
Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic

Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel

Frank Moore Cross



Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic

Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic

Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel

Frank Moore Cross

Harvard University Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
and London, England

©Copyright 1973 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College
All rights reserved
Ninth printing, 1997

This book has been digitally reprinted. The content
remains identical to that of previous printings.

First Harvard University Press paperback edition, 1997

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 72-76564
ISBN 0-674-09175-2 (cloth)
ISBN 0-674-09176-0 (pbk.)
Printed in the United States of America

To Elizabeth Anne Cross

Preface

The essays which follow are preliminary studies directed toward a new synthesis of the history of the religion of Israel. Each study is addressed to a special and, in my view, unsolved problem in the description of Israel's religious development. The barriers in the way of progress toward a new synthesis are many. While the burgeoning archaeological enterprise has increasingly uncovered materials which can be used to reconstruct the ancient environment of Israel, at the same time its discoveries have thrown the field into chaos. Great strides have been taken in the endeavor to interpret the new data from the centuries contemporary with ancient Israel and to view the history of Israelite religion whole in its ancient context; still, the sheer mass of new or unassimilated lore hinders synthetic treatment.

Another obstacle in the way of attempts to rewrite the history of Israelite religion has been the obstinate survival of remnants of older syntheses, especially the idealistic synthesis initiated by Wilhelm Vatke and given classic statement by Julius Wellhausen. It is true that the idealistic and romantic presuppositions which informed the early development of literary-critical and form-critical methods have largely been discarded when brought fully to consciousness. Few today would follow Gunkel in presuming that the primitive Israelite was incapable of retaining more than a line or two of poetry. Not a few, however, continue to date short poems or poetic fragments earlier than longer poems. In this fashion the results and models based on the idealistic synthesis often persist unrecognized and unexamined. Particularly difficult and troublesome, for example, is the task of disentangling and removing antinomian tendencies of idealistic or existentialist origin from the analysis of law and covenant and their role in the religion of Israel. Hegel's evaluation of Israelite law might as easily have been written by a contemporary scholar: "The liberator [Moses] of his nation was also its lawgiver; this could mean only that the man who had freed it from one yoke had laid on it another." Unhappily, such a view is also wholly in tune with an older Christian polemic against Judaism.

Yet another hindrance has been the tendency of scholars to overlook or suppress continuities between the early religion of Israel and the Canaanite (or Northwest Semitic) culture from which it emerged. There has been a preoccupation with the novelty of Israel's religious con-

sciousness. More serious, the religion of Israel has been conceived as a unique or isolated phenomenon, radically or wholly discontinuous with its environment. In extreme form these views root ultimately in dogmatic systems, metaphysical or theological, and often serve an apologetic purpose. Yehezkel Kaufmann's monumental attempt to write a history of the religion of Israel comes under this criticism. The empirical historian must describe novel configurations in Israel's religion as having their origin in an orderly set of relationships which follow the usual typological sequences of historical change. Kaufmann's insistence that Israelite religion "was absolutely different from anything the pagan world ever knew" violates fundamental postulates of scientific historical method.

Characteristic of the religion of Israel is a perennial and unrelaxed tension between the mythic and the historical. Concern with this aspect of Israel's religious expression gives some unity to the essays to follow. Israel's religion emerged from a mythopoeic past under the impact of certain historical experiences which stimulated the creation of an epic cycle and its associated covenant rites of the early time. This epic, rather than the Canaanite cosmogonic myth, was featured in the ritual drama of the old Israelite cultus. At the same time the epic events and their interpretation were shaped strongly by inherited mythic patterns and language, so that they gained a vertical dimension in addition to their horizontal, historical stance. In this tension between mythic and historical elements the meaning of Israel's history became transparent.

Perhaps the term "epic" best designates the constitutive genre of Israel's religious expression. Epic in interpreting historical events combines mythic and historical features in various ways and proportions. Usually Israel's epic forms have been labeled "historical." This is a legitimate use of the term "historical." At the same time confusion often enters at this point. The epic form, designed to recreate and give meaning to the historical experiences of a people or nation, is not merely or simply historical. In epic narrative, a people and their god or gods interact in the temporal course of events. In historical narrative only human actors have parts. Appeal to divine agency is illegitimate.

Thus the composer of epic and the historian are very different in their methods of approach to the materials of history. Yet both are moved by a common impulse in view of their concern with the human and the temporal process. By contrast myth in its purest form is concerned with "primordial events" and seeks static structures of meaning behind or beyond the historical flux.

The epic cycle of the Israelite league was taken up into the prose Epic (JE) sources in the course of the early monarchy. The Pentateuch itself may be described as a baroque elaboration of these Epic sources. The Deuteronomistic history (Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings) and the Chronicler's work (Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah) in effect extended the Epic, interpreting the later history of Israel in Epic patterns. Epic was, of course, a well-known literary genre in ancient Canaanite (Ugaritic) religious literature albeit of marginal interest as compared with the Canaanite mythic cycle which provided the libretto to primary rites of the cult. Israel's choice of the epic form to express religious reality, and the elevation of this form to centrality in their cultic drama, illustrates both the linkage of the religion of Israel to its Canaanite past and the appearance of novelty in Israel's peculiar religious concern with the "historical."

This volume is decidedly lopsided in the space it gives to problems belonging to the earlier stages of Israel's history. The ancient era is the least known, of course, and its historical description is in the greatest need of revision. In any case, the study of origins always has a special fascination, and the writer has yielded to its blandishments in apportioning space.

I wish to acknowledge indebtedness and express gratitude to many friends including colleagues and students, who have come to my aid in the preparation of this book. My chief scholarly debt is to William Foxwell Albright, "from whom I gratefully acknowledge myself to have learnt best and most." I owe much, too, to the stimulus of G. Ernest Wright, my colleague for more than twenty years, and to the encouragement and criticisms of David Noel Freedman. Father Richard Clifford has kindly read my manuscript and saved me from many errors. Miss Carolyn Cross has typed the long and wearisome manuscript, handling with miraculous accuracy Roman, Greek, and Hebrew type. To her I offer my special thanks. My thanks go, too, to my daughter, Susan Elizabeth, who has given her precious vacation days to the improvement of my manuscript.

F.M.C.
July 1, 1971

Contents

Abbreviations	xv
I The Religion of Canaan and the God of Israel	1
1 <i>The God of the Fathers</i>	3
2 <i>'El and the God of the Fathers</i>	13
'Eil in the Ugaritic Pantheon	13
The Epithets of 'El	15
'Eil in the Canaanite Myth	20
'Eil and Ba'l Ḥamōn	24
The Abode of 'El	36
'Eil the Divine Patriarch	39
3 <i>Yahweh and 'El</i>	44
'Eil in the Bible	44
'Eil Epithets in Patriarchal Narratives	46
The Name Yahweh	60
II The Cultus of the Israelite League	77
4 <i>Prolegomena</i>	79
The Myth and Ritual School	82
The History-of-Redemption School	83
5 <i>The Divine Warrior</i>	91
Psalm 24 and the Warrior-King	91
The "Ritual Conquest"	99
Transformations of the "Ritual Conquest"	105
6 <i>The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth</i>	112
The Mythic Cycle of Ba'l and 'Anat	112
The Song of the Sea	121
III League and Kingdom	145
7 <i>Yahweh and Ba'l</i>	147
The Theophany of Ba'l	147
The Storm Theophany in the Bible	156
The Revelation at Sinai	163
History of the Tradition of the Storm Theophany	169
'Eil's Modes of Revelation	177
Yahweh and the Council of the Gods	186

Ba'1 versus Yahweh	190
<i>8 The Priestly Houses of Early Israel</i>	195
The Classical View of Israel's Early Priesthood	195
The Function of the Stories of Conflict	198
The Priestly Genealogies	206
The Priests of David's National Shrine	207
IV Kings and Prophets	217
<i>9 The Ideologies of Kingship in the Era of the Empire: Conditional Covenant and Eternal Decree</i>	219
The Limited Monarchy of Saul and Monarchy in the Northern Kingdom	219
Davidic Kingship	229
The Imperial Rule of Solomon	237
The Judaeen Royal Theology	241
The Typology of the Royal Ideology	264
A Brief Excursus on <i>bērīt</i> , "Covenant"	265
<i>10 The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History</i>	274
The Contemporary Discussion of the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History	274
The Two Themes of the First Edition of the Deuteronomistic History (Dtr ¹)	278
The Theme of the Exilic Edition of the History (Dtr ²)	285
The Two Editions of the Deuteronomistic History	287
V Exile and Apocalyptic	291
<i>11 The Priestly Work</i>	293
The So-Called P-Source of the Pentateuch	293
The P System of Covenants	295
Is P a Narrative Source?	301
Documents Used by P	321
Archaizing Language in P	322
The Date of P	323
The Composition of the Priestly Work	324
<i>12 The Early History of the Apocalyptic Community at Qumrân</i>	326
The Archaeological Context of the Qumrân	326
Qumrân and the Essenes	330

<i>Contents</i>	xiii
The Essenes: Priestly Apocalyptists	332
Essene Origins	334
A Note on the Study of Apocalyptic Origins	343
Index of Biblical Citations	349
Index of Ugaritic Citations	364
Index of Technical Terms	366
Index of Authors	367
General Index	371

Abbreviations

<i>AASOR</i>	<i>Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>AfO</i>	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>AJSL</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
<i>ALQ²</i>	<i>The Ancient Library of Qumrân</i> , by F. M. Cross, 2nd ed. (New York, Doubleday, 1961)
<i>ANEP</i>	<i>The Ancient Near East in Pictures</i> , ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1954)
<i>ANES</i>	<i>The Ancient Near East: Supplementary Texts and Pictures</i> , ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1969)
<i>ANET</i>	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts</i> , ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1950)
<i>AR(A)</i>	<i>Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia</i> , ed. D. D. Luckenbill (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1926)
<i>AR(E)</i>	<i>Ancient Records of Egypt</i> , ed. J. H. Breasted (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1906)
<i>ARI</i>	<i>Archaeology and the Religion of Israel</i> , by W. F. Albright (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1942)
<i>ARM</i>	<i>Archives Royales de Mari</i> , ed. A. Parrot and G. Dossin (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1940—)
<i>ASTI</i>	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
<i>AThNT</i>	<i>Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments</i>
<i>B</i>	Codex Vaticanus
<i>BA</i>	<i>The Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>BAL</i>	<i>Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig</i>
<i>BANE</i>	<i>The Bible and the Ancient Near East</i> [Albright Volume], ed. G. Ernest Wright (New York, Doubleday, 1961)
<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist Reader</i> (New York, Doubleday, I, 1961; II, 1964; III, 1970)
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BAV</i>	<i>Die Beziehungen Aegyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.</i> , by Wolfgang Helck (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1962)
<i>BK</i>	<i>Biblischer Kommentar</i>

<i>BMP</i>	<i>The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri</i> , ed. E. G. Kraeling (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953)
<i>BWANT</i>	<i>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>BZAW</i>	<i>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>CAD</i>	<i>Chicago Assyrian Dictionary</i> (Chicago, The Oriental Institute, 1956—)
<i>CAH²</i>	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i> , rev. ed. (Cambridge University Press, 1971—)
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>C-F</i>	“Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry,” by F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, photocopy (Baltimore, 1950)
<i>CIS</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum</i> (Paris, 1881—)
<i>CRAIBL</i>	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres</i> (Paris)
<i>CTA</i>	<i>Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques</i> , by A. Herdner (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1963)
<i>CTBT</i>	<i>Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets (in the British Museum)</i>
<i>DJD</i>	<i>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert</i> (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955—)
<i>EA</i>	<i>Die El-Amarna-Tafeln</i> , ed. J. A. Knudtzon (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1915)
<i>EHO</i>	<i>Early Hebrew Orthography</i> , by F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman (New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1952)
<i>EI</i>	<i>Eretz Israel</i> (Jerusalem)
<i>G</i>	The Old Greek translation (“Septuaginta”)
<i>G^B</i>	The Egyptian recension of the Old Greek
<i>G^L</i>	The Lucianic Recension of the Old Greek
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>H_zAT</i>	<i>Handbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>ICC</i>	<i>International Critical Commentary</i>
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JCS</i>	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
<i>JEA</i>	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>

<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JPOS</i>	<i>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JThC</i>	<i>Journal of Theology and the Church</i>
<i>JThS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KAI</i>	<i>Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften</i> , by H. Donner and W. Rollig (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1962–64)
<i>KS (Alt)</i>	<i>Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel</i> , by A. Alt (Munich, C. H. Beck, 1953–59)
<i>KS (Eissfeldt)</i>	<i>Kleine Schriften</i> , by Otto Eissfeldt (Tübingen, Mohr, 1962–68)
<i>L</i>	Vetus Latina
<i>M</i>	Massoretic Text
<i>MAD</i>	<i>Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary</i> (Chicago)
<i>MDOG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i>
<i>MVAG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch (Ägyptisch)en Gesellschaft</i>
<i>NPS</i>	<i>Noms propres sud-sémitiques</i> , by G. Ryckmans (Louvain, Muséon, 1934)
<i>OA</i>	<i>Oriens antiquus</i>
<i>OLZ</i>	<i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>OIP</i>	<i>Oriental Institute Publications</i>
<i>PRU</i>	<i>Palais royal d'Ugarit</i> , ed. C. F. A. Schaeffer (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1955—)
<i>PTU</i>	<i>Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit</i> , by F. Gröndahl (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967)
Q	Qumrân
1QIsa ^a	The great Isaiah manuscript from Qumrân, Cave 1
1QpHab	The Habakkuk Peshar from Qumrân, Cave 1
1QS	The Order of the Community from Qumrân, Cave 1
4QpNah	The Nahum Peshar from Cave 4, Qumrân
4QPssJos	The Psalms of Joshua from Cave 4, Qumrân
4QSam ^a	The great Samuel manuscript from Cave 4, Qumrân
<i>RA</i>	<i>Revue d'Assyriologie</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RSO</i>	<i>Revista degli studi orientali</i>
<i>SBS</i>	<i>Stuttgarter Bibelstudien</i>
<i>SBT</i>	<i>Studies in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>SMir</i>	"The Song of Miriam," by F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, <i>JNES</i> , 14 (1955), 237–250

<i>SVT</i>	<i>Supplement to Vetus Testamentum</i>
Sy	The Peshitto (Syriac) translation
<i>ThLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>ÜGS</i>	<i>Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien</i> , by M. Noth (Tübingen, 1943)
<i>UT</i>	<i>Ugaritic Textbook</i> , by C. H. Gordon (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965)
V	Vulgate
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>WM</i>	<i>Wörterbuch der Mythologie</i> , ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart)
<i>WO</i>	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
<i>YGC</i>	<i>Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan</i> , by W. F. Albright (New York, Doubleday, 1968)
<i>ZA</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZThK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

I The Religion of Canaan and the God of Israel

1 *The God of the Fathers*

The modern discussion of Patriarchal religion may be said to begin with the brilliant essay of Albrecht Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, published first in 1929.¹ Alt proposed to use new means to penetrate into the prehistory of Israel's traditions of the old time. He repudiated the methods of such earlier scholars as Robertson Smith and Julius Wellhausen, who attempted to reconstruct the pre-Yahwistic stage of the tribal forebears of Israel by sifting Israel's early but fully Yahwistic sources for primitive features, primitive in terms of an a priori typology of religious ideas derived largely from nineteenth-century idealism. Such procedures, Alt recognized, yielded merely the superstitious dregs of Israelite religion at any of its stages. As early as 1929, it had become obvious to him that new historical data, much of it from archaeological sources, gave a very different picture from that painted by the older historians. At least it was clear that the religion of Israel's neighbors was on a very much more sophisticated level than that being predicated of the Israelite tribes.

Alt was no less aware than his predecessors of the formidable barriers obstructing the historian's approach to the Patriarchal Age. Even the earliest epic traditions of Israel did not reflect directly the religious milieu of the time of their origin. Rather, by oral transmission over gulfs of time, more or less uncontrolled by written sources, they were shaped even before precipitation into literary form by the events which created the union of the tribes and the Yahwistic cult which was the primary ground of their unity. Nevertheless, the tools for the analysis of the pre-literary history of the old traditions had been forged by Hermann Gunkel's programmatic work in the legends of Genesis,² as well as in studies of other complexes of Old Testament tradition, and by such

1. Albrecht Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, III, 12 (1929). Republished in A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Munich, Beck, 1953), I, 1-78 (later references are to this edition); in English in *Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. R. A. Wilson (New York, Anchor Books, 1966), pp. 1-100.

2. See especially Hermann Gunkel's introduction to his *Genesis (HzAT)* 2nd ed. (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1902), "Die Sagen der Genesis," pp. xi-xcii. This introduction has been republished in English translation under the title *The Legends of Genesis* (New York, Schocken Paperback, 1965).

analysis—especially by freeing ancient cult names and divine epithets from their secondary (Yahwistic) complex—Alt saw the possibility of progress.

One group of epithets in the Patriarchal legends is characterized by the element *'ēl*. Following Gunkel and especially Gressmann, Alt attributed the *'ēl* appellations to local *numina*, local deities tied to Palestinian shrines or localities, encountered by elements of Israel when they entered the land of Canaan.³ He gave relatively little time to an examination of the “*'ēl* religion” as he called it, and this part of his monograph now appears wholly unsatisfactory.

Alt was much more interested in isolating another group of epithets and analyzing its typology: epithets in which the god is identified by the name of a patriarch. He called these “the gods of the Fathers,” *theoī patrōoi*; they were originally distinct deities presumably, but all belonging to a special religious type, which in the development of Israel's traditions were coalesced into a single family god by the artificial genealogical linkage of the Fathers and at the same time assimilated to Yahweh. These were the “Benefactor⁴ of Abraham,” the “Fear (possibly Kinsman⁵) of Isaac,” and the “Bull of Jacob,”⁶ later the “god of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.” We note with interest that all three epithets

3. For Alt these contacts were not so much in the Patriarchal, i.e., the pre-Mosaic period, as in the era of the entry into Canaan in “Israelite” times. In our view, this is a fundamental weakness in Alt's historical stance, a position increasingly untenable in view of our present knowledge of the movements in Palestine in the second millennium B.C. See, for example, G. E. Mendenhall, “The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine,” *BA*, 25 (1962), 66–87; and Roland de Vaux, “Les Patriarches hébreux et l'histoire,” in his *Bible et orient* (Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1967), pp. 175–185, and the literature cited therein. Except in describing Alt's views, we shall mean by the designation “Patriarchs” the elements of Israel's forebears who moved about in Palestine before the Mosaic age.

4. We read here *māgān*, Ugar. *ma-ga-ni*, Phoenician *māgōn*, from the root *mgn*, “to bestow (favor).” On this form and meaning, see M. Dahood, *Psalms, I, The Anchor Bible* (New York, Doubleday, 1966), pp. 16f. and references. Its use in the couplet in Gen. 15:1 (*mgn lk* parallel to *škrk*) appears decisive; however, cf. Dt. 33:29.

5. Cf. W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, 1946), pp. 188f., n. 71; p. 327; Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, p. 26, n. 2. In a forthcoming article by Delbert R. Hillers, “Paḥad Yišḥaq,” the meaning “kinsman” is repudiated.

6. Hebrew *'ābīr* originally meant “bull,” or “stallion.” The names of male animals were used often in Old Hebrew and Ugaritic to apply to nobles, lords, or heroes. In Ugaritic, compare CTA, 15.4.6f. (KRT B) *šh. šb'(m).try (7) ṭmnm.[zb]yy* (see H. L. Ginsberg, *The Legend of King Keret, BASOR Suppl. Series* Nos. 2–3, [1946], p. 42; and *SMir*, p. 248, for the biblical parallels in Exod. 15:15; Isa. 14:9; Ezek. 17:13; and 2 Sam. 1:19). Other examples include Ugaritic texts CTA 5.5.8f. (*ḥnzrk*, “boars” parallel to *glmk*, “heroes”); 4.4.38 (*'ēl* designated as *tōr* “bull”); and 5.5.18f. (cf. Amos 4:1). See also B. Mazar, “The Military Elite of King David,” *VT*, 13 (1963), 312. A

contain in their initial element a frozen archaism, terms which did not survive in later Hebrew in their early, ordinary meaning.

Elohistic tradition in Exodus 3: 13–15 is crucial to Alt's analysis:

When I come to the people Israel and say to them, "the god of your fathers sent me to you," they will say to me, "What is his name?" What shall I say to them? And God said to Moses, "'ehyē 'āšer 'ehyē." Thus you shall say to the people Israel, "'ehyē sent me to you." Again God said to Moses, "Thus you will say to the people Israel, *Yahweh* the god of your fathers, the god of Abraham, the god of Isaac, and the god of Jacob sent me to you; this is my name forever, and by this (name) I shall be remembered always."

In this text there is a clear claim for the continuity between the religion of the Fathers and the Yahwistic faith of later Israel. At the same time the text, precisely in its insistence that *Yahweh* is to be identified with the god of the Fathers, discloses to the historian that the old religion and the Mosaic religion were historically distinct or, in any case, belonged to two stages in a historical development.⁷

The Priestly tradition in Exodus 6:2–3 points in part in a similar direction: "God said to Moses, 'I am *Yahweh*. I revealed myself to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as 'El Šadday, but was not known to them by my name *Yahweh*.'" In this stratum of tradition there is also the recognition of a cleavage between the ancient time and the Yahwistic era, though again there is the theological affirmation of the ultimate identity of the god of the Patriarchs and *Yahweh*. The use here of an 'El appellation is disturbing to Alt's scheme. He admits the authenticity of the title, but argues that this stream of tradition (that is, P) has merely chosen the name of a *numen* of a local shrine, broken it loose from its moorings, and substituted the name for the "god of the Fa-

systematic study of this phenomenon, the use of animal, especially male animal, names to designate nobility has been made by P. W. Miller, "Animal Names as Designations in Ugaritic and Hebrew," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 2 (1971), 177–186.

7. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, p. 10: "Dagegen ist die Identität Jahwes mit dem Gott der Väter nicht einfach vorausgesetzt, sondern wird sozusagen vor dem Auge des Lesers erst im Verlauf der Erzählung feierlich vollzogen, indem der erscheinende Gott auf Moses Fragen hin seinen Namen Jahwe mit eigenem Munde auspricht (V. 14). Eben darin besteht die spezifische Funktion dieser Erzählung im Gesamtaufbau des elohistischen Werkes, dass sie dem Leser einerseits den ganzen Abstand zwischen Väterzeit und Mosezeit *sub specie Dei* zum Bewusstsein bringt und andererseits den Unterschied dann doch wieder in einer höheren Einheit ausgleicht, indem sie ein und denselben Gott als Träger der alten und der neuen Gottesbezeichnung erscheinen lässt."

thers.” More fully assimilated to later Yahwistic institutions is the tradition of the Yahwist, who simply assumes the use of the name Yahweh in pre-Mosaic times and reshapes his tradition in this light.⁸

Alt turns next to a detailed analysis of the Patriarchal traditions in the Epic sources.⁹ In them he finds evidence of the divine type, “the god of the Father,” and discovers clues to the essential traits of this religion. It differs radically, according to Alt, from the cults of the Canaanite *’ēlim*, the *numina* of particular holy places. The god of the Father is not attached to a shrine, but is designated by the name of the Patriarch with whom he has a special relation, or rather, in Alt’s view, by the name of the founder of his cult. He is not a local deity, but the patron of the clan, the social group. He may be described as a “historical” god, that is, one who enters into a kinship or covenantal relationship with a clan,¹⁰ and who guides the social group in its peregrinations, its wars, in short through historical vicissitudes to its destiny. The election motif running through the Patriarchal histories was native to the religion of the Fathers, and, though heavily nuanced by later Yahwistic features, was not a theme simply read back into primitive tradition. The special traits of the cult of the Patriarchal gods in fact anticipate at a number of points characteristics of the religion of Yahweh, the lord of covenant and community. These provide continuity between the old religious forms and the new, a historically credible background for emergent Yahwism and an explanation of the development of a religious unity of apparently disparate clans which came together in the Yahwistic league. The gods of the Fathers were *paidagōgoi* to the god Yahweh who later took their place.

Alt also seeks support for his historical construction by a comparison of the Israelite “god of the Father” with analogous divine types, drawn from the Nabataean and related sources. Here there is abundant evidence of epithets of the form, “god of PN.” As in the case of the biblical epithets, Alt posits a simple evolutionary scheme for the epithets of the inscriptions. As nomadic clans entered civilized country, according to Alt, they brought anonymous gods of the type, “god of PN,” and after acculturation began identifying their patriarchal god with *Dū-Šarā*,

8. The key text in J is Gen. 4:26.

9. By “Epic” we mean JE and the epic of which J and E were, in origin, oral variants.

10. It is in this context that we are to understand the kinship elements common in the Amorite names of the second millennium B.C. and in the earliest onomastic material of Israel: *’ab* (“father”), *’ad* (“father”), *’ah* (“brother”), *hal* (“uncle,” “kinsman”), *’amm* (“kinsman”), and *ḥatan* (“relative by marriage”).

the national god, or *Baʿl šamēn*, the “Landesgott,” or *Zeus Anikētos*.¹¹

We must argue, however, that the Nabataean and Palmyrene evidence, which furnished Alt’s principal analogy with the religion of the Patriarchs, has become ambiguous at best in the light of further analysis and new data.

One may ask seriously if *Dū-Šarā* is not native to the Nabataean tribes; he is unknown earlier in the Transjordanian country. One must also ask if the great gods of the Arabian as well as the Aramaean peoples were unknown to the Nabataeans, or to newly settled people. Alt attributes a strange primitivism to the Nabataeans (and *mutatis mutandis* to Israel) in view of what we now know of their forebears’ religion, even in North Arabia. It is quite true that an invading people identify old gods with new. Canaanite and Babylonian deities were, of course, systematically identified, as were the Canaanite and Egyptian pantheons, and so on.¹² Moreover, there can no longer be any doubt that many of the old Semitic gods, like ʿAṭtar/ʿAṭtart or ʾEl, were common to the old Arabic and Canaanite pantheons.¹³

In the Nabataean inscriptions we have a number of overt identifications: ʾlh (*mrʿnʿ*) *rbʿl* with *dwšrʿ* (*ʿrʿ dy bbsrʿ*) [Alt, Nos. 5–11];¹⁴ *bʿlšmn* with ʾlh *mtnw* [Alt, No. 12], *bʿlšmn* with ʾlh *šʿydw* [Alt, No. 15], *Theos Aumou* with *Theos Anikētos* and *Dios Anikētou Hēliou*,¹⁵ and

11. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, pp. 68–77.

12. See further below. The Nabataean-Arab goddess, ʾal-Kutbāʿ, presents an interesting study in syncretism. See John Strugnell, “The Nabataean Goddess ʾAl-Kutbāʿ and Her Sanctuaries,” *BASOR*, 156 (1959), 29–37.

13. Identifications are often obscured by secondary cult titles or local epithets. W. F. Albright has recently identified *Baʿl Šamēm* of Canaan with ʿAṭtar *Šamayn*, a god popular in North Arabia as early as the seventh century B.C. (and no doubt earlier) when Assyrian records mention a league (*ʾlū*) of ʿAtarsamain (*Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* [New York, Doubleday, 1968], pp. 226–232). There are problems, however, with this identification. The solar character of Baʿl Šamēm is explicitly stated by Philo Byblius, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. evan.* 1.10 (ed. Mras), and perhaps more important, in Nabataean texts in Greek, Baʿl Šamēm is regularly equivalent to Zeus Hēlios. In *Ugaritica V* (Paris, 1968), pp. 48–50, Jean Nougayrol has proposed to read the name of a conflated deity Adad-and-šamaš in a pantheon list (No. 18). Such a deity would fit well with what we know of Baʿl Šamēm. However, probably the reading of IDIM ū IDIM should be *šamū ū eṣitu* parallel to Text 9 (p. 580), 1.5 ʾars *wšmm* (Riekele Borger, “Zu Ugaritica V, Nr. 18 und 138,” *RA*, 63 [1969], 171f.). The Baʿl of the “Biqʿat Baʿl” (Baalbek; cf. Amos 1:5), evidently had solar features to judge by the Greek name of Baalbek; Heliopolis. More data is needed, we believe, before the identity of the god bearing the epithet *baʿl šamēm* can be ascertained.

14. To this series add Milik 2 in Milik, “Nouvelles Inscriptions nabatéennes,” *Syria*, 35 (1958), 231. The new inscription reads . . . *ldwšrʿ ʾlh rbʿl*.

15. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, Nos. 33–45.

perhaps *ʾlh qšyw* with *bʿl šmn*.¹⁶ The first mentioned, since it is the god of Rabʿel, presumably Rabʿel II,¹⁷ may be called a special case. But Alt is too facile, perhaps, in describing the formula *Theos Aumou* as primitive. *Theos Aumou* indeed occurs in the earliest of the inscriptions of the series (second century of the Christian era!); later we find *Dios Anikētou Hēliou Theou Aumou* (third-fourth centuries); in the latest of the series, however, the “primitive” form *Theos Aumou* reappears. Alt speaks of this latest formula as the survival of the archaic form. We now know that the oldest of the formal Nabataean inscriptions,¹⁸ that of Aṣṣlah [Alt, No. 3] from ca. 95 B.C. is to be read . . . *ldwšrʾ ʾlh mlktw* (written *mnktw*) . . .¹⁹ The “*Dū-Šara*, god of Malikatō” of this inscription then must be identified presumably with the *Theos Maleichatou* of Alt’s inscription numbers 51 and 52, from A.D. 106 and 175. This is to reverse Alt’s line of evolution unless we persevere in arguing that the earliest inscription is late typologically and *vice versa*.

We also must question the legitimacy of the analogy between the Nabataean Arabs and ancient Israel. The time span is, of course, formidable. Much more serious is Alt’s tacit assumption that Israel, like the Nabataeans, infiltrated Palestine from the desert as simple nomads, untouched by the civilization of the settled country. One may question the validity of this conception of the Northern Arabs in the Hellenistic age. Certainly it is an untenable view of Israel. The era of the Patriarchs must be placed in the Middle and Late Bronze Age, the era of Amorite movements from North Mesopotamia, not at the end of the Late Bronze Age (ca. 1200 B.C.) in the time of the conquest of Canaan by Yahwistic clans. The Patriarchs belonged to an age of donkey-nomadism and

16. Ibid., Nos. 13, 14. The latter reads *ʾl qšyw ʾlhhm bʿl [šmn]*, “the league of qšyw to their god Baʿlšamēm,” the former *ʾlh qšyw*. On Nabataean *ʾl*, see the discussion in note 13. The root of *ʾl*, Akk. *ʾlu*, is *eʿēlu* “to bind,” perhaps cognate with Arab. *ʾhl*. CAD translates *ʾlu* as “confederation,” “amphictyony,” no doubt correctly.

17. On the date of the *ʾlh rbʿel* series, see Milik, “Nouvelles Inscriptions nabatéennes,” pp. 233f.

18. On the chronology of the early Nabataean inscriptions, see F. M. Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. Ernest Wright (New York, Doubleday, 1961), p. 161 and notes 103-105; Jean Starcky, “Inscriptions archaïques de Palmyre,” in *Studi orientalistici in onore de Giorgio Levi della Vida* (Roma, Instituto per l’oriente, 1956), II, 520-527.

19. On the reading, see Jean Starcky, “Inscriptions archaïques de Palmyre,” p. 523, n. 3, and on the interchange *mlkw/mnkw*, *mlktw/mnktw*, see also Milik, “Nouvelles Inscriptions nabatéennes,” pp. 228, 234; and “Nouvelles Inscriptions sémitiques et grecques du pays de Moab,” *Studi Bibliici Franciscani, Liber Annus*, 9 (1958-59), 354f.

moved through settled lands, never far from water. It was an age, too, when a cultural continuum stretched from Ugarit in the north through Canaan, for much of the period an Egyptian dependency, into the western delta, especially the area of the Wādī Ṭumeilāt (Goshen).²⁰

The most vulnerable points in Alt's construction of the religious type, the gods of the Father, are found in the notion that these gods were without personal names or cult places.

Julius Lewy attacked Alt's position on the basis of parallels from the Cappadocian (Old Assyrian) texts of the early second millennium.²¹ Here in a series of formulae, Lewy could show that the expressions *il abika*, "the god of your father," *Ilabrat il abīni*, "Ilabrat, the god of our father," and *Ilabrat* (simply), were interchangeable elements. He concluded that the Amorites attached to the Assyrian merchant colonies, while adopting the high god Assur of Assyria, called as well on the ancestral god, "the god of your father," or "the god of our fathers," or without further specification, *Ilabrat*,²² the proper name of their god. To Lewy this appeared to be clear evidence that Patriarchal deities were not anonymous, at least in his archaic texts, and suggested that the Old Testament God of the Fathers was a family god as tradition had it, and that his proper name was ^ʾēl šadday, quite as Priestly tradition claimed. For example, in the old poem in Genesis 49: 25 there is the bicolon:

m'l ʾbyk wy'zrk
w'⟨l⟩²³ šdy wybrkk

From the god of your father who supports you,
 ʾEl-Šadday who blesses you.²⁴

20. Cf. W. F. Albright, "Abram the Hebrew," *BASOR*, 163 (October 1961), 36-54. We need not accept all the conclusions of Albright's *tour de force* to establish our case. Cf. on the other hand, R. de Vaux, "El et Baal, le dieu des Pères et Yahweh," *Ugaritica VI* (Paris, Geuthner, 1969), pp. 510-514.

21. Julius Lewy, "Les Textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 110 (1934), 29-65; cf. A. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, p. 31, n. 1.

22. *Ilabrat* corresponds to Sumerian Ninšubur, messenger and grand vizier of Anu; cf. Lewy, p. 52, n. 57. Note also *il ebbarūtum*, "the god of the collegium," and *ili ummeāniya*, "god of my principal" ["Les Textes paléo-assyriens," p. 53, n. 59; *CAD*, VII, 97] which replace *Ilabrat*. On Ninšubur, see most recently D. O. Edzard, *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart, n.d.) I, 113. Thorkild Jacobsen suggests that Il(i)-abrat is most likely a shortened appellative form of il(i)abrātum, "god of the people/folk" (private communication).

23. Correcting the Massoretic text on the basis of Sam and Sy; cf. G.

24. For similar views, see M. Haran, "The Religion of the Patriarchs, an Attempt at Synthesis," *ASTI*, 4 (1965), 30-55; cf. also, S. Yeivin, "The Age of the Patriarchs," *RSO*, 38 (1963), 277-302.

Thanks to the publication of additional Cappadocian (Old Assyrian) texts, the evidence which Lewy drew upon is now expanded. In addition to Ilabrat, the god Amurru is called *i-li a-bi-a*, “the god of my father,” and in another instance, Ištar the star (*kakkubum*) is called *i-li a-ba-e-ni*, “the god of our fathers.”²⁵

In inscriptions from Zinçirli there are references to “the gods of my father’s house”²⁶ on a broken orthostat of Bir-Rākib,²⁷ and to Rākib-’El as the family patron (*b’l byt*)²⁸ on inscriptions of Panamū and Kilamuwa. In the text of Kilamuwa a series of family gods are recorded: *b’l šmd ’š lgr*, “Ba’l Šimd who belonged to Gabbar”; *b’l ḥmn ’š lbnh*, “Ba’l of the Amanus²⁹ who belonged to BMH”; and *rkb’l b’l bt*, “Rākib’il, patron of (my) family.”³⁰ In the texts of his successors the epithets used here are replaced by the personal names of the gods in question except in the case of Rākib’il: Hadad for Ba’l Šimd, “lord of the Warclub;” ’El for Ba’l Ḥamōn.³¹ We are not certain of the identification of Rākib’il.³² To be sure, the objection can be made that we are dealing here, not with the old “gods of the Fathers,” but national gods, patrons of the royal house, comparable to the Nabataean god of Rab’il.

25. See P. Garelli’s review of *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets (CCT)V* in *JSS*, 3 (1958), 298-301 (also in Garelli’s volume, *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce* [Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve, 1963]); H. Hirsch, “Gott der Väter.” *AJO*, 21 (1966), 56ff. (also in Hirsch’s volume, *Untersuchungen zur altassyrischen Religion* [Beiheft 13/14 *AJO*, Graz, 1961]). Cf. also the discussions of R. de Vaux, *Ugaritica VI*, 502ff.; and J. Ouellette, “More on ’El Šaddāy and Bēl Šadē,” *JBL*, 88 (1969), 470f.

26. *KAI*, 217:3.

27. On the pronunciation of Bir-Rākib, see J. Friedrich, “Das bildhethitische Siegel des Br-Rkb von Sam’al,” *Orientalia*, 26 (1957), 345-347.

28. *KAI*, 215.22; 24.16 (Kilamuwa of Zinçirli). Compare the Nabataean text Jaussen I, 59 [Alt 16] *lmr byt’ lh t/ymw*, “to the patron of the family, the god of T . . .”

29. On *ḥmn* (<*ḥmn*) “Amanus,” see below.

30. *KAI*, 24.15, 16.

31. On the identification of ’El with “the lord of the Amanus,” see below where the views of Landsberger and others will be taken up.

32. The epithet *rākib* often is used of Ba’l-Haddu. See now the names *bin rakub-ba’l* and *bin ili-ma-rakub* at Ugarit (cf. F. Gröndahl, *PTU*, p. 179), and the frequent epithet of Haddu, *rākib ’arapāti*, “rider of the cloud-chariot.” However, Rākib-il at Zinçirli appears to be the lunar god *Yariḥ*. We have Bir-Rākib speak of *Rākib’il* as *mr’y*, “my lord”; he speaks also of Ba’l Ḥarran (Sin) as *mr’y*, suggesting their identification. The symbol of the moon, full and crescent, is apparently the symbol of both. Regularly Rākib’il is listed alongside *Šamš* in series (Panammu I, 2-3, 11, 18; II, 22). R. Rendtorff in “El, Ba’l und Jahwe,” *ZAW*, 78 (1966), 277-292, fails to understand the special order of gods at Zinçirli (according to the series of patron gods of the dynasty), and at Sefire (patron gods, high gods, old gods, the regular order of treaty witnesses.) There is no doubt possible concerning El’s place at the head of the pantheon.

No such objection can be leveled at the evidence which comes from the onomasticon of Amorite tribal folk. We alluded above to the kinship names of the Amorites. Such names have their *Sitz im Leben* in the cult of the personal or covenant god who enters into special relationship with the Patriarch and his offspring. A perusal of the names shows, however, that the Amorite gods of the Father are neither anonymous gods nor minor genii.³³ Most common in these names are the gods 'El, Hadad, and Dagan.

Another group of Amorite names are those compounded with *sumu*, "the name," *sumuhu*, "his name," *sumuna*, "our name," plus a divine name or epithet. The element *sum-* refers to the hypostatized name of the god of the family or clan (that is, the personal or Patriarchal god) on whom he can call or by whom he swears. Frequently we find this element compounded with 'El ('Él): *su-mu-la-AN* /*sumū(hu)-la-'il/* "'Él is indeed his personal god"; *su-mu-AN* /*sumū-'il/* "'Él is his personal God"; and so on. It also appears with other high gods: Dagan, Ba'1 (Haddu), and so on.³⁴ The same name formation is found in early Hebrew *šmw'l* (> *šimuhu-'Il > šimū'Él), and in Old South Arabic *šmh'ly* /*šumhu-^cAlí/*.³⁵ Such a hypostatization of the name stands in the background of the Deuteronomic name theology.³⁶ A frequent onomastic pattern also is *sum-* plus a kinship epithet of deity: *su-mu-a-mi/sumū-^cammi/* "The (divine) kinsman is his personal god"; *su-mu-na-a-bi/sumuna-^cabi/* "The (divine) Father is our personal god."³⁷

Two biblical names of the god of the Father particularly resist inclusion in Alt's scheme. There is 'El Šadday which is patterned after the 'Él epithets and is attached, at least by Priestly tradition, to Bêt-'Él (Gen. 48:3). 'Él Šadday, moreover, is explicitly named "the god of your father" not merely in Priestly tradition but in the archaic Blessing of Jacob. There is also the epithet 'Él 'ēlohē yisrā'el "El, god of (the Patriarch) Israel" (Gen. 33:22) attached to an etiology of the altar at

33. Contrast Sumerian religious culture where the personal gods of common folk are minor gods.

34. See H. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965), pp. 248f.

35. We find names with the 3 m.s. suffix both with h and š. See G. Ryckmans, *Les Noms propres sud-sémitiques* (Louvain, Muséon, 1934) I, 266.

36. See the forthcoming monograph of S. Dean McBride, *The Deuteronomic Name Theology* (Ph. D. diss., Harvard, 1969), especially the section entitled "Hypostatization of the Divine Name in Northwest Semitic Religion," pp. 136-141.

37. Another interesting group of names is represented by *a-ya-la-su-m-ú/ 'ayya-la-umū/* "where is his personal god?"

Shechem.³⁸ We shall return to these epithets in discussing the 'El names.

Our examination of Alt's analysis of Patriarchal religion has raised a number of questions. I should not deny that Alt has performed an extremely significant work in distinguishing a special type of deity or divine cult which he labels "the god of the Father." I do not believe that the Patriarchal gods were typically nameless, designated only by the eponym of the clan and/or the cult founder. In fact we should regard the formula "god of PN" as specifying the cultus of a clan or tribal league, and hence a special cultic epithet used in place of the usual proper name of the god. Insofar as these Patriarchal deities belong to a pastoral or migrant folk, no doubt they were imported, ancestral gods in origin rather than the gods of popular sanctuaries in the lands of Patriarchal sojournings. However, there seems to be no reason to doubt, in view of our evidence, that these clan or "social" gods were high gods and were quickly identified by common traits or by cognate names with gods of the local pantheon. For example, an Amorite moving from northern Mesopotamia to Canaan would have no difficulty in identifying Amorite 'Il and Canaanite 'El, Amorite Dagan and Canaanite Dagnu, Amorite Hadad and Canaanite Haddu. In any case, the movement of the Patriarchs of Israel was from an old culture to a new but related culture, an old pantheon to a new, not from anonymous gods to named gods, nor from a cultural blank into first contacts with civilization.

38. Cf. */'el 'elohé 'abikā*, "'El god of your father," in Gen. 46:3. The article is to be omitted in this epithet, since in any case the article developed after the beginning of the Iron Age.

2 ʿĒl and the God of the Fathers

ʿĒl in the Ugaritic Pantheon

The discovery of the Ugaritic texts beginning in 1929 and continuing into the present has removed any doubt that in the Canaanite pantheon ʿIl was the proper name of the god par excellence, the head of the pantheon. While ʿil may be used, of course, as an appellative of deity, for example in such an expression as ʿil Haddu, “the god Haddu,” such usage is relatively rare. In mythic texts, in epic texts, in pantheon lists and temple records, ʿIl is normally a proper name.¹ That ʿĒl was the name of a particular deity should have been clear from the beginning from Sakkunyaton’s “Phoenician Theology” preserved in fragments in Philo Byblius who in turn was epitomized by Eusebius in the *Praeparatio evangelica*.²

Moving to East Semitic we find again very ancient evidence that Il was the proper name of a deity. *Il* appears often in earliest Old Akkadian sources without the case ending,³ unambiguously the divine name and not an appellative.⁴ The forms *Ilu* and *Ilum* are ambiguous as are forms written logographically with DINGIR, but many of these forms, too, are no doubt the divine name. For example, the pattern DN-I₃-lum does not occur, but kinship names (*Abu-ilum Aĥu-ilum*, and so on) and like patterns (*Ilum-bānī*, “Il/God is my creator,” *Ilum-qurād*, “Il/God is a warrior”) are frequent and give the same picture of the god as patron, creator, “god of the Father,” and warrior that we find in unambiguous names. One also finds names like I-li-DINGIR-lum / Ilī-ilum/ “my god

1. See the study of O. Eissfeldt, *El in ugaritischen Pantheon* (Leipzig, Akademie Verlag, 1951), and the excellent treatment by M. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts, VT Suppl. 2* (Leiden, 1955).

2. The best critical text is that of K. Mras, ed., *Eusebius Werke*, vol. 8, part 1, *Die Praeparatio evangelica* (Berlin, 1954) I.10, 1–44 (hereafter referred to as *Praep. evang.*). Cf. C. Clemen, *Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos* (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1939); O. Eissfeldt, *Ras Shamra und Sanchunyatón* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1939); *Sanchunyatón von Berut und Ilumilku von Ugarit* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1952). The most thoroughgoing recent study of Sakkunyaton is the unpublished Harvard dissertation of Lynn R. Clapham, *Sanchuniathon: The First Two Cycles* (1969).

3. Exclusive of the predicate state.

4. See the recent study of J. M. Roberts, *The Early Akkadian Pantheon* to be published shortly by the Johns Hopkins Press. Cf. also I. J. Gelb, *Glossary of Old Akkadian, MAD¹* (Chicago, 1957), pp. 26–36, esp. p. 28; *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, 2nd ed. *MAD²* (Chicago, 1961), pp. 139–142, 145–148.

is Il(um).” I. J. Gelb has gone so far as to say “we may note the very common use of the element *Il* in Akkadian theophorous names, which seems to indicate that the god *Il* (later Semitic *’El*) was the chief divinity of the Mesopotamian Semites in the Pre-Sargonic period.”⁵

In the Amorite onomasticon of the eighteenth century B.C. the god *’Il* plays a large role.⁶ Occasionally the divine name is spelled *ila* which many scholars have normalized /’ilāh/.⁷ It is perhaps best to take the *-a* of *ila* as a morpheme denoting predicate state both in Amorite and Old Akkadian.⁸

Among the more interesting Amorite names are those compounded with *sumu* “the name,” *sumuhu* “his name,” plus the element *’Il* or *’ila*. Kinship terms used as theophorous elements are also frequent with the name *’Il* in the onomasticon: *’abum-’ilu*, “’Il is the (divine) father”; *’adī-’ilu*, “’Il is my (divine) sire”; *’aḥum-ma-’il*, “’Il is my (divine) brother”; *Ḥali-ma-’ilu*, *’ammu-’ilu*, and *Ḥatnī-’ilu*, all “’Il is my (divine) kinsman.”

The divine proper name *’Il* is frequently found in Old South Arabic. As we have noted, some of the patterns of Amorite *’Il* names are found also in South Arabic.

In view of the fact that *’Il* appears as a proper name in the earliest strata of languages belonging to East Semitic, Northwest Semitic, and South Semitic, we may conclude that this denotation of *’il* belongs to Proto-Semitic as well as its use as a generic appellative. To argue that one of the two denotations takes priority is to speculate in the shadowy realm of a pre-Semitic language and is without point.

In the three pantheon lists⁹ found at Ugarit, first in order came *’il-’ib* (Akk. DINGIR.a-bi) followed by *’Il* (Akk. *ilum* [DINGIR-lum]). *Dagnu* (later *Dāgān* > Heb. *dāgān*, Phoen. *dāgōn*) and *Ba’l Ṣapān* are third and fourth respectively.¹⁰ The designation *’il-’ib*, Hurrian *en atn*, plural *enna-šta attanna[šta]* apparently applies to a generic type of deity,

5. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, p. 6.

6. Cf. Huffmon, *Amorite Names* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 165, and the literature cited.

7. Cf. Huffmon, *Amorite Names*, p. 165, and the literature cited.

8. Cf. I. J. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Grammar* (Chicago, 1961), pp. 146f., and “La lingua degli Amoriti,” *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Rendiconto della Classe de scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, ser. VIII, vol. XIII (Rome, 1958), p. 154, § 3.2.3.1.4 and p. 155, § 3.2.5.

9. *CTA* 29 (Gordon 17); and J. Nougayrol et al., *Ugaritica V* (Paris, Geuthner, 1968), No. 18 and pp. 42–64; the third text, as yet unpublished, is described on pp. 63f.

10. Compare the Hurrian god lists, *Ugaritica V*, pp. 518–527.

perhaps the divine (dead) ancestor.¹¹ In any case, the major gods of the cult begin with ʿIl. His place at the head of the pantheon is clear also in the mythic texts of Ugarit and in the lore of Sakkunyaton.

The Epithets of ʿĒl

The character of the god ʿĒl is revealed in part in his epithets. A number of epithets portray ʿĒl as father and creator. He is called on occasion ʿabū banī ʿili,¹² “father of the gods.” One may compare:

lōru ʿil ʿabūhu
ʿIl malk dū yakāninuhu¹³

Bull ʿĒl his father
King ʿĒl who created him

Though Baʿl is called son of Dagan regularly in these texts, here ʿĒl is called his father and progenitor. However, we are dealing here with a fixed oral formula which could be used of any of the sons of ʿĒl, that is, any god.¹⁴ The epithet “Bull” is noteworthy. One may compare, for example, the epithet of the patriarchal god ʿĀbīr Yaʿqob, “the Bull of Jacob.” Like epithets are *bāniyu binwāti*,¹⁵ “Creator of (all) creatures,” and ʿabū ʿadami,¹⁶ “Father of man.” In Text 10 we find the ʿĒl epithet:

kī qāniyunu ʿōlam
kī dārdā⟨r⟩ dū yakāninunu¹⁷

Indeed our creator is eternal
Indeed ageless he who formed us.

Compare also *qāniyatu ʿilīma*,¹⁸ “Creatress of the gods,” a formula applied to ʿĒl’s consort Asherah-ʿĒlat. Yet another designation used of ʿĒl is *hātikuka*, “thy patriarch.”¹⁹ In later West Semitic texts we

11. See *YGC*, pp. 141f.

12. *CTA*, 32.1.25, 33, etc.

13. *CTA*, 3.5.43; 4.1.5; 4.4.47; etc.

14. In *Praep. evan.* 1, 10.26, we find the plain statement that Baʿl was born to ʿĒl.

15. *CTA*, 6.3.4, 10; 4.3.31; etc.

16. *CTA*, 14.1.36; 14.3.150; 14.6.296; etc.

17. *CTA*, 10.3.6. The reading is based on the reconstruction of H. L. Ginsberg.

18. *CTA*, 4.3.30; 4.4.32; 4.1.23; etc.

19. *CTA*, 1.2.18; 1.3.6. On *hātik*, see F. M. Cross, “The Canaanite Tablet from Taanach,” *BASOR*, 190 (1968), p. 45, n. 24.

find the liturgical name *'Ēl qōnē 'arš*, Hittite *Ilkunirsa*, "'El, creator of earth."²⁰

Another series of epithets describe *'Ēl* as the "ancient one" or the "eternal one" with grey beard and concomitant wisdom. One is cited above. In another Asherah speaks of a decree of *'Ēl* as follows:

taḥmuka 'ilu ḥakamu
ḥakamu (*sic!*) 'ima 'ōlami
hayyatu ḥizzata taḥmuka²¹

Thy decree O *'Ēl* is wise,
Wise unto eternity,
A life of fortune thy decree.

In the same context Lady Asherah addresses *'Ēl*:

rabīta 'ilu-mi la-ḥakamta
šēbatu daqanika la-tasiruka²²

Thou art great O *'Ēl*, verily Thou art wise
Thy hoary beard indeed instructs Thee.

In *Ugaritica V* a new text has been published which gives to *'Ēl* the familiar biblical epithet *mélek 'ōlām*, "eternal king."²³ A similar liturgical name of *'Ēl* is *malku 'abū šanīma*, "king, father of years."²⁴ This in turn is reminiscent of biblical *'ēl gibbōr 'abī 'ad* "El the warrior, eternal father," and of the white-haired "Ancient of Days," *'attīq yômīn* of Daniel 7.²⁵

20. *KAI*, 26A III, 18; 129, 1. On the Hittite *Ilkunirsa*, consort of *Ašertu* (Asherah), see Otten, "Ein kanaanäischer Mythos aus Boğazköy," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* (1953), pp. 125–150; and the discussion of Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, pp. 52–54. To his comments we should add only that the god *kinnār*, Akk. *ki-narum*, now appears in a pantheon list, *Ugaritica V*, No. 18, 31, and pp. 59f.

21. *CTA*, 4.4.41; 3.5.38.

22. *CTA*, 4.5.66; cf. 3.5.10.

23. Text 2.1; verso 4.5 (?), 6; cf. Jer. 10:10. The writer predicted in 1962 that biblical *mlk 'wlm* would prove to be an *'Ēl* epithet ("Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *HTR*, 55 [1962], 236). The title is also used of Amenophis III in *PRU*, V, 8.9.

24. *CTA*, 6.1.36; 17.6.49; etc. That *šnm* appears here should not occasion surprise. The plurals *šnm* and *šnt* were available in Old Canaanite, and the Ugaritic materials reflect more than one level of dialect. We judge it to be a frozen formula. Note that *'ab šnm* appears only with *mlk*, confirming that *mlk 'lm* and *mlk 'ab šnm* are alternate formulaic epithets of the god *'Ēl*.

25. Isa. 9:5; Dan. 7:9; cf. Isa. 40:28.

The text of Daniel 7 is of particular interest. The apocalyptist utilized for his eschatological vision an old mythological theme: ’Ēl sitting in judgment in his court. The identity of the Ancient One is transparent.²⁶ The manlike Being (“like a son of man”) who comes to receive kingship is evidently young Ba’l reinterpreted and democratized by the apocalyptist as the Jewish nation. This has been clearly recognized and defended by J. A. Emerton.²⁷ It has not been pointed out, I believe, that the *’nny šmy’* who come with the “one like a man” belong to the traditional entourage of Ba’l, the (deified) storm clouds (or cloud chariot) accompanying him or on which he rides.²⁸

On occasion the name *’Ōlām (simpliciter)* may be used of ’Ēl. An excellent example is found in a Phoenician incantation on a plaque of the seventh century B.C. from Arslan Tash. The text reads in poetic parallelism:

The Eternal One has made a covenant oath with us,
Asherah has made (a pact) with us.²⁹

The formulaic juxtaposition of ’Ēl’s consort Asherah with *’Ōlām* in the bicolon argues strongly for the identification of *’Ōlām* as an appellation or cult name of ’Ēl. The two supreme gods are named and then follows:

And all the sons of El,
And the great of the council of all the Holy Ones.
With oaths of Heaven and Ancient Earth,

26. See below.

27. J. A. Emerton, “The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery,” *JThS*, 9 (1958), 225-242.

28. See *CTA*, 5.5.6-11; 2.1.35; 10.2.33 and the discussion below.

29. This reading is discussed by F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, “Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria,” *BASOR*, 197 (February 1970), 42-46; the text is written largely in Phoenician orthography but Aramaic script:

k:r:/rt.ln.ʾlt/ʾlm
 ʾšr. krt/lm
 wkl bn ʾlm
 wrb.dr kl. qdšn /sic!/
 bʾlt.šmm.wʾrš/ʾlm
 bʾlt.bʾl/[ʾ]dnʾrš
 bʾʾl/lt hwrn.ʾš tm py
 wšbʾ.šrty
 wšm/nh.ʾšt.bʾl qdš

With oaths of Baʿl, lord of earth,
 With oaths of Ḥawrān whose word is true,
 And his seven concubines,
 And Baʿl Qudš' eight wives.

Other evidence of the divine name 'Ōlām appears in the place-name *bt ʿrml(m)*, that is, *bēt ʿōlām*, "(city of the) temple of 'Ōlām." The place-name is found in the Shishak List³⁰ of towns allegedly conquered in his campaign in the late tenth century B.C. The name 'Ōlām also appears in the Phoenician theogony of Moschos reported by Damascius, in the late Phoenician form transliterated into Greek: *oulōm(os)*.³¹ Its context strongly suggests, however, that it applies not to a god of the cult such as ʿEl, but to one of the old gods belonging to the abstract theogonic pairs. This would equate Moschos' *oulōmos* with Philo Byblius' *Aiōn* of the pair *Aiōn* and *Prōtogenos*,³² and, of course, the *Aiōn(s)* of later Gnosticism.

We also find the epithet 'ōlām applied to the "old god" Earth in the theogonic pair: "Heaven and Eternal Earth."³³

Perhaps the most striking evidence portraying ʿEl as the Ancient (or Eternal) One has come from the Proto-Canaanite inscriptions of the fifteenth century B.C.³⁴ In 1947, W. F. Albright, during his campaign at Serābīt el-Ḥādem, recognized that the miners of Sinai in their proto-Canaanite texts used appellations of the Canaanite deities identified with the Egyptian gods, notably with Ptaḥ, creator god of Memphis and with Ḥathor whose temple was in Serābīt el-Ḥādem. The late Sir

30. No. 36 in A. Jirku's edition, *Die ägyptischen Listen palästinensischer und syrischer Ortsnamen (Klio, Beiheft 37, 1937)*, p. 48.

31. Damascius, *De primis principiis* (ed. J. Kopp), p. 125.

32. *Praep. evang.*, I, 10.9.

33. See above, note 29. We should also take into account the divine epithet *šps ʿlm*, "the eternal sun," in the Karatepe Inscription (B III, 18-IV [*margo*]). This title, in the form *šamaš dārētum* (a Canaanite feminine!) appears in the Amarna texts (*EA*, 155:6, etc.), used as an epithet of the Pharaoh. The late Arthur Darby Nock called my attention to *semesilam*, probably for *semsōlam*, the equivalent of Hebrew *šemes ʿōlām*, in the magical papyri: K. Preisendanz, *Papyri graecae magicae* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1928), II 169/70; IV 591, 1805; V 351, 366, etc. These papyri are full of archaic elements, e.g., *ereschigal* (=Sumerian *Ereškigal* [II, 341]); nevertheless, it is interesting to find a Canaanite epithet known from Egyptian documents of the fourteenth century B.C. surviving in texts of the fourth century of our era.

34. These texts are treated by W. F. Albright in his important monograph, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and Their Decipherment* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1966); see also "The Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from Sinai and Their Decipherment," *BASOR*, 110 (1948), 6-22.

Alan Gardiner had made the first step by reading correctly *lb'lt* "(dedicated) to the Lady," the title of the goddess of Byblos who was identified both in Egypt and Canaan with Ḥathor.³⁵ Albright read also *ḏt bṯn* "the Serpent Lady," an epithet of Qudšu-Asherah.³⁶ There was also the epithet *ḏ ṯb* "the Merciful One," much like the Ugaritic appellation of 'Ēl: *dū pa'idi*, "the Compassionate One."

In 1958 I recognized that a mine inscription, owing to a poor facsimile, had been misread and hence remained undeciphered.³⁷ It reads 'lq'lm, 'il qū 'ōlami, "El, the Ancient One" or "'El, lord of Eternity." It is evidently the epithet which stands behind the biblical 'Ēl 'Ōlām, "the god of eternity,"³⁸ and may be compared with Ptaḥ's epithets *nb ḏt* or *nb nḥh*, both meaning "the lord (or one) of eternity."³⁹

A similar epithet in form if not in content appears in a prism from Lachish.⁴⁰ It bears on one face the name of Amenophis II (ca. 1435–1420 B.C.), on another face a representation of Ptaḥ and an inscription beside Ptaḥ in Proto-Canaanite letters identical in date with the Sinai script. Albright recognized here the epithet *qū gitti*, "lord of Gath," an appellation he already had found in Serābīt Text 353.⁴¹ I should take both to be liturgical names from an 'Ēl cult at Gath in south-western Palestine.⁴²

Aside from the confirmation of the dating of the Sinaitic inscriptions

35. Alan Gardiner, "The Egyptian Origin of the Semitic Alphabet," *JEA* (1916), pp. 1–16.

36. See below, notes 119 and 120.

37. The Mine M inscription (No. 358) was published by Romain F. Butin, S.M., in "The Serabit Expedition of 1930," *HTR*, 25 (1932), 184f. and Pl. XXVII. Monsignor P. W. Skehan has kindly written to me reporting that Butin's squeeze, in the collection of the Catholic University of America, conforms to my reading. W. F. Albright accepts the reading in his latest study, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions*, p. 24.

38. Genesis 21:33. As generally recognized, *yhwh* is secondary here. (See also below.)

39. See Papyrus Harris 5308 (Breasted, *AR* IV, 163); the Memphite theology, *passim* (see John Wilson in *ANET*, pp. 4–6, and bibliography); etc.

40. *Lachish IV: The Bronze Age*, by Olga Tufnell et al., Text 128 (Diringer), pl. 38, 295. Cf. the Amenophis II seal, Rowe S. 37 (Alan Rowe, *A Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs* [Cairo, Imp. de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1936]), which bears a representation of Ptaḥ, and a hieroglyphic inscription *pth*.

41. Albright, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions*, p. 22, reads *ḏ gnt*. In the photograph I see only *ḏ gt* and prefer the assimilated form. At Sinai there are both assimilated and unassimilated *nuns*.

42. Albright takes the epithet to be "Lord of the Vintage (or Winepress)," the Egyptian god Shesmu, a god in the entourage of Ptaḥ who was, Albright explains, apparently taken by the Semites to be "only a form of his immediate chief Ptaḥ" (*The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions*, p. 4).

and the identification of Ptaḥ with Canaanite ʾĒl, the little inscription adds to the evidence that in south Canaan and in the Sinai the cult of ʾĒl was widespread⁴³ and that liturgical epithets of the type *dū ʾólami*, *dū paʾidi*, *dū tābi*, and *dū Gitti* were characteristic of the period.⁴⁴ The consort of ʾĒl, Canaanite and Egyptian *Qudšū*, whose other names included ʾ*Aṭirāt yammi*, “she who treads on Sea,” and ʾ*Ēlat*, also is well documented in the south.⁴⁵

ʾĒl in Canaanite Myth

In a recently published text⁴⁶ we find ʾĒl, called *Rapiʾu malk ʾólami*, “the Hale One, eternal king,” presiding at a courtly banquet. His epithet *rapiʾu*, literally “one who is hale,” applied to the great gods ʾĒl and apparently Baʿl-Haddu,⁴⁷ as well as to El’s entourage. The element *rapiʾ* is found often in kinship names of personal gods: *ʾabrpʾu / abī-rapiʾu* / “Rapiʾ is my (divine) father”; *ʾmrpʾi / ʾammu-rapiʾ* / “Rapiʾ is the Kinsman”; *mt rpiʾ*, an epithet of Danʾil, “man of Rapiʾ”; and so on. Semantically, the term is close to *heilig*, “holy one.” As is the case with ʾ*ēlōhīm* in Hebrew, *rapiʾ* may secondarily apply to dead gods or heroes. Note, however, that in the so-called “Rephaim” cycle,⁴⁸ *rapiʾūma* (pl.) is parallel regularly to *ʾilāniyūma*, “divinities,” later Phoenician ʾ*ēlōnīm* and ʾ*ēlōnūt*, the generic appellative for “gods,”

43. On the temple of Ptaḥ (-ʾEl) at Ascalon in the Late Bronze Age, see J. Wilson in *The Megiddo Ivories*, by Gordon Loud (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939), pp. 11–13; and W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1962), pp. 480f.

44. In the Old Testament the usage survives, with a noun, in *zē sīnay*, older **dū sīnay* in Judges 5:5, and as a relative before verbs sporadically, e.g., *zū qānitā* “whom thou didst create” (Exod. 15:16). This usage is, of course, well known in Phoenician (cf. J. Friedrich, “Zur Einleitungsformel der ältesten phönizischen Inschriften aus Byblos,” in *Mélanges Dussaud* [Paris, Geuthner, 1939], pp. 37–47). The use of *dū* in divine epithets is frequent in Old Canaanite and ubiquitous in South Arabic. We shall have occasion to cite several below. The grammatical formation also appears not infrequently in Amorite personal names: *zū-ḥatni*, *zū-sumim*, etc. See the discussions of I. J. Gelb, “La lingua degli Amoriti,” p. 152, and W. L. Moran, “The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background,” in *BANE*, p. 61.

45. On Asherah-ʾIlat’s cult in thirteenth century Lachish, see F. M. Cross, “The Evolution of the Proto-Canaanite Alphabet,” *BASOR*, 134 (1954), 20f.; “The Origin and Early Evolution of the Alphabet,” *Eretz-Israel*, 8 (1967), 16*. Much later she appears also on coins of Ascalon, presumably still in association with ʾĒl. She holds the *aphlaston* and otherwise displays her associations with the sea.

46. *Ugaritica V*, Text 2 (RS 24.252).

47. Cf. *CTA*, 22.2.8.

48. *CTA*, 20–22.

“goddesses.”⁴⁹ The text reads:

ʾIlu yaṭību ba-ʿattarti ʿšadī
 ʾIlu ṭapaṭa ba-Haddi rāʿiyu
 dū yašīru wa-yaḡammīru ba-kinnāri⁵⁰

ʾEl is enthroned with ʿAttart (of the field):
 ʾEl sits as judge with Haddu his shepherd,
 Who sings and plays on the lyre . . .

The scene is a pleasant one, the old king sitting in state with his young mistress and with the shepherd Haddu singing and playing in court as David sang to old Saul. Evidently Haddu sits at the right hand of the father-god, ʿAttart on his left. The scene fits strikingly with lore to be found in Sakkunyaton: “Astartē, the greatest goddess and . . . Adodos, king of the gods, ruled the country with the consent of Kronos (ʾĒl).”⁵¹

The text ends in a broken but intriguing way:

[yaṭputu?] rapiʾ malk ʿōlami baʿuzzi[hu]
 [yaṭputu? m]alk ʿōlami ba-ḡimrihu
 bal [yamluk] ba-ḡatkihu ba-namirtihu
 larā[mim ba]ʾarši ʿuzzaka
 ḡimrika la [panī]nu (?) ḡatkika

namirtuka ba-tōk ʾUgarīti
 la-yāmāt šapši wa-yariḡi
 wa-naʿīmatu šanāti ʾīli

49. Neither in this text nor in the Rephaim cycle do I see the slightest reason to assign the scene to the lower world.

50. I have no illusions that my vocalizations of Ugaritic here and elsewhere reflect accurately the actual pronunciation of the text. By this risky procedure, however, the morphology and syntax of the interpretation is made plain. More important, vocalization of some sort is necessary for prosodic analysis and unless the prosodic patterns are correctly grasped, the interpretation is often faulty. Finally, I suppose I should say that vocalization of the text is a habit acquired in drilling students in comparative grammar, a necessary pedagogical device, I think, in dealing with a language which in fact we must reconstruct by comparative techniques to read. Happily, data from cuneiform transcriptions of words and names are steadily increasing our limited knowledge.

51. *Praep. evang.*, I, 10.31. It is unfortunate that this text comes to light precisely in time to refute much of Ulf Oldenburg’s thesis in *The Conflict Between El and Baʿal in Canaanite Religion* (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1969). See also below where the Mesopotamian theology is discussed.

Let Rapi' the eternal king [judge?] in might,
 Let [the eter]nal king [judge?] in strength,
 Verily let him [rule] his offspring in his grace:

To ex[alt(?)] thy might in the earth
 Thy strength be[fore] us (?) thy offspring,
 Thy grace in the midst of Ugarit
 As long as the years of Sun and Moon
 And the pleasance of the years of 'Ēl

It should be pointed out that the “ancient king’s” role here stands in remarkable contrast to earlier pictures drawn by scholars portraying 'Ēl as a *deus otiosus* and confirms those who have balanced Ugaritic lore against Sakkunyaton’s doctrine.⁵²

The chief text falling into the pattern of the *hieros gamos* tells of 'Ēl (and not Ba'!) with his two wives and of the birth of his sons Dawn and Dusk (Šaḥar and Šalim).⁵³ The text is the libretto for a cultic drama. It has been badly misunderstood by reason of its impressionistic and repetitious series of scenes. Glimpses of action—'Ēl’s hunting and feasting, the squeals of his wives being seduced, their lovemaking and the birth of the gods—follow one on another, but not in sequence, sometimes anticipating, sometimes repeating actions described earlier. We are given a description of the lovemaking and birth, for example, followed by a repetition of the description of lovemaking and birth. The repetition is a literary or mimetic device, not an account of two different episodes.

After some broken text, the drama opens with 'Ēl preparing a meal at his abode near the sea.

...
 [yqḥ.]'il.mšt'ltm.
 mšt'ltm.lr'is'agn

hlh.[t]špl.
 hlh.trm.

...
 'Ēl takes two ladlesful,⁵⁴
 Two ladlesful filling a flagon.

Behold one: she bends low.
 Behold the other: she rises up.

52. In the latter category is the paper of Patrick W. Miller, “El the Warrior,” *HTR*, 60 (1967), 411–431.

53. *CTA*, 23.31–53 [Gordon 52].

54. We have translated the passage in the historical present since the movement back and forth in time is more easily expressed in this fashion.

hlh.tṣḥ ʾd ʾd whlh.tṣḥ ʾum.ʾum	Behold one cries Sire! Sire! Behold one cries Mother! Mother! ⁵⁵
tʾirkm.yd.ʾil.kym wyd.ʾil.kmdb ʾark.yd.ʾil.kym w.yd.ʾil.kmdb	ʾEl’s power ⁵⁶ is great like Sea’s, ʾEl’s power is like that of Flood; Long is ʾEl’s member like Sea’s, ʾEl’s member like that of Flood.
yqḥ.ʾil.mštʾltm mštʾltm.lrʾis.ʾagn. yqḥ.yš<t>.bbth	ʾEl takes two ladlesful, Two ladlesful filling a flagon, He takes (it), he drinks in his house.
ʾil.ḥṯh.nḥt. ʾil ʾymnn.mṯ.ydh. yšʾu yr.šmmh	ʾEl bends his bowstave, ⁵⁷ He drew ⁵⁸ his mighty ⁵⁹ shaft, He lifts (it), he shoots skyward.
yr.bšmm.ʿsr yḥrt yšt lḫm	He shoots a bird in the sky, He plucks (it), he sets (it) on coals.
ʾil.ʾaṯtm.k ypt. hm.ʾaṯtm. tṣḥn ymt[.]mt. nḥtm.ḥtk mmnmm.mṯ.ydk	ʾEl seduces his wives, Lo, the two women cry: O husband! husband! stretched is your bowstave, Drawn is your mighty shaft.
h[.] ʿsr.thrr.lʾišt ṣḥrrt.lḫmm	Behold the bird is roasted, Broiled on the coals.

55. The two wives, no doubt mentioned in the break, bob up and down in embarrassment and excitement. Metrically, the verses form a quatrain b:b:l:l [for this notation, see chapter 6, n. 14]. In traditional stress notation they would be read 2:2::3:3. *Hlh*, “Behold her,” introduces each colon.

56. We have expressed the *double entendre* by translating the identical cola, differently suggesting the two levels of meaning. The use of puns or paranomasia continues throughout this section of the poem. For the idiom “long of hand” meaning “great in power,” compare Hebrew *qisrē yad* or *ha-vad YHWH tiqṣar* (Num. 11:23), etc. Of course ʾark.yd.ʾil could also mean “El’s penis is long.”

57. *ḥt* here means bowstave; cf. 19.1.14 where *ḥt* is in parallelism with *qṣt*, “bow,” and *qṣt*, “darts,” “arrows.” The idiom *nḥt qṣt*, “to bend or stretch a bow” is found in 2 Sam. 22:35 (= Ps. 18:35), “my arm to stretch the bronze (composite) bow.”

58. The verb is denominative from *yamīn*, “right hand”: “to draw (with the right hand)” is precisely the meaning of *mymymym . . . bhym bqṣt* in I Chron. 12:2.

59. *Mt*, Hebrew *matte* means “shaft,” “dart” in Hab. 3:9, 14. In 3:9 it is parallel to *qṣt*: 3:14 reads, “thou didst pierce his head with arrows.” Also in Text 3.2.15, 16 *mim* and *qṣt* are a formulaic pair.

ʾa[t]tm.ʾatt.ʾil.	The women are (now) ʾEl's wives,
ʾatt.ʾil.wʾlmh.	The wives of ʾEl forever.

. . .

. . .

After repetitions with subtle variations we read :

yhbr.špthm.yš[q]	He reclines; he kisses their lips.
hn.špthm.mtqtm	Lo, their lips are sweet,
mtqtm.k lrmn[m]	Sweet indeed as pomegranates.

bm.nšq.whr.	As they kiss they conceive,
bḥbq. <w> ḥmḥmt.	As they embrace, they are made pregnant,

tqt[nšn] tldn	The two travail and give birth,
šḥr.wšlm	To (the gods) Dawn and Dusk.

ʾEl in this text lives up to the reputation found in Sakkunyaton's lore that he was a vigorous and prodigiously lusty old man as is fitting for the primordial procreator and patriarch.

ʾEl and Baʿl Ḥamōn

In 1948 Benno Landsberger observed, "Eine gewisse Wahrscheinlichkeit für die Gleichung *Baʿal-ḥammān* = El ergibt sich, wenn man den obigen Gedankengang gutheisst, aus dem Vergleich der Aufzählung des Hauptgötter (*Baʿal-šemed*, *Baʿal-ḥammān*, *Rakkab-El*) mit der Reihe *Hadad*, *El*, *Rakkab-El* (*Hadad* 18; *Pan.* 22). Die Variante *El-ḥammān* findet sich in späten phönizischen Inschriften."⁶⁰ There is now overwhelming evidence identifying *Bʿl Ḥmn* of Zinçirli and *Bʿl Ḥmn* of the western Punic colonies with Canaanite ʾEl.⁶¹ As a matter of fact, both the epithets *Bʿl Ḥmn* and *Tnt* (his consort) survived only on the peripheries of the spread of Canaanite culture, a mark of archa-

60. Benno Landsberger, *Samʿal* (Ankara, Druckerei der Türkischen Historischen Gesellschaft, 1948), p. 47, n. 117. The inscriptions referred to are *KAI*, 24.16 (Kilamuwa); *KAI*, 214.2, 11, 18 (*Hadad*); 215.22 (*Panamū*). The inscriptions reading *ʾl ḥmn* have proved to be irrelevant. The term is used of the god *mlkʾštri* at his temple at Umm el-ʿAmed. See M. Dunand and R. Duru, *Oumm el-ʿAmed* (Paris, Librairie de l'Amérique et de l'Orient, 1962).

61. For *bl ḥmwn* at Palmyra, see most recently, H. Ingholt, Henri Seyrig, and J. Starcky, *Recueil des Tessères de Palmyre* (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1955), Nos. 212–215; and R. du Mesnil du Buisson, *CRAIBL*, 1966, pp. 165–174 and references.

ism comparable to the survival of linguistic archaism at the frontiers of the spread of a family of languages.

Philo Byblius, and other classical sources, and inscriptions in Greek and Latin all establish the formula that *B^{cl} Hmn* on the one hand, and 'El on the other, are Greek *Kronos*, Latin *Saturnus*.⁶² These equations have long been known,⁶³ and all new data confirm the ancient. Moreover, we now perceive the significance of the epithets *gerontis* used of the Kronos of Gadir (Cadiz), *senex* used of Saturnus of New Carthage, and, indeed, of the epithet *saeculo [frugifero]* used of the African Saturnus.⁶⁴ They reproduce 'El's appellation 'ôlām, "the Ancient One."

W. F. Albright, S. Moscati, and R. de Vaux recently have drawn upon classical sources and new archaeological data from Africa, Sardinia, and Sicily to describe the cult of child sacrifice in the Punic world. "Tophets" in Carthage, Sousse (Hadrumetum), and Cirta (near Constantine) have been found in North Africa where archaeological or inscriptional evidence established the existence of the grim cult.⁶⁵ Italian scholars under the leadership of Sabatino Moscati, in a remarkable series of archaeological missions have found precincts ("tophets") and shrines where child sacrifice was practiced in Sicily at Motya (Mozia)⁶⁶ and in Sardinia at Monte Sirai,⁶⁷ Nora, Tharros, and Sulcis.⁶⁸

62. Most explicit of course is Philo Byblius, but the inscriptions are equally convincing.

63. For the early discussion, see Stéphan Gsell's standard work, *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du nord* (Paris, Hachette, 1920), IV, 277-301.

64. The classical references are found in Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, 290, 298. An illustration of the coin of Claudius Albinus may be found in A. Merlin, *Le Sanctuaire de Baal et de Tanit près de Siagu*. Notes et Documents IV (Paris, 1910), Pl. II, 4.

65. See YGC, pp. 234-238, and references; S. Moscati, *The World of the Phoenicians* (New York, Praeger, 1968), pp. 142ff.; 150f.; 215-218; "Il sacrificio dei fanciulli," *Rendicotti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, 38 (1965-66), 1-8; "New Light on Punic Art," in *The Role of the Phoenicians in the Interaction of Mediterranean Civilizations*, ed. William A. Ward (Beirut, American University of Beirut, 1968), pp. 65-75, and references; A. Berthier and R. Charlier, *Le Sanctuaire punique d'el-Hofra à Constantine* (Paris, Arts et métiers graphiques, 1955); D. Harden, *The Phoenicians* (London, Thames and Hudson, 1962), pp. 94-101; R. de Vaux, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice* (Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 1964), pp. 75-87.

66. A. Ciasca et al., *Mozia I* (Rome, Istituto di studi del Vicino Oriente, 1964); A. Ciasca et al., *Mozia II* (Rome, 1966); I. Brancoli et al., *Mozia III* (Rome, 1967). The series was scheduled to publish *Mozia IV* in 1968 and *Mozia V* in 1969.

67. F. Barreca et al., *Monte Sirai, I* (Rome, Istituto di studi del Vicino Oriente, 1964); M. G. Amadasi et al., *Monte Sirai*, vols. II-IV (Rome, 1965-67).

68. See G. Pesce, *Sardegna punica* (Cagliari, Fossataro, 1961), and the brief review of S. Moscati, "New Light on Punic Art," pp. 67-72.

Diodorus Siculus specifically observes that the cult of human sacrifice was limited to worship of Kronos, that is, of 'El, and alludes to the myth of 'El's sacrifice of his own children. Sakkunyaton preserves the myth of 'El's sacrifice of *Yadīd*⁶⁹ and *Môt*,⁷⁰ a theme repeated thrice by the hierophant. An echo of this aspect of the 'El cult is probably heard in the biblical tradition that the first-born belonged to the deity, and in the background of the story of Isaac's sacrifice as well as in the paganizing cult of the "mulk sacrifice."⁷¹ As Albright has emphasized, there is no longer any basis to doubt Diodorus' accuracy both in describing the cultus itself or in his assertion that the cult was linked to Kronos, that is, to Ba'1 ḤMN-'El.

There has been a long discussion of the meaning of the epithet *Ba'1 ḤMN*. Two etymologies of *ḤMN* which have survived from the older discussion⁷² are (1) to understand *ḤMN* to denote Mt. Amanus (Halevy) and (2) to relate *ḤMN* to the biblical term *ḥammānīm* (Lagrange). With the establishment by H. Ingholt of the meaning "incense altar, brazier," for *ḥammān* (inscribed on an incense altar), a series of scholars took *B'1 ḤMN* to be *ba'1 ḥammān*, the "lord of the Brazier" including J. Starcky (1949),⁷³ Moscati,⁷⁴ and recently W. F. Albright.⁷⁵

There is decisive new data from Ugarit. In 1967 the writer recognized that there was sufficient data to settle this question, and that the epithet *ba'1 ḥamōn* applied to 'El meant the "Lord of the Amanus."⁷⁶ The

69. Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*, XX.14.4-7 (ed. Loeb).

70. *Apud* Eusebius, *Praep. evang.*, I.10.21, 34, 44.

71. See O. Eissfeldt, *Molk als Opferbegriff im Punischen und Hebräischen und das Ende des Gottes Moloch* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1935); on the meaning of *molk/mulk*, "royal sacrifice," see *YGC*, pp. 235-243.

72. The early discussion is summarized in a most helpful way by S. Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, 280-286.

73. J. Starcky, "Autour d'une dedicace palmyrenienne à Sadrafa et à Du'anat," *Syria*, 26 (1949), 51-54. Cf. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), p. 146 and notes 58f., pp. 215f.

74. *The World of the Phoenicians*, p. 138.

75. *YGC*, p. 233. Cf. *KAI*, II, 77f.

76. F. M. Cross, "The Origin and Early Evolution of the Alphabet," p. 12, n. 27. See O. Eissfeldt, "Die Wanderung palästinisch-syrischer Göttes nach Ost und West," *JPOS*, 14 (1934), 294-300 [*Kleine Schriften II* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1963), pp. 55-60, esp. p. 58]. More recently, Y. Yadin has attempted to identify Ba'1 Ḥamōn as a moon god, the "lord of the Amanus." While agreeing that Ḥamōn in the epithet means the Amanus, I can accept none of Yadin's arguments in support. See Y. Yadin, "Symbols of Deities at Zinjirli, Carthage and Hazor," in *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century*, ed. J. A. Sanders (New York, Doubleday, 1970), pp. 199-231, esp. p. 216.

alphabetic writing *hmn* for a theophorus element appearing in Ugaritic personal names (cuneiform *ḥa-ma-nu*),⁷⁷ as well as the Hurrian reading in alphabetic script: in *ḥmnnd /eni ḥamān-ni-da/* “to the divine (mountain) Ḥamān,”⁷⁸ proved that there could be no relation between the deity Baʿl Ḥamān and the brazier *ḥammān*. The laryngeals *ḥ* and *ḫ* are different. The *mēm* is doubled in *ḥammān*, derived from a root *ḥmm* “to be hot”; it is not doubled in any of the certain transcriptions of Ḥamān in cuneiform or Greek.⁷⁹

There is now every reason to equate *ḥamān* with the element *hmn* in the epithet *bʿl hmn*. Punic *Ἀμων*:⁸⁰ it is likely also that Greek *Ἄμωνός*, *Ἄμωνος ὄρος* and Punic *Ἀμων* derive from the forms *ḥamān* and *ḥamōn*, Iron Age forms in the north and south respectively, after the merging of *ḥ* and *ḫ* (>*ḥ*). The usual transcriptions in cuneiform are KUR Ḥa-ma-nu, KUR Ḥa-ma-ni, and KUR Ḥa-ma-a-nu.⁸¹

The mountain *Ḥamānu*, Mount Amanus, is not to be confused with the mountain *ʿAmmana*⁸² in the same general region. The latter is Ugaritic *ḡr ʿamn /ḡuru ʿamma-na/*,⁸³ cuneiform Hittite *Am-ma-na*, *Am-ma-a-na*, *A-ma-na*, *A-ma-a-na*, and probably also Akkadian *Am-ma-na-na*. In early cuneiform transcriptions we find also *Ām-a-num* or *A-ma-num*, the omission of doubling perhaps owing to early orthogra-

77. The names include *ʿabdi-ḥa-ma-nu* and *ʿbdhmn*. See *PRU*, II, 223; *PRU*, III, 240; *PRU*, V, 84.12. Interestingly enough, the name (of a tenth-century B.C. Tyrian) survives in the form *Αβδημωνος*: Menander *apud* Josephus, *Contra Apion*, I, 120. Note the Phoenician shift *ā > ḡ > ū*.

78. *CTA*, 172.1; cf. in *ḥmnnd* in 261.6, 16; 295.7 and below, n. 85.

79. See above, n. 77, and below.

80. From Carthage comes the transcription *βαλ Ἀμων*. Cf. Berthier and Charlier, *Le Sanctuaire punique d'El-Hofra*, No. 1-Greek, Pl. XXVIII, A.

81. See the material collected by J. Lewy, “The Old West Semitic Sun-God Ḥammu,” *HUCA*, 18 (1944), 454–459. Cf. Honigmann, “Amanus,” in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, ed. Erich Ebeling and Bruno Meissner (Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 1928), I, 92. Other variants occur (e.g., see R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien* [Graz, Beiheft 9 *Afo*, 1956] references on p. 131), but none reflect a different West Semitic etymology. The root evidently is *ḥwm*, the noun patterned like *qāmōn* from *qwm*.

82. See J. Lewy, *HUCA*, 18 (1944), 454–459, and references. Cf. H. Otten, “Die Berg- und Flusslisten im Hišūwa Festrival,” *ZA*, 59 (1969), 247–260, esp. 251; A. Goetze in *JCS*, 23 (1970), p. 26. The geographical location of Mt. Amman is not certain. The older identification with the Anti-Lebanon may be too far to the south. It is usually paired with Mt. Casius (Ḥazzi), and may be the Bargylus, Strabo’s Anti-Casius, or a peak in the Amanus, perhaps Jebel Arsūz (Strabo’s Pieria) at the southernmost extension of the Amanus. Cf. W. F. Albright, “A Geographical Treatise on Sargon of Akkad’s Empire,” *JAOS*, 45 (1925), 197, nn. 5, 7.

83. *PRU*, II, 12.16.

phic usage. In Canticles 4:8 *'amma* is written *'mnh*, probably to be read **'ammānā*.

Thus the equation between the mountain *Ḥamān* and the element *ḥmn/Amūn* in *'El*'s epithet presents no linguistic obstacles.

There is yet more evidence. In *Ugaritica V*, Laroche published a hymn to *'El*⁸⁴ in which we read the following: *'il pbnhwn/ḥmn . . .* (ll. 9f.), */ʾIl() paban-ḥi-wi-ni ḥamān()/* “*'El* the One of the Mountain/*Ḥamān* . . .”⁸⁵ As a matter of fact, such an expression as *in ḥmnd*, “to the god *Ḥamān*,” and *in ḥmndd* “to the divine (Mountain) *Ḥamān*” (*the Ḥamān* with the article *-ni*) is the precise Hurrian equivalent of such a mountain designation as *'il Ṣapān*, “the divine (mountain) *Ṣapān*. *Ṣapān/Ṣapōn* also is used in both Phoenician and Ugaritic personal names as is *Ḥamān*, and both receive offerings independently of the gods *Baʿl-Haddu* and *'El*.⁸⁶ It is interesting also that the names are patterned alike.⁸⁷

We experience much more difficulty in identifying the consort of Punic *'El*. She is referred to as *Tannit*, or more fully “*Tannit*, the presence of *Baʿl*,” *panē Baʿl*, in Greek transcription *φανε βαλ*.⁸⁸ In *Sakkunyaton* *'El-Kronos* takes three wives: his sisters *Astarte*, *Rhea*, and *Dione*.⁸⁹ *Rhea* and *Dione* appear to be alternate identifications (as happens often) of the goddess *Asherah*, Ugaritic *'atiratu*, that is, *Rhea* = *Asherah*, and *Dione* = *'Elat*.⁹⁰ The third great goddess *'Anat* is most easily identified with Greek *Athena*, called by *Sakkunyaton*

84. Pp. 510–516. The text is RS 24.278. We note that in the text *Kumarbi* and *Ellil* (*Enlil*) are mentioned among others, the gods equivalent to *'El* in the Hurrian and Mesopotamian pantheons.

85. The syntax is not wholly clear. *Ḥamān* probably stands independently in parallelism.

86. Philo Byblius lists four such divine mountains from *Sakkunyaton*'s lore: *Casius*, *Lebanon*, *Mt. Hermon* (*šryn*), and *βραθν*, i.e., the cypress (mountain), Greek *βραθν*, Hebrew *bērōš*, which is the *Amanus*. The relation between *ḥamān* “*Amanus*” and the god who appears as *Ḥumunni* and *Ḥammanni* in Hurrian and Hittite sources is not wholly clear. See I. J. Gelb, P. M. Purvis, and A. A. MacRae, *Nuzi Personal Names*, *OIP* 57 (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1943), p. 213 and references; and E. Laroche, *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (Paris, G. P. Maisonneuve, 1947), p. 49.

87. Both appear to be substantives derived from hollow roots to which are added the adjectival morpheme *-ānu*.

88. The transcription is found in the inscription cited in note 80; it is also found on coins of *Ascalon*. See G. F. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Palestine* (London, British Museum, 1914), p. 129; Pl. XIII, 18, 19.

89. *Praep. evang.* I, 10.24.

90. In *Praep. evan.* I, 10.35, *Kronos* is said to give *Baaltis* (= *Baʿlat Gebal*) the city of *Byblus*, explaining that *Baaltis* is *Dione*. However, *Baʿalat* appears to be equiva-

Kronos/El's daughter,⁹¹ but ʾAnat does not appear in Sakkunyaton by her Semitic name.

Tannit at Carthage and in the West was identified with Greek Hēra, Latin Juno.⁹² We should have expected either Aphrodite/Venus⁹³ the usual counterpart of Astarte, or Rhea with whom Asherah/Elat is identified in Sakkunyaton, or Athena for ʾAnat.

In recent discussion, Tannit has been identified with each of the three Phoenician goddesses.

The evidence for the identification of Tannit with ʾAstarte is in my view the weakest. One may argue, however, that Tannit replaces Astarte in Africa. Tannit in western Punic texts is rare before the fifth century. By the fall of Carthage, Tannit is almost exclusively mentioned in Carthaginian texts. At the same time, the element ʾ*aš*art persists in personal names. Several Italian scholars, including Garbini and Moscati, have argued recently for this identification on the basis of the inscriptional data found in association with the temple of Hēra/Juno (the *fanum Iunonis* of Cicero) at Tas Silg. On a stone architectural element from the shrine is a votive inscription to ʾ*Aš*art.⁹⁴ At the same time there have been found large numbers of inscriptions mostly on bowls inscribed *lʾšrt* or *lnt* (or abbreviated *lt*).⁹⁵ These data have been taken to suggest that ʾ*Aš*art and *Tannit* should be identified, at least in this precinct and perhaps throughout the Punic world.⁹⁵

Alternate titles of Tannit—Caelestis, Juno Caelestis, and Virgo Caelestis, and even Nutrix (Saturni)—can be appropriately applied to Astarte. In a Sidonian inscription she is called ʾ*šrt šmm ʾdrm*, “ʾ*Aš*art of the awesome heavens.”⁹⁷ In Egypt she and ʾAnat are described as

lent at Sinai to Hathor, and perhaps to *Qudšū*, an alternate designation of Asherah at Ugarit and in Egypt. One notes the transparent etymological relation between Dione and Zeus (gen. *Dios*), ʾ*Elat* and ʾ*El*.

91. ʾAnat, a war goddess, is identified with Athena in *KAI*, 42: ΑΘΗΝΑ ΣΩΤΕΙΡΑ ΝΙΚΗ = ʾ*nt*.

92. The classical references are collected in Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, pp. 255-277; cf. W. Röllig in *WM*, I, 311f.

93. This is explicit in Philo Byblius; cf. *Praep. evang.*, I, 10.32.

94. See G. Garbini in V. Bonello et al., *Missione archeologica italiana a Malta I* (Rome, Università di Roma, 1964), pp. 83-89; Pl. 26.

95. In M. Cagiano de Azevedo et al., *Malta II* (Rome: Università di Roma, 1966), Garbini gives statistics, p. 64.

96. See G. Garbini, *Malta I*, pp. 94ff.; and S. Moscati, *The World of the Phoenicians*, pp. 137ff., and 191-194; cf. G. Garbini, *OA*, I (1962), 297f.

97. *KAI*, 14:16 (Ešmunʾazōr).

“the great goddesses who conceive but do not bear”⁹⁸ referring, it appears, to their role as divine bride or virgin in the *hieros gamos*, while at the same time they are goddesses of fertility. In Egypt ‘*Astart* is also called “Mistress of Heaven,”⁹⁹ and is pictured as a war goddess, as sometimes Tannit and Juno are portrayed.¹⁰⁰

Finally, ‘*Astart*’s epithet, *šm b’l*, “Name of Ba’l” found at Ugarit in the fourteenth century, and at Sidon in the fifth is semantically equivalent to the epithet *panē ba’l* used of Tannit.¹⁰¹ These epithets belong to a general development of hypostases of deity in Canaanite religion. Similar tendencies are found in Israel’s religion. The “name” and the “presence” of Yahweh act for him, in effect protecting his transcendence. The “Angel of the Presence,” or the angel “in whom is Yahweh’s Name” is given to Israel to guide them in the Exodus-Conquest.¹⁰²

There are equally strong arguments against the identification of ‘*Astart* and *Tannit*. An inscription from Carthage begins: *lrbt l’šrt wltnt blbnn* “To the Ladies, ‘*Astart* and *Tannit* in Lebanon.”¹⁰³ The text goes on to speak of their new temples (in the plural). There is not the slightest reason to doubt the identity of *lnt pn b’l* and *lnt blbnn*. Both Ba’l Ḥamōn and Tannit were Canaanite deities bearing archaic and rare epithets (see below). These data suggest strongly that at Tas Silg we must construe the mixture of dedications to ‘*Astart* and to *Tannit* as evidence that the temple originally was dedicated to both, and perhaps to the triad, ‘*El* and his two wives.¹⁰⁴

98. Cf. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 75; W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Aegyptens zu Vorderasien*, p. 495.

99. *BAV*, p. 492.

100. For ‘*Astart* as a war goddess, see *ANEP*, Pls. 468 and 479; *YGC*, p. 133; J. Leclant, “Astarté a cheval d’après les représentations égyptiennes,” *Syria*, 37 (1960), pp. 1–67; *BAV*, pp. 492–494. For Tannit = Juno as war goddess, see the Ascalon coins of *phanē Bal* which portray the goddess with sword, shield, and palm branch (see n. 88 for references), and the tradition of “the arms and chariot of Juno” residing at Carthage. Cf. Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, 256f. (citing Virgil, *Aeneid* I, 16, 17).

101. *CTA*, 16.6.56, and *KAI*, 14, 18.

102. For the “angel of the presence,” see Exod. 33:14 and esp. Isa. 63:9 *ml’k pnyw*: for the angel of the name see Exod. 23:20, 21. Cf. the names *šmw’l* and *pnw’l* referring to manifestations of ‘*El* available to the worshipper. The development of the *šēm* theology in later Israelite religion, especially in Deuteronomic tradition, is traced in the study of S. Dean McBride, Jr., “The Deuteronomic Name Theology” (Harvard dissertation, 1969).

103. *KAI*, 81:1 (*CIS*, I, 3914).

104. An early text from Spain published by J. M. Solá-Solé was first read to refer to both ‘*šrt* and *lnt*. However, on closer examination, the reading *lnt* disappears. See now M. G. Amadasi, *Le iscrizioni fenicie e puniche delle colonie in occidente* (Rome,

The case for the identification of *Tannit* with 'Anat has been made most persuasively by Albright.¹⁰⁵ He combines the relatively rare identification of *Tannit* as *Virgo Caelestis*, with 'Anat's usual title at Ugarit: *Batultu 'Anatu*, "the Virgin 'Anat." He notes also the epithets of 'Anat in a new Ugaritic text: *ba'latu mulki*, *ba'latu darkati*, and *ba'latu šamēmi rāmīma*,¹⁰⁶ and compares the title *Caelestis* with 'Anat's epithet "Lady of the Highest Heavens," and *ba'latu darkati*, "Mistress of Dominion" with *Derketō*, the name of a goddess of Ascalon preserved by Diodorus.¹⁰⁷ The war goddess of Ascalon called *Phanē Balos* thus is linked to 'Anat, the war goddess par excellence of Canaan.

Problems persist in this identification. The goddess *Derketō* is described clearly as a marine goddess by Diodorus. Moreover, alongside the coins with *Phanē Balos* stamped on them are other coins depicting a marine goddess standing aboard a ship, holding in the left hand an *aphlaston* (a ship's stern ornament), in the right hand a standard topped by a triangle or so-called "sign of *Tannit*." The goddess is associated with an incense altar¹⁰⁸ and dove.¹⁰⁹ Another series shows the goddess, crowned with crescent or crescent and disc, standing on a *triton* holding a scepter in the left hand, a dove in the right. I find it easiest to identify as one the goddess portrayed in the three types; in any case *Derketō* should be seen in the latter two coins. Of course, *darkatu* "dominion" like *mulk* or *milkat*, "royalty," "queen," is appropriately applied to any one of the three great goddesses.

Asherah, Ugaritic *'aṭiratu yammi*, "she who treads on the sea," has the only clear marine connections of the three. She is associated with *Daggay 'Aṭirati* at Ugarit, the "fisherman of Asherah."¹¹⁰ 'Elat of Tyre¹¹¹ is also portrayed as a goddess of the sea on Tyrian coins.¹¹²

Universita di Roma, 1967), pp. 149ff. (Spain No. 16); and F. M. Cross, "The Old Phoenician Inscription from Spain Dedicated to Hurrian Astarte," *HTR*, 64 (1971), 189-195.

105. *YGC*, pp. 42f., n. 86; 130, 134f.

106. *Ugaritica V*, Text 2.6f. (p. 551).

107. II, 4.2-6; cf. Herodotus I, 105.

108. The incense altar in question together with the Greek caduceus belong to the ancestry of the Punic caduceus.

109. In Diodorus' story of *Derketō*, doves play an important role.

110. *CTA*, 3.6.10.

111. The epithet "'ilt šrm" appears in *CTA*, 14.4.198, 201.

112. See H. Hamburger, "A Hoard of Syrian Tetradrachms and Tyrian Bronze Coins from Gush Ḥalav," *IEJ*, 4 (1954), 224, No. 137 (Pl. 20, 137). The goddess is

On a priori grounds we should expect Punic ʿEl to have as his consort ʿElat. At Ugarit and in Sakkunyaton ʿElat-Asherah is the primary wife of ʿEl, and as such, the “Creatress of Creatures,” and “Creatress of the gods,” the great mother goddess. Later, especially in biblical notices, she is the consort of Baʿl.¹¹³ The latter connection can provide an explanation for the identification of Tannit in the West with Hēra the consort of Zeus. On the other hand, Tannit is also identified with *Ops*,¹¹⁴ consort of Saturn, the counterpart of Rhea, and is called *Nutrix* or *Nutrix Saturni*,¹¹⁵ and ʿm, “mother.”¹¹⁶ She is, in short, a mother goddess and a virgin bride. Hēra also is a mother goddess, and as participant in the *hieros gamos* called *parthenos*.¹¹⁷

In 1967 the writer proposed to read the Proto-Sinaitic Text 347 *tnt* [tannittu] “Tannit.” This would be easily the oldest occurrence of the epithet. The text itself is on a sphinx found in the Ḥaṭḥor temple: a second text on a sphinx reads as reconstructed by Albright: lb[ʿlt].¹¹⁸ “to the Lady [of Byblus].” These appear to be parallel epithets. In the past *tnt* has been taken to be an infinitive of Canaanite *ytn/ntn*: *tintu*. This is highly unlikely, since *nun* is generally assimilated in these texts.¹¹⁹

The epithet *tannittu* would mean literally, “the One of the serpent.” or, possibly, “the Dragon Lady.” The most straight-forward derivation of Punic *Tennit* (Greek ΘΕΝΝΕΙΘ, ΘΙΝ(N)ΙΘ) is from Canaanite **Tannit*¹²⁰ < **tannittu* < **tannintu*. These shifts all reflect normal

shown riding in a galley. The legend reads ʿlt *sr*. On the related coin showing the goddess in a building enterprise, see Albright, *YGC*, p. 122, n. 30. Cf. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phoenicia* (London, British Museum, 1910), Pl. XLIV, 8, 9.

113. See the myth preserved in Hittite, H. Otten, “Ein kanaanäisches Mythos aus Boğazköy,” pp. 125–150.

114. See Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, pp. 259f. and references.

115. See Gsell, *Histoire*, IV, 260 and reference. At Ugarit, both ʿAṭirat and ʿAnat were wet nurses: *CTA*, 15.2.26.

116. *CIS*, I, 195, 380.

117. M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (Munich, C. H. Beck, 1941), I, 402.

118. *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions*, p. 17.

119. Theoretically, one could posit a form **tinatu* from *y/ntn*. For example, Heb. *šenā* from *ʾšn* is so patterned (in Phoenician *šr* < *šintu* [ʿAḥiram I.1]). This apparently is Yadin’s proposal, comparing Aramaic (Nabataean) *tnt*, “gift” (“Symbols of Deities at Zinjirti,” p. 230, n. 96). However, such a derivation is impossible for the name of the goddess Tannit. The Greek transcriptions and parallel data are clear that *nūn* is doubled and that a vowel in the i-class follows (see W. Röllig, in *WM*, I, 311 and references).

120. On the shift of short a > e, cf. G. Levi della Vida, “Sulle iscrizioni ‘Latino-Libiche della Tripolitania,’” *OA*, 2 (1963), 72; cf. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970), § 75b.

and documented Canaanite/Phoenician sound changes.¹²¹ The name is the feminine of a *qatīl* pattern which in Phoenician becomes regularly *qatīltu*.¹²² The form is thus a feminine derivative of *tannīn*, “serpent,” and is precisely parallel to the old epithet of Asherah *labīʿt(u)*, the “One of the Lion,” or the “Lion Lady.”¹²³ Closely parallel also are the epithets *ḏt bʿn*, *ḏāt baʿni*, “Lady of the Serpent,” identified in the Proto-Sinaitic texts by Albright, and *rabbat ʿaṭiratu yammi*, “the Lady who treads on the Sea(-dragon),” both old epithets of Asherah/'Ēlat. Both the names Baʿl Ḥamūn (=ʿĒl) and his consort Tannit (=ʿĒlat) thus go back to very early epithets of well-known patterns, lost in central Phoenicia, surviving only on the fringes of the Canaanite realm (Ugarit, Šamʿāl, Sinai, Carthage, and the western Mediterranean).

Another epithet of Asherah found in Ugarit¹²⁴ and in Egypt¹²⁵ is *Qudšu*, “Holiness.” She is portrayed on reliefs as a nude goddess standing on a lion, holding one or more serpents. Her headdress is described by Edwards:

The goddess . . . is represented on the Berlin stela wearing on her head the wig of Ḥaṭḥor surmounted by a naos with volutes and at the top of the naos are the disk and crescent . . . Such an elaborate headdress is, however, exceptional; as a rule, the naos is omitted and the wig is surmounted either by a simple disk and crescent or by a member which, in the Ḥaṭḥor capital, forms the abacus. In some cases this member also is surmounted by the disk and crescent.¹²⁶

121. W. F. Albright has proposed (*YGC*, p. 42f., n. 86; p. 135, n. 63; and pp. 266f.) a derivation from Hebrew/Phoenician *tabnīt* > **tannīt* > **tannī* > *tennīt*, translating “glory.” We should prefer to take *tabnīt* in Hebrew to mean “pattern,” or “creature.” In any case *tbnt* appears (without the putative assimilation) in Phoenician and Hebrew. Albright discovers the middle form **tannīt* in Psalm 17:15 parallel to *pnm*, comparing Ugaritic *tmn*/*pnt* in Text 2.4.17f., 26. The argument is easily reversed. Hebrew *tēmūnah* in Ps. 17:15 would appear to be confirmed by the Ugaritic parallel. Cf. the Hebrew meanings “image, apparition.” Similarly, the suggestion that the Greek form of the royal name *Tennēs* reflects *Tennit* is perhaps possible, but to use it to argue that *Tennit* derives from *tabnīt* is to beg the question. Compare the hypocoristica of such Tyrian royal names as *ʿAštart* (*Astartos*) and *Baʿl* (*Baal*, *Bal*), as well as the personal names *Asmunis* (?), *mlqrt*, *skn* (*Sachonis*, *Secchun*), *hdd* (Edomite).

122. Cf. Phoenician *qatīl* > *qatīltu*; *ʿdr*/*ʿdrt*; in Latin transcription *berict/berect* < *barikt* (note the vowel shift, a > e); *labīʿ*/*labīʿtu* [Ugaritic *lbʿit*, Phoen. *lbʿt*/*lbt*]; Hebrew *šallī*/*šallējet*; etc.

123. See F. M. Cross, “The Origin and Early Evolution of the Alphabet,” p. 13 and notes 31–33.

124. *CTA*, 14.4.197; cf. 16.1, 11, 22, etc.

125. See now I. E. S. Edwards, “A Relief of Qudshu-Astarte-Anath in the Winchester College Collection,” *JNES*, 14 (1955), 49–51; *YGC*, p. 121, n. 27.

126. Edwards, “A Relief of Qudšu-Astarte-Anath,” pp. 49f.

Of special interest is the Winchester relief on which three names, Qudšu, 'Astart, 'Anat, appear revealing the confusion of the three goddesses, but also using *Qudšu* as the equivalent of Asherah.¹²⁷ Plaques and figurines from the Canaanite realms in Syria Palestine conform to the Qudšu representations in Egypt.¹²⁸

The epithets *Tannit*, "Lady of the Serpent," and *Labi't*, "the Lady of the Lion" thus fit best with Asherah's iconography.

The Egyptianizing headdress of the goddess *Qudšu* persists throughout Phoenician and Punic representations. It may take the form of the Ḥaṭḥor horns and disk.¹²⁹ It may be ornamented by the abacus alone, or with naos and crescent and disk.¹³⁰ An example of special interest comes from Ibiza from a Tannit sanctuary described by A. Garcia y Bellido as follows: "on the '*kalathos*' as on the breast there are ornaments, among them the lotos, solar disk, crescent moon, and rosettes of four or six petals."¹³¹ The most persistent motif, however, is the crescent and disk. On the Qudšu representations, it resembles more the Khonsu crown than that of Ḥaṭḥor,¹³² and there was evidently some confusion on the part of Phoenician artisans. Relatively early Punic representations of the goddess crowned by the disk and crescent are found on the steles of Motya.¹³³ Especially in the relatively early *cippo naiskos* steles, the disk and crescent is placed above the niche on the pediment or frieze; the symbol alternates with the flying sun disk. In late steles, notably of the cusped type, the crescent and disk have become

127. *Ibid.*

128. Most of the materials are collected by J. B. Pritchard, *Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature* (New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1943), pp. 33-42; see also *ANEP*, Pls. 469-477.

129. Examples are the Yaḥawmilk stele portraying *Ba'lat Gēbal* as Ḥaṭḥor: *ANEP*, Pl. 477; the bas relief on the *naos* from the Wādī 'Ašūr; on a stele from Dafneh (Ba'l Šapōn): *Oumm el-'Amed*, Pls. 75 and 76; and the stele from Hadrumetum, A. M. Bisi, *Le Stele puniche* (Rome, Università di Roma, 1967), Fig. 42. Cf. the bas relief picturing a winged Nutrix, with horns and disk from Ugarit, *ANEP*, Pl. 829.

130. Examples may be found in *ANEP*, Pl. 471 (abacus, naos and crescent and disc); Edwards, "A Relief of Qudšu-Astarte-Anath," Pl. IV (with abacus alone), and *Ugaritica II*, Fig. 10, p. 36 (with abacus alone).

131. A. Garcia y Bellido, *Fenicios y carthagineses en Occidente* (Madrid, C. Bermejo, 1942), pp. 248f.; Pl. XX, 1. The form is clearly influenced by the Ḥaṭḥor-column tradition. Cf. the Ḥaṭḥor columns of the stele from Sousse on which the Ḥaṭḥor hair braids are topped by crescents and disks (A. M. Bisi, *Le stele puniche*, Pl. 24, 2).

132. Cf. *ANEP*, Pl. 474.

133. Isabella Brancoli et al., *Mozia*, III, Pl. 39 (stele No. 130), Pl. 42 (stele No. 129), a dedication to Ba'l Ḥamōn, despite female with Ḥaṭḥor headdress in relief. Often there is a disk alone: Pl. 35 (stele 112). Cf. the relief from Fi, Moscati, *The World of the Phoenicians*, Fig. 11 (p. 57).

merely a conventional decoration placed usually at the peak of the stele. Sometimes the disk turns into a rosette or solar disk. Late coins of Ascalon and of Punic Africa also represent the goddess with disk and crescent over her head.¹³⁴

A different tradition of the *Qudšu* iconography appears in the Thinisut figurine, in which the goddess stands on a lion.¹³⁵ Two statues of goddesses from this same sanctuary (of Baʿl [Hamōn?] and Tannit) are lion-headed,¹³⁶ in the tradition of Egyptian Sekhmet. Confusion between Sekhmet of Egypt and the Canaanite "Lion Lady" is not surprising since Sekhmet is also consort of Ptaḥ, Canaanite ʿĒl.

The iconography of Punic Baʿl Ḥamōn derives directly from older Canaanite representations of ʿĒl. From Ugarit comes a relief¹³⁷ of a male god, with long beard, sitting on a throne with his right hand raised in a gesture of blessing. On his head is a high conical crown below which bovine horns protrude prominently; above is a winged sun disk. A priest is in attendance. From Hadrumentum (Sousse) comes a strikingly similar relief.¹³⁸ A long-bearded god is portrayed seated upon a cherubim (that is, winged-sphinxes) throne. His right hand is lifted in the gesture of benediction. He wears a high conical crown. His left hand holds a spear. A priest stands before him. A winged sundisk is in the frieze above. Two scarabs from Sardinia have virtually identical scenes.¹³⁹ In each the god wears the conical headdress and raises his right hand in benediction; each is bearded. One is seated on a cherubim throne and holds the *wšs*-scepter, a spear in the background. The other is seated on a plain throne with a spear in his left hand. Merlin has published a small statue of a male deity, bearded, raising the right hand in blessing, sitting upon

134. Hill, *Catalogue . . . Palestine*, No. 192; Pl. XIII, 21; L. Müller, *Numismatique de l'ancienne Afrique* (Copenhagen, B. Luno, 1860-1874), III, 53, No. 63 (Hippo Regius and Tipasa); p. 177, Nos. 289, 290 (Mauretania).

135. A. Merlin, *Le Sanctuaire de Baal et de Tanit près de Siagu*, p. 9 and Pl. 6, 2. The abbreviation C on the image may be for C(aelestis).

136. *Ibid.*, Pl. III. Merlin compares the coin of Cl. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio minted in Africa which pictures a lion-headed goddess, her head crowned with the disk and crescent, which is inscribed G. T. A., which has been explained as G(enius) T(erra) A(frīcae).

137. C. F.-A. Schaeffer, "Les Fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit. Huitième campagne." *Syria*, vol. 18 (1937), pl. XVII (*ANEP*, pl. 493). Compare the figurine of an aging god, with right hand upraised, seated (on a missing throne), published by Schaeffer, "Nouveaux Témoignages du culte de El." *Syria*, vol. 43 (1966), pl. 2 (*ANEP*, pl. 826).

138. P. Cintas, "Le Sanctuaire punique de Sousse." *Revue Africaine*, 91 (1947), 1-36; esp. Pl. 49 and Fig. 48.

139. Bisi, *Le stele puniche*, Figs. 57, 58.

a cherub throne.¹⁴⁰ He differs from earlier representations in that he is pictured from the front and wears a feathered crown.¹⁴¹ The coin of Claudius Albinus (who was born in Hadrumet) is stamped with the same motif.¹⁴² A bearded god sits on a cherubim throne. His right hand is lifted in blessing. He is crowned with a feather crown. Before him stands a worshiper. Most significant, he is named in the legend, *Saeculo Frugifero*.

The Abode of 'El

The descriptions of the abode of 'El and his council in the Ugaritic texts have been the subject of much discussion and little agreement. One of the most frequent themes, stereotyped and repetitious, is as follows:

'idaka la-tattin panīma
 'im 'il mabbikē naharēmi
 qirba 'apīqē tihāmatēmi
 tagliyu ḏadī 'il wa-tibā'u
 qarašī malki 'abī šanīma
 li-pa'nē 'il tahbur wa-tiqal
 tištaḥwiyu wa-takabbiduhu

Then she ('Elat) set her face,
 Toward 'El at the sources of the two rivers,
 In the midst of the fountains of the double-deep.
 She opened the domed tent (?)¹⁴³ of 'El and entered.
 The tabernacle¹⁴⁴ of King, Father of Years,
 Before 'El she bowed and fell,
 She did obeisance and honored him.¹⁴⁵

140. Cintas, "Le Sanctuaire punique," pl. II, 2.

141. Cintas presents other parallels from the same area. See especially pl. II, 1, where the god wears the conical crown. One perhaps should also refer to the stele of Sulcis on which a bearded God stands in a niche, his right hand raised, his left holding the spear. On the frieze above is the crescent and disk. See G. Pesce, "Due opere di arte fenicia in Sardegna," *OA*, 2 (1963), 247-256, esp. pl. 41.

142. See note 64 above.

143. This meaning for *ḏd* is that suggested and defended by Richard Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* shortly to be published by the Harvard University Press. See also below.

144. On the tent shrine of 'El and the biblical tabernacle, see F. M. Cross, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *JThC*, 5 (1968), 2f., n. 5; and R. J. Clifford, "The Tent of El and the Israelite Tent of Meeting," *CBQ*, 33 (1971), 221-227.

145. *CTA*, 4.4.20-26; cf. 2.3.4-6; 1.3.23; 17.6.46-51; 3.5.15.

The passage continues with a charming view of ʿĒl receiving ʿAsherāh.

halum ʿil kī yipāhannaha
yapruqu liṣba wa-yiṣhaq
paʿnēhu la-hudumi yaṭpud
wa-yakarkir uṣbaʿātihi

As soon as ʿĒl spied her
He unfastened his scabbard and laughed;
He put his feet on his footstool
And wiggled his toes.

He offered her food and drink and his conjugal bed before hearing her petition on Baʿl's behalf for a temple.

A second passage relates an account of the arrival of Yamm's two messengers at the council of ʿĒl:

ʿidaka panīma la-yattinā
tōk ḡūri ʿiʿli¹⁴⁶
ʿim puḥri mōʿidi
ʿap ʿilūma la-laḥmi yaṭibū
banī qudši la-ṭrm
baʿlu qāmu ʿal ʿili

Then the two set their faces
Toward the mountain of ʿĒl,
Toward the gathered council.
Indeed the gods were sitting at table,
The sons of Qudšu(-ʿĒlat) at banquet,
Baʿl stands by (enthroned) ʿĒl.¹⁴⁷

The picture of ʿĒl's abode given in these two passages places it at the cosmic mount of assembly in the north at whose base the cosmic waters well up; there the council of ʿĒl meets in his Tabernacle of assembly (biblical *ʾōhel mōʿēd*) on the shore of sea.¹⁴⁸ Recognizing that ʿĒl's

146. *CTA*, 2.1.19-21.

147. This idiomatic use of ʿl with a verb of "standing" is well known, applying to the courtiers (heavenly or earthly) standing by a seated monarch or judge (divine or human). Cf. 1 Kings 22:19; Zech. 4:14 (both of council of Yahweh; cf. Isa. 6:2), and Exod. 18:13, 14 (Moses sitting in judgment). See also *Ugaritica* V, Text 2 (cited above).

148. Cf. Tyre's description as "dwelling in the midst of the sea." The same expression is used of Arvad in Akkadian (URU Ar-ma-da ša qabal tāmti). Mt. Ḥamān is regularly

abode is in the north, we can solve a number of problems. In Isaiah 14:13 we find "I shall be enthroned in the mount of the council (of 'El) in the distant north." This has been taken to be a reference to Mt. Şapōn south of the Orontes, the traditional abode of Ba'1 Şapōn. There is no need to impute such confusion to Hebrew tradition. In fact the expression *yarkētē şāpōn* elsewhere refers to the territory in the Amanus and farther north.¹⁴⁹ Mt. Ḥamān, which towers over even Mt. Cassius, also bubbles with fountains at its foot.¹⁵⁰ The description also fits with the biblical description of "Eden, the garden of God at the Mount of God."¹⁵¹ The mythic pattern which couples the cosmic river(s) with the Mount of God, the place where the gates of heaven and the watery passage into hell are found, may be applied to any great mountain with springs at its foot or side where a sanctuary of 'El (or Yahweh) exists. In Enoch and the Testament of Levi, Mount Hermon and the springs of Banias are so treated (on the occasion of great revelations).¹⁵² The pattern is also transferred to Zion in the Bible. This is patent in such passages as Ezekiel 47:1-12, Joel 4:18, Zechariah 14:8, and Isaiah 33:20-22. The theme in another transformation also is found in Genesis 2:10 where the waters springing from Eden are divided and one identified as Gihon. Perhaps the most extraordinary case of identification of Zion with the cosmic mount of assembly is in Psalm 48:3 where Zion, Yahweh's holy mountain, is given the name *Yarkētē Şāpōn*, "the Far North."

A third form of the theme occurs only in broken contexts:¹⁵³

'idaka la-yatinu panīma
 'im Luṭpāni 'il dī pa'idi
 tōk ḥuršā[ni
 [tōk ḡuri ks]

described as by the sea. For example, cf. *AR*, § 641 "the great sea of the setting sun as far as Mt. Ḥamān."

149. Cf. Ezekiel 38:6, 15:39:2.

150. See *AR* § 600, p. 215: rēš e-ni 'ĪD sa-lu-a-ra ša šēp šadē-c KUR Ḥa-ma-ni, "at the sources of the River Saluara which is at the foot of Mt. Ḥamān."

151. Ezekiel 28:2, 13, 14, 16. In the Assyrian annals a royal garden of trees and herbs is often compared with Mt. Ḥamān.

152. See J. T. Milik, "Le Testament de Levi en araméen," *RB*, 62 (1955), 404f. and n. 2. Marvin Pope, in his attempt to locate 'El's abode at Afqa at the source of the Nahr Ibrāhīm, has simply chosen another valid example of the mythic parallelism of the cosmic mount and source with an actual sanctuary at a mountain spring. Cf. *El in the Ugaritic Texts* pp. 72-81.

153. *CTA*, 1.3.21-25; 1.3.11-12; 1.2.23.

yagliyu ḏadī ʿi[l wayibāʿu]
[qarašī malki] ʿabī šanīma

Then he set his face
Toward Luṭpān ʿĒl the Compassionate,
Toward the mountain [. . . .
[Toward Mount Ks]
He opened the domed tent of ʿĒl,
He entered the tabernacle of King Father of years.

These verses serve only to confirm the mountainous character of ʿĒl's abode; it is interesting that the loanword *ḥursān* is used parallel to Canaanite *ḡūr*. One wonders what connotations it carried beside the usual meaning "mountain." Can it refer also to the place of the river ordeal (at the entrance to Sheol) as in Mesopotamia?

ʿĒl the Divine Patriarch

In another recently published text we find ʿĒl feasting in his *marziḥu*, the *θείασις* or cultic revel.¹⁵⁴ The gods are invited to the banquet: they prepare food and drink for ʿĒl, and his lackeys warn the gods to care well for the patriarch, who in consequence becomes drunk as a lord and finally passes out, meanwhile having confronted a certain Ḥubbay, "he of the horns and tail," about whom we should like to know more.

The exercise of authority by ʿĒl over his council suggests that his role is more that of a patriarch, or that of the judge in the council of a league of tribes, than the role of a divine king. It is extraordinary to discover two new epithets of ʿĒl in the Hurrian hymn to ʿĒl discussed above,¹⁵⁵ namely *'il brt* and *'il dn*. Laroche suggests that we read "El des sources, El du jugement." We should expect in this period, however, that "sources" would be written *b'irt*. Rather we should read *'Ēl bērit* and *'Ēl dān*, "god of the covenant," and "'Ēl the Judge." The former may be compared with the epithet of the god whose cult was at Shechem,¹⁵⁶ *'ēl bērit*¹⁵⁷ or *bā'l bērit*.¹⁵⁸

154. *Ugaritica* V, Text 1, pp. 545-551.

155. See above note 84.

156. See now G. Ernest Wright's chapter, "The Sacred Area of Shechem in Early Biblical Tradition," in his volume *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1965), pp. 123-138.

157. Judg. 9:46.

158. Judg. 8:33; 9:4.

If one examines the major decrees of 'El, he finds 'El a strong but not absolute ruler. In Text 2, for example, 'El appears to give in to the desires of Prince Sea, giving Ba'l over to Sea. Ba'l is the only member of the divine council who is not cowed. He stands by 'El's throne and rants at the assembly. Nevertheless, Ba'l is given to Prince Sea as his "perpetual slave," and apparently Ba'l has not enough power to contest the decision. In Text 6 Môt, "the beloved of 'El" as he is called here, and in Sakkunyaton, is doing battle with Ba'l. Šapšu warns Môt that if 'El learns of his fighting against Ba'l, "he ['El] will overthrow your royal throne/ He will break the scepter of your judgeship." Môt is sufficiently afraid of 'El to leave off combat and seek reconciliation. A final example we shall cite is in Text 4. Ba'l desires a temple of his own. 'Asherah-'Élat goes to 'El to lobby in Ba'l's behalf, and through flattery and cajolery gains 'El's reluctant agreement.

'El also appears as the divine warrior: 'El *Gibbôr*.¹⁵⁹ Patrick Miller in a paper entitled "El the Warrior,"¹⁶⁰ describes 'El's role as a patron god of Kirta, "the son of 'El." He instructs Kirta in an incubation to prepare and conduct a campaign of "holy war" in order to secure a bride. In the mythic texts of Ugarit the great cosmogonic battles are waged by Ba'l and 'Anat with 'El like an aging David remaining at home seducing goddesses, but 'El plays the mighty man of war in the narrative of Sakkunyaton. His battles, however, fit not so much in the context of cosmogonic myth, as in myths of theogony, the story of the old gods, the natural pairs like Heaven and Earth, which stand behind the pantheon. In the sophisticated, or rather typologically more developed, cosmogonic myths, the theogony of the old divine pairs often function as an introduction, giving the complex myth placement in "time." This is the case in *Enūma eliš* and also in the conflate series of cosmogonies in Sakkunyaton. Theogonic series are also linked with the great gods in another function: the listing of witnesses to a treaty or covenant. An intriguing case is found in the Sefireh Treaty Inscription.¹⁶¹ After listing the major patron deities of each party to the treaty, the text then names the high god 'El-and-'Elyon and then goes on to list primordial pairs: Heav[en and Earth], [Ab]yss and Sources, Day and Night. Similar sequences are familiar in the Hittite treaties. It will be noted that in the list of witnesses the theogonic sequence is reversed, moving behind the

159. This title, used of Yahweh, probably goes back to an 'El epithet.

160. *HTR*, 60(1967), 411-431.

161. *KAI*, 222.I.A.8-12.

“executive” deities to more fundamental structures that bind even the gods. This special use of the old gods survives in the Old Testament in the covenant lawsuit oracle; witnesses are called, Heaven and Earth or Heaven and Mountains to hear the case of the divine suzerain against his rebellious vassal. As a matter of fact, 'Ēl like Enlil stands at the “transition point” between the old gods and the deities of the cultus. To put it another way, 'Ēl reflects the patriarchal structures of society in many of the myths and the organized institutions of kingship in other titles and functions. He may be a state god or a “god of the father.”

The particular wars of 'Ēl are to establish his headship in the family of the gods. His wars are against his father *Šamēm*, “Heaven,” in behalf of his wronged mother *Arš*, “Earth”; the two, Heaven and Earth are the last of the theogonic pairs. 'Ēl takes his sisters to wife and emasculates his father. The parallels with the Theogony of Hesiod are close: Earth by her firstborn Heaven gave birth to the great gods, among them Rhea and Kronos. It is Kronos who, in defense of his mother Earth, emasculates Heaven. Zeus the son of Rhea and Kronos went to war against his parents and defeated them, casting them into the nether world.¹⁶² Similarly, in the Kumarbi myth, Kumarbi emasculated his father Anu (Heaven), who in his own time had cast his father Alalu into the nether world.

The most extraordinary example of what we may call the patricide-incest motif is found in a newly published theogony.¹⁶³ Through some six generations of theogonic pairs, power is transferred by the device of patricide and incest. In the second generation the young god Sumuqan kills his father (whose identity is uncertain), weds his mother Earth and his sister Sea for good measure. Sea also kills her mother and rival wife Earth. In the third through the sixth generation the young god murders the patriarch (twice his mother as well), and regularly weds his sister (only in the third generation does he wed his mother also). In the seventh generation the young god holds his father captive. In the broken lines that follow we meet the great gods of the pantheon, Enlil and his twin sons Nušku and Ninurta, who apparently share rule amicably.

The existence of this “baroque” form of the patricidal and incestuous

162. Hesiod, *Theogony*, 165–180; 455–490; 650–730 (ed. Loeb).

163. W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard *CTBT*, vol. 46 (1965), Pl. 39; W. G. Lambert and Peter Walcot, “A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod,” *Kadmos*, 4 (1965), 64–72; W. F. Albright, *YGC*, pp. 81ff. The most penetrating study I have seen is that of Thorkild Jacobsen entitled “The Harab Myth,” forthcoming.

pattern of the theogonic myth should make clear once and for all that the succession of the Gods: Šamêm to 'El, and 'El to Ba'l-Haddu, and so on, does not root in the history of a sequence of cults, one following the other in the history of the Canaanite (Mesopotamian, Hurrian, and so on) religion. The pattern of violence in the generations of the old gods (one or more) comes to an end at the point of transition to the great gods of the cult, those who finally establish an uneasy, but tolerable, peace. In Greece the transition went over two generations, Zeus "the Father of the gods and man" successfully banishing his old father to Tartarus. In the Canaanite shift from the old gods to the established cosmic state, 'El like Enlil established himself father of the gods, associating his son (or nephew) in his rule over the cosmos.

The myths of 'El present static or eternal structures which constitute nature and the uneasy order of a patriarchal society. They do not seek to explain the historical course in the rising or falling popularity of a god's cult. In the cosmic family of the gods the patriarch always stands between the old (or dead) god and his lusty and ambitious son. It is this structure the myth describes, a "primordial" structure. The older theogonic pairs, at least at first, must inevitably be incestuous. Moreover, patriarchal society creates settings in which the temptation to incest on the one side and revolt against the father on the other side constantly threaten family peace. In the court history of David these forces are dramatically revealed. The rape of Absalom's sister Tamar by Amnon, another son of David, began a conflict which included fratricide and ultimately the revolt of Absalom against David. The transfer of power was signaled by Absalom's violation of his father's harem, and the episode ended only in a test of arms in which Absalom fell. The succession to David's throne by Solomon whom David appointed king in his last days also was marked by fratricidal conflict and harem intrigue. This is the pattern of life of men and gods who live in the extended families of patriarchal society.

We see 'El as the figure of the divine father. 'El cannot be described as a sky god like Anu, a storm god like Enlil or Zeus, a chthonic god like Nergal, or a grain god like Dagon. The one image of 'El that seems to tie all of his myths together is that of the patriarch. Unlike the great gods who represent the powers behind the phenomena of nature, 'El is in the first instance a social god. He is the primordial father of gods and men, sometimes stern, often compassionate, always wise in judgment.

While he has taken on royal prerogatives and epithets, he stands closer to the patriarchal judge over the council of gods. He is at once

father and ruler of the family of gods, functions brought together in the human sphere only in those societies which are organized in tribal leagues or in kingdoms where kinship survives as an organizing power in the society. He is a tent-dweller in many of his myths. His tent on the mount of assembly in the far north is the place of cosmic decisions. There are myths of monumental carousals where he appears to live in a palace, *hēkal*, and live like a king. Such uneven layers of tradition in oral poetry should not occasion surprise.

'El is creator, the ancient one whose extraordinary procreative powers have populated heaven and earth, and there is little evidence that his vigor has flagged. Myths of 'El perceive creation as theogony. Myths of Ba'l view creation as cosmogony. 'El rests now from ancient wars in which he won patriarchal authority; feats of arms "now" are fought by younger gods, Ba'l in particular, and he shares 'El's rule. 'El's chief wife, the mother of the gods, is occupied with family intrigues. 'El appears affectionate toward her, but the *hieros gamos* texts of 'El reveal that he often turns to younger wives. His three important consorts are his two sisters Asherah and Astarte, and his daughter 'Anat. Ba'l also takes 'Anat as consort, and 'El shows particular favor to Astarte the divine courtesan.

In Akkadian and Amorite religion as also in Canaanite, 'El frequently plays the role of "god of the father," the social deity who governs the tribe or league, often bound to league or king with kinship or covenant ties.

His characteristic mode of manifestation appears to be the vision or audition, often in dreams. This mode stands in strong contrast to the theophany of the storm god whose voice is the thunder and who goes out to battle riding the cloud chariot, shaking the mountains with stormy blasts of his nostrils, striking the enemy with fiery bolts. Ba'l comes near in his shining storm cloud. 'El is the transcendent one.

3 *Yahweh and 'Ēl*

'Ēl in the Bible

'Ēl is rarely if ever used in the Bible as the proper name of a non-Israelite, Canaanite deity in the full consciousness of a distinction between 'Ēl and Yahweh, god of Israel. This is a most extraordinary datum.

In Ezekiel, 28:2, the prophet's famous oracle against Tyre, he describes 'Ēl in excessively mythological terms, suggesting that he knew that he sang of the Canaanite deity: "Because your heart was proud you (Tyre) said, 'I am 'Ēl, in the seat of 'Elōhīm I am enthroned in the midst of the seas'." The abode of 'Ēl is described precisely in Canaanite language. Yet there are problems. Ezekiel uses 'Elōhīm in parallel to 'Ēl here, and later in vv. 14 and 16 speaks of 'Ēl's mountain as *har 'ēlōhīm*, and in v. 2 uses 'Ēl in its fairly frequent generic sense. I am inclined to believe the prophet was aware of the background of the language he used. In the phrase, "you are human and not divine/'Ēl," it appears that he plays on the double possibility in meanings of 'ēl: "a divinity"/"the divinity 'Ēl". Similarly in using the expressions *gan 'ēlōhīm* and *har 'ēlōhīm*¹ he may have been aware that 'ēlōhīm could be used with a double meaning: the "plural of cult manifestations" of a proper name (like Bē'ālīm = Ba'1), as well as a simple plural: "gods". Still problems remain and the evidence is not wholly clear.

In Judges 9:46 there is a reference to the temple of 'ēl *bērīt*. As we have noted above, this appears to be a specific epithet of Canaanite 'Ēl. Here again, however, one must ask how the epithet was understood in later biblical tradition. In view of the parallel title *Ba'1 bērīt*, the god was evidently understood to be a pagan deity.

Some have suggested that the expression 'ādat 'Ēl in Psalm 82:1 be taken as "the council of 'Ēl," and the poem read to mean that Yahweh (revised to 'ēlōhīm in the 'Elohistic Psalter) stood in 'Ēl's council. I doubt that this is so and would place the passage among those in early poetry where 'Ēl is clearly regarded as a proper name of Yahweh. However, there can be no doubt that the origin of the designation 'ādat

1. Cf. hr. 'il in Text 4.2.36.

'El is in Canaanite myth. It appears at Ugarit in the form *'adatu 'Ili-ma* (*'dt 'ilm*), "council of 'El."²

A similar frozen, archaic phrase having its origin in Canaanite mythic language is *kôkabê 'El*, "the stars of 'El,"³ that is, the northern or circumpolar stars. The expression has turned up in the Pyrgi Inscription in the form *hkkbm 'l*.⁴

In the same category, I think, are the expressions *'arzê 'El* (Psalm 80:11) and *hararê 'el* (Psalm 36:7; compare Psalm 50:10). The usual explanation, that *'el* here means "preeminent," or "grand," appears weaker, especially in view of 'El's abode in the "cedar mountains" of the Amanus. It is doubtful that the original connotations of any of these archaisms survived in Israelite usage after the era when Yahweh ceased to be an epithet of 'El (see below).

The use of the apparent plural *'lym* requires special treatment. It occurs in the Bible only four times, three times⁵ in early Hebrew poetry: Psalm 29:1, Psalm 89:7⁶ and Exodus 15:11;⁷ and once in a late Apocalyptic context, Daniel 11:36. In Psalms 29:1 and 89:7, it is used in the phrase *bny 'lym*. The original referent was, of course, to the family of 'El and hence to members of the genus "god." These two occurrences, one evidently in a borrowed Ba'al hymn,⁸ require further comment in view of Canaanite usage. In the Ugaritic texts the council of the gods is designated by the following phrases: *dr bn'il / dār banī 'ili / mphrt bn 'il, p̄hr bn 'ilm / puḥru banī 'ili-ma /*. 'El is called

2. *CTA*, 15:2.7, 11.

3. Isa. 14:13.

4. On the problem of the article and the m-enclitic, see M. Dahood, "Punic *hkkbm 'l* and Isa. 14, 13," *Orientalia*, 34 (1965), 170-172; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Phoenician Inscription from Pyrgi," *JAOS*, 86 (1966), 285-297; and T. O. Lambdin, "The Junctural Origin of the West Semitic Definite Article," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, ed. Hans Goedicke (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), p. 329, n. 24.

5. We need not treat here the use of *'lym* and *'ly* in such passages as *'ly gbwrym* in Ezekiel 32:21 or *'lym* in Job 41:17. There are simply orthographic variants of *'ly* and *'lym* in passages where the animal name is used as a military or noble appellation. Such usage (with various animal names) is frequent in Canaanite literature and in the Bible.

6. The material in Ps. 89:6-19 is quite archaic although now brought together with later hymnic tradition in the Psalm as a whole.

7. See below where I argue for a late twelfth or early eleventh century date for the poem.

8. See H. L. Ginsberg, *Kitvé Ugarit* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem, Bialik Foundation, 1936), pp. 129ff.; and F. M. Cross, "Notes on a Canaanite Psalm in the Old Testament," *BASOR*, 117 (1950), 19ff., and the references cited there.

ʿab bn ʿil /ʿabū banī ʿili/. Epithets of a single member of the “family,” divine or human, include *bn ʿil /bin ʿili/*, and *bn ʿilm /bin ʿili-ma/*. These data may be taken to suggest that *ʿlm*⁹ in Psalm 29:1 and Psalm 89:7 is to be read as a singular with the enclitic. In later Phoenician *bn ʿlm* appears, for example, in *kl bn ʿlm* in the Arslan Tash Plaque (seventh century B.C.). As in the case of the biblical occurrences, it is in archaizing poetry. In Phoenician, *ʿlm* can reflect the singular *ʿĒl* plus the enclitic, a plural applied to a single god (*ʿĒl* or any other!), or a simple plural of the generic appellative. We know that the m-enclitic survives at least as late as the fifth century B.C. in Phoenician.¹⁰ The balance of evidence seems to be on the side of reading the proper name *ʿĒl* plus the enclitic in both occurrences in the Psalter and in the incantation from Arslan Tash as well. At all events, this usage was long dead when the apocalyptists revived the use of *ʿēlīm* and *bʿnē ʿēlīm* in which *ʿēlīm* is taken to be the appellative plural. In Exodus 15:11 we have the sole biblical example of the living use of the plural *ʿēlīm* as an ordinary generic appellative before the time of the late apocalyptic (Daniel 11:36).

ʿĒl Epithets in Patriarchal Narratives

We are prepared now to return to the *ʿĒl* epithets in the Patriarchal narratives of Genesis. These names are compounded of the element *ʿēl* with a following substantive or adjective, among them *ʿēl ʿōlām* (Genesis 21:33),¹¹ *ʿēl ʿelyōn* (Genesis 14:18ff.),¹² *ʿēl ʿēlōhē yiśrāʿēl* (Genesis 33:20),¹³ *ʿēl rōʿi* (Genesis 16:13), *ʿēl bêt-ʿēl* (Genesis 35:7:

9. We use here pre-Exilic orthography in which *ʿēlīm* and *ʿeli-m* could not be distinguished.

10. See above note 4, where an instance from fifth-century Pyrgi is cited.

11. As is generally recognized, *yhwh* is secondary in Gen. 21:33.

12. In Gen. 14:22, omit *yhwh* with G and Sy; Sam reads here *hʿlthym ʿl ʿlywn* which adds slightly to the evidence for omitting *yhwh*. That is, both *yhwh* and *hʿlthym* are additions for explication.

13. “*Ēl*, god of (the Patriarch) Israel.” Cf. [*ʿēl ʿēlōhē ʿābikā*, Genesis 46:3, “*Ēl*, god of your father,” an epithet used at Beersheba. Omit the article (with Sy) in the epithet, since in any case it developed after the loss of inflectional endings in Canaanite at the beginning of the Iron Age. The first examples of the true article fall in the tenth century, and even in inscriptions of this period it is not used systematically: it is quite late in invading poetic and/or liturgical language. For the non-use of the article in Canaanite poetry, see F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, “Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria,” p. 48. In Ugaritic prose, *hnd* and *hnk* are demonstrative pronouns, the element *hm-* probably unrelated to the later Canaanite article. See W. F. Albright, “Specimens of Ugaritic Prose,” *BASOR*, 150 (April 1958), 37f., n. 11; M. Dahood, “The Linguistic Position of Ugaritic in Light of

compare 31:13);¹⁴ and 'ēl šadday.¹⁵ Most of the epithets are tied to specific Patriarchal sanctuaries or altars, 'ēl 'ōlām to Beersheba, 'ēl 'elyōn to Jerusalem, 'ēl 'ēlōhē yisrā'ēl to Shechem,¹⁶ 'ēl rō'ī to Beerlahay-roi, and 'ēl bēt-'ēl, of course, to Bethel. 'Ēl Šadday, unlike the other epithets, is not firmly fixed in cultic aetiology, although the P source does attach the name to Bethel in Genesis 48:3.

Many of these epithets are capable philologically of receiving more than one interpretation. We may read 'ēl as a proper name 'Ēl or as a generic appellation, "god." In the first instance, the second element will normally be an attributive adjective or participle, or a substantive in apposition. In the second instance, the second element may be taken as a divine proper name in apposition, or a substantive in a genitive relationship. Thus 'ēl 'ōlām, for example, may be read "the god 'Ōlām," or "the god of eternity" ("the ancient god"). Again, we may take the epithet 'ēl 'elyōn to mean "the God 'Elyōn," or "'Ēl, the highest one," or conceivably "the highest god."

The choice of one of these alternate interpretations has been determined in the past by general views of the history of Canaanite and Patriarchal religion. Usually the choice in one instance has determined the choice in all or most of the others. Thus, under the influence of the theory that the gods of Canaan were local genii, one school has consistently read the element 'ēl as an appellation.¹⁷ On the other hand, scholars with much more sophisticated views of Canaanite religion have arrived at much the same conclusion as to the correct philological

Recent Discoveries," in *Sacra Pagina*, ed. J. Coppens et al. (Paris, Lecoffre, 1959), pp. 271f. and references; and especially T. O. Lambdin, "The Junctural Origin of the West Semitic Definite Article," pp. 315-333.

14. This epithet raises special problems in view of the hypostatization of Bethel and the eventual emergence of Bethel as a full-fledged deity. See provisionally the material collected by O. Eissfeldt, "Der Gott Bethel," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 28 (1930), 1-30 (reprinted in *KS* [Eissfeldt], I, 206-233); A. Vincent, *La Religion des judéo-araméens d'Éléphantine* (Paris, Geuthner, 1937), esp. pp. 562-592. In our view we should read "the god of Bethel" in the two passages of Genesis, not "the god Bethel." At some early point in history the name *Bēt-'ēl* must have meant simply "the temple of 'Ēl": but these issues cannot detain us here.

15. In the form 'ēl šadday (as opposed to šadday alone) the epithet occurs in contexts of the Priestly strata: Gen. 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3 and Exod. 6:3. The full epithet also appears once in an archaic context: Gen. 49:25 (with G Sam Sy) in parallel to 'ēl 'abika, sufficient evidence that P draws upon old tradition.

16. The epithet 'ēl bērit is also attached to Shechem; cf. above, notes 156ff.

17. The classical, critical statement of this view is that of Alt; U. Cassuto defends with modern tools a modified version of the traditional view (*La questione della Genesi* [Florence, F. Le Monnier, 1934], pp. 60-82).

analysis of the epithets. No doubt the most powerful argument for reading "the god PN" lies in the fact that such elements of epithets as 'ólām,¹⁸ 'elyōn, and šadday appear in the Bible and in extrabiblical sources independently, without the prefixed 'ēl. In view of such data it was easiest to suppose that the element 'ēl has been leveled through the material in the late development of tradition,¹⁹ namely, when the old divine epithets were reapplied to Yahweh, in the pattern Yahweh, 'El 'Ôlām, and so forth.

The view that these cultic or liturgical names are epithets of the god 'El has been given a new life by the expansion of our knowledge of Canaanite and Amorite religion. As we have seen, 'El has emerged from the texts as a central figure of the pantheon. We know that in south Canaan his cult was especially popular in the second millennium and that in the Punic Occident he dominated, not only theoretically as head of the pantheon, but actually in his several cults. We know that 'il in the Canaanite texts is regularly, or rather in a majority of cases, the proper name of 'El. Some scholars actually have argued for a tendency in Canaan toward an 'El monotheism, or, better, pantheism.²⁰ On the contrary, it seems clear that no later than the fourteenth century B.C. in north Syria, the cult of 'El was declining, giving place to the cult of Ba'1-Haddu in point of popularity. The cult of Ba'1, it seems, was more supportive of the institution of kingship and of an agricultural as opposed to a cattle-keeping economy. However this may be, it has become tempting to see the epithets 'ēl 'ólām, and so on as titles of Canaanite 'El, epithets drawn from liturgical names of the father of the gods as he was worshipped in the chief Palestinian sanctuaries.²¹

18. On 'ólām as a divine name in the Old Testament, see F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," *JBL*, 67 (1948), 209, n. 85. Dt. 33:27 reads, *mē'ōnō [sic!] 'ēlohē qēdem/mittahtaw zero ot olam*. "His (Jeshurun's) refuge is the God of old/Under him are the arms of the Ancient One." A divine name is expected after *zero ot*, to parallel *'ēlohē qēdem*. On the other hand, it may be argued that *zērō'* is often the hypostasis of the divine power and hence may make an adequate parallel. Cf. Isa. 40:28 and Jer. 10:10. M. Dahood has found the divine name *olam* in a number of places in the Psalter: Ps. 24:7, 9; 52:11; 66:7; 73:12; 75:10; and 89:3. Had he found fewer instances his case would appear stronger; see *Psalms*, I, *The Anchor Bible* (New York, Doubleday, 1966), p. xxxvii and *ad loc.*

19. See M. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden, Brill, 1955), pp. 14f.

20. Cf. R. Dussaud, *Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l'ancien Testament*, 2nd ed. (Paris, P. Geuthner, 1941); and especially O. Eissfeldt, *El im ugaritischen Pantheon*; and "El and Yahweh," *JSS*, 1 (1956), 25-37 (reprinted in *KS* [Eissfeldt], III, 386-397).

21. This position has been most eloquently defended by O. Eissfeldt.

Such an epithet as 'ēl 'ēlōhē yisrā'ēl, "'Ēl, the god of (the Patriarch Jacob) Israel" is unambiguous. It simply must be read as identifying the god of the Father with Canaanite 'Ēl. The epithet²² [] 'Ēl 'ēlōhē 'ābika, "'Ēl, the god of your father," also seems to be a transparent reference to 'Ēl. Does it not follow then that 'ēl 'ōlām, 'ēl šadday, and so forth are each variant cult forms of 'Ēl?

There are grammatical problems in so construing some of the names. An epithet 'ēl 'ōlām is most easily read "the god of eternity." We cannot take the proper name 'Ēl to be in a construct relationship to the noun 'ōlām.²³

Again, on methodological grounds, I do not believe that the interpretation of the several epithets can be solved by general religio-historical constructions. To be sure, we can speak no longer of the 'ēlīm of Canaan as "local *numina*." The great gods of the Canaanite pantheon were cosmic deities. There is, indeed, a double movement clearly discernible in Syro-Palestinian religion. A great god such as 'Ēl or 'Asherah appears in local manifestations in the cult places and gains special titles, attributes, hypostases. In the process, one cult or title may split apart and a new god emerge to take his place beside 'Ēl or 'Asherah in the pantheon. On the other hand, there is a basic syncretistic impulse in Near Eastern polytheism which tends to merge gods with similar traits and functions. A minor deity, worshipped by a small group of adherents, may become popular and merge with a great deity; major deities in a single culture's pantheon may fuse; or deities holding similar positions in separate pantheons may be identified.²⁴

22. See above, note 13.

23. This applies, too, to 'ēl Bethel, 'ēl bērit, and possibly 'ēl rō'ī. The original epithet of the Shechemite god was probably 'Ēl ba'l bērit, "'Ēl lord of Covenant." As we have seen, the liturgical formula underlying 'Ēl 'ōlām was probably 'Ēl qū 'ōlām, "'Ēl lord of eternity," as well as simple 'ōlām. Of course, it is possible to form compound divine names, in effect hyphenated forms. Examples are 'Ilu'ib, 'Ilu-wer or with other gods 'ir'ī (Atargatis), 'štrtkmš, 'ršp mlqrt, etc. At Ugarit occasionally we find double names of gods or rather names of gods used in fixed or formulaic pairs joined in hendiadys: Kōṭar wa-Ḥassis, Nikkal wa-'Ib, Qudšu wa-'Amrur, and 'Aṭirat wa-Raḥmay. But these are nevertheless unusual.

24. See A. Bertholet's essay, *Götterspaltung und Göttervereinigung* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1933), now somewhat antiquated. An extraordinary example of cross-cultural assimilations is found in Kumarbi myths published by H. G. Güterbock, *Kumarbi* (Zürich-New York, Europa Verlag, 1946). Another old but still useful collection of bizarre instances of both hypostatization and fusion can be found in W. F. Albright, "The Evolution of the West-Semitic Divinity 'an-'anat-'atta," *AJSL*, 41 (1925), 73-101.

It must be maintained after all that, aside from one or two, the divine epithets are ambiguous. To illustrate from Ugaritic texts, we can cite the following formulae: *'il malk*, *rašp malk*, and *'il haddu*. The first appellation is used exclusively of 'El, and we may suitably translate, "'El, the king." Similarly, *rašp malk* must be translated "Rašp the king." But the third name, a title of Ba'l-Haddu as its context certifies, is "the god Haddu." It may be noted, however, that the latter construction is rare among the divine epithets which proliferated in Ugaritic myths and liturgies. At all events, if we are to identify 'ēl 'ōlām with the head of the Canaanite pantheon, 'El, we must do so on the basis of evidence that 'ōlām is a characteristic appellation of 'El and that 'ōlām is not better applied to another deity. The same holds true for 'ēl 'elyōn and 'ēl šadday, although the second element in each may easily be understood as a substantive in apposition. We must establish the identity of the god on the basis of evidence other than that of the biblical formula itself.

In the case of 'El 'ōlām, "the god of eternity" or "the ancient god," the evidence, in our view, is overwhelming to identify the epithet as an epithet of 'El. This is the source of Yahweh's epithets "the ancient one" or "the ancient of days," as well as the biblical and Ugaritic epithet *malk 'ōlām*. It is found in fuller form in the Sinai epithet *'il dū 'ōlam*. At Ugarit and in the Punic world, 'El is the "old one" or "ancient one" par excellence: *'ōlam*, *gerōn*, *senex*, *saeculum*, he of the grey beard, he of eternal wisdom.

This is not to claim that the epithet 'ōlam is used exclusively of 'El. In the Arslan Tash incantation we found 'ōlam both as an epithet of 'El and applied to "ancient Earth," *'ars 'ōlam*; and the "old god" of a Sakkunyaton theogony is called Aeōn, the *Oulōmos* of Moschus. There can be no question, however, of Patriarchal 'ēl 'ōlām being identified with a god in the sequence of primordial pairs. Such gods do not belong to the present or to the cult save in the highly specialized functions we have described above. 'El 'ōlām is an "executive deity," a deity of the cult, namely the cultus of the ('El) shrine at Beersheba.

'El as the "ancient one" brings us to the biblical epithet 'ēl 'elyōn *qōnē šamāyim wā-āreš*. The title theoretically could mean "the god 'Elyōn, creator of (heaven and) earth," or "'El, Most High, creator . . .," or "'El-'Elyōn, creator . . ." (that is, a double divine name). Whatever the precise form of the epithet, *qōnē (šamāyim wā-) 'āreš* (and the shorter form is perhaps original in view of its widespread occurrence

documented above²⁵), it is patent that 'El is the creator god of the Canaanites and that *qōnē 'ars*, at any rate, applies exclusively to him. Indeed there is no alternate candidate for such an epithet. A question remains about the epithet 'Elyōn conjoined to 'ēl here. It (*ilyoun*) is used of an old god in Sakkunyaton, one of the theogonic pair in the generation before Heaven and Earth. Again we must say that the old god is not the active creator, god of the shrine of Jerusalem. Nowhere does such an old god appear in the pantheon lists or in the lists of gods given sacrifices.²⁶

The mention of 'Elyōn in the Sefire I inscription is more pertinent to our discussion. The pair 'l w'lyn, 'El and 'Elyōn²⁷ comes after the tutelary gods, immediately before the great natural pairs summarizing the old powers of the cosmos. What are we to make of the pair? Certainly 'Elyōn here is not the member of the theogonic pair listed by Sakkunyaton. One may argue that since the gods appear paired with their consorts, each a separate deity, 'El and 'Elyōn are here to be distinguished. But they obviously are not god and consort. On the other hand their association in a pair in such a series, and followed by natural pairs, suggests that they must be intimately associated. It is even possible to interpret the pair as a double name of a single god as often is the case at Ugarit, perhaps carried in stereotyped language when the pair was borrowed from the Canaanites into the Aramaean realm.²⁸ Or one may take 'elyōn as an early epithet of 'El, split apart in a separate cult and hence taken as an independent deity. I am inclined to believe that 'elyōn in Genesis 14 serves as a proper epithet of 'El and is not an intrusive ele-

25. References are given in chapter 2, note 20. To these may be added L. della Vida, "El 'Elyōn in Genesis 14:18-20," *JBL*, 63 (1944), 1-9. We should also call attention to the Aramaic papyrus of the late seventh century published by A. Dupont-Sommer. "Un Papyrus araméen d'époque saïte découvert à Saqqarah," *Semitica* 1 (1948), pp. 43-68; cf. H. L. Ginsberg, "An Aramaic Contemporary of the Lachish Letters," *BASOR*, 111 (October 1948), 24-27; and J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Letter of King Adon to the Egyptian Pharaoh," *Biblica*, 46 (1965), 49. Here in a broken context the epithet of a god is found "[] of heaven and earth . . ." which may be tentatively read (with Ginsberg in part), "'El creator of heaven and earth." We may compare also the Akkadian epithets *bānī šamē u eršiti*, "creator of heaven and earth" (Marduk), *bēl šamē u eršiti*, "lord of heaven and earth" (Anu, Enlil, Marduk, Šamaš); *bānāt šamē u eršiti*, "creatress of heaven and earth" (Maḥ); and *bēlit šamē u eršiti*, "mistress of heaven and earth" (Damkina, Inanna, Ištar).

26. See the article of Rémi Lack, "Les Origines de Elyon, le Très-Haut, dans le tradition culturelle d'Israël," *CBQ*, 24 (1962), 44-64.

27. Hardly Aramaized to 'Elyān (pace Fitzmyer).

28. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (Rome, The Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), pp. 37f

ment in the formula.²⁹ Such epithets expand and contract in a variety of lengths suitable to metrical form in orally composed poetry.³⁰ In any case, the creator god of Jerusalem was 'El, and later, at least, the epithets 'elyōn and 'eli³¹ both became standard epithets of Yahweh alongside his alias 'El.

The epithet 'ēl šadday, while the most frequent of the biblical epithets under consideration, is also the most enigmatic. It is the primary designation of the Patriarchal deity in Priestly tradition, as we have seen, and at the same time is rooted in very old poetic tradition.³² The element šadday, older šadayyu³³ derives from a root ṭdw/y as shown persuasively by W. F. Albright in 1935.³⁴ The writer furbished the argument with new evidence in 1962.³⁵ More material has accumulated since.

A chief problem has been to establish the identity of the sibilant in šadday.³⁶ The Hebrew notation, šdy ordinarily would require an etymological s₁ or s₃ (ṭ or š) standing behind the form. In this case s₂ is eliminated. S₂ is preempted also by Hebrew šdy/šdh "field," unless

29. The epithet also occurs in an early context in Psalm 78:35. Compare Old South Arabic 'l i'ly. "'El, Most High" (G. Ryckmans, *Les Noms propres sud-sémitiques* [Louvain, Muséon, 1934], I, 2).

30. Cf. Albert Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 30–67, and especially Richard E. Whitaker, "A Formulaic Analysis of Ugaritic Poetry" (Ph. D. diss., Harvard 1970).

31. The element 'ly appears in the biblical hypocoristicon 'Eli and appears in an eighth-century ostrakon from Samaria in the name whw'ly. We are not inclined to read 'ly in 2 Sam. 23:1; 4QSam reads 'l.

32. Gen. 49:25 is part of the Joseph blessing which occurs in two oral variants in the Blessing of Jacob and in the Blessing of Moses (Dt. 33:13–17). It must be dated in the era of the Judges, probably in the eleventh century B.C. See F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry," photocopy (Baltimore, 1950), pp. 129–183.

33. The doubling is secondary in šaddav, arising apparently by analogy with forms qattal or qattāl from third-weak roots. The same secondary development may be seen in the East Semitic šaddāyu/šaddā'ū.

34. W. F. Albright, "The Names Shaddai and Abram," *JBL*, 54 (1935), 180–187.

35. F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *HTR*, 55 (1962), pp. 244–250; cf. M. Weippert, "Erwägungen zur Etymologie des Gottesnames 'El Šaddaj," *ZDMG*, n.s. 36 (1961), 42–62.

36. For our purposes we shall label as s₁ Proto-Canaanite *l* as s₂ Canaanite š (surviving in Hebrew š), and s₃, Canaanite š. Our notation implies nothing about phonetic realizations of the phonemes in question. There is some reason to believe, for example, that the binary opposition in Ugaritic is phonetically equivalent to Amorite and, similarly, that Egyptian transcription reflects the binary opposition seen in Jerusalem Canaanite, suggesting that the traditional cuneiform notations have been reversed. There are very strong reasons to believe that the phonetic realization of Ugaritic *l* was

one proposes to label *šdy* a loanword equivalent to *šdy* "field."³⁷ The writing *ša-de₄-e* "field" in Jerusalem Amarna Letter 287, 56 should not confuse one. This is the notation for *s*₁ and *s*₂, while *s*₃ is consistently rendered *s* by the Jerusalem scribe. We should read /*šadé*/ in all likelihood since the binary opposition *s*_{1,2} vs. *s*₃ is transcribed by Egyptian *s* vs. *š* and in Proto-Sinaitic by *š* vs. *š̄*.

Further evidence comes from the appearance of the name *šadāy* in an element in a personal name of the late fourteenth century B.C., written in Egyptian syllabic orthography: *ša-di-^c-m-i/ šadē-^cammī*.³⁸ The same name with the elements reversed '*myšdy* and a comparable name *šdy'wr* (*šēdē'ūr*) appear in Priestly lists of personal names at-

/s/. These matters need not concern us here; for a full discussion, see L. Rustom-Shehadeh, "The Sibilants of the West Semitic Languages of the Second Millennium" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard 1969). What is important for our purposes is to recognize that the following equivalences hold throughout the material:

Proto-Canaanite	Egypt. Transc.	Jerusalem Cuneiform	Proto-Sinaitic	Ugar. Alph.	N. Can. Cuneiform	Amorite Cuneiform
<i>s</i> ₁	š̄	š̄	š̄	l̄(s)	š̄	š̄
<i>s</i> ₂	š̄	š̄	š̄	š̄	š̄	s
<i>s</i> ₃	š	s	š	š	š	s

37. The best defense of this position is made by M. Weippert, "Erwägungen zur Etymologie des Gottesnames 'El Šaddaj." It is clear that in Phoenician and North Canaanite (of the reduced "Ugaritic" alphabet) *s*₁ merged with *s*_{2,3} (l̄/s/ > š̄) before 1200 B.C. At the same time, the phonetic shift of *samekh* (š) from an affricate, transcribed by Egyptian l̄ (ḏ), to a fricative transcribed by Egyptian *s* gave rise to a new binary opposition. These shifts took place before the development of the conventional Phoenician alphabet from the older Proto-Canaanite alphabet. In both Hebrew and Old Aramaic, notation of the sibilants is incomplete because scribes adopted, under the influence of Phoenician scribal tradition, a reduced alphabet, not devised for their phonemic system. In no case can it be held that the Proto-Canaanite alphabet developed independently in Palestine into the Hebrew alphabet and in Aram into the Aramaic. The palaeographical data will not allow such a view.

38. See M. Burchardt, *Die altkanaanäischen Fremdwörter und Eigennamen in Aegyptischen* (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1909–10), II, No. 826; cf. W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1946), p. 183 and n. 61; *The Biblical Period*, (Pittsburgh, 1950), p. 7 and note 20. The transcription follows the system devised by Albright and revised by Albright and T. O. Lambdin, "New Material for Egyptian Syllabic Orthography," *JSS*, 2 (1957), 113–127. Cf. W. Helck, *BAV*, p. 376, No. 28 who reads the name *ša-di-mi*! The reading *mi* is incorrect; Helck may have meant to write *mí*, but neither is this correct. The name, that of a petty official, is written on a figurine published by W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Kahun, Gurob, and Hawara* (London, 1890), Pl. 24. The hieroglyphs š̄, then *m*, stand separately followed by 'i (the writing of the l.p.s. suffix which the scribe evidently understood). There is no reason to suppose that the sequence ^c followed by *m* is an alternate writing for *mi* (forearm-over-owl), Gardiner G20.

tributed to the Mosaic Age, which, whatever their history, actually reflect characteristic formations of the onomasticon of the second millennium.³⁹ The Egyptian transcription of *šadday* with *ś* once again establishes the sibilant as *s*₁ or *s*₂ (*ṯ* or *ś*). The Egyptian transcriptions of the Canaanite sibilants beginning in the Middle Kingdom with the Execration Texts and continuing through the New Kingdom are remarkably consistent, *s*₁ and *s*₂ being transcribed with Egyptian *ś*, *s*₃ being transcribed with Egyptian *š*. Since Hebrew *šadday* requires either *s*₁ or *s*₃ (*ṯ* or *š*), and the Egyptian evidence *s*₁ or *s*₂ (*ṯ* or *ś*), an etymology from *s*₁ (*ṯ*) is required.

A group of names from Ugarit gave additional confirmation of the etymology, including the names *ṯdy ṯdyn* and *ṯdtb*.⁴⁰ Indeed, there is evidence from Ugarit that the element *ṯdy* meant "mountain," distinguishing it from *śd*, "field."⁴¹ Probably also we should combine West Semitic *ṯdw/ṯdy* with East Semitic *šadū* [*<*ṯadwum*], "mountain," despite some difficulties.⁴² Whether this equivalence proves to be correct or incorrect, the Northwest Semitic evidence is determinant for the etymology of *šadday*.

39. See the lists in Num. 1:5-15; 2:3-29; etc.

40. See F. Gröndahl, *PTU*, p. 416. The last-mentioned name, *ṯdtb*, evidently is *ṯadē-ṯāb*, comparing *ṯb'm* and *ṯb'l*. On the formation, see I. J. Gelb, "La lingua degli amoriti." *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, 8, *Rendiconti*. Classe di scienze, morali, storiche e filologiche, vol. 13 (1958), §3.3.8.2.4, and compare the epithet of ʿEl: *dū-ṯabi*, "the Compassionate One" (Sinai).

41. A. F. Rainey called my attention to this evidence in a personal letter dated February 20, 1966. I quote:

"Concerning the meaning of the personal names *šdyn* (*UT* Glossary 19.2387) and *ṯdy, ṯdyn* (*ibid.*, 19.264), there is important confirmation from the PN's cited by Nougayrol (*PRU* III, pp. 256-257). His entry No. 3 must be removed from the list; Nos. 1, 2 and 6 are written^mA.ŠĀ-ia-nu with the ideogram for "field." They belong with^msa-de_e-ia-nu (*PRU* III, p. 256) as demonstrated by *ša-de_e* as the gloss for *ugari* in EA 287:56. These names are obviously reflexes of *šdyn*.

"On the other hand, Nougayrol's No. 5 is *ša-du-ya*(WA) and No. 7 is *ša-du-ya*(WA); this latter is paralleled by^mKUR^d [u-ya] in line 11 of the same text. They all probably represent *ṯdy*. Finally *ṯdyn* clearly corresponds to Nougayrol's No. 4^mša-du-ya-na and Nos. 9 and 10 of which the latter is^mKUR-ia-na.

"The distinction between names with 'field' [A.ŠĀ] and with 'mountain' [KUR] is therefore certain."

42. The development of the sibilants in Akkadian is still not clear. The data for the etymology of *šadū* is found in Old Akkadian. Among the recent treatments of this material are J. Aro, "Die semitischen Zischlaute (*ṯ*), *š*, *ś* und *s* und ihre Vertretung im Akkadischen," *Orientalia*, 28 (1959), 321-335; I. J. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, 2nd ed. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1961), especially pp. 35-39; A. Goetze, "The Sibilants in Old Babylonian," *RA*, 52 (1958), 137-149; and L. Rostum-Shehadeh, "The Sibilants in the West Semitic Languages."

The epithet *šadday* thus proves to mean “the mountain one,” The primitive meaning of *tdw/y* is obviously “breast,” Arabic *tdy*, Hebrew *šādāyim*, Ugaritic *td* and perhaps *dd*,⁴³ Aramaic *tēdayyā*, and so on. However, the secondary meaning “mountain” developed for transparent reasons,⁴⁴ and early in Semitic, in view of its occurrence in both East and West Semitic.

In Old Akkadian, *šadwum appears written SA.TU and ša-du(im). The latter writing is expected, since etymological: *l* normally is written ša, ši, šu, etc. The writing SA, normal with etymological *š/š*, also occurs with etymological *s*, (*t*) in the normative phase of Old Akkadian and so frequently (see Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, p. 36) that its occurrence certainly cannot surprise.

The only real argument for identifying the sibilant in Akk. *šadū* with *s*, as a number of scholars have done, has been to equate it with West Semitic *šadē* “field, steppe” on the basis of meanings. However, their only common ground (if we may put it so) is upland steppes or lowland hills (*pace* Heidel). As for their nuclear meanings, *šadē* is to *har* as *šēru* is to *šadū*, and their etymological identity can be argued only on the analogy of what the Arab lexicographers call *didd* (literally, “contrary/similar”).

43. The usual word for breast in Ugaritic is *td*. It appears in the variant form *dd* twice (CTA, 23.1.61; cf. 23.1.59), once written *zd* (CTA, 23.1.24). One is reminded of the terms for “teat,” “nipple” which arise in onomatopoeia or rather, baby talk: Heb. *dad*, Greek *tithos*, etc. It is possible that *d* represents the dental voiced spirant /*d*/; it does so often. It is far more likely that it represents the dental unvoiced spirant /*t*/ in this case, since, as we have shown elsewhere, it also represents etymological /*t*/. In Ugaritic it is clear from Egyptian and Hittite transcriptions that the graph *t* in the usual Ugaritic notation had a phonetic realization in the sibilant range which we note with /*s*/. Hence both dental spirants /*t*/ and /*d*/ were lost except in archaizing contexts and in foreign words, when they are both rendered by the old sign *d*. For a detailed discussion, see F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, “The Name of Ashdod,” *BASOR*, 175 (1964), 48–50; Cross, “Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs,” *HTR*, 55 (1962), 249f.; cf. Jonas Greenfield, in *JAOS*, 89 (1969), 175.

In some seven passages we find the mention of the *dd 'il*. Writing in 1962 I proposed that we read *šad'il* “mountain” since it appears in a context with *gr <'i>l*, mountain of 'El, and the *hursān*, the mount of the divine assembly (1.3.23; see above). However, my student Richard Clifford has convinced me that the proper parallels to *dd 'il* are (1) *qrš mlk*, “the tabernacle of King ['El], and (2) *<'a>hlm*, “tents” (19.4.213), and that the term means “tent-shrine” or the like. I am inclined to suppose that the term means “dome” with the identical etymology. Many parallels to such a meaning can be given. For example, the term in Arabic for a tent shrine is *qubbah*. The Mosaic “Tent of Meeting” was so translated in the Arabic Bible, and indeed we find the term *qubbā* in biblical Hebrew twice, in both instances, we believe, as an archaic designation for the Tabernacle (Num 25:8 *bis*). Literally, *qubbā* means “dome” or “domed tent.” Since the biblical “domed tent” is modeled after the pattern (*tabnit*) of the cosmic tent of assembly, that is, the tabernacle of 'El, it is appropriately called *šad* “dome.” The play on the meanings “mountain of 'El” and “dome of 'El” may very well have been in the poet's mind.

44. For parallels to the development of the meaning “mound,” “peak,” “mountain” from terms originally meaning “breast,” see Albright, “The Names Shaddai and Abram,” p. 184, and E. P. Dhorme, “L'Emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien,” *RB*, 31 (1922), 230f. (to which may be added the

Šadday, the “One of the Mountain” is paralleled precisely by the epithet of ʾEl in the Hurrian hymn cited above, *ʾIl paban-ḫi-wi-ni* . . . “ʾEl the one of the mountain . . .” The formation of the name, a natural element plus the adjectival suffix *-ay* (< *-ayyu*)⁴⁵ cannot be separated, I believe, from the series of divine names known from Ugaritic sources, *Pidray*,⁴⁶ *Ṭallay*,⁴⁷ and especially *ʾAršay*, all goddesses belonging to Baʿl’s entourage.⁴⁸ The pattern, “the One of . . .” and an element of nature such as mist, dew, earth, or mountain, is wholly suitable. *ʾAršay*, “the one of the earth” must be taken to mean “the one of the Underworld.”⁴⁹ Similarly, we should assume that the epithet *šadday* refers to a cosmic mount, no doubt “particularized” and “realized” in a number of earthly mountains associated with shrines of the deity.

The question may now be asked, is the appellation *ʾEl Šadday* a liturgical epithet of Canaanite ʾEl who tented on the mount of assembly in the far north? Certainly it would be an appropriate epithet. How-

American Grand Teton range). Note also in Genesis 49:25, 26, that after the mention of “your father’s god,” and its parallel ʾEl Šadday, blessings are listed from Heaven (*šāmáyim*), Deep (*tēhōm*), Breasts (*šadáyim*) and Womb (*rāḥam*), and finally mountains (*harārē ʾād/gibʾōt ʾólām*). There appears to be a play on words here between *šadday* and *šadáyim*, and it is just possible that in the fertility clichés behind the present composition there is also knowledge of the epithet of ʾEl’s consort *Rahmay*. We may also draw attention to the mythological identification of the breasts of Tiamāt with mountains (having gushing springs) in the creation account. See the lines of *Enūma eliš* published by O. R. Gurney and J. J. Finkelstein. *The Sultantepe Tablets* (London, 1957), vol. I, 12, lines 8’-9’, now combined with older material, B. Landsberger and J. V. Kinnier Wilson, “The Fifth Tablet of *Enūma eliš*,” *JNES*, 20 (1961), 154-179, esp. pp. 160 and 175.

45. In view of Ugaritic and Amorite data we are inclined to posit closely related adjectival suffixes in two series: *-i/a/u-yya* and *-ī/ā/ū-ya* which appear also in the compound suffixes *-yānu*, *-uyānu*, etc. Certain members of the series specialized in certain uses, gentilic, hypocoristic, etc., varying according to dialect. The Hebrew hypocoristic ending *-ay* (< *ayyu*) in such names as *yīššay*, *ʾamāšay*, *hūšay* is probably ultimately identical with the adjectival suffix of such names as *Šadday*, *Ṭallay*, *Pidray*, *Daggay*, etc. Compare the Ugaritic names *dādaya* (cf. Hebrew *dōday*) *nuʾmaya*, etc.

46. The divine name appears vocalized DINGIR pí-id-ra-i in Text 17.116, *PRU*, IV, p. 132. Nougayrol failed to recognize the goddess, vocalizing ^hbi-it-ra-i; cf. Albright, in *BASOR*, 146 (1957), 35.

47. The divine name may appear in the feminine personal name Ṭá-la-ia. Cf. Gröndahl, *PTU*, p. 359; *PRU*, III, Pl. LV, RS 16.156.17; cf. J. T. Milik, “Giobbe 38, 28 in siro-palestinese e la dea, *Pdry bt ʾar*,” *Revista biblica*, 3 (1958), 252ff.

48. See the standard list repeated in the mythic texts; *CTA* 5.5.10; 3.3.3; 4.1.17; etc. A similar divine name is *Daggay*, Asherah’s fisherman.

49. This is confirmed in the pantheon list by her identification with Allatum. She probably is the goddess, the daughter of ʾEl, equated with Persephone in Philo Byblius (*Præp. evang.* 1.10.18 [ed. Mras]). It should be noted that while they are called Baʿl’s “lasses,” they are in fact his wives (Ginsberg). See *CTA*, 3.1.23.

ever, I do not believe that there is sufficient evidence to establish such a thesis. For one thing, we are embarrassed with the plenitude of deities associated with mountains in the Canaanite and Amorite pantheons, not to mention the Akkadian gods called *šadū* [KUR] or *šadū rabū* [KUR.GAL].⁵⁰

The Amorite deity called Amurru and Ilu Amurrū [DINGIR.DIN-GIR.MAR.TU] in cuneiform sources has a particularly close relation to a mountain or mountains to judge from his epithets *bēlu šadī* or *bēl šadē*, "lord of the mountain," *dūr-hur-sag-gá sikil-a-ke*, "He who dwells on the pure mountain," *kur-za-gin ti-[la]*, "who inhabits the shining mountain."⁵¹ Amurru, one will remember, is named a "god of the father," a clan god, in the Cappadocian texts. These data have been the basis of an identification of Šadday with the Amorite Amurru proposed in a new form by Lloyd R. Bailey and Jean Ouellette.⁵² The name Ilu-Amurru is interesting, as is Amurru's liaison with Ašratu, no doubt the counterpart of Canaanite Ašertu/Aširatu, consort of 'Ēl. The place of Amurru's abode KUR.ZA.GĪN, Akk. *šadū ellu*, is described in the same terms, the "shining mountains" or "snow-covered mountains" used in Akkadian of the Amanus.⁵³ These items suggest the identification of 'Ilu Amurru with Amorite 'Ēl. Such an identifica-

50. K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (Helsinki, Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1938), p. 221, lists Aššur, Enlil, and Adad among others.

51. See K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta*, pp. 54 and 251; J.-R. Kupper, *L'Iconographie du dieu Amurru* (Brussels, Académie royale de Belgique, 1961), pp. 56-80; and E. Ebeling, ed., *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (Berlin and Leipzig, De Gruyter, 1932), I, p. 102.

52. L. R. Bailey, "Israelite 'Ēl šadday and Amorite Bēl šadē," *JBL*, 87 (1968), 434-438; and Jean Ouellette, "More on 'Ēl Šadday and Bēl Šadē," *JBL*, 88 (1969), 470f. I do not find the connection made by Bailey with Sin (bēl Harrān) convincing in the slightest. The storm god, 'Ēl, and Amurru are mountain dwellers, which is not the same as being a patron god of steppe and mountain people. Sin's abode is celestial (*āšib šamē ellūti*). Moreover, if we were to identify every god pictured with the sun disk above, or the crescent above, with the sun or moon we could make equations between virtually every god in the pantheon, male and female, with the sun and the moon. The appearance of the conflated Sin-Amurru is very strange (cf. Kupper, *L'Iconographie du dieu Amurru*, pp. 60f. and 77), but must be set alongside the frequent mention of Sin and Amurru as distinct, if associated, deities of the Amorites. Compare also the juxtaposition: DIN-GIR.Mar-tu DINGIR Geštin-an-na.

53. The mountain of Amurru is also named Di-da-num (TI-da-nu-um), a name identical with North Arabian and biblical Dedan, though we cannot be sure that the place name is not used in more than a single locale. However, it is not impossible that Amurru's mountain country lies in the south. See Kupper, *L'Iconographie du dieu Amurru*, p. 68, and (missed by Kupper) W. F. Albright's discussion, "Dedan," *Geschichte und Altes Testament* [Festschrift A. Alt] (Tübingen, Mohr, 1953), pp. 11f.

tion would also explain the extreme paucity of Amorite personal names compounded with Amurru. In any case, in the West the god Amurru must have borne a different but familiar name.

Generally Amurru has been taken to be a storm god, and it must be said that most of his epithets and descriptions point in this direction. He receives the epithet *ramān* held in common with Hadad (compare biblical Hadad-rimmōn). He is called *bāriqu*, "hurler of the thunderbolt," *Adad ša a-bu-be* "Adad of the deluge." At the same time he is clearly distinguished from Adad in his iconography and not infrequently stands holding his throwstick alongside Adad who holds the thunderbolt.⁵⁴

Perhaps his most pristine character is that of the war god bearing mace and bow, going forth in blazing fire to destroy the wicked enemy. As divine warrior he naturally assimilated features of the storm god, the seven winds with which he was armed, the storm chariot and the blazing fire and thunderbolts which preceded him.

We are reminded of Ezekiel's allusions to "a noise like the voice of Šadday."⁵⁵ Šadday's "voice" is the thunder, obviously, and has its background in the lightning and thunder which accompany the theophany of the storm god. We are not certain, however, that Ezekiel here uses traditions of the god of the Fathers which had survived intact from the old time. In early Israel the language of the storm theophany was taken over and applied to Yahweh in his role of divine warrior, marching from the south, as well as in the theophany at Sinai. In the sixth century B.C., Ezekiel, Job, and Second Isaiah resurrected the ancient symbols and mythic forms of the storm theophany in descriptions of Yahweh's appearances and in war songs describing his universal victory in the new age. It may be that Šadday received the traits of the storm god in Ezekiel from Šadday's assimilation to Yahweh.

The god as "divine warrior" belongs to two types, stemming from parallel but distinct *Sitze im Leben*. One finds its place in the great cosmogonic myth in which the storm god, overcoming the powers of chaos (Tiāmat, Yamm, or Môt according to the myth), usually in individual combat, establishes kingship and with it the order of heaven and earth. The other type has its setting in the patriarchal society, as "god of the father," or especially as god of a league. Here the fundamental institution is "holy warfare," in defense of clan or league, or in the

54. See Kupper, *L'iconographie du dieu Amurru, passim*. Amurru's assimilation to the gods of the Ea cycle is apparently secondary.

55. Ezek. 1:25; 10:5.

movement of semi-nomadic peoples who, to survive or flourish, must enter and secure new domains in wars led by their tutelary deity. To be sure, these two types do not remain in ideal form, clean and distinct, but tend to become mixed. The war god who establishes the order of the cosmos also establishes the political-historical order thereby. Kingship in heaven and kingship on earth belong to the "orders of creation." In the same way, historical wars of a league may be given cosmic-universal significance, and the god of the league given the attributes of the storm god, at least in his attack on the enemy. We shall have to return to this typology in discussing the relationships between Ba'1 Šapōn and Yahweh.

It seems not unlikely that *šadday* was an epithet of Amorite 'El, and that 'El as the divine warrior of important western tribes or leagues was reintroduced into Mesopotamia under the name *Amurru*. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient evidence to prove either equation.

It appears less likely that *Šadday* was an epithet of Amorite Hadad or Canaanite Ba'1 Šapōn, the Haddu of Mt. Ḥazzi. The latter is, of course, the great storm god of the Canaanites, and as storm god is inevitably and regularly associated with the mountain, in his epithets and in descriptions of his abode in Canaanite mythological lore. However, if *šadday* were the Canaanite storm god, it is difficult to explain (as Eissfeldt has argued⁵⁶) how, in Israelite tradition, 'El *Šadday* or *Šadday* could be used blandly as an orthodox epithet of Yahweh. Certainly Ba'1 epithets, when understood to be such, were shunned in Israel at least from the ninth century B.C. onwards.

The distribution of *Šadday* as a Yahweh epithet is interesting in this respect. It forms a highly irregular pattern, very much like that of 'El used as a Yahweh epithet or alias. After use in the 'ēl names of Genesis and early Exodus, both *Šadday* and 'El are found frequently in archaic poetry.⁵⁷ There is then a gap in usage of *Šadday* until the sixth century when it is taken up again by Ezekiel and, above all, by the author of the dialogues of Job.⁵⁸ *Šadday* occurs more than thirty times in Job as the proper name of the god of Israel, 'El some fifty times, a dozen in parallel with *Šadday*. Equally interesting, *Yahweh* is never used in the dia-

56. "El and Yahweh," *JSS*, 1 (1956), pp. 25–27 (*KS* [Eissfeldt], III, 386–397).

57. In the Oracles of Balaam, *Šadday* is found once, 'El eight times. *Šadday* is found in Psalm 68:15 ('El six times in Ps. 68), Psalm 91:1 (parallel to 'Elyōn; cf. O. Eissfeldt, "Jahwes Verhältnis zu 'Elyon und Schaddaj nach Psalm 91," *KS* [Eissfeldt], III, 441–447). We have referred above to 'El *Šadday* in the blessing in Genesis 49.

58. Only four references remain to be given: Ruth 1:20, 21; Isa. 13:6=Joel 1:15.

logues of Job, only in the prologue and epilogue and in rubrics of the Yahweh speeches where it is probably secondary.⁵⁹ In other words, Yahweh appears only in the prose parts of the book. One must argue, I believe, that the poet of the Dialogues either belongs to a different tradition or is engaged in a heroic effort to archaize or both. At all events, it is clear that the Yahweh epithets, 'Ēl, Šadday, and 'Elyon are associated in the earliest strata of biblical poetry as if interchangeable and are used again in the archaizing literature of the Exile.⁶⁰

In sum, we cannot eliminate the possibility that 'Ēl Šadday was (1) an Amorite or Canaanite storm god to be equated more or less with Ba¹=Haddu or (2) an epithet of Canaanite 'Ēl parallel to other 'ēl epithets in Genesis. We are inclined to believe, however, that 'Ēl Šadday was (3) an epithet of Amorite 'Ēl in his role as divine warrior, identified early by the Fathers with Canaanite 'Ēl. An identification of Šadday with *Ilu Amurru*, possible in solution (1) and attractive in solution (3), must be left *sub judice*.

We have found that the epithets 'ēl 'ōlām, 'ēl qōnē 'arš, 'ēl 'ēlōhé yiśrā'ēl, and 'ēl [ba'/?] bē'rūt are epithets of 'Ēl preserved in Patriarchal tradition; 'ēl 'elyōn probably is to be added, along with 'ēl bēt-'ēl, and finally there is a good possibility that 'ēl šadday is an epithet of Canaanite or Amorite 'Ēl (or both).

The Name Yahweh

The discussion of the meaning and origin of the name Yahweh constitutes a monumental witness to the industry and ingenuity of biblical scholars. Fortunately, there is no space to review it here.⁶¹ Several new

59. Job 12:9 would appear to be an exception; however, the textual evidence is divided between 'ēlōh and *Yahweh*.

60. The name 'Ēl, often used in archaic poetry as a name of Yahweh, is used sporadically in a few passages of the Elohist and Hosea in the same way, and some fifteen times in Psalms 43-83, especially in the more archaic psalms of the "Elohistic Psalter." In the late literature of Israel, only Second Isaiah other than Job makes extensive use of 'Ēl as a proper name of the god of Israel. We judge the phenomenon to be explained by his revitalization of old liturgical forms and his general impulse to archaize (much in the same way as does the author of the Job dialogues). In late Psalms, in Daniel, and especially in postbiblical apocalyptic works, 'Ēl returns to popularity, finally ousting the sacred name *Yahweh* in Hellenistic Jewish literature. These data tend to support the argument for a northern (or non-Judean) origin of the Book of Job, argued in the past on quite different grounds. Cf. the arguments of D. N. Freedman and W. F. Albright in "Orthographic Peculiarities in the Book of Job," *Eretz Israel*, 9 (1969), 35-44.

61. A review of recent research until 1957 can be found in R. Mayer, "Der Gottesname Jahwe im Lichte der neuesten Forschung," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, n.s. 2 (1958), 26-53. To this we should add the following selected items of recent date not to be found in

lines of evidence have emerged, however, which promise to advance the discussion.

In the first place, the form *Yahweh* has been established as primitive by its appearance in epigraphic sources. In extrabiblical materials which date before the Exile, it is the invariable independent form. This is not to say that the jussive (and combinatory) form *yahū* is not early; in fact it is surprising that *yahū* as an independent name does not appear before the fifth century B.C.. At all events, there seems to be no valid reason to doubt that *Yahweh* is a primitive divine name, the verbal (hypocoristic) element in a liturgical epithet or sentence name. The name appears as *yhwh* in the seventh-early-sixth century letters from Lachish and 'Arad. It appears also on an unpublished seal of the eighth century B.C. acquired by the Harvard Semitic Museum. The seal reads, interestingly enough, *lmqnyw/'bd.yhwh*,⁶² "Belonging to Miqneiah, the slave of Yahweh." Israel's god appears also in the Meša^c Stele from ninth-century Moab written *yhwh*. The earliest appearance of what appears to be the independent form of the name is found in fourteenth and thirteenth century lists of South Palestinian (Edomite) place-names, written *yhw*, in syllabic orthography probably to be read

Mayer's paper: A. Murtonen, *A Philological and Literary Treatise on the Old Testament Divine Names 'l, 'lwh, 'lhym, and yhwh* (Helsinki, Societas orientalis Fennica, 1952); M. H. Segal, "'El, Elohim, and YHWH in the Bible," *JQR* 46 (1955), 89-115; M. Reisel, *The Mysterious Name of Y.H.W.H.* (Assen, Van Gorcum, 1957); David Noel Freedman, "The Name of the God of Moses," *JBL*, 79 (1960), 151-156; R. Abba, "The Divine Name Yahweh," *JBL*, 80 (1961), 320-328; S. Mowinckel, "The Name of the God of Moses," *HUCA*, 32 (1961), 121-133; F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *HTR*, 55 (1962), 250-259; O. Eissfeldt, "Jahwe, der Gott der Väter," *ThLZ*, 88 (1963), cols. 481-490 (*KS* [Eissfeldt], IV, 79-91); cf. "'ähëyäh 'äsär 'ähëyäh und 'El 'ölām," *KS* [Eissfeldt], IV, 193-198; H. Kosmala, "The Name of God (YHWH and HU)," *ASTI*, 2 (1963), 103-120; Joh. Lindblom, "Noch einmal die Deutung des Jahwe-Namens in Ex 3:14," *ASTI*, 3 (1964), 4-15; J. P. Hyatt, "The Origin of Mosaic Yahwism," in *The Teacher's Yoke*, ed. E. J. Vardaman et al. (Waco, Texas, Baylor University Press, 1964), pp. 85-93; André Finet, "Iawi-ilā, roi de Talhayūm," *Syria*, 41 (1964), 117-142, esp. pp. 118-122; W. von Soden, "Jahwe, 'er ist, er erweist sich," *WO*, 3 (1944-66), pp. 177-187; J. P. Hyatt, "Was Yahweh Originally a Creator Deity?" *JBL*, 86 (1967), 369-377; W. F. Albright, *YGC*, pp. 168-172; R. de Vaux, "El et Baal, le Dieu des Pères et Yahweh," *Ugaritica* IV (Paris, 1969), pp. 501-517.

62. The seal, shortly to be published, along with the Museum's fairly extensive collection, is exquisitely designed and engraved, on one side in the positive, on the other side in the negative. No doubt it belonged to a temple official of Judah. The element *-yaw* < *-yahū* is expected in early Judah as well as in Samaria. After about 700 B.C., despite a continuing general tendency to syncopate intervocalic *h*, spellings reverted to the historic *-yhw* only to shift again to *-yw* (*-yaw*) by the fifth century. Assyrian transcriptions throughout this period reflect the pronunciation *-yaw*.

ya-h-wi.⁶³ No other suggested occurrences seem to withstand close linguistic scrutiny.

We must begin in any analysis of the name, therefore, with the form *yahweh* (as well as the form *yahū*). This should have been recognized earlier by historical linguists on the basis of parallels in related Near Eastern material. West Semitic personal names normally begin in transparent appellations or sentence names and shorten or disintegrate. Divine epithets and often divine names follow the same patterns of formation and shortening. They do not begin in numinous grunts or shouts and build up into liturgical sentences or appellations.

Again, new evidence for the morphological analysis of the verbal element *yahweh* has appeared in Amorite personal names, notably in the Mari texts.⁶⁴ There are now more than a score of names which follow the pattern: *ya-wi-DINGIR* / *yahwī-ʿIl*/, *ya-wi-i-la/Yahwī-ʿIla*/, *ya-wi-DINGIR.IM* / *Yahwī-Haddu*/, *la-wi-DINGIR/Lahwī-ʿIl*/ from **La-yahwī-Il*. A second group, more restricted in number, is represented by the following: *ya-aḥ-wi-DINGIR* / *yaḥwī-ʿIl*/ or /*yahwi-ʿIl*/; *la-aḥ-wi-ba-lu* / *Laḥwī-Baʿlu*/ or /*Lahwi-Baʿlu*/, *la-aḥ-wi-DINGIR* / *Laḥwi-ʿIl*/ or /*Lahwī-Il*/, *la-aḥ-wi-ma-li-ku* / *Laḥwī-Maliku*/ or /*Lahwī-Maliku*/. Finally, there are two interesting names *ya-u-i-li* / *Yahū-ʿIlī*/ and *ya-ḥi-DINGIR* / *yaḥī-ʿIl*/.

These several formations document a series of characteristic verb forms used in Amorite. Since Amorite *h* is represented by *ḥ* in these inscriptions in a very high percentage of its occurrences, and, conversely, *h* is represented in a low percentage (but *is* occasionally represented by *ḥ*), it seems certain that *Yahwī-N* is usually to be read in the first, larger group.⁶⁵ In the second, smaller group, probably *YaḥwīN* or *Laḥwī-N* is the dominant form, but we cannot be sure of the laryngeal.

63. The name appears in a list of Amenophis III (1417-1379 B.C.) from Soleb and in a copy of this list from the time of Rameses II (1304-1237 B.C.). See R. Givon, "Toponymes Ouest-Asiatiques à Soleb," *VT*, 14 (1964), 239-255; esp. p. 244. The vocalization of the toponym follows the notation of W. Helck who posits the value *wī* and *wu* for *w* as well as its usual value *wa*. Admittedly, the evidence is very flimsy. Cf. W. F. Albright, in *JBL*, 67 (1948), p. 380, who vocalizes *Ya-h-wē(a)*.

64. It must be emphasized that the Amorite verbal form is of interest only in attempting to reconstruct the proto-Hebrew or South Canaanite verbal form used in the name *Yahweh*. We should argue vigorously against attempts to take Amorite *yahwi* and *yahū* as divine epithets. In this we agree fully with W. von Soden, "Jahwe, 'er ist, er erweist sich," pp. 178f., against A. Finet "lawi-ilā," pp. 118-122.

65. Both Huffmon and Gelb pass over the statistical evidence in the Akkadian transcription of West Semitic *h* and *ḥ*.

The final two forms are interesting as shortened or, better, apocopated jussives: *yahī-* and *yahū-*.

The forms represented here, *yahwī-* and *yahwī*, *yahū-* and *yahī-*, are most easily taken to be causatives, imperfect and jussive. The meaning of the names in this case would be: "the god N brings (or brought) into being (a child),"⁶⁶ or "the god N gives (or gave) life (to a child)." The jussives and precatives would mean, "Let (the child) endure, O god N" or "Give life, O God N."⁶⁷

Recently new arguments have been given for taking *yahwī* from the Simple (G) stem.⁶⁸ It is true that *yahwī* in Amorite could be analyzed as a G-form. The stative-intransitive use of *yaqtal/yaqtal* appears to be dying in Mari Amorite, although a number of forms in *yaqtal* appear.⁶⁹ The Babylonian name *Ibašši-ilu(m)*⁷⁰ is alleged to be analogous in meaning: "The god is (in evidence)."⁷¹ There are, however, grave problems in so reading the South Canaanite verbal element in the name Yahweh.

66. The verbal element *yahwī* may reflect the durative (present-future) *yaqtill(u)* or the preterit *yaqtīl* of Northwest Semitic. It contrasts with *yahū* (<*yahwi), the jussive.

67. One may compare Akkadian names commonly formed with *ušabši* and *šabši*: Nabū-ušabši "Nabu has called into being," Nabu-šabši "call into being (a child), O Nabu," etc. Cf. K. L. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names* (Helsingfors, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1914), p. 276 (for references); Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung* (Leipzig, *MVAG* 44, 1939), pp. 145, 148f. Not infrequently the object of the verb is specified: Nabū-zēra-ušabši "Nabu has brought progeny into being," Bēl-aḫa-ušabši "Bel has called a brother into being," etc.

68. W. von Soden, "Jahwe 'Er ist, er erweist sich'," pp. 177-187. Von Soden argues for a *yaqtul/yaqattal* opposition in the prefix conjugation in Amorite. In light of the evidence, however, at most one can speak of frozen vestiges of *yaqattal*. The argument for the existence of present *yaqattal* is based only on a small handful of forms, all *ulti-mae-y*, all capable of being read as D-forms. The patterning of the Amorite verb fits easily into the durative-punctual opposition of Ugaritic and South Canaanite prefixal and suffixal conjugations, an opposition which, we believe, must be Proto-Canaanite (in which we include Amorite) and, indeed, Proto-Northwest Semitic. In addition to Huffmon's study, see W. L. Moran, "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets," (Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins 1950); and "The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background," in *BANE*, pp. 54-72; G. E. Mendenhall, "The Verb in Early Northwest Semitic Dialects" (Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins 1947); and C. Krahmalkov, "Studies in Amorite Grammar" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard 1965).

69. The form *yaqtal* appears for the most part with verbs, active or stative, containing a laryngeal or *rēš* in their second or third radical. Forms *iqtal* or *eqtal* need not stem from *yaqtal* since in some Amorite dialects there is a general shift of initial *ya > yi/ye > i/e* both in verbal and substantive forms.

70. On the meaning of the name, see J. J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung*, pp. 20f. and especially 135. The name is written I-ba-aš-ši-DINGIR.

71. Von Soden, "Jahwe, 'er ist, er erweist sich'," p. 179, explains the name as meaning "er erweist sich dauernd (als kraftvoller Helfer)."

(1) Canaanite expresses the meaning “’El exists, endures” in a well-known group of names: ḥa-ya-il /ḥayya-’il/ (alphabetic ḥy’*il*), “’El lives,” or “’El endures”; Hebrew *yšy*, a hypocoristicon of Canaanite *’*ilē-N*⁷² “the god N exists,” that is, manifests his existence or renewed life (in the case of dying and rising gods) in the birth of a child or in fertility; and *hw’il* /*huwa-’il*/, “’El exists.”⁷³ Albright has rightly compared such names with the Ugaritic couplet:

kī ḥayya ’al’iyānu ba’lu
kī ’itē zubulu ba’l arši

Indeed ’Al’iyān Ba’l lives,
Indeed Prince lord of Earth exists.⁷⁴

(2) The stative-intransitive *yiqtal* is very much alive in South Canaanite. In Canaanite, if not in Amorite, the imperfect of the Simple stem properly was *yihway*. Both in Old Hebrew and Old Aramaic roots *ultimae-y*, the G-imperfect took two forms, *yaqtil* (active) and *yiqtal* (stative), as is evidenced by contrasting orthographies.⁷⁵

72. Compare Hebrew *yšyhw* (?), Aramaic names ’*ylybl*, ’*yly’l*, etc. The names ’*šy* ’*š*’, ’*šb’l*, ’*šyhw* (unpublished from ‘Arad) may also be derived from the element Canaanite ’*il(ē)*, Hebrew *yš* and ’*š*. However, there is ambiguity in the analysis of these forms. The element ’*š* also may reflect the root ’*wš*, “to give,” which appears, for example, in Hebrew *y’wš* (Lachish Letters), *y’šyhw*, etc. It is not impossible that Ugaritic ’*šb’l*, cuneiform i-ši-DINGIR.U/’iše-ba’l/ is a South Canaanite form for what would normally appear in Ugaritic as *’*ib’l*. So *YGC*, p. 170; cf. F. M. Cross, “An Aramaic Inscription from Daskyleion,” *BASOR*, 184 (December 1966), p. 8f., n. 17.

73. Compare *hy’di/hiya-adātu* “the (Divine) Lady exists,” and *hy’abn/hiya-abnu* “the Rock exists.” The Hebrew personal name *yēhū*’ also belongs here [**yahū-hū* > **yawhū* > *yōhū*’, and by dissimilation > *yēhū*’. Cf. *YGC*, p. 263, n. 155. The use of the pronouns *hw* and *hy* in this sense is dramatically underlined by the writing of the pronoun *ū-wa* /*huwa*/ in the polyglot vocabulary from Ugarit parallel with Hurrian *manni*, “he is.” See *Ugaritica V*, pp. 244f., where Nougayrol unhappily repeats the error of C. Virolleaud taking the word to reflect *hw* “to be.” In 1962 the writer pointed out that the reading reflected the pronoun (“Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs,” *HTR*, 55 [1962], 254, n. 124). The same interpretation has been given independently by A. F. Rainey, “Notes on the Syllabic Ugaritic Vocabularies,” *IEJ*, 19 (1969), 107f. The verb *hw* unhappily does not yet appear in Ugaritic texts.

74. *CTA*, 6.3.21; cf. 6.3.3; 6.3.9.

75. In Old Aramaic the imperfect *thry* “may she (not) become pregnant,” and *thwy* “may it become” stand in contrast with *yb’h* “he seeks (my head),” etc. We must read *tihray* and *tihway* over against *tib’e* (< **tab’i*), etc. The *mater lectionis* *y* always marks a final *i* or the diphthong *-ay* (which was uncontracted in Old Aramaic); *h* is used for *-ē* (< *i*), *-ō*, and *ā*. See *EHO*, p. 31, and Nos. 47 and 53 (p. 28). The form *yhw*h in Sefireh

(3) As we shall see below, in the sentence-names of which South Canaanite ⁷⁶ *yahwē* is an element, the verbal form takes an object: *yahwē šēba'ôt*, "he creates the (divine) hosts." This cannot be read "Yahweh of hosts," that is, as a construct chain. A proper name cannot be put into the construct state (as a *nomen regens*) according to grammatical law.⁷⁷

The accumulated evidence thus strongly supports the view that the name *Yahweh* is a causative imperfect of the Canaanite-Proto-Hebrew verb *hwy*, "to be."⁷⁸

Occasionally, one hears a protest that a verb form meaning "to cause to be," "to create" is too abstract or philosophic a concept to be predicated of an ancient Proto-Israelite deity. The problem may be semantic and solved by translating "procreate," or the like. In personal names,

II A4 is to be read as *aphel* imperf. (which appears also in Syriac). In Hebrew the archaizing forms *yibkāvūn*, "they wept," *yehmāvūn*, "they roared," etc., preserve witness in the stative-intransitive *yiqal* in verbs *tertiaē yod*. Cf. W. F. Albright, in *JBL*, 67 (1948), p. 380.

76. That *Yahwē* is South Canaanite can hardly be doubted. The name should conform to early Hebrew phonetic and morphological laws. Its occurrence in South Palestine in a place name of the fourteenth century, that is, in pre-Mosaic times, makes any other supposition precarious.

77. J. P. Hyatt blunders here in his article which for the most part is most useful and challenging: "Was Yahweh Originally a Creator Deity?" p. 377.

78. In his article "The Name of the God of Moses," S. Mowinckel asked how one explained the form *yahū* if *yahwē* was taken to be a finite, imperfect verb form. As a matter of fact, the necessity of explaining both forms on the basis of documented historical changes is one of the reasons why *yahwē* must be analyzed as an imperfect of the causative stem. In the early Canaanite dialects, the imperfect of the causative was *yaqtīhu* (indicative durative), *yaqtīl* (jussive-past). In *tertiaē-yod* verbs the forms appeared as *yagliyu* and *yaglī*: in the verbs med. *waw* and tert. *yod*, the forms were **yahwiyu* > *yahwī* (indicative durative) and *yahū* (jussive-past). These forms are not theoretical projections, but are based on patterns in Canaanite and Amorite verb forms which actually appear in vocalized scripts (cuneiform, Egyptian syllabic orthography, and roots in 'alep in Ugaritic). Hebrew reflects the late stages of the parallel development of imperfects and past-jussive: *yihyē/vēhī*, *yihyē/vēhī*. The št-stem (causative reflexive) of *hwy* in Hebrew (and Ugaritic) also supplies an analogy: *yīštahwē* (imperfect indicative) *yīštahū* (jussive, 3.m.sing.).

Mowinckel also argues that Neo-Babylonian transcriptions of Jewish names ending in *-ya-a-ma* indicate a pronunciation *yahwa* [*sic!*] of the divine name in these combinations. As the notion seems to survive among Hebraists in spite of all advances in our knowledge of Neo-Babylonian orthography, a comment is in order. Final short vowels were lost in Babylonian well before the Late Babylonian era, but the syllabary designed to show these vowels continued in use. *Ma* in the final position in transcriptions represents *-w* (only); *ya-a-ma* is the normal way in Late Babylonian to write *-yaw*. This *-yaw* is the same as that of the fifth-fourth century alphabetic texts *-yw* for *-yaw* < *yahū*. See the fundamental work of J. P. Hyatt, *The Treatment of Final Vowels in Early Neo-Babylonian* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1941).

the causative forms of “to be” such as Akk. *ušabšī*, Can.-Am. *yahwī* and *yakīn*, as well as other verbal forms meaning “to create” *yakānīn* (*yēkōnēn*), *yaqnī*, *yabnī*, and so on specify the creation, or the calling into being of a son, a name, progeny. Such usage obviously does not involve ontological speculation nor a notion of “cosmic creation.” In the case of divine personal names and epithets taken from liturgical or hymnic sentences, the same terms are used to speak of a god’s procreation of other gods, in the case of ’El the procreation of gods and men of whom he is father. Both in Canaan and in Mesopotamia the epithets of the gods describe them, male and female, as creators of heaven and earth, father or creatress of all creatures, gods and men, formers or progenitors of the world.⁷⁹ As a matter of fact, fertility, order, and creation are bound together in the old myths.

Our evidence also points strongly to the conclusion that *yahwē* is a shortened form of a sentence name taken from a cultic formula. An ample number of parallels may be found in which West Semitic divine names are the first element, frequently a verbal element in view of West Semitic syntax, of a sentence name from a litany or cultic cliché. These names evolve just as hypocoristic personal names develop from sentence names, often leaving only the initial verbal element, with or without a hypocoristic affix or internal patterning. From Canaanite sources we may list *’al’iyu qarrādīma*, “I prevail over the heroes,”⁸⁰ and the

79. One is hard put to understand the protest of J. P. Hyatt “that it is a mistake to cite Amorite names as support for the notion of cosmic creation; it is a long step from recognition that a deity forms the child in the mother’s womb and preserves its life (an idea very widespread in the ancient Near East) to the belief that the deity is creator of the universe.” The personal names with the element *yahwī* have been cited primarily for the purposes of a grammatical analysis of the name *Yahweh*. However, I should not be willing to separate so widely the role of a god in creating a child and his role as creator of gods in view of epithets such as “creator of gods and men.” In any case, the epithets of the gods describe them constantly as “cosmic creators.” We have cited such epithets of ’El and ’Elat above, and in note 25 have listed a very few of the multitude of epithets predicating “cosmic creation” of the great gods of Mesopotamia. Can Professor Hyatt be arguing that Israel was a backward people which lost or forgot the notion of creator gods held so centrally by their Canaanite and Mesopotamian forebears in Patriarchal times? Surely not, in view of the preservation of such Canaanite names as *qōnē šamāyim wā-’āreš* “creator of heaven and earth” in Israelite tradition.

80. See “Recent Progress in North-Canaanite Research,” W. F. Albright, *BASOR*, 70 (1938), 19; and *ARI*, p. 195, n. 11; A. Goetze, “Peace on Earth,” *BASOR*, 93 (1944), 18, has queried the longer sentence name proposed by Albright: *’al’iyu qurādīma qāriyēya ba-’arši malḥamati*. In *CTA*, 4.8.34; 5.2.10, 18 the short form *’al’iyu qarrādīma* is used; in 3.3.11; 3.4.51; 7.2.14 the long formula occurs. The issue need not be decided for our purposes here. The short form *’al’iyu qarrādīma* is indisputably a sentence name.

typical hypocoristicon *'al'iyānu*, once *'al'iyuba'l*.⁸¹ *Aṭirat* (*'aṭirat* > *'āsērā*) is a perfect verb, formally stative, from the fuller name *'aṭirat yammī* "She who treads upon Sea." Other examples are *Yagarriš*, "He drives out," and *'Ay-yamarri*, "Ho, he routs," magical names given to the divine clubs fashioned for Ba'l's combat, and the appellation *Rākib* or *Rakub* shortened from *rakub 'arapāti*⁸² or *rākib 'arapāti*.⁸³ Another divine name is *yā' ylh̄n*, *yadi' yilhan*, in which imperfect verbal elements are used: "He knows, he understands."⁸⁴

From Mari comes the interesting name of a patriarchal deity of the Amorites (DINGIR.) *yakrub-il*, "the god (or 'El) blesses." Fortunately, there can be no doubt that *Yakrub-'Il* is a divine name in view of its context in Mari texts and from the use of the DINGIR sign as determinative. The name is of special interest in view of the suggestion of David Noel Freedman, on wholly different grounds, that the curious combination *Yahwē 'ēlōhīm* in the primordial stories of Genesis goes back to an earlier sentence name of the god of Israel, namely *Yahwē-'El*, in which the element *yahwē* still preserved verbal force.⁸⁵

Two other Amorite divine names are worthy of attention. One appears as *Yapuḥ* (or in the Amorite dialectal form *Epuḥ*), the other is *Yašuḥ* (*Ešuḥ*).⁸⁶ Both names have transparent etymologies and forms: *yapu'* from *wp'* "to be radiant (in theophany)" and *yaṭu'* from *yṭ'* "to be victor." Both may be analyzed as perfect statives of the G-stem,⁸⁷ comparable with the theophorous elements *šaduk* and *rakub*, or with the *qatil(a)* stative frozen as a divine name: *rapi'*.

81. *CTA*, 5.5.17. This need not be an error for the usual *'al'iyānu ba'l*, but the hypocoristicon without termination: "I Ba'l prevail . . ." Cf. Hebrew *'ehyē* in Exodus 3:14 and Hosea 1:9.

82. Compare the personal names *ili-ma-rakub* and *rakub-ba'l*. The stative perfect *rakub(a)* is probably original. In Canaan *rkb* seems to have been used in the epithets of Ba'l-Haddu, e.g., *rkb 'rpt*, "the Cloud Rider." At Zinčirli *rkb'l* named alongside 'El and Hadad has split apart to become an independent god, perhaps originally as a hypostasis from Ba'l or 'El. On the other hand, *rkb'l* could be "the god is a charioteer," *rākib-* (stative) or *rakub-'il*, a suitable epithet of the moon god.

83. Cf. Akk. *šākin urpāti* and *rākib ūmi*, epithets of Adad.

84. On *ylh̄n* see F. M. Cross, "Epigraphic Notes on the Ammān Citadel Inscription," *BASOR*, 193 (1969), 18, n. 12. The god appears as a candidate for kingship in *CTA*, 6.1.48.

85. Freedman, "The Name of the God of Moses," p. 156.

86. There can be no doubt that these have become divine epithets. See Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), pp. 77 and 98f.

87. An alternate is to read them as *qatūl* forms, a well-known old hypocoristic pattern. Cf. M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik* (Giessen, Töpelmann, 1908), II, 21f.

The names or appellatives of two South Arabic deities which also exhibit the G-imperfect formation may be cited: *yagūl*,⁸⁸ literally, “He brings aid,” and *dū yahriq*⁸⁹ “he (the star) who sets,” that is, the god Aṭtar as the evening star.

Two archaic liturgical formulae require re-examination in view of the data collected above on the cult-names of ʿEl and the origin of the name Yahweh. One is the famous crux of Exodus 3:14, *ʾhyh ʾsr ʾhyh*, the other is the cult name *yhw h šbʾt*, *yahwē šēbaʾôt* stemming from the Shiloh cultus as argued persuasively by O. Eissfeldt.⁹⁰

The first formula has been vocalized by the Massoretes to read “I am he who exists,”⁹¹ or “I am he who endures.” Not only is the meaning rather odd for an ancient liturgical formula but is not idiomatically expressed. We should expect *ʾānī hūʾ ʾašer ʾehyē* or even better *ʾānī ʾel ʾolām*, “I am he who exists,” “I am the god who endures.” Furthermore, the expression *ʾhyh šlhny* in v. 14 is repeated in parallel form in v. 15: *yhw h . . . šlhny* so that it is clear that *ʾhyh*, the first person form, and *yhw h*, the third person form, are taken as acceptable alternate forms of the name.⁹² Divine epithets as we have seen can be derived both from first and third person formulae so that the alternation in the revelation of the name is not surprising.

This brings us then to the view that the formula is probably original in the third person as pointed out first, I believe, by Paul Haupt,⁹³ and long defended by Albright. The vocalization of the formula would then be *yahwē ʾašer yahwē*.⁹⁴ Further, we know that the element *ʾašer*

88. *NPS*, I, 16.

89. *NPS*, I, 28.

90. O. Eissfeldt, “Jahwe Zebaoth,” in *Miscellanea Academia Berolinensia* (Berlin, 1950), pp. 127–150 (*KS*, III, 103–123).

91. This rendering has been demonstrated by Joh. Lindblom in his paper cited in n. 61.

92. Charles Krahmalkov, “Studies in Amorite Grammar,” has analyzed the name e-wi-ma-lik (Alalakh 194, 2) as /ʾehwī-malik <yahwī-malik, the form *ʾehwī* simply the dialect form showing the shift of initial ya > e. This would provide a rather neat explanation of the ʾehwē/yahwē variation in Exodus 3:14, 15. However, *ewi* also can be taken as a Hurrian element, and we do not expect an Amorite dialect form in a name native to South Palestine.

93. Paul Haupt, “Der Name Jahweh,” *OLZ* (1909), cols. 211–214.

94. In the case of the formula *ʾhyh ʾsr ʾhyh*, we must vocalize *ʾahyē ʾašer ʾahyē*, “I create what I create” in place of the Masoretic pointing which rests on Hellenistic Jewish tradition (to judge from the Old Greek). In the era of the Elohist it was probably understood as an *idem per idem* construction, in effect, “I am the creator” as pointed out by D. N. Freedman.

cannot be original if the formula *is* old. *Ašer* began to replace the relative particle *qū* (> *zū*) no earlier than the beginning of the Iron Age in Hebrew to judge from its scant use in early Yahwistic poetry. All this yields the reconstructed formula **yahwī qū yahwī*.

It will be noted immediately that the phrase *qū yahwī* is precisely parallel to several formulae in Ugaritic literature: *dū yakāninu* in the couplet spoken by Baʿl: *kī qāniyunū 'ólāmu/kī dārdā'rw dū yakāninunū*, “Indeed our creator is eternal/Indeed ageless *he who formed us*”;⁹⁵ *dū yakāninu* in the couplet *tōru 'il 'abūhu/ 'il malk dū yakāninuhū*, “Bull 'El his father/King 'El *who created him* (Baʿl)”;⁹⁶ and [*'il dū yaqniyu . . .*], “[’El *who created . . .*”⁹⁷ We may compare also the verse of Deuteronomy 32:6 which speaks of Yahweh:

hl' hw' 'byk qnyk
hw' 'šk wyknnk

Was he not thy father, who created thee,
Who formed thee and brought thee into being?

In all of the longer forms of these formulae, the verbal element “to create” takes an object: a god, the council of the gods, the host of heaven. We expect such a concrete object in the original cultic clichés. This brings us to the second formula, *yahwē šēbā'ôt*. It finds its original setting in the liturgical name of the ark: *ywhw šb'wt yšb (h)krbym*.⁹⁸ The epithet *yōšēb kērūbīm*,⁹⁹ “who is enthroned on the cherubim” applies, of course, to the cherub throne which belonged to the iconography of the shrine at Shiloh and its successor at Jerusalem. We have described above the characteristic iconography of 'El in reliefs from Ugarit and from Punic shrines in which 'El is portrayed characteristically seated upon a throne flanked by *kērūbīm*. The epithet *yōšēb kērūbīm* is evidently an 'El epithet applied to Yahweh. We are more interested, however, in the archaic epithet *yahwē šēbā'ôt*. There can be no doubt, in my opinion, that *yahwē šēbā'ôt* is the earliest form of the epithet and that *yahwē 'ēlōhé šēbā'ôt* is secondary. The latter fits into the

95. See above, chapter 2, note 17.

96. See above, chapter 2, note 13.

97. *CTA*, 19.4.220. The context is broken and difficult.

98. 1 Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2.

99. The epithet is used apart from the ark in Psalm 80:2; 99:1; cf. 2 Sam. 22:11 = Psalm 18:11.

category of *lectio facilior*. 'Elōhē is inserted to ease the supposed ungrammatical juxtaposition of *yahwē* and *šēbā'ôt* after *yahwē* came to be known only as the personal name of the deity.¹⁰⁰ *Yahwē šēbā'ôt* conforms to Hebrew grammar only when *yahwē* still carries verbal force and takes an object. *Yahwē šēbā'ôt* cannot be a construct chain, nor can *šēbā'ôt*, the ordinary word for heavenly armies (the gods) and earthly armies, be turned into an adjective or participle in agreement with Yahweh.¹⁰¹

On the basis of the mythological parallels, *šēbā'ôt* in this context probably means "the hosts of heaven," the *banū 'ilima*, "sons of 'El" or "holy ones." In this case Yahweh is described as *qū yahwī šaba'ôt*, "He who creates (the heavenly) armies," a title of the divine warrior and creator. It is thus not greatly different from 'El's epithets, "Father of the gods," "creator of creatures." Moreover, such an epithet lent itself to use not merely as a creation formula, but as an appropriate name of the god who called together the tribes to form the militia of the League, who led Israel in her historical wars. In the holy war ideology Yahweh led the cosmic forces of heaven alongside the armies of Israel. We need only remind ourselves of this powerful motif¹⁰² in early poetry and old tradition. At the beginning of the conquest proper, Joshua was confronted by the *šar haš-šēbā' yahwē*, "the general of the (heavenly) army of Yahweh," Joshua's cosmic counterpart.¹⁰³ In the victory song in Judges 5 we are told that "the stars fought from heaven,"¹⁰⁴ and at Gibeon even the sun and moon support Yahweh's host "... the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the nation had taken vengeance on their enemies."¹⁰⁵ The same theme is found in the archaic tradition preserved in a part of the hymn in Habakkuk 3:

... God came from the South,
The Holy One from Mount Paran . . .
Before him marched Dabr,

100. It is interesting to observe alternate techniques of suppressing the anomaly: in 1 Kings 19:15 (cf. Isa. 37:16) and 1 Chron. 13:6 (the parallel to 2 Sam. 6:2) *šēbā'ôt* is simply omitted.

101. Cf. W. F. Albright's review of B. N. Wambacq, *L'Épithète divine Jahvé Š'ba'ôt: Étude philologique, historique et exégétique* (Bruges, Belgium, 1947), in *JBL*, 67 (1948), 377-381.

102. See below in the essay on "The Divine Warrior," and the dissertation of Patrick D. Miller, "Holy War and Cosmic War in Early Israel" (Ph.D. diss. Harvard, 1963).

103. Josh. 5:14.

104. Judg. 5:20.

105. Josh. 10:12f.

Rašp went forth at his feet . . .
 The eternal mountains were split,
 The ancient hills collapsed . . .
 The mountains saw thee and writhed,
 [] the Deep roared:
 On high Sun raised his arms,
 Moon stood <on> his lordly dais.¹⁰⁶
 They march by the glare of thy darts,
 By the (lightning) flash of thy spear.¹⁰⁷

In the archaizing poetry of Second Isaiah comes an echo of the theme: "Lift your eyes to heaven, Behold who created these? Who mustered their army by number? Called each of them by name?"¹⁰⁸

We must ask finally if the phrase *dū yahwī šaba'ôt*, "He who creates the heavenly armies" is not in origin an epithet of 'Ēl, and if the primitive formula is not better reconstructed in the pattern *'ēl zū yahwī (šaba'ôt)* in parallel with Ugaritic *'il malk dū yakāninu . . . , 'il dū yaqniyu*, and more remotely *'il dū 'ōlami, 'il dū pa'idi*, and so forth. The substitution of *Yahweh* for 'Ēl in the first position would be natural when *Yahweh* became the principal cult name: *yahwē zū yahwē (šaba'ôt*, and so on).

If the construction appears radical, we may observe that, after all, both Elohistic and Priestly tradition have anticipated this proposal in recording the revelation of the name *Yahweh*, and, of course, identifying him with 'Ēl the god of the Patriarchs.¹⁰⁹

If *Yahweh* is recognized as originally a cultic name of 'Ēl, perhaps the epithet of 'Ēl as patron deity of the Midianite League in the south, a number of problems in the history of the religion of Israel can be solved. We can sketch here only a few such problems and solutions, assuming that the god *Yahweh* split off from 'Ēl in the radical differentiation of his cultus in the Proto-Israelite league, ultimately ousting 'Ēl from his place in the divine council, and eventually condemning the ancient powers to death (Psalm 82).

'Ēl, 'Elyōn, Šadday, and 'Ōlām continued throughout Israel's his-

106. We follow here the reconstruction of W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy (T. H. Robinson Volume)*, ed. H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh, Clark, 1950), p. 16, note mm.

107. Hab. 3:3, 5f., 10ff.

108. Isa. 40:26.

109. We can enlist also the authority of Julius Wellhausen, "Jehovah was only a special name of El . . ." in *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, trans. Bloch and Menzies (Edinburgh, 1885), p. 433, n. 1.

tory to be suitable names for Yahweh despite fierce animosity to Baʿl, the chief god of Syria in the first millennium B.C.; as has been eloquently stated by Eissfeldt,¹¹⁰ no reconstruction of the origins of Yahwism can be successful which has no adequate explanation of these contrasting phenomena.

The popularity of the cult of ʾĒl in the Semitic community in Sinai, the eastern delta of Egypt, and Seir gives some plausibility to the notion that Yahweh was an ʾĒl figure. Moreover, to reformulate one of Alt's arguments, we contend that some prior cultic unity, binding people of Patriarchal stock and the disparate elements invading Canaan from the wilderness, must be posited to explain the rapid cultic unification of the diverse peoples who were bound into the twelve-tribe league around the shrine of the Ark of Yahweh Šēbāʾōt.

Many of the traits and functions of ʾĒl appear as traits and functions of Yahweh in the earliest traditions of Israel: Yahweh's role as judge in the court of ʾĒl (Psalm 82; Psalm 89: 6–8) and in the general picture of Yahweh at the head of the Divine council; Yahweh's kingship (Exodus 15: 18; Deuteronomy 33: 15; Numbers 24: 21); Yahweh's wisdom, age, and compassion (*yahwê ʾēl raḥūm wē-ḥannūn*)¹¹¹ and above all, Yahweh as creator and father (Genesis 49: 25; Deuteronomy 32: 6).

The early cultic establishment of Yahweh and its appurtenances—the Tabernacle, its structure of *qērašīm*, its curtains embroidered with cherubim and its cherubim throne, and its proportions according to the pattern (*tabnīt*) of the cosmic shrine—all reflect Canaanite models, and specifically the Tent of ʾĒl and his cherubim throne.¹¹² We have reason to believe that the biblical descriptions in the Priestly traditions go back to the Tent of David. Behind David's Tent stands an earlier Tent tradition expressed powerfully in Nathan's oracle denouncing David's plans to innovate by constructing a temple: "Will you build a temple for my dais? Indeed, I have never dwelt in a temple from the day I

110. "El and Yahweh," pp. 25–37.

111. See the perceptive comments of D. N. Freedman in his discussion of this old liturgical formula, "The Name of the God of Moses," p. 154.

112. The writer described the Canaanite motifs of the Tabernacle in his 1947 paper "The Priestly Tabernacle," republished in *BAR*, I, 201–228. See also the references above, chapter 2, notes 143 and 144. Of special interest is the description of ʾĒl's abode in a Hittite version of the Canaanite myth of ʾĒl and Ašertu. One of the terms used is GIŠ.ZA.LAM.GAR.=Akk. Kuštaru, "tent." See H. Otten, "Ein Kanaanäischer Mythos aus Boğazköy," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, 1 (1953), 126, 1.7; and most recently, R. J. Clifford, "The Tent of El and the Israelite Tent of Meeting," *CBQ*, 33 (1971), 221–227.

brought the children of Israel up from Egypt unto this day but have moved about in a tent and in a tabernacle."¹¹³ Although Nathan's oracle has been written over in light of Solomon's subsequent building of the Temple, we can perceive that Nathan's attack was actually against the notion of a temple as an appropriate cultic establishment for Yahweh. David thus returned to the tradition of the league sanctuary at Shiloh in his new, national shrine in Jerusalem¹¹⁴ and appointed the scion of the old Mushite family of Shiloh as one of his two highpriests.

If 'El and Yahweh were related as we have suggested, many of the puzzling features of the cult of Jeroboam¹¹⁵ would have immediate explanation. On the one hand, the "sin of Jeroboam" was claimed to be the chief sin of Israel by Deuteronomistic sources, themselves ultimately rooted in Shilonite priestly tradition. Moreover, the traditions of Aaron's sin in the matter of the bull stemmed from the North, was preserved in Elohist tradition, and was obviously shaped by the polemic against the Bethel cultus and its Aaronid priesthood.¹¹⁶ In spite of its polemical distortion, the slogan "Behold your god(s) who brought you up out of the land of Egypt" is a characteristic Yahwistic confession, and further scrutiny reveals that the singular "god" must have been original. In I Kings 12:28 the expression *hnh 'lhyk*, "Behold thy god/gods" is ambiguous, though the context, the making of the two young bulls, permits a plural interpretation.¹¹⁷ In Exodus 32:4,

113. 2 Sam. 7:5f.

114. It has been customary for scholars to assume that the sanctuary at Shiloh was in fact a temple in light of the mention of the *hēkal yahweh* at Shiloh in the 1 Sam. 1:9 and 3:3. However, in early liturgical poetry, older than the folkloristic prose sources of Samuel, the pre-Davidic sanctuary is clearly portrayed as a tent (Psalm 132:6-7; pre-Solomonic in its original form and Psalm 78:60), and Nathan's oracle could not be more explicit. We must rather take the prose source in Samuel as anachronistic. Cf. Virgil W. Rabe, "Israelite Opposition to the Temple," *CBQ*, 29 (1967), 228-233.

115. On the cult of Jeroboam, see R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961), pp. 332-336, and the literature cited on pp. 540-543.

116. On the conflict between the Mushites of Shiloh and the Aaronids of Bethel, see below, chapter 8.

117. The young bulls were no doubt conceived as pedestals for the same god in the two national shrines. However, there were, we suspect, grounds for the accusation in Exodus 32:4 = I Kings 12:28 that the bulls of Dan and Bethel were worshipped. A god and his animal "participate in each other," and while the god may be conceived as enthroned or standing on the bull in Canaanite mythology and iconography, he also is immanent in his animal so that the two may be confused. On the interesting question of the aniconic tradition among the Phoenicians, see S. Moscati, "Iconismo e aniconismo nelle più antiche stele Puniche," *OA* 8 (1969), 59-67.

8 *'lh 'lhyk 'sr h'lwk m'rš mšrym*, while originally ambiguous, is difficult not to read as plural: "These are thy gods . . ." However, the effect is weird. Aaron only made one calf. "These gods" belong to Dan and Bethel. In Nehemiah 9:18, Aaron's words are altered to read unambiguously in the singular: *zh 'lhyk 'sr h'lk m'rš mšrym*.

It is inconceivable that the national cult of Jeroboam was other than Yahwistic. Jeroboam and the tribes of the North seceded in the face of Solomonic innovations and remained the center of League traditions. Jeroboam, desperate to consolidate his kingdom, wrenched from the Davidids and desirous of wooing his own people away from the shrine of the ark in Jerusalem and its pilgrimage festivals, would not have repudiated Yahweh and chosen a new god. Nor would he have flown in the face of fact and tradition by naming *another* god as the god who brought Israel up from Egypt.

Further, it is impossible to believe that opponents of the Bethel establishment from the Northern Kingdom invented the account of Aaron and the Bull. Aaron receives strange handling in the account.¹¹⁸ How did it come about that venerable Aaron himself was credited with the manufacture of the double of Bethel's bull and the recital of a classic Yahwistic cult formula over it? Other peculiarities appear in the story: the mention of the pilgrim feast by Aaron and his insistence on a miracle; the young bull "emerged" from the fire. There are too many loose threads in the account. Underneath the polemical tale must have been a cult legend of the old sanctuary of Bethel claiming Aaronic authority for its bull iconography. In short, it appears that Jeroboam did not invent a new cultus, but, choosing the famous sanctuary of 'El at Bethel, attempted to archaize even more radically than the astute David had done when he brought tent and ark and the cherubim iconography to Jerusalem, transferring the nimbus of the old league sanctuary at Shiloh to Zion.¹¹⁹ The sanctuary of Bethel had Patriarchal connections according to tradition, and the Bull iconography of Jeroboam's shrine merely reintroduced an iconography having Aaronic connections. The young bull apparently had dual associations; the storm god is often pictured standing on a bull, a symbol of virility, and

118. The account in Exodus 32 is basically Elohist, i.e., pre-Deuteronomic in origin.

119. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, "Silo und Jerusalem," in *VT. Suppl.* (Leiden, 1957), IV, 138-147; M. Haran, "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch," *JBL*, 81 (1962), 14-24; V. W. Rabe, "The Identity of the Priestly Tabernacle," *JNES*, 25 (1966), 132ff.

the bull was the animal of *Tôr 'Il 'abika*, "Bull 'El your father." There can be no question of Jeroboam introducing a Ba'l-Haddu cult; if he had, tradition should have preserved the fact, in vivid invective. As a matter of fact there seems to have been no awareness on the part of those who preserved the Elijah-Elisha traditions, or upon the part of Amos, or the tradents of I Kings 13, 14, of the radical idolatry of the Bethel shrine and its bull. None of them made any mention of the young bull when they visited Bethel.

Apparently, Jeroboam's real sin was in establishing a rival to the central sanctuary in Jerusalem, not in the introduction of a foreign god or a pagan idol. As we have argued, it is wholly implausible that an insecure usurper, in the attempt to secure his throne and to woo his subjects would flout fierce Yahwists by installing a foreign or novel god in his national shrine. Yet he made an 'El shrine his royal chapel. The only real solution for these several problems, so far as I can see, is to recognize in Yahweh an 'El figure.

Our interests have been directed toward the continuities between the god of the Fathers and Yahweh, god of Israel. We have agreed with Alt to this extent, that Patriarchal religion had special features: the tutelary deity or deities entered into an intimate relationship with a social group expressed in terms of kinship or covenant, established its justice, led its battles, guided its destiny.¹²⁰ This strain entered Yahwism. Yahweh was judge and war leader of the historical community. He revealed himself to the Patriarch Moses, led Israel in the Conquest; he was the god who brought Israel up from the land of Egypt, her savior. There is also the second strain which entered Israel's primitive religion, that of the high and eternal one, 'El the creator of heaven and earth, father of all.

120. Professor Thorkild Jacobsen, who has aided me in more than one difficulty in dealing with Mesopotamian lore, comments on the "historical" character of the Patriarchal god as follows: "I have the impression that a great deal of what is seen as true in Alt's view can be very greatly deepened by going into the Mesopotamian concept of the 'personal' god . . . The elements of 'power to effective decision and acting' inherent in the concept of the 'personal god,' and the development in Mesopotamia around the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon which has the 'personal god' turn away from his protégé in anger at cultic and moral offences leaving him open to attack by evil, all seems to me to have relevance here."

II The Cultus of the Israelite League

4 Prolegomena

Recent discussion of the history of the early Israelite cultus is voluminous and variegated, but can be schematized for our purposes as follows.¹

(1) The central or constitutive element in the early cult was the dramatic reenactment, by recital and ritual acts, of the events of the Exodus and Conquest. This reenactment of the *magnalia Dei* may be seen as the primary or initial movement in a covenant-renewal ceremony (at either the fall or spring New Year) in which the basis of the community's common life and institutions is restored or renewed.² Or it may be placed in the setting of a festival, perhaps Passover, which, it is claimed, is to be distinguished sharply from the festival of law and covenant held in the fall.³

(2) The central or constitutive movement in the early cultus was the celebration of the enthronement of Yahweh as king and creator of

1. Chapters 4 and 5 of Section II draw heavily on the writer's paper, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," in *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, Philip W. Lown Institute for Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University, Studies and Texts, 3, ed. A. Altmann (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 11-30.

2. This view has emerged in the wake of recent studies of ancient Near Eastern covenant forms and their utilization in old Israel. The pioneer work in relating this lore to the Old Testament was that of George E. Mendenhall, "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," *BA*, 17 (1954), 26-46; and "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *BA*, 17 (1954), 50-76 (reprinted in the *Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, ed. E. F. Campbell and D. N. Freedman (New York, Doubleday, 1970), III, 3-53). His programmatic essays have been followed by a number of important studies, including Klaus Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular* (Neukirchen, Neukirchener Verlag, 1960); G. Ernest Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York, Harper, 1962); J. Harvey, "Le 'Rib-Pattern', réquisitoire prophétique sur la rupture de l'alliance," *Biblica*, 43 (1962), 172-196; and Delbert Hillers, *Treaty Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964).

3. This view received classical statement in G. von Rad, *Das form-geschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1938), now reprinted in his *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei, 8 (Munich, C. Kaiser, 1958), pp. 9-86; and in English, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, tr. E. W. T. Dicken (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966), pp. 1-78; it draws heavily on the work of A. Alt, *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts* (Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1934), reprinted in *KS* (Alt), pp. 278-332; in English, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* tr. R. A. Wilson (New York, Doubleday, 1968), pp. 103-171; and in turn has been extended by H. J. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, 2nd ed. (Munich, C. Kaiser, 1962); cf. Kraus, "Gilgal. Ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels," *VT*, 1 (1951), 181-199. Sharp as well as lengthy debate in recent years has marked the discussion of the Exodus-

cosmos by virtue of his victory over his enemy or enemies in a cosmogonic struggle.⁴

The first view has arisen out of a preoccupation (on the part of such scholars as Alt, Mendenhall, Baltzer) with the form-critical analysis of early legal and covenantal formulae and (by men such as Noth and von Rad) of early historical traditions, notably the Israelite Epic sources.⁵ These investigations have led to the reconstruction of the cultic function of cycles of liturgical (apodeictic) law and of the cultic function of the recitation of the *magnalia Dei*.

The second view stemmed largely from the analysis of the Psalms and the attempt to reconstruct the cultus underlying them. This research was carried out in the new light of lore from neighboring religions, at first (by Volz, Hooke, and especially Mowinckel) primarily from Babylon, and later (by Engnell) from Canaanite sources.⁶

These two "views" are what we may call ideal types, in Weberian

Conquest events, the Sinai Covenant traditions and theophany motif, and their relationship. For a review of the discussion and citation of pertinent literature, see J. M. Schmidt, "Erwägungen zum Verhältnis von Auszugs und Sinaïtradition," *ZAW*, 82 (1970), 1-31; D. J. McCarthy, *Der Gottesbund im Alten Testament, Ein Bericht über die Forschung der letzten Jahre*, SBS 13 (Stuttgart, 1966). A few items may be singled out for special mention: W. Beyerlin, *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaïtraditionen* (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1961); in English, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions*, tr. S. Rudman (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1965); W. L. Moran, "Review of K. Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular*," *Biblica*, 43 (1962), 100-106; D. J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, *Analecta Biblica*, 21 (Rome, 1963); R. Smend, *Jahwekreis und Stämmebund* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot. Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11*, *Analecta Biblica*, 20 (Rome, 1963); G. Fohrer, *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus*, *BZAW* 91 (Berlin, 1964); H. B. Huffmon, "The Exodus, Sinai and the Credo," *CBQ*, 27 (1965), 101-113; H. Gese, "Bemerkungen zur Sinaïtradition," *ZAW*, 79 (1967), 10-154; G. W. Coats, "The Tradito-historical Character of the Reed Sea Motif," *VT*, 17 (1967), 253-265; D. R. Hillers, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea* (Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1969).

4. This construction had its stimulus in two fundamental works: P. Volz, *Das Neujahrsfest Jahwes* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1912); and S. Mowinckel, *Psalmstudien II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie* (1922; reprinted, Amsterdam, P. Schippers, 1961); for selected bibliography of more recent works, see R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh (London, Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1961), pp. 551f., and Kraus, *Gottesdienst*, p. 79, n. 92.

5. In addition to the literature cited in note 1, see M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1948). See also Noth's critique of the myth-and-ritual school "Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei, VI (Munich, 1960).

6. See especially I. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells, 1943). Cf. S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, trans. G. W. Anderson (New York, Abingdon Press, n.d. [1954]), pp. 52-95; and the literature cited by de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 526f.

language, and neither is found in pure form, perhaps, in current research. Since one deals primarily with the cultus of the league the other with the ideology of the cult in the era of the kings, they need not be conceived as being in direct opposition to each other, and, in fact, various accommodations of one view to the other have been attempted.

The late Professor Engnell could argue, for example, that the motifs of Exodus and Conquest and of covenant renewal of the cultic community grew out of a progressive historicizing of mythological forms. He insisted, however, that the mythic patterns were typologically primary, since obviously they existed before the foundation of Israelite cultic institutions. This gives a strange picture of the cultus: those constitutive "historical" elements discovered in the festival liturgies and hymns of the league are secondary to the cosmogonic and mythological elements derived from analysis of the liturgies and hymns of the monarchy.

Kraus, representing the Alt school, takes the reverse position. The old themes of Exodus and Conquest are in part suppressed in the age of the kings, owing to the inauguration of a royal *Zionfest*.⁷ This festival celebrates primarily the election of the house of David and the choice of Zion as the site of Israel's new sanctuary. The rites included a procession of the Ark to Zion's shrine, reenacting the original choice of Zion. This new festival, while preserving some continuities with the traditions of the early sanctuaries of the Ark, also drew deeply, we are told, upon the mythic sources of the old Jebusite cult of 'El 'Elyōn, above all in its incorporation of the motif of the "kingship of God." Kraus thus explains the mythological elements in the royal cultus as lately introduced into Israel with the rise of monarchic forms, and by this means he suggests a mode of dealing with the enthronement hymns. This solution to the problem of historical development is most awkward, also: Israel, having had an essentially "historical" cultus in the early time (when Canaanite influence is most expected!),⁸ later

7. H. J. Kraus, *Psalmen I*, Biblischer Kommentar, XI, 1 (Neukirchen, 1960), pp. 197-206; *Gottesdienst*, pp. 215-220.

8. One may compare the Sea Peoples, notably the Philistines, who (contrary to Israel) came from an alien culture into the Canaanite cultural realm and in the course of the twelfth and eleventh centuries were wholly assimilated to the Canaanite religious environment. Israel on the contrary (though the elements who sojourned in the strongly Canaanite settlements in the eastern delta and the elements who never left Palestine were for some centuries dissolved in a Canaanite milieu) remained fundamentally unaffected, such a view must maintain, until David met the priests of 'El 'Elyōn (that is, the familiar 'El of the Fathers!) in Jerusalem in the tenth century. Such a view should be described, rather, as incredible.

retrogressed, so to speak, by accepting (in attenuated form, to be sure) mythological lore from the Canaanite cult of Jerusalem. Israel's religious development thus moved from the era of the league, with its distinctive historical themes, into an era of kingship, when these themes were infused with Canaanite language and mythology—in a word, mythologized.

One can discern certain strengths and weaknesses in these alternative views, one of which we can label as belonging to the “myth-and-ritual” school, the other to the *Heilsgeschichte* school.

The Myth and Ritual School

In the position of the myth-and-ritual school, there is the tacit assumption that the development of the cult must move from the “natural” to the “historical,” a legacy of the tradition of Vatke and Wellhausen. Those of the school merely substitute for Wellhausen's essentially Hegelian concept of natural religion⁹ Canaanite myth and ritual as discerned in current research. For the main part, the approach of this school has been phenomenological rather than historical, so that it has not grappled with the problem of “earlier” historical elements, later mythological elements, in the cult. So by and large the school has been content with a simple interpretation in terms of a unilinear, diachronic development: the historicizing of myth. We are never told what was the motive power disintegrating myth into history—in a Hegelian system the movement from the natural to the historical belongs to the very logic of historical process—but while idealistic premises are discarded by myth-and-ritualists (or most), extraordinarily enough, the idealistic framework of the evolution is kept. This posture requires, in our view, a dogged suppression of much of the evidence drawn from the early prose and legal material. Or rather we should say, this school subordinates early prose and early hymnic tradition to the body of hymns from the royal period. With this subordination come dangers. The royal hymns utilize, in their prosodic style and language, a classical style which had its origin in Bronze Age Canaan. Wholesale borrowings of mythological material

9. Lothar Perlit in his *Vatke und Wellhausen*, *BZAW*, 94 (Berlin, 1965), tries mightily to free Wellhausen from the heritage of Vatke and Hegel, but succeeds only in revealing his own inability to stand apart from that same tradition whose influence is still pervasive in German Old Testament scholarship. Had Wellhausen proceeded purely as a positivistic historian, his great synthesis would never have been written, and he would not have become the powerful figure he was and is.

were made under the tyranny of this Canaanite aesthetic tradition. In reconstructing the cultic function or *Sitz im Leben* of such hymns, one is never quite sure whether he arrives at a description of Israel's royal cult or at a picture of an old Canaanite cultus from which the hymnic tradition stems. Analysis of a borrowed psalm, or of a hymn or liturgy heavily dependent on Canaanite hymnody, is a dangerous and subtle, if not a subjective, process. One must detect not one, but a series of *Sitze im Kultleben*. On the one hand, it is obvious that in the reuse of such material an altered context altered meaning. On the other hand, it is equally important to observe that the transformation of such material cannot have been absolute, that there must have been some continuity between the religious cultures so engaged. There must have been a suitable matrix into which Canaanite lore could be grafted and in which it could remain alive.¹⁰ Control here must come from the corpus of archaic poetry, law, and Epic tradition.¹¹

The History-of-Redemption School

The history-of-redemption school has pictured the development along at least two lines: a dominant line (as the name of the school suggests) bearing the theme of the Exodus-Conquest—that is, the history of redemption—and an alternate theme of revelation (of the Law) at Sinai, preserved in the covenant-renewal ceremonies in the central sanctuary of the league at Sukkōt.¹² I think it is not unfair to say that in this analysis the key to Israel's early cultic history is found in the traditional contrast between gospel and law, and its form-critical analogue, *kērygma* and *didachē*.¹³ Such duplicity or doubleness in Israel's cultic development must be repudiated in view of our fresh understanding of the forms of the covenant and the covenant re-

10. That old Canaanite myth remained alive, however attenuated, in royal psalms or in Prophetic oracles, is clear from early apocalyptic. Here myths stemming from old Israelite sources, especially from hymns and liturgies of the royal cult, break out anew in transformed but vigorous modes of life. Fresh borrowings of myth in apocalyptic composition are exceedingly rare, as becomes clearer with each advance of our knowledge of apocalyptic origins. See below in Section V, "A Note on Apocalyptic Origins." On the contrary, there was direct reintroduction of Phoenician theogonic and cosmogonic lore in early Gnosticism.

11. By "Epic" sources we mean here and elsewhere the so-called JE sources and the common poetic tradition that lies behind them.

12. To the fall calendar, Kraus would add a "tent festival" underlying traditions of Sukkōt that preserve traditions of the desert history (*Gottesdienst*, pp. 152-159).

13. One is tempted to say, in a radical Lutheran understanding of grace and law and its Idealistic analogues.

newal.¹⁴ It is now clear that the confession of the *magnalia Dei* or recitation of the Epic theme (von Rad's *heilsgeschichtliche Credo*) belongs to the covenant formulary as its first major element or prologue, to the covenant renewal festival as its first movement. The recitation of the law and the renewal or actualization of the covenant comes as a consequent act in the ritual drama.¹⁵ In the present shape

14. See above, note 2.

15. The parade example of the covenant ritual is found in the accounts of Joshua's covenant making in Joshua 24:2-28 happily supplemented by Joshua 8:30-34 and Deuteronomy 27 (11-15-26). Verses 2-13 of Joshua 24 recite the history of Yahweh's redemption (the promises to the Fathers, the Exodus and Conquest); verses 14-28 the subsequent rites of the covenant making (the putting away of alien gods, the oath of the people, the deposit of the covenant document). A missing feature only hinted at in Joshua 24:27, namely the blessings and curses of the covenant, is described in the parallel account in Joshua 8:30-34, and Deuteronomy 27:15-26 preserves some of the cultic recitation of curses surviving from the old time.

Actually we must probably see in Deuteronomy disintegrated materials of the old fall festival of Shechem, as is argued by Alt, von Rad, and Baltzer. After the fall of Shechem in the late twelfth century B.C., the annual cultus presumably ceased, perhaps replaced by a seven-year cycle of pilgrimage festivals during the era when Shechem lay abandoned. Cf. Deut. 31:10.

The attempt has been made to see the Epic traditions of Exodus 19-24 (32, 33) 34 similarly as disintegrated materials of the same Shechemite covenant (von Rad, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch*, pp. 13-26). It is true that cultic materials are woven into these traditions, including the archaic poetic (liturgical) prologue in 19:3-6 (on the age and meaning of this passage, see W. L. Moran, "A Kingdom of Priests," in *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought*, ed. J. L. McKenzie [New York, Herder and Herder, 1962], pp. 7-20); the stipulations of the covenant 20:2-23:19; the covenant ceremony proper in 24:1-11; and parallel materials in 34:10-17; 27. Cf. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), pp. 152-167. However, the ordering and selection of materials here by the Priestly editor, and his inclusion of his great cycles of law, priestly prescriptions, etc., in the Sinaitic context obscures the covenant formulary in E and, indeed, suppresses even the main part of Yahwistic decalogue. The actual covenant formulary, if we seek the parallel to Deuteronomy, is to be found in the Priestly reformulation; Prologue, Exodus 6:2-19:6; the law 20:2-14 (revised by P); 21-23; the covenant ceremony 24; ordinances of the sanctuary, the depository of the law 25-29 (30, 31); breach of covenant and renewal 32-34; establishment of the covenant cultus and its prescriptions, 35-40, Leviticus 1-16; covenant stipulations Leviticus 17-26:2; and blessings and curses of the covenant, 26:3-13 and 26:14-45.

It is difficult to detect any elements of the cultic traditions of Sinai which attach themselves to Sukkōt, i.e., to the Fall New Year. In the old traditions the clearest ties are to the spring celebration at Gilgal. Thus the erection of twelve stelae (Exod. 24:4) stands parallel to the twelve stones of Gilgal, the latter specifically connected with Passover (Josh. 5:10; cf. 4:19f.). Priestly tradition places the covenant meal of Exodus 24 at the Feast of Weeks (Exod. 19:1); however, the first festival celebrated after the erection of the Tabernacle is the Passover, shortly before Israel departs from Sinai (Exod. 40:2, 17; Num. 9:1; 10:11). Although the Priestly editors have preserved a remnant of the "second" covenant-making in Exodus 34, one notes that no mention of a covenant feast survives from the Yahwistic tradition. There is, thus, in the final stage of the Tetra-

of Epic tradition, the ritual pattern of the covenant-renewal ceremony has been displaced. Not only have diverse traditions (including non-cultic materials) been introduced to expand the account of the events of the Exodus and Wilderness sojourn, the cultic form of traditions also has been dissolved in the interests of the historical or prose-epic form into which our sources recast available tradition. The primary displacement is the intrusion of covenant rites into the middle of the *Heilsgeschichte*, rather than at the end in their proper cultic position, following the historical recital of the call of the Fathers, the deliverance from Egypt, and the gift of the land in the Conquest. That is, the formation of the covenant is placed after the Exodus and before the Conquest, while in the ritual of covenant renewal, the covenant rites proper are placed in the context of the twelve-tribe league, celebrating the gift of the land in the Conquest. But the epic order of events—Exodus, Covenant at Sinai, Conquest—is based on older historical memory, not on the more directly cultic traditions in which the recitation of the historical acts of God and the recitation of the stipulations of the covenant are two separate acts in a single cultic drama of the League. This background explains the absence of the “revelation at Sinai” in such archaic materials as those found in Joshua 24, which reflect cultic traditions of the covenant festival at Shechem, and in Exodus 15 (the Song of the Sea), which reflects traditions of the covenant renewal rites of old Gilgal (see below). In this view, it was the cultic use of the covenant formulary in the era of the league which displaced the Sinaitic traditions. There can be little doubt, however, that the Sinai traditions ultimately stem from preleague cult, as well as historical memory, and are “correctly” located in epic tradition. In other words, the cultus of the twelve-tribe league (covenant renewal ceremonies in variant forms at the great sanctuaries) presented the events of Exodus and Conquest as a single continuity to be reenacted in a single act, preceding formally the covenant ceremony in which the tribes bound themselves anew in community. Indeed there is evidence in some early traditions that the march of the Divine Warrior from the South or the Wars of Yahweh tended to dominate the cultic reenactment of the *magnalia Dei*. The Yahwistic account of the covenant in

teach no covenant *renewal* festival until the Ark of the Covenant, its tent, and the entire Priestly apparatus is established at the Spring New Year (Exod. 40:2, 17), the priesthood consecrated (seven days, Lev. 8), and the *nēsī'im* present their gifts (the first day) and offerings (twelve days, Num. 7). The Passover on the fourteenth (Num. 9:1ff.) thus crowns the service of dedication in the Priestly tradition in its final form.

Exodus 34:10–27, despite its expansion and reworking, preserves elements which place the covenant making, not in the context of the events of the Exodus, but by anticipation juxtaposed to the “terrible events” of Conquest and the gift of the land. As in the Yahwistic tradition of Genesis 15, covenant is understood more in terms of divine oath or promise of blessing, a reformulation of the covenant form in the interest of the monarchy, into the eternal decree or oaths to the house of David.¹⁶ More eloquent testimony is to be found in the archaic hymns to be discussed in the next section. Thus Exodus 15:1–18 treats both Exodus and Conquest; Deuteronomy 33:1–3, 26–29; Judges 5:4–5 (= Psalms 68:8–9); and Habakkuk 3:3–7, all describe the Divine Warrior marching in conquest from the Southland.¹⁷ In these poems one finds the language of the theophany of the Divine Warrior utilizing mythical elements from the theophany of the stormgod as warrior. The theophanic language of the prose sources of the Sinai revelation is secondary, derived from the hymns of the Wars of Yahweh, where the (Exodus-) Conquest motif is naturally and primitively linked with theophany.¹⁸

Taken in the revised form suggested above, this covenant-renewal festival becomes the cultic carrier of Israel’s historical traditions, and the early cult can be understood to have a unity comparable to that posited by the myth-and-ritual school. In one, the history of the community’s creation is rehearsed or reenacted to reconstitute its life and institutions, since the historical community is conceived as the community of salvation. In the other, the primordial events (the battle of creation, the theophany of Yahweh as king manifest) are recited and reenacted, in order to restore the orders of creation or, to say the same thing, to actualize the “eschatological” kingdom of God.

At least one major problem remains. The history-of-redemption school, while minimizing the impact of borrowings from Canaan, must

16. Cf. N. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid. Eine Studie zu Gn 15*, SBS 28 (Stuttgart, 1967).

17. Cf. Numbers 10:35f. The earliest sources use in parallelism, Sinai, Seir, and Paran (Dt. 33:2), Sinai, Seir and Edom (Judg. 5:4f.), Teman and Paran (Hab. 3:3). Qadesh in Num. 13:26 is placed in the Wilderness of Paran, in Num. 20:1; 33:36 in the Wilderness of Zin (all P); Deut. 1:1–3 associates (roughly) Paran, Mt. Seir, and Qadesh-barnea. Num. 20:14, 16 (E) places Qadesh on the Edomite border from whence messengers are dispatched to the king of Edom. These data along with the place name [*Bêt*] *Yahwi* in Edom/Seir not only point to Yahweh’s association with the southeastern mountains, but reinforce those theories of Yahweh’s origins in the Midianite amphityony. Cf. also the place name El-paran in Gen. 14:16.

18. See below, Chapter 7.

admit to a considerable invasion of mythological lore in the time of the monarchy. In view of the recrudescence of extraordinarily vivacious motifs of Canaanite origin in Jewish apocalyptic, mediated by Israel's royal ideology and the Wisdom tradition, we cannot escape such a conclusion. This sequence in the development of the cult posits a cultus in the early period dominated by historical categories: celebration of the history of Israel's redemption in the Exodus and Conquest, reenactment of the ancient covenant rooted in these gracious acts of Yahweh. The question of how this historical cult rose out of the mythopoeic religious culture which preceded is left unanswered, as is the problem of the receptivity of Israel's religion and cult to the increment of mythological symbols and motives in the imperial and monarchic eras.

As a matter of fact, students of the Alt school, even more than their master, appear to be incapable of dealing with the origins of a historical cultus or of tracing the lines of historical continuity between the myth and ritual patterns of pre-Mosaic Canaan and the earliest forms of Israelite religious and cultic practices. The movement from dominantly mythical to dominantly historical patterns is not a natural or inevitable tendency, as is evidenced by the perennial resurgence of mythic forms and language in biblical religion: in the royal theology, in apocalyptic, in Gnosticism, in Qabbalah. The reason for this failure or inability lies in the refusal of many form critics or historians of tradition to raise the question of actual historical memory lying behind cultic patterning of the Exodus, Covenant at Sinai, and Conquest. The thrust of historical events, recognized as crucially or ultimately meaningful, alone had the power to displace the mythic pattern. Even then we should expect the survival of some mythic forms, and the secondary mythologizing of historical experiences to point to their cosmic or transcendent meaning. An obvious example is the description of the victory of Israel and her God over the Egyptians: the overthrow of the Egyptian host in the sea is singled out to symbolize Israel's deliverance, Yahweh's victory. Later, an equation is fully drawn between the "drying up of the sea" and the Creator's defeat of Rahab or Yamm (Isaiah 51:9-11); the historical event is thereby given cosmic or primordial meaning. As a matter of fact, the earliest sources do not equate the crossing of the sea and the killing of the Dragon by the Divine Warrior,¹⁹ but it is highly likely that the role of the sea in the Exodus story was singled out and stressed

19. See Chapter 6.

precisely because of the ubiquitous motif of the cosmogonic battle between the creator god and Sea in West Semitic mythology.

The tendency of form critics is to break up what is properly and primitively a pattern into artificial units. This tendency is not inherent in the method, although the philosophical presuppositions which informed the methodology in its early development by Gunkel and Alt led to this tendency, and it persists as a defective inheritance in the contemporary use of form-critical techniques for historical analysis. Hence, some members of the history-of-redemption school are driven to find separate cults or festivals, or separate units of Israel contributing one by one the elements in the historical pattern of Israel's early cult and epic: Exodus traditions stemming from one place, those of the covenant making at Sinai from another, Conquest traditions from a third cult or shrine or tribe. While it is true, obviously, that all elements of later twelve-tribe Israel did not engage in these epic events but came to share them as historical memories through the "actualizing" of them in the covenantal cultus, it also must be insisted that the pattern—Exodus from Egypt, Covenant at Sinai, Conquest of Canaan—is prior, cultically and historically, to the several elements in the pattern or *Gestalt*.

These remarks may be illustrated by reference to Gerhard von Rad's important monograph, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel*.²⁰ Here von Rad describes Israel's sacral warfare as an institution of the era of the Judges, limited to the defensive wars of Israel. Von Rad takes this stand in conscious contradiction of the unanimous witness of Israelite tradition that the wars of Yahweh par excellence were the wars of the Conquest. His view rests on the dogma of the Alt school that only individual tribes entered the land, or infiltrated it, and that the traditions of the Conquest are a secondary complex composed of unitary traditions of individual tribes. The Conquest so understood is not a historical event (not even a reinterpreted, schematized set of incidents) nor a historical event covered over with accretions of legend and myth. It is a construct of the *Heilsgeschichte*, but not history. The upshot is that von Rad fails to deal with the origins of holy war in Israel and in turn with the mythological elements in holy war as practiced by earliest Israel, and indeed as practiced by pre-Yahwistic and non-Israelite peoples.²¹ He ignores also the earliest psalmody of Israel, where certain

20. Gerhard von Rad, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, *AThNT* 20 (Zürich, 1951).

21. For an extended treatment of the origins of holy war in Israel as well as for a detailed analysis of cosmic or mythological elements in sacral warfare, see the disserta-

mythic features still cling, and fails to perceive, therefore, the reutilization of some of these mythological elements in the royal cult, in prophecy, and above all in the apocalyptic development of the concept of the Divine Warrior.

We should argue that the development of Israel's cultic themes and institutions was a more complex evolution than is envisaged by either of these schools. In the pre-Yahwistic phase of the religion of the patriarchal folk, we can discern both historical and mythic features. On the one hand, there was the cult of the Divine Kinsman, the tutelary deity who entered into an intimate relationship with a social group, established its justice, and directed its battles. This is Alt's divine type, "the god of the Father." On the other hand, there was the cult of Canaanite 'Ēl, the Divine Patriarch, "creator of heaven and earth," and leader of cosmic armies.²² How early these types of deity could merge in the cult of one god we do not know. At all events, these two had coalesced in the figure of Yahweh in the earliest stratum of Israelite tradition.

In the era of the league in Canaan, the historical impulse became powerful in the Mosaic faith and in the covenant festivals of the great sanctuaries and especially of the shrine of the Ark.²³ On the whole, the school of Alt has done great service here in analyzing old prose and legal traditions. Even in the cult of the league, however, themes of mythological origin can be detected, standing in tension with themes of historical memory or enhancing redemptive events by assimilating them to primordial events. These mythic features are to be found especially in archaic psalmody, which underwent less shaping in transmission than the prose. It is this more or less subdued mythological element

tion of my student Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "Holy War and Cosmic War in Early Israel" (Harvard University, 1963), shortly to be published under the title, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*. Compare R. Smend, *Yahwekrieg und Stämmebund*, a title which has been clumsily translated in English as *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*, trans. M. G. Rogers (Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1970). For a discussion of a non-Israelite Holy War song, see P. D. Hanson, "The Song of Heshbon and David's Nir," *HTR*, 61 (1968), 297-320.

22. See below, Chapter 7 on Ba'1 as Divine Warrior.

23. Professor Paul Riemann has argued that Israel's central sanctuary during the era of the League was not at a fixed place, but that the central shrine was defined as that sanctuary where the portable Ark for the moment stood. Such is the force of the old portion of Nathan's oracle (2 Sam. 7:5-7), and provides an explanation for the fact that many circles in the north continued to regard Jerusalem as the legitimate central sanctuary even after Jeroboam's creation of his national shrines. We think particularly of the Elohistic polemic against Bethel (Exodus 32), and the sources of Deuteronomic tradition which regard as legitimate the shrine (*māqōm*) where Yahweh "will place his name."

of the old time that breaks out afresh in the cultus and ideology of the monarchy. This movement is counterbalanced by the great prophets who, while influenced by the royal cult and its liturgical style, recall the more austere themes of the covenant forms of the league, its legal language, and its relatively minor use of mythological material. As late prophecy and remnants of the royal ideology flow together to create the early apocalyptic movement, we may say that the old mythological themes rise to a new crescendo, though even in the apocalyptic the expression of Israel's faith is still firmly controlled by a historical framework. The primordial events of creation and the eschatological events of the new creation are typologically related but are held apart by the events of human history so that, unlike the movement of myth, the primordial event and the eschatological event never merge in a cultic "Now."

In short, Israel's early cultus does visibly emerge from a mythopoeic past; the emergent is new, but in Patriarchal religion there was a *praeparatio* and the lines of continuity may be discerned. In the subsequent history of the cult, in the league, in the days of the kings and prophets, and in the time of the apocalyptic seers, both historical and mythologically derived elements were interwoven or blended in the cult. But here we must also say that the *Heilsgeschichte* school is correct in recognizing the historical or epic framework into which mythic materials were introduced and thereby transformed in Israel. In Israel, myth and history always stood in strong tension, myth serving primarily to give a cosmic dimension and transcendent meaning to the historical, rarely functioning to dissolve history.

5 *The Divine Warrior*

Psalm 24 and the Warrior-King

To illustrate the general comments in chapter 4, I have chosen to discuss some of the transformations of the motif of the Divine Warrior, the Day of Yahweh, and related themes. Two quotations may be juxtaposed, each representing one of the schools above, one from Gerhard von Rad and one from Sigmund Mowinckel. Von Rad writes:

the Day of Yahweh encompasses a pure event of war, the rise of Yahweh against his enemies, his battle and his victory . . .

There is no support whatsoever in these texts for the supposition that the enthronement of Yahweh, too, belongs to the concept of the Day of Yahweh . . . the entire material for this imagery which surrounds the concept of the Day of Yahweh is of old-Israelite origin. It derives from the tradition of the holy wars of Yahweh in which Yahweh appeared personally to annihilate his enemies.¹

Mowinckel writes:

[the] original meaning [of the Day of Yahweh] is really the day of His manifestation or epiphany, the day of His festival, and particularly that festal day which was also the day of His enthronement, his royal day, *the* festival of Yahweh, the day when as king He came and “wrought salvation for his people.”²

Our comments can begin with a brief exegesis of Psalm 24:7–10, a tenth-century B.C. liturgical fragment, which can serve as a testing ground.

שאו שערים ראשיכם ³

הנשאו פתחי עולם [] ⁴

1. G. von Rad, “The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh,” *JSS*, 4 (1959), 103f.

2. S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 145.

3. The structure of the strophe is typical of early lyric poetry: mixed meter, regularly arranged. In syllabic notation (l=*longum*, b=*breve*):

l:l

b:b::b:b

In stress notation: 3:3, 2:2::2:2.

4. Omit the conjunction here and elsewhere as noted, for stylistic reasons. Cf. F. M.

[] יבא מלך כבוד
 מי זה מלך [] כבוד
 יהוה עוז וגבור
 יהוה גבור מלחמה

שאו שערִים ראשיכם
 (הג) שאו פתחי עולם

[] יבא מלך כבוד
 מי⁶ [] זה מלך [] כבוד
 יהוה צבאות
 הוא מלך [] כבוד

Lift up, O Gates, your heads,
 Lift yourselves up, ancient⁷ doors!

The king of glory shall enter.
 Who is this king of Glory?
 Yahweh mighty and valiant,
 Yahweh the warrior.

Lift up, O Gates, your heads,
 Lift yourselves up, ancient doors!

The king of glory shall enter.
 Who is this king of glory?
 Yahweh of the [Heavenly] hosts,
 He is the king of Glory.

Cross and D. N. Freedman, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22=Psalm 18," *JBL*, 72 (1953), 19f.

5. The article is probably secondary. See F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, "Phoenician Incantations," *BASOR*, 197 (1970), 48.

6. The *hw*⁷ here is a prosaic addition, anticipating the last colon.

7. Father Mitchell Dahood recently has suggested that *wlm* here be read as the divine epithet, "The Eternal," *Psalms, I* (New York, Doubleday, 1966), p. 153. I prefer "ancient (doors)" on stylistic grounds. The solemn announcement of the Name of the victorious warrior is anticlimactic if his name "The Ancient One" is already given away in the name of the gates. And I should reject the suggestion that two gods, the Ancient One, 'El, and the Warrior god, Yahweh, are specified in the hymn. Moreover, the Temple and its towers are "primordial" in their mythic identity with the heavenly or cosmic temple.

The psalm is an antiphonal liturgy used in the autumn festival. The portion of the psalm in verses 7–10 had its origin in the procession of the Ark to the sanctuary at its founding, celebrated annually in the cult of Solomon and perhaps even of David. On this there can be little disagreement. But how are we to understand its archaic phrases? The prosodic form is intriguing, falling into the mixed meter and repetitive parallelism characteristic of Israel's earliest poetry.

We may see reflected in this liturgy the reenactment of the victory of Yahweh in the primordial battle and his enthronement in the divine council or, better, in his newly built (cosmic) temple.

Such an interpretation assumes a Canaanite myth-and-ritual pattern standing behind the Israelite rite reflected in the psalm. This Canaanite "pattern" can be described tersely as follows: Yamm, deified Sea, claimed kingship among the gods. The council of the gods assembled and, told of Yamm's intentions to seize the kingship and take Ba'l captive, made no protest. They were cowed and despairing, sitting with heads bowed to their knees. Ba'l rises, rebukes the divine assembly, and goes forth to war. In the (cosmogonic) battle he is victorious, and he returns to take up kingship.⁸ Presumably he returned to the assembled gods and appeared in glory, and the divine assembly rejoiced. In a later text⁹ Ba'l's temple, symbolic of his new sovereignty,¹⁰ is completed, and the gods sit at banquet celebrating. Ba'l is king. Similarly, in Tablet VI of the Babylonian Creation Epic, Marduk, after battling the primordial ocean, Tīāmat, and creating the universe out of her carcass, receives from the gods a newly constructed temple where the gods sit at banquet celebrating his kingship. The Babylonian account of creation in *Enūma eliš* is not too remote a parallel since there is some evidence, collected by Thorkild Jacobsen,¹¹ that the battle with the dragon Ocean is West Semitic in origin.

Psalm 24:7–10 can be fitted into the Canaanite pattern, provided we assume that it was modified somewhat in the Israelite context. One

8. *CTA*, 2 and 4.

9. *CTA*, 4. In column VII of this text, there is a repetition of the narrative of Ba'l's going on the warpath (7–14), a return to his temple, theophany (29–35), and proclamation of kingship.

10. See A. S. Kapelrud, "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings," *Orientalia*, 32 (1963), 56–62; and below, chapter 6.

11. Thorkild Jacobsen, "The Battle Between Marduk and Tiamat," *JAOS*, 88 (1968), 104–108.

may observe that the so-called “torah liturgy” of verses 1–5, the present introduction to the archaic liturgical fragment, begins:

The Earth is Yahweh’s and its fullness,
The world and they who live in it.

He has founded it upon Seas
And on Rivers he has created it.

Moreover, we can have no doubt as to the identity of him who comes. It is the Divine Warrior, “Yahweh mighty and valiant, Yahweh the Warrior, Yahweh *š^cbā³ōt*.” The procession of the Ark marks the going forth of the Divine Warrior to battle and his return to his royal seat. In Psalm 132, an old hymn of the royal cult, there is allusion to the processional of the Ark when Yahweh first took up his abode on Zion.¹² The second strophe, verses 6–9, may be read as follows.

הַיָּהוָה שָׁמְעוּהוּ בְּאֶפְרַתָּה
מִצִּיּוֹן בְּשָׂדֵי יַעֲרֹ
נִבְאָה לְמִשְׁכַּנְתּוֹ
נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְהַדָּם רַגְלָיו

קוּמָה יְהוָה לְנַחֲתֶיךָ¹⁵
אַתָּה וְאַרְוֹן עוֹךְ

כַּהֲנִיךְ יִלְבְּשׁוּ צִדִּיק
חֲסִדֶיךָ יִרְנְנוּ

Lo, we heard of it (the Ark)¹⁵ in Ephratah,¹⁶
We found it in the fields of Ya^cr.

12. This hymn is appropriately quoted by the Chronicler on the occasion of the inauguration of Solomon’s Temple (2 Chron. 6:41).

13. The short form is preferable, *metri causa*.

14. Psalm 132:8 reads *lmnwḥtk*, 2 Chron. 6:41 *lnwḥk*. Read *lnwḥtk*; *mnwḥt* is the *lectio illior*, introduced probably under the influence of *mnwḥty* in v. 14. The shorter reading better metrically. Cf. the use of *nḥt* in *CTA*, 16 (KRT C) .6. 23f.

yṯb l-ks’i mlk

l-nḥt l-kḥt drkt

[Kirta returned to his assembly:]

He sat upon his royal throne,

On the restful seat of dominion.

We follow Albright in taking *lnḥt lkḥt* as a hendiadys (“The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Tenth Century B.C.,” *JAOS*, 67 [1947], 156, n. 26). Compare also *CTA*. 22.A.18.

15. אַרְוֹן is treated both as masculine and feminine in classical Hebrew.

16. Ephratah stands in parallelism with ya^cr, certainly a shortened name of Kiryat

Let us enter into his encampment,¹⁷
 Let us fall down before his footstool.¹⁸

Arise,¹⁹ Yahweh, from thy rest,²⁰
 Thou and the Ark of thy might.

Let thy priests dress in righteousness,²¹
 Thy devout shout for joy.

The structure of this liturgical hymn is quite clear:

A. *Strophe I* 4 (1:1)

1. Rubric to Oath (vv. [1-]2²²)
2. Oath of David (vv. 3-5)

B. *Strophe II* 5 (1:1)

Ye'ārīm. There is no escape, I think, from the conclusion that Ephrat is a clan name in the district of Kiryat Ye'ārīm. Delitzsch's evidence established this understanding firmly despite the tendency of recent scholars to overlook it. By Ephrat, Caleb sired clans who settled at Bethlehem and at Kiryat Ye'ārīm (F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Psalms* [New York, n.d. (1883?)] III, 310). According to 1 Chron. 2:19, Caleb begot Hur by Ephrat. From Hur stems a Bethlehemite clan (1 Chron. 4:4), and through his son Shabal the clan which settled Kiryat Ye'ārīm (1 Chron. 2:50). Probably we are to identify *Caleb Ephratah* with Kiryat Ye'ārīm (1 Chron. 2:24).

17. The plural *miškānōt* is used in its archaic sense, "camp," "tent." See provisionally, F. M. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," *BAR*, I, p. 225.

18. *Miškānōt* refers to the tent shrine, *hadōm* to the Ark in all probability. Cf. Ps. 99:5.

19. Delbert Hillers in his paper "Ritual Procession of the Ark and Ps 132," *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 48-55, discusses this line and is probably correct in translating "Arise O Yahweh from your resting-place/You and your mighty ark." He is certainly correct in seeing the background of *qūm(ā)* in the language of Holy War when the Ark sets out, comparing Num. 10:35 from the era of the League or even earlier. One may compare *qūm Bārāq* in Judg. 5:12 or of the deity in relatively early contexts: Psalms 132:12; 74:22; 82:8; and in general the use of *qūm ('al)* in the sense of "attack" and *qām* in the sense of "attacker." Compare also the related use of *'ūr* in Holy War contexts. (Compare also, the excellent article of T. E. Fretheim, "Psalm 132: A Form Critical Study," *JBL*, 86 (1967), 289-300, which came into my hands after this section had been written.)

20. We have elected to read *l* "from" following Hillers, a change from our earlier position, which followed exegetical tradition in taking *lnwhtk* as a pregnant construction, but comparing the Ugaritic and early Hebrew idiom *ysb l* of enthronement (cf. *CTA*, 3.4.47; 16.6.24; Ps. 9:5; 29:10). However, the juxtaposition "arise"/"take thy (royal) seat" is too harsh. See now M. Dahood, *Psalms III* (New York, Doubleday, 1970), p. 245.

21. See the variants in 2 Chron. 6:41.

22. We are inclined to believe that the original first line of the hymn was *nšb' <dwd> lyhwh/ndr P'hyr y'qb* parallel to *nšb' yhwh ldwd* etc., v. 11.

1. The Old Sanctuary: Search and Entrance (vv. 6–7)
 2. Summons to Yahweh to Go Forth (v. 8)
 3. Appeal for Victory in Behalf of
 - a. priests and faithful (v. 9)
 - b. the Anointed (v. 10)
- A₁. *Strophe III* 4 (1:1)
1. Rubric to Oath (v. 11a)
 2. Oath of Yahweh (vv. 11b–12)
- B₁. *Strophe IV* 5 (1:1)
1. The New Sanctuary: Yahweh Takes up Abode (vv. 13–14)
 - [2. Promise of Blessing on Poor (v. 15)]
 3. Promise of Victory to
 - a. priests and faithful (v. 16)
 - b. the Anointed (vv. 17–18)

The only real difficulty in interpretation is found in Strophe II. Verse 6 speaks of the search for the (old) tent-shrine of Yahweh and its discovery. Insufficient notice has been taken of the conflict between this account and the traditions of 2 Samuel 6. Psalm 132:6 implies that the Shrine of the Ark, and even its location, has fallen more or less from memory. David finds it, and the summons comes to enter the tent shrine and do obeisance to the Ark. Then follows the battle cry, “Arise, Yahweh, from thy resting place” (that is, the old shrine), and finally the petition for (victorious) celebration by priests and people.

The juxtaposed Strophe IV (after Yahweh’s oath) tells of Yahweh’s choice of Zion which is (now) become his eternal seat or resting place. The priests and devout are promised victory and celebration. There are verbal parallels, as well as structural, between Strophes II and IV. The placenames Ephratah and Zion stand in parallel positions; *nwh̄tk* (or MT *mnwh̄tk*) is parallel to *mnwh̄ty* in v. 14; and vv. 9 and 16 are verbally parallel with only one significant change, that of the verb from petition to promise. In short, the strophes center upon the transition from the old sanctuary to the new.

In 1 Samuel 7:1f. and 2 Samuel 6:1–15 we hear of the Ark coming to Kiryat Yefārīm to the house of Abinadab whose son Eleazar was sanctified to care for the Ark. Here it remained, we are told, for twenty years. Nothing is said of a tent-shrine, and the story is told as if the place of the Ark were well known and the Ark in effect in storage awaiting its transfer to a genuine national sanctuary. The episode of Obed-

edom's care of the Ark after David's first abortive attempt to bring it to Jerusalem has no reflex in Psalm 132.

The above data point strongly to the conclusion that the traditions of Psalm 132 are wholly independent of the traditions in the Deuteronomic history. They combine with the archaic royal theology²³ of Strophe III (vv. 11–12), as indicators that the psalm preserves very old material stemming from the time of David's cultus,²⁴ reworked only slightly in the later royal cult.²⁵

Returning to Psalm 24, we find the Divine Warrior recognized as the "glorious king"; and the procession of the Warrior-King into his temple may be said to reenact the founding of the Temple (at the fall New Year) and the choice of Zion as the shrine of the Ark.

The strongest evidence for recognizing mythological elements in Psalm 24, to my knowledge, has gone unrecognized. Certain images in Psalm 24 are very strange. The circle of gate towers is commanded to "lift their heads," to receive the returning Warrior, the glorious

23. See below, chapter 9.

24. There are several archaic, or archaizing elements in Psalm 132 overlooked by Hillers, "Ritual Procession of the Ark," in addition to *l* "from" in v. 8, a preposition replaced by *min* early in classical Hebrew. Similarly, the idiom *yšb l* (*ks'*, etc.) of enthronement, is frequent only in early Hebrew poetry (Ps. 132:12, Judg. 5:17; Ps. 29:10) and archaizing contexts (Ps. 9:5, Isa. 47:1 [?]). The normal Hebrew prose idiom is *yšb 'l* (*ks'*, etc.). The use of *mšknwt*, plural, in a singular sense, "tent" or "tent shrine" is used of Yahweh's old sanctuary in archaic contexts (Ps. 132:5, 7; Ps. 78:28 [cf. Ps. 78:60], or of the temple in archaizing contexts (Ps. 43:3; cf. 46:5). The root *škb* and its derivatives, especially *šebet* and *mōšāb*, are used of the *earthly* shrine of Yahweh almost exclusively in archaic contexts (Exod. 15:17; Ps. 68:17; 1 Kings 8:12 [quoted from book of Yašar] and Ps. 132:13 *bis*). Otherwise, *yšb* is used of the cosmic abode of Yahweh or in *denials* of his earthly abode (2 Sam. 7:5; 1 Kings 8:30, etc.). *yšb* and its derivatives are replaced by the "Name Theology" in Deuteronomic tradition, by *škn*, "to tent" in other traditions, and by the archaizing use of *škn*, actually a denominative of *mīškān* "tabernacle" in Priestly tradition. The *hapax legomenon* *nwhṭk*, known in Ugaritic and early Canaanite *may* be archaic. In v. 17 we are to read *nīr*, "mandate," parallel to *qēren*, a living use of *nīr*, in contrast to the frozen cliché of the Deuteronomist, parallel to *nīr* in Num. 21:30, as shown by Paul Hanson, "The Song of Heshbon," pp. 310–320. Hillers's suggestion that *šnt* is an archaism may be correct. I am inclined to think it a conflate reading of variants *šnh*, the usual Hebrew for "sleep," and dialectal *št* "sleep" known from tenth century Phoenician (*'Ahirām*).

25. The pattern of Psalm 132 is found also in an early hymn, Psalm 89:2–19: vv. 2–5, the battle of the Divine Warrior, and the processional (vv. 16–19, esp. v. 16), and in such archaizing materials as Isa. 62:6–12 (a passage called to my attention in this connection by Mr. James Sauer) where there is a clear echo of David's oath (vv. 6f.) followed by Yahweh's oath ("democratized," vv. 8–9), after which we find the description of the "ritual conquest," a processional way leading to Zion (vv. 10–12). We shall return to the "Second Conquest" theme below.

King. The metaphor seems odd at first look, not to say bizarre. How does a gate lift its head? Where is its head that it may be lifted? We hasten to say that gate types in the ancient world did not include the portcullis which moves up and down, only gates which swing sideways on their pivots.

The figure is actually one of full personification of the circle of gate towers which like a council of elders sat waiting the return of the army and its Great Warrior gone to battle, and which sat bowed and anxious. Then comes the shout,

שאו שערים ראשכם

Lift up, O Gates, your heads!

In Ugaritic Text 2.1.19–37,²⁶ we find a picture of the council of the gods assembled in the mountain of 'El. On the approach of emissaries of Ba'al's archfoe, Prince Sea, the gods are cowed and fearful, "dropping their heads onto their knees, down on their princely thrones," sitting in fear and despair. Ba'al, the young king, shouts:

*š'u 'ilm r'aštkm*²⁷

Lift up, O Gods, your heads!

Ba'al can deal with the foe. The verse is addressed to the divine council in this text²⁸ and the phrases in the Psalm are strikingly alike in wording²⁹ and prosodic form. While the Ugaritic verse is preserved

26. III AB B:19–37 (= Gordon 137).

27. *CTA*, 2.1.27.

28. In Ugaritic, the colon represents a classical *Gattung*: "the address to the divine assembly." The writer has discussed this literary type in another connection in "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274–277. The address in plural imperatives, especially in repetitive form, is characteristic. This reinforces the conclusion that the Psalm passage is a transformation of the "address to the divine council."

29. The Akkadian idiom *ullū* with *rēšu* can mean "to finish a building or structure to its summit." However, this usage is unrelated to the Hebrew idiom. Much closer is the sense "to be proud" or "to show independence" (cf. Judg. 8:28; Zech. 2:4; Job 10:15, and *CTA*, 16.3.12 (KRT C). The latter text has been related to Psalm 24 by Father Mitchell Dahood, "Ugaritic Studies and the Bible," *Gregorianum*, 43 (1962), 77f., who renders the idiom "rejoice." The passage is ambiguous: the plowmen may be "looking up" at the coming rain, or may be "taking courage" with the coming of the rain, in which case the meaning is much the same as Text 2.1.27.

only in a passage anticipating Baʿl's going to do battle with Yamm (Sea), we can claim confidently, in view of the repetitive style of the Ugaritic texts, that the shout was repeated, addressed to the council of gods, when Baʿl returned in victory to receive the kingship.

The "Ritual Conquest"

Having given the myth-and-ritual school its due, and more, we wish to approach Psalm 24 by a different path. Central to the early cultus of Israel was the reenactment of the Exodus-Conquest: what we may label shortly "the ritual Conquest." While the motif "creation-kingship" is present in Psalm 24 and was especially popular during the monarchy and in apocalyptic, it was by no means central or formative.³⁰

The language of holy war and its symbolism may be said to be the clue to an adequate interpretation of Psalm 24 and its place in the cultic history of Israel. The Glorious King is called *gibbōr milhāmā* and *yahwē šebā'ōt*. These epithets stem from the old ideology of the league, from the "Songs of the Wars of Yahweh."³¹

30. Neither was it absent in early Israel. The kingship of the gods, including ʾEl, was a popular theme in Canaanite religion. The common scholarly position that the concept of Yahweh as reigning or as king is a relatively late development in Israelite thought seems untenable in the light of this, and is directly contradicted by the evidence of the earliest Israelite poems. Cf. Num. 23:21; Deut. 33:5; Ps. 68:25; Exod. 15:18; and F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry" (Ph.D. diss. Johns Hopkins 1950), *passim*. One is astonished by perennial attempts to discover the source of kingship and creation motifs in the Jebusite cult of ʾEl ʾElyōn (see, for example, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I [Neukirchen, Neukirchener Verlag, 1961] 193–206). In fact, the cult of King ʾEl (*ʾilu milku*) was ubiquitous in Canaan in the Late Bronze Age as we have seen, and the cult of Prince Haddu was well known. Of the many shrines of ʾEl, Jerusalem was merely one. To be sure, the language of kingship was not used frequently in premonarchic Israel when league forms were ascendant, but with the coming of monarchy and the Canaanite palace-temple of Jerusalem, the language of kingship became popular. But this was the resurgence of an old language, not the introduction of a novel, pagan language. The elements making up Israel derived from Canaanite and Amorite stock, spoke a South Canaanite dialect, and preserved old North Mesopotamian traditions and Canaanite traditions rooted in the second millennium B.C. They did not emerge from the desert as newcomers to Canaanite culture, nor did they speak the language of North Arabia.

31. We see no sufficient evidence to separate the institutions of the League, and the institution of "Jahwekrieg" in their origins (*pace* R. Smend). Legal and military functions coinhere in the office *šōpēt*, the undifferentiated executive institution of the league; the symbols of covenant-making are at the same time the means of calling up the league militia to holy war. See most recently, R. Polzin, "HWQY" and Covenantal Institutions in Early Israel," *HTR*, 62 (1969), 233–240.

Again, the procession of the Ark, with its immediate background in the Davidic and Solomonic processions to the Jerusalem sanctuary, had a long prehistory in the cult and ritual warfare of Old Israel.

In Numbers 10:35f., we find the archaic formula:

קמה יהוה ויפצו איבֵיך
וינסו משנאיך מפניך

שבה יהוה <ב> רבת³²
<אל ב> אלפי ישראל³³

Arise, Yahweh, let thy enemies be scattered,
Let thy adversaries flee before thee.³⁴

Return, Yahweh [with] the myriads,
[ʾEl with] the thousands of Israel.

Evidently, these are liturgical fragments rooted in holy war ideology, used secondarily also in the reenactment of the wars of Yahweh.

The “ritual conquest” appears as a basic ingredient of certain cultic traditions in Old Israel. And as we examine these traditions, it becomes apparent that the normal locus of holy warfare is discovered in the Exodus-Conquest, not in the primordial battle of creation.

The oldest poetry of Israel, our earliest biblical sources which survive in unrevised form, is marked by a ubiquitous motif: the march of Yahweh from the southern mountains (or from Egypt) with heavenly armies. We may mention first Judges 5:4–5 (compare Psalm 68:8–9):

בצעדך משדה אדם	יהוה בצאתך משעיר
הרים נולו	ארץ רעשה
זו סיני	מפני יהוה
אלהי ישראל	מפני יהוה

32. The text is corrupt, perhaps hopelessly corrupt, and any reconstruction is speculative. Our suggested reconstruction is patterned on Deut. 33:2–3 and especially Ps. 68:18 (cf. W. F. Albright, “A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems,” *HUCA*, 23 [1950–51], 14, 24f.).

33. The haplography arose, perhaps, in early orthography: אֵלֶּב < אלף > or in any case by homoioarkton.

34. The couplet also appears in slightly variant form, in Psalm 68:2. Apparently each couplet is the *incipit* of a longer liturgical piece.

When Thou, Yahweh, went forth from Seir,
 When Thou didst march forth from the highlands of Edom,
 Earth shook, mountains shuddered;
 Before Yahweh, Lord of Sinai,
 Before Yahweh, God of Israel.³⁵

In Deuteronomy 33:2–3, we read:³⁶

יהו מסני בא
 [] זרח משער לג
 הפע מהר פרן
 את־מ רבבת קדש
 מימנ אש־ר³⁷ [א]לם
 אף חבב³⁸ עמם

Yahweh from Sinai came,
 He beamed forth from Seir upon us,
 He shone from Mount Paran.

With him were myriads of holy ones
 At his right hand marched the divine ones
 Yea, the purified of the peoples.

Note that here in Deuteronomy 33:2, in Judges 5:4–5 (*zū Sīnay*), and in Psalm 68:18, Sinai plays a role in the march of the Conquest. It is integral to Israel's earliest traditions of Exodus-Conquest.

35. The readings are based on a reconstruction of the original text underlying Judges 5:4–5 and Psalm 68:8–9. [*p*] *šmym nṣpw*, “yea, the heavens shook” and *hrym nzlw*, “the mountains shuddered,” are ancient oral variants. The verbs are to be derived from *ṭpp* and *zll* respectively. Cf. W. F. Albright, “A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems,” p. 20; and Isa. 63:19. The colon *gm ḥbyṃ nṣpw mym*, missing in Ps. 68, is secondary, attracted to *šmym nṣpw*. It is parallel only after reinterpretation of *nṣpw* as “dripped,” and metrically is impossible.

36. We have reconstructed the line in tenth-century B.C. orthography (= Phoenician notation). The readings of the text are defended in F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, “The Blessing of Moses,” *JBL*, 67 (1948), 191–210. Changes in readings from that study are noted below. See also P. D. Miller, “Two Critical Notes on Psalm 68 and Deuteronomy 33,” *HTR*, 57 (1964), 240–243, and references to recent studies.

37. For alternate reconstructions, see Miller, “Two Critical Notes,” pp. 241ff., and M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965), p. 52f.

38. *ḥbb* “to be pure,” Akk. *ebēbu* was first suggested to me by George Mendenhall, who compared the use of *iēbibtum* at Mari. However, the meaning “military census”

Psalm 68: 18 reads:

רכב אלהם רבתם
אלפ שנג [יהו]
>ב <בא <מסני בקדש

The chariots of God are two myriads
Two thousand the bowmen³⁹ of Yahweh
When he came from Sinai with the Holy Ones.

To these may be added the old fragment in the Song of Habakkuk
3:3-6:

אלה מתימן יבא וקדש מהר פרן⁴⁰
כסה שמים הדרה [] תהלתה מלאה [] ארץ⁴¹

לפניו ילך דבר ויצא רשף לרגליו
עמד וימדד ארץ ראה ויתר גוים
[] יתפצצו הררי עד שחו גבעת עלם

God came from the Southland,
And the Holy One from Mount Paran.
His glory covered the heaven,
His praise filled the earth.

Before him walked Pestilence,
Plague marched at his feet.
He stood and shook Earth;
He looked and startled the nations.

is by no means undisputed. See *CAD*, IV, 6f., s.v. "ebēbu"; G. E. Mendenhall, "The Census Lists of Numbers 1 and 26," *JBL*, 77 (1958), 52-66, esp. 56. Still the meaning "to be pure," often in a ritual sense, adheres to the root and may carry such meaning here, whatever the special derived sense of *tēbibtum* at Mari. We expect a stative participle plural in the text.

39. On the reading, see W. F. Albright, "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems," pp. 24f. On *tann*, "composite bow," see Albright *apud* Cross, "The Evolution of the Proto-Canaanite Alphabet," *BASOR*, 134 (1954), 19, 24 n. 32.

40. The poem is inscribed in pre-Exilic orthography; the pronominal suffix 3.m.s. was written -h (*uh* > *ō*).

41. The ellipsis dots which follow indicate that the text of v. 4 is badly corrupt. The best reconstruction (though radical) is perhaps that of W. F. Albright in his paper, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, ed. H. H. Rowley [The T. H. Robinson Volume], (Edinburgh, Clark, 1950) pp. 11, 13f.

The ancient mountains were shattered,
The eternal hills collapsed.

In many ways the best example is the Song of the Sea, which will be studied in more detail in the next chapter.

Thou hast faithfully led
The people whom thou hast delivered.
Thou hast guided in thy might
To thy holy encampment.
The peoples heard, they shuddered,
Horror seized the dwellers of Philistia.

While thy people passed over, Yahweh,
While thy people passed over whom thou hast created.

Thou didst bring them, thou didst plant them
In the mount of thy heritage . . .⁴²

The relation of this motif, the march of Conquest, to the early Israelite cultus has been insufficiently studied. The last-mentioned hymn, in Exodus 15, is rooted in the liturgy of the spring festival ("Pass-over" or Maṣṣōt), and it may be argued that it stems originally from the Gilgal cultus as early as the twelfth century B.C.⁴³ It rehearses the story of the Exodus in a primitive form, the march of Conquest (vv. 13–18), and after "crossing over," the arrival at the sanctuary (vv. 13, 17).

It will be useful to take the Gilgal cultus, so far as we can reconstruct it, as exemplifying the use of the "ritual Conquest" as a movement in the cultus. It has been recognized that chapters 3–5 of Joshua preserve traditions derived from the Gilgal sanctuary and, especially, traditions of its spring ritual, utilized by the Deuteronomistic historian and probably by earlier tradents to reconstruct the history of Israel's entry into

42. For the basis of this translation, see *SMir* pp. 237–250 and the next chapter.

43. In addition to this study by David Noel Freedman and the writer (see n. 42 and "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *JThC*, 5 [1968], 1–25), see now the study from the point of view of linguistic typology, David A. Robertson, "Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry" (Ph. D. diss., Yale, 1966). On page 231 he writes, "But what cannot be challenged without first exposing the inadequacies of [Robertson's] methodology is the use of linguistic evidence as a very strong argument for dating Ex 15 early. This is the one unequivocal, firmly grounded conclusion of this study."

the Promised Land.⁴⁴ The festival may be reconstituted from the Joshua materials as follows. (1) The people are required to sanctify themselves, as for holy war, or as in the approach to a sanctuary (Joshua 3:5). (2) The Ark of the Covenant, palladium of battle, is borne in solemn procession, which is at the same time battle array, to the sanctuary of Gilgal. (3) The Jordan, playing the role of the Red Sea, parts for the passage of the Ark and the people of Israel. The repetition of the Exodus is the transparent symbolism in the processional (Joshua 4:21–24; compare Psalms 114:1a, 3–5; 66:6). At the same time, “from Shittim to Gilgal” (Micah 6:5) represents the decisive movement of the Conquest, and Gilgal was the battle camp of the Conquest, “when they passed over.”⁴⁵ (4) At the desert sanctuary of Gilgal, twelve stones were set up, memorial to the twelve tribes united in the covenant festival celebrated there; we must understand this festival to be the festival of the old spring New Year. It is explicitly called Passover, and the tradition of eating parched grain and unleavened bread, as well as the etiological notice of the suspension of manna, lends confirmation (Joshua 5:10–12).⁴⁶ The setting up of the twelve *maššēbōt* of the *gilgal* is paralleled by Moses’ setting up of the “twelve *maššēbōt* for the twelve tribes of Israel” at Sinai (Exodus 24:4) (5) We must note also the circumcision etiology (Joshua 5:2–8),⁴⁷ and finally (6) the ap-

44. The pioneer study was the essay of H. J. Kraus, “Gilgal. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte Israels.” *VT*, 1 (1951), 181–199; cf. *Gottesdienst in Israel*, 2nd ed. (Munich, Kaiser Verlag, 1962) pp. 179–189 (literature cited on p. 180, n. 87); M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1953), pp. 32–35; Jan Dus, “Die Analyse zweier Ladeerzählungen des Josuabuches (Jos. 3–4 und 6),” *ZAW*, 72 (1960), 107–134; E. Vogt, “Die Erzählung vom Jordanübergang: Josue 3–4,” *Biblica*, 46 (1965), 125–148; and especially J. A. Soggin, “Gilgal, Passah und Landnahme . . .,” *SVT*, 15 (1966), 263–277. The last-mentioned study is the most balanced and sensible since Kraus’s first paper. It also deals exhaustively with the intervening literature of which we have listed only special items. On the complicated literary-critical problems, see both Soggin and Vogt.

45. One perceives that Joshua 5:1 contains reminiscences of Exodus 15:13–17. When they crossed over (*‘d ‘brm*; cf. *‘d y’br*), the rulers of Transjordan and Canaan (cf. Exod. 15:15) heard (cf. Exod. 15:14) and melted with fear (cf. Exod. 15:15). At the same time, there is no hint of the sea drying up or of a path through the sea in Exodus 15. These are later accretions, arising precisely from the ritual crossing of the Jordan. See chapter 6.

46. That is to say, later tradition has attributed to the spring festival the elements of variant forms of spring festivals of a later time, elements both of Passover and *Maššōt*. This should not obscure the very early elements in this account (*pace* Kutsch).

47. For parallels between Exod. 12–15 and Josh. 3–5, see Soggin, “Gilgal, Passah und Landnahme,” p. 270. He includes circumcision, but strangely omits reference to the twelve stelae.

pearance of the (angelic) general of the host of Yahweh (Joshua 5: 13–15; compare Ex. 3: 2ff.; 14: 19).

In these fragments of cultic tradition we recognize the use of the ritual procession of the Ark as a means of reenactment of the “history of redemption,” of the Exodus-Conquest theme, preparatory to the covenant festival of the spring New Year.⁴⁸

Transformations of the “Ritual Conquest”

As has become evident, our thesis is that the two apparently opposed views of the history of Israel’s cultus prove to be complementary. The joining of the motif of Conquest and kingship in the royal cult is readily explained. The ideology of holy war makes possible the transition from the cultus of the league to the cultus of the kingdom, and ultimately to the ideology of the apocalyptic.

The ideology of holy war in early Israel and in pre-Israelite times was characterized by a number of cosmic elements. This may be seen in the imagery of the heavenly council of Yahweh, which may take on the characteristics of a judicial court or assembly, a royal court, or of a Divine Warrior leading heavenly armies. The “heavenly host” fights in the wars of Yahweh (Judges 5: 20, 23; Joshua 10: 12–13, and so on); these are the wars of *Yahweh Šēbā’ōt*, “Creator of the heavenly armies.” The cosmic elements give mythic “depth” to the historical events of the Exodus and Conquest. Moreover, we may be sure that the institution of holy war, a primary function of tribal federation, existed in several pre-Yahwistic or non-Yahwistic leagues in southern Palestine: Moab, Edom, Ammon, Midian, and Qedar.⁴⁹ Holy war terminology appears in Moab in the royal period in the Meša^c Inscription. In Numbers 21: 27–30, we actually have a fragment of an old song reflecting holy-war ideology in non-Yahwistic circles.⁵⁰ In the ideology

48. The major spring festival of Gilgal, later at Shiloh (and much later in Jerusalem in the time of Josiah), and the major fall festival of Shechem, later in Solomonic Jerusalem (as well as Bethel), are thus variant covenant festivals of old sanctuaries which at different periods or at different seasons played their role as sites of a pilgrim festival of the league.

49. On the Midianite and Qedarite league, see William J. Dumbrell, “The Midianites and Their Transjordanian Successors” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1970). The Qedarite league is called *i’lu ša ʿAṭar-samayn* (LU i’-lu šá DINGIR a-tar-sa-ma-a-a-in) in Assurbanipal’s records, “the amphictyony of ‘Attar-of-the-Heavens.” On *i’lu*, “amphictyony,” see *CAD*, I under *a’lu/i’lu* (p. 374). See also E. F. Campbell and G. E. Wright, “Tribal League Shrines in Ammon and Shechem,” *BA*, 32 (1969), 104–116.

50. See Paul D. Hanson, “The Song of Heshbon and David’s Nir,” *HTR*, 61 (1968), 297–310.

of these non-Israelite leagues, the mythopoeic motifs of the cosmic warrior no doubt were present. At all events, the cosmic elements and survivals of myth provided a matrix for the reintroduction of the kingship theme and also, especially, of creation motifs of Canaanite or West Semitic lore.

The institution of kingship and the inauguration of a temple in the Canaanite style in Israel obviously gave an occasion for the radical mythologizing of the "historical" festivals, especially the "ritual conquest," and the procession of the "Ark of the Covenant" of *Yahweh šēbā'ōt yōšēb kērūbīm* ("who is enthroned on the cherubim"). In turn, the cultic institutions of the league tended to decay; covenant forms and festivals languished or were suppressed in the interests of the royal festivals,⁵¹ in which the eternal decrees of God, the choosing of the house of David and Zion, were celebrated. Nevertheless, the "ritual conquest" persisted, transformed, in the royal cultus.

It is only by such a historical analysis of the cultus that we can understand the "processional way" in Second Isaiah, combining notions of cosmic warfare with the theme of the Second Conquest or Exodus, and with the motif of the processional to Zion.⁵²

In Isaiah 40:3–6 we read:

A voice [of a herald]⁵³ cries:
 "Prepare in the desert the way of Yahweh,
 Make straight in the wilderness a highway for our God.
 Every valley shall be raised up, every hill made low . . .
 And the glory of Yahweh shall be revealed,
 And all flesh see it together."

The theophany of the Divine Warrior marching victoriously through the desert to Zion with his redeemed appears in like form in Isaiah 35:

The desert and the wasteland shall exult,
 And the wilderness shall burst into bloom . . .

51. The covenant festival of the spring as a national pilgrim feast ceased during the era of kingship until its revival in the Josianic Reform. At least this is the plain meaning of 2 Kings 23:21f. See below chapter 9.

52. Were there no processional psalms, the proto-apocalyptic theme of the Second Exodus-Conquest, the way through the desert to Zion, would require the reconstruction of a processional march of the Divine Warrior in the royal cult.

53. On the proclamation of the divine (angelic) herald, in this and other contexts, see the brief paper of the writer, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," pp. 274–277.

They shall see the glory of Yahweh,
The splendor of our god.

Then follows the address to the divine council:

Strengthen ye the weak hands,
Make firm the wobbly knees,
Proclaim to the fearful of heart,
“Be strong, be not afraid.
Behold your god with vengeance,
With divine recompense he comes,
He comes and saves you.”

Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened,
The ears of the deaf unstopped,
The lame shall leap as the hart,
And the tongue of the dumb sing.

For water shall gush forth in the desert,
Streams in the wilderness . . .

There shall be there a highway and a way,
And it shall be named the “Way of Holiness.”
The unclean shall not pass over it,
And the redeemed shall not stray.
The lion shall not be found there,
Nor shall a beast of prey go up on it.⁵⁴
The redeemed shall walk upon the way,
Those ransomed by Yahweh shall return,
They shall enter Zion with a shout of joy.

Eternal joy shall be on their head
Rejoicing and joy shall pursue (them)
Sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

In Isaiah 51:9–11, we read:

Awake, awake, dress in power, Arm of Yahweh . . .
The repetitive imperative, reminiscent of Canaanite style, begins
an apostrophe to the arm of the Divine Warrior.

54. We have omitted ancient variants which have been conflated in the Massoretic Text.

Awake as in ancient times, primeval generations.
 Was it not thou who smote through Rahab?
 Who pierced Tannin (the dragon)?

The allusion is to the cosmogonic myth, the battle of creation, in which the monster of chaos is slain by the God who thereby establishes kingship.

Was it not thou who dried up Sea,
 The waters of the abysmal Deep?

Suddenly the myth is penetrated by historical memory; the battle with the dragon Sea becomes the redemption from Egypt. Creation and cosmic redemption are one.

Who makes the deep places of the sea a way
 For the redeemed to pass over.
 The redeemed of Yahweh shall return,
 And come with shouts of joy to Zion.

Once again time turns fluid, and the Second Conquest, the new redemption, is described in terms of the old. And yet not precisely. As in Isaiah 35:8-10; 40:3-5, 51:9-10 quoted above, in 44:24-28 and especially in 62:24-28 (Third Isaiah), the old Exodus-Conquest route,⁵⁵ the way through the wilderness, becomes at the same time the pilgrimage way to Zion. The march of the Conquest abruptly shifts into the festal, ritual procession to Zion. The procession to Zion and the feast on the holy mountain (compare Isaiah 25:6-8; 55:1-5) have recast, so to speak, or redirected the route of the Exodus and Conquest to lead to Zion.

Isaiah 52:7-12 is another extremely instructive passage. It begins with a picture of the herald of victory and looks forward to the proclamation of God's kingship and to the return of Yahweh to Zion:

How beautiful on the mountains,
 Are the feet of the herald of good tidings,
 Who proclaims peace, who brings tidings of good,

55. See the excellent essay of Bernhard W. Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York, Harper, 1962), pp. 177-195.

Who proclaims victory,
Who says to Zion: "Thy God reigneth."

Thy watchmen lift up (their) voice,⁵⁶
Together they shout;
For they see, eye to eye,
When Yahweh returns to Zion.

It continues (verses 10–12) with a description of the theophany of the Divine Warrior, the proclamation of release to captives, who are to purify themselves to join the procession which bears the holy vessels, substitutes for the Ark, to Zion. Yahweh marches with Israel.

Yahweh has bared his holy arm
In the eyes of all the nations.
All the ends of the earth see
The victory of our God.

Depart, depart, go out thence,
Touch no unclean thing.
Go out from her midst, cleanse yourselves!
Ye who bear the vessels of Yahweh.
For you go out not in haste,
Nor go in flight:
For Yahweh goes before you,
The God of Israel your rear guard.

In these and other passages (for example, Hosea 2:16–17⁵⁷), it is necessary to recognize the wedding of two themes: one derived from

56. *qwl spyk nš'w* and *spyk nš'w qwl* were ancient variants conflated to produce the MT.

57. As early as Hosea (2:16–17), the motif of a second Exodus-Conquest may be detected. See H. W. Wolff, *Hosea* (BK), pp. 49–53. Wolff has missed our discussion of the northern boundary line of Judah (F. M. Cross and J. T. Milik, "Explorations in the Judaean Buqé'ah," *BASOR*, 142 [1956], 5–17, esp. 15–17 and note 32). Our brief remarks can be amplified. The boundary runs (according to Joshua 15:5–7; 18:17–19) from the mouth of the Jordan (11 km. south of ancient Jericho), to Beth Hoglah by 'Ēn Hājle over against the Hājle ford (5 km. north of the Jordan mouth), one of the few certain identifications in the desert province of Judah. It then passes to the Stone of Bohan, modern Hajar el-'Ešba' (cf. R. de Vaux, "Exploration de la region de Qumrān," *RB*, 60 [1953], p. 541) north of Beth 'Arabah. The last-named is probably the Iron Age site at Khirbet Qumrān since no other sizable Iron Age remains appear south of a line drawn from Beth Hoglah to Hajar el-'Ešba' which towers over the cliffs on the south side of the Wādī Dabr. The boundary then goes up towards Dēbīr, a place name preserved in the modern Wādī Dabr, from the 'Ēmeq 'Ākōr. After passing Gēllōt (with Numbers 18:17), over against the Ascent of Adummim, usually associated with the

the ritual conquest,⁵⁸ one from the procession of the Ark to Zion and the manifestation of Yahweh's kingship.

Ṭal'at ed-damm but uncertain, the boundary passed En-Shemesh ('*Ēn Hōd*) to En-rogel in the Kidron Valley south of Jerusalem. The listing of the towns of the desert province in Joshua 15:61f. is instructive. First named is Beth-'Arabah (Khīrbet Qumrān), next Madon, Secacah, and Nibshan, the three royal settlements in the *Buqē'ah* with their elaborate irrigation works (from north to south presumably, Khīrbet Abū Ṭabaq, Khīrbet es-Samrah, and Khīrbet el-Maqārī), and finally "The City of Salt, and En-gedi." En-gedi is the well-known Tel Jurn. The City of Salt has been identified with Khīrbet Qumrān by Noth and, formerly, by the writer. To be preferred, however, is the Iron Age site at 'Ēn Feskhaḥ or further south, between the mouth of the Kidron (Wādī en-Nār) and 'Ēn Gedi where Iron Age fortresses have been reported.

In exploring the *Buqē'ah* we found that an ancient road, connecting with the southernmost fords of the Jordan, ran up the Wādī Dabr through the opening into the *Buqē'ah*, traversed this "little valley" in a southwesterly direction until it branches, one track connecting a little more than a kilometer north of Mar Saba with the old road along the Kidron to Jerusalem, the other track continuing south in the direction of Hebron. On the guard stations along this road from the Wādī Dabr entrance to the intersections with the Kidron (Wādī en-Nār), see our paper listed above. For travelers coming from Moab, crossing the Jordan at the Ḥajle Ford, the road through the *Buqē'ah* to Jerusalem would be as direct and much easier than the Wādī Qelt road up from Jericho. Thus Hosea's notion that the '*Emeq 'Ākōr*, the Vale of Trouble, would become the Door of Hope in the Second Conquest appears less farfetched. Certainly the battle camp in the '*Arbōt Mō'āb* tradition lay immediately opposite the southernmost fords of the Jordan from Abel Shittim (Tell el-Ḥammām, south of the Wādī Kefrein) southward to Beth-jeshimoth (Numbers 33:49, Tell el-'Azeimeh, on the south side of the Wādī 'Azeimeh). On the identifications, see N. Glueck, *Explorations in Eastern Palestine IV*, *AASOR* 25-28 (1945-1949), pp. 366-404. On the shift of the site of the Valley of 'Ākōr to the northeast of Jericho, see J. T. Milik, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrān*, *DJD*, (Oxford, 1962), III, 262. Gilgal similarly appears to have been moved north in tradition in association with the Valley of 'Ākōr and Jericho, being connected apparently with the ruins at Khīrbet Mefjir. However, the Iron Age remains found thus far at Mefjir appear to be relatively insignificant. Cf. James Muilenburg, "The Site of Ancient Gilgal," *BASOR*, 140 (1955), 11-27.

It is not impossible that Hosea's tradition stemmed from the Jerusalemite cultus (cf. Isaiah 65:9f.) which early viewed Jerusalem and the Temple of the Ark as the ultimate goal of the "ritual conquest": from Shittim to Gilgal, and by way of the Valley of 'Ākōr, to Jerusalem! In any case, Hosea may have witnessed the transformation of the 'Ākōr from a barren wasteland into a garden by the elaborate irrigation works built probably in the eighth century B.C. by King Uzziah, who "built towers in the wilderness and hewed out many cisterns . . ." (2 Chron. 26:10). This is a revision of views expressed in F. M. Cross and G. E. Wright, "The Boundary and Province Lists of the Kingdom of Judah," *JBL*, 75 (1956), 202-266. We should now see in the list of towns in the wilderness province (Josh. 15:61f.) an appendage, later added to the basic list in Josh. 15:21-60. Such a dating conforms better with the epigraphic and ceramic evidence from the *Buqē'ah*.

On the doctrine of the Second Conquest at Qumrān, see Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*, trans. B. and C. Rabin (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), chapter 3; and F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumrān*, 2nd ed. (New York, Doubleday, 1961), p. 78 and note 36a. The typology of the second Exodus-Conquest appears in the use of Isa. 40 (IQS 8:12-14) and Ezek. 20 (IQS 6:2 *mgwryhm*: cf. Ezek. 20:38; IQM 1:3 *mbr h'mym*: cf. Ezek. 20:35), etc.

58. In Isaiah 42:10-16 there is a "new song" of the march of Yahweh: "Yahweh

Late Prophetic and proto-apocalyptic eschatology was born of this wedding of kingship and Conquest themes in the cultus. The Day of Yahweh is the day of victory in holy warfare; it is also the Day of Yahweh's festival, when the ritual Conquest was reenacted in the procession of the Ark, the procession of the King of Glory to the Temple, when "God went up with the festival blast, Yahweh with the sound of the horn . . . for Yahweh is king of the whole earth."⁵⁹

In apocalyptic, the battle of the sons of light and darkness—the Second Conquest—becomes a central feature of the "last days." At the same time it is the time of the manifestation of the kingdom of God, when the dark powers of chaos and evil are subdued and the new heavens and earth created. Here mythic and historical themes are combined in a radical tension.

Arise, O Warrior,
Take thy captives, O Glorious One,
And gather thy spoil, Doer of Valor.
Put forth thy hand on the neck of thy enemies.
And thy foot on the heaps of the slain.

...
O Zion, rejoice exceedingly;
Break forth with joyful song, O Jerusalem,
And exult, all ye cities of Judah.

Open thy gates forever,
That [men] may bring thee the wealth of nations,
And their kings serve thee.⁶⁰

goes forth as a warrior, as a man of war he stirs his wrath . . ." In Ezekiel 20:33-42 appears the motif of a second Exodus: "As I live, oracle of the Lord Yahweh, 'surely I will be king over you with a mighty hand, an outstretched arm and wrath poured out, and I will bring you forth from the peoples'." There is a covenant in the wilderness, and a return to the land and [says Yahweh] "In my holy mountain, in the mountain of the height of Israel . . . there shall the whole house of Israel worship me . . ." See the detailed treatment of W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* (BK 13.1), pp. 454-458.

59. Psalm 47:6, 8.

60. *Serek Milhāmā* (1QM) 12.9f., 12f.

6 *The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth*

The Mythic Cycle of Baʿl and ʿAnat

Much study has been given in recent years to the mythic cycle of Baʿl and ʿAnat.¹ The texts are written in Canaanite cuneiform² of the mid-fourteenth century B.C. and come from Rās eš-Šāmra, ancient Ugarit. The date of the copies we possess does not answer the more important question of their date of composition, nor does the Ugaritic provenience determine the original setting in which they were first sung. There can be no doubt that this poetic cycle was orally composed. It is marked by oral formulae, by characteristic repetitions, and by fixed pairs of synonyms (a type of formula) in traditional thought rhyme (*parallelismus membrorum*) which marks Semitic oral literature as well as much of the oral literature throughout the world.³ Moreover, their repertoire of traditional formulae overlaps broadly with that of the

1. This chapter is a revised and expanded form of the writer's essay, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *JThC*, 5 (1968), 1-25; it rests, too, on *SMir*, pp. 237-250 [= *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, Baltimore, 1950 (microfilm-reprint, Ann Arbor, 1961, pp. 84-127)].

2. The appearance of tablets in a simple cuneiform alphabetic script from three sites in Palestine, as well as a second type of alphabetic cuneiform at Ugarit, makes clear that the system had wide usage in Syria-Palestine and cannot be viewed as a local Ugaritic script. That the cuneiform alphabet was not originally designed for the Ugaritic dialect should have already been clear from such evidence as the existence of the grapheme *d*, a sign for the voiced dental spirant which at Ugarit had already merged with the stop *d*. It may be that the secondary development of the 'alep sign into 'a, 'i, and 'u is a local Ugaritic phenomenon designed to facilitate transcription of Hurrian, but even this is uncertain. Very likely, the center for the radiation of the Canaanite cuneiform alphabet was central Phoenicia. However, we shall have to await systematic archaeological exploration of the great port cities before we can be sure; these cities have escaped major excavations carried out with modern techniques.

3. See the epoch-making work on the character of oral literature by A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960). The methods of formula analysis developed by Milman Parry, Albert Lord, and their followers furnish new tools to attack both Ugaritic and early biblical literature. For the analysis of Ugaritic literature utilizing these methods, see Richard Whitaker's forthcoming study based on his Harvard dissertation, "A Formulaic Analysis of Ugaritic Poetry" (1970). Among other things, they sharply undercut theoretical conceptions of oral transmission presently ruling certain circles of both Old and New Testament scholars and may very well have an impact on the analysis of biblical tradition comparable to that of *Gattungsforschung* which similarly developed first in Homeric studies. See also the paper of R. Jakobson, "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet," *Language*, 42 (1966), 399-429. (This study is wider in scope than its title suggests.)

earliest Hebrew poetry, a circumstance impossible to explain unless a common tradition of oral literature embraced both Israel in the south and Ugarit in the north. In view of this shared oral repertoire, its formulae, its themes, and its prosodic patterns, it seems highly likely that the mythic cycle stems from the main centers of Canaanite culture and dates in terms of its earliest oral forms no later than the Middle Bronze Age (1800–1500 B.C.). Such a context is confirmed both by the geographical terms preserved in the corpus and by its archaizing diction.⁴

The mythic themes in the Baʿl texts share much in common with the Phoenician traditions preserved by Sakkunyaton (Sanchuniathon), and for that matter, in the Bible. At a greater distance, we also can perceive now the influence of the Canaanite theme of the battle with the sea-dragon in the Mesopotamian creation epic, *Enuma eliš*,⁵ and in the Greek myth of *Typhoeus-Typhon*.⁶ At all events, we must insist that in the Baʿl cycle we are dealing with a version of a mythic literature common to the Canaanites and to those who shared their culture from the border of Egypt to the Amanus in the Middle and Late Bronze Age.

When first the content of this complex of myths becomes clear, we find a conflict developing between Prince Sea and mighty Baʿl-Haddu.⁷ The scene portrays Yamm, Sea, sending his divine pair of messengers to the assembly of the gods held at the tabernacle⁸ of ʾEl located at the source of the double-deep, at the cosmic mountain, that is, at the gates to heaven and the entry into the abyss. Prince Yamm, alias Judge River, demands that Baʿl be given over to him as a captive and that his, Yamm's, lordship be acknowledged.

4. The contrast between the prose of letters from Ugaritic and the older parts of the mythic literature is very striking.

5. See above, chapter 5, n. 11.

6. Professor David Flusser has reminded me of the unmistakable ties of the Typhon myth with the East. Apollodorus, *Bibl.*, I, 5, 3.7ff. describes Typhon's birth of Gaia and Tartarus in Cilicia and Zeus' battle with Typhon on Mount Cassios (Hittite *Ḫazi*, Canaanite *Ṣapōn*). Cf. Homer, *Iliad*, 2, 782f.; Hesiod, *Theog.*, 820ff. Compare also the curious story of the she-dragon and Typhon in Hom., *Hymn to Apollo*, 300–375. The Hittite myth of Illuyanka has also influenced the form of the Typhon myth, but in general is further removed from the Greek theme than the Canaanite. Cf. E. von Schuler, in *WM*, I, 178.

7. Mesopotamian Adad <Hādād <Haddu. Compare Phoenician Dagōn (Hebrew dāgān) <Dāgān Dagnu, etc.

8. See above, chapter 3, note 112; and chapter 2, notes 143 and 144.

The council is cowed, and despite Baʿl's rebuke, ʾEl, patriarch of the gods, replies to the terrible ambassadors of Yamm:

ʿabduka baʿlu ya-yammu-mi
 ʿabduka baʿlu [la-ʿôla]mi
 bin dagani ʾasīruka-mi

Baʿl is thy slave, O Sea,
 Baʿl is thy slave forever,
 The son of Dagan thy prisoner.⁹

Baʿl in this decree of the assembly comes under the sway of Prince Sea. After a break in the text we hear Kôṭar, craftsman of the gods, predicting a victory of Baʿl over his captors:

la-ragamtī laka la-zubūli baʿli
 tanītī la rākibi ʿurapāti
 hitta ʾibaka baʿlu-mi
 hitta ʾibaka timḥaṣu
 hitta taṣmit(u) ṣarrataka

tiqqahu mulka ʿôlamika
 darkata dāta dārdārika

Let me speak to you, O Prince Baʿl,
 Let me recite (to you), O Rider of the Clouds:

Behold, thy enemy, O Baʿl,
 Behold, thy enemy thou shalt smite,
 Behold, thou shalt smite thy foes.

Thou shalt take thy eternal kingship,
 Thy dominion forever and ever.¹⁰

Kôṭar fashioned two clubs for Baʿl and gave them magical names:

9. *CTA*, 2.1.36f. Note the pattern abc:abd:efg, and the chiasm of the last line. The enclitic *-mi* provides perfect overall symmetry of line (9:9:9) as well as rhyme.

10. *CTA*, 2.4.7–10. Cf. Ps. 92:10. The metrical forms in the passage are typical. Each unit is symmetrical: a bicolon 11:11 (in syllables); a tricolon 8:8:8 (9); and a bicolon 9:9. The tricolon is in climactic parallelism (abc:abd:aef). The final bicolon is marked by strong assonance, especially with the repetition of the syllables *ka* and *da(r)*.

šimuka 'atta yagarriš
 yagarriš garriš yamma
 garriš yamma la-kussi'ihū
 nahar(a) la-kaḥṭi darkatihū

Thy name is Yagarriš ("Let him drive out . . ."):
 Yagarriš, drive out Sea!
 Drive out Sea from his throne,
 River from the seat of his dominion.¹¹

šimuka 'atta 'āy-yammarī
 'āy-yamarrī marrī yamma
 marrī yamma la-kussi'ihū
 nahar(a) la-kaḥṭi darkatihū

Thy name is 'Āy-yamarrī ("Ho! let him rout . . ."):
 'Āy-yamarrī rout Sea
 Rout Sea from his throne,
 River from the seat of his dominion.¹²

With clubs, Ba'1 overcomes Yamm:

yaparsiḥ yammu/yaqul la-'arši
 tinnagišna pinnātihū/wa-yadlup tamūnihū
 yaquttu Ba'lu/wa-yaštī yamma
 yakalliyu¹³ ṭāpiṭa nahara

Sea fell,	He sank to earth,
His joints trembled,	His frame collapsed.
Ba'1 destroyed,	Drank Sea!
He finished off Judge River. ¹⁴	

11. *CTA*, 2.4.11–13. The names like personal names and divine names are verbal elements, shortened from sentence names. In this passage as in the following, the two bicola are interlocked by repetition to form what is in effect a tetracolon in a variation of climactic parallelism.

12. *CTA*, 2.4.19f. 'āy is cognate with Hebrew *hōy* or 'ōy.

13. The vocalization of prefixal verb forms in the perfect sense, or better, for historical narration, is here puzzling. Apparently *yaqtul* and *yaqtulu* can be placed in "impressionistic" parallelism, quite as *qatal* and *yaqtul* are placed in parallel. We should expect *yaqtul* not *yaqtulu/a*. For a discussion of the use of the standard Canaanite verb forms, see W. L. Moran, *A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets* (Xerox reprint, Ann Arbor, University microfilms, 1961) pp. 43–52.

14. *CTA*, 2.4.25ff. In the battle, the meter shifts into staccato form. Described in terms of the Ley-Sievers system the passage scans: 2:2::2:2, 2:2:3 or one could read 4:4, 4:3.

Then comes the shout:

yamma la-mitu
Sea verily is dead;

ba'lu-mi yamlu[ku]
Ba'1 rules!¹⁵

The next major episode is the assembly of the gods at which it is decreed by 'Ēl, father of the gods, that a temple be built for Ba'1, king of the gods. The craftsman Kôtar constructs a palace so that Ba'1 exults:

ahātiya banītī dāta kaspi
hēkaliya dāta-mi ḥurāši

My temple I have built of silver,
My palace, indeed, of gold.¹⁶

The completion of the palace on Mt. Šapōn is the occasion then of a great feast of the gods, celebrating Ba'1's installation and inaugurating the temple cult.

A second conflict then developed, a struggle between Ba'1 and the ruler of the underworld, Môt (Death). If Yamm represented the unruly powers of the universe who threatened chaos, until restricted and tamed by Ba'1, then Môt, 'Ēl's dead son, represents the dark chthonic powers which bring sterility, disease, and death. The drama, however, is still a cosmogony, the victory of the god of life.

Ba'1 and his entourage, Clouds, Winds, and Rain, together with the goddesses "Misty One, daughter of Bright Cloud, Dewy One, daughter of Showers"¹⁷ went down into the Underworld city of dread Môt. The

The former is more accurate since there is internal parallelism. However, an accentual scheme of scanning is not as efficient in revealing the symmetry of the cola as syllable counting. In syllables the cola count is 5:5, 8:7, and 5:5::10. We note the symmetry is by bicola in the first lines, but two short cola precisely balance a long colon (5:5::10) in the last lines. In general we prefer to speak of building blocks of short cola for which the siglum will be b (*breve*), and long cola signified by l (*longum*). The present passage thus scans: b:b, b:b, b:b::l. Mixed meter of the type l:l, l:l:l, b:b::b:b, b:b::l, l::b:b is typical of Ugaritic epic style. In pure form it is found only in the earliest Hebrew poetry, notably the Song of the Sea, the Song of Deborah (Judges 5), the Lament of David, and Psalm 29. (Provisionally see *C-F, passim*).

15. *CTA*, 2.4.32.

16. *CTA*, 4.6.36ff. I have translated "temple" and "palace" in the singular. Actually the terms are plural: "temple complex." Cf. Hebrew *miškānōt*, "tent shrine."

17. *CTA*, 5.5.10f. 'immaka Pidrayya bitta 'āri' immaka tallayya bitta rabbi. With Ba'1 also are "seven squires (*galamika*), eight knights" (*hanzīrika*, lit., "boars").

scene is a fearful one:

[šaptu la-ʾa]rši šaptu la-šamēmi
[yaʾarrik la]šāna la-kabkabīma
yaʿrub baʿlu ba-pīhu
la-kabidihu yarid

[One lip to ea]rth, one lip to heaven,
[He stretched out his] tongue to the stars.
Baʿl entered his mouth,
Descended into his maw.¹⁸

He became a slave to Môt “in the midst of his city Ooze, Decay the seat of his enthronement, Slime the land of his heritage.”¹⁹ Ultimately the message is brought to ʾEl:

kī mita ʾalʾiyānu baʿlu
ḥaliqa zubulu baʿl ʾarši

Mighty Baʿl is dead indeed,
The Prince lord of earth has perished.²⁰

ʾAnat the consort of Baʿl appears to succor her lord, giving battle to Môt:

tiḥad bin ʾili-mi môt(a)
ba-ḥarbi tabaqqiʿunannu
ba-ḥarri tadriyunannū
ba-ʾišti tašrupunnannū
ba-riḥêma tiḥānannū
ba-šadī tadarriʿunnū

She seized ʾEl’s son Môt.
With a sword she sliced him;

18. *CTA*, 5.2.2–4. The reconstruction is based in part on *CTA*, 23.61f., partly on *Isa.* 57:4. Cf. *Isa.* 5:14; *Hab.* 2:5; *Prov.* 1:12; *Ps.* 141:7; and *Jon.* 2:6. The structure is b:b:l, l:l [5:6 (=11):12, 8:8]. The paired formulae in the final bicolon have been reversed. Such errors often occur in oral literature when it is dictated to a scribe, not sung and hence controlled by music, as A. B. Lord has shown (*The Singer of Tales*, pp. 124–138). Several errors involving reversed formulae in the Ugaritic corpus can be corrected by parallel passages.

19. The description is found in *CTA*, 5.2.15; cf. 4.8.12.

20. Cf. *CTA*, 5.6.9; 6.1.4; 6.3.1.

With a sieve she winnowed him ;
 With a fire she burnt him ;
 With millstones she ground him ;
 In the field she scattered him.²¹

The imitative magic of Canaanite fertility rites could not be more obvious than here. With the victory of 'Anat, the dead god is strewn to fertilize the fields.

In the next episode, the god 'El sees in a prophetic vision the outcome of 'Anat's (and hence Ba'l's) victory over Death :

wa-himma ḥayyu 'al'iyānu ba'lu
 wa-himma 'iṭē zubulu ba'l 'arši
 . . .
 šamāmi šamna tamaṭṭirūna
 naḥalūma talikū nubta-mi

Behold, Mighty Ba'l lives ;
 Behold, the Prince, lord of earth exists.

. . .
 The heavens rain oil,
 The wadis flow with mead.²²

The divine warrior Ba'l, after yet another combat with the dead god, returns to take up his government, sitting as king of the gods.

In addition to these major themes we find elsewhere in our texts reference to Ba'l and 'Anat's battle with a dragon called Lôtān, biblical Leviathan :

kī timḥaṣ lôtāna baṭna barīḥa
 takalliyu' baṭna 'aqalatāna
 šilyaṭa dī šab'ati ri'ašīma
 tiṭkaḥū titrapū šamūma
 ka-ri<ka> sī'ipādika

21. *CTA*, 6.2.30-35. In the last colon, the second *n* of *tdr'ni* is taken as a dittography. The vocalization of 'iṣi assumes that the doubling of *š* in Hebrew and Aramaic is secondary.

22. *CTA*, 6.3.3f., 6f. Probably the conjunctions beginning the two cola of the first bicolon should be dropped as secondary. Cf. 6.3.9, 21. Note again the *-mi /-ma* particle used *metri causa*.

When you (Ba'1)²³ smote Lôtān the ancient dragon,
 Destroyed the crooked serpent,
 Šilyat with the seven heads,
 (Then) the heavens withered (and) drooped
 Like the loops of your garment.²⁴

The cosmogonic form of the passage is clear ("when . . . then," the standard structure), as are parallels in biblical literature. The beast of Revelation 12, the dragon of Canaanite myth, and Tiāmat of *Enūma eliš* all have seven heads. Typhon is many-headed.

Variants to the Lôtān theme are found recorded in the Ugaritic texts in apparent contradiction. 'Anat slew both Yamm and/or the crooked serpent in two extant texts:

Did I ('Anat) not smite the beloved of 'El, Sea?
 Did I not destroy 'El's River, Rabbīm?
 Did I not muzzle the dragon (*tnn*)?
 I smote the crooked serpent
 Šilyat of seven heads.²⁵

ba'arši mḥnm ṭarapa yamma
 lašanāmi tilḥakā šamēma
 taṭrupā yamma ḏanabatāmi
 tunnāna²⁶ lā-šabūma tašīt
 tirkas la-miryamī laba[nāni]

In the land of Mḥnm he (the dragon) swirled the sea.
 His double tongue flicked the heavens;
 His double tail swirled the sea.
 She fixed the unmuzzled dragon;
 She bound him to the heights of Leba[non].²⁷

23. Ba'1 must be addressed, to judge from the form *tkly*, *takalliyu*. If 'Anat were addressed, the form would be *tkl* (*takallī* < **takalliyī*) or *tkln*. However, it is 'Anat who smites the dragon in *CTA*, 3.3.38f. Cf. *PRU*, II.1.1 (Ba'1 smites the dragon?) and *PRU*, II.3.3–11.

24. Text 5.1.1–5. The first tricolon is remarkably symmetrical. W. F. Albright's article written in 1941 is still useful: "Are the Ephod and the Teraphim Mentioned in Ugaritic Literature?" *BASOR*, 83 (1941), 39f. Note the biblical parallels: Ps. 74:14; Isa. 27:1; Job 26:10; Rev. 12:9. Isa. 34:4 is thoroughly reminiscent of the final bicolon.

25. *CTA*, 3.3.35–39.

26. On this vocalization, see *Ugaritica* V, 137.8 (pp. 240f.). The form *quttāl*, *tunnān* is augmentative, evidently, used along side of *tannin* and *tannittu*.

27. *PRU*, II.3.3–11. Cf. Job 40:25.

In the biblical parallels to these texts it is clear that there is full identification between Yamm and the dragon (Isa. 27: 1, and especially Isa. 51:9–10).

It is easiest to suppose that the tale of *Yamm-Nahar* elaborated in the cycle has a major variant in the myth of Lôtān, the sea dragon. One may compare the confusion in Greek mythology between Typhoeus, Typhon, and the old she-dragon of Delphi. In the extant tradition, the dragon motif appears as a torso only, but we can imagine that in Canaan as in Mesopotamia and Israel, Sea was portrayed as a seven-headed dragon, a dragon to be slain in order to establish the rule of the warrior-gods. Such variation and unevenness in oral cycles of myth and epic are not surprising; indeed they are characteristic of the genre.

The interpretation of the myth of Baʿl is not an easy task, as becomes apparent in the diverse literature devoted to the subject. One scholar will claim that the old Canaanite myths do not speak of “creation,” despite the attribution in biblical lore of these myths to the time of the beginning or of the end (the new creation). Another will characterize the entire complex cycle as an elaborated cosmogonic myth, and hence properly called a “creation story.” One of the problems is the confusion of two types of myths, owing to the tendency to approach Canaanite and other Near Eastern myth utilizing the biblical creation story as a yardstick. Often this is an unconscious prejudice. The biblical creation accounts, however, are atypical. The “primordial” events have been radically historicized in the Israelite environment so that the beginning is “merely” a first event in a historical sequence.

We have distinguished above²⁸ two ideal forms of “creation” myth, one the theogony, the other the cultic cosmogony. The theogonic myth normally uses the language of time; its events were of old. The cultic cosmogony may or may not use time language. Yet the myth always delineates “primordial” events, that is, events which constitute cosmos and, hence, are properly timeless or cyclical or “eschatological” in character. It appears to us that the myths of combat with Yamm, Môt, and Lôtān are indeed cosmogonic myths, primitive in that there is no reference to the beginning, that is, no explicit time language. The Baʿl cycle relates the emergence of kingship among the gods. The tale of the establishment of a dynastic temple and its cultus is a typical subtheme of the cosmogony and its ritual and is found also in *Enūma eliš* and, as we shall see, in the Bible.

28. See above in the final section of chapter 2.

The Song of the Sea

We turn now to the archaic victory song in Exodus 15:1b–18.²⁹ Much debate has been expended recently on the date of the song. The poem is to be dated by (1) the typology of its language, (2) the typology of its prosody, (3) orthographic analysis, (4) the typology of the development of Israel's religion, (5) the history of tradition, and (6) historical allusions. Most scholars have based their datings on the last three methods. The first two are more objective techniques; the third is a precarious procedure at best since usually it depends on the failure of scribes to revise spellings to later orthographic systems owing to misunderstanding or corruption of the text.³⁰

We have argued elsewhere³¹ that the language of Exodus 15 is more consistently archaic than that of any other prose or poetic work of some length in the Bible.³² The poem conforms throughout to the prosodic patterns and canons of the Late Bronze Age. Its use of mixed metrical structure, its extreme use of climactic (repetitive) parallelism, internal rhyme and assonance, place it alongside the Song of Deborah. The latest comparable poems are Psalm 29 and the Lament of David.

29. Recent bibliography can be found in S. E. Loewenstamm, *The Tradition of the Exodus in its Development* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1965), pp. 146–150. To the works cited there should be added now, D. N. Freedman, "Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry," *ZAW*, 72 (1960), 101–107; M. Dahood, "Nādā 'To Hurl' in Ex. 15, 16," *Biblica*, 43 (1962), 248f.; L. S. Hay, "What Really Happened at the Sea of Reeds," *JBL*, 83 (1964), 397–403; G. Fohrer, *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus*, *BZAW*, 91 (Berlin, 1964), pp. 110–116; N. Lohfink, *Das Siegeslied am Schilfmeer* (Frankfurt am Main, 1965), pp. 103–128 (also "De Moysis epinicia," *Verbum Domini*, 41 [1963], 277–289); G. W. Coats, "The Traditio-Historical Character of the Reed Sea Motif," *VT*, 17 (1967), 253–265; J. Muilenburg, "A Liturgy on the Triumphs of Yahweh," *Studia biblica et semitica*, Vriezen Volume (Wageningen, 1966), pp. 233–251; G. W. Coats, "The Song of the Sea," *CBQ*, 31 (1969), 1–17; and B. S. Childs, "A Traditio-Historical Study of the Reed Sea Tradition," *VT*, 20 (1970), 406–418, and references. The writer has also had the benefit of studying a forthcoming article of D. N. Freedman, "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15." Mention must also be made of the Yale dissertation of David A. Robertson, "Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry" (1966) which eventually will bring an end to the discussion of the date of the poem, at least for those with training in the history of the Canaanite dialects.

30. The several orthographic systems represented at Qumrân have enriched our knowledge of scribal practices in revision, both in the direction of modernization and in certain traditions in attempts to archaize. See the writer's discussion in "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," *IEJ*, 16 (1966), esp. 89f., and references.

31. *SMir*, pp. 237–250.

32. This evidence has been extended by Robertson, "Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry."

The former is a Canaanite hymn borrowed by Israel probably in the tenth century but older in its original form.³³ The Lament of David is doubtless a tenth-century work. While it uses an archaic elegiac meter,³⁴ the patterns of climactic parallelism have largely disappeared.

33. See below, chapter 7, for discussion and references.

34. The lament is written in b:b::b:b meter (in stress notation, 2:2::2:2 [not 2:2, or 4:4]), broken by refrains in 1:1:1 (twice) and 1:1 (once, in conclusion). The structure of the refrain has not been understood owing to the corruption of its first use at the beginning of the poem. It can, however, be reconstructed. Let us review the refrain structure beginning at the end and working back to the beginning:

איכה) נפלו גברים	1(8)	v. 27
יאבדו כלי מלחמה	1(8)	
איכה) נפלו גברים	1(8)	v. 25
בתוך)מלחמה יונתן	1(8)	
עלי במתיך חלל	1(8)	
הו) צבי ישראל >שאול <	1(8)	v. 19
עלי במתיך חלל	1(8)	
איכה) נפלו גברים		

How the warriors have fallen;
Perished the weapons of war.

How the warriors have fallen,
In the midst of battle, Jonathan
On thy heights slain.

Ho, prince (lit. gazelle) of Israel, Saul
On thy heights slain
How the warriors have fallen!

The use of the name of a male animal as a noble or military title is now well known. Precisely this usage of *šby*, "gazelle," "noble" is found in the *KRT* Epic (*CTA*, 15.4.6f.):

šh šb'm try
tmnym zbyy
tr Ḥbr rbt

Summon my seventy peers (lit. "bulls"),
My eighty lords (lit. "gazelles"),
The nobles (lit. "bulls") of Great Ḥubur.

A confusion of the familiar אלים, אילים, "chiefs" (cf. Exod. 15:15 below) and אלים "gods" probably lies behind the corrupt text of Judg. 5:8:

1 יבחרו אלים חדשים
1 אזי לק-חם שערים

In this regard it shares prosodic form with eleventh century poems, Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33, and the tenth-century hymn 2 Samuel 22 = Psalm 18.³⁵

We have collected some orthographic data which would suggest a tenth-century date or earlier for its being put first into writing.³⁶

We shall discuss at some length below the question of the place of the Song of the Sea in Israel's early cult. In our view, the hymn is not merely one of the oldest compositions preserved by biblical sources. It is the primary source for the central event in Israel's history, the Exodus-Conquest. In its present context, and originally, I believe, it was associated with the cultus of the old spring New Year's festival.³⁷ Apparently, the song was preserved in both strands of Israel's Epic tradition, that is, both in the Yahwistic version of the Epic (Exodus 15:1b-18) and in the Elohist (Exodus 15:21), where only the *incipit* of the hymn, that is, its name, is cited. The view that the

They choose new leaders,

Yea, they took for themselves captains (lit. "bucks").

The loss of *s'wl* after *ysr'l* is a simple haplography, probably of the fourth-third century when *waw* and *res* were virtually identical in form. The structure of the refrains can be described as follows:

v. 19 abc (tricolon)

v. 25 cab (tricolon)

v. 27 ad (bicolon)

Hence colon "a" of v. 25, *btwk mlhnh ywntn*, should be precisely parallel to colon "a" of v. 19, *hw sby ysr'l s'wl*. Symmetry thus requires the restoration of the personal name paired with "Jonathan" elsewhere in the lament.

35. Cf. Cross and Freedman, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving," *JBL*, 72 (1953), 15-34; W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, ed. H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh, Clark, 1950), pp. 1-10, and especially his general discussion of the typology of early prosody, *YGC*, chapter 1 (pp. 1-52).

36. *SMir*, pp. 243-250 (notes to the text).

37. We must posit two New Year's festivals in the early cult of Israel, both covenant-renewal festivals. The autumn festival, falling on the New Year common to Canaan and Egypt, in Israel became the great feast of the era of kingship, both in Jerusalem and Beth'el. The spring New Year, with its ultimately Mesopotamian connections, appears to have been the time of the major festival at the old league sanctuaries of Gilgal and Shiloh, a covenant festival which virtually disappeared during the monarchy as a national pilgrimage feast, until the archaizing reforms of Josiah (2 Kings 23:22; cf. 2 Chron. 30:1-26). The associations of the Gilgal rites with the spring, with the covenant, with the sea crossing and the "ritual conquest," seem very clear indeed. I am not interested here in speculating on the origins and history of the feasts of Passover and *Maššôt*, and their conflation in later tradition, at least in the present discussion. The problems are, of course, very complex. B. S. Childs' comments, "a Traditio-Historical Study of the Reed Sea Tradition," p. 415, are based on a misunderstanding of my reconstruction of the Gilgal cultus.

incipit, or the first line of the Song of the Sea, is itself the archaic hymn, the body of the victory song having been appended secondarily, survives long after the theoretical structure which permitted such an analysis has vanished. The notion that old Israel in its early stages was incapable of composing or listening to long compositions, and that "early" and "short" were in effect synonymous, stems especially from the idealistic and romantic views of the last century, expressed in most painful form by Hermann Gunkel.³⁸

The poem must have been available to the Yahwist no later than the early tenth century B.C., and if we posit it as common to both Epic sources, we are pushed back into the era of the league and to the common lore of its chief shrines.

In short all the evidence points to a premonarchic date for the Song of the Sea, in the late twelfth or early eleventh century B.C..

The allusion to the Philistines in v. 14 has been a severe barrier to any dating of the Song of the Sea before the late twelfth century B.C. Customarily the date of the arrival of the Philistines in the maritime plain of Palestine has been placed in the reign of Ramses III at the beginning of the twelfth century. The reference then would be anachronistic, and sufficient time would have to pass for the precise time of the coming of the Philistines to be forgotten. New evidence concerning the fall of the Hittite empire, the conquests of Ugarit and Cyprus, and the southern sweep of the Sea Peoples requires that the date of the first Philistine settlements be placed a good deal earlier, in the reigns of Ramses II (1304–1237) and Merneptah (1237–1225).³⁹ This earlier date of the Sea Peoples' settlement eases somewhat the problem of the mention of the Philistines in a poem purporting to describe the inhabitants of the land in the era of the Israelite Conquest. Other references, to the chieftains of Edom and the nobles of Moab, reflect cor-

38. This view appeared to be supported by short couplets or verses embedded in the old sources of the Pentateuch, and also, perhaps, by the shortness of original oracle units in Prophecy. In the latter case, brevity belongs to the ecstatic origins of the oracle form. In the case of the Epic materials, however, we are inclined to reconstruct a long and rich poetic epic of the era of the league, underlying JE, and to take the prose epic variants (with their surviving poetic fragments) preserved in the P work (i.e., the Tetrateuch, JEP) as truncated and secondary derivatives. In any case, we possess long, poetic epics from old Canaan, from ancient Mesopotamia, and Homeric Greece, and to find the same phenomenon in Israel would not be surprising.

39. See W. F. Albright, *CAH²*, chapter XXXIII (pp. 24–33 in preliminary publication), and his references. Cf. *YGC*, pp. 157–164; G. Ernest Wright, "Fresh Evidence for the Philistine Story," *BA*, 29 (1966), 70–86.

rectly (contrary to Epic tradition [JE]) the terminology of the brief premonarchical period in these nations founded in the thirteenth century. This picture can hardly be explained as studied archaizing.⁴⁰

The allusion to the *neʾwe qodšeka* (v. 13) cannot be used as an argument for late date. It is a specific designation of a tent-shrine.⁴¹ Similarly the expression “mount of thy possession” gives no hint of the date of the poem; it is a formula in the oral literature of Canaan in the Late Bronze Age, a standard way for a poet, in Ugarit⁴² or in Israel, to specify the special seat of the deity, either his cosmic shrine or its earthly counterpart; often it stands in parallelism to *ksʾu tbt* (compare *mākōn lešibtekā* in Exodus 15:17).⁴³ The identification of the sanctuary in v. 17 will be discussed below.

A comment should be made on the use of the “tenses,” which bears both on the question of the age of the hymn and on its interpretation. Consistently *yaqtul* is used to express narrative past, precisely as in Old Canaanite of the Byblus-Amarna correspondence and in Ugaritic. Thus it stands in parallelism frequently with *qatal* forms.⁴⁴ In verses 16b and 17 we should take the *yaqtul* forms, *yaʿābōr*, *tēbīʿēmō*, and *tittāʿēmō*, as preterit in force. In this case the conquest is not anticipated but is described along with the event at the sea, as a past event. Only with the later misunderstanding of this archaic tense usage was the poem attributed to Miriam or to Moses, in Epic (JE) tradition. It is to be noted, moreover, that this misunderstanding is very ancient.

The hymn falls into two major sections by content and structure, Part I (vv. 1b–12) describing the victory of Yahweh over the Egyptians

40. On the “non-mention” of Ammon, see *SMir*, p. 239, and Loewenstamm, *The Tradition of the Exodus*, pp. 113f.

41. See *SMir*, p. 248, n. 42; and D. O. Edzard, “Altbabylonisch *nawūm*,” *ZA*, 19 (1959), 168–173, and most recently *YGC*, p. 27, n. 63. The basic meaning is “pastoral abode” or “encampment.” On the localization of the tent shrine, see below.

42. See *CTA*, 1.3.1; 3.6.16; 4.8.14; 5.2.16; 3.3.27; 3.4.64.

43. See *CTA*, 1.3.1; 3.6.15; 4.8.13; 5.2.16; cf. 1 Kings 8:13, a quotation from the Book of Yašar, and Ps. 89:15.

44. In v. 5 *yēkasyūmū* parallel to *yārēdū*; in v. 7 *tahārōs*, *tēšallah*, *yōkelēmō* parallel to (v. 8) *neʾermū*, *niššēbū*, and *qāpēʾū*; v. 14 *sāmēʾū* parallel to *yirgāzūn*; v. 15 *nibhātū* parallel to *yōhāzēmō*, to *nāmōgū*, *tippōl*, and *yiddēmū*. While *yaqtul* forms (<*yaqtulu*) are also used of the future (v. 9 and v. 18), for the most part *yaqtul* has preterit force. Often in early poetry, for example, in Judges 5 and 2 Samuel 22, this stage of verbal usage has been obscured by the introduction of *waw-consecutive* at the beginning of cola. Fortunately, the Song of Miriam is preserved in pristine form. Cf. the discussion of this phenomenon in Cross and Freedman, “A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18,” *JBL*, 72 (1953), 17–20.

at the sea; Part II (vv. 13–18), the leading through the desert and the entry into the land. Smaller units, sequences of alternating couplets and triplets, are marked off by the change of meter:⁴⁵

Part I

1. couplet	2(b: b)	v. 1b	(2:2: :2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 2b	(3:3)
2. triplet	3 (b: b)	v. 3, 4	(2:2: :2:2: :2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 5	(3:3)
3. couplet	2 (b: b)	v. 6	(2:2: :2:2)
triplet	3 (b: b)	vv. 7, 8a	(2:2: :2:2: :2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 8bc	(3:3)
4. triplet	3 (b: b)	v. 9	(2:2: :2:2: :2:2)
couplet	2 (b: b)	v. 10	(2:2: :2:2)
triplet	1:1:1	v. 11	(3:3:3)
5. short couplet	b: b	v. 12	(2:2)

Part II

6. couplet	2 (b: b)	v. 13	(2:2: :2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 14	(3:3)
7. triplet	3 (b: b)	v. 15	(2:2: :2:2: :2:2)
couplet	2 (b: b)	v. 16a	(2:2: :2:2)
couplet	1:1	v. 16b	(3:3)
8. triplet	3 (b: b)	v. 17	(2:2: :2:2: :2:2)
9. short couplet	b: b	v. 18	(2:2)

45. This analysis stands somewhere between that of *SMir* written in 1955 and Freedman's forthcoming study, "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15." We are indebted to the latter study at a number of points. The present analysis also differs from that of 1968 in reflecting increasing scepticism that the oral poet intended strophe divisions larger than those marked off by change of meter.

Exodus 15:1b-18⁴⁶

Part I

1.

Sing to Yahweh,	(1)	שִׁיר לַיהוָה ⁴⁷	b
For he is highly exalted,		כִּנְגַא נָא	b
Horse and chariotry		סָס וּרְכִיב ⁴⁸	b
He cast into the Sea.		רָמַ בַּיָּם [] ⁴⁹	b

This is my god whom I exalt,	(2b)	זֶ אֱלֹהֵי אֲרַמְמָנָה ⁵⁰	l
The god of my father whom I admire.		אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִי וְאֲנֹה ⁵²	l

2.

Yahweh is a warrior,	(3)	יְהוָה גִּבּוֹר [] ⁵³	b
Yahweh is his name.		יְהוָה שְׁמוֹ	b
Pharaoh and his army	(4)	פֶּרַעַ וְחָלָי ⁵⁴ []	b

46. The poem is transcribed in the consonantal notation used in Israel in the tenth century B.C. and earlier and used throughout Proto-Canaanite and classical Phoenician texts.

47. *Širā*, v. 21, is preferable *metri causa*. For a more detailed discussion of the variant readings *'āšīrā*, *nāšīrā*, and the conflate *'šrw* of the Samaritan, see *SMir*, p. 243, n. 1.

48. Reading *rēkeb* with P. Haupt. *rōkēbō* or Old Greek *rōkēb*, is awkward, to be read "chariot driver" if correct. The original text, to judge from the renderings of the versions read *rk̄b*. In the era of the Conquest, cavalry had not come into use in Egypt. It appears not to have been used in Israel until the ninth century B.C.

49. V. 2a is a secondary interpolation. In the poem 1:1 and 1:1:1 appears as antiphonal elements. A quatrain 1:1::1:1 is wholly out of place. Presumably v. 2a was a familiar bicolon; it is found also in Isa. 12:2b and Ps. 118:14. A fuller discussion of v. 2a is given in *SMir*, p. 243 and nn. a-d.

50. As the received text stands, the second colon is considerably longer than the first. The simplest solution to this metrical imbalance is to interchange the verb; this produces the desired symmetry. The transposition of terms in a formulaic pair is frequent both in texts orally composed and dictated (e.g., the Ugaritic texts), and in the written transmission of a text, especially in a case where both words begin and end with the same letter.

51. In the genitive, the suffix of the first person singular is *-iya* in early Canaanite and Phoenician, written with consonantal *yod*.

52. W. F. Albright associates *'anwēhū* (cf. Hab. 2:5 *ywh*) with Arabic *nwy*, Eth. *nawa*, Ugaritic *nwyt*, "settlement," Mari *nawūm*, Heb. *nāwē* "pastoral or nomadic camp," etc. He derives these from a root meaning "to aim at," which then developed in two directions, "to look ardently at," and "to reach or settle." The *h-stem* here may be translated, "I shall make him a cynosure, I shall admire him" (i.e., "I shall cause him to be the object of ardent gazing"). The versions interpret the word correctly, either from knowledge of its true meaning or from context.

53. The major versions (Sam G Sy) have the reading *gbr mlhmh*. Evidently we have here a conflation of ancient variants: *yahwē gibbōr* and *'is mlhāmā*. For metrical reasons *gibbor* seems the preferable reading. Note the climactic pattern *ab:ac* in the first bicolon.

54. We follow Albright's suggestion that *mrkbt pr'h* and *pr'h whylw* are ancient variants. There is no basis, really, to choose between them: they are metrically identical.

He hurled into the sea.		יר בים	b
His elite troops		מבחר שלו ⁵⁵ []	b
Drowned in the Reed Sea.		טבע בים-סף	b

The deeps covered them ;	(5)	תהמת יכסימ ⁵⁶	l
They sank in the depths like a stone.		ירד במצלת כמ-אבן	l

3.

Your right hand, Yahweh,	(6)	ימנכ יהו ⁵⁷	b
Is terrible in strength ;		נאדר בכח	b
Your right hand, Yahweh,		ימנכ יהו	b
Shattered the enemy.		תרעץ איב	b
In your great majesty	(7)	[] ברב גאנב	b
You crushed your foes.		תהרס קמכ	b
You sent forth your fury,		תשלח הרנכ	b
It consumed them like stubble.		יאכלמ קקש	b
At the blast of your nostrils	(8)	[] ברח אפכ	b
The waters were heaped up.		נערמ מם	b

The swells mounted up as a hill ;		נצב כמ-נדר ⁵⁸ נולם	l
The deeps foamed in the heart of the sea.		קפא ⁵⁹ תהמת לבל-ים	l

55. On the omission of the conjunction here and below, cf. *SMir*, pp. 245 n. 7, 246 nn. 15 and 24. See also Cross and Saley, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria," *BASOR*, 197 (1970), 48.

56. This form is doubly archaic, preserving the final *yod* of the root as well as the archaic suffix (-*mū* = -*mō*). Note that -*mō* is used regularly in Exod. 15 with the verb as the 3.m.pl. pronominal suffix, a sure sign of archaism.

57. Note the repetitive style in the couple of v. 6:ab:cd::ab:ef; this is the equivalent in meter with *b*-couplets of the pattern abc:abd in the climactic 1-bicolon.

58. *nēd* is a rare word, and appears elsewhere in the Bible only in passages dependent on this passage: Ps. 78:13; Josh. 3:13, 16. Other putative occurrences are suspected of corruption or mispointing. There is every reason to take at face value the only etymological evidence we possess, the Arabic cognate *nadd* "hill," "large mound of earth or dirt."

59. The verb *qp'w* has been taken traditionally to mean "congeal" i.e., into solid walls. Most recently, B. S. Childs insists on this meaning, claiming that the Priestly notion of a wall of water is present here (*VT*, 20 [1970], 411f., and note 3). Unhappily, there are only three occurrences of the root other than in Exod. 15:8; Zech. 14:6 where the meaning is wholly obscure, Zeph. 1:12, of the dregs of wine, and Job 10:10, used of the curdling of cheese (parallel to the pouring of milk). Apparently, the action common to wine dregs and curdled milk is the precipitation of sediment or solids. In *SMir* we assumed that the original meaning was "to churn (of milk)," or "to work (of wine)," the process leading to precipitation. Whether this be right or wrong, we see no ground for a meaning "congeal," *except* the traditional interpretation of Exod. 15:8, drawn anachronistically from the P account of the walls of water. In Mishnaic Hebrew and

4.

The enemy said :	(9)	אמר איב	b
I shall pursue, I shall overtake;		ארדף אסב	b
I shall divide the spoil,		אחלק שלל	b
My greed will be sated,		תמלא-ם ⁶⁰ נפש	b
I shall bare my sword,		ארק חרב	b
My hand will conquer.		תרש-ם יד	b
You blew with your breath,	(10)	נשפת ברחב	b
Sea covered them.		כסמ ים	b
They sank like a lead weight		צלל כעפרת	b
In the dreadful waters.		במם אדרם	b

Who is like you among the gods, Yahweh? (11) מ-כמכ באלם יהו |
 Who is like you, terrible among the holy ones?⁶¹ מ-כמכ נאדר בקדש |
 Awesome in praises, wonder worker. נרא תהלת עש פלא |

5.

You stretched out your hand,	(12)	נטת ימנב	b
The Underworld swallowed them.		תבלעמ ארץ ⁶²	b

the Aramaic of the Talmud, the basic meaning is "to precipitate" of solids in liquid, hence "to rise to surface," "form scum, froth or foam," "to curdle": in the D-stem and causative-stem, "to skim," "remove foam from wine," and "to make float," "to coagulate blood (by boiling)," "to foam over" and "to flood." The derivative *qippūy* means most often "froth" or "spume," and is used specifically of the froth on the surface of fermenting wine (e.g., *Abōdā zārā* 56a). In Syriac the verb means "to skim off," "to collect," "to float (of scum or froth)." Cf. *qēpāyā*, "flotsom," "scum," and *qūpāyā*, "spume," "foam," "floatage," "scum (of broth)." In the Aramaic text of *Ahiqar*, *qā* occurs in association with the sea and has been translated "flood," and "foam." The latter reading is preferable.

These data require that we take *qāpē'ū tēhōmōt* to mean "the deeps foamed," or "the deeps churned into foam," or the like, probably under the figure of wine. The rendering "congeal (as ice? gelatine?)" must be firmly rejected.

60. *timlā'em*, v. 9, and *tōrišēm* are verbal forms augmented by the enclitic *-m* (<*mi/ma*) particle. The pronominal suffixes are out of place (Albright). Cf. *SMir*, p. 246 and nn. 25, 26.

61. *qdš* is to be taken as a collective as suggested by J. T. Milik here and in Deut. 33:3. In these instances the Old Greek and certain other witnesses translate in the plural. The alternate in v. 11 is to suppose a haplography of *mēm* before the following *nūn* (in Palaeo-Hebrew script).

62. For documentation of this meaning of *'éres* in biblical Hebrew and elsewhere, see *SMir*, p. 247, n. 39; cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms*, vols. I-III, under *'éres* in the indices to each volume.

Part II

6.

You faithfully led	(13)	נחת בחסדך	b
The people whom you redeemed;		עם זגאלת	b
You guided in your might		נהלת בעוז	b
To your holy encampment.		אל נו קדשכ ⁶³	b

The peoples heard, they shuddered;	(14)	שמע עמם ירגון	l
Horror seized the inhabitants of Philistia.		חל אחז ישב פלשת	l

7.

Yea, they were undone,	(15)	אז נבהל	b
The chieftains of Edom.		אלפ אדם	b
The nobles of Moab		אל מאב	b
Were seized by panic.		יאחזמ רעד	b
They were melted utterly,		נמג כל ⁶⁴	b
The enthroned of Canaan.		ישב ⁶⁵ כנען	b
You brought down on them	(16)	תפל עליהם	b
Terror and dread.		אמת ופחד	b
By thy great power		בגדל זרעך	b
They were struck dumb like a stone.		ידמ ⁶⁶ כאבן	b

While your people passed over, Yahweh,	עד-יעבר ⁶⁷ עמך יהו	l
While your people passed over whom you have created.	עד-יעבר עם ז קנת	l

63. See above n. 41.

64. This appears to be a rare instance of enjambment. On the other hand *kl* may hide an old adverb (cf. late *kullō*). Compare the remarks in *SMir*, p. 248, n. 48.

65. "Enthroned," i.e., reigning kings. This meaning, which is not infrequent, seems required by parallelism. Cf. in particular, Amos 1:5, 8.

66. See M. Dahood, *Psalms*, vol. I, for an alternate interpretation of this colon.

67. This verb *y'br*, and the following *tb'm* and *tf'm*, must be read as preterits, referring to past events. Compare Joshua 13:13:

[] ידם שמש ירה עמד
עד יקם גוי איביו

Sun stood, Moon stayed,
While the nation took vengeance on its enemies.

This means that, contrary to the usual interpretation of v. 16b, the poet wrote from the point of view of Israel after the Conquest, or rather from the point of view of one re-enacting the Conquest, including both the episode of the sea and the passing over into the land to a Palestinian sanctuary. This we shall argue is in fact the *Sitz im Leben* of the hymn.

8.

You brought them, you planted them	(17)	תבאמ [] תטעמ	b
In the mount of your heritage,		בהר נחלתכ ⁶⁸	b
The dais of your throne		מכן לשבתכ ⁶⁹	b
Which you made, Yahweh,		פעלת יהו ⁷⁰	b
The sanctuary, Yahweh,		מקדש יהו ⁷⁰	b
Which your hands created.		כננ ידכ	b

9.

Let Yahweh reign	(18)	יהו ימלך	b
Forever and ever.		לעלם ועד	b

Part I of the hymn describes the combat of the Divine Warrior with his enemies: Yahweh's defeat of the Egyptians at the Reed Sea. His weapon was a storm at sea, a storm blown up by a blast of wind from his dilated nostrils. The key passages are as follows:

At the blast of your nostrils
The waters were heaped up.

The swells mounted up as a hill,
The deeps foamed in the heart of the sea. (15:8)

You blew with your breath,
Sea covered them.
They sank like a lead weight
In the dreadful waters. (15:10)

There is no suggestion in the poem of a splitting of the sea or of an east wind blowing the waters back so that the Israelites can cross on a dry sea bottom or of the waters "returning" to overwhelm the Egyptians mired in the mud. Rather it is a storm-tossed sea that is directed against the Egyptians by the breath of the Deity. Moreover, the sea is not personified or hostile, but a passive instrument in Yahweh's control. There is no question here of a mythological combat between

68. See above, n. 42.

69. See above, n. 43.

70. *'dny* is obviously secondary. Sam. reads *yhw*, a rare instance of its preserving the older reading.

two gods. Yahweh defeats historical, human enemies. Most extraordinary, there is no mention of Israel's crossing the sea⁷¹ or of a way through the deep places of the sea for the redeemed to cross over.⁷² The absence of these traditional motifs is surprising and requires explanation. So far as we can tell, the Egyptians are thrown from barks or barges into the stormy sea; they sink in the sea like a rock or a weight and drown.

The phrases are unambiguous:

Horse and chariotry
He cast into the sea. (15:1b, 21b)

Pharaoh and his army
He hurled into the sea.
His elite troops
Drowned in the Reed Sea.
The deeps covered them,
They sank in the depths like a stone. (15:4f.)

They sank like a lead weight
In the dreadful waters. (15:10b)

In the late prose sources in the Bible, it is perfectly clear that one picture of the episode at the Reed Sea had become regnant. It is well expressed by the Chronicler: "And you split (*bq't*) the sea before them and they crossed over in the midst of the sea on dry ground and their pursuers you threw into the deeps like a stone in the mighty waters." (Neh. 9:11).

While the last phrase is directly reminiscent of the Song of the Sea,

71. V. 16b refers to passing over Jordan into the land in the Conquest.

72. Loewenstamm reads these verses, esp. v. 8 and v. 10, in a traditional way, one referring to the dividing of the sea, one to its return, overwhelming the Egyptians (pp. 117f.). But this cannot be deduced from these archaic verses, except by reading in the (later) prose tradition. The five strophes in Part I are parallel, not consecutive in their themes. The first strophe says Yahweh cast the Egyptians into the sea, the second that he hurled them into the sea and they sank in it; the third strophe speaks of the shattering of the enemy, the sending forth of his fury to consume the foe, the blast of the storm wind against the Egyptians . . . *not* to give Israel a path in the sea; the fourth and fifth strophes reiterate the mode of the Egyptian defeat. At no point is Israel's succor mentioned until Part II. Then the account is of the leading in the wilderness, the crossing of Jordan, and the arrival at the shrine of Yahweh. The poem simply cannot be made to conform to the patterns of the prose traditions, neither to that of the older (JE) sources nor to that of the Priestly source.

the primary motif is that of the sea dividing and Israel crossing on dry ground.

The Priestly editor of the Tetrateuch⁷³ wrote in the sixth century as follows: “The children of Israel came into the midst of the sea on dry ground, the waters being a wall (*hōmā*) for them on their right and left . . . And Yahweh said to Moses, ‘Stretch out your hand over the sea that the waters will fall back (*wěyvāšūbū*) on the Egyptians, on their chariotry and on their horsemen” (Exodus 14:22, 26).

Obviously this picture is identical with that of the Chronicler. The song in Exodus 15, however, can be dependent on neither. There is little doubt, however, that the Priestly traditionist knew the Song of the Sea. *Hōmā* in the P account appears to be a prosaized translation of the old poetic word *nēd*; if so, its meaning is distorted, unknowingly no doubt, to agree with another traditional view.⁷⁴

The Deuteronomist of the seventh century B.C.⁷⁵ places the following speech on the lips of Rahab: “I know that Yahweh gave the land to you and that your terror has fallen on us and that all the inhabitants of the land melted before you. For we have heard how Yahweh dried up the waters of the Reed Sea before you in your exodus from Egypt” (Joshua 2:9f.).

Joshua 2:9 is clearly reminiscent of Exodus 15:15 and 15:16; but the account of the drying up of the sea for Israel’s escape belongs to a different tradition, close to those of the Chronicler and the Priestly tradent.⁷⁶

The old narrative sources come from the Epic tradition of the Yahwist (tenth century B.C.) and from Joshua 24, where archaic tradition (ninth century or earlier) is only slightly reworked by the Deuteronomistic editor. In the Yahwistic source in Exodus we read: “and Yahweh made the sea go back with a strong east wind (blowing) all night, and so made the sea into dry ground . . . and the sea turned back (*wayyāšob*) again in the morning to its steady flow, and the Egyptians fled against it, and Yahweh routed the Egyptians in the midst of the sea” (Exodus 14:21, 27).

Once again it is clear that the Song of the Sea does not derive its account from Yahwistic tradition. While a wind blows in each, the

73. See below, Chapter 11.

74. Note also the anachronistic mention of cavalry here.

75. See below, Chapter 10.

76. Cf. also, Deut. 11:4 and Josh. 4:23, the latter to be discussed below.

timing and effect are different. The Egyptians are drowned when the wind ceases to blow and the sea returns to its perennial state (*'êtānō*) according to the Epic tradition. In the song, the divine wind overthrows Pharaoh and his host. Contrary to the late tradition, the sea is not split so that Israel marches through the sea on dry ground while towering walls of water rose on their right and left. Rather, the divine act is described in more naturalistic language; an east wind blows, driving the waters of the shallow sea back, laying bare dry ground. The divine act is not so naturalistic as the account in the Song of the Sea in which the Egyptians sink in a wind-tossed sea.

In Joshua 24 we read: "and you came to the sea, and the Egyptians pursued your fathers . . . to the Reed Sea, and they cried out to Yahweh and he put a dark cloud between you and the Egyptians, and he brought on them the sea and it covered them" (Joshua 24:6, 7).

Interestingly enough, nothing seems to be said here about Israel's crossing the sea on dry ground, only that they came to the sea and that Yahweh caused the sea to cover the Egyptians while a dark cloud hid the Israelites. The passage has clear contacts with Epic material in Exodus 14, usually attributed to the Elohist. While in some ways the tradition in Joshua 24 stands closest to that of the Song of the Sea, it must be said, finally, that the hymn can only be prior to it or independent of it.

We have traced above the history of the prose traditions of the event at the sea. Nowhere, from the time of the earliest Epic sources down to the end of the Persian Age can we find a place for the traditions preserved in the song to have come into being. Most of the prose sources have reminiscences of Exodus 15, but the song cannot be derived from any of them. The primary and most dramatic theme in the prose sources, the splitting or drying up of the sea and Israel's escape across the dry sea bottom, is wholly absent from the hymn. In short, the tradition preserved in the Song of the Sea must be much older.

The poetic sources also give an interesting picture of the development of the Exodus tradition. Psalm 78, a song dated by Eissfeldt and Albright as early as the united monarchy,⁷⁷ and in any case pre-Exilic, includes a reference to the event at the sea in verse 13:

77. O. Eissfeldt, "Das Lied Moses Deuteronomium 32:1-43 und das Lehrgedicht Asaphs Psalm 78 samt einer Analyse der Umgebung des Mose-Liedes," *BAL*, vol. 104, no. 5 (Berlin, 1958). Cf. *YGC*, pp. 17 n.41, 25 n.56, 212; and G. Ernest Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. B. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York, Harper, 1962), pp. 36-41.

He split Sea and brought them across,
He made the waters to stand as a hill.

בקע ים ויעבירם
ויצב מים כמו גר

This passage fits with the prose accounts in centering on the division of the sea and Israel's crossing. The term *bq'*, "split," is used as in Nehemiah 9:11, a word more appropriate to the smiting of the Sea-dragon than to the drying up of the sea. The second colon, however, echoes Exodus 15:8 and is secondary to it. Other psalms, most of them late, reflect precisely the prose tradition: Psalms 136:15; 66:6; 106:9.

We turn next to texts which refer directly to Yahweh's battle with Sea or the Sea-Dragon. They fall into two groups, one in which the language is purely mythic, with no reference to the historical event at the Reed Sea remembered in Israelite tradition, another in which the cosmogonic or creation battle with monstrous Sea is combined with the historical tradition of the Exodus.

In the first group belong the passages in Psalm 89:10f.⁷⁸ and Psalm 93:1-4. Both hymns are early, or at least the sections from which our passages come are early, probably of the tenth century B.C.⁷⁹ Both are psalms of the royal cult and deal with creation. Also to be placed here are Isaiah 27:1; Job 7:12, 9:8, 26:12, and 38:7-11, all from sixth-century contexts,⁸⁰ and Nahum 1:4 from the end of the seventh century B.C. (at the earliest). These passages need not concern us here. They do fit into the general typology of the development of Israel's religion. Mythic elements were present at the beginning of Israel's history when Yahwism emerged from its mythopoeic environment. The cultus of the league was strongly shaped by historical patterns; however, it is best expressed in the Epic tradition of Israel as shown by A. Alt and his students. The myths of creation and kingship became recrudescient with the introduction of kingship and its ideology, especially in the Solomonic era with the institution of the dynastic temple. The Exile was a second era of the recrudescence of myth in the rise of proto-apocalyptic. In this era, however, notably in the poetry of Second Isaiah (including Isaiah 34, 35) and the Isaianic

78. In v. 11 read *'wybk*, "thy enemy." The mythological combatant is meant, not historical enemies.

79. Note, for example, the creation of the old gods (the mountains) in Ps. 89:13 (where *hmn* or *'mn* is to be read for *wymyn*).

80. See provisionally the Harvard dissertation of William Millar, "Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic" (1970) which deals with the Isaianic apocalypse as a proto-apocalyptic rather than apocalyptic work.

“apocalypse,” the myths were transformed and combined with historical themes in order to formulate an eschatology, or a typology of “old things” and “new things” in the drama of salvation.

We are brought to a final group of passages in which the creation myth is fully combined with the Exodus-Conquest events. From the early monarchy comes a pertinent section of Psalm 77:⁸¹

The Waters saw you, Yahweh,⁸²
 The Waters saw you and writhed;⁸³
 Yea the Deeps shuddered.

The clouds⁸⁴ streamed water,
 The heavens roared,
 Your bolts shot back and forth.

Your thunder was in the tempest,⁸⁵
 Lightning lighted the world,
 Earth shuddered and shook.

Your way was through the sea, Yahweh⁸⁶
 Your path in the deep waters,
 Your tracks beyond our understanding.⁸⁷

(Psalm 77: 17–20)

A number of passages in which creation and historical conquest are combined are found in Second Isaiah.⁸⁸ We can best refer again to the “Ode to Yahweh’s Arm”:

81. Verse 17 begins a series of four archaic bicola inserted into Psalm 77. On their tenth century date see M. Dahood, *Psalms*, II, note to Ps. 77:17 and his references. The first bicolon is climactic structure: abc:abd:efg.

82. Reading *yhw* for *'lhym* as is necessary often in the Elohist Psalter.

83. “Writhe” makes clear the dragon-like form of “waters,” i.e. Yamm. Cf. Psalm 29:8.

84. Probably we should read *'rbt* for *'by*, *metri causa*.

85. See M. Dahood’s interesting suggestion for *glgl*, *Psalms*, II, p. 232, n. 19.

86. The first colon is not symmetrical. A divine name has dropped out most probably: *'lhym* before *bym* perhaps or *šdy* before *šbyl*. In the first instance, *'lhym* would be a substitute for *yhw*.

87. We prefer to read *l' nd'*, “we do not know.” Orthographically *lō' nōda'ū* would be identical with *lō' nēda'* in the tenth century B.C. Also, it improves the symmetry of the tricolon. For the idiom, cf. Job 37:5.

88. In addition to Isa. 51:9–11, note 43:15f.; 50:2; cf. Ps. 106:9, and especially 114:1–5 (on which see below).

Was it not you who smashed Rahab, the writhing dragon?
Was it not you who dried up Sea, the waters of the great deep?
Did you not make a way in the depths of the sea for the redeemed
to cross?

The ransomed of Yahweh shall return and enter Zion with a shout.
(Isaiah 51:9-11)

In this poem, the battle of creation merges with events of the crossing of the sea and the old Exodus gives way to a vision of the new Exodus-Conquest, the return to Zion, and the feast of the New Jerusalem. In these passages the main theme is the "Way" which splits through the Sea(-dragon) along which Yahweh leads his people, a theme absent from the Song of the Sea.

Our survey brings us to the conclusion that the Song of the Sea cannot be fitted into the history of the prose and poetic accounts of the Exodus-Conquest, except at the beginning of the development in the period of the Judges. Its independence is remarkable, preserved by the fixity of its poetic form, while prose traditions, especially those orally transmitted and the later poetic traditions, developed and crystallized into more or less stereotyped themes and images, replacing or reinterpreting the archaic poetic tradition. Our examination below of the second part of the composition will show further that the hymn fits well into the religious environment of the league, its cultic institutions and concepts. This conclusion conforms with the place the poem has in typologies of language and prosody.

How are we to understand the development of these traditions, from the archaic poetry in Exodus 15 in which the Egyptians founder in a storm to the late prose traditions in which Israel marches through walls of water which then collapse on the hapless Egyptians, or to Proto-apocalyptic poetry in which the way through the depths of the sea fuses mythically with the split in the defeated sea-dragon and the new creation?

First of all it should be said that it was not by chance that the episode at the sea was chosen as symbolic of Israel's redemption and creation as a community. Theoretically, other episodes might have been selected just as well as this one, say the march from the southern mountains into the new land, a favorite theme of old Israelite poetry, or the Conquest proper in Canaan. Nor is it by coincidence that, with the recrudescence of myth late in Israel's history, myths of creation, especially the battle with sea, came to be identified with the historical battle in which Yahweh won salvation for Israel. In choosing the event

of the sea, Israel drew upon available symbols and language which retained power and meaning even when the old mythic patterns which gave them birth had been attenuated or broken by Israel's austere historical consciousness.

More can be said about the mode in which the episode at the Reed Sea and associated traditions evolved in Israel's early cultus. In the last chapter⁸⁹ we discussed the reconstruction of the cultus at the early league shrine at Gilgal from traditions preserved in Joshua 3-5. The Ark was borne in solemn procession from the battle-camp across the Jordan at Abel-shittim to the river and from thence to the shrine at Gilgal where a covenant-renewal ceremony was consummated. The crossing of the Jordan which was "divided," that is, dammed,⁹⁰ so that Israel in battle array could pass over on dry ground, was understood as dramatic reenactment of the crossing of the sea, and as well the "crossing over" to the new land in the Conquest. Exodus and entrance, the sea-crossing from Egypt and the river-crossing of the Conquest were ritually fused in these cultic acts, followed then by the consummation of the covenant which created the community at Sinai and established them in the land at Gilgal. Yahweh dried up River as he had dried up Sea (Joshua 5: 1). The cultic identity of River and Sea, of course, lies close at hand in Canaanite myth in which Prince Sea and Judge River are formulaic pairs. The pairing of Sea and Jordan is found in Psalm 114.

When Israel went forth from Egypt,
 The house of Jacob from an outlandish nation,
 Judah became his sanctuary,
 Israel his dominion.
 The Sea saw and fled,
 The Jordan turned back.
 The mountains danced like rams,
 The hills like lambs.
 What ailed you, O Sea, that you fled?
 You, Jordan, that you turned back?
 The mountains danced like rams,
 The hills like lambs,
 Before the lord of all⁹¹ the earth,

89. For literature, see Chapter 5, note 44.

90. In Joshua 3:13, the expression *nēd 'ehād* is evidently a gloss. It is not found in the Old Greek and is under the asterisk in the Hexaplaric tradition.

91. We read *kl* for *hl* (in later orthography *hwlv*), and compare Josh. 3:11, 13.

Before the god of Jacob,
 Who turned rock into a pool of water,
 Flint into fountains of water.

(Psalm 114:1-8)

This hymn makes very clear Israel's pairing of River and Sea;⁹² it is further documentation of the ritual procession of the Gilgal cult. The psalm has many archaic features and formulae. Verses 1a and 7 have contacts with Judges 5:4-5, and verses 4, 6, 7 with Psalm 29:6, 8. The psalm is not dependent on these early psalms; it merely uses formulae common to early Israel and Canaan. The use of tenses in the psalm is remarkable. *Yaqtul* is used for narrative past in parallelism with *qatal* forms.⁹³ The conjunction is never used at the beginning of cola. The epithet *'dn kl 'rs*⁹⁴ is a specific tie to the Gilgal cult. The cultic function of the hymn is difficult to conceive (as scholars have confessed), unless it is placed in the setting of the Gilgal processional, and the covenant festival celebrated there. In verse 2 there is specific reference to the creation of the nation. As we find parallelism between the crossing of Sea and River, so we should see parallelism between the covenant making of Sinai, whose sign in tradition is the twelve stone stelae (Exodus 24:4), and the festival in Gilgal and the traditions of the twelve stones set up there.⁹⁵ Finally note the two case-endings preserved in verse 8, which may be a mark of archaism (or of archaizing).⁹⁶

92. Cf. also Psalm 66:6: "He turned the sea into dry land/They crossed through the river by foot."

93. In verse 3, *yissōb*; verse 5 *tānūs* and *tissōb*; in verse 6 *tirqēdū*.

94. This epithet may originally have belonged to Ba'1. Cf. *zbl b'l 'ars* (CTA, 5.6.10; 6.3.9; etc.)

95. There is, of course, duplication in the traditions of the twelve stones at Gilgal. As a matter of fact, there may be three variant forms of the tradition of the twelve stones and the covenant ceremony at Gilgal. Recently Otto Eissfeldt has drawn attention to confusion between Gilgal and Shechem in a series of Deuteronomic passages, notably Deut. 27:1-8 which records the instruction to set up "large stones," plastered and inscribed with the "words of the law," and to build an altar, all, according to the time notice, "on the day you cross the Jordan" (Deut. 27:2). On the complicated critical problems involved, see O. Eissfeldt, "Gilgal or Shechem?," in *Proclamation and Presence* [G. Henton Davies Volume], ed. J. I. Durham and J. R. Porter (Richmond, John Knox, 1970), pp. 90-101; and Soggin, "Gilgal, Passah und Landnahme," *SVT*, 15 (1966), 263-277.

96. [] *hōpēki* and *lēma'yēn[ī]*. [The Massoretic text reads *Im'yww*.] Owing to the fact that there is a period of considerable length in which *yōd* and *waw* were not distinguished at all in the Jewish script, and an even longer period in which *yōd* and *waw* were so similar as to be easily confused, one must be very brash to claim the poet mixed case-

The parallelism between Sea and River also is found in the old verses preserved in the Psalm of Habakkuk.⁹⁷

Was not your wrath against River, Yahweh,⁹⁸
 Your anger against River,
 Your ire against Sea,
 When you drove your horses,
 The chariot⁹⁹ of your salvation?

These verses stand much closer to the myth of Yamm/Nahar and the Cloud Rider than those in Psalm 114.¹⁰⁰ But they also reveal how easily the Reed Sea and the Jordan could merge in ritual reenactment in the cult at Gilgal.

The cultic repetition of the crossing of River-Sea in the cultus of early Israel at Gilgal had a reflex effect on the historical traditions of the Exodus. Both the old mythic pattern of Canaan and the ritual crossing of the Jordan on dry ground reshaped the later story of the episode of the sea. The way is prepared for the shift of interest from Yahweh's defeat of the Egyptians, primary in Exodus 15, to interest in the march of the redeemed, the making of a way through the sea on dry ground.

The absence in Exodus 15 of the motifs of the splitting (*bq^c*)¹⁰¹ of

endings. In support of such a mixing Dahood (*Psalms*, III, 137) cites *'dtw* (*KAI*, 6, 2); however, the *waw* is the 3.m.s suffix on a plural noun (cf. *'addōnay*). For similar reasons we must reject Dahood's postulation of a third m.s. suffix written *y* which he compares with Phoenician, forgetting apparently that the Phoenician suffix written *-y* stands for *-iyū*, *ēyū*, etc., which in Hebrew orthography would be written *-yw*. The explanation of the bizarre *hw²/hy²* confusion in the Pentateuch must be similarly explained as owing to the falling together of *waw* and *yōd* in a form which looked like *waw* to a copyist a century or so later when an old (and excellent) manuscript became the basis of the Rabbinic recension (i.e., the *textus receptus*) of the Pentateuch.

97. The basic study is still that of W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," pp. 1-18.

98. We read:

'm bnhr-m yhwh
'm bnhr-m 'pk
'm bym 'brtk

'm or *h* should be leveled through. Note the first colon in the Old Greek. Albright first recognized the enclitic *-m* with *nahar*.

99. Read the singular with Greek *ἵππασία*. There is no reason to introduce a verb (vs. Albright); the bicolon counts 7/7 in syllables (1:1) though it fits badly in a stress-metrical scansion (3:3); *rk^b* can mean both "to drive horses and chariot" or "to ride a horse."

100. See also the enthronement hymn, Psalm 93:1-5, where *nēhārōt/maym rabbīm/mišbērē-yām* stand in parallel.

101. Cf. Ps. 78:13; Exod. 14:16, 21; Neh. 9:11; cf. Ps. 74:14f.

Sea, of Israel's walking through the sea, and of the walls of water is a mark of its high antiquity. The Song of the Sea alone of the traditions of the Exodus escaped this shaping by rite and preserved an older version of the event. The poet knew only of a storm at sea and the sinking into the sea of the Egyptians. To be sure, the elements of myth which created the Gilgal rites were present in early Israel, and the pattern of the myth makes itself felt more fully in the second portion of the hymn. One must conclude, however, that influence of the mythic pattern is extraordinarily restrained in Part I, a restraint which can be due only to the force of historical impulses in Israel's earliest Epic traditions.

Part II of the Song of the Sea preserves materials of special interest to the historian of tradition. Two passages require discussion.

While your people passed over, Yahweh
While your people passed over whom you created . . .
(Exodus 15: 16b)

What does this couplet mean? The first strophe of this section described Yahweh's leading of Israel through the wilderness. Israel is brought to the "holy encampment" of Yahweh. Conceivably this expression might apply to a shrine in Sinai or Qadesh. Much more likely, in view of the cultic function of the hymn, is the battle encampment of Shittim, that is, the traditional site from which Israel launched her conquest across Jordan and where the procession of the Ark began in the early traditions of Joshua.¹⁰² The strophe which the above couplet concludes describes the dread which overwhelmed the enemy in the land as Israel was poised for Holy War. In effect Yahweh had already defeated the enemy in accord with the ideology of Holy War. In this context we must certainly understand the words of the couplet to refer to the crossing of the river, to the "passing over" into the land through Jordan: "from Shittim to Gilgal" (Micah 6:5).

You brought them, you planted them
In the mount of your possession,
The dais of your throne
Which you made, Yahweh,

102. It is in the same encampment in the plains of Moab that Moses, according to Deuteronomistic lore, preached the great sermons that make up the Book of Deuteronomy.

The sanctuary, Yahweh,
Which your hands created.

Yahweh will reign
Forever and ever.

(Exodus 15: 17f.)

We stressed above the formulaic character of the triplet (verse 17). Yahweh led his people into the land of which he took possession¹⁰³ and to his shrine. Yahweh built his own sanctuary.¹⁰⁴ This contrasts with Baʿl's arrangements to build a temple in which to be enthroned. Baʿl had to seek the consent of the divine council chaired by ʿEl, and the actual building is done by the craftsman of the gods. Still Baʿl, too, could say that he had built a temple of silver and gold.¹⁰⁵ We recognize here the old mythic pattern which the following themes of the Song of the Sea preserve:

(1) the combat of the Divine Warrior and his victory at the Sea, (2) the building of a sanctuary on the "mount of possession" won in battle, and (3) the god's manifestation of "eternal" kingship.

It is appropriate to ask what sanctuary is referred to in verse 17. The "mountain of inheritance" is often a general term referring to the special land of the god; here we judge it to refer to the hill-country of Canaan as Yahweh's special possession. The actual shrine referred to in the original composition is at once the earthly sanctuary and the "cosmic" mountain of which the earthly sanctuary is the duplicate and local manifestation—built, incidentally, by the god's worshippers.¹⁰⁶ In this case, it may be proper to say the poet had in mind the sanctuary of Gilgal. One may complain that Gilgal was not on a high mountain and that its tent-shrine and twelve stelae were unprepossessing. Such matters were no problem to the ancient Canaanite or Israelite. A temple precinct in Sidon was called "the high heavens," *šamēm rōmīm!*¹⁰⁷ A temple mound or platform constituted the counter-

103. This is the old force of the term *naḥālā*. Compare also Baʿl's "mount of victory," *gr iʿit*, and the formula cited in note 42 above.

104. Cf. Psalm 78:69: Yahweh builds his temple in the likeness of that in the height (of heaven), reading *kmrm*.

105. See above, note 16.

106. See Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*, Harvard Semitic Monographs (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1972).

107. See Sakkunyaton *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. evan.*, I.10.9 (ed. K. Mras); O. Eissfeldt, "Schamemrumim 'Hoher Himmel,' ein Stadtteil von Gross-Sidon," in *KS* (Eissfeldt), II, 122–126; and Ugaritic Text RS 24.252 (a title of ʿAnat: *baʿlat šamēmi rāmīma*); as well as in the inscription of Bodʿaštart.

part of the cosmic mountain. It should be remembered also that Mount Zion itself was a low hillock overshadowed by the towering heights of the Mount of Olives; yet it was a mountain which "at the end of days . . . shall be established as the top of the mountains/and shall be exalted above the hills."¹⁰⁸ In the Apocalypse, "Zion" has become a name of heaven. In short, the language of verse 17 could apply to any Yahwistic sanctuary. Certainly, in later times the verse was assumed to apply to the temple "mount" in Jerusalem.

Study of the mythic pattern of Bronze Age Canaan and the history of traditions of the episode at the Reed Sea in Israel's literature reveal a dialectic in the evolution of Israelite religion and religious institutions. Israel's religion in its beginning stood in a clear line of continuity with the mythopoeic patterns of West Semitic, especially Canaanite myth.¹⁰⁹ Yet its religion did emerge from the old matrix, and its institutions were transformed by the impact of formative historical events and their interpretation by elements of what we may call "Proto-Israel" which came together in the days of Moses and in the era of the Conquest. In any case, the rites and religious ethos of the days of the league were fundamentally shaped by celebration of historical events, preserved in Israelite memory, which were conceived as acts of Yahweh creating a new community. The reenactment of primordial events of cosmogonic myth gave way to festivals reenacting epic events in Israel's past, thus renewing her life as a historical community. This was the character of the covenant renewal festivals of the league. This was the context of the composition of the Song of the Sea. Israel's early religious evolution was neither simple nor unilinear. It will not do to describe the process as a progressive historicizing of myth. Even in Hegel's dialectic, the movement from the natural to the historical was complex, and the modern historian presumably permits no metaphysical principle to motivate the movement from natural to historical consciousness. The Canaanite mythic pattern is not the core of Israel's epic of Exodus and Conquest. On the other hand, it is equally unsatisfactory to posit a radical break between Israel's mythological and cultic past and the historical cultus of the league. The power of the mythic pattern was enormous. The Song of the Sea reveals this power as mythological

108. Mic. 4:1 = Isa. 2:2.

109. At the present stage of our knowledge of Amorite religion, we can say little of its distinctiveness from Canaanite religion. No doubt Israel did inherit elements of Amorite myth and rite.

themes shape its mode of presenting epic memories. It is proper to speak of this counterforce as the tendency to mythologize historical episodes to reveal their transcendent meaning. The history of the Exodus-Conquest theme illustrates this dialectic well.

With the institution of kingship in Israel and the temple cultus, both institutions of Canaanite origin, the old myths became resurgent. In hymns like Psalms 29, 93, and 89B (verses 6–19), the myths of creation appear, unsullied by historicizing, for example, by reference to the Epic theme of the victory at the Reed Sea. With the close of the monarchy and the end of classical (pre-Exilic) prophecy, the older theologies of history which interpreted Epic themes, the Yahwistic, Deuteronomic, and Priestly, give way to a new synthesis of mythic, royal ideological, and literary forms (now freed from their older cultic functions) and the Prophetic tradition that harked back to the league. The Song of the Arm of Yahweh in Isaiah 51 is a superb example of this new synthesis, in which the old Exodus is described in terms of the Creation myth and in turn becomes the archetype of a new Exodus. The old Songs of the Wars of Yahweh were transformed into descriptions of eschatological battle (Isaiah 34; 63). The ancient royal festival became a future “Messianic banquet” (Isaiah 55:1–3). At the feast on the mountain, Death (Môt) was to be “swallowed up” forever (Isaiah 25:6–8). In Second Isaiah, Third Isaiah, Second Zechariah, Isaiah 24–27, and the eschatological visions of Ezekiel, we detect tendencies which will produce the Apocalyptic in which historical and mythological elements are combined in a new tension and take on a new life.

III

League and Kingdom

7 *Yahweh and Baʿl*

The Theophany of Baʿl

The relationships and continuities between Yahweh, god of Israel, and Canaanite ʿĒl and his mythology have been much elaborated in the preceding pages. Yahwism also owes a debt to the myths of Baʿl. In the earliest poetic sources the language depicting Yahweh as divine warrior manifest is borrowed almost directly from Canaanite descriptions of the theophany of Baʿl as storm god. As a matter of fact, any discussion of the language of theophany in early Israel must begin with an examination of the Canaanite lore.¹

(1) Baʿl, who on one occasion is called “[the god] Haddu, lord of the Stormcloud” or “lord of the Nimbus,”² appears enthroned on his (newly-won) mountain in an important text:³

bʿl. yṭb. kṭbt. ḡr.
hd. r[ʿy] (2) k mdb.
btk. ḡrh. ʿil ṣpn.
b[m] (3) ḡr. tlʿiyt.

Baʿl sits enthroned, (his) mountain like a dais,
Haddu the shepherd, like the Flood dragon,⁴

1. Jörg Jeremias in his excellent study, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung*. Wissenschaftlich Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 10 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), draws upon Mesopotamian and (less fully) Canaanite descriptions of the theophany of the storm god. Nevertheless, he does not examine the *form* of Baʿl’s theophany in the mythic cycle from Ugarit, the starting point in our view for the discussion of the early biblical theophany. He does not treat the transformation of the Canaanite *Gattung* in the early Israelite context. Jeremias therefore does not recognize (as does Westermann) the primary connections of the battle with/at the sea with the theophanic form. Cf. E. Jenni, “‘Kommen’ im theologischen Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments,” in *Wort-Gebot-Glaube* [Eichrodt Festschrift], ed. J. J. Stamm and E. Jenni (Zürich, Zwingli Verlag, 1970), pp. 251–261.

2. CTA, 10.2.33 [ʿil.]hd. dʿnn[.]. On the meaning of ʿanan, see the discussion below.

3. *Ugaritica* V, 3 (RS 24.245). See the recent treatments of L. R. Fisher and F. B. Knutson, “An Enthronement Ritual at Ugarit,” *JNES*, 28 (1969), 157–167; J. C. de Moor, “Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra.I,” *Ugaritica-Forschungen*, 1, (1969), 180–183.

4. Compare Psalm 29:10 *yahwē lammabbūl yāšab*, “Yahweh sits enthroned on the Flooddragon,” and Job 36:30: “Behold ʿĒl spreads his bright clouds/his throne is on

In the midst of his mount, Divine Şapōn,
On the mount of (his) victory.

The appearance of the victorious warrior is described as follows:

šb't. brqm [yr]
ṭmnt. 'iṣr r't.
'š brq y[mn]

Seven lightning bolts he casts,
Eight magazines of thunder;
He brandishes a spear of lightning.⁵

Fisher calls attention to the identity of this description with iconographic representations of Ba'1 and the Syrian wargod.⁶

The cultic background of the scene is evidently the return of the god from victory over Yamm or the flood-dragon, and his subsequent sitting in state on his throne, manifesting himself as lord of the storm. The theophany can be said to take place in his temple on Mount Şapōn, and at the same time in the ritual in his earthly temple on its platform or dais representing the Divine Şapōn. Unhappily, the tablet is too damaged to make out the next episode; Ba'1 appears to be in the midst of his harem.

(2) In a closely related text,⁷ after 'El gives the decree for the building of Ba'1's temple on Şapōn, Lady Asherah praises 'El's wise decision and says:

(68) wn 'ap. 'dn. mṛrh (69) b'1.
y'dn. 'dn. ṭr⁸ bglṭ

the roots of Sea." For 'ār, "bright cloud," cf. Job 37:11, 15 and Ugar. 'ār in the epithet *pdry bt 'ar*, "Misty, daughter of Bright Cloud," Note the parallel phrase in v. 29 using *prš* with 'āb. "cloud-mass." Cf. M. Pope, *Job*, (New York, Doubleday, 1965), p. 237. "Roots of Sea" are the primordial mountains. Compare Ps. 46:3, and the "teats of Tiamat" used of mountains in *Enūma eliš* (Tablet 5). On the name *pdry*, "misty," see J. T. Milik, "Giobbe 38, 28 in siro-palestinese e la dea ugaritica *Pdry bt ar*," *Revista biblica*, 3 (1958), 252-254. The second colon is highly elliptical. Apparently Ba'1's mountain is compared with a dais, and with the (back of the) dragon.

5. The last line is filled out with the denominative verb *ymn*, "to do with the right hand," used both in Hebrew and at Ugarit (cf. *CTA*, 23.37f.) of throwing or shooting darts. It stands with *yr* to make a formulaic pair in Ugaritic. The word *r't*. *ra'attu* < *ra'adu* occasions no difficulty.

6. Fisher and Knutson, "An Enthronement Ritual at Ugarit," p. 159, n. 10. Compare also *ANEP*, Nos. 501, 537 as well as 490.

7. *CTA*, 4.5.68-71.

8. Gaster and Driver have read *trt*. I am inclined to read *ṭr* only which stands closer to the cuneiform, and which may occur in *Ugaritica* V, 3.8/[*hdj*] *il ṭr*. "Haddu, god of moisture" (?). The root is *ṭry*.

(70) w<y>tn. qlh. bʿrpt
 (71)šrh. lʿarš. brqm

Behold now, Baʿl has appointed his rains;
 He has appointed the wet and snowy season.
 He has thundered in the stormclouds,
 He has blazed his lightning bolts to the earth.

(3) In a parallel text, Baʿl's theophany coincides with the opening of a window by the craftsman god in Baʿl's new temple.⁹

(29) qlh. qdš[.] b[ʿl. y]tn
 (30) yṭny. bʿl. š[ʿat. š]pth
 (31) qlh. q[dš ypr]r¹⁰ ʿarš

(32), [bgʿrth]¹¹ ḡrm. ṭḡšn
 (33) rḡq [] (34) qdm ym
 bmt. ʿa[rš] (35) ṭṭn.

Baʿl gives forth his holy voice,
 Baʿl repeats the utterance of his lips,
 His holy voice [shatters] the earth.

[At his roar] the mountains quake,
 Afar [] before Sea,
 The highplaces of the earth shake.

(4) In the mixed tradition preserved at Ugarit, both Baʿl and his consort ʿAnat are credited with killing the seven-headed dragon.¹² Both also are credited with victorious battles over Yamm-Nahar. Evidently we have in each case “alloforms” of the basic cosmogonic myth. Important for present purposes is the “cosmogonic formula” found in Text 5.¹³

9. *CTA*, 4.7.29–35.

10. Compare Isa. 24:19 and Ps. 74:13 for *pr* used in similar contexts (parallel to *mt*, used of the earth in Isa. 24:19). Of course, the reconstruction is speculative.

11. For the reconstruction, compare Ps. 18:16; Job 26:11; and Isa. 66:15. *gʿr* appears at Ugarit with the meaning “roar.”

12. ʿAnat defeats the dragon (and Yamm among others), in *CTA*, 3.3.35–43. The description of Baʿl killing the dragon (*tnn*) is found in *PRU*, II.1.1 and in the text discussed below.

13. *CTA*, 5.1.1–5.

kī timḥaṣ lôtāna baṭna barīḥa	1 (11)
takalliyu ¹⁴ baṭna ʿaḳalatāna	1 (11)
šilyaṭa dī šabʿatiriʾašīma	1 (11)
tiṭkaḥū titrapū šamūma ¹⁵	1 (9)
ka-ri <ka> sī ʾipādika	1 (8)

When¹⁶ you (Baʿl)¹⁷ smote Lôtan the primeval dragon,
 Destroyed the coiled serpent,
 Tyrant (Šilyaṭ) of the seven heads,

(Then) the heavens withered (and) drooped
 Like the loops of your garment.

The collapse of the cosmos in response to the battle of the divine warrior is well known in biblical lore. A particularly good example is found in the “Song of the War of Yahweh” in Isaiah 34. After the announcement of the ban (*ḥérem*) on all nations and their armies, we read:

The heavens roll up like a scroll,
 And all their hosts languish,
 As the vine leaf withers,
 As the fig droops.

An equally useful example is found in Habakkuk 3:5-12, cited above, describing the march of the divine warrior, before whom mountains shatter and earth shakes.

(5) Baʿl as the divine warrior and thunderer was well known also in Egypt.¹⁸ Interesting is a comparison of the Pharaoh Akhenaton to Baʿl in a letter from Abimilki of Tyre written to his suzerain by an Egyptian scribe.¹⁹

14. The preservation of the *yod* assures us that the address is 2. person, masculine, that is, to Baʿl. The feminine form would be *takallī* (< **takalliyi*) or *takallīna*.

15. On this vocalization, see *Ugaritica* V, p. 352.

16. The characteristic “When . . . then” formula of cosmogonies is unmistakable. {?}. See note 14 above and Miss Herdner’s comment, *CTA*, p. 32, n. 1.

18. See the collection of these materials in *BAV*, pp. 482-485; and R. Stadelmann, *Syrisch-palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten* (Leiden, Brill, 1967).

19. *EA*, 147.13-15. On the Egyptian scribe, see W. F. Albright, “The Amarna Letters,” in *ANET*, p. 484, n. 2.

... ša iddin rigmašu ina šamē
 kīma Addi u tarkub gabbi
 māti ištu rigmašu

... who utters his (battle) cry in the heavens,
 like Haddu so that the whole land
 shakes at his cry.

Several passages, while not describing directly the epiphany of the stormgod, nevertheless are useful in revealing the two-sidedness of Baʿl's role of stormgod; on the one hand, the dread warrior before whom all nature blanches and dies, on the other hand, the god whose sway brings the fructifying rain which makes the desert bloom.

(6) In the Aqhat Epic a drought is depicted as follows:

šb^c. šnt(43)yšrk bʿl.
 ṭmn. rkb (44) ʿrpt.
 bl. ṭl. bl rbb
 (45) bl. š^c. thmtm.
 bl. (46) ṭbn. ql. bʿl.

Seven years Baʿl failed,
 Eight the Cloud Rider;
 No dew nor shower,
 No surging of the double-deep,
 Nor goodly sound of Baʿl's voice.²⁰

(7) This passage may be compared to the vision of ʿEl in which Baʿl's coming to life is revealed:

šamūma šamna tamaṭṭirūna
 naḥalūma talikū nubta-mi

The heavens are raining oil,
 The wādīs run with mead.²¹

(8) Alongside these Canaanite traditions of the stormgod may be put the Canaanite hymn preserved in the Psalter, namely Psalm 29. H. L. Ginsberg in 1936 drew up conclusive evidence that Psalm 29 is

20. *CTA*, 19.1.42-46.

21. *CTA*, 6.3.6f., 12f.

an ancient Baʿl hymn,²² only slightly modified for use in the early cultus of Yahweh.²³ Further study has steadily added confirmatory detail. In its Israelite form it is no later than tenth century B.C. and probably was borrowed in Solomonic times. The hymn is introduced by a classic "Address to the Divine Council" in repetitive, imperative plurals²⁴ (verses 1f.); the theophany of the storm god follows (verse 9), and with it the convulsions and travail of sea and mountain, forest and creature (verses 3-9b), and finally the appearance of the god as victor and king enthroned in his temple (verses 9c f.). The text is reconstructed in Canaanite orthography in use in Israel until the end of the empire.

(v. 1)	הב ליהו בנ אלם ²⁵	b:b (5:4 < 4:4) ²⁶	ab:cd
	הב ליהו כבד ועו	b:b (5:4 < 4:4)	ab:ef
(v. 2)	הב ליהו כבד שממ ²⁷	b:b (5:4 < 4:4)	ab:eg
	השתחו ליהוה בהדרת ²⁸ קדש ²⁹	b:b (7:6 < 6:6)	

22. H. L. Ginsberg, *Ktby 'wgryt* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem, The Bialik Foundation, 1936), pp. 129ff. See also Gaster's treatment, "Psalm 29," *JQR*, 37 (1946-47), 55ff.; and the writer's early treatment, "Notes on a Canaanite Psalm in the Old Testament," *BASOR*, 117 (1950), 19ff. Recently, fresh interest has been directed at the psalm: for discussion and references, see M. Dahood, *Psalms*, I, 174-178; H. Strauss, "Zur Auslegung von Ps. 29 auf dem Hintergrund seiner kanaanäischen Bezüge," *ZAW*, 72 (1960), 101-107.

23. The revisions would include the substitution of "Yahweh" for "Baʿl" (which occasionally disturbs the meter slightly), and particularly the closing verse (v. 11). Language in part and orthography throughout, of course, have undergone "modernizing" revision. It is interesting to compare the thorough revision of old formulae in Psalm 96 (e.g., *mišpēhōt 'ammim* for *bēnē 'ēlim*).

24. On the form in question, see F. M. Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274-277 (which deals chiefly with the revival of the form); and below.

25. D. N. Freedman is probably correct in reading here 'Eli-m, "El" with the enclitic, as often at Ugarit. See "Archaic Forms of Early Hebrew Poetry," p. 104f.

26. The syllable counts given are based on (1) the Israelite adaptation with the divine name *Yahwē*, and (2) the putative Canaanite original with the divine name *Baʿl* or, perhaps, *Hadd*.

27. The Canaanite suffix may have been *-hū* at the time of the composition of the poem. This writing is used as late as the tenth-century Byblus inscriptions. In Israel, however, the suffix was *-ū* or *ō*, zero in the orthography of the tenth-century text from Gezer.

28. As pointed out by the writer in 1950, *hdt* here probably means "apparition," as in the KRT text, *CTA*, 14.3.155, where it is in parallelism with *hulumu*, "vision," "dream." This suggestion has been generally accepted. Recently, H. Donner, "Ugaritismen in der Psalmenforschung," *ZAW*, 79 (1967), 331ff., has raised objections against the meaning "appearance," "theophany" in the KRT text, contending that strict paral-

(v. 3)	אל כבוד ³⁰ הרעם ³¹	b (5)
	קל יהו על ³² מים	b (6 < 5)
	יהו על מים רבם	b (6 < 5)

lelism requires a translation, "Traumgesicht, Vision." I can see no reason, however, for such mechanically strict parallelism. In the vision or incubation of KRT (Kirta), 'El descends and draws near (14.1.35ff.) before addressing and instructing KRT. Surely such is appropriately described as a divine "apparition," whether seen in a dream or in the waking state: *-hdrt qdš* is a frozen expression in classical Hebrew, its several occurrences all dependent on the phrase in Psalm 29 (Ps. 96:9, 1 Chron. 16:29 and probably 2 Chron. 20:21 [the last-mentioned derives from a text in disarray and creates special problems]). This suggests that we are dealing with a special idiom. *hdrt* in Prov. 14:28, and the West Semitic loan word in Egyptian *hdrt*, both seem to mean "ornament," byforms merely of *hādār* and *héder*. The expression *bhdrt qdš*, if translated in traditional fashion: "in the beauty of holiness," "in holy finery," or "im heiligen Schmuck," does not make good sense, much less good poetry. It is the god Yahweh who appears in holiness, not the worshippers who fall down before him "in fine garments." The reading *qdšw* witnessed to by G (*en aulē hagia autou*) and Sy (*hdrt' d-qwdšh*) appears therefore to be the superior reading. In the tenth century, the suffix would have been *zero* in the orthography. It is not impossible that *bēhadrat qodšō* should be taken to mean, "in (the presence of) his holy splendor." It is easier, however, to look to the two old contexts of *hdrt*, in KRT and in Psalm 29, and find a meaning for *hdrt* which satisfies the requirements of both— if such a meaning can be found. The meaning "apparition" or "revelation" in fact fulfils such requirements. Cf. Strauss, "Zur Auslagung von Ps 29," p. 93.

29. Reading *qodšō*; see note 28.

30. Here and in v. 9 *kābōd* appears to be a technical term, namely the refulgent and radiant aureole which surrounds the deity in his manifestations or theophanies. The original image giving rise to this technical usage is not clear. Usually it is taken to be a concretizing or objectivization (hypostatization) of the abstract "majesty," "glory." Often it is compared with Akk. *melemmu*, *melammu* (a Sumerian loan word) applied generally to the aureole of gods, demons, and kings. Apparently the term *melammu* originally was used of the sparkling headgear or mask worn by a god (see A. L. Oppenheim, "Akkadian *pu(u)h(t)u* and *melammu*," *JAO*S, 63 [1943], 31–34). Alternately, *kābōd* can be taken to have originated in the dark but fiery storm cloud especially associated with the theophany of the storm god. In this case, *kābōd* can be taken as a substantive derived from such a designation as *'nn kbd*, "storm cloud." Cf. Isa. 30:27, *wkbd mš'h*, "a cloud of smoke." In fact, a like expression appears in Exodus 19:16 (vocalized by the Massoretes *'ānān kābēd*), applied to Yahweh's theophanic cloud which descended on the mount in Elohistic tradition, parallel to *'ānān* (Exod. 34:5) and *kābōd* (Exod. 33:18, 22) in Yahwistic tradition, the last-mentioned in the form *kēbōd Yahwē* taken up as an archaism in Priestly tradition (Exod. 16:10; 40:34f.; etc.). The Priestly source distinguished carefully between the *'ānān* and the *kābōd*, but this may be secondary, a harmonizing conflation of parallel traditions.

31. We have reversed the first and second colon of v. 3 to fit the usual patterns of repetition; it would be equally possible to reverse the second and third colon. In case of verse written stichometrically (as is often the case at Qumrān) such displacements are not infrequent.

32. Perhaps to be vocalized *'alē, metri causa*.

(v. 4)	קל יהו בכח קל יהו בהדר	b:b (5:6 < 4:5)
(v. 5)	קל יהו ³³ <שב ^ר ארום	1 (9 < 8)
	ישבר יהו ארוז לבנן	b:b (5:5 < 4:5)
(v. 6)	ירקדם ³⁴ כמ עגל לבנן	1 (9)
	ושרין כמ בנ ראמם	1 (9)
(v. 7)	קל יהו חצב להבת אש	1 (8 < 7)
(v. 9b)	>קל יהו <יחסף ³⁶ יערת ³⁵	1 (8 < 7)
(v. 8)	קל יהו יחל מדבר	1 (7 < 6)
	יחל יהו מדבר קדש ³⁷	1 (7 < 6)
(v. 9a)	יהו יחלל אילת ³⁸ { }	1 (8 < 7)
	בהכל ³⁹ אמר ⁴⁰ כבד ⁴¹	1 (8)

33. The second colon is quite short. We suggest here the patterning $yšbr . . . yšbr$ like $yhl . . . yhl$ in v. 8. The conjunction before the second $yšbr$ is to be deleted.

34. The verb with enclitic $mēm$ as recognized by H. L. Ginsberg. Again the conjunction is probably not original.

35. As generally recognized, $wyḥšp y'rwt$ is a fragment in v. 9b, no doubt arising in a haplography, a very easy scribal error in repetitive material. Verse 7 also is without a parallel colon or cola; we thus have combined the two cola filling out the second with $ql yhw$ to achieve metrical symmetry. However, much more of the poem may be lost and hence not recoverable. Compare here Strauss, "Zur Auslegung von Ps 29," p. 91.

36. We read $yḥsp$ for $yḥšp$ with Ugaritic $ḥsp$ and Arabic $ḥasupa$, both meaning "to pour water," "drench" (with Strauss). The root is found also in Isa. 30:14 and Hag. 2:16.

37. As long ago suggested, $mḏbr qdš$ must be taken here as the Syrian desert, the $mḏbr qdš$ of CTA, 23.65, to fit with the other northern placenames, Lebanon and Sirion (Antilebanon).

38. $qōl$ is to be dropped as a so-called vertical dittography. The colon is full long with $qōl$ omitted. The symmetry of seven repetitions of the expression $qōl yahwē$ is preserved by the insertion in v. 9b (see n. 35).

39. The colon as it stands makes no sense; $kullō$ is prosaic in any case; the colon also is metrically impossible. We should reconstruct $bēhēkālō 'āmōr kābōd. klw$ is taken to be a dittography, $'mr$ is vocalized as the stative $qatula, 'amur > 'āmōr$, in the archaic meaning "to see," stative-passive, "to appear." The latter is familiar from the Canaanite name: $a-mur-ḏba'l$ (PTU, p. 320 and references) $/ 'amur-ba'l/$. "Ba'l is seen," better "Ba'l appeared." On Hebrew $'mr$, "to see," see M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography I," *Biblica*, 44 (1963), 295f. In Psalm 29:9 he reads $'ōmer kābōd$, "vision of the Glorious One," and the colon, "while in his temple -- all of it, a vision of the Glorious One." I find this rendering awkward and prosaic as well as metrically impossible.

40. See n. 39. The $qatula$ form is quite common also in Amorite names. Cf. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), pp. 92ff.; I. J. Gelb, "La lingua degli Amoriti," *Atti Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, 8, *Rendiconti. Classe di Scienze, storiche e filologiche*, 12 (1958), p. 155 § 3.2.5.4.

41. The pronominal suffix of $hēkālō$ may be treated as a "double-duty" suffix so that we need not read $kēbōdō$.

יהוה למבול ישב⁴³ 1 (7 < 6)
 ישב יהוה מלך לעולם []⁴⁴ 1 (8 < 7)

- v. 1 Ascribe to Yahweh, O sons of 'Ēl,
 Ascribe to Yahweh glory and might;
 Ascribe to Yahweh the glory due his name.

Fall down before Yahweh who appears in holiness!

The god of the Glory thunders,
 The voice of Yahweh is on the Waters,
 Yahweh is upon the Deep Waters.

The voice of Yahweh is mighty; the voice of Yahweh is majestic.
 The voice of Yahweh splinters the cedars;
 Yahweh splinters the cedars of Lebanon.

He makes Lebanon dance like a bullcalf,
 Sirion like a young buffalo.

The voice of Yahweh strikes with flaming fire,
 < The voice of Yahweh > drenches the forests.

The voice of Yahweh makes the desert writhe;
 Yahweh makes the Holy Desert to writhe;
 Yahweh makes the hinds to writhe (that is, calve).

In his temple (his) Glory appears!
 Yahweh sits enthroned on the Flooddragon;
 Yahweh is enthroned, king forever.

From the several texts cited, two patterns or genres can be discerned either in separate or mixed form. The first pattern (1) is the march of the Divine Warrior to battle, bearing his terrible weapons, the thunderbolt and the winds. He drives his fiery cloud-chariot against his enemy. His wrath is reflected in all nature. Mountains shatter; the heavens

42. On *mabbūl*. see W. F. Albright, "The Predeuteronomic Primeval," *JBL*, 58 (1939), 98 and the references cited there.

43. The idiom *yšb/yṯb l-*, "to sit enthroned," is typical of Canaanite diction where normally Hebrew prefers *yšb 'l* (Albright). Compare the text *Ugaritica* V, 3 discussed above, and nn. 3, 4.

44. The final bicolon appears to be an Israelite addition.

collapse at his glance. A terrible slaughter is appointed. All nature wilts and languishes. In the foreground is the cosmogonic struggle in which chaos—Yamm or Lôtān—is defeated.⁴⁵

The second pattern (2), and the most frequent, is the coming of the Divine Warrior from battle to his new temple on his newly-won mount.⁴⁶ In the background is his victory over Sea or the flood-dragon, though it is often alluded to, especially in his being enthroned on the Flood. Primary is his manifestation as Victor and King in the storm. The roar of his voice awakens nature. The appearance of his radiant storm cloud is both awesome and fructifying. His rule is manifest in the fertility of the drenched earth, of seed and womb. The mountains dance before the lord of life and all the trees clap their hands.⁴⁷

These related genres or themes are sometimes mixed, especially in the theophany proper. The storm god, whether attacking his enemy or thundering from his temple-mount, is terrifying. While “the rain of Ba’l is sweet to the earth,”⁴⁸ and one may speak of his “goodly voice,” nevertheless, the dancing of the mountains, the writhing of the desert, and the spears of lightning cast to earth are also manifestations of numinous power. Each storm, each epiphany of Ba’l, is a recapitulation of his victory over Sea. Thus in Psalm 29, in the central theophany, the “voice” of the storm god is “on the Waters,” or makes “the highplaces of the earth shake,” as well as making “the heavens rain oil, the wādīs run with mead.”

The Storm Theophany in the Bible

In hymnic descriptions of the theophany of Yahweh we find these same patterns and motifs. (Otherwise the Canaanite hymn, Psalm 29, would hardly have been accommodated to the cult.) The language

45. See especially the passages under headings (4); cf. (5).

46. The best description of “his newly-won mount” is found in *CTA*, 3.3.26ff.

batōk ġuriya ’īli šapāna
ba-quḏši ba-ġūri naḥlatiya
ba-nu’mi bagib’i tal’iyati

In the midst of my mount, Divine Šapān,
In the holy mount of which I took possession,
In the lovely height of (my) victory.

Note the use of hendiadys in the last lines and the symmetry of the tricolon: 10:10:10.

47. See the passages under headings (1) to (3); cf. (6) through (8).

48. *CTA*, 3.3.7.

of theophany in early Israel was primarily language drawn from the theophany of Baʿl.

Hymns which fall into our first category, the march of the Divine Warrior to battle, convulsing nature by his wrath, have been treated at length above under the headings “The Divine Warrior” (chapter 5) and the “Song of the Sea” (chapter 6). They include virtually all of Israel’s oldest hymns and in most instances are fixed geographically and historically with the march of Conquest, sometimes including the event of the Reed Sea, regularly including the march from the southern mountains and the gift of the land. The Song in Exodus 15: 1–18 has been found to be the earliest as well as the fullest example. Other examples which include the event at the Reed Sea as part of the Conquest march are the Song of Habakkuk (Habakkuk 3: 3–15), Psalm 77: 15–20, and Psalm 114.⁴⁹ The poem underlying Judges 5: 4–5 and Psalm 68: 8–9; Psalm 68: 18; and Deuteronomy 33: 2f, 26–29 rehearse only the march from Sinai northward, the Conquest proper. The closing verses of the Blessing of Moses, while descriptive of the Conquest, also are strong with reminiscences of the storm god in their language:

- (v. 26) There is none like the god of Jeshurun,⁵⁰
 Who rides the heavens mightly,⁵¹
 Who gloriously rides the clouds.
- (v. 27) His (Jeshurun’s) refuge is the God of old;
 Under him are the arms of the Ancient One.⁵²
- He drove out the enemy before you;
 < Before you > he smashed < the foe >.⁵³
- (v. 28) Israel encamps in safety;
 Jacob dwells securely apart

49. Although special problems are involved, the materials in Numbers 23: 22–24; 24: 8–9 bear witness to the same tradition.

50. Detailed notes on this reconstruction of the text can be found in F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, “The Blessing of Moses,” *JBL*, 67 (1948), 191–210, esp. 209f.

51. See Cross and Freedman, “A Note on Deuteronomy 33: 26,” *BASOR*, 108 (1947), 6f., where we propose to read: *rkb šmym b’z rkbg’wt šqm*.

52. Note the juxtaposition of Baʿl epithets in v. 26 and ʿEl epithets in v. 27.

53. The fragmentary text is restored on the assumption that the second colon has suffered a haplography by homoioteleuton. Note the chiasmic pattern. Presumably *wy’mr* was secondarily added as a rubric.

ygrš ’yb mpnyk

<wšn’mpnyk> hšmd

Upon his land are grain and wine;
Yea, his heavens drip down dew.

- (v. 29) Blessed are you, O Israel,⁵⁴
A people who gained victory in Yahweh,
Whose shield is your help,
Whose sword is your glory.
Your enemies fawn upon you,
But you tread upon their backs.

One ancient fragment⁵⁵ containing the imagery of the storm-god theophany requires special comment: 2 Samuel 22:8–16 = Psalm 18:8–16. If it had historical ties they are no longer preserved. In verse 16 we find “the sources of the sea were exposed . . . at the blast of your nostrils,” and enemies are defeated in verse 15, but there is no sufficient reason to suppose that these are references to the Exodus-Conquest. At the same time, the context in which the fragment is placed, the succor of the king by the descent of Yahweh from his cosmic palace, appears not to be original. The psalmist drew on older sources and included only the storm theophany proper of the Divine Warrior:

- (v. 8) The earth quaked and shook;⁵⁶
The foundations of the mountains shuddered;
They quaked when his wrath waxed hot.
- (v. 9) Smoke rose⁵⁷ from⁵⁸ his nostrils,
And fire from his mouth devoured;
Coals flamed forth from him.

54. We have chosen arbitrarily one of the ancient variants conflated in this verse:

(1) šryk yšr'l

(2) yšr'l my kmwk

55. On the date of the psalm and the theophany within it, cf. Cross and Freedman, “A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18,” *JBL*, 72 (1953), 16–21.

56. For detailed discussion of the text, see Cross and Freedman, “A Royal Song of Thanksgiving,” pp. 23–26.

57. Verses 8 and 9 form two tricola, verse 13 an additional tricolon. Note also the sequence of the tenses in v. 9.: perfect, imperfect, perfect (without waw-consecutive), fitting the early use of *yaqtul*.

58. The preposition *b* is used with the archaic meaning “from” as also in vv. 14 and 16.

- (v. 10) He spread apart the heavens and descended,⁵⁹
A storm cloud under his feet.
- (v. 11) He rode a cherub and flew,
He soared on the wings of the wind.
- (v. 12) He set darkness round about him,
His pavilion is the raincloud.⁶⁰
- (v. 13) Cloud-banks were before him,⁶¹
Before him his clouds raced by,
Hail and coals of fire.
- (v. 14) From⁶² the heavens Yahweh thundered,
And 'Elyon gave forth his voice.
- (v. 15) He shot forth his arrows and scattered them,
Lightning-bolts he flashed and put them in panic.
- (v. 16) The sources of the sea were exposed;
The foundations of the world laid bare;
At your roar,⁶³ O Yahweh,
At the windy blast of your nostrils.

59. The meaning of this passage is explained by a similar passage in Isaiah 63:19, *lū' qāra'tā sāmāyim yāradtā mippānēkā hārīm nāzōllū*, "Truly you have torn open the heavens, you have come down; before you the mountains shook." The sense of the root *nr* here must be, "to spread out, to spread apart, to spread open (as curtains)."

60. *ḥašrat māyim* is the more difficult reading, and probably correct: *ḥeškat* in Psalm 18 apparently has been substituted under the influence of *hōšek* earlier in the verse. The word has been connected falsely with Akk. *ašāru*, Arab. *ḥašara*. It is etymologically related to Neo-Hebrew *ḥšth*, "sieve," and *ḥšr* which is used occasionally of clouds sifting or distilling water (cf. the Vulgate translation, *cribans*). Ugaritic *ḥtr* also fits into the picture, with the meaning "sieve" or the like. In the present context, the phrase must refer to the clouds as sieve-like containers from which the rain-water drops. Cf. the remarks of S. I. Feigin, "The Heavenly Sieve," *JNES*, 9 (1950), 40-43.

61. We read here (in pre-Exilic orthography):

עבי שחקם נגדה	1 (7)
נגדה עבו עברו	1 (7)
ברד וגחלי אש	1 (7)

mngh is a corruption of *ngdh*, *nigdō*, the initial *mēm* being due to dittography of the final *mēm* of the preceding word; the final *hē* is correct for the 3rd m.s. suffix in pre-Exilic times. The text of Samuel here has suffered haplography and been influenced by v. 9: *ghlm b'rw mmmw*.

62. See n. 58.

63. The root *g'r* may mean "roar" as well as "rebuke." Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms*, I, 110, citing H. G. May, "Some Cosmic Connotations of *Māyim Rabbīm*, 'Many Waters,'" *JBL*, 74 (1955), p. 17, n. 32. Both meanings are found in Ugaritic. See above, n. 11.

After Psalm 29, Psalm 89B (verses 6–19) is most characteristic of the second pattern, the coming of the Divine Warrior from the battle of creation to manifest his kingship.

- (6) Let heaven confess your wonders, Yahweh,⁶⁴
Your faithful deeds in the council of holy ones.
- (7) For who in the heavens compares with Yahweh?
Who may be likened to Yahweh among the gods?
- (8) The god terrible⁶⁵ in the council of the holy ones,
Great and dreadful above all around him,
- (9) Yahweh, god of hosts, who is like you?
Your might and your fidelity surround you,⁶⁶
- (10) You rule (enthroned) on the back⁶⁷ of Sea.
When his waves rise you calm them.
- (11) You crushed Rahab as a corpse,
With your mighty arm you despatched your enemy⁶⁸
- (12) The heavens are yours, yea, and earth is yours.
The world which you created.⁶⁹

64. Verse six introduces a new hymn. *Waw* at the beginning of the first colon is secondary. The form here is the address to the Divine Council as in Psalm 29:1f, requiring a jussive form. We reconstruct the first bicolon as follows:

יודו שמים פלאיך יהוה	1 (10)
אמנתך בקהל קדשם	1 (11)

We read *ywdw* for M *wywdw* with GVSy. *pl'yk*, plural, follows GVSy, and *'mntk* altered to *'mntyk* to conform, *'ap*, a particle often added to cola in the process of transmission is deleted *metri causa*.

65. Compare the epithet of *Attar* at Ugarit: *'ttr 'rz*, "Attar the Terrible."

66. Probably the text should read:

יהוה אלהי צבאת מי-כמך	1 (12)
חסנכה ואמתך סבכתך	1 (12)

The reconstruction is in pre-Exilic orthography. *hsnkh*, an old spelling now found in an inscription from Beit Lei, has given rise to the corrupt *hsyn yh*. See F. M. Cross, "The Cave Inscriptions from Khirbet Beit Lei," in *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century*, ed. J. A. Sanders (New York, Doubleday, 1970), 299–306.

67. We read *gwt*, *gēwat* "back," following for the most part M. Dahood, *Psalms* 1, 279; cf. M. Pope in *Job*, p. 69, on Job 9:8b; Psalm 29:10 above.

68. Read *'wybk*, singular.

69. *wml'h* is secondary, introduced to fill out the usual cliché; the *m* of *ywdtm* is enclitic with the 3. f. singular suffix.

לך שמים אף לך ארץ	1 (8)
תבל אתה יסדתם	1 (8)

- (13) Ṣapōn and Amanus⁷⁰ whom you created,
Tabor and Hermon shout joyfully in your name.
- (14) You possess a mighty arm;
Your hand is strong and your right hand high.
- (15) Righteousness and Justice are the dais of your throne,
Loyalty and Fidelity march before you.
- (16) Blessed are the people who know your clarion,
Who march, Yahweh, in the the light of your face.
- (17) In your name they rejoice all the day,
And in thy righteousness they are exalted.
- (18) For you are our⁷¹ glorious might;
In your favor our horn is exalted.
- (19) Indeed⁷² Yahweh is our ruler⁷³
The holy one of Israel our king.

The hymn begins with the address to the divine assembly to give praise to Yahweh and to acknowledge him the incomparable and terrible warrior (verses 6–9; compare Psalm 29: 1f.). The deity is then pictured as king, ruling enthroned on the Flood (verse 10; compare Psalm 29: 10). Allusion is made to his recent victory over the Flood dragon Rahab and to the subsequent mighty works of creation, the forming of Heaven and Earth, the mountains, and the divine giants (verses 12f.). Each of these evokes names of the old gods. He is portrayed as victor (verse 14); he is enthroned on the dais named Righteousness and Justice, words redolent of the Canaanite gods bearing abstract names: *Ṣidqu* and *Miṣōru*.⁷⁴ In the triumphal procession Loyalty and Fidelity are his vanguard; his people march bathed in the radiance of his nimbus (verses 15f.). The tableau shifts finally to the

70. We have discussed in chapter 2 the mountains *ḥanōn* and *ʿamn* (Hebrew *ʿmnh*) identifying the former with Amanus, the latter with Anti-Cassius. Either reading could be original here; I am inclined to think the corruption is most easily derived from *whmwn*. It has long been recognized that the two mountains (that is the old gods of Canaanite mythology) are to be found here. See most recently Dahood, *Psalms* II, 314, and references.

71. Read *ʿznw*. In the old Hebrew script *mēm* and *nūn* are regularly confused, especially in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. The shift from third to first person between v. 17 and v. 18 no doubt accounts for the scribal error.

72. The *lamed* is "emphatic *lamed*." See M. Dahood, *Psalms*, II, 315, and references.

73. Read *magān*, Phoenician *magōn*, "ruler," "commander." Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms*, I, 16f.; *Psalms*, II, 316.

74. Ugaritic *ṣdq* and *mšr*, Sakkunyaton's *suduk* and *misōr* (*Praep. evang.* I.10.14 [ed. K. Mras]). Cf. M. Astour, "Some New Divine Names from Ugarit," *JAOS*, 86 (1966), 282f.

victory feast in which the victorious warrior is acknowledged as ruler and king.

The parallel motifs in this hymn and in Psalm 29 are quite striking. Psalm 89B differs, however, in that in it imagery of the storm theophany is eschewed. Only in verse 16 is there a hint of it.

Another hymn in this category is Psalm 97:1–6:

Yahweh is king, let the earth rejoice,
 Let the many isles be glad.
 Bright cloud and Storm cloud surround him,
 Righteousness and Justice are the dais of his throne.
 Fire goes forth before him,
 And blazes about his back.⁷⁵
 His lightning bolts light up the world,
 The earth sees and writhes,
 The mountains are melted like wax
 Before the <Lord>Yahweh,⁷⁶
 Before the Lord of all the earth.⁷⁷

The heavens declare his righteousness,
 The peoples see his Glory.

Many other examples, early and late, lie at hand: Psalms 96 and 98 recount the rejoicing of nature before the Divine Judge; Psalm 93 is allied. Compare also Psalm 46:7f.; Psalm 50:1–6; Psalm 104:1–9, 31; and Job 26:11–13.

In the Canaanite and early Hebrew poetry thus far examined, texts have tended to fall into two categories, (1) the march of the Divine Warrior to battle, and (2) the return of the Divine Warrior to take up kingship. One sees behind these two types of texts an archaic mythic pattern:

- (a) The Divine Warrior goes forth to battle against chaos (Yamm, Leviathan, Môt).
- (b) Nature convulses (writhes) and languishes when the Warrior manifests his wrath.

75. On this translation of *šryw* (*šūrāw*), see M. Dahood, *Psalms*, II, 361.

76. Often *mlpny yhw* is deleted as a dittography. The textual witnesses which omit the phrase are late and few, and are better reckoned as having suffered secondary haplography. However, parallels (Ps. 114:7; Judg. 5:5=Ps. 68:9) and meter suggest that *mlpny yhw* is the torso of a colon. We have expanded with *'ādōn* which satisfies the meter, increases repetition, and provides the basis of a haplography.

77. Father Dahood has called attention to the Ugaritic epithet *'adn 'ilm rbm* (as well as the well-known *ba'l 'arši*). See *Ugaritica* V.6.1.

- (c) The warrior-god returns to take up kingship among the gods, and is enthroned on his mountain.
- (d) The Divine Warrior utters his voice from his temple, and Nature again responds. The heavens fertilize the earth, animals writhe in giving birth, and men and mountains whirl in dancing and festive glee.

In the earliest texts of Israel this mythic pattern is replaced by an epic pattern. Yahweh as Divine Warrior fought battles which are particularized in place and time. The first element of the mythic pattern is replaced by the wars of Exodus and Conquest, by the march from Egypt or Sinai in the old victory hymns. The substitution of the historical wars of Yahweh is not complete, however, and especially in the royal cultus and in sixth-century prophecy (properly proto-apocalyptic) the Exodus-Conquest motif often merges with that of the battle with Sea.

The conflation in question is a conflation in fact of the god of the Fathers, ʾEl the warrior at the head of his covenant-folk, who leads in “historical” battles, and Baʿl, the storm god, who defeats Sea in the cosmogonic struggle. It is a conflation of ʾEl, creator-progenitor, kinsman, and Baʿl-Haddu, dragon-killer and creator-cosmic ruler. In the victory hymns of the league the epic theme dominates; the mythic pattern, however, was never wholly suppressed or submerged.

The Revelation at Sinai

In Israel’s prose epic the primary locus and normative form of the theophany of Yahweh is found in the episode at Sinai. At first glance this appears surprising. In view of the theophanies in the old victory songs of Israel, one would suppose that the appearance of the Divine Warrior in battle at the sea, and/or marching to the Conquest of the land from the southern mountains, would provide the classic pattern of the theophany of the warrior god in Israel’s tradition. In this view, the first of our genres of theophany discussed above would be original, the theophany at Sinai a secondary construct. Although this view is held by a number of scholars who have studied theophanic forms, it is too simple and unitary. The theophanies of the old hymns of the wars of Yahweh were written from the point of view of the league cultus in a shrine in Canaan. This is the reason that the march of the Divine Warrior is at the same time a “coming” in some of these texts, a “bringing” in others. Necessarily this march of the god-manifest is

linked to the theophany of the god who returns to his cosmic mount and there reveals himself from his palace as the invincible king.

The revelation at Sinai falls into genre (2), and presumes a tradition in which Yahweh's cosmic mount and ancient sanctuary were in the southern mountains. In the theophanic tradition, Yahweh was *zē sīnay*, "lord of Sinai" (Judges 5:5). At Sinai he showed himself in stormy and fiery cloud as ruler and lawgiver.⁷⁸ Here, too, however, the complete pattern exists, much obscured by the Priestly ordering of Epic tradition. In the background is the victory over Egypt at the sea. The use of the language of the storm theophany begins, not at Sinai, but at the sea. This is true, not only of the old hymns, the Song of the Sea, Psalm 77:15–20, Psalm 114, and the Song of Habakkuk, but also of the Epic sources, J and E. In Exodus 13:21f., Yahwistic tradition records the appearance of "the column of cloud," *'mwd 'nn*, by day and of "the column of fire," *'mwd 'š*, by night, beginning at the border of Egypt. At the sea, according to the Yahwist in Exodus 14:24, "in the morning watch, Yahweh looked down on the Egyptian camp from the column of fire and cloud (*b'mwd 'š w'nn*) and threw the camp of the Egyptians into panic." In Elohist tradition in Exodus 14:19f. "the column of cloud" intervened, stationing itself between the battlecamps at the sea, being "a dark cloud."⁷⁹

To be sure, the language of the prose sources is secondary to the mythic and poetic imagery descriptive of the storm theophany. The Yahwist's expressions, *'mwd 'nn* and *'mwd 'š*, did not refer to separate phenomena, but the one "column of fire and cloud," *'mwd 'š w'nn* (Exodus 14:24).⁸⁰ The Elohist uses the term "column of cloud," *'mwd h'nn* or *'mwd 'nn* (Exodus 14:19; 33:10; and Deuteronomy 31:15), but varies his language with the parallel expression, *'b h'nn*, "cloud bank" (Exodus 19:9), *'nn kbd*, "storm cloud" (Exodus 19:16), and *'rpl*, "dark and fiery cloud, storm cloud" (Exodus 20:21).⁸¹ This last

78. Apparently this is the case in the difficult introduction to the Blessing of Moses, Deuteronomy 33:4f.

79. Both the Massoretic and Greek texts are corrupt here. Joshua 24:7, reflecting the same tradition, says succinctly "and he put a dark cloud *ma'āpēl* between you and the Egyptians." M and G may reveal two ancient variants: *h'nn whššk/hššk whm'pl*, a hendiadys in each case for "dark cloud." *wy'r 't hlyth* is probably a harmonistic gloss. The Greek reading is different but unacceptable. Cf. Joel 2:2; Zeph. 1:15: *ywm hšk w'plh ywm 'nn w'rpl*.

80. Cf. Dt. 1:33, *b's lyth . . . wb'nn ywmm*.

81. Cf. the quotation from the Book of *Yašar* quoted in 1 Kings 8:12, "Yahweh has set the sun in the heavens/but said he would tent in the dark cloud (*'rpl*)."

term, a derivative of *ʿrp*,⁸² is familiar from 2 Samuel 22: 10 (= Psalm 18: 10) in the context of the storm theophany, “and the storm-cloud under his feet,” and is often paired with *ʿānān* in prose and poetry.⁸³ In Deuteronomic tradition, the theophanic cloud is described as “fire or darkness, dark cloud, and storm cloud” (*hšk/ʾš ʿnn wʿrpl*).⁸⁴ All of these designations point back to the theophanic cloud of the storm god. Taken out of their poetic and ultimately mythic sources, they have been objectified and “historicized” in Epic and later tradition. The language is therefore a step away from its original context. The storm cloud, at once dark and fiery, on which the god rides, or which he drives as a chariot, has become a column of cloud by day, of fire by night, which succors Israel at the sea and then leads them to Sinai. When Yahweh reveals himself, the storm cloud hides the godhead who speaks (not thunders) from it. At Sinai the heavy cloud (*ʿnn kbd*) descends on the mount to the accompaniment of “the sounds of thunder” and “lightning bolts” (Exodus 19: 16 and 20: 18 E), the most explicit reminiscences of the poetic storm theophanies. The response of nature in convulsions of fear and/or dances of joy has been lost in the process of demythologizing.⁸⁵

The relation between the *ʿānān* or *ʿārāpel*, “the storm cloud,” and the *kēbōd yahwē*, “the Glory of Yahweh,” is not wholly clear. We have suggested above two possible origins of the technical meaning of *kābōd* in the context of theophany, in the hypostatization of the abstract “majesty” of the deity, or as a shortened form of *ʿnn kbd*, “storm cloud.”⁸⁶ The former appears to be the more likely. The

82. Cf. Ugaritic *rkb ʿrpt* (*rākib ʿarapāti*), Hebrew *rōkēb baʿārābōt*, “Cloud Rider” (Psalm 68: 5) used of the storm god.

83. Ezek. 34: 12; Psalm 97: 2; Job 38: 9.

84. Dt. 5: 19 and 4: 11.

85. J. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, emphasizes the point that the response of nature is missing, pp. 100–111.

86. See above, note 30. George E. Mendenhall in recent lectures at the Biblical Colloquium and Johns Hopkins University [to be published under the title *The Tenth Generation*; cf. *YGC*, p. 274, add. (bb)] has argued, if I understand him correctly, that the term *ʿānān* corresponds in origin to the *melammu* of the Akkadians and has been misunderstood in later Israelite tradition. The *ʿānān* then would be the symbol of sovereignty of the king or god, presumably an aureole. As the writer pointed out in the discussion of Mendenhall’s paper, this construction requires that *ʿanānu* in West Semitic only secondarily came to mean storm cloud. However, in Hebrew, biblical Aramaic, and Syriac, the meaning “cloud, rain cloud” seems to be primary. In Arabic the meaning of the verb “to appear” and the nouns in the sense “apparition, phenomenon” are most easily explained as denominative, i.e., secondarily derived from the meaning

earliest prose source using the term *kābōd* of the refulgent aureole surrounding or worn by the deity is found in Exodus 33:17–23. Moses asks Yahweh to show him his “Glory.” Moses, hidden by Yahweh in a cave or cleft of rock, is permitted to see the back of the Glory after Yahweh has passed by. As has generally been recognized, the tradition in 1 Kings 19:9–13, the incubation of Elijah in the cave of the Mount of God, although very different in language, must in some way be dependent on Exodus 33:17–23. The tradition of Elijah in 1 Kings 19 is undoubtedly pre-Deuteronomic, going back to northern traditions which began to take form in the ninth century B.C. Exodus 33:17–23 is Yahwistic in its present form, and it is very likely that the tradition is older. The Priestly editor of the Tetrateuch took up the term *kēbōd Yahwē* as part of his rich vocabulary of revelation. Certainly the Priestly source carefully distinguished the *kābōd* or nimbus from the *‘ānān* or storm cloud. In Exodus 16:10 from the Priestly hand we read, “Behold the Glory of Yahweh appeared in the cloud.” In Exodus 24:18 we are told that Moses “entered into the midst of the cloud” covering Mount Sinai. He certainly did not enter the “Glory.”⁸⁷ The Priestly description of the Glory says

“cloud, cloud bank.” The relation to the term *‘nm*, du./pl. *‘nmm* in Ugaritic is most problematic. *Haddu dū ‘anani* (see above, n. 2) can be taken to mean either “storm cloud” or “nimbus.” Otherwise the term *‘nm(m)* applies to messenger boys, frequently called *‘nm ‘ilm* “divine messenger boys.” This designation is sometimes applied to members of Ba‘l’s retinue (2.1.18, 35), Ba‘l’s messengers Gapn and Ugar (4.8.14), and other messengers (1.3.17; 3.4.76). *CTA*, 4.4.58–60 is of special interest. ‘El speaks: “Am I a slave, the (messenger?) boy of Asherah? Am I a slave, an apprentice mason?” One might argue that the divine clouds were messengers of Ba‘l in the first instance, and then *‘nm* came to mean “messenger, errand boy.” In another listing of Ba‘l’s entourage, the term *‘rpt*, “clouds,” is used (5.5.6–11). It is interesting in this connection to note that in the scene of ‘El’s council underlying Daniel 7, the man-like one (Ba‘l) comes to receive kingship from the Ancient of Days (‘El) accompanied by the *‘ānanē šēmayyā*, “the clouds (?) of heaven.” This entire discussion of the Ugaritic material is highly speculative, and must be left aside in the present discussion.

87. In Exodus 24:15f. and 40:34 we find two curiously parallel phrases:

wyks h‘nn ‘t hhr
wyškn kbd yhwh ‘l hr syny

wyks h‘nn ‘t ‘hl mw’d
wkbd yhwh ml’ ‘t mškn

The parallelism is greatest in Exod. 40:34 where in prose form the parallel members have ten syllables each. If minimum changes are made to turn the lines into poetry, the symmetry remains:

only that the *kēbōd Yahwē* had the appearance of “devouring fire,” *ʿēš ʾōkēlet*.⁸⁸ Fire is, of course, regularly used in descriptions of the theophany of the storm god, and is part of the stock language of war oracles.⁸⁹ It is fitting in combination with the term *hēmā*, “hotness, wrath,” and *rēšep* “burning, disease,”⁹⁰ as well as with the fiery storm-cloud(s) and the lightning bolt, the storm god’s characteristic weapon. The epithet *ʿēl kābōd* belongs to Baʿl-Haddu in the *Vorlage* of Psalm 29, and *mēlek kābōd* used repeatedly in Psalm 24 may have been a Baʿl title as well to judge from the Canaanizing context. This is not to suggest that only Haddu and later Yahwē had the “Glory,” or that the “Glory” was exclusively the possession of the storm god. But it may be said that the appearance of the “Glory” in the storm theophany is characteristic.

A large company of scholars continues to claim that the oldest and most original strand of the Sinai theophany, notably the Yahwistic tradition (as well as later Deuteronomic and Priestly accounts of the theophany) derives its imagery from the phenomena of a volcanic eruption.⁹¹ The traditions of the Elohist cannot be so construed; there can be no doubt that one of the Epic sources used the language of the theophany of the storm god. The crucial Yahwistic text is Exodus 19: 18: “Mount Sinai smoked, all of it, before Yahweh who descended upon it in fire, and smoke went up as the smoke of an oven, so that all the people⁹² were terrified.”⁹³

Such a tradition surely rests, not on a description of volcanic activity, but upon hyperbolic language used in the storm theophany.

In the poetic tradition which antedates the prose sources, the Divine Warrior is described as follows:

יכסה ענן אהל מועד	1(8)
כבוד יהוה מלא משכן	1(8)

There can be little doubt that the Priestly editor drew on poetic sources in composing Genesis 1, as has been recently demonstrated to me by Father John Kselman. It may be that these passages, too, reflect a poetic source hitherto unsuspected. We know that *ʾhl* and *mškn* constituted a formulaic pair already in Ugaritic verse. One might argue that *ʾnn* and *kbd* similarly form a poetic pair.

88. Exod. 24:17; cf. Ezek. 1:28.

89. In old theophanic poetry, e.g., Ps. 18:9, 13=2 Sam. 22:9, 13, and Ps. 29:7; in later hymns, see, e.g., Ps. 50:3; 97:2-4; and 104:4; in Prophecy and proto-apocalyptic see, e.g., Amos 1:4-2:5; Isa. 29:6; 30:27, 30; 31:9; and 66:15f.

90. *Rēšep* is part of the storm god’s bodyguard in Hab. 3:5.

91. See the discussion of Jörg Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 100-111.

92. On the text here, see Jeremias, *Theophanie*, p. 102, n. 1.

93. Cf. Deut. 4:11f.; 5:23f.; 9:15b.

Smoke rose from his nostrils,
 And fire from his mouth devoured
 Coals flamed forth from him.⁹⁴

In later poetic tradition this language is still echoed in theophanies of the Divine Warrior. In Psalm 104 Yahweh is addressed:

- You are dressed in splendor and majesty,
 (2) Enwrapt in light as a garment.
- . . .
- Who makes the clouds your chariot,
 Who goes forth on the wings of the wind.
 (4) Who makes the winds his messengers,
 Fire and Flame his ministers.⁹⁵
- . . .
- (7) At your roar (the waters) fled,
 At the noise of your thundering they ran away.
- . . .
- (31) Let the glory of Yahweh be forever,
 Let Yahweh rejoice in his works,
 (32) Who looks upon the earth and it quakes,
 Who touches the mountains and they smoke.⁹⁶

A similar passage is found in Psalm 144:5, 6:

O Yahweh, incline your heavens and come down;
 Touch the mountains so that they smoke!
 Hurl your lightning bolts and scatter them;
 Shoot your darts and put them in panic!

In a war song in Isaiah 31, the prophet may speak even of Zion as the locus of fire and smoking oven:

. . . Oracle of Yahweh,
 Whose flame is in Zion,
 Whose Oven is in Jerusalem.⁹⁷

94. 2 Sam. 22:8f. = Ps. 18:8f.

95. Cf. Amos 7:4 and the discussion of Delbert Hillers, "Amos 7, 4 and Ancient Parallels," *CBQ*, 26 (1964), 221-225. See also the Canaanite deities *Pyr* and *Phlox* in Philo Byblius *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. evang.*, 1.10.9, and the discussion of P. W. Miller, "Fire in the Mythology of Canaan and Israel," *CBQ*, 27 (1965), 256-261.

96. Psalm 104:1b-4, 7, 31f.

97. Isa. 31:9b.

Fire and light, smoke and shining cloud, thunder and quaking are all elements intimately bound together in the poetic descriptions of the theophany of the storm god, or of the attack of the Divine Warrior. When Sinai or Zion is described as on fire or smoking, we need not send for seismologists. Experienced mountain climbers know well the frequency, violence, and special danger of the thunder storm in high mountains. The approach of towering black clouds lighted from within by so-called sheet lightning is an awesome spectacle. It is not a rare sight, moreover, to see lightning strike high points including often isolated trees near the timber line. Those who bear witness to such sights speak of explosions of fire, smoke, and steam. Such experiences stand behind the highly imaginative poetry of the storm god's epiphany. The northern storms of Lebanon, Cassius, or the Amanus no doubt gave initial rise to the tradition of the theophany, rather than Sinai or the southern mountains. That is, Israel used traditional Canaanite language in early descriptions of Yahweh's theophany, and it is this traditional poetic language, objectified and historicized in excessively literal prose that we find in the Epic accounts of the revelation at Sinai. This follows the same pattern of development that we have observed in the history of the traditions of the event at the sea.⁹⁸

History of the Tradition of the Storm Theophany

In early Israel, as late as the tenth century B.C., the storm theophany or derivative language was a frequent means of describing Yahweh's mode of revelation. It returned to popularity in the sixth century in proto-apocalyptic and persisted into full-blown apocalyptic.

In Job, which contains archaic material, reworked most probably in the sixth century B.C., we find the language describing the creator god and his revelation in the storm in fairly pure form: Job 26:5-14 and 38:1=4:6; compare 9:5. In the inaugural oracle of Ezekiel, the prophet describes the manifestation of Yahweh in the northern storm

98. In the past the theory that Israel in Sinai encountered a volcano was bound up with the view that Yahweh was the local *numen* of the desert mountain. The latter view has collapsed and with it most of the underpinnings of the volcano theory. Yahweh was more akin to Baʿl, not to mention ʿEl, than to the local volcano genius of nineteenth-century constructs. One notes in passing that the actual Vulcan of the Canaanite pantheon had as his heritage and abode Egypt and the western isles, notably Crete as is wholly fitting, and so far as we can see, had no distinctive features or epithets in common with Yahweh.

associated with a great cloud, fire and lightning, and, of course, the appearance of the Glory. In the proto-apocalyptic of Isaiah, much of it dating from the sixth century, the imagery of the storm god as divine warrior is ubiquitous: Isaiah 24: 19–23; 26:21; 34:4, 8–10; 35:1–10; 42:13–15; 50:2f.; 59:16–19; 63:19b–64:2; and 66:15f. Related proto-apocalyptic materials include Zechariah 9:14; 14:5b–9; and Haggai 2:6f., 21.⁹⁹

In the majority of these contexts, we find the coming of the Divine Warrior in eschatological warfare with imagery drawn from Israel's old hymns and from the royal cultus. The transformations of the old forms and language were not inconsiderable. The language of nature's response or uproar, in the presence of the warrior-god, in particular was reutilized. The explicit language of lightning and thunder is used, but is relatively infrequent. On the other hand, the theme of divine kingship and new creation becomes dominant.

One of the passages cited above will illustrate these continuities and transformations: Isaiah 35:1–10.

1.

(v. 1)	The desert and the steppe shall laugh, The wilderness shall rejoice and blossom;	יששום ¹⁰⁰ מדבר וציה 1 (8) תגל ערבה ותפרח ¹⁰¹ 1 (8)
(v. 2)	Like the crocus it shall burst into bloom, And shall rejoice, yea, rejoicing and singing.	כחבצלת פרח תפרח 1 (8) ותגל אף גיל ורנן ¹⁰²
	The glory of Lebanon shall be given to it, The splendor of Carmel and Sharon.	כבוד ¹⁰³ לבנון נתן לה 1 (8) הדר כרמל ושרון 1 (7)

99. From the same date and background are the war oracles in Nahum 1 (the acrostic poem first recognized by Gunkel as late); Jeremiah 10:10, 13; and 25:30bf.; and several Psalms including Psalm 50:2–6; and 104:32f.

100. The anomalous *mēm* has been explained as a dittography, as *sandhi*; the assimilation of *yššwn* to *mdbr* (Torrey), and as enclitic, a rather esoteric archaism for this period.

101. Omit the conjunction for stylistic reasons, and with G.

102. Note the use of repetition and *figura etymologica*, but in patterns different from the genuinely archaic: *gyl* and *igl* (*bis*) *prh* and *tprh* (*bis*).

103. The article is often omitted here and below for stylistic or metrical reasons. Here IQIs^a omits the article before *lbnwn*.

They shall see the Glory of Yahweh,	המה יראו כבוד יהוה	1 (8)
The splendor of the eternal god.	הדר אלהי <עולם> ¹⁰⁴	1 (7)

2.

(v. 3) Strengthen weak hands;	הזקו ידיים רפות ¹⁰⁵	1 (7)
Make strong feeble knees,	ברכים כשלות אמצו	1 (8)
(v. 4) Say to the fearful of heart:	אמרו לנמהרי-לב	1 (7)
Be strong, fear not.	חזקו אל תיראו	1 (7)
Behold your god with vindication,	הנה אלהיכם נקם	1 (8)
He comes with divine recompense;	יבוא גמול אלהים	1 (7)
It is he who comes and saves you.	הוא יבוא וישעכם ¹⁰⁶	1 (8)
(v. 5) Then the eyes of the blind shall see,	אז תפקחנה עיני עורים	1 (10)
And the ears of the deaf be opened.	ואזני חרשים תפתחנה ¹⁰⁷	1 (10)
(v. 6) The lame shall leap as a gazelle,	ידלג כאיל פסח ¹⁰⁸	1 (8)
And the tongue of the dumb sing.	ויתרנן לשון אלם ¹⁰⁹	1 (8)

3.

Indeed waters shall break out in the desert,	כי נבקעו במדבר מים	1 (8)
And streams in the wilderness.	ונוחלים בערבה ¹¹⁰	1 (8)
(v. 7) And glaring desert shall become a swamp,	והיה שרב לאגם	1 (7)
Parched earth springs of water.	צמאון למבוקי מים	1 (7)

104. In IQIs^a, there is an omission from *wlm* (34:17) to *hzwq* (35:3). It has been filled in by a hand of the Herodian Age (roughly a century after the *floruit* of the original scribe) with the traditional text for the most part. The omission could be explained as a haplography by homoioteleuton if *wlm* completed verse 2. A reading *'lhym wlm* could also stand behind *'lhynw* <*'lhym. m* and *nw* are often confused. At all events, the metrical form and *'lhynw* can scarcely be correct in the Massoretic reading. Notice again the use of repetition in the quatrain, and the use of chiasm in the second bicolon.

105. The series of imperative plurals introduce the address to the divine council. Note the repetition of *hzwq* (*pi'el*) and *hzwq* (*qal*) in the first and fourth cola binding together the quatrain. The first colon also exhibits chiasm.

106. The tricolon stands very close to Isa. 40:10. Note the repetition of *ybw*³ and *'lhykm*/*'lhym* binding the tricolon together. The meter builds.

107. The bicolon is marked by the assonance of *'z*/*'zny* and *tpqnhh*/*tpthnh*, and by chiasm.

108. The *'z* here is to be deleted as vertical dittography.

109. The longer form is required, *metri causa*.

110. This bicolon is a striking instance of stress meter giving an improper scansion, syllabic meter reflecting a fuller symmetry (and correct scansion) of the bicolon. Note the chiasm.

The abode of jackals shall become a pasturage.	112 וְנִבְנֶה תְּנִימִים 1 (7)
	לְמַרְבֵּץ
Open land (turn into) reeds and papyrus.	113 חֲצֵרֵי לִקְנֵה וְגַמָּא 1 (7)

4.

(v. 8) There shall be there a highroad, And it shall be called the Holy Way.	114 יְהִיָּה שֵׁם מַסְלֹל וְדֶרֶךְ 1 (7)
	וְדֶרֶךְ קְדֵשׁ יִקְרָא לֶהֱיָא 1 (8)
The unclean shall not pass over it, But the redeemed shall walk upon it, And the scattered shall not get lost.	1 (7) לֹא יַעֲבִירוּ טְמֵאָה
	1 (8) וְיִוָּהֲלֹכוּ בָּהּ גְּאוּלָּיִם
	1 (8) <וּפְזוּרִים> לֹא יִתְעוּ
(v. 9) The lion shall not be found there, Nor the beast of prey go up there- on.	117 לֹא תִמְצָא שָׁמָּה 118 אֲרִיָּה 1 (8)
	1 (8) פֶּרִיץ חַיּוֹת כָּל יַעֲלֶנָּה
(v. 10) The ransomed of Yahweh shall return. And enter Zion with a joyful shout.	1 (8) פְּדוּיֵי יְהוָה יָשׁוּבוּן
	1 (8) וּבָאוּ צִיּוֹן בְּרִנָּה 119
And eternal joy shall be on their heads:	1 (8) וְשִׂמְחַת עוֹלָם עַל רֵאשֵׁם
Gladness and joy shall overtake (them):	1 (8) שִׂשׂוֹן וְשִׂמְחָה יִשְׂגוּ

111. The bicolon is badly corrupted. If we presume that the pattern of the preceding bicolon continues (as it surely does in the final colon) our reconstruction should not be far off the original. Note also the parallel pair *nwh gmlym* and *mrby š'n* in Ezekiel 25:5.

112. In the old script *lm* could have been lost by haplography after *m* of *tnym*.

113. *hasēr*, unfenced country or settlement, is probably the correct reading (with G).

114. Reading *yhyh* with IQIs^a [sic!].

115. Note the chiasitic repetition of *wdrk*. *mstwl wdrk* is a hendiadys; the omission of *wdrk* in G and IQIs^a is a simple instance of haplography.

116. *whw' lmw hlk drk w'wlym* is a corrupt reflection of *whlkw drk g'wlym*, an ancient variant of *whlkw bh pzwrym* (B). Behind the corruption stands a haplography of *pzwrym* (M) and a haplography of *g'wlym* (G). The corruption has spread to the final colon of v. 9 where M has *whlkw g'wlym*. G *whlkw bh g'wlym*, doublets of the colon of v. 8. The text is further confused by the parallel reading in Isa. 51:10 *drk l'br g'wlym* which in IQIs^a reads *drk l'bwr g'wlym* [*wpdwyy* (erased)] *wpzwry yhw yšwbw*.

117. In M *l' yhyh šm* and *l' tms' šm* are ancient variants, the latter coming into the text from the margin, and hence displaced. The slightly longer form of the colon is to be preferred. Note the chiasitic pattern of the bicolon.

118. Read *šammā, metri causa* (and with IQIs^a).

119. Note the chiasitic pattern of the bicolon.

Sorrow and sighing shall flee away. נסו יגון ואנחה¹²⁰ 1 (8)

The poem begins with the anticipated response of nature to the theophany of the victorious warrior. The dry and sterile desert is to bloom and rejoice; the wilderness will become as fertile and green as the well-watered fields of Sharon and the wooded hills of Carmel and Lebanon. The theophany which the transformed lands witness is expressed in the ancient language of the “glory” and “splendor” which appear associated with his manifestation as victor and king. In the companion piece in chapter 34 of Isaiah, the divine warrior goes forth to battle, and the heavens “roll up as a scroll, and all their armies languish.”

In both chapter 34 and 35, we recognize the ancient forms of the theophany of the storm god in his role as warrior and king. Much of the storm imagery has been leached out of the new forms of the sixth century. Enough survives to make its origin patent.

The second strophe begins with the address to the divine council (by heralds) announcing the coming of the god with “deliverance, recompense, and victory,”¹²¹ a message to hearten the feeble and fearful. The surge of renewal and new creation now is portrayed in the healing of the maimed and defective, and in the third strophe by hyperbolic transformation of the desert into springs and marshes. Water in the desert, like the blooming of the desert, is a theme ultimately integral to the manifestation of the god of fertility, the storm god. However, in Israel it also is reminiscent of Israel’s march through the wilderness in the Exodus-Conquest. The third strophe thus serves as a transition to the climactic fourth strophe in which the theme of the New Exodus-Conquest breaks out plainly.

The high road across the desert (in Isaiah 40 built by the council of Yahweh) as a theme recalls both the old march of the divine warrior at the head of his hosts and the armies of Israel in the conquest of the land and the battle at the sea, and the processional of the “glorious king” back from victory to his throne in what we have termed the

120. The first two cola of the tricolon are bound together by repetition of *šmḥt*; the last two by chiasmic order. Note the extraordinary assonance achieved by the repetition of *m* in colon 1, the repetition of the rather rare *š* in colon 2, and the repetition of *n* in the final colon.

121. These are, perhaps, better translations in this context of *nāqām*, *gamūl*, and *yōšīʿ*. G. E. Mendenhall in a forthcoming study traces the meaning “deliver” for *nqm* from Amarna Canaanite to late classical Hebrew. *Nāqām* is two-sided—vengeance against enemies, deliverance or vindication to one’s friends.

“ritual conquest.” The festal context of the latter with its celebration on Zion in the royal cultus involves the transformation of the theme of the old hymns and the Epic.

The old Exodus-Conquest is conflated with the battle of creation and its mythical associations. In turn the theme undergoes a second transformation in the eschatological context of proto-apocalyptic. The new Exodus-Conquest is merged with the new creation.

In the era of the kings and prophets, after the division of the kingdom, and before the destruction of Jerusalem, the tradition of the nature theophany of the divine warrior is carried in the royal cultus in a restricted group of Canaanizing hymns: Psalm 46:7f., 93, 96, 97:1–6 (quoted above), 98, and 144:5f. Two of these, 46 and 93, may be archaic; at least both include ancient material. Psalm 96 echoes Psalm 29, imitates the repetitive prosodic patterns of the ancient hymns, but must be labeled archaizing, not archaic.

In classical prophetic oracles, this tradition is excessively rare, and where it exists the explicit language of the storm has been largely eschewed. In Amos 1:2, for example, the tradition evidently lies in the background.

יהוה מציון ישאג
מירושלים יתן קולו
אבלו נוות רעים
ויבש ראש כרמל

Yahweh roars from Zion,
From Jerusalem he gives voice.
The pastures of the shepherds languished,
The peak of Carmel became sere.

The context is the declaration of war against the nations of the Davidic empire who have breached covenant. The divine warrior is to go forth. Hence nature blanches. Here no doubt is the language of the storm theophany, but not explicitly. One must know the tradition to detect it. The first bicolon appears to be in the figure of the lion roaring, rather than of the storm god roaring and thundering. One suspects that the voice of Yahweh as thunder may lie just under the surface; if so, the language is muted.

Micah 1:3 is another, similar instance. Yahweh goes forth to war from his cosmic sanctuary:

122 הנה יהוה יצא ממקומו
 ירד ודרך על במותי־ארץ
 ונמסו הרים תחתיו
 ועמקים יתבקעו
 כדונג מפני אש
 כמים מגרים במורד

Behold Yahweh shall go forth from his place,
 He shall descend and tread the heights of earth.
 The mountain shall melt beneath him,
 And the valleys shall burst,
 Like wax before fire,
 Like water running down a slope

The second bicolon has verbal contacts with the war song of Isaiah 34: 3f.

ונמסו הרים מדמם
 ונמקו > כל עמקים < 123
 ונגלו כספר שמים
 וכל צבאם יבול
 כנבל עלה מגפן
 וכנבלת מתאנה

The mountains shall melt with their blood,
 And all the valleys rot away.
 The heavens roll up as a scroll,
 And all their host languishes,
 As the wilting of the vineleaf,
 As the withering of the fig.

In both there is a high level of assonance and paronomasia of a similar sort, as well as parallelism of ideas and form. So close are the verbal and stylistic correspondences that one is pressed to give one of two possible explanations: (1) that both paraphrase an archaic battle hymn, or (2) that Micah 1:3f. is an insertion of late material of the Isaianic

122. *ky* is omitted at the beginning of v. 3. *waw* from the beginning of the second colon of verse three (hence *yērēd* for *wē-yārad*), and the article from the first word of the second colon of v. 4. all for prosodic reasons.

123. *kl 'mqym* has been lost by haplography. The corruption of the text is complex here. IQIs^a reintroduced *wh'mqym*, but is influenced by Micah 1:3. G reflects the full haplography. *kl šb' hšmym* is a doublet of *kl šb'm* immediately below.

tradition of the sixth century B.C., corresponding to the late Isaianic material incorporated in Micah 4:1–4 (= Isaiah 2:4–4). It is not impossible that both (1) and (2) are true.

Both passages describe the convulsions and sterility of nature before the onslaught of the divine warrior. Again, explicit phenomena of the storm are remote.

Only one other passage deserves our attention as coming possibly from the age of classical prophecy,¹²⁴ Isaiah 30:27–33, especially verse 30. It proves to be a quotation from a war song, as is made explicit in verse 27:

You shall sing the song,	השיר יהיה לכם	b (6)
As in the night when the feast is celebrated,	כליל התקדש חג	b (6)
And your heart will rejoice,	ושמחת לבב	b (5)
As when one goes in procession with the pipe.	כהולך בחליל	b (6)
To enter to the mount of Yahweh,	לבוא בהר יהוה	b (6)
To the Rock of Israel.	אל צור ישראל	b (5)
“Yahweh has made heard the crash of his voice:	השמיע יהוה הד ¹²⁶ קולו	1 (7)
His arm has drawn his bow and he has shot (arrows of lightning):	נחת ¹²⁷ זרועו ¹²⁸ ירה	1 (8)
With hot wrath and consuming flame,	בוץ אף ו ¹²⁹ {להב} {אש} אוכלה	1 (8)

124. Isa. 19:1, a highly modified description of “the rider on a swift cloud,” must be considered later. The hymnic fragments in Amos 4:13; 5:8–9; and 9:5–6 are secondary in the collection. The hymn may be older (as is the case with the Hymn of Habakkuk), or, perhaps, Exilic. For the recent discussion of these materials, see J. L. Crenshaw, “Amos and the Theophanic Tradition,” *ZAW*, 80 (1968), 203–215; older literature is cited by Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 3rd ed. (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), p. 540, n. 3.

125. The hymn quoted from the cult was probably cast, originally, at least, in the narrative past. Hence, we have omitted *waws* at the beginning of cola. However, meter remains unaffected by casting in the future.

126. Ehrlich is probably correct in reading *hēd*, “crash (of thunder),” *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1912), 111.

127. Read *nihhat* (= 2 Sam. 22:35) or *nihhātā* (= Psalm 18:38). *nht* with *zērōʿ* in Ugaritic and early Hebrew is an idiom meaning “to draw the bow,” or “to shoot a bow.” See our discussion above, chapter 2, notes 57, 59 and especially 58. Add also Psalm 38:3 to parallels cited. The noun *zērōʿ* may be feminine or masculine.

128. *Waw* has been lost by haplography, probably, although we need not introduce it. The *ʾalef* was introduced in a secondary revision when the colon was misunderstood.

129. *Lāhab* and *ʾēs* are conflated old variants.

With cloudburst and flood and hail.” נפץ הרים ואבן ברד 1 (7)

In all these passages from prophecy, the old language of theophany is restricted to the context of divine warfare against the nations. In fact, the ordinary language of divine manifestation and revelation in prophetic oracles belongs to a very different tradition.

ʾEl's Modes of Revelation

Baʿl's characteristic mode of self-revelation is in the storm theophany. ʾEl on the other hand makes his will known in the word or decree of the council of the gods. ʾEl's word is, in effect, the judgment or decision of the divine council, and it may be announced by the messenger of the council or more directly to mankind in dream or visitation. These two different modes of manifestation and revelation are well defined in the Canaanite, especially the Ugaritic, sources preserved, limited though these sources are.

(1) In the first tablet of the ʾAqhat Epic¹³⁰ we find Danīʾil engaged in an incubation. For a week he gives offerings, spending each night awaiting a divine revelation. On the seventh day, the scene shifts to the council of ʾEl. Baʿl approached the throne of ʾEl with a plea:

Wretched is Daniel, man of Rapiʾ;¹³¹
 Ġazr, man of the Harnamite¹³² is sad,
 Who has no son like his brothers,
 Nor scion like his kindred.
 Should he not have a son like his brother?
 Or a scion like his kindred?

He has given offerings for the gods to eat;
 He has given offerings for the sons of Qudšu¹³³ to drink.
 Will you not bless him, O Bull ʾIl []¹³⁴
 Grant him grace, O Creator of Creatures?

130. *CTA*, 17 (Gordon 2 ʾAqht).

131. *Rapiʾ* as we have seen above (chapter 2) means “Hale One,” a god or especially ʾEl himself. ʾEl appears evidently to be the patron of Daniel.

132. On the place name Harnam, modern Hermel near Baʿlbeq, see W. F. Albright, “The Traditional Home of the Syrian Daniel,” *BASOR*, 130 (1953), 26f.; and D. N. Freedman and F. I. Anderson, “Harmon in Amos 4:3,” *BASOR*, 198 (1970), 41. *Harnamay*, then, would be the “one of Harnam,” perhaps a deity.

133. Here *Qudšu* probably is the epithet of Asherah, mother of the gods.

134. The text reads l-tr. ʾil ʾaby. ʾaby. “my father” is probably to be omitted. Often epithets “filled out” in copying, a confusion between the short or long alternate formulae.

Let there be a son in his house,¹³⁵
A scion in the midst of his palace.¹³⁶

A formulaic description of the duties of the heir follows. Then ʾĒl takes the case of Daniel presented by Baʿl as advocate¹³⁷ and renders a favorable decision:

[Behold], ʾĒl took his servant (into his care).¹³⁸
He blessed Daniel, man of Rapiʿ,
He gave power to Ġazr, man of the Harnamite:

“Let Daniel be enlived with vitality,
With spirit Ġazr, the man of the Harnamite.”¹³⁹

ʾĒl continues with instructions, to be transmitted to Daniel, directing him to mount his conjugal couch and embrace his wife, with the result that she conceive a child. ʾĒl concludes:

Let him have a son in his house,
A scion in the midst of his palace.”¹⁴⁰

In the missing portion at the end of column 1 and at the beginning of column 2, Daniel is informed by messenger or in a dream of ʾĒl’s decree and blessing, and in the first preserved lines of column 2 we find him rejoicing.

(2) A closely similar episode is found in the Keret Epic, the second

135. The text reads:

wa-yakun binuhū babēti
šuršu baqirbi hēkalihū

136. *CTA*, 17.1.17-28.

137. Baʿl plays the same intercessory role in the Keret Epic, *CTA*, 15.2.11-end to be discussed below.

138. The line is reconstructed as follows:

[hn.y]ʾihd. ʾil.ʾbdh.
Behold, ʾEl took his servant.”

An alternate reading is barely possible:

[byd.y]ʾihd. ʾil.ʾbdh.
“ʾEl took his servant by the hand.”

There is very little room in the lacuna, so that the first reading is preferable.

The meaning of ʾhd in this context is figurative. Whether or not it is construed with *byd*, it means “to succor,” “to take care of.” Cf., for example, Ps. 73:23, and such names as ʾāhazyāhū, “Yahweh has taken (by the hand),” “Yahweh has cared for.”

139. *CTA*, 17.1.35-38.

140. *CTA*, 17.1.43f.

column of the second tablet.¹⁴¹ A half-dozen major gods are mentioned in the first, broken lines. Keret like Daniel appears to have arranged a feast for the gods.

[The]n the council of ʿEl¹⁴² arrived,
[And] ʿAlʿiyān Baʿl took up speech.

Come [now], O kindly One, [ʿEl the] Compassionate,
Will you not bless [Keret] the Noble?
Will you not grant grace to Nuʿmān, [Lad] of ʿEl?

[ʿEl] took a cup in (his) hand,
A goblet in (his) right hand.

Verily he blessed [his servant];
ʿEl blessed Keret [the Noble];
[He granted] grace to Nuʿman, Lad of ʿEl.

“A w[ife you shall ta]ke, O Keret,
A wife you shall take in your house;
A maiden you shall bring into your court.
She shall bear seven sons to you;
Indeed she shall give birth to eight.

She shall bear Yaṣṣib the lad,
Who shall suck the milk of Asherah,
Who shall suckle the breasts of the Maid ʿAnat.”¹⁴³

After the naming of the sons and daughters to be born, with their births, and Keret’s exaltation among his peers, the episode ends with the verses:

The gods blessed, they proceeded,
They proceeded to their tents,
The family of ʿEl to their encampments.¹⁴⁴

The place of the meeting of the divine council is not wholly clear. It may be that the ambiguity stems from the usual dualism of the feast, the feast at the god’s shrine, and its paradigm in the cosmic mount of the assembly. In the present case Keret seems to have participated in

141. *CTA*, 15.2.11–28 (end).

142. *ʿidatu ʿili-mi*, identical with biblical *ʿadat ʿel*, Ps. 82:1.

143. *CTA*, 15.2.11–27.

144. *CTA*, 15.3.17–19.

the divine assembly, much as the prophet Isaiah in his inaugural oracle saw the proceedings in Yahweh's cosmic temple and took part in its actions.¹⁴⁵ One may also compare the visitation of Abraham at the terebinths of Mamre when he was promised a son (Genesis 18: 1–16).

Again Ba'1 plays the role of intercessor or advocate in addressing 'El. One is immediately reminded of the role of the *mal'ak yahweh*, the advocate in the heavenly court, who, as the late Sigmund Mowinckel showed, is identical with the Heavenly Vindicator, *gō'ēl*, or Heavenly Witness, *'ēd*, in Job.¹⁴⁶

Finally, as in the case of Daniel, 'El blessed Keret and gave a proclamation of what the future held, namely, the birth of progeny to Keret.

(3) In the first tablet of the Keret Epic 'El appears to Keret in a dream or vision.

In his (Keret's) dream, 'El descended,
 In his vision, the Father of Mankind,
 He drew near, questioning Keret:¹⁴⁷
 "What ails Keret that he cries?
 That Nu'mān the Lad of 'El weeps?
 Does he desire the kingship of Bull, his father?¹⁴⁸
 Or, indeed, dominion like the Father of Mankind's?"¹⁴⁹

Keret replies at length, describing first what he does *not* wish, finally coming to the point:

[Grant that] I may beget sons;
 [Grant that] I may multiply kindred.¹⁵⁰

'El then directs Keret to cleanse himself, prepare meat and drink

145. Isa. 6:1–8. Cf. the remarks of the writer, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah." *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274–277.

146. See Sigmund Mowinckel, "Hiobs *gō'ēl* und Zeuge im Himmel," in *Vom Alten Testament (Marti Festschrift)*, ed. K. Budde (Giessen, A. Töpelmann, 1925), pp. 207–212; and "Die Vorstellungen der Spätjudentums von heiligem Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet." *ZNW*, 32 (1933) 97–130. Much new data is to be found in materials from Qumrān: cf. provisionally, *ALQ*², pp. 213ff.

147. The text is to be read: wa-yiqrab ba-šī'ali kirta.

148. It is of interest that 'El asks if Keret wishes to usurp his throne. It is a surprising question. Yet it scarcely can be coincidence that both Tyre and Babylon are accused of desiring to take 'El's seat, "in the heart of the seas" (Ezek. 28:2) or on "the mount of the council" (Isaiah 14:13).

149. *CTA*, 14.1.35–43.

150. The reconstruction is that of H. L. Ginsberg, *The Legend of King Keret, BASOR, Supplementary Series 2–3* (1946), p. 36.

offerings, and mount the top of his temple-tower (*migdāl*):

Lift up your hands to heaven;
Sacrifice to Bull, your father ʾEl.
Minister to Baʿl with your sacrifice,
The Son of Dagan with your provision.¹⁵¹

ʾEl then directs Keret to prepare for war, to gather supplies and muster armies, for a campaign against Pabel, king of ʾUdum. The prize of the campaign will be fair Hurriya, Pabel's first-born, the gift of ʾEl to Keret to provide him with progeny.¹⁵²

(4) In the last tablet of the Keret Epic there is a curious scene of ʾEl presiding over his assembly. Seven times he addresses the gods:

“Who among the gods will exorcise illness?
Who will drive out sickness?”¹⁵³
No one among the gods answered him.
Then the Kindly One, ʾEl the Compassionate spoke:
“Sit, my children, on your seats,
On your princely thrones.
I myself will practice magic;
I will surely create¹⁵⁴.
An exorcist¹⁵⁵ of the illness,
One who will drive out the sickness.”¹⁵⁶

ʾEl then forms a female creature named Šaʿtiqat to send to Keret to heal him and instructs her:

“Let Death now be extirpated,
Let Šaʿtiqat prevail.”¹⁵⁷

And so Keret was healed.

151. *CTA*, 14.2.75–79.

152. *CTA*, 14.3.155 ends the dream sequence. The text 14.3.152 has been corrected by Professor Dean McBride to read:

k!t!ld. šph. lkrt
kī talidu šipha la-Kirta

153. H. L. Ginsberg has argued that *zbl* means “illness” as well as “prince” (*The Legend of King Keret*, p. 34). This meaning may be denominative from *ršp zbl*, “Rašpu the Prince” (cf. *CTA*, 15.2.6), the god of disease. Compare *dāgān*, “grain,” *ʿaštārôt*, “fertility.” See also *UT*, glossary, No. 816; and M. Held, “The Root ZBL/SBL in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew,” *JAOS*, 88 (1968), 90–96.

154. The verb *šakānu* in old Canaanite had usages parallel to those in Akkadian, “to establish,” “to make,” “to create.”

155. The forms *ydt* and *gršt*, which Miss Herdner insists are correct (*CTA*, p. 76, n. 4), must be vocalized as feminine participles: *yādtu* and *gārištu*, “exorcist,” “ex-peller.”

156. *CTA*, 16.5. 20–28.

157. *CTA*, 16.6.1f.

In the passage above ʾEl appears as the Divine Patriarch, the “god of the Father,” caring for his elect. Many parallels exist between the functions and modes of manifestation of ʾEl in the two epic texts, and in the Patriarchal sagas of Genesis. ʾEl blessed Daniel and Keret. In Genesis 12:1–3, the god of Abraham blesses Abraham; in Genesis 14:19f. Abraham is called the blessed of ʾEl ʾElyon; and in Genesis 17:15 it is revealed to Abraham that Sarah will be blessed and bear a son and that Ishmael will be blessed with issue. Both Keret and Daniel learn in dreams or visitations by messenger or by ʾEl himself that they are to have offspring and are instructed as to procedures by which they may find wives or regain vitality and produce sons. A major theme of Israel’s Epic is the account of the visitation of Abraham, the promise of a legitimate heir to be born of aged and barren Sarah. The Elohist account describes the appearance of the god of Abraham in a vision promising seed.¹⁵⁸ The Yahwist’s account¹⁵⁹ describes a visitation by three men, for whom Abraham gives a feast. They prove to be divine messengers and reveal the promise of a male heir to Abraham and Sarah. There is an echo of this theme in the story of Isaac and Rebekah.¹⁶⁰ Not wholly dissimilar is the case of King Abimelech of Gerar who sinned inadvertently by taking Sarah, Abraham’s wife, for himself. The god of Abraham visited him in a dream giving warning that he had sinned by taking another man’s wife and was a “dead man.” The nature of Abimelech’s illness is withheld by the narrator until the end of the tale when we discover that Abimelech had become impotent, his wife and maidservants unable to conceive. Abimelech pleads his innocence. God answered him saying that he was well aware that Abimelech was innocent and indeed had not touched Sarah, since it was divine intervention that prevented his consummating the marriage. Abimelech is to restore Sarah to her husband and to beg Abraham to intercede in Abimelech’s favor with his god! So Abimelech did. Abraham prayed for him; he and his harem were healed, and regained sexual vitality. The healing or the revitalizing by the god ʾEl appears in both the Daniel Epic and Keret epics [items (1) and (4) above]. Among other parallel themes, one more is worthy of mention: the succor of Abraham in war by

158. Gen. 15:1f., 5.

159. Gen. 18:1–16; 21:1a, 2, 7.

160. Gen. 25:21–23 (J).

ʾEl ʿElyōn, the guidance of Keret in his military expedition by his father ʾEl.

It comes as no surprise that the functions of Canaanite ʾEl and his modes of manifestation are virtually the same as those of the god of the Israelite Patriarchs. It is perhaps more surprising that Yahweh in Israelite Epic tradition of the tenth and ninth centuries appears chiefly in the same roles, except in the Sinai pericope and in the archaic hymns cited in the Epic sources.

The texts listed above have to do chiefly with ʾEl's dealings with men. In several ʾEl explicitly is portrayed in the setting of his divine court, the *ʿidatu ʾIli-mi* [items (1), (2), and (4)]. Another set of texts describes ʾEl's decisions concerning matters of the gods taken on his mount of assembly.

(5) In Text 2 of the Baʿl cycle, in the familiar tale of the conflict between Yamm-Nahar and Baʿl, Yamm sent an embassy to the "assembled council in the midst of the Mount of <ʿE>I." His terrible messengers approach, frightening the members of the assembly. Baʿl roars his rebuke, promising to deal with Yamm's messengers. Nevertheless, when the embassy lays down its demands, it is ʿEl who replies, giving his decree:

"Give, O ʾEl, him whom you revere,
Him whom the multitude obeys.
Give Baʿl and his entourage,
The son of Dagon, whose abundance¹⁶¹ I shall possess."

And Bull, his father ʾEl replied:

"Baʿl is your slave, O Yamm;
Baʿl is your slave forever,
The son of Dagan your prisoner."¹⁶²

(6) In another familiar episode, Asherah went to the abode of ʾEl to

161. The word *pd* is unexplained. It may belong to the group of words in which the grapheme *d* stands for etymological *l*. Cf. F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "The Name of Ashdod," *BASOR*, 175 (1964), 48–50. In this case the Arabic root *ptt* "to empty, pour out," *mafaṭṭat* "abundance" might be compared.

162. *CTA*, 2.1.34–37. The final tricolon is an excellent example of repetitive parallelism:

ʾabduka baʿlu ya-yammu-mi	1 (9)
ʾabduka baʿlu [la-ʿôla]mi	1 (9)
binu Dagni ʾasrûka-mi	1 (9)

wheedle from her aged spouse permission to build Baʿl's royal palace.
Having done obeisance, she began with praise for ʿEl's (earlier) decree.

tuḥumuka ʿilu ḥakama	1 (9)
ḥukmuka ʿima ʿōlami	1 (8)
ḥayyat ḥizzati tuḥumuka	1 (9)
malkunū ʿalʿiyāna baʿlu	1 (9)
ṭiptunū wa-ʿên dū-ʿalennahū	1 (10)

Your decree, O ʿEl, is wise,
Your wisdom is eternal,
A life of good fortune thy decree.¹⁶³

Our king is ʿAlʿiyān Baʿl,
Our judge without rival.¹⁶⁴

The same formulae were rehearsed by ʿAnat in an earlier scene.¹⁶⁵

(7) ʿEl's decree which directed that Baʿl's temple be built appears somewhat later.

yubnê bêta la-baʿli kamā ʿilīma
wa-ḥazira ka-banī ʿaṭirati

wa-taʿnī rabbatu ʿaṭiratu yammi
rabīta ʿilu-mi la-ḥakamta
šēbatu daqanika la-tasiruka
...

“Let a temple for Baʿl be built like the gods’,
And a court like that of Asherah’s sons.”

And Lady Asherah-of-the-Sea replied:

Note the rhyme, and the use of enclitic -mi (-ma). The vocalization of ʿōlamu presumes a form ʿawlam (Albright), Aramaic (> Arabic) ʿālam is a loan word in which there has been a back formation. Cf. Akk. *ullu, ullānu*, “distant in time.”

163. One notes the unusual assonance of this tricolon: the repetition of ḥ six times, at the beginning of each colon, and in each word of the third colon, and repetition of -ka. Noteworthy also is the intricate chiasmus of *tuḥumuka* (beginning and ending the tricolon), and of *ḥakama/ḥukmuka*.

164. *CTA*, 4.4.41–44.

165. *CTA*, 3.5.38–41.

“You are great, O ʿĒl, and very wise;
Your gray beard instructs you . . .”¹⁶⁶

(8) To be counted also among the decrees of ʿĒl is his declaration in the Epic of ʿAqhat, made under duress, that his “refractory daughter” ʿAnat would get her heart’s desire and that “whatever opposed [her would] be crushed.”¹⁶⁷

We have seen above¹⁶⁸ the characteristic picture of ʿĒl sitting in judgment, ruling with might and grace, with Baʿl-Haddu at his right hand.¹⁶⁹ In his iconography also, ʿĒl is pictured regularly as seated upon his cherub throne, his hand lifted in blessing. The place of his judgments and council is in his distant mount, his abode generally pictured as the tent of the patriarch, the “tent of meeting or council.” The binding judgments of ʿĒl or of the gods, spoken by ʿĒl, presume this setting. In contrast, Baʿl reveals himself from his temple in Mount Şapōn in the storm theophany. No universal decrees or judgments of the divine council of the gods issue from Şapōn. This is not to say that Baʿl cannot send messengers to instruct ʿAnat or to announce his capitulation to Môt. He does both.¹⁷⁰ But Baʿl’s role in the council of the gods is subordinate. ʿĒl’s mount is the site of the council, not Şapōn, and ʿĒl’s word is final. Baʿl’s advice in council is not always heeded despite his titles “king” and “judge.” In short, the mode and content of ʿĒl’s revelations are typologically distinct from those of Baʿl in all our sources.

In the Epic descriptions of the revelation at Sinai this typological distinction does not hold up. The language of storm theophany obviously is present. However, the legal decrees and judgments from the mount and from the Tent of Meeting¹⁷¹ are, so to speak, the business of ʿĒl. Yahweh’s role as lawgiver is consonant only with the functions of ʿĒl on the mount of assembly. Indeed, covenant stipulations and law codes dominate the Sinaitic tradition, so much so that there can be little doubt that the tradition of the revelation of the law, and

166. *CTA*, 4.4.62–4.5.66.

167. *CTA*, 18.1.15–19; cf. 17.6.46–55.

168. Chapter 2 (e); *Ugaritica* V, Text 2.

169. Baʿl as shepherd and musician to this court comes as a surprise. However, a strong hint of Baʿl’s musical ability is found in *CTA*, 17.6.31f.

170. *CTA*, 3.3.10–28; 5.2.10–12.

171. Cf. Exod. 33:7–11 (E), and, of course, Priestly tradition. See also F. M. Cross, “The Priestly Tabernacle,” *BAR*, 1 (1961), 223f. and R. J. Clifford, “The Tent of El and the Israelite Tent of Meeting,” *CBQ*, 33 (1971), 221–227.

the formation of the covenant (with its background in the functions of Patriarchal ʾĒl) is original and at the core of the tradition. In their present form, however, the Epic sources conflate the ʾĒl and Baʿl modes and content of revelation. The only reasonable explanation of this conflation is to be found in the combination of Baʿl elements from the theme of Yahweh as Divine Warrior at the Sea and River, that is, in Exodus and Conquest, with the conceptions of Yahweh as head of the Divine Council and giver of decrees, and as gracious patron, derivative in substantial part from the mythology of ʾĒl. This conclusion requires, however, that we view the linkage of Exodus-Conquest and the Covenant at Sinai as themes as prior to the Epic sources and their common ancestor. In fact, it becomes difficult to believe that the combination of these themes, also found in the early hymns, is not primitive in Israel, belonging to the earliest strata of tradition available to the historian.¹⁷²

Yahweh and the Council of the Gods

The language of revelation in prophecy does not stem from the Baʿl epiphany and its figures and images.¹⁷³ Rather, it originates ultimately in the judgments of ʾĒl. Behind the revelation of the word of Yahweh (that is, the divine decision or judgment) lies a basic picture of the Council of Yahweh, the Israelite counterpart of the council of ʾĒl. H. Wheeler Robinson first perceived something of the importance of the concept of the Council of Yahweh in the prophetic consciousness.¹⁷⁴ He drew upon such passages as Jeremiah 23:18, “who has stood in the council of Yahweh and seen?/ who has attended his word and announced (it).”¹⁷⁵ The classical passages are the vision of Micaiah in I Kings 22:5–28; especially 19–28; Psalm 82; and Isaiah 6:1–12.

Micaiah saw “Yahweh sitting on his throne, and all the heavenly army stood around him, on his right hand and on his left.” He listened to the deliberations of the court until Yahweh pronounced his decision. Then the prophet could pronounce his “Thus saith Yahweh . . .” as messenger of the Divine Court. In Psalm 82 Yahweh judges in the *ʿadat ʾĒl*, “the assembly of ʾĒl [= Yahweh].” In an intriguing decision, Yahweh

172. See above, chapter 4.

173. On the polemics of Nathan against Canaanizing institutions, see below chapter 9.

174. H. Wheeler Robinson, “The Council of Yahweh,” *JTS*, 45 (1944), 151–157.

175. The received text is in disorder. On the basis of the versions, we can reconstruct two ancient variants of the second colon:

(1) *my hqšyb dbrw wyšmʿ*

(2) *dbrw my hqšyb wyšmʿ*

condemns the gods of the council to death. In the last-mentioned passage, Isaiah hears Yahweh's address to the council, "Who will go for us?"¹⁷⁶ and replies himself, "Send me," subsequently receiving the oracle or decree of Yahweh which he is to announce to his people. Thus the prophet becomes in effect the *mal'āk* or herald of Yahweh's council, and like a supernatural ambassador mediates the divine pronouncement. To these passages may be added many others, early (Psalm 89: 6–8) and late (the prologue to Job). In Zechariah 3: 1–10, the prophet is shown the proceedings in the council in the matter of Joshua the priest. Both the advocate, the *mal'āk*, "herald" of Yahweh and the adversary stand in the council. The herald of Yahweh speaks, introducing his words with the messenger formula "Thus saith Yahweh of hosts . . . (v. 7)," and proclaims the coming of Yahweh's servant, the "Branch."

Two special forms reflecting the Divine Council and Yahweh's decisions require comment. One is the "Address to the Divine Council" made by Yahweh or his herald.¹⁷⁷ Normally, this form is introduced by a plural imperative, often by repeated imperatives. The form is found as early as Judges 5: 2:

אורו מרוז אמר יהוה ¹⁷⁸	1 (8)
אורו ארור ישביה	1 (8)
כי לא באו לעזרת יהוה	1 (9)
לעזרת יהוה בגבורים	1 (9)

Curse ye Meroz, saith Yahweh,
Bitterly curse its inhabitants,
For they came not to the help of Yahweh,
To the help of Yahweh with heroes.

It is especially popular in Second Isaiah and related materials: Isaiah 35: 3–4; 40: 1–8; 48: 20–21; 57: 14.¹⁷⁹ Isaiah 40: 1–8 is a paradigmatic

176. In both Ugaritic and biblical literature, the use of the first person plural is characteristic of address in the divine council. The familiar "we" of Gen. 1: 26, "Let us make man in our image . . ." Gen. 3: 22, "Behold the man is become as one of us . . ." and Gen. 11: 7, "Come, let us go down and let us confound their language . . .," has long been recognized as the plural address used by Yahweh in his council. Cf. *CTA*, 4.4.41–44: "Our king is 'Al'iyān Baʿl, our judge without rival."

177. See F. M. Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274–277.

178. We have omitted *mal'ak* as secondary for metrical reasons. It is also possible to read 'wrw <rw> mrwz in the first colon.

179. Cf. Isa. 52: 7–10; 62: 10–12; Zech. 3: 4.

example of this literary form in Second Isaiah. The passage opens with the characteristic series of active imperatives, plural: *naḥāmū, naḥāmū, dabbērū, qir’ū*, “comfort ye, comfort ye,” “speak ye,” “proclaim ye.” The setting is in the heavenly council in which Yahweh addresses his heralds, “Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people.” That such is the dramatic background of the passage is immediately confirmed by the following verses in which herald voices (introduced by *qōl qōrē’* or *qōl ’ōmēr*) are heard proclaiming the divine decree quite as directed in verses 1 and 2. Their proclamation announces the imminence of Yahweh’s appearance in acts of redemption and, more specifically, directs preparations for the construction of a desert highway on which Yahweh will march through a transformed wilderness at the head of his people. This herald proclamation in verse 3 and 4, to level hills and raise valleys, is directed to supernatural beings, to the council of Yahweh, as is indicated by the cosmic scale of the project. In verses 6–8 an anonymous herald addresses the prophet, announcing to him his inaugural oracle, “All flesh is grass . . . but the word of our God shall stand forever.” Verse 6a is to be read with the versions and the great Isaiah scroll from Qumrān (1QIs^a), “A (herald) voice said, ‘Proclaim’; and I said, ‘What shall I proclaim?’” This passage is a remarkable parallel to Isaiah 6:1–12.

The second variant form is the “covenant lawsuit,” *rīb*, a familiar oracle type in the classical prophetic literature.¹⁸⁰ It undoubtedly had its origins in conceptions of the role of Yahweh’s divine assembly as a court. At the same time, the imagery of the divine council has receded into the background, and the lawsuit oracle has been so modified as to preserve reminiscences of its origin only in its literary framework and in stereotyped introductory phrases. Compare, for example, the linguistic and conceptual points of contact between the *rīb*, of Isaiah 3:13–15 and Psalm 82. The classical introductory formulae of the prophetic *rīb* contain reminiscences of the address to the divine council: “Hear, O Mountains, the lawsuit of Yahweh, and <give ear> O Foundations of the earth”;¹⁸¹ “Listen, O Heavens, give ear O Earth”;¹⁸² “Be astonished, O Heavens, on this account; be appalled greatly, <O Mountains>.”¹⁸³ However, the form is specialized, reflecting the old treaty formula in which the witnesses to the covenant are the patron gods of the contracting parties, the “great of the council

180. For recent bibliography, see Chapter 4, n. 2.

181. Mic. 6:2a.

182. Isa. 1:2a.

183. Jer. 3:12; cf. Jer. 3:9f.

of all the Holy Ones,"¹⁸⁴ and finally the old gods, Heaven and Earth, Mountains, Rivers, and so forth. In Israel's appropriation of the covenant form in the league system, Yahweh takes two roles. He is at once party to the covenant and Judge of the Divine Assembly. In the Prophetic lawsuit, a literary form secondarily derived from Israel's old political forms, Yahweh is both plaintiff and judge, and the witnesses to the covenant are reduced to the "old gods," more or less innocuous members of the divine assembly.¹⁸⁵

Form-critical analysis of the prophetic forms of speech has yielded the information that the prophet's office is that of messenger and that the fundamental message he brings is the judgment, *Gerichtswort*.¹⁸⁶ The oracle of judgment properly carries overtones of a judicial decree or verdict, and rests upon a basic legal metaphor. More concretely, the prophet is the messenger of the divine court or council, and his authority rests upon the absolute authority of the council, its great Judge or great King who pronounces the judgment which the prophetic messenger is to transmit.¹⁸⁷ The prophet himself receives the word of the Judge and court normally in vision or audition, most frequently the latter. In short, the typology of the ʾĒl revelation—the Patriarch in his council rendering judgment as the fundamental context, the word or vision as the mode—is found in the prophetic understanding of revelation. Like ʾĒl, Yahweh may be seen as Judge in his council, as

184. See Cross and Saley, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria," *BASOR*, 197 (1970), 45 and n. 19.

185. In an otherwise excellent article, Herbert Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL*, 78 (1959), 285–295, follows uncritically the analysis of Gunkel-Begrich in assuming that "Heaven and Earth" are judges. They play no such role either in Canaanite lore or in Israel. The address to the heaven, earth, and mountains involves a substitution of a part for the whole in Israel, but one which echoes covenant traditions.

186. The history of the discussion, including the important contributions of Gunkel, Lindblom, and Wolff, has been sketched by Claus Westermann in his excellent study, *Grundformen prophetischer Rede* (Munich, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960), pp. 7–63; in English, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, trans. H. C. White (Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 13–89. To the literature cited by Westermann, add K. Baltzer, "Considerations Regarding the Office and Calling of the Prophet," *HTR*, 61 (1968), 567–581; J. F. Ross, "Prophecy in Hamath, Israel, and Mari," *HTR*, 63 (1970), 1–28; J. Limburg, "The Root *ryb* and the Prophetic Lawsuit Speeches," *JBL*, 88 (1969), 291–304; W. L. Moran, "New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy," *Biblica*, 50 (1969), 15–56; and John S. Holladay, Jr., "Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophets of Israel," *HTR*, 63 (1970), 29–51.

187. Recently, stress has been laid upon the high office of the prophet by Baltzer and Holladay, one speaking of the prophet as "vizier" of the king, the other of the authority of the royal messenger or ambassador (see above, n. 186). This emphasis evidently points

King in his court, or as Divine Warrior surrounded by the heavenly hosts. In Canaan the original image of 'El is as Judge in his assembly. In Israel also, the dominant image is that of Yahweh judging in his divine council. In Israel this is nuanced by the analogy of league forms, with its assembly (*mô'ēd*) of tribal representatives led by the Judge, the military and judicial head of the league. In Canaan, Ba'l and his mythology tended to take over the epithets and especially the functions of king and warrior. On the contrary, Israel was free to use the language of kingship and war in its image of Yahweh and his retinue, although it exposed the faith of the nation to the inroads of syncretism, notably the absorption of the myth of Ba'l's battle of creation.

Ba'l versus Yahweh

In his suggestive essay "Jahve und Baal,"¹⁸⁸ Otto Eissfeldt has underlined the importance of the ninth-century prophets, above all Elijah, in the crucial conflict between Yahweh and Ba'l. The religion of Israel in its first lusty and creative impulse absorbed mythic elements readily into its language of faith and into its cult, its dynamic transforming these elements to the service of Yahwism. By the ninth century B.C., however, Israel had become vulnerable to a less wholesome syncretism, and in fact the religion of Yahweh began to give way to

in the right direction. However, the office is that of the herald, in our view, who repeats the message he bears in the name of Yahweh and the divine council. To use either the term ambassador or vizier is to mislead. The power and the authority of the office of messenger of the gods in Canaanite antiquity is in fact profound. One need only examine the terrible messengers of Yamm approaching the council of 'El:

Yea, the gods sat at banquet,
The sons of Asherah at the feast.

Behold, the gods spied them;
They spied the messengers of Sea,
The heralds of Judge River.

The gods lowered their heads
To the top of their knees,
To their princely thrones,

...

A fire, two fires [the messengers] appeared;
Their tongue a sharpened sword.
(*CTA*, 2.1.20-24, 32f.)

188. *KS* (Eissfeldt), I, 1-12.

the popular cult of Baʿl. Mythical elements in the old language of the Yahwistic tradition were no longer harmless, but were used as conduits through which to introduce the full, sophisticated mythology of Canaanite Baʿl. The threat was not so much that Yahweh be forgotten but that he subside into ordinary membership in the Canaanite pantheon. The battle against syncretism and Baʿlism with its missionary prophets was mounted by the prophets of Yahweh, at whose head in symbol and in fact stood the giant figure of Elijah. In the legends of the Elijah cycle the conflict is sharpened into a simple opposition: Yahweh versus Baʿl. In this crucible of conflict the prophets of Israel were tested and tempered, and from it emerged the classical tradition of Israelite prophecy.

It is not coincidental that the language of theophany and the imagery of revelation derived from the mythology of the storm god largely fell out of use, beginning in the ninth century, and including the two centuries to follow, in prophetic Yahwism. The prophets chose another language, other imagery with which to describe their intercourse with Yahweh, drawn as we have seen from the concept of the messenger of the Council of ʿEl. So far as we are able to tell, the prophets did not attempt to suppress in systematic fashion the old hymns and traditions which used the uncouth language of the storm theophany. The attack was on Baʿl and not on the notion that Yahweh controlled the elements of nature. Nevertheless, they used a refined or purged language of revelation, because Yahweh, so to say, no longer used the storm as a mode of self-manifestation. The revised prophetic language was also, of course, a traditional language of revelation, narrowed and specified by the evolution of the prophetic office.

In chapters 18 and 19 of 1 Kings, the account of the crisis on Mount Carmel and its sequel, the "second" revelation on Mount Sinai, we find the central, climactic events in Elijah's battle against Baʿl. The two chapters are marked strongly by traits of oral composition, and in their present form are little shaped by the Deuteronomistic historian.¹⁸⁹ These chapters share with the Elijah cycle as a whole the shaping of

189. Cf. the brilliant study of R. A. Carlson, "Élie à l'Horeb," *VT*, 19 (1969), 416-439. Among other important recent studies of this pericope are Jörg Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 112-115; J. J. Stamm, "Elia am Horeb," in *Studia biblica et semitica* [Vriezen Festschrift], ed. W. C. van Unnik and A. S. van der Woude (Wageningen, Veenman, 1966), pp. 327-334; E. Würthwein, "Elijah at Horeb: Reflections on 1 Kings 19:9-18," in *Proclamation and Presence* [G. Henton Davies Volume], ed. S. I. Durham and J. R. Porter, (Richmond, 1970), pp. 152-166; and O. H. Steck, *Überlieferung und Zeitgeschichte in den Elia-Erzählungen* (Neukirchen, Neukirchener Verlag, 1968).

Elijah into the figure of the new Moses.¹⁹⁰ Elijah's translation to heaven in Transjordan opposite Jericho is strongly reminiscent of Moses' death. The dramatic parting of the river Jordan by Elijah, like the splitting of the river in the Gilgal cult, carries the symbolism of the splitting of the sea by Moses. Elisha plays the minister of Elijah (1 Kings 17:21) as Joshua is minister (*mēšārēt*) to Moses, succeeds him, and crosses Jordan on dry ground in the path of Joshua.

More important for our purposes are the parallels in the episodes at Carmel and Sinai. At Carmel the events are shaped into the pattern of covenant making. As Moses built an altar at Sinai and set up twelve stones for the twelve tribes (Exodus 24:4), and Joshua erected the twelve stones at Gilgal in the Gilgal covenant festival (Joshua 4:3), so Elijah built an altar of twelve stones "according to the number of the tribes" of Israel (1 Kings 17:31).¹⁹¹ Similarly we find the covenant-motif "cleansing from alien gods" in the Carmel episode, beginning in Elijah's words, "How long will you straddle either side? If Yahweh be God follow him, and if Baʿl, follow him,"¹⁹² and ending in Elijah's command to slay the prophets of Baʿl.¹⁹³ While this motif is more familiar from Joshua's speech in Joshua 24, it is found also at Sinai in the aftermath of the affair of the golden bull. Moses said, "Whoever is on the side of Yahweh, [rally] to me."¹⁹⁴ Moses then led the Levites in a slaughter of the devotees of the bull.

Parallels between Moses and Elijah in the episode at Sinai in 1 Kings 19 are even more striking. In the present form of the Sinai traditions, Moses returned into the mount for a second sojourn, following the slaughter of the apostates. Probably we have to do here with a doublet in the Epic tradition. At all events, Elijah's sojourn in Sinai is parallel to this second sojourn, immediately following the slaughter of the prophets of Baʿl. In fear, rage, and despair, Elijah fled, and under divine guidance and care was led to Sinai.¹⁹⁵ The account of the sojourn

190. The recognition of this parallelism between Elijah and Moses goes far back in the history of scholarship. See recently, G. Fohrer, *Elija* (Zürich, 1957); and Carlson, "Élie à l'Horeb."

191. There is reason to believe that the falling of fire from heaven to consume the offering also reflects a tradition of covenant-making at Sinai which has fallen out of the Priestly edition of the Epic sources; an echo is found in the "flaming torch" which miraculously sealed the Abrahamic covenant in Gen. 15:17.

192. 1 Kings 18:21; cf. Josh. 24:14f.

193. 1 Kings 18:40.

194. Exodus 32:26.

195. Elijah's forty days and nights to the mountain of God are probably not to be

in the mount in I Kings 19:9-14 shows direct dependence on the archaic lore of Exodus 33:17-23; 34:6-8. Elijah "came thence to *the* cave," that is, the "hole in the rock"¹⁹⁶ where Moses had been hidden. Not only did Elijah return to the holy mountain; he returned to the very site of Yahweh's supreme revelation to Moses, the theophany in which Yahweh passed by Moses in the cave, reciting his own names in Moses' hearing, and, granting Moses his request, permitted him, a mortal, a glimpse of the back of his "Glory." From the point of view of the traditionist who composed the pericope in Exodus 33:12-23, Yahweh's "passing" and Moses' glimpse of his back represented the ultimate approach of the godhead to Israel, the definitive revelation. The narrative in I Kings 18 and 19 has prepared us for a repetition of this theophany, the most audacious parallelism between Moses and Elijah.

Unhappily, in verses 9b-14, there appears to be a doublet in the tradition which has obscured the interpretation of the climax of the legend. Carlson has argued that the so-called doublet is merely repetition natural to style of the Elijah cycle. Others have argued that a dittography or gloss has intruded, and that verses 9b-11aα are to be omitted, or alternately, verses 13b-14.¹⁹⁷ I am inclined to believe that the original account possessed both an incubation and a "passing by" of Yahweh as Elijah stood in the door of the cave. Whichever of these three solutions is taken, the basic intention of the account seems to be clear. The narrative leads up to an expected theophany in the pattern of the traditional theophany at Sinai. One is not troubled that Yahweh speaks to Elijah freely throughout the episode. The Epic description of the original theophany at Sinai portrays Yahweh as communicating freely with Moses in the manner in which he (later) imparts his word to the prophets, alongside the theophanic form in which he speaks from the cloud or storm, or from his "Glory." Yahweh does pass by Elijah in the cave on Sinai. There is repetition as required. The god of Moses approaches his great prophet Elijah.

taken as a parallel to Moses' forty days and nights in the mount. It is a cliché of oral literature.

196. I Kings 19:9a parallel to Exod. 33:21f.

197. Würthwein has the temerity to suggest that vv. 11-13a are to be omitted, as an addition, that is, the entire theophany. This is an instance of throwing out the baby with the bathwater. The whole story of the return to Sinai, not to mention the incubation in the cave, makes no literary sense unless Yahweh "passes by," and the remarkable "addition" becomes more obscure, the more Würthwein attempts to explain it.

Again Sinai is wracked by storm wind, by quaking, and by fire—the three hallmarks of the theophany of the storm god. At this point the repetition abruptly ends, and the expectations of the hearer (or reader) of the tale are shattered by a surprise ending. Three times the narrator repeats, “Yahweh was not in the stormwind . . . Yahweh was not in the quaking . . . Yahweh was not in the fire.” Yahweh passed in a “thin whisper of sound” *qōl dēmāmā daqqā*, that is to say, imperceptibly, in silence. Perhaps we should translate in each case, “Yahweh was no longer in the storm.” In any case, Yahweh was not immanent in the storm. The *qōl Baʿl*, the thunderous voice of Baʿl, has become the *qōl dēmāmā daqqā*, the imperceptible whisper. And Elijah does not see the hidden god. Then follows the three-fold oracle, commissioning the prophetic revolution which is to fall upon the house of Omri.

The abrupt refusal of Yahweh to appear as in the traditional theophany at Sinai marked the beginning of a new era in his mode of self-disclosure. This is the way, we believe, that the ancient prophetic school of Elijah viewed the matter.

The historian perceives here a polemic against Baʿl¹⁹⁸ and the language of his storm theophany; he perceives also a legend supportive of the prophetic language of the “word” or “judgment” of Yahweh . . . and the council of ʿEl.

198. J. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, has correctly stressed this point.

8 *The Priestly Houses of Early Israel*

The Classical View of Israel's Early Priesthood

One of the pillars of Julius Wellhausen's great synthesis of the history of Israelite religion was his reconstruction of the history of the priesthood.¹ He sought to establish a three-fold development of the priestly office to match the three-fold patterns of the history of the place of worship, the evolution of the sacrifices, and the growth of the sacral feasts. There was (1) an early age when there was no fixed, hereditary priesthood, (2) the age of the kings when a Levitic priesthood began to emerge dominant in Jerusalem, and (3) the postexilic theocracy in which the Aaronids ruled supreme, and Levites in general became hierodules.² The power of Wellhausen's construction may be perceived in recent histories of the priesthood. For example, in Father Roland de Vaux's monumental study of the institutions of Israel, his history of priestly institutions still preserves the Wellhausenist rubrics intact: (1) Non-Levitic Priests, (2) Levite Priests, and (3) Priests and Levites.³ Details of Wellhausen's beguilingly simple hypothesis have been under reexamination in recent years. Kurt Möhlenbrink in 1934 published a thoroughgoing review of the Levitical traditions, no doubt the most important monograph on the history of the priesthood since Wellhausen.⁴ Since Möhlenbrink, the literature has burgeoned, but it is fair to say that the overall view of the early history of priesthood has changed very little if at all.⁵

1. Chapter 8 is an expansion of lectures given at Brandeis University on December 11, 1968, and at Yale University, April 9, 1969. I am in special debt to my hosts, Professor Nahum Sarna and Professor Dean McBride, for their courtesies and kindness.

2. Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, trans. J. S. Black and A. Menzies (Edinburgh, 1885), pp. 151-161.

3. Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions*, trans. J. McHugh (London, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1961), pp. 361-366. Cf. Aelred Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), whose positions stand close to those of Father de Vaux.

4. Kurt Möhlenbrink, "Die levitischen Überlieferungen des Alten Testaments," *ZAW*, n.s. 11 (1934), 184-231. My student Professor Merlin Rehm has developed the views of Möhlenbrink in his Harvard dissertation, "Studies in the History of the Pre-exilic Levites" (1968).

5. See the bibliography of Aelred Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*, pp. xvi-xxvii. The best of recent studies is the monograph of A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1965).

Wellhausen argued strenuously that neither Zadok nor Abiathar, the high priests of David, stemmed from the house of Aaron. Zadok was without genealogy, a *homo novus*. As for the genealogical notice in 2 Samuel 8:17 which calls Zadok the son of Ahitub, the text is evidently corrupt. Ahitub was the grandfather of Abiathar in the Elid line of Shiloh; that Zadok was not an Elid is apparent from 1 Samuel 2:30–36 where the end of the Elid line is prophesied unequivocally, and the faithful prophet to come, that is, Zadok, juxtaposed to the Elid house. The genealogies of the Chronicler are late and contrived in Wellhausen's view, and cannot be used to support an Aaronid origin of Zadok.⁶ A caveat is necessary here, however; it is Wellhausen, not the Chronicler, who equates 'Ahitub the putative father of Zadok with 'Ahitub the grandfather of Abiathar.⁷ The Chronicler traces Zadok to the Aaronid Eleazar, Abiathar to the Aaronid Ithamar.⁸ At all events, Wellhausen concludes, "obviously [Zadok] does not figure as an intermediate link in the line of Aaron, but as the beginning of an entirely new genealogy."⁹

David's other high priest, Abiathar, has a genealogy in the older sources linking him to the house of Eli.¹⁰ While Wellhausen assumed that the house of Eli was originally non-Levitic, he recognized that it laid claim to Levitic descent, not through Aaron, however, but through Moses. In 1 Samuel 2:27 an anonymous prophet declared to Eli, "Thus says Yahweh, 'Did I not wholly reveal myself to the house of your father when they were in Egypt, slaves¹¹ of Pharaoh's house? . . . and did I not choose him from all the tribes of Israel to become my priest . . .?'" Wellhausen asserts that in the passages, "it is clearly Moses who is thought of as the recipient of the revelation."¹² To some Wellhausen's exegesis will appear exces-

6. 1 Chron. 5:27–41; 6:35–38 (cf. 1 Chron. 9:10f.; Neh. 11:10f.). The problems of these genealogies are manifold and need not be examined here. We note, however, that the sequence Meraioth, Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok is followed later by the sequence Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok in 1 Chron. 5:27–41, producing a haplography (Amariah to Amariah II) in Ezra 7:1–5. That the lists are highly confused with doublets and omissions is evident in the omission of *known* pre-Exilic highpriests, and in the secondary intrusion of Meraioth in the document underlying 1 Chron. 9:11–Neh. 11:11.

7. 1 Sam. 22:9, 20.

8. Cf. 1 Chron. 24:3, 6, 31.

9. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 126.

10. 1 Sam. 22:9, 11, 20; cf. 1 Sam. 14:3; 1 Kings 2:27.

11. This is the reading of G with *doulōn*, 'bdym which has dropped out owing to homoioteleuton (-rym/-dym). Cf. Lev. 26:13; Deut. 6:21 (Driver).

12. *Prolegomena*, p. 142.

sively subtle. To be sure, the prime recipient of the Sinaitic revelation was Moses, and the earlier the source the greater Moses' predominance over Aaron. However, Wellhausen's case rests on a much wider base than 1 Samuel 2:27. In Exodus 33:7-11 Moses and Joshua act as priests in the Tent of Meeting in violation of all the Priestly law (compare Numbers 11:16, 17a, 24b-25, 30; 14:14; and Deuteronomy 31:1a, b, 15). Here Moses is seen as founder of the priestly order. In the archaic hymn in Deuteronomy 33:8 he finds a reference to Moses:

Give to Levi your Thumim,	הבו ללוי תמיך ¹³	1 (8)
Your Urim to your faithful one,	אוריך לאיש חסדך	1 (8)
Whom you tested at Massah,	אשר נסיתו במו ¹⁴ מסה	1 (9)
Whom you tried at Meribah.	תריבהו על-מי מריבה	1 (9)

That Moses is the faithful one of Levi, tried at Massah and Meribah, appears clearly in Epic tradition, Exodus 17:2-7.¹⁶ In the blessing, Levi the tribe and Moses, Yahweh's faithful man, are placed in parallelism, and, as Wellhausen observed, each stands for the other.¹⁷ Further, he contended, Aaron originally played little or no role in Yahwistic tradition. Moses is the dominant priestly figure of the oldest traditions. In this view Wellhausen is probably correct.

Wellhausen recognized wider claims to Mosaic (better Mushite) ancestry among the priestly families of early Israel. He observed that in addition to the Mushite house of Eli at Shiloh, there was a Mushite priesthood at the royal shrine of Dan, appointed by Jeroboam. The origin of the priesthood of the temple of Dan is traced in Judges 18:30 to "Jonathan son of Gershom, son of Moses."¹⁸ The patronymic of

13. The reading *hbw llwy* has dropped out in an unusual haplography after *llwy 'mr*. The full reading is found in 4QDt^b (unpublished) and in G.

14. The relative particle is suspect in early poetry, and perhaps we should substitute *zū* or *ša*. Verse 9 is a prosaic gloss alluding to Exodus 32:26-29. Cf. Cross and Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," *JBL*, 67 (1948), 203f., n. 28.

15. In old orthography *hms* < *hmms*.

16. In the J material in Numbers 20:1-13, Aaron is not associated with Moses; only in Priestly sections does Aaron appear, and even here in a secondary role. Cf. Num. 27:14; Deut. 6:16; 9:22; 32:51; Pss. 81:8; 95:8; 106:32. Cf. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester*, pp. 37-44; and E. Nielsen, "The Levites in Ancient Israel," *ASTI*, 3 (1964), 17-20.

17. Wellhausen bases his remarks on the received text, not the critical text as we have reconstructed it: *Prolegomena*, p. 135.

18. The reading *mšh* is that of G^LV (cf. M), and evidently original.

Gershom is probably to be understood as the clan name, suggesting that Gershom—in traditional genealogies the first son of Levi, as well as the name of Moses' son—was a Mushite clan.

The arguments of Wellhausen for the Mushite origin of the priest-hoods of Shiloh and Dan are not all of equal weight, and certain of his presuppositions must be jettisoned. Nevertheless, his conclusion, we believe, remains sound, and additional arguments are now available, based on new data.

The Function of the Stories of Conflict

There is evidence in Israel's earliest traditions that has never been sufficiently utilized which bears upon the history of the early priestly houses of Israel, namely, the stories of conflict in the wilderness.

(1) The most dramatic story of conflict in the wilderness era is the account of the rebellion of Aaron in Exodus 32.¹⁹ Although Aaron is virtually missing in the Yahwistic tradition, here he appears as a cult founder, albeit of a paganizing cult, in northern, Elohist tradition. He also stands in opposition to Moses in the northern material (Exodus 32:1-6, 15-24, 35).²⁰ In its present form the account has a tendency to shift blame from Aaron to the people; in its pristine Elohist form Aaron was, no doubt, more the central figure.²¹ The pericope attributes to Aaron the unthinkable sin of fashioning the young bull, the prototype of the iconography of the Bethel temple. We have seen here a polemic against the Aaronids since the tradition must rest upon Bethelite claims to an iconography stemming from Aaron himself. The polemic itself cannot have arisen in a sanctuary claiming Aaronite origins; thus the polemic was not devised in the late Jerusalemite priesthood. Rather, the polemical form of the tradition of Aaron's bull must have originated in an old northern priesthood, a rival priesthood of non-Aaronite lineage, defenders of

19. See our discussion above at the end of chapter 3.

20. M. Noth (*Exodus* [Philadelphia, Westminster, 1962], pp. 243-252) followed by G. W. Coats, *Rebellion in the Desert* (Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1968), pp. 184-191, attempts to attribute the narrative to J. This stands against the style of the section and its date in view of evident reminiscences of the cult of Jeroboam. Certainly the polemic against Aaron did not derive from the Zadokite circles of Jerusalem. Cf. W. Beyerlin's analysis in *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1965), pp. 126-133.

21. Contrast the harsh treatment of Aaron in Deut. 9:20. It is wholly unsatisfactory in our view to suppose that priestly circles in Jerusalem would have accented Aaron's part in the account! Aaron's role thus must go back at least to Epic tradition.

an alternate iconographic tradition. The Mushite priesthood of Shiloh, later of Nob, is the natural candidate, and the iconography they supported was obviously the cherubim throne associated with Shiloh.²² The priestly family attacked must be the Aaronidae of Bethel. This conclusion would appear to be contradicted by 1 Kings 12:31ff. which states: "And he made the temples of the high places, and he made priests from all and any of the people who were not of the sons of Levi . . . and he placed in office in Bethel priests of the high places he had built." These words belong to the Deuteronomistic polemic against Jeroboam I in which he is accused of making anyone a priest of the high places and mingling high-place priests with those of the Bethel sanctuary. That the polemic is imprecise is clear from the traditions establishing the priesthood of Dan as Mushite. It may very well be that the Mushite sources of the Deuteronomist did not reckon the Bethel Aaronites as of Levitic descent. It appears highly probable in any case that Bethel's priesthood claimed Aaronic descent. Certainly the iconography of Bethel, its bull, had connections with the house of Aaron. Also we find in Judges 20:26–28 an archaic tradition placing Phinehas the son of Eleazar the son of Aaron at the sanctuary of Bethel in the early era when the ark was in Bethel. Thus Bethel possessed Aaronic associations.

We must conclude that Jeroboam carefully appointed two priest-hoods for his two national shrines, one of Mushite stock, one of Aaronite ancestry. As we have seen, Jeroboam was in fact no innovator. In his establishment of his cult and cult places he attempted to "out-archaize" David. In the choice of priesthood he also proposed to alienate neither of the rival priestly houses, choosing two national shrines (a procedure in itself demanding explanation!) and two priestly houses to serve him. Withal he attempted to strengthen his kingship, as a usurper must, against the house of David and the great sanctuary of the Ark in Jerusalem.

(2) In Exodus 32:26–29 we find, in the present form of the tradition-complex, a sequel to the episode of Aaron's infidelity. At this stage, in any case, the Levites rally to Moses' side and slay, we are told, about three thousand apostates, neighbor and kindred alike. For their single-minded fidelity they are consecrated priests. Probably we must

22. See above, chapter 3, and O. Eissfeldt, "Yahwe Zebaoth," in *KS* (Eissfeldt), III, 103–123; "Silo und Jerusalem," in *KS* (Eissfeldt), III, 417–425.

separate 32:26–29 from the Elohist account of Aaron's bull; it appears to be secondary in its present position. In any case, the consecration to the priesthood of the Levites is as unexpected a tradition in the Priestly edition of the Tetrateuch as is the story of the apostasy of Aaron. It fits precisely, however, with the blessing of Levi in Deuteronomy 33:8, 10f. in which Moses and the Levites are given the full priestly office and in which there is an allusion to strife: "Smite the loins of his foes, His enemies, whoever attacks him."²³ Deuteronomy 33:9, an intrusive (or retouched) verse, overtly connects the blessing with the tradition of Exodus 32:27.

In these traditions we note that Moses' allies are Levitical priests, confronting the idolators, at whose head stands Aaron!

(3) In a series of episodes during the wilderness interlude, Moses is closely associated with Midian, the ancient southern league in which the Kenites were an important element.²⁴ The priest of Midian provided Moses with a wife, apparently a priestess in her own right,²⁵ and he also offered sacrifices to Yahweh and instituted a judicial system according to Epic tradition (Exodus 18). Hobab, a kinsman by marriage to Moses,²⁶ designated both as a Midianite (Numbers 10:29) and a Kenite (Judges 1:16; 4:11), served as guide to Moses in the wilderness (Numbers 10:29–32). The survival of such traditions in the face of rival traditions of utter hostility to the Midianites is remarkable and suggests that Moses' interconnections with the priestly house of Midian were too old and well established to be suppressed quietly or forgotten.

The recovery of the Yahwistic shrine at 'Arad in the Negeb in the excavations of Yohanan Aharoni has added a new dimension to the traditions of the Midianite priesthood allied with the Mushite priest-

23. On the text of this verse, see Cross and Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," *JBL*, 67 (1948), 204, nn. 33–35.

24. See the Harvard dissertation of William J. Dumbrell, "The Midianites and Their Transjordanian Successors" (1970). Dumbrell develops the thesis, first suggested by Paul Haupt, that Midian included a shifting group of tribes and, like the later Arab tribes of the seventh century B.C., was organized as an amphictyony inhabiting the Edomite-Sinaitic southland.

25. Cf. Exod. 4:24–26. One may compare also Miriam and Jael.

26. We do not propose to decide whether Hobab was *hōtēn* or *hātān Mošē*. See W. F. Albright, "Jethro, Hobab, and Reuel in Early Hebrew Tradition," *CBQ*, 25 (1963), 1–11. Albright makes a good case for distinguishing an older priest of Midian and a younger, vigorous Hobab, Moses' guide. On the meaning of *hōtēn*, see now T. C. Mitchell, "The Meaning of the Noun *hōtēn* in the Old Testament," *VT*, 17 (1969), 93–112.

hood.²⁷ Benyamin Mazar in a brilliant paper²⁸ recognized that the children of Hobab, Moses' kinsman, constituted a priestly family which migrated to the desert of Judah, settling among the Judahites in Negeb-Arad²⁹ and serving as the priests of the sanctuary of 'Arad.³⁰ In Judges 4:11 we read of the migration of one branch of the family northward to Kadesh-Naphtali establishing itself at a sacred terebinth, Elon-bezaananim. Mazar is no doubt correct in seeing Heber and his wife Jael as persisting in their priestly functions at a *temenos* related to the terebinth. The preeminence of Jael is clear from Judges 5:6 where she is paired with the judge Shamgar. Mazar further makes a plausible case for his conclusion "that Sisera fled from the battle to the tent of Jael not only to seek the peace which reigned between Jabin king of Hazor and the family of Heber and Kenite, but also because of the special exalted position of Jael, and because her dwelling place, Elon-bezaananim, was recognized as a sanctified spot and a place of refuge where protection was given even to an enemy."

There is evidence here that there was an early alliance between the priestly descendants of Moses and the descendants of the priest of Midian and that this priesthood preserved traditions at several sanctuaries, Shiloh, Dan, Arad, and Kadesh-Naphtali. These traditions functioned to support their legitimacy and to denigrate rival priestly families.

(4) In Numbers 25:6-15 the Priestly tradent has attached an account of sacrilege to the Epic story (JE) of Ba'l-pe'or, the most infamous occasion of idolatry subsequent to the affair of Aaron's bull.

27. Y. Aharoni and R. Amiran, "Arad: A Biblical City in Southern Palestine," *Archaeology*, 17 (1964), 43-53; "Excavations at Tel Arad: Preliminary Report of the First Season," *IEJ*, 14 (1964), 131-147; Y. Aharoni, "Excavations at Tel Arad: Preliminary Report of the Second Season," *IEJ*, 17 (1967), 233-249; "Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple," *BA*, 31 (1968), 2-32.

28. Benyamin Mazar, "The Sanctuary of Arad and the Family of Hobab the Kenite," *JNES*, 24 (1965), 297-303.

29. Judges 1:16, "And the children of Hobab the Kenite, the in-law of Moses went up from the City of the Palms with the children of Judah to the Judean desert which is in Negeb-Arad . . ." The reading "Hobab" is no doubt original: the G manuscripts are split between $\omega\theta\omicron\omicron\alpha$ and $\omega\beta\alpha\beta$. The manuscript tradition behind M probably read $ytr'w$, left blank as an apparent error (in light of the parallel in Judges 4:11). Precisely the same phenomenon appears in 2 Sam. 4:1f; see our discussion in *ALQ*², p. 191, n. 45.

30. The foundations of the 'Arad temple are later than the events we are describing: before the temple, we presume, was a *temenos* or high place with altar.

The attachment of the P account at this point to the orgiastic rites of Baʿl-peʿor with the daughters of Moab in the plains of Moab is certainly secondary.³¹ While in Epic tradition Israel's intimate relationships with Midian have been recorded favorably or with disinterest, in Priestly tradition, in Numbers 25:6–15, the Midianites are portrayed as archenemies of Israel, and even worse, as those who have led Israel into apostasy and unspeakable sacrilege.

There are archaic elements in the account, including rare words of non-Priestly usage, and, as has been generally recognized, the original form of the tradition must be quite early. The narrative tells of an Israelite bringing a Midianite maiden into the Israelite congregation, and notably “before the eyes of Moses,” at the door of the Tent of Meeting. Phinehas, the Aaronid, spied the couple, entered into the “domed tent,”³² that is, the Tent of Meeting itself, and slew the two with a single thrust of his spear. Evidently the two were engaged in the rites of ritual prostitution, an appalling sacrilege in orthodox Israelite eyes. For extirpating the sinners and the cleansing of the Israelite cultus from Midianite religious practice, Phinehas was given Yahweh's covenant to be “for him and his seed after him a covenant of eternal priesthood, because he was jealous for his God and made atonement for the children of Israel.”³³ That is to say, the priesthood passed to the Aaronites precisely for their service in cleansing Israel from the taint of Midianite rites! The polemical tone could not be stronger or more obvious.

It is quite impossible to separate this account from the story leading up to the rejection of the Elid (Mushite) priestly house in 1 Samuel 2:22–25. The two sons of Eli “lay with the women who did service at the door of the Tent of Meeting.”³⁴ In the sequel, 1 Samuel 2:27–36,

31. See the discussion of Martin Noth, *Numbers*, trans. J. D. Martin (Philadelphia, 1968), pp. 195–199. On the related Priestly narrative in Num. 31:1–12, see pp. 228ff. Psalm 106:28–31 is dependent on the combined sources. See also Dumbrell, *The Midianites*, chapter 4.

32. On the term *qubbā*, “domed tent-shrine,” see F. M. Cross, “The Priestly Tabernacle,” in *BAR*, I, 218f. *ʾl-hqbh* and *ʾl-qbth* (with locative enclitic) are ancient variants.

33. Num. 25:13.

34. 1 Sam. 2:22bβ is missing in 4QSam^a and in G^{BL}. Its language sounds Priestly (cf. Exod. 38:8), and it has been observed that the sanctuary at Shiloh was a *hēkal*, not a tent. However, the latter argument is very precarious (see chapter 3, n. 114 and M. Haran, “Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch,” *JBL*, 81 [1962], 22), and it is difficult to see just how and why such a notice came into the Deuteronomistic history from Priestly sources in the post-Exilic period when the

we find the prophecy of “the faithful priest” for whom Yahweh would build a secure dynasty to “walk before my anointed always,” that is, the house of Zadok.

The story in Numbers 25 stops short of condemning Moses in its present form, just as some of the anti-Aaronic traditions tend to spare Aaron. In its received form, the Priestly account presumes the Epic context (Numbers 25: 1–5) and Moses’ positive action against “those who yoked themselves to Ba‘l-pe‘or.” Verse 5, however, suggests a form of the story in which Moses viewed the sacrilege but *failed* to act, at least until Phinehas took initiative. The Priestly editor in verses 14f. gives names and titles (the principals are children of nobles of Israel and Midian) after telling the story first without such detail. Evidently he drew on more than a single strand of tradition in composing his story. This suggests, as does the gloss in 1 Samuel 2:22, a polemical literature reflecting conflicting claims of the great priestly families much wider than has survived in our sources.

(5) Numbers 12 is a complex story vindicating the unique relation of Moses to Yahweh as opposed to the rivals Miriam and Aaron. Two issues are combined in the Epic tale, no doubt stemming from originally distinct stories of conflict, but now combined in a single narrative too unified to dissect. Moses is attacked by Miriam and Aaron “because of the Cushite woman whom he married.” The issue then becomes, “Has Yahweh indeed spoken *only* with Moses? Has he not also spoken by us [Aaron and Miriam]?” Yahweh called the three to the door of the Tent of Meeting, appeared in his cloud, and addressed Aaron and Miriam:³⁵

If there be a prophet among you,	אם יהיה נביא ³⁶ בככם ³⁷	1 (7)
I make myself known to him in a vision;	במראה ³⁸ לו אתודע	1 (7)
In a dream I speak with him.	בחלום אדבר בו	1 (7)

Mushite-Aaronite controversy no longer raged. I am inclined to think that the verse is part of a job of retouching by a priestly hand, but one drawing on an earlier tradition relating to the Mushites and Zadok.

35. Num. 12:6–8. Note the poetic form pointing to the relative antiquity of the tradition.

36. The traditional text *nby'km* has suffered haplography owing to the similarity (in many periods) of *kaf* and *bêt*.

37. *yhw* is a correction inserted at the wrong point: it belongs in v. 6a after *wy'mr*. Cf. G^L.

38. Normally the indirect (personal) object of the *niphal* and *hiphil* of *yd'* is construed with *l* rather than with *'l*. Further, the *'alef* can be taken as a dittography in the early orthography: *bmr'ʿʿlh* > *bmr'h'lyw*.

Not so (with) my servant Moses ;	לא כן עבדי משה	1 (6)
In all my household he (alone) is faithful.	בכל ביתי נאמן הוא	1 (7)
Mouth to mouth I speak with him.	פה אל פה ארבר בו	1 (7)
In clarity and not riddles ;	במראה ולא חידת	1 (7) ³⁹
The form of Yahweh he beholds.	תמנת יהוה יביט	1 (7) ⁴⁰

Moses thus is set over priest or prophet as the peerless mediator of divine revelation in these verses. Aaron and Miriam stand rebuffed and humiliated. The story ends with Miriam's punishment. She is made snow-white with leprosy. It is perhaps easiest to tie this punishment to the objection made to Moses' Cushite priestess-wife. The term *Kūš* originally applied to an element in the Midianite league, a name elsewhere used of a south Transjordanian district alongside the byform *Kūšān*.⁴¹ There is thus no reason to suppose that the Cushite wife is not also the Zipporah of Yahwistic tradition. The term "Cushite" may also have had connotations of blackness derived from its homonym, "Ethiopian," rendering the whitened skin of Miriam a singularly fit punishment for her objections to the Cushite wife.

The two themes in Numbers 12 appear to be (1) Moses' superiority to the house of Aaron as mediator of the divine command, and (2) the affirmation of the legitimacy of the Mushite priesthood despite its "mixed" blood. Some such function must be asserted for the formation and preservation of the traditions.⁴²

(6) In Leviticus 10: 1-7 the Priestly source records a tale of two clans of Aaronic priests. Nadab and Abihu, in tradition the elder sons of Aaron, offered "strange fire," whatever that may be, before Yahweh. Fire streamed forth "from before Yahweh" and consumed them. Moses then pointedly said to Aaron, "That is what Yahweh spoke about, 'I shall be treated as holy by those who draw near to me (in priestly service), so that I shall be glorified before all people,' and Aaron was silent."⁴³ The verse is highly elliptical, even mysterious. We do not

39. This is the reading in 4QNum^a, 4QNum^b, G and Syr (cf. Sam.), and is best metrically, enough evidence to counter the argument *lectio difficilior praeferenda est*.

40. Omit the conjunction here and at the beginning of the preceding colon, *metri causa*.

41. The data have been collected by W. F. Albright, *ARI*, p. 205, n. 49.

42. Cf. G. W. Coats, *Rebellion in the Desert*, pp. 261-264. The treatment leans heavily on the views of Noth.

43. Lev. 12:3.

know the antecedent of the demonstrative "that" (*hū*). It is obvious that Aaron does understand that he has been rebuked for sufficient cause and is without words to reply. In any case, two Aaronite clans were repudiated and, though senior to Eleazar and Ithamar, disappear from history.⁴⁴

(7) Numbers 16 consists of two accounts, an Epic story of the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram the Reubenites (verses 12–15, 25–32a, 33–34), and Priestly narrative (1a, 2b–11, 16–24, 32b, and 35–40) attached to it and partially integrated with it by the Priestly editor.⁴⁵ That the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram was once independent of the traditions of Korah is confirmed by Deuteronomy 11:6 which gives only the Epic story of Dathan and Abiram.

The narrative of Leviticus 10:1–7 and the Priestly strata of Numbers 16:1–40 show interesting parallels and contrasts. Both reflect old rivalries between priestly families. In Leviticus 10, two Aaronic clans are repudiated, in Numbers 16, a Levitic clan. The ritual of bringing incense burners to the sanctuary appears in both; in both, fire from Yahweh consumes the sinners. In Leviticus 10, Aaron appears to be rebuked; in Numbers 16 it is the Levites who are rebuked, Aaron who is upheld, and both from the mouth of Moses! In short, a similar theme is used in two contexts, one anti-Aaronite, the other pro-Aaronite in bias.⁴⁶

In Numbers 16–17, however, the tradition of ancient conflicts between Levitic or Mushite priests and the priestly house of Aaron stands far in the background. In the present form of the Priestly polemic the hierodule status of the Levite is assumed by the Priestly tradent though he still takes pains to point out the significance of the copper-covered altar (Numbers 17:5).

In our sketch of the stories of conflict we have asked the following questions: (1) How were the traditions of the priest of Midian and Moses' Midianite connections preserved? Where did they have a cultic or social function? (2) Why is it that Moses is portrayed as in perpetual conflict with Aaron and related clans? What is the primitive function of these tales? (3) How is it that Moses dominates the earliest traditions

44. Nadab and Abihu appear elsewhere (save in genealogies) only in Exod. 24:1, 9, where they are associated with Aaron and Moses in the covenant making at Sinai.

45. Cf. Jacob Liver, "Korah, Dathan and Abiram," *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 8 (Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, 1961), 180–217. On the labors of the Priestly editors of the Tetrateuch, see chapter 12 below.

46. Cf. Coats, *Rebellion in the Desert*, pp. 257–260.

heroically, Aaron playing at most a negative role, but in later levels of tradition Aaron takes an increasingly important part, ending up as Moses' alter ego in Priestly tradition?

All these questions receive answers if we posit an ancient and prolonged strife between priestly houses: the Mushite priesthood which flourished at the sanctuaries of Shiloh and Dan and an allied Mushite-Kenite priesthood of the local shrines at 'Arad and Kadesh opposed to the Aaronite priesthood of Bethel and Jerusalem.

The Priestly Genealogies

Despite the repetition of priestly genealogies with small variations in Priestly sources in the Tetrateuch and in the Chronicler's work, there is only one standard genealogy preserved. This genealogy goes back only to the Priestly school in Exile. In it, Levi is divided into three clans: Gershon, Kohath, and Merari. From the eldest, Gershon, stem two clans, Libni and Shimei (both gentiles); from the youngest, Merari, stem Mahli and Mushi (both also clan names). Kohath gives rise to four sons: Amram, father of Aaron; Izhar, father of Korah; Hebron; and Uziel.

Fortunately, the fragment of a second genealogy has survived in Numbers 26:58a. Its importance and antiquity was recognized by Wellhausen and strongly emphasized by Möhlenbrink.⁴⁷ The original form of the list seems to have read: "These are the clans of Levi: the clan of the Libnites, the clan of the Hebronites,⁴⁸ the clan of the Mushites, and the clan of the Korahites (*Qorhī*)." In this list the names which figurę in the official genealogy also appear, but the old list records, in parallel, names belonging to the second generation after Levi, and in the case of Korah, to the third. The first two names are obviously called after the Levitic cities Hebron and Libnah. No name from the official Aaronite line is mentioned. Only Hebron and Korah from the traditional Kohathite line are found here. Most curious is the failure to mention the clan of the descendants of Aaron. The natural explanation is that the Aaronids originally were reckoned as Hebronites, but that this datum was suppressed in favor of the official genealogy.

47. Möhlenbrink, "Die levitischen Überlieferungen," pp. 191-197; Liver, "Korah, Dathan and Abiram," pp. 212f.

48. G omits *mšpht hmhly*. One can argue that it was added in view of the regular association of *mhly* and *mwšy*; on the other hand, G may have suffered a haplography. We have chosen the *lectio brevior*.

Confirmation of the Aaronid tie to Hebron is implicit in Joshua 21:10, 13 and 1 Chronicles 6:42, "And to the sons of Aaron they gave the city of refuge Hebron . . ." Professor Mazar has emphasized the importance of the Hebronite clan in the crowning of David in Hebron and later in the administration of David's kingdom, functioning in all parts of Israel.⁴⁹

The Priests of David's National Shrine

In light of these data we return to the problem of the two priests of David serving the national sanctuary in Jerusalem. It has been argued that the priesthood of Shiloh was Mushite. The evidence is not all we should desire.⁵⁰ Such a conclusion, however, explains many of the peculiarities of Epic (JE) tradition. There is also evidence that the polemic against Bethel stemmed not only from Jerusalem but also from Shilonite circles. Indeed, the conception of Jerusalem as the successor of Shiloh had deep roots in northern tradition, preserved no doubt in the priestly circles of Nob and Anathoth and taking definitive form in the traditional lore of Deuteronomy. Old Deuteronomic tradition, originating in the north looked upon Jerusalem as the sanctuary chosen by Yahweh "to place his name there." If the Yahwist gives short shrift to Aaron, the Deuteronomic source mentions Aaron only to condemn him: "And Yahweh was furious with Aaron to the point of destroying him, but I [Moses] interceded for Aaron in that time." No other mention of Aaron is to be found in Deuteronomy.⁵¹

In the era of the Empire, David then wisely chose a scion of the Shilonite house, establishing for his national cult place the nimbus of the old Mushite sanctuary, its ark and its priesthood, and not least, its cherubim iconography of *Yahweh šēbā'ōt*.⁵²

A peculiarity of David's religious establishment was that it boasted two high priests. Such is without precedent or parallel in Israel. Jeroboam had a high priest at each of his two sanctuaries, but this is not precisely parallel. In some remote sense Moses and Aaron formed a di-

49. B. Mazar, "The Cities of the Priests and the Levites," *SVT*, 7 (1959), 197 and references. Cf. W. F. Albright, "The List of Levitic Cities," in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (New York, American Academy for Jewish Research, 1945), p. 59, n. 24.

50. The Chronicler's attachment of Eli to Ithamar (1 Chron. 24:3) was based on a reordering of the genealogies and cannot be taken at face value.

51. Deut. 9:20. Deut. 10:6 and 32:50 both belong, of course, to Epic tradition.

52. See above, chapter 3, n. 119.

archy, but only in late tradition. David's policy requires more direct explanation. Close to hand is the explanation that the two priests were appointed to represent two great priestly houses, presumably two rival houses. In view of the evidence mustered above we must posit two major contending factions in the League and also in Northern Israel in the time of Jeroboam I: a Mushite house and an Aaronite house. It is natural to conclude, therefore, that David appointed the head of each house to minister in the national cultus. He appointed Abiathar, scion of the Mushite house of Eli of the old northern sanctuary at Shiloh, and Zadok, scion of the Aaronid house of Hebron.

No one can doubt that in the years of the Divided Monarchy, after Abiathar was ousted from office by Solomon, Aaronic traditions steadily grew stronger until the Jerusalem priests at the end of the kingdom stood alone with all memory of rival houses and families repressed, Aaron mounting in importance in the Priestly edition of the Tetrateuch. By the Chronicler's time even the house of Eli could be integrated into the line of Ithamar, Aaron's youngest son. Evidently, the Aaronids had come into sole power. The official genealogy reflects this state of the priestly history. In large degree, the victory of the sons of Aaron—the Priestly designation of the legitimate priesthood in the history of the Mosaic times (that is in the P Work)—meant, in the language of the late monarchy and the Exile, the victory of the Zadokites. At least the Zadokites became the dominant Aaronite family. But if this be the case, we must assign Zadok to the Aaronid family. How else can the evolution of priestly tradition be explained, ending as it does in the overwhelming dominance of pro-Aaronite tradition. Since we have argued for Abiathar's Mushite lineage, Zadok and his descendants must be recognized as the bearers and promoters of the Aaronite tradition.

In light of these arguments, it is difficult to understand why Zadok has been denied Aaronid ancestry. Such a denial made some sense in Wellhausen's reconstruction with its animus against any fixed, hereditary institutions in early Israel and its assumption that much of the priestly lore both in the Priestly work and Chronicles was pious fraud. In view of our present knowledge of hereditary institutions in early Israel and contemporary Canaan, priestly families, hereditary craft, military guilds, and the like, Wellhausen's reconstruction becomes less plausible. Even Wellhausen reckoned that the claim of the house of Eli to Mushite origins was not without basis in view of the recur-

rence of the name Phinehas.⁵³ We should add that the expansion of Aaron's role in biblical tradition, and the pro- and anti-Aaronic propaganda can be dated no later than the ninth century in view of its place in the Elohist strand of the Epic. There is no question of the Priestly tradent inventing the stories of conflict between the Aaronite and Mushite houses. He does present the Aaronid or Zadokite claims with fanatical zeal⁵⁴ and assumes a subordinate position of the Levites, including the Mushites, which distorts the history of the priestly families and their relationships in the old time.

The theory of Zadok's origin which finds broadest adherence today may be termed the "Jebusite hypothesis."⁵⁵ Zadok is made the priest of the old Canaanite shrine in Jerusalem, the temple of 'El 'Elyōn. Many of the arguments for the hypothesis are painfully weak. The combination of the name Zadok with older Melchizedek of Patriarchal times, or Adonizedek of Jerusalem in the age of the Conquest is without significance. The element *šdq* is extremely common in Amorite, Ugaritic, Canaanite, and Hebrew names. Extant names generally follow three patterns: (1) *šdqī-DN*, "the god N is my righteousness (vindicator)," (2) *DN-šaduq*, "the god N is (has shown himself to be) righteous,"⁵⁶ and (3) names in which the element *šidqu* is a divine name, *bitta-šidqi*, "the daughter of *šidqu*, *malkī-šidqu*, *'adōnī-šidqu* [Ugaritic *'adnšdq*] "my king/lord is *šidqu*." The name of the kings of Jerusalem contain the divine element *šidqu*, a familiar Canaanite god (not to be identified with 'El 'Elyōn!). The element *šaduq* > Hebrew *šādōq* is a hypocoristic of type (2) *DN-šaduq* and hence without any connection whatever with names in which DN is *šidqu*.⁵⁷ Another argument is that

53. We can add that the recurrence of Egyptian names, Phinehas and Hophni, especially the latter which is relatively rare, suggests not merely a line back to the Phinehas at the beginning of the League but back into the Mosaic age. See Aelred Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*, p. 70f.

54. Compare the explicitly Zadokite claims in the Book of Ezekiel.

55. See especially H. H. Rowley, "Zadok and Nehushtan," *JBL*, 58 (1939), 113-141; A. Bentzen, "Zur Geschichte der Šadokiden," *ZAW*, n.s. 10 (1933), 173-176. For a summary of other views of Zadok's origin, see Aelred Cody, *A History of the Old Testament Priesthood*, pp. 88-93; de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions*, pp. 372-376. E. Auerbach has returned to the defense of his views in his paper, "Das Aharon-Problem," *SVT*, 17 (1969), 37-63.

56. Cf. Ugaritic *'ilsdq*, *b'lsdq*; names in *šadaq* (*yahū-šadaq*) are byforms of older *šaduq*.

57. The name *šādōq* in Greek transcription, and perhaps in some Jewish traditions, was assimilated to the hypocoristic pattern *qattūl*, *šaddūq*. It has been suggested that

David may have utilized the site of the Canaanite temple of 'El 'Elyōn for his sanctuary. But there is no suggestion of evidence in our sources that David pitched his sacred tent on the locus of the Canaanite shrine.⁵⁸

A better argument for Zadok's Jebusite origin is the observation that in the era of the Empire, especially in Solomonic times, strong Canaanite influences shaped the national rites and royal ideology; these influences may have come from Zadok's Jebusite heritage. Certainly it is true that under Solomon new Canaanite influences affected the cultic establishment and the concept of kingship. Much of this can be attributed to Solomon's intimate relations with Tyre, but why not *some* influence from a Jebusite Zadok? Zadok's appointment, however, was by David, a primitive Yahwist of well-documented piety. Why would David who obviously attempted to draw all the old League traditions to his new religious establishment, turn and invite a pagan priest as one of the high priests of the national cultus? As a matter of fact, David bowed to Nathan's oracle and refused even to build a temple in Zion lest ancient League forms be violated.⁵⁹ How is it, too,

the internal pattern *qatul* also may be a hypocoristic form (M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik* II [Giessen, Töpelmann, 1908], 22). If this were the case, the name Šādōq < Šaduq could derive from any of the three patterns listed above. The names in *qatul*, however, are more easily described as stative verbs or adjectives in the Canaanite onomasticon.

58. Cf. R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, p. 374, and *apud* Cody, *A History of the Israelite Priesthood* p. 92, n. 17. G. W. Ahlstrom has argued that Araunah was king of Jerusalem and owner of a sanctuary, the "threshing floor" of Araunah. His evidence rests unhappily on the corrupt text of 2 Sam. 24:23. Both 2 Sam. 24:18-25 and 1 Chron. 21:18-26 have suffered badly in transmission. We can isolate one of the haplographies in 2 Sam. 24:20 = 1 Chron. 21:20 21bα. Between *wyšb 'rnn wyr' 't hml'k* (1 Chron. 21:20αα) and *wyšqp* (var. *wybt*) *'rwnh* (var. *'rnn*) *wyr' 't hmlk*, the text of Samuel in the Massoretic tradition has suffered a routine haplography by homoioarkton (*'rwnh wyr' 't hmlk*). The omitted lines include reference to Araunah's threshing, *w'rwn' dš h'tym*, a reading preserved in 4QSam^a (as well as Josephus and 1 Chron. 21:21). Evidently the king of Jerusalem was not *threshing* in his *sanctuary*. In verse 23, 1 Chronicles has suffered haplography also. However, the reading *hkl nty* is superior to 1 Sam. 24:23a which has suffered dittography. It may be remarked in passing that the Massoretic "fundamentalism" which has marked the work of Nyberg, Engnell, and their students, as well as Dahood and his students, must be repudiated in view of the different text-types extant in Cave 4, Qumrān, and the advances they support in the text-critical analysis of certain parts of the Hebrew Bible, including especially the historical books (Former Prophets). On the above reading *w'rwn' dš h'tym*, see Wellhausen's acute remarks, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen, 1871), p. 221.

59. See chapter 9 for a discussion of Nathan's oracle in 2 Sam. 7:4-6 and its significance, and for a contrast of the cultic forms and royal ideology which characterized David's regime on the one hand and Solomon's on the other.

that the Zadokites claimed an Aaronid pedigree? Why did they not exploit their proud lineage reaching back to Melchizedek?⁶⁰ Supporters of the Jebusite hypothesis attempt to explain Zadok's appointment as a sop to the Jebusites, but, if this is so, why is Zadok's ancestry suppressed in contemporary tradition and fabricated shortly thereafter?⁶¹

Again, can we suppose (in the interests of this theory) that David spurned the Aaronids, the priesthood of old Judah, and the shrine of Hebron, his first capital city? If the choice of Abiathar won the north, the seat of the central sanctuary in the era of the League, so we should expect the choice of an Aaronid to maintain the primary base of David's power in Judah. In our view, David's choice of two priests was motivated by the same diplomatic interests that led Jeroboam I to appoint an Aaronid shrine in Bethel and a Mushite shrine in Dan as dual national shrines in Israel. Indeed we should rather say that Jeroboam imitated David's device to avoid alienating either of the great priestly families.

As far as the Canaanite influence on Israel's royal cult is concerned, we need not multiply further the manifold sources of such lore by adding the priest of a Jebusite 'Elshrine to transmit myths of 'El. Yahwism was conceived in the matrix of the Patriarchal 'El cults, and 'El shrines dotted the land in the era of the League. The new Canaanite influences which informed the temple cult on Zion in the late Empire and which shaped the ideology of kingship which developed especially in the Solomonic era and later, stemmed not from 'El myths but in large part from the Ba'l cult, as might be expected in view of the Tyrian design of the temple and its appurtenances and the dominant patterns of Canaanite kingship.

The linchpin of all constructions which deny to Zadok Aaronid ancestry is the claim that Zadok is without genealogy. To be sure, the Chronicler records straightforward genealogies of Zadok tracing him through Ahitub, Amariah, Meraioth, and others, back to Eleazar and

60. Both Genesis 14 and Psalm 110 are rooted in the royal ideology not in the priestly.

61. The contemporary tradition we have in mind is, of course, the "Court History of David," a source of unusual objectivity as well as antiquity, found in 2 Samuel 9-20; 1 Kings 1. We give only its minimal limits; the source almost certainly began earlier, including at least the primitive portion of Nathan's prophecy in 2 Sam. 7:1-11a; most scholars add 1 Kings 2.

Aaron.⁶² Unhappily, the frequent repetition of names in the Zadokite genealogy⁶³ has led to both haplography and dittography. For example, three Azariahs (‘Azaryah/‘Azaryahu) are found in the list in 1 Chronicles 5:27–41, and it omits two other Azariahs known from the reigns of Uzziah and Hezekiah.⁶⁴ For the historian of Israel’s priesthood this popularity of a restricted group of names is most frustrating. In any case, the Chronicler’s genealogies have been ignored as without historical value. It is to be readily admitted that his genealogies are often secondary constructions and may be here. At the same time, the Deuteronomistic history also lists Zadok as a son of Ahitub. The passage in question is 2 Samuel 8:17.⁶⁵ It has been thrown out of evidence, however, since the time of Wellhausen in favor of Wellhausen’s emendation. The passage reads in the Massoretic text of Samuel, “Zadok son of Ahitub and Ahimelech son of Abiathar were [David’s] priests.” The parallel text in 1 Chronicles reads “and Zadok son of Ahitub and *Abimelech* son of Abiathar . . .” The reading Abimelech for Ahimelech (ʿbymlk for ʿhymlk) is found in only a few minuscules in 2 Samuel 8:17, but Abimelech often stands as the old Greek reading in place of Ahimelech, and evidently was the Old Palestinian reading.⁶⁶ Wellhausen made no attempt to make a text-critical reconstruction of the corrupt text of 2 Samuel 8:17. He

62. 1 Chron. 5:27–41; cf. 6:35–38; 9:11; Ezra 7:1–5; and Neh. 11:10. All these genealogies exhibit textual disarray; doublets (5:27–41) and/or haplography (6:35–38, Ezra 7:1–5); 1 Chron. 9:11 (=Neh. 11:10) is particularly bizarre. Cf. Möhlenbrink, “Die levitischen Überlieferungen,” pp. 203ff., 210.

63. We do not speak here of the practice of papponymy which obtained in the Zadokite dynasty in the Persian and Hellenistic ages. On the late practice, see F. M. Cross, “Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dāliyah,” in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, ed. D. N. Freedman and J. C. Greenfield (New York, Doubleday, 1969), pp. 55f.

64. 2 Chron. 26:20; 31:10. cf. the highpriests Jehoiada of Jehoash’s reign (2 Kings 12:8) and Uriah of Ahaz’ reign (2 Kings 16:10) also omitted from the Zadokite lineage. Josephus preserved a longer form of the genealogy with some corrupt names, but also with some names which appear authentic: Ourias [ʿūrīyah], Nēria [Nērīyah], Odaiah [Hōdawyah]. See Josephus, *Antiquities*, X. 152f.

65. 1 Chron. 18:16 is the parallel passage. Cf. also 2 Sam. 20:23–26; and 1 Kings 4:2–6.

66. See 1 Sam. 21:1; 22:20; 23:6; etc., etc. On the text of Chronicles as an Old Palestinian witness to the text of Samuel-Kings, see F. M. Cross, “The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Texts,” *IEJ*, 16 (1966), 88 and references, and 93f. Josephus also uses the form *Abimelech*, as is expected since his text reflected the late Palestinian tradition (the so-called Proto-Lucianic recension); cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, VI.242, etc.

assumed that the *Ahitub* mentioned had to be the Elid despite the opposition in 1 Samuel 2:30–36 between the Elidae and the house of Zadok. This merely meant that Ahitub was a mistake, not that the Ahitub in question was other than the grandson of Eli.⁶⁷ Further, since Ahimelech (or Abimelech) was the father of Abiathar and not the son (here Wellhausen is on solid ground), he proposes that the order (1) Zadok, (2) Ahitub, (3) Ahimelech, (4) Abiathar was reversed from the original order (1) Abiathar, (2) Ahimelech, (3) Ahitub, (4) Zadok. The reversal of order was due to the *parti pris* of an ancient Zadokite who wished Zadok to be in the first position. Wellhausen's proposal has a beguiling symmetry but no sense. If a scribe wished to alter the sequence *'bytr bn 'hymk bn 'hytwb wšdwq*, he would have written *šdwq w'bytr bn 'hymk bn 'hytwb* (presuming he knew the meaning of the word *bn*, "son"). Furthermore, Wellhausen's reconstructed text, giving no patronymic for Zadok but two generations of Abiathar's ancestry, violates the form of this list in 2 Samuel 8:16f. and its parallels.⁶⁸ We expect a single patronymic in each case to judge from the remainder of the list of David's cabinet (or perhaps none).

If possible, the corruption of the text of 2 Samuel 8:17 should be explained on the basis of ordinary text-critical principles. As recent text-critical study of the Qumrān manuscripts has shown once again, the overwhelming majority of textual differences in Hebrew and Greek manuscripts are the result of inadvertent or unconscious errors—as should have been expected. Our first approach to the crucial text then should look for an ordinary text-critical explanation of its several text forms.

By text-critical means we can reach no further back than the following two ancient variants:

šdwq bn 'hytwb w'bytr bn 'hymk
šdwq bn 'hytwb w'bytr bn 'bymk

The first reading is that of the Syriac (though the Syriac text may have been revised back to this reading).⁶⁹ The second reading, better than the first perhaps, lends itself to haplography:

67. Cf. 1 Sam. 14:3; 22:11, 20; 1 Kings 2:27.

68. Cf. 2 Sam. 20:23–26; and 1 Kings 4:2–6.

69. If so, the passage in 1 Chron. 18:16 (Sy) was missed for it reads *šdwk br 'hytwb w'hymk br 'bytr*.

šdwq bn ḥṭwb w[ʿbytr bn]ʿbymlk

giving rise to a text:

šdwq bn ḥṭwb wʿbymlk

which in turn was further corrupted from a marginal note reading ḥbytr,⁷⁰ inserted in the wrong place and filled out with *bn*. Wrongly placed restorations of haplographies are among the common scribal errors which can be documented, for example, by a comparison of the Qumrān manuscripts, including the three manuscripts of Samuel, with the traditional text and the Old Greek.

At all events, our concern is with the reading *šādōq ben ʿahīṭūb*, and this reading shows no variations in any of our texts, Hebrew or Greek. It follows the structure of the cabinet list which regularly gives name and patronymic only. Must we indeed follow Wellhausen's lead and insist that the Ahitub here is necessarily identical with Ahitub, the grandfather of Abiathar? We have noted the fashion in which names repeat in the priestly onomasticon. It would be a small coincidence indeed for the name to belong genuinely to *each* genealogy, to two different priests. Certainly neither the Zadokites nor the Chronicler proposed to trace Zadok's line through Eli in listing his father as Ahitub.

There is much to commend the attachment of Zadok to the house of Aaron in Hebron and to the well-known shrine there where both David and Absalom were anointed king.⁷¹ In 1 Chronicles 12:27–29 in a notice purporting to list the members of the house of Aaron who rallied to David in Hebron, a certain Jehoiada (bearing a name later popular among the Zadokites) is listed as commander (*nagīd*) of the Aaronid forces and with him an aide⁷² named Zadok. Such a connection between David and Zadok is precisely what we should expect,

70. The variation between ḥymlk and ḥymk need give no concern. Manuscripts of different traditions tended to have one form or the other leveled through, subsequent to the corruption as the parallel texts of 2 Sam. 8:17 and 1 Chron. 18:16 show. The readings of 1 Chron. 24:6, 31 which take Ahimelech to be the son of Abiathar are, of course, based on the corrupted text.

71. Menahem Haran has commented, "It seems likely that the family of Zadok originated in Hebron—the most prominent priestly city in Judah" ("Studies in the Account of the Levitical Cities, II," *JBL*, 80 [1961], 161).

72. The Hebrew is *naʿr* which often designates a subordinate official as in the expression *naʿr ham-melek*.

tying Zadok to David before the transfer of the capital to Jerusalem.⁷³

To sum up. David's unusual choice of two chief priests, like many of his decisions relating to Israel's new central sanctuary in Jerusalem, was based on sure diplomatic grounds; he chose a priest from each of the great, rival priestly families: Abiathar of the Shilonite house of Eli which claimed descent from Moses, Zadok from the Hebronite clan which traced its line to Aaron.⁷⁴

73. If indeed it could be shown that the Aaronid Zadok from Hebron alluded to here were not the later highpriest Zadok (although their ages appear to match) it still would indicate that Zadok was a good Aaronid name. On the list in 1 Chronicles 12, see G. E. Mendenhall, "The Census Lists of Numbers 1 and 26," *JBL*, 77 (1958), 61-63, who dates the list to the early United Monarchy and discusses its numbers. Contrast the remarks of C. E. Hauer, "Who was Zadok?" *JBL*, 82 (1963), 89-94.

74. David's "choice," as we have termed it, was not an arbitrary decision taken in Jerusalem without preparation or prehistory. David cultivated the friendship and loyalty of Abiathar, and apparently Zadok as well, from the beginning of his rise to power.

IV

Kings and Prophets

9 *The Ideologies of Kingship in the Era of the Empire: Conditional Covenant and Eternal Decree*

The Limited Monarchy of Saul and Monarchy in the Northern Kingdom

Albrecht Alt in his subtle analysis of the rise of kingship in ancient Israel stresses the continuities between the institutions of the covenanted tribes in the era of the league and the early monarchy in Israel.¹ Evidently the formation of the monarchy was stimulated by the ineffectiveness of the league in withstanding threats from more highly organized states, above all the expansive Philistine power, but also the revived Phoenician city-states and the nations beyond Jordan. The realization of monarchical forms in Israel was not achieved at one stroke, however; and the transition from the league with its rural and patriarchal traditions, to the monarchy with its centralized, urban patterns was not abrupt. Monarchical institutions and ideology were in no small part imported from outside Israel. Nevertheless, to use the words of Alt, "History usually makes a very cautious and economical use of such a procedure; it links new developments as closely as possible with the previous state of affairs in the immediate vicinity, and only looks beyond this when everything has been derived from it which can be utilized in the fashioning of the new situation."²

The Kingship of Saul

The kingship of Saul in Alt's view was rooted in charismatic leadership, as was the office of "judge,"³ and must be sharply differentiated

1. Albrecht Alt, *Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina, KS* (Alt), II, 1 65; in English translation "The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine," in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. R. A. Wilson (New York, Doubleday, 1968), 225-309. Compare G. Buccellati, *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria* (Rome, Università di Roma, 1967); and Hayim Tadmor, "'The People' and the Kingship in Ancient Israel: The Role of Political Institutions in the Biblical Period," *Journal of World History*, 11 (1968), 3-23.

2. A. Alt, "The Formation of the Israelite State," p. 240 [German, p. 12].

3. The office of *sōpēl* in Israel is best described as an undifferentiated executive office of the league. The "judge" seems to have presided over intertribal councils, called up the league militia for holy war, and otherwise exercised judicial, military, and cultic functions. The translation "ruler" or "commander" is no more misleading than the translation "judge," as is increasingly clear in parallel usage: Amorite *sāpiṭum*, Ugaritic *iāpiṭu*, and Phoenician and Punic *sūpēl*. The office of "judge" was evidently charismatic

from the later "routinized," or dynastic kingship of David and Solomon. Saul rose to be a "military king." The title *nāgīd* used of Saul in the older narrative of his rise⁴ probably is to be translated "commander," applied originally perhaps to the commander of the national militia of the league. In any case, it carried the tradition of league institutions and implied thereby a limitation on the kingship of Saul.⁵ Alt has argued further that this military kingship was based on a covenant in the archaic shrine at Gilgal, although the term *covenant* by chance is not used in the narrative. "This is shown particularly by the action

and occasional: tendencies toward dynastic judgeship in the case of the sons of Eli and Samuel were unsuccessful. See most recently, W. Richter, "Zu den 'Richtern' Israel," *ZAW*, 77 (1965), 40-72; and A. Malamat, *Encyclopaedia Miqra'it*, IV, cols. 576f.; and "Aspects of Tribal Societies in Mari and Israel," *XV^e Rencontre assyriologique internationale* (Liège, 1967), pp. 129-138.

4. We follow the partition of the Deuteronomistic sources as follows: the older (northern) source "A," 1 Sam. 9:1-10:16; 11:1-15; 13; 14; the younger northern source "B," 1 Sam. 7:3-17; 8:1-22a; 10:18-25a; 12; 15. *Nāgīd* is used in 1 Sam. 9:16 and 10:1 of the "A" source, never in the "B" source.

5. The term *ngd* most probably means "military commander" in Old Aramaic, specifically in Sefīreh III, 10 where it stands between "royal princes" and "officers." See J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefīre* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), p. 112f. and W. F. Albright, *Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement*, The Goldenson Lecture for 1961 (Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press, 1961), pp. 15f. Cf. R. de Vaux, "Le Roi d'Israël, vassal de Yahvé," *Mélanges Eugene Tisserant* (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1964), pp. 120f. and the references in n. 4; and especially W. Richter, "Die *nāgīd*-Formel," *BZ*, 9 (1965), 71-84. Richter correctly discerns the military background of the term, suggested strongly by its frequent occurrence with 'am (1 Sam. 9:16; 13:14; 2 Sam. 6:21; 7:8; 1 Kings 14:7; 16:2; 2 Kings 20:5), and argues plausibly, if overprecisely, for its origin among the northern tribes (the seat of the league), its evolved use as a designation of David and Solomon in their relation to the northern tribes, and its survival in prophetic language, as a vestigial title, reacquired by the Northern Kingdom after Solomon, later losing its precise connotations in its use in Judah after the fall of Samaria.

The Nora stone of the ninth century B.C. also preserves an instance of *nagīd* in Canaanite in the sense "commander," "general." I am inclined to read, on the basis of new photographs and revised readings of the stone by Father Brian Peckham:

3. bšrdn š
4. lm h' šl
5. m šb' m
6. lk(y)tn bn
7. šbn ngd
8. lpm y

Vocalized in Canaanite, assuming that the late vocalic sound shifts of Phoenician have not taken place, we read:

ba-šarden šallim hū' šallim šaba'ō
milkyatan bin šubnā nagīd lapumay.

With (these same) Sardinians, Milkyatan son of Shubna, the commander of Pumay, and his army made (a covenant of) peace.

of the tribes in paying homage, not on the battlefield, but far away from it in a holy place, so that the whole procedure was under the guarantee and control of Yahweh, which was necessary to any 'covenant' in the Israelite sense of the word."⁶ Certainly Saul's exaltation to the office of *nāgīd* or *mélek*, "king" was conceived by the tribesmen as a conditional appointment or covenant, so long as the "Spirit of God was upon him," and so long as he did not violate the legal traditions or constitution of the league.

While Saul gathered some professional warriors to his person (1 Samuel 14:52), he relied, not on a standing army, but upon the tribal militia, that is, the elements of Israel under the covenantal obligation to bear arms in the "wars of Yahweh." His capital, if it may be dignified by the term, was a small, rustic fortress at Gibeah, originally built, apparently, as a Philistine outpost. If one compares Saul's call up of the tribes to war against Ammon in 1 Samuel 11:6-11, with the summons of the militia in Judges 19:29-20:3, he perceives that Saul faithfully followed, in this instance at least, the covenantal ritual of the league.⁷ Equally revealing are the accounts of Saul's violation of covenantal laws of holy warfare. All our sources, whatever their attitude towards the nascent monarchy, are in accord in reporting that Saul forfeited the kingship, for himself and his house, by his breach of old law, namely by attempts (in one way or another) to manipulate the fixed forms of holy war in his own interest.⁸ In the present form of the tradition, Samuel plays a part which anticipates the prophetic role over against the king which we associate with such figures as Elijah. Similarly, Samuel's sermons, designed to limit the office of kingship in Israel, are strongly colored by the specific polemic against kingship that emerged in Solomonic and early post-Solomonic times.⁹ Nevertheless, we should insist that the old order and its powers as personified in Samuel were successful at least in sharply limiting the monarchy of Saul. Moreover, the division of powers between king and prophet which we perceive

6. Alt, *The Formation of the Israelite State*, pp. 253f.

7. Cf. Robert Polzin, "HWQY' and Covenantal Institutions in Early Israel," *HTR*, 62 (1969), 233-240; M. Held, "Philological Notes on the Mari Covenant Rituals," *BASOR*, 200 (1971), 32-40, and references; esp. O. Masson, "A propos d'un rituel hittite pour la lustration d'une armée," *RHR*, 137 (1950), 5-25; and G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant," in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville, Abingdon, 1962), I, 714-723.

8. 1 Sam. 13:5-14 and 15:1-31.

9. This is particularly clear in Samuel's sermon in 1 Sam. 8:10-18 which stems from the same circle of tradition as Deut. 17:14-20. Cf. 1 Sam. 10:25 and 12:13-25.

in the Northern Kingdom in the ninth century B.C. had a beginning, at least, in the reactionary designs of the historical Samuel. Saul's "military kingship" was successfully limited and its conditionality demonstrated in the failure of the house of Saul to secure the succession.

Kingship in the North

Passing over the reigns of David and Solomon for the moment, we note that conditional kingship (not "charismatic"), much in the pattern of the monarchy of Saul, reestablished itself in the Northern Kingdom with the revolt of the Israelite tribes against Solomon's son.¹⁰ With the exception of the dynasties of Omri and Jehu, each with four kings having a significant length of tenure, Jeroboam, Baasha, and the last kings of Israel were unable to maintain their heirs on the throne. Even the two dynasties which did endure were separated by the prophetic revolution whose rallying cry was "Jezreel," an allusion to the violation of the ancient law of inheritance by the crown and symbolic of the growth of an aristocracy and the multiplication of feudal estates.¹¹ Jeroboam received the title *nāgīd* from the Shilonite prophet Ahijah according to Deuteronomistic tradition, and Jehu the prophet refers to Baasha, who murdered Jeroboam's surviving sons, by this same title.¹²

Among the major institutions limiting kingship in Israel were the traditional law of the league and the phenomenon of prophecy. Israelite law received its normative form before the advent of the kingdom, and,

10. A. Alt, "The Monarchy in the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah," *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, pp. 313-334; *KS* (Alt), II, 116-134. Buccellati, *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria*, argues soundly that the kingship of Saul in theory was "dynastic." So, too, kingship in the North followed the dynastic pattern. His polemic against Alt and Alt's use of the contrast "charismatic"/"dynastic" is also sound as far as it goes. Indeed the dynastic principle appears fleetingly already in the office of judgeship. Buccellati fails, however, to reckon with the distinction between the limited, conditional kingship of Saul, a conception preserved in northern prophetic tradition, and the absolute, unconditional kingship of Solomon claimed in later Judaeic royal ideology. The term "charismatic" applied to Saul and indeed to David is legitimate only so far as it points to the conditional, covenantal character of their royal office. Compare Tadmor, "'The People' and the Kingship," pp. 14-20.

11. The Samaria Ostraca illustrate the growth of great estates in Israel most vividly if we are correct in taking them to be copies of tax receipts for shipment of oil and wine from land barons (*gibbōrē hāyil*) to Samaria, usually by means of messengers (men without *l* prefixed to their names). These "non-l" men do not repeat, except with the same "l-men" (landowners to whom the tax is credited), from the same district and village. The "l-men" not only repeat, they are associated with a variety of villages and sometimes with more than one district.

12. 1 Kings 11:34; 16:2.

as Martin Noth has stressed, was never reformulated in a state law code.¹³ The single exception is the “law of the king” in Deuteronomy 17: 14–20. However, even this legislation was not promulgated by the state, but added stipulations, precisely limiting kingship, to the league constitution.¹⁴

Prophecy and the Limitations of Kingship

It is fair to say that the institution of prophecy appeared simultaneously with kingship in Israel and fell with kingship.¹⁵ This is no coincidence: the two offices belong to the Israelite political structure which emerged from the conflict between league and kingdom. While prophecy was not an institution of the league, the charismatic principle of leadership which obtained in the era of the Judges survived in its liveliest form in the office of the prophet.

We are wholly dependent upon the Deuteronomistic historian and his reworked sources for the history of early prophecy. It will be of interest, however, to sketch the Deuteronomistic data on the office and function of the prophet from its beginnings to the end of the ninth century B.C. The seventh-century¹⁶ Deuteronomistic understanding of the prophetic office as it is shaped from the Deuteronomist’s sources can be useful as a preliminary stage in the reconstruction of the actual history of the early prophetic office in Israel and its relation to kingship.

The figure of Samuel in the Deuteronomistic history provides a paradigm of the prophetic leader. He appeared at least on one occasion as presiding over a school of prophets.¹⁷ Whether or not Samuel in fact was head of a prophetic guild, it is certainly true that Elijah and Elisha among others were “chief prophets,” heading schools organized more or less in a hierarchical structure. Samuel is described as engaged in several activities which will characterize functions of the prophet in the following century in Israel. (1) He designated the chosen of Yahweh

13. M. Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 1–193, esp. pp. 28–41; *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (Munich, Kaiser Verlag, 1960), pp. 9–141, esp. pp. 42–58.

14. Cf. Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch*, p. 36.

15. The office of *nābī*, the prophet *sensu stricto*, appears in Syria-Palestine only in the eleventh century and functions in classical patterns in our sources beginning with Samuel. On the decline of prophecy, see the “Note on the Study of Apocalyptic Origins.” The transformation of classical prophecy into proto-apocalyptic takes place in the oracles of Ezekiel before one’s eyes, coinciding with the fall of the house of David.

16. See below, chapter 10, for the dates of the editions (Dtr¹ and Dtr²) of the Deuteronomistic history.

17. 1 Sam. 19:20.

to be king by royal oracle and anointing.¹⁸ (2) He pronounced judgment on the king, the forfeit of kingship for breach of law or covenant, as well as the death of the king for like reasons.¹⁹ (3) He called Israel to battle in the authentic “war of Yahweh,” as well as determined the times for Israel to go to war (in victory or in defeat).²⁰

If one reviews the activity of the prophets of the Northern Kingdom in the tenth and ninth centuries, as recorded in the Deuteronomistic history, he finds that the great majority of their oracles and acts fall under identical rubrics.

(1) Of the *royal oracles* of the northern prophets, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite heads the list. Ahijah announced the division of the Empire, “the rending of the kingdom from Solomon’s hand,” and the appointment of Jeroboam to kingship over the ten tribes of Israel.²¹ At the same time he announced that Judah will be left to the Davidic house, “that David my servant may have a fief always.” On the condition of obedience to covenant law, Yahweh promised to Jeroboam a “secure dynasty.” In 1 Kings 19:16 Elijah was empowered at Sinai to anoint to kingship Jehu to supplant the dynasty of Omri and to anoint Hazael king of Damascus,²² as well as to anoint Elisha as (chief) prophet in his place. According to 2 Kings 9:1–10 it was Elisha who arranged that a member of his prophetic guild anoint Jehu and proclaim his kingship. The remaining kings pass in kaleidoscopic fashion without room for comment on their anointing.

18. The anointing of Saul is mentioned in 1 Sam. 10:1; afterward the Spirit of Yahweh comes upon Saul (1 Sam. 10:6–9). Public proclamation of Saul’s kingship appears in each of the two sources. In 1 Sam. 10:24f. Samuel at Mizpah proclaims Saul king and writes the “law of the king” and deposits it in the sanctuary (“before Yahweh”). Evidently, the document constitutes Saul’s covenant of kingship. In 1 Sam. 11:14f. (the “A” Source) Saul is made king at Gilgal, or as the present text reads, the (covenant of) kingship was renewed. The anointing of David was carried out before Saul’s death and the *de facto* termination of his reign. However, the spirit of Yahweh comes upon David and abandons Saul at David’s anointing (according to our source in 1 Sam. 16:13).

19. In 1 Sam. 13:13f. (“A” Source), Samuel repudiates Saul’s kingship for breach of the law of Holy War; although Yahweh would have established his kingdom forever (a dynastic covenant is evidently presumed), now it will go to another. In 1 Sam. 15:28 (“B” Source) Samuel in a poetic oracle announces Yahweh’s rejection of Saul for breach of league law of holy warfare. In 1 Sam. 28:8–25, poor Samuel’s shade is brought up to repeat the oracle of divine rejection, but also to proclaim Saul’s death with his sons in battle.

20. 1 Sam. 15:1–35 (Source “B”); cf. 1 Sam. 13:8–14; and 28:8–25.

21. 1 Kings 11:29–39; cf. 12:15–20; and G 12:24.o (where Shemaiah acclaims Jeroboam king).

22. Cf. 2 Kings 8:7–15.

(2) *Oracles of judgment* on northern kings and their houses, beginning with Ahijah's decree of the end of the house of Jeroboam, usually are formulaic:

Thus says Yahweh the God of Israel: "Inasmuch as I raised you up from among the people, and made you commander over my people Israel . . . and you have done evil above all which was done before you, and have gone and made for yourself alien gods . . . Therefore I am bringing evil on the house of Jeroboam, and I will cut off every male child whatsoever belonging to Jeroboam in Israel . . . Dogs shall eat Jeroboam's dead in the city, and in the country birds shall eat (his) dead.

(1 Kings 14:7–11)

Jehu the prophet repeated many of these same formulae over Baasha in announcing judgment on his house.²³ King Ahab received the decree of death from the mouth of several prophets. An unnamed prophet in 1 Kings 20:40f. condemned Ahab for breach of *herem*, "holy war" in sparing the life of Ben-Hadad. Most familiar is Elijah's proclamation of doom upon Ahab, Jezebel, and their royal progeny. The formulae cited above are repeated here, but with more concrete detail: "Thus says Yahweh: 'In the place where the dogs licked the blood of Naboth, dogs shall lick your blood, even yours . . . and I will cut off every male child whatever . . . and I shall make your house like the house of Jeroboam the son of Nebat and like the house of Baasha'" (1 Kings 21:19–22). A bloody end was also decreed for Jezebel. Ahab's crime was his violation of the traditional law of inheritance, as we have seen, the seizure of the plot in Jezreel, achieved by Jezebel's arrangement for Naboth's assassination ("Hast thou killed and also taken possession?"). Micaiah, asked to give a war oracle, also proclaimed the death of Ahab: "I saw all Israel scattered upon the mountains as sheep who have no shepherd; and Yahweh said, 'these have no master; let each return to his house in peace'."²⁴ Finally, the young prophet serving Elisha, in the course of the anointing of Jehu, directed him in Yahweh's name to smite the house of Ahab "that I (Yahweh) may avenge the blood of my servants the prophets . . . and the whole house of Ahab shall perish, and I will cut off every male child."²⁵ Ahab's

23. 1 Kings 16:1–4, 7, 12.

24. 1 Kings 22:1–37; esp. v. 17.

25. 2 Kings 9:6–10.

son Ahaziah who ruled only briefly also was condemned to death in an oracle of Elijah for consulting a pagan god.²⁶

(3) *War oracles* are exceedingly frequent on lips of the northern prophets in the Deuteronomistic sources. Evidently, the function of proclaiming a holy war, or forbidding resort to war on the part of Israel's king, was understood to belong to the office of the prophet. The title "the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof" was used both of Elijah and Elisha and can only signify their crucial function in holy warfare.²⁷ The wars against Aram provided occasions for a number of prophetic war oracles. Two unnamed prophets directed Ahab in wars against Ben-Hadad (1 Kings 20: 13–15; 28f.). War oracles of the four hundred prophets headed by Zedekiah and the prophecy of Micaiah before Ahab and Jehoshaphat, alluded to above, deserve mention in this context as well.²⁸ A curious series of legendary episodes, in which Elisha directed war against Aram, is found in 2 Kings 6:8–23. They reveal better than historical events the survival of the old ideology of holy war in prophetic circles. Elisha with help only from heavenly armies captured "a host with horses and chariots," rendered them blind, and led them to Samaria. The prophet then forbade their slaughter by Israel's king and sent them home to relate their story, after which we note the laconic remark, "And the troops of Aram came no more into the land of Israel." A similar legend is told of a siege of Samaria by Aram in which Elisha counseled patience on the part of the king to await the act of God. In accord with Elisha's prophecy, the host of Aram melted away, frightened by the noise of a mighty host.²⁹ Another legend is placed in the context of the reign of Joash of Israel at the end of Elisha's life. The king was directed to shoot an arrow. Elisha then described the arrow as "Yahweh's arrow of victory and the arrow of victory over Aram."³⁰ Joash was further instructed to drive darts into the ground which he did three times. Elisha, angry that he did not shoot more than three times, interpreted this act: the king will "smite the Aramaeans but thrice." We are not interested in possible belomancy in the background of the tale, only in the prophet's role in warfare as understood by the Deuteronomist. The campaign against Moab by the

26. 2 Kings 1:2–4.

27. 2 Kings 2:12; 13:4.

28. 1 Kings 22:1–38.

29. 2 Kings 6:24–7:20.

30. 2 Kings 13:14–19.

kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom was yet another occasion for a war oracle by Elisha.³¹

Behind the Deuteronomistic forms of the traditions of prophecy discussed above, we posit an ideology of kingship in Israel, at least in prophetic circles, which presumed the conditional and covenantal character of kingship in the north. This is the least we can distill from royal oracles and judgment oracles attributed to the prophets.³² An additional limitation of the king may be perceived in the prophetic war oracles in which the ideology of holy war, in part carried over from the league, was imposed on the king by the prophet.

In contrast to the phenomenon of prophecy in the north, the era following David in Judah is a virtual blank in prophetic history until we reach the Judaeen prophets of the eighth century. Nathan in the time of David played a similar role to that of the northern prophets to follow. He prophesied against the breach of league tradition in the matter of building a temple. As in the case of Ahijah and others in the northern succession, the preservation of traditional forms of the cultus of the Ark sanctuary appears to have been a matter of intense concern to Nathan. To Nathan, also, is attributed a royal oracle. As we shall see, however, it is a unique oracle promising to the Davidic house eternal, unconditional kingship. Severe historical problems are encountered here; the “insubstantial tent” and the “secure house” juxtaposed in the oracle point to incongruent ideologies, derived on the one hand from the sacred league and on the other hand from Canaanite kingship. Later in David’s reign, David was rebuked by the prophet for violations of the laws against adultery and murder in the matter of Bathsheba, and Gad the prophet imposed harsh punishment upon Israel for David’s violation of the tenets of Israel’s volunteer militia by imposing a military census on the nation.³³ Also, Nathan appears to have participated in the anointing of Solomon.³⁴ Finally, in the revolt

31. 2 Kings 3:6–27. On the complex historical and textual problems of this passage, see J. D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 1 (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 87–111.

32. We should note here that the ideology of kingship held by the Deuteronomist (Dtr¹) is not to be identified with the prophetic view of the Northern Kingdom. (See the discussion in the following chapter.)

33. 2 Sam, 24:1–25.

34. Cf. 1 Kings 1:34, 38f. While David directed Zadok and Nathan to anoint Solomon and both appeared in the royal party, in 1 Kings 1:39, it is Zadok alone who takes the oil from the Tent and anoints the new king. This passage may be influenced by later Judaeen tradition in which the priest took the lead in the ceremony of anointing and

of Israel from the house of David, initiated by the northern prophet Ahijah, a certain Shemaiah, presumably from Judah, gave a war oracle to Rehoboam forbidding a war to recapture the tribes which had seceded.³⁵

Before passing on to the subject of the Davidic kingship, we should note that the office of the prophet as sketched in the Deuteronomistic history is consonant with classical prophecy in Judah in the eighth and seventh centuries.

(1) *Royal oracles* appear, modified by the dynastic ideology of the Davidic house. Isaiah 9:1-6 is a parade example of this oracle type as are Jeremiah 23:1-6; 33:19-22,³⁶ and the sixth century prophecy in Isaiah 11:1-9. Such royal oracles are spoken in the name of Yahweh the Divine King by the prophet, his ambassador.

(2) *Oracles of judgment* against king,³⁷ people, and cult for breach of covenant law is an enormously expanded form. The so-called "covenant lawsuit," an oracle form which appears to have arisen in the north in prophetic circles,³⁸ became a dominant oracle type in Judaeon prophecy of the classical age.³⁹ The judgment or decree of the Divine Judge is proclaimed by the prophet, the messenger of the Divine Court.

(3) *War oracles* evolved in complex formal patterns in classical prophecy. There are oracles which sent a king to war or forbade resort to war, which may be called the "original" form. Amos 1:2-2:16 is constructed of a cycle of brief war oracles directed against elements

enthronement. Cf. 2 Kings 11:9-12, 17, the enthronement of Jehoash by the priest Jehoiada; and G. von Rad's paper, "The Royal Ritual in Judah," in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. E. W. T. Dicken (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966), pp. 222-231. In so detailed a description on the enthronement ritual, the absence of a prophet is striking.

35. 1 Kings 12:21-24; cf. 2 Chron. 11:2ff.; 12:5ff, which record other supposed activities of Shemaiah, as well as G 12:24.o.

36. This oracle cannot originate with the Exilic Deuteronomist who reckons the fall of the state and the Davidic house in some sense final. It cannot come either from Priestly circles in view of its doctrine of the priesthood ("The *Levitic* priest"). We are inclined to attribute it to Jeremican circles if not to Jeremiah himself despite its absence from the Old Greek text.

37. For example, Jer. 22:10-30; Micah 3:9-12; etc.

38. See G. Ernest Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York, Harper, 1962), pp. 26-67.

39. Highly formalized examples include Hosea 2 (under the figure of breach of wedding contract) 4:1-3; Micah 3:9-12; 6:1-8; Jeremiah 2:2-13; 3:9, 10, 12; Isa. 1:2a; 10-20; 3:13-15. Cf. Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1967); *Grundformen prophetischer Rede* (Munich, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960).

bound together by covenant or conquest in the (long past) Davidic and Solomonic Empire.⁴⁰ The cycle was a device to announce the war of Yahweh against Israel⁴¹ for her covenant violations, and is not, so to speak, a routine oracle in a rite of holy warfare. From such prophetic usage develops secondarily the "oracle against foreign nations." In the same "developed" category may be put oracles of the Day of Yahweh and late, eschatological war songs.⁴² The prophetic oracles against alliances also stemmed from the old ideology of war with its stress on faith in Yahweh of hosts as the sole basis of victory. The war oracle was pronounced by the prophet as courier of the Divine Warrior, Yahweh of Hosts.

In the view of Albrecht Alt, and his view has been followed generally, the kingship of Saul with its limited, conditional features is to be linked with the later ideology of kingship in the Northern Kingdom, and set over against the kingship of David and Solomon. The latter were marked by the Davidic covenant, and an ideology of kingship which survived in the kingdom of Judah. This view of the two ideologies of kingship comprehends much of the relatively scant evidence at our disposal. On the other hand, it neglects certain attributes of the Davidic kingship which link the Davidic institution more closely with Saul and the institutions of old Israel than with the absolute monarchy of Solomon. There appear to be complexities in the typology of the royal ideologies of the Empire and of later Judah which still require investigation.

Davidic Kingship

On a priori grounds, we should expect the kingship of David to stand in close continuity with the kingship of Saul. David came to power as a charismatic leader, and indeed, as a rebel against the reigning

40. Compare the similar cycle of nations reflecting traditions of the Davidic Empire in Zech. 9:1-8.

41. The oracle against Judah (Amos 2:4-5) is prosaic and fits poorly in the cycle. Aside from minor textual corruptions the remainder of the units appear to be authentic. On the place of Amos 1:2-2:16 in the evolution of the "oracle against foreign nations" see the writer's views summarized by G. Ernest Wright in his paper "The Nations in Hebrew Prophecy," *Encounter*, 26 (1965), pp. 236f. Cf. also P. Miller, "The Divine Council and the Prophetic Call to War," *VT*, 18 (1968), 100-107 and references, especially R. Bach, *Die Aufforderung zu Flucht und zum Kampf in alttestamentlichen Prophetenspruch* (Neukirchen, Neukirchener Verlag, 1962); and B. B. Margulis, "Studies in the Oracles Against the Nations" (Ph. D. diss., Brandeis 1967).

42. Examples are Isa. 34 and 63:1-6.

house. We know little of the character of his rule over Judah. As a condottiere and later feudal chief of Ziklag⁴³ on the border of Judah, he had established a limited base of power and had gathered to himself important elements of Judah. In any case, he was anointed king in Hebron by the elders of Judah and after a number of years of civil war succeeded finally in winning the tribes of Israel. Representatives of Israel sought him out in Hebron and there "before Yahweh" made a covenant with him. Although we cannot be certain, it appears that Judah was attached to David by a covenant of kingship,⁴⁴ Israel to David by a second covenant, presumably designating David as *nāgīd*, commander of the twelve tribes.⁴⁵ There is, thus, a duality in the kingship of David, a duality which reasserted itself in the breaking free of Israel from Judah and the Davidic dynasty after the death of Solomon.⁴⁶ This duality of the kingdoms was also to be reflected in the administrative system imposed by Solomon.⁴⁷ David elected to establish his capital neither in Israel, the traditional seat of the league, nor in Judah his own tribe and the locus of his first capital. Rather he conquered and chose Jerusalem, a neutral city, so to speak, between his two kingdoms. Jerusalem became the city of David, the personal possession of the king by right of conquest, providing the king with an independent power base over which he exercised absolute sway. A similar pattern may be seen in his military organization with its concentric rings: a foreign bodyguard with no loyalties but to David; a standing, professional army, including the "Three" and the "Thirty";⁴⁸ and the militias of Judah and Israel. David's royal establishment thus is somewhat more complex than that of Saul but for the most part evolves naturally from it.

A balance to the novelty of Israel's new capital in Jerusalem was David's endeavor to draw to himself and his city the cultic traditions

43. 1 Sam. 27:6.

44. 2 Sam. 2:4. A *covenant* is not explicitly mentioned.

45. 2 Sam. 5:1-3. In verse 2 David is designated shepherd of Israel and *nāgīd*. Cf. 2 Sam. 7:8; the two passages are dependent on old liturgical materials. In 5:3 the term "*king over Israel*" which is used may be technically an anachronism.

46. A. Alt, *The Formation of the Israelite State*, p. 282.

47. See G. E. Wright, "The Provinces of Solomon (1 Kings 4:7-19)," *Eretz-Israel*, 8 (1967), 58-68; and W. F. Albright, "The Administrative Divisions of Israel and Judah," *JPOS*, 5 (1925), 17-54; and A. Alt, "Israel's Gaue unter Salomo," in *KS* (Alt), II, 76-89.

48. 2 Sam. 23:8-39; 1 Chron. 11:10-47. See the useful study of B. Mazar, "The Military Elite of King David," *VT*, 13 (1963), 310-320.

of the league, establishing the City of David as the central sanctuary of league and state. In this endeavor he was fabulously successful.

Most important, David sought out the ancient Ark of the Covenant of "Yahweh of hosts who is enthroned on the cherubim," the symbol of the tribal covenant, Israel's palladium in the Wars of Yahweh, and the marker of the seat of the central sanctuary of the league. Jerusalem was made successor to Shiloh. David himself took lead in the procession of the Ark to Jerusalem dancing in primitive ecstasy before it.⁴⁹

David chose to place the Ark in a tent-shrine. In this choice he elected to follow age-old tradition recalled in the oracle of the prophet Nathan (2 Samuel 7:5-7). We cannot be sure, despite later tradition, that David considered the tent provisional and that he himself persisted in planning to build a temple of cedar, that is, a dynastic shrine in the Canaanite pattern. Certainly the temple and its cult were largely, if not exclusively, the creation and innovation of Solomon. The later attribution to David of preparations and plans to build a temple remind us of a series of actions and policies of Solomon which were credited to his father by Solomon, but which diametrically opposed the actual policies of David before the regency of Solomon.⁵⁰ We have discussed above the typology of the Tent of 'El and the royal temple of Ba'l and their foundation in patriarchal and monarchical social structures respectively.⁵¹ The extraordinary vigor of the tradition of the tent as the ideal shrine of Israel may be seen in its survival in the Priestly Tabernacle.⁵²

49. 2 Sam. 6:14; cf. Ps. 132:6-9 and the discussion above, chapter 5 ("Psalm 24 and the Warrior-King").

50. See the discussion below of Solomon's innovations. The most glaring instances of this technique of the Solomonic court may be found in the murders which secured Solomon's throne, the murder of Joab and Shimei in particular, attributed to privy instructions of David on his deathbed.

51. See above chapter 2 and especially chapter 3 ('El in Canaanite Myth), and nn. 112, 114.

52. See provisionally F. M. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," in *BAR*, I, 201-228. Contrast the views of M. Haran, "The Nature of the 'Ohel Mo'edh' in Pentateuchal Sources," *JSS*, 5 (1960), 50-65, who neglects the evidence that *mō'ed* means "assembly, council" in old Canaanite and refers to the divine assembly and its earthly counterpart, the political assembly of a league or city-state. Rather, he develops an *ad hoc* meaning for 'ohel mō'ed, based solely on fragmentary Epic tradition. Haran's historical reconstruction is all the more puzzling since he recognizes that the Priestly tabernacle had historical basis in the league tent of Shiloh, a view paralleling closely the writer's arguments that the Priestly Tabernacle represented "the highest and most elaborate development" of the institution of the tent-shrine of Israel. However, in our view this final form of the tent tradition reflected primarily the Tent of David, the successor of the

Not least, David chose Abiathar, a priest tracing his lineage to the Mushite priesthood of Shiloh to serve at his national shrine alongside Zadok, chief priest of the kingdom of Judah, once again knitting together the institutions of the league and his kingdom.⁵³

The degree of David's success in establishing Jerusalem as the city of the central sanctuary of the tribes of Israel (as well as its royal shrine) may be gauged by Jeroboam's frantic attempts to set up a counter-cultus and the opposition to his cult both in the north⁵⁴ and in the south, where it came to be a central theme of the Deuteronomistic history.

In short, David moved slowly in the matter of innovation and stressed continuities between his kingship and the constitution or covenant of the league. It is in this context that we must look for David's own conception of his kingship and the conception of the "Davidic Covenant" in its primitive, historical form. The task of historical construction is not easy in view of the overcoating of virtually all genuine materials of Davidic date by the official Judaeen royal ideology, which developed beginning with Solomon and his dynastic temple and which was endorsed by the Deuteronomistic historian (of the age of Josiah) who has edited all prose texts dealing with David's kingship.⁵⁵

Our earliest witness to the Davidic covenant is found in lore of Davidic date embedded in Psalm 132.⁵⁶

(v. 11)	Yahweh swore to David,	נשבע יהוה לדוד	1 (7)
	Nor will he turn aside (his)	אמת לא ישב	1 (8)
	fidelity from him :	ממנה ⁵⁸	

Tent of the Ark at Shiloh. Cf. Virgil W. Rabe, "The Identity of the Priestly Tabernacle," *JNES*, 25 (1966), 132-134; M. Haran, "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch," *JBL*, 81 (1962), 14-24; R. de Vaux, "Arche d'alliance et tente de réunion," in *Bible et Orient* (Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1967), pp. 261-276.

53. See above chapter 8 on the priests of David's national shrine.

54. See M. Noth, "Jerusalem and the Israelite Tradition," in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1966), pp. 132-144; S. Dean McBride, "The Deuteronomistic Name Theology" (Ph. D. diss., Harvard 1969), pp. 197-210; and above, chapter 3.

55. See below, chapter 10, on the Deuteronomistic ideology of kingship.

56. See the discussion of Psalm 132 above in chapter 5, which treats strophe 2 (vv. 6-9) and lists evidence for its date. Verse 10 and strophe 4 (vv. 13-18) do not belong to the original oral composition, but provide for the new setting of the psalm in the temple cult. Strophe 4 has replaced a strophe, to judge from the structure of the poem (see chapter 5), which dealt with the Tent of David.

57. We read *yašīb*; the M pointing is based on a misreading of *mmnh* (see next note).

58. M preserves an old spelling of *mimmēnō*.

The fruit of your body <I will raise up>, I will set (them) on your throne.	מפרי בטנך >אקים ⁵⁹ אשית לכסא לך	1 (8) 1 (7)
(v. 12) If your sons keep my covenant, And my stipulations which I teach them.	אם ישמרו בניך בריתי ועדתי ⁶⁰ זו אלמדמ ⁶¹ .	1 (10) 1 (10)
Their children also, forever, Shall sit upon your throne.	גם בניהם עדי עד ישבו לכסא לך	1 (7) 1 (8)

The “covenant” and “stipulations” designated here are conditional. There can be no doubt. Obedience is explicitly required. Such a conception of the Davidic covenant is precisely in agreement with the concept of kingship in the era of Saul and in the later Northern Kingdom. It conforms with the status of David’s kingship at the beginning of his reign. At the same time, it stands in sharp contrast to the standard Judaeian ideology of kingship with its notion of an unconditional and eternal decree of kingship promised the Davidic house. Yet there can be no question about the origin of Psalm 132. It belongs to the Jerusalem cultus and must be placed early in the development of that cultus. The notion of a conditional covenant of kingship, a codicil, so to speak, in Israel’s covenant with Yahweh (after the manner of the dynastic stipulations in suzerainty treaties), fits well with the conditional Tent of David, and its Ark of the old covenant. It fits not at all into the ideology of the dynastic temple, the eternal dwelling of the deity, and the symbol of the permanent house or dynasty. Nor will it fit with other materials of the Jerusalem royal cult. There is no hint of the Canaanite ideology of divine adoption found already in such documents as 2 Samuel 7:16–17 and Psalm 89:20–38, both of which specify that under no conditions will David’s house be thrown down.

It is surprising and fortunate that this old poem survived.⁶² Even

59. *’āqīm* or the like has fallen out by haplography (*homoioarkton*); parallelism and meter require such an element.

60. On the meaning of *’d(w)t*, see *YGC*, p. 104, n. 128; p. 106 and nn. 135f., and below.

61. Restoring the archaic form of the pronoun, *metri causa*. In tenth-century orthography, the *waw* of *-ēmō* would not be written.

62. One wonders if it survived in the circle of Abiathar’s descendants where Deuteronomic tradition was reworked, which was probably the circle from which Jeremiah

if it had not, however, I am inclined to believe that there is sufficient indirect evidence that the later Judaeen royal ideology was part of a pattern of innovations begun by Solomon, “Canaanizing” the royal ideology and cult, and that David’s kingship was more limited and more responsive to Israel’s traditional politico-religious forms.

Another passage of early date is the poetic “Last Words of David.” Archaic elements suggest a tenth century date. Whether it is to be assigned to David himself or to a later poet setting forth the covenant ideology attributed to David is difficult to decide. Unhappily, the poem is very badly preserved. Thanks to evidence from a Qumrân manuscript (4QSam^a) a few readings can be cleared up. The Old Greek also is useful, but is preserved only in G¹ (the Lucianic Recension = βοϰε₂L Theodoret). The usual “Septuagint” is basically the so-called καίγυε Recension which has been revised to a text rather close to the received text (M).⁶³

נאם דוד בן ישי	1(7) (v. 1)
נאם הגבר הקים ⁶⁵ אל ⁶⁶	1(7)
משיח אלהי יעקב	1(7)
נעים זמרת ⁶⁷ ישראל	1(7)
רוח יהוה דבר בי	1(6) (v. 2)
מלתו על לשוני ⁶⁸	1(7)

stemmed. Certainly the traditions of the conditionality of the royal house and the conditionality of the Jerusalem (and Shiloh) shrine survive primarily in these circles. Cf. Jer. 7, 26 and 22. It should be noted that the Deuteronomic “Levites” or “Levitic priests” include as a major element the Mushite priesthood.

63. The Recension has suffered inner-Greek corruption in the passage to an unusual degree. On G¹ see F. M. Cross, “The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert,” *HTR*, 57 (1964), 281-299.

64. The conjunction is to be omitted *metri causa*, and with Sy and G^L.

65. The reading is that of 4QSam^a; see next note.

66. We read ’l, “god” for M ’l with 4QSam^a, and G^L. The reading ’l or ’ly, ’ēlī often has been suggested: “The Most High.” For references, see Cross and Freedman, “The Blessing of Moses,” *JBL*, 67 (1948), 204f., n. 38. However, in view of frequent interchange of ’l and ’l (both pronounced with “e”-class vowel in late Hebrew) in textual transmission, the reading ’ēl, the divine name used elsewhere in the poem, is to be preferred.

67. On *zimrat*, see T. H. Gaster, “Notes on ‘the Song of the Sea,’” *Expository Times*, 48 (1936-37), 45; and *SMir*, p. 243, note b. G^L correctly read *zmrt* (sing.).

68. Omit conjunction, *metri causa*.

(v. 3)	אמר אלהי >יעקב ⁶⁹	1(7)
	לי דבר צור ישראל	1(7)
	משל ⁷⁰ באדם >ב-צדק	1(7)
	משל יראת אלהים	1(7)
(v. 4)	⁷² כאור בקר יזרח שמש ⁷³	1(6)
	...	
(v. 5)	כי לי ⁷⁴ כן ⁷⁵ ביתי עם אל	1(7)
	כי ברית עולם שם לי	1(7)
	ערוכה [שמורה ⁷⁶]	1(7)
	...	

(v. 1) Oracle of David son of Jesse,
Oracle of him whom ³El exalted.

69. *yisrā'el* in the second colon requires its formulaic equivalent *ya'qōb* in the first colon. The latter is to be inserted, *metri causa*, as well as for stylistic reasons, with G^L.

70. 4QSam^a reads *mšl*, to be vocalized as an imperative with G^L in each colon.

71. Perhaps the preposition *b* is to be inserted. The insertion of *b* before *yr't* in some MSS is probably secondary, however; we expect the preposition (or a case ending) only in the first colon for stylistic and metrical reasons. The meaning "in righteousness" parallel to "in the fear of God" is desiderated. Cf. G^L *δικαιως*.

72. The conjunction is to be omitted with G^L and Sy.

73. The last two cola of v. 4 are corrupt, perhaps hopelessly corrupt. They make little sense and, in their present form, break sharply from the regular meter of the first eleven cola of the poem.

74. For *P*, read the emphatic *lamed*. So Jorge Mejía. "El lamed enfático en nuevos textos del Antiguo Testamento," *Estudios Bíblicos*, 22 (1963), 189; M. Dahood, *Canaanite-Phoenician Influence in Qohelet* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1952), p. 24; F. Nötscher, "Zum emphatischen Lamed," *VT*, 3 (1953), 372-380; H. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 223, and references, especially W. L. Moran, "The Hebrew Language in Its Northwest Semitic Background," in *BANE*, pp. 60-61, n. 60. The name La-ki-in-a-du/La-kin-Haddu/cited from D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (London, British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953), p. 141, by Moran, contains the same elements: *la* and *kin* > Heb. *kēn*. Emphatic *lamed* extended by *-mā*, known from Ugaritic, also appears in Hebrew though to my knowledge it has been overlooked: *wdn lnh ygwr 'nywt* "And Dan verily sojourns on ships" (Judg. 5:17; cf. 5:16). Usually this "blessing" has been taken to suggest that Dan (and other tribes) took no part in the Battle of Kishon. No such content is to be found in any of the series of blessings. Only Meroz (v. 23) is specified as absent, and cursed for not coming "to the aid of Yahweh with warriors." This has important consequences for our understanding of this instance of league "holy war."

75. Read *kēn* "right," "true"; see n. 74.

76. *bkl* is evidently an expansion of specification.

77. The remaining verses are difficult to scan and difficult to understand; the versions are of little help.

Anointed of the god of Jacob,
Favorite of the Mighty One of Israel.

(v. 2) The spirit of Yahweh spoke through me,
His word was on my tongue.

(v. 3) The god of Jacob spoke;
The Rock of Israel addressed me:

“Rule over men in righteousness,
Rule in the fear of God.”

(v. 4) Like the morning light at sunrise

(v. 5) Indeed, my house is surely right with 'El;
Indeed, he has made with me an eternal⁷⁸ covenant.

Set forth in order⁷⁹ and secured.

The language of covenant is used in verse 5: indeed, the text presumably speaks of an “eternal” or “perpetual” covenant. On the other hand, in verse 3b Yahweh commands David to rule justly and in the fear of God, and in verses 4 and 6f. a contrast appears to be made between the consequences of righteous rule and evil rule, one compared with morning light (verse 4), one with thorns which will be burnt in fire (verse 6).

That a covenant be described as “perpetual” need not mean necessarily that it is unconditional. The “eternal covenant” of the Priestly strata of the Tetrateuch presumes the entire Sinaitic law.⁸⁰ The expression

78. It is also possible to read the divine name 'Ólām parallel to 'El, “The Eternal has made a covenant with me,” a colon remarkably parallel to *krt ln 'li 'lm* in the Arslan Tash text: “The Eternal has made a covenant with us.” Cf. F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, “Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria,” *BASOR*, 197 (1970), 44f.

79. Our understanding of this crucial colon is that of S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 360: “*rwkh bkl wšmwrh* is an expression borrowed probably from legal terminology, and intended to describe the *bryt* as one of which the terms are fully and duly set forth (comp. the forensic use of 'rk in Job 13:18 al. *to state in order* or *set forth* pleadings), and which is secured by proper precautions against surreptitious alteration or injury.”

80. See the discussion below in chapter 11; and the data collected by M. Tsevat, “Studies in the Book of Samuel, III,” *HUCA*, 34 (1963), 76f.; and Isa. 24:5.

‘*arūkā*, moreover, suggests stipulations, as does the contrast described above. The “Last Words of David” may belong thus with the archaic conception of the Davidic covenant found in Psalm 132. On the other hand, the presumption is that “eternal covenant” ordinarily specifies an “unconditional decree,” and if this be the case here, the poem expresses the standard Judaeon ideology of kingship, the “eternal decree” of Solomon and his successors. Until we can understand better the corrupt passages of composition, its concept of kingship will remain ambiguous.⁸¹

The Imperial Rule of Solomon

The kingship of Solomon was consolidated by ruthless suppression of all possible opposition. Solomon’s chief potential rival, Adonijah, David’s eldest after Absalom, was murdered on the pretext that he had asked for the hand of David’s young wife Abishag. Such a request—if Adonijah made it—would have been understood in Israel as an open claim to David’s throne. The circumstances under which Adonijah’s alleged request for Abishag were made are remarkable. The request was transmitted through Bathsheba, whose ambitious court intrigues designed to place her beloved son Solomon on the throne were well known.

Solomon denied, so to speak, his mother’s request and executed Adonijah for sufficient cause. We doubt if even the most fervid supporter of Solomon could have related this tale without tongue in cheek. If Adonijah did in fact behave as claimed, he deserved to be executed—for stupidity. Joab, general of the armies of David and an early supporter of Adonijah, was murdered at the altar allegedly on privy instructions of David on his deathbed. Shimei, a survivor of the house of Saul, was placed under house arrest and later executed.

More important breaks with the past were marked by the banishment of Abiathar the high priest, also a member at one time of Adonijah’s party. With Abiathar’s retirement to Anathoth a primary link with league institutions, specifically the Levitic (Mushite) priesthood of

81. I am inclined to assign 2 Sam. 23:1–7 to the earlier level of royal ideology on the basis of arguments from silence also, while very much conscious of their precarious nature. There is in 2 Sam. 23:1–7 no hint of the adoption formulae regularly associated with the developed royal ideology (2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 89:27f.; Ps. 2:7; Isa. 9:5f.; cf. A. Alt, “Jesaja 8:23–9:6: Befreiungsnacht und Krönungstag,” in *KS* (Alt), II, 206–225; G. von Rad, “The Royal Ritual in Judah,” in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, pp. 222–231); neither is there any hint of what may be called “*bāyit-bāyit* dualism,” i.e., the linkage of Temple and dynasty as eternal institutions.

Shiloh, was severed. Nathan, the prophet of David and a firm supporter of Solomon's enthronement, also disappeared from the scene at the beginning of Solomon's reign. According to 1 Kings 1:45, Nathan was associated with Zadok the high priest in the anointing of Solomon. On the other hand, in 1 Kings 1:39, a more detailed description of the anointing, only Zadok is mentioned and in 1:45 Nathan's name may be a pious addition of the Deuteronomistic editor. In any case, the last mention of Nathan is at the coronation of Solomon, and with his disappearance or death⁸² the prophetic office effectively disappeared from the Judean court, to revive only in the eighth century B.C.

With the chief supporters of the traditions of the league cult⁸³ no longer on the scene, Solomon was freer to fashion a new cultus appropriate to his pretensions of imperial grandeur. He imported the architects and artisans of his Phoenician ally Hiram to build his royal shrine in the pattern of the Canaanite dynastic temple.⁸⁴ To be sure, this break with past cultic traditions was not complete. The procession of the Ark to its place in the Temple of Solomon linked the cult of the league with the new, permanent shrine and its cultus. Nor should one forget the Canaanite elements already incorporated in the Tent of David if we are correct in seeing it refracted in the Priestly description of the Tabernacle. Nevertheless, Solomon instituted a new cultus which shifted the focus of Israel's festal celebrations further away from the covenantal renewal feasts of the league and the limited covenantal forms of David's royal ideology. The chief festival of Solomon's cultus was the festival of the Fall New Year celebrating the foundation of the Temple and the Davidic house. In other words, the feast celebrated the election of David and Jerusalem as the eternal recipients of Yahweh's grace and promise.⁸⁵ At the same time, the cultus assimilated mythological themes inherent in the dualistic typology of the Canaanite temple: the

82. Nathan's disappearance from the scene may be owing merely to his death of old age. Two of Solomon's officers listed in 1 Kings 4:5 are sons of a certain Nathan, whether the prophet of that name or not we do not know. The name was popular in the period. We should note, however, that the Chronicler attributes to "Nathan the prophet" accounts of both the reigns of David (1 Chron. 29:29) and Solomon (1 Chron. 9:29), data that presume the prophet's survival.

83. On Nathan's support of the Tent tradition, see below the discussion of 2 Sam. 7:1-7.

84. See *ARI*, pp. 139-155; esp. p. 139.

85. See the later elements in Ps. 132, esp. vv. 13f., 17; Ps. 78:68-72; 1 Kings 11:13, 32, 36; 14:2, 15:4; etc. On David's election, cf. 2 Sam. 6:21; 1 Kings 8:16; Ps. 89:25, 29, 34; Isa. 55:3; 2 Chron. 13:5; etc. We shall return to the parade passage, 2 Sam. 7:8-

mythic identification of creation (that is, victory over chaos) with the foundation of the temple; the establishment of kingship with the foundation of the temple, both the kingship of Yahweh and its earthly type, the kingship of David, Yahweh's adopted son. All this may be subsumed under the abbreviation, the "*bêt Yahweh—bêt David* typology." We have described above⁸⁶ the Israelite development of the theme of the Divine Warrior in its historical and mythological transformations in the royal cult and need not repeat the discussion here. In its mythic dimension, the Temple of Zion and the kingship of the Davidic house are fixed in the "orders of creation," and thereby given eternal stability. Covenantal forms in their conditionality gave way to eternal forms in the royal cult. This applied both to the covenant of the league (the so-called Sinaitic covenant) and the covenant of David, which despite the continuance of the term *bērīt*⁸⁷ was transformed into an eternal decree in the new context of the Temple cult.

Another index of Solomon's departure from the ways of his father and assimilation of foreign styles of kingship may be found in his cultivation of wisdom. Solomon expended his energies not in the primitive, exuberant Yahwism of David but in the pursuit of cosmopolitan and tolerant wisdom in the fashion of the foreign courts, especially of Phoenicia and of Egypt, the latter mediated largely through the wisemen and hierophants of Phoenicia. His tolerance also extended to the shrines of foreign cults established in his cosmopolis.

In political and military affairs, Solomon's break with the rustic court of David was equally dramatic. Solomon introduced chariotry in Israel and with it a new class of military nobility.⁸⁸ In fact, a whole new elite emerged made up of officers of the court, the *'abdē ham-mélek*, who administered the new royal cartels, the expanded corvée, and fiscal systems. Solomon followed the familiar pattern of rewarding military and administrative services with land, bringing into being a landed aristocracy with loyalties directly bound to the court. So great

16. For the development of this theme, see especially H.-J. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, 2nd ed. (Munich: C. Kaiser, 1962), pp. 210-220, and references to his own earlier work; and R. E. Clements, *God and Temple* (London: Blackwell, 1965), pp. 48-62 and references.

86. See chapter 5.

87. For the discussion of the etymology and historical meanings of *bērīt* in the history of Israelite religion, see the excursus below.

88. On Solomon's chariotry and trade with Egypt and Cilicia in horses and chariots, see 1 Kings 5:6-8; 10:26, 28f.; on Solomon's navy, see 1 Kings 9:26.

was the shock on the more or less egalitarian tribesmen of Israel that the polemic against kingship preserved in Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic sources⁸⁹ singles out and proscribes the specific innovations of Solomon in imitation of his royal neighbors.⁹⁰

Solomon made a direct attack upon the organization of the league by dividing his realm on arbitrary lines into suitable fiscal districts over which he appointed officials attached to the crown. Hence, the tribal divisions and the tribal representatives used still by David were overthrown.⁹¹ David's census, primarily designed for military purposes, may have been a first move toward fiscal redistricting; if so, it failed, and David repented "his crime," according to tradition and accepted divine punishment specified by the prophet Gad.⁹²

Some word should be said of Solomon's system of parity treaties or alliances with surrounding nations, including Egypt. While David extended Israel's boundaries to form an empire, there is no record of his entry into parity treaties with the possible exception of his treaty with Tyre. Even in this case, however, the language used strongly suggests that David was the suzerain of Hiram: "For Hiram had been faithful (*'ōhēb hāyā lēdāwīd*) to David all (his) days."⁹³ If the earlier covenant set David over Hiram, the later covenant with Solomon was certainly a parity treaty.⁹⁴ At all events, contrary to David's policy, Solomon systematically set out to erect a series of alliances for mutual defense and for trade. In adopting such a policy Solomon went in the face of the ideology of holy war with its demand for the sole dependence of the confederation on Yahweh and his armies. This tradition remained lively in prophetic circles to the end of the kingdom as is revealed in their persistent opposition to all alliances.

In summary, we may say that while David eschewed outright innovations which seriously violated traditional religious and social

89. See Deut. 17:14-17; 1 Sam. 8:11-18, esp. 12-14.

90. Compare the similar development in Northern Israel brought to a climax in the prophetic revolution of 842 B.C.

91. See already W. F. Albright, "The Administrative Divisions of Israel and Judah," pp. 17-54; and *ARI*, p. 140 and n. 37; the most recent study is that of G. E. Wright, "The Provinces of Solomon," *EI*, 8 (1967), 58*-68*.

92. 2 Sam. 24:1-14. Like Nathan, Gad appears as the defender of the league constitution.

93. On the force of the term *'ōhēb* in this context, see W. L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *CBQ*, 25 (1963), 77-87, esp. 80.

94. Cf. 1 Kings 5:26; 9:11-14; Amos 1:9.

institutions, his son Solomon sought to transform Israel into a full-fledged Oriental monarchy and was prepared to ignore or to flout older institutions in his determination to centralize powers and to consolidate his realm. In his ambition to raise the outlandish little kingdom to an exalted place among the sophisticated states of the world, he was successful in his lifetime, but he overreached, sowing the seeds of civil war and hastening the end of the brief days of the Israelite Empire. That is another story, however, and we are here interested in the shattering of Solomon's empire only as it illuminates the extent and violence of his innovations.

The Judaeon Royal Theology

We must look more closely at the several texts which contain the basic lore of the standard Judaeon ideology of kingship and investigate its initiation in the cultus of the Solomonic Temple.

The so-called oracle of Nathan in 2 Samuel 7 has been the object of repeated study but still bristles with difficulties.⁹⁵ The text is disturbed by a fundamental dichotomy. Verses 1-7 contain an oracle in prose opposing the building of a temple. This theme is very striking since it stands in opposition not only to the pro-temple oracle in verses 11b-16 but to the royal ideology of the Deuteronomistic historian of the seventh century who was responsible for the present form of 2 Samuel 7. Attempts to overcome this dichotomy and to harmonize the two oracles (or the two sections of the oracle)⁹⁶ have proliferated, with none proving satisfactory.

A number of scholars have suggested that the Tent of David was meant to be a temporary structure until a temple, desired by both Nathan and David, could be built. This view has been based sometimes on the wording of Nathan's initial response to David: "All that is in

95. For recent bibliography, see A. Soggin, "Der offiziell geförderte Synkretismus in Israel während des 10. Jahrhunderts," *ZAW*, 78 (1966), 185, nn. 18 and 18a, to which should be added H. Gese, "Der Davidsbund und die Zionserwählung," *ZThK*, 61 (1964), 10-26; and A. Soggin, *Das Königtum in Israel*, *BZAW* 104 (Berlin, Töpelmann, 1967), pp. 70-73; R. E. Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 55-61; *Prophecy and Covenant* (London, SCM Press, 1965), pp. 56-66; A. Weiser, "Die Tempelbaukrise unter David," *ZAW*, 77 (1965), 153-168; G. Widengren, "King and Covenant," *JSS*, 2 (1957), 1-32; A. H. J. Gunneweg, "Sinaibund und Davidsbund," *VT*, 10 (1960), 335-341; V. W. Rabe, "Israelite Opposition to the Temple," *CBQ*, 29 (1967), 228-233; and T. E. Fretheim, "The Priestly Document: Anti-Temple?," *VT*, 18 (1968), 318-329.

96. We shall argue below that the kernel of two oracles are imbedded in 2 Sam. 7. Note the new departure in v. 8 *w'th . . . kh 'mr yhw'h*.

your heart go and do, for Yahweh is with you" (2 Samuel 7:3). The later oracle against David's projected temple building (verses 5f.) is meant then to put off the building of the temple for strategic reasons of one sort or another, for example, owing to opposition from Abiathar and his party. The notion that verse 3 is evidence that Nathan supported David's desire cannot stand. Its words follow familiar protocol appropriate to Nathan, the subject, speaking to his king.⁹⁷ Similar comments are made by other prophets⁹⁸ with no bearing whatever on their later judgment or oracle as Yahweh's prophet. We must assume furthermore that the oracle itself expressed the prophet's fundamental judgment as well as his understanding of the word of Yahweh. The alternative leads one into imposing a kind of supernaturalistic schizophrenia on the prophet.

Again we must argue that the oracle of verses 5-7 is meant to oppose the building of a temple permanently. Despite the fact that the Deuteronomistic historian regarded the Temple as the appropriate place for the "name" of Yahweh and otherwise supported the royal ideology, a sufficiently precise quotation of his source survives. The Ark had always been associated with a tent shrine, wherever it wandered, wherever the central sanctuary was established. Had Yahweh desired a cedar palace, he long since would have asked for one, or, in mythological language, built one for himself.⁹⁹ In a word, the tradition of the league with regard to the shrine of the people Israel must be maintained. Unfortunately, the failure of scholars to recognize the priority of the early poetry of Israel in placing a tent at Shiloh and Kiryath Yearim rather than certain folkloristic prose sources which refer to the Shiloh shrine as a temple (*hêkāl*) has confused the interpretation of 2 Samuel 7.¹⁰⁰ David is portrayed in 2 Samuel 7:2 as assuming that the Ark is resting in a tent-shrine in agreement with Psalm 132:5; in 2 Samuel

97. M. Noth expresses it well: "Nathan's statement in vs. 3 is hardly a decision (in the narrator's sense) on the question of building a temple, but is a polite formality customary before the king, which is only then followed by the divine decision which the 'prophet' had received" "David and Israel in II Samuel VII." in his *The Laws in the Pentateuch*, p. 257).

98. Compare Micaiah's first response to Ahab and his consequent oracle, 1 Kings 22:15; and Jeremiah's comments in 28:5, 11.

99. See above, chapter 6 on Exod. 15:17f. and n. 104 commenting on Psalm 78:69.

100. The writer under the influence of traditional literary-critical analysis earlier held the view that a temple replaced the tabernacle at Shiloh. For our present position, see above chapter 2; chapter 3 and nn. 312, 314; and n. 52 above. Compare the discussion of T. E. Fretheim, "The Priestly Document: Anti-Temple?," pp. 324ff.

7:6 embedded in the prose is the formulaic pair *'ōhel/miškān*, a remnant presumably of an earlier poetic form of the oracle, designating the past shrines of the league in agreement with Psalm 78:60 (*miškān/'ōhel*, in reference to Shiloh).¹⁰¹ Tent and ark were firmly linked in old tradition, and the oracle of Nathan directed David not to violate this tradition. It is hard not to believe that the opposition which lay behind the insistence on this old symbolism and iconography was directed against the Canaanite ideology of kingship of the sort which developed immediately in fact, with the building of the Temple. The historicity of the oracle of Nathan against the building of a temple for the Ark is guaranteed by its context with which it stands in the greatest tension and by the evidence that David in fact never built a temple. In effect, it testifies to David's acceptance of a limited kingship, which on other grounds appears to have been the case.¹⁰²

Another line of harmonizing interpretations has been developed from special interpretations of verse 5: *ha-'attā tibnē lī bāyit lē-šibī*. "Will you indeed build for me a temple for my enthronement/dwelling?" H. Gese¹⁰³ interprets the sentence with its stress on "you" to mean, "do *you*, a man, plan to build a house for me, God?" That is, the oracle is addressed not to the general question of whether or not a temple is to be built, but to the issue of who may take the initiative in building a Temple. Yahweh could long have had a temple if he had wanted it built. He alone will build his temple, that is, take initiative in appointing a temple to be built, not man (David). The promise of a house of David, therefore, is pure grace, *sola gratia*, and not a response to the establishment of the shrine of the Ark in Jerusalem. Gese rejects the argument that verse 13a, "He it is who will build a temple for me" is a gloss. Rather he insists that the Deuteronomistic cliché "(a house) for my name," *lšmy*, is not part of the original text.¹⁰⁴ Gese might have

101. The shrine of Shiloh is termed a *hēkāl* in 1 Sam. 1:9; 3:3. Cf. *bēt yahweh* in 1 Sam. 1:7; 3:15; and *'ōhel mō'ēd* in the archaic fragment, 1 Sam. 2:22 M. The Deuteronomistic historian creates an anachronism by attributing to David 2 Sam. 22:7b with its mention of the heavenly/earthly *hēkāl*. A twelfth-century reference to an Israelite tent-shrine occurs in Exod. 15:13 (*nēwē qodsēkā*).

102. Both Martin Noth and Matitiah Tsevat have argued strongly that Nathan's pronouncement of the divine decision against the building of a temple was meant to be permanent and was so understood by David. See Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch*, p. 258; Tsevat, "Studies in the Book of Samuel III: The Steadfast House: What Was David Promised in Exod. 15:13b 16?" *HUCA*, 34 (1963), 71-82.

103. "Der Davidsbund und die Zionerwählung," *ZThK*, 61 (1964), 10-26.

104. The reading of the Chronicler, 1 Chron. 17:12, is to be followed in this verse. Gese wrongly attributes the Chronicler's reading to the Old Greek of 1 Sam. 7:13, which

appealed in support of his view to the reading of the Lucianic recension of the Old Greek: "that he (Yahweh) will build a temple *for himself*."¹⁰⁵

There are difficulties here. The concrete reason given in the oracle for the refusal is that Yahweh has always in the past had a tent shrine (verse 6). This reason is gratuitous, without point, if the problem is one of divine initiative. As for the "thou" that is stressed in verse 5, in its immediate context it stands in juxtaposition to *šōpēṭê yišrā'el*,¹⁰⁶ "the judges of Israel" who had never been reprimanded for their failure to build a temple (verse 7). In the final, Deuteronomistic form of the combined oracles, it may also have been set in contrast to "He" (Yahweh) in verse 13a. Furthermore, David did institute a new shrine for Yahweh. Psalm 132, as a matter of fact, records David's oath in which he swore to provide a tent-shrine for Yahweh:

נשבע <דוד> ליהוה	1(7)	(v. 2)
גדר לאביר יעקב	1(7)	
אם אבא באהל ביתי	1(7)	(v. 3)
אם אעלה ערש יצועי	1(8)	
אם אתן שנת לעיני	1(8)	(v. 4)
לעפעפי תנומה	1(7)	
עד אמצא מקום ליהוה	1(8)	(v. 5)
משכנות לאביר יעקב	1(8)	

- (v. 2) <David> swore to Yahweh,
He vowed to Jacob's champion:
- (v. 3) I will not enter my canopied room,
Nor mount my cushioned bed.
- (v. 4) I will not give my eyes sleep,
My eyelids slumber.
- (v. 5) Until I find a shrine for Yahweh,
A tabernacle¹⁰⁷ for Jacob's champion.

in fact reads both *ly* and *lšmy*, presumably conflating the readings of Sam. and Chron. The reading *lšmy* evidently arose under the influence of 1 Kings 8:17-20.

105. The reading is *οικοδομησει εαυτω*. The Old Greek *οικοδομησεις αυτω* (!), probably is an error for *οικοδομησε αυτω*.

106. The stressed "Thou," ha'attā may in fact be Deuteronomistic, set in contrast to "He" in verse 13a. We cannot agree with the textual judgment which finds *šōpēṭê* (1 Chron. 17:6) inferior to *šibṭê* (M); contrast P. de Robert, "Juges ou tribus en 2 Samuel VII 7," *VT*, 21 (1971), 116ff.

107. The use of the plural of *miskān*, "tent," in a singular sense, "tabernacle, camp"

Yahweh responded in turn with his oath, according to verses 11 and 12 of the psalm, establishing a conditional dynastic covenant.¹⁰⁸ The structure of the oaths and covenant are strongly reminiscent of the patriarchal oaths initiating cults of the god of the Fathers as illustrated, for example, in Genesis 28:10–22.¹⁰⁹ We should have expected such a covenantal structure in the original form of Nathan's oracle.

Another of the harmonizing interpretations of verse 5 focuses on the expression *lè-šibī*, taking it in a literal sense to mean "to dwell in" rather than figuratively "for my enthronement."¹¹⁰ Yahweh's oracle then repudiated the notion that David (or anyone) was able to construct a shrine in which Yahweh would *dwell*. On the contrary, Yahweh has always "gone about" (*mthlk*, not *yšb*) in a tent or whatever. The notion of building a temple, however, is not directly repudiated according to this view. J. Schreiner in arguing this case has applied a distinction developed by the writer¹¹¹ between the terms *škn* and *yšb*, "to tent" and "to dwell" respectively, the first used of Yahweh's immanence in his shrine, the latter normally not used of deity. While it is true that *škn* is used characteristically of Yahweh's "tenting" in his shrine in archaic contexts,¹¹² yet it is only in the Priestly strata and contemporary or later sources that the distinction between *škn* and *yšb* is maintained systematically and consciously. The Priestly tradent characteristically took up an archaic word or expression and used it, often with a narrowed or technical meaning.¹¹³ The term *škn* is such an archaism in P and became in Priestly usage a technical theological term to designate the presence of the transcendent god in his sanctuary. One may describe the use of *škn* in P as denominative in

is characteristic of the early poetic use of the word. On the meaning and use of *škn* and *miškān*, see the writer's provisional remarks in "The Priestly Tabernacle," *BAR*, 1 (1959), 224–227.

108. See our description of the structure of Psalm 132 in chapter 5, and the translation and discussion above in this chapter (compare note 56).

109. The Yahwistic tradition in Genesis 15, on the other hand, is peculiarly shaped by the ideological tendencies of the Solomonic age and is not typical; the passage will be taken up again below.

110. See already W. J. Phythian-Adams, *The People and the Presence* (London, Oxford University Press, 1942), pp. 14f.

111. "The Tabernacle . . .," *BA*, 10 (1947), 65–68 (§17); reprinted in revised form in "The Priestly Tabernacle," *BAR*, 1 (1961), 224–227; cf. J. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem, Jahwes Königstz* (Munich, Koesel-Verlag, 1963), pp. 90ff.; and H. W. Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel*, tr. J. S. Bowen (Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1967), p. 285.

112. For example, Dt. 33:12, 16; 1 Kings 8:12; Ps. 68:17, 19; etc.

113. Other examples are his re-use of the terms *qrš*, *kēbōd yahweh*, *'ōhel mō'ēd*, *br'*, *'ēl sadday*, *'ēdūt* (← *ādōt*), *lwn*, *hayētō 'ēreš* (*hayaytu 'arsi*), etc.

effect, from *miškān*, “(the) Tabernacle.” In Deuteronomy *škn* has an entirely different usage. It appears used of Yahweh only in the idiom *lškn šmw šm*, “to place his name there.”¹¹⁴ an idiom found already in the Jerusalem Amarna letters.¹¹⁵ In early contexts, especially in archaic poetry, derivatives of *yšb* were used of Yahweh, especially in reference to his enthronement in the sanctuary. One thinks immediately of *yōšēb hak-kērūbīm*, “enthroned on the cherubim” (1 Samuel 4:4, and so on), and *mākōn lēšibtēkā*, “the dais of your throne” in Exodus 15:17 (the Song of the Sea) and 1 Kings 8:12 (from the Book of Yašar according to G). The ancient, composite Psalm 68 has derivatives of *yšb* used in parallel in verse 17: “. . . the mountain God desired for his throne/abode (*lēšibtō*)/ Where Yahweh will tent (*yiškōn*) forever.” Psalm 132:13 is very similar: “For Yahweh has chosen Zion/ He desired it for his abode (*mōšāb*).” In short, the distinction between *yšb* and its derivatives and *škn* does not hold for material of the date of the oracle embedded in 7:5f. Moreover, when all has been said and done, the text and David’s subsequent failure to build a temple make clear that Yahweh was understood to prefer his traditional tent.¹¹⁶

On the other hand, 2 Samuel 7 does exhibit certain elements of unity. Its theme is the “house of David.” The story begins (like David’s oath in Psalm 132) with David’s newly-built “house of cedar,” which marked his kingship after his victories had been won. Properly—as David understood—the royal palace should be matched with the divine palace, the *bêt David* with the *bêt Yahweh*, in the pattern of royal piety. Unlike Solomon, who built both a new palace for himself and the temple of Yahweh, David in fact founded only a tent-shrine for Yahweh, a well-known historical fact, for which an explanation is supplied by the author, based on an older tradition of an oracle of Nathan (verses 5f.). The allusion to Nathan’s oracle against a temple is a minor element in the narrative, important chiefly to the modern historian who recognizes its antitemple sentiment. All of this, verses 1–7, is

114. Dt. 12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11, 26:2; and cf. 12:5. The pointing in the *piel* (factive) is secondary, developing under the influence of Priestly denominative usage of the *qal* stem. The old meaning of the root in Canaanite was “to put, place,” and especially “to pitch a tent” (*miškān* or *miškānōt*). The Deuteronomic usage “to place (*lškn*) his name there” is merely an archaic variant of the standard Hebrew of the editors of Deuteronomy including the Deuteronomistic historian: *lšwm šmw šm*. However, the Exilic Deuteronomist (*Dtr²*) could use *škn* in its Priestly sense on occasion: 1 Kings 6:13. Cf. S. Dean McBride, “The Deuteronomic Name Theology,” pp. 204–210.

115. EA 287:60; 288:5f.

116. Cf. R. E. Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 58.

preliminary, as the new oracle formula in verse 8 shows. After a review of Yahweh's favor in raising David to kingship, the main oracle begins in verse 11b focusing on the *bêt David*, the dynasty of David, which Yahweh will build. Yahweh will establish the seed of David on the throne. David's son will build Yahweh's *bêt*, supplying the symbolic symmetry.¹¹⁷ David's house is mentioned in verse 11b and again in verse 16 as secure and eternal. A liturgical fragment is quoted in verse 14 proclaiming the adoption of the king as divine son. Verses 18–29, the prayer of David, is a Deuteronomistic composition underlining the importance of the oracle, the promise to David of an eternal house. It presumes the full, composite oracle.¹¹⁸ The central theme is obvious: the *bêt David*, David's eternal dynasty is mentioned seven times, in verses 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, and 29 (bis).

A formal unity of the whole of chapter 7, the preliminary oracle, the main oracle, and the prayer, has been urged recently by a number of scholars, for the most part under the influence of the study of S. Herrmann¹¹⁹ comparing 1 Kings 3:4–15 and 2 Samuel 7 with the Egyptian literary genre, the *Königsnovelle*, etiological stories of royal projects or decrees which include substantial sections which recite royal ideology. Herrmann recognized that the Egyptian royal theology with its conception of the king as a physical son of the god and the Israelite conception of the adoptive sonship of the king were not identical. He does think the parallel significant. He does not attempt to discuss the rapidly increasing evidence of the specifically Canaanite origin of Israelite ideas of the king as son of god. Perhaps one may argue that the Egyptian royal ideology (and with it the *Königsnovelle*) came to be known among the early Canaanites and hence, indirectly at most, shaped royal liturgical forms in Israel. The royal ideological story in Egypt, we are told, often gave the etiology of a building project. Nathan's oracle contains (as a minor element) an explanation of why

117. Gese's choice in v. 13a of *ly* for *lšmy* (see above, n. 104) with Chronicles, the *lectio brevior*, is clearly correct. In either case the reading is Deuteronomistic.

118. M. Tsevat, "The House of David in Nathan's Prophecy," *Biblica*, 46 (1965), 353–356, has argued that, since David prays for the future blessing and permanency of his dynasty, the oracle did not include an unconditional promise of kingship (viz. vv. 13–16). His argument is too rationalistic. A traditionally pious man prays daily that the divine promise, be it the throne of Israel, the kingdom of God, or the (new) temple of Jerusalem (all the same promise), be fulfilled.

119. S. Herrmann, "Die Königsnovelle in Ägypten und in Israel." *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität, Leipzig*, 3 (1953/54) *Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*. Part 1, pp. 51–83.

David did *not* build a temple. And, at all events, the contravention of the king's proposal by a subject is unthinkable, transferred to an Egyptian court.¹²⁰

Herrmann's detailed comparisons are equally tenuous or unilluminating. He finds the introductory phrase, "when the king dwelt in his house . . ." ¹²¹ in 7:1 a clear mark of the style of the Egyptian royal story. The closer we examine this feature, however, the more the parallel fades. In Egyptian introductions to the *Königsnovelle* we find recorded the "general" circumstance that the king sits in his *q̄;dw*, his hall for public audience, and receives his ministers in customary fashion. Specific plans or projects are presented in some such setting. In 7:1 the introductory phrase refers rather to the specific setting of the oracle on the "house of David," when David took up his residency in his cedar house after his early victories in the field, the appropriate occasion for building a temple to his patron god "matching" his own house and securing thereby his "house" in the pattern of the Canaanite conception of the dynastic temple. The tie between David's house and David's dynasty is even more clearly discerned in the matching oaths of David and Yahweh in Psalm 132. In short the theme of David's house is set already in the first words of the pericope; the introduction is not a general one as taken by Herrmann.

In 7:9 Herrmann takes the expression "and I will make for you a name like the name of the great ones that are in the earth" to contain an Egyptianism: 'šh šm "to make a name" or 'šh šm ḡdwl "to make a great name."¹²² The comparison is with Egyptian *iri rn (wr)*, *sdd rn*, *smn rn*, and so forth. If so, the Hebrew expression along with *šwm šm*, "to make a name," have become Deuteronomistic clichés.¹²³ However, equally strong or stronger arguments could be made that the phrase is an Akkadianism from *šumam (rabêmi) šakānum (šitkunum)*, *šumam šuzūzum*, and so on. As a matter of fact, the notion of "making

120. It will not do, as we have seen, to attribute the denial to Yahweh in violation of Nathan's own convictions.

121. Herrmann correctly attributes the remainder of the sentence "and the Lord had given him rest from all his enemies round about" to the Deuteronomistic editor. See below.

122. Herrmann here follows S. Morenz, "Die Königsnovelle," p. 59. Cf. P. J. Calderone, *Dynastic Oracle and Suzerainty Treaty* (Manila, Ateneo de Manila University, 1966), p. 45, n. 19. From a text-critical point of view, the reading of 1 Chron. 17:8 and G^b, the *lectio brevior* is superior: *w'šyty lk šm kšm ḡdlym*. Cf. *šmw ḡdwl* in 1 Sam. 12:22.

123. The full data are quoted below.

a (great) name” is a common Hamito-Semitic concept, forming parallel idioms in many daughter languages.¹²⁴

The best case for the unity of 2 Samuel 7 has been made by Dennis McCarthy.¹²⁵ He leaves aside the question of possible literary sources while noting “the marks of the deuteronomistic hand.” He is anxious rather to demonstrate that the pericope belongs to the series of major Deuteronomistic speeches and like passages which gave structure to the entire Deuteronomistic history. He tries “to show that the text operates with ideas that are important and special to the deuteronomistic [*sic*] work, that it is closely integrated into its immediate literary context, and finally that, in part in virtue of the very foregoing factors, it has a key position in the scheme of the whole massive work which extends from Deuteronomy to Kings.”¹²⁶ We need not review fully McCarthy’s arguments. It will be useful, however, to sketch the themes of the Deuteronomistic history in large strokes and the place of Nathan’s oracle within them, drawing on McCarthy’s work and our own.

In the introduction of the Deuteronomist to the Book of Deuteronomy and to the entire Deuteronomistic history (Deuteronomy 1:6–3:29) the speech of Moses focuses attention on a new departure.¹²⁷ Moses and his generation had violated the covenant and were appointed to death in the desert before Israel could enter “the good land” promised in Yahweh’s oath to the fathers. The oath was unconditional, however, and Yahweh would give the land sworn to the fathers to the new generation of Israel led by Joshua.¹²⁸ In speeches in Joshua 1:10–15 and 23:2–10, 14,¹²⁹ the commission of Joshua was begun and ended fulfilling the oath to the fathers, establishing Israel in the land. The pattern of covenant violation followed by punishment (the curses of the covenant) and then by the emergence of new hope, a new departure initiated by Yahweh’s call of a new leader, was repeated after Joshua’s death. This pattern or movement became the very dialectic

124. In the Northwest Semitic, compare the Aramaic of the Nerab text (*KAI*, 226:3) *šmny šm lb*; Amorite names Yakūn-sumu-abim (Ya-ku-un-sū-mu-a-bi-im), Yasim-sumuhu (Ya-si-im-su-mu-ú), etc. See S. Dean McBride, “The Deuteronomistic Name Theology, pp. 77–117.

125. Dennis McCarthy, “II Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History,” *JBL*, 84 (1965), 131–138.

126. McCarthy, “II Samuel 7,” p. 132.

127. Dt. 1:8, 39; 3:18–22, 28.

128. Note the characteristic expression in Dt. 3:20 *‘d ’sr ynyh yhw* . . . “Until Yahweh gives rest . . .” which will reappear. Cf. Josh. 1:15 repeating Dt. 3:20.

129. Joshua 23:11–13, 14–16 is an expansion in the hand of Dtr², the Exilic editor.

of history in the Deuteronomistic work. The gift of the land was qualified by Israel's apostasy according to Judges 2. Remnants of the nations were left in the land; Yahweh refused to drive them out. They were to be as snares or stumbling blocks trying Israel's fidelity. Yet Yahweh (or his angel) states flatly in 2:1 "I have brought you into the land which I swore to your fathers and I said, 'Never will I break my covenant with you . . .'" In the long theological section in Judges 2:11–23, placed immediately after the death of Joshua, we find first the account of Israel's new sins of apostasy and Yahweh's response bringing the punishments of the covenant upon them, delivering them into the hands of their enemies. Then, as in the past, he raised up a new leader, the judge who delivers Israel from her straits. As with Joshua, so Yahweh is "with the judge" as the Deuteronomistic cliché puts it.¹³⁰ With the death of each judge the dialectic traces a similar pattern. The story of the era of the Judges is thus the persistence of apostasy in Israel and the persistence of Yahweh's punishment of Israel, dark themes qualified by Yahweh's appointment of new leaders, new departures, and new hope. Samuel brought the era to an end and initiated the kingdom. 1 Samuel 12 contains the Deuteronomistic speech of Samuel rehearsing the past and setting forth the promise and warning to people and king. Although the Deuteronomist recognized that the request for a king was occasioned by Israel's infidelity, her failure of trust despite all Yahweh's works of salvation mediated by Israel's old leaders, he insisted that "Yahweh will not forsake his people for his great name's sake for Yahweh determined to make you his own people."¹³¹ Yahweh chose to accept the institution of kingship, and indeed to use it as an instrument of salvation in the Deuteronomistic view.

Saul's kingdom ended in failure and defeat for Saul and Israel, attributed by the Deuteronomist to Saul's breaches of ancient, covenant law. Yet Yahweh raised up a new leader, *nāgīd*, over his people Israel.

130. Cf. Dt. 31:8, 23 (Joshua), Judges 2:18 (judges), 1 Sam. 3:19 (Samuel), 1 Sam. 10:7 (Saul), 2 Sam. 7:3, 9 (David), etc.

131. 1 Sam. 12:22. As generally recognized, 12:25 is the revision of the Exilic Deuteronomist. The Deuteronomist is perfectly willing to recognize and quote sources which regard the institution of kingship as breach of trust in Yahweh and to recount the evils of kingship, notably of Solomonic kingship (cf. 1 Sam. 8). Ultimately, however, his view of the monarchy, especially of the Davidic monarchy, is overwhelmingly positive. In this he diverges both from concepts of limited monarchy characteristic of Northern elements in the old Deuteronomistic traditions, and even more strikingly from the Exilic editor who overwrote his history. See below, chapter 10.

The dialectic persists. Despite sin, and following punishment, Yahweh in his fidelity created a new beginning. In the Deuteronomist's understanding, Yahweh chose David to be over his people Israel¹³² and Jerusalem as his eternal throne,¹³³ or rather, as the sanctuary of his name.¹³⁴ In 2 Samuel 7 David, who had been faithful in establishing the shrine of the Ark in Jerusalem, was promised a new kind of kingship and Israel granted a new form of hope. Actual history is telescoped in 2 Samuel 7. While the promise was made to David, it is the house of David and the house of Yahweh that were bound together and promised eternity.

2 Samuel 7 echoes the themes we have been tracing. The unconditional promise of the land in Moses' speech (Deuteronomy 1:8, 39, and so on) and in Yahweh's address to Joshua (Joshua 1:6, and so on) and the assertion of Yahweh to Joshua and Israel that he will never break his covenant with them (Judges 2:1), and the words in Samuel's address, "For the Lord will not forsake his people for his great name's sake . . ." (1 Samuel 12:22) find their natural culmination and climax in the oracle to David: "He shall build a house for me, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever . . . if he commit iniquity I will chasten him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men; but my faithfulness shall not depart from him . . . and thy house and thy kingdom shall be sure forever before me; thy throne shall be established forever" (2 Samuel 7:13b-16). Minor motifs repeat themselves in similar fashion. "Yahweh is with him" is recited of Joshua, the judges, Samuel, Saul, and David.¹³⁵ There is the repeated reference to Yahweh "giving rest (from surrounding enemies)."¹³⁶ Moses is called repeatedly by Yahweh "my servant Moses"¹³⁷ or the "servant of Yahweh";¹³⁸ Joshua is given the title "servant of Yahweh";¹³⁹ and David is often called by Yahweh, "David my servant," including references in Nathan's oracle.¹⁴⁰

The promise of the future thus is focused upon David, the servant

132. 2 Sam. 7:8; 1 Kings 8:16.

133. 1 Kings 8:12f.; cf. Ps. 132:13f.

134. 1 Kings 8:20.

135. See above, note 130.

136. Dt. 3:20; 12:10; 25:19; Josh. 1:13, 15; 21:42; 22:4; 23:1; 2 Sam. 7:1, 9; 1 Kings 5:18; etc.

137. Cf. Josh. 1:2, 7; etc.

138. Dt. 34:5; Josh. 1:1, 13; 22:2; etc.

139. Josh. 24:29; Judg. 2:8.

140. 2 Sam. 7:5, 8; cf. 2 Sam. 3:18; 1 Kings 11:13, 32, 34, 36, 38; etc.

of Yahweh, in new and unique fashion in 2 Samuel 7. Repetition and emphasis is found in the original parts of Solomon's speech in 1 Kings 8.¹⁴¹ While Solomon's sins of oppression and idolatry spell doom for the empire, one tribe is left to the house of David "for the sake of David my servant," and we are informed in Yahweh's oracle, "I shall afflict the seed of David . . . but not forever,"¹⁴² an indirect promise of the restoration of David's kingdom. For Jeroboam's dread sin, the bull and the altar of Bethel in particular, the destruction of the Northern Kingdom is decreed. Fulfilment of the promises will be found in the new David, Josiah, destined (in the view of the Deuteronomistic historian of the seventh century) to recreate the Davidic empire, and, having destroyed the altar of Bethel, to reestablish Jerusalem as the central shrine of all Israel.¹⁴³

The unity of 2 Samuel 7 is a unity imposed on his sources by the mind and point of view of the Deuteronomistic historian. We have noted his themes and some of his clichés in chapter 7 and have recognized the chapter as one of a sequence of key passages in the Deuteronomistic history. One finds it surprising that more attention has not been given to the Deuteronomistic idiom of the chapter. It fairly swarms with expressions found elsewhere in works of the Deuteronomistic school.¹⁴⁴ The list below gives examples, but does not pretend completeness in citation.

(1) *hnyh* (*lw msbyb*), of Yahweh giving rest or peace (from surrounding enemies): 2 Sam. 7:1, 11; see Deut. 3:20; 12:10; 25:19; Josh. 1:13, 15; 21:44; 22:4; 23:1; 1 Kings 5:18; and so forth.

(2) *yhw* 'mk/w, of Yahweh's presence with or support of a leader: 2 Sam. 7:3, 9; see Deut. 31:8, 23 (Joshua); Judg. 2:18 (the judges); 6:12, 16 (Gideon); 1 Sam. 3:19 (Samuel); 10:7 (Saul); 16:18; 18:12, 14 (David); 2 Sam. 5:10 (David); 2 Kings 18:7 (Hezekiah); and so on. Compare Exod. 3:12 (Moses); and so forth.

(3) *kl 'sr bbbk*, "all that is in your mind": 2 Sam. 7:3; see 1 Sam. 9:19; 14:7; 1 Kings 10:2.

141. 1 Kings 8 has been heavily reworked by the Exilic Deuteronomist (Dtr²). Verses 12-21 appear to be from the pen of Dtr¹ (quoting the older liturgy in v. 12). Verses 44-53 are certainly Exilic (Dtr²). In between is much material of debatable date; cf. J. A. Montgomery, *Kings* (New York, Scribner's, 1951), pp. 189-203. Verse 25b ("If only your sons keep their way . . .") stands in contradiction to 2 Sam. 7 which is being recapitulated, and evidently is a gloss.

142. 1 Kings 11:39; see the fuller discussion in chapter 10.

143. Cf. McCarthy's statement: "Surely the deuteronomist's preoccupation with the kings' attitudes to worship arises in part out of the connection of the house of David with the temple which is based on Nathan's promise" ("II Samuel 7" p. 137).

144. We include here the rhetoric of Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic history (exclusive of 2 Sam. 9-20, 1 Kings 1-2), and the Deuteronomistic (source C) materials in Jeremiah. Parallels in Chronicles are cited only when there are textual variants of significance.

(4) *mtlk*: 2 Sam. 7:6; *hthlky*: 2 Sam. 7:7, of Yahweh's "walking about," see Deut. 23:15; compare 1 Sam. 2:35; 12:2; 25:15, 27; 30:31; compare also Gen. 3:8; Lev. 26:12, and so on.

(5) *h'ty (bny ysr'l) mmsrym*, "I brought (the children of Israel) from Egypt": 2 Sam. 7:6; see Deut. 20:1;¹⁴⁵ Josh. 24:32; Judg. 2:1; 6:8, 13; 1 Sam. 10:18; 12:6; 1 Kings 12:28; 2 Kings 17:7, 36; Jer. 16:14; 23:7; compare Ex. 3:17, and so on.¹⁴⁶

(6) *hbr dbrty* and the like use of *dbr* with its cognate accusative in the sense "to give a command," or "to say a word" (on *hbr 'sr dbrt* "to make a promise," 2 Sam. 7:25, see below no. [21]); 2 Sam. 7:7; see Deut. 1:14; 5:22 (19); 18:20, 22; 31:1, 28; Judg. 8:3; 11:11; 1 Sam. 11:4; 20:23; 1 Kings 12:7; 2 Kings 18:27; Jer. 7:22, 27; 25:13; 34:5; and so forth.¹⁴⁷

(7) *lr'wt 't 'my* of David as shepherd of Yahweh's people: 2 Sam. 7:7; see 2 Sam. 5:2; 2 Sam. 24:17a¹⁴⁸ and Jer. 23:4; compare Ps. 78:70f.

(8) *'bdy dwd*, "David my servant": 2 Sam. 7:5; see 2 Sam. 3:18; 1 Kings 11:13, 32, 34, 36, 38; 14:8; 2 Kings 19:34; 20:6; Jer. 33:21, 22, 26; and so on; compare Josh. 1:2, 7, and so on ("my servant Moses"): Deut. 34:5; Josh. 1:1, 13; 22:2; and so on (Moses, "the servant of Yahweh"); and Josh. 24:29; Judg. 2:8 (Joshua, "the servant of Yahweh").

(9) *ngyd*, "commander (of the people Israel)": 2 Sam. 7:8; see 1 Sam. 9:16; 10:1; 13:14; 25:30; 2 Sam. 5:2; 6:21; 2 Kings 20:5. The Deuteronomistic use applied to the king derives apparently from an old league title.¹⁴⁹

(10) *w'krt 't (kl) 'ybyk*, "and I have cut off all your enemies": 2 Sam. 7:9; see 1 Sam. 20:15; compare Josh. 23:4; Deut. 12:29; 19:1; Mic. 5:8.

(11) *w'sty lk sm (gdwl)*¹⁵⁰ . . . , "and I shall make you a (great) name . . .": 2 Sam. 7:9; see 2 Sam. 8:13; Jer. 32:20;¹⁵¹ compare 1 Sam. 12:22; Jer. 13:11. Coupled with the idiom is the use of *l'swm sm* in the same sense, "to make, establish a name":¹⁵² 2 Sam. 7:23; see 2 Sam. 14:7; Nerab 11, 3;¹⁵³ compare Judg. 8:31; 2 Kings 17:34. A third idiom also belongs here: *wygd smk*, "and let thy name be great . . .": 2 Sam. 7:25; compare *w'gdh smk*, Gen. 12:2; *yytb 'lhyk 't sm smh*, 1 Kings 1:47; 1 Sam. 18:30; and 1 Kings 5:11.

(12) *w'smty mqwm l'my ysr'l*, "and I will make a place for my people Israel": 2 Sam. 7:10; compare Deut. 1:33; 1 Kings 8:56.

(13) *wnt'tyw*, "and I will plant them . . .": 2 Sam. 7:10; see Jer. 31:28; 32:41; compare Jer. 1:10; 2:21; 24:6; 42:10; Exod. 15:17; Amos 9:15; and so on.

(14) *bny 'wlh l'nnw*, "(Neither shall) the children of wickedness afflict them (again) . . .": 2 Sam. 7:10. The colon *bn 'wlh l' y'nnw* appears in Ps. 89:23, suggesting

145. Deuteronomy uses *hws'* more frequently.

146. The cliché occurs frequently in JE and occasionally elsewhere and cannot therefore be useful as a mark of exclusively Deuteronomistic style. It is, however, regular in Deuteronomistic material.

147. While the usage is a favorite of the Deuteronomistic school, it is not rare elsewhere.

148. We read *w'nk hr'h hr'ty w'lh hs'n* with 4QSam^a and G^L; cf. 1 Chron. 21:17a. Cf. *ALQ*², pp. 188ff., n. 40a.

149. See above, n. 5. *ngyd* found in old sources of the Deuteronomistic history was taken up and used frequently by Dtr¹.

150. See above, n. 122.

151. See also Gen. 11:4; Isa. 63:12, 14; Neh. 9:10 and Dan. 9:15.

152. This usage is to be sharply distinguished from the Deuteronomic *l'swm smy/w sm* and *l'skn smy/w sm*, "to place my/his name there," of Yahweh's "Name" in the temple in Deuteronomic theology; cf. Dt. 12:21; 14:24 etc., etc.

153. See above, n. 124.

that both stem from an oral formula of the early temple liturgy. For *bny 'wlh* see also 2 Sam. 3:34 (early poetry). For parallels to *l'nwtw* in Deuteronomistic contexts, see Deut. 26:6; 1 Kings 8:35 (G); 11:39; 2 Kings. 17:20.

(15) *k'sr br'swnh*, "as at the first": 2 Sam. 7:10; see Josh. 8:5, 6; compare *kbr'snh* Judg. 20:32; 1 Kings 13:6; Jer. 33:7, 11; and Isa. 1:26.

(16) *byt l'smy* "a house for my name": 2 Sam. 7:13a (M); see 1 Kings. 5:9; 8:18, 19; 9:7; compare 1 Kings. 8:44, 48 (*byt l'smk*). The entire Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic name theology stands behind this expression.

(17) *n'mn bytv*, "my dynasty is secure (forever)": 2 Sam. 7:16; compare *byt n'mn* 1 Sam. 2:35; 25:28; 1 Kings 11:38.

(18) *pdh* of Yahweh's redeeming Israel from Egypt: 2 Sam. 7:23 (bis); see Deut. 7:8; 9:26; 13:5, 6; 15:15; 21:8; 24:18; Jer. 31:11; compare Neh. 1:10.

(19) *gdwt wnt'wt*, "great and terrible things": 2 Sam. 7:23 (revised by 1 Chron. 17:21); see Deut. 10:21; compare Deut. 1:19; 7:21; 8:15; 10:17; Ps. 99:3; Joel 3:4; Mal. 3:23; Neh. 9:32; and Dan. 9:4.

(20) *w'th yhw hyyt lhm l'lym*, "and you, O Yahweh became their god": 2 Sam. 7:24; see Deut. 26:17; 29:12; Jer. 7:23; 11:4; 30:22; 31:33; 32:38; and so on; compare Gen. 17:7, 8; Exod. 6:7; and so forth.

(21) *hbr 'sr dbrt*, "the promise you made" (compare above, no. [6] *hbr dbrtv*): 2 Sam. 7:25; see 1 Kings 6:12; 8:26; compare the Deuteronomistic use of *dbr* in the special sense, "to promise": Deut. 1:11, 12; 6:3; 9:3, 28; 10:9; 11:25; 12:20; 15:6; 18:2; 26:18; 27:3; 29:12; Josh. 13:14, 33; 22:4; 23:5, 10; and so forth.

(22) *lhtpl tplh*, "to pray (with the cognate accusative)": 2 Sam. 7:27; see 1 Kings. 8:29.

(23) *glyth 't 'zn*, "you (Yahweh) have uncovered the ear": 2 Sam. 7:27; see 1 Sam. 9:15; 20:2, 12, 13, 22; 8 (bis), 17; compare Ruth 4:4; Job 33:16; and 36:10, 15.

(24) *hw'l* plus finite verb (= 1 Chron. 17:27 *hw'l* plus infinitive), "Be pleased to . . .": 2 Sam. 7:29; see Deut. 1:5; Josh. 7:7, 12; Judg. 1:27, 35; 17:11; 19:6; 1 Sam. 12:22; 17:39; 2 Kings 5:23; 6:3; compare Gen. 18:27, 31; Exod. 2:21; Hos. 5:11; and Job 6:9, 28.

An attempt to penetrate beneath the Deuteronomistic composition of 2 Samuel 7:1–17,¹⁵⁴ despite its severe difficulties, must be undertaken if the important chapter is to be used for reconstruction of the royal ideology of the united kingdom. In its present form the oracle merely reflects, as we have seen, the normative view of the Deuteronomist. The oracle falls into three parts: materials based on (1) the "old oracle" of Nathan 7:1–7; (2) the oracle of the eternal divine decree in 7:11b–16; and (3) the Deuteronomistic linkage (between the above two parts) in 7:8–11a. The third part, 7:8–11a, appears to reflect some older material,¹⁵⁵ but is not an integral part of either oracle (1) or (2). It need not detain us. Parts (1) and (2), however, require closer examination.

The "old oracle" of Nathan in its present form is Deuteronomistic

154. We need not treat further the prayer of David in 2 Sam. 7:18–29; it is a free Deuteronomistic composition presuming the Dtr. oracle in vv. 1–17, without clear evidence of the use of earlier sources.

155. For example, the phrase *bny 'wlh l'nwtw* has poetic parallels in Ps. 89:23 and 2 Sam. 3:34; and the shepherd theme is found in Ps. 78:70f.

prose. However, it contains oracular material which in original form was directed against the building of a temple for Israel's central sanctuary on the grounds of the tradition of Yahweh's tent-shrine of the era of the league. The Deuteronomist has understood the proscription of the temple to be temporary, applying only to David, and, to judge from his language in 1 Kings 8:15–19, continued to attribute at least the plans of the temple to David. He cited the oracle for two reasons, to explain the historical fact that David did not build a temple and because in its original form the oracle probably contained an oath of Yahweh concerning David's seed, now replaced by the "eternal decree" of verse 7:11b–16. The content of this replaced or revised portion of the oracle dealing with David's dynasty should have had much the same content as Psalm 132:11f., which, as we have argued above, reflects the actual concept of the "Davidic covenant" held in pre-Solomonic Jerusalem.

Remnants of the old poetic oracle of Nathan in 2 Samuel 7:1–7 may be perceived in the poetic (metrical) pair: *bbyt 'rzym/ b'twk yry'h*, "in a house of cedar"/"in the midst of curtains," both expressions unique to this oracle. The original bicolon may have been in roughly the following form:

אנכי ישב בבית ארזים	1 (10)
וארון ישב בתוך יריעה	1 (10)

As for me, I dwell in a cedar palace;
But the Ark dwells in the midst of curtains.

Noteworthy is the use of *yšb* of Yahweh's dwelling in his tent-shrine. The Deuteronomist would not have used this expression, but only here and in 1 Kings 8:13 (*mkwn lšbtk 'wlmym*), another quotation from poetry, does he permit the expression to stand. The Chronicler on the other hand has revised the line to read *'rwn bryt yhw' t'ht yry'wt* avoiding the verb *yšb* as well as reducing *b'twk yry'h* to prose.¹⁵⁶ Another poetic remnant is found in the formulaic pair *b'hl* and *bmškn*,¹⁵⁷ "in a tent" and "in a tabernacle." There is no reason to doubt, in view of the antitemple sentiment of the old oracle, that in poetic form it goes back to Davidic times.

156. Here G^{BL} stands with M over against Chron.; this is good evidence that the Chronicler has revised his text.

157. Modified in 1 Chron. 17:5 to *m'hl 'l 'hl wmmškn <'l mškn>* (the latter phrase lost by haplography).

The eternal decree contained in 2 Samuel 7:11b–16 follows new introductory rubrics in verses 8 and 11b α and is followed in verse 17 by another Deuteronomistic rubric describing Nathan's oracle as a *hizzāyōn*, "vision." Verse 11 is corrupt in both 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles as well as in the Greek traditions. Its original form probably was as follows:

w'gd lk¹⁵⁸ ky¹⁵⁹ byt 'bnh¹⁶⁰
lk¹⁶¹ whyh¹⁶²

And I (now) make known to you that
I will build a house for you. [v. 12] and it
shall come to pass . . .

This half-verse reveals the Deuteronomistic structure of the entire chapter, pointing back to the question in verse 5: "Will you build me a house for my enthronement?" and finding an echo in verse 27, "I will build a house for you." It is tied most closely, however, with the Deuteronomistic affirmation in verse 13a: "He (it is) who shall build a house for me . . ." ¹⁶³ Thus the *bêt David/bêt Yahweh* typology is consistently carried through the entire chapter.

The oldest level of the second oracle is found in 2 Samuel 7:14:

אני אהיה לו לאב	1 (7)
והוא יהיה לי לבן	1 (7)
בהעותו והכחתיהו	1 (9)
ופקדתי ¹⁶⁴ בשכט אנשים	1 (9)
ובנגעי בני אדם	1 (9)

158. 1 Chronicles 17:10 correctly preserved the first person here. The third person formulation was developed when *yhwh* was read for *whyh* (see n. 162); later *yhwh* was introduced following *whgd lk* in the tradition behind M. The reading in 2 Sam. 7:27, *byt 'bnh lk*, tends to confirm the first person form.

159. *ky* probably was lost by haplography in 1 Chron. 17:10.

160. *'bnh* stands in 2 Sam. 7:27, quoting this verse. It goes with the phrase *h'th tbnh ly byt* in 2 Sam. 7:5. M *y'sh* appears to be a prosaizing correction of (corrupt) *ybnh*, the reading in 1 Chron. 17:10. G^B reads *tbnh lw [sic!]*, G^L *ybnh lw [sic!]*, supporting at least the root *bny* against M's use of *'šy*.

161. So with M and Chron. vs. G's *lw*.

162. *whyh* at the beginning of the next verse (2 Sam. 7:12=1 Chron. 17:11) was misread *yhwh*, giving rise to the reading of 2 Sam. 7:11b (*yhwh*) and the conflate reading of 1 Chron. 17:10/11 (*yhwh whyh*). Only G preserves the original short reading *whyh*.

163. See above note 104 on the reading chosen.

164. A word is needed to reconstruct the missing member of a formulaic pair to parallel *hōkahtihū*. We can restore perhaps *paqadī* as missing member. *paqadī* actually appears in a similar colon from a royal hymn of early date, Ps. 89:33, where the formulaic pair *šēbeṭ* and *nēgā'im* are also to be found. Indeed, the two passages may be called oral variants of one another.

I will become his father,
And he shall become my son.

If he does evil, then I will chastise him;
I will punish (him) with the rod of men,
And with the stripes of the children of man.

We have set up these lines as they fall out into easily scanned poetry with both parallelism and meter. The following verses are far more prosaized. However, *whsdy l'165 'wsr mmmw*, “But my fidelity I will not turn away from him” evidently reflects an archaic liturgical colon to judge from the oral variant in Psalm 89:34: *whsdy l' pyr m'mw*, “But my fidelity to him I will not violate.” With manipulation, perhaps excessive manipulation, the following bicolon can be reconstructed:

n'mn bytk []lpny¹⁶⁶ 1 (8)
ks'k []nkwn 'd 'wlm 1 (8)

Thy house shall be secure before me,
Thy throne will be established forever.¹⁶⁷

The poetic fragments piece together to reveal a royal oracle, much like its counterpart in Psalm 89:20–38.¹⁶⁸ As in the case of Psalm 89A (3–5) and 89C (20–38) as well as Isaiah 9:1–6,¹⁶⁹ the oracle finds its function in the coronation liturgy and in its repetition in the yearly royal festival.

Central in these fragments of liturgy is the Canaanite formula of divine sonship of the king which marked the “high theology” of the Jerusalem court. The formula appears specifically in 2 Samuel 7:14a; Psalm 89:27f.; Isaiah 9:5, and in Psalm 2:7 (always in metrical form). In 2 Samuel 7:14a this formula appears to stand in the place of the covenant formula. The kinship bond was closely related, of course, to the covenant bond in a society in which patriarchal patterns persisted. The covenant relation is properly described as a substitute kinship

165. The reading here follows 1 Chron. 17:3, G to 2 Sam. 7:15, etc.

166. The reading is with G.

167. Cf. Ps. 89:37f. The repetitious use of 'd 'wlm suggests its omission in the first (reconstructed) colon; *yhyh* is a prosaic element to be omitted from the second colon.

168. Cf. G. W. Ahlström, *Psalm 89: Eine Liturgie aus dem Ritual des leidenden Königs* (Lund, Gleerups Förlag, 1959), pp. 98–131.

169. See A. Alt, “Jesaja 8:23–9:6: Befreiungsnacht und Krönungstag.” in *KS* (Alt), II, 206–225.

relation. Conceptually, they differed in that the father-son relationship was inherently permanent, “eternal,” while the covenant relationship was conditional in time and scope, qualified by stipulations.¹⁷⁰ In each of the texts which contains the formula of adoption or birth of the royal son of God, we find special emphasis on the unconditional “eternity” of the royal house of David. In 2 Samuel 7: 14b–16, immediately following the sonship formula, there is the specific assertion that no wrongdoing on the king’s part can bring an end to David’s perdurable dynasty. Psalm 89: 20–38 is the ultimate statement of this doctrine:

(v. 20) Then you spoke in a vision¹⁷¹ to your faithful one¹⁷²
and said:

I have made a stripling¹⁷³ ruler¹⁷⁴ over the warrior;
I have exalted a youth above the host.

(v. 21) I found David my servant;
With my holy oil I anointed him.

(v. 25) My loyalty and fidelity are with him;
And his horn is exalted¹⁷⁵ in my name.

(v. 26) I set¹⁷⁶ his hand on Sea,
His right hand over River.¹⁷⁷

(v. 27) He proclaimed to me, “You are my father,”
“My god and the rock of my salvation.”

170. The term “covenant” will be discussed further below with animadversions directed toward some recent study of the term.

171. Compare *hāzōn* here with *hāzzayōn* (Chron. *hāzōn*) in 2 Sam. 7:17. Some such tie permitted the substitution of the oracular material of 2 Sam. 7:11b–16 for an older form of dynastic covenant.

172. We read *lḥsdk*, “your faithful one” with most recent commentators.

173. Hebrew *zr* = Ugar. *ḡzr* “lad,” “young hero.”

174. Ugar. *lwy* “to rule(?)”. Cf. A. A. Wieder, “Ugaritic-Hebrew Lexicographical Notes,” *JBL*, 84 (1965), 160ff., and Dahood, *Psalms*, II (New York, Doubleday, 1969), 316, who discards the 4QPs 89 reading *št, šattī*, probably correctly.

175. The tenses of Psalm 89 are archaic. Often *yql* may be read as narrative past as well as a durative present-future.

176. We have omitted the conjunction at the beginning of first colon. Either tense is suitable.

177. The mythical allusion to the victory of the divine warrior over the watery chaos has been applied to the king, a natural transfer in the ideology of Canaanite kingship, but remarkable in an Israelite context.

- (v. 28) I indeed made him my firstborn,
The highest of earthly kings.
- (v. 29) Forever I will keep faith with him,
And my covenant with him shall endure.
- (v. 30) I have established his seed forever,
His throne as the days of Heaven.¹⁷⁸
- (v. 31) If his sons abandon my law,
And do not walk by my judgments,
- (v. 32) If they violate my statutes,
And do not keep my commands,
- (v. 33) I shall punish their disobedience with the rod,
And their iniquity with stripes.
- (v. 34) But I will not break faith with him,
Nor in my fidelity deal falsely.
- (v. 35) I will not violate my covenant,
Nor alter my decree.
- (v. 36) Once I have sworn by my holiness,
I surely will not lie to David.
- (v. 37) His seed shall exist forever,
And as the sun, his throne before me.
- . . .

While all texts with the sonship formula hold that the dynastic decree is perpetual and explicitly or implicitly unconditional, the texts which use the covenant formulation may be explicitly conditional (Psalm 132:11f.), explicitly unconditional (Psalm 89:20–38; Jeremiah 33:17, 19–22;¹⁷⁹ 2 Chronicles 13:4[?]), or ambiguous (2 Samuel 23:5; 2 Chronicles 21:7). In the last-mentioned “ambiguous” passages, however, the covenant is called “eternal” or its perpetual nature assumed.

178. Heaven is one of the “old gods” giving rise to the smite.

179. The oracular material in this pericope (Jer. 33:14–26) is absent from the short Greek text of Jeremiah, and hence suspect. However, it appears to derive from Deuteronomistic circles in view of its unbreakable promise extended also to the “Levitic priests,” a term which disappears in the Exile.

These data suggest that two sources of royal ideology have merged in early Israel. One is the covenant theology of the league, the kingship of Saul and David, surviving in the Northern Kingdom, at least in prophetic circles. The second is the theology of divine sonship or the eternal decree of adoption. The mixing of the two streams, most evident in Psalm 89: 20–38, the only liturgical source using the explicit language of both the covenant and sonship formulae, gave rise to the standard Judaeen royal ideology, which, whatever language it used, conceived the choice of the Davidic house and the sanctuary of Zion to be by eternal decree. The impact of the emergent ideology was profound, shaping the understanding of the royal covenant or decree, and by retrojection, the understanding of the covenant of the patriarchs. *Bērīt*, “covenant,” developed a new sense, coming to mean “unconditional promise or oath,” or simply “eternal divine decree.” The Deuteronomist of the seventh century clearly understood Nathan’s oracle to be such an eternal divine decree although his own views are obscured both by the conditional league theology implicit in early Deuteronomistic sources on the one side and the conditional understanding of the kingship on the part of the Deuteronomistic editor of the Exile.¹⁸⁰

The Judaeen ideology developed at an early date. On a priori grounds one would expect its emergence in the flux between old and new, Israelite and Canaanite, which marked the imperial court of Solomon and which shaped the very structure of his new, national shrine. The materials in the eternal decree of 2 Samuel 7: 11b–16, both the typology of the house of David with the house of Yahweh and the formula of eternal adoption, can be no earlier than Solomonic, in our view, and can hardly be much later. Psalm 89: 20–38 is very archaic in language and shares formulae with Nathan’s oracle. Most useful for fixing the *terminus ad quem* of

180. Strange to say, it appears that the Deuteronomist avoids the term “covenant,” *bērīt*, in his work except in application to the covenant with patriarchs (e.g., see 2 Kings 13: 23), and, of course, to the Mosaic covenant. No mention of a Davidic covenant is found in 2 Sam. 7. The only certain reference in the Deuteronomistic history to the *bērīt*, covenant of David, is in the quotation of the Last Words of David, 2 Sam. 23: 5. 2 Kings 11: 12 uses the term *‘dwt* “covenant stipulations” of a document given to the king (on *‘dwt*, see above, n. 60). 1 Kings 11: 11 describes Solomon as not having kept:

M bryty wḥqwtḏ

G mṣwtḏ wḥqwtḏ

The Syriac conflates all three terms. The original reading in all probability is *hḳwtḏ*, the element common to the three text types. The expansion into series of such terms so commonly found together is a well-known scribal tendency quite frequent in “full” texts from Qumrān. Cf. 1 Kings 8: 23; 2 Kings 17: 15; and 18: 12, all of which we take to refer to the Sinaitic covenant.

this ideology is its appearance in the Yahwist, an Epic text but dated to the Solomonic age and appropriately called a propaganda work of the Israelite Empire.

The Yahwist took up the Epic traditions of the old league sanctuaries. With the rise of kingship and the royal cultus in Jerusalem, the old covenant festivals of the league fell into desuetude, freeing the Epic themes and the poetic and liturgical forms in which they were cast from their concrete cultic function, the reenactment of Israel's "common" history which found its denouement in the renewal of the league covenant. The Epic pattern, the covenants with the fathers adumbrating the covenant of Sinai and the gift of the land promised to the fathers in the wars of Yahweh, was reshaped into a new pattern, linking the promises made to the fathers with ultimate fulfillment in the empire. In the Yahwist the covenant language persisted, including an account of the covenant at Sinai.¹⁸¹ However, the covenant of the fathers, notably the covenant with Abraham, remains in the Yahwist a covenant, *bērīt*, in name only.¹⁸² Its content is reshaped in the pattern of its fulfillment in the so-called Davidic covenant, or more precisely in the "eternal decree," or unconditional oath, sworn to the house of David. Thus the royal theology of the type found in 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 89:20-38 stands behind the Yahwistic reformulation of the patriarchal covenants. Actual, historical covenant forms, including both the covenants of patriarchal religion and the covenant of the Israelite league were left behind with their mutual, conditional, elements. The old covenants in Israel may be described as "historical," growing out of human relations with "historical" or social gods as we have defined the old covenant gods of the fathers. The patriarchal covenant thus was mythologized in the royal theology. Kingship in Israel became rooted in creation and fixed in eternity. These new features cannot be separated in origin from the myth of Ba'1's kingship and its counterpart in the Canaanite royal

181. Exod. 34:10, 14, 17, 27f. The main covenant account utilized in the P work (JEP) is, of course, the Elohist. It is likely that this choice is not chance but based on its more elaborate and detailed form. Covenant forms persisted in the North in much more lively form than in Jerusalem.

182. See especially Norbert Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid* (Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967) whose treatment of Genesis 15 is excellent. I cannot accept, however, his understanding of the development of the term *bērīt*. The oath of Yahweh to the Davidic house was not a revival of older forms, but a reinterpretation of the religion of patriarchal gods and their covenants in the light of Israel's new royal institutions. For similar reasons we find Clements's reconstruction of the background of the Davidic covenant unconvincing. See R. Clements, *Abraham and David: Genesis 15 and its Meaning*, SBT 2nd ser. 5 (Napierville, Allenson, 1967).

ideology. "I set his hand on Sea/His right hand over River . . . His seed shall exist forever/ And as the sun, his throne before me."¹⁸³ In short, we perceive in the Yahwist the transformation of the patriarchal covenant, recently freed from its context in the league cultus, into the archetype of the eternal decree of kingship which characterized the mythological understanding of kingship taken up by the imperial court and refurbished with covenantal language surviving from the Davidic kingship.

The reflexes of imperial interest in the promises to the fathers were not exhausted in their formal reshaping of the patriarchal covenant. The content of the promises, too, was adjusted to their fulfilment in the imperial establishment. The Yahwistic "covenant" in Genesis 15:18 sets the boundaries of the land promised to Abraham "from the river of Egypt unto the great river," that is, from the traditional border of Egypt to the Euphrates. This promise corresponds only to the most buoyant claims of the Davidic and Solomonic empire and existed at most for a brief period at the height of David's power. The description corresponds closely, however, to the Solomonic claims reflected in 1 Kings 5:1, "And Solomon had hegemony over all the kingdoms¹⁸⁴ from the River . . . to the boundary of Egypt."¹⁸⁵ There can be no question that the regimes of both David and Solomon could properly be described as extending to the Euphrates. Aram Zobah and Aram Damascus were under Israelite sway, and Hamath under tribute. The border in the south poses problems.¹⁸⁶ Certainly Philistia was not annexed or placed under garrison by David. On the other hand, there is some reason to believe that Achish of Gath became vassal to David, a reversal of his former status, and that, theoretically at least, Gath had hegemony over the other Philistine cities.¹⁸⁷ Much the same relationship must have existed between David and Hiram.¹⁸⁸

183. Psalm 89:26, 37.

184. Or "kings," as in Phoenician. Cf. 1 Chron. 9:26 and esp. 2:46k in G. Cf. 10:30 G.

185. 1 Kings 5:1 reads after *hnh*, 'rš plštyim; 1 Chron. 9:21 reads 'd 'rš plštyim; cf. G to 2:46k and 10:30.

186. Cf. N. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung*, pp. 65-78; A. Malamat, "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon," *JNES* 22 (1963), 1-17.

187. See 2 Sam. 8:1, 12; and especially 1 Kings 5:4. The special problem of the text of 2 Sam. 8:1 = 1 Chron. 18:1 has not been solved. See also 2 Sam. 15:18 (David's battalion of Gittites); 2 Chron. 11:8 (Rehoboam's fortification of Gath). The episode of Shimei's slaves in 1 Kings 1:39-46 also suggests that Gath was a vassal state (*pace* Malamat). On the location of Gath, see most recently G. E. Wright, "Fresh Evidence for the Philistine Story," *BA*, 29 (1966), 78-86.

188. See the discussion above and n. 93.

In any case, imperial claims reached to Gaza and, hence, to the traditional boundary of the Egyptian province of Canaan; inland, the southern boundary of David certainly reached to the River of Egypt. Early in Solomon's reign, however, Siamun marched into the Philistine country, annexing Philistia as far north as Gezer.¹⁸⁹ Solomon avoided war by entering into a treaty with the Egyptian king, sealed by marriage to Pharaoh's daughter. Solomon accepted Gezer as a dowry and apparently ceded the southwestern Philistine cities to Egyptian control.¹⁹⁰

The correspondence between the boundaries of the empire and the Yahwistic promises to Abraham in Genesis 15:8 is particularly dramatic in virtue of the discrepancy between these boundaries and the territory claimed by the tribes in the era of the league.¹⁹¹

A major theme of the Yahwist is found in the blessing formula repeated three times to Abraham, and to Isaac and Jacob: "I will bless them that bless you, curse them that curse you, and all the families of earth will find blessing in thee."¹⁹² One finds here the same buoyant, expansive spirit found in the promise of the land. There is a new element here, however, which sees in Israel's expansion and destiny a source of blessing for the nations. Somehow the weal and woe of the nations is bound up in the people blessed by Yahweh. Here we see the universalism of mythic kingship, the reverberations, so to speak, of the universal victory of the divine warrior-king transforming the patriarchal covenant into the image of the divine decree with its eternal and universal significance. From such mythic elements stems an incipient eschatology in Israel, found already in the liturgy of Isaiah 9:1-6, developing on the one hand into democratized forms of the royal ideology, for example, in Isaiah 55:1-5, and on the other hand into the dreams of the messiah to come in late apocalyptic.

There are certain other features of the Yahwistic prose epic which appear to link the Yahwist with the cultural and religious impulses

189. 1 Kings 9:16f. Cf. Malamat, "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David," pp. 10-17.

190. B. Mazar points out that the cities between Gaza and Gezer go unmentioned in Shishak's list of conquered towns, and hence in his time were presumably Egyptian dependencies, "The Philistines and the Rise of Israel and Tyre," in *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* (Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1964), I, 14, and references in n. 20.

191. See the description of the "land that was left," Joshua 13:2-6.

192. Genesis 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; and 28:14. The interchanging use of the *nip'al* or *hitpa'el*, *nibrëkû* or *hitbärëkû*, is to be explained as reflecting the archaic use of the *nip'al*, the frequent use of the *hitpa'el*, to express indirect reflexive meaning, "to find blessing in you."

and tendencies of the glorious age of Solomon. The Yahwist reveals a cosmopolitan spirit in the collection of ancient lore and in his inclusion of disparate materials betrays a wide-sweeping and rich interest in human culture. He has little fear of syncretism, so robust and aggressive is the mood of his Yahwism. There is no sustained polemic against Baʿl in his epic, a major prophetic concern of the ninth century B.C.; nor is there a hint of the prophetic covenant-lawsuit, an oracle genre rooted in the league's understanding of Israel's conditional covenant and a major means of proclaiming Israel's judgment for breach of the covenant law, already abroad in Israel in the ninth century.¹⁹³

The Typology of the Royal Ideology

The typology of the ideologies of kingship in ancient Israel can be sketched as follows.

(1) Israel's earliest royal theology utilized the traditional language of a covenant granted by divine initiative and conditional upon divinely-imposed stipulations. Although we perceive in the Davidic covenant continuity with older covenantal forms, the relation of the royal covenant to the covenant of "the people Israel" is not wholly clear. It may have been conceived as one of the stipulations of the old covenant as was the case in dynastic stipulations in suzerainty treaties. Or the new royal covenant may have effectively, if not theoretically, absorbed the older covenant forms. This early covenant of kingship remained ideal in Northern Israel, which rejected the conception of kingship which evolved in Solomon's Canaanizing despotism. At first opportunity, on the accession of Rehoboam and his adoption of his father's policy and doctrine, they revolted, dividing the nation. Despite attempts to reunite the kingdom, the rejection of the Davidids by the Northern tribes was to be permanent.

(2) In the transformation of David's kingdom into a full-fledged international power, kingship and royal cultus under the stimulus of Canaanite monarchical institutions evolved further. The "Davidic covenant" became an unconditional, eternal decree of deity, the mount of Zion his eternal dwelling place. This ideology survived in Judah until

193. The prophetic use of the covenant lawsuit to express judgment is ubiquitous in classical prophecy. It appears first in extant literature, so far as I am aware, in the Song of Moses in Deut. 32. See G. E. Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 26-67. Despite strong arguments offered by Eissfeldt, Albright, and others for an eleventh-century dating of the hymn, I am not inclined to date it earlier than the ninth century B.C.

the fall of the kingdom and with it the house of David. In Solomonic kingship the language of divine sonship became normative, and, after the division of the kingdom, Judah was given to the Davidids for the sake of David, Yahweh's servant, that he might have a fief before Yahweh forever. Cosmic-universal rule was attributed to the king in the royal liturgies as well as eternal election to the dynasty (Psalm 89:1-38; Isaiah 11:1-9; Psalm 2; 110). This standard Judaeon ideology stamps the Yahwist's epic, especially its understanding of the covenant of the fathers. It is fundamental to the Deuteronomist's hope in the Davidic house and to Isaiah's faith that Jerusalem will stand.

(3) In exilic and postexilic times both ideologies survived. The Exilic Deuteronomist revised the great history as an unrelieved proclamation of doom. The sins of Jeroboam and the sins of Manasseh, in which their people had joined, inalterably violated Yahweh's covenant with king and with people and brought irrevocably against them the full arsenal of the curses of the covenant. Second Isaiah democratized the vocation of David and foresaw its fulfilment in the people Israel as the new servant of Yahweh. The Priestly school used the term "eternal covenant" of the patriarchal covenant in the tradition of the Yahwist and the Judaeon royal ideology. However, the covenant theology of the P strata of the Tetrateuch is complex and will require a special study.¹⁹⁴ In apocalyptic the eternal covenants of Zadok (1 Samuel 2:35) and David are to be fulfilled in the New Age in a new Zadok and new David who will reign in the new Jerusalem.¹⁹⁵

A Brief Excursus on *bērīt* "Covenant."

Epigraphic discoveries in recent years have thrown much new light on the language and rites of covenant-making in the ancient Semitic world. At Mari the Amorite idiom meaning "to make a covenant" is *ḥayarum qatālum*, literally "to kill a young donkey" referring to the ceremony establishing a pact. The idiom is, in effect, translated by Akkadian *saṭmam šakānum* in one text, "to make a concord."¹⁹⁶ In the same letter there is reference to an alternate covenant ritual, using a young dog and goat. The Amorite data confirm the origin of the

194. See below, chapter 11.

195. See below, chapter 13. In the rich messianism of late apocalyptic we have chosen to speak only of one strand.

196. See most recently, Moshe Held, "Philological Notes on the Mari Covenant Rituals," *BASOR*, 200 (1970), 32-40, and his references. The chief text is *ARM*, II.37.

idiom *krt bryt*, “to cut a covenant” in the ceremony of cutting up an animal. Even clearer is the evidence of the Old Aramaic inscription of Sefireh which uses the expression *gZR ʿdyʿ* of making a suzerainty treaty: *wa-ʿādāyyaʿ ʾillīn dī gazar Bir Gaʿyā . . .* “Now (it is) this treaty (these covenant stipulations) which Bir-Gaʿya has made (cut) . . .”¹⁹⁷ In the section detailing the curses upon the covenant-breaker, the function of the animal is specified: */wʿyk zy/ ygZR ʿglʿ znh kn ygZR mtʿl*, “Just as this calf (young bull) is cut up, so may Matīʿil be cut up.”¹⁹⁸ In the treaty between this same Matīʿil and Aššurnirari V (755–746 B.C.), a lamb is killed and its function carefully denoted. It is “neither for sacrifice, nor for banquet . . .” but for making the treaty. The identification between the lamb and Matīʿil is explicit as is the dismembering of the lamb with the dismembering of Matīʿil and his house (in the event the treaty is violated).¹⁹⁹ A similar equation is found in a tablet from Alalakh published by D. J. Wiseman:²⁰⁰ “Abban placed himself under oath to Yarimlim and had cut the neck of a sheep (saying): ‘(Let me so die) if I take back that which I gave thee.’”²⁰¹ Robert Polzin has shown recently that the biblical expression *hwqyʿ* in 2 Samuel 21:6, 9, 13 and in Numbers 25:4 is the *terminus technicus* for dismembering the violators of a covenant.²⁰² He compares, also, the ritual of dismembering an animal or a human victim in calling up the militia of the league to punish violators of its covenant stipulations.²⁰³ Evidently these patterns belong to a single ideological complex.²⁰⁴

Parallel to *krt bryt* in Hebrew, we find *krt ln ʿlt ʿlm*, “The Eternal One has made a covenant with us,” in the Phoenician incantation text from Arslan Tash,²⁰⁵ as well as similar use of *ʾātāʾ/ʾātōt* “covenant oath/

197. Sefireh (*KAI*, 222) I.A.7.

198. Sefireh (*KAI*, 222) I.A.40.

199. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefīre*, pp. 56f.; Erica Reiner, *Supplement to ANET*, pp. 532f.; S. E. Loewenstamm, “Zur Traditionsgeschichte des Bundes zwischen den Stücken,” *VT*, 18 (1968), 500–506, and references.

200. D. J. Wiseman, “Abban and Alalah,” *JCS*, 12 (1958), 124–129.

201. We follow Wiseman’s translation. Cf. R. Polzin, “HWQYʿ and Covenantal Institutions in Israel,” *HTR*, 62 (1969), 236f.

202. R. Polzin, “HWQYʿ,” pp. 227–240.

203. R. Polzin, “HWQYʿ,” pp. 239f. The prime example is Judges 19:11–20:48. M. Held, “Mari Covenant Rituals,” p. 40, compares a Hittite ceremony in which a human being, a goat, a puppy, and a pig are “cut through,” and participants walk between the pieces. However, this ritual appears to be intended for expiation or purification after defeat in battle. Cf. O. Masson, “A propos d’un rituel hittite pour lustration d’une armée,” *RHR*, 137 (1950), 5–25.

204. Cf. 1 Sam. 11:1–10.

205. See above, n. 78.

curses” in Hebrew.²⁰⁶ The plural usage in Phoenician is strongly reminiscent of Aramaic *gazar ‘adayya’*, and, more remotely, *horkia tameshthai* (Latin *percutere foedus*), in Greek.

The etymology for the terms meaning “covenant” and “treaty” in Semitic raise a number of problems. To begin with the last term, *’*ālatu*, *’*āltu* > Hebrew *’ālā*, we are now able to tie it to the root *’hl*, “to bind together,” Akkadian *a’ālu/e’ēlu*, “to bind together,” and *’a’lu*, *LŪ.a’lu*, “amphictyony, confederation.”²⁰⁷ This derivation is not unlike the etymology of Aramaic *‘adayya’*, Akkadian *ādū, ādē*, “covenant,” “agreement.” The root is *’hd*, cognate with Arabic *‘ahd*, “covenant,” or more precisely, “das Verhältnis zwischen Zusammengehörigen mit allen aus diesem Verhältnis entspringenden Rechten und Pflichten.”²⁰⁸ As W. F. Albright has shown, the Hebrew term *‘ēdūt*, “covenant” applied to the Ark and Tabernacle of Yahweh, stems from *’*ahdāt* > *’*ādōt* > *‘ēdōt*.²⁰⁹

The most troublesome etymology is that of *bērīt*. Two plausible derivations have been suggested. One relates the term to Akkadian *birītu/birtu*, “bond,” and the Egyptian loanword (from West Semitic) *bi-rī-ta*,²¹⁰ “treaty,”²¹¹ found in twelfth-century texts. The other derivation takes Hebrew *bērīt* as a loanword from the Akkadian preposition *birīt*, “between.”²¹² The former view is more likely.²¹³

206. See Deut. 29:20 (“curses of covenant”), 29:11, 13 (= *bērīt*), etc.

207. Cf. *CAD*, vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 374 (*a’lu*) and vol. 4, pp. 40ff. (*e’ēlu/a’ālu*).

208. Quoted from Johs. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten* (Strassburg, 1914), p. 8.

209. *YGC*, p. 92, n. 136; p. 90, n. 128. Akkadian *ādē* is a loanword as is apparent from its phonetic structure.

210. We follow the notation here of W. Helck. *BAV*, pp. 601f.; cf. p. 558. Albright, *YGC*, reads *birta*.

211. This view has been best defended by W. F. Albright, “The Hebrew Expression for ‘Making a Covenant’ in Pre-Israelite Documents,” *BASOR*, 121 (1951), 22, n. 5; cf. *YGC*, p. 92, n. 135. Cf. O. Loretz, “ברית—Band-Bund,” *VT*, 16 (1966), 239–241; Loretz is mistaken about the distribution of *birītu* in Akkadian (see *CAD*, 2, pp. 252–255).

212. M. Noth, “Old Testament Covenant-Making in the Light of a Text from Mari,” in his *The Laws in the Pentateuch*, pp. 112–117; E. A. Speiser, *Genesis. The Anchor Bible* (New York, Doubleday, 1964), p. 114.

213. On the possible occurrence of the idiom, “to cut a covenant” in the Akkadian of Qatna, TAR *be-ri-ti*, see W. F. Albright, “The Hebrew Expression for ‘making a covenant,’” *BASOR*, 121 (1951), 21f., and J. A. Soggin, “Akkadisch TAR *beriti* und hebräisch *krt bryt*,” *VT*, 18 (1968), 210–215. The objection that *birītu* “bond,” used with *krt*, makes an improper idiom is not to be taken seriously. *Bērīt* had come to mean simply “covenant,” “treaty” already in the second millennium as the Egyptian loanword demonstrates, and *kērōt bērīt* meant “to cut a covenant,” not “to sever a bond!” The same is true of *’*ahlu*, Akk. *a’lu*, Hebrew *’ālā*, all of which originally meant “bond.”

The covenant ceremonies described above in extra-biblical sources as well as in Genesis 15:9–17 and Jeremiah 34:18–20, have their origin in secular covenants in which one or both parties to the covenant took upon themselves covenant stipulations which, if broken, brought upon themselves the death and dismemberment suffered by the covenant animal. Such covenants or treaties were in the nature of the case mutual. This is true not merely of parity treaties, but also of suzerainty treaties or treaties in which only one party is bound. This was correctly observed long ago by Pedersen in his sharp critique of Krätzschar²¹⁴ and by M. Noth in his critique of Begrich.²¹⁵ In the Hittite suzerainty treaties, the suzerain indicates the obligations he has assumed (in the past and moving into the future) usually in the section called the “Historical Prologue.” Frequently the suzerain refers to the fact that he has placed a vassal king on his throne and guarantees his future dynasty.²¹⁶ Also the suzerain may confirm a vassal in the possession of his land²¹⁷ and in general describe his role as that of protector to the vassal.

In the case of a suzerainty treaty between Šamši-Adad I of Assyria (1748–1716 B.C.) and a princelet of Šušarra in the Zagros mountains, the suzerain mentions not only the “oath” of Yašub-Addu the vassal, but also his own (Šamši-Adad’s) “oath.” In other words, in his suzerainty treaty the two parties exchanged vows. As William Moran has observed, the pattern here is formally parallel to the covenant oaths of Yahweh and Israel found in Deuteronomy 26:16–19, a covenant form claimed to be “late.”²¹⁸

The mutuality of the suzerainty covenant is apparent not merely in the etymology of the terms for covenant and in obligations voluntarily assumed by the suzerain, but in the relationship between the lord and vassal as described in the treaty texts. H. B. Huffmon has described the

214. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten*, p. 39.

215. M. Noth, “Old Testament Covenant Making,” pp. 114f.

216. See, for example, the treaty of Musilis with Duppi-Tessup of Amurru: “To be sure, you were sick and ailing, but although you were ailing, I, the Sun, put you in the place of your father . . . And I, the king will be loyal to you, Duppi-Tessup. When . . . you beget an heir, he shall be king in Amurru land likewise. And just as I shall be loyal toward you, even so shall I be loyal toward your son.” The translation is taken from A. Goetze, “Hittite Treaties,” *ANET*, p. 204. Cf. the treaty of Mursilis II and Niqmeqa of Ugarit, *PRU*, IV, 84–101.

217. See the treaty between Tudhaliyas IV and Ulmi-Tessup cited by D. J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), pp. 183ff.; and the treaty of Mursilis II and Niqmeqa cited in n. 216.

218. William Moran in *ANET*, p. 628.

use of the expression “know,” Hebrew *yād* and equivalent terms, in covenant contexts: “The obvious technical usage of ‘know’ is that with reference to mutual legal recognition on the part of suzerain and vassal.”²¹⁹ In the treaty between Muwattallis and Alaksandus, the great king assures his vassal that he will come to his aid in case of rebellion against the rule of the vassal: “I [the Su]n will know only you, Alaksandus.”²²⁰ The words are closely parallel to Amos 3:2: “You only have I known of all the families on earth,” words of Yahweh referring to Israel as his covenant people. As the vassal must “love” his suzerain, so the suzerain is expected to “love” his servant.²²¹

One of the most archaic descriptions of a covenant in the biblical sources is found in Genesis 31:44–55. Both J and E strata are present, pointing to its existence in a common Epic source. Verse 44 has interesting problems owing to its archaism: “Come now, let us make a covenant, and let it be a treaty (*‘ād*) between you and me.” The term *‘ād*, “treaty” has been mispointed by the Massoretes to read *‘ēd* “witness” (Albright). In order that the etymology of Gilead, Hebrew *Gil‘ād* (*Gil‘ād*) be wrested from the passage, the place name was repointed (uniquely) *Gal‘ēd* to permit the secondary etymology “cairn of witness.”²²² Originally the explanation of the name Gil‘ād no doubt was “the cairn of the treaty (between Laban and Jacob).”²²³ The treaty itself as described is a typical covenant between two parties. Jacob was bound to treat his wives (Laban’s daughters) with kindness; Laban was bound not to cross Jacob’s boundaries with hostile intent. Each swore by the god(s) of their father, Jacob by the archaic epithet *Pāḥad Yiṣḥāq*, “the Fear of Isaac.”

219. H. B. Huffmon, “The Treaty Background of Hebrew *yāda’*,” *BASOR* 181 (1966), pp. 31–37.

220. Cited by Huffmon, “The Treaty Background of Hebrew *yāda’*,” p. 32, from Johs. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprach*, *MVAG*, vol. 34, no. 1 (Leipzig, 1930), II, 58f.

221. See W. L. Moran, “The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy,” *CBQ*, 25 (1963), 77–87.

222. A gloss attempting to explain 31:44 has been intruded into the *Vorlage* of G at verse 44, in M at verse 50. The plus is not in this case the result of haplography, despite the common ending. Similarly, v. 47 is a doublet of v. 48, and presumes the secondary *‘ēd = šāhādūtā*. V. 48, however, should be read: “And Laban said, this cairn is (the sign of) the treaty (*‘ād*) between me and you this day; therefore its name shall be called ‘the cairn of the treaty,’ *Gil‘ād*.”

223. The argument is not that the etymology “cairn of the treaty” is superior to “cairn of witness,” but that one popular etymology is less forced than the other.

No such typical covenant between a patriarch and his deity, “the god of the father,” has been preserved in Epic tradition. Perhaps the closest to the old pattern is the description in Genesis 28:10–22 of Jacob’s vision at Bethel. The basic account stems from the Elohist, built around a Yahwistic promise of the land (verses 13–16). After the vision of the deity, Jacob vowed that if the god of Bethel was with him and cared for him on his journey, on his return he would set up a pillar for the god’s cult and pay him a tithe.

While the explicit language of kinship or covenant is not used, the account reflects the old pattern of the patriarchal cults. In these, the god of the father revealed himself, entering into a special relation with the patriarch and his clan. This relationship may use the language of kinship with its attendant privileges and obligations. The god may be called *’ab*, “father,” *’ad*, “sire,” *’ah*, “brother,” and *’am*, *ḥatan*, and *ḥal* all “kinsman” in various, rather bizarre shadings. The relationship may also be described in covenant language. The deity elected a patriarch or tribe by revealing his identity or by an act of succor; he promised his direction and protection, guaranteed the boundaries of the patriarch, or gave him progeny. The patriarch and his folk in turn took the deity “to be their god” (Genesis 28:21b), agreed to celebrate his cult (Genesis 28:22), to bring him tithes (Genesis 28:22b; compare 18:20) or the first born (Genesis 22:1–18; cf. Exodus 22:28b), to be faithful and obedient (Genesis 15:6; 17:1; 18:19; 22:16, 18b), and to follow the deity’s directives in holy war or in migration (compare Genesis 12:1).

The Priestly covenant with Abraham in Genesis 17:1–27 has been shaped strongly by later theological constructions and, like Genesis 15:7–21, does not preserve the archaic form of the covenant of the god of the father. The covenant is fitted into a sequence of three covenants, each adumbrating its successor, each funneling down to the people Israel. The Noachic covenant (Genesis 9:1–17) had as its sign (*’ōt*) the rainbow and as its law the prohibition of the eating of blood. The Mosaic covenant had as its sign the Sabbath, a sign already hidden in creation but revealed only at Sinai, and as its law the cultic prescriptions of the Tabernacle cult and the entire “Holiness code.” The covenant with Abraham is peculiar in having both its sign (*’ōt*) and its law, the circumcision of the male. That circumcision was the sign of the covenant is plainly said (Genesis 17:11); that circumcision was a stipulation of the covenant is explicit in the apodictic law, “you shall circumcize every male” (17:10) and the punishment for infraction,

namely expulsion from the covenanted community, was the usual punishment for violation of covenant law (17:14).²²⁴ The main thrust of the Abrahamic covenant, however, was promise of numerous progeny and of the land of Canaan as an "eternal possession," and the patriarchal covenant in the Priestly terminology is an "eternal covenant."

The historical covenant of the league in Israel, and presumably in the other confederacies of southern Palestine, was merely a variant, elaborated form of the covenants of patriarchal type which actually functioned in patriarchal religion. The deity disclosed himself to Moses and chose Israel in an act of redemption. He became their protector, their leader in war and migration, and established them in the land of their heritage. In short, he took initiative in their election and salvation. All this is proper to both the covenant of the father and the covenant of the league and has its formal analogy in the historical prologue to the suzerainty treaty. In the league covenant, the obligation of the league to establish the cult of the god, to provide for the league shrine, and to give to the deity (exclusive) worship and fidelity is elaborated in the covenant stipulations. These features are found, for example, in the archaic description of the covenant rites at Shechem in Joshua 24: 2-28. The obligations or law in the god-of-the-father covenant are rudimentary, however, in comparison with the league constitution. The patriarchal family was bound tightly in the duties and obligations of kinship in which the deity participated. In the tribal league the bonds of kinship were expanded to grotesque proportions, so to speak, in the covenant; and the stipulations of the covenant necessarily had to govern, not merely the relations between the god and the patriarch, but also the relations between tribe and tribe, and tribesman and tribesman. In this feature the deity was also the guarantor of the covenant between the several human parties, giving the league covenant a complexity without close analogy either in the patriarchal covenant or in the international treaties.

One must not suppose, however, that even in the Epic sources, the full, historical form of a league covenant is presented. The Epic sources,

224. Compare G. E. Mendenhall, *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York-Nashville. Abingdon, 1962), I, 714-723, who argues that the Abrahamic covenant in the Priestly tradition is without obligation, circumcision being a sign only. However, both circumcision and the Sabbath, sign of the Sinai covenant, are at once signs and laws, which if broken bring separation from the covenant people. The Priestly strata are influenced by the mythic and antinomian tendencies of the royal Judaeian theology, but law is a part of each of the Priestly covenants. See further, in chapter 11.

and particularly the Yahwistic version, preserve only fragments which fit into the reinterpretation of Israel's history from the point of view of the monarchy; for example, the Yahwist specifically portrays the empire as the fulfilment of the divine promises to the fathers and to the nascent league of Moses.²²⁵ In Yahwistic tradition, both in Genesis 15, the account of the Abrahamic covenant, and in Exodus 19 and 34, where remnants of a Yahwistic account of the Mosaic covenant may be searched out, the primary interest is in the "historical prologue" to the covenant. The great legal corpus attributed to the Sinaitic covenant stems largely from the Elohist and the Priestly strata. The curses of the covenant, a major element in the covenant of the league (as in the suzerainty treaties) are passed over wholly by both Epic traditions and would be unknown save for their survival in prophetic oracles, and later in Deuteronomic and Priestly lore, especially in Deuteronomy 28 and Leviticus 26.²²⁶

Special comment must be made on the patriarchal covenant in Genesis 15, from the hand of the Yahwist, and the royal ideology of 2 Samuel 7. Recent treatments of "covenant," *bērīt*, persist in taking the use of *bērīt* in Genesis 15 as archaic and normative for early Israel. By this device, a neo-Wellhausenist interpretation²²⁷ of the evolution of legal forms is being reintroduced into the discussion of covenantal language.²²⁸ In our view, such interpretations not only distort the biblical data but stand in plain contradiction to the extra-biblical evidence.

In Genesis 15:7-12, 17-21 we find the Yahwistic reworking of an older narrative from which the Yahwist extracted an oracle or pro-

225. Cf. G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *BA*, 17 (1954), 71.

226. See Delbert R. Hillers's excellent study, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964).

227. In some instances, idealistic antinomianism and Christian apologetics combine to furnish the special tendencies of the treatment of covenant and law. See especially the series of studies by E. Kutsch including "Gesetz und Gnade: Probleme des alttestamentlichen Bundesbegriffs," *ZAW*, 79 (1967), 18-35; and "Der Begriff ברית in vordeuteronomischer Zeit," *Das ferne und nahe Wort* [Festschrift L. Rost] (Berlin, Töpelmann, 1967), pp. 133-143.

228. See J. Begrich, "Berit. Ein Beitrag zur Erfassung einer alttestamentlichen Denkform," *ZAW*, n.s. 19 (1944), 1-11; A. Jepsen, "Berith. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Exilzeit," *Verbannung und Heimkehr* [Festschrift W. Rudolph (Tübingen, Mohr, 1961)]; G. Fohrer, "Amphiktyonic und 'Bund'?" *ThLZ*, 91 (1966), 801-816; 894-903. To a lesser or greater degree the volumes of R. E. Clements, *Abraham and David*, *SBT*, 2nd ser. 5 (Naperville, Illinois, A. R. Allenson, 1967); and N. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid*, *SBS* 28 (Stuttgart, 1967), have been influenced by these tendencies.

mise of the land, which he conformed to the boundaries of the Solomonic empire and from which he drew an archaic account of a covenant ceremony.²²⁹ In Genesis 15:1–6 there is like material from at least two sources in which the deity gave the promise of seed. The Yahwist's hand is to be seen in the shaping of at least one of the sources of 15:1–6, and the Yahwist's linking of the promise of seed and land is well known from Genesis 12:1, 26:2–5, and 28:13–15, revelations of the patriarchal covenant to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob respectively in the Yahwistic scheme.²³⁰ The Priestly description of the Abrahamic covenant in Genesis 17:1–19 also includes both seed and land in the covenant promises, echoing the Yahwistic tradition. In Genesis 15, there is no hint of covenant stipulations binding Abraham. Abraham was granted progeny and the land by divine decree, apparently unconditionally. The parallel to the divine decree of 2 Samuel 7:11b–16 in which eternal kingship is granted to the Davidic house is obvious. It is interesting that, in his recounting of the promises in Genesis 12:1–3 and elsewhere (other than Genesis 15:18), the Yahwist avoided the term *bērīt*, “covenant,” just as 2 Samuel 7:11b–16 fails to use the term *bērīt* of the decree of kingship. In both cases, however, older tradition preserved the notion of covenant. In effect, the Yahwist and the Solomonic royal ideology selected only the “historical prologue” to the older covenant, that is, the promises of the land and of dynastic succession familiar from the historical prologues of suzerainty treaties. In another sense the older *bērīt* in each case was transformed into an eternal, unconditional decree or oath of the deity in the interests of the royal theology of the Davidids. It should be observed, however, that remnants of the older covenantal form of the patriarchal promises survive, not only in the term “covenant” and in the archaic covenant rite of Genesis 15:9–12, 17 (which presumes mutuality and conditionality in its original context) but also in both Yahwistic and Elohist traditions of Abraham's fidelity, which have their counterpart in the faithfulness of David.²³¹

229. Cf. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid*, pp. 35–64.

230. Explicit covenant language appears in the Abrahamic covenant, Gen. 15:18. In 18:19 the expression “I have known him” is used in a technical, covenantal sense. Gen. 26:3 uses the term “oath,” *šebū'ā*, and 28:15 “promise,” *dibbārtī*. Cf. Gen. 22:16.

231. Gen. 18:19; 22:15–18; and 26:2–5, while occurring in Yahwistic contexts, are probably secondary references to the obedience of the patriarch.

10 *The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History*

The Contemporary Discussion of the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History

The contemporary discussion of the structure of the Deuteronomistic¹ history was initiated by the brilliant essay of Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*.² Noth radically revised literary-critical views which asserted that the books of the Former Prophets, namely Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, grew into their present shape out of sources combined in a series of redactions. He viewed the whole, Joshua through Kings, as a single historical work, created by a highly original author during the Exile, about 550 B.C. Diverse sources, sometimes rewritten in the peculiar Deuteronomistic rhetoric, sometimes not, were selected and informed by a framework into a unity expressing the theological and historical slant of the editor. An older form of Deuteronomy, supplied with a new Deuteronomistic introduction and conclusion,³ was prefixed to the historical work proper, together forming a great Deuteronomistic block of tradition. This work stands over against the Tetrateuch, Genesis through Numbers, or what is more appropriately called the Priestly work.⁴

The framework of the Deuteronomistic history is marked in particular by speeches in pure Deuteronomistic style patterned after Deuteronomy, the whole of which is cast as the last speech of Moses to Israel. These passages include the speeches of Joshua (Joshua 1:11-15; and 23), the address of Samuel (1 Samuel 12:1-24), and the prayer of Solomon (1

1. In M. Noth's usage "Deuteronomistic" (Dtr) identifies the hand of the Exilic author of the great work Joshua-Kings and the framework of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomistic (Dt) is reserved for the old core of the book of Deuteronomy (Dtn), that is, the legal code and its immediate, framing passages. In our discussion, the above sigla are modified only by the use of Dtr¹ to designate the seventh-century author of the Deuteronomistic history, Dtr² to apply to the Exilic editor of the work. This involves a change in the terminology used in my lecture underlying the present essay published under the title, "The Structure of the Deuteronomistic [sic!] History," *Perspectives in Jewish Learning*, Annual of the College of Jewish Studies, 3 (Chicago, 1968), 9-24.

2. The essay, hereafter designated *ÜGS* was first published in 1943; the second (unchanged) edition in Tübingen, 1957.

3. Dtn. 1:1-4:43 and 31:1-32:44 (excepting secondary material). Dtn. 33:1-34:12 was later added to Dtn, taken from the end of the Priestly Work (Gen.-Num.).

4. See F. M. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," *BAR*, I, 216f.; and chapter 11 below.

Kings 8:12–51). Oddly, Noth ignores the oracle of Nathan and the Prayer of David (2 Samuel 7:1–16 and 7:18–29) which surely belong to this series.⁵ Other major Deuteronomistic summaries include Judges 2:11–22, and especially 2 Kings 17:7–18, 20–23, the Deuteronomistic peroration on the fall of Samaria.

The theme running through the framework of the Deuteronomistic history, according to Noth, is a proclamation of unrelieved and irreversible doom. The story of Israel is a story of apostasy and idolatry. The inevitable result has been the visitation of God's judgment and the curses of the covenant: death, disease, captivity, destruction. In the era of the kings, the violation of the law of the central sanctuary comes to the fore. In the sin of Jeroboam (northern) Israel earned God's rejection, and in Manasseh's grave apostasy Judah was damned to irrevocable destruction. The Deuteronomistic author, according to Noth, thus addressed his work to the exiles. His theology of history, revealed in the framework of his great work, justified God's wrath and explained the exiles' plight.

Older literary critics, as well as their more recent followers, argued for two editions of the Deuteronomistic complex of traditions, one pre-Exilic, the basic promulgation of the Deuteronomistic history, and one Exilic, retouching the earlier edition to bring it up to date. We need not review here the variety of views nor their specific arguments.⁶ Some of their arguments are very strong, for example, the use of the expression "to this day," not merely in the sources but also in portions by the Deuteronomistic author, which presumes the existence of the Judaeian state, notably 2 Kings 8:22 and 16:6.⁷ The increase in epigraphic material of the late seventh and early sixth century, including the extraordinary series from Tel 'Arad, has made clear that the complex syntactical style of the Deuteronomist (if not his peculiar archaizing forms)

5. See above, chapter 9, and D. J. McCarthy, "II Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," *JBL*, 84 (1965), 131–138.

6. The "orthodox" literary-critical viewpoint was framed by Kuenen and Wellhausen, in particular, and survives in such recent works as R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1941), pp. 277ff.; and John Gray, *I & II Kings. A Commentary* (London, S. C. M. Press, 1963), pp. 13ff. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 3rd ed. (Tübingen, Mohr, 1964), pp. 321–330; 376–404. A. Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*, 2nd ed. (Halle, Niemeyer, 1956), while assuming two primary redactors in his complex analysis, is in basic agreement with M. Noth (though independent). He holds that the Exilic "prophetic" redactor gave to an earlier "priestly" history of the two kingdoms its essential framework and Deuteronomistic stamp.

7. Cf. 1 Kings 8:8; 9:21; 10:12; 12:19; 2 Kings 10:27; 14:7; 17:23.

characterized late pre-Exilic prose.⁸ It has been argued also that the availability of sources to the Deuteronomistic editor requires a pre-Exilic date.⁹ Nevertheless, from our point of view, the strongest arguments for the pre-Exilic date of the basic promulgation of the Deuteronomistic history have not yet entered into the discussion (see below). Yet the view of M. Noth has increasingly gained sway, especially in German circles, and much recent writing presumes his basic position as the foundation for further research.

Two important recent studies have attempted to bring modification to Noth's view of the essential purpose and teaching of the Deuteronomist. Gerhard von Rad in his *Studies in Deuteronomy* took up again the question of the Deuteronomistic theology of history in the Book of Kings.¹⁰ Von Rad was anxious to emphasize not only the motifs of lawsuit and judgment which follow upon the breach of covenant law (as stressed almost exclusively by Noth), but also to develop a counter-theme in the Deuteronomistic presentation of the history of the kingdom, that is, the theme of grace, God's promise to David which was eternal and hence the ground of hope. In the oracle of Nathan to David, and its persistent reiteration in later Judaeen reigns, Von Rad found a major Deuteronomistic theme. Moreover, it appears that the Deuteronomist never really repudiated this promise.¹¹ In 2 Samuel 7:13-16, Yahweh addressed David concerning his seed, "and I will establish the throne of his kingship forever. I will become his father and he my son; whenever he commits iniquity I will discipline him with the rod of men and the stripes of the children of men, but my faithfulness I will not turn aside from him . . . your dynasty shall be firm and your kingship forever before <me>: your throne shall be established forever." Von Rad speaks of this repeated theme as proving that in the day of the Deuteronomist¹² there remained a cycle of "messianic conceptions," a hope that the

8. It goes without saying that it persisted into the early Exilic age, or at least was imitated accurately in the later period.

9. See W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period* (Pittsburg, 1950) pp. 45f. and n. 108.

10. Gerhard von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, *SBT*, 9 (London, 1953), 74-79. Cf. his *Old Testament Theology* (New York, Harper, 1962), I, 334-347.

11. In certain passages, 1 Kings 9:6-9, for example, the eternal decree of kingship is followed by a specific reference to the Exile and the destruction of the temple. With Kuenen and most earlier commentators we should regard the passage as secondary, in direct conflict with 2 Samuel 7:18-29 and the Deuteronomistic theme to be discussed below. Cf. 2 Kings 20:17-18, an obvious addition.

12. That is, in the Exile, of course. Von Rad follows Noth fully in his dating of the Deuteronomist.

Davidic house would be reestablished after the Exile. The final notice in 2 Kings 25: 27–30, recording the release of Jehoiachin, was taken by Von Rad as having a special theological significance, alluding to the hope of salvation in the Davidic dynasty.

We must confess that Noth has the better of the argument when it comes to the interpretation of 2 Kings 25: 27–30.¹³ That Jehoiachin was released from prison and lived off the bounty of the Babylonian crown—still in exile for the remainder of his days—is a thin thread upon which to hang the expectation of the fulfilment of the promises to David. Yet Von Rad has singled out a theme, the promise to the house of David, which must be dealt with systematically; the neglect of this theme is a serious failure in Noth's study.

H. W. Wolff recently has taken up again the Deuteronomist's future hope or, as he puts it, the Deuteronomist's *kērygma*.¹⁴ He finds Noth's analysis of the Deuteronomist's doctrine of history defective in its portrayal of the end of Israel as a monochromatic picture of unmitigated judgment. He cannot conceive of the Deuteronomist taking up the tedious task of composing a great theology of history as a labor devised and designed to teach only the message that the disaster of Israel is final. At the same time Wolff rejects Von Rad's position, noting the qualification of the eternal decree of Davidic kingship in 1 Kings 9: 6–9, 2 Kings 24: 2, and so on.¹⁵ Wolff seeks a note of grace, a modest future hope in certain Deuteronomistic passages which call for repentance and which promise that when Israel cries out to God and repudiates her apostate ways he will repent of his evil and listen to their prayers.¹⁶ Nothing is said of the restoration of the house of David. The only clear hope is that the Lord will restore a repentant people to his covenant.

13. Noth, *ÜGS*, p. 108.

14. H. W. Wolff, "Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes," *ZAW*, 73 (1961), 171–186. Incidentally, the importation of the term *kērygma* into the form criticism of the Hebrew Bible is to be deplored as an inelegant and presumptuous anachronism.

15. On the former passage, see above, n. 11. The cycle of passages attributing the fall of the Davidic house to the sin of Manasseh belong to a special Exilic group and will be dealt with below.

16. The chief passages are Judg. 2: 18; 1 Sam. 12: 1–24; and (dealing with repentance) 1 Sam. 7: 3; 1 Kings 8: 33, 35; 2 Kings 17: 13; 23: 25. A series more explicitly related to exile or captivity is 1 Kings 8: 46–53; Dtn. 4: 25–31; 30: 1–10 (the latter two form a later hand than the Deuteronomist proper in Wolff's view; i.e., they are secondary to the Exilic [*sic!*] work). See Wolff, "Das Kerygma," pp. 180ff.; Noth, *ÜGS*, pp. 17, 109. Only Dtn. 30: 4 speaks explicitly of a return from Exile.

Wolff correctly discerns a theme of hope which comes from the hand of a Deuteronomistic editor in the Exile (our Dtr²), especially in Deuteronomy 4: 25–31 and 30: 1–20 (framing the old Deuteronomistic work), and in the addition to Solomon's prayer in 1 Kings 8: 46–53. One may question, however, whether the alternating pattern of grace and judgment in the Deuteronomistic notices of the era of the Judges had as its original setting the Exilic situation. It is easier to understand it as exhortation to reform with the hope of national salvation.¹⁷ Here one listens with sympathy to Von Rad's plaintive comment that "it is difficult to think that the editing of the Book of Judges and that of the Book of Kings could have taken place as a single piece of work."¹⁸ At all events, Wolff has not given an adequate explanation of the persistent, and in many ways major, theme of the Book of Kings: the promises to David. If Von Rad's handling of this theme is unconvincing, we are not thereby justified in ignoring it. The persistence of the Deuteronomistic stress upon the eternal decree of Davidic kingship cannot be explained as a survival of royal ideology taken over mechanically from monarchist sources. It *must* be pertinent to the Deuteronomistic theology of history.

We are left unsatisfied by each of these attempts to analyze the themes of the Deuteronomistic history, especially in their treatment of Kings. Each seems too simple, incapable of handling the complexity of the theological lore in the great collection. In short, it appears that these fresh attempts to examine the history of the Deuteronomistic tradition, while casting much light on the Deuteronomistic corpus, leave many embarrassing contradictions and unsolved problems.

The Two Themes of the First Edition of the Deuteronomistic History (Dtr¹)

We desire first to analyze the latter part of the Deuteronomistic history, especially the Book of Kings. Here we should find the climactic section of the history. As the historian draws closer to his own times, we expect him to express his intent most clearly both in specifically theological or parenetic sections which would constitute his framework and in the shaping of special themes which unify his work.¹⁹

There are indeed two grand themes or bundles of themes running

17. See further below. Note that 1 Samuel 12: 25 is to be taken as a secondary addition (Dtr²).

18. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 347.

19. Cf. G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, p. 75 and n. 2.

through the Book of Kings. In combination these themes must stem from a very specific setting having a specific social function. We shall argue that they belong properly to a Josianic edition of the Deuteronomistic history.

(1) One theme is summed up in the following saying:

This thing became the sin of the house of Jeroboam to crush (it) and to destroy (it) from the face of the earth.²⁰

The crucial event in the history of the Northern Kingdom was the sin of Jeroboam.

Earlier, Ahijah of the prophetic circle of Shiloh had prophesied that, if Jeroboam acted faithfully as did David, he would be given a sure house. This promise was not an eternal decree after the pattern of the oracle of Nathan to David. Ahijah added the qualification that while the seed of David would be chastised for a season, God would not afflict Judah forever.²¹ In this statement we must understand that the oracle presumes an ultimate reunion of the two kingdoms under a Davidid. In 1 Kings 12:26–33, we read a strongly Deuteronomistic description of Jeroboam's archcrime, namely the establishment of a countercultus in Bethel and Dan. The account assumes that Jeroboam's motivation is fear that traditions of the central sanctuary which David brought together and focused upon Zion would ultimately lure his people back to the Davidic house even as the national shrine of Jerusalem attracted them in the time of the pilgrimage feasts. Hence, he established new shrines at ancient holy places of the north, introducing an idolatrous iconography and a syncretistic cult.²² An account of the prophecy of "a man of God and of Judah," otherwise unidentified; follows. The prophet is made to give utterance to one of the most astonishing as well as rare instances of a *vaticinium post eventum* found in the Bible, obviously shaped by an overenthusiastic editor's hand: "He cried against the altar [of Bethel] . . . 'Altar, Altar, thus saith Yahweh: behold a son will be born to the house of David, Josiah by name, and he will sacrifice upon you the priests of the high places who burn incense on you, and human bones

20. 1 Kings 13:34 (reading *hdbh* with G Syr. et al.).

21. 1 Kings 11:29–39, esp. v. 39.

22. We are not concerned here with reconstructing the actual, historical character of the cultus of Jeroboam. We have argued (above chapter 3) that, in choosing Bethel and in reverting to a bull iconography (in place of the cherubim of Jerusalem and earlier of Shiloh), he actually was attempting to "out-archaize" Jerusalem.

<he> will burn upon you.’’²³ The reform of Josiah is here anticipated, preparing the reader’s mind for the coming climax.

Ahijah of Shiloh also proclaimed an oracle which would be repeated almost verbatim, like a refrain, pointing forward to the crescendo of this theme in Kings, the fall of the North. “Thus saith Yahweh, God of Israel: ‘Because I exalted you from the midst of the people and made you commander (*nāgīd*) over my people Israel, tearing the kingdom from the house of David to give it to you, yet you have not been like my servant David . . . but have done evil . . . casting me behind your back, therefore I will bring evil on the house of Jeroboam and will cut off from Jeroboam every male, whatever his status, and I shall consume the house of Jeroboam, as one burns up dung and it is gone. He of (the house of) Jeroboam who dies in the city the dogs shall devour, and he who dies in the field the birds of the heaven shall eat.’”²⁴ The grisly fulfilment of Ahijah’s prophecy is carefully noted in 1 Kings 15: 29.²⁵ “Jehu the son of Hanani proclaimed against Baasha, ‘. . . behold I will consume Baasha and his house and I will make his house to be like the house of Jeroboam son of Nebat. He (of the house) of Baasha who dies in the city the dogs shall devour, and his dead in the field the birds of the heaven shall eat.’”²⁶

Against each king of Israel in turn the judgment comes, “[he] did evil in the eyes of Yahweh, doing evil above all who were before him, and he walked in the way of Jeroboam.”

Elijah the Tishbite prophesied against Ahab:

Thus saith Yahweh, “Have you murdered and also taken possession? . . . in the place where the dogs lapped the blood of Naboth, the dogs will lap your blood, even you . . . Behold I will bring on you evil and I will consume you and cut off from Ahab every male, whatever his status, in Israel, and I will make your house like the house of Jeroboam the son of Nebat and like the house of Baasha . . . and also concerning Jezebel Yahweh has spoken, saying, the dogs shall eat Jezebel in the plot of Jezreel. He (of the house) of Ahab who dies in the city the dogs shall devour, and he who dies in the field the birds of the heaven shall eat.”²⁷

23. 1 Kings 13: 2-5.

24. 1 Kings 14: 7-11.

25. Cf. 2 Kings 17: 7-23.

26. 1 Kings 16: 1-4.

27. 1 Kings 21: 17-29. Cf. also the prophecies of 1 Kings 20: 42f.; Micahiah in 1 Kings 22: 8-28; and of Elijah in 2 Kings 1: 2-17.

The word of Yahweh was in part delayed (1 Kings 21:29), in part fulfilled in Ahab's death (1 Kings 22:37f.) and in Ahaziah's death. The prophecy was roundly fulfilled in the revolution of Jehu in which the king (Ahab's son Joram) together with the "seventy sons of Ahab" and Jezebel the queen mother were slaughtered in Jezreel and in Samaria.²⁸

Elijah's prophecy against the house of Ahab no doubt goes back to an old poetic oracle. The earlier oracles, in wording at least, were shaped to it by the Deuteronomist so that a refrain-like rhythm is given to the theme of prophetic decree and fulfilment.

The string of oracles and judgments which make up this theme in Kings is completed in the great peroration on the fall of Samaria in 2 Kings 17:1-23. Here the Deuteronomist reached the first great climax of the last section of his work and rang the changes on his theme of Jeroboam's sin and Israel's judgment.

And Yahweh rejected the entire seed of Israel and afflicted them and gave them into the hands of spoilers until he had cast them out from his presence. For he tore Israel from the house of David and they made Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, king, and Jeroboam enticed Israel away from Yahweh and caused them to sin a great sin. The children of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam which he did; they did not turn aside from it until Yahweh turned Israel aside from his presence, as he had spoken through all his servants the prophets, and Israel was taken captive from off their land to Assyria until this day.²⁹

The lawsuit of Yahweh is complete. The verdict is rendered. The curses of the covenant are effected. In Jeroboam's monstrous sin, Israel's doom was sealed.

(2) The second theme we wish to analyze begins in 2 Samuel 7 and runs through the book of Kings. It may be tersely put in the refrain-like phrase:

for the sake of David my servant and for the sake of Jerusalem which I have chosen.³⁰

An alloform is the expression "so that David my servant will have a fief always before me in Jerusalem, the city I have chosen for myself to

28. 2 Kings 9:1-10:11.

29. 2 Kings 17:20-23.

30. 1 Kings 11:12, 13, 32, 34, 36; 15:4; 2 Kings 8:19; 19:34 (quoting Isa. 37:35); 20:6.

put my name there.”³¹ The crucial event in Judah, comparable to the sin of Jeroboam was the faithfulness of David. Through much of Kings this theme of grace and hope parallels the dark theme of judgment. David established Yahweh’s sanctuary in Jerusalem, an eternal shrine on chosen Zion; Jeroboam established the rival shrine of Bethel, a cultus abhorrent to Yahweh, bringing eternal condemnation. David in Kings is the symbol of fidelity, Jeroboam the symbol of infidelity. In view of the antimonarchical elements surviving in Deuteronomistic (Dt) tradition, notably in the law of the king,³² and in certain sources in the books of Judges and Samuel, it is remarkable to discover that the Deuteronomist in 2 Samuel 7 and in Kings shares in unqualified form the ideology of the Judaeon monarchy.³³

We have discussed at some length in the last chapter the Deuteronomistic character of both the so-called oracle of Nathan in 2 Samuel 7: 11b–16 and the prayer of David in 2 Samuel 7: 18–29. In promising an eternal throne to the Davidic dynasty the Deuteronomist appears to take up specific elements of the royal liturgy also found reflected in Psalm 89: 20–38.³⁴ The prayer of David, framed in wholly Deuteronomistic language, echoes similar hopes and expectations for the permanence of the Davidic house.³⁵

In 1 Kings 11 the Deuteronomist condemned Solomon for his apostasy and idolatry. The ten tribes were “torn away” from the Judaeon king and given to Jeroboam. Solomon thus “did evil in the sight of Yahweh” and went not fully after Yahweh as did David his father. Yet even in the context of Solomon’s sin we find the following formula: “Yet in your days I shall not do it [that is, rend away the northern tribes), for the sake of David your father.”³⁶ Again, it is said of Solomon by Ahijah: “But I shall not take the whole kingdom from his hand for I will make him a prince (*nāšīr*) all the days of his life for the sake of David my servant whom I have chosen, who has kept my commandments and statutes . . . to his son I will give one tribe in order that there may be a fief for David my servant always before me in Jerusalem the city which I have chosen for myself, to place my name

31. 1 Kings 11:36; 15:4; 2 Kings 8:19; 2 Chron. 21:7.

32. Dtn. 17:14–20.

33. See above chapter 9. Cf. G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, p. 89; *Old Testament Theology*, I, 344ff.

34. See above, chapter 9 for a translation of this text.

35. See above, chapter 9.

36. 1 Kings 11:12f.

there."³⁷ Even in the context of Ahijah's prophecy of the division of the kingdom, however, we find the striking promise. "And I will afflict the seed of David on this account yet not always."³⁸

The refrain persists. Of Abijah we read: "but his heart was not perfect with Yahweh his god as the heart of David his father. Yet for the sake of David Yahweh his god gave him a fief in Jerusalem in setting up his son after him and in establishing Jerusalem because David did that which was right in the eyes of Yahweh."³⁹

Jehoram of Judah "walked in the ways of the kings of Israel . . . and did that which was evil in the eyes of Yahweh. But Yahweh was unwilling to destroy Judah for the sake of David his servant as he promised him to give him a fief for his sons always."⁴⁰

Interwoven with these repeated formulae is another element belonging to this theme. While the kings of Israel were always condemned, each having done "that which was evil in the eyes of Yahweh," judgment does not come automatically upon the kings of Judah. Certain kings, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Hezekiah, and above all Josiah "did that which was right in the eyes of Yahweh, as did David his father." Even King David and Hezekiah had peccadilloes. Josiah alone escaped all criticism. Josiah "did that which was right in the eyes of Yahweh and walked in all the ways of David his father and did not turn aside to the right or to the left."⁴¹ "And like him there was no king before him turning to Yahweh with his whole mind and soul and strength according to all the law of Moses."⁴²

The second theme reaches its climax in the reform of Josiah, 2 Kings 22: 1-23: 25. We have been prepared for this climax. Josiah, as already predicted, becomes the protagonist of the drama, extirpating the counter-cultus of Jeroboam at Bethel. He attempted to restore the kingdom or empire of David in all detail. The cultus was centralized according to the ancient law of the sanctuary, and Passover was celebrated as it had not been "since the days of the Judges." The story of the renewal of the covenant and the resurrection of the Davidic empire by the reincorporation of the North is told at a length not given to the labors of other approved kings after David.

37. 1 Kings 11: 34-36.

38. See above, n. 21.

39. 1 Kings 15: 3-5a.

40. 2 Kings 8: 18f.

41. 2 Kings 22: 2.

42. 2 Kings 23: 25a.

The Deuteronomistic historian thus contrasted two themes, the sin of Jeroboam and the faithfulness of David and Josiah. Jeroboam led Israel into idolatry and ultimate destruction as all the prophets had warned. In Josiah who cleansed the sanctuary founded by David and brought a final end to the shrine founded by Jeroboam, in Josiah who sought Yahweh with all his heart, the promises to David were to be fulfilled. Punishment and salvation had indeed alternated in the history of Judah . . . as in the era of the Judges. Yahweh has afflicted Judah, but will not forever.

The two themes in the Deuteronomistic Book of Kings appear to reflect two theological stances, one stemming from the old Deuteronomic covenant theology which regarded destruction of dynasty and people as tied necessarily to apostasy, and a second, drawn from the royal ideology in Judah: the eternal promises to David. In the second instance, while chastisement has regularly come upon Judah in her seasons of apostasy, hope remains in the Davidic house to which Yahweh has sworn fidelity for David's sake, and for Jerusalem, the city of God. A righteous scion of David has sprung from Judah.

In fact, the juxtaposition of the two themes, of threat and promise, provide the platform of the Josianic reform. The Deuteronomistic history, insofar as these themes reflect its central concerns, may be described as a propaganda work of the Josianic reformation and imperial program. In particular, the document speaks to the North, calling Israel to return to Judah and to Yahweh's sole legitimate shrine in Jerusalem, asserting the claims of the ancient Davidic monarchy upon all Israel. Even the destruction of Bethel and the cults of the high places was predicted by the prophets, pointing to the centrality of Josiah's role for northern Israel. It speaks equally or more emphatically to Judah. Its restoration to ancient grandeur depends on the return of the nation to the covenant of Yahweh and on the wholehearted return of her king to the ways of David, the servant of Yahweh. In Josiah is centered the hope of a new Israel and the renewing of the "sure mercies" shown to David.⁴³ Judah's idolatry has been its undoing again and again in the past. The days of the Judges, of Samuel and Saul reveal a pattern of alternating judgment and deliverance. But in David and in his son Josiah is salvation.

Before the pericope on Manasseh there is no hint in the Deuteronomistic history that hope in the Davidic house and in ultimate national

43. Cf. Isa. 55:3; 2 Chron. 6:42.

salvation is futile. The very persistence of this theme of hope in the promises to David and his house is proof that it was relevant to the original audience or readership of the Deuteronomistic historian. It is not enough that the faithfulness of God to David and Jerusalem merely delay the end, postpone disaster. The historian has combined his motifs of the old covenant forms of the league and of the north, with those taken from the royal theology of the Davidids to create a complex and eloquent program, or rather, one may say, he has written a great sermon to rally Israel to the new possibility of salvation, through obedience to the ancient covenant of Yahweh, and hope in the new David, King Josiah.

The Theme of the Exilic Edition of the History (Dtr²)

There is to be found in the Deuteronomistic history a subtheme which we have suppressed until now in the interest of clarifying the major motifs of the Josianic edition of Kings. We should attribute this subtheme to the Exilic editor (Dtr²) who retouched or overwrote the Deuteronomistic work to bring it up to date in the Exile, to record the fall of Jerusalem, and to reshape the history, with a minimum of reworking, into a document relevant to exiles for whom the bright expectations of the Josianic era were hopelessly past.

This subtheme is found articulated most clearly in the pericope dealing with Manasseh and the significance of his sins of syncretism and idolatry, in 2 Kings 21:2–15. The section is modeled almost exactly on the section treating the fall of Samaria.

He [Manasseh] set up the image of Asherah which he had made in the house of which Yahweh had said to David and to his son Solomon, "In this house and in Jerusalem which I chose of all the tribes of Israel, I will set my name forever, nor will I again cause Israel's foot to wander from the land which I have given to their fathers, only if they be careful to do according to all which I commanded them and to all the law which my servant Moses commanded them." But they did not listen, and Manasseh led them astray so that they did more evil than the nations which Yahweh destroyed before the children of Israel. And Yahweh spoke by his servants the prophets saying, because Manasseh the king of Judah has done these abominations . . . and caused Israel to sin with his idols, therefore, thus saith Yahweh, god of Israel, "Behold I shall bring such evil on Jerusalem and on Judah that the two ears of whoever hears of it shall tingle. And I will extend over Jerusalem the cord of Samaria and the plum-

met of Ahab's house, and I will wipe out Jerusalem as one wipes out a dish, wiping it and turning it upside down. I shall cast off the remnant of my possession and I will give them into the hand of their enemies, and they shall become spoil and prey for looting to all their enemies."⁴⁴

One is struck by the weakness of the phrase, "Yahweh spoke by his servants the prophets, saying . . ." No specific prophet is named by name. Moreover, no prophecies concerning Manasseh's great sin, and the inevitable rejection it entailed, are to found in the earlier parts of the Deuteronomistic history. Not one.⁴⁵ On the contrary, the hopes of the reader have been steadily titillated by the promises. All has pointed to a future salvation in virtue of the fidelity of Yahweh to the Davidic house and to Josiah, who called for a wholehearted return to the god of Israel's covenant. Moreover, we are driven to ask, why is the culprit not Solomon or even Rehoboam? In short, there are a number of reasons to suppose that the attribution of Judah's demise to the unforgivable sins of Manasseh is tacked on and not integral to the original structure of the history.

The same must be said for the content of the prophecy of Hulda which speaks of the delay of disaster owing to Josiah's piety and penitence.⁴⁶

Attached to the end of the account of Josiah's reforms we find the following significant addition: "and after [Josiah] none like him arose. Yet Yahweh did not turn back from the heat of his great wrath which was kindled against Judah on account of all the vexations with which Manasseh vexed him. And Yahweh said, 'Also Judah I will turn aside from my presence even as I turned aside Israel, and I will reject this city which I have chosen, Jerusalem, and the house of which I said, my name shall be there.'"⁴⁷ This is evidently from the hand of an Exilic editor.

44. 2 Kings 21:7-14.

45. We speak here of the Deuteronomist's work. Whether the Exilic editor had in mind prophecies of Micah, Zephaniah, and especially Jeremiah, we cannot tell. The absence of explicit allusion to Jeremiah's prophecies in the Deuteronomistic history is most extraordinary if we suppose the latter to be an Exilic work. The silence is far easier to explain if we suppose that the great history had its principal edition in the time of Josiah. The close ties between Jeremiah and the Deuteronomistic school, early and late, are well known, of course, as is the traditional attribution of the Book of Kings to Jeremiah himself (Talmud Babli, Baba Batra 15a).

46. 2 Kings 22:15-20. No doubt there is an old nucleus in Hulda's prophecy which predates Josiah's *unpeaceful* end.

47. 2 Kings 23:25b-27.

There are a sprinkling of passages in the Deuteronomistic work which threaten defeat and captivity. These need not necessarily stem from an Exilic editor. Captivity and exile were all too familiar fates in the Neo-Assyrian age. More important, the threat of exile or captivity was common in the curses of Ancient Near Eastern treaties and came naturally over into the curses attached to Israel's covenant.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, there are a limited number of passages which appear to be addressed to exiles and to call for their repentance, or in one case even promise restoration of the captives to their land. These latter are most naturally regarded as coming from the hand of an Exilic editor.

Such passages include Deuteronomy 4:27-31 which is addressed to captives "scattered among the nations whither Yahweh will lead you away," and gives to them the assurance that Yahweh will not "forget the covenant of your fathers." Deuteronomy 30:1-10, promising return from captivity, must be coupled with Deuteronomy 4:27-31 as an Exilic addition in a style distinct from the hand of the primary Deuteronomistic author (Dtr¹). Other passages which include short glosses can be listed: Deuteronomy 28:36f., 63-68; 29:27; Joshua 23:11-13, 15f.; 1 Samuel 12:25; 1 Kings 2:4; 6:11-13; 8:25b, 46-53; 9:4-9; 2 Kings 17:19; 20:17f.⁴⁹

The Two Editions of the Deuteronomistic History

We are pressed to the conclusion by these data that there were two editions of the Deuteronomistic history, one written in the era of Josiah as a programmatic document of his reform and of his revival of the Davidic state. In this edition the themes of judgment and hope interact to provide a powerful motivation both for the return to the austere and jealous god of old Israel, and for the reunion of the alienated half-kingdoms of Israel and Judah under the aegis of Josiah. The second edition, completed about 550 B.C., not only updated the history by adding a chronicle of events subsequent to Josiah's reign, it also attempted to transform the work into a sermon on history addressed to Judean exiles. In this revision the account of Manasseh's reign in

48. See D. R. Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964), p. 34 and *passim*. Cf. J. Harvey, "Le 'Rib-pattern,' réquisitoire prophétique sur la rupture de l'alliance," *Biblica*, 43 (1962), esp. 180, 189-196.

49. Obviously the end of the history, 2 Kings 23:26-25:30, belongs to the Exilic sections. Certain other passages may be described as suspect: e.g., Dtn. 30:11-20; and 1 Kings 3:14.

particular was retouched, conforming Judah's fate to that of Samaria and Manasseh's role to that of Jeroboam. This new element does not exhaust the work of the Exilic Deuteronomist, but—in general the re-touching by his pen was light, not wholly obscuring the earlier framework.

When we examine the Exilic editor's account of the fall of Jerusalem and the captivity of Judah, we find that the story is told laconically. There is no peroration on the fall of Jerusalem, much less an elaborate one like that upon the destruction of Samaria. The events are recorded without comment, without theological reflection. This is remarkable, given the Deuteronomist's penchant for composing final addresses, edifying prayers, and theological exhortations on significant events. One might argue that the Deuteronomist has said his say, has said earlier all that is necessary to prepare the reader for an understanding of the fall of Jerusalem. However, it must be said that the Deuteronomistic historian never tires of repetition of his themes and clichés and is fond of bracketing events and periods with an explicit theological framework. The omission of a final, edifying discourse on the fall of chosen Zion and the Davidic crown is better explained by attributing these final terse paragraphs of the history to a less articulate Exilic editor.

In the light of our understanding of the two editions of the work and their different tendencies, the primary edition (Dtr¹) from the author of the era of Josiah, the second (Dtr²) from a late Deuteronomist of the Exile, a number of puzzles and apparent contradictions in the Deuteronomistic history are dissolved or explained. Little or no hint of inevitable disaster is found in the Deuteronomistic historian's framework and transitional passages in Joshua, Judges, and Samuel. Yet the Book of Kings and the Deuteronomistic history in its final form offer little hope to Judah, as Noth has correctly maintained. In the retouching of the original work by an Exilic hand, the original theme of hope is overwritten and contradicted, namely the expectation of the restoration of the state under a righteous Davidid to the remembered greatness of the golden age of David. Von Rad's instincts were correct in searching here for an element of grace and hope. The strange shape of the Exilic edition with its muted hope of repentance (as Wolff has described it) and possible return (Deuteronomy 30: 1–10) is best explained, we believe, by the relatively modest extent of the Exilic editor's work and his fidelity in preserving intact the work of the Josianic Deuteronomist. This explains the lack of a peroration on Jerusalem's fall. This explains the

anti-climax of Josiah's reign, falling as it does, in the present form of the history, after Judah's fate has been sealed by Manasseh. This explains the contrast between the Deuteronomistic history and the great works of the Exile with their lively hope of restoration; of the eternal covenant and return (the Priestly work), of a new Exodus and Conquest (Second Isaiah), and of a new allotment of the land, a new Temple, and a new Davidid (Ezekiel).⁵⁰ The failure of such a dominant theme of God's coming restoration can be explained best by removing the primary Deuteronomistic history from the setting of the Exile.

Our analysis of the themes of the Deuteronomistic history has led us to views which superficially resemble positions taken in the nineteenth century. At least we have opted for dating the fundamental composition of the Deuteronomistic history in the era of Josiah. At the same time, we must assert broad agreement with Noth's description of the primary Deuteronomistic historian (Noth's Dtr, our Dtr¹) as a creative author and historian and our full agreement with the sharp distinction made by Noth and the late Ivan Engnell between the Tetrateuch (or Priestly work) and the Deuteronomistic history. In our view, however, the Priestly work is the work par excellence of the mid-sixth century B.C.; essentially, the Deuteronomistic history is a work of the late Kingdom, suffering only minor modification by a member of the Deuteronomistic school in the Exile.

50. I hope to discuss elsewhere the date of the Priestly work and of Ezekiel 40-48; see provisionally, F. M. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," pp. 209-228; meanwhile, see chapter 11.

11 *The Priestly Work*

The So-Called P-Source of the Pentateuch

The classical partition of the Pentateuchal sources posited four major sources: the Yahwist (J) and Elohist (E), old traditional documents of the ninth and eighth centuries B.C., Deuteronomistic tradition (D) stemming largely from the seventh century B.C., and the Priestly document or codex (P) of the Exilic or post-Exilic period. Pentateuchal study over the past half century, despite radical assaults upon the documentary hypothesis, has produced relatively minor changes in this partition although very different language is often used to describe the sources or strata. We prefer to speak of J and E as variant forms in prose of an older, largely poetic Epic cycle of the era of the Judges. While aware of two levels, and not infrequently more than two levels, in JE tradition, we are less inclined to resort to the multiplication of "documents" and more inclined to speak generally of the "Epic sources" or simply "Epic tradition." No doubt the Epic cycle was originally composed orally and was utilized in the cult of covenant-renewal festivals of the league, taking on variant forms at different sanctuaries and in different times. The Yahwistic source from the age of Solomon was promulgated in the interests of the national cult of the empire. The Elohist document appears to have been derived from continuing Epic tradition in the north probably no later than the ninth century B.C. The Tetrateuch (Genesis-Numbers) seems to have escaped the influence of the Deuteronomist or, in any case, systematic editing by a member of the Deuteronomistic school. This significant observation and its corollary, that Deuteronomy and Joshua were edited by the Deuteronomist, not by the final tradent of the Tetrateuch, were made independently by Martin Noth and Ivan Engnell in studies prepared during the Second World War.¹

1. M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Halle-Saale, Niemeyer Verlag), first published in 1943; and *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer), published in 1948; Ivan Engnell, *Gamla Testamentet*, I (Stockholm, 1945); cf. "Mosesböckerna," *Svenskt Bibliskt Upplagsverk* (Gävle, Skolfoerlaget, 1948-), 324-342. Compare S. Mowinkel, *Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch* (Berlin, Töpelmann, 1964); and *Erwägungen zur Pentateuch Quellenfrage* (Trondheim, Universitetsforlaget, 1964). For a bibliography of the other literature, especially treating the P Document, see R. J. Thompson, *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism Since Graf*, SVT. 19 (Leiden, 1970).

Noth's studies have proved to be the most influential in recent discussions of the Pentateuch and the Priestly source. He argued that the Priestly strata had their origin in a "narrative" source secondarily combined with the JE tradition complex by a redactor. In order to reconstruct this narrative, Noth was obliged to count as accretions the massive collections of legal lore in Priestly sections of the Tetrateuch. For example, in Leviticus, all of which stems ultimately from the same Priestly school, only the narrative elements in chapters 8 and 9 were eligible in Noth's view for inclusion in the primary P strand. The P "narrative" of the Tetrateuch as put together by Noth is a rather strange document. Its "narrative" is nothing like the narrative of saga. In Genesis, the book with the largest content of "primary" P narrative, four narratives only are found; the creation account, the flood, the formulaic description of the covenant with Abraham, and the record of the purchase of the Cave of Machpela. As for the remaining P material, it consists of genealogical and chronological notices and connective formulae. In Wellhausen's words, "It is as if Q [Wellhausen's siglum for P] were the scarlet thread on which the pearls of JE are hung."² In fact, if we are to suppose that the Priestly strata were ever an independent narrative source, we must suppose also that a redactor has used only a précis of P to frame the Epic tradition. On the other hand, one must account for the great expansion of the spare "narrative" with major legal documents stamped with P formulae, if Noth's analysis be followed.

Engnell's view provides a more parsimonious explanation of these phenomena. He insisted that there was no literary, narrative source "P." P rather was the "circle" which last handled the complex of tradition we call the Tetrateuch. P and the redactor in effect merge and the Tetrateuch becomes the P-work in Engnell's analysis.

In 1947 the writer sketched his views of the Priestly work as follows:³ "Priestly tradition seems never to have taken the form of an independent 'Code.' It is most easily described as a . . . systematizing expansion of the normative JE tradition in the Tetrateuch . . . evidently priests of

2. J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, trans. J. S. Black and A. Menzies (Edinburgh, A. and C. Black, 1885), p. 332.

3. F. M. Cross, "The Tabernacle: A Study from an Archaeological Approach," *BA*, 10 (1947), 57f.; reprinted with insignificant changes in *BAR*, 1 (1961), 215f. and in S. Sandmel, ed., *Old Testament Issues* (New York, 1968), pp. 52f. This paper, written while the author was a student, contains much to which he would not ascribe today; however, the general view of the Priestly work expressed there will be defended below.

the . . . Exilic period collected and edited ancient . . . documents, perhaps salvaged from Temple . . . archives . . . An Exilic date for the normative edition of the Priestly Work seems almost certain now.”

These comments in their original form were directed against Noth. They find agreement with Engnell’s views, at least, in the assertion that P was never an independent narrative source.

Sigmund Mowinckel writing recently on the Priestly document also reveals a strong reaction to Noth’s work.⁴ Although he makes no break with older views of P as an independent document combined secondarily with JE by a redactor, he argues emphatically that P is at once a narrator (or rather a historian) and a codifier of law and that his work as a historian is in some degree only to provide the context of law.⁵ Mowinckel also argues persuasively that P was directly dependent on Epic tradition (Mowinckel’s J=JE), or in other words, that Epic tradition was a primary source utilized by P.

The P System of Covenants

The Priestly strata of the Tetrateuch are marked by a powerful tendency to the periodization of history. On one level P can be described as sharing a mythic view of time with its sacred times and seasons, especially in his treatment of the Sabbath. The seven days with the Sabbath rest were written into the “orders of creation.” At the same time the Sabbath was the sign (*’ōt*) of the covenant at Sinai.⁶ This creation-redemption typology is reminiscent of myth, and adumbrates as well the proto-apocalyptic periodization of world history.

The Priestly tradent divided history into four ages, the ages of Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses. Each period after creation was marked by a covenant. Julius Wellhausen counted four covenants and used the designation *Liber quattuor foederum*, abbreviated Q, in preference to P for the “Priestly Document.” As has been frequently pointed out, he erred in speaking of a covenant of creation or a covenant with Adam. Creation was marked by the blessing, “Be fruitful and multiply (and fill the earth).”⁷ This blessing was addressed to man (Adam) and also to fish and fowl. It was a blessing associated with each of the Priestly

4. See the works cited in n. 1 above.

5. *Erwägungen zur Pentateuch Quellenfrage*, pp. 21–47.

6. Exodus 31:13.

7. Gen. 1:28; cf. 1:22.

covenants, the Noachic,⁸ the Abrahamic,⁹ and the Mosaic.¹⁰ Preliminary fulfilment of the blessing is noted when the tribes multiplied in Egypt.¹¹ The primary use of this blessing formula, however, is related to the promise of the land and to Israel multiplying in the land. This is not only apparent in the peroration on the covenant in Leviticus 26:9; it is apparent in the use of a parallel formula in the Epic tradition of Exodus 23:30f., listing blessings of the covenant in the peroration at the end of the covenant code, and significantly in Exilic prophecies of the return to the land and Zion.¹²

The blessing of creation, and the Sabbath "hidden in creation," in themselves do not constitute a covenant. Both are archetypes, the blessing of creation pointing to the blessing to be fulfilled in the land, the sabbath of creation adumbrating the revelation at Sinai of the law of the Sabbath, the special sign of the Sinai covenant. Finally, P did not apply one of his terms for covenant (*berit* and *'ēdūt*) to creation.

The Priestly covenant schemata began with the covenant of Noah. The age of Adam was separated from the age of Noah by the Flood. The new age was marked by a covenant with all flesh, that is, a universal covenant.¹³ The god who revealed himself was known by the general designation *'Elōhīm*. He gave them the blessing, "Be fruitful, multiply . . ." The obligation laid down by the covenant was the law of blood (including murder). God bound himself never again to destroy the earth or "all flesh" by a flood and gave the rainbow as the sign of the covenant.

The age of Noah was separated from the age of the Fathers by the migration of Terah and Abraham. The covenant of Abraham was at once deeper and narrower than the Noachic covenant. More is revealed to fewer. *'Elōhīm*, "God," now revealed himself by his more intimate and precise epithet *'El Šadday*.¹⁴ *'El Šadday* declared, "Walk before me with integrity (that is, worship me in obedience and trust) and I will establish my covenant between me and you." In his new relationship a new name "Abraham" was given (to Abram), and he received the

8. Gen. 9:7; cf. 8:17.

9. Genesis 17:6. Ishmael also receives the blessing in 17:20 as does Jacob in 35:11. These may be termed extensions of the primary Patriarchal blessing of Abraham.

10. Lev. 26:9.

11. Gen. 47:27 and Exod. 1:7.

12. Ezek. 36:11f.; Jer. 3:16; 23:3.

13. Gen. 9:1-17.

14. Gen. 17:1-27.

blessing “I will make thee exceedingly fruitful . . . and kings shall come forth from thee.” ’El Šadday bound himself to an “eternal covenant” to give the land of Canaan to Abraham’s seed and “to be a god” to Abraham and his offspring. The sign of the covenant, and at the same time a law of the covenant (in addition to the obligation to maintain ’El Šadday’s cult),¹⁵ was circumcision.

The Abrahamic covenant was extended to Isaac,¹⁶ and more fully to Jacob.¹⁷ In the latter instance the term “covenant” was not used, but most of the formulae of the covenant were applied: “I am ’El Šadday”; “No more Jacob but rather Israel shall be your name”; “Be fruitful, multiply . . . kings shall go forth from your loins”; “the land I have given to Abraham and Isaac I will give to you.”

The age of the Fathers was separated from the Mosaic age by the exodus of Israel from Egypt. The third covenant, the covenant with Israel at Sinai had been foreshadowed by the blessing and the sabbath of creation, and with increasing intensity, by the covenant of Noah and more particularly by the covenant of Abraham. On the one hand, each pointed forward as the genealogies and the scope of the recipients of the covenants funneled down; on the other hand, in each the divine self-disclosure and promises expanded. While both the Noachic and Abrahamic covenants remained valid, each was provisional, a stage on the way to God’s ultimate covenant and ultimate self-disclosure.

In the universal covenant and in the patriarchal covenant, we have found compact lists of covenant formulae. In the covenant with Israel the covenant formulae were spread over the entire, massive Sinai pericope, extending from Exodus 19 to Numbers 10:10 according to the Priestly headings. In fact, the covenant formulary of the Priestly author began even earlier with the anticipatory prologue to the covenant in the theological document found in Exodus 6:2–9 and was effectively ended with the closing exhortation enumerating the blessings and curses of the covenant in Leviticus 26:3–45.¹⁸

15. See our remark above on Gen. 17:1, and chapter 9, n. 224.

16. Gen. 17:21: 21:4.

17. Gen. 35:9–13.

18. This chapter, in origin the peroration of the Holiness Code, contains much archaic material as has been shown particularly by Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*, pp. 40–42, and *passim*. The chapter has been thoroughly reworked by P, however, with the introduction of his formulae, in verses 9, 11, and especially 45, as well as in the verses anticipating the Exile, especially 32–35, and 40–45. One should note that the self-presentation formula “I am Yahweh” is at home in P as well as in the Holiness Code. Compare, e.g., Lev. 26:13 with Exod. 6:6, 8; 20:2; etc.

The prologue to the covenant, set out in Exodus 6:2–9, began with the disclosure, finally, of the deity's proper name, Yahweh. This gives the sequence 'Elōhīm, 'El Šadday, Yahweh in the Priestly schema of covenants, the general appellative, "god," the archaic epithet, "'El Šadday," and the unique proper name "Yahweh." The blessing of the covenant is not found in this prologue, but appears in its proper place in the sequence of the blessings (and curses) which come at the close of the covenant formulary: "I will make you fruitful and multiply you and confirm my covenant with you" (Leviticus 26:9). Also part of the prologue was the renewed promise of the land (Exodus 6:8); however, the gift of the land was put into the context of a new and central theme of the prologue: "I am Yahweh, and I will bring you forth from under the burdens of Egypt . . . and I will take you to be my people and I will become your god and you shall know that I am Yahweh . . . and I will bring you into the land . . ." (Exodus 6:6–8).

The sign of the covenant of Sinai was the sabbath. This is explicitly stated in Exodus 31:13, 16f.: "Indeed you shall keep my sabbaths for it is a sign (*'ōt*) between me and you throughout your generations that you may know that I am Yahweh who sanctified you . . . and the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath to make it throughout their generations an eternal covenant. Between me and the children of Israel it shall be a sign forever." One notes that the same formulae which label circumcision, the sign of the Abrahamic covenant, "an eternal covenant," here apply to the sabbath.

The covenant formulary, "I will become your god," applied first to Abraham in Genesis 17:8, is applied to the children of Israel in Exodus 6:7 in more elaborate form. Its expression in the center of the Priestly covenant materials was further expanded and brings us to the very heart of the Priestly covenant theology. Two passages are crucial here. One is in Leviticus 26:11–13:

And I will put my "Tabernacle" (*miškān*) in your midst, and I myself will not despise you. I will walk about among you and will become your god and you shall become my people. I am Yahweh your god who brought you forth from the land of Egypt . . .

The second passage is Exodus 29:45ff.:

And I will "tabernacle" in the midst of the children of Israel and I will become their god. And they shall know that I am Yahweh their god

who brought them from the land of Egypt that I may “tabernacle” in your midst; I am Yahweh their god.

The prime benefit of the Sinaitic covenant in the view of the Priestly tradent was the “tabernacling” presence of Yahweh in Israel’s midst. Yahweh not only would become their god, he would become the god in their midst, who “walks about” among them. Archaizing technical vocabulary is used in these Priestly passages. The verbal root *škn* specialized early in Canaanite (including Ugaritic) to mean “to tent” or “to lead the roving life of the tent dweller,” evidently a denominative meaning from *miškān* “tent, tabernacle,” *miškānōt* “encampment.”¹⁹ The verb *škn*, used in archaic contexts of the immanence of the deity in his shrine,²⁰ was taken up anew by the Priestly circle and used exclusively of the “covenant presence” of the deity in the *miškān*, “the tabernacle,” becoming the keyword of their theological vocabulary. The Priestly source wholly eschewed the literal term *yšb*, “to dwell” of the divine presence or “nearness” in his earthly shrine. Those who have translated *miškān* as “Dwelling,” and imputed a doctrine of the concrete abode of Yahweh in his shrine to the Priestly school could not be further from understanding the Priestly, self-conscious, technical usage. The translation “to tabernacle” is not felicitous but at least has the advantage of pointing to the relation between the verbal usage of *škn* and the Tabernacle par excellence, the *miškān* in the Priestly source.²¹

The entire cultic paraphernalia and cultus was designed to express and overcome the problem of the holy, transcendent God visiting his pervasively sinful people. Zones of holiness in the Tabernacle and court, and in the battle camp vividly express the paradox of the immanence of the Holy One. Indeed the agonizing problem of the Exile, reflected in a variety of literature, and perhaps most exquisitely in P, was precisely the divine hiddenness and Israel’s sinfulness.²² For the Priestly tradent the Sinaitic covenant, its cultus and its law, was the device contrived by

19. See provisionally the writer’s discussion in “The Priestly Tabernacle,” pp. 225ff. On the meaning “to put or place” which survives in Deuteronomic usage, see chapter 9, n. 114.

20. Dtn. 33:12, 16; 1 Kings 8:12; and Ps. 68:16, 18.

21. Other important passages include Exod. 24:16; 25:8; 40:35; Num. 5:3; 35:34; cf. 1 Kings 6:13; Ezek. 37:27; 43:7, 9.

22. An instructive illustration is the elaboration of the Epic “murmuring” theme (Exod. 15:24; 17:3 both J) by the Priestly source, utilizing the archaic terms *lwn* and *tlnh*: Exod. 16:2, 7-9, 12; Num. 14:2, 27, 36; 16:11; 17:6, 20, 25.

Yahweh to make possible his “tabernacling” in Israel’s midst, which alone could make full the redemption of Israel.

The Priestly reinterpretation of another archaic term denoting Israel’s early shrine, *’ôhel mō’ēd*, is pertinent; *’ôhel mō’ēd*, which we can translate accurately as “tent of the council or assembly” thanks to extra-biblical lexical material, was understood in P as the “tent of the divine-human meeting,” that is, “the tent of revelation.”²³

The stipulations or law of the covenant in the Priestly view includes the entire, baroque collection of law and cultic prescriptions, beginning in Exodus 20 and extending (originally) to Leviticus 26.²⁴ The primary legal documents utilized by P and remodeled by him were the Decalogue in Exodus 20 and the Holiness Code in Leviticus 17–26. The “covenant” or covenant document proper in P, however, consists of the tablets of the law, that is, the decalogue which he designated the “covenant,” *’ēdūt*, which, as we have seen, is another instance of P taking up an archaic word and using it as a technical term.²⁵

The *’ēdūt*, “covenant,” was to be put into the “ark of the covenant” (*’ārōn hā’ēdūt*).²⁶ Similarly one may speak of the “two tablets of the covenant” (*šny lḥt h’dt*).²⁷ These parallel the expression *lḥwt hbryt*²⁸ and, of course, *’rwn (h)bryt*. The tabernacle, like the ark, may be designated the “tabernacle of the covenant” (*miškān hā’ēdūt*) or “tent of the covenant” (*’ôhel ’ēdūt*).²⁹

The term *bryt*, “covenant,” also may be applied to the specific stipulations of the covenant, *pars pro toto*, the obligation to keep the sabbath, to use salt with the offerings, and so on,³⁰ as well as generally to the Sinaitic covenant.³¹

23. Exodus 29:42, 43; 25:22; 30:36; cf. Cross, “The Priestly Tabernacle,” p. 223f.

24. See the rubric in Lev. 26:46. Cf. S. Mowinkel, *Erwägungen zur Pentateuch Quellenfrage*, p. 21.

25. See the discussion in chapter 9, “Excursus.” Archaic contexts include Ps. 132:12; 78:5, 56; Gen. 31:48.

26. Exod. 25:16; cf. 25:21, 22.

27. Exod. 31:18; 32:15.

28. Dtn. 9:11, 15.

29. Exod. 38:21; Num. 1:53; 10:11; and Num. 9:15.

30. Exod. 31:16; Lev. 2:13; 24:8.

31. Lev. 26:9, 15; and especially 26:45. One should observe that, even in the context of the Sinaitic covenant, the Priestly author continued to allude to the covenant with the fathers, primarily in dealing with the promise of the land which has its primary connection with the covenant of the fathers (Exod. 6:8 and Lev. 26:42). This fact has led to some confusion in the analysis of the covenant schemata of P to which we shall return below.

Is P a Narrative Source?

P is not a narrative source. It begins with a schematic presentation of the creation in Genesis 1:1–2:3, based upon a poetic document probably of catechetical origin.³² In its present form, however, Priestly language and clichés are manifest. After the creation account, before the Yahwistic story of the creation and rebellion of man, the Priestly tradent has intruded the rubric beginning *'lh twldwt . . .*, “These are the generations . . .” To understand this rubric and its place in the composition of P, it is necessary to examine the other contexts in Genesis beginning *'lh twldwt PN*, “these are the generations of so and so.”

The Priestly formula was secondarily derived from an ancient document, the *séper tōlēdōt 'ādām*, “the book (better, ‘document’) of the generations of Adam,” mentioned in the heading of the so-called Sethite genealogy in Genesis 5:1–32, spanning the generations from Adam to Noah. The genealogy in question is cast in a highly distinct style: “[These are the generations of] N_1 . N_1 was X years old and begot N_2 . The days of N_1 after he begot N_2 were Y years, and he begot sons and daughters. [All the days of the life of N_1 were Z years and he died].” This same style is found elsewhere only in the genealogical materials headed *'lh twldwt šm*, “these are the generations of Shem” in Genesis 11:10–26, spanning the generations from Shem to Abraham (Abram). The first portion of the “Book of Generations” in Genesis 5:1–32 parallels the Epic genealogy of Cain in Genesis 4:17–26 and, indeed, goes back to an oral variant of the Cainite genealogy. Similarly, the second part of the “Book of Generations” in Genesis 11:10–26 is paralleled by the so-called “Table of Nations” in Genesis 10:2–32. There is strong reason to believe that the Priestly historian made use of an older document consisting of a continuous genealogical series from Adam to Abraham, secondarily split up by P to separate the era of creation from the era of Noah, and the era of Noah from the era of the Fathers, in short, to periodize the old times. It should be noted, however, that the characteristic *séper tōlēdōt* style ends with Terah, the father of Abram. There is no heading *'lh twldwt 'brm*, “These are the generations of Abram,” and the genealogies of Ishmael, Isaac, Esau, and Jacob belong to an entirely different set of genealogical styles despite their headings: *'lh twldwt PN*.

32. See the Harvard dissertation of John Kselman, “The Poetic Background of Certain Priestly Traditions” (1971).

The rubric *'lh twldwt . . .*, “These are the generations of . . .” appears five times in the so-called primordial history before Terah (Genesis 1–11), five times in the patriarchal history (Genesis 12–50), ten times in all.³³ By this formula P framed the major sections of Genesis.

(1) Genesis 2:4a. The first heading reads, “These are the generations of heaven and earth when they were made.” The position of this heading, and its meaning, has long puzzled those who regarded P as a narrative source. Some have shifted it before Genesis 1:1 (for which there is not a shred of evidence), in view of their recognition that it is a heading, not a concluding rubric. Others have tried to make sense of it as a subscription to the P creation account. But this view cannot stand in view of Priestly usage and the awkwardness of designating seven days of creation with “generations.” The formula usually designated either the descendants of PN by generation, the original use in the *Tôlēdôt* document, or, where no genealogy follows the formula, introduced a section with stories about the descendants of PN (see nos. 6, 8, and 10 below), regularly JE narrative sections. It follows then that Genesis 2:4a, “These are the generations of heaven and earth . . .” stands as a heading to the Yahwistic section, stories of creation and human rebellion, Genesis 2:4b–4:26. Confirmation is found in the fact that in all cases in which the formula is used (apart from specific genealogical headings),³⁴ it is a superscription to a section.

(2) Genesis 5:1. This heading, “This is the book of the generations of Adam,” is the rubric opening the document (5:1–32; 11:10b–26) utilized by P for the framework of the “primordial” history. In its present context it is a rubric heading Genesis 5:1–6:8, a mixture of Epic and P tradition.

(3) Genesis 6:9. The heading “These are the generations of Noah” is not the heading of a genealogy. Noah’s genealogical notices are begun in Genesis 5:32 in the *Tôlēdôt* Book, “And Noah was five hundred years old; and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japhet,” and continued without break in 9:28f. “And Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty

33. This reckoning omits its occurrence in Gen. 36:9, the second identical heading of the “generations of Esau,” echoing Gen. 36:1. The original heading of the genealogy is preserved in Gen. 36:10, *'lh šmwt bny 'šw*. The formula *'lh šmwt bny* PN introduces a very different genealogical genre, one found combined with the formula *'lh twldwt* PN in Gen. 25:12f. (Ishmael), and without in Gen. 46:8 and Exod. 1:1. The formula *'lh twldwt* is conflated with an *'lh šmwt* genealogy also in Num. 3:1f. properly the genealogy of the “sons of Aaron,” not “the generations of Aaron and Moses”!

34. Nos. (5), (7), and (9) below.

years. And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty and he died." The rubric in Genesis 6:9 thus must be understood as the heading of the JP Flood story (including the Noachic covenant anticipated in Genesis 6:18 and described in 9:1–17). The Flood story has been completely rewritten by P. As in the Plagues narrative in Exodus 7:1–12:51, the interweaving of the sources is not the work of a redactor juxtaposing blocks of material, but that of a tradent reworking and supplementing a traditional story.

(4) Genesis 10:1. The heading "These are the generations of the sons of Noah," is the P heading to the JE Table of Nations in Genesis 10:2–31, which has been reworked and supplemented by P.

(5) Genesis 11:10. The heading "These are the generations of Shem" introduces the second section of the *Tôlēdôt* document, 11:10b–26, which brings the "primordial" history to a close with the begetting of Abram by Terah (verse 26). This completes the five headings of "the old times."

(6) Genesis 11:27. The heading, "These are the generations of Terah" is the introduction to stories of the descendants of Terah, for the most part of Abraham (11:28–25:11 [the death of Abraham]). There is no heading "These are the generations of Abraham." A similar pattern is found in the following headings: "These are the generations of Isaac" introduces not Isaac but the stories of Esau and Jacob. "These are the generations of Jacob" introduces the Joseph story. The content of Genesis 11:28–25:11 is, of course, largely JE. Aside from brief notices, mostly chronological, the only P compositions under this heading are found in Genesis 17:1–27, the covenant with Abraham, and Genesis 23:1–20, the purchase of the cave of Machpelah for Sarah's burial. The Priestly account of the covenant with Abraham and the blessing of Sarah are dependent on J and add no narrative elements.

(7) Genesis 25:12. The heading "These are the generations of Ishmael" has been placed before a genealogy in *'lh šmwt* ("These are the names of . . .") style, and hence there is the double rubric. Other genealogies in the same style, and presumably from the same source, are found in Genesis 36:10–30, Genesis 46:8–27, Exodus 1:1–6; and Numbers 3:2–4.

(8) Genesis 25:19. The heading "These are the generations of Isaac" introduces the first cycle of Jacob-Esau stories (Genesis 25:19–35:29 [the death of Isaac]).³⁵ Genesis 25:19b, "Abraham begot Isaac" gives the

35. Cf. no. (6) and no. (10) which mark sections ending with the death of Abraham (6) and Joseph (10).

appearance of being a gloss by a scribe who missed a heading, "These are the generations of Abraham." To have Isaac's birth mentioned in his own genealogy is quite without parallel. Besides, the P notice of Isaac's birth and circumcision is found in Genesis 21:3-5.³⁶ In any case, the heading introduces the JE section, not the genealogical tidbit, whatever its origin. In the entire section, aside from chronological notices in 25:20, 26b; 26:34; and 35:28f., the only P portions of substance are found in Genesis 28:1-9, the blessing of Jacob (the Priestly account is dependent on the JE account in Genesis 27 and adds little except formulae)³⁷ and the account of the extension of Abraham's covenant to Jacob in Genesis 35:9-13, 15. P again is dependent on the JE narrative of Jacob's first visit to Bethel (for which there is no P parallel)³⁸ and the E narrative of the return to Bethel.

(9) Genesis 36:1. The heading "These are the generations of Esau" stands above a series of genealogies of complex makeup which need not occupy us here. We have noted above that the double heading of 36:9 is secondary. The genealogies of Esau terminate the P section.

(10) Genesis 37:2. The heading "These are the generations of Jacob" is associated with no genealogical material. It serves only to introduce the epic story of Joseph and his brethren (Genesis 37:2-50:13 [the burial of Jacob] or Exodus 1:7 [the death of Joseph]). The section contains no narrative materials of P. In addition to the usual chronological notices, the only P passages of any length are 46:8-27, the genealogy of the children of Israel headed with the formula, "These are the names . . ."; 47:5-11, and 48:3-7.

We have listed ten P rubrics: all are superscriptions either to genealogies or (equally often) to JE (or in one case JP) sections. Headings to the JE sections are: 1, 6, 8, and 10; to JP, 3; to P genealogies, 2, 5, 7, and 9; to a JP genealogy, 4. We have asserted that these headings belong to P and form his framework to JE tradition in Genesis. Conceivably one could assert that the *'lh twldwt PN* superscriptions were the work of a redactor who framed Epic blocks in ten-fold fashion and genealogies of *séper tōlēdōt* style and of *'ēllē sēmōt* style. The periodiz-

36. The suggestion has been made that the original reading here was "these are the generations of Abraham." This is highly unlikely. The heading with *Isaac* should follow the Ishmael genealogy just as the heading with *Jacob* follows immediately on the Esau genealogy.

37. He adds also a new motivation for Jacob's flight from Esau, namely the seeking of a non-Canaanite wife.

38. Gen. 28:10-22.

ing of the primordial, Noachic, patriarchal, and Mosaic ages also is involved in this scheme and would, in this case, be attributed to the redactor. Such an explanation actually leads to the positing of two P authors, a less parsimonious solution than that of eliminating the redactor or, to say the same thing, merging P and the redactor of the Tetrateuch into a single siglum: P. As we shall see, the Priestly tradent's documentary sources, including JE, are very close to the surface: his primary work was imposing the framing elements, and supplementing JE with his theological formulae and an occasional discrete document, until reaching the Sinai sojourn when his supplementation became massive. His "discrete" documents in Genesis included the poetic source underlying the creation account, the "Book of the generations of Adam,"³⁹ the source of the *'ēllē šēmōt* genealogies, the etiology of the Machpelah cave, the J account of the Flood and the J Table of Nations, both reworked by P, and above all, we should argue, the JE narrative as a whole.

If one examines the Priestly material in Genesis, he is soon struck by the paucity of narrative. Only the account of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah comes close to literary narrative. For the rest of P's own material, it is at best epitomized history. The bulk of independent Priestly material consists of the blessing and covenant pericopes.⁴⁰ None can properly be called a narrative. Most depend directly on a parallel JE narrative. Jacob's covenant blessing on his return to Bethel is an example (Genesis 35:9–13). No narrative elements are in the account. It concluded the JE account of Jacob's return to Bethel, just as 28:1–10 gave an introduction to the JE narrative of the first visit and revelation to Jacob at Bethel, using (the same) blessing and covenant formulae. But nowhere in P is there an account of the main vision of God at Bethel and related episodes. Unless P presumed the JE narra-

39. We have noted above that the genealogical and chronological pattern of the *sēper tōlēdōt* runs only from Adam to Abraham in two Priestly blocks, the genealogies of Adam and Shem. However, the chronological framework (as opposed to the *'ēllē šēmōt* genealogies) in Genesis 12–50 does preserve data similar in content and in style to the *sēper tōlēdōt* (the age of the Patriarch at the birth of a child, the "days of the patriarch was x years," etc.). It is quite possible that the *sēper tōlēdōt* continued from Abraham to Jacob, but was used only in fragments by P. The passages in question are: Gen. 11:32; 12:46; 16:3, 16:16; 17:1; 21:5; 23:1; 25:7; 25:17; 25:20; 25:26b; 27:34; 35:28; 37:29; 41:45b; 47:9; 47:28.

40. Gen. 9:1–17 (Noachic covenant); 17:1–22 (Abrahamic covenant and blessing of Sarah); 28:1–9 (Isaac's blessing of Jacob); 35:9–13 (Jacob's blessing on return to Bethel); and 48:3–7 (the blessing of Joseph's sons).

tive of both visits to Bethel, his introduction and conclusion are without context and senseless.

Perhaps the most persuasive evidence that the Priestly strata of the Tetrateuch never had existence as an independent narrative source comes from its omissions. Traditions or accounts in JE (without parallel in P, but crucial to P's schema—presumed in his framework, fundamental to his theology—or necessary to a coherent account of Israel's past) are frequent. One must conclude either that a redactor has mindlessly mutilated P by suppressing much of the source, or that P was never an independent source but rather was a tradent who shaped and supplemented the received Epic tradition of Israel. The scale becomes tipped even more strongly by the patent evidence that P in fact did know and use JE tradition.

There is no account of primordial human rebellion in the Priestly strata of Genesis 1–11. Save for the rubric in Genesis 2:4a, P is absent in chapters 2 and 3, the narrative of the rebellion of man, as well as in chapter 4, the story of fratricide and limitless vengeance, not to mention chapter 11:1–9, the fall and division of “civilized” human society. In P's formulaic introduction to the JP Flood story, God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before me for the earth is filled with violence through them.”⁴¹ So far as the Priestly stratum is concerned, this is the first hint of the intrusion of sin and rebellion into the good creation. In Genesis 9:6 P quoted the legal couplet “He who spills man's blood, his blood shall be spilled by man” which (so far as P is concerned) is unmotivated unless it presumes the earlier Epic narratives of murder.

That a Priestly narrative once existed without an account of man's rebellion and sin is very hard to believe. The Flood account well-known to P presumes the background of Adam's rebellion and subsequent corruption of the creation. It cannot stand alone as a narrative in its present form. P's summary statement referring to violence and corruption must presume a knowledge of concrete and colorful narratives of the corruption of the creation. Otherwise, it has neither literary nor theological force. Not only the Flood story must be seen against the background of the story of human sin and its universal spread, but also the entire schemata of Priestly covenants. Yahweh's covenants were given, in the Priestly view, to provide the means of atonement and reconciliation of the sinful people with their god and to sanctify Israel through his law so that he could place his Tabernacle in their midst and

41. Genesis 6:13; cf. 6:11f.

bless them in their new land. The atonement for sin is the function of the elaborate Priestly cultus. As is the case with Ezekiel, P's brooding consciousness of human uncleanness and Israel's rebelliousness dominates his work. The Priestly source stemmed from the crisis of Exile. It was designed to provoke overwhelming remorse in Israel and sought by the reconstruction of the age of Moses, its cult and law, to project a community of Israel in which Yahweh could return to "tabernacle" in their land. The somber, sin-obsessed consciousness of P, as opposed to the buoyant and free spirit of J, so stressed by an older generation in their partition and dating of the sources of the Pentateuch, must not be forgotten. At the same time, we must explain the apparent paradox that P neglected the origins of human sin if we persist in treating his work as a narrative and independent document.

Other lesser narrative traditions are missing from the putative P narrative source: the sacrifice of Isaac and Abraham's fidelity (Genesis 22), the thrice-repeated story of the patriarch whose wife is passed off as his sister bringing disaster on a king (Genesis 12: 10–20; 20: 1–17; 26: 1–14), the search for Isaac's wife and the discovery of Rebekah (Genesis 24);⁴² the rivalry between Esau and Jacob for Isaac's prime blessing (Genesis 27), Jacob's initial (main) vision at Bethel (Genesis 28: 10–22);⁴³ the entire Jacob and Laban cycle (Genesis 29–33), the tale of Dinah and Shechem (Genesis 34),⁴⁴ and the Joseph story (Genesis 37: 2b–47; 26 [–50; 26]).⁴⁵ What remains makes a poor narrative indeed.⁴⁶

P in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers is not different from P in Genesis. If possible, it has even a lesser claim to being a narrative source than P in Genesis. Nor does P cease to depend on Epic tradition.

42. The notice of Gen. 25: 20, in origin a chronological fragment, makes clear that P had knowledge of the story of Rebekah.

43. See our remarks above. It is certain from Genesis 35: 9–13 that P knew the JE tradition.

44. There is duplication in the story but no reason to suppose one is P. That P knew the JE tradition is clear from Gen. 33: 18b.

45. Gen. 37: 1, 2a is the P heading to the Joseph story. The chronological notices in 41: 45b, 46a; 47: 5–11, 47: 27b, 28; the genealogy in 46: 6–27; the blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh, 48: 3–6 (cf. 48: 8–22 JE); the death and burial of Jacob, Gen. 49: 28–33; 50: 12f., all make clear that P had the JE story before him. P, however, contains none of the long Joseph saga proper.

46. Julius Wellhausen quoted the whole of the Patriarchal history of P, abbreviating only the very long passages, and when he was done he made this comment: "That is the whole of it. As a rule nothing more is aimed at than to give the mere links and articulations of the narrative" (*Prolegomena*, pp. 327–332). It is remarkable that Wellhausen after demonstrating to his own satisfaction that P included no true literary narrative did not go on to the conclusion that P was never an independent source.

A new framing device was taken up in Exodus-Leviticus-Numbers by the Priestly tradent. He apportioned his Epic and Priestly tradition in blocks, according to the stations of Israel in the journey from Egypt to the Plains of Moab. The formula of the headings is "They departed (*way-yis'ū*) from PN and encamped (*way-yahānū*) at PN." Occasionally the wording deviates slightly from this pattern, usually to add a note. Sections set off by the formula vary greatly in size; they are quite short until one reaches the "wilderness of Sinai" where the complex of Epic and especially Priestly legislation runs from Exodus 19:1 to Numbers 10:10. Other long sections include Israel's stay in the Wilderness of Paran (Numbers 10:11–19:22) and in the Plains of Moab (Numbers 22:1–36:13 plus Deuteronomy 34). There are twelve formulaic headings, six allotted to the trip from Egypt to the last station, Rephidim, before Sinai, six from Sinai to the Plains of Moab. The parallel to the use of the Genesis headings is quite striking.⁴⁷ We found the origin of the Genesis formula in a document utilized by P, the *sēper tōlēdōt*, "Book of Generations," which in part can be reconstructed. The formula in Exodus-Leviticus-Numbers also was based on a document in P's possession, a list of stations from Egypt to the Plains of Moab. In the latter case, however, the document was actually preserved intact in Numbers 33:5–49. We are thus able to follow P's manner of working with his documentary sources in precise detail. His chief problem, apparently, was that the Station List contained many place names concerning which no traditions were preserved, neither in Epic nor in Priestly lore. Indeed, the number of stations was too many to make a symmetrical framework of ten or twelve headings. His device to overcome these problems was to use a general locality to embrace a number of stations in the list. Specifically he used *midbar PN* for a sequence of place names when necessary. Since, frequently, the general designation *midbar PN*, "the Wilderness of PN," actually occurs in the Stations List, little distortion was caused by his technique. As in the case of the Genesis sections, P's headings or superscriptions stand above JE material, P material, and JEP blocks of material. Again it is certain, I believe, that the periodizing sections were designed to frame Epic tradition; otherwise the abbreviation of the list by selecting generalized local names has no motivation.

The List of Stations in Numbers 33 is a most interesting document.

47. One notes that the actual number of occurrences of *'ēllē tōlēdōt* are twelve, two of which, Gen. 36:9 and Num. 3:1, we have argued are secondary.

It contains some series of names found nowhere else. These fall largely into four groups, which P in his headings listed as (1) the wilderness of Sin: Dophkah and Alush, (2) the wilderness of Paran: thirteen place-names⁴⁸ (Numbers 33: 18b–30a, 34b [Abronah], plus two names mentioned in J (33: 16ff. [Kibroth-hataavah, Hazeroth]⁴⁹) plus five names reminiscent of names in Deuteronomy 10: 6f.,⁵⁰ (3) the wilderness of Zin: Zalmonah and Punon, and (4) the wilderness before Moab: Dibon-gad, Almon-diblathaim, mountains of Abarim. Thus the document cannot be considered a collection of stations found in JEP. At the same time, it does not include all JE stations mentioned⁵¹ and, hence, cannot be described as a conflation of an old document in P's possession with Epic tradition.⁵² There are also some conflicts with JE tradition. For example, the JE notice of a trip to the Red Sea after Mount Hor and before Oboth in the P sequence does not appear in Numbers 33.⁵³ This is no more serious, however, than conflicts within the Priestly station tradition itself.⁵⁴

The List of Stations in Numbers 33 presently consists of forty-two stations. In view of the Priestly penchant for traditional numbers, it is highly likely that two place names are secondary⁵⁵ and that the old list consisted of forty stations.⁵⁶

48. The names are Rithmah, Rimmon-perez, Libnah, Rissa, Kehelah, Mount Shepher, Haradah, Makheloth, Tahat, Terah Mithkah, Hashmonah, and Abronah.

49. Num. 11: 34f.

50. Numbers 33:30–34a lists Moseroth, Bene-jaakon, Hor-haggidgad, and Jotbah (msrwt, bny y'qn, hr hgdgd, ytbt) Deuteronomy 10:6f., Beeroth-bene-jaakan, Moserah, Gudgod, Jotbah (b'rt bny y'qn, mwsrh, gdgd, ytbt). The order and forms of the place names vary considerably. A common document stands behind the two lists. As Noth has observed it is not possible to designate either as original.

51. Cf., for example, Num. 21:18–20; Mattanah, Nahaliel, Bamoth; Exod. 17:7; Massah, Meribah (cf. Num. 20:13 P!); Num. 11:3; Taberah; and Num. 14:45; Hormah.

52. There may be conflations; see note 55 below. Num. 33:40 is certainly secondary.

53. A minor, probably textual, error is found in the variation between "the desert of Shur" in Exod. 15:22 (P) and Num. 33:8: "the desert of Etham." The former is clearly original. More serious is the omission in 16:1 (P) of the encampment on the Red Sea (Num. 33:10f.). Here it is not unlikely that Num. 33:10f. is corrupt.

54. See note 53 above.

55. Good candidates are Marah (conflated from Exodus 15:23 J: note that the Exodus passage does not have Israel camping at Marah explicitly) and the Reed Sea in 33:10b, 11a (omitted in Exodus 16:1).

56. The function of the old list in its original setting is obscure. M. Noth some years ago suggested that it originated in a list of pilgrimage stations from Canaan to Sinai. See "Der Wallfahrtsweg zum Sinai," *Palästinajahrbuch*, 36 (1940), 5–28. No more plausible suggestion has been made; yet many problems remain.

The Priestly headings ordering Epic and Priestly tradition in Exodus-Leviticus-Numbers are the following:

(1) Exodus 12:37a. "And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth." Compare Numbers 33:5, "and the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses and encamped in Succoth." Rameses was the traditional home of Israel in P.⁵⁷ The heading is immediately followed by J tradition⁵⁸ of the manner of Israel's departure from Egypt and ordinances of Passover (Exodus 12:37b-39: 13-16) as well as P legislation (Exodus 12:40-13:2) and an E notice (Exodus 13:17-19). P in Numbers 33:3 gives the dating: "the first month, on the fifteenth day of the first month [of the first year]."

(2) Exodus 13:20. "And they journeyed from Succoth and encamped in Etham at the edge of the desert." Compare Numbers 33:6 with the identical reading. It introduces only the brief Yahwistic section (Exodus 13:21f.) which tells of Yahweh's pillar of cloud and pillar of fire which led Israel.

(3) Exodus 14:1f. ["And Yahweh said to Moses, 'speak to the children of Israel.] Let them go back and camp before Pihahiroth between Migdol and the sea before Baal Zephon: Over against it you shall encamp on the sea'." Compare Numbers 33:7. "And they journeyed from Etham and went back by Pihahiroth which was before Baal Zephon, and they encamped before Migdol." The heading introduces the Epic account of the crossing of the sea and the victory over the Egyptians who drown in the sea (Exodus 14 and 15:1-21 [the Song of the Sea]). Chapter 14 has been thoroughly reworked by the Priestly hand so that his special view of the division of the waters prevails.

(4) Exodus 15:22a. "And Moses made Israel journey from the Reed Sea, and they went forth into the wilderness of Shur."⁵⁹ This is the first of several headings which list the "wilderness of PN" to cover several localities in the list of Numbers 33. Here Numbers 33:8f. reads as we have reconstructed it.⁶⁰ "And they journeyed from Pihahiroth and they crossed in the midst of the sea into the desert <of Shur> and entered Elim." The heading is placed on a J story of murmuring at Marah (Exodus 15:23-25a) and fragments, probably E, concerning a statute, and arrival at Elim (Exodus 15:25bf., 27).

57. See Gen. 47:11 P. Cf. Exod. 2:11 J.

58. Cf. Num. 11:21 J where the number 600,000 appears again.

59. Noth has recognized correctly the Priestly hand here. *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, p. 18.

60. See above, notes 53 and 55.

(5) Exodus 16:1. "And they journeyed from Elim and the congregation entered the Wilderness of Sin." A chronological note is appended, noting that their arrival was on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing from Egypt. Numbers 33:10-33 as reconstructed reads, "And they journeyed from Elim [] and encamped in the wilderness of Sin. And they journeyed from the wilderness of Sin and encamped in Dophkah. And they journeyed from Dophkah and encamped at Alush." This is the second case in which "wilderness of PN" covers more than one locality in the list of Numbers 33, in this case place names without parallel elsewhere. The heading introduces a major P section, elaborating the motif of rebellious murmuring on the part of Israel and Yahweh's response: the apparition of the "Glory of Yahweh" and the provision of quails and manna (Exodus 16:1-36).

(6) Exodus 17:1a. "And the entire congregation of the children of Israel journeyed from the wilderness of Sin by their stages according to Yahweh's command and encamped in Rephidim, and there was no water for the people to drink." Numbers 33:14 reads "And they journeyed from Alush and encamped in Rephidim, and there was no water there for the people to drink." The notice that there was no water at Rephidim is not to be taken as a conflation from Epic tradition; rather it is one more indication that Epic tradition was known to P and his tradition. The heading stands above an important JE section, the account of strife at Massah-Meribah (Exodus 17:2-7) concerning water and Moses' "smiting the rock." Interestingly enough, the same motif is placed in Kadesh in a doublet of Epic tradition thoroughly reworked by P in Numbers 20:1-13. The JE section includes also the war with Amalek placed at Rephidim in Epic tradition (Exodus 17:8-16); and, surprisingly, the story of Jethro and his dealings with Moses (Exodus 18:1-27). Epic tradition clearly placed Jethro's visit at the Mount of God (Exodus 18:5), that is, at Sinai. Here P's forcing of the Epic tradition into the Rephidim section suggests that his anti-Midianite polemic,⁶¹ patent in Numbers 25:6-18 and 31:1-54, has occasioned his shift of locale. One should note that the section contains only Epic tradition, another instance of a P heading to JE tradition.

(7) Exodus 19:2. "And they journeyed from Rephidim and came to the wilderness of Sinai." Numbers 33:15 is similar, "And they journeyed from Rephidim and encamped in the wilderness of Sinai." P

61. On the origins of this polemic in the Mushite-Aaronite rivalry, see above, chapter 8.

gives the date as “In the third month⁶² after the departure from Egypt.” The day of the month may have fallen out by haplography.⁶³ There can be no doubt, in any case, that P chose the time of the arrival at Sinai so that the covenant meal of Exodus 24: 3–8 (E) fell on the Feast of Weeks, the sixth of the third month.⁶⁴ The heading introduces the entire, complex JEP tradition, its narratives and its legislation, running from Exodus 19: 2b to Numbers 10: 10. Numbers 10: 11 records the departure from Sinai at the beginning of the next Priestly rubric. The section begins with the JE account of the preparations for and the beginning of the theophany on the mount (Exodus 19: 2–25). Two covenant documents follow, the Decalogue and the Covenant Code (Exodus 20: 21–23), and then the covenant ceremony of Exodus 24: 1–8. The Decalogue in its present form is clearly a Priestly document, just as the decalogue of Deuteronomy 5: 6–22 is a Deuteronomic recension of the Decalogue.⁶⁵ To be sure, the decalogue of Exodus 20: 2–17 is an old document taken from Epic sources and reworked, especially by expansion of the parenthetic material in 20: 4 and 20: 11.⁶⁶ As we have seen, P uses the archaic term ‘*ēdūt*, “covenant” of the Decalogue, and calls the ark the “ark of the covenant (‘*ēdūt*),” and the tent shrine the “tabernacle” or “tent of the covenant (‘*ēdūt*),” in view of the “tablets of the covenant (*lūhōt* ‘*ēdūt*)” which they contain. The covenant rites, for the most part stemming from Elohist tradition (Exodus 24: 1–8), follow upon the covenant documents. A key to the Priestly understanding of the Sinaitic covenant is given immediately after the covenant rites when, according

62. M. Noth, *Exodus* (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1962), p. 155, takes the date as the third new moon.

63. Compare the pattern *bhdš hr’swn bhšh ywm lhdš hr’swn* which lends itself to haplography (Numbers 33: 3).

64. It is intriguing to note that the entry into the new covenant at Qumrān also fell on Pentecost, as does the creation of the church, following old Jewish tradition going back to the Priestly chronology.

65. See most recently S. Mowinckel, *Erwägungen zur Pentateuch Quellenfrage*, pp. 31f. The P and D decalogues have passed through a long period of conflation and mutual influence. P and D elements now exist in *both*. The history of this development can now be seen even more clearly thanks to the Nash Papyrus and the All Souls’ Deuteronomy from Cave 4, Qumrān, as the writer hopes to show in a forthcoming publication.

66. Deuteronomy 5: 12–15 and Exodus 20: 8–11 show several differences, especially differences in the motivation of the sabbath celebration which are characteristically rooted in D and P formulae respectively. 4QDt¹⁹ carries the process of conflation further by combining even these D and P formulae. See provisionally F. M. Cross, ed., *Scrolls from the Wilderness of the Dead Sea* (Cambridge, American Schools of Oriental Research, 1965), pp. 31f. and Pl. 19.

to Elohist tradition, Moses went up in the mount to receive the tablets of the covenant stipulations:⁶⁷ “And the glory of Yahweh (*kēbōd Yahwē*) “tabernacled” (*way-yiškōn*) on Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it for six days and he called to Moses in the seventh day from the midst of the cloud. And the appearance of the glory of Yahweh was like devouring fire on the peak of the mountain.” At this point the Priestly writer chose to introduce his long document describing the ark and Tabernacle. His motivation is made clear in the course of his document. It is two-fold: (a) to prepare a shrine for Yahweh’s “tabernacling Glory” which has come down on the mount, and which through the cultic paraphernalia of the Tabernacle and its appurtenances will accompany Israel to the land, and (b) to provide for the housing of the covenant document, the *‘ēdūt*. On (a), see Exodus 25:8, “And they shall make a sanctuary for me that I may ‘tabernacle’ (*šākantī*) in their midst,” and Exodus 29:43–46, “And I will meet with the children of Israel there, and it will be sanctified by my Glory . . . and I will ‘tabernacle’ in the midst of the children of Israel.”⁶⁸ On (b), see Exodus 25:16, “And you shall put into the Ark the (tablets of the) covenant (*‘ēdūt*) which I shall give to you,” and Exodus 25:21, “And you shall put the propitiatory on top of the ark, and into the ark you shall put the (tablets

67. Priestly tradition has it that the content of the decalogue was revealed before the tablets were given: this is clear from his placement of his decalogue and the occasion of the presentation of the tablets in P in Exod. 31:18a. In this order he followed Elohist tradition which has the reading of the book of the covenant (Exod. 24:7) as a part of the covenant rites and followed this with Moses going up in the mount to receive the tablets (Exod. 24:12). The Yahwistic document appears to have another tradition in which the decalogue is given first after Moses brings the tablets to the mount, and the covenant making on the basis of the ten commandments (*had-dēbārīm hā’ēllē*, Exod. 34:27; *‘aséret had-dēbarīm*, Exod. 34:27) follows. E followed by P has the double giving of the tablets sandwiched around the tradition of Aaron’s idolatrous revolt (Exod. 32:1–24:30–35). The Yahwistic Decalogue, so-called, exists only as a torso in Exod. 34:14, “You shall not bow down before an alien god [for Yahweh whose name is jealous is a jealous god],” and 34:17, “You shall not make yourselves cast gods.” The form of the two apodeictic commands is older than that of the Priestly Decalogue. *’El ‘ahhēr* is superior to (Deuteronomizing?) *’ēlohīm ‘ahērīm*. Certainly the parenetic comment concerning Yahweh’s jealousy makes better sense attached to the first commandment. And the form of this second commandment, expanded by the priestly hand, is inferior to the second Yahwistic commandment despite the latter’s inverted order. For some years Professor G. Ernest Wright and the writer have planned to write a joint paper on the Yahwistic decalogue. It appears quite probably to us that the last eight commandments for some reason have been suppressed to make room for a cultic calendar (not a “ritual decalogue”), one which has common origin with the cultic calendar in the Covenant Code, Exod. 23:14–19.

68. See also Exodus 40:34–38 “And the cloud covered the Tent of Assembly and the glory of Yahweh (*kēbōd Yahwē*) filled the tabernacle . . .”

of the) covenant which I shall give you, and I will meet you there and speak with you from above the propitiatory between the two cherubim which are over the ark of the covenant (*'ēdūt*).” The Priestly tradent ends the long section on the ark and tabernacle (Exodus 25–31) with the conclusion, “And he gave to Moses, when he had finished speaking with him in Mount Sinai, the two tablets of the covenant (*'ēdūt*).” At Exodus 32: 15 comes the E notice, “And Moses turned and went down from the mountain, and the two tablets of the covenant (*'ēdūt*)⁶⁹ were in his hand.” The JE pericope in chapters 32–34 of Exodus ends with the Yahwistic comment “And he wrote upon the tablets the stipulations of the covenant (*dibrē hab-bērīt*), the ‘ten commandments’.”⁷⁰ Then follows the long series of Priestly sections: Exodus 34: 29–35 (a Priestly postscript to the JE section above): 35–40 (the second use of the Tabernacle document by P);⁷¹ Leviticus 1–7 (the manual of offerings);⁷² Leviticus 8–9 (Investment of Aaron): 10 (the death of Nadab and Abihu, and so on), 11–15 (Law of the Clean and Unclean): 16 (ritual of the Day of Atonement): 17–25, 26 (the Holiness Code, and the blessings and curses of the covenant, the peroration of the Holiness Code, utilized by P to end his main legislative sections): 27 (appendix); Numbers 1–4 (census and organization of the battle camp around the Tabernacle); 5–6 (various ordinances): 7 (offerings of the “princes” [*nēšī'im*]); 8–9:14 (miscellaneous appendices): 9:15–10:10 (preparations for departure from Sinai). All of this mass of legislation is placed by the Priestly tradent at Sinai.

(8) Numbers 10: 12. “And the children of Israel journeyed [according to their stages] from the wilderness of Sinai, and the cloud ‘tabernacled’ in the wilderness of Paran.” As in the Sinai heading in Exodus 19:2, this superscription is preceded by a chronological notice: the second year, the second month, the twentieth day. The Priestly use of the general term “wilderness of Paran” for this heading, equivalent to a series of specific localities in Numbers 33: 16–36, is the third case of this device.⁷³ In this case, however, the wilderness of Paran is not men-

69. There is no reason to suppress *'ēdūt* here as a gloss of the Priestly school. See the discussion below of P's archaisms in vocabulary.

70. Exodus 32: 28b.

71. On the Tabernacle document used in Exod. 25–31: 35–40, see below.

72. See R. Rendtorff, *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963); and K. Koch, *Die Priesterschrift von Exodus 25 bis Leviticus 16* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1959) for discussions of possible documents, oral or written, underlying Priestly legislation, especially in Leviticus 1–7 and 11–15.

73. See above nos. (4) and (5), and below (8) and (11).

tioned in the present text of Numbers 33.⁷⁴ It is found rather in Numbers 12:16, a fragment of J's itinerary which includes Hazeroth, and Kibroth-hattaavah (Numbers 12:34f.), and in Numbers 13:3, 26 in the Priestly sections of the reworked Epic story of the spies (JEP). The block of JE and P tradition under this heading is a large one. It begins with a description of the battle camp on the march, Numbers 9:13–28, in which the Priestly documents, the List of *Nəšī'im* and the Order of the Battle Camp are reutilized.⁷⁵ Appended is JE lore relating to the march of Israel's host, Numbers 10:29–33, 35f. There follow: the JE account of the Quails (Numbers 11); the Elohist account of Miriam's rebellion against Moses (Numbers 12); the Epic tradition of the spies and Israel's rebellion, introduced by a Priestly list of the spies, and reworked and supplemented by the Priestly editor⁷⁶ (Numbers 13, 14); supplementary Priestly legislation (Numbers, chapters 15, 17–19); a Priestly account of Korah's rebellion, oddly conflated by P with the Epic tradition of the revolt of Dathan and Abiram⁷⁷ (Numbers 16).

(9) Numbers 20:1a. "And the children of Israel, [all the congregation] entered the wilderness of Zin." Numbers 33:36 reads, "And they journeyed from Ezion-geber, and encamped in the wilderness of Zin [that is, Kadesh]." The Priestly dependence on the Numbers 33 list is rather apparent here in the omission of the first part of the formula, "And they journeyed from PN" in the heading. It is surprising that P did not compose the first part of the formula anew by substituting *midbar Pārān* for *Ešyōn-gāber*. The heading is to a short section, the Priestly reworking of an Epic doublet of the Meribah episode, when Moses brought forth water from the rock (Numbers 20:1b–13), and the Epic account of the embassy to Edom (Numbers 20:14–21).

(10) Numbers 20:22. "And they journeyed from Kadesh, and [the children of Israel, all the congregation] came to Mount Hor." Num-

74. Num. 33:18 may have suffered haplography, reading originally, "And they journeyed from Hazeroth and they *encamped* [in the wilderness of Paran. And they journeyed from the wilderness of Paran, and *encamped*] in Rithmah." Cf. Num. 12:16, "And afterward the people journeyed from Hazeroth and encamped in the wilderness of Paran." The formulaic style of the List of Stations invites haplography.

75. See the discussion of the documents used by the Priestly source below.

76. It is clear from Num. 13:26b that Epic tradition placed the sending of the spies (and their return) at Kadesh. Priestly tradition overrides this tradition, placing the story in the wilderness of Paran (Num. 13:3: 26a). Kadesh is placed in the wilderness of Zin, the next heading, in the Priestly itinerary.

77. Happily an earlier version of the story is found in Dtn. 11:6. Cf. Ps. 106:17. Such a "creative" and bold composite of two rebellion stories is hardly the work of a redactor. The Priestly tradent himself must be responsible.

bers 33:37 reads, "And they journeyed from Kadesh and encamped in Mount Hor." The Priestly heading here departs from its stereotyped pattern (which should have read "They journeyed from *the wilderness of Zin* . . .") to follow Numbers 33:37, another indication of dependence.⁷⁸ The heading introduces only the short Priestly pericope on the death of Aaron (Numbers 20:23-29), Epic traditions of the battle with the king of Arad in the Negeb (Numbers 21:1-3), and the strange etiology of Moses' bronze serpent (Numbers 21:1-9).

(11) Numbers 21:10f. "And the children of Israel journeyed <from Mount Hor>,"⁷⁹ and encamped in Aboth. And they journeyed from Aboth and encamped in the wilderness before Moab eastward." This heading in its present form is a conflation of the Epic itinerary (which continues in 21:12f. and 21:18b-20) and the Priestly heading. The Priestly heading should have read, "And the children of Israel journeyed from Mount Hor"⁸⁰ and encamped in the wilderness before Moab eastward." Once again the general designation of a wilderness absorbs a series of place names found in Numbers 33:42-48a, the parallel passage in the Station List. This is the fourth instance of this phenomenon.⁸¹ The heading is to a short section containing only Epic tradition, an itinerary interspersed with fragments of archaic poetry, especially the Song of Heshbon (Numbers 21:12-35).

(12) Numbers 22:1. "And the children of Israel journeyed, and encamped in the Plains of Moab beyond Jordan at Jericho." The parallel passage in Numbers 33:48 reads "And they journeyed from the mountains of Abarim and encamped in the Plains of Moab by the Jordan at Jericho." P has left his formula defective, choosing neither to introduce "the wilderness before Moab" used in his previous heading nor follow his source and introduce "the mountains of Abarim" hitherto unmentioned. Once again we are given insight into the manner in which P handled his sources. This final heading is a relatively long one. Its *pièce de résistance* is the Epic Balaam cycle (Numbers 22-24). It also spans the Epic and (dependent) Priestly accounts of the affair of Ba'l Pe'or, the latter turning the account into an anti-Midianite polemic (Numbers 25:1-5 JE; 6-18 P); the census list (Numbers 26); Priestly

78. Numbers 33:38f., the notice of Aaron's death and age at death may belong to the Priestly form of the old Station List: 33:40 is certainly intrusive.

79. See note 80 below.

80. The omission of Mt. Hor in Num. 21:10 is due to its mention in the Epic itinerary in 21:4.

81. See above n. 73. The place names include Zalmonah, Punon, Dibon-gad, Almondiblathaim, and "the mountains of Abarim."

accounts of the inheritance of the daughters of Zelophehad⁸² (Numbers 27:1-11) and Moses' appointment of Joshua (Numbers 27:12-23); additional Priestly legislation (Numbers 28-30);⁸³ the polemical Priestly account of vengeful war against Midian in which Balaam is killed (Numbers 31); a Priestly account of the distribution by Moses of the Transjordanian inheritances (Numbers 32); the Priestly list of the stations of the Exodus (Numbers 33); the Priestly list of the boundaries of the land of Canaan (Numbers 34); Priestly legislation anticipating the conquest of the land⁸⁴ (Numbers 35); an appendix on the inheritances of the daughters of Zelophehad (Numbers 36); and finally the JE account of the death of Moses, supplemented by P (transferred to the end of the Book of Deuteronomy, chapter 34).

The Priestly headings of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, like the Priestly superscriptions of Genesis, were drawn from a tangible Priestly document. They were used to introduce sections of Epic tradition alone or Priestly tradition alone, or JE traditions systematically reworked or supplemented by P. The Priestly author included one doublet in Epic tradition, the account of Moses' striking water from the rock at (Massah-)Meribah. He placed the Elohist account under his rubric no. (6), and the Yahwistic under no. (9).⁸⁵ Only the latter variant was thoroughly reworked in P, but there is evidence that he knew both or, in other words, had before him the combined JE tradition.

Again, it may be useful in arguing our case to look at P in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers with the questions in mind, "what kind of narrative does P make without Epic tradition?" and "what traditions are omitted by P which appear necessary to his system or among his presuppositions?"

The Priestly strata in their received form contain no traditions of the birth of Moses, his young manhood in Egypt, his flight to the desert, or his return to Egypt; and the tradition of his death (without the supple-

82. The name *šlphd* is to be reconstructed as *šilli-Pāhad* "My protection is the Awesome One." Cf. *Paḥad Yišḥaq*.

83. The tradition of legislation being given by Moses in the Plains of Moab may be compared with Deuteronomic tradition which attributes the lion's share of Mosaic legislation to this local context; in contrast, P attributes the greater portion of his legal corpus to Sinai.

84. The closing theological comment of the Priestly source is found in Numbers 35:34, anticipating Israel's entrance into the land: "You shall not defile the land in which you will be dwelling (*yōšēbīm*), in the midst of which I shall 'tabernacle' (*šōkēn*); for I, Yahweh, will 'tabernacle' (*šōkēn*) in the midst of the children of Israel."

85. These passages are Exod. 17 and Num. 20:1b-13.

ment of Epic tradition) gives nothing of the circumstances of his death or place of burial. Since Moses is the central figure in the Priestly source and the reconstruction of the history and institutions of the Mosaic age is both his primary interest and the climax of his work, these omissions appear inexplicable if he knew such traditions and did not report them. It is even more difficult to imagine that he knew no such traditions.

A number of the JE narratives, reworked and supplemented by P, appear now in such unified form that questions have been raised about their partition into sources.⁸⁶ The Plague story (Exodus 7–11) and the legend of the crossing of the sea (Exodus 14) fall into this category, as do the account of the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Numbers 16) and the tradition of the spies (Numbers 13–14). It is not easy to attribute their present shape to the more or less mechanical piecework of a redactor.

The Priestly strata do not contain any of the traditions of the Balaam cycle in Numbers 22–24. Yet one cannot conclude that P did not know the Balaam narrative and oracle tradition, particularly in view of the Priestly references to the “counsel of Balaam” and the death of Balaam in Numbers 31:8 and 31:16.

The most stunning omission from the Priestly document is a narrative of the covenant ceremony proper. The covenant at Sinai was the climax to which the entire Priestly labor had been directed. Israel’s final gift of the series of covenants was the gift of the presence of Yahweh’s Glory “tabernacling” in their midst. Israel’s final law, adumbrated in earlier covenants, was now revealed in full in its symmetrical complexity at Sinai and also in its simplicity in the covenant document, the ten words which formed the covenant par excellence. It is not by chance that the P tradent poured his traditions into the Sinai section until it dwarfed all his other sections and indeed his other periods. The climactic blessing of Leviticus 26:9, 11–13a stresses most clearly the supreme meaning of the covenant at Sinai, Yahweh’s tabernacle in Israel’s midst and thereby his covenant presence with his people:

And I will recognize you and make you fruitful, and multiply you, and will establish my covenant with you . . . and I will set my tabernacle with you . . . I am Yahweh who brought you forth out of the land of Egypt . . .

86. See, e.g., J. Pedersen, “Passafest und Passalegende,” *ZAW*, n.s. 2 (1934), pp. 161–175.

In looking to the darkness of exile and beyond, the last words of the peroration of Leviticus 26 made Yahweh's purpose clear (and the purpose of the Priestly hand which added this summary to the Holiness Code):

And withal, when they are in the land of their enemies I will not reject them . . . or break my covenant with them . . . But I will remember for their sakes the covenant of the former ones whom I brought out from the land of Egypt.⁸⁷

Ezekiel in looking to the future in Exile expressed the same theme of the covenant and the covenant sanctuary of the future:

Moreover I will make with them a covenant of peace, an eternal covenant it shall be with them . . . and I will multiply them and put my sanctuary in their midst forever, and my tabernacle shall be with them and I shall become their god and they shall become my people.⁸⁸

We have mentioned earlier the concluding blessings and curses of the Sinaitic covenant in Leviticus 26. Special note should be made of the curses as well as the blessings.

If you do not obey me and do not do all of these commandments and if you reject my statutes and despise my judgments so that you do not perform my commandments but violate my covenant (*bērīt*), then I will do this to you: I will appoint terror over you . . . (Leviticus 26:14–16).

I will bring on you the sword which shall execute the vengeance of the covenant (*nēqam bērīt*) and you shall be gathered to your cities and I will send plague into your midst and I will give you into the hand of the enemy (Leviticus 26:25).

The traditional covenant form is intact in these verses.

To suppose that the Priestly tradent simply had no tradition of the covenant rites at Sinai is incredible.⁸⁹ To posit a theory that P had no

87. Leviticus 26:44f.

88. Ezekiel 34:26f.

89. The Priestly covenant with Abraham has no tradition of a covenant ritual in Genesis 17. We must assume that the J rites in Genesis 15 serve the purpose.

covenant at all at Sinai is a *fortiori* beyond credence.⁹⁰ Either the Priestly tradent had the tradition and a redactor has removed it in combining P with JE,⁹¹ or he relied on the Epic tradition, especially the E tradition of Exodus 24: 1–8 for the narrative of the covenant rites. In our view, the latter alternate fits far more easily with the evidence. The E covenant ceremony in the Priestly work (that is, JEP) is sandwiched between the Priestly Decalogue in Exodus 20, and the Priestly prescriptions for its housing in the ark and tent of the covenant in Exodus 25–26 under the Priestly heading “Sinai.”

The Priestly edition of the Tetrateuch ends with the death of Moses. The Priestly school desired to reconstruct the institutions of the normative Mosaic age as a model for the future cultic institutions and covenant theology of Israel. Its tabernacle traditions and order of the battle camp thus have common ideological themes with the Ezekielian vision of the new temple and land. While the Priestly traditions in Numbers anticipated the conquest and the allotting of inheritances to the tribes, the Priestly tradent cut his labors short with the events in the Plains of Moab where Israel stood poised for the conquest. In the process, it appears, he also truncated the Epic tradition. The structure of the Yahwist calls for fulfilment in the land and in the empire. However, it is the great merit of Noth’s work on the Deuteronomist that he has proved that the Deuteronomist edited or wrote the great history running from Deuteronomy through Kings. The Deuteronomist systematically reworked, sifted, and supplemented the Book of Joshua. The Deuteronomist did not rewrite or edit the Tetrateuch systematically. Nor did Joshua pass through Priestly hands. JEP and D (D+Dtr) separate cleanly. It is true that the documents used by the Deuteronomist, especially in Joshua 13–19, have marks of Priestly style, both in their headings and “inside” the documents. Evidently the Deuteronomist had access to some of the

90. Recently several scholars, noting that P has no covenant ceremony of its own, and assuming, of course, that the P document originated in an independent narrative source, have therefore revived the suggestion that P had no Sinaitic covenant in his tradition, despite the fact that (in Martin Noth’s words!) “the central theme of this narrative [P] is the event which took place at Sinai, in which (historically speaking) the connection between covenant and law had its roots . . .” See Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch* (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1967), pp. 91ff.; and especially W. Zimmerli, “Sinaibund und Abrahambund,” *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Munich, C. Kaiser, 1963), pp. 205–216; cf. *The Law and the Prophets*, trans. R. E. Clements (New York, Harper, 1963), pp. 90f.

91. Zimmerli’s position that the “old” Priestly tradition had a Sinaitic covenant, but that a later member of the Priestly school suppressed it “through a bold alteration,” actually is not too far from this alternative.

documents handled by forerunners of the Priestly school in the temple archives. We know, for example, that Deuteronomy 10:6f. was drawn from an itinerary list ultimately identical with the Priestly source of Numbers 33, although in their present forms one cannot be derived from the other.

The violence of the truncation of the Epic sources suggests again that the Priestly tradent himself brought the Tetrateuch into being in its present form. The ancient redactor tended to conflate tradition, fortunately, not suppress variant forms of tradition. The purpose and theological tendency of the Priestly school in Exile, however, was satisfied with a history of Israel down to the end of the desert era. Israel again was in the "wilderness of the nations," and the Priestly school proposed to reestablish "Mosaic" institutions in the Restoration including a "Mosaic" constitution and cultic establishment.

Documents Used by P

A word or two may be said about the documents available to the Priestly source and its handling of them. We have analyzed in some detail above the *séper tōlēdōt* and the List of Stations of the Exodus. Another document "near the surface" of the Priestly work is the list of league officials called *něšī'im*. The Priestly editor exploits the list to the full, using it in the census of Numbers (Numbers 1:5-16), in the description of the militia (Numbers 2:3-31), in the lists of provisions for sacrifices of the *něšī'im* (Numbers 7:12-88), and in the description of the battle camp on the move (Numbers 10:14-28). The origin and original function of the list is difficult to fathom. In the present state of our knowledge of history of the Canaanite and Israelite onomasticon, however, we can assign the set of name types found in the list to the second millennium.

Less popular, but utilized more than once in Priestly composition, are the census lists of Numbers 1 and 26, the description of the battle camp (which very likely had its origin in the cultic reenactment of the Exodus-Conquest) found in Numbers 2-4 and 10:14-28, and the Tabernacle document used to compose the prescriptions given by Yahweh to Moses for the construction of the ark and tabernacle in Exodus 25-27 and reutilized in Exodus 35-38 and again in Exodus 40 in the subsequent directions of Moses for its fabrication and assemblage. The description of the Tabernacle goes back ultimately to Canaanite models of the (cosmic) tent shrine of 'Ēl built with a solid framework, *qéres*, Ugaritic

qaršu, and designated *ʾôhel mōʿēd*, tent of (the divine) assembly (on the *har mōʿēd*, “the mount of assembly”). Immediately, it must go back to the latest form of the tabernacle tradition, the tent of David, or to an idealized reconstruction based on historical traditions of David’s shrine. Many more documents which yield a lesser control can be isolated and identified by tradition criticism as studies of Priestly law have shown.

Archaizing Language in P

In the course of the discussion above, special mention has been made of the Priestly penchant for refurbishing an archaic term and using it with a narrowed, technical meaning. The term *miškān* and the derived verb *šākēn* “to tabernacle” have been discussed, as have the related terms *ʾôhel mōʿēd*, “tent of assembly,”⁹² and *qéres* “tent-frame, tent-shrine.”⁹³ All of these appear in early Hebrew or Canaanite contexts and, after a gap of time, in P. We have also noted the use of *ʿēdūt* in old texts, Exodus 32:15, Psalm 132:12, and Psalm 78:56 in the sense “covenant,” and then frequently in the Priestly source. The expression *kēbōd Yahwē*, “Glory of Yahweh,” in its technical sense the nimbus of the deity, appears in Yahwistic tradition at Sinai in Exodus 33:18, 22. It became a key theological concept in the Priestly strata, Second Isaiah, and Ezekiel. Another Yahwistic motif was expressed characteristically by the verb *lwn*, “to murmur” in Exodus 15:24 and 17:3. The Priestly school took over the theme and expanded it, using the same terminology, especially in Exodus 16 and Numbers 14, 16, and 17. The term *nāšīʾ*, “league official” or “tribal official” in its original meaning, was taken up by P as a favorite *terminus technicus*. It also appears in an archaic law in Exodus 22:27 and became popular in its original sense and in a derived sense in Ezekiel.⁹⁴

ʾĒl Šadday, the Priestly designation of the god of the fathers, is certainly another instance of the taking up of an archaic term, in this case a divine epithet, and using it with narrowed sense. Other than in P it occurs only in the early poem of Genesis 49:25.⁹⁵ The name *Šadday*

92. *ʾôhel mōʿēd* is found in Epic tradition at Exodus 33:7.

93. In addition to its Ugaritic use of the abode of ʾĒl, and in the Priestly Tabernacle accounts, it is found only in Ezekiel.

94. Ezekiel uses the term in 27:21, for example, of tribal officials of the Qedarite league. Normally, however, it is applied to Israel’s (future) king or to alien kings or leaders. Ezra 1:8 suggests that Sin-ab-ušur (biblical Sheshbazzar and Shinazzar) the Davidid who led the earliest return from captivity was called *nāšīʾ*.

95. The reading *ʾēl šadday* here follows the versions: G Sam Sy.

simpliciter also tends to be distributed either in very early contexts or in Exilic materials, especially in Job.

A group of terms related to creation also falls into the category of archaisms: *br'* "to create," *tōhū* (*wābōhū*), "chaos," and *mērahḥēpet*, "soaring." The verbal root *br'* appears early in Psalm 89:13. It has become a technical term for divine creation in the Priestly creation story and is popular in Second Isaiah.⁹⁶ A similar pattern exists in the case of *tōhū*; it is found first in the relatively early Song of Moses, Deuteronomy 32:10; it becomes fairly frequent in Exilic contexts: Isaiah 24:10; 34:11; and in Second Isaiah. *Mērahḥēpet* in Genesis 1:2 is a *hapax legomenon*. It is used in Ugaritic, however, in the sense "to soar," and very likely is an old poetic word in Hebrew.

The Date of P

One is able to draw upon the list of Priestly archaisms for evidence in dating the Priestly Work. Inasmuch as these terms take on new or restricted force in Priestly usage, we can distinguish the archaic from the archaizing and pursue Priestly influences. The technical use of *škn* and *miškān* of the covenant presence of Yahweh, or his Glory, in his sanctuary was systematically developed in the Priestly strata. It is found also in Ezekiel⁹⁷ and in the sixth-century material of Zechariah.⁹⁸ This archaizing usage is to be sharply distinguished from the genuinely archaic use of *škn* of the tenting of Yahweh,⁹⁹ or of the gods of Ugarit.¹⁰⁰ The new Priestly doctrine of the "tabernacling" of Yahweh in his sanctuary gave rise to a sudden burst of names with the element *škn*, *šékanyāhū*, Shekariah, beginning with men born (and named) in the mid-sixth century¹⁰¹ and continuing into the fifth-century community.

96. A. S. Kapelrud in a recent study, "The Date of the Priestly Code (P)." *ASTI*, 3 (1964), 58-64, has drawn attention to the close ties between the Priestly terminology for creation and that of Second Isaiah. The phenomenon makes a strong piece of evidence for an Exilic date for P.

97. See Ezek. 37:27; 43:7, 9.

98. See Zech. 2:14, 15; 8:3, 8.

99. Dtn. 33:12, 16; 1 Kings 8:12 (from Book of Yašar); Ps. 68:16, 18. We should give here a caveat. The archaic cliché *šōkēn yērušalayim* survives in a late text or two: Isa. 8:18; 33:5; parallel is the Aramaic: *yhw 'lh' škn yb br'*, "Yahū the god who tents in Yeb the fortress" (*BMP*, 12:2).

100. *CTA*, 15.3.19; 17.5.32.

101. Cf. Neh. 12:3 (a Shekariah who went up with Zerubbabel); 1 Chron. 3:21, 22; Ezra 8:3, 5 (a grandson, according to the best reading, of Zerubbabel the Davidid); Neh. 6:18 (the father-in-law of Tobiah), etc. According to 1 Chron. 24:11, the head of

At any rate, this seems to be the most natural explanation of the phenomenon. It is noteworthy, too, that the name was used especially in priestly families. The distribution of other Priestly technical terms, *kābōd*, "Glory," *nāšī'*, "leader," *Šadday*, and the creation terms *br'*, "to create," and *tōhū*, "chaos" in Ezekiel and Second Isaiah all tend to reinforce the linguistic evidence for the sixth century date of the Priestly work.

Another linguistic argument can be made. In a recent study, Robert Polzin has compared syntactic features in Epic prose, Deuteronomic prose, Priestly prose, and the prose of the Chronicler.¹⁰² His results are impressive, I believe, in establishing a typology of grammatical usage which places the Priestly document at a slightly more advanced stage than the Deuteronomistic historian in his syntactical usage and at a far less advanced stage than the Chronicler.

The traditional arguments for a date later than Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history still hold firm. For example, the development of a sharp distinction between the priests and Levites had not taken place in Deuteronomistic tradition in the seventh century when the primary edition of the Deuteronomistic work was published. In the Priestly work, on the other hand, the distinction is fully developed.

The powerful tendency toward periodization in P is another trait which pushes us to the Exile for its date. The proto-apocalyptic tendency to periodization is found also in Ezekiel and Second Isaiah, especially in the latter.¹⁰³

The Composition of the Priestly Work

The foregoing argument concerning the composition and structure of the Priestly work can be summed up in the following items.

(1) The Priestly Work was composed by a narrow school or single tradent using many written and, no doubt, some oral documents. Most important among them was the Epic (JE) tradition.

(2) The Priestly strata of the Tetrateuch never existed as an independent narrative document.

a course of priests is named Shekaniah, and according to 2 Chron. 31:15, a priest of the era of Hezekiah is named Shekaniah. If the tradition is to be trusted, the name was in use (presumably without its later technical specialization) also at an early date: Cf. Neh. 3:29; Ezra 10:2 etc.

102. Robert Michael Polzin, "An Analysis of the Language of the Chronicler and of the Priestly Document" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard 1971).

103. See the discussion below in chapter 12.

(3) The Priestly tradent framed and systematized JE with Priestly lore, and, especially at points of special interest, greatly supplemented JE.

(4) The Priestly work had as its central goal the reconstruction of the covenant of Sinai and its associated institutions. At the same time, it was a program written in preparation for and in hope of the restoration of Israel.

(5) The Priestly work, JEP, was essentially the Tetrateuch in its penultimate form. Later changes, including the rearrangement which created a Pentateuch, were relatively minor.

(6) The Priestly strata and hence the Priestly Tetrateuch as a completed work must be roughly coeval with Ezekiel's vision of chapters 40–48 of Ezekiel, and slightly earlier, perhaps, than Second Isaiah and proto-Zechariah. Hence it must have been completed in the sixth century, late in the Exile.

12 *The Early History of the Apocalyptic Community at Qumrân*

The Archaeological Context of the Qumrân Community

After a quarter century of discovery and publication, the study of the manuscripts from the desert of Judah has entered into a more mature phase.¹ The heat and noise of the early controversies have not wholly dissipated. One occasionally hears the agonized cry of a scholar pinned beneath a collapsed theory. And in the popular press, no doubt, the so-called battle of the scrolls will continue to be fought with mercenaries for many a year. However, the period of initial confusion is properly past. From the burgeoning field of scroll research and the new disciplines it has created, certain coherent patterns of fact and meaning have emerged.

The scrolls and the people of the scrolls can be placed within a broad historical framework with relative certitude in virtue of external controls furnished by the archaeologist and the palaeographer. The historian must begin here, for the internal data from the scrolls pose special problems for the historian because of their esoteric language, and the usual methods of historical criticism are difficult to apply without the intrusion of an excessively subjective element.

The archaeological context of the community of the Dead Sea—its caves, community center, and agricultural adjunct at 'Ên Fešhah—has been established by six major seasons of excavations. The ancient center has yielded a clear stratification, and in turn the strata are closely dated by their yield of artifacts, notably coins. For the era in which we are interested, the site exhibits three phases. The first of these, so-called Period Ia, consists of the remains of the earliest communal structures. In Period Ib the settlement was almost completely rebuilt and enlarged. The coin series suggests that the buildings of the second phase were constructed, as we shall see, in the time of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 B.C.). The problem of the foundation of the settlement is an interesting and subtle one. So thoroughly were the structures of the first phase rebuilt that it is questionable whether any of the coins can

1. This essay is a revised version of a paper written for a symposium on "The Dead Sea Scrolls after Twenty Years" published in the *McCormick Quarterly* 21 (1968), 249–264, and also in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, ed. D. N. Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield (New York, Doubleday, 1969), pp. 63–79.

be attributed to it. Moreover, it is notoriously difficult to date foundations, since a certain time must elapse before debris, including lost coins, accumulates. This is complicated in the present instance by the short life of the first phase (Ia). At the same time, coins have a considerable period of currency. When John Hyrcanus introduced the new Jewish coinage late in his reign, coins of the Seleucid kings continued to circulate, and John's own coinage did not cease to circulate on the day of his death. The earliest coins of Period I are five Seleucid coppers of imprecise date, coming down to the era of Antiochus VII Sidetes (138–129 B.C.), and some eleven silver coins of the Seleucid stamp, five, at least, to be attributed to Antiochus Sidetes. The paucity of Seleucid coppers earlier than the reigns of John Hyrcanus and Antiochus Sidetes suggests that it would be most precarious to date the main buildings of Period Ib before their era, and one may argue that the main building phase belongs to the time of Alexander Jannaeus, beginning in 103 B.C. The series of Jewish coppers contains one certain coin of John Hyrcanus I,² one coin of Judas Aristobulus (104–103 B.C.), 143 coins of Alexander Jannaeus, and ten coins of the remaining Hasmonaeans (76–37 B.C.). These data suggest strongly that the second phase, that is, the main period of the construction, is to be dated early in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus. The first phase, Ia, is evidently earlier. How much earlier is difficult to say; certainly it was short-lived. The rarity of coins dating before Antiochus Sidetes becomes more difficult to explain for every day we push back earlier than 138 B.C., the beginning of his reign. In short, we must place the foundation of the site in the wilderness of Qumrân within the extreme limits 150–100 B.C., and probable limits of 140–120 B.C.

In the second phase, Period Ib, the community center took its permanent form, though extensions or repairs of a minor sort were introduced before the destruction of its buildings in the earthquake of 31 B.C. reported by Flavius Josephus. After a period of abandonment, indeterminate in length, the site was reoccupied, rebuilt, and repaired precisely on the plan of the old communal complex and flourished until A.D. 68 when it was stormed and occupied by the forces of Vespasian in the course of his raid on Jericho.

2. This is a revised figure; in the preliminary report fifteen coins were attributed to Hyrcanus I. See now Roland de Vaux, *L'Archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (London, Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 14ff. [Y. Meshorer has shown that John Hyrcanus I minted no coins. The "one certain coin of John Hyrcanus I" must be added to the coins of Hyrcanus II.]

Theoretically, I suppose, the communities occupying the ruins in each of these phases need not have been related.³ In fact, the community of the second and third, and, no doubt, the little known first phase, was one continuing community. The peculiarity of the life at Qumrân was such in these periods that the historian's normally vivacious imagination is overtaxed in trying to conceive of two such communities, as specified by the functions of the communal establishment in the wilderness, following one upon another without relationship. The very setting of the community requires a special explanation. Only powerful motivations would send a large group of persons into this wasteland. But more difficult to explain than the desolate environment chosen by the desert folk is the special character of the community center. The center was composed of communal facilities for study, writing, eating, domestic industries, and common stores. The members of the community did not live in the buildings (for the most part at any rate) but in caves and shelters radiating out from the central buildings. That is to say, the architectural functions of the rooms and structures require a special mode of religious and communistic life. We can conclude only that the people of the scrolls founded the community in the second half of the second century B.C. and occupied it, with a brief interruption in the reign of Herod the Great, until the dreadful days of the Jewish Revolt.

Corroboration of this reading of the archaeological evidence is immediately furnished by the palaeographical analysis of some six hundred manuscripts recovered from Qumrân. The main lines of the evolution of the late Aramaic and early Jewish bookhands were already fixed on the basis of documents and inscriptions in the interval between the two World Wars.⁴ Now, thanks to the discoveries in the Judaeian desert, the science of early Jewish palaeography has grown rich in materials for the typology of scripts.⁵ These discoveries include not only the manuscripts of Qumrân in Palaeo-Hebrew, Jewish, and Greek bookhands, but also the important discoveries from the Wādī Murabba'ât and the Naḥal Heber, written in both formal and cursive Jewish hands, as well as in Greek, Latin, and Nabataean. While these discoveries have occupied the center of the stage, other discoveries from the Wādī

3. As claimed by G. R. Driver, for example, in his erratic and arbitrary study, *The Judaeian Scrolls* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1965).

4. W. F. Albright, "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus," *JBL*, 56 (1937), 145-176.

5. See F. M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in *BANE*, pp. 133-202.

ed-Dâliyeh north of Jericho,⁶ from the excavations of Hirbet Qumrân, from the tombs of Jerusalem, and from the excavations at Masada,⁷ to mention only the most important, have steadily expanded, extending our knowledge of the evolution and relative dating of early Jewish scripts.

Not only do we now possess ample materials for precise typological analysis of the scripts of the Qumrân manuscripts, we have also accumulated a series of externally dated scripts by which the relative dates gained by typological study can be turned into absolute dates. Most striking no doubt are the documents bearing date formulae of the late fourth century B.C. (Dâliyeh) and of the first century and second century of the Christian era (Qumrân, Murabba'ât, and Heber), which overlap in part and extend the Qumrân series backward and forward in time. To these may be added documents from excavations, notably from Qumrân itself and Masada, dated by archaeological context to the first century B.C. and later.

The scripts from Qumrân belong to three periods of palaeographical development. A very small group of biblical manuscripts belong to an archaic style whose limits are ca. 250–150 B.C. Very frequent are manuscripts in hands of the Hasmonaeon period, between 150 and 30 B.C. Manuscripts composed as well as copied by the sectarian community begin, most significantly, about the middle of the Hasmonaeon period, that is, about 100 B.C. Finally, there is a relatively large corpus of Herodian manuscripts dating between 30 B.C. and A.D. 70.

The spread of these manuscripts in date and in quantity furnishes extremely important data for the historian. The life of the people of the scrolls must be related to the dates of the books of their library, especially to the books of sectarian content, many composed and copied for the governance and teaching of the desert community. The termination of the series with late Herodian hands correlates precisely with archaeological data. The library was abandoned at the time of the destruction of the community in A.D. 68. We must in turn establish the origins of the community no later than the date of the earliest sectarian compositions, that is, before ca. 100 B.C. Perhaps we can extract even more information from the series. Nonsectarian scrolls, especially the

6. See F. M. Cross, "Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dâliyeh," in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, pp. 41–62 and Pls. 34–35, 36–39.

7. Cf. Y. Yadin, *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand*, tr. Moshe Pearlman (New York, Random House, 1966), and *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1965).

biblical manuscripts, begin in quantity about 150 B.C. Scrolls of the Archaic Period are exceedingly rare and are best reckoned master scrolls brought into the community at the time of its founding. Extant copies of such characteristic sectarian scrolls as the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document go back to the beginning of the first century B.C. Sectarian commentaries on Habakkuk, Nahum, and other biblical works date mostly from the second half of the first century B.C. and contain traditional lore of biblical interpretation developed in the community in its earlier history and precipitated into writing relatively late in the life of the sect.

We may say in summary therefore that the sect of Qumrân came into being between ca. 150 and 100 B.C. to judge purely on the basis of palaeographical evidence.⁸

The almost identical results of the independent disciplines of the archaeologist and palaeographer establish the framework within which we must reconstruct the history of the sectarian Jewish community. We are now prepared to plunge into the complex historical data which may be culled from the manuscripts themselves and from the classical texts dealing with pre-Christian Jewish movements.

Qumrân and the Essenes

Extant classical texts which treat the history of the second century B.C. mention four Jewish movements in Judaea: the Ḥasidim, a pious "congregation" which disappeared in the Maccabæan era, and three orders which emerge no later than the early Hasmonæan era and presumably have their roots in the Maccabæan period. These are the Essenes, the Pharisees, and the Saducees. Of these three only the Essene order can be described as separatist in the radical sense that they regarded themselves as the only true Israel and separated themselves fully from contact with their fellow Jews. Josephus informs us that the Essenes rejected even the sacrificial service of the Temple as unclean and "offered their sacrifices by themselves." Pliny (or rather his sources)⁹

8. The chronological schema presented by the writer in "The Development of the Jewish Scripts" (see n. 5) has proved to be minimal in date by the sequence of fourth-century scripts from Dāliyeh, and may need to be raised slightly, especially in the Archaic Period. Any attempt to date the events of the origins of the sect to the late first century B.C., much less in the first century of our era, now can be dismissed as unworthy of serious consideration.

9. See my remarks *ALQ*², p. 75, n. 33.

tells us of their "city" in the wilderness between Jericho and 'Ēn Gédî near the shore of the Dead Sea.

The last-mentioned datum is virtually decisive in view of the absence of strong counter-arguments in fixing the identification of the sectarians of Qumrân with the Essenes. We know of no other sect arising in the second century B.C. which can be associated with the wilderness community. Surface exploration has turned up no rival settlement in the crucial era. Further, the community at Qumrân was organized precisely as a new Israel, a true sect which repudiated the priesthood and cultus of Jerusalem. Neither the Pharisees nor the Saducees can qualify. The Essenes qualify perfectly. There is no reason to belabor the point here. A careful examination of the classical notices side by side with the texts of Qumrân establishes the identification, in my opinion, beyond cavil. The strongest argument which has been raised against the identification of the Qumrân sect with the Essenes is as follows: since Palestine "swarmed" with obscure sects in the first century of the Christian era, one must exercise caution in assigning the Dead Sea sect to a known group. The argument had plausibility only when a few manuscripts of uncertain date were known. The Qumrân sect was not one of the small, ephemeral groups of the first century of the common era. Its substantial community at Qumrân was established in the second century B.C. and flourished some two centuries or more. Moreover, it was not restricted to Qumrân, but, like the Essenes of the classical sources, counted its camps and settlements throughout the villages of Judah.

Its own sectarian literature was enormous, exercising a considerable influence upon later sectarian, including Christian, literature. The task, therefore, is to identify a major sect in Judaism. To suppose that a major group in Judaism in this period went unnoticed in our sources is simply incredible. The scholar who would "exercise caution" in identifying the sect of Qumrân with the Essenes places himself in an astonishing position: he must suggest seriously that two major parties formed communistic religious communities in the same district of the desert of the Dead Sea and lived together in effect for two centuries, holding similar bizarre views, performing similar or rather identical lustrations, ritual meals, and ceremonies. He must suppose that one, carefully described by classical authors, disappeared without leaving building remains or even potsherds behind; the other, systematically ignored by the classical sources, left extensive ruins, and indeed a great library. I prefer to be reckless and flatly identify the men of Qumrân

with their perennial houseguests, the Essenes. At all events, in the remainder of our essay, we shall assume the identification and draw freely upon both classical and Qumrân texts.

The Essenes: Priestly Apocalyptists

The Essenes of Qumrân were a priestly party. Their leader was a priest. The archenemy of the sect was a priest, usually designated the Wicked Priest. In protocols of their community the priests took precedence, and in the age-to-come, a messiah priest ranked above the traditional Davidic or royal messiah. There is some reason to believe that the sect conducted a sacrificial system in its community at Qumrân. At any rate, the community was preoccupied with priestly lore, ceremonial law, the orders of the priests, and the liturgical calendar; many of their sectarian compositions reflect their almost obsessive interest in priestly orthopraxy.

The community referred to its priesthood as "sons of Zadok," that is, members of the ancient line of high priests established in Scripture. At the same time, they heaped scorn and bitter condemnation upon the ungodly priests of Jerusalem who, they argued, were illegitimate. This animosity against the priests in power in Judah on the part of the priests at Qumrân did not stem merely from doctrinal differences. Our texts rather reflect a historical struggle for power between high priestly families. The Essenes withdrew in defeat and formed their community in exile which was organized as a counter-Israel led by a counter-priesthood, or viewed with Essene eyes, as the true Israel of God led by the legitimate priesthood. Even in exile the theocrat of Jerusalem, the so-called Wicked Priest, attacked the Essenes and made an attempt on the life of the Righteous Teacher, the priestly leader. For their part, the Essene priests confidently expected divine intervention to establish their cause. They predicted that the Wicked Priest and his cronies would meet violent death at the hand of God and their enemies and searched Scripture for prophecies of the end of days when they, the poor of the desert, would be reestablished in a new, transfigured Jerusalem.

Mention of the Essene hopes of a New Age of glory leads us naturally to some comments on the special theological views of the Essenes which informed their understanding of history and gave to their community its peculiar institutions. The Essenes belong in the center of that movement which goes under the designation *apocalypticism*. The late visionaries of the Old Testament, notably the author of Daniel, as well as the later

Baptist and Christian communities, discovered themselves to be living in the last days of the Old Age, or rather in the days when the Old Age was passing away and the Kingdom of God was dawning. The upsurge of evil powers in history reflected the last defiant outbreak of cosmic Satanic powers, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, manifest in the community of the faithful, adumbrated the age of the Spirit to follow the final war in which the Spirit of Truth and his heavenly armies would put an end to the rule of the powers of darkness.

The constitution of the Essene community was a crystallized apocalyptic vision. Each institution and practice of the community was a preparation for or, by anticipation, a realization of, life in the New Age of God's rule. On the one hand, their communal life was a reenactment of the events of the end-time, both the final days of the Old Age and the era of Armageddon. On the other hand, their community, being heirs of the kingdom, participated already in the gifts and glories which were the first fruits of the age-to-come. The fashion in which all this was to be accomplished is extraordinary. It is not always easy to know the events, offices, and institutions which will come into being in the age of the New Jerusalem. For the apocalypticist of Qumrân, the key to these future mysteries was at hand. One had only to read the biblical prophecies with the understanding given the inspired interpreter, that is, by pneumatic exegesis, for all the secrets of events to come in the last days were foretold by God through the mouth of his holy prophets. So the Essenes searched the Scriptures. They developed a body of traditional exegesis, no doubt inspired by patterns laid down by their founder, which is reflected in most of their works, above all in their biblical commentaries, *p̄šārîm*, in which their common tradition was fixed in writing.

In apocalyptic exegesis, there are three principles to be kept in mind. Prophecy openly or cryptically refers to the last days. Secondly, the so-called last days are in fact the present, the days of the sect's life. And, finally, the history of ancient Israel's redemption, her offices and institutions, are prototypes of the events and figures of the new Israel.

On this basis, the Essene camp in the wilderness found its prototype in the Mosaic camp of Numbers. Here the Essenes retired to "prepare the way of the Lord" in the wilderness. As God established his ancient covenant in the desert, so the Essenes entered into the new covenant on their return to the desert. As Israel in the desert was mustered into army ranks in preparation for the Holy war of conquest, so the Essenes marshaled their community in battle array and wrote liturgies of the

Holy Warfare of Armageddon, living for the day of the second conquest when they would march with their Messianic leaders to Zion. Meanwhile, they kept the laws of purity laid down in Scripture for soldiers in Holy Warfare, an ascetic regimen which at the same time anticipated life with the holy angels before the throne of God, a situation requiring similar ritual purity.

The offices of the sect reveal this apocalyptic typology. The council of the community was numbered after the princes of Israel and Levi in the desert; at the same time, they prefigured the judges who would rule the tribes of Israel in the New Age. As God sent Moses, Aaron, and David, so they looked for three messiahs: prophet, priest, and prince. The founder of their community bore a biblical sobriquet, the "Righteous Teacher" (from Hosea 10:12 and Joel 2:23), apparently understood as the title of a priestly forerunner of the Messianic age. And even the enemies of the sect, the False Oracle, the Wrathful Lion, and so on, all bore designations culled ingeniously from prophecy.

The great external events of the history of their times were discovered in the Scriptures, predicted as signs of the last days: the Seleucid rule, the wars of the Hasmonaeans, the rise of the Romans, and the conquest of Pompey. And the internal events of sectarian life and history were rehearsed even more dramatically in the sayings of the prophets. Here we come upon one of the major difficulties in writing Essene history. Major political events and, from our point of view, minor or private events in the life of the sect are mixed in their expositions of Scripture in dizzying fashion, and if this were not bad enough, the whole is veiled in the esoteric language of apocalyptic.

To sum up. The Essenes of Qumrân were a community formed and guided by a party of ancient Zadokite priests. In the latter half of the second century B.C., having lost hope of regaining their ancient authority in the theocracy of Jerusalem and under active persecution by a new house of reigning priests, they fled to the desert and, finding new hope in apocalyptic dreams, readied themselves for the imminent judgment when their enemies would be vanquished and they, God's elect, would be given final victory in accordance with the predictions of the prophets.

Essene Origins

There is no difficulty whatever in discovering the general background of the rise of a dissident priestly party within the chronological limits which have been marked off. In the days of Antiochus Epiphanes

(175–163 B.C.), the orderly succession of Zadokite high priests failed. The high priestly office became a prize dispensed by the Seleucid overlord, to be purchased by the highest bidder. The strife between rivals for the theocratic office shortly developed into civil war, and in the resulting chaos divine Antiochus found opportunity to carry out his fearful massacres, terminating in the notorious desecration of the Temple and the Hellenization of Holy Jerusalem. The stage was set for the rise of the Maccabees, whose destiny it was to lead the Jews in a heroic war of independence, and who, having won popularity by freeing Judah from foreign suzerains, usurped the high priestly office. In this way, the ancient Zadokite house gave way to the lusty, if illegitimate, Hasmonaean dynasty. Essene origins are to be discovered precisely in the struggle between these priestly houses and their adherents.

Perhaps the historian should say no more. However, the historical allusions in the expositions of biblical passages tempt one to attempt more precise reconstructions of the origins of the sect of Qumrân. We should like to know the identity of the Wicked Priest of Jerusalem and to fix more exactly the occasion for the flight and persecution of the sectarians; and we should like, if possible, to relate the Essene sect to the other Jewish parties, especially to the Pharisees who came into being in the same historical milieu. Perhaps it is too much to ask the identity of the Essene Teacher or of other sectarian figures who from the standpoint of general history played insignificant roles.

Before proceeding to the problem of Essene beginnings, it should be noted that on occasion references to contemporary persons or events in the expositions of the sectarians are explicit or at least transparent. In a commentary on Nahum we read, “[This is to be interpreted as referring to Deme]trius, the Greek king who attempted to enter into Jerusalem at the advice of ‘Those Who Seek Flattery’ . . .” A little further on the text continues, “the Greek kings from Antiochus until the succession of the rulers of the Kittiyim,” and a few lines later, “This refers to the ‘Wrathful Lion’ . . . who hangs men alive.”¹⁰ We have sufficient information here to reconstruct the series of historical

10. See J. M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4 I (4Q158-4Q186)*, *DJD*, V, No. 169, pp. 38f. and pl. XII; and John Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan’,” *RQ*, 26 (1970), 204-210. See also A. Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte (4QpNah),” *Semítica*, 13 (1963), 55-88; and “Observations sur le commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte,” *Journal des Savants* (October-December 1963), pp. 201-227.

episodes to which the expositors applied the prophecies of Nahum. The text sets the broad framework: the Seleucid era between Antiochus and the accession of the Roman rulers, that is, from the time of one of the Antiochids of the second century B.C. until the Roman conquest in 64 B.C. The Demetrius in question is Demetrius III who was invited by the Jews to put down the villain Alexander Jannaeus in 88 B.C. The latter is well known for his mass crucifixions and hence qualified for the Prophetic sobriquet, the "Wrathful Lion."

With the first discovery of this text a number of scholars, including the writer, seized on Alexander Jannaeus as a prime candidate for the archvillain of the sect and attempted to place Essene beginnings in the civil strife which occupied six years of his reign. Upon further study, however, the reconstruction appeared less attractive. For one thing, it was becoming clear that the commentaries reflected the accumulated lore of Essene exegetes over a considerable period of time. Nowhere else is the title "Wrathful Lion" used of the so-called Wicked Priest, and the Righteous Teacher does not appear in the text at all. Furthermore, other names of Hasmonaean rulers as well as Aemelius Scaurus, Roman governor of Syria in 62 B.C., appeared in an unpublished text from Qumrân, so that the novelty of the Nahum text wore off. Again, the strife in Jannaeus' time is clearly between the Pharisees and the Hasmonaean house. There is good reason to believe from our texts that both the Pharisees and Essenes derived from the older Hasidic congregation and that their separation developed when the Pharisees supported, or at least tolerated, the rise of the Maccabaeen high priests while the Essenes fought until forced to separate from the Jewish community. The civil war against Jannaeus, the high priest, led by Pharisees does not appear a suitable occasion for the separation of the Essene and Pharisaic wings of Judaism. Therefore, all that can be won from the Nahum commentary is a *terminus ad quem* for the foundation of the sect, and this might have been assumed all along from Josephus' reference to an episode in the time of Aristobulus I (103 B.C.) in which an Essene "prophet" took part. At the present stage of study, however, with the increasingly rigid controls furnished by palaeography and archaeology, I believe the attempt to place sectarian beginnings in the time of Jannaeus falls out of consideration. We cannot come down later than the reign of Jannaeus for the date of extant copies of Essene works, including the Rule of the Community. This rule is not, moreover, a programmatic work, but a codification of developed laws and institutions in use in the established community. And we have argued already that the

archaeological evidence suggests limits between 140 and 120 B.C. for the construction of the desert community and, hence, the foundation of the sect.

Another document, the so-called list of Testimonia¹¹ from Cave 4, Qumrân, appears to contain transparent references. The document itself is of some interest. It consists of four quotations, three from the Bible, the fourth from a pseudepigraphical work, the Psalms of Joshua. The first quotation (a conflation of two quotations of Deuteronomy, 5:28–29 and 18:18, 19, found in one witness to the Palestinian textual tradition at Exodus 20:21)¹² records the prophecy of the coming prophet “like unto Moses,” no doubt the eschatological Prophet expected by the Essenes. The second quotation is from the Oracles of Balaam (Numbers 24:15–17) concerning the Star of Jacob and the Scepter of Israel. These figures are explained elsewhere in sectarian texts as, respectively, the priestly messiah and the royal messiah. The third testimonium is taken from the Blessing of Moses on Levi (in Deuteronomy 33:8–11) “for he kept your word and guarded your covenant; he taught [or illuminated]¹³ your judgments to Jacob, your teaching (*tôrā*) to Israel.” The words are clearly applicable to a priestly teacher and presumably are taken to apply to the Righteous Teacher of the last days. The fourth testimonium is the most extraordinary. It refers to the “Cursed One” predicted in Joshua 6:26 as elaborated in the Psalms of Joshua, one of the sectarian pseudepigrapha. Presumably, in view of the other figures to whom testimonia apply, the messianic prophet, priest, and king, and the priestly forerunner of the New Age who founded the sect, the “Cursed One” must be a central figure in the sect’s history, perhaps their archenemy, certainly a figure worthy of juxtaposition with the Righteous Teacher.

The quotation from the Psalms of Joshua first recites Joshua’s curse of Jericho, or rather of one who rebuilt the destroyed city: “Cursed before the Lord be the man who shall build this city; at the cost of his first-born shall he lay its foundation, and at the cost of his youngest son shall he set up its gates.” As is well known, the prophecy was

11. See J. M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4 I*, no. 174, pp. 57–60 and pl. XXI; cf. John Strugnell, “Notes en marge,” pp. 225–229.

12. We refer here to the Samaritan Pentateuch. This observation was first made by Monsignor P. W. Skehan.

13. The reading is $\text{w}^{\text{p}}\text{t}^{\text{r}}\text{w}$ for $\text{M}^{\text{p}}\text{w}^{\text{r}}\text{w}$. There is a familiar pun here playing on the word *light* or *illuminate* and *Torah* or *teaching*. Note, however, *šmr*, *ynšr*, singulars with Sam. The singular throughout is probably original.

fulfilled, or rather the curse was effective, when in the ninth century B.C. Jericho was rebuilt by a certain Hiel with the loss of his sons.¹⁴ It is all the more remarkable that the Essenes chose this particular text, once fulfilled, and reapplied it to their own time. Yet as their language shows, they were aware that the building of the city in their day was a second rebuilding. Presumably they supposed that the curse held permanently. At all events, the exposition, partly broken, runs as follows:

And behold, a cursed man, a man of Belial, shall come to power to be a trapper's snare and ruin to all his neighbors, and he shall come to power and [his sons] . . . [with him],¹⁵ the two of them becoming violent instruments, and they shall rebuild again the [city . . . and shall set] up a wall and towers for it, to make a stronghold of wickedness [in the land and a great evil]¹⁶ in Israel and horrors in Ephraim and in Judah . . . [and they shall com]mit sacrilege in the land and great contumely among the children of [Jacob and blo]od [shall be poured out] like water on the battlement of the daughter of Zion and in the district of Jerusalem.¹⁷

If we follow the pattern of close apocalyptic exegesis which normally obtains in sectarian exposition of Scripture, we must look for an event connected with the fortification of Jericho by a major enemy of the sect when the dreadful curse of Joshua repeated itself. And properly, we must look for a high priest of Jerusalem who associated his sons with him in his rule. These requirements are sufficiently explicit, thanks to the unusual and specific character of the ancient curse, that we should be able to identify the persons and events.

Within our historical limits, one series of events immediately comes to mind which fulfils the requirements of the passage as I have outlined them: the death of Simon the Maccabee and his two sons in Jericho in 134 B.C. The circumstances are worth our careful attention. In

14. 1 Kings 16: 34.

15. The first portion of l. 25 may be reconstructed in several ways: [w'w]m(dym bnyw 'mw lh]ywt, or w]ym['lw bnyw lh]ywt, etc. We must understand in the context that the father will rise to power and associate his sons in his rule, the two of them fulfilling the scriptural role of "vessels of violence" (Genesis 49:5).

16. See Strugnell, "Notes en marge," p. 228.

17. 4Q Testimonia, 11.22-30. The lacunae in Lines 25-29 are restored partly on the basis of an extant copy of the Psalms of Joshua: 4QPssJos (unpublished). Cf. *ALQ*², pp. 149-152, n. 83a for a detailed discussion of the problems in the text.

138 B.C. Antiochus VII Sidetes was successful in ousting Tryphon, pretender to the Seleucid diadem, and he consolidated the Seleucid state. He immediately took steps to reassert Syrian control of Judaea, sending an army against Simon Maccabaeus. Simon, the last and perhaps the greatest of the five Maccabean brothers, was quite aged. He had set his sons over the Jewish armies and associated them with himself in the administration of the country. Antiochus' army under Kendebaios was defeated, and both Antiochus and Simon immediately began preparations for another round. In February of 134 Simon together with Judas (probably his eldest son) and Mattathias his youngest toured the cities of Judah, evidently reviewing fortifications which he had built or which were in the process of construction. Antiochus Sidetes was to strike and conquer Judaea and Jerusalem later in the same year. On their tour, Simon and his sons descended to Jericho. Jericho was administered under Simon by one Ptolemy son of Abubos. The district of Jericho was heavily Idumaeen in population in this period and formed a political unit separate from Judaea proper. Ptolemy appears to have been an Idumaeen and in certain ways reminds us of his fellow Idumaeen Herod the Great, who was finally to be successful in reestablishing the Idumaeen power. Ptolemy like Herod was more or less Judaized, to judge from his marriage to Simon's daughter, though it is clear that the marriage was a political one. Ptolemy had ambitions to rule Judaea and he organized a plot of considerable proportions, no doubt with the complicity of Antiochus Sidetes.

Ptolemy's opportunity came upon the occasion of Simon's visit to Jericho. Ptolemy held a banquet for his victims in a newly completed fortress guarding Jericho. When Simon and his sons were drunk, Ptolemy's men murdered Simon, and later his two sons. Ultimately Ptolemy's plot failed. John Hyrcanus, Simon's remaining son, was resident governor in Gezer. A runner informed him of the plot, and John was able to elude assassins sent to slay him and to escape to Jerusalem in time to rally loyal Jews against the forces sent by Ptolemy to take the city. Meanwhile, Ptolemy had sent word to Antiochus of the coup, asking immediate aid and official appointment over Judaea. Antiochus arrived too late to succor Ptolemy, but was successful in reducing the country and in forcing Jerusalem to surrender.

These events seem to explain adequately the resurrection of the old curse on Jericho by the Essenes. Most of the elements of the prophecy fit strikingly: the association of a cursed man with two sons in the fortification overlooking Jericho, their death at the hands of

Ptolemy's Idumaeen henchmen as evidence of the effectiveness of the curse, and the subsequent devastation and bloodshed in Judah and Jerusalem. I find it very difficult not to conclude that Simon is hereby established as the Cursed Man of the Testimonia and entitled to the distinction of being the archvillain of the sect. Is this "Cursed Man" identical with the Wicked Priest? His juxtaposition with the other central figures of the sect strongly suggests the identification, but perhaps we should proceed with caution, since at least one other high priest, Jonathan, may qualify as an alternative to Simon.

Jonathan (162–142 B.C.) was the second of the Maccabean brothers, the first to usurp the high priestly office. In 152 B.C. by appointment of Alexander Balas, one of two rivals for the Syrian throne, he assumed the robes of the high priestly office. While there is no direct evidence, it is quite impossible to suppose that Jonathan's flagrant violation of Zadokite rights to the high priesthood did not bring immediate and violent opposition from the Zadokite house and the Ḥasidic elements of Jewry who had never supported the Maccabees more than half-heartedly. It would appear probable that the ministry of the Righteous Teacher goes back to this ominous turn of events.

Furthermore, Jonathan's death fits precisely with Essene comments on the violent end of the Wicked Priest. In the Commentary on Habakkuk we read, "This is to be interpreted as referring to the Wicked Priest whom, because of transgression against the Righteous Teacher and the men of his party, God gave into the hand of his enemies to bring him low with a mortal blow."¹⁸ Tryphon captured Jonathan by treachery and, after holding him a prisoner for a time, murdered him in 142 B.C. In another commentary, the Wicked Priest is said to be given "into the hands of violent foreigners,"¹⁹ a cliché from Ezekiel's prophecies.²⁰ It has been argued plausibly that these texts fit perfectly only when applied to Jonathan.²¹ It is true that Ptolemy himself was probably Judaized despite his Idumaeen affiliations and that the Syrian role in the affair was indirect. Hence, while Simon's demise can be fitted with these biblical phrases applied by the Essenes to the Wicked Priest's death, Jonathan's end fits equally well or better.

18. 1 QpHab. 9:9–12.

19. 4QpPs. 37 (to 37:32–33).

20. Ezek. 28:7; 30:11, etc.

21. See J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, SBT, 26 (London, S.C.M. Press, 1959), pp. 61–71.

For a number of reasons Simon makes the better Wicked Priest. Jonathan became *de facto* high priest at the appointment of one of the Seleucid contenders for kingship. His position was tenuous, however, throughout his term in the office. Jewish independence was not to be fully won until the reign of Simon. To the end of his days Jonathan struggled to maintain himself against foreign foes. It seems unlikely that he was sufficiently secure to turn upon his fellow Jews and persecute the Zadokites; moreover, in view of the *de facto* nature of his theocratic rule and the uncertainty of the times, the Zadokite priests would not have abandoned hope and fled Jerusalem upon the occasion of Jonathan's donning the high priestly robes. On the contrary, we should expect the move to initiate hostilities between the orthodox and the Maccabaeen nationalists.

The lot fell upon Simon, Jonathan's successor, to bring his brothers' national dreams to fulfilment. In the second year of his rule he succeeded in driving out the Syrian garrison from the citadel in Jerusalem. Judaea only then became fully free of the Seleucid yoke. Simon ruled in peace and was at liberty to consolidate his realm. In 140 B.C., the third year of his reign, a great assembly was held "of the priests and people and heads of the nation and the elders of the country." The decree of the assembly was engraved in bronze and set up on stelae in Mount Zion. The work of the assembly and the significance of the decree for the history of the high priesthood cannot be overestimated. Simon was made high priest *de jure*, by the assembly's decree, and the high priesthood was given to Simon's house forever, "until a faithful prophet should arise."²² The claim is made here to a legal transference of the high priesthood from the Zadokite dynasty (appointed by David!) to the Hasmonaeen dynasty. The illegitimacy of Simon's house is admitted tacitly in the phrase "until a faithful prophet arise," that is, until a final arbiter between the rival houses appears in the age-to-come. Further, the decree warned against any opposition to Simon by layman or priest, prohibited private assembly, and threatened punishment to anyone who acted contrary to the stipulations of the decree.

In this decree we can clearly discern the new high priest's determination to stamp out opposition, to persecute those who refused to recognize the full legitimacy of his office. This program, falling in the early years of Simon, seems to give the appropriate occasion for the crystallization

22. 1 Macc. 14:30-39.

of the Essene sect, its persecution and the persecution of the Righteous Teacher, and the exile in the wilderness of Judah. Simon had the leisure, power, popularity, and inclination to root out Jewish opposition to the ascendancy of his party and his house. Certain texts, especially the Testimonia, give evidence in support of our identification of the Wicked Priest with Simon. Finally, it should not be overlooked that the archaeological evidence for the dating of the foundation of the community fits more easily with a date in Simon's reign than with a date in Jonathan's reign.

We have not dealt, of course, with a large number of texts relating to the Wicked Priest and his relations with the Righteous Teacher and the exiled community. Most fit equally well with Jonathan or Simon, or indeed with a number of other priests. In this era one cannot complain of a shortage of wicked priests. One final text, however, deserves mention. In a passage of the Commentary on Habakkuk, the expositor comments, "This means the priest whose dishonor was greater than his honor. For he . . . walked in the ways of drunkenness in order to quench his thirst. But the cup of God's wrath will swallow him up . . .!"²³ The high priest caroused once too often. In the hands of Ptolemy Abubos the cup of pleasure turned into the cup of wrath and swallowed Simon. So I should interpret the text.

We have been able to fix the general framework of the Essene community's life in the desert. Perhaps we have succeeded also in identifying the villain of the esoteric commentaries. I dare say we have succeeded far better in introducing the complexities and frustrations which face the student of the Essene library from Qumrân.

23. 1QpHab. 11:12-15.

*A Note on the Study of Apocalyptic Origins**

The evolution of late biblical religion has not been adequately traced: the decline and transformation of prophecy, the recrudescence of mythic themes stemming in part from decadent royal ideologies and from archaic lore preserved in the wisdom schools, and the new synthesis of these elements which should be designated "proto-apocalyptic."

The origins of the apocalyptic must be searched for as early as the sixth century B.C. In the catastrophe of the Exile the older forms of the faith and tradition came into crisis, and Israel's institutions, including her religious institutions, collapsed or were transformed.

Prophecy was transformed. The intimate relationships between the office of the king and the office of prophet have not been sufficiently stressed in the past. Of course, it is commonly recognized that prophecy *sensu stricto* emerged as an office with the rise of kingship. The standard oracle types—royal oracles, war oracles, oracles of legal judgment against king and people—were political as well as religious functions of Israelite prophecy. With the fall of the kingdom, classical prophecy ceased. Haggai and Zechariah are only apparent exceptions. They are the last flicker of the old prophetic spirit which briefly flared when Zerubbabel rose up as pretender to the royal office. Prophecy and kingship in fact expired together.

The religious currents of the sixth century were incredibly rich. The old Epic traditions of the Tetrateuch were reworked into a crystallized covenant theology by Priestly traditionists. A final editor of the Deuteronomistic history overwrote the promises to the house of David in the seventh-century work, and promulgated a theology of history in which blessing and curse were directly related to obedience and disobedience to the covenant of God. Both theologies, even more than the Epic tradition, were "horizontally" historical, with most of the mythic dimension, the vertical referent, leached out. The hand of God was found plainly visible in the course of historical events. Future and past were illuminated only from within ordinary history. The ambiguities of history were suppressed. These attempts at the interpretation of history ultimately were inadequate. Both were exercises in archaism. The eyes of their tradents were toward the past.

New voices rose to make this plain. The argument of Job attacked

* Remarks excerpted from a "Symposium on Apocalyptic" held at the December 28, 1967, meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature.

the central theme of Israel's religion.¹ It repudiated the God of history whose realm is politics, law, and justice, whose delight is to lift up the poor and to free the slave. The God who called Israel out of Egypt, who spoke by prophet, the covenant god of Deuteronomy, did not reveal himself to Job. It is true that God spoke, but note that he spoke from the storm cloud. It is true that he revealed transcendent wisdom and power, but they were revealed in thunder and lightning, in the language of Ba'l. He was revealed in the defeat of the dragon of chaos, in the myths of creation. There is a sense in which Job brought the ancient religion of Israel to an end.² History to Job was opaque. Job viewed the flux of history in despair; he detected no pattern of meaning there. History was a riddle beyond man's fathoming. The Lord of history failed to act. 'El or Ba'l, the transcendent creator spoke. Only He lived. Job saw Him and bowed his knee.

It is not enough to set Job in contrast to wisdom clichés. He represented more profound mythic strains, transmitted in circles of court wisemen and preserved in royal ideology and cult. He repudiated not only a simplistic Deuteronomistic view of historical process in which the mighty acts of God are transparent and history's theme is a simple one of blessing or curse, the way of life or the way of death. He recalled the patriarchal god, 'El the creator. The ancient myths regained their meaning in Job; the Epic theme became obscure.

Israel was never to return to the formulae of the ancient faith. The kingdom of God which Israel would seek was never to be the restoration of the old nation of God. The great figures of the Exile, freed from old functions of the prophetic office vis-à-vis the crown, created a new form of the faith. Job's myths and wisdom tradition were not repudiated, but now flowed into the new. Nor was his painful perception set aside that God is the hidden one, the *deus absconditus*. Proto-apocalyptists would salvage the ancient faith but in radically new forms. History and myth, the wisdom tradition³ and the prophetic

1. There is much in the dialogues of Job which is most archaic, and much which is directed against the simplicities of wisdom lore. Whatever the date when the original versions of the dialogues were orally composed, the Book of Job came into its present form in the sixth century B.C. and made its great impact on the mainstream of the Israelite faith in this era.

2. The traditional faith did revive briefly in the Chronicler who was a disciple both of the Deuteronomistic school and the Priestly school. His language is often an odd conglomerate of the clichés of both.

3. Wisdom, too, lost its concrete *Sitz im Leben* with the demise of kingship; the wisemen were without a patron, without an audience to entertain or instruct.

tradition, coalesced in the late sixth century never fully to separate again.

Job belongs in the main line of the evolution of Israel's religion. It is intriguing that Job's importance was not forgotten in apocalyptic circles. At Qumrân it alone outside of the Pentateuch survived in Palaeo-Hebrew script, and there is evidence that it was always so distinguished⁴ and received de facto canonization as early as the Pentateuch, in advance of the prophetic canon.

However, the creation of the new faith of Israel fell on shoulders other than those of the author of Job. In Second Isaiah, Isaiah 24–27 (the so-called Isaianic apocalypse), and 34–35, all from the sixth century, and in part in the later oracles of the book of Ezekiel, we discern a vast transformation in the character of prophecy. Old oracle types (*Gattungen*) persisted, but were radically altered. The old songs of the wars of Yahweh⁵ were transformed into eschatological songs of imminent war in which Yahweh's universal rule would be established. A new Conquest was described in terms of the language of the old Conquest of Israel's Epic.⁶ A new Exodus was described in the language of the old Exodus, and with bold mythological language which dissolved both old and new Exodus into the language of the battle with Yamm or Leviathan, dragon of chaos.⁷ The myths of creation, in short, were given an eschatological function.⁸ The old lawsuit oracle (*riib*) was transformed into a rhetorical lawsuit between Israel's god and the gods of the nations.⁹ Royal and prophetic offices were democratized,

4. For example, the text underlying the Old Greek translation has been shown by Orlinsky to have been based on a text written not in the Jewish (<Aramaic) script but in Palaeo-Hebrew.

5. Here I am thinking not only of the oracles of prophets to the king and people giving God's word to go to war or to desist in which traditional language of the divine warrior was used, but also of the oracles against the nations which stem ultimately from the ideology of holy war directed against nations, Yahweh's vassals, who have broken covenant with Israel (Amos 1–2:7, and so forth).

6. For example, Isa. 34.

7. For example, Isa. 51:9–11.

8. For example, Isa. 25:6–8; 65:17–25. The mythological lore of Ugarit will be increasingly important for apocalyptic studies. One thinks of the superb paper of J. A. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *JThS*, n.s. 9 (1958), 225–242.

9. Actually, two earlier forms are merging here. In addition to the prophetic, covenant lawsuit, there is also the mythological battle in heaven in which the rebel gods are judged by the young god, the executive of the divine council, and cast out into the netherworld to be dead gods. This theme is well preserved in Ps. 82 (as well as in later apocalyptic, for example, Dan. 7).

and the old oracles of kingship and the inaugural oracles or "confessions" (autobiographical oracles) of the prophet proclaimed to the nation Israel.¹⁰ Israel herself was to be the prophet, the servant of the Lord. The people Israel was to be ambassador to the nations bearing the law to the peoples.¹¹

Illustrations of these transformations could be multiplied almost indefinitely. In all these reformulations of the prophetic tradition and of the royal ideology, we detect certain distinctive traits or patterns emerging. One is the democratizing and eschatologizing of classical prophetic themes and forms. A second is the doctrine of two ages, an era of "old things" and an era of "new things." We detect here the beginning of a typological treatment of historical events. The significance of history was increasingly discovered in a future fulfilment. These "new things" were imminent. They had been announced by a colloquy of angelic heralds from the divine council,¹² so that the joy of salvation was present. In all this we detect the (limited) use of a mythic conception of time. A third element is the resurgent influence of myths of creation used to frame history and to lend history transcendent significance, significance not apparent in the ordinary events of horizontal history. In these ways, the Epic themes of old Israel become transfigured in a new, complex view of history, given dark dimensions with dualistic elements of myth, yet affirming the sovereignty of Yahweh in history and confirming the vocation of Israel as the people of God. I think it is accurate to say that it is in this late Exilic and early post-Exilic literature that we detect the rudimentary traits and motives of apocalypticism.¹³

10. For example, Isa. 55:1-5 (royal); Isa. 52:13-53:12 (largely prophetic).

11. Paul Hanson in his Harvard dissertation "Studies in the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic" (1969) develops the theme that in the oracles of Deutero-Zechariah and Third Isaiah are clear evidences of a setting in which Israel's doctrine of election was increasingly restricted to a special group in Israel over against the majority who were condemned, and that in this sectarian impulse we discern the origins of later apocalyptic communities.

12. See F. M. Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274-277.

13. With the recovery of the Canaanite mythic and epic poetry, certain judgments about the character of apocalyptic syncretism must be modified. It has become vividly clear that the primary source of mythic material informing Jewish apocalyptic was *old* Canaanite mythic lore. This, of course, is not to dispense with all resort to Iranian, Mesopotamian, or Greek borrowings in describing the evolution of apocalyptic. It does mean, however, that many apocalyptic traditions go back through earliest Israel to Canaanite sources so that more rather than fewer continuities with the old biblical community must be recognized.

Indices

Index of Biblical Citations

Genesis		15	86, 245n, 261n, 272–273, 319n
1	166n	15:1	4n
1:1–2:3	301	15:1f.	182
1:2	323	15:5	182
1:22	295n	15:6	270
1:26	187n	15:7–21	270
1:28	295	15:8	182
2:4a	302, 306	15:9–12	273
2:4b–4:26	302	15:9–17	268
2:10	38	15:17	192n, 273
3:8	253	15:18	262, 273
3:22	187n	16:3	305n
4:17–26	301	16:13	46
4:26	6n	16:16	305n
5:1	302	17	319n
5:1–32	301, 302	17:1	47n, 270, 297n, 305n
5:1–6:8	302	17:1–19	273
5:32	302	17:1–22	305n
6:9	302, 303	17:1–27	270–271, 296n, 303
6:11f.	306n	17:6	296n
6:13	306	17:7	254
6:18	303	17:8	254, 298
8:17	296n	17:15	182
9:1–17	270, 296n, 303, 305n	17:20	296n
9:6	306	17:21	297n
9:7	296n	18:1–16	180, 182
9:28f.	302	18:18	263n
10:1	303	18:19	270, 273n
10:2–32	301, 303	18:20	270
11:1–9	306	18:27	254
11:4	253n	18:31	254
11:7	187n	20:1–17	307
11:10	303	21:1a, 2	182
11:10–26	301	21:3–5	304
11:10b–26	302, 303	21:4	297n
11:27	303	21:5	305n
11:28–25:11	303	21:7	182
11:32	305n	21:23	19, 46
12:1	270, 273	22	307
12:1–3	182, 273	22:1–18	270
12:2	253	22:15–18	273n
12:3	263n	22:16	270, 273n
12:10–20	307	22:18	263n
12:46	305n	22:18b	270
14	211n	23:1	305n
14:9f.	182	23:1–20	303
14:16	86n	24	307
14:18ff.	46	25:7	305n

25:12	303	47:9	305n
25:12f.	302n	47:11	310n
25:17	305n	47:27	296n
25:19	303	47:27b	307n
25:19-35:29	303	47:28	305n, 307n
25:19b	303	48:3	11, 47n
25:20	304, 305n, 307n	48:3-6	307n
25:21-23	182	48:3-7	304, 305n
25:26b	304, 305n	48:8-22	307n
26:1-14	306	49	59n, 123
26:2-5	273	49:5	338
26:3	273n	49:25	9, 47n, 52n, 55n, 72
26:4	263n	49:26	55n
26:34	304	49:28-33	307n
27	304, 307	50:12f.	307n
27:34	305n		
28:1-9	304, 305n	Exodus	
28:1-10	305	1:1	302n
28:3	47n	1:1-6	303
28:10-22	245, 270, 304n, 307	1:7	296n, 304
28:13-15	273	2:11	310n
28:14	263n	2:21	254
28:15	273n	3:2ff.	105
29-33	307	3:12	252
31:13	47	3:13-15	5
31:44-55	269	3:14	67n, 68
31:48	300n	3:15	68
33:18b	307n	3:17	253
33:20	46	4:24-26	200n
33:22	11	6:2-3	5
34	307	6:2-9	297, 298
35:7	46	6:2-19:6	84n
35:9-13	297n, 304, 305, 305n, 307n	6:3	47n
35:11	47n, 296n	6:6	297n
35:15	304	6:7	254
35:28	305n	6:8	297n, 300n
35:28f.	304	7-11	318
36:1	302n, 304	7:1-12:51	303
36:9	302n, 304, 308n	12-15	104
36:10	302n	12:37a	310
36:10-30	303	12:37b-39	310
37:1, 2a	307n	12:40-13:2	310
37:2	304	13-16	310
37:2-50:13	304	13:17-19	310
37:29	305n	13:20	310
41:45b	305n, 307n	13:21f.	164, 310
41:46a	307n	14	134, 310, 318
43:14	47n	14:1f.	310
46:3	12n, 46n	14:16	140n
46:6-27	307n	14:19	105, 164
46:8	302n	14:19f.	164
46:8-27	303, 304	14:21	133, 140n
47:5-11	304, 307n	14:22	133

14:24	164	20:2	297n
14:26	133	20:2-14	84n
14:27	133	20:2-17	312
15	85, 103	20:2-23:14	84n
15:1-18	86, 115n, 121-144 passim, 157, 164	29:18	165
15:1-21	310	20:21	164, 337
15:11	45, 46	20:21-23	312
15:13	243n	21-23	84n
15:13-17	104n	22:27	322
15:15	4n	22:28b	270
15:16	20n	23:14-19	313n
15:17	97n, 246, 253	23:20, 21	30n
15:17f.	242n	23:30f.	296
15:18	72, 99n	24	84n
15:21	123	24:1	205n
15:22a	310	24:1-8	312, 320
15:22	309n	24:1-11	84n
15:23	309n	24:3-8	312
15:23-25a	310	24:4	84n, 104, 139, 192
15:24	299n, 322	24:7	313n
15:25b f.	310	24:9	205n
15:27	310	24:12	313n
16	322	24:15f.	166n
16:1	309n, 311	24:16	299n
16:1-36	311	24:17	167n
16:2	299n	24:18	166
16:7-9	299n	25-26	320
16:10	153n, 166	25-27	321
16:12	299n	25-29	84n
17	317n	25-31	314
17:1a	311	25:6-18	311
17:2-7	197, 311	25:8	299n, 313
17:3	299n, 322	25:16	300n, 313
17:7	309n	25:21	300n, 313
17:8-16	311	25:22	300n
18	200	29:42	300n
18:1-27	311	29:43	300n
18:5	311	29:43-46	313
18:13, 14	37n	29:45ff.	298-299
19	272	30-31	84n
19-24	84n	30:36	300n
19-Num. 10:19	297, 308	31:1-54	311
19:1	84n	31:13	295n, 298
19:2	311, 314	31:16	300n
19:2-25	311	31:16f.	298
19:26-Num. 10:10	311	31:18a	313n
19:3-6	84n	31:18	300n
19:9	164	32	74n, 84n, 89n, 198-200
19:16	153n, 164, 165	32-34	84n, 314
19:18	167	32:1-24	313n
20	300, 320	32:4	73n
20:1b-13	317n	32:8	74
		32:15	300n, 314, 322

32:26-29	197n	26:11-13a	318
32:30-35	313n	26:11-13	298
32:36	192	26:12	253
33	84	26:13	196n, 297n
33:7	322n	26:14-16	319
33:7-11	185n, 197	26:14-45	84n
33:10	164	26:15	300n
33:12-23	193	26:25	319
33:14	30n	26:42	300n
33:17-23	166, 193	26:44f.	319
33:18	153n, 322	26:45	300n
33:22	153n, 322	26:46	300n
34	84n, 272	27	314
34:5	153n		
34:6-8	193	Numbers	
34:10	261n	1	321
34:10-17	84n	1-4	314
34:10-27	86	1:5-15	54n
34:14	261n, 313n	1:53	300n
34:17	261n, 313n	2-4	321
34:27	84n, 313n	2:3-29	54n
34:27f.	261n	2:3-31	321
34:29-35	314	3:1	308n
35-38	321	3:1f.	302n
35-40	84n, 314	3:2-4	303
38:8	202n	5-6	314
38:21	300n	5:3	299n
40	321	7	84n, 314
40:2	84n	7:12-88	321
40:17	84n	8-9:14	314
40:34	166n	9:1	84n
40:34f.	153n	9:1f.	84n
40:34-38	313n	9:13-28	315
40:35	299n	9:15	300n
Leviticus		9:15-10:10	314
1-7	314	10:11	84n, 300n, 312
1-16	84n	10:11-19:22	308
2:13	300n	10:12	314
8	84n	10:14-28	321
8-9	314	10:29-32	200
10	314	10:29-33	315
10:1-7	204-205	10:35	95n
11-15	314	10:35f.	86n, 100, 315
12:3	204-205	11	315
16	314	11:3	309n
17-26:2	84n	11:16, 17a	197
17-26	300, 314	11:21	310n
24:8	300n	11:23	23
26	272, 300	11:24-25	197
26:3-13	84n	11:30	197
26:3-45	297	11:34f.	309n
26:9	296, 298, 300n, 318	12	203-204, 315
		12:16	315, 315n

12:34f.	315	24:21	72
13	315	25	203
13-14	318	25:1-5	316
13:3	315, 315n	25:4	266
13:26a	315n	25:6-15	201-202
13:26	86n, 315	25:8	55n
13:26b	315n	26	316, 321
14	315, 322	26:58a	206
14:2	299n	27:1-11	317
14:14	197	27:12-23	317
14:27	299n	27:14	197n
14:36	299n	28-30	317
14:45	309n	31	317
15	315	31:1-12	202n
16	315, 318, 322	31:8	318
16-17	205	31:16	318
16:1	309n	32	317
16:11	299n	33	308-317, 321
17	322	33:5-49	308
17-19	315	33:36	86n
17:6	299n	33:49	109n
17:20	299n	34	317
17:25	299n	35	317
18:17	109n	35:34	299n, 317n
20:1a	315	36	317
20:1	86n		
20:1-13	197n, 311	Deuteronomy	
20:1b-13	315	1:1-3	86n
20:13	309n	1:1-4:43	274n
20:14	86n	1:5	254
20:14-21	315	1:6-3:29	249
20:16	86n	1:8	251
20:22	315	1:11	254
20:23-29	316	1:12	254
21:1-3	316	1:14	253
21:1-9	316	1:19	254
21:4	316n	1:33	164n, 253
21:10	316n	1:39	251
21:10f.	316	3:20	251n, 252
21:12f.	316	4:11	165n
21:12-35	316	4:11f.	167n
21:18-20	309n	4:25-31	277n, 278
21:18b-20	316	4:27-31	287
21:27-30	105	5:6-22	312
21:30	97n	5:19	165n, 253
22-24	316, 318	5:22	253
22:1	316	5:23	167n
22:1-36:13	308	5:28-29	337
23-24	59n	6:3	254
23:21	99n	6:16	197n
23:22-24	157n	6:21	196n
24:8-9	157n	7:8	254
24:15-17	337	7:21	254

8:15	254	28:63-68	287
9:3	254	29:11	267n
9:11	300n	29:12	254
9:15	167n, 300n	29:13	267n
9:20	198n, 207n	29:20	267n
9:22	197n	29:27	287
9:26	254	30:1-10	277n, 287, 288
9:28	254	30:1-20	278
10:6	207n	30:11-20	287n
10:6f.	309, 321	31:1-32:44	274n
10:9	254	31:1	197, 253
10:17	254	31:8	250n, 252
10:21	254	31:15	164, 197
11:4	133n	31:23	250n, 252
11:6	205, 315n	31:28	253
11:25	254	32	264n
12:5	246n	32:6	69, 72
12:10	251n, 252	32:10	323
12:11	246n	32:14-20	282n
12:20	254	32:50	207n
12:21	253n	32:51	197n
12:29	253	33	123
13:5, 6	254	33:1-3	86
14:23	246n	33:1-34:12	274n
14:24	253n	33:2	86n
15:6	254	33:2-3	100n, 101, 157
15:15	254	33:3	129n
16:2	246n	33:4f.	164n
16:6	246n	33:5	99n
16:11	246n	33:8	197, 200
17:14-17	240n	33:8-11	337
17:14-20	221n, 223	33:9	200
18:2	254	33:10f.	200
18:18	337	33:12	245n, 299n, 323n
18:19	337	33:13-17	52n
18:20	253	33:15	72
18:22	253	33:16	245n, 299n, 323n
19:1	253	33:26-29	86, 157-158
20:1	253	33:27	48n
21:8	254	33:29	4n
23:15	253	34	308
24:18	254	34:5	251n, 253
25:19	251n, 252		
26:2	246n	Joshua	
26:6	254	1:1	251n, 253
26:16-19	268	1:2	251n, 253
26:17	254	1:6	251
26:18	254	1:7	251n, 253
27:1-8	139n	1:10-15	249
27:3	254	1:11-15	274
27:(11-)15-26	84n	1:13	251n, 252, 253
28	272	1:15	251n, 252
28:36f.	287	2:9f.	133

3-5	103-105, 138	4:11	200-201
3:11	138	5	70, 115n, 125n
3:13	128n, 138	5:2	187
3:16	128n	5:4-5	86n, 100-101, 139, 157
4:3	192	5:5	20n, 162n, 164
4:19f.	84n	5:6	201
4:23	133n	5:8	122n
5:10	84n	5:12	95n
5:14	70	5:16	235n
6:26	337	5:17	97n, 235n
7:7	254	5:20	70, 105
7:12	254	5:23	105, 235n
8:5, 6	254	6:8	253
8:30-34	84n	6:12	252
10:12f.	70	6:13	253
13-19	320	6:16	252
13:2-6	263n	8:3	253
13:13	130n	8:28	98n
13:33	254	8:31	253
15:5-7	109n	8:33	39
15:61f.	109n	9:4	39
18:17-19	109n	9:46	39, 44
21:10, 13	207	11:11	253
21:42	251n	17:11	254
21:44	252	18:30	197-198
22:2	251n, 253	19:6	254
22:4	251n, 252, 254	19:11-20:48	266n
23	274	19:29-20:3	221
23:1	252	20:26-28	199
23:2-10	249	20:32	254
23:4	253		
23:5	254	1 Samuel	
23:10	254	1:7	243n
23:11-13	249n, 287	1:9	73n, 243n
23:14	249	2:22	202n, 203, 243n
23:14-16	249n	2:27	197-198
23:15f.	287	2:30-36	213
24	85, 133, 192	2:35	253, 254, 265
24:2-28	84n, 271	3:3	73n, 243n
24:6, 7	134	3:15	243n
24:7	164n	3:19	250n, 252
24:14f.	192n	4:4	69, 246
24:29	251n, 253	7:1f.	96
24:32	253	7:3	277n
		7:3-17	220n
Judges		7:13	243n
1:16	200, 201n	8	250n
1:27	254	8:1-22a	220n
1:35	254	8:10-18	221n
2	250	8:11-18	240n
2:1	251, 253	9:1-10:16	220n
2:11-22	275	9:15	254
2:18	252, 277n	9:16	220n, 253

9:19	252	25:30	253
10:1	220n, 224n, 253	27:6	230n
10:6-9	224n	28:8-25	224n
10:7	250n, 252	30:31	253
10:18	253		
10:18-25a	270n		
10:24f.	224n	2 Samuel	
10:25	221n	1:19	4n
11:1-10	266n	2:4	230n
11:1-15	220n	2:19-27	116n, 122-123
11:4	253	2:22-25	202
11:6-11	221	2:27-36	202-203
11:14f.	224n	3:18	251n, 253
12	250	3:34	254, 254n
12:1-24	274, 277n	4:1f.	201n
12:2	253	5:1-3	230n
12:6	253	5:2	253
12:13-25	22n	5:10	252
12:15	220n	6	96
12:22	248, 250, 251, 253, 254	6:1-15	96
12:25	278n, 287	6:2	69, 70n
13:5-14	221n	6:14	231n
13:8-14	224n	6:21	220n, 238n, 253
13:13f.	224n	7	241-261 passim, 272, 281-282
13:14	220n, 253	7:1-11a	211n
14:3	196n, 213n	7:1-16	275
14:7	252, 253	7:4-6	210n
14:52	221	7:5	97n
15:1-31	221n	7:5f.	73
15:1-35	224n	7:5-7	89n, 231
15:28	224n	7:8	220n, 230n
16:13	224n	7:8-16	238n
16:18	252	7:11b-16	273
17:39	254	7:13-16	276
18:12	252	7:14	237n
18:14	252	7:16-17	233
18:30	253	7:17-18	276n
19:20	223	7:18-29	275
20:2	254	8:1	262n
20:12	254	8:12	262n
20:13	254	8:13	253
20:15	253	8:16f.	213
20:23	253	8:17	196, 212-214
21:1	212n	9-20	211n, 252
22:8	254	15:18	262n
22:9	196n	20:23-26	212n, 213n
22:11	196n, 213n	21:6	266
22:17	254	21:9	266
22:20	196n, 212n, 213n	21:13	266
23:6	212n	22	123, 125n
25:15	253	22:7b	243n
25:27	253	22:8f.	168
25:28	254	22:8-16	158-159

22:9	167n	8:25b	287
22:10	165	8:26	254
22:11	69	8:29	254
22:13	167n	8:30	97n
22:35	23n, 176n	8:33	277n
23:1	52n	8:35	254, 277n
23:1-5	234-237	8:44	254
23:1-7	237n	8:46-53	277n, 278, 287
23:5	259, 260n	8:48	254
23:8-39	230n	8:56	253
24:1-14	240n	9:1-10:11	281n
24:1-25	227n	9:4-9	287
24:17a	253	9:6-9	276n, 277
24:18-25	210n	9:7	254
		9:11-14	240n
1 Kings		9:16f.	263n
1	211n, 252	9:21	275n
1:34	227n	9:26	239n
1:38f.	227n	10:2	252
1:39	238	10:12	275n
1:39-46	262n	10:26	239n
1:45	238	10:28f.	239n
1:47	253	11	282-283
2	211n, 252	11:12	281
2:4	287	11:13	238n, 251n, 253, 281
2:27	196n, 213n	11:29-39	224n, 279n
3:4-15	247	11:32	238n, 251n, 253, 281
3:14	287n	11:34	222n, 251n, 253, 281
4:2-6	212n, 213n	11:36	238n, 251n, 253, 281
4:5	238n	11:38	251n, 253, 254
5:1	262	11:39	252, 254
5:4	262n	12:7	253
5:6-8	239n	12:8	212n
5:9	254	12:15-20	224n
5:11	253	12:19	275n
5:18	251n, 252	12:21-24	228n
6:11-13	287	12:26-33	279
6:12	254	12:28	73n, 253
6:13	246n, 299n	12:31ff.	199
8	252	13-14	75
8:8	275n	13:2-5	279-280
8:12	97n, 164n, 245n, 246, 299n, 323n	13:6	254
		13:34	279
8:12f.	251n	14:2	238n
8:12-51	274-275	14:7	220n, 280
8:13	125n, 255	14:7-11	225
8:15-19	255	15:3-5a	283n
8:16	238n, 251	15:4	238n, 281, 282n
8:17-20	243n	15:29	280
8:18	254	16:1-4	225n, 280
8:19	254	16:2	220n
8:20	251n	16:7	225n
8:23	260n	16:10	212n

16:12	225n	17:19	287
16:34	338	17:20	254
17:21	192	17:20-23	275
17:31	192	17:23	275n
18-19	191-193	17:34	253
19	166	17:36	253
19:15	70n	18:7	252
19:16	224	18:12	260n
20:13-15	226	18:27	253
20:28f.	226	19:34	253, 281
20:40f.	225	20:5	220n, 253
20:42f.	280n	20:6	253, 281
21:17-29	280	20:17-18	276n, 287
21:19-22	225	21:1-23:25	283
21:29	281	21:2-15	285-286
22:1-37	225	22:2	283
22:1-38	226n	22:15-20	286n
22:5-28	186	23:21f.	106n
22:8-28	280n	23:22	123n
22:15	242n	23:25	277n, 283
22:19	37n	23:25b-27	286
22:37f.	281	23:26-25:30	287n
2 Kings		24:2	277
1:2-4	226n	25:27-30	277
1:2-17	280n	Isaiah	
2:12	226	1:2a	188, 228n
3:6-27	277n	1:10-20	228n
5:23	254	1:26	254
6:3	254	2:1-4	176
6:8-23	226	2:2	143
6:24-7:20	226n	3:13-15	188, 228n
8:7-15	224n	5:14	117n
8:18f.	283n	6:1-8	180n
8:19	281, 282n	6:1-12	186-188
8:22	275	6:2	37
9:1-10	224	9:1-6	228, 257, 263
9:6-10	225	9:5	16n, 257
10:27	275n	9:5f.	237n
11:9-12	227n	11:1-9	228, 265
11:12	260n	12:2b	127n
11:17	227n	13:6	59n
13:4	226	14:9	4n
13:14-19	226	14:13	38, 45, 180n
13:23	260n	19:1	176n
14:7	275n	24-27	144, 345
16:6	275	24:5	236n
17:1-23	281	24:10	323
17:7	253	24:19	149n
17:7-18	275	24:19-23	170
17:7-23	280n	25:6-8	108, 144, 345n
17:13	277n	26:21	170
17:15	260n	27:1	119n, 120, 135

29:6	167n	63:9	30n
30:14	154n	63:12	253n
30:27	153n, 167n	63:14	253n
30:27–33	176–177	63:19	101n, 159n
30:30	167n	63:19b–64:2	170
31:9b	167n, 168	65:9f.	109n
33:20–22	38	65:17–25	345n
34	135, 144, 173, 229n, 345n	66:15	149n
34–35	345	66:15f.	167n, 170
34:3f.	175		
34:4	119n, 170	Jeremiah	
34:5	150	1:10	253
34:8–10	170	2:2–13	228n
34:11	323	2:21	253
34:17	171n	3:9f.	188n, 228n
35	106, 135	3:12	188, 228n
35:1–10	170–174	3:16	296n
35:3–4	187	7	233n
35:8–10	108	7:22	253
37:16	70n	7:23	254
37:35	281	7:27	253
40	109n, 173	10:10	16n, 48n, 170n
40:1–8	187–188	10:13	170n
40:3–6	106, 108	11:4	254
40:10	170n	13:11	253
40:26	71	16:14	223
40:28	16n, 48n	22	233n
42:10–16	110n	22:10–30	228n
42:13–15	170	23:1–6	228
43:15f.	136n	23:3	296n
44:24–28	108	23:4	253
47:1	97n	23:7	253
48:20–21	187	23:18	186
50:2	136n	24:6	253
50:2f.	170	25:13	253
51	144	25:30bf.	170n
51:9–10	120	26	233n
51:9–11	87, 107–108, 136–137, 345n	28:5	242n
51:10	172n	28:11	242n
52:7–10	187n	30:22	254
52:7–12	108	31:11	254
55:1–3	144	31:28	253
55:1–5	108–109, 263, 346n	31:33	254
55:3	238n, 284n	32:20	253
56:13–57:12	346n	32:38	253
57:4	117n	32:41	253
57:14	187	33:7	254
57:16–19	170	33:11	254
62:6–12	97n	33:14–26	259n
62:10–12	187n	33:17	259
62:24–28	108	33:19–22	228, 259
63	144	33:21	253
63:1–6	229n	33:22	253

33:26	253	2:16-17	109
34:5	253	4:1-3	228n
34:18-20	268	5:11	254
42:10	253	10:12	334
Ezekiel		Joel	
1:25	58	1:15	59n
1:28	167n	2:2	164n
10:5	58	2:23	334
17:13	4n	3:4	254
20	109n	4:18	38
20:33-42	110n		
20:35	109n	Jonah	
20:38	109n	2:6	117n
25:5	172n		
27:21	322n	Micah	
28:2	38n, 44, 180n	1:3f.	174-176
28:7	340	3:9-12	228n
28:13	38n	4:1	143
28:14	38n, 44	4:1-4	176
28:16	38n, 44	5:8	253
30:11	340	6:1-8	228n
32:21	45n	6:2a	188
34:12	165n	6:5	104, 141
34:26f.	319		
36:11f.	296n	Nahum	
37:27	299n, 323n	1	170n
38:6	38n	1:4	135
38:15	38n		
39:2	38n	Habakkuk	
40-48	289n	2:5	117n, 127n
43:7	299n, 323n	3	70
43:9	299n, 323n	3:3	71, 86n
47:1-12	38	3:3-6	102-103
		3:3-7	86
Amos		3:3-15	157, 164, 176n
1-2:7	345n	3:5	167n
1:2-2:16	228-229	3:5f.	71
1:4-2:5	167n	3:5-12	150
1:5	7n, 130n	3:8	140
1:8	130n	3:9	23n
1:9	240n	3:10ff.	71
3:2	269	3:14	23n
4:1	4n		
4:13	176n	Zephaniah	
5:8-9	176n	1:12	128n
7:4	168n	1:15	164
9:5-6	176n		
9:15	253	Haggai	
		2:6f.	170
Hosea		2:16	154n
1:9	67n	2:21	170
2	228n		

Zechariah		50:1-6	162
2:4	98n	50:2-6	170n
2:14	323n	50:3	167n
2:15	323n	50:10	45
3:1-10	187	52:11	48n
3:4	187n	66:6	104, 135, 139n
4:14	37n	66:7	48n
8:3	323n	68	59n, 101
8:8	323n	68:2	100n
9:1-8	229n	68:5	165n
9:14	170	68:8-9	86, 100, 101, 157
14:5b-9	170	68:9	162n
14:6	128n	68:15	59n
14:8	38	68:16	299n, 323n
		68:17	97n, 245n
		68:18	100n, 101, 102, 157, 299n, 323n
Malachi		68:19	245n
3:23	254	68:25	99n
		73:12	48n
		73:23	178n
Psalms		74:13	149n
2	265	74:14	119n
2:7	237n, 257	74:14f.	140n
9:5	95n, 97n	74:22	95n
17:15	33n	75:10	48n
18	123	77:15-20	157, 164
18:8f.	168	77:17-20	136
18:8-16	158-159	78:5	300n
18:9	167n	78:13	128n, 134-135, 140n
18:10	165	78:28	97n
18:11	69	78:35	52n
18:13	167n	78:56	300n, 322
18:16	149n	78:60	73n, 97n, 243
18:35	23n, 176n	78:68-72	238n
24	91-111 <i>passim</i> , 167	78:69	142n, 242n
24:1-5	94	78:70f.	253, 254n
24:7	48n	80:11	45
(24:7-10)	91-93)	81:8	197n
24:9	48n	82	71, 72, 186-188, 345n
29	115n, 121, 144, 151-157, 160-162, 167, 174	82:1	44, 179n
29:1	45, 46	82:8	95n
29:6	139	89:1-38	265
29:7	167n	89:2-19	97n
29:8	136n	89:3	48n
29:10	95n, 97n, 147n	89:3-5	257
36:7	45	89:6-8	72, 187
38:3	176n	89:6-19	45n, 144, 160-162
43:3	97n	89:7	45, 46
43:8	38	89:10f.	135
46:3	147n	89:13	135m, 323
46:5	97n	89:15	125n
46:7f.	162, 174	89:17	246
47:6, 8	111n	89:20-38	233, 257-261, 282

89:23	253, 254n	Job	
89:25	238	1:1-2:13	187
89:27f.	237n, 257	4:6	169
89:29	238n	6:9	254
89:33	255n	6:28	254
89:34	238n, 257	7:12	135
89:37f.	257	9:5	169
91:1	59n	9:8	135, 160
92:10	114n	10:10	128n
93	144, 162, 174	10:15	98n
93:1-4	135	12:9	60n
93:1-5	140	13:18	236n
95:8	197n	26:5-14	169
96	152n, 162, 174	26:10	119n
96:9	152n	26:11	149n
97:1-6	162, 174	26:11-13	162
97:2	165n	26:12	135
97:2-4	167n	33:16	254
98	162, 174	36:10	254
99:1	69	36:15	254
99:3	254	36:29	148
99:5	95n	36:30	147n
104:1-9	162	37:5	136n
104:1b-4	168	37:11	147n
104:4	167n	37:15	147n
104:31	162	38:1	169
104:31f.	168	38:7-11	135
104:32f.	170n	38:9	165n
106:9	135, 136n	40:25	119n
106:17	315n	41:17	45n
106:28-31	202n		
106:32	197n	Ruth	
110	211n, 265	1:20, 21	59n
114	140, 157, 164	4:4	254
114:1a	104		
114:1-5	136n	Cant.	
114:1-8	138-139	4:8	28
114:3-5	104		
114:7	162n	Daniel	
118:14	127n	7	16, 17, 165n, 345n
132	94-97, 232-235, 237, 238	7:9	16n
	244-246, 248	9:4	254
132:5	242	9:15	253n
132:6-9	231n	11:36	45, 46
132:11f.	255, 259		
132:12	300n, 322	Ezra	
132:13f.	251n	1:8	322n
136:15	135	7:1-5	196n, 212n
141:7	117n	8:3	323n
144:5, 6	168, 174	8:5	323n
		10:2	323n
Proverbs		Nehemiah	
1:12	117n	1:10	254
14:28	152n	3:29	323n

6:18	323n	18:1	262n
9:10	253n	18:16	212, 213n, 214n
9:11	132, 135, 140n	21:17a	253n
9:18	74	21:18–26	210n
9:32	254	24:3	196n, 207n
11:10	212n	24:6	196n, 214n
11:10f.	196n	24:11	323n
12:3	323n	24:31	196n, 214n
		29:29	238n
1 Chronicles			
2:19	94n	2 Chronicles	
2:24	94n	6:41	94n, 95n
2:50	94n	6:42	284n
3:21	323n	11:2ff.	228n
3:22	323n	11:8	262n
4:4	94n	12:5ff.	228n
5:27–41	196, 212	13:4	259
6:35–38	196n, 212n	13:5	238n
6:42	207	20:21	153
9:10	196n	21:7	259, 282n
9:11	196n; 212n	26:10	109n
9:21	262n	26:20	212
9:26	262n	30:1–26	123n
9:29	238n	31:10	312
11:10–47	230n	31:15	323n
12	215n		
12:2	23n	Revelation	
12:27–29	214–215	Book of	143
13:6	70n	12	119
16:29	152n	12:9	119n
17:3	257		
17:5	255	Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	
17:6	244n	Book of Enoch	38
17:8	248n	Psalms of Joshua	37
17:10	255n	Testament of Levi	38
17:11	255n		
17:12	243n		
17:21	254	1 Maccabees	
17:27	254	14:30–39	341n

Index of Ugaritic Citations

CTA 1 (Gordon 'nt, pl. IX, X)		CTA 4 (Gordon 51)	
1.2.18	15	4	40, 93
1.2.23	38	4.1.5	15
1.3.1	125nn	4.1.17	56n
1.3.6	15	4.1.23	15
1.3.11-12	38	4.2.36	44n
1.3.17	166n	4.3.30, 31	15
1.3.21-25	38	4.4.20ff.	36-37
1.3.23	36n	4.4.32	15
		4.4.38	4n
CTA 2 (Gordon 137, 129, 68)		4.4.41	16
2	40, 93	4.4.41-44	184
2.1.18, 35	166n	4.4.47	15
2.1.19ff.	37	4.4.58-60	166n
2.1.19-37	98	4.4.62-4.5.66	184-185
2.1.20-24, 32f.	190n	4.5.66	16
2.1.34-37	183	4.5.68-71	148-149
2.1.35	17	4.6.36ff.	116
2.1.36f.	114	4.7	93n
2.3.4-6	36n	4.7.29-35	149
2.4.7-10	114	4.8.12	117n
2.4.11-13	115	4.8.13, 14	125n
2.4.17f.	33n	4.8.14	166n
2.4.19f.	115	4.8.34	66n
2.4.25ff.	115		
2.4.26	33n	CTA 5 (Gordon 67)	
2.4.32	116	5.1.1-5	118, 119, 149-150
		5.2.2-4	117, 117n
CTA 3 (Gordon 'nt)		5.2.10, 18	66n
3.1.23	56n	5.2.15	117
3.2.15, 16	23n	5.2.16	125nn
3.3.3	56n	5.5.6-11	17, 166n
3.3.7	156	5.5.8	4n
3.3.10-28	185	5.5.10	56n
3.3.11	66n	5.5.10f.	116, 116n
3.3.26ff.	156n	5.5.18f.	4n
3.3.27	125n	5.6.9	117
3.3.35-39	119, 119n	5.6.10	139n
3.3.35-43	149n		
3.4.51	66n	CTA 6 (Gordon 49, 62)	
3.4.64	125n	6	40
3.5.10	16	6.1	162n
3.5.15	36n	6.1.4	117
3.5.38	16	6.1.36	16
3.5.38-41	184	6.1.48	67n
3.5.43	15	6.2.30-35	117-118
3.6.10	31	6.3.1	117
3.6.15, 16	125n	6.3.3	64n

6.3.3f.	118	17.6.1f.	181
6.3.4	15	17.6.31f.	185n
6.3.6f.	118, 151	17.6.46–55	185, 36n
6.3.9	64n, 118n, 139n	17.6.49	16
6.3.10	15		
6.3.12f.	151	CTA 18 (Gordon 3 Aqht)	
6.3.21	64, 118n	18.1.15–19	185
CTA 7 (Gordon 130, 131)		CTA 19 (Gordon 1 Aqht)	
7.2.14	66n	19.1.42–46	151
		19.4.213	55n
CTA 10 (Gordon 76)		19.4.220	69
10.2.33	17, 147		
10.3.6	15	CTA 20 (Gordon 121)	
		20–22	20n
CTA 14 (Gordon KRT)			
14.1.35–43	180	CTA 22 (Gordon 123, 124)	
14.1.36	15	22.A.18	94n
14.2.75–79	181	22.B.8	20n
14.3.150	15		
14.3.152	181n		
14.3.155	152n, 181n	CTA 23 (Gordon 52)	
14.4.198	31, 31n	23.24	55n
14.4.201	31, 31n	23.31–53	22–24
14.6.296	15	23.37f.	148n
		23.59, 61	55n
CTA 15 (Gordon 128)		23.61f.	117n
15.2.6	181n	23.65	154n
15.2.7	45		
15.2.11	45, 178n	CTA 29 (Gordon 17)	
15.2.11–27	179	29	14
15.3.17–19	179–180		
15.3.19	323	<i>Ugaritica V</i> , I, 18 (RS 20.24)	
15.4.6f.	4n, 122n	I, 18, 31	16n
CTA 16 (Gordon 125, 126, 127)		II, 5(a) (RS 24.278)	28, 28n
16.23f.	94f.	III, 1 (RS 24.258)	39
16.5.20–28	181	III, 2 (RS 24.252)	20–22, 37n, 142n, 185
16.6.1f.		III, 2, 1	16
		III, 2, 6f.	31
CTA 17 (Gordon 2 Aqht)		III, 3 (RS 24.245)	147–148, 155n
17.1.17–28	177–178	III, 3, 8	148n
17.1.35–38	178	III, 6, 1 (RS 24.272)	162n
17.1.43f.	178	III, 9 (RS 24.643)	7n
17.5.32	323		

Index of Technical Terms

- ʿābīr, 4n
 ʿād, 269
 ʿādat ʿEl, 44–45
 ʿālā/ʿālōt, 266–267
 ʿalʿiyu qarrādīma (ʿalʿiyānu), 66–67, 66n
 ʿānān, 164–167
 ʿārāpel, 164–165
 ʿarūkā, 236, 236n, 237
- benē ʿēlīm* (*banū ʿilima*), 45–46, 70
bērūt, 39, 260, 260n, 265–274, 296, 300
bēt David, 239, 246–247, 256
brʿ, 323, 324
- ʿēdūt, 267, 296, 300, 312, 313, 314, 322
 ʿEl *bērūt*, 39n, 44, 47n, 49n, 60
 ʿEl *bēt-ʿEl*, 46–47, 47n, 49n, 60
 ʿEl ʿēlōhē ʿābīka, 12n, 46n, 49
 ʿEl ʿēlōhē yīsrāʿel, 11, 46, 46n, 49, 60
 ʿEl ʿōlām, 46, 47, 48, 48n, 49, 50, 68, 71
 ʿEl qōnē ʿars, 16, 50–51, 60. See also
 ʿEl ʿelyōn
 ʿEl rōʿī, 46, 49n
 ʿElyōn, 46, 47, 48, 50–52, 60, 71
- gibbōr* (*milḥama*), 40, 99, 127n
- har ʿelōhīm*, 44
hwqyʿ, 266
- kābōd*, 153n, 165–167, 245n, 313, 322,
 324
kōkabē ʿEl, 45, 45n
Kūs, 204
- Labʿūt* (“Lady of the Lion”), 33, 34, 35
- māgān*, 4n
malku ʿabū sanīma, 16, 16n
- mērahēpet*, 323
miškān(ōt), 95n, 97n, 244n, 246n, 298–
 299
- nābīʿ*, 223n
nāgīd, 220, 220n, 221, 222
nāšīʿ, 322, 324
nēd, 128n, 133
- ʿōhel *mōʿēd*, 37, 231n, 245n, 300, 322
 ʿōlām, 17–19, 25, 48n, 71, 236n. See also
 ʿEl ʿōlām
- panē Baʿl*, 30, 30n
- šdq*, 209, 209nn
- qāpēʿū tēhōmōt*, 128n–129n
qéres, 321–322
qudšu, 33–35
- rīb*, 188–189
- sadday*, 11, 47, 47n, 48–60, 71
sākēn, 245, 245n, 246, 246n, 299, 313,
 322, 323
sanīma, 16n
šēm Baʿl, 30
šemeš ʿōlām (*šps ʿlm, šamaš dārētum*),
 18n
šōpēʿt, 99n, 219n, 220n
- tabnūt*, 33n
ʿd (dd), 55n
tōhū, 323, 324
- Yahwē yēbāʿōt*, 65, 68–71, 99, 106
yarkētē Šapōn, 38
yḏ, 269
yšb, 245–246, 299

Index of Authors

- Aharoni, Y., 201n
Ahlström, G. W., 210n, 257n
Albright, W. F., 4n, 7n, 9n, 18–19, 25, 26, 27n, 30nn, 31, 31nn, 32, 32n, 33, 33n, 41n, 46n, 49n, 52, 53n, 55n, 56n, 57n, 60nn, 62n, 64nn, 66n, 68, 70n, 71n, 94n, 100n, 101n, 102nn, 119n, 123n, 124n, 125n, 127nn, 129n, 135n, 140nn, 150n, 155nn, 165n, 177n, 184n, 200n, 204n, 207n, 220n, 230n, 233n, 238n, 240n, 264n, 267, 267nn, 276n, 328n
Allegro, J. M., 335n, 337n
Alt, Albrecht, 3–9, 11, 12, 47n, 75n, 79n, 80, 81, 84, 87, 88, 89, 135, 219–221, 222n, 229, 230nn, 237n, 257n
Altmann, A., 79n
Amadasi, M. G., 25n, 30n
Amiran, R., 201n
Anderson, B. W., 79n, 108n, 134n, 228n
Anderson, F. I., 177n
Aro, J., 54n
Astour, M., 161n
Auerbach, E., 209n

Bach, R., 229n
Bailey, Lloyd R., 57
Baltzer, Klaus, 79n, 80, 84n, 189n
Barreca, F., 25n
Begrich, J., 268, 272n
Bentzen, A., 209n
Berthier, A., 25n, 27n
Bertholet, A., 49n
Beyerlin, W., 79n, 198n
Bisi, A. M., 34n, 35n
Borger, R., 27n
Brancoli, Isabella, 34n
Buccellati, G., 219n
Budde, K., 180n
Burchardt, M., 53n
Butin, Romain F., S.M., 19n

Calderone, P. J., 248n
Campbell, E. F., 79n, 105n
Carlson, R. A., 191n, 192n
Cassuto, V., 47n
Charlier, R., 25n, 27n
Childs, B. S., 121n, 123n, 128n

Ciasca, A., 25n
Cintas, P., 35n, 36nn
Clapham, L. R., 13n
Clements, R. E., 238n, 241n, 246n, 261n, 272n
Clifford, R. J., 36nn, 72n, 142n, 185n
Coats, G. W., 79n, 121n, 198n, 204n, 205n
Cody, A., 195nn, 209nn, 210n
Coppens, J., 47n
Crenshaw, J. L., 176n
Cross, F. M., 8n, 15, 16n, 17n, 20n, 26n, 30n, 33n, 36n, 45n, 46n, 48n, 52nn, 55n, 60n, 64nn, 67n, 72n, 79n, 91n, 92n, 95n, 98n, 99n, 101n, 102n, 103n, 106n, 109n, 112n, 115n, 121nn, 123nn, 125nn, 126n, 127nn, 128nn, 129nn, 130n, 152nn, 157nn, 158nn, 160n, 180n, 183n, 185n, 187n, 189n, 197n, 200n, 202n, 212nn, 231n, 234nn, 236n, 242n, 245n, 274nn, 289n, 294–295, 299n, 300n, 312n, 326n, 328n, 329n, 330nn, 338n, 346n

Dahood, M., 4n, 45n, 46n, 48n, 92n, 95n, 98n, 101n, 121n, 129n, 130n, 136nn, 139n, 152n, 154n, 159n, 160n, 161nn, 162nn, 210n, 235n, 258n
Delitzsch, F., 94n
De Moor, J. C., see Moor
De Robert, P., see Robert
De Vaux, R., see Vaux
Dhorme, E. P., 55n
Diringer, 19n
Donner, H., 152n
Driver, G. R., 148n, 328n
Driver, S. R., 196n, 236n
Dumbrell, W. J., 105n, 200n, 202n
Du Mesnil du Buisson, R., 24n
Dunand, M., 24n
Dupont-Sommer, A., 51n, 335n
Durham, J. I., 139n, 191n
Duru, R., 24n
Dus, Jan, 104n
Dussaud, R., 48n

Ebeling, E., 27n, 57n
Edwards, J. E. S., 33, 33n, 34nn

- Edzard, D. O., 9n, 125n
 Ehrlich, A. B., 176n
 Eissfeldt, O., 13nn, 26nn, 47n, 48nn,
 59, 59n, 60n, 68n, 72, 74n, 135n, 139n,
 142n, 176n, 190, 199n, 264n, 275n
 Emerton, J. A., 17, 345n
 Engnell, I., 80–81, 210n, 293n, 294, 295
- Feigen, S. I., 159n
 Finet, André, 60n, 62n
 Finkelstein, J. J., 55n
 Fisher, L. R., 147n, 148n
 Fitzmyer, J. A., 45n, 51nn, 220n, 266n
 Flinders Petrie, W. M., 53n
 Flusser, D., 113n
 Fohrer, G., 121n, 192n, 272n
 Freedman, D. N., 48n, 52n, 55n, 60nn,
 67, 68n, 72n, 79n, 91n, 99n, 101n, 103n,
 112n, 115n, 121nn, 123nn, 125nn, 126n,
 127nn, 128nn, 129nn, 130n, 152n,
 157nn, 158nn, 177n, 183n, 197n, 200n,
 212n, 234n, 326n
 Fretheim, T. E., 95n, 241n, 242n
 Friedrich, J., 10n, 20n, 32n, 269n
- Garbini, G., 29, 29n
 Garcia y Bellido, A., 34
 Gardiner, A., 19
 Garelli, P., 10n
 Gaster, T. H., 148n, 152n, 234n
 Gelb, I. J., 13n, 14, 14n, 20n, 28n, 54nn,
 62n, 154n
 Gese, H., 79n, 241n, 243, 247n
 Ginsberg, H. L., 4n, 45n, 51n, 56n, 151,
 152n, 154n, 180n, 181n
 Giveon, R., 62n
 Glueck, N., 109n
 Goedicke, H., 45n
 Goetze, A., 27n, 54n, 66n, 268n
 Gray, J., 275n
 Greenfield, J. C., 55n, 212n, 326n
 Gressmann, H., 4
 Gründahl, F., 10n, 54n, 56n
 Gsell, S., 25nn, 26n, 29n, 30n, 32nn
 Güterbock, H. G., 49n
 Gunkel, Hermann, 3, 124, 170n, 189n
 Gunneweg, A. H. J., 195n, 197n, 241n
 Gurney, O. R., 55n
- Hamburger, H., 31n
 Hanson, P. D., 88n, 97n, 105n, 346n
 Haran, M., 9n, 74n, 202n, 214n, 231n
 Harden, D., 25n
- Harrelson, W., 79n, 108n, 134n, 228n
 Harvey, J., 79n, 287n
 Hauer, C. E., 215n
 Haupt, Paul, 68, 127n, 200n
 Haussig, H. W., 9n
 Hay, L. S., 121n
 Heidel, A., 54n
 Helck, W., 20n, 30n, 53n, 62n, 267n
 Held, M., 181n, 221n, 265n, 266n
 Herdner, A., 150n, 181n
 Herrmann, S., 247–248
 Hertzberg, H. W., 245n
 Hill, G. F., 28n, 31n, 35n
 Hillers, D. R., 4n, 79nn, 95n, 97n, 168n,
 272n, 287n, 297n
 Hirsch, H., 10n
 Holladay, J. S., Jr., 189n
 Honigmann, S., 27n
 Hooke, S. H., 80
 Huffmon, H. B., 11n, 14nn, 62n, 63n,
 67n, 79n, 154n, 189n, 235n, 268–269
 Hyatt, J. P., 60nn, 65nn, 66n
- Ingeholt, H., 24n
- Jacobsen, T., 9n, 41n, 75n, 93
 Jakobson, R., 112n
 Jenni, E., 147n
 Jepsen, A., 272n, 275n
 Jeremias, J., 147n, 165n, 167nn, 191n,
 194n
 Jirku, A., 18n
- Kapelrud, A. S., 93n, 323n
 Kinnier Wilson, J. F., 55n
 Knutson, F. B., 147n, 148n
 Koch, K., 314n
 Kosmala, H., 60n
 Krätzschar, R., 268
 Krahmalkov, C., 63n, 68n
 Kraus, H. J., 79n, 80n, 81, 83n, 99n, 104n,
 238n
 Kselman, J., 166n, 301n
 Kuenen, A., 275n
 Kupper, J. R., 57nn, 58n
 Kutsch, E., 272n
- Lack, R., 51n
 Lambdin, T. O., 45n, 46n, 53n
 Lambert, W. G., 41n
 Landsberger, B., 10n, 24, 55n
 Laroche, E., 28n, 39
 Leclant, J., 30n

- Levi della Vida, G., 32n, 51n
 Lewy, J., 9-10, 27nn
 Lidzbarski, M., 67n, 209n
 Limburg, J., 189n
 Lindblom, J., 60n, 68n, 189n
 Liver, J., 205n, 206n
 Loewenstamm, S. E., 121n, 125n, 132n, 266n
 Lohfink, N., 79n, 86n, 121n, 261n, 262n, 272n, 273n
 Lord, A. B., 52n, 112n, 117n
 Loretz, O., 267n
 Loud, G., 20n
 MacRae, A. A., 28n
 Malamat, A., 219n, 262n, 263n
 Margulis, B. B., 229n
 Masson, O., 221n, 266n
 May, H. G., 159n
 Mayer, R., 60n
 Mazar, B., 4n, 201, 207, 230n, 263n
 McBride, S. D., 11n, 30n, 181n, 232n, 246n, 249n
 McCarthy, D. J., 79n, 84n, 249, 252n, 268n, 275n
 McKenzie, J. L., 84n
 Meissner, B., 27n
 Mejia, J., 235n
 Mendenhall, G. E., 4n, 63n, 79n, 80, 101n, 165n, 173n, 215n, 221n, 271n, 272
 Merlin, A., 25n, 35, 35nn
 Milik, J. T., 7n, 8nn, 38n, 56n, 109n, 129n, 147n, 340n
 Millar, W., 135n
 Millard, A. R., 41n
 Miller, P. D., 5n, 22n, 40, 70n, 88n, 101nn, 168n, 229n
 Mitchell, T. C., 200n
 Möhlenbrink, K., 195, 206n, 212n
 Montgomery, J. A., 252n
 De Moor, J. C., 147n
 Moran, W. L., 20n, 63n, 79n, 84n, 115n, 189n, 235n, 240n, 268n, 269n
 Morenz, S., 248n
 Moscati, S., 25, 26, 29, 29n, 34n, 73n
 Mowinckel, S., 60n, 65n, 80, 80n, 91, 180, 293n, 295, 300n, 312n
 Müller, L., 35n
 Muilenburg, J., 109n, 121n
 Murtonen, A., 60n
 Nielson, E., 197n
 Nilsson, M. D., 32n
 Nock, A. D., 18n
 Nötscher, F., 235n
 Noth, M., 80, 104n, 198n, 202n, 223, 223n, 232n, 242n, 243n, 267n, 268, 274, 275, 275n, 276, 276n, 277, 277n, 288, 289, 293n, 294, 295, 309n, 310n, 312n, 320n
 Nougayrol, J., 7n, 14n, 54n, 56n, 64n
 Nyberg, H., 210n
 Oldenburg, U., 21n
 Oppenheim, A. L., 153n
 Otten, H., 16n, 27n, 32n, 72n
 Ouellette, J., 10n, 57
 Parry, M., 112n
 Peckam, J. B., 220n
 Pedersen, J., 267n, 268, 318n
 Perlitt, L., 82n
 Pesce, G., 25n, 36n
 Pfeiffer, R. H., 275n
 Polzin, R. M., 99n, 221n, 266, 266n, 324n
 Pope, M., 13n, 16n, 38n, 48n, 147n, 160n
 Porter, J. R., 139n, 191n
 Preisendanz, K., 18n
 Pritchard, J. B., 34n
 Purvis, P. M., 28n
 Rabe, V. W., 73n, 74n, 231n, 241n
 Von Rad, G., 79n, 80, 84, 84n, 88, 91, 227n, 237n, 276, 277, 278, 278n, 282n, 288
 Rainey, A. F., 54n, 64n
 Rehm, M., 195n
 Reisel, M., 60n
 Rendtorff, R., 10n, 314n
 Richter, W., 219n, 220n
 Riemann, P., 89n
 De Robert, P., 244n
 Roberts, J. J. M., 13n
 Robertson, D. A., 103n, 121nn
 Robinson, H. W., 186
 Röllig, W., 29n, 32n
 Ross, J. F., 189n
 Rowe, A., 19n
 Rowley, H. H., 71n, 102n, 123n, 209n
 Rustum-Shehadeh, L., 52n, 54n
 Ryckmans, G., 11n, 52n
 Saley, R. J., 17n, 46n, 92n, 128n, 189n, 236n

- Sanders, J. A., 26n, 160n
 Sauer, J., 97n
 Schaeffer, C. F. -A., 35n
 Schmidt, J. M., 80n
 Schreiner, J., 245
 Von Schuler, E., 113n
 Segal, M. H., 60n
 Seyrig, H., 24n
 Shenkel, J. D., 227n
 Skehan, P. W., 19n, 337n
 Smend, R., 80n, 88n, 99n
 Smith, R., 3
 Von Soden, W., 60n, 62n, 63nn
 Soggin, J. A., 104nn, 139n, 241n, 267n
 Solá-Solé, J. M., 30n
 Speiser, E. A., 267n
 Stadelmann, R., 150n
 Stamm, J. J., 63nn, 147n, 191n
 Starcky, J., 8n, 24n, 26
 Steck, O. H., 191n
 Strauss, H., 152nn, 154nn
 Strugnell, J., 7n, 335n, 338n
- Tadmor, H., 219n, 222n
 Tallqvist, K., 57nn, 63n
 Thompson, R. J., 293n
 Tsevat, M., 236n, 243n, 247n
 Tufnell, Olga, 19n
- Van der Woude, A. S., 191n
 Van Unnik, W. C., 191n
 Vardaman, E. J., 60n
 Vatke, W., 82
 De Vaux, R., 4n, 9n, 10n, 25, 60n, 73n,
- 80nn, 109n, 195, 209n, 210n, 220n, 231n, 327n
 Vincent, A., 47n
 Virolleaud, C., 64n
 Vogt, E., 104n
 Volz, P., 80, 80n
 Von Rad, G., see Rad
 Von Schuler, E., see Schuler
 Von Soden, W., see Soden
- Walcot, Peter, 41n
 Wambacq, B. N., 70n
 Ward, W. A., 25n
 Weber, M., 80
 Weippert, M., 52n, 53n
 Weiser, A., 241n
 Welhausen, J., 3, 71n, 82, 195–198, 208–209, 210n, 212–213, 275n, 294, 295, 307n
 Westermann, C., 189n, 228n
 Whitaker, R. E., 52n, 112n
 Widengren, G., 241n
 Wieder, A. A., 258n
 Wilson, J., 19n, 20n
 Wiseman, D. J., 235n, 266, 266n
 Wolff, H. W., 109n, 189n, 277, 278, 288
 Wright, G. E., 8n, 39n, 79n, 105n, 109n, 124n, 134n, 228n, 229n, 230n, 240n, 262n, 264n, 313n
 Würthwein, E., 191n, 193n
- Yadin, Y., 26n, 109n, 329n
 Yeivin, S., 9n
 Zimmerli, W., 110n, 320nn

General Index

- Aaron, 73, 74, 195–215, 314, 316, 316n, 334
Aaronid priesthood, 73, 195–215
Abarim, mountains of, 309, 316
Abiathar, 196, 208, 212, 213, 214, 232, 233n, 237, 242
Abihu, 204–205, 314
Abijah, 283
Abimelech, King of Gerar, 182
Abimelech, son of Abiathar, see Ahimelech
Abimilki of Tyre, 150
Abinadab, 96
Abiram, 205, 315, 318
Abishag, 237
Aboth, 316
Abraham, 4, 5, 180, 182, 261, 262, 263, 270–271, 273, 294–298, 301, 303, 303n, 304, 304n, 307, 319n
Abronah, 309n
Absalom, 42, 237
Achish, 262
Adam, 295, 296, 301, 302, 305, 306
Adonijah, 237
Adonizedek, 209
Aemilius Scaurus, 336
Ahab, 225, 226, 280, 281, 286
Ahaz, 212n
Ahaziah, 226
Ahijah, 224–225, 227, 228, 279–280, 282–283
Ahimelech, 212, 213, 214
Ahitub, 196, 211, 212, 213, 214
Akhenaton, 150
Alaksandus, 269
Alalakh tablets, 266
Alexander Jannaeus, 326, 327, 336
All Souls' Deuteronomy, 312n
Almon-diblathaim, 309, 316
Alphabet, cuneiform, 112n
Alush, 309, 311
Amalek, 311
Amanus (Ḥamān), Mount, 26–28, 38, 57, 113, 169
Amariah, 196n, 211
Amarna letters, 53, 125, 150–151, 246
Ammon, 105, 221
Ammon, 42
Amorite names, 6n, 11, 14, 20n, 62–64, 67, 249, 265, 268n
Amram, 206
Amurru (DN), 10, 57–58
ʿAnat, 28–29, 31, 34, 112, 117–119, 142n, 149, 179, 184, 185
Anathoth, 207, 237
Antiochus Epiphanes, 334
Antiochus VII Sidetes, 327, 339
Anu, 41, 42
Apocalyptic, 87, 99, 169, 263, 265, 326–346
ʿArad, 200–201, 206, 316
ʿArad letters, 61, 64n, 275
Aram, 226, 262
Araunah, 210n
Aristobulus I, 336
Ark of the Covenant, 37, 81, 89, 89n, 93, 94–97, 100–105, 106–111, 138–144, 199, 231, 231n, 233, 238, 242–243, 243n, 251, 300, 312, 321, 322
Armageddon, 334
Arslan Tash plaque, 17, 17n, 50, 266
Arvad, 37n
Asa, 283
Ascalon, 20n, 31
Asherah, 15, 16, 19, 20n, 28, 29, 31–33, 34, 36–37, 40, 49, 57, 67, 148, 166n, 177, 179, 183–185, 190n
ʿAshtar, 7, 7n, 68, 105n, 160n
ʿAshtart, 7, 21, 29–30, 34
Aššurnirari V, 266
Atargatis (DN), 49n
Azariah, 212

Baal Zephon (placename), 310
Baasha, 222, 225, 280
Baʿl (Baʿl Ṣapōn), 10n, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 28, 30, 40, 43, 48, 50, 56, 59, 64, 66–67, 72, 75, 93, 98–99, 112–120, 140, 142, 147–178, 180, 183–186, 190–231, 261, 264, 344. *See also* Hadad
Baʿl Ḥamōn, 10, 24–28, 35–36
Baʿl Ḥarran (Sin), 10n
Baʿl-peʿor, 201–203, 316
Baʿl Ṣamēm, 7n, 8, 8n
Balaam, 316, 318, 337
Baʿlat (Geba), 28n, 34n
Bamoth, 305n

- Bathsheba, 227, 237
 Beit Lei inscriptions, 160n
 Ben-Hadad, 225, 226
 Bene-Jaakon, 309n
 Bethel, 47, 73, 73n, 74, 75, 89n, 123, 198, 199, 206, 207, 211, 252, 270, 279, 279n, 283, 304, 305, 307
 Bethlehem, 95n
 Buqé'ah, 109n–110n
- Cain, genealogy, 301
 Cappadocian texts, 9–10, 57
 Carmel, 170, 173, 174, 191, 192
 Carthage, 33
 Cassius (Ḥazzi), Mount, 27n, 38, 59, 169
 Cherubim, 74, 207, 231, 246
 Chronicler, 196, 206, 207n, 208, 214, 243n, 252, 255, 255n, 324
 Cilicia, 239n
 Circumcision, 270, 297
 Claudius Albinus, 36
 Cosmogonic myth, 39–43, 120
 Covenant, 232–233, 236–237, 239, 245, 258–261, 261n, 262–274, 287, 294–300, 303–320, 320n
 Covenant-renewal ceremony, 79, 83–86
 “Cursed One,” 337–338, 340
- Dagon (Dagan), 11, 12, 14, 15, 113n
 Dāliyah, Wādī ed-, 328–329
 Damascius, *see* Moschos
 Damascus, 224, 262
 Damascus Document, 330
 Dan, 73n, 74, 197–199, 201, 206, 211, 235n, 279
 Dan'il, 20, 177–178, 182
 Dathan, 205, 315, 318
 David, 42, 72, 74, 81, 86, 93, 97, 97n, 106, 196, 199, 207–215, 220, 220n, 222, 222n, 224, 224n, 227–247, 247nn, 250n, 251–265, 273, 277–287, 332, 334, 341, 343
 Dawn (Šaḥar) (DN), 22–24
 “Day of Yahweh,” 91ff., 229
 Demetrius (III), 335, 336
 Derketō, 31
 Deuteronomistic work (Dtr₁, Dtr₂), 133, 143, 167, 191, 220n, 223–224, 226, 227, 227n, 228, 228n, 232, 233, 240, 241, 243, 244, 246n, 247, 248, 248n, 249–260, 265, 272, 274–289, 293, 312, 320, 324, 343, 344
 Dibon-gad, 309, 316n
- Dinah, 307
 Diodorus Siculus, 26, 31
 Divine Council, 152, 174, 177–186, 346; of Yahweh, 186–190
 Divine Sonship theology, 257–260, 264–265
 Divine Warrior, 40, 58–59, 85, 86, 87, 89, 91–111, 131, 142, 155–177, 229, 239, 258n, 263, 345n
 Dophkah, 309, 311
 Dū-Sarā (DN), 6–7
 Duppi-Tessup, 268n
 Dusk (Šalim) (DN), 22–24
- Eden, 38
 Edom, 105, 124, 130, 227, 315
 'Ēl, 11–75, 89, 99n, 113–119, 147–148, 163, 177–186, 211, 231, 236, 321, 344
 'Ēl 'Elyōn, 46, 47, 48, 50–52, 60, 71, 81, 182, 183, 209, 210
 'Ēl Šadday, 5, 11, 47, 47n, 48, 49, 50, 52–60, 71, 245n, 296, 297, 298, 322–323, 324
 'Ēlat (DN), *see* Asherah
 Eleazar, 96, 196, 199, 205, 211
 Eli, 196, 202, 207n, 208, 213, 214
 Elijah, 75, 191–194, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 280, 281
 Elim, 310, 311
 Elisha, 75, 192, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227
 Elohist (E), 124n, 132n, 134, 198, 200, 209, 270, 272, 273, 293, 304, 310, 313, 313n, 314, 315. *See also* Epic Sources
 Elon-bezaananim, 201
 'Ēn Fešḥah, 326
 'Ēn Gēdi, 331
 Enlil, 41, 42
 Enthronement festival, 79
 Enūma Eliš, 40, 93, 113, 120
 Ephratah, 94–96, 94n
 Epic Sources, 6, 6n, 80, 84, 124, 124n, 125, 134, 143, 167, 169, 174, 182, 183, 185, 200–203, 205, 207, 231n, 253n, 261, 269, 271, 271n, 293–296, 301, 303–312, 315–318, 320, 321, 324, 343–345
 Esau, 301, 301n, 303, 304, 304nn, 307
 Essenes, 330–342
 Eternal Decree of Adoption, *see* Divine Sonship theology
 Etham, Desert of, 309n, 310
 Euphrates, 262
 Ezion-Geber, 315
 Excretion Texts, 54

- Gad, 227, 240, 240n
 Gath, 262, 262n
 Gaza, 263, 263n
 Gershom, 197–198
 Gershon, 206
 Gezer, 263, 339
 Gibeah, 221
 Gibeon, 70
 Gideon, 252
 Gihon, 38
 Gilead, 269
 Gilgal, 84n, 85, 103–105, 105n, 110n,
 123n, 138–144, 192, 220, 224n
 Gnosticism, 83n, 87
 Goshen (Wādī Ṭumeilāt), 9

 Hadad (Haddu, etc.), 10n, 11–13, 21,
 58, 59, 62, 99n, 113n. *See also* Baʿl
 Hadad inscription, 24n
 Hadrumetum (Sousse), 34n, 35, 36
 Ham, 302
 Hamath, 262
 Haradah, 309n
 Hashmonah, 309n
 Ḥasidim, 330, 336, 340
 Ḥaṭṭor, 19, 32, 34, 34nn
 Hazael, 224
 Hazeroth, 309, 315
 Hazor, 201
 Heber, 201
 Ḥeber, Naḥal, 328, 329
 Hebron (city), 206–207, 208, 211, 214–
 215, 230
 Hebron, son of Kohath, 206
 Hegel, 82, 143
 Hermon, Mount, 38
 Herod the Great, 328, 339
 Herodian manuscripts, 329
 Hesiod, 41
 Hezekiah, 212, 283
 Hiel, 338
 History of Redemption (*Heilsgeschichte*)
 School, 82, 83–90
 Hiram, 238, 240, 262
 Hobab, 201
 Holy War, 100, 105–106, 221, 224, 224n,
 225, 226–229, 235n, 333–334
 Hophni, 209n
 Hor, Mount, 309, 315, 316
 Hor-haggidgad (Gudgod), 309n
 Hulda, 286, 286n
 Ḥurriya, 181

 Ilabrat, 9, 9n
 Ilkunirsa (DN, Hittite), 16, 16n
 Isaac, 4, 5, 182, 263, 269, 273, 301, 304,
 304n, 307
 Ishmael, 182, 301, 304n
 Ithamar, 196, 205, 207n, 208
 Izhar, 206

 Jabin, 201
 Jacob, 4, 5, 15, 49, 244, 263, 269, 270,
 273, 297, 301, 303, 304, 304nn, 305,
 307, 337, 338
 Jael, 201
 Japhet, 302
 Jebusites, 81, 99n, 209–211
 Jehoash, 212n, 228n
 Jehoiachin, 277
 Jehoiada, 214
 Jehoiada (the high priest), 212n, 228n
 Jehoram, 283
 Jehoshapat, 226, 283
 Jehu, 222, 224, 225
 Jehu (prophet), son of Hanani, 225, 280
 Jeremiah, 228n, 233n
 Jericho, 316, 327, 329, 331, 337, 338, 339
 Jeroboam, 73, 74, 89n, 197, 199, 207–
 208, 211, 222, 224, 224n, 225, 232,
 252, 265, 275, 279, 279n, 280, 281, 282,
 283, 284, 288
 Jerusalem, 73, 75, 81n, 99n, 123, 143,
 174, 195, 198, 206, 207, 208, 210n,
 230–232, 243, 252, 257, 261, 265, 279n,
 281–285, 288, 329, 332, 334, 335, 338–
 341. *See also* Zion
 Jewish Revolt, 328
 Jezebel, 225, 280, 281
 Jezreel, 222, 225, 280
 Joab, 231n, 237
 Joash, 226, 283
 John Hyrcanus, 327, 339
 Jonathan, 122n
 Jonathan, Maccabaeus, 340–342
 Jonathan, son of Gershom, 197
 Joram, 281
 Joseph, 303n, 304, 307
 Josephus, 327, 330, 336
 Joshua, 192, 197, 249–250
 Josiah, 232, 252, 279, 283, 284, 286, 287–
 289
 Josianic Reform, 106n, 287–289. *See*
also Josiah
 Jotbah, 309n

- Judas Aristobulus, 327
 Judas Maccabaeus, 339
- Kadesh, 315, 315n, 316
 Kadesh-Naphtali, 201, 201n
 Karatepe inscription, 18n
 Kehelah, 309n
 Kendebaios, 339
 Kenites, 200, 206
 Kibroth-hataavah, 309, 315
 Kilamuwa inscription, 10, 24n
 Kirta (Keret), 40, 179, 180–181, 182–183
 Kiryat Ye'ārīm, 94–97, 94n, 242
 Kittiyim, 335
 Kohath, 206
 Königsnovelle, 247–249
 Korah, 205, 206, 315, 318
 Kōtar wa-Ḥassis, 49n, 114–116
 Kumarbi myth, 41, 49n
- Laban, 269, 307
 Lachish, 19, 20n
 Lachish letters, 61, 64n
 Lebanon, 169, 170, 173
 Levi, 197, 200, 206, 334, 337
 Levites, 195–215, 234n, 237, 324. *See also* Aaronid priesthood: Mushites
 Libnah, 206, 309n
 Libni, 206
 Lōtān (Leviathan), 118–120, 156, 162, 345
- Maccabees, 335, 340
 Machpela, Cave of, 294, 303, 305
 Mahli, 206
 Makheloth, 309n
 Mamre, 180
 Manasseh, 265, 275, 277n, 284, 285–286, 287–288, 289
 Marah, 309n, 310
 Marduk, 93
 Mari, 62, 63, 67, 265
 Masada, 329
 Massah, 197, 311
 Matṣ'il, 266
 Mattanah, 309n
 Mattathias Maccabaeus, 339
 Melchizedek, 209, 211
 Meraioth, 196n, 211
 Merari, 206
 Meribah, 197, 311, 315
 Merneptah, 124
 Meroz, 235n
- Meša' Stele, 61, 105
 Messianism, 332–334, 337
 Micaiah, 225, 226
 Midianite League, 71, 105, 200, 200n, 202, 203–204, 205–206, 316
 Migdol, 310
 Milkyatan, 220n
 Miriam, 125, 203–204
 Mīšōru (DN), 161, 161n, 162
 Mizpah, 224n
 Moab, 61, 105, 124, 130, 202, 226, 308, 309, 316, 320
 Moschos (Mochos), 18, 50
 Moseroth (Moserah), 309n
 Moses, 5, 75, 125, 133, 143, 157, 166, 192–193, 195–215, 249, 252, 253, 270, 272, 283, 295, 296, 301, 305, 307, 310, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 321, 333, 334, 337
 Mōt (DN), 26, 40, 58, 116–118, 120, 144, 162, 185
 Murabba'āt, Wādī, 328, 329
 Mursilis I, 268n; II, 268n
 Mushi, 206
 Mushites, 73, 197–215, 232, 234n, 237
 Muwattallis, 269
 "Myth and Ritual" School, 82–83, 86
- Nabataeans, 6–9, 10
 Naboth, 225
 Nadab, 204–205, 314
 Nahaliel, 309n
 Nash Papyrus, 312n
 Nathan, 73, 89n, 210, 227, 227n, 231, 238, 238n, 241–260, 275, 276, 279, 282
 Negeb, 200–201, 316
 Nerab Text, 248n
 New Year festivals, 79, 105, 105n, 123, 123n, 238. *See also* Gilgal
 Ninurta, 41
 Niqmepa, 268n
 Noah, 270, 295, 296, 297, 302, 303, 305, 306
 Nob, 199, 207
 Nora Stone, 220n
 Nušku, 41
- Obededom, 96–97
 Oboth, 309
 Omri, 222, 224
 Oral literature, 112, 112n, 117n, 127n

- Pabel, King of 'Udum, 181
 Palmyra inscription, 24n
 Panamū Inscription, 10, 24n
 Papponymy, 212n
 Paran, Mount, 101, 102
 Paran, wilderness of, 309, 314, 315
 Passover, 79, 84, 103, 123n
 Pharisees, 330, 331, 336
 Philistines, 81n, 124, 130, 219, 221, 262, 263
 Philo Byblius, *see* Sakkunyaton
 Phinehas, 199, 202–203, 209n
 Phoenicians, 219, 238, 239
 Pidrayya, 116, 116n
 Pihahiroth, 310
 Pliny, 330
 Pompey, 334
 Priestly work (Priestly source: P), 124n, 132n, 133, 143, 166, 167, 200–209, 228, 236, 245, 245n, 265, 270–272, 274, 289, 293–325, 343
 Prophecy, 187–194, 223–229, 343, 345–346
 Proto-apocalyptic, 135, 137, 169, 171, 174, 324, 343–346
 Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions (Serābīt el-Ḥādem), 18–19, 32, 50
 Ptāḥ, 19, 19n
 Ptolemy, son of Abubos, 339, 340
 Pumay, 220n
 Punon, 309, 316n
 Qabbalah, 87
 Qadesh, 141
 Qatna, 267n
 Qedar, 105, 105n
 Qudšu, *see* Asherah
 Qumran, 121n, 153n, 213, 214, 234, 312n, 326–342, 345
 Rabbīm, 119
 Rahab, 108, 137, 160–161. *See also* Lōtān; Yamm
 Rahab (the harlot), 133
 Rainbow, 270, 297
 Rākib-'il, 10, 10n, 67, 67n
 Rameses, 310
 Rameses III, 124
 Rašp(u) (DN), 50
 Rebekah, 182, 307
 Rehoboam, 228, 262n, 264, 286
 Rephidim, 308, 311
 "Righteous Teacher," 332, 334, 335, 336, 337, 340, 342
 Rimmon-perez, 309n
 Rissa, 309n
 Rithmah, 309n
 Rule of the Community Scroll, 330, 336
 Sabbath, 270, 295, 296, 298
 Saducees, 330, 331
 Sakkunyaton (Sanchuniathon), 13, 15, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 40, 50, 51, 113, 161n, 168n
 Šam'al, 33
 Samaria Ostraca, 222n
 Šamaš, 10n, 18n
 Šamši-Adad I, 268
 Samuel, 221–222, 221n, 223–224, 224nn, 250, 251, 252, 284
 Šapōn, Mount, 28, 38, 116, 148, 185
 Šapšu (DN), 18n, 40. *See also* Šamaš
 Sarah, 182, 303
 Sardinia, 35, 220n
 Ša'tīqat, 181
 Saul, 122n, 219–222, 222n, 224nn, 229, 230, 233, 250, 251, 252, 260, 284
 Sefire Treaty inscriptions, 10n, 40, 51, 220n, 266
 Seir, 72, 101
 Sekhmet, 35
 Seleucid coins, 327
 Seth, genealogy, 301
 Shamgar, 201
 Sharon, 170, 173
 Shechem, 39, 84n, 85, 105n, 139n, 307
 Shem, genealogy, 301, 302, 305
 Shemaiah, 224n, 228
 Shepher, Mount, 309n
 Shiloh, 73, 74, 105n, 123n, 197–199, 201, 202n, 206, 207, 208, 215, 222, 224, 231, 231n, 232, 238, 242, 242n, 279, 279n, 280
 Shimei, 206, 231n, 237
 Shishak list, 18, 263n
 Shittim, 104, 110n, 141
 Shubna, 220n
 Shur, Desert of, 309n, 310
 Siamun, 263
 Sidon, 142
 Šidqu (DN), 161, 161n, 162, 209
 Simon the Maccabee, 338–342
 Sin (DN), *see* Ba'l Harran
 Sin, wilderness of, 309, 311
 Sinai, 33, 72, 83, 84n, 85, 101, 102, 139n, 163–169, 183, 185, 192, 193, 197, 205n,

- 224, 236, 261, 270, 295, 297–300, 300n, 305, 308, 309, 313, 314, 318–320, 320n, 325
- Sisera, 201
- Solomon, 42, 73, 74, 93, 152, 208, 210, 211, 220, 220n, 221, 222, 222n, 224, 227, 227n, 229, 230, 231, 231n, 234, 237–241, 246, 250n, 252, 255, 260, 260n, 262, 263, 273, 278, 282, 286
- Storm theophany, 156–177, 185, 191, 194, 344
- Sukkōt, 83, 84n, 310
- Sušarra, 268
- Tabernacle, Priestly, 231, 231n, 270, 306, 313, 321
- Tahat, 309n
- Ṭallaya, 116, 116n
- Tamar, 42
- Tannīn, 108
- Tannit (DN), 28–33, 33n, 34, 35
- Tent of David, 232n, 233, 238, 241. *See also* Tabernacle
- Tent of Meeting, 37, 185, 197, 202, 203
- Terah, 296, 301, 302, 303
- Terah Mithkah, 309n
- Testamonia list, 337, 340, 342
- Theogonic creation myth, 39–43, 120
- Tiāmat, 58
- Tryphon, 339, 340
- Typhon myth, 113, 113n, 120
- Tyre, 31, 37n, 44, 210, 211, 240
- Uriah, 212n
- Uziel, 206
- Uzziah, 110n, 212
- Vespasian, 327
- Weeks, Feast of, 84n, 312, 312n
- “Wicked Priest,” 332, 335, 336, 340, 341, 342
- Winchester relief, 34
- Wisdom tradition, 87, 344, 344n
- “Wrathful Lion,” 334, 335
- Yadīd, 26
- Yahwist (J), 124, 124n, 132n, 198, 204, 245n, 261, 262, 263–264, 265, 270, 272, 273, 293, 301, 303, 307, 310, 313n, 314, 315, 320. *See also* Epic Sources
- Yamm (DN), 23, 37, 40, 58, 67, 87, 93, 98–99, 113–116, 119–120, 137, 140, 148, 149, 156, 160, 162, 183, 186, 190n, 345
- Yariḥ (DN), 10n
- Yašub-Addu, 268
- Yeḥawmilk stele, 34n
- Zadok and Zadokite priesthood, 196, 208–215, 227n, 232, 238, 265, 332, 334, 335, 340, 341
- Zagros Mountains, 268
- Zalmonah, 309, 316n
- Zedekiah, 226
- Zerubbabel, 343
- Ziklag, 230
- Zin, wilderness of, 309, 315, 315n, 316
- Zinçirli inscriptions, 10, 67
- Zion, 38, 74, 81, 94, 96, 97n, 106, 109, 137, 143, 169, 172, 174, 210, 211, 260, 279, 282, 288, 296, 334, 338. *See also* Jerusalem
- Zipporah, 204
- Zobah, 262