MELCHIZEDEK

An Exegetical Study

of

Genesis 14 and the Psalter

A thesis submitted to the University of Edinburgh in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D. by the Reverend John G. Gammie who was admitted by the Senatus as a candidate under the Ph.D. Ordinance on November 9, 1955.

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

PREFACE

At its inception it was anticipated that the present study would be a history of the exegesis of Melchizedek. Contrary to my own expectations, the material available on this obscure figure, and the problems surrounding the interpretation of the two Old Testament passages in which he is mentioned, were of sufficient magnitude to arrest the historical inquiry before it had gone very far into the Christian era. The exegetical problems connected with Genesis 14 seemed to beckon like a mountain to the climber: "Ascend me if you would see aright the figure of your pursuit." In a similar fashion the problems connected with the interpretation of Psalm 110 resisted summary dismission and seemed to direct the necessity of transcending first, following the pathways of other scholars, the range of other related psalms -- hence the subtitle mentions the Psalter and not Psalm 110 alone.

I wish to express my deep gratitude to my appointed advisors, The Reverend Professors James Barr and Thomas F. Torrance, for the warmth and generosity with which they gave of their best counsel. Professor Torrance started me off on the present study and Professor Barr assumed the greater burden when it became apparent that the end result would be more in the realm of the Old Testament than Christian Dogmatics. In fairness to Professor Barr it must be said that just before my leaving Edinburgh in the Spring of 1958, he remarked to me that had he known the final dissertation would be in the Old Testament, he would have taken me even more in hand. I will not be able to repay him or Professor Torrance -- or indeed, the entire faculty of New College, for the incentive and encouragement derived from the example of their sound scholarship and devotion to the theology of the Word. In particular, I would like to express my further appreciation to the Reverend Professor Norman W. Porteous for his kind and wise counsel; to the Librarian of New College, the Reverend Dr. John A. Lamb for his unerring advice in research; and to the able Assistant Librarian, Miss E. R. Leslie.

My wife has assisted in the proof-reading at all stages and has made many helpful suggestions as to style and format. In a great measure it is due to her encouragement and assistance that the present study has been brought to a state of completion. For the excellent job of typing the final manuscript, I have to thank the good offices of Peggy Sweet in New York City.

John G. Gammie

Great Neck,
New York

Reformation Day, 1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		i
ABBREVIATIONS		ix
	PART I	
	AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF GENESIS 14	
PARAGRAPH #1	INTRODUCTION	1 - 5
PARAGRAPH #2	SURVEY OF LATE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURY INTERPRETATIONS OF GENESIS 14	6 -36

The Two Camps (pg. 6). Nöldeke (pp. 6ff.) Wellhausen (pp. 8f.). Defenders of historicity -- common features in Delitzsch, Dillmann and Kittel (pp. 9ff.).

Camps Within Camps in the 20th Century (pp. 12f.). Winckler's Contribution (pp. 13ff.). In defense of its historicity (pp. 15ff.).
Literary Analysis (pp. 18f.). Gunkel's mixture theory (pp. 19ff.). Procksch: stages of development (pp. 21ff.). Benzinger's source analysis (pp. 23f.).

Selected Miscellaneous Studies (pp. 25-30). Siever's scansion (pp. 25f.). Sellin (pg. 26). Meinhold -- again unhistorical (pp. 26ff.). Busse -- Melchizedek interpreted in context (pp. 28ff.).

Articles on the Place of Origin (pp. 30ff.). Landersdorfer (pp. 30f.). Hertzberg (pp. 31f.). Kroeze's dissertation (pp. 32ff.). Nyberg and "Religionskampf" in Gen. 14 (pp. 34ff.).

PARAGRAPH #3	THE FORMATION OF GENESIS 14 The clue in the Unebenheiten (pg. 37).	37 - 80

Stages of Development (pp. 38-74).
Stage 1 (Vss. 8 and 10): A period of primitive hostility (pp. 29-44). Parallel accounts of the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah (pp. 39-43). Vss. 2 and 3 seen as footnotes to vs. 8 (pp. 43f.).
Stage 2 (vss. 11, 14, 16, 17aαbα, 21-23): Property is the Key (pp. 44-51). Reasons for assignment to Stage 2 (pp. 45ff.). A suggested re-interpretation of Abram's dealings with Sodom (pp. 47ff.). Corroboration from Genesis 23 (pp. 49f.). Source of the material (pp. 50f.).
Stage 3 (vss. 1-5aα, 9): Remoulding Old Traditions (pp. 52f.).
Stage 4 (vss. 5aβ-7, 12, 13, 15, 17aβ and 24): In answer to the demand for explanations (pp. 53-59).
Stage 5 (vss. 18-20): Interpolation (59-73). Reasons for assignment to Stage 5 (pp. 59f.). Its appositeness to the chapter (pp. 61f.). Probable antiquity (pp. 62f.). Vital to interpretation -- 1. Summary of views on the patriarchs (pp. 64-69) and 2. Summary of views on non-Israelite figures (pp. 69ff.).

Suggested application of Noth's interpretation of the Jethro-Moses encounter to Melchizedek-Abram (pp. 70f.). Priestly origin of the interpolation (pp. 72f.).
Stage 6: Glosses (pp. 73ff.).

Implications of the Present Analysis (pp. 75-80): (1) Modification necessary of previous uses of chapter to date Abram (pp. 76-79); (2) Literary criticism of chapter essential if provenance of Melchizedek to be determined with accuracy (pp. 79f.).

PARAGRAPH #4 PLACE OF ORIGIN AND SUBSEQUENT ABODES OF THE MELCHIZEDEK PRIESTHOOD 81 - 93

(a) Evidence that the Melchizedek priesthood was at some time or another associated with Jerusalem (pp. 82f.).
(b) Indications that this association was not original (pp. 83ff.).
(c) Reasons for positing an earlier association with Shechem -- Salem interpreted as an area name (pp. 85-90).
(d) Evidence to show that Shiloh was at one time the centre of the Melchizedek priesthood (pp. 90f.).
(e) The most likely route the Melchizedek priesthood travelled: Shechem to Shiloh, Shiloh to Nob, Nob to Jerusalem (pp. 92f.).

PARAGRAPH #5 THE NATURE OF THE DEITY WORSHIPPED BY MELCHIZEDEK 94 - 132

Proposition #1: That the deity worshipped by Melchizedek was called Salem -- Lewy, Nyberg (pp. 94-96).
Proposition #2: That the deity worshipped by Melchizedek was called Zedek -- 3 meanings of Melchizedek discussed (pp. 99f.).
Proposition #3: That the deity worshipped by Melchizedek was called Melki, Milku or the like -- 3 other meanings of Melchizedek and the unfortunate nature of Milki (pp. 101 f.)
Proposition #4: That El and ʿElyon are identical -- Nyberg (pp. 102-105).
Proposition #5: That El ʿElyon means El, grandson of ʿElyon -- Pope's modification of Dussaud's suggestion (pp. 105-115).
(a) The proposition set vis à vis other interpretations of El ʿElyon (pp. 105ff.).
(b) Part of the Phoenician pantheon according to Philo of Byblus (pp. 107f.).
(c) The Reliability of the Sanchuniathon Tradition (pp. 108-115).
(1) Are Elioun and Ouranos a duplication? (pg. 108).
(2) Comparative Hittite material (pp. 109f.).
(3) Comparative material from the Accadian creation epic (pp. 110ff.).
(4) ʿElyon's procreation of heaven and earth is reflected in the descriptive phrase קנה שמים וארץ -- Humbert's analysis of קנה critically reviewed (pp. 112ff.).
Proposition #6: That few of the ʿElyon passages in the Bible throw light on the nature of the original deity ʿElyon (pp. 115-121). Summary of the ʿElyon passages -- virtual identification with Yahweh (pp. 115ff.). Four revealing passages: Deut. 32:8-9 (pg. 118); Isa. 14:12-15 (pg. 119f.); Psalm 82 (pp. 119f.); Num. 24:15f. (pp. 120f.).
Proposition #7: That Shaddai was the chief deity of the patriarchs (pp. 121-128). Alt's "Der Gott der Väter" reviewed (pp. 121ff.). Modifications of Alt suggested by Lewy, Nyberg, May, Eissfeldt, and Albright (pp. 123-126). The antiquity of Shaddai (pg. 127). Shaddai originally associated with Jacob -- and only latterly with other patriarchs (pg. 128).

Proposition #8: That it was necessary for Abram to pay homage to El ʿElyon in order to establish his right to remain in Palestine and rule over the land -- Lewy's view accepted when modified (pp. 129-131).

Concluding Note. The Remarkability of Abram's Relation to El ʿElyon (pp. 131f.).

PART II

AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF THE PSALTER

PARAGRAPH #1 INTRODUCTION 133 - 138

PARAGRAPH #2 ON THE PROBABLE USE OF PSALM 110 AT THE "CORONATION" OF THE JUDAIC KING 139 - 145

Dürr (pg. 139). Gaster (pp. 139f.). Widengren (pp. 140f.).
(i) Some observations on the history of the coronation in Israel and implications on dating Psalm 110 (pp. 142f.).
(ii) Internal Evidence. Character of coronation day defined: day of judgement and day of strength. Anticipation of thesis (pp. 143f.).
(iii) Internal Evidence continued. Failure of most interpreters who assign psalms to the coronation to perceive and emphasize that it defines the nature of the king's rôle in the cultic drama which takes the form of a ritual combat or mock battle (pp. 144f.). A Set Season for the coronation? (pg. 145).

PARAGRAPH #3 INDICATIONS OF A SPECIAL MEANING FOR THE ROYAL PSALMS IN THE AUTUMN 146 - 152

(1) Storm a sign of Yahweh's judgement (pp. 147f.).
(2) October inaugurates the season of storms (pg. 148).
(3) Climatic conditions slightly drier today than in biblical times (pp. 148f.).
(4) Appropriateness of Royal Psalms in autumnal setting because of prominence of element of judgement (pp. 149f.).
(5) Common emphasis on victory over enemies in Enthronement Psalms and some Royal Psalms (pp. 150f.).
(6) Certain phrases and expressions common to some Enthronement Psalms and Royal Psalms (pg. 151).
(7) In Psalm 89 New Year theme of victory over Chaos-monster is prominent (pp. 151f.).

PARAGRAPH #4 TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS 153 - 159

(a) The Text (pp. 153f.).
(b) Translation (pg. 155).
(c) Comments on the translation of vs. 4 (pp. 155f.).
(d) Analysis of contents (pp. 157f.).
(e) On the interpretation of vs. 4 (pp. 158f.)

PARAGRAPH #5 THE RELATIONSHIP OF PSALM 110 AND GENESIS 14 160 - 167
(a) The link was Zadok of Jerusalem: Rowley and Johnson (pp. 160-165).
(i) The association of "righteousness" with Jerusalem (pp. 160ff.).
(ii) Its probability (pp. 163ff.).
(b) The link was late (pp. 166f.).

Page

PARAGRAPH #6 REVIEW OF THE TYPES OF DRAMATIC RÔLE ASSIGNED TO THE KING IN THE CULT 168 - 173

Mowinckel (pg. 168). Schmidt (pp. 168f.). Johnson (pp. 169f.). Engnell and Widengren (pp. 170-174).

PARAGRAPH #7 THE KING AS MOSES (1): LEADER OF THE CULT, PRIEST, BUT NOT HIGH PRIEST, EFFECTOR OF DELIVERANCE AND VICTORY 174 - 183

Similarities of Moses and the king (pp. 175-180). Uniqueness of the Israelite kingship epitomized by its Mosaic character (pp. 181-183).

PARAGRAPH #8 DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIRST PART OF THE THESIS. THE KING AS MOSES (2): WIELDER OF THE ROD IN A CULTIC REPRESENTATION OF DESTRUCTION OF ENEMIES 184 - 225

The rod of Moses (pp. 184-187). Statement of thesis (pp. 187ff.). Nature in the thought-world of the Old Testament (pp. 189-192). The problem of categories of enemies in the Psalms (pp. 193f.)

Evidence of the Psalms (pp. 194-208). Psalm 2 (pp. 194f.). Psalm 83 (pp. 195f.). I Samuel 2: 1-10 (pp. 196f.). Psalm 48 (pp. 197f.). Psalms 54, 92, and 73 (pp. 198f.). Psalm 20 (pp. 199ff.). Psalm 21 (pp. 201f.). Psalm 46 (pp. 202ff.). Psalm 76 (pg. 204). Psalm 18 (pp. 205-208). Summary of Evidence in the Psalms (pp. 208ff.).

The Evidence of Historical Texts (pp. 210-219).

(1) Passages on the ban indicate that idols and symbols of royalty, including the royalty itself, were destroyed -- or were supposed to be destroyed -- as part of the same ceremony (pp. 211ff.).

(2) All of the passages describing pre-monarchial ceremonies of putting away "foreign" gods have a political and martial significance (pp. 213ff.).

(3) In the history of the monarchy there is ample evidence that idols, images, and other cultic objects were not only cut down and broken, but occasionally beaten to dust and burned (pp. 215ff.). The placement of the king (pp. 217ff.).

Discussion of the Historical Evidence (pp. 219-224). Summary (pp. 224f.).

PARAGRAPH #9 DEVELOPMENT OF THE SECOND PART OF THE THESIS 226 - 268

The correspondence of things earthly and things heavenly (pg. 226). Departure from Mowinckel (pp. 226-230). Evidence for early Israelite belief in the conception, "a god for each nation" (pp. 230ff.).

Evidence from the Psalms (pp. 233-252). Psalm 29 (pp. 233ff.). Psalm 89 (pp. 235f.). Psalm 82 (pp. 237f.). The centrality of emphasis on Yahweh's sovereignty and judgement (pg. 238). Points at issue in interpretation (pp. 238ff.). A possible clue on sequence of recitation (pp. 240f.). Psalm 97 (pp. 241f.). Psalm 98 (pp. 242ff.). Sequence in which some Psalms were recited (pg. 244). Psalm 65 (pg. 244). Psalm 47 (pp. 245-250). Psalm 149 (pp. 250ff.).

Page

Summary of Evidence from the Psalms (pp. 252ff.) The Lightning of Yahweh and the rod of the monarch (pp. 254ff.).

Interpretation of Psalm 110 (pp. 257, 268).

(a) Presuppositions (pg. 257.)
(b) The "setting in life" of Psalm 110 (pp. 57-268).
(i) Statement of Interpretation (pp. 257ff.).
(ii) Discussion of Interpretation (pp. 259-268).
Date of Recital (pg. 259).
Place of Recital (pp. 259-262).
A Liturgical Text of a Drama Enacting Destruction of Enemies (pp. 262-268).

PARAGRAPH #10 ANALOGOUS CEREMONIES ENACTING DESTRUCTION OF ENEMIES 262 - 279

The Sethe "execration texts" (pp. 269ff). The Significance of the Sethe "execration texts" -- similarities to different forms of the biblical ceremony (pp. 271-275). Nielsen's study of image destruction -- further Babylonian and Egyptian parallels (pp. 275-278). Significance of the parallel rites (pg. 279).

SUMMARY 280f.

APPENDIX A 282f.

1. Indications that Psalm 89:39-53 and Lamentations reflect a similar shock and dejection owing to the demise of the Davidic king (pg. 282).

2. Indications that the "old time" promises of Psalm 89 were genuine reflections on promises that had been made to the Judaic king in the royal liturgy (pp. 283f.).

APPENDIX B 285ff.

Gideon's Victory over the Midianites

BIBLIOGRAPHY 288-308

ABBREVIATIONS

ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts, ed. J. B. Pritchard (1955).
APAW	Abhandlungen der Preussischer Akademie der Wissenschaften.
ARV	The Standard American Edition of the Revised Version of the Bible (1901).
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch, edd. V. Herntrich and O. Weiser.
BA	The Biblical Archaeologist.
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
BDB	Brown, Driver, and Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (1906).
BH	Biblia Hebraica, ed. R. Kittel.
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten and Neuen Testament.
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
CAH	The Cambridge Ancient History.
G-K	Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, 2nd English Edition, rev. by A. E. Cowley (1910).
GVI	Geschichte des Volkes Israel, by R. Kittel.
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament, ed. O. Eissfeldt.
HDB	A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. J. Hastings (1898-1904).
HERE	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. J. Hastings (1908-1926).
ICC	The International Critical Commentary, edd. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer and C. A. Briggs.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature.
JE	The Jewish Encyclopedia (1901-1906).
JMUEOS	Journal of the Manchester University Egyptian and Oriental Society.
JPOS	Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.
JSOR	Journal of the Society of Oriental Research.
KJV	King James Version (1611)
KThWB	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel
K-B	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.
LXX	The Septuagint.
MT	The Massoretic Text.
Ned	Nedarim.

PART I

AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF GENESIS 14

PARAGRAPH # 1.

INTRODUCTION

Melchizedek is an enigmatic figure who makes his first appearance in the Bible in an enigmatic chapter, Genesis 14. He is mentioned other times in the Bible: once in Psalm 110 which was probably used in connexion with a king, and finally in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapters five to seven. Neither one of the latter passages throws much light on the interesting king. An oracle of the Psalm, which a majority of modern scholars agree was spoken to the king, says: "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek."[1] The opening verses of Hebrews 7 hardly supply us with more information than is already given in Psalm 110 or Genesis 14:

> For this Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, met Abraham returning from the slaughter of kings and blessed him; and to him Abraham apportioned a tenth part of everything. He is first, by translation of his name, king of righteousness, and then he is also king of Salem, that is, king of peace.

And the third verse of this chapter intensifies the mystery, for something new is added which finds no direct basis in Old Testament tradition:

> He is without father or mother or genealogy, and has neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling (ἀφωμοιωμένος) the Son of God he continues a priest for ever.

From the point of view of the Christian faith, the most important of these passages on Melchizedek is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In this letter, Jesus, who is acclaimed as "the pioneer and perfecter of our faith" (Heb. 12: 2) is also proclaimed as a "(high)

---

1. Ps. 110:4. The Hebrew words על דברתי מלכי־צדק may also be interpreted "because I have spoken righteously, my king." See Part II, p 153 ff.

priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (Heb. 5:10; 6:20; cf. 7:3,15,17,21). As such, the author of this letter testifies, "he is able for all time to save those who draw near to God through him, since he always lives to make intercession for them" (Heb. 7:25). The Melchizedek of Genesis 14 and Psalm 110 has unquestionably enjoyed a greater importance and received more persistent attention in Christian circles precisely because the eternal priesthood of Jesus was affirmed to be a priesthood after the order of the same Old Testament figure, Melchizedek. Even though certain instances are highly disputed, it has been established beyond doubt that even the Jewish attitude towards Melchizedek was not unaffected by the New Testament interpretation.[1] Nonetheless, as we have indicated above, the enigma of the original meaning of Melchizedek in Genesis 14 is not solved by what we learn of him in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In order to penetrate the mystery that surrounds him, in order to arrive at a clearer understanding of his significance in the traditions of Genesis and in the liturgical songs of the Psalter, all thought of his place in the Epistle to the Hebrews must be set aside. The matters of historical setting, stages of tradition and literary composition with which we shall deal can only be settled by critical reasoning and careful analysis. Dogmatic considerations must not direct the line of research or govern the ultimate findings. Both Roman Catholic and Protestant investigations of the history of interpretation of Melchizedek have shown, however, that since the time of the Reformation there has been an uninterrupted battle between the two centres of Christendom on the meaning of this controversial figure in each of the three passages in which he is

---

1. See esp. M. Simon, "Melchisédech dans la polémique entre juifs et chrétiens et dans la légende," RHPR 1937, pp. 58-93 and H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck's "Der 110 Psalm in der altrabbinischen Literatur," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Bd. 4, Teil 1, München, 1928, pp. 458ff. For the opinion that certain Jewish interpretations were not affected by the Epistle to the Hebrews but by other considerations, see G. Wuttke, Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese. BZNW 5, 1927, pg. 17 and J. J. Petuchowski in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXVIII, 1957, pp. 127-136.

mentioned.[1] In Genesis 14, for example, Roman Catholic views have tended to find in Melchizedek's bringing forth of bread and wine a sacrificial offering pre-figuring the sacrifice of the Mass. Protestant scholars, on the other hand, have tended to assert that the offering of bread and wine had nothing to do with a sacrifice but were rather proffered solely as refreshment to Abraham's returning army. Escape from denominational bias is difficult to attain, Notwithstanding, what is presented in the following pages is the result of an earnest attempt to avoid fruitless partisan debate in order to pursue the more precious goal of arriving at a proper historical understanding of the texts before us. As the Reformed theologian, Karl Barth, reminds every student of the Scriptures: the discipline of determining the original historical meaning of the Bible for its original hearers is a task that cannot be taken too seriously.[2]

The present study will confine itself to a consideration of the meaning of Melchizedek in the Old Testament. Of necessity it has involved treatment of contemporary theories on a variety of related subjects ranging from the historicity of Genesis 14 to the cultic use of Royal and Enthronement Psalms. Especially in Part II, wherein he endeavours to interpret the significance of Melchizedek in Psalm 110 through a study of analogous types of Psalms, the writer may be accused of having lost sight of his objective, for in that part he considers afresh the significance of the autumnal celebration of the kingship of

---

1. See: Wuttke, cited in the previous note; F. J. Jerome's Das geschichtliche Melchisedech Bild, Strasbourg, 1920 and G. T. Kennedy's St. Paul's Conception of the Priesthood of Melchisedech: An Historico-Exegetical Investigation, Washington, 1951. All three are doctoral dissertations. Wuttke's study, though detailed for his rabbinic and early church treatment, is very thin from the 6th century onwards. His discussion of Luther's interpretations is an exception. Jerome's survey for the Post Reformation period is the most adequate even though he reveals an unmistakable Roman Catholic bias in his summary of 19th century interpretations. Kennedy's work is valuable as a documentation of recent Irish writing on Melchisedek. The fact that Kennedy had only a second hand knowledge of German works greatly detracts from its overall merit. It is to be especially regretted that Kennedy was apparently unaware that Jerome and Wuttke had already written in the same field.

2. Kirkliche Dogmatik, I/II, 1938, pg. 513.

Yahweh in Israel and seeks to demonstrate a hitherto unnoticed rôle played by the Israelite king in these celebrations. The central interest in both parts of the thesis has nonetheless remained Melchizedek. For this reason the thesis title is not a misnomer. In Part I as in Part II, however, research is not always confined to Melchizedek or factors relating directly to him. In many instances matters are considered which have only indirect bearing on the subject of the entire study. Thus it is proper to note at the outset that Melchizedek was the point of departure for the investigation, the results of which are presented below; once the passages in which he is mentioned were taken up and examined, however, interest of necessity turned to the passages themselves and to other biblical passages that aid us in interpreting them. Our exegesis has thus in both instances paid a great deal of attention to <u>context</u> — to the literary, historical, and, in so far as it can be determined, liturgical context out of which the biblical words on Melchizedek arose. In each instance the writer set out with no pre-conceived notion of what he should find. The results of his research are those which seemed most nearly in accordance with demonstrably available facts. Reasons for results are always given and, as already indicated, considerable attention is paid to the research of leading Old Testament scholars.

Paragraph # 2 will summarize the results of late 19th century studies on Genesis 14. The material presented in that paragraph provides the background for the subsequent discussion.

In Paragraph # 3 an attempt is made on the basis of a literary analysis of the chapter to reconstruct the subsequent stages in its formation in oral and literary tradition. For each constituent part of the chapter, a suggested interpretation is offered.

Paragraph # 4 discusses the subject of the origin of the tradition of Melchizedek. The majority of scholars are of the opinion that it is Jerusalem. This view is challenged and the thesis posited that the tradition shifted from Shechem to Shiloh and finally from Shiloh to Jerusalem.

Paragraph # 5 concludes Part I with a consideration of patriarchal religion and especially the nature of the deity of Melchizedek.

The line of approach taken in the exegesis of Psalm 110 will be found in the introductory paragraph of Part II.

PARAGRAPH # 2.

SURVEY OF LATE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURY INTERPRETATIONS OF GENESIS 14.

It is no exaggeration to say that the late 19th century interpretations of Genesis 14 fell into two distinct and diametrically opposed camps. On the one hand scholars like Hitzig, Nöldeke, Meyer, Kuenen, Wellhausen and Holzinger denied the historical reliability of the chapter outright, considering it the artistic product of an age far later than Abram and Lot. On the other hand the historical reliability of the chapter was staunchly defended by such scholars as Delitzsch, Diestel, and R. Kittel who followed the position held by the earlier scholar Ewald. In his Genesis commentary A. Dillmann sided by and large with the "historical camp" but in no wooden way. Even though he saw no reason to doubt the historicity of the account, he considered the Melchizedek episode to be an insertion in the chapter, the object of which insertion he held to be the glorification of Abram. His writing thus blazed the trail to the middle of the road approach taken later by English commentators.

With the appearance of his Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments in 1869, Theodor Nöldeke gave classic expression to the view that the account of Genesis 14 is historically unreliable. In his appropriately entitled essay, "Die Ungeschichtlichkeit der Erzählung Gen. XIV," he sought to show that the chapter abounded in the improbable (e.g. the route followed by the eastern kings), the impossible (e.g. Abram's victory over the enemy coalition with only 318 men, the assigning of "Amoritic" names to Abram's confederates) and the highly artistic (namely: the selection of colourful names for the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah; having Chedorlaomer's coalition defeat the mythical and feared peoples of the Rephaim and Emim as well as the historically known peoples of the Amalekites, the Amorites and the

Horites; the preservation of details such as the names of Abram's allies and the number of men with which he attacked; and finally the portrayal of Abram as one who fought unselfishly with no desire for reward). The entire piece, Nöldeke maintained, was "executed with great skill and magnificently told." As to its provenance, Nöldeke held out three not entirely consistent possibilities: (1) that it originated from a source not found in the Pentateuch; (2) that it came from the Redactor of the Pentateuch; or (3) that it stemmed from the Yahwist who in turn relied on another source. He believed that the piece was written about 800 B. C. The Melchizedek episode had no organic relation to the rest of the chapter, he averred, and even if the contents of the chapter were historical, the priestly king, Melchizedek, was without a doubt a poetic figure. The use of proper names in the chapter recalled the Book of Esther and its battle descriptions recalled the Book of Judith.

Despite its outspokenness Nöldeke's essay showed itself to be, on the one hand, more cautious than other attacks on the historicity of Genesis 14, and on the other hand, more hospitably inclined towards opposing extremely sceptical views than a number of scholars who took a similar stand. Nöldeke pointed out that the Jerusalem Targum and Rashi both indulged in a fanciful interpretation of all the names of the kings of the Pentapolis. He himself, however, would only allow for such a fanciful interpretation in the names of the first two kings, Bera (בֶּרַע) = "Son of Evil" (בֶּן־רָע), king of Sodom, and Birsha (בִּרְשַׁע) = "Son of Wickedness" (בֶּן־רֶשַׁע), king of Gomorrah. He admitted that שְׁמְאֶבֶר (for שְׁמְאֵבֶר) had as a possible meaning, "the name is lost" and that עֵמֶק הַשִּׂדִּים might be read עֵמֶק שְׂדִּים and thus translated as "Demon Valley" rather than the Valley of Siddim, but he did not wish to carry this kind of interpretation too far. Hitzig was quite different in this regard, preferring to interpret the names of the named kings of Pentapolis as "Blasphemer," "Rogue," "Serpent's Tooth" and "Scorpion's Poison." Of this Delitzsch remarked laconically, "[it] has only the value of a poor witticism."

Evidence of Nöldeke's sympathy with views treasured by the upholders of the historicity of the chapter were, as noted above, not entirely absent. Thus he was willing to concede that some of the names of the Eastern kings might have been genuine; he allowed for the possibility that the Valley of Siddim may have been located in the shallow Southern portion of the Dead Sea which at an earlier period may not have been covered over with water; he thought it a plausible alternative that the tale was handed down by the Yahwist; and finally he saw in the name Melchizedek and in the use of the word Salem for Jerusalem evidence of "a great age." As he stated at the outset of his essay, it was not so much the details of the tale that caused him to doubt its historical truth but rather the untenability of the general context.

Wellhausen was among those who saw nothing reliable whatsoever in Genesis 14. In the first edition (1866) of his famous Die Composition des Hexateuchs, he was especially critical of the scholars who attempted to assign the chapter to any one of the usual sources, J,E,D or P. J in his view was not a serious contender, nor was P despite certain linguistic similarities. Other scholars had assigned the chapter to E, but in Wellhausen's mind wrongly, for in E least of all did Abraham appear as a warrior, rather his rôle in E was that of "Muslim" (Gen. 22:16b) and prophet (Gen. 20). Most convincing of all, E, who could be proven to be no native of Judah, would never have glorified Jerusalem the way this chapter does in vss. 17-24. The most likely period in which the chapter found its way into the Pentateuch was at the time of its final edition by the end redactor. Because the chapter was so lacking in ties to the known sources Wellhausen noted that the words applied to Melchisedek, that he was without father, without mother and without genealogy, could be applied to the chapter with equal justification. In subsequent editions of Die Composition des Hexateuchs (1877 and 1899) Wellhausen declared that Nöldeke had delivered the death blow to belief in the historicity of the story of Abram's victory over the Elamite king Chedorlaomer. The monumental evidence being uncovered by cuneiform research in no way whatsoever

increased the credibility of the account. Nöldeke had already conceded that even if the names of the four kings could be proven historical, that in itself would constitute no proof that the story, so fraught with impossibilities, was historical. To Wellhausen the entire piece, constructed on the basis of miscellaneous (zerstreuten) material, was an artistic construction made to look archaic through its glosses and antiquarian notes. In this latter opinion Wellhausen went beyond Nöldeke's scepticism of the reliability of the chapter. Whether they were early or late, Nöldeke at least considered the glosses (vss. 2,3,7,8,17) to be genuine. In the same vein Wellhausen criticized Nöldeke's views that the chapter contained material of a great age, that it had artistic merit and that it may have emanated from the Yahwist. Perhaps most interesting of all the opinions expressed by Wellhausen was his belief that Jerusalem was never called by the name Salem. To him the use of the name Salem was but another indication of the intentionally archaistic character of the chapter.[1]

Defenders of the historicity of the chapter took quite a different tack and not infrequently would directly challenge their opponents. A common feature among them was the tendency to assign the chapter to one of the known sources and to posit the view that it also drew upon an older Israelite or Canaanite document. Thus the conservative scholar Franz Delitzsch, following Knobel in agreement with Hupfeld, argued that the chapter had more in common with J than with what was then considered to be the older E.[2] In support of this position he pointed out: its relation with the previous chapter 13 through the mention of Mamre; its use of "Hebrew" as a surname, as in Gen. 39:17; the mention of the towns Admah and Zeboim also known to J in Gen. 10:19; etc. Following Knobel in another regard, Delitzsch

---

1. Die Composition des Hexateuchs. 3. Aufl., Berlin, 1899, pg. 313.

2. Cf. Franz Delitzsch, A New Commentary on Genesis. Eng. Tr., based on the 5th German Edition, Vol. I, 1889, pg. 395.

considered it likely that one chapter had been derived from the "Book of the Wars of Yahweh," which book is mentioned in Num. 21:14. The most stalwart defenders of the historicity of Gen. 14, R. Kittel and A. Dillmann, on the other hand, were of the opinion that the chapter emanated from E. This was the view held by the influential H. Ewald. Kittel especially followed Ewald's judgement that the mention of the word "Hebrew" in vs. 13 of the chapter was an unmistakable indication that an extra-Israelitic source[1] had been drawn upon by its composer, for it was a word that was not infrequently found on the lips of foreigners when mention was made of a child of Israel (cf. Gen. 39:14, 17; 41:12; Ex. 1:16; 2:7; 3:18; 5:3; 7:16, etc.). Reasons given by Dillmann for assigning the chapter to E included the following: E makes mention elsewhere of a covenant made by Abraham with a native prince (Gen. 21) and of military activity undertaken by the patriarch Jacob against Shechem (Gen. 48:21). E generally uses the designation "Amorite" (אֱמֹרִי). The use of the words Admah and Zeboim can also be explained most easily as coming from E in view of the fact that they are mentioned by the (northern) prophet Hosea (Hos. 11:8). The use of the names of these two towns in Gen. 10:19 and Deut. 29:22 are secondary. As for Wellhausen's chiding that Abraham is portrayed by E as a "Muslim" and prophet rather than as a warrior, Dillmann retorts, "Did not Mohammed also occasionally engage in war?"[2]

Another feature common to the defenders of the historicity of Genesis 14 was the persistent attempt to answer the charge that the chapter contained improbabilities and even impossibilities. Especially favoured among the arguments of defense was the view that Abram's victory over Chedorlaomer and his associates with 318 men was similar

---

1. Fr. Hommel in Altisraelitische Ueberlieferung (pg. 153) maintained that the original source was from old Babylonia and had been preserved in a translation in the temple archives of the Salem which was later called Jerusalem. Cf. A. Jeremias, The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East. Eng. Tr. of the 2nd German Edition, Vol. II, London, 1911, pg. 22.

2. Cf. Die Genesis, 5. Aufl., Leipzig, 1886, pg. 231.

to the victory accomplished by Gideon over the Midianites. In Judges 7 a detailed description is found of the clever means which Gideon employed to conquer his foe. The means employed by Abram and his men (dividing his forces and attacking by night) were not very different. The victory of Abram is thus not at all impossible or improbable but highly plausible on the grounds of Gideon's analogous triumph. Other "improbabilities" were answered in the following manner. The king of Sodom, who appears to be alive again in vs. 17 of the chapter, did not himself fall in the bitumen pits (vs. 10); it was rather members of his army that fell (Delitzsch and Dillmann). The difference in order in which the Eastern kings are named in vss. 1 and 9 can be explained through the fact that the first list is alphabetical (!) and the second list names the kings in their order of importance (Delitzsch). The name Dan used in vs. 14 had been considered by unfriendly critics to be an anachronism owing to the fact that Judges 18:29 records that the city had been known as Laish prior to the capture of the city by the Danites in the period of the Judges. Delitzsch responds with the suggestion that we have in the use of the name Dan in Gen. 14:14 an instance where a name added in a gloss (Dan) has supplanted its original (Laish). Other arguments might be given but these will suffice to indicate the nature of the defense offered on behalf of the authenticity and historicity of Genesis 14 in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Despite the unanimity of this camp there was division among it in one important regard. Delitzsch, like Hupfeld, felt that the chapter was an indivisible whole. For Dillmann and Kittel, however, the defense of the chapter's historicity rested in part on their willingness to see in it elements that came from different periods and diverse sources. Thus Dillmann conceded Wellhausen's point that a glorification of Jerusalem could not have come from the hand of E but must have come from Judaic quarters. The Melchizedek episode may have been added to the chapter as late as the Deuteronomic redactor, who also inserted vss. 5-6, but it did not bear sufficient signs of fabrication to have been considered solely a poetic and historically false account. Delitzsch would have

nothing to do with reasoning such as this and criticized Dillmann, whom he regarded in many other ways as an ally, for it. For Delitzsch the incidence of Melchizedek was, as the Epistle to the Hebrews affirms, an episode in "Typical history" prefiguring the superiority of the royal priesthood of Christ.

Camps Within Camps in the 20th Century

The turn of the century did not mark any great change in the history of the interpretations of Genesis 14. The writings of most scholars still tended to fall into one or the other of two fairly distinguishable camps. Thus Skinner writing 1910 could say, "There are obvious reasons why this chapter should have come to be regarded in some quarters as a 'shibboleth' between two schools of OT criticism."[1] Up to the present day Skinner's remark remains valid. The only important differences that characterize the 20th century situation as over and against the 19th century are that few of the chapter's defenders today maintain that it was originally an indivisible unity and that many who see in it an artistic creation of the post-exilic era are also willing to concede that one or more of the elements in the chapter are very old. Thus it might be said that critics and defenders of the chapter have mellowed. The positions held today are as a rule less hard and fast. Closer analysis reveals, however, that within each camp there are two fairly distinct parties. In the camp of the critics there are those who followed more or less faithfully the judgements of Wellhausen. These include Meinhold (1911), Steuernagel (1912), O. Eissfeldt (1934 and 1956), M. Noth (1948), and C. A. Simpson (1952). On the other hand H. Gunkel in his famed Genesis commentary (1901) propounded the view that the chapter contained a mixture of the impossible with the historical, the very old with the legendary. His position has most recently been championed by G. von Rad (1952) and has been highly influential in shaping and modifying the opinions of many scholars.

---

1. Cf. J. Skinner, Genesis , ICC, Revised Ed., 1925, pg. 271. First Ed. 1910.

These include not only Gressmann (1910), Procksch (1913 and 1924), and Bentzen (1949 and 1952) but also the English commentators J. Skinner (1910 and 1925) and H. E. Ryle (1921). Nevertheless, the latter two commentators may more properly be considered as members of the camp which defended (or was inclined to defend) the historicity of the chapter. Both Skinner and Ryle, like their renowned predecessor S. R. Driver in his Genesis commentary (1904) were of the opinion that the historicity of the chapter could not be impeached with finality; at the same time, all three held that it was equally impossible to establish beyond any peradventure the chapter's reliability. Thus the English commentators, although standing definitely within the "historicity camp" affirmed with one accord that the facts available simply did not permit a final judgement on the matter. On the other hand, within the same camp there have been a number of scholars who have continued to defend the essential historicity of the chapter. These include Hommel (1897), Winckler (1900), Jeremias (1906), Kittel (1888 and 1912), König (1919), Jirku (1921), Albright (1921, 1922, 1926, 1949), Heinisch (1930), deVaux (1946, 1948) and Wright (1957). The student of the Old Testament will notice that the latter position has, understandably enough, received considerable support from archaeologists.

Winckler's Contribution

Of the previously mentioned scholars, H. Winckler is perhaps the most radical and his literary analysis the most thorough-going. In his Geschichte Israels, Teil II (1900) he maintained that the chapter contained portions that went back to the Elohist (as indicated by the mention of Kadesh) and to the Yahwist (as indicated by the later references to Lot and Sodom). Vss. 1-10 contained a story that had as its original protagonists only the king of S on the one hand, and the four kings named in vs. 1, against whom as pitted. The king of Sodom acquired his four allies on the basis of the similarity of this tale with that found in Joshua 10 where there were originally five kings. Vss. 11, 13, 14b and 21-24 belonged to the second stage (J) of the

formation of the chapter, and vss. 17-20 (the Melchizedek episode) were an interpolation. Vss. 15-16 were additions. The view for which Winckler is most famous is the significance which he attaches to the number 318, the number of men with which it is said that Abram pursued the hostile armies. This number, Winckler avers, is the clue to the interpretation of Abram. There are 318 days in the year in which the moon is visible and thus the number 318 in Gen. 14:14 is a clear indication that the most important factor for a proper understanding of the patriarchs is their relationship to the cult of the moon god. The chapter was patterned after a Babylonian historical legend and completed before the Exile.

Few of the 20th century defenders of the historicity of Genesis 14 agree with Winckler's moon god theory and carry their literary analysis as far. They have, however, rallied around a position to which he gave most explicit expression in his essay, Abraham als Babylonier (1903). In that work he expressed the opinion that the patriarchal sagas revealed a faithful correspondence to major events in the history of the ancient Near East.[1] A. Jeremias expressed and defended at greater length the same view in The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East (2nd. Germ. Ed., 1906)[2] and summarizes his treatment of the patriarchs in these words, "The background of contemporary history and the details of manners and customs agree with those we find recorded upon the monuments of these periods, and answer for it that the Biblical tradition was drawn from good sources."[3] This judgement of Winckler and Jeremias has found repeated confirmation in the course of the present century. Discoveries of the Egyptian execration texts, the Nuzu and Mari texts, and the Ras Shamra

---

1. Abraham als Babylonier. Leipzig, 1903. Cf. esp. pp. 10 and 27.

2. Eng. Tr. by C. L. Beaumont. Vol. II edited by C. H. W. Johns, London 1911.

3. Ibid., pg. 2.

tablets have only strengthened the correctness of their conclusions as any present day hand book on biblical archaeology will soon make plain. Professor H. H. Rowley puts it this way, "It is . . . not because scholars of to-day begin with more conservative presuppositions than their predecessors that they have a much greater respect for the patriarchal stories than was formerly common, but because the evidence warrants it."[1] Before commenting on the characteristics of the literary critical analysis of Genesis 14 offered by the defenders of the chapter's historicity, it will be convenient here to outline the most important evidence adduced by scholars to support the general verisimilitude of the narrative of Genesis 14.

In Defense of Its Historicity

Two arguments first offered in the 19th century to strengthen the supposition that Genesis 14 has a foundation in history have won repeated, even though varied, emphasis throughout the present century. (1) It has been established that before the rise of the first Babylonian dynasty the land of Elam enjoyed a vast hegemony.[2] The leader of the coalition of Eastern kings in Genesis 14 is Chedorlaomer, king of Elam. Not only is his name composed of genuinely Elamite elements (kudur means "servant" and lagamar or lagamal is a known Elamite deity)[3]

---

1. "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age" in The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays. London, 1952, pg. 305.

2. This was asserted by E. Meyer, Geschichte des Alterthums, I, 1884, pp. 164f., recognized widely at the turn of the century (cf. Gunkel, Genesis, 1901, pg. 256 and Driver, Genesis, London 1904, pg. 157), and most recently resubstantiated by Père de Vaux in his important article "Les Patriarches Hébreux et les Découvertes Modernes," iv-vi, RB LV, 1948, pp. 334ff.

3. Ibid., pg. 334.

but settlements along the route [1] taken by the armies under his leadership (vss. 5-7) have been shown by archaeology to have suffered an abrupt destruction at the end of the Middle Bronze Age I (plus or minus 1900 B. C.).[2] These facts would seem to afford remarkable confirmation of the historical reliability of the chapter. (2) A second interesting argument which still enjoys popularity was, to our knowledge, first propounded by Delitzsch. It is the view that the Valley of Siddim, at which site the major battle of the chapter transpired, is located somewhere under the waters of the extremely shallow (3 to 15 feet) Southern portion of the Dead Sea.[3] Formerly, it is maintained, this land was above water. Not only the shallowness of the present day waters of the Southern Dead Sea make this supposition likely, but

---

1. Recent maps of this entire route may be found in Grollenberg, Atlas of The Bible, London, 1956, pg. 29, Map 4 (with the exception of El Paran) and in E. G. Kraeling, Bible Atlas, New York, 1956, pg. 67. For a long time the route has been commented on for its unusualness (cf., e.g., Driver, Genesis, in loc.) -- the more ordinary route would have been along the Western side of the Jordan rather than along the east. Kraeling suggests that the discovery that copper mining was anciently carried on in the region between the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aqabah lends additional probability to this route. Detailed discussion on the names of the places along the route may be found in W. F. Albright's "The Historical Background of Genesis XIV," JSOR X, 1926, pp. 231ff.; in Kraeling, op. cit., pp. 66ff.; cf. also RB LV, 1948, pp. 328ff.

2. Cf. N. Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, New Haven, 1940, pg. 114; J. Finegan, Light From the Ancient Past, Princeton, 1946, pg. 131; and N. Glueck, "The Age of Abraham in the Negeb," BA XVIII, No. 1, Feb. 1955, pp. 2-9.

3. This supposition found most recent support from W. F. Albright. Exhaustive evidence is presented in BA V, No. 2 (May 1942), pp. 17-32 and BA VI, No. 3 (Sept. 1943), pp. 41-54 in two articles entitled "Sodom and Gomorrah" by J. P. Harland. Harland assembles the evidence to show that the water level has steadily risen. His arguments are convincing. Cf. also G. E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology, London, 1957, pp. 50ff.

also the fact that bitumen is a product indigenous to the region.[1] It will be recalled that the demise of the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah (or their armies) came about through their falling into pits of bitumen (Gen. 14:10).

Other attempts to relate the data or events of Genesis 14 to the history of the ancient Near East have been more ephemeral in their success. The identification of Amraphel, king of Shinar, with Hammurabi, king of Babylon, used to enjoy a fairly widespread support.[2] Today, however, this identification has been virtually abandoned.[3] Not only is the equation questionable on linguistic grounds but on internal grounds as well. If Amraphel was Hammurabi then it is impossible to understand why he, instead of the Elamite king, Chedorlaomer, is not portrayed as the leader of the coalition. The two other kings, Tidal, king of the Goiim and Arioch, king of Ellasar, have been shown to be genuine Hittite and Hurrite names respectively, but every endeavour to identify either one of these biblical kings with a king has, in the end, floundered.[4]

Our survey of arguments in support of the chapter's antiquity and authenticity may be concluded by listing a few of the more interesting reasons made on the basis of literary and linguistic observations: (1) it contains a number of glosses -- a sure indication that the original names were so out-dated that they had to be identified by a

---

1. G. A. Smith defines bitumen as follows: "Bitumen is petroleum hardened by evaporation and oxidation, Dawson, Mod. Science in Bible Lands, 487f. The bituminous limestone, which burns like bright coal (Burckhardt, Syria 394), is so-called Dead Sea stone from which articles are made for sale in Jerusalem and Bethlehem" (The Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 25th Ed., London 1931, pg. 501, n.1). For more recent data cf. Harland's citations from the report of the American geologist, F. G. Clapp, "Geology and Bitumen of the Dead Sea Area, Palestine and Transjordan," BA VI, pp. 48f.

2. Cf. H. H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, Schweich Lectures 1948, London, 1950, pp. 61ff.

3. Ibid. Cf. also RB LV, 1948, pp. 331f. and ZAW 70, 1958, pp. 255f.

4. Cf. RB 1948, pp. 333f.; Albright, Archaeology of Palestine, 1st Ed., London, 1949, pg. 236 and Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, pp. 62ff.

later writer (so König);[1] (2) the style of the chapter is historical (Jirku);[2] (3) the word נְשִׂיא was used of the retainers of Palestinian chieftains in the Egyptian execration texts as early as the 19th century B. C. (Albright).[3]

Literary Analysis

With the exception of Winckler, the literary analysis of Genesis 14 played only a minor rôle in the defense of the historicity of the chapter. However, it is virtually unanimously agreed by scholars of this camp that the Melchizedek episode (vss. 18-20) comes from a source independent from the rest of the chapter (Winckler, Driver, Jeremias, Kittel, Skinner, Albright, Heinisch, Frey, Kroeze, de Vaux). It is also generally agreed by the same scholars that vss. 17,21-24 belong together and that there seems to be a division in the chapter between vss. 16 and 17. Some of these scholars (especially Albright)[4] have pointed to the poetical nature of the chapter. Albright cites vs. 10 as an especially good example of its poetical flavour and conjectures that the chapter may have been an offshoot of the (Babylonian) Sargon epic. Other scholars of this camp (e. g. Hommel, Jeremias, Sellin, Kittel, Heinisch) have also favoured the

---

1. Cf. Ed. König, Die Genesis, Gütersloh, 1919, pp. 468ff.

2. Cf. A. Jirku, "Zum historischen Stil von Genesis 14," ZAW 39, 1921, pp. 313-314. Jirku adduces parallels to the expression "four kings against five" to show it is in accord with other historical writing. These include, for instance, the phrase "together 23 kings of the Nairi lands" (Tiglath Pileser I, Col. IV, 20ff., cf. Prisma Inschrift ed. by H. Winckler, Leipzig, 1893, pg. 12) and "in all 42 lands and their kings" in ibid., Col. VI, 39. (English translations which show the Assyrian-Babylonian annalistic style may be found in ANET, pp. 274ff.)

3. Albright, The Archeology of Palestine, pg. 236.

4. Cf. Albright, JSOR X, 1926, 263.

supposition that the chapter is based on a Babylonian or Canaanite original. As a rule one finds that concern with the literary analysis of Genesis 14 appears as a secondary thought in a footnote (Kittel) or as an interesting, but historically irrelevant exercise (Driver, Skinner, Albright, Heinisch, Kroeze, Kennedy, Wright).

The literary character of Genesis 14 has unquestionably received more attention in quarters that were less motivated by a desire to prove — or disprove — its historical accuracy. Three analyses of the chapter deserve especial mention: that made by Gunkel in his famous commentary (1901); that offered by Procksch in the second edition (1924) of his commentary; and the attempt by I. Benzinger to assign the entirety of the chapter to the traditional sources, J and E (BZAW41, 1925).

Gunkel's Mixture Theory

Gunkel was of the opinion that the chapter contained old material but was in the final analysis a scholarly product of post-exilic Judaism. It was of a piece with legends of Judaism such as Chronicles, Judith, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs and Jubilees. The purpose of the creation was to glorify Abraham; the spiritual source was the yearning for military fame. "The Jewry of this age marvelled over renown for martial victory all the more as they themselves could bring about no victory. And they gladly told about the mighty deeds of their forefathers because unhappily they had no occasion to extol present deeds of victory."[1] Nonetheless Gunkel also maintained (perhaps not entirely consistently) that the chapter represented an example of "the beginning of historical scholarship."[2] It betrayed elements of considerable age. The Melchizedek episode in particular was not a product of fabrication but a genuine tradition that centered in Jerusalem. It is hardly likely, Gunkel argued, that

---

1. Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, 1, Aufl., 1901, pp. 263f.
2. Ibid., pg. 263.

post-exilic Judaism would have selected a Canaanite priest-king as the prototype (Bild) for the high priesthood. They already had Aaron and did not need another. The Melchizedek episode — and especially the descriptive title "priest after the order of Melchizedek" which appears in the pre-exilic Psalm 110 (vs. 4) — was used by David, however, as a means of bolstering the prestige of his kingdom; in a similar fashion Charlemagne and the German kaisers utilized the name Caesar which had associations of past glory and worldly rule.[1] The chapter abounds in evidence which betrays how it was put together. The introduction of Lot into the tale in vs. 12, for example, is awkward as is indicated by the repetition of the verb וַיֵּלֶכוּ ("and they departed"). Similarly the use of the verb עָשָׂה ("made (war)") without a subject (vs. 2) betrays that only a loose (lässig) relationship exists between the sentences.[2] The recording of the demise of the king of Sodom and Gomorrah in vs. 10 but his reappearance alive again in vs. 17 is typical of this loose manner of narration. In his final analysis of the "pre-history" of the chapter, Gunkel distinguished the four following elements: (1) the account of the victory of the four kings (i. e., vss. 1-10); (2) the legend of Abraham's feat of arms (i. e., vss. 11-16); (3) the meeting with Melchizedek (i. e., vss. 18-20); and (4) the scene with the king of Sodom (i. e., vss. 17,21-24).[3] Of its source he said that the use of the word "Hebrew" in vs. 13 is an unmistakable indication that the report was of foreign origin; and his concluding

---

1. Ibid., pg..261.

2. This point in syntax is frequently commented on by scholars. Jirku in ZAW 39, 1921, pg. 152, sought to explain it by conjecturing that the unevenness originated in a cuneiform original. He cites as an example a text which records a treaty between the Hittite king Subbiluliuma and the Mittani king Matiuaza where the following phrase is found, "When with the sun Subbiluliuma, with the great king, with the king, with the king of the land of the city of Ḫatti, with the darling of the god Lišup, Artama, the king of the land of Ḫarri — with one another made a covenant."

3. Cf. Genesis, 1. Aufl., pg. 264. This judgement was retracted in later editions (cf. e. g., Genesis, 4. Aufl., 1917, pg. 290) where he remarks that only the Melchizedek episode was not of a piece with the original construction of the chapter.

remarks on the origin of the data of the piece were:

> The story is [therefore] a mixture of Babylonian (the story of the four kings), Canaanitic-Israelite (Melchizedek and Abraham) and pure Israelite material . . . . Finally, the number 318 may go back to a moon myth; but there are not any further sure traces in the chapter which point towards a moon myth.[1]

Procksch: Stages of Development

Procksch's analysis of Genesis 14 underwent a marked change between the appearance of the first edition of his commentary (1913) and the second and third edition (1924). In both editions he strongly emphasizes reasons why we must give up the notion that the story of Chedorlaomer contains material historically relevant to the age of Abraham.[2] Typical among these were: Elam was strong around 2000 B.C., but Abraham lived about 1800 B. C.;[3] the match between the Eastern kings and the border kings (Zaunkönige) is as well-balanced as a match between a cat and a mouse;[4] "Mamre, Eshcol and Aner as men instead of places sounds as it would if Luther were in covenant with Wittenberg, Erfurt and Eisleben" (!);[5] the expedition of the 318 slaves and their victory over the world powers which fled without stopping but surrendered all their booty is neither an historical nor a poetical reality

---

1. Cf. Genesis, 1. Aufl., pg. 263.

2. Cf. O. Procksch, Die Genesis, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, E. Sellin (Ed.), Bd. I, 1. Aufl., Leipzig, 1913, pg. 515; 2. and 3. Aufl., pp. 512f.

3. Ibid., 1. Aufl., pg. 515. The matter of the dating of Abraham is a complicated issue. A thorough study of the matter may be found in Rowley's From Joseph to Joshua, cf. esp. pp. 57ff., 62ff., 77, 114f. According to Rowley's figuring Abraham must be dated in the 17th century, towards the end of the Hyksos period (pp. 114f.). Albright used to favour this date (from 1924 to 1927) but has most recently advocated a 19th or 20th century setting (Archeology of Palestine, 1949, pg. 83). DeVaux in RB LV, 1948, pp. 335f. comes down for c. 1850 B. C. as the date when Abraham was at Hebron. Finegan, on the other hand, inclined towards 1935 B. C. (Light From the Ancient Past, Princeton, 1946, pg. 57). The truth of the following comment on Genesis 14 by G. Kraeling, op. cit., pg. 66 is, of course, well-known, "Few chapters of the Old Testament have had so much written about them. The urge to restudy it arises from the fact that this is the sole point at which a synchronism establishing the date of Abraham could conceivably be found. For here are mentioned a number of oriental kings." For the present writer's observations on the date of Abraham, cf. below, pp. 63, 76-79.

4. Ibid., 1. Aufl., pg. 515, 2, and 3. Aufl., pg. 513.

5. Ibid.

but simply a lifeless legend.[1] In his earlier edition Procksch opined that the vss. about Melchizedek may have come from the author of the chapter but that in any event they were the prototype for the messianic king of the future (recollecting the name of the messiah, יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ (Jer. 23:6), whom Jeremiah also imagined in a priestly rôle (Jer. 30:31).[2] The Melchizedek episode was the "gem" of the chapter, inserted into the earlier conclusion of the tale (vss. 17, 21-24).[3] The joining of the two separate strands was accomplished not through the addition of יהוה in vs. 22 as commonly supposed, but rather through the addition of אֵל עֶלְיוֹן.[4] In his second and third edition these judgements were completely altered. What had been called the gem inserted into an earlier creation became the very core around which the story of the chapter was set as a frame.[5] Earlier it had been merely stated that the chapter had affinities with P;[6] latterly it was affirmed that the chapter, as well as the special portion on Melchizedek, should definitely be ranked among the writings of that source.[7] This shift in judgement is indicative of the heightened degree of definiteness and clarity with which Procksch set down his later analysis of the entire chapter.

> /But/ the piece is not a unity -- a fact which has been acknowledged for a long time with regard to the Melchizedek episode because Melchizedek (vss. 18-20) jars with the account of the king of Sodom (vss. 17, 21ff.). But what is more, it seems to me that the whole episode of the Eastern kings (vss. 1, 4-9, 13, 15) is a post script which is supposed to set the history of Abraham within the framework of world history. Originally the battle (vs. 2) appears to have transpired not at all between the Eastern king

---

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid., 1. Aufl., pg. 514.
3. Ibid., 1. Aufl., pg. 512.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., 2. and 3. Aufl., pg. 512.
6. Ibid., 1. Aufl., pg. 506.
7. Ibid., 2. and 3. Aufl., pg. 501.

and the border kings (Zaunkönige) of the Dead Sea, but between Sodom and Gomorrah on one side and Admah, Zeboim and Bela' on the other. The subjects of 'conducted war with (את) Bera' and with (את) Birsha' were probably first of all Shin'ab (without את), Shem'eber (without את) and the king [of] Bela' (without את). Also vss. 10f. portray only Sodom and Gomorrah as the vanquished; their conquerors are very likely therefore the three other kings. The latter also take Lot and travel northward (vss. 10-12) where they are seized by Abram and his confederates near Dan at the source of the Jordan (vs. 14) and lose the booty (vs. 16). Upon Abram's return the Melchizedek scene takes place (vss. 18-20). Thus emerges a picture with sharp contours which are confined to Palestine; as a result the impossible trial of strength of the five border kings against the world conquerors disappears entirely. The wondrous military march in a circle around the Dead Sea (vss. 1, 4-7), the battle (vss. 8f.), the defeat (vs. 13) north of Damascus (vs. 15) as well as the final scene between Abram and the king of Sodom (vss. 17, 21ff.) are late trimmings (Verbrämung). If one strips away this latter cloak, he gains a clear insight into the entire piece.[1]

Benzinger's Source Analysis.

Immanuel Benzinger's brief essay, "Zur Quellenscheidung in Gen. 14"[2] was the first (and the last) serious attempt to explain the character of the chapter solely on the basis of assigning its parts either to J or E. Benzinger considered Winckler's theory (that an initial story taken over from a Babylonian source had been worked over) as a valid alternative but sought to demonstrate that his view (that the chapter received its present shape through the combining of two independent stories) offered a more satisfactory explanation of the apparently "loose" construction of the final product. To J belonged those portions of the chapter which dealt with the more southerly regions around the Dead Sea (vss. 5-7a), with Lot (vs. 12), Abram's rescue of him (vss. 14abα and 16) and with the final greeting from Melchizedek, king of Salem (Jerusalem) (vss. 18-20). To E belonged those portions of the chapter which dealt with the defeat of the Amorites in Hazazon Tamar (vs. 7b), with the more northerly regions

---

1. Ibid., 2. and 3. Aufl. pg. 502.
2. ZAWB 41, 1925, pp. 21-27.

(Shechem,[1] Dan, Hobah, Damascus, vss. 13, 14b , 15), and with the final encounter between the king of Sodom and Abram (vss. 17, 21-24). The first verse, containing the names of the four Eastern kings, went back to an old Babylonian source and was common to both J and E. The second verse, however, containing the names of the Canaanite kings, belonged to J alone. Verse three, which records the meeting for battle in the Valley of Siddim, did not belong to J because J does not mention the meeting for battle in the Valley of Siddim until vs. 8. Vs. 4 (rebellion against Chedorlaomer in 13th year) belongs to J as do vss. 9 and 10 (names of four Eastern kings and report of fall of the king of Sodom and Gomorrah in the bitumen pits). Vs. 11 comes from E and in vs. 14 the term חניכין from J but the expression לידי ביתו from E. Albright is entirely correct in saying, "Benzinger's main criterion is the relation of geographical and topographical material to the views of the Judaic and Ephraimite sources."[2] His judgement, however, that Benzinger's analysis "follows entirely superficial principles" and "does not touch on stylistic difficulties"[3] is only partially justified and seems to the present writer to be something of a caricature rather than an accurate estimate of the essay.

---

1. Benzinger follows the view of A. Jeremias that there is evidence within the chapter of an association with Shechem. Cf. The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East. Eng. Tr., pp. 26, 29. Benzinger reads אלני מרים as אלני ממרא (cf. Gen. 22:2) and, with Jeremias, sees in the term בעלי ברית (vs. 13) used of Abram's confederates a clear indication of a relation to Shechem in that the deity of that cultic centre was called אל ברית (cf. Ju. 9:46).

2. Cf. JSOR X, 1926, pg. 262, n. 66.

3. Ibid., pg. 262.

Selected Specialized Studies of Genesis 14

Since the turn of the century a number of separate articles, essays, monographs and theses have subjected various aspects of the chapter to close scrutiny. It is difficult to classify the majority of these writings under one heading but the designation "miscellaneous studies," even though very general, will suffice. The present paragraph may be concluded with a consideration of what have shown themselves to be the most important of these studies.

Sievers' Scansion.- The most authoritative work on the poetry of Genesis 14 is undoubtedly Par. # 85 of Eduard Sievers' classical endeavour to scan the book of Genesis, Metrische Studien II: Die Hebräische Genesis (1904). Nearly all of the verses in the chapter he found to be in hexameter. To vss. 18-20 (and 23), however, he assigned seven metrical feet instead of six.[1] In order to accomplish this scansion Sievers found it necessary to eliminate the words מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק ("Melchizedek") and כֹּהֵן לְאֵל עֶלְיוֹן ("priest to the Most High") from vs. 18; from the earlier vss. are deleted the proper names of the kings (vss. 1, 2, 9), and from vs. 10, to cite another instance, he strikes out the phrase מֶלֶךְ־סְדֹם וַעֲמֹרָה ("king of Sodom and Gomorrah").[2] Sievers finds justification for his deletion of the names of the kings in vs. 8 where the names of the kings are not found. This verse, he reasons, contains the clue to the significance of most of the proper names within the chapter. Because they are not given in this vs. he conjectures that they are not original. Furthermore, the scansion of the chapter is made considerably easier if the names are judged to be secondary. Although Sievers is able, through this process, to render the chapter as passable verse, he is hardly well satisfied with the end result. He concedes that the

---

1. Contrast this with Albright's remark, "Verses 18-24 can be written almost throughout in a perfectly satisfactory way 3 plus 3 meter with the typical poetic repetitions and amplification" (Ibid., pg. 263).

2. It is interesting to observe that Albright in JSOR X, 1926 cites vs. 10 as an illustration of the poetical nature of the chapter. Unfortunately he does not comment on Sievers' analysis.

chapter may be genuine prose[1] and concludes "[its] prosaic sobriety alone makes it the worst poetic verse that I know."[2]

Sellin.- In 1905 an oft quoted essay by E. Sellin made its appearance under the title, "Melchisedek: Ein Beitrag zu der Geschichte Abrahams."[3] The essay is notable for its liberal use of citations from Accadian and Babylonian texts. For the most part these citations were used to substantiate the popular thesis that a cuneiform original underlies the chapter. Contrary to general opinion, Sellin maintained that vss. 17, 21-24 were not earlier than, but rather a consciously developed later counterpart of, vss. 18-20.[4] Among his unique contributions were the conjecture that the mention of bread and wine in vs. 18 indicated a cultic usage[5] and the suggestion that the chapter may have been preserved in the archives of the temple of El ʿElyon at Jerusalem and fell into David's hands after his conquest of that city.[6] The chapter received its final form, he believed, at the hands of those who gathered together the "Jehovistic Book" in the 7th century.[7]

Again Unhistorical.- In 1911, J. Meinhold had printed in a Beiheft of the Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft an important essay entitled, "1. Mose 14. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung."[8] Meinhold's sole intent was to disprove the theory that a Babylonian original lay behind Genesis 14, to adduce all the indications he could muster to prove that the chapter shows signs of

---

1. Sievers, Metrische Studien II. Leipzig, 1904, pp. 267, 274.
2. Ibid., pg. 274.
3. Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift XVI, 1905, pp. 929-951.
4. Ibid., pp. 939, 945.
5. Ibid., pg. 938.
6. Ibid., pp. 946f.
7. Ibid., pg. 948.
8. ZAWB 22, 1911.

composition at a late date, and to discredit once and for all the attempts to utilize the chapter as a trustworthy bulwark of the historicity of Abraham. The earliest date which Meinhold is willing to consider seriously is 600 B. C. At that time the bulk of the chapter might have originated from the redactor of J and E.[1] It is also certain from the similarity of the peoples and places mentioned in vss. 5-7 with the peoples and places of Deut. 2: 10ff., 20ff. that these vss. cannot be earlier than 600 B. C.[2] Vss. 18-20, on the other hand, show signs of emanating from the post-exilic era. Even though they were an insertion into the chapter, they did not arise independently of the rest of the chapter in that the blessing by Melchizedek already presupposes the tradition of Abram's victory over his enemies.[3] About the only thing old in the Melchizedek episode is the name itself.[4] But this does not prove the historicity of the piece any more than does the appearance of great names earlier in the chapter. Judith and Daniel also utilized big names. Perhaps the greatest single clue as to the origin of the chapter is that it presupposes the amalgamation of the legends about Abraham and Lot. It is natural to suppose, Meinhold argues, that the author utilized the relationship of Lot and Abraham (found in J:1 and P but not in E and J:2) as an opportunity to glorify the heroism of the Israelite patriarch (Abraham) over the patriarch of Moab and Ammon (Lot).[5] The fact that P contains the promise that Abraham shall be the forefather of kings (Gen. 17:6, 16; 35:11) further suggests that the story of Abraham's heroic encounter with kings has a more natural background in the post-exilic period.[6] Thus

---

1. Ibid., pg. 13.
2. Ibid., pg. 24.
3. Ibid., pg. 44.
4. Ibid., pg. 50.
5. Ibid., pg. 43f.
6. Ibid., pg. 41.

Meinhold inclined towards assigning the authorship of Genesis 14 to the redactor of P.[1] Nevertheless, he was willing to consider as an outside possibility that the chapter may have come from J:1[2] for J:1 also presupposed the conjoining of the legends about Abraham and Lot.

With the exception of his observations on vss. 5-7 and vss. 18-20, Meinhold comments only very briefly on the possible stages of development in the pre-formation of Genesis 14. One such comment, however, is of great interest. He suggests that the chapter originally contained an account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by the elohim, i. e. gods, and that this account was a part of a larger saga complex.[3] The story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by Yahweh (Am. 4:11; Isa. 13:19; Jer. 49:18; 50:40) he takes to be an Israelite adaptation of the Canaanite original.

Busse: Melchizedek Interpreted in Context

It is ironical that one of the most constructive contributions towards a proper interpretation of the Melchizedek episode has been probably the least noticed. In his excellent study, Der Wein im Kult des Alten Testamentes (1922),[4] the Roman Catholic scholar Ed. Busse, with an enviable freedom from denominational bias, among other things, has accomplished an indisputably valid exegesis of Gen. 14: 18-20 in its present context.[5] Busse examines two alternative interpretations of the meaning of Melchizedek's bringing forth bread and wine before disclosing the third, and most commendable, alternative. First, the bread and wine may have been presented only to serve as nourishment for the returning Abraham (cf., e. g. Deut. 29:5; Jos. 9:5; Ju. 19:19). Second, these elements may very well point to an offering of

---

1. Ibid., pg. 13.
2. Ibid., pg. 14.
3. Ibid., pg. 35.
4. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten Testament: Freiburger Theologische Studien, Heft 29, Paderborn, 1922.
5. Ibid., pp. 37-41.

thanksgiving especially in view of the fact that Melchizedek is called a priest of the Most High God.[1] The most lively option is neither one of these alternatives but rather that Melchizedek brought forth bread and wine to bring himself into a closer relationship. i.e. covenant relationship, with Abram. A comparison of Genesis 14: 18-20 with two similar instances makes this interpretation well nigh compelling.

In the ninth chapter of Joshua there is a recorded tale of how the inhabitants of the land of Gibeon make Joshua, the feared conqueror of Jericho and Ai, their covenant partner through a stratagem. They adorn themselves with the clothes of beggars and set out for Joshua's camp with poor provisions. After persisting they succeed in getting Joshua and the leaders of the congregation to make a covenant with them by drinking their wine and eating their bread (Josh. 9: 3-14). As a part of the ceremony the leaders of the congregation of Israel swear that they will not kill their covenant partners (Josh. 9:15-20). When it is later discovered that the Gibeonites did not come from "a very far country," as they had lead the Israelites to believe (Josh. 9:9), but were neighbours instead, the deceit did not render the covenant invalid. Despite the murmuring of the people of Israel the leaders declared that what they had vowed could not be undone lest the wrath of Yahweh descend upon them (Josh. 9:18-20). They therefore decreed "Let them live" (Josh. 9:21). The second similar instance is found in the book of Genesis where Abimelech of Gerar with Ahuzzath, his adviser, and Phicol, the commander of his army, approach Isaac for the express purpose of making a covenant that he will not harm them (Gen. 26: 26-29). It is, of course, of interest that Abimelech refers to Isaac in his speech as one "blessed of Yahweh"

---

1. Of this alternative Busse remarks that neither the Old Testament (Ps. 110) nor the New Testament (Hebrews 7) place any emphasis on the elements themselves; the emphasis is rather on the uniqueness of the personality of Melchizedek. The view that the bread and wine were an offering came into vogue in Christian circles because of their use in the Eucharist, but cannot be justified on the basis of the Hebrew, Greek or Latin text (Ibid., pp. 38f.). For a different opinion see Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception of the Priesthood of Melchizedek, pp. 19ff.

(Gen. 26:29, cp. Gen. 14:19). Isaac's response to Abimelech's entreaty is tersely recorded, "So he made them a feast, and they ate and drank. In the morning they rose early and took oath with one another; and Isaac set them on their way, and they departed from him in peace" (Gen. 26:30-31). Busse rightly comments that in both of these instances not only are the food and drink the integral parts of the covenant ceremony but the oath as well.[1] The oath is wanting in Gen. 14: 18-20 but this may be explained on the grounds that Melchizedek and Abram honoured the same god, El 'Elyon.[2] Or, perhaps, as he suggests, the giving of the tithe implies an oath.[3] The absence of a direct mention of an oath in the Melchizedek episode is of little significance in view of the fact which Busse has indisputably established[4] when the background reflects military activity, the partaking of bread and wine clearly indicates a covenant ceremony between actual or potential combatants. In the Semitic world as well as in the realm of ancient religions it is a frequent occurrence that the sharing of bread and wine in a fellowship of the table constituted a sacral fellowship which could not be lightly broken.

Articles on Place of Origin

In the later half of the 1920's two articles appeared which opened wide the discussion on the identification of Melchizedek's home city, Salem. The majority of scholars have maintained that Salem is Jerusalem. (1) In his essay, "Das Priesterkönigtum von Salem" S. Landersdorfer[5] endorsed an earlier suggestion of W. Erbt[6] that Salem

---

1. Cf. Ed. Busse, Der Wein im Kult des A. T., pg. 39.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., pp. 40f.

4. Cf. Ibid., pg. 40. See also W. R. Smith, Religion of the Semites, Rev. Ed., London, 1907, pp. 269ff. and J. Pedersen, Israel — Its Life and Culture I-II, Eng. Tr., Copenhagen, 1946, pp. 304f.

5. Cf. JSOR IX, 1925, pp. 203-216.

6. Cf. W. Erbt, Die Hebräer, Leipzig, 1906, pp. 71ff.

was not originally Jerusalem but rather Shechem.[1] Landersdorfer favoured the Shechem identification because of such passages as Gen. 33:18 (where Salem is said to be a city of Shechem) and Judith 4:4 (where Salem is a valley in the vicinity of Shechem) and because of the importance Shechem maintained in the history of Israelite kingship (cf. Ju. 9:3ff.; I Kings 12:1).[2] He tended to follow Erbt's view, perhaps too uncritically, that the Gilgal where Saul was anointed was the Gilgal near Shechem and not the Gilgal near Jericho,[3] but nonetheless succeeded in making the point that Shechem cannot be summarily ruled out as a plausible and correct identification for Melchizedek's Salem.[4] (2) In 1928 H. W. Hertzberg[5] evolved an extremely interesting theory which proposed to settle the matter of how it is that the traditions about Melchizedek seem to be associated with different localities. He submitted that the region of Mount Tabor was the origin of the traditions about the ancient priest king and the first Salem.[6]

---

1. A. Jeremias in The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient Past, Vol. II, pp. 26, 29f,, had also adopted this view. In the previous century A. Schlatter identified (following Robinson's suggestion) Salem with the village of Salim which was 2 or 3 hours East of Shechem, Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas, Stuttgart, 1893. Ewald and Tuch also were disinclined towards Jerusalem in favour of a Northern city, Salumnias: Scythopolis = Beth Shan after the identification of Jerome (against Josephus) in Ep. LXXXIII. 7 (ca. 398 A. D.). For the text of Jerome's letter see J. Labourt's edition, Saint Jérôme Lettres, Paris, 1949, Tome IV, pp. 19ff. For the references to Ewald and Tuch cf. Delitzsch, Genesis, Eng. Ed., pg. 396. F. M. Abel in his Géographie de la Palestine, Tome II, Paris, 1938, pg. 441, points out, however, that in the year 404 Jerome reverted to his earlier favouring of Jerusalem (cf. Ep. CVIII, 9). Other advocates of a Salem of the Jordan Valley were Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinarius and Eustatius of Antioch.

2. Cf. JSOR IX, 1925, pg. 210.

3. L. H. Grollenberg in Atlas of the Bible, Eng. Ed., 1956, London, pg. 150, lists 5 different Gilgals. The Gilgal mentioned in I Samuel, however, he includes among those passages which refer to the Gilgal "East of Jericho."

4. The identification of Salem with Shechem has been taken up most recently by Cameron Mackay in REQ, 1948, pp. 121-130.

5. Cf. JPOS VIII, 1928, pp. 169-179. The article is entitled, "Die Melkisedeq-Traditionen."

6. Melchizedek is prominent in the "Pilgrim literature" from the 10th to the 15th century A. D. (Cf. JPOS VIII, 1928, pg. 174 for references).

Thereafter, he suggested, the tradition shifted to Mount Gerizim (i. e. Shechem); thence to Jerusalem (and the temple area in particular) and finally, for the reason that Christ was called a priest after the order of Melchizedek, to Golgotha in the Christian era. Hertzberg's approach constituted an important step forward towards an adequate solution of the vexing problem of the Heimat of Melchizedek in that he sought to develop an explanation that would do justice to the obvious indications that Melchizedek was associated with more than one locale. Recent discussion on the identification of Salem has unfortunately tended to by-pass Hertzberg's strong position that the traditions about Melchizedek shifted from place to place and have inclined towards the weaker view that the tradition remained fixed in one spot.[1]

Kroeze's Dissertation

Reference has already been made to several twentieth century doctoral dissertations on the history of the exegesis of the Melchizedek passages.[2] The first was produced by the Roman Catholic scholar J. Jerome under the title Das geschichtliche Melchisedech Bild (1920) and the second by a Lutheran, Gottfried Wuttke under the title Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese (1927). A third dissertation on Melchizedek appeared ten years later under the title Genesis Veertien: Een Exegetisch-Historische Studie (1937). The author was J. H. Kroeze, a member of the Gereformeerde Kerk. Kroeze's learned study is of especial interest because it includes a transcription into Hebrew, a translation and a commentary of the celebrated Ras Shamra text, "The Birth of the

---

1. This is a tendency apparent, for example, in both the writings of Mackay,(cf. pg. 31, n.4) who favours an identification with Shechem and in those of H. H. Rowley who favours an identification with Jerusalem,' Festschrift für A. Bertholet, 1950, pp. 461-472.

2. Cf. pg. 3.

Beautiful and Gracious Gods."[1] It contains a thorough and detailed analysis of nearly all of the relevant problems attached to the exegesis of Genesis 14. The work is conservative theologically as well as imaginatively. Seldom does Kroeze venture an original suggestion towards the solution of any one of the chapter's vexing problems. He is concerned to show that it has its place in the grand plan of God's revelation and that the chapter is essentially correct in portraying Abraham against the background of world history: history is the place after all where the revelation of God is unfolded. At times Kroeze is exceptionally polemical. This is most apparent in his strong objection to the view of Gunkel and Kittel that the Israelite king acted as a priest.[2] Point by point he seeks to demonstrate that seemingly priestly actions of David, Solomon and other Israelite kings had nothing to do with their supposed office as priests. They were primarily actions based on their office as king.[3] Kroese is original in his utilization of Sellin's suggestion that vss. 17, 21-24 (the episode with the king of Sodom) are parallel to vss. 18-20.[4] The attitude of the king of Sodom is haughty and impertinent; the attitude of the king of Salem is gracious and beneficent. Abram's actions towards the king of Sodom do not so much reflect Abram's generosity towards the impertinent king, but rather his reverence to God. Here again, however, the author's interest seems to be in

---

1. Cf. J. H. Kroeze, Genesis Viertien, Hilversum, 1937, pp. 170-200. This interesting poem is translated and commented on by W. F. Albright in JPOS XIV, 1934, pp. 101-140 (also along with the poem of Al'yan Baal) by G. A. Barton in JBL LIII, 1934, pp. 61-78 and also by M. Virolleaud in Syria XIV, 128-151. It is not found in Pritchard's ANET.

2. Cf. J. H. Kroeze, op. cit., pp. 207-216.

3. In this stand can be seen perhaps a Protestant bias against all interpretations which support the widely held Roman Catholic view that Melchizedek's priestly offering of bread and wine is a prefiguration of the sacrifice of the Mass. Cf. ibid., pg. 99 where he subjects the Roman view to especially sharp criticism.

4. Ibid., pg. 112ff.

showing that not only the entire setting of the chapter but especially the parallelism between 17, 21-24 and 18-20 underline the royal, as opposed to the priestly, character of Melchizedek's acts. In discussing the historicity of the chapter Kroeze makes only a passing reference to source analysis,[1] but stands in agreement with the accepted view that the chapter has behind it Israelite and Canaanite sources.[2] The real key to the chapter is found in its political background in the time of the Elamite hegemony from the 21st to the 19th centuries B. C.[3] and in David's use of it (for political purposes) after the capture of Jerusalem.[4] In this latter opinion as in many others Kroeze is but lending support to a previously established position; in this instance R. Kittel had been the chief spokesman for understanding the later phases of the chapter against the background of David's kingdom.[5]

Nyberg and "Religionskampf" in Genesis 14.

In the year following the publication of Kroeze's thesis there appeared in Archiv für Religionswissenschaft a highly original article entitled, "Studien zum Religionskampf im Alten Testament."[6] The author was the noted Swedish scholar, H. S. Nyberg. Nyberg's argument is characterized by a creative and imaginative use not only of research in archaeology and patriarchal religion but of the extant biblical materials as well. He commences by adducing biblical and extra-biblical evidence for the existence of a god ʿal.[7] From passages such as I Sam. 2:10 and Ps. 18:14 he concludes that this god, who is also identical with ʾel and ʿelyon, is by nature a thunder god.[8]

---

1. Ibid., pp. 112ff.
2. Ibid., pp. 137ff.
3. Ibid., pp. 144ff.
4. Ibid., pp. 137ff.; 222ff.
5. Cf. Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Bd. 1, 5. and 6. Aufl., Gotha, 1923, pp. 286ff.
6. Cf. ARW XXXV, 1938, pp. 329-387.
7. Ibid., pp. 239-345.
8. Ibid., pg. 337.

Basing his case chiefly on the theories of J. Lewy who held that Salem (Sulmānu) and 'El 'Elyon were identical gods,[1] Nyberg sought to extend the names of this same deity ʿal to include also ʾEl Shaddai and Sidq.[2] Jerusalem was the centre of this many-named land god but his hegemony extended over a wide territory.[3] In Genesis 14 we have, Nyberg maintains, an example of Religionskampf (struggle of religions). The cities of the pentapolis which meet with destruction are destroyed by the all powerful, multinominous "god of the Amorites" because they do not reverence him.[4] The account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 19 is but a Yahwization of this earlier saga.[5] The chapter goes back to a period before 900 B. C. This is apparent not only from vocabulary names and other expressions, but especially from the naïveté of the piece.[6] In the same way that the chapter reflects the struggle of the Amorite religion against the recalcitrant region of the South, the figures Abram and Lot are not to be understood as private individuals but rather as the forefathers and representatives[7] of Israel and Moab-Ammon respectively.[8] The purpose of the tale of

---

1. Cf. Revue de l'histoire des Religions, Tome 110, 1934, pg. 64.

2. Cf. Nyberg, op. cit., pg. 356.

3. The territory corresponded roughly to the lands promised to Abram in Genesis 15:18. Cf. ibid.

4. Ibid., pp. 359ff.

5. Ibid., pg. 362.

6. Ibid., pg. 363.

7. The theory that the patriarchs and their associates were "representatives" or "personifications" of tribes and nations was put forward with greatest elaboration by C. Steuernagel in Die Wanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan, 1901. R. de Vaux discusses this theory and other theories on the patriarchs in his important article in RB LIII,1946, pp. 321ff. For further references, see below pp. 64ff.

8. Cf. Nyberg, op. cit., pp. 359f.

Abram's rescue of Lot is to show that Moab and Ammon have Israel to thank for their very existence. David utilized this aspect of the chapter when he extended the Israelite protectorate (Protektorat) to these lands.[1] And the account of Melchizedek he utilized as the ideological document on which he sought to base his recognition of the god ʾEl ʿElyon[2] and to establish his right to rule Jerusalem. In this sense Genesis 14 is an historical document. The worship of Yahweh is something that came to Israel only by way of Egypt. Prior to the Exodus the patriarchs in Canaan worshipped at first their family gods whom they had brought with them, but finally the land god of the Amorites whom they called ʾEl Shaddai. After the Exodus and occupation of Canaan by the Israelites Yahweh replaced the land god. It is not only possible, but probable that the worship of Yahweh by the patriarchs is something that was read back into the original story.[3] The patriarchal narratives reveal that this land god was worshipped at Shechem, Shiloh,[4] and Jerusalem. Jerusalem was the central shrine and the last to fall to Yahwism. Nyberg's theories, together with many of the miscellaneous and other studies reviewed above, will be considered below in appropriate places.

---

1. Ibid., pg. 376.
2. Ibid., pp. 375ff.
3. Ibid., pp. 364ff.
4. This is concluded from, among other things, Shilonite personal names, e.g. ʿEli, Elkanah and Samuel.

PARAGRAPH # 3.

THE FORMATION OF GENESIS 14.

In his first edition of the Penguin book, The Archaeology of Palestine, W. F. Albright concluded his treatment of the chapter under survey with these words, "Gen. XIV remains [therefore] an enigma which only the future can solve."[1] It is the contention of the present paragraph that a pathway to a solution of the enigma of Genesis 14 has already been blazed. In the following pages we will seek to show that the key to unlock its mystery is already in the hands of the present generation of students of the Old Testament. That key consists not in external evidence but is to be found within the chapter itself, in what Gunkel called its Unebenheiten, its rough edges. The chapter contains redundances; it contains awkward sentence constructions; it contains inconsistencies; and some of its verses seem to presuppose a context different from the present one. Precisely these characteristics furnish the clue to a sound and defensible interpretation of the chapter. They can be minimized, as they are, by many of the defenders of the chapter's historicity, or they can be emphasized by those sceptical of its historical reliability, but the best use of all is to follow their lead in reconstructing how the chapter came to acquire its present shape. Once this is done, once the different stages in the chapter's development have been clearly discerned, then the discussion of the matter of historicity may properly take place.

In the opinion of the present writer the trail to a sound interpretation of Genesis 14 was blazed in the writings of Winckler, Gunkel, Sievers and Procksch. As we have seen above in the previous paragraph each of these scholars subjected the literary aspects of the

---

1. Cf. The Archaeology of Palestine, 1949, pg. 236.

chapter to scrutiny. They arrive at solutions different in detail but have in common the view that the chapter reached its present state after much re-working and editing. This point of common agreement is the point of departure of the present investigation of the chapter. One eye has been kept on the work of these men, but primary regard has been directed to the chapter itself.

Stages of Development. Examination of Genesis 14 shows that five or six stages in its development are discernible. The marks of each successive stage are fairly obvious and the course of the chapter may be clearly traced. First they may be briefly listed and then commented upon.

Stage 1. An account of the fall of the king of Sodom and Gomorrah in the bitumen pits of the Valley of Siddim upon the occasion of a war with Admah and Zeboiim (vss. 8,10).

Stage 2. An account of Abram's rescuing the persons and property belonging to his captive relative Lot and of his dealings with the king of Sodom with regard to the property (vss. 11, 14, 17aα b α , 21-23).

Stage 3. An alternative account of the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah together with their allies (sic) Admah and Zeboiim in a battle against the kings of Elam, Goiim, Shinar and Ellasar. Characteristic of this account is its fondness for numbers and names (vss. 1-5aα 9).

Stage 4. Explanatory notes are added, possibly from a Deuteronomistic source, to fill in details of the itinerary followed by the invading eastern kings, of Abram's relationship with Lot, of his confederates, and of how he defeated his foe (vss. 5aβ -7,12,13,15, 17aβ ,24).

Stage 5. The Melchizedek episode is inserted into the above framework by a priestly source (vss. 18-20).

Glosses were added in the final stage of transmission (cf. vss. 2,3,7,8,17).

The above steps in the development of Genesis 14 may now be reviewed in turn.

Stage 1: A Period of Primitive Hostility. Scholars have long noted that only one king is mentioned in the MT of vs. 10 and he is "the king of Sodom and Gomorrah." The LXX, Samaritan Pentateuch and Peshitta read instead "the king of Sodom and the king of Gomorrah" -- a rendering which is certainly more in harmony with the third person plural in the verbs וַיָּנֻסוּ ("and they fled") and וַיִּפְּלוּ ("and they fell"). In vs. 8, however, where the kings of the Pentapolis are mentioned, but not named, the phenomenon which we have just observed in vs. 10 is reversed. That is to say, in vs. 8 the initial verb וַיֵּצֵא ("and he went forth") is in the third person singular even though the subject is apparently multiple. The most satisfactory explanation of these irregularities is that the king of Sodom was originally also the king of Gomorrah (deleting the second מֶלֶךְ in vs. 8 and reading, "the king of Sodom and Gomorrah" as in vs. 10). Vs. 8 spoke of his going forth (וַיֵּצֵא) to battle with the hostile kings from Admah and Zeboiim and vs. 10 of his demise in the bitumen pits. Some changes have been made in the verbs in vs. 10 and in a preposition (אִתָּן to אִתָּם) in vs. 8 to suit the present context. The irregular syntax which we have noted thus indicates that the original account of these vss. ran as follows:

> And the king of Sodom and Gomorrah went forth, and the king of Admah and the king of Zeboiim drew up in battle order against him in the Valley of Siddim. Now the Valley of Siddim had pits upon pits of bitumen and the king of Sodom and Gomorrah fled but he fell there and the survivors fled to the mountain.

Parallel Accounts of the Fall of Sodom and Gomorrah. It will be readily observed that the above vss. afford a remarkable, even though minute, parallel to the account of the fall of the valley of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 19. There, as well, the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah was connected with 1) a valley, 2) inflammable material[1] and 3) a

---

1. Cf. pp. 41ff. below

flight to the hills. For reasons that will become more apparent as investigation of the chapter procedes, it is submitted that these vss. as emended, constitute the original core of the chapter. They were altered as the context of the narrative changed. The alteration was not complete, however, and enough of the original form of the tale remains to enable a reconstruction such as the one here suggested.

According to a gloss in vs. 3 the Valley of Siddim is identified with "the Sea of Salt," i. e., with the Dead Sea. As we have had occasion to notice above a goodly number of scholars are of the opinion that this is a correct identification and that the Valley of Siddim may well be the shallow portion of the Dead Sea south of the peninsula of the Lisan.[1] In his famous study, Nöldeke was entirely amenable to the suggestion that עֵמֶק הַשִּׂדִּים should be altered to עֵמֶק שֵׂדִים and read "the Valley of Demons." Such a name, he averred, "could have been the actual popular designation of that awesome (schaurigen) region."[2] To the non-Palestinian the very real awesomeness of the southerly region of the Dead Sea can be easily overlooked and thereby the naturalness with which tales of dread and horror gravitated towards this region only imperfectly perceived. If due regard is paid to the peculiar character of the region it is not at all necessary to insist upon the acceptance or rejection of the reading "Valley of Demons." The eerieness and sense of desolation about the district continues to the present to make a lasting impression on its visitors as Dr. George Adam Smith has memorably recorded.

> These bitter and imprisoned waters, that are yet so blue and brilliant, chafe a low beach of gravel, varied by marl or salted marsh. Twice on the west side the cliffs come down to the water's edge and on the east coast there is a curious peninsula, called El-Lisan, The Tongue, though the shape is more that of a spurred boat. This is formed of steep banks of marl, from forty to sixty feet high, that shine over the blue waters like the walls of an iceberg. Elsewhere is gravel, clean and fair as the waters which lave it. But the gravel is crowned with an almost constant hedge of driftwood, every particle of which is stripped of bark

---

1. See pp. 16ff.

2. Cf. Nöldeke, op. cit., pg. 160 n. 3.

> and bleached. You could not imagine a more proper crown for Death. With this the brilliant illusion of the Dead Sea fades, and everywhere beyond, to the heights of the surrounding hills, reign violence and desolation. If the coast is flat you have saltpans, or a briny swamp; if terraced, there is a yellow, scurly stretch of soil, with few thorn-bushes and succulent weeds. Ancient beaches are visible round it, steep banks from five to fifty feet of stained and greasy marl, very friable, with heaps of rubbish at their feet, and crowned by nothing but their own bare, crumbling brows. Some hold that these gave the region its name, the Valley of Siddim; and in truth they chiefly haunt one's memory of the Dead Sea. Lost crumbling shelves of the upper world, there are not in nature more weird symbols of forsakenness and desolation.[1]

Out of this strange region the story of the fall of the king of Sodom and Gomorrah arose, and in it the story was kept alive. In some instances, as in the variation of Gen. 19,it has been greatly elaborated.

We have suggested above that the account of the demise of the king of Sodom and Gomorrah, in vss. 8 and 10 of Gen. 14 may be a miniature version of the account in Genesis 19. At first sight the similarity between the two tales seems quite remote. The chief point of difference is the means by which the cities were destroyed. In Genesis 19 the destructive agent was the well-known rain of fire and brimstone from heaven (Gen. 19:24); in Gen. 14 it was a fall into pits of bitumen. There is no mention of a fire in Genesis 14. A fairly recent scientific study of the Dead Sea s southerly region has, in the opinion of the present writer, opened up the possibility of an even closer relationship between the two tales of the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah. The following is an excerpt from the secular, non-theological, but scientifically reliable report of the American geologist, Frederick G. Clapp. The report was printed in 1936 and is entitled, "Geology and Bitumen of the Dead Sea Area, Palestine and Transjordan."

> Exudations of bitumen, petroleum and probably natural gas (since the last-named is generally an accompaniment of these substances), emerging throughout historical times, may have been erratic and have taken place wherever disastrous earthquakes or controlling subterranean pressure impulses were manifested. The seepages catching fire from lightning or human action, would adequately account for recorded phenomena without necessarily having recourse to supernatural or fanciful theories . . . . Bitumen from

---

1. G. A. Smith, The Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 25th Ed., pg. 502f.

> the earth is the most combustible material, especially as there are voluminous asphalt deposits . . . . about a mile west of Jebel Usdum . . . . In this spot one finds seepages of semi-fluid petroleum in the form of soft bitumen saturating tarry conglomerates of late Tertiary or Recent age, which have a reported volume of . . . . nearly 750,000 cu. ft. containing 140,000 cu. ft. of asphalt emanating either from below the surface or from contiguous Senonian limestones. The notorious 'slime pits' [KJV] . . . . were . . . . probably oil or bitumen seepages, 'mud volcanoes' or primitive hand-dug petroleum wells (perhaps a complex of asphaltic ground) such as have been observed by travelers in the Soviet Union, Iraq, and Iran during the past century.[1]

Practically every interpreter of Genesis 14 has either rejected or ignored the notion that a natural phenomenon -- such as the ignition of bitumen and natural gases by lightning or man, as suggested by Clapp -- lies behind the tradition of Genesis 14.[2] Although the theological attitude of Mr. Clapp is not to us commendable, his observation that a conflagration in the region of the Dead Sea bitumen pits may have given rise to the tradition of a "supernatural" destruction has much to commend it. To the inhabitants of Palestine the name חֵמָר ("bitumen") would readily connote "an inflamable substance." G. A. Smith remarks that it "burns like bright coal."[3] A fall into bitumen pits, therefore, may easily have been understood to have been a fall into a flaming inferno and may thus be the prototype of the long line of tales which dwell on the demise of sinful man. A natural phenomenon such as a burning of gases and the substance called bitumen may not appear to modern, scientific man to be of especial note or cause for comment. To man of the pre-scientific era, however, the occurrence of such a phenomenon could only have been viewed with astonishment and awe. If the occurrence were striking and unusual enough -- as the ignition of gases and bitumen would certainly have been -- it is only to be expected that

---

1. This excerpt is taken from J. Penrose Harland's article in the Biblical Archaeologist, Vol. VI, No. 3, Sept. 1943, pg. 49. Clapp's report was printed in The Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, 1936, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 881-909.

2. Cf., e. g., Nyberg, AFW 35, 1938, pg. 362, who directly opposes the idea. No reasons are given except that this runs against his explication of the chapter as the outgrowth of a religious struggle between two cults.

3. Cf. G. A. Smith, Historical Geography, pg. 501, n. 1.

a tradition conserving it should have emerged and developed in different directions. Thus the relationship between the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah under the rain of brimstone and fire from heaven (Gen. 19:24) and the fall of their king into pits of fire (i.e., ignited bitumen) may have been closer in origin than is commonly observed. In any event the above proposition has sufficient probability to warrant more serious attention than it has received.[1]

An Evaluation of Vss. 2 and 3.

Before proceeding to a consideration of the second stage in the formation of Genesis 14 one matter pertaining to the first remains to be treated. In his keen analysis of the chapter put forward in the second and third editions of his commentary on Genesis, O. Procksch has submitted that vss. 2-3 -- rather than vs. 8, as submitted above -- constituted the first part of the core of the chapter. According to Procksch these vss. should be read,

> Then Shinab, king of Admah, and Shemeber, king of Zeboim, and the king of Bela (that is, Zoar) made war with (את) Bera', king of Sodom and with (את) Birsha, king of Gomorrah. All of these joined forces in the Valley of Siddim (that is the Salt Sea).

When Procksch came to vs. 8, however, he did not attempt to explain the fact that the list of the kings of the Pentapolis and mention of a battle in the Valley of Siddim are both repeated; the vs. is simply called a "pleonasm." Explanations of any sort can only be conjectural; and the conjectures which merit greater acceptation are those that show themselves to be more probable. In the opinion of the present writer vss. 2 and 3 have the character of a marginal note on vs. 8. In the re-working of the chapter it appears that this note has been elevated to form part of the text. Procksch is surely right in pointing out that the absence of the particle את before the names of the kings of

---

1. If the sentiment expressed by F. Cornelius in his article, "Genesis XIV" (ZAW 72, 1960, pg. 6) is any criterion, it would appear that a return to a "natural" explanation for the origin of the story of the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah is regaining favour. Cornelius suggests that the Eastern Mediterranean earthquake of 1650 B.C. caused the ignition of gases in the region of the Dead Sea south of the Lisan peninsula. Whether such precision in dating is possible may be questioned.

Admah and Zeboiim may indicate that originally vs. 3 recorded a hostility that transpired between Sodom and Gomorrah, on the one side, and Admah, Zeboiim, and Bela, on the other. Vs. 8, however, suggests a different alignment. There the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah are not two men, but one. Furthermore, in vs. 8 none of the kings of the Pentapolis are named as they are in vs. 2. We have noted above that Sievers in his scansion of Genesis 14 saw, in the absence of the names of the kings in vs. 8 the clue to the chapter. The names were later additions, he claimed. In this judgement, it seems to us, Sievers was correct. Not only the verb in the singular, וַיַּעַז , suggests that we have in this vs. evidence of an earlier version, but also the absence of the names of the kings suggests the same. Conversely, the inclusion of the names of the kings in vs. 2 and the evidence that the battle was then set by two against three, instead of by one against two,[1] point towards a later stage of developement. We will return to a treatment of vss. 2 and 3 in the discussion of Stage 3 below.

Stage 2: Property is the Key.- The vss. that constitute the second stage in the development of Genesis 14 (vss. 11, 14, 16, 17aα bα, 21-23) have been probably the most poorly understood of any in the chapter. There can be no doubt that the great emphasis in the latter half of the chapter rests upon the fate of the property (רְכֻשׁ) of Sodom and Lot. With the exception of vss. 14 and 17, all of the vss. in Stage 2, deal with this subject. It seems to us that herein lies an important clue on the meaning of our chapter. What happens to the goods of Sodom and Lot, and particularly how Abram deals with them, is a point of central concern from vs. 11 onwards. Before proceeding to an examination of this concern, a closer look may be taken at the above-listed vss. themselves and our reasons for assigning them to the second stage of development.

---

1. וּמֶלֶךְ בֶּלַע הִיא צֹעַר ("and the king of Bela, that is Zoar") seems to the present writer to be an addition to the chapter made in the third stage. See below pp 52ff.

If read in succession they originally went as follows:

> And they took all the property of Sodom and Gomorrah[1] and went away. And Abram heard that his kinsman had been taken captive and he reviewed[2] his retainers[3], born in his house,[4] and pursued[5] as far as Dan. And he returned all the property and he brought back also Lot, his kinsman, and his property, and also the women and people. And the king of Sodom went forth to meet him[6] in the Valley of Saweh and the king of Sodom said to Abram, "Give me the persons and take the property for yourself." But Abram said to the king of Sodom, "I lift up my hand unto God[7] that I will not take a thread or a sandal thong or anything that belongs to you lest you should say, 'I have made Abram rich'."

Several factors commend the assignment of these vss. to the second formative stage.

1) In the first place vss. 17aα bα, 21-23 presuppose a different context from vss. 8, 10 in that the king of Sodom is portrayed as being alive and very much a central figure. These vss. cannot therefore have come from the same level of tradition which spoke about his demise.

2) Secondly, vs. 11, which introduces the section, does not seem to know anything at all about an <u>alliance</u> between Sodom and Gomorrah, and Admah and Zeboiim and Bela. The defeated party is Sodom and Gomorrah for it is reported that these two cities were despoiled of their goods. This fact suggests that the section of tradition introduced by vs. 11 knew only of <u>opposition</u> between the king of Sodom

---

1. וְאֶת־כָּל־אָכְלָם ("and all their provisions") seems to the present writer to be an addition made in the fourth stage of the chapter's development. The phrase relates to vs. 24 and was therefore added to the chapter together with that vs.

2. Reading וַיְרֻדְּק (דוק ר), following Gunkel <u>et al</u>. and esp. Köhler-Baumgartner's <u>Lexicon</u>, pg. 206. Albright suggests that the word should be translated "and he levied" from the <u>Accadian</u> daqu (<u>JSOR</u> X, 1926, pg. 262).

3. K-B prefer the rendering "followers" (pg. 315). Albright on the basis of Egyptian (Tanaach tablets) and Accadian (Boghaskōi) vocabularies, favours "armed retainer."

4. The number 318 is an addition from the third stage.

5. The LXX and Peshitta add, "after them."

6. אַחֲרֵי שׁוּבוֹ ג.ר.א. to אִתּוֹ ("after his return" etc. to "with him") were added in the fourth stage. See below, pp. 56ff.

7. הָאֵל עֶלְיוֹן (Elohim) from the Sam. Pent. It was later replaced by יְהוָה etc. after the insertion of the Melchisedek episode into the chapter. יְהוָה, as most commentators agree, was most likely an addition to eliminate all ambiguity as to the identity of El Elyon.

(and Gomorrah) and the three other kings. That a similar background is presupposed is borne out by the concluding vss. of the section (vss. 17aα b α, 21-23) where mention is made only of Abram's dealings with the king of Sodom over the matter of the recaptured goods. No mention is made of other kings. This second level of tradition therefore seems to have built upon the foundation of a story that reported a battle in which Sodom and Gomorrah alone were sacked of their goods. If that story included also a suggestion that Sodom and Gomorrah were in alliance with other cities, it is logical to expect that mention of the allied cities would have been made. It is somewhat dangerous to argue e silentio, of course, but the above reasoning is sufficiently sound to warrant the conclusion that, if these vss.(11, 14, 16, 17aα bα , 21-23) belong together, they came from a period when Sodom's relationship to Admah and Zeboiim and Bela was either unfriendly or casual.

3) A third factor which commends the correctness of the assignment of these vss. to the second formative level in the traditions of the chapter is the presence of the unifying theme, the fate of the property of Sodom and Lot. In vs. 11 we are told that the property has been taken; in vs. 14 this capture is reported to Abram who rallies and pursues with his retainers; in vs. 16 it is revealed that his mission was successful, the property is recovered; in vs. 17a the king of Sodom is introduced; in vs. 21 he addresses Abram asking only for the people but not his property; in vss. 22-23 Abram responds that he will not take even a sandal thong etc. lest the king of Sodom take the opportunity of boasting that he has made Abram rich. The unity of theme throughout these vss. is unmistakable; they are of a piece and therefore together presuppose a situation that knows neither of the downfall of the king of Sodom nor of his alliance with Admah, Zeboiim and Bela.

4) A fourth factor which supports the above contention is that examination of the intervening vss. (12, 13, 15 and 17aβ bβ) and the concluding vs. (24) shows them to be of a secondary and explanatory nature. The character of these latter vss. will be considered more

fully below in a discussion of the fourth level in the formation of our chapter.

The above remarks suffice to show that adequate justification is present for assigning precisely vss. 11, 14, 16, 17aα bα , 21-23 to that stage of tradition which was subsequent to the account of the fall of the king of Sodom and Gomorrah (vss. 8, 10) but antecedent to the account of his reported alliance with Admah, Zeboiim and Bela (vs. 2). We may now turn to a consideration of the central and unifying theme of this second stage in the development of the chapter, namely, the fate of the property of Sodom and Lot. Following a treatment of this theme we will consider the possible relationship of these vss. to one of the recognized sources.

A Suggested Re-Interpretation of Abram's Dealings with Sodom.

As stated above it is our contention that the vss. which comprise the second level of the traditions of Genesis 14 (vss. 11, 14, 16, 17aα bα , 21-23) have been misunderstood probably more than any other vss. in the chapter. Commentators of the different camps seem to make a truce when it comes to interpreting these vss. With almost one accord they aver that the vss. were written to show that Abram was a man of nobility (Sellin) and generosity (Gunkel, Driver, Skinner) and magnanimity (Procksch) and reverence (Kroeze). In the opinion of the present writer none of these views seems really to get to the heart of the matter. Much more than the generosity or nobility of the founding father is being asserted. In the first place we may note that pains are taken to underline that Abram did not take even the most minute particle that belonged to the king of Sodom ("neither a thread nor a sandal thong nor anything that belongs to you"). Perhaps we cannot arrive immediately upon an answer to the question why it is so strongly emphasized that Abram took nothing from Sodom and therefore that he did not owe his wealth to him, but we can take a clue from this emphasis and attempt to come to a satisfactory explanation of the manner in which it is set forth. In the second place we may note that for the most part Abram is dealing in these vss. with the king of Sodom -- and

Sodom is a place for which the Bible elsewhere has nothing good to say. The region in which it lay was, to be sure, "well watered everywhere like the garden of Yahweh' (Gen. 13:10) but its inhabitants were said to be "wicked, great sinners against Yahweh" (Gen. 13:13). Its very name became a by-word for sin and evil and that which Yahweh had singled out for an especially severe destruction on account of its wickedness (cf. Gen. 18:12; Dt. 29:22; Isa. 1:10; Jer. 49:18; 50:40; Am. 4:11 etc.). It is of course possible in these vss. of Gen. 14 that Abram's dealings with the king of Sodom are merely recorded as are his meetings with the Egyptian Pharaoh (Gen. 12) or with the Negebite king Abimelech and his entourage (Gen. 20). But in the light of the overwhelming verdict on Sodom in other parts of the Bible it is incumbent upon the interpreter to ask whether or not a similar attitude towards her king underlines Gen. 14 as well. It cannot, of course, be decided in advance what kind of outlook Gen. 14 has on the king of Sodom, i. e., whether it was neutralist or favourable or unfavourable, but neither can the matter be left unexamined if we are to arrive at a satisfactory exegesis.

On first appearance the attitude towards the king of Sodom in vss. 11, 14, 16, 17aα bα , 21-23 seems to be neutral. He figures in the narrative only because Lot happens to reside there. It is therefore passably satisfying to assert that Abram's refusal to take even the slightest particle of Sodom's property is but an indication of the greatness of his heart. The king might have been any other contemporary and the moral of the tale would remain the same: Abram is not self-seeking but rather benevolent to a highly refined degree! Such an interpretation has in any event by and large held the day. In the view of the present writer the crucial question is whether or not there is any special significance in the fact that precisely Sodom's goods are refused. He answers in the affirmative. That is, he is of the opinion that <u>the emphasis in these vss. dealing with Abram's relation with the king of Sodom is designed to show that the greatness of the founding father did not depend in any way whatsoever upon what he had received from Sodom</u>. The underlying attitude towards the king of Sodom is not

neutralist at all, but rather highly unfavourable.[1] The same attitude towards Sodom in other parts of the Bible obtains also in Genesis 14. Such a degree of opprobrium was attached to that name that in all likelihood, the present tradition of Gen. 14:11, 14, 16, 17aα bα , 21-23 arose to absolve the exalted father from every trace of defamation that might have arisen from the tales of his rescue of his kinsman Lot who resided in "Sodom".[2] It is submitted that such an interpretation does greater justice to the text of Genesis 14 than the favoured alternate approach which generally assumes that Abram's attitude towards Sodom is neutralistic and that his refusal of property over which Sodom may have had a claim was an act of magnanimity.

The above interpretation is corroborated to a great extent by an incident recorded in Genesis 23, namely, the purchase of the cave of Machpelah from the Hittites. To the average Israelite the means by which the burial ground of the patriarchs was acquired may have been a matter of indifference, but it surely was not to the Priestly source, to which provenance scholars unanimously assign Genesis 23. The ground was not given to Abraham, but was rather purchased for four hundred shekels of silver from Ephron the Hittite (Gen. 23:16). Thus the fathers rested in ground that was no longer Hittite, but genuinely and legitimately Israelite. A similar, legalistic point of view seems to inhere in vss. 11, 14, 16, 17aα bα , 21-23 of Genesis 14. The fate of the property (רְכֻשׁ) is closely followed; the king of Sodom says that he will be satisfied with the persons (נֶפֶשׁ) of the booty

---

1. Kroeze saw this esp. clearly. Cf. pp. 32ff above.

2. Israel's treatment of foreign spoils forms a remarkably close analogy to Abram's treatment in Gen. 14 of the goods to which the king of Sodom may have had a claim. Cf. Num. 21:1-3. Pedersen's description of the "old Israelite view" towards enemy property is also highly instructive in the present instance, "The enemy and all his property was pervaded by a soul foreign to Israel. In order to preserve themselves the Israelites had to exercise the utmost caution towards what was alien, and in all instances only appropriate what they could actually assimilate." (Israel - Its Life and Culture III-IV , Reprinted Copenhagen, 1947, pg. 27). Cf. also Ju. 1:17, Dt. 2:34f; Josh. 6-7; 10:28, 34, 37, 39f.; 11:10ff.

and that Abram can have the goods. Abram's response is designed to clear up the matter which was held to be of importance, namely, whether or not Sodom in any way contributed to his wealth. It may be observed that Abram not only refused the offer made by the king of Sodom but he goes one step further and takes nothing. In the same way he not only refused the offer of the Hittites in Genesis 23 but also went one step further and bought the desired field. In both instances the point at issue is the means by which, and the source from which, Abram acquires his property.[1]

The Source of the Material in Stage 2.

If we have been correct in maintaining that Genesis 23 throws light on the meaning of Abram's actions towards the king of Sodom in Genesis 14, it is likely that the two accounts come from a common provenance, P. Other factors strengthen the impression that this second stage of tradition in Genesis 14 came from a background similar to, if not identical with, that of P. It may be observed, for example, that vss. in this section presuppose that Abram is wealthy. The protestations in vss. 21-23 are made not to deny Abram's wealth but to deny that Sodom had any part in building it up. Two of the sources clearly speak about Abram's wealth, J and P (Gen. 13:2 and 13:5 (J); 13:6 and

---

1. The reader familiar with the views of Del Medico propounded in ZAW 69, 1957, pp. 160ff. will have noticed the similarity between his interpretation of the significance of Abram's refusal to accept goods from Sodom and the interpretation offered here. In the mind of the present writer, the weakness in Del Medico's view lies in his failure to pay sufficient regard to the associations with evil that inhered in the name Sodom. This same weakness led him to the notion that Israelite tradition at one time looked upon the king of Sodom as a "righteous king." All the available evidence points in the opposite direction.

24:34-35 (P)).[1] If there were more points of contact between the second stage of Genesis 14 and J, it would be entirely permissible to assert that it emanated from J. As it is, however, all of the points of contact indicate that the provenance had much in common with P, which also shares the teaching that Abram was a man of wealth. It is thus perhaps not by accident that the key words for "property, goods" (רְכֻשׁ) and "persons" (הַנֶּפֶשׁ) are both characteristic of the Priestly source.[2] As we have seen above the interest in the fate of the רְכֻשׁ of Sodom and Lot runs throughout the second stage in the development of the chapter. If vss. 11, 14, 16, 17aα bα , 21-23 are to be assigned to one of the recognized sources, evidence compels us to assign them to P.

Summary.- If the metaphor of a body may be used to describe the formation of Genesis 14, vss. 8 and 10 constitute the head; vss. 11, 14, 16, 17aα bα , 21-23 the torso; vss. 1-5aα , 9 a worldly headdress; and vss. 5aβ - 7, 12, 13, 15, 17aβ , 24 the filling in of the flesh.

---

1. No clear reference to Abram's worldly state is found in the third source, E, but if the first two vss. of the controversial oracle in Gen. 15: 13-16 belong to E, as is held possible by many scholars (e.g., Gunkel, Driver, Skinner, von Rad), E would stand in marked contrast to the other two sources. In those vss. (and esp. 14b) the holding of great possessions does not seem to be a present reality for the patriarch but rather a promise that will be fulfilled only after the exodus from bondage in Egypt. It is thus probable that in E Abram's state is closer to penury than affluence. On the part played by רְכֻשׁ in the assignment of this passage, cf. n. 2 below.

2. See S. R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 9th Ed., pg. 132, items 17 and 19. The רְכֻשׁ passages in P are Gen. 12:5; 13:6, 31:18; 36:7; 46:6; Nu. 16:32; 35:3. Driver was inclined not to assign Gen. 14:15 to P, thus displaying a reluctance to view the occurrence of רְכֻשׁ in a passage as an infallible linguistic guide. Gunkel, Skinner and Procksch (all in loc.) seem to say that such a passage could only have emanated from P. Such an execution of literary analysis on the basis of vocabulary alone seems to the present writer to be highly precarious. As observed above in note 1, the mention of רְכֻשׁ in Gen. 15:14 presupposes an entirely different outlook on Abram's state of worldly wealth than is presupposed by P in Gen. 13:6.

Passages in P in which נֶפֶשׁ in the sense of person or persons are: Gen. 12:5; 36:6; 46:15, 18, 22, 25, 26, 27; Ex. 7:1; 12:4, 16, 19; 16:16; Lev. 2:1; 4:2, 27; 5:1, 2; 17:12; 22:11; 27:2; Nu. 31:28, 35, 40, 46, etc.

Stage 3. Remoulding Old Traditions.- Vss. 1-5a∝ , 9 constitute the third stage in the development of the chapter. They may be commented upon more briefly than the first two stages. Essentially they recast the initial version of the conflict of the king of Sodom and Gomorrah over and against the king of Admah and the king of Zeboiim. In doing so they utilized vss. 2-3 which, as suggested above, seem to have originated first by way of marginal notes on the older tradition of vs. 8. The names given to the kings in those marginal notes were kept and the fifth (unnamed) king, the "king of Bela" may have been introduced either in the marginal notes or by the source that utilized them. In any event, the new array portrayed a band of four led by Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, over and against a band of five, led by the king of Sodom. An interest in numbers characterizes this level of tradition and it, like the previous stage, may thus have come from a priestly provenance.[1] The names of the kings have for a long time been the source of great interest and much speculation. Some of the names are highly colourful. In order that this aspect of these vss. might not escape notice, we have included the most acceptable English renderings of some of these names in the following translation.

> And it came to pass in the days of "The Mouth of God has spoken" (Amraphel)[2], king of Shinar,[3] "Arioch,"[4] king of Ellasar,

---

1. For the interest of P in numbers, see Driver, Intrg., 9th Ed., pg. 129.

2. So de Vaux, RB LV, 1948, pg. 332. On his identity, cf. ZAW 70, 1958, pp. 255f.

3. Shinar is read as Babel by both the Jerusalem Targum and Targum Onkelos. This reading in turn undoubtedly derives from the fact that Babel is associated with the "land of Shinar" in Gen. 10:10 (J) and 11:2 (J). The popularity of the identification of Amraphel of Shinar with Hammurabi of Babylon was thus strengthened by the biblical data.

4. For recent discussions on this name, see Noth in VT I, 1951, pp. 136-140. For a long time (cf. Kittel, GVI I, pp. 283f.) it was held that the monumental Rim-Sin, which can be pronounced Eriaku, was identical with Arioch. Rim-Sin was from Larsa. This identification enjoys no favour now. More recently scholars have been inclined to identify Arioch with Ar-ri-wu-uk, the son of Zimrilin of Mari (see de Vaux, RB LV, 1948, pg. 333). Noth seeks to shatter this attempt. It is generally agreed, however, that the name itself may be genuinely Hurrian. Cornelius in ZAW 72, 1960, pg. 2, takes the identification of Arioch further by submitting that Ellasar was the well-known Hurrian city of Alsija.

> "Chedorlaomer,"[1] king of Elam[2] and "Tidal,"[3] king of the nations (that these kings) made war upon "Evil Son" (Bera),[4] king of Sodom, upon "Wickedness Son" (Birsha),[5] king of Gomorrah, "The Moon is Father" (Shinab),[6] king of Admah,[7] "Shem is Mighty,"[8] king of Zeboiim, and Bela.[9] All these marched together to the Valley of Siddim. They had served "Chedorlaomer" twelve years but on the thirteenth they rebelled. And in the fourteenth year "Chedorlaomer" and the kings who were with him intervened . . . . with "Chedorlaomer," king of Elam, and "Tidal," king of the nations, and "The Mouth of God has spoken," king of Shinar and "Arioch," king of Ellasar, four kings against five.

In addition to the above vss. the number 318 may have been inserted by the same source into vs. 14. The mention of "Chedorlaomer" in vs. 17 may come from this same stage, but it, together with other explanatory notes, we are inclined to assign to the fourth stage.

Stage 4: In Answer to the Demand for Explanations.- The fourth level of tradition in the formation of Genesis 14 is comprised

---

1. This name has for a long time been held to be a genuinely Elamite name even though there is monumental evidence only for the elements of which the name is comprised.

2. Elam is mentioned, as is Shinar, in the famous geneaology of nations in Genesis 10 and is listed there (vs. 22 - P) as the first son of Shem. For further remarks on this place and the others mentioned in the chapter, cf. de Vaux, RB LV, 1948, pp. 332ff.

3. Scholars have for a long time inclined towards an identification with the monumental Tudhalia of Northern Syria or Asia Minor. Cf. de Vaux, RB LV, 1948, pp. 333f. and Cornelius, ZAW 72, 1960, pg. 3. Because the epithet "king of the nations" is almost identical to an epithet used of the leader of the Hyksos who went into Palestine with Hammurabi, Cornelius is inclined to date the campaign of Gen. 14 in the latter years of Hammurabi, i. e., c. 1694-86.

4. Cf. Albright, JPOS I, 1921, pp. 69f., Nyberg, ARW 35, 1938, pg. 352.

5. Ibid.

6. Cf. Albright, JSOR X, 1926, pg. 259.

7. Admah and Zeboiim are generally mentioned, as they are in Gen. 14, with Sodom and Gomorrah, with the exception of Hos. 11:8. Cf. Gen. 10:19 and Deut. 29:22, Hos. 11:8 is commonly taken by scholars to be an indication that Admah and Zeboiim were originally in the North and had nothing to do with Sodom and Gomorrah, but were added to this chapter only as later glosses. (Cf. e. g., Gunkel, Genesis, 4 . Aufl., pg. 280). The view taken in the present study is that Admah and Zeboiim were originally foes of Sodom and Gomorrah (following Procksch).

8. Cf. Albright, JSOR, X, 1926, pg. 259.

9. Bela may have meant "Swallowed," cf. Jer. 51:44 and K-B, pg. 131.

chiefly of explanatory notes (5aβ - 7, 12, 13, 15, 17aβ , and 24).

These may be cited and commented upon in turn.

> And they smote giants (Rephaim)[1] in Two-horned Ashtaroth,[2] the "Mighty Men" (Zuzim)[3] in Ham, the "Terrors" (Emim)[4] in the plain of Kiriathaim (the plain of the two cities?)[5] and the Horites[6] in the mountains of Seir[7] as far as

---

1. Cf. esp. Deut. 2:10-12, 20-21. N. B. LXX γίγαντες According to Albright, Karge has succeeded in proving in a work entitled Rephaim that the cairns and dolmens of Transjordan were ascribed by the Israelites to the Rephaim (JSOR X, 1926, pg. 260).

2. This city, Ham and Shaveh Kiriathaim are all located in Transjordania. Cf. Albright who reads Ashteroth we Karnaim, i. e. Ashteroth and Karnaim as if it were a question of two separate cities. They were, he asserts, only an hour's walk apart and thus were quite naturally mentioned together. (Ibid., n. 60).

3. Probably identical with the Zamzummim of Deut. 2:20-21 who were also of the lineage of giants. The LXX calls them ἔθνη ἰσχυρά.

4. Cf. Deut. 2:10-12 and BDB, pg. 34. K-B translates "frightening beings."

5. For the translation of שָׁוֵה as "plain" (or "large valley") cf. de Vaux, RB LV, 1948, pg. 329, BDB pg. 1000 and K-B pg. 954. It is probable that קִרְיָתַיִם is the dual of קִרְיָה ; cf. K-B pg. 856, BDB pg. 900. Albright prefers to read, Shaveh we Kiriathaim as he does in the instance cited in n. 2. The latter spot he identifies with "the well-known Moabite place of the name, between Madeba and Dibar" (JSOR X, 1926, pg. 261). Biblical references are Jer. 48:1, 23; Ez. 25:9; Nu. 32:37; Jos. 13:19.

6. The Horites are now identified as the Hurrians. Cf. K-B, pg. 333. Formerly the name was understood to mean "cave-dwellers" for which view cf. BDB pg. 360.

7. Seir is elsewhere used as the name of the territory of the land of Edom (Gen. 32:4; 36:30; Ju. 5:4; Nu. 24:18 etc.) or as the name of the mountains in Edom (Gen. 36:8-9; Deut. 1:2; 2:1-15; Ez. 35:2-3, 7, 15 etc.). As has been long recognized Seir (שֵׂעִיר) also figures prominently in the story of Esau, the heros eponymos of Edom. That his hands are said to be שֵׂעִר (śair, i. e., hairy) in Gen. 27:11ff. is generally acknowledged to be a conscious play on words which underlines the relationship of Esau to the territory called Seir (שֵׂעִיר). It is of interest that Lot (=Lotan) probably also enjoyed a long standing relationship to the Edomite district named Seir. In Gen. 36:20 in any event, a certain Lotan is the first named son of Seir, the Horite. Skinner observes (in loc.) that nunation in Edomite name endings such as -ān and -ōn is frequent. In this regard it is of further interest to note that in vss. attributed to P, the relationship of Abram and Lot is very similar to the relationship between Jacob and Esau. In Gen. 12:6 Abram and Lot separate because the land could not support them both; in Gen. 36:6ff. Jacob and Esau separate for the same reason. It is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory explanation for this obvious, but seldom noticed, duplication of tradition.

El-paran[1] which is by the wilderness. And they turned back and entered the Fountain of Judgement[2] and they smote all of the country of the Amalekites[3] and also the Amorites[4] who were dwelling in Hazazon of the Palm[5] (vss. 5aβ - 7).

. . . . and all of their provisions . . . . (vs. 11).

And they took Lot, the son of Abram's brother, and all of his property and they went away; and he was dwelling in Sodom. And one who had escaped came and told Abram, the Hebrew; and he was dwelling by the oaks of Mamre, the Amorite, his brother "Grape Cluster" (Eshcol), and his brother Aner; and these were partners[6] of a covenant of Abram (vss. 12-13).

And he divided himself against them by night, he and his servants, and he pursued them as far as Hobah which is north of Damascus (vs. 15).

---

1. Paran is located on the Gulf of Aqabah and is identified with Elath 'ar Aila. Cf. Kraeling, Bible Atlas, pg. 67. According to K-B אֵל may mean "large, mighty tree," pg. 37. According to the older BDB it may have meant "terebinth" or "palm," pg. 18.

2. So the LXX τὴν πηγὴν τὴν κρίσεως . The spot is identified by a gloss as being identical to Kadesh. An interesting discussion on the significance of En Mishpat as a centre for litigation ceremonies is found in VT IV, 1954, pp. 41-49 in an article by Matitiahu Tsevat entitled, "The Canaanite God Šälaḥ." Robertson Smith in Religion of the Semites, 2nd Ed., pg. 181 put forward a similar view.

3. The Amalekites were predatory nomads. Cf. the excellent survey of the biblical material on the Amalekites by M. Noth in Ueberlieferüngsgeschichte des Pentateuch, pp. 127ff.

4. K-B lists 3 main uses of the term אֱמֹרִי in the plural: (1) the people separated from Moab by the Arnon (Nu. 21:13, 32; Deut. 1:24; Judg. 10:8; etc.); (2) in lists of peoples along with Canaanites etc. (Gen. 15:21; Ex. 3:8; Deut. 7:1; Jos. 3:10; 11:3; Ju. 3:5; Ne. 9:8; etc. and (3) as anterior residents of Western Palestine (Gen. 48:22; Jos. 10:5; Ju. 1:35). The use in Gen. 14:7 comes under (2) and (3). An older, but fairly detailed and useful, discussion of the term may be found in T. H. Robinson's A History of Israel, pp. 36-40.

5. According to II Chron. 20:2 Hazazon Tamar is identical with Engedi. Cf. BDB pg. 346 which favoured locating the city on the West side of the Dead Sea. Grollenberg in his Atlas of the Bible, locates it 7-8 miles south of the southern end of the Dead Sea (Map 4, pg. 29). Cf. also his legend on pg. 151.

6. Or confederates. Cf. K-B pg. 137 and BDB pg. 127.

> . . . . after his return from the slaughter of Chedorlaomer and the kings who were with him (vs. 17aβ) . . . .
>
> Only that which the young men have eaten and the share of the men who went with me, Aner, Eshcol and Mamre, let these take their share (vs. 24).

The following may be said on the character and interrelation of these verses.

Vss. 5aβ - 7 do not seem to emanate from the same circle as the others do. They are closely related to the "editorial notes" or "antiquarian notices" of Deut. 2:10-12, 20-22 wherein mention is also made of (1) the Emim, (2) Rephaim, (3) Horites in the region of Seir, and (4) the Zamzummin (=Zuzim). The term "Amorite" (cf. Gen. 14:7) recurs in Gen. 14:13, but there is no obvious attempt to link Mamre, the Amorite, in the latter vs. with the Amorites who dwelt in Hazazon of the Palm. It would rather seem that the two references were originally made without regard to, or knowledge of, the other. As will become apparent, the character of vss. 5aβ - 7 is nonetheless remarkably similar to other explanatory notes in the chapter and they may rightly be classified together as constituents of the fourth stage in its development. These vss. not only supply an itinerary of the Eastern kings, but may also provide an answer to a question posited by Deut. 2:10-12, 20-22. The latter passages relate that the Rephaim (also called Zamzummin and Emim)formerly inhabited Moab and Ammon. Thus Gen. 14: 5-7 may well have arisen out of a demand for more information pertaining to the demise of the Rephaim in the lands they formerly inhabited.

It has been recognized for a long time that vs. 12 is not of a piece with vs. 11. In vs. 11 it is said, "And they took all of the property of Sodom and Gomorrah . . . .[1] and went away. The redundancy

---

1. It is possible that the omitted phrase "and all of their provisions (וְאֶת־כָּל־אָכְלָם)" was original to vs. 11, but in view of the assertion in vs. 24 that "the young men have eaten (אָכְלוּ)" it seems likely that this phrase was added along with the other refinements of the story in vss. 13 and 24.

of vs. 12 is unmistakable, "And they took Lot, the son of Abram's brother, and all of his property and they went away; and he was dwelling in Sodom." It will have been observed that the verb וַיִּלְכוּ ("and they went away") is repeated as well as the reference to property. Vs. 12 thus seems to come from a source that did not presuppose that the residence of Lot in Sodom was well known. Perhaps it arose in the course of time as an advisable, if not indispensable, reminder to the hearers so that surprise would not overtake them at the mention of the rescue of Lot later on (vs. 16). The presence of vs. 12, in any event, suggests that it may not have been customary to recite the chapter in connexion with other tales in the Abram-Lot cycle.

The closely related vss. 13 and 24 show with exceptional clarity the type of interests which characterizes the fourth stage in the development of Genesis 14. They inform the hearer by what means Abram heard that his kinsman had been captured (vs. 13a); they instruct him that Abram was not unmindful in his oath to the king of Sodom that his slaves and confederates had, of necessity, already eaten part of the booty (vs. 24a); they make the account of Abram's defeat of Chedorlaomer all the more plausible in that Abram's forces are comprised in these vss. not only of the retainers born in his house but also of partners or confederates who must have been very nearly his equal (vs. 13b); and, finally, they relate the disposition of the goods in the booty down to the finest detail: Abram's allies received their share along with the king of Sodom while Abram himself took nothing (vs. 24b). These vss. are the result of a demand for greater detail, coherence and consistency. They posit the answers to the searching questions which undoubtedly arose during the telling of the earlier stages of the chapter. The חֲנִיכָיו יְלִידֵי בֵיתוֹ ("retainers born in his house") were understood to be young men and were referred to as such (הַנְּעָרִים) in vs. 24. The part which the retainers played in the defeat of Chedorlaomer is thus not denied but rather presupposed and interwoven into the enlarged version of the chapter.

Vs. 15, like vss. 13 and 24, presupposes the second stage (vss. 11, 14, 16, 17aα bα , 21-23) in the growth of Genesis 14. This is clear from the fact that the vs. mentions the "slaves" (עֲבָדָיו) of Abram, which is an obvious reference to the חֲנִיכָיו ("retainers") of the second stage. Like vss. 13 and 24, vs. 15 also seems to have arisen out of a demand for more detail and explanation than was afforded by the briefer, earlier version of Abram's conquest. The vs. thus not only relates the names of the places in which the defeat was inflicted, but also the time of day at which it occured as well as the stratagem (the division of his forces) used to effect it.

Vs. 17aβ reflects the common interest found in vss. 13, 15, and 24, namely, the desire to fill in certain details which were omitted by the previous stages of tradition. This part of vs. 17a relates the precise time at which Abram met the king of Sodom. In view of the mention of "Chedorlaomer and the kings who were with him" it presupposes, with vss. 13, 15 and 24, an earlier stage of the chapter.

We have thus seen that even though the vss. which comprise the fourth stage in the development of Genesis 14 do not all come from the same hand, they may be grouped together as "explanatory notes." As we had occasion to remark before, they do serve the function of adding greater body to the entire tale. Aside from the fact that vss. 5aβ - 7 are undoubtedly closely related to the "antiquarian notices" of Deut. 2:10-12, 20, 21, the notes of the fourth stage carry no sure signs of a relationship with other known sources. Vs. 13, 15, 17aβ and 24 are most likely themselves related in view of their common interest in precision of detail. It may be observed, however, that these latter vss. appear to be of the same lineage as the Book of Jubilees. Like the Book of Jubilees these vss. speak to rationalistic objections that might have been raised with regard to an earlier layer of biblical tradition. In re-working the narratives of Genesis, Jubilees went further, of course, than these few vss. in Genesis 14. Nonetheless the same process was at work in both instances: difficulties in the biblical narrative are explained, gaps are supplied, the spirit of the older tradition is

made to be more in accordance with the outlook and spirit of the new day.[1] As long as there is vitality within a religious faith such a process is never ending. The earlier traditions had to be interpreted in order to remain authoritative. Inevitably interpretation meant a re-interpretation which spoke, it was believed, more directly and effectively to the questions and needs of the contemporary generation.[2]

Stage 5: Interpolation.- The fifth stage in the development of Genesis 14 is found in vs. 22b (in the phrase "El 'Elyon begetter[3] of heaven and earth") and in vss. 18-20, the so-called Melchizedek episode.[4]

> And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was a priest to El 'Elyon. And he blessed him and said:
>
> Blessed is Abram unto El 'Elyon, begetter of heaven and earth; And blessed is El 'Elyon who delivers thine adversaries into thine hands.
>
> And he gave him a tithe from all.

Scholars of all camps are virtually unanimous in the opinion that vss. 18-20 were not originally of a piece with vss. 17, 21-24. Most commentators hold them to have been an interpolation into the

---

1. R. H. Charles says of Jubilees, "In the course of re-editing he incorporated a large body of traditional lore, which the midrashic process had put at his disposal, and also not a few fresh legal enactments that the exigencies of the past had called forth. His work constituted an enlarged Targum on Genesis and Exodus, in which difficulties in the biblical narrative are solved, gaps supplied, dogmatically offensive elements removed, and the spirit of later Judaism infused into the primitive history of the world." (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Vol. II, pg. 1). The similarity of Jubilees with vss. 13, 15, 17aβ, and 24 in the fourth stage of the development of Genesis 14 is apparent.

2. The phenomenon of interpretation by a later day which amounts in reality to a re-interpretation is one which we shall have occasion to observe again. See below our comments on the changing understanding of vs. in Ps. 110, pp.163f.

3. "Maker," "possessor" and "creator" are also valid translations of קֹנֵה. "Begetter" is to be preferred because the idea of procreation generally inheres in קנה when found in a similar context. Cf. our discussion below, pp.112ff.

4. As Procksch has conclusively demonstrated, the phrase "El 'Elyon etc." in vs. 22 was not original but was added later to help make vss. 18-20 better harmonize with their context. Against Procksch the present writer holds that יהוה was not original either but rather הָאֵל יְהוִה. See above pg.45, n. 7.

latter vss.[1] And with good reason. (1) The flow of the narrative is altogether smooth if vs. 21 is read immediately after vs. 17. (2) Vss. 18-20 are more poetical in form and language than vss. 17, 21-24 from which they may be easily distinguished.[2] (3) In vs. 17 the king of Sodom is portrayed as the one who has come forward to meet Abram. In vs. 18, however, no mention of the king of Sodom is found at all, rather a new figure is introduced who had not been previously mentioned and who is not mentioned again after vs. 20. (4) The mention of the tithe in vs. 20, but silence about it elsewhere, can best be explained on the supposition that vss. 18-20 were a late interpolation. According to the present context it seems most probable that the reader is intended to conclude that Abram gave a tithe to Melchizedek out of the booty which he had brought back with him from the defeated kings. In vss. 21ff. pains are taken to show that Abram did not want even a shoe lace of the booty for himself; in vs. 24 the exact break down of the booty is given presumably to demonstrate that, as he had claimed, Abram received none of the booty.[3] In view of this minute break down it is more than likely that explicit mention would also have been made of Abram's tithe to Melchizedek if the stage of tradition in which vs. 24 is contained (Stage Four) had had at its disposal the Melchizedek episode of vss. 18-20. As it stands, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Melchizedek episode was not known by the compiler or composer of the fourth stage in the development of the chapter. Had the account of Abram's giving of a tithe to Melchizedek been known at the time when the fourth state

---

1. For an exception to this general opinion, see Sellin's view on pg. 26.

2. Cf. esp. Sievers, Metrische Studien II, pp. 267ff.

3. As noted above in our treatment of Stage Two, an accounting for the fate of the booty is given down to the minutest detail. The bulk of it is given to the king of Sodom, but it is acknowledged that the "young men" (i. e. "retainers" first mentioned in vs. 14 (Stage Two)) had eaten part of the provisions and it is requested that the "men" (i. e. confederates of Abram mentioned in vs. 13 (Stage Four)) be permitted to "take their share."

of the chapter reached its present state, the chances are that it could not have been easily overlooked. We therefore submit that there is ample justification for the assumption that vss. 18-20 comprise the fifth stage in the development of Genesis 14.

Its Appositeness.- Even though vss. 18-20 bear unmistakable signs of an origin different from that of the rest of the chapter, several factors make these vss. especially suitable to their context. (1) Kroeze, following Sellin, has pointed out that the friendly and intimate relations between Abram and Melchizedek afford an instructive contrast with the overt hostility Abram displays towards the king of Sodom. (2) Melchizedek's blessing includes the phrase "blessed be El 'Elyon who delivers (or, who has delivered) thine adversaries into thine hands." This phrase seems to presuppose a victory by Abram over his adversaries and thus goes remarkably well with the context of the chapter which reports that Abram routed Chedorlaomer and the kings with him. (3) It may be noted that the Melchizedek episode occurs immediately following the explicit reference to Abram's "slaughter" (הַכּוֹת) of Chedorlaomer (vs. 17). Even though the episode interferes with the natural flow of the narrative from vs. 17 to vs. 21, its setting precisely after vs. 17 strongly suggests that the interpolator intended the hearer and reader to understand that the priest king Melchizedek made a covenant with the warrior Abram not so much for Abram's sake as his own. As we observed above in our summary of Busse's important interpretation of the Melchizedek episode, bread and wine indicate elsewhere in the Bible (Gen. 26:30f.; Josh. 9:3ff.) that a covenantal meal has transpired.[1]

Notwithstanding these points of contact between vss. 18-20 and the rest of the chapter, the conclusion reached above that these vss. are an interpolation remains valid. The interpolation was apposite, as we have just seen, but these observations on its appositeness do not in any way confound the arguments adduced to demonstrate that the Melchizedek

---

1. Cf. above pp. 28ff.

episode is an insertion into the originally unified context of vss. 17, 21ff. The present context of vss. 18-20 cannot therefore be assumed to contain definitive or infallible clues as to the correct original meaning of these vss. The vss. should be examined themselves apart from their context and internal clues investigated if we are to arrive at a reliable interpretation of the original significance of the Melchizedek episode.

Probable Antiquity.- In the same way that the interpolatory character of the Melchizedek episode need not obscure its points of contact with the rest of the chapter, so its lateness as a newcomer into the chapter need not lead to the conclusion that the account of the episode itself also originated at a late date. As is well known to the student of the psalms, it is difficult to set with any degree of precision the date of much Hebrew poetry. Occasionally an archaism of style or expression betrays the great antiquity of a piece. A. Causse, in his pioneer work in the study of the oral traditions in the Old Testament, Les Plus Vieux Chants de la Bible (1926), has submitted that the Melchizedek blessing is "a cultic benediction of very ancient colour."[1] He places it in a class with other brief, chiefly rhythmic, primitive chants such as war cries, work songs, cultic and magic formulae, which comprise the oldest class of poetry in the Bible. Specific songs listed include the song of the vendetta of Lamech (Gen. 4:23, 24), the song of the ark (Num. 10:35, 36), the saying against Amalek (Ex. 17:16), the cry of Gideon's men (Ju. 7:18). the chant of Miriam (Ex. 15:21), as well song (Num. 21:17-18), a blessing on departure (Gen. 24:60), ancient maledictions (e. g. Num. 22:6; Ju. 5:23; Isa. 15, 16; II Kings 13:14-19; Deut. 27:15-26; Josh. 6:26; Gen. 9:25-27), and funeral laments (Am. 5:16; Jer. 22:18; I Kings 13:30). It may be argued with considerable justification that these poems are so diverse in nature that all of them could not possibly come from the same stage. Causse openly acknowledges

---

1. Les Plus Vieux Chants de la Bible, Strasbourg, 1926, pg. 18.

that Gunkel's categorization is more precise.[1] Despite the good points of the latter, however, Causse rejects it as being too artificial in complexity -- a schematization designed to serve the purposes of criticism rather than one which corresponds to reality. Causse himself spent little time in attempting to date with precision the poems he discusses. He nonetheless maintains that a formula, such as the Aaronic blessing, may have gone back to the time of Moses and should be assigned to the oldest epoch of Hebrew poetry even though it is found in the Priestly Code.[2]

Matters affecting the date of the Melchizedek blessing will engage our attention below and especially in Paragraph # 4, but may be introduced here. Melchizedek's god, El 'Elyon, is best interpreted as meaning El, grandson of the deity, 'Elyon.[3] From the Ugaritic texts we know that El enjoyed a hegemony among the deities of the West-Semitic pantheon well before the middle of the second millenium; the blessing therefore very probably goes back to the same period before the middle of the second millenium B. C.[4] In any event, even though the Melchizedek episode was late in finding its way into Genesis 14, there do not seem to be any compelling reasons for assigning the episode to a correspondingly late period. On the contrary, it bears indications of considerable age.

---

1. Ibid., pg. 35, n. 1., "Gunkel, in his Israelitische Literatur, Die Kultur der Gegenwart I, Vol. VII, and in his articles "Profane Dichtung im A.T." and "Psalmen" in Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, maintains that he is able to subdivide the oldest epoch of biblical literature into: (1) private and profane poetry, songs of victory, funeral laments; (2) political poems, royal songs, songs of combat and victory; satirical songs; pseudonymous benedictions and maledictions; and (3) cultic songs: hymns, lamentations, songs of sacrifice."

2. Ibid., pg. 18

3. Cf. below pp. 105ff.

4. The antiquity of the blessing is reflected esp. in the word קֹנֵה ("Creator" or "Begetter") which undoubtedly reflects the background of a second millenium mythology in which 'Elyon was the procreator of heaven and earth. Cf. below, pp. 112ff. where this point is developed. Cf. also M. Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. II, 1955, pg. 83. For a contrary view on the age of קֹנֵה in Gen. 14, cf. Meinhold, 1. Mose 14, 1911, pg. 45, n. 1.

Vital to Interpretation.- Unquestionably one of the most important matters to be settled before a satisfactory explanation of the original Melchizedek episode can be attained is to determine who Melchizedek and Abram were. This may seem to be a "tall order," in the first place, because so little is known about Melchizedek and, in the second place, because so many divergent views have been propounded regarding the patriarch Abram. Nonetheless by examining the characteristics of other non-Israelite figures[1] and by summarizing the key attitudes towards the patriarchs, the student can arrive at some fairly sound conclusions. It will be more convenient to commence with a consideration of the most favoured opinions on the patriarchs.

1. Summary of Views on Patriarchs.- By the patriarchs we mean Abram, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, Esau and Joseph. Five basically different views on the patriarchs may be distinguished.

---

1. Melchizedek is almost universally acknowledged to be a non-Israelite figure. The Rabbis recognizing the threat to the prestige and authority of Abram that would ensue if he were openly acknowledged as such, propounded the view that Melchizedek was the Israelite Shem. It is interesting to note that Luther also accepted the Shem-Melchizedek identification. For further discussion and references, see the Jewish Encyclopedia VII, pg. 450 and Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXVIII, 1957, pp. 127ff.

(1) The Patriarchs were historical persons and their names individual personal names.[1] This view has been traditionally popular among archaeologists and has been advocated by noted scholars such as R. Kittel.[2]

---

1. It is widely held that the name Abraham is an Aramaic form of the name Abram (so Albright, "The Name Shaddai and Abram," JBL LIV, 1935, pg. 203; Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen, 1928, pg. 145, n. 1; Gressmann, ZAW 30, 1910, pg. 2 and n. 4). Woolley in his controversial book Abraham, London, 1936 follows an earlier suggestion of Montgomery's and suggests that the form Abraham derives from an Arabic spelling, pg. 274. K-B refer to I. Eitan's note ("Two Onomatological Studies" in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 49, 1929, pp. 30ff.) in which he submits, "The two forms אברם and אברהם must then represent two etymologically different names, the first and earlier are apparently of Babylonian origin, the second and later one of Western-Canaanitish or Amoritic -- extraction." Even though Albright does not deal directly with Eitan's note, he does not accept the arguments Eitan utilizes. Albright's article contains the fullest survey of contemporary discussion on the subject. He submits that the name Abram does not mean, as it has been widely held, "exalted father" or "the father is exalted" or even, as Lewy suggested, "The god Ram is father," but rather "He is exalted with respect to father." Albright thus apparently does not take the element אב to be, in this instance, theophorous. He thus goes against the opinion of scholars of considerable authority. M. Noth in Die israelitischen Personennamen, pg. 69, asserted "Als Subjekte sind (aber) אב und אח ohne Zweifel theophore Elements." Of like opinion were Nestle, Gray, Kerber, Ulmer and Lagrange. To Noth the elements אב and אח reflected the relationship that was thought to inhere between the god and the tribe, i. e., the name reflects the belief that their god was to them a father or brother. For further references see Noth, Die isr. Personennamen, pg. 75. For discussion and reference on the meaning of other patriarchal names, see R. de Vaux, "Les Patriarches Hébreux et les Découvertes Modernes" (1), RB LIII, 1946, pp. 323f.

2. Cf. R. Kittel, GVI I, 5. u. 6. Aufl., 1923, Par. 26, "Die sogenannten Volksväter: Personen? Stämme? Götter," pp. 270ff.

A. Jirku,[1] A. Alt,[2] M. Noth,[3] W. F. Albright,[4] R. de Vaux,[5] and H.H. Rowley.[6]

---

1. Cf., e. g., ZAW 39, 1921, pp. 152-156; 313-314.

2. Cf. esp. his epoch-making study of patriarchal religion, "Der Gott der Väter," (BWANT III/12, 1929, and reprinted in Kleine Schriften, Bd. I, pp. 1-78). Alt was sharply critical of the older view that the patriarchs were read back into the history of Israel and readily acknowledged that the subject of patriarchal religion is intimately bound up with the patriarchs themselves (Kl. Schr., I, pp. 30ff.) Even though Alt maintained that "The god of Abraham," "The Fear of Isaac," and "The Mighty One of Jacob" were different from other numina in that they adhered to the group rather than to a particular locale, close examination of the texts suggested to him that each patriarch had a favoured sphere of movement (Jacob in Joseph's territory in the North; Isaac in the South; and Abraham (despite his contact with Shechem and Bethel) in Mamre) (Kl. Schr. I, pp. 56).

3. Noth's views on the Patriarchs may be found in detail in Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, 1948, pp. 86-127 and in summary form in The History of Israel, Eng. Tr., 1958, pp. 120-126. He builds his theories upon the work of Alt. Even though he acknowledges the patriarchs to have been historical he does not hesitate to assert that we have no detailed evidence about their lives and that the patriarchal narratives in their present form took shape only after the settlement. The importance of the patriarchs he believes rests in the fact that they were the receivers of the promise. Noth is sceptical whether the genealogy Abraham - Isaac - Jacob was original. He is rather of the opinion that the traditions about Jacob are oldest, and that those pertaining to Isaac are older than those pertaining to Abraham. A weakness in Noth's theory appears in the fact that the promise of Yahweh is not a major theme at all in the Jacob stories. Noth's assertions that the theme "Promise to the Patriarchs" originated in relation to Jacob are to the present writer singularly unconvincing. (Cf. Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, pp. 58ff.).

4. Cf. W. F. Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine, Rev. Ed., 1956, pg. 236, "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob no longer seem isolated figures, much less reflections of later Israelite history; they now appear as true children of their age, bearing the same names, moving about over the same territory, visiting the same towns (especially Harran and Nahor), practising the same customs as their contemporaries. In other words, the patriarchal narratives have a historical nucleus throughout, though it is likely that long oral transmission of the original poems and later prose sagas which underlie the present text of Genesis has considerably refracted the original events."

5. R. de Vaux's article is unquestionably the most thorough and authoritative recent treatment on the patriarchs. His initial article in RB LIII, 1946, pp. 321-348 was concluded in RB LV, 1948, pp. 321-347. The first instalment is especially valuable for its summary of, and references to, alternate interpretations of the patriarchs.

6. Cf. "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age" in The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament, London, 1952, pp. 271-305, (first published in Bulletin of the John Rylands Library XXXII, 1949-50, pp. 44-79).

As indicated in the notes each scholar tends to modify his advocacy of the one general position with qualifying views not necessarily shared by others.

(2) The patriarchs are not individual persons but personifications or representations of tribes and nations. This view was adhered to by J. Wellhausen;[1] and it is to this day universally acknowledged to contain much truth.[2] C. Steuernagel performed great service by applying this "ethnological principle," as it has been called, down to the minutest detail.[3] Gunkel summarizes his work in these words, "the results he obtained turned out to be so amazing that everyone could see the impossibility of giving this ethnological interpretation to the entire material."[4]

(3) The patriarchs are not so much personifications of tribes as poetic "types" of a given class of people, such as shepherds, hunters, nomads and the like. This view was first propounded with consistency by H. Gressman in an important article, "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen."[5] Gressmann built on the writing of Wundt who

---

1. Cf. Prolegomena to the History of Israel, Eng. Tr., Edinburgh, 1885. Even though he held firmly to the position that the patriarchal narratives tell us more about the age in which they arose than they tell us about the age which they purport to describe, he is willing to admit that some of the accounts are based on historical events and that the materials are "not mythical, but national" (pg. 323).

2. Cf. the excellent summary of contemporary views of the patriarchs found in G. Ernest Wright's Biblical Archaeology, 1957, pp. 40ff. "Often too, in speaking of a people the Hebrew storyteller personified the group, i. e., used the name of the supposed patriarchal father of the group for the people itself. Thus today, when reading the stories of Esau and Jacob, for example, it is difficult to be quite certain in a given instance whether the original narrator meant the men themselves, or whether he was talking about the tribes which they were believed to have started." (pg. 40).

3. Cf. C. Steuernagel, Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan, 1901. R. de Vaux also cites C. F. Burney's Israel's Settlement in Canaan, 1918, as an advocate of this same principle of interpretation.

4. Cf. "Jacob" (Eng. Tr.) in What Remains of the Old Testament, London 1928, pg. 153. This same essay by Gunkel first appeared in Preussische Jahrbücher, Bd. 176, Juni Heft, 1919.

5. Cf. ZAW 30, 1910, pp. 1-34.

asserted that fairy-tales of an international character were the forerunners of saga in the Old Testament. He readily acknowledged that Abraham, Isaac, etc., may well have been personal names, but adds, so were the names of Hanzel and Gretel! Gunkel was an ardent champion of Gressmann's views which were so close to his own.[1] It may be admitted that there is much to commend the suggestion that Esau is a type of hunter and Jacob a type of shepherd but, as Kittel pointed out soon after the publication of Gressmann's article, this approach to the patriarchal narratives founders on Joseph and Abraham in particular.[2]

(4) The patriarchs were legendary founders of Canaanite sanctuaries. R. Weill may be cited as a spokesman for this view.[3] R. de Vaux demonstrates in his survey of this position that the sanctuaries which were supposed to be "legitimitized" (Bethel, Hebron, and Beersheba) played almost no religious rôle up until the time of David; on the other hand, he underlines the fact that, with the exception of Shechem, none of the sanctuaries which played an indisputably dominant rôle in the period of the monarchy (Gilgal, Shiloh, Mispah, Gibeon) so much as receive mention in the patriarchal narratives.[4] De Vaux has thus effectively challenged not only the view that the patriarchs were legendary founders of Canaanite sanctuaries but also the opinion widely accepted since Wellhausen[5] that the patriarchal narratives tell us more about the age in which they arose than about the age which they purport to describe.

---

1. Cf. note 4 above, pg. 67.

2. The first volume of Kittel's second edition of Geschichte der Hebräer appeared in 1912 under the new title, Geschichte des Volkes Israel. In that edition he took Gressmann to task, pp. 278f. He was also of the opinion that Gressmann's view could not be successfully applied to Jacob, but, it seems to the present writer, with considerably less justification.

3. Cf. "L'installation des Israelites en Palestine et la légende des Patriarches," RHR LXXXVII, 1923, pp. 69-120; LXXXVIII, 1923, pp. 1-44, and "La Légende des Patriarches et l'histoire," Rev. des Études Sémitiques, 1937, pp. 145-206.

4. Cf. RB LIII, 1946, pg. 325.

5. Cf. above pg. 67 n. 1.

(5) The patriarchs are divinities and the stories about them reflect Babylonian or Canaanite myths. H. Winckler was the votary of the theory that the patriarchs represented figures in Babylonian lunar myths;[1] E. Meyer was the outstanding spokesman for the theory that they should be considered as Canaanite divinities.[2] Neither one of the two forms of this theory has gained wide acceptance. Although one or two factors seem to commend them they too founder, in this instance, on the simple fact that the names of the patriarchs are indisputably personal names so formed that they could not possibly have been applied to gods.[3]

Of the various options the first and second alone have continued to commend themselves to successive generations of scholars. In the present thesis, therefore, we understand Abram to have been an historical person whose actions reflect not only his personal movements but also the movements of the group of which he was the head.

2. An Acceptable Evaluation of Non-Israelite Figures.- In order to round out our endeavour to settle the basic matter of determining who the two protagonists of vss. 18-20 were, we may now turn to a consideration of other non-Israelite figures in the Pentateuch who, by analogy, will throw light on Melchizedek.

In his provocative and influential Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, M. Noth sets forward the view that the non-Israelite figures in the Pentateuch may be 1) historical personalities (e. g. Jethro), 2) personifications of groups or tribes (e. g. Hamor and Shechem in Gen. 34, Abimelech of Gerar in Gen. 21) or 3) types of Canaanite leaders (e. g. (possibly) Abimelech of Gerar).[4] The reader will thus observe that Noth commends three kinds of interpretations for

---

1. Cf. Geschichte Israels II, 1900, pp. 20ff.
2. Cf. Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, 1906, pp. 249ff.
3. So de Vaux in RB LIII, 1946, pg. 323.
4. Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, pp. 152f., 170ff.

the non-Israelite figures which have also enjoyed favour as interpretations of the patriarchs. Although Noth himself does not discuss Melchizedek, because he judges that Genesis 14 is "probably a late scholastic construction," in the opinion of the present writer his comments on other non-Israelite figures pave the way for a satisfactory interpretation not only of Melchizedek (as an historical person or representative or type of a Canaanite clan) but also of Melchizedek's encounter with Abram in Gen. 14: 18-20.

Particularly instructive are Noth's comments on Jethro and his suggestions as to the kind of historical reality that lies behind the account of Moses' contact with Jethro in the narrative of Ex. 18: 1-12. Although the story as we now have it suggests that the meeting between Moses and Jethro was an affair that happened once and was not repeated, Noth suggests that the narrative may have arisen out of the practice of "a more or less regular pilgrimage to that distant "Mountain of God" in the desert."[1] Such a practice, we submit, may very well lie behind the contact of Melchizedek and Abram in vss. 18-20 of Genesis 14. Proof is, in the nature of the case, lacking. However, the similarity between the Jethro-Moses episode and the Melchizedek-Abram episode is in itself sufficiently striking to commend the application of Noth's interpretation of Ex. 18: 1-12 to Gen. 14: 18-20.[2] In both instances: (1) there is a meeting between an Israelite leader and a non-Israelite priest; (2) the priest blesses the Israelite leader; (3) he gives thanks for the delivering power of the deity; and (4) there is a sacrificial meal of bread (Moses-Jethro) or bread and wine (Abram-Melchizedek).[3]

---

1. Ibid., pp. 152f.

2. The present writer is not original in citing the similarity between the Jethro-Moses episode and the Melchizedek-Abram encounter. Cf., esp., M. Buber's Moses, Oxford, Eng. Tr., 1946, who on more than one occasion (pp. 44 and 96) calls attention to the similarity of the two incidents.

3. The tithe appears in the Abram-Melchizedek episode but not in the Moses-Jethro encounter. On the significance of the tithe in antiquity, cf. HERE XII, pg. 347; in Israel, J. Pedersen, Israel III-IV, pp. 307-313 and G. B. Gray, Numbers (ICC), pp. 231-241. H. Cazelles has suggested that 'sr in Hebrew and Ugaritic means "libation;" cf. VT I, 1951, pp. 131-34.

The reader's attention is also called to the liturgical form of Melchizedek's blessing.[1] This fact surely lends support to our contention that Gen. 14: 18-20 had behind it a cultic practice wherein Abram periodically renewed his contact with a priesthood over which the priest-king, Melchizedek, at one time presided. In view of the content of the blessing it seems likely that the priesthood was especially renowned for its power to effect victory over all sorts of adversaries or hostile forces.

The more the above interpretation is examined, the more it commends itself. It accords entirely with the ancient Near East rôle of "priest" and "king." As J. Pedersen, among others, has pointed out, the word melekh (the common designation for "king") "has had highly varying connotations. It is employed indiscriminately about the mighty rulers of the great empires and about the small chiefs of the Canaanite communities (Judg. 5:19; 9:6; cf. Gen. 20:2; Josh. 10:1; 11:1)."[2] In view of the fact that the city of Melchizedek, Salem, is to be located somewhere in Canaan,[3] the meaning of melekh when applied to Melchizedek is clear. It must be understood to mean a small chief of a Canaanite community rather than a mighty ruler of a great empire. It is also interesting to observe that even though the designation melekh had varying connotations, it is a universal phenomenon that one of the most important rôles of the melekh in the ancient near east was

---

1. To the knowledge of the present writer, J. Skinner was the first to underline the liturgical character of Melchizedek's blessing. He maintained it was a liturgical formula rather than a bona fide old style blessing. Others have followed in the same judgement, whether in dependence on Skinner or not, it is impossible to determine. So Procksch (Genesis), Mowinckel (Ps. St. V), Beyer (KThWB, II), etc.

2. Israel — Its Life and Culture III-IV, pg. 46. For another important and more recent reference see also the article by J. Gray referred to in n. 2 below, on pg. 72.

3. Cf. paragraph # 4 below.

his rôle as a priest.[1] This was true not only in Canaan,[2] but also in the kingdoms of the Hittites,[3] Egyptians,[4] Assyrians and Babylonians,[5] as well as in Israel.[6]

Summary.- Our inquiry into the nature of the patriarchs and non-Israelite figures analogous to Melchizedek have thus led to the conclusion that Gen. 14: 18-20 has behind it not only the historical personages of Abram and a Canaanite priest-king by the name of Melchizedek,[7] but possibly also the historical practice of a cultic blessing and sacrificial meal which were celebrated as regular occurences during the time of Abram and Melchizedek.

Priestly Origin of the Interpolation.- To conclude the present discussion on the fifth stage in the development of Genesis 14, we may now briefly discuss its possible relation to other sources and the date in which it was interpolated into the rest of the chapter. No decisive clues seem present within the vss. themselves; however, all factors do point towards the assumption that the interpolation was made by priestly hands in Jerusalem during the period after the exile.

---

1. For a convenient, though not always accurate, summary of the ancient near eastern scene, see E. O. James' chapter on "Kingship and Priesthood" in his book, The Nature and Function of Priesthood, London, 1955, pp. 105-144. Cf. also, H. Frankfort's Kingship and the Gods under "Priest" and S. H. Hooke (Ed.) Myth, Ritual and Kingship, 1958, under "king--priestly functions of."

2. See John Gray, "Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice," VT II, 1952, pg. 203; S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, Eng. Tr., Oxford, 1956, pp. 52ff.; Engnell Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, Uppsala, 1943, pp. 108f.

3. Cf. O. R. Gurney, The Hittites, Penguin Books, 2nd Ed., 1954, pp. 65f.

4. Cf. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, pp. 79ff.

5. Ibid., pp. 238ff.; 313ff.

6. Cf. A. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, Cardiff, 1955; G. Widengren, Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testament und im Judentum, Stuttgart, 1955 and S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 56ff. for examples, references and documentation. Cf. also below where the priestly rôle of the Israelite king is discussed, Part II, pp. 174ff.

7. The meaning of the name Melchizedek will be discussed below in connection with an inquiry into the nature of the deity El ʿElyon. Cf. pp. 99 ff.

We have already observed that the second, and possibly the third, level of tradition emanated from a priestly source, while the fourth level reflects the kind of demand for rationalistic explanations that reaches fruition in the Book of Jubilees. In view of these observations, an early date for the insertion of vss. 18-20 is out of the question. Furthermore, because of the fact that this episode makes plain the obeisance of even the father of the Hebrew people to the priesthood at Salem through his giving of the tithe, it is highly likely that the interpolator was one whose allegiance to the priesthood in Jerusalem was unambiguous. It may be that the ascending power of the Zadokite priests saw in this episode of Melchizedek (note the common root צדק) their charter of supremacy.[1] Here, of course, we are entering into the realm of pure speculation, but the apparent lateness of the interpolation and the known emphasis placed on tithing in the postexilic era (cf. Neh. 10:37-38; 12:44; 13:5,12) are fairly solid pegs on which to hang the above conjecture.

Stage 6: Glosses.- We may now proceed to a brief treatment of the sixth stage in the development of Genesis 14. To this final stratum in the chapter belong its glosses: "that is Zoar" (in identification of Bela in vss. 2 and 8); "that is the Salt Sea" (in identification of the valley of Siddim in vs. 3); "that is Kadesh" (in identification of En-mishpat in vs. 7); "that is the King's Valley" (in identification of the Valley of Shaveh in vs. 17); and "Yahweh" (in identification of El 'Elyon in vs. 22).

In assigning the above glosses to the final stage in the development of Genesis 14 we do not wish to insist that they could not possibly have found their way into the chapter at an earlier stage. All of the vss. in which they appear were already part of the chapter by the

---

1. On the ascendancy of the Zadokite priesthood, cf. G. B. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, Oxford, 1925, pp. 226ff.; M. Noth, The History of Israel, Eng. Tr., pg. 315. For a fuller treatment see A. Bentzen's Studier over det zadokidiske praesteskabs historie, 1931. The latter is summarized in ZAW 1933, pp. 173-176.

end of the third stage. They may very well have been inserted along with the explanatory notes of the fourth stage. In view of their brevity, however, it seems most probable to the present writer that they were not added until all the other stages of the chapter had been completed.

An unusual explanation is not at all necessary to account for their insertion. All of them supply names that were better known than the names to which they were a parenthesis. A brief comment may be made on each gloss.

Zoar (vss. 2 and 8) is also mentioned in connexion with Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen. 13:10 and 19: 17-22. In the latter passage, it will be recalled, Zoar is the city of refuge to which Lot flees. From Deut. 34:3, Isa. 15:5 and Jer. 48:34 it is clear that Zoar was something of a terminal city located in the area south of the Dead Sea across from Moab.[1] The gloss may thus be a simple identification of Bela with the historically known city. Bela, which the gloss identifies, is not referred to elsewhere in the Old Testament as a place name, though it is used occasionally as a proper name for the king of Edom (Gen. 36:32, I Chron. 1:43), the first son of Benjamin (Gen. 46:21; Num. 26:38, 40; I Chron. 7:6,7; 8:1,3) and a Reubenite (I Chron. 5:8).

The Salt Sea (vs. 3) is of course the occasionally used Old Testament designation for the Dead Sea (Num. 34:3,12; Deut. 3:17). It is also referred to as the Sea of the Arabah (Jos. 3:16; 12:3) and the East Sea (Ezek. 47:18; Joel 2:20). The Valley of Siddim is not mentioned elsewhere in the Old Testament. As to the possible significance of the name Siddim, and for a more detailed discussion on the southerly portion of the Dead Sea, the reader is referred to our previous discussion.[2]

Kadesh (vs. 7), also called Kadesh Barnea, is the name of the

---

1. Cf. Grollenberg, Atlas of the Bible, pg. 159 under "Pentapolis."

2. See pp. 39ff.

abode of the Israelites during their desert sojourn (Deut. 1:46) and was thus, like the names in the other glosses, a well known spot. The city is usually identified with the Modern Ain Qadeis in Negeb.[1] En-mishpat (fountain of judgement) which it identifies, is not mentioned elsewhere in the Old Testament.

The King's Valley (vs. 17) is mentioned in Sam. II 18:18 as the place in which Absalom erected a memorial pillar to himself. Josephus in Antiquities VII, 10, 3 says that the latter King's Valley was "two furlongs distant from Jerusalem." It may thus be that the glossator intended to identify the Valley of Shaveh with a spot near Jerusalem. To the present day, commentators utilize this gloss, together with the above mentioned remark in the Antiquities, in order to commend the identification of Melchizedek's city of Salem with Jerusalem. Whether this procedure is justified or not will be discussed in a concluding remark below.

Yahweh (Vs. 22) is widely held to be a gloss. This view receives some justification in view of the fact that Yahweh is not found in the LXX or Peshitta. In the Samaritan Pentateuch וָאֱלֹהִים appears instead of יהוה . As noted above, it seems to the present writer that the name of the deity originally referred to in this verse is preserved by the Samaritan Pentateuch.[2]

Implications of the Preceding Analysis on the Chapter's Development.- Having thus completed a reconstruction of how Genesis 14 came to acquire its present shape, we may now turn to a consideration of the implications that the above reconstruction will have upon 1) the date of Abram and 2) the locale of Melchizedek.

---

1. Cf. Grollenberg, Atlas of the Bible, pg. 154. For a recent discussion on Kadesh see John Gray's "The Desert Sojourn of the Hebrews and the Sinai Horeb Tradition," VT IV, 1954, pp. 149f.

2. Cf. pg. 45, n. 7 and pg. 59, n. 4.

(1) Modification Necessary of Previous Uses of Chapter to Date Abram.- From the end of the last century up to the present day scholars have turned to Genesis 14 with the earnest desire of finding some detail that would yield a secure clue for determining the age of the patriarch Abram. A favoured clue was seen in the first named king in the chapter, Amraphel of Shinar. The sober and generally conservative Aramaic translation of the Targum Onkelos had quite unselfconsciously understood that Amraphel of Shinar was in reality Amraphel of Babel.[1] Thus little seemed to stand in the way of the identification between Amraphel of Shinar and Hammurabi of Babylon. There is no doubt that the increased knowledge that archaeology had produced about Hammurabi had the effect of exerting increasingly strong pressure on the students of the ancient near east to make this important identification. Once the identification was made, however, it came to be realised with further thought and discoveries that the cast of Amraphel did not fit Hammurabi as comfortably as fond hopes had led some scholars to believe. As noted above in the preceding paragraph, one of the most difficult facts to explain under the new identification was the simple fact that Chedorlaomer and not Amraphel was the indisputed leader in the coalition of the Eastern Kings in Genesis 14.[2]

Once the Amraphel-Hammurabi identification had been discarded along with most attempts to identify the other named-kings, scholars tended to look for other clues in the chapter to yield information on which the date of Abram might be pinned. Most popular has been the observation of archaeologists that the chapter records a widespread military expedition in Transjordania and the Negeb (vss. 5-7).[3] This observation coupled with the archaeological evidence that civilization in Transjordania and the Negeb was interrupted abruptly in the late

---

1. The tower of Babel was built in the land of Shinar (Gen. 11: 1-9). The identification of Shinar with Babel is thus quite natural.

2. Cf. pg. 17 above.

3. So Albright, Glueck, De Vaux, Finegan, Wright. Cf. pg. 16 n. 1.

19th or early 18th century, has led to the belief that the date of Abram's sojourn in Canaan should be dated accordingly.[1] The weakness in both the latter and the former attempt to date Abram is that by and large they by-passed a thorough literary-critical analysis of the chapter and assumed without sufficient justification that the life of the historical Abram was inextricably bound up with the life and expeditions of one or more of the Eastern kings. In the literary-critical analysis of Genesis 14 presented in the preceding pages it became apparent that the relationship between Abram and the Eastern kings is extremely tenuous. The chapter itself bears indications that the original antagonists were, on the one hand, Sodom and Gomorrah, and Admah, Zeboiim, and possibly Bela, on the other. The tradition recording Abram's rescue of Lot appears to have emanated from the period in which Sodom and Gomorrah were hostile, rather than confederate, with Admah, Zeboiim and Bela, and thus from a period when neither the Eastern kings nor their expedition were in any way related to Abram. Therefore, from a literary-critical point of view, the assumption that Abram's encounter with the Eastern kings is a matter of historical fact, is highly precarious and so lacking in adequate support as to render it incapable of yielding a trustworthy clue to the date of Abram.

It is plain that if the materials in Genesis 14 are to be utilized as a means of arriving at a date for Abram, they must first be critically evaluated and used accordingly. Although the present writer is of the opinion that Genesis 14 does yield some important clues on the date of Abram,[2] it is obvious for another reason that the expedition of the Eastern kings is in reality a very poor anchor on which to attempt to secure Abram within the known history of the ancient near east. It is true that the finds of archaeology have been startling in showing that

---

1. See references on pg. 16 n. 2 and pg. 78 n. 3.
2. Cf. above 63 and esp. n. 4 on that page.

precisely such cities as Ashtaroth and Karnaim[1] and Ham and Shaveh and Kiriathaim[2] -- the trans-Jordanian cities through which the expedition of the Eastern kings is reported to have transgressed -- suffered an abrupt interuption of civilised life in the second millenium.[3] But the cities named are only half of the biblical tradition; the peoples who inhabited the cities are also mentioned. Among them are listed the Rephaim, Zuzim and Emim. According to Deut. 2:10-12, 20-23, the Zamzummin (= Zuzim) and Emim were alternate names for the Rephaim, an ancient and extinct people of gigantic stature who had formerly inhabited the land of Moab and Ammon before the Moabites and Ammonites.[4] Since the writing of Karge's Rephaim in 1925, scholars have generally associated the Rephaim with the neolithic era (fifth millenium B. C.);[5] and W. F. Albright himself, who is in favour of dating Abram well within the bounds of historic times, acknowledges that the Zamzummin belong to a "pre-historic" era.[6] When one reflects on the fact that scholars desiring to date Abram on the basis of the expeditionary route of vss. 5-7 have fixed attention on one part of the biblical tradition (i. e., the names

---

1. The city Astaroth-Karnaim is understood by Albright to have been two cities closely situated. Albright submits that the) originally linking the two names has dropped out. Cf. JSOR X, 1926, pg. 260 and pg. 54, n.2. above.

2. The same thing is pointed out by Albright for the cities Shaveh and Kiriathaim, i. e.) has to be supplied in the text. See previous note and JSOR X, 1926, pg. 261.

3. See references on pg. 16, n.2 and also JSOR X, 1926, pg. 236 and De Vaux in RB LV, 1948, pp. 335ff.

4. Note also that even the Horites who are also mentioned in vss. 5-7 are recognized by biblical tradition to have lived in an ancient era (cf. Deut. 2:10-12; 20-23) and the Amalekites were looked upon as being so old they are called in one of the oracles of Balaam "the first of the nations" (Num. 24:20).

5. Cf. Albright in JSOR X, 1926, pg. 260, Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I, (1952), pg. 241, T. H. Robinson, History of Israel, Vol. I, pg. 32. For another view, cf. J. Gray in an article, "The Rephaim," PEQ, 1949, pp. 127-139, who advises that the Rephaim belong to legend rather than history.

6. "The less said about the Zuzim and their relation to the Zamzummin of prehistoric Ammon the better, since we really have no evidence whatsoever with regard to these mysterious races." So, Albright in JSOR X, 1926, pp. 260f.

of the cities), but have ignored the other (i. e., the names of the reported inhabitants), their conclusions are immediately thrown into question. Instead of providing a firm anchor for Abram within historical time, the expeditionary route of vss. 5-7 seems rather to suggest that whoever was responsible for the inclusion of these vss. in the chapter, saw no objection for regarding Abram as contemporary with the ancient Rephaim, Zuzim and Emim, that is, with peoples who, according to biblical tradition, came from a period of hoar antiquity, and who, according to modern scientific judgement, are to be dated, at the latest, in the neolithic era of the dawn of history. We therefore submit that if vss. 5-7 are to be taken as reliable clues to the date of Abram, they indicate that a setting in the fifth millenium is as permissible as a setting in the second.

(2) Literary Analysis Essential if Provenance of Melchizedek to be determined.- The present paragraph may be brought to a close by considering how a literary-critical regard of Genesis 14 can guide us in deciding where the tradition about Melchizedek originated and circulated. The same principle which we observed above in the discussion on dating Abram holds here as well. That is to say, data found in the chapter must be used discriminately; seeming clues ought not to be given any weight unless it can be established that the vs. or vss. in which the clues are contained stood in an original relationship to the figure in question. Abram did not stand in an original relationship with either the Eastern kings or the itinerary they were reported to have followed; the seeming clues in the vss. about the kings and their itinerary could thus not safely be used in attempting to set Abram's dates. In the same way, it is important to observe that the vss. in which Melchizedek is mentioned, vss. 18-20, are widely acknowledged to have been an interpolation. Therefore, none of the vss. in Genesis 14 outside vss. 18-20 can be regarded as safe guides for reliable information on Melchizedek. From the point of view of a scholarship that accepts the basic principles of literary-critical analysis, such reasoning is irrefutable. It is interesting to note, however, that many scholars seeking to determine

the location of Melchizedek's city of Salem have violated what appears to be a very elementary principle of literary-critical analysis. The fact that the Melchizedek episode quite obviously interrupts the flow of the narrative between vss. 17 and 21 has been virtually ignored; data from the latter half of the chapter especially has been used without discretion. A favourite has been the attempt to identify Melchizedek's city of Salem with Jerusalem by pointing out that the King's Valley in vs. 17 -- which is itself a gloss -- has been located by Josephus (Antiquities VII, 10,3) "two furlongs distant from Jerusalem."[1] It has also been common for commentators to point out that Jerusalem would have been in the pathway of the home-returning Abram after his victory over Chedorlaomer.[2] The extent to which this conclusion (that Salem was Jerusalem) may be justified, shall be discussed at length below.

We have thus seen above with regard to Abram and Melchizedek two illustrations of the now established rule that literary-critical analysis is of crucial importance in attempts to arrive at historical certainty.

---

1. So, e.g., C. W. Wilson, "Salem" in HDB IV (1902), pg. 353; Skinner, Genesis, ICC, 1st Ed., 1910, pg. 267; H. W. Hertzberg, "Die Melkisedeq Traditionen," JPOS VIII, 1928, pg. 171; Frey, Das Buch der Anfänge, Bd. I, 1935, pg. 34; L. H. Vincent, "Abraham à Jerusalem," RB LVIII, 1951, pp. 360ff.

2. Cf. the references in notes 1 and 2 on pg. 16 above.

PARAGRAPH # 4.

PLACE OF ORIGIN AND SUBSEQUENT ABODES OF THE MELCHIZEDEK PRIESTHOOD.

In the first paragraph it was observed that the overwhelming majority of scholars in the present century have been of the opinion that Melchizedek's home city of Salem was in reality Jerusalem. Despite its popularity this view did not enjoy the unanimous support of leading critics. Schlatter,[1] Jeremias,[2] Benzinger,[3] Landersdorfer,[4] and most notably Hertzberg[5] and Nyberg[6] have been among those who asserted that there are indications that the Melchizedek priesthood originated elsewhere than Jerusalem. All of the previously mentioned scholars believed that the evidence for a prior relationship to Shechem was undeniable. Hertzberg has been virtually alone in suggesting that the Melchizedek priesthood originated in Tabor and Nyberg has, to the surprise of the present writer, found only a few supporters for his view that the Melchizedek priesthood was also at one time associated with Shiloh. In the pages below we shall: (a) review the evidence which establishes a relation between the Melchizedek priesthood and Jerusalem; (b) adduce a number of factors which indicated that this association was not original; (c) set forth the reasons for positing an earlier association with Shechem; (d) seek to demonstrate that Shiloh also was a sacred centre where priests of the line of

---

1. A. Schlatter, Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas, Stuttgart, 1893, pp. 258ff.

2. A. Jeremias, The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East, Eng. Tr., Vol. II, London, 1911, pp. 29f.

3. I. Benzinger, "Zur Quellenscheidung in Gen 14," ZAW, Beiheft 41, 1925, pg. 25.

4. S. Landersdorfer, Das Priesterkönigtum von Salem" JSOR, Vol. IX, 1925, pp. 203-216.

5. H. W. Hertzberg, JPOS VIII, 1928, pp. 169-179.

6. H. S. Nyberg, ARW XXXV, 1938, pp. 366f.

Melchizedek worshipped; and (e) conclude by suggesting that the most likely route which the Melchizedek tradition travelled was from Shechem to Shiloh and from Shiloh to Jerusalem.

(a) Evidence that the Melchizedek tradition was associated with Jerusalem.

(1) Of recent scholars who have held that the Melchizedek priesthood was indigenous to Jerusalem. A. R. Johnson[1] and C. A. Simpson[2] have pointed out that the divine name 'Elyon occurs in a number of psalms which are clearly associated with Zion and the temple and hence with Jerusalem.[3] The name of Melchizedek's deity in Gen. 14: 18-20 is, of course, El 'Elyon. As Simpson phrases it, it is a "possible inference that El Elyon was the ancient name of the deity of the sanctuary at Jerusalem, which was later carried over to Yahweh."

(2) Salem is now known to have been the name of an ancient Canaanite god.[4] It is common knowledge that cities in oriental antiquity often owed their names to a god or gods worshipped by the inhabitants of the city in question.[5] The use of Salem in Gen. 14:18 may thus very well be an abbreviated reference to Jerusalem.

(3) In Ps. 76:3, Salem is used in parallelism with Zion.

> In Judah God is known,
> his name is great in Israel.
> His abode has been established in Salem.
> his dwelling place in Zion.

(4) The action in the one Psalm which mentions Melchizedek (Ps. 110, vs. 4) takes place on Zion (vs. 2).

---

1. Cf. A. R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship, passim.

2. Cf. C. A. Simpson, Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I, in loc.

3. Cf. Pss. 9:3 (9:2 E.T.); 21:8 (7 E. T.):46:5 (46:4 E. T.); 50:14; 78:17; 87:5: 92:2.

4. Cf. "The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods," lines 7, 52, 53. Albright's translation is found in JPOS XIV, pp. 133-140.

5. Cf. L. H. Vincent, "Abraham à Jerusalem," RB 1951, pg. 363; W. F. Albright, JPOS XV, 1935, pg. 218.

(5) The figure Adonizedek, reputed king of Jerusalem according to Joshua 10: 1.3, is an obvious counterpart of the Melchizedek, king of Salem of Genesis.14.[1]

(b) Indications that this association was not original. On the basis of the above evidence it is apparent that an intimate relationship existed between the Melchizedek priesthood and Jerusalem. Several factors suggest, however, that this relationship was not original: the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek may have emanated from some sacral centre outside Jerusalem.

(1) In the first place it is important to recall that there is no mention of Jerusalem in the Pentateuch. This of course does not preclude the possibility that Jerusalem is mentioned in Genesis 14; it does, however, place the burden of the proof upon him who asserts that Salem originally meant Jerusalem.[2]

(2) The name Salem is found nowhere as a name for old Jerusalem. It is found in Ps. 76:3, for example, as noted above, but from the beginning the name of the city seems to have been Jerusalem or something close to it. The oldest known reference to Jerusalem is found in the Egyptian execration texts against foreign princes, etc., published by Sethe. These texts go back to ca. 2000 B.C. and refer to a 3wsꜣmm but to no Salem. In the very similar texts published by Posener, 3wsꜣmm(i) is also mentioned, but not Salem. The Posener texts are dated at ca. 1700 B.C. In the Amarna tablets (ca. 1400-1350) reference is made to a Urusalim but not to a Salem. The name Shalem (srm) is found in the so-called Ramesseum-list of Ramesses II (ca. 1290-1224) but the context in

---

1. Cooke, Rowley and Johnson have argued further that there was not only an association of Adonizedek with Jerusalem, but also a "persistent association of 'righteousness' with Jerusalem." In Part II we examine this claim and it has therefore been omitted from the list of evidence adduced here.

2. If contact of the patriarchs with Jerusalem were a matter of common knowledge, proof of an additional contact would not have to be documented so fully.

which this name appears makes it plain that a town considerably north of Jerusalem -- in Samaria, Galilee or Syria -- is intended.[1] All of this indicates that Salem was not used as a name for the Jerusalem of antiquity.

(3) None of the personal names which emanate from Jerusalem indicate that El ʿElyon, the deity of Melchizedek, was worshipped there. It is common knowledge that personal names reflect the religious worship of the name givers. In the entire history of Jerusalem there is not one name found which contains in it the root בע to indicate an adherence to the worship of בעל.

(4) The name Adonizedek, found in Joshua 10:1,3 in connexion with Jerusalem, is not original. It has been established by M. Noth that that association is secondary and derives from the fact that in the older tradition of Judges 1: 5-8, Adonibezek (!) is taken to Jerusalem after capture.[2] The association of Melchizedek with Jerusalem is thus left entirely without an analogy. This in itself does not establish that the relationship of the Melchizedek priesthood was not original, but it decidedly weakens the case in that it removes from the domain of reliable history a possible royal descendent.

(5) Wine did not play a prominent part in the liturgy and worship of Jerusalem. The use of wine in the Melchizedek priesthood, however, was obviously of prominence and importance, "and he brought forth bread and wine" (Gen. 14:18). Wine was utilized in the cult at Jerusalem, but only in a minor and subordinate way. It is not until the third century, at the earliest, for example, that wine is first mentioned as an element in the Passover celebrations (Jubilees 49:6). The relative unimportance of the use of wine in the Jerusalemite cult

---

1. Cf. J. Simons' Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists of Western Asia, 1937, List XIX, pp. 64 and 148; cf. also J. Simons, "Topographical Elements in the Story of Abimelech," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Deel II, 1943, pp. 45f., for further discussion.

2. Cf. M. Noth, HAT 7, Das Buch Josua, 2 Aufl., pg. 63; cf. also Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, 1957, pp. 172f.

becomes especially apparent if a comparison is made between descriptions of cultic observances at Jerusalem and at other cultic centres such as Shechem or Shiloh. Since an integral part of the ceremonies of the Melchizedek priesthood evidently involved the use of wine, it is less likely that the priesthood emanated in Jerusalem where the rôle of wine in the cult was so insignificant.

(c) Reasons for positing an earlier association with Shechem. In view of the above factors, it is apparent that an original and subsequently unbroken association of the Melchizedek priesthood with Jerusalem is not at all indicated. In the light of Ps. 76:3 it is, of course, certain that the Salem of Genesis 14:18 may have been understood at a later date to mean Jerusalem. But neither Ps. 76:3 nor the clear association of Melchizedek with Zion in Ps. 110 nor even the mention of 'Elyon in several of the Zion Psalms is sufficient to establish that the relationship was original. A number of factors indicate that the priesthood may have emanated from the vicinity of Shechem, if not Shechem itself.[1] We offer below what seem to be the most cogent arguments in favour of such an association.

(1) The Book of Genesis itself provides us with the proper identification of Salem. In Gen. 33:18 it is written, "And Jacob went to Salem, to the city of Shechem" (וַיָּבֹא יַעֲקֹב שָׁלֵם עִיר שְׁכֶם). A number of writers choose to read שָׁלֵם as an adjective and thus eliminate one of the clearest indications of the correct identity of Salem. שָׁלֵם means then, we are told, "in good condition," "in safety," peace-minded" or the like. The use of שָׁלֵם in such a manner is, however, entirely without analogy. If the writer intended to convey that Jacob arrived "in good condition" or "peace-minded," the more

---

1. The sum of all possible arguments for associating the Melchizedek priesthood with Shechem have most recently been marshalled by Cameron Mackay in an article, "Salem," PEQ, 1948-49, pp. 121-129. Although Mackay's list is impressive, in the opinion of the present writer he greatly weakens his case by: (i) apparently making no distinction between degrees of reliability of evidence, and (ii) refusing even to accept obvious indications (e.g. Ps. 76:3) that Salem was at one time a poetic name for Jerusalem. Other defences in favour of the Shechem-Salem identification may be found by consulting the references made on pg. 81.

natural way to have expressed it would have been to use the term adverbially, בְּשָׁלוֹם. Some writers suggest that שָׁלֵם should be emended accordingly. The emendation is slight and apparently logical but syntactical considerations speak against it. Used adverbially, שָׁלוֹם frequently modifies בּוֹא and other verbs of motion, but whenever the location (to which or from which the motion is directed) is given, the adverb follows and generally does not precede the location mentioned.[1] If בְּשָׁלֵם were original, the chances are that the Hebrew would read: וַיָּבֹא יַעֲקֹב עִיר שְׁכֶם בְּשָׁלֵם . The placement of שָׁלֵם in Gen. 33:18 thus indicates it should not be emended and understood adverbially.

At the same time it must be admitted that if Salem is understood as the name of a city, some serious objections can be raised to reading it as a place name. As Skinner (after Delitzsch) pointed out some time ago, there is "no case of a village described as a 'city' of the neighbouring town."[2] But, (1) must Salem be a city name? and (2) must Shechem in Gen. 33:18 be a place name? To answer the second question first: the context of Gen. 33: 18-19 and the chapter that follows suggests that Shechem is a personal, and not a place name. Nielsen points out that the LXX from Gen. 33:18 to 35:5 uses the transcription Συχεμ for the person, but Σικιμα for the city. In Gen. 33:18 Σικιμα is used! The inference Nielsen draws is that שְׁכֶם in Gen. 33:18 cannot be understood as a personal name. In answer to Nielsen he may be reminded of his own words "it is difficult to understand how a modern scholar could prefer the Greek"[3] -- or, it might be added, use the Greek to establish an important point.

---

1. Cf., e.g., Gen. 15:15; Josh. 10:21; Jud. 11:13; I Kings 22:17; Jer. 43:12; II Chron. 18:16; 19:1; 34:28. For exceptions see Gen. 28:21; II Sam. 19:25; I Kings 2:6.

2. Cf. Skinner, Genesis, ICC, 1910, pg. 416.

3. Cf. E. Nielsen, Shechem, pp. 86 and 223.

The first question may be answered after the analogy of Gen. 24:10, וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶל־אֲרַם נַהֲרַיִם אֶל־עִיר נָחוֹר "and he went to Mesopotamia, to the city of Nahor." Might not Salem be the name of an area rather than the name of a city? In his careful study, "Topographical and Archaeological Elements in the Story of Abimelech," J. Simons has this comment to make of the present day village of Sâlim which is located on the slope of Jebel el Kebîr some 3 miles east of the site of the ancient city of Shechem, "There is very little probability in the supposition (König, i.h.l.) that the place-name of Sâlim came into existence solely by the influence of Gen. XXXIII 18 without any support in the topographical nomenclature of the district."[1] The present writer wishes to submit that the name Salem at the time of Abram and Melchizedek was applied to the entire valley or basin bounded on the north by Mount Ebal (3100') and Jebel el-Kebîr (2575') and on the south by Mount Garizim (2910') and the scarp near Taanath-Shiloh (2880').[2] This view receives support from the reference in Judith 4:4 to "the valley of Salem" and the fact that to this day the land bounded by the four above mentioned heights is quite naturally referred to as "the basin of Salim."[3]

It may be underlined that the above is a modification of the usual Salem-Shechem identification. In our view Salem is a district name; unless the context suggests otherwise. Shechem is the name of a city within that district. We have seen that if Salem is so understood, all the

---

1. Cf. Oudtestamentische Studiën, Deel II, pg. 50, n.1. Simons is interested in establishing that Mount Ṣalmon may have formerly been called Mount Salem.

2. In order to visualize this basin, see Plate 100 in Grollenberg's Atlas of the Bible, pg. 35. Salim on the slopes of Jebel el-Kabîr can be seen in the upper right. The same picture is found in O.T. Studiën II, 1943, opp. pg. 57. Plates 95, 96 and 101 also show the basin to good advantage as do any of the relief maps of the area, however small (cf., e.g., Map 11, pg. 59 in Grollenberg's Atlas or the somewhat cruder relief map in D. Baly's The Geography of the Bible, 1957, Fig. 35, pg. 177.

3. Cf. D. Baly, Geography of the Bible, pg. 178.

major objections to Salem as the place name of a city fall away. The advocates of the Shechem-Salem identification, though erring in precision, were thus quite right in pointing out that the motif of the name of Salem seems to be purposely woven into the words of Hamor and of his son Shechem in Gen. 34:21, "These men are friendly (שְׁלֵמִים) with us; let them dwell in the land and trade in it, for behold the land is large enough for them...."

Other factors which corroborate the association of Salem with Shechem -- or, more correctly, Shechem with Salem -- may be listed more briefly.

(2) In Shechem we know that from an early date wine was used as a regular part of the cult. "And Gaal the son of Ebed moved into Shechem with his kinsmen; and the men of Shechem put confidence in him. And they went out into the field, and gathered the grapes from their vineyards and trod them, and held festivals, and went into the house of their god, and ate and drank and reviled Abimelech" (Ju. 9:26-27).

(3) In the tradition of Genesis 14:18-20, Melchizedek pronounces a blessing. According to Deut. 27:12 Mount Garizim (by Shechem) was a mountain of blessing. Nielsen has recently established that the association of blessing with Shechem is not an invention of the Deuteronomist but goes back to ancient tradition.[1]

(4) In Judges 8:33 it is related of the people of Israel at Shechem that they "turned again and played the harlot after the Baals, and made Baal Berith their god." In Ju. 9:4 it is recorded that the men of Shechem gave Abimelech funds out of the house of Baal Berith. And in Ju. 9:46 the people of Migdal Shechem[2] enter the stronghold of the house

---

1. Cf. E. Nielsen, Shechem, pp. 50-85, 86-212. The assertion that Deuteronomy preserves traditions from the North and from Shechem in particular goes back, of course, to the time of Oestreicher (1923) and Welch (1924). Present day scholarship has to a great degree accepted this thesis. Cf. G. E. Wright's "The Book of Deuteronomy," Interpreter's Bible, Vol. II, pp. 324f.

2. The city of Shechem is to be distinguished from Migdal Shechem. Cf. J. P. Nagele, Sichems Zerstörung durch Abimelech," JPOS XII, 1932, pg. 155; J. Simons, OT Studiën II, 1943, pp. 50f.

of El Berith. The deity Berith is thus clearly associated with Shechem. In the Sanchuniathon tradition preserved by Philo of Byblus. Βηρούθ is the consort of Ἐλιοῦν .[1] The revering of the deity בְּרִית at Shechem may thus also indicate that 'Elyon was also worshipped there.

(5) In Judges 9:6 it is recorded that Abimelech was made king at Shechem; in I Kings 12:1 it is recorded that Rehoboam went to Shechem "for all Israel had come to Shechem to make him king." Shechem thus obviously possessed sanctity as a proper location for king-making. This sanctity may well have emanated from the days of Melchizedek.

(6) Not only from the narrative of Gen. 14, but from the blessing of Melchizedek itself, "Blessed be Abram by El 'Elyon...," it is apparent that Abram was in direct contact with Melchizedek, and therefore, of course, with the domain which Melchizedek governed. In Gen. 12:6 the very first place in Canaan at which Abram stopped is said to have been Shechem. One of the most recent students of the traditions of Shechem muses on Gen. 12:6 in the following vein:

> Would it be too far-fetched to regard these few words as reflecting the idea (or fact) that it was at Shechem that the first contact between the ancestors of the people and the original inhabitants of the country was effected? The importance of Shechem in the earliest period of Israelite history as a centre of Canaanite and Israelite culture was, as we have seen above, not concealed by the Deuteronomists. The fact that the Canaanites are mentioned in connection with Shechem may, therefore, have a very special significance. And as far as this tradition of the first Israelite altar for the Lord on the soil of Canaan is concerned, it may in reality contain some elements of truth, especially when regarded in the light of Dt. and the book of Joshua.[2]

(7) Archaeological excavation has shown that Shechem was

---

1. Cf. Eusebii Preparatio Evangelica edited by E. H. Gifford, 1903, 36a.

2. Cf. E. Nielsen, Shechem, pg. 216.

inhabited during the Middle Bronze Period (2100-1550 B.C.).[1] Thus from a scientific point of view nothing stands in the way of a probable contact between Abram and Melchizedek at Shechem some time during this period.

(d) Evidence to show that Shiloh was at one time the centre of the Melchizedek priesthood. As we have noted above, the relation of the priesthood of Melchizedek to Shiloh was first established by H. S. Nyberg in his provocative essay on the god ʿAl.[2]

(1) Nyberg pointed out that the personal names of the chief priest 'Eli (עֵלִי) and of the father of Samuel, Elkanah (אֶלְקָנָה), undoubtedly reflect the worship of the deity ʿElyon at Shiloh. It will be recalled that in the blessing of Melchizedek El ʿElyon is described as a god who is קֹנֵה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ ("procreator of heaven and earth").[3] Even though one might cavil with other aspects of Nyberg's thesis, it is to be doubted whether any serious objection can be raised to his observation that the personal names ʿEli and Elkanah indicate the worship of ʿElyon.

(2) At Shiloh, even more clearly than was the case at Shechem, wine played an important part in the cult. This is apparent not only from Ju. 21:19ff.,

> Behold, there is the yearly feast of Yahweh at Shiloh. . . Go and lie wait in the vineyards, and watch; if the daughters of Shiloh come out to dance in the dances, then come out of the vineyards and seize each man his wife from the daughters of Shiloh.

---

1. Cf. W. F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 1946, pg. 188 for a survey of the divergent opinions on the problem of the "temple" at Balâṭah. Of the disputed building Albright himself says, "in view of its characteristic Canaanite house-form with a central court and rooms on all four sides, I have no hesitation in regarding it as a patrician villa of the sixteenth century B.C.." J. Simons reviews the dispute on the date of this building in OT Studiën II, 1943, pp. 71f. For a survey of the trends in population movement for the Middle Bronze Period, cf. W. F. Albright's "Archaeology of Palestine" in H. H. Rowley's The Old Testament and Modern Study, pg. 5.

2. Cf. ARW XXXV, 1938, pp. 329-387.

3. For justification of the translation "procreator" see below, pp. 112ff.

but also from I Sam. 1:9 where it is said that the celebrants at Shiloh "had eaten and drunk" and I Sam. 1:14 where Hannah, the wife of Elanah is suspected of having become drunk at the entrance to the temple, "And ʿEli said to her, 'How long will you be drunken? Put away your wine from you.'" In this connexion it is of more than passing interest to note that in the Danish excavations at Shiloh one of the oldest vessels (Vessel 1) had the sedimentation of wine resting at the bottom.[1] The archaeologist H. Kjaer also observed that there was "a wine press in the neighbourhood, cut into the rock."[2]

(3) One of the outstanding features of the Melchizedek priesthood was its apparent power to effect victory over enemies. In his blessing on Abram, Melchizedek says, "blessed be El ʿElyon who has delivered your enemies into your hand!" This same power to effect victory over enemies inhered at Shiloh in the ark (I Sam. 3:3: 4:3-4) and after the destruction of Shiloh when the priesthood transferred to Nob, in the linen ephod, the holy bread and in the cultic object, the sword of Goliath (I Sam. 21:2-10). It is thus highly probable that the peculiar power of the Shilonite priesthood to effect victory over enemies went back to the time of Melchizedek with whom that same power rested. Even though E (Ex. 17:8-16), the Deuteronomist (Deut. 20:1-9), and the Priestly source (Nu. 10:9,35-36; 31:6) recall the power of the Mosaic-Aaronitic priesthood prior to, and during, a battle against enemies, nowhere does this power appear to be as integral a part of their priesthood as it was of the priesthood of Melchizedek and the Shilonites. The participation of the Mosaic-Aaronitic priest in battle was but one of many sacral actions he performed; the relationship of Melchizedek and the priests of Shiloh-Nob to battle was, however, an outstanding aspect of their sacral power.

(4) The excavations at Shiloh unearthed a house (House A)

---

1. Cf. Hans Kjaer, "The Excavation of Shiloh," JPOS X, 1930, pp. 99f.

2. Ibid., pg. 88.

that may date back to 1200 B.C.[1] Unless Kjaer revealed information in the Danish publication of his findings which he did not reveal in the English account, E. Nielsen was not right in stating "Excavations carried out at Seilūn have proved that Shiloh was inhabited already during M Br Age."[2] The earliest period that Kjaer mentions is Iron Age I (1200-900 B.C.). The student of the Old Testament is therefore not quite so free to conjecture that the Melchizedek priesthood flourished at Shiloh during the Middle Bronze or even Late Bronze Periods. It is interesting to note, however, that the excavations have shown that House A was destroyed by a catastrophe involving fire at a date suggested by Albright, ca. 1050 B.C. The Biblical account of the destruction of Shiloh in I Samuel 4 has thus received archaeological confirmation and we enjoy a relative confidence about the terminus ad quem of the Shilonite priesthood, if not the terminus a quo.

(e) The most likely route which the Melchizedek priesthood travelled: Shechem to Shiloh, Shiloh to Nob, Nob to Jerusalem. With the exception of the opinion of W. F. Albright,[3] there is widespread agreement among leading contemporary scholars that after the glory of the sanctuary at Shechem had faded, it transferred to Shiloh and ultimately to Jerusalem.[4] That the traditions about, and the priesthood of, Melchizedek travelled a similar course is a natural inference from the apparent fact that the Melchizedek priesthood flourished in all three places. The transference of importance (from the sanctuary at Shechem to the sanctuary at Shiloh) has

---

1. Cf. JPOS X, 1930, pg. 105.

2. Cf. Shechem, pg. 316.

3. Cf. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, pg. 103. Albright is challenged by Nielsen in Shechem, pg. 315.

4. Cf. A. Alt, "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Betel," Kleine Schriften, Band I, pg. 85; M. Noth, The History of Israel, Eng. Tr., 1958, pp. 94f; and E. Nielsen, Shechem, pp. 85, 315, 322, 339, 345.

been sufficiently documented so as not to require a re-submission of evidence here. The transference of the priesthood, the traditions about Melchizedek, and its inherent power to effect victory over enemies, to Jerusalem took place via Nob. As S. R. Driver remarked some time ago, from I Sam. 22, "it may be observed, the priesthood settled formerly at Shiloh appears at Nob."[1] The destruction of all of the priests at Nob, save one, Abiathar, is recorded in the chapter. Thenceforward, Abiathar, the sole heir of the priesthood after the order of Melchizdedek, adheres to David (I Sam. 23:6, 30:7) until finally David settles in Jerusalem (II Sam. 5-7) with an heir of Abiathar still in his company (II Sam. 8:17).[2]

---

1. Cf. HDB IV, pg. 500. It is widely agreed that Nob is to be located in the near vicinity of Jerusalem. Cf. S. R. Driver on the question in HDB, pg. 557; E. E. Voigt "The Site of Nob," JPOS 3, 1923, pp. 79-87; and H. W. Hertzberg "Mizpa," ZAW 47, 1929, esp. pp. 177-179.

2. The authenticity of this vs. is, unfortunately, highly contested. The biggest issue, however, is not over whether an heir of the Shiloh-Nob priesthood remained in the court of David, but rather over Zadok and his background. For further discussion see any of the commentaries and H. H. Rowley "Zadok and Nehustan," JBL LVIII, 1939, pp. 113-142.

PARAGRAPH # 5.

THE NATURE OF THE DEITY WORSHIPPED BY MELCHIZEDEK.

Past enquiries into the nature of the deity worshipped by Melchizedek have tended to result in rather diverse conclusions. Three divergent views are attributable to different interpretations of the names Salem and Melchizedek; two other views emerge owing to a difference of opinion as to how the two elements El and ʿElyon are to be related. Each of these views will be examined below. In each instance the view will be stated in the form of a proposition and the reliability of the proposition then discussed. The sixth proposition investigates how much light the biblical material throws on the nature of the god of Melchizedek; and the last two concern themselves with the relation of the god of Melchizedek to the god of Abram.

Proposition # 1: That the deity worshipped by Melchizedek was called Salem. In his celebrated address, "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament,"[1] Julius Lewy put forward the view that El ʿElyon was not the original name of the deity worshipped by Melchizedek. The name of the original deity lies hidden in the Melchizedek passage in the name of Melchizedek's home city, Salem (i.e. Šālēm). Lewy pointed to the fact that the ancient cities of Ḥarran, Naḥur and ʿAnat were all named after gods who were believed to reside there.[2] He thought that evidence of the existence of this god was also to be found in the personal names of שלמה (Solomon) and אבשלם (Absalom) which he interpreted "Father is שלם ." Lewy also pointed to the existence of the personal names A-bu-Ša-lim ("Father is Šalim) and I-li-Ša-lim ("My God is

---

1. Cf. Revue de l'Histoire des Religions. Tome 110, 1934, pp. 29-65. The essay was first delivered in London before the Society for Old Testament Study.

2. Ibid., pp. 46ff., 60.

Šalim") in the old Assyrian texts which date from the early part of the second millenium. At the other end of the historical scale Lewy maintained that the high rank of the god Salim (=Šulmānu),[1] is attested in the personal name which Adad-narari I (1310-1281), the first of the monarchs of the middle Assyrian Empire who penetrated to the western frontier of Mesopotamia, gave his son: Šulmānu-asarid ("Šulmānu is the first (of the gods)"). After the publication of his address to the Society for Old Testament Study, Lewy later found in the Amarna letter, No. 290, l. 15 substantiation for his previous suggestion that Šulmānu was worshipped in Jerusalem, for there he reads that Abdiḫiba of Jerusalem reported the loss of his capital in the following terms, "And now, in addition, the capital of the country of Jerusalem -- its name is Bit Šulmāni (i.e. "House of Šulmān") --, the king's city, has broken away (to the place) (w)here the people of Kilti (are)."[2]

In 1938 H. S. Nyberg published a full scale documentation of his view that there existed in the ancient Semitic world a god 'Al (אל with a secondary form אלי).[3] 'Elyon (עליון), he said, was but a synonym for the same god 'Al. Continuing from where Lewy left off, Nyberg adduced further evidence that Šalim was one of the names (!) of the deity worshipped by Melchizedek. In addition to pointing to personal names in the old Assyrian texts, Nyberg also included such arguments as: (1) The name Jerusalem means "Foundation of (the god) Salim";[4] (2) in the Ras Shamra

---

1. Cf. Ibid., pg. 62 for Lewy's suggestion that the occurence of Salim in personal and place names sometimes with and sometimes without the suffix -an (um), justifies our concluding that Salem and Sulmānum are identical.

2. Cf. "The Šulmān Temple in Jerusalem" in JBL LIV, 1940, pp. 519f.

3. The earlier statement of Nyberg's "recovery" (Pope's description) of the god 'Al is found in his Studien zum Hoseabuch (Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift, 1935, Pt. 6, pp. 58ff., 90, 120). The fuller statement is in ARW 35, 1938, pp. 329-387. For additional observations on Nyberg's theories, see below, pp. 102f.

4. Nyberg, ARW 35, 1938, pg. 352. For a similar rendering of the meaning of Jerusalem, see Albright in JPOS VIII, 1935, pg. 218, n. 78 ("Let the god Salem found") and Vincent (adopting the same reading) in RB, 1951, pg. 364.

texts, the god Shalim is the son of the high god El;[1] (3) certain Phoenician names indicate that Salim was worshipped there, e.g., כושלם ("Salim is firm"), שלמבעל ("Salim is Lord"), and בתשלם ("Daughter of Salim"); (4) since the word שָׁלוֹם also bears the meaning "success." שלם is a highly appropriate name for the god of Melchizedek since this same god is extolled, "And blessed is El 'Elyon who has delivered your enemies into your hand" (i.e., who has granted you success in war);[2] (5) and finally, Nyberg is especially happy to be able to adduce the personal name Ša-lim-ḫa-lu-um ("Šalim is 'Al") which name appears in one of Lewy's unpublished texts.[3]

Despite the diversity of these arguments and their apparent cumulative weight, they do not establish the point that Salem-Šalim was the name of the god whom Melchizedek worshipped. Certainly the research of Lewy and Nyberg reiterate the veracity of a fact recognized well before the discovery of the Ugaritic texts at Ras Shamra: Salem was the name of an ancient near eastern deity.[4] Lewy is surely right in underlining that the late fourteenth and early thirteenth century B.C. personal name Šulmānu-assarid ("Šulmānu is the first (of the gods)") indicates the high position of the god Šulmānu; and his argument that Bit Šulmāni appears as a name of Jerusalem in early fourteenth century B.C. Amarna Letter No. 290 is not wanting in cogency.[5] However, we cannot overlook

---

1. Cf. ARW 35, 1938, pp. 352f. Cf. also IV AB "The Birth of the Beautiful and Gracious Gods." The most recent English translation is found in G.R. Driver's Canaanite Mytha and Legends. Edinburgh, 1956, pp. 120ff., under the title "Shachar and Shalim." For earlier English commentaries cf. G. A. Barton in JBL LII, 1934, pp. 61-78 and W. F. Albright, JPOS 14, 1934, 101-140.

2. Nyberg refers the reader to Pedersen's treatment of the subject in Israel I-II (Eng. Tr.), Copenhagen, 1926, pp. 236-335.

3. Cf. ARW 35, 1938, pp. 331, n. 4, 352. Reference is made to Lewy, RHR 110, 1934, pg. 64. n. 86.

4. Cf., eg., R. Kittel, GVI I, 3. u. 4 Aufl., pg. 230, 5 Aufl., pg. 185.

5. Cf. W. F. Albright, however, who with G. E. Mendenhall in ANET, pg. 489, reads Bit-Lahmi.

the following facts: (1) what was true in Mesopotamia was not necessarily true in Canaan and (2) as we saw in the previous paragraph, Jerusalem was by no means the undisputed centre of Melchizedek. (3) But what is even more important, the evidence from Ras Shamra indicates that the god Salem (Shalim) instead of being a "high god" was instead a rather obscure offspring of the high god El. Outside of the celebration of his birth together with Shachar, this god does not figure at all in the Ugaritic pantheon. When he does figure, his power does not appear to be nearly as mighty as Nyberg suggests it might be in his excursus on the meaning of שלם. Whereas Shachar means "Dawn," Salem (Shalim) means "Dusk" or "Sunset."[1] Lewy more cautiously than Nyberg makes very little of the Salem (Shalim) of Ras Shamra who as "Sunset" can hardly be said to approach the exalted position of the god of Melchizedek who is extolled as "creator of heaven and earth."

Perhaps the most spectacular piece of evidence adduced in favour of the proposition under discussion is the name Šá-lim-ḫa-lu-um proferred by Nyberg and interpreted as "Šalim is ʿAl." The name he purports to find in the divine name Sulmanḫe mentioned by Lewy.[2] Both Lewy and Albright were of the opinion, however, that ḫe or ḫa was but a Hurrite suffix and that Sulmanuḫa/e and Samnuḫa are but Hurrianized forms of Šulmānu.[3] Nyberg provides us with neither justification nor explanation for his reading of the Hurrite ḫe as the equivalent of ḫa-lu-um. For want of evidence, therefore, his reading cannot be accepted.

---

1. For a justification of the reading "Sunset," cf. W. F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 4th Ed., pg. 195, n. 10. G. R. Driver, op. cit., prefers "Dusk." In the second edition of his From Stone Age to Christianity, however, Albright keeps the reading "the Perfect One" as a rendering of Shalim (cf. pg.175).

2. Cf. for Nyberg's statements ARW 35, 1938, pp. 331, n. 4, 352 and for Lewy's RHR 110, 1934, pg. 64.

3. Cf. JBL LIX, 1940, pg. 519, n. 2.

The assertion that the names of the two sons of David, Solomon and Absalom are theophorous is of interest to the student of Biblical history, for, if true, it would be a good indication that David himself paid obeisance to a deity named שלם . As it stands, the matter is far from certain. As Professor Norman Porteous has said, "David may have had a family reason for giving two of his sons the names Absalom and Solomon, to reinforce the reason suggested to him by his capital Jerusalem."[1]

The results are similarly inconclusive when it comes to the meaning of the place name, Salem. It is not a fixed rule that ancient near eastern cities always derived their names from deities worshipped in them. It may, of course, be admitted that Lewy's argument is strong in view of the fact that the existence of a god Salem (Shalim) is beyond dispute. However, even if the name of Melchizedek's locale Salem, was in fact named after the deity who was at one time worshipped there, this alone would not constitute sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that Melchizedek worshipped a deity of the same name. To conclude that Melchizedek worshipped a deity Salem (Shalim) we would have to establish that the date in which the city acquired the name Salem was close enough to the date of Melchizedek to make it likely that Melchizedek continued to worship the same deity. And this information is simply not available. As M. Noth has pointed out, there is indication in the altar name Yahweh-Shalom (Ju. 6:24) that a deity שלם יהוה was worshipped at Ophrah,[2] but this does not permit us to conclude that a deity of the same name was also worshipped by Melchizedek at Shechem during the patriarchal age.

---

1. Cf. N. W. Porteous "Shalem-Shalom" in the Glasgow University Oriental Society, Vol. X., 1940-41, pp. 1-7. Prof. Porteous recognizes the existence of the god Shalem and suggests he was an Amorite deity.

2. Cf. Die israelitischen Personennamen. BWANT III/10, 1928, pg. 165.

Proposition #2: That the deity worshipped by Melchizedek was called Zedek. The name Melchizedek has been interpreted in a variety of ways. Three of them will be briefly reviewed in the present discussion.

(1) In the latter part of the last century and in the earlier part of the present century, the name Melchizedek was frequently interpreted as "king of righteousness"[1] or "legitimate king"[2] reading the medial ' as a hireq compaginis. This interpretation of the meaning of the name Melchizedek is manifestly that of the Letter to the Hebrews,

πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης

"He is first, by translation of his name, king of righteousness" (Heb. 7:2).

This older and revered reading is not receiving today as wide an acceptance. W. F. Albright remarks, for example, "Against the theory of hireq compaginis is the fact that the progress of recent ancient Oriental onomatology is absolutely opposed to the existence of the formation in proper names."[3] The way would thus seem to be more open for accepting other interpretations of the name.

(2) and (3). The second and third interpretations of the name Melchizedek are virtually identical. They have in common with the views of M. Lewy the conviction that the name of the original deity of Melchizedek is hidden -- in this case, not in the name of his home city, but in his own name. Accordingly the name is interpreted "Zedek is my king" or, simply, "Zedek is king." In his study of Israelite personal names, M. Noth has pointed out that a medial i is frequently dropped (e.g., Absalom and Abisalom)[4] or replaced by the medial u (e.g., Abu-milki in

---

1. Cf. G-K, Par. 90 l; Skinner, Genesis (ICC) 1910, pg. 267.
2. Cf. W. F. Albright, JSOR X, 1926, pg. 264.
3. Cf. W. F. Albright, JBL LIV, 1935, pg. 193.
4. Cf. I Kings 15:2,10 and II Chronicles 11:20, 21.

Amarna Letter No. 152, 55 instead of Abi-milki); he therefore suggests that the medial i is not the first person singular suffix but the remnant of a case (genitive) ending which has in turn become a neutral linking vowel.[1] If Noth's reasoning is valid, of the two above interpretations, "Zedek is king" is preferable. Noth's study leads him even further to the conclusion that the word order in מלכי־צדק speaks decisively against interpreting צדק as the theophorous element.[2] He acknowledged, of course, the fact widely recognized since the turn of the century[3] that צדק is a theophorous element in other Semitic names (e.g., Rab-zidki in Amarna Letter No. 170, 37). Other scholars have persisted in interpreting צדק as the theophorous element.[4] Geo Widengren has even attempted to demonstrate that in Pss. 85:11,12,14 and 89:15 there is a reference to the deity.[5] And a god Σηδύκ (Suduc) is mentioned in the Phoenician pantheon of Philo of Byblus.[6] Nevertheless the judgement of Prof. Johnson, who has recently reviewed the latter and other interpretations of "Melchizedek," may be regarded as sound, "we cannot affirm it with certainty."[7]

---

1. Noth, Die isr. Personennamen 1928, pp. 33ff.

2. Ibid., pg. 161, n. 4.

3. Cf., e.g., Baudissin, Adonis und Esmun, 1911, pp. 247f.; R. Kittel, GVI I, 6 Aufl., 1922, pg. 185.

4. Cf., e.g., A. Johnson's "The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus" in The Labyrinth, S. H. Hooke, Ed., London, 1935, pp. 83f. (which view was later abandoned in Sacral Kingship, 1955, pp. 32f.); G. Widengren, Accadian and Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation, Stockholm 1937, pp. 71, 322; H. S. Nyberg, ARW 35, 1938 pp. 355ff.; and H. H. Rowley "Melchizedek and Zadok" in the Bertholetfestschrift, pp. 464f.

5. Cf. G. Widengren, op. cit., pg. 721. To the present writer Ringgren's suggestion that Zedek and Salem "might be regarded as hypostatized functions of the high-god El" is preferable to the view of Widengren. Cf. H. Ringgren, Word and Wisdom, Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East, Lund, 1947, pg. 88.

6. Cf. Eusebii Preparatio Evangelii, E. H. Gifford, Ed., Oxford, 1903, 36a.

7. Cf. A. Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 32f.

Proposition # 3: <u>That the deity worshipped by Melchizedek was called Milki, Milku or the like.</u> In addition to the three interpretations of the name Melchizedek dealt with above, three others may be mentioned in connexion with the present proposition: (4) "My king is righteous";[1] (5) "The King is righteous";[2] (6) "<u>Milki</u> is righteous." Although there is no need to be dogmatic on the matter (5) and (6) seem preferable to (4). As we had occasion to observe in the discussion of the previous proposition, it is very likely that the medial י is not the first person singular suffix. Thus interpretation (4) does not especially commend itself.

It is more difficult to decide between (5) and (6). מלך appears as a theophorous element in a number of Biblical names.[3] In one or two of these instances and in an impressive number of names from the Canaanite area, there is reason to believe that the element מלך appears as the divine name <u>Milku</u>, <u>Milki</u>, <u>Milk</u> or the like.[4] In view of

---

1. The full meaning is, "The god whom I worship as king is righteous."

2. The full meaning could be theophorous ("The deity, who is king, is righteous") or it could refer to an earthly king. For the latter view cf. Benj. Meisler, "Das Vordavidische Jerusalem," <u>JPOS</u> X, 1930, pg. 187, n. 2, who, on the basis of Theo. Bauer's <u>Ostkanaäner</u> views "Melchizedek" as an Amorite name which came from Babylonia and being a straight translation of <u>Sarrukēn</u> means "The king (is) legitimate."

3. Cf., e.g., M. Noth, <u>Die isr. Personennamen</u>, pg. 141, who lists the following in which the element מלך was originally theophorous: (1) אֲבִימֶלֶךְ (Abimelech: (a) a Canaanite contemporary of Abraham and Isaac in Gen. 20: 1-18 (E); 21:22-32 (E); 26: 1-33 (J); and (b) the son of Gideon Judges 8:31; 9:1-10 and II Sam. 11:21); (2) אֲחִימֶלֶךְ (Ahimelech: (a) a priest at Nob in I Sam. 21:2-10; 22:6-23; 23:6; 30:7 and (b) the reputed son of the priest Abiathar in II Sam. 8:17; and (c) a Hittite companion of David in his flight from Saul in I Sam. 26:6); (3) אֱלִימֶלֶךְ (Elimelech in Ruth 1:2,3; 2:3; 4:3,9 who is Naomi's husband); and (4) מַלְכִּיָּהוּ (Malchijah: (a) the father of Pashhur, one of Zedekiah's advisors in Jer. 21:1, 38:1, and (b) a prince of the royal house in Jer. 38:6, etc.). Johnson in <u>Sacral Kingship</u>, pp. 39f. includes in the list of biblical names in which מלך is theophorous: מַלְכִּיאֵל (Malchiel) and מַלְכִּי־שׁוּעַ (Malchi-shua).

******

4. Cf. A. Johnson, <u>Sacral Kingship</u>, pg. 39 who suggests that Ahimelech may have meant originally "Brother of Milku(-i)" and by inference he suggests a similar original meaning as probable for Abimelech. Personal names in the Amarna letters reveal the reverencing of <u>Milku(-i)</u>; in Ras Shamra the deity <u>Milkum</u>; in Phoenician epigraphic texts the deity <u>Melqart</u>; and in Punic epigraphic texts a deity <u>Milk</u> (pp. 35ff.).

the fact that Milku (i) is well attested in the Canaanite area as a divine name as early as the fifteenth century B.C.,[1] and the fact that Melik is attested in Accadian texts as early as the third millenium,[2] it is probable that we ought to interpret Melchizedek as (6) "Milki is righteous."[3] The disturbing part of this interpretation, however, is that Albright has brought forth evidence to show that Malik ("king") or Muluk ("kingship") was regarded among the early Semitic inhabitants of northern Mesopotamia and Syria as the patron of vows and solemn promises to whom children might be sacrificed as the harshest and most binding pledge of the sanctity of a promise.[4] It would thus also be probable that we have in the Milki of Melchizedek the forerunner of the abomination Molech (Milk)[5] to whom children were sacrificed in Israel.[6]

Proposition # 4: That El and ʿElyon are identical. In his important article on the god ʿAl, H. S. Nyberg put forward the view that El and ʿAl (ʿElyon) are identical.[7] One of the main supports for this conclusion he drew from a comparative study of old west Semitic and Hebrew names. These "old west Semitic" names he took from the Kültepe texts published by J. Lewy[8] and from T. Bauer's Die Ostkanaäner.[9] The

---

1. Ibid., pg. 35.

2. Cf. W. F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 4th Ed., 1956, pg. 162.

3. This is also the conclusion to which A. R. Johnson comes, Sacral Kingship, pg. 42.

4. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 4th Ed., pp. 162f.

5. It is widely observed that the vowels in Molech are not original but derive from בֹּשֶׁת ("shame"), thus reflecting the condemnation of the biblical writer on the god and the manner in which he was worshipped.

6. Cf. Lev. 18:21 (H); 20:2-5 (H); II Kings 23:10; Jer. 32:35. R. Kittel also did not hesitate to draw a connecting line between the pre-Israelite Milk and the Israelite Molech, GVI I, 6. Aufl., pg. 184. The very caution with which Albright delimits the worship of Malik or Muluk to northern Mesopotamia and Syria suggests an understandable reluctance to draw the connecting line as directly.

7. Cf. ARW 35, 1938, pp. 334ff.

8. Cf. ibid., pg. 329, n. 2 for a complete list of references.

9. Nyberg preferred the term "old west Semitic" to Bauer's "east Canaanite."

comparative material and Nyberg's conclusions will be given below. It need only be noted that Bauer did not see in ḫa-lum the proper name of a deity, but rather a simple reference to "uncle (on the mother's side)."[1]

Old West Semitic		Hebrew	
Ì-lí-a-lim	אל־על	אל־אל cp.	אל־הו Elijah
A-la-bu-um	עלאב	אל־אב cp.	יואב Joab
Ia-da-ah-ḫa-lum	ידע־על		
Ia-da-ah-AN	ידע־אל	אל־דע cp.	יהידע
Su-mu-ḫa-la	שמועל		
Su-mu-AN	שמואל	שמואל	Samuel
Šú-ub-na-ḫi-lu	שבנא־על	שׁוּבָאֵל	
Šú-ub-na-AN	שבנא־אל		
Mu-ut-ḫa-li	מחעל	מחושאל	, if separated
		metu - sa - el	
Ia-ku-un-a-li	יכן־על	(but cp. אליכין)	יכניהו
Ḫa-li-sa-da	על־שדי	(cp. אל שדי)	
Sa-lim-ḫa-lu-um[2]	שלם־על	cp. שלמיאל	

This material shows that the old west Semitic ʿAl and Ilu were identical concepts. In other words, ʿAl was for them Ilu, god in the actual meaning of that word, and Ilu in the pregnant sense -- according to all appearances the word Ilu was originally simply a designation of the numinous -- was ʿAl. ʿAl was the proper name for Ilu.[3]

In the view of the present writer, Nyberg attempts to press far too much out of the material he adduces. To be sure, his comparison of the old west Semitic with the Hebrew names does indicate that ḥ א in the Hebrew and ḥ y were used in a parallel fashion, but his conclusion is precarious.

---

1. Cf. Theo. Bauer, Die Ostkanaäner, Leipzig 1926, pg. 61.

2. Cf. above, pg. 97 for an explanation of how Nyberg arrives at this name.

3. Cf. Nyberg, op. cit., pp. 334f.

It is common knowledge to students of Israelite and ancient Semitic onomatology that the elements אב and אח are used in a parallel fashion.[1] This fact, however, does not permit us to go so far as to suggest that אח is the proper name for אב or vice versa. "Father" and "Brother" may be used in exactly the same way in the formation of Semitic personal names, but it would be unsound to press this fact to the conclusion that "Father" was "Brother" or "Brother" "Father."

Equally precarious is Nyberg's inference that in the place name אֶלְעָלֵה (Elealeh)[2] is found the name of the god ʿAlē who is of the same type as the Hebrew ʿElyon and the south Arabic ʿAlīy. The fact that the locality of Elealeh is 934 M. high is in itself sufficient to account for the name.[3] The present day name of the location, El-ʿAl (i.e., "The Height")[4] lends support to such a conclusion and tends to confirm the soundness in attributing the original name to its height rather than to its association with a god.

Perhaps most nearly convincing of all the evidence Nyberg brings forward is his reference to the old Aramaic Sujin inscription found in 1930 by Ronzevalle at Sefire near Aleppo.[5] In this inscription, which has been dated in the second half of the eighth century B.C., אב and ן-בע are separated only by a connecting ו. Nyberg thus observes that the two deities are "very closely related, perhaps as immediately as 'day and night.'"[6] There can be no question that the Sujin

---

1. Nyberg himself acknowledges, pg. 334, that abu and ahu are used in a parallel fashion to name formations with ʿal and Ilu.

2. Cf. Num. 32:3; Isa. 15:4; 16:9; Jer. 48:34. In Num. 32:37 it is written אֶלְעָלָא

3. Cf. K-B, pg. 56.

4. Ibid.

5. A report of this inscription is made by Hempel in ZAW 50, 1932, pp. 178-182. A complete bibliography is found in F. Rosenthal's Die Aramaistische Forschung, Leiden, 1939, pg. 13, n. 5.

6. Pope points out the similarity between this Sujin construction and the Ugaritic Ktr wHss and Qds wAmrr and notes that Cassuto concluded the Sujin inscription referred to a single deity. Nyberg did not go as far as Cassuto for he acknowledged that the Sujin אב and ן-בע were separate deities. For references, cf. Pope's El, pg. 55..

inscription does lend strong support to the view that El and ʿElyon were intimately related. Subsequent research has shown, however, that there is very little ground on which to establish the identity of El and ʿElyon. In 1944 Della Vida published an article, "El ʿElyon in Genesis 14:18-20,"[1] in which he showed from a (second century A.D.) Neo-Punic inscription from Leptis Magna in Tripolitania that El was a god separate and distinct from ʿElyon. The inscription opens with the phrase לארן לאל קן ארץ "To the Lord, El, Lord[2] of Earth." In a bi-lingual inscription from Palmyra dated in 39 A.D., Della Vida found another reference to ʾl qn [illegible] rʿ [illegible]. In 1948 an even more startling confirmation of Della Vida's views appeared with the publication of Phoenician inscriptions from Karatepe by Bossert.[3] In the gate inscription which dates back to the 8th century B.C., the phrase אל קן ארץ is found once again, but no reference is made at all to ʿElyon. The soundest conclusion to be drawn from a perusal of these inscriptions seems to be: although perhaps related, ʾEl and ʿElyon were nonetheless two distinct and separate deities.

Proposition # 5: That El ʿElyon means El, grandson of ʿElyon.

(a) The proposition set vis à vis other interpretations of El ʿElyon.

R. Dussaud put forth the suggestion that El ʿElyon means "El (son of) Elyon."[4] M. Pope in his monograph, El in the Ugaritic Texts, observes that Dussaud's suggested reading is not quite as accurate as it

---

1. Cf. JBL 63, 1944, pp. 1-9.

2. Della Vida preferred "Lord" as a translation of קנה. For his justification, cf. ibid., pg. 1, n. 1.

3. For the most accessible transcription of these inscriptions with translation and notes, cf. A. Alt "Die phönikischen Inschriften von Karatepe" in Die Welt des Orients, 1949, pp. 272-287. Reference to the Bossert reports are found in ibid., pg. 272, n. 1.

4. Cf. Syria, 27, 1950, pg. 333, n. 2.

might be, for in the pantheon of Philo of Byblos, El appears as the grandson and not as the son of ʿElyon.[1] In the opinion of the present writer, Pope's modification of Dussaud's suggested reading is the most satisfactory interpretation of the meaning of El ʿElyon that has been put forward to date.[2] Here are some of the other leading interpretations of the name El ʿElyon.

(1) Eissfeldt has suggested recently, "In Gen. xiv. 18, 19, 22 ʿElyon is either an adjectival apposition following El or an appellative with the meaning "god" preceding ʿElyon understood as a proper name, probably the former."[3]

(2) Cassuto was of the opinion that this and other names compounded with ʾel in Genesis are a "testimony to the religion of Israel in Canaan after the conquest rather than archaic survivals."[4]

(3) Della Vida was even more forthright than Cassuto in rejecting the originality of El ʿElyon in Genesis 14: the god, he says, "has been artificially set up through the combination of El the Lord of earth with ʿElyon the Lord of Heaven."[5]

(4) As we saw in the course of the preceding proposition, Nyberg thought that El was identical with ʿElyon; El ʿElyon he considered to be but an Umschreibung (circumlocution) standing for the high god ʿAl.[6]

The factor in common to the four preceding interpretations of El ʿElyon is that all of them pay little or no attention to the information

---

1. Cf. Pope, op. cit., pp. 55f.

2. This interpretation may be defended in the following manner. We have here an instance where the second of two nouns defines more precisely the first (cf. G-K, Par. 82a, 125h, 127f-k and H. Bauer and P. Leander, Historische Grammatik des Alten Testaments, 1922, Par. 64g). עֶלְיוֹן distinguishes this אֵל from others. בֵּן (or בֶּן־בֵּן) has been omitted but is understood. Similar instances of an ellipse in the determination of one noun by another are given by G-K, Par. 125h.

3. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh" in Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. I, pg. 29, n. 1.

4. The quote is taken from Pope, op. cit., pg. 15.

5. Cf. Della Vida, op. cit., pg. 9. Della Vida held to the identity of ʿElyon with Baal Shamem, as did Eissfeldt in Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton, Halle, 1939, pg. 115, n. 1, but cf. Pope, El, pp. 56ff. where the correctness of this identification is doubted.

6. Cf. Nyberg op. cit., pg. 335.

regarding the Phoenician pantheon passed on by Philo of Byblus.[1] Scepticism has been expressed even after the discovery of the Ras Shamra texts concerning Philo. We may observe for the moment, however, that the material of Philo is being regarded with increasing respect. The noted near eastern authority W. F. Albright has thus opined,

> Since not only the names of gods and the mythological atmosphere, but also many details of Philo's narrative are in complete agreement with Ugaritic and later Phoenician inscriptions, we are fully justified in accepting provisionally all data preserved by him, though we may often remain in doubt as to the exact meaning of a passage or the original name underlying Philo's Greek equivalent.[2]

The most important points at which the reliability of his pantheon is questioned will be examined below in section (c).

(b) Part of the Phoenician pantheon according to Philo.

As stated, Pope's modification of Dussaud's suggestion undoubtedly receives its main support from the pantheon which Philo has taken from Sanchuniathon. The pertinent material found in Book I, Chapter X of the Preparatio Evangelica (36a-36c) reads as follows:

> From Suduc[3] came the Dioscuri, or Cabeiri, or Corybantes, or Samathraces: These, he says first invented a ship. From them have sprung others, who discovered herbs, and the healing of venomous bites and charms. In their time is born (γίνεται) a certain 'Elioun (Ἐλιοῦν) called the "Most High" (Ὕψιστος) and a female named Beruth (Βηρούθ)[4] and

---

1. The remarks of Philo are preserved for us by Eusebius, the Christian historian, in his Preparatio Evangelica. Philo, a native of Byblus in Phoenicia, lived in the first century A.D., but wrote on "Phoenician Matters" and "Phoenician History." He reports that his material concerning the Phoenician gods has been taken from a Phoenician priest, Sanchuniathon, whom scholars believe lived anywhere from the 14th to the 6th Century B.C. Cf. for further details, Eissfeldt, Ras Schamra und Sarchunjaton, 1939; W. F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 4th Ed., pp. 69ff., and F. Løkkegaard, "Some Comments on the Sanchuniathon Tradition in Studia Theologica, Vol. VIII, Fasc. II, 1954, pp. 51-76.

2. Cf. Arch. and Relig. Israel, 4th Ed., pp. 70f.

3. This is most likely the deity Zedek (צֶדֶק) discussed in Proposition #2 above.

4. In the opinion of the present writer this is the deity Berith (בְּרִית) who was worshipped at Shechem (cf. Ju. 8:33; 9:4; 46). It is interesting to note that E. Nielsen comes close to identifying Berith with Berouth when he describes Berith as being a Phoenician deity of covenant who may have been worshipped by the entire city coalition (Cf. Shechem, pg. 9).

> these dwelt in the neighborhood of Byblos. And from them is born Epigeius (Ἐπίγειος)[1] or Autochthon (Αὐτόχθων)[2] whom they afterwards called Uranus (Οὐρανός);[3] so that from him they named the element above us Uranus because of the excellence of its beauty. And he has a sister born of the aforesaid parents, who is called Ge (Γῆ)[4], and from her, he says, because of her beauty, they called the earth by the same name. And their father, the Most High, died in an encounter with wild beasts, and was deified (ἀφιερώθη), and his children offered to him libations and sacrifices.
>
> And Uranus, having succeeded to his father's rule, takes to himself in marriage his sister Ge, and gets by her four sons, Elus[5] who is also called Kronos, and Baetylus, and Dagon who is Siton and Atlas.

Probably the most important fact to be learned from this material is that Elioun is not originally a god, but a mortal man.[6] His offspring, Uranus, after whom heaven was named, is also a man who is deified at his death (38b). Eusebius' citation from Philo ends with the report that "Astarte, the great goddess, and Zeus Demarus, and Adodus,[7] king of gods reigned over the country with the consent of Kronos" (38c). If more had been taken from Philo, it is fairly safe to conjecture that he would have recorded also the deification of Elus-Kronos. In this material from Sanchuniathon, in any event, El(us) is the grandson of Elioun (= 'Elyon).

(c) The Reliability of the Sanchuniathon Tradition

(1) Are Elioun and Ouranos a duplication? Eissfeldt, Dussaud, Løkkegaard and others are of the opinion that despite the reliability of Philo in certain regards, Elioun and Ouranos are a

---

1. That is Terrestial or "The one who is above Earth" (Della Vida).

2. That is Aboriginal or Indigenous.

3. That is Heaven.

4. That is Earth.

5. That is 'El.

6. Prof. James Barr has pointed out to me that this fact may be due to Philo's euhemerism (on which cf. HERE V, pp. 572f.). It would, of course, be unsound to attribute every instance of Philo's assigning a human origin to a deity solely to this cause.

7. That is Hadad, the ancient Semitic storm god, on whom cf. Albright, Arch. and Relig. Israel, 4th Ed., pp. 73f, and Pedersen, Israel III, IV, pg. 718, n.

duplication.[1] Dussaud puts it this way, "It has been recognized for a long time that Philo wanted to adorn his city, Berytos, with a peculiar glamour, and that he duplicated the personage of 'Elioun-Ouranos in order to make Berouth the mother of Ge, which reveals an excessive local claim."[2] The assertion has much cogency; and Eissfeldt even makes a convincing case for concluding that "Heaven" and "Earth" were originally names of certain parts of the Phoenician countryside (near Byblos and Berytos).[3] Comparative material, however, suggests that we ought not to dismiss the pantheon of Philo too perfunctorily.

(2) Comparative material from the land of the Hitties.

Among the Hittite myths, for example, there is found in the Hurrian language a myth of divine kingship, the first part of which reads:

> Once in the olden days Alalus was king in heaven. (As long as) Alalus was seated on the throne, the mighty Anus, first among the gods, was standing before him. He would sink at his feet and set the drinking cup in his hand.
>
> Nine in number were the years that Alalus was king in heaven. In the ninth year Anus gave battle to Alalus and he vanquished Alalus. He fled before him and went down to the dark earth. Down he went to the dark earth, but Anus took his seat upon the throne. The mighty Kumarbis would give him his food. He would sink at his feet and set the drinking cup in his hand.[4]

The correspondence between this part of the Hittite myth and the material contained in Philo is striking. The sequence Alalu- Anu (Sumerian an = heaven)[5]-Kumarbi is matched in the Sanchuniathon tradition by Elioun-Ouranos (heaven)-Elus. There are also differences. In the Hittite myth Alalu, Anu and Kumarbi are obviously gods; in Sanchuniathon their counterparts are men. In the Sanchuniathon tradition, on the other hand, Elioun

---

1. Cf. Eissfeldt's Ras Shamra und Sanchunjaton, pg. 116, and n. 4 on the same page; Dussaud's Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra, 2 e Ed., 1941, pg. 112; and Løkkegaard, op. cit., pg. 60.

2. Cf. Dussaud, Ras Shemra, pg. 112.

3. Cf. Eissfeldt, Ras Shamra, pp. 109ff.

4. Cf. ANET, pg. 120; lines 8-18, A. Goetze is the translator.

5. Cf. O. R. Gurney, The Hittites, 2nd Edition, 1954, pg. 190f. for an excellent commentary on this myth. Gurney, after the original translator Güterbock, compares it with the information found in Hesiod's Theogony.

meets his end in an encounter with wild beasts, while the Hittite myth relates a theomachy between Alalu and Anu. These differences are slight, however, especially in view of an even more remarkable similarity between the two sequences of gods. In part of the Hittite myth, not quoted above, the demise of Anu is brought about by Kumarbi who "bites off his 'knees' (i.e., male parts)," while in the Phoenician version Ouranos is also emasculated by his son, Elus. This latter correspondence is of particular importance and will be dealt with again below. The fact which we wish to underline here is that in this Hurrian text the sequence of rulers does not begin with Anu (Heaven), but with Alalu. In view of other points of correspondence between Philo's account of Phoenician men and gods and the Hittite account, it is highly probable that the Phoenician version may have been derived in part from the Hittite. The text of the Hittite myth dates from the 13th Century B.C.[1] but undoubtedly reflects Hittite belief considerably earlier than that. In any event the very existence of this Hittite myth makes it certain that the presence of Elioun in the Phoenician pantheon prior to Ouranos was not necessarily a fabrication of Sanchuniathon or Philo.[2]

(3) Comparative material from the Accadian Creation Epic.

In the same way that a regard towards the Hittite myth of divine kingship tends to strengthen our inclination to rely on the tradition of Philo of Byblus, so a glance at the opening strains of the Babylonian Creation Epic, the Enuma Elish, provides us with material to show that Philo rings true.[3]

---

1. Cf. M. Pope, El, pg. 56.

2. Cassuto believed that Philo or his sources was responsible for the separation of Elioun and El into two separate entities. Cf. Pope, El, pg. 55, n. 2.

3. Cf. ANET, pp. 60f, for E. A. Speiser's translation of the Enuma Elish. For an excellent commentary cf. T. Jacobsen's remarks in Before Philosophy, Penguin Books, 1954, pp. 182ff.

Out of the intermingled chaos of Apsu (sweet waters), Ti'amat (the sea) and Mummu (cloud banks and mist?) arise Lahmu and Lahamu. From these derive the next divine pair, Anshar (the male circle which circumscribes the sky) and Kishar (the female circle which circumscribes the earth). And this pair gives birth to Anu, the god of the sky, who in turn begets Nudimmut, another name for Ea, or En-ki (Lord-Earth). In commenting on this part of the myth, Thorkild Jacobsen notes how the birth of Nudimmut breaks the progression by pairs and suggests that the redactor may have wished "to stress the male aspect of the earth, Ea-Enki, since the latter figured as father of Marduk in Babylonian theology."[1] He continues, "Originally, therefore, Anshar-Kishar may have been followed by An-ki, 'heaven and earth.'" If Jacobsen is right in this conjecture, there exists a striking parallelism between the Babylonian and Phoenician stories. Anshar - Kishar: An - Ki:: Elioun - Berouth: Ouranos - Ge. It may be pointed out that there appears to be a certain duplication in the Babylonian Creation Epic in that before Anu (heaven) there is Anshar (the sky's horizon) and before earth, Kishar (the earth's horizon). The duplication is carried even further when it is reported later on during the epic that the sky has been fashioned by the wind-god out of half of the body of the sea. Jacobsen has explained that there lies behind two of these diverse accounts in reality only variations of the one theme: "heaven and earth were two great discs deposited by silt in the watery chaos and forced apart by the wind, so that the present universe is a sort of inflated sack surrounded by waters above and below."[2] With regard to the other account, he submits that Anu came to be viewed more as the power behind the sky rather than the sky itself "to make this inherent contradiction less acute."[3] All of this is highly instructive as to the

---

1. Ibid., pg. 186.
2. Ibid., pg. 195.
3. Ibid.

kind of judgements we ought and ought not to make when evaluating any other ancient accounts of gods and their domains. It is true as Della Vida and others have pointed out, that the very name 'Elyon (Most High) calls to mind a deity of the heavens -- Della Vida suggested of the astral heavens.[1] It is also true that if Elioun was a deity of the heavens, the birth of Ouranos (Heaven) does appear to be a duplication. The duplication can be explained perhaps, as it is by Della Vida, who says that Ouranos (Samen) was god of the "Atmospheric or meteoric sky," or it can be asserted that the two are simply a duplication, as is done by Eissfeldt, Dussaud and Lokkegaard. Both of these attempts to explain sequence Elioun-Ouranos, however, suffer from a demand for the kind of logic and consistency of thought which we know was not indigenous to the ancient near east.[2] The very fact that there appears to be a duplication of function between Elioun and Ouranos tends to speak in favour of their authenticity rather than against it.

(4) Elyon's fatherhood of heaven and earth is reflected in the descriptive phrase, קֹנֵה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ . The verb קנה is found fairly frequently in Scriptures (83 times), but it is seldom used to describe an action of God,[3] and just about as seldom to describe divine creativity.[4] By and large the word means "to get, to acquire, or to buy."[5] In the context of Genesis 14 the participle קֹנֵה has been rendered

---

1. Cf. Della Vida, JBL 63, 1944, pg. 4.

2. Cf. in addition to the above observations on contradictions in the Enuma Elish, the opening chapter of Before Philosophy where H. and H. G. Frankfort make a brilliant presentation on the nature of mythopoeic thought.

3. Ex. 15:16; Pss. 74:2, 78:54; Isa. 11:11.

4. Gen. 14:19.22 (heaven and earth); Dt. 32:6 (Israel); Ps. 139:13 (inward parts); Prov. 8:22 (wisdom).

5. Cf. BDB, 1907, pg. 888f. and K-B 1953, pg. 843.

variously as "Creator,"[1] "Maker,"[2] "Owner,"[3] "Possessor,"[4] "Lord."[5] P. Humbert has recently examined these passages in his article, "'Qana' en Hebreu Biblique."[6] Humbert's thesis is that there are two roots underlying the biblical קנה: קנה meaning "create" and קנן meaning "acquire, possess." We wish to point out here that the notion of "procreation" underlies the biblical and Ugaritic root, קנה .

In three out of the five [7] biblical passages in which, Humbert avers, קנה may properly be translated "create," the context unmistakably involves the idea of "procreation," i.e., begetting, as in fatherhood, or forming and bringing forth as at birth.

> Do you thus requite the Lord,
> you foolish and senseless people?
> Is he not your father, who created you (קָנֶךָּ).
> who made you (עָשְׂךָ) and established you (וַיְכֹנְנֶךָּ) (Dt. 32:6);
>
> For thou didst form (קָנִיתָ) my inward parts,
> thou didst knit me together (תְּסָכְּנִי) in my mother's womb.
>
> (Ps. 139:13);
>
> The Lord created me (קָנָנִי) at the beginning of his work,
> the first of his acts of old.
> Ages ago I was set up (נְסַכְתִּי),
> at the first before the beginning of the earth.
> When there were no depths I was brought forth (חוֹלָלְתִּי)[8]
> when there were no springs abounding with water.
> (Prov. 8:22,24).

---

1. So. LXX, Luther, Moffatt (1922), Zürcher Bibel (1931), An Am. Translation (1939).

2. So. RSV (1952).

3. So. JE XI, 1905, pg. 270 as a secondary meaning.

4. So. ARV (1901).

5. So. Della Vida, JBL 63, 1944, pg. 1,h.)

6. Bertholetfestschrift, 1950, pp. 259-266.

7. Humbert, ibid., pg. 260 wants us also to translate קנתה in Ps. 78:54 as "create." He himself, however, puts forward this view with diffidence, appending either a "(?)," pg. 260, or a "?," pg. 266. Because the context of Ps. 78:54 makes such a translation highly questionable (RSV translates "won") we cannot accept this verse as one which "may properly be translated 'create.'"

8. The use of this verb in Ps. 51:7 and Job 15:7 can leave little doubt that however poetically this verb is employed here, the idea of being brought forth as a child from his mother's womb does not lie far from the surface. The verb is repeated, moreover, in vs. 25.

On the grounds of these three passages it is reasonable to suggest that the two remaining occurances of קָנָה in Genesis 14 bear also a similar nuance, and therefore, that the view of 'Elyon or El 'Elyon portrayed there is one of "Father," "procreator," or "begetter." In Genesis 4:1, it may be added, surely involves the idea of procreation:

> Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived (וַתַּהַר) and bore (וַתֵּלֶד) Cain (קַיִן), saying, "I have gotten (קָנִיתִי) a man with (the help of?) Yahweh (אֶת־יְהוָה)."

When one turns to the passages in Ugaritic which Humbert suggests constituted the background (arrière-fond) of קָנָה as "create" in the Bible, the notion of "procreate" becomes even more apparent. He cites Keret I:57; Danel II, 6:41; II AB, I:22, 23; 3:25, 26, 28-30,34,35.[1] The references from II AB refer for the most part to the goddess Asherah, who is Qnyt 'elm, "Creatress of the Gods" according to Albright's rendering[2] and "Progenitress of the Gods" according to Ginsberg.[3] It is well known, of course, to students of Ugaritic literature that the relationship between El and his wives can hardly be described as Platonic.[4] Humbert's reference from Danel II (Aqhat II or AQHT A), 6:41 is translated by Driver,

> '[With it?' Forthwith] Anat laughed and forged [a plot]
> in her heart (saying). 'Attend to me O hero Aqhat, attend to me and [I will speak]'[5]

His first reference, in which King Keret speaks, reads,

> [Grant] I may get sons (or 'a son')
> [grant] that I may multiply kin.[6]

---

1. Op. cit., pg. 266.

2. JPOS XIV, 1934, pp. 118ff.

3. ANET, pg. 131.

4. See esp. IV AB also called "The Birth of the Beautiful and Gracious Gods," l. 55 or IV AB - RS 319 (in ANET, pg. 141f). Pope discusses the subject and gives further references in his monograph El in the Ugaritic Texts, VT Supplement, Vol. II, 1955.

5. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, pp. 54-55.

6. Cf. Col. ii, 4-5; Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, pg. 28-29; ANET pg. 143.

If Humbert is correct in suggesting that these Ugaritic parallels form the arrière-fond of the biblical קָנָה meaning "create," it must be admitted that the notion of "procreate" is very much present.

In view of the above investigation, it seems safe to conclude that behind the phrase קָנָה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ there lay a mythology which taught that heaven and earth were divinely procreated by ʿElyon. Thus once again the reliability of the information of Philo of Byblus regarding the fatherhood of Elioun receives corroboration.

With the reliability of the Sanchuniathon tradition pertaining to the fatherhood of Elioun tested and tried from these several points of view, we may with increased confidence accept as well the report that El was the son of Ouranos and grandson of Elioun.

Proposition #6: That Few of the ʿElyon Passages in the Bible Throw Light on the Nature of the Original Deity ʿElyon. At the outset of his article on El ʿElyon in Genesis 14, Della Vida demonstrated a characteristic scholarly reserve when he stated, after citing several Psalms in which ʿElyon is a poetic synonym for Yahweh, "How much its popularity may have been favored by the recollection of the old Canaanite deity, I do not venture to guess."[1] In the course of discussion of the present proposition, the writer wishes to underscore the inference of the previous statement of Della Vida's: namely, to cite Biblical passages in which ʿElyon is used as a name of God and to draw conclusions from them as to the original nature of the Canaanite deity ʿElyon, is a highly precarious procedure.

It may be observed in the first place that very few Biblical names indicate that ʿElyon was remembered as the name of a god. When the two names ʿEli (עֶלִי) and Elkanah (אֶלְקָנָה) have been mentioned, the list has been exhausted.[2] It is thus apparent that the period in which ʿElyon flourished as an independent deity had passed well before the beginning of the monarchy in Israel.

---

1. Cf. Della Vida, JBL 63, 1944, pg. 1, n. 2.
2. Cf. our discussion on these names in pp. 90 f above.

It may be observed in the second place that, with one exception,[1] all of the passages in which ʿElyon occurs are poetic, most of them being in the Psalms. This fact ought not to be dismissed lightly. In the vast majority of instances where ʿElyon occurs, the poet or Psalmist uses it in its natural connotation ("higher, highest, most high") to emphasize one aspect or another of the lofty sovereignty of the deity: a) his world wide rulership,[2] b) his judgement,[3] or c) his mighty power to effect victories over enemies.[4] Thus, for example, it is both natural and appropriate that it is ʿElyon (i.e., Yahweh) who thunders his voice from the heavens (Ps. 18:13). Or, again, the absurdity and futility of man's rebellion against Yahweh is stressed in that it is against ʿElyon, ("the Most High" used as a synonym of Yahweh) that he rebels (Ps. 78:17,56; 107:11). Psalmist, priest and prophetic poet thus employed ʿElyon with a regard to its natural connotation to stress one aspect or another of Yahweh's sovereignty. If aspects of the original deity ʿElyon are recalled it was surely more by accident than design. This is even more obvious when we observe the point below that ʿElyon in the Bible is but another name for Yahweh.

In the third place we may briefly document something widely recognised, namely the identification between ʿElyon and Yahweh in the Bible is virtually complete. In addition to Genesis 14:22 where יְהוָה is in apposition to אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, the name יְהוָה עֶלְיוֹן is found three times in Pss. 7:18; 47:3; 97:9; and עֶלְיוֹן and יְהוָה are employed as parallel designations in no less than ten instances (Deut. 32:8f; II Sam. 22:14; Pss. 9:2f; 18:14;

---

1. Genesis 14:22 is the exception where, as we had occasion to see in Paragraph #2 above, the phrase in which ʿElyon occurs is undoubtedly an interpolation.

2. Cf. Pss. 47:3; 57:3; 83:19; 97:9.

3. Cf. Pss. 7:7-9(18); 9:(3),10; 18:8, (14); 21:(8)-10; 46:(5)-8; 47:(3),10;73:(11),15-20; 82:1, (6),7; 91:7,8,(9),10. The name ʿElyon is found in the verses in parentheses.

4. Cf. Pss. 18:(14), 18,38,47-49; 21:(8),13; 50:(14),15; 78:(56),66; 83;18,(19); 92:(2),9,12; 97:(9),10.

21:8; 83:19; 87:5f; 91:1f, 9; 92:2). In the so-called "Elohistic Psalter" (Pss. 42-83) it is not surprising that אֱלֹהִים and עֶלְיוֹן are used in parallelism (Pss. 46:5; 47:2f. and 50:14) and that there also the name עֶלְיוֹן אֱלֹהִים is found (Pss. 57:3; 78:56). In four of these instances where אֱלֹהִים and עֶלְיוֹן are used in close association, it is apparent, however, that אֱלֹהִים and therefore also עֶלְיוֹן, are used synonymously with יְהוָה (Pss. 46,47,50, 78).[1] Similarly אֲדֹנָי is used in parallelism with עֶלְיוֹן in Lam. 3:35f. and 37f, but אֲדֹנָי in turn is used as an alternate designation for יְהוָה.[2] In the same manner, עֶלְיוֹן and אֵל are found not infrequently in parallelism (Num. 24:16; Pss. 73:11; 78:17f; 107:11; Isa. 14:14); with but one exception,[3] אֵל in each instance clearly refers to יְהוָה.[4]

The above figures may now be evaluated. עֶלְיוֹן occurs as a name of God, whether by itself or in conjunction with יְהוָה 31 times in the Old Testament. In 25 of these instances an association with יְהוָה is unmistakable. The exceptions occur in the Elohistic Psalter (Pss. 57,77 and 82) and in Gen. 14:18-20 (3 times). In the Elohistic Psalter, however, it is universally accepted that in the majority of instances אֱלֹהִים is a substitute for the more original reading of יְהוָה. And even in the Genesis 14 passage, the tendency to identify אֵל עֶלְיוֹן and יְהוָה was not withstood (cf. vs. 22).

Despite the virtually complete identification of Yahweh and ʿElyon there remain a few passages which seem to reflect a genuine knowledge of some of the aspects of the original deity ʿElyon. In addition to Genesis 14: 18-20 which has already been investigated in this connexion above, there are: Deut. 32:8, Isa. 14:14; Ps. 82:6 and Num. 24:16.

---

1. יְהוָה is found in these psalms in the following verses: 46:9; 47:3,6; 50:1; 78:4,21.

2. יְהוָה is found in Lam. 3:22, 24,25,26,40,50,55,59,61,64.

3. יְהוָה is not mentioned in Ps. 77.

4. יְהוָה is found in these passages in the following verses: Num. 24:13; Pss. 73:28; 78:4,21; 107:2,6,15,19,24,28; Isa. 14:5.

The "Song of Moses" is found in Deut. 32: 1-43.[1] Eissfeldt[2] has recently submitted that vss. 8 and 9 of this prophetic sermon[3] reflect the original supremacy of ʿElyon. The people are challenged to remember how in the days of old. . .

> When ʿElyon gave to the nations their inheritance,
> when he separated the sons of men,
> he fixed the bounds of the peoples
> according to the number of the sons of God.[4]

On these verses he comments,

> The real acknowledgement of El[5] as the highest god expressing itself in worship had, at the time when our Song came into existence, spparently already given way to the belief that, at least for Israel, Yahweh was the only real God, since at the end it summons not only the heavens but also all gods to acclaim Yahweh. But this did not exclude the retention of the notion -- intended to be more cosmological and mythological than religious and cultic -- of ʿElyon as the god who had apportioned the peoples of the world to their gods.[6]

In a similar manner, the identification between Yahweh and ʿElyon is complete in the prophetic taunt against the king of Babylon in Isa. 14: 4-22, but there remains as well the memory of an originally independent and supreme deity ʿElyon.[7]

---

1. The Song has been dated anywhere from the time of Elijah to the first half of the fifth century (Pfeiffer), with a majority of scholars favouring a date soon before or after the exile. For a good summary of opinion, cf. G. E. Wright, Interpreters Bible, Vol. II, pg. 517.

2. Cf. Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh" in Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. I, pp. 29ff.

3. So called by Bentzen in Introduction to the Old Testament, 2nd Ed. Vol. I, pg. 208.

4. Reading, as is commonly done, בְּנֵי אֵל for בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

5. It will be recalled that Eissfeldt believes that El and ʿElyon were identical. The tenability of this identification has been discussed above in pp. 102ff.

6. Cf. Eissfeldt, Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. I, pg. 29.

7. We have taken A. R. Johnson's translation of Isa. 14:12-15 from The Labyrinth, pp. 82f.

How art thou fallen from Heaven,
Helal ben Sahar!
Thou art hewn to Earth.
Prostrate with the nations.
Yet thou didst say in thy heart;
"I will mount up to Heaven;
Beyond the divine stars
I will raise my throne:
Yea, I will sit on the Mount of Assembly
On the heights of Ṣapon.[1]
I will climb above the lofty clouds;
I will make myself like 'Elyon!"
Howbeit, to Sheol thou art brought down,
To the depths of the Pit.

As it is known from Ras Shamra, Ṣapon was very likely the place of the divine assembly[2] as well as being the place of residence of Baal,[3] and probably also of El.[4]

Psalm 82 seems also to contain a genuine remembrance of the nature of the deity 'Elyon. Interestingly enough the psalm opens also in the presence of the heavenly council.

God has taken his place in the divine council;
in the midst of the gods he holds judgement;[5]

It continues further on,

I say, "You are gods,
sons of 'Elyon, all of you;
surely you shall die like men,
and fall like any prince."[6]

These two verses seem to reflect precisely the information regarding Elioun transmitted by Philo of Byblus! The gods are reminded that they are the sons of 'Elyon and in the next breath they are told that they will die like men. The mortality aspect of Elioun has been the source of much suspicion and speculation.[7] But here that unusual aspect of the

---

1. For a convincing argument that יַרְכְּתֵי צָפוֹן is best translated "on the heights of Sapon" rather than "far north," cf. Eissfeldt, Baal Zaphon, Zeus Casios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer, 1923, pp. 14ff.

2. Cf. III AB B: line 19-31 found in Driver's Canaanite Myths and Legends, as III*B, pp. 78ff. Cf. also Pope's discussion of the point in El, pp. 95ff.

3. Cf. B II, VI 17, VII 6 in Driver's Canaanite Myths and Legends, pp. 98ff. Also cf. Driver, ibid., pg. 20, n. 1.

4. Cf. Pope's discussion in El, pp. 95ff.

5. Ps. 82:1.

6. Ps. 82:6,7.

7. Cf., for example, Eissfeldt's first discussion in Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton, pp. 114ff.

Sanchuniathon tradition seems to receive confirmation. Knowledge of a tradition pertaining to the death of ʿElyon is taken for granted; his name appears in the Psalm almost as a by-word for mortality. It may well be that belief in the mortality of ʿElyon and of his offspring, Heaven and Earth, was more widespread than has been observed in critical studies of Sanchuniathon. As late as the Sibylline Oracles, for example, in a portion that has been dated between 80 and 40 B.C., eloquent witness is borne to the mortality of one, who in the Sanchuniathon tradition, is the son of Elioun.[1]

> And Cronos, Titan, and Iapetus were kings, the goodliest children of Gaia and Ouranos, whom men called Earth and Heaven, dubbing them so because they were the first of all articulate men. Threefold were the divisions of earth in the portion of each, and each was king in his own sphere, nor did they fight, for oaths had been made to their father, and the shares were just. Then their father's full time of age arrived and so he died. And his sons in monstrous transgression of their oaths stirred up strife against one another as to who should reign over mortals in possession of royal honour.[2]

A fifth passage which may very well reflect a knowledge of the original deity ʿElyon is found in the oracles of Balaam (Num. 24: 15f.):

> The oracle of Balaam the son of Beor,
> the oracle of the man whose eye is opened,
> the oracle of him who hears the words of El (אֵל),
> and knows the knowledge of ʿElyon,
> who sees the vision of Shaddai (שַׁדַּי),
> falling down, but having his eyes uncovered.

In an extremely interesting though speculative article, "The Divine Triad of Biblical Mythology," J. Morgenstern has attempted to demonstrate, using the above verses as a cornerstone for his argument, "that in the early period of Israel's settlement in Palestine, and therefore, no doubt, likewise among the Canaanite predecessors of Israel in the land, the regular

---

1. For the dating, cf. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepegraphia Vol. II, pp. 371f.

2. Lines 110 - 120. Eissfeldt discussed lines 110-114 in his study of Sanchuniathon (Ras Schamra pp. 118f) but noted their divergencies from Sanchuniathon rather than similarities.

North-Semitic triad of deities was worshipped under the names, ʾEloah or ʿElyon, Shaddai and El."[1] If Morgenstern was right, which may be questioned, Shaddai was the Semitic equivalent of Ouranos (Samen). Even though it has been suggested by no less an authority than Albright that early Hebrew popular religion undoubtedly had its triads of gods similar to the South Arabian pantheons of father, mother and son,[2] the evidence is simply too scanty to pronounce with assurance any such judgement as suggested by Morgenstern. The most that we can conclude with safety is that the three names El, ʿElyon and Shaddai are used in such a way in Num. 24:16 as to suggest that each one had been previously worshipped as an individual and independent deity. The fact that the writer of this lay chooses precisely these three divine names also suggests that the named deities were the most important in the centuries preceding its composition.[3] Further it is not safe to go. We have already indicated in the course of the discussion of Proposition #5 how ʾEl and ʿElyon were most likely related. The relation of Shaddai to ʾEl will be briefly dealt with in the next proposition which will treat in greater detail the relation of the patriarchs to Shaddai.

Proposition #7: That Shaddai[4] was the chief deity of the patriarchs. The starting point for all recent discussion of patriarchal religion is A. Alt's famous essay "Der Gott der Väter" (1920).[5] In this

---

1. Cf. JBL LXIV, 1945, pg. 36.

2. Cf. Albright, From Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd Edition, Baltimore, 1946, pp. 187, 321, n. 3. (Anchor Books, 1957, pp. 173, 247).

3. The lays of Balaam in Num. 24: 3-9 and 16-19, have been variously dated; eighth century B. C. (Eissfeldt), ninth century (Mowinckel), tenth century (Bentzen), eleventh century (Rudolph). Cf. Eissfeldt in ZAW 57, 1939, pp. 234ff; A. Weiser, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 2. Aufl., pp. 83f; Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, 2nd ed., pg. 142.

4. For a recent and comprehensive bibliography of leading interpretations of the divine name Shaddai, see Norman Walker, "A New Interpretation of the Divine Name 'Shaddai'," ZAW 72, 1960, pp. 64-66. Walker submits that the name meant originally "The All-knowing," "The Omniscient."

5. Originally published in BWAT III/12 appears also in Alt's Kleine Schriften, Band I, 1953, pp. 1-78.

essay Alt begins with the view, derived chiefly from Gressmann, that the ʾElim of Palestine (ʾEl Roi, ʾEl ʿOlam, ʾEl Bethel, ʾEl Shaddai, ʾEl ʿElyon and the like) were for the most part local numina attached to one particular shrine.[1] On the other hand, he argues that the God of the fathers differed from the ʾElim in that his importance was not nearly so fleeting nor was he restricted to any particular location. The God of the Fathers, Alt avers, was an amalgamation deity who came to be worshipped at approximately the same time as the separate patriarchal cults were merging with the cult of Yahweh. Before the time of the God of the Fathers there existed three separate cults which worshipped independently the God of Abraham,[2] the Fear of Isaac, and the Mighty One of Jacob. These deities took their names from individuals; they were worshipped first by a group of immediate relatives of the individual after whom the deity was named, and finally by the whole tribe. They were not bound to a place, but to group and tribe. A similar phenomenon of a deity being named after an individual and becoming eventually the tribal god was observed by Alt among the Nabataeans on the Sinai peninsula and among the people of Palmyra in Syria in cultures that closely approximated to the culture of the Israelites in the Patriarchal age.[3] A number of scriptural passages from J, E, and P were cited by Alt to corroborate his thesis that there was a genuine cult of the God of the Fathers. The territory of the God of Abraham was Mamre, the territory of the Fear of Isaac was Beersheba, and the territory of the Mighty One of Jacob, the land generally assigned to the tribes of Joseph. Each of the cults absorbed the local numina into themselves, and the numen names became mere epithets of the respective Gods of the Fathers before their

---

1. Exceptions were El Shaddai and El ʿElyon whose original locality could not be recovered (Kleine Schriften, I, pg. 7).

2. Possibly to be named "The Shield of Abraham," cf. Kleine Schriften, I, pg. 67, n. 4.

3. Alt has been criticized because the texts he cites are all from the Christian era, but this fact does not seem to the present writer to be of any significance in itself, because the cultures were similar.

amalgamation into the one God of the Fathers and the final amalgamation with Yahweh. ʾEl Shaddai, originally a numen attached to a fixed locality, was raised to importance by the author of the Priestly Code -- an importance which he by no means enjoyed originally.

J. Lewy made the first significant attack on Alt's thesis, maintaining that Alt had not discriminated carefully enough between God of the Fathers (plural) and God of the Father (singular).[1] The latter, he argued, was the usual manner in which the patriarchs referred to the deity, and not the former. Relying heavily on the LXX translation of אֵל שַׁדַּי (El Shaddai) as ὁ θεός μου (Genesis 48:3), ὁ θεός σου (Genesis 17:1; 43:14), and θεὸς ὢν αὐτῶν (Exodus 6:2-3), Lewy sought to demonstrate that Genesis 49:25 held the clue to the true name of the tutelary god of the patriarchs. There, he observed, "the God of your Father" and "El[2] Shaddai" are used in parallelism. In other words, El Shaddai was the God of the Father![3] To support his thesis, Lewy cited some of the old (23rd Century B. C.) Assyrian texts in which were found the formulae: 1) Aššur littul "May Ashur be witness"; 2) Aššur u Ilabrat littulā "May Ashur and Ilabrat bear witness"; 3) Aššur u ilka littulā "May Ashur and your God bear witness"; 4) Aššur u il abika littulā "May Ashur and the God of your Father bear witness." In these texts Ashur was the land god - corresponding to El ʿElyon, and Ilabrat was the deity of the settlers corresponding to El Shaddai. His second criticism was directed against the fact that Alt did not distinguish between El Shaddai, El ʿElyon, El Berith, El ʿOlam and the others. They were not on the same level. El ʿElyon was the supreme deity, the "founder of heaven and earth," the deity whose domain was Canaan; El Shaddai was the tutelary deity of the patriarchs; the others were numina.

---

1. Cf. RHR, Tome 110 1934, pp. 29-65, and esp. 51.

2. Reading אֵל for the MT את .

3. This particular view of Lewy's does not commend itself. Cf. May's treatment of it in JBL LX, 1941, pg. 122, n. 26.

H. S. Nyberg, although not agreeing entirely with Lewy, supported his view that there was a very old relation between Shaddai and patriarchs. Nyberg also underlined a point Lewy had brushed on, namely, that Alt's relegation of El ʿElyon to the rank of a small local numen was hardly appropriate for a deity who was worshipped as the "creator of heaven and earth."[1] Unlike Lewy, however, Nyberg went on to his by now familiar thesis that Shaddai also was another name for the great land God ʿAl = El = ʿElyon = Salem = Zedek!

In 1941 H. G. May fully documented the truth in Lewy's criticism that "the God of my (thy, etc.) Father" (singular) was the favoured expression in the Old Testament and not "the God of their (your, etc.) Fathers" (plural).[2] He succeeded in showing that the former is an early and genuine expression, whereas the latter is late -- exilic or post-exilic. At the same time May, in another place,[3] rejected Lewy's notion that El Shaddai was the name of the God of the Father, and doubted, too, whether "the God of my (your, etc.) Father" could be identified with any of the known deities of the West Semitic pantheon. "The God of my (your, etc.) Father" reveals the intimate personal relationship which the worshipper had to his God. In it the expressions "my Father," "thy Father," etc. undoubtedly meant the immediate parent. Even Abraham probably used the same formula, but later Hebrew tradition could not tolerate such a reference on Abraham's lips, for that would seem to make of him a pagan! May's view on the meaning of Shaddai is that the patriarchs worshipped the West Semitic deity El, and that El Shaddai was but one of a various number of his titles.[4]

One of the most recent criticisms of Alt's thesis has been offered by O. Eissfeldt in his article "El and Yahweh."[5] In the course of his

---

1. Cf. Nyberg, ARW 35, 1938, pp. 345ff; 352f.

2. Cf. "The God of My Father - A Study of Patriarchal Religion," Journal of Bible and Religion, IX, 1941, 155-158.

3. Cf. JBL LX, 1941, pp. 113-128.

4. Ibid., pp. 114ff. That the patriarchs venerated El as their high god has been observed for a long time. Cf., for example, Kittel, GVI I, 1923, pp. 237f.

5. Cf. Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. I, 1956, pp. 25-37.

exposition Eissfeldt raises a question not faced by Alt, Lewy, Nyberg or May: Who were the "foreign gods" of Genesis 35:1-4 and "the gods which your fathers served beyond the River" of Joshua 24:14-15 whom Jacob and all Israel were commanded to put away? He answers that these "foreign gods," "the gods whom your fathers served beyond the River," were not the 'Elim or 'El, but rather gods of the type described so impressively by Alt, namely the God of Abraham, the Kinsman of Isaac[1] and the Mighty One of Jacob. El must be distinguished from these "foreign gods"; he was not served "beyond the River" (i.e. in Mesopotamia). All of the patriarchal encounters with the god El took place exclusively in the land of Canaan. The attitude toward El is friendly: "El was thought of as a revelation in the past of the God who manifested Himself later by His real name as Yahweh."[2] The Priestly Code was thus historically correct in reporting (Ex. 6:3) that prior to Yahweh's revelation of his name he had made himself known as El.

Eissfeldt's modification of Alt's thesis has much to commend it, and may be accepted with the following reservations: 1) It must be doubted whether the Israelites participating in the ceremony of putting away foreign gods consciously thought: "Now we are putting away 'the God of Abraham,' 'the Kinsman of Isaac,' 'the Mighty One of Jacob.'" 2) In suggesting that the "foreign gods" put away in Gen. 35:1-4 and Josh. 24:14-15 were of the type described by Alt, Eissfeldt is in reality suggesting that "the God of Abraham, "the Kinsman of Isaac" and "the Mighty One of Jacob" were idols, i.e. physical representations that could be "put away" and "buried." Nowhere does Alt suggest that Gods of the Fathers were idols. Eissfeldt's modification of Alt may nonetheless be accepted if we understand it to mean: before the patriarchs worshipped El in Palestine, they

---

1. So Eissfeldt, Albright et al. choose to render פַּחַד יִצְחָק rather than as "Fear of Isaac."

2. Cf. Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. I, 1956, pg. 36.

worshipped, before and after they emigrated from "beyond the River," the God of Abraham, the Kinsman of Isaac and the Mighty One of Jacob.

Taking Eissfeldt's modification of Alt, as clarified, together with the modifications offered by Lewy, Nyberg, May and that of Albright, given below, we come perhaps as close as possible to a historically reliable description of worship in the patriarchal age.

In 1935 W. F. Albright demonstrated that Shaddai was ultimately derived from the Accadian šadu ("mountain").[1] He also posited the opinion that Shaddai was the more original form of the name.[2] Later, he accepted the view that Shaddai was the chief deity of the patriarchs and submitted that even earlier Shaddai (which means "the One of the Mountains") may have been the son of El in a divine triad of El - Elat or Amat - Shaddai.[3] He went on to say something that, for the present writer at least, describes how we should best understand references to El and Shaddai in the patriarchal narratives.

> It is only reasonable to suppose that there were also other minor divinities whose existence was recognized by different groups. Whether there was a sharp line of demarcation between El and Shaddai is questionable, in view of the fluidity of all known early Semitic pantheons. It is most unlikely that the element el in early Hebrew names refers exclusively to the all-father El; it may also have been a surrogate for another divine name (i.e. the gods) or even in some cases a more fluid dynamistic expression for impersonal supernatural power. It must similarly be emphasized that the fluid conception of the god of a clan as being its blood relative takes root in dynamistic and corporative ideas of great antiquity.[4]

---

1. Cf. his article "The Names Shaddai and Abram" in JBL LIV, pp. 173ff.

2. Ibid.

3. From Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd Ed., pp. 187f (Anchor Books, 1957, pg. 247)

4. From Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd Ed., pg. 188 (Anchor Books, 1957, pg. 247).

There can be no question, Shaddai as a divine name is extremely old.[1] It appears as an element in three pre-Mosaic names (Ammishaddai, Shedeur and Zurishaddai)[2] and is attested in the west Semitic personal name, Ḫa-li-sa-da as early as the first part of the second millenium.[3] All of our evidence indicates that the worship of Shaddai -- as distinct from El Shaddai -- undoubtedly belonged to the earlier stage of patriarchal religion. Despite its antiquity it may be questioned whether Shaddai was worshipped by all of the patriarchs. Aside from the occurrence of the personal name Zurishaddai, which comes out of the southern tribe of Simeon, there is good reason to believe that the worship of Shaddai was confined to a territory in Western and Northern Palestine, which roughly corresponds to the territory of Joseph with which the name of Jacob has been more intimately linked.[4] Ammishaddai is a name from the extremely northern tribe of Dan which borders on the territory of Manasseh, the so-called "half tribe" (of Joseph), and Shedeur is from the Eastern tribe of Reuben which is only some six miles distant from the southernmost part of Manasseh.

---

1. This has been widely recognized, cf., for example, M. Noth's Die isr. Personennamen, pg. 130; W. F. Albright, JBL LIV, 1935, pp. 173ff.; E. Jacob Theology of the Old Testament, Eng. Tr. 4, 1958, pg. 46. For a contrary view ("its age is uncertain"), cf. L. Koehler, Old Testament Theology, Eng. Tr., 1957, pg. 46.

2. Cf. Num. 1:12; 2:25; 7:66; 7:71; 10:25 (Ammishaddai); Num. 1:5; 2:10; 7:30,35; 10:18 (Shedeur); Num. 1:6; 2:12; 7:36,41; 10:19 (Zurishaddai).

3. Cf. Th. Bauer, Die Ostkanaäner, pg. 19. The name appears in Bauer's Group I which includes some rulers' names in the dynasty of Hammurabi and come from the oldest documents of Kish and Sippor. Cf. pp. 5ff. Nyberg, of course, uses this name as a partial support for his thesis that Shaddai was identical to ʿAl.

4. Alt has observed that all of the places east and west of Jordan with which Jacob had contact fall in the territory of the house of Joseph. Cf. Kl. Schriften I, pg. 52. Cf. also Noth's Das Buch Josua, 2. Aufl., HAT 7, 1953, pp. 73ff. and the map on pg. 77. As Noth points out in his History of Israel, pg. 71, Simeon's locale in Gen. 34 is in the vicinity of Shechem; at a later date the tribe of Simeon migrated south (pg. 76). Thus all three names, Ammishaddai, Shedeur, and Zurishaddai came from land near or within the Joseph territory.

An examination of the Pentateuchal passages in which Shaddai or El Shaddai occur yields even more surprising results. The name Shaddai alone occurs in three older passages which are certainly not from P. 1) It is probably not accidental that in the blessing of Joseph in Gen. 49, Shaddai appears at the end of a row of names of God which begins with "the Mighty One of Jacob" (vs. 25). 2) Similarly in the two early Oracles of Balaam it may not be sheer accident that Shaddai appears in connexion with the pronouncement, "How fair are your tents, O Jacob, your encampment, O Israel!" (cf. Num. 24:3-5) and 3) the prediction, "a star shall come forth out of Jacob" (cf. Num. 24:15-17). It is interesting, in any event, that in a passage attributed to J or E, the name El Shaddai appears on the lips of Israel (Jacob) when he grants Judah permission to return to Egypt with Benjamin (Gen. 43:14). It is interesting, too, that P seems to preserve the relationship between Jacob and Shaddai which may well have been original. Isaac sends Jacob away to Laban with the blessing of El Shaddai upon him (Gen. 28:3); God (אֵל שַׁדָּי) reveals himself to Jacob as El Shaddai at Paddan-aram (Gen. 35:11); and ill Jacob, summoning Joseph, says, "El Shaddai appeared to me at Luz in the land of Canaan and blessed me. . . ." (Gen. 48:3). There are only two other passages in the Pentateuch where El Shaddai is mentioned. In one of these El Shaddai is the name with which Yahweh reveals himself to Abram (Gen. 17:1) and the other is the locus classicus, "And God said to Moses, 'I am Yahweh. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob, as El Shaddai. . . .'" (Ex. 6:3). The fact that Shaddai is associated with Jacob -- whether loosely as in Gen. 49:25, Num. 24:4,16, or intimately as in Gen. 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3 -- in eight out of nine references to Shaddai in the Pentateuch is surely remarkable and a fairly secure indication that Shaddai was originally worshipped by the patriarch Jacob alone. The name undoubtedly became the property of all the tribes of Israel at the time when the tribes and their cults became amalgamated, but, in view of the above evidence, was very likely not the name of the tutelary deity of all three patriarchs.

Proposition #8: That it was necessary for Abram to pay homage to ʾEl ʿElyon in order to establish his right to remain in Palestine and rule over the land. As noted in the previous proposition, J. Lewy was of the opinion that ʾEl ʿElyon was a land god of the same type as Ashur. Using another old Assyrian text to bolster his argument, Lewy proposed that Abram's reverencing of ʾEl ʿElyon was part of the necessary procedure of becoming invested by the supreme deity of the land. This practice of establishing one's right to rule the land he had conquered is attested, Lewy reminds us, by numerous inscriptions throughout three milleniums up to the Hellenistic epoch.

> The original inscriptions of the first founder of a universal Semitic empire, which extended from Elam and the Persian Gulf to the Phoenician coast, that is, the inscriptions of King Sargon of Accadia who has for good reason been called the Charlemagne of the Babylonians and the Assyrians, expresses this principle in the 26th Century before our era in the following words, "Sargon, the king, before the god Dagon in Tuttul. Because of his prayer the latter gave him the Upper Region: Maʾeri, Jarmuti, Ibla as far as the cedar forest and the clear mountains."[1]

Lewy's argument would be irresistible if it could be proven that the historical Abram was a conquering hero and Charlemagne in any sense of the word. Whether Abram came to Palestine as a part of the "Amorite" movement of the 19th and 18th centuries B.C. (de Vaux, Finegan, Wright, Albright) or as a part of the Hyksos movement in the 18th and 17th centuries (Rowley), he most certainly did not come as the conqueror. As we had occasion to rote above in our discussion on the formation of Genesis 14, in the strata assigned to E, Abram is pictured as a poor man, who does not possess great possessions; they are but promised to him (Gen. 15:13-16).[2] In J and P Abram is a man of wealth (Gen. 13:2,5 (J) and Gen. 13:6; 24:34-35 (P)) and in J and E Abram appears to be of sufficient

---

1. Cf. RHR 110, 1934, pp. 59f. A very similar translation of the Sargon text is found in ANET, pp. 267f.

2. Cf. pg. 51 n.1 above.

strength and military importance for the Canaanite king, Abimelech, and Phicol, the commander of his army, to be desirous of securing from him an oath that he will not deal falsely with them (Gen. 21:22-34).[1] But outside of these passages and the tradition of Abram's "slaughter of Chedorlaomer," which comes in the fourth stage in the formation of Genesis 14,[2] there is little indication that Abram was a man of material and military prowess. In his suggested interpretation of the meaning of Abram's paying homage to ʾEl ʿElyon, Lewy accepts without question the implication of Genesis 14 that Abram was a man of military might, a conqueror who would "rule over the land." As we sought to demonstrate above, however, it is unsound to treat the chapter as an entire piece, and to view all of its parts as equally reliable sources for information on the historical Abram. Literary analysis demonstrates -- whether it be that offered in the above pages or the analysis of any commentator who has undertaken the task seriously -- that it is highly questionable whether Abram's victory over Chedorlaomer may be listed as one of his genuine accomplishments.

In spite of his mistaken presupposition that Abram came into Palestine as a conqueror, Lewy does provide us with the key to a more satisfactory interpretation of his obeisance to the distinctly Canaanite deity ʾEl ʿElyon. Whether as an immigrating nomad chieftain, his herds great or small, contact with some of the indigenous Canaanite population was inevitable. Even though not a conqueror, if the district of Salem was poorly defended, Abram may very well have been a threat to its inhabitants as he appears to have been to Abimelech in Gen. 21:22-34. His contact with the priestly king may then have taken the form of a covenant ceremony

---

1. A similar account is found in Gen. 26:1-33 where Isaac (and Rebekah) have relations with Abimelech and his commander.

2. Cf. pp. 53ff.

which the leader of Salem was anxious to have performed because it would mean that Abram would be honour bound not to attack his land. Such was the interpretation of Gen. 14:18-20 suggested by Busse, which interpretation was examined above at length.[1] On the other hand if Abram was inferior in power to the priestly king of Salem, he would have been very interested in maintaining friendly relations with him so that his people could count on dealing with the people of Salem without fear of attack. Or, again, if the relative power of Abram and the leader of Salem was about equal, friendly relations would have been all the more in the best interests of both parties. No matter which of these power alignments actually existed, the truth in Lewy's insight may readily be acknowledged: the immigrant leader, Abram, paid obeisance to the local deity in order to establish himself more securely in the land.

Concluding Note - the Remarkability of Abram's Relation to El ʿElyon.

In his excellent commentary on Genesis, G. von Rad underlines how unusual it is for Genesis 14 to record so openly the friendly contact of the patriarch Abram with a foreign cult, "Such a positive, tolerant estimation of a non-Israelite, Canaanite cult is not to be found elsewhere in the Old Testament. Above all, Abram's homage before a heathen cultic official is from the standpoint of the Old Testament faith in Yahweh absolutely extraordinary."[2] Nonetheless, extraordinary as it is, that seems to be precisely what is recorded in the vss. which portray Abram's contact with Melchizedek and the deity whom he served. Three facts fostered the preservation of the account of the patriarch's worship of El ʿElyon: (i) by the time our chapter reached the written stage El had become synonymous with Yahweh; (ii) ʿElyon had also become a lofty way of addressing the same creator of heaven and earth; and (iii) El ʿElyon was unambiguously identified with Yahweh in vs. 22. As we have seen in the preceding pages, the deity was certainly non-Israelite and, therefore, the

---

1. Cf. pp. 28ff.

2. Cf. Das erste Buch Mose, ATD 3, 1952, pg. 151.

founding father of Israel indulged in a greater compromise with a Canaanite cult than a later piety was willing to admit. How much more remarkable it is that this same piety so respected the traditions of their fathers that they preserved intact even the scraps of information they had about them. They may have adorned these scraps or put them into more seemly frames so that the original picture would not seem so harsh, but, if the verses examined above are any criterion, they did not, after all, try to "improve" or "touch up" the original.

PART II

AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF THE PSALTER

PARAGRAPH # 1.

INTRODUCTION

In order to reach a proper understanding of the significance of the phrase על דברתי מלכי־צדק in Psalm 110 it is essential first to come to an appreciation of the nature of the psalm itself. To interpret any particular psalm involves a consideration of at least three factors:[1] (1) its type or Gattung; (2) its use in the cult; and (3) parallel expressions and phrases found in other ancient Near Eastern literature. There is almost universal agreement among contemporary scholars (1) that the psalm is a Royal Psalm;[2] (2) that it was used at the coronation of a Judaic king and perhaps later at an annual celebration of his enthronement; and (3) that it contains several points of contact with Ugaritic,[3] and possibly Babylonian[4] and Egyptian circles.[5]

---

1. Cf. S. Mowinckel, "Psalm Criticism Between 1900 and 1935," VT V, 1955, pp. 13-33, and especially A. R. Johnson's comprehensive essay "The Psalms" in ed. H. H. Rowley, The Old Testament and Modern Study, Oxford, 1951, pp. 162-209, which traces with model fairness and conciseness the unfolding stages of psalm interpretation in the twentieth century.

2. The Roman Catholic scholar, E. J. Kissane, The Book of Psalms, Vol. II, Dublin, 1954, pg. 189, for example, is an exception. Kissane maintains that the psalm relates to no earthly king, but to the coming messiah.

3. Cf. G. Widengren, Psalm 110 och det sakrala kungadömet: I, Israel Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1941, passim; cf. also J. H. Patton's useful Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms, Baltimore, 1944, esp. pp. 30, 31 and 37, R. T. O'Callaghan's article "Echoes of Canaanite Literature in the Psalms" VT IV, 1954, pp. 164-176 and Helen Genevieve Jefferson's "Is Psalm 110 Canaanite?" JBL LXXIII, 1954, pp. 152-156. See also the following note.

4. Cf. especially H. Gunkel's Einleitung in die Psalmen, Erste Hälfte, Gottingen, 1928, pp. 160ff. G. R. Driver in "The Psalms in the Light of Babylonian Research," The Psalmists, ed. R. C. Simpson, Oxford, 1926, pp. 109ff. tends to minimize the Babylonian influence.

5. Cf. reference in the above note and also J. de Savignac's stimulating article "Essai d'Interprétation du Psaume CX à l'Aide de la Littérature Égyptienne," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Deel IX, 1951, pp. 107-135.

(1) The Royal Psalms. The Royal Psalms is that group of psalms in which the king is either mentioned directly or referred to indirectly. By common agreement this Gattung includes at least Pss. 2, 18, 20, 21, 45, 72, 89, 101, 110, 132 and 144:1-11. Mowinckel includes Pss. 28, 61, 63, 84 and I Sam. 2:1-10 as well,[1] and, thanks to the research of H. Birkeland on the "enemies" in the Psalter, there is every indication that the list of Royal Psalms may have to be expanded greatly.[2] The fullest literary analysis of this group of psalms is found in Gunkel's Einleitung in die Psalmen.[3] As is well know, his analysis, not only of this Gattung but of the entire Psalter, has had a decisive influence on the study of the Book of Psalms in the 20th century. The basic principle of his work, that the psalms cannot be studied in isolation, but must be analysed, according to their form, in conjunction with other psalms of the same class or type is widely accepted today and a matter of little debate.

(2) Use of the Royal Psalms in the Cult. Far more controversial is the second factor enumerated above, namely, how were these psalms used in the cult? or, to be more precise, what do these psalms tell us about Israelite kingship and Israelite worship? To these questions much of our attention will be directed throughout the second part of this study.

According to Gunkel, the Royal Psalms were sung amidst great pomp and ceremony in the presence of the king and his retinue either in the palace or in the royal temple.[4] He described the special occasions on which

---

1. Cf., e.g., S. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien III. Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen, SNVAO II, 1922, No. 1, 1923, pg. 78.

2. Birkeland's latest discussion is contained in The Evildoers in The Book of Psalms, Oslo, 1955, pp. 14ff. His earlier and fuller work is Die Feinde des Individuums in der israelitischen Psalmenliteratur, Oslo, 1933.

3. H. Gunkel, Einleitung in die Psalmen, Göttingen, 1933, pp. 140-171. An indispensable introduction to interpretations of the Royal Psalms from Gunkel onwards is found in A. R. Johnson's "Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship: Divine Kingship and the Old Testament," The Expository Times LXII, Nov. 1950, pp. 36-42.

4. Ibid., pg. 144.

they were recited as follows: on the great festival day of the accession to the throne when the herald proclaimed, "He is become King!"; on the day when the poet announced the divine election of the king and his priesthood (Ps. 110); on the day when a drama was enacted of the king's binding rebellious peoples (Ps. 2); when the noble principles of his dominion were proclaimed (Ps. 101); on the anniversary of his victory over enemies (Ps. 21); on the anniversary of the foundation of the temple (Ps. 132); at his marriage (Ps. 45); when his army had won a victory (Ps. 144:1-11); in prayer for victory and an attending divine oracle (Ps. 20); in thanksgiving for a victory (Ps. 18); or in painting a picture of his ideal lordship over the world (Ps. 72).[1]

Dating the Royal Psalms. The majority of these psalms were not composed in glorification of a future king, but were written of one of the reigning monarchs as ideal pictures of what he was like and what he would be like in the future.[2] Accordingly, Gunkel was of the opinion that, with the exception of Psalm 89 in its final form, all of the Royal Psalms were composed in the time before the Exile -- most of them rather late in the period of the monarchy.[3]

---

1. Ibid., pg. 14ff.
2. Ibid., pg. 170.
3. Ibid., pg. 168. For more recent attempts to date some Royal Psalms, see R. Tournay's "Recherches sur la chronologie des Psaumes II," RB 1959, pp. 161-190. His earlier remarks on the problems attending dating of the psalms are especially worthy of consideration (cf. RB 1958, pg. 321 and 324, n.4). See also E. R. Hardy, Jr., "The Date of Psalm 110," JBL 64, 1945, pp. 385-390 and the excellent work by G. Buchanan Gray, "The References to 'King' in the Psalter in their Bearing on Questions of Date and Messianic Belief," Jewish Quarterly Review VII, July 1895, pp. 658-686. Gray openly admits the rôle that "prejudice" tended to play in dating the psalms. Relying chiefly on the similar attitude toward the "nations," "Gentiles" and "kings" found in the Royal Psalms and Second Isaiah (cp. esp. Pss. 2:1,2; 72:11; 89:28 and 110:5 with Isa. 41:2; 45:1; 49:7,23; 52:15, etc.), Gray concluded that the Royal Psalms were, with the possible exception of 20 and 110, all post-exilic. When the "King" was referred to, it was but a reference to the nation. The arguments used by Gray to support the latter point constitute a valuable documentation of the degree to which the fate of the nation was bound up with the welfare of the King. In the course of his study he made the following observation, "The parallels between Ps. lxxxix and Lamentations scarcely appear to have gained the attention they deserve." Though 65 years old, Gray's statement still holds true today! Before reading Gray the present writer was led to the conclusion, however, that the parallels between Lamentations and Psalm lxxxix support a pre-exilic date for the Royal Psalms. These parallels we have set down in Appendix A. Because a detailed discussion of date is a study unto itself, reference to it has been by and large omitted in the pages that follow. One exception appears on pp. 142f. where we point out that if Psalm 110 was used at the coronation of a Judaic king, it was most probably not used until after Solomon.

(3) Royal Psalms in Other Lands. Gunkel did not hesitate to put forward the view that the exaggerated oriental depictions of the Israelite king drew upon Egyptian and Babylonian patterns which reached the Israelites via the medium of Canaanite literature.[1] This view is gaining increased favour today especially among Scandinavian writers.

On the Importance of the Cultic Drama: S. Mowinckel. Next to Gunkel the most influential writer on the psalms is the Norwegian scholar, Sigmind Mowinckel. It is primarily due to his work that the present generation of Old Testament scholars has been led to a new understanding of the Israelite cultus in pre-exilic times. Following lines similar to those laid down by the renowned Danish anthropologist, Vilhelm Grønbech,[2] Mowinckel insisted from the outset of his famous Psalmenstudien (1921-24) that Protestant research has been governed to such an extent by its one-sided emphasis on personal religion that it has failed entirely to grasp the different Weltanschauung of the primitive thought in the psalms.[3] This primitive thought can by no means be called "magic," but it does have this much in common with what can be called "sorcery," namely, its belief that cultic acts and words are not only figurative and symbolic, but actually have the power to effect what they enact or declare.[4] This judgement of Mowinckel underlies everything he has to say about the psalms. Although Mowinckel himself did not draw out the implication of this judgement when he came to treat many of the Royal Psalms in his Psalmenstudien III, there is little question that he prepared the ground in his Psalmenstudien II.

---

1. H. Gunkel, Einleitung in die Psalmen, Göttingen, 1933, pg. 165.

2. Grønbech's work originally published 1909-1912 is available in the English translation, The Culture of the Teutons, 2 Vols., Copenhagen, 1931. See esp. his essay on Ritual Drama in Vol. II, pp. 260-340. The debt that J. Pedersen, author of the penetrating Israel -- Its Life and Culture I-II, Eng. Tr., Copenhagen, 1926, and III-IV, Eng. Tr. Copenhagen, 1940, also owes to Grønbech is striking.

3. Psalmenstudien I. Åwän und die individuellen Klagepsalmen, SNVAO II, 1921, No. 4, pg. v.

4. Ibid., pg. 61.

To be more explicit: in Psalmenstudien II, Teil I (Die Thronbesteigungspsalmen und das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwä's) the Norwegian scholar develops the thought that within the cult a creative drama is enacted, i.e. a drama creative of the reality which it portrays. The great cultic or ritual drama in Israel was that of Yahweh's accession to the throne and his defeat of the primeval powers of chaos. In the so-called "Accession (or Enthronement) Psalms," Pss. 47, 93, 95-100, as well as in many others, we have, to put it in colloquial terms, the script of the play. The acts of this drama portrayed the contents of Israel's beliefs about Yahweh, which beliefs Mowinckel suggests we call "myth." There were, he maintains, five strands to the "myth": (1) creation and combat with leviathan; (2) combat with the gods; (3) the exodus from Egypt (which was an "historification" of the original "myth"); (4) combat with the nations (which was of especial contemporary interest to the participants); and (5) the judgement on nations and gods (which is closely related to (1), (2) and (4)). At this Festival of Yahweh's Enthronement, which was celebrated annually in the autumn, it was very likely that the earthly king as well ascended his throne and played a leading part in the entire drama.

It is interesting that Mowinckel only goes so far in developing the rôle played by the Israelite king. Part of the reason for this stems from the fact that he assigns only one Royal Psalm to the New Year Festival, namely, Psalm 132 which, he avers, was sung in accompaniment to the bringing forward of the Ark, the symbol of the presence of Yahweh.

Point of Departure. The present study is an attempt to contribute to the discussion on the Royal and Enthronement Psalms that has ensued since Mowinckel's classic work. We have assumed the basic correctness of Mowinckel's judgements on the cultic use of the psalms and on the Weltanschauung of the worshipper in pre-exilic Israel. At several points, however, we enter the discussion by taking direct issue with the Psalmenstudien itself.

(i) As Schmidt,[1] and especially Johnson[2] have pointed out, Mowinckel's great study did not investigate in any detail the possible setting or the Royal Psalms in the autumnal celebrations. Discussion or this subject is raised in Paragraph # 3 where we seek to adduce further reasons for assigning the Royal Psalms to the autumnal celebrations.

(ii) In Paragraph # 6 we examine more closely what Mowinckel (and others) have had to say about the rôle of the king in the cult. After so doing, we go on in Paragraph # 7 to demonstrate that in many regards the king corresponded to Moses.

(iii) In Paragraph # 8 we submit that one of the most important cultic roles of the king as Moses was wielder of the rod in a ceremony in which objects symbolic of foreign kings and nations were smashed.

(iv) In Paragraph # 9 we attempt to show that Mowinckel's lack of emphasis on the importance of natural phenomena caused him to overlook the marked degree to which the symbolic actions of the king were meant to interpret to Israel the meaning of Yahweh's actions of judgement in the heavens.

Psalm 110 is not interpreted in detail until well towards the end (pp. 257ff.) of the present study. The reason for the delay is due to our belief that the Psalm must be interpreted against the background of the autumnal ceremonies, the nature of which is drawn out during the entire section. A preliminary interpretation of the Psalm is given, however, in Paragraph # 4; its relation to Genesis 14 is discussed in Paragraph # 5; and we commence the second part of this study with a review of reasons given by scholars for assigning the Psalm to the coronation ceremonies of a Judaic king.

---

1. Cf. H. Schmidt, Die Thronfahrt Jahves. Sammlung Gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte 122, Tübingen, 1927.

2. Cf. A. R. Johnson, "The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalum Cultus," ed. S. M. Hooke, The Labyrinth, London, 1935, pp. 71-111 and Sacral Kingship, Cardiff, 1955.

PARAGRAPH # 2

ON THE PROBABLE USE OF PSALM 110 AT THE "CORONATION" OF THE JUDAIC KING

There is widespread agreement among contemporary biblical scholars that Psalm 2 and 110 were used on the day of the enthronement of the Judaic king. This view is followed, for example, by Mowinckel, Gunkel, Dürr, Gaster, Bentzen, Widengren, etc. In 1929 Dürr developed this conception.[1] Bentzen summarizes the findings of Dürr's essay as follows:

> He thinks that the different acts of the coronation festival stand out distinctly behind the psalm. The psalm gives the text accompanying the rites, and so we can in fact speak of a coronation ritual, or an agenda for the ceremonies, which were accompanied by the words of the prophet speaking the oracle of Psalm 110. Durr finds in the psalm the Enthronement (vs. 1), the Investiture (vs. 2) especially with the sceptre, the acclamation (vs. 3), the Ordination as priest (vs. 4), the Promise of victory over enemies (vv. 5-6), and the sacramental cup of water from the Holy Well (vs. 7).[2]

Independently, Gaster put forward a similar interpretation of Psalm 110 in 1937, viewing it "as a part of a coronation-ritual, its several verses being the words spoken by the officiant whilst performing a series of ceremonial acts."[3] Gaster's own summary and translation of the psalm are recorded below.

---

1. "Psalm 110 im Lichte der neueren altorientalischen Forschung" in Vorlesungsverzeichnis der Staatl. Akademie in Braunsberg für das Winter-semester, 1929-30. We have not had access to this article.

2. Cf. A. Bentzen, King and Messiah, London, 1953, pg. 23.

3. Cf. Theo H. Gaster, "Psalm 110," JMUEOS XXI, 1937, pg. 37.

The king is installed at the right hand of a divine statue, whilst the officiant says:

The Pronouncement of YHWH to my lord:
"Sit thou at My right hand.

The footstool is placed in position.

Whilst that I make thy foeman
A footstool at thy feet!"

The royal sceptre is handed to the king, and the officiant says:

The sceptre of thy prowess doth YHWH send from Zion,
(Saying) "Rule thou in the midst of thy foemen!"

The allegiance of the king's subjects is solemnly pledged.

Thy people do offer ready service,
Whensoever thou musterest thine host!

The king is anointed, and the officiant says:

East on the holy mountains,
From the womb did He anoint thee,
(Saying) "Thine be ever the dew of thy youth!"

The divine appointment of the king is proclaimed by the officiant:

YHWH hath sworn, and doth not now relent:
"Thou shalt be priest for ever,
A monarch lawfully appointed,
In accordance with Mine order!"

The prowess of the king is rehearsed.

Kings hath he smitten in the day of his anger;
(So may he ever wreak judgment on the nations!)
He hath produced a plenitude of corpses,
He hath smitten men's heads!

A chalice is proffered. Whilst the king drinks, the officiant (or the assembled multitude?) says:

Upon all desert soil,
May he ever have to drink by a brook upon the way!
Therefore let him bear himself with pride![1]

In 1941, in the first of a series of monographs on King and Messiah, the Swedish scholar Geo Widengren, like Gaster, regarded it as certain that Psalm 110 had an integral part in the coronation ritual of the

---

1. Ibid., pp. 43f.

Israelite king.[1] Widengren's study is notable for: (i) its abundance of Ugaritic and Mesopotamian parallels felt to be instructive for a proper understanding of the Psalm[2] and (ii) its examination of the probable dress worn by the ancient Israelite monarch.[3] Later, he used Psalm 110 to reconstruct the following probable sequence of events at the coronation.[4]

1. Divine oracle with proclamation of divine sonship
2. Ascension of the throne
3. Investiture with the sceptre
4. Presentation of gifts to the king
5. Robing with the holy garments
6. Walk of the king
7. Drink from the water.

Either before or after the divine oracle, the anointing and washing took place.[5]

In the view of Dürr, Gaster and Widengren, Psalm 110 is of value in helping us picture a typical coronation of a Judaic king. From the Canaanite parallels they adduce, it is also obvious that the psalm is a good example of the great degree to which the soil in which Israel grew, affected the flowering and produce of her culture. That many features in the psalm are admirably explained under the supposition that it was used at a coronation, and that it contains parallels of Canaanite language and thought, ought not to overshadow the importance and exegetical value of two other factors: (1) a consideration of what we know of the history of the coronation in Israel and (ii) an examination of the contents of the psalm itself.

---

1. Cf. G. Widengren, Psalm 110, pg. 3.

2. Ibid., passim.

3. Ibid., pp. 12-20. This interest is also apparent in his Munich lectures, Sakrales Königtum, Stuttgart, 1955, pp. 24-29.

4. Sakrales Königtum, pg. 49.

5. Ibid.

(i) Some observations on the history of the coronation in Israel and implications on dating the psalm. The outstanding characteristic of the early making of kings in Israel (Saul, David, Adonijah, Solomon) is that there are but few essentials and no set pattern. The essentials involve neither crown nor sceptre, nor drinking from holy water, but simply an anointing of him who is to become king with holy oil by a prophet of Yahweh, a priest of Yahweh, elders, or the people. Generally the making of a king was an occasion of public acclamation and festal celebration. So it was with Saul (I Sam. 10:1; 11:14f.), David (II Sam. 2:4; 5:1-5), Adonijah (I Kings 1:5-25), and Solomon (I Kings 1:32-40). As is well known, Solomon's "coronation" was a hurried one. His rival, Adonijah, had apparently assembled all the prerequisites for kingship: assertion of prowess in war; assent of a recognised priest (Abiathar); support of a military leader (Joab); assumption of the royal prerogative of sacrifice; respect for past traditions; astute use of the sanctity of holy places; and a bold invitation to all the royal officials of Judah that they should come and celebrate his kingship. He had all of the prerequisites save one -- the blessing of the ageing king David. Nathan therefore advises Bathsheba to rush in to David in order to procure from him the desired blessing for Solomon. It almost seems that according to the laws then operating that Adonijah would have been king had the sun gone down without the retiring king's registering his favour for another. Whether we are correct in this supposition or not, it is plain that the pattern for the making of kings was still in the process of development at the time of Solomon's accession to the throne. With an eye towards facts such as these we may ask: If Psalm 110 was used at a coronation ritual, at whose coronation is it most likely that it was first employed? It could hardly have been the coronation ritual for Saul (who was anointed, according to one tradition, on the outskirts of Ramah [I Sam. 9:27-10:1] and, according to another, at Gilgal [I Sam. 11:14f.]) or for David (who was anointed in

Hebron [II Sam. 2:4; 5:1-5]. Conceivably it could have been part of the coronation ritual for Solomon, but, quite apart from the vexed question of the locality of Zion, the psalm does not at all suit the circumstances surrounding Solomon's rushed accession for which apparently little preparation or planning had been made. Ritual texts do not as a rule spring into being or become accepted for use in a matter of a few hours. Probability thus directs us to a post-Solomonic date for our psalm and therefore to a discarding of the notion that the psalm can be properly understood within the historical context of the Davidic or Solomonic era.

(ii) Internal evidence. Character of coronation day defined: day of judgement and day of strength. Anticipation of thesis. Perhaps most important of all for interpreting the psalm and drawing from it instruction on the coronation of the Judaic king, we must look to the contents of the psalm itself. Few psalms are as specific and obvious as Psalm 110 in disclosing the nature of the day on which they were celebrated. The psalm itself gives us two unmistakable clues. These we propose to use as the foundation stones of all of the interpretation that follows. In vs. 3 we read, "Thy people are willing on the day of thy strength (חֵילֶךָ)" and in vs. 5, "He smites kings on the day of his wrath." If the assumption is correct that Psalm 110 was used at the coronation or Judaic kings, the coronation day was then: (i) a day in which the wrath and judgements of Yahweh upon the nations was especially remembered and (ii) a day in which the king's power and strength (in battle?) were particularly celebrated. These two aspects of the same day on which the psalm was recited are intimately related. We conceive that the relationship was portrayed to the worshippers on Zion in this manner. The wrath and judgement of Yahweh were shown forth cosmically through the coming of the autumnal thunderstorms and the strength of the king was shown forth cultically in a dramatic enactment of the destruction of Israel's enemies, the nations and their gods. As Yahweh was judging in the heavens, so the king was making plain to his people the nature of Yahweh's judgement. The cultic drama in which the king

played a leading rôle corresponded to the cosmic drama which Yahweh, the supreme king, was effecting from his throne in the stormy heavens.

(iii) Internal evidence continued. Failure of most interpreters who assign psalm to the coronation to perceive and emphasize that it defines the nature of the king's rôle in the cultic drama which takes the form of a ritual combat or mock battle. It must be acknowledged immediately that scholars have for some time now intimated that the Royal Psalms, and possibly Psalm 110 among them, contain indications that the king played a rôle of leader in a cultic drama depicting victory over enemies. In his famous Psalmenstudien S. Mowinckel put forward the suggestion that the earthly king played a leading rôle in the enthronement festival;[1] Johnson followed Mowinckel in his essay and lectures on the Royal Psalms and similarly maintained that Yahweh's recreative work was "presented in the form of a ritual drama in which the Davidic king, who is the focus of the people as a psychic whole, is the leading actor."[2] Neither Mowinckel nor Johnson, however, specifically cites or expounds Psalm 110 as if it were a ritual text indicating the nature of the king's rôle in the cultic drama. Gaster does admit, in commenting on מחץ of Ps. 110:5 which he renders 'he hath smitten,' "the preterite may well refer to the new king's triumph in routing those enemies who encounter him in the mimetic combat which usually [sic] preceded the coronation in ancient times."[3] It was not until the appearance of Bentzen's Messias-Moses Redivivus-Menschensohn in 1948 that due stress was laid on the strong probability that behind not only Psalm 110, but others as well (2, 18, 20, 21, 42, 43, 54, 55, 88, 89, 132, etc.) lay not only the background of the drama of a coronation, but also the drama of a ritual combat. Although we are not

---

1. Cf. Ps. St. II, pp. 114, 177f., 298.
2. The Labyrinth, pp. 110f.
3. JMUEOS XXI, pg. 41.

in agreement with Bentzen's arrangement of various psalms in relation to the "central theme, the ritual combat," we do feel that this much of his position can be underlined as deserving the strongest support, namely, it does justice to the predominance of the martial element in Pss. 2, 18, 20, 21, and 110 -- to mention only the most obvious of the Royal Psalms -- which element the stricter "coronation" interpretations of Dürr, Gaster, and Widengren grossly underemphasize to the point of neglect. Fuller discussion of this matter is necessary but may be postponed until paragraphs # 6 and # 8 below.

A Set Season for the Coronation? Before concluding this paragraph it seems advisable to raise one further question: Was the coronation of the Israelite king celebrated at a stipulated season of the year? The immediate and obvious answer must be No. There is only one passage in the OT (I Sam. 12:17) which suggests that the king's accession took place at a specific season; all other accounts of the entrance of a new king into kingship suggest that the necessary rites transpired shortly after (or before) the demise of the previous king and were not, therefore, restricted to a specific season. In I Sam. 12:17, however, which comes to us from that strand of the Books of Samuel known for its anti-regal bias, we have recorded the fact that Saul was anointed on the day of the wheat harvest, that is, late in the spring of the year.[1] Subsequent accounts of ascending kings in the Books of Samuel and Kings (and Chronicles, as well) do not, as we have indicated, stipulate so definitely a season of the year. We therefore are not at liberty to draw any far reaching conclusions from the I Sam. 12:17 reference. Our own view on the season in which the Royal Psalms had a special significance has been alluded to above and will be developed in the following paragraph.

---

1. See below, paragraph # 6. Cf. also HDB IV, pg. 914, "The wheat harvest commences in the lowlands of the Jordan Valley in April, and ends on sub-alpine Lebanon in August."

PARAGRAPH # 3

INDICATIONS OF A SPECIAL MEANING FOR THE ROYAL PSALMS IN THE AUTUMN

In his Einleitung in die Psalmen, H. Gunkel argues vehemently against the position that the Enthronement Psalms (Mowinckel) and the Royal Psalms (Schmidt) were celebrated in conjunction with the autumnal New Year Festival. There is no proof, he exclaims. Then by an examination of the pertinent elements in Psalms 100, 48, 65, 132, 81, 15 and 2 he seeks to demonstrate that there is nothing in any of these psalms which forces on us the conclusion that their primary meaning lies within the autumnal festival.[1] He continues his criticism of Mowinckel and Schmidt in particular, maintaining that they laid too much stress on the interrelated thoughts of all the psalms assigned to the New Year Festival.[2] It is of great interest, however, that once Gunkel has stated his objections he goes on not only to accept Mowinckel's point as proven: that there was an annual festival in Israel in which especially the kingship of Yahweh was extolled, but he even lets stand Schmidt's conjecture that the Royal Psalms presuppose the same festival![3] The main argument to which Gunkel turns in support of the latter conjecture is to assert that it was a natural setting for the kingship of the human king to be celebrated along with Yahweh's divine kingship. Gunkel defines the relation between the Enthronement Psalms (Pss. 47, 93, 96, 97, 99) and the Royal Psalms in this manner. The Enthronement Psalms, he says, were originally Royal Psalms composed for use by the earthly king; only later were they transferred to

---

1. Gunkel, Einleitung in die Psalmen, pp. 100-103.
2. Ibid., pg. 104.
3. Ibid., pp. 95-97, 111, 141.

Yahweh and a festival extolling his divine kingship.[1] This inclusion we do not consider to be a happy one, but it need not detain us here.

As observed above, A. Johnson sets the Royal Psalms within the context of the autumnal festival. In the published form of the Haskell Lectures delivered at Oberlin (1951), he considers Psalms 2, 110 and 21 to be "the final stage in the dramatic ritual under review."[2] That element in the ritual drama which Johnson stresses in both his earlier and later work is the cultic victory over death (Ps. 48:15)[3] which was consummated at daybreak (Ps. 46:6).[4] This victory over (or deliverance from) death, which marks the rebirth of the true Messiah, is a sign of the king's adoption as a son of Yahweh and "issues, as one might expect, in his re-enthronement as Yahweh's vicegerent endowed now with universal power."[5] Johnson, like Schmidt and Gunkel, adduces inferential evidence for assigning the Royal Psalms to the autumnal festival and suggests that the most appropriate date of their recital was in connexion with the Feast of Tabernacles.[6] In view of the fact that our interpretation of the Royal Psalms and Psalm 110 in particular is dependent upon the correctness of the assumption that these psalms had a special meaning in the autumnal season, some further evidence may be reproduced here.

(1) Storm as a sign of Yahweh's judgement. In another regard we had occasion in the preceding paragraph to refer to I Sam. 12:17. This verse and the one following it afford an excellent illustration of the well-known conception that storm and thunder were taken by the Israelites to be signs of Yahweh's displeasure and judgement. These verses read,

---

1. Ibid., pg. 106.

2. Sacral Kingship, pg. 118.

3. Reading this vs., "Our God who abideth forever,/ Is our leader against death." Sacral Kingship, pp. 77ff.

4. Cf. The Labyrinth, pp. 95f. and Sacral Kingship, pp. 77ff., 92f.

5. Sacral Kingship, pg. 119.

6. Ibid., pp. 47-54.

> Is it not the wheat harvest today? I will call upon Yahweh, that he may send thunder and rain; and you shall know and see that your wickedness is great, which you have done in the sight of Yahweh in asking for yourselves a king. So Samuel called upon Yahweh and Yahweh sent thunder and rain that day; and all the people greatly feared Yahweh and Samuel.

The fear came because thunderstorms were little less than a miracle, as G. A. Smith observes, during the dry season from May to October.[1]

(2) October inaugurates the season of storms. With the coming of October, the spell of the summer drought was broken -- and this often in accompaniment with thunderstorms and a violent pouring forth of the heavens.[2] Tishri (September/October) was, of course, the month in which the New Year Festival, as reconstructed by Mowinckel, Schmidt et al., was celebrated.[3] It is instructive to read F. M. Abel's words on the distribution of rain in the month of October:

> The first rain normally makes its appearance in the form of a highly localized, thundery and torrential downpour (geboulee) followed by long days of fair weather. On the average, two days and a half of rain with 10 to 15 millimetres of water. In 1920, 1924 and 1930 the rain occurred in Galilee toward the middle of the month; in 1928 on the 13th, with a thunderstorm. In 1925, on the 18th, a thunderstorm accompanied, but not at Jerusalem. In 1896 in ʿAǧlun on the 13th there was lightning and thunder and 10 mm. of rain in twenty minutes. Generally the rain is earlier on the coast and in Galilee, while more often than not the Judaeo-Samaritan mountains and the Gār are without water in October.[4]

Thus we have a thumbnail sketch of a typical October in the twentieth century.

(3) Climatic conditions slightly drier today than in biblical times. The question naturally arises: Were climatic conditions in Palestine in the pre-exilic era the same as they are today? Denis Baly in a sober and cautious discussion maintains "that climate is not static, that changes in climate do take place and that significant changes have

---

1. G. A. Smith, The Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 25th Ed., pg. 65.

2. Cf. D. Baly, The Geography of the Bible, London, 1957, pp. 49f.

3. Cf. Mowinckel, Ps. St. II, pp. 81-89, 204-209; Schmidt, op. cit., who observes passim the frequent reference in the New Year Psalms to the rainy season, e.g., Pss. 65, 47, 96, etc. See also Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 47ff, for a careful discussion of this point.

4. Géographie de la Palestine, Tome I, Paris, 1933, pg. 125.

occurred between 5000 B.C. and the present day."[1] Although Baly is reluctant to commit himself to any far reaching conclusions, he does consider a weather diary kept by Claudius Ptolemaeus at Alexandria in the first century A. D. in an area somewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean as being of sufficient value to warrant the following observation. "This would suggest that the period of absolute drought was rather shorter than it is now, and that there were more north winds in winter and more thunder and weather changes in summer than there are at the present time."[2] In any event, despite probable changes in climatic conditions between pre-exilic days and ours, it is nonetheless safe to conclude that then, as now, it was not an infrequent phenomenon for the rainy season to open with the imposing and impressive phenomenon of a thunderstorm.[3]

(4) Appropriateness of Royal Psalms in autumnal setting because of prominence of element of judgement. In view of the fact that the autumnal rainy season in October was often accompanied by thunderstorms and in view of the fact that thunderstorms were understood to be signs of Yahweh's sitting in judgement, we believe there are indications in not one, but several of the Royal Psalms, which suggest that they had their ideal setting in the autumn of the year. In Psalm 110:5 we have, for example, a phrase already noted, "on the day of his wrath." In the closely related Psalm 2 the theme of judgement runs through the entire piece. In I Sam. 2:10 we have not only mention of Yahweh's judgement from the heavens, but this is found, as it is in Ps. 110, in the closest juxtaposition with the "strength of the king":

---

1. Baly, op. cit., pg. 74.

2. Ibid., pg. 73.

3. Cf. Baly, op. cit., pg. 50, "The beginning of the rainy season in October or November is often marked by severe thunderstorms, which result from the rapid rise of the damp air above the still overheated land."

The adversaries of Yahweh shall be broken to pieces;
'Al[1] will thunder in heaven.
Yahweh will judge the ends of the earth;
he will give strength to his king,
and exalt the power of his anointed.

In Ps. 20:7 is found the confident note "Now I know that Yahweh will help his anointed;/ he will answer him from his holy heaven/ with mighty victories by his right hand." In Ps. 21:9-10 we find the same vigorous confidence that Yahweh's right hand will effect victory in its judgement.

Your hand will find out all your enemies;
your right hand will find out those who hate you.
You will make them as a blazing oven
when you appear.
Yahweh will swallow them up in his wrath;
and fire will consume them.

In Psalm 18:8-16 we have a vivid description of the drama of Yahweh's judgement as symbolized by the phenomenon of a storm. Ps 144, which is not infrequently said to be dependent on Ps. 18, contains elements very similar. In the former psalm it comes out clearly in vss. 5-6 that it is especially appropriate for an autumnal season,

Bow thy heavens, O Yahweh, and come down!
Touch thy mountains that they smoke!
Flash forth lightning and scatter them,
send out thy arrows and rout them!

In addition Ps. 72, which emphasized Yahweh's judgement (vs. 2), and Ps. 89, which contains a whole section on Yahweh's sitting in a council of heavenly judgement (vss. 6-19) are equally well suited for the autumn.

It is this aspect of the Royal Psalms which clearly acknowledges and extols Yahweh's heavenly judgement that we consider to be the most important and significant indication that their use in the cult had a heightened meaning in the autumnal season. There are, however, other indications in these psalms which suggest the appropriateness of our proposed setting.

(5) Common emphasis on victory over enemies in Enthronement Psalms and some Royal Psalms. In his monograph, Die Thronfahrt Jahves, H. Schmidt took a stand against Gunkel's interpretation of Ps. 20. Gunkel maintained it was a composition employed before a battle. On this

---

1. עלי is possibly 'Elyon.

Schmidt says, "It seems to me more likely that we should also think here of the annual festival of the divine king during which perhaps the earthly king also celebrated the anniversary of his rule. For the victory over the surrounding 'nations' is -- as we have seen -- in accord with the one of this festival."[1] We wish here to underline the correctness of Schmidt's observation. In Pss. 46, 47, 48, 96 and 98, which are universally acknowledged to belong to the core of the New Year Festival, we find the element of victory over kings and nations. In the following Royal Psalms we find the same element: Pss. 2, 18, 20, 45, 72, 110, 144. This correspondence of themes in our view is not accidental. It validates the interpretation of the Royal Psalms in the light of the autumnal celebrations.

(6) Certain phrases and expressions common to some Enthronement Psalms and Royal Psalms. This contention receives further support through the fact that phrases or expressions which appear in certain Royal Psalms not infrequently recur particularly in the so-called Enthronement Psalms or psalms which were very likely sung at the New Year Festival. Examples are found in: (i) worshipping before Yahweh "in holy array" (בְּהַדְרַת־קֹדֶשׁ) Ps. 110:3; cf. Pss. 29:2; 96:9; (ii) acknowledging Yahweh as the source of power (עֹז) 29:1; 46:2; 61:4; 66:3; 68:29,34; 81:2; 89:11; 93:1; 96:6; 99:4; 110:2 (his rod); 132:8 (his Ark); for his people (28:8; 29:11; 68:35; 89:18) or for his king (21:2; 28:7; 61:4; 118:14); (iii) mention of Yahweh's right hand (יָמִין) as the means by which victory is accomplished: 18:36; 20:7; 21:9 (יְמִינֶךָ); 45:5; 63:9; 89:14,26,43; 91:7; 98:1; 110:5; 118:15,16.

(7) In Psalm 89 New Year theme of victory over Chaos-monster is prominent. One final reference may be made in concluding this paragraph wherein we have sought to give reasons for understanding the Royal Psalms as reflecting a day of Yahweh's wrath and judgement. In vss. 6-19 of Psalm 89 we find a section devoted to the theme of conquest of the chaos

---

1. Schmidt, op. cit., pg. 39.

monster Rahab, which theme Mowinckel singles out as being, along with the creation motif of which it is a part, the most important characteristic of the New Year Festival.[1] In view of the fact that these vss. in Ps. 89 seem at first glance only loosely related to the rest of the psalm, commentators are not hesitant to suggest that we have in the one psalm the juxtaposition of what was originally two (I: 2,3,6-19; II: 4,5,20-52, so Gunkel) or three (I: 6-19; II: 4,5,20-38: III: 39-52,so Oesterley) psalms. A. R. Johnson challenges this view in his Sacral Kingship[2] and attributes the failure of commentators to see the unity of the psalm to their misevaluation of the transitions. They mark, according to Johnson, not separate poems, but different stages in its liturgical use. Whether one views the poem as a unity or not, the psalm as we have it is an eloquent witness to the fact that the themes of heavenly judgement, victory over chaos monster and exultant celebration of Yahweh's granting strength to his king, are not only intimately associated in vss. 6-19 but these verses and the themes upon which they play are in turn closely bound up with Yahweh's promise to vanquish the enemies of the Davidic king (vss. 20-24) and to establish the Davidic throne forever (vss. 2-5, 28-38). In other words the present state of Psalm 89 gives us further reason for adhering to the principle that certain of the Royal Psalms are to be interpreted in the light of their recital during the New Year celebrations of the autumn.

---

1. Ps. St. II, pp. 45-50.
2. Sacral Kingship, pg. 97.

PARAGRAPH # 4

TEXT, TRANSLATION AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS

As is widely known to students of the Psalter, the text of Psalm 110 is not easy, particularly in vss. 3 and 6. However, with a minimum of textual change, it makes straightforward sense. As the reader will discern from our presentation of the text, we have resisted (in so far as sense has permitted) the engaging process of emendation. It is impossible to discuss all the various renderings of this psalm which have been suggested by commentators and translators even within the past two decades. We are entirely their debtor, but have nonetheless embarked on a rendering and interpretation of the psalm that is dependent on no one commentator. The remarks offered in this paragraph to indicate our understanding of the use of the psalm will be more fully explicated in the remaining paragraphs of Part II and especially in paragraph # 9.

(a) <u>The Text</u>.

(1) Amended Hebrew text.[1]

לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר

1 נְאֻם יְהוָה לַאדֹנִי שֵׁב לִימִינִי
עַד אָשִׁית אֹיְבֶיךָ הֲדֹם לְרַגְלֶיךָ׃

2 מַטֵּה עֻזְּךָ יִשְׁלַח יְהוָה מִצִּיּוֹן
רְדֵה בְּקֶרֶב אֹיְבֶיךָ׃

3 עַמְּךָ נְדָבֹת בְּיוֹם חֵילֶךָ׃
בְּהַדְרֵי־קֹדֶשׁ מֵרֶחֶם שַׁחַר לְךָ כְּטַל יַלְדֻתֶיךָ׃

4 נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה וְלֹא יִנָּחֵם
אַתָּה־כֹהֵן לְעֹלָם עַל־דִּבְרָתִי מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק׃

5 אֲדֹנָי עַל־יְמִינְךָ מָחַץ בְּיוֹם אַפּוֹ מְלָכִים׃

6 יָדִין בַּגּוֹיִם מָלֵא גְוִיּוֹת מָחַץ רֹאשׁ עַל־אֶרֶץ רַבָּה׃

7 מִנַּחַל בַּדֶּרֶךְ יִשְׁתֶּה עַל־כֵּן יָרִים רֹאשׁ׃

---

1. Cf. ed. R. Kittel, <u>Biblia Hebraica</u>, Editio Tertia, Stuttgart, 1950, pg. 1074.

The following are our deviations from the MT:

Vs. 3. שַׁחַר for מִשְׁחָר Dittography from the preceding מ.
כְּשַׁל for כְּ. שַׁל having been absorbed in לְךָ.
Vs. 4. דִּבְרַתִי for דִּבְרָתִי. Repointing.
מַלְכִּי צֶדֶק for מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק. Omitting maqqeph.
Vs. 6. מִלֵּא for מָלֵא. Repointing.
גְּוִיֹּת for גְּוִיֹּת. So Aq., Sym., Jerome.
רֹאשׁ for רֹאשׁ. So 1 MS.
רֹאשׁוֹ for רֹאשׁ. So 2 MSS., Sym.

(2) The LXX (Rahlfs).[1]

1 Τῷ Δαυιδ ψαλμός.
Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,
ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.
2 ῥάβδον δυνάμεώς σου ἐξαποστελεῖ κύριος ἐκ Σιων,
καὶ κατακυρίευε ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου.
3 μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς δυνάμεώς σου
ἐν ταῖς λαμπρότησιν τῶν ἁγίων·
ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐξεγέννησά σε.[2]
4 ὤμοσεν κύριος καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται
Σὺ εἶ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδεκ.
5 κύριος ἐκ δεξιῶν σου συνέθλασεν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς
αὐτοῦ βασιλεῖς·
6 κρινεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, πληρώσει πτώματα,
συνθλάσει κεφαλὰς ἐπὶ γῆς πολλῶν.
7 ἐκ χειμάρρου ἐν ὁδῷ πίεται·
διὰ τοῦτο ὑψώσει κεφαλήν.

---

1. Cf. ed. A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta, Vol. II, Editio Quinta, Stuttgart, 1952, pg. 124.

2. Aquila translates this vs. as follows. Cf. F. Field's Origenis Hexapla, Vol. II, Oxford, 1875, pp.265ff.

μετὰ σοῦ ἐκουσιασμοὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐπορίας σοῦ
ἐνδιαπρεπείαις ἡγιασμέναις ἀπὸ μήτρας
ἐξωρθρισμένης σοι δρόσος παιδιότητος σοῦ.

(3) Jerome's Iuxta Hebraeos.[1]

David canticum.

Dixit Dominus domino meo, Sede a dextris meis,
    donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum.
Uirgam fortitudinis tuae emittet Dominus ex Sion:
    dominare in medio inimicorum tuorum.
Populi tui duces spontanei erunt in die fortitudinis tuae:
    in montibus sanctis
quasi de uulua orientur tibi
    ros adulescentiae tuae.
Iurauit Dominus, et non paenitebit eum,
    Tu es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech.
Dominus ad dexteram tuam
    percussit in die furoris sui reges.
Iudicabit in gentibus, implebit usalles:
    percutiet caput in terra multa.
De torrente in uia bibet;
    propterea exaltabit caput.

(b) Translation.

David's. A Song.

1 An oracle of Yahweh to my lord:
"Sit at my right hand
Until I (shall) make thine enemies a stool for thy feet."
2 Let Yahweh stretch forth from Zion the sceptre of thy might.
Rule in the midst of thine enemies.
3 Thy people are willing* on the day of thy strength.
Thy youth in holy array are to you as dew from the womb of dawn.
4 Yahweh has sworn and will not repent:
"Thou art a priest forever
Because I have spoken righteously, my king."
5 By thy right hand, my lord,
He smites kings on the day of his wrath.
6 Let him judge among the nations:
He fills valleys:
My chief smites the earth forcefully.**
7 He will drink from a torrent along the way.
Because of this he will lift up his head.

* or, offer themselves freely
** or, many times

(c) Comments on the translation of vs. 4. Pedersen,[2] Gaster,[3] and Del Medico[4] suggest similar translations for vs. 4. The usual translation is, "Yahweh has sworn and will not repent, 'Thou art a priest forever

---

1. Cf. J. M. Harden, Psalterium Iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi, London, 1922, pg. 145.

2. Cf. Israel -- Its Life and Culture III-IV, pp. 708f.

3. Cf. above, pg. 140.

4. Cf. ZAW 69, 1957, pp. 168ff.

after the order of Melchizedek.'" This is the translation followed by the LXX, Jerome, the NT, and the majority of commentators. We prefer to render the Hebrew of the underlined phrase, "because I have spoken righteously, my king." Our reasons follow. (i) It suits better the parallelism and repetitive character of the psalm. (ii) The use of עַל alone as a conjunction, meaning "because, because of" is known from Gen. 31:20 and Ps. 119:136. (iii) The use of עֲדָקִן adverbially, meaning, "righteously," though not frequent, is not unknown (Deut. 1:16; Jer. 11:20; Prov. 31:9). (iv) It is in keeping with the manner in which Ps. 89 records similar promises were made to the king in that: (a) the direct address is employed:

> Thou hast said, "I have made a covenant with my chosen one,
> I have sworn to David my servant:
> 'I will establish your descendants for ever,
> and build your throne for all generations.'"
>
> (vss. 4-5);

and (b) Yahweh swears by his holiness just as he swears "righteously" in Ps. 110, i.e., by his righteousness and therefore irrevocably,[1]

> Once for all I have sworn by my holiness;
> I will not lie to David.
> His line shall endure for ever,
> His throne as long as the sun before me.
>
> (vss. 36-37);

and, finally, (v) we have an exactly parallel use of the direct address in the closely related Ps. 2, "I have set my king/ on Zion, my holy hill" (vs. 6).

The above reasons seem not only to justify our rendering of the text, but to demand it, especially in view of the fact that no alteration of the consonantal text is required.

---

1. The following words of Norman Snaith in his Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London, 1944, support our understanding that the nuance "irrevocably" lies behind the adverbial use of עֲדָקִן is Ps. 110, "We take /therefore/ the original significance of the root ts-d-q to have been 'to be straight.' The word thus very easily comes to be used as a figure for that which is, or ought to be, firmly established, successful and enduring in human affairs," pg. 73. Accordingly it would seem that we are justified in the following interpretation of Ps. 110:4: the priesthood promised to the king is a priesthood for ever because Yahweh has promised it righteously, that is, irrevocably.

(d) Analysis of contents. We take Psalm 110 to be a liturgical text. It contains two oracles (vss. 1 and 4) which have been indented in the above translation in order that they might be differentiated from the type of address found in the rest of the psalm. The other vss. either contain rubrics (vss. 2 and 6) or words of assurance spoken to: the king (vs. 3), the king and the people (vs. 5), or the people (vs. 7). Vs. 2 as well as being a rubric (indicating that the king should raise and stretch forth his sceptre) is a petition to Yahweh that he will act through the person of the king. Vs. 3 is an assurance to the king that his people are loyally assembled, and also something of a rubric, indicating that a number of the king's subjects were ceremonially attired for the occasion. Vs. 5 is an assurance to the king that Yahweh is in fact acting through his ceremonial stretching forth of the sceptre; at the same time it is an assurance to the assembled gathering that Yahweh is smiting by means of the king's right hand. Vs. 6 is an interpretative rubric. At the mention of "nations," "valleys" (or "corpses"?) and "wide land" it seems evident that a different cultic object or locality is pointed to by the reciting prophet. The final vs. is an assurance to the people alone. The king seems to have departed from the scene. Contrary to many "cultic" interpretations of this psalm (e.g., Dürr, Weiser, Widengren) we do not understand the last vs. to be an indication that the king imbibes a sacramental drink. We take it rather to be an indication that there will be water in the streams from which he can drink because it will have rained. The climax of the psalm is thus found in the last verse, when the assurance is given to the people that the blessing of rain is soon to come. Because of this blessing the king will exultantly lift up his head.

The scene for the entire ritual is set by the opening oracle. In it the king is instructed that his rôle is in reality a passive one; he is assured by one of Yahweh's spokesmen, as if it were Yahweh himself speaking, that all of his enemies will be subdued. The note sounded in this opening oracle resounds throughout the psalm: Yahweh is the real actor. It is he who will empower the king to stretch forth the sceptre of

his might (vs. 2); it is he who smites (vs. 5); it is he who will judge, even as it is he who fills the valleys (vs. 6). But the interplay is complete. As Yahweh is invoked to stretch forth his sceptre, the king raises his rod (vs. 2). Yahweh smites, but the king is assured that it is by his own right hand that Yahweh does the smiting (vs. 5). Yahweh will judge among the nations, piling high the valleys (with corpses?), but the people are informed that it is the king who is smiting the earth (vs. 6). The final verse, however, like the opening verse, makes plain the nature of the relationship between Yahweh and his king. The king is the apparent actor: it is he who is to drink and lift up his head. But behind these words lies the knowledge that there would be nothing to drink, no cause for exultation, had not Yahweh showered down his blessing of rain. There is a relationship between the "rule amongst enemies," the "smiting of kings," the "judging amongst the nations" and the "drinking from the brook." This relationship will be developed in all of the paragraphs below, but especially in paragraph # 9.

(e) On the interpretation of vs. 4. The second oracle of the psalm (vs. 4) must be understood within the above context. In it the promise of priesthood is made to the king. The context of the psalm defines the character of the priesthood that is here promised: it is a martial priesthood. We may, of course, extract this oracle from the psalm and use it to illustrate and expound the nature of the relationship between king and priest in Israel. Before doing so, however, it is important to note what aspects of the priesthood are stressed: not only is it a priesthood forever but also a priesthood for war. It must be admitted that it is not readily apparent what bearing the military context of the psalm has upon the promised priesthood. If we assume, however, as we must, that the psalm had meaning and coherence, it is incumbent upon the interpreter to remain dissatisfied with an atomistic commentary on the separate verses. The attempt must be made to discover its unity, its interrelationships, its internal structure. It therefore seems not only logical but imperative that we assume a connexion in meaning between the first oracle of the psalm and the second. The connexion seems to necessitate

at least this: (i) the king is invested as priest while he is sitting (on the throne) and (ii) the investiture has a special relation to his ability to play effectively the role of smiter of enemies. He wields the sceptre of Yahweh not only as king, but as priest as well. We will define more precisely below the nature of the relation between priest and king (paragraph # 7) and the significance of the wielding of the sceptre (paragraph # 8).

PARAGRAPH # 5

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PSALM 110 AND GENESIS 14

(a) The Link is Zadok of Jerusalem: Rowley and Johnson. Before 1940 Professor Rowley of Manchester and Professor A. R. Johnson of Cardiff advocated in separate essays the view that the priest Zadok, who suddenly appears in the reign of David as a bearer of the Ark (II Sam. 15:25ff.), is best understood as a Jebusite devotee of El ʿElyon in Jerusalem.[1] Professor Rowley goes to great pains to show the weaknesses and improbabilities in alternative explanations of the origin of Zadok.[2] His argument is tightly fitting and does not on the face of it want for cogency or probability. Close examination shows, however, that useful as such an explanation may be in helping us establish a relationship between Psalm 110 and Genesis 14, it is lacking the kind of support that is most telling. The views of Professors Rowley and Johnson are not alike in all respects; on the point presently under discussion, however, they are virtually identical. We will examine the key supports for their position, namely: (i) the contention that there has been a "persistent association or 'righteousness' with Jerusalem"; (ii) its overall probability, considering especially (a) the indirect evidence of proper names and (b) the satisfactoriness of its accounting for the handling of the Ark in Jerusalem.

(i) In four separate instances Rowley and Johnson either quote or refer to these words from the pen of S. A. Cook, "The persistent association of 'righteousness' with Jerusalem is of the greatest interest" and "Apart from the question whether there was also a god Ṣedek

---

1. Cf. H. H. Rowley, "Zadok and Nehushtan," JBL LVIII, II, June 1939, pp. 113-142 and A. R. Johnson, "The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," in The Labyrinth, pp. 71-111.

2. Cf. esp. JBL LVIII, pp. 116-130.

at Jerusalem, then, it may be concluded that this persistent association of the idea 'right' with the city carried with it ideas, beliefs and practices which were capable of profound development."[1] Cook's assertions seem authoritative, but examination of the evidence he adduces shows them to be poorly grounded in fact. Emphasis must be placed on his phrase "capable of profound development" (which development unquestionably did take place under the canonical prophets); otherwise his statements must be dismissed in their entirety as untrustworthy. He refers us -- as do Rowley and Johnson -- to Isa. 1:26; Jer. 31:23; 33:16; (50:7); in support of the argument that there was a later association of 'righteousness' with Jerusalem, but the only <u>certain</u> references which he is able to give in support of an <u>early</u> (i.e. pre-Isaian) association are (1) the name Adonizedek (Josh. 10:1,3) and (2) we quote from Cook, "A derivative of the root צדק occurs once in the Amarna letters (cclxxxvii, 32), when Abdi-Khiba of Jerusalem protests that he is 'in the right.'"[2] In the case of the references to Adonizedek in Josh. 10:1,3 we do not have as secure a reference as might be desired, for in both instances the LXX reads Αδωνιβεζεκ (Adonibezek) and, it is perhaps not without significance that when this king of Jerusalem is mentioned subsequently in Joshua, his name is not indicated (10:23; 12:10). And in the second reference to the Amarna Letter No. 287, support for Cook's contention seems to be entirely lacking. The sentence which he cites

---

1. The quotations are from S. A. Cook's portion of <u>The Cambridge Ancient History</u>, Vol. II, Cambridge, 1924, pp. 397f. References are made to them by Johnson in <u>The Labyrinth</u>, pg. 76 and in <u>Sacral Kingship</u>, pg. 33; and by Rowley in <u>JBL</u> LVIII, pg. 131 and <u>Bertholetfestschrift</u>, pg. 465, n.5.

2. Cf. Cook, <u>CAH</u> II, pp. 397f. Johnson refers to this same passage in support of his contention that there is an "early" association of "righteousness" with Jerusalem (<u>Sacral Kingship</u>, pg. 31). He goes on to cite a passage from Ugarit (KRT A, 12f.) which gives to the root צדק a similar meaning to the one found in the Amarna letter. We fail entirely to see how this adds to the significance of the occurrence of the root in the Amarna letter. It seems to us to work in entirely the opposite direction from the one desired by Johnson in that it makes clear there is nothing really noteworthy about the appearance of the root צדק aside from the fact that it does occur. The meaning in both instances is quite commonplace and certainly not religious. Cf. also note 2 on the following page.

reads as follows, "Behold, this deed of Milkilu and the deed of the sons of Lab'ayu who have given the land of the king to the ʿApiru. Behold, O king, my Lord, I am right!"[1] The writer of the letter is obviously merely asserting that he is handling affairs justly and properly; it is evidence that he is not making any assertions about the inherent righteousness of Jerusalem. We suggest, therefore, that the inadequacy of this latter reference is a good indication of the literal dearth of evidence for associating "righteousness" with Jerusalem prior to the latter half of the 8th century B.C. When Nyberg was going over the same ground in his study on the god ʿAl, candour caused him to recognize the lack of evidence of which we have been speaking. It was to him so striking that he felt forced to conclude that "righteousness" in original Yahwism had no specifically religious content and that the religious meaning which the concept develops later goes back to an ʿElyon-Zedek-Salem cultus in Jerusalem.[3] Nyberg's explanation of the source of the specifically religious content of this root, we find unconvincing. We must look elsewhere for its origin, namely to the North, because after the appearance of Zadok in connexion with Jerusalem, the first significant clue is found in the personal name, Zedekiah, the prophet attached to the court of the northern king of Israel, Ahab (I Kings 22:11ff., 24). As is widely recognized, personal names give unconscious expression to the tenor of religious belief. The following question may well be put to those scholars who maintain that the evidence for an early association of "righteousness" with Jerusalem is "scarcely open to doubt" (Rowley) or "beyond dispute" (Johnson): If it were to turn out that Zedekiah was a prophet in the court of king Asa or king Jehoshaphat, let us say, would not this detail be welcomed as a further justification for associating צדק with Jerusalem? In summary, because the association of Adonizedek with Jerusalem is not beyond dispute, and because the early association

---

1. Cf. ANET, pg. 488, EA No. 287: 29-32.
2. Cf. H. S. Nyberg, ARW 35, 1938, pg. 375.
3. Ibid.

of Melchizedek with Jerusalem is open to doubt,[1] and because the element צדק is conspicuously lacking in Jerusalemite personal names,[2] does not honesty force us to conclude that the remarkable thing in the association of "righteousness" with Jerusalem is that it is virtually non-existent until the canonical prophets?

(iia) Professor Johnson seeks to maintain "that, after the capture of Jerusalem, David found in the Jebusite cultus with its worship of the 'Most High' and its royal-priestly order of Melchizedek a ritual and mythology which might prove to be the means of carrying out Yahweh's purposes for Israel and fusing the chosen people into a model of national righteousness."[3] If in fact a god called "Most High" (ʿElyon) was worshipped in Jerusalem to any significant extent -- and, it is to be noted that Professor Johnson holds it was significant enough for David to want to bring it under his control -- we are surely justified in asking, what is the evidence for this assertion. Nyberg's answer, in the essay referred to above,[4] is to conjecture that there was a great Canaanite land god who went under the different names Zedek-Salem-ʿElyon. This theory enables Nyberg to affirm that an association of Salem with Jerusalem was tantamount to an association of Zedek with Jerusalem. Professor Johnson, however, does not take Nyberg's line. He relies chiefly (in a scholarly discussion) on the inferences he is able to draw from an examination of the use of the roots מלך and צדק in the name מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק Melhizedek.[5] He succeeds in taking his case this far: an association of

---

1. Cf. our discussion in Part I, pp. 81-93.

2. Zadok, Uzziah's father-in-law, ca. 791-740 B.C. (II Kings 15:33; II Chron. 27:1); Jehozadak, high priest and grandson of Hilkiah, ca. 588-86 B.C. (I Chron. 5:40-41) and Zedekiah, king of Judah, ca. 597-586 B.C. *II Kings 24:17-25:7; II Chron. 36:10-11; cf. I Chron. 3:15; Jer. 1:3; 21:1-7; etc.) and Zedekiah, a prince of Judah and son of Hananiah (Jer. 36:12), ca. 600 B.C. are the only instances we can discover between the time of the Davidic Zadok and the Exile.

3. Cf. Sacral Kingship, pg. 46.

4. Cf. Nyberg, op. cit., pp. 329-345.

5. Sacral Kingship, pp. 27-46.

Melchizedek and "righteousness" with Jerusalem is at least reasonable. However, he is unable to offer evidence to indicate that a deity El ʿElyon was worshipped in Jerusalem before or during the time of David.

As shown above in Part I, evidence is not wanting for seeing an association of ʿElyon with places other than Jerusalem.[1] We saw this especially clearly with regard to Shiloh in (1) the personal name of the senior priest ʿEli (עֵלִי) who officiated there (I Sam. 1:1-4) and in (2) the personal name of Elkanah (אֶלְקָנָה) who worshipped there and who also was the father of Samuel who served there (I Sam. 1-2).[2]

(ii b) The final objection that we wish to raise with the view that Zadok is to be associated with Jerusalem pertains to the handling of the Ark. Professor Rowley maintains that David did not build a shrine of his own in Jerusalem (II Sam. 7) but brought his own priest Abiathar and then later the Ark with him. He continues, "Clearly some home would need to be found for the Ark prior to the building of Solomon's Temple, and it is therefore probable that it was placed in the already existing shrine."[3] Rowley acknowledges, of course, that there is evidence contrary to this supposition. According to I Kings 8:4 the Ark was housed in a tent which had been pitched by David (II Sam. 6:17 and 7:2). By casting doubt on the historical reliability of all three of these passages Professor Rowley suggests, "The later orthodoxy that dictated [I Samuel] 7:6 and I Kings 8:4, however, would doubtless have suppressed or disguised any account of the Ark's being taken to the pre-Davidic shrine, even if it were recorded."[4] Such an explanation is improbable as the tale of I Sam. 5:1ff. illustrates. There we find the account of the ills that befell the House of Dagon when the Philistines tried to appropriate the Ark for their own (cultic?) use: "And when the people of Ashdod rose early the next day, behold, Dagon had

---

1. Cf. above, pp. 83ff.
2. Cf. pp. 90f.
3. JBL LVIII, 1939, pg. 126.
4. Ibid., pg. 127.

fallen face downward on the ground before the ark of Yahweh" (I Sam. 5:3). And when the Philistines raised their idol the fate that befell it the next night was even worse so that the Philistine rulers resolved that the best solution was to pack the Ark off to some other spot (I Sam. 5:4-8). Had a later orthodoxy had at its disposal an account that the Ark was first lodged in a heathen shrine before finding its rightful resting place in the temple of Solomon, surely it would only have been too delighted to draw out the logical object lesson that, as it was in Ashdod, so it was in Jerusalem: the only shrine capable of containing the Ark of Yahweh was the temple on Mount Zion. But let us take the matter further. Even the Chronicler does not shrink from reporting that the temple site selected by David had connexions with the Jebusite Ornan (I Chron. 21: 28-22:1). Professor Rowley seems to suggest that this mention of Ornan (who is clearly the Araunah of II Sam. 24:15-25 whose threshing floor David buys for an altar) is dictated by the Chronicler's piety.[1] We fail to see how the acknowledgement that the temple had been built on the high ground of a Jebusite leader would in any way serve the interests of the Chronicler's piety. We suggest rather that the Chronicler records a tradition that was too well established to be passed over. If we were to concede Professor Rowley's point, however, and grant that a later piety would want to conceal the relationship of the Davidic cultus to the Jebusite cultus, surely the very presence of the account of David's purchase of the future temple grounds from Araunah (II Sam. 24:15-25) requires us first to look to this narrative rather than to the dubious conjecture that Zadok presided over a cultus to El ʿElyon. All in all, therefore, granting the permissibility of some of Professor Rowley's assumptions, the case for the probability of a shrine in Jerusalem at which Zadok presided as priest can hardly be regarded as established. This is unfortunate because it seems to leave the question of the relation of Genesis 14 to Psalm 110 unsettled.

---

1. Ibid., pg. 128.

(b) The link was late. The link between Psalm 110 and Genesis 14 lies in the phrase על דברתי מלכי צדק . We do not have to look far afield to understand why later generations would translate this phrase, "after the order of Melchizedek." Professor Rowley records these words of G. B. Gray, "Ezekiel . . . leaves us . . . in no doubt that the distinction between the sons of Zadok and other priests which he would introduce in the future had not been a feature of life before the fall of Jerusalem."[1] However uncertain the origin of the Davidic Zadok, it is clear that from towards the end of the monarchial period onwards the priestly sons of Zadok assume an importance that they obviously had not enjoyed before.[2] It was during this era, we suggest, that the phrase in question came to be interpreted with a meaning different from that which it originally held. Reasons again are close to hand. As Gray succinctly puts the well-known fact, "Before the Exile the Jewish State was a monarchy; after the Exile a hierarchy: before, a king reigned; afterwards, priests."[3] It was within the worshipping community of the post-exilic temple that the scriptures of the Old Testament were preserved, interpreted and appropriated into the life of the community before taking their final shape. It would be strange if those traditions from the past which were most vitally related to her life should not have in the process undergone re-interpretation.[4] Indeed, re-interpretation was essential if the rich heritage of the past was to be appropriated to the full. Such, we suggest, is what transpired in the case of the phrase under discussion. Words that were originally addressed to the king, by the slightest change

---

1. Quoted by Rowley, JBL LVIII, pg. 115, n. 1 from G. B. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, Oxford, 1925, pg. 64.

2. Cf. Gray, Sacrifice in the OT, pp. 64f., 229ff. Also note the increase of personal names with the root פקד in the period after the Exile (Zadok: Ezra 7:2; Neh. 3:4,29; 10:21; 13:13).

3. Ibid., pg. 211.

4. For comments of a similar nature see A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, Vol. II, pg. 168.

in inflection were now, in the post-exilic community, addressed to the high priest.[1] It is this re-interpretation and not the original meaning that has left its mark on the religious consciousness of the Jewish and Christian community.[2]

---

1. Cf. Geo Widengren, Sakrales Königtum, pg. 16, on the transference of religious and spiritual power from the king to the high priest. See also J. J. Petuchowski, "The Controversial Figure of Melchizedek," Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXVIII, 1957, pp. 127-136. Dr. Petuchowski argues that Psalm 110:4 was used as a "legitimization" of the Hasmonean High-priesthood.

2. The outstanding Jewish interpretation of Melchizedek is found in b. Ned. 32b wherein Rabbi Ishmael (c. 135 A.D.) is quoted; the outstanding Christian interpretation is found, of course, in Hebrews 5-7. For further discussion see the references above on pg. 2, n. 1 - Del Medico's contention that a relationship between the "Melchizedek" of Genesis 14 and Psalm 110 was not seen until the Christian era is to the present writer entirely lacking in probability. It rests on the questionable notion that Melchizedek in Genesis 14 was not understood to be a proper name (ZAW 69, 1957, pg. 170).

PARAGRAPH # 6

REVIEW OF THE TYPES OF DRAMATIC RÔLE ASSIGNED TO THE KING IN THE CULT

For all of the insistence of many recent scholars that there was such a thing as a ritual combat, a sham fight, a mock battle or dramatic enactment within the cult, there is a surprising degree of caution -- approaching timidity -- when it comes to defining specifically what role the king played in that cultic drama. Mowinckel, for example, who set forth in classic terms the nature of the "creative drama" (Ps.St. II, pp. 16-43) scarcely goes beyond the following assertions: (1) the earthly king played an important rôle in the enthronement festival (Ps.St. II, pg. 298); (2) that role was fulfilled chiefly through (a) the cultic dance (II Sam. 6: cf. Ps.St. II, pp. 107-112), (b) his playing the rôle of David in finding a resting place for the Ark (Ps. 132: cf. Ps.St. II, pp. 113-114), and (c) his acting as a channel of blessing on his people (Pss. 72,132: cf. Ps.St. II, pp. 177, 298-304). As to the possible rôle that the king might have played in a cultic enactment of Yahweh's victory over enemies, Mowinckel avoids definiteness and rests content with the following conjecture, which is as close as he ever comes to describing in detail other aspects of the cultic drama: "We may perhaps think here [i.e. in relation to Ps. 46:9f in particular but also to Pss. 33, 48 and 76 in general] of symbolic acts something like the throwing of the spears by the Arval priests in Rome. Perhaps with a mind to certain ritual regulations, bows and arrows were broken, shields burned, etc. We do not know the 'How'; we have to remain satisfied with having established the 'That' [i.e. 'that' cultic enactments did take place]."[1]

Schmidt underlines (Die Thronfahrt Jahves, pp. 36-42) the king's dispensing of blessing (Ps. 132), his sacrificing and probable bringing up

---

1. Psalmenstudien II, pg. 128.

of the rear of the procession (Ps. 20), his being crowned (Ps. 21), or ascending the throne (Pss. 2, 110), and finally his drinking a sacramental drink from the brook (Ps. 110:7) which he identifies as being Gihon. Mowinckel (He That Cometh, pp. 63f.) follows Schmidt's interpretation of Ps. 110:7, as did Widengren (Ps. 110, pp. 22ff.), with the additional view that we have here a rite of purification which took place at the spring. Schmidt mentions victory over kings (Ps. 20) and Yahweh's combat with the chaos monster (Ps. 89) but does not even suggest that any action of the king might have symbolized these deeds.

In his earlier essay, "The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," A. R. Johnson displays a reluctance to go beyond Mowinckel. As we have already had occasion to note, he held then (1935) that Yahweh's "recreative work" was "presented in the form of a ritual drama" in which the Davidic king was "the leading actor." With but one exception he adheres rigidly to Mowinckel's caveat that we cannot get beyond establishing the "that." Both the exception and the caution of Professor Johnson's position comes out especially clearly in his own summary of his earlier essay. This summary merits quoting in full.

> Taking his stand upon the view that Ps. 2, 18, 89, 110, 118, 132 are all royal psalms, he advanced the thesis that the New Year Festival, in the modified form of Mowinckel's theory which the writer is prepared to accept, was rooted in the pre-Davidic cultus of עֶלְיוֹן אֵל (R.V. 'God Most High'), and that in the ritual drama the kings or nations of the earth, who represented the forces of darkness and death as opposed to those of light and life, united in an effort to destroy Yahweh's chosen people by slaying the Davidic king upon whom its vitality and indeed its survival as a social body was held to be dependent. At first the king, who is described as the Son, the Servant, and the Messiah of Yahweh, was allowed to suffer defeat and as a result was nearly engulfed in the waters of the Underworld, but at the last moment, after a plea of loyalty to the Davidic covenant and an acknowledgment of his ultimate dependence upon Yahweh, he was delivered by the personal intervention of the Most High and brought back in triumph to the land of light and life. Such a restoration to life, however, was in a sense a rebirth; it was a sign that this suffering servant and humble Messiah had been adopted once more as the Son of the Most High or, to express this vitally important role in another way, that he had been reinstalled in office as priest 'after the order of Melchizedek.' Accordingly the survival and indeed the prosperity of the nation, for which the king was directly responsible, found provisional assurance for yet another year.[1]

---

1. Johnson, "Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship: Divine Kingship and the Old Testament," The Expository Times, LXII, No. 2., November 1950, pg. 39.

In his book, Sacral Kingship, Johnson abandons the view that the enactments of the New Year Festival effected a social renewal,[1] he reaffirms his understanding of Pss. 18, 89 and 118 as being illustrative of the king's ritual humiliation[2] and dispels a degree of the vagueness of his earlier position by conjecturing that Yahweh's work of salvation "is portrayed by means of some kind of mime" or prophetic symbolism.[3] The old caution lingers, however, and in his latest work he does not explicitly state what cultic rôle he believes the king played.

While Johnson shows restraint in the statement of his views, the Swedish scholars Engnell and Widengren do not seem nearly as encumbered with conservative tendencies. Quite the contrary. What Johnson sees as an indication of "ritual humiliation," the former scholars see as evidence that the king "corporalizes the Tammuz-figure" and thereby represents in the cultic drama a dying and resurrected deity.[4] Other Scandinavian scholars, notably Bentzen[5] and Mowinckel,[6] are highly critical of this particular departure which is receiving to this day such fervent support in Uppsala.[7] Johnson himself expresses his "grave misgivings" about the kind of approach taken by the Scandinavian scholars (and particularly those of the Uppsala School) in their utilisation of comparative anthropological data to the relative neglect of the findings of archaeology. The Uppsala conjecture that the king "corporalizes the Tammuz-figure" merits a fuller treatment than we shall give it here. We shall limit ourselves to a few remarks. To the mind of the present writer

---

1. Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pg. 54, n. 1.

2. Ibid., pp. 97-118.

3. Ibid., pp. 92f.

4. Cf. Engnell, Divine Kingship, pp. 78, 149; Widengren, Ps. 110, pp. 7ff.; Widengren, Sakrales Königtum, pp. 62-76.

5. King and Messiah, pp. 26ff.

6. He That Cometh, pp. 85ff.

7. Cf. e.g., Widengren's essay, "Early Hebrew Myths and Their Interpretation" in S. H. Hooke (Ed.), Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, 1958, pp. 149-203.

they carry their conjecture too far and rely too heavily on texts which have an unmistakable historical background, and it seems that only by an inadmissible ignoring of, or diverting attention away from, this historical background are they able to discover in these texts evidence of significant parallels to elements of the Tammuz liturgy. This comes out especially clearly when Widengren cites passages from Ps. 78 (vss. 60-64) and Lamentations (2:12; 4:4,9) as illustrations of the themes of destruction of temple and city, death of suckling children on mothers' breasts, children seeking food, bread and wine in vain, and death through starvation -- all of which are common themes in the Mesopotamian Tammuz and Ishtar liturgies.[1] Psalm 78 quite evidently is not a liturgy but an historical review of Yahweh's relationship with Israel; the review includes the account of the fall of the Shiloh sanctuary and was prompted at some time between the years of 721 and 597 when the composer was deeply moved by Yahweh's abiding protection of Jerusalem. Lamentations, on the other hand, comes from the period after the fall of Jerusalem. The specificness of its language and its poignant utterances of mourning would be inexplicable under the interpretation Widengren proposes. Final acceptance or rejection of Widengren's exposition rests, in our view, on how satisfactorily he proves wrong the normal historical understanding of passages like Psalm 78 and those he adduces from Lamentations. In Sakrales Königtum he has not offered any proof but has rather assumed that the passages he cites were in fact liturgical texts or at least that they preserve an accurate picture of what was celebrated in the liturgy. This assumption wants support. Although we are in sympathy with the contemporary trend to understand many texts as liturgical in nature, we think it impossible to demonstrate convincingly that Lamentations was written as the script for a cultic play which portrayed the destruction of Jerusalem, or that Ps. 78 contains the rubrics for a similar liturgy.[2]

---

1. Cf. Sakrales Königtum, pp. 63ff.

2. In his Sakrales Königtum (pg. 76) Widengren literally taunted Johnson for ignoring the view that the Israelite king played the rôle of the dying and rising god. Johnson answered (Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, pg. 233), "I find nothing in the evidence cited which warrants such a view; and in my opinion one of the basic mistakes made in this connexion is that of taking the Hebrew text too literally and with insufficient regard for the use of idiom or purely figurative language."

Once the conjecture has been made that the king as Tammuz plays the rôle of a dying and rising god, the Uppsala scholars do not treat the conjecture with the same delicacy as Johnson treats his. Rather they proceed confident in it and in following it through to its logical conclusions so long as parallel material is not wanting. Thus once the conjecture has been made, they do not hesitate to press their case to include the ἱερὸς γάμος or sacred marriage wherein the king, through his sexual relations in the cult, portrays the relations of the deity as a consort to a goddess.[1] This enactment, Widengren argues, took place in the booths which were a regular feature of the Feast of Tabernacles and was intimately related to the insurance of fertility throughout the land in the coming year. The sacred marriage is, of course, one of the elements in the so-called "ritual pattern" described by S. H. Hooke in his opening essay in the first volume of Essays on Myth and Ritual.[2] W. O. E. Oesterley, in the same series, acknowledges the possibility that the dwelling in booths at the New Year Festival receives a satisfactory explanation if some sort of ritual prostitution is conjectured, but he is nonetheless careful not to insist that the evidence demands such a conclusion.[3] For a long time Johnson ignored the subject altogether.[4] Mowinckel, who touches on its presence in other Near Eastern cultures, does not consider the evidence for the practice of the sacred marriage in Israel to be sufficient to warrant its being included among the established elements of Israelite kingship ideology.[5] Space does not permit further discussion of this interesting subject.

---

1. Cf. Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship, pp. 77, 149 and Widengren, Sakrales Königtum, pp. 76-79.

2. Myth and Ritual, pg. 8.

3. Ibid., pg. 145.

4. See, however, his brief remark found in n. 2 on pg. 171. The remark was also made with reference to the sacred marriage. Unfortunately Johnson did not elaborate his disagreement with Widengren on this issue.

5. He That Cometh, pp. 24, 42f., 48, 50f., 52ff., 456 and note the absence of reference to sacred marriage in pp. 56-95.

We have seen that a variety of rôles in the drama of the cult have been assigned to the king. Different scholars have stressed different aspects: Mowinckel, how the king plays David in relation to the Ark; Schmidt, how he sacrifices and dispenses blessing; Johnson, how he suffers ritual humiliation and portrays Yahweh's victory over death, the forces of darkness and the nations; Widengren and Engnell, how he embodies the Tammuz-figure, enacts the part of a dying and rising god and takes a leading rôle in the sacred marriage. In the view of the present writer, none of the above alternatives is entirely satisfactory. Rather than the king's playing the rôle of David, he played, we maintain, the rôle of Moses. As leader of the cult he commanded the Ark; as priest he sacrificed; as leader in war and in cultic combat, he effected and enacted victories over enemies. In the following two paragraphs the thesis that the king played the rôle of Moses in the drama of the cult will be more fully developed. In paragraph # 7 the attempt is made to show that priestly functions performed by the king were almost the exact parallel of the priestly functions exercised by Moses. In paragraph # 8 we have sought to establish that the king's use of his rod defines specifically the rôle he played in the cultic drama.

PARAGRAPH # 7

THE KING AS MOSES: (1) LEADER OF THE CULT, PRIEST, BUT NOT HIGH PRIEST, EFFECTOR OF DELIVERANCE AND VICTORY

It has been pointed out by many scholars that the Israelite king exercised functions and held a position parallel to that held by Moses. We propose in the present paragraph to underline the correctness of this observation and to suggest that it might be applied more rigorously as a suitable means to emphasize the peculiar character of the Israelite kingship over and against other Near Eastern kingships.

When Mowinckel was commenting on Psalm 110 in Psalmenstudien III, he made the following assertion:

> The oriental kingship had, as Gunkel has very rightly emphasized,[1] two main aspects: the office of judge, i.e., the ruling, conquering and protecting office, and the office of priest. In Canaan from ancient times the kingly and priestly offices were bound up in the person of the king just as they were in Egypt and in Babylonia-Assyria. The Israelites took over this same point of view. This came to pass all the more easily because the old Israelite and pre-Canaanite chieftain as well exercised the functions of leader and judge on the one hand and of seer and priest on the other; so did Moses. Thus we see that Gideon is priest as well as chieftain-king (Ju. 8:22ff.). David as well as Solomon was a priest (II Sam. 6:5,13f.,18; 7:18ff.; 8:18; I Kings 8:14f., 54f., 62ff.).[2]

That Moses functioned as a leader (Ex. 3:16-18; 5:1; 6:2-9, etc.) and judge (Ex. 18:13-27) as well as a prophetic seer (Lev. 10:16; Ex. 7:1ff.; Deut. 18:18) and priest (Ex. 29:35-37; Lev. 8:14-17; Ps. 99:6) is well-known. That the king exercised similar functions as leader of his people (I Sam. 8:10-20; 10:1) judge (II Sam. 15:1-6; I Kings 3:3-28), prophetic seer (I Sam. 10:9-13; 30:8), and priest (I Sam. 13:9; II Sam. 6:13,17; I Kings 3:4,15; 8:5,63; 9:25; 10:5; II Kings 16:12ff.) is also well-known. The uniting of these same important functions in the persons of

---

1. "Die Königspsalmen," Preuss. Jahrbücher, CLVIII, 1914.
2. Ps. St. III, pg. 91.

Moses and the king, is in itself sufficiently striking to suggest the possibility that the relationship between traditions about Moses and the ideals of Hebrew kingship was more than superficial.

There is, we believe, ample indication in our texts to justify the assertion that Moses was looked to as the pattern and type of what the ideal Israelite kingship should be and do. This becomes especially clear from a consideration of the following.

(1) Both Moses and the Israelite king were not only political leaders but leaders of the cult as well in that (a) they were both priest-makers (Ex. 28-29; Lev. 8 (Moses); II Sam. 8:17f.; I Kings 4:2; II Kings 10:11 (Israelite king)) and (b) they were both in final control of the Ark (Num. 10:35-36 (Moses); I Sam. 14:18; II Sam. 6:2 (Israelite king).

(2) The office of high priest devolved upon another individual -- Aaron, in the time of Moses, and various designees under Israelite kings. But that Moses maintained an authority superior to Aaron's is clear not only from the references given above under (1) but also in the instance of the making of the Golden Calf (Ex. 32:15-35) as well as in the instance of Aaron's leading with Miriam a rebellion (Num. 12:1-16) in both of which cases Aaron is rebuked by his brother who maintains throughout a closer relation to Yahweh and a truer prophetic insight into his will. Similarly, the king of Israel retains the decisive say in cultic matters even though a hierarchy, led by a high priest, was permitted to flourish. This is evident not only from the passages cited in (1) above but also from these facts: (a) the Jerusalem temple was constructed under the command of the king (I Kings 5-7) and was in fact, as was the temple at Bethel (Amos 7:13), a royal sanctuary, adjacent to the palace (II Kings 11:19) and protected by the same great court wall (II Kings 7:12);[1] (b) with one apparent exception,[2]

---

1. See Montgomery's Kings, ICC, pp. 158f. on I Kings 6:36 and T.W. Davies' detailed discussion in HDB IV, pp. 695f.

2. In the "legend" (Mowinckel) of King Uzziah's conflict with Azariah, the chief priest, we find that apparent exception (II Chron. 26: 16ff.). As Mowinckel points out this tale is a good illustration of the rivalry that existed between the king and the priesthood (He That Cometh, pg. 6). On the rivalry between ruler and priest, cf. also C. J. Gadd, Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East, n. 4 on pg. 40.

the king retained power to break, as well as to make, priests (I Kings 2:26f.); and (c) kings throughout the history of Israel instituted cultic changes -- and sometimes reforms -- which may have been opposed by priests but which they nonetheless were powerless to alter because they remained his subjects (I Kings 15:9-13 (Asa); II Kings 3:1-3 (Jehoram); 12:4-8 (Jehoash); 16:1-4,10-16 (Ahaz); 18:4 (Hezekiah); 21:3-9 (Manasseh); 22:1-7; 23:1-14 (Josiah)).[1]

(3) The relationship of Moses to the high priest (Aaron) is almost identical to the relationship of the Israelite king to the chief or high priest. In some instances Moses and Aaron appear to occupy a dual leadership (Lev. 9:22) just as in the period after the Exile the prince (Zerubbabel) and high priest (Joshua) occupy positions of almost equal authority (Zech. 4:14)[2] but by and large, as we have seen in the passages in (1) and (2) above, Aaron is subordinate to Moses in the same manner as the high priest is subordinate to the king. It can be argued, of course, as it has been recently by Widengren, that the king was high priest.[3] The main support for such a contention derives from the fact that the king (I Kings 9:25), like the high priest (Lev. 16), played a leading rôle in the cult three times during the year but on other occasions seems to have let his priestly prerogatives devolve upon lesser figures. This correspondence is striking, but not in itself conclusive. Before the Exile as well as immediately after, a distinction was maintained between ruler and chief priest. In his chapter "The High Priest," Gray reminds us,

---

1. Johnson's way of expressing the fact of the responsibility of the Israelite king for matters of cult and temple is, ". . . the king is not only found leading his people in worship with the offering of sacrifice and prayer on important occasions in 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." Sacral Kingship, pg. 12. References (apart from those given from Chronicles) are: II Sam. 6; 24:18-25; I Kings 5:15-8:66; 15:12-15; II Kings 12:5-17; 18:4; 22:3-23:23.

2. Cf. G. B. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, pg. 262 and G. Widengren, Sakrales Königtum, pg. 19.

3. Sakrales Königtum, pp. 17ff.

> Wellhausen himself points out that before the Exile differences of rank and office existed in the priesthood at Jerusalem, that we hear of a chief priest there, of a second priest, and of elders of the priests, and that we see that the chief priest had considerable influence in securing positions for his colleagues of lower rank (II Kings 11:18; 12:7,10; 19:2; 23:4; 25:18; Jer. 19:1; 20:1; 29:25f.).[1]

That there remained a distinction between chief priest and king before the Exile reveals the weakness in Widengren's contention that the king was "high priest."[2] "Cultic leader" (Widengren), "priest-maker" (Gray), "superintendent of the cult" (Johnson) are all appropriate descriptions of the relationship of Moses and the king to the sphere of sacrificial worship; but "high priest," apart from the special priestly functions performed by the king three times a year, is not.

(4) The position of the king as a leader in war is almost identical to the corresponding position maintained by Moses. This element so prominent in the royal ideologies of Egypt, Canaan and particularly Mesopotamia must form an important segment in any true portrayal of the Israelite kingship.

The fact of Moses' functioning as a leader in war is so well-known as hardly to require documentation. He is successful in leading his people out of Egypt through the Red Sea, in routing the Egyptians (Ex. 14), and at a later period in effecting victory over the Amalekites (Ex. 17: 8-16). His close association with the Exodus alone vouchsafes the correctness of the assertion that prominent among the reasons for which he was remembered was his leadership in war.

Similar prominence among the Israelite kings is equally well attested. Like Moses they were representatives and spokesmen for their nations and leaders in battle. When the Israelites, unmoved by Samuel's hard words on how much a king will demand by way of chariots, servants and produce (I Sam. 8:10-18), still insist on having a king, these reasons

---

1. Cf. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, pg. 257.

2. Cf. C. J. Gadd's Ideas of Divine Rule, pg. 40, "The kings of Israel . . . had never been in strict theory high-priests."

are proffered "that we also may be like all the nations, and that our king govern us and go out before us and fight our battles." In these few words we have expressed not only a sentiment of envy and ambition but an acute awareness that the king as a leader against a common foe was not only a powerful symbol of a longed for unity and sense of community, but, through his rôle as leader in battle, an effector of it. The popular designation of the king as "representative of the people" is, we maintain, if rightly understood not only a dispassionately accurate description of the rôle which Israel assigned to her king; it was a powerful reality filled with significance for the conscious life of the community. As the king lived and prospered in private and especially in battle, so did his people. As the kingship developed out its background of Canaanite chieftainship,[1] what has been called his "sacral" character apparently developed at the same time. In any event, we do note a concern for the person of king David on the eve of a victory in battle, a concern which seems to outmatch the corresponding concern displayed for his predecessor. "David's men adjured him, 'You shall no more go out with us to battle, lest you quench the lamp of Israel.'" (II Sam. 21:17). Because of the mention of subsequent battles in the verses that follow, it is apparent that king David did not heed the plea of his followers. This verse remains nonetheless significant as a good illustration of the fact that the Israelites felt their welfare to be intimately bound up with the welfare of their king. He remained throughout the history of Israel the symbolic leader in battle, if not the leader in fact. John Gray has demonstrated in his essay, "Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice," that the king's priestly and military authority in the course of time "was no longer concentrated in the hands of the king but had devolved upon several classes."[2] Gray convincingly argues that a similar devolution took place in Israel. Nonetheless, the king's responsibility and place in the popular consciousness as a leader in war hardly devolved from him. That this is so

---

1. Cf. Pedersen, Israel III-IV, pp. 41ff. and article referred to in following note.

2. VT II, 1952, pg. 218.

is assured us in some lines which do not appear in the Massoretic text but have been preserved in the LXX of I Sam. 10:1:

> Then Samuel took a vial of oil and poured it on his head, and kissed him and said, "Has not Yahweh anointed you to be a prince over his people Israel?" [And the LXX alone continues:] "And you shall reign over the people of the Lord and you will save them from the hand of their enemies round about. And this shall be the sign to you that the Lord has anointed you to be prince over his heritage."

H. P. Smith may be right in asserting "it is possible that theological prejudice had something to do with the mutilation of the text, for, to the later view, Saul did not actually save Israel from their enemies."[1] But no matter what theological prejudices may have been operative to cause omission or alteration of certain aspects in Israelite teaching about the king, it is clear from this verse that the tradition of the king's leadership in battle and of his deliverance of Israel from enemies was far from dead even long after the monarchy had ceased to be an historical institution.

The Israelite king was then, like Moses in several important regards. (1) He, like Moses, was a leader of the cult. (2) Neither one was ever high priest, but distinct from, and superior to, the high priest. (3) The relationship of Moses to Aaron is remarkably mirrored in the history of the relationship of Israelite kings to high priests. (4) The king, like Moses, was a leader in war and an effector of victory and deliverance.

In addition to these similarities we have already noted how the king, like Moses, acted as leader and judge, prophetic seer and priest.[2] There is therefore considerable justification for asserting that Moses was the conscious or subconscious pattern or type for the Israelite kingship. Most recently this position has been espoused with good reason and support by Geo Widengren in his Sakrales Königtum. Widengren reminds us, as Moses was the recipient of the plan of the place of worship in the

---

1. Smith, Samuel, ICC, pg. 67.
2. Cf. pg. 174 above.

wilderness and the overseer of its building (Ex. 25-27; 30-31; 35-38) so the king is the temple builder concerned with initiating plans for its erection (II Sam. 7) and in carrying them out (I Kings 6-7; cf. Ezra 1:8).[1] But even more important, Widengren avers that in even so central an instance as the receiving of the law, the Israelite kingship was faithful to its Mosaic pattern -- or, as he further suggests, it may be the other way around in that accounts of Moses' reception of the law on Sinai may well have been influenced by liturgical practices where the king received in the cult the Book of the Covenant.[2] As an illustration of his point that the king, like Moses, was a recipient of the law, the Uppsala scholar cites the controversial II Kings 11:12 where it is related that the young Jehoash was given at his coronation הָעֵדוּת which he and others translate "the testimony" and equate with the tables of the law. As another illustration of his point Widengren cites II Kings 23:1-3: King Josiah stands holding and reading from the Book of the Covenant as he makes with the people a covenant with Yahweh. Josiah appears here, Widengren suggests, as a new Moses.[3] Although we believe that in some cases his evidence tends to argue against rather than for his contention -- cf., for example, his handling of Deut. 17:18-19 -- by and large his supporting arguments are convincing and collectively sufficient to establish his point. It would therefore seem that the similarity of the Israelite kingship with Moses is well nigh complete. Every significant aspect of the monarchy has a near or exact counterpart in the person and functions of Moses.[4]

---

1. Sakrales Königtum, pp. 14f.

2. Ibid., pp. 29f. For a further development of the thesis that the stories of Moses were written with royalty in mind, see E. R. Goodenough's "Kingship in Early Israel," JBL XLVIII, 1929, pg. 178.

3. Ibid., cf. also The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book (King and Saviour III), Uppsala, 1950.

4. It is interesting to observe that A. L. Williams comments, "At the Exodus Moses supplied the place of a king, centralizing in himself all the visible power." HDB II, pg. 840.

The fact that the kingship in Israel took Moses as its conscious or unconscious "type" can serve as a useful means to high-light the uniqueness of the kingship in Israel. There is a fairly widespread agreement among scholars concerning the elements in the kingship of Israel which distinguish it from the views of other ancient near eastern peoples toward their king. We will enumerate briefly the points of agreement and then go on to show how proper emphasis on the Mosaic character of the Israelite kingship epitomizes its uniqueness.

(i) Writers generally point out that the kingship proper in Israel was late in coming. The law and the basic character of her religion and institutions developed their formative pattern at a period before the kingship was on the scene. This was not so in Egypt, Babylonia or Assyria where kingship and the early institutions were simultaneous developments mutually affecting one another.[1]

(ii) There is almost as wide an agreement that the humanity of the Israelite king distinguished him from the semi-divine king of Babylonia and Assyria and from the god incarnate pharaoh in Egypt. As A. R. Johnson rightly asserts, "he is by nature a man; and, so far as his subjects are concerned, he is no more than primus inter pares" (cf. Ps. 61:8).[2]

(iii) By virtue of the absolute stress on the sovereignty of God in Israel, the extent of the sovereignty of the Israelite monarch was severely limited. He may have been adopted as a son (Ps. 2:7) or even have been addressed as a god (Ps. 45:6) but he was always responsible to Yahweh (II Sam. 7) in whose governance, rather than the king's, lay the control and ordering of nature (Ps. 24, 104).[3]

---

1. Cf. A. Alt, "Das Königtum in den Reichen Israel und Juda," VT I, 1951, pp. 2ff. (also found in Kleine Schriften, II, pp. 116ff.); C. J. Gadd, Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East, Oxford, 1948, pg. 21; G. v. Rad, KThWB I, pp. 563f.

2. Sacral Kingship, pg. 27. Cf. also v. Rad, KThWB I, 564; Gadd, op. cit., pg. 48; Weiser, Die Psalmen I, 1955, pg. 42. For defenders of the position that the Israelite kingship was a "divine kingship" cf. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 62f. and the references in n. 1 on pg. 62.

3. Cf. H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, pp. 342f.; Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 75f.; 84ff.

(iv) Yahweh's demands on the king as a representative of the people were obedience (I Sam. 15:22), righteousness (Pss. 72, 101) and an upholding of his law (Pss. 132:11-12) rather than a servile fulfilment of ritualistic minutiae which characterized the kingship in Egypt, and especially in Assyria and Babylonia. In contrast to the stern but ordered requirements of the law of Yahweh[1] the kings of Mesopotamia were bound to a slavish execution of the findings of a priest's examination of the liver of a sacrificial beast. Yahweh's nature did not demand such a ritualistic satisfaction (even though we do have recorded in the Old Testament an instance where a ritualistic impropriety on the part of the king is the cause of severe censure: I Sam. 13:8-14; cf. 15) nor did his righteous nature permit his king to be subjected to such a state of obsequious ritualism.[2]

Granting certain exceptions and differences in emphasis such as those noted above, the Israelite kingship nonetheless has much in common with the Babylonian-Assyrian kingship. The importance of the king's rôle as judge, priest, priest-maker and leader in war, and an accent on the king's humanity and responsibility to the deity, are the most salient similarities. In defining the uniqueness of the Israelite kingship it is thus obviously important to distinguish it carefully from the kingship of Mesopotamia. The differences between the two kingships has been drawn perhaps most boldly in the following, controversial, words of the late H. Frankfort:

> There is a tendency to overrate the similarities between the Mesopotamian and the Judeo-Christian viewpoints. It is true that the Mesopotamians lived under a divine imperative and knew themselves to fall short of what was asked of them. But they did not have "The Law." The will of God had not been revealed to them once and for all, nor were they sustained by the consciousness of being a "chosen people." They

---

1. On the importance of the obedience of the Israelite king see especially A. Weiser's remarks on Pss. 18:21ff; 72:2; 101; 89:31ff.; and 45:8 in Die Psalmen I (1-60), ATD 14, 4. Aufl., Göttingen, 1955 and Die Psalmen II (61-150), ATD 15, 4. Aufl., Göttingen, 1955.

2. Cf. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 38ff.; 75ff.; 89ff.; Gadd, op. cit., pp. 53ff.; Labat, Le caractère religieux de la royauté Assyro-Babylonienne, Paris, 1939, pp. 362ff.

> were not singled out by divine love, and the divine wrath lacked the resentment caused by ingratitude. The Mesopotamians, while they knew themselves to be subject to the decrees of the gods, had no reason to believe that these decrees were necessarily just. Hence their penitential psalms abound in confessions of guilt but ignore the sense of sin; they are vibrant with despair but not with contrition -- with regret but not with repentance.[1]

Frankfort's summary in the Epilogue of his Kingship and the Gods, and presumably also the summary just quoted, have been severely criticized by Hooke and Johnson,[2] and slightly less severely by Mowinckel.[3] To the mind of the present writer, however, the heart of the above summary -- that the pervasive influence of the law, the sense of election and certainty in the absolute justice and righteousness of God were dominant pillars in Israelite belief -- can scarcely be gainsaid. They formed the background against which the Israelite monarchy must be understood. For this reason it can be asserted with considerable justification that the uniqueness of the Israelite kingship is conveniently and accurately defined by the term "Mosaic." Not only does the term embrace such nuances as a proper definition of the king's relation to the high priest in Israel, and his leadership in war, but it suggests in a word, as none other, the background of divine election, law, justice and covenant demand for righteousness which were unique to Israel.[4]

---

1. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, pg. 278.

2. Cf. Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, pp. 8f., 214f.

3. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pg. 63, n. 3.

4. Contrary to the position set forward here Mowinckel in He That Cometh, pg. 60 maintains that Moses "represents ideals and traditions which were opposed to the monarchy" but cf. the arguments of Pedersen in Israel III-IV, pp. 662f. with which we are in complete agreement.

PARAGRAPH # 8

DEVELOPMENT OF FIRST PART OF THESIS. THE KING AS MOSES: (2) WIELDER OF THE ROD IN A CULTIC REPRESENTATION OF DESTRUCTION OF ENEMIES

In the previous paragraph we looked to the Mosaic character of the Israelite kingship as a highly suitable way of emphasizing its uniqueness over and against other ancient oriental kingships. In this paragraph we will seek to show that one aspect of the Mosaic character of the Israelite kingship also provides us with a remarkable point of contact with these same kingships. We refer to the probable use to which the Israelite king put his rod or sceptre within the cult. It was used, we will seek to maintain, in a fashion that parallels, but does not mirror exactly the use to which Moses is recorded to have put his wondrous rod.

The <u>rod</u> (מַטֶּה) <u>of Moses</u> undeniably had a magical and numinous quality about it: (i) it was Yahweh's gift to Moses on Sinai which could be transformed at will into a serpent by casting it to the ground (Ex. 4:1-17; 7:8-13); (ii) by means of it certain of the plagues were brought to pass on Egypt: the first, when the water of the Nile was changed into blood (Ex. 7:20-24); the second, when the country was swarmed with frogs (Ex. 7:26-8:11); the third, when the dust of the ground was transformed into a plague of gnats (Ex. 8:12-15); the seventh, when "Yahweh sent thunder and hail, and fire ran down to the earth" (Ex. 9:22-26); and the eighth, in which swarms of locusts darkened the face of the land (Ex. 10:12-20); (iii) it was used for the dividing of the Red Sea that the children of Israel might pass over on dry ground (Ex. 14:16-22) and for summoning the waters back to their wonted course that the Egyptian pursuers might be routed (Ex. 14:26-29); (iv) after the Israelites had reached the wilderness, it was used to strike a rock at Horeb and bring forth water (Ex. 17:1-7; Num. 20: 2-13); and (v) by

holding it uplifted, victory was effected over the Amalekites (Ex. 17:8-16). We shall endeavour to demonstrate that the Israelite king put his rod (מַטֶּה) to a <u>similar</u> use in the instances of (iii), (iv) and especially (v).

In his classic, <u>Mose und seine Zeit,</u> Hugo Gressmann has some exceedingly interesting things to say about Moses' wondrous rod. He affirms that there can be no doubt that the rod received veneration in the cult[1] and conjectures that that cultic veneration included its standing before the altar erected at Rephidim (Ex. 17:15),[2] its being carried by the priests before the Ark,[3] and its being preserved within the Holy of Holies in the temple at Jerusalem.[4] Yahweh stands in the closest relationship to the rod,[5] it is, in fact -- like his hand -- an attribute of Yahweh himself, possessing the divine power.[6] Gressman is furthermore convinced that the rod of Moses is identical with the brazen serpent which had miraculous effects on its viewers (Nu. 21:7ff.),[7] with the javelin of Joshua which enabled him to win a victory over the city of Ai (Josh. 8:18,26)[8] and indeed with the brazen serpent, Nehushtan, which was an object in the cult at Jerusalem until the time of Hezekiah (II Kings 18:4).[9] As to its shape, Gressmann holds that it appears at different times as a pole, cudgel or spear.[10] In the account of the victory over the Amalekites at Rephidim (Ex. 17:8-16) it was used as a standard

---

1. Cf. H. Gressmann, <u>Mose und seine Zeit,</u> Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 1. Göttingen, 1913, pg. 157.

2. <u>Ibid.</u>

3. <u>Ibid.</u>, pg. 459, n. 5.

4. <u>Ibid.</u>, pg. 459, n. 6.

5. <u>Ibid.</u>, pg. 157.

6. <u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 158f., 458f.

7. <u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 161, 284ff., 453ff.

8. <u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 157, 456.

9. <u>Ibid.</u>, pg. 289.

10. <u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 157ff.

that could be decorated with banners -- hence the name of the altar at Rephidim, "Yahweh is my banner" (Ex. 17:15).[1]

With the exception of Gressmann's proposition that the rod of Moses is identical with the brazen serpent of Numbers 21 and the brazen serpent venerated at Jerusalem, we are in entire agreement with his views on the characteristics and nature of the rod. Our reasons for rejecting Gressmann's suggestion that the rod is equivalent to Nehushtan will become abundantly clear in the course of this paragraph, but may be stated briefly at this juncture. In II Kings 18:4 it is written of Hezekiah,

> He removed the high places, and broke the pillars, and cut down the Asherah. And he broke in pieces the bronze serpent that Moses had made, for until those days the People of Israel had burned incense (or sacrified) to it; it was called Nehushtan.

It is clear that Nehushtan was conceived to be an undesirable idol and was destroyed in the course of Hezekiah's general iconoclastic programme.

In our view one of the most distinctive uses to which the Israelite king put his rod was the smashing of idols or cultic objects representative of foreign kings. Insofar as the rod of the king was thought to be the counterpart, if not the exact copy of, the rod of Moses, it is extremely unlikely that the rod itself was venerated as an idol. Rather it was the potent symbol of the anti-idolatrous activity of the king. We do not propose to argue or insist that the rod of the Israelite king was made in the express image of what the rod of Moses was thought to be like. We merely suggest, in view of the mutual effect that the traditions about Moses and the Israelite king had on one another, it is exceedingly likely that the king's rod came to be coloured with some of the traditions that had previously accrued to the rod of Moses. How the king's rod was used in his iconoclastic endeavours we propose to demonstrate below.

---

1. Ibid., pg. 160.

Before proceeding to a fuller statement of our thesis and to an examination of the evidence for it, a word is necessary on the size and shape of the rod. The reader will have perhaps noted that there is a slight inconsistency in Gressmann's maintaining that the rod (מַטֶּה) was at once like a cudgel (i.e., a short club) and at the same time like a pole, a spear, or a standard -- unless, of course, we assume he is thinking of a short pole, a truncated spear and a rather unimposing looking standard. Linguistically, either a short or a long rod may be intended by the word מַטֶּה. In several passages (Isa. 10:15; 14:5) שֵׁבֶט is used as a synonym for מַטֶּה . And שֵׁבֶט according to a very interesting article on "Sceptre" in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, may stand either for a short sceptre or for a long staff reaching to the ground.[1] If a short shepherd's rod is intended, another article in the same Dictionary suggests that we should think in terms of a club or mace about 2 1/2 ft. long, made of an oak sapling, rounded, and bulging (and perhaps studded) at one end.[2] We are not in a position to say with complete assurance that the מַטֶּה of Ps. 110:2 was more like a mace than a staff or spear. We are certain in affirming, however, that if the king's rod in Ps. 110:2 was identical with the "rod of iron (שֵׁבֶט בַּרְזֶל)" of Ps. 2:9, it was a mace or club for the shorter instrument is unquestionably more suitable than a longer staff or spear for dashing to pieces something like a potter's vessel.

Statement of thesis. Our thesis falls into two parts. The first part is that there was at some point in the post-Solomonic monarchy a ceremony celebrated in the autumn of the year in which cultic objects representative of foreign deities or kings were [illegible]troyed and perhaps burned. It is entirely possible that these symbol smashing tactics were a part of the coronation ritual or of festivities in which the anniversary of the king's ascension to the throne were celebrated. A goodly number of the Royal Psalms (I Sam. 2:1-10 and Pss. 2, 110, 45, 20, 21, 18 and 144)

---

1. HDB IV, pg. 417.
2. Ibid., pg. 291.

afford sufficient evidence to establish that such a ceremony was actually practised. In it the king played the rôle of Moses by either giving a signal with his rod (if it was a long one) for the votaries of Yahweh to commence their destruction of the cultic objects representative of foreign kings and deities, or (if the king's rod was a short one) he himself actively took part in the smashing of the objects. There is, furthermore, ample evidence (Gen. 35:2ff.; Josh. 24:14ff.; Judges 10:6ff.; I Sam. 7:2ff.; I Kings 15:9-15; 11:17-20; 18:4; 23:4-20; I Chron. 14:11-12) that ceremonies were not unknown in the course of the history of Israel in which objects of veneration in a foreign cult -- and especially idols -- were smashed, buried or burned. This first part of the thesis will be discussed, along with most of the passages listed above, in the present paragraph.

The second part of the thesis will be discussed most thoroughly in the following paragraph, but it may be briefly stated here so that the reader may be aware of the precise interpretation that we would place on the iconoclastic and symbol smashing ceremony. It is this. The purpose of the ceremony in which objects representative of foreign kings and idols were put away or done away with, was primarily to make plain to the congregation the nature of the judgements of Yahweh which were taking place in the regions above the earth. With the beginning of the autumnal rainy season and accompanying thunder showers, Yahweh was believed to be sitting in judgement upon the rebellious heavenly deities and watery forces. And so within the cult, the king, wielding his potent rod like a new Moses, made plain what Yahweh was doing by leading or initiating a cultic destruction of objects representative of kings. As these objects and foreign idols were smashed and destroyed, so it was made dramatically vivid to the worshipping community how Yahweh was dealing with the gods of foreign nations. As a part of the same ceremony the king may have once again played the rôle of Moses by smiting the waters of the brazen sea with his rod to signify Yahweh's division of the seas by his might and his crushing the head of Leviathan

(Ps. 74:13).[1] Because Yahweh's subjection of the rebellious gods gave assurance to the nation that they would be as equally successful in whatever dealings they had during the coming year with foreign nations, and because the successful division of the seas and conquest of Leviathan provided a sure sign that the longed for rains were soon to come, the day was preeminently a day of joy and thanksgiving. The validity of the second part of this thesis is substantiated by an examination of Pss. 29, 82, 89, 65, 96, 97, 98, 47 and 149. It is in the light of both parts of this thesis that Ps. 110 will be examined and interpreted.

The thought-world of the Old Testament. Before proceeding to an examination of the psalms and historical texts which support the first part of our thesis, it seems advisable to say here a word about the old Israelite view of the symbolic meaning of natural events and the symbolic power of certain human actions. By this brief digression we hope, at best, to substantiate the claim that both parts of the above thesis are quite in accord with the kind of thinking which is common to the Old Testament, and, at least, to make this claim more plausible and acceptable.

A full discussion of Israelite attitudes towards nature would take us too far afield.[2] We wish, first, merely to adduce a few salient examples which will serve to remind us that the Israelites believed Yahweh spoke and acted in and through natural phenomena as well as in and through the events of history.[3] We may start with what is an obvious, though often underplayed, example. The very thunder in the heavens

---

1. Cf. Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 52f. and also pp. 35f in the present study.

2. Cf. however, the excellent discussion in H. Wheeler Robinson's Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, Oxford, 1946, pp. 1-48. For an excellent delineation of the Hebrew attitude to nature as over and against the Egyptian and Mesopotamian attitude see the concluding chapter of H. Frankfort's Before Philosophy: The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man, 1954.

3. Cf. G. Ernest Wright, The Old Testament Against Its Environment. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 2, SCM, London, 1950, pp. 68ff.

was thought to be the "voice of Yahweh" (Ps. 29:3; Job 40:9) and lightning and hail signs of his displeasure (Pss. 18:14-15; 97:3-4; 144:5-6; etc.). In a passage already examined (I Sam. 12:17) we have seen that similarly, unseasonable rain and thunder were interpreted to be signs of divine disapproval.[1] Even more familiar are the instances of Yahweh's speaking to Elijah after the wind, earthquake and fire in a "still small voice" of the calm that followed the storm (I Kings 19:11ff.) and his speaking to Job out of the whirlwind (Job 40:6). Another striking illustration of the great meaning that the Israelites attached to events in the natural order is found in the account of David's battle against the Philistines. He inquires of Yahweh and receives this as the later part of his answer, "And when you hear the sound of marching in the tops of the balsam trees, then bestir yourself; for then Yahweh has gone out before you to smite the army of the Philistines." (II Sam. 5:24). In view of these instances it is not out of keeping with the character of Old Testament thought to assert, as we do in the second part of our thesis, that the beginning of the autumnal rainy season was held by the Israelites to be the time when Yahweh, seated at the head of a heavenly council, was thundering forth his judgement upon foreign gods.

In a similar fashion, we believe, the first part of our thesis may be shown to be in accord with the thought world of the Old Testament. It is our contention that there was enacted in the cult a dramatic destruction of foreign cultic objects and idols. This destruction had the primary purpose of making plain what Yahweh was doing in the heavenly places, but it was also viewed as being contributory to the final defeat of the hostile deities, whose idols and cultic objects were smashed. Such a claim is not at all foreign to those familiar with the nature of prophetic symbolism.[2] The prophetic sign or מֹשֶׁל, such as Jeremiah's replacing the broken wooden yoke about his neck with the iron yoke

---

1. Cf. above, pp. 147f.

2. Cf. for references and a survey of important works in this field, O. Eissfeldt's essay, "The Prophetic Literature" in H. H. Rowley (Ed.), The Old Testament and Modern Study, esp. pp. 141ff.

(Jer. 28:14) was understood to be not only a means of declaring Yahweh's intentions, but also an action which contributed to the ultimate subjugation of Israel to the yoke of slavery. Examples might be multiplied. For the present two instances will suffice to illustrate the kind of interpretation which we hold should be put on the ceremony of the destruction of foreign cultic objects and idols. When the Ark of the God of Israel is captured by the Philistines, one of the disturbing occurrences that ensued was the outbreak of tumors on young and old; another was the fact that the land was plagued with mice. The Philistines, eager to see themselves rid of this source of disease and destruction, consult their priests and diviners to seek guidance on how they should best dispense with it. The priests and diviners advise that five images (עֳפָלֵיהֶם) of the tumors and five golden images of the mice should be made -- one for each of the lords of the Philistines -- and packed in a box (or bag) along with the Ark onto a new cart drawn by two milch cows which had not previously been yoked. The cows were to be separated from their calves, yoked to pull their imposing burden, and sent off in whichever direction they chose. The making of the images of the tumours and mice, and sending them off along with the Ark, was explained by the priests and diviners to be a guilt offering (אָשָׁם) by which they would "give glory to the God of Israel" that "perhaps he will lighten his hand from off you and your gods and your land" (I Sam. 6:5). It is abundantly clear that the Philistines hoped to rid themselves of their plagues by packing with the Ark the golden figures (כְּלֵי זָהָב) which they had fashioned. The second illustration is the account of the interview of kingJoash with the prophet Elisha shortly before the latter's death. Elisha instructs the king to shoot out of a window eastward with a bow and arrow. Joash shoots and Elisha says, "Yahweh's arrow of victory, the arrow of victory over Syria! For you shall fight the Syrians in Aphek until you have made an end of them." (II Kings 13:17). The king is then instructed to strike the ground with the arrows. When he strikes the ground with them only three times, Elisha rebukes him in anger, "You should have struck five or six times; then you would have struck down Syria until you had made an end of it, but

now you will strike down Syria only three times." (II Kings 13:19). In both of these illustrations there is thought to be a direct and binding relation between what is done symbolically and that which will come to pass in fact. In the former case the sending away of the figures was believed to be the means of sending away plagues; in the latter case the king's smiting the ground with arrows was believed to have the symbolic power of effecting victory over his enemies. Call this type of thinking what we will -- prophetic symbolism, sympathetic magic,[1] or, more popularly, the power of suggestive action -- it is part and parcel of the Old Testament way of looking at the world.[2]

After one more necessary deviation we shall turn to those psalms in which there is evidence that a ceremony was conducted in Israel during which symbols of foreign nations and gods were destroyed.

---

1. Cf. H. Gressmann, Mose und seine Zeit, pg. 287, who includes the case of the Philistines' making images of tumors and mice within the sphere of a "passive form" of "sympathetic magic." Without a doubt both of the above instances fall within the sphere of magic as classically defined by Sir James G. Frazer, "The principles of thought on which magic is based appear to resolve themselves into two: first, that like produces like, as that an effect resembles its cause; and, second, that things which have once been in contact continue to act on each other even after the contact has been severed. The former principle may be called the Law of Similarity, the latter the Law of Contact or Contagion. From the first of these principles -- namely, the Law of Similarity -- the magician infers that he can produce any effect he desires merely by imitating it; from the second -- namely, the Law of Contact or Contagion -- he concludes that whatever he does to a material object will affect equally the person with whom the object was once in contact, whether it formed part of his body or not. Charms based on the Law of Similarity may be called Homeopathic or Imitative Magic. Charms based on the Law of Contact or Contagion may be called Contagious Magic." Lectures on the Early History of Kingship, London, 1905, pp. 37f.

2. This type of thinking is, we believe, after all, not so very far removed from us. The present writer has seen, for example, a Canadian turn away in great anger and disgust upon discovering that a Scottish nationalist addressing a gathering in The Mound, Edinburgh, was using the Union Jack as a mat for his feet. His angry retort was, "There was a lot of Scottish and Commonwealth blood shed for that flag in two world wars." Or, again, the present writer has felt considerable horror upon being confronted in the front page of a newspaper by the photograph of a White American mob burning in effigy the figure of a Negro. To this day destructive actions inflicted on symbols of a nation or peoples have an extremely powerful psychological effect on the eyes of the viewers. So much the more was this the case in the days of pre-scientific thought. Cf. the opening chapter "Myth and Reality" in Frankfort's Before Philosophy for an excellent statement on primitive views on "causation," esp. pp. 23-30.

The Problem of Categories of Enemies in the Psalms. One of the most controversial subjects that has particularly engaged the attention of recent generations of biblical scholars has been the identification of the enemies in the Psalms. As is well known, the opening work in Mowinckel's famous Psalmenstudien dealt with precisely this subject.[1] He comes to the conclusion that in the psalms of individual lamentation, the enemies are for the most part, sorcerers or "workers of iniquity" who had brought the suffering psalmist under their spell. Mowinckel's pupil, H. Birkeland in 1933[2] and more recently in 1955[3] put forward the thesis that the enemies are in the majority of instances national enemies of Israel, i.e., the gentiles. Before Birkeland, H. Schmidt had proposed that the enemies in certain instances are men who have brought a legal suit against the psalmist.[4] The older (and now less popular) view on the matter is that the enemies in the psalms represent the party strife in post-exilic Judaism. The latter view is, of course, especially favoured by those scholars who adhere to a post-exilic dating for most of the psalms. It finds exceedingly able exponents in the persons of Duhm, Gunkel and Oesterley. Even though Professor Johnson in reviewing this same material is undoubtedly right in affirming, "the problem as to who are meant by the 'enemies' in these psalms is not likely to be solved by resort to any one formula,"[5] Birkeland's thesis shows itself to be especially appropriate when it comes to the Royal and Enthronement Psalms considered in the course of the present study. It will thus be noticed of the Royal Psalms treated in the present paragraph that the enemies are in the majority of instances "peoples," "kings," "foreigners" or the like. The enemies in the Enthronement Psalms treated in the next paragraph remain national, but with a

---

1. Ps. St. I, Kristiana, 1921.

2. Cf. H. Birkeland, Die Feinde des Individuums in der israelitischen Psalmenliteratur, Oslo, 1933.

3. Cf. H. Birkeland, The Evildoers in the Book of Psalms, Oslo, 1955.

4. Cf. H. Schmidt, Das Gebet der Angeklagten im Alten Testament, BZAW XLIX, 1928.

5. Cf. A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms" in H. H. Rowley (Ed.), The Old Testament and Modern Study, pg. 203.

slight shift in emphasis -- "idols" and "gods" tend to become the representatives of the nations instead of "kings."

Evidence of the Psalms. The most direct indication that the Israelite king (as Moses) wielded the rod in a cultic drama portraying the destruction of symbolic enemies may be found in the third strophe of Psalm 2. As is widely recognized, the psalm falls naturally into four strophes.

In the first (vss. 1-3) we hear of the hostile nations and peoples, kings and rulers who are resolved on rebellion against Yahweh and his anointed.

In the second strophe Yahweh laughs from his heavens, as the psalmist envisions how Yahweh will display to them his wrath, for he has established his king in Zion.

In the third strophe (vss. 7-9), the speaker tells us of Yahweh's ordinance which includes: (i) the declaration that the king is his son; (ii) the promise that the nations will be his heritage; and (iii) the promise or command,

> Thou shalt break them[1] with a rod of iron,
> and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

It is possible, of course, that vs. 9 is metaphorical and is merely illustrative of the potency that will be granted to the anointed of Yahweh, but this vs. may also be a clue to a recovery of a ceremony where symbolic enemy kings were smashed. Vs. 9 is the last part of Yahweh's ordinance or decree. The word חֹק is occasionally used of a liturgical ordinance (e.g. Ex. 12:24 (of Passover) and Ps. 81:5,6 (of blowing the trumpet at a festival)) or in the plural (חֻקִּים) of liturgical ordinances (e.g. Deut. 16:12 (of keeping the Feast of Tabernacles); Deut. 26:16 (of eating the tithe); Deut. 12:1 (of destroying foreign idols)). It is therefore

---

1. תְּרֹעֵם (second person singular). In passing it is interesting to observe that this verb and its suffix is paranomastic with רָעַם ("to thunder"). This may, of course, be fortuitous, but may also be an indirect indication that the royal smashing of enemies on earth was believed to reflect the thundering judgement of Yahweh in the heavens above.

not improbable that vs. 9 also was understood to be part of a liturgical ordinance and that the king was actually enjoined here to smash with his rod vessels symbolic of enemy nations.

The final strophe (vss. 10-11) accords well with such a conjecture.

> Now, therefore, O kings, be wise;
> be warned, O rulers of the earth.
> Serve Yahweh with fear,
> with trembling kiss his feet,
> lest he be angry, and you perish in the way;
> for his wrath is quickly kindled.
> Blessed are all who take refuge in him.

Why are the kings exhorted to be wise and warned? Is it not clearly on the basis of the decree or ordinance of the previous strophe which included the king's adoption, the promise of an inheritance, and the promise or command that he would smash the enemy nations? The particle (עַתָּה) with which the fourth strophe opens suggests that something vivid and concrete has just transpired.[1] Following a dramatic enactment of the smashing of earthenware vessels it would have been appropriate for the king or one of his prophets to have exhorted:

> Now, therefore, O kings, be wise;
> be warned, O rulers of the earth.

The remainder of the strophe would have thus said in effect: if you do not turn away from your gods to serve Yahweh with fear and trembling, swiftly and with utter destruction the wrath of Yahweh will descend upon you even as the king's rod shattered your images or the images of your gods in the cult. After such an admonition we can picture the assembled faithful chanting or singing the refrain, "Blessed are all who take refuge in him!"

Commentators often refer to Psalm 110 as a companion piece and parallel to Psalm 2. The similarities between Psalm 2 and Psalm 83 are less frequently noticed. Yet in many ways Psalm 83 mirrors, even more closely than Psalm 110, the form and sentiments of Psalm 2. Here, as in

---

1. We submit that it is this particle -- and not אָז ("then") of vs. 5, as Bentzen suggests in King and Messiah, pp. 18f. -- which is the crucial particle of the psalm.

Psalm 2, the nations are in tumult, conspiring together against Yahweh and, here, his people. In place of the declaration of Yahweh's ordinance commanding (or promising) destruction of the enemies, we find an open petition for their annihilation (vss. 9-18) which begins with the following words:

> Do to them as thou didst to Midian,
> as to Sisera and Jabin at the river Kishon,
> who were destroyed at Endor,
> who became dung for the ground.
> Make their nobles like Oreb and Zeeb,
> all their princes like Zebah and Zalmunna.
>
> O my God, make them like whirling dust,
> like chaff before the wind.
> As fire consumes the forest,
> as the flame sets the mountains ablaze,
> so do thou pursue them with thy tempest
> and terrify them with thy hurricane!
>
> (Ps. 83:9-10,13-15).

Whether these verses like Ps. 2:9 bear testimony to a cultic ceremony in which representative figures of the enemies of Israel were destroyed or whether they only contain, as A. Weiser suggests, "a last echo of originally sympathetic magic acts," it is impossible to affirm. More surely they bear witness to the psalmist's conviction that Yahweh was wreaking out his judgement in nature, not only to quell the open rebellion of the nations, but in order that they might turn from their idolatrous worship and acknowledge the sovereignty of the true God. Thus the Psalm concludes:

> Fill their faces with shame,
> that they might seek thy name, O Yahweh.
> Let them be put to shame and dismayed for ever;
> let them perish in disgrace.
> Let them know that thou alone, whose name is Yahweh,
> art the Most High over all the earth.
>
> (vss. 17-19)

The Royal Psalm I Sam. 2:1-10 affords supporting evidence for the contention that a cultic ceremony was enacted in Israel which depicted the destruction of enemies. This comes out especially clearly in the first last verses of the psalm.

My heart exults in Yahweh:
my strength is exalted in Yahweh.
My mouth derides my enemies.
because I rejoice in thy victory (בִּישׁוּעָתֶךָ).

. . . . .

The adversaries of Yahweh shall be broken to pieces;
against them he will thunder in heaven.
Yahweh will judge the ends of the earth;
he will give strength to his king,
and exalt the power of his anointed.

The opening verse of the psalm looks forward in confidence to the ultimate victory of Yahweh over his and the psalmist's enemies. The last verse clarifies how this shall take place: his adversaries -- or more correctly those who are striving against him (מְרִיבָו) -- shall be broken in pieces (יֻחַתּוּ). For the judging Yahweh promises to give strength and power to his king. As we have already had occasion to observe,[1] this promise indicates that there was believed to be a close relationship between Yahweh's judgement and the king's power. As Yahweh thundered forth his judgement in heaven, so he gave to his anointed strength to smite and destroy the enemies whom he confronted -- possibly in the drama of the cult.

Psalm 48 also points to the existence of a ceremony such as the one conjectured above. The kings assemble (vs. 5). The psalm continues, as the ARV translates:

They saw it, then were they amazed;
They were dismayed, they hasted away.
Trembling took hold of them there,
Pain, as of a woman in travail.
As with the east wind
That breaketh the ships of Tarshish.
As we have heard, so have we seen
In the city of Yahweh of Hosts,
In the city of our God:
God will establish it for ever.

(vss. 6-9).

The panic that the foreign kings experience is an element not wanting in Psalms 2:11 and 83:16 which we have previously examined. The source of the panic may very well have been the same in each instance. Here it is especially plain: even as they have heard the wind of Yahweh's judgement

---

1. Cf. above pp. 143f. and 149f.

which on the sea shatters ships, so they (along with the followers of Yahweh) have seen enacted before their eyes the cultic destruction of objects or figures representing themselves. Professor A. R. Johnson translates vs. 10 of the psalm, "O God, we have pictured Thy devotion/ In the midst of Thy Temple." He interprets,

> 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 מָשָׁל par excellence.[1]

As the contemporary student of the Psalter will have observed, the present writer is deeply indebted to Professor Johnson's interpretations of the Royal and Enthronement Psalms. This is so particularly with regard to a recovery of the "ritual performance" such as mentioned above. The points at which we diverge from Johnson will become apparent in the course of the present paragraph and will be touched on in the summary of the present section.

Other psalms not assigned to the hard core of the Royal Psalms or Enthronement Psalms attest that a מָשָׁל of the type we have described above was enacted in the Israelite cultus. Psalm 54: 8,9 is an example.

> With a free-will offering I will sacrifice to thee;
> I will give thanks to thy name, O Yahweh, for it is good.
> For he has delivered me from every trouble,
> and my eye has looked in triumph on my enemies.

Similarly Ps. 92 also seems to contain a grateful acknowledgement of the efficacy of so vivid a portrayal of destruction of enemies. Hence it reads:

> But thou hast exalted my horn like that of the wild ox;
> thou has poured over me fresh oil.
> My eyes have seen the downfall of my enemies,
> my ears have heard the doom of my evil assailants.
>
> (vss. 11, 12)

With equal force Ps. 73 indicates that the psalmist was remarkably uplifted by the destruction of the haughty scoffers of heaven. He is debating, and

---

1. Sacral Kingship, pp. 79f.

at a loss to explain, the prosperity of the wicked and his own apparent suffering.

> But when I thought how to understand this,
> it seemed to me a wearisome task,
> until I went into the sanctuary of God;
> then I perceived their end.
> Truly thou dost set them in slippery places;
> thou dost make them fall to ruin.
> How they are destroyed in a moment,
> swept away utterly by terrors!
> They are like a dream when one awakes,
> on awaking you despose their image.
>
> (vss. 16-20)

The destruction of enemies in Psalms 54 and 92 is something the psalmist beholds with his own eyes in the temple (Pss. 54) or in the cult (Ps. 92). His rejoicing in the temple in Psalm 73 similarly seems to stem from more than a promised assurance or decree. No mention of the king (or kings) is made in these psalms, but this fact does not preclude the possibility that the ceremony beheld by the psalmists may have been one in which the king was a leading actor.

Psalms 20 and 21 are in excellent accord with the type of ceremony we envisage. Psalm 20 opens with the acknowledgement that the king (and presumably the nation also) is in "a day of trouble" (vs. 2). Then follow a number of petitions that the name of the God of Jacob might protect and support the king from Zion, that his offerings might be regarded with favour, that his plans (עֲצָתְךָ) might be fulfilled, and, finally, that victory might be granted so the people can shout for joy and set up banners (or behold: דגל) in the name of their God (vss. 2b-6). Assuming for the moment thereality of the ritual destruction of national enemies conjectured above, we further submit that the background of the ceremony of Psalm 20 is this. The day of trouble was a D-day, a Danger-day, a day in the autumn of the year by which time the early rains should have commenced, but have not. Preparations are under way for the ceremony enacting destruction of Yahweh's and Israel's enemies. The petitions are all raised in favour of the king for the ritual performance that is about to take place. In between vss. 6 and 7 the drama is enacted. Very possibly,

in this instance, the drama took the form of smashing either pottery vessels with the names of foreign kings upon them,[1] or symbolic chariots and horses such as the ones the kings of Judah had dedicated to the sun at the entrance to the house of Yahweh (II Kings 23:11). The latter alternative is suggested by vs. 8, "Some boast of chariots, and some of horses;/ but we boast of the name of Yahweh our God." Regardless of the form it took, it is highly likely that some sort of ritual drama was enacted between the recitation of vss. 6 and 7; under other suppositions, the peculiar force of vs. 7 is more difficult to explain.

> Now (עַתָּה) I know that Yahweh will help his anointed;
> he will answer him from his holy heaven,
> with mighty victories by his right hand.[2]

The reader will recall our words above on the force and meaning of עַתָּה in Ps. 2. Exactly the same force and meaning seem to obtain here. The entire verse lends support to our contention that the usual rains and accompanying thunder storms were late in coming, for Yahweh's answer from heaven had not yet come. As we see it, the same ceremony took on a different meaning according to whether the rainy season commenced on time (mid-October) or not. If the rains came, the ceremony was understood to be an interpretation of the meaning or Yahweh's thundering. If the rains did not come, the ceremony would have been taken as an assurance that Yahweh would answer in the present year as he had in the past. The assurance would have resided in the fact that the people saw smashed before their eyes objects representative of their (and Yahweh's) enemies. In view of the delay in the coming of the rains, they may very well have also considered the ceremony to be an assurance that Yahweh would soon defeat the rebellious Leviathan in a similar fashion. And with his defeat, of course, the rains would come. In any event, it is probable that the king employed his rod to smash the symbolic enemies of Yahweh, and that this enactment led in turn to a confidence that Yahweh would answer from heaven with

---

1. This conjecture is corroborated by the Posener and Sethe Execration texts. Cf. paragraph # 10 for fuller discussion. Note also the emphasis in this brief psalm on the name of Yahweh (vss. 2, 6, 8).

2. For evidence to indicate that "his right hand" is a poetic expression for Yahweh's lightning, cf. pg. 255 below.

victories "by his right hand" (vs. 7).[1] While A. Weiser has taken the concluding vs. of the psalm to be an addition made after the composition of the psalm proper, we suggest that this vs. is better understood as the refrain which the people chanted during the enactment of the cultic drama:

> Give victory to the king, O Yahweh;
> Answer us when we call.

Psalm 21 is similar to Psalm 20 and may also have been sung at a time before the descent of the tardy autumn rains. The validity of such a suggestion receives support from the second strophe of the psalm (vss. 9-13). The strophe opens on a note of confidence:

> Thy hand will find out all thine enemies;
> thy right hand will find out those that hate thee.
> Thou wilt make them as a fiery furnace
> in the time of thine anger;
> Yahweh will swallow them up in his wrath,
> and fire will devour them.
>
> (vss. 9-10)[2]

The source of the confidence seems to lie chiefly in something that has preceded the opening of the psalm. The first strophe (vss. 2-8) makes plain that a primary cause for the psalmist's vibrant exultation is the victory (תְּשׁוּעָה) which Yahweh has given the king (vss. 2 and 6). That victory was, we submit, a successful completion of a royal enactment of the destruction of symbolic enemies. Part of the psalmist's joy stems from the fact that the king survived the awesome task of confronting and conquering enemies whose victory could have meant death and the end of days for him ("He asked of thee life, thou gavest it him" vs. 5a). An attendant cause for joy was also, of course, the coronation ("Thou settest a crown of fine gold on his head" vs. 4b). It may be that in vss. 9 and 13 of the psalm we have an indication of the methods which the king employed in fulfilling his rôle as cultic destroyer of enemies. In vs. 9

---

1. On the correspondence between the king's rod and Yahweh's "right hand," see below, pp. 254ff.

2. The ARV translation of Ps. 21 is used in this paragraph; the RSV translation below.

the mention of Yahweh's hand, his right hand, suggests that the king used a rod, as he clearly did in Ps. 2:9, and as he very likely did in the ceremony which prompted Psalm 20. In vs. 13 the mention of Yahweh's making ready his (bow)strings (מֵיתָרֶיךָ) against the face of the enemy, likewise suggests that the king may have employed a bow in the course of the ceremony.

The concluding verse of the psalm was a refrain sung or chanted by the congregation -- if we have been correct in the above reconstruction, just after the enactment of the drama of the destruction of enemies. It was a brief petition which now looks forward to Yahweh's ultimate display of strength in consummating with his own victory in the heavens the victory he has just symbolically granted to his king on earth:

> Be thou exalted, O Yahweh, in thy strength:
> so will we sing and praise thy power.
>
> (vs. 14)

If Psalms 20 and 21 were recited in the cult <u>before</u> the descent of the autumnal rains, Psalms 46 and 76 find their most natural setting in a time <u>after</u> the descent of the early rain and just before (Ps. 46:8) and after (Pss. 46:9-12; 76) the cultic destruction of enemies. It is of interest and worthy of comment that the two refrains of Psalms 2 and 21 find their fulfilment in <u>Psalm 46</u>. The note of the refrain in Psalm 2, "Blessed are all who take refuge (חוֹסֵי) in him" resounds through Psalm 46 from the beginning ("God is our refuge and strength/ a very present help in trouble"; (vs. 2) to the refrain ("Yahweh of hosts is with us;/ the God of Jacob is our refuge": מִשְׂגָּב) which occurs at the end of the second and last strophes (vss. 8, 12). Similarly the refrain of Psalm 21 ("Be exalted, O Yahweh, in thy strength./ We will sing and praise thy power.": vs. 14) finds an echo in the opening verse of Ps. 46 and an exceedingly forceful consummation in the next to last verse,

> Be still, and know that I am God.
> I am exalted among the nations,
> I am exalted in the earth!
>
> (vs. 11)

The note of complete confidence -- so transparent in the verses just quoted and so characteristic of the whole Psalm -- very likely owes its explanation to the double assurance of Yahweh's strength and power received through observation of Yahweh's triumphant victory in nature and in the cult. That these two factors adequately explain the psalmist's exultant faith is apparent from the psalm.

The first strophe (vss. 2-4) expresses the confidence that even though the earth should change, the waters roar and the mountains tremble in tumult, the psalmist will not fear because Yahweh is his refuge. The second strophe (vss. 5-8) rejoices that even though the nations are raging and kingdoms tottering, Yahweh's uttering his voice means, for the city of Zion, not only the descent of the gladdening streams of rain, but the assurance of his very presence and assistance in -- we conjecture -- the cultic drama wherein the king will symbolically portray Yahweh's judgement on, and victory over, his enemies. The third strophe (vss. 9-12) would then have been sung immediately after the ritual performance of destruction of enemies had taken place. Praise is sounded to Yahweh for what had been vouchsafed to his worshippers in nature and cult.

> Come, behold the works of Yahweh,
> how he has wrought desolations in the earth.
> He makes wars cease to the end of the earth;
> he breaks the bow, and shatters the spear,
> he burns the chariots with fire!
> "Be still, and know that I am God.
> I am exalted among the nations,
> I am exalted in the earth!"
> Yahweh of hosts is with us;
> the God of Jacob is our refuge.
>
> (vss. 9-12)

The emphasis in the last strophe is upon what Yahweh has done "on earth" (vss. 9, 10, 11), just as in the previous two strophes the emphasis is more upon what he has done "from the heavens." There is a balance and blending of the two types of "works of Yahweh." From vs. 10 of this psalm it seems apparent that if a ceremony portraying the destruction of cultic objects representative of enemies was enacted, it included the ritual breaking of an enemy bow and spear, and the burning of a foreign

chariot.[1] Earthly ceremony and heavenly fury may have thus joined to display Yahweh's sovereignty over the tumultuous nations and forces of nature.

Psalm 76 is closely related to Psalm 46 and complements it, as Psalm 21 complements Psalm 20. The cultic ceremony portraying destruction of enemies probably occurred between the strophes of Psalms 20 and 46, but seems to precede the opening of Psalms 21 and 76. The difference in the setting of the two pairs of psalms lies in the fact, as we have suggested above, that Psalms 20 and 21 were employed in celebrations where the rain is late in coming; Psalms 46 and 76, on the other hand, were probably employed in celebrations where the rain had arrived more or less as expected. From Ps. 76:4 it appears that arrows, a shield and a sword were among the weapons of war to be broken in the drama symbolizing the destruction of Israel's enemies.

> There he broke the flashing arrows,
> the shield, the sword, and the weapons of war.

From vss. 8-10 and 13 of the psalm it is apparent that Yahweh's judgement "from the heavens" (vs. 9) upon the "kings of the earth" (vs. 13) is used as the basis for the appeal of the psalm:

> Make your vows to Yahweh your God, and perform them;
> let all around him bring gifts
> to him who is to be feared.
>
> (vs. 12)

Thus all of the elements in Psalm 76 are ones which we have encountered already: probable ceremony portraying destruction of objects representative of enemies; the correspondence of this ceremony with Yahweh's judgement in heaven; affirmation of Yahweh's sovereignty over the nations and an appeal for near and far to forsake their idols and worship him. Like Ps. 46, Psalm 76 also may be explained satisfactorily on the supposition that it was recited in connexion with a drama portraying the symbolic destruction of Israelite enemies.

---

1. Cf. pg.168 where Mowinckel's interpretation of Ps. 46:10 is recorded and discussed.

Psalm 18, like the two Psalms considered above, fits remarkably well into our scheme of interpretation. It contains references that seem to be best explained on the supposition that both a cosmic display of Yahweh's judgement and a ceremony enacting destruction of enemies lie behind it, and the relationship and coherence of the seemingly disparate sections of the psalm may be accounted for under this supposition as naturally as under any other. The parts of the psalm, according to the excellent analysis of contents by A. Weiser, are:

Section I: Deliverance

*Hymnic introduction	vss. 2-3
Need and Petition	vss. 4-7
*Theophany	vss. 8-16
Deliverance	vss. 17-20
Righteousness of the king	vss. 21-25
Confession	vss. 26-31

Section II: Salvation of the king

*Preparation	vss. 32-37
*Victory	vss. 38-43
*Sovereignty over the nations	vss. 44-46
*Praise and thanksgiving	vss. 47-49
*Hymnic conclusion	vss. 50-51

All of the parts of the psalm marked with an asterisk are prominent elements in the ceremony portraying cultic destruction of enemies which has been discussed above. As to the parts not marked with an asterisk, the following may be said. Although there is a mention of need and trouble in the ceremony (Pss. 20:2; 76:2) and of petition (Ps. 20:2-6), the need is not of the sort that appears in Ps. 18 where the king is threatened by "cords of death" and "torrents of perdition" (vss. 5,6) and ensnared in "many waters" (vs. 17). The need of the king in Psalm 18 is nonetheless similar to that which we have seen above in that it is also portrayed as opposition by "my enemies" (vs. 4) and "my strong enemy" or "those who hated me" (vs. 18). The hostility of the enemies thus appears in Psalm 18 in a different light: To be more precise, the emphasis is on an aspect not mentioned at all in the other psalms which were recited in relation to a cultic ceremony portraying the destruction of enemies. The threat to the king's life here is more personal; the need in which he finds himself is far more akin to the need of the psalmist in the psalms of individual

lamentation.[1] Accordingly, the type of deliverance described in the first section of the psalm (vss. 17-20) and the two parts which follow (where the king claims that his righteousness has been vindicated (vss. 21-25) and lauds the perfection of God's way (vss. 26-31)), do not have any real counterparts in the psalms we have considered and will consider.[2] But the dissimilarity ends there. According to the present reconstruction, Yahweh's self-disclosure and judgement in nature (vss. 8-16), the king's victory over his enemies with the help of Yahweh (vss. 38-43,51)[3] and the king's (and Yahweh's) sovereignty over the "peoples" and "foreigners" (vss. 45, 46, 48) constitute key elements in the ceremony portraying destruction of enemies. Therefore, even though this psalm contains some aspects which are absent from most of the other psalms used in connexion with our ceremony, the prominence in the psalm of the three main elements of the ceremony is sufficient ground to suggest the strong probability that it was employed in connexion with the same celebration.

The difficulty comes in the question: is it more natural to expound verses 32-43 as descriptions of historical warfare or of warfare in the cult? We affirm that the latter is more likely. That is to say, vss. 32-43 do not refer to any historical campaign or campaigns of a Judaic king, but are rather descriptions of his actions in a cultic drama which portrayed his destruction of enemies. Few commentators endeavour to assign these vss. to any particular campaign, or campaigns, of any one king. There is some preference for either David (Oesterley, Weiser, Hertzberg)

---

1. Cf. Gunkel-Begrich, Einleitung in die Psalmen, # 6, pp. 172ff.

2. Ps. 144 is not considered anywhere at length in the present study. It is widely acknowledged, however, that Ps. 144 has many points of contact with Ps. 18, including the more personal nature of the king's need. In Ps. 144 the king's deliverance seems dependent upon Yahweh's bowing down from the heavens and flashing forth his lightning to scatter the enemies (vss. 5-7). Cf. the next note.

3. Gunkel has pointed out (in loc.) that the king's victory over enemies in the second part of the psalm is intimately related with the deliverance from his need described in the first part of the psalm. In the previous note we observed that the same relationship between deliverance and victory over enemies seems to obtain in Ps. 144 as well.

or Josiah (Kittel, Gunkel) but no insistence that the psalmist-king is offering thanksgiving for this or that particular victory. The suggestion of the appropriateness of the psalm as a description of the historical exploits of any one king is not infrequently couched in rather general and vague terms. W. O. E. Oesterley says, for instance, "There is nothing in these verses (i.e., vss. 37-48) which calls for special comment; they seem to recall episodes in the life of David whose constant wars were an outstanding element during his reign."[1] Hertzberg is even more general,

> Other psalms may have portrayed individual episodes in David's life; Psalm 18 has a comprehensive significance. Indeed, it furnishes us with a theological commentary of the history of David. The history of David should be read and heard in the light of this psalm.[2]

The case made by Oesterley and Hertzberg would be stronger were it not for the fact that the language of vss. 32-43 lends itself to a more natural explanation. As Weiser has most recently pointed out, the language employed here is highly stylistic, "Thoughts and notions which stem from contemporary courtly style and which are also partly known from ancient oriental documents and pictures, are singularly employed in the presentation."[3] The similarity of the stylistic character of these verses with the courtly style of other ancient near eastern peoples strongly suggests the possibility that not only was there a similarity in the kind of language used, but a similarity as well in what that language was describing, namely, the acts in a cultic drama portraying the destruction of enemies. Significant examples of Mesopotamian and Egyptian ceremonies which portrayed in the cult the destruction of national enemies will be adduced in paragraph # 10 below. It is wisest, as Frankfort continually admonishes,[4] however, not to assume that similarity in form means similarity in content. To establish the validity of his thesis, the present writer therefore seeks

---

1. Oesterley, The Psalms, SPCK, 1939, pg. 167.
2. Hertzberg, Die Samuelbücher, ATD 10, 1955, pg. 319.
3. Weiser, Die Psalmen, ATD 14, 1955, pg. 131.
4. Kingship and the Gods, passim.

to place a minimum of emphasis upon the comparative material. Leaving the matter of similarity aside, the point still holds that the highly stylized character of Ps. 18:32-43 can be explained as well, if not better, on the supposition that it describes the steps taken by the king in a cultic combat. These steps were: (1) the king sets out on the "way" (possibly a path or set route leading from the temple to the site of the ceremony: vs. 33); (2) the opening scene on a portion of raised ground: either a hill or a mountain or mound which stands in sufficient contrast to the ground around so that it can rightly be called a "height" (בָּמוֹת: vs. 34); (3) the king points to the first weapons he will employ during the contest: the bow of bronze (vs. 35) and a shield (vs. 36); (4) cultic run (or dance?) in pursuit of figures representative of his enemies (vs. 38); (5) shatteri: em (מחץ) with his mace until they fall to the ground (vs. 39); (6) beating them (שחק) with the same weapon until they become fine as dust (vs. 43).

After the drama there follows the familiar extolling of Yahweh for the victory he has granted the king over the "peoples" (vss. 44-51). Thus the psalm ends in a final paean of praise:

> For this I will extol thee, O Yahweh, among the nations,
> and sing praises to thy name,
> Great triumphs (מַגְדִּיל יְשׁוּעוֹת) he gives to his king,
> and shows steadfast love to his anointed,
> to David and his descendants for ever.
>
> (vss. 50-51)

Summary of Evidence in the Psalms

In the above treatment of certain psalms it has been our main interest to establish the point that there is ample evidence in the Psalter to indicate that a ceremony enacting the destruction of national enemies was a significant feature in Israelite worship. It has been impossible to confine ourselves to the one point for the simple reason that this ceremony had to be understood in the light of its relation to the appearance of the autumnal rains. It is this insistence upon the heavenly orientation of the ceremony, if we may so express it, that constitutes what is new in the present restatement of material that is so well known to all contemporary students of the Psalms. The king, acting as Moses in wielding

the rod, was not so much "a potent extension of the Divine Personality"[1] as his prophet and counterpart, making plain through a dramatic presentation that as Yahweh was judging foreign gods, so he was destroying foreign kings -- or, if the rains were late in coming, his cultic actions were taken to be an earnest that Yahweh's decisive judgement in the heavens was soon to come.

In fairness it may be repeated that A. R. Johnson has also sought to demonstrate the existence of a ritual performance similar to the one which we have attempted to reconstruct in the present section.[2] There is, however, a considerable difference in the place of emphasis and the type of ceremony reconstructed. Johnson stresses the combat with "Death" which element we have deliberately neglected in order that the more prominent feature of victory over, and destruction of, kings might be given the fuller stress it deserves. Another difference between the present thesis and Johnson's has been stated above, namely, we aver that the ceremony enacting destruction of enemies was understood to be either an interpretation of Yahweh's heavenly judgement or an anticipation of it, but never as an entity where a regard for Yahweh's actions in the heavens was absent.[3] There are other points of difference which the reader familiar with Professor Johnson's work will quickly detect. The most important, which should be mentioned here, is the thesis that idols or objects representative of foreign deities were destroyed, as well as objects representative of foreign kings. We maintain that the one drama portraying destruction of national enemies had two acts: (i) -- where symbols of the

---

1. Johnson's phrase in Sacral Kingship, pg. 14.

2. Cf. esp. his treatment of Ps. 21, Sacral Kingship, pp. 122-124.

3. Johnson's views on Ps. 98 come close to ours, "Yahweh's earthly victory has its counterpart in the heavenly places." (Sacral Kingship, pg. 93). Our view is rather that it is the earthly victory which is the counterpart of the heavenly.

nations' earthly power were destroyed, and (ii) -- where symbols of the nations' heavenly powers were destroyed.[1]

It may be pointed out that too sharp a demarcation between the acts would not accord with the facts. In Psalm 2, for example, the enemies are hostile towards Yahweh as well as his anointed; they are the "nations," "peoples," "kings of the earth," "rulers" and are thus fairly obviously earthly. But because they are also Yahweh's enemies, Yahweh's injunction to the king to smash them with a rod of iron may have meant the smashing of figurines symbolic of hostile deities as well as kings. To cite another example, in Psalm 83 Yahweh's enemies ("thy enemies") are clearly specific nations which have set themselves against Israel. These examples suffice to show that despite our desire to stipulate whether the cultic objects destroyed were symbols of a nation's king or a nation's deity, the matter cannot always be definitely determined. Both gods and kings alike were taken to be representatives of a nation. For the most part we have assumed that the objects destroyed in the ceremony lying behind the psalms treated in this paragraph were symbols of the king.

The Evidence of Historical Texts. We now turn to the matter of the "proof" for our thesis in the historical texts and especially those in the historical books. In a brief but excellent article, "The Jewish Kingship and The Sacred Combat," W. J. Ferrar reviewed the theories put forward by A. R. Johnson in The Labyrinth and was persuaded enough by what he read there to have said,

---

1. The fact that the strength and power of a nation's god was held to be a determining factor in the earthly welfare of that nation is well known. Perhaps the most outstanding illustration of this fact appears in the words which the Assyrian commander, Rabshakeh, instructs his messengers to deliver to king Hezekiah. "Thus shall you speak to Hezekiah king of Judah: 'Do not let your God on whom you rely deceive you by promising that Jerusalem will not be given into the hand of the king of Assyria. Behold, you have heard what the kings of Assyria have done to all lands, destroying them utterly. And shall you be delivered? Have the gods of the nations delivered them, the nations which my fathers destroyed, Gozan, Haran, Rezeph, and the people of Eden who were in Telassar? Where is the king of Hamath, the king of Arpad, the king of the city of Sepharvaim, the king of Hena, or the king of Ivvah?'" (II Kings 19:10-13). This passage is also of interest because it illustrates the equally well known fact that a king, more than any other human being, was a nation's representative.

> The Psalms are undoubtedly the chief support of the new theories; in fairness it must be admitted that if these theories could be solidly based on history, the Psalms would be a valuable adjunct to their support, and afford a series of valuable illustrations.[1]

We submit that the kind of basis that W. J. Ferrar was requesting, is not wanting. We will adduce that "proof" under three heads. But before doing so we wish to underline one point. In the nature of the case the evidence we have to present is not evidence that is beyond dispute. We cannot refer to any passage which offers unambiguous proof in the sense that that word is generally taken. The proof we have to offer is of an indirect and suggestive kind; we have therefore put this word in quotation marks in order to make clear that we are not claiming more for the texts we shall adduce than they seem to carry naturally.

(1) Passages on the ban (חֵרֶם) clearly indicate that idols and symbols of royalty, including the royalty itself, were destroyed -- or were supposed to be destroyed -- as part of the same ceremony. This fact is not always emphasized, but it is indisputable that when complete extermination is enjoined or practiced, it included, of necessity, destruction of idols, gods, and, of course, of all the symbols pertaining to the king. This was clearly the case in the conquest of Jericho, where Achan is severely criticized, and put to death by stoning, for withholding some of the goods devoted to the ban (Josh. 7). It is also the case in the account of Saul's conquest of the Amalekites. He is enjoined by Yahweh to destroy everything (I Sam. 15:1-3) but fails to do so -- sparing the life of Agag, the king (I Sam. 15:8); for this he is censured in the memorable words of Samuel that obedience is better than sacrifice, and that because he has rejected Yahweh's word, Yahweh has rejected him from being king (I Sam. 15:22-23). Samuel himself then obediently fulfils the letter of Yahweh's command by hewing Agag to pieces before Yahweh in Gilgal

---

1. Theology, Vol. XXXII, 1936, pg. 40.

(I Sam. 15:33).[1]

In the Book of Deuteronomy we do not have an instance of Yahweh's commanding complete extermination of a peoples and their goods. Some goods and spoils were exempted from the ban (Deut. 2:34, 35; 3:7), but otherwise it was virtually complete -- especially when it came to doing away with foreign deities, idols and kings. This is evident from the following two striking quotations:

> When Yahweh your God brings you into the land which you are entering to take possession of it, and clears away many nations before you, the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than yourselves, and when Yahweh your God gives them over to you, and you defeat them; then you must utterly destroy them; you shall make no covenant with them. . . . But thus shall you deal with them: you shall break down their altars, and dash in pieces their pillars, and hew down their Asherim, and burn their graven images with fire.
>
> (Deut. 7:1-2,5)

> Yahweh your God will clear away these nations before you little by little; you may not make an end of them at once, lest the wild beasts grow too numerous for you. But Yahweh your God will give them over to you, and throw them into great confusion, until they are destroyed. And he will give their kings into your hand, and you shall make their name perish from under heaven; not a man shall be able to stand against you, until you have destroyed them. The graven images of their gods you shall burn with fire; you shall not covet the silver or the gold that is on them, or take it for yourselves, lest you be ensnared by it; for it is an abomination to Yahweh your God. And you shall not bring an abominable thing into your house, and become accursed like it; you shall utterly detest and abhor it; for it is an accursed (devoted) thing.
>
> (Deut. 7:22-26)

In commenting on the latter passage in his stimulating Studies in Deuteronomy, G. von Rad raises a provocative question and thereby provides us with the clue for the correct understanding of this and other passages on "the holy war" in Deuteronomy. He suggests,

---

1. It is inviting to conjecture that we have here an aetiological account of the beginning of the cultic ceremony wherein symbols or representative objects of foreign kings were destroyed. Space does not permit us to pursue it further.

> Is it not conceivable that this is the kind of language which would actually have been used in a period whose chief aim it was to re-introduce sacral regulations of periods long past?[1]

Von Rad does not say that the sacral regulation he has in mind concerns itself with the re-institution of an iconoclastic ceremony. He does assert, however, that the statutes in Deuteronomy on the holy war and ban have "a much more marked political atmosphere" than one finds in the Priestly Document or Holiness Code.[2] In our view the statutes in Deuteronomy relating to the ban do reflect a movement to re-institute or re-emphasize old ceremonies portraying the destruction of national enemies of Israel. From the evidence in Deuteronomy adduced above it seems to us extremely likely that that ceremony included the destruction of cultic objects representing foreign kings as well as the destruction of foreign idols and deities. If Deuteronomy 7 has any implications on cultic practices at all, surely we must conclude that the words of 7:24 are highly suggestive, "And he will give their kings into your hand, and you shall make their name perish from under heaven."

(2) <u>All of the passages describing pre-monarchial ceremonies of putting away "foreign" gods have a political and martial significance.</u> Recently the Danish scholar E. Nielsen has subjected the passages relating to the "putting away" (הָסִיר) of foreign gods to a fairly close scrutiny.[3] He is careful to point out that in Gen. 35 just after the burial of the foreign gods by Jacob under the oak at Shechem (vss. 1-4), "a divine terror (חִתַּת אֱלֹהִים) fell upon the inhabitants of the neighbouring Canaanite cities with the result that the Canaanites were unable to persecute Jacob and his sons when they left Shechem after their plundering of the city" (vs. 5).[4] In this passage and the other passages with

---

1. <u>Studies in Biblical Theology</u>, No. 9, SCM, 1953, pg. 55.

2. <u>Ibid.</u>, pg. 58.

3. Cf. E. Nielsen, "The Burial of the Foreign Gods, "<u>Studia Theologica</u>, Vol. VIII, Fasc. II, 1954, pp. 103-122 and Nielsen's doctoral dissertation, <u>Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation</u>, Copenhagen, 1955, esp. pp. 99-106.

4. <u>Studia Theologica</u>, VIII, Fasc. II, pg. 103.

which he concerns himself, Josh. 24:14-24, Judges 10:6-16; I Sam. 7:3-4, he affirms that there can be discerned a quite distinct pattern of development which he sums up with these words, "the application of 'abolishing the idols' to the Canaanite gods represents an extension of a ritual which once had a more definitely political significance."[1] The political aspect of the ceremony, he asserts, is perhaps less obvious in Gen. 35:1-4 where the gods Jacob "puts away" are Aramaean household gods, but clearly underlies Josh. 24 where reference is made to: (a) the fathers having put away gods served beyond the River and in Egypt; (b) their having to choose between these gods, "the gods of the Amorites" (vs. 15) and Yahweh; and (c) Yahweh's driving out from before the Israelites the Amorites who lived in the land (vs. 18). The political aspect also even more clearly underlies Judges 10, Nielsen argues, where Yahweh's wrath is aroused because the people of Israel "served the Baals and the Ashtaroth, the gods of Syria, the gods of Sidon, the gods of Moab, the gods of the Ammonites, and the gods of the Philistines; and they forsook Yahweh, and did not serve him" (vs. 6). Finally, he avers, that the political aspect of the ceremony is also present in I Sam. 7:3-5 where the Israelites are once again entreated to put away not only the Baals and the Ashtaroth but also the foreign gods (אלהי הנכר).[2] Nielsen observes that the qualifying adjective (ה)נכר ("foreign"), as over and against the more neutral, אחרים ("other") has a distinctly political meaning.[3] What he fails to observe is a striking similarity in all four of these passages on another important matter. In each one of them, and especially in the latter three, Yahweh's promise of deliverance and the granting of military victory is contingent upon Israel's putting away from her the foreign gods; even in Gen. 35 the same principle is implied when it is related that immediately after the ceremony of putting away the gods, a terror fell upon the surrounding cities. The ceremony of putting

---

1. Shechem, pp. 102-104.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., pg. 103.

away foreign gods was thus believed to have very definite implications on the success or failure of Israel's military encounters with her national foes.[1]

(3) In the history of the monarchy there is ample evidence that idols, images, and other cultic objects were not only cut down and broken, but occasionally beaten to dust and burned. In the history of Judah four kings are especially noted for their iconoclastic endeavours: Asa (911-870 B.C.);[2] Jehoash (835-796 B.C.); Hezekiah (715-686 B.C.); and Josiah (640-608 B.C.). In Israel, Jehu's (841-814 B.C.) zeal alone along similar lines is recorded (II Kings 10:25-28).

Some of the details in the accounts of the activities of these kings are worthy of comment.

(a) Asa is said to have put away (הֵסִיר) the הַקְּדֵשִׁים, i.e., the male prostitutes, as the RSV translates,[3] removed the idols (הַגִּלֻּלִים) which his fathers had made, and cut down the abominable image (מִפְלֶצֶת) which his mother, Maacah had made for Asherah, and had it burned at the brook Kidron (I Kings 15:9-13).

(b) Among the bloody deeds of the zealous Jehu in the North was the slaying of the worshippers of Baal at a solemn assembly, a burning of the pillars (מַצֵּבוֹת) of Baal, and a demolishing of his house (II Kings 10:18-27).

(c) At about the same time in Jerusalem a similar zeal for Yahweh was displayed at the coronation of Jehoash by Jehoiada:

---

1. In his excellent study on the "holy war," Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel, 1951, pp. 68ff., G. von Rad points out how the "holy war" in Deuteronomy represents primarily a cultic struggle of Yahwism against the pagan Canaanite cult. He fails to observe in his study, however, that occasionally iconoclasm played an important part in the institution of the holy war as he unfolds it. As we have seen in the proposition just treated, iconoclasm in Gen. 35: 1-4, Joshua 24:14-24, Judges 10:6-16 and I Samuel 7:3-4 was believed to contribute substantially to Israel's victory in (holy) war.

2. The chronology established by E. R. Thiele's The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings is used throughout.

3. Cf. Montgomery's discussion of this term in his Kings, ICC, pg. 268.

> And Jehoiada made a covenant between Yahweh and the king and the people, that they should be Yahweh's people; and also between the king and the people. Then all the people of the land went to the house of Baal, and tore it down; his altars and his images (צְלָמָיו) they broke in pieces (שִׁבְּרוּ), and slew Mattan the priest of Baal before the altars. And the priest posted watchmen over the house of Yahweh. And he took the captains, the Carites, the guards, and all the people of the land; and they brought the king down from the house of Yahweh, marching through the gate of the guards to the king's house. And he took his seat on the throne of the kings. So all the people of the land rejoiced.
>
> (II Kings 11:17-20a).

It is significant, we maintain, that the iconoclastic actions described here took place after the coronation of the king but before his perambulation from the temple to the palace and his accession to the throne. In this instance the iconoclastic activity unquestionably constituted an integral part of the entire coronation and the attendant covenant-making celebrations. The supposition therefore seems very natural that such iconoclastic activity formed a part of the ceremonies of other coronations as well.

(d) In any event, we know that such activity was among the accomplishments of Hezekiah as it is recorded of him,

> He removed (הֵסִיר) the high places, and broke the pillars, and cut down the Asherah. And he broke in pieces (כִּתַּת) the bronze serpent that Moses had made, for until those days the people had burned incense (or sacrificed) to it; it was called Nehushtan.
>
> (II Kings 18:4)

(e) But the champion of them all was yet to appear on the scene. He makes his entry after the discovery of the Book of the Law in the temple (II Kings 22:8-20) in the person of king Josiah. In comparison with Josiah's thorough-going, pillar-hacking, idol-burning, priest-slaughtering, and Baal-defiling activities, not only in Jerusalem but in Bethel and Samaria from North to South (II Kings 23:4-20), even the iconoclasm of the zealous Jehu appears to be rather tepid and anaemic. The list of what Josiah does in Jerusalem alone is imposing: (i) he burns the vessels for Baal and for Asherah in the house of Yahweh and has the ashes carried to Bethel; (ii) he puts down (הִשְׁבִּית) idolatrous priests; (iii) he removes the Asherah from the house of Yahweh, burns it at the brook Kidron,

beats it to dust and then casts the dust on the graves of the common people; (iv) he breaks down the houses of the cult prostitutes; (v) he defiles Topheth in the Valley of the children of Hinnom so that no one could any longer burn his son or daughter as an offering to Molech; (vi) he removes the horses that the kings of Judah had dedicated to the sun, at the entrance to the house of Yahweh and burns the chariots of the sun with fire; and (vii) he pulls down the altars on the roof of the upper chamber of Ahaz, which the kings of Judah had made, breaks them up (רצץ)[1] and casts the dust into the brook Kidron. Outside of Jerusalem Josiah defiled (טִמֵּא) the high places which Solomon had built to the east of the city for Ashtoreth ("the abomination of the Sidonians"), for Chemosh ("the abomination of Moab"), and for Milcom ("the abomination of the Ammonites"). Finally, it is recorded that the king broke in pieces the pillars, cut down the Asherim and filled their places with the bones of men. These activities are described immediately after the king read from the book of the covenant and made a covenant along with the people to walk after Yahweh and to keep his commandments, testimonies and statutes (II Kings 23:1-3).

The significance of the propositions presented above will be considered below in the section "Discussion of Historical Evidence." We wish to discuss first an interesting detail pertaining to the iconoclastic ceremonies.

The Placement of the King. It is perhaps not without significance that in II Kings 23: 1-3 as well as in the coronation ceremonies of Jehoash, the king made the covenant while standing "by the pillar," which, as II Kings 11:14 affirms, he did "according to custom" (כַּמִּשְׁפָּט), i.e., as Montgomery suggests, "according to the ritual."[2] The significance we take to be this: it gives us the clue as to the place where the king may

---

1. Following Kimchi's suggested emendation from וַיִּרְץ מִשָּׁם to וַיִּרְצֵם שָׁם. Cf. Montgomery, Kings, pg. 540.

2. Ibid., pg. 421.

have stood during the iconoclastic ceremonies, namely, "by the pillar." This conjecture is not inappropriate; precisely because it is mentioned in two instances as the place where the king is standing before the iconoclastic ceremonies commence. From II Kings 11:19 it appears extremely likely that after the coronation and during the iconoclastic ceremonies the king remained in this spot until he was brought down from the temple to the palace. The question then arises: where was this pillar located? Montgomery suggests, "For the pillar Jachin or Boaz comes to mind. Ezekiel's ritual for royal worship was that 'the prince . . . shall stand by the post of the gate' (46:2)."[1] Jachin and Boaz, according to I Kings 7:21, were just outside the porch or vestibule of the temple, with Jachin to the south and Boaz to the north. According to Ezekiel 46:2, the post of the gate was located in the same place, i. e., at "the gate of the inner court that faces east."[2] That the king stands outside the temple in the inner court facing in an easterly direction at the outset and presumably at the close of the iconoclastic ceremonies is significant because of the light that it throws on the probable rôle he played during this ceremony. In precisely that spot he would have been ideally situated to give some sort of signal with his rod to

---

1. Ibid. For a discussion on the various possible uses of Jachin and Boaz, see Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 4th Ed., 1956, pp. 138-155. See also Vincent, Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament, IIe Partie, 1956, pp. 405-414. In an article "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," R. B. Y. Scott (JBL 58, 1939, pp. 143-149) has convincingly demonstrated that the importance of the pillars at the coronation of a new king has given us the clue to the meaning of their names. He has shown that they were in all probability named after the first word of inscriptions found on them. He suggests for Jachin the inscription "Yakin (Yahweh) kissē Dāwîd ûmamlaktô lᵉ zarʿô ʿad ʿôlam": "He (Yahweh) will establish the throne of David, and his kingdom to his seed forever." (Cf. the prominence of the verb kûn in the royal psalms 89:4-5, 22, 37, 37; cf. also 9:8, 93:2; 103:19). For Boaz he suggests the inscription, "bᵉ ʿōz Yahweh yismah melek": "In the strength of Yahweh shall the king rejoice" (adapted from Psalm 21:2a). Scott notes the frequency of mention of ʿoz (strength) in the psalms of Yahweh's enthronement (e.g. Pss. 93:1; 96:6,7,10; 99:1,4; 132:8) and in the royal liturgies (Pss. 21:2,14; 110:2). He calls our attention to the association of kun and ʿoz in Pss. 89:14,15; 93:1,2; 99:4. It need hardly be pointed out that if Scott's interpretation is correct, it lends considerable support to the present thesis. See above our remarks on the coronation day as a day of strength (pp. 143f.).

2. Cf. the diagrams in HDB IV, 695, 697 and Grollenberg's Atlas of the Bible, pg. 71 and pg. 96 (Map 24).

indicate that the burning and/or smashing of the Asherah and other idolatrous cultic objects should begin at the brook Kidron. The brook Kidron, as a glance at a map will show, lies barely 200 yards due east of the old temple site.[1] There was ample room within the inner court for a goodly number of Yahweh's votaries to have either observed or participated in the iconoclastic ceremonies which the king directed or led. In any event, the clues of II Kings 11:14 and 23:1-3 are unquestionably the best that we have to go on if the attempt is made to ascertain the most probable location of the king during the iconoclastic ceremonies.

Discussion of the Historical Evidence. It is widely accepted among contemporary students of the Old Testament that the ceremony recorded in Joshua 24, of putting away foreign gods, very likely constituted a part of covenant renewal ceremonies observed at Shechem by members of the Israelite tribal amphictyony toward the end of the thirteenth century.[2] The iconoclastic endeavours of king Asa some 300 years later do not bear any apparent resemblance to the iconoclasm of the covenant renewal ceremonies one confines himself to the Book of Kings. Asa's iconoclasm is described elsewhere, however, in the Book of Chronicles, and the resemblance between the rites of Asa, as described there, and the amphictyonic rites of Joshua 24 are striking enough to be pointed out even though the historical reliability of the passage (II Chronicles 15:1-15) is questionable. (i) There is a gathering of different tribal elements under Asa (II Chronicles 15:9) as there was under Joshua (Joshua 24:1). (ii) A covenant was made to serve (Joshua 24:19ff.) or to seek (II Chronicles 15:12) Yahweh. The amphictyonic covenant was made between Joshua and the people with Yahweh; the covenant at the time of Asa was made directly with Yahweh without any leader being singled out for mention. (iii) "Abominable idols" (וַיָּשֵׁקֻצֵי֙) were put away under Asa (II Chronicles

---

1. See the last reference in the previous note.

2. Cf. M. Noth's The History of Israel, pg. 100, and Das Buch Josua, HAT 7, 2. Aufl., 1953, pg. 139. This view was originally defended by Noth in Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels (1930). See also J. Bright's A History of Israel, 1960, pg. 145 and E. Nielsen's Shechem, pg. 35.

15:8) and the "foreign gods" under Joshua. (iv) The above ceremonies under Asa were performed at the conclusion of a war with forces from the South (II Chronicles 14:9-15:15).[1] The martial context of the covenant renewal ceremonies at Shechem is not specifically mentioned in Joshua 24, but as G. von Rad has pointed out the effect of the ceremony on the tribes' success in war can hardly have been absent.[2]

It is certain that these parallels are for the most part due to the influence of the Deuteronomistic redaction of Joshua 24 on the Chronicler,[3] but may nonetheless have some substance in fact. Some scholars, notably Weiser, have argued that the annual autumnal festival at which the Accession (or Enthronement) Psalms and Royal Psalms were sung was so dominated by the aspect of covenant renewal that it is called the Bundesfest (Covenant Festival).[4] The psalms must be understood against this background, he submits. The relation of the monarchial festival of covenant renewal to the amphictyonic festival he draws out in the following words.

---

1. On the probable historical reliability of the account of the war, see Bright's History, pg. 215.

2. "The amphictyony was not, in the last analysis, a religious union assembling simply for the communal performance of sacrifice and for hearing the rules which God gave it for its life. Rather was it a band of tribes which, besides engaging in cultic activities in the narrower sense, also safeguarded and defended its whole political existence, sword in hand. Now, of course, this second side of its activity was not secular, but cultic, just like the other, and subject to definite laws and ideas. We refer to the institution to which we give the name, the Holy War. Perhaps it was in the Holy War even more than the Covenant Festival at Shechem that ancient Israel really first entered into her grand form." (Studies in Deuteronomy, pg. 45).

3. Cf. A. C. Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 1939, pp. 122-148 for comments and references on the relation of the Chronicler and Deuteronomy.

3. A. Weiser, Die Psalmen I (1-60), ATD 14, 4. Aufl., 1955, pp. 22ff.

> If the old Pentateuchal tradition is to be appraised as the literary deposit of the sacral tradition of the history of redemption (Heilsgeschichte) delivered by oral recital at the annually celebrated Covenant Festival with Yahweh,[1] then the possibility must be immediately reckoned with that those psalms which for the most part arose in pre-exilic times and manifest external or internal ties with the basic elements of this Festival also originated in the cult of the Yahweh Festival of the original tribal league. The tribal league survived even the separation of the Northern and Southern kingdoms. It remained intact during the monarchial period at least at the Jerusalem temple as the true bearer of the genuine "Israelite" tradition concerning Yahweh.[2]

It must be admitted that Weiser's thesis is highly conjectural and his references given to support it[3] themselves need explication. Nevertheless, the conjecture is of sufficient merit to receive at least provisional acceptance.

From a brief notice in the Book of Kings it appears that Jehoshaphat, Asa's son and successor, did not alter any of Asa's religious policies, but continued in them (I Kings 22:43). His peace with the king of Israel, however, and the marriage alliance that he allowed to be consummated between his son Jehoram and Athaliah, Ahab's daughter, led inevitably to a reintroduction of a pagan influence in the cult at Jerusalem which was not eradicated until the assassination of Athaliah and the coronation of the boy king, Jehoash, under Jehoiada the priest.

At the coronation of Jehoash we encounter the second reference in the Book of Kings to iconoclasm at Jerusalem in the period of the monarchy. On the face of it this ceremony bears little resemblance to the old amphictyonic rites reflected in Joshua 24. The tribes, or elements from them, are not gathered together and, accordingly, the military significance of the ceremony seems to be far in the background. On the other hand, the destruction of foreign gods -- in this instance, images

---

1. Cf. von Rad's Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch, 1938 to which Weiser refers as well as his own Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 2. Aufl., 1949, Par. 13.

2. A. Weiser, Die Psalmen I (1-60), pg. 16.

3. Cf. I Kings 12:26ff.; II Kings 11:17; 23:1ff.; II Chronicles 15:12ff.; 29:10; Jer. 41:4ff. and also Noth's "Die Gesetze im Pentateuch," 1940, pp. 22ff.

of (Tyrian) Baal -- and the covenant between the leader(s) and the people and Yahweh are specifically mentioned. It does not seem likely, however, that Jehoida fashioned the coronation ceremonies with a conscious awareness of, or knowledge of, the old amphictyonic rites. On the other hand, it is certain that the coronation of Jehoash was carefully planned and with an eye to past traditions. As we observed, it is recorded that after the coronation the young king stood "by the pillar" כַּמִּשְׁפָּט, i.e., according to custom.[1] From Athaliah's reaction at seeing the young king standing by the pillar it is apparent that that very act was symbolic of the authority possessed by previous kings of Judah. The spot must have been sacrosanct, proscribed by tradition to everyone save the king, else it is difficult to explain why the precise moment was remembered at which Athaliah cried "Treason!"[2] The presence of the captains and the trumpeters around the king is but one of many indications of a carefully planned ritual. In regard to the captains, it is of interest that prior to the cororation Jehoiada gave them the spears and shields of David. This action may, of course, have been solely a matter of necessity to protect the life of Jehoash. It is more likely, however, that here we have an indication of the important influence the memory of king David continued to exercise on the Judahite kingship. We may conclude, therefore, that even though the amphictyonic ceremony of cultic renewal was probably not remembered at the time of the coronation of Jehoash, the coronation was conducted with a sufficient regard to past traditions so as not to rule out entirely the probability that the old amphictyonic rite exerted an indirect influence on the covenantal and iconoclastic aspect of the coronation liturgy. The strength of this probability depends chiefly on the

---

1. It might be argued that the pillar had replaced the oak tree which figures so prominently in the amphictyonic rites (Joshua 24:26), but such a conjecture would require considerable documentation before it would merit acceptance.

2. Cf. R. B. Y. Scott, JBL 58, 1939, pp. 146ff. "Why should this point be mentioned unless the pillar had some special significance for the covenant and coronation ceremonies, like the stone of Scone for the coronation of a British king?"

validity of the assumption made above that the old amphictyonic ceremonies of covenant renewal were remembered still in the time of Asa.

The overthrow of Athaliah marked a clear victory for the conservative and anti-syncretistic forces in Jerusalem. Notwithstanding, as the Book of Kings underlines, the purge did not extend to the high places[1] until the reign of Hezekiah (715-686). The greatest paganizing influence in the latter half of the eighth century was due to the ascendancy of Assyria and the reduction of Judah, in effect, to the state of a tributary vassal. The influence of the king of Assyria on the cult at Jerusalem is openly recorded in II Kings 16:10-18. "So long as Judah was a tributary Assyrian vassal, that is to say, far into the reign of Hezekiah, the official Assyrian religion had a place alongside the traditional worship of Yahweh in the State sanctuary in Jerusalem" (Noth).[2] During this period it seems hardly likely that any foreign gods were "put away" in iconoclastic ceremonies.

In Hezekiah's play for independence from Assyrian domination (c. 705) iconoclasm was re-introduced into the cult. For the first time in the deuteronomistic history of the monarchy it is related that the "high places" were purged and even a syncretistic feature of the cult hallowed by the name of Moses was removed (II Kings 18:4). It is, of course, certain that Isaiah's preaching of single-minded fealty to Yahweh contributed to the religious reform of Hezekiah, even though the king so rarely followed his political advice.

The most thorough-going reform in Jerusalem took place under Josiah (640-608). After the excesses of his predecessors it was surely long overdue in the eyes of the conservative Yahwistic forces. The steps in this reform in and out of Jerusalem have been reviewed already and need

---

1. For a treatment on the significance of the "high places," cf. Albright's Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 4th Ed., 1956, pp. 66,92, 105-107, and 202f.

2. The History of Israel, Eng. Tr., pg. 266.

not be repeated here. It may be observed that again we see the iconoclasm taking place within the context of a covenant renewal (II Kings 23: 1-3) and it is entirely likely that the old amphictyonic ceremony of Joshua 24, which was re-worded in deuteronomistic circles,[1] had come to light before the reform and had contributed to its shape. We have already suggested that two passages in Deuteronomy 7 on the "holy war" and the "ban" do reflect a "period whose chief aim it was to re-introduce sacral regulations of periods long past" (von Rad). Von Rad had in mind, of course, the age of Josiah.[2] Certainly the thoroughness of his reform -- which included even the removal of the high places that had stood east of Jerusalem since they were erected by Solomon (I Kings 11:5-7) for the god of the Sidonians (Ashtoreth), the god of Moab (Chemosh), and the god of the Ammonites (Milcom) -- reflects the same desire for complete destruction of foreign gods which is enjoined in the passages on the ban in Deuteronomy 7.

Summary. Iconoclastic ceremonies such as those observed by the old Israelite amphictyony at Shechem were very likely celebrated also under Asa and they probably influenced, even though indirectly, the iconoclasm that accompanied the coronation of Jehoash. Because the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah were accomplished at periods when Judah's nationalism was raised to new heights either by extreme pressure from without (Hezekiah),[3] or by a fresh annexation of northern Israel (Josiah),[4] they were undoubtedly performed with a greater consciousness that precisely foreign gods, the gods of the nations, were being removed or destroyed. Even though the nationalistic element was secondary at the time of the coronation of Jehoash, it was not entirely absent, for the cult of Baal extirpated at that time was surely associated with Athaliah and Tyre from whence

---

1. Cf. Noth, Das Buch Josua, 2. Aufl., 1953, pg. 139.

2. Cf. Der Heilige Krieg in alten Israel. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testament, Herausg. v. W. Eichrodt u. O. Cullmann, 20, 1951, pp. 76-78.

3. Cf. J. Bright, History, pp. 261ff.

4. Ibid., pp. 297f.

Jezebel had brought it to Israel. Similarly, there is a nationalistic element in Asa's reform in that the abomination of Maacah, the queen mother, represented an Aramaean influence.[1] If the account of II Chronicles 15:1-15 is accepted as reliable, the entire movement of Asa's reform was conducted in conjunction with the dedication of spoil from war with invaders from the South and was therefore certainly nationalistic in character. Even if the account of II Chronicles 15:1-15 is discounted altogether, it may be regarded as established that the iconoclastic ceremonies observed in Judah during the monarchial period carried with them unmistakable nationalistic overtones.

In conclusion it may be observed that very near the end of the monarchy Jeremiah symbolically smashes an earthen vessel in the Valley of Benhinnom by the Potsherd Gate saying in the name of Yahweh, "So will I break this people and this city, as one breaks a potter's vessel" (cf. Jer. 19:1-2, 10-12a).[2] To the present writer at least it seems highly probable that this act was a way of saying especially poignantly that the city which had observed the smashing of symbolic enemies and idols would itself soon be destroyed under the judgement of God.

---

1. Ibid., pg. 220.

2. This passage is historically authentic (so Orelli, Cornill, Weiser and Leslie) even though probably preserved by the scribe Baruch. Duhm considered it to be a midrash.

PARAGRAPH # 9

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SECOND PART OF THE THESIS

In his lectures published under the title Sacrifice in the Old Testament, G. B. Gray asserted that in worship the idea of the correspondence of things earthly and things heavenly "appears to be very ancient."[1] He continued, "Among the Jews the general idea of the correspondence of things earthly and things heavenly was undergoing special development and expansion at a quite late period."[2] To establish his point he went on to cite passages from Ezekiel, the Priestly Code, Jubilees, The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs and Revelation. In this paragraph we will seek to adduce evidence to support the view that this general idea of which Gray spoke was already well on its way even before the time of Ezekiel. We shall seek to establish that this general idea provides the essential key for arriving at a proper understanding not only of most psalms which deal with the Judaic king, but of those psalms which exalt the kingship of Yahweh as well. To a certain degree we have already shown how this idea is reflected in a number of psalms in which the Judaic king is a protagonist. We affirmed that the king's cultic destruction of enemies was but an interpretation, or anticipation, of Yahweh's heavenly judgement.

Departure from Mowinckel. It is our contention that modern research has failed to recognize the absolute centrality of the idea of correspondence of the earthly to the heavenly in interpreting many of the Royal and Enthronement Psalms. The fountainhead of this failure

---

1. Sacrifice in the Old Testament, pg. 150.
2. Ibid.

is to be found in the very work that has done so much to stimulate thought and research on the psalms, namely, in Mowinckel's Psalmenstudien. In the first part of Psalmenstudien II, Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie, he sets forth his thesis that the dream of the cult was the all important place where joy and fear, penitence and longing, humility and exultation, trust and thankfulness, ecstasy and feeling of certainty were so vividly realized by the worshipping community. The high point of the entire enthronement festival, he holds, was marked by the dramatic presentation which recalled to the minds of the worshippers, Yahweh's great deeds of salvation: his conquest of the primeval ocean and original ascension to the throne or perhaps his deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt.[1] This dramatic presentation was not necessarily "played"; the great events of the drama may have been recalled by the symbolic actions either of the enthronement of the king or of the dramatic entrance of the Ark of Yahweh in festal procession. In any event, he avers that the latter became the central attraction of the festival.[2] But behind the ritual lay, as we have seen above,[3] an elaborate myth. The myth, in a sense, was all important; the ritual was but a means of recollecting the myth and representing it in dramatic form. Of the myths which comprised the cycle of the Israelite New Year, the most important, the formative myth was, according to Mowinckel, the myth of Yahweh's victory over the primeval ocean at creation. All of the other myths are viewed as subordinate to, or restatements of, this primary myth.[4] It is the cultic "repetition" or "reenactment" of this myth especially that was the source of joy, ecstasy, expectation and trust. Victory over the primeval ocean is the prerequisite for enthronement; the other victories, like his victory over (or his righteous judgement

---

1. Ps. St. II, pp. 107ff.
2. Ibid.
3. Cf. above, pp. 136f.
4. Ps. St. II, pp. 44ff.

on) the gods of nations, are variations of the primary theme. The more important victory insofar as the worshippers were concerned was probably Yahweh's victory over his enemies, the nations, but even this was a humanisation (Vermenschlichung) of Yahweh's victory over the chaos monster.[1] Such is the essence of Mowinckel's analysis of the unique character of the Israelite "Enthronement Festival."

In all of Mowinckel's remarks only the slightest note is taken of the events of the natural order and of their relation to the drama of the cult. Not until his material has been entirely presented and he has begun the second part of Psalmenstudien II does he dwell at all on the relevance of natural phenomena to cultic acts. These words are important, we have suggested, because they have been widely accepted as a valid and accurate description of the Israelite attitude towards nature which underlies the psalms. In order to obviate unfairness we shall quote at length his words which deal with the significance of the mention of natural phenomena in the psalms recited at the New Year Festival.

> This day of Yahweh's arrival is a day of his revelation, a day of theophany (Ps. 97), and this glorious revelation is described with all the media of myth and saga, with features which are derived as much from the creation myth (Ps. 93), the Exodus saga (Ps. 97:2; 99:7) and the revelation of Sinai as from his imposing and fearful rule in nature as a whole; all of these are joined in Ps. 29. Because the divine revelation is for one a ground for fright and horror and for another a cause for joy, the fearful aspect of the revelation is emphasized as well: the day is a day of divine revelation of horror and a day of destructive catastrophies -- and moreover chiefly the events of nature are used such as lightning (Ps. 29:8), thunder (Ps. 29:3), storm (Ps. 48:8), earthquake (Ps. 29:6; 46:7), volcanic eruption (Ps. 29:7); however, the wording and combination of all of these forms of revelation which appear in the Sinai myth (Ps. 97) are also used, as are the elevating and beneficial aspects of the latter (Ps. 97:2; 99:7). The poet takes the details and colours of these depictions just as they are, unconcerned that perhaps they stand in no original and organic relationship to the myth (Ps. 29).
>
> Actually Yahweh comes now because the nation needs her God. He comes by means of the cult which runs according to a yearly cycle. -- But this is expressed in the mythical language of a religion founded on myths.

---

1. Ibid., pp. 57ff.

The occasion of Yahweh's coming is that his enemies have rebelled against him and his people (Ps. 97); hawking unrestrainedly (Ps. 82) they attacked his people (Ps. 46;48;76). Before the raging of the enemies the world totters and becomes once more almost a chaos, a Tohu (Ps. 65:8). The divine epiphany thus presupposes a horrible time of need and of oppression which has made Yahweh's intervention necessary.

But now he comes, and the day of his coming is a day of battle; he resigns himself to fight against his enemies . . . .

The advance of the enemies, throwing the world into confusion, and devastating it, is dreadful and catastrophic (Ps. 46:3f.; 75:4f.; 82:5; 93:3). The combat also becomes dreadful. For with every means of horror and devastation Yahweh sets out against the hostile world -- with lightning, thunder, earthquake, fire, storm (see above).

The victory remains Yahweh's -- his day is a day of victory --; his enemies are destroyed in catastrophic defeat -- for them it is a day of frightful catastrophes (Ps. 48:6-8; 149). -- Among them his coming is figured almost as a world catastrophe; the entire world totters before Yahweh's coming and the wondrous power of the thunder of his voice (Ps. 46:7, 29), as before the raging of his enemies. But that is poetic hyperbole, embellishment, hymnic ornamentation; we never hear of an actual world debacle and as we have seen above the new creation presupposes real destruction of the world.[1]

It is obvious from the above words, that Mowinckel does not think in terms of a theophany in nature; the place of theophany is rather the cult. It thus seems to us, as we shall attempt to show, that he does not take seriously enough the words of the psalms which suggest that Yahweh is making himself and his judgements known through the events of the natural order. He recognizes the force of the co-incidence of the celebrations in the cult and the probable attendant phenomena in the natural world -- and this is perhaps even more evident in his references to the New Year celebrations in his latest work,[2] but nowhere does he concede that this coincidence has anything near a central importance for the interpretation of the psalms he assigns to these celebrations. In dismissing the clear testimony of the psalms (cf. esp. Ps. 29) that the thunder was actually believed to be the voice of Yahweh, we submit that the real focal point of the festival has been obscured and the inner relationship of the other parts of the festival has remained somewhat

---

1. Ibid., pp. 215f.
2. He That Cometh, pp. 139ff.

blurred. This has come to pass because he has erroneously made central a point of the festival which is peripheral. In opposition to this attitude of Mowinckel, it is our thesis that the shape of Israelite worship in the middle of October was literally dominated and determined by thoughts of heaven; at that time of year it was believed that Yahweh sounded forth his judgement on the gods of the nations who were in rebellion against him; the earthly celebrations -- and especially the cultic drama portraying the destruction of enemies -- was understood to be but a reflection, an interpretation, or an anticipation of that judgement. In other words, we maintain that a conscious attempt was made to have earthly celebrations in the cult correspond to the significant heavenly events. After dealing with one necessary preliminary matter, we will endeavour to demonstrate that this thesis provides us with the most plausible and unstrained explanation of the meaning the psalms assumed in the cult when they were sung in the autumn of the year. It seems to us that if the pertinent psalms are viewed through this focal point, they take on a remarkable clarity of meaning in themselves as well as a sharper perspective and a deeper coherence in relation to one another.

Evidence for Early Israelite Belief in the Conception: "a god for each nation." There is tolerably good evidence to substantiate the contention that before, and soon after, the end of the monarchial period it was a commonplace belief that each nation had ruling over it a god. Five instances selected from texts outside the psalms will suffice to prove the point.[1]

(i) We have already seen evidence of this belief in the quotation made above from II Kings 19:10-13.[2] (ii) It is very close to the surface of Deut. 7 which we have also cited above.[3] (iii) It comes out especially clearly in the LXX of Deut. 32:8:

---

1. The psalms furnish excellent evidence to support this contention (cf., e.g., Pss. 29;82; 89:5-8; etc.). We have not made reference to these passages in this section in order to underline the fact that evidence outside the Psalter is sufficient to establish the validity of the contention.

2. Cf. pg. 210 n. 1.

3. Cf. pg. 212 above.

When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance,
when he separated the sons of men,
he fixed the bounds of the peoples
according to the number of the sons of God.
(κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ) 1

(iv) The same belief is apparent in a text which is probably somewhat later than the above, Zephaniah 2:11,

Yahweh will be terrible against them;
yea, he will famish all the gods of the earth,
and to him shall bow down,
each in its place,
all the coasts of the nations.

(v) And it also appears with remarkable clarity in Micah 4:5 which may be cited even though it is considerably later than the passages adduced above,

For all the peoples walk
each in the name of its god,
but we walk in the name of Yahweh our God
for ever and ever.

The question then arises as to the date of these five passages. This must be determined before our point can be considered established. To enter into a detailed discussion of the date of each passage would lead us far afield. We will rest content with a general designation of the date as suggested by recent commentators. (i) Montgomery in his commentary quotes with approval Pfeiffer's judgement that "the date of the original edition can be fixed without misgivings between Josiah's reforms in 621, based on the finding of Deuteronomy, and the destruction of Jerusalem in 586."[2] Montgomery considers Rabshakeh's speech in II Kings 19:10-13 to be a part of the original and therefore holds these verses to be pre-exilic. (ii) Deuteronomy 7 can with reasonable certainty be assigned to the early part of the same (621-586 B.C.) period.[3]

---

1. The MT of this phrase reads לְמִסְפַּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל which, of course, makes straightforward sense as Driver (Deuteronomy, ICC, in loc.) maintained some time ago. On the grounds of the LXX, the context, and the supporting tradition in the Vulgate and the Peshitta, we favour the RSV translation given above as being the more original.

2. Kings, ICC, pg. 45. The quote is from Pfeiffer's Intro., pg. 377.

3. Cf. A. C. Welch, Deuteronomy. The Framework of the Code, pp. 69-80.

(iii) Deuteronomy 32, the so-called "Song of Moses" probably comes from, according to the careful reasoning of A. C. Welch, a period not too long after the fall of Samaria in 721 B.C.[1] (iv) K. Elliger adheres to a date early in the reign of Josiah (c. 640-608 B.C.) for the prophet Zephaniah; Zeph. 2:10-11,[2] however, he considers to be an addition to the oracles against the nations.[3] He does not suggest a date for this addition, but we may assume he intends the time of the Exile -- the time of the original compilation of the book[4] -- or later. (v) In accordance with a widely accepted view, A. Weiser maintains that Micah 4:1-4 (// Isa. 2:1-4) originated in the post-exilic era.[5] Vs. 5, which we have quoted above, he suggests is best understood as a liturgical responsus of the congregation and comes from a later date than vss. 1-4.[6] Critical opinion thus demonstrates that the conception "over each nation a god" was not only prominent in Deuteronomic circles before the Exile, but that it continued to enjoy a widespread acceptance during and after that period.[7]

---

1. Ibid., pp. 149-151, 204. Cf. also pp. 141ff. where the chapter is analysed. For different views on the date, see Driver, Deuteronomy, ICC, 1896, pp. 346-7 and Bentzen, Introduction to the O.T., I, pg. 208.

2. Das Buch der zwölf Kleine Propheten II, ATD 25,2.Aufl.,1951, pg. 53.

3. Ibid., pp. 66-69.

4. Ibid., pg. 54.

5. Das Buch der zwölf Kleine Propheten I, ATD 24,2.Aufl., 1956, pg. 262.

6. Ibid., pg. 264. For an earlier (ca. 700 B.C.) dating, cf. G. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Vol. I, pg. 367.

7. Belief in the protective care of a heavenly being over each nation is especially prominent in Daniel (10:2-13,20). For further literature see the articles in KThWB on ἄγγελος (I,75-81) and ἔθνος (II,362-366). Unfortunately neither article raises the question as to the terminus a quo of the conception under discussion. The former article esp. abounds in instances of the conception in the post-exilic era. Cf. also Eichrodt, Theologie des A.T., Teil 1, 5th Aufl. Göttingen, 1957, pg. 312 where it is asserted that the judgement on the nations in Amos 1 and 2 presupposes a divine judgement in the form of a de-thronement of national gods and therefore that this form of judgement was well known in Israel. Eichrodt's position is thus attractive. Unfortunately the argument he employs is not especially strong. We do not think that the concluding oracle, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities" (Amos 3:2) necessarily implies that Yahweh had already passed judgement on other national gods. Eichrodt's argument is: if the premise "You only have I known" is to be taken seriously, the judgement on the nations in Chh. 1 and 2 must have taken the form of a judgement on the gods of the nations and not on the nations themselves. -- For an excellent summary statement on Israel's acceptance of the notion of a divine council, see G. E. Wright "The Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I, pg. 360. Wright maintains this conception was early (i.e. pre-exilic. His references are: Gen. 3:22; Ex. 15:11 (LXX); Dt. 32:8-9 (LXX); 33:2-3; I Kings 22:19-22; Pss. 29; 89:5-8.

Evidence from the Psalms. With the point established that the conception "to each nation a god" belonged already to the beliefs of the monarchial era, we may proceed to an examination of the pertinent psalms. Psalm 29 is a suitable place to begin not only because it affords us remarkable confirmation of the validity of our thesis, but also because it is one of the psalms which Mowinckel uses to assert the centrality of the myth of creation and slaying of the chaos monster. It may thus also serve as a good example of our specific differences with, and points of departure from, Mowinckel's approach to the New Year psalms.

We have already seen from the above quotation that Mowinckel is very much inclined to debilitate what appears to the present writer to be the natural force of Psalm 29 by describing its depictions as "poetic hyperbole, embellishment and hymnic ornamentation." In accordance with this estimate, when he first dealt with the psalm, he emphatically rejected the view that the psalm celebrates the revelation of Yahweh in a thunderstorm.[1] Such an interpretation, he asserts, is far too limiting to the general sweep of the psalm; rather it contains clear references to Yahweh's combat with the primeval ocean, the tehōm, the Babylonian tiamat, which originally covered all. These are seen in Ps. 29:3f., 10. Yahweh's weapon in the combat is his voice, that is, the "Word"; with it he subdues the primeval ocean and creates the world. Thus the pertinent verses run:

> The voice of Yahweh is upon the waters;
> the God of glory thunders,
> Yahweh upon many waters.
> The voice of Yahweh is powerful,
> the voice of Yahweh is full of majesty.
> Yahweh sits enthroned over the flood;
> Yahweh is enthroned as king for ever.

These verses unquestionably lend strong support to Mowinckel's thesis and we are not at all desirous of denying that they may well constitute echoes of the creation myth and the subduing of the primeval ocean. Our objection

---

1. Ps. St. II, pg. 47, n. 5.

is that once this observation has been made, it has been allowed to dominate the interpretation of the psalm and thus to obscure the very powerful meaning it had for the worshipping community apart from possible echoes of a creation myth.

We contend that the background of the psalm was a thunderstorm and that only under this supposition can we discern its unity, its mounting force and final impact on its original hearers. The psalm is an interpretation of what that thunderstorm meant: in the heavens (vss.1-4); in other places on the earth outside of Jerusalem (vss. 5-9b) and finally in the temple at Jerusalem (vs. 9c). Vs. 10 is an utterance of absolute confidence in what Yahweh has accomplished; and vs. 11 is a final petition for strength and blessing to the God who has displayed the majesty of his glory so mightily. The climax of the psalm is found in vs. 9c where the response of the congregation to Yahweh's manifestation of judgement in the heavens is given full expression,

> And in his temple all cry, "Glory!"[1]

It is difficult to understand why the worshippers in the temple[2] should cry "Glory!" if they were not deeply impressed with, and affected by, the heavenly display of Yahweh's might. The opening lines of the psalm

> Ascribe to Yahweh, O sons of gods,
> ascribe to Yahweh glory and strength.
> Ascribe to Yahweh the glory of his name;
> worship (lit. bow down before) Yahweh in holy array.

---

1. It is interesting to observe that Mowinckel passes over this significant verse in complete silence. Cf. Ps. St. II, pp. 47ff.

2. Some scholars are of the opinion that the temple referred to in vs. 9c was a heavenly temple. Cf., e.g., A.F. Kirkpatrick, The Book of the Psalms, Cambridge, 1916, pg. 150. This view is unconvincing for two reasons. (1) As G. B. Gray has asserted, the development of the general idea of the correspondence of things heavenly and things earthly did not get under way until after 500 B.C. (Cf. Sacrifice in the Old Testament, pg. 157). Ps. 29, on the other hand, is assigned by many scholars to a date considerably earlien (Cf., e.g., Gunkel, Oesterley, Weiser in loc.) It is therefore unlikely that the psalm should contain so advanced a development of the idea of correspondence as the notion of a heavenly temple. (2) As we noticed above in our brief sketch of the contents of the psalm, vss. 1-4 deal with Yahweh's heavenly manifestation of judgement and vss. 5-9b with the effect that judgement was having on earth. It would therefore be a decided wrenching of the structure of the psalm if vs. 9c were not also concerned with the effect of Yahweh's judgement on earth.

bear testimony to the Israelite belief that at the sounding forth of Yahweh's voice of judgement, the lesser gods (of the nations) were summoned to pay him homage. The rejoicing and human ascription of glory to Yahweh thus stem not so much from the fact that the congregation was impressed with Yahweh's display of might, as from the firm belief that the display meant (i) the subjection of the gods of the national enemies of Israel, the "heavenly beings" and (ii) a reassertion of his rule over the "many waters."[1]

We turn now to Psalm 89 and first a brief consideration of a use to which the king may have put his rod to portray Yahweh's rule over the "many waters," the "raging of the sea" as reflected in that psalm. We sought to show in paragraphs #7 and #8 above that the king in many ways was -- to use Bentzen's term -- a Moses redivivus, a new Moses. Johnson has suggestively pointed out in his Sacral Kingship,

> it seems clear that the 'bronze sea' which figures so prominently in the furnishing of Solomon's Temple was intended as a replica of this cosmic sea, and, as such must have been designed to play a prominent part in the ritual of the cultus.[2]

In the opinion of the present writer Johnson's suggestion may be taken a step further: Yahweh's assertion of rule over the "flood," "the waters," "the roaring sea" may well have been dramatically enacted before the eyes of the temple congregation by the king's taking his rod and making a symbolic gesture of smiting and dividing the bronze sea. If we are right at all in following through on Johnson's suggestion in this manner, we wish to make it plain that our own preference would be to consider this action more as a prophetic interpretation of the significance of Yahweh's thundering above rather than as some form of sympathetic magic. That the king had something to do with such a ceremony is indicated by the well-known

---

1. Thus Schmidt, as far as he went, was surely right in emphasizing that the rejoicing in the earthly temple (sic) was due to the belief that the heavenly waters, from which the rains were to come, were fully in Yahweh's control, Die Thronfahrt Jahves, pp. 26f.

2. Sacral Kingship, pp. 52f.

fact that the assertion of Yahweh's rule over the raging of the sea is a very prominent feature in the Royal Psalm 89, as the following verses show:

> Let the heavens praise thy wonders, O Yahweh,
> thy faithfulness in the assembly of the holy ones!
> For who in the skies can be compared to Yahweh?
> Who among the sons of gods is like Yahweh,
> a God feared in the council of the holy ones,
> great and terrible above all that are round about him?
> O Yahweh God of hosts,
> who is mighty as thou art, O Yahweh,
> with thy faithfulness round about thee?
> Thou dost rule the raging of the sea;
> when its waves rise, thou stillest them.
> Thou didst crush Rahab like a carcass,
> thou didst scatter thy enemies with thy mighty arm.
> The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine;
> the world and all that is in it, thou
> hast founded them.
>
> (vss. 6-12)

That not only a cultic enactment of smiting and dividing the waters of the cosmic sea, but also another form of cultic destruction of enemies was practiced by the king, seems evident in the oracle of Yahweh's promise to the Davidic king,

> I will crush his foes before him
> and strike down those who hate him.
>
> I will set his hand on the sea
> and his right hand on the rivers.
>
> (vss. 24,26)

In the verses from Psalm 89 cited above, and especially in vss. 6-12, the theories of S. Mowinckel receive strong support. It may be pointed out, however, that the myth of creation through the slaying of the chaos monster appears as no more than an echo in the other psalms with which we have been dealing. And even here it is sounded in the closest harmony with the note emphasizing Yahweh's superiority to all the other "sons of the gods" who are depicted as sitting in a heavenly council with him. In Psalm 89, as in Ps. 29, we suggest that the "sons of gods" were understood to be the gods of the nations; they were his "enemies" scattered (vs. 11b) apparently almost as a part of the same stroke that crushed Rahab (vs. 11a).

The notion that Yahweh was considered to sit in judgement on the gods of the nations is known best of all from Psalm 82.[1] The gods (אֱלֹהִים) are condemned for their own unjust judgements and for showing partiality to the wicked (vs. 2). A plea is then made for Yahweh to intervene on behalf of those who have been oppressed by the wicked (vss. 3-4). Vs. 5 mocks the lack of understanding and inability of the gods in terms that recall Deutero-Isaiah's scathing censure of the idols of the nations (Isa. 41:21-24; 45:20-21; 46:5-7). In vss. 6-7 Yahweh pronounces his final judgement of death on the gods,

> I say, "You are gods,
> sons of 'Elyon, all of you;
> surely you shall die like men,
> and fall like any prince.

The last verse contains a plea for Yahweh to judge the earth "for thou shalt inherit all the nations!" The psalm thus affords substantiation of the thesis that the cultic destruction of national enemies in Israel was enacted as an interpretation, or anticipation, of Yahweh's heavenly judgement upon the gods of the nations.[2] The psalm contains three important emphases which were central to the autumnal celebrations and which most of the pertinent psalms have in common. These emphases will be examined presently. For the moment it may be pointed out that the two verses quoted above would have been highly appropriate lines to accompany the destruction of idols or symbols representative of foreign gods. We can envisage the king smiting these idols with his rod, or perhaps slashing them with his sword, as a prophetic spokesman or choir

---

1. Cf. G. E. Wright's The Old Testament Against Its Environment where it is also maintained that these gods were national deities, pp. 30-41. Wright's references to the interpretations of other scholars are full and his discussion on the importance of this psalm for an understanding of Israelite "monotheism" is excellent.

2. We have taken it for granted above that the בְּנֵי אֵלִים of Psalms 29:1 and 89:6-8 and the אֱלֹהִים of Psalm 82:1,6 were gods of the nations. In making this presupposition we have leaned primarily upon the section above in which we sought to demonstrate that the conception "to each nation a god" was already commonplace before the end of the monarchial period. If there is perhaps a question as to the correctness of this identification in Psalms 29 and 89, there is less of a question in Psalm 82 in view of the mention of nations in vs. 8 of that psalm.

chanted "you shall die like men, and fall like any prince." Here, as in all of the other psalms with which we are dealing in the present study, the earthly ceremony is but a dramatic enactment of what had taken place (or was to take place) in the heavens.

The Centrality of Emphasis on Sovereignty and Judgement. Scholars of the Enthronement Psalms have for a long time observed in them and in other psalms recited at the New Year Festival, a recurrent stress on Yahweh's sovereignty and judgement. The emphasis on sovereignty consistently takes two forms (#1) his superiority to other gods (Pss. 29:1, 82:1-2,6-7; 98:4-5; etc.) or (#2) his supremacy over the nations (Pss. 82:3,8; 96:13; etc.). The theme of (#3) a coming judgement on earth is prominent (Pss. 82:8; 96:13; etc.) even though a past judgement in heaven is frequently stated or presupposed (Pss. 29:1; 82:1-2,6-7; 96:1-5; etc.). Occasionally (#4) the righteous character of the coming judgement is stressed (Pss. 82:3; 96:13; etc.). As these different emphases appear in the psalms treated below, they will be underlined. The frequency of their recurrence makes the following conclusion unavoidable: they were not only an important, but a permanent fixture in the thought-world of the celebrations at which they were sung.

Points at Issue: the Nature of Yahweh's Sovereignty and Judgement

Despite agreement among students of the Psalter on recurrent themes in the psalms sung at the New Year Festival, there is a marked divergence of opinion as to the proper interpretation that should be placed on these themes. Mowinckel, for example, eager to stress the immediacy and sense of joy in the cult at the Festival of Accession, asserted, "These [Accession] Psalms celebrate the establishment of Yahweh's kingdom, the kingdom of God. They presuppose that Yahweh has just come to establish his kingdom and that this kingdom of Yahweh's is world encompassing."[1] In sentences such as these Mowinckel comes close to fostering

---

1. Ps. St. II, pg. 10.

the view that prior to the festival the kingship was uncertain and the throne empty. Latterly he has disavowed all sympathy with the conception that Yahweh ever abdicated his rulership;[1] but it remains undeniable that if stress is placed upon Yahweh's just having come to ascend the throne, the worshipper had to keep alive in his own thoughts such views as: "Yahweh was not always king"; "There was a time when the chaos monster was not conquered"; "Yahweh's sovereignty is something newly established." In the desire to disassociate themselves from overtones such as these, scholars such as A. R. Johnson have chosen to render the disputed phrase יהוה מלך as "Yahweh is king"[2] or "The Lord reigns" (RSV) rather than accepting (as did Gunkel, Schmidt, Oesterly and others) the translation "Yahweh has (is) become king."

Those who render the phrase יהוה מלך with the same translation are often worlds apart when it comes to designating the time of Yahweh's coming judgement and salvation. This is notably the case with Gunkel and Mowinckel. For Gunkel the coming is eschatological; for Mowinckel it is experienced in the cult and only later, when the New Year celebrations lost their sense of immediacy and exultation, were these psalms understood and interpreted eschatologically.

To these differences of opinion, the present writer may now add his own interpretation. The marked note of exultation, so characteristic of the New Year Psalms, stems not at all from the re-enthronement of a previously powerless deity, but rather from the awareness of his already powerful judgements (the foreign gods have been doomed and the raging waters once more tamed)[3] and, from the confident anticipation of his future judgement on earth which was made so real through the drama of the cult. The worshipper was confident of the future, joyous that

---

1. He That Cometh, pg. 85.

2. Cf. Sacral Kingship, pg. 57 and esp. n. 2.

3. Note that the tamed waters join in the acclamation of Yahweh's kingship over all creation (Pss. 96:11b; 98:7-8).

the arm of Yahweh's justice would be exercised on earth, because he was soon to see and hear the destruction of cultic objects representative of foreign kings or as is suggested by the text of Psalm 96, foreign idols.[1] Proleptically he witnessed in the cult Yahweh's final judgement on earth. As the conclusion of Psalm 96 bears out, the joyous anticipation of Yahweh's future judgement on earth became one with his anticipation of the cultic enactment of the destruction of enemies.

> Say among the nations, "Yahweh reigns!
> Yea, the world is established, it shall never be moved;
> he will judge the peoples with equity."
> Let the heavens be glad, and let the earth rejoice;
> let the sea roar, and all that fills it;
> let the field exult, and everything in it!
> Then shall all the trees of the wood sing for joy
> before Yahweh, for he comes,
> for he comes to judge the earth.
> He will judge the world with righteousness,
> and the peoples with his truth.

Yahweh's judgement on earth was thus not entirely a matter of the future (Gunkel) but was actually experienced and realized in the cult (Mowinckel) through the participation of the congregation in the enactment of the destruction of symbolic enemies. Despite the tremendous cultic significance of the New Year Psalms, however, the eschatological element was never absent (Johnson).[2] The cultic and proleptic judgement was not confused with the final judgement and salvation to come. There remained in Israel, after all, a distinction between the symbol and the object which it symbolized, between the spear or bow which represented a foreign power and the foreign power itself.

A Possible Clue on Sequence of Recitation. It is interesting to note that Psalms 96 and 29 have several phrases in common. These are: "ascribe to Yahweh glory and strength" (Pss. 29:1; 96:7a); "ascribe to Yahweh the glory due his name" (Pss. 29:2a; 96:8a); and "worship Yahweh in holy array" (Pss. 29:2b; 96:9a; cf. 110:3b). Identity in phraseology

---

1. For great is Yahweh, and greatly to be praised
   he is to be feared above all gods.
   For all the gods of the peoples are idols (אֱלִילִים); but Yahweh made the heavens. (vss. 4-5).

2. Sacral Kingship, pg. 54, n. 1.

always suggests the probability of: a) a borrowing; b) a common origin; or c) a similar use in the cult. We submit that the identity in phraseology noted above provides us with a valuable clue as to the sequence in which these two Psalms were used in relation to one another in the cult. In Psalm 29 those exhorted to "ascribe glory" are "the sons of gods" (vs. 1); whereas in Ps. 96 those exhorted to "ascribe glory" are "the families of the peoples" (vs. 7). This may suggest that there is a progression of thought from Ps. 29 to Ps. 96. Once it was recognized that Yahweh was sitting in heavenly judgement, the worshipping congregation lifted up the chant that the "gods" should ascribe to him the glory due his name; soon after there came the chant that follows in logical progression: now that the "gods" of the nations have been judged and condemned and themselves exhorted to pay obeisance to Yahweh, the "peoples" of these nations must similarly "ascribe unto Yahweh glory" and "worship" -- even as their divine masters had --"in holy array," for soon they would be judged on earth as their gods had been in heaven.

Psalms 97 and 98

Psalm 97, like the psalms dealt with above, accords remarkably well with our reconstruction of the autumnal ceremonies which celebrated the kingship of Yahweh. This may be shown through an enumeration of five points.

1. It emphasizes, in common with Pss. 28, 82 and 97 (#1) Yahweh's superiority to other gods, "let all the gods bow down before him" (vs. 7c) and

> For thou, O Yahweh, art most high over all the earth;
> thou art exalted far above all gods.
>
> (vs. 9)

2. From the preceding verses, and the opening verse of the psalm,

> Yahweh is king; let the earth rejoice;
> let the many coastlands be glad.

it is plain that this psalm, in common with our emphasis #2, is also exultant because Yahweh is sovereign over all the nations of the earth.

3. The psalm contains eloquent testimony to the belief that Yahweh was manifesting his judgement in nature,

> Clouds and thick darkness are round about him;
> righteousness and justice are the foundation of his throne.
> Fire goes before him,
> and burns up his adversaries round about.
> His lightnings lighten the world;
> the earth sees and trembles.
> The mountains melt like wax before Yahweh,
> before the Lord of all the earth.
> The heavens proclaim his righteousness;
> and all the peoples of the earth see his glory.
>
> (vss. 2-6)

4. That precisely this heavenly manifestation of judgement, which all the peoples of the earth could see, was a primary cause for Israelite jubilation is certain from the words of vs. 8,

> Zion hears and is glad,
> and the daughters of Judah rejoice,
> because of thy judgements, O God.

5. The psalm would have served as an excellent background or introduction to the ceremonies portraying the destruction of national enemies not only for the above reasons but also because of the specific mention of "images" and "idols,"

> All worshipers of images are put to shame,
> who make their boast in worthless idols;
> all gods bow down before him.
>
> (vs. 7).

Psalm 98 in many ways parallels and complements the thoughts of Psalm 97. The opening verses are jubilant. If we note carefully its language, and compare it with the language of Psalm 97, the cause for jubilation is quickly recognized.

> O sing to Yahweh a new song,
> for he has done marvellous things!
> His right hand and his holy arm
> have gotten him victory (הוֹשִׁיעָה־לּוֹ).
> Yahweh has made known his victory,
> he has revealed his vindication (צִדְקָתוֹ) in the sight
> of the nations.
> He has remembered his steadfast love and faithfulness
> to the house of Israel.
> All the ends of the earth have seen
> the victory of our God.
>
> (vss. 1-3).

It is apparent that Yahweh's right hand and his holy arm are used here as poetic images to capture the extremely intimate association that existed in the poet's mind between Yahweh himself and the manifestation of his righteousness and glory in nature. "His right hand" and "his holy arm" clearly and vividly bring to mind in this context Yahweh stretching forth his hand of judgement as fire went before him striking his adversaries (Ps. 97:3) with all the earth beholding and trembling at his lightnings which lightened the world (Ps. 97:4; cf. 98:3). Just as it was in Ps. 97, so here, the nations of the earth have beheld the fate of their gods -- smitten with the judging arm of the victorious (i.e., salvation-bestowing) Yahweh. If Psalm 98 is to be interpreted in relation to Ps. 97 at all, such a conclusion is unavoidable. Ps. 98 presupposes Yahweh's judgement upon, and his sovereignty over, the gods of the nations (common emphasis #1) even though they are not specifically mentioned. The psalm also contains the note of confidence and expectation that Yahweh is coming to judge <u>on earth</u> (#3).

> Let the sea roar, and all that fills it;
> the world and those who dwell in it!
> Let the floods clap their hands;
> let the hills sing for joy together
> before Yahweh, for he comes to rule the earth
> He will judge the world with righteousness,
> and the peoples with equity.
>
> (vss. 7-9; cf. Ps. 96:11-13).

That the coming judgement will be one of righteousness and equity is something we have already noted above (#4) in Ps. 96. Emphasis #2, that Yahweh is sovereign over all the nations of the earth is unquestionably implied in the opening verses of the psalm,

> he has revealed his vindication in the sight of the nations
>
> (vs. 2b)

and

> All the ends of the earth have seen the victory of our God.
>
> (vs. 3b)

Like its companion piece, Psalm 98 bears remarkable testimony to Israelite belief that Yahweh was manifesting his victorious and righteous judgements

on the nations in the events of the natural world which "all the ends of the earth" could behold. (vs. 3). As such it would have been highly appropriate for autumnal celebrations in which symbols of the nations were destroyed.

Sequence in which Psalms were recited. In the psalms dealt with above a sequence or order of recitation can be established. We have suggested that Psalm 29 was the most likely choice for an opening piece if the weather was appropriate, i.e., if the initial autumnal thunderstorm had recently occurred. Psalms 82 and 89:2-38 may well have followed, interpreting to the congregation in clear terms the significance of the storm, i.e., Yahweh has sat in heavenly council in judgement upon the gods of the nations. Psalm 97 very likely followed them, being still in something of the same vein because of its explicit mention of theophany in nature; and Psalms 98 and 96, in that order, would prepare the congregation for the ceremonies that were about to be enacted to portray Yahweh's judgement on earth. It seems likely that Psalm 96 would have been the latter of the two because the note of certainty that the peoples of the earth must ascribe glory and honour unto Yahweh suggests a time of recital very close to the actual ceremonies where symbols representing them and their gods would be smashed and destroyed. We thus arrive at the probable sequence: Psalms 29; 82; 89:2-38; 97; 98; 96.

Psalm 65 may have been sung as a part of these ceremonies, but its most appropriate place would have been some time after the autumnal thunderstorms had ceased and after the rains had begun to fall. This is indicated by the manner in which Yahweh is praised as having been one

"who dost still the roaring of the seas,/ the roaring of their waves,/ the tumult of the peoples" (vs. 8). The praise and thanksgiving continues:

> Thou visitest the earth and waterest it,
> thou greatly enrichest it;
> the river of God is full of water;
> thou providest their grain,
> for so thou hast prepared it.
> Thou waterest its furrows abundantly,
> settling its ridges,
> softening it with showers,
> and blessing its growth.
>
> (vss. 10-11).

Psalm 47. In details as well as in general outline Psalm 47 shows itself to be a fitting component of autumnal celebrations wherein Yahweh's judgement on the nations was enacted in the drama of the cult. This may be demonstrated by an examination of the sweep of the psalm as well as of important particulars.

The assertion of Yahweh's sovereignty over the nations (common emphasis #2) is the place of greatest stress in the psalm. This is apparent in vss. 3 and 4 and especially in its closing verses:

> God reigns over the nations;
> God sits on his holy throne.
> The princes of the peoples gather
> with the people of the God of Abraham.
> For the shields (or rulers)[1] of the earth belong to God;
> he is highly exalted.
>
> (vss. 9-10)

Hand in hand with this emphasis there is a stress on (#1) his sovereignty over the gods. An examination of the MT of vss. 7 and 8 shows that the "gods" of the nations are exhorted to sing praises unto Yahweh as they are in Psalm 29. This latter stress is not frequently noted primarily because the pertinent verses are generally translated:

> Sing praises to God, sing praises!
> Sing praises to our king, sing praises!
> For God is the king of all the earth;
> sing praises with a psalm!

It will be noticed that the above translation requires the addition of a ל. We submit that the following translation, which requires no change in the MT, is a preferable rendering.

> Sing praises, O ye gods, sing praises!
> Sing praises to our king, sing praises!
> For he is king of all the earth;
> Sing praises, O ye gods, wisely (מַשְׂכִּיל).

Under this rendering we have not only the imperative זַמְּרוּ, "Sing praises!" but the direct address, "O ye gods," which is very natural and entirely to be expected. אֱלֹהִים is the name for God used most frequently in the psalm (vss. 2, 6, 8, 9, 9, (10), 10), but there is no

---

1. The LXX has κραταιοί. Cf. Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pg. 68, n. 2 and further references there.

ambiguity whatsoever when the "gods" are meant and when "Yahweh." When Yahweh is intended the verb in the third person singular is always present as we see from the מָלַךְ ("he rules") and יָשַׁב ("he sits") of vs. 9 and the נַעֲלָה ("he is exalted") of vs. 10. What needs explaining is the change of emphasis from Yahweh's sovereignty over the nations in vss. 2-5 to the emphasis on his sovereignty over their gods in vss. 6-8. A very natural explanation is at hand. The psalm stands in a chiasmic relation to other psalms of the autumnal celebrations (such as Psalms 29 and 96). That is, instead of (a) the gods being exhorted to praise Yahweh first and then (b) the nations, the order is reversed here, (b) (a). The psalm opens with "all peoples" being incited to clap their hands and shout to God with loud songs of joy (vs. 2); the imperative continues with the direct address being shifted from "peoples" to their "gods." Now they, and not the "peoples" or "nations" (vs. 4) are urged to "sing praises." -- מַשְׂכִּיל we have rendered "wisely" or "with wisdom" on the basis of comparison with Psalm 2:10, "Now, therefore O kings, be wise (וַהַשְׂכִּילוּ)." Here the gods instead of the earthly rulers are enjoined to exercise wisdom; the kings were admonished (in Psalm 2) that they should do so because of the dramatic enactment of their destruction within the cult; the gods are here charged to do so undoubtedly because of Yahweh's display of judgement and power which go hand in hand in the psalmist's mind with images of Yahweh's "terror" (נוֹרָא : vs. 3) and kingship (vss. 3, 7, 9). The degree of unanimity among scholars in interpreting the meaning of מַשְׂכִּיל in Ps. 47:8 has hardly improved since Professor Brown laconically noted in his treatment of שֵׂכֶל some years ago, "meanings hard to classify: scholars differ greatly."[1] Thus Oesterley reads, "choice song"; Johnson, "soundness of judgement"; Weiser, "preisendes Lied" ("song of praise"); Smith (in an American Translation) defers judgement of this matter to the reader, "with a maskil"; while the

---

1. BDB, pg. 968.

older translations (KJV and ARV) preferred, "with understanding" in the text, or "everyone that hath understanding" (KJV) or "with a skilful psalm" (ARV) in the margin. The point is not crucial, however, and need not detain us.

Of greater importance for our understanding of the psalm as a whole is the verb עָלָה (vs. 6) which has been much disputed. Among those commentators who are inclined to interpret the psalms in accordance with their most probable use in the cult, there is widespread agreement that the verb עָלָה indicates here: a) that the psalm was very likely recited in connection with the ascension to the throne of the earthly king (so Gunkel, Mowinckel, Schmidt, et al.); b) that the psalm celebrates Yahweh's ascension -- or more correctly, re-ascension -- of the heavenly throne (so Gunkel, Mowinckel, Schmidt, Oesterley, Weiser, et al.); and c) that Yahweh's heavenly ascension was represented in the cult by the "going up" of the Ark in festal procession from some lower location to the temple (so Gunkel, Mowinc[illegible] Schmidt, Oesterley, Weiser, Johnson, et al.). The present writer is in agreement with all three of these points save the implication that there ever was a time in Israelite eyes when Yahweh abdicated the throne.

There is one connotation of the verb רָעַשׁ which we feel should be especially stressed for a proper evaluation of the psalm and its relation to other psalms sung in connexion with the autumnal festival. As Mowinckel, Gunkel, Schmidt and others have pointed out, the context of the psalm makes it clear that Yahweh's ascent is in this instance an ascent of the throne (Ps. 47:9). It is not always brought out as clearly

by these same commentators that one of the primary functions performed by a sovereign when seated on his throne was judgement! This was true of the earthly sovereign (I Kings 7:7; cf. Ex. 18:13) and of the divine sovereign, Yahweh (Ps. 2:4; 9:5; Joel 4:12; Mal. 3:3). It comes out so clearly in Ps. 9:8-9 that Yahweh's throne was a throne of judgement that we may cite these verses here:

> But Yahweh sits enthroned for ever,
> he has established his throne for judgement;
> and he judges the world with righteousness,
> he judges the peoples with equity.[1]

Thus in the opinion of the present writer, the theme of judgement over the nations rings through the phrase, "God goes up with a shout." This theme also lies close to the surface in vs. 9 of the psalm,

> God reigns over the nations;
> God sits on his holy throne.

---

1. Psalms 9 and 10 are generally regarded as a unity. The present writer is not entirely convinced of the correctness of this judgement but the matter need not detain us here. We do wish to endorse Weiser's observation on the origin of the psalms, "In a prayer of lamentation in which the enemy is more fully described, he sets his need before God -- probably in the Jerusalem temple (9:12, 15) -- and prays for deliverance from his enemy (10:1-15). This personal complaint stands in a more widely extended context which is probably to be explained on the basis of the cultic festival: Yahweh ascends his throne as king (9:5; 10:16) in order to pass judgement on the nations (9:8f., 20). It was obviously at the celebration of the Yahweh-covenant festival at which the psalm was recited and the poet sets forth his own predicament in terms of the basic ideas of the festival." Die Psalmen, I, ATD 14, 4. Aufl., 1955, pg. 100.

Unlike the other psalms dealt with in this paragraph, Psalm 47 seems to give us an unmistakable clue as to the nature of the symbolic drama which represented Yahweh's judgement and destruction of enemies,

> Princes of the peoples (נְדִיבֵי עַמִּים) gather
> with the people of the God of Abraham.
> For the shields of the earth (מָגִנֵּי־אֶרֶץ) belong to God.
> (Vs. 10a-c).

From this verse it seems clear that shields (representative of the foreign nations of the earth) were borne by Israelite worshippers. We do not know of what material these shields were made, but it may be that they were of the war-shield type, i.e., leather stretched over a wooden frame.[1] As such they would have made ideal targets for archers, and it seems to the present writer very probable that this is the use to which the shields were put in the ceremony enacting destruction of foreign rulers and idols. Psalm 21:13 makes this conjecture all the more probable; the psalmist concludes his confident outcry that Yahweh will wreak vengeance on his enemies in these words,

> For you will put them to flight;
> you will aim at their faces with your bows.
> (Ps. 21:13)

On the other hand, on the basis of the LXX translation of עֲגָלוֹת in Psalm 46:10, it may be that some shields (the עֲגָלוֹת if not the מָגִנִּים) were burned in the course of the ceremony. The עֲגָלוֹת is frequently translated "chariots" but by the LXX with θυρεούς i.e., the acc. plural of θυρεός , an "oblong shield (shaped like a door)."[2] Possibly therefore the מָגִנִּים were burned as the עֲגָלוֹת were in Ps. 46:10,

> He makes wars to cease to the end of the earth;
> he breaks the bow, and shatters the spear,
> he burns the עֲגָלוֹת with fire.

---

1. Cf. the article, "Shield" in HDB IV, pg. 498.

2. Liddell & Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, 9th ed., 1941, Vol. I, pg. 811.

Both means of destruction -- having the shields used as targets or burning -- would have been equally effective.

In view of the above observations we can assert with a fair degree of certainty that in all its important details the psalm well accords with the present writer's interpretation and reconstruction of the autumnal ceremonies when Yahweh's rôle as royal judge of the nations was celebrated by a symbolic drama.

Psalm 149. Psalm 149 like Psalm 47 contains indications of the type of symbolic actions that were employed in the cultic drama enacting judgement and destruction on Israel's and Yahweh's enemies. This psalm, like other psalms considered in the present paragraph, is characterized from beginning to end by the extremest kind of exultation. Song (vss. 1,5), dancing (vs. 2), melody with timbrel and lyre (vs. 2) are all utilized to render praise to Yahweh "in the assembly of the faithful" (vs. 1). It is apparent that this psalm, like Psalm 47, has as a main emphasis the basis of its great joy, Yahweh's "chastisement on the peoples" (vs. 7), i.e. (#2) his judgement on the nations -- the element, which recurs so frequently in the psalms considered in this paragraph. The psalm contains also an emphasis on (#3) Yahweh's judgement on earth only with a great difference. Here, with the joy mounting almost to a state of frenzy, the judgement is no longer a matter for the future; it is in the process of being accomplished!

> For Yahweh takes pleasure in his people;
> he adorns the humble with victory.
>
> (vs. 4)

What kind of victory Yahweh has granted unto his people seems plain enough from the psalm itself. Images or objects representative of foreign kings were bound with iron fetters and then slashed, with lusty praise to Yahweh for his vengeance and punishment of the nations.

> Let the high praises of God be in their throats
> and two-edged swords in their hands,
> to wreak vengeance on the nations
> and chastisement on the peoples,
> to bind their kings with chains
> and their nobles with fetters of iron,
> to execute on them the judgement written!
> This is glory for all his faithful ones.
> Hallelujah!

The pendulum has swung full cycle. In Psalm 29 we saw that the motivating factor for the outcry in the temple, "Glory!" was Yahweh's manifestation of his judgement and power in the heavens. Here in Psalm 149 the motivating factor behind the same cry is the successful performance of the earthly counterpart of Yahweh's heavenly victory and judgement. As Yahweh had judged and condemned the gods of the nations to die as princes (Ps. 82:7), so here his worshippers proclaim that judgement by symbolically bringing death to the effigies of foreign nobles bound in chains. One commentator has gone as far as suggesting that we have in Psalm 149 an instance of human sacrifice in Israel. Thus Schmidt proposes that foreign kings were actually bound and slaughtered, probably in the Hinnom Valley where child sacrifices were not unknown.[1] Although we are in disagreement with this conjecture, it has the virtue of seeking to take seriously the most natural meaning of the psalm. Had Schmidt perceived the central position occupied by the ceremony representing Yahweh's judgement and victory over the divine and human rulers of the nations, it is unlikely that he would have seen in Psalm 149 evidence of human sacrifice. It was rather idols and objects representative of foreign kings and deities that were destroyed to make plain to the congregation Yahweh's judgement. Schmidt and Mowinckel were surely right, on the other hand, in insisting that this day in which Yahweh's judgement was celebrated was a day of the greatest joy in Israel because his judgement was not falling upon them, his chosen people, but rather upon the nations of the earth.[2]

In few instances does the joy at Yahweh's judgement and destruction of his enemies mingle with such a spirit of unmitigated vengeance; in the majority of instances the joy is characterized by exultation in Yahweh's sovereignty, his worldwide rulership, his breaking the weapons of war, or his election of Israel. In the latter instances, the

---

1. Die Thronfahrt Jahves, pp. 29f.

2. Cf. Mowinckel, Ps. St. II, pg. 184; Schmidt, Die Thronfahrt Jahves, pg. 29.

symbolic destruction of enemies seems almost entirely free from enmity and thirst for revenge. Psalm 149, however, stands with the minority and has a poignant personal tone about it that is absent from most of the other psalms treated above which, in comparison, seem more formal and less impassioned. We do not feel it necessary to make any apology here for the vindictive spirit of this psalm. Any student of the Psalter will have long since come to grips with the issue of vengeance and imprecation in the Psalms.[1] We do wish to note, as strange as it may seem, that a spirit of vengeance is by no means the most characteristic element in the ceremony portraying destruction of enemies. The most characteristic element, as we have indicated, was rather a spirit of rejoicing that Yahweh was sitting in judgement over the gods of the nations of the earth and would soon make it plain to his worshippers by means of the drama of the cult that the earthly supremacy of Israel over the nations would follow his victory over their gods.

Summary of Evidence from the Psalms. We may conclude our examination of psalms that lend support to the second part of our thesis. The psalms that we have adduced have sufficed to demonstrate the probability, at least, that autumnal thunderings and lightnings in the heavens (Pss. 29, 97:2-5; 98:1-3) were considered to be a glorious sign that Yahweh, sitting in heavenly council (Pss. 82:1; 89:28), had judged and doomed the gods of the nations (Pss. 82:6-7; 89:8; 96:5; 97:7; 46:7-8) and that this judgement was very likely enacted on earth by means of a cultic ceremony in which idols (Pss. 96:5; 97:7) and objects representative of nations' leaders (Pss. 47:10; 149:8) were destroyed.

Throughout the present paragraph we have not underlined the fact that not infrequently in the Royal Psalms and other psalms treated in the preceding paragraph we have mention of a theophany of Yahweh in the heavens. This is especially apparent in Psalm 18:8-16 as the graphic nature of the following verses will suffice to recall:

---

1. For a straightforward treatment of this issue, see A. F. Kirkpatrick's old but helpful introductory section on the "Imprecatory Psalms" in The Book of Psalms, Cambridge Bible, 1916, pp. lxxxviii-xcvii.

Yahweh also thundered in the heavens,
and the Most High uttered his voice,
hailstones and coals of fire.
And he sent out his arrows, and scattered them;
he flashed forth lightnings, and routed them.
Then the channels of the sea were seen,
and the foundations of the world were laid bare,
at thy rebuke, O Yahweh,
at the blast of the breath of thy nostrils.

(vss. 14-16)

It is also apparent from Psalm 46 that a cosmic backdrop to the cultic drama was the common and not the exceptional occurrence.

There is a river whose streams make glad the city of God,
the holy habitation of the Most High.
God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved;
God will help her right early.
The nations rage, the kingdoms totter;
he utters his voice, the earth melts.

(vss. 5-7)

The same conception of Yahweh's residing in, and judging from, the heavens is seen also in Pss. 2:4; 20:7; 21:9-11; 48:8; 76:8-10; and 144:5-6 of the psalms dealt with in paragraph #8 as well as in Pss. 29; 82; 89:6-19; 97:2-5; and 98:1-3 which have been mentioned in the present paragraph.

In view of the persistent and graphic mention in these psalms of Yahweh's heavenly judgement and his manifestation of it through heavenly phenomena, we have solid ground on which to base our thesis that the idea of correspondence of things earthly to things heavenly is the real key for the proper interpretation of psalms sung during the monarchial period in the autumn of the year. For once the observation has been made and established that we find not in a few, but in many, of these psalms unmistakable evidence of the belief that Yahweh was manifesting his righteous judgement in the heavens, we are then forced to conclude that this manifestation of Yahweh's judgement was not a peripheral element in the autumnal ceremonies, but rather a central one. If this belief was central to the autumnal celebrations -- and the present writer does not see how exegetes can escape this conclusion -- the question remains, how were the ceremonies in the cult, the acts of worship, related to it? The answer to this question proposed in paragraph #8

is that a select group of worshippers, with the king as their head, conducted a ceremony which had as its purpose the making plain to the entire congregation the nature of Yahweh's judgements; accordingly cultic objects representative of foreign deities or kings were broken, smashed, burned, or otherwise destroyed to show forth that Yahweh had sat in heavenly judgement and was now, through his votaries in the cult, effecting his judgement on earth. In other words, the ritual corresponded to what the worshippers believed to be Yahweh's actions in the heavens. The validity of this thesis we have sought to test and verify at every turn in paragraphs #8 and #9. Without exception, every psalm treated seems to fall naturally, without resort to a forced exegesis, into the interpretation we advocate. The validity of the thesis is seen perhaps best of all in those psalms which contain obvious indications of a theophany in the heavens and, at the same time, indications of the enactment of a ceremony depicting the destruction of objects representative of enemies. Most of these psalms were treated in the previous paragraph (Pss. 2, 18, 20, 21, 46, 48 and 76).

It is against this background of the correspondence of cultic to heavenly activities that we propose Psalm 110 must be interpreted. Before turning to this long postponed task we wish to make but one further observation on the correspondence of things earthly to things heavenly.

The Lightning of Yahweh and the Rod of the Monarch

As we have intimated above in paragraph #8, we are of the opinion that the king used his rod in the cultic ceremony portraying judgement and destruction on enemies. The rod, we suggest, was taken to be the counterpart of Yahweh's lightning; the noise it made in initially smashing objects was the counterpart of his thunder. This latter assertion we cannot really "prove," but we are certainly justified in concluding that if we have been right at all in the deliberations of paragraphs #8 and #9, such an assertion is entirely natural and to be expected. The validity of the assertion may be established with even greater certainty if we note a few points:

(a) Mention of Yahweh's יָמִין ("right hand") occurs not infrequently in the psalms with which we have been dealing. In four instances it seems clear that this term יָמִין is used figuratively as a symbol of lightning:

(1) Now I know that Yahweh will help his anointed;
he will answer him from his holy heaven
with mighty victories by his right hand.

(Ps. 20:7);

(2) Your hand will find out all your enemies;
your right hand will find out those who hate you.
You will make them as a blazing oven
when you appear.
Yahweh will swallow them up in his wrath;
and fire will consume them.

(Ps. 21:9-10);

(3) As thy name, O God,
so thy praise reaches to the ends of the earth.
Thy right hand is filled with victory;
Let Mount Zion be glad.

(Ps. 48:11); and

(4) O sing to Yahweh a new song,
for he has done marvelous things!
His right hand and his holy arm
have gotten him victory.
Yahweh has made known his victory,
he has revealed his vindication in the sight of all nations.

All the ends of the earth have seen
the victory of our God.

(Ps. 89:1-2,3b).

A questionable instance is (3), but in view of Ps. 98 and the context of Ps. 48 itself, which we omitted above, it seems fairly certain that here too "right hand" was a symbol of Yahweh's lightning.

(b) Just as lightning was the means by which Yahweh exercised judgement and achieved for himself victory, so the king's rod (or sceptre) was the means by which he exercised judgement and established his superiority over kings. This is evident from the following:

(1) Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage,
and the ends of the earth your possession.
You shall break them with a rod of iron,
and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

(Ps. 2:8,9);

(2) Your divine throne[1] endures for ever and ever.
Your royal sceptre is a sceptre of equity (מִישׁוֹר);
you love righteousness and hate wickedness.

(Ps. 45:7,8a); and

(3) He shall not judge by what his eyes see,
or decide by what his ears hear;
but with righteousness he shall judge the poor,
and decide with equity for the meek of the earth;
and he shall smite (וְהִכָּה) the earth with the rod of his mouth,
and with the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked.

(Isa. 11:3b-5).

The latter passage is of especial interest precisely because it is not dealing directly with the king and his rule, but is rather speaking about the future realm of the Messiah, while employing terms of the present kingship. Because the main concern is not at all in the present king, but in a realm that is to come, Isaiah's references to the Messiah's judging and smiting with the rod or his mouth give us an invaluable indication that judgement and smiting with the rod on the part of Israelite kings was commonplace enough a practice for it to be readily present in the mind of the prophet.

Through the consideration of the passages adduced under (a) and (b) we have documented the contention that Yahweh's lightning and the king's rod were used for the similar purposes of exercising judgement on enemies. It is an easy and natural inference from these two points to conclude that when the king used his rod in the cult to portray Yahweh's judgement on enemies, it was taken to be the counterpart of lightning, Yahweh's rod of judgement. To these two points we may add a third.

(c) The very shape of the rod -- whether the shorter mace-like object or the longer pole-like staff -- made it an ideal symbol for lightning, and this would obtain all the more in an instance where the rod was used in a ceremony enacting judgement.

---

[1] So the RSV. The phrase כִּסְאֲךָ אֱלֹהִים is a long recognised crux interpretum. Some scholars take it as evidence, since this psalm occurs in the Elohistic Psalter (Pss. 42-83) that the king was addressed originally not as אֱלֹהִים, i.e., "O god" or "O divine one," but as "O Yahweh!" Other scholars see in it evidence for asserting the "divinity" of Israelite kings -- so Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship, pp. 175f. and Mowinckel, Ps. St. II, pp. 298ff.; He That Cometh, pp. 62ff. For further discussion and references see the previously mentioned works as well as the commentaries on Ps. 45:7 and 110:3.

Interpretation of Psalm 110

(a) Presuppositions. Three assumptions underlie the following interpretation of Psalm 110. The first was briefly touched on above and pertains to Psalm 110 alone; the other two have been already discussed at length and pertain to the Royal and Enthronement Psalms.

1. Unity. The psalm is a unity even though it contains seemingly disparate thoughts and ideas (cf. pp.144f). It is the task of the interpreter to attempt to explain the relationship and coherence of these ideas. This task is aided through Gattung analysis. Labelling a psalm, however, is only a beginning, merely indicating the other psalms that are most likely to throw light on the psalm under consideration.

2. King and Cult. The Israelite king in all probability was a leader in cultic dramas in which he played the rôle of Moses (cf. Paragraphs #7 and #8).

3. Sitz im Leben. It is the proper business of the exegete to attempt to discover the "setting in life" of the psalms. Even though the relation of the psalms to seasonal festivals has been stressed in the past, the tendency has been to derive their primary meaning from their setting in the cult to the relative neglect of their relation to the life of nature itself (cf. pp. 226ff.). It is the contention of the present study that the setting of the psalms in relation to natural phenomena -- and especially the autumnal rainfall -- is as important as their setting in the cult.

(b) The "setting in life" of Psalm 110. An exposition of Psalm 110 will be presented in the following manner: (i) the "setting in life" assigned to the psalm will be briefly stated and (ii) a fuller discussion and interpretation will follow with reasons for assigning the psalm to the stated "setting."

(i) Statement of Interpretation

Liturgical Text. As anticipated above in Paragraph #4 (d) we take this psalm to be the text of a liturgical drama in which the king

played a leading rôle of judge and smiter of symbolic enemy kings. The rubrics found in vss. 2a, 3, 5, and 7 indicate:

(1) The king stretches forth the sceptre of his office (vs. 2a);

(2) A multitude of youthful worshippers are participants in the drama (vs. 3);

(3) The king smites with his sceptre cultic objects representative of foreign kings (vs. 5);

(4) The youthful participants follow suit (vs. 5);

(5) The king piles the shattered objects in a portion of the chamber which is representative of the valleys of the earth (vs. 6b);

(6) The king once more strikes the ground (and the objects on it?) either forcefully or repeatedly (רַבָּה :vs. 6c).

(7) The king separates himself from the assembled multitude for a period of penitence and intercession. With his drinking on the way (i.e. with the coming of the rain) the period of humiliation will cease and he will then lift up his head in exultation (vs. 7).

Date of Recital. The psalm is best explained on the supposition that it was recited some time after the regular autumnal festival celebrating Yahweh's kingship. The particular occasion of the psalm seems to have been a drought. The main part, if not all, of the ceremonies anticipating Yahweh's judgement in the heavens had already taken place, but still the skies remained clear, the thunderstorms had not come, the rains had been withheld.

Place of Recital. In view of the opening command, "Sit at my right hand . . ." (vs. 1), the psalm was not (contra Schmidt) sung at the brook Gihon, nor in the temple (as Johnson suggests) nor outside the temple with the king standing by the pillar (as suggested earlier for some other psalms),[1] but on the porch set aside by Solomon for his throne of judgement (I Kings 7:7).

---

1. Cf. pp. 217ff.

(ii) Discussion of Interpretation

Date of Recital. Psalm 110 may have been sung as an integral part of autumnal celebrations anticipating Yahweh's judgement among the nations, but it is doubtful, even though the psalm contains indications that it was recited before the autumnal rains. That Yahweh had not yet judged among the nations (vs. 6) suggests that his lightning had not been seen in the heavens. That the king is promised he will drink from a torrent along the way (vs. 7) implies that water was sparse. Furthermore, the other psalms that have their "setting" in the festival proper and also bear indications of a recital before the autumnal rains (Pss. 20, 21, 83, and 144) possess a buoyant confidence and proleptic exultation which is absent from Psalm 110. The tenor of Psalm 110 is far removed from,

> Now I know that Yahweh will help his anointed;
> he will answer him from his holy heaven.
>
> (Ps. 20:7)

and from

> In thy strength the king rejoices, O Yahweh;
> and in thy help how greatly he exults!
>
> (Ps. 21:2)

Instead of the irrepressible joy of the petitions of Psalms 20, 21, and 144 we have in Psalm 110 the sense of a need for reassurance. Even in Psalm 144 where the king appears to be in some sort of difficulty (vs. 7), there is nothing like the state of implied dejection of Psalm 110:7 where the king's head is bent low in apparent humiliation. The king appears to be in a state of penitence -- and such a note is not in harmony with the autumnal festival reflected in nearly all the Royal and Enthronement Psalms examined above. All in all, therefore, a date after the festival proper seems to accord best with the indications of the psalm itself. It was recited at a time when the stress of drought was beginning to be felt acutely.

Place of recital. Five alternatives will be considered.

(1) That the psalm was recited at the Spring Gihon (from which the king took a ceremonial drink) has been suggested by Schmidt.[1] Against this view is the fact that it does not accord well with the implication of vs. 1, "Sit at my right hand" (that the king is sitting on his throne) nor with the obvious indication of vs. 2, "Let Yahweh stretch forth from Zion . . . ." (that the psalm was sung on Zion).[2]

(2) Johnson seems to suggest that the psalm was recited in the temple when he says it was "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] This supposition suits the "from Zion" reference in vs. 2, but does not do justice to the opening command, "Sit at my right hand!" unless it is supposed that these words were uttered in anticipation of the king's ascent to the throne. The most natural way to understand the command is that it directs the king to be seated immediately on his throne. Another objection can be raised to a recital in the temple proper. The third verse of the psalm implies that a large body of the king's subjects were present. A fairly sizeable gathering is suggested not only by the phrase "thy youth are to you as (plentiful as) dew," but also by the fact that mention of the "people" is made to the king, "Thy people are willing. . . ." The smaller and more confined space of the temple would not have been appropriate for a large assembly of people.

---

1. Die Thronfahrt Jahves, pg. 42.

2. Zion referred at first to a limited area in the holy city. For a recent discussion on the name, see J. Simons, Jerusalem in the Old Testament, Leiden, 1952, pp. 60ff. See also L. H. Vincent and A. M. Steve, Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament, IIIe Partie, 1956, pg. 632. A summary statement by C. W. Wilson many years ago remains tenable and useful: "The following view may be suggested. When David took Jerusalem it was a hill town on the south part of the eastern spur, with a small castle or acropolis, called Zion, situated at a convenient spot to the south of the present Haram esh-Sherif. . . . The stronghold of Zion became the city of David, and this name was soon extended to the town at the south end of the spur. When the town spread northward, Zion was connected with the central part of the spur, on which lay the royal buildings and, adjoining them on the north, at the top of the hill, the temple area; and so it became a sacred name for the spot on which the temple, the dwelling place of Yahweh stood. Afterwards the name was frequently applied by prophets and poets to the temple enclosure, to the eastern spur, and to the holy city of Jerusalem." (HDB IV, pg. 984).

3. Sacral Kingship, pg. 120.

(3) The palace of the king which held the "throne of the kings" (II Kings 11:19) has much to commend it. According to the description of the coronation given in II Kings 11:4-20 the king's ascent of the throne was the last part of the ceremonies. That this throne was the one from which the king inaugurated the drama enacting destruction of enemies is thus very probable -- especially if scholars are right in assigning this psalm to the coronation. Under this supposition both of the indications "Sit at my right hand" and "from Zion" are satisfactorily accounted for. The supposition even bears pressing, for according to an older diagram of the plan of royal buildings (Benzinger),[1] and according to a more recent one(Grollenberg),[2] the king's palace is located to the south ( ]יָמִין) of the temple. That is to say, the palace was literally "at the right hand of (the temple of) Yahweh." The primary objection against this supposition is that it like (2) would not have been a suitable spot from which a large gathering of worshippers could have participated in and observed the ceremonies.

(4) In the light of our examination of II Kings 11:14 and 23: 1-3 we were led to posit a location by the pillar of the temple as the most likely spot from which the iconoclastic activities were launched by the king.[3] This spot opened out onto the inner court and would therefore have been suitable for a larger gathering than could be accommodated in the temple. The phrase "Let Yahweh stretch forth from Zion the sceptre of thy might" suits this view. We can imagine the eyes of signalmen eagerly concentrating on every movement of the king, waiting for the sign of the uplifted sceptre in order that the ceremony of ritualistic destruction of the abominable images might begin. As seen above in (2), even the phrase "Sit at my right hand" can be accommodated to a recitation from the

---

1. HDB IV, pg. 695.

2. Atlas of the Bible, pg. 96, Maps 24B and C. Cf. also J. Simons, Jerusalem in the Old Testament, pg. 436.

3. Cf. pp. 217ff.

temple if the command is taken as an anticipation of the king's ascent to the throne. A recitation with the king by the pillar agrees with II Kings 11:13-20 where it relates that Jehoash walked through the gate of the guards to the palace immediately after leaving the pillar. We might well settle on the location by the pillar did not a fifth alternative have more in its favour.

(5) The porch (אוּלָם) of Solomon's house of the forest of Lebanon in which stood the throne of judgement (I Kings 7:7) emerges as the most probable focal point around which the psalm was recited. It accords most satisfactorily with all the key indications of the psalm. (a) "Sit" (the king would become seated on the throne of judgement); (b) "at my right hand" (the house of cedar described in I Kings 7:2-8 was also located to the south (נֶגֶב) of the temple); (c) "from Zion" (the exact locality intended by "Zion" depends on the date of the psalm; in all probability it referred at the time of recitation to the entire royal compound -- temple, palace, and other buildings);[1] (d) "thy youth are to you as (plentiful as) dew" (the porch faced out, according to Benzinger's plan, onto the great court and would have been ideal of a sizeable gathering); and (e) "Let him judge" (liturgical judgement enacted from the throne of judgement would have carried with it the greatest possible symbolic effect).

A Liturgical Text of a Drama Enacting Destruction of Enemies

If the above reasoning has been correct, at the time of the recitation of the psalm all Israel was beginning to fear that her fondest hopes for relief would themselves soon be shattered. Psalm 110 and the ceremony behind it come as a reassurance that this will not happen. The reassurance is extended in the cult through the spoken and acted word. The king and people are exhorted to have patience and are encouraged to hold fast the faith. The following reassurances seem to be given:

---

1. Cf. pg. 260 n. 1, on the changing meaning of "Zion."

(i) that the king's previous priestly acts of symbolic destruction had been efficacious; (ii) that Yahweh would fulfil his promises and subject their enemies and his; (iii) that the gods of the nations would be judged; (iv) that the deeps would be divided; (v) that the rains would come. At the same time it may be observed that the psalm contains two fervent petitions for Yahweh to perform what he has promised ("Let him stretch forth (his) rod!" and "Let him judge amongst the nations!"). The petitions as well as the reassurance are chanted and enacted in a cultic drama. In view of the probable date of recitation it is not likely that the drama was an exact duplicate of the symbolic destruction of enemies which belonged to the autumnal festival proper. It is nonetheless probable that the cultic drama of Psalm 110 closely reflects the ceremonies that had been performed earlier in the autumn. An exposition such as this at least has the merits of satisfactorily accounting for the disparate elements in the psalm, of suggesting how they are naturally related, and of recommending a "setting" that accords well with its tenor.

The psalm opens (vs. 1) with the words of a prophet or prophet-priest spoken to the Israelite king. He is very likely already seated on the throne and hears the words of the prophet as a reassurance that he sits on his throne by the divine decree of Yahweh who promises that he will vanquish the enemies of Israel and of the king, making them as the stool underneath the king's feet. In this opening oracle the immediate "setting" of the psalm can be discerned. A ceremony enacting Yahweh's subjection of the king's enemies is about to take place.

A choir sings or perhaps chants the lines that contain the initial rubrics of the ceremony, "Let Yahweh stretch forth from Zion the rod of thy might! Rule in the midst of thine enemies!" (vs. 2). With the singing of these lines attention obviously focuses upon the king who stretches forth his sceptre and then upon the objects representative of his enemies. While the sceptre is raised, the verse is perhaps repeated by the people united in invocation that Yahweh will act in and through the person of their king. As we have suggested above, the rod with which the king was

dramatically to dominate his enemies was a potent symbol of Yahweh's own instrument of domination, his lightning.

With vs. 3 the list of participants in the ceremony is completed. The last actors mentioned are youths. We do not know exactly what rôle the young men played in the drama but may conjecture that they themselves participated in the actual rites by dramatically destroying symbols of foreign kings upon the signal given by the king. If the story of Gideon's three hundred select men bringing panic upon the Midianite camp through smashing pottery jars and blowing trumpets has behind it a liturgical tradition, as we believe it does,[1] then an active participation of young men in the ceremony is altogether natural. The term נְדָבוֹת ("willing") with which the youthful participants are here described is used in the Song of Deborah of people offering themselves for the army (Judges 5:1) and of their commanders (Judges 5:9), and seems to indicate that the participants were cultic warriors. That they were clad "in holy array" means that they wore festal garments. This aspect of the ceremony seems to suggest a similarity with the other psalms employed in the regular celebrations of Yahweh's judgement and kingship. In Psalm 29:2, for example, the sons of the gods are summoned to bow down before Yahweh "in holy array" and in Psalm 96:9 the families of the peoples are also enjoyed to worship him "in holy array." In Psalm 110:3 Yahweh's votaries present themselves, attired in like manner, "in holy array." As intimated above, there must have been many youths participating in the drama, as is indicated by the phrase "are to you as dew from the womb of dawn," i.e., are to you as plentiful as the dew of the dawn. From the phrase "the day of thy strength" there comes the assurance that this day would ultimately become a day of victory and triumph for the king.

Vs. 4 contains the second oracle of the psalm which was most probably spoken by the prophet or prophet-priest who intoned the opening

---

1. Cf. Appendix B.

oracle. In the same way that the opening oracle reassured the king that he sat on the throne by divine decree, the oracle here reassures the king that, even though events may indicate the contrary, Yahweh has no intention of going back on his promise: the king is a priest, and ever shall be, because Yahweh has sworn by his own righteousness and therefore irrevocably.[1] It may be that we have in vs. 4 the actual words of investiture of the king as a priest. Although possible this does not especially commend itself in view of the context and the way in which the oracle proper is prefaced. "Yahweh has sworn and will not repent" seem to be words designed to reassure the assembled congregation of Yahweh's faithfulness to a prior promise. The particular reassurance afforded by the oracle evidently pertains to the king's priestly office and very likely to priestly activities performed in that office. We have suggested above that some of the activities performed by the king were similar, if not identical, to some of the activities performed by Moses, such as, smiting the waters of the bronze sea with his rod or raising his rod as a symbol of strength by which victory over enemies could be effected. Moses is called a "priest" in Ps. 99:6 (which very likely is also to be included among the psalms sung at the autumnal festival), and it seems entirely natural that here the prophet is reassuring the king that every activity performed by him as Moses has been efficacious. That is to say, we are suggesting that the words "Thou art a priest for ever" were designed to reassure one and all that the king's priestly actions of smiting the Brazen Sea and stretching forth his sceptre in symbolic rule over his enemies had not been empty ritualistic gestures performed by a monarch who has lost favour with Yahweh. They were, in fact, so the prophet seems to say, highly significant acts which would contribute to the ultimate occurrence of the reality they portrayed because they were performed by a monarch who as priest had Yahweh's full blessing.

---

1. For the meaning of עֶדְקִי in this vs. see above, pp. 155f. and esp. pg. 156n. 1.

The reassurance spoken to the king continues in vs. 5 when he is told, either by the prophet or by the choir's chant, that his ritualistic action of smiting kings with his rod is, in reality, not his action at all, but Yahweh's. The particle בְּ we translated earlier as "by."[1] With perhaps too great enthusiasm for the notion that the king was the apparent actor but Yahweh the real actor, we intimated that בְּ had the meaning "by means of."[2] It is usually translated here as "at" (RSV) or "on" (BDB).[3] "At" or "by" (the side of) the king's right hand is about to be enacted the judgement that Yahweh performs on the day of his wrath. While this verse is being sung we can picture the king initiating the more active and awesome part of the ceremony where objects representative of foreign kings are smashed once again, perhaps first by the king and then in turn by the youths in holy array. If the objects were destroyed by the youths simultaneously or by rows, we can imagine that the noise would have been considerable, and the manner in which the entire drama thus imitated Yahweh's thundering unusually impressive. Through the whole ceremony, but especially through the action described in this verse, the congregation would proleptically experience the terror of Yahweh's wrath and the swiftness of his action which characterized his day of judgement. A similar response to the cultic enactment of destruction of enemies is also experienced by the observers of the ceremony for which Psalm 2 provides the liturgy (cf. Ps. 2:10f.).

With the opening of vs. 6 the congregation once again lifts up a petition that Yahweh will act. In this instance the plea "Let him judge among the nations!" is uttered at the same time as the congregation is beholding the king's unerring judgement wielded on objects representative of foreign kings. The plea thus has behind it exactly the same kind

---

1. Cf. pg. 155.

2. Cf. pp. 157f.

3. Cf., however, E. Kissane, The Book of Psalms, Vol. II, pp. 193f. who prefers "because of."

of double entendre found in the petition of vs. 2a, "Let Yahweh stretch forth from Zion the rod of thy might!" Both petitions indicate either the ritualistic action of the king (he stretches forth his sceptre) or its significance (he is judging); and both petitions at the same time so much as say, "O that Yahweh will act as the king is acting now!" In vs. 6b it seems likely that the double entendre continues: "He fills valleys," or, as this verse perhaps should be read (following the translation of Jerome), "He fills valleys with corpses." With the chanting of these words the king very likely heaped fragments of the broken cultic objects into a pitted rock surface[1] or a portion of the chamber that (by its slightly lower level) symbolized a valley. At the same time the chant is an anticipation of the results that will be forthcoming when Yahweh stretches forth his hand and holds judgement in the heavens: the valleys will become filled with rain. Here the double entendre ends.

With vs. 6c, "My chief smites the earth forcefully" we have a simple and straight-forward rubric: the climax of the ceremony is conducted by the king alone; he smites the ground with his rod forcefully, or, as the Hebrew רַבָּה may also mean, many times.[2] רֹאשׁ is commonly emended to רָאשִׁים and reads as "heads" or "chiefs" (LXX, RSV) and as commonly understood to be the object, and not the subject of מָחַץ ("he smites"). If the recommended emendation is accepted for the moment and the entire phrase rendered "he smites chiefs (or heads) over a wide land" the validity of the interpretation we have been suggesting for verses 5-6 is not diminished, but in fact enhanced. For then the double entendre would be preserved; as the king wields his final blow upon the objects representative of foreign kings, the congregation continues to entertain the fervent hope that Yahweh will likewise soon shatter chiefs over a wide land.

---

1. We owe the suggestion of this possibility to Professor James Barr.

2. רַבָּה is generally translated with the adjectival meaning "wide" and the phrase עַל־אֶרֶץ רַבָּה may be rendered, "over a wide land." The adverbial meaning of רַבָּה is well attested, however (Pss. 62:3; 78:15; 89:8; cf. 123:3; 18:15), and seems the more natural meaning here.

The translation we have offered above requires less emendation (רֹאשׁ to רֹאשִׁי), and provides a fitting concluding touch to the ceremony portraying judgement and destruction of enemies, for here the king is referred to in the direct address ("my chief"), the characteristic manner of address employed at the outset of the ceremony ("my lord": vs. 1), in the oracle assuring the efficacy of the priesthood ("my king": vs. 4), and at the point of the most dramatic symbolism ("my lord": vs. 5).

At the conclusion of the ceremony we can imagine the king departing from the assembled gathering, perhaps walking through the ranks of assembled worshippers as they sing the final chant,

> He will drink from a torrent along the way;
> because of this he lifts up his head.

As Elijah was commanded by Yahweh (I Kings 17:1-7) to go to drink from the brook (כְּרִית) Cherith, so the king here departs, like Elijah, to hide himself until the rains shall come and the brook shall once again be filled. With this final fulfilment of Yahweh's promises, the king shall lift up his head. His state seems to have been one of humiliation and penitence because the rains had been withheld.

To uphold him during the period of isolation and penance the king had the promises of Yahweh himself, spoken to him through the mouth of his prophet and dramatically portrayed again in a symbolic ceremony over which he had presided as Yahweh's elect priest.

PARAGRAPH # 10

ANALOGOUS CEREMONIES ENACTING CULTIC DESTRUCTION OF ENEMIES

In Paragraphs # 8 and # 9 above we sought to establish, from an examination of certain psalms and historical texts, that a ceremony was practiced in the monarchial period of Israel in which cultic objects representative of foreign enemies were destroyed. The purpose of the present paragraph is to adduce a few analogous rites from neighbouring cultures and to compare them with the Israelite ceremony in order to bring out its uniqueness.

The Sethe "Execration Texts"

The particular form of the Israelite ceremony which we are interested in elucidating further, is the one wherein the king employed his sceptre to smash objects representative of foreign kings (Pss. 2:9; 83:14; II Sam. 2:10; Pss. 48:5-9; 18:39-43; 110:5). A remarkably similar ceremony is known to have been practiced in the Middle Kingdom of Egypt (c. 2000 B.C.). This ceremony has been reconstructed by the Egyptologist, K. Sethe, in his publication of the so-called "Execration Texts."[1] Sethe's presentation, for its thoroughness and clarity, is an enviable model of scholarship. With a minimum of comment we present below a synopsis of his story of the fragments of the earthenware vessels.

The texts were written on three main sizes of vessels: (1) saucer-like vessels 1 1/2" deep and 6 1/4" - 7" in diameter;[2] bowls,

---

1. "Die Ächtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefasscherben des Mittleren Reiches. Nach den Originalen im Berliner Museum," APAW, Philos. - Historische Klasse, 1926, Nr. 5.

2. We have converted Sethe's metrical figures to the nearest eighth of an inch.

2"-2 1/4" deep, running up to as large as 19 3/4" in circumference; and (3) small red lantern-like jars with a depth of 2" and an upper circumference of 8" and a lower circumference of 10". The names of the enemies were inscribed on the convex side (and occasionally on the concave side) of the vessels according to a regular pattern.

The regular pattern in which the execrations were written was: (1) the rulers, with the exception of the texts on Libya, are mentioned by name; (2) the nations of these rulers is given with a list of specifically named towns and districts (Libya is an exception); (3) "their strong men, their swift runners, their allies and their associates"; (4) "who may rebel, who may plot, who may fight, who may talk of fighting, or who may talk of rebelling -- in this entire land."[1] This final formula, the so-called Rebellion Formula, appears in nearly all of the texts -- whether the nations mentioned were the Africans, the Asiatics, or the Egyptians.

The use to which these pieces of pottery were put is of interest. They were destroyed, Sethe conjectures, neither by throwing them down, nor with the palm of the hand, but by means of a fret saw. Originally the red jar was not broken by sawing, however, but by some other means for according to the Pyramid texts (also published by Sethe)[2] proverb #244 was to be recited with "a breaking of the red jar." It was the sharp edges in the breaks that led Sethe to his suggestion that a small saw was used to effect the fragmentation of the vessels. Examination of Sethe's photographs of the saucer-like vessels,[3] however, strongly suggests that the fragmentation may have been caused by the blow of a rod or mace (an alternative not considered by Sethe), for in two photographs of vessels which Sethe had pieced together, the breaks emanate from the centre.

---

1. Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte, Leipzig, 1908; translations are found in Sethe's Ueberzetzung und Kommentar zu den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten, Glückstadt, n.d.

2. Further excerpts of these texts may be found in English in ANET, pp. 328f.

3. Unfortunately these are not available in Pritchard's The Ancient Near East in Pictures.

In view of the fact that the fragments, although purchased in Luxor were reported to have come from a tomb in western Thebes, and in view of the fact that according to Egyptian belief the death of a monarch was the occasion for widespread rebellion and revolt, Sethe was strongly inclined to eliminate all other occasions from his list of probable times and dates of recital and to settle on the occasion of the burial of a Pharaoh.

The purpose of the ceremony is most interesting of all. In his text "o" there occurs the phrase, "he shall die." This phrase, plus the nature of what is written on the pottery and the nature of the breaks, led Sethe to conclude that they were ceremonially destroyed with the intent of effecting the destruction of the princes, nations, rebels and evil-spirits who were mentioned on the fragmented objects. The purpose of destroying the earthenware vessels remained the same, he affirms, whether they were destroyed at a sacred place in which the enemies were thought to be especially powerful (e.g. a temple), or, on the occasion of the founding of a temple, at the burial or accession of a monarch, or, at a festival of victory or some other festival.

The Significance of the Sethe "Execration Texts"

The Egyptian vessels and the intent with which they were destroyed illuminate the Israelite ceremony in which objects representative of foreign kings were destroyed, and, at the same time, provide us with a means of pointing up the peculiar form of the Israelite ceremony.

We have submitted above that the nature of the breaks in the pottery suggests that a rod or mace was the instrument used to fragment them. We know from many inscriptions and depictions of Pharaoh, in any event, that the two rods, the mace and sceptre, were favoured emblems of office.[1] Perhaps the most remarkable -- and for our purposes, instructive --

---

1. Cf. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, pp. 105-09; cf. also, for an example, J. B. Pritchard's The Ancient Near East in Pictures, Princeton, 1954, Fig. 414, a statue of King Tut-ankh-Amon holding a (javelin-like) sceptre in his left hand and a mace in his right. See also Figures 549, 552, 556 and 563 in all of which the sceptre is an insignia of divine rule.

example of the king's use of the mace appears in a scene carved on the Nar-mer palette. In it the king, with a mace in his right hand, is smiting a kneeling chieftain on the head; the king's left hand clasps a peg, which is held on top of the captive chieftain's head and is apparently the object struck rather than the prisoner's head itself.[1] The suggestion that a mace was the instrument employed to break the execration text vessels thus well accords with our knowledge of the Egyptian monarch and his insignia of office. If it is a correct suggestion, the similarity between the Egyptian ceremony and the biblical ceremony is all the closer. As it is, at least six points of contact between the execration texts' ceremony and the biblical ceremony are apparent:

(i) In the texts pertaining to both ceremonies there is mention of plotting, rebellion and conspiracy (compare Pss. 2:1-3; 83:3-6; 21:9; 48:5; 65:8 with Sethe's "d," "h," "l" and "n" texts).

(ii) In both texts mention is made of nations and their rulers. In the execration texts specific names of rulers ("a" and "e") and nations ("b" (African), "f" (Asian), "i" (Libyans) and "m" (Egyptians)) are given as a rule, but no names of the Libyan rulers are given in the brief (only 3 lines) "i" texts. In the psalms a general indication is made of rulers (more commonly "kings": Pss. 2:2; 48:5; 76:13; 110:5; 149:8) and nations (Pss. 2:2, 8; 18:44; 46:7, 11; 82:8; 98:2; 110:6; 149:7) or peoples (Pss. 2:1; 18:48; 47:4; 96:7,13; 98:9, 144:2), but occasionally, as in Ps. 83, enemy nations are listed by name.

> Yea, they conspire with one accord;
> against thee they make a covenant --
> the tents of Edom and the Ishmaelites,
> Moab and the Hagrites,
> Gebal and Ammon and Amalek,
> Philistia with the inhabitants of Tyre;
> Assyria also has joined them;
> they are the strong arm of the children of Lot.
>
> (Vss. 5-8)

---

1. Cf. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, Fig. 3; J. B. Pritchard, The Ancient Near East in Pictures, Fig. 296. Cp. Judges 5:26, "She put her hand to the tent peg and her right hand to the workmen's mallet; she struck Sisera a blow, she crushed his head, she shattered and pierced his temple."

(iii) In both ceremonies the cultic objects destroyed were either definitely earthenware vessels (compare Ps. 2:8,9 with the description of the vessels on which the execration texts were written) or else they were destroyed in a manner that strongly suggests they were earthenware (see our exposition above on I Sam. 2:10 and Pss. 18:39,43; 48:8,9; and 89:24).

(iv) In both ceremonies the cultic objects destroyed were in the majority of instances[1] representative (or symbolic) of enemy nations and rulers. (See texts "a" to "l" and Pss. 2:7-11; 18:32-49; 20:8; 21:9; 46:10; 48:5-9; 76:4; 89:23,24; 110:5,6; 149:8)

(v) Towards the end of texts used in both ceremonies there occurs in the Egyptian and Hebrew two obscure, but strikingly similar phrases, "in this entire land" ("d 6," "h 6," "l 6," "n 7) and "over the wide earth" (Ps. 110:6 (RSV) עַל־אֶרֶץ רַבָּה). Sethe, followed by Alt, interpreted the phrase to mean, "in any part of Egypt whatsoever."[2] Albright argues[3] that this is too limited and literal a meaning to place on it. The phrase is archaic, he avers, dating back to the Pyramid Age, and bears the double meaning "the whole land" and "the whole earth." We have suggested above that the Hebrew might better be rendered "upon the ground forcefully," but feel nonetheless that this similarity in phraseology in these two texts, which were ex hypothesi used in a similar ceremony merits the mention we give it here.[4]

(vi) The purpose for which the cultic objects were destroyed in both ceremonies was similar, though by no means identical. The safest

---

1. Exceptions were the objects on which Sethe's texts "m" to "p" were written and instances in the Israelite ceremony where they were representative of the enemy nation's deity, cf. paragraph #9.

2. Cf. APAW, Phil-Hist. Kl., 1926, Nr. 5, pg. 43 and Alt in Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache, 63, pp. 39-45.

3. JPOS VIII, 1928, pg. 228.

4. It would, of course, be too much to say that the similarity in phraseology actually lends support to our thesis on the use of Psalm 110 as a liturgical text for the occasion of a symbolic destruction of enemies. It cannot be denied, however, that the similarity is suggestive.

means of comparing the intention behind the destruction of the objects is to take the clues afforded by the texts themselves. In texts "a" and "e" the rulers of the enemy lands or territories are described with a hieroglyph that, in the Old and Middle kingdoms, commonly meant "dying man"; this fact surely commends Sethe's explanation that the hieroglyph was used on the principle that "the wish is the father of the thought."[1] In the text "o" in which specifically named Egyptians are execrated with the opening formula "he shall die," it is obvious that the motivating wish was to effect the downfall of the personages named. The evidence of the psalms, on the other hand, points towards a different underlying purpose, namely, to admonish enemy nations by a portrayal of Y[illegible]'s judgement on them. This is apparent from Psalm 2:10,

> Now therefore, O kings, be wise;
> be warned (הִוָּסְרוּ) O rulers of the earth.

and especially pointedly in Psalm 149:5-9a,

> Let the faithful exult in glory;
> let them sing for joy on their couches.
> Let the high praises of God be in their throats
> and two-edged swords in their hands,
> to wreak vengeance on the nations
> and chastisement (תּוֹכָחוֹת) on the peoples,
> to bind their kings with chains
> and their nobles with fetters of iron,
> to execute on them the judgement written (מִשְׁפָּט כָּתוּב).

The mention of the use of a sword (vs. 6) and iron fetters to bind the kings (vs. 8) indicates that the psalm was employed in connexion with a different form of the ceremony of destruction of enemies (an analogy of which form we shall presently discuss below), but vss. 7 and 9a (underlined) are of value as a particularly clear statement of the purpose of the Israelite ceremony regardless of the form it took.

No far reaching conclusions may be drawn on the basis of these six points of contact between the two ceremonies. They are remarkable enough and speak for themselves. We do submit, however, that the similarity is sufficient to warrant at least two conclusions. (1) Names and

---

1. APAW, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1926, Nr. 5.

formulae similar to the ones found on the Egyptian texts were in all probability inscribed on the objects destroyed in the Israelite ceremony whether these objects were smashed with a rod (Pss. 2, 18, 48, 89, 110) or hewn with a sword or bound (Ps. 149) or broken (Pss. 45, 76) or burned with fire (Pss. 21, 46, 97). An indirect indication of this practice is found in Ps. 20 where persistent mention is made of the name of God (vss. 2, 6, 8). Reference to the name of the deity elsewhere may likewise reflect a similar background (cf. Pss. 18:50; 76:2; 89:13; 17, 25; 96:2, 8; 149:3).

(ii) The element of sympathetic magic (apparent in the Egyptian rite) is not altogether absent from the Israelite ceremony even though it does not characterize the latter. In a ceremony of the type we have reconstructed, it would have been extraordinary if it was believed that the deed of destroying enemies symbolically did not contribute in some way to their eventual downfall.[1]

Nielsen's Study of Image Destruction

The task of adducing further parallels to the Israelite autumnal ceremonies has been greatly lightened thanks to the work of E. Nielsen. Nielsen's interest in the account of the burial of foreign gods at Shechem (Gen. 35 and Josh. 24) led him into a study of analogous rites in Egypt and Mesopotamia. The results are found in his valuable, though somewhat mis-named, "The Burial of the Foreign Gods."[2] He convincingly demonstrates that the biblical rites of "putting away" foreign gods are unique in their "confessional" character; only in the Old Testament do we have an instance of a people's renouncing foreign deities in favour of their own national god.

---

1. Cf. above our section "Thought-world of the Old Testament, pp. 189-192.

2. Studia Theologica, Vol. VII, Fasc. II, 1954, pp. 103-122. In this article Nielsen deals with a few important instances where objects representative of foreign nations are buried, but the majority of cases adduced are not at all accurately described by his given title. For example, all of his illustrations (with two exceptions) are Egyptian or Mesopotamian, yet in his own concluding remarks he cannot avoid observing that iconoclasm (i.e. the destruction of gods) is conspicuous in Egypt and Babylonia by its absence! (pg. 120). The practice of iconoclasm is rather, he avers, "typical only of nomads." (pg. 121).

It is interesting to observe the almost limitless variety of methods which the ancients devised to vex, torture, abuse, and finally dispense with figurines and images representative of threatening forces of evil. Most of Nielsen's illustrations come from Babylonia where the use of images made of different materials (e.g., clay, wax, tallow, sulphur, asphalt, tamarisk and cedar wood, etc.) made it possible for a celebrant to offer (symbolic) pieces of his enemy for the consumption of dogs and pigs! The purpose of the majority of these rituals was purificatory and exorcistic; others were "apotropaic" and "prophylactic," i.e., they were designed to keep evil forces away and to prevent their coming. One example of the former type may be cited. It is of interest because it is similar in content, but not in purpose, to two forms of the biblical ceremony. Two small (7 finger-widths high) images are made of cedar and tamarisk. Both of the images have the right hand raised to the god Nabu; one has in the left hand a snake; the other a scorpion. The images are clothed in red, bound in the middle with a palm branch and placed in the house of the god Medan (the Divine Judge). They are offered food, and then, as Nielsen translates,

> on the 6th day, when the God Nabu arrives at the Ehursagtila, the carrier of the sword . . . shall strike off their heads and before Nabu they shall kindle a fire, then they shall be thrown into the fire.[1]

It may be observed that the Babylonian rites were not directed against <u>political</u> enemies of the nation to the same extent as were the rites of the Egyptians and Israelites.

The nationalistic character of the Egyptian ceremonies appears especially clearly in a ceremony that is also of interest because of the variety of means of abuse employed. In it a figure of the god Seth is made; upon the figure are inscribed the words, "Seth, the miserable"; and then, according to the ritual, the figure is bound, spat upon, beaten, cut down, and finally cast into a fire for burning.[2] Nielsen points out that Seth,

---

1. <u>Ibid</u>., pg. 110.
2. <u>Ibid</u>., pg. 105.

in this instance, represents threatening foreign powers; the abuse he receives is thus analogous to the chastisement meted out upon objects representative of foreign gods and kings in the different forms of the biblical ceremony.

For Nielsen's purposes and ours, one of the most remarkable parallels is Egyptian. Not only is it analogous to one form of the biblical ceremony, but archaeological evidence is at hand which suggests that a similar rite was practiced in Palestine. We refer to the execration texts from the Middle Kingdom published by G. Posener under the title, Princes et Pays d'Asie et de Nubie: Textes hiératiques sur des figurines d'envoûtment du moyen empire.[1] Nielsen summarizes Posener's results as follows:

> These execration texts are written upon earthen figurines which were unearthed near the Teti-pyramid at Saccarah. The figurines were inscribed both on the front and the back with names of magic powers as well as with names of Nubian and Palestinian places and princes. The majority of the figurines were 10-15cm. (3 7/8 - 4 1/4") high, but some few of them were larger, 31-34 cm. (12 1/4 - 13 3/8") in height. In spite of their different sizes the figurines had one thing in common; they represented men in an attitude typical of Egyptian captives: kneeling, and with the arms bound together behind the back. At least one of them was placed in a little sarcophagus of clay; this suggests that the ritual which was performed with these figurines was that of a burial. It is interesting to note that foreign princes and regions were equated with evil-powers. The ritual may be characterized as "sympathetic magic"; by burying the figurines of the foreign princes in the earth Pharaoh secures his kingdom against attacks from these regions. He conquers their territories, or he "frustrates their knavish" revolts. The interpretation of these figurines as a kind of sympathetic magic, which was given by Capart, seems beyond doubt, especially when the figurines are compared with the intentionally broken potsherds on which the first-published series of Egyptian execration texts were written.[2]

The following observations may be made. (1) The figurines themselves -- and the probable use to which they were put -- afford a striking parallel

---

1. They were published in Brussels in 1940. For the dating of the texts see also the studies by Alt, Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins, 64, 1941, pp. 21-39 and Albright, Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 83, pp. 30-36.

2. Studia Theologica, Vol. VIII, Fasc. II, pp. 104f. A picture of one of the figurines is found in Pritchard's The Ancient Near East in Pictures, Fig. 593. For excerpts of the texts, cf. ANET, pp. 328f.

to the Israelite ceremony recorded in Psalm 149 wherein the kings of the nations were bound "with chains and their nobles with fetters of iron" (vs. 8) in order "to execute on them the judgement written" (vs. 9a). (ii) The Posener texts lend support to the suggestion above that names and formulae were inscribed on different cultic objects representative of foreign kings. The words "to execute on them the judgement written" may thus have been a direct indication that foreign names and formulae of imprecation and judgement were written on the bound images of the foreign kings.

The suggestion that there was practiced in Israel a ceremony where objects representative of foreign kings were bound with chains (and we may presume, in various ways abused) receives additional support from archaeology. Nielsen reports,

> [But] from the archaeological exploration of Palestine we may mention a discovery made more than 50 years ago by the excavators of Tell Sandahanneh (ancient מרשה - Μαρίσσα In a large building dating from the Seleucidian age and situated at the south-east corner of the city just inside the gate, 16 small figurines of lead were found scattered in the debris at about floor-level. They had their hands bound together before the breast or behind the back with thin "ropes" of lead. The excavator, Bliss, thought that the large structure in which the figurines were found was the barracks of the city, but it might equally well have been a sanctuary. This much is clear, that the building was not an ordinary private house. Whether these "enemies" or "captives" were political, personal, or demoniac, cannot be decided with certainty.[1]

The Tell Sandahanneh evidence is not, of course, conclusive. It is, however, undeniably suggestive. That figurines with bound hands should be found on the floor of a third century B. C. public building in the heart of Judah (but 23 miles southwest of Jerusalem) surely betokens the persistence of a ceremony similar to the one reflected in the Posener execrations texts and Psalm 149.

---

1. Ibid., pg. 108. Bliss' preliminary report, with illustrations, is found in Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement, 1900, pp. 332-34. Further discussion is found in Lods, Israel, 1930, pp. 119ff.; Lods believed such figurines were used in connexion with the worship of the dead. Nielsen (pg. 108, n. 2) suggests that Lods' interpretation is "somewhat free."

Significance of the Parallel Rites. Nowhere in the above analogies adduced by Nielsen do we encounter rites whose symbolism was meant to make plain the divine will or act, i.e., rites that might be called "prophetic." Students of the ancient Near East have, of course, for a long time now, observed how ritual has corresponded to, and put into dramatic form, myth. Since myth generally contains also an expression of divine will, it might be argued that rites may properly be called "prophetic" whenever ritual corresponds to myth. Frankfort cites an interesting example of such a correspondence; it occurs in the Babylonian New Year Festival. In the text describing the procession to Bit Akitu, we hear of "the king smashing a hariu pot with a weapon: that is Marduk who subjected Tiamat."[1] As Frankfort avers, this text is not so much one of "sympathetic magic" but rather an instance where cultic acts "are evidently parallel to phases of the victory as related in the [Creation] Epic."[2] Despite the similarity of this ritual to Israelite ceremonies wherein the king employs his sceptre, they are not of the same character. If the two theses presented in Paragraphs # 8 and # 9 are correct, the biblical ritual did not correspond to myth as much as it corresponded to the anticipated or actual heavenly judgements of Yahweh. Even though the biblical ceremonies did have an element of sympathetic magic about them, and even though they were similar to the rites of Egypt in their political and nationalistic character, the heightened degree to which they were "prophetic" and "confessional" made them unique.

---

1. Cf. Ps. St. II, pp. 19ff. and S. H. Hooke (Ed.) Myth and Ritual, passim.

2. Cf. H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, pg. 328.

SUMMARY

Two objectives have directed the line of research in the above pages: (i) to see in sharper perspective the Old Testament figure Melchizedek and (ii) to solve some of the exegetical problems in the passages in which Melchizedek is mentioned.

Contrary to the notion that Genesis 14 was the creation of one author in one age, an analysis of its contents revealed distinct stages of development (Paragraph #3). Stages 1 and 3 present different accounts of the alliances and fate of Sodom. Stage 4 is midrashic in character and stages 2 and 5 are of priestly origin. The latter two relate how the founding father resisted the temptation of becoming contaminated with the evil king of Sodom and how he had encountered in the past Melchizedek of Salem. Following contemporary interpretations of the patriarchs, we submitted that both Abram and Melchizedek were historical figures and that the tradition of Gen. 14:18-20 reflected actual historical contacts between the people of Abram and the people of Melchizedek. Examination of the evidence available to identify the Salem of Melchizedek pointed to the district surrounding Shechem as his original provenance, to Shiloh as an interim centre of the traditions of the Melchizedek priesthood, and to Jerusalem as their final place of residence (Paragraph #4). The Melchizedek of the Salim basin was in all probability a worshipper of the god Milki to whom human sacrifice were made and of the god El whose grandfather ʿElyon was believed to have procreated heaven and earth (Paragraph #5).

In Part II we submitted that Melchizedek did not emerge as a proper name in Psalm 110 until after the rise of the Zadokite priesthood and the fall of the monarchy (Paragraph #5). The Psalm is a Royal Psalm (Paragraph #1) and was probably sung in connexion with the coronation of a Judaic king (Paragraph #2). Although there does not appear to have been any set season for the coronation, the Royal Psalms take on a special significance if we see as their background the autumnal New Year celebrations (Paragraph #3). Scholars have assigned different cultic rôles to the king (Paragraph #6). The rôle he played is best summarized by the

term "Mosaic," which term also serves well to express the unique character of the Israelite kingship (Paragraph #7). Not only a number of Royal Psalms (2, 83, I Samuel 2: 1-10, 20, 21 and 18) but other psalms (48, 54, 92, 73 and 46) as well as a number of historical texts provide evidence to support the contention that the Israelite king, wielding his rod as Moses, was a leader in image smashing ceremonies (Paragraph #8). Examination of the Enthronement Psalms and other psalms (29; 89: 2-38, 82, 96, 97, 98, 47 and 149) reflected the belief that the autumnal storms were the time when Yahweh in the heavens sat in judgement on the gods of the nations (Paragraph #9). The king in the cult made plain through dramatic enactment the meaning of Yahweh's thunder and lightning (Paragraphs #8 and #9). Against this background Psalm 110 was interpreted. Were it not for the note of dejection and humiliation which characterizes the Psalm, we could assign it with little hesitation to the ceremonies of the New Year Festival proper. The note of dejection implied especially in the last verse, however, suggested a setting some time after the festival was over, during a period of drought.

APPENDIX A[1]

1. Indications that Psalm 89:39-53 and Lamentations reflect a similar shock and dejection owing to the demise of the Davidic king.

Rejection of the Messiah

But now thou hast cast off and rejected,
thou art full of wrath against thy anointed. (Ps. 89:39)

The breath of our nostrils,
Yahweh's anointed,
was taken in their pits,
he of whom we said, "Under his shadow
we shall live among the nations." (Lam. 4:20)

Loss of the Crown

Thou hast renounced the covenant with thy servant;
thou hast defiled his crown in the dust. (Ps. 89:40)

The crown has fallen from our head;
woe to us, for we have sinned!
For this our heart has become sick,
for these things our eyes have grown dim,
for Mount Zion which lies desolate;
jackals prowl over it.
(Lam. 5:16-18)

The Walls Have Been Broken - The King Scorned

Thou hast breached all his walls;
thou hast laid his strongholds in ruins.
All that pass by despoil him;
he has become the scorn of his neighbours. (Ps. 89:41-42)

The Lord has destroyed without mercy
all the habitations of Jacob;
in his wrath he has broken down
the strongholds of the daughter of Judah;
he has brought down to the ground in dishonour
the kingdom and its rulers.
(Lam. 2:2)

The Searching Lament and Appeal for Remembrance

Lord, where is thy steadfast love of old,
which by thy faithfulness thou didst swear to David?
Remember, O Lord, how thy servant is scorned;
how I bear in my bosom the insults of the peoples,
with which thy enemies taunt, O Yahweh,
with which they mock the footsteps of thy anointed. (Ps. 89: 50-52)

Why dost thou forget us for ever,
why dost thou so long forsake us?
Restore us to thyself, O Yahweh,
that we may be restored!
Renew our days as of old!
Or hast thou utterly rejected us?
Art thou exceedingly angry with us?
(Lam. 5:20-22)

The Re-affirmation of Faith

Blessed be Yahweh for ever!
Amen and Amen. (Ps. 89: 53)

But thou, O Yahweh, dost reign for ever;
thy throne endures to all generations. (Lam. 5: 19)

---

1. Cf. pg. 135, n. 3 above.

2. Indications that the "old time" promises of Psalm 89 were genuine reflections on promises that had been made to the Judaic king in the royal liturgy.

"OLD TIME" PROMISES IN PSALM 89	PROMISES IN THE ROYAL PSALMS
Of the Crown	
I have set the crown upon one who is mighty, I have exalted one chosen from the people. (Ps. 89:20)	For thou dost meet him with goodly blessings; thou dost set a crown of fine gold upon his head. (Ps. 21:3)
Of Divine Installation	
I have found David, my servant; with my holy oil I have anointed him; so that my hand shall ever abide with him, my arm shall strengthen him. (Ps. 89:21-22)	I have set my king on Zion, my holy hill. (Ps. 2:6) He made my feet like hinds' feet, and set me secure on the heights. (Ps. 18:33) Sit at my right hand. (Ps. 110:1)
Of Victory Over Enemies	
I will crush his foes before him and strike down those who hate him. (Ps. 89:24)	You shall break them with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. (Ps. 2:9) Now I know that Yahweh will help his anointed; he will answer him from his holy heaven with mighty victories by his right hand. (Ps. 20:7) Your hand will find out all your enemies; your right hand will find out those who hate you. (Ps. 21:8) Yahweh is at your right hand; he will shatter kings on the day of his wrath. (Ps. 110:5)
Of an Intimate, Paternal, and Protective Relationship	
He shall cry to me, "Thou art my Father, my God, and the Rock of my salvation." (Ps. 89:27)	I will tell of the decree of Yahweh: He said to me, "You are my son, today I have begotten you." (Ps. 2:7) Yahweh is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer, my God, my rock, in whom I take refuge, my shield, and the horn of my salvation, my stronghold. (Ps. 18:3)

Of the Eternal Covenant

My steadfast love I will keep for
him for ever,
and my covenant will stand firm
for him.
I will establish his line for ever
and his throne as the days of
the heavens. (Ps. 89:29-30)

Yahweh swore to David a sure oath
from which he will not turn back:
"One of the sons of your body
I will set on your throne.
If your sons keep my covenant
and my testimonies which I shall
teach them,
their sons also for ever
shall sit upon your throne."
(Ps. 132: 11-12)

APPENDIX B[1]

Gideon's victory over the Midianites. In Judges 7:15-25 there is found the well-known narrative of how the wily Gideon divides his company of men into three parties and leads them to victory over the Midianites. The core of the narrative runs as follows:

> So Gideon and the hundred men who were with him came to the outskirts of the camp at the beginning of the middle watch, when they had just set the watch; and they blew the trumpets and smashed the jars that were in their hands. And the three companies blew the trumpets and broke the jars, holding in their left hands the torches, and in their right hands the trumpets to blow; and they cried, "A sword for Yahweh and for Gideon!" They stood every man in his place round about the camp, and all the army ran; they cried out and fled.
>
> (Ju. 7:19-21)

Because there are repetitions in the tale and because the means employed to create panic in the enemy camp were so unusual, scholars are almost unanimous in suggesting that we must have in this account two (or three) interwoven tales (so Moore, Burney, Garstang, Hertzberg, etc.). Budde underlines the improbability of the text as it stands in the following words, "To carry a burning torch in a pitcher turned upside down over it requires two hands; thus there is no hand left for the trumpet, or vice-versa. In the same way it is impossible at once to blow a horn and to raise a battle-cry."[2] The explanation of the unusual nature of this part of the narrative is not, we submit, necessarily due to the interweaving of two separate accounts. The character of the narrative can be adequately explained on the supposition that we have here an aetiological legend which relates the supposed origin of a popular cultic ceremony. The various activities of Gideon's men were probably not carried out at the same time, but rather represent successive stages of the ceremony. The elements in that cultic ceremony appear to have been: (i) the blowing of trumpets; (ii) the symbolic smashing of pottery jars in which torches were held; (iii) the

---

1. Cf. pg. 264, n. 1.

2. Quoted in C. F. Burney's The Book of Judges, London, 1918, pg. 180 from pg. 60 of Budde's commentary.

utterance of the ceremonial cry, "A sword for Yahweh and for _____ (name of chieftain or king)!"; and (iv) the ritual slaying of enemy images with a sword.

The entire ceremony seems to have had the nature of an anticipation of Yahweh's heavenly judgement. The smashing of the jars was a simulation of thunder, the disclosure of the torches a simulation of lightning, the ritual slaying of images of enemies a dramatic portrayal of the downfall of Israel's foes which Yahweh's heavenly judgement augured. The cry, "A sword for Yahweh and for Gideon!" suggests that the use of the sword by Gideon and/or his men anticipated (and in a certain sense called forth) Yahweh's use of his sword (i.e., his lightning, cf. Gen. 3:24) in the same way that the king's use of his rod similarly anticipated and called forth Yahweh's heavenly action.[1]

If we are right in suggesting that Judges 7:15-25 is an aetiological legend to explain the origin of a given cultic ceremony, it is of interest to note that the ceremony was nocturnal, for torches were employed. In his imaginative study, Das Neujahrfest Jahwes (Laubhüttenfest), P. Volz took pains to establish the supposition that a good part of the celebrations at the Feast of Tabernacles took place at night.[2] Volz worked with late material (chiefly the Mishna and the New Testament) but was also able to call our attention to certain passages in the Old Testament which speak either clearly of celebrations by night (Isa. 30:29; Pss. 92:3; 57:9; 134:1) or indicate a special concern with light (I Kings 11:36; Ps. 18:29; Prov. 24:20; Ps. 118:27; etc.). Both S. Mowinckel[3] and H. Schmidt[4] underlined the correctness of Volz's observations, including within the cycle of their New Year psalms, Psalms 130 and 81. The former is obviously

---

1. Cf. pp. 254ff. and pp. 262ff.
2. Pp. 26ff.
3. Ps. St. II, pp. 91f.
4. Die Thronfahrt Jahves, pp. 25, 33ff.

appropriate for recitation at night (cf. Ps. 130:6), and the latter, Schmidt affirms, was sung on the night of the full moon (cf. Ps. 81:4).[1] The ceremony which underlies the narrative of Gideon's victory over the Midianites would therefore have stood near the beginning of a long line of Israelite ceremonies which were conducted after sundown.

---

1. Die Thronfahrt Jahves, pg. 35.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABEL, F. M. Géographie de la Palestine. Tome I, Paris, 1933. Tome II, 1938.

ALBRIGHT, WILLIAM FOXWELL. "A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology," JPOS I, 1921, pp. 49-79.

_____. "The Earliest Forms of Hebrew Verse," JPOS II, 1922, pp. 69-86.

_____. "Bronze Age Mounds of Northern Palestine and the Hauran: The Spring Trip of the School in Jerusalem," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 19, December 1924, pp. 5-19.

_____. "The Historical Background of Genesis XIV," JSOR X, 1926, pp. 231-269.

_____. "The Egyptian Empire in Asia in the Twenty-first Century B.C.," JPOS VIII, 1928, pp. 223-256.

_____. "The North-Canaanite Poems of Al ʾElyan Baʿal and the 'Gracious Gods,'" JPOS XIV, 1934, pp. 101-140.

_____. "The Names Shaddai and Abram," JBL LIV, 1935, pp. 173-204.

_____. "Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands," R. Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible, 21st American Ed., New York, 1936.

_____. From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process. 1st Ed., Baltimore, 1940. 2nd Ed., Baltimore, 1946.

_____. "New Egyptian Data on Palestine in the Patriarchal Age," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 81, 1941, pp. 16-21.

_____. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel. 1st Ed., Baltimore, 1942. 2nd Ed., 1946, 3rd Ed., 1953, 4th Ed., 1956.

_____. "The Land of Damascus Between 1850 and 1750 B.C.," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 83, 1941, pp. 30-36.

_____. The Archaeology of Palestine. 1st Ed., London, 1949. 2nd Ed., 1956.

_____. "Baal-Zephon," Festschrift für A. Bertholet. Tübingen, 1950, pp. 1-14.

_____. "The Old Testament World," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I, Nashville, 1952, pp. 233-271.

ALT, ALBRECHT. "Der Gott der Väter," BWANT III/12, Stuttgart, 1929. (Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Bd. I, Munich, 1953, pp. 1-78).

_____. "Die Wahlfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel," In piam memoriam Al. v. Bulmerincq, Abh. d. Herder-Inst. z. Riga, VI, 3, 1939. (Kleine Schriften, Bd. I, pp. 79-88).

_____. "Die phönikischen Inschriften von Karatepe," Die Welt des Orients. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Kunde des Morgenlandes herausg. Ernst Michel (Ed.), Heft 4, Stuttgart, 1949, pp. 272-287.

ALT, ALBRECHT. "Jesaja 8, 23-9,6: Befreiungsnacht und Kronungstag," Festschrift für A. Bertholet. Tübingen, 1950, pp. 29-49.

_____. "Das Königtum in den Reichen Israel und Juda," VT I, 1951, pp. 2-22. (Kleine Schriften, Bd. II, Munich, 1953, pp. 116-134).

AVIGNAD, NAHMAN and WADIN, YIGAIL. A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea. Jerusalem, 1956.

BACON, BENJAMIN WISNER. The Triple Tradition of Exodus. Hartford, 1894.

BALY, DENIS. The Geography of the Bible: A Study in Historical Geography. London, 1957.

BARDY, G. "Melchisédech dans la Tradition patristique," RB 1926, pp. 496-507; RB 1927, pp. 25-45.

BARNES, W. E. The Psalms. Westminster Commentaries. 2 Vols., London, 1931.

BARNSTEIN, HENRY. The Targum of Onkelos to Genesis. London, 1896.

BARR, JAMES. "Tradition and Expectation in Ancient Israel," Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 10, 1957, pp. 24-34.

BARTH, KARL. Die Kirkliche Dogmatik. Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes, Bd. I/1 , 7. Aufl., Zürich, 1955; Bd. I/II, 4. Aufl., 1948.

BARTON, GEORGE A. "A Liturgy for the Celebration of the Spring Festival at Jerusalem in the Age of Abraham and Melchizedek," JBL LIII, 1934, pp. 61-78.

BAUDISSIN, WOLF WILHELM GRAFEN. Die Geschichte des Alttestmentlichen Priesterthums. Leipzig, 1889.

BAUER, H. and LEANDER, P. Historische Grammatik der hebräischer Sprache des Alten Testaments, Bd. I, Halle, 1922.

BAUER, H. "Die Gottheiten von Ras Schamra," ZAW 10, Heft 2, 1933, pp. 81-101.

BAUER, THEO. Die Ostkanaanäer, Leipzig, 1926.

BEHM, JOHANNES. "ἄρτος", KThWB I, pp. 475f.

BENTZEN, AAGE. Die Josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen. Copenhagen, 1926.

_____. "Zur Geschichte der Sadokiden," ZAW 10, 1933, Heft 2, pp. 173-6.

_____. "The Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel," JBL LXVII, 1948, pp. 37-54.

_____. Introduction to the Old Testament. 2 Vols. 1st Ed., Copenhagen, 1948. 2nd Ed., 1952.

_____. King and Messiah. London, 1955.

BENZINGER, IMMANUEL. Die Bücher der Königs. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, K. Marti (Ed.), Leipzig, 1899.

_____. "Zur Quellenscheidung in Gen. 14," BZAW 41, 1925, pp. 21-27.

BERLINER, A. (Ed.). Targum Onkelos. Text nach editio Sabionets V.J. 1557.

BERTRAM, GEORGE. "ἔθνος" KThWB II, pp. 362-366.

BEYER, HERMANN WOLFGANG. "εὐλογέω, εὐλογητός, εὐλογία, ἐνευλογέω," KThWB II, pp. 751-763.

BIRKELAND, HARRIS. The Evildoers in the Book of Psalms. Oslo, 1955.

BLACK, MATTHEW. "The Messiah in the Testament of Levi XVIII," The Expository Times, Vol. LX, 1948-49, pp. 321f.; Vol. LXI, 1949-50, pp. 157f.

BOWIE, WALTER RUSSELL. "The Book of Genesis: Exposition," Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I, Nashville, 1952.

BRIGHT, JOHN. Early Israel in Recent History Writing. A Study in Method. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 19, London, 1956.

_____. A History of Israel. London, 1960.

BROOKS, ALAN ENGLAND and McLEAN, NORMAN (Edd.) The Old Testament in Greek. Vol. 1, The Octateuch. Part I, Genesis. Cambridge, 1906.

BROWN, FRANCIS, DRIVER, S.R., and BRIGGS, C.A. (Edd.) A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. 1st Ed., Oxford, 1907. Corrected Impression, 1952.

BRUNNER, EMIL. The Mediator. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia, 1947.

BUBER, MARTIN. Moses. Oxford, 1946.

_____. Right and Wrong. An Interpretation of Some Psalms. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith, London, 1952.

BUDDE, KARL. Das Buch der Richter. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, K. Marti (Ed.), Bd. VII, Leipzig, 1897.

BURNEY, C.F. The Book of Judges. London, 1918.

BURROWS, MILLAR. What Mean These Stones? The Significance of Archaeology for Biblical Studies. New Haven, 1941.

_____. The Dead Sea Scrolls. London, 1956.

_____. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. London, 1958.

BUSSE, EDUARD. Der Wein im Kult des Alten Testamentes. Freiburger Theologische Studien. Heft 29. Gottfried Hoberg (Ed.), Paderborn, 1922.

BUTTENWEISER, MOSES. The Psalms. Chronoligically Treated with a New Translation. Chicago, 1938.

BUTTRICK, GEORGE ARTHUR (Ed.). The Interpreter's Bible, Vols. I-XII, Nashville, 1952-57.

CARPENTER, J. ESTLIN and HARFORD, GEORGE. The Composition of the Hexateuch. London, 1902.

CAUSSE, A. Les Plus Vieux Chants de la Bible. Strasbourg, 1926.

CASPARI, D. WILHELM. Die Samuelbucher. Kommentar zum Alten Testament. E. Sillin (Ed.), Leipzig, 1926.

CAZELLES, H. "La Dîme Israélite et Les Textes de Ras Shamra," VT I, 1951, pp. 131-34.

CHARLES, R.H. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. 2 Vols. Oxford, 1913.

_____. The Assumption of Moses. Oxford, 1897.

CHURGIN, PINKHOS. Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. New Haven, 1907.

CLARK, OTHA L. "The Patriarchal Narratives in the Light of Today," The Journal of Bible and Religion, Vol. IX, 1941, pp. 94-97.

COLWELL, ERNEST CADMAN. The Study of the Bible. Chicago, 1937. Sixth Impression, 1950.

_____. "Biblical Criticism: Lower and Higher," JBL LXVII, 1948, pp. 1-12.

COOK, S.A. The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. II. The Egyptian and Hittite Empires to c. 1000 B.C. Cambridge, 1924.

CORNELIUS, FRIEDRICH. "Genesis XIV," ZAW 72, 1960, pp. 1-7.

CRAWLEY, A.E. "Dew," HERE IV, pp. 698-701.

DALMAN, GUSTAV. Jerusalem und sein Gelände. Gütersloh, 1930.

_____. Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina. Bd. IV. Brot, Oel und Wein. Schriften des Deutschen Palästina-Instituts. 7 Bd., 1935.

DANBY, HERBERT. The Mishnah. 1st Ed., 1933. Reprint, London, 1954.

DAVIDSON, A.B. Hebrew Syntax. Edinburgh, 1896.

_____. Biblical and Literary Essays. 2nd Ed., London, 1903.

_____. The Theology of the Old Testament. Edinburgh, 1904.

DEL MEDICO, H.E. "Melchisédech," ZAW 69, 1957, pp. 160-170.

DELITZSCH, FRANZ. A New Commentary on Genesis. Translated by S. Taylor. Vol. I, New York, 1889; Vol. II, 1894.

DELLA VIDA, G. LEVI. "El ʿElyon in Genesis 14:18-20," JBL 63, 1944, pp. 1-9.

DILLMANN, A. Die Genesis. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. 5. Aufl., Leipzig, 1886.

_____. Genesis, Critically and Exegetically Expounded. Two Vols. Translated by Wm. B. Stevenson, Edinburgh, 1897.

DODD, C.H. The Bible and the Greeks. London, 1935. Second Impression, 1954.

DRIVER, G.R. "The Psalms in the Light of Babylonian Research," The Psalmists. D. C. Simpson (Ed.), Oxford, 1926.

_____. "Hebrew Notes," ZAW 52, 1934, pp. 51-56.

_____. "Reflections on Recent Articles," JBL 73, 1954, pp. 125-136.

_____. Canaanite Myths and Legends. Edinburgh, 1956.

DRIVER, S.R. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Samuel. First Ed., Oxford, 1890. 2nd Ed., 1913.

_____. An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. International Theological Library. 1st Ed., Edinburgh, 1891; 9th Ed., 1913.

_____. Deuteronomy, ICC. 1st Ed., Edinburgh, 1895; 3rd Ed., 1908.

_____. The Book of Genesis. Westminster Commentaries. 1st Ed., London, 1904; 15th Ed., 1948.

_____. The Book of Exodus. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge, 1911. Reprint, 1953.

_____. Studies in the Psalms. Edited by C. F. Burney. London, 1915.

DUHM, BERNARD. Das Buch Jesaia. Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. W. Nowack (Ed.), 3. Aufl., Göttingen, 1914.

DUSSAUD, RENÉ. Les origines Canaanéennes du sacrifice israelite. Paris, 1921. Deuxième Edition, 1941.

_____. Les Decouvertes de Ras Shamra et l'Ancien Testament. Paris, 1937.

EERDMANS, B.D. Alttestamentliche Studien III, Das Buch Exodus. Giessen, 1910.

_____. The Hebrew Book of Psalms, Oudtestamentische Studiën, Deel IV, Leiden, 1947.

EICHRODT, WALTHER. Die Quellen der Genesis von Neuem Untersucht. Giessen, 1916.

_____. Theologie des Alten Testaments. 3 Vols. Leipzig, 1933-39.

_____. Men in the Old Testament. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 4. Translated by K. and R. Gregor Smith, Chicago, 1951.

EISSFELDT, OTTO. Baal Zaphon Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer. Beitr. z. Relig. gesch. des Altertums 1. Halle, 1932.

_____. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. 1. Aufl., Tübingen, 1934. 2. Aufl.. 1956.

_____. Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton. Halle, 1939.

_____. "El and Yahweh," Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. I, 1956, pp. 25-37.

EITAN, ISRAEL. "Two Onomatological Studies: 1. The Name Eve; 2. The Name Abraham," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 49, 1929, pp. 30-33.

ELLIGER, KARL. Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten II. ATD 25. 1. Aufl. Gottingen, 1949. 2. Aufl., 1951.

_____."Der Jakobskampf am Jabbok: Gen. 32, 22ff. als hermaneutisches Problem," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 48, 1951, pp. 1-31.

ENGNELL, IVAN. Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East. Uppsala, 1943.

ETHERIDGE, J.W. The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch. 2 Vols. London, 1862.

FARRAR, FREDERICK WILLIAM. History of Interpretation. New York, 1886.

FERRAR, W.J. "The Jewish Kingship and The Sacred Combat," Theology, Vol. XXXII, 1936, pp. 37-43.

FIELD, FREDERICK. Origenis Hexaplorum. 2 Vols. Oxford, 1875.

FINEGAN, JACK. Light from the Ancient Past. The Archaeological Background of the Hebrew Religion. Princeton, 1946.

FOERSTER, WERNER. "ἐχθρός, ἔχθρα," KThWB II, pp. 810-815.

FRANKFORT, HENRI. (Ed.). Before Philosophy. London, 1949.

_____. Kingship and the Gods. A Study of the Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature. Chicago, 1948.

FRAZER, JAMES GEORGE. Lectures on the Early History of Kingship. London,1905.

_____. Folklore in the Old Testament. Studies in Comparative Religion, Legend, and Law. London, 1923.

FREEDMAN, H. Seder Nashim, Nedarim. The Babylonian Talmud. London, 1936.

FREEDHMAN H. and SIMON, M. (Edd.) Midrash Rabbah. Vols. I-IX. London,1939.

FREY, HELLMUTH. Das Buch der Anfänge. Die Botschaft des Alten Testaments. 4 Vols. Stuttgart, 1935.

FRIEDLAENDER, M. "La Secte de Melchisédec et l'Épitre aux Hébreux," Revue des Études Juives, Tome V, 1882, pp. 1-26; Tome VI, 1883, pp. 187-199.

FRIEDRICH, GERHARD. (Ed.) Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, begrundet von G. Kittel. Bd. V, 1954.

GADD, C.J. Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East. The Schweich Lectures 1945. London, 1948.

GARBER, [illegible] L. "Reconsidering the Reconstruction of Solomon's Temple," JBL XXXVII, 1958, pp. 123ff.

GARRETT, T.S. "Recent Biblical Studies and Their Doctrinal Implications," Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 7, pp. 225ff.

GARSTANG, JOHN. Joshua-Judges. The Foundations of Bible History. London,1931.

GASSNER, JEROME. The Canon of the Mass. Its History, Theology and Art. London, 1949.

GASTER, THEODOR H. "Psalm 110," JMUEOS XXI, 1937, pp. 37-44.

_____. Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East, New York, 1950.

_____. New Year: Its History, Customs and Superstitions. New York, 1955.

GEHMAN, HENRY S. "Ἅγιος in the Septuagint, and its Relation to the Hebrew Original," VT IV, 1954, pp. 337-348.

GIFFORD, E.H. (Ed.) Eusebii Preparatio Evangelica. Vols. I-IV. Oxford, 1903.

GIRDLESTONE, ROBERT BAKER. Synonyms of the Old Testament. 2nd Ed., London, 1897.

GLUECK, NELSON. The Other Side of the Jordan. New Haven, 1940.

_____. "The Age of Abraham in the Negeb," BA XVIII, 1955, pp. 2-9.

_____. "The Seventh Season of Archaeological Exploration in the Negeb," Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research, No. 152, December 1958, pp. 18-38.

GOFF, BEATRICE L. "Syncretism in the Religion of Israel," JBL LVIII, 1939, pp. 151-162.

GOODENOUGH, EDWIN R. "Kingship in Early Israel," JBL XLVIII, 1929, pp. 169-205.

GOTTWALD, NORMAN K. Studies in the Book of Lamentations. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 14. London, 1954.

GRAY, G. BUCHANAN. "The References to the 'King' in the Psalter in their Bearing on Questions of Date and Messianic Belief," Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. VII, 1895, pp. 658-686.

_____. Studies in Hebrew Proper Names. London, 1896.

_____. Numbers. ICC. Edinburgh, 1903.

_____. Sacrifice in the Old Testament, Its Theory and Practice. Oxford, 1925.

GRAY, JOHN. "The Rephaim," PEQ 1949, pp. 127-139.

_____. "Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice," VT II, 1952, pp. 193-220.

_____. "The Desert Sojourn of the Hebrews and the Sinai-Horeb Tradition," VT IV, 1954, pp. 149f.

GRELOT, P. "Notes sur le Testament araméen de Levi," RB 1956, pp. 391-406.

GRESSMANN, H. "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen," ZAW 30, 1910, pp. 1-34.

_____. Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels (von Samuel bis Amos und Hosea). Die Schriften des Alten Testaments, Teil II, Bd. I, Göttingen, 1910.

_____. Mose und seine Zeit. Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen. Forschung zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 1. Göttingen, 1913.

_____. Die Anfänge Israels (von 2. Mosis bis Richter und Ruth). Die Schriften des Alten Testaments, Teil I, Bd. 2. Göttingen, 1914.

_____. "The Development of Hebrew Psalmody," The Psalmists. D. C. Simpson (Ed.), Oxford, 1926, pp. 1-21.

_____. "Amalekiter," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Bd. I, Tübingen, 2. Aufl., 1927, col. 289.

GROLLENBERG, L. H. Atlas of the Bible. Translated and Edited by Joyce M. H. Reid and H. H. Rowley. London, 1956.

GUNKEL, HERMANN. The Legends of Genesis. Translated by W. H. Carruth. Chicago, 1901.

_____. Genesis. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. W. Nowack (Ed.). 3 Aufl., Göttingen, 1910. 4. Aufl., 1917. 5. Aufl., 1922.

_____. Ausgewählte Psalmen. 2. Aufl., Göttingen, 1905.

_____. What Remains of the Old Testament, and other Essays. Translated by Rev. A. K. Dallas. London, 1928.

_____. "Melchisedek," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Bd. III, 2. Aufl., Tübingen, 1929, col. 2083.

_____. "Psalmen," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Bd. IV, Tübingen, 2. Aufl. 1930, cols. 1610-1627.

GUNKEL, HERMAN and BEGRICH, JOACHIM. Einleitung in die Psalmen. Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels. Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen, 1933.

GRØNBECH, VILHELM. The Culture of the Teutons. 2 Vols. Copenhagen, 1931. Translated into English from Vor folkeoet i altiden I-IV, Copenhagen, 1909-1912.

HALDAR, A. Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites. (Dissertation). Uppsala, 1945.

HARDEN, J. M. Psalterium Iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi. Edited with Introduction and apparatus criticus. London, 1922.

HARDY, E.R. Jr. "The Date of Psalm 110," JBL LXIV, 1945, pp. 385-390.

HARLAND, J. PENROSE. "Sodom and Gomorrah: I. The Location of the Cities of the Plain," BA V, No. 2., May 1942, pp. 17-22.

_____. "Sodom and Gomorrah: II. The Destruction of the Cities of the Plain," BA VI, No. 3., September 1943, pp. 41-54.

HASTINGS, JAMES. (Ed.). A Dictionary of the Bible. Vols. I-V. Edinburgh, 1898-1904.

_____. (Ed.). Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Vols. I-XIII. Edinburgh, 1908-1926.

HATCH, EDWIN and REDPATH, HENRY A. A Concordance to the Septuagint. Vols. I-II. Oxford, 1897. (Photo reprint, Graz, Austria, 1954).

HEBERT, A.G. The Authority of the Old Testament. London, 1947.

HEINISCH, PAUL. Das Buch Genesis. Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes, Bd. I. Franz Feldmann and Heinr. Herkenne (Edd.), Bonn, 1930.

HERTZ, J.H. The Pentateuch and Haftorahs. London, 1929.

HERTZBERG, HANS WILHELM. "Die Melkisedeq-Traditionen," JPOS VIII, 1928, pp. 169-179.

_____. "Mizpa," ZAW 47, 1929, pp. 161ff.

_____. Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth. ATD 9. Göttingen, 1953.

_____. Die Samuelbucher. ATD 10. Gottingen, 1956.

_____. Der Erste Jesaja. Bibel Hilfe für die Gemeinde, E. Stange (Ed.). 2. Aufl., Kassel, 1952.

HIRSCH, EMIL G. " 'Shemoneh 'Esreh," JE XI, pp. 270-282.

HOLLIS, F.J. "The Sun-Cult and the Temple at Jerusalem," Essay V, Myth and Ritual. S. H. Hooke (Ed.). London, 1933, pp. 87-110.

HOLZINGER, H. Genesis. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, Teil I. K. Marti (Ed.). Freiburg, 1898.

HOOKE, S.H. (Ed.). Myth and Ritual. Essays on the Myth and Ritual of the Hebrews in relation to the Culture Pattern of the Ancient East. London, 1933.

_____. (Ed.). The Labyrinth. Further Studies in the Relation between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World. London, 1935.

_____. The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual. London, 1938.

_____. The Siege Perilous. Essays in Biblical Anthropology. London, 1956.

_____. (Ed.). Myth, Ritual, and Kingship. Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel. Oxford, 1958.

HOROWITZ, S. "Midrash," JE VIII, New York, 1904, pp. 548-550.

HYATT, J. PHILIP. "Yahweh as 'The God of My Father,'" VT V, 1955, pp. 130-136.

JACOB, B. Das erste Buch der Tora, Genesis. Berlin, 1934.

JACOB, EDMOND. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock. London, 1958.

JAMES. E.O. The Nature and Function of Priesthood: A Comparative and Anthropological Study. London, 1955.

JARITZ, KURT. "Wer is Amraphel in Gen. 14?" ZAW 70, 1958, pp. 255f.

JASTROW, MORRIS Jr. Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens. 2 Bände. 2. Aufl., Giessen, 1905-1912.

JEFFERSON, HELEN G. "Is Psalm 110 Canaanite?" JBL LXXII, 1954, pp. 152-156.

JEREMIAS, ALFRED. The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East: Manual of Biblical Archaeology. Eng. Ed. translated from the Second German Edition by C. L. Beaumont. C. H. W. Johns (Ed.). Vol. II. London, 1911.

_____. Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients. 4. Aufl., Leipzig, 1930.

JEROME, FRANZ JOSEF. Das geschichtliche Melchisedech-Bild und seine Bedeutung im Hebräerbriefe. (Dissertation). Freiburg, 1920.

JIRKU, A. "Zum historischen Stil von Gen. 14," ZAW 39, 1921, pp. 313f.

_____. "Neues keilinschriftliches Material zum Alten Testament," ZAW 39, 1921, pp. 144-160.

JOHNSON, AUBREY R. "The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," The Labyrinth. S. H. Hooke (Ed.)., London, 1935, pp. 71-111.

_____. The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God. Cardiff, 1942.

_____. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel. Cardiff, 1949.

_____. "Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship: Divine Kingship and the Old Testament," The Expository Times, Vol. LXII, 1950-1, pp. 36-42.

_____. "The Psalms," The Old Testament and Modern Study. H. H. Rowley (Ed.). Oxford, 1951, pp. 162-209.

_____. Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel. Cardiff, 1955.

_____. "Old Testament Exegesis, Imaginative and Unimaginative (A Reply to Professor McCullough's article, 'Israel's Kings, Sacral and Otherwise'), The Expository Times, Vol. LXVIII, March 1957, pp. 178f.

_____. "Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship," Myth, Ritual, and Kingship. S. H. Hooke (Ed.). Oxford, 1958, pp. 204-235.

de JONGE, M. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin. Assen, 1953.

JUDGE, H. G. "Aaron, Zadok, and Abiathar," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. VII, Part I, April 1956, pp., 70-74.

JUNKER, HUBERT. Das Buch Deuteronomium. Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes, Bd. II. Franz Feldmann and Heinr. Herkenne (Edd.). Bonn, 1933.

KAHLE, PAUL E. The Cairo Geniza. The Schweich Lectures 1941. Oxford, 1947.

KAUTZSCH, E. (Ed.). Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Second English Edition. A. E. Cowley (Ed.). Oxford, 1910. (Photo reprint, 1949).

KEET, C.C. A Liturgical Study of the Psalter. A Consideration of Some Liturgical and Ceremonial Aspects of Jewish Worship Exhibited in the Book of Psalms. London, 1928.

KENNEDY, A.R.S. "Showbread," HDB IV, Edinburgh, 1906, pp. 495-497.

KENNEDY, GERALD THOMAS. St. Paul's Conception of the Priesthood of Melchizedech: An Historico-Exegetical Investigation. (Dissertation). Washington, 1951.

KENNEDY, JAMES An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament. H. Levison (Ed.). Edinburgh, 1928.

KIRKPATRICK, A.F. The Book of Psalms. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. 1st Ed., 1902. Reprinted 1916. Cambridge, 1916.

KITTEL, GERHARD (Ed.). [illegible]logisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Bände I-IV, Stuttgart, 1933-1942.

_____. "ἄγγελος im NT," KTbWB I, 1933, pp. 81-87.

KITTEL, RUDOLPH. A History of the Hebrews. 2 Vols. English translation by John Taylor. Edinburgh, 1895-96.

_____. Die Psalmen, übersetzt und erklärt. 1. u. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, 1914.

_____. Geschichte des Volkes Israel. Bd. I, 5. u. 6. Aufl. Gotha, 1923.

_____. Great Men and Movements in Israel. Authorized Translation by Charlotte A. Knoch and C. D. Wright. New York, 1929.

_____ (Ed.). Biblia Hebraica, 3. Aufl., Stuttgart, 1950.

KISSANE, EDWARD J. The Book of Isaiah, Vol. I (I-XXXIX). Dublin, 1941. Vol. II (XL-LXVI), 1943.

_____. The Book of Psalms. Vol. I (Psalms 1-72). Dublin, 1953. Vol. II (Psalms 73-150), 1954.

KJAER, HANS. "The Excavation of Shiloh, 1929, Preliminary Report," JPOS X, 1930, pp. 87-174.

KLAUSNER, JOSEPH. The Messianic Idea in Israel from Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah. Translated from the Third Hebrew Edition by W. F. Stinespring. London, 1956.

KOEHLER, LUDWIG and BAUMGARTNER, WALTER. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. A Dictionary of the Hebrew Old Testament in English and German. A Dictionary of the Aramaic Parts of the Old Testament in English and German. Leiden, 1953.

KOEHLER, LUDWIG. Old Testament Theology. Translated by A. S. Todd from the Third Revised Edition of 1953. London, 1957.

KOHLER, KAUFMAN. "Circumcision," JE IV, New York, 1903, pp. 92-96.

_____. "Melchizedek," JE VIII, New York, 1904, pg. 450.

KÖNIG, EDUARD. "Number," HDB III, 6th Impr., Edinburgh, 1906, pp. 561-567.

_____. Das Deuteronium: Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Bd. III. E. Sellin (Ed.). Leipzig, 1917.

_____. Die Genesis. Gütersloh, 1919.

KRAELING, E.G. Bible Atlas. New York, 1956.

KRAUS, HANS JOACHIM. "Gilgal: Ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels," VT I, 1951, pp. 181-199.

_____. Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie. G. Ebeling (Ed.) Tübingen, 1951.

_____. "Das Problem der Heilsgeschichte in der 'Kirkliche Dogmatik.'" Antwort, Festschrirt zum siebzigsten Geburtstag von Karl Barth. Zürich, 1956, pp. 69-83.

_____. Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart. Hamburg, 1956.

KRAUSS, SAMUEL. "Flavius Josephus," JE VII, New York, 1904, pp. 274-281.

KROEZE, J. H. Genesis Veertien: een exegetisch-historische Studie. (Dissertation). Leiden, 1937.

LABAT, R. Le Caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne. Paris, 1939.

LABOURT, JEROME. Saint Jérôme Lettres. 4 Tomes. Paris, 1949.

LAGARDE, PAUL de. Psalterium, Iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi. Leipzig, 1894.

LANDERSDORFER, S. "Das Priesterkönigtum von Salem," JSOR IX, 1925, pp. 203-216.

LAUTERBACH, JACOB ZALLEL. "Midrash Halakah," JE VIII, New York, 1904, pp. 569-572.

_____. "Talmud Hermeneutics," JE XII, New York, 1906, pp. 30-33.

LESLIE, ELMER A. The Psalms. Translated and Interpreted in the Light of Hebrew Life and Worship. Nashville, 1949.

LEWY, JULIUS. "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament," RHR 110, 1934, pp. 29-65.

_____. "The Šulmân Temple in Jerusalem," JBL LIX, 1940, pp. 519-522.

LIDDELL, HENRY GEORGE and SCOTT, ROBERT. A Greek-English Lexicon. 2 Vols. 9th Ed., Oxford, 1951.

LØKKEGAARD, F. "Some Comments on the Sanchuniaton Tradition," Studia Theologica, Vol. VIII, Fasc. II, 1954, pp. 51-76.

LUEKEN, WILHELM. Michael. Eine Darstellung und Vergleichung der judischen und der morgenlandisch-christlichen Tradition vom Erzengel Michael. Göttingen, 1898.

MACALISTER, A. "Bread," HDB I, Edinburgh, 1898, pp. 315-319.

_____. "Food," HDB II, Edinburgh, 1899, pp. 27-43.

MACKAY, CAMERON. "Salem," PEQ 1948-49, pp. 121-130.

MAISLER, BENJAMIN. "Das Vordavidsche Jerusalem," JPOS X, 1930, pp. 181-191.

MANDELKERN, SOLOMON. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae. Photo reprint of the 1937 Ed. Graz, Austria, 1955.

MARTI, KARL. Religion of the Old Testament. Eng. Tr. New York, 1907.

MAY, HERBERT G. "The Patriarchal Idea of God," JBL LX, 1941, pp. 113-128.

_____. "The God of My Father -- a Study of Patriarchal Religion," Journal of Bible and Religion, Vol. IX, 1941, pp. 155-158.

McCULLOUGH, W. STEWART. "The Book of Psalms," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. IV. Nashville, 1955.

_____. "Israel's Kings, Sacral and Otherwise," The Expository Times, Vol. LXVIII, February 1957, pp. 144-148.

McINTYRE, JOHN. The Christian Doctrine of History. Edinburgh, 1957.

McNEILE, A.H. The Book of Exodus. Westminster Commentaries. London, 1908.

MEEK, THEOPHILE JAMES. Hebrew Origins. 1st Ed., New York, 1936. Rev. Ed., 1950.

MEINHOLD, JOHANNES. 1. Mose 14. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung, BZAW XXII. Giessen, 1911.

MEISSNER, BRUNO. Babylonien und Assyrien. Bd. I. Heidelberg, 1920. Bd. II, 1925.

MENDENHALL, GEORGE E. "Mari," BA XI, February 1948, No. 1.

MICHEL, O. "Μελχισεδέκ," KTbWB IV, Stuttgart, 1942, pp. 573-75.

MOHLENBRINK, KURT. "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua," ZAW 56, 1938, pp. 238-268.

MONTGOMERY, JAMES A. The Books of Kings. ICC. Henry Snyder Gehman (Ed.). Edinburgh, 1951.

MOORE, GEORGE F. Judges. ICC. Edinburgh, 1895.

MORGENSTERN, JULIAN. "The Divine Triad in Biblical Mythology," JBL LXIV, 1945, pp. 15-37.

MORITZ, B. "Edomitische Genologien, I," ZAW 44, 1926, pp. 81-93.

MOWINCKEL, SIGMUND. Psalmenstudien I. Åwän und Die Individuellen Klagepsalmen. SNVAO. Hist.-Filos. Klasse II. 1921, No. 4. Kristiania, 1921.

_____. Psalmenstudien II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie. SNVAO. Hist.-Filos. Klasse II, 1921, No. 6. Kristiania, 1922.

_____. Psalmenstudien III. Kultprophetie und Prophetische Psalmen. SNVAO. Hist.-Filos. Klasse II. 1922, No. 1. Kristiania, 1923.

_____. Psalmenstudien IV. Die Technischen Termini in den Psalmen-Überschriften. SNVAO. Hist.-Filos. Klasse II, 1922, No. 2. Kristiania, 1923.

_____. Psalmenstudien V. Segen und Fluch in Israels Kult und Psalmdichtung. SNVAO. Hist.-Filos. Klasse II, 1923, No. 3. Kristiania, 1924.

_____. Psalmenstudien VI. Die Psalmdichter. SNVAO. Hist.-Filos. Klasse II, 1924, No. 1. Kristiania, 1924.

_____. "Die letzten Worte Davids: II Sam. 23 1-7," ZAW 45, 1927, pp. 30-58.

_____. "Die Komposition des Jesajabuches Kap. 1-39," Acta Orientalia, 1933, pp. 267-292.

_____. "Psalm Criticism Between 1900 and 1935 (Ugarit and Psalm Exegesis)," VT V, 1955, pp. 13-33.

_____. He That Cometh. The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Oxford, 1956.

_____. Zum israelitischen Neujahr und zur Deutung der Thronbesteigungspsalmen. Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1952, No. 2. Oslo, 1952.

MUILENBURG, JAMES. "Mizpah of Benjamin," Studia Theologica, Vol. VIII, Fasc. I. Lund, 1955, pp. 25-42.

_____. "The History of the Religion of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I. Nashville, 1952, pp. 292-348.

NAGELE, P. JOHANNES. 'Sichems Zerstörung durch Abimelech," JPOS XII, 1932, pp. 152-161.

NIELSEN, EDUARD. Oral Tradition. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 11. London, 1954.

_____."The Burial of the Foreign Gods," Studia Theologica, Vol. VIII, Fasc. II. Lund, 1954, pp. 103-122.

_____. Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation. (Dissertation). Copenhagen, 1955.

NÖLDEKE, THEODOR. Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments. Kiel, 1869.

NORTH, CHRISTOPHER R. "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," ZAW 50, 1932, pp. 8-38.

_____. The Old Testament Interpretation of History. London, 1946. Reprint, 1953.

_____. "The Essence of Idolatry," Von Ugarit Nach Qumren. O. Eissfeldt Festschrift, J. Hempel and L. Rost (Edd.). Berlin, 1958, pp. 151-160.

NOTH, MARTIN. Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. BWANT 111/10. Stuttgart, 1928.

_____. Das Buch Josua. HAT 7. 1. Aufl., Tübingen, 1937. 2. Aufl., 1953.

_____. Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I. Die Sammelnden und Bearbeitendenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament. Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, 18. Jahr. Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, Heft 2. Halle, 1943.

_____. Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch. Stuttgart, 1948.

_____. Geschichte Israels. Göttingen, 1950.

_____. Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament. Theolgische Bucherei 6. München, 1957.

_____. The History of Israel. Eng. Tr. London, 1958.

NYBERG, H.S. "Studien zum Religionskampf im Alten Testament -- I. Der Gott ʿAl: Belege und Bedeutung des Namans. II. Geschichte des Gottes ʿAl im Alten Testament," ARW XXXV, 1938, pp. 329-387.

O'CALLAGHAN, ROGER T. "Echoes of Canaanite Literature in the Psalms," VT IV, 1954, pp. 164-176.

OESTERLEY, W.O.E. A History of Israel. Vol. II. From the Fall of Jerusalem, 586 B.C. to the Bar-Kokhba Revolt, AD. 135. Oxford, 1932.

_____. The Psalms. 2 Vols. London, 1939.

_____. "Early Hebrew Festival Rituals," Myth and Ritual, S. H. Hooke (Ed.). London, 1933, pp. 111-146.

von PÁKOZDY, LADISLAS MARTIN. "Theologische Redaktionsarbeit in der Bileam-Perikope (Num. 22-24)," Von Ugarit Nach Qumran. O. Eissfeldt Festschrift, Berlin, 1958, pp. 161-176.

PATERSON, W. P. "Sacrifice, HDB IV, Edinburgh, 1902, pp. 329-349.

PATTON, JOHN HASTINGS. Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms. Baltimore, 1944.

PEAKE, A.S. "Tithe," HDB IV, Edinburgh, 1902, pp. 780f.

PEDERSEN, JOHANNES. Der Eid bei den Semiten. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orient. Zwanglose Beihefte zu der Zeitschrift "Der Islam." C. H. Becker (Ed.), Strasbourg, 1914.

_____. Israel -- Its Life and Culture I-II, Copenhagen, 1926 (Fotoprint 1946). III-IV, 1940 (Fotoprint 1947).

PETUCHOWSKI, JAKOB J. "The Controversial Figure of Melchizedek," Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXXVIII, 1957, pp. 127-136.

PFEIFFER, ROBERT H. "A Non-Israelite Source of the Book of Genesis," ZAW NF 7, 1930, pp. 66-73.

_____. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York, 1941. Rev. Ed., 1948.

_____. History of New Testament Times. With an Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York, 1949.

PODECHARD, E. Le Psautier II. Psaumes 76-100 et 110. Lyon, 1954.

POPE, MARVIN H. El in the Ugaritic Texts. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. II. Leiden, 1955.

PORTECUS, NORMAN W. "Shalem-Shalom," Glasglow University Oriental Society Transactions, Vol. X, 1940-41, pp. 1-7.

POSENER, G. Prince et pays d'Asie et de Nubie. Textes hiératiques sur des figurines d'envoûtement du Moyen Empire. Brussels, 1940.

PRITCHARD, JAMES B. (Ed.). Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Princeton, 1950. 2nd Ed., 1955.

_____. (Ed.). The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament, Princeton, 1954.

PROCKSCH, OTTO. Die Genesis. Kommentar zum Alten Testament. E. Sellin (Ed.). Bd. IX, Leipzig, 1930.

PUUKKO, A.F. "Der Feind in Den Alttestamentlichen Psalmen," Oudtestamentamentische Studiën, Deel VIII, Leiden, 1950, pp. 48-65.

RABIM, CHAIM. The Zadokite Documents. Oxford, 1954.

von RAD, GERHARD. " מַלְאָךְ im AT," KThWB I, Stutgart, 1933. pp. 75-9.

_____. "מֶלֶךְ und מַלְכוּת im AT," KThWB I, Stuttgart, 1933, pp. 563-569.

_____. Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch literarisch untersucht und theologisch gewertet. Beitrage zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament. A. Alt und G. Kittel (Edd.). 4. Folge, Heft 13. Stuttgart, 1934.

von RAD, GERHARD. Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament. R. Kittel (Ed.). 4. Folge, Heft 26. Stuttgart, 1938.

_____. "Erwägungen zu den Königspsalmen," ZAW 57, 1940-41, pp. 216-222.

_____. "Das jüdische Königsritual," Theologische Literaturzeitung 72, 1947, cols. 211-216.

_____. Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, No. 20. W. Eichrodt and O. Cullmann (Edd.). Zürich, 1951.

_____. Studies in Deuteronomy. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 9. London, 1953.

_____. Das erste Buch Mose. Genesis Kapitel 1-12,9,4. Aufl., ATD 2, Göttingen, 1956. Genesis Kapitel 12,10 - 25,18, ATD 3, 1952. Genesis Kapitel 25,19 - 50,26, ATD 4, 1953.

RAHLFS, ALFRED. (Ed.). Septuaginta. 2 Vols. 5. Aufl., Stuttgart, 1952.

REID, J. K. S. The Authority of Scripture: A Study of the Reformation and Post Reformation Understanding of the Bible. London, 1957.

RICHARDSON, ALAN and SCHWEITZER, W. (Edd.). Biblical Authority for Today. London, 1951.

RINGGREN, HELMER. Word and Wisdom. Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East. (Dissertation). Lund, 1947.

_____. The Messiah in the Old Testament. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 18, London, 1956.

RIST, MARTIN. "The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: a Liturgical and Magical Formula," JBL LVII, 1938, pp. 289ff.

ROBERTS, BLEDDYN J. The Old Testament Text and Versions. Cardiff, 1951.

ROBINSON, H. WHEELER. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. London, 1913.

_____. Deuteronomy and Joshua. The New Century Bible. Oxford. Not dated.

_____. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford, 1946.

ROBINSON, THEODORE H. A History of Israel. Vol. I, From the Exodus to the Fall of Jerusalem, 586 B.C. Oxford, 1932.

_____. "Some Principles of Hebrew Metrics," ZAW 54, 1936, pp. 28-43.

ROTHSTEIN, J. WILHELM. "Die ältere Schicht (J:1) in der jahwistischen Ueberlieferung der Urgeschichte," BZAW 41, 1925, pp. 238-252.

ROWLEY, H. H. "Zadok and Nehustan," JBL LVIII, 1939, pp. 113-142.

_____. The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament. 3rd Impr., London, 1945.

_____. From Joseph to Joshua. Biblical Traditions in the Light of Archaeology." The Schweich Lectures 1948. London, 1950.

ROWLEY, H. H. "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen. 14 and Ps. 110)," Festschrift für A. Bertholet. Tübingen, 1950, pp. 461-472.

_____. (Ed.). The Old Testament and Modern Study: A Generation of Discovery and Research. Oxford, 1951.

_____. The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament. London, 1952.

_____. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford, 1952.

_____. "Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets," Myth, Ritual and Kingship. S. H. Hooke (Ed.). Oxford, 1958, pp. 236-260.

RUDOLPH, WILHELM. Chronikbücher. HAT 21. Tübingen, 1955.

RYLAARSDAM, J. COERT. The Book of Exodus. The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I. Nashville, 1952, pp. 831-1099.

RYLE, H. E. "Abraham," BDB I, Edinburgh, 1898, pp. 13-17.

_____. The Book of Genesis. The Cambridge Bible. Cambridge, 1921.

SASSE, HERMANN. "αἰών," KThWB I, Stuttgart, 1933, pp. 197-209.

de SAVIGNAC, JEAN. "Essai d'Interprétation du Psaume CX à l'Aide de la Littérature Égyptienne," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Deel IX, Leiden, 1951, pp. 107-135.

SAYCE, A. M. "Melchizedek," HDB III, Edinburgh, 1900, pg. 335.

SCHLATTER, ADOLPH. Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas. Stuttgart, 1893.

SCHMIDT, HANS. Die Thronfahrt Jahves. Sammlung Gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte 122. Tübingen, 1927.

SCHRENK, GOTTLOB. "Ἱερεύς, Ἀρχιερεύς," KThWB III, Stuttgart, 1938, pp. 257-286.

SCHWAB, MOSES. The Talmud of Jerusalem. Translated for the first time by Dr. Moses Schwab. Vol. I. Berakhoth. London, 1886.

SCOTT, R. B. Y. "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," JBL 58, 1939, pp. 143-149.

SEESEMANN, HEINRICH. "οἶνος," KThWB V, Stuttgart, 1954, pp. 163-167.

SELIGSOHN, MAX. "Shem--In Rabbinical Literature," JE XI, New York, 1905. pp. 261f.

SELLIN, E. "Melchisedek: Ein Beitrag zu der Geschichte Abrahams," Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift XVI, 1905, pp. 929-951.

SETHE, KURT. "Die Aechtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf ältägyptischen Töngefassscherben des Mittleren Reiches. Nach den Originalen im Berliner Museum," APAW, Philos.-Histor. Klasse 1926, Nr. 5.

SIEGFRIED, CARL. "Philo Judaeus," JE X, New York, 1905, pp. 6-15.

SIEVERS, EDUARD. Metrische Studien II. Die Hebräische Genesis. Leipzig, 1904.

SIMON, M. "Melchisédech dans la polémique entre juifs et chrétiens et dans la légende," RHPR 1937, pp. 58-93.

SIMONS, J. Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories. Leiden, 1952.

_____. "Topographical Elements in the Story of Abimelech," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Deel II, 1943, pp. 35-78.

SIMPSON, CUTHBERT AIKMAN. The Early Traditions of Israel: A Critical Analysis of the Pre-deuteronomic Narrative of the Hexateuch. Oxford, 1948.

_____. "The Growth of the Hexateuch," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I, Nashville, 1952, pp. 185-200.

_____. "The Book of Genesis: Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I, Nashville, 1952, pp. 437-829.

SIMPSON, D. C. (Ed.). The Psalmists. Oxford, 1926.

SKINNER, JOHN. Genesis. ICC. 1st Ed., New York, 1910. Rev. Ed., 1925.

_____. The Divine Names in Genesis. London, 1914.

_____. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, Chapters I-XXXIX. The Cambridge Bible. Cambridge, 1915.

SLOTKI, ISRAEL W. Sukkah, Seder Mo'ed. The Babylonian Talmud. London, 1938.

SMITH, GEORGE ADAM. The Historical Geography of the Holy Lend. 1st Ed., London, 1894. 25th Ed., 1931.

_____. The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Vol. I. 1st Ed., Edinburgh, 1896. Rev. Ed., 1928.

SMITH, HENRY PRESERVED. The Books of Samuel. ICC. Edinburgh, 1899.

SMITH, W. ROBERTSON. Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. The Fundamental Institutions. 1st Ed., London, 1889. Rev. Ed., 1894. Reprinted, 1907.

SNAITH, NORMAN H. Studies in the Psalter. London, 1934.

_____. The Psalms: A Short Introduction. Study Notes on Bible Books. London, 1945.

_____. The Jewish New Year Festival -- Its Origin and Development. London, 1947.

_____. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. Sixth Impression, London, 1955. First published, 1944.

_____. "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," VT VII, 1957, pp. 308-317.

STEUERNAGEL, CARL. Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Tübingen, 1912.

STRACK, HERMANN L. Die Genesis. Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments sowie zu den Apokryphen. H. Strack and O. Zöckler (Edd.). Heft 1. Munich, 1905.

SWETE, HENRY BARCLAY. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. 1st Ed., Cambridge, 1900. 2nd Ed., 1902.

TERRIEN, SAMUEL. The Psalms and their Meaning for Today. New York, 1952.

THEODOR, J. "Bereshit Rabbah," JE III, New York, 1902, pp. 62-65.

_____. "Midrash Haggadah," JE VIII, New York, 1904, pp. 550-569.

_____. "Midrashim, Smaller," JE VIII, New York, 1904, pp. 572-580.

THIELE, EDWIN R. The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings. A Reconstruction of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Chicago, 1951.

THOMAS, D. WINTON. "Jerusalem in the Lachish Ostraca," PEQ 1946, pp. 86-91.

TILLICH, PAUL. Biblical Religion and the Search for Ultimate Reality. Chicago, 1955.

_____. Systematic Theology. Vol. I, Chicago, 1951. Vol. II, London, 1957.

TISSERANT, S.E. (et. al.) Abraham: Père des Croyants. Paris, 1952.

TORRANCE, THOMAS F. Royal Priesthood. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 3. Edinburgh, 1955.

TORREY, CHARLES CUTLER. The Apocryphal Literature. A Brief Introduction. New Haven, 1946.

_____. "A Hebrew Fragment of Jubilees," JBL LXXI, 1952, pp. 39-41.

TOURNAY, R. "Recherches sur la chronologie des Psaumes," RB 1958, pp. 321-357; 1959, pp. 161-190.

TSEVAT, MATITIAHU. "The Canaanite God Šălaḥ," VT IV, 1954, pp. 41-49.

de VAUX, R. "Les Patriarches Hébreux et les Découvertes Modernes (1)," RB LIII, 1946, pp. 321-348; (2) RB LV, 1948, pp. 321-347.

VINCENT, L.H. "Abraham à Jerusalem," RB LVIII, 1951, pp. 360-371.

VINCENT, L.H. and STÈVE, A.M. Jérusalem de l'ancien testament. Tome I. Paris, 1954. Tome II, 1956.

VOIGHT, EDWIN E. "The Site of Nob," JPOS 3, 1923, pp. 79-87.

VOLZ, PAUL. Das Neujahrfest Jahwes (Laubhüttenfest). Tübingen, 1912.

_____. "Ein Arbeitsplan für die Textkritik des Alten Testaments," ZAW 54, 1936, pp. 100-113.

WALKER, NORMAN. "Israel," VT IV, 1954, pg. 434.

_____. "The Date of Deuteronomy," VT III, 1953, pp. 413f.

_____. "A New Interpretation of the Divine Name 'Shaddai,'" ZAW 72, 1960, pp. 64-66.

WEISER, ARTUR. Die Psalmen ausgewählt, übersetzt and erklärt. Göttingen, 1935.

WEISER, ARTUR. "I Samuel 15," ZAW 54, 1936, pp. 1-28.

_____. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. 2. Aufl. Göttingen, 1949.

_____. "Zur Frage nach den Beziehungen der Psalmen zum Kult: Die Darstellung der Theophanie in den Psalmen und im Festkult," Festschrift für A. Bertholet. Tübingen, 1950, pp. 513-531.

_____. Die Psalmen I (Psalm 1-60), II (Psalm 61-150). ATD 14 and 15. 4. Aufl., Göttingen, 1955.

_____. Das Buch der zwolf Kleine Propheten I, ATD 24, 2. Aufl. Göttingen, 1956.

WELCH, ADAM C. Deuteronomy: The Framework to the Code. London, 1932.

_____. The Work of the Chronicler: Its Purpose and Date. The Schweich Lectures 1938. London, 1939.

WELLHAUSEN, JULIUS. Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments. 1. Aufl., Berlin, 1866. 2. Aufl., 1877. 3. Aufl., 1899.

_____. Der Text der Bücher Samuelis. Berlin, 1871.

_____. Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. Berlin, 1884.

_____. Prolegomena to the History of Israel. Eng. Tr. by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. Edinburgh, 1885.

_____. The Book of Psalms. A New English Translation by Horace H. Furness. London, 1898.

WHITLEY, G.F. "The Sources of the Gideon Stories," VT VII, 1957, pp. 157ff.

WIDENGREN, GEO. The Accadian and Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation as Religious Documents. A Comparative Study. (Dissertation). Stockholm, 1937.

_____. Psalm 110 och det sakrala kungadömet i Israel. Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1941: 7,1.

_____. The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book (King and Saviour III). Uppsala, 1950.

_____. The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion (King and Saviour IV). Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1951:4.

_____. Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testament und im Judentum. Stuttgart, 1955.

WILSON, C.W. "Zion," HDB IV, Edinburgh, 1902, pp. 982-984.

WINCKLER, HUGO. Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen. Teil II, Die Legende. Leipzig, 1900.

_____. Abraham als Babylonier, Joseph als Aegypter. Der weltgeschichtliche Hintergund der biblischen Vätergeschichten auf Grund der Keilinschriften. Leipzig, 1903.

WINTER, J. and WUENSCHE, A. Mechiltha. Ein tannaitischer Midrasch zu Exodus. Leipzig, 1909.

WOOLLEY, LEONARD. Abraham. Recent Discoveries and Hebrew Origin. London, 1936.

WRIGHT, GEORGE ERNEST and FILSON, FLOYD VIVIAN. The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible. Philadelphia, 1945.

WRIGHT, GEORGE ERNEST. "The Literary and Historical Problem of Joshua 10 and Judges 1," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, V, 1946, pp. 105-114.

_____. "The Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. I. Nashville, 1952, pp. 349-389.

_____. "The Book of Deuteronomy," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. II. Nashville, 1953, pp. 309-537.

_____. The Old Testament Against Its Environment. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 2. London, 1954.

_____. Biblical Archaeology. London, 1957.

WUENSCHE, AUG. Der Midrasch Bereschit Rabba. Leipzig, 1881.

WUTTKE, GOTTFRIED. Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese. (Dissertation). BZNW 5. Giessen, 1927.

YAHUDA, A. S. The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian. Vol. I. London, 1933.

YOUNG, EDWARD J. An Introduction to the Old Testament. 1st Ed., London, 1949. Rev. Ed., 1956.

YOUNG, ROBERT. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. 21st American Ed. New York, 1936.