from which He will not turn back. 
‘Of the fruit of thy body 
Will I set upon thy throne. 
If thy sons keep My covenant 
And My testimony (or testimonies) that I shall teach them, 
Their sons too, for ever, 
Shall sit upon thy throne.’ 
For Yahweh hath chosen Zion; 
He hath desired it for His abode.

1 lit. ‘resting-place’; but see, for example, Ruth 1:9.
2 In the writer’s opinion the nearest English equivalent to the term ἄγνωστον (EW. ‘mercy’, ‘kindness’, ‘lovingkindness’) is ‘devotion’; and, correspondingly, the term ἄγνωστον (EW. ‘saint’, ‘holy’, ‘godly’, ‘merciful’ etc.) denotes one who is ‘devoted’, i.e. a ‘devotee’ or ‘votary’ or, in certain contexts, one who is ‘devout’. See now my discussion of the use of these terms in Interpretationes ad Vetum Testamentum pertinentes (S. Mowinckel Festschrift) = Nor. T.T. ivi (1955), pp. 100-12.
4 See above, p. 19, n. 2.
5 The vocalization of M.T. (ךָתִיר) points to an uncertainty as to whether one should read a singular form, ‘My testimony’ (ךָתִיר), or the plural, ‘My testimonies’ (ךָתִים). See further, p. 67, n. 2.
6 (or וָנָתָה) תָּתָה or וָנָתָה: 2 Kings xi. 12: cf. 2 Esdras xliii. 11.
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the king was made to wear, not merely the royal crown, but a document embodying the basic terms of Yahweh’s covenant with the House of David, i.e. in much the same way as the devout Jew, generation after generation, has to learn the words of the Shema (the basic principle underlying the Sinaitic covenant as defined in the book of Deuteronomism) and wear them, bound on the arm and the brow, at morning prayer. 2 Thus the conditions for the continua-speed (1935); R. Patai, H.U.C.A. xx (1947), p. 195, alternatively; A. Causse and C. Jaeger, in La Bible du Centenaire, ii (1947); R. de Vaux, S.B.J. (1949), but see now the qualification, op. cit., 2nd edit. rev. (1958), and especially the more recent work cited below, n. 2, ad fin.; N. H. Snaith, I.B. (1954); E. Dhorme, B.P.A.T. i (1956); A. van den Born, B.O.T. (1958).

2 Something of the true significance of this passage was realized by W. E. Barnes, C.B., 2nd edit. rev. (1928), in Zoc., and T. H. Robinson, in W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, A History of Israel (1932), i, p. 351, both of whom rightly refrained from an attempted emendation of the text. The passage holds good of G. Widengren, Psalm 2 a nach det sahrana hungudmen in Israel, U.U.A. 1941: 7. i (1941), p. 19 f. (followed by G. Östborn, Töra in the Old Testament: a Semantic Study (1945), pp. 76 ff.), The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book = King and Saviour III, U.U.A. 1950: 7 (1950), pp. 24 ff., The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion = King and Saviour IV, U.U.A. 1951: 1 (1951), pp. 39 f., and now ‘King and Covenant’, J.S.S. ii (1957), p. 5 f.; but in the present writer’s opinion he makes the mistake of accepting the traditional view which sees in the term מִדיָם a reference to the Mosaic ‘Tablets of the Law’. Another step in the right direction is that of G. von Rad, in ‘Das judische Königsrindt’, T.L.Z. lxxii (1947), cols. 211-18=Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament (1958), pp. 205-13 (followed, for example, by Mowinckel, Offenbar und sangoffier, pp. 73 f., E.T., i, p. 62; G. Förster, ‘Der Vertrag zwischen König und Volk in Israel’, Z.A.W. lxxii (1959), pp. 11 f.), who in partial dependence upon Ps. ii. 7 (cf. also Ps. cv. 10) sees in the reference to the מִדיָם not the conditions which the king undertakes to observe (as the present writer maintains), but the promises to which Yahweh commits Himself in fulfilment of the covenant, i.e.: ‘In diesem Könnigsprotokoll spricht Yahwe in direkter Rede den Kbnig an, nennt ihn Sohn, belehnt ihn mit der Herrschaft, nennt seine Thronnamen usw.’ Again, however, it seems to the writer that the language of Ps. cv. 10 requires the interpretation given in the text. See also in general H. G. May, J.B.L. lvii (1938), p. 181; J. A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, I.C.C. (1951), in Zoc. ; and now, in support of the view advanced above in the text, J. Gray, I & II Kings (1964),

25

tion of the Davidic dynasty were explicit enough, and, no doubt, they were so framed in order to remind David’s successors of the responsibilities of their office; but, as we have already had occasion to note and as we shall see again presently, there remains the underlying thought that David has an ‘everlasting covenant’ with Yahweh, so that failure at any point to fulfill the conditions, while it must meet with suitable punishment, will not be allowed to annul the promise which was originally made to the founder of the royal house.

This thought comes clearly to the fore in Psalm lxxxix, where the covenant between Yahweh and David is referred to at such length that we are able to complete our picture of the intimate relationship which was held to exist between Yahweh and the successive kings of the Davidic dynasty. The poem itself, which belongs to the class of royal psalms, is a perfectly organic whole; for the variation in metre and theme, which is so commonly regarded as an indication of different authorship, ‘is simply due to its liturgical background. In other words, it is a perfectly straightforward work which reveals sufficiently clearly of itself the circumstances which have called it into being. Disaster has overtaken the royal forces or, at least, the pp. 5 f., who, unlike Widengren, op. cit., p. 6, n. 2, ad fin., rightly distinguishes this interpretation of the text in question from that advanced by von Rad ; R. de Vaux, ‘Le Roi d’Israel’, vassal de Yahave, in Mélanges Eugene Tisserant (1964), i, p. 127 f. 1 Cf., for example, B. Duhm, K.H.C., 2nd edit. rev. (1923); W. Staerk, S.A.T. iii., 2nd edit. rev. (1920); R. Kittel, K.A.T.; 5th and 6th edit. (1929), possibly; H. Gunkel, H.K. (1926); H. Schmidt, H.A.T. (1934); J. Calés, Le Livre des psaumes (1936), probably; M. Buttenwieser, The Psalms: Chronologically treated with a New Translation (1938); W. O. E. Oesterley, The Psalms (1939); F. Nötscher, Echt. B. (1947), 2nd edit. rev. (1950), possibly; E. Podehard, Le Psautier, Traduction littérale, explication historique et notes critiques, ii (1954). See, however, (a) the emphatic rejection of this view by E. König, Die Psalmen (1927); F. M. Th. Böhl, T.U. (1947); and (b) the suggestion of a common background of cultic tradition which is more strongly emphasized by Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien III, pp. 34 ff.; E. A. Leslie, The Psalms: Translated and Interpreted in the Light of Hebrew Life and Worship (1949); A. Winter, A.T.D. (1950), 5th edit. rev. (1959), E.T. by H. Hartwell (1962); and now H. J. Kraus, B.K.A.T., 2nd edit. rev. (1961).
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king has suffered some deep humiliation; and the trouble is attributed to the anger of Yahweh. Accordingly the representatives of the people, under the leadership of the king himself, have assembled in the Temple in order to implore the divine favour. The opening lines form a hymn of praise celebrating the supremacy of Yahweh, as the ‘Holy One’ of Israel, and His power in Creation; and this is followed by an equally lengthy passage in which Yahweh is reminded of His former promises to David and, in David, to his descendants upon the throne of Jerusalem. It is this passage which is our immediate concern, i.e.:

Of old Thou didst speak by a prophets
To Thy votaries, and saidst—
‘I have bestowed upon a manly one,

I have exalted a youth from among the people.
I have found David, My Servant;
With My holy oil I have anointed him,
So that My Hand shall be his constant support.
Mine Arm also shall strengthen him.
No enemy shall oppress him,
Nor shall the wrongdoer afflict him;
But I will beat down his adversaries before him,
And I will smite them that hate him.
My faithfulness and My devotion shall be with him,
And through My Name shall his horn be lifted up.
I will lay his hand also upon the sea,
And his right hand upon the ocean currents.
He shall cry unto Me, “Thou art my Father,
My God and the Rock that is my salvation.”
I on My part will make him My first-born,
The highest of earthly kings.
I will always preserve for him My devotion,
Always keep My covenant true for him.
I will make his seed to endure for ever
And his throne as the days of heaven.

These lines are not to be taken at their face value, as if they refer merely to the individual whom we know as David;

See W. F. A. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine* (1949), p. 233, 4th edit. rev. (1950), p. 234. This seems possible, and it has now been accepted by Weiser, op. cit., 5th edit. (1950), E.T. (1962); but it also seems to the writer that the traditional interpretation (cf. LXX) is supported by the analogous construction in Ps. xxi. 6 (EW. 5), which, like Ps. lxxxix, may be classed as a royal psalm. Cf. R. Tournay, *R.B. I* (1951), p. 617, n. 2; and see below, pp. 132f.

1 See above, pp. 22, n. 2.

2 For the signification of this picturesque idiom and some indication of its importance for our understanding of the Psalter, see *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, 2nd edit., p. 70, n. 3.

3 It is usually assumed that the reference in this line must be to the Mediterranean and the Euphrates, the plural form מַחֲלֶרֶת (EW. ‘rivers’), being explained either as a poetic generalization or as denoting the Euphrates and its canals. Cf. Deut. xi. 24; Pss. lxxx. 11, cxxvii. 1; and see further, for example, Kirkpatrick, op. cit., in loc. However, it should be borne in mind that the term מַחֲלֶרֶת is also used of the ‘currents’ of the cosmic sea (e.g. Pss. xxiv. 2, xlii. 3, as above, pp. 65 f. and 72 f.; so that here again the thought appears to be of one a dominion extending over the wide circle of the earth, i.e. as in the expression ‘from sea to sea’ in Ps. lxxii. 8, as above, pp. 10 f. Cf. already Pedersen, *Israel III-IV*, p. 496, E.T., p. 655.

4 See above, p. 19, n. 2.
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they must be read in the light of what we know about Israelite ideas of corporate personality. When this is done, they are seen to imply that the line of David is to issue in one who shall be something more than ‘The Messiah of Yahweh’. He and, in him, his ancestor David will be the accepted ‘Son’ of the national deity, and, what is more, in virtue of this fact he will hold sway as ‘the highest of earthly kings’. As we shall see, these two complementary promises, (a) that the Messiah will ultimately be, not merely the Servant, but the ‘Son’ of the national deity, and (b) that he shall thus have supremacy over all earthly kings, are of the first importance and recur elsewhere in the Psalter. Meantime, however, it is to be observed that in the light of the covenant background the promise of ‘Sonship’ is simply one of adoption, which carries with it certain attendant conditions so far as David and his descendants are concerned. Moreover, as the oracle goes on to show, failure to observe these conditions must bring strict discipline; but even so, whatever an individual member of the ruling dynasty may do and however he may fare as a result, Yahweh’s covenant with David is valid for all time, for, as we have seen, it is an everlasting covenant.

‘If his children forsake My law,
And walk not according to My judgements (or rulings),
If they violate My statutes,
And do not keep My commandments,
I will attend to their rebellion with a rod
And their iniquity with blows.
But My devotion will I not break off from him,
I will not violate My covenant,
Nor alter that which hath passed My Lips.
I once for all have I sworn by My Holiness,
To David I will not lie;
His seed shall endure for ever,
And his throne like the sun before Me,
Like the moon, which shall continue for ever,
A faithful witness in the sky.’

As we shall have occasion to note again later, it is this important promise which is made the ground of appeal in the last part of the liturgy; for the psalm concludes with a plea, in which the king himself takes part, begging that in the present hour of need Yahweh may not forget His sworn devotion to the House of David. For the present, however, enough has been said to make it evident that the Davidic Messiah, as the ‘Son’ of the national deity, is to possess only a limited monarchy, and that in the last resort he will be responsible to Yahweh for the right administration of his office. Indeed it may be observed that, despite this reference to David’s ‘Sonship’, the oracle does not conceal but rather emphasizes the king’s essential humanity with the opening reference to the founder of the dynasty:

‘I have bestowed aid upon a manly one,
And exalted a youth from among the people.’

For that matter, the same is true of the poem which we know as ‘The Last Words of David’, where there is an unmistakable emphasis upon the fact that the founder of the dynasty was ‘the son of Jesse’ and ‘the man who was raised on high’. Accordingly, despite David’s promised elevation to the rank of Yahweh’s ‘Son’ and despite the

1 Cf. 2 Sam. vii. 14; 1 Chron. xxii. 10, xxviii. 6; and see above, pp. 2 ff.
2 Cf. such passages as: Kings viii. 66, xi. 36, xii. 16; also (although this is to anticipate a proposed sequel to the present work) Jer. xxx. g; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 f.; Hos. iii. 5.
3 Cf. v. 21b (EW. 20b); also w. 30, 32 (EW. 38, 51).
4 For the somewhat remote parallels to this form of divine ‘sonship’ which are furnished by Mesopotamian thought, see, for example, Labat, Le Caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne, pp. 63 ff.; H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods. A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature (1948), pp. 209 ff.
5 Cf. 2 Sam. vii. 14.
6 w. 31-38 (EW. 30-37).
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II

Straightforward as all this is, however, it leaves us with one outstanding question which is prompted by the statement made in the oracular section of Psalm cxxxii:1

Yahweh hath chosen Zion;
He hath desired it for His abode.

In short, we have to ask what there was about Mount Zion that it should have grown to such importance, inviting under discussion on the familiar and perfectly justifiable ground of haplography; and in that case we should arrive quite simply at the same conclusion. All in all, therefore, and independently of the point which is made in the final sentence of the next paragraph, the view that in Ps. xlv. 7 (EVV 6) we have evidence for a belief in ‘divine kingship’ has little to support it.

Again, the supposed analogies in the name יַעֲרָבָא (A.V. ‘The mighty God’), R.V. ‘The mighty God’, as applied to the Davidic Messiah in Isa. ix. 5 (EVV 6), which is cited, for example, by R. Kittel, K.A.T., 5th and 6th edit. (1929), H. Gunkel, H.K. (1926), A. Benzeen, Fortolkning til de gammeltestamentlige Salmer (1939), in connexion with Ps. xlv. 7 (EVV 6), again appears to be the product of a too literal approach to Hebrew idiom; for, 
pace H. W. Wolff, in T.Z. xvi (1960), pp. 316 ff., the expression in question (like יַעֲרָבָא, ‘Wonderful Counsellor’, lit. ‘a wonder of a counsellor’) need mean no more than ‘Mighty Warrior’, lit. ‘a god of a warrior’; and we may compare the way in which English permits one to speak of ‘a devil of a fellow’. In other words, it seems to me that we must beware of jumping to the understandable but somewhat hasty conclusion that the grammatical construction in this expression is similar to that which is used of Yahweh in Deut. x. 17, Neh. ix. 32, Jer. xxxiii. 18, for in every one of these three passages we have an example of asyndeton which ought not to be overlooked.

Correspondingly, the recurrence of the expression יִשְׁלֹחַ הָנָּר in Isa. x. 21 with reference to Yahweh may imply, not that He is the ‘Mighty God’, but simply that He is the Warrior par excellence, i.e. in much the same way as He is described in Exod. xv. 3 as יִשְׁלֹחַ הָנָּר (EVV. ‘a man of war’). Moreover, it seems worthy of note in this connexion that, even if it could be shown conclusively that in Ps. xlv. 7 (EVV 6) an Israelite king is being addressed as a ‘god’, this would not of necessity carry with it the implication that he was actually regarded as divine—any more than the fact that Yahweh could be referred to as ‘a man of war’, as in the passage just cited, carries with it the implication that He was thought to be human.

Finally, if Ps. xlv is to be traced in origin to the Northern, rather than the Southern, Kingdom, we should also bear in mind the conception of kingship which comes to the fore in the story of the healing of Naaman the leper by Elisha; i.e. when we are told that the king of Israel, having read the appeal addressed to him on Naaman’s behalf by the king of Syria, asks in consternation, ‘Am I God (or a god) to cause to die and to make to live?’ (2 Kings v. 7).

1 Verse 13.
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another psalmist to begin his hymn of praise and thanksgiving with the words:1

God is renowned in Judah,
His Name is great in Israel.
His covert is to be found in Salem,
And in Zion hath He made His lair.

The answer to this question is usually given, of course, in terms of David's military and political foresight.2 It is pointed out, for example, that this stronghold, which David succeeded in capturing only by a ruse, occupied an almost impregnable site at the southern end of the easterly of the two hills over which the city of Jerusalem subse-

1 Ps. lxxvi. 2 f. (EW. 1 f.). Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, pp. 57 ff., 126 ff., stresses the first word of verse 4 (EW. 3), i.e. בַּעֲבֵד, on the ground that it points to the use of some form of dramatic symbolism within the sacred precincts of the city itself, i.e.

There He hath shattered the bow's bright missile,
Shield and sword in war's encounter.

Cf. Schmidt, Bentzen, Leslie, op. cit., in Zoc. Although the present writer thinks that in principle the suggestion of a ritual drama or the like may be sound (see below, pp. 85 ff.), he cannot but agree with T. W. Davies, Cent.B. (n.d.), in Zoc., that on metrical grounds the form in question should be read as בָּעֲבֵד and construed as the last word of verse 3 (EW. 2), i.e. somewhat more literally than above:

And as for His lair, in Zion hath He set it.

On the ground of style this reading, which involves one's regarding בָּעֲבֵד as a case of permutation, seems more likely than בַּעֲבֵד (or בַּעֲבֵד), which is favoured by C. A. Briggs, I.C.C. (1906–7) and T. H. Robinson, in Oesterley, op. cit. In any case it is obvious that the form בָּעֲבֵד may not be pressed in support of the theory of a ritual drama or some corresponding form of dramatic symbolism.


quentilly spread; and, what is more, it lay immediately above the spring Gihon, with which it was connected by means of a shaft and tunnel excavated in the rock, so that it was possible for the inhabitants to draw water without going outside the city walls. Further, it was situated in a safely remote but reasonably strategic position on the backbone of the central range of hills. Indeed, it was so placed that David could not hope to unify the rival tribes of north and south in anything like an effective way while it remained in Jebusite hands. Finally it occupied neutral ground between these northern and southern tribes, and therefore could give neither group reason to be jealous of the sovereign claims of the other; and, allied to this, it had no prior religious associations for any of the tribes, and so, by housing the Ark, seemed readily adaptable as the chief cultic centre of the tribal brotherhood of Israel in its new role as a united kingdom. All this is true, of course, but it may be questioned if it gives us the whole of the picture. Although this Canaanite city had no religious associations for any of the Israelite tribes, it cannot have been without its own cultic traditions; and the question therefore arises as to whether or not it may have had a contribution to make along these lines to its growth in importance as the city of David and the earthly abode of the heavenly King.

This is no idle question, for it seems clear that David, on capturing the city, made no attempt to exterminate its inhabitants, but actually went out of his way to conciliate


them and secure their good will, if we give what appears to be due weight to the fact that he did not seize Araunah’s threshing-floor as by right of conquest, when he required it as the site of an altar to Yahweh, but was willing to purchase it at a fair price from its Jebusite owner.1 Further, this city, which David captured but obviously did not destroy, must already have witnessed a thousand years of history, to say the least, for its name occurs in Egyptian exorcism texts which apparently date from the closing years of the twelfth dynasty (c. 2000–1780 B.C.).2 Five hundred years later it is well represented in the Tell el-Amarna tablets of the late fifteenth and early fourteenth centuries B.C. by the half-dozen letters of its ruler Abdi-Hiba; and it is obvious, both from Abdi-Hiba’s own statements and from the references made to him by his ally and former enemy Suwardata, that at this time it was an important and comparatively powerful city-state dominating a large part of the surrounding hill-country.3 Indeed these data from the archaeological field simply reinforce the picture presented by the Old Testament itself. Thus another four hundred years after the time of David it was

1 Cf. 2 Sam. xxiv, esp. verses 16 ff.; Chron. xxi. --xxii. 1.
2 See K. Sethe, Die Achtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefäßen des Mittleren Reiches, A.P.A.W. 1926: 5 (1926), p. 53; G. Posener, Princes et pays d’Asie et de Nubie. Textes hiératiques sur des figurines d’aménisation du Moyen Empire (1950), p. 86. The texts published by Sethe were found on fragments of clay bowls and jars, and contained the names of neighbouring peoples and rulers, as well as individuals in Egypt itself, who were regarded as planning war, fomenting rebellion, or similarly plotting mischief of some kind against the state. It seems clear that, after the bowls and jars in question had been inscribed with these names, they were smashed in symbolic fashion and probably with magical intent as a means of bringing these plans to nought. The texts published by Posener, which are of a slightly later date, were inscribed for the most part on clay figurines rudely fashioned to represent prisoners in a kneeling position with their arms bound by the elbows behind their backs; and, while a similar purpose probably underlies their construction, it is questionable in this case if such damage as they have suffered was intentional, and, therefore, a direct result of the magical design which brought them into being.
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still possible for Ezekiel to begin his scathing picture of the city’s failure to live up to its high calling by saying :¹

Thine origin and birth were of the land of the Canaanite;
Thy father was an Amorite, and thy mother a Hittite.
Moreover, a tradition was current which reached far back into this early period and told of the friendly treatment Abram had received at the hands of Melchizedek, king of Salem;² and, finally, there was a full and graphic account of the way in which Joshua had found in Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, the determined leader of a Canaanite coalition which sought in vain to stem the tide of invasion.³

Now it is a striking fact about the names of these traditional kings of Jerusalem that each is compounded from the root which in Hebrew gives us the term ṣaduq, ‘righteousness’; and this is made the more interesting by the fact that Abdi-Hiba himself, although employing Accadian as the medium of his correspondence with the Egyptian court, actually makes use of the cognate term ṣaduq(se-du-uk), which is clearly a Canaanite word, in order to affirm that he has done or said the right thing in his dealings with the king of Egypt:⁴

Behold, my lord the king, I am in the right
with regard to the Kasi people.

Further, such an early use of this root in the Canaanite area is well attested outside Jerusalem in the Ras Shamra tablets (i.e. the literary remains of the ancient city of Ugarit in northern Syria which come to us from the early part of the fourteenth century B.C.),⁵ where it is used quite clearly to denote the thought of right relationship, as when Keret, the king, is introduced with a passing reference to ‘his rightful wife’ (att,sādīb) and ‘his true spouse’ (mtrḥt).

¹ Gen. xvi. 3.
² Joshua x. 1-28 (JE/R). Cf., probably, Judges i. 5-7, as discussed by C. F. Burney, The Book of judges (1920), inloc.
³ Joshua x. 1-28 (JE/R). Cf., probably, Judges i. 5-7, as discussed by C. F. Burney, The Book of judges (1920), in loc.
⁴ A-MUR ŠARRUBEL-ŠA-DA-DU-UK A-NA 1A-A-31
⁵ A-SUM AMELĪTI KA-ŠI-WI.
⁶ See above, p. 4, n. 4.
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and its employ-

of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near

On the analogy of other early names of this type,

What

p.

5

with Yahweh, see (with caution)

---

an

F or the rest, it is really of little

ys'i;h). 1 Here the form in use, i.e. the noun $dqh$, is one which corresponds to the Hebrew form $ysh$, and its employment is wholly in keeping with that which is to be found a thousand years later in a Phoenician inscription of the third or second century B.C. from the island of Cyprus, where it or the corresponding adjective (Hebrew: $ysh$) is used of a man's

rightful

offspring' ($qthshur$). 2 What is even more significant in the present connexion, the Phoenician epigraphic texts reveal the fact that already in or about the tenth century B.C. Yehimilk, king of Byblos, like his successor Yehawmilk in the fifth century B.C., was prepared to advance the claim that he should be rewarded with a long life on the ground that he was 'a

righteous

king' ($ysh tbdn$). 3 For the rest, it is really of little moment that, so far as the names Melchizedek and Adoni-

zedek are concerned, there is no general agreement as to how the element under discussion is to be construed. The

traditional interpretation, adopted for example, by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, 4 is that which yields the meaning 'King of righteousness' and 'Lord of

righteous-

ness'. 5 On the analogy of other names of this type, however, such a rendering must be regarded as unlikely, and it has been suggested accordingly that the element in question should be construed as a divine name, embodying, so to speak, the ideal which the term implies; and in that case the names must be held to mean 'My King is $zdkt$' and 'My Lord is $zdkt$' or (to adopt a simple transcription

1 Cf. Ginsberg, op. cit., pp. 5 f.

2 Cf., for example, W. W. Graf Baudissin, Adonis und Esman. Eine Unter-

suchung zur Geschichte des Glaubens an Auferstehungsgötter und an Heilig-

götter (1911), pp. 71 and 247 f. (alternatively), Kyrios als Gottesname im Juden-

dum und seine Stellen der Religionsgeschichte, iii, pp. 45, n. 1, and 54 (alternatively); von Gall, op. cit., pp. 155 f.; G. Widengren, The Accadian and Hebrew


3 Cf. the similar ambiguity with regard to the Ugaritic personal name

$sdkt$ (Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook or Ugaritic Manual or Ugaritic Textbook, 321, iii 4; Herdner, Mission de Ras Shamra X, 119, iii 4), which is held to mean $sdkt is (my) god' by F. Thureau-Dangin, R.A. xxxvii (1940-1), p. 14; Ringgren, loc. cit., Albright, loc. cit., whereas O. Eissfeldt, Et im ugaritischen Pantheon, B.V.S.A.W.L. 98, 4 (1951), pp. 48 f., insists that it must be construed so as to yield the meaning 'My is righteous'.

4 Cf. Baudissin, Adonis und Esman, loc. cit. (alternatively), Kyrios als


5 See below, p. 45, n. 4; and, for a general discussion of this ideal in its association with the gods of the ancient Near East, particularly as an aid to understanding the association of $ysh$ with Yahweh, see (with caution) Baudissin, op. cit., pp. 379 ff.; also S. A. Cook, op. cit., pp. 397 ff., in W. R. Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, 3rd edit. rev. (1927), pp. 655 ff., and The Truth of the Bible (1938), pp. 108 ff., 140 ff.
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These names Melchizedek and Adoni-zedek, however, are instructive in yet another respect, i.e. the elements corresponding to the Hebrew terms יְהֵウェָה ('King') and בֵּל ('lord'). As is well known, the latter not only came to be used as an appellation with reference to Yahweh, but could also be employed by itself in what appears to be a suffixed form as virtually a proper name in much the same way as the Accadian term BELU ('lord') came to be employed in connexion with the Babylonian pantheon, notably with reference to Marduk, as the name of a deity, i.e. Bel. This, of course, was the form which the Massoretes reproduced as a possible plural of divine majesty, i.e. פֵּל or, to adopt another simple transcription, Adonai ('My Lord'). Accordingly, in view of the foregoing suggestion that the name Adoni-zedek should be construed as meaning 'My (or The) Lord is righteous', it is conceivable that the first component already has the force of a proper name even here, i.e., to adopt a simple transcription once again, ‘Adoni is righteous’; and, if we restrict the analogy merely to the term under discussion, we may compare the way in which the Greeks came to know the dying and rising god named Adonis (Ἀδωνις), whose original home seems to have been Phoenicia. It is the term יְהֵウェָה, however, which must engage our attention, for there is reason to believe that even if the term does not occur in a theophorous name with clear reference to Yahweh until the time of Jeremiah, it had long been employed in the liturgy of the royal Temple in Jerusalem as a divine appellation, i.e. that, whether or not the Hebrews entertained the thought of such a divine ‘Kingship’ at the time of the settlement in Canaan, the

Cf. Isa. xlvi. 1; Jer. 1. 2, 11. 44; Bel and the Dragon.

For an introduction to the vexed question of (a) the origin of this form, and (b) the history of the use of this term in its application to Yahweh, see Baudissin, op. cit. i-ii; and G. Quell, TH.W. N.T. iii (1938), pp. 1056 ff., E.T. by H. P. Kingdom, Lord, B.K.W. (1938), pp. 363 ff.


For the view that the conception of Yahweh as יְהֵウェָה or 'King' is to be traced back to so early a period, see (a) E. Sellin, Alter, Wesen und Ursprung der alttestamentlichen Eschatologie, in Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus (1912), pp. 132 ff., 153 ff., 167, 183 ff; (b) with what appears to be an exaggerated emphasis upon the primary meaning of the term יְהֵウェָה as 'counsellor' or 'leader', M. Buber, Das Kommende im Königtum Gottes. 2nd edit. enlarged (1936), 3rd edit. enlarged (1936), paazim, supplemented by 'Das Volksbegehren', in In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer, ed. W. Schmauch (1951), pp. 53-66, which was to have been published as the first chapter (and now by 'Die Erzählung von Sauls Königtum', V, V, vi (1950), pp. 11-73, which is the second chapter) of Das Kommende II. Der Gesalbt; also Moses (1946), pp. 78, 105 ff., 113 ff., 137 ff., 157 ff., 170 f.; and 'Het Geloof van Israel', in De Godsdienst in de Wereld, ed. G. van der Leeuw, 2nd edit. (1948), pp. 193 f. or, similarly, in a translation from the Hebrew by C. Witton Davies, The Prophetic Faith (1949), pp. 45 ff; (c) from Fraine, L'Aspect religieux de la royauté israélite, pp. 117-34; (d) H. Wildberger, 'Yahweh Eigentumsrolle', A.T.A.H. 37 (1960), pp. 20 ff. The problem really centres, of course, in the vexed question of the date and historical value of such passages as Exod. xvi. 18, xix. 6 (JE); Num. xxii. 21 (JE); Deut. xxvii. 15; and Sam. vii. 8. xii. 12; also Judges viii. 23.

Cf. what follows with the theory advanced by von Gall, op. cit., pp. 152-69; and note, with reference to the Northern Kingdom in the ninth century B.C., the significance of the picture presented by Micaiah's vision in Kings xxi. 19. Incidentally, it should be clear from the way in which the foregoing note is introduced that the writer allows for the possibility that the conception of Yahweh as King' already played a part in Israel's worship at an early cultic centre such as Shiloh, whether or not this was due to Canaanite influence. Cf. W. Schmidt, 'Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel', B.Z.A. W. 80 (1951), pp. 76 ff.

Knutson, op. cit., and Mercer, op. cit. 15. 45 (AN.ZUGAL); 286, 36.

E.g. Knudtson, op. cit., and Mercer, op. cit. (a) 267, 4; 268, 3; 269, 4; 270, 4; 271, 4; 289, 5, 11, 25; (b) 249, 16; 250, 6. See also 249, 6; 250, 32, 54; 254, 27, 29; 273, 24; 287, 29.
personal names as 'ahmlk ('ihmlk),1 meaning ‘Brother of the king’ or ‘Brother of Milku(-i),2 'ahmlk,2 meaning ‘Brother of the king’ or ‘Brother of Milku(-i),3 and mlkn,4 meaning something like ‘The (or My) king is a delight’ or ‘Milku(-i) is a delight’;5 and here the possibility that the term under discussion may in some instances have the force of a proper name becomes more of a probability in view of the fact that it appears to occur in a list of gods as just such a personal name in a form which corresponds to the foregoing mlkn (-i) with imitation, i.e. mlkn or, as it is probably to be vocalized, Milkm.6 Further, from as early as the tenth century B.C. or thereabout, when it appears in the form $milkm$ i.e. Yehimilk (‘May Milk live’),7 the Ugarit, e.g. Nougayrol, Mission de Ras Shamra VI, 16. 356, 5, 7, 11, 16; 16. 283, 6, 10, 13; 15. 154 + 164, rev. 8; 15. 155, 16, 23; 16. 204, rev. 4, 7; 16. 154, 4, 18; 16. 205 + 192, 17, n. 14, 23; 16. 257 + 258 + 17. 370 ( = Herdner, 123, A 2) ( = Herdner, 123, A 2). See also 155, 3, 14, 2; 152, 25; 164, 5. See also 153, 2, 21 (abi-Milki).

2 Cf. the corresponding Hebrew form $milkm$, as referred to below, p. 44.

3 Cf. Gordon, op. cit. 95, 4 (= Herdner, op. cit. 51, 4). Cf. again the parallels in the Accadian texts from Ugarit, e.g. Nougayrol, op. cit. 15. 89, 197, 16; 15. 154, 16; 15. 199, 7; 16. 125, 2; 15. 185, 1006, 9; 1024, 20; 1035, rev. 5; 1081, 6; supplemented by C.R.B. Gordon, op. cit. 326, 1, 2; 123, 1; 2093, 3; 2097, 15.

4 Cf. the corresponding Hebrew form $milkm$, as referred to below, p. 44.

5 Cf. Gordon, op. cit. 95, 4 (= Herdner, op. cit. 51, 4). Cf. again the parallels in the Accadian texts from Ugarit, e.g. Nougayrol, op. cit. 15. 89, 197, 16; 15. 154, 16; 15. 199, 7; 16. 125, 2; 15. 185, 1006, 9; 1024, 20; 1035, rev. 5; 1081, 6; supplemented by C.R.B. Gordon, op. cit. 326, 1, 2; 123, 1; 2093, 3; 2097, 15.

6 Cf. the Hebrew proper names $yehmilk, yehimilk$ (Judges iv. 6, 12, v. 11, 12), YAHREMILK (a) i Sam. xiv. 50, (b) i Sam. xxv. 23, xxvii. 3, etc. cf. Diringer, op. cit., pp. 48, 49, and BEMLIK (Chron. xi. 45), as discussed by G. B. Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names (1896), pp. 80 ff., and especially Noth, op. cit., pp. 16, 18, 166.

7 Cf. the Hebrew proper names $yehmilk, yehimilk$ (Judges iv. 6, 12, v. 11, 12), YAHREMILK (a) i Sam. xiv. 50, (b) i Sam. xxv. 23, xxvii. 3, etc. cf. Diringer, op. cit., pp. 48, 49, and BEMLIK (Chron. xi. 45), as discussed by G. B. Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names (1896), pp. 80 ff., and especially Noth, op. cit., pp. 16, 18, 166.

term under discussion frequently recurs in just such a personal form as a component of theophorous names in Phoenician and, later, Punic epigraphic texts; while the god Milk (מִלַּק) or, to use a more familiar form, Melqart (יוֹדָאֵל) and Melqartes (יוֹדָאֵל), who figures so prominently in the life of Tyre, owes his name to the fact that he was originally regarded as ‘King of the city’ (מלך־עיר); and in the light of the Ugaritic texts it is

1 e.g. Milk כִּי־מֻלַּק, ‘May Milk grant life’ (C.I.S. i. 1 = N.S.I. 3, K.A.I. 10, as above, p. 4, n. 1); מַלָּק, ‘Milk hath given’ (e.g. C.I.S. i. 10 = N.S.I. 12, K.A.I. 32); מִלַּק, id. (e.g. C.I.S. i. 24, 41); מַלָּק־חיים, corresponding to the Hebrew מַלָּק־חיים (as noticed above, p. 41, n. 2, and below, p. 44); cf. J. Friedrich, Phönikische-Punische Grammatik (1938), §94, ‘Brother of Milk’ (e.g. C.I.S. i. 44 = N.S.I. 40, K.A.I. 66: common in the Punic votive inscriptions); מַלָּק־חיים, corresponding to the Hebrew מַלָּק־חיים (as noticed above, p. 41, n. 4; cf. Friedrich, loc.cit.), ‘Sister of Milk’ (e.g. C.I.S. i. 459); מַלָּק־חיים, corresponding to the Hebrew מַלָּק־חיים (as noticed above, p. 40, n. 5, and below, p. 45, n. 3), ‘Servant of Milk’ (e.g. C.I.S. i. 46 = N.S.I. 16, K.A.I. 35); מַלָּק־חיים, ‘Handmaid of Milk’ (C.I.S. i. 137); מַלָּק־חיים, ‘Milk is (my) strength’ (M. Lidzbarski, Handbuch der nordsemittischen Epigraphik (1898), p. 189 = N.S.I. 8: common in the Punic votive inscriptions); מַלָּק־חיים, ‘Milk is exalted’ (N.S.I. 22, 1).

2 e.g. Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica, i. 10, 27, Cf. C. Clemen, Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos, M.V.A.G. xiii. 3 (1939), p. 28.

3 i.e. milk har. Cf. for example, C.I.S. i. 122 = N.S.I. 36, K.A.I. 47: also such proper names as מַלָּק־חיים, ‘Servant of Melqart’ (e.g. C.I.S. i. 14: especially common in the Punic votive inscriptions); מַלָּק־חיים, ‘Handmaid of Melqart’ (e.g. C.I.S. i. 446); מַלָּק־חיים, ‘Protégé of Melqart’ (e.g. C.I.S. i. 47 = N.S.I. 17, K.A.I. 36); מַלָּק־חיים, ‘Client of Melqart’ or, more likely perhaps, ‘By means of (i.e. Thanks to) Melqart’ (C.I.S. i. 139 = N.S.I. 39, K.A.I. 64: frequent in the Punic votive inscriptions). Cf. for example, Z. S. Harris, A Grammar of the Phoenician Language (1936), p. 85; Friedrich, op. cit., §80 (a); also Eissfeldt, Z. i. die germanischen Pantheon (1949). See also (a) the remarkable stela, bearing a relief of Melqart accompanied by an inscription in Aramaic, which appears to date from the ninth century B.C. Cf. M. Dunand, ‘Stèle araméenne dédiée à Melqart’, B.M.B. iii (1939), pp. 6576; W. F. Albright, ‘A Votive Stele Erected by Henbadah I of Damascus to the God Melkarth’, B.A.S.O.R. 87 (Oct. 1942), pp. 23–29; and see further A. Herdner, in Syria xxv (1946–8), pp. 329 f., and now K.A.I. 201. (b) the possible occurrence of the name Melqart (in the form מילקער) in the record of a treaty effected in the seventh century B.C. between Bar’al of Tyre and Esarhaddon of Assyria. Cf. S. Langdon, ‘A Phoenician Treaty of Asshur’, R.A. xxvi (1929), pp. 189–94; E. Weidner, A.J.O. viii (1932–3), pp. 29–34; and now R. Boverg, Die Inschriften Asshaddons König von Assyrien, A.J.O., Beiheft 9 (1950).

obvious that all this is in keeping with early Canaanite tradition. Moreover, the national deity of the Ammonites, Israel’s neighbours in Transjordan, was clearly worshipped under this name in the form which the Massoretes reproduce as מַלָּק (EW. ‘Milcom’); and there is little reason to doubt that this corresponds to the fore-mentioned Milkom of the Ras Shamra tablets. So far as the Hebrew field itself is concerned, we must, of course, recognize that the appearance of the name Malchiel (מַלְךִיֵּל) as that of a grandson of Asher in the genealogical lists of P and the Chronicler offers doubtful testimony to the use of this term in theophorous names prior to the settlement, despite the fact that it corresponds to the MILK(•)-HIL(•)-I (of the Tell el-Amarna tablets, for it is still difficult to know what value to place on these lists; and a similar doubt as to its authenticity must be admitted for the analogous forms

pp. 107–8. It is usually assumed that Melqart (qua ‘King of the city’) was so named as being the tutelary god of Tyre; but in Albright’s opinion (loc. cit.) the occurrence of this name in the foregoing Aramaic inscription affords strong support for his view that the element katt (‘city’) is here used of the underworld, and indeed that the name Melqart thus reflects the cosmic character of this god. Cf., originally, A.J.S.L. liii (1936–7), p. 112: also Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 3rd edit. (1953), pp. 83, 196, and 226 ff.; From the Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd edit. (1946), pp. 235 and 333, id. with a new introduction (1957), p. 307. While the present writer agrees that Melqart was probably a cosmic deity, he finds it difficult to believe that the element katt here refers to the underworld. Cf. G. Levi Della Vida, ‘Some Notes on the Stele of Ben-hadad’, B.A.S.O.R. go (Apr. 1943), pp. 30 ff., together with the reply by Albright, op. cit., pp. 32 ff; and now Comte du Mesnil du Buisson, ‘Origine et évolution du panthéon de Tyr,’ R.H.R. clxv (1963), pp. 133–5, specifically p. 137: and see below, p. 86, n. 6. Finally, on Melqart in general, see R. Dussaud, ‘Melqart’, Syria xxv (1946–8), pp. 205–20; and now ‘Melqart, d’apres de recents travaux’, R.H.R. cli (1957), p. 1–27; and also H. Seyrig, Syria xiv (1944–5), pp. 62–80, esp. pp. 69 ff.

1 Kings xi. 5, 7 (cf. LXX, 33); 2 Kings xxiii. 13; Jer. xlix. i (LXX, S, V); LXX, S, V; Zeph. i. 5 (LXX); S, V: also, perhaps, 2 Sam. xii. 30 (cf. LXX) = 1 Chron. xx. 2 (cf. LXX, V); and, more doubtfully, Amos i. 15 (cf. S and Jer. xlix. 3). 2 e.g. Gray, op. cit., pp. 15 ff, 146 ff.; Noth, op. cit., pp. 14 ff. 3 Gen. xxi. 17 (P); Num. xxvi. 45 (P); 1 Chron. vii. 31. Cf. too, 1 Chron. vili. 35 (LXX, V) and ix. 41 (LXX); where Milchiel is given as the name of a great-grandson of Jonathan, a reading which is the more remarkable because of the occurrence of the name Malchi-shua as that of a brother of Jonathan. See below, p. 45, n. 2.
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Elimelech (אֵל-מָלְכֵּה), which appears in what is the somewhat late, if not post-exilic, book of Ruth as the name of Naomi’s husband-in-the-period of the Judges, even though it too has an early parallel in the Tell el-Amarna tablets in the form ʼILU(-1)-MILKU as also in the Ugaritic texts in the form 'ilmk. On the other hand, the name Abimelech (אֵל-מָלָכָה), וּחיָא a בָּא has its parallels in both series of tablets in the forms ABU(-1)-MILKI and 'abmlk, is found in relatively early Israelite sources as that of a Canaanite king of Gerar in the patriarchal period and as that of the son of Gideon who in the period of the Judges early left his mark on Israelite history as one who sought royal power over Shechem and its neighbourhood. Similarly the name Ahimelech (אֵה-מָלָכָה), which has its parallel in the Ugaritic texts under the form ʼalmk, is well attested as that borne by two of David’s contemporaries, i.e. the head of the priestly community at Nob who befriended David when he was a fugitive from the court of Saul and, equally remarkable, a Hittite who was his companion during his flight; and it finds ample archaeological support at least as early as the time of Jeroboam II (c. 786-746 B.C.E.).

In short, so far as our comparatively meagre evidence goes, the use of names of this type, whether the term under discussion be regarded as an appellative or as a proper name, was as common at the beginning of the monarchy as at its close; and, what is more important in the present connexion, it already had a long history behind it so far as the land of Canaan was concerned.

and the Religion of Israel, p. 214. See also S. Moscati, L’égiproche ebraica antica 1935-1950 (1951), pp. 52, 58, 63, 76, for its occurrence on Hebrew seals. In Phoenician circles it must have enjoyed considerable popularity, for it appears frequently in Punic in the abbreviated form ʼilmk, as noticed above, p. 42, n. 1.

1 Cf. Noth, op. cit., p. 154, n. 2 (also p. xviii).
2 Sam. xiv. 49, xxii. 2; 1 Chron. viii. 33, ix. 39, x. 2.
3 Cf. Nathan-melech (נַתְנָן-מָלְךָ), corresponding to the Phoenician (Punic){[Nathan-melech]}, referred to above, p. 42, n. 1, a court official of the time of Josiah, 2 Kings xxii. 11; Ebed-melech (אֶבד-מָלְכָּה), corresponding to the forms ABDI-MELKI and ’abmlk, discussed above, p. 40.; an Ethiopian court official of the time of Zedekiah, Jer. xxxvii. 17, xxix. 15-18; Malchiram (Malchi-shua), corresponding to the Phoenician Malchi-shua, referred to above, p. 42, n. 1, a son of Jehoiachin, 1 Chron. iii. 18; and, if the text be sound, Regem-melech (נַתְנָן-מָלְךָ), meaning originally, perhaps, ‘Milk hath spoken’ (cf. Ugaritic rgm, ‘to say’, and Hebrew names of the type Nathan-melech, ‘Abiathar’, is usually recognized to be a mistake for ‘Abiathar the son of Ahimelech’: see the following note.
4 Cf., for example, Diringer, op. cit., pp. 21-68; Albright, Archaeology
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the term under discussion also comes to the fore in Hebrew circles at this time in the name Malchi-shua (מלכי-שוע), meaning either ‘My king (= Yahweh?) is salvation’ or ‘Miliku(-i) is salvation’, which was given by Saul to one of his sons.2 In short, so far as our comparatively meagre evidence goes, the use of names of this type, whether the term under discussion be regarded as an appellative or as a proper name, was as common at the beginning of the monarchy as at its close; and, what is more important in the present connexion, it already had a long history behind it so far as the land of Canaan was concerned.4
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As it happens, there is no clear evidence for the explicit association of this term with Yahweh as the component of a theophorous name until the appearance of the form Malchiah or Malchijah (מַלְכִּיהַ), 'My king is Yah(u)' or 'Yah(u) is (my) king', towards the end of the seventh century B.C. Thereafter it figures prominently in the genealogical lists of the Chronicler, as also in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Indeed, in the case of the Chronicler it is given very early authority, for it appears inter alia as the name of an ancestor of Asaph, the reputed founder of one of the three musical guilds established by David, and as that of the head of one of the divisions or courses of priests similarly in-

above-mentioned passages must then be construed as the sacrificing of children, not to Molech (מֹלֶךְ), but as a melch (Memelch). This being the case, all reference to the name of a god seems to disappear. The argument is attractive and, on the whole, convincing; but, while Eissfeldt adopts the view that the Hebrew melch ( = Punic milk) is to be associated with the Syrian ṣsā, 'to cause in its secondary sense to promise', and thus made to yield the meaning 'promise' or 'vow', it seems more likely that the term in question should continue to be associated with the worship of Milk ( = 'king'), and interpreted in terms of what we should call a 'royalty'. Cf. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, pp. 162 ff., who recognizes that the idea of a 'vow' may have been derived from the divine name Muluk ( = Malik, corresponding to Milk), which is well attested for the region of the Middle Euphrates c. 1800 B.C. This seems more probable than the view advanced by J. G. Février, R.H.R. cxliii (1953), pp. 8 ff., following A. Alt, W.O. iv (1940), pp. 282 ff., that the Punic 𐤅𐤇𐤊𐤌 may be connected with the Yiphʿl of יִשְׁתַּח, as used in the Phoenician inscriptions from Karatepe (G. II, 19 = K.A.I. 26, II 19) with reference to the offering (or, rather, providing) of sacrifice for, as Alt himself recognized, it is difficult to reconcile this with the vocalization of the Punic term in the construct state as melch, which is attested by the form of its transliteration in the Latin inscriptions on which the whole argument is based (i.e. in the first element of molchomor, morchomor, and mochmata, interpreted as meaning 'sacrifice of a lamb'). Cf. Friedrich, op. cit., §193. Finally, for a valuable survey of the whole question and full bibliographical references, see now H. Cazelles, art. 'Molok', D.B.S. v (1957), cols. 1337-46, and de Vaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacri$c,$ (sacrifices of the Ancien Testament, pp. 67-81).

1 (a) the father of Pashhur, one of Zedekiah's advisers, Jer. xxxi. 1, xxxviii. 1; (b) a prince of the royal house, Jer. xxxviii. 6.
2 Chron. vi. 25 (EW. 40), ix. 12 (cf. Neh. xi. 12), xxiv. 9.
3 Ezra x. 25 (ibid.), 31 ( = Neh. iii. 11).
4 Neh. iii. 11 ( = Ezra x. 31), 14, 31, viii. 4, x. 4 (EW. 3), xi. 12 (cf. 1 Chron. ix. 12), xii. 42.
5 Chron. vi. 25 (EW. 40).
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stituted by David but, as already observed in the case of the analogous form Malchiel, it remains a difficult matter to determine the precise historical value of the genealogical lists of P and the Chronicler. In any case, with all the foregoing evidence before us, there is no reason to doubt that the name Melchizedek correctly points to the fact that a term milchut (מִלְכּות), corresponding to the Hebrew מַלְכֵּי ('king'), was used as a divine appellative if not a proper name in the pre-Israelite worship of Jerusalem. Indeed, in the light of the foregoing discussion and in view of what was said earlier with regard to the meaning of the name Adoni-zedek, it may well be that the name Melchizedek, if it means at basis 'My (or The) King is righteous', should be thought of, rather, as 'Milki is righteous'. In any case, while we must again be prepared to find a revision of opinion as to what is involved in this notion of divine 'Kingship', there is obviously every reason to accept its early association with the notion of 'rightness' or 'righteousness' so far as the pre-Israelite city of Jerusalem is concerned.

The story of Melchizedek, however, teaches us something more than this about the pre-Israelite worship of Jerusalem, for we are told that, while Abram was returning from his victory over the coalition of kings who had plundered Sodom and Gomorrah,
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Melchizedek, the king of Salem, who was priest to God Most High, had brought forth bread and wine, and had greeted him and said:

'Blessed' be Abram by God Most High, Owner (or Creator) of heaven and earth!

Blessed be God Most High.

Who hath delivered thy foes into thy hand?

And he had given him a tenth of everything.

While the historical value of Genesis xiv remains uncertain, it is becoming increasingly clear that the names of the kings to which it refers are quite authentic for the first half of the second millennium B.C. Cf., for example, R. de Vaux, 'Les Patriarches hébreux et les découvertes modernes' (suite), R.R. iv (1948), pp. 326 ff. = Die hebräischen Patriarchen und die modernen Entdeckungen (1961), pp. 33 ff.
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This story of Abram's deference towards the sacral king of a Canaanite city, coupled with the emphatic and repeated reference to 'El 'Elyôn (ה'לְיהוֹן) or 'God Most High' (cf. R.V., R.S.V.) is quite remarkable. If it is not historical (and this is much disputed), the only satisfactory explanation of its existence would seem to be that it is an aetiological myth designed to justify the pre-Israelite worship of Jerusalem in the eyes of those who were worshippers of Yahweh; and, as such, it would be most suitably assigned to the reign of David.2 Now, until recently the only evidence outside the general stream of Biblical tradition for the use of the epithet 'Elyôn as a divine name was that offered by Philo of Byblos (A.D. 64–161), who knew of a god 'Eliou called Most High' (Ἐλίου ὑψίστου) who had once been worshipped in the neighbourhood of that city;3 but striking evidence for the existence of this divine name outside Israel is now to be found in the formal expression ה'לְיהוֹן יָדֵעַ לָגַד, corresponding to the Hebrew for 'in the presence of 'El and 'Elyôn', which occurs in the record of a treaty, inscribed in Aramaic and dating from the middle of the eighth century B.C., which has
The importance of this discovery lies, not merely in the fact that it offers much earlier testimony of an extra-Biblical kind to the use of this divine name in northern Syria, but also in the fact that it serves to confirm what the Old Testament itself leads one to suspect, i.e. that in the expression 'El 'Elyôn ('God Most High') two divine names 'El ('God') and 'Elyôn ('Most High'), which were originally distinct, have been fused together so as to suggest one supreme God. All in all, therefore, there is no reason to doubt that, so far as Jerusalem was concerned, the term 'Elyôn ('Most High') was just what the epithet itself implies, i.e. an appellation of the high god who had been worshipped in this ancient Canaanite city prior to its capture by David.


3 Cf., for example, Num. xxiv. 16 (J and E); and see below, pp. 74 ff.

4 The fact that in the foregoing Aramaic inscription the preposition מ (M) is not repeated before מ (M) makes it clear that a similar fusion of these two terms was under way in northern Syria in the eighth century B.C., as will be seen if the expression is read in its immediate context. G. Levi Della Vida, 'El 'Elyon in Genesis 14, 18-20', J.B.L. lxxiii (1944), pp. 1-9, followed by J. Morgenstern, 'The Divine Triad in Biblical Mythology', J.B.L. lxiv (1945), pp. 35-37, thinks it possible to distinguish a god El, who was the lord of earth, and a god 'Elyon, who was the lord of heaven (i.e. 'the astral sky, the seat of sun, moon and stars' as opposed to 'the atmospheric or meteoric sky, where storms are formed').

5 It is possible that one should recognize the survival of a corresponding divine name 'A or 'El in a number of Old Testament passages, e.g. Deut. xxxiii. 12; Sam. ii. 19; Sam. xxi. 1 (as noticed above, p. 16, n. 1); Ps. xxii. 9 (EVV. 8). Cf. for example, the Uguritic ubû (uû) in KRT C, col. 3, 6 and 8 (= Gordon, Uguritic Textbook, 126, iii. 6 and 8, and Herder, Mission de Ras Shemmar, 16, iii 6 and 8); and especially the name yhwh (yîwînÁ'). 'May'ly grant life' which occurs in the ostraca from Samaria (Diringer, op. cit., pp. 35 f.; cf. Noth, op. cit., pp. 129, 206), and the familiar Old Testament name 'El or El (i Sam. i.iv, xiv. 3; Kings ii. 27). See further Nyberg, op. cit., passim, also Studien zum Hoseabuch, pp. 57 ff; Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, pp. 201 ff; C.B.O. vii (1945), p. 53, n. 89; F. M. Cross jr. and D. N. Freedman, J.B.L. lxiv (1948), pp. 204 ff.; R. Tournay, R.B. Ivi (1949), pp. 48 ff.; M. Dahood, 'The Divine Name 'El in the Psalms', T.S. xiv (1953), pp. 452-7; Cf. now H. Schmid, 'Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem', Z.A.W. lvii (1955), pp. 168-97;
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doubtful, although there is some reason to believe that, if
the association of a god Šedek with Jerusalem remains ex-
tremely uncertain, its tutelary deity may have been the god
to refer to a military leader of some kind. Cf., for example, G. Dossin, A.R.M.
i (1959), Nos. 69, 92, 124; C. F. Jean, A.R.M. ii (1959), Nos. 74, 141; Dossin, A.R.M. iv (1957), Nos. 33, 40, 41; A.R.M. v (1958), Nos. 2, 72; also J. Bottéro and A. Finet, A.R.M. xv (1954), p. 200 (s.v. Davidam). However,
it now seems clear that the form in question should be regarded, rather,
as a variant of dabbda, 'defeat'. Cf. H. Tadmor (citing B. Landsberger), in
J.N.E.S. xvii (1958), pp. 129ff., followed, for example, by A.D. and A.H.,
as.d. dabbda.

Finally, for more recent discussion of the original significance of the name
David along with much in divergent lines as those already indicated, see
now (a) G. W. Ahlström, Psalm 89. Eine Liturgie aus dem Ritual des leidenden
Königs (1959), pp. 163 ff., and (b) J. J. Stamm, 'Der Name des Königs
who stresses, as an alternative to the meaning 'Beloved' ('Liebling'), that
of paternal 'Uncle' ('Vatersbruder'). In connexion with the latter work, how-
ever, I must enter a protest against the fact that the first edition of this
monograph is cited (p. 171, n. 1; with the broad reference 'psalms')
as evidence for the statement that I have taken up and developed the argument
of L. Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East (1943),
pp. 176 f., who claimed (i) that the term Šedek had been used originally in
Jebusite Jerusalem as 'an appellative or a proper name of the "vegetation-
deity" corporalized in the king', (ii) that it came to be employed in the Old
Testament 'simply as a title of the reigning king', and (iii) that, correspond-
ingly, its use in the expression šâdên, which figures so often in the headings
to the individual compositions in the Psalter, is to be interpreted as an
original cultic-liturgical rubric inherited from pre-Israelite Jebusite times
with the actual import of "a psalm for the king". It should have been clear,
both from the statement in the text which has given rise to this footnote and
from the wording of this note in its original form, that I was reserving judg-
ment as, obviously, I still do on the whole of this highly controversial issue.
What is more, the fact that this monograph develops the argument of a work
which I published eight years before that of Engnell (see above, in the preface
to the first edition) should have been sufficient to show that its thesis owes
nothing to any hints which had been dropped by this Swedish scholar. The
fact is that, as I have indicated repeatedly elsewhere (see above, p. 7, n. 1),
i owe my treatment of the psalms in question to Gunkel's valuable recogni-
tion of a class of psalm which he described as 'royal psalms' ('Königspsalmen'),
many of which, as it seems to me, have close links with a modified form of
Mowinckel's epoch-making treatment of the psalms which celebrate the King-
ship of Yahweh.

1 See above, pp. 36 f. It has also been suggested that the figure of Zadok,
a priest of uncertain genealogy, who comes suddenly to the fore as an
associate of Abiathar when once David is established in Jerusalem, acquires
deepen significance when seen in the light of the Melchizedek tradition; in
fact, that he may have been either the earlier Jebusite king of Jerusalem, who,
in line with David's general policy of conciliation, had been allowed to
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Ṣālēm. In any case, as we turn in the following pages to an examination of those psalms which are to be our main concern, we shall find reason to believe that, after the capture of Jerusalem, David found in the Jebusite cultus with its worship of the 'Most High' in association with the royal-
prise order of Melchizedek a ritual and mythology which might prove to be the means of carrying out Yahweh's pur-
poses for Israel and fusing the chosen people into a model of
national righteousness.2

retain something of his earlier priestly status, or, simply, a priest of this
earlier Jebusite cultus. Cf., for example, 2 Sam. viii. 17, xx. 24 ff., xvii. 15,
xiv. 12 (EW. xi); Kings i. r-li. 35; i Chron. v. 34-40 (EW. vi. 4-14),
vi. 35-38 (EW. 50-52), xviii. 16; and see (a) A. Benzen, Studier over det
zadokieske præstekabst historie (1933), pp. 8-18, following the suggestions
of S. Mowinckel, Eren den skrifslæde (1916), p. 109, n. 2 (cf. Offersang
og sangoffier, p. 135, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, i. p. 133), and H. R. Hall,
of this work in German by the author, Z. A. W. li (1933), pp. 173-6; Nyberg,
A.R.W. xxxv (1938), p. 375 (b) H. H. Rowley, Zadok and Nehushtan,
J.B.L. xivii (1939), pp. 113-41, 'Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen. 14 and Ps.
110)', Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet (1950), pp. 4612; and now C. E.
Hauer Jr., Who was Zadok?, J.B.L. lixxii (1963), pp. 89-94.

2 It is possible that a divine name Šālōm should be recognized behind the
alternative names of the city, Salem (i.e. Šālōm) and Jerusalem ("Foundation
of Šālōm"?), and the personal names which were given by David to his
two favourite sons, Absalom (originally "Šālōm is father") and Solomon
(but see in this connexion J. J. Stamm, 'Der Name des Königs Salomo', T.Z.
xvi (1960), pp. 283-97). The form Šālōm which occurs unmistakably in the
Ras Shamra tablets as the name of a god (Gordon, op. cit., 17, 1252, 521 =
Herdner, 29, rev. 12:23, 52 f.; see also G. R. Driver, Canaanite Myths and
Legends, pp. 120 ff.), and the divine names Šālām and Šālānum which are
attested by theoephoric names in Accadian texts. See further, for example,
cx (1934), p. 60 ff.; The Šālāmīn Temple in Jerusalem,' J.B.L. ix (1940),
pp. 519-22; also Nyberg, op. cit., pp. 352 ff.; N. W. Porteous, "Šālānum-
Shalam', G. U. O. S. T. x (1940 and 1941, published 1943), pp. 17; J. Gray,
The Desert God 'Aṭṭu in the Literature and Religion of Canaan,' J.N.E.S.
viii (1940), pp. 72-83; and now Vincent and Steve, op. cit., p. 612; G.

It has been claimed that kingship as an institution was in decline in Canaan
at the time of the Hebrew settlement, and, in particular, that the absence
of any reference to a contemporary king of Jerusalem in the account of David's
capture of the city (2 Sam. v. 6-8) makes it likely that there was no kingship in
existence there at that time. Cf. J. Gray, 'Canaanite Kingship in Theory and
Practice', V.T. i (1952), pp. 89-220, following A. Alt, Die Staatsbildung
der Israeliten in Palästina (1930), pp. 3 ff. ( = Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte


The dedication of Solomon’s Temple, which adjoined the palace and was first and foremost a royal chapel, took place at the celebration of a great autumn festival. This corresponds to a leading feature of Jeroboam’s attempt to consolidate his position in the north, following the disruption of the monarchy and the successful break-away from the House of David; for we learn that he established rival centres of worship at Dan in the north and Bethel in the south of his kingdom, and we are expressly told that, in establishing what was essentially a royal cultus at Bethel as a rival to the similar cultus in Jerusalem (the book of Amos revealing that the sanctuary at Bethel, like that in Jerusalem, was indeed a royal sanctuary), he followed the example of the Southern Kingdom by inaugurating at this particular centre a corresponding autumnal festival.

This is important; for it indicates that the festival in question was used in Jerusalem for the important purpose of binding the people in loyalty not only to the national deity but also to the reigning house.

Moreover, we learn that the festival under discussion was celebrated in Jerusalem in the month Ethanim, which is then explained as being the seventh month, i.e. the month Tishri (October-November) according to the Babylonian calendar and the numbering of the months from that of Nisan (March–April). In Bethel, on the other hand, it is said to have taken place in the eighth month, i.e. the month Bul or, according to the Babylonian calendar, Marcheshvan (November-December), the variation probably being in keeping with local tradition as well as reflecting the absence of any central control such as that which emerged in close association with the Jerusalem Temple after the Exile. Further, it is generally agreed that the festival in question must have been the last and most important of the three great festivals of the Israelite year, i.e. ‘The Feast par excellence’, which occurs in the earlier legal codes as ‘The Feast of Ingathering’ (יִסְפָּרָה יָפִיא), but ultimately even isolated rulers, the Southern Kingdom remained faithful to the House of David throughout some four centuries until the kingdom itself was overthrown from outside.

1 Kings xii. 26-33. Furthermore, Jeroboam’s policy of rivalry can be seen as a result of the absence of any central control such as that which emerged in close association with the Jerusalem Temple after the Exile. 

Moreover, we learn that the festival under discussion was celebrated in Jerusalem in the month Ethanim, which is then explained as being the seventh month, i.e. the month Tishri (October-November) according to the Babylonian calendar and the numbering of the months from that of Nisan (March–April). In Bethel, on the other hand, it is said to have taken place in the eighth month, i.e. the month Bul or, according to the Babylonian calendar, Marcheshvan (November-December), the variation probably being in keeping with local tradition as well as reflecting the absence of any central control such as that which emerged in close association with the Jerusalem Temple after the Exile. Further, it is generally agreed that the festival in question must have been the last and most important of the three great festivals of the Israelite year, i.e. ‘The Feast par excellence’, which occurs in the earlier legal codes as ‘The Feast of Ingathering’ (יִסְפָּרָה יָפִיא), but ultimately even isolated rulers, the Southern Kingdom remained faithful to the House of David throughout some four centuries until the kingdom itself was overthrown from outside. 

1: Kings viii. 2. 2: Kings xii. 26-33. 3: Cf. Judges xii. 15; 1 Kings viii. 2. 4: Cf. J. Skinner, Cent. B. (n.d.), 1: Kings viii. 2. 5: Cf. N. H. Snaith, The Jewish New Year Festival: Its Origins and Development (1947), pp. 47 ff. It is, perhaps, worthy of note in this connexion that, whereas the Northern Kingdom witnessed a succession of dynasties and
appears in the later codes as ‘The Feast of Tabernacles’ or, better perhaps, ‘Feast of Booths’ (זִיכְרָו). According to pre-exilic sources this festival took place ‘in the going out of the year’ (תַּמָּכָה), or ‘at the turn of the year’ (יָמָה תָּמָכָה); and a strong case can be made out for the view that the expression ‘the going out of the year’ denotes the end of the year. Nevertheless it is difficult to escape the impression that the phrase ‘the going out of the year’ should be regarded as the opposite of the expression ‘the return of the year’ (יָמָה חוֹזָה), which is defined as the time when military operations might be expected to begin and therefore probably bears reference to the spring. If that should be so, these two contrary expressions may reflect the thought of the dying and reviving year; and, this being the case, the expression ‘the going out of the year’ should not be stressed as clearly marking, in and of itself, the end of one year or by implication the beginning of the next. In other words, this expression simply denotes one of the two recognized turning points in the cycle of the year.

On the other hand, some support for the view that the Feast of Ingathering was closely connected with the thought of at least an agricultural New Year is to be found in the so-called Gezer Calendar (possibly as early as the tenth century B.C.), which lists the agricultural operations of the year in their monthly order beginning with that of ‘Ingathering’ (Ingatherer): and such a forward look is confirmed by the explicit association of the Feast of Tabernacles with the coming of the rain which would be so necessary if these agricultural operations were to issue in a successful harvest by the end of the ensuing twelve months. Further, it is a noteworthy fact that in the post-exilic period Tishri 1 or the first day of the seventh month was a day of memorial to be celebrated in a special way with the sounding of trumpet or horn; and that in the rabbinical tradition represented by the Mishnah it is expressly stated to be a New Year’s Day: for this seems best understood as a reflection of the traditional importance which must have been attached to this season of the year. Moreover, it is to be observed that, whereas this New Year’s Day fell on Tishri 1, i.e. at the new moon, the Feast of Tabernacles did not begin its week of celebrations until Tishri 15, i.e. at the full moon; so that the great autumnal festival now came well within the new year marked by this particular New Year’s Day.
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Unfortunately the Old Testament offers little direct evidence as to the ritual and mythology of this great annual festival in any of its forms; and even the little that is available is post-exilic in date. In short, there is the well-known practice of dwelling in ‘booths’ throughout the seven days of the festival, and there are the regulations concerning the special sacrifices which are to be offered on each successive day; but none of this takes us very far, and it seems extraordinary that so important a festival should have left no little trace. Happily, however, there is a brief but important passage in the post-exilic book of Zechariah which touches on the Feast of Tabernacles and, in so doing, yields a valuable clue to the indirect evidence which is available for the reconstruction of the ritual pattern as it existed in Jerusalem, i.e. 3

And it shall come to pass that every one that is left of all the nations which came up against Jerusalem shall go up from year to year to worship the King, Yahweh of Hosts, and to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles. Moreover, it shall be that, whoever of all the families of the earth goeth not up to Jerusalem to worship the King, Yahweh of Hosts, upon them the rain shall not come.

It seems reasonable to infer that such an eschatological picture (and for the present writer’s argument as a whole this eschatological aspect must be emphasized) is based upon what was already the established complex of ideas associated with this festival in the form which had been current in Jerusalem, i.e. to infer, as a general principle, that the gift of rain was bound up with the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles (an inference borne out from other sources).2 and, what is more, that this celebration found its focus in the worship of Yahweh as King and even, perhaps, the universal King.

At this point it is necessary to recall the fact that in Israelite thought the sky is a concrete dome-like structure or ‘firmament’ which rests upon the circle of the earth, while the earth itself is supported above a part of the all-embracing cosmic sea, in which are sunk the bases of the mountains as the very pillars of heaven. The breaks in the earth’s surface, which are caused by the seas and the rivers, the flooded wadies, and the bubbling springs, all reveal the presence of the subterranean waters; and rain is due to the fact that a supply from the upper reaches of this great cosmic sea is released from time to time by Yahweh through the window-like openings of heaven for the service of

1 See below, p. 61, n. 1.
consider evidence which serves to show that the psalms in question, far from being influenced in some cases by the thought of Deutero-Isaiah as is commonly supposed, are of pre-exilic date, and must be regarded rather as having themselves exerted a powerful influence upon the thought of this great prophet of the Exile.1

Tabernacles) no reference is made to this conception of Yahweh as King; but such an omission does not prove that the association of ideas in the book of Zechariah is purely fortuitous, for the tractate is merely concerned with the preservation of traditional material relating to certain practices associated with the festival as celebrated in connexion with the Second Temple or the provincial synagogues, and shows little, if any, interest in the accompanying ideology.1

1 See especially Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien II*, pp. 190-202, and *Zum israelitischen Neujahr und zur Deutung der Thronbesteigungspsalmen*, pp. 39-53; also the present writer’s comments in his essay on ‘The Psalms’, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley (1951), pp. 194 ff., where it is pointed out (i) that the list of parallels between Psalms xxiii, xcvi-xcviii and Isaiah xi-iv, drawn up by N. H. Snith, *Studies in the Psalter* (1934), pp. 66-69 (cf. *The Jewish New Year Festival*, pp. 200 f.) in support of his claim that the former are dependent upon the latter is something of a two-edged sword, for quite the opposite conclusion may be drawn; and (ii) that, if the psalms in question owed their existence to the influence of Deutero-Isaiah, one would expect to find some reference to Yahweh’s activity, not only as the universal King, but also as the proven ‘redeemer’ or, rather, as argued by the present writer in S.V.T. i (1953), pp. 67-77, ‘protector’ of His people, for this idea dominates the thought of Isaiah xi-iv from beginning to end (cf. (a) xli. 14, xliii. 14, xlv. 6,67,71 (P$P$), (b) xlvi. 24, xlvii. 4, xlviii. 17, lix. 26, liv. 5; cf. xli. 13; 2 Kings vii. 23-26 (cf. 2 Chron. iv. 2 ff.); 2 Kings xxv. 13. Cf., for example, Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, pp. 148 ff.

The writer’s basic dependence upon Mowinckel’s epoch-making work for the ensuing interpretation of the psalms in question is clearly indicated in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, pp. 196 f., as also in ‘Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship. Divine Kingship and the Old Testament’, E.T. (ixii (1950-1), p. 39, and it is again gratefully acknowledged here. Nevertheless, if the writer may be allowed to anticipate the conclusion of his argument at so early a stage as this, it seems desirable to add that, while preparing this series of lectures during the winter of 1950-1 after the aforementioned articles had gone to press, he found himself compelled to modify his earlier views at a number of points; and included in these modifications is one change of quite a major character. This is (a) the rejection of the view that the festival under discussion was concerned with the cyclic revival of the social unit, and (b) the recognition that its orientation was not merely towards the following cycle of twelve months but towards a completely new era. That is to say, if ever it had its roots in a complex of myth and ritual which was primarily concerned with the cycle of the year and an annual attempt to secure a renewal of life for a specific social unit, this had been refashioned in...
Turning now to the liturgical works which call for consideration, we may begin with Psalm xxix, which is of special importance in that it reveals some close parallels in both language and form with the Ugaritic literature of the latter part of the second millennium B.C., and so may safely be assigned to the pre-exilic period and, indeed, the early pre-exilic period. In fact the parallels with Ugaritic are so close that the psalm has been described as in origin a hymn to Baal which has been but slightly revised in terms of Yahwism; and as such it has been assigned tentatively to the tenth century B.C. This is important, for it admits the possibility that we have here a hymn of the early Jebusite cultus of Jerusalem which was adapted to the worship of Yahweh after the capture of the city by David. The psalm of the Hebrew experience of Yahweh's activity on the plane of history, and the thought in question was really the creation of a new world order and the introduction of an age of universal righteousness and peace. In short, while the writer continues to reject the historical interpretation of these psalms, he now holds, not only that they were cultic in intention from the first, but that their orientation was also eschatological from the first.

The foregoing paragraph (apart from the form of citation in the reference to my own work) has been reproduced, as it stands, from the first edition of this monograph; but the reader may now be referred to my essay on 'Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship', in Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, ed. S. H. Hooke (1958), pp. 204–215, for a renewed acknowledgement of my indebtedness to H. J. Holmwood. At the same time, in view of much current misrepresentation of my own line of approach and its conclusions, I must stress the fact, which is there recorded, that I have ventured to differ from him on a number of important points, including this shift of emphasis with regard to the eschatological interpretation of the psalms under discussion.


2 Albright, loc. cit.; also Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, p.129.

3 Cf. the suggestion advanced in connexion with the Tell el-Amarna tablets, that the somewhat extravagant language which is occasionally used by the petty rulers of Canaan in addressing their Egyptian overlords may be drawn from contemporaneous Canaanite hymnology, and that the contemporary psalm may be held to indicate the existence of Canaanite prototypes for the Israelite psalms. F. M. Th. Böhl, 'Hymnisches und Rhythmisches in den Amarnabriefen aus Kanaan', T.U. 1, xxxvi (1914), cols. 337 ff.: cf. De Psalmen, T.U. i (1946), pp. 25 ff. See also A. Jirku, 'Kana'änäische Psalmenfragmente in der vorisraelitischen Zeit Palästinas und Syriens', J.B.L. iii (1933), pp. 105–20.

4 Cf. Ps. lxxxix. 9 (EW. 6), as below, p. 108: also, for the corresponding expression סירון (Sirion), Gen. vi. 2. 4 (f.); Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxviii. 7. See further The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, pp. 25 ff., 2nd ed., pp. 22 ff., which may be supplemented by H. W. Robinson, The Council of Yahweh', J.T.S. xlv (1943), pp. 151–7, and Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament (1946), pp. 166 ff. also, now, the careful study by G. Cooke, 'The Sons of the Gods', Z.A.W. ixvi (1954), pp. 22–47, although I must add that his attempt to distinguish between 'mythological' and 'psychological' sets of ideas (pp. 40 ff.) introduces a false antithesis which must do less than justice to the conception of the divine מ might or 'Spirit'.


6 Cf. Deut. iii. 23; also, perhaps, i Chron. v. 16 (LXX). In the former passage 'Sirion' is explained as being the Sidonian, i.e. the Phoenician or Canaanite name of Hermon as opposed to the Amorite 'Senir'; and this now finds confirmation in Ugaritic. Cf. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, 51, vi 19, 21 = Hurdner, Mission de Ras Shamra X. 4, vi 19, 21: also Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, pp. 98–9.
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The Voice of Yahweh soundeth over the waters;
The most glorious God hath thundered forth.
Even Yahweh, over the many waters.
The Voice of Yahweh is full of power;
The Voice of Yahweh is full of splendour.
The Voice of Yahweh shattereth the cedars,
Yahweh doth shatter the cedars of Lebanon.
He maketh Lebanon skip like a calf,
And Sirion like the young of the wild-ox;
The Voice of Yahweh cleaveth flames of fire;
The Voice of Yahweh convulseth the wilderness,
Yahweh doth convulse the wilderness of Kadesh.
The Voice of Yahweh doth make hinds to calve,And causeth the birth of kids in haste,1
While all His Temple echoeth the word 'Glory'!

The whole is then brought to a triumphant conclusion in words which make completely clear the ground for such an atmosphere of excitement:2

Yahweh is enthroned over the flood;3
Yahweh is enthroned as King for ever.
Yahweh will give strength to His people;
Yahweh will endow4 His people with welfare

To sum up, the theme of this early hymn is obviously that of Yahweh's Kingship over what we should call the realm of nature; and this assurance of His enthronement over the physical universe and, in particular, the chaos of waters or cosmic sea brings with it a guarantee that He can be relied upon to ensure the seasonal rains and the consequent prosperity of His people. In virtue of both its content and its date, therefore, we have good grounds for associating this particular psalm with the occasion under discussion, i.e. Israel's great autumnal festival as celebrated in the Jerusalem Temple during the period of the monarchy.5

---

2 W. 10-11.  
4 Lit. 'bless'.  
5 It is difficult to resist the impression that Isaiah's vision at the time of his

---
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The foregoing composition acquires added importance, however, in that it now seems to fix the date and interpretation of a number of similar pieces in the Psalter, e.g. Psalm xcviii, which may be rendered as follows:

It is Yahweh who is King! He is clothed in majesty:

Yahweh is clothed, He is girded with strength!

'call' (vi. i ff.) should be seen against this background. Cf., for example, the antiphonal hymn with its emphasis upon the fact that the whole earth is full of Yahweh's 'Glory' (verse 3), the vivid impression of an earthquake in the rocking of the Temple (verse 4), and the final realization, 'Mine eyes have seen the King, Yahweh of Hosts' (verse 5). Cf., in principle, Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i. pp. 349 ff.

1 The present writer is not convinced by Mowinckel's argument that the expression יְהַּוֵּה קָנָן (Yahweh has become King) and that we should think in terms of an annual enthronement of Yahweh. Cf. *Psalmenstudien* ii, pp. 6 ff.; also *Oeffnung und Sagenalter*, pp. 523-6, and now *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, ii, pp. 222-4 (in reply to O. Eissfeldt, 'Jahwe als König', Z.A.W. xvi (1938), pp. 100 ff.). In the present writer's opinion the thought which dominates these psalms is that of Yahweh's Kingship from the beginning to the end of time, the emphasis lying rather upon the thought that it is Yahweh who is King. As will be seen, this is also true of Ps. lxxvi. 9 (EW. 8), despite (a) the exception which even Eissfeldt makes in this case, op. cit., p. 101, and (b) the stress which is also laid upon this particular passage by H. J. Kraus, *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament*, B.H.T. 13 (1951), pp. 5 ff. See below, p. 66, n. 3, and p. 77, n. 1; and note indeed that Mowinckel's view is clearly belied by verse 2 of the psalm under discussion.

Since the publication of the first edition of this monograph D. Michel, 'Studien zu den sogenannten Thronebesteigungspsalmen', *V. T.* vi (1956), pp. 40-68, has rightly stressed the fact that the verb יְהַּוֵּה קָנָן denotes the activity proper to a king, i.e. the function of 'reigning'; and, indeed, this is recognized by the translators of A.V., R.V., and R.S.V. in the passage under consideration. Further, despite the arguments of (i) A. S. Kapelrud, 'Nochmals יְהַּוֵּה קָנָן', *J.T.T.* xiii (1963), pp. 229-31, who maintains that the activity implied by the expression under discussion is 'ingressiv sowohl als durativ', and thinks to translate the Hebrew by 'Jahwe herrscht jetzt aktiv als König', and (ii) E. Lipiński, 'Yahvehmalki', *Biblica* xiv (1963), pp. 495-60, and *La Royauté de Yahvé dans la poésie et la littérature de l'ancien Israël* (1965), pp. 336-91, whose citation of supposedly relevant comparative material from Accadian, Egyptian, and Ugaritic sources has, it seems to me, little if any bearing on the question, I find no evidence to show that the form יְהַּוֵּה קָנָן is ever used in the Old Testament of anything but an existent condition, whatever the temporal circumstances may be. This is not to deny that the form is sometimes used in circumstances which give it an inchoative colouring: but, as I see it, such colouring is not inherent in the form but is due to the light which is shed upon the form by its context. Thus in such a case as יְהַּוֵּה קָנָן (Ps. Sam. xv. 10; cf. 2 Kings ix. 13) the Hebrew simply means...
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Yes, the world doth continue immovable!
Thy throne was established of old;
Thou Thyself art from ages past!
The currents lift up, 0 Yahweh,
The currents lift up their voice;
The currents lift up their clamour.
Yahweh in the heights is mightier
Than the voice of the many waters,1
Mighty as are the breakers of the sea.
Thy testimonies are strongly supported;
It is seemly that Thy House should be holy,
0 Yahweh, who abidest throughout the years!2

The similarity to Psalm xxix in both form and content is so marked that there appears to be every justification for the view that it was intended for the same occasion. The order of the opening words יִשְׁתַּחַם, i.e. ‘It is Yahweh who is King’, sounds a somewhat polemical note, emphasizing the fact, as in the case of Psalm xxix, that it is the God of Israel who is supreme in the general assembly of the gods.3 Moreover, ‘Absalom is king’ or, more forcefully, ‘Absalom reigneth’; but we gather from the context that the exercising of this function by Absalom is something new, the addition of the words in Hebron as compared with the simple form of the corresponding statement in Kings ix. 13 indicating the temporary seat of government under what is intended to be a new régime. On the other hand, the context of the statement יִשְׁתַּחַם, meaning quite simply ‘Thy God is King’ or, more forcefully, ‘Thy God reigneth’, with which the great prophet of the Exile sums up the good news now on its way to Zion (Isa. iii. 2), does not require one to think in terms of a formal proclamation to the effect that, with the overthrow of Babylon, Zion’s God has become King; rather, it offers Zion the glad assurance that, despite possible appearances to the contrary during the long years of exile, the evidence is now at hand to prove that Yahweh is still King, the order of the words also showing the point at issue to be the reality of Yahweh’s Kingship rather than any question as to who among the gods is King (cf. n. 3).

1 For this special sense of the term הָנִים, which is the normal word for ‘river’, see Ps. xxv. 2 (as below, p. 73); Jonah ii. 4 (EW. 3); also, perhaps, Isa. xliv. 27. It now finds illustration in the Ugaritic texts, i.e. in the account of the conflict between Baal and ‘Prince Sea’ (abl ym) or ‘Judge River’ (gpp nnr). Cf. Gordon, op. cit., 68, 12 ff. = Herder, op. cit., 2, iv 12 ff. ; also Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, pp. 81 ff.

2 The word הָנִים, which occurs in the Old Testament only in the plural, is traditionally rendered by the word ‘testimony;’ but it must be borne in mind that it is used in the Old Testament in a specialized sense, i.e. not of that which one testifies to have happened in the past (i.e. evidence) but of that which one protests shall happen in the future (i.e. a solemn promise or pledge), and so, specifically, of the terms of the covenant or, rather, the covenants between Yahweh and His votaries. Accordingly it may be used either (a) of Yahweh’s promises to His followers, as here, or (b) of the undertakings which He requires of them in return, i.e. His ‘laws’. Cf., for example, Pss. xxv. 10, cxxxii. 12 and see above, pp. 22 ff. The writer hopes to develop this point more fully in another connexion; see The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, p. 88, n. 1, 2nd edit., p. 86, n. 7.

3 Cf. the simple statement יִשְׁתַּחֲמָה, ‘Adonijah is king’ (1 Kings i. 11) with the inverted form יִשְׁתַּחֲמָה (verse 8), where stress is clearly being laid upon the fact that, contrary to David’s solemn promise that Solomon should succeed him, ‘it is Adonijah who is king’. Cf. in general L. Koehehler, ‘Syntactica III. IV. יִשְׁתַּחֲמָה’, V. T. iii (1953), pp. 188 f., who is right in his primary inference from the order of the words in the Hebrew expression under discussion but is without justification in the conclusion which he then draws with regard to the dating of this and the corresponding psalms; as against J. Ridderbos, ‘Yahweh Makal’, V. T. iv (1954), pp. 87-89, with whose further argument I also disagree, in part, for reasons which are sufficiently indicated above, p. 65, n. 1.
the psalm, is again the assurance that this need can be met. At the same time, in this concluding reference to the covenant relationship between Yahweh and His people, we are carried a step further in our recognition of the way in which the old Canaanite mythology was remodelled in relation to the Hebrew traditions with their focus in the events at Sinai–Horeb.

The last point is important; for another of the so-called enthronement psalms presents us with the other side of the picture, laying stress not on Yahweh’s promises to Israel but on Israel’s corresponding obligations towards Yahweh. This is Psalm xcvi, which opens with a summons to unite in the worship of Yahweh (i) as the great God and King who is also the Creator of the earth, and (ii) as the Maker and Shepherd of His chosen people Israel:1

0 come, let us applaud Yahweh,
Let us acclaim the Rock that is our salvation.
Let us approach His Person with thanksgiving,
While we acclaim Him with songs.

For Yahweh is a great God,
Even the great King over all the gods;
In whose Hand are the depths of the earth,
Whose is the sea, which He Himself made,
And the dry land, which His own Hands moulded.
Come, let us make obeisance, let us bow down,
Let us kneel before Yahweh our Maker;
For it is He who is our God, while we
Are the people whom He doth shepherd, the flock under His Hand.

At this point, however, the course of the utterance undergoes a change. The speaker, instead of acting as the leader of the assembly in a call to worship, now becomes the representative of Yahweh; and as such he administers on this solemn day an equally solemn charge to the worshippers not to be like their disobedient forefathers in the wilderness, but to hearken dutifully to the omnipotent God who has

---

1 v.v. 1–7ab.

---

led His chosen people so signally into the land which He had selected as His earthly home. He begins with the significant appeal:1

0 that today ye may hearken to His Voice!

Then the personality of the speaker (possibly a cultic prophet) gives way, as it were, to that of the Godhead; so that, acting as an extension of the divine Personality,3 he proceeds to address his hearers as Yahweh Himself, and reminds them of this lesson in loyalty from the period of the Wandering:4

‘Harden not your heart as at Meribah (i.e. ‘Contention’),
As on the day at Massah (i.e. ‘Trial’) in the wilderness,
When your fathers put Me on trial,
Tested Me, though they had seen what I had done.
Through forty years I loathed
That generation, and said,
“They are a people errant of heart,
A people who ignore My ways.”
Wherefore I swore in My wrath
That they should not enter My homeland.’6

All this, however, is wholly in line with the fact that, as is now generally recognized, the agricultural festivals of Canaan were taken over by the Hebrews and given an historical interpretation, the dwelling in booths at the Feast of Tabernacles coming to be treated as a reminder of the time when Israel dwelt in tents in the wilderness—the very theme of the present psalm.7 In other words, the first part of our psalm, with its characteristic emphasis upon Yahweh’s universal Kingship and His power in Creation, is mainly a legacy from Canaanite mythology, while the second part, with its emphasis upon the lesson in obedience which is to be drawn from the history of the Wandering, is based upon the Hebrew traditions concerning the great

---

1 Verse 7c.
2 See above, p. 22, n. 3.
3 Cf. The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, pp. 36 ff., 2nd edit., pp. 32 ff.
4 w. 8–11.
5 Cf. LXX, Jerome, S. 22, n. 1.
6 See above, p. 22, n. 1.
7 Cf. Lev. xxiii. 42 f. (H): and see above, p. 38, n. 3.
events of the Exodus; and, all in all, we have good reason to believe that both together formed an important element in the liturgy of the great autumnal festival as celebrated in Jerusalem during the period of the monarchy.1

In Psalm xcix, another of the so-called enthronement psalms, we have an obvious companion-piece to the foregoing composition, bringing the sacred story of Yahweh’s dealings with Israel down to the years which saw the rise of the monarchy and the transference of the Ark to its new home on Mount Zion. In the first part of the psalm an eschatological note is clearly sounded, and we are given a glimpse of that ultimate purpose of Yahweh in choosing Israel which, as we shall see, is the dominant theme of the ritual and mythology of this festival which we are attempting in some measure to reconstruct, i.e.: 2

It is Yahweh who is King! The peoples quake.
He that is seated on the cherubim! The earth trembleth.
Great is Yahweh, whose home is in Zion;
He is exalted above all the peoples.
Let them praise Thy Name as great and terrible,
One which is mighty in its holiness.3

1 Cf. Psalm lxxxi, which offers a remarkable parallel to Psalm xcix in both form and content, although it appears to stand much closer to the pure Hebrew tradition. This may well be so, for it seems to have come from the north; and, what is even more important in the present connexion, there are ample grounds for believing that it was composed for use at the celebration of some New Year festival of the pre-exilic period. Cf. Snarr, The Jewish New Year Festival, pp. 99-103. It is possible, too, that the Song of Miriam (Exod. xv. 1-21) belongs to the same circle of poems; for it links in much the same way the Hebrew traditions concerning the Exodus, specifically the miraculous deliverance at the Sea of Reeds, with the celebration of Yahweh’s uniqueness amongst the gods. His settlement in Canaan as His chosen earthly home, and, finally, the fact that He is the everlasting King. On the other hand, Psalm c, which has one or two points of contact with Psalm xcix and is commonly classed with the so-called enthronement psalms (although there is no explicit reference to Yahweh’s Kingship), is really of far too general a character to be ascribed with any certainty to a particular festival.

2 w. 1-5.

3 Lit. ‘Holy is it—and mighty.’ It is difficult to obtain sense from the consonantal text of verses 3 and 4 as vocalized in M.T.; but the meaning of these lines becomes clear, if the first word of verse 4 is read as יְהֵנָא and construed with verse 3. The cause of the trouble is probably the view that we have here a refrain corresponding to that which occurs in verses 5c and gc.

The point of view which the psalm reveals is thus perfectly clear, and may be summed up by saying that, after the long vicissitudes of the Wandering and the Settlement, Yahweh is now firmly established in Zion, where, manifesting His presence as ‘He that is seated on the cherubim’ through the

Being a King who loveth justice,
Thou hast established equity,
Thou hast wrought
Justice and righteousness in Jacob.
Exalt Yahweh our God,
And make obeisance at His footstool;
Such is His holiness!

Thus, as is made clear in the second part of the psalm, we are shown here the ultimate issue of those long years of discipline under the leadership of Yahweh which began with the Exodus, i.e.: 4

Moses, and Aaron as His priest,
And Samuel as one who calls on His Name
Would cry to Yahweh, and He would answer them.2
In the pillar of cloud He would speak to those
Who kept His testimonies and the statute He gave them.
Thou, Yahweh our God, didst answer them;
Thou wast for them a forbearing God,
While punishing their misdeeds.
Exalt Yahweh our God,
And make obeisance at His holy hill;
For such is the holiness of Yahweh our God!

2 vv. 6-9.

The traditional rendering of this verse, which numbers Moses with Yahweh’s priests (e.g. A.V. ‘Moses and Aaron among his priests, and Samuel among them that call upon his name’), is due to a misunderstanding of Hebrew syntax. In the first metrical line of the Hebrew there are two examples of the beth essentiae in association with a plural of excellence (cf., for example, Ps. cxviii. 7a, as below, p. 125; and see further G.K., §§119i, 124b-7; and the reference is (a) to Moses who is in a class by himself, (b) to Aaron as Yahweh’s priest par excellence, and (c) to Samuel as His prophet par excellence. For the terminology in the last case, see The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, pp. 47 ff., and edit., pp. 54 ff. Accordingly there is not the slightest justification for the claim that, as Moses and Samuel are here classed along with Aaron as priests, this harmonizes with the late dating of the so-called enthronement psalms. Cf., for example, Gunkel, H.K., in loc.
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instrumentality of the Ark,1 He is to rule over the earth as the universal King; and, what is more, the achievement of justice and righteousness amongst His own chosen people is to be the guarantee of His actual presence as a King who is resolved that His rule shall be just and equitable.

Enough has been said to sketch the general background of our festival, and we may now take a further step in its attempted reconstruction by observing that in several psalms we have evidence for a procession in which Yahweh is again acclaimed as King. The first of these to engage our attention is Psalm xxiv, which clearly requires us to think in terms of a scene in which the Ark, as the aforementioned symbol of Yahweh’s presence and the focus of His worship, is borne in procession up the slopes of Mount Zion towards the gates of Solomon’s Temple. The psalm itself, which may have something of an antiphonal character,2 begins significantly enough with a brief reference to Yahweh’s activity in Creation;3


2 It has been argued, on the ground of content and variation in metre, that Psalm xxiv may be divided up into two or three originally independent pieces; cf., for example, J. Maier, Das altisraelitische Ladeheiligtum, B.Z.A.W. 93 (1953), p. 77. However, we must beware of using such considerations as an argument for chopping up a composition of this kind in so mechanical a way, when we ought to be taking into consideration the question of a liturgical Sitz im Leben with all that this may have involved in terms of (i) ritual background and corresponding variation in theme, and (ii) musical accompaniment.

3 w. 1–2.

The earth is Yahweh’s, and all that filleth it. The world and they that dwell therein; For it is He who founded it upon the seas, And doth maintain it above the ocean currents.’

This is followed by a short section, couched in terms of question and answer, in which one is reminded of the moral integrity that Yahweh requires of His worshippers;4

Who may ascend Yahweh’s hill? Who may stand in His holy place? The clean of hands and the pure of heart, Who hath not made falsity his aim, And sworn with intent to deceive! He shall receive blessing5 from the presence of Yahweh, A due response from the God who is his salvation. Such is the lot6 of those who look for Him, Those who seek the Person7 (lit. Face) of the God of Jacob.6

Finally we have the appeal of the worshippers that the gates of the Temple should be opened to admit Yahweh into His sanctuary; and again we note that, as in Psalm xxix, the theme of the song is the actual presence of Yahweh as King in all His attendant ‘Glory’:8

Lift up your heads, 0 ye gates; Be lifted up, 0 everlasting doors; That the glorious King may enter! Who is this—The glorious King? Yahweh strong and mighty, Yahweh mighty in battle!

Lift up your heads, 0 ye gates; Lift them up, 0 everlasting doors; That the glorious King may enter!

1 See above, p. 67, n. 1. 2 w. 3–6. 3 See above, p. 48, n. 1. 4 Cf. G. R. Driver, J.B.L. liii (1953), p. 285. 5 Cf. F. J. Neuberg, J.N.E.S. ix (1950), pp. 216 f. 6 So LXX. M.T. ‘Thy Person (lit. Face), 0 Jacob.’ 7 w. 7–10. Cf. 1 Sam. iv. 19–22, i.e. the way in which the wife of Phinehas, when she heard that the Philistines had captured the Ark and that her husband as well as her father-in-law was dead, named her new-born child ‘Ichabod’ (i.e. ‘Inglorious’), saying: ‘Glory is an exile from Israel, For the Ark of God hath been taken.’
Who is this—'The glorious King'?
Yahweh of Hosts,
He is 'The glorious King'!

Two points stand out in this important psalm, and they must be stressed. In the first place we have to note that, as in the case of the preceding psalm, Yahweh's Kingship is here represented as something more than a sovereignty over the realm of nature. It also includes His sovereign power over what we should call the moral realm; He is, as we shall have further occasion to see, vitally concerned with the way in which men behave. In other words, the divine King is not only worshipped as the Creator; He is also revered as a Judge, who demands that those who would rely upon Him must be able to plead their innocence in both thought and deed and their freedom from all taint of insincerity. The second point to be observed is the emphasis which is laid upon the identification of this King with One who has been proved 'mighty in battle'. That is to say, the procession of this God who is so actively concerned with both the physical and the moral realms is obviously a triumphant one.

It is as a victorious warrior that the divine King is now entering His Temple. A similar situation and indeed the climax of the procession is suggested by Psalm xlvii, in which the Kingship of Yahweh is again an object of emphasis; and this time we have to notice at the outset that, in being acclaimed as King, Yahweh is also addressed as 'Most High', an expression which we have already seen to be the special appellation of the high god worshipped in Jerusalem in pre-Israelite days. That is to say, we have another indication that we are on the right track in seeing in this celebration of Yahweh as King an adaptation of the earlier worship characteristic of this one-time Canaanite city. The psalm itself falls readily into two parts, the first of which begins with a universal summons to hail the heavenly King with clapping of hands and loud acclamation.1 This is followed by the exultant affirmation that the Kingship of Yahweh is a universal one which guarantees the supremacy of His own chosen people over all the other nations; and the strophe as a whole closes with a word-play on the appellation 'Most High' (יהוה) in the triumphant assertion that Yahweh has ascended (יהוה) to His Temple with appropriate acclamation and to the sound of the horn.2 Accordingly there seems to be no good reason to doubt that here again, as in the case of Psalm xxiv, we should think in terms of a procession which has just ascended to the Temple on Mount Zion in company with the Ark as the guarantee of Yahweh's presence in power with His people; and, this being the case, we are now in a position to see why such emphasis was laid in Psalm xxiv upon the fact that it is as a victorious warrior that the divine King enters His sanctuary. As such He is the guarantor in some way of Israel's ultimate supremacy over the nations. The first strophe, then, may be rendered as follows:3

Clap your hands, all ye peoples;
Make acclamation to God with applauding voice.
For Yahweh Most High (יהוה) is to be feared,
The great King over all the earth!

1 For a valuable discussion of the significance of the corresponding Hebrew root, which is used again in verse 6, see P. Humbert, La 'Teroua': analyse d'un rite biblique (1946), although, in the present writer's opinion, he tends to follow Mowinckel a little too closely in his stress on the supposed annual enthronement of Yahweh.
2 For this use of the verb מנה with reference to the ascent of Mount Zion, see Ps. xxiv. 3, as above, p. 73, and Ps. lxviii. 19 (EW. 18), as below, p. 82; and, for the subsequent word-play on מנה, it should be borne in mind that, just as the Ark is the symbol of Yahweh's Person, so Mount Zion corresponds to the divine Mound of Assembly, and the Temple itself is the earthly counterpart of the divine King's heavenly Palace. Cf. Ps. xlviii. 3 (EW. 2), as below, p. 86; and, for the elaboration of this idea in later Judaism, see, for example, Patai, Man and Temple, pp. 130 ff.
3 W. 2-6 (EW. 1-5). In the ensuing translation of this psalm and its fellows little attempt has been made to restore the divine name 'Yahweh' in those cases where it, rather than the present reading 'God', may have been original. There can be no reasonable doubt that such substitution has been made in many of the psalms of Books II and III (i.e. Pss. xiii-lxxxix); but it is difficult to determine every case.
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He subdueth the peoples beneath us,
Yea, the nations beneath our feet,
While our inheritance is of His choosing.
This proud possession of His beloved Jacob.
God hath ascended (נַעֲלֵֽה) with acclamation,
Even Yahweh, to the sound of the horn!

The second strophe repeats and expands the thought of the first, emphasizing, to begin with, the universal Kingship of Yahweh and then unfolding its implications as to the supremacy of Israel over the nations, inasmuch as earth’s rulers are now all united in subjection to Him. Finally, like the first strophe again, it closes with a word-play on the appellation ‘Most High’, summing up the theme of the whole psalm in the thought that Yahweh in His universal, sovereign power as the divine King is highly exalted (נַעֲלֵֽה).

Sing the praises of God, sing praises;
Sing praises to our King, sing praises.
Of a truth He is King throughout the earth;
Sing praises for God’s success;
God is King over the nations;
God is seated on His holy throne.
The princes of the peoples are assembled
With Him who is the God of Abraham,
For the rulers of earth are subject to God,
Who is highly exalted (נַעֲלֵֽה).

1 It may not be without significance that the rare verbal form in this stichos, i.e. the Hiphil of נַעֲלֵֽה, is found elsewhere only once-and on the lips of the Messiah when he says of the Most High in exactly parallel fashion to the above, ‘He hath subdued the peoples beneath me.’ Ps. xxvii. 48 (EW. 47), as below, p. 123. For the term itself, see G. R. Driver, J.T.S. xxxi (1930-31), pp. 283 f.
2 Insert נ in many MSS., and vocalize נַעֲלֵֽה as נַעֲלֵֽה.
3 lit. ‘as One who is successful’, i.e. the Hiphil participle of נַעֲלֵֽה used predicatively; cf. the similar construction in Ps. xxi. 3, as above, p. 70, i.e. ‘Let them praise Thy Name as great and terrible.’ For the use of this form in an obviously specialized way to denote a discreet and, therefore, successful individual, see Sam. xviii. 14 f.; Job xxii. 2; Ps. xxxiv. 2; xxxvi. 2 (EW. 1); Prov. x. 3; Lv. 35, xvi. 20, xvi. 22. Cf., too, Jer. xlix. 5, where this verb is used to describe the successful ruler who is to issue from the House of David.
4 Vocalizing נַעֲלֵֽה as נַעֲלֵֽה with LXX, S, and V.

Clearly Yahweh has returned in triumph to His throne, having asserted His age-long Kingship once and for all by His complete subjection of the nations and their earthly rulers. I This graphic description of the kings of the earth as being brought together in subjection to Yahweh is one which we need to bear in mind; for we shall see in due course that they appear to have been formally represented as the captives of this triumphant and victorious King.

The next hymn of this kind to engage our attention is Psalm lxxxviii, which is extraordinarily graphic and picturesque in its description of the triumphant passage of the divine King into His Temple, and, as a result, succeeds in taking us still further in our attempted reconstruction of the ritual and mythology of this festival. It is also deserving of note, perhaps, that, like Psalm xxix, this hymn is said to offer close parallels to the Ugaritic texts, and for this reason has been similarly assigned to the early years of the monarchy, specifically the tenth century B.C. 2 While the parallels with Ugaritic are apt to be exaggerated, the foregoing discussion has opened the way for us to recognize that the apparent confusion of its thought, which has made it something of a crux interpretum, 3 is due to a weaving...
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Whose Name consisteth of ‘Yahweth’, and exult before Him!

God in His holy abode
Is a father of the fatherless and a defender of widows;
God giveth the lonely a home wherein to dwell,
He skillfully setteth free those in bondage;

But ( אלנuggage) the rebellious make their home in the arid waste!

The last reference gives the key to the situation, for the ultimate issue in this picturesque statement of the deliverance and well-being vouchsafed to the righteous is clearly one of rain; and this immediately furnishes an occasion to quote somewhat freely a passage from the Song of Deborah which portrays Yahweh less as a god of war than as a god of earthquake and storm. Moreover, this is followed by an explicit forecast of rain as Yahweh’s gift to His chosen people, who are now described in obvious contrast to the nation’s foes as ‘humble’ or ‘submissive’ ( מִרְמֵי).

0 Yahweh, when Thou wentest forth before Thy people,
When Thou didst march through the desert.
The earth quaked, yea, the heavens were in downpour
Before Yahweh, Him of Sinai,

Before Yahweh, the God of Israel.

Hebrew traditions of the Wandering and the Settlement: cf., again with due regard to the context, Deut. xxxii. 13. It is true that in verse 34 (EW. 33) Yahweh is referred to as riding through the heavens; but there the context is very different, for it lays stress on Yahweh’s universal power.

Despite G.K., § 1193, it seems to me that we have here an excellent example of the beth essentiae.

The meaning of the Hebrew term is now made abundantly clear by the Ugaritic texts, notably (a) in the form הַשָּׁרַף (or הרָּאשׁוֹר), which is the name of the craftsman of the gods; and (b) in the form הָרָאשׁוֹר, which is used of skilled female singers or ‘artistes’. Cf., for example, Gordon, op. cit., (a) § 1, v 108 ff., viii 20 f.; 2 Avh, v g ff., vii 24: cf. Driver, op. cit., pp. 58 f., 100 f.; 52 ff.: (b) 2 Avh, ii 26 f. ( = Herdner, op. cit., 17, ii 26 f.: cf. Driver, op. cit., pp. 50 f.). See further, for example, H. L. Ginsberg, B.A.S.O.R. 72 (Dec. 1938), pp. 13 ff.; Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, pp. 81 f.; Gaster, Thespis, pp. 89, 154 ff., 277 f., 2nd edit., pp. 161 f., 338 ff.

3 w. 8-11 (EW. 7-10). In the ensuing translation the name ‘Yahweh’ has been substituted for ‘God’ in verses 8-9 (EW. 7-8), following the Song of Deborah (Judges v. 4-5).

4 ‘who is Sinai’. Cf., for example, Pss. ixi. 2, ii. 58; Prov. xxiii. 22. Here, as in Judges v. 5 and again in verse 18 (EW. 17) below, the term
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The transition in thought, however, is not nearly so abrupt as may at first appear, for we have already had occasion to notice that Yahweh’s Kingship carries with it, not only the thought of His power over the cosmic sea and His consequent control of the rains, but also the prospect of victory over the nation’s foes; and it is obvious that these foreign kings threaten the life of Israel quite as much as would the absence of rain. Accordingly we must not be surprised to find that these two ideas are woven together in a remarkably impressive way.

At this point attention is focused on the procession itself, as it makes its way into the Temple; and in an opening apostrophe the imposing mountains of Bashan are derided for their jealousy of Mount Zion, which Yahweh has chosen in place of Mount Sinai to be His earthly abode. Further, we learn that, as in the case of Psalm xxiv, Yahweh’s entry into the Temple is that of a warrior god who is returning in triumph from a victory over His foes; and, what is more, He is accompanied by those who have opposed His choice of Mount Zion as His earthly home. As already indicated and as we shall have still further occasion to realize, these can scarcely be other than the kings of the nations who have been threatening the existence of the Holy City.1

0 mighty mountain-range of Bashan,2
0 lofty mountain-range of Bashan,
Why do ye look askance, 0 lofty mountains, At the mount that God hath desired for His abode, Yea, where Yahweh would settle forever?

7 The 8 and Arabic ʿarābā, the simply correlative of ʿāraḥ, and the construction as a whole indicates that the two conceptions are essentially the same.
8 Probably the modern Gebel Haurân. Cf. Abel, Géographie de la Palestine, i, pp. 377 f.

1 יִשְׂחַל (vs. 16-19). 2 Heb. ‘O mountain(-range) of God(s), 0 mountain(-range) of Bashan’.

The use of the term ‘God(s)’ is here idiomatic; and, to appreciate the full force of the original, the reader should consult the careful discussion of this and related problems by D. W. Thomas, ‘A Consideration of some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, V. T. iii (1953), pp. 209–24. a 9868
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The chariots of God are thousands upon thousands;1
The Lord (\(\text{יהוה}\)) is amid them, He of Sinai2 is in the sanctuary!
Thou hast ascended on high, leading Thy captives;
Thou hast taken tribute from amongst mankind,
Even those who rebelled at Yah’s choice of a home!3

The jubilation then reaches its peak in the exultant recognition that Israel’s God and Saviour, who is extolled elsewhere as the ‘Living God’,4 has delivered them from the onslaught of ‘Death’, and so assured His chosen people that none of their enemies shall escape their vengeance, though they flee to these heights of Bashan5 or, at the other extreme, seek refuge in the depths of the sea.6

Blessed be the Lord (\(\text{יהוה}\)) continually!6
God beareth for us the burden of our salvation.
God is for us a god who saveth,
And through Yahweh, the Lord (\(\text{יהוה}\)), ‘Death’ is expelled.7
Yea, God doth crush the head of His enemies,8
The hairy skull of him who persisteth in his guilt.
The Lord (\(\text{יהוה}\)) said, ‘I will bring back from Bashan,9
I will bring back from the depths of the sea,
That thou mayest plunge thy foot in blood,
That the tongue of thy dogs may have its share in the foe.’

This passage, with its emphasis upon the fact that ‘Death’ is

---

1 G.K., § 97f.
2 See above, p. 79, n. 4.
3 lit. ‘Yah’s settling down’. The Hebrew adds ‘God’, which is obviously a variant of ‘Yah’.
5 W. 20–24 (EW. 19–23).
6 lit. ‘every day’.7 Or (following the analogy of Ugaritic):
And through Yahweh, the Lord, there is deliverance from ‘Death’.
Cf. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, pp. 92 f., 98 f. (§§ 10–1, 11–1).
8 ‘See below, p. 132, n. 5.
9 The writer can find no justification for the proposal to see in the Hebrew text of this stichos the equivalent of the Ugaritic behem, ‘serpent’, and in the line as a whole a reference to the mythical monster of the Deep. Cf. Gordon, op. cit., 67, i f.; ‘nt, iii 38 (= Herdner, op. cit., 5, i f.); 3, iii 38: cf. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, pp. 102 f., 86 f.; and see further, for example, Gaster, Thespi, p. 93; Albright, H.U.C.A. xxiii, p. 27. This suggestion again fails to do justice to the context (cf. verse 16 [EW. 15]), and it exaggerates the significance of the parallelism. The ideas actually involved find ready illustration in Amos ix. 3.

---
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the arch-enemy over whom Yahweh has triumphed, is of quite extraordinary importance and needs to be borne in mind, for we shall meet it again.

Meantime, continuing our way through the psalm, we now find that we are given a more detailed account of the procession itself; and the pointed allusion to Yahweh as ‘King’, coupled with the reference to the instrumentalists and singers, provides what seems to be the necessary context to Psalm xxiv with its theme of Yahweh’s Kingship and its obviously processional background centring in the Ark.

Further (and this is most important), we learn that Yahweh, the heavenly King, has passed into the Temple in triumphal procession from ‘Israel’s Spring’; and this can hardly be other than the spring Gihon, which, as early as the time of David, clearly had some special significance in connexion with the ritual of accession to the throne.1 Finally, it is to be observed that this vindication of Yahweh’s universal sovereignty is evidently thought of in close association with the ancient tribal confederation of Israel, for reference is made to figures who are representative, not only of such southern tribes as those of Benjamin and Judah, but also of tribes from the far north such as Zebulun and Naphtali.2

What a spectacle3 was Thy procession, O God,
The procession of my God, my King (\(\text{יהוה}\)),4 into the sanctuary!
The singers were in front, the minstrels followed behind.
All flanked by maidens with their timbrels.
In companies they greeted God,
Even Yahweh, from Israel’s Spring.
Benjamin was there, that mettlesome youth,

---

1 Cf. kings i. 33–35, 45 f.; and see above, pp. 32 ff.
2 w. 25–28 (EW. 24–27).
3 lit. ‘they have seen’, i.e. an active form of the Hebrew verb with an indefinite subject, corresponding to a passive construction in English. Cf. LXX and see G.K., § 144 f.
4 See above, pp. 35 ff., esp. pp. 38 ff.
5 Cf. the Arabic \(\text{ضِحَّ} \), which is used of the emission of short, sharp sounds -specifically the ‘twanging’ of a bow. The reference appears to be to the military prowess of the tribe of Benjamin as exemplified in the use of the bow. Cf. Gen. xlix. 27 (J); Judges xx. 16; Chron. viii. 40, xii. 2; and see further, for example, Lane, op. cit., s.v.
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The nobility of honest-spoken Judah.
The nobility of Zebulun and of Naphtali.

Following this dramatic description of Yahweh's royal passage into the Temple, He is summoned to make known His good will and pleasure as regards His subject peoples, who now come to Jerusalem, not to gain spoil for themselves as they had once fondly hoped, but to present to the God of Israel their own tribute of loyalty and obedience.

Issue Thy commands, my God, as befitting Thy might.
The divine might which Thou hast exercised for us!

How potent Thou art on behalf of Jerusalem;
Kings bring Thee their offerings!
The wild beast of the marshes?

He hath scattered the peoples who delighted in war.
They are coming from Egypt with their tribute;
Cush hath stretched out its hands to God.

The wild beast of the marshes?

In fact this reference to Yahweh as One who is the 'Rider of the Clouds' links up admirably with the foregoing association of Israel's King with 'Israel's Spring' (i.e. one of the channels connected with the subterranean ocean), for this is wholly appropriate to a festival which associates the coming of the rains with Yahweh's enthronement over the turbulent waters of the great cosmic sea. All in all, it looks as if something dramatic must have happened at 'Israel's Spring'; and we are left with the question as to what this may have been.

IV

We are now in a position to trace back to a still earlier phase the actual course of this ceremony as it came to be celebrated in the capital of the Southern Kingdom: for the original consonantal text. Cf. the Accadian tarasu xatu, 'to stretch out the hand'; and see further F. Perles, Analysen zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge, ii (1922), p. 34. This suggestion overcomes the difficulty of construing 'Cush' as both feminine and masculine, i.e. 'She stretched forth (lit. runneth out) his hands.'

1 w. 33-36 (EW. 32-33).
2 Vocalizing the consonantal text so as to read stabil naphthali. Cf. Gen. xxiv. 31, xxvi. 29 (J).
3 See above, p. 78, n. 6.
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Psalm xlviii, another of the familiar enthronement psalms, indicates the way in which the mentioned victory over 'Death' has been brought about. It opens with a few general lines of praise in celebration of the fact that Yahweh reigns as King and, indeed, as the 'great King' in His city of Zion; and it is to be observed that the sacred mountain itself is here extolled as being יִבְדַּש or, to adopt the form of transcription made current by the standard English Versions, 'Zaphon'! (EW. 'the north'), a name which appears in the Ugaritic texts as that of the mythological mountain where Baal, the 'Rider of the Clouds', had his royal throne. The lines in question may be rendered: \(2\)

Great is Yahweh and greatly to be praised
In the city of our God (or in our divine city)! His holy mountain is beautiful in elevation.
The joy of all the earth,
Mount Zion, the heights of Zaphon,
The city of the mighty King!

The body of the psalm is then taken up with a vivid picture of the way in which Yahweh, as the stronghold of His people, has brought discomfiture to the kings of the earth; and it is to be noted that this has taken place within the sacred area itself. Thus we read (in further reference to Mount Zion): \(7\)

God in the palaces thereof
Hath shown Himself a stronghold.\(^8\)

---

1 Joshua xiii. 27.
3 vv. 2-3 (EVV. 1-2).
4 The metrical structure of the poem as a whole makes it clear that the last two words of verse \(2\) (EW. \(2\)) should be construed with verse \(3\) (EW. \(2\)).
5 lit. 'recesses'. Cf. 0. Eissfeldt, Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchgang der Israeliten durchs Meer (1932), pp. 15 f.; and see below, p. 94, n.
6 N.B. בְּרֵאָס אָדָם. Cf. p. 42, n. 3.
7 vv. 4-8 (EW. 37).
8 Cf. the refrain of Psalm xlvii, as discussed below, pp. 92 ff.
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ritual performance, but have been instructed as to its meaning by the accompanying mythology. Even stronger evidence than all this, however, is to be found in the next line of the psalm; and for the moment we leave one word untranslated: 1

0 God, we have ... Thy devotion (תַּעֲנֵב)
In the midst of Thy Temple.

The word which we have left untranslated, the Piel of יַעֲנֵב, is rendered in the standard English Versions by 'to think', e.g. in the Revised Version:

We have thought on thy lovingkindness, 0 God,
In the midst of thy temple.

Such a rendering, however, is wholly inadequate. The verbal form in question, which means literally 'to make like', is used elsewhere in the Old Testament in one of two senses: (a) that of 'to compare', a rendering which is obviously inappropriate here, and (b) that of 'to picture' something in the present which is to happen in the future and so 'to plan'. 2 The latter is evidently the meaning which is intended here, and we may render the line thus:

0 God, we have pictured Thy devotion
In the midst of Thy Temple.

Even so, however, the context shows that this anticipation of the future is something more than a mere mental 'picture', i.e. something more than that which is seen, as we say, by the mind's eye. It is a ritual performance or acted 'picture' of a piece with the prophetic symbolism but on the grand scale-the par excellence. 3

The next few lines of the psalm then proceed to extol Yahweh because of this anticipated manifestation of His righteousness (מִיַּדְיָם) and His corresponding acts of judgment.

What is even more important, the last few lines of the psalm again deal with a ritual procession; and it will be observed that they close with an emphasis upon the fact that Yahweh is the leader of His people in the struggle against 'Death', i.e. the very same thought which we have already noticed in the case of Psalm lxviii. 4 Accordingly it seems clear that in this psalm we are dealing with the situation immediately preceding the procession which has been engaging our attention in connexion with Psalms xxiv, xlvii, and lxviii. The exhortation to begin this triumphant procession runs as follows: 5

March around Zion, go round about her,
Number her towers,
Pay heed to her ramparts,
Pass between her palaces,
That ye may tell the coming generation
That such is God!
Our God, who abideth for ever,
Is our leader against 'Death. 6

1 Verse 10 (EW. 9).

10,11-12 (EW. 10-11). Note the resultant example of chiasmus.
3 See above, p. 82.
4 v. 13-15 (EW. 12-14).
5 Vocalizing the consonantal text so as to read יִפְרֶנְת. These words have long been a crux interpretum, and again we can see that the general failure to understand the allusion has been due to the fact that the psalm has been
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All in all, therefore, it seems quite clear that the adversary over whom Yahweh has triumphed is ‘Death’; and it is tempting to compare the story of Baal’s conflict with Mot (‘Death’) in the mythology of the Ras Shamra tablets and so to find yet another parallel in the field of Canaanite culture as represented by the literature of ancient Ugarit.¹ At the same time it should be borne in mind that there is no indication whatsoever that in this ritual and mythology of the Jerusalem cultus ‘Death’ is thought of as a god, even though, as we shall see, the Underworld and its forces are represented as threatening the life of the nation as focused in the person of the Messiah. In fact, so far as this ritual performance is concerned, the mass attack of ‘Death’ is obviously portrayed as an onslaught by the kings (and ipso facto the nations) of the earth; and ‘Death’ is driven out of the city through their discomfiture inasmuch as Yahweh has revealed Himself in some way as the ‘stronghold’ of His people.²

I find it remarkable that, despite the above explicit rejection of any suggestion that ‘Death’ is here regarded as a god (cf., too, ‘The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus’ (as referred to above, p. 7, n. 1)), he followed the usual practice of attempting to improve the reading, and only discovered later, as his work developed, that in so doing he was destroying a valuable piece of evidence and an important link in his argument!

² Cf. H. J. Kraus, The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus, pp. 94 f., I am repeatedly cited in terms which suggest that in my opinion we have here a definite allusion to the god Mot.

At the same time it should be borne in mind that there is no indication whatsoever that in this ritual and mythology of the Jerusalem cultus ‘Death’ is thought of as a god (cf., too, ‘The Role of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel’, because (a) I realized that we are here in a very different realm of thought from that which is represented by the Ugaritic texts, and (b) it seemed that, to appreciate this, we needed a clear formulation of Israelite ideas concerning ‘life’ and ‘death’. Cf. what I have to say on this matter in E.T. lxii (1950-1), p. 418; also lxviii (1956-7), p. 179b.

PRESENTLY WE SHALL SEE SOMETHING OF THE WAY IN WHICH
Yahweh’s followers enjoy His protection as their ‘stronghold’; but we must first examine Psalm cxlix, which apparently introduces the worshippers as themselves sharing in this ritual performance. The psalm opens with a summons to the worshippers, Yahweh’s ‘votaries’ (םירבד), to offer praise to their God as their Maker and King; and again we meet the thought that Yahweh takes pleasure in His people (or finds them acceptable) and brings them salvation because they are ‘humble’ or ‘submissive’ (נפז). What is more, we have to note that they are summoned to sing a ‘new song’; and this, one need hardly say, is a thought which is particularly appropriate to our festival with its exultant anticipation of a new era of universal dominion and national prosperity.¹

Sing unto Yahweh a new song.
Let Israel be glad because of His Maker.
Let the children of Zion rejoice in their King.
Let them praise His Name with dancing.
Let them sing His praises with timbrel and lyre;
For Yahweh findeth His people acceptable.²
He adorneth the humble with salvation.

In the latter part of the psalm, however, Yahweh’s worshippers or ‘votaries’ are called upon, not merely to be exultant at the thought of the glory which is coming to them, but to be prepared, sword in hand, to execute the sentence which Yahweh has pronounced or, rather, is about to pronounce upon the nations of the earth; and, significantly enough, this involves their making the kings of these nations their captives.³

Let the devout (םירבד) exult at the thought of glory;
Let them break out in applause upon their bedding.

¹ vv. 1-4.
³ w. 5-9.
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Let the praises of God be in their throat,
And a two-edged sword in their hand.
To wreak vengeance upon the nations,
Chastisement upon the peoples,
To bind their kings with chains,
Their nobility with iron fetters,
To execute upon these the judgement prescribed
Is an honour which falleth to all His votaries (אֹתוֹ).!

There seems to be only one theory which does justice to this psalm in every detail and without recourse to emendation, i.e. that which sees it as the prelude to a ritual performance of the type to which we have already referred. Accordingly we are brought a stage nearer to the exact timing of the above-mentioned spectacle, for the fact that Yahweh’s followers are described as seated or lying upon their bedding indicates that it is at night that they are assembled so expectantly in the Temple.

Fortunately we possess in Psalm xlvii a hymn which may fittingly be said to throw light on this point; and in so doing it also gives some indication of the way in which Yahweh has proved Himself to be the ‘stronghold’ of His people. It seems to fall into three parts; and of these the first deals with the assurance of Yahweh’s help in virtue of His power over the great cosmic sea, which is not merely the source of the rains and the rivers but apparently represents (somewhat like Tiamat, the body of salt water, in the Babylonian Epic of Creation) the primeval forces of darkness.²

¹ In its current form this myth is probably to be assigned to the period of the First Babylonian Dynasty, i.e. the nineteenth to the sixteenth centuries B.C.; and, as is now well known, it describes the way in which Marduk first subdued the primal chaos by overthrowing the monster Tiamat, the mother of the gods, and her equally monstrous allies under the leadership of her consort, the god Kingu, and then created the visible world by splitting her corpse into two parts and using the one half to form the solid firmament of heaven. In the present connexion it is also worthy of note that the divine assembly, faced with the need to meet the challenge of Tiamat, the mother of the gods, and her equally monstrous allies under the leadership of her consort, the god Kingu, and then created the visible world by splitting her corpse into two parts and using the one half to form the solid firmament of heaven, is at night that they are assembled so expectantly in the Temple.


² Or ‘protection’? Cf. K. B., p. 603.

³ This line is not in the Hebrew text; but it seems likely that in verses 8 and 12 (EVV 7 and 11) we have a refrain which has fallen out at this particular point.

In the second strophe attention is drawn to one of the currents of the cosmic ocean which, as a good servant but a bad master, is thought of as ministering to the needs of the Holy City; and in general the passage recalls, say, Psalm xxi with its description of Yahweh’s enthronement over the flood and the convulsive effect of His thundering ‘Voice’. Indeed we learn that Yahweh’s power in the realm of nature, as shown in His subjection of the turbulent activity of the cosmic sea, has its parallel in what we may again call the moral realm; but in this case it is revealed in the overthrow of the kingdoms of the earth, which in their own way similarly threaten the safety or well-being of the nation. Accordingly, as in Psalm xlviii, emphasis is laid upon the fact that Yahweh has proved to be the ‘stronghold’ of His people; and in this connexion it is significant (a) that it should be as the ‘Most High’ that Yahweh preserves His sacred city, and (b) that it is at daybreak that He brings succour to His people. In short, it is in the person of the ‘Most High’, worshipped with all the eloquent symbolism the text by George Smith in The Chaldean Account of Genesis (1876) practically the complete story has been recovered, and a whole series of revised editions and translations has appeared. A critical edition of the text is available in A. Deimel, Enuma Elish sive Babylonicum de creatione mundi, 2nd edit. rev. (1956), and a convenient translation and translation in R. Labat, Le Poème babylonien de la création (1935). The fullest and most up-to-date translations into English, however, are those of A. Heidel, The Babylonian Genesis, 2nd edit. (1951), pp. 18–60, and E. A. Speiser in Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, ed. J. B. Pritchard, 2nd edit. rev. (1955), pp. 60–72.
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of the sun, that Yahweh triumphs over the forces of darkness, the gloomy underworld of ‘Death’, and the kings (or nations) of the earth who threaten the life of His chosen people.  

As for ‘The River’, 2 its streams make glad the city of God,

The most holy abode of the Most High. 3

With God in her midst she cannot be shaken;

God doth help her as the morning appeareth.

The nations clamour, the kingdoms reel;

At the sound of His Voice the earth is in turmoil.

Yahweh of Hosts is with us,

The God of Jacob is our stronghold.

1 vv, 5-8 (EW. 47). The passages in the canonical prophets, particularly the book of Isaiah, which need to be seen against the background of this festival are so numerous that the writer refrains, for the most part, from drawing attention to them at this stage; but the reader should compare at this point the fragment from the cycle of mythology associated with the ‘Moab’ which has been preserved for us through its being given an historical application, i.e. Isa. xiv. 12-15, which, as the context shows, celebrates the prospective downfall of some tyrant of the ancient Near East:

How art thou fallen from heaven,

Gleaming One, son of the Dawn!

Thou, who didst override the nations,

Art hewn to earth.

Yet thou didst say in thine heart,

‘I will mount up to heaven;

Beyond the divine stars

Will I raise my throne.

I will sit on the Mount of Assembly,

In the heights (lit, recesses) of Zaphon.

I will climb above the clouds;

I will make myself like the Most High!’

Howbeit to Sheol art thou brought down,

To the depths (lit, recesses) of the Pit!

The picture is obviously that of a morning star, which strives to reach the height of heaven but only succeeds in being hurled down to the underworld, the more powerful rays of the sun, whose role it is clearly attempting to fill, causing it to fade and disappear. This is not to say, of course, that Yahweh was identified in any way with the sun. On the contrary it was His expressed wish that He should be shrouded in darkness from mortal eyes. Cf., for example, E. Podechard, Le Psautier: Notes critiques, i (1949), in loc.  

Indeed, the thought of these last lines is particularly striking; for the ideal which is visualized is one which is pathetically familiar to modern ears, i.e. that of a war which is to end all wars. At the same time it is to be observed that, while Israel is the chosen instrument of God for the achievement of His purpose, which, as we shall see, is one of universal righteousness and justice, the assurance of ultimate victory is found, not in the weapons of His followers, but in His own omnipotence. When all is said and done, the deeds must be Yahweh’s deeds, and it is He alone who can really make wars to cease throughout the earth. 4

We are now in a position to understand Psalm xcvi, which brings us back to the situation indicated by the psalms with which our treatment of this festival began; and in examining it we need to bear in mind that Israel never lived in a vacuum, so that already in early times its

1 vv, 9-12 (EW. 8-11).

2 The Hebrew adds, ‘Who hath laid waste the earth’; but there is reason to believe on the ground of both syntax and metre that this is a prosaic gloss. Cf., for example, E. Podechard, Le Psautier: Notes critiques, i (1949), in loc.

3 M.T. ‘wagons’; but it seems likely that the consonantal text should be vocalized so as to read מַעַרְר, a word which is not found elsewhere in the Old Testament but may well have existed as a parallel to the Aramaic מַעַרְר, מַעַר, ‘shield’. Cf. LXX and T: and see further, for example, Podechard, op. cit., in loc.

4 Cf. Psalm lxxvi, which has much in common with Psalms xlvi and xlviii, and may well have its original Sitz im Leben just here. See above, p. 32, n. 1.
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religious thinkers were bound to face the question as to what exactly was Yahweh’s relation to the gods of the surrounding nations. The psalm begins with a summons to the world at large to rejoice in the fact that it is Yahweh who is King, and then continues with a description of the way in which He has manifested the basic righteousness and justice of His rule by a dramatic demonstration of His power in the realm of nature. This is pictured in the now familiar terms of earthquake and thunderstorm, the flashes of His lightning not only wiping out His adversaries but illuminating the whole world, so that all peoples have been able to see His ‘Glory’. When we come to consider the role of the Davidic King (or the Messiah) in this ritual, we shall be better able to appreciate the meaning of this dramatic intervention on the part of Yahweh. Meantime we may recall that, according to Psalm xxix, the theme on everyone’s lips in the Temple was similarly one of ‘Glory’.

It is Yahweh who is King! Let the earth rejoice!
Let the many coasts be glad!
Cloud, deep cloud, is round about Him;
Righteousness and justice are the foundation of His throne.
Fire goeth before Him,
Setting His foes ablaze on every side.
His lightning illumined the world;
The earth saw and writhed.
The mountains melted like wax before Yahweh,
Before the Lord of all the earth.
The heavens have declared His righteousness,
And all the peoples have seen His ‘Glory’.

In the following lines our attention is directed to the conclusion which is to be drawn from Yahweh’s triumph over the nations of the world. It is a proof that these image-worshipping peoples, who are obviously contrasted with the Israelites and their traditional imageless worship of Yahweh, are the wards of inferior gods who in the defeat

1 vv. 1-6.

of their own followers have been compelled to acknowledge the supremacy of Yahweh and, what is more, the defeat of their own ambitious schemes to overthrow His righteous rule and produce anarchy in the earth; and again we are reminded of Psalm xxix with its summons to the gods to render to Yahweh the glory due to His Name. In fact, the point of view which occurs here is to be understood in terms of a passage from the so-called ‘Song of Moses’, as restored on the basis of the Septuagint, i.e.: 1

When the Most High gave to the nations their possessions,
When He divided up mankind,
Fixing the territories of the peoples
According to the number of the ‘gods’;
Yahweh’s own share was His own people.
Jacob was the portion of which He took possession.

Further, it is interesting to observe that Yahweh’s supremacy in this way is also expressed in this section of the psalm by means of a double word-play on the appellation ‘Most High’ (לֹּא יָרוּ ס) like that which we have already observed in the case of Psalm xlvii, i.e. Yahweh is high (לֹּא יָרוּ ס) over the earth, He is highly exalted (Niph’al of לֹּא יָרוּ ס) above all the gods. 2

All who serve a graven image are put to shame,
Those who take pride in worthless idols,
All the gods having made obeisance to Him.4
Zion hath heard and is glad,
And the daughters of Judah rejoice,
Because of Thine acts of judgement, 0 Yahweh.5
For Thou, Yahweh, art high (לֹּא יָרוּ ס) over all the earth;
Thou art highly exalted (Niph’al of לֹּא יָרוּ ס) above all the gods.

1 Deut. xxxii. 8-9.
2 M.T. לֹּא יָרוּ ס, LXX (καταδοχήμενον) διαγιγενείσαντος, i.e. reading לֹּא יָרוּ ס.
Cf. Job i. 6, ii, xxxviii. 7, and note that the reading of LXX is now confirmed by the fragments of a Hebrew manuscript from Qumran, as described by P. W. Skehan, B.A.S.O.R. 136 (Dec. 1954), p. 12, and J.B.L. Lxxviii (1959), p. 27.
3 vv. 7-9.
4 i.e. construing the Hebrew verb as the perfect indicative (cf. R.S.V.) rather than an imperative (cf. EW.).
5 Cf. Ps. xviii. 12 (EW. ii), as above, p. 89.
In view of this occasion for rejoicing, Yahweh's followers are then reminded that to love Him carries with it the responsibility of hating evil; for, when all is said and done, this is the indispensable condition of success. Yahweh is there to watch over the lives of His 'votaries' (מֹדֵיק), those who are devoted to Him or pledged to His service within the covenant, and it is His responsibility to deliver them from the power of the 'wicked'. The latter term, as we have seen, is one which is used categorically of the nation's enemies, whereas Yahweh's 'votaries' are idealized as the 'righteous'; and on these, significantly enough, the glad light is said to have shone. That is to say, it is a righteous people who have been delivered with the coming of the dawn from the sorrows of darkness and 'Death'.

Those who love Yahweh hate evil;
He who guardeth the lives of His votaries
Doth deliver them from the hand of the wicked.
Light is sown (or risen) for the righteous;
And gladness for the upright of heart.
Be glad in Yahweh, 0 ye righteous,
And give thanks to His holy Name!

We are now in a position to understand Psalm lxxxii, which has long been regarded as one of the most perplexing compositions in the whole of the Psalter. It introduces us at the outset to the heavenly court, and reveals Yahweh as pronouncing sentence upon the assembled gods of the nations because of their misrule:

How long will ye judge unjustly,
And show partiality towards the wicked?
Secure justice for the weak and the fatherless;
Grant the humble and the poor their right.
Rescue the weak and the poor,
Deliver them from the hand of the wicked,
Who have neither knowledge nor understanding,
But live persistently in darkness,
So that all the foundations of the earth are shaken.'

Accordingly, despite their standing as the sons of God, Yahweh goes on to pronounce what must be the final sentence upon them for failing to live up to this ideal, decreeing that as a result they shall die like ordinary human beings, i.e.:

'I admit that ye are gods,
And all of you sons of the Most High.
Nevertheless ye shall die like men,
And fall like any ordinary prince.'

This means, of course, that Yahweh will be left to take charge of their territories and, as the unchallenged, omnipotent, and indeed only God, will be able to enforce the universal reign of justice; and it is in lively anticipation of this happy consummation that the psalm draws to a close:

Arise, 0 God (or Yahweh)! Secure justice for the earth!
For Thou wilt take possession of all the nations.

The exultation aroused by this thought finds ready illustration in Psalm xcviii, which begins with the now familiar
summons to the world at large to sing a new song in honour of Yahweh. As such it is an obvious prelude to the new era of righteousness and justice which is to dawn for mankind when Yahweh comes to judge the earth.

Sing unto Yahweh a new song,
For He hath performed wondrous things!
His Right Hand and His holy Arm
Have wrought salvation for Him.
Yahweh hath made known His salvation;
He hath revealed to the nations His righteousness.
He hath remembered His devotion [to Jacob],
And His faithfulness to the House of Israel.
All the ends of the earth have seen
The salvation of our God.
Make acclamation unto Yahweh, all the earth;
Break out in applause, and sing praises!
Sing praises to Yahweh with the lyre,
With the lyre and the sound of singing!
With trumpets and the sound of the horn
Make acclamation before the King—Yahweh!
Let the sea thunder with all its fullness,
The world and they that dwell therein;
Let the rivers clap their hands,
Let the hills unite in applause,
Before Yahweh, for He cometh,
[For He cometh] to judge the earth.
He will judge the world with righteousness,
And the peoples with equity.

Nevertheless it must be borne in mind that this exultant anticipation of Yahweh’s coming in triumph to judge the earth is tempered with words of caution; for, as we have seen, it is only to a righteous nation that Yahweh thus comes in final demonstration of His universal sovereignty. That is to say, the festival as a whole serves as a reminder of the other psalms which are dealt with in the text. At the same time one must beware of seeing conscious dependence in a case of this kind. It may well be that we should think, rather, of a common heritage of established phraseology. Cf. the repetition which so often occurs in the Accadian epics and annals and in the Ugaritic texts as well as the similar stock phrases in, say, Homer.  

Accordingly, summarizing our discussion thus far, we may say that the following features can now be recognized in the festival under consideration. In the first place we have (a) the celebration of Yahweh’s original triumph, as leader of the forces of light, over the forces of darkness as represented by the monstrous chaos of waters or primeval ocean; (b) His subjection of this cosmic sea and His enthronement as King in the assembly of the gods; and (c) the further demonstration of His might and power in the creation of the habitable world. Cosmogony, however, gives place to eschatology; for all this is the prelude to the thought of His re-creative work, which is expressed in the form of a ritual drama, and, as such, is wholly in line with what we are told about prophetic symbolism of the type which appears to have been embraced by the term הָשָׂר יִהוֹ ו. In fact it is the הָשָׂר יִהוֹ ו par excellence, and is designed as an effective demonstration of Yahweh’s ultimate will and purpose for Israel and the world. In this ritual drama the worshippers are given (a) an assurance of final victory over ‘Death’, i.e. all that obstructs the fullness of life for mankind which was Yahweh’s design in the creation of the habitable world; (b) a summons to a renewal of their faith in Yahweh and His plans for them and for the world; and (c) a challenge to a renewed endeavour to be faithful to Him and His demands.

\[P.s. xcvi. 13.\]
so that the day may indeed dawn when this vision of a universal realm of righteousness and peace will be realized, and His Kingdom will be seen in all its power and glory. This work of 'salvation' (נשׁוּא), as it is called, is portrayed by means of some kind of mime in which the kings (i.e. nations) of the earth, representing the forces of darkness and 'Death' as opposed to light and 'Life' and commonly designated the 'wicked' (שׁוּא), unite in an attempt to overthrow Yahweh's covenanted followers, i.e. His 'votaries' (קדוש) or the 'righteous' (צדק; and victory (or salvation)2 is eventually secured through the direct intervention of Yahweh (or the 'Most High') at dawn on this fateful day. In this way Yahweh reveals His own devotion (קדוש) and righteousness (צדק) to His covenant people. This is not all, however, for Yahweh's earthly victory has its counterpart in the heavenly places. The rebellion of the kings of the earth is but a reflection of the rebellious misrule of the lesser gods in the divine assembly to whom the Most High had granted jurisdiction over those territories which were occupied by the other nations of the earth. Accordingly the overthrow of the kings of the earth corresponds to the overthrow of these rebellious gods, who, having shown their unfitness to rule, are condemned to die like any earthly princes. Thus Yahweh proves to be what has been aptly called 'the enduring power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness';3 and the helpless, the poor, and the humble, not merely in Israel but throughout the world, may look forward to an era of universal righteousness and peace, as the one omnipotent God comes with judicial power to enforce His beneficent rule upon the earth.

V

Now inasmuch as Yahweh thus enlivens His people with this dramatic assurance of His will and power to deliver them from the forces of darkness and 'Death', it is to be expected that the ritual of this festival should have some definite connexion with the earthly king, who, as we have seen, is the focal point of the life of the nation. Accordingly we have now to consider a number of psalms which seem to require interpretation along these lines; and in the nature of the case most of these belong to the class known as royal psalms.1

A simple indication of the importance which was undoubtedly attached to the king in this connexion may be found in Psalm lxxiv, which is best explained as a hymn sung by Yahweh's worshippers in celebration of their pilgrimage from the towns and villages of the land at the time of this autumnal festival. It opens with a vivid description of the emotional response aroused by the thought of the Temple in the hearts of those who have to spend their lives out of sight of the Holy City, and so are unable to enjoy the privileges shared by the chosen few whose duties enable them to make it their permanent home; and it is noteworthy that He in whose honour it stands is addressed or referred to, not merely as Yahweh of Hosts, but also as the 'Living God' (נֶפֶץ) and the divine 'King'.3

How lovely is Thy dwelling-place, 0 Yahweh of Hosts!
My whole being longeth, yea, pineth For Yahweh's courts;
My heart and my flesh cry out Unto the Living God!
Even the sparrow findeth a home And the swallow a nest for itself, Laying its young beside Thine altars, 0 Yahweh of Hosts, my King5 and my God!
How happy are they who dwell in Thy house, Who can always be praising Thee!

See above, p. 7, n. 2.
Cf., for example, 1Sam. xiv. 45; and see further Pedersen, Israel I-II, pp. 237 ff., E.T., pp. 330 ff.
See above, p. 13, n. 2.
Cf. Ps. lxviii. 25 (EW. 24), as above, p. 83.
In the following lines, however, we learn that even the pilgrim has his own peculiar happiness, for he knows that, following his worship of this ‘Living God’, the parched and thirsty ground over which he has to travel will soon be transformed, and will be dotted in due course with pools which will be the result of the winter’s rains; and this thought spurs him on with increased vigour to meet with God in Zion and to present before Him his special prayer, namely that Yahweh will bless the earthly king in Jerusalem, who is at once the ‘shield’ of his people and the ‘Messiah’ of God. Thus the thought of the heavenly King leads on to that of His specially anointed deputy, the reigning member of the House of David; for the Temple, we must be careful to bear in mind, was first and foremost a royal temple and its cultus primarily a royal cultus.1

How happy mankind who make Thee their strength,
Whose heart is set on pilgrimage2
Passing through the arid3 valley,
They convert it into a spring:
Yea, the early rains clothe it with pools.4
They go from strength to strength,5
Until the God of gods is seen in Zion.
0 Yahweh ( ) of Hosts, hear my prayer;
Hearken, 0 God of Jacob!

1 w. 6-10 (EW. 5-g). 2 lit. ‘who have the highways in their heart’. 3 The point of the comparison is indicated, not only by the context, but also by the Arabic (אכ), ‘to have little milk’ (eg. of a ewe), ‘to have little water’ (eg. of a well), and so generally of that which is unproductive. Cf. Lane, op. cit., s.v. j, G. Hava, Arabic-English Dictionary, rev. edl. (19 5), s.v. y; and see further König, Die Psalmen, p. 304.
4 Vocalizing the consonantal text so as to read ℳחך. Cf. A.V. and P.B.V. as against R.V. As is clear from the use of this root in both Arabic (אכ, ‘pool’) and Hebrew (אכ, id.), rain was regarded as the ‘blessing’ pur excellence.
5 Alternatively the reference may be to the swelling ranks of the pilgrims.
6 The consonantal text admits this interpretation, and indeed it was so understood by LXX, Jerome, and S. Cf., too, the Hebrew of Ps. 1. i.
7 I.e. in all the accompaniment of worship.
8 The Hebrew adds ‘God’, but this should be omitted as an intended substitute for ‘Yahweh’.

Finally, having reached this focal point at which the worship of the heavenly King and a due regard for the earthly king are linked with the coming of the needed rain, the worshipper returns to his original theme, and contemplates afresh the incomparable pleasure that awaits the pilgrim in the worship of the Temple:2

For I prefer a day in Thy courts
To a thousand elsewhere,3
Hovering on the threshold in the house of my God
To dwelling in the tents of wickedness.
For Yahweh ( ) is both sun6 and shield;
He bestoweth grace and glory.

1 The traditional view (following LXX) is that גֵּד, ‘our shield’, should be construed as a vocative and therefore as co-ordinate with ‘God’; but the parallelism in the Hebrew shows quite clearly that it should be construed as the object of the verb so as to yield an example of chiasmus. Cf., for example, Gunkel, H. K., and Pannier-Renard, S. B., in Zoc. For the same reason one must reject the view, advanced on the basis of Ugaritic, that גֵּד here means ‘our entreaty’ = ‘we implore’. Cf. Patton, Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms, p. 41, where the reader will find other equally untenable examples of this alleged form (including Ps. xlvii. 10 (EW. 9), as discussed above, p. 76, and Ps. lxxix. 19 (EW. 18), as discussed below, p. 109). In fact, here again we see how important it is to examine a form carefully in the light of its context before attempting to interpret it in a novel way in terms of Ugaritic. See above, p. 78, n. 6, and p. 82, n. g.
2 w. 11-13 (EW. 10-12).
3 The rendering of this metrical line must be regarded as doubtful. In fact it is almost certain that the consonantal text of the form rendered by ‘I prefer’ (M.T.: יָפֵי לֶבֶן) involves some such meaning as ‘in my own home’, and that this and the following line should be rendered:
For better is a day in Thy courts
Than a thousand in my own home . . . (?).
Better to hover on the threshold in the house of my God
Than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.
As yet, however, so far as the present writer is aware, no completely convincing solution of the problem has been offered.
4 Cf. p. 104, n. 8.
5 Better ‘buckler’ or, rather, ‘battlement’? Cf. Isa. liv. 12; and see further, for example, Gunkel, op. cit., in Zoc., Tourmey-Schawb, op. cit., in loc., K.B., s.v. Note, however, the words of caution offered by Kraus, op. cit., in loc., with which I am much inclined to agree for it is also important to
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Yahweh doth not withhold what is good
From those who walk in integrity.

0 Yahweh of Hosts,
How happy mankind who trust in Thee!

We are now in a position to recognize the real significance of Psalm lxxxix, the theme of which is subject to such sudden change that commentators have been misled into regarding it as a fusion of two and even three originally independent compositions, failing to realize that these transitions are due to its liturgical background; and, as we shall see, there is good reason to believe that the liturgical background in question is that of the festival which we are attempting in some measure to reconstruct. The psalm opens with a hymn in praise of Yahweh; and it is important to note that this combines the thought of Yahweh’s devotion and faithfulness to the House of David with the background of thought which we have seen to be proper to this festival. The first two lines run as follows:

I will ever sing of Yahweh’s continued devotion.

Through all generations I will make known Thy faithfulness

with my mouth.

bear in mind that, as already observed (pp. 93 f., 101 f.; cf. pp. 134 f.), the symbolism afforded by the light of the sun is of outstanding importance in the ritual and mythology under review.

On metrical grounds ‘Yahweh’ should probably be construed with what follows rather than with what precedes.


The writer trusts that the argument of these pages, taken as a whole, provides sufficient answer to the criticism levelled by Mowinckel, Oftersang og sangoffer, pp. 570 ff., against his use of this psalm (as also Psalms xviii and cxviii) in ‘The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus’. See above, p. 7, n. 1.

The revised version of Mowinckel’s critical comments may now be found in The Psalms in Israel’s Worship, ii, pp. 253 ff.; and what I have to say in reply may be summed up by expressing surprise at Mowinckel’s attitude to the psalms in question in view of his early comment on the psalms which celebrate the Kingship of Yahweh: ‘Dal3 die zeitgeschichtliche Deutung verfehlt ist, geht erstens aus dem vollen Mangel an konkreten geschichtlichen Hindeutungen und Reminiszenzen hervor.’ (PsalmentudienII, p. 12.)

The writer hopes to deal with the principle of the הָדוּד and its related terminology in a subsequent publication. Cf. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, p. 88, n. 1, 2nd edit., p. 96, n. 7, and p. 103, n. 4. 2nd edit., p. 105, n. 2.

Cf., for example, the works of Mowinckel, Gunkel (followed by Kraus, Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament, pp. 75 ff; but see now B.K.A.T., in Zac.), Buttenwieser, Oesterley, Leslie, and Podechard, as cited above, p. 25, n. 1.

Yea, I acknowledge that devotion will ever be built up
Along with the heavens themselves Thou wilt maintain
Thy faithfulness.

Now such language, with its assurance of Yahweh’s devotion and faithfulness is really idiomatic, for it is the language appropriate to the thought of fulfilling one’s part in a covenant; and this is confirmed by the two following verses, which introduce a summary quotation of Yahweh’s actual vow under the terms of the Davidic covenant.

‘I have made a covenant with My chosen one;
I have sworn to David My Servant:

“I will maintain thy seed for ever;
Through all generations I will build up thy throne.”

This quotation is introduced with such apparent abruptness, the ‘I’ who now speaks being Yahweh, that the text is commonly supposed to be corrupt, and it has even been suggested that these lines have been severed from their supposedly original connexion later in the psalm, where, as we shall see, we meet with an extended reference to this Davidic covenant. Such drastic treatment of the text, however, is completely without justification; for we need to bear in mind that the introductory lines already quoted would at once arouse the thought of a covenant in the minds of the worshippers; and this would be the more ready in view of the fact that, as we shall see, they are uttered in the presence of the Davidic king himself. Moreover, there is such a striking parallelism in the language of the two passages (i.e. in the balanced use of the verbal forms הָדוּד and הָדוּד, including their general chiastic arrangement), that their close association must have been...
intended from the first. The sequence of thought is really quite unbroken.1

The initial affirmation that Yahweh’s faithfulness in respect of this vow is as sure as the heavens themselves is now explained as being due to the fact that He is without peer in the assembly of the gods; for it was He who triumphed over the chaos monster and its allies, and this victory not only ensured His rule over the cosmic sea but also made possible His creation of the ordered world of earth and heaven. It is hardly necessary to add that with this threefold thought we at once enter the realm of ideas which we have already seen to be associated with the conception of Yahweh as the heavenly King and, what is more, with the celebration of the autumnal festival of the Jerusalem cultus in its pre-exilic form.2

The heavens praise Thy wondrous work, 0 Yahweh,
Even Thy faithfulness in the assembly of the holy ones.
For who in the sky can be compared with Yahweh,
Is like Yahweh among the gods (ןֵאָשׁוֹעַ)?
A God who is awesome in the council of the holy ones,

2 Reading יהב for the extraordinary יהב of M.T. Cf., for example, Gunkel, op. cit., in loc.

i.e. the primeval chaos-monster, which makes its appearance in Israel’s religious literature as Rahab or Leviathan, the dragon or tortuous serpent with many heads. See in general Job iii. 8, vii. 12 ff. (cf. xl. 25-xlf. 26 (EW. xlii.34)); Pss. lxiv. 12 f.; cv. 25 f.; Isa. xxvii. 1, xxx. 7, lii. 9; Amos ix. 2 f. The conception of Leviathan, the dragon or serpent with many heads, may now be illustrated from the Ugaritic texts, e.g. Gordon, op. cit., 67; lxxix. 1; Jer. iii. 35 ff. (= Herdner, op. cit., 5, lxxix. 1, 9, iii. 35 ff.; cf. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, pp. 102 f., 86 f.), which not only furnish a close parallel to Isa. xxvii. (cf., too, Job xxvi. 13), but supplement Ps. lxxiv. 13 f. by describing the monster in question as seven-headed. It is obvious that we have here (as in the Babylonian Epic of Creation) a motif which, in principle, was the common property of the Near East in the second millennium B.C. and had as its main theme the struggle to create and maintain an ordered world. See further, for example, the careful survey of the material by H. A. Brongers, De scheppingstraadities bij de profeten (1945), pp. 3376. 1 See above, p. 75, n. 1.

2 The determinism of nature has its parallel in the assurance of an equal stability in the moral realm. As He is supreme in the assembly of the gods, Yahweh is able to rule the world with the basic principles of righteousness (צדק) and justice (צדק); and this means that He never loses sight of the twin factors in His covenant relationship with Israel and the House of David, i.e. devotion and fidelity (הלל ו靖). Accordingly His followers, who know what it means to share in the ‘festal acclamation’ (III), may live exultantly in the light of His presence. Through Yahweh’s righteousness and goodwill they are assured of the nation’s supremacy and prosperity; for in the ultimate it is He in His omnipotence who is really Israel’s King.2

Thine is an Arm with might;
Thy Hand is strong, and Thy Right Hand on high.
Righteousness and justice are the foundation of Thy throne;
Devotion and fidelity are present before Thee.
How happy the people who share in the festal acclamation,
Who walk, 0 Yahweh, in the light of Thy presence!
In Thy Name they shall rejoice all the day long;
And through Thy righteousness they shall be exalted.
For Thou in Thy splendour art the source of their strength;
In Thy goodwill Thou wilt lift up our horn.4
For it is Yahweh who is really our shield;
It is the Holy One of Israel who is really our King.5

Further, this assurance of a stability in the realm of nature has its parallel in the assurance of an equal stability in the moral realm. As He is supreme in the assembly of the gods, Yahweh is able to rule the world with the basic principles of righteousness (צדק) and justice (צדק); and this means that He never loses sight of the twin factors in His covenant relationship with Israel and the House of David, i.e. devotion and fidelity (הלל ו靖). Accordingly His followers, who know what it means to share in the ‘festal acclamation’ (III), may live exultantly in the light of His presence. Through Yahweh’s righteousness and goodwill they are assured of the nation’s supremacy and prosperity; for in the ultimate it is He in His omnipotence who is really Israel’s King.2

Thine is an Arm with might;
Thy Hand is strong, and Thy Right Hand on high.
Righteousness and justice are the foundation of Thy throne;
Devotion and fidelity are present before Thee.
How happy the people who share in the festal acclamation,
Who walk, 0 Yahweh, in the light of Thy presence!
In Thy Name they shall rejoice all the day long;
And through Thy righteousness they shall be exalted.
For Thou in Thy splendour art the source of their strength;
In Thy goodwill Thou wilt lift up our horn.4
For it is Yahweh who is really our shield;
It is the Holy One of Israel who is really our King.5

Thine are the heavens, Thine too is the earth;
It was Thou who didst found the world and all that filleth it.
It was Thou who didst create the north and the south;
Tabor and Hermon applaud Thy Name!

References:
Thus the hymn closes, as it began, with the confident expectation that Yahweh will be loyal to His covenant obligations; and the intervening lines offer the justification for this assurance. It is because Israel's 'Holy One' is supreme in the council of the 'holy ones', or (what is the same thing) it is because the God of Israel is omnipotent in the assembly of the gods; and in His omnipotence as the heavenly King He not only created the universe but sustains it in righteousness, for He is faithful and true.

This hymn of praise is then followed by the lengthy reminder of Yahweh's covenant with the House of David, which we have already discussed at length; and it must be repeated here for the sake of continuity, i.e.:  

```
Of old Thou didst speak by a prophet
To Thy votaries, and saidst—
'I have bestowed aid upon a manly one,
I have exalted a youth from among the people.
I have found David, My Servant;
With My holy oil I have anointed him,
So that My Hand shall be his constant support,
Mine Arm also shall strengthen him.
No enemy shall oppress him,
Nor shall the wrongdoer afflict him;
But I will beat down his adversaries before him,
And I will smite them that hate him.
```

1 See above, pp. 25 ff.
2 w. 20-38 (EW. 19-37). As indicated above, p. 26, n. 2, the relationship of these verses to the prophecy of Nathan, as recorded in 2 Sam. vii. 1-17 and i Chron. xvii. 1-15, continues to be a matter of dispute. Cf., for example, the markedly different points of view represented by (a) R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (1941), 2nd (English) edn. (1952), pp. 388-73, who finds the prose narratives to be dependent upon the psalm, which is itself post-exilic (cf. now Ahlström, Psalm 89. Eine Liturgie aus dem Ritual des leidenden Königs, pp. 182-5, who nevertheless traces the psalm back to a date at least early in the monarchy); (b) J. L. McKenzie, 'The Dynastic Oracle: II Samuel 7', T.S. viii (1947), pp. 187-218, who finds the prose narratives on the one hand and the poem on the other to be dependent upon a common source (cf. now A. Caquot, 'La Prophétie de Nathan et ses Chansons lyriques', S.V.T. ix (1963), pp. 213-24); and (c) H. van den Bussche, Le Texte de la prophétie de Nathan sur la dynastie davidique, A.L.B.O. ii. 7 (1948), who accepts the primacy of the prose passages, the text of Chronicles being inferior to that of Samuel.

At this point, however, the optimistic note of the earlier verses comes to an end, and there follows a remarkable passage in which bewilderment is expressed at the thought that Yahweh has permitted the defeat and humiliation of His Messiah in a combat which seems likely to prove mortal:  

```
Yet Thou hast spurned and rejected,
Thou hast been wroth with Thy Messiah.
Thou hast repudiated the covenant with Thy Servant;
Thou hast brought his crown to pollution in the dust.
Thou hast broken down all his walls;
Thou hast laid his defences in ruins.
```

1 See above, pp. 25 ff.
All the passers-by have despoiled him; 
He has become a mockery to his neighbours. 
Thou hast raised on high the right hand of his foes; 
Thou hast made glad all his enemies. 
Yea, Thou hast turned back the edge of his sword, 
And hast not upheld him in battle. 
Thou hast made an end of his splendour (or Thou hast destroyed his illustrious sceptre), 
And Thou hast hurled his throne to the ground. 
Thou hast shortened the days of his prime; 
Thou hast wrapped him about with shame.

Now we have already seen that at the festival under discussion the celebration of Yahweh's Kingship is the background to a ritual drama in which the kings of the earth combine to make an attack upon Yahweh's holy city. In the nature of the case, however, this would also be an attack upon Yahweh's vicegerent, the Davidic king. Accordingly, as the celebration of Yahweh's universal Kingship is also the identical background to the present lament, it seems reasonable to infer that the defeat or humiliation of the Davidic king, which is indicated in these lines, is not any specific historical event, for indeed there is none that can be made to fit the scene, but is an important element in the ritual drama. This is confirmed by the language of the last part of the psalm; for the king himself apparently brings the liturgy to a close by pleading that he may not be allowed to die, but may be delivered from the humiliation which he is suffering at the hands of his foes.

How long, O Yahweh, wilt Thou continue to hide Thyself? 
How long shall Thine anger burn like fire? 
Remember, I am not everlasting: 
As nought hast Thou created all mankind.

2 The text of this somewhat short stichos is commonly, and probably rightly, suspected of being corrupt; and the alternative rendering given above is based on the reading which assumes a simple case of haplography.
3 (as in Kings xii. 16, Song of Sol. vii. 4), and מַעַשְׂךָ corresponds to the Arabic negative ٌلا (as in Kings xii. 16, Song of Sol. vii. 4), and מַעַשְׂךָ corresponds to the Arabic ٌلا, 'failing'.
4 Or 'Thy Servant' for 'Thy servants' with twenty-four MSS. and S. T.}

The foregoing מַעַשְׂךָ corresponds to the Arabic negative ٌلا (as in Kings xii. 16, Song of Sol. viii. 4), and מַעַשְׂךָ corresponds to the Arabic ٌلا, 'failing'.

1 Reading 'Thy Servant' for 'Thy servants' with twenty-four MSS. and S. T.
3 Cf., for example, C. J. Gadd, in Myth and Ritual: Essays on the Myth and Ritual of the Hebrews in relation to the Culture Pattern of the Ancient East, ed. S. H. Hooke (1933), pp. 53 f.; Labat, Le Caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne, pp. 167 f.; Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, pp. 319 f. The statement made above in the text corresponds to that which was made by the writer in 'The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus', p. 100; and it has been described by L. Cerfi, The Day of Yahweh and some Relevant Problems (1948), p. 29. As containing 'a great exaggeration'.

This seems to the writer to be without justification and to be based on a failure to pay due regard to the pivotal words 'in principle'; for the principle is surely the same, i.e. that of reminding the king that in the ultimate he holds office by will of his divine overlord, whose responsible servant he is.


112 Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel

What man can live and not see death, 
Can deliver himself from the hand of Sheol? Where are Thy former acts of devotion, O Lord, Which Thou didst swear to David by Thy faithfulness? Remember, 0 Lord, the mockery of Thy Servant. How I bear in my bosom the insults of many peoples,2 How Thine enemies make mock, 0 Yahweh, How they make mock of Thy Messiah at every step!

Thus we see that at this autumnal festival the Davidic king, for all that he is the specially chosen Servant of the omnipotent, heavenly King, is a suffering Servant. He is the Messiah of Yahweh; but on this occasion, at least, he is a humble Messiah. What we see, however, is a ritual humiliation which in principle is not unlike that suffered by the Babylonian king in the analogous New Year Festival.3 That is to say, this dramatic deliverance from the kings (or nations) of the earth, this victory over 'Death', is not achieved without an early disaster, which is clearly intended as a lesson in dependence upon Yahweh. Salvation, for king and commoner alike, must come from Israel's God, for all human aids are really worthless to this end.4

Now we possess in Psalm ci a composition in the first person which fits remarkably into this context, and in so
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The foregoing מַעַשְׂךָ corresponds to the Arabic negative ٌلا (as in Kings xii. 16, Song of Sol. viii. 4), and מַעַשְׂךָ corresponds to the Arabic ٌلا, 'failing'.

1 Reading 'Thy Servant' for 'Thy servants' with twenty-four MSS. and S. T.
3 Cf., for example, C. J. Gadd, in Myth and Ritual: Essays on the Myth and Ritual of the Hebrews in relation to the Culture Pattern of the Ancient East, ed. S. H. Hooke (1933), pp. 53 f.; Labat, Le Caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne, pp. 167 f.; Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, pp. 319 f. The statement made above in the text corresponds to that which was made by the writer in 'The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus', p. 100; and it has been described by L. Cerfi, The Day of Yahweh and some Relevant Problems (1948), p. 29. As containing 'a great exaggeration'.

This seems to the writer to be without justification and to be based on a failure to pay due regard to the pivotal words 'in principle'; for the principle is surely the same, i.e. that of reminding the king that in the ultimate he holds office by will of his divine overlord, whose responsible servant he is.

doing reveals the Messiah as pleading the justice of his rule and longing for the moment when Yahweh will come to him in his apparent abandonment. Most recent commentators are agreed that the psalm embodies the code of *behaviour governing the conduct of an Israelite ruler*; and we may safely infer from the reference to ‘Yahweh’s city’ in the last line of the poem that the ruler in question is the Davidic king. Indeed its standpoint is so similar to that of the so-called ‘Last Words of David’ that it may well mirror the moral code to which the Davidic king (and originally David himself) was pledged under the terms of the Davidic covenant. For our immediate purpose, however, the most remarkable feature of the poem is to be found in the first two lines, for these end with a question which at first sight appears strangely out of keeping with the context:

> Of devotion and justice will I sing; Unto Thee, O Yahweh, will I raise a psalm.
> I will make my theme4 ‘A Faultless Way’.

When wilt Thou come to me?

The question in the last stichos has been found so irrelevant and so incomprehensible that some commentators have felt bound to infer a corruption of the text; but we are now in a position to place it in its full context and so to grasp its purpose. The fact is that the Messiah is pleading his loyalty to the Davidic covenant in terms of his devotion (דַּעַן) and justice (שָׁפָט), and is claiming that his rule is altogether without ‘fault; he has behaved with complete integrity. Accordingly he can look confidently for Yahweh to come to him in his hour of need. He has fulfilled his own part in the covenant, and it is now for Yahweh to show a corresponding loyalty or devotion. The remainder of the psalm then presents us with an elaboration of this *defence*. That is to say, it offers us not so much a vow as to the type of rule which he proposes to exercise but an affirmation of the rule which he is wont to exercise.

1 The statement which is made above in the text is in line with the usual understanding of the fist metrical line; but Kaiser, op. cit., p. 202 (following Kraus, B.K.A.T., in *loc.*), thinks that we have here a reference, not (a) to the qualities, subsequently illustrated, which the Davidic king claims to have shown in fulfilment of his obligations under the covenant, but (b) to the corresponding qualities in Yahweh to which he can appeal in virtue of his own behaviour in upholding the covenant. This is a tempting suggestion, for, as Kaiser goes on to make clear, it would serve to strengthen rather than weaken my argument; but I am not convinced that this interpretation is required by the parallelism or, again, by the wording of Psalm lxxxix. 2

> I walk in the integrity of my heart
> Within my house.
> I set before mine eyes
> No evil thing.
> I hate him that practiseth5 deceit;
> He is no adherent of mine.
> The crooked heart departeth from me;
> I consort with none who is evil.
> Whoso slandereth his fellow in secret,
> Him I put to silence.
> As for the lofty of eye and the proud of heart,
> Him I cannot endure.

---

1 e.g. Kirkpatrick, Kittel, Gunkel, König-Schmidt, Herkenne, Calhe, Leslie, and Weiser; also Kraus. For a valuable discussion of the form and content of this psalm, see now O. Kaiser, ‘Erwügungen zu Psalm 101’, Z.A.W. lxixv (1962), pp. 195–205, where stress is rightly laid upon the use of the Qinah rhythm (i.e. the metre which is characteristic of the dirge).

2 Cf. Ps. cvii. 2 f., 9 (EW. i f., 8), as above, pp. 85 ff.; Isa. lx. 14.

3 vv. 1–2a.

4 The *High’l of* נַעֲלֶת does not appear to be used with reference to the composition or use of a Hebrew poem of the type known as a *יִשְׂרָאֵל* (EW. ‘Maschil’). Cf. the use of יַעֲלֶת in the preceding verse (including the heading to the psalm).
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Mine eyes are upon the faithful of the land,
That they may dwell with me.
Whoso walketh in a faultless way,
He becometh my servant.
There doth not dwell within my house
Any that committeth deception.
He that telleth lies may not stand
Before mine eyes.
Morning by morning I put to silence
All the wicked in the land,
Cutting off from Yahweh's city
All who make trouble.1

The language is so simple and direct that comment is unnecessary; but one important conclusion must now be borne in mind, i.e. that the Messiah, in pleading that he has proved worthy of his trust, is affirming not only his own righteousness but also that of his subjects. Whatever their standing in society, Yahweh's בּוֹדֵךְ or 'votaries' are, one and all, בּוֹדֵךְ or 'righteous'. In short, the Messiah has purged the nation of its evil and made it a fit instrument for the realization of Yahweh's purposes.

The next work to engage our attention is Psalm xviii,2 which, as the conclusion shows quite clearly, must have been composed for the use of the Davidic king or Messiah. We have already seen how, in Psalms lxxxix and ci, the Messiah has appealed to Yahweh for deliverance from his distress, and here we have his thanksgiving for answered prayer. It falls clearly into three parts, which celebrate (a) his deliverance from 'Death' through the intervention of Yahweh in the person of the 'Most High'; (b) his resultant justification or, better perhaps, the consequent vindication of his righteousness (conciliation); and (c) his triumph over the nations of the earth.

The general situation revealed by the psalm is so clear that little is required in the way of detailed comment. The Messiah begins with a few general lines in praise of Yahweh for His saving power:3

I love Thee, O Yahweh, my strength!
Yahweh is my crag, my fortress, my deliverer;
My God is my rock wherein I seek refuge,
My shield, my saving horn, my tower.
I call for Yahweh, the subject of my praise,
And I am delivered from mine enemies.

This is followed by a description of his deliverance which is not only vivid and picturesque but highly instructive. His fight with his powerful foes, who, as we learn from the last part of the psalm, are the nations of the earth, continues to be a struggle with 'Death'. As such, however, it is also a battle with the breakers of the cosmic sea which threatens every moment to engulf him and thus plunge the nation (and indeed, by implication, the whole earth) into chaos.2

Death's breakers engulfed me,
And the evil torrents o'erwhelmed me.
Sheol's cords were round about me;
Death's snares confronted me.
In my distress I called for Yahweh,
And unto my God I appealed for help.

As we have already seen, however, this disastrous experience is really designed as a lesson in dependence upon Yahweh; and it is only when the outlook is blackest that the latter

1 The reference is to the role of the king as the supreme judge to whom difficult cases might be referred. Cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 1-6; 1 Kings iii. 16-28; Jer. xxii. 12. In the Yemen, for example, it was still the practice only a few years ago for the Imam to sit for an hour every morning under the Tree of Justice in San'a to deal with his subjects' grievances. Cf. A. Rihani, Arabian Peak and Desert: Travels in Al-Yaman (1930), pp. 103 f.
2 Cf. 2 Sam. xxii, which has been followed occasionally in the ensuing translation.
3 w. 2-4 (EW. 1-3).
4 w. 5-7a (EW. 4-6a). For the cosmology underlying this scene, see The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, pp. 85 ff., and now, especially, 2nd. edit. rev., pp. 88 ff.; also, for valuable comparative data, O. Kaiser, Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel, B.Z.A.W., 2nd edit. rev. (1962).
5 Reading 'breakers' with 2 Sam. xxii. 5 rather than 'cords', which occurs again in the following line.
intervenes on behalf of this Messiah who has proved worthy of ‘Sonship’, and delivers him (and ipso facto the nation) from the arch-enemy ‘Death’. Moreover, it is significant to find that deliverance comes through the intervention of Yahweh in the person of the ‘Most High’, for this harmonizes with the fact that the triumphant issue of the ritual combat was found to take place with the intervention of the ‘Most High’ at daybreak. That is to say, the life of the Messiah is renewed at dawn; and this is a point to be borne in mind, for we shall have occasion to return to it in due course. Moreover, it is wholly in line with what we have already learnt concerning Yahweh’s subjection of the cosmic sea, as celebrated at this festival, that He comes to the aid of His Messiah in His role as the ‘Rider of the Clouds’, and that His theophany is described as taking place in all the terrifying splendour of a thunderstorm.

In His Palace (or Temple) He heard my voice,
And my appeal (2) came to His Ears.
The earth heaved and quaked,
While the foundations of the mountains quivered;
Yea, they rocked because He was wroth.
Smoke rose from His Nostril,
While fire leapt devouring from His Mouth;
Live coals came kindling therefrom.
He parted the heavens, and descended,
With a cloud beneath His Feet.
He rode upon a cherub and flew;
He sped on the wings of the wind.
He made darkness His covert,
His shelter around Him the watery blackness,
Masses of cloud which had no brightness.

1 w. 7b-20 (EW. 6b-19).
2 Omitting ‘before Him’ as a variant of ‘to His Ears’; cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 7.
3 Vocalizing the consonantal text so as to read מַיְּמַי, ‘And He thrust aside’ (i.e. like a curtain).
4 A mythical creature, probably pictured as a winged and human-headed lion. Cf. Gen. iii. 24 (J); Exod. xxv. 18-22 (P); Ps. xxix. 1; Ezek. 1. 5-28, x. 1-22. xxviii. 11-19; etc. and see above, p. 72, n. 1.
5 Construing the first word of verse 13 (EW. 12) with verse 12 (EW. 11).

It is difficult not to link this dramatic picture with the procession from ‘Israel’s Spring’, which we have already seen to be closely associated with the manifestation of Yahweh’s victorious power over the waters of the cosmic sea; and one cannot but conjecture (although this is no more than a conjecture) that something like a baptismal scene within the confines of the spring Gihon may have been the focal point of this dramatic ritual. Be this as it may, it

For the significance of the verb דָּרֵךְ in this connexion, see Isa. xxxiii. 21; Lam. iii. 44. The rendering in the text is based upon that of Buttenwieser, op. cit., in loc.
2 Omitting ‘hailstones and coals of fire’ as an obvious duplication from the preceding verse. Cf. LXX and 2 Sam. xxii. 14.
3 Lit. ‘the watery channels’ or (as in 2 Sam. xxii. 16) ‘the channels of the sea’; but see also Patton, op. cit., pp. 12 and 34, and F. M. Cross jr. and D. N. Freedman, J.B.L. Ixxii (1953), p. 26, n. 41.
4 Or, as in 2 Sam. xxii. 16.
5 ‘At the rebuke of Yahweh,
At the tempestuous breathing of His Nostril.’
6 Lit. ‘He brought me forth into a broad place.’
7 Cf. J. Steinmann, David: Roi d’Israel (1948), pp. 144 f. The reader may also be referred at this point to the interesting comparative data now furnished by C. S. Mann, ‘Sacral Kingship—an Ashanti Footnote’, J.S.S. v (1960), pp. 378-87, esp. 381 f.
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will be observed that, following his ascent from the waters of the Underworld, the Messiah knows himself to be the 'Son' in whom his heavenly Father is well-pleased.1

It is appropriate, therefore, to find that the Messiah, whom we have already seen in Psalm ci to be pleading his faithfulness to his trust, then goes on to emphasize the fact that by his deliverance from 'Death' he has been vindicated with regard to his 'righteousness' (תֵּשׁוּבָה); he has been justified or proved 'righteous' (חָיָנה). Moreover, this is in line with his humility before his God and Father; for it is only a humble people (יהוֹשֻׁעַ), proved such in the person of their king, whom Yahweh consents to save. It is for man, even when called to the highest office in the service of his Creator, to remember his place in the divine economy. The Davidic king must be taught that he is no more than a vicegerent in the service of the divine King, for only so can he be sure of Yahweh's support in time of need; and in the scene before us the true Messiah, having been vindicated with regard to his righteousness, is assured that his lamp will not be extinguished. In this way we again see that Yahweh's victory is not only the triumph of the 'Living God' over the forces of 'Death' but also the triumph of light over the forces of darkness; and the resultant deliverance of the Messiah from the dark underworld of 'Death' is a dramatic escape from the encircling defences of a prison into the world of light and life which is Yahweh's special creation and care.2

Yahweh doth recompense me according to my righteousness;
According to the purity of my hands He maketh me restoration.
For I have kept Yahweh's ways;
And I have not departed wickedly from my God.
For all His judgements are before me;
And I turn not His statutes from me.
I have been faultless in my relations with Him;
And I have abstained from all that would render me guilty.

1 G. R. Driver, H.T.R. xxix (1936), pp. 172 ff., suggests that the verbal forms from וַיְשָׁפָר in this line should be associated with the Syriac שְׁפָר, 'simple, rude', and the Arabic ضار, 'wild, savage', so as to secure an example of synonymous parallelism in contrast to that of the preceding verse, e.g.

With the boorish Thou dost show Thyself boorish,
And with the crooked Thou dost show Thyself tortuous.

Once again, however, it seems to the writer that what is an attractive suggestion when considered in comparative isolation becomes untenable when seen in its full context; for this example scarcely does justice to the use of וַיְשָׁפָר in verses 21 and 25 (EW. 20 and 24), i.e. 'to cut', 'to divide', with reference to the purity of my hands. Indeed the fact that the second stichos in verse 27 is introduced by the conjunction conjunctio, is absent from the three preceding stichoi, serves to point the contrast thus finally introduced. (Professor Driver, in a private note to the writer, defends his view on the ground that this is 'one of those cases in which a Hebrew author intentionally juxtaposes homonyms with different senses' (cf. V. T. iv (1954), pp. 242 ff.), and claims that on his theory verses 26 and 27 (EW. 25 and 26) offer an example of parallelism, combined with chiasmus, which is decisive; but the writer remains unconvinced.)

2 Cf. Gen. xxx. 8 (v).

3 Vocalizing the consonantal text so as to read ולא; cf. A.V. mg. At the same time there seems to be no justification for taking the further step of reading צְבִי ('troop') for צָבָי. Cf., for example, Duhm, op. cit., in loc.

The term צָבָי appears to have the primary meaning of 'section' or 'division' (cf. צָבָי, 'to cut'), whence the traditional rendering of EW., 'a troop'. Here, however, it seems to be used of a 'division' with reference to that which actually divides, i.e. a partition, barrier, or fence. Accordingly it should be retained, the more so that it is confirmed by the text of 2 Sam. xxii. 30.
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‘Death’, then goes on to praise Yahweh, the one omnipotent God, in equally picturesque language for this assurance of victory over his enemies and a resultant supremacy amongst the nations of the earth.1

As the God whose way is faultless,
Yahweh’s speech is without dross;
He is a shield to all who seek refuge in Him.

For what god is there beside Yahweh,
And what rock is there except our God?
The God who girdeth me with might,
And hath rendered my way faultless;
Who maketh my feet like those of a hind,
And setteth me firm on the heights;2
Who traineth my hands for battle,
So that mine arms can aim a bow of bronze!”

Thou hast given me also Thy saving shield,
While Thy Right Hand upholdeth me,
And Thy support4 maketh me great.
Thou dost extend my strides beneath me,
And mine ankles do not give way.
I pursue and overtake mine enemies,
And I turn not back until making an end of them.
I smite them so that they cannot rise;
They fall beneath my feet.
Thou hast girded me with might for battle;
Thou dost subdue mine opponents beneath me.
Thou hast made mine enemies turn back before me,
And them that hate me I put to silence.
They appeal for help, but there is none to save them,
Even to Yahweh, but He doth not answer them.
I grind them small like dust before the wind,
I crush5 them like the mire of the streets.

The whole psalm is then brought to an end on a note of personal thanksgiving to Him who is obviously the ‘Living God’:

Blessed be my rock!
The God who doth save me is supreme,
The God who hath granted me vengeance,
And subdued5 the peoples beneath me!
As my deliverer from mine angry foes,
Thou dost give me supremacy over mine adversaries,
From violent men Thou dost rescue me.
Therefore I will thank Thee amid the nations, O Yahweh,
I will sing praises to Thy Name,
To Him who doth give great victories6 to His king
And sheweth devotion to His Messiah,
To David and his seed for ever.

In Psalm cxviii we have an obvious companion-piece to the foregoing. It opens with a general summons by or on behalf of the king to offer thanks to Yahweh for His unending devotion (יִדוּע); and the whole nation, afterwards distinguished as the ‘priesthood and the general body of worshippers,’ is then bidden to echo this thought of Yahweh’s continued regard for His chosen people. It is true that the king is not specifically mentioned, but the language and thought of the psalm as a whole are obviously in harmony with the other psalms in this series which centre in the person of the Messiah; and, of course, if the king is

1 vv. 31-46 (EW. 30-45).
2 Reading יִתְנַב for יָתִנַב with LXX, Jerome, and S on the ground of dittography.
3 Cf. G. R. Driver, W. O. 1 (1947-52), p. 410; also F. T. 1 (1951), p. 248, where it is suggested that ‘bow’ must be used here by synecdoche with reference to a bronze-tipped ‘arrow’.
4 lit. ‘answer’ or ‘response’, i.e. reading יָתֵב לְעֹל in agreement with 2 Sam. xxii. 36. Cf. verse 42 (EW. 41) with its reference to the vain appeal to Yahweh made by the Messiah’s enemies.
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With Yahweh on my side I do not fear
What man may do to me.

With Yahweh on my side to give me aid,
I gaze in triumph on them that hate me.

It is better to seek refuge in Yahweh
Than to trust in man.

It is better to seek refuge in Yahweh
Than to trust in princes.

All nations surrounded me;
Through the Name of Yahweh I cut them off.

They surrounded me, yea, they surrounded me;
Through the Name of Yahweh I cut them off.

They surrounded me like bees;
They died away like a fire of thistles;

Through the Name of Yahweh I cut them off.

Thou didst press me sore that I might fall,
But Yahweh came to mine aid.

Yah, who is my strength and song,
Hath become my salvation.

In the ensuing lines we are able to discern a little more of the ritual background of this psalm; for once again, as in Psalms xxiv and lxviii, we find ourselves in the company of a procession which is approaching the gates of the Temple and seeking admission to its precincts. In this case, however, we find that the focus of interest is not the Ark as the manifestation par excellence of the presence of the divine King amidst His chosen people but His earthly representative, the Messiah of the House of David; and the whole ceremony, according to the writer of the psalm, is a symbolic representation of Yahweh's act of deliverance of his servant, the Messiah, from the nations which surrounded him as bees.

1 Or 'I warded them off'? Cf. LXX (τοράσαν), and see further G. R. Driver, Z.A.W. lii (1934), p. 54.

2 Reading the Qal for the Pu'al of the M.T. The simile is that of a bonfire of thistles, which blazes up furiously enough at first but quickly dies away. Cf. the simile of the dying wick in Isa. xliii. 17; and, for the picture, see 2 Sam. xxiii. 6 f. (as above, p. 19).

3 The placing of this psalm in what appears to be its original setting throws light on a reading which is commonly emended to לְעָלַת, following LXX, Jerome, and S, so as to yield the meaning 'I was pressed sore'; for it is now possible to explain this reading in terms of an aside addressed to the leader of the 'kings' of the earth, who, as we have seen, are led captive to the Temple in this triumphant procession of Yahweh's Messiah. In other words, the M.T. has happily preserved what is an appropriately dramatic touch.
as it now appears before our eyes, is one which compels a certain admiration. The Messiah has been made to suffer humiliation; he has been ‘chastened sore’ and thereby brought close to the gates of the Underworld. Nevertheless through Yahweh’s devotion (רְשִׁיָּהוּ) and righteousness (יְשׁוּרָן) his faith has been justified, and he has been delivered from the power of ‘Death’ and thereby proved righteous (גוֹרֵעַ). Thus the well-being of the community is assured; and public testimony is borne to the fact that the key to ‘Life’ is righteousness (יִשְׂרָאֵל), the loyal functioning of the corporate whole, based on a resolute faith in Yahweh. Accordingly the procession of the righteous now moves forward through ‘the gates of righteousness’, through ‘the gate whereby the righteous may enter’, to continue the ritual in a ceremony with which we have yet to deal.1

Hark to the cries of victory2
In the tents of the righteous!
Yahweh’s Right Hand acteth mightily,
Yahweh’s Right Hand is exalted,
Yahweh’s Right Hand acteth mightily!
I am not to die but live,
And relate the deeds of Yah.
Yah hath chastened me sore,
But He hath not given me over to ‘Death’.
Open for me the gates of righteousness,3
That I may enter thereby and acknowledge Yah.
This is that gate of Yahweh,
Whereby the righteous may enter.

1vv. 15-21.
2 Or ‘salvation’, i.e. the same word as in verses 14 and 21. See again p. 102, n. 2.
3 Cf. the interesting collection of traditional material, Jewish and Christian, assembled by J. Morgenstern, ‘The Gates of Righteousness’, H.U.C.A. vi (1929), pp.1-37, although the citation of this work must not be construed as an acceptance of the theories developed by Morgenstern in this connexion. Cf. the writer’s comment, E.T. lxii (1950-1), p. 60; and see above, p. 55, n. 2.

These concluding lines of the psalm then present us with what appears to be the royal summons to begin the festal dance as an act of thanksgiving to Yahweh for His lasting devotion (רְשִׁיָּהוּ); and it is worthy of note that the worshipers appear to have been equipped with festal branches of some kind. In the circumstances it is reasonable to infer that these are branches of palm, myrtle, and willow such as were traditionally associated with the ritual encirclement of the altar in the post-exilic form of the Feast of

1vv. 22-25a. Cf. Matt. xxi. 9 ; Mark xi. 9 f. ; John xii. 13,
2 Cf. Ps. xcvi. 1-13, as above, p. 98, n. 6.
Join in the dance with festal boughs
Up to the horns of the altar!
Thou art my God, and I will acknowledge Thee;
My God, I will extol Thee.
Give thanks to Yahweh, for He is good;
For His devotion is everlasting.

V I
(a)

We come now to what appears to be the final stage in the dramatic ritual under review, and to appreciate its significance we have to recall that David was promised supremacy over the kings of the earth in virtue of his being the adopted ‘Son’ of Yahweh; for we now meet with the thought of the eventual fulfilment of this promise in the person of his descendant and ideal successor upon the throne, the true Messiah of the House of David. We have already seen how Yahweh secures the latter’s supremacy over the nations by giving him victory in the ritual combat at daybreak on this—‘the day on which Yahweh hath acted’. The complementary idea, however, is present at the same time, for this deliverance from ‘Death’ also marks the renewal of life or rebirth of him who has proved to be the true Messiah; it is the sign of his adoption as the ‘Son’ of Yahweh, and issues, as one might expect, in his re-enthronement as Yahweh’s vicegerent endowed now with universal power. This finds ready illustration in Psalm ii, which shows us the kings of the earth, after their abortive attempt throughout the years to thwart Yahweh’s plans to make good His sovereign power through the line of David, being compelled to acknowledge the universal sovereignty of this particular Messiah in virtue of his triumphant enthronement as one

1 Cf., for example, Buttenwieser, op. cit., in Zoc.
2 w. 275–29.
3 See above, pp. 2 f. and 25 ff.
4 w. 7–9.
5 w. 10–12.
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Now therefore, ye kings, show prudence; 
Take warning, ye rulers of earth. 
Serve Yahweh with fear; 
With trembling kiss 'His Feet';4 
Lest He be angry, and ye vanish away. 
For His anger is quickly kindled. 
Happy all those who seek refuge in Him!2

The same association of ideas may be found in Psalm cx, which appears to be an oracle delivered specially for the occasion by one of the cultic prophets whose role in the formal worship of the Temple we have already had occasion to note.3 The psalm begins with the word יִבְשָׂא (which is, of course, the normal term for a prophetic oracle;4 and the opening lines, which are quite straightforward, may be rendered thus:5

Oracle of Yahweh to my lord! 
Sit thou at My Right Hand, while I make Thine enemies a stool for thy feet. 
Yahweh doth extend thy powerful sceptre;6 
Rule from Zion amidst thy foes!

The words which immediately follow have long been a crux interpretum, as one may see from a comparison of the various renderings. The expression מָלְאָךְ הַעֵדֶת (at the beginning of verse 12 (A.V. 'Kiss the Son'; R.V. 'Kiss the son') is a well-known crux interpretum, as the use of the word 'ך as an Aramaism for 'son' is extremely unlikely in this context.6 The rendering accepted above involves the assumption that the present text of this stichos has arisen from corruption of an original מָלְאָךְ הַעֵדֶת, and see in general H. H. Rowley, J.T.S. xlii. (1941), pp. 152 f.

3 Cf. Ps. cxviii. 8 f., as above, p. 212. 
5 Cf. for the idiom, 1 Sam. xiv. 27; and, for the metaphor, the code of Ḫammurabi (as above, p. 4, n. 4), Epilogue rev. xxvi. 14 f., 'May Shamash lengthen his sceptre', i.e. 'May Shamash extend his rule', which is variously explained (a) as the prolonging of one's reign (cf. T. J. Meek, in Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, p. 198), (b) as the enlarging of one's empire (cf. G. R. Driver and J. C. Miles, The Babylonian Laws, ii, pp. 100 f., and (c) as an extending of one's rule in both time and space (cf. P. Cruvelièr, Commentaire du code d'Hammourabi (1938), pp. 268 f. Cf., too, the picturesque idiom which is referred to above, p. 27, n. 2.
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Massoretic text with the renderings of the ancient versions. Nevertheless there appears to be little, if anything, wrong with the consonantal text, when it is read in the light of the foregoing discussion. The fact is that it deals in a perfectly straightforward way with the rebirth of the Messiah, which, as we now know, takes place on this eventful day with his deliverance from the Underworld, apparently at the spring Gihon, at dawn or 'as the morning appeareth'; and this carries with it the implication that the Messiah, in all the fresh vigour of his new-born life (which is here symbolized by the morning dew),1 has been elevated for all time not only to the throne of David but also to the traditional priesthood of Melchizedek.2

Thou hast the homage of thy people on the day of thy birth4

In sacred splendour2 from the womb of dawn.6

Thou hast the dew wherewith I have begotten thee;6

Yahweh hath sworn beyond recall: Thou art priest for ever;

After the order of Melchizedek.

The oracle then comes to an end with a reminder of the way in which Yahweh came to the aid of His hard-pressed Messiah; and in the portrayal of this scene we are given a

2 Cf. for example, Ps. xxxiii. 3; Isa. xxvi. 19; and see further E. Burrows, 'Psalm 110 (Vulgate 109) Interpreted', in The Gospel of the Infancy and Other Biblical Essays (1940), pp. 88 ff.; G. Widengren, Psalm 110 och det sakrala kungadömet i Israel, U.U.A. 1941; 1, f. As Burrows indicates on the analogy of Ps. cxxxiii. 2 f. there may well be a ritual counterpart to this reference in the fact of anointing from which the title 'Messiah' is derived. See above, p. 14, n. 2.

3 w. 3-4.

4 It is possible that the consonantal text should be vocalized so as to read מָלְאָךְ הַעֵדֶת. 'Thou hast made thy people willing', rather than as M.T., i.e. 'Thy people are all willingness.'

5 Vocalizing the consonantal text as מָלְאָךְ הַעֵדֶת, i.e. Qal infinitive construct of מָלְאָךְ with an objective suffix, on the analogy of Isa. xiv. 10.

6 Many MSS. (in common with Symmachus and Jerome) read 'in the sacred mountains', which seems equally possible in the context.

7 The anomalous רָעָב in the line should perhaps be read as רָעָב on the ground of dittography.

8 Or, a little more literally perhaps, 'of My begetting thee', i.e. vocalizing the consonantal text so as to read מְלָאכְ הַעֵדֶת with LXX. Cf. Ps. ii. 7 (as above, p. 129); and, for the syntax, see G.K. § 135b.
vivid glimpse of the heavenly King, who is known to all as the omnipotent God who has proved ‘mighty in battle’, pausing to slake His thirst ere He pursues afresh His work of slaughter and retribution.2

The Lord hath smitten away at thy right hand, Judging3 kings in the day of His anger.

He hath taken His fill of corpses among the nations;4 He hath crushed heads5 o’er all the wide earth.

He would drink from a stream on His way,6 Thus holding His Head on high!

In conclusion we are now in a position to appreciate the original significance of Psalm xxi, for this in turn gains in coherence when studied against the foregoing background of ritual and mythology. It opens with an emphasis upon the fact that the king is able to rejoice in an affirmative re-

sponse to his plea for ‘life’ (ד’ויה).  Through some great act of ‘victory’ or ‘salvation’ (י’ויהש) on the part of Yahweh, which is not further defined but now stands revealed, this has been vouchsified to him; and it is described in glowing terms as ‘length of days for ever and ever’. What is more, this assurance of answered prayer with its issue in the king’s coronation or enthronement is the outcome of a true cove-

nant relationship, whereby the king’s trust (ס”ע) in Yahweh is matched by a signal act of devotion (ס”ע) from Yahweh’s side; and it is all of a piece with the liturgical setting which is here proposed for our psalm that Yahweh, who has already figured so prominently as the ‘Most High’, is again referred to at this point by means of this particular appellation.7

The king is glad, 0 Yahweh, by reason of Thy might; How greatly doth he rejoice because of Thy victory8

1 Cf. Ps. xxiv. 8, as above, p. 73. 2 vv. 5-7. 3 Construing the first word of verse 6 with verse 5 on the ground of both metre and sense. 4 Cf. Exod. xvi. 9. 5 Cf. the language of Ps. lxviii. 22 (EW. 21), as above, p. 82, and that of Hab. iii. 13. 6 The Hebrew corresponds exactly to the French ‘en route’!

In the second half of the psalm we meet with the exul-

tant thought that the future may be faced with confidence by Yahweh’s followers, for the dramatic victory which they have been celebrating is an earnest of that which is to come. In short, it offers the assurance that in due course Yahweh will indeed root out those who have been planning mischief against Him and, by implication, His Messiah; and, in keeping with our earlier study of the triumph of the heavenly King,3 He is finally urged to arise that He may bring to pass this final act of judgement upon those who have sought to oppose His will.4

Thy Hand will reach out to all Thine enemies; Thy Right Hand will find out those who hate Thee. Thou wilt make them like a blazing oven In Thine own good time.5 Yahweh. In His anger He will swallow them up; Fire will devour them.6 Thou wilt destroy their fruit from the earth, And their seed from amongst mankind.

1 EW. ‘salvation’. Cf. again p. 102, n. 2.

2 i.e. construing as a relative clause.

3 See above, pp. 98 ff.

4 w. 9–14 (EW. 8–13).

5 Cf. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, p. 46, n. 3, 2nd edit., p. 64, n. 3.

6 It is tempting to omit this line as a gloss on the ground that it is comparatively short and introduces a reference to Yahweh in the 3rd person rather than a direct address. Cf., for example, Kittel, op. cit., in loc. On the other hand, however, its omission would destroy the balance of the two halves of

7 w. 2-8 (EW. 1-7). 8 EW. ‘salvation’. Cf. again p. 102, n. 2.
Because they intended evil against Thee,  
They planned mischief which they could not effect,  
Thou wilt surely make them turn to flight,  
When Thou dost aim at them with Thy bowstrings.  
Rise up, 0 Yahweh, in Thy strength.  
That we may sing the praises of Thy might!

All in all, therefore, enough has been said to prove the literally vital part played by the Messiah of the House of David in the ritual and mythology of the Jerusalem cultus during the period of the Israelite monarchy; and, summarizing our conclusions once again, we may now say that the following features are to be recognized in the festival under discussion as celebrated in Solomon’s Temple between the tenth and sixth centuries B.C. In the first place we have (a) the celebration of Yahweh’s original triumph, as leader of the forces of light, over the forces of darkness as represented by the monstrous chaos of waters or primeval ocean; (b) His subjection of this cosmic sea and His enthronement as King in the assembly of the gods; and (c) the further demonstration of His might and power in the creation of the habitable world. Cosmogony, however, gives place to eschatology; for all this is the prelude to the thought of His re-creative work, which is expressed in the form of a ritual drama, and, as such, is wholly in line with what we are told about prophetic symbolism of the type which appears to have been embraced by the term בֶּן־יָהוָה. In fact it is the בֶּן־יָהוָה par excellence, and is designed as an effective demonstration of Yahweh’s ultimate will and purpose for Israel and the world. In this ritual drama the worshippers are given (a) an assurance of final victory over ‘Death’, i.e. all that obstructs the fullness of life for mankind which was Yahweh’s design in the creation of the habitable world; (b) a summons to a renewal of their faith in Yahweh and His plans for them and for the world; and (c) a challenge to a renewed endeavour to be faithful to Him and His demands, so that the day may indeed dawn when this vision of a universal realm of righteousness and peace will be realized, and His Kingdom will be seen in all its power and glory. Moreover, the summons and the challenge are directed first and foremost towards the ruling member of the House of David, in whom rest the hopes of Yahweh and His people; for we now know that, humanly speaking, the leading actor in this drama is the Davidic king, in whom the life of the nation as a corporate whole finds its focus. This work of ‘salvation’ (בֶּן־יָהוָה), as it is called, is portrayed by means of some kind of mime in which the kings (i.e. nations) of the earth, representing the forces of darkness and ‘Death’ as opposed to light and ‘Life’ and commonly designated the ‘wicked’ (בֶּן־יָהוָה), unite in an attempt to overthrow Yahweh’s covenanted followers, i.e. His ‘votaries’ (בֶּן־יָהוָה) or the ‘righteous’ (בֶּן־יָהוָה), under the leadership of the Messiah. The latter, who is also described as the Servant of Yahweh, suffers an initial humiliation; but this issue in his salvation and that of his people, for it involves the recognition of an ultimate dependence upon Yahweh rather than ‘the arm of flesh’, and thus sets the seal upon the basic plea of ‘fidelity’ (בֶּן־יָהוָה), ‘devotion’ (בֶּן־יָהוָה), and ‘righteousness’ (בֶּן־יָהוָה) on the part of the Messiah and his subjects. As a result victory (or salvation) is eventually secured through the dramatic intervention of Yahweh Himself in the person of the ‘Most High’, who makes His presence felt at dawn on this fateful day, and delivers the Messiah and ipso facto the nation from the forces of darkness and ‘Death’. In this way Yahweh reveals His own ‘fidelity’ (בֶּן־יָהוָה),

1 For the setting of this conception in a wider context, see the valuable study by C. Lindhagen, The Servant Motif in the Old Testament (1950).

2 A consideration of the possibility that the conception of the Suffering Servant in the work of Deutero-Isaiah may have some connexion with that of the Davidic Messiah lies outside the scope of the present study; but the writer hopes to return to the question in another monograph in this series. Meantime the reader may be referred to the careful survey of recent work in this field by H. H. Rowley, The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah, O.T.S. viii (1950), pp. 100–36, reprinted in The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament (1952), pp. 59-88, and now, with an up-to-date bibliography, ibid., 2nd edit. rev. (1965), pp. 61-93.
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‘devotion’ (דְּבֵד), and ‘righteousness’ (דְּבֵד) in relation to His covenant people. Further, this--deliverance from ‘Death’ marks the renewal of life or the rebirth of the king in question. It is the sign that in virtue of his faithfulness and basically by reason of his faith this suffering Servant and humble Messiah has been adopted as ‘Son’ of Yahweh or, to express this mediatory office in another way, has become an everlasting Priest ‘after the order of Melchizedek’; and, as such, he is enthroned on Mount Zion as Yahweh’s unmistakable vicegerent upon earth. This is not all, however, for Yahweh’s earthly victory has its counterpart in the heavenly places. The rebellion of the kings of the earth is but a reflection of the rebellious misrule of the lesser gods in the divine assembly, to whom the ‘Most High’ had granted the jurisdiction over those territories which were occupied by the other nations of the earth. Accordingly the overthrow of the kings of the earth corresponds to the overthrow of these rebellious gods, who, having shown their unfitness to rule, are condemned to die like any earthly princes. Thus Yahweh proves to be what has been aptly called ‘the enduring power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness’; and the helpless, the poor, and the humble, not merely in Israel but throughout the world, may look forward to an era of universal righteousness and peace, as the one omnipotent God comes with judicial power to destroy the wicked, to justify His Messiah and His Messiah’s people in their responsible mission to the world, and to enforce His beneficent rule upon the earth.

(b)

All this, however, is to summarize our conclusions in close adherence to the terminology of the sacred texts. If we would adopt more general terms, we must state them afresh in the following way. In saying ‘Amen’ to the conditions laid down in the Davidic covenant the king becomes the trustee of Yahweh’s chosen people. Henceforth it is his responsibility to defend the nation from internal corruption and external attack; and success in the latter connexion is conditioned by his success in the former. In other words, it is the king’s function to ensure the ‘righteousness’ or right relationship within the borders of his territory which will ensure the economic well-being of his people and at the same time will safeguard them from foreign interference. There can be no prosperity and no assurance of continuity for the nation without righteousness; and there can be no righteousness without the fidelity to Yahweh and His laws to which the tribal brotherhood of Israel was pledged under the terms of the Sinaitic covenant. In the ultimate, therefore, the righteousness of the nation is dependent upon the righteousness of the king. Under the changed conditions of the monarchy it is the king’s devotion and fidelity to Yahweh under the terms of the Davidic covenant which is the basis of the nation’s fidelity and righteousness. Thus the king is in a very real sense the ‘shield’ of his people; and his first care must be the administration of justice, ensuring obedience to the formal definitions of righteousness which are enshrined in Yahweh’s laws and thus maintaining the appropriate balance between the rights and the responsibilities of the individual. It is only in this way that he can ensure the prosperity and the survival of his people, i.e. all that is implied by the Hebrew term for ‘life’ and so makes it possible and indeed necessary to speak of the continuing and abundant life of the social body or, better, its ‘vitality’. Thus, as already indicated, it is the king’s duty to remove the obstacles which impede the way of life within and without the borders of the nation (i.e., in other words, to safeguard the liberty of the individual and of the state), so that one and all may follow freely the road which leads to economic prosperity. Accordingly, while the freedom for which the king longs in his dramatic

1 The Hebrew terminology which is normally reproduced as that of ‘salvation’ (יָשָׁר) and its derivatives is first and foremost the language of ‘freedom’ or ‘liberty’. See above, p. 19, n. 2.
struggle with the forces of darkness and ‘Death’ is obviously freedom to live and, implicitly, to prosper, it is not a freedom to live altogether in the way of his own choosing or freedom to prosper at the expense of his fellows. It is a freedom to be of service, a freedom to live in accordance with the will of Yahweh and thus to promote, not merely his own personal welfare, but the well-being of the community as a whole, i.e. the well-being of the nation for whom he has accepted responsibility under the terms of the Davidic covenant.

Accordingly, if the argument of these pages is sound, the ritual of the festival which we have been attempting to reconstruct was designed to foster the corporate sense of Israel (i.e. as the tribal brotherhood in covenant relationship with Yahweh) by recalling the traditions of Yahweh’s active intervention on their behalf in the field of history and the consequent demands which He made upon those who were so obviously the people of His choice. Under the changed conditions of the monarchy, however, all this was set in the wider context furnished by the thought of Yahweh as the omnipotent, divine King, who is also the Creator and Sustainer of the universe, which appears to have had its roots in the earlier worship of Canaan as represented by the Jebusite cultus in Jerusalem. The implications of Yahweh’s choice of the Hebrews were now unfolded, and the historic episodes of the Exodus, the Wandering, and the Settlement were seen in a new light. Yahweh’s ultimate purpose was now clear; it was that of a universal realm of righteousness and peace, in which not merely the twelve tribes of Israel but all the nations of the earth should be united in one common life. This was Israel’s mission to the world; and the successful direction of that mission had been entrusted to the House of David. The purpose of the Davidic covenant was to ensure righteousness within Israel and thus make righteousness safe for the world. The world was in danger of collapsing into primitive chaos, and it could only be saved from such utter collapse as Israel succeeded in producing the necessary response to Yahweh’s attempt to create an ordered world.

If there is a robust nationalism here, it is a nationalism which is tempered by a sense of responsibility towards Yahweh as the one omnipotent God who is ‘the power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness’ and by a lively concern for the establishment of His Kingdom as an actual fact in the international sphere. If it is a nationalism which may give rise to the dream of a sovereign state, it is also one which foresees the breakdown of national barriers and the establishment of a righteousness which the tribal brotherhood of Israel (with its story of a common ancestry and its emphasis upon a community of blood and soil) may ultimately share with all the nations of the earth, as the Creator Himself comes to the aid of His righteous people and so smooths the way for that universal obedience which will ensure the fruits of His beneficent rule for the whole of mankind. Finally (and this is of basic importance), it is also a nationalism which offers no ground for pride, but on the contrary stresses the fact of man’s creaturely dependence upon God. There can be no righteousness where there is no humility; and in this respect Israel, like the king himself, is no more than primus inter pares. When all is said and done, man everywhere must learn to be humble, if he would inherit the earth.

It should be obvious, of course, that what we have in this dramatic ritual and its attendant mythology is no attempt of a magical or magico-religious kind to present Yahweh with a fait accompli, i.e. an opus operatum which carries with it the implication that His Hand can be forced, and that He may be manoeuvred into giving His worshippers the material blessings which they want. It is, rather, a theory of the universe, a creative vision of an ultimate purpose for them and for the world, which discerns an ideal pattern of behaviour for mankind and must needs be communicated to Yahweh’s followers with all the measured symbolism and moving imagery afforded by splendid architecture, exciting drama, rousing music, and stirring verse. It is intended to evoke an awareness of a common life, not only within
Israel but also throughout mankind, and a recognition of the necessity to co-operate for the common good in no narrow nationalistic sense but with a view to the well-being of society at large. It is designed to arouse in the worshippers and especially in the king a lofty sense of the need to unify society in a common admission of dependence upon and responsibility towards the Creator and thus make possible an entry into that fuller life which He has designed for mankind. It is only as His rule is acknowledged in the moral realm, or it is only as His will is done on earth as also in heaven, that the full benefit of His creative activity in the realm of nature can become available for mankind, and that His Kingdom may be seen in the fullness of its glory.

In other words, this ritual drama is a summons to convert into actual fact the social ideal which is here depicted in moving symbols culled from all the arts, and its purpose is to give Yahweh’s followers the opportunity to renew their willingness and their power to co-operate for the common good, not only of Israel, but also of all mankind. Thus it is the lively hope of a new world which is brought before the king and his subjects with the coming of a new cycle of the year; and who should sympathize with this point of view more readily than we who know that every new year has its own way of inviting new resolutions or the renewal of old resolutions which have worn thin with the passage of time?

Finally in this connexion, it remains to be said that the ritual and mythology under review thus serve to focus the attention of the worshippers, both the king and his subjects, upon ‘what is unquestionably a cardinal dogma of the cultus, i.e. that it is only the righteous, whether this be the individual or the community, who may be expected to ‘live’ in the full sense which the Hebrew term may imply, and, what is more, that the righteous will ‘live’ in this way in virtue of his fidelity or faithfulness. Nay more, through this dramatic act of worship the king and his people are given the opportunity year by year, not merely to pledge afresh their devotion and their faithfulness, but also, in renewing their vows, to renew their faith. For, when all is said and done, this ritual drama offers the assurance that, however unequal the struggle may appear, victory is ultimately certain if Israel will only prove steadfast. That is to say, its final implication is one which pervades the Old Testament from beginning to end, i.e. the principle that the righteous will ‘live’ (with all that this means or may come to mean), not merely in virtue of his faithfulness, but primarily by reason of his faith.1

Looking still more closely at the worship under discussion we see a ritual pattern in which the broadly verifiable data of history are interwoven with an imaginative portrayal of that which made possible the long pageant of human life and that which is to be its ultimate issue (i.e., in more technical language, a cosmogony and an eschatology), both of which clearly belong to the colourful sphere of myth. Accordingly, if there was ever any concentration upon the cycle of the year and the annual revival of the social unit, this has been transcended; and ‘salvation’ has become a matter of the historical process. The purpose of this ritual and its associated mythology is simply to secure what may be described as a ‘frame of mind’,2 the conscious acceptance of a pattern of thought and behaviour which will give direction not only to one’s own life but also to the life of society. Its aim is (a) to reaffirm one’s belief in the principles underlying the behaviour thus envisaged and one’s faith in Yahweh as their author, and (b) to evoke afresh the assent of the will in a renewed pledge of faithfulness to Him and His demands. Accordingly, the memory of Yahweh’s earlier dealings with His people is carefully employed as an aid to present faith and faithfulness; and

---

1 Cf. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, p.3, ad init., 2nd edit., p. v, ad init.
the vision set before the worshippers is the extended one, not merely of a new cycle of the year, but of a new age in which Israel's destiny and indeed the destiny of all mankind will have been realized. Thus, if we have here no formal statement of faith which warrants the word 'creed', there is ample material for the framing of one; and in so far as it is implicit it is quite remarkable for its affirmation concerning the character and purpose of the Godhead as expressed in His sovereignty over space and time and, in particular, its emphasis upon the ultimate welfare of mankind as the guiding motif of His activity in creation and history.

This sovereignty of Yahweh first manifests itself in the creation of the earth as a habitable place for mankind, and it continues to prove itself an actuality in the multifarious processes of nature which form the context of human life; but it still remains to be made effectual in the field of human action, which is continually permitted to oppose His will and thwart His plans for the general good. Nevertheless His determination to ensure His sovereignty even in the realm of man's behaviour is already discernible in the history of His chosen people, who, by their formal acceptance of the covenant obligations imposed at Sinai-Horeb, have consented to be the agents of His purpose in establishing a universal order of society which shall function in perfect harmony with the great cosmic order and so shall form the crown and climax of His activity in creation. With the settlement in Canaan and the founding of the monarchy He is prepared to take the final step for the establishment of His rule in the moral realm; and this is to take place as soon as the House of David fulfils its own covenanted task of raising His chosen people to the required standard of social righteousness and thus forging a community which will be justified in serving as the moral and spiritual leaders of mankind. In other words, Israel is to serve as the great bridge-head in Yahweh's campaign against the forces of evil; and when this has been successfully built up, the
dine will be ripe (or the vital moment will have arrived) and the great 'Day' will have dawned when He will be justified in intervening decisively in the affairs of men as the sovereign Ruler and Judge of mankind. The latter will then be an organic whole enjoying the fullness of life which has been designed for the human race by the God of Israel, who in His sovereign power is the 'Living God' (יהוה) or the true 'Giver of Life'.

Thus at the point in time represented by any one of these recurrent festal days the worshipper's gaze is directed first, in retrospect, to the beginning of time or the creation of the natural order; in the second place, to Yahweh's control of the natural world and His active concern with the behaviour of mankind on the plane of history; and, in the third place, to the prospect of the consummation of both creation and history in a universal moral order, i.e. the coming of the great 'Day' which will usher in a new era of world-wide righteousness and peace.

Accordingly, in this great act of worship the eschatological hope, which centres in the House of David, finds vivid expression in the contemporary scene, and that which is really yet to be occurs dramatically before one's eyes as a challenge and a means of inspiration for all who are prepared to take it seriously. In particular it brings before each reigning member of the House of David the vision that he may yet be instrumental in preparing the way for the conclusive demonstration of Yahweh's sovereign power and His determination to secure an ordered world, or, in other words, that he himself may have a decisive part to play in the fulfilment of Yahweh's plans for making His Kingship effectual amongst men and ensuring that His will shall be done upon earth as also in heaven. In this way the House of David is reminded that it is the responsibility of the true Messiah to put an end to everything
which disturbs the right relationship between the various members of society both on the human plane and vis-à-vis the Godhead, i.e. to root out from the social body the deadly cancer of sin, which finds expression most forcibly in its avarice and pride, and thus bring his people into that effective unity with one another and with the Creator which will not only ensure their own well-being but will lead to that decisive intervention on the part of Yahweh in the affairs of mankind which will bring about universal righteousness and peace. In short, this great act of worship looks forward to the day when the crisis will have been reached in the persistent struggle between the forces of light and the forces of darkness, i.e. the day when the true Messiah of the House of David, by his own dependence upon the holy Spirit and his own filial devotion to the Godhead, will have justified the decisive intervention of Yahweh, and final victory (i.e. man's full 'salvation' or his enjoyment of perfect freedom) will thus be assured.
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