The eschatology of the psalter: a study in the religious development of Israel as reflected in the book of pslams, with special reference to the destinies of the individual and the nation

Jellicoe, Sidney

THE
ESCHATOLOGY
OF THE PSALTER

A STUDY IN THE RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT OF ISRAEL
AS REFLECTED IN THE BOOK OF PSALMS,
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
THE DESTINIES OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE NATION.

A
THESIS
SUBMITTED BY

SIDNEY JELLICOE
OF ST. CHAD'S COLLEGE

FOR THE DEGREE OF
BACHELOR OF DIVINITY.

EASTER - 1944

C O N T E N T S

PREFATORY NOTE.

The present work is based throughout on the Hebrew text of the Book of Psalms, hence the references are in all cases to the verse or verses in that text, the equivalent in the English (Authorised and Revised) Versions, when varying from the Hebrew, being added in brackets. These, in their turn, differ not infrequently from the Prayer Book Version, as a glance through the "Cambridge Parallel Psalter" will reveal.

The accepted literary abbreviations have been employed: to tabulate these has been considered superfluous. The standard works of reference have been cited as follows:

B.D.B.	"A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, with an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic". F.Brown, S.R.Driver, C.A.Briggs. (Oxford, 1906).
E.Bi.	"Encyclopaedia Biblica". Ed. T.K.Cheyne and J.S.Black. (London, 1899-1903).
Ency.Brit.	"Encyclopaedia Britannica", 14th edn.(London,1929).
E.R.E.	"Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics". Ed. James Hastings. (Edinburgh, 1908-1926).
G-K.	"Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar", as edited and enlarged by the late E.Kautzsch. 2nd English edn., revised in accordance with the 28th German edn.(1909) by A.E.Cowley. (Oxford, 1910).
H.D.B.	"A Dictionary of the Bible." Ed. James Hastings. (Edinburgh, 1898-1904).
J.E.	"Jewish Encyclopaedia." Ed. Isidore Singer. (New York and London, 1901-1905).

While most of these works, in varying proportions, stand in need of revision they nevertheless still contain much which is of value. In the case of B.D.B. an up-to-date edition is overdue. In addition to the above, the following abbreviations should be noted:

Cheyne's works on the Psalter (all publ. London, Kegan Paul), "The Book of Psalms or the Praises of Israel, A new trans. with comm." (1888); "The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of O.T. Criticism and the History of Religions"(Bampton Lectures 1889, publ.1891); "The Book of Psalms translated from a revised text with Notes and Introduction" (2 vols., 1904), a declension on his earlier works (see p. 41 below), -- these three works are cited respectively as Cheyne (1888), Origin, and Cheyne (1904).

The names, Perowne, Kirkp(atrick), Briggs, Barnes, refer respectively (unless otherwise stated) to these writers' commentaries on the Psalms, each of two volumes except Kirkpatrick (in "Cambridge Bible") where the edition in one volume (1902+) has been used. References to Perowne, first published in 1864 and still of great value, especially for the Versions and quotations from Rabbinic and later Jewish writings, are to the 7th edn. (1890). Briggs (in I.C.C) was first published in 1906, and W. Emery Barnes (in Westm.Comm.) in 1931. W.T. Davison and T. Witton Davies (in Cent. Bi.) bear no date.

Dr. Oesterley's two-volume work, "The Psalms, trans. with text-critical and exegetical notes", (London, 1939), is cited as Oest., followed by the volume and page; his earlier work of 1937, "A Fresh Approach to the Psalms" in the "International Library of Christian Knowledge", being referred to as Oest., "Fr. App." The abbreviation Oest. & Rob. relates, unless otherwise stated, to Oesterley and (Theodore H.) Robinson: "Hebrew Religion, its Origin and Development", 2nd, revised and enlarged, edn., (London, 1937).

Dr. & Gray indicates S.R.Driver and G.B.Gray: "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job" in I.C.C. (1921), part I consisting of Introduction, translation, and exegetical notes, and part II of philological notes (both in one volume), a work which the present writer has found indispensable. S.R.Driver's well-known "Parallel Psalter" (2nd edn., Oxford, 1904) is cited as Dr.//Psr.

P.C. and N.C. denote respectively the one-volume Commentaries edited by Peake (1919; Supplement ed. A.J.Grieve 1936) and Gore (1928). Symbols used for other series of Commentaries are too well-known to need repetition.

Works comprising upwards of one volume are usually cited by the number of the volume in small Roman numerals followed by that of the page in Arabic figures (e.g., ii 343). A small 'a' and 'b' denote respectively the left- and right-hand columns in a work of double-column format, sq. and sqq. in such cases referring to the following column or columns.

Dates given in parentheses are those of the initial publication of a work, reprinting being ignored unless representing a revised edition, in which case the number of the edition and date are cited. For convenience' sake details of a work are sometimes repeated in full instead of employing an 'op. cit.', especially when a former reference occurs at a much earlier stage.

Pentateuchal analysis is based on the 9th edition (1913) of S.R. Driver's "Introd. to the Literature of the O.T."

Biblical references, where no book is indicated, are to the Book of Psalms. An index of Psalm passages will be found at the end of the work.

The 'Vulgate' (Vulg.) of the Psalms is the Gallican Version, which Jerome (Jer.) did not succeed in displacing in the usage of the Church (see further, Briggs i, p.xxxi sq.).

The letter 'v', followed by a full point = 'vide', otherwise = the numeral five, of volume or chapter. Articles in standard works of reference are cited in capitals. 'Infra' and 'supra' relate in all cases to the present work.

The obelisk (†) in lexicographical references indicates that all passages in the Old Testament in which the word or phrase occurs are cited.

THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF ESCHATOLOGY.

He who embarks upon the study of any particular subject, especially when that study involves the attempt to elucidate the outstanding problems inherent in the subject-matter, soon finds himself in concert with Sir James Frazer when the latter declares[1] that "the full solution of any one problem involves the solution of many more; nay, that nothing short of omniscience could suffice to answer all the questions implicitly raised by the seemingly simplest inquiry." Lines of investigation are opened up "which branch out in many directions; and in following them we are insensibly drawn on into wider and wider fields of inquiry."[2] What is true of the study of folk-lore is equally, if not more abundantly, true of any branch or sub-division of theological study: for none of these may be pursued in isolation. This may the more easily be apprehended by a comparison with the ever-increasing ramifications of the "sciences". Though any branch may reach the stage where it claims excision from the parent stem and elevation to the status of an autonomous science, it does not thereby become independent and self-contained; rather does its continued prosecution contribute to a sounder knowledge of its kindred branches, while itself receiving both stimulus and lumination from their growth. A glance at "the vast and diversified landscape which is con-

stituted by the various sciences commonly grouped together under the comprehensive title of 'Theology'"[1], as set out in systematic form by Dr. N.P. Williams in the course of his comprehensive essay "What is Theology?"[2], shows at once the independence, but still more clearly the interdependence, of "that which every joint supplieth."

As compared with the research worker in one of the physical sciences, the student of any particular branch of theological inquiry finds himself at the outset destined to labour under at least two disadvantages. Firstly, whereas the former has usually at his disposal an abundance of material and is in a position continually to create anew, as often as may be needed, the conditions required for the purpose of further experiment and research, the latter, especially in the field of Old Testament studies, is confined to a very limited collection of documents themselves of such a nature that before he can effectively deal with their subject-matter questions of date, authorship (single or composite, original or redactional), and philology, first claim attention. In regard to the last-mentioned, which is basic, the difficulties are formidable. "It must never be forgotten" writes Professor G.R. Driver[3], "that classical Hebrew is not a language well known, like Greek, from a vast body of very diverse types of literature, but one confined to a small set of books handling almost exclusively a single theme,

and that consequently, even within the narrow limits of that theme, (italics mine) there must necessarily be, owing to the lack of any other documents from which to draw comparisons, much that is obscure." More recently Professor D. Winton Thomas has drawn attention to the same problem. In his inaugural lecture on succeeding to the Chair of Hebrew at Cambridge, he raises the question of the adequacy of the Old Testament for the study of Hebrew. His reply is unequivocal. "To ask this question is at once to lay bare the problem. We have the Old Testament,—but how meagre a monument it is of a people's literature! It is important, for the proper understanding of the problem before us, that clear recognition should at the outset be given to the fact that the Hebrew literature which the Old Testament preserves is but a part, and a small part, of an extensive Hebrew literature, which has otherwise failed to survive. How extensive a literature the Hebrews possessed we can only guess..... But certain considerations point to the disappearance of a considerable Hebrew literature..... And again we think of the fact that many, if not most, of the apocryphal books were originally written in Hebrew. Considerations of this kind impress upon us the essential fact that the Old Testament, representing as it does a very small part of the literature of the Hebrews, can preserve only a fraction of the Hebrew language. It

cannot then of itself provide a sufficient basis for the study of ancient Hebrew."[1]

In spite of the abundance of new material which has come to light[2] - much of it within our own times - and the remarkable advances in comparative Semitic philology, the problem still remains acute.

To pass over the problems of literary criticism which next face the student of the Old Testament, we arrive at the second of the difficulties mentioned above, which belongs to an entirely different sphere of reference. This consists in the nature of the subject-matter, and turns upon the definition of terms. Although the interdependence of the concrete physical sciences has been readily conceded, it is nevertheless not a matter of great difficulty to determine the subject-matter proper ~~of~~ to each.

If within theological studies we may distinguish between the more "concrete" and the more "abstract", we should find that the former were in concord with the physical sciences in that the boundaries of their subject-matter may be fairly clearly marked out. To the former belong such branches as biblical archaeology, philology and that "humble handmaid in the great task of Bible study"[3] - textual criticism, while the more abstract would embrace, for example, the philosophy and psychology of religion, together with our own particular subject, eschatology.

Here we are at once faced with the vexed problem of definition, - the logomachies of the logicians. While it remains beyond our purview to discuss this matter in any detail, some attempt must be made, perforce, to mark out the road over which we must travel; for, in the words of John Stuart Mill:- "Whether a name is to be used as an instrument of thinking, or as a means of communicating the result of thought, it is imperative to determine exactly the attribute or attributes which it is to express; to give it, in short, a fixed and ascertained connotation."[1] But this, as suggested above, is in the case of abstract terms by no means easy, especially in regard to the definition of a particular science itself, which definition must necessarily be "progressive and provisional."[2] "To define," says the same writer, "is to select from among all the properties of a thing, those which shall be understood to be designated and declared by its name; and the properties must be well known to us before we can be competent to determine which of them are fittest to be chosen for this purpose. Accordingly, in the case of so complex an aggregation of particulars as are comprehended in anything which can be called a science the definition we set out with is seldom that which a more extensive knowledge of the subject shews to be the most appropriate. Until we know the particulars themselves, we

cannot fix upon the most correct and compact mode of circumscribing them by a general description. . . . As much, therefore, as is to be expected from a definition placed at the commencement of a subject, is that it should define the scope of our inquiries."[1]

'Prima fronte', eschatology might appear to be patient of comparatively straightforward definition, the connotation being implicit in the etymology of the word itself. In this connexion we cannot do better than quote the summary of Dr. A.E. Garvie: "Eschatology (the doctrine of last things) is a theological term derived from the New Testament phrases 'the last day' (ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, John vi 39), 'the last times' (ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων, I Pet. i 20), 'the last state' (τὰ ἔσχατα, Matt. xii 45), a conception taken over from ancient prophecy (Isa. ii 2, Mal. iv 1). . . . . The use of the term, however, has been extended so as to include all that is taught in the Scriptures about the future life of the individual as well as the final destiny of the world."[2]

It is this extension which makes the task of definition, so necessary at the outset, one of no small difficulty. What are we to include, and even more important, what may we with safety exclude? For the future life of the individual must, in a morally-ordered world, be inextricably bound up with the quality of his life upon earth, while the final destiny

of the world at once raises the question of its creation, and the purpose which, "in the beginning", evoked the Divine 'fiat'. Here already are two distinct fields of study, ethology and cosmology, which, in so far as they relate to our subject, cannot be excluded if a proper understanding and a right perspective be sought. Indeed, some have seen in man and the created universe the principal factors in the science of eschatology. Thus, in the volume devoted to eschatology in the Pohle-Preuss series, it is asserted that "eschatology is anthropological and cosmological rather than theological; for though it deals with God as the Consummator and Universal Judge, strictly speaking its subject is the created universe: i.e., man and the cosmos."[1] Such a judgment might be in accordance with the traditional conspectus of the subject, conceived as "the department of theological science concerned with 'the four last things: death, judgement, heaven, and hell'".

This is the definition in the "New (Oxford) English Dictionary"[2], where three examples of usage are cited. It is perhaps a little unfortunate that it is the last of these which alone has found a place in the abridgement.[3] Culled from the writings of James Baldwin Brown the younger[4], it is illuminating as expressing a view widely held at that period

when the floodgates of materialism and mechanistic theory were opened on the world: "Eschatology, the science of the last things, is, as a science, one of the most baseless."[1]

The judgment is not altogether without justification. Identifying eschatology with apocalyptic, "the logical mind of Latin Christianity took the symbolism of the Apocalyptists 'au pied de la lettre,' and then gradually worked it up into the coherent system of Heaven, (Purgatory) and Hell, which till recently dominated European religious thought."[2] Thus was the tawdry vehicle mistaken for the content, which was allowed to suffer an obscurity and distortion[3] now so well known as to render further illustration or amplification superfluous.

But the fresh light which the past half-century has thrown upon the subject renders such a definition as that just quoted, and such a judgment as that of Pohle-Preuss, too narrow. The common tendency to identify eschatology with apocalyptic is a confusion not wholly surprising, since it was the rediscovery of the extra-canonical Pseud-epigrapha with its large apocalyptic content which has illuminated and influenced eschatological studies as at no time before. Dispelled for all time is the once-prevalent idea that "between Malachi and the Christian era there was a period

of silence, in which there was no inspiration and no prophet, and no development in religious thought and experience, and that Christianity practically leapt full-grown into life at the beginning of the Christian era, unbeholden to these so-called years of silence."[1] Recent discovery and research have revealed the existence of pseudepigraphical sections within the Old Testament canon itself,[2] and have established a genetic connexion between the two Testaments. Perhaps in no respect has the contribution furnished by this new knowledge been more fruitful than in the revolution it has brought about in our ideas of the "Kingdom of God." "The great discovery of the age in which we live is the immense prominence given in the Gospel to the Kingdom of God. To us it is quite extraordinary that it figures so little in the theology and religious writings of almost the entire period of Christian history."[3]

But to regard apocalyptic as synonymous with eschatology, or their provinces as co-terminous, is an identification almost entirely false.[4] Prophecy has its eschatology no less than apocalyptic: "With each it (i.e. eschatology) is in part synonymous. Eschatology is strictly the doctrine of the last things; and is no more to be identified with apocalyptic than it should be with prophecy - a most radical blunder that has been made recently by many English and German scholars. Prophetic eschatology is the child of prophecy, and apocalyptic

eschatology is the child of apocalyptic. As might be expected, the two eschatologies by no means agree."[1]

Having concluded, in the light of modern research, that the traditional tetrad -- death, judgment (regarded as one single future assize[2]), heaven and hell (each conceived as immutable states of being[3]) -- can no longer be regarded as a sufficient basis of investigation for eschatological inquiry, and having seen that its province is much wider than that of apocalyptic alone; and further, having in mind the 'caveat' of Mill,[4] we must frame our tentative initial definition in terms sufficiently wide as not to exclude any contributory factor which might illumine, albeit even indirectly, the path to be trodden. The definition should be therefore in general rather than in particular, and therefore restrictive, terms. We shall then be in a position to follow out the argument "whithersoever it might lead us", unfettered by any limited connotation which the term might traditionally have borne. Though the tree might be known by its fruits, and not its roots,[5] it is nevertheless dependent upon them and the soil from which they draw their life-giving properties for every moment of its existence. Not less might it be said of eschatology that any attempt to understand and appreciate its nature and signification must see its roots in Creation, and its growth in Israel "in the mortal strife of spiritual experience."[6] Hence it must be viewed in a wider 'milieu' than it has occupied in the highly speculative

and often lurid tetrachotomy of the Christian era. As Charles rightly insists, eschatology "cannot be studied in and by itself alone. It must be dealt with in connexion with theology, that is, the doctrine of God, or the particular forms which the conception of God assumed in the course of Israel's history."[1] Ethical questions, too, will claim a hearing, as will narrower, but no less important data from such fields as cosmogony and comparative religion. In short, nothing may be safely excluded which might impoverish our survey: Our terms of reference must be wide enough to draw upon any branch of study which might have any bearing upon the task to which we have set our hand.

Farmer[2] makes a useful distinction between a wider and narrower sense in which the term might be employed. In the wider sense, any statement about the ultimate destiny of the individual, or the world in general, might be held to fall within the ambit of eschatological studies. Thus the fate of the universe as predicted in the law of Entropy[3] ("the new 'Götterdämmerung'")[4] is, in the wider sense of the term, an eschatological theory, though having no necessary connexion with theological speculation. It is, however, with the narrower use of the term that we shall be mainly concerned in what follows. Although not wholly excluding the wider use, we shall find it more convenient generally to restrict the term to the religious sphere, and thus regard it, in its theological signification, as the doctrine - or, more correctly,

doctrines[1] - of the ultimate destiny of man and the world in the light of the purpose of God, as understood by the representative succession of writers./The last phrase is of supreme importance, for, apart from this overt purpose, Biblical eschatology would be meaningless. As Farmer tersely expresses it: "It is the thought of God as determining the ultimate outcome of things, whatever this may be, which, according to this usage, constitutes a doctrine specifically eschatological."[2]

It is for this reason that to regard, with Pohle-Preuss, eschatology as primarily anthropological and cosmological is misleading.[3] It might be thus conceived pantheistically or atheistically, although it is quite certain, as well from the immediate context as from the contents of the volume as a whole, that the author's conception throughout is conditioned by Christian theological pre-suppositions. Jewish eschatology, no less than Christian, is bound up inextricably with history, and with history as the background against which is enacted the drama of God's purpose expressing itself in Creation as its initial act, and unfolding itself in successive - though by reason of the very perverseness of the actors, not always/in progressive - acts.[4] Nevertheless, the final act, the climax for which the whole of the preceding drama is in a sense preparatory, is conceived of throughout, not - to employ a phrase made popular by Sir E. Ray Lankester - as

"the Kingdom of Man"[1] but of God. In the words of that fine scholar of a former generation: "The Old Testament...is what might be called Theocentric. Jehovah operates; He accomplishes all; and He finds the motives of His operations in Himself. Hence the final condition of the world is not in the Old Testament the issue of a long ethical development in human society, ending in a perfect moral world of kingdom of righteousness upon the earth. The final condition is rather due to an interposition, or a series of interpositions, of Jehovah. These interpositions, of course, are all on moral lines; in the interests of righteousness they are to make an end of sin and bring in everlasting righteousness, and the issue is a kingdom of righteousness. But the issue is due to a sudden act, or a sudden appearance, of God, and is not the fruit of a growth in the hearts of mankind."[2]

It is in this very fact that the late-lamented Dr. Edwyn Bevan has seen the distinction between the two main stems to which the now living religions of mankind belong. That distinction is not between East and West, or between Aryan and Semite, but rests upon a radical difference in conceptions of God. Hebraic religion, with its representative branches (Christianity, Judaism and Islam,) derives its distinctive character, as against Greek and Hindu philosophical thinking, by its regarding God as righteous Will rather than as timeless Being, and by its conceiving of the world process as

the realisation of a Divine purpose moving through a series of unique events to its final consummation.[1] "History," Dr. Whale has reminded us, "is God's roaring loom. That is why eschatology is the Christian teleology"[2] — as it was with Israel of old. It was the genius of the writer of that apocalypse, which later was adjudged a fitting conclusion to the canonical Scriptures, to commend this very truth to a Greek-speaking world under the symbol of Alpha and Omega.[3] But the symbol is Greek in form only: the truth which underlies it was conceived in the spiritual matrix of Israel.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

(I) EARLIER STAGES OF BELIEF.

Jahveh, the Group, and the Individual.

It is sometimes asserted that there is a place for a full-scale work on the theology of the Psalter, or, better still, of the Old Testament itself.[1] If by this is meant something in the nature of a 'Summa Theologica' such a demand must be void of accomplishment. By the very nature of the Old Testament any treatment of its subject-matter must be historical: for in it we are dealing, not with fully developed static doctrines (if any doctrine may, in fact, properly be regarded as static), but with a record of man's feeling after God, a long and arduous process of trial and error.[2] Thus there must be as many "theologies" of the Old Testament, and therefore of the Psalter (which, in modern parlance, might be described not inaptly as a "running commentary" upon Old Testament religion[3]) as there are stages in the growth of its religious ideas. It is impossible, as Wardle[4] rightly insists, to set forth a "theology of the Psalter."

Already it has been pointed out that to see eschatology in its true perspective nothing may with safety be neglected in the sphere of the present life, by which eschatology is conditioned and of which it is the final consummation. It will be necessary, therefore, to treat of the development of the religious ideas of Israel in general, so far as these have direct bearing on the final state of man, with special reference to their occurrence in

the Book of Psalms.

The sequentiality of the state of the future life and one's conduct in this, which for centuries has been a commonplace in all religions except those which are sometimes described as "unmoral" or "praeter-moral,"[1] is unknown in the earliest stages of the religion of Israel. So long as ideas of sin were bound up with 'mana' and 'taboo'[2], and the emotions aroused in the individual strictly "ambivalent"[3], no conception of sin as the deliberate transgression of a known moral law could, in fact, arise.[4] It is true that here, as later, sin is regarded as that of which the deities disapprove, but as their thoughts and actions are governed by caprice rather than righteous will, man can have only a 'post eventum' knowledge of sin,[5] which might or might not serve him aright on a subsequent occasion. That this fear of unwitting offence was not altogether dispelled by the coming of "ethical monotheism" is seen, for example, in Ps. xix 13 (12)sq. in the distinction between "secret faults" (שְׁגִיאוֹת)[6] and "presumptuous sins" (זֵדִים),[7] the Law providing atonement in the case of the former[8], while the latter were adjudged incapable of admitting of atonement.[9]

A further and more important reason for the lack of the bearing of the character of the individual upon his status in a future life was the position which he was held to occupy in the eyes of Jahveh and in relation to his fellow-men. Jahveh was not concerned primarily with the individual 'qua' individual, but rather with the family, tribe, or wider community of which the

individual formed a part, a method which "obliterated the rights of the individual, or under which, at least, the individual did not come into the prominence that belonged to him."[1] Thus, as Wheeler Robinson points out, the increasing "social consciousness" of the present time is not, as is often naively supposed, something entirely new in the history of civilisation, but has been prominent at other periods of human development, with results "which, from the modern standpoint, are often startling, and even immoral."[2] At the same time, there has been a tendency in some writers to overstress the aspect of "corporate personality", upon which more will be said below. For the present it will suffice to assert that personal desires were subordinated to the larger issue of the welfare of the group, so that, broadly speaking, as far as as this life is concerned individual retribution does not at this stage feature prominently, still less in the nebulous state of existence which awaited the soul at death.

As all ideas regarding this life and the next hinge ultimately upon the conception of God, it will be necessary in the first place to determine, as far as the material at our disposal enables us to do so, the nature of these beliefs in pre-prophetic Israel. This is the more necessary in the case of Hebrew eschatology for two reasons: firstly because, as mentioned above, eschatology itself involves more than simply "the last things," and cannot therefore, if a balanced view is at all desired, be studied 'in vacuo'; and secondly for the important reason to which R.H.Charles directs attention at the beginning of his monumental work, "A

Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life"[1], namely, that if we attempt to treat of those passages which relate to the after-world alone --- and this is true of the whole field from Mosaism to the dawn of the Christian era --- we should find ourselves compelled to deal with isolated data, and with sources which are often defective and coloured by a later environment, with the result that attempts to trace any semblance of coherence and orderly development would be entirely out of the question. It should not, however, be supposed that the religious development of Israel followed a regular upward path from a primitive corpus of ideas common to ancient Semitic peoples to the finest heights attained by the greatest of the spiritual mentors of the Hebrews, for in the long course of the "divine education" (to borrow Lessing's phrase) of the people of God retrogression all too often played its inevitable part. Yet in spite of this a steady advance was made, thus enabling us rightly to speak of a "development" which has made Israel's religious history unique in the annals of the world.[2]

There is no need for our present purpose to discuss the origin of Jahvism, which is still --- and perhaps will ever remain --- veiled in impenetrable obscurity. We may accept its universal attribution to Moses[3], "one of the most remarkable figures that have ever passed across the stage of history[4]," a figure so important that, as the same writers have remarked elsewhere, had we no record of him, it would have been necessary to invent him.[5] He it was who welded together the tribes of the Exodus and imparted to them the consciousness of their being a "peculiar people."[6] In this

act of choosing, Jahveh had Himself taken the initiative, sealing that choice in a renewal of the "covenant relationship" earlier established with the Patriarchs (Gn. ix 9 sqq., xvii 1 sqq.(P); xv 18 (J); Dt. xxvi 17 sq.). In return for their loyal service He undertakes to give them a country (Ex. iii 7-17(JE);vi 2-8(P)). This will involve hostilities with greater and mightier nations, but He will lead their armies and fight their battles (Dt. i 28-30; iv 37 sq. Cf. Jg. v 4 sq.; Ps. lxviii 8(7)sq., lxxviii 52-4,etc.). Whatever meaning the later exponents of transcendence might have attached to the appellation "Jahveh of Hosts" it is certain that at this stage it denotes the God of the armies of Israel.[1] So deeply seated did the term become in the vocabulary of the nation that it appears throughout its literature, occurring in the Psalter alone fifteen times.[2]

For long, Jahveh was a "local" God, dwelling, when first He meets Israel, at Sinai (or Horeb)[3]; His presence among His people, as they take up their journeyings, is represented by the Ark.[1] Yet, in spite of the prevalence of primitive ideas, there is within Mosaism the seed of ethical monotheism; the Covenant presupposes the quality of good faith both on the part of Jahveh and upon that of Israel, a quality which is extended to cover the relationship between man and man (cf. Ps. lv 21(20)), and which follows from the integrity of Jahveh and His care for His people. Although judgment may be administered by Moses and his subordinates, that judgment is always conceived of as Jahveh's.[4]

Passing on to the period of the "conquest" and settlement in

Canaan, Jahveh, Who has hitherto marched at the head of His people, now assumes suzerainty in the land which He has given. An important point arises here, which had far-reaching consequences for the eschatology of the individual. Although He might be more powerful than other gods, Jahveh was nevertheless but one among many. While the ancient tradition still persists that the Sinaitic region is His proper home[1] there appears a growing conviction that the land which He has given to His people is His land: within its confines He is supreme, and He alone is to be worshipped.[2] But to those confines His jurisdiction is limited: within alien territory other gods prevail, and demand the allegiance of their subjects, whether of permanent or temporary domicile. That this was the view accepted in Israel is clear from many well-known and oft-quoted passages in the literature of that people. Milcom is the god of Ammon; Ashtoreth of the Sidonians; Chemosh of Moab.[3] David's lament on his pursuit by Saul is that he has been deprived of his customary worship of Jahveh and compelled to serve other gods.[4] Naaman, on resolving henceforth to serve the God of Elisha alone, takes the cumbersome step of transporting to his own territory some of Jahveh's soil upon which to practise his devotions.[5] As late as the Exile the writer of Psalm xlii-xliii[6] counts it his greatest sorrow that he is leaving his God behind him as he goes into captivity, and the same plaintive note is struck in cxxxvii 4:

"How shall we sing Jahveh-songs: in a strange land?"

This localisation of Jahveh's territory had an important bearing on the nature of the after-life. If absence, temporary or permanent,

excluded the Hebrew from the worship of his God, death was held to be the final rupture in that relationship, eternal and without hope of restoration: for Jahveh's jurisdiction being co-terminous with the boundaries of Palestine, He could have no dealings with the departed, whose abode, Sheol, was conceived of as external to that land.

Before proceeding to examine the prominent position which the Sheol doctrine occupied in Old Testament thought, and in that of the psalmists in particular, we would direct attention to the supreme factor which evinces itself in the earliest stages of Hebrew religion and history, and which remains dominant throughout. In all, Jahveh is paramount: He has taken the initiative, and all things derive from Him. In the course of a fine essay on "The Contents of the (Old Testament) Literature" Professor Hempel has said: "As understood by the Israelite, history is at all times the activity of God."[1] (Italics the original writer's). So strongly does this conviction pervade the Old Testament documents that it is no exaggeration to aver with the same writer that "even in cases where there is no call to speak of God or His rule, as in the ..... Davidic history and -- in quite another way -- in the Book of Esther, there is discernable in the background, for those who will see it, a belief in a retributive and providential activity of God."[2] It is this fundamental belief -- nay more, unquenchable conviction -- that "God is working His purpose out as year succeeds to year" which gives meaning and content to Hebrew eschatology, both individual and national, at whatever level it may, at any particular moment, have reached.

The Sheol Doctrine.

As the nature of Sheol and the state of the departed within its confines is a constantly recurring theme in the Psalter it must occupy our attention in some detail. We shall first make a brief survey of the doctrine as it appears in the Old Testament, after which every occurrence of the actual term in the Psalter will be recorded and examined as necessary. This will be followed, in turn, by a review of the various synonyms employed by the psalmists for Sheol itself and for its inhabitants.

It may be well, at the outset, to enter a 'caveat'. If we expect to find clear and self-consistent ideas, we are inviting disappointment. Logically compatible ideas are rarely to be found in religious belief even as affecting the present life. It is not only the bigot ('pace' Dr. Inge), whose ideas are of "amazing crudity" because he has not thought them out, whose mind is stocked with inconsistencies, but also the genuine seeker after truth who finds himself, in the end, faced with antinomies, and often in large measure destined to share a similar fate. Further, when thought leaves the present world and enters upon the highly speculative realm of the next, even more glaring inconsistencies are to be expected, and do, in fact, appear. Charles, in the course of his work mentioned above[1], is continually drawing attention to mutually incompatible ideas which persist side by side, and which do not admit of resolution.[2]

Scholars are divided on the question of whether the Hebrew beliefs regarding Sheol are the result of direct borrowing from

Babylonian sources[1], themselves original, or whether both Hebrew and Babylonian are themselves derived independently from a common pre-Semitic source. As much still remains obscure regarding the nature of this pre-Semitic source[2] the matter must remain one for conjecture, and were its nature authentically established the question would still remain whether Hebrew ideas represented a primary or secondary stage of borrowing. One thing is certain: Hebrew beliefs regarding the after-world are not peculiar to that people, as the parallels to be noted will make abundantly clear. While affinities with Babylonian ideas are frequent, and often striking, Egyptian ideas relative to the state of the dead, although of a highly developed nature, appear to have had little influence upon Hebrew thought. The closest resemblance between the two peoples, Hebrew and Egyptian, in the matter of their extant writings, is of a purely "literary" nature.[3] Perhaps the most important feature of the supposed indebtedness of the Jew to Egypt is in the rise of the "Messianic hope", but this view must be regarded as being far from established by its advocates.[4] Far more potent than Egyptian influence was that of Persia, but as this was chiefly of an "apocalyptic" nature it finds little place in the Book of Psalms.

No attempt can be made in a work such as the present to provide anything in the nature of a systematic commentary on the Psalter. The method of treatment must be, in the main, selective; but in view of the prominence accorded to Sheol in the thought of the Psalmists, its hold upon the imagination of the Hebrews, and

long-continued persistence, it must occupy the major portion of the present study. Nor will it be possible to discuss in detail the dating of individual psalms and psalm-passages, especially as the attempt -- once so characteristic -- to assign precise dates has now been almost universally abandoned, a point on which more will be said at a later stage.[1] For the present it may be remarked that, in common with many other Old Testament passages where the only available evidence for dating is scanty or ambiguous, such a process must, in the last resort, be almost entirely subjective. The view here adopted is that the Psalter, as we know it to-day, is not earlier than the beginning of the third century, B.C., and that just as in the case of the Hebrew text there are forms that "have survived the levelling labours of the Massoretes",[2] thereby furnishing the philologist with valuable data for his study of the growth of the language, so there are early passages which have fortunately escaped the attention of a tendentious redactor and furnish parallel data to the exegete.

In Babylonia, the abode of the dead is a mighty place situated under the earth, in the depths of the mountain Aralû, with its entrance in the west, the region of sunset.[3] It is interesting to note that Kautzsch draws attention to the suggestion of Zimmern that שְׁאוֹל may be an Hebraic form of the Babylonian Shil(l)am (=west).[4] I Enoch xxii, which gives a very detailed account of Sheol, places it in the west, but this is the only passage in the Jewish writings, canonical and otherwise, which so locates it. Charles[5] sees in the passage[6] the influence of Greek ideas, noting that in all other sections of Enoch the Hebrew view prevails.

This view seems to connect Sheol exclusively with the underworld without any reference to fixed geographical location, although the mountainous association of I Enoch xxii 1 ("And (Uriel) showed me in the west another great and high mountain of hard rock) would appear to be borne out by the poetical allusion of Jonah ii 7(6):

"To the bottoms of the mountains I descended;
The earth with her bars was about me for ever: ..."

In the Psalter alone, references to the subterranean location of Sheol are frequent, as will be seen later. Like "them that go down to the Pit" is the condition of those upon earth from whom Jahveh withholds communion (xxviii 1). In xxx 3(2) the writer, delivered from a sickness nigh unto death, and meditating on "what is now and what has been", cries:

"Jahveh, Thou hast brought up my soul from Sheol;
Thou hast kept me alive from them that go down to the Pit."

Horror of the Pit recurs later in the psalm, bringing to mind the poignant background of lxxxviii, "the saddest psalm in the whole Psalter."[1] A sudden, living descent into Sheol is regarded by another psalmist as the only fitting end for a perfidious companion with whom the writer had been on terms of table-fellowship.[2]

Milton's "Total eclipse without all hope of day"[3] would serve as an exceedingly apt description of the state of the departed in Sheol. The aspect assumed is, on the whole, of a negative rather than positive existence; lying in dark places, in the bowels of the earth, perhaps even under the sea, the soul, deprived of its once-cherished communion with God, is left to occupy itself in an all-pervading silence: for

"The dead praise not Jah,
Neither any that go down into silence."[1]

When man returns to his earth, in that day his very thoughts perish;[2] Jahveh, for His part, remembers him no more.[3] To those lying in the land of forgetfulness Jahveh's loving-kindness, His faithfulness, His wonders, cannot be made manifest.[4] Nor is there, at this stage, any hope of restoration. Within "the gates of death"[5] the soul is fast bound and cannot come forth: the "stranger and sojourner"[6] after enjoying communion with his God during a brief life here upon earth is destined to pass his days for ever in "the land of no return" -- the 'irsit la tari (tarat)' of the Babylonian cosmogony. How closely the Hebrew resembles the Babylonian will be clear from the following description from the "Descent of Ishtar":

"To the land without return, the earth . . .
(Set) Ishtar, the daughter of Sin, her ear.
The daughter of Sin set her ear
To the dark house, the dwelling of Irkalla,
To the house, from which he who enters never emerges,
To the way, going on which has no turning back,
To the house, into which he who enters is without light,
When dust is their nourishment, clay their food,
They see not light, they sit in darkness,....
Dust (rusts) on door and bolt."[7]

Unlike the Hebrew, the Babylonian abode of the departed has its pantheon, the creation of the "theologians of the Euphrates Valley".[8] The chief of this pantheon is not a god, but a goddess, Eresh-kigal, whose marriage to Nergal is described on one of the Tell el-Amarna tablets.[9]

Alongside the privative notions regarding the dead, which have been mentioned above, there appears to have persisted, in

spite of the 'Tendenzmeldungen' of the prophets, a firm conviction that the inhabitants of the other world were not altogether in a state of supineness -- at least so far as mental and emotional activity was concerned. Superior knowledge was often attributed to them, as witness the term (ם)ידעני[1] and the widespread and prolonged practice of necromancy, to eradicate which the eighth century prophets and their successors sought to establish what has been described as the "official" doctrine of Sheol.[2] Nescience can hardly be compatible with Rachel's weeping for her children,[3] or (according to a possible interpretation of the passage) the Servant's 'post-obitum' satisfaction.[4] Nor is the cognitive faculty entirely dulled, or the power of communication or of sentience withdrawn in the vivid descriptions of the dead in Ezekiel[5] and Isaiah.[6] The evidence, however, both Hebrew and Babylonian, scanty as it is, seems to point to the fact that superior knowledge was confined to those who had already been endowed with it in this life. In the case of the former, the summoning of Samuel will spring readily to mind,[7] while Babylonian sources furnish a somewhat parallel incident in the appearance of Ea-bani to Gilgamesh.[8] To bring back the dead is, according to I Sam. xxviii 15, to "disquiet"[9] them: Samuel's message is one of impending catastrophe in the things of this world,[10] while Ea-bani has even gloomier tidings of the nature of the world to come.[11]

The most striking consideration, from the point of view of religious development, in regard to the condition of the dead is the entire absence of any ethical element. There is no

question of reward or punishment for deeds done in the flesh: all alike, both good and bad, share the same fate. Even the normal existence in Sheol requires as its preliminary an act entirely outside the power of the individual concerned, namely, proper burial.[1] If Charles is right in supposing that Sheol was a natural extension of the family grave,[2] burial would follow as a 'sine qua non' of entrance into it. Cremation was rare[3] (and on Charles's showing the reason would readily be apparent) and was, in fact, regarded as an injury to the dead: hence it was prescribed in extreme cases only, to render the death sentence more severe.[4] In the more humane Deuteronomic legislation, even the criminal who is impaled must be buried before nightfall.[5] The aversion to cremation, and the insistence upon proper burial,[6] was in all probability bound up with the current belief that soul and body should remain united even in death. Nor was this insistence upon burial wholly altruistic, for the spirit, if not bound in burial to the body, would be left to wander seeking rest, and might, in its wanderings, disturb the living. Although references to non-burial, and the indignity which it implied, are fairly frequent in the Old Testament,[7] and receive mention in the Babylonian writings,[8] there is in the Psalter but one direct instance of this:

> "The dead bodies of Thy servants have they given to be meat unto the fowls of ~~the fowls of~~ the heavens: the flesh of Thy godly ones to the beasts of the earth. Their blood have they shed like water round about Jerusalem: and there was none to bury (them)." [9]

Another possible reference occurs at cxli 7, but here the text is corrupt and will call for consideration in another place.[10]

After burial, the dead continue to exist, even in the most negatively conceived form of the Sheol doctrine, as is plain from the references already given; their shadowy existence is not peculiar to Hebrew, nor even to Semitic eschatology as a whole, but is well-nigh universal.[1] Of great moment is the fact that nowhere does identity appear as obliterated, an aspect which ought to ~~to~~ receive due consideration by those who tend to overstress "corporate personality." Continuity of personal identity is sometimes attested in a graphic manner: Samuel is apparently known by his robe;[2] the warrior is accroutred with his weapons of war;[3] kings are seated on their thrones.[4] In the Babylonian Aralû the dead are naked,[5] though here too, as is abundantly evident, personality continues. The persistence of featural appearance among the 'luce carentes' is vividly reflected in the 11th Tablet of the "Gilgamesh Epic", where the hero expresses surprise at finding Ut-napishtim[6] unchanged:

> "I consider thee, O Ut-napishtim,
> Thy features are not changed, like me thou art,
> Thou art not different: even as I am, thou art."[7]

Continuity of personality, even though long visualised as of a shadowy nature, cannot, as a belief, be assessed too highly, for it it had a bearing of cardinal importance for the later Jewish doctrine of resurrection, which, in turn, markedly affected the Christian. Charles, commenting on II Baruch xlix and l, says: "We have here, undoubtedly, a very interesting view of the resurrection. Thus the dead will rise possessing every defect and deformity they had at the moment of death. This is the earliest

appearance of a doctrine which was developed to extravagant lengths in later Judaism and Christianity. Thus, according to the Talmud (Sanhedrin 90b), not only were the dead to be raised exactly as they were when they died, but there was to be a resurrection of the very clothes in which they were buried."[1]

Setting aside the undoubted crudities which have arisen in the learned as well as in the vulgar mind, the idea of the persistence of personality(which all along characterises Old Testament thought regarding the state of the dead, and which is at the root of St. Paul's doctrine of the resurrection of man) is of inestimable importance for an ethical religion which seeks to give due regard to the dignity of the individual.[2]

We may conclude this review by noting that, as far as the Old Testament leads us, clearly-defined ideas regarding the nature of Sheol and its dwellers are hardly to be found. Babylonian evidence is, on the whole, more explicit, but here again much is conflicting and uncertain. The most explicit Jewish reference lies outside the Old Testament and its Apocrypha. Within the Old Testament the computable material is almost wholly to be gleaned from references which, although many in number, are rarely direct; the two which -- to quote Professor G.A. Cooke -- "illustrate more vividly than any other passages in the Old Testament current notions of the Underworld"[3] lie outside the Psalter.[4]

"Deep asleep he seemed, yet all awake" — the condition of the Lotos-eater of Tennyson's poem — is the impression invited by a consideration of the plight of the ancient Sheol-dweller.

The term "Sheol" in the Psalter.

We now pass on to a consideration of the term "Sheol", its meaning, and occurrences in the Book of Psalms.

שְׁאוֹל, (s.d. שְׁאֹל rare, never in Psalter), noun fem., but apparently masc. in Job xxvi 6. For שְׁאוֹל ... עוֹרֵר ... הַקִּיץ in Isa. xiv 9 cf. G.B. Gray, I.C.C. "Isaiah" (i-xxvii(1912)) phil. n., p.255, and G-K 145t.

G. Margoliouth equates with 'Shuálu', "one of the names of the (Bab.) underworld" (E.R.E. i 437b, also 440a, 446a, artt. ANCESTOR-WORSHIP,(HEB.),(BAB.)), a view first advanced by Frd. Delitzsch and followed by A. Jeremias, Gunkel, al. (for refs. v. E. Bi., art. SHEOL, 4453 sq., where this view is tentatively adopted); Charles (Esch. p.34 n.2) regards the identification as probable.

Jensen, however, denies the existence of the word 'Shuálu' in Bab.; it is regarded with suspicion by others (Schwally, Zimmern) and Delitzsch himself omits from his later work "Ass. Handwörterbuch" (1896) (refs. E.Bi. ibid.).

Jastrow (cited E.Bi. ibid.; E.R.E.440a) derives 'Shuálu', i.q. 'Sheol', from √ sha'al, "ask", "inquire", hence "place of inquiry" in connexion with necromancy. A. Jeremias in his "Babylonian Conception of Heaven and Hell" p.28 (cited Margoliouth, E.R.E. i 439b) regards the 'Sha'ilu', one of the minor classes of Bab. priesthood, as the "inquirer of the dead", but as the function of the 'Sha'ilu' is very uncertain (v. E.R.E. x 287a, art. PRIEST, PRIESTHOOD (BAB.)), any attempt to build upon this a derivation of 'Shuálu'='She'ol' from √ sha'al can only be regarded as circular.

Kautzsch (H.D.B. v 668a, n.1) derives from √ shl, "wide gaping", "deep sinking", and draws attention to Zimmern's conjecture, already mentioned above (p.25), that the form 'She'ol' may be due to the Hebraising of the Bab. 'shil(l)am' = "west" (ap. Beer, "Der biblische Hades" p.15).

The derivation from √ sha'al "to be hollow", hence 'She'ol' as the "Hollow place" (cf. German 'Hölle') is favoured by R.L. Ottley, "Aspects of the O.T." (Bampton Lects., 1897) p.336; A.B. Davidson, "The Theology of the O.T." p.425;[2] Oest. and Rob. p. 246; G. Margoliouth (apparently) op. cit. p.440a.

B.D.B. (s.v. שְׁאוֹל p.982b, q.v.) "√ dubious" is still all that can really be said of the etymology.

The most frequently occurring name for the abode of the dead among the Babylonians was 'Aral(l)û', a word usually regarded as having no cognate in Hebrew. The point, however, is worthy of further examination. Edward Langton has remarked in his recent study, "Good and Evil Spirits,"[1] that "it may be urged that if the Hebrews had borrowed the idea of the abode of the dead from the Babylonians, we should reasonably expect that they would also have taken over the name by which it was commonly designated — namely, 'Aralû'". Yet, without assuming direct borrowing (which Langton, on the basis of the widespread uniformity of ideas among early peoples relating to the nature of the underworld, regards as inconclusive) the striking similarity between Hebrew and Babylonian conceptions of the state of the departed might be held to justify our refusing to rest content with the simple 'non liquet' of that writer and many others, and proceeding to seek further possible illumination from the realm of comparative philology.

[1] A. Jeremias (cited Margoliouth, E.R.E. i 437b, n.2) equates 'Aralû' with 'Ariel' (אֲרִיאֵל) in Isa. xxix 1, 2 (bis), 7, both words apparently signifying (1) the "mountain of the gods", the Hebrew Zion; (2) "a place of desolation and woe."

There may, at first sight, appear to be little connexion between the two meanings: they may, indeed, appear self-contradictory, but such is far from the case as presented by fuller prosecution. Mountainous regions were widely regarded by the ancients as the homes of gods: Jahveh was formerly a 'Mountain-El' (Oest. and Rob. pp. 154, 225, and cf. supra p. 21); nor was this belief peculiar to the Semitic peoples: — for sacred mountains generally see Oest. and Rob. p.11, n.3; in Palestine, id. p.48 sq.; W.M. Ramsay (H.D.B. v, p. 119, art. RELIGION OF GREECE) gives examples from Gk. inscriptions and coins; Wiedemann (id. p. 189a, art. RELIGION OF EGYPT) from that country, although from its geographical nature they are less numerous here; M. Jastrow (jnr.) speaks

of the 'zikkurat' as an imitation of a mountain (id. 577b sq., q.v. for conclusions, art. RELIGION OF BABYLONIA); (cf. H. Zimmern in E.R.E. ii 318a: "The tower (of the zikkurat) seems also to have been frequently looked upon as the 'grave' of the god to whom the temple belonged." Art. BABYLONIANS AND ASSYRIANS).

In Isa. xiv 13 the interesting reference to the "mount of congregation" (הַר־מוֹעֵד) "the dwelling place of the gods, which the Babylonians located in the far north" (H.D.B. i 452b; see also id. i 466b) contrasts it with Sheol (verse 15) located in the south, hence below the earth (id. i 216, and see further Sir G.A. Smith: "The Book of Isaiah" Vol. I, p.432)[1]

Beer (op. cit. pp. 7, 19) conjectured that Sheol was originally the abode of the Semitic deities, a view in which he has been followed by E.O.James ("The O.T. in the Light of Anthropology" p. 79sq.)[2].

The evidence would thus appear to point back to a primitive idea of a community of abode of gods and spirits, themselves in all probability being originally regarded as identical. When at a later stage the two became differentiated, the abode of the former would naturally be located above, and that of the latter below, the earth. If the equation of Aralû and Ariel be correct, both originally designating the same thing, the terms have followed exactly opposite lines of semantic development, Aralû finally indicating the abode of the dead (= Sheol), and Ariel in Hebrew the dwelling place of Jahveh. (Cf. Pss. ix 12 (11); lxxiv 2; lxxvi 3 (2); also for a reflection of the same idea ii 6; xliii 3; xlvi (in toto); xcix 9; cxxi 1).

If this theory of Jeremias, which the present writer regards with considerable favour, could be upheld it could almost certainly be adduced as evidence for the view which sees in ancestor-worship the source of religious beliefs and prac-

tices. This hypothesis, associated with the name of Herbert Spencer, although having undergone some considerable modification since it was first advanced by that writer in 1876 (Principles of Sociology" Vol. i, esp. Chapp. xx-xxv), has shown but little tendency to abandonment. It has, for example, been maintained within recent times by Professor Rafael Karsten, of the University of Finland, Helsingfors, who concludes his survey, "The Origins of Religion"[1], a work expressing views "not written down hastily, but after mature consideration" (v. Preface), as follows: "The worship of dead ancestors undoubtedly constitutes the most important form of primitive religion, being perhaps the one from which a religious cult in the proper sense of the word has sprung"[2], a judgment substantially that of Spencer[3] and Frazer.[4]

Although far from identifying ourselves with this conclusion, believing that religion has not one but many roots, we regard the existence of some form of ancestor-worship in ancient Israel as practically certain from the extant evidence, notwithstanding that long before the Psalter had assumed its present form the cult had fallen into desuetude, save for its possible continuance in necromantic rites and practices.[5]

(For evidence in Israel see Charles "Esch." pp 20-31; G. Margoliouth, loc. cit.; A. Lods "Israel"[6] pp. 218-230; Max Loehr "A History of Religion in the O.T."[7] pp. 24sqq. (more cautious); Oest. and Rob. pp. 98 sqq. (non-committal); Kautzsch in H.D.B. v. 614 sq. allows tendencies towards ancestor-worship in the pre-Mosaic period, but holds that no consciousness of this survived to historical times.

For examination and criticism of the theory of ancestor-worship generally v. W. Crooke in E.R.E. i 427 sq.; W. Schmidt "The Origin and Growth of Religion"[8] pp 61-72, esp. p.71 sq.; Oest. and Rob. pp. 19 sqq., et al[9]).

It should be pointed out, however, as against what has been said above, that the weight of opinion amongst scholars is against the interpretation of Ariel in Isa. xxix as "Mountain of the gods" or "of God", a matter which should therefore justly fall for consideration.

B.D.B. takes אֲרִיאֵל as "lioness of 'El" or "(altar-) hearth of 'El"(p. 72a, s.v.; cf. also אֲרִאִיל ibid.); so RVm; R.R. Ottley "The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint", vol. i (Cambr. 1904) p. 170, n. on verse 1, but reads "lion" for "lioness", as does Sir G.A. Smith (op.cit., vol. i p.215) and interprets figuratively; H. Danby "The Mishnah trans. from the Heb." (Oxf., 1933) n. on Midd. iv 7, p. 597, "lion of God" only; Melville Scott "Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Pss., and Isa." (Lond., 1927) p.200, as Ottley and G.A.Smith.

Cheyne (E.Bi.298, art. ARIEL) reads (prob.) אֲרִיאֵל in verses 1, 2a, 7,(this reading being known, he suggests, to the author of Isa. xxxi 9: "says Jahveh who has a fire (אוּר) in Zion" etc.) and Arial (אֲרִיֵל = אֲרִאֵל) in 2b= "altar-hearth", with which he compares Ezek. xliii 15 sq., of altar-hearth in Ezekiel's Temple (ibid. f.n. 6, q.v. for Heb. forms; also B.D.B. s.v.אֲרִאֵיל; cf. G.A. Cooke (I.C.C."Ezekiel") p.468 and phil. n. p.475.

"Altar-hearth" is the interpretation, too, of Robertson Smith (O.T.J.C. 2nd edn., p. 356); Kennedy in H.D.B. i 147b, art. ARIEL, q.v. for others supporting this and "lion(ess) of God"; T.H. Robinson (Clar. Bi. O.T. vol. iii, ad loc., p.164), "Altar-hearth".

The form 𐤀𐤓𐤀𐤋 (אראל) appears on the Stele of Mesha, line 12, and is there rendered "altar-hearth" by S.R. Driver (E.Bi. 3042); W.H. Bennett (prob.) in H.D.B. iii 407b, n.'h'; S.A. Cook (C.A.H. iii (1925) p. 373) who compares Ezek. xliii 15 and Isa. xxix 1 ("its numen"?).

In lines 17-18 the lacuna א++ לי יהוה is restored אראלי יהוה by Bennett (loc.cit) "altar-hearths of YHWH"; H.R.H.Hall, Sidney Smith, S.R.K. Glanville, in "Bible Illustrations"(the supplement to "Helps to the Study of the Bible", 2nd edn., Oxf., 1931, p.12), following Prim and Socin, restore similarly but avoid translation, rendering "Ariel" in line 12 and "Ariels"-[?]sacred emblem(s) in line 17 sq. Driver (loc.cit.) restores line 17 sq. א[ת כ]לי יהוה "vessels of Yahwè", and is followed in this respect by S.A. Cook (loc. cit.).

Cook's rendering is followed by C. Singer in "The Legacy of Israel". (Oxf. 1927) pp. xiii-xv; Driver is followed throughout by L.E. Binns (Clar. Bi. O.T. ii, 238 sqq.); S.L. Caiger in his useful though secondary work "Bible and Spade"

(Oxf., 1936) follows Driver in line 17, and renders "ariel" ("i.e. shrine") in line 12, but cites no authority (p. 137).

Sayce, who regards the term 'arels' (or 'ariels') as apparently "having specially belonged to the language of the Moabites" notes that the same word is found in the Egyptian "Travels of the Mohar", having been borrowed from the Canaanites in the sense of a "hero", and so interprets as of persons.[1] ("The Early History of the Hebrews" (Lond., 1897) p. 416.

We have cited the authorities available at some considerable length in an attempt to arrive, if possible, at a reasoned conclusion. Setting aside as unlikely, if not altogether meaningless, "lion(ess) of El (God)" we are left with the larger consensus in favour of "altar-hearth (of El)". In view of the not inconsiderable doubt which exists as to the meaning of אראל on the Moabite Stone, little help can be gained from this source. Nor does there appear to be any justification for connecting this word with Ariel in Isa. xxix., except as following on a prior assumption — or, to employ Streeter's euphemism, "a 'scientific' guess" — that both words signify "altar-hearth".

Let us assume for a moment that the signification is correct. Is it then possible along such lines to equate Ariel with the Babylonian Aralû? A tentative hypothesis might be offered as follows:- Primitive and more advanced ideas subsist side by side in the Old Testament;[2] but quite often, in the evolutionary course, a conception might undergo complete transformation, and the more developed idea thus present the appearance of having little or no relation to the source whence it originally sprang. Ariel (= Aralu = altar-hearth) would then be a case in point, the link being sought in the remote mists of antiquity in the custom of burying the dead near the hearth.[3]

In issue, the hypothesis yields a similar result to that of Jeremias, for it would again appear to point back to a primitive worship (or at least veneration) of ancestors, earlier customs acquiring in the course of religious development entirely different associations, the altar-hearth of the Temple indicating to the anthropologist its origin in ruder antecedents.[1]

To attempt to work out the question further would hardly be called for within the compass of the present study. We must therefore conclude by observing that, on the evidence such as it is, an original equation of Ariel and Aralû is at least possible, especially on the theory of Jeremias to which we incline as by far the more probable. On either view the words as now known to us represent quite clearly different semantic trends, Aralû having retained in its signification the stage at which deities and the spirits of the dead were differentiated[2], whilst Ariel continued to develop alongside a growing Jahvism and so accommodating itself to its demands.

Having given some attention to the term 'Sheol' and its Babylonian counterpart 'Aralû', we now record, with philological and exegetical notes where necessary, those passages in the Psalter in which the former term is found. For completeness' sake, all occurrences of the term will be given in this section[3], and those of its synonyms in the

one following. Where more developed conceptions are involved these will be treated of more fully at a later stage.

שְׁאוֹל

(I) vi 6 (5) "In death there is no remembrance of Thee:
In Sheol who shall give Thee thanks?".

שְׁאוֹל // מָוֶת as in (IV),(VII),(X),(XIII),(XIV), infra.

(II) ix 18 (17) "The wicked shall return to Sheol;
Even all the nations that forget God."

The thought here is (as Briggs i 75) that the fate of the wicked nations will be so disastrous that they will "suffer national death, and so descend as nations to the abode of the dead." There is no reference to the future destiny of individuals, such as Oest. (i 145) descries.

(III) xvi 10. "Thou wilt not abandon me[a] to Sheol: [b]
Thou wilt not suffer Thy godly one[c] to see the Pit"

[a] נַפְשִׁי prob. "me" (/חֲסִידְךָ) rather than "my soul" (G-K 139f; B.D.B. 660a, s.v. נֶפֶשׁ; cf. infra p.109.

[b] For "Pit" v. sub שַׁחַת infra.

[c] "Thy godly one": Kt. חסידיך plur.; read, with Qre and all ancient Versns, חֲסִידְךָ (so Acts ii 27, xiii 35. See further, Perowne i 204 for Rabb. authorities, etc.).

(IV) xviii 6 (5). Should be cited in conjunction with the previous verse, of which it is a continuation:

5 (4) "Cords (?) of death encompassed me;
Torrents of Belial terrified me;
6 (5) Cords of Sheol surrounded me;
Snares of death came upon me."

On 5 (4) v. infra sub מָוֶת (p.55) and בְּלִיַּעַל (p.74) and on whole see extensive note in Cheyne (1904) i p. 67 for derivation from Bab. mythology. Cheyne reads צַלְמָוֶת for מָוֶת in 6 (5) and so sees four names for the nether world — Deathland, Ruinland, Sheol, Gloomland — an imaginative picture reminiscent of Bunyan. See further, extended note at end of this section.

נפש (contd.)

(V) xxx 4 (3). "Thou, Jahveh, hast brought me (נַפְשִׁי) up from Sheol;
Thou hast kept me alive (a) that I should not be of them that go down (a) into the Pit."

For נַפְשִׁי v. (III) supra.

(a) ..... (a): Perowne's rendering, which well brings out the sense of Kt. R.V. here follows Qre (מִיָּרַדְתִּי) as A.V., Trg., Jer., but PBV, RVm, following the Versns, read, with Kt., מִיָּרְדִי, the better reading of the two. Inf. constr. of יָרַד is regularly רְדֶת, the form יָרֹד postulated by Qre nowhere occurring (G-K 69m:= "a very remarkable case of the strong form"), although as Perowne notes (i 291) a similar anomolous inf. constr. occurs in Job xxxviii 4 (יָסַדְתִּי).
Kt. followed by B.D.B. p. 432b; Oest., and most moderns.

(VI) xxxi 18 (17). "Let the wicked be ashamed;
Let them be silent in Sheol."

On this, v. infra, sub דּוּמָה

(VII), (VIII), (IX). xlix 15 (bis), 16.(15 sq. EVV.).

The corrupt state of this passage, "the central passage of the psalm" (Cheyne: "Origin of the Psalter" p.382), has been the despair of commentators. To enter ~~would~~ discussion into detailed philological would involve a great deal of space: reference should be made to the commentaries. The following is Oesterley's rendering (i 265, q.v. for underlying Heb. text):

"Like a flock of Sheol are they destroyed,
Death is their shepherd, and hath dominion over them;
In the field of Abaddon is their resting-place,
In the belly of Sheol is their dwelling;
But God will redeem my soul
From the power of Sheol, for he will receive me."

Cheyne's rendering has, nevertheless, much to commend it. The following is taken from his Bampton Lectures of 1889 (publ. 1891, "The Origin of the Psalter"), and differs from his version of 1888 ("The Book of Psalms")[1] (quoted Oest. "Fr. App." p. 256) in unimportant particulars as noted:

שאול (Contd.)

"Like sheep, they are folded in Sheol;
Death is their shepherd, and their frame[a] shall waste away;
Sheol shall be their palace[b] for ever,
And the upright shall trample upon them at dawn[c].
Nevertheless God shall set free my soul;
From the hand of Sheol shall he take me."

1888: (a)'form'; (b)'castle'; (c)..(c)'in the morning'.

(Note: Compared with this, his version of 1904 (i 217), though ingenious, need not detain us. The whole work is vitiated, as is much of his work in E.Bi., by the unfortunate "Jerahmeelite theory", of which S.A. Cook has justly written:- "Cheyne attempted to substantiate his conviction of the ubiquitous prominence of the Judaean clan Jerahmeel in the O.T. by repeated emendation of the Hebrew text in defiance of the accepted principles of textual criticism." (Hibbert Journal, Jan., 1943, p.134). In saying this, we do not wish in any way to minimise the great contribution of that great scholar to O.T. and related studies. His remarkable genius for emendation - sometimes almost uncanny - has led to many of his proposals having stood the test of time, and gaining the approval of more conservative scholars.)

As Oesterley remarks ("Fr. App"., p.256), Cheyne's comments in his work of 1888 (p.138) are very much to the point. We give them, therefore, in Cheyne's own words: "A parallel from Arabic literature may throw light on the imagery. It occurs in an Arabic poem in the 'Ḥamâsa' which is probably of pre-Islamic origin.[1] A plague had smitten the tribe to which the poet belonged, and the tribe is therefore compared to a herd of camels, with Death for their herdsman, 'to whose stall they all must come home, some sooner, some later':

'And to-day they wander, a trembling herd, their herdsman Death;
One speeds away to his rest at eve, one stays till dawn.'"[2]

The personification of Death, with which Sheol often stands in parallelism, is interesting. It has been suggested that Sheol was personified as a deity by the ancient Semites (see L.B. Paton in E.R.E. iii 181a, art. CANAANITES), but it is more probable that the name Sheol was in early times that of a god or goddess of the underworld. (Cf. Eresh-kigal, of which 'Sheol', noun fem., and always without article, might conceivably be a corruption or Hebraised form.) Oest. ("Fr. App".

שאול (cont'd.)

p.252) regards the latter suggestion as attradive, but holds that there is no evidence to support it. S.A. Cook however notes that the title "the king of terrors" in Job xviii 14 suggests that the Hebrew Sheol was once believed to have a ruler ("The OT - A Re-interpretation," p.240, n. to p. 133). Dr. and Gray ("Job" I.C.C., p.161 sq.) take מֶלֶךְ בַּלְהוֹת as Death personified as a king, and compare the Ps. paggage here under review, also Isa. xxviii 15 (Death(// Sheol) as a party to a treaty.
Kennett ("The Church of Israel" p. 145) takes the Isa. ref. = "we are in no danger of death", there being no thought of a compact with a god of the lower regions; G.A. Smith (Book of Isaiah" i p.160): "We have bought destruction off!", of some treaty with a foreign power. As Dr. and Gray (loc. cit.) remark on Job xviii 14:- "Curiously enough, the ancient Versns, with exception of the Targ, do not recognise the phrase "the king of terrors" (see further phil. n. Pt.II, p.119 in same work).

Nevertheless, in view of what has already been said of the existence in the O.T. of mutually incompatible ideas, together with the persistence of primitive conceptions (supra pp 23, 25, 37), we strongly incline to the view expressed by S.A. Cook, and hold that there is at least some evidence to support it. Cf. further the case of 'Belial' (infra p. 75).

(X) lv 16 (15). "Let death come treacherously upon them;
Let them go down alive into Sheol."

For notes v. sub מָוֶת infra, p. 56.

(XI) lxxxvi 13. "For Thy loving-kindness[a] is great upon me[b];
And Thou wilt pluck me[c] from Sheol beneath.[d]"

(a) חֶסֶד . (b) Oest. omits (arbitrarily) עָלָי ; cf. with Dr. ("// Psr." p.253, n.3) ciii 17 (חֶסֶד ... עַל־יְרֵאָיו).
(c) v. supra p.39, sub (III). (d) v. infra sub תַּחְתִּי, p.73.

(XII) lxxxviii 4 (3). "My soul[a] is sated with misery(רָעוֹת)[b];
And my life draweth nigh to Sheol."

(a) Here rendered 'soul', // with 'life' (חַיַּי).
(b) Intensive plur. (רָעוֹת) used here - cf. G-K 124e. "... A desperate cry of suffering, unrelieved by a single ray of comfort or of hope." (Oest. ii 393); cf. Kirkp., cited supra p. 26.
G.R. Driver has noted that in Bab., as well as in Palestine, "the sick sometimes fancied themselves in their despair already dead; .... the Babylonian addresses his god as one who brings back him 'whose body has

been taken down to Arallu.'"("The Psalmists" p. 129). Added point is given to the lament if the psalm be correctly interpreted as that of a leper, in that the victim was already accounted dead. Langdon (E.R.E. iv 444a,b, cites examples from the literature of Bab., showing, like the Heb., a poignant dread of death, the ineluctable nature of which is brought out in the next passage:

(XIII) lxxxix 49 (48). "What man is there living who shall not see death?
That shall deliver himself from the power (יָד) of Sheol?"

For notes v. sub מָוֶת, p. 58.

(XIV) cxvi 3. "The cords of death encompassed me,
And the straits (?) of Sheol held me."

"Straits of Sheol" (מְצָרֵי שְׁ"): so Dr. (// Psr. p.345, and B.D.B. p.865b s.v.); EVV: "pains." The word occurs otherwise only twice, viz., Lam. i 3; Ps. cxviii 5. In all three cases the context would be appropriate to Oesterley's suggestion (ii 476, text-crit. n. ad loc.) that the word should be rendered "ropes", as in late Heb. (cf. Arab. صَرَّ - "bind" (B.D.B. s.v. צָרַר 864b).

(XV) cxxxix 8. "If I ascend into heaven Thou art there;
If I descend to Sheol Thou art there too.

"Descend": with LXX and Syr. Heb: יָצַע Hiph., rare (4 t.) and late, "make my couch"(?),(cf. Gilgamesh Epic, Tab. xii, col. vi: "He rests upon a couch, etc."). See further Briggs ii 500 and Oest. ii 554, crit.nn.

The psalm is late, and indicative of the conviction of the Divine omnipresence -- even Sheol is no longer without the jurisdiction of Jahveh.

The verse invites comparison with two lines from the "Babylonian Job", quoted at some length in Dr. and Gray, op. cit., pp. xxxi-xxxiii,(q.v. for description, literature, etc.):-

"If it go well with them, they speak of climbing up (elû) to heaven:
If they be in trouble, they talk of going down (arâdu) to hell."

G.R. Driver (op. cit, p.132), however, cites as closer verbal parallels the two following phrases: "They mount up (עָלָה) to heaven"(Ps. cvii 26), and "Let them go down(יָרַד) into Sheol"(Ps. lv 16 (15)), and omits any reference to the passage under review. While it is the case that the verbs are different,(נָסַק,(but see B.D.B. s.v.,(652b);and יָצַע Hiph.), the similarity furnished by the antithesis is striking. (Briggs (ii 494 and 500) regards the verbs in Ps. cxxxix 8 as interpolations).

The verse should, of course, be read in its context, especially together with the preceding and the two following verses. There is no need to read Greek influence into the passage (so Oest., ii 556 = the Gk. 'Eos'), as Marduk too was Dawn-god, = "Son of the Sun", "Child of the Day", (E.R.E. viii 63b). This, together with his being a god of healing (id. ii 312a), may be reflected in the imagery of Mal. iii 20 (EVV iv 2); cf. also title of Ps. xxii, "Hind of the Dawn" (עַל־אַיֶּלֶת הַשַּׁחַר), which, as Astley points out (Biblical Anthropology", p.90),[1] is a"well-known epithet to describe the rising sun. In the Bab. Talmud the first appearance of light is called 'the hind of the morning's dawn.'" We do not, however, follow this writer in regarding the ps. (xxii)[2] as Messianic, though it may well be that it is based on an early "descent-myth", just as xlv in its present form probably preserves a secular poem worked over with a religious veneer.[4] (See further on ps. titles, infra p. 62.).

(XVI) cxli 7. There is some disorder here. A dislocation appears to have taken place. 7a should follow 6a, and the whole (viz., 6a, 7a, 7b) be regarded as an imprecatory gloss, as Briggs (ii 509),[3] with whom read:

"O that their governors had been thrown down by the sides of the crag,
As one splits open and bursts asunder on the ground;
O that their bones were scattered at the mouth of Sheol."

This reconstruction is more satisfactory than Kirkp (p.799) who includes 6b. If it be correct, the meaning becomes fairly clear, suggesting vengeance by a form of execution rendering burial virtually impossible, and so bringing the victim into the direst calamity. (See Charles "Esch" p.31 sq.; W.H. Bennett in E.R.E. iv 498a; Nöldeke, id. i 672b for examples.).

שְׁאוֹל (contd.)

EXTENDED NOTE. Sheol and "the waters."

An interesting phenomenon, which might well repay investigation, is the frequent location by the O.T. poetical writers of Sheol as lying beneath "the waters", or, where the location does not receive specific mention, the use of the metaphor "waters" (or its synonyms) in association with the underworld.

Where this is noticed by commentators, it is usually taken as meaning "the waters of the sea", i.e., Sheol extending, or situated wholly, beneath the sea. There is, however, little evidence for this view. In those cases in which the waters are found in close association with Sheol, the subterranean waters appear almost wholly to be indicated. A vivid picture is given in Ps. xviii,[1] of which a passage is cited above at p. 39. Although verse 16 (15) might appear to refer to the waters of the sea,(which is the reading in the parallel passage in II Sam. xxii 16), the writer would seem rather to have in mind the subterranean waters ~~in mind~~, for the following verse is anticipatory of Sheol:

"He sent down from on high, He took me,
He drew me out of mighty waters."[2]

(With this might be compared the line from the Bab. psalm: "Grasp his hand when he has fallen into the water." (Cited from E.R.E. vi 252a)).

The same idea seems to be present in xxxii 6, where sickness had brought the psalmist to muse on the contingency of Sheol:

"In time of distress",(following Duhm, cited Oest. i§208)
"at the flowing of many waters -
Unto him (i.e., the godly man) they shall not come nigh."[3]

In lxxxviii 8 (7), 17 (16) sq., the connexion is evident; the waves and billows of the nether world are graphically depicted. So, too, in lxix 2 (1) sq., 15 (14) sq., where, in verse 16 (15) the Pit (בְּאֵר) is actually named in parallelism to שִׁבְּלֵת מַיִם and מְצוּלָה in the same verse.

The metaphors employed by the writer of cxxiv appear redolent of the underworld, especially in view of their juxtaposition to Sheol and its synonyms in undoubted contexts: the swallowing up alive (ver. 3); the intended prey (ver. 6); the escape from the snare (ver. 7); and especially in the present regard, verses 4 and 5:

"Then had the waters swept us away;
The torrent had gone over us;
It had gone over us -- the proud waters."

Some reference here to the waters of Sheol would appear to be the most natural explanation.

(A note on "the proud" or "the raging waters" is perhaps called for. זֵידוֹנִים is α.λ. ; si vera lect., it would derive from √זוד = 'boil' 'swell' 'rage';-hence 'proud', the rendering of EVV, Dr.("// Psr."), Briggs, is a secondary meaning. Briggs (ii 52 sq.) is prob. right in regarding verse 5 as a gloss. LXX renders τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ἀνυπόστατον - 'irresistible' 'not to be withstood'. But read, perhaps, מֵימֵי אֲבַדּוֹן .)

Two other passages, themselves poetical though not in the Psalter, should be taken into account with the foregoing. The first is Jon. ii 3-10 (EVV 2-9),[1] which has already received some mention above (p. 26). It consists of a poem inserted by a later hand -- a thanksgiving for deliverance from Sheol (בֶּטֶן שְׁאוֹל, ver. 3), the watery nature of which forms the theme almost throughout. "In the heart of the seas" (בִּלְבַב יַמִּים) (ver. 4) is a gloss to harmonise with Jonah's marine submersion (i 15). נָהָר (ver. 4) is usually a 'river', esp. the Nile (Horton, Cent. Bi., ad loc., p.209), though more frequently of Euphrates (B.D.B., 625b sq., s.v.). In Job xxviii 11 (plur.) it is understood by most of 'underground streams' (B.D.B. ibid., but on this cf. Dr. and Gray (I.C.C., p.239 and phil. n., Pt.II p.195)) which would appear to be the meaning here, viz., the river of the underworld.

In ver. 6, תְּהוֹם is used of 'the deep'. It is "philologically the same word as the Bab. 'Tiâmat' (G.R. Driver, "Psalmists" p. 140) and recalls the Bab. "Epic of Creation". It is always used of "waters". Briggs, in citing all occurrences in the Psalter (i 293), distinguishes among its five usages one possible allusion to the subterranean waters, viz., Ps. lxxi 20 (so Dr. ("// Psr." p. 203, n.5) who compares xxiv 2). (On תְּהוֹם see further, Skinner "Genesis" (I.C.C.)[2] p. 16.). The verse may be rendered, with Qre and most Versns, as follows:

"Yea, from the depths of the earth (וּמִתְּהוֹמוֹת הָאָרֶץ)
Thou didst bring me (Kt. 'us') up again."

But perhaps the most suggestive reference is Job xxvi 5:

"The shades (הָרְפָאִים) do tremble
beneath the waters and the inhabitants thereof" (so MT)

Here the location of Sheol beneath the subterranean waters, as in Jonah (on which see further J.A. Bewer "Jonah" (I.C.C.)[3] p. 46), is explicit. For the "inhabitants" (שֹׁכְנֶיהָ) Dr. and Gray (op.cit. p.219 sq.) suggest "the fish", but recognise that this is not altogether satisfactory. Peake (Cent. Bi., ad loc., p.235): "probably the great sea monsters".

A more likely explanation, which in view of what has already been said would render the passage instinct with meaning, is that the "inhabitants" are none other than the 'Rephaim'. This interpretation would, we submit, throw light upon a professedly difficult verse, and would have the added merit of avoiding any interference with M.T.. (Dr. and Gray, for example, suggest the placing of the athnach beneath מִתַּחַת, as Ley and Ehrlich.) By reading the waw of וְשׁכְנֵיהֶם as 'waw explicativum' (G-K 154a(b)) the parallelism would point to the waters as synonymous with the abode of the 'Rephaim':

"The shades do tremble beneath the waters, even their (inhabitants."

Should this interpretation be correct, it might serve to throw some light on the Second Commandment. Just as the Third is regarded by some as prohibitive of the use of the Divine Name for magical purposes (e.g. Wardle, Clar.Bi., O.T., vol.i,p.138; see also M.Gaster[1] in E.R.E. iv 813b), so in the Second the injunction forbidding the making of graven images of anything in "the waters under the earth" might equally well be a prohibition of the 'Teraphim'. While the nature of these objects is still undetermined, the contention of Stade and Schwally that they were images of ancestors has been widely approved,and still appears to be the most probable explanation. (See further, Charles, "Esch" pp 20 sqq., esp. f.nn. pp.20-25; Oest and Rob, pp. 100 sq; Burney, "Judges" p.421, who connects with necromancy; E.R.E. and Bible Dictionaries, passim)[2].

That images of fish or monsters of the deep are implied in the prohibition in the Decalogue is a most improbable view. Although fish- and water-gods were known to the ancients, including the Babylonians (Oest and Rob., p.33; H.D.B. i 544a; E.Bi. 334,line 14 sqq; 1530 sq.) the fish-god nevertheless "seems to be a somewhat rare phenomenon"(E.R.E. i 514b). Dagon, the Philistine god (Jg. xvi 23, I Sam. v 2-7; Beth-Dagon - I Chron. x 10), is now almost universally conceded to have been a corn-spirit (Oest and Rob. 177; Clar.Bi. O.T. i 44 and ii 158; Cent Bi. "Samuel" p.61; see also artt. DAGON in H.D.B. i 554 and E.Bi. 983 sqq), the etymological connection with דָּג(as Kirkp., Cambr.Bi. "I Sam." (1880) p.76) having been abandoned in favour of דָּגָן(cf.B.D.B. s.v. דָּגָן p.186a; Stenning in "New Comm." p.220b, etc.). Sayce, op.cit., p.356, holds that Dagon had been worshipped in Palestine prior to the Philistine invasion,(a view which has followed by others, e.g., Strahan in P.C. 268b sq., Kennedy in Cent Bi., loc.cit.,) which would further militate against his being a fish-god.

It is true that Deut iv 18 states specifically "the likeness of any fish" (תַּבְנִית כָּל־דָּגָה), but this is at best only a tertiary authority, being a paraphrase of a recension of the

original "Ten Words" (cf. similarly Deut v 15 with Ex. xx 11 (E)) at a date when the meaning of the prohibition would have been misunderstood, the practice therein forbidden having fallen into desuetude.

To summarise:- the frequent mention of "the waters" in connexion with the underworld suggests that at one stage at least the two were regarded as synonymous terms. A close examination of some of the passages concerned serves to elicit tangible presumptive evidence for the conclusion in favour of the prevalence of ancestor-worship, and perhaps necromancy, centring in the 'Teraphim', as put forward above.

Sheol -- it s synonyms and the state of its inhabitants.

In this section the various synonyms of Sheol which occur in the Psalter are reviewed, together with the terms which are indicative of its inhabitants.

בּוֹר noun masc. 'pit','cistern','well'. As synonym of Sheol usage is late and poetical, always without article.

Derivation uncertain, that from √בָּאַר (only in Piel), (B.D.B. p.91a) unsatisfactory. Attempts to justify, as e.g. Ewing in H.D.B. iii 885a, art. PIT, can only be regarded as artificial. More plausible is √בָּרָה 'eat', hence 'swallow up'. On term, see further E.Bi. 3781 and 880 sq.

Some regard the use of the term, from Ezek. xxxii 23 sqq. onwards, as indicative of some differentiation between the Sheol dwellers (Oest. and Rob. p.354; Oest. in "Fr.App" p.256 sq., and "Pss" i 198; Briggs i. 60; B.D.B. p.983a, s.v. שְׁאוֹל sect.3; id. p.92b, s.v. בּוֹר sect.5.). With Davidson, however, ("Theol. of O.T." p.428 sq., q.v.) we are doubtful whether such a distinction can be maintained within the O.T. canon.

The passages containing the term are as follows:

(I) vii 16 (15) Not of Sheol.

(II) xxviii 1. "If Thou be silent unto me
I become like them that go down to the Pit."
See on this verse, p.77.

(III) xxx 4 (3). v. supra, sub שְׁאוֹל (V), p.40.

(IV) xl 3 (2). "He brought me up also out of the roaring (?) Pit, out of the mi[illegible]ry clay."

"Roaring", so Dr. ("//Psr" p.113). The Heb. word שָׁאוֹן occurs only here in Psalter, and elsewhere rarely (see B.D.B., p.981a, s.v. where all instances cited). Grätz reads שִׁוְּאָה (cf. xxxv 8); so Cheyne (1904) in 177, שִׁוְּעָה (sic); Duhm שָׁוְא; Oest. i 233, following Gressmann, שְׁאוֹל, the best emendation, although the context does not really favour a reference to Sheol.

בּוֹר (contd.)

The 'Yalqūṭ Shimōnī', in what H. Loewe describes as "a striking piece of eschatology" (Essay "Pharisaism" in "Judaism and Christianity", vol. i)[1], refers the passage to the deliverance of the "sinners of Israel and the righteous of the Gentiles" from Gehenna by Michael and Gabriel.[2] See also on this M. Joseph in E.R.E. xi 148a, art. SALVATION (Jewish).

For "miry clay" (טִיט הַיְוֵן) cf. lxix 3 (2) and 15 (14); also Jer. xxxviii 6, on the basis of which some of the older commentators have ascribed authorship of the ps. to that prophet. Cf. also the "Descent of Ishtar": "Dust is their nourishment, clay their food. ..... Should I .... eat clay instead of food?"

(V) lxxxviii 5 (4) "I am numbered with them that go down into the Pit;
I am become as a man without strength."

Cf. verse 11 (10) of the same ps.: "Shall Rephaim (the weak, strengthless ones (?)) rise to praise Thee?" On 'Rephaim' v. infra, p.61.

(VI) ibid., verse 7 (6) "Thou hast laid me in the lowest Pit."

On this phrase see under תַּחְתִּית infra, pp. 72-74.

(VII) cxliii 7 "Hide not Thy face from me
Lest I be like them that go down to the Pit."

Similar in thought to (II) supra.

בְּאֵר

Closely allied to the preceding is בְּאֵר, properly 'well', which B.D.B. connect, as בּוֹר, with √באר, but point out that the connexion with this √ is not clear (p. 91b). The possible √ברה has already been mentioned (supra, p.49), though this is open to philological objections. It may well be that both בּוֹר and בְּאֵר are variants of a common √ *br* (see G.R. Driver in J.T.S., April, 1935, p. 152, for interchange of א and ו, a "variation of orthography and dialect", and n.2 ibid. for further examples; also P.R.Ackroyd id., July-Oct., 1942, p.160 sq.); cf. Arab. بِئْر, also √ברר.

The term בְּאֵר occurs only twice in Psalter:-

(I) lv 24 (23) on which see below, s.v. שַׁחַת (IV).

(II) lxix 16 (15) "Let not the water-flood flow over me,
And let not the deep swallow me up,
And let not the Pit (בְּאֵר) shut her mouth upon me."

The parallelisms here have been noted above at p. 45, q.v. for Heb. terms.
On verb אָטַר (αλ) 'shut up' 'close' 'bind', see Briggs ii 122 for emendations, and B.D.B. p.32a.

שַׁחַת noun fem. √ שׁוּחַ 'sink down' (B.D.B. p.1001). LXX passim, and frequently followed by EVV, erroneously connecting with √שחת renders διαφθορά.
The word is used of a hollow dug in the earth for catching prey in Ps. vii 16(15), ix 16(15), xciv 13; Prov. xxvi 27; Ezek xix 4; of a natural hollow in Job ix 31.
It is applied to Sheol in Job xvii 14 and xxxiii (5t.); Isa. xxxviii 17, li 14 (?); Ezek. xxviii 8; Jonah ii 7 (6), and in the following passages in the Psalter:- 2.

(I) xvi 10 "Thou wilt not suffer Thy godly one to see the Pit."

LXX ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν; EVV "corruption; RVm "the pit".
On "Thy godly one" v. supra sub שָׁאוֹל (III), p.39.
On שַׁחַת see useful n. in Perowne i 205.

(II) xxx 10 (9) "What profit is there in my blood when I go down to the Pit?"

LXX εἰς διαφθοράν; EVV "the pit"; Oest. "corruption."

שַׁחַת (contd.)

(III) xlix 10(9) connects with 8(7), verse 9(8) being a parenthesis. Reading (with Ewald, Duhm, Kirkp., Oest., et al.) אָח֣ יִפְדֶּה for MT פָּדֹה יִפְדֶּה, and following Oest. (q.v., i. 265, but cf. G.R. Driver in J.T.S. Jul-Oct 1942, p.155), the passage may be rendered:

"But no man may buy himself off, nor pay his ransom to God,
And so live for ever and ever, and never see the Pit."

LXX καταφθορά ; EVV (except PBV "the grave") "corruption"; RVm "the pit".

(IV) lv 24(23) The text of this psalm is in considerable disorder. As it stands, the verse reads:

"But Thou, O God, wilt bring them down to the well of the Pit (בְּאֵר שַׁחַת);
Men of blood and deceit shall not live out half their days (לֹא־יֶחֱצוּ יְמֵיהֶם);
But I will trust in Thee."

Logically this verse should follow 22(21), the intervening verse being in all probability a gloss on 24c (23c). בְּאֵר שַׁחַת is not easy to translate. LXX renders εἰς φρέαρ διαφθορᾶς ; EVV "pit of destruction". Briggs (ii p.29) renders "Pit of Sheol" = בּוֹר , the reading of Baethgen and Duhm. Oest., following Buhl, "Pit of doom" (בְּאֵר שַׁחַת).

As Cheyne notes (i 247 (1904)), the expression is tautological. But it should not be rejected on these grounds alone, for tautology is not uncommon in Hebrew. His emendation has little to commend it apart from the fact which he probably had in mind, viz., that the phrase בְּרֶגַע שְׁאוֹל יֵרֵדוּ occurs in Job xxi 13, to quote B.D.B. (s.v. רֶגַע p.921a) "of a quick and painless death" on which see further Dr.& Gray ad loc., p. 184,and phil. n., id. Pt.II, p.146. Cheyne reads: "Thou ... wilt bring them down in a moment to the Pit", which is certainly in keeping with the general tone of the psalm; cf. verse 16(15), and Kirkp's note (p.315) on verse 24(23). Emendation, however, is not required. Leaving MT as it stands the phrase may be rendered "well of the Pit", or, as B.D.B. s.v. בְּאֵר "Pit of(the)grave" (p.91b). It is not necessary to regard the phrase as indicative of later distinctions in Sheol, although this as other terms noticed might have appeared to sanction such distinctions as were characteristic of doctrinal development.

שַׁחַת (contd.)

(V) ciii 4. "(Bless Jahveh) Who redeemeth Thy life from the Pit."

LXX ἐκ φθορᾶς; EVV "destruction"; RVm "the pit".

"Redeemeth" (גָּאַל). In all occurrences of the verb in the Psalter God is the subject, and personal relationship is implied. For full references see Briggs i 175.

עָפָר noun masc. 'dry earth' 'dust'. ✓ dubious, see B.D.B.779b.

That "dust" should be used as a synonym of Sheol is not surprising. In the Bab. cosmogony there are passages which suggest its universal prevalence in Aralû; it rests on doors and bolts; it is the nourishment of the departed. In Job, where affinities between Heb. and Bab. ideas of the underworld are the most striking of all, the metaphor occurs in vii 21, xvii 16, xx 11, xxi 26, xix 25 (?). On last-mentioned see below, p.99sq. Commentators vary on the precise interpretation of these and similar verses, some seeing a mere reference to the grave, others to Sheol itself. See further Dr. & Gray (ICC) and Peake (Cent.Bi.).

עָפָר occurs 13 times in the Psalter. A careful examination of these passages reveals that in only three instances can a direct allusion to the after-life be inferred. vii 6(5) "Let the enemy ... lay my glory (כְּבוֹד) in the dust" is of humiliation rather than the dust of death (cf. Briggs i p.58). In civ 29, again, "When Thou withdrawest (תֹּסֵף for תֹּאסֵף, Qal imperf. 2 masc. sing. (see B.D.B. p.62a s.v.; G-K 68h.) Briggs ii 339 wrongly takes as Hiph. imperf.) their breath they die, and to their dust they return" the reference is not to Sheol 'per se', but to the material of the human body, to which, on death, it will return (cf. ciii 14; Gen. ii 7, iii 19 (both J); for other refs. see B.D.B. s.v. עָפָר, sect. 1 b, p.779b).

The three eschatological passages are as follows:

(I) xxii 16(15) "Thou hast brought me into the dust of death (לַעֲפַר־מָוֶת תִּשְׁפְּתֵנִי)".

Oest. (i 178), following Gunkel, reads וְעָפָר בִּשְׁפָתִי. Having in mind the dusty nature of Sheol the reading is attractive, but unnecessary.

עָפָר (Contd.)

(II) xxii 30(29). "All they that go down to the dust shall bow before him."

As Kirkp. remarks, this is "a most obscure verse." On the various interpretations which have been offered the commentaries should be consulted. It is certain, however, that the reference is to death, and the verse, together with the whole psalm, will fall for consideration later. See under "The Eschatology of the Nation", infra, p. 151 sq.

(III) xxx 10(9). "Shall the dust praise Thee? shall it declare Thy truth?"

Here עָפָר // to שַׁחַת. Quotation is the complement of that under שַׁחַת (II), p. 51 supra.

מָוֶת noun masc., occurring , according to B.D.B. (s.v. p.560b) 161 t. in O.T. In Psalter it occurs 21 t. (noun). Verbal forms will be dealt with under מוּת.

B.D.B. (loc. cit.) distinguishes three usages of the term:
(i) death as opposed to life, a distinction not universal among primitive peoples; cf. W.H.R. Rivers: "Psychology and Ethnology" (Lond., 1926), pp 40sq.
(ii) death by violence as a penalty.
(iii) state or place of death.
It is only with (iii) that we are here concerned.

(I) vi 6(5) // שְׁאוֹל q.v. (I), p.39 supra.

(II) vii 14(13) "the instruments of death" (כְּלֵי־מָוֶת). Not of (Sheol.

(III) ix 14(13). See under (XVII)(Ps. cvii 18) below.

(IV) xiii 4(3). "Lighten mine eyes lest I sleep in death."

EVV (except PBV "in death") "lest I sleep (the sleep) of death." On construction see G-K. 117 r, n.4.

Two aspects are present here:
(1) absence from God as the condition of the dead, the "lightening of the eyes" (i.e., life; but cf. xix 9(8) where the expression is used in a different sense)

מָוֶת (contd.)

being the consequence of the shining of God's countenance (פָּנִים). The thought recurs in xxxi 17(16), where again the context favours a contrast between life and death. For other refs. to the metaphor in Pss. and elsewhere see Briggs i 101.
W.T. Davison (in Cent. Bi. "Pss." i p.83) regards the "lightening of the eyes" as the receiving of fresh strength and courage, comparing the case of Jonathan in I Sam xiv 27, 29, and Ezra ix 8; so Dr. (//Psr, p.31 n.2); Kirkp. p.64; Oest. i 152. The expression, however, seems to imply more than a temporary re-vivifying, denoting rather a continuous state of life, dependent for its very existence upon God's favour as shown by the shining of His countenance (cf. the Christian doctrine of Grace). Thus Briggs (loc. cit.) rightly equates with Num. vi 25 (יָאֵר יְהוָה פָּנָיו אֵלֶיךָ).

(2) The negative character of Sheol as expressed in "sleep". Although Briggs denies the implication "that the dead continue in a state of sleep in Sheol", holding rather that "the state of dying is a falling asleep to awake in another world" (ibid.) it seems clear nevertheless that such passages as Job iii 13, 17sq., xiv 12, conceive of death as a state of perpetual sleep, a view which has ever been widely held and which has persisted to the present day. Cf. the well-known lines of Catullus:

> "Soles occidere et redire possunt:
> Nobis, cum semel occidit brevis ~~brevis~~ lux,
> Nox est perpetua una dormienda." ('Carm.' v 4.)

(V) and (VI). xviii 5(4) sq.

> 5 (4) "Cords (?) of death encompassed me;
> Torrents of Belial terrified me;
> 6 (5) Cords of Sheol surrounded me;
> Snares of death came upon me."

For "cords" (חֲבָלִים) read probably, as II Sam. xxii 5 "waves" (מִשְׁבְּרֵי־מָ֫); so Oest., Kirkp.; Briggs favours as "a beautiful metaphor". The reading חֲבָלִים appears to be a copyist's error in assimilation to verse 6 (5), but, as Kirkp. remarks, it must be very ancient, as it is recognised in cxvi 3: "Cords of death encompassed me," etc. On this verse see under שְׁאוֹל (XIV), supra p.43.

"Snares of death" (מוֹקְשֵׁי מָ֫). Only occurrence in Psalter of מוֹקֵשׁ in this sense, although the term occurs elsewhere in Psalter 5 t. (fem. in cxli 9, otherwise always masc.).

(VII) xxii 16(15) See above, p.53, under עֲפָר (I).

מָוֶת (contd.)

(VIII) xxxiii 19. "The eye of Jahveh is upon them that fear Him ..... (verse 18)
To deliver their soul from death
And to keep them alive in famine."

(IX) xlix 15(14). See above pp. 40 sqq. on this passage.

(X) lv 5(4). "Terrors of death are fallen upon me."

Read: "Terrors are upon me", omitting מָוֶת נָפְלוּ עָלָי with Oest., following Gunkel. (i 285). (dittography. Briggs (ii p.27), following Cheyne, omits מָוֶת only, as

(XI) lv 16(15). Text corrupt as frequently in this psalm. Kt. שִׁימוֹת "desolations" (as RVm) improbable, the word occurring elsewhere only in the place-name בֵּית הַיְשִׁימוֹת 4 t., 'scriptio plena' only in Ezek. xxv 9. For remaining instances see B.D.B. p.1111b, and cf. id. p.445a s.v. יְשִׁימָה.

Qre: יְשֵׁי מָוֶת . יְשֵׁי Hiph. imperf. s.d. for יְשִׁיא (G-K 74k) = 'beguile' and so 'come treacherously (upon)', as Dr. (//Psr., p.155), the reading of the majority of the MSS and Versns (on which see Perowne i 459). LXX: ἐλθέτω θάνατος ἐπ' αὐτούς.

Read, probably, with Brüll: יְשִׁיא מָוֶת יְבָלְעֵמוֹ, noted as plausible by B.D.B. s.v. נָשָׁא II, p.674a; favoured by Briggs (ii p.28, where note נְשָׁא misprinted וְשָׁא). Brüll's emendation followed by Oest. (i p.285, where note misprint, metathesis of ל and ע).

The verse may then be rendered as follows:

"Let death come treacherously upon them; let it swallow them up; let them go down alive into Sheol."

בלע occurs in the same ps. at verse 10(9), elsewhere in Psalter 7 t.
The writer has in mind the Dathan and Abiram episode: cf. Num. xvi 32 "And the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up (וַתִּבְלַע אֹתָם)" (JE). The convulsive action of the earth is recalled again in Ps. cvi 17: "The earth opened and swallowed up Dathan, and covered the company of Abiram", where the combination with the Korah narrative (P) in the following verse would appear to indicate a date posterior to the final redaction of the Pentateuch.

Cf. also Ps. lxix 16(15), supra, p.51; Prov. i 12.

(XII) lvi 14(13). "For Thou hast delivered my soul from death,
Thou hast kept my feet from stumbling,
That I might walk before God
In the light of life (הַחַיִּים)."

"Thou hast kept": reading with Oest., following Halévy, כָּלֵאתָ for חָלַצְתָּ. On the form כָּלֵאתָ, exemplifying the close relation between verbs Lamedh He and Lamedh 'Aleph see G-K 75 nn and oo.

This verse also occurs in cxvi 8 sq. with variations, for which see Briggs ii p.36.

(XIII) lxviii 21(20). The sense of this verse is best brought out in Driver's translation (//Psr p.189):-

"God is unto us a God of deliverances; (death."
And unto Jahveh the Lord belong ways of escape from

"Ways of escape" תּוֹצָאוֹת, only plur., and usually of extremity (border) of territory. Only here in Psalter, and at all in this sense.
"From death" לַמָּוֶת = "in face of death".
Oest. (ii 322): "The Lord Jahveh hath issues from death."

(XIV) (lxxiii 4). Bracketed as a doubtful reference.

Speaking of the "arrogant" (הוֹלְלִים), here, as in lxxv 5(4), // to רְשָׁעִים, MT reads כִּי אֵין חַרְצֻבוֹת לְמוֹתָם וּבָרִיא אוּלָם: which both AV and RV render: "For there are no bands (RVm 'pangs') in their death: But their strength is firm"; PBV: "For they are in no peril of death."

As the context hardly favours a reference to death we adopt with most moderns, following Moerlius (1737), לְמוֹ תָּם "For they have no torments; sound and fat is their body." חַרְצֻבוֹת is difficult, occurring only here and Isa. lviii 6. Cheyne ("Origin" p.477): "A quadrilateral of a specially Aramaic type", the insertion of ר in lieu of dagesh being common in Aramaic (id. p.478). See also BDB p.359a, s.v.. תָּם is taken with the second member of the verse. Perowne's objection that the word is "nowhere used of physical, but always of moral, soundness" (ii p.17) is hardly borne out by usage, e.g., Cant. v 2, vi 9: תַּמָּתִי EVV "my undefiled"; Ginsburg renders "my perfect beauty", and quotes Rosenmüller's explanation, תמים אין בה ("The Song of Songs" (London, 1857) p.164 sq.).

מָוֶת (contd.)

(XV) lxxviii 50. "He (Jahveh) withheld not their soul from death,
But their life He delivered to pestilence."

"Soul" (נֶפֶשׁ) // "life" (חַיָּה), though possibly this should be rendered (as RVm) "beasts", the more usual meaning; "life" only in late poetry(BDB p.312b, s.v. I, sectn. 2.).

(XVI) lxxxix 49(48). "What man is there living who shall not see death?
"That shall deliver himself from the power of Sheol?"

"Himself" נַפְשׁוֹ. "Power" יָד. "Man" גֶּבֶר, as strong, distinguished from women, children, and non-combatants whom he is to defend; chiefly poetic; 66 t. in O.T. (BDB 149b sq.). 9 t. in Psalter.
"See death" - only occurrence of phrase in O.T. Not necessarily a personification, but cf. xlix 15(14), supra pp. 40 sqq.

(XVII) cvii 18. "All (manner of) food doth their soul abhor;
And they draw near to the gates of death."

cf. ix 14(13) "Be gracious unto me Jahveh .....
Thou that liftest me up from the gates of death."

The latter verse is difficult owing to textual corruption (see Oest. i pp 142 and 144), though the reference to the gates of death is certain.

שַׁעֲרֵי־מָוֶת: interesting in view of parallels in Babylonian mythology. The earlier - at least in the form in which they are known - is the Legend of Nergal and Eresh-kigal, contained in two fragments in the Tell el-Amarna tablets (c. B.C. 1360). In this story, fourteen gates bar the way to the abode of the dead. In the later Descent of Ishtar (found on three tablets from Kuyunjik, which probably belonged to the library of Ashurbanipal, c.650 B.C.), the estate of Eresh-kigal, the goddess-ruler of the underworld, is guarded by seven doors.

Two further references in O.T. may here be recorded:

(1) Isa. xxxviii 10, which depicts the gloom which filled the Hebrew mind in contemplation of Sheol, a gloom which he shared with the Babylonian (p.43 supra).
The poem is probably much later than the time of Hezekiah, apparently inserted by an editor who thought it suitable to the monarch's circumstances.(so A.S. Peake in P.C. p.459b. Late features and interruption of context

מָוֶת (contd.)

noted by Sir G.A.Smith, "Isaiah" i 394, n.1, who, however, does not translate this verse.). RV gives an excellent rendering. Peake (loc.cit.) paraphrases, following whom (in the main) we may render: "I thought that when I had reached the zenith of my days (דִּמְיִ יָמַי) I should be banished to the gates of Sheol (בִּשְׁעֲרֵי שְׁאוֹל). Cf. for similarity of idea Ps. cii 24(23)sq.

דִּמְיִ constr. of דִּמְיִ (BDB, 198b דָּמִי), formerly considered an uncertain word, but now satisfactorily explained by G.R. Driver (J.T.S., Jan. 1937, p.46, q.v.) as from √דמה I = 'be like' 'resemble' (and not from דמה II as BDB), hence = 'half', the half being the 'likeness' of the half. Thus דִּמְיִ יָמַי, as Accadian 'mišil ūmi', = 'midday', so vindicating LXX, ἐν μέσῳ and RV, 'noontide'.

(2) Job xxxviii 17. Jahveh's speech in reply to Job, which Dr. & Gray (ICC) regard as an original element of the Book, which they assign to the 5th cty. (Introd., pp. l and lxix). RV renders the verse as follows:

"Have the gates of death been revealed unto thee?
Or hast thou seen the gates of the shadow of death?"

Dr. & Gray (p.330, and phil.n., Pt.II, p.303) and Peake (in "Cent.Bi" (Job), p.317), following Duhm, read with LXX (πυλωροί) שֹׁעֲרֵי, the repetition of שַׁעֲרֵי being unlikely. "Gate-keepers", with reference to Sheol, do not appear elsewhere in O.T., though present in Bab. and other ethnic conceptions. On "shadow of death" (צַלְמָוֶת) see below, p.81 sq.

(XVIII) cxvi 3. On this verse see above, pp 43 and 55.

(XIX) cxvi 8. See (XII), p.57 above.

(XX) cxvi 15. "Precious in the sight of Jahveh is the death of His godly ones."

"Death" מָוְתָה: si vera lect., fem. form of מָוֶת (Briggs ii 401), and ℵ.λ.. Another fem. form (which Oest. here reads for מָוְתָה (ii 476)) occurs in the phrase בְּנֵי תְכוּתָה = "those worthy of death and appointed to death" (BDB s.v. תְּכוּתָה p.560b), only found in Pss. lxxix 11 and cii 21(20).

(XXI) cxviii 18 "Jah hath chastened me sore,
But to death He hath not delivered me."

"Chastened me sore" יַסֹּר יִסְּרַנִּי, Piel, of "discipline with severity" (Briggs i 409), representing that stage in religious development when the sufferings of the righteous were regarded as the prelude to enhanced blessings.

A careful examination of the foregoing twenty-one passages in relation to their context reveals the fact that while all contribute to Hebrew eschatology in showing the dread with which death was contemplated, comparatively few throw any appreciable light on the nature of the future life or the state of the dead.

We now pass on to review the occurrences of the verb מוּת in the Book of Psalms. Of the seventeen instances (four being participial) five may be eliminated at the outset (viz., xxxiv 22(21), xxxvii 32, lix 1 (title in EVV), cv 29, and cix 16) as contributing nothing to the present inquiry. Of those remaining, the first five relate to the gloomy and negative character of Sheol, whilst of the residue some are important and will demand close examination.

(I) lxxxviii 6(5). Hardly "Free among the dead", as EVV (except RV "cast off") following LXX and Vulgate, seeing that the condition of the dead is contextually the reverse of free. BDB takes חָפְשִׁי (s.v., p.344b) as "free" in the sense of "adrift, cut off from Jahveh's remembrance", but this is unsatisfactory. Either with S.R.Driver (//Psr p.256 n.4) read חֲפָשִׁי for חָפְשִׁי, or with G.R.Driver (J.T.S., Jan-Apr.,1943, p.17) כְּמוֹ מֵתִים חֲפָשִׁים or כְּמֵתִים חֲפָשִׁים בַּחֲלָלִים שׁ׳ק (rhythmi causa)= "like the prostrate dead, like the slain lying in the grave." Perowne (ii 145) notes pertinently that the equation of חָפְשִׁי with the Arab. خفش would accord well with רְפָאִים in verse 11(10).

The verse (6(5)) further records the dead as those "whom Thou (i.e., Jahveh) rememberest no more, seeing they are cut off from Thy hand (יָד)."

(II) lxxxviii 11(10). "Wilt Thou work a wonder among the [dead? Or shall the 'Shades' arise to praise Thee?"

"Wonder" פֶּלֶא, mostly poetical and late, 13 t. inO.T., 7 of these in Psalter (BDB p.810).

מוּת (contd.)

אִם .... הֲ: rhetorical question expecting negative reply (G-K 150 g,h.), and so emphasising the impossibility of such idea in the psalmist's mind.

"Rephaim" (רְפָאִים), often rendered "the Shades", as a name for the departed occurs in Psalter only here. It is connected by most (as BDB p.952a, s.v. I) with √רפה 'sink' 'relax' (id.951b). Schwally's regarding as sister-form to Teraphim[1] (cf. supra, p.47) is unlikely on philological grounds alone. From other occurrences of term in O.T.[†] (Isa.xiv 9, xxvi 14,19, Prov.ii 18, ix 18, xxi 16, Job xxvi 5) it is clear that its use - at least in the later literature - as a name for the dead is well established. The etymology, however, remains uncertain. Some, following Schwally, connect with the ancient giants of Deut. ii 11, 20, etc. (v. BDB s.v. רְפָאִים II, p.952a). This is the most probable explanation (v. S.R.Driver "Deut." ICC, (3rd edn.,1902), p.40, MS. n. by W. Robertson Smith). In view of the excellent discussion in Oe.& Rob. pp.249-253 (see also Dr.& Gray "Job" p.219; E.Bi. 1042, para.3, and 4033 sqq.) it is unnecessary to add further here, save to remark that the later application of the term to the inhabitants of Sheol might have been the direct result of the post-prophetic tendency to depreciate their powers.

III) cxv 17. "The dead (הַמֵּתִים) praise not Jah,
Neither any that go down into silence."

On "silence" see under דּוּמָה below, p.75 sq.
Cf. Hezekiah's meditation, (Isa. xxxviii 18 sq.), with this and the following verse, where the same contrast between the dead and the living in their access to Jahveh is vividly brought out. Identical in thought is the following passage:

(IV) cxviii 17. "I shall not die but live,
And recount (וַאֲסַפֵּר) the works of Jah."

"Works of Jah" מַעֲשֵׂי יָהּ; some MSS read sing.: מַעֲשֵׂה
On verb עָשָׂה see A. Guillaume in J.T.S., Jan-Apr.1943, pp.23sq.
Noun, of Jahveh, passim in Psalter.

(V) cxliii 3. Here the darkness of Sheol is before the writer's mind. On this see further, pp.77sqq. below. The verse reads:

"For the enemy persecuteth my soul,
He crusheth down my life to the earth,
He causeth me to dwell in dark places
As those that have been long dead."

Briggs (ii 518) omits the verse as a gloss. Oest (ii 567) כְּמֵתֵי עוֹלָם only, rhythmi causa. The whole phrase הוֹשִׁיבַנִי בְמַחֲשַׁכִּים כְּמֵתֵי עוֹלָם is here cited from Lam. iii 6, with a slight difference in the order.

מוּת (contd.)

The next case which falls for examination presents some difficulties. It comprises the concluding words in the Hebrew of Psalm xlviii 15(14), which EVV render:

"He (i.e. Elohim) will (PBV "shall") be our guide (even) unto death." (עַל־מוּת).

LXX follows the reading עַלְמוֹת, although fem. plur. is not found elsewhere. (Masc.plur. in O.T., script.plena 8 t., s.d. 3 t., constr. once (BDB s.v. עוֹלָם p.761b); full refs. in Briggs i p.83). Fem. plur. form not recognised in BDB.

עַל־מוּת can hardly bear the meaning "unto death", or, as Driver (//Psr p.137) "unto dying (?)" (sic), which would require עַד־מ. עַל־מוּת would appear to be no part of this verse, but a displacement from the title of the following psalm (xlix). Both originally belonged to the same collection, the Qorahite (assigned by Peters to the sanctuary of Dan), hence the displacement is probably earlier than the final redaction. For further discussion and emendations the commentaries should be consulted, (though, as the present writer hopes to show, emendation is unnecessary). See esp., Perowne i 409 sq. for Versns, and Cheyne (1904) i 215 for Gk. BDB's note and ref. (end of para. 1, p.560a)(s.v. מוּת) will be dealt with below.

The suggestion that some of the psalm titles might refer to the subject-matter — a natural one — has already been put forward by Mowinckel (v. Oest. "Fr. App.", pp.85, 89) with convincing results. Following this line of investigation we would venture the suggestion that here is another case in point, עַל־מוּת, or better, עַל־מָוֶת = "upon (i.e. concerning) death"; (v. BDB p.754b, (h), for this use of עַל). This accords well with the subject-matter of Ps. xlix, and may throw some light on the // in the superscription to Ps. ix, (which, with x, was originally one psalm) which has usually been taken as the title of the melody to which the psalm was to be sung, a view difficult to maintain without violence to the Hebrew.

If however לַבֵּן be pointed לְבֵן and equated with the Ass. ✓ 'labanu' = 'throw down' 'prostrate' (for which see BDB p.527b, line 3), and מוּת be pointed מוֹת (constr. of מָוֶת), this title, too, would be indicative of the subject-matter of Psalm ix-x, = "concerning the death (= end) of the oppressor", i.e., the wicked, whose overthrow the psalmist envisages (ix 6(5)sq., 16 (15)sqq., x 15 sqq.).

Cf. also in this connexion, title of xlvi (verse 1 in Heb.) עַל־עֲלָמוֹת, which still requires satisfactory explanation. BDB (s.v. עַלְמָה, to which ref. is made at p.560a as noted above) עַל־עֲלָמוֹת (p.761b) is improbable, as Oest. (i p.16) shows. Perhaps "concerning (the) age-long existence (of Jahveh's tutelage)"

מוּת (contd.)

which, to the psalmist, was "fully proved" (Oesterley's rendering of נִמְצָא מְאֹד in verse 2(1)) by His abiding presence in Zion (cf. verse 6(5)).

The remaining passages are, for our purpose, among the most important in the Book of Psalms.

cvi 28. "They joined themselves also to Baal of Peor (בַּעַל פְּעוֹר),
And ate the sacrifices of the Dead (זִבְחֵי מֵתִים)."

This passage calls for detailed discussion. Are the words "sacrifices of the dead" to be understood in a literal sense and taken as a reference to ancestor-worship or necromancy, or is מֵתִים a synonym of "no-gods" — lifeless beings, as opposed to Jahveh, the living God? (as Kirkp., who compares Ps. cxv 4sqq, Jer. x 11, Wisd. xiii 10).

As often in the "retrospective" psalms, the writer looks back upon outstanding events, both good and bad, in the past history of his people. The incident of Baal-Peor is known to us primarily from Num. xxv 1-5, where no indication is given as to the nature of the cult, although both this passage and Hos. ix 10 state the incident as an act of infidelity to Jahveh. Considerable confusion characterises the Numbers narrative, not only at this point, but also in the preceding and following sections - a criticism which might, with justice, be extended to cover practically the whole of that Book. (See L.E. Binns, 'Numbers', Introd. p.xiv). Josephus (Antiq. IV vi) furnishes a much more connected narrative, which, on an initial reading is redolent of a midrash. It is possible, however, that he is here using a source or sources from which the Biblical writers have merely taken excerpts. This may be held to be borne out by the testimony of the writer of the psalm, who appears to attribute the plague to punishment for the Baal-Peor trespass. In the Josephus account, however, no mention is made of Baal-Peor, but the trespass in which Zimri was only one amongst many (in Numbers he appears as the sole offender) is represented as having its origin in the suggestion of Balaam (loc.cit., sect.6; cf. Num. xxxi 8, 16).

The person of Balaam as presented in the Biblical narrative is shrouded in almost impenetrable obscurity. While it is clearly outside the scope of the present study to examine the evidence regarding his person in any detail, there is one question upon which something should be said, for it has a marked bearing upon the elucidation of Psalm cvi 28 sqq. Can it be that Baal-Peor is none other than Balaam himself? Two lines of thought suggest themselves here.

(1) In the first place, it has already been conjectured by S. Daiches that Balaam was a 'bārû',[1] a sorcerer pure and simple. Among his methods of divination[2] we may posit that of the "raiser of the spirit of the dead", one of the offices of the various Babylonian orders of priests: as Kautzsch has noted, he is nowhere called a prophet or seer (H.D.B. v 650a). That he was a necromancer (a 'shā'ilu'), if that be, in fact, a correct identification) seems to be further borne out by the designation 'Baal-Peor', פְּעוֹר being a 'cleft' 'fissure' (v. BDB sub √ פְּעַר, p.822a; E.Bi.3653 s.v. 'Peor'). Such were commonly regarded by the ancients as entrances to the underworld, hence places where the dead were wont to be consulted. In the Gilgamesh Epic (Tab. xii, col. iii, line 27 sq.) Nergal "opened the hole of the earth and the spirit ('utukku') of Ea-bani like a mist arose" (Pinches op.cit.110; E.R.E. i 440a); among the Greeks "deep chasms or openings in the earth were observed, through which the shades could rise from their subterranean home, and give responses to the living. The Greeks called such places oracles of the dead (νεκυομαντεῖον, ψυχομαντεῖον, ψυχοπομπεῖον). The most ancient oracle of this kind was that of Thesprotia, where Periander succeeded in conjuring up and questioning the ghost of his murdered wife, Melissa (Herod. v 92; Paus. ix 30 3). There was another at Phigalia in Arcadia (Paus. iii 17 8,9), and Italy possessed one at Lake Avernus (Diod. iv 22; Strabo v 244)[3]." Kautzsch's derivation of Sheol as 'wide gaping' is interesting in this connexion (v. supra, p.32).

In view of this evidence, פְּעוֹר, by metonymy, might have been a local designation of the underworld (cf. שַׁחַת, בּוֹר etc.). On the analogy of בַּעַל אוֹב, בַּעַל פְּעוֹר would indicate one having the power to summon the inhabitants of פְּעוֹר, with the object of invoking their good or malign offices. It was the latter which Balak desired Balaam to secure against Israel on his behalf. The equating of פְּעוֹר with the underworld, hence its inhabitants, is further borne out by the fact that no such mountain site (Num. xxiii 28) is known (v. E.Bi. 3653 sq.); again, if the etymology (= 'fissure') be correct, it is hardly conceivable that a mountain would be so termed unless it were volcanic, which in turn would only serve further to establish the association with Sheol, a volcanic site strongly suggesting an entrance to the abyss.

Within the narrative of Balaam as we have it to-day there are other traces which tend to confirm the view that he was a necromancer. In xxiv 2 he divines by the "spirit of Elohim" (רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים; cf. I Sam. xxviii 13); his behest to the messengers to tarry all night[4] (Num. xxii 8) is in accord with known methods of necromancy among the Greeks (see Frazer, "Folk-lore in the O.T.", abr. edn. p.298sq; E.R.E. i 428b); the sacrifice (Num. xxiii 1-6) calls to mind the famous passage in the Odyssey (xi lines 23 sqq.) where Ulysses summons up the ghosts from the underworld,[5] who will only communicate with him after the offer-

ing of the necessary sacrifice. It is tempting to see in Num. xxiii 24 ("He shall not lie down until he .... drink the blood of the slain") a parallel which has become obscured. Again, the passage which has so puzzled commentators and elicited entirely opposite meanings[1] (xxiv 3, 15 הַגֶּבֶר שְׁתֻם הָעָיִן "the man whose eye was opened (?)") may be a reference to one of the pre-requisites of a diviner,—that he must be physically sound. One "defective as to the eyes" etc., could not, among the Babylonains, be a keeper of oracles (E.R.E. x 285b; H.D.B. v 579b), the same stringency obtaining in regard to the Hebrew priesthood (Lev. xxi 16sqq.). Pirqe Abôth v 22 appears to have had in mind Num. xxiv 3, 15, and to have interpreted שְׁתֻם הָעָיִן, the meaning of which was not known, as an instance of the operation of the "evil eye" (עַיִן רָעָה, for which see Lightfoot's comprehensive note on Gal. iii 1).

If Balaam be an historical figure we may conclude that he was a sorcerer of Babylonian or Assyrian origin (Num. xxii 5, xxiii 7), perhaps settled in the neighbourhood of Ammon (reading with several Mss, Sam., Syr., etc., עַמּוֹן for עַמּוֹ in xxii 5). That a seer's activities were not confined to his native place is clear from the cases of Amos and Jonah. The confusion regarding his original home extends even to his name (including the patronymic 'ben Beor', i.q. Peor(?)) which most derive from √בלע, 'swallow'.[2] In this connexion, the evidence would seem to point to the verb as one form of expansion of an earlier bi-literal √לע implying the making of guttural or 'swallowing' noises,[3] and so 'hesitancy in speech',[4] hence, the inarticulate murmurings of a soothsayer (cf. Isa. viii 19, xxix 4), whence the derivation of the name Balaam (בִּלְעָם).

It is difficult to escape the conviction, although based almost entirely on indirect evidence, that in the strange story of Balaam we have an account of a necromancer consulted by Balak, and, in some way which has perhaps been deliberately obscured by the redactor, by the Israelites or their representatives on the strength of his former oracle in their favour. It is not improbable that the incident of the witch of Endor (I Sam xxviii) might have suffered a like redactional fate had it not served the useful purpose of providing ready material ~~for the~~ for the designed denigration of the tragic figure of Saul.

(2) The second line of thought which can here receive but brief mention is the possibility that in one form in which the Balaam story circulated, although almost entirely obscured in the final redaction (cf. Sellin "Introduction to the O.T."[5] p.32) is the consultation by Balak in his role of Priest-king (E.R.E. x 286a) of the god of the underworld, Baal Peor. (cf. the case of Nebuchadrezzar in Ezek. xxi 26 (21 in EVV). This tradition was perhaps the one known to Micah (vi 5), the difficulty being to determine what are the glosses in this reference.

In this event, Baal-Peor would be the god of the underworld, the "king of terrors" of Job xviii 14 (see above, p.42). Be that as it may, we may with some justification conclude that there is a fair measure of probability in th association of Ps. cvi 28 with the activities of Balaam and his necromantic rites. In some manner the partaking of the Israelites in these rites persisted in tradition, although the actual time and manner of their so doing has become obscured. After struggling with the narrative in the Book of Numbers,[1] together with the works of the various commentators, it is refreshing to read Burkitt's robust treatment.[2] Brushing aside the difficulties, which are well-nigh insuperable, he brings to mind the boldness with which Irenaeus confutes all heretics![3]

Closely allied in thought with this passage is Ps. lxxxii, which, it is sugge sted, in an earlier form was a condemnation of the necromancer and his trafficking with 'familiar spirits.'

The presence in the Psalter of references to sorcerers, magical terms and formulas, is familiar enough through the researches of Mowinckel. Although it is no doubt true of this scholar and his followers, as of all pioneers, that the case they advocate is overstated,[4] it cannot be denied that he has at least established a strong case for recognition and further investigation. If it be true, as Summers asserts, that it is impossible to understand life at such a comparatively late period as Medieval England unless the important place occupied by witchcraft and sorcery is given full weight,[5] how much more truly can this be postulated of the ancient world in general and, for our present purpose, Israel in particular? That ancestor-worship and its derivative, necromancy, were practised in early Israel is an inference few would dispute; although the former seems to have disappeared at a comparatively early date, the latter persisted to the period of the Exile and even beyond. As Kautzsch points out, all the zeal of the reforming prophets could not stop this and other forms of sorcery (H.D.B. v 651a).

The psalm under review is a notable 'crux interpretum', turning on the meaning of "Elohim". Some, as Cheyne (1888) and "Origin of Psr"), Hupfeld, Gunkel, and Oest., following Bleek, regard the "Elohim" of the psalm as angels, the guardian spirits of the nations (cf. Plutarch and the government of the 'Ultimate God' through "deputies" (ἐπόπται), also the view of Celsus. For refs. and discussion see Glover, "The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire"[6] p.95); others, as Ewald, De Wette, Briggs, regard the psalm as an invective against heathen rulers who have oppressed Israel; while Kirkp., Perowne, Kittel, Cheyne (1904), W.E. Barnes,

adopt the traditional view dating back to the Targum, that the "Elohim" are the oppressive native judges of Israel.

To each of these interpretations objections can be raised. Welch ("The Psalter in Life, Worship and History",[1] p.43) criticises the last-named, the present writer thinks, conclusively. But his own view, the first named above in preceding paragraph, is not without difficulties. It would postulate, for this particular psalm, a date later than the present writer is prepared to concede. (While a possible // might be found in the Prologue to Job, the basic idea behind the view of Welch, Gunkel, et al., is much more developed, and would be more exactly paralleled in Daniel (2nd Cty., B.C.) The present writer, however, regards the prologue to Job as a composition later in date than the body of the work, to which he would assign a date not later than the closing years of the 6th Cty.). Again, on such a view, it would be difficult, without a semblance of artificiality, to fit verses 3 and 4 into such a context. The second-named view is the least probable of the three.

While not without its own peculiar difficulties, there is at least the possibility that the Psalm, in its original form, was, as suggested above, a polemic directed against the widespread practice of enquiring of the dead. That there are objections to such a view is fully admitted, but what is true of a would-be writer of a history of Israel can be no less true of a would-be interpreter in the much more restricted field of a particular psalm: he must, in the words of S.A. Cook "select his material, and ignore or glide over difficulties." (Preface to Kennett, "The Church of Israel", p.xxxvii.).

In this case, the "Elohim" of the psalm would refer, as in I Sam. xxviii 13, to the spirits of the dead, whom the psalmist sees arraigned — not for judgment on an ethical basis as in Dan xii 2 and the extra-canonical works — but for uttering perverse oracles through the medium of the necromancer. It should here be pointed out that a discussion such as that of Kirkp. in Cambr. Bi. (I Sam., p.244sq.) is, in fact, irrelevant, for we are concerned in I Sam. xxviii and in other passages bearing on the same subject, not with the question of the actual objectivity of the supposed underlying reality, but with current beliefs. From the manner in which the O.T. writers speak of necromancy it is clear that a belief in the invocation of the departed was unquestionably real (see, in addition to I Sam. xxviii, Deut. xviii 10-12 (the 'locus classicus' for witchcraft), II Kings xxi 6, Isa. viii 19 and xxix 4, Ecclus. xlvi 20; also, according to some, Isa. lxv 3 sq, lxvi 17 (of necromantic rites in gardens, the sites of tombs, cf. S.John xix 41, xx 15)).

As often, the text of Ps. lxxxii has suffered considerably at the hands of the redactor, so that the original form is diff-

cult, if not impossible, to determine. The following philological and exegetical notes are offered in an attempt to elucidate some of the main points at issue. (The numbers are those of the verses of the psalm.)

1. אֱלֹהִים נִצָּב) A substitution of the Elohistic redactor for יְהוָה נ (Kirkp. ad loc.). Perhaps originally נצב יהוה

(בַּעֲדַת־) אֵל An alteration of the Elohist to avoid repetition. Read אֱלֹהִים : cf. LXX Θεῶν.

בְּקֶרֶב) Read perhaps בְּקֶבֶר: "in the grave the 'elohim' He judges".

2. רְשָׁעִים) the necromancers.

3, 4. These verses are admittedly not easy to assimilate to the context proposed. If the רְשָׁעִים be correctly identified with the sorcerer, there are many //s in the Psalter: e.g., v 6(5)sq., xiv 4 i.q. liii 5, xxviii 3-5, lviii, lix, xciv, etc.

5. This verse, usually regarded as a gloss (Moffatt omits), now becomes illuminating. The condition of the dead is negative in the extreme: "they know not" לֹא יָדָעוּ, a permansive-perfect form, denoting a state which has "become habitual, whether in the case of individual persons or in universal propositions" (v. G.R.Driver, "Probs. of the Heb. Verbal System" p.115 sq. for examples). The negative conception of Sheol (v. supra, p.27sq.) appears to have had its origin in what is sometimes termed the "prophetic revolution", which, among its other reforms, sought to stop trafficking with the dead as unfaithfulness to Jahveh. (E.O. James, "The O.T. in the Light of Anthrop." p.79, and same writer in N.C., p.684b; Kautzsch, ref. on p.66 above). If our hypothesis for the background of the psalm be true, the assertion in this verse is fully in line with ~~with~~ the thought of the prophets (cf. Isa. viii 19, etc.), evoking the fine satire in verses 6 and 7.

"They know not") cf. Dr.& Gray, n. on Job xiv 21,22: "Knowledge does not survive death" (p.131).

They understand not") i.e., their state renders them incapable of apprehending the issues on which their judgment is sought, and therefore of giving any valid counsel. Verb is preterite-imperf. form, denoting a state of understanding that can never come to fruition (cf. G.R.Driver, op. cit., p.122). So, "they walk to and fro in darkness", the same form in almost a gnomic sense (ibid.).

מזמור (contd.)

5.(contd.) "All the foundations of the earth are shaken") So M.T., and interpreted as the principles of social order, — justice, righteousness, etc. But the comparison to a "world destroying earthquake" (Oest. ii 374) would appear, on any interpretation of the psalm, a gratuitous hyperbole.

Read perhaps: יַשְׁעוּ כָּל־מוֹשְׁבֵי אָרֶץ "they deceive all the inhabitants of the earth", thus retaining the parallelism. For such deception by false oracles see J. Hempel in J.T.S., Apr. 1939, p.123.

6. אֲנִי) Read אָם, correlative to אָכֵן in following verse. Cf. lxvi 18, 19.

7. כְּאָדָם) expressing conformity to a standard or rule (BDB s.v. כְּ 1.c.(1), p.454a), i.e., in conformity with the destiny of the genus 'man' ye are dead (universal or gnomic, G.R. Driver, op.cit., pp. 10, 122.). Briggs's comment, although he takes a different view of the ps., would obtain here: "They were not really divine but human" (ii p.216).

"As one of the princes are ye fallen") Perhaps the writer has in mind the fate of the primitive 'Bne 'Elohim' of Gen. vi 1-4 (J). So Addis in P.C., p.387b. W.E. Barnes (ad loc., ii 396sq) renders: "And fall as one man, O Princes", reading כְּאֶחָד as Ewald.

Psalm lviii next claims attention, for there is a close alliance between it and the preceding (lxxxii), compared with which the text has suffered more, either in transmission or by deliberate alteration. In view of the similarity, it is unnecessary to examine the psalm in such close detail. If we could "draw aside the curtain of words" we should undoubtedly have here a vivid, contemporary picture of the sorcerer amid all the elaborate accroutrements of his office: 8(7), for example, is a clear reference to belomancy.

Here the "Elohim" again appear, reading with most modern commentators אֱלִים for M.T. אֱלֹם. (Oest. i 292, misleading here, as often. The reading אֱלִים is much older than Ewald, dating back to Bishop Lowth, the first writer definitely to establish the principle of parallelism in Hebrew poetry, although it had been adumbrated in earlier times (v. Briggs i p.xxxv)). For other emendations see Briggs ii p.46, and, more recently, G.R.Driver in J.T.S., July-Oct., 1942, p.157).

Unless a condemnation of the sorcerer be the purport of this psalm it is wholly unintelligible. The abrupt beginning, together with the continuity of thought, suggest that lvii and lviii were originally one psalm.

הוה (contd.)

Belonging to the same 'Gattung' is Ps. v, which reflects the confidence of one who remains faithful to Jahveh, living in His fear, as against those whose lives are directed by the sorcerers' oracles. Again, unfortunately, the text is out of order, especially in the last two verses. The important verse, however, for our consideration is 10(9):

"There is no understanding in their mouth;
Their inward part is destruction;
An open sepulchre is their throat;
They deceive with their tongue."

The purport is clear: there is no substance (נְכוֹנָה fem. part. כון Niph.; LXX ἀλήθεια) in the words of the soothsayer, his thoughts being a mere reflection of the environment of the dead (הַוּוֹת intens. plur., "the ruin into which one has fallen and been engulfed" (Briggs i p.44), hence an apt synonym of Sheol (cf. Arab. هَاوِيَة 'deep pit' 'hell'; Syr. ܗܘܝܬܐ (S.Luke xvi 26) 'gulf' 'chasm' (BDB p.217b, s.v. הָוָה).
Having regard to the point which Kennett used so persistently to emphasise and illustrate, namely, that Hebrew thought is directed in the main towards the "effect" or "result" (summarised in Essay IV, "The Grammar of O.T. Study", in "The Church of Israel", pp. 139 sqq., esp. pp. 143, 148) the meaning of the verse becomes clear. The words spoken by the necromancer are mere vanity, since the dead, as contrasted with the living God, are in no position to advise and protect the living. Hence the soothsayer's throat, as the organ of speech, is an opened sepulchre (so B.D.B. s.v. קֶבֶר p.173b), iterating the worthless vapourings of the dead; his tongue is the instrument of their seductiveness.

xli 6(5). "Mine enemies speak evil against me
(Saying), When shall he die and his name perish?"

Here again the sorcerer appears. For "speak evil" and other magical terms in the psalm see Oest. i p.239. The parallels with Bab. magic are certainly striking. For the latter see Jastrow in H.D.B. v 537b sq., 551b-556a, where illustrations from incantation ritual given; for Egyptian, H.D.B. iii 207b; Useful summary of magic in Heb. and Bab. life in E.Bi., art. MAGIC, 2895 sqq., where Heb. terms given; Oest.& Rob. pp.71 sqq; Lods "Israel" pp.211 sqq; on the whole subject, Sir E.A. Wallis-Budge "Amulets and Superstitions" (Oxford, 1930), copiously illustrated; for the works of Blau, Mowinckel, Nickolsky, see Oest. i 239 n.1. W.E. Barnes, in his work on the Psalms, attaches less than due weight to the presence of magical elements (i pp.lxxi sqq).

The second point of interest in connexion with this verse is the perishing of the name, that is, the personality and all the qualities accruing to it, with death. Briggs takes as of the nation, but the reference here is surely to the individual. The meaning is best brought by Perowne (i 356, following Diodati):

מות (contd.)

"When shall he die and his name have perished?" (See n. on tenses opposite). It is unnecessary to read into this passage (as Cheyne, "Origin" p.246) "O that his posterity might be cut off", as in cix 13 (so, too, Kirkp. p.217). The desire expressed is the disappearance of his memory (as Davison, Cent.Bi. ad loc.,p.217), and so // with xxxiv 17(16): "The face of Jahveh is against evil doers, to cut off their memory (זֵכֶר) from the earth."

Similar in thought is xlix 18(17):

"He will take nothing away when he dieth;
His glory will not descend after him."

"His glory" כְּבוֹדוֹ, "the outward tokens of his prosperity" (H.D.B. ii 183, art. GLORY), which for long were regarded as an infallible index of a man's integrity in the sight of Jahveh. See Charles "Eschat." p.64 sq.
Cf. Job i 21: "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither." It is unlikely that physical nakedness is implied (cf. supra, p.30, n.5), but rather a being shorn of worldly possessions, as befits the context. Job is thus // to the psalm under consideration, and to Qoh. v 15, I Tim. vi 7.

The idea of the passing of one's memory amongst former acquaintances occurs again in xxxi 13(12):

"I am forgotten as one dead (and) out of mind;
I am become as a perishing vessel."

The passage which concludes our survey of the occurrences of the verb מות in the Psalter emphasises once again the inevitable fate awaiting all. Even wisdom, so much to be sought, and so highly prized, is unable to deliver its possessor. In the words of Ovid:

"Tendimus huc omnes; metam properamus ad unam;
Omnia sub leges mors vocat atra suas." (Ad Liv. 359)

So the psalmist sees "that wise men (חֲכָמִים) die: the fool (כְּסִיל) and the brutish (בַּעַר) perish together." (xlix 11(10)).

חֲכָמִים here = the ethically wise, walking in the fear of Jahveh.[2]
כְּסִיל: "unreceptive of instruction, either by counsel or experience (H.D.B. ii p.44). בַּעַר: "by nature stupid" (ibid). בַּעַר only poetical (BDB s.v., p.129b).

גָּוַע, to die, properly 'expire' (P and poetical), (BDB p.157a), occurs twice in Psalter: גָּוֹעַ, 'ready to die' (lxxxviii 16(15), and יִגְוָעוּן 'they die' (civ 29, on which see above, p.53, sub עָפָר). These passages add nothing germane to the present inquiry.

Further terms illustrative of Sheol are as follows:-

קֶבֶר (noun) 'grave' 'sepulchre' / קָבַר 'bury', the verb occurring 132 t. in O.T., but only once in Psalter (lxxix 3; see p.29 above). קֶבֶר (noun) 67 t., of which 4 (MT, 3) in Pss.

(I) v 10(9). v. supra, p. 70.

(II) lxxxviii 6(5).-v. supra, p. 60.

(III) lxxxviii 12(11). v. infra, s.v. אֲבַדּוֹן

(IV) Reading, after LXX, Vulg., Targ., and with most commentators, קִרְבָּם for קִבְרֵיהֶם (v. B.D.B. p.899a, lines 5 and 4 from bottom):

"Graves are their houses evermore;
Their dwelling-places for ever and ever."
(xlix 12(11).

Cf. R.H. Charles's view that Sheol was extension of the family grave (ref. supra, p.29, n.2).

אֲבַדּוֹן noun fem.(?). Only here in Psalter, otherwise only in Wisdom literature: Job xxvi 6, xxviii 22, xxxi 12; Prov. xv 11, xxvii 20 (Qre). Beer adopts as original reading in Job xli 22(14), on the evidence of LXX, which here renders ἡ ἀπώλεια, the rendering of אֲבַדּוֹן in all passages except Jb. xxxi 12. (Dr.&Gray, Pt.II, p.341, phil.n.).

Briggs (ii 249) "the place of ruin in Sheol", but we would prefer "Sheol as place of ruin". Cheyne (ii, p.60 (1904)) "Perdition land." The ps. in which it occurs is, as might be expected, the gloomy 88th, verse 12(11). The occurrence is interesting, in view of the later distinctions in Sheol (cf. supra, pp. 49 and 52). Such a distinction does not appear to be implied in this ps., the term being simply one of a fourfold parallelism descriptive of the underworld:- the grave, Abaddon, Darkness, the Land of Forgetfulness.

The same question arises in regard to the next term to be considered:

תַּחְתִּי BDB (p. 1066 a,sq.) takes as adj. and noun = 'lower' 'lowest'(places). The question again arises as to whether the usage of the word implies the recognition of divisions in the Underworld, or whether it is merely a circumlocution for Sheol. An examination of the relevant usages strongly suggests the latter. Three of these are in the Psalter, the first two of which may be taken together:

תַּחְתִּי (contd.)

(I) lxxxviii 7(6). "Thou (Jahveh) hast laid me in the lowest Pit (בְּבוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת).

(II) lxxxvi 13. (See also under שְׁאוֹל XI, p. 42, above).

"For Thy loving-kindness is great upon me;
And Thou wilt pluck me from Sheol beneath."
(וְהוֹשַׁעְתָּ מִשְּׁאוֹל תַּחְתִּיָּה).

The term is found again in conjunction with שְׁאוֹל in the poetical passage, Deut. xxxii 22, the date of which is uncertain: Driver (ICC, p.347), assigns (prob.) to age of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. From the context it is clear that the meaning is simply "to the furthest limits of Sheol":

"A fire burneth to the nethermost Sheol" (עַד־שְׁאוֹל תַּחְתִּית),

"a graphic but hyperbolical description ... of the far-reaching and destructive operation of the Divine anger; ... the stream of Jahveh's fire penetrates even to the Underworld". (ibid. p.366). Driver compares Amos ix 2. Another comparison is Job xxxi 12.

(III) In Ps. lxiii 10(9) the term is no more than a synonym of Sheol as situated beneath the earth:

"They that seek after my life to destroy it (or, "to their own destruction") (לְשׁוֹאָה)
Shall go into the lower (or "lowest") parts of the earth."
(בְּתַחְתִּיּוֹת הָאָרֶץ).

Perhaps omit לְשׁוֹאָה as gloss (so Oest.); it is ambiguous, and can be interpreted either subjectively or objectively. If the original were לִשְׁאוֹל, which is unlikely, a distinction might be admitted, especially if MT in following verse is correct:

"They shall be delivered (with LXX, Syr., יִגָּרוּ for יַגִּירֻהוּ)
to the power of the sword;
They shall be a portion for jackals" (שְׁעָלִים).

but שְׁעָלִים is dubious. Si vera lect., absence of burial would seem to be indicated, with all its deleterious consequences (see p.29 above). Probably the word should be pointed שְׁעָלִים = 'hollow places'.

It might be urged that the form תַּחְתִּיּוֹת is an intensive plur., meaning 'the lowest places', and that in this form the term implies a distinction. But in Ezk., both sing. and plur. appear to be used indiscriminately: xxxi 14, אֶל־אֶרֶץ תַּחְתִּית // בּוֹר; 16, בְּאֶרֶץ // בּוֹר and שְׁאוֹל; 18, form as in 14; xxvi 20, בְּאֶרֶץ // תַּחְתִּיּוֹת; xxxii 18, 24, אֶל־אֶרֶץ תַּחְתִּיּוֹת // בּוֹר in both cases. In Isa. xliv 23, תַּחְתִּיּוֹת אֶרֶץ contrasted with the heavens: Sir G.A.Smith (ii p.170) " deeps of the earth." Lam. iii 55: מִבּוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת.

תַּחְתִּי (contd.)

(IV) The remaining occurrence in the Psalter is cxxxix 15 (בְּתַחְתִּיּוֹת אֶרֶץ) where some see an allusion to an early legend of the fashioning of the body, then of the soul, in the underworld; v. H.D.B. iv 63b, art. PRE-EXISTENCE OF SOULS; Oest. ii 557. But the reference may be nothing more than figurative of the inner recesses of the womb (so H.D.B. iii 225b: "context points to the embryonic development of the body."). More will be said on this matter at a later stage.

To summarise: in our judgment there would appear to be evidence, either in the use of the term תחתי, -ה, -ת, -ות in the Book of Psalms or elsewhere in the Old Testament, which would imply any distinctions in Sheol such as were recognised at a later stage.

בְּלִיַּעַל BDB regards the term as a compound, בְּלִי 'not' 'without', and יַעַל 'worth' 'use' 'profit' ((s.v. p.116a). So most commentators. It is difficult to regard this etymology otherwise than purely artificial. יַעַל as a noun, does not occur apart from this putative combination with בְּלִי, though this is not, of itself, conclusive against its existence. Far more probable is Cheyne's view (E.Bi., art. BELIAL, 525 sqq., where origin and meaning of term fully discussed). Following Lagarde, he derives from בְּלִי יַעֲלָה = 'no rising up', hence of Sheol as the 'land of no return', but originally the name of a goddess of vegetation, hence of the underworld, a view favoured by G.R. Driver (in "The Psalmists", p.146.). See also Cheyne ((1904) i p. 67a; E.R.E. iv 601a. With Cheyne's derivation from בלע (op.cit.67b) cf. the view taken of Balaam above (p.65)).

Cheyne's view would accord well with the context in Ps. xviii 5(4):

"Waves of death encompassed me;
Torrents of Belial terrified me". (see p.55 above)

In xli 9(8) the word is found in juxtaposition with דָּבָר, where an incantation seems to be indicated:

(דְּבַר בְּלִיַּעַל)
"A curse/do they pour out against me; (reading יִצְקוּ for יָצוּק, and with LXX, בִּי for בּוֹ)
'Let him lie down and rise up again no more'."

G.R. Driver reads דֶּבֶר בַּ, 'a devilish plague' (J.T.S., July-Oct., 1942, p.154., but the psalm, as Guillaume remarks, is almost certainly a prayer against the sorcerers, verse 8(7) containing "two words of dubious associations with the occult, 'lahash' and 'hashab'!" ("Prophecy and Divination", Bampton Lectures for 1938, p. 34, and ibid., n.3). See further, id., pp.279, 284.

The term 'Belial' occurs again in ci 3, which Oest. (ii 432) renders:

בְּלִיַּעַל (contd.)

"I will not set before mine eyes a base thing;
An act of apostasy I hate, it shall not cleave to me."

"A base thing" דְּבַר־בְּלִיָּעַל.
The psalm, like the preceding example, appears originally to have been an abrogation of witchcraft and sorcery. Oest.(loc.cit.) regards it as having been adapted to liturgical use by altering the opening words to an appropriate form for worship.
The same meaning is discernible in Nah. i 11, while in i 15(EVV), (Heb., ii 1), the term appears to be a synonym of death or destruction. It is quite possible that with the increasing tendency to emphasise the negative aspect of Sheol and the dead, the term 'Belial' might have acquired the secondary connotation of "worthlessness". It is certain that in this term we have a relic of ancient Semitic mythology, as in 'Tehom' (xxxiii 7 & 11 t.); 'Leviathan'(lxxiv 14, civ 26); 'Tannim' 'Tannin' (xliv 20, lxxiv 13, cxlviii 7); Rahab (lxxxix 11(10), of Egypt lxxxvii 4). Barton is probably right in conjecturing that "Belial was an old name for Sheol." It would explain why, when the Underworld was later regarded as the abode of evil spirits, it became among the extra-canonical writers "the name of the prince and leader of all evil and destructive spirits". (Art. DEMONS AND SPIRITS (Hebrew), E.R.E. iv p.601a).

"Silence" as a characteristic of Sheol occurs continually in the Psalter, and frequently in the Book of Job.

דוּמָה noun fem., occurs twice:

xciv 17. "Unless Jahveh had been my help
My soul had soon dwelt in silence."

cxv 17. "The dead praise not Jah,
Neither any that go down into silence."

In the latter case, the condition of those "that go down into silence" (יֹרְדֵי דוּמָה, phrase א.ל. Briggs (ii 397) compares יֹרְדֵי בוֹר, xxviii 1, cxliii 7) is contrasted with that of the living: (as cxviii 17):-
"But we (וַאֲנַחְנוּ; LXX equally emphatic, inserting ἡμεῖς) will bless Jah,
From this time forth and for ever." (cxv 18).

It should be noted that there is some uncertainty attaching to the word. As an abstract noun it is found only in the above two passages. In Isa. xxi 11 it occurs as the title of an oracle (מַשָּׂא דוּמָה, where Ewald and Dillmann interpret as of 'concealment' = hidden meaning (B.D.B. s.v. p.189a). E.Bi. (s.v. SILENCE, 4521) regards "the existence of such a word as most improbable; no Ass. //". B.D.B. (loc. cit.) gives no cognates, and places the word

דוּמָה (contd.)

under the doubtful √ דום , whereas it should correctly be placed under דמם I, p.198b.

As a proper name it occurs 3 t., viz., Gen. xxv 14 (P) = I Chron i 30, a son of Ishmael; Josh xv 52, as name of a city in the hill country of Judah. Some would here add Isa. xxi 11, e.g. Sir G.A. Smith ("Isaiah" i p.283), as an "anagram for Edom and an enigmatic sign to the wise Edomites", their land lying under the "silence" of rapid decay. Similarly Peake in P.C., p.451a; L.E.Binns in N.C., p.448b; D.S. Margoliouth in HDB, s.v. Even if regarded as a textual error for אֲדוֹם (as J.A. Selbie (HDB iv 519a, art. SIMEON (Tribe)) this would not explain its occurrence in these two psalm passages. On Isa. xxi 11, it is impossible to go beyond G.B. Gray ("Isaiah" i-xxvii. ICC): "The Hebrew title 'The Oracle of Dumah' presents an unsolved riddle" (p.358), and LXX τῆς Ἰδουμαίας "possibly an interpretation rather than a variant" (phil.n., p.359).

In his work of 1904 (ad loc., ii p.95), Cheyne emends in the psalm passages to עַלְמוּת . This is entirely unjustifiable, for his argument that it can hardly be a synonym for Sheol on the grounds of its absence from Job is extremely precarious — literally an argument from "silence"! If emendation be sought the most plausible would be אֲדָמָה , but none is necessary.

דּוּמִיָּה (BDB 189a) occurs in xxii 3(2), xxxix 3(2), lxii 2(1), lxv 2(1) s.d., but in none of these cases has it any reference to the underworld.

דָּמִי , in Psalter. lxxxiii 2(1): "O God, let no rest (דָּמִי) be Thine." A different word from דָּמִי in Isa. xxxviii 10, which, as shown above (p. 59) should be placed under √ דמה I, and not II as BDB. דָּמִי in this ps. passage is correctly placed, but is not relevant to the present inquiry.

אֵלֶם 'silence', occurs twice in Psalter (MT), and not elsewhere. In both cases it is almost universally emended:-

(1) lvi 1 (title in EVV), reading אַלְם with most commentators, following Bochart: "To 'The Dove of the distant terebinths'" (of title of melody).

(2) lviii 2(1). Read אִלִּים following Lowth. (v. supra, p. 69).

דָּמַם verb, 'be silent' 'dumb' 'still'. Two of the seven occurrences of the verb in the Psalter are in relation to Sheol:

xxxi 18(17) "Let the wicked be ashamed;
Let them be silent (יִדְּמוּ) in Sheol".

דָּמַם (contd.)

And in xxx 13(12), contrasting his former wretchedness and contemplation of Sheol (verses 4(3) and 10(9)) with his present condition in which Jahveh has "girded him with joy" (12(11)), the psalmist exults:

"That my heart may sing praise to Thee and not be silent".
(וְלֹא יִדֹּם)

"My heart", reading כְּבֵדִי for כָּבוֹד, with Oest.(i 203). Others take כָּבוֹד as כְּבוֹדִי (so LXX. ἡ δόξά μου) as vii 6(5), xvi 9, of the soul. But in xvi 9 כְּבֵדִי should prob. be read, as Gunkel. In lvii 9(8) read, with LXX, כְּבוֹדִי.
כָּבֵד literally 'liver' as seat of the emotions (BDB 458a).

In xxviii 1 the silence is on the part of Jahveh, Who can have no dealings with those in the Pit:

"Unto Thee, O my Rock, do I cry: be not silent(a) unto me,
Lest, if Thou be silent(b) in relation to me, I should be
like them that go down to the Pit."

(a) Or 'be dumb', חָרַשׁ. Elsewhere in Psalter 7 t., but not in this sense.
(b) חָשָׁה. Elsewhere in Psalter twice, but again not of Sheol.

In view of the testimony of these last three passages, together with other Old Testament passages witnessing to the silence of the inhabitants of Sheol, we may conclude that there is strong presumptive evidence for the accuracy of דּוּמָה = 'silence', and its being correctly regarded as standing for a synonym of the underworld. It was so taken by LXX, which renders ᾅδης in both passages.

Sheol as a land of darkness and gloom is frequently encountered in the Psalms, as in Job, where it is an inseparable characteristic. The 'locus classicus' is Job x 22, where even the sunshine is black. Although the text here is not altogether in order the import is clear (see Dr. & Gray ad loc., and phil. n., Pt. II, p.66).

חָשַׁךְ and its derivatives חֹשֶׁךְ ('darkness' 'obscurity'), חֲשֵׁכָה ('darkness', chiefly poet.), מַחְשַׁךְ ('dark place', poet.) are predicated of Sheol in the following passages:

חָשַׁךְ and derivatives (contd.)

(I) lxxxviii 7(6). "Thou hast laid me in the Lowest Pit,
In dark places, in the depths."

"The lowest Pit" בּוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת. On the phrase see pp.72 sqq.
"Dark places" מַחֲשַׁכִּים, plur. of מַחְשָׁךְ, (noun fem.). Plur. only here and cxliii 3 = Lam. iii 6. Plur. constr. only lxxiv 20, not of Sheol. Sing. lxxxviii 19(18) (pausal), otherwise Isa. xxix 15, xlii 16, the two last not of Sheol. Oest. ii 394 reads בְּמוֹ חֲשֻׁכִים "among them that are restrained in the depths."
"Depths" מְצוּלוֹת, of submarine location of Sheol, as lxix 3(2), on which see above, p.45. On forms [מְצוּלָה] מְצוּלָה, see BDB p.846b.

(II) id. 19(18). "Thou hast removed from me lover and friend;
My acquaintances are darkness."

The second member is difficult: מְיֻדָּעַי מַחְשָׁךְ
LXX reads: ἐμάκρυνας ἀπ' ἐμοῦ φίλον καὶ τοὺς γνωστούς μου ἀπὸ ταλαιπωρίας ; so Vulg. "Elongasti a me amicum et proximum: et notos meos a miseria.
Oest. (loc.cit.), after Jer. ("notos meos abstulisti") and Syr., reads וּמְיֻדָּע תַּשְׁכֵּחְתָּ: "Lover hast thou taken far from me, and comrade hast thou withdrawn." Prob. this is the reading to be preferred.

(III) id. ~~xiii 13~~ 13(12). "Shall Thy wonders be known in the darkness?
Thy righteousness in the land of oblivion?" (נְשִׁיָּה)

"Darkness" חֹשֶׁךְ, (noun masc.), 11 t. in Psalter. Only here certainly of Sheol, and possibly cvii 10, 14, cxxxix 11, 12, which are examined below.

"Oblivion", or "forgetfulness", √נָשָׁה II, 'forget' (BDB 674b). "A poetic term, unknown elsewhere, suggesting prob. that the dead were forgotten by the dwellers upon earth and also by God, as verse 6(5), rather than that they are forgetful of their life in this world." (Briggs, ii 247). Cf. xxxi 13(12), p.71 supra; Job xiv 21. Cheyne reads: נִ֫ישְׁנִים "in the land of sleepers" (ii p.60, and crit.n., p.61sq(1904))

(IV) cvii 10-16. This passage is usually taken as a thanksgiving for deliverance from prison or captivity, but it is reasonable to see in the writer's mind some analogy to the final prison from which there is no release. In verse 10 they dwell in darkness (חֹשֶׁךְ) and deathly gloom (צַלְמָוֶת), bound in misery and iron; both terms re-appear in verse 14; the "gates of bronze" and the "bars of iron" feature in verse 16; and in 18, where the sick are under consideration, they become the "gates of death" (v. supra, p.58sq.). The idea of imprisonment occurs also in lxxxviii 9(8), which PBV following LXX (אֶכְלָא for כָּלָא) renders: "I am so fast in prison: that I cannot get forth."

חֹשֶׁךְ and derivatives (contd.)

(V) In cxxxix 8-12 Sheol is no longer outside Jahveh's reach: its darkness has become light. The reference here is indirect, and denotes darkness generally, including, it may fairly be assumed, the darkness of the underworld.

We adopt Oesterley's rendering of verses 11 and 12:

"If I said, 'Surely darkness will cover me,
And night be a veil about me,'
Yea, darkness would not darken from thee,
And night like day would give light!" [1] ("Pss" ii 554)

"Darkness" חֹשֶׁךְ in both cases.
"Would not darken" לֹא יַחְשִׁיךְ (Hiph.) Verb, apart from here, only twice in Psalter, lxix 24(23) of the eyes of enemies, cv 28[3] of the plagues on Egypt.
Oesterley's readings are: וְאֹמַר for "וְ ; יְשׁוּפֵנִי for יְשׁוּפֵנִי , a reading favoured by Ewald and most moderns, after Jer. and Symm. See further, Briggs ii 500; BDB s.v. שׁוּף, p.1003a.
אָיוּד for אוֹר (with Wutz) is somewhat doubtful, the word occurring, so far as the present writer can ascertain, nowhere in O.T. אָד would prob. be better, although this term is very obscure, being found only in Gen. ii 6 and Job xxxvi 27, and having no known etymology in Hebrew. Dr. & Gray (ICC) read אָדוֹ, 'his mist', in Job xxxvi 30 (following Duhm et al.) for אוֹרוֹ , but regard Hoffmann's emendation, אָד for אוֹר in xxxviii 24 as less probable. Peake (Cent. Bi.) adopts the emendation in the latter, but not the former, where he follows Heb. (pp. 304 sq., 318). See, more fully Dr. & Gray, ad locc., pp. 315 sq., 332, and phil. nn. in Pt II, pp. 282 sq., 304. On אָד see J.Skinner (ICC "Genesis" p.55) and G.J. Spurrell ("Notes on the Text of the Book of Genesis", 2nd edn., (Oxford, 1896), p.24) for useful phil. nn.; and cf. BDB s.v., p.15b.

(VI) cxliii 3. "He (i.e., the enemy) causeth me to dwell in
dark places (בְּמַחֲשַׁכִּים)
As those that have been long dead."

For critical note on this verse see p. 61 above.

Before leaving חֹשֶׁךְ and its derivatives the three occurrences of חֲשֵׁכָה in the Psalter should be noted. In cxxxix 12 (see above) Oest. (loc.cit.) omits as a marginal comment which has become incorporated into the text. In xviii 12(11) it occurs in combination with מַיִם of a theophany, but prob. read here, as // II Sam. xxii 12, חֲשֹׁכַת־מַיִם ' a mass of water". In lxxxii 5 commentators interpret figuratively as "lack of understanding", but on the view taken of this psalm above (pp.66 sqq.) the reference would be to the darkness pervading the underworld.

אֹפֶל (noun masc., only poet., (verb אָפַל not found)) 'darkness' 'gloom' (cf. Arab. أَفَلَ 'set' (of the sun)), occurs only twice in the Psalter.
In Job x 22 (bis) the context clearly denotes the underworld, verses 21 and 22 furnishing a powerful word-picture of the utter blackness and gloom of Sheol — the land of no return.

In Ps. xi 2 the word is used of the darkness in which the wicked (רְשָׁעִים) shoot their arrow. Oest. (i 147) omits בַּמּוֹ אֹפֶל (misprinted עֹפֶל), but his comment on the phrase is inept, the reference being not to the darkness of night, but figurative of evil designs. The allusion is prob. to the sorcerer with his magical arrow.(v. Guillaume, op.cit., p.276).

The other instance is Ps. xci 6. This is important, as one of the most effective of prophylactic texts, being known as the "Song against the assaults of evil". (Guillaume, op.cit., pp.268, 287). In this particular verse we have a personification of disease // to that of the Bab. plague-demon Namtar, whose connexion with the underworld is evident from the "Descent of Ishtar". In this poem he appears as the servant of Eresh-kigal, the goddess of Aralû, at whose behest he imprisons Ishtar, smites her with disease, and later sprinkles her with the "water of life". (E.R.E. ii 315b, 316b; iv 517a).
He appears again as the servant of Eresh-kigal in the "Legend of Nergal and Eresh-kigal", in which he is sent by her to the banquet of the gods above. All do him honour except Nergal, who, for his discourtesy, is taken by Namtar at the command of Eresh-kigal to the underworld. (E.R.E. xi 828).
The inference that Namtar or his Heb. counterpart is personified as "the pestilence that roameth in darkness" (דֶּבֶר בְּאֹפֶל יְהַלֵּךְ) is re-inforced by the occurrence in the latter portion of the verse of the term קֶטֶב (PBV 'sickness', AV and RV 'destruction'), which was understood in the Rabbinical literature, as Oesterley (ii p.410) points out, as the proper name of a demon. (Quotation from the 'Midrash' given by Oest., loc.cit., and more fully in "Fresh Appr.", p.286; for quotation from Bab. Talm. (Pesahim, 111b) see E.R.E. iv 613b). Caution is needed, however, in drawing too weighty conclusions. LXX and Aquila both make specific mention of a demon, as Oest. notes; (LXX ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ), but, as Perowne points out (ii 177), this might have been due to misreading שֹׁד. (On the verb in this passage see R.Gordis in J.T.S., Jan.,1940, p.39 sq., who, equating with Syr. ✓ שׁדד 'pour' 'rush with force', renders "the pestilence that rushes at noon".) On the other hand, names connected with mythology and demonology do occur in the O.T. Some, found in the Psalms, have been noted above (p.75); mention might be made of others: 'Robeṣ', the Bab. rabiṣu' (Gen. iv 7; v. Oest. & Rob. p.116 sq); 'Lilith' (Isa. xxxiv 14; (?) Gad and Meni (Isa. lxv 11); 'Azazel' (Lev. xvi 8, 10, 26). Kennett regards the last-named, not as a demon, but as the name of a settler of pagan origin in Judaean territory between 586 B.C. and the time of Nehemiah, whose setting

up of a pagan image, or continued observance of some pagan practice, in a place near Jerusalem, gave his name to that place which was regarded by the Jews as desecrated and so became "the dumping-ground for Jewish sin". ("O.T. Essays" (Cambr., 1928) p. 114 sq.). This view is highly improbable, but is mentioned from the point of view of interest.

It is impossible to pursue this fascinating subject further here. Suffice it to make reference to Oest. & Rob., Chap. X, pp.108 sqq., where further examples given; H.D.B. v 537b sq., 551b-556a for Bab. incantation rituals with illustrations from the texts, and bibliography; cf. esp. with O.T. demonology the names of the chief Bab. classes of demons on the 'Maqlu' tablet, p.552a; E.R.E. iv, artt. DEMONS AND SPIRITS (Assyr.-Bab.), (Heb.) (Jewish), pp.568b, sqq., 594b, sqq., 612a, sqq.; E.O.James,"The O.T. in the Light of Anthropology", p.78; on Hos. xiii 14 see Cheyne,("Origin of Psr."p.385 and ref., n.2.)-a passage reminiscent of the Namtar myth.

A further example of the darkness of Sheol, which has affinities with the Greek βλέπειν, λείπειν φάος, (of the upper world), and the 'luce-carentes' of Lucretius and Vergil, is found in Ps. xlix 20(19). Reading, with EVV following LXX, יָבֹא for תָּבֹא (unless תָּבֹא be taken as referring back to נֶפֶשׁ in previous verse (as Briggs i. 412), which is improbable), and singular for plural in second member (as LXX, PBV; but AV and RV follow Heb. in reading plural), the verse may be translated:

> "He shall go unto the generation of his fathers;
> Nevermore shall he see the light."

The verse reflects the general tenor of the psalm (except in verse 16(15), a later editorial insertion) in keeping with the Babylonian, where the state of the dead appears to have been regarded as unalterable and permanent (v. E.R.E. ii 316b). Cf. also with this verse Job iii 16, Qoh. vi 3-6.

We must finally consider the term צַלְמָוֶת, which occurs in the Psalter four times. In each case MT points צַלְמָוֶת. We give in each case the Heb. with corresponding LXX rendering:

(1) xxiii 4. בְּגֵ֣יא צַלְמָ֑וֶת ; ἐν μέσῳ σκιᾶς θανάτου.

(2) xliv 20(19). וַתְּכַ֣ס עָלֵ֣ינוּ בְצַ֑ל ; ἐπεκάλυψεν ἡμᾶς σκιὰ θανάτου.

(3) cvii 10. יֹשְׁבֵ֣י חֹ֭שֶׁךְ וְצַ֣ל ; καθημένους ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου.

(4) cvii 14. יוֹצִיאֵ֥ם מֵחֹ֗שֶׁךְ וְצַ֫ל ; ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ σκότους καὶ σκιᾶς θανάτου.

In cvii // חֹשֶׁךְ in both cases. In xliv // בְּמְקוֹם תַּנִּים, so M.T., followed by Perowne, Kirkp., Briggs, etc. LXX: ἐν τόπῳ κακώσεως; Aq: ἐν τ. ἀοικήτῳ. Read, with Jer., (draconum) תַּנִּינִים, as Oest.

צַלְמָוֶת (contd.)

In these four passages, as in most, LXX presupposes צַל מָוֶת, which may have been the original, two distinct words being understood before the division. (On divisions of words see A.A. Bevan in E.Bi., 5361, art. WRITING; S.A. Cook, "The O.T., A Re-interpretation", p.23). The uniform vocalisation is probably an instance of what G.R. Driver has described as "the levelling labours of the Massoretes" (v. supra, p.25, n.2; cf. D.W.Thomas in "Record and Revelation" p.383 sq.).

Most commentators, however, (Briggs, Kirkp., Oest., Davison, Cheyne, Perowne, and among the older, Qimchi), regard צַלְמָוֶת as a derivative of צֶלֶם. (For abstracts from concretes by addition of ות, ו[ת] see G-K 86k). Barnes does not agree, regarding צַלְמָוֶת as "only an invention of grammarians devised to oust 'zal māveth' wherever it occurs": (see his caustic note on Ps. xxiii 4, vol i, p.118).

The probable truth of the matter is that put forward in the art. SHADOW OF DEATH in E.Bi. 4420 (Editorial), namely, that some contexts favour צַל מָוֶת and others צַלְמָוֶת. To the former the present writer would assign only xliv 20(19) in the Psalter. In the remaining passages צַלְמָוֶת is much better suited to the context. An excellent note on the word and its vocalisation, in the course of which Nöldeke's defence of the traditional vocalisation is discussed and rejected, will be found in Dr. & Gray, "Job" (ICC), Pt.II, p.18 sq. See also BDB p.853b. s.v. צַלְמָוֶת.

מַהֲמֹרוֹת, Ps. cxl.11(10). For completeness this word is included here, where its etymology will be dealt with. Term is α.λ. Briggs (ii 506) and BDB p.243a derive from a √המר, not found in Heb., but having in Arab. (همر) the meaning 'pour' 'pour out'. LXX, ἐν ταλαιπωρίαις "in hardships"; Symm., Targ., Jer., "pits, pitfalls". Ibn Ezra and Qimchi explain as "deep pits", without good reason Perowne thinks, himself rendering "floods of water", Arab. همر 'cataract' (√ as above).

While it is impossible to be certain, the word would prob. best be translated "torrents" (as Kirkp. p.795: "If they try to escape the fiery storm, may they be swept away by torrents!"). In this case the ps. might be taken as an additional allusion to the waters of Sheol.

We have now reviewed in detail those passages in the Psalter (together with other relevant Old Testament passages) having reference, either direct or presumptive, to the eschatology of the individual in relation to Sheol. To what conclusion do these passages lead?

Some, as Renan, have seen in the denial of any survival — that is, in any positive sense — one of the chief claims of Hebrew religion to superiority.[1] Had the "virtue-its-own-reward" of Habakkuk established itself widely and firmly there might have been substance in this claim. Integrity of life and purpose

> "Not with the hope of gaining aught,
> Not seeking a reward"[2]

might indeed have been the creed of the more contemplative and high-souled servants of Jahveh: but they were few. Retribution remained the watchword of the many, a retribution which the "official" doctrine of Sheol —

> "Lethe's gloom, but not its quiet,
> The pain without the peace of death —"[3]

demanded ever more stridently and insistently. Nor can Qoheleth be adduced against this as the charter of the God-fearer without hope beyond. Qoheleth's point of view, as Barton has said, is "a natural evolution ... from Israel's earlier thought;"[4] but, shorn of its glosses, it is the point of view not of the God-fearer but of the disillusioned — the cynic.

Nevertheless, this stage of Israel's religious development — which, be it observed, is but a stage and not a finality,

a mistake which is frequently made by those who would claim it as evidence for the possibility of the existence of an ethical religion which rejects belief in a future life, a possibility which we would in nowise deny — raises a question which we may here formulate without attempting to answer. Could Judaism, had it remained static from the sixth or fifth century onwards, have continued to claim the allegiance of the nation? Or, in other words, — Is belief in personal immortality in a positive sense a 'sine qua non' of a living and vivifying faith?

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

(II) LATER STAGES OF BELIEF.

From the foregoing catena of passages it will readily be seen that the Sheol doctrine is predominantly the doctrine of the Psalter, and indeed of the Old Testament in general, as concerning the final state of the individual. There were those who found it wholly unsatisfactory; but so deeply had it taken root in the national consciousness that many refused to abandon it, even though its incompatibility with more worthy conceptions of Jahveh became increasingly patent and its retention raised moral issues of the profoundest concern.

It was not by direct speculative reasoning on Sheol itself, nor on the state of its inhabitants, that any doctrinal development took place,[1] for in Israel "this pleasing hope, this fond desire, This longing, after immortality"[2] was entirely absent, - at least in the accepted sense of the term. Rather was it in the light of the growing elevation of the doctrine of God that the popular conception of Sheol was increasingly felt to be untenable. "The God of the Old Testament," writes N.H.Snaith, "is not 'One Who Is' so much as 'One Who Does,'"[3] and it was as a necessary corollary to this increasingly conceived activity, together with the ever-widening sphere in which that activity was regarded as operative, that the earlier beliefs concerning Jahveh's relation to His people, underwent considerable

change.

A distinction is wont to be made between the eschatology of the nation and that of the individual. Such distinction, while useful for convenience' sake, is not altogether a happy one. It has arisen in the attempt to contrast the earlier conception of "corporate personality" with the later "religion of the individual." But the former, be it remarked, in so far as it was the Jewish nation in which Jahveh's purpose was regarded as being worked out, can at no time be said to have been superseded by the recognition of the right of direct individual access to God; while, similarly, there was no time in the history of the nation when the individual did not fully have his part to play, for it was round the persons of individual men - and women - that the history of the nation, right from its very origins was woven. The Patriarchs, Moses, the Judges, the succession of the Prophets - did not each and all have direct dealings with Jahveh, and so become the vehicles of His revelation?

The insistence of Jeremiah and Ezekiel upon individual relationship to Jahveh (which is commonly regarded as the removal of the centre of gravity from the nation to the person, and so investing the latter with a status which hitherto he had not enjoyed) should be viewed not so much as an abrogation on the part of these prophets of the idea of "corporate personality," as of the sanction which that idea

had seemed to afford for the convenient repudiation of individual responsibility. Nor was it from a humanitarian motive that "the fathers were not to be put to death for the children" and vice versa,[1] but rather from sheer force of necessity in maintaining the population at a time when the continued existence of the nation stood in grave jeopardy,[2] the importance of which is urged upon the exiles by Jeremiah (xxix. 5.6.)

Hence, without in any way attempting to depreciate the work of the late Archdeacon Charles, than whom probably none has done more to illumine the labyrinthine ways of eschatology and apocalyptic, we find it impossible to identify ourselves with that scholar when he asserts that "no individual retribution was looked for in ~~the~~ pre-prophetic times."[3] Taking the J and E documents alone, which are almost universally acknowledged to date from the pre-prophetic period, sufficient evidence may be adduced to impugn this assertion, even if allowed the latitude conceded to a generalisation. The punishment of Adam (Gen. iii. 17 sqq. (J)); Cain (Gen.iv.11. sqq. (J)); Miriam (Num. xii. 10. (E)); Dathan and Abiram (Num. xvi. 27b - 32a (JE)); the reward of Noah (Gen. vii. 1. (J)); Abram (Gen.xv. (JE)); - these are just a few instances of direct individual retribution, while the deception of Jacob by Laban (Gen.xxix. 25. (J)) and later by his own sons (Gen. xxxvii. 31-35 (J)), can hardly be regarded as other than condign judgment for his own earlier deception of his father Isaac (Gen xxvii. (J)).

It is true that group solidarity, both family and tribal, was more cohesive in the earlier period, as in all primitive communities, but at no time can the pre-prophetic evidence be taken to justify the statement of Charles. Jahveh's justice was axiomatic throughout; the prophets were concerned to re-assert its operation and re-emphasise its application in face of the flagrant abuses of their own particular age. Their contribution to personal religion was not so much a new departure in the severance of the individual from the group as an enhancement of his status as a moral being, brought about by deeper insight into the nature of God. It is against this background that the most acute and poignant problems of suffering and retribution take the stage, and to their rise and treatment at the hands of the Old Testament writers we must now proceed to direct attention.

That belief in a future life - that is what Charles designates "a blessed future life" in contradistinction to the 'amoral' doctrine of Sheol - was the logical and in-eluctable conclusion of the implications of the ethical mono-theism is the almost unanimous verdict of those who have sought to follow the development of Hebrew thought as portrayed in the canonical and extra-canonical literature. Some there were who refused to tread these hitherto un-charted paths. The author of Qoheleth is their uncompromising spokesman. Like Swinburne he remained convinced "That dead

men rise up never."[1] But those who were prepared to consider afresh the demands of experience, and to challenge contemporary platitudes, were destined to find themselves faced with the growing conviction: "Thou wilt not leave us in the dust."[2]

Theoretically, be it admitted, the question of survival is not, per se, exclusively religious; yet, historically, it has always borne such a close connexion with religious belief and practice that the two are virtually inseparable. Some have gone as far as to assert that faith in human immortality "stands or falls with the belief in God."[3] As a simple, unqualified statement this is misleading. O.C.Quick is more true to fact. "It is quite possible" he rightly argues, "to have a belief in God, and yet no belief in the survival of the human soul. Such, for instance, was the creed of the Sadducees in our Lord's time. Again, it is quite possible to have no belief in God, and yet to believe in the survival of the human soul..... This question of survival can be, and often is, treated simply as a matter of scientific enquiry."[4] It is the nature of the continued existence, not the mere fact of survival, with which religion is concerned. It is obviously this which, on a careful reading, Inge is really concerned to maintain, and is well expressed in his quotation from Von Hugel's "Essays and Addresses."[5] Nevertheless, some of the Old Testament writers, and in particular some of the Psalmists, have shewn that we are not "led by the belief in the one (i.e. in God) to the belief in the other," (i.e. the immortality of the soul.)

But it is to those who were led on to such belief that we

now must turn our minds, as it is with them that the development in Old Testament ideas of God and man, which forms the theme of our present study, necessarily lies. We must, however, as stated above, disabuse our minds of the idea that Israel's religious development can be represented by a regular, ascending curve. No field of human progress can be thus delineated if all factors are to be taken into consideration. Yet, in anything less than a full history (for which the requisite data are not always available) such a general method must, perforce, be adopted, for behind all the "changes and chances" of Old Testament religion there runs an upward trend. The position has been well stated by Prof. G.A.Cooke: "We are undoubtedly justified in tracing a growth in knowledge of religious truth; but .... we must do justice to all the facts. We must beware of any mechanical theory, for it is not true that the order of progress runs in a straight line from a crude naturalism up to a purified morality."[1]

The endeavour to trace out some measure of orderly development at once brings us face to face with the vexed question of the dating of the psalms,[2] a problem which cannot be ignored in a work of this nature. The once-popular method (as in Kirkpatrick and Briggs) of attempting to assign individual psalms to particular historical events[3] is now almost wholly discredited, although it has been recently revived by Buttenwieser[4] in an extreme form. The Maccabaean dating, while still having its supporters, notably among English scholars R.H.Kennett,[5] has

tended to yield to considerable modification in the light of comparative study, Gressmann[1] arguing for the pre-exilic origin of many of the psalms. Care must be taken to avoid confusion in this matter: it is important to distinguish between the Psalter as a whole, (or any one psalm) in its present form, and the psalm or psalms as originally written.[2] The view adopted by the present writer is that few, if any of the psalms, now stand as they came from the pen of the original composer. Individual psalms, and smaller collections, were in circulation at a comparatively early date, and were undoubtedly, as Peters suggests, used at local sanctuaries.[3] These formed the nucleus of larger collections, perhaps undergoing some modification in the process, until finally, in the fourth century, larger collections were gathered into one anthology which we now know as the Psalter. At each stage the psalms have suffered at the hands of a redactor; fortunately, the work of the latter consisted for the most part of additions and insertions, with little interference with the original text,[4] so that earlier and later ideas not infrequently stand in the same psalm, in juxtaposition. Psalm LI is an example in point: it is inconceivable that the same hand could have written verses 18 and 21 (E.VV. 16 and 19.)

Dating of individual psalms, or portions of psalms, is therefore possible only within very broad limits; as G.R.Driver remarks in his review of Buttenwieser's bulky volume:[5] "It is of course obvious that a few psalms can clearly be assigned to a definite period (e.g. Psalm cxxxvii

to the Exile); but any endeavour to fix the dates of most of them can but be in the highest degree subjective....."[1] This is substantially the view of the present writer, though he would add that the Exile provides merely a "terminus a quo" for the psalm adduced, for on this criterion the preceding psalm might be assigned to the settlement in Canaan.

In the development of religious thought in Israel, culminating in the doctrine of a future life for the individual Oesterley distinguishes three stages,[2] which for convenience' sake, we may be permitted to follow. The first is that which may be termed "primitive" or "ethnic" in which the dead assume a character in which they are invested with superior knowledge and are virtually regarded as אֱלֹהִים[3] "mighty ones," or אֱלֹהִים[4] "gods." As in all primitive communities - indeed we might add, (having regard to its prevalence even in our own day), and among "civilised " communities, - this elevated status accorded to the dead, especially the illustrious dead, led to the practice of their being consulted by the living. That the practice was prevalent in Israel, and that despite its denunciation in both the Prophets and the Law, it persisted until a comparatively late date, has already been shown. So far as the Psalter is concerned, with the exception of Psalm 82 (which the present writer regards as a definite polemic against the practice) and ~~te~~ cvi.28, references are indirect, being found in those psalms relating to the machinations of the magicians,[5] among which the power to invoke the spirits of the dead for

good or evil was undoubtedly an important element. Among these are iii, vi, vii, x, xi, xiii, xxxi, lviii, lix, xci, ci, cix. While it is tempting to pause for an examination of these psalms or psalm passages, we must forego the digression, save for a reference to Guillaume, who in his recent Bampton Lectures (1938) regards Mowinckel's thesis as "sound, though not for the reasons which Mowinckel gives."[1]

With the appearance of the "writing prophets," the state of the dead, and the nature of their abode, underwent a profound change. Their insistence upon Jahveh as righteousness, holiness and love, Himself the only God of Israel, left no room for inferior deities. Without at first denying their existence, their power and jurisdiction became increasingly attenuated, a process which continued until finally Deutero-Isaiah could declare of Jahveh: "Beside me there is no other."[2] A somewhat similar fate was share by the lesser "gods," the spirits of the dead. Their existence was not denied, but they were shorn of all power and activity. The "mighty" (אֵלִים)[3] became the "weak" (רְפָאִים)[4]; the "knowing" ones (יִדְּעֹנִים),[5] the "dead who know not anything"[6] their abode the land of silence. No more could they be consulted; they were destined to remain for ever fast bound in "the land of no return."

This, the dominant eschatology of the individual in the Psalter, has already been treated of "in extenso" above; it is therefore unnecessary to repeat what has already been

said. The doctrine forms the second stage in the history of the growth of the future life, and was destined to raise problems affecting life in the present world, which again in turn re-acted radically upon beliefs regarding the next.

The eighth century prophets, in their zeal for an unswerving loyalty to Jahveh, and their consequent desire to stop the current trafficking with the dead, could have had little idea of the far-reaching consequences of their teaching. With their loftier conception of God and the re-emphasis on His dealing with the individual, which later formed the centre of the teaching of Jeremiah,[1] the question of rewards and punishments inevitably arose. If all alike were destined to share the same shadowy existence in Sheol, irrespective of their conduct in this life; and if God were indeed righteous, His righteousness demanding retribution; such retribution could be meted out in only one place - this side of the grave, since Jahveh's jurisdiction, so far as the individual was concerned, extended no further. Such a limitation falls strangely upon the ears of a modern reader of the Old Testament, especially in view of the fact that Jahveh was regarded as creator of the whole world, and as having the ability, as early as Amos, of stirring up foreign powers; but unless these incompatibilities represent mutually divergent traditions (a phenomenon to which the present writer hopes to direct his attention at some future date) they can only be regarded as another example of what

Oesterley so aptly describes as "that kind of incongruity (which) has been characteristic of men's religious beliefs in all ages."[1]

The religion of the individual - if so it might be termed - occupies a central position in Jeremiah, whose teaching exerted a wide-spread influence. Wellhausen has gone so far as to assert that without him psalms could not have been composed.[2] Allowing for some measure of hyperbole, a common fault in all who write in admiration of a great man, we may admit the general truth of the statement. As shown above, Jahveh's dealings with individuals was no new truth adumbrated by the eighth century prophets and made articulate by Jeremiah, but had been a feature of the religion of Israel as far back as the records enable us to travel. A.B.Davidson has set the prophet in true perspective: "Though the truths in Jeremiah are old, they all appear in him with an impress of personality which gives them novelty."[3]

Jeremiah's teaching was adopted and developed by his contemporary, Ezekiel, in whom the doctrine of individual responsibility, freeing a man from the trammels of his progenitors, and at the same time investing him with a dignity which has hardly been surpassed in the most ardent advocates of absolute free-will, and at times almost Pelagian in its vehemence, opened the flood-gates to a rigid theory of divine retribution. The righteous must be rewarded, and the wicked receive condign punishment - in this life, a doctrine which became rooted deep in the national consciousness, and

was variously applied in what R.H.Charles so aptly describes as the "two great popular handbooks, the Psalter and the Book of Proverbs."[1]

That this is the "official" doctrine of the Psalter, taken as a whole, is clear not only from the number of times in which it occurs, but also because it constitutes the theme of Psalm i., which is regarded by commentators in general as a proem to the book. Here the righteous is likened to

> "A tree planted by the (streams of)[2] water
> That bringeth forth its fruit in its season,
> Whose leaf also doth not wither
> And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."[3]

In marked contradiction is the lot of the wicked:

> "Not so are the wicked, not so,[4]
> But they are like the chaff which the wind driveth away."

Similarly in Psalm xcii. 13 (12).

> "The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree
> He shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon."

But experience had already begun to call into question the truth of these sentiments. Was it, in a phrase so popular in our day, mere "wishful thinking?" For the righteous did not always prosper; indeed, it was often he who suffered, while the wicked prospered - not infrequently at his expense. "No," replied orthodoxy, "Jahveh allows the righteous to suffer so that his subsequent prosperity may appear the greater, while the wicked is allowed to prosper that his inevitable downfall may be the more sudden and humiliating:

So is Jahveh's justice more fully vindicated, and His power manifested as supreme."[1] This truth is not vouchsafed to fools:

"A brutish man (אִישׁ-בַּעַר) knoweth not;
Neither doth a fool (כְּסִיל) understand this."[2]

When the wicked grow and prosper "it is only[3] that they will be destroyed for ever."[4] Though many afflictions may befall the righteous, Jahveh will deliver him from all. His bones, to which great importance was attached in Hebrew thought,[5] (the bones being regarded with the blood as the seat of life,[6] and later as the nucleus of the resurrection body,[7]) being kept intact (Psalm xxxiv. 19 - 21.)[8] The conviction finds its fullest expression in Psalm xxxvii, - the "locus classicus" which the present writer has from childhood regarded as one of the most beautiful in the Psalter. It is too well known to need quotation; indeed, to do justice to the psalm quotation "in toto" would be demanded.

But it was not only the "brutish and the fool" who could not understand this specious doctrine. The more acute minds among devout thinkers began to be repelled by a doctrine which universal experience, over a long period, had proved to be manifestly untrue. While Job is its monumental refutation, there is more than a trace of such impatience in Psalm lxxiii. Centuries before Stone penned his now famous hymn, the Saints of Israel

"their watch are keeping
Their cry goes up, How long?"

Collectively or individually the cry is the same:

"How long, O God, shall the adversary insult?
Shall the foe despise Thy Name for ever?" (lxxiv 10)

"Surely in vain have I cleansed my heart,
And washed my hands in innocency." (lxxiii 13)

"Return, O Jahveh, how long?
And let it repent Thee concerning Thy servants." (xc 13)

If the earlier portion of Psalm lxxiii expresses the view of the impatient, the musings of the author of xxxix have reached ignition point. In poignancy of meditation, and constancy in face of utter desolation, he is worthy to take his place alongside the writer of the Book of Job. But, unlike Job and his fellow-psalmist, he is not prepared to take the audacious plunge, and falls back on the transitoriness of human life and the vanity of worldly aims, "praying for relief and respite" (Kirkpatrick, ad loc.). Orthodoxy is too strong; he dares not to question it: He is a stranger (גֵּר) with Jahveh, and a sojourner (תּוֹשָׁב) as were all his fathers (xxxix 14(13)).[1]

The same theme, the brevity and evanescence of human life, appears again in Psalm xc, but, as Perowne points out, "in a loftier and more impressive strain" (i 338). (Cf. xxxix 5 with xc 5sq., 9sq.). The parallels with Job are striking, so much so that some of the older commentators (e.g. Delitzsch) regarded Job as having borrowed from the psalm. It is not, however, necessary to attempt either to justify or refute such a conjecture, for the problem could not fail to be present to the minds of all who were not content slavishly to follow current ideas. Job, however, is their spokesman, and it is in this book

rather than in the Psalter that the problem receives, as far as was possible for the age, the full-scale treatment it demanded. It is unnecessary to attempt to trace the development of Job's thought; indeed it is questionable whether we can speak of a "development." In the book as it stands (if we may adapt a sentence from Waterhouse, used in another connexion) "all we can hope to do with profit is to view in turn, rather than in order, the various expressions" of Job's meditations.[1] Charles has already given them admirable summary. It is Job's appeal from "the God of outer providence, from the God of circumstance, to the God of faith"[2] which is germane to our purpose. The passage is well-known, one might almost say too well-known, for at the hand of the writer of the libretto of Handel's "Messiah" and under the chisel of the monumental mason, the passage, together with other important Old Testament passages, has been shorn of its context, and its essential content thereby wholly obscured, to the detriment of sound exegesis.

So important is the passage as marking the dawn of a new era in religious development, albeit itself but the faintest glimmer, that we give it in full as rendered by R.H.Charles,[3] together with some philological and exegetical notes:-

"But I know that my Avenger liveth,
And that at the last he will appear above (my) grave:
[4]And after my skin hath been thus destroyed,[4]
Without my body shall I see God:
Whom I shall see for myself,
And mine eyes shall behold, and not another."

1. "Avenger," better "my Vindicator" (גֹּאֲלִי) as RVm and Oesterley ad loc. (Hebrew Religion, 2nd. edn. p. 356), Driver and Gray (I.C.C.) Jahveh is often described as the גֹּאֵל of His people, especially in the sense of Deliverer from bondage (Egypt) and Exile, the latter usage being frequent in Deutro- and Trito-Isaiah (for references see B.D.B. s.v. גָּאַל I., 3 b. and c. (p. 145b); a (ibid.) for individual deliverance,) but the word should not be so rendered here. As Peake remarks (Cent. Bi. "Job" ad loc. p. 193): "'Vindicator' is the sense required; it is not redemption from Sheol, but the clearing of his fame, to which Job looks forward." גָּאַל occurs eleven times in Psalter. For complete references with analyses, see Briggs on Psalm xix 15 (Vol.i. p. 175.) In addition to these Halevy[2] reads גֹּאֲלִי for גֹּל אֶל in Psalm xxii. 9 (8).

2. Not "at the last," (so R.V.) which, as Oesterley points out, does not accurately represent the Hebrew. אַחֲרוֹן is adjectival rather than adverbial (Peake), and its position in the sentence significant. The best rendering is that of B.D.B. (p. 31a) "and as one coming after (me) (and so able to establish my innocence when I am dead) will he.....arise upon the dust."

3. Hebrew corrupt. Driver and Gray (op.cit.) leave the line blank in translation (p. 174) but a full discussion of the line with proposed emendations is included in Part II (philological notes, pp. 128 - 132.) The above, which is followed by Oesterley, brings out the sense as nearly as is possible. See also Peake, (op. cit. pp. 193 sq.)

4. "Without my body." This is a paraphrase. The Hebrew מִבְּשָׂרִי is ambiguous. "From" = "away from", "without", is clearly required by the context.

An important point to be noted here is that the way is laid open for what Charles describes as "A new doctrine of the soul[3]." Although merely in embryo, the possibility that the soul will persist, not in excommunication from God as taught in the current Sheol doctrine, but as an entity capable of continued communion with Him is entertained.

5. "Whom I shall see for myself." The "I" is emphatic. אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי אֶחֱזֶה-לִּי "I, even I, shall see." (Peake) "For myself": better (as RVm) "on my side," (so Driver and Gray.)

6. Either: "Mine eyes shall see [Jahveh] , and not as a stranger" וְלֹא-זָר (as RVm) i.e. he will see God as his friend, come to vindicate his innocence, or "Mine eyes and not (those of) a stranger shall see." The Hebrew is patient of either translation, but the former should certainly be adopted.

The quotation should be completed by Job's expressions of his overwhelming yearning to see God, and witness His attestation of his innocence. "My reins are consumed within me,"[1] i.e the kidneys (כְּלָיוֹת) as the seat of intense emotion, almost an exact anticipation of modern endocrinology! The word is found five times in the Psalter, three of these, it is interesting to note, being in psalms in which some have seen direct reference to the future life (xvi. 7., lxxiii. 21., cxxxix. 13.) for which see below; the remaining passages, added for completeness, are vii. 10.[2], and xxvi. 2.

It is disappointing to find that after reaching such sublimity of thought the poet should have taken refuge, like the writer of Psalm xxxix, in the orthodox material doctrine set forth in such thorough-going fashion in Deuteronomy. While we cannot here discuss the critical problems relating to the book, we would venture to express considerable doubt as to whether the prologue and epilogue are from the hand of the author of the main body of the work. Rather would they seem to be the work of a redactor who sought to bring the book within the limits of orthodox thought.

As Charles points out, Job brings us to the parting of the ways.[3] He has at least considered the possibility of a future life (xiv. 13 - 15) but its development into the level of a dogma was left to his successors. Throughout the whole of the book there is no suggestion of immortality as it was later

understood. Job is content to assert that he shall himself witness his vindication and enjoy, albeit for a fleeting moment, the vision of Jahveh. "The possibility of the continuance, much less of the everlastingness, of this higher life does not seem to have dawned on Job, though it lay in the line of his reasonings."[1] As the same writer goes on to say: "Nevertheless, the importance of the spiritual advance here made cannot be exaggerated; for Job had so emphasised the difficulties that beset the theology of his time that thoughtful and religious men in Palestine were forced to consider them afresh, and so in due time rise to a newer and higher theology."[2]

It was inevitable that a reconsideration of the problem should lead to a cleavage in the realm of religious thought. So deeply engrafted into the religious consciousness was the traditional creed that many were content to remain "strangers and sojourners." Qoheleth represents the "Canticles of Scepticism" (Heine)[3] rather than "The Canticles of the Fear of God." (Delitzsch.)[3] The importance of this anonymous work is well seen in the widely divergent manner in which its thoughts have been assessed. Renan[4] has called it "livre charmant! Le seul livre aimable qui ait été composé par un juif," while Von Hartmann's[4] verdict designates the same work as "the breviary of the most modern materialism." Yet in its very scepticism the book has an abiding value, making its own particular contribution to a problem of age-old antiquity, and had the more liberal school of Hillel failed to secure for it a place in the Canon,[5]

future generations would have sustained no small loss. It represents that "honest doubt" which sooner or later must overtake the minds of all who are concerned to think out afresh the foundations upon which rests their faith.

In contrast to Qoheleth, there were those whose speculations led them to postulate some higher destiny for the individual than a perpetual home among the "Shades". In the Psalter there are four passages which are often held to express such a hope, although there is by no means universal agreement on their interpretation. We shall take them in numerical order. The first is xvi 10 sq.

> "Thou wilt not abandon me to Sheol;
> Thou wilt not suffer thy godly one (חָסִידְךָ)[1] to see the Pit.
> Thou wilt show me the path of life;
> In Thy presence is fulness of joy;
> (Spiritual) delights are at Thy right hand perpetually."

There is little evidence to support any reference in this passage to a future life. That the psalmist has this life in mind is clear.[2] The thought is an expansion of that of the previous verse[3]: "My flesh doth dwell in safety" (לָבֶטַח, not "in hope" as LXX ἐπ' ἐλπίδι , which encourages a forced exegesis). Cf. Davison, "Cent. Bi." ad loc.: "The phrase 'dwell in safety' was a customary one to describe Israel as abiding under the protection of God, and does not in itself necessitate any reference to a future life".(p.91).

Similarly, a reference to a future life in the last verse of Ps. xvii cannot be sustained:

> "As for me, in righteousness shall I behold Thy face;
> When I awake may Thy likeness sustain me."[4]

(Cf. below on cxxxix 18). In the case of xvii there is a greater probability than in xvi of some idea of a future life, but in view of the uncertainty there is little to be gained from a discussion which would add nothing to what is already available in the

various commentaries. The conclusion, like that regarding the attitude of the prophets towards sacrifice,[1] must in the last resort remain one for purely subjective judgment.

In xlix 16(15) we are on different ground. The theme is similar to that of xxxvii and lxxiii - the prosperity of the wicked and the sufferings of the righteous - , but to the psalmist any idea of retribution in this life is purely chimerical: he will have none of it. Death is the great leveller; wealth will avail nothing; the rich, together with the poor, will find only Sheol awaiting them. There are many textual and literary problems connected with the psalm, and upon them turn some quite important points of exegesis. Ethically the psalm represents little advance, yet, if Cheyne's version be adopted (v. supra, p.41), there would appear to be in Sheol itself a vindication of the righteous at the expense of the wicked: "the upright shall trample upon them at dawn." There is no suggestion that Jahveh's jurisdiction extends to Sheol, or of any judgment on His part, though the seeds of both may be legitimately descried. In verse 16(15) He has the power to pluck the righteous from the power of the underworld:

> "Nevertheless God shall set free my soul;
> From the hand of Sheol shall he take me." (Cheyne)

The verse is clearly in the nature of an interpolation. In its present form it can hardly be indigenous to the psalm. But the excision suggested by some scholars (e.g., Briggs, i 411) may be avoided by regarding the interpolation not as the insertion of a whole verse, but rather as a deliberate alteration on the part of a redactor of what was originally a rhetorical question expecting a negative

reply:

"Shall God set free his soul?
Shall he deliver him from the hand of Sheol."

A parallel may be found in lxxxix 49(48):

"What man is there living who shall not see death?
That shall deliver himself (נַפְשׁוֹ) from the hand of Sheol?"[1]

This view, apart from restoring the rhythm, would accord with the tenor of the psalm, and in particular with verse 8(7): (for readings see p.52 above):-

"But no man may buy himself off, nor pay his ransom to God,
And so live for ever and ever, and never see the Pit."

We conclude, therefore, that in the psalm as it originally stood the official Sheol doctrine was all-pervasive; but in its present form there is a development representing Jahveh literally as "the Lord by Whom we escape death." This might give a possible 'terminus a quo' later than P, as the alteration postulated above may be reminiscent of Enoch's translation (Gen. v 24). The word used is the same in both cases, also in Ps. lxxiii 24 (לָקַח), but this cannot be pressed owing to the frequency of the word, BDB (p.542b) recording its occurrences at 965.

The fourth, and most important of the psalms in question, is lxxiii, on which there is a wider measure of agreement regarding a possible allusion to a future life for the individual. In Gunkel's classification ('Gattungen', a method promising fruitful results,[2] though still in its infancy), this psalm falls within the "Wisdom" group. In theme it is related, as noted above, to xxxvii and xlix, having both in language and thought more marked affinities with the former, yet excelling it in profundity. Kittel

has designated it "the Great Nevertheless",[1] and Oesterley's description, "~~the~~ epitome of the Book of Job"[2] is not without some justification. Its intensely personal tone gives strong grounds for reading with Grätz in verse 1 לְיִשְׂרָאֵל for לְיָשָׁר אֵל:[3]

"Surely good to the upright is God;
(Even) Elohim to the pure in heart."

Thus the psalmist begins by stating his conclusion: - in spite of all appearances to the contrary (with which he proceeds to deal, and which had almost led the writer himself into apostacy) it remains the supreme truth that God is assuredly (אַךְ)[4] good to those who follow Him.

The critical verse is 24:

בַּעֲצָתְךָ תַּנְחֵנִי וְאַחַר כָּבוֹד תִּקָּחֵנִי : , literally:

"With Thy counsel Thou wilt lead me,
And after glory Thou wilt take me."

While there is considerable support for the adverbial use of אַחַר (BDB s.v. 1.b, p.29b) = "afterwards", it is impossible to justify the adverbial use of כָּבוֹד = "gloriously", "with glory", as PBV, RVm, Kirkp., Oest., Driver, following LXX μετὰ δόξης ; and still less the rendering "unto glory", as AV, RV, Perowne, Briggs, T.H. Robinson (in "The Psalmists", p.106). Edwyn Bevan (J.T.S., Jan.-Apr.,1942, p.81) describes the Hebrew text as it stands as "meaningless" and "obviously corrupt". This would certainly appear to be the case if the phrase אַחַר כָּבוֹד were to be found in this passage alone. But the same expression occurs in Zech.ii 12 (EVV 8): "For thus saith Jahveh of Hosts: After glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you," etc. Date and authorship are not material to our present purpose, although Sir G.A.

Smith is undoubtedly right in regarding the passage (ii 10-17, EVV 6-13) as contemporaneous with Deutero-Isaiah.[1] The words אַחַר כָּבוֹד שְׁלָחָנִי form a parenthesis describing the prophet's authority as given by theophany. Thus the words may be paraphrased: "following a vision in which He appeared and commissioned me hath He sent me." Compare with this the call of the Patriarchs, Abraham (Gen. xv 1 (JE)), Isaac (Gen. xxvi 24 (J)), Jacob (Gen. xxviii 10 sqq.(JE)); the theophany on Sinai (Exod. xxxiii 12 sqq. (J), כָּבוֹד in verses 18 and 22); Isaiah's vision and call (Isa. vi, כָּבוֹד in verse 3; Ezek. i 28, iii 23, etc., כָּבוֹד).

In the light of these passages it would appear that in Ps. lxxiii 24 the writer envisages a theophany in which Jahveh will appear to him and take him. This is a claim even more audacious than that of Job. There the theophany is merely momentary and Jahveh's function declaratory only (Jb. xix 25 sqq.). But here the psalmist combines the hope that Jahveh, as well as appearing, will also, as in the case of Enoch, take (לָקַח) him to Himself. Viewed thus, emendation, either in Zechariah[2] or in this psalm,[3] becomes entirely unnecessary.

It is at this point that the developing thought in Israel which led onwards from aspiration to certainty in the hope of a future life reaches, in the Psalter, its highest expression. With its further sequence we are not here concerned, though it may be remarked that the development proceeded on dichotomous lines. The doctrines of resurrection and of the immortality of the soul are often confused, as though they represented one and

the same line of thought. This is not necessarily the case: the immortality of the soul may be held without belief in a resurrection, as with the Greeks and in Hinduism. In Judaism itself there appears to have been some tendency towards the former alone, especially amongst the Alexandrian Jews and in Palestine amongst the Essenes,[1] but it did not succeed in establishing itself as the official doctrine.[2] The germ may be discerned in the psalm last discussed, where the author conceives of his flesh (שְׁאֵר = physical power) and heart (לֵבָב = the seat of the intelligence) as ceasing to be (כָּלָה).[3] Unless this is rhetorical it is pure pantheism, the writer having become so obsessed with adoration of his Creator that his supreme desire is to be subsumed entirely within His Being. This is scarcely conceivable in the thought of the average Jew. Even in the case of the writer of the Book of Wisdom, who held the Platonic doctrine of the evil nature of the flesh, e.g. i 4, ix 15, the soul is regarded as existing after death as an entity (iii 1 sqq.): there is no suggestion of an ultimate Nirvana.

To go further into this question would bring us into the realms of philosophy and Hebrew psychology, but passing reference should be made, in connexion with Ps. lxxiii 26, to what appears to the present writer a constant danger in the work of some scholars, namely, that of attaching a too rigid connotation to such terms as לֵבָב, נֶפֶשׁ, רוּחַ, etc., implying in the usage of these and kindred terms a resolution into fixed categories which the historical facts, so far as they are ascertainable, refuse to sustain. The true position has been well stated by Professor G.A. Barton in the course of his article "SOUL (Semitic and Egypt-

ian)". He writes:

> "The Hebrews did not have a clear-cut psychology of the inner life of man with a well-defined terminology, but held a very simple view of the constitution of human nature and employed terms with a vagueness and an overlapping characteristic of popular unscientific thought. (E.R.E. xi p.750b).

Mention might also here be made of what has rendered the greatest disservice to a scientific exegesis of the Old Testament in general, and the Psalms in particular, namely, the so-called "mystical" interpretation of Christian devotion, a method in its beginnings older than Christianity and inherited from the Alexandrian Philo and the Palestinian Rabbinic schools.[1] McNeile,[2] though careful to point out the literal meaning of psalm passages which have suffered at the hands of allegorisers,[3] might himself be held to sanction the perpetuation of the method, which is perhaps inevitable in a commentary which seeks to combine critical and devotional exegesis. Whatever, for example, the phrase "Daughter of Sion" might mean to a Christian, it had no meaning for the Hebrew writer other than a synonym for the Jewish people.[4] In the psalm under discussion, allowing that LXX might preserve an original reading in verse 28,[5] the putative allusion to a future life in verse 24 would in no way be strengthened, as the declaration by the psalmist is of Jahveh's works <u>in this life</u> and among his own contemporaries (cf. xxii 23(22), 26(25); xl 10 (9) sq.; cii 22(21)). This should be borne in mind in the interpretation of ix, where a forced exegesis might descry a distinction, wholly abortive, in the destiny of the righteous and wicked (verses 15(14) and 18(17)). So, too, in xxiii only an illegitimate mystical interpretation can extract from the final verse (6)

an eternal abode in the presence of God. The natural interpretation would seem to point, as in Num. xii 7, to "the whole people of God."[1] The utmost care needs to be exercised before assigning to a psalm passage a reference to the future life. The point may be illustrated by an example from the publications of Dr.Oesterley, where conjectures of this nature are made only to be retracted later. In his "Fresh Approach" (1937, p.268) he regards as "most natural and probable" the assumption of Duhm ('Die Psalmen'(1899), p.115) that in xc 7(6)sq. "the poet in silent thought hoped for the continuance of life after death." But in his two-volume work of 1939 no mention is made of Duhm, and the view is tacitly withdrawn.[5] ("The Psalms, vol. ii, pp. 403 sqq.). The case of cxxxix is dealt with below. Instances might be multiplied from commentaries and works on the Psalms, both of a critical and devotional nature, of passages being taken as references to a future life on the slenderest, and sometimes almost non-existent, evidence. Duhm, for example includes xxxix (on which see Addis in P.C., p.378b sq.) and Rappoport ("The Psalms"[2], p.139) strangely enough, vii (perhaps error for xvii).

Before concluding this section some attention should be paid to an interesting point raised by Oesterley in his interpretation of Ps. cxxxix.[3] That the psalm is late is apparent from its subject-matter, although the present writer would hesitate to assign it to so late an era as the Greek period,[4] unless the very early years of this period are posited. Few, however, would dispute Oesterley's judgment that "for the conceptions regarding the

Divine Nature, the omniscience, and the omnipresence of God, this Psalm stands out as the greatest gem in the Psalter."[1]

We have already noted above (p.79) its teaching on the omnipresence of God, a belief which had its roots in the eighth century prophets, gaining fuller expression in Deutero-Isaiah under the impetus of exilic experience. Amos had declared: "Though they dig into Sheol thence shall My hand take them; and though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down," (ix 2); and Hosea expresses the conviction: "I will ransom them from the hand of Sheol; I will redeem them from death." (xiii 14). Isaiah, when confronting the vacillating Ahaz, challenges him to ask a sign, "either in Sheol or in the height above" (vii 11). These, however, are but momentary outbursts, sporadic flashes illuminating an otherwise dark place. The professed extension of Jahveh's jurisdiction would follow as a corollary of his increasingly-conceived 'imperium singulare': in this psalm that extension had almost, if not entirely, reached elevation to the level of dogma.

But whether we may legitimately infer that the psalmist envisages Jahveh as active in Sheol to the extent of fashioning there for the believer "another body after death for the life that is to be"[2] is open to very grave doubt. We give the passage in full as Oesterley renders it:

> "My frame was not hidden from thee
> When I was made in secret,
> And curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.
> Thine eyes did see mine unformed substance,
> And in thy book hath it all been written.
> Days were ordained
> When as yet there were none of them.[3]

How precious to me are thy thoughts, O God,
How great is the sum of them.
Should I count them, they would be more in number than
the grains of sand;
When I shall have awakened I shall still be with thee." [1]

(cxxxix 15-18)

Two points arise: firstly, whether verses 15 and 16 may be construed as patient of such an interpretation as that outlined above; and secondly, whether verse 18 affirms that "when he (the Psalmist) awakes from the sleep of death, he will find himself in the presence of God." [2]

'A fortiori', the latter would appear the better attested, but there is no reason for supposing that the reference is to an awakening from the sleep of death. The thought so well expressed in Keble's hymn "New every morning is the love" was an integral part of Hebrew devotion which the prospect of morning worship in the Temple greatly enhanced. This is seen in such a passage as iii 6(5):

"I laid me down and slept;
I awoke, for Jahveh sustaineth me,"

and further, 'inter alia', in v 3(2)sq., lix 17(16), lxxxiv 3(2) and 5(4), xcii 3(2). The thought is, in fact, parallel with that of xvii 15, hence we conclude, as there, that no reference to a future life is necessarily implied.

When this is recognised, the exegesis of the preceding verses is seriously affected. It is true that in later Jewish thought Sheol came to be regarded as an intermediate state -- the temporary abode of the righteous awaiting resurrection, and ultimately the final abode of the wicked with attendant punishment. Sheol as a temporary place of sojourn is anticipated as early as Job xiv 1-15, but it was not until early in the second century B.C. that this became the prevailing doctrine.[3] The idea

of a fashioning of a body in Sheol for the future life would constitute a further considerable advance, and is on this account hardly likely to have arisen until some time later, that is, posterior to 200 B.C. The Corinthian question: "How are the dead raised up, and with what manner of body (ποίῳ σώματι) do they come?", while inevitable among the Greeks, does not appear to have excited Hebrew speculation. To the latter, with a few exceptions, it was simply an article of belief that the dead would rise and that their earthly bodies would be transformed:

> "And the righteous and elect shall have risen from the earth,
> And ceased to be of downcast countenance.
> And they shall have been clothed with garments of glory,
> And they shall be the garments of life from the Lord of (Spirits:
> And your garments shall not grow old,
> Nor your glory pass away before the Lord of Spirits.
> (I Enoch lxii 15sq.)[1]

The section from which this quotation is taken[2] is dated by Charles 94-64 B.C.,[3] and is the earliest documentary evidence for any definite statement regarding a "spiritual body." In an earlier section (vi-xxxvi), dated by the same scholar probably prior to 170 B.C.,[4] nothing is said of the nature of the resurrection body. The "spirits of the souls of the dead" (xxii 3), also called "the spirits of the dead" (9), "the spirits of the children of men who were dead" (5, Ethiop., but not in Greek), or simply "spirits" (11 etc.) are in Sheol, which here consists of four divisions,[5] awaiting "the great judgment" (4). The "righteous and holy" alone (xxv 4) appear to enjoy a true resurrection, the nature of which is inferential rather than explicit. As in the slightly later work of Daniel, the risen body "seems to possess its natural appetites" (Charles, E.Bi. 1358), for it

enjoys the fruit of the tree "fragrant beyond all fragrance" (xxiv 4 sq.), of which the fragrance "shall be in their bones" (xxv 6). We are therefore undoubtedly justified in concluding that the earliest conception of a resurrection body was that of the former carnal body in a resuscitated condition. This would appear to be borne out by the evidence of Isa. xxvi 19 if the usual interpretation be adopted. The present writer, however, is far from convinced that the passage relates to a resurrection of individuals. As Sir G.A. Smith points out ("The Book of Isaiah", 2nd edn., vol i, p.466), LXX omits the clause "my dead bodies shall arise." R.R. Ottley ("The Bk. of Isa. acc. to the LXX"[1], p. 161) renders: "For the dead shall arise, and they that are in the tombs shall be roused up, and they that are in the earth shall rejoice." The date of this passage is one of the most disputed in Old Testament chronology.[2] When the question of the nature of the resurrection body is finally raised (late 1st century, A.D.) in such a form as to require an unequivocal reply (II Baruch xlix 2,3), Baruch is told by God that "the earth will then assuredly restore the dead ... making no change in their form (l. 2).[3] Thus the Greeks of Corinth had anticipated the Jews [= Chap. 50, verse 2.] in a desire for exact knowledge.

We have dealt with the matter at some length in an endeavour to show that such an interpretation as Oesterley has accorded to the psalm passage under review is not only extremely difficult to extract from the immediate context, but appears to be wholly alien to contemporary thought. It should be noted that Oesterley

himself/appears to have abandoned the position in his works of 1937 and 1939 in favour of the view that the passage is reminiscent of an old-world belief that, prior to its entry into the womb, the human body was "skilfully wrought in the depths of the earth". (Fr. App., p.271; "The Psalms" ii p.557.) This is a possible interpretation, and may reflect Iranian influence, which was not inconsiderable in its effects upon later Judaism. The passage cannot be ignored. Unless it is a metaphor for the womb, it can only be taken literally as postulating the formation of an earthly body prior to birth, and although not itself directly teaching the doctrine of pre-existence, which was highly developed in the post-Biblical period and which to-day forms part of the creed of orthodox Judaism, it is certainly in conformity with that line of thought. We must, however, leave this highly interesting subject with a reference to Prof. R. Moore's article in E.R.E., where a comprehensive outline of the Jewish history of the doctrine is given.[1] Briggs[2] regards the words רֻקַּמְתִּי בְּתַחְתִּיּוֹת אֶרֶץ as a marginal note which has found its way into the text, and renders verse 15, with LXX:

> "My frame was not hid from Thee,
> Which Thou didst make in the secret place."[3]

Whether this view be correct or not, the context seems to point to nothing more than the embryonic development of the body in the womb.[4] Nevertheless, in the light of the later doctrine of pre-existence, and the highly speculative nature of beliefs (and in some cases, practices) in connexion with the periods of utero-gestation, parturition, and early infancy,[5] it would be rash to

exclude entirely another possible line of interpretation. We may, however, without such temerity, regard Oesterley as correct in his abandonment of the view taken in "Hebrew Religion"(2nd edn.). Further evidence of the revision of his former position, in which all trace of a future life is expunged from the psalm, is to be found in his treatment in his work of 1939 of verse 18, where, for M.T. הֶקִיצוֹתִי וְעוֹדִי עִמָּךְ he reads [1]הֶקְצוֹתִי וְעוֹדִי [2]שָׁכֵם:-

"Would I count them, they would outnumber the sand,
Did I finish, I should still be counting."

This is altogether too pedestrian to gain acceptance; וְאֶחָד עַמֶּךָ would be better: "Did I finish, I should be but one of Thy people", i.e., one among many who might count God's thoughts; but emendation is quite superfluous.

Though all reference to a future life be entirely denied, the intrinsic value of this psalm is in no way diminished. The psalmist's sensibility of the immanence of God, so intimately conceived in His knowledge of, and relationship with, the individual, yet without losing sight of His transcendence, is sufficient to mark out his thought as a contribution of no mean measure to the loftier side of Israel's religious genius.

It now remains to summarise briefly the conclusions reached regarding the destiny of the individual as portrayed in the Book of Psalms. Some are concerned with the evanescence of human life as compared with the eternity of God (xxxix, xc, ciii 13-18), while a larger number are occupied with the ever-recurring problem of the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked, in the face of which they attempt to frame a theodicy.

There is, broadly speaking, little trace of the antecedent stage which we may term Deuteronomic, in which prosperity and adversity are meted out in direct proportion to goodness and wrong-doing, although Job and Proverbs join their testimony with the Psalter in showing that the converse of this doctrine, which saw in a man's outward condition an infallible index of his inward character in the sight of God, was, as Charles has so well pointed out, so deeply rooted in the national consciousness as to have been axiomatic.[1] The stage at which the psalmists meet us is in advance of the "Deuteronomic", experience having given the lie to its unconditional operation. The "prophetical" doctrine of Sheol for long precluded any advance beyond a state of specious optimism: rewards and punishments were delayed by the righteous Jahveh in order that they might be, in the one case more ample, and in the other more devastating.

Morally this stage represents little advance, for nowhere is the wicked conceived of as desirous or capable of repentance: the cry of the righteous against him is for swift and full requital.[2] A step forward in an ethical direction is taken when the sufferings of the righteous, which are to be of temporary duration only, are regarded as disciplinary and as calling for constancy and fortitude. All will be well in the end: prosperity will come to the upright, while destruction will overtake the evil-doer. Remarkably enough, in spite of its subsequent repudiation at the hands of the very nation which gave it birth,[3] this perverse belief has survived even to our own times. Truly, 'Mit der Dummheit kämpfen Götter selbst vergebens!'[4]

Not all, however, were prepared to adopt this facile and ready course. If the Psalter fails to produce a Qoheleth that is no indictment of its contributors on a charge of intellectual obtusity. "Belief was not easy to the Psalmists and they let us feel so."[1] It was in virtue of their very doubts and questionings that the more courageous dared to record a momentary flight of faith[2] — "this shall be written for those that come after."

"This conviction of a personal relation to God, independent of time and change, and not any particular theory as to the character of the life after death, is the lasting contribution of the Old Testament to the doctrine of a Future Life." This judgment of Burney's,[3] in which we whole-heartedly concur, is not less true of its miniature[4] the Psalter.

(III). THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NATION.

Preliminary Survey.

In order to obtain a comprehensive and measured view of this aspect of our subject it will be necessary to employ the term "eschatology" in its widest sense, and allow it to cover the various forms in which the hopes and aspirations of the nation found their content and expression.

In patriarchal times, and extending into the post-Mosaic era of "settlement" in Canaan, Israel conceived of its future highest blessedness in terms of fecundity and longevity. Abraham's seed was to be "as the stars of heaven for multitude" (Gen. xv 5 (E), xvii 4 sqq.(P), xxii 17 (J); Deut. i 10, x 22, etc.): this was Jahveh's promise in the Covenant.[1] Material blessings were to be of such magnitude as to form a standard whereby others might assess their own prosperity (Gen. xii 3(J), xxviii 14 (J), the latter being the Northern counterpart of the Southern Abrahamic provenance)[2]. The promise is renewed in the Sinaitic Covenant:[1] Canaan, with its abundance of milk and honey, is to be the possession of the Chosen People for "length of days" (Exod. iii 17 (J), et passim Exod., Num., Deut.).

The hard conditions attending the conquest and settlement afforded an all too slender fulfilment of national desires, yet, as Pope has so truly observed,

> "Hope springs eternal in the human breast:
> Man never is, but always to be, blest."[3]

Hence the longed-for time would come, and Israel looked forward to a "Day of Jahveh" (יוֹם יְהוָה) which would assuredly dawn, bringing with it the overthrow of national foes and the realisation of the covenanted blessings. That the idea was widespread and popular may be inferred from the manner of its use by the earlier prophets -- sometimes they refer to it simply as "that day" (Amos ii 16, Hos. i 5, Isa. ii 11, Jer. iv 9, etc.). But to the prophets the Day of Jahveh was not to herald a golden age of unparalleled prosperity: Israel was wholly undeserving of such blessedness, and the righteous Jahveh could not reward unrighteousness with favour.[1] Against the current complacency which regarded Jahveh as particularly indulgent towards His own people Amos inveighs with trenchancy and marked emphasis: "You alone (רַק אֶתְכֶם) have I known," -- therefore, in comparison with other peoples, your punishment will be all the greater (iii 2); Micah is no less severe (iii 12); Hosea, although nowhere employing the term "Day of Jahveh" is nevertheless in the same line of thought; while Isaiah, in virtue of his emphasis upon Jahveh's holiness, sees that judgment upon His people must come.[2] The especial contribution of Isaiah to our study is twofold: namely, his visualising a "remnant" which should survive the impending judgment, conceived of as an invasion by a foreign power; and secondly, the character of the ruler who should exercise authority over this remnant -- the restored community. "It is with Isaiah that we find the beginning of that conception which later ripened into a full Messianic doctrine."[3] It should, however, be

pointed out that the combination of Messiah and the Kingdom (the two being inseparable in Christian thought) was by no means universal in the successors of Isaiah, whether prophets or apocalyptists. There is no mention of a Messiah in Zephaniah, Nahum or Habakkuk; nor, with the exception of II(IV) Esdras, in the whole of the Old Testament Apocrypha. Even in the case of Esdras, the Messiah who "after these years shall ... die" (vii 29) is, in all probability, a redactional element.[1] Exact ideas are as remote in the eschatology of the nation as they have been found to be in that of the individual. In those books in which Messiah appears he is so variously conceived as to render a single clear-cut picture impossible of attainment. In Malachi, for example, it is doubtful whether the figure presented can properly be described as Messiah at all.

Reverting to the main prophetical sequence we now consider the influence of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, under whom the national religious consciousness underwent a profound transformation. A deepening of the sense of sin, both individual and national, is to be traced to the experience of the Exile. N. P. Williams has so finely expressed the situation that we are constrained to give it in his own words: "The great catastrophe had burnt the ethical teaching of the prophets deeply into the mind of Israel, had produced a poignant sense of sin, both national and individual, and had fostered a mood of sombre introspectiveness in which the soul seeks refuge within itself from the disappointments of the unfriendly world without, only to be confronted by

the spectacle of weakness and disharmony within."[1] This newly-sanctioned introspectiveness produced in the Psalter and elsewhere[2] some of the most deeply moving passages in the world's penitential literature, and did much towards lifting escatological thought from its pristine non-ethical and nationalistic bias to that higher plane which it was destined to occupy in the utterances of its best exponents. Yet here again, development was by no means uniform and progressive. In these very two particulars -- ideas of sin, and of the coming judgment and its aftermath -- post-exilic Judaism manifests not infrequently a signal declension on the thought of those who in time past had striven so well for worthier conceptions.

The early years of the Return constitute a period of despondency and frustration, well-mirrored in the books of Haggai and Zechariah. A student of social psychology might find in that period an abundance of illuminating material for an examination of the inferiority-complex in its corporate aspects. With that, however, we have but passing concern: the point for our notice is that in face of external oppression an inner consolidation took place, assuming (save for some notable exceptions) a form so concrete, rigid and circumscribed, as to preclude that unfettered and organic growth which is the 'sine qua non' of a living religion.

Herein lay the basis of that great contrast which, in the form that it took in post-exilic Judaism, had its roots in the teaching of Jeremiah and Ezekiel respectively. How much the

latter was influenced by his older contemporary is plain from his writings.[1] But the differences in outlook are even more striking. Both had inherited from their predecessors the conviction of a coming Day of Jahveh with its concomitant Judgment and subsequent inauguration of the Kingdom. But whereas in Jeremiah the Kingdom was to embrace the Gentiles, in Ezekiel it was confined to the Jews alone. Ezekiel's exclusiveness was consolidated in the reforms of Nehemiah, receiving its final sanction at the hands of Ezra. Against this angustate particularism not all the eloquence of a Deutero-Isaiah, nor the idyllic beauty of the appeal of Ruth, nor the widely-conceived poetic utterances of Psalm lxxxvii, nor the venturesome allegorising of the Book of Jonah, was able to countervail.

The situation presented by the Psalter, consequent upon these conflicting views of Israel's status, has been admirably assessed by two modern scholars, R.H. Charles and R.H. Kennett: "As Ezekiel is the real spiritual founder of the narrowest phases of Talmudic Judaism", said the former in the course of a sermon preached before the University of Oxford, "Jeremiah is the true forerunner of Christianity, teaching, as he did, that the Kingdom was to be within man, that God's law was to be written on his heart, from which truths it naturally followed that the Kingdom was to be world-wide."[2] And Kennett, in very similar vein, thus concludes his study of Ezekiel: "To Ezekiel ... the result of the cleansing of men's hearts is not a vision of God, but an increase in material prosperity. In Ezekiel's

mouth our Saviour's beatitude would have run, 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall have good harvests, and shall be free from toil and anxiety.' Ezekiel's influence on subsequent ages has been enormous. Legalists, writers of apocalypses, and psalmists are all in great measure dependent upon him. He was the father of Judaism, but of a Judaism in which the Gospel could not germinate. In Jeremiah on the other hand we see 'as in a mirror darkly' the truth which Jesus Christ made manifest in all its glory. Of Ezekiel's teaching the almost inevitable outcome was Caiaphas; while Jeremiah marked out the way which led to Jesus Christ."[1]

Before proceeding to examine those passages in the Psalter which might be held to relate to the future state of the nation it is well to note the wide divergence of opinion which has existed, and still exists, among scholars on the question of eschatological content. And this applies not only to the Psalms, but to the Old Testament generally. On the one hand there are writers such as Kennett who are convinced that "eschatology is not to be found in the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament"[2]; while on the other Ed. Meyer, Gunkel, and Gressmann are representatives of a school which traces the roots of Hebrew eschatology back through the pre-prophetic period to Egyptian or Babylonian sources, or both.[3] The issue, we would suggest, is one which really depends upon the definition of terms. The term "eschatology", through its employment by writers in such a variety of usages, has so lent itself to ambiguity that we have

allowed it in this study the widest possible connotation. Its confusion with apocalyptic, as pointed out early in the present work,[1] has undoubtedly created the greatest degree of error: in the wider sense of the term it is impossible to deny the existence of an eschatology to any people, for the question 'quo vadimus?' is one which would inevitably accompany the earliest and rudest stages of intellectual activity. In this sense, eschatological speculation would precede cosmogonical.[2]

Whether the end be conceived of as a multiplicity of offspring enjoying worldly prosperity and gradually extending their territorial frontiers, though each such generation having served its day is gathered at the last to the sepulchres of its fathers in "the land of no return"; or whether the golden age is viewed by each such generation as about to dawn before it "goes hence and is no more seen"; or whether in that golden age the faithful progenitors are raised to share its blessings for a time or for eternity, be that Kingdom an ideal monarchy or under direct theocratic suzerainty; or whether after death -- at once, or in the distant future -- righteous and wicked appear before the Divine judgment-seat and are segregated for ever as the sheep and goats; or finally, whether in the world beyond there is still further progress for the righteous and the possibility of regeneration for the wicked: -- all these are eschatological conceptions: disparate as ethical values it is true, but none the less, eschatological.

The Day of Jahveh and the Judgment.

The phrase "the Day of Jahveh", although frequent in the Prophets, is not found in the Book of Psalms. But the ideas associated with that Day, both in the older "popular" form (described by T.H. Robinson as "patriotic"[1], and by German scholars as "Heil", an eschatology in which the nations are to be destroyed and Israel reign unmolested), and also in the higher "ethical"[1] ("Unheil") form (in which Israel is itself to be the primary object of judgment), are found frequently and often in combination. A 'post eventum' allusion is to be found in the exilic (or post-exilic) elegy, Psalm cxxxvii. Here, surely, is an instance where the Prayer Book version, although not a strictly accurate translation, nevertheless brings out in vivid form the fullest sense of the original:

"Remember the children of Edom, O Lord, in the day of Jerusalem: How they said, Down with it, down with it, even to the ground."[2]

Compared with this, subsequent renderings are prosaic and much less effective.

Kennett,[3] in discussing the meaning of the term "the Day of the Lord", concludes that it is "without anything eschatological about it". He reminds us that the word "day" is used with other genitives as well, -- the day of Midian (Isa. ix 3(4)), the day of Jezreel (Hos. ii 2 (i 11)), the day of Mordecai (II Macc. xv 36), as well as in the passage under review (Ps. cxxxvii 7), and holds that it merely denotes "a time which is memorable in con-

nexion with someone or something". In this we readily concur, but on the writer's own showing, in all these examples, together with other parallels, the "memorable time" is never conceived of as other than a judgment, whether of doom on unrighteousness or vindication of integrity.[1] Thus, even if the term "the Day of the Lord" be regarded, with Kennett, as designative of "the day of the Lord's activity", such activity is always in the nature of a judgment, an integral factor in the eschatological process.

This judgment, which is to be, according to some, universal and catastrophic, while in other writers taking the form of a judgment first of Israel and then of those nations who are the instruments of Jahveh for the punishment of His people, is often mentioned by the psalmists. Not all the references in the Psalter, however, to a "judgment" can be regarded as strictly eschatological. Often the term implies little more than an opinion passed by Jahveh on present or past conduct, -- Jahveh's thoughts rather than His delivering any judicial pronouncement, as when the psalmist asks his God to think well of him or to vindicate him in the face of the contumely of his opponents (e.g., xxvi, xxxv 24, xliii 1, cf. cxxxix 23 sq.). It might, of course, be urged that any such opinion or thought would, in view of Jahveh's wholly righteous character, have the effect of a judicial pronouncement; but whether this could rightly be construed as eschatological is at least dubious. Nor are we helped by the Hebrew: the terms regularly employed (דִּין and שְׁפַט) are virtually synonymous[2] and, as a few examples will show, may be employed in both

an eschatological and non-eschatological sense.

In vii 9(8) both terms are employed in parallelism in the course of a passage admittedly eschatological:[1]

"Jahveh ministereth judgment (דִּין) to the peoples:
Judge me (שָׁפְטֵנִי), Jahveh, according to my righteousness,
And according to my integrity reward me[2]."

Again, in Ps. ix (originally, with x, one psalm, an acrostic), where a scene anticipatory of the Final Judgment is presented,[3] it is stated of Jahveh:

"Thou sittest on the throne judging (שׁוֹפֵט) righteously." (ix 5(4)).

And, in the same context:

"He (i.e., Jahveh) judgeth (יִשְׁפֹּט) the world in righteousness;
He ministereth judgment (דִּין) to the peoples in uprightness (ix 9(8)).

In the non-eschatological psalm liv, the word דִּין is used of supplicating God's vindication:

"O God, by Thy Name save me,
And by Thy might vindicate me (תְּדִינֵנִי)." (liv 3(1)).

A similar situation confronts us in xliii (a continuation of xlii, and with it originally one psalm), where the word used is שָׁפַט:

"Vindicate me (שָׁפְטֵנִי), O God, and champion my cause[4]
Against an ungodly nation." (xliii 1).

Thus a comparison of usage shows that the terms are employed interchangeably:[5] hence the question of whether any passage in which either term occurs is eschatological or not must be determined on other criteria.

In those passages in which the Judgment is admittedly eschatological, the references, as one would expect in the Psalter, are declaratory rather than descriptive. They do not serve

the purpose of providing a clear picture of the Judgment as visualised at any particular period, but rather it may be said of each, as T.H. Robinson has expressed it in relation to the First Psalm, that "it helps us to see how the references to the 'judgment' of the enthroned Jahveh were interpreted and gradually woven into the eschatological scheme."[1] The reference to the Judgment in this psalm (i 5) is sometimes taken as adumbrative of a resurrection of the righteous, that is, a resurrection in which the wicked take no part, as in sections lxxxiii-xc and xci-civ of I Enoch, Psalms of Solomon i-xvi, and Jubilees xxxiii 3.[2] The verse in question, which reads:

"Therefore the wicked shall not stand (לֹא־יָקֻמוּ) in the judgment(בַּמִּשְׁפָּט),
Nor the sinners in the assembly (עֲדָת)[3] of the righteous",

lends itself readily to such an interpretation, and indeed was interpreted of resurrection by Jewish commentators (so Rashi, Qimchi).[4] There are, however, no sufficient grounds for so regarding it: as Oesterley rightly remarks, "the psalmist is dealing with present conditions, not with the world of the future."[5]

The Judgment and the Kingdom are so closely linked in the Psalter that it is virtually impossible to separate them. Hence, in what follows, these conceptions are for the most part regarded as a unity.

The "reign of Jahveh", an ever-recurring theme, has been much to the fore within recent years through the researches of Gunkel, Mowinckel, and others who have followed them in this

line of interpretation. On the basis of such psalms as xlvii, xciii, xcv-xcix (Mowinckel adds c), these scholars have worked on the close connexion between the Psalter and the cultus. The now famous Norwegian scholar regards these psalms as having been composed for, or used in, the annual Enthronement Festival of Jahveh (Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs), celebrated in the ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles.[1] Like the theory of the "workers of mischief" noted above, it has certainly much to commend it, and throws considerable light upon the composition and liturgical use of the Psalter. Professor G. R. Driver, while regarding the illustrations from Babylonian custom as "an interesting parallel", thinks that the theory of the Accession Feast of Jahveh "needs to be proved up to the hilt from the Hebrew side before it can be accepted by Biblical scholars."[2]

Surely such a position is over-cautious. Very few theories in the field of Old Testament scholarship are capable of decisive proof to demonstration. In most, probability —"the guide of life" — is all that we can reasonably expect, and once it is granted that the Hebrews must originally have partaken of the common stock of Semitic religious beliefs there can be nothing strange in supposing that such conceptions should colour their subsequent ideas. It is hardly an exaggeration to assert that the loftier ideas which characterise the later phases of Israel's growth represent not so much a radical cleavage with the past as a superimposition of nobler and worthier tenets upon a primitive corpus of basic beliefs.

While it is undoubtedly true that no direct evidence exists for the observance of an Accession Festival in Israel such as was held in Babylon in honour of Marduk, it is equally true that there is no evidence against it: on grounds of probability it is reasonable to assume at the least that such a festival formed part of the primitive cultus in Israel[1] and that the Enthronement Psalms in their earlier form were composed or adapted for the occasion.

Characteristic of these Accession or Enthronement Psalms[2] is the declaration of Jahveh's sovereignty, "Jahveh has become King", (יְהוָה מָלָךְ), psalms xciii, xcvii and xcix opening with this formula. On the Babylonian parallel, "Marduk-ma sharru", G. R. Driver doubts whether this would not be more correctly rendered, "Marduk is king" rather than "Marduk has become king". Even if this be so, we cannot see how it follows that "the idea of an accession is greatly weakened."[3]

The analogy of Jahveh's enthronement is that of the accession of a human king:

> "Jahveh is become King,
> Apparelled in majesty,
> Apparelled is Jahveh,
> Girded with strength." (Ps. xciii 1)

This, together with parallel passages, seems to suggest beyond reasonable doubt that in ancient Israel a ritual pattern existed in which the king took a central part. The dramatic framework is well known and need not detain us.[4] The following quotation from a recent work of Professor E. O. James affords an admirable statement of the position which presents itself in the Book of

Psalms. After summarising the chief enactments in the ritual pattern, which forms "the framework of all New Year Festivals and installation rites from Ancient Egypt and Babylonia to those of the Christian Church", he continues: "In the process of diffusion and re-interpretation the various constituent elements have undergone considerable modification. For instance, among the Hebrews, despite their proximity to and many cultural contacts with Babylonia, Syria and Egypt, though the pattern is discernible in the Jerusalem cultus, it has been broken up and redistributed almost beyond recognition."[1]

This, we may well believe, is the only way in which many psalms (or portions of psalms) can be rendered at all intelligible, and furnishes a reasonable background not only for the "Enthronement" group, but also for some of the "Royal" psalms, on which more will be said below. It will be sufficient for the present to note that the discernible elements of a past cultic procedure have, for the most part, been stripped of untoward associations, clothed with grandiose aspirations, and projected into the future. It is this eagerly-awaited establishment of Jahveh's sovereignty (מַלְכוּת)[2], whether as a pure theocracy[3] (in the sense that no Messianic king is envisaged, as, for example, in Ps. lxxxv), or as an earthly dominion under an ideal king, which in the Psalter constitutes the national eschatology.

As in the other religious writings, canonical and extra-canonical, so in the Book of Psalms, the judgment of the

nations and their place in the kingdom are variously conceived. In the Enthronement psalms nothing is said of the fate of the nations; in xcvi 7 they are bidden to render to Jahveh "glory and strength"; in xcviii 2 they are witnesses of His salvation and the revelation of His righteousness. The only exception is xlvii where, strangely enough in the same psalm, two contradictory conceptions are put forward. In verse 4(3) Israel appears as the "most favoured nation":

> "He shall subdue peoples under us,
> And nations under our feet".

Yet in the last verse (10(9)),

> "The princes of the peoples are gathered together
> With the people of the God of Abraham."[1]

In view of the strong "universalist" tone of these psalms it is fairly clear that verses 3 and 4 (2 and 3) of Ps. xlvii should be regarded as later insertions of the Persian or early Greek period, representing a recrudescence of the earlier and unethical "Heil" eschatology.

The world-wide acknowledgment of Jahveh as Sovereign is not, however, confined to the Enthronement psalms. It appears, for example, in the 86th, a cry for help against enemies, a psalm which in its earlier form (like cxv 4 sqq., cxxxv 5, 15 sqq.) was apparently henotheistic (verse 8). The psalm continues:

> "All nations whom Thou hast made shall come,
> They shall worship before Thee, Adonai, and glorify
> Thy Name." (verse 9).[2]

This line of thought reaches its finest expression in Ps. lxxxvii. Unfortunately, like so many of the key passages in the Old Test-

ament, the text is in some disorder and dislocations have taken place.[1] But the purport is clear --- Mother Sion[2] claiming all nations equally as her offspring, a thought which later was to capture the imagination of St. Paul and so receive transformation at his hands.[3] Here again, Jahveh is King and Sion is His foundation (מוסדתו). The psalm is eschatological in a fine sense. It visualises the world-process as reaching its consummation in the recognition of a common origin of all nations and their destiny as instruments in the hand of Jahveh of a common purpose. While it needed a St. Paul to draw out its full potentialities (and in so far as this was necessary the eschatology of the psalm must be regarded as defective), it nevertheless reaches a height that it would be difficult to exaggerate. Its true value lies not in its inherent possibilities, far-reaching as they were, but in its own intrinsic worth as an expression of a breadth of outlook having few parallels in Old Testament thought. In this connexion we are reminded of a warning given by the late Sub-Dean of Westminster in his lucid little volume, "What is the Kingdom of God?" He rightly regards as mistaken the common tendency which views the Old Testament revelation as merely preparatory for the New, a way of thinking which has been much encouraged by an overweening concentration upon St. Augustine's well-known dictum. "The revelation possessed intrinsic worth at each of its stages," writes Canon Storr. ".... Childhood is not a mere preparation for manhood. It is one stage of a progressive life with values of its own, which are yet prophetic of richer values to come."[4]

This is an apposite illustration of eschatological development. Just as the experiences of childhood and infancy, to a very marked degree, mould the man, so early features are everywhere present in a more mature eschatology.[1] In the Enthronement psalms, and elsewhere in those places in which the final reign of God is envisaged, the old-world Creation myth of Marduk and Tiâmat is still in the mind of the writer:

> "The floods rise up, Jahveh,
> The floods lift up their voice,
> The floods lift up their roaring." (xciii 3)

But more powerful than them all is Jahveh, glorious on high (verse 4). Again,

> "Thou rulest the proud swelling of the sea;
> When the waves thereof arise Thou stillest them:
> Thou didst crush Rahab as one that is pierced."
> (lxxxix 10(9)sq.)

Here, as G.R. Driver points out, Rahab, like Leviathan in lxxiv 13 sq., represents not Egypt but the primeval waters.[2] As Jahveh was thus the Creator, bringing order out of chaos, so, too, is He Lord of Nature. To the psalmists His works testify to His greatness and their orderliness to His supreme rule:[3]

> "The heavens declare the glory of God:
> And the work of His hands doth the firmament proclaim."
> (xix 2(1)).[4]

Like the Hebrew of old, and the Babylonian and Egyptian from whom he may have borrowed, a poet in any age might be forgiven for regarding such manifestation as one of Berkeley's truths "so near and obvious to the mind that a man need only open his eyes to see them."[5] But the statement has not been without its challengers.

Comte thought that it was the glory of Kepler and Newton that the heavens declared,[1] while the present occupant of the Plumian Chair of Astronomy at Cambridge tells us that "probably most astronomers, if they were to speak frankly, would confess to some chafing when they are reminded of the psalm."[2] We cannot be entirely without sympathy, however, when we understand the reason for their restiveness!

Psalm civ is not simply an epic of Creation. It is all that and more. The question of its dependence upon Babylonian mythological elements and its manifest parallels with Aknaton's "Hymn to the Sun" and the Cairo "Hymn to Amun" have been so fully discussed elsewhere[3] that they need not detain us here. Oesterley, in comparing it with the previous psalm (ciii), describes the latter as praising Jahveh as the God of History and civ as magnifying Him as Lord of Nature.[4] But Jahveh is still the God of History in civ, as witness the psalmist's closing petition:

> "May sinners be consumed from the earth;
> May the wicked be no more."

Thus the writer looks forward from first things to last;[5] Jahveh's rule in the natural order is to become His rule in the moral order; the perfect kingdom is to be established on earth, and the righteous alone will inherit it.

Often the inauguration of the kingdom is envisaged in a manner which can only be described as apocalyptic. A distinction is sometimes drawn between prophecy and apocalyptic on the grounds of their respective use of natural, as contrasted with cataclysmic, phenomena. It is supposed, on this theory, that the

prophets see the doom to come heralded by such events as war, plague and famine, whereas the apocalyptists predict a direct Divine intervention in the natural order as the precursor of the coming judgment. Such a sharp distinction is unquestionably false. Wars, plagues and pestilences would themselves, in the thought of the prophets, furnish the seeds from which still further disorders might arise until a fully-grown "apocalyptic" imagery would appear naturally upon the scene. To discuss whether apocalyptic figures, properly so called, appear in the earlier prophets or not, would take us beyond the limits of this work, especially in view of the division of opinion on the matter: suffice it to state that the grounds adduced for assigning an inordinately late date to some of these prophetical passages cannot be regarded as other than a 'petitio principii'. Unnatural events were by no means the prerogative of inventive minds of a late period. Many of the psalmists remembered that

"The sea saw and fled; Jordan was driven back", (cxiv 3)

and how

"In the sight of their fathers He wrought marvels
In the land of Egypt, the field of Soan." (lxxviii 12)

Had not, too, the now lost Book of Jashar recorded that masterpiece of mandatory verse:

"Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon,
And thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon"? (Josh. x 12)

Here alone would be a sufficiency of material to furnish the groundwork, and moreover the authority, for the most extravagant vagaries of the apocalyptic imagination. The more extreme type

finds no place in the Psalter, though the apocalyptic element is by no means absent. One or two examples will suffice to illustrate:

> "Clouds and darkness are round about Him, ...
> Fire goeth before Him, and burneth His adversaries round about.
> His lightenings enlighten the world: the earth beholdeth and trembleth.
> The mountains melt like wax[1] before Jahveh[1]: before the Lord of all the earth." (xcvii 2-5)

Here the eschatological drama seems to be based on the theophany at Sinai, which event appears from the literature of the Hebrews to have impressed itself indelibly upon their memory in each succeeding generation. Some of the supposed eschatological references in the Psalter are retrospective of this formative epoch of national history, and to project its major characteristics into a future display of Jahveh's powers was but a natural sequel. "We may guess," says T.H. Robinson, "... that what Jahveh has done once, He will do again."[2] The crossing of the Red Sea, as already shown, is further evidence of this tendency, and, most prominently of all, the Creation. Only the Creator could re-create,[3] even if that re-creation must be preceded by catastrophe, as when

> "He uttereth His voice and the earth is dissolved (מָגַג)". (xlvi 7(6))

If מָגַג be a true reading, and if Oesterley be correct in reading the same verb for תָּמֹ֑וג in verse 3(2), the psalm would present a very fine picture of a re-created world,[4] reflecting in some measure Iranian eschatological features (cf.lxxv 4(3)).

On the other hand, if שוד בת be read in the above passage and the emendation in verse 3(2) rejected, the psalm may be simply a pre-exilic paean of confidence in the inviolability of Sion. A somewhat similar difficulty arises in the interpretation of Ps. lxxv. It is clearly a psalm of judgment, but whether verse 4(3):

"The earth is dissolved and all its dwellers (ישבי ארץ)[1];
I established its pillars,"

is to be taken literally as envisaging a final conflagration, or simply as figurative of the chaos which man has imposed upon the world-order, must remain an open question.

The conclusions reached in this section may be briefly summarised as follows: The Day of Jahveh, although not specifically mentioned in the Psalter is, throughout, implicit, and appears with both "Heil" and "Unheil" associations. The former does not necessarily indicate an early date, as the stress of post-exilic oppression and frustration provided a fruitful soil for its reappearance.[2] The Judgment and the Kingdom appear, though whether they were to be preceded by the inversion of world-order as visualised by the apocalyptists is doubtful. The Kingdom throughout is conceived of as upon the earth and of indefinite duration; it is wholly the work of God: He is its Initiator and remains its Ruler. Psalm cxlv (an acrostic) is, perhaps, the most expressive form which the Psalter gives of this Divine Kingdom:

"Let all Thy works, Jahveh, render Thee thanks,
And let Thy godly ones bless Thee.
The glory of Thy Kingdom let them affirm,
And speak of Thy power,
To make known to the sons of men Thy might[1]
And the glory of the majesty of Thy Kingdom.
Thy Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom[2]
And Thy Kingship embraceth all generations."

(cxlv 10-13)

Messiah and the Kingdom.

As already stated above, the Kingdom and the "Messianic" King, so closely linked together -- in fact inseparably bound up -- in the minds of Christian people, are by no means a universal combination in the Old Testament. In their origin they represent two distinct elements of thought, developing for long upon independent, and for the most part mutually exclusive, lines, which coalesced at a comparatively late period and then only in some writers.

The Kingdom has its roots in the "Day of the Lord"; the Messiah in human kingship. Both, in their crudest form, must be regarded as political and nationalistic nather than directly ethical. Saul was undoubtedly a better character than his biographers have made him out to be.[1] But he failed to stem the Philistine invasion and all eyes turned to the rising hero David.[2] His remarkable success branded him in the eyes of subsequent generations as the ideal ruler; hence in times of misfortune it was natural to hope that a second David might arise to accomplish even greater things. This is the earliest "Messianic hope" and has no connexion at all with "the end".[3] Such is the conception visualised by the first Isaiah: his ideal king will simply rule as a perfect sovereign.[4] Jeremiah and Ezekiel,[5] like Isaiah, envisaged this ruler as of the stock of Jesse, but in them the perfect order is governed by a dynasty of Davidic kings, and the

Kingdom over which he rules is an earthly one, though regenerated.

The conception of the Kingdom is elevated in Deutero-Isaaiah; he is the first Old Testament writer to base the Kingdom on what became a prominent figure in later apocalyptic -- Jahveh as "the first and the last",[1] and here there is no suggestion of its inauguration by a Messiah.[2] This conception, which appears prominently in later apocalyptic, and in which the present age is superseded by the age to come, (an activity in which the Messiah plays a leading part), is exceedingly obscure in regard to its origins. Gressmann[3] and others have traced the origin of the Messiah to Egypt, though, so far as we can ascertain, the Egyptians did not expect their king to return at the end of time.[4] It would appear that the later idea of the Messianic Kingdom was due to an intermingling in Jewish thought of Egyptian, Iranian and Hellenic influence.[5]

Messiah, in its original connotation, is not a technical term; still less is it a proper name.[6] With the article prefixed it occurs in the Old Testament only of the anointed priest (הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ)[7], but by far the most regular use is as a designation of the king in the historical books,[9] and in Lam. iv 20 of Zedekiah; in Deutero-Isaiah its use is extended to the foreign monarch Cyrus (לְמְשִׁיחוֹ לְכוֹרֶשׁ, xlv 1).[8] In the Psalter the word occurs ten times, but not in all cases can the usage be claimed as eschatological, nor even as referring to a monarch. Thus in the historical retrospect (cv 15 = I Chron. xvi 22),

"Touch not mine anointed (מְשִׁיחָי)" (RVm "anointed ones")

refers quite clearly to the patriarchs. When Jahveh is said to be

"the strength of His people,
The fortress Who saves His anointed (מְשִׁיחוֹ)"[1]

the parallelism certainly suggests that the מָשִׁיחַ is the whole of the faithful nation.[2] Again, in the beautiful 84th psalm, which is undoubtedly a processional,[3]

"Behold, O God, our defender,
And look upon the face of Thine anointed", (מְשִׁיחֶךָ),[4]

the probability here is that the words represent the lament of a priest living far from the sanctuary,[5] rather than a prayer for the welfare of the king.[6]

It is exceedingly difficult for any mind replete with the usual background of mystical exegesis to attempt to divest itself of the impression that the well-known second psalm[7] is not Messianic in the strict sense of that term.[8] The use of the psalm at Morning Prayer at Christmastide and on Easter Day; its quotation in the course of the Epistle for Christmas Day; together with its application to our Lord in the New Testament writings:-- all these tend to invest it with a meaning which the original cannot sustain. Thanks to Bertholet,[9] a major difficulty in the text has been satisfactorily cleared up, and in his proposed reconstruction most scholars have since followed him. For the meaningless "rejoice with trembling, kiss (the) son"[11] Bertholet, reading וְנִשְׁקוּ בְרַגְלָיו בִּרְעָדָה , "with trembling kiss his feet", has given the 'coup de grace' to any lingering vestige of typological predilection. To kiss the feet is, of course, to acknowledge subjugation, a usage paralleled in Egyptian and Babylonian documents.[10] Widely

divergent views have been put forward in an attempt to establish the date and occasion of the psalm, ranging from the time of Solomon to Alexander Jannaeus. Their failure, as Box suggests,[1] seems to indicate a fundamental idealist element in the psalm, a conclusion which might well be extended to cover the whole of the "Royal" group.

The remaining psalms which make mention of the Anointed (מָשִׁיחַ) may be dealt with briefly. The 20th appears to refer to a reigning monarch, and is a prayer for victory on the eve of battle:

> "Now know I assuredly that Jahǻveh is the saviour of His anointed (מְשִׁיחוֹ):
> He will answer from His holy heavens." (xx 7(6))

Psalm lxxxix is best explained (as Oesterley, who compares xix, xxvii, cxxvii, each a combination of two separate psalms) as a combining of three originally independent psalms. Oesterley continues: "This is suggested by the entirely different subject-matter of each of the three component parts. The purpose of the compiler in combining these appears to have been to set in review the origin, development, and final appearance of the Kingship."[2] Whether this hypothesis be accepted or not, the change at verse 39(38) is remarkable:[3]

> "But Thou hast cast off and despised,
> Thou hast been wroth with Thine anointed (מְשִׁיחֶךָ)."

The disappearance of the kingship appears to be the subject of this ~~this~~ last section. Kirkpatrick remarks: "David's heir has the same fate as Saul (I Sam. xv 23, 26), inspite of the express promise that it should not be so (II Sam. vii 15)."[4] The same

writer suggests the discrowned Jehoiachin, led through the streets of Babylon in the conqueror's triumph, as the "anointed whose footsteps have been blasphemed,"[1] (lxxxix 52(51)), but historical identifications of this nature must be treated with extreme reserve.

Psalm cxxxii, in which the term מְשִׁיחַ appears twice (at verses 10 and 17), is one of which Oesterley rightly holds that to interpret in a Messianic sense is to miss its meaning.[2] It looks forward, in the prophetic spirit, to a restoration of the Davidic house "more glorious and more dread than from no fall". As T.H. Robinson[3] so well renders verse 17 (in language worthy of the Garter King of Arms!):

> "There will I raise up for David,
> A dynasty puissant.
> I have set[4] Mine anointed a lamp[5]
> That shall never go out."

The last of the psalms to be considered in this connexion as making definite use of the term מְשִׁיחַ is the 18th.[10] Whatever be the date of its present form, it certainly makes use of some very ancient elements.[6] The first part of the psalm, the present writer thinks, was originally a poem after the pattern of the Babylonian "Descent of Ishtar" in which Jahveh goes down to Sheol to deliver the subject of the epic from its terrors.[7] The second part, which seems to have little relation to the first,[8] pictures Jahveh in his ancient role of War God, the original application of the term "Jahveh of Hosts" (יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת).[9] T.H. Robinson regards the psalm as "a song of triumph placed in

the mouth of a King who has won, not merely victory, but also dominion, through a great theophany."[1] This view is tenable only if the whole be regarded as a unity, which does not appear to be the case. The latter portion of the psalm should, in all probabilty, be regarded as the work of a court-poet of the age of David, and its presence accounted for on the "projectionist" theory.[2] This theory seems by far the most satisfactory hypothesis on which an explanation may be attempted of the presence in the Psalter of the so-called "Royal" and "Messianic" psalms. In all cases an earthly monarch, either the one actually reigning at the time of the original composition or an outstanding royal figure of the past, usually David himself, appears to be indicated.[3]

In Psalm lxxii the ideal king put forward is Solomon, traditionally famed for his wisdom and (although the matter is not indisputable) the extension of Israel's boundaries during his reign to their widest limits.[4]

The ascription of Psalm cx to Simon Maccabaeus is so well known that mention of it is almost superfluous. It has been thought to have received further support from the interesting phenomenon to which G. Margoliouth and the Roman Catholic scholar Bickell have (independently) directed attention,[5] namely, that the oracle beginning "Sit thou" (יָשַׁב)[6] forms an acrostic on the name Simon. Is this, however, a mere coincidence? The weakness of the theory which regards the acrostic as designed is that it is not continued throughout the psalm: Oesterley has

gone so far as to describe the theory as "fantastic".[1] While we would not be prepared to deny categorically the existence of Maccabaean elements in the Psalter we regard their presence as doubtful, and, if admitted, of rare occurrence: or, in the words of Sellin: "while there is in principle no reason why there should not be a few Maccabaean psalms in the Psalter, their presence has certainly not yet been proved."[2]

Working on the observations of two scholars who are widely separated on the question of dating, it seems at least possible to advance a satisfactory explanation of the psalm without an extreme dating in either direction. Kennett, in rendering the Hebrew phrase עַל־דִּבְרָתִי מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק[3] as "'because of'[4] (not 'after the order of') Melchizedek," remarks that the meaning of the phrase is that "the precedent of Melchizedek justifies the holding of the high-priesthood by one who is the civil ruler."[5] Gunkel,[6] who regards the psalm as pre-exilic, points out that the priestly function was sometimes exercised by pre-exilic kings (e.g. II Sam. vi 18; I Kings viii 14, 22, ix 25, etc.). These two observations, taken together, would appear to provide the clue to the purpose of the psalmist. The king's prerogative of exercising the priesthood, or a combination within the person of the monarch of the dual role of king and priest, is one which goes back to remote antiquity.[7] It was exercised, as has been seen, by the early kings of Israel; this later became a matter of dispute, and finally of entire prohibition (cf. II Chron. xxvi 16 sqq., and see more fully on the whole subject E.O.James

in "Myth and Ritual", p. 159 sq.). Restrictive measures, none the less, are not imposed without some resistance; even if that resistance be unavailing the passing of the years serves only to nourish the hope that the things lost may again be restored in an even richer measure of grandeur, the old assuming at the same time a glory which in reality had never been. In such vein does the writer of Psalm cx look forward to a revival of the monarchy in the person of one who, like Saul, David and Solomon of old, would be to his people both king and priest. Beyond Zadok, and beyond even Levi, he looks for his authority. From the mists of antiquity there emerges the shadowy figure of Melchizedek,[1] King of Salem, Priest of 'El 'Elyôn.[2] Salem restored shall have but one supreme ruler: the king of Sion shall be also priest of its holy Mount.[3]

The remainder of the "Royal" group do not call for special attention. An examination of their contents, together with those above, serves as one more illustration of the almost prophetic insight of that fine old scholar, William Robertson Smith. The elapse of sixty years has done nothing to set aside, but rather the more securely to establish, the conclusions which he first put forward in respect of the "Royal" psalms in an article written in 1883, which, revised by Cheyne and Kautzsch, was incorporated into the "Encyclopaedia Biblica" (art. MESSIAH). The following is the relevant excerpt, than which no more succinct statement of the position

could be desired:

> "When the Psalter became a liturgical book the historical kingship had gone by, and the idea alone remained, no longer as the interpretation of a present political fact, but as part of Israel's religious inheritance. It was impossible, however, to think that a true idea had become obsolete merely because it found no expression on earth for the time being; Israel looked again for an anointed king to whom the words of the sacred hymns should apply with a force never realised in the imperfect kingship of the past. Thus the psalms, especially such psalms as the second, were necessarily viewed as prophetic; and meantime, in accordance with the common Hebrew representation of ideal things as existing in heaven, the true king remains hidden with God." [1]

We have now examined, with a view to attempting to establish this particular aspect of the eschatology of Israel's psalmists, the main passages which have been regarded as "Messianic." Although varying in some details, our conclusion must be substantially that of Professor T. H. Robinson: "As with the coming of Jahveh to inaugurate the new time, so with the Messianic hope, we are constrained to admit that if we want absolute certainty we must seek it elsewhere than in the Psalter,[2]" a conclusion which is the more certain if the term Messiah be restricted, as for the sake of clarity it undoubtedly ought to be, to the Divine or semi-Divine Being of apocalyptic eschatology. Like the term "Son of Man", that of "Messiah" underwent a process of semantic development in the course of which it became so completely transformed that in its most advanced association it bears as little relation to its humbler application in the historical books of the Old

Testament as does the "Son of Man" of the Gospels to the בְּנֵי אָדָם of Psalm viii 5(4) or Numbers xxiii 19.

Psalm xxii calls for special mention as representing, so far as the Psalter is concerned, a new departure in regard to the destiny of the nation. While some of its passages find parallels in other psalms, xxii is, in its essence, 'sui generis' in the Psalter, being "written very largely in the spirit of Deutero-Isaiah,[1] and probably is dependent on his writings. The speaker in the psalm is the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, though the term 'Servant' is not actually employed."[2] Other interpretations have been placed upon the psalm,[3] and while dogmatism here, as so often (one might almost say universally) in the Psalter would be misplaced, the view adopted is the one which appears to the present writer the most plausible. The point of view of the psalmist has been so admirably stated by Professor S.H. Hooke in his exposition of the "Servant poems" in his little volume in the "Interpreter Series", "Prophets and Priests",[4] the value of which is out of all proportion to its modest dimensions, that we are constrained to quote him 'in extenso', more especially as there is nothing in Professor Hooke's statement from which we would dissent.

> "There is fairly general agreement that these poems are not by the author of the rest of Second Isaiah, the fundamental point of difference being that, whereas the author of Second Isaiah looks forward with passionate intensity to the restoration of his people and the future glory of Zion, the author of the Servant Songs takes an

entirely different view of the future of Israel. ...

The central point of interest in these poems lies in a new interpretation of contemporary history. The distinguishing characteristic of the prophets of the protest had been their historical realism. Abandoning the attempt of the old ritual pattern to control the environment, whether natural or historical, they accepted the historical situation, and sought to interpret it in terms of their conception of a God who was active in history with a moral purpose. But hitherto no prophet, not even Jeremiah, had abandoned the idea that this moral purpose had its centre in Israel and was localized in Palestine. But the author of the Servant Songs recognized that the most important historical fact of his time was the Dispersion, voluntary or involuntary, and he proceeded to interpret this fact, not as a temporary chastisement, to be followed by restoration, but as the evidence of a moral purpose which his people had been too blind to recognize.

In his re-interpretation the author holds fast to the following guiding ideas: first, that the distinguishing possession of Israel was a knowledge of God such as no other people of his time possessed, a point of view which is reflected in such a passage as Deuteronomy iv. 7-8; second, that the theory of chastisement, however it might have been justified in the past, was an inadequate explanation of the sufferings of the righteous community which, for the author, represented the true Israel; and third, that in the larger perspective of history the restoration of Israel to national independence was "too light a thing" for a God whose moral purposes embraced the good of all the nations and not merely of Israel.

Hence we find this great poet and prophet rising to a height of which no previous prophet had been capable, and, we might say, transforming the central element of the ancient ritual pattern, the death of the representative individual upon whom the well-being of the community depended, into the vicarious death of the Servant, that is to say, the death of Israel in a political sense. He abandons the hope of the resurrection of Israel as a nation, and accepts the accomplished fact of their dispersion throughout the ancient world as the result of God's purpose to make them the bearers of the knowledge of him to the Gentiles. In this purpose he finds the meaning of the Servant's sufferings."[1]

Herein, we believe, lies the key to a sound exegesis of Psalm xxii.

CONCLUSION.

If we were to attempt to summarise very briefly the conclusions reached in this study they might be stated within broad limits as follows.

In the first place, the term "eschatology" must be accorded a much wider signification than that of a synonym of the "Novissima" of the Scholastic theology: its roots must be traced to conditions, individual, national, and international, prevailing in the present sphere; and the genetic connexion between the present and the future must be a first principle in its apprehension.

The eschatology of the Psalter is primarily an eschatology of the individual. Sheol as the final destination of all predominates, and that a Sheol of the negative character emphasised in the prophets. A "blessed future life" reaches, so far as we are able to determine, no higher articulation than a momentary hope impelled by the apparent injustice of the unfriendly world without. While all the requisite material for subsequent advance lies smouldering within the pages of the Psalter, none had yet come who might kindle it into flame. Attempts at theodicy[1] show not infrequently a profundity of spiritual insight and a childlike trust in God, having issue in the injunction,

> "Keep integrity, and foster uprightness,
> For the latter end of the upright is peace."[2]

In regard to the destiny of the nation, both "Heil" and "Unheil" eschatologies subsist side by side, the cry for the destruction of the oppressor, both contemporary and of times past, receiving more than just compensation in the breadth of vision of the writers of Psalms xxii and lxxxvii. Length of days and material prosperity, established upon a foundation of justice and freedom from tyrrany, represent the mean of future hopes. Where the Kingdom that is to be is visualised as ruled by a monarch, the kingship is conceived in the light of the greatly idealised glories of the past. Yet in all, Jahveh reigns supreme.[1] Every psalmist, with all the fulness of individual conviction, could avouch that

> "through sorrow and through sinning
> He shall suffice me, for He hath sufficed."[2]

After this brief summary a further question arises. Although 'prima facie' it might appear to lie without the purview of the task to which we have set our hand, a little reflection will reveal it to be fundamental; for the work would be incomplete — perhaps even lacking in purpose — were it ignored. Was the resurgent hope, expressed in divers manners and which underlies all eschatology, an illusion? In other words, was Baldwin Brown right in pronouncing eschatology baseless?[3]

To ask this is to raise the kindred question, itself one which must occur over and over again to all who seek to inter-

pret the poetical utterances of the Hebrews of old, namely, whether we can be justified in subjecting such language to recondite critical investigation. Is not the language of poetry by its very nature -- to borrow a phrase from Windelband[1] -- "above the changing interests of the times" and therefore to stand immune from the methods of scientific inquiry? Let us deal at once with this latter question, for on the answer depends not only our attitude towards eschatology and all else relating to the Nature and Being of God, but every thought -- ethereal, profane, and all that lies between -- which at any time has sought expression through the poetic medium.

(It should be observed that the term "poetry" is not itself altogether free from ambiguity, being employed in a narrower and wider sense, and signifying either or both of the following:

(1) as synonymous with prosody, thus relating to such matters as metre, rhyme, alliteration, versification, etc., -- in the case of Hebrew poetry[2] rhythm, parallelism, stichoi, strophe, etc., -- i.e., the form constitutive of poetry as distinct from prose.

(2) what is sometimes called "poetic diction", i.e., the language and imagery proper to poetry, but which may nevertheless be employed in prose writing.[3]

In the case of the Psalter both senses are comprehended.)

If "the making of great history has often given a first impulse to the writing of history"[4] it is not less true to assert that great thoughts about God and His creative, sustaining, and purposive activity have, throughout the long course of world-history, given to those who have sought to apprehend and make them known to others the

impulse to set them forth in language worthy of their greatness: in other words, to endeavour to create in the minds of their fellow-men the things made known to them. The medium desiderated, as the literature of civilisation so eloquently attests, has been overwhelmingly the language of poetry.[1]

As Spearman has so well pointed out, the "Creative Mind", the "'Nous Poetikos', that great mystery conceived by Aristotle . . . is that which converts the potential things into the actual things, as light turns potential colour into actual colour. . . . . The very word 'poet' expresses in Greek what 'creator' does in Latin, 'he who makes'".[2] And what the poet makes must have meaning and purpose. Hence for the student of the Psalter, and of Hebrew poetry in general, there must ever be the task of seeking out the inherent meaning which the creative minds of the succession of writers sought to convey to those who would read and understand. In bringing to this task all the aids -- textual, philological, literary, comparative, and historical -- that scholarship can afford, he seeks not less to value the medium of expression, but rather to make known to the sons of men in ever-increasing measure, those riches which lie yet unrevealed within the music of poetry, "the only adequate revelation of divine truth."[3]

Having treated of the medium, we now pass on to consider the validity of the subject-matter thus finding its expression. Much has been written on "future" and "realised" eschatology. The distinction is academic rather than practical.[1] The "Kingdom" may be realised in all its fulness and power at what time soever men are ready to acknowledge it and, in submission, concede its claims. In this sense eschatology is anthropological:[2] for until the creature can recognise "that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men" so long will that rule be but partial. But the "Kingdom" is pre-eminently theological, a truth which, in an age of confidence in the power of man alone to achieve a new world-order, needs searing into mind and conscience in letters of flame.

> "I will not cease from mental fight,
> Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand
> Till we have built Jerusalem
> In England's green and pleasant land"[3]

may sound a stirring emotional alarum to a self-confident people intent upon social amelioration for its own sake. But it offers a buoyancy entirely illusory, and any incipient reconstruction which sets its hopes upon man's power to build is ineluctably foredoomed to immersion, sooner or later, in the Waters of Death.

For "Jerusalem," as Edwyn Bevan has so pointedly declared, "was not built by any man upon the earth."[4] The city of true eschatology, to which the Psalter makes no

mean contribution,[1] is that, and that alone, "which hath the (eternal)[2] foundations, whose architect and builder is God."[3]

INDEX OF PSALMS AND PSALM PASSAGES.

(references are to the Hebrew.)