

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

3-1-2015

Covenant Relationships and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter : An Investigation of the Relationship between the Davidic Covenant and the Abrahamic and Mosaic Conventions as Reflected in the Editing of the Psalter

Adam Daniel Hensley

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_hensleya@csel.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/phd>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hensley, Adam Daniel, "Covenant Relationships and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter : An Investigation of the Relationship between the Davidic Covenant and the Abrahamic and Mosaic Conventions as Reflected in the Editing of the Psalter" (2015). *Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation*. 136.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/phd/136>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csel.edu.

**COVENANT RELATIONSHIPS AND THE EDITING OF THE HEBREW PSALTER:
AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAVIDIC COVENANT
AND THE ABRAHAMIC AND MOSAIC COVENANTS AS REFLECTED IN THE EDITING
OF THE PSALTER**

**A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

**By
Adam Daniel Hensley
March 2015**

Approved by

Timothy Saleska **Advisor**

Paul Raabe **Reader**

Jerome F. D. Creach **Reader**

To my wife Joanna, and our children Samuel, Mary, John, Lucy, and Thomas

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xi
ABSTRACT	xii
Chapter	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Current Status of the Question	2
Approaching the Question of Covenant Relationships in the Psalter.....	14
The Thesis.....	16
Major Aspects of the Thesis in Scholarship	16
Methodological Procedure.....	19
1. IDENTIFYING EDITORIAL EVIDENCE IN THE PSALTER.....	23
The Handling of Editorial Evidence in the Hebrew Psalter in Scholarship	24
Pre-Enlightenment Views: Some Illustrative Examples.....	24
Modern “Accretion” Explanations Prior to Wilson.....	26
Gerald H. Wilson and Recent Scholarship	30
Conclusion.....	40
2. REEVALUATING EDITORIAL EVIDENCE IN THE PSALTER	41
Qumran and the MT Psalter.....	43
Evaluation.....	46
The LXX Psalter and the MT Psalter	51
Editorial Use of Superscripts.....	52

Authorship as a Principle of Organization.....	53
Genre.....	56
Other Superscriptional Elements	59
Summary Remarks on Superscripts and Their Implications	62
The Postscript of 72:20.....	64
“Doublets”	71
אֱלֹהִים/יְהוָה Predominance	73
Doxologies.....	78
Books I–III.....	79
Psalm 106:48	82
Summary Remarks on Doxologies and Their Implications.....	88
Lexical and Thematic Connections between Psalms.....	89
Conclusion.....	91
3. AN EXPLORATORY SURVEY OF COVENANTAL REFERENCES AND ALLUSIONS IN THE PSALTER. PART ONE: PROLEGOMENA AND DIRECT REFERENCES TO YAHWEH’S בְּרִית	93
Prolegomena to the Survey of Covenantal References and Allusions	93
Previous Surveys of “Covenant” in the Psalter	94
Methodological Considerations	96
Direct References Achieved with the Term בְּרִית.....	101
Psalm 25	101
Psalm 44	103

Psalm 50	104
Psalm 74	107
Psalm 78	109
Psalm 89	115
Psalm 103	130
Psalm 105	132
Psalm 106	133
Psalm 111	136
Psalm 132	138
Conclusion	141
Addendum: חֶזֶק and עֲדוּת in Their Singular Forms	142
4. AN EXPLORATORY SURVEY OF COVENANTAL REFERENCES AND ALLUSIONS IN THE PSALTER, PART TWO: ALLUSIONS VIA IMPLICIT “CRITERIA” AND THEIR ASSOCIATION WITH “DAVID”	147
David as Yahweh’s Faithful Covenant Partner: The “Royalization” of the Covenant Formula (להיות לך לאלהים and להיות לי לעם) and Related Terminology	149
David and the Covenant Formula	152
King and People as Yahweh’s “Inheritance”/“Possession,” and Yahweh as their “Portion”	158
David as (Vicarious?) Keeper of the Mosaic Covenant	162
David and the Shema’ (Deuteronomy 6:4–7)	162
Clustered Terms Relating to Covenantal Stipulations: עֲדוּת; חֶזֶק/חֻקִּים; מִשְׁפָּטִים; פְּקוּדִים; מִצְוֹת	167

Allusions to Specific Commands of the Decalogue (Exodus 20:1–17; Deuteronomy 5:6–21).....	175
Walking in Yahweh’s Way and Fearing Him: Wisdom/Deuteronomic Themes (The Fear of Yahweh (יִרְאַתַּת יְהוָה), and Yahweh’s Way(s) (דְּרָדָר)/the “Two Way” Motif)	179
David as (Priestly?) Mediator of Yahweh’s Blessing and Intercessor: Intertextual Allusions to Numbers 6:24–27 and Deuteronomy 9:26.....	184
David as New Moses: “Moses,” the “Song of the Sea,” Sinai/Horeb, and the Land-Giving	192
The Song of the Sea (and Psalms 33, 96, 98, 149)	196
“Sinai” (סִינַי) and “Horeb” (חֹרֵב)	199
The Gift of the Land	200
David as Royal Servant and Son of Yahweh.....	205
Yahweh’s Sworn (עֲבָרָה) Promises	212
Conclusion	214
5. PSALM 72:17 IN THE CONTEXT OF BOOK II	215
Psalm 72:17 in its Psalm Context.....	215
Psalm 72:17 and the Abrahamic Covenantal Promise of Blessing to All Nations.....	216
Psalm 72:17 in Psalm 72	218
Psalm 72 as Royal Intercession for a Royal Successor	222
Psalm 72 in the Context of Book(s I–)II.....	224
Major Allusions to the Abrahamic Covenant in the Psalter and Their Particular Occurrences in Books I–II	224

Psalm 72 in the Context of the Structure and Covenant Allusions of Book II (Psalms 42–72)	230
David II (51–72): David as Exemplar and Fulfiller of Yahweh’s Summons in Psalm 50	235
Conclusion	243
6. EXODUS 34:6 IN PSALMS 86, 103, AND 145 IN THEIR BOOK CONTEXTS	245
The Grace Formula: Exodus 34:6.....	246
Major Theological Entailments of the Grace Formula in Exodus 34.....	249
The Psalter’s Allusions to the Grace Formula and Its Special Association with “David”	252
Exodus 34:6 in the Psalms 86, 103, and 145, and their Book Contexts	256
The Grace Formula in Psalm 86:15	256
Psalm 86 in Its Book Context.....	260
Exodus 34:6 in Psalm 103	271
The Grace Formula in Psalm 103:8	271
Psalm 103 in Its Book Context.....	273
Exodus 34:6 in Psalm 145	285
The Grace Formula in Psalm 145:8	285
Psalm 145 in Its Book Context.....	288
Conclusion	298
CONCLUSION	301
Psalms 1–2 as Introduction to the Psalter	305

Conclusion	315
Appendix	
1. APPENDIX A: THE LXX AND MT PSALTERS	318
LXX and 11QPs ^a Agreements Against the MT.....	318
Further Observations Regarding LXX Superscriptional Evidence in Relation to the MT Psalter	320
Is the LXX Psalter a More “Davidic” Response to Exile?.....	321
Time-Line Issues and Characteristics of the LXX and Their Bearing on Wilson’s Two-Stage Redactional Theory.....	323
Summary.....	326
2. APPENDIX B: SURVEY OF DEUT 6:7’S COMMAND TO INSTRUCT FUTURE GENERATIONS IN THE PSALTER.....	327
3. APPENDIX C: SURVEY OF ALLUSIONS TO THE COVENANT FORMULA.....	329
4. APPENDIX D: OTHER FORMS OF ADDRESS TO YAHWEH/ELOHIM	332
“My Rock” (סֶלֶעַי; צוֹרִי).....	332
“My Salvation” (יְשׁוּעָתִי; יְשׁוּעָתִי; יְשׁוּעָתִי).....	334
Yahweh as “Shield” (מָגֵן).....	335
Summary.....	336
5. APPENDIX E: ADDITIONAL EXPRESSIONS REFLECTING A UNIVERSALIZED UNDERSTANDING OF “THE EARTH”	338
6. APPENDIX F: THE THEME OF ELECTION (בְּחִירָה; בְּחִירָה).....	340
7. APPENDIX G: “WISDOM”/DEUTERONOMIC THEMES AND DAVID: YAHWEH’S WAY, THE CONTRASTING WAY(S) OF THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WICKED, AND THE FEAR OF YAHWEH	343
Yahweh’s Way(s)	344

The Contrasting Way(s) of the Righteous and the Wicked	346
Other Cases of the Fear of Yahweh (יִרְאַת יְהוָה).....	352
Summary	354
8. APPENDIX H: FURTHER EXAMINATION OF “STEADFAST LOVE” (חֶסֶד).....	356
9. APPENDIX I: REFERENCES AND ALLUSIONS TO OFFERINGS.....	361
“Thanksgiving Offering” (תּוֹדָה)	363
“Give thanks” (יָדָה).....	363
“Sacrifice” (זָבַח), “Burnt Offering” (עֹלָה), “Gift (Offering)” (מִנְחָה), “Sin Offering” (חַטָּאת)	365
“Arrange” (עָרַךְ).....	366
Summary.....	367
BIBLIOGRAPHY	369
VITA	387

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to the many people who have supported me through this project in various ways. In particular I would like to thank my dissertation supervisor Dr Timothy Saleska for his guidance and suggestions throughout the process. Always very supportive, he has been a continual source of encouragement over these past five years. I would also like to thank Drs Paul Raabe and Jerome F. D. Creach for serving on my dissertation committee and giving their invaluable feedback and suggestions. Thank you also to Dr R. Reed Lessing for first giving me the idea of working in the Psalter and to Dr Eric Hermann for feedback in the earlier stages of my research. I am grateful for the Concordia Seminary St. Louis community: its faculty, the camaraderie of my fellow graduate students, and the willing service of library staff maintain such an excellent facility. Similarly, the staff and extensive resources of Mullen Library at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C., were very important in the earlier stages of my research when we were living nearby. I would also like to thank my current colleagues at Concordia University Irvine and especially my Dean Dr Steven Mueller for their support and encouragement over the last two and a half years.

Finally, I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my family. I am thankful to my mother, June, and father, Peter, for their support and encouragement. I am grateful to my in-laws Drs Gene Edward and Jackquelyn H. Veith for their encouragement and advice along the way, and their generous hospitality to our family during the earlier stages of my research. Thanks especially to my wife Joanna who has been constant in her support and encouragement and has sacrificed in countless ways to make this project possible (she has worked at least as hard as I!), and to our children Samuel, Mary, John, Lucy, and Thomas—three fifths of whom came into the world during these five years of research and writing. Above all, thanks be to the Triune God, gracious and compassionate, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love! *Soli Deo Gloria.*

ABSTRACT

Hensley, Adam, D. "Covenant Relationships and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter: An Investigation of the Relationship between the Davidic Covenant and the Abrahamic and Mosaic Covenants as Reflected in the Editing of the Psalter." Ph.D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 2015. 386 pp.

This dissertation examines the relationship between the Davidic covenant and Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants as it is reflected in the editorial shape and shaping of the Masoretic Psalter. It hypothesizes that editors understood these covenants as a theological unity, whose common fulfillment centers on the anticipated royal successor of David. The promises and obligations of the covenants would be realized through this "new David," whom editors understood in terms of a Moses-like intercessor and mediator of covenant renewal, and the leader of a "new song" for a "new exodus." The dissertation tests the hypothesis by examining the Psalter's references and allusions to the covenant(s) in light of editorial evidence. After reassessing different kinds of editorial evidence, it engages in extensive survey work on references and allusions to the covenant(s) in the Psalter in light of that evidence. It then investigates the allusion to the Abrahamic covenantal promises in Ps 72:17 in the context of Book II, and the Psalter's fullest echoes of the "grace formula" in 86:15, 103:8, and 145:8 in the contexts of Books III, IV, and V respectively.

The dissertation therefore contributes to the canonical study of the Psalter. It challenges the view espoused by Gerald H. Wilson that editors addressed the crisis of "failed" Davidic covenantal theology with the concerns of Wisdom and pre-monarchic life under Moses and the Sinai covenant. Whereas for Wilson Book IV's emphasis on Moses indicates editors' intention to shift hope away from royal covenantal theology, this investigation finds that Book IV's greater concentration on "Moses" and "Abraham" complements that theology. Book IV instead depicts "David" as instrumental in the realization of Book IV's vision, as seen especially in Pss 101–103. It therefore offers an alternative paradigm for understanding the Davidic covenant in relation to its pre-monarchic counterparts. Rather than reinterpret the Davidic covenant in terms of a postexilic temple theocracy minus Davidic king within a program of "democratization," the Psalter evidences the reverse: a "royalization" of Abrahamic and Mosaic covenantal promises and obligations. Accordingly, the covenants find their theological unity in God's faithful realization of his promises to David (2 Sam 7): the hoped for new "David" through whom the covenant is renewed.

INTRODUCTION

Until recently, modern Psalms scholars concentrated their interpretive efforts on individual Psalms, without looking to the Psalter as a meaningful or especially illuminating literary context. This situation is especially evident in the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, when such influential scholars as Hermann Gunkel and Sigmund Mowinckel established the form-critical method as the predominant approach to studying the Psalms.¹ Scholarship therefore became concerned with the origin, genre and historical setting of individual psalms as opposed to their literary setting in the Psalter.

However, scholarly interests have recently expanded to embrace the Psalter itself as a primary object of inquiry. Broadly speaking, this trend in psalms study can be attributed to Brevard Childs' influential call for a canonical critical approach in particular,² and the gravitation of biblical scholarship to study tradition history and the final forms of texts in general.³ However, it was given particular momentum by his student Gerald H. Wilson, whose 1981 dissertation, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*,⁴ convincingly demonstrated various identifiable editorial

¹ Esp. Hermann Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel* (trans. James D. Nogalski; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University, 1998); and Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas; 2 vols; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962).

² Brevard Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 504–25. See also Nancy L. deClassé-Walford, “The Canonical Approach to Scripture and The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter,” in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship* (ed. Nancy L. deClassé-Walford. Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 1–12, who offers a good concise summary of recent scholarship.

³ The tradition-historical approach of Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (trans. D. M. G. Stalker; 2 vols.; New York: Harper & Row, 1965), was especially influential in this regard.

⁴ Gerald H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985).

techniques in the Psalter as pervasive evidence of purposeful arrangement. Since Wilson's groundbreaking study there has been an explosion in scholarly literature investigating the Psalter as a collection. These contributions typically set out to answer questions about editorial history and theological agenda, or simply elucidate meaningful sequences of psalms; whether for the Psalter as a whole or for presumed earlier stages of its development.

Work on editorial agenda in the Psalter to date shows that there would be significant benefit to investigating the relationships between covenants in the Psalter as an aspect of editorial agenda.

The Current Status of the Question, What is the Relationship between the Davidic Covenant and Abrahamic/Mosaic Covenants Reflected in the Editorial Priorities of the Psalter?

The status of the question can be summed up rather simply: The question has been posed in general terms but it has not been directly or thoroughly investigated. James Hely-Hutchinson raises the issue of covenant relationships in the Psalter when he claims that, "questions of degrees of continuity and discontinuity between the new covenant and covenants set up before the exile... may be fruitfully studied in the books of Psalms and Chronicles."⁵ However, there are no studies that set out specifically to investigate the question in its own right with a methodology suited to the purpose.⁶

There is, however, more to the picture. Most editorial theories on the Psalter do at least "suggest" some view of the relationship between the covenants, or even presuppose one. Wilson himself provides a starting point because his work raises questions about a particular set of relationships; namely, how the Davidic covenant relates to the Mosaic and Abrahamic covenants.

⁵ James Hely Hutchinson, "A New-Covenant Slogan in the Old Testament," in *The God of Covenant: Biblical Theological and Contemporary Perspectives* (ed. Jamie A. Grant and Alistair I. Wilson; Leicester: Apollos, 2005), 120.

⁶ Hutchinson's doctoral thesis purportedly addresses the question of covenant relationships in the Psalter. See the brief biography in Firth and Johnston (eds.), *Interpreting the Psalms*, 8. I was not able to access it, however.

His view that Book IV (Pss 90–106) presents the pre-monarchic theocratic life in Moses' time as the model solution for a "failed" Davidic covenant (which he sees reflected in Ps 89) implies a theological contrast between the Davidic covenant and the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants.⁷ Obviously the relationship between the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants is another important dimension of "covenant relationships," too, and Chapter Five will address the relatively high incidence of references to "Abraham" and "Moses" in Book IV. But so far as the whole Psalter is concerned, Wilson's alleged contrast between Book IV (and V) and Davidic covenantal theology in Books I–III raises the question: how did the editors understand the relationship between the Davidic covenant and these pre-monarchic covenants, and what it means for post-exilic Israel?

For Wilson, the "failure" of the Davidic covenant poses a theological problem whose solution is found in Book IV's focus on life as it was in Moses' day when Yahweh alone reigned.⁸ After describing Book IV (Pss 90–106) as the "editorial center" of the Psalter, Wilson summarizes its message thus, "(1) YHWH is King; (2) He has been our "refuge" in the past, long before the monarchy existed (i.e., in the Mosaic period); (3) He will continue to be our refuge now that the monarchy is gone; (4) Blessed are they that trust in him!"⁹ Ostensibly, Wilson contrasts Book IV's emphasis on Yahweh's rule (cf. Pss 93–99). But in view of Book IV's significant focus on Mosaic/Abrahamic *covenantal* life and promises (cf. Pss 103:18; 105:5–10; 106:45), Wilson's summary implies that post-exilic Israel must hope for Yahweh's mercy and restoration exclusively in terms of these premonarchic covenants, in deliberate contrast to the Davidic covenant as a locus of hope.¹⁰

⁷ Wilson, *Editing*, 215.

⁸ Cf. C. Hassell Bullock, *Encountering the Book of Psalms: A Literary and Theological Introduction* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2001), 188, who understands Book IV to represent "a shift of attention away from the Davidic to the Mosaic and Abrahamic covenants."

⁹ Wilson, *Editing*, 215.

¹⁰ Robert E. Wallace, "Gerald Wilson and the Characterization of David in Book 5 of the Psalter," in *The*

However conscious Wilson was of these implications, his account of Book IV bears striking resemblance to the historical reconstruction popularized by George Mendenhall.¹¹ As Dennis McCarthy summarizes, Mendenhall constructed “an interpretation of the history of Israel in terms of an original covenant mediated by Moses, then a falling away from this early pure Mosaic covenant under and because of the monarchy in which the religious community tried to become a civil community and was thus corrupted, and finally a reform, a return to the pure Mosaic tradition of the covenant.”¹²

However, Hans-Joachim Kraus’s description of the relationship between the Sinaitic and Davidic covenants in the Deuteronomic History may offer an alternative model. Kraus maintains that, in the DH, Davidic kings who purified the cult were in effect renewing the Sinaitic covenant. He further states that “the real aim behind the tradition of the Davidic covenant, as it was preserved in the priestly circles and evidently especially cherished by the ‘people of the land’, was the renewal of the fellowship between God and his people.”¹³ According to Kraus, then, the DH regards the king as focal in the preservation of Israel’s covenant life as God’s people. The Davidic and Mosaic covenants are therefore intimately and functionally related to each other. What happens to that expectation during and after the exile becomes the new

Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship (ed. Nancy L. deClassé-Walford; Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 194, explains Wilson’s position precisely this way when he writes, “Book 4 provides the climax and turning point in the story as the exilic community finds an answer that predates the Davidic covenant, the Sinaitic covenant.”

¹¹ George Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh, Pa.: Biblical Colloquium, 1955).

¹² Dennis J. McCarthy, “Covenant in the Old Testament: The Present State of Inquiry,” *CBQ* 27 (1965): 220. Robert E. Wallace, *The Narrative Effect of Book IV of the Hebrew Psalter* (Studies in Biblical Literature 112; New York: Lang, 2007), 143, explicitly draws this implication for covenantal relationships, maintaining that in the latter part of Book IV David sanctions a “shift in focus to Mosaic covenant.”

¹³ Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament* (trans. G. Buswell; Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1965), 195.

question: is it *abandoned* in the face of exile, or do exilic and postexilic biblical authors—or *editors*, in the case of the Psalter—continue to express the hope that a future Davidide will again (and perfectly?) restore fellowship between God and his people? This latter possibility deserves serious attention in the Psalter.

Wilson’s construal of the Psalter’s editorial agenda clearly reflects Mendenhall’s view in its main contours, even if he does not explicitly declare indebtedness to Mendenhall.¹⁴ Assuming this perspective of Israel’s history, Book IV seems amenable to being read as Wilson interprets it.¹⁵ Yahweh’s reign is unquestionably a dominant theme in Book IV, while “Moses” and “Abraham” appear ten times¹⁶ compared with just two mentions of “David” in superscripts (Pss 101 and 103). Accordingly, many scholars share Wilson’s assessment of Book IV, though the extent to which they take this to be indicative of the Psalter’s theological trajectory varies. Scholars also vary on the closely related issue of whether the emphasis on Yahweh’s reign is intended to contrast with *David’s* reign in the Psalter generally and Book IV specifically.¹⁷

¹⁴ In his latest contribution prior to his death in 2005, Gerald H. Wilson, “King, Messiah, and the Reign of God: Revisiting the Royal Psalms and the Shape of the Psalter” in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (ed. Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller; Leiden: Brill, 2005), allows room for a “priestly” David in Book V of the Psalter based predominantly on Ps 110. However, Wilson continued to consider Books IV and V as presenting Yahweh as exclusive king minus a Davidic vice-regent.

¹⁵ In recent years there have been numerous studies of Book IV. See, e.g., Michael G. McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh: A Canonical Study of Book IV of the Psalter* (Piscataway, N.J.: Georgias, 2014), 16–17, who follows Wilson in viewing Book IV as an answer to Ps 89 as a lament over “the crisis of exile” and “failure of the Davidic Covenant”; Wallace, *The Narrative Effect of Book IV of the Hebrew Psalter*; James Todd Borger, “Moses in the Fourth Book of the Psalter” (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002).

¹⁶ מִשְׁפָּה occurs seven times in Book IV (90:1 [superscription]; 99:6; 103:7; 105:26; 106:16, 23, and 32), and only once elsewhere (77:21). מִבְּרָרָה occurs three times (105:6, 9, and 42), and otherwise only in Ps 47:9.

¹⁷ For instance, Jamie A. Grant, *The King as Exemplar: The Function of Deuteronomy’s Kingship Law in the Shaping of the Book of Psalms* (Atlanta: SBL, 2004), 34, calls into question Wilson’s “strong contrast between the reign of Yahweh and his kingdom, on the one hand, and the co-regent reign of Yahweh’s anointed, on the other.” See also Jerome F. D. Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous in the Psalms* (St. Louis: Chalice, 2008), chap. 7, and David C. Mitchell, “Lord, Remember David: G. H. Wilson and the Message of the Psalter,” *VT* 56 (2006), 526–48,

With regard to “David’s” place in the theological trajectory of the Psalter, then, there seems to be two main directions that scholars take. On the one hand, several scholars follow Wilson in drastically downplaying “David” and the Davidic covenant in the overall theological message of the Psalter. For example, Clinton McCann and Nancy de-Claissé-Walford essentially agree with Wilson that “David” and the Davidic covenant give way to these other themes in the Psalter’s overall theological trajectory.¹⁸

According to McCann, even in Books I–III “one discovers a pattern that serves to instruct the postexilic community not only to face the disorienting reality of exile but also to reach toward a reorientation beyond the traditional grounds for hope, that is, beyond the Davidic/Zion covenant theology.”¹⁹ McCann’s emphasis on the importance of Torah in the overall shape and shaping of the Psalter thus replaces the Davidic covenant as the ostensive theological focus of the Psalter.

for further objections to Wilson’s hypothesis, which include Grant’s objection above. For their part, Wilson and McCann reinterpret, e.g., Ps 2 in light of their overall analysis of the Psalter. J. Clinton McCann Jr., *A Theological Introduction to the Book of Psalms: The Psalms as Torah* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 43, writes that “Gerald Wilson provides further evidence for the claim that Psalm 2 should be heard primarily as an affirmation of God’s sovereignty rather than the sovereignty of the Davidic monarchy.” McCann then summarizes Wilson’s view of the Psalter’s editorial agenda as the “evidence” that urges this reading of Ps 2. On the other hand, James Luther Mays, *The Lord Reigns: A Theological Handbook to the Psalms* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 101, pairs “the sovereignty of Yhwh and his Messiah” together, which is opposed by the “autonomous exercise of governance by rulers.”

¹⁸ McCann, *A Theological Introduction*; “Books I–III and the Editorial Purpose of the Psalter,” in *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (ed. J. Clinton McCann Jr.; JSOTSup 159; London: Sheffield Academic, 1993): 93–107; Nancy deClassé-Walford, *Introduction to the Psalms: A Song from Ancient Israel* (St. Louis: Chalice, 2004); “The Canonical Shape of the Psalms,” in *An Introduction to Wisdom Literature and the Psalms: Festschrift Marvin E. Tate* (ed. H. Wayne Ballard and W. Dennis Tucker Jr.; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2000). Cf. Wallace, *The Narrative Effect of Book IV of the Psalter*, 94, who concludes that, “Davidic covenant can be set aside. David agrees that Moses is the authority, and David no longer rules. YHWH reigns!” Wallace, *ibid.*, 15, 92–93, places considerable stock in Wilson’s and Nancy de-Claissé-Walford’s view (see below) of the Psalter’s sense of “plot,” so it is no surprise that his view Book IV’s message agrees with Wilson’s.

¹⁹ McCann, “Books I–III and the Editorial Purpose of the Psalter,” 95.

Similarly, deClaissé-Walford claims that the Psalter reflects the post-exilic community's striving "to find a new structure for existence and identity which went beyond traditional ancient Near Eastern concepts of nationhood. King and court could no longer be the center and grounding of national life; temple and cult had to assume that position—with YHWH, not David, as king over a new "religious nation" of Israel."²⁰ Indeed, deClaissé-Walford attributes David's resurgence in Book V to editors' desire to instruct the post-exilic community by appealing to David's example, rather than promote the hope for Davidic restoration.²¹ However, whereas McCann lumps "Zion" in the "problem" camp, deClaissé-Walford sees "temple and cult"—terms naturally compatible with Zion—as the solution.

On the other hand, an increasing number of scholars who recognize the unique characteristics about Book IV also find in Book V a more positive Davidic trajectory.²² Jerome Creach,²³ David C. Mitchell,²⁴ Jamie Grant,²⁵ James Hely Hutchinson,²⁶ James Luther Mays,²⁷

²⁰ DeClaissé-Walford, "The Canonical Shape of the Psalms," 99.

²¹ Cf. deClaissé-Walford, "The Canonical Shape of the Psalms," 110, who states, "The significant presence of David in book 5 of the Psalter gives a strong message to the postexilic community. David, who is no longer king over ancient Israel, David, who as no hope of any of his heirs ever again being king over ancient Israel, David acknowledges God as sovereign, as king. If David, for whom any hope of fulfillment of the promises given by God seems forever lost, if David can praise YHWH the king, then all Israel can and must do the same."

²² Note the greater incidence of psalms attributed to David in Book V (Pss 108–110; 122, 124, 131, 133, 138–145) as well as four references in the body of Ps 132 (vv. 1, 10, 11, and 17) and one in Ps 144:10.

²³ Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*.

²⁴ David C. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms* (London: Sheffield Academic, 1997); "Lord, Remember David."

²⁵ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*.

²⁶ Hutchinson, "A New-Covenant Slogan in the Old Testament," and, "The Psalms and Praise," in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches* (ed. David Firth and Philip S. Johnston; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 85–100.

²⁷ Mays, *The Lord Reigns*.

Norbert Lohfink, and Erich Zenger²⁸ are a few examples. Indeed, Zenger illustrates the situation well. In Zenger's view Book IV responds to "the lament over the end of the Davidic kingdom and is actually meant to be read as a counter-concept to the Davidic kingdom."²⁹ But he continues, "In contrast to this, the fifth book of psalms takes up the Davidic-messianic idea again in a positive way and puts it into service of its theocratic message."³⁰ Thus, editors first added Book IV to answer Ps 89's lament over the Davidic kingdom with its counter-conceptual message, and then they added Book V with its "Davidic" reinterpretation of that "universal kingdom."

However, while these scholars generally recognize "David" and the Davidic covenant as a going concern in Book V, what that means is another question. Does it translate into the expectation of a future Davidide, thus preserving the specific promises made to David (e.g. Ps 89:2–38)? Or do the editors radically reinterpret the Davidic covenant in terms of the post-exilic temple theocracy, without the expectation of future Davidide(s)? Accordingly, this represents a fork in the road for *how* the Davidic covenant relates to the Mosaic and Abrahamic covenants. Either the promises of the Davidic covenant find fulfillment in terms of a *future king* who exercises his proper royal vocation regarding the Sinaitic covenant (cf. Kraus), or those promises are directly fulfilled in terms of the Torah-keeping *people* as Abraham's seed.

Once again, Zenger proves a helpful example, well illustrating the latter of these interpretive stances. Zenger stresses that Israel's covenant-history is *singular*, and therefore supports the theological unity of the covenants. For him and Lohfink the biblical concept of

²⁸ Norbert L. Lohfink and Erich Zenger, eds., *The God of Israel and the Nations: Studies in Isaiah and the Psalms* (trans. Everett R. Kalin; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000).

²⁹ Erich Zenger, "The Composition and Theology of the Fifth Book of the Psalms, Psalms 107–45," *JSOT* 80 (1998): 77–102 (here 81).

³⁰ Zenger, "Composition and Theology," 81–82, adds that it "seems likely that these four books already existed as a complete compositional entity before the fifth book was added."

“covenant” is “not a question of ‘covenants’, but of the one covenant from Sinai that unfolds and is actualized and becomes new (that is, renewed by YHWH) again and again...an ‘open’ category.”³¹ Precisely how the Davidic covenant fits into this picture they do not indicate. Within the Psalter, however, they see psalms like Pss 2, 86, and 100–103 as applying to *Israel* with “‘messianic,’ that is, ‘Davidic’ characteristics,” rather than to an anticipated Davidic figure.³² That is, Zenger and Lohfink see *Israel*, not a new “David,” as the messianized “mediator of God’s Torah to the nations.”³³ So, while recognizing the ultimately Davidic trajectory of the

³¹ Lohfink and Zenger, *The God of Israel and the Nations*, 191.

³² Lohfink and Zenger, *The God of Israel and the Nations*, 192. The authors do not explain how psalms like Ps 2 apply to Israel rather than David in this context. However, earlier Lohfink and Zenger, *The God of Israel and the Nations*, 162, make it clear that they view Books IV–V as characterized by a “theocratic program” in contrast to the “messianic program” of Books I–III. This would explain how a psalm like Ps 2 might become an object of “relecture” that understands “Israel” for the term “anointed”—indeed, Zenger sees later redactors’ relecture of older psalms as a major dimension in the expansion of the Psalter. Psalm 86 represents a different situation. Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 3: A Commentary on Psalms 101–150* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 6, attribute it to the final redaction of the Psalter; i.e., it was not originally part of the messianic program but was inserted between Korahite Pss 84–85 and 87–88 by redactors working with the theocratic program. Accordingly, Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51–100* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 370–71, understands “David” in Ps 86’s superscript thus, “the question hotly discussed among scholars, whether the praying subject is an individual or Israel, is in fact already decided: this is”David” as collective primary subject...though not as the battling and victorious king, but rather as the suffering servant...who in a situation of crisis clings to the God of Sinai.” Zenger thus identifies the praying subject as collective Israel understood as suffering servant minus any royal moorings. He continues, “[t]hose who, as “successors” to David, pray Psalm 86 participate in the dynamic of YHWH’s actions...etc.” Thus, from the time Ps 86 was incorporated into the Psalter, redactors understood its real praying subject to be a David-like Israel rather than a future Davidic king.

See also W. Dennis Tucker Jr., “Democratization and the Language of the Poor in Psalms 2–89,” *HBT* 25 (2003): 161–78. Tucker, *ibid.*, 162, argues that the “poor” are “[c]entral to the development of a democratized kingship in the Psalter,” following Zenger and Hossfeld’s view that a “collective messianic perspective” reflected in royal Pss 2, 72, and 89 provide “a new hermeneutical horizon” from which to read the whole Psalter.

³³ Lohfink and Zenger, *The God of Israel and the Nations*, 192. Cf. Jean-Marie Auwers, “Le Psautier comme livre biblique: Édition, rédaction, fonction,” in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (ed. Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller; VTSup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 84, who similarly argues that, “le peuple et les

Psalter, in concrete terms this translates into a theocratic Israel under the renewed Sinai covenant. From the editors' perspective the Davidic covenant has been absorbed into the essentially *Sinaitic* covenantal history of Israel. It is a bygone chapter that adds color to the present covenantal reality the editors wish to paint.

In general, this theological move—the application of Davidic covenantal associations to the people—has been called “democratization” of the Davidic covenant.³⁴ Jerome Creach, for example, appears to understand Ps 106 this way, when he writes,

When Book 4 assures that God honors God's covenant (Ps 106:45), it does not identify the covenant. In the immediate context, however, are references to the covenant with Abraham (Ps 105:10, 42). It seems that here the Davidic and Abrahamic covenants have been conflated, as in Jeremiah 33:19–22 (see also Aramaic Targum on Ps 89:4 [5] and see Mt. 1:1). The promises once given to David have now been applied to the whole people.³⁵

prêtes...prennent le relais de la maison de David dans la faveur de Dieu.”

³⁴ Note the subheading “democratization” under Jamie A. Grant, “Royal Court,” *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry & Writings* (ed. Tremper Longman III and Peter Enns; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2008): 668–72. See also Derek E. Wittman, “Let Us Cast Off Their Ropes from Us: The Editorial Significance of the Portrayal of Foreign Nations in Psalms 2 and 149,” in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship* (ed. Nancy L. deClassé-Walford; Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 53–69, who includes a brief summary of Mays, Wilson, McCann, Mitchell, Grant's varying views on the status of the Davidic covenant in the Psalter as it relates to the idea of democratization (esp. pp. 65–66). The observation that Pss 2 and 149 offer similar perspectives on Divine kingship and foreign nations with the latter omitting obvious references to the Davidic king inclines Wittman to favor a democratizing agenda in the Psalter. However, while interesting to compare, Pss 2 and 149 do not the whole Psalter comprise, and so restrictive a comparison runs a strong risk of yielding arbitrary and artificial impressions on the question. Moreover, while “David” does not receive in Ps 149 and surrounding Halleluiahs psalms, he is not on that account “absent” from them, as our study will explore. Indeed, we shall argue that he is present not as the content and object of those psalms' praises but as their leader.

³⁵ Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 79. To this example we may add Ps 72:17 (see below). See also Bernhard Gosse, “Abraham and David,” *JSOT* 34 (2009): 25–31, who argues for covenantal continuity between David and Abraham in Genesis 14–15, 1–2 Samuel, and Pss 105–106 among other texts. Gosse, *ibid.*, 31, concludes that “Abraham, the Patriarchs, and their descendents replace David in some aspects” in Pss 105–106, befitting Pss 90–106's response to the disappearance of the monarchy by proclaiming Yahweh's reign.

Creach sparingly speaks of democratization,³⁶ and does not believe that such a “reinterpretation” of the Davidic covenant comes at the expense of a future Davidic king.³⁷ Nevertheless, “democratization” denotes a view of covenant relationships that sees the transference of Davidic covenantal promises directly to the people.³⁸ Jamie Grant suggests that “the process of

³⁶ See, e.g., *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 101, in connection with a discussion of Ps 20.

³⁷ Creach’s main argument is that the Davidic king identifies with the righteous in their suffering. Since the “destiny of the righteous” is associated with the destiny of “David” in the Psalms, both have a place in God’s future. Indeed, our hypothesis embraces these ideas. However, “democratization” is often used to denote a more total transference of Davidic promises to the people without the expectation of a future David, contrary to our hypothesis.

The term “conflation” also warrants comment. It suitably implies an editorial perspective that advocates *one* covenant rather than several. However it may also imply that earlier perspectives saw greater diversity and less continuity between covenants than later perspectives held. Of course, multistage redaction-historical models inherently suggest that possibility. But this cannot simply be assumed, and it underscores the importance of investigating the question of covenant relationships directly.

³⁸ Cf. Marko Marttila, *Collective Reinterpretation in the Psalms: A Study of the Redaction History of the Psalter* (FAT 2/13; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), who perceives a postexilic redactional tendency to reinterpret individual psalms in a collective way. For instance, Marttila, accentuates the role of exilic and postexilic Deuteronomist redactors who are presumed to recast messianic identity in terms of the people. Perhaps Susan Gillingham, “The Zion Tradition and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter,” in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. John Day; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 308–41, belongs here too. Like deClaisse-Walford, Gillingham considers the theme of Zion to be a central editorial concern in the Psalter. Indeed, for Gillingham the Zion motif is a collecting point for both didactic themes (e.g. Torah) and eschatological themes (e.g. Yahweh’s reign as king) in the Psalter. Most notably, Gillingham, “The Zion Tradition,” 334, sees the association of the Psalter with David as important in part because “it speaks...of David as the founder of the Temple (as expressed in 2 Sam. 7) and marks out the Temple as the focal point for the good life and future hope.” That there is a major debate over whether David’s prominence in 1–2 Chronicles arises from messianic expectation or propagandistic justification of the Temple theocracy seems significant here as well. Gillingham clearly understands David’s prominence in the Psalter as having a similar function over against Temple/Zion themes, and one is left to wonder to what extent Davidic covenantal promises are absorbed into those themes. Rather, Gillingham thinks that messianic expectation in the Psalter owes more to its reception history rather than editorial intent. See Susan Gillingham, “The Messiah in the Psalms: A Question of Reception History and the Psalter,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 187–208.

Sampson S. Ndogo, “Revisiting the Theocratic Agenda of Book 4 of the Psalter for Interpretive Premise,” in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship* (ed. Nancy L. deClaisse-Walford;

democratization as a two way street” that “takes the particular and generalizes it for application to many, but it also particularizes the many by inviting them to see themselves standing in the shoes of the king and his courtiers.”³⁹ However, from the standpoint of covenant relationships, democratization is still a one way street: the king ceases to be an active covenantal figure, and instead becomes a symbolic identity for the people in whom the Davidic covenantal promises are realized directly.

More importantly, we may ask whether “democratization” correctly discerns the *direction* of transference. That editor(s) may instead have seen the *reverse* transference in instances like Ps 106:45 deserves consideration. This is especially the case for Ps 72:17, which is a key focus of our own investigation. That is, the Psalter editor(s) may in fact view the Abrahamic covenantal promises—promises normally conceived in terms of the *people*—in terms of (a future) “David” rather than the other way around.

Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 147–59 (esp. 157–58), seems to adopt a similar if differently nuanced view. Ndogo also suggests that Book III and IV shift focus from the Davidic to the Mosaic covenant, but notes that both books end “rather pessimistically and inconclusively” and that “[t]he kingship of YHWH predates both the Mosaic and the Davidic covenants.” This suggests that both covenants fall into the “problem” camp, with Yahweh as solution. While this offers a more accurate picture of the Mosaic covenant in the Psalter, Ndogo goes on to say that Book V “thrives on the foundation laid in book 4,” suggesting that Pss 108–110 “echo a failed monarchy” in Book III and that the Book’s liturgical collections, wisdom psalms, and even the final Davidic group (138–145) “underscore the true king” Yahweh in contradistinction to human/Davidic kingship.

³⁹ Grant, “Royal Court,” 670.

Of course, this presupposes that the editorial agenda of the Psalter includes the anticipation of a future Davidide—the other major way of interpreting the ultimate Davidic trajectory of the Psalter. Here David C. Mitchell⁴⁰ is a good example. Mitchell recognizes a single editorial impulse behind the Psalter’s macrostructure that includes at its core the expectation of an eschatological Davidic king. Indeed, from most points of view Mitchell’s analysis of the Psalter contrasts with Wilson’s more starkly than any other. Mitchell succinctly summarizes the differences between Wilson’s views and his own:

I agreed that the Psalms had been redacted to represent a developing sequence of ideas. But I parted from Wilson and others in proposing that the Psalms were prophetic rather than didactic or wisdom literature. And so between us we indicated the way to two quite different understandings of the redactional agenda of the Psalms: I, eschatologico-messianic, pointing to a coming son of David; he, historic-didactic and non-messianic, pointing Israel to a future without the house of David.⁴¹

Apart from the “messianic”/“didactic” divide, Mitchell draws attention to another key difference relating to the Psalter’s chronological perspective. Whereas Mitchell recognizes a predominantly eschatological editorial perspective,⁴² Wilson and deClaissé-Walford believe the editors interpret the Davidic covenant and its history solely in terms of present existential

⁴⁰ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*; “Lord, Remember David.”

⁴¹ Mitchell, “Lord, Remember David,” 527. More recently, Gerald H. Wilson, “The Structure of the Psalter,” in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches* (ed. David Firth and Philip Johnston; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 239, acknowledged an eschatological dimension in the Psalter, but he limits it to Books I–III (Pss 2–89) and maintains his original position that the Psalter’s *final* editorial agenda is dominated by Wisdom themes in opposition to Davidic covenantal theology. Although he cites Mitchell in support, he neglects to mention that Mitchell’s evidence for an eschatological agenda in the Psalter actually spans the Books II–V, as is seen especially in his analysis of the Asaph psalms (Pss 50, 73–83) and Songs of Ascent (Pss 120–134).

⁴² Cf. D. M. Vincent, “The Shape of the Psalter: An Eschatological Dimension?” in *New Heaven and New Earth Prophecies and the Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (ed. P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward; Lieden: Brill, 1999), 61–82. Vincent sees potential for an eschatological dimension to the Psalter’s shape, but cautions that his essentially synchronic analysis of the Psalter’s organization cannot be said *necessarily* to reflect redactional intent. Vincent, *ibid.*, 62n7, indicates that he did not have access to Mitchell’s work.

circumstances.⁴³ However, this latter view of editorial perspective deserves more critical scrutiny that it has received. To assume that modern existentialism primarily defines how ancient editors interpreted the Davidic covenant and exilic experience runs the risk of anachronism.

Furthermore, Mitchell successfully establishes the historical plausibility—indeed the strong likelihood—that editors reflected on these events eschatologically.⁴⁴

To summarize, there seem to be three general ways scholars have implicitly related the Davidic covenant to the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants. First, there is the “problem-solution” model reflected in Wilson’s construal of the Psalter’s editorial agenda, which suggests that they are theological *alternatives*. Second, the “democratization” model generally affirms their theological unity, but transfers the content and promises of the Davidic covenant to the people through their cultic life together. Third, there is what we might dub a “Davidization” or “Messianic” model, whereby covenantal promises and obligations associated with the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants are realized in a future Davidic king. This third model also accentuates the theological unity of the covenants in question, but reverses the orientation of the relationship and recognizes the premonarchic covenants as *royalized* in the Psalter.

Approaching the Question of Covenant Relationships in the Psalter

The above summary suggests that the question of covenant relationships is far from a peripheral concern. Though it has not been investigated, this question lies at the heart of current debates about the Psalter’s editorial agenda. Accordingly, this dissertation investigates how the

⁴³ Indeed, deClassé-Walford, *Introduction to the Psalms*, 53, writes, “Israel survived because the people asked basic, existential questions of identity and survival—Who are we? Where have we come from? And where are we going?”

⁴⁴ See esp. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 82–87. Our critique applies more to Wilson and deClassé-Walford than to others. E.g., Zenger and Lohfink, *The God of Israel and the Nations*, 160, recognize an eschatological dimension to *Zion/Israel* in the Psalter.

Davidic covenant relates to the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants as reflected in the editing of the MT Psalter. To explore this question, our investigation integrates two major subsidiary foci.

First, the question of “editorial evidence” in the Hebrew Psalter requires exploration and reevaluation. This is important for two reasons. On the one hand, one’s take on how editors understood covenant relationships is often a consequence of a particular construal of the Psalter’s editorial history and in many cases “redactional layering.” Therefore, exploring and reevaluating editorial evidence in the Psalter will enable us preliminarily to assess how well founded are those views that depend on compositional models that postulate divergent editorial perspectives. On the other hand, reassessing the major kinds of editorial evidence in the Psalter facilitates our own investigation. It equips us to engage data whose editorial intentionality can be soundly argued. Approaching the investigation in this way will ensure that *editorial* perspective—not simply that of psalms’ original authors—remains the actual object of our inquiry about covenant relationships.

The second major focus is the theme of “covenant” itself. Indeed, a major task of this dissertation is to survey all covenant references and allusions in the Psalter, whereupon we utilize our reevaluation of editorial evidence to highlight references and allusions with demonstrable editorial importance. In particular, our investigation sets out to identify and analyze instances where the Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Davidic covenants appear related to each other, and to assess the nature and consistency of those instances across the Psalter.

Indeed, Chapters One to Four examine these two subsidiary foci in the Psalter respectively, finding that Pss 1–2, 72, 86, 103, and 145 qualify as psalms with strongest potential to answer the question of covenant relationships in the Psalter. Chapters Five and Six further test our hypothesis concerning covenant relationships in the Psalter, which aligns with the third, “Davidization”/“royalization” model discussed above. But it also gives theological shape to the manner in which the Psalter’s editors expected a future Davidic king/the Davidic covenant to bring fulfillment and renewal to Abrahamic and Mosaic covenantal promises and obligations.

The Thesis

In the Psalter, the Abrahamic, Mosaic and Davidic “covenants” are viewed as a theological unity. Their fulfillment is anticipated in terms of a future Davidic successor to whom is attributed the traditionally Mosaic role of mediator of covenant renewal (cf. Exod 33–34). “David” fulfills traditionally Abrahamic covenantal promises, supersedes Moses as intercessor for the people in the face of their covenantal unfaithfulness, is faithful to Mosaic covenantal obligations, and therefore qualifies as Yahweh’s faithful covenant partner in contrast with the people’s failure in this regard. Accordingly, we hypothesize that Book IV’s uniquely greater concentration on “Moses” and “Abraham” does not present Abrahamic and Mosaic covenantal themes as an alternative covenantal theology to that of “failed” Davidic covenantal theology, but presumes an essential coherence and continuity between these covenants. This thesis therefore challenges the popular view that sees a decisive theological-perspectival shift after Ps 89 regarding expectations of future Davidic rule and covenantal fulfillment.

Major Aspects of the Thesis in Scholarship

While very few have contributed directly to the question of covenant relationships in the Psalter, other contributions touch on individual aspects of our thesis. Some in particular bear mentioning at this point.

Jamie Grant’s published dissertation, *The King as Exemplar: The Function of Deuteronomy’s Kingship Law in the Shaping of the Book of Psalms*,⁴⁵ is especially pertinent. It argues that editors consciously juxtaposed the three Torah psalms (Pss 1, 19, and 119) with royal or quasi-royal psalms (i.e., Pss 2, 18, and 118). Accordingly, Grant argues that editors present an idealized king who by virtue of his Torah piety fulfills Deut 17’s “kingship law.” He therefore concludes that, “in response to the climate of messianic expectation, the editors wished to make clear that the restored Davidic king should be one who follows the ideal of the kingship, rather

⁴⁵ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*.

than the historical examples found in the Deuteronomic History” and that “the Law of the King defined the monarch as an example of devotion to Yahweh... for the whole people, and the editors of the Psalter wished to pick up on this exemplary commitment to God, and set it as a model for the readers of the psalms to follow.”⁴⁶ Our thesis agrees with Grant’s analysis and takes it further. Grant has done valuable groundwork for investigating the question of covenant relationships without, however, exploring further implications. Indeed, if Grant is correct that the editors wished to portray the king as an exemplary keeper of Torah, then the anticipated king is *ipso facto* one who keeps the obligations of the Mosaic/Sinaitic covenant. Thus, the anticipated king unites in his person obedience to the Mosaic/Sinaitic covenant and the fulfillment of the Davidic covenant. Moreover, our thesis sets Grant’s insight in a greater context: the expected king does not merely lead by example, but intercedes for the people to restore their proper covenantal relationship to Yahweh. He thus extends the benefits of his own Mosaic covenantal observance to them as God’s restored people.⁴⁷

Several recent contributions to the key psalms of our thesis, Pss 72, 86, 103, 145, also bear mentioning at this point.

Following Brevard Childs,⁴⁸ scholars widely agree that Ps 72 follows deliberately from Ps 71 in concluding the Davidic group Pss 51–72 or Books I–II as a whole. Psalm 71 is the prayer

⁴⁶ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 291.

⁴⁷ Similarly Michael Barber’s briefer examination of the Psalter, *Singing in the Reign: The Psalms and the Liturgy of God’s Kingdom* (Steubenville, Ohio: Emmaus Road, 2001), 59–133 (esp. 66–67, 118–26), which understands the restoration of the Davidic kingdom and realization of a “new exodus” at the center of the Psalter’s theological agenda, making numerous helpful observations in line with our thesis. Specifically, Barber, *ibid.*, 76–78 and 122–24, notes the Psalter’s interest in the *todah* offering, which he connects with the themes of a restored kingdom and new exodus. Similar to Grant, Barber, *ibid.*, 133, sees David “as a kind of example for Israel in its affliction “ who “embodies the wise man who endures suffering by learning to offer *todah*, trusting in the Lord.” Our thesis explores such characterizations of “David” further, but with a more instrumental role in covenantal renewal through intercession.

⁴⁸ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 516.

of an aging David, while Ps 72 is his testament “for Solomon,” his successor. Editors are thought to have reinterpreted the superscript לְשִׁלְמֹה to denote the beneficiary of the prayer, while the postscript at 72:20 identifies David as its speaker. Chapters Two and Five take this up further, but for now it is worth observing that the Pss 71–72 sequence introduces to the Psalter the notion of *royal succession*. Accordingly, our thesis claims that the Psalter anticipates a *future* David, and does not maintain an exclusive focus on the original “historical” David as a figure of purely nostalgic recollection.⁴⁹ Moreover, James Luther Mays views Ps 72 in a manner very similar to our thesis, even though he does not address the specific question of covenant relationships in detail. Mays essentially argues for the attribution of Abrahamic promises to the king in Ps 72, writing that the king’s “name should endure forever, and the nations bless themselves by that name as God’s promise to Abraham is kept through him.”⁵⁰

In recent years there has been a spate of dissertations that investigate the quotation of Exod 34:6 in Pss 86, 103, and 145. These scholars include Nathan C. Lane II, Philip Pang, Susan Marie Pigot, Mary Vanderzee-Pals, and Donna Petter,⁵¹ each of whom analyze the numerous repetitions of the grace formula throughout the whole OT, not just the Psalms.⁵² These studies are

⁴⁹ Contrast, e.g., déClassé-Walford, “The Canonical Shape of the Psalms,” 93–110.

⁵⁰ Mays, *The Lord Reigns*, 104. Otherwise, Mays, *ibid.*, 100–107, selects Pss 2, 3, 18, 72, 89, 110, and 132 for his analysis of the Psalter’s perspective on the relationship between Yahweh and the Messiah. His different purpose notwithstanding, Mays’ treatment of Messianic identity in the Psalter overlooks Pss 86 and 101–103 and their potential to answer the question of covenant relationships.

⁵¹ Nathan C. Lane II, “Exodus 34:6–7: A Canonical Analysis” (Ph.D. diss., Baylor Graduate School, 2007); Philip K. Pang, “Exodus 34:6–7 and Its Intertextuality in the Old Testament” (Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2002); Susan Marie Pigot, “God of Compassion and Mercy: An Analysis of the Background, Use, and Theological Significance of Exodus 34:6–7” (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995); Mary Vanderzee-Pals, “God’s Moral Essence: Exodus 34:6–7a and Its Echoes in the Old Testament” (master’s thesis, Calvin Theological Seminary, 1996); Donna Petter, “Exodus 34:6–7: The Function and Meaning of the Declaration” (master’s thesis, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, 1997). See also Alphonso Groenewald, “Exodus, Psalms and Hebrews: A God Abounding in Steadfast Love (Ex 34:6),” *HvTSt* 64 (2008): 1365–78.

⁵² Other “fuller” instances of Exod 34: 6(–7) include Num 14:18; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; Nah 1:3; and Neh 9:17.

noteworthy because they draw attention to how pervasive the “grace formula” is throughout the OT canon and show its importance to biblical theology. Indeed, it is remarkable that Pss 86, 103, and 145 have not been more prominent in editorial theories to date. Of the above examples, Lane’s analysis of these three psalms pays most attention to the editorial shape of the Psalter. However, Lane devotes a little more than 40 pages to the Psalter in his fourth chapter, and uncritically accepts the editorial theories of Wilson, McCann and de-Claissé Walford.⁵³ Indeed, Lane’s dissertation illustrates a limitation from which all these investigations suffer. Their broader focus precludes them from mounting a purposeful investigation of how the grace formula may contribute to our understanding of editorial agenda in the Psalter.

Finally, of the recent studies in Book IV that we noted earlier, James Borger’s dissertation, “Moses in the Fourth Book of the Psalter,”⁵⁴ recognizes the significance of intercession—another important aspect of our thesis. Borger examines the nature of Moses’ significance in the Book IV, finding that it especially highlights his intercessory role. Borger confines his analysis to “Moses” in Book IV, however, and does not consider the possibility that Book IV extends the theme of Moses-style intercession to “David” as our thesis does.

Methodological Procedure

Unlike biblical narrative, the Psalter does not present itself as a single composition but as a collection of previously authored “sources” readily identified as the individual psalms themselves. Therefore, unlike narrative, the Psalter explicitly elicits the question of how its earlier composed parts came to be arranged in their whole. This difference suggests that one should not to expect the Psalter to conform to standards of continuity found in narrative, which is, in our view, a weakness of narrative approaches such as Wallace’s that risk reading into

⁵³ Lane, “Exodus 34:6–7,” 150–93 (esp. 159).

⁵⁴ Borger, “Moses in the Fourth Book of the Psalter.”

sequences of psalms an unintended narrative-like “plot development.”⁵⁵ While this can be demonstrated in certain instances (e.g., Pss 71–72), it is risky to assume a linear plot development and sometimes contrary to the editorial arrangement of certain groups of psalms. Nevertheless, recent scholarship is justified in its assumption that the Psalter plausibly reflects specific editorial concerns.

From the outset, we may fairly question whether multistage redaction-historical models *must* entail such dramatic shifts in covenantal perspective as Wilson advocates between Books I–III and IV–V. Indeed, the perspectival consistency and coherence regarding covenant relationships in the Psalter is an important and legitimate object of inquiry in itself. Accordingly, this dissertation addresses the question via examination of editorially significant psalms that offer a perspective on covenant relationships—though without assuming any particular view of the Psalter’s compositional history. Furthermore, the degree of consistency or inconsistency between the views expressed in these places is a genuine *object of investigation* rather than a methodological assumption as Wilson *et al.* effectively makes it when he assigns markedly different perspectives that correspond to the different redactional layers they identify.

Chapters One and Two lay the foundation for the investigation by reexamining editorial evidence in the Psalter. Chapter One identifies phenomena in the Psalms that scholars commonly

⁵⁵ Referring to the legacy of Wilson’s work in the Psalter, Wallace, “Characterization of David,” 193, writes, “It struck me that even though Wilson was speaking of the early redaction of the Psalter, a sense of story, plot, and characterization began to emerge when Wilson looked at the Psalter. Though perhaps not purposely, Wilson was noting that although the Psalter is not narrative material, as Robert Alter noted, a narrative impulse exists in biblical poetry.” A note of caution seems appropriate here, however, for to expect a sense of “plot development” seems at odds with significant compositional characteristics of the Psalter. Indeed, psalms are frequently arranged not linearly but concentrically (as in Pss 15–24, the Korah II group (84–88), or perhaps the overarching structure of Book V [see Chapter Six]), or interchangeably in an apparent attempt to group certain themes (e.g., Korah Pss 45–48; see Chapter Five). Such arrangements accentuate the themes/psalms at their center, or perhaps whole group as a composite picture, rather than a sequence of linear unfolding events, and it seems best to let editorial clues determine when a sense of “plot development” may be present or otherwise, rather than too readily assume one at the outset.

appeal to as “editorial evidence,” whereupon Chapter Two reassesses each kind of evidence. To avoid unintended methodological baggage, in general we speak of “editors,” “editorial evidence,” and the “editing of the Psalter” rather than “redactors/redactional etc.”—except where the latter provides an accurate description of other scholars’ methods. These chapters also offer good reason to understand editors as “collectors” and “arrangers” of psalms rather than manipulators of their contents as redaction critics have often understood them.

Since “editorial evidence” and its interpretation is an area of considerable dispute, preliminary investigation into this area of study is necessarily tentative, aiming at elucidating issues and distinguishing conclusions that are relatively more certain from those that are more speculative in nature. Nevertheless, our initial foray into this area serves its two main purposes sufficiently well. First, it enables us to examine macrostructural issues that have a significant bearing on our question of covenant relationships in the Psalter. Indeed, our reevaluation of editorial evidence will show that scholarly differentiations between “different” editorial perspectives within the Psalter are not necessarily founded on reliable evidence. This criticism, it turns out, applies especially to multistage models of the Psalter’s composition that propose vastly different editorial perspectives for their different editorial stages. Second, our reevaluation of editorial evidence will identify those kinds of editorial evidence that offer the most solid basis from which to draw our own conclusions. It will therefore equip us to test the intentionality behind the placement of particular psalms that have special relevance to the question of covenant relationships. This is the primary purpose of Chapters One and Two: to distinguish those kinds of editorial evidence that are more reliable from those that are more speculative in order to identify *demonstrable* editorial intent at various points in the Psalter. Having this before us ensures that our investigation of covenant relationships pays particular attention to parts of the Psalter where editorial intent can be identified with relative confidence.

Chapters Three and Four survey covenant references and allusions in the Psalter and map their distribution. Chapter Three investigates the Psalter’s *direct* references to Yahweh’s covenant via the term בְּרִית, identifying their particular covenantal associations as far as possible

and making preliminary observations about בְּרִית in the Psalms. Chapter Four completes the survey by examining different “criteria” that potentially allude to the historical covenants or some major aspect of them, and such conclusions about covenant relationships as the data allow. In this way Chapters Three and Four set out to provide as full a view of covenant references and potential allusions as practically possible.

Chapters Five and Six examine Pss 72, 86, 103, and 145 in their respective “Book contexts.” These chapters’ purpose is to test whether and how their editorial placement bears out our hypothesis that the relationship between the Davidic covenant and its premonarchic counterparts reflects theological continuity that centers on the expectation of a coming royal intercessor. For our purposes “Book contexts” means, narrowly, the milieu of other covenant references/allusions as they intersect with the editorial and structural concerns of each Book. These chapters thus do not offer a general, unqualified analysis of each Book but specifically address how the above psalms relate to their respective Books in terms of our question and the key psalm texts in view for each Book (i.e., 72:27; 86:15; 103:8; and 145:8), bringing editorial evidence to bear on the investigation.

Finally, the Conclusion sums up the investigation, evaluating the extent to which covenant-alluding data and the key psalms in their Book Contexts reflect a consistent and coherent view of covenant relationships. The Conclusion also offers a brief account of Pss 1–2 and its bearing on the question, befitting these psalms’ obvious importance as an introduction to the whole Psalter.

CHAPTER ONE

IDENTIFYING EDITORIAL EVIDENCE IN THE PSALTER

This chapter prepares for our investigation by identifying kinds of editorial evidence in the Psalter,⁵⁶ whereupon Chapter Two offers a reevaluation of their potential implications and general utility for identifying the purposeful arrangement of psalms.

Among the various implications scholars have drawn, two macrostructural issues deserve mention at the outset. First, following Wilson, scholars today commonly assume that Psalter's "books" are its major editorial subunits. While few would challenge this, other contributors suggest that the five part division may to some degree be artificial; a later set of divisions imposed on the Psalter.⁵⁷ This issue is of particular interest because numerous covenant allusions occur near the Psalter's book-divisions or "seams" (e.g. Pss 72:17; 89:4, 29, 35, 40; 105:5–10; 106:45 etc.).⁵⁸ Second, scholars predominately adduce multi-stage redaction-historical models

⁵⁶ Most investigations into the Psalter offer some kind of preamble on major scholarly contributions to editorial issues, though few set out to reevaluate the major kinds of evidence. This is surprising given the variety of redaction-historical opinions and methodologies in the field. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, chas. 1 and 2, is an exception, however. For more general summaries of recent scholarship, see David M. Howard Jr., "The Psalms and Current Study," in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches* (ed. David Firth and Philip Johnston; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 23–40; and "Recent Trends in Psalms Study," in *The Face of Old Testament Studies* (ed. David W. Baker and Bill T. Arnold; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1999), 329–68.

⁵⁷ E.g., Matthias Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters: Ein formgeschichtlicher Ansatz* (FAT 9; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994); Christoph Levin, "Die Entstehung der Büchereinteilung des Psalters," *VT* 54 (2004): 83–90.

⁵⁸ The issue also has methodological significance for our investigation given that Chapters Five and Six presuppose that the Psalter's books constitute its major editorial subdivisions. The present chapter's reevaluation of

from certain editorial evidence. As noted in the Introduction, existing views on covenant relationships are mostly a consequence of reconstructions of the Psalter's editorial history that presuppose divergent editorial agendas, implying either that the covenants are theological alternatives (e.g. Wilson) or reinterpreting the Davidic covenant in radically different terms (e.g., Zenger). By reevaluating the main kinds of evidence and their potential editorial implications, Chapters One and Two preliminarily reassess the editorial support for these views of the Psalter.

The Handling of Editorial Evidence in the Hebrew Psalter in Scholarship

Our goal here is to identify data that scholars have perceived as “editorial evidence,” noting the implications scholars have drawn from such data. Since most attention to the editing of the Psalter comes from the modern era the following survey concentrates chiefly on it.

Pre-Enlightenment Views: Some Illustrative Examples

Early interpreters seldom sought to explain the order of the psalms, but they puzzled over certain features. For instance, the historical prologues sometimes raise questions of chronology. Why does Ps 3 (David's flight from Absalom) precede Ps 51 (David's adultery with Bathsheba)? In response this kind of “problem,” the *Midrash* on Psalms appeals to the Psalter's inscrutability:

As to the exact order of David's Psalms, Scripture says elsewhere *Man knoweth not the order thereof* (Job 28:13). R. Eleazar taught: “The sections of Scripture are not arranged in their proper order. For if they were arranged in their proper order, and any man so read them, he would be able to resurrect the dead and perform other miracles.” ...the proper order of the sections of Scripture is hidden from mortals.⁵⁹

Early Jewish and Christian interpreters were also aware of the five book structure of the Psalms. Hippolytus (A.D. 170—235) offers the earliest written evidence that the doxologies were understood this way.⁶⁰ *Midrash Tehillim* explicitly compares this fivefold division with the

editorial evidence thus sets out to show the legitimacy of Wilson's view on this issue.

⁵⁹ William G. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), 49.

⁶⁰ *On the Psalms. I. The Argument of the Exposition of the Psalms by Hippolytus, (Bishop) of Rome (ANF*

Mosaic Torah.⁶¹ On the other hand, Augustine could offer no explanation and considered it more important to defend the unity of the Psalter as one book.⁶² Similarly, Jerome rejected the five book structure and Origen viewed it as Jewish.⁶³ Another feature that attracted early attention is the postscript of Ps 72:20, which reads, “the prayers of David, son of Jesse, are ended.” Two Rabbinic examples in particular are instructive. In the twelfth century, Abraham Ibn Ezra offered an intriguing explanation, taking *יְקַלְבֵּל* in the sense of “fulfilled.” According to Kimhi,

Ibn Ezra interprets it as follows. When all these consolations will be completed, then *Fulfilled are the prayers of David ben Jesse*. It does not say ‘Fulfilled are the songs’ or ‘Fulfilled are the hymns,’ but *Fulfilled are the prayers of David*, in relation to atonement and deliverance. For when everything is completed, that Israel go forth from the exile and are in their land, and the King Messiah ben David rules over them, nothing will be lacking, neither atonement, nor deliverance, nor prosperity, for everything will be theirs. And then *Fulfilled are the prayers of David ben Jesse*.⁶⁴

Evidently, Ibn Ezra attributes prophetic significance to 72:20, and if *יְקַלְבֵּל* is to be understood

5:201), “And further, let not this fact escape thee, O man of learning, that the Hebrews also divided the Psalter into five books, so that it might be another Pentateuch.”

⁶¹ See Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms*, 5, which states, “As Moses gave five books of laws to Israel, so David gave five Books of Psalms to Israel.”

⁶² Augustine, *Expositions on the Psalms* (NPNF 8:681), writes, “Now in that some have believed that the Psalms are divided into five books, they have been led by the fact, that so often at the end of Psalms are the words, “so be it, so be it.” But when I endeavoured to make out the principle of this division, I was not able; for neither are the five parts equal one to another, neither in quantity of contents, nor yet even in number of Psalms, so as for each to contain thirty. And if each book end with, “so be it, so be it,” we may reasonably ask, why the fifth and last book hath not the same conclusion. We however, following the authority of canonical Scripture, where it is said, “For it is written in the book of Psalms,” know that there is but one book of Psalms.” Augustine continues to press the unity of the Psalter as one book.

⁶³ Paul Sanders, “Five Books of Psalms?” in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms* (ed. Erich Zenger; BETL 238; Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010), 677–87 (esp. 683). Sanders cites Henri de Sainte-Marie, *Sancti Hieronymi Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* (Collectanea Biblica Latina 11; Rome: Abbaye Saint-Jérôme, 1954), 5.

⁶⁴ Kimhi, Commentary on Psalms 42–72, quoted from Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 68. Cf. Samuel Raphael Hirsch, *The Psalms* (trans. Gertrude Hirschler; 2 vols.; New York: Philipp Feldheim, Inc., 1960), who translates 72:20 “Then the Prayers of David, the son of Jesse will be at an end.”

in terms of “fulfillment,” then the presence of subsequent Davidic psalms would no longer pose a “problem.” Though not convincing in all its details,⁶⁵ Ibn Ezra’s explanation is important because it attempts to explain what 72:20 and its specific terminology *means*. The *Midrash* on Psalms also offers a “semantic” explanation of 72:20, reinterpreting the term *וְלֵבָב* and qualifying *תְּפִלֹּתָיו*,

“*The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended (kalu)* (Ps 72:20). And are not the remaining prayers also prayers of David the son of Jesse? *Kalu*, however, is to be read as *kol ’ellu*, “all of these,” and hence the verse means that all of these were prayers David uttered concerning his son Solomon and concerning king Messiah. In a different interpretation of *The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended*, *prayers* is taken to mean the prayers of yearning, as is written *My soul yearneth, yeah, even pineth* (Ps. 84:3).”⁶⁶

These examples show that Rabbinic explanations of Ps 72:20 tend to be semantic in nature. By contrast, we shall see that modern redaction-critical explanations rarely address the meaning of Ps 72:20 but instead approach it functionally as a redaction-historical phenomenon.

Modern “Accretion” Explanations Prior to Wilson

Until the last few decades, modern scholars assumed that the Psalter acquired its final shape not through deliberate redaction but by gradual growth. David C. Mitchell⁶⁷ summarizes a predominating view prior to the nineteenth century that assumed Ps 72:20 marked the end of an earlier Psalter. This expanded gradually to eventually include all 150 psalms. It was thought that,

⁶⁵ The LXX reflects the more usual understanding of *וְלֵבָב* as “finished” or “ceased,” translating with the words *Ἐξέλιπον οἱ ὕμνοι Δαυὶδ τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ*, and according to Liddell and Scott, “ἐκλείπω,” 511, “fulfilled” is not a valid option for *ἐκλείπω*. Likewise *Tg. Ket.* translates *וְלֵבָב* with the peal perfect *גמרון* *גמרון*, which according to Koehler and Baumgartner, “גמר,” *HALOT* CD-ROM Edition, 197, defines as “be complete.” Also interesting is Ibn Ezra’s insistence that *תְּפִלֹּתָיו* means *prayers* to the exclusion of “songs” or “hymns,” when the LXX translates *οἱ ὕμνοι*.

⁶⁶ Braude, *The Midrash*, 563. No textual evidence supports such an emendation, while the qualification of *תְּפִלֹּתָיו* as only “prayers of yearning” seems arbitrary. Interestingly, the meaning of 72:20 is ambiguous in a few MSS and the Syriac that lack *וְלֵבָב* altogether, rendering it a mere phrase, “Prayers of David, son of Jesse.” It is tempting to explain this as an omission to overcome the perceived problem 72:20 creates.

⁶⁷ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 66.

since Davidic psalms⁶⁸ are found beyond Ps 72, the Psalter’s expansion to 150 psalms must have occurred through additions. Both J. G. Eichhorn (1753–1827) and W. M. L. de Wette (1780–1849) held that 72:20 implied an earlier collection comprising Pss 1–72.⁶⁹ Franz Delitzsch saw Pss 3–72 as the earlier group.⁷⁰

However, the new discovery of the so-called “Elohistic Psalter”—the sequence of Pss 42–83 where אלהים predominates over יהוה ⁷¹—complicated this hypothesis, and the pre-existence of Pss 42–83 as a separate early collection became a key redactional datum. Subsequently, the EP has enjoyed a virtually unquestioned place in modern scholarship as a datum that must be accounted for in any theory of the Psalter’s compositional history. Beyond this, Mitchell notes that “many nineteenth century interpreters were unable to agree on any theory about the Psalter’s redaction, except to affirm that the process was piecemeal.” Mitchell continues, “How this conclusion was reached is not clear. It generally seems to have been assumed.”⁷²

Twentieth century form critics like Herman Gunkel and Sigmund Mowinckel basically shared this perspective. They were more interested in establishing psalms’ genre and setting, and to a large extent their focus on individual psalms corresponds to their minimalist understanding

⁶⁸ i.e., Pss 86, 101, 103, 108, 109, 110, 122, 124, 131, 133, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, and 145.

⁶⁹ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 66n1, quotes de Wette, “. . . aber nimmt an, dass vor der letzten grossen Hauptsammlung, schon zu Hiskia’s Zeit, eine kleinere Sammlung vorhanden gewesen, welche die ersten zwei und siebenzig Psalmen enthalten, und mit dem Schlusse: Ende der Psalmen Davids, den wir noch am Ende des 72. Ps. finden, versehen gewesen sei.”

⁷⁰ Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Psalms* (trans. Francis Bolton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1871), 1:18. Delitzsch writes, “The two groups iii–lxxii, lxxiii–lxxxix, although not preserved in the original arrangement, and augmented by several kinds of interpolations, at least represent the first two stages of the growth of the Psalter.”

⁷¹ A. F. Kirkpatrick, *Books IV and V*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), iv, counts 200 occurrences of אלהים and 43 occurrences of יהוה in the EP, whereas in Pss 1–41 יהוה occurs 278 times including doxologies and אלהים only 15 times. Pss 84–150 also prefer יהוה over אלהים , making Pss 42–83 stand out in its preference for אלהים .

⁷² Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 67.

of redactional intent across the whole Psalter. They nevertheless do have things to say about the growth of the Psalter that affirm these elements' place as important editorial data.⁷³

Mowinckel's description of the Psalter's growth is worth summarizing because it corresponds closely to more recent views of Books I–III, while his conclusions about Books IV and V resemble the piecemeal accretion theory supported by earlier scholars like de Wette and Eichhorn. Like them Mowinckel thought the Psalter to have been compiled gradually, composed from several earlier, shorter collections. To justify this assumption, Mowinckel appeals to the existence of “doublets,” 72:20, and the predominance of אלהים in Pss 42–83 and יהוה elsewhere in the Psalter—though he does not always explain exactly how all these features argue for the gradual compilation from earlier collections.⁷⁴ The first of the preexisting collections of which Mowinckel speaks was the so-called “first Davidic Psalter” (David I, Pss 3–41), with the untitled Ps 33 a possible late addition.⁷⁵ The EP was a later collection made up of three smaller collections: Korahite Psalms (42–49); a second Davidic group (51–72); and the Psalms of Asaph (50, 73–83). Moreover, Mowinckel thinks Pss 84–89—a second Korahite⁷⁶ collection incorporating the Davidic Ps 86—was added when David I and the Elohist Psalter were combined. At this time Ps 2 was also added as an introduction to form the new collection, Pss 2–89. For Mowinckel Pss 90–150 became part of the developing Psalter in a process of gradual

⁷³ See, e.g., Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*; Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms*, 333–48. The main difference lies with Gunkel's rejection of a cultic explanation of the rationale for the *whole* collection. Gunkel, who dates the collection to ca. 350–200 B.C. (cf. 336–39), considers the EP a collection of smaller cultically motivated collections distinguishable by their Korahite, Asaphite, and Davidic attributions, as well as Davidic Ps 3–41 (cf. 344).

⁷⁴ Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2:193. Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters*, 169, appeals to the same observations to argue that the EP once existed as an early form of the Psalter.

⁷⁵ Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2:193.

⁷⁶ Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2:194–95, explains that Heman the Ezrahite (Ps 88) and Ethan the Elamite (Ps 89) were both supposed to belong to the sons of Korah.

extension “by means of other small collections—perhaps both earlier and later ones: Pss 93–100, 113–118, 120–134 (136), and 146–150, and some individual psalms.”⁷⁷ Mowinckel’s explanation Books IV–V is therefore vaguer, lacking the level of precision with which he describes the growth process of Books I–III.

Two features of Mowinckel’s explanation are important for our purposes. First, Mowinckel takes Ps 72:20 to be evidence of Pss 51–72 as an early Davidic collection. Second, the so-called Elohist Psalter (Pss 42–83) was once a separate group of psalms with its own redactional history. Both conclusions have received widespread acceptance,⁷⁸ and both phenomena, 72:20 and the predominance of יְהוָה in Pss 42–83, are major instances of “editorial evidence” that require our attention in this chapter.

When it comes to superscripts, post-Enlightenment scholarship tended to regard them as inauthentic late additions and so diminish their editorial value. According to Mitchell, “De Wette, von Lengerke, Olshausen, Hupfield, Graetz, Kuenen, Reuss, Stade, Cheyne and Duhm are unwilling to connect any psalms with the individuals named. Ewald and Hitzig are more

⁷⁷ Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel’s Worship*, 2:196.

⁷⁸ Cf. Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, (trans. Hilton C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 19, who, also considers the Psalter’s final form to be the result of an untraceable “process by which the partial compilations *gradually* came together” (italics added). Concerning the Elohist Psalter and 72:20, Kraus, *ibid.*, 17–18, writes, “among these partial compilations, the so-called “Elohist Psalter” undoubtedly occupies a leading position... The extensive partial compilation overlaps the division into books and must be viewed without regard to the closing doxology in Ps. 72:19 [*sic.*]. The division into books definitely proves to be secondary, also in other connections. If we think of the “Elohist Psalter” as separate component, a partial compilation within the chief collection of the Psalter, then it becomes apparent: (a) that the “Elohist Psalter” is put together from three sources; and (b) that it was the compiler of the Elohist part of the Psalter who undertook the consistent use of יְהוָה as the name of God... A closing formula brings to a close the group of Psalms of David collected by the “Elohist compiler” is found in Ps. 72:20...” Cf. also Erhard S. Gerstenberger, *Psalms Part I with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*, (FOTL 14; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1988), 36–39; Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 4–5; Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary* (OT; trans. H. Hartwell; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), 99–101.

generous, the former allowing one psalm to David, the latter about thirteen.”⁷⁹ Thus, the issue concentrated on whether the superscripts accurately identify the original authors of psalms or not. Presumed unreliable, their potential editorial significance for the *Psalter* was also overlooked, except to recognize obvious sequences of psalms grouped by authorial attribution (e.g., Pss 3–41; 42–49; 51–72; 73–83 etc.) or שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלִילֹת (Pss 120–134). Likewise, scholars typically doubted that editors responsible for arranging the psalms intended the doxologies⁸⁰ to distinguish the Psalter’s books.⁸¹ New discoveries toward the end of the twentieth century soon gave good cause to rethink these assumptions, however.

Gerald H. Wilson and Recent Scholarship

In the 1980s, Gerald H. Wilson⁸² brought to light evidence of editorial techniques in the arrangement of the MT Psalter that led scholars to view it as the product of waves of *deliberate* redaction rather than more or less accidental accretion.⁸³ This extended to the Psalter’s five book

⁷⁹ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 41.

⁸⁰ Pss 41:14; 72:18–19; 89:53; and 106:48.

⁸¹ E.g., Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2:197, agrees with B. D. Erdmans, *The Hebrew Book of Psalms* (OTS 4; Lieden: Brill, 1947), that the doxologies “happened to occur in the texts from the earlier collections... [but] were taken to be intended divisions and concluding doxologies between ‘the books’” against their original function. “Originally...these doxologies had nothing to do with the collection, neither with the earlier smaller collections, nor with the composition of the Psalter as a whole.” Similarly, Gerstenberger, *Psalms, Part 1 with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*, 36–37, dates the five book division to A.D. 4th century, seeing it as an outgrowth of “Jewish synagogal worship practices” in which the יהוה יהוה יהוה formula played an increasingly important role. On the other hand, Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms*, 348, suggests the (final?) collector “apparently adopted three doxologies with the smaller collections...[and] added a fourth himself to the end of Ps 106, thus completing the division of the entire psalter into five sections.” See also Harmut Gese, “Die Entstehung der Büchereinteilung des Psalters,” in *Vom Sinai zum Zion: Alttestamentliche Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie* (BEvT 64. München: Kaiser, 1974), 159–67.

⁸² Wilson, *Editing*. This monograph is Wilson’s published 1981 dissertation.

⁸³ For example, Klaus Seybold, *Introducing the Psalms* (trans. R. Graeme Dunphy; Edinburgh; T&T Clark, 1990), 19–23, offers such an account the Psalter’s alleged growth process.

structure as well. Whereas previous scholars had largely taken the five-fold book division to be artificial and late, Wilson proposed that editors made use of the psalm superscripts to collate and organize psalms into the five Books, confirming the concluding function of the doxologies for their respective Books (Pss 41:14; 72:18–19; 89:53; and 106:48).⁸⁴ Thus, although Wilson did not offer precise answers about *when* or *by whom* the superscripts were appended to individual psalms, he nevertheless demonstrated their organizational function to the satisfaction of many.

One of Wilson's major contributions was to show that such techniques have ancient precedent in the Sumerian Temple Hymns and Mesopotamian Catalogue of Hymnic Incipits.

Wilson explains:

Moreover, certain techniques employed in the organization of the collection should not be ignored. Two stand out in particular in relation to the Hebrew Psalter. The use of an explicit doxology to Nisaba at the conclusion of TH 42 (line 542), along with the corroborating data of the earlier collection from Abu Salabikh (in which each composition is concluded by the same doxology *zà-mi* "Praise") affirms a similarity of practice when compared with the frequent use of concluding doxology in the Hebrew Psalter. The use of TH 42 as an expanded doxology concluding the whole Temple Hymn Collection is, likewise comparable to the use of Psalm 150, in the absence of a fifth explicit doxology, as a final, expanded doxology concluding the last book of the Psalter as well as the Psalter as a whole.

The second technique—the retention of the colophonic material as a "frozen" part of a literary composition, even after subsequent additions and editing has skewed the function of the work from that of the original—is comparable to the retention in the biblical pss-headings of data referring to cultic background and function of the pss which have been adapted to function in a far different and later context.⁸⁵

Wilson showed that these two techniques—the concluding function of "doxologies" and the organizational use of superscriptional psalm headings—corroborate each other as evidence of purposeful arrangement in the Psalter. Like others before him, Wilson recognized that *authorial*

⁸⁴ Wilson suggested that Pss 146–150 function as the doxological conclusion both for Book V and the Psalter as a whole

⁸⁵ Wilson, *Editing*, 23.

attribution served as a primary principle of organization, especially in Books I–III, far more than classification by *genre*.⁸⁶ However, he observed that the same or similar *genre* classifications (מְזוֹמָר, שִׁיר, מְשֻׁכָּל etc.) occur atop psalms that transition between author-groups (e.g. Korahite Pss 42–49, 84–88; Davidic Pss 51–72; Asaph Pss 73–83 etc.). The effect was to “soften” the transition from one author group to another. Most importantly, Wilson observed that this “softening” technique is lacking at the transition points between books where the doxologies occur.⁸⁷ For example, Ps 73’s superscript bears no similarity to Ps 72’s. Nor does Ps 90’s superscript resemble those atop Book III’s concluding psalms. Yet the change of authorial attribution at these places marks them as points of disjuncture. Wilson concludes that the doxologies appear at real, “unsoftened” editorial breaks in the Psalter, thus confirming their intentional use to conclude Books of psalms by the editors who composed the Psalter.⁸⁸ Wilson summarizes the situation as follows:

My study of the distribution of the technical terms in the pss-headings has already shown that the five-fold division is a real and purposeful division which is indicated internally by the editorial use of author designations and genre categories to mark the points of division and to bind together disparate groups within these larger sections. This coincidence of internal breaks and the occurrence of the doxologies is certainly not fortuitous, but represents editorially induced methods of giving “shape” to the pss corpus.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Wilson, *Editing*, 155 and 161.

⁸⁷ Wilson, *Editing*, 155–67.

⁸⁸ Appealing to the occurrence of additional material *after* the doxologies of Pss 72:18–19 and 106:48 (i.e., the 72:20 postscript and הַלְלֵי־יְיָ respectively), Wilson, *Editing*, 185–86, concluded that “the doxologies in 42:14; 72:19; 89:53 and 106:48 are not simply late editorial insertions for the purpose of dividing the Psalter in to five “books.” They are instead integral parts of the pss they accompany and have their origin in the liturgical milieu of the cult.”

⁸⁹ Wilson, *Editing*, 186 (italics original).

On the other hand, Wilson’s analysis of the organization of Books IV–V built upon the obviously lesser role that authorial attribution plays in organization.⁹⁰ With the exception of Pss 108–110, 120–134, and 138–145, other organizational techniques predominate in Books IV–V. First, he noted that the הַלְלֵנוּ יְהוָה psalms fall into clusters: Pss 104–106; Pss 111–117; Ps 135; and Pss 146–150. Wilson concluded that, just as with “the Mesopotamian hymns and catalogues, “praise” and “blessing” (Hallel and Doxology) frequently concluded documents or sections within documents,”⁹¹ so הַלְלֵנוּ יְהוָה psalms conclude sub-groupings in Books IV–V of the Hebrew Psalter. Second, in the first three cases, the *next* psalm begins with the formula: הַדָּו לַיהוָה הַדָּו לַיהוָה (Pss 107:1; 118:1, 136:1). Accordingly, he concluded that psalms bearing this formula function begin new subsections within Books IV–V.

Wilson’s theory of the Psalter’s editorial history has also been very influential. He argued that the different editorial techniques found in Books I–III and Books IV–V reflect two main editorial stages for which he found support in the DSS. In respect to the latter, Wilson followed James Sanders’ “Qumran Psalms Hypothesis,” which Peter W. Flint’s more recent work also supports.⁹² This hypothesis argues that an early Psalter (Pss 2–89) had stabilized earlier in the postexilic period before the Dead Sea Psalms scrolls were produced, and that Books IV–V had not yet taken shape. For Wilson, then, Ps 89 marks a major redaction-historical break.⁹³

⁹⁰ Wilson, *Editing*, 155, notes that of the 61 psalms in Books IV–V “only 19 bear authorial attribution.”

⁹¹ Wilson, *Editing*, 186.

⁹² James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QP^a)* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965); Peter W. Flint, “The Book of Psalms in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *VT* 48 (1998): 453–72; *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997); “The Psalms Scrolls from the Judean Desert: Relationships and Textual Affiliations,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings from the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. George J. Brooke; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 31–52.

⁹³ See, e.g., Wilson, *Editing*, 121. In later publications Wilson restated his views more firmly. See, Gerald H. Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter: A Consideration of Editorial Linkage in the Book of Psalms,” in *Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (ed. J. Clinton McCann Jr.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 73–74; “Psalms and Psalter: Paradigm for Biblical Theology,” in *Biblical Theology: Retrospect and Prospect*. (ed. Scott J. Hafemann; Downers

For Wilson these two editorial stages provide the key to properly interpreting the final form of the Psalter. Wilson posited that “royal” Pss 2, 72, and 89 mark important places in the early form of the Psalter. Psalms 2 and 89 create a royal covenantal frame that culminates in a lament of over the present exilic crisis and “failure” of the Davidic covenant (Ps 89). Later, however, editors added Books IV–V along with a new introduction (Ps 1), enveloping the earlier Psalter in a framework that Wilson deemed to be dominated by wisdom concerns⁹⁴ and giving the final Psalter’s answer to the crisis. As noted in the Introduction, this alleged shift in theological perspective after Ps 89 is the most pertinent element of Wilson’s analysis for our question regarding the relationship between covenants. His deconstruction the Psalter’s editorial history inherently contrasts Davidic covenantal theology with Mosaic/pre-monarchic themes, yet without directly raising the question of how the covenants relate. Of all scholarly propositions relating to the composition-history of the Psalter, then, it is this purported editorial shift after Ps 89 that concerns us most.

Scholars have substantially accepted Wilson’s two major editorial stages, even if many posit other stages besides.⁹⁵ On the continent, Christoph Rösel also argues for an early form of the Psalter comprising Pss 2–89.⁹⁶ Martin Rose similarly proposes successive additions by which an exilic Pss 51–72 “Davidic” Psalter was expanded into the Messianic Psalter.⁹⁷ For his part, Rose suggests that priestly editors sought to reinterpret this Messianic Psalter by expanding it with *theocratic* Pss 90–99, attributing a similar editorial motive as in Wilson’s view. Zenger and

Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 100–110; “King, Messiah, and the Reign of God,” 391–93.

⁹⁴ See esp. Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter,” 72–82.

⁹⁵ Wilson, “King, Messiah, and the Reign of God,” 393.

⁹⁶ Christoph Rösel, *Die messianische Redaktion des Psalters: Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie der Sammlung 2–89* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1999).

⁹⁷ Rose, “Psaumes,” in *Introduction à l’Ancien Testament* (ed. Thomas Römer, Jean-Daniel Macchi, and Christophe Nihan; Le Monde de la Bible 49. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2004), 562–78 (here 569).

Hossfeld's commentary—somewhat unique for emphasizing redaction history in the interpretation of individual psalms—also recognizes the “Messianic Psalter” as a redactional stage of development, albeit within a much more complex composition-historical model.⁹⁸

There are, however, others who reconstruct the Psalter's compositional history without this editorial “stage.” Matthias Millard advocates Pss 11–100 rather than Pss 2–89 as the intermediate stage between an original Elohist Psalter and the final MT Psalter.⁹⁹ Alternatively, Jean-Marie Auwers limits his “Messianic Psalter” to Ps 83, interpreting several common features between Pss 2 and 83 as an editorial *inclusio*. Nevertheless, Auwers ultimately agrees that a theocratic program redefines royal covenantal theology, whose fulfillment is recast in terms of the people and priests.¹⁰⁰ David C. Mitchell differs more radically by positing one editorial impulse behind the Psalter's macrostructure. Instead of explaining the Psalter's editorial shape and history in terms of Israel's exilic and post-exilic history, Mitchell argues that an eschatological program provides the meta-narrative of the canonical Psalter, finding precedents among the later OT prophets.¹⁰¹ Similarly, Roger T. Beckwith advocates one major editorial effort behind a Psalter originally subdivided into three major sections corresponding to Book I, Books II–III, and Books

⁹⁸ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 3*, 1–7, outline numerous redactional layers affecting Pss 51–100. See also Erich Zenger, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (7th ed.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2008), 364–66, for Zenger's redaction history summary; and Auwers, “Le Psautier comme livre biblique,” 67–89, for a further summary of Hossfeld's and Zenger's view.

⁹⁹ Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters*. Millard's redaction-historical theory is relatively straightforward, comprising three major redactional stages: an exilic Elohist Psalter (Pss 42–83); a broader collection embracing Pss 11–100 in the Persian era; and the final form (1–150) in the Hellenistic age.

¹⁰⁰ Auwers, “Le Psautier comme livre biblique,” 84–85.

¹⁰¹ Mitchell, “Lord, Remember David”; *The Message of the Psalter*.

IV–V, rather than the existing five book structure.¹⁰² For both Mitchell and Beckwith, the LXX’s macrostructural similarity to the MT Psalter calls Wilson’s two-redaction model into question.¹⁰³

From this brief sketch, it is clear that no consensus exists on the Psalter’s editorial history. Accordingly, some scholars have generally avoided diachronic speculation in favor of synchronic investigation of editorial arrangement, or focused their attention on smaller subgroups of psalms.¹⁰⁴ For example, Jerome Creach’s analyses of “the destiny of the righteous” and “Yahweh as refuge”¹⁰⁵ employ what David Howard describes as a “semantic field or thematic approach...” using “his findings to comment on the organization of the whole work.”¹⁰⁶ Such an approach avoids having to adopt a particular redaction-historical model as the interpretive starting point. Second, scholars who agree with Wilson’s redactional break after Ps 89 usually agree that the following psalms evidence a significant perspectival shift regarding the Davidic covenant—whether as a covenant “failed” and replaced, or a covenant translated into new terms without the person of a king. Nevertheless, our summary also illustrates a great diversity of redaction-historical opinions among those who advocate such perspectival shifts.

These observations suggest that the consistency or inconsistency of editorial perspective throughout the Psalter cannot safely be assumed, but must be tested; in our case with regard to

¹⁰² Roger T. Beckwith, “The Early History of the Psalter,” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 1–27.

¹⁰³ See Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 80; “Lord, Remember David,” 543–45; and Beckwith, “The Early History of the Psalter,” 21.

¹⁰⁴ E.g., Walter Brueggemann, “Bounded by Obedience and Praise: The Psalms as Canon,” *JSOT* 50 (1991): 63–92; David M. Howard, *The Structure of Psalms 93–100* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997); Robert Cole, *The Shape and Message of Book III (Psalms 73–89)* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000); and Wallace, *The Narrative Effect of Book IV of the Hebrew Psalter*.

¹⁰⁵ Jerome F. D. Creach, *Yahweh as Refuge and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (JSOTSup 217; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996); *The Destiny of the Righteous*.

¹⁰⁶ Howard, “The Psalms and Current Study,” 28.

the Davidic covenant in relation to the premonarchic covenants. Indeed, our reevaluation of editorial evidence underscores this (see Chapter Two).

Recent Scholarship and Editorial Evidence. In terms of internal editorial evidence alone, Wilson can be credited with reviving interest in the doxologies as intentional conclusions to the Psalter's books and, by extension, in the books themselves as major subunits of the Psalter. However, recent contributions by Reinhard Kratz, Christoph Levin, Erich Zenger et al. present different perspectives on the doxologies that make it necessary to reassess their editorial significance. Wilson's identification of superscriptional organization also counts as a "new" kind of editorial evidence to which scholarship has responded, as are his observations concerning הַדָּוִד and הַלְלֵה לַיהוָה psalms. Beyond these, several older features continue to be recognized as evidence of editorial shaping: the predominance of $\text{אֲלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ in Pss 42–83 (and preference for יהוה outside these psalms), the postscript of Ps 72:20, "doublets," and the phenomenon of lexical and thematic connections between psalms.

Concerning the last of these, Walter Zimmerli's 1972 article, "Zwillingspsalmen," addressed psalms that appear to be deliberately collocated according to similar content or themes, focusing especially on Pss 111–112 and 105–106.¹⁰⁷ In a small way, therefore, Zimmerli revived the principle of concatenation that Delitzsch had seen, as did Christoph Barth regarding Book I in 1976.¹⁰⁸ More recently, Matthias Millard has taken such psalm pairs as an important point of departure for his form-critical approach to identifying different stages of the Psalter's

¹⁰⁷ Walter Zimmerli, "Zwillingspsalmen," in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch: Beiträge zu Psalmen und Propheten: Festschrift für J. Ziegler* (ed. J. Schreiner; Würzburg: Echter, 1972), 105–13. Zimmerli also briefly notes various kinds of *Stichwörter* that connect Pss 1–2, 3–4, 9–10, 32–33, 38–41, 42–43, 43–44, 69–70, 74–75, 77–78, 80–81, and 127–128.

¹⁰⁸ Barth, Christoph. "Concatenatio im ersten Buch des Psalters," in *Wort und Wirklichkeit: Studien zur Afrikanistik und Orientalistik 1: Eugen Ludwig Rapp zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Brigitta Benzing, Otto Böcher, and Günter Mayer; Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1976), 30–40.

growth.¹⁰⁹ For Millard the collocation of psalms linked by common themes and *Stichwörter* evidences a primary means by which editors arranged individual psalms into larger clusters. Similarly, David M. Howard's analysis of Pss 93–100 appeals to the same kind of data by investigating the linguistic and thematic ties between sequences of psalms.¹¹⁰ Recent scholarship therefore recognizes this kind of evidence as a useful means to examine editorial intent behind smaller groups of psalms. Since the strength and number of linguistic and thematic links between psalms varies, each case must be judged on merit. Accordingly, our reevaluation will address the different kinds of explanation scholars have given to these connections in a more general way.

These kinds of editorial evidence have most shaped scholars' views on the Psalter's editing, and therefore merit our specific attention. Nevertheless, there are other "derivative" kinds of evidence to which we need only offer a few brief remarks here owing to their nature.

First, recent scholarship has become more sensitive to structural possibilities like chiasmic or concentric arrangements of psalms. For example, Zenger sees chiasmic arrangements within Pss 3–14, 15–24, 25–34 and 42–49; each group centered about hymns (Pss 9, 19, 29, and 46 respectively).¹¹¹ Again, arguments vary in strength from case to case. But the possibility seems well demonstrated especially in Pss 15–24,¹¹² and therefore deserves consideration elsewhere.

¹⁰⁹ Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters*.

¹¹⁰ Howard, *The Structure of Psalms 93–100*.

¹¹¹ So reports Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters*, 25.

¹¹² See Pierre Auffret, *La Sagesse a bâti sa maison: Études de structures littéraires dans l'Ancient Testament et spécialement dans les Psaumes* (OBO 49; Fribourg, Switzerland: Editions Universitaires, 1982), 407–38. See also, e.g., Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters*, 24–27; Patrick D. Miller, "Kingship, Torah Obedience and Prayer: The Theology of Psalms 15–24," in *Israelite Religion and Biblical Theology: Collected Essays* (ed. Patrick D. Miller; JSOTSup 267; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 279–97; and Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, "'Wer darf hinaufziehen zum Berg JHWHs?' Zur Redaktionsgeschichte und Theologie der Psalmengruppe 15–24," in *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel: für Norbert Lohfink SJ* (ed. Georg Braulik, Walter Groß, and Sean McEvenue; Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1993), 166–82.

Second, convinced that the Psalter exhibits purposeful shape, some scholars direct their attention to the Psalter's beginning and end—places of assumed significance in any intentional composition—or psalms that are in some sense “central.” A prime example is Walter Brueggemann's synchronic interpretation of the Psalter, which yields a pattern of orientation (Ps 1), disorientation (Pss 73) and reorientation (Ps 150). For Brueggemann, *praise* (Ps 150) reorients the community's disorienting struggle with theodicy (Ps 73) now that conventional wisdom (Ps 1) appears too simplistic.¹¹³ Brueggemann's theological conclusions aside, his analysis clearly concentrates on the Psalter's beginning, end, and approximate midpoint.¹¹⁴ Regarding the Psalter's end, Wilson suggested that Ps 145:21 introduces Pss 146–150 as a doxological conclusion for the whole Psalter, and this has been generally accepted.¹¹⁵ Considerable debate surrounds Pss 1–2 at beginning of the Psalter, which are analyzed in the Conclusion.

Third, some scholars have argued that the significant placement of other recurrent themes indicates their editorial importance. For example, Jerome Creach sets out “to show that ‘refuge’ is part of an intentional editorial schema, not a subjective structure imposed on the collection. The starting point for the thesis is the presence of the phrase, *'ašrê kol hōsê bô*, at the end of Psalm 2.”¹¹⁶ Similarly, Susan Gillingham argues that the Zion motif is a key editorial concern that binds together various other aspects of the Psalter, specifically its didactic and eschatological

¹¹³ Brueggemann, “Bounded by Obedience and Praise”; cf. Walter Brueggemann and Patrick D. Miller, “Psalm 73 as a Canonical Marker,” *JOT* 72 (1996): 45–56.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 17, who similarly justifies his focus on 1–2, 18–19, and 118–119 by appealing to the importance of “introduction, centrality, and conclusion.” The only difference with Grant's analysis is that he applies the principle of “centrality” to individual Books (e.g., Book V) or subgroups (e.g., Pss 15–24)—rather than the whole Psalter—in the case of Pss 18–19 and 118–119.

¹¹⁵ Wilson, *Editing*, 189 and 225–26.

¹¹⁶ Creach, *Yahweh as Refuge*, 17.

dimensions.¹¹⁷ Similarly, James L. Mays claims special editorial significance for the “Torah psalms” (Pss 1, 19, and 119).¹¹⁸ While Mays notes that Pss 1, 19, and 119 resist traditional form critical categories,¹¹⁹ their pronounced focus on Torah makes them identifiable as a special class.¹²⁰ His theory is therefore of a similar kind to Creach’s and Gillingham’s that explore the editorial prominence of particular themes. To the extent that all these studies successfully demonstrate the editorial importance of their respective themes, they add to the pool of editorial evidence.

Conclusion

This brief survey identifies numerous kinds of evidence that scholars consider to have implications for the editorial history, shape, and theology of the MT Psalter, whether small or great. Most of these are “internal” kinds of evidence found within the MT Psalter itself. Others—chiefly the DSS and LXX—are “external” sources of evidence that potentially bear witness to the composition history of the MT Psalter. It remains now to reassess their utility in identifying

¹¹⁷ Gillingham, “The Zion Tradition and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter,” 308–41.

¹¹⁸ James Luther Mays, “The Place of the Torah-Psalms in the Psalter,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 3, explores the possibility that this “latest and smallest group of the Psalms may provide the central clue to the way the Psalms, individually and as a book, were read and understood at the time of their composition and inclusion.” Cf. Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, who argues that the Torah psalms were deliberately paired with (quasi-)royal Pss 2, 18, and 118 respectively to accentuate the king’s Torah piety.

¹¹⁹ Mays, “The Place of the Torah-Psalms,” 3.

¹²⁰ Royal psalms are another example—e.g. Pss 2, 72, and 89 in Wilson’s theory. For Wilson the editorial importance of these psalms lies primarily in their positions at the seams of Books I–III, however, and his redaction-historical model leads him to downplay subsequent royal psalms. However scholars suggest that subsequent royal psalms in Books IV–V must be also accounted for, thus making a case for their editorial significance as well (e.g. Pss 101, 110, 132, 144:1–11 etc.). See, e.g., Howard N. Wallace, *Psalms* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009), 6; and Mark S. Smith, “The Theology of the Redaction of the Psalter: Some Observations,” *ZAW* 104 (1992): 408–12, who highlights Ps 110.

demonstrable instances of editorial activity and their potential implications for how to understand the MT Psalter's editorial history and shape.

CHAPTER TWO

REEVALUATING EDITORIAL EVIDENCE IN THE PSALTER

The previous chapter identified numerous phenomena in the Psalms that scholars have recognized as evidence of editorial activity. This chapter's purpose is to reassess the value and possible implications of each kind of evidence.

Though external to the MT, the DSS and LXX have important potential implications for understanding the editorial history, shape, and theology of the Psalter. Accordingly, this chapter shall address these first. Indeed, studies on the editing of the Psalter readily demonstrate that, when it comes to redaction-historical questions in general and the question of a theological-perspectival shift between Books III and IV in particular, much turns on how scholars evaluate these text traditions.¹²¹ Consequently, the LXX and DSS have potential—if indirect—relevance to the question of covenant relationships. Beyond this, how scholars assess them sometimes affects their interpretation of internal evidence too. For example, Wilson accentuates differences in editorial techniques between Books I–III and IV–V.

After an examination of these external kinds of evidence, subsequent subheadings treat major kinds of internal evidence that have shaped modern views about the Psalter's shape and

¹²¹ Regarding the major textual witnesses to the Pentateuch, Emmanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed., Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 155–63, prefers to speak of “texts” rather than “text-types” or “recensions” to denote the MT, LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch. Obviously the Psalter presents a different set of chief witnesses—i.e., 11QPs^a instead of SP—that give rise to profoundly different compositional issues. Nevertheless, to avoid confusion we shall simply speak in terms of “traditions” when referring to 11QPs^a, MT and LXX Psalters.

shaping: superscripts (esp. authorial attribution and genre), יהֲדָוִד and הַלְלֵהוּ psalms, 72:20, “doublets,” and אֱלֹהִים/יְהוָה predominance, doxologies, and lexical and thematic links. Our intention is not to analyze every instance of these kinds of evidence exhaustively, but rather to reconsider both their potential implications for redaction-history and their usefulness for identifying editorial intention to relate psalms to each other. Particular instances receive more detailed attention in later chapters as necessary.

Qumran and the MT Psalter

As noted above, The “Qumran Psalms Hypothesis” advocated by Sanders, Wilson, and Flint argues for a two (or more) stage stabilization process of the Hebrew Psalter. On the other hand, Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, Shemaryahu Talmon, Patrick Skehan, and Ulrich Dahmen argue that 11QPs^a is a secondary arrangement of psalms that presumes an already established MT Psalter.¹²² For them the MT Psalter was final before the DSS were copied, leading to the conclusion that they do not bear direct witness to the compositional history of the MT Psalter.

A brief summary of the “Qumran Psalms Hypothesis” is necessary in order to offer our preliminary assessment the DSS’s implications for the MT Psalter’s arrangement. As summarized by Flint, the Hypothesis comprises several discreet arguments. These concern the Psalter’s “stabilization,” the existence of multiple Psalter “editions” of which an “11QPs^a

¹²² Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, “The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a): A Problem of Canon and Text,” *Textus 5* (1966): 22–33; Talmon, “Pisqah Be’emsa’ Pasuq and 11QPs^a,” *Textus 5* (1965): 11–21; Patrick Skehan, “A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs^a,” *CBQ* 35 (1973): 202–5; “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” in *Qumran: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Gembloux, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1978), 163–82; and Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs^a aus Qumran* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003). Goshen-Gottstein and Talmon suggest a liturgical rationale, while Skehan considers 11QPs^a a “library edition.” Dahmen’s monograph entails an extensive textual analysis of 11QPs^a, which he deems to be a creative reordering of the proto-Masoretic Psalter. Similarly, Zenger, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (7th ed.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2008), 364–67, believes that MT Pss 1–145 were fixed in the B.C. 4th century, and Pss 146–150 were added in the B.C. 2d century. In composition-historical terms, then, 11QPs^a has no bearing on the MT for Zenger.

Psalter” is the major alternative to the MT, and 11QPs^a’s provenance.

First, Wilson and Flint argue for the early stabilization of Books I–III on the basis of content and ordering of psalms the Qumran MSS.¹²³ With respect to content, “no compositions absent from the Received Psalter are found joined to any of these Psalms” (i.e., Pss 1–89), while such variations in content are “frequent” for psalms known from Books IV–V of the MT.¹²⁴ Regarding arrangement, Wilson’s and Flint’s data show that, “evidence in support of the MT arrangement of pss is fairly consistent throughout,” but also that “examples of variation, practically non-existent in the first three books, increase markedly in Books Four to Five.”¹²⁵ Accordingly, these scholars infer that the order and composition of Books IV–V was still fluid whereas Books I–III were a stabilized collection.

Second, according to Flint, the DSS bear witness to three forms of the Psalter: an early collection comprising Pss (1)2–89; the “11QPs^a Psalter;” and (possibly) the MT Psalter. For Flint, Sanders, and Wilson, the “11QPs^a Psalter” consisted of “Psalms i–lxxxix followed by the arrangement preserved in 11QPs^a,”¹²⁶ and represents an alternative edition of the Psalter to that of the MT Psalter.¹²⁷ Flint claims that the Qumran MSS predominantly reflect this form over the

¹²³ Sanders recognizes Pss 1–100 as the “stabilized” portion of the Psalter, but Wilson’s work has since shifted the focus to Pss [1]2–89. For further summaries and perspective on the earlier debate, see Gerald H. Wilson, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll [11QPs^a] Reconsidered: Analysis of the Debate,” *CBQ* 47 (1985): 624–42; and Peter W. Flint, “The Contribution of Gerald Wilson Toward Understanding the Book of Psalms in Light of the Psalms Scrolls,” in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship* (ed. Nancy L. deClassé-Walford; Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 209–30.

¹²⁴ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 141

¹²⁵ Wilson, *Editing*, 121. Flint and Wilson nevertheless disagree on the merit of comparing the ages of MSS that support or contradict the MT. Wilson, *Editing*, 121–22, claims that the earlier MSS from Qumran contradict the MT arrangement, while only MSS from A.D. first century support it, thus evidencing a gradual stabilization. On the other hand, Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 144, disagrees with Wilson’s assessment of certain MSS as “contradictory” or “supportive.”

¹²⁶ Flint, “The Book of Psalms,” 462.

¹²⁷ See also Wilson, “The Structure of the Psalter,” 242; Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 167–71.

MT Psalter. He counts three MSS (4QPs^e, 11QPs^a, and 11QPs^b) that affirm it against the MT ordering of psalms, compared with a single MS from Masada that supports the MT (MasPs^b) against 11QPs^a. On the other hand, “no Qumran manuscript supports the MT-150 arrangement against 11QPs^a on the macro-level; perhaps some Qumran Psalms scrolls may be aligned with the MT on the basis of key individual variants—but this remains to be demonstrated.”¹²⁸

Third, although Sanders originally argued that 11QPs^a was composed at Qumran, he later modified his view, claiming that it was brought to Qumran when the covenanters fled Jerusalem and was merely copied there. This is an important aspect of the theory because it allows Sanders and Flint to claim a wider provenance for 11QPs^a than just the Qumran sectarian community.¹²⁹ According to the Hypothesis, this has ramifications for the Mt Psalter’s canonical status just before the turn of the era: the MT Psalter was not “the” Psalter in wider Judaism, but one among several. Or, more radically, 11QPs^a’s wider provenance could be interpreted to mean that the MT Psalter had not yet *taken shape*.¹³⁰

¹²⁸ Flint, “The Book of Psalms,” 463. Flint reports that the only MS supporting the MT against 11QPs^a is MasPs^b found at Masada.

¹²⁹ See Flint, “The Book of Psalms,” 469–71; *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 199–200.

¹³⁰ Flint generally reflects the first view: the MT Psalter existed contemporaneously with the “11QPs^a Psalter” in wider Judaism (see the second and third points above). Wilson, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll 11QPs^a Reconsidered,” 641, entertains both scenarios. There he outlines three hypothetical ways to understand 11QPs^a’s place in the history of the Psalter. The first is essentially Skehan’s (et al.) view that 11QPs^a presupposes the “fixed and canonized” MT. The second is that 11QPs^a “is an intermediate form prior to the fixation of the Psalter.” And third, that it presents a competing text tradition beside the MT Psalter, providing the impetus for later recognition of the “leaner MT” as the official text. In both the second and third scenarios, Pss 1–100 are “fixed” at an early stage. However, the third scenario implies that Pss 1–150 were, for all intents and purposes “fixed” also, even if not universally (!) recognized as “the official text.” So in terms of the MT’s *composition history*, there seems to be no significant difference between options 1 and 3, and what differences there are arise from some subtle distinction between “fixation” and “canonization.” Therefore, unless one sees 11QPs^a as an intermediate form of the developing MT Psalter (Wilson’s second option), Flint’s suggestion that the “11QPs^a Psalter” was an alternative to the MT is virtually without consequence if it was a uniquely Qumranic edition. Cf. Zenger, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 366–67, for whom the Qumran MSS are irrelevant for dating the Mt Psalter’s composition.

Evaluation

One's view of 11QPs^a's provenance is very important for interpreting Wilson's and Flint's statistics. According to Wilson's data 11QPs^a accounts for 26 of the 31 instances of variation (84%) for psalms from Books IV–V; a percentage that jumps to 90% if we include 11QPs^b.¹³¹ Without 11QPs^a, then, Wilson's and Flint's statistics are far less impressive. It therefore matters a great deal if 11QPs^a reflects the state of affairs at Qumran alone or a more widespread situation. However Flint's arguments for wider provenance suffers serious flaws. First, he claims that "[a]ll the individual compositions in 11QPs^a seem to predate the Qumran period."¹³² Flint has in mind here the non-canonical compositions, which he dates to B.C. third century or earlier.¹³³ But all this proves is that the compilers copied previously authored material, which is unsurprising and says nothing about them as an arranged collection. Second, "the absence of 'sectually explicit' Qumranic indicators"¹³⁴ is precisely that: an argument from absence in a partially preserved scroll. Third, Flint suggests that 11QPs^a's "[e]xpanded orthography is by no means a sure indicator of Qumranic provenance."¹³⁵ Against the second of Flint's claims listed here, "expanded orthography" is very much a characteristic of Qumran MSS.¹³⁶ So, while Flint is probably correct to warn against firm conclusions on the basis of orthography, it would be more accurate to describe 11QPs^a's expanded orthography as "an *uncertain* indicator of Qumranic provenance." Finally, Flint correctly infers from David's Compositions (column XXVII)¹³⁷ that

¹³¹ 11QPs^b agrees with 11QPs^a in its contradiction of the MT ordering of Books IV–V psalms: Pss 141→133→144. See Wilson, *Editing*, 117.

¹³² Flint, "The Book of Psalms," 470.

¹³³ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 199.

¹³⁴ Flint, "The Book of Psalms," 470.

¹³⁵ Flint, "The Book of Psalms," 470

¹³⁶ See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 108–9.

¹³⁷ Line 6 claims that David provided 365 psalms for the perpetual offering, one for each day of the year (התמיד לכול יום ויום לכול ימי השנה ארבעה וששים ושלוש מאות).

11QPs^a reflects a solar calendar. Since the solar calendar was used “among other Jewish circles”¹³⁸ as well, Flint finds cause to dismiss Goshen-Gottstein’s view that 11QPs^a’s acceptance of the solar calendar indicates its sectarian origin.¹³⁹ While Flint probably has the better of the argument with Goshen-Gottstein on this point, the solar calendar issue is immaterial. That 11QPs^a should reflect a characteristic that is widespread in Judaism does not make 11QPs^a the product of wider Judaism. Thus, Flint’s arguments do no more than establish the possibility of wider provenance in certain respects. On the other hand, MasPs^b’s affiliation with the MT Psalter suggests that a geographical explanation for 11QPs^a’s different arrangement should be entertained.¹⁴⁰

Flint claims that three MSS testify to the existence of the hypothetical “11QPs^a Psalter” (11QPs^a, 11QPs^b, and 4QPs^c). Specifically, he claims that, “[w]hile the earlier part of the 11QPs^a-Psalter is not found in 11QPs^a, material from both Psalms i–lxxxix and the later part is preserved in both 4QPs^c and 11QPs^b.”¹⁴¹ Of these 4QPs^c yields seven canonical psalms from Books I–III while 11QPs^b yields two.¹⁴² However, Flint exaggerates the correspondence between 4QPs^c and 11QPs^a when he claims that 4QPs^c reflects *five* psalms in a sequence known from 11QPs^a: “cxviii→civ→[cxlvi]→cv→cxlvi.”¹⁴³ Psalm 147 is absent from 4QPs^c, as indicated by his square brackets. He is probably correct in identifying Ps 118, even though only a

¹³⁸ Flint, “The Book of Psalms,” 470.

¹³⁹ Goshen-Gottstein, “The Psalms Scroll [11QPs^a],” 28n30.

¹⁴⁰ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 200, draws the valid distinction “between the origin of *collections* and production of individual *scrolls*” (emphasis original). Once again, however, this line of reasoning merely permits the possibility that 11QPs^a reflects a recognized collection. As we shall see, the evidence for the “11QPs^a Psalter” is not that strong, however.

¹⁴¹ Flint, “The Book of Psalms,” 462.

¹⁴² Flint, “The Book of Psalms,” 462n57, summarizes, “In 4QPs^c: Psalms lxxvi 10–12; lxxvii 1; lxxviii (*sic!*) 6–7, 31–33; lxxxii 2–3; lxxxvi 10–11; lxxxviii 1–5; lxxxix 44–48, 50–53. In 11QPs^b: Psalms lxxvii 18–21; lxxviii 1.”

¹⁴³ Flint, “The Book of Psalms,” 462n56.

meager portion of its final v. 29 remains (טוב כי לע).¹⁴⁴ On the other hand, his identification of Ps 146 is based solely on הללויה as the surviving text. This psalm remnant follows Ps 105 in 4QPs^e, and since MT Ps 106 also begins with הללויה, this textual remnant is at least as likely to be Ps 106 as Ps 146—not to mention other Halleluiahs psalms.¹⁴⁵ We are therefore left with a four psalm sequence of Pss 118, 104, 105,¹⁴⁶ and possibly 106, which is no closer to the 11QPs^a sequence than the MT. So while 4QPs^e clearly differs from the MT sequence of psalms overall, it does not offer very solid support 11QPs^a and may even contradict it.¹⁴⁷ Flint makes a stronger argument in the case of 11QPs^b, whose sequence of Pss 141, 133, and 144—as well as the apocryphal “Plea for Deliverance”—matches that found in 11QPs^a.¹⁴⁸ But since 11QPs^b supports only Pss 77–78 from the supposedly stabilized collection, its support for the hypothetical “11QPs^a Psalter” overall is very minimal. In sum, the evidence for an “11QPs^a Psalter” comprised of “Psalms i–lxxxix followed by the arrangement preserved in 11QPs^a” is very thin, and illustrates the difficulties raised by the fragmentary nature of the evidence.

Several other observations work against the hypothetical “11QPs^a Psalter.” First, some MSS actually contradict the psalm sequence in 11QPs^a. 4QPs^d is noteworthy here because it reverses the sequence of Pss 147 and 104 from that found in 11QPs^a 5 II. Similarly, Wilson admits that 4QPs^f’s “placement...of the ‘Apostrophe to Zion’ immediately preceding other

¹⁴⁴ Psalm 118:29’s reconstructed form is the thanksgiving formula: יהודו ליהוה כִּי־טוֹב כִּי לְעוֹלָם חַסְדּוֹ. The thanksgiving formula occurs in various places, but only Ps 118 concludes with it, and the blank space after this verse in 4QPs^e 5 I probably indicates that this line contained the concluding line of a psalm. Cf. Wilson, *Editing*, 104.

¹⁴⁵ Wilson, *Editing*, 104, agrees that “it is impossible to conclusively identify it, though Ps 106 may be the logical choice.”

¹⁴⁶ Assuming that fragments 15–16 and 17–18 I are properly ordered.

¹⁴⁷ Dahmen, *Psalm- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum*, 231, similarly concludes, “daß 4QPs^e kein Parallelexemplar dieser Rolle 11QPs^a sein kann.”

¹⁴⁸ Wilson, *Editing*, 114. Wilson also identifies in 11QPs^b part of a “Catena” of different verses found in 11QPs^a, i.e., Ps 118:1, 15–16.

apocryphal compositions does not confirm the order of 11QPs^a where this work was followed immediately by the canonical Ps 93 and then eight other canonical psalms.”¹⁴⁹ Skehan notes these and several other instances that contradict 11QPs^a.¹⁵⁰ The apparent flexibility with which the Qumran MSS order their psalms suggests that talk of an “11QPs^a Psalter” overstates the “fixed” or authoritative status of its particular sequence at Qumran, let alone wider Judaism. More consistent with the available evidence, Heinz-Josef Fabry believes that individual psalms were rearranged for specific purposes at Qumran, and that this sufficiently explains the variety and diversity of psalms scrolls at Qumran.¹⁵¹

Second, Beckwith questions the statistical reliability of the surviving Qumran MSS, claiming that “only three manuscripts, in total, speak for Book II of the Psalter, and only three for Book III; and even for Book I there are still two irregular manuscripts, the same as for Book IV.” He concludes that “the abundance of evidence for irregularities in Book IV–V corresponds directly to the abundance of manuscript material for those two books.”¹⁵² Beckwith’s argument thus recalls the point made earlier that 11QPs^a and 11QPs^b account for 90% of the evidence against the MT arrangement with respect to Books IV–V.

Third, Andrew E. Steinmann claims that “all of the scholars who deny that the standard collection of 150 psalms was a closed, stabilized collection (Sanders, Wilson, and Flint) ignore

¹⁴⁹ Wilson, *Editing*, 68. Wilson offers this conclusion notwithstanding some uncertainties about the integrity of 4QPs^f in other respects.

¹⁵⁰ Skehan, “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” 166, adds 4QPs^k to the list of contradictory MSS. Whereas 4QPs^k preserves the bottoms of two adjacent columns containing Pss 135 and (according to Skehan) 99:1–5, in 11QPs^a Ps 135 “is followed by Ps 136, borrowings from Ps 118, Ps 145, the apocryphal Ps 154, and so on, with no room for the text of 4QPs^k.” Wilson, *Editing*, 106, expresses doubts about Skehan’s identification of Ps 99, but this in no wise impairs the fact that 4QPs^k testifies against 11QPs^a.

¹⁵¹ Heinz-Josef Fabry, “Der Psalter in Qumran,” in *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum* (ed. Erich Zenger; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1998), 137–63 (esp. 159). Fabry nevertheless recognizes a “Qumran Psalter” that he describes as “flexible” in a few points.

¹⁵² Beckwith, “The Early History of the Psalter,” 21–22.

the implication that 11QPs^a itself is assuming that 150 is the basic number of psalms. These scholars never address this point and do not offer any defense for rejecting it as relevant.”¹⁵³ Steinmann’s claim that 11QPs^a assumes 150 to be a “standard” number arises from Skehan’s assessment of the prose catalogue (“David’s Compositions”) in column 27.¹⁵⁴ This credits David with 3600 psalms (תהלים), counts an additional 450 songs for daily, weekly (every Sabbath), and festival occasions, and for praying over the sick (446 + 4), and then lists the total of 4050. Skehan recognizes the divisibility of all three figures by 150 as testimony to the established significance of 150 for psalm collections, hence the MT Psalter.¹⁵⁵

In conclusion, the relationship of Qumran MSS to the canonical Psalter as Wilson and Flint interpret it remains highly speculative, and others more convincingly explain the Qumran MSS as creative, probably liturgical arrangements that presuppose an existing MT Psalter. In terms of genre, it seems reasonable to expect that hymnic material would be susceptible to reorganization according to the peculiarities of a community. Since there is little to commend a wider provenance for 11QPs^a, the different arrangement in 11QPs^a seems best explained by the Qumran community’s idiosyncratic liturgical needs.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵³ Andrew E. Steinmann, *The Oracles of God: The Old Testament Canon* (St. Louis: CPH, 1999), 76. Beckwith, “The Early History of the Psalter,” 22, makes the same point.

¹⁵⁴ Skehan, “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” 169–70, adds, “that [11QPs^a] begins the last 50 of the 150 Psalms is of a piece with the kind of mathematics in the catalogue of col. xxvii.”

¹⁵⁵ Furthermore, that the prose catalogue refers to the number of psalms written by David specifically as תהלים—the title given to the canonical MT Psalter—itsself suggests the possibility that its author recognized a close association between David and all 150 MT תהלים.

¹⁵⁶ N.B. the insular and sectarian nature of the Qumran community suggested by such MSS as the Damascus Document and the Community Rule. Moreover, MasPs^b confirmation of the MT Psalter further suggests that 11QPs^a’s different arrangement should be explained geographically.

The LXX Psalter and the MT Psalter

The LXX is further evidence to be reckoned against the Qumran Psalms Hypothesis and its implication that only Books I–III had stabilized as a collection by the 2d century B.C. Indeed, Mitchell and Beckwith both claim that the translation of LXX in the 2d century B.C. precludes a late date for the final form MT Psalter claimed by Wilson.¹⁵⁷ A fuller discussion of the LXX's relationship to the MT Psalter can be found in Appendix A. Here we shall make a few summary observations that favor these scholars' view rather than Wilson's.

For his part, Wilson does not deny that the Hebrew Psalter was translated into Greek, but disputes its content at the time, implying this could have been the earlier form of the Psalter advocated by his theory (i.e., Books I–III) rather than the canonical MT Psalter.¹⁵⁸ However, the LXX's macrostructural dependence on the MT Psalter is clear, notwithstanding its different division and conjoining of psalms and the addition of Ps 151, also testified at Qumran. Moreover, while the LXX Psalter shows many differences in superscriptional data, these always expand on their MT source rather than remove material; a pattern consistent throughout all five Books.¹⁵⁹ The only exceptions are the missing Davidic attributions to MT Pss 122 and 124 in LXX Pss 121 and 123. The simplest explanation is that the LXX scribes had the whole MT Psalter before them. On the other hand, Wilson's theoretical proposition of a smaller, earlier collection must offer an unnecessarily complicated account of how the LXX Psalter came to preserve the MT Psalter so precisely if its original translation was only partial. One might claim a later revision of the LXX that sought to conform it to the MT text. However, the LXX's

¹⁵⁷ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 16; Beckwith, "Early History of the Psalter," 6. Menahem Haran also dates the LXX to the first half of the second century B.C. at the latest. Haran, "11QPs^a and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minhah le-Nahum* (ed. M. Brettler and Michael Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 194n2, notes that "Greek translations of Chronicles and Esther appeared already in the second century BCE, and it cannot be supposed that the Greek translation of the Psalms came after these."

¹⁵⁸ Wilson, "King, Messiah, and the Reign of God," 394.

¹⁵⁹ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 17–18.

preservation of the MT's macrostructure and superscriptional traditions presumes that the whole MT 150 had stabilized when the "final" LXX Psalter took shape. Thus it is more likely that the "final" MT Psalter had attained authoritative status by the time the LXX Psalter was complete and that the final MT Psalter must have existed for some time for the LXX translators to so respect its form. Moreover, the character of the differences we do see between the LXX and MT Psalters point in this direction too. The LXX's expansions seem largely interpretive by offering further information about individual psalms (e.g., the Davidic identity of the psalmist in Pss 92–98 et al.) or the Psalter as a whole (e.g., the postscriptural character of Ps 151, which the LXX explicitly describes as "outside the number" [ἐξῴθηεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ]). In keeping with Steinman's argument above, then, this situation better fits a scenario whereby the MT Psalter sequence of 150 psalms had become sacrosanct to the Greek translators, not merely Books I–III. On the other hand, Wilson's A.D. 1st century dating of the MT Psalter would require an extremely late date for a "final" LXX Psalter as we know it. Certainly the LXX and MT Psalters could not have been contemporary editions of the Psalter during some hypothetical stage when their canonical status was still "up in the air" along with a Qumran Psalter, as the Qumran Psalms Hypothesis suggests.

In conclusion, the LXX offers no direct evidence of the compositional history of the MT except to confirm the established authority of its macrostructure in the 2d century B.C., thus adding another reason to question the Qumran Psalms Hypothesis. Furthermore, LXX scribes' efforts to preserve MT superscriptional traditions offers important evidence that superscriptional data was held in high regard by ancient scribes. The additional Davidic attribution found in psalms like the above examples offers an important window into how ancient scribes understood the MT Psalter, and underscores the care with which they sought to preserve them.

Editorial Use of Superscripts

In contrast to Wilson's propositions about the Psalter's history and theological agenda, his observations about the deliberate use of superscripts have met with relatively little disagreement.

We shall therefore address the organizational function of authorial attribution, genre, and other elements (esp. historical prologues), as well as יהוה and יהוה לללו psalms.

Authorship as a Principle of Organization

There can be no doubt that editors deliberately grouped psalms by common author. This is clearly visible throughout the Psalter, no matter how many editorial stages are posited. Book I (Pss 3–41) is clearly Davidic, besides anonymous Pss 10 and 33. Psalm 10 may form a broken acrostic with Ps 9, but its quasi-Davidic status can be inferred from its strongly Davidic context. The same may be said for Ps 33. Furthermore, scholars have recognized affinities between Ps 33 and Pss 32 and 34, which would seem to confirm editorial intention to associate it with David.¹⁶⁰

Books II and III contain several clear author groups: a Korahite group (Pss 42–49), a Davidic group (Pss 51–72), an Asaph group (Pss 73–83), and another Korahite group (Pss 84–85, 87–88). Several instances require further comment. First, Pss 50 and 86 are special cases because they occur as isolated, attributed psalms. Whatever the specific reasons for Asaph Ps

¹⁶⁰ Norbert L. Lohfink, “The Covenant Formula in Psalm 33,” in *The God of Israel and the Nations: Studies in Isaiah and the Psalms* (ed. Norbert L. Lohfink and Erich Zenger; trans. Everett R. Kalin; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000), 117, suggests that Ps 33 was created for its present location. Lohfink further cites Hossfeld and Zenger, “‘Von Seinem Thron sitz Schaut Er Nieder Auf Alle Bewohner Der Erde’ (Ps 33, 14): Redaktionsgeschichte Und Kompositionskritik Der Psalmengruppe 25–34,” in *‘Wer Ist Wie Du, Herr, Unter Den Göttern?’ Studien zur Theologie und Religionsgeschichte für Otto Kaiser zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Ingo et al. Koltspierper; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1994), 375–88, who view Ps 33 as “supplemental commentary” to Ps 32. Regarding the affinities between Pss 33 and 34, see Pierre Auffret, “‘Allez, Fils, Entendez-Moi!’ Etude Structurale Du Psaume 34 et son Rapport au Psaume 33,” *EgT* 19 (1988): 5–31. Furthermore, Gerald H. Wilson, “The Use of ‘Untitled’ Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter,” *ZAW* 97 (1985): 408, compares the oft-noted similarity between 32:11 and 33:1 to “the Mesopotamian practice of providing successive tablets in a series with ‘tag lines’ in the colophon which consisted of the incipit (opening line) of the next tablet in sequence.”

Wilson, “The Use of ‘Untitled’ Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter,” 405–7, notes that the MT, Targum and 4QPs^a (B.C. 2nd century) lack a superscript for Ps 33, whereas LXX adds Τῷ Δαυὶδ and 4QPs^a (A.D. 1st century) adds יהוה לללו מְזִמֹר. Wilson believes the MT form to be authentic due to the LXX’s and 4QPs^a’s discordant witness and because 4QPs^a is later. Wilson, sees these as “secondary attempts to resolve the peculiarity” of untitled Ps 33.

50's dislocation from the main Asaph group (see Chapters Three and Five), its thematic affinities with Ps 51 suggests deliberate placement, as does the common genre of Pss 49–51 (מְזֹמֵר) according to Wilson's "softening" theory. On the other hand, a single Davidic psalm, Ps 86, splits the Korahite group Pss 84–88, though its superscript bears no resemblance to theirs.¹⁶¹ This can hardly be random either. Its centrality to the Korahite group finds a likely counterpart in Ps 78, which is the central psalm of the Asaph collection. At the very end of Ps 78 we find the only mention of David in the Asaph group, where he is called Yahweh's עֶבְדְּךָ (v. 70). Meanwhile, the psalmist in Ps 86 refers to himself as "your servant" (עַבְדְּךָ) three times (vv. 2, 4, and 16). Moreover, the oft-noted lament of Ps 89 confirms the specific importance of David as Yahweh's servant (cf. vv. 4, 21, and 40) in Book III. Further investigation must wait until Chapter Six, but these observations make it clear that the names atop the psalms were important to the editors, and that authorial attribution played an important role in the placement of these psalms. Second, Pss 43 and 71 lack superscripts but show signs of deliberate association with their attributed neighbors, just like Pss 10 and 33 in Book I.¹⁶² Psalms 42 and 43 share a common refrain (42:6, 12; and 43:5). Psalm 71 creates a noteworthy thematic sequence with Ps 72 and lies between Davidic Ps 70 and the "Davidizing" postscript of 72:20, about which we shall say more shortly. Third, anonymous Pss 66–67 are likewise "sandwiched" between Davidic Pss 65 and 68, and show further evidence of deliberate association with their neighbors through common genre (all

¹⁶¹ Besides the difference in authorial attribution, Ps 86 is a הַתְּפִלָּה, whereas Ps 85 is a מְזֹמֵר and Ps 87 a מְזֹמֵר שִׁיר.

¹⁶² Regarding untitled Pss 10, 33, 43, and 71, Wilson, *Editing*, 131–32, notes that, "[f]or each of these there is strong Mss evidence for combination with the ps which precedes... One is inclined to explain this phenomenon of combination as a secondary attempt to resolve the "problem" presented by the presence of such "untitled" pss in their MT context." See also, Wilson, "The Use of 'Untitled' Psalms," 404–8. Wilson, *Editing*, 173–77, thinks the MT preserves "alternate traditions": one tradition has the second psalm conjoined with its predecessor; the other recognizes its independence. Cf. R. Dean Anderson Jr., "The Division and Order of the Psalms," *WTJ* 56 (1994): 228–31.

four psalms have מְזֹמֵר and שִׁיר in their superscripts). Lastly, Pss 87–89 are uniquely linked via authorial attribution. The “double” superscript of Ps 88 attributes it to the Korahites (like Ps 87 preceding it) and to an Ezrahite (like Ps 89 after it). Wilson sums up Ps 88 thus, “Perhaps the present extended s/s is an attempt to preserve alternate traditions about this ps... Regardless of the origin, its effect is quite clear. The first half binds Ps 88 with what precedes (the Qorahite collection) while the second half, with its use of the terms mśky| and h'zrhy, binds it to Ps 89 as well.”¹⁶³ We will address this further below.

Book IV exhibits the lowest proportion of attributed psalms, with just three of its seventeen psalms bearing a name (Ps 90: לְמִשְׁחָה; Pss 101 and 103: לְדָוִד). Thus, lexical and thematic links are relatively more important for establishing editorial intent to group the psalms of Book IV. Indeed, on a synchronic reading, Lohfink and Zenger suggest that Pss 90–92 are “Mosaic” due to common themes, and that Pss 101–106 are “Davidic” because they constitute three pairs of “twin” psalms.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, the Pss 101–103 sequence reflects the same “sandwiching” technique observable with Pss 9–11, 32–33, 42–44 etc. Psalm 102 is headed “the prayer of a poor man, when he pours out his complaint before Yahweh” (תְּפִלָּה לְעַנִּי כִּי־יַעֲטֹף וְלִפְנֵי יְהוָה (יִשְׁפָּךְ שִׁירָו:)), and it would seem that editors identified this anonymous “poor man” as the “David” of the preceding and following psalms; a suggest we shall address further in Chapter Six. Moreover, Davidic Pss 122 and 124, and 131 and 133 similarly “Davidize” their intervening psalm with the Songs of Ascent. This is especially clear in the latter case because Ps 132 ostensibly focuses on David and the Davidic covenant.¹⁶⁵ In the case of the former, 11QPs^a attributes Ps 123 to David, suggesting that it was read as a Davidic psalm.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ Wilson, *Editing*, 165.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Erich Zenger, “The God of Israel’s Reign Over the World (Psalms 90–106) in *The God of Israel and the Nations* (ed. Norbert L. Lohfink and Erich Zenger; trans Everett R. Kalin; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000), 167–68, 183–90.

¹⁶⁵ The location of these two Davidic either side of Solomonian Ps 127 in the approximate middle of the Songs

Book V has two main clusters of Davidic psalms: Pss 108–110 and Pss 138–140. Beyond these there are only five attributed psalms, and all occur in the Songs of Ascent (Davidic Pss 122, 124, 131, and 133; and Solomonic Ps 127). Otherwise Book V displays several conspicuous groups of psalms recognizable by their superscripts as in the Songs of Ascent, **שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת**, (Pss 120–134) or as clustered Halleluiahs psalms (Pss 111–117). These groups are obviously not organized by author. Uniquely, the Songs of Ascent prioritize *genre* over authorship!

Genre

We have briefly summarized Wilson’s observations regarding the use of genre categories to “soften” the transition between differently attributed groups (or individual psalms in the case of Ps 50), except at Book divisions. Strictly speaking only Books II–III use *genre* to this effect, however. As noted above, Book I is essentially Davidic, and therefore has no author transitions that need softening. Similarly, Books IV and V contain far fewer attributed psalms and therefore do not create the same conditions either. On the other hand, Books II–III exhibit several places where superscriptional arrangement appears to soften transitions. The Korahite-Asaph-Davidic sequence in Pss 49–51 (all **מְזֻמָּר**) and Asaph-Korahite transition between Pss 83 and 84 (both **מְזֻמָּר**)¹⁶⁷ are the chief instances where genre appears to “soften” transitions specifically between *author*-groups. As mentioned above, the combination of **מְזֻמָּר** and **שִׁיר** throughout each of Pss 65–68 suggests the same use of genre, but there the softening effect appears to ensure that

of Ascent also seems significant. We take this up further in Chapter Six.

¹⁶⁶ In 11QPs^a, Ps 123’s superscript reads **לְדוֹיֵד לְמַעֲלוֹת** [שִׁיר ל]. See Flint, “The Book of Psalms,” 456n17. Given that Ps 123 is Davidized via the sandwiching technique in the MT, it is tempting to explain the 11QPs^a superscript as a secondary attempt to make its Davidic status explicit. Flint, “The Book of Psalms,” 456, indicates that in general “[t]he extant superscriptions reveal little variation in comparison with the MT-Psalter,” citing only this example and Ps 145:1 as “interesting exceptions.” Psalm 145’s superscript in the MT reads **תְּהִלָּה לַדָּוִד** (praise-hymn) but appears as **תְּפִלָּה לַדָּוִד** (thanksgiving hymn) in 11QPs^a. This is probably best explained as פ/ת confusion or scribal correction (wittingly or not) toward the commoner genre type.

¹⁶⁷ In fact Pss 82–85 are all **מְזֻמָּר**, of which Ps 83 is also designated **שִׁיר**.

anonymous Pss 66–67 are “Davidized” within David II. Moreover, Pss 87–89 provide a comparable, if unique, example. We noted above that Ps 88’s double authorship binds it to both its predecessor and the following psalm. The same applies to genre: Pss 87–88 are both *שִׁיר מְזֻמָּר*, while Pss 88–89 are both designated *מִשְׁכֵּיל*. These genre designations correspond to the Korahite and Ezrahite attributions respectively, and reinforce the linking function of these superscriptional elements.

Wilson’s theory does not explain the whole story, however. Leslie McFall observes that psalms appear to be sorted by genre in Book II as well. He notes that only Book II has conspicuous genre groupings because it alone has a variety of genres in sufficient quantities for such groupings to be possible.¹⁶⁸ However McFall’s view of genre as a “sorting” principle does not satisfactorily explain exceptions like Davidic Ps 51 (*מְזֻמָּר*), which differs generically from the subsequent Pss 52–55 group (*מִשְׁכֵּיל*). It seems, then, that both theories explain features that the other overlooks. In fact, where there is overlap they are quite compatible. For instance, within McFall’s larger group of Davidic *מְזֻמָּר* Pss 62–68, the editors positioned Pss 65 and 68—the only psalms also designated *שִׁיר* in this group—either side of anonymous *מְזֻמָּר שִׁיר* Pss 66–67. It appears, then, that genre functions both as a sorting principle within author groups and as a “softening” technique to bind psalms more closely together in Book II.

More questionably, McFall argues that editors concluded genre-groups with a psalm in which author-genre sequence as found throughout the group is reversed, citing Pss 19–24, 38–40, 56–60, and 75–77.¹⁶⁹ However, the exceptions to this pattern are numerous.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, Ps 41

¹⁶⁸ Leslie McFall, “The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter,” *WTJ* 62 (2000), 233. The genre blocks in Book II are as follows: Pss 42, 44–45 = *מִשְׁכֵּיל*; Pss 45–46 = *שִׁיר*; Pss 47–51 = *מְזֻמָּר* (Ps 48 also a *שִׁיר*); Pss 52–55 = *מִשְׁכֵּיל*; Pss 56–60 = *מִכְתָּם*; Pss 62–68 = *מְזֻמָּר*, of which 65–68 are also identified as *שִׁיר*.

¹⁶⁹ McFall, “The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter,” 235.

¹⁷⁰ Other examples of three or more psalms in sequence that are of the same or similar genre include: Pss 3–6, 29–31, 42–44 (counting 42–43 together), 47–49, 52–55, 62–65. Each group either retains the same author-genre sequence for all their superscripts or reverses the sequence multiple times.

disqualifies McFall’s second example because its superscript resumes the original genre-author sequence of Pss 38–39. Given the subsequent change in authorship in Ps 42 and doxology in 41:14, Ps 41 must be the true conclusion of this group of מְזִמּוֹר psalms (and Book I) rather than Ps 40. In addition, McFall speculates that portions of the present superscripts—including genre—might originally have been *postscripts*, and that editors “imposed uniformity on the final arrangement [by] the positioning of all postscript material at the head of the Psalm,” citing Habakkuk 3:1–19 as a precedent.¹⁷¹ This is too speculative to seriously entertain.¹⁷² However it becomes especially important in McFall’s alternative view of the Pss 87–89 sequence from that of Wilson summarized above. For McFall, the first part of Ps 88’s superscript (שִׁיר מְזִמּוֹר לְבַיִת) (קָרַח) was originally a postscript to Ps 87 that reverses the author-genre sequence of Pss 84–85, and 87.¹⁷³ Thus, Ps 88’s original “singular” superscript read לְמִנְצַחַת עַל-מַחְלַת לְעֵנּוֹת מְשָׁפִיל לְהִימָן הָאֲזִזְרָחִי; the “double” tradition resulting from an error in psalm division during the Psalter’s transmission. Apart from the speculative nature of the argument, there are several other problems. First, it would be the only other (originally) deliberate postscript besides 72:20 in the psalms, as McFall himself admits.¹⁷⁴ Second, while McFall correctly recognizes that “the term לְמִנְצַחַת is not in its normal initial position” in Ps 88:1 and that “[t]his is unique in the Psalter,”¹⁷⁵ Ps 88’s double superscript is itself unique. In any case, לְמִנְצַחַת retains its usual initial position according to Wilson’s double tradition explanation, since it constitutes the first element of the second tradition. Third, McFall claims that “four prime witnesses agree in placing the proposed

¹⁷¹ McFall, “The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter,” 236–37.

¹⁷² Note, too, the observation made earlier that MT editors did *not* impose uniformity on the position of הַלְלוּ הָיָה in the case of Halleluiah psalms in Books IV–V, even though the LXX divides the text so Ἀλληλουια only occupies the superscript position.

¹⁷³ Beckwith, “Early History,” 8, entertains this possibility.

¹⁷⁴ McFall, “The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter,” 239.

¹⁷⁵ McFall, “The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter,” 238 (italics original).

postscript in no-man’s land,” between Pss 87 and 88, appealing to gaps in Leningrad Codex 19^a and three other witnesses. However, L leaves an entire line vacant between Ps 87:7 and the “first” superscript atop Ps 88, whereas Ps 88’s “second” superscript occupies its own line as is normal for the Codex. Thus, McFall’s “open section break” between the two parts of the double superscript seems due simply to the presence of two superscripts and nothing more. Moreover, the final portion of the “second” superscript, מְשָׁכִיל לְהִימָן הָאֲזָרְחִי, is also set off from the preceding superscriptional material by a small gap, which cautions against reading too much into the space between the two superscripts. Fourth, שִׁיר מְזֻמֹּר לְבָנֵי קָרַח resembles the other Korahite superscripts in every way. Even if editors did reverse the author-genre sequence to conclude generically similar psalms, there is no reason why it could not name Ps 88 as the last Korahite psalm of the שִׁיר מְזֻמֹּר genre. Finally, if editors imposed a general uniformity on the psalms by shifting postscript material to the superscriptional position, we may wonder how this “postscript” escaped their attention long enough to later be confused with Ps 88.

In conclusion, McFall’s account of Ps 88:1 is not compelling, and does not seriously challenge Wilson’s theory that editors softened author transitions within books in Books II–III. The only exception is Davidic Ps 86. But its above-mentioned centrality to the Korahite group and thematic and lexical affinities with Ps 78 suggest that Ps 86 is structurally integral to Book III.

Other Superscriptional Elements

Further superscriptional elements include brief historical prologues and possible tunes and musical directions of various sorts. These elements are typically more sporadic than author and genre categories in their distribution, and yield no clear editorial techniques for organizing psalms.¹⁷⁶ However, the general distribution these features in the Psalter may reflect on the relative character of its books.

¹⁷⁶ Brevard Childs, “Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis,” *JSS* 16 (1971): 137–50. Childs attributes the

For instance, twelve out of thirteen historical notes in the Psalter occur in Books I–II, eight of which occur in Book II alone.¹⁷⁷ Their predominance in Books I–II suggests that the editor(s) who arranged these books wished to reflect a stronger historical focus on David’s life. Similarly, musical directions and tunes—whatever their precise meanings—occur only in the first three books, with Book II showing the highest concentration.¹⁷⁸ Their predominance in Books I–III probably reflects a similar intention to accentuate David’s role as a psalm-singer as well as the Temple musicians (i.e., Korah, Asaph, Heman, and Ethan) who are strongly represented in these Books.

וַיְהִי and הַלְלֵהוּ Psalms. Wilson theorizes that וַיְהִי psalms begin groups of psalms and הַלְלֵהוּ psalms conclude them, resulting in several subgroups within Books IV and V. First, the הַלְלֵהוּ Pss 104–106 conclude Book IV, and therefore coincide with the 106:48 doxology. This leads Wilson to recognize three main groups in Book V: Pss 107–117, Pss 118–135, and Pss 136–145, after which comes the final doxological conclusion to the whole Psalter in Pss 146–150.¹⁷⁹ On the one hand, this breakdown allows Wilson to recognize the integrity of the Songs of Ascent (Pss 120–134) as part of his second group in Book V. On the other hand, his theory implies an editorial division within the Egyptian Hallel group (Pss 113–118) because Ps 118

historical notes to early midrashic exegesis, but does not discuss how this phenomenon might relate to the compositional history of the Psalter and those psalms’ inclusion in it.

¹⁷⁷ Smith, “The Theology of the Redaction of the Psalter,” 408–12. These include Pss 3, 7, 18, and 34 in Book I; Pss 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, and 63 in Book II, and Ps 142 in Book V.

¹⁷⁸ Besides the very frequent לְמִנְצֵחַ (Pss 4–6; 8–14; 18–22; 31; 36; 39–42; 44–47; 49; 51–62; 64–70; 75–77; 80–81; 84–85; 88; and 109), psalms with musical direction or tune notations (or both) include: seven in Book I (Pss 4–6, 8–9, 12, and 22); thirteen in Book II (Pss 45–46, 53–61, 67, and 69); and seven in Book III (Pss 75–77, 80–81, 84, and 88).

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Klaus Koch, “Der Psalter und seine Redaktionsgeschichte,” in *Neue Wege der Psalmenforschung* (ed. Klaus Seybold and Erich Zenger; Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1994), 243–77; and Reinhard Kratz, “Die Tora Davids: Psalm 1 und die doxologische Fünfteilung des Psalters,” *ZTK* 93 (1996): 1–34, who attribute similar functions to וַיְהִי and הַלְלֵהוּ psalms.

(וְהַדָּוָד) introduces Pss 118–135.¹⁸⁰ In general, Wilson finds solid evidence that scribes used doxological conclusions to mark off subsections of their collections, both at Qumran and among more ancient hymnic collections such as the Sumerian Temple Hymns. This offers support to his claim that הַלְלֵי יְהוָה psalms conclude groups. On the other hand, the introductory function of וְהַדָּוָד psalms derives from their position after הַלְלֵי יְהוָה psalms of the previous group, as well as thematic parallels with the הַלְלֵי יְהוָה psalm at the end of the same group, which Wilson considers to be deliberate inclusio.¹⁸¹

It remains open to question whether Wilson’s proposed division of Book V is as important as other more conspicuous groups like Pss 120–134 (Songs of Ascent) and 138–145 (Davidic). This “concluding” function of Halleluiah psalms comports well with that of other doxological elements like Pss 106:48 and 135:21.¹⁸² Nevertheless, Ps 106 creates a small problem for Wilson’s interpretation of וְהַדָּוָד psalms because both Pss 106 and 107 begin with וְהַדָּוָד, while Ps 106 is also a Halleluiah psalm. Clearly Ps 106 cannot both conclude and commence different sections in this case. Indeed, Ps 106 will come up for discussion again when we reevaluate the Psalter’s doxologies.

Returning to the issue of two redactions, Wilson himself recognizes that in 11QPs^a, “[t]here is no clear evidence... of a functional distinction between halelu-yah psalms (for closing segments) and hodu psalms (for opening segments).”¹⁸³ Therefore, the similarity of editorial technique between Books IV–V and 11QPs^a is not so precise as to require more than a general

¹⁸⁰ So objects Zenger, “Composition and Theology,” 87.

¹⁸¹ Wilson, *Editing*, 187–90.

¹⁸² Zenger, “Composition and Theology,” 80, sees Ps 106:48 as a later addition to the psalm, and for that reason thinks that Wilson overstates the concluding significance of הַלְלֵי יְהוָה psalms. However Ps 106’s status as a הַלְלֵי יְהוָה psalm is already established in v. 1. Moreover, one may question whether 106:48 is a later addition at all (see “Doxologies” below).

¹⁸³ Wilson, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a) and the Canonical Psalter: Comparison of Editorial Shaping,” *CBQ* 59 (1997): 448–64 (here 456).

comparison of arranging techniques. Already the far older evidence of the Sumerian Temple Hymns offers an ancient precedent for the closing function of doxological elements, as Wilson himself brought to light.¹⁸⁴ Given that this organizational technique vastly predates the period of scribal activity at Qumran (circa. 200 B.C. to A.D. 100), such similarities as do exist between MT Books IV–V and 11QPs^a are hardly remarkable. Moreover, the absence of יהוה הללוהו psalms in Books I–III renders these books’ dissimilarity to 11QPs^a equally unremarkable. Thus, the similarity of editorial techniques in 11QPs^a and Books IV–V vis-à-vis the relative dissimilarity between the same and Books I–III cannot be relied upon as evidence of two editorial stages.

Summary Remarks on Superscripts and Their Implications

The preceding discussion suggests that the psalms themselves dictate when certain techniques are used, and that superscripts remain the primary means of arranging psalms throughout the Psalter. Redaction-historically speaking, these observations indicate that Wilson et al. exaggerate the differences between editorial techniques evidenced in Book IV–V and those of Books I–III. The differences cannot simply be explained by different (i.e., later) editorial preference, but are in large part due to the psalms themselves—whether they have superscripts and of what kind those superscripts are.

Interestingly, Wilson himself approaches this same conclusion. Regarding the more prominent organizational role that authorship plays in Books I–III than in Books IV–V, he states that this, “is probably due to the paucity of non-Davidic authors for Pss 90–150.”¹⁸⁵ In principle, then, Wilson recognizes that the “frozen” superscriptional material limited the extent to which authorship could play an important organizational role for Books IV–V; that the nature of the psalms themselves accounts for the organizational techniques displayed therein. In practice,

¹⁸⁴ Wilson, *Editing*, 23n31, makes it clear that “the frequent use of concluding doxology in the Hebrew Psalter” includes יהוה הללוהו psalms and not just the doxologies in 41:14, 72:18–19, 89:53, and 106:48.

¹⁸⁵ Wilson, *Editing*, 157–58.

however, Wilson makes little use of this insight. His two-stage redactional theory accentuates the organizational differences between Books I–III and IV–V. For Wilson, then, these differences in organizational technique combine with the DSS evidence (see above) in pointing to two redactional stages.¹⁸⁶ To these factors Wilson adds a third, namely the significant placement of royal psalms (esp. Pss 2, 72, and 89) in Pss 2–89 vis-à-vis wisdom/torah psalms found outside these psalms that he attributes to the second redactional stage (e.g., Pss 1, 90, 107, and 145).¹⁸⁷

This is an opportune time to offer a brief critique of Wilson’s theory as it accounts for these features. To its credit, Wilson’s hypothesis is internally coherent to a fair extent: his two-stage theory offers a generally coherent explanation of the different editorial techniques, the DSS evidence, and the placement of royal psalms if Pss 2–89 are assumed to be the first edition. But when these factors are examined individually, support for theory of two redactional stages is shown to be fragile. As discussed above, the different editorial techniques seem most directly a consequence of the extant superscripts scribes had to work with. We have also seen that the Qumran Psalms Hypothesis itself lacks compelling evidence. The same ensues for the placement of royal and torah/wisdom psalms in the Psalter as Wilson views them. A glance at the Psalter readily shows that Books I–III contain wisdom/torah psalms (e.g., Pss 8, 19, and 73) and Books IV–V contain royal psalms in (e.g., Pss 101, 110, 132, 144, etc.), indicating that royal and wisdom concerns permeate the whole Psalter. For his part, Wilson accounts for the royal psalms in Books IV–V by attributing them to a “royal frame” (Pss 2 and 144) enclosed by an overriding “wisdom frame” (Pss 1 and 145),¹⁸⁸ whereupon he contends that “the shape of the canonical Psalter preserves a tense dialogue (or a dialogue in tension) between royal covenantal hopes

¹⁸⁶ Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter”, 73; and “King, Messiah, and the Reign of God,” 393.

¹⁸⁷ See esp. Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter,” 81.

¹⁸⁸ Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter,” 80–81, suggests that royal Pss 2 and 144 form an inner frame, which is enveloped by Pss 1 and 145. Both pairs of paralleled psalms participate in a larger interlocking royal and wisdom framework.

associated with the first two-thirds of the Psalter and the wisdom counsel to trust YHWH alone associated with the final third.”¹⁸⁹ But it is not clear why these two expressions of hope should be set against each other, or why wisdom Ps 1 provides a redactional corrective to the royal covenantal theology in Ps 2—unless one assumes this at the outset. Moreover, Wilson’s “royal” and “wisdom” frames seem an overly intricate way to justify these theological contrasts and overcome the prevalence of royal and wisdom themes throughout the whole Psalter. Thus, there seems to be very little substantial editorial evidence for Wilson’s hypothesis. On the other hand, Wilson is right to acknowledge that the presence or absence of superscripts often seems to determine which editorial techniques bind such psalms together.

The Postscript of 72:20

Wilson remarks that, “[d]espite the existence of so may [*sic.*] s/ss (and one p/s) of obvious secondary origin (i.e., they do not form an integral part of the compositions they accompany, but evidence various secondary concerns), only *one* of the these explicit statements can be said to exercise any organizational function. The exceptional case is the p/s preserved in Ps 72:20.”¹⁹⁰ Wilson is essentially correct: 72:20 is the only *explicit* organizational evidence in the Psalter, in that it is the only direct editorial comment that relates to a group of psalms. Indeed, none dispute its importance as “editorial evidence.” There is less agreement about its significance and implications, however, and the issues involved have consequences for covenantal perspective in the Psalter.

Wilson illustrates the broader struggle to account for 72:20 when he offers two mutually exclusive views on its place in the Psalter’s formation. In general, Wilson sees 72:20 as evidence that “Books One and Two may have combined to form an earlier collection introduced and concluded by “Royal” pss, a collection which because of its high Davidic content (60 out of 70

¹⁸⁹ Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter,” 81.

¹⁹⁰ Wilson, *Editing*, 139. See also Gerald H. Wilson, “The Shape of the Book of Psalms,” *Int* 46 (1992): 135.

pss) might well justify the description “prayers of David.”¹⁹¹ This notion leads Wilson to recognize different editorial perspectives on the Davidic covenant. For Wilson, Pss 2–72 “might represent a pre-exilic collection reflecting more positively and hopefully on the fortunes of the Davidic kingship, while the extension in 73–89 modifies these hopes in light of the exilic experience.”¹⁹² Elsewhere, however, Wilson speculates that 72:20 “may be a later editorial intrusion that has disturbed the original integrity of the Elohist Psalter.”¹⁹³ Here Wilson seems to acknowledge an originally independent EP. But one cannot have it both ways. If Ps 72 with its postscript “disturbed the original integrity of the Elohist Psalter,” then at no time could it have marked the end of an early form of the Psalter comprising Books I–II.

Scholars generally take 72:20 (בְּלֹוּ תִפְלֹוּת דָּוִד בְּיָשׁוּ׃) to be the remnant of an older collection, normally Pss 51–72.¹⁹⁴ For many the significance of Ps 72 begins and ends there. However, this situation is remarkable in light of the common scholarly presupposition that editors exercised considerable freedom when reshaping and extending earlier collections. If this was indeed the case, and if 72:20 had no further significance than a redactional remnant, then why would editors responsible for Pss 86, 101, 103, 108–110 etc. leave it there? Perhaps the only

¹⁹¹ Wilson, *Editing*, 208; “Shaping the Psalter,” 73; “The Use of Royal Psalms at the ‘Seams’ of the Hebrew Psalter” *JSOT* 35 (1986): 87–89.

¹⁹² Wilson, “The Use of Royal Psalms,” 91.

¹⁹³ Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter,” 77. Wilson goes on to say that his “purpose at this point is to describe the final shape of the Psalter rather than the process by which it assumed that shape. These difficulties, while important and intriguing, are not ultimately decisive for my discussion.” However, the questions of “final form” and “process” intertwine in Wilson’s propositions, since there is no way 72:20 could be added into the *midst* of Pss 42–83 and mark the end of (2)3–72. In general, Wilson’s comment reveals the problem that the EP represents to his general theory of the Psalter’s development if assumed to be a discrete *redactional* unit.

¹⁹⁴ E.g., Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms*, 344; Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel’s Worship*, 2:194; Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 18; Gerstenberger, *Psalms Part 1 with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*, 38. In addition, Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2, 4*, attribute 72:20 to an Asaphite redactor responsible for Pss 50–83, and John Day, *Psalms* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 113, considers that 72:20 and subsequent Davidic psalms “only make sense if books 1–2 originally constituted a separate collection from books 3–5.”

explanation might be that Ps 86 was added at the final redaction as Hossfeld and Zenger hold, and that an originally Messianic Psalter (without any Davidic psalms after 72:20) stood independent long enough that its contents—including 72:20—became sacrosanct for later editors. But even this explanation seems self-defeating, for the later addition of Ps 86 would seem to violate the integrity of the Psalter’s “sacrosanct” appearance.¹⁹⁵

When it comes to assessing 72:70’s editorial significance, then, two distinct issues need to be distinguished: the *origin* of 72:20 (whether originally appended to a different psalm or created for its present context), and the possibility of a new editorial *meaning* or *function* within the expanded collection. Consideration of this second, largely overlooked question yields compelling possibilities.

Even if we suppose that editors appended 72:20 to a theoretical Psalter comprising Pss 51–72 or that an Asaphite editor added it to mark off those Davidic psalms within his newly expanded collection (Pss 50–83), it is plausible that (later) editors intended 72:20 to mark the end of the predominantly Davidic Books I–II within a greater collection. This view has the advantage of crediting 72:20 with a concluding function toward Books I–II without advocating the now generally unpopular view that those books constituted an earlier collection. It also suggests a badly needed rationale for why later editors would retain 72:20 from an earlier collection when they could so easily have rid themselves of it.¹⁹⁶ How, then, might later editors have understood it?

We noted earlier that, unlike ancient interpreters, modern scholars typically steer clear of semantic explanations. Semantically, however, it is striking that David is cited in genealogical

¹⁹⁵ Even the LXX’s expansionistic character would offer no real precedent for such scribal behavior, since it evidences only the expansion of superscripts and, where a psalm *is* added to the established collection (i.e., Ps 151) it appears outside it without disrupting the established sequence.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Wilson, *Editing*, 208; “The use of the Royal Psalms,” 88; and “King, Messiah, and the Reign of God,” 392n5. Day, *Psalms*, 113, takes the same view.

terms with the qualifier **בְּיַמֵּי־שָׁלֹמֹה**. This identifies him as the “historical” David with whom Yahweh made his covenant promises (2Sam 7). Indeed, this is confirmed upon comparison with 2 Sam 23:1, which uses the same full expression (**בְּיַמֵּי־שָׁלֹמֹה דָוִד**) to introduce David’s final words there (**וְאֵלֶּה דְבָרַי דָּוִד הָאֲחֵרִים**). This suggests that editors understood 72:20 to conclude the prayers of the original, *historical* David ben-Jesse.¹⁹⁷ Within the framework of the whole Psalter, editors may have understood this qualification to imply that subsequent Davidically attributed psalms looked forward to a future Davidide. That is, editors had in mind a successor Davidic king—whether *every* Davidide generically or a future eschatological figure, when psalms concern themselves with “David” after Ps 72.¹⁹⁸ Several arguments give considerable credence to this hypothesis.

First, as noted above, twelve of the thirteen psalms bearing historical prologues occur in Books I–II, thus accentuating their historicity.¹⁹⁹ Second, the next Davidic psalm to appear, Ps 86, is superscripted with **לְדָוִד**, the same genre that 72:20 indicates are “ended.” Since Ps

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Rose, “Psaumes,” 569, who notes that exilic editors responsible for a Pss 51–72 collection chose not to describe David by titles such as “king of Israel,” “servant of Yahweh,” “anointed/messiah,” etc., but saw in the figure of David “le modèle de l’homme qui, individuellement, expose ses complaints devant son Dieu.”

¹⁹⁸ The most common way this happens is when psalms are attributed to **לְדָוִד** in their superscripts. Our contention here is that editors primarily had a different *referent* in mind at least in terms of hermeneutical horizon pre- and post-Ps 72: “historical David” and future/eschatological “David.” It is *not* suggested that editors understood the **ל** in **לְדָוִד** pre- and post-Ps 72 to have a different *function*—e.g., “by David” (as author) before Ps 72, and thereafter “for David” or “about David” (lamed of specification; see Ronald J. Williams, *Williams Hebrew Syntax*, [3d ed.; University of Toronto Press: Toronto, 2007], 108).

¹⁹⁹ Smith, “The Theology of the Redaction of the Psalter,” 410, surmises that “[t]he single allusion to David’s life in Book V, namely 142,1, shows that the old David is in view, but his lament in this psalm may assume a paradigmatic character.” Whatever the editor’s intention with this psalm, it is worth noting that this is the briefest historical reference: “when he was in the cave,” (**בְּהַיְוֹתַי בְּמַעְרָה**). It may be a vaguer reference to the same occasion to which Ps 57:1’s much fuller historical prologue refers. Alternatively, the vagueness of the reference may have been meant to dissociate it from this mooring in the historical David’s life to instead reflect Mitchell’s eschatological stricken shepherd (cf. Ps 88).

86 is one of only five תַּפְּלָה psalms in the Psalter (Pss 17, 86, 90, 102, and 142) it is almost inconceivable that editors selected a psalm superscripted לְדָוִד תַּפְּלָה without recognizing the equivalent phrase in 72:20 (cf. תַּפְּלוֹת דָּוִד in 72:20)²⁰⁰ and the sense of contradiction it creates if one and the same David were in view in both places. Indeed, this is the only genre designation that has the capacity to *heighten* the sense of contradiction within the overall Psalter; unless, that is, editors understood those later psalms in terms of a *future* David. Third, Pss 71–72 depict an aging David who hands over the throne to “Solomon.” Brevard Childs suggests that 72:20 influences the meaning of the Solomonic superscription in Ps 72:1. Rather than designate Solomon as the purported *author*, editors intended לְשֹׁלֹמֹה to identify Solomon as the successor-king of Ps 72 for whom *David* prays.²⁰¹ This widely accepted view finds ready support in the first verse, אֱלֹהִים מְשַׁפְּטֵי לְמֹלְךָ תָּגֵן וְצַדִּיקְתָּהּ לְבֹן־מֶלֶךְ, in which “king” (מֶלֶךְ) is paralleled with “the king’s son” (בֶּן־מֶלֶךְ). Since the superscript and postscript identify Solomon and David respectively, the identification of the (new) king with the king’s son in v. 1 suggests that *Solomon* and his immanent reign are the focus of the prayer of Ps 72. Moreover, Ps 71 is the prayer of an aged person, and therefore fits this picture of an elderly David about to cede the throne to his son.²⁰² Thus, the theme of royal succession is already clear from Pss 71–72. In this light, 72:20’s identification of the historical David ben-Jesse virtually expects subsequent

²⁰⁰ Of the five, Pss 90 and 102 are not strictly Davidic, although we noted above that Ps 102 has been Davidized by its insertion between Davidic Pss 101 and 103. Another matter is the position of the athnac in 72:20, יִשְׁעֵי בֶן־יֵשׁוּעַ, that suggests a break in the construct chain, altering its the meaning to “prayers are ended. David, son of Jesse.” It is tempting to see this as the Masorettes’ effort to remove the apparent problem posed by 72:20. Indeed, such an attempt at semantic alteration would resemble the Rabbinic approaches to 72:20 above.

²⁰¹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 516.

²⁰² The psalmist bases his plea for salvation on the fact that Yahweh has been his confidence since his youth and upheld him since the womb (vv. 5–6), explicitly prays that he not be cast off in old age when his strength is gone (v.9), prays that Yahweh not forsake him in his old age and gray hair (v. 18), and reflects on the many troubles and evils Yahweh has made him see, yet saves him.

appearances of some other “Davidic” personage in later psalms. Ezekiel and Hosea prove the plausibility of such an editorial rereading of דָּוִד , since both refer to an anticipated future Davidic king as simply “David.”²⁰³ This is not to suggest that the Psalter loses sight of historical David altogether, but rather that editors intended 72:20 to signal a general shift of focus to a future “David” thereafter within the Psalter’s macrostructure. Moreover, this example shows that editors could ascribe another important role to authorial attribution in the superscripts besides the purely organizational one discussed earlier: namely, to identify the figure by whom (e.g., “David” in Ps 86) or for whom (e.g., Solomon in Ps 72) the psalm is prayed.²⁰⁴

Besides marking the end of David’s prayers, 72:20 also exerts a more immediate function. Not only does it “Davidize” (Solomonic) Ps 72; it also confirms the Davidic identity of the anonymous aged psalmist in Ps 71. This confirms editorial intent behind the sequence described above.²⁰⁵ It also confirms the quasi-attribution of anonymous psalms via the “sandwiching” technique described above.

²⁰³ Cf. Ezek 34:23–24; 37:24–25; and Hos 3:5. NB the reference to “latter days” ($\text{בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים}$) in Hos 3:5.

²⁰⁴ Indeed, editors likely assumed that David wrote all psalms attributed דָּוִד and would have readily recognized the ב as an indication of those psalms’ authorial tradition. But we are also suggesting that, in their arranging of the psalms, editors read and reused psalms headed by דָּוִד as prayers, praises, laments etc. “of/by David” beyond mere authorship, in keeping with ב ’s inherent ambiguity. Within the Psalter as edited product, then, דָּוִד comes to mean “David is praying here” (cf. 72:20); the point at issue being: which “David?” The possibility that editors did not restrict the ב in authorial attributions narrowly to historical authorship is readily demonstrated by the different sense in which editors reused the ascription to *Solomon* in Ps 72’s superscript (see below). It is therefore very plausible that later psalms “of David” are—in editors’ understanding—*prayed* or *declared* “by (a future) David” as appropriate to their genre—without editors denying historical David as their original author. Our proposition means, e.g., that although “David” prays in both Pss 51 and 86 editors recognized the latter as a prayer of a future David and the former as that of historical David (even if editors also saw him as Ps 51’s author!).

²⁰⁵ Earlier we noted a tradition of combining Ps 71 with its predecessor, Davidic Ps 70, and BHS indicates many MSS that conjoin these psalms. If the MT Psalter conjoined them originally, then it could not be claimed that 72:20 “Davidizes” Ps 71, since it would already be part of Davidic Ps 70. However, the evidence seems to favor codex Leningrad’s witness to Ps 71 as distinct (cf. Wilson’s view that the MT preserves two alternate traditions of Ps 71’s independence from and conjunction with Ps 70 by leaving it distinct yet without superscript, as noted

To sum up: 72:20 is an unquestionably strong, unique instance of editorial evidence. Our reevaluation suggests that it is more than a mechanical redactional remnant. Far from problematic due to later Davidic psalms, 72:20 may indicate that the editors responsible for the placement of subsequent Davidic psalms had a Davidic successor in mind—not simply the historical David as an object of nostalgic reminiscence or pious mimesis. Moreover, if the semantic possibilities just explored are correct, the claim that 72:20 signals the existence of an earlier Psalter becomes arbitrary. To return to the two issues we distinguished earlier, it is of course possible that 72:20 owes its *origin* to an earlier collection, and that later editors retained and “reused” it to suit their new purposes. But 72:20 could equally have been created for its present context in a Psalter with subsequent Davidic psalms. On the one hand, this possibility invalidates the claim that 72:20 *must* evidence an earlier collection.²⁰⁶ On the other hand, the new function and meaning of 72:20 in the Psalter just discussed is clearly more significant than questions about origin in any investigation of “David” in the Psalter.

above). There are two main reasons for this conclusion. First, 4QPs^a fragment g conjoins Ps 71 with MT Ps 38 rather than Ps 70, evidencing a tradition of joining Ps 71 to Psalms superscripted with לְדָוִד, and only Pss 38 and 70 fall into this category (see Wilson, *Editing*, 97, 131–32). This weakens the case for Ps 71’s particular identification with Ps 70 originally. It also seems best explained as an effort at handling the absence of any superscript for Ps 71 in the MT. The opposite situation—that Pss 70–71 were originally one in the MT concluding psalms of Book II but were split somewhere in transmission—is, on the other hand, difficult to account for, let alone the attachment of these split off verses to MT Ps 38 in 4QPs^a. Second, whereas the LXX appears to resolve the absence of a superscript for MT Pss 10 and 43 by adjoining them to the preceding psalm, it is notable that LXX Ps 70 [= MT 71] bears the attribution Τῷ Δαυιδ (LXX Ps 32 [= MT Ps 33]), thus testifying to its independence from MT Ps 70. See also Anderson, “Division and order of the Psalms,” 231, who comes to the same conclusion about Ps 71. In the case of other untitled psalms in Books I–III, however, Anderson is reluctant to recognize *editorial* significance to their placement on grounds that they may have been accidentally “split off” from the previous psalm in transmission. But whereas the affinities between these untitled psalms and their predecessors provide a reason why MSS might *conjoin* them in transmission, they also make the reverse scenario more difficult to imagine.

²⁰⁶ E.g., McFall, “The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter,” 243.

“Doublets”

Within the Psalter there are three instances of near-identical psalms or psalm portions: Ps 14 \cong Ps 53; Ps 40:14–18 \cong Ps 70:2–6; and Pss 57:8–12 + 60:7–14 \cong Ps 108:2–14.²⁰⁷ It is generally presupposed that the doublets arose through in the growth process of the Psalter, and therefore offer evidence about that process. For instance, for Millard the Psalter expanded from the Elohist Psalter—itsself an earlier “Psalter”—during which Pss 14, 40:14–18, and 108 were produced as duplications of their Elohist counterparts. Setting aside the specifics of Millard’s proposal, his argument raises possibilities about the editorial significance of the doublets, specifically the question of whether the EP represents an earlier, independent collection or mini Psalter. We will address this more deliberately in the next section and restrict the present discussion to the doublets *per se*.

First, literary critical opinions differ on the direction of dependence. For instance, Kraus claims that Bernhard Duhm “clearly pointed out that the divergent readings of Psalm 53 are in all points secondary over against Psalm 14,” while Millard takes the opposite view.²⁰⁸ Interestingly, Hossfeld and Zenger also account for the differences between Pss 14 and 53 in redactional terms, but attribute those differences to the David I and David II contexts of Pss 14 and 53 respectively.²⁰⁹ They describe Ps 14 as the “model” (*Vorlage*) that is “only slightly altered” by its Ps 53 counterpart,²¹⁰ so that in their view Ps 14 stands closer to an original form that both redactional contexts subsequently adapted to their purposes. Regarding Pss 40:14–18 and 70:2–

²⁰⁷ E.g., Ernst Axel Knauf, “Psalm LX und Psalm CVIII,” *VT* 50 (2000): 55–65.

²⁰⁸ Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 220; Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters*, 172.

²⁰⁹ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 36–39.

²¹⁰ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 39. Gerstenberger, *Psalms: Part 1 with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*, 218–19, recognizes some of the same distinct characteristics of each version psalms as Hossfeld and Zenger note; viz. Ps 14’s concern for the poor, and Ps 53’s focus on the destruction of the wicked.

6, most scholars argue that Ps 40 reflects an expansion of an originally independent psalm equivalent to Ps 70 and Ps 40:14–18, to which was appended to 40:2–13.²¹¹

Second, the preference for יהוה or אלהים in the doublets yields ambiguous data. Psalm 14 three times uses יהוה where Ps 53 has אלהים, so that each part follows the nominal preference of its psalm-group context. Similarly, Pss 40:14 and 17 have יהוה whereas 70:2 and 5 have אלהים. However the reverse occurs in their final verses: the “non-Elohistic” Ps 40:18 has אלהים while Ps 70:6 has יהוה. Different again, Ps 108 reflects the same six instances of אלהים as in Pss 57:8–12 and 60:7–14, while the equivalent 57:10 and 108:4 have אדני and יהוה respectively. These contrary examples are not explained by a process of simple duplication from a preexisting EP.

There is, however, another possibility besides editorial duplication: that the similar psalms had already taken shape and later editors placed them in their present context, preserving their received integrity. Several observations speak for this possibility. First, a cultic, “pre-literary” origin for *both* psalms more reasonably explains their differences. Indeed, Gerstenberger speculates that both Pss 14 and 53 “could be variants in their own right, transmitted in different circles of liturgists.”²¹² Similarly, Gerstenberger defends the possibility that Ps 40 presents a

²¹¹See, e.g., Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 187, who cite Friedrich Bathgen, *Die Psalmen übersetzt und erklärt* (HKAT 2; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897), 112, as an example of a “minority of commentators” who “are of the opinion that 40:2–18 is an original composition whose latter portion was cut off and secondarily used as an independent psalm, namely Psalm 70.” Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 187, themselves advocate the opposite view along with “[t]he majority of scholars.” As these scholars discuss it, the genesis of one psalm from the other is assumed to have occurred within the process of the Psalter’s composition. Alternatively Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 423, is concerned chiefly with the unity of Ps 40, concluding only “that Psalm 40B was originally transmitted in isolation” (see also *Psalms 60–150*, 67). He therefore does not speculate on the possible reduplication of that original independent psalm within the Psalter’s growth process. Whatever Kraus’ views in that regard, his analysis—appropriately in my view—allows for the idea that these psalms assumed their current appearance outside of the Psalter’s composition history.

²¹² Gerstenberger, *Psalms: Part 1 with an Introduction*, 218.

unity, claiming that “[i]ndependent use of the complaint in Psalm 70 does not preclude the existence of a genuine liturgical composition that embraces precursory thanksgiving and praise.”²¹³ On the other hand, if one psalm originated from another via literary reduplication in the process of the Psalter’s compilation, we could reasonably expect the two to correspond more precisely. Second, superscriptional evidence also suggests parallel traditions. The superscripts of Pss 57 and 60 differ greatly from Ps 108, having only לְדָוִד in common.²¹⁴ Given editors’ evident care to preserve existing superscripts, it is unlikely that they creatively detached Pss 57 and 60 from their superscriptional moorings, let alone invent the שִׁיר מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד superscript atop Ps 108.

אֱלֹהִים/יְהוָה Predominance

Numerous attempts have been made to explain the so-called Elohist Psalter. Once again, the phenomenon of Pss 42–83’s preference for the Divine epithet אֱלֹהִים is hardly in question, having been recognized since Gesenius, Ewald, and Delitzsch.²¹⁵ The novelty resides rather in how scholars explain the observation and its editorial *implications*.

The older opinion that the EP once stood alone persists in recent scholarship.²¹⁶ The most common explanation is that the preference for אֱלֹהִים in these psalms resulted from a program of

²¹³ Gerstenberger, *Psalms: Part 1 with an Introduction*, 169.

²¹⁴ Psalms 57 are both given the genre of מִקְתָּם, while Ps 108 is a שִׁיר מִזְמוֹר. Other features not reflected in Ps 108 include: Pss 57 and 60 are both headed with לְמִנְצֵחַ; each has a tune (Ps 57, אֶל־תִּשְׁחַח; Ps 60, עַל־שׁוֹעַן); and Ps 57 includes a historical note (בְּבִרְחוֹ מִפְּגִי־שָׂאוֹל בְּמַעְרָה) and Ps 60 a further direction about its purpose (לְלִמְדָּה).

²¹⁵ For a brief history of scholarship, see Hossfeld and Zenger, “The So-Called Elohist Psalter: A New Solution for an Old Problem,” in *A God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller* (ed. Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 35–51.

²¹⁶ E.g., Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters*, 169, points out several generally accepted “compelling indications” to accept Pss 42–83 as an earlier stage of the Psalter; viz., the doublets, Ps 72:20, and the Elohist tendency. Thus, Millard essentially restates Mowinckel’s reasons for the Psalter’s gradual process of formation and the original independence of Pss 42–83 specifically.

editing that replaced יהוה with אֱלֹהִים.²¹⁷ For instance, Mowinckel believed that the EP arose in a later period which “shrank from pronouncing the name of God, and so the change [from יהוה to אֱלֹהִים] is linked to the use of this collection in the temple service.”²¹⁸ Recent scholarship generally finds this explanation wanting, however. First, the “later period” to which Mowinckel refers is too late to explain the phenomenon. As Mitchell observes, the prevalence of יהוה throughout Pss 84–150 shows that not even editors responsible for the final Psalter were influenced by “Tetragrammaton reverence,” making it even less likely that the (supposedly) earlier EP editors came under that influence.²¹⁹ Second, there are over forty instances of יהוה occur throughout Pss 42–83, which speak against any kind of programmatic editing based on editorial or authorial preference for אֱלֹהִים. Moreover, Hossfeld and Zenger note that that אֲדֹנָי, not אֱלֹהִים, was the usual replacement of choice.²²⁰

More recent scholarship suggests that a theological rationale lies behind the EP according to the EP editors’ historical situation. For instance, Martin Rose dates the EP to the Persian era, at which time its editors sought to proclaim Yahweh as the one God.²²¹ Similarly, Hossfeld and Zenger attribute Pss 42–83’s Elohistic tendency to an increasingly monotheistic characterization

²¹⁷ Alternatively, Wilson, *Editing*, 196–97, and Gerstenberger, *Psalms: Part 1 with an Introduction*, 37, entertain the possibility Pss 1–41 and 84–150 underwent a “Yahwistic” editing to eliminate אֱלֹהִים. Hossfeld and Zenger, “The So-Called Elohistic Psalter,” 39, view this idea with skepticism. Indeed, the theory entails the unlikely suggestion that the program of editing was not carried out consistently in Pss 42–83.

²¹⁸ Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel’s Worship*, 2:194.

²¹⁹ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 70.

²²⁰ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 4–5. Hossfeld and Zenger cite Rösel, *Die messianische Redaktion des Psalters*, 35–36n104. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 71, observes that the EP editor, “allowed 44 occurrences of Yhwh to exist in the EP...and even changed *elohim* to *Yhwh* (40.18 [17]; 70.6 [5]).”

²²¹ Rose, “Psaumes,” 570.

of Yahweh that spanned the pre- to postexilic eras, noting especially the interest in “name theology” that attends the raw statistical preference for אֱלֹהִים over יְהוָה.²²²

Other explanations presuppose that Pss 42–83 were already part of a larger Psalter. For instance, Laura Joffe argues that editors desired to limit the incidences of יְהוָה to forty-two in a collection of forty-two psalms commencing with the forty-second psalm in the Psalter.²²³ Joffe’s proposed rationale is that forty-two signifies disaster and divine judgment, and is a significant organizing element in ANE catalogues. However this rationale is evaluated, the argument suffers from the actual frequency of יְהוָה, which is at least forty-four.²²⁴ David Mitchell also offers a theological explanation in his theory of an eschatological program in the Psalter. Mitchell suggests that his hypothesis “hints at a literary and theological explanation for the Elohist Psalter (Pss. 42–83) in exactly its present scope and position. As in the Asaph Psalms, so in the rest of the Elohist Psalter, the predominance of the term *elohim* might suggest that Israel in the initial period up until the eschatological conflict are estranged from God and under his judgment and wrath.”²²⁵ Whether editors achieved the EP’s divine name distribution by selecting “Elohist” psalms or through a program of editing Mitchell does not indicate, but his rationale seems compatible with Joffe’s proposition.

Leslie McFall provides a different kind of explanation, though one that need not preclude theological motivations such as Mitchell suggests. McFall sees the predominance of אֱלֹהִים or יְהוָה in individual psalms as one of several sorting principles editors used. According to McFall, editors sorted Davidic and Korahite psalms into groups where יְהוָה outnumbered אֱלֹהִים in the individual psalms (e.g. Pss 3–41 and 84, 85, and 87), and groups of psalms exhibiting the reverse

²²² Hossfeld and Zenger, “The So-Called Elohist Psalter,” 42–51.

²²³ Joffe, Laura. “The Answer to the Meaning of Life, Universe and the Elohist Psalter,” *JSOT* 27 (2002): 223–35; “The Elohist Psalter: What, How and Why?” *SJOT* 15 (2001): 142–66.

²²⁴ Burnett, “Forty-Two Songs for Elohim,” 90, counts forty-five plus two instances of “Yah.”

²²⁵ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 299–300.

trend (e.g., Pss 51–72 and 42–49).²²⁶ McFall therefore does not attribute the predominance of אֱלֹהִים or יְהוָה to an editing program applied to an existing groups of psalms; he rather views it as an inherent characteristic of the individual psalms themselves. In this McFall takes a similar position to Delitzsch, who had connected the phenomenon to these psalms’ “peculiar style of composition,” and “not from the caprice of an editor.”²²⁷

So far as our investigation of covenants is concerned, our chief concern here is whether and how the predominance of אֱלֹהִים in Pss 42–83 contributes to our recognition of the Psalter’s shape and shaping. Does it dilute the importance of the Psalter’s prima facie book structure by presenting an alternative subunit more deserving of our attention than the Book divisions? There are several reasons to answer this in the negative.

First, the above summary shows that the EP’s redaction-historical implications are anything but clear. Although improving on theories that suggest a mechanical program of editing, it is not clear that the theological rationales offered by Hossfeld and Zenger (i.e., monotheistic perspective and “name theology”) or Rose (i.e., purposeful identification of יְהוָה as the only God) must be tied to a particular historical era, or that the EP must have been an independent, earlier collection. In fact, the explanations of Hossfeld and Zenger and Rose seem better suited to the emphasis on Yahweh’s sovereignty found in purportedly later stages of the Psalter’s development such as Book IV’s emphasis on Yahweh’s reign (i.e., מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה Pss 93, 97, and 99 in Book IV). In this light, the predominance of אֱלֹהִים in 42–83 presents a very thin basis on which to conclude the original independence of the EP.

Second, the supportive evidence for an independent EP proves ambiguous. Millard argues for a literary-critical break (*ein literarkritischer Bruch*) after Ps 83 because he assumes that

²²⁶ McFall, “The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter,” 228–32.

²²⁷ Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 1:22.

72:20 precludes further Davidic psalms.²²⁸ But as shown above, this assumption is not as secure as Millard supposes, and his claim for a literary break before Davidic Ps 86 is questionable at best. Besides this Millard also suggests that the doublets point to the EP as an early Psalter because Pss 14, 40 and 108 are supposedly secondary to their counterparts in the EP.²²⁹ But this depends on a specific relationship of dependence between Pss 40 and 70, Pss 14 and 53, and Pss 57/60 and 108. It also assumes that those relationships arose in the compositional process of the Psalter. Even granting the latter, our earlier discussion of the doublets shows considerable scholarly disagreement about the direction of dependence. In any case, the portions of the doublets found in the EP occur within the narrower bounds of David II (Pss 51–72). If the doublets provide evidence of an earlier collection, then, David II is the more obvious candidate for the “earlier group” than a broader group consisting of Pss 42–83. In general, the most we can say for Millard’s argument is that the *assumption* of a preexisting EP conveys a certain kind of sense to 72:20 and the doublets when understood in a particular way. But the evidence does not point irresistibly in this direction, especially when other structural markers present a more compelling case.

Third, as we have seen, Wilson’s thesis that superscriptional evidence reflects conscious editorial effort to smooth transitions within the Psalter’s books seems very sound. However, that effort continues beyond Pss 42–83 with Pss 84–89 at the end of Book III, and similarly reflects a conscious break after Ps 72. While it is possible that editors supplemented an existing EP to achieve this result, it leaves unanswered why, within a once independent EP, two author transitions involving Korahites (Pss 42–49), Asaph (Ps 50), and David (Ps 51–72) were softened by genre while the transition between Solomon/Davidic Ps 72 and Asaph Ps 73 was not.

²²⁸ Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters*, 169.

²²⁹ Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters*, 172. See also Weiser, *The Psalms*, 99, who attributes a similar relevance to the doublets in relation to the EP.

Moreover, Mitchell suggests that Pss 42–89 form “the real literary unit,” due to a chiasmic arrangement: Korah Pss 42–49; Asaph Ps 50; David Pss 51–65, 68–70; Asaph Pss 73–83; Korah Pss 84–85, 87–88, (89).²³⁰ While a single Asaph psalm (Ps 50) must be counted to complete the chiasm, single psalms of other or no attribution (e.g., Davidic Ps 86) have to be overlooked to maintain it. But if we set aside claims of chiasmus, there is still considerable merit in the suggestion that a second Korahite group (Pss 84–88) should, with the exception of Ps 89, round off the literary unit comprising Books II–III just as the first Korahite group had begun it. In any case, the mutually affirming evidence of the doxologies and superscriptional arrangement speaks more clearly for Pss 42–72 and Pss 73–89 as the Psalter’s intended subunits than אלהים’ predominance does for Pss 42–83.

In summing up, the evidence that Pss 42–83 constitute a major editorial subunit is at best ambiguous. The balance achieved through subsequent Korahite Pss 84–85, 87–88, combined with superscriptional evidence and the doxologies at 72:18–19 and 89:53 argue far more strongly for two distinct books that were consciously structured that way. Accordingly, in our view Pss 42–83 likely did not constitute an early stage with its own theological profile (contra Millard, Hossfeld and Zenger et al.). Nevertheless, this possibility cannot be ruled out absolutely.

Doxologies

As noted above, numerous modern scholars including Mowinckel, Gese, Gerstenberger, et al. connect the 41:14, 72:18–19, 89:52, and 106:48 to their respective psalms or immediate group, without recognizing an intentional division of the Psalter into books.²³¹ While more recent scholarship recognizes the five book structure to be editorially intended, some of these theories

²³⁰ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 71.

²³¹ We shall not concern ourselves here with the question of the fifth doxology, because it has little bearing on the five part division itself. Generally speaking, Wilson’s view that Ps 145:21 introduces 146–150 as the Psalter’s doxological conclusion (Wilson, *Editing*, 225–28) prevails over the older view that Ps 150 constitutes the fifth and final doxology (e.g., Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 1:15). See Chapter Six.

nevertheless view the book structure as a later, somewhat superficial imposition. For instance, Christoph Levin argues that 106:48 was deliberately added to shape the Psalter into five books analogous to the Pentateuch. The first three doxologies owe their existence to the Psalter's growth process, whose main stages constituted the first Davidic collection (Pss 3–41), the second “Elohistic” Davidic Psalter (Pss 51–72), and the Messianic Psalter (Pss 2–89). However the fourth doxology, 106:48, was added to divide Pss 90–150 into Books IV and V, thus creating the five book structure via collaboration with the three preexisting doxologies.²³² For Beckwith both 72:18–19 and 106:48 were added to divide a three part Psalter into its five books.²³³ Kratz goes further, attributing all four doxologies to a later redactional effort that also added Ps 1, thereby giving the Psalter a Torah-like profile.²³⁴ Thus, all three scholars consider the book structure intentional, but with caveats: the divisions marked by the doxologies are sometimes artificial (e.g., 106:48), or doxologies were intended to conclude groups of psalms other than their preceding book (e.g., Levin's account of 72:18–19). In contrast to these, Wilson argues that all the doxologies occur at real junctures in the Psalter (see above). They therefore intentionally divide the Psalter into books; not as late, artificial additions, but as features that are original to the arranging of psalms in the Psalter. At stake here is whether and in what sense the Psalter's books are its true, editorially intended subunits. The issue therefore merits closer attention. We will address 106:48 separately because it raises a different set of issues.

Books I–III

Wilson recognized that “genre softening” techniques are conspicuously absent at the Pss 41–42, 72–73 and 89–90 transitions, suggesting that these author changes represent intentional

²³² Levin, “Die Entstehung der Büchereinteilung des Psalters,” 83–89. Seybold, *Introducing the Psalms*, 17–18, also thinks that the fourth doxology was secondary, added to achieve the five-fold division of the Psalter late in its development.

²³³ Beckwith, “Early History,” 6–7.

²³⁴ Kratz, “Die Tora Davids,” 28–29.

breaks. Accordingly, the doxologies at 41:14, 72:18–19, and 89:53 conclude real sections of the Psalter.²³⁵ On the other hand, Levin connects these doxologies exclusively with their presumed redactional contexts, and denies them any intended function with regard to the Psalter's book structure.²³⁶ According to Levin only 41:14 intentionally concluded a group of psalms that lines up with one of the Psalter's books (i.e., Pss 3–41), but it became a mere relic when Pss 3–41 were combined with 42–88 and framed by Pss 2 and 89 to create the Messianic Psalter.²³⁷

In arguing his case, Levin makes an important recognition in principle: the doxologies are integral to the editorial process that yielded the Psalter's psalms sequences.²³⁸ His point of departure is the example of 72:18–19 because it precedes the 72:20 postscript. He cogently argues that this would not be the case if it were it a later insertion as Kratz suggests.²³⁹ Levin's argument resembles Wilson's at this point, who argues that the doxologies belong to their respective psalms rather than a later editorial addition after the psalms sequence had already become established.²⁴⁰ But Levin views them through a different redaction-historical paradigm that relates the 72:18–19 doxology to the "Elohistic" Davidic psalms (David II) rather than the whole of Book II as Wilson does.

²³⁵ Beckwith, "Early History," 6–8, makes the unconvincing argument for an original division into three parts that correspond to Books I, II–III, and IV–V. His main reasons include the relative shortness of Books III and IV (seventeen psalms each) and internal similarities between these three sections with respect to psalm titles and Halleluiah groups (Books IV–V).

²³⁶ Levin, "Entstehung," 89.

²³⁷ Levin, "Entstehung," 85–86.

²³⁸ Zenger, "Der Psalter als Buch: Beobachtungen zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Funktion," in *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum* (ed. Erich Zenger; Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1998), 27–31, takes a similar view, but nevertheless considers 106:48 as an intentional division between Books IV and V.

²³⁹ Levin, "Entstehung," 84–85.

²⁴⁰ Wilson, *Editing*, 184.

However, whereas Wilson's view depends on relatively straightforward observations about the use of superscripts, Levin's view operates with more complex redaction-historical speculations and overlooks those same observations. Levin presumes an Asaphite redaction that extended Pss 51–72 by Pss 73–83 and marked the end of David's prayers by adding the postscript.²⁴¹ Without the preceding Korahite Pss 42–49, Levin can claim that the 72:18–19 doxology concludes only David II rather than a group of psalms corresponding to Book II.²⁴² But in order to be viable, an "Asaphite redaction" cannot be so simple as Levin presents it. First, it seems unlikely that a "Davidic" collection would end with a Solomonic prayer (Ps 72) not yet "Davidized" by 72:20. Similarly, 72:20 clearly belongs to the strong thematic sequence in Pss 71–72 discussed earlier, where an ageing David (Ps 71) cedes the throne to his successor (Ps 72). These observations suggest that 72:20 *already* belonged to the Pss 51–72 sequence; the "Davidic core" that Levin thinks was extended by an Asaphite redactor. This would suggest, then, that 72:20 was *not* a product of the supposed Asaphite redaction after all, unless one credits the Asaphite redactor with adding (at least) Ps 72 itself in order to create the above described sequence.²⁴³ Indeed, this is Hossfeld and Zenger's view. They attribute the present shape of David II psalms to Asaphite redactors who expanded "the exilic collection Psalms 52–68 to form the Davidic Psalter, Psalms 51–72... insert[ing] a caesura between Psalms 51–72 and their own Psalms 73–83," concluding it with the postscript at 72:20.²⁴⁴ It seems, then, that one must adopt a

²⁴¹ Levin, "Entstehung," 84, cites Gese ("Die Entstehung der Büchereinteilung des Psalters," 162) approvingly: "Daß die Doxologie lxxii 18–19 'sich allein auf die Sammlung C [= Ps 51–72] bezieht, ist schon aus der Stellung vor der Redaktionsbermerkung V. 20 zu schließen."

²⁴² Levin does not say how Asaph Ps 50 fits in here, but he clearly attributes Korahite Pss 42–49 to a later redactional stage. His main objective is not to describe the process in detail but to disprove Kratz's view that 72:18–19 were added after Psalter had acquired its present macrostructural psalms sequence.

²⁴³ Already our reevaluation of 72:20 suggests other viable possibilities besides viewing it as a redactional remnant, though one cannot absolutely rule this out as an explanation of its origin (see above).

²⁴⁴ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 2, 4.

much more complex redaction-historical paradigm like Hossfeld and Zenger's at this point, if one is to salvage an Asaphite redaction in which the doxology in 72:18–19 concluded the narrower, Davidic group Pss 51–72 as an independent, redacted stage. Moreover, it is unclear why the author-groups should be taken to indicate consecutive redactions in the first place, especially when Levin also entertains an EP redaction that contributes some Korahite Pss (42–49) but not others (84–85, 87–88)!²⁴⁵

More significantly, it overlooks the superscriptional evidence reviewed above, which indicates editorial intention to bind Korahite Pss 42–49, Asaph Ps 50, and Davidic Pss 51–72 into a unit via Wilson's "softening" technique (not to mention Pss 73–89). This suggests that Pss 42–72—that is, Book II—is the real unit concluded by 72:18–19.²⁴⁶ In the final analysis, then, there seems to be more reason to recognize 41:14, 72:18–19, and 89:53 as doxological conclusions to the preceding books than merely some portion of them.

Psalm 106:48

Although they offer different explanations, Wilson, Levin, Hossfeld and Zenger, Kratz, and Beckwith all agree that 106:48 intentionally divides Books IV and V. Despite this agreement, they differ on the extent to which Books IV and V constitute intentional subunits within the Psalter. For instance, for Levin the Book IV/V division created by 106:48 does little more than bring about the fivefold structure akin to the Pentateuch. Levin explains the position of 106:48 on the basis of the symmetry it creates between Books I and V (41 and 44 psalms respectively) and Books III and IV (17 psalms apiece).²⁴⁷ As a result he finds little reason to consider Pss 90–

²⁴⁵ Levin, "Entstehung," 84.

²⁴⁶ Moreover, this view does not rule out the possibility that 72:20 refers only to David II, for 72:20 itself specifies *Davidic* psalms in its text, apparently excluding Korahite Pss 42–49 and Asaph 50 if we are only looking at Book II. But it does not follow that the 72:18–19 doxology shared this limitation; a proposition that requires the questionable premise of an Asaphite redaction.

²⁴⁷ Levin, "Entstehung," 89.

106 as a highly significant subunit of the Psalter.²⁴⁸ Zenger, on the other hand, attributes a stronger editorial integrity to Book IV because for him the Psalter already consisted of Books I–IV when Book V (and 106:48) was added.²⁴⁹ Wilson, as we have seen, similarly takes Pss 90–106 to be an editorially intended subunit with its own theological profile.

There are several factors to this question. First, Levin is right to recognize the relative weakness of the “break” between Pss 106 and 107 compared with the other three book divisions.²⁵⁰ This is principally because these psalms lack authorial attribution, so that change in authorship cannot play the same disjunctive role as in the other examples. As discussed above, Wilson argues that Ps 106 concludes a section because it is a Halleluiah psalm, and because Ps 107’s opening הַדָּוִד statement commences a new section. However, both Pss 106 and 107 begin with הַדָּוִד לִיהוָה כִּי־טוֹב כִּי לְעוֹלָם חַסְדּוֹ, and this has led numerous scholars to see them as an intended sequence rather than a point of disjuncture.²⁵¹ In light of this apparent linkage, the second part of Wilson’s argument is the weaker of his two claims. Nevertheless, הַלְלֵי־יְהוָה precedes the הַדָּוִד clause in Ps 106:1, which suggests that the psalm is primarily to be recognized by its הַלְלֵי־יְהוָה superscript and postscript (cf. v. 48).²⁵² So although the הַדָּוִד clause creates a sense of continuity between Pss 106 and 107, Ps 106 appears to exercise a concluding function after

²⁴⁸ Levin, “Enstehung,” 89n23.

²⁴⁹ Zenger, “Der Psalter als Buch,” 29. See also Koch, “Der Psalter und seine Redaktionsgeschichte,” 250, “Dann aber liegt nahe, daß die ersten vier Teile einmal ein Psalterbuch für sich gebildet hatten, während das jetzige 5. Psalmenbuch seine eigene Gesichte gehabt hat und in späterer Zeit angegliedert wurde.”

²⁵⁰ Levin, “Enstehung,” 86.

²⁵¹ E.g., Gese, “Die Entstehung der Büchereinteilung des Psalters”; Sanders, “Five Books of Psalms?,” 679; and Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 213–14.

²⁵² LXX shifts the Ἀλληλουια from the end of Ps 106 to the beginning of Ps 107, but this is a characteristic feature of the LXX. Syriac omits הַלְלֵי־יְהוָה after the 106:48 doxology altogether. Zenger, “Der Psalter als Buch,” 29, likewise argues that הַלְלֵי־יְהוָה belongs to Ps 106.

all.²⁵³ In addition, Paul Sanders considers Ps 107:3's "He gathered them" (קִבְּצָם) as an answer to Ps 106:46's petition to Yahweh to "gather us" (וְקִבְּצֵנוּ).²⁵⁴ However it is unclear why this detail should argue for Pss 106–107 as part of an original sequence, rather than reflect editorial intent that Book V respond to the Book VI. All in all, then, the connections between Pss 106 and 107 are not so strong as to preclude a deliberate break after 106:48.

Second, scholars have drawn various conclusions from a comparison of 106:48 with other biblical texts. Among the doxologies, for instance, 106:48's closest parallel is 41:14. A minor difference is 106:48's מִן־הָעוֹלָם where 41:14 has the contracted prepositional form מִהָעוֹלָם.²⁵⁵ The main difference is 106:48's longer final clause, וְאָמַר כָּל־הָעַם אָמֵן הַלְלוּ־יָהּ, where 41:14 has a double אָמֵן instead. Accordingly, Levin proposes that 106:48 was constructed from 41:14, and suggests that the latter part comes from Deut 27:15–26, where it occurs twelve times in the catalogue of curses.²⁵⁶ While the correlations are impressive, they do not explain the textual relationships involved; that is, whether these parallels were produced by Ps 106's author, or a later editor who drew upon Ps 41 in its present place in the Psalter. Alternatively, scholars commonly argue for a connection between 106:48 and 1 Chr 16:36; the final phrase in 1 Chr 16:36 showing only minor differences (וַיֹּאמְרוּ כָל־הָעַם אָמֵן וְהַלֵּל לַיהוָה:). For instance, Patrick

²⁵³ Auwers, "Le Psautier comme livre biblique," 76–77, similarly views the sequence of Halleluiahs psalms (Pss 104–106) as the more decisive factor.

²⁵⁴ For Sanders' view see, e.g., Sanders, "Five Books of Psalms?" 679. See also Day, *Psalms*, 112, whom Sanders also cites.

There is also a small textual question over וְקִבְּצֵנוּ in Ps 106:46. A few MSS add וְהַצִּילֵנוּ in an apparent effort to make it conform to 1 Chr 16:35 where both verbs appear. However, the uncorrected LXX omits וְקִבְּצֵנוּ in 1 Chr 16:35, attesting a form of the text that only has וְהַצִּילֵנוּ. It would seem that later LXX scribes sought to conform 1 Chr 16:35 to include both verbs. However, the evidence is too scant ambiguous to conclude that וְקִבְּצֵנוּ is not original to Ps 106:46.

²⁵⁵ 106:48 reads: בְּרִיךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן־הָעוֹלָם | וְעַד הָעוֹלָם וְאָמַר כָּל־הָעַם אָמֵן הַלְלוּ־יָהּ: | 41:14 reads: בְּרִיךְ יְהוָה | אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִהָעוֹלָם | וְעַד הָעוֹלָם | אָמֵן | וְאָמַן: |

²⁵⁶ Levin, "Entstehung," 88.

Skehan has argued that 1 Chr 16 presupposes a Psalter where Ps 106:48 was already known to conclude Book IV.²⁵⁷ It is indeed noteworthy that 1 Chr 16:7–36 is composed of Pss 105:1–15, 96:1–13, and 106:1, 47–48, which could suggest that the Chronicler knew Book IV.²⁵⁸ Aware of the chronological implications for the Psalter’s compositional history and dating, Wilson prefers Sanders’ suggestion that “the combination of “floating bits of liturgical material” was a viable means of creating new pss for different situations or occasions.”²⁵⁹ He therefore questions a direct dependence between these psalms and 1 Chr 16, including their respective doxologies. While 1 Chr 16:7–36’s dependence on Book IV seems the more compelling scenario, Wilson’s objection cannot be automatically ruled out. In summary, the correlations between Ps 106:48, Ps 41:14, Deut 27, and 1 Chr 16:36 undoubtedly suggest a relationship between these texts, but we can only speculate about its nature.

Third, we return to the question of whether 106:48 was original to Ps 106 when the psalm was incorporated into the Psalter or was added later as a “redactional” insertion. However the question is to some degree a moot point. On the one hand, some scholars who take the latter view see Pss 90–106 as an editorially important subunit of the Psalter (e.g., Zenger) while others downplay its importance (e.g., Levin). On the other hand, the opinion that 106:48 was original to Ps 106 need not minimize its book-dividing role. Indeed Wilson, who takes Mowinckel’s view that the doxologies arose from the “liturgical milieu of the cult,” argues that Ps 106 *en toto* was

²⁵⁷ Skehan, “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” 167–68.

²⁵⁸ Levin, “Entstehung,” 86–88, argues against a direct relationship, in part because he understands 1 Chr 16:7–36 as a late insertion within 1 Chronicles that in his view complicates the theories of Gese and Kratz. Alternatively, Wilson, *Editing*, 185, considers it “obvious” that Ps 106:48 depends on 1 Chr 16:36, suggesting that “[t]he perfect verb form (otherwise unparalleled in these doxologies) is clear evidence for the dependence of Ps 106 on 1 Chr 16.” How this constitutes “clear evidence” is unclear, however.

²⁵⁹ Wilson, *Editing*, 81, quoting James A. Sanders, “Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon,” *McCQ* 21 (1968): 287.

purposefully placed at the end of Book IV to conclude it.²⁶⁰ Wilson's main argument is that this doxology contains subsequent material (הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה) just as 72:18–19 precedes the v. 20 postscript, and therefore appears to be part of the psalm.²⁶¹ On the other hand, Zenger sees this הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה as part of the doxological addition (though the initial הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה in Ps 106:1 suggests that the final הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה is at home in the psalm). While possibilities such as Zenger's cannot be entirely ruled out, we earlier suggested that the Psalter's compilers organized the psalms chiefly by arranging whole psalms, rather than manipulating their compositional integrity. Given this proclivity, Wilson's proposition seems the more likely suggestion.

Nevertheless, other הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה formulae occur in the Psalter that provide additional support for the originality of v. 48 to Ps 106. These include Pss 28:6; 31:22; 66:20; 68:20, 36; 119:12; 124:6; 135:21; 144:1; and perhaps 18:47.²⁶² Notably, all of these occur in the body of their psalms except for Pss 66:20, 68:36, and 135:21, which occur at the end. This shows that psalmists clearly employed הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה formulae in their compositions. Moreover, since Pss 66:20, 68:36, and 135:21 are the final verses of their respective psalms, they potentially function in a similar—if lesser—concluding way as 106:48.²⁶³ Of course Ps 66:20 and 68:38 occur within David II, where such a function is unlikely. But these examples bear minimal resemblance to the four main

²⁶⁰ Wilson, *Editing*, 185–86, quoting Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2:193. See also Auwers, "Le Psautier comme livre biblique," 77.

²⁶¹ Wilson, *Editing*, 185–86.

²⁶² Cf. Levin, "Entstehung," 87, who on this basis rejects Kratz's view that 106:48 (and 1Chr 16:36 as part of a late insertion encompassing vv. 7–36) originate from Chronicles. See Kratz, "Die Tora Davids."

²⁶³ The DSS yields some interesting if inconclusive data on these psalms. In a few cases the preserved portion begins with the verse *after* the one containing הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה. For example, 4QPs^a 4 I contains Ps 31:23–25 (moreover, Hev Ps may end with the הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה v. 22). Similarly, 11QPs^a 6 IV commences Ps 124 at v. 7. Nevertheless, this may be due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence. On the other hand, Pss 119:10–21 is preserved in 4QPs^b (hence v. 12 remains in the body of the psalm fragment), while Ps 144:1 similarly occurs in 11QPs^a and 11QPs^b with subsequent verses known from the MT.

doxologies in any case.²⁶⁴ On the other hand, Psalm 135:21 (**בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה | מִצִּיּוֹן שֶׁכֵּן יְרוּשָׁלַם**) (**הַלְלוּ-יְהוָה**) offers a closer parallel, even if it lacks key terms like **אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, **עוֹלָם**, and **אָמֵן** that distinguish the other four doxologies. It is therefore striking that Wilson identifies a minor break at Ps 135/136 because Ps 135 is a Halleluiah psalm and 136 commences with **הוֹדוּ**.²⁶⁵ It would appear that Ps 135:21 therefore offers a similar parallel to Ps 106:48 and the other major doxologies, albeit on a smaller scale; as a “lesser” **בְּרוּךְ** formula, 135:21 occurs at a correspondingly “lesser” juncture within the Psalter. Importantly, the imperative form **בְּרַכּוּ** occurs twice in v. 20, offering good reason to recognize the **בְּרוּךְ** formula in v. 21 as part of Ps 135 rather than a later insertion. It therefore seems that an editor selected Ps 135 with doxology included, and intended it to conclude the previous psalms, in this case the Songs of Ascent Pss 120–134 and perhaps Pss 118–119 if Wilson’s account of Book V’s structure is accepted. The example of 135:21 therefore adds weight to the view that Ps 106 was selected *en toto* because of v. 48’s close formal resemblance to the other major doxologies.²⁶⁶

Finally, there is the question of Pss 90–106’s unity; whether there are other signs that it forms a major subunit concluded by 106:48. Indeed, several observations suggest as much. First, the concluding function of Halleluiah Pss 104–106 presupposes a larger sequence of which it is a part, and Pss 90–106 presents a good *prima facie* candidate. Second, David Howard has traced the numerous lexical and thematic connections throughout Pss 93–100 especially, showing the apparently deliberate editorial effort to associate these psalms with one another in their present

²⁶⁴ 66:20 reads: **וְחִסְדּוֹ מֵאֵתֵי**; **בְּרוּךְ אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא-הָסִיר תְּפִלָּתִי וְחִסְדּוֹ מֵאֵתֵי**, and 68:38 has simply **בְּרוּךְ אֱלֹהִים**. Thus neither follow the **יְהוָה בְּרוּךְ** form of the four main doxologies. Indeed, **בְּרוּךְ** is the only element it has in common with the four doxologies, for whereas the other doxologies have the construct form **אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, 66:20 and 68:38 employ **אֱלֹהִים** in its absolute form after **בְּרוּךְ**.

²⁶⁵ Wilson, *Editing*, 188–89.

²⁶⁶ Cf. Zenger, “Der Psalter als Buch,” 28–29, who recognizes a chiasmic relationship between the four doxologies. For Zenger this accounts for 89:53’s relative brevity,

group.²⁶⁷ Moreover, Book IV contains seven out of eight mentions of “Moses” in the Psalter (90:1; 99:6; 103:7; 105:26; 106:16, 23, and 32). These span the entire Book and form part of what is arguably a deliberate thematic inclusio between Pss 90 and 106 (cf. also “anger” [אֵרָא] in 90:11 and 106:14).²⁶⁸ There thus exist very good reasons to view Book IV as an editorially intentional unity.

Summary Remarks on Doxologies and Their Implications

How then do we evaluate the apparent five-book structure of the Psalter suggested by the doxologies? From a synchronic perspective the five book structure hints at an analogy to the Mosaic Pentateuch. Whatever theological significance is drawn from this analogy, it suggests that the Psalter’s books are its major subunits as many investigations into the Psalter presuppose. However the issue becomes more involved from a diachronic perspective, as we have seen. On one hand, if the Psalter’s macrostructure arose from one major editorial effort then the doxologies were undoubtedly intended to divide it into five books. On the other hand, it is plain that Wilson and Levin’s differing conclusions about the doxologies correspond to their different redaction-historical models. For Levin the assumption of Asaphite, EP and Messianic Psalter redactions proscribes limits on the doxologies’ intended relevance, whereas for Wilson the superscriptional evidence is decisive. In our view, Wilson’s analysis convincingly accounts for the Korahite-Asaph-David author-group transitions in Books I–III, making it unnecessary—even counter-intuitive—to attribute these transitions to redactional layering. Significantly, such theories of redactional layering fail to account for the superscriptional techniques noticed by Wilson. Moreover, our reevaluation of the EP, 72:20, and doublets suggested that the redactional layers scholars infer from them are more speculative than is generally recognized.

²⁶⁷ Howard, *The Structure of Psalms 93–100*. See also Zenger, “The God of Israel’s Reign over the World (Pss 90–106),” 183–87, who argues further for the paring of psalms in the 101–106 group.

²⁶⁸ See Wilson, *Editing*, 189–90. Chapter Six discusses the significance of Moses in Book IV.

Of course, in Wilson's two stage model the five book structure is only a product of the "final" redaction. But our main concern has been whether or not the Psalter's books constitute its major editorial units. Even supposing that Pss 2–89 were originally independent, their doxologies would suggest a "three book structure" according to Wilson's analysis, with the addition of Books IV–V simply increasing the number to five. Thus, the "original" and "final" functions of the doxologies remain the same toward their respective books. Although his two stage model is open to criticism, then, Wilson was justified in recognizing the "seams" as places of high editorial importance, and the covenantal references and allusions found near them merit close attention.

Lexical and Thematic Connections between Psalms

Scholars typically account for lexical and thematic "links" between psalms in two ways: either they originated with the individual psalms and motivated their placement, or editors created them to bind psalms together—or some combination thereof.²⁶⁹ Delitzsch and McFall, for example, predominantly reflect the first approach.²⁷⁰ On the other hand, classical literary-critical methodologies (e.g., Lohfink, Hossfeld, and Zenger) often invoke the second kind of explanation, routinely accounting for common features as redactional glosses or additions. To illustrate, Zenger claims that Ps 104:29b ("and return to their dust") is secondary and "traces an arc to "Ps 103:14b ('he remembers that we are dust')." Likewise, they surmise that other "[i]mportant keyword connections between the two psalms, which possibly were only created redactionally, are the motifs of 'satisfying with good' (Pss 103:5; 104:28) and the 'renewal' of life by Yhwh (Pss 103:5; 104:30)."²⁷¹ However the degree to which editors adapted the psalms to

²⁶⁹ Zenger, "Der Psalter als Buch," 12, makes the same distinction between *iuxtapositio* (deliberate collocation), and *concatenatio* (redactional linkage).

²⁷⁰ Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 1:21; McFall, "The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter."

²⁷¹ Zenger, "The God of Israel's Reign Over the World (Psalms 90–106)," 185. Cf. Marko Marttila, *Collective Reinterpretation in the Psalms*, who presupposes the same kind of editorial activity in his investigation of an

“create” links between them is impossible to tell on the basis of the text itself. Provided the connections are strong or numerous enough, however, one can detect editorial intention to associate certain psalms without these speculative explanations.

That said, there is also reason to think that editors did not routinely manipulate psalms when they incorporated them into the Psalter. Wilson’s analysis suggests the editors went to considerable lengths to retain existing psalm superscripts when arranging sequences of psalms. Their use of “frozen” superscripts reflects a conscious effort to preserve traditions associated with individual psalms, even when obsolete to their new literary context.²⁷² Significantly, Wilson shows that this apparently Psalter-wide phenomenon is not unique to the Psalter, but a long-established ANE practice.²⁷³ This suggests an important implication: when psalms were “adapted to a function in a far different and later context,” as Wilson describes it,²⁷⁴ this was achieved ostensibly through placement and ordering rather than literary manipulation. For instance, anonymous Pss 66 and 67 have been “Davidized” without altering their superscripts. The same effect could have been achieved more simply by adding דָּוִד to the superscripts if the editor(s) responsible for the arrangement had been disposed to making such alterations. Under these circumstances it is difficult to imagine editors routinely adding redactional glosses. Nor do the parallels between 1 Chr 16:7–36 and Pss 105:1–15, 96:1–13, and 106:1, 47–48, or between the

apparent shift from individual-focused psalms to a more collective perspective in the Psalter.

²⁷² See also McFall, “The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter,” 236, who, due largely to superscriptional variation in the MT, argues that “the compiler is arranging rather than editing the material that has come down to him.” On a related point, various technical terms in the superscripts (e.g., לְדָוִד) had already become obscure by the time of the LXX, which further testifies to their antiquity. See Anderson, “Division and Order,” 226; and Beckwith, “Early History,” 10–11.

²⁷³ Wilson, *Editing*, 21–23, suggests a formative transmission history of the Sumerian Temple Hymn collection that spans from the time of its original compiler, Enheduanna the daughter of Sargon of Akkad (2334–2279 B.C.) to the Ur III period (end of the third century), with some hymns possibly going back to 2600 B.C.

²⁷⁴ Wilson, *Editing*, 23. It is not entirely clear from the quotation if Wilson means that the psalms were “adapted” only in function due to a new literary context or also in their composition.

Psalter's "doublets," suggest that editors routinely reshaped psalms through redactional glosses. Sanders' claim about the recombination of "floating bits of liturgical material" encountered above²⁷⁵ is a plausible explanation for these parallels. But it does not speak for the likelihood that editors routinely added redactional glosses at their theological whim, let alone prove that these recombinations occurred during the Psalter's compilation process.²⁷⁶ We therefore suggest that lexical and thematic links between psalms generally reflect editorial selection of psalms rather than "redactional" manipulation of their contents.

Conclusion

This examination of editorial evidence has yielded several outcomes important for our investigation. First, the major editorial data at best offers ambiguous support for multi-stage redaction hypotheses like those of Wilson or Zenger. For instance, Zenger's interpretation of author transitions, the "EP," 72:20, etc. as evidence of redactional layering ultimately seems arbitrary in the light of other implications for these editorial phenomena. On closer examination, the evidence from Qumran or superscriptional evidence does not offer very strong support for Wilson's two-stage redaction either. Diachronically speaking, Mitchell's hypothesis of one

²⁷⁵ Sanders, "Cave 11 Surprises," 287.

²⁷⁶ Although favoring growth by accretion, Anthony Gelston, "Editorial Arrangement in Book IV of the Psalter," in *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms: A Festschrift to Honour Professor John Emerton for His Eightieth Birthday* (ed. Katharine J. Dell, Graham Davies, and Yee Von Koh; VTSup 135; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 165, offers a similar perspective when he states, "it seems overwhelmingly probable that the unit of composition in the Psalter is the individual psalm...it is evident that there was no final process of editing the Psalter, by which such duplications might have been removed, and textual inconsistencies between parallel passages ironed out. In all probability this should not be ascribed to editorial negligence, but rather to respect for texts hallowed by long usage in worship, which had already acquired a degree of sacrosanctity." Gelston, *ibid.*, 175, otherwise thinks it possible to find evidence of editorial arrangement of smaller groups of psalms based on thematic and lexical similarities, but that "[t]he larger the group of psalms under consideration, the harder it is to trace a convincing overall thematic arrangement."

redactional impulse behind the Psalter's macrostructure is at least as likely as any of the alternatives. The implications for our investigation are clear: (a) it should not presuppose any one redactional model; and (b) the degree of continuity or discontinuity in editorial perspective(s) within the Psalter must remain a *demonstrandum*, not a methodological presupposition.

Second, we are better placed to identify editorially intended relationships between psalms in the Psalter. The specific results can be summarized as follows. Author groups play a conspicuous role in organizing psalms, both conjunctively and disjunctively. This is especially apparent at book divisions and when anonymous psalms are "sandwiched" between authored psalms. Genre plays a predominately conjunctive role, though one that is generally subordinate to authorship except in the Songs of Ascent. Lexical and thematic links likewise reveal conscious effort to associate psalms more closely together, depending on the strength and/or number of the connections. Similarly, individual themes (e.g., those argued by Creach, Gillingham, et al.) and *leitwörter* may also play a conscious organizing role. 72:20 "Davidizes" anonymous Ps 71 and Solomonic Ps 72, and proves that consecutive psalms may intentionally convey an unfolding "meta-narrative" sequence. Moreover, rather than being (merely) a redactional relic, editors likely intended that it signal a transition from historical David to David's successor(s). On the other hand, it is difficult to draw more confident conclusions about the doublets owing to their small number and uncertain genesis. In any case, their potential editorial significance relates to redaction-historical questions rather than the relationships between psalms. A similar situation ensues with the EP, though it at least suggests that similar theological emphases span Pss 42–83. Finally, editors sometimes employed concentric or chiasmic structures in arranging (and therefore relating) psalms (e.g., Pss 15–24), and gave intentional shape to the Psalter in terms of its beginning and end (Pss 1–2, 146–150).

CHAPTER THREE

AN EXPLORATORY SURVEY OF COVENANTAL REFERENCES AND ALLUSIONS IN THE PSALTER. PART ONE: PROLEGOMENA AND DIRECT REFERENCES TO YAHWEH'S בְּרִית

In order to facilitate our study of covenant relationships, the next two chapters survey covenant references and allusions throughout the Psalter. As the first part of this survey, the present chapter examines the term בְּרִית in individual psalms to ascertain its major covenantal entailments and to draw preliminary conclusions about its potential to shed light on covenant relationships, as each psalm allows. It also includes a short addendum on חֶק (“decree”) and עֵדוּת (“testimony”) in their sg. forms as potential synonyms for בְּרִית. This chapter thus begins to test our hypothesis set out in the Introduction. Chapter Four then surveys different kinds of implicit “criteria” or indirect reference (phrases, lexemes, formulae, themes, etc.) that recall prominent aspects of pre-monarchic covenants to examine their (re-)association with David in the Psalter. Before commencing our investigation of direct references in this chapter, some general preliminary remarks are necessary. These primarily have to do with methodology and relevant scholarship.

Prolegomena to the Survey of Covenantal References and Allusions

Methodical attempts to survey the Psalter’s covenantal allusions are rare. This is not surprising for a couple of reasons. First, the importance of Israel’s covenant traditions in the psalms is self-evident and requires no methodological demonstration (e.g., Pss 50, 81, 89, etc.). Second, earlier scholarship generally took a dimmer view of the editorial intentionality behind the canonical Psalter, giving little reason for such a survey. Instead their interest in psalms’

covenantal themes and theology focused predominantly on individual psalms and their historical *Sitze im Leben*. However, a survey of references and allusions to the major biblical covenants is essential if the *Psalter's* covenantal theological contours are to be discovered and analyzed.

Previous Surveys of “Covenant” in the Psalter

Artur Weiser’s commentary on the Psalms is the most comprehensive attempt to account for the Psalter’s covenantal concerns. Consistent with earlier scholarship, however, Weiser approaches the matter with a cult-functional approach rather than one that analyzes the Psalter as an edited product.²⁷⁷ Weiser redefined Mowinckel’s “annual enthronement festival” in terms of a *covenant* renewal festival, which according to him provided the original *Sitz im Leben* for most of the psalms.²⁷⁸ Accordingly, Weiser sees many psalmic expressions and terms as evidence of the psalms’ use in this hypothetical autumn festival. For instance, he connects expressions like the “face of Yahweh” (e.g. Ps 95:2) or Yahweh’s “shining forth” (הוֹפִיֵּא in 50:2; 80:2; and 94:1) with the theophany “at the heart of the covenant festival.”²⁷⁹ This enables him to attribute very particular covenantal associations to these data: they denote Yahweh’s appearance *at the renewing of the covenant*. For Weiser, “[t]he theme of the Old Testament Covenant Festival is the continually renewed encounter of God with his people which has as its final aim the renewal of the Sinai Covenant and of the salvation it promised.”²⁸⁰

While such expressions no doubt evoked covenant associations for those who arranged the Psalter, their connection with a particular annual festival remains conjectural. Subsequent scholarship has seen the same weakness in Weiser’s covenant renewal festival as it has Mowinckel’s: there is insufficient evidence for such a festival in Israel accounting for the all or

²⁷⁷ Weiser, *The Psalms*.

²⁷⁸ Weiser, *The Psalms*, 35.

²⁷⁹ Weiser, *The Psalms*, 38–39.

²⁸⁰ Weiser, *The Psalms*, 28–29.

most of the Psalms.²⁸¹ On the other hand, certain psalms (e.g., Pss 50, 81, and 95) are widely understood to have their *Sitze* in cultic festivals that celebrated Yahweh's covenant with his people.²⁸² Methodologically, these facts suggest that we should consider potential allusions without the assumption of a covenant renewal festival to steer our interpretation of them. Moreover, although it is very probable that some psalms were used in cultic "covenant renewal" contexts, the issue is not as pressing as it might seem. Our interest is in later editors' perception and literary use of those psalms, not their liturgical *Sitze im Leben*.

²⁸¹ E.g., Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 60, summarizes the situation thus, "While we know ancient Near Eastern texts that very precisely regulate the entire course of the worship and even provide individual directions for managing it, the Psalter in this matter leaves us without a satisfactory clarification. The Psalms have basically a fragmentary, incomplete character if we consider them from the viewpoint of a closed ritual." Nevertheless, Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 61–62, recognizes the cult-liturgical function of individual psalms, citing as examples: Pss 15, 24, and 118, as "entrance liturgies," Ps 121 as a "recessional," Pss 12, 14 (= 53), 75, and 82 as examples of "cultic prophetic lamentation liturg[ies]," with 52 "an imitation of a lamentation liturgy," Ps 107 as "a liturgy for a festival of thanksgiving," and Ps 67 as a "psalm of blessing" that "could point to a cultic-liturgical situation." Similarly, Samuel Terrien, review of Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary*, *JBR* 4 (1963), 334, questions Weiser's exclusive focus on an autumn festival, suggesting that "room must also be reserved for the other seasonal feasts, Massoth and Pesach, and also Shebhu'oth, as well as a score of other public acts of worship." In her specific study of references to the Sinai covenant in the Psalter, Johanna W. H. Bos, "Psalms and Sinai Covenant" (Ph.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1977), finds relatively few direct references to the Sinai event, whereupon she rejects Weiser's hypothesis.

²⁸² Cf. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 60, describes Pss 50, 81, and 95 as "the great festival psalms in the Psalter." Kraus cites Jörg Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels* (WMANT 35; Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), 125. Cf. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 326 and 459–60. Hossfeld, 460, sees all three psalms as consisting of two parts wherein, "[t]he first section in each psalm, despite all differences, functions to tie the dominant YHWH discourse [i.e., the second part] into the cult." Zenger and Seidl question the unity of Ps 95, however, hence its comparability with Pss 50 and 81. Weiser, *The Psalms*, 35–36, 391–99, 551–56, and 625–27, also recognizes a close relationship between Pss 81 and 95 in particular.

For a different viewpoint see Gerstenberger, *Psalms: Part 1 with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*, 210, who views Ps 50 as postexilic. For Gerstenberger the mention of Zion in v. 2 precludes its use in the temple because he views Zion theology as a later development. Gerstenberger, *Psalms, Part 2, and Lamentations* (FOTL 14; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1988), 111–12 and 184–85, also places Pss 81 and 95 in a later Jewish congregational setting.

Few other attempts have been made to collate the Psalter's allusions to covenant in any systematic way.²⁸³ Johanna W. H. Bos's 1977 dissertation on the Sinai covenant in the Psalter²⁸⁴ disputes Weiser's covenant renewal festival hypothesis, principally by tracing *בְּרִית* in eight psalms where she believes this term potentially elicits the Sinai covenant: Pss 25, 44, 50, 74, 78, 103, 106, and 111. However, Bos is more narrowly concerned with whether or not *בְּרִית* refers to the covenant-making at Sinai in these psalms. Bos answers this negatively,²⁸⁵ though recognizes that the theme of "covenant" is not absent from the psalms on that account. In any case, our investigation of covenant relationships requires a more comprehensive survey of covenantal allusions than Bos offers.

Methodological Considerations

What constitutes an inner-biblical allusion and how do we identify allusions? Scholars agree that there is no "one size fits all" answer to these questions. As a starting point, Beth Tanner reasonably suggests that genuine allusions are both intended by the author and identifiable to the reader.²⁸⁶ Ordinarily, this raises further questions about *who* those readers are,

²⁸³ Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, "Bundestheologie im Psalter" in *Der neue Bund im Alten: Studien zur Bundestheologie der beiden Testamente* (ed. Erich Zenger; Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1992), 169–76; and "Bund und Tora in den Psalmen," in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition: Festschrift für J. Maier* (ed. H. Merklein; BBB 88; Frankfurt, 1993), 66–77, are more interpretive and selective than heuristic or comprehensive treatments of covenant in the Psalter.

²⁸⁴ Johanna W. H. Bos, "Psalms and Sinai Covenant."

²⁸⁵ Bos, "The Psalms and Sinai Covenant," 102 and 128, concludes that *בְּרִית* does not refer to the covenant making in Pss 25, 44, 78, 103, 106, and 111, and she, *op. cit.*, 242–44, attributes *בְּרִית* in 74:10 to textual error. Finally, Bos, *op. cit.*, 231, sees Pss 50, 81, and 95 as evidence that "there were professional poets connected with the cult, namely the cultic prophets, whose poetry reflects an awareness of the covenant and of its obligations and demands," but that there is nevertheless "no evidence...of a commemoration of the Sinai covenant in the form of a covenant festival."

²⁸⁶ Beth LaNeel Tanner, "Allusion or Illusion in the Psalms: How Do We Decide?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, San Francisco, 20 November, 2011).

and how to determine whether they perceived the allusion and how. The first part of this question is considerably narrowed by our investigation's focus on *editorial* perspective, for it is their view that concerns us.²⁸⁷ Indeed, the editors' perception of the psalms they collected and arranged is even more important for our investigation than that of the psalms' original composers. Our focus on editorial perspective also suggests a way forward for answering the latter question, because the editorial evidence discussed in Chapters One and Two often sheds considerable light on how editors understood and employed the allusion. In addition, some covenant allusions are so explicit as to eliminate any doubt that editors recognized them (e.g. Pss 50, 89 and 105)—whether they occur at the Psalter's "seams" or not.

Michael Fishbane offers a similar caution concerning inner-biblical allusions. Fishbane rightly insists that instances of biblical allusion must be evaluated case by case, since the recurrence of lexical features known from older biblical *tradita* does not guarantee that the authors of those texts intended an allusion.²⁸⁸ Common lexical features may just be coincidental; the product of shared vocabulary or schools of thought.²⁸⁹

However, Fishbane's caution has limited relevance for the present investigation. First, whereas Fishbane investigates an author's exegetical reuse of a *traditum*, our investigation is concerned with the editorial reception and reuse of the *individual psalms* in which this dynamic has already occurred. In terms of focus, then, our investigation is one step removed from the *traditum-traditio* phenomenon as Fishbane examines it. Second, our investigation requires us to identify kinds of covenant allusion across multiple psalms, not examine them as isolated

²⁸⁷ That the identities of the Psalter's editors remain unknown matters less than it might seem, since we are in any case more interested in what editors actually *did* with the psalms they received than who they were.

²⁸⁸ Cf. Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 12–13, 289.

²⁸⁹ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 13, warns that, "it makes all the difference... whether a specific *traditum* has been reused or annotated; or whether, on the contrary, it contains independent reflexes of common idioms or comments which are original to the particular composition or teaching."

instances of exegesis.²⁹⁰ Accordingly, our survey ought to be focused on the incidence of potentially allusive data throughout the Psalter rather than adopt a purely “case by case” approach. In other words the Psalter, its subgroups, and psalm-sequences are our “text”—not individual psalms in isolation. Therefore, this chapter’s case by case examination of explicit examples using תִּרְיָדָה must be supplemented by Chapter Four’s survey of covenant-alluding “criteria,”²⁹¹ thereby ensuring that our survey provides a sufficiently full view of the Psalter’s covenantal allusions for the purposes of testing our hypothesis. Third, Fishbane’s investigation of inner-biblical exegesis confines him to those instances where a *traditum* has undergone some degree of discernible transformation through scribes’ interpretive reuse. By contrast we are concerned with allusions to biblical covenants whether the psalmist has significantly reshaped or redirected his received *traditum* or not. Again, this is because our object is to examine the *editors’* perspective, not that of the psalm authors. Fourth, while most covenant allusions are *textual* allusions (e.g. 2 Sam 7, Exod 34, etc.), our investigation is not strictly limited in this way. Some themes (e.g. promise of land, “two ways” theology, etc.) and vocabulary (e.g. דָּרָבָה, אָמַרְתָּ, אָמַרְתָּ, and their frequent pairing) have potential to achieve a covenantal allusion without specific or obvious dependency on any one covenantal text.

A Two-Pronged Approach: Direct References and Indirect Allusions. In light of these considerations, an initial survey of תִּרְיָדָה followed by a survey of covenant-alluding criteria suits

²⁹⁰ The editorial reuse of psalms itself may be said to fit within the *traditum-traditio* dynamic that Fishbane explores. In practice, however, Fishbane pays little attention to the Psalter as an editorial product, except regarding the doxologies (41:14, 72:18–19; 89:53, and 106:48) and the postscript at 72:20 as examples of general scribal conventions (op. cit., 28–29). For instance, Fishbane’s investigation of Ps 89’s “mantic” exegetical reuse of the oracle to David in 2 Sam 7 stops short of examining that psalm’s later editorial use of this psalm in the Psalter. By exploring the editorial appropriation of covenant-alluding psalms, therefore, our investigation contributes to the phenomenon of intertextuality at a level at some remove from that which Fishbane’s study examines.

²⁹¹ That is, to survey indirect reference (phrases, lexemes, formulae, themes, etc.) that recall prominent aspects of the Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Davidic covenants

the nature of this investigation. The Psalter contains numerous psalms that refer directly to Yahweh's covenant via the term **בְּרִית**, and these provide a logical place from which to expand our survey of allusive criteria. In some cases psalms identify which covenant is ostensibly in view.²⁹² For example, **בְּרִית** occurs four times in Ps 89 in plain reference to the Davidic covenant (vv. 4, 29, 35, and 40), and twice in Ps 105:8–11 regarding the Abrahamic covenant (vv. 8 and 10). These psalms refer directly to David or Abraham in their use of **בְּרִית**. Other cases are more subtle. For instance, contextual factors suggest that **בְּרִית** has primarily *Mosaic* covenantal entailments in Pss 25, 44, 50, and 78—usually by allusion to Sinaitic commandments (cf. Ps 50:17–18) or the covenantal obligation to walk in Yahweh's "way" or torah (e.g., Pss 25: 9–10 and 44:17–18), historical recollection, or echoes of the "grace formula" (Exod 34:6–7).²⁹³

Since these psalms already refer to **בְּרִית**, they demonstrate the potential of such implicit "criteria" to achieve *indirect* allusions in psalms that lack **בְּרִית**, and our survey must account for these also if it is to provide an expansive view of the Psalter's references and allusions to covenant. In many cases these "criteria" are best viewed as a potential indicator of covenantal themes, not a strict condition of an allusion to a covenant. Indeed, the allusive strength of these criteria varies from instance to instance. We cannot simply assume that every instance of a given criterion in the Psalter—be it a term like **אֱמֶת** or a theological theme like the "two ways"—has equally strong covenantal associations (consider, e.g., the latter's Wisdom associations). Accordingly, the results of this second part of the survey are necessarily tentative, and its basic goal is to map out and examine the distribution of each covenant-alluding criterion throughout the Psalter.

²⁹² Nevertheless a caveat is in order here. Although a particular covenant may be ostensibly in view in certain cases, it does not follow this should be the *exclusive* meaning of **בְּרִית** there—at least in terms of how editors understood the term. Indeed, the degree of unity that editors perceived between the covenants is itself an aspect of the question under investigation.

²⁹³ Note, e.g., **יְכַפֵּר עוֹן, וְהוּא רַחוּם | וְהוּא רַחוּם** as an allusion to Exod 34:6–7 in 78:38, and the pre-monarchic focus of vv. 5–67.

Sketching their distribution in this way benefits our investigation in important ways. First, it provides a better view of each of these covenant-related themes across groups of psalms, enabling us in a preliminary way to assess their potential editorial importance and draw conclusions relevant to the thesis we are testing. Second, it highlights psalms where several criteria mutually confirm their covenant-alluding force. Finally, it complements our initial survey of **בְּרִית** in the present chapter, thus furnishing a fuller view of the Psalter's covenantal "landscape." The survey further justifies our selection of Pss 72:17, 86:15, 103:8, and 145:8 as key texts for addressing the question of the relationship between the Davidic and pre-monarchic covenants, and provides data helpful for analyzing these psalms their Book contexts, thus paving the way for Chapters Five and Six.

A Question of Terminology: the "Mosaic Covenant." For several reasons we shall generally use the more inclusive term "Mosaic" rather than "Sinaitic" when referring to that covenant. First, this investigation is concerned with *editorial* perception of the tradition, not to mount a historical investigation of narrower traditional strata. For their part, editors likely did not perceive any meaningful difference between the Sinaitic covenant and the second law-giving recorded Deuteronomy, but recognized the same Mosaic covenantal reality in both. Second, as noted in the Introduction, Book IV includes the name of "Moses" seven times and itself raises the question of how the Davidic covenant—so focal in Books I–III—relates to its premonarchic counterparts. Thus the Psalter as an "editorial product" prompts the question of covenant relationships in broader "Mosaic" terms rather than the "Sinai covenant" narrowly conceived.²⁹⁴ Thus the term "Mosaic covenant" is appropriate for our investigation.

²⁹⁴ Some psalms highlight the Sinaitic theophany (e.g., Ps 50) or other particular events (e.g., Ps 103's allusion to Moses' intercession after the golden calf incident). In general, however, the Psalter's allusions to the Sinai event are found within a broader "Mosaic" tradition complex (e.g., Exodus and wilderness narrative allusions). We may also readily observe the relative infrequency of the term "Sinai" compared with "Moses" in the Psalter. "Sinai" occurs only twice in one psalm (Ps 68:9 and 18), while Book IV's Ps 106:19 contains the only reference to "Horeb."

Direct References Achieved with the Term בְּרִית

The term בְּרִית occurs twenty one times in the Psalter in thirteen psalms: Pss 25:10, 14; 44:17; 50:5, 16; 55:21; 74:20; 78:10, 37; 83:6; 89:4, 29, 35, 40; 103:18; 105:8, 10; 106:45; 111:5, 9; and 132:12. Of these, Pss 55:21 and 83:6 can be discounted, since they either refer to a private covenant or agreement or a covenant made against Yahweh by his enemies.²⁹⁵

Psalm 25

Davidic Ps 25 is an acrostic prayer that asks for Yahweh's forgiveness, help, and instruction.²⁹⁶ Other features that give Ps 25 its "wisdom" character include "fearing Yahweh" introduced in v. 12 (יִרְאֵ יְהוָה), an emphasis on teaching and instruction (cf. יוֹרָה in v. 8, and לִמּוּד in vv. 4, 5, and 9), and frequent references to Yahweh's "ways" (cf. דְּרָדָּר in vv. 4, 5, 8, 9, and 12). Within Book I, Ps 25 appears to introduce a subgroup of psalms after the oft-noted chiastically-arranged subgroup, Pss 15–24, which is centered on Torah Ps 19 and neighboring royal psalms (Pss 18, 20–21).²⁹⁷ This gives Ps 25 a place of relative prominence, together with the subject of "Yahweh's covenant," which is itself prominent within the psalm.²⁹⁸

²⁹⁵ Paul Kalluveetil, *Declaration and Covenant: A Comprehensive Review of Covenant Formula from the Old Testament and Ancient Near East* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1982), 9, classifies Ps 55:9 as "a secular *b'rit* text." In Ps 83:6 a league of ten nations (cf. vv. 7–9) "conspire with one accord and *make a covenant against you* (עָלִיךָ בְּרִית יְבָרְתוּ)."

²⁹⁶ Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 319, thinks that אֶלֶּהִי in v. 2 properly belongs at the end of v. 1, thus preserving the acrostic pattern by beginning v. 2 with הָיָה בְּרִיתִי (cf. LXX), and suggests that the final פַּ verse (v. 22) may be a later addition given its departure from the alphabetical arrangement. Kraus rejects the traditional view that Ps 25 is a lament because "it is preponderantly characterized by petitions and expressions of trust."

²⁹⁷ See, e.g., Miller, "Kingship, Torah Obedience, and Prayer." Cf. also Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 73, who draws further significance from the juxtaposition of Torah Ps 19 with Royal psalms. Psalms 15 and 24 begin and conclude the group as entrance liturgies then, moving inward, Pss 16 and 23 parallel each other as psalms of trust, Pss 17 and 22 as laments, Pss 18 and 20–21 as royal psalms, with Torah Ps 19 at the center of the chiastic group.

²⁹⁸ The scope of this subsequent group could extend to the end of Book I as, e.g., Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 239, seems to suggest. Alternatively, Ps 34 might conclude a subgroup of equivalent length to Pss 15–24, for it too is an acrostic and shares numerous affinities with Ps 25 (see Les D. Maloney, "Intertextual Links: Part of the Poetic Artistry within the Book I Acrostic Psalms," *RQ* 49 [2007], 11–21, who explores these psalms' intertextual links and

Indeed, Ps 25 uses the term **בְּרִית** twice (vv. 10 and 14); both times with a 3ms suffix (**בְּרִיתוֹ**) to identify it as *Yahweh's* covenant. Both instances use the term without further qualification, which suggests that the psalmist deems its meaning self-evident. Moreover, the definite, singular form of the reference, “his covenant,” accentuates the singularity and particularity of Yahweh’s covenant and excludes any sense of a plurality of covenants within the horizon of the psalm.

Verse 10 pairs **בְּרִיתוֹ** with **וְעִדְתָיו** which Yahweh’s people “keep” (**לְנֹצְרֵי בְּרִיתוֹ וְעִדְתָיו**); expressions most naturally associated with the Mosaic covenant.²⁹⁹ Moreover, vv. 6–7 contain numerous terms found in Exod 34:6–7 (**רַחֵם, חַסֵּד, חַטָּאָה, and פִּלְשָׁע**).³⁰⁰ The psalmist pleads with Yahweh to “remember your mercies” and “forget the sins of my youth,” basing these petitions on Yahweh’s nature as he revealed it to Moses when about to the Sinaitic covenant, much as Moses himself did in his intercessory pleas for forgiveness in Num 14:18–19. A few verses later v. 13 declares concerning “the man who fears Yahweh” (**הַיִּירָא יְהוָה**—v. 12) that “his offspring shall inherit the land (**וְיִרְשׁוּ אֶרֶץ**),” echoing the promise of the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 15:18) taken up extensively in Deuteronomy. The following verse

draws attention to David Noel Freedman’s work on them). Either way, Ps 25 appears as the first of a group of psalms following Pss 15–24. David’s trust in this and the following psalm (25:2; 26:1), as one who has, e.g., “washed [his] hands in innocence and go[es] about your altar” (26:6) follows well after the previous subgroup, particularly its focus on the king, Torah piety, and the theme of entering the sanctuary.

²⁹⁹ When human beings are the subject, **נָצַר** most often occurs with plural nouns like **מִצְוֹת** (e.g., 78:7), **חֻקִּים** (e.g., Ps 105:45; 119:145), **עֲדוּת** (Ps 119:2, 22) and similar terms. Other theologically charged uses of **נָצַר** usually have Yahweh as subject; e.g., Exod 34:7 where Yahweh is “keeper of steadfast love (**נֹצֵר חֶסֶד**),” and Isa 42:9 where Yahweh promises to “keep you” (i.e., his servant) and “give you as a covenant to the people (**וְאֶתְנַהֵךְ לְבְרִית**)” (i.e., his servant). However Moses’ blessing of Levi in Deut 33:9 offers a close parallel to Ps 25:10. In Deut 33:9 as in Ps 25:10 **נָצַר** has an m. pl. subject and **בְּרִית** as its object (**וְנָצַרְתָּ וּבְרִיתְךָ יְנַצְרֵנוּ**), whereupon Moses enjoins the Levites to “teach Jacob your rules (**מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ**) and Israel your law (**וְתוֹרָתְךָ**).” Psalm 132:12 also has **בְּרִית** in parallel with either **עֲדוּת** or **עֲדוּת** as well (see discussion in Chapter Four), as the object of **שָׁמַר**, a semantic equivalent of **נָצַר**.

³⁰⁰ To this list we may add **טוֹב**, which occurs in Yahweh’s 33:19.

continues the wisdom terminology, where Yahweh's covenant (בְּרִיתוֹ) parallels his "counsel" (סֹד יְהוָה); a term that occurs predominantly in the prophets and wisdom literature:³⁰¹ "The counsel of Yahweh is for those who fear him (לִירְאָיו) to make them know (לְהוֹדִיעֵם) his covenant."

In sum, the "Davidic" praying subject of Ps 25 describes "Yahweh's covenant" in sapiential tones, drawing in both Abrahamic promises and Mosaic covenantal life and obligations. Moreover, both indicative statements about Yahweh's covenant in vv. 10 and 14 are preceded by petitions for mercy or forgiveness, suggesting that Yahweh's forgiving character is foundational to the integrity of the covenant and the psalmist's participation in it (see esp. 6–7). Indeed, these parallels to Moses' intercession in Num 14 at least raise the possibility that later editors perceived Ps 25 as David praying for himself according to a model of Mosaic intercession, whose importance for the preservation and renewal of the covenant was well-established.

Psalm 44

Psalm 44 is the third psalm of the Korahite group, Pss 42–49, and also of Book II (or second if Pss 42–43 are treated as one psalm). As in Ps 25, בְּרִית in Ps 44:18 is definite, this time with a 2d sg. suffix. Again, definiteness stresses its singularity and particularity. After recalling God's favorable dealings in former times (vv. 1–9), and lamenting his present rejection (vv. 10–17), the psalmist claims in v. 18 that, "all this has come upon us, though we have not forsaken you (וְלֹא שָׁכַחְנוּךָ), and we have not been false to your covenant (וְלֹא־שָׁקַרְנוּ בְּבְרִיתֶךָ)." Indeed, Deuteronomy's frequent warning not to "forget Yahweh" or his covenant seems to stand behind the psalm in general and v. 18 in particular.³⁰² In v. 19 the psalmist further affirms the people's covenantal fidelity by declaring with terminology most familiar from the Prophets, "Our heart

³⁰¹ סֹד occurs mostly in Jeremiah, Job, Proverbs, Psalms, and once in Genesis, Ezekiel, and Amos.

³⁰² In several notable places in Deuteronomy the verb שָׁכַח takes יְהוָה as its object (6:12; 8:11, 14, 19) as well as בְּרִית (4:23 and 31), often preceded by "lest..." (e.g., 6:12, אֶת־יְהוָה, פֶּן־תִּשְׁכַּח אֶת־יְהוָה).

has not turned back, nor have our steps departed from your way.”³⁰³ In v. 21 the psalmist indirectly claims that the people are innocent with regard to “forgetting God’s name” (אִם-שָׁכַחְנוּ שֵׁם אֱלֹהֵינוּ) and worshipping “foreign gods” (וּנְפָרַשׁ כַּפֵּינוּ לְאֵל זָר), which allude to the commands to “have no other gods” (cf. אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים in Exod 20:3/Deut 5:7) and to not “take Yahweh your God’s name in vain” (cf. לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת-שֵׁם-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׁוּא in Exod 20:7/Deut 5:11).³⁰⁴ Rhetorically, the psalmist protests that Yahweh has rejected and disgraced the people (vv. 10–17) even though they have heeded the stipulations of the Mosaic covenant. Thus, Ps 44 laments God’s apparent rejection of his people in a manner reminiscent of Ps 89 in that it levels no blame at the people just as Ps 89 levels no blame at the king.³⁰⁵ Furthermore, in vv. 3–4 the psalmist acknowledges that they had possessed the land by Yahweh’s doing, not their own military power (cf. v. 4a כִּי לֹא בְחַרְבָּם יָרְשׁוּ אֶרֶץ אֲרָץ), thus echoing the motif of the gift of land prominent in the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenantal texts (e.g. Gen 15:7; Exod 23:30; Lev 20:24; 25:24; Num 35:53; Deut 3:18; 4:14; 6:1; 7:6–7; 9:4–5 etc.). Their success in gaining the land was God’s doing, and he alone can prosper them now (vv. 5–9).

Psalm 50

Psalm 50 is conspicuous by its separation from the main group of Asaph psalms (Pss 73–83) and the apparent editorial effort to smooth the transition from the Korahite and Davidic psalms either side of it (see Chapter Two). Moreover, Ps 50 and David’s penitential Ps 51 each display a special interest in offerings (see 50:5, 7, 14, 23; 51:18–22), suggesting deliberate

³⁰³ The term for “way” here is דִּרְכָּךְ, which occurs only twice in the Pentateuch (Gen 18:11 and 49:17). Similarly, the verb שָׁב occurs only in Deut 19:14 and 27:17—both times in reference to the shifting of boundary stones rather than “turning back” from Yahweh’s ways (cf. Prov 22:28 and 23:10). On the other hand, these terms are used in comparable ways in prophetic literature (cf. Isa 42:17; 50:5; 59:14; Jer 38:22; and 46:5).

³⁰⁴ To avoid confusion I will avoid using the existing systems for numbering the commandments.

³⁰⁵ Note also the shared verb נָתַתָּהּ in 44:10 and 89:39. John Goldingay, *Psalms* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2006–2008), 2:663, suggests that Ps 89 may be seen “as a heightened version of Ps. 44.”

connection between Asaph Ps 50 and David II around this theme.³⁰⁶ It therefore stands in a place of demonstrable editorial importance.

As one of the three commonly identified “festival psalms,”³⁰⁷ Ps 50 moves from a description of divine theophany (vv. 1–6) to God’s address to his covenant people (vv. 7–23). The term *בְּרִית* occurs first in v. 5, where God summons his “faithful ones (*חֲסִידַי*),³⁰⁸ who made a covenant with [him] by sacrifice (*כַּרְתִּי בְרִיתִי עֲלֵי־זֶבַח*).” The second occurrence is in v. 16, where God challenges “the wicked” (*וְלֹא־שָׁע*), asking them, “what right have you to recite my statutes (*חֻקַּי*) or take my covenant on your lips (*וְהִטָּא בְרִיתִי עֲלֵי־פִיךָ*)?” Both times *בְּרִית* has

³⁰⁶ Scholars usually explain 51:20–21 as a later editorial gloss in order to explain the “problem” of an apparent shift in attitude toward the offering system from disparagement in v. 18 to approval in v. 21. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 500, writes, “It has been recognized a long time that...vv. 18–19 [= vv. 20–21]...is a later accretion which corrects the thoughts about offerings in v. 15 in a striking way and inserts a time-conditioned plea: to build the walls of Jerusalem.” Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 18, share the view that vv. 20–21 are an addition to the “primary psalm” (vv. 1–19), but do not consider it to have arisen amid the circumstances surrounding the historical rebuilding of the temple. For them v. 20 is an editor’s “plea for eschatological restoration of the city of God” and part of “a more broadly applied redaction...whose program is developed most fully in the final Hallel (cf. Psalm 147).” Whether due to such “redactional layering” in the growth process of the Psalter, or—more likely in our view (see previous chapter)—an editor’s deliberate collocation of psalms that bear similar themes, there can be little question that Pss 50–51’s common emphasis on sacrifice reflects editorial intent to connect David II with Ps 50’s theophanic address to the people with its emphasis on offerings (see, Christine D. B. Jones, “The Psalms of Asaph: A Study of the Function of a Psalm Collection” [Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 2009], 137).

Against the widespread scholarly assumption that vv. 20–21 is “a later accretion” attested by Kraus, we may question whether the above-mentioned attitudinal shift between vv. 18 and 21 is real or perceived. If read with David’s adultery with Bathsheba and murder of Uriah the Hittite in view as Ps 51’s superscript directs, v. 18’s “For you will not delight in sacrifice, or I would give it, you will not be pleased with a burnt offering” is most easily explained as David’s recognition that no sin or guilt offering had been provided for his grave sins—not a general criticism of the offering system *en toto*. Understood thus, v. 21’s hopeful anticipation of the resumption of pleasing burnt offerings does not “correct” earlier comments about the value of offerings so much as anticipate the right relationship between God and Israel in the wake of God’s forgiveness of the king (cf. 2Sam 12:13). In our view, alternative explanations like those identified above offer an unnecessarily complicated account of vv. 20–21.

³⁰⁷ See above.

³⁰⁸ MS evidence from Cairo Geniza, as well as the LXX and Syriac reflect 3 sg. suffix.

the 1st sg. suffix. The parallel between כְּרַחֵי בְרִיתִי עָלַי-זָבַח and חֲסִידַי in v. 5 identifies the people closely with the sacrificial cult. More specifically, v. 5 appears to recall Exodus 24 where Moses consecrated the people with the “blood of the covenant” at Mt Sinai.³⁰⁹ Indeed, several other indicators within the psalm highlight these Mosaic covenantal concerns. The address in v. 7, “Hear, O my people (שְׁמַעַה עַמִּי)...I am God, your God (אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵיךָ אֲנִי)” resembles the Shema in Deut 6:4 and the numerous instances of similar “self-introductory” formulae found throughout Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy.³¹⁰ Moreover, v. 18 charges the wicked with consorting with thieves and adulterers, thus alluding to the corresponding prohibitions in the Decalogue (Exod 20:14–15; Deut 5:18–19).³¹¹ In addition, v. 20 seems to allude to the command against false witness in Exod 20:16, despite lexical dissimilarities.³¹²

Moreover, Ps 50’s attribution to Asaph suggests that Ps 50 may be naturally associated with centralized worship under David and especially Solomon (cf. 2 Chr 7). Indeed, v. 2 locates the theophany in Zion: “Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God shines forth.” As Jon Levenson notes, “the renewal of the Siniatic covenant has become a liturgy of the Temple of Jerusalem.”³¹³ For Levenson, the covenantal life begun at Sinai was not merely superceded, but vibrantly taken up at Mt Zion, which Ps 50’s divine summons demonstrates powerfully. When it

³⁰⁹ Cf. Geoffrey W. Grogan, *Psalms* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 105; Willem A. Vangemeren, *Psalms* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2008), 428.

³¹⁰ Rolf Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (OTS; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 15n23, credits the term “self introductory formula” to Walter Zimmerli, who identifies it as “Ich bin Jahwe.” The formula usually uses “Yahweh” (e.g., Exod 6:7, אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, and some 27 other instances in Exodus-Deuteronomy, which account for the vast majority of occurrences). But the resemblance is scarcely obscured by Ps 50’s use of אֱלֹהִים, especially since it occurs in the “Elohistic” portion of the Psalter.

³¹¹ Cf. Peter Craigie, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC 19; Waco, Tex: 1983), 365.

³¹² Cf. Ps 50:20, “You sit and speak against your brother; you slander your own mother’s son” (תֵּשֵׁב בְּאָחִיךָ / תְּדַבֵּר בְּבֶן-אִמְךָ תִּתְּנֵן-דַּפִּי לֹא-תִעֲנֶה / בְּרַעַד עַד שֶׁקֶר); cf. Deut 5:20 that has שָׁאֵן instead of שֶׁקֶר.

³¹³ Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai & Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (New York: HarperCollins, 1985), 207.

comes to human kingship, however, further possibilities need to be explored than Levenson's analysis allows. Indeed, the dissociation of Ps 50 from other Asaph psalms raises the possibility that editors deliberately sought to associate it with the subsequent Davidic group (Pss 51–72), perhaps in order to present David or the royal office as a response to God's summons in Ps 50 in some sense, thereby raising compelling implications for how editors understood David's relationship to the Mosaic covenant.³¹⁴ Chapter Five's analysis of Books I–II will address this further.

Psalm 74

Asaph Ps 74 laments the oppression of a scoffing enemy (e.g., vv. 18, 22–23) that has profaned Yahweh's name and defiled his sanctuary (cf. vv. 3–8, 18). Whether or not the psalm was authored with the destruction of the temple in view (587 B.C.), editors living after that event could hardly avoid this association.³¹⁵

Verse 20 petitions God to “have regard for the covenant” (הִבֵּט לְבְרִית). This definite form of בְּרִית is unique in the psalms, where בְּרִית normally takes a possessive suffix.³¹⁶ Nevertheless בְּרִית with the definite article has numerous precedents outside the Psalter, particularly in regard to the Noahic covenant (Gen 9:12, 17) and in construct chains from clear Mosaic covenantal contexts: e.g., “the book of the covenant” (סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית) in Exod 24:7, “the blood of the

³¹⁴ See also Samuel Terrien, *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 396, who writes that “[t]he Hebrew stories of theophany, originally part of the Sinai tradition... were later transferred to Zion.” Similarly Levenson, *Sinai & Zion*.

³¹⁵ Jones, “The Psalms of Asaph,” 68 and 72.

³¹⁶ Bos, “Psalms and Sinai Covenant,” 243. For Bos “the mention of “the covenant” without qualification, the sole instance of its kind in the psalms,” is cause to suspect textual corruption. Moreover, Bos observes that this verb-object combination is a *hapax* and objects that “the colon is too short.” Accordingly, she emends the text to read “Look at the hollows (לְבָרוֹת).” However none of these objections seem serious enough to justify emendation, especially since הַבְּרִית (i.e., with the definite article) is attested outside the Psalms (see above). Moreover, בְּרִית often lacks explicit qualification in the Psalter as we have noted (e.g., Ps 25:10, 14; 44:18 etc.); its possessive suffix doing little to qualify it in any meaningful way.

covenant” (דַּם־הַבְּרִית in Exod 24:8), “the words of the covenant” (דְּבָרֵי הַבְּרִית in Exod 34:28), “the tablets of the covenant” (לְחֹת הַבְּרִית in Deut 9:9, 11, 15), “the ark of the covenant” (אָרוֹן הַבְּרִית in Josh 3:6, 8, 14; 4:9; 6:6), etc. More pertinently, Deut 7:9 describes “Yahweh your God” as “the faithful God who keeps *the covenant* and steadfast love with those who love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations” (וַיִּדְעַתָּה כִּי־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים) (הָאֵל הַנֶּאֱמָן שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֲסֵד לְאֲהַבָיו וּלְשֹׁמְרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו לְאֶלְף דּוֹר הַבְּרִית). Like in Ps 74:20, the definite form הַבְּרִית is stated in an absolute, unqualified manner, and it is possible that Ps 74:20 appeals to Yahweh to act according to his nature as expressed in Deut 7:9. The evidence for a specific allusion to Deut 7:9 here is otherwise minimal though. In any case, a conscious allusion to Deut 7:9 would not necessarily clarify whether a specific covenant is in view, since Deut 7:9 describes Yahweh himself rather than a particular covenant *per se*.

However v. 2 presents a corresponding petition to v. 20 that clarifies the horizon of Ps 74. It asks God to “remember your congregation, which you purchased of old, which you have redeemed to be the tribe of your heritage (זָכֹר עֲדָתְךָ | קְנִיתָ קֹדֶם גָּאֵלְתָּ שֶׁבֶט נַחֲלֹתְךָ), [remember] Mount Zion where you have dwelt (הַר־צִיּוֹן זֶה | שָׁכַנְתָּ בּוֹ).” This petition bears striking lexical and conceptual similarities to the Song of the Sea in Exod 15 in the way it describes the “congregation” (e.g., the expressions עַם־נְזָאֲלֹתָ and עַם־נְזָאֲלֹתָ in Exod 15:13 and 16 respectively). Moreover, Ps 74:2’s mention of Zion and v. 3’s lament that “the enemy has destroyed everything in the sanctuary (בְּקֹדֶשׁ)” (see also מִקְדָּשְׁךָ in v. 7)³¹⁷ employs similar terms and concepts found in v.17 of the Song of the Sea. There Yahweh leads his people to “the mountain of your inheritance (בְּהַר נַחֲלֹתְךָ), the place... which you have made for your abode (מִקְדָּשׁ אֲדֹנָי כּוֹנֵנוֹ), and the sanctuary... which your hands have established (מִקְדָּשׁ אֲדֹנָי כּוֹנֵנוֹ).

³¹⁷ Multiple MSS have the plural, “your sanctuaries.” However LXX, Vg, and Tg all witness a singular form. That מִקְדָּשְׁךָ is paralleled by another sg. noun (מִשְׁכַּן־שְׁמֶיךָ) further suggests the sg. Nevertheless, in v. 8 the enemies “burned all the meeting places of God (כָּל־מוֹעֲדֵי־אֱלֹהִים) in the land,” which may account for the plural in those MSS that attest it.

יָדִיָּךְ.” Verse 2 also petitions God to “remember your congregation... which you redeemed (גָּאֲלִיתָ)...etc.,” echoing Exod 15:13’s similar description of the people. Added to these associations is v.1’s description of God’s people as “the sheep of your pasture (בְּצֹאֵן מְרֻעֵיתֶךָ);” a phrase strongly reminiscent of variations on the covenant formula found in Ps 95:7 and 100:3 (see the same expression in Asaph Ps 79:13).³¹⁸

These implicit data suggest that the psalmist associates “the covenant” (לְבָרִית) with both God’s redemption and acquisition of his people at the Exodus and Mt Zion. The covenant, then, exists between God and his people—a point reflected by Ps 74’s linguistic parallels to the Song of the Sea and probable reflection of the covenant formula in v. 1—and centers upon the sanctuary at Zion. As Jon Levenson’s study of Sinai and Zion also suggests, the seamless shift from לְבָרִית to “Zion” reflects an essential unity between the Mosaic covenant and Zion as its locale.³¹⁹ Here in Ps 74 the Mosaic covenant and Zion go together very closely. Moreover, inasmuch as Ps 74 associates בְּרִית with a blend of both Exodus and Zion motifs, it also reflects a similar convergence of themes found in Ps 78, whose earlier focus on the Mosaic covenant shifts to God’s election of Judah, Zion, and David.

Psalm 78

At seventy-two verses long, Ps 78 is surpassed in length only by Ps 119 and dominates the main group of eleven Asaph psalms at whose center it stands.³²⁰ Psalm 78 is often described as a historical psalm similar to Pss 105 and 106, all three of which contain the term בְּרִית. Psalm 78

³¹⁸ Ps 95:7a reads, יָדוּ וְצִאֵן יְדוּ עִם מְרֻעֵיתוֹ וְצִאֵן יְדוּ; and Ps 100:3 reads, דָּעוּ כִּי־יְהוָה הוּא אֱלֹהֵימֶן. Cf. Lohfink, “The Covenant Formula in Psalm 33,” 87, who regards Pss 33:12, 95:7, and 100:3 as allusions to covenant formula “with a high degree of certainty.” See further below.

³¹⁹ Levenson, *Sinai & Zion*, esp. 187–217. Levenson describes the relationship between Sinai and Zion traditions as more complex than a simple matter of transfer from one locale to another, or the replacement of the one with the other.

³²⁰ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 285.

presents Israel's history as a repeating cycle of the people's faithlessness followed by God's mercy and intervention, and culminates with God's election of Judah, Zion, and David (vv. 68–72).³²¹ Indeed, Ps 78's final, positive focus on David, Zion and Judah—in contrast to the foregoing pattern of sin and rebellion—suggest that Yahweh's "election" of these (בַּחֹר in vv. 68 and 70) is in some sense his solution to the people's perpetual faithlessness to Yahweh. The sequence in vv. 68–72 narrows from tribe (Judah) to city/mountain (Zion) to sanctuary to an individual, David, whose vocation is elaborated on more fully in vv. 70–72 at the psalm's conclusion. Even within the narrower purview of this sequence, then, David appears to be the culminating point.³²² David's specific role is "to shepherd Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance (נַחֲלָתוֹ)," thus preserving a key aspect of their status within the Mosaic covenant as Moses had done through his intercession for them (e.g., Deut 9:26, 29; cf. 4:20). Verse 72 then concludes the psalm by identifying David's "uprightness of heart" (כִּבְבוֹ) and "skillful hand" (וּבְתַבּוּנוֹת כַּפָּיו) as instrumental to David's success in his vocational task as shepherd. This raises important implications for covenant relationships, presenting David or the Davidic king as God's solution to his people's perennial faithlessness to the Mosaic covenant, and suggesting that he is somehow central to the renewal of the Mosaic covenant and the people's

³²¹ Psalm 78 seems primarily concerned with this theological pattern of Israel's existence, rather than chronological precision. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 286, comment, "In contrast to an exact description of events, here we find *history in poetic refraction*... The history of the people Israel is clumped together and narrated for the most part *in an arbitrary sequence*."

³²² Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 405. Jones, "The Psalms of Asaph," 89, suggests that vv. 67–72 "[i]n some sense... provide great hope." However, Jones goes on to say that "read in light of the exile, the point of the last verses is less clear," limiting the substance of that hope to the idea "the people of the exile can gain religious identity from the recollection of Judah/David's election," and that "God does wake up and God does restore a relationship, albeit in a new way (vv 65–72)." This is methodologically consistent with her purpose, "The Psalms of Asaph," 2, to "test the thesis that the Psalms of Asaph as a collection guide the reader through the turmoil experienced by the people as a result of exile," and therefore resembles the historicizing approaches of Wilson, McCann and others discussed in the Introduction. Accordingly, Jones' approach precludes the Davidic monarchy or a future Davidide from being a more meaningful source of hope in Ps 78 than that.

continued status as “Yahweh’s inheritance” within it. Indeed, Ps 78 places “David” in a relationship to the Mosaic covenant that coheres with Kraus’ description of the king’s central role in the maintenance/renewal of the Mosaic covenant (see Introduction). At the very least, Ps 78 presents the monarchy as the solution to *Mosaic* covenantal failure, rather than the Mosaic covenant as the solution to *Davidic* covenantal failure as Wilson suggests (see Introduction).

Indeed, both instances of בְּרִית (vv. 10 and 37) offer succinct statements about Israel’s unfaithfulness to Yahweh in terms that primarily evoke the Mosaic covenant. Verse 10 states, “They did not keep God’s covenant, but refused to walk according to his law.” Thus, v. 10 parallels the notions of (not) “walking according to Torah” (וּבְתוֹרָתוֹ מֵאֵנוּ לִלְכֹת) and (not) “keeping covenant” (לֹא שָׁמְרוּ בְרִית אֱלֹהִים), that is, the Mosaic covenant. Similarly, v. 37 expresses Israel’s problem as its faithlessness to God’s בְּרִית. Here “not being faithful” (וְלֹא יִתְּנוּ) is met by God’s compassionate (רַחוּם) and forgiving (יִכַּפֵּר עֲוֹן) response (v. 38) in which Yahweh turns from “his anger” (אַפּוֹ); terms that elicit Yahweh’s response in Exod 34:6–7 to Israel’s breach of the Mosaic covenant, whereupon he renewed that covenant (Exod 34:10).³²³ Since Yahweh’s choice of Judah, Zion, and David in vv. 68–72 culminates Ps 78’s “recounting” of his praises, mighty works, and the wonders he has done (תְּהַלֵּלוֹת יְהוָה וְעֲזָוֹנוֹ)

³²³ Mary Vanderzee-Pals, “God’s Moral Essence: Exodus 34:6–7a and Its Echoes in the Old Testament,” 106, identifies Ps 78:38 as an echo of Exod 34:6–7.

Significantly, v. 37 occurs at the approximate midpoint of the psalm within a centrally located theological summary of Israel’s condition before God, and his mercy toward them (vv. 32–39). Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 286, highlight vv. 32–39 and vv. 61–64 as portions where the psalm’s “metaphors and poetic depictions” are “not to be applied precisely to a concrete event.” Indeed, it appears that the psalmist appropriated Exod 34:6–7 terminology as a general commentary on Israel’s faithlessness toward the Mosaic covenant and Yahweh’s gracious dealings with his people.

Interestingly, the Masoretes also recognize the preceding verse, v. 36 (“But they flattered him with their mouths; they lied to him with their tongues”), as the midpoint of the Psalter itself. It is tempting to conclude that the (final?) editors intended this unit to be the theological “center” of the Psalter; that the heart of the Psalter is the covenant relationship between Yahweh and his people as a story of sin and grace.

וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה), the psalm presupposes continuity between God’s compassionate forgiveness of his people and covenant renewal in Exod 34:6–7 on the one hand, and his election of David as shepherd on the other. Indeed, this pairing already stands out within the Psalter as we noted earlier and shall investigate further in Chapter Six.

Psalm 78’s use of עֲדוּת also suggests that בְּרִית primarily has Mosaic covenantal associations in the psalm. According to v. 5 God “established a testimony (עֲדוּת) in Jacob and appointed a law (וְתוֹרָה) in Israel, which he commanded our fathers to teach their children.” Verse 4 indicates that Yahweh’s “praises” (תְּהִלֹּת יְהוָה), “might” (וְעֲזוֹנוֹ), and “the wonders he has done” (וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה) are the substance of that command, so that עֲדוּת and תוֹרָה are most directly concerned with Yahweh’s acts about to be recounted. The psalmist invites his hearers to “give ear to my instruction” (תוֹרָה),³²⁴ resolving to “tell to the coming generation” (v. 3) the “things that we have heard and known, that our fathers have told us” (v. 3): Yahweh’s praises, mighty works, and wonders, and resembling Moses’ injunction to teach future generations in Deut 6:4–7. Thus, while we cannot say that עֲדוּת here is a direct reference to the Mosaic covenant *per se*, it denotes a command equivalent to the great *Shema* of Deut 6, and thus reinforces the above uses of בְּרִית in primary reference to the Mosaic covenant. Moreover, Psalm 78’s premonarchic focus prior to v. 68 also suggests the particular association of בְּרִית and עֲדוּת in vv. 5, 10, and 37 with the Mosaic covenant.

Thus Ps 78 employs בְּרִית primarily in reference to the Mosaic covenant.³²⁵ Of most interest for our investigation is the larger context in which Ps 78 employs these references. The people keep breaking the covenant, and God keeps judging and showing mercy to sustain the

³²⁴ תוֹרָה here need not exclude the Mosaic covenantal stipulations, but these do not seem to be the main focus.

³²⁵ Indeed, Goldingay, *Psalms* 2, 479, likens the whole psalm to Moses song in Deut 32, describing it as “exhortation in poetic form.” Similarly, Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 2, 286, liken it to Exod 15, Deut 32, and Judg 5, and consider its superscript’s description of it as “an instructional poem” (מְשֻׁכֵּל) an accurate description of the psalm’s form. These observations further support Ps 78’s primary interest in the Mosaic covenant.

covenant relationship—a cycle seen clearly in the DH. The psalm culminates the cycle with the rejection of the northern tribes (vv. 65–67) and election of Judah, Zion, and David (vv. 68–72). The psalmist does not care to recount the Davidic dynasty’s subsequent “highs and lows” as the DH does, but rather accentuates David’s status as “his servant” (עֶבְדֶּךָ) —a feature that becomes especially significant for our analysis of Book III in Chapter Six. Within the horizon of Ps 78 Yahweh’s election of Judah, Zion, and David is only positive, and the institutions of monarchy and centralized sanctuary are presented as God’s answer to this cycle.

How, then, did editors understand by “David.” There seem to be two main possibilities. One possibility is that editors understood 78:68–72 as a nostalgic, historical reference to the centralization of worship in Zion and election of historical David as the next, now passé, stage in dealing with his people. Grammatically, the verb sequence $\text{וַיְנַחֵם} \dots \text{וַיְנַחֵם}$ in v. 72—a waw consecutive imperfect verb followed by a shortened imperfect verb form—is perhaps most naturally understood as historic sequence rather than present. Nevertheless the second verb-form leaves room for its interpretation in a present, ongoing, or even future sense: “He guides them” or “will (still/yet) guide them” etc. However, non-agreement in verb sequences is common in Hebrew poetry, making it difficult to be dogmatic about tense on the basis of verb form alone. Even if editors understood the “historic” David of the past as these verbs’ ostensive referent, it does not follow that they saw no present or future implications in God’s election of “David” as founding figure for the Davidic *monarchy*. Indeed, such a present/future perspective seems more in keeping with Ps 78’s illustrative way of recalling history as seen, for example, with v. 38’s general application of the echoes of Exod 34:6–7.³²⁶ The whole psalm seems less concerned with temporal sequence than it does establishing the Davidic covenant’s theological importance in relation to the Mosaic covenant that God’s people repeatedly broke. On the one hand, this echoes Levenson’s view on the close relationship between the Mosaic covenant and Zion. On the other

³²⁶ Cf. Hossfeld and Zenger’s views above.

hand, noting that the construction of the Temple (v. 69) precedes David's election (v. 70), Levenson writes, "In contrast to what we read in Samuel and Kings, Psalm 78 describes the divine choice of Zion (in the tribe of Judah) as lying before the rise of David...because to the psalmist, the essential meaning of the Temple lies in its foundation in primal times, in *illo tempore*, in other words, in its protological character."³²⁷ Levenson's point concerning the Temple's significance is valid,³²⁸ but Ps 78's final verses suggest that there's more to the psalmist's lack of regard for strict chronology than just this. Indeed, we see in Ps 78:68–72 a narrowing focus from tribe (Judah) to mountain (Zion) to individual (David) that culminates with the latter. Though clearly going together, it is on the last of these, "David," that the psalm itself places greatest stress.

Indeed, it is very plausible that editors understood the election of Judah, Zion, and David in a more "institutional" sense that transcends the particularities of 10th century B.C. events and keeps in view the divine purpose for Davidide king and sanctuary in the present and future. Within the canonical Psalter, or even a hypothetical smaller collection like the EP or the larger "Messianic Psalter" (Books I–III), Ps 78's placement after the "royal succession" themed Pss 71–72 makes an exclusive focus on "historical David" in Ps 78 seem an unlikely way for editors to understand the reference to David. Rather, Ps 78's position after Ps 72 suggests that editors saw in vv. 70–72 the institution of the monarchy and future Davidides. Such a view is also more consistent with Book III's "present" interest in the fortunes of the monarchy—a characteristic most clearly evident in Ps 89 as we shall see.

³²⁷ Levenson, *Sinai & Zion*, 106.

³²⁸ For his full analysis of Zion as cosmic mountain, see Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 111–36.

Psalm 89

Psalm 89's placement at the end of Book III—also the so-called “Messianic Psalter” (Pss 2–89)³²⁹—and earnest lament over Yahweh's apparent neglect of the Davidic covenant make it focal for an investigation of covenant relationships. Indeed, at the macrostructural level, Wilson observes that Ps 89 presents a crisis to which Books IV–V seem to offer some kind of response; a view generally followed by recent scholars despite some variations (see Introduction). Accordingly, Ps 89 provides an important window into how the editors understood that covenant and the crisis it apparently portends. After examining Ps 89's presentation of the Davidic covenant and use of **בְּרִית**, then, the following analysis will also consider to the psalm's potential for editorial reuse.

Psalm 89's Presentation of the Davidic Covenant. In general, scholars believe the author of Ps 89 consciously depended on Nathan's oracle to David in 2Sam 7. Fishbane sees Ps 89 as an example “mantic exegesis,” which sought to preserve the validity of the oracle in a new historical situation through “subtle adjustments” that in his view ultimately exceed the intention of 2 Sam 7. Indeed, in Fishbane's view Ps 89 stretches its source text in tendentious ways.³³⁰ Knut Heim offers a more positive evaluation, acknowledging that Ps 89 “is a highly artistic piece of poetry” that “may go *beyond* its source text, but it does not go *against* it.”³³¹ Alternatively,

³²⁹ See Chapter One.

³³⁰ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 466–67, 534. Fishbane notes several differences introduced by Ps 89 that he later describes as “numerous tendentious changes... which go well beyond any implicit sense of the language of 2 Sam. 7.” These include Ps 89's focus on dynastic crisis and omission of the Temple, restriction of the promise of respite from enemies to David alone in vv. 23–24, application of Yahweh's father-son relationship to David himself rather than his heirs as in 2 Sam 7, and the reference to Nathan's prophecy in “covenant-legal terms” in Ps 89 that Fishbane, following Sarna, deems lacking in the prose version.

³³¹ Knut Heim, “The (God-)Forsaken King of Psalm 89: A Historical and Intertextual Enquiry,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 301.

Goldingay suggests neither piece bears the marks of direct dependence on the other.³³² As noted earlier, the question of direct or indirect dependence on 2 Sam 7 is relatively unimportant to our investigation of the *editors'* use of Ps 89.³³³ Nevertheless, scholars' comparisons of Ps 89 with 2 Sam 7 illuminate Ps 89's portrayal of the Davidic covenant and the crisis surrounding it.

For instance, Fishbane observes that whereas 2 Sam 7:12–15 describes the promises of an established kingdom and Yahweh's father-son relationship to the king in terms of David's *offspring* (cf. אֲנִי־בְרִיתִי וְיָעֲרֹךְ in 2 Sam 12), Ps 89 ostensibly relates these promises directly to *David himself* (cf. vv. 26–28).³³⁴ Additionally, Fishbane notes that Ps 89 omits any reference to the building of Yahweh's house (cf. 2 Sam 7:13), thereby “highlighting the contemporary threat to the royal line.”³³⁵ Both observations are noteworthy, and we shall explore their possible implications for Ps 89's editorial reuse further below.

A second general difference that scholars perceive between the two texts involves Ps 89's presentation of Yahweh's promises to David as “a full-blown covenant,”³³⁶ even using the formal expression, “to cut a covenant” (i.e., כָּרַתִּי בְרִית in v. 4). In light of the Psalter's use of כָּרַתִּי to

³³² Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:668. Jungwoo Kim, “Psalm 89: Its Biblical-Theological Contribution to the Presence of Law within the Unconditional Covenant” (Ph.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1989), 80, notes that Casper J. Labuschagne expressed this view in 1960.

³³³ Nahum M. Sarna, “Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis,” in *Biblical and Other Studies* (ed. Alexander Altmann; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1963), 29–46, lists Duhm, Kirkpatrick, Chajes, Briggs, Gunkel, E. A. Leslie, M. Simon, van den Bussche, and himself among those advocating the greater antiquity of 2 Sam 7 over Ps 89, and Mowinkel, C. R. North, R. H. Pfeiffer, A. R. Johnson, and Ahlström among those who take the opposite view.

³³⁴ This difference is mitigated somewhat when it is recognized that 2 Sam 7:16 also concludes Yahweh's speech with direct reference *David's* house (בְּיִתִּי), kingdom (וּמַמְלַכְתְּךָ), and throne (בְּסִדְּךָ), as established forever (וְנִאֲמָן... עַד־עוֹלָם... עַד־עוֹלָם)

³³⁵ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 467.

³³⁶ Heim, “The (God-)Forsaken King,” 300. Similarly, Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 467, notes that vv. 4, 35–36, 40, and 50 “strikingly refers to the prophecy in covenant-legal terms. No such reference is found in the prose version of the dynastic oracle in 2 Sam. 7.”

ostensibly refer to the Mosaic covenant observed in the psalms examined above, Ps 89's presentation of Yahweh's promises to David via such explicit covenantal language is indeed striking.

Heim notes two other "developments" of Nathan's oracle in Ps 89. First, he understands v. 26, "I will set his hand on the sea and his right hand on the rivers," as an explicit statement about "the expansion of David's rule to a worldwide scope."³³⁷ Indeed, Ps 72 already presents its universal vision of the king's son's reign at the end of Book II (cf. Ps 72:8–11; esp. v. 8's "sea to sea" and "from the River to the ends of the earth").³³⁸ This suggests that Heim's observation reflects the editors' perspective also, and not merely that of Ps 89's author—at least as far as Book II–III are concerned. A second adaptation that Heim notes is Ps 89's transfer of divine chastisement "from David's immediate successor (cf. 2 Sam. 7.14) to the whole dynasty (Ps. 89.31–33)."³³⁹ Indeed, Ps 89:31 uses a plural (cf. לְבָנָיו in v. 31) where 2 Sam 7:14 uses singular pronouns. Although this feature is notable within a psalm otherwise preoccupied with the singular personage of "David," it is hard to determine how significant it is, beyond the general observation that vv. 31–33 are as close as the psalm comes to the question of royal culpability for exile so dear to the Deuteronomic Historian. Verses 31–33 only threaten punishment for faithless incumbents of the Davidic throne; they do not make Yahweh's promises conditional, as vv. 34–38 make abundantly clear, let alone claim any guilt on the part of the current Davidide.³⁴⁰

³³⁷ Heim, "The (God-)Forsaken King," 299.

³³⁸ Reading Pss 72 and 89 as a developing sequence of ideas within the Psalter, Wilson, "The Use of Royal Psalms at the 'Seams' of the Hebrew Psalter," views Ps 89:39–47's lament over the current misfortunes of the king shows that Ps 72's vision has not been realized. However, whether or in what sense this might the Psalter's "final" message concerning Davidic rule depends on one's account of Books IV–V (see Introduction).

³³⁹ Heim, "The (God-)Forsaken King," 299.

³⁴⁰ Cf. Kim, "Psalm 89," 351–79, who argues that it is the law's function, not its mere presence, that distinguishes the Davidic covenant as an "unconditional" covenant. Kim, "Psalm 89," 361–62, accepts a distinction between "grant" and "treaty" types of covenant proffered by Moshe Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old

בְּרִית in Psalm 89:4, 29, 35, and 40. **בְּרִית** occurs four times in Ps 89 (vv. 4, 29, 35, and 40); twice more than any other (Pss 25, 50, 78, 105, and 111 each have two occurrences). The first three instances occur in the first “positive” part of the psalm (vv. 1–38), which celebrates Yahweh’s fidelity to his **בְּרִית** with David. The fourth occurrence laments Yahweh’s apparent rejection of his promises to David and will be treated under a separate subheading.

The psalm opens with the psalmist’s resolve to sing of Yahweh’s “steadfast love” (**חַסְדֵי**)³⁴¹ and “faithfulness” (**אֱמוּנָתְךָ**), whereupon vv. 3–5 proclaim that Yahweh’s “steadfast love” (**חַסֵּד**) is “built up in the heavens (cf. **שָׁמַיִם** in v. 3), before relating Yahweh’s own words in v. 4: “I have made a covenant (**בְּרִית**) with my chosen one (**לְבַחֲרִי**); I have sworn to David my servant (**נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְדָוִד עַבְדִּי**). The oracle continues in v. 5, where Yahweh declares his Davidic covenantal promise to establish David’s seed (**זֶרְעִי**) and throne (**כִּסְאֵךָ**). Thus, vv. 3–5 recognize Yahweh’s covenantal faithfulness (**חַסְדֵי יְהוָה**) toward David to be in the same league as his faithfulness toward creation.³⁴² Like in v. 40, **בְּרִית** here lacks a pronominal suffix, though it is clear this is *Yahweh’s* covenant. Indeed, v. 4, “I have cut a covenant with my chosen one,” gives the impression of telling the story of the Davidic covenant from the very beginning, focusing on Yahweh’s fidelity as a solemn promise (cf. **נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי**). We may also note that, at the editorial level, the description of David as “my chosen one” (**בַּחֲרִי**) in 89:4 seems to recall Ps 78:70’s use of the cognate **בַּחַר** in relation to David (cf. vv. 67–68).

Testament and in the Ancient Near East,” *JAOS* 90 (1970), 184–203, and his view that the Davidic and Abrahamic covenants belong the former kind. Kim summarizes Weinfeld’s explanation of implications of law for a grant: “By “unconditional covenant” he means that the violation of stipulations on the part of the participants of the covenant does not annul the original grant of the suzerain, although the individual wrong-doer is to be punished.” See further our earlier comments regarding the allusion to Deut 7:9 in vv. 29 and (32), 34–35, which accentuates the unconditional nature of Yahweh’s commitment to his promises to David.

³⁴¹ Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:660, translates “Yahweh’s acts of commitment.”

³⁴² Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:664, rightly identifies the “twofold theme” of Yahweh’s “sovereignty and faithfulness in creation and in the Davidic covenant,” in vv. 2–5, on which vv. 6–15 and 16–38 elaborate respectively. Indeed, the combination of David’s **רָעַע** and **אֶפְסָה** occurs again in v. 37–38 (see below).

Indeed, the term *בַּחֵר* invites several possible associations with potential significance for the Davidic covenant's relationship to other covenants. On the one hand, Goldingay notes in relation to v. 20 that the similar phrase “one chosen from the people” (*בְּחֵיר מֵעַם*) “underlines the fact that in Deuteronomy it was the people who were chosen.”³⁴³ Given that v. 28 also describes the Davidic king as “firstborn” (*בְּבִכּוֹר*)—a term normally applied to Israel (cf. Exod 4:22; Deut 26:19, and 28:1), Goldingay generalizes that “the psalm itself applies language to the king that applies primarily to the people as a whole: they are Yhwh’s chosen, Yhwh’s firstborn.”³⁴⁴ If this is correct, then Ps 89’s language reflects a “royalizing” of motifs normally reserved for the people in contexts where the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants form the conceptual background; that is, the reverse of the “democratizing” theological trend that scholars—including Goldingay—deem the standard response to the loss of the Davidic king due to exile.³⁴⁵ This does not in itself preclude a later, democratizing editorial agenda, but it does indicate that such an agenda would require editors to read Ps 89 against its own grain. On the other hand, Deut 17:15 offers a closer parallel to 89:20—and by extension to v. 4 also—where Yahweh will choose (*בַּחֵר*) the king whom the people will set over themselves “from among his brothers” (cf. *מִקֵּרֵב אֶחָיו* as semantic equivalent of Ps 89:20’s *מֵעַם*). Indeed, Verses 31–32 suggest conscious allusion to the “kingship law” in Deut 17 due to their strong lexical and thematic resemblance specifically with Deut 17:19–20. Verses 31–32 read: “If his children forsake my *law* (*תּוֹרַתִּי*) and do not walk according to my *rules* (*מִשְׁפָּטַי*), if they violate my *statutes* (*הַקְּנִי*) and do not keep my *commandments* (*מִצְוֹתַי*).” Three of the four italicized terms occur in Deut 17:19–20, where the king is to “keep all the words of *this torah* (*הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת*)

³⁴³ Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:677.

³⁴⁴ Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:692.

³⁴⁵ As, for instance, John Goldingay, *The Message of Isaiah 40–55: A Literary-Theological Commentary* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 547, believes concerning Isa 55:3.

and *these statutes* (הַחֻקִּים הָאֵלֶּה)” and “not turn aside from the *commandment* (הַמִּצְוָה).”³⁴⁶ It seems, then, that Ps 89 consciously reflects the expectation of the Deuteronomic kingship law that Yahweh’s chosen king is to keep the Mosaic covenantal torah and stipulations.³⁴⁷ This would allow editors to recognize בְּחִירִי as a direct reference to Yahweh’s choice of a *king*, without necessarily viewing it as the royal application of a motif normally reserved for people and nation. (Of course, in the bigger picture of Ps 89, the fortunes of people and nation are not forgotten despite the psalms almost exclusive focus on the king’s fate [cf. עֲבָדֶיךָ in v. 51]).³⁴⁸ More importantly for our purposes, Ps 89 elicits Deut 17 precisely at the point where it relates Mosaic covenantal observance to the person of the king (vv. 31–32): as Yahweh’s chosen one the king is to observe the stipulations of the Mosaic covenant—a point consistent with our hypothesis and Jamie Grant’s study of Pss 1–2, 18–19, and 118–119.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁶ Kim, “Psalm 89,” 191–92, makes the same observation, adding also that all four terms “are found in 2 Kgs 17:34, 37...to give a theological explanation for the fall of the northern kingdom: Samaria was ruined and exiled because it failed to keep the conditions of the covenant it made with the LORD at Sinai (v. 38).” Kim also notes texts such as Deut 6:1 and 7:11, where three of the four terms occur (הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים, הַחֻקִּים, and הַמִּצְוָה). These observations support the idea that the combination of תּוֹרַתִי, מִשְׁפָּטִי, חֻקִּי, and מִצְוֹתַי in Ps 89:31–32 refer to Mosaic covenantal stipulations, which the Davidic king was to observe according to Deut 17. Indeed, the connection between vv. 31–32 and Deut 17 implied by these three overlapping terms is all the more marked when we compare 2 Sam 7:14, which simply has “when he commits iniquity” (בְּהִטָּאתוֹ). Meanwhile 1 Chr 17, which like Ps 89 specifically refers to Yahweh’s Davidic covenantal promises as spoken in a “dream” (cf. הִזּוֹן in 1Chron 17:15 and Ps 89:20), omits any reference to royal culpability at all.

³⁴⁷ Cf. Mays, *The Lord Reigns*, 125, who writes, “The law of the LORD is the norm by which Davidic kings are to be judged (89:30–33).” Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 68, quotes Mays in this regard and seems to recognize the same connection.

³⁴⁸ Notwithstanding numerous LXX MSS and the Syriac, which attest the sg. עֲבָדֶיךָ.

³⁴⁹ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*. In reference to vv. 31–32, Kim, “Psalm 89: Its Biblical-Theological Contribution to the Presence of Law Within the Unconditional Covenant,” 371, similarly concludes that, “the stipulations in the Mosaic covenant, probably the royal charter in Dt 17:18–20 and its later developments, was incorporated as an important element within the Davidic covenant.”

The Aramaic Targum offers another perspective on v. 4. It replaces “Ethan the Ezrahite” in Ps 89’s superscript with “Abraham come from the east” (דאברהם דאתא מן מדינחא), understanding בְּחִירִי in v. 4 as a reference to Abraham.³⁵⁰ Since v. 4 has the covenant explicitly in view, Tg Pss suggests that Ps 89 laments the status of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenant as a unity. The question becomes, did the Psalter’s editors so envisage the unity of biblical covenants that they too understood Ps 89’s lament over the Davidic king as effectively a lament over the Abrahamic covenant and its associated promises? Indeed, the intertwined fortunes of David and people noted earlier suggests as much, as do other laments over the destruction of land and temple in Book III (e.g., Pss 74, 79, 80). Other more specific observations point in the same direction too. Although we have noted connections between Ps 89:4 and 78:70—namely the use of בָּחַר in connection with David, at the macrostructural level Ps 105:9 uses the same combination of כָּרַת and שָׁבַע (niph) found in 89:4 in reference to the Abrahamic covenant: “[the covenant] that he made (כָּרַת) with Abraham, his sworn promise (וּשְׁבוּעָתוֹ) to Isaac.” The parallel is editorially noteworthy because the historical Pss 105–106 pair conclude Book IV, just as Ps 89 concludes Book III. So, if the placement of covenant-referring psalms at the conclusion of Books III and IV demonstrates editors’ interest in the biblical covenants, this consistency of language regarding ostensibly distinct covenants further suggests that editors recognized a convergence between the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants similar to the unified perspective of Tg Pss.³⁵¹

We shall address Ps 105 further momentarily. The situation becomes more intriguing, however, when we consider Ps 72:17—also the last psalm of its Book—that identifies David’s

³⁵⁰ גזרית קיים לאברהם בחירי קיימת לדוד עבדי: Cf. LXX 90:4 (= MT 88:4), which makes “chosen one” pl. (τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς μου), and might similarly relate the Abrahamic covenant to the Davidic.

³⁵¹ Cf. Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 79, who suggests that “the Davidic and Abrahamic covenants have been conflated” in both places. Creach surmises that “the promises once given to David have now been applied to the whole people”; i.e., a democratization of the Davidic covenant.

successor(s) as Abraham’s seed (see Chapter Five). Though not using **בָּהָר**, 72:17 “royalizes” Abrahamic covenantal promises in manner consistent with what we see in 89:28. As Chapter Five will show, Ps 72 shows the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants as a theological unity, in which David’s successor fulfills a key promise traditionally applied to all Abraham’s “seed.” Thus, within the final psalms of Books II–IV (Pss 72, 89, and 105–106) “covenant” is cast as singular entity. Moreover, in Pss 72 and 89 Abrahamic/Mosaic covenantal themes, obligations, promises etc. quite clearly coalesce around the person or office of the Davidic king.

The second and third instances of **בְּרִית** (vv. 29 and 35) occur in vv. 20–38. This portion of the psalm reports Yahweh’s promises to David via first person discourse, with both occurrences of **בְּרִית** sporting a 1cs suffix (**בְּרִיתִי**) in reference to Yahweh’s original declaration, “I have made a covenant with my chosen one” in v. 4. Within this section Yahweh declares his numerous commitments to David concerning his enemies (vv. 23–24), dominion (v. 26), status as Yahweh’s royal son (vv. 27–28), offspring (vv. 30 and 37–38), and throne (vv. 37–38), and so enunciates the content of Yahweh’s **בְּרִית** with David seen in 2 Sam 7. Indeed, this section recalls v. 5’s summary of Yahweh’s covenantal promise to David to forever establish (**עַד־עוֹלָם**) (**אֶבְרַח**) “your offspring...and your throne” (**אֶבְרַח ... וְעַד־עוֹלָם**) by culminating with David’s “offspring” and “throne” (**וְעַד־עוֹלָם ... וְעַד־עוֹלָם**) in v. 37.

Other individual features of Yahweh’s discourse merit attention. In v. 27 Yahweh says, “He shall cry to me, ‘You are my Father (**אֱבִי**), my God (**אֱלֹהֵי**), and the Rock of my salvation (**יְשׁוּעָתִי**).” This is elicits several poignant intertextual connections. First, “you are my Father” (**אֱבִי אֱתָהּ**) expresses the counterpart to the adoption formula “you are my Son” (**בְּנִי אֱתָהּ**) in Ps 2:7, and without doubt recalls it at the editorial level. Second, “you are...my God” seems a clear echo the covenant formula (see Chapter Four), which normally concerns Israel corporately. Third, “the Rock of my salvation” possibly recalls texts like the Song of the Sea, where Yahweh has “become my salvation” (Exod 15:2), and the Song of Moses, where he is

Israel's "Rock" (cf. צור in Deut 32:4, 15, 18, 30–31, and 37). Whereas these pivotal Pentateuchal texts typically describe Yahweh as the "God" and "Rock" of Israel corporately,³⁵² Ps 89:27 applies the same terminology to the relationship between the *Davidic king* and Yahweh. Traditional covenantal language normally applicable to all Israel is here "royalized" by applying it specifically to David. Indeed, as the next chapter will show, "my God" and "my Rock" occur almost exclusively in Davidic psalms, suggesting that this is a Psalter-wide phenomenon.

In v. 29 Yahweh declares, "My steadfast love (חֶסֶדִי) I will keep for him forever (לְעוֹלָם) (אֲשַׁמְרֶה לּוֹ), and my covenant will stand firm for him (וְבְרִיתִי נֹאֲמָנָה לּוֹ)." Earlier we raised the possibility that Ps 74:20 may allude to the confession of Yahweh in Deut 7:9, though the connecting points are few. In contrast, Ps 89:29 reflects the key vocabulary found in Deut 7:9, "Yahweh your God is God, the faithful God (הָאֱלֹהִים הַנֶּאֱמָנִים) who keeps the covenant and steadfast love (שָׁמַר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד) with those who love him and keep his commandments."³⁵³ Indeed, this lexical overlap suggests that the same Deuteronomic confession of Yahweh's faithfulness to his covenant underlies Ps 89's presentation of the Davidic covenant. As in Ps 74, this allusion does not so much identify the covenant as underscore Yahweh's character in relation to it, and in fact Deut 7 and Ps 89 show by their contexts that they ostensibly have "different" covenants in view. Interestingly, Solomon also alludes to Deut 7:9 in reference to Yahweh's promises to his father David in his prayer at the dedication of the temple (1Kgs 8:23–26).³⁵⁴ Like 1Kgs 8:23–26, Ps 89:29 appropriates to the Davidic covenant a formulaic expression of God's faithfulness to the Mosaic covenant. The continuity and unity between covenants implied by such intertextuality is

³⁵² The noun צור normally refers to a physical rock in the Pentateuch, but in Deut 32:30–31 צור describes *Yahweh* as Israel's "Rock" (cf. 3d pl. suffixes).

³⁵³ The terms בְּרִית and חֶסֶד are focal in both verses, which use the same verbs as well: שָׁמַר and a niph. pt. form of אָמַן. Although הַנֶּאֱמָנִים/נֹאֲמָנָה qualify different subjects ("my covenant" and "God" respectively), in both cases Yahweh "keeps" (שָׁמַר) "steadfast love" (חֶסֶד).

³⁵⁴ Note the same phrase שָׁמַר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד in 1 Kgs 8:23.

therefore *theological* in the truest sense; common to both is Yahweh’s faithfulness and steadfast commitment to his promises.

Later in v. 35 Yahweh expresses the same commitment negatively, “I will not violate my covenant (לֹא־אֶחַלֵּל בְּרִיתִי) or alter the word that went forth from my lips (וּמוֹצֵא שְׂפִתַי לֹא) (אֲשַׁנֶּה).” In fact, the לֹא statements begin in v. 34, where—in answer to vv. 31–32’s casuistic warning of punishment for disobedience to torah etc.—Yahweh declares, “but I will not remove from him my steadfast love (חֶסֶדִי) or my faithfulness (אֱמוּנָתִי). Within vv. 34–35, then, בְּרִית and מוֹצֵא שְׂפִתַי are parallel to אֱמוּנָה and חֶסֶד, thus confirming the latter’s references specifically to promises and commitments Yahweh made in the Davidic covenant. It is also worth noting that vv. 34–35 once again allude to Deut 7:9, repeating three of the four key lexemes from Deut 7:9 that we observed in v. 29: בְּרִית, חֶסֶד, and a cognate of אֱמוּנָה, אֱמֶנֶת (rather than the niph. pt.). The negative construction of vv. 34–35 explains why the fourth term (שֶׁמֶר) is missing. In any case, the statement “I will not remove (לֹא־אֶפִּיר) my steadfast love” in v. 34, and “I will not violate (לֹא־אֶחַלֵּל) my covenant” in v. 35 provide state negatively what שֶׁמֶר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד affirms positively in Deut 7:9. Moreover, the final clause in the protasis of vv. 31–33’s casuistic warning, “and if...he does not keep my commandments” (אִם...וּמִצְוֹתַי לֹא) (יִשְׁמֵר) in v. 32b creates another parallel with Deut 7:9, which states that Yahweh’s faithfulness is “with those who love him and *keep his commandments*” (וּלְשֹׂמְרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו). The intertextual links between Ps 89 and Deut 7 are therefore numerous. Nevertheless, neither Ps 89:31–33’s casuistic warning nor its allusion to texts like Deut 7:9 give any warrant to view Yahweh’s faithfulness to his Davidic covenantal promises as conditional, for vv. 34–35 quickly assert Yahweh’s faithfulness. Whether editors understood this casuistic warning as a (very!) subtle admission of royal guilt is impossible to determine with certainty, however it is most unlikely since the psalm charges Yahweh with responsibility for the current state of affairs. It is thus reasonable to conclude that “royal guilt” was not on their theological agenda in Book III.

Psalm 89:34–35’s use of חֶסֶד and אֱמוּנָה as *covenantal* terms requires further comment, for this word pair occurs some five times in this editorially pivotal psalm (cf. vv. 2, 3, 25, 34, and

50). It therefore seems likely that editors understood them in covenantal terms elsewhere in the Psalter too (cf. Pss 36:6; 40:11; 88:12; 92:3; 98:3; 100:5).³⁵⁵ Of course, the terms **קִדְדָה** and **אֲמוֹנָה** are capable of wider application, as v. 3 shows when it states that Yahweh’s **קִדְדָה** and **אֲמוֹנָה** are displayed in the heavens (cf. also vv. 6, 9, and 15), though even in v. 3 Yahweh’s **קִדְדָה** and **אֲמוֹנָה** “in the heavens” may be more than merely *illustrative* of Yahweh’s **קִדְדָה** and **אֲמוֹנָה** toward David. Verses 37–38 conclude Yahweh’s discourse by converging the dual themes of heaven/creation and the Davidic covenant, likening the perpetuity of David’s throne and seed *themselves*—not just Yahweh’s **קִדְדָה** and **אֲמוֹנָה** regarding them—to the sun and the moon (**וְזָרְעוּ לְעוֹלָם יְהִי וְכִסְאוֹ כְשֶׁמֶשׁ נֹגֵדִי... בְּיָרֵחַ יִבּוֹן עוֹלָם**), and declaring them a “faithful witness in the clouds” (**וְעֵד בְּשָׁחַק נְאֻמָּו**).³⁵⁶ These verses make it possible to understand David’s seed and throne in celestial, if somewhat enigmatic, terms. Ultimately, then, it is possible that editors reading and reusing Ps 89 saw no meaningful difference between Yahweh’s **קִדְדָה** and **אֲמוֹנָה** “in the heavens” (vv. 2–3) and “to David” (vv. 25, 34), envisioning an eschatological view of the king.

Obviously much depends on whether editors understood and appropriated this and the various other promises in vv. 20–38 within an interpretive framework that was historical (Wilson) or eschatological (Mitchell), or perhaps a combination of both. While the observations above do not settle that issue, they do demonstrate the plausibility of editors envisioning a future Davidide by which Yahweh would again demonstrate his faithfulness to his promises (Deut 7:9). Most commentators, Wilson among them, grant this even if they hold that such hopes were

³⁵⁵ See Chapter Four.

³⁵⁶ Admittedly, the antecedent of **וְעֵד** here is a little ambiguous—whether David’s throne or the heavenly bodies. However, the fact that “sun” and “moon” are similes prefixed with **כ** suggests that **וְכִסְאוֹ** is the more natural antecedent. Incidentally, it is possible that 89:38 intentionally casts the Davidic covenant in terms of the Noachic covenant. Though lexically different, “a faithful witness in the skies” (**וְעֵד בְּשָׁחַק נְאֻמָּו**) in v. 38 is semantically similar to Gen 9:12–14, where the “sign of the covenant” with Noah and all life (**אֹתֹת־הַבְּרִית**) is Yahweh’s bow that he sets “in the cloud” (**בְּעָנָן**).

redirected as the Psalter expanded. Key to that view, though, is the “democratization” of the Davidic covenant. However our analysis of Ps 89 and comparison with the concluding psalms of its neighboring books has so far suggested the opposite theological move: the royalization of traditionally Abrahamic or Mosaic covenantal entailments.

The final instance of בְּרִית occurs in v. 40. If the second and third occurrences of בְּרִית emphatically underscore Yahweh’s commitment to the Davidic covenant, this fourth occurrence accuses Yahweh of forsaking it just as emphatically.³⁵⁷ In v. 40 the psalmist complains to Yahweh that he has “renounced the covenant with your servant (נִאֲרָתָהּ בְּרִית עֲבָדֶיךָ).” This follows immediately after v. 39’s three similarly accusatory verbs, “But you have cast off and rejected (וְאַתָּה זָנַחְתָּ וְתָמָאֵסְתָּ) ...are full of wrath against your anointed (הִתְעַבְּרָתָּ עִם־מְשִׁיחֶיךָ),” and together underlines the grave contradiction between Yahweh’s promised faithfulness and the present situation. Goldingay notes that the second of these verbs (תָּמָאֵס) bites especially hard because it is the same term Samuel uses in reference to Yahweh’s rejection of Saul in 1 Sam 15:23 and 26,³⁵⁸ something Yahweh has promised would not happen to David’s offspring (cf. 2 Sam 7:15). At the rhetorical level, then, the second, third, and fourth instances of בְּרִית in Ps 89 highlight the discrepancy between promise and reality, and thus form the basis Ps 89’s lament.

Psalm 89’s Potential for Editorial Reuse. The preceding analysis has already made some isolated observations about Ps 89’s potential for reuse, but this psalm’s importance to our investigation merits a more specific treatment.

In light of the above, Ps 89 lends itself to reuse by editors in several important ways. First, we noted that Ps 89 amplifies the name “David” in its presentation of the Davidic covenant by directly applying Yahweh’s promises to “David” himself. Whether the editors responsible for Ps

³⁵⁷ Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:664, describes it as an “extraordinary somersault,” in which “[l]ike Ps. 88, the psalm...takes the form of a prayer psalm and turns it inside out, though in a different way. Instead of omitting statements of faith, it emphasizes them in order to let them have their scandalous effect.”

³⁵⁸ Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:685.

89's placement in the Psalter had in mind a historical exile or an eschatological one, Ps 89's ostensive focus on David must have fitted their understanding of the present (or future?) royal crisis now being lamented (vv. 39–51). Yahweh's rejection of David's latest, current, or future descendent amounts to his unthinkable rejection of *David*, to whom Yahweh had made such sure promises (vv. 2–5; also vv. 6–38). Future Davidides are, for all intents and purposes, “David” himself to whom Yahweh promised his eternal fidelity; a point congruent with our hypothesis and proposition regarding editors' understanding of “David” after Ps 72 in the Psalter.

Second, Ps 89's silence about the building of the temple has implications for its reuse at the editorial level. Psalms 74 and 79 compensate for this “omission” within Book III, reflecting obvious editorial concern for the sanctuary though these Psalms' lament over its destruction. Fishbane's observation about Ps 89 is nevertheless important, for Ps 89's narrowed focus on the apparent failure of the Davidic line suggests that the editors who made Ps 89 the climax of Book III viewed this specific crisis as the most pressing theological problem within it. Perhaps the temple had already been rebuilt when Book III was given its shape, thus mitigating the urgency of that particular crisis.³⁵⁹ But against this Pss 74 and 79 suggests that the destruction of the temple was a present crisis for Book Three's editors, even if the Asaph group already bore its canonical shape when they appropriated its psalms. Indeed, Book III's lament shifts from the destruction of the sanctuary to the rejection of the king, which corresponds to Ps 78:68–72's narrowing sequence in God's election of Judah, Zion and sanctuary, and finally David. This could offer a clue as to how Book III's editors understood David's relationship to the temple: “David” is in some sense foundational to its (full?) restoration and the fulfillment of its purpose, just as he was to its original construction as reflected in the Chronicler's account—also postexilic—that magnifies David's role in the design of the temple (cf. 1 Chr 22; 28:11–21; 2

³⁵⁹ Verse 41 refers to the destruction of David's “walls” (כָּל־גְּדֵרֵי־תֵיבוֹ) and “strongholds” (מְבֻצְרָיו), which focuses attention on David's empire. The psalm can therefore be read as lamenting Yahweh's removal of David and his empire, without bringing into explicit view the destruction of the Temple associated with it.

Chr 2–5). Scholarly opinion varies as to whether restoration of the monarchy was a key concern of the Chronicler, or whether he accentuated David’s role in its design only to validate a postexilic temple theocracy.³⁶⁰ For the editors of Book III, however, Ps 89 placement at its climax makes it clear that the crisis is not over until “David” rules once more, not simply the rebuilding of the temple. This could suggest that from the editors’ perspective God’s restoration of “David” is necessary for the temple to fulfill its divine purpose. Central to that purpose was reconciliation between God and his people and the mediatory role of the priesthood. Accordingly, our hypothesis that the expected “David” has an intercessory role in covenant renewal could explain *how* he might bring the temple’s purpose to fulfillment: he, like Moses, intercedes for them and Yahweh restores them. At the very least, Book III clearly yearns for restoration of both “temple” and “king,” the latter receiving special focus in Ps 89.

Third, Ps 89 lays responsibility for the Davidic covenantal crisis squarely at Yahweh’s feet and makes no accusation of royal guilt in relation to the crisis. As noted earlier, this is remarkable given that both the DH and Chronicles do so throughout their historiographies. In light of this silence, Ps 89’s affiliations with Deut 17 make it possible to view the king according to the ideal set forth in Deut 17;³⁶¹ a faultless David as per our hypothesis. The nearest the psalm comes to the topic of royal culpability is Yahweh’s casuistic warning in vv. 31–33 discussed above, but it stops short of any report of the king’s guilt. Any royal guilt must be inferred from historical circumstance³⁶² (assuming editors appropriated the psalm with the historical exile in

³⁶⁰ See, e.g., A. M. Brunet, “La théologie du Chroniste: Théocratie et Messianisme,” in *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica*, I (ed. J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and E. Massaux; BETL, 12–13; Gembloux, Belgium: Duculot, 1959), 384–97; David N. Freedman, “The Chronicler’s Purpose,” *CBQ* 23 (1961): 436–42; James Newsome, “Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purposes,” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 25–44.

³⁶¹ As noted in the Introduction, Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, argues for the influence of Deut 17 on the Psalter’s view of kingship more generally.

³⁶² Cf. Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 106, “Psalm 89 does not indict the king for any wrongdoing and

mind rather than an eschatological one). If royal culpability has even a peripheral significance within Book III's editorial agenda, we might expect the Book to reflect this in the way it presents the king. Consequently, Chapter Six's analysis of Book III will also take up this question, but for now we note that royal culpability for the royal crisis is foreign to Ps 89. If one is to conclude that editors intended Ps 89 to be read against the backdrop of the Judean kings' culpability, there must be clear signs of such concerns in the editorial shape of Book III. On the other hand, if editors read Ps 89 against a future-oriented rather than purely historical background,³⁶³ Ps 89's silence about any actual guilt on the part of the king opens up the possibility that they envisaged a Davidic king who does *not* fall short of the Deut 17 ideal.

Fourth, the psalmist's questions and petitions to Yahweh in vv. 47–52 provide some parameters for what may be inferred about the editorial use of this psalm. Verse 47 asks “*How long* (עַד־מָה) ... will you hide yourself forever?...your wrath burn like fire?” and v. 50 asks directly, “*where* is your steadfast love (אֱמֻנָה) of old, which by your faithfulness you swore to David (אֱמֻנָה בְּאֵמוּנֹתָ לְדָוִד לְשִׁבְעָה לְשָׁבוּעַ)?” These are deeply anguished questions, to be sure, but they nevertheless do not despair of Yahweh's promises.³⁶⁴ They rather recall Yahweh's promises to David and seem to expect that Yahweh must come good concerning them.³⁶⁵ In consequence, any

does not call monarchy as an institution into question.” Creach suggests this is true of the whole Psalter.

³⁶³ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 255; and “Lord, Remember David,” 527.

³⁶⁴ Cf. Hutchinson, “A New-Covenant Slogan in the Old Testament,” 106, who suggests that “Books 4 and 5 are designed to respond to the *despair* of Book 3—and in particular the *despair* at the end of Psalm 89” (italics added). While it is true that Books IV–V in some sense respond to the questions and petitions in Ps 89:47–52, they are not the kind of questions and imperatives that suggest a loss of hope or a giving up on Yahweh's promises. On the contrary, they lament a deep contradiction between promise and current experience, and appeal to Yahweh to rectify the situation.

³⁶⁵ The other questions found 48b–49 resonate with Ps 88, “For what vanity you have created all the children of man! What man can live and never see death? Who can deliver his soul from the power of Sheol?” (cf. 88:4), thus accentuating these psalms' combined lament about the mortality of the king. Finally, this concluding section twice implores Yahweh to “remember” (זָכַר) both the psalmist's short life and the scorn endured by Yahweh's servants

theory of editorial agenda that sees Ps 89 as sounding the failure of the Davidic covenant³⁶⁶ must finally reinterpret these questions either as pleas that have fallen on deaf ears or as a non-serious rhetorical devices; not genuine pleas for Yahweh to set things right by honoring his promises to David. Indeed, while Wilson contends that editors of the earlier Psalter (Pss 2–89) still held out hope for Davidic restoration, expressed especially in Ps 89’s “agonized pleas for deliverance,” his view that subsequent editors sought to “redirect the hopes of the reader away from an earthly Davidic kingdom to the kingship of Yahweh” requires that these editors radically altered Ps 89’s function within the Psalter.³⁶⁷ Psalm 89 becomes merely an editorial signpost for a failed Davidic covenant, rather than a serious plea for Yahweh to keep his promises. On its own terms, however, Ps 89 does not ostensibly sound the death knell of the Davidic covenant but stresses its perpetuity, and Wilson’s theory must read Ps 89 against its grain.³⁶⁸

Psalm 103

Davidic Ps 103 begins and ends with a summons to “bless Yahweh.” This command or summons is first addressed to “my soul” in vv. 1–2 (בְּרַכֵּי יְהוָה נַפְשִׁי), and then to Yahweh’s “angels,” “mighty ones,” “hosts,” “ministers,” “works,” and “my soul” once more in vv. 20–22 (בְּרַכֵּי

(עַבְדֵי יְהוָה) in v. 51.

³⁶⁶ E.g., Wilson, *Editing*, 213.

³⁶⁷ Wilson, “King, Messiah, and the Reign of God, 391–92. Wilson’s use of the term “earthly” reflects a lack of precision in his account of the Davidic covenant and its status in the Psalter. On the one hand, the qualification “earthly” leaves room for a “heavenly” (i.e., messianic) David, and indeed Wilson seems to accept the possibility of a priestly David in his later writing based principally on Ps 110:4. On the other hand, at the heart of his theory of the Psalter’s editorial agenda is the questionable contrast between divine and human rule, expressed as the failure of the Davidic covenant vis-à-vis the (successful) rule of Yahweh.

³⁶⁸ Kim, “Psalm 89,” 74, and 366–69, cites the seven-fold use of עֹלָם to describe Yahweh’s promises to David (vv. 2, 3, 5, 29, 37, 38, and 50). Against Matitahu Tsevat, “The Steadfast House: What Was David Promised in 2 Sam 7:11b–16?,” *HUCA* 34 (1963): 71–82, who objects that “immutability” and “unconditionality” are western concepts foreign to the term עֹלָם, Kim draws attention to Ps 89’s association of עֹלָם with the heavens (v. 30b), and the sun and moon (v. 37b).

יְפָשִׁי... בְּרַכּוּ. etc.). Between this inclusio the body of the psalm praises Yahweh's forgiveness and mercy. Accordingly, Hossfeld and Zenger are justified in describing it as a thanksgiving song, highlighting its hymnic character.³⁶⁹ Notably, the superscript identifies it as *David's* hymn of thanksgiving in a Book where Davidic psalms are otherwise rare (see Chapter Two); he it is who invokes his own soul to “bless Yahweh,” and angels, hosts, etc. because of Yahweh's compassion and mercy.

The psalm refers explicitly to Yahweh's covenant in v. 18: “those who keep his covenant and remember to do his commandments” (לְשִׁמְרֵי בְרִיתוֹ וְלִזְכָּרֵי פְקֻדָּיו לַעֲשׂוֹתָם:) receive Yahweh's eternal “steadfast love” (cf. יְהוָה וְחֶסֶד יְהוָה in v. 17). This ostensibly identifies בְּרִיתוֹ as the Mosaic covenant, the keeping of which entails “remembering to do his precepts.” Notably, the term פְּקֻדָּיִם is unique to the Psalter, occurring at Ps 19:9, 103:18; 111:7; and a further twenty-one times in Ps 119. These contexts extol the joyfulness and trustworthiness of Yahweh's “precepts.”³⁷⁰ In Ps 103:18 פְּקֻדָּיו is the object of the coordinated verbal sequence “remember” and “do” (עֲשֵׂה and זָכַר), and the only other place this combination can be found is in Num 15:39–40 (with מְצֻוֹת), where the Mosaic covenant is clearly in view. The psalm thus evokes the Mosaic covenant as something to be kept, but in terms that underscore the joy and pleasantness of doing so (cf. the same attitude reflected throughout Ps 119). Moreover, the psalm sets this in the greater context of Yahweh's compassion and grace toward sinners (cf. vv. 3–5; 8–13). Indeed, the quotation from Exod 34:6 in v. 8—a feature to be examined in more detail in Chapter Six—is especially noteworthy here, as it recalls Yahweh's renewal of the *Sinaitic* covenant after the golden calf incident. The psalm thus recalls Yahweh's renewal of the covenant because of his grace and mercy as it praises Yahweh's compassion and mercy as a present reality.

³⁶⁹ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 3, 31.

³⁷⁰ In Ps 19:9 “the precepts of Yahweh are upright, gladdening the heart” (פְּקֻדָּיֵי יְהוָה יְשָׁרִים מְשִׂמְחֵי-לֵב), paralleling the term with Yahweh's commandment, which is pure and enlightens the eyes (מְצֻוֹת יְהוָה בְּרָה מְאִירַת (עֵינַיִם)). In Ps 111:7 they are “trustworthy” (נְאֻמָּנִים).

Psalm 105

As the conclusion to Book IV, the paired historical Pss 105 and 106 recount Israel's history and give their theological interpretation of it. Whereas Ps 106 accentuates the people's faithlessness toward Yahweh, Ps 105 relates Yahweh's "wondrous works" (נִפְלְאוֹתָיו), "miracles" (מִפְתָּיו), and "the judgments he uttered" (וּמִשְׁפָּטֵי־פִיו; cf. v. 5). The history spans the period from Yahweh's covenantal promise of the land spoken first to the patriarchs (105:5–11) to his fulfillment of that promise (vv.42–45). The intervening sections relate Yahweh's constant protection and provision during Israel's descent to Egypt, the Exodus, and their wilderness wanderings (vv. 12–41). Thus, the historical timeframe of Pss 105–106 embraces the pre-monarchic period.

בְּרִית occurs in vv. 8 and 10 where it refers directly to the Abrahamic covenant. Indeed, "Abraham" is mentioned in vv. 6, 9, and 42, and only once elsewhere in the Psalter (Ps 47:9). Verse 8 declares that Yahweh "remembers his covenant (בְּרִיתוֹ) forever," whereupon vv. 9–10 qualify it as the covenant "that he made with Abraham, his sworn promise (שְׁבוּעָתוֹ) to Isaac, which he confirmed to Jacob as a statute (חֹק), to Israel as an everlasting covenant (בְּרִית עוֹלָם)." Verse 8 therefore parallels "his covenant" (בְּרִיתוֹ) with "the word that he commanded" (דְּבַר צְוָה), "sworn promise" (שְׁבוּעָה) and "statute" (חֹק) as functional equivalents. Indeed these other terms underscore the promissory character of the Abrahamic covenant, whose essential content is, according to v. 11, Yahweh's promise to "give you the land of Canaan as your portion for an inheritance" (לֵךְ אֶתֶּן אֶת־אֶרֶץ־כְּנָעַן חֶבְלֵי נַחֲלֹתְכֶם).³⁷¹ It could be that the four terms mentioned above (חֹק, דְּבַר צְוָה, בְּרִית, שְׁבוּעָה) refer narrowly to that promise in Ps 105:11. However the phrase וּשְׁבוּעָתוֹ לְיִשְׁחָק in v. 9 seems to recall Gen 26:3–4, where Yahweh's

³⁷¹ At the macrostructural level this almost certainly recalls the same promise directed to the king in Ps 2:8, Ask of me and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession" (שְׁאַל מִמֶּנִּי וְאֶתְּנָה) (גוֹיִם נַחֲלֹתֶיךָ וְאַחֲזִיתֶךָ אֶפְסֵי־אֶרֶץ). Both psalms are placed very near the Psalter's seams (Pss 1–2 introduce the Psalter!) and are deliberately paired with a neighboring psalm (see Conclusion).

שְׁבוּעָה to Isaac entails the promise of many descendents and blessing for all nations through Isaac's seed as well. If so, then Ps 105:5–11 embraces the promises of Abrahamic covenant more broadly, and not just the gift of land. Verses 8–10 also demonstrate that terms like חֶק, שְׁבוּעָה, and דְּבָר can refer directly to Yahweh's covenant within the Psalter, as Kalluveettil suggests.

Psalm 105 repeats דְּבָר in v. 42, where it is again the object of Yahweh's "remembering" and denotes Yahweh's "holy promise" to Abraham (:פִּי־זָכַר אֶת־דְּבָר קִדְשׁוֹ אֶת־אֲבֹרָהֶם עֲבָדָיו:). Indeed, v. 44 recalls v. 11 as a promise fulfilled: "he gave them the lands of the nations" (וַיִּתֵּן לָהֶם אֲרָצוֹת גּוֹיִם). That "the land of Canaan" in v. 11 gives way to "the lands of nations" may signify a broadening of the promise. Significantly, v. 45 relates Yahweh's purpose in terms that elicit the Mosaic covenant, "that they might keep his statutes (יִשְׁמְרוּ חֻקָּיו) and observe his laws (וְתוֹרָתוֹ יִנְצְרוּ)." This suggests that the psalmist recognizes an essential theological unity between the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants. Indeed, the explicit and historical manner in which Ps 105:5–11 recalls the Abrahamic covenant is itself significant, especially in light of Pss 105–106's location at the end of Book IV. Evidently the editors wanted to accentuate the Abrahamic covenant as an event in *historical* continuity with the later Mosaic covenant.³⁷²

Psalm 106

Like Ps 78, Ps 106 recounts the people's cyclical unfaithfulness to Yahweh. The psalm concludes by affirming that Yahweh "looked upon their distress...heard their cry" and "for their sake...remembered his covenant (וַיִּזְכֹּר לָהֶם בְּרִיתוֹ)" in vv. 44–45. The rest of verse, "and relented according to the abundance of his steadfast love (וַיִּנְחַם כְּרַב חַסְדּוֹ)," echoes the grace formula (cf. וַיִּרְבַּח חַסֵּד in Exod 34:6) and Moses' petition that Yahweh "relent (נָחַם) from this disaster against your people" in Exod 32:12, followed by Yahweh's compliance in v. 14. As in Ps 103, then, Ps 106 recalls Yahweh's בְּרִית with conscious recollection of his merciful renewal

³⁷² Verse 26's explicit mention of "Moses his servant (עֲבָד)" and "Aaron whom he had chosen (בַּחַר)" also suggests historical continuity, for Abraham was also described this way earlier in v. 5.

of the covenant at Sinai. Moreover, at the approximate center of the psalm's recapitulation of the people's infidelity, vv. 19–23 explicitly recalls the golden calf incident that occasioned it.

Indeed, Yahweh's gracious renewal of the covenant at Horeb is a larger theme in Ps 106 and not confined to v. 45. Already in Ps 106:6 the psalmist confesses the sins of the people, employing key terminology from Exod 34:6–7 in doing so: "Both we and our fathers have sinned (חָטְאוּנוּ); we have committed iniquity (הִעֲוִינוּ); we have done wickedness. Our fathers, when they were in Egypt, did not consider your wondrous works; they did not remember the abundance of your steadfast love (רַב־חַסְדֶּיךָ), but rebelled by the sea, at the Red Sea." Notably, the psalmist confesses his generation's solidarity with the fathers in their breach of the Mosaic covenant (cf. חָטְאוּנוּ עִם־אֲבוֹתֵינוּ). For editors appropriating it, Ps 106 provides a confession of guilt and plea for grace on behalf of the present generation, rather than a nostalgic reminiscence of Yahweh's past ways before the monarchy.

As in other psalms, then, v. 45 speaks of "covenant" as a singular entity, without explicit qualification. Since Pss 105–106 are clearly a pair, editors apparently recognized בְּרִית in v. 45 as the patriarchal covenant already referred to in Ps 105:5 and 8, with later rebellious generations in focus. This is confirmed by the fact that וַיִּזְכֹּר לָהֶם בְּרִיתוֹ in 106:45 recalls Ps 105:8's זָכַר בְּרִיתוֹ לְעוֹלָם בְּרִיתוֹ, creating a thematic inclusio near the beginning and end of this historical psalm pair. But given its evocation of the Mosaic covenantal context just mentioned, the psalm presupposes a seamless continuity between the Abrahamic and Mosaic "covenants" that sees them as essentially one and the same. Indeed, the psalm's final petition, "Save us, Yahweh our God" (הוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ | יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ), uses language reminiscent from the covenant formula found in both Abrahamic and Mosaic covenantal contexts.³⁷³ The Pss 105–106 pair thus confirms the continuity between Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants observed in our separate analysis of Ps 105: these psalms recognize them to be the one covenant of Yahweh established with Abraham

³⁷³ See Chapter Four for a fuller discussion of the covenant formula.

and graciously sustained and renewed at Horeb. At the same time, as Ps 105:45 also effectively equates **זָכַר** with Yahweh's promises rather than the Mosaic covenantal stipulations, for Yahweh "remembering his covenant" can only refer to his promised commitment to his people. The Mosaic covenant may be bi-lateral, but only Yahweh's promise counts for anything in the story of its preservation and renewal.

The contemporary nature of Ps 106's confession noted above has important implications for its editorial reuse. Psalm 106's premonarchic focus means that Book IV concludes by highlighting the people's infidelity to Yahweh as the threat to the covenant. The psalm engages its readers to identify with "our fathers," removing the monarchic era from view and with it the faintest whiff of royal culpability. Psalm 89 offered a consistent view on this point, attributing the current lamentable circumstances to Yahweh's inaction rather than any royal fault. Indeed, since both psalms conclude their respective books and address their respective covenants directly, to ask the question of how editors understood the shift of focus from Davidic covenant in Ps 89 to its premonarchic counterparts in Pss 105–106 is effectively to ask about the relationship between them. As noted in the introduction, Wilson sees Book IV as the editors' answer to the "problem" of failed royal covenantal theology; its solution being to accentuate Yahweh's reign instead of David's. Rather than herald premonarchic life in the Mosaic era as the solution, however, Book IV's concluding psalms draw attention only to the people's faithlessness to Yahweh's covenant as the crisis to be overcome by Yahweh's mercy. If Chapter Six's analysis should indeed show the king to be the focal point of Yahweh's solution to the people's covenantal faithlessness in Book III as Ps 78 suggests—then both the pressing nature of Ps 89's lament and Ps 106's dogged focus on the people's infidelity find a ready explanation: the return of "David" is expected to bring about covenant renewal and answer the people's prayer for Yahweh's mercy as in days of old. The plausibility of this explanation can then be tested further through the same chapter's analysis of Book IV, which will assess "David's" prominence in that Book and examine its portrayal of him there.

Psalm 111

Like Ps 25, Ps 111 is an acrostic poem with obvious wisdom concerns (cf. v. 10 and Prov 1:7) that draws in several covenant-related themes. **יִזְכֹּר** (יִזְכֹּר) occurs in its י' colon in v. 5b (**יִזְכֹּר**; cf. Ps 106:45) and its צ' colon in v. 9b (**צִוְּהָה לְעוֹלָם בְּרִיתוֹ**). Both instances emphasize the enduring nature of Yahweh's covenant, asserting that Yahweh both "remembers" (זכר) and "has commanded" (צוה) his covenant "forever" (**לְעוֹלָם**). Furthermore, the "fear of Yahweh" stands in close proximity to both instances of **בְּרִית** (cf. **לִירְאָיו** in v. 5a and **יְהוָה יִרְאֵת** in v. 10a), providing another point of similarity with Ps 25 (esp. vv. 10, 12, and 14)³⁷⁴ and common theme with Pss 112 with which it is paired (112:1).

Once again, **בְּרִית** takes a 3d sg. suffix denoting Yahweh's covenant, with no explicit qualification regarding which historic covenant is in view. All the same, some of its cola draw on phrases and language known from Mosaic covenantal contexts. First, in the ח' colon of v. 4 the speaker confesses that "Yahweh is gracious and compassionate" (**חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם יְהוָה**); a distinctive element of the grace formula in Exod 34:6. Yet again this key OT text is associated directly with **בְּרִית** in the Psalms. Indeed, most commentators recognize vv. 4–6 as an allusion to the exodus and conquest.³⁷⁵ The same word pair **חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם** occurs in Ps 112:4's ח' colon as well, underscoring the prominence of Yahweh's gracious and compassionate nature for this acrostic pair. As in Ps 103, Ps 111 recalls Yahweh's self-disclosure to Moses on Mt Sinai after the golden calf incident (Exod 32–34), and once again it is the speaker of Ps 111—rather than Yahweh

³⁷⁴ Maloney, "Intertextual Links," 14 notes that the Psalter's acrostics are evenly divided between Books I and V, and further cites Gottwald's suggestion that the final editors may have provided Book V's acrostics as "balancing counterparts" to those in Book I (Norman K. Gottwald, *The Hebrew Bible: A Socio-Literary Introduction* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987], 537). The above similarities between Pss 25 and 111 underscore this sense of symmetry.

³⁷⁵ Psalm 111's terse style notwithstanding, most commentators recognize vv. 4–6 as references to Yahweh's historic "wonders" in the exodus and land-giving. E.g., Goldingay, *Psalms* 3:305; Grogan, *Psalms*, 186; Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 3, 164; Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101–150* (WBC 21; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002), 101–150, 125.

himself as was the case in Exod 34—who proclaims Yahweh’s nature. Since Yahweh’s gracious and compassionate nature proves to be the basis for covenantal renewal in Exod 34, the allusion to the grace formula in v. 4 apparently praises Yahweh for sustaining/renewing the covenant. Verse 5, “he remembers his covenant forever,” confirms this, as does the similar statement in v. 9. Indeed, this appears to be the reason that Ps 111 can use the adverbial term לְעוֹלָם in vv. 5b and 9b at all: Yahweh “remembers” and “has commanded” his covenant *forever* because it is in his gracious nature to renew it. Whether this allusion to Exod 34:6 identifies בְּרִית in vv. 5 and 9 as the Mosaic covenant, however, is another question. Editors could conceivably understand these references to “his covenant” in broader terms that embrace the Davidic and Abrahamic covenants consistent with what we have seen elsewhere (e.g., Pss 105–106).

Indeed, several implicit criteria suggest both Abrahamic and Mosaic covenantal entailments. Verse 6 echoes Yahweh’s promise to give the land as an inheritance: “He has shown his people the power of his works, in giving them the inheritance of the nations (לְתַת לָהֶם נַחֲלָת) (גוֹיִם);” which again echoes Ps 2:8’s way of expressing the promise (וְאַתָּנָה גוֹיִם נַחֲלָתָךְ) as we saw with Ps 105:11. Moreover, the expression בְּכָל-לֵבָב the 8 colon in v. 1 recalls the similar expression in Deut 6:5, where the people of Israel are commanded, “You shall love (אַהֲב) Yahweh your God with all your heart (בְּכָל-לֵבָבְךָ).”³⁷⁶ This suggests that the speaker of Ps 111 in some sense embodies the obedience Moses calls for through his heartfelt praise of Yahweh throughout his acrostic poem. Yet the anonymity of the first person speaker of the 8 colon (cf. אֲוִדָּה) raises intriguing possibilities about the speaker’s identity, especially in light of Pss 111–112 placement after Davidic Pss 108–110. Indeed, analysis of Book V suggests that editors

³⁷⁶ Cf. Zenger, Dahood, *Psalms* (3 vols; Anchor Bible 16–17A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965–1970) 3:122, suggests that, “[b]eing the name of a part of the body, *lēbāb* needs no suffix.” On the other hand, לֵבָב has the 1st sg. suffix in the similar expression in 86:12 (note also the correspondence between אֲוִדָּה יְהוָה in 111:1 and אֲוִדָּה אֲדָנִי אֱלֹהֵי in 86:12). Meanwhile, while the equivalent phrase using the shorter noun form (לֵב) sometimes uses the suffix (e.g., 9:2; 119:10; 138:1), and sometimes does not (119:2, 34, 58, 69, 145).

deliberately collocated these psalms so that “David” would be understood as the one declaring Yahweh’s faithfulness to his covenant in accordance with our thesis.

Psalm 132

Psalm 132 ostensibly recalls the Davidic Covenant, mentioning David three times in the body of the psalm (vv. 1, 11, and 17). Verses 1–5 relates David’s resolve to find a resting place for Yahweh (cf. 2 Sam 7:2), whereupon vv. 6–18 address themselves ark (וְאָרְזֹן עֲנִי... לְהָדִים), Yahweh’s “resting place” (מְנוּחָתָךְ), and Yahweh’s sure oath to David. Accordingly, David and Zion come together in Ps 132 as we saw in Ps 78, precluding any idea that temple theology constitutes a theological alternative to royalty. Indeed, “For Yahweh has chosen Zion (כִּי־בָחַר יְהוָה בְּצִיּוֹן)...as his dwelling place” (cf. 78:68) follows directly from vv. 11–12’s report of Yahweh’s promise to David (לְדָוִד אָמַתְּ) in v. 11; cf. 78:70) to seat his progeny on his throne. The psalm then describes Zion as Yahweh’s eternal resting place (זֹאת־מְנוּחָתִי) in v. 14, where Yahweh provides for and blesses his people, priests etc. (vv. 15–16), and causes “a horn for David” to sprout, erects a “lamp for [his] anointed” (שָׁם אֶצְמִיחַ קֶרֶן לְדָוִד) (עֲרֹכְתִי נֵר לְמִשְׁחִי), and gives victory over his enemies (vv. 17–18).

Though the psalm’s obvious focus is the Davidic covenant, בְּרִית in v. 12 seems to embrace both the Mosaic and Davidic covenants. Verse 12 reads, “If your sons keep my covenant and my testimonies that I shall teach them (אִם־יִשְׁמְרוּ בְנֵיךְ | בְּרִיתִי וְעֵדוּתִי זֹ אֶלְמַדְמָם), their sons also forever shall sit on your throne.” The parallelism between בְּרִית and אֶלְמַדְמָם may suggest that בְּרִית here refers specifically to the Mosaic covenantal stipulations or Torah that the king was to keep according to Deut 17 and implied in the warnings of 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 89:31–33.³⁷⁷ If this is correct, then v. 12 witnesses directly to an aspect of how the psalmist, at least,

³⁷⁷ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 466n17, understands Ps 132:11–12 as a “nomistic revision” of the oracle in 2 Sam 7:12–16, apparently seeing v. 12’s “if your sons keep my covenant and my testimonies etc.” as an interpretive embellishment of 2 Sam 7:14’s “when he commits iniquity” (אֲשֶׁר בְּהַעֲוֹתוֹ).

Kim, “Psalm 89,” 351–79 provides a helpful discussion of the conditionality of the covenants, arguing that

viewed the relationship between the Davidic and Mosaic covenants: Yahweh expects the Davidic king to keep the Mosaic law (cf. Ps 89:31–33).

The text of v. 12 merits closer scrutiny, however, for **וְעֵדוּתִי** is ambiguously pointed. Koehler and Baumgartner observe that this pointing “leaves open the choice between sg. **עֵדוּתִי** and pl. **עֵדוּתַי**,” a confusion attested in the MS evidence as well.³⁷⁸ This ambiguity could reflect a corresponding uncertainty about the referent of **בְּרִיתִי** with which it is paralleled, though it is impossible to say if only later copyists or the editors responsible for Ps 132’s placement in the Psalter experienced this uncertainty, or which form they read. Indeed, these two options raise different translational possibilities that potentially alter how v. 12’s reference to **בְּרִית** was understood to some extent. On the one hand, a text reading the pl. **עֵדוּתַי** translates “my testimonies” as the ESV has it (above), thus qualifying **בְּרִיתִי** via probable reference to Mosaic covenantal stipulations since they must be *kept* (**שָׁמַר**) by the David’s sons. This would mean that the latter half of v. 12 further elaborates **בְּרִיתִי** in terms of the Mosaic covenantal stipulations or commands. As stated above, this would mean that v. 12 more directly reflects Deut 17’s command that the king keep Torah. On this view, the psalm highlights royal obedience to the Mosaic covenantal stipulations as the connecting point between the Davidic and Mosaic covenants. The Davidic covenant is ostensibly in view, but it entails royal obedience to the Mosaic covenant in the way the king rules the nation. On the other hand, a text reading sg. **עֵדוּתִי** translates “my testimony/covenant,”³⁷⁹ makes it a potential synonym for **בְּרִיתִי** and a second

law is present in all covenants, but its function varies. In so-called “unconditional” covenants like the Davidic and Abrahamic, the law serves an administrative function and the promises of Yahweh as suzerain are not abrogated by the vassal’s breach of the terms. In the case of the Davidic covenant the individual king may be cut off but the dynastic promise remains secure.

³⁷⁸ HALOT, 790. 11QPs^a 6, IV has a plenary form **וְעֵדוּוֹתַי** (= **עֵדוּוֹתַי**?) which seems to suggest that the Qumran scribes understood the sg. like the Vg. (“et testificationem meam quam docuero eos”). On the other hand, LXX has the pl. **τὰ μαρτύρια μου ταῦτα** (reading **וְ** for **וִי** with 11QPs^a and a MS from Cairo Geniza).

³⁷⁹ The sg. form results in a closer parallel with the also sg. **בְּרִיתִי**, while a pl. form increases their dissimilarity

reference to the Davidic covenant given Ps 132's ostensive focus. Thus the covenant itself becomes that which Yahweh "teaches" (אֲלֶמְדָּם), and would seem to lessen v. 12's focus on the Mosaic covenantal stipulations and commands *per se* in comparison to the pl. reading of עֲדֹתַי.

Significantly, in Ps 25:10 we have already seen בְּרִיתוֹ paralleled with the pl. וְעֲדֹתַי as the dual object of the semantically equivalent "to keep" (לְנַצְרֵי). This tips the scales in favor of the plural in Ps 132 also. In either case, though, Ps 132 expects future Davidic monarchs to keep (אִם-יִשְׁמְרוּ) Yahweh's teaching (cf. אֲלֶמְדָּם וְ), and in this respect seems to echo the same expectation of Davidide kings in Deut 17. As Fishbane observes, Ps 132 accentuates the conditionality of David's sons' reigns on their keeping Yahweh's teaching, more so than the oracle in 2 Sam 7. In 2 Sam 7:14 Yahweh will "discipline" David's seed (זֶרְעֶךָ) with the rod of men "when he commits iniquity" (בְּהַעֲוֹתוֹ), yet Yahweh's "steadfast love will not depart from him" (וְחַסְדֵי לֹא-יִסּוּר מִמֶּנּוּ). By contrast, Ps 132:12 seems to make the reign of "the sons of David's sons" (בְּנֵי-בְנֵיהֶם עַד-עַד... בְּנֵיךָ) contingent upon keeping "my covenant etc." (בְּרִיתִי) (וְעֲדֹתַי וְ אֲלֶמְדָּם).³⁸⁰ Perhaps more significant is that Ps 132:12 expresses the conditionality *positively*: "If your sons keep my covenant...etc." David's heirs aren't simply to *avoid* breaking Yahweh's commands as in 2 Sam 7:14 or Ps 89:31–33; they are actively to keep his covenant and testimony/testimonies. In contrast to Book III, Book V bears a stronger Davidic stamp on it and is dominated by thanksgiving and liturgical collections that celebrate Yahweh's salvation (e.g. Pss 113–118; 120–134).³⁸¹ In view of "David's" resurgence in this final Book of the Psalter, it is possible editors intended Ps 132:12's positive way of expressing its 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 89:31–33 parallels to be read as a condition *met* by the "David" of Book V. Such a "David" fits

and emphasizes what "keeping my covenant" entails, viz., "keeping my stipulations."

³⁸⁰ At issue in v. 12 is David's heirs' occupancy of his throne, not the throne itself. Verse 12 casts its condition in an open way, with no mention of whether their persistent infidelity would automatically result in end of the David's throne and all hope for future Davidic rule.

³⁸¹ See Chapter Six.

our hypothesis and is at least consistent with the general silence regarding any royal culpability that our survey has uncovered so far in Books III–V. Accordingly, subsequent chapters will also investigate whether and how the Psalms present “David” keeper of Torah.

Conclusion

Our survey of בְּרִית yields several observations. First, בְּרִית only occurs in the singular, usually with a pronominal suffix identifying it as *Yahweh’s* covenant. Its definiteness in each context underscores the singularity of Yahweh’s covenant. Nowhere do the above psalms emphasize a plurality of covenants. Second, though Pss 89 and 105 qualify בְּרִית by direct reference to “David” or “Abraham,” the remaining psalms containing בְּרִית expect that its meaning is self-evident, and *implicit* contextual factors suggest that Mosaic or Sinaitic covenantal concerns are often primary. From the point of view of our thesis question, these two observations suggest a potential tension between the singularity and specificity of the covenant(s). But the psalms themselves seem completely unaware of any such tension. With apparent ease the Psalms allude to historically distinct covenants with Abraham, Moses, and David and at the same time speak of “Yahweh’s covenant” as a singular concept. This suggests that the unity of the covenants is in some sense a *theological* unity undergirded by a historical continuity. It therefore behooves us to consider wherein their theological unity lies. Indeed, the above survey has yielded some numerous clues that lend weight to our hypothesis. Among the more significant observations are the lack of royal culpability vis-à-vis Israel’s cyclical infidelity and “David” as God’s answer to that unfaithfulness (Pss 89, 132), the implied relationship between “David” and Judah/Zion/sanctuary (Pss 50[?], 78, 132), the common association between בְּרִית and the “grace formula” in Exod 34:6–7 (Pss 25, 89, 105–106, 111–112). Moreover, our survey of בְּרִית psalms has suggested the psalms that offer a discernible perspective on covenant relationships evidence a theological “royalization” of the Abrahamic/Mosaic covenants rather than a “democratization” of the Davidic covenant. This too lends weight to our hypothesis.

Addendum: חֶק and עֲדוּת in Their Singular Forms

We saw that חֶק (sg.) and דְּבָר parallels בְּרִית in Ps 105:10 in reference to the Abarahmic covenant.³⁸² Similarly, חֶק (“decree”) elsewhere as well as the sg. noun עֲדוּת (“testimony”) have potential to function as another term for “covenant.”³⁸³ Indeed, Kalluveettil argues that עֲדוּת in its sg. form functions as virtual synonyms for “covenant” in several instances (e.g. 2 Kg 11:12).³⁸⁴ What follows is a brief survey of such instances in the Psalter.

Only four cases of חֶק in the singular concern us here because a fifth instance, Ps 94:20, refers to an unjust statute rather than Yahweh’s. This leaves Pss 2:7; 81:5; 99:7; and 148:6. As noted above, עֲדוּת sg. occurs in Pss 19:8; 78:5; 81:6; and 122:4 (not counting the superscripts to Pss 60 and 80).

In Ps 2:7 חֶק refers to Yahweh’s actual words to his anointed, “You are my Son, today I have begotten you” (cf. the paring of יְהוָה and מְשִׁיחוֹ in v. 2). Here חֶק denotes a central promise of the Davidic covenant (cf. 2 Sam 7:14). Given Pss 1–2’s introductory function, the Davidic covenant—specifically the Yahweh-king relationship at its hear—is thus a central concern of the Psalter.

Korahite Ps 81:5–6a read, “For it is a statute (חֶק) for Israel, a rule (מִשְׁפָּט) of the God of Jacob. He made it a decree (עֲדוּת) in Joseph when he went out over the land of Egypt.”³⁸⁵ Here

³⁸² Similarly, חֶק parallels בְּרִית in Num 18:19, Josh 24:25, Isa 24:5, and 1 Chr 16:17 (= Ps 105:10), where these terms display semantic overlap. Psalm 147:19 is a further possibility where

³⁸³ H. Ringgren, “חֶקֶת *hāqāq*; חֶקֶת *hāqā*; חֶקֶת *hūqāq*,” *TDOT* 5:139–47, observes that in most cases חֶק involves the meaning “statute” or “ordinance” initiated by the superior party but takes different concrete meanings depending on context. Cf. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, “חֶק,” *HALOT on CD-ROM*. 1999, 356, who define it as “(allotted) portion,” “law,” “regulation,” “prescription,” and “rule”; and F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, “חֶק,” *BDB*, 349, who define חֶק as “something prescribed, a statute due,” be it a “task,” “portion,” “limit” or “boundary,” an “enactment” or “specific decree.”

³⁸⁴ Kalluveettil, *Declaration and Covenant*, 31.

³⁸⁵ LXX has ἐκ γῆς for עַל-אֶרֶץ, which may be a correction to Exod 20:2. Either way, historical allusion to the Exodus seems assured, especially since v. 8 refers to the incident at Meribah during the wilderness wanderings

חֹק, עֲדוֹת, and מְשָׁפֵט form a cluster typical of the Mosaic covenantal terms surveyed in Chapter Four. Nevertheless, none of these are plural here, and instead refer most directly to the command to keep the feast day (cf. vv. 2–4). However Ps 81’s allusion to Deut 6:4 in vv. 9 and 12 and the Decalogue in vv. 10–11 show that the festival it celebrates concerns the Mosaic covenant. Thus, חֹק and עֲדוֹת (and מְשָׁפֵט) effectively command participation in Mosaic covenantal life in Ps 81.

In Ps 99:7 חֹק parallels עֲדוֹתָיו, as the dual object of שָׁמְרוּ, “they kept.” Since Yahweh had “given them” this חֹק (cf. נָתַן-לָמוֹ), there is some cause to understand חֹק as a functional synonym for a בְּרִית whose stipulations (i.e., עֲדוֹתָיו) people were obliged to keep. The mention of Moses, Aaron, and Samuel in the previous verse locates the covenant in the pre-monarchic period and suggests that these prophetic and priestly figures are the “they” who kept Yahweh’s עֲדוֹת and חֹק, underscoring that the Mosaic covenant is in view.

Psalm 148:6 presents an interesting case that deserves a little more discussion. The ESV translates Ps 148:6, “And he established them forever and ever; he gave a decree, and it shall not pass away (חֹק-נִתְּנָן וְלֹא יֵעָבֹר).”³⁸⁶ Translated thus, חֹק refers to Yahweh’s creational decree or possibly “covenant” with the heavenly bodies (vv. 3–4; cf. Gen 1:6–8, 14–19)—a virtual restatement of v. 5b, “for he commanded and they were created.” However, several reasons make it plausible that editors—even the original author—understood v. 6 differently, with חֹק being a covenant to which heavenly bodies *bear witness* like in the Mosaic covenant (cf. Deut 4:26; 30:19, 28). First, although לְעֹלָם לְעֹלָם can be rendered “forever and ever,”³⁸⁷ it can also be read:

³⁸⁶ Kalluveetil, *Declaration and Covenant*, 170n187, cites this as an example of *covenantal* transgression. While חֹק and עֲבָר are typical covenantal language, it is well to note that the sg. verb יֵעָבֹר makes חֹק its subject, not its object: the decree or covenant *itself* will not pass away. BHS editor H. Bardkte offers the conjecture that the final two consonants should be reversed, yielding a pl. subject (עֲבָרוּ). This would make the heavenly bodies in vv. 3–4 the subject: the sun, moon, stars etc. will not transgress the decree—i.e., break their orbits. No MS evidence supports this conjecture however.

³⁸⁷ i.e., a ל of duration. See. Williams, *Williams Hebrew Syntax*, 106. Most commentators read it this way, understanding חֹק as God’s creational command to the heavenly bodies, e.g., Derek Kidner, *Psalms 73–150* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1975), 525; Goldingay, *Psalms*, 3:731; Vangemeren, *Psalms*, 1002; and

“He established them as a *witness* forever (וַיִּעֲמִידֵם לְעוֹלָם); he gave a decree, and it shall not pass away.” A similar expression occurs in Isa 30:8 (לְעַד עַד-עוֹלָם), where it clearly means “as a witness forever” rather than “forever and ever.” On the other hand, Ps 111:8 provides support for the usual translation because לְעַד לְעוֹלָם probably does mean “forever and ever” there—Yahweh’s “works of his hands” (מַעֲשֵׂי יָדָיו) and “precepts” (כָּל-פְּקוּדָיו) are eternally established.³⁸⁸ If correct, however, the description of the heavenly bodies as “witnesses” would suggest that editors may have connected חָק with the Mosaic covenant (universalized?) in 148:6 that “shall not pass away.” A second reason editors might have read it this way is Ps 89:37–38’s comparison of David’s throne with the sun and moon as a witness. Indeed, there already exists a possible connection between the final psalm of Book III and this central psalm of the final Hallel group. When Ps 148 repeats the call to praise Yahweh’s name in v. 13, it goes on to declare that Yahweh “has raised up (וַיָּרָם) a horn (קֶרֶן)” in v. 14.³⁸⁹ This provides a plausible connection with Ps 89 at the editorial level, for the latter twice speaks of “our horn” (v. 18)³⁹⁰ and “his [i.e., David’s] horn” (v. 25) being “exalted” (תָּרַם). Besides the editorial importance of Ps 89, the Psalter’s other uses of קֶרֶן also suggest that לְעַמּוֹ | וַיָּרָם קֶרֶן in 148:14 has the Davidic king in view. קֶרֶן mostly occurs in royal psalms (cf. 18:3; 89:18, 25; 132:17—the pl. in quasi-royal

Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 3*, 148, who suggest that חָק-נֶגְדָן may allude to “Torah as the “eternal law” for creation.”

³⁸⁸ However, the verb there is קָמוּ (pt.), not וַיִּעֲמִידֵם. Syntactically, 148:6a (וַיִּעֲמִידֵם לְעוֹלָם) shares a closer formal correspondence with Ps 105:10a (וַיִּעֲמִידֵהָ לְיַעֲקֹב לְחֹק), in that both these texts employ the *hiphil* of עָמַד (with objective suffix) followed by a double ל. Since Ps 105:10 has a ל of product (לְחֹק) following the *hiphil* of עָמַד, it seems likely that editors might recognize a similar syntactical relationship in 148:6; i.e., לְעַד as ל of product + “witness.” Moreover, where עַד and עוֹלָם occur elsewhere in the Psalter as clear temporal adverbs (Pss 10:16; 21:5; 45:7; 48:15; 52:10; 104:5), their order is normally reversed and ל is lacking: עוֹלָם וְעַד.

³⁸⁹ Cf. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 3*, 638–39, who see this as “the reason for and content of the praise Israel is to sing.”

³⁹⁰ Fragmentary evidence from Cairo Geniza witnesses the plural, “our horns” in v. 18. Concerning the verb, the *ketib* here תָּרַם (hiph.). The Masoretes perhaps amended it with the *gere* form תָּרַם (qal) to align it with v. 25.

118:27 refers to the altar]).³⁹¹ Given the oft-noted editorial importance of royal psalms,³⁹² it is highly likely that editors understood לְעֹמֹד קֶרֶן וַיִּרְם in v. 14 in relation to the Davidic king or kingdom in some sense, and that Ps 148:14 recalls the twofold appearance of קֶרֶן in Ps 89.³⁹³ Thus, the חֹק to praise Yahweh in 148:6 very plausibly celebrates the Mosaic covenantal relationship between God and people as a fact established by the “royal horn” whom Yahweh has raised up.

³⁹¹ Of its remaining instances, in 92:11 קֶרֶן relates to the psalmist and in 112:9 קֶרֶן relates to “blessed man who fears Yahweh,” while in Pss 22:22 and 75:5, 6, and 11 קֶרֶן relates to “the wild oxen” (וּבְמִקְרָנֵי רָמִים) as the psalmist’s oppressors and “the wicked.” Clearly, Ps 148:14 cannot mean the horn of “oppressors” (Ps 22) or “the wicked” (Ps 75), leaving us with Pss 92 and 112. It is possible that both psalms associate קֶרֶן with royalty like the royal psalms. Regarding the latter, we have already noted Zenger’s opinion that “the blessed man” of 112 is “David” from the preceding Davidic group (Pss 108–110). Psalm 92:11 reads, “you have exalted my horn like that of the wild ox” (וּבְמִקְרָנֵי קֶרֶן). Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 282–84, notes the same image in Moses’ blessing of the tribes of Joseph (i.e., Ephraim and Manasseh) in Deut 33:17: “A firstborn bull—he has majesty, and his horns (קֶרֶן) are the horns of a wild ox (וּבְמִקְרָנֵי רָאֵם).” Accordingly, Mitchell argues that a messianic interpretation of 92:11 found in later *Midrash on Psalms* and the Venice edition of *Pirque de Rabbi Eleazer* very plausibly goes back to the biblical authors themselves, so that Ps 92:11 has messianic overtones (cf. the reference to anointing in v. 11b: “you have poured over me fresh oil [שֶׁמֶן מְרִיחַ]”). Thus, Mitchell entertains the very plausible possibility that the Psalter draws on both Davidic messianic imagery and language and this Ephraimitic imagery. In Ps 22:22 we noted the same image, “the horns of the wild ox,” is applied to the psalmist’s oppressors rather than in any such positive sense. But Ps 92:11 uses the imagery *positively* in a simile (cf. בְּ), and for that reason may evoke the blessing of Deut 33:27 for editors—if not for the original author of the psalm himself. Thus, Mitchell’s suggestion that Ps 92:11 applies קֶרֶן in a messianic sense seems very plausible, even if conclusive proof is wanting.

³⁹² Cf. Chapter One and, e.g., Wilson, “The Use of Royal Psalms.”

³⁹³ Cf. Grogan, *Psalms*, 228, who sees a probable allusion to “the messianic hope of a powerful king (cf. 132:17).” Most commentators understand לְעֹמֹד קֶרֶן וַיִּרְם in v. 14 as Yahweh’s bestowal of dignity and power on Israel only in a general way, e.g., Goldingay, *Psalms*, 3:734; Terrien, *The Psalms*, 921; Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 3, 638–39; and Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150: A Continental Commentary* (trans. Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 564, who thinks the precise referent of קֶרֶן is unknowable. Granted, Ps 89 speaks of the people’s horn (v. 18) and David’s (v. 25), and Ps 148:14’s mention of a “horn for his people” might be taken as a deliberate exclusion of David as recipient of honor, power etc. But this ignores two important points. First, within Ps 89 the people’s and David’s “honor” are intertwined (cf. vv. 50–52)—no such dichotomy between David and people is in view. Second, for the most part it is royal psalms that use קֶרֶן in a positive way as discussed above, making it likely that editors read the term with the king in view.

Three of the four instances of עֲדוּת (sg.) are either accounted for above (78:5; and 81:6) or will come up in Chapter Four (Pss 19:8).³⁹⁴ This leaves Davidic Ps 122:4, where לְיִשְׂרָאֵל עֲדוּת refers to the decree that “the tribes of Yah” (שְׁבִיטֵי־יָהּ) ascend Jerusalem to praise Yahweh’s name. However, 11QPs^a has עֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל (“the congregation of Israel;” cf. ἐκκλησία in the Greek of Symmachus), casting some doubt over whether the text should read לְיִשְׂרָאֵל עֲדוּת at all. If the MT is correct, however, then עֲדוּת would amount to a liturgically-oriented command similar to Ps 81:6. But whereas Ps 81 has several conspicuous Mosaic covenantal elements, Ps 122 accentuates the Davidic throne. Verse 5 states, “There (כִּי שִׁמְרָה) the thrones for judgment were set, the thrones of the house of David.” Whether כִּי is causal or emphatic, the Davidic throne is in some sense the reason for praising Yahweh’s name in Ps 122.

To sum up: in Ps 2 חֶק refers to a core promise of the Davidic covenant, and in Ps 81 חֶק, עֲדוּת, and מְשַׁפֵּט all express Yahweh’s command to keep a feast with strong Mosaic covenantal entailments. Similarly, חֶק seems to refer to the Mosaic covenant in Ps 99. Although not conclusive, there are some reasons to suggest that editors understood חֶק in Ps 148:6 as Yahweh’s covenant in a broad—even universal—sense established by “David.” Finally, there is some textual uncertainty regarding עֲדוּת in Ps 122:4 it, but if עֲדוּת is the correct reading then Ps 122 connects it most obviously with thanksgiving in Jerusalem and the house of David.

³⁹⁴ עֲדוּת also occurs the superscripts for Pss 60 and 80 in tune names.

CHAPTER FOUR

AN EXPLORATORY SURVEY OF COVENANTAL REFERENCES AND ALLUSIONS IN THE PSALTER, PART TWO: ALLUSIONS VIA IMPLICIT “CRITERIA” AND THEIR ASSOCIATION WITH “DAVID”

In the previous chapter’s survey of בְּרִית we observed contextual features—terms, promises, obligations, expressions, etc.—that helped clarify that term’s specific covenantal associations in context. The purpose of this chapter is to trace such features or “criteria” with potential to reflect some aspect of the pre-monarchic covenants pertinent to our hypothesis.³⁹⁵ Doing this allows us to explore the extent to which major characteristics of the major pre-monarchic covenants (promises, obligations, formulae etc.) coalesce around the personage of “David” in the Psalter.³⁹⁶ This proffers a fuller view of covenantal allusions in the Psalter and their relationship to David. It also provides valuable data for the analyses of subsequent chapters.

³⁹⁵ As mentioned previously, the term “criteria” is not intended to imply a strict condition by which certain covenantal associations may be known, but simply to refer to features with particular allusive potential.

³⁹⁶ Obviously, psalms that elicit the Mosaic covenant or its characteristics abound in the Psalter. This is not surprising given the large amount of Pentateuchal material devoted to the Mosaic covenant throughout Exod–Deut and the influence of the cult on the Psalms. Accordingly, our survey selects criteria whose allusive potential have already been established in Cha. Three, and can be traced through recurring themes and lexical data. Our methodology assumes that the greater the lexical, syntactic, and/or thematic similarities between biblical texts and their possible allusions in the Psalter, the stronger the allusion recognizable to editors.

Occasionally the survey explores intertextuality concerning specific texts (e.g., Deut 6:4–7 and 7:9–10) for reasons explained below. This is not to deny the importance of other Pentateuchal texts, especially those that contain some of the same elements. For example, an allusion to Deut 6:5’s command to “love Yahweh with all your heart” might well be understood as an allusion to Deut 13:4. In the final analysis what matters is that the psalm in question evokes key themes or terms with strong Mosaic covenantal associations.

Some criteria belong naturally to Chapters Five and Six and so are examined there. Chapter Five investigates allusions to Gen 12:3 (and parallels) and “Abraham” due to that chapter’s focus on Ps 72:17’s allusion to the Abrahamic promise in Gen 12:3 and their predominance in Books I–II. In terms of our hypothesis, then, Chapter Five focuses on David as an “agent of blessing” and the promised seed through which all nations would be blessed. Similarly Chapter Six surveys the Psalter’s allusions to Exod 34:6 since it investigates the “grace formula” (Exod 34:6) in Pss 86, 103, and 145 in Books III–V,³⁹⁷ thus taking up the possibility of David as a Moses-like Intercessor and Proclaimer of Yahweh’s mercy.

Our investigation of these criteria is organized under headings reflecting the major aspects of our hypothesis. First, it explores “David” as Yahweh’s covenant partner *par excellence* by investigating allusions to the covenant formula and to Yahweh’s “Inheritance” (נַחֲלָה) or “special possession” (סִגְלָה). Second, it explores David as observer of the Mosaic covenant by examining allusions to the *Shema* (Deut 6:4[–7]), clustered terminology relating to covenant stipulations (מִשְׁפָּטִים, מִצְוֹת, עֲדוּת, חֻקִּים/תְּקוּנוֹת, and עֲדוּת), singular nouns like חֻק, תּוֹרָה, and עֲדוּת, allusions to the Decalogue, and wisdom motifs such as “walking” in Yahweh’s “way,” the “two ways,” and the fear of Yahweh, of which Deuteronomic theology makes generous use. Third, it explores David as a priestly mediator of Yahweh’s blessing and a Moses-like Intercessor by investigating allusions to Num 6:24–26 and Deut 9:26. Fourth, it examines the Psalter’s allusions to Deut 7:9–10’s confession of Yahweh’s faithfulness to his covenant and reprisal for the wicked, examining to what extent this confession relates to “David” and how. Fifth, the survey

³⁹⁷ Terms like חֻק, and אִמְנָה, and אִמְנוּנָה also appeared prominently in בְּרִית psalms (Pss 25, 44, 89, 103, 106, 111, and 132). The combination of these lexemes has the potential to echo texts like Deut 7:9 and Exod 34:6, which are treated below and in Cha. Six respectively, supplemented by Appendix H’s fuller investigation of חֻק and its pairing with אִמְנָה, and אִמְנוּנָה. It is also worth repeating that Cha. Three demonstrated that these terms helped to underscore the theological unity of “Yahweh’s covenant” in the Psalter by the consistent way they describe Yahweh’s expected or experienced disposition toward his covenant partner(s)—rather than accentuate the theological distinctiveness of the covenants.

traces the distribution of “Moses,” “Sinai”/“Horeb,” and allusions to the Song of the Sea (Exod 15) to explore the possibility that editors viewed David as a *Moses*-like singer of praise who, like Moses, praises God for a new Exodus-like salvation. If so, this would further complement our hypothesis that “David” fills the traditionally Mosaic role of intercessor to renew the covenant. Exploring these themes also prepares for Chapter Six’s investigation of Pss 86, 103, and 145 in their “book contexts,” for some of the strongest evidence for purposeful allusion to the Song of the Sea comes from Pss 93–100 in Book IV—the so-called “editorial center” of the Psalter according to Wilson.³⁹⁸ Then follows an examination of allusions to the gift/possessing of the land promised first in the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 12:1, 7–8; 15:7, 16; 17:8), which finds that this promise appears to be both “universalized” and “royalized” in the Psalter overall. Finally, the survey explores some criteria that are not distinctively *pre-monarchic* but nevertheless provide important evidence for our hypothesis. Specifically, it examines the extent to which “Servant-Lord” (אֲדֹנָי/עֲבָדָה) and “Father-Son” (בֶּן/אָב) language is reserved for *David* and Yahweh, suggesting David’s status as Royal Son and Servant of Yahweh. It also, offers a brief examination of those few references to Yahweh’s sworn promises (שָׁבוּעַ; שְׁבוּעָה) in the Psalter.

David as Yahweh’s Faithful Covenant Partner: The “Royalization” of the Covenant Formula (להיות לך לאלהים and להיות לי לעם) and Related Terminology

The relationship between Yahweh and his people is expressed in several notable ways, the most conspicuous being the covenant formula, “to be(come) for you God (להיות לך לאלהים) and “to be(come) for me a people” להיות לי לעם and its variations. As Rolf Rendtorff’s study of the formula shows, the term בְּרִית is often “indissolubly linked” with the covenant formula, leading him to describe it as an “explication” of the covenant and “an exposition of what the word *b^crit* means.”³⁹⁹ This can be seen in four “highly important instances” in Gen–Lev (Gen

³⁹⁸ Wilson, *Editing*, 215. See Introduction.

³⁹⁹ Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula*, 88.

17:7 Exod 6:7; and Lev 26:12, 45), but also in many other places (Deut 4:20; 7:6; 29:11; Jer 11:4; 31:31–34; 32:36–40; Ezek 34:24; 37:23, 27; and 2Kgs 11:17).⁴⁰⁰ Represented among these are the Abrahamic, Mosaic, and even the “New” covenants. Rendtorff proposes three basic forms of the formula as it appears in the Pentateuch: Formula A, “to be God to you” (להיות לך) (לאלהים); Formula B, “to be to me a people” (להיות לי לעם); and their combination in a single formula, Formula C (להיות לך לאלהים + להיות לי לעם).⁴⁰¹ He argues convincingly that these different forms are readily explained by the theological priorities of those contexts.⁴⁰² While all three forms follow a similar syntactical pattern, the verb “to be” (הָיָה) and double ל, Rendtorff’s list of occurrences of the covenant formula in the OT demonstrates even more variation within these basic forms as well. For instance, the verb הָיָה sometimes gives way to another verb.⁴⁰³ Pronominal suffixes on the ל vary in person and number according to literary context.⁴⁰⁴

⁴⁰⁰ Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula*, 43–44.

⁴⁰¹ Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula*, 12–13. Rendtorff observes, “[t]his concept whereby the bilateral formula is judged the real main form, and the other two formulas are viewed as parts or ‘halves’ of this formula, has met with widespread approval.”

⁴⁰² Of the shorter forms, Formula A predominates in Genesis to Leviticus, where God’s promise to be their God is accented more strongly, while Formula B predominates in Deuteronomy, where there is a specific emphasis on Israel’s demarcation from all other nations.

⁴⁰³ E.g., לָקַח (Exod 6:7); קוּם (Deut 28:9; 29:12); עָשָׂה (1 Sam 12:22); and בּוֹן (2 Sam 7:24). Note also Deut 7:6 and 14:2, where הָיָה is preceded by בָּחַר.

⁴⁰⁴ According to Rendtorff’s Appendix, which tabulates the ל להיות formulae in the OT, the distribution of pronominal suffixes for ל (taken possessively) is as follows:

ל + suffix qualifying לאלהים (i.e., from Formulas A and C) include: “your (sg.) God,” אֱלֹהֶיךָ, three times (Gen 17:7b; Deut 26:17; and 29:12); “your(pl.) God,” אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, nine times (Exod 6:7; Lev 11:45; 22:33; 25:38; 26:12; Num 15:41; Jer 7:23; 11:4; 30:22; and Ezek 36:28); and “their God,” אֱלֹהֵיהֶם, thirteen times (Gen 17:8b; Exod 29:45; Lev 26:45; 2Sam 7:24; Jer 24:7; 31:33; 32:38; Ezek 11:20; 14:11; 34:24; 37:23, 27; and Zech 8:8). In addition to these, Gen 17:7 adds וְלִזְרַעְךָ אֱלֹהֵי אֲחֵרֶיךָ to אֱלֹהֶיךָ; Jer 31:1 forgoes a pronoun in favor of a third plural noun equivalent לְבָל מְשֻׁפְחוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל.

ל + suffix qualifying לעם (i.e., from Formulas B and C) include: “my people,” לִי, sixteen times (Exod 6:7; Lev 26:12; Jer 7:23; 11:4; 13:11; 24:7; 30:22; 31:1, 3; 32:38; Ezek 11:20; 14:11; 36:28; 37:23, 27; and Zech 8:8);

Additional qualifiers of עַם such as סִגְלָה,⁴⁰⁵ קְדוֹשׁ,⁴⁰⁶ and שְׂרָאֵל⁴⁰⁷ are also sometimes added. Yet none of these variations jeopardize their integrity as legitimate, recognizable examples of the formula. Although the different narrative or dialogical contexts in which the formula occurs affect their appearance, they remain clearly recognizable instances of the covenant formula.

Furthermore, outside the Psalter some otherwise “strict” formulations of the covenant formula—i.e., which have הָיָה and double לְ—also use possessive pronominal suffixes appended directly to אֱלֹהִים or עַם. For example, Leviticus 11:44–45, 25:38, 26:12–13, and Num 15:41 follow the regular form of the covenant formula לְהִיּוֹת לְכֶם לְאֱלֹהִים with the synonymous אֲנִי אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, thus declaring what the covenant formula expresses as a present reality.⁴⁰⁸ Leviticus 26:44–45 is similar, but with 3d per. suffixes instead (כִּי אֲנִי לְהִיּוֹת לָהֶם לְאֱלֹהִים) (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם). Similarly, Deut 7:6 introduces the covenant formula לֹא לְעַם לְהִיּוֹת לוֹ with עַם קְדוֹשׁ אֲתָה לִיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ. In these and other instances, אֱלֹהִים or עַם plus pronominal suffix states as present fact what its covenant formulaic equivalent expresses to the essence of what the covenant is about: the God-people relationship.⁴⁰⁹

“your people,” לְךָ, once (David’s prayer in 2Sam 7:24); and “his people,” לוֹ, seven times (Deut 4:20; 7:6; 14:2; 26:19; 28:9; 29:12; and 1Sam 12:22). Moreover, Deut 27:9 and 2Kgs 11:17 forego the third person sg. suffix in favor of לְיְהוָה, Deut 27:9 even adding אֱלֹהֵיךָ.

⁴⁰⁵ Deut 7:6; 14:2; and 26:19.

⁴⁰⁶ Deut 28:9.

⁴⁰⁷ 2 Sam 7:24.

⁴⁰⁸ Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula*, 47, notes that the covenant formula is frequently associated with the “self-revelation” (כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה) and “recognition” formulas.

⁴⁰⁹ Other examples include the following. 1Samuel 12:22 prefaces the formulaic לֹא לְעַם with its semantic equivalent עַמּוֹ, and 2Sam 7:24 similarly prefaces לְעַם לְךָ with עַמְּךָ. In Deut 7:6, 14:2, and 27:9, the expression אֱלֹהֵיךָ אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה is the implied counterpart to לְעַם לְךָ and appears to replace its strict formulaic equivalent. Elsewhere in Deut 26:19; 28:9; 29:11–12 אֱלֹהֵיךָ אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה keeps close company with its “strict” formulaic equivalent.

Given its flexibility, the Psalter seems to allude to the covenant formula more commonly than is often recognized, as we shall see. We may further ask, to what extent does its distribution reflect a particular focus on *David* as Yahweh’s covenant partner?

David and the Covenant Formula

Norbert Lohfink provides a useful starting point. He points out three places that allude to it “with a high degree of certainty”: Pss 33:12; 95:7; and 100:3.⁴¹⁰ Psalm 33:12 reads, “Blessed is the nation whose God is Yahweh, the people whom he has chosen as his heritage” (אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה בָּחַר לְנַחֲלָה לּוֹ); Ps 95:7 reads, “For he is our God, and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand” (כִּי הוּא אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאֶנְחֵנוּ עִם מְרֻעֵיתוֹ וְצֹאן יָדוֹ); and Ps 100:3 reads “Know that Yahweh, he is God! It is he who made us, and we are his; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture” (דַּעוּ כִּי־יְהוָה הוּא אֱלֹהִים הוּא־עָשָׂנוּ וְלֹא אֶנְחֵנוּ עִמּוֹ) (וְצֹאן מְרֻעֵיתוֹ). Several observations bear making. First, Lohfink apparently singles out these three cases because they reflect—or nearly reflect—the full “bilateral” form of the covenant formula (Formula C).⁴¹¹ But Rendtorff’s analysis suggests instances of the so-called “half-formulae” (Formulae A and B) in the Psalms also deserve our attention. Indeed, these turn out to be quite numerous. Second, Pss 95:7 and 100:3 do not share the הִיָּה plus double לַ syntax, but a simple, verbless subject-complement syntax (e.g., הוּא אֱלֹהֵינוּ; וְאֶנְחֵנוּ עִם),⁴¹² yet he—correctly in my view—counts these them as strong allusions to the formula. This squares with the variation in the formula elsewhere in the OT observed above.

⁴¹⁰ Lohfink, “The Covenant Formula in Psalm 33,” 87.

⁴¹¹ Strictly speaking, Ps 100 reflects Formula B, since כִּי־יְהוָה הוּא אֱלֹהֵינוּ omits a possessive suffix or *lamedh* relating Yahweh to the people as “*their/our God*.” On the other hand this clause gives a balance to 100:3 characteristic of the bilateral version of the formula.

⁴¹² Psalm 100:3 has וְלֹא אֶנְחֵנוּ עִמּוֹ, but the *qere* reads לוֹ (“to him”)—i.e., *lamedh* of possession or advantage.

The Psalter alludes to Formula B just once.⁴¹³ In Asaph Ps 79:13 the psalmist declares, “But we are your people (וְאֵנִי עַמְּךָ), the sheep of your pasture.” This combination of covenant formulaic language with the pastoral motif can also be seen clearly in two of Lohfink’s parade examples, Pss 95 and 100, which adds to the likelihood that Ps 79:13 indeed reflects the covenant formula. Incidentally, the preceding two psalms conclude with the pastoral motive as well (cf. אֱלֹהֵינוּ in 77:21 and אֱלֹהֵינוּ in 78:72), which suggests a probable reason why editors grouped Pss 77–79.⁴¹⁴

Allusions to Formula A are more frequent; the most common being those with the 1st sg. possessive suffix (אֱלֹהֵי/אֱלֹהֵי): “You are/Yahweh is *my* God”: Pss 18:3; 22:11; 31:15; 63:2; 86:2; 89:27; 118:28; 140:7; 143:10.⁴¹⁵ Eight of these nine psalms are either Davidic or place these words in “David’s” mouth as in Ps 89:27 where Yahweh declares, “He shall cry to me, ‘*You are my Father, my God etc.*’” (הוּא יִקְרָאֵנִי אָבִי אֱתָהּ אֱלֹהֵי).⁴¹⁶ The exception is Ps 118, which may be quasi-royal in any case as noted earlier.⁴¹⁷ Within the Psalter, then, the claim,

⁴¹³ See Appendix C, Tables 1 and 2 for a fuller presentation of the data.

⁴¹⁴ They are also central to the Asaph collection (cf. Ps 78’s centrality in the Asaph group discussed in Chapters One and Six).

⁴¹⁵ Cf. Isa 25:1 (אֱתָהּ אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה) and Jer 31:18 (אֱתָהּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי). By addressing Yahweh thus, the psalmist declares Yahweh’s relationship to himself in a manner that also alludes to the First Commandment, not just covenant formula. Such ambiguity is not surprising given their overlapping concerns, both in terms of the implied relationship and the Pentateuchal contexts observed above. Moreover, we noted above that the covenant formula is often associated closely with the self-introductory formula, and the Decalogue in Exod 20:2 with precisely that: “I am Yahweh your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt...etc.”

⁴¹⁶ In Ps 89:27 אֱלֹהֵי is the first of two subsequent terms in apposition to a different primary complement, “my father” (אָבִי). הוּא יִקְרָאֵנִי אָבִי אֱתָהּ אֱלֹהֵי וְצוֹר יְשׁוּעָתִי (אָבִי). The primary statement, “You are my father,” corresponds to the *adoption* formula (cf. Ps 2:7), so that two covenantal formulations appear to be combined via apposition. The syntactical terseness of the declaration makes it difficult to determine the relationship between the two formulaic allusions; whether the three complements are equated to each other, supplement each other as a series of independent confessions, or the second two (אֱלֹהֵי וְצוֹר יְשׁוּעָתִי) in some sense qualify the first.

⁴¹⁷ Psalm 18:3 presents a similar situation to 89:27, in that אֱלֹהֵי is the fourth of five complements of יְהוָה: יְהוָה | סִלְעִי וּמְצוּדָתִי וּמְפִלְטִי אֱלֹהֵי צוֹרִי אֲחֻסָּהּ בְּגִבְעוֹתֵי יְהוָה. In both cases the subject-complement syntax is the same as the

“You are/Yahweh is *my* God,” is almost exclusively made by “David.” This observation offers a measure of support for our hypothesis that editors viewed “David” as the quintessential covenant partner of Yahweh. Indeed, in Ps 86:2 “David” describes himself in terms that suggests his covenant fidelity to Yahweh, “I am godly/faithful” (אֲנִי צַדִּיק). It may also be significant that every instance except for Ps 18:3 has “you” as subject (i.e., אֲלֵי אַתָּה or equivalent) in prayerful address to God. Many of these have the character of lament (e.g., 22:11; 31:15; 63:2; 140:7) as “David” appeals to his covenant relationship with Yahweh when petitioning Yahweh for help. On the other hand, the three instances of Formula A with a 1st *pl.* suffix (אֲלֵהֶינּוּ)—Pss 48:15; 95:7; 105:7—take the form of a confession or creed: “He (הוֹאֵלֵנוּ) is (Yahweh) our God.” A fourth example, Davidic Ps 124:1–2, also falls into this 1st *pl.* category. Even though the ESV translates לֹא־יְהוָה שְׁהָיָה לָנוּ לְלוֹאֵי יְהוָה, “If it had not been...[Yahweh]... who was on our side,” its syntax closely follows that of the covenant formula by employing הָיָה and ל (omitting אֲלֵהֶימָם).⁴¹⁸

Much rarer are instances that reflect Formula A with the 2d *per.* suffix (אֲלֵהֶיךָ) and 3d *per.* suffix (אֲלֵהֶיוּ). “I am God/Yahweh your God (אֲלֵהֶיךָ)” occurs twice in the Psalter, both times in the so-called “festival psalms” where Yahweh addresses his people (אֲלֵהֶימָם אֲלֵהֶיךָ אֲנֹכִי in 50:7 and אֲלֵהֶיךָ יְהוָה אֲנֹכִי in 81:11). These correspond closely to the way God addresses his people in the Pentateuch.⁴¹⁹ We find אֲלֵהֶיוּ in Ps 33:12 noted by Lohfink, and once more in Davidic Ps

other examples of Formula A surveyed here.

⁴¹⁸ The close formal correspondence to the “normal” covenant formula reflected in הָיָה and ל suggests an allusion. Grammatically, the ל here may best be described as “ל of advantage,” hence the ESV’s “on our side.”

⁴¹⁹ Note Zimmerli’s “self-revelation formula,” “I am Yahweh,” which occurs frequently in the Pentateuch, esp. Leviticus. Although יְהוָה is the primary complement of the “I” (אֲנֹכִי/אֲנִי), the appositional relationship between “Yahweh” and “your God” (אֲלֵהֶיךָ) found in Ps 50:7 and 81:11 renders them a declaration of the covenant relationship. Indeed, Rendtorff discusses some seven occurrences where the self-revelation formula occurs in close proximity to the covenant formula, and five of these occurrences employ a suffixed form of אֲלֵהֶימָם as complement to יְהוָה or corresponding pronoun: Exod 29:45; Lev 11:44–45; Lev 26:12–13; 26:44–45 (all have אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲלֵהֶימָם); Deut 7:6–9 (וַיִּדְעוּתָּ כִּי־יְהוָה אֲלֵהֶיךָ הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים); The other instances he discusses are Exod 6:2–8 and Jer 24:7, having only אֲנִי יְהוָה. The association of these two formulae indicates that expressions like אֲנֹכִי [יְהוָה]

144:15, where “David” proclaims, “Blessed are the people to whom such blessings fall! *Blessed are the people whose God is Yahweh!*” (אַשְׁרֵי הָעָם שְׂפַכָּה לָּו אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיו). In fact, 33:12a and 144:15b are virtually identical,⁴²⁰ suggesting that Ps 144:15 is as strong an allusion to the covenant formula as 33:12. And since Ps 33 is sandwiched between Davidic psalms, editors ensured that “David” speaks *both* these near identical pronouncements of blessing. In Pss 33 and 144, then, it is David who applies the formula to the *people* whose God is Yahweh.

These data permit some tentative conclusions. If it is correct to speak of a “royalization” of the covenant formula in the Psalter, it cannot be at the expense of the corporate identity of God’s people. Nevertheless, the Psalter strongly underscores David’s relationship to Yahweh (Ps 89:27; cf. Ps 2:7), and it is principally David who addresses Yahweh in covenant formulaic terms. Given that David also declares blessed the people whose God is Yahweh (Pss 33 and 144), then it is conceivable that editors credited the people’s status in these psalms to (an anticipated) David’s ministrations—his intercessions—as Yahweh’s covenant partner.

Finally, אֱלֹהֵי־ם or אֱלֹהֵי־ם are frequently suffixed in addresses to Yahweh or statements about him. Indeed, individual terms such as אֱלֹהֵי־יְהוָה, אֱלֹהֵי־יְהוָה, אֱלֹהֵי־יְהוָה, אֱלֹהֵי־יְהוָה, אֱלֹהֵי־יְהוָה, and אֱלֹהֵי־יְהוָה very likely allude to the covenant formula by evoking the very relationship it expresses. Although very numerous these suffixed forms permit some general observations.⁴²¹ Especially noteworthy is how often the 1st sg. possessive form, “*my* God,” occurs in direct address as a vocative. About two thirds of such forms are found in prayer/petitions *to* God.⁴²² All but six instances of “*my* God” occur in Davidic Psalms, and of those six Pss 104:1 and 118:28

אֱלֹהֵי־יְהוָה (or 2mp or 3mp suffix) are an established way of declaring Formula A as present reality.

⁴²⁰ Psalm 33:12’s אֱשֶׁר־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיו differs from 144:15 only in respect to הָעָם/יְהוָה and the prefixed form of the relative particle in 144:15, though a few MSS witness this form in 33:12.

⁴²¹ See Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix C.

⁴²² i.e., twenty-five out of twenty-seven (92.6%). If we include the three instances of Formula A, which are also expressed in the 3d per. (see above), the percentage increases slightly (93.3%)

potentially have Davidic associations at the editorial level. Thus, it is almost exclusively *David* who addresses Yahweh as יהו(י)לֵא or יְאֵל. The 1st *pl.* form “our God” (יְאֵלֵינוּ) occurs predominantly in statements about God and are distributed widely across predominantly Davidic, Korahite, and anonymous psalms.⁴²³ Indeed, this fits the pattern regarding “You are/Yahweh is my God” and “He is Yahweh/God our God” observed above. Analysis of similar vocative epithets for Yahweh shows a similar picture (see Appendix D).

The same allusive potential applies also to עֲמִי, אֲמִי, and אֵמִי. First, as may be expected the 1st per. suffixed form (אֲמִי) occurs in festival Pss 50:7 and 81:9 in divine address, “I am God/Yahweh your God” (see above). אֲמִי occurs twice more in Ps 81 in vv. 12 and 14.

Second, the 2d sg. suffixed form (אִמִּי) predictably occurs in psalmists’ address to God—i.e., in prayer(like) language. Six of its fifteen instances occur in Davidic psalms, where we see David referring to “your people” in various ways. In these psalms “David” announces Yahweh’s blessing upon “your people” (Pss 3:9), petitions Yahweh to save them (28:9), laments God’s harsh imposition upon them (60:5), recalls God’s deliverance at the exodus (68:8), proclaims his wish that “the royal son” to “judge your people in righteousness” (72:2; N.B. jussive), and announces “your people” as a “free-will offering” (110:3).⁴²⁴ The remaining nine instances in non-Davidic psalms either use אִמִּי in complaints or petitions (44:13; 77:16, 21; 80:5; 83:4 and 94:14) as they recall Yahweh’s forgiveness (85:3, 7) or anticipate his favor (106:4). Plainly, “David” is not the only one who prays for God’s people in some way, though this point need not detract from his centrality and importance as an intercessor. The remaining nine instances of אִמִּי are concentrated mostly in Asaph and Korahite psalms in Books II–III, as well as two

⁴²³ See Appendix C, which identifies Pss 18:32; 20:6, 8; 40:4; 44:21; 48:2, 9; 50:3; 66:8; 67:7; 90:17; 92:14; 94:23; 98:3; 99:5, 9 (x2); 113:5; 115:3; 116:5; 122:9; 123:2; 135:2; 147:1, 7. Psalm 90:17 uses יְאֵלֵינוּ in a jussive clause, after which it addresses God with 2d per. imperatives (cf. כִּוְנֵנָה). Here are represented some six Davidic or Davidized psalms, three Korahite, ten anonymous, one Mosaic, and one Asaph.

⁴²⁴ The MT has אֲמִי נְדָבָתָהּ, whereas the LXX, μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχή, suggesting a repointing to אֲמִי (“with you”).

anonymous psalms in Book IV (94 and 106). Without attempting to account for all the above Asaph and Korahite psalms, we may recall that editors appear to have understood or at least re-appropriated pre-Ps 72 psalms as “prayers of David” (see Chapter Two). This would suggest, for example, that they saw Ps 44:13’s lament for God’s people as in some sense David’s prayer (cf. 60:5). Moreover, Ps 106’s anticipation of Yahweh’s favor comes at the end of Book IV, whereupon Book V answers with a strong emphasis on “David” and the grace formula (see Chapter Six).

Finally, besides the covenant formula in 100:3, the 3d per. suffixed form, **עָמוּ**, occurs exclusively in statements about Yahweh’s people. Interestingly, **עָמוּ** parallels **וַיִּלְקָח** in Pss 78:62, 71 and 94:14, now to be addressed.

In summary, once we recognize that the covenant formula already shows variation elsewhere in the OT it becomes apparent that there are many more potential allusions beyond Lohfink’s three examples. As we saw, many of these take the form of a nominal sentence whereby the psalmist states the fact of his or others’ relationship to God (e.g., “You are my God”), while other weaker allusions are simple vocatives that evoke the same relational reality (e.g., “my God”). The discovery of note here is that “David” is predominantly the “me/my” in view, giving the impression overall that he is *a* or *the* primary covenant partner of Yahweh in the Psalter in keeping with the close relationship between Yahweh and his Anointed in Ps 2:2. Insofar as these expressions evoke the covenant relationship described by the Formula, these data suggest the royalization of the Formula rather than a democratizing agenda.⁴²⁵

⁴²⁵ Of course one could debate the extent to which these instances reflect conscious allusion to the formula *per se* in individual psalms. Psalmists need not always use the stock address, “my God,” as a deliberate confession of David’s covenantal relationship to Yahweh. However, what *is* in view is the reality of the relationship itself as the psalmist “lives out” the relationship expressed by the covenant formula. So as common or “stock” as such expressions may be they invariably evoke the reality of Yahweh’s covenant relationship with Israel. This makes the above data all the more interesting and enlightening, for at the editorial level there appears to be a strong preference for psalms in which “David” speaks or is spoken of in these covenant-relational terms.

King and People as Yahweh's "Inheritance"/"Possession," and Yahweh as their "Portion"

Besides the formulae just examined, in Deut 4, 9, and 32 Moses describes the people as "Yahweh's inheritance" (נַחֲלָה) and his "portion" (חֶלֶק). Still other texts describe them as his "possession" (סְגֻלָּה) in the context of the covenant formula, notably Exod 19:5; Deut 7:6; 14:2; and 26:18. All three terms are echoed in the Psalter, though only once in the case of סְגֻלָּה.

The term סְגֻלָּה occurs in Ps 135:4, "For (כִּי) Yahweh has chosen (בָּחַר) Jacob for himself, Israel as his own *possession*," which gives the reason why Yahweh should be praised (vv. 1–3). Psalm 135 thus praises Yahweh because he has chosen "his people" for his own possession (סְגֻלָּה).

The term נַחֲלָה can apply to *land* in the Pentateuch, but Deuteronomy also uses it to describe *Jacob/Israel* as Yahweh's "inheritance." These contexts often have the covenant relationship in full view, as well as Moses' intercessory role in restoring that relationship. For example, Deut 4:20 employs it with עַם in a construct chain within the covenant formula (לְהִיּוֹת לְךָ לְעַם נַחֲלָה). In Deut 9:25–29 Moses recalls his intercession for the people after their rebellion narrated in Exod 17 and Num 11, wherein the terms עַם and נַחֲלָה appear in apposition with 2d sg. possessive suffixes and are the basis for Moses' intercession (וְהֵם עַמִּי וְנַחֲלָתִי אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָ ... אֶל־תִּשְׁחַת עַמִּי וְנַחֲלָתִי in vv. 26 and 29). Finally, Moses' song (Deut 32:9) proclaims the people to be his "portion" (חֶלֶק) and "allotted inheritance" (חֶבֶל נַחֲלָתוֹ). Thus several Pentateuchal texts clearly connect Yahweh's people as his "inheritance" with the covenant relationship; also when that relationship was restored through Moses' intercession.

In the Psalter, נַחֲלָה is used to describe the people as Yahweh's "inheritance" in Pss 28:9; 33:12;⁴²⁶ 78:62; 94:5, 14; 106:5 and 40.⁴²⁷ The case can be made that nearly all of these entail the

⁴²⁶ See the above discussion of the covenant formula. Indeed, the choice of verb in 33:12b, "the people whom *he has chosen* as his heritage" (לְךָ לְעַם נַחֲלָה לְךָ) and Deut 4:20, "to be a people of his own inheritance" (לְהִיּוֹת לְךָ לְעַם נַחֲלָה) constitutes the only substantial difference between these texts.

⁴²⁷ In Ps 127:3 *children* (בְּנֵי) are the "inheritance of/from Yahweh" and a "reward" (שָׂכָר).

notion of “intercession” at the editorial level. Davidic Ps 28 is intercessory in function⁴²⁸ and reminiscent of Deut 9 when the psalmist prays in its final verse, “save your people (עַמֶּךָ) and bless your heritage (נַחֲלֶתְךָ)! Be their shepherd and carry them forever.” Anonymous Ps 94 is similar in this regard. Verse 5 employs the עַמֶּךָ/נַחֲלֶתְךָ parallel in a prayer for Yahweh’s people, whom the wicked (רְשָׁעִים) are crushing. Verse 14 later affirms Yahweh’s faithfulness to his “people” and “heritage.” The cycle of sin, judgment, and intercession typified by Deut 9 and the events it recalls also seem to be in the background of Ps 78:62 and 71, where עַמֶּךָ and נַחֲלֶתְךָ also occur in parallel. However in keeping with our discussion of Ps 78 in Chapter Three, the traditionally Mosaic coloration of “intercession” gives way to David as intercessor. In v. 62 God “gave his people over to the sword” (וַיִּסְגַּר לְתַרְבֵּב עַמּוֹ) and “vented his wrath on his heritage” (וַיִּבְנֶנְהָ לְתוֹ הַתְּעַבְרָה). But in vv. 70–71 God chose (בַּחַר) David and took him from looking after sheep “to shepherd Jacob his people, Israel his inheritance (לְרִעוּת בְּיַעֲקֹב עַמּוֹ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל נַחֲלֶתוֹ). So these verses place David in the role of “shepherding” (רָעָה) and “guiding” (נָחָה in v. 72) Yahweh’s people/heritage as Moses had done.⁴²⁹ Indeed, to editors familiar with Deut 9:25–29, the contrast between v. 62’s and v. 71’s deployment of the עַמֶּךָ/נַחֲלֶתְךָ parallel could scarcely avoid evoking Moses’ intercessory role in averting Yahweh’s wrath against the people. Since Ps 77 concludes with a clear reference to Moses’ and Aaron’s leadership in v. 20, “You led your people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron,” it seems likely that editors read Ps 78:62 and 71 in terms of David taking over Moses’ leadership role. All this suggests that David assumes the Mosaic roles of leader *and intercessor*, whereby he maintains Israel in their proper vocation as Yahweh’s people and heritage as our hypothesis suggests. Finally, in Ps 106:4–5 the psalmist petitions Yahweh to “remember” (זָכַר) and “help” (פָּקַד) him/us⁴³⁰ “that I may look

⁴²⁸ See, e.g., Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 339.

⁴²⁹ E.g., Exod 3:1; Ps 77:19. Cf. Joshua’s appointment to lead the people “that the congregation of Yahweh may not be as sheep that have no shepherd (רָעָה) in Num 27:17.

⁴³⁰ The MT reads זָכַרְנִי, but numerous Greek witnesses (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Origen) and some of

upon the prosperity of your chosen ones (בְּחִירֵיךָ)...rejoice in the gladness of *your nation* (גְּוִיָּךְ)⁴³¹...[and] glory with *your inheritance* (נַחֲלֶיךָ),” thus referring to God’s people by these parallel terms. Then v. 40 reports Yahweh’s anger “against *his people* (בְּעַמּוֹ)” and that “he abhorred *his heritage*” (נַחֲלֹתָיו). But the idea of intercession is made explicit in Ps 106:23, which reflects historically on Moses as Yahweh’s “chosen one” (בְּחִירוֹ) who “stood in the breach before him (עָמַד בְּפִרְצוֹ לְפָנָיו), to turn away his wrath *from destroying them* (מִמְשַׁחֲתֵיהֶם)” after the golden calf incident (cf. vv. 19–22).⁴³² This raises a couple of possibilities. Editors may have used Ps 106 to express the hope/expectation of an intercessor, or perhaps they intended Ps 106 to function as an act of intercession as the petitions of vv.47 would suggest. Indeed, Cha. Six will take this up further, arguing that Book IV presents “David” as the anticipated intercessor before Yahweh.

Finally, the term חֶלֶק couples with נַחֲלָה in Ps 16:5–6, “Yahweh is my chosen portion (מִנְחַת־חֶלֶקִי) and my cup...indeed, I have a beautiful inheritance (אֶף־נַחֲלָתִי שְׂפָרָה עָלַי).” While these terms pair up according to common idiom,⁴³³ Num 18:20’s use of נַחֲלָה is noteworthy because *Yahweh* is Aaron’s “portion and inheritance” (אֲנִי חֶלֶקְךָ וְנַחֲלָתְךָ). Similarly, in Deut 10:9 Yahweh’s is Levi’s “inheritance,” who otherwise “has no portion or inheritance (חֶלֶק

the Syriac tradition suggest the 1st pl. suffix. Perhaps the confusion in number reflected here is due to v. 47’s petition in the 1st pl. to “save us” (הוֹשִׁיעֵנו) and “gather us from among the nations” (וְקַבְּצֵנוּ מִן־הַגּוֹיִם); a few Hebrew MSS add וְהִצִּילֵנוּ, apparently to conform it to 1 Chr 16:35).

⁴³¹ “your nation” is omitted in the Syriac tradition.

⁴³² Borger, “Moses in the Fourth Book of the Psalter,” 143–44 notes that the expression “in the breach” (בְּפִרְצוֹ) otherwise occurs only in Ezek 22:30 where it is also used to describe “an intercessory figure.”

⁴³³ The idiomatic combination of “portion” and “lot” occurs, e.g., in 31:14 regarding Rachel and Leah’s inheritance. Cf. similar usage in Deut 12:12; 14:27, 29; 18:1; Josh 18:7 (see next note); 19:9; 2 Sam 20:1; 1 Kgs 12:16; Job 20:29; 27:13; 31:2; and 2 Chr 10:16. Jeremiah 10:16 and 51:19 also pair these terms, though with mixed referentiality so that Yahweh is Jacob’s portion (חֶלֶק יַעֲקֹב) and Jacob is the tribe of *Yahweh’s* inheritance (שִׁבְטֵי נַחֲלֹתָיו [וְיִשְׂרָאֵל]); ⚡ omits שִׁבְטֵי).

נַחֲלָה) with his brothers.”⁴³⁴ Accordingly, Davidic Ps 16:5–6 appears to adopt the same Aaronic/Levite perspective when the psalmist claims, “Yahweh is my chosen portion (מִנְתַּחֲלָקִי) and my cup; you hold my lot. The lines have fallen for me in pleasant places; indeed I have a beautiful inheritance (נַחֲלָתִי).”⁴³⁵ As part of the Pss 15–24 subgroup, Ps 16 puts special focus on the king in the David-Yahweh relationship (see Chapter Two).⁴³⁶ Indeed, it is possible that this characterization of “David” in Ps 16 foreshadows Ps 110:4’s association of “the Davidic descendent... with an eternal priesthood “according to the order of Melchizedek.”⁴³⁷ Otherwise נַחֲלָה occurs five on its own, and in three these the psalmist addresses Yahweh/God as “my portion” (חֲלָקִי): Asaph Ps 73:26—himself among the Levitical courses; (quasi-Davidic?) Ps 119:57; and Davidic Ps 142:6.⁴³⁸ The examples are therefore few, but more often than not Yahweh is *David’s* “portion.”

To recap the main points: נַחֲלָה and סֶגֶל (when the latter does not denote land) evoke the relationship expressed in the covenant formula. When it is the *people* who are Yahweh’s נַחֲלָה

⁴³⁴ See also Josh 18:7, where the Levites have no “portion” (חֲלָקִי), because “the priesthood of Yahweh is his/their inheritance” (פִּי-כֹהֲנָתִי יְהוָה נַחֲלָתִי) (וְיִהְיֶה לְיְהוָה נַחֲלָתִי).

⁴³⁵ ESV follows the LXX, which has ἡ κληρονομία μου suggesting a 1st pl. suffix rather than cst. form (cf. Syriac)

⁴³⁶ Interestingly, though the term נַחֲלָה occurs only six times in the Psalter (Pss 16:5; 17:14; 50:18; 73:26; 119:57; 142:6), in the MT it next occurs in the following psalm, Ps 17:14, in reference to “men” (מִתִּים) whose *portion* is in some sense “of this world” or “in this life” (מִמְתִּים מִחֲלֹד חֲלָקִים בְּחַיִּים). It seems that editors juxtaposed Pss 16 and 17 to differentiate David with worldly men by implicitly contrasting their respective “portions” through concatenation. Although there are numerous textual variants in v. 14 that complicate translation, and the BHS critical apparatus suspects that the whole first colon of v. 14 is corrupt, the root חלק is sufficiently well established to be considered original (cf. διαμέρισον αὐτούς, indicating the verb “to divide” [“חֲלָקִי” GKC 283]; and 11QP^s 8, which preserves either a noun or verb from חלק with 3d pl. suffix and בְּחַיִּים: יהוה ממתים מחלד [יהוה בחייהם] [ח]לקם בחייהם),

⁴³⁷ See, e.g., Wilson, “King, Messiah, and the Reign of God, 403.

⁴³⁸ Of the remaining two, 50:18 applies the term to adulterers, while 17:14, which suffers from numerous textual issues, applies it to “this life” (חֲלָקִים בְּחַיִּים).

rather than an individual (e.g., David), the context is usually one of judgment or intercession for them (cf. Deut 9:25–29). Moreover, in several other psalms Yahweh is David’s **הַלֵּלְךָ** and/or **הַתְּלִיָּה**, comporting well with our analysis of covenant formulae such like “my God,” and likely evoking for editors additional priestly/Levitical connotations to the royal office, especially in Ps 16.

David as (Vicarious?) Keeper of the Mosaic Covenant

As noted in the Introduction Jamie Grant argues that editors accentuated the king’s role as a Torah-observer by collocating the Torah psalms with royal or quasi-royal psalms.⁴³⁹ Our hypothesis takes Grant’s thesis of the king as an “exemplar” of Torah-piety further by suggesting that a(n expected) Davidic ruler both models Torah-piety *and fulfills* the Mosaic covenantal obligations where the people fail. Already our examination of Ps 89 repudiated any notion of royal culpability within that psalm.

The following survey examines this aspect of our hypothesis by exploring possible intertextual allusions to the *Shema*’, terms denoting Yahweh’s Mosaic covenantal commands (**מְשַׁפְּטִים**; **פְּקוּדִים**; **מִצְוֹת**; **עֲדוּת**; **חֻקֹּת/חֻקִּים**), the terms **חֻק** (sg.) and **עֲדוּת** (sg.), and allusions to specific commands of the Decalogue.

David and the Shema’ (Deuteronomy 6:4–7)

Earlier we observed that several psalms referring directly to Yahweh’s **יְהוָה** also contain allusions to Deut 6:4–7 (cf. also Deut 13:4; 30:6, 20). These included the appeal, “Hear me, my people” (50:7), and the expression “with all my heart” (111:1); criteria that turn up in numerous other psalms also.⁴⁴⁰ Beyond these, a number of psalms make Yahweh the object of **אָהַב**, and

⁴³⁹ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*.

⁴⁴⁰ To this could be added the command to teach future generations (78:5–6), which recognizably echoes Deut 6:7. Besides 78:5–6, however, the Psalter only contains some approximate semantic equivalents to the injunction in Deut 6:7. These are identified and examined briefly in Appendix B.

thus potentially allude to the command to “love Yahweh your God (וְאַהַבְתָּ אֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ) with all your heart...etc.” (בְּכָל-לִבְבְּךָ) in 6:5 and throughout Deuteronomy.⁴⁴¹ Indeed, scholars since William L. Moran have recognized the strong covenantal connotations of אהב when applied to divine-human relationships in the bible.⁴⁴²

“Hear” (שָׁמַע). Besides Ps 50, God enjoins his people to “Hear!” in Ps 81:9 with the words, “Hear me, my people” (שָׁמַע עַמִּי), whereupon he later declares that “my people did not listen to my voice” (וְלֹא-שָׁמַע עַמִּי לְקוֹלִי) in v. 12. The intervening vv. 10–11 repeat the command to have no “strange god” (אֱלֹהִים זָרִים) nor to worship a “foreign god” (אֱלֹהֵי גֵוִים) reminiscent of the Decalogue, and declare, “I am Yahweh your God, who brought you up from the land of Egypt,” which is characteristic of the “self-introductory” or “recognition formulae.”⁴⁴³ Thus, Ps 81’s allusion to Deut 6:4 is confirmed by these other strong Mosaic covenantal features.

Sometimes the psalmist directs this same imperative to Yahweh as the implied subject of “hearing;” e.g., שָׁמַע-אֱלֹהִים-יְהוָה in Pss 17:6; 27:7; 28:2; 30:11; 54:5; 64:2; and 143:1. Obviously these examples do not offer functional parallels to Deut 6:4 like Pss 50 and 81 do, despite having the sg. imperative form of the verb. On the other hand, the lexical similitude of these cries to *Yahweh* to “hear/listen” offers at least some basis for the possibility that editors understood them as a “play” on the *Shema*; a kind of role-reversal in which the psalmist calls on Yahweh to remain faithful to the covenant relationship by heeding his cries for help. If this possibility is granted, then it is remarkable that the above Psalms are all Davidic, for it suggests

⁴⁴¹ See also Deut 10:12; 11:1,13, 22; 13:4; 19:9; 30:6, 16, and 20.

⁴⁴² William L. Moran, “The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy,” *CBQ* 25 (1963): 78, sums up the meaning of אהב in Deuteronomy thus, “For to love God is, in answer to a unique claim (6,4), to be loyal to him (11,1.22; 30,20), to walk in his ways (10,12; 11,22; 19,9; 30,16), to keep his commandments (10,12; 11,1.22; 19,9), to do them (11,22; 19,9), to heed them or his voice (11,13; 30,16), to serve him (10,12; 11,1.13). It is, in brief, a love defined by and pledged in the covenant—a covenantal love.”

⁴⁴³ E.g., Exod 6:2, 6, 8; 29:46; Lev 11:44; 26:13. See Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula*, 47–49.

that *David* characteristically calls to Yahweh to implore God’s intervention and salvation. Moreover, this is supported by the remaining instances of שמע with Yahweh as (implied) *subject*, which show a strong pattern of Yahweh “hearing” *David’s* or *Davidized* prayers. The Davidic Psalmist declares that Yahweh has heard (שמע) my voice (קול), pleas for mercy (תחנונים), prayer (תפלה), “word” (אמרה) or some combination of these in five psalms: Pss 6:9–10; 22:25; 28:6; 34:7; 66:(18–)19.⁴⁴⁴ Interestingly, in Davidized Ps 66:18–19⁴⁴⁵ the psalmist declares, “If I had cherished iniquity (און) in my heart, the Lord would not have listened (לא יאזני) | (שמע).⁴⁴⁶ But truly God has listened; he has attended to the voice of my prayer (אזן שמי).” The Davidization of this psalm suggests that editors viewed *David* as one to whom God listens because he has not “cherished iniquity;” a picture comparable to Pss 15–24’s portrayal of the Torah-loving king who may enter Yahweh’s sanctuary because of the cleanness of his hands. This agrees with Kraus’ opinion that the king took a central role in the renewal of the Sinai covenant.⁴⁴⁷ On the other hand, when God “hears” his *people* in Ps 78:21 and 59, they are not petitioning God but grumbling and rebelling, so God responds with divine wrath.⁴⁴⁸

⁴⁴⁴ The remaining instances of שמע in a more general sense (59:8), or are used in the psalmist’s description of his plight as deaf-/mute-like (38:15), and therefore not relevant to our investigation.

⁴⁴⁵ See Chapter Two.

⁴⁴⁶ The Syriac witnesses to the 2d pers. Instead of שמע it has תושיעני.

⁴⁴⁷ This portrayal of the king may also raise the question of how strong a delineation editors intended to draw between the prayers of “historical David” and his successor(s) pre- and post-Ps 72, assuming our thesis regarding 72:20 is on the right track. As discussed in Chapter Two, it seems safest to posit a general focus on an expected future Davidide post-Ps 72 that does not lose sight of the founding figure of the Davidic covenant.

⁴⁴⁸ Yahweh hears persons besides David in Pss 34:18 and 69:34, but these clearly include David and, moreover, put David in the role of one who proclaims God’s ways toward the righteous/poor. Regarding Ps 34, the psalmist recalls his personal experience of Yahweh’s hearing and saving him in vv. 2–8. Shortly afterward there begins a didactic section of the psalm (i.e., vv. 11–23) that opens with an imperative of שמע (“Come, O children, listen [שמעו לי] to me”) and declares that Yahweh hears the righteous when they cry to him (v. 18). Accordingly, the psalm clearly presupposes David’s status as the “righteous” who trust in Yahweh (cf. Creach, *The Destiny of the*

“**With All (My) Heart.**” Negatively, the Psalter proclaims that David’s heart did *not* “cherish iniquity” in texts like Ps 66:18. But positively it also declares that David praises Yahweh with his “whole heart.” Besides Ps 111:1, the expression בְּכָל־לִבִּי/לְבָבִי occurs in Pss 9:2; 86:12; 119:10; and 138:1, and without the 1st sg. suffix (i.e., “with [the] whole heart”) in Ps 119: 34, 58, 69, and 145.⁴⁴⁹ All of these are Davidic psalms except for Ps 119, whose juxtaposition with Ps 118 may cast the psalmist as a royal figure in any case, as Grant argues.⁴⁵⁰ Davidic Ps 37:31, “the law of his God is in his heart” (תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהָיו בְּלִבּוֹ), offers another possibility, made stronger by this psalm’s righteous/wicked contrast (see below) and its description of those who wait on Yahweh as the ones who “inherit the land” (v. 9). Again, it is overwhelmingly *David* who embodies this aspect of the *Shema*’ in the Psalter.

“**Love (Yahweh).**” Psalm 31:24 reiterates the essential command of Deut 6:5 to “love Yahweh your God” (וְאָהַבְתָּ אֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ), commanding the faithful (בְּלִי־חֶסֶד־יְדִיּוֹ) to: “Love Yahweh” (אָהַבְוּ אֶת־יְהוָה). It also resembles Deut 7:9–10 in this and other features (see below). Other psalms reflect Deut 6:5 with participial or perfect forms of אָהַב: Pss 97:10, “you who love

Righteous), portraying him as a wisdom teacher who instructs others. Indeed, David even issues a command to “listen to me” similar to Yahweh’s own summons in Pss 50:7, 81:9, and the *Shema* itself, putting him in “God’s shoes” as it were! Similarly, in 69:34 the Davidic psalmist declares that Yahweh “hears the needy and does not despise his own people who are prisoners” having just declared his own intent to “praise the name of God with a song...magnify him with thanksgiving (v. 30). Thus both are voiced by David whose own cries or vows to praise precede their general statements about God’s hearing the righteous or the poor. These observations suggest that David is focal in mediating the covenantal relationship between God and his people.

⁴⁴⁹ Cf. Zenger, “Composition and Theology,” 93, who recognizes this phrase as an allusion to Deut 6:5 (cf. the similar expression in Deut 13:4: וּבְכָל־נַפְשְׁכֶם וּבְכָל־לִבְבְּכֶם בְּכָל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם בְּכָל־לִבְבְּכֶם). In various ways, Pss 15:2; 19:15; 26:2; 36:11; 37:31; 57:8 (= 108:2); 64:11; and 97:11 describe the “heart” as “upright” (שׁוֹר), “established” (נָכוֹן), “clean” (בָּר) or not guilty of “cherishing iniquity” (אֲנִי אִם־רָאִיתִי בְּלִבִּי) etc., and thus reflect a piety befitting Deut 6:5 in only a very general way.

⁴⁵⁰ Cf. Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 171–75. One could also argue that Ps 119’s central concern is summed up by Deut 6:6’s expectation that “these words that I command you today shall be on your heart” (וְהָיוּ הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה) (אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מְצַוְּךָ הַיּוֹם עַל־לִבְבְּךָ).

Yahweh” (אֱהָבֵי יְהוָה);⁴⁵¹ 145:20, “Yahweh preserves all who love him” (שׁוֹמְרֵי יְהוָה), and probably Ps 116:1 as well, though here “I love” (אֶהְבֶּתִּי) lacks a direct object.⁴⁵² So while the command in Ps 31:24 most strongly echoes Deut 6:5, Pss 97, 145, and 116 also seem to evoke the covenant relationship underlying Deut 6:5.⁴⁵³ By comparison the other examples bear little lexical and syntactical resemblance to Deut 6:5, and are weaker allusions at best.⁴⁵⁴

⁴⁵¹ Like Ps 31:24, Ps 97:10 describes those who love Yahweh as “faithful ones” (חֲסִידָיו; ESV: “saints”).

⁴⁵² The implied direct object is most likely Yahweh, but the following clause אֶת־קוֹלִי תִּחְנַנְנִי could be understood as an objective clause rather than a causal clause; i.e., “I love *that* Yahweh heard” rather than “I love [Yahweh], for Yahweh heard.” See, e.g., Williams, *Williams Hebrew Syntax*, 175 and 189. However scholars generally agree that Yahweh is the implied direct object. See, e.g., Goldingay, *Psalms*, 3:339; Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 151; Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 384–85; and Susan Ackerman, “The Personal is Political: Covenantal and Affectionate Love (*’āhēb*, *’ahābā*) in the Hebrew Bible,” *VT* 52 (2002): 437–58, esp. 445. Ackerman observes that the bible rarely describes the people as keeping the command to love Yahweh, citing Ps 116:1 as the only exception in the Psalms. Alternatively, Dahood, *Psalms*, 3:145 reprints the consonantal text as a substantive form with 1st sg. suffix (אֶהְבֶּתִּי), meaning “out of love for me” (lit. “my love”).

⁴⁵³ Otherwise אָהַב more often takes other objects such as Yahweh’s name (שֵׁם; cf. Pss 5:12; 69:37; and 119:132), his “commandments,” “Torah,” “testimonies,” “promise,” and “precepts” (מִצְוֹת, תּוֹרָה, מְצֻוֹת), and “salvation” (אֲהַבֵּי תְּשׁוּעָתְךָ in 40:17, and אֲהַבֵּי יְשׁוּעָתְךָ in 70:5), and “the habitation of your house” (מִעֹן בֵּיתְךָ in 26:8). These expressions—particularly those involving Yahweh’s name and commandments, Torah etc.—share substantially the same concerns as Deut 6:5. Indeed, Deut 7:9; 11:1, 22; 19:9; and 30:16 explicitly connect “loving Yahweh” with keeping his commands, Torah etc., so that Ps 119 powerfully reflects Deut 6:5 and its Mosaic covenantal context.

⁴⁵⁴ Yahweh is the stated or implied *subject* of אָהַב in some eight psalms, some of which likely exploit the covenantal entailments of this verb. In Pss 47:5, 78:68, 87:2, and 146:8 Yahweh loves “Jacob,” “Zion,” or “the righteous.” (Cf. 33:5, 37:28, and 99:4, where Yahweh loves “justice” [מִשְׁפָּט], and 11:7, where he loves “righteous deeds” [צְדָקוֹת]). It seems probable that texts like Deut 4:37 (“because he loved your fathers and chose their offspring after them and brought you out of Egypt...etc.”) lie in the background of Ps 47:5, especially since 47:5 also reflects the land-giving (“he chose our heritage for us” [וַיִּבְחַרְלָנוּ אֶת־נַחֲלָתָנוּ אֵת גְּאוֹן יַעֲקֹב אֲשֶׁר־אָהַב]). Similarly, Ps 78:68 speaks of God’s “choosing” Judah and Zion (וַיִּבְחַר אֶת־שִׁבְט יְהוּדָה אֶת־הָר צִיּוֹן אֲשֶׁר אָהַב), and begins the final climactic section (vv. 68–72) of this explicitly covenant-focused psalm (see above).

To summarize: Pss 9, 86, 111, 119, and 138 use the expression “with all (my) heart.” Three of these bear Davidic attribution, while editors closely identified acrostic Pss 111 and 119 with David to the extent that Zenger’s and Grant’s views are accurate. Consistent with our thesis, then, the Psalter appears to associate the “whole-hearted” aspect of the Shema primarily—if not entirely—with David who embodies this quality. Second, only “festival” Pss 50 and 81 repeat the summons of Deut 6:4, “Hear,” or its equivalent. While these psalms address the people, in both psalms Yahweh confronts them with a veiled or explicit accusation of unfaithfulness (cf. אִוְרְיָה... וְאֵעִידָהּ בְּךָ in 50:7–8; 81:12–14). Third, Ps 31 alone repeats Deut 6:5’s imperative to “Love Yahweh your God” as a command. However, Pss 97, 145, and probably 116 allude to the command indirectly. Two of these are Davidic (Pss 31 and 145). Psalms 97 and 116 are anonymous, but we will later see evidence to suggest that the psalmist in 116 may be the Davidic king as Yahweh’s “son” and “servant” (cf. v. 16; see below). Thus, in the clear case of Ps 31 and in at least half these other psalms as well, it is David who voices this key command of the Torah.

Indeed, this survey suggests that allusions to Deut 6:5 predominate in Davidic Psalms. Moreover, both Pss 138 and 145—the first and last psalms of the final Davidic group of the Psalter—are among these psalms and underscore the importance of Deut 6:5 as a David-related theme in the Psalter. It also occurs in Pss 78 and 86—two structurally central psalms in Book III that show reflect a common interest in David as Yahweh’s servant as we have seen. It seems, then, that the Psalter as a whole associates the *Shema*’ with “David,” who heeds it by praising Yahweh “with his whole heart” (9:2; 86:12; 138:1) vis-à-vis the people who have not done so (Pss 50, 78:5–67; 81).

Clustered Terms Relating to Covenantal Stipulations: עֲדוּת; מִצְוֹת; פְּקוּדִים; מְשֻׁפְּטִים

Helmer Ringgren observes that עֲדוּת, מִצְוֹת, and מְשֻׁפְּטִים frequently occur in combination in Deuteronomy and the DH as a way of referring to the whole Mosaic law (תּוֹרָה)

without necessarily stressing distinctive meanings for each term.⁴⁵⁵ These terms appear in various combinations in numerous Mosaic covenantal texts.⁴⁵⁶ It is therefore highly likely that editors who encountered similar combinations in the Psalms recognized them as references to the Mosaic covenantal commands by which God regulated Israel’s moral and ritual/worship life.⁴⁵⁷ Accordingly, the following survey explores psalms that contain more than one of these terms. This is not to deny their distinctive meanings or the capacity of these terms to evoke the Mosaic covenant individually,⁴⁵⁸ but to recognize the greater lexical overlap that exists with the Pentateuchal texts when these terms occur together. The situation with פקודים is different because it occurs only in the Psalter,⁴⁵⁹ so that its particular use in connection with Mosaic covenantal commands derives from its association with these other terms in the Psalms. The term תורה receives further attention given its normal Mosaic connotations.

⁴⁵⁵ H. Ringgren, “קִקְוָה *hāqqaq*; הָקְוָה *hāqā*; קִחְוָה *hōq*; הִקְוָה *huqqā*,” *TDOT* 5:139–47.

⁴⁵⁶ E.g., Exod 18:20; Lev 26:46; Deut 4:1, 5, 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1, 31; 6:1, 17, 20; 7:11; 11:32; 12:1; 17:19; 26:16.

⁴⁵⁷ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 99–100, sees these terms (and הַיְיָ in Ps 19:10) as reflecting “the holistic nature of torah being referred to in the Psalter, including all the different types of legal text and much more.” While this may be true, these terms’ Mosaic covenantal connotations are unmistakable when grouped together given similarly clustered terminology throughout Exodus, Leviticus, and especially Deuteronomy. Such clusters also occasionally occur in other, pre-Moses narrative settings. For example Gen 26:5’s account of God’s confirming the covenant with Isaac: “because Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws (מִצְוֹתַי וְתוֹרָתִי וְקִוְיֹתַי).” Their normal association is, however, with Mosaic instruction.

⁴⁵⁸ Cf. Ringgren, “קִקְוָה *hāqqaq*; הָקְוָה *hāqā*; קִחְוָה *hōq*; הִקְוָה *huqqā*,” *TDOT* 5:143, who cites several scholars’ view on the meanings of קִחְוָה and מִשְׁפָּט, which are frequently paired in Deuteronomy—also in Chronicles and Ezekiel, the common view being that קִחְוָה refers to cultic ordinance and מִשְׁפָּט to civil ordinances. Regarding their use in Leviticus, see John W. Kleinig, *Leviticus* (St. Louis: CPH 2003), 2, 13. Kleinig notes that מִצְוֹת are “authoritative mandates that authorize the ritual duties of the Israelites and so establish the liturgical tradition”; קִוְיֹת (sg. קִוְיָה) are, ““ritual statutes”...that ordain an important ritual enactment or taboo and distinguish it from forbidden pagan practices”; מִשְׁפָּטִים are, ““ritual ordinances”...that establish, case by case, how the sacrificial ritual is to be enacted...as well as the conditions for right involvement in it”; while תוֹרָה is “ritual instruction” to “teach the priests and the people of Israel how to engage in the divine service without desecrating God’s holiness.” The Mosaic covenantal stipulations thus include ritual instruction, not only commandments of a purely moral nature.

⁴⁵⁹ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 158, who suggests that פקודים is a poetic equivalent of קִקְוָה.

Not surprisingly, Ps 119 accounts for most occurrences of these word clusters. In fact, several of these occur exactly twenty-two times—an average of one for each eight-verse alphabetical strophe in the psalm. The plural *חֻקֹת/חֻקִים* and *עֲדוֹת* each occur twenty-two times in Ps 119 and always have a sg. suffix identifying them as Yahweh’s, with an additional sg. instance of *עֲדוֹת* in v. 88 (lacking suffix).⁴⁶⁰ *מִצְוֹת* occurs twenty-one times plus one sg. instance (v. 96) to bring the total to twenty-two as well, all but one of them appended with pronominal suffix.⁴⁶¹ *פְּקוּדִים* occurs twenty times, with another possible instance in v. 128,⁴⁶² totaling twenty-one times. *מִשְׁפָּטִים* occurs fifteen times in construct or with a pronominal suffix, and a further seven times in the sg., totaling twenty-three times.⁴⁶³ *תּוֹרָה* deviates the most from this pattern with twenty-five occurrences.⁴⁶⁴

⁴⁶⁰ *חֻקֹת/חֻקִים* occurs in vv. 5, 8, 12, 16, 23, 26, 33, 48, 54, 64, 68, 71, 80, 83, 112, 117, 118, 124, 135, 145, 155, and 171; *עֲדוֹת* occurs in vv. 2, 14, 22, 24, 31, 36, 46, 59, 79, 95, 99, 111, 119, 125, 129, 138, 144, 146, 152, 157, 167, and 168. Ps 119 uses both the plenary and shorter spelling of the plural form (*עֲדוֹת* and *עֲדָת*). The shorter pl. spelling may reflect either of two sg. nouns, *עֲדוּת* or *עֲדָה*. Though *עֲדָה* can mean “congregation” (“*עֲדָה*” *BDB*: 729) it frequently means “testimonies” in the plural (cf. “*עֲדָה*” *BDB*: 729).

⁴⁶¹ The exception is the construct chain *מִצְוֹת אֱלֹהֵי* in v. 115, which identifies them as Yahweh’s commandments. Otherwise *מִצְוֹת* occurs in vv. 6, 10, 19, 21, 32, 35, 47, 48, 60, 66, 73, 86, 98, 115, 127, 131, 143, 151, 166, 172, and 176. The related verb, *צוּה*, occasionally takes as its object one of the other terms surveyed here: Pss 7:7; 78:5; 105:8; 119:4, 138. Psalms 78:5 and 105:8 have already drawn our attention, as has Ps 119 in a general way. Psalm 7:7 is an appeal to Yahweh, who has “appointed a judgment” (*מִשְׁפָּט צִוְּיָתָהּ*), to rise to the psalmist’s defense, and thus not a clear combination of Mosaic covenantal terminology.

⁴⁶² *פְּקוּדִים* occurs in 4, 15, 27, 40, 45, 56, 63, 69, 78, 87, 93, 94, 100, 104, 110, 134, 141, 159, 168, and 173. LXX 118:128 (= MT 119:128) reads *διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς πάσας τὰς ἐντολάς σου κατωρθούμην* for *עַל-כֵּן כָּל-פְּקוּדֵי כָל יְשׁוּרֵי*, for which reason H. Bardtke suggests *יְשׁוּרֵי כָל-פְּקוּדֵי* as an emendation.

⁴⁶³ *מִשְׁפָּט* (pl.) occurs in vv. 7, 13, 20, 30, 39, 52, 62, 75, 91, 102, 106, 108, 120, 137, 156, and 164. The sg. is found in vv. 43, 84, 121, 132, 149, 160, and 175. Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 180, counts twenty-two. Any Mosaic covenantal connotations that may attach to the sg. form of *מִשְׁפָּט* are only apparent from its context in Ps 119, and its thirty other instances in the Psalter tend to reflect its more general meaning of “judgment” (cf. “*מִשְׁפָּט*” *BDB*: 1048; *HALOT*: 651).

⁴⁶⁴ *תּוֹרָה* occurs in vv. 1, 18, 29, 34, 44, 51, 53, 55, 61, 70, 72, 77, 85, 92, 97, 109, 113, 126, 136, 142, 150, 153, 163, 165, and 174.

Outside Ps 119, **מְשֻׁפָּטִים**, **פְּקוּדִים**, **מִצּוֹת**, **עֲדוֹת**, **חֻקֹּת/חֻקִּים**, and **תּוֹרָה** occur only a handful of times. **חֻקֹּת/חֻקִּים** (pl.) occurs five more times: Pss 18:23; 50:16; 89:32; 105:45; and 147:19. **עֲדוֹת** occurs four other times in Pss 25:10 (paired with **בְּרִית**), 78:56, 93:5, 99:7—five if 132:12 is included⁴⁶⁵—and always takes a pronominal suffix (e.g., **עֲדוֹתַי**, **עֲדוֹתָי**, etc.) identifying them as *Yahweh's* testimonies. (The sg. instances of **חֻק** and **עֲדוֹת** were discussed in the previous chapter's addendum). **מִצּוֹת** (pl.) occurs only three other times in Pss 78:7; 89:32; and 112:1, while **מִצְוָה** (sg.) in Ps 19:9. **פְּקוּדִים** also occurs in only three other psalms: Pss 19:9; 103:18; 111:7. **מְשֻׁפָּטִים** occurs in ten psalms: Pss 10:5; 18:23; 19:10; 48:12; 72:1; 89:31; 97:8; 103:6; 105:5, 7; and 147:19–20 (as well as some twenty-nine times in the sg.). Finally, **תּוֹרָה** occurs in Pss 1:2; 19:8; 37:31; 40:9; 78:1, 5, 10; 89:31; 94:12; and 105:45.

Several observations bear making. First, discounting Ps 119, most of the time these terms occur in psalms that explicitly refer to **בְּרִית**.⁴⁶⁶ That these terms so often occur in **בְּרִית** psalms makes it almost certain that editors understood them within the conceptual framework of “covenant” when they also encountered them in psalms lacking **בְּרִית**.

Second, surprisingly few psalms combine two or more of these terms besides those noted in our survey of **בְּרִית** (i.e., Pss 78, 89, and 105).⁴⁶⁷ As may be expected, “Torah” Ps 19:8–10 clusters several of them: **תּוֹרָה**, **פְּקוּדִים**, **מְשֻׁפָּטִים**, as well as **עֲדוֹת** (sg.) and **מִצְוָה** (sg.).⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁶⁵ Indeed, Chapter Three's discussion of **בְּרִית** in Ps 132 noted textual uncertainty regarding number (see below for further discussion).

⁴⁶⁶ Three out of five psalms containing the pl. **חֻקֹּת/חֻקִּים** were surveyed in Chapter Three. Similarly, two out of four psalms containing the pl. **עֲדוֹת** (or three out of five, depending on Ps 132:12—see below). All three psalms containing the pl. **מִצּוֹת**, two out of three psalms containing **פְּקוּדִים**, three out of ten psalms containing **מְשֻׁפָּטִים**, and three out of eight psalms containing **תּוֹרָה** (representing half the actual instances of **תּוֹרָה**) were psalms that explicitly refer to *Yahweh's* **בְּרִית**.

⁴⁶⁷ Recall from Chapter Three that Ps 50:16 parallels **בְּרִית** with “my statutes” (**חֻקִּי**) in another clear reference to the Mosaic covenant, and that the Pss 111–112 pair, which contain **פְּקוּדִים** (111:7) and **מִצּוֹת** (112:1) some four verses (eight short cola) apart, do so in an explicitly covenant-focused context (cf. v. 9b).

⁴⁶⁸ Psalm 19:10 includes a sixth term, **יִרְאַת יְהוָה**—i.e., “the fear of *Yahweh*” (**יִרְאַת יְהוָה**). We examine this theme

Strikingly, we read in the preceding “royal” Ps 18:23, “For all his rules (כָּל־מִשְׁפָּטָיו) were before me, and his statutes (וְחֻקֵּי) I did not put away from me.” This suggests that delight in and faithfulness to Yahweh’s statutes, instruction etc. were an important focus for the editors who so collocated Pss 18 and 19.⁴⁶⁹ Also to be included here are Pss 81:5–6 (חֻק, עֲדוּת, and מִשְׁפָּט); Ps 99:7 (חֻק and עֲדוּתָיו); and 147:19 (חֻקים and מִשְׁפָּטִים, as well as דְּבָרִים/דְּבָר [see above]).

Thus, apart from Ps 119 only eight psalms in all—Pss 18, 19, 78, 81, 89, 99, 105, and 147— combine two or more of these terms to offer a relatively strong allusion to the Mosaic covenantal stipulations.⁴⁷⁰ At least half of these psalms clearly have David in view, and directly or indirectly present the king as one who observes the covenant and its stipulations. Indeed, Grant has already noted the strong royal flavor of Pss 18–19 at the center of the concentrically arranged Pss 15–24 group (see also Chapter Two). Psalm 89 directly invokes these terms to describe the king’s obligations in the covenant, and we have already noted Ps 78’s positive focus on David after the people’s breach of the Mosaic covenant (vv. 10, 56; see Cha. Three). On the other hand, any Davidic associations for anonymous Ps 147:19 must be inferred from the preceding Davidic Pss 138–145 group, which introduces the final praise of the Psalter in Pss 146–150. Psalm 147 concludes its calls to praise (vv. 1, 7, 12) by highlighting Israel’s

below.

⁴⁶⁹ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 81–83 does not discuss כָּל־מִשְׁפָּטָיו and וְחֻקֵּי in Ps 18:23 specifically, but nevertheless makes a similar point when he suggests that Ps 18:21–25 is carefully structured “to emphasize the significance of Yahweh’s torah in the life of the king, the speaker of the psalm,” citing James L. Mays, *Psalms* (IBC; Louisville: John Knox, 1994), 92–93, and J. Clinton McCann Jr., *The Book of Psalms* (NIB; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 748, in support of his view.

⁴⁷⁰ Pss 81 and 99 have חֻק and/or עֲדוּת as singular nouns that potentially function as a synonym for בְּרִית, and so these are treated below.

Another much weaker example is Ps 103, which has מִשְׁפָּטִים (v. 6) and פְּקוּדִים (18), but these terms are separated by some twelve verses. We did, however, note in Cha. Three that וּלְזַכְרֵי פְּקוּדָיו לַעֲשׂוֹתָם (103:18) has fairly clear Mosaic covenantal connotations on its own terms.

uniqueness as the only nation to whom Yahweh has made known “his word... statutes and rules.”⁴⁷¹ “David” receives no direct mention here, but as Chapter Six will explore, David declares the basic reason to praise Yahweh in Ps 145: Yahweh’s gracious and compassionate character in renewing the covenant. In that light, , at the editorial level it is at least plausible that Ps 147:19–20 praises Yahweh for the covenant’s continuing validity or even renewal by its new, anticipated mediator, “David.”

In summary, then, although few psalms outside Ps 19 cluster מְצוֹת, עֲדוֹת, חֻקוֹת/חֻקִּים, מִצְוֹת, מְשֻׁפְּטִים, פְּקוּדִים, approximately half of them seem to associate them with royal obedience to Mosaic covenantal stipulations/instruction in some way (esp. Pss 18–19, 78, and 89).

References to תּוֹרָה. As we have just seen, the term תּוֹרָה has unmistakable Mosaic covenantal entailments in Pss 19, 78, 89, 105, and 119, and occurs with other terms for covenant stipulations. It remains, then, to explore its other instances in Pss 1:2; 37:31; 40:9; and 94:12. Psalm 1:2 reads, “but his delight is in the law (תּוֹרָה) of Yahweh, and on his law (תּוֹרָה) he meditates day and night.” Some suggest that editors responsible for giving Ps 1 its introductory function intended תּוֹרָה in v. 2 as a reference to the Psalter itself, and that this goes hand in hand with the Psalter’s five book structure analogous to the Pentateuch.⁴⁷² Whatever merit this suggestion has, the Psalter-Pentateuch analogy is only possible by first recognizing תּוֹרָה’s normal association with *Mosaic* Torah. More significantly, several scholars have recognized that Ps 1’s description of the righteous closely resembles Moses’ charge to Joshua in Josh 1:8 and the Deuteronomic kingship law in Deut 17:19,⁴⁷³ where תּוֹרָה clearly relates to Mosaic covenantal

⁴⁷¹ Here the [incorrectly pointed] *Ketib* דְּבָרָו witnesses the sg. form (cf. the *Qere* דְּבָרָיו) and stands in parallel with Yahweh’s חֻקִּים and מְשֻׁפְּטִים to Israel: מְגִיד דְּבָרָיו לְיַעֲקֹב חֻקָּיו וּמְשֻׁפְּטָיו לְיִשְׂרָאֵל. Indeed, if the sg. form is correct here it would seem that דְּבָרָו effectively means “the Mosaic covenant,” much like in 105:8 where דְּבָרָו parallels בְּרִיתוֹ as a functional synonym for the (Abrahamic) covenant (see also v. 42). If pl., however, then “his words” must mean the covenant stipulations themselves (cf. הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה in Exod 20:1).

⁴⁷² E.g., McCann, *A Theological Introduction*, 27.

⁴⁷³ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 46–48, 66–69; Mays, *The Lord Reigns*, 129.

commands. Indeed, the clause, “and on his law he meditates day and night” (וְבַתּוֹרַתוֹ יִהְיֶה יוֹמָם וּלְיָלֵיָּהּ) in Ps 1:2 unmistakably resembles Josh 1:8’s command to “meditate on” (i.e., the “book of the Torah” [סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה]) day and night” (וְהִגִּיתָ בּוֹ יוֹמָם וּלְיָלֵיָּהּ). This intertextual connection suggests that תּוֹרָה primarily evoked *Mosaic* instruction for the editor(s) responsible for its placement in the Psalter. Others have already noted the editorial linking of Pss 1 and 2, identifying Ps 2’s royal figure with the “righteous” who meditates on Torah.⁴⁷⁴ Whereas in Ps 2:1 nations and foreign kings “meditate vanity” (יִהְגּוּ רֵיקָה), Yahweh’s royal vice-regent meditates on Torah in accordance with to Deut 17 and Josh 1:8. Moreover, Ps 2:12 enjoins foreign kings to “kiss the son” (נִשְׁקוּ בְּרֵךְ) directly after a similar injunction to “fear Yahweh” (v. 11). Moreover, the psalm implies that those kings will avoid “perishing in the way” (פָּנֵי יִיאָנְהוּ | וְתֵאבְדוּ דְרָדָה; cf 1:6) if they pay homage to Yahweh’s royal Son thus, hinting at a mediatory role for the king. We shall explore this further in the Conclusion, but for now note that the Psalter’s the dual introduction of Pss 1–2 portrays Yahweh’s Torah-observing/meditating king and “son” (2:7, 12) as one through whom others are somehow set right with Yahweh.⁴⁷⁵

The other three instances of תּוֹרָה (Pss 37:1; 40:9; 94:12) occur in contexts that are similar to Ps 1 in some respects. Two are Davidic psalms from Book I, and the third reproduces similar entailments for תּוֹרָה such that Book IV’s editors are likely to have recognized their association with David in the earlier portion of the Psalter. Indeed, Pss 1 and 37 both explicitly contrast the “righteous” and the “wicked” (cf. 1:6 and 37:32) and have an obvious “wisdom” character.⁴⁷⁶

⁴⁷⁴ E.g., Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 60–67. This is supported by Ps 2’s contrast between those peoples and kings on the one hand and “Yahweh and his anointed” (v. 2) on the other, correlating to the righteous/wicked contrast in Ps 1:6. The “perishing way” of the wicked (1:6) and the warning to kings lest they “perish in the way” in 2:12 underscores the identification of foreign, recalcitrant kings and peoples as the “wicked” of Ps 1:4–6, hence the contrast with the righteous, Torah-meditating king.

⁴⁷⁵ See Conclusion for further discussion on Pss 1–2.

⁴⁷⁶ Mays, *The Lord Reigns*, 129, observes that: “In form, vocabulary, and topic Psalm 1 is a creation of the literary conventions found in Proverbs.” Similarly, Ps 37’s acrostic structure and emphasis on the “righteous” and

Psalm 40:9 also has significant points in common with Ps 1. There, at the center of the psalm, the psalmist declares, “I delight (חפץ) to do you will, O my God; your law (תורה) is within my heart.” This use of חפץ and תורה in the first person reflects the same attitude of delight toward Torah as 1:2. Moreover, v. 5’s “blessed” saying, “Blessed (אַשְׁרֵי) is the man who makes Yahweh his trust,” creates another conspicuous similarity with the אַשְׁרֵי saying of Ps 1:1–2. Finally, Ps 94:12 also begins with a “blessed” statement, “Blessed (אַשְׁרֵי) is the man whom you discipline, Yahweh, and whom you teach out of your law (תורה).” Verses 13–15 then continue by contrasting the “wicked” (רשע) with “his people” (עמו) and “his inheritance” (וְנַחֲלָתוֹ), who are further described as the “righteous” (צדיק) to whom “justice (משפט) will return.” Similar terms are found in Ps 1:5, “Therefore the wicked (רשעים) will not stand *in the judgment* (בַּמִּשְׁפָּט).” So in Ps 94 uses the term תורה in a very similar way as the Psalter’s opening Torah psalm. Besides תורה’s normal association with Moses, then, the similarities that Pss 37:31, 40:9, and 94:12 share with Ps 1 suggests that editors recognized the same Mosaic entailments for תורה in all these contexts.⁴⁷⁷

Two other terms occur in similar quantity in Ps 119 as functional synonyms for תורה, namely, דְּבָרִים/דְּבָר and אִמְרָה.⁴⁷⁸ However in most of these instances דְּבָר and אִמְרָה take broader or different meanings, so there is little to gain from exploring them further.⁴⁷⁹

the “wicked” reflect its wisdom character. We shall explore these further below.

⁴⁷⁷ This is, of course, a synchronic observation. Diachronically speaking, it is possible that the one editor placed all three psalms and thus created a focus on the theme of delighting in Yahweh’s torah in Pss 1 and 40, or that Ps 1 was added to an existing Book I–IV (et al.?), thus accentuating an existing theme.

⁴⁷⁸ Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 180. Allen counts twenty-four instances of דְּבָרִים/דְּבָר and twenty cases of אִמְרָה. Allen sees תורה and its seven synonyms as a probable reason why the composer of Ps 119 constructed each alphabetic strophe with eight lines.

The OT applies the term דְּבָר in many different ways, but numerous texts (Exod 19:6–7; 20:1; 24:3, 8; 34:1, 27–28; 35:1 and Deut 5:22) specifically describe the Mosaic commandments as “these words” (הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה) or “the words Yahweh commanded” (הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה). Similarly, the Deuteronomic kingship law in Deut 17:19 refers to “the words of this law (כָּל־דְּבָרֵי הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת) and these statutes (הַחֻקִּים הָאֵלֶּה).” אִמְרָה is much

Allusions to Specific Commands of the Decalogue (Exodus 20:1–17; Deuteronomy 5:6–21)

In our survey of בְּרִית we noted allusions to several commandments from the Decalogue in Ps 44:21 (against foreign gods and misuse of Yahweh's name) and Ps 50:18 (against theft, adultery, and false witness). Both psalms use these allusions to make a claim about the identity of the people in question—whether they are faithful to the covenant stipulations (Ps 44) or unfaithful (Ps 50). Moreover Pss 44 and 50 each contain allusions to *multiple* commands, increasing their potential to be appreciated as allusions to the Decalogue of the Mosaic covenant.

Psalms 15 and 24 merit particular attention because they stipulate who qualifies to dwell in Yahweh's house and holy hill (cf. Pss 15:1; 24:1)—i.e., participate in the liturgical life of Israel commanded by Moses. Somewhat surprisingly, the closest that Ps 15's multifaceted answer comes to alluding directly to the Decalogue concerns just one commandment in v. 3: “who does not slander with his tongue and does no evil to his neighbor” (לֹא-רָגַל עַל-לְשׁוֹנוֹ וְחָרְפָה לֹא-נֶשְׂאָ (עַל-קַרְבּוֹ). This resemblance to the command about false witness (Exod 20:16/Deut 5:20) is, however, purely semantic, showing no significant lexical overlap with the Pentateuchal texts. Psalm 24 is a different story, however. Goldingay recognizes Ps 24:4's answer, “he who has

rarer outside the Psalms, but appears in parallel with בְּרִית in Deut 33:9 and with תּוֹרָה in Isa 5:24. Thus, both terms can refer to the Mosaic covenant or its stipulations despite their inherent semantic breadth.

Psalms referring to *Yahweh's* “word(s)” (דְּבָר) include Pss 17:4; 33:4, 6; 56:5, 11; 105:8, 19, 27, 28, 42; 106:12, 24; 107:20; 130:5; 145:5; and 147:19. The psalms that use אִמְרָה are Pss 12:7; 18:31; and 105:19.

⁴⁷⁹ Psalms 12:7, 17:4, and 147:19 (discussed above) potentially have in view the Mosaic covenantal commands. Psalm 12:7's “pure words” (אִמְרֹת יְהוָה אִמְרֹת טְהוֹרוֹת) conceivably evokes Moses' commands and/or ritual instruction in Exodus and Leviticus, for the Davidic psalmist explicitly contrasts Yahweh's words and those of liars and flatterers (cf. vv. 3–5). Indeed, Exodus–Leviticus alone accounts for just over half the occurrences of טְהוֹר (some forty-nine out of ninety-six, or 51%), and though many of these occur in the expression “pure gold” (זָהָב טְהוֹר), טְהוֹר frequently relates to ritual purity commanded by Yahweh. In 17:4 the Davidic psalmist declares, “by the word of your lips (בְּדִבְרֵי שְׂפָתַי) I have avoided the ways (אֲרָחוֹת) of the violent.” This could also be read as an allusion to the Mosaic commands, since the “the word of your lips” ostensibly differentiates him from the “ways” of the wicked (cf. vv. 9 and 13). Thus it is possible that Pss 12 and 17 present David as proclaiming the purifying words of Yahweh through Moses and embodying that purity.

clean hands (נְקִי כַפַּיִם) and a pure heart, who does not lift up [his] soul to what is false (לֹא־נִשְׁאָל (לְשׂוֹן נִפְשִׁי) and does not swear deceitfully (וְלֹא נִשְׁבַּע לְמַרְמָה), as an allusion to various commands from the Decalogue. According to Goldingay 24:4 alludes Exod 20:7 concerning Yahweh’s name (cf. לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת־שֵׁם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׂוֹן) and Deut 5:20 regarding false witness (Exod 20:16 has עַד שֶׁקֶר where Deut 5:20 has עַד שֶׁוֹן). Goldingay rightly understands נְקִי כַפַּיִם as “hands that are not covered in blood,” and are therefore innocent of murder, which recalls Exod 20:13.⁴⁸⁰ Psalm 24:4’s allusion to multiple commands and strong lexical and syntactic agreement with Exod 20:7 (נִשְׁאָל...נִשְׂאָ) give it strong allusive potential. Since Pss 15–24 center around the king who praises Yahweh’s Torah (cf. Pss 18–21), it seems clear that editors understood the worthy entrant into the sanctuary to be the king who keeps Yahweh’s commands.⁴⁸¹

Psalms 16, 78, 97, 106, 115, and 135 all seem to allude to the commandments about “other gods” (אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים) and idolatry (פְּסֻל). Davidic Ps 16:4, “the sorrows of those who run after another [god] shall multiply” (יִרְבוּ עֲצָבוֹתֶם אַחֵר מִהָרִו), seems to pick up אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים from Exod 20:3/Deut 5:7, and differentiates the psalmist from such people. Another clear example is the historical report of Ps 78:58, which reports that the people “moved [God] to jealousy with their idols (וּבִפְסִילֵיהֶם יִקְנִיאֹהוּ),” thus recalling Yahweh as a “jealous God” (אֵל קַנָּא) in Exod 5:5/Deut 5:9. Similarly, Ps 97:7, “All worshipers of images are put to shame” (יִבְשׂוּ כָּל־עֹבְדֵי (פְּסֻל) appears to echo Exodus 20:4–6’s prohibition against crafting and worshipping an idol (פְּסֻל), which is repeated in Deut 5:8–11. Other psalms make similar references to idolatry,

⁴⁸⁰ Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1:359. Goldingay draws his understanding of נְקִי כַפַּיִם on comparison with Exod 21:28; Josh 2:17–20; 2 Sam 3:28; and 14:9, where bloodguilt is clearly in view. Regarding the phrase לֹא־נִשְׁאָל נִפְשִׁי, Dahood, *Psalms*, 1:151, translates לְשׂוֹן as “to an idol.” If correct, the whole phrase would allude to both the command regarding Yahweh’s name and the prohibition of idols. On the other hand, Vangemeren, *Psalms*, 260–61, sees no particular reference to idolatry.

⁴⁸¹ Levenson, *Sinai & Zion*, 169–76, offers a helpful discussion of Pss 15 and 24. But since his study does not examine them in terms of how Pss 15–24 are arranged, it overlooks these psalms’ particular focus on the king.

especially historical Ps 106:36–38, and the anti-idol polemics in 115:4–8 and 135:15–18 (using **עָצָב** and **מִעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי אָדָם** instead of the term **פִּסְל**).⁴⁸² Finally, Dahood believes that several instances of **שִׁוְיָ** should be translated as “idol.” By his reckoning, the psalmist declares his rejection of idol worship in Davidic Pss 26:4, 31:7, and 119:37. That we find a corresponding expression of trust in Yahweh or loyalty to him lends weight to a contrast with idols in these instances.⁴⁸³

Allusions to other commandments appear sporadically throughout the Psalter. Editors could have very easily read Davidic Ps 139:20’s “your enemies take [your name] in vain” (**נִשְׂא לְשׁוֹן אֶרְיָדָה**) as an allusion to Exod 20:7/Deut 5:11.⁴⁸⁴ As a “song for the Sabbath,” Ps 92 overtly presupposes the command to keep the Sabbath in Exod 20:8/Deut 5:12. Psalm 94:6’s complaint against the “wicked” who “kill (רָגַ) the widow and the sojourner, and murder (רָצַח) the fatherless” clearly reflects Exod 20:13’s/Deut 5:17’s command against murder (רָצַח).⁴⁸⁵ Since Ps 94 clearly contrasts “the wicked” in vv. 3–7 with “the man whom you... teach out of your law

⁴⁸² Other possibilities may exist in the Psalms, but are too subtle to merit our attention. E.g., Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1:120, believes that the implicit contrast between “my glory” (**כְּבוֹדִי**) and “vanity” (**רִיק**)/“lie” (**כַּזָּב**) in Ps 4:3 contrasts Yahweh and other gods.

⁴⁸³ Dahood, *Psalms* 1:151, renders **מְתַיִשְׁוִי** in Ps 26:4 as “idol worshipers.” There the psalmist states that he does not dwell with such people, preferring Yahweh’s “altar” (v. 6) and “house”(v. 8) instead. Dahood also believes that **הַבְּלִי־שִׁוְיָ** in Ps 31:7 ought to be translated “vain idols.” The psalmist declares, “I hate those who pay regard to worthless idols (**הַשִּׁוְיָ הַבְּלִי־שִׁוְיָ**), but I trust in Yahweh.” Finally, Dahood translates Ps 119:37 as “Prevent my eyes from looking at an idol” (**אִשָּׁ**).

Dahood, *Psalms*, 3:297, translates **שִׁוְיָ** in Ps 139:20 as “vanities,” but recognizes vv. 19–20 to be concerned with idols and idolatry (cf. **זָמָה**, **דְּמִים**, which Dahood translates as “idols” and “figurine” respectively). Alternatively, the ESV translates v. 20b, “your enemies take your name in vain” (**נִשְׂא לְשׁוֹן אֶרְיָדָה**), which suggests an allusion to the command concerning Yahweh’s name. Perhaps both commands are in view (i.e., those concerning Yahweh’s name and idols), as could be the case in Ps 24:4 discussed earlier.

⁴⁸⁴ See previous footnote.

⁴⁸⁵ Perhaps also Ps 62:4, which asks “how long will all of you attack a man to batter (so ESV) him (רָצַח),” especially if v. 5’s “they take pleasure in falsehood” (**רָצוּ כְּזָב**) alludes to the command against false witness.

(תּוֹרָה), Yah” (v. 12) and “his people...his heritage” (v. 14), it is all the more likely that editors understood the mention of “murder” in v. 6 with regard to the Mosaic commandment; breaking this Mosaic covenantal stipulation against murder disqualifies “the wicked” from being Yahweh’s people. Psalms 12 and 144 may allude to Deut 5:20’s command against false witness (שָׁוֹא) and Ps 27:12 to the equivalent command in Exod 20:16. Psalm 12:3 has two key terms in common with Deut 5:20, “Everyone utters lies (שָׁוֹא) to his neighbor (רֵעֵהוּ),” while Ps 144:8 and 11 uses Exod 20:16’s term for “lie” (שָׁקֵר) as well as Deut 5:20’s term (שָׁוֹא): “whose mouths speak lies (שָׁוֹא) and whose right hand is a right hand of falsehood (שָׁקֵר).” Similarly, in Ps 27:12 the psalmist complains that “false witnesses (עֵדֵי-שָׁוֹא) have risen up against me.” The same command also seems to lie behind Ps 41:7–8: “he utters empty words (שָׁוֹא)...when he goes out he tells it abroad. All who hate me whisper together about me (יְחַדְּעוּ עָלַי יְתִלְחֹשׁוּ) (כָּל-שֹׂנְאָי).” Finally, Ps 51’s superscript alludes to David’s adultery with Bathsheba (cf. 2 Sam 11)—a sin for which there was no sacrificial atonement available according to Lev 20:10, as Ps 51:18 apparently recognizes.⁴⁸⁶ Through this allusion in the superscript, then, the whole thought world of the penitential Ps 51 broadly presupposes the Mosaic covenant.⁴⁸⁷

In summary, we find potential allusions to specific commands from the Decalogue scattered throughout the Psalter: Pss 12, 15, 16, 24, 31, 41, 44, 50, 51, 78, 92, 94, 97, 106, 115, 135, and 144. The strongest allusions appear in psalms that either evoke more than one commandment (e.g., Pss 24, 44, 50), provide historical context that highlights the specifically *covenantal* significance of the command (Pss 78 and 106), or correspond closely to the command

⁴⁸⁶ On Ps 51 see Chapter Three.

⁴⁸⁷ Of the other key terms from the Decalogue, “to commit adultery” (נָאֵף) and “thief” (גָּנַב) occur only in Ps 50:18 already discussed. “Desire” or “covet” (חָמַד; cf. Exod 20:17/Deut 5:21) refers to ordinary human desires only in Ps 39:12, “You consume like a moth what is dear to him (חָמַדְתָּ).” Although “coveting” in the negative sense is possible in light the psalmist’s “transgression” (פְּשָׁע) in v.9 and “guilt” (עוֹן) earlier in v. 12, Ps 39:12 gives no reason to connect these terms with חָמַדְתָּ, which more likely refers to “what is dear to him” in a more neutral sense.

lexically/syntactically (e.g. Pss 41, 139, 144). This distribution appears to be quite even and therefore further reflects the Psalter’s pervasive interest in the Mosaic covenant. Although these instances do not permit strong conclusions, approximately half of them are Davidic. Some of these offer considerable support for our hypothesis. For example the entrance liturgies Pss 15 and 24 seem deliberately placed to identify the Torah-keeping King as the one worthy to enter Yahweh’s sanctuary. On the other hand Ps 51 reflects historical David’s adultery and murder. Yet, as Chapter Five will argue, the location of Ps 51 at the head of the David II collection after Asaph Ps 50 appears to showcase even historical David—that conscience-struck “founding father” of the Davidic covenant—as the quintessential covenant partner of Yahweh. This would seem to underscore the strong continuity between historical David and future Davidide(s) to which the Psalter’s primary focus seems to shift after Ps 72 (see Chapter Two).

Walking in Yahweh’s Way and Fearing Him: Wisdom/Deuteronomic Themes (The Fear of Yahweh (יְרֵאָת יְהוָה), and Yahweh’s Way(s) (דְרָדָר)/the “Two Way” Motif)

As noted above, Ps 1:2 already seems to entail the thought-world of the Mosaic covenant. (e.g., its allusion to Josh 1:8 and the kingship law in Deut 17). Additionally, Ps 1 explicitly contrasts the “way of the righteous” (דְרָדָר צְדִיקִים) and the “way of the wicked” (דְרָדָר רְשָׁעִים). Yahweh “knows” (יָדַע) the way of the righteous, who delight (חִפְּזוּ) in Yahweh’s Torah (תּוֹרָה) and meditate/muse upon (הִגִּד) it day and night (v. 2).⁴⁸⁸ Moreover, Ps 2:11–12’s exhortation to “kings” to “be wise” (הִשְׁכִּילוּ) and to “serve Yahweh with fear (בְּיִרְאָה),” and to “kiss the son lest he be angry, and you perish in the way (וְתִאֲבָדוּ דְרָדָר)” both resumes the “way” theology of Ps 1 and introduces the wisdom theme of “the fear of Yahweh” (יְרֵאָת יְהוָה). Indeed, scholars

⁴⁸⁸ Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 2–5, helpfully defines what “righteous” means in the psalms. Far from a moralistic view or one that envisages absolute ethical perfection, “righteousness” in the Psalms consists of right relationship to God and others from which also flows a “right” moral disposition and the fulfillment of obligations that arise within those relationships. Indeed, that basic description coheres well with the general intent of the Mosaic covenant, which regulated Israel’s worship and life and sustained them as God’s holy people (cf. Kleinig, *Leviticus* [St. Louis: CPH, 2003], 2–3).

commonly view אבד and דרך in 1:6 and 2:12 as one of several features that bind Pss 1 and 2 together, reflecting editors' particular interest in this "perishing way of the wicked" as a theme.⁴⁸⁹ As is well known, these themes—"the fear of Yahweh" and Yahweh's "way(s)"/"two ways"—are commonly recognized characteristics of the wisdom genre (cf. Prov 1:7; 4:10–19; 9:10; 31:31; Job 1:1, 8; 2:3; 28:28; Eccl 12:13)⁴⁹⁰ of which Deuteronomic theology makes generous use when urging faithfulness to the Mosaic covenant.⁴⁹¹ Indeed the Book of Deuteronomy itself regularly describes the Mosaic covenantal commands in terms of Yahweh's "way(s)" (דרך),⁴⁹² contrasting this with the practices of the pagan nations in Deut 30:15–20 (cf. 28; 29:15–18) and associating it with "fearing Yahweh" (ירא) in texts like Deut 8:6; 10:12; and 13:5. For example, Deut 8:6 reads, "So you shall keep the commandments (מצוות) of Yahweh your God by walking in his ways (ללכת בדרךיו) and by fearing him (וליראה אותו)."⁴⁹³ It is very likely that editors

⁴⁸⁹ E.g., Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 61–63; McCann, *A Theological Introduction*, 41–42; Creach, *Yahweh as Refuge*, 77–80. Other common features include אשירי (1:1; 2:12), הגה (1:2; 2:1), ישב (1:1; 2:4)

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. E. C. Lucas, "Wisdom Theology," *DOTWPW* 907; Norman Habel, "The Symbolism of Wisdom in Proverbs 1–9," *Int.* 26 (1972): 131–57 (esp. 135–39); and Roland E. Murphy, *The Tree of Life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature* (3d ed.; Grand Rapids; Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 17, who marks the similarity of Prov 4 with Deuteronomic preaching.

⁴⁹¹ On the relationship between wisdom and Yahweh's covenant generally, see Jamie A. Grant, "Wisdom and Covenant: Revisiting Zimmerli," *EuroJTh* 12 (2003): 103–11. Grant critiques Walter Zimmerli's influential article, "The Place and Limit of the Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology," *SJT* 17 (1964): 146–58, in which Zimmerli argued that wisdom "has no relation to the history between God and Israel" told in other OT writings (torah, historiography etc.).

⁴⁹² Cf. Deut 5:33; 8:6; 9:12, 16; 10:12; 11:22, 28; 13:6; 19:9; 26:17; 28:9, describe life the reality of Mosaic covenantal life via the דרך/ים/דרך, often in the phrase, "way that Yahweh commanded" (הדרך אשר צוה יהוה).

⁴⁹³ Cf. R. Van Leeuwen, *The Book of Proverbs: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 33. In many cases these contexts also include injunctions to "serve" (עבד) Yahweh and/or keep his commands. Cf., Deut 6:24–25, "And Yahweh commanded us to do all these statutes (כל־החוקים האלה), to fear Yahweh our God (ליראה את־יהוה אלהינו), for our good always, that he might preserve us alive, as we are this day. And it will be righteousness for us (וצדקה תהיה־לנו), if we are careful to do all this commandment (כל־המצוות הזאת) before Yahweh our God, as he had commanded us." Deuteronomy 6:2 and 13 similarly stress "fear of Yahweh" (cf. 4:10; 10:12).

read these characteristically “wisdom” motifs with these covenantal entailments. Analysis of these themes yields several observations.⁴⁹⁴

Yahweh’s “Way.” Oftentimes in the Psalter, Yahweh’s “way” refers primarily to *his* salvific activity rather than the human response of “walking” in Yahweh’s command.⁴⁹⁵ Our interest, however, lies in those instances that suggests that Mosaic covenantal life/Torah is in view; when Yahweh’s “ways” are “known/made known” /“taught” to people or “kept” by them. Yahweh’s way or ways shows up with these primary entailments in Pss 5:8–9; 18:22; 25:4; 27:11; 37:34; 51:15; 81:14; 86:11; 95:10; 128:1. Notably, two thirds of these are Davidic psalms in which the psalmist identifies positively with Yahweh’s way, further suggesting Grant’s understanding of the king as one who exemplifies Torah piety. On top of this the non-Davidic contexts also lament the *people’s* failure to walk in Yahweh’s way(s). This is especially notable in Ps 81’s charge against “my people” and in Ps 95’s recollection of the Meribah incident. This contrasting picture of David and people seems to endorse our thesis that the Psalter as editorial product consciously contrasts popular disobedience and royal obedience. On their own these data do not provide a sufficient basis to argue that David’s Torah-observance is *vicarious*. Nevertheless this contrasting picture of king and people fits well with our hypothesis that “David” intercedes for and restores them as Yahweh’s covenant people.

Yahweh’s Way(s) Contrasted with Those of the Wicked. The contrasting ways of the righteous and the wicked show up throughout the Psalter in other ways too. There are psalms that explicitly contrast the “way of the righteous” with that of the “wicked”: 1:1–6; 18:21–27; 32:8; 37:10–40; 50:23; 125:3; 146:8–9. Several other psalms implicitly contrast the “way” (דָּרָךְ) of the wicked or how they “walk” (דָּלַדַּל) with the poor, the “right” way, or with psalmist himself.

⁴⁹⁴ Appendix G offers a more extensive investigation of these motifs in the Psalter.

⁴⁹⁵ For example, in Ps 103:7 Yahweh “made known his ways (דָּרָךְ) to Moses, his saving acts to the people of Israel.” It is important to stress that we are concerned with *primary* entailments here, and that we are not advocating that Yahweh’s salvific “way” has no connection with the “way” he calls his people to walk.

Examples of this kind include Pss 10:5; 26:4–5; 36:5; 39:2; 82:4–5; 84:11–12; and possibly 12:9. Still other psalms contrast “the righteous/righteousness” and “the wicked/wickedness” more generally, without explicit mention of “way”: Pss 7:9–10; 9:5–6;⁴⁹⁶ 11:2–7; 31:18–19; 34:10, 16, 20, 22; 45:8; 55:4, 20, 23; 58:4, 11–12; 68:3–4; 75:11; 92:8, 11; 94:3, 12–13, 15, 21; 97:10–11; 104:33–35;⁴⁹⁷ 112:1, 4, 6, 10; 140:5, 9, 14; and 141:4–5, 10.

Several observations are noteworthy here. Davidic Psalms are strongly represented here, confirming yet again the Psalter’s particular emphasis on David as one who walks in Yahweh’s “way”—his commands and Torah.⁴⁹⁸ Moreover, several show quite strong similarities to Ps 1 (Pss 92:7–10; 111:9–10; 112:1), affirming the Psalter’s ongoing interest in the two-way theological agenda first presented in Ps 1. Psalms 27 and 28 also show possible signs of concatenation with Pss 25 and 26 in respect to the two way motif and therefore seem to confirm editorial awareness of and interest in this theme there.

Fear of Yahweh. Several of the psalms listed in the previous section also invoke “fear of Yahweh” (e.g., 34:10; 55:20; [68:36?]). The noun יִרְאָה occurs a few other times with Yahweh as its implied object: Pss 19:10; 90:11; and 119:38; two of which are Torah Psalms whose Mosaic covenantal entailments are therefore clear. The verb יָרָא often relates to fear in a general sense or fear of enemies in the Psalter, but in numerous places (besides those identified above)

⁴⁹⁶ Psalm 9:4 describes Yahweh on his throne “giving righteous judgment” ($\text{שׁוֹפֵט טַרְדֵּם צְדָקָה}$), but the Targum has a definite substantival adjective form $\text{זַכָּיָה (=קִיָּה)}$, “judging the righteous.” Verse 5 declares, “You have rebuked the nations; you have made the wicked perish ($\text{עָשָׂה לְרַשָׁעִים תְּהִיבָה}$)” (LXX has $\text{καὶ ἀπόλετο} = \text{qal } \text{דָּבַר}$). Psalm 9:4–5 therefore contrast Yahweh’s treatment of the righteous and the wicked, describing the latter’s fate in similar terms as Ps 1:6.

⁴⁹⁷ The end of Ps 104 contrasts the psalmist’s present and future joy toward Yahweh with the destruction of the wicked. The psalmist “will sing praise” to Yahweh and “rejoices” in him (vv. 33–34), then declares, “Let sinners be consumed from the earth, and let the wicked (דֹּמְיָם) be no more” (v. 35).

⁴⁹⁸ Some nineteen of these are Davidic or royal (e.g., Ps 45), while Pss 104 and 112 might well be classified as quasi-Davidic by association. There are ten non-Davidic psalms in this list.

Yahweh is the object or implied object of fear in Pss 15:4; 33:8;⁴⁹⁹ 40:4; 47:3; 52:8;⁵⁰⁰ 67:8; 72:5;⁵⁰¹ 76:8, 9(?), 13; 89:8; 96:4; and 130:4. *Yahweh*'s/God's "awesome deeds" are in view in 64:10(?); 65:6, 9(?); 66:3, 5; 106:22; 139:14(?). *Yahweh*'s "name" is feared in Pss 86:11; 99:3; 102:16. And *Yahweh*'s "word(s)" or "judgments" are feared in Pss 119:38, 63, 120.⁵⁰²

Again, the vast majority of these psalms are (quasi-)Davidic or royal with the king commending/teaching the fear of *Yahweh* or exemplifying it: Pss [2?], 5, 15, 19, 33, 34, 40, 52, 55, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 72, 86, 89, 102, and 139. If Grant is correct in identifying the psalmist of Ps 119 as royal and Zenger's connection between the king and Pss 111–112 is sound, we are left with only five psalms (76, 90, 96, 99, and 106) that do not ostensibly associate the fear of *Yahweh* with David/the king.

Summary. Although Wilson concludes that the Psalter's final redaction responsible for adding Books IV–V was "shaped by the concerns of wisdom,"⁵⁰³ the "earlier" segment (Pss 2–89) is also heavily saturated with these themes as well. This suggests that Wilson may have overdrawn his contrast between the "royal-covenantal" and "wisdom" frames he finds in the Psalter. Indeed, it is striking that Davidic or "Davidized" anonymous psalms in the first half of the Psalter account for most of the data just surveyed. These data suggest that "David" is generally the "God-fearer" who both exemplifies and teaches *Yahweh*'s way.⁵⁰⁴

⁴⁹⁹ "Let all the earth fear *Yahweh* (מִיָּהוָה)."

⁵⁰⁰ Here it is the "righteous" (צַדִּיקִים) who "see and fear." Moreover, the psalmist then likens himself to "a green olive tree in the house of God" (וְאֲנִי כְּזֵיתֵי רֵעֵן בְּבַיִת אֱלֹהִים), thus employing a similar simile to that in Ps 1:3.

⁵⁰¹ LXX has καὶ συμπαραμηνεῖ (= דָּרְשָׁהּ).

⁵⁰² Many of these examples employ the *niphal* participle נִוְרָאוֹת/נִוְרָאוֹת (i.e., those in Pss 47; 65–66, 68; 72; 76; 89; 96; 99; 106; 139; 145), so that any connection to "fear of *Yahweh*" is primarily lexical/conceptual rather syntactical.

⁵⁰³ Wilson, "Shaping the Psalter," 80.

⁵⁰⁴ See also Michael Barber, *Singing in the Reign: The Psalms and the Liturgy of God's Kingdom*

David as (Priestly?) Mediator of Yahweh's Blessing and Intercessor: Intertextual Allusions to Numbers 6:24–27 and Deuteronomy 9:26

Our hypothesis contends that the anticipated Davidic king would mediate God's blessing and intercede for the people—functions inherent to the priesthood. Indeed, Davidic Ps 110:4 strongly suggests a priestly dimension to the royal office when Yahweh famously “swears” concerning “David's lord” (לְאֹדֹנָי),⁵⁰⁵ “You are a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek” (אַתָּה־כֹּהֵן לְעוֹלָם עַל־דְּבַרְתִּי מִלְכִּי־צֶדֶק). Chapters Five and Six will explore this aspect of the hypothesis most directly as they address the Psalter's allusions to Gen 12:3, 22:18, and 26:4 in Ps 72 and to Exod 34:6 in Pss 86, 103, and 145. However besides these texts we also find a few allusions to the Aaronic Blessing in Num 6:24–26 and Moses' intercessory petition in Deut 9:26 in the Psalter. The following survey examines their distribution, with Chapter Five taking up the case of Deut 9:26 further.

Numbers 6:24–27. The clearest allusion to the Aaronic blessing in Num 6 occurs in Ps 67:2: “May God be gracious to us and bless us and make his face to shine upon us” (אֱלֹהִים יְחַנְּנוּ (וַיְבָרְכֵנוּ יְאֹר פְּנֵינוּ אֲתָנוּ). Here the psalmist invokes God's blessing on “us,” whereupon vv. 7–8 extend the allusion via the acclamation, “God has blessed us” (אֱלֹהֵינוּ [אֱלֹהִים]).⁵⁰⁶ He thus both invokes God's blessing and announces its reality. In Asaph Ps 80 the phrase, “let your face shine, that we may be saved!” (וְהָאֵר פְּנֵיךָ וְנִשְׁעָה) occurs in that lament psalm's thrice-

(Steubenville, Ohio: Emmaus Road, 2001), 73–74.

⁵⁰⁵ The referent here seems to be royal figure given the militaristic imagery that follows, “sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool,” even if later pseudepigrapha and Qumran provide some evidence of two “messianic” figures,” one priestly and one royal (cf. A. J. B. Higgins, “Priest and Messiah,” *VT* 3 [1958]: 321–36). Wilson acknowledged the possibility of an anticipated priestly messiah later in his career (see Introduction, 4n13).

⁵⁰⁶ See, e.g., Vangemeren, *Psalms*, 510. Grogan, *Psalms*, 123–24, sees Ps 67's universal purview as a reflection of Yahweh's Abrahamic promises in Gen 12; cf. Terrien, *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary*, 483, who sees a decisive difference between Ps 67 and the Aaronic blessing in Num 6:24–27 on the grounds that it is not for performance by a cult official like a priest. However Ps 67's different liturgical function does not preclude a deliberate allusion Num 6 with which it has strong verbal ties (see, e.g., Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:300).

occurring petition to “restore us” (הַשִּׁיבֵנוּ) in vv. 4, 8, and 20. This allusion to the Aaronic Blessing is thus connected with God’s anticipated intervention amid the desolations wrought by enemies against Yahweh’s “vine” (vv. 9–18). Moreover, v. 18 petitions Yahweh to empower “the man of your right hand” (אִישׁ יְמִינֶךָ) and the “son of man” (בֶּן-אָדָם) whom he has “strengthened” (אָמַץ). If editors took this to refer to the king as seems natural (cf. לְיָמֵי in Ps 110:1), then Ps 80’s three-fold petition seems to expect “God’s face shining” upon and saving his people through the agency of the king he strengthens.⁵⁰⁷ Similar petitions occur in Davidic Ps 31:17 (הָאֲרִירָה פָּנֶיךָ עַל-עַבְדְּךָ הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי בַחֲסִדֶּךָ) and in Ps 119:135 (פָּנֶיךָ הָאֵר בְּעַבְדְּךָ). Finally, Ps 118:26–27 proclaims, “Blessed is he who comes in the name of Yahweh! We bless you from the house of Yahweh” (בְּרִוֶּךְ הַבָּא בְשֵׁם יְהוָה בְּרַכְנוּכֶם מִבַּיִת יְהוָה), and then proclaims that “Yahweh is God” and that “he has made his light to shine upon us” (וַיֹּאֲרֶ לָנוּ). The subsequent command to “bind the festal sacrifice” makes the liturgical context clear, suggesting a conscious echo of the Aaronic blessing in vv. 26–27.⁵⁰⁸

Thus, Davidic Ps 31 and Ps 67, Asaph Ps 80, and Pss 118 and 119 allude to the Aaronic blessing in a recognizable way. It is intriguing that Pss 118–119 are among this handful of psalms and allude to Num 6:25, suggesting another reason for their juxtaposition in addition to those offered by Grant.⁵⁰⁹ Significantly for our thesis, numerous commentators identify the

⁵⁰⁷ We also find the same pairing of “right hand” and “son you have strengthened for yourself” in v. 16 (וְכִנְיָהּ (אֲשֶׁר-רַחֲמֵנִי יְמִינֶךָ וְעַל-בֶּן אֲמַצְתָּה לְךָ). There Yahweh’s “right hand” has “planted” the “stock”, i.e., Israel. Moreover, the BHS editors suspect dittography for the latter half of the verse given its similarity to v. 18.

⁵⁰⁸ Dahood, *Psalms*, 3:233 sees Ps 129:8 as an “emphatic repetition” of the blessing Ps 118:26. On its own terms, Ps 129:8b reads “we bless you in the name of Yahweh” (בְּרַכְתֵּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם בְּרַכְנוּ אֶתְכֶם בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה). Insofar as it connects blessing with Yahweh’s name it resembles the purpose of the Aaronic blessing described in Num 6:27; i.e., to put Yahweh’s name upon the people and that Yahweh bless them. Beyond this thematic similarity, however, Ps 129:8 shares little in common with Num 6:24–27. Cf. Goldingay, *Psalms*, 3:519, who recognizes it as a traditional greeting at the harvest festival.

⁵⁰⁹ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 178–79 counts אָוֶר among several significant lexical links between Pss 118 and 119, but compares 118:27 with 119:105 and 130 rather than with the verb in v. 135. Otherwise Grant recognizes

speaker of Ps 118 as a royal figure, or at least one who speaks on behalf of the people.⁵¹⁰

Moreover, the most explicit example, Ps 67, is “sandwiched” within the David II group (see Cha. One), reflecting editorial intent to associate this anonymous psalm with David. Indeed, since the theme of blessing forms an *inclusio* about Ps 67 and dominates Ps 67, the allusion to Num 6 is especially prominent and doubtless an important factor in editors’ “Davidization” of this psalm.

At the literary level, then, “David” predominantly invokes the Aaronic blessing upon “us” (the people) or seems to be connected with its realization somehow (Ps 80:18). Thus it appears that editors ascribed to “David” the priestly function of blessing in some sense. Our hypothesis that “David” is instrumental in the fulfillment of Yahweh’s Abrahamic covenantal promise to bless all nations therefore seems very plausible.

Deuteronomy 9:26. In Deut 9:26 Moses recalls how he prayed (וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל) to Yahweh for the people after they provoked his anger and rebelled at Taberah, Massah, Kibroth-hattaavah and Kadesh-barnea (vv. 22–24). Moses relates his intercession in v. 26 thus, “O Yahweh, do not destroy your people and your heritage (אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱמָרָה עַמְּךָ וְנַחֲלֶיךָ), whom you have redeemed through your greatness, whom you have brought out of Egypt with a mighty hand etc.” When we turn to the Psalter, the superscripts of four psalms reproduce the essence of Moses’ intercessory petition: אֱלֹהֵינוּ.⁵¹¹ Three of them are consecutive (Pss 57–59) and share identical superscriptional information, while the fourth superscript (Ps 75) differs in the other details. As Chapter Two discusses, the editors of Book II evidently grouped Pss 57–59 according to a third “principle of organization” after authorship and genre, since these psalms are part of a larger

the “idea of “blessedness”” as another general commonality between the psalms.

⁵¹⁰ Cf. Goldingay, *Psalms*, 3:354; Dahood, *Psalms*, 3:155–56; and Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 165–68, who counts it as a royal psalm. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 397, is more cautious, seeing Ps 118 as an individual song of thanksgiving that may have adopted the language of royal psalms. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 232 and 236, date it to the postexilic period.

⁵¹¹ This is probably the name of a tune. Its original function is inconsequential in any case.

group of Davidic *miktams* spanning Pss 56–60.⁵¹² The intercessory character of the petition “destroy not” (אַל־תִּשְׁחַת) in Deut 9:26 raises a possibility relevant to our hypothesis: did editors intend to accentuate David’s intercessory role by grouping Pss 57–59 together in this way?

As a group, Davidic Pss 57–59 and Asaph Ps 75 display some notable characteristics. First, all of Ps 57 and a good deal of Ps 59 constitute an earnest prayer for Yahweh’s deliverance (Ps 59:2–8, esp. הַצִּילֵנִי in vv. 2, 3). Clearly these psalms are petitionary in nature, although the psalmist prays mostly for himself (N.B. 1st sg. throughout Ps 57 and in 59:2–4). At first blush this could appear to rule out a specifically intercessory role. However, Pss 57–59 and 75 collectively demonstrate a more general concern for God’s judgment as vindication for the righteous. In fact two of the three Davidic psalms headed with אַל־תִּשְׁחַת—i.e., Pss 58–59—broaden the horizon beyond the fortunes of individual psalmist by expecting God’s judgment to be universally acknowledged. Psalms 58 and 59 even invoke God’s judgment on the nations in a manner reminiscent of Ps 2.⁵¹³ Psalm 75 offers a similar perspective.⁵¹⁴

Moreover, Ps 59: 9 and 12 give cause to understand the psalmist as a royal figure who “owns” the *nation’s* problems as his problem,⁵¹⁵ effectively praying on their behalf. First, v. 9’s

⁵¹² See the discussion of Leslie McFall’s proposal in Chapter Two.

⁵¹³ Psalm 58 begins with a charge of against the “gods” or rulers, and ends with the expectation that “mankind will say (וַיֹּאמְרוּ אַדָּם), “Surely there is a reward for the righteous; surely there is a God who judges on earth (וַיִּשְׁפֹּט בְּאָרֶץ יֵשׁ-אֱלֹהִים שֹׁפֵטִים שָׁפְטִים בְּאָרֶץ.” In between are petitions God to punish the wicked by breaking their teeth (v. 7), and the expectation that the righteous (sg.) “will bathe his feet in the blood of the wicked” (v. 11). Psalm 59:6 petitions God to “punish all the nations” (לְפָקֹד כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם) and vv. 12–14 continues this with specific requests like “make them totter” (הַנְּיַעֲמוּ), “let them be trapped in their pride” (וַיִּלְכְּדוּ בְּגִאוֹנָם), and “consume them in wrath (כִּלְהֵם בְּחַמָּה)...that they may know that God rules over Jacob to the ends of the earth.”

⁵¹⁴ The major theme of Ps 75 is God’s judgment of the wicked (vv. 3 and 8) on a scale that has the earth and its inhabitants in view (v. 4).

⁵¹⁵ Steven J. L. Croft, *The Identity of the Individual in the Psalms* (JSOTSup 44; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987), 123, questions whether Ps 59 should be read as an individual psalm at all given its apparent references to a siege (cf. vv. 7–8). But there is no need to decide the identity of the psalmist based on whether the prayer concerns an individual only or the community. Rhetorically, the king may pray for himself, but that his

“But you, O Yahweh, laugh at them (תִּשְׂחַק־לָמוֹ); you hold all the nations in derision (תִּלְעַג (לְכָל־גּוֹיִם),” is strongly reminiscent of Ps 2:4. At the editorial level, then, Ps 59 evokes Ps 2’s vision of the supremacy of Yahweh and his מְשִׁיחַ over the nations, rather than purely personal enemies.⁵¹⁶ Indeed, Ps 59:6 already identifies the Davidic psalmist’s enemies as *national* rather than personal as he urges God to “rouse yourself to punish the nations” (הִקְיֹצֵה לְפָקֹד כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם). Second, the petition אֱלֹהֵי־תִהְרַגֵּם in the body of the psalm (v. 12) is semantically very similar to אֱלֹהֵי־תִשְׁחַת in the superscript and Deut 9:26, and may offer clues as to how editors understood the superscript. Notably the psalmist does not apply this petition to himself (i.e., “do not kill/destroy *me*”), but to his *enemies*, so that they may serve as an “object lesson” for the people: “Kill them not, lest my people forget” (אֱלֹהֵי־תִהְרַגֵּם | פֶּן־יִשְׁכְּחוּ עַמִּי).⁵¹⁷ If the allusion to Deut 9:26 via אֱלֹהֵי־תִשְׁחַת is once again picked up in v. 12’s אֱלֹהֵי־תִהְרַגֵּם, then 59:12 appears to allude to Moses’ petition subversively. Whereas Moses had prayed that Yahweh not destroy the *people* (but forgive them), David prays that he not destroy *the enemies* “lest my people forget.”

welfare is of great concern to the people he rules (cf. Ps 89). Generally speaking, Croft investigates the identity of the psalmist in terms of each psalm’s presumed cultic *Sitz im Leben* rather than its *Sitz im Buch*. However the latter also offers an important perspective if—as Croft, *Identity*, 177, proposes—“every person who reads the Psalms today” is to determine “who is the individual who speaks through these pages.”

⁵¹⁶ This is obviously a synchronic observation. But even if—diachronically—Ps 2 was added later than Ps 59 when the messianic Psalter was formed, its effect is to accentuate this existing theme and, consequently, the Davidic identity of the psalmist.

⁵¹⁷ Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51–100* (WBC 20; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1990), 98, speculates that the speaker is the king for similar reasons. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 542, suggests that drawing out the enemies’ demise “does not contain an inhumane impulse, but the urgent desire that the demonstration of God’s intervention may be visible everywhere and of enduring effectiveness.” So far as it goes, Kraus’ view well fits the concern of Pss 58–59 that all acknowledge God’s judgment (see above). However he overlooks the fact that “my people” in particular somehow benefit. A better interpretation is offered by Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:219, who considers this “for the spiritual benefit of Israel.”

The semantic equivalence of “Kill them not” (אֱלֹהֵי־תִהְרַגֵּם) to אֱלֹהֵי־תִשְׁחַת offers a clue as to why Ps 59 was *originally* set to a tune so named. However, the explanation does not work for the other three psalms with this tune; nor can it explain why Pss 57–59 are grouped together—hence the need to consider them as an editorial group.

Notwithstanding this difference, editors plausibly viewed David in Ps 59 in a similar intercessory role to Moses, praying on behalf of the people.

David and Yahweh the Faithful God: Allusions to Deuteronomy 7:9–10. The first part of our survey detected likely allusions to Deut 7:9 in Ps 89:29, 32, 34–35, and a weaker possibility in Ps 74:20. No other psalms combine a sufficient number of Deut 7:9’s key terms to yield a sure allusion. However, the word-pair **חֶסֶד** and **אֱמוּנָה** (“faithfulness”) combine two important lexemes from Deut 7:9, which describes Yahweh as “the faithful God” (**הָאֱלֹהִים הַנֶּאֱמָן**) and who “keeps [the] covenant and steadfast love” (**שָׁמַר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד**). It is therefore possible that editors encountering **חֶסֶד** and **אֱמוּנָה** in parallel or combined via the conjunction *waw* might recognize in this quasi-formulaic word pair Deut 7:9’s own formulaic description of Yahweh’s faithfulness to the covenant.⁵¹⁸ Indeed, **חֶסֶד** and **אֱמוּנָה** parallel each other eight times (Pss 36:6; 88:12, 89:2, 3, 34, 50; 92:3; and 100:5), and are twice joined by *waw* as a dual subject or object (Pss 89:25 and 98:3). Psalm 89 accounts for half these instances, in which Yahweh’s **חֶסֶד** and **אֱמוּנָה** relate to his promises to David (and probably 88:12 too by editorial association). In Ps 36 David, “Servant of Yahweh” (v. 1), declares Yahweh’s **חֶסֶד** and **אֱמוּנָה** and seems to base his later petitions on behalf of “those who know you” (**לְיֹדְעֶיךָ**) and “the upright in heart” (**לְיֹשְׁרֵי-לֵב**) on these divine characteristics (v. 11).

⁵¹⁸ Although **חֶסֶד** is common in the OT, the formulaic description of Yahweh as **הָאֱלֹהִים הַנֶּאֱמָן** is unique to Deut 7:9. Isaiah 49:7 is the only other passage that directly describes Yahweh as “faithful,” but within a relative clause (**יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר נֶאֱמָן**). Thus, Deut 7:9 uniquely combines **חֶסֶד** and **אֱמוּנָה** in its confession of Yahweh. Accordingly, the stock combination of **חֶסֶד** and **אֱמוּנָה** throughout the Psalter most closely recalls its terminology. Outside of these we do not find **חֶסֶד** and **אֱמוּנָה** so paired (Jer 42:5 applies the Niph. pt. **נֶאֱמָן** indirectly to Yahweh and combines it with **אֱמִתּוֹ** [rather than **חֶסֶד**], calling Yahweh a “true and faithful witness” [**עֵד אֱמִתּוֹ וְנֶאֱמָן**]). Psalm 19:8 describes Yahweh’s “testimony” [**עֲדוֹת**] as “faithful” (f. **נֶאֱמָנָה**). In other contexts **נֶאֱמָן** refers to human beings or related entities; e.g., Abraham’s heart (Neh 9:8), Moses (Num 12:7), Samuel (1 Sam 2:35; 3:20), David (1 Sam 22:14), or David’s house (1 Sam 25:28; cf. 1 Kgs 11:38; cf. also the differently pointed—but consonantly identical—perfect form (**נֶאֱמָן**) in 2 Sam 7:16).

The remaining three instances occur in Book IV. In the “New Song” of Ps 98 (cf. Ps 96), Yahweh remembers his **דָּקָה** and **אַמְוֵנָה** toward *Israel* as he universally makes known (vv. 2–3) his salvation and righteousness “by his right hand and holy arm” (**יְמִינוֹ וְיָדוֹ יְקֹדֶשׁוֹ**). A few psalms earlier, Ps 92’s “Sabbath Song” states that it is good to declare Yahweh’s **דָּקָה** and **אַמְוֵנָה** daily (92:2–3), and shortly after Ps 98 the entrance liturgy of Ps 100 declares that his **דָּקָה** and **אַמְוֵנָה** endure forever/to all generations. Also important is that Ps 98’s references to Yahweh’s “right hand” and “salvation”—together with its juxtaposition with the “Yahweh is King” psalms (Pss 97 and 99)—create striking affinities to Moses’ “Song of the Sea” in Exod 15, which also praises Yahweh’s salvation, right hand, and kingship (cf. vv. 2, 6, 18), which seems further supported by Moses’ high profile in Book IV (see Chapter Two).⁵¹⁹ We will examine such features further below and especially in Chapter Six. But for now we note that Deut 7:9’s confession of Yahweh as faithful and steadfast follows directly from v. 8’s recollection of the first Exodus. The prominence of **דָּקָה** and **אַמְוֵנָה** in Pss 92–100 thus appear to evoke God’s covenant faithfulness in terms that accentuate his restorative Exodus-like redemption of his people. Though Pss 90–100 do not focus attention on David, affinities with the Davidic group Pss 101–103 (104–106?) give reason to think that editors nevertheless viewed “David” as instrumental to its vision (see Chapter Six).

Deuteronomy 7:10 confesses another dimension of Yahweh’s response: he “repays to *their face those who hate him* (**לְשׂוֹנְאָיו אֶל־פְּנֵיו**).” A very similar warning occurs in Exod 20:5 and Deut 5:9, where God “visits the iniquity of the fathers...of those who hate me (**לְשׂוֹנְאֵי**).”⁵²⁰ In a similar way Pss 68, 81, 83, and 139 employ the participial form of **שָׂנֵא** with Yahweh as the object of hatred: **שָׂנֵאֵנִי** in 68:2; **שָׂנֵאֵנִי יְהוָה** in 81:16; **שָׂנֵאֵנִי** in 83:3 and 139:21. In Ps 81—a

⁵¹⁹ McCann, *The Book of Psalms*, 1072–73, even claims that, “[e]very major item of vocabulary recalls Exodus 15,” whereupon he identifies such similarities between Ps 98 and Exod 15.

⁵²⁰ Within the Pentateuch, these are the only other occurrences of the qal pt. of **שָׂנֵא** with a suffix referring to Yahweh; i.e., another text with strong Mosaic covenantal associations.

psalm with well established Mosaic covenantal associations as seen above—the claim that “those who hate Yahweh would cringe before him” (יִכָּחֲשׁוּ-לֹוּ מִשְׁנֵאֵי יְהוָה) hints at divine-reprisal affirmed in Deut 7:10 and Exod 20:5/Deut 5:9. Davidic Ps 68 echoes this even more clearly again when the psalmist declares, “God shall arise, his enemies shall be scattered; *and those who hate him shall flee before him* (וַיָּנוּסוּ מִשְׁנֵאֵי מִפְּנֵי).” Thus, Ps 68 is the strongest parallel of the four. “David” comes into view in Davidic Ps 139, where he sides with Yahweh against the wicked who hate him (cf. vv. 19–20), “Do I not hate those who hate you, Yahweh?” (הֲלֹא-אֲשֹׁנֵא יְהוָה | יְהוָה). This portrayal is consistent with Ps 2’s depiction of Yahweh and his Anointed against whom the nations conspire (2:2; cf. vv. 11–12).

Finally, Pss 31 and 62—also Davidic psalms—may echo the confession in Deut 7:9–10. The concluding verse of Ps 62 declares that דָּקָה belongs to God because (כִּי) “you will render (תַּשְׁלֵם) to a man according to his work.” In addition to this lexical overlap with Deut 7:9–10, however, the causal connection between Yahweh’s דָּקָה and his reprisal (שָׁלַם)⁵²¹ in Ps 62:13 reflects a subtle difference in meaning from Deut 7:9–10. Whereas Deut 7 reserves Yahweh’s דָּקָה for “those who love him etc.” and his reprisal (שָׁלַם...שָׁלַם) for “those who hate him,” Ps 62 connects Yahweh’s דָּקָה more immediately with his reprisal. Nevertheless, Ps 62:13’s clear association of Yahweh’s reprisal (שָׁלַם) with his דָּקָה suggests a recognizable echo of Deut 7:9–10 and its confession of God’s faithfulness. Psalm 31:24 also makes a similar confession to that of Deut 7:9–10. Psalm 31:24 reads, “Love (אֶהְבֶּבֶ) Yahweh, all you his saints (כָּל-חַסְדֵי-יְיָ)! Yahweh preserves the faithful (אֶמְוִנִים) but abundantly repays (וַיִּשְׁלַם) the one who acts in pride.” Admittedly the nouns דָּקָה and מְנַא differ in form from their cognates in Deut 7:9 (דָּקָה and הַנְּאֻמָּן) and refer to Yahweh’s *people* rather than qualities of Yahweh himself. But like Deut 7:9–10 (and Exod 20:5–6/Deut 5:9), Ps 31:24 confesses the same two-fold response of Yahweh

⁵²¹ שָׁלַם occurs some 17 times in the Psalter. All but 62:13 have a human subject, most often in the context of fulfilling vows. See “Oath (שָׁבַע)” below.

to humanity and expresses Yahweh's reprisal via the same piel pt. **מִשְׁלֵם** found in Deut 7:10 (but not in Exod 20:5–6/Deut 5:9, which use the verb **פָּקַד**). Moreover, the allusion is shored up by its command that Yahweh's people "love (**יֵאָהֲבֵהוּ**) Yahweh," which seems to echo Deut 7:9's "those who love him" (**לְיֹהֲבָיו**) in particular and throughout Deuteronomy in general as noted earlier (see above).

In summary, Ps 89 contains the clearest allusions to Deut 7:9's confession of Yahweh's faithfulness, but it seems likely that editors perceived allusions to it in Pss 31, 36, 62, 92, 98, and 100. Of course, these allusions to Deut 7:9 primarily concern Yahweh's character as he relates to his covenant people, rather than an attribute of the covenant itself. Psalmists proclaim Yahweh as one who is faithful, both to his covenant and in repaying the wicked. But this also means that Deut 7:9 lends itself naturally to application beyond its *Mosaic* covenantal moorings: Yahweh is the faithful God and keeper of the *Davidic* covenant and steadfast love in Ps 89:29, 32, 34–35 (cf. 1 Kgs 8:23–26).⁵²² As noted above, Book IV's praise of Yahweh's faithful and steadfast love toward *Israel* (98:3) raises the question of what role *David* has with respect to the salvation of Yahweh's people envisioned in that Book. Finally, allusions to Yahweh's reprisal toward his haters (Deut 7:10) are divided evenly between Davidic psalms (68 and 139) and Asaph Pss 81 and 83. Thus, although echoes of Deut 7:9–10 are not confined to Davidic psalms, we see "David" echoing Deut 7's confession of Yahweh (31:34; 36:6; 62:12), the beneficiary of God's faithfulness (Ps 89), or aligning himself with Yahweh in terms reminiscent of Deut 7 (139).

David as New Moses: "Moses," the "Song of the Sea," Sinai/Horeb, and the Land-Giving

Our main exploration of "David" as a Moses-like intercessor is in Chapter Six's investigation of the grace formula in the Psalter. However it also bears exploring whether or to what extent the characterization of David as a Moses-like intercessor might reflect other related

⁵²² Indeed, the same ensues for Exod 34:6–7; both are confessions about *Yahweh*.

“Mosaic” characteristics as well. Since Pentateuch sets Moses’ intercessory role in the broader context of exodus/Sinai/land-giving, a larger question bears asking: did editors view “David” as Moses-like intercessor also within a broader context of a “new” exodus-like salvation? To the extent that this possibility can be demonstrated it would add to the evidence that they indeed viewed “David” this way, further fill out that picture in the process. (Indeed, the previous section briefly noted features in Pss 98 and surrounding psalms that point in this direction).

Before examining evidence from the Psalter, Dale Allison argues convincingly that another postexilic work, the Books of Chronicles, proffers a typological relationship between Moses and David. If correct, Allison’s observations further substantiate the plausibility of the Psalter’s editors viewing David as a “new Moses.” After noting several points of similarity between Moses and David,⁵²³ Allison cites 1 Chron 22:6–13 where David charges Solomon to build the temple, pointing out numerous similarities that cast David in a Mosaic mold. Allison writes,

The venerable king told Solomon that God would be with him (v. 11), enjoined him to keep the law (v. 12), reminded him that keeping the law would bring prosperity (v. 13), and entreated him to be strong and of good courage, and not be afraid or dismayed (v. 13). All this irresistibly recalls the commissioning stories in Deuteronomy 31 and Joshua 1. According to these, Moses, near the end of his days, along with God told Joshua that God would be with him (Deut. 31:8, 23; Josh. 1:5), enjoined him to keep the law (Josh. 1:7–8), reminded him that keeping the law

⁵²³ Dale C. Allison Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 1993), 35–36, observes that both Moses and David were shepherds, both called “man of God” (אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים); Allison cites Deut 33:1; Josh 14:6; Ps 90:1; Ezra 3:2; 1 Chron 23:14; and 2 Chron 30:16 for Moses, and Neh 12:24 and 2 Chron 8:14 for David), and both applauded for doing right in Yahweh’s eyes with specific exceptions (for Moses the Meribah incident in Num 20 and for David “the matter of Uriah the Hittite” [1 Kgs 15:5] related in 2 Sam 11). Allison notes that besides the Midrash on Ps 1:1 comparison of Moses and David is surprisingly scarce in Rabbinic literature. However “the Hebrew Bible,” says Allison, 36, “does contain one book in which David plays the part of Moses...1Chronicles.”

would bring prosperity (Josh. 1:8), and entreated him to be strong and of good courage, and not be afraid or dismayed (Deut. 31:7–8, 23; Josh 1:9).⁵²⁴

For Allison these similarities signal more than simply the Chronicler’s intent to model Solomon’s succession after Joshua’s; they also reflect a conscious interest in *David* as a Moses-like figure. Here Allison turns to 1 Chron 28:11–19, where David gives Solomon the pattern (תַּבְּנִיט) for the temple and furnishings. Noting its obvious dependence on Exod 25–31 (cf. תַּבְּנִיט in Exod 25:9), Allison observes that, “[j]ust as Moses was directly given by God the plans for the tabernacle, so too David; and just as Moses handed on the plans to Bezalel (Exod 31:3; 35:30–35), similarly did David hand on the plans he received to Solomon.”⁵²⁵ Since Exodus 25 has Bezalel in view and not Joshua, Allison argues that the Moses/David comparison must have a greater significance than simply the Chronicler’s interest in establishing Solomon as the legitimate Davidic successor. Indeed, it seems that the Chronicler sought to cast David with “a Moses type authority” as Allison suggests,⁵²⁶ indicating that a similar perspective on the part of those who edited the Psalter is very plausible.

So what of the Psalter *per se*? Is David presented as a “new Moses” there too? Chapter Six addresses that question more directly, but our present purpose of surveying the Psalter is an important preliminary step, for it shows that Moses and Moses-related events turn up frequently in the Psalter in ways that illicit this very question. For instance, some significantly placed psalms explicitly recall the exodus (and sometimes the land-giving also). Psalms 74 and 89, for

⁵²⁴ Allison, *The New Moses*, 37. To these similarities Allison, 38, adds that “the sequence of a private commissioning of Solomon followed by a public commissioning, found in 1 Chronicles 22 and 28” finds parallel in Joshua in Deut 31:14–15 and Josh 1, and that “the association of the concept of rest with Solomon and the building of the temple (1 Chron. 22:9) depends upon the Book of Joshua, where rest is the prerequisite for the assembling of the tent of meeting at Shiloh (see esp. Josh 11:23 and 18:1).”

⁵²⁵ Allison, *The New Moses*, 39.

⁵²⁶ Allison, *The New Moses*, 39.

example, recall God’s might against Egypt as they make their laments about the destroyed sanctuary and cast-off king at the beginning and end of Book III.⁵²⁷ Likewise, several Asaph psalms and the historical psalms (78, 105–106) make generous reference to the exodus.⁵²⁸ These instances attest to its importance in the Psalter. As is the case throughout the OT, the exodus is the major salvific event in Israel’s memory, and psalmists evoke its memory when petitioning God for salvation or or instructing the people about it. Accordingly, we shall examine some key exodus-related criteria in order to explore whether editors understood the exodus as a paradigm Yahweh’s anticipated salvation for his people by his “servant” David (see below).

Another obvious criterion is the name “Moses” itself. It is widely recognized that seven of the Psalter’s eight mentions of “Moses” occur in Book IV; the remaining instance being Ps 77:21 (Book III).⁵²⁹ Interestingly, James Borger concludes that Book IV’s recollections of Moses emphasize his intercessory role in particular.⁵³⁰ This raises the question of *how* Book IV appropriates this emphasis on Mosaic intercession. Chapter Six takes up that question more directly as it analyzes Book Four’s appropriation of Pss 101–103 to explore the possibility that

⁵²⁷ See Ps 74:12–17 (esp. v. 13). Psalm 89:11 declares, “you crushed Rahab (רַהַב) like a carcass; you scattered your enemies with your mighty arm (בְּיָדְךָ אֱמִינִי),” which likely refers to the Exodus given that Rahab usually denotes Egypt (cf. “רַהַב,” *BDB* 758; “רַהַב,” *TWOT* 834). Moreover, Yahweh’s “arm” (יָד) is the oft-cited instrument of the deliverance from Egypt. Cf.: Exod 6:6; 15:16; Deut 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 9:29; 11:2; and 26:8.

⁵²⁸ Psalms 77:12–20; 78:12–13, 43–53; 80:9–12; 81:5–8, 11; 105:23–45; 106:7–33 (vv. 34–46 relate the Israelites’ faithlessness in the land). See also Pss 66:6; 68 (e.g. vv. 7–11); 83:10–13; 114:1–8; 135:8–11 (v. 12 relates the land-giving).

Moreover, McCann, *A Theological Introduction*, 147–49, finds allusions between “Zion” Ps 48 and the Song of the Sea, though via more subtle linguistic and thematic connections (e.g., “panic” in Ps 48:6 and Exod 15:15; “east wind” in Ps 48:7 and Exod 14:21; and the “mountain”/“place” where Yahweh reigns in Exod 15:17–18 as “precisely what Ps 48 is about”). Indeed, that Jerusalem and temple should be theologically equated with the Sinai sanctuary (to which he was bringing his people in the first exodus) is consistent with Ps 68 examined briefly below.

⁵²⁹ Psalms 90:1; 99:6 103:7; 105:26; 106:16, 23, and 32.

⁵³⁰ Borger, “Moses in the Fourth Book of the Psalter,” 173–74.

editors envisioned a Davidic intercessor in this classically Mosaic role. Besides “Moses,” other pertinent criteria include allusions to the “Song of the Sea” (Exod 15), Sinai/Horeb, and the Land-Giving.

The Song of the Sea (and Psalms 33, 96, 98, 149)

Although numerous psalms recall the exodus and wilderness wanderings, possible allusions to the Song of the Sea (Exod 15:1–18) in Pss 33, 96, 98, 144, and 149 raise important possibilities for our investigation. Besides several other psalms that contain the imperative, “sing [to Yahweh],”⁵³¹ Pss 33:3, 96:1[–2], 98:1, and 149:1 call for a *new* song to Yahweh (שִׁירוּ לַיהוָה) שִׁירוּ לַיהוָה (שִׁירוּ לַיהוָה); cf. “this song” [הַשִּׁירָה הַזֹּאת] and the importance of the name “Yahweh” in Exod 15:1–3). Moreover, in Davidic Ps 144:9 David announces, “I will sing to you a new song, O God” (אֲלֵהִים שִׁיר חֲדָשׁ אֲשִׁירָה לָךְ). Similarly, Isa 42:10 echoes this same command to sing a new song in Isaiah’s “Book of Comfort” (Isa 40–55), which regularly recalls exodus themes as it announces Yahweh’s “new” exodus-like salvation for his exiled people.⁵³² This comes shortly after announcing the central figure in Yahweh’s new exodus (besides Cyrus) in the first “Servant Song” (vv. 1–6). Indeed, scholars have demonstrated various lexical, theological, and phraseological similarities between Isaiah 40–55 and Book IV that imply some kind of relationship between them. Such similarities add weight to the idea that the “new songs” in Pss 96 and 98 imply a new exodus as in Isaiah.⁵³³

In the previous section we noted that Pss 93–99, a group to which Wilson attributes great editorial importance, calls for a “new song” (Pss 96 and 98) interspersed between the “Yahweh Reigns” psalms (Pss 93, [96:10], 97, [98:6], 99; cf. יְהוָה | יִמְלֹךְ לְעֹלָם וָעֶד in Exod 15:18).

⁵³¹ Pss 68:5, 33; and 105:2.

⁵³² For example, 43:13–19 and 51:9–12, and Yahweh’s call to “go out” in 48:20 (N.B. v. 21’s wilderness wandering motif of “water from the rock”) and 52:10–12.

⁵³³ See, e.g., Jerome F. D. Creach, “The Shape of Book Four of the Psalter and the Shape of Second Isaiah,” *JSOT* 80 (1998): 63–76.

Already we have seen that these psalms accentuate God’s “salvation” and “right hand “(96:2; 98:1–2). Additionally, Pss 96 and 98 highlight themes that resonate well with the first exodus and Yahweh’s purpose of bringing them to Sinai to worship him. These include the themes of judgment over the nations and earth (Pss 96:10, 13; cf. 99:4), “his wonders among the nations” (96:3), denunciation of idols/gods of the nations (96:4–5), and call to worship in the sanctuary/mountain (96:6–9; cf. 99:9 and entrance liturgies Pss 95 and 100). Moreover, Ps 99:6–8 explicitly recalls Moses and Aaron, the pillar of cloud, and Yahweh’s forgiveness.⁵³⁴ Found throughout Pss 93–100, these similarities can hardly be coincidental, especially given the editorial unity of these psalms in Book IV.⁵³⁵

So are there other clear allusions to the Song of the Sea in the Psalms that would suggest its prominence in the Psalter? Besides Pss 96 and 98, psalms that declare a “new song” include Pss 33:3 and 149:1. Of these, anonymous Ps 33 has been Davidized by its placement in Book I, reflecting an editorial move to make David the “announcer” of a new song. Correspondingly, Ps 149 is the penultimate psalm of the great Laudate that concludes the Psalter—again introduced by David in 145:21 as discussed earlier. This suggests that editors viewed “David” as one who announces a “new song,” leading the people in praise of Yahweh as Moses had done (Exod 15).

A few other psalms contain strong echoes. In Ps 59:17–18 the psalmist says, “I will sing of your strength (עֲזָרָתִי אֲשִׁיר עֲזָרָתִי)...O my Strength (עֲזָרָתִי).” Similarly, the Song of the Sea opens

⁵³⁴ McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 75–76, 133–34, 151–52, 293–94, similarly argues for conscious allusions to the Song of the Sea in Pss 93, 98, and 99.

⁵³⁵ Howard, *The Structure of Psalms 93–100*. Though somewhat outside his purpose, it is surprising that Howard does not examine these points in common with the Song of the Sea. This goes for most commentators. For example, Mays, *The Lord Reigns*, 140–41, examines connections between Ps 118 and Exod 15, while McCann, *A Theological Introduction*, 147–49, explores connections between 48 and Exod 15. Despite both authors’ recognition of the importance of the 93–99(100) group within the Psalter, neither explores these psalms’ relationship to Exod 15 and possible significance for the editorial agenda of Psalter. On the other hand, see Barber, *Singing in the Reign*, 121–24, who recognizes these psalms as allusions to the exodus and Exod 15.

with “I will sing to Yahweh” (אָשִׁירָה לַיהוָה) whereupon “Yah” is called “my strength” in v. 2: עָנִי וְחֲמַרְתָּ לִּי. Psalm 118:14’s declaration, “Yahweh is my strength and my song; he has become my salvation” (עָנִי וְחֲמַרְתָּ יְהוָה וַיְהִי־לִי לְיִשׁוּעָה), exactly replicates Exod 15:2a, and v. 21 repeats the latter part in the second person, “you...have become my salvation” (וַתְּהִי־לִי לְיִשׁוּעָה).⁵³⁶ This is particularly significant because Ps 118 concludes the Egyptian Hallel group, with its other allusions to the exodus. Davidic Ps 140:8, “Yahweh, my Lord, the strength of my salvation” (יְהוָה אֱדָנִי עֹז יִשׁוּעָתִי) addresses Yahweh via two of the three terms in Exod 15:2a—albeit in a construct chain (עֹז יִשׁוּעָתִי) rather than joined by conjunction.⁵³⁷ These examples allow a few general observations. First, allusions to the Song of the Sea are not purely “historic,” nostalgic recollection of deliverance from the *Egyptian* slavery (e.g., Pss 59, 118, and 140), but applied to psalmists’ present circumstances.⁵³⁸ Second, many of these are Davidic, supporting the possibility that the “new song” belongs on the lips of David in a manner analogous to the first

⁵³⁶ Cf. Mays, *The Lord Reigns*, 140–41, as noted above. VanGemeren, *Psalms*, 206, also finds the language of vv. 17–20 reminiscent of the exodus. Indeed, the focus on rescue against enemies, the expression, “he brought me out” (וַיּוֹצֵאֲנִי) in v. 20, and the mention of “many waters” (מַיִם רַבִּים) in v. 17 all could point this way. However, v. 17, “he drew me out of many waters” (וַיִּמְשְׁגֵנִי מִמַּיִם רַבִּים) more likely recalls the naming of Moses in Exod 2:10 (כִּי מִן־הַמַּיִם מָשִׂיתָהוּ), so that the (Davidic!) psalmist likens his own rescue to that of the infant Moses (cf. Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1:266). Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, takes מַיִם רַבִּים as a reference to “chaos,” but this does not preclude allusion to Exod 2:10.

A couple other psalms potentially evoke Exod 15. The psalmist’s prayer that Yahweh say to him, “I am your salvation” (יִשְׁעָתֶךָ אֲנִי) in Ps 35:3 could evoke Exod 15:2 in light of Ps 35’s opening petition that Yahweh fight for him. Psalm 116:6b states, “when I was brought low, he saved me (וְלִי יְהוָה שִׁיעָה),” using the hiph. form of ישע with ל of advantage in contrast to Exod 15:2’s use of the cognate noun יִשׁוּעָה and possessive ל (cf. Williams, *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*, 106–107). But the resulting resemblance of Ps 116:6 to Exod 15:2 is faint at best.

⁵³⁷ See Appendix D.

⁵³⁸ By so recognizing the present experience of Yahweh as “my strength and my salvation” the psalmists seem to presuppose a fundamental continuity between the their current experience and relationship to Yahweh, on the one hand, and that of Israel’s experience and relationship to Yahweh in the archetypal act of deliverance in the exodus on the other. So evoking the memory of the exodus therefore associates the psalmist with those who, historically, were rescued and brought to the foot of Sinai.

song sung by Moses (33, 59, 140).⁵³⁹ Moreover, Pss 118, 140, and 149 reflect an increasing prominence of allusions to the Song of the Sea in Book V and the Psalter overall. This suggests that they are an important factor in understanding how the Pss 93–99(100) group relate to the wider context of the Psalter; a matter addressed further in Chapter Six. But rather than pit the kingship of David against that of Yahweh as Wilson does,⁵⁴⁰ Chapter Six explores the possibility that “David” is the instrumental leader of a new exodus in Book IV, and that Pss 93–99(100)’s “new song” is in some way attributed to him by virtue of the Davidic Pss 101–103 group immediately following.

“Sinai” (סִינַי) and “Horeb” (חֹרֵב)

“Sinai” occurs only twice; both times in Ps 68. According to the MT, v. 9 declares, “the earth quaked, the heavens poured down rain, before God (מִפְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים), the One of Sinai” (זֶה סִינַי),⁵⁴¹ before God, the God of Israel (מִפְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל).” Allowing for Ps 68’s preference for אֱלֹהִים over יְהוָה, identical phrases appear in Deborah’s song in Judg 5:5, which reads, “The mountains quaked before Yahweh, the One of Sinai (זֶה סִינַי),⁵⁴² before Yahweh, the God of Israel (מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל).”⁵⁴³ Sinai occurs again in v. 18 of Ps 68, where the

⁵³⁹ Cf. the potential editorial association of Ps 149 with David, and Ps 118’s quasi-royal character.

⁵⁴⁰ See Introduction.

⁵⁴¹ זֶה סִינַי is missing in a few MSS, so the BHS editors speculate that it may be a gloss. But see Dahood, *Psalms*, 2:139, “the deletion of this epithet as a gloss, lately sustained by I. L. Seeligmann in VT 14 (1964), 80, n. 1, and E. Vogt in *Biblica* 46 (1965), 208, disregards both Northwest Semitic usage and metrical exigencies.” Oddly, BHS apparatus accounts for the identical phrase in Judg 5:5 as an addition as well, without citing textual support.

⁵⁴² ESV has “even Sinai” for זֶה סִינַי, but cf. Dahood, *Psalms*, 2:139, just noted.

⁵⁴³ Other phraseological similarities with Judg 5 include a reference to the flight of the “kings of the armies” (מִלְכֵי צָבָאוֹת) and “division of the spoil” (דִּחְלֹק שָׁלַל) in v. 13 (cf. Judg 5:19: בָּאוּ מְלָכִים נִלְחָמוּ; and v. 30: (וַיִּחְלְקוּ שָׁלַל); the phrase, “among the sheepfolds” (בֵּין שֹׁפְתָיִם) in v. 14 (cf. Judg 5:16: הִמְשִׁפְּתָיִם); and the praise of Benjamin, Judah, Zebulun and Naphtali in v. 28 (cf. Judg 5:14, 18). Cf. also v. 18’s reference to “the chariots of God” (רֶכֶב אֱלֹהִים). Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:325, suggests that Pharaoh’s chariotry (cf. Exod 14–15) and Sisera’s (cf. Judg 4–5) are significant here.

psalmist questions the mountains of Bashan, “Why do you look with hatred, O many-peaked mountain, at the mount that God desired for his abode (הָהָר הַחֲמֹד אֱלֹהִים לְשִׁבְתּוֹ), yes, where Yahweh will dwell forever (יִשְׁכֵּן לְנֶצַח)? The chariots of God are twice ten thousand, thousands upon thousands; Yahweh is among them (אֲדֹנָי בָּם); Sinai is now in the sanctuary (בְּקִדְשׁ).” Here the psalmist explicitly recognizes the transference of God’s abode from Sinai to the sanctuary in Zion. Others take בְּקִדְשׁ to mean “in holiness” rather than “in the sanctuary,” but in either case vv. 25–27 envision a procession into the sanctuary, identified as the temple in Jerusalem in v. 30.⁵⁴⁴ Since Zion is a prominent theme throughout the Psalter it seems likely that editors perceived this movement from Sinai to Zion.⁵⁴⁵ Moreover, In light of Ps 78’s explicit connection between God’s election of Zion and David (cf. vv. 68–72), this shift from Sinai to Zion further suggests the essential unity between the Mosaic and Davidic covenants.

The name “Horeb” only occurs once in Ps 105:19, which relates the golden calf incident and therefore recalls a pivotal moment in Mosaic covenantal history.

The Gift of the Land

As we saw in the previous chapter, Ps 105 recalls the Abrahamic covenant as an historical event and presupposes historical continuity with the later Mosaic covenant (cf. vv. 26 and 45). It follows that the share important characteristics. Principal among them are the gift of the land and Israel’s status as a people belonging to Yahweh. The promise of land is first made to Abraham in Gen 15:7 and confirmed by Isaac to Jacob in Gen 28:4, and in each case Yahweh “gives” (נָתַן)

⁵⁴⁴ Hossfeld (Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 165) views vv. 18–19 as “the ascent of the Sinai God to his throne on Zion.” Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 166, who notes that “into the holy place” (i.e., “sanctuary”) is the most common rendering of בְּקִדְשׁ in c. 18 (cf. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 44). Goldingay, *Psalms*, 324, 328–29, translates “in holiness,” but understands Ps 68 to have in mind the movement of “the God of Sinai” to Zion.

⁵⁴⁵ See Gillingham, “The Zion Tradition and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter,” 308–41, who traces this important motif in the Psalter (see below). Cf. McCann, *A Theological Introduction*, 147–149, who sees a similar move from Sinai to Zion presupposed in Ps 48.

the “land” (אֶרֶץ) to “you to take possession” (ירש) of it.⁵⁴⁶ Thereafter Exod 34:24, Lev 20:24, and many places in Numbers and Deuteronomy repeat the promise via the verbs ירש or נתן both, often describing the land as the people’s “inheritance” (נַחֲלָה).⁵⁴⁷ Accordingly, the following survey traces instances אֶרֶץ is the object of ירש and/or נתן.

Several psalms unmistakably refer to God’s gift of the land: Ps 2:8; 25:13; 37:9, 11, 22, 29, 34; 44:3–4; 69:36; 105:11, 44; 111:6; 115:16; 135:12; 136:21–22. In Chapter Two we noted significant lexical overlap between Pss 2:8; 105:11, 44; and 111:6 (i.e., נתן, גוים, נַחֲלָה—as well as אֶרֶץ in Pss 2 and 105), raising the possibility that editors intended a connection between them. Psalms 135 and 136 also explicitly state that Yahweh “gives” (נתן) the “land” (אֶרֶץ), the latter two describing it further as an “inheritance” (נַחֲלָה).⁵⁴⁸ Psalm 2:8 is noteworthy because it presents the Abrahamic/Mosaic promise within a universal horizon and applies it to the Davidic king. Yahweh addresses his “king” (cf. v. 6), saying, “Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage (וְאֶתְנַהֵג גוֹיִם נַחֲלָתְךָ), and the ends of the earth (אֶפְסֵי־אֶרֶץ) your possession.” Thus, Yahweh will give (נתן) not merely “the land,” but the whole world and its nations as the king’s inheritance. We have already noted a similar “broadening” of Ps 105:11’s promise to the patriarchs later in that psalm (i.e., אֶרֶץ־כְּנָעַן חֻבַּל נַחֲלַתְכֶם in v. 11 becomes אֶרְצוֹת גוֹיִם in v. 44). Psalms 135:12 also resembles Ps 2:8 in its terminology: “and he gave their land as a

⁵⁴⁶ In Gen 15:7 Yahweh states his purpose in bringing Abram out of Ur: “to give you this land to possess” (לָקַחְתָּ לְךָ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לְרִשְׁתָּהּ). In Gen 28:4 Jacob

⁵⁴⁷ Numbers 14:24; 16:14; 18:20–24; 21:24, 35; 26:52–62; 27:6–11; 32:18–19, 32; 33:52–55; 34:2, 14–15; 36:1–13; Deut 1:8, 21; 2:24; 3:12, 18, 20; 4:1, 5, 14, 21, 26, 38; 5:31–33; 6:1, 18; 7:1; 8:1; 9:4–6, 23; 10:11; 11:8–11, 29–31; 12:1, 9–12, 29; 14:27–29; 15:4; 16:20; 17:14; 18:1–2; 19:1–2, 10, 14; 20:16; 21:23; 24:4; 25:19; 26:1; 29:7 and 30:5, 16. Many of these also cast the promise as a command (e.g., Num 33:52–55; Deut 1:8, 21; 2:24, 31; 9:23; 10:11) or as an accomplished fact (Num 21:24; Deut 3:12; 4:47. Cf. Deut 9:4).

⁵⁴⁸ Psalm 115:16 also combines these terms. But since it contrasts heaven as Yahweh’s realm and the earth as his gift to humanity (הַשָּׁמַיִם שְׁמַיִם לַיהוָה וְהָאָרֶץ נָתַן לְבְנֵי־אָדָם), its focus appears to be creation in general rather than the specific Abrahamic/Mosaic covenantal promise.

heritage, a heritage to his people Israel (וְנָתַן אֲרָצָם נַחֲלָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל עַמּוֹ). Significantly, we see this repeated almost identically in Ps 136:21a (וְנָתַן אֲרָצָם לְנַחֲלָה) and 22a (נַחֲלָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל) when we look beyond that psalm’s refrain (כִּי לְעוֹלָם חַסְדּוֹ) dividing these clauses, the main difference being the description of Israel as “his people” and “his servant” respectively. Moreover, the same can be said for 135:10–12 and 136:17–22 in spite of a few variations.⁵⁴⁹ These similarities between the two psalms produce concatenation between these psalms that attests to the editors’ particular interest in the theme of Israel’s inheriting the land of defeated kings and nations. Thus, Pss 105, 111, 135, and 136 all identify Israel/Yahweh’s people as those to whom Yahweh “gave their land.”

Wilson’s account of the Psalter’s composition history might interpret these psalms as an indication that later editors of Books IV–V replaced the earlier universalized promise to the *king* (i.e., Ps 2:8; cf. Ps 72) with a “democratized” view of Israel/Yahweh’s people as the beneficiaries of the promise. However analysis of these psalms *per se* suggests not the “democratization” of this promise of land but its “royalization.” Significantly, Ps 2:8 presents the promise as Yahweh’s direct invitation to “ask of me etc.” This invitation to petition Yahweh is, on face value, the means by which Israel’s historic, pre-exilic possession of land would be realized on a universal scale. Significantly, it is the *king* who is to “ask of me,” making him central—even instrumental—in the realization of this promise. On the other hand, when Pss 105, 111, 135, and 136 relate the promise of land it is in the context of historical reflection, exemplifying Yahweh’s power and his faithfulness to his people (cf. 105:1–2; 111:4–6; 135:5–6; 136:4).⁵⁵⁰

⁵⁴⁹ In 135:10 and 136:17a and 18a Yahweh “strikes” (נָכַח) and “kills kings” (מְלָכִים + הָרַג), and in 135:11ab and 136:19a and 20a identically single out the kings Sihon and Og (מֶלֶךְ הָאֱמֹרִי וְלָעוֹג מֶלֶךְ הַבְּשָׁן).

⁵⁵⁰ Admittedly, Ps 111 is the most subtly “historic” of these four psalms, alluding more vaguely to the exodus (v. 4), manna/quail (v. 5a), and land-giving (v. 6) to proclaim Yahweh’s ongoing covenant faithfulness (v. 5b).

It is interesting that instances where אָרֶץ is the object of יָרַשׁ are mostly confined to Books I–II: Pss 25, 37, 44, and 69 (also Ps 105:44 just noted, adding their possession of “the fruit of the peoples’ toil” [וְעַמְּלֵל לְאֶמְּיָם]). Wisdom Pss 25 and 37 are both Davidic and refer to “possessing the land” for didactic rather than historical purposes. In Ps 25:13 it is the “man who fears Yahweh” (הָאִישׁ יִרְאֵהוּ) whose “seed” (זֶרַע) will inherit the earth (see previous chapter). In Ps 37 it is “those who wait for Yahweh” (וְקוֹנֵי יְהוָה in v. 9), “the meek” (וְעֲנָוִים in v. 11), “those blessed by Yahweh” (מְבָרְכֵי in v. 22),⁵⁵¹ and the “righteous” (צַדִּיקִים in v. 29) who “inherit the land,” with v. 34 urging the reader to, “wait for Yahweh and keep his way (וְשָׁמַר) (דְּרָכָו), and he will exalt you to inherit the land.” Psalm 25 follows directly from Pss 15–24’s accentuation on the *king* (see above), which could reflect editorial intent to give greater focus to the king as the quintessential God-fearer who inherits the land.⁵⁵²

While many of the Psalter’s casual references to “the land” probably have the Abrahamic promise in the background,⁵⁵³ only those surveyed above explicitly reiterate the promise itself through a combination of key terms. Nevertheless, the Psalter’s use of אָרֶץ in formulae that accentuate its *universalized* scope also proves interesting. In Davidic Ps 22:28, “all the ends of the earth (כָּל-אַפְסֵי-אָרֶץ) shall remember and turn to Yahweh” is followed by the reference to “all the families of the nations” (כָּל-מִשְׁפְּחוֹת גּוֹיִם)—a probable allusion to the Abrahamic covenantal promise in Gen 12:3. In this context, at least, the expression “all the ends of the earth” appears to universalize the promise to Abraham in a manner comparable to Ps 2:8’s universalized presentation of the motif with the expression אַפְסֵי-אָרֶץ. Davidic Ps 67:8 also uses

⁵⁵¹ LXX has οἱ εὐλογοῦντες αὐτόν (= מְבָרְכֵי), “those who bless him.”

⁵⁵² Regarding the other two instances in Pss 44 and 69, Ps 44:3–4 reflects historically on the conquest, crediting Yahweh with “driving out the nations” (אֶתְהַרְגֵן יְדָדָה גּוֹיִם הוֹרֵשֶׁתָּ) and denying that this came about through the people’s military power (כִּי לֹא בַחֲרֻבָם יִרְשׁוּ אָרֶץ), while in Ps 69:36–37 “Zion” and “the cities of Judah” are what “they” will possess (וְיִרְשׁוּהָ) and “the offspring of his servants (זֶרַע עַבְדָּיו) shall inherit it (נָחֵל).”

⁵⁵³ אָרֶץ occurs some one hundred ninety times altogether!

the same expression, “let all *the ends of the earth* fear him (אֵרָא),” and so combines the essence of Ps 2:8 and 11 in the one jussive clause (cf. Pss 76:13; 102:16, where “[all] the kings of the earth fear” Yahweh). Even more significant from an editorial viewpoint, however, is Ps 72 at the end of Book II, which uses this expression to describe David’s successor’s universal dominion in v. 8, “may he have dominion... from the River to the ends of the earth (עַד־אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ).” In light of the homage that “all kings” and “all nations” ought to pay the king in v. 11 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ־לּוֹ (כָּל־מְלָכִים כָּל־גּוֹיִם יַעֲבֹדוּהוּ), Ps 72 clearly echoes these central concerns from Ps 2, so that Pss 2 and 72 enclose Books I–II with the universal rule of Yahweh’s king and the subjection of all kings and nations. These data show that the Psalter’s universalized vision/promise of land has strong royal entailments.⁵⁵⁴

Summary. The exodus and land-giving are clearly very prominent themes in the Book of Psalms. Besides explicit recollections of the exodus, allusions to the Song of the Sea and the land-giving seem often to presuppose a new reactualization of God’s mighty acts and promises. That is, God’s rescue of this people and gift of the land serve as a theological paradigm for his future exodus-like restoration of his people and universal rule over all nations. Critically, the preceding study found that the king is often focal in realizing the reactualization of these mighty acts and promises. Psalms 33, 59, 118, 140, and 149’s allusions to Exod 15’s Song of the Sea were especially noteworthy in this regard, for they suggest that Psalter in some measure reactualizes that Song and its associated exodus traditions and demonstrate “David’s” prominent role in announcing it. Indeed, this further justifies Chapter Six’s exploration of “David’s” role regarding Pss 96 and 98’s “new songs.” Indeed, our analysis of allusions to the land-giving yielded similar conclusions.

If editors did indeed view “David” as a Moses-like intercessor as proposed in our hypothesis, the prominence of the exodus and “new song” suggests that this might indeed be set

⁵⁵⁴ Vaguer echoes are also possible in other instances of אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ (e.g., Pss 59:14; 67:8; 98:3).

in a broader context of related “Mosaic” characteristics. Indeed, these added points of similarity further suggest that editors viewed “David” as Moses-like, adding yet greater plausibility to our hypothesis as well.

David as Royal Servant and Son of Yahweh

The characterization of the king as Yahweh’s “servant” and “Son” is prominent in the Psalter. David is Yahweh’s “servant” in Pss 18:1 and 78:70 and his “son” in Pss 2:7, 12 and 89:27, most of which occupy places of high editorial significance, justifying further exploration.

The Servant-Lord (עֲבָד/אֲדֹנָי) Relationship. According to Paul Kalluveettil the terms אֲדֹנָי and עֲבָד frequently evoke the covenantal relationship that exists between suzerain and vassal.⁵⁵⁵ Of its thirteen occurrences in the Psalter, אֲדֹנָי has the 1st pl. possessive suffix four times in unambiguous reference to Yahweh as “our lord” (אֲדֹנָינוּ in Pss 8:2, 10; 135:5; and 147:5).⁵⁵⁶ Psalm 114:7 parallels אֲדֹנָי with אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְעֻקֵּב, possibly expressing the same idea. Accordingly, these instances seem to evoke the covenantal relationship that exists between Yahweh and his people. Other instances of אֲדֹנָי, however, only accentuate Yahweh’s superiority without necessarily evoking a covenant relationship.⁵⁵⁷

The term עֲבָד can also imply a covenant relationship to varying degrees, depending on context.⁵⁵⁸ Indeed, עֲבָד occurs some fifty-seven times in the Psalter, often as a self-referential

⁵⁵⁵ See esp. Kalluveettil, *Declaration and Covenant*, 66–79, 119–22, 186–97.

⁵⁵⁶ Psalm 45:12 (אֲדֹנָיָהּ) refers to the king as אֲדֹנָי to the “daughter” mentioned in v. 11. In Ps 110:1 (אֲדֹנָי לְאֲדֹנָי יְהוָה) Yahweh addresses the king, the psalmist’s אֲדֹנָי.

⁵⁵⁷ Psalm 123:2 cites the relationship between “servants” (עֲבָדֵימֶ) and “their masters” (אֲדֹנָיֵהֶם) as a simile to denote the people’s dependence on Yahweh, rather than that of suzerain and vassal. Similarly, the expression אֲדֹנָיִם אֲדֹנָיִם in Ps 136:3 employs the term twice to express Yahweh’s superiority as a superlative, but without any obvious covenant associations. This also appears to be the case for אֲדֹנָי קִלְיָהָ אֲרָץ in Ps 97:5. Of the remaining instances, אֲדֹנָי occurs in the rhetorical question, “who is master over us?” in 12:5, and refers to Joseph’s lordship over Egypt in 105:21.

⁵⁵⁸ Kalluveettil, *Declaration and Covenant*, 67, views the concept עֲבָד and “the covenant of vassalage” as “inseparable,” apparently viewing all relational contexts in which the term appears in covenantal terms.

term by psalmists.⁵⁵⁹ Moreover, it is also clear that עבד describes David in covenantal relationship to Yahweh in Ps 89:2–4, where there is a close connection between Yahweh’s חסד and David’s status as Yahweh’s servant.

Given its editorial prominence in the Psalter, Ps 89’s identification of David as Yahweh’s עבד and its overtly covenantal language (cf. also Ps 78) suggests that editors likely had the David-Yahweh covenantal relationship in view whenever psalms identify David as “servant of Yahweh” in psalms. This occurs when “David” and עבד appear together in the body or superscript of a psalm (e.g., Pss 18:1; 78:70), or when the psalmist is described as “Yahweh’s servant” via עבד with the appropriate pronominal suffix in psalms attributed to David. Accordingly, Pss 18:1; 19:12, 14; 27:9; 31:7; 35:27;⁵⁶⁰ 36:1; 69:18; 78:70; 86:2, 4, 16; 89:4, 21, 40; 109:28; 132:10; 143:2, 12; and 144:10 evoke the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and David describing David as “Yahweh’s servant.” Interestingly, in Ps 143:12 “David” confidently declares that, “in your steadfast love (חֶסֶד) you will cut off my enemies, and you will destroy all the adversaries of my soul, *for I am your servant* (כִּי אֲנִי עַבְדְּךָ).” It therefore seems that “David” anticipates Yahweh’s fulfillment of the Davidic covenantal promise in 2 Sam

⁵⁵⁹ Scholars disagree on whether a psalmist’s self-reference as Yahweh’s עבד reflects an appeal to obligate Yahweh to act in his favor on the basis of the covenant, or if the psalmist uses it purely to express his loyalty and dependency. Edward J. Bridge, “Loyalty, Dependency and Status with YHWH: The Use of ‘bd in the Psalms,” (*VT* 59 [2009]), 360–78 (esp. 377), favors the latter, concluding that “the psalms in which עבד appears do not emphasize any obligation for YHWH to answer favorably, except maybe in Pss 86:16 and 143:12,” and that “עבד is not normally a term that indicates a reciprocal relationship with YHWH.” Bridge further explains “עבד as indicating loyalty to YHWH is an emotional argument of YHWH to answer supplication.” On the other hand, John H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms* (London: Student Christian Movement, 1976), 149–50, and Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:513 and 621, point out that some psalms emphasize Yahweh’s commitment to David while describing him as Yahweh’s עבד (e.g., Pss 78:70; 86:2). The psalmist’s dependency on Yahweh is, of course, part and parcel of the covenantal relationship, and any “obligation” on Yahweh’s part is self-imposed within the covenant. That is, Yahweh binds himself to his promises, giving David a firm basis on which to make his appeal as Yahweh’s dependent.

⁵⁶⁰ The 3d m. sg. suffix occurs in Ps 35:27 (עַבְדֶּיךָ), but here the psalmist reports the speech of others in which “servant” refers to the psalmist.

7:11 to “give you rest from all your enemies” (וְהִנְיָחוּתִי לְךָ מִכָּל-אֹיְבָיִךָ); a vision generally shared by Ps 2 at the beginning of the Psalter as well (cf. vv. 7–9). Of special note is that in 143:12 David expects this promise to be realized on the basis of his relationship to Yahweh as his עֶבֶד.

Concerning the remaining instances of עֶבֶד in non-Davidic psalms, several observations bear making. First, עֲבַדְתִּי occurs in Ps 116:16 and thirteen times in Ps 119:17, 23, 38, 49, 65, 76, 84, 122, 124, 125, 135, 140, and 176 as a self-reference to their anonymous psalmists. In fact, this is the only 1st sg. suffixed noun to function this way in Ps 119. Moreover, Davidic Ps 86 uses עֲבַדְתִּי the same way three times.⁵⁶¹ Thus, the use of עֲבַדְתִּי in Ps 119 may provide further evidence for Grant’s identification of the psalmist as a royal figure, especially when compared with Ps 78:70’s similar description of David as עֲבַדְתִּי; a psalm whose length and centrality make it stand out within the Asaph group in a way similar to Ps 119 in Book V (see Chapter Six). Second, Abraham is Yahweh’s עֶבֶד twice in historical Ps 105 (vv. 6 and 42), where its covenantal focus is clear (see Chapter Three). The same psalm also identifies Moses as Yahweh’s עֶבֶד (Ps 105:26; cf. Deut 34:5), paralleling it with “Aaron whom he chose (בָּחַר).” This mention of Aaron and the signs they performed “in the land of Ham” (v. 27) highlights their role as agents through whom Yahweh rescued the people from Egypt (vv. 27–38) and fed them in the wilderness (vv. 39–41). עֲבָדָה therefore seems to entail much more than just an honorific title. Finally, עֶבֶד appears seventeen times in the plural (Pss 34:23; 69:37; 79:2, 10; 89:51; 90:13, 16; 102:15, 29; 105:25; 113:1; 119:91; 123:2; 134:1; 135:1, 9, 14); always in reference to God’s people (cf. עֲבָדָיו in Ps 136:22, which refers to Israel collectively). Given that עֲבָדִים reflects the people’s relationship to Yahweh, it seems likely that these instances primarily evoke the Abrahamic/Mosaic covenantal identity of Yahweh’s worshipping people. Yet these instances give little reason to think that the people *replace* David as the “servant of Yahweh” within some

⁵⁶¹ Psalm 86:2 pairs the plea “save your servant” (הוֹשֵׁעַ עֲבַדְתִּי) with “you are my God” (אַתָּה אֱלֹהָי), and v. 4 connects עֲבַדְתִּי with its corresponding term אֲדַנִּי. Twice, then, Ps 86 expresses both sides of the covenant relationship: Yahweh as אֱלֹהָי/אֱלֹהֵי, and the Davidic psalmist as עֲבַדְתִּי.

democratizing agenda, as is often suggested for Isa 55:3–5 (cf. עֲבָדֵי יְהוָה in 54:17).⁵⁶² As noted, Ps 105:25 describes Yahweh’s people as “his servants” (בְּעַבְדָּיו) right before the mention of Moses “his servant.” There the relationship between the many and the one certainly does *not* involve the many “taking over” the one. On the contrary, Yahweh delivers and provides for his *servants* through his *servant*—a dynamic equally plausible for the relationship between David as “servant” and the people as “servants” (cf. Ps 89:51). Chapter Six’s investigation of Book Three takes this up further.

Father-Son. The Psalter use of another epithet, Yahweh’s “son” (בֶּן), offers a view consistent with this. Most of the Psalter’s one hundred three instances of בֶּן are used to denote “children” in a general sense or other familiar relationships (e.g., בְּנֵי אִמִּי as equivalent of אֶחָיו in 69:9), or in common idioms such as “son of man” (בֶּן־אָדָם; שָׂרֵשׁ; בְּנֵי אָדָם), gentilic expressions (e.g., בְּנֵי־יַעֲקֹב in 77:16, or בְּנֵי־אֶפְרַיִם in 78:9), authorial attributions to the Korahites (לְבָנֵי־קָרַח), etc. Here, however, we are concerned with cases where there is an implied “father-

⁵⁶² So, e.g., Tucker, “Democratization and the Language of the Poor in Psalms 2–89,” 164–65, and Otto Eissfeldt, “The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55:1–5,” in *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson; New York: Harper, 1962), 196–207. Cf. Goldingay, *The Message of Isaiah 40–55*, 547. On the other hand, Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Doubleday, 2002), 370, expresses doubts about Eissfeldt’s interpretation, which “goes some way beyond what the author says,” and raises the difficulty of why the author would use the analogy of Yahweh’s commitment to David if not persuaded of its permanence.

Appealing to this supposedly similar theological move in Isa 55, Tucker, “Democratization and the Language of the Poor in Psalms 2–89,” 172–73, believes the plural עַבְדֵי in Ps 89:51 signals the democratization of the Davidic covenantal promises to the poor; i.e., the people. Tucker rightly observes that, “[i]n v. 50 [= MT 51] it is the עַבְדֵי who are taunted, in verse 51 [= MT 52] it is the מֶלֶךְ.” A natural reading of vv. 51–52 suggests king (מֶלֶךְ) and people (עַבְדֵי) are both in view here, their fortunes intertwined (see Chapter Three). However, to press the argument for a democratizing agenda in Ps 89 Tucker suggests that, “[a]lthough מֶלֶךְ appears in the singular, it should probably be read in light of the plural, עַבְדֵי, found in v. 50” (= MT 51). This is a remarkable conclusion given Ps 89’s primary focus on the fortunes of the king, and shows the fragility of arguments that fundamentally reread royal terms like “king” or “anointed” as metonyms for the people, let alone assuming a democratizing agenda based on perceived parallels to texts like Isa 55:3.

son” relationship between *Yahweh* and another person or people. Instances where בן is potentially used in this way include: Pss 2:7; 73:15; 80:16,18; 86:16; 89:27; 116:6; and perhaps 147:13.⁵⁶³ According to Kalluveettil, ANE expressions like “I am your son (בן), you are my father (אב)” can be applied to different kinds of relationships besides that between a god and a king. Indeed, in Exod 4:23 *Yahweh* refers to *Israel* as “my son” (בני) rather than a king.⁵⁶⁴ However the Psalter’s appropriation of father/son motif reflects an exclusive interest in the *king* as *Yahweh*’s son, seen most obviously in Pss 2 and 89’s appropriation of 2 Sam 7:14.⁵⁶⁵

In Ps 2:7 *Yahweh* declares to the king (vv. 2, 6), “You are my son, today I have begotten you” (בני אתה אָנִי הַיּוֹם יְלִדְתִּיךָ). The covenantal character of *Yahweh*’s words is clear from their similarity to adoption formulae.⁵⁶⁶ Psalm 2:7 identifies this declaration of *Yahweh* as *Yahweh*’s קֶּטֶן (decree)—a functional synonym for (the Davidic) “covenant” in this context. Indeed, the allusion to Nathan’s oracle in 2 Sam 7:14 (“I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son”) is unmistakable. But whereas *Yahweh* applies the promise of “father-son” relationship to David’s *seed* in Nathan’s oracle, in Ps 2:7 *Yahweh* declares it directly to a royal person whom he addresses. Therefore Ps 2 alludes to this Davidic covenantal promise in a manner that implies its fulfillment with the royal addressee. The Psalter thus introduces *Yahweh*’s anointed as one in whom God’s promise to David in 2 Sam 7:14 finds fulfillment.⁵⁶⁷

⁵⁶³ Another expressions may imply a father-son relationship with *Yahweh* to similar effect, e.g., “children of the most high” (בְּנֵי עֶלְיוֹן in 82:6; cf. “sons of gods” [בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים] in 29:1 and 89:7?).

⁵⁶⁴ N.B., LXX has τὸν λαόν μου. This is not to deny *Israel*’s royal status by virtue of this Father-Son relationship with *Yahweh* the King (cf. Exod 15:18), and Exodus’ intentional comparison between the *Yahweh*-*Israel* relationship and that between Pharaoh and his firstborn in Exod 4:23.

⁵⁶⁵ This element commonly leads scholars to classify Ps 110 among the royal psalms, which are themselves identified by terminology and themes that reflect the Davidic covenant. See the discussion in Bullock, *Encountering the Book of Psalms*, 178–180.

⁵⁶⁶ Kalluveettil, *Declaration and Covenant*, 130.

⁵⁶⁷ No doubt Ps 2’s probable use in coronation ceremonies explains why *Yahweh* should address the king directly as his son, and not merely refer to the king’s seed as such, as in 2 Sam 7:14. The (pre-exilic) king being

Psalm 89:27 offers an analogous combination: “He shall cry to me, “You are my Father, my God, and the Rock of my salvation” (הוא יִקְרָאֵנִי אָבִי אֶתְהָא אֱלֹהֵי וְצוּר יְשׁוּעָתִי). Here Yahweh reports the *king*’s declaration of the formula (אָבִי אֶתְהָא) and invocation of the covenant formula in the process (אֱלֹהֵי; see above).⁵⁶⁸

Kalluveettil also raises the possibility that Ps 116:6 (discussed above) combines the “servant” and “son” formulae: “Yahweh, I am your servant; I am your servant, your faithful son” (אָנֹכִי יְהוָה כִּי־אָנֹכִי עַבְדְּךָ אֲנִי־עַבְדְּךָ בֶן־אֲמֻנָה).⁵⁶⁹ Indeed, Kalluveettil’s observation becomes even more compelling when we bring editorial evidence to bear on the question, for the Psalter’s application of both עַבְדְּךָ and בֶּן to *David* have already shown up in some editorially very prominent places: Ps 2 (introduction to the Psalter), centrally located Pss 78 and 86, and Ps 89 at Book III’s end (see Chapter Six). Especially poignant here is David’s self-identification in Ps 86:16’s using the same expressions, “your servant” (לְעַבְדְּךָ) and “your faithful son” (בֶּן־אֲמֻנָה) as found in 116:5. If Ps 116 takes up Pss 86 and 89’s dual identification of the *king* as Yahweh’s servant (עַבְדְּךָ) and son (בֶּן), then editors plausibly understood Ps 116 to present the *king* as the one who “loves Yahweh” (v. 1), declares him “gracious,” “righteous,” and “merciful” (v. 5), “lift[s] up the cup of salvation and call[s] on the name of Yahweh” (vv. 13, 17) and “will pay

anointed *is* David’s seed and one in whom hopes surrounding Yahweh’s promises to David are centered. However, this does not satisfactorily explain Ps 2’s prominent place as an introduction to the Psalter as *literary* product, where Yahweh’s identification of the royal addressee as “my son” must apply to “David” in some larger sense than any one particular pre-exilic Davidic successor.

⁵⁶⁸ Kalluveettil, *Declaration and Covenant*, 130, identifies Isa 63:16; 64:8; and Ps 89:27 as examples of this declaration formula spoken to God, while two other examples, 2Sam 7:14 and Jer 31:9b are spoken in the third person, and are therefore fall into a different category for Kalluveettil.

⁵⁶⁹ Kalluveettil, *Declaration and Covenant*, 134n82, notes the disputed nature of Dahood’s rendering of בֶּן־אֲמֻנָה as “your faithful son” rather than “the son of your maidservant,” and notes that the lack of conjunction joining “servant” and “son” and the elaboration “does not strictly conform to the standard...formula.”

[his] vows to Yahweh” (v. 18), thereby fulfilling or declaring these other (Mosaic!) covenantal criteria.⁵⁷⁰

The remaining instances Pss 80:16, 18, and 147:13 also merit some comment. As Ps 80 laments God’s destruction of his “vineyard” (esp. vv. 13–19), v. 16 petitions Yahweh to look upon the “son (יָדָבָר) whom you made strong for yourself,” whereupon v. 18’s parallel petition follows: “let your hand be upon *the man of your right hand* (יְמִינֵי שְׂרָפָה), *the son of man* (יָדָבָר/מִיָּדָבָר) whom you have made strong for yourself.” Taking the psalm in isolation, it might be possible to understand these verse as referring to the *people* in view of the vine motif in v. 15 and the psalm’s petition to “restore *us*” (יְשִׁבֵנוּ in vv. 4, 8, 20; cf. also “Jacob,” “servants,” and 1st pl. pronouns in 79:7–9, 13). But a couple of reasons suggest that the editors responsible had *both* people/Israel *and* king in view in 80:15–18. First, the singularity of יְמִינֵי שְׂרָפָה in v. 18 more naturally evokes a royal individual (see, e.g., Ps 110:1). Second, at the editorial level David has recently received very prominent attention in 78:70–72 (see above). As in Ps 89, then, it seems that Ps 80:15–18 hold together the fates of both king and people, and that “son” therefore applies to the “David” in this context as well. Turning to Ps 147, amongst the reasons to “praise Yahweh” (v. 12) v. 13 declares, “for...he blesses (יְבָרֵךְ) your children (בְּנֵי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם) within you (i.e., Zion).” Clearly בְּנֵי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם refers to the people here, stating as fact the promise of divine blessing to Zion’s children in Zion. Moreover, at the editorial level it seems possible—even likely—that the psalm praises God for the realization of the specifically *Abrahamic* promise of blessing. First, this comes within the concluding Laudate psalms (146–150), whose praise seems inspired by God’s redemptive work also toward the nations as can be seen, e.g., in Ps 72:17 (see Chapters Five and Six). Moreover, the theme of “sonship to Zion” comes up earlier in Korah Ps 87, which depicts foreign nations as children of Zion. Verse 4 lists several foreign nations who “know”

⁵⁷⁰ One might argue on the basis of Ps 116’s anonymity that a shift has taken place away from the identification of *David* as son and servant, but this seems unlikely in view of the immanent resurgence of Davidic Psalms (Pss 138–145) where David once again holds the floor and the fact that the speaker in Ps 116 is an individual.

Yahweh, including Egypt (רַהֲבִי), Babylon, Philistia, Tyre, and Cush, whereupon v. 5 declares: “And of Zion it shall be said, ‘This one and that one were born in her (יִלְדוּ-בָהּ)’” (see also v. 6). Although Ps 87 stands at some distance from Ps 147, it demonstrates the nations’ new status as “Zion’s children” as an important dimension of the inclusion of the nations. Indeed, Chapter Five’s exploration of Abrahamic covenantal allusions will also show that the Psalter emphasizes the nations as beneficiaries of its promises (see esp. Ps 47:9–10). It therefore seems likely that Ps 147:13 praises God for realizing his promise to bless all nations in Zion—a point consistent with our thesis. As noted in Chapter Two, “David” introduces that praise. Chapters Five and Six will explore ways in which he is also instrumental in realizing the reasons for praising Yahweh in 146–150, including the vision of 147:13.

Summary. As terms that denote a relationship to *Yahweh*, the epithets “son” and “servant” seem to be reserved for David. Our findings confirm the Psalter’s interest in the father-son relationship between God and king in 2 Sam 7:14 (esp. Pss 2 and 89). We also saw that David is “servant of Yahweh” throughout Book III (Pss 78; 86; 89). Yet the status of God’s people as “servants” and even the nations as “sons” of *Zion* anything but lost to view. The fortunes of king and people belong together. These data also comport well with our earlier study of the covenant formula, which suggested that the Psalter gives marked prominence to David as the primary covenant partner of Yahweh.

Yahweh’s Sworn (שבַּע) Promises

The noun שְׁבוּעָה occurs only in Ps 105:9, where it refers to the Abrahamic covenant confirmed to Isaac and Jacob. The cognate verb שָׁבַע is most often used of people rather than Yahweh.⁵⁷¹ The situation becomes more interesting when we turn to the instances where Yahweh

⁵⁷¹ In Ps 63:12 it is used of people who swear by God or the king in general: וְהִמְלִיךָ יְשׁוּמָה בְּאֱלֹהִים יְתְהַלֵּל (the antecedent of the 3d m. sg. suffix could refer either to the “king” or “God”). In Pss 15:4 and 24:4 the subject of שָׁבַע is the one who may approach Yahweh’s tent or ascent his hill (cf. 15:1 and 24:3)—a common feature lending support to the view that Pss 15–24 are chiasmatically arranged around the Royal/Torah psalms 18–21

is the subject. In Ps 95:10 he swears in his anger not to allow the grumbling generation to enter his rest (מְנוּחָה), recalling Num 32:13. However the remaining cases where Yahweh is subject of שָׁבַע reflect his commitment to the Davidic Covenant. All three instances of in Ps 89 relate to Yahweh’s promises to David (vv. 4, 16, and 50). In Ps 110 Yahweh “swears” to David that “you are priest forever after the order of Melchizedek” (v. 4), thus uniting royal and priestly theological concerns in the person of the king. The verb occurs twice in Ps 132 with different subjects. In v. 2 David swears “to Yahweh” and vows (נָדַר) to “the Mighty One of Jacob” (לְאֱבִיר יִעֲקֹב) not to rest until he has found a “place” (מְקוֹם) for Yahweh and “resting place” (מְשַׁכְּנֹת) for the Mighty One of Jacob. However in v. 11 Yahweh swears to David that he will establish his seed upon the throne. This reciprocation of subjects recalls David’s resolve to build Yahweh a house, only to end with Yahweh promising to establish *David’s* house (cf. 2 Sam 7:2, 11). These instances of שָׁבַע in royal psalms underscore the importance of Yahweh’s sworn promises to David in fifth Book of the Psalter, and suggest a hopeful answer to the agonized question in Ps 89:50, “where is your steadfast love of old, which by your faithfulness you swore to David?” Nor are there obvious signs of “democratization” in Ps 132 that might suggest editors understood David in some figurative sense. On the contrary, the promise of royal succession is central to Yahweh’s oath (v. 12) and the psalm concludes with the promise of vindication for David—“Yahweh’s anointed”—against his enemies.⁵⁷²

(see Cha. Two). Accordingly, editors plausibly understood the oath-keeping individual as a Davidic figure. Similarly, in Ps 119:106 the psalmist swears to keep Yahweh’s “righteous rules” and, according to Grant’s thesis, could similarly be understood in Davidic terms. On the other hand, שָׁבַע is used in a negative sense in Ps 102:9, where the Davidized psalmist suffers taunts from enemies who “use my name for a curse” (so ESV; the Hebrew reads, מְהוֹלְלֵי בִי וְשָׁבְעוּ, or “swear against me.”

⁵⁷² Albeit less conclusive, a study of “election” via the term בָּחַר and cognates (בְּחִירָה) also suggests that “David”/Zion are integral to the people’s/“Jacob’s” continued status as Yahweh’s elect, rather than “democratize” the notion of David’s election to the people at the expense of a Davidic incumbent upon the throne. בָּחַר occurs with Yahweh as (implied) subject in Pss 33:12; 47:5; 78:67–68, 70; 89:20; 105:26; 132:13; and 135:4. As with Yahweh’s “oath,” Ps 132 seems to preclude such a democratizing agenda. See Appendix F.

Conclusion

The foregoing survey affords a view of individual criteria throughout the Psalter. It shows that “David” is often the focal point for the anticipated fulfilment of the major aspects of the pre-monarchic covenants in ways befitting each kind of criteria. Although approximately half the Psalms are attributed to David or are “Davidized” in the MT (see Chapter Two), many criteria occur predominantly or exclusively in Davidic psalms, and suggest that editors’ selection and arrangement of psalms was in part motivated by a desire to present “David” as Yahweh’s covenant partner *par excellence*, son, and Moses-like servant to whom no blame is attributed—in stark contrast to the oft-unfaithful people of Israel, but who exhibits whole-hearted devotion to Yahweh as per Deut 6:5. Moreover, the survey showed glimpses of a “priestly” David who brings blessing to all people (esp. Pss 67; 110) as per the Abrahamic covenantal promise (Gen 12:3; 22:18; 26:4), and sings a “new song” praising Yahweh’s salvation as Moses had done. These observations provide helpful background for subsequent chapters’ investigation of “David” as agent of blessing and Moses-like Intercessor.

CHAPTER FIVE

PSALM 72:17 IN THE CONTEXT OF BOOK II

Having examined תִּרְיָא psalms in Chapter Three and explored significant covenantal criteria in Chapter Four, we are now better placed to test they hypothesis further by examining the editorial use of Pss 72:17, 86:15, 103:8, and 145:8 in their book contexts. Accordingly, this chapter examines Ps 72:17 in Book Two, mindful that editors likely intended Ps 72 as a conclusion to the whole of Books I–II (see Chapter Two).

Psalm 72:17 in its Psalm Context

Psalm 72:17 reads, “May his name endure forever, his fame continue as long as the sun! May people/all nations be blessed in him, all nations/they call him blessed!”⁵⁷³ As discussed in Chapter Two, the editorial placement and “Davidization” of Solomonic Ps 72 suggests that David here prays for Solomon, with v. 17 declaring the fulfillment of key Abrahamic covenantal promises through his son. And since only the doxology (vv. 18–19) and postscript (v. 20) follow, v. 17 constitutes the final element in the body of Ps 72 and thus culminates this important royal psalm within the Psalter. The body of the psalm therefore concludes with the royalization of two major Abrahamic covenantal promises: the promise of a “great name” (itself applied to David in 2 Sam 7:9) and the promise of blessing for “all the families of the earth” through the king (cf. Gen 12:2–3). Before addressing its Book context, then, we shall further explore the intertextual relationship between v. 17 and its source texts in Genesis.

⁵⁷³ See below for a discussion of the translation issue here.

Psalm 72:17 and the Abrahamic Covenantal Promise of Blessing to All Nations

In the MT, Ps 72:17 reads:

יְהִי שְׁמוֹ לְעוֹלָם לְפָנֵי־שָׁמַיִם יִגִּן שְׁמוֹ וַיְתַבְּרֵכּוּ בְּכָל־גּוֹיִם יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ:

Though not always apparent in English translations, this bears very strong resemblance to Abrahamic covenantal texts in Gen 12, 22, and 26. Genesis 12:3b reads וַיְבָרְכֵךָ בְּךָ כָּל מְשֻׁפָּחֵת (וְהִתְבָּרְכֵךָ בְּזֶרְעֶךָ כָּל גּוֹיֵי הָאָרֶץ) and Gen 22:18 and 26:4 reiterate the promise (וְהִתְבָּרְכֵךָ בְּכָל־גּוֹיִם יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ). Indeed, notwithstanding a few variations Ps 72:17b, “May they (all nations) be blessed/bless themselves in him,⁵⁷⁴ (May) all nations call him blessed,” (וַיְתַבְּרֵכּוּ בְּכָל־גּוֹיִם יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ) reproduces major lexical and syntactical features found in Gen 12:3 and reflects its reiterations in Gen 22:18 and 26:4 even more closely. There is a verb of “blessing” (בָּרַךְ), followed by instrumental ב (or agent), and “all (כָּל) nations/families (מְשֻׁפָּחֵת/גּוֹיִם). 72:17’s preference for the hithpael form of בָּרַךְ and for גּוֹיִם over מְשֻׁפָּחֵת also reflects a closer correspondence between it and the reiterations of the promise in Gen 22:18 and 26:4, which otherwise read “by your seed” (בְּזֶרְעֶךָ). Thus the major difference between 72:17 and these reiterations is the object of the preposition ב, which in 72:17 returns to a singular pronominal suffix (בוֹ) as in the original in Gen 12:3 (בְּךָ). In Ps 72, however, the suffix refers to the royal figure for whom David prays (see below).

In accordance with Masoretic accenting in poetic texts, the *ole veyored* marks the major division in the text rather than the *athnac*. So divided the first “half” of the verse highlights the highlighted the king’s name, יְהִי שְׁמוֹ לְעוֹלָם לְפָנֵי־שָׁמַיִם יִגִּן שְׁמוֹ, while the second highlights

⁵⁷⁴ Benjamin Noonan, “Abraham, Blessing, and the Nations: A Re-examination of the Niphal and Hitpael of בָּרַךְ in the Patriarchal Narratives,” *HS* 51 (2010): 73–93, favors the former sense, “be blessed,” rather than “bless themselves.” Noonan argues that while there are different nuances for niphal of בָּרַךְ in Gen 12:3 and the hitpael Gen 18:22 and 26:4, both forms indicate that the nations are blessed through Abraham/his seed, not that they invoke blessing in Abraham’s name as “bless themselves” might suggest. Noonan, 93, concludes, “Whereas the medio-passive Niphal is not specific as to the role of the subject in the action, instead only noting that the subject was blessed, the Hitpael specifically denotes the nations’ active role in seeking the patriarchs’ blessing... The difference between the Niphal and Hitpael of בָּרַךְ is thus one of focus, but even though their nuances are different, both stems reflect the same paradigm of blessing mediation rather than blessing utterance.”

the theme of blessing, **וַיִּתְבָּרְכוּ בּוֹ כָּל־גּוֹיִם יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ**. Indeed, this division also makes sense of structural considerations, since “May his name (**שְׁמוֹ**) endure forever, his fame (**שְׁמוֹ**) continue as long as the sun” is bracketed by the twice occurring **שְׁמוֹ**, while semantic equivalents **בָּרַךְ** and **אֲשַׁר** similarly bracket the second half, “May they be blessed/bless themselves (**וַיִּתְבָּרְכוּ**) in him, (May) all nations call him blessed (**יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ**).”⁵⁷⁵

To the extent that the *athnac* under “in him” (**בּוֹ**) implies another pause in the text, it might seem that “all nations” (**כָּל־גּוֹיִם**) belongs to the verb after it (**יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ**) rather than preceding it (**וַיִּתְבָּרְכוּ**). So understood, the *syntactic* resemblance to the Genesis texts is lessened, for those texts make “the nations” or equivalent the subject of **בָּרַךְ**. Indeed the ESV and NKJV reflect this syntax by providing a subject for **וַיִּתְבָּרְכוּ** and making “all nations” the subject of **יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ**. On the other hand, the NIV and NRSV better preserve the allusion to the Genesis texts, making “all nations” the subject of “be blessed” (**בָּרַךְ**) instead.⁵⁷⁶ So if we disregard the *athnac*—a feature much later than the consonantal text in any case, the subject **כָּל־גּוֹיִם** connects more naturally with **וַיִּתְבָּרְכוּ** than with **יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ**. This means that **כָּל־גּוֹיִם** provides *both* verbs with their actual or implied subject: “all nations” will “be blessed” (**וַיִּתְבָּרְכוּ**) and “they” will “call him blessed” (**יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ**). Indeed, the strong lexical resemblance to Gen 22:18 and 26:4 make it more likely that editors read 72:17 with the same syntactical relationship between **כָּל־גּוֹיִם** (or its Genesis equivalent) and the first verb **וַיִּתְבָּרְכוּ**, and therefore primarily associated the subject noun with it.⁵⁷⁷

⁵⁷⁵ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 2, 207.

⁵⁷⁶ The ESV reads, “May *people* be blessed in him, all nations call him blessed,” and similarly the NKJV has, “And *men* shall be blessed in Him; All nations shall call Him blessed.” On the other hand the NIV and NRSV better preserve the Genesis allusion: “*All nations* will be blessed through him, and they will call him blessed” (NIV), and “May *all nations* be blessed in him” (NRSV).

⁵⁷⁷ Interestingly, the LXX adds “all the tribes of the earth” (**πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς**) after **וַיִּתְבָּרְכוּ בּוֹ**. Admittedly this means they associated **כָּל־גּוֹיִם** with **יִאֲשְׁרוּהוּ**. But more significantly it proves that that they recognized the allusion to the Abrahamic covenantal promise in any case! Indeed, **πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ** more nearly

Most importantly for our purposes, however, is the substitution of רְאֵי־נְךָ , “your seed,” in Genesis 22:18 and 26:4 with the 3d masc. sg. suffix on the preposition ב in Ps 72:17. This pronominal suffix identifies the *king* as the agent, avenue, or cause of blessing for “all nations.”⁵⁷⁸ In fact, Ps 72:17 returns to a singular pronoun (יְבֹרַךְ) as was the case in the Gen 12:3 context (רְבֹרַךְ), which had Abraham in view. Once broadened from Abraham (רְבֹרַךְ in Gen 12:3) to his “seed” (רְאֵי־נְךָ in Gen 22:18 and 26:4), the agent of blessing for all nations in Ps 72 is narrowed once more to David’s royal successor (יְבֹרַךְ).⁵⁷⁹

Psalm 72:17 in Psalm 72

The traditional interpretation of Ps 72 as a “messianic” psalm has been challenged in the wake of history of religions studies.⁵⁸⁰ For instance, Hans Joachim Kraus describes psalm 72 as an “intercession” as numerous commentators do;⁵⁸¹ a description with obvious relevance to our

approximates כָּל מְשִׁפְּחֹת and mirrors the LXX’s own translation of the original Gen 12:3 instantiation of the promise, making the allusion even more explicit.

⁵⁷⁸ Roland E. Clements, *Abraham and David: Genesis XV and Its Meaning for Israelite Tradition* (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1967), 59, notes the similarity of language, stating that 72:17 “echoes very closely the language of the third of the divine promises by which the Yahwist historian interpreted Israel’s rise to nationhood” in Genesis 12. Clements sees strong continuity between the Abrahamic covenant recorded by the so-called Yahwist in Genesis and Ps 72’s royal appropriation of the promise concerning the blessing of nations. If correct, this would suggest that the “royalization” of the Abrahamic covenantal promise here was an organic and natural one. However in his discussion Clements speaks more directly in terms of the “religious significance and sacred authority of the Davidic state” (emphasis added). In contrast, Ps 72 is focuses primarily—even exclusively—on the royal son himself as agent of blessing and justice etc., albeit while not losing sight of the kingdom over which he reigns (e.g., vv. 4, 8). Thus, when compared with Gen 12 the Ps 72 brings a perceptible and significant shift in focus from people to king.

⁵⁷⁹ Incidentally, such an understanding of Ps 72:17’s allusion to the Abrahamic covenantal promise may underlie Paul’s discussion of “seed” as a singular in Gal 4.

⁵⁸⁰ See further the discussion in Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 204–5. Broadly speaking Hossfeld and Zenger attribute this to the ideology of kingship in which a king’s royal ministrations reflect the deity’s conquest over chaos.

⁵⁸¹ E.g., Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:393; Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 222.

hypothesis given its editorial recasting as a prayer of David. Kraus concludes that “[t]he traditional “messianic” interpretation of the song” is “invalid,” in light of similar “wishes for blessing” upon the king discovered in other ancient Near Eastern sources.⁵⁸² It could be objected that correlations to other ANE examples do not preclude a messianic dimension in Israel. However our primary concern with Ps 72’s editorial reuse (rather than its original *Sitz im Leben*) sets us on a similar trajectory as Kraus in any case, for he softens his stance when it comes to Ps 72’s potential for a more Messianic understanding of the psalm. Kraus writes, “it is beyond doubt that Psalm 72 speaks about the king of salvation in a manner that provides an impulse for more intensive thought.”⁵⁸³ Indeed, most recent studies of the editing of the Psalter agree that the messianism Kraus sees budding in Ps 72 comes to bloom in the hands of the editors;⁵⁸⁴ a movement reflected in the editorial use of 72:20 to bind Pss 71 and 72 to the preceding Davidic psalms (see Chapter Two) and in the universalized perspective of the psalm.

As the penultimate conclusion of Ps 72, prior vv. 18–19’s doxology,⁵⁸⁵ v. 17’s identification of David’s successor as agent of blessing is clearly of major importance to the thought-world of the Psalm. In the context of Ps 72, v. 17 culminates the preceding sequence of jussive clauses by which David has been praying for his son and successor in vv 2–11, 15–17,⁵⁸⁶ which put “flesh on the bones” of v. 1’s opening petition that God give (יָמֵךְ) the king his “justice” (יְיָ־טֹבֵ־שִׁמְרֹ־ךְ; cf. v. 2) and “righteousness” (יְיָ־קִדְמֹ־ךְ; cf. v. 2).

⁵⁸² Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 80.

⁵⁸³ Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 81.

⁵⁸⁴ Cf. esp. Wilson, “The Use of Royal Psalms at the ‘Seams’ of the Hebrew Psalter,” 85–94, who regards Ps 89 as an indication that such hopes have failed (see Introduction and Chapter One for further proponents of the so-called “Messianic Psalter”).

⁵⁸⁵ See Chapter Two on the question of whether the doxology was original to the psalm or added by later editors. In either event, the subsequent postscript in v. 20 suggests that editors viewed the doxology as part of Ps 72 as last of David’s “prayers.”

⁵⁸⁶ On vv. 12–14 see below.

While scholars differ in their structural analyses, a good number recognize vv. 15–17 as a discrete strophe to conclude the psalm.⁵⁸⁷ For instance, Hossfeld and Zenger follow Janowski’s suggestion that vv. 12–14’s concern for the king’s advocacy for the poor parallels his role of “judging” in vv. 2–4. According to them the subsequent verses, vv. 15–17 and vv. 5–7, also parallel each other by proclaiming the king as “a *mediator of divine blessing*, whose rule is salvifically worked out in nature.”⁵⁸⁸ Hossfeld and Zenger further claim that, “the theme of fruitfulness of the earth that is common to the sections in vv. 5–7 and 15–17 is intensified, inasmuch as vv. 5–7 contain the motif of the rain that waters the earth and the beginnings of growth, while vv. 15–17 envision a superabundant fruitfulness through the image of the grain fields ripe for the harvest and the eternally fertile name of the king.”⁵⁸⁹ This view of the king as conduit of divine blessing thus embraces the Abrahamic promise of *land* and associated Mosaic covenantal promises about its fruitfulness; fruitfulness that the Mosaic covenant makes contingent on the people’s faithfulness (Deut 7:13; 28:11; cf. 11:17). Here, however, the focus is entirely on the king who is to act justly (see below), suggesting that the Davidic covenantal expectation of the king’s faithfulness (2 Sam 7:14; Pss 89:31–33; 132:11–12) is the key to the

⁵⁸⁷ E.g., Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:381, sees the psalm comprising three sections, vv. 1–7, 8–14, and 15–17. Grogan, *Psalms*, 132–33, analyzes the psalm under four sections: vv. 1–7, 8–11, 12–14, and 15–17. Craig C. Broyles, *Psalms* (NIBC; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), 295, also identifies three sections, but divides them differently (vv. 1–3, 4–11, and 12–17). For an incisive critique of Zenger’s proposal of three distinct redactional stages in Ps 72’s history spanning the 7th century, Persian, and Hellenistic periods, see Gianni Babiero, “The Risks of a Fragmented Reading of the Psalms: Psalm 72 as a Case in Point,” *ZAW* 119 (2007): 67–91. Whereas Zenger dates vv. 1–7, 12–14, and 16–17ab to the 7th century, the postscript to the Persian period when Ps 72 was supposedly incorporated into David II, and vv. 8–11, 15, and 17cd to the Hellenistic period, Babiero cites structural parallels that traverse vv. 5–8 and 9–11 among other compelling reasons that caution against such diachronic conclusions. See Chapter Two for further discussion on the likelihood that editors respected the original integrity of psalms.

⁵⁸⁸ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 2, 207, citing Bernd Janowski, *Stellvertretung: Alttestamentliche Studien zu einem theologischen Grundbegriff* (SBS 165; Stuttgart; Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997), 48–49 (emphasis original).

⁵⁸⁹ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 2, 207. Cf. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 81, “[t]he singer of Psalm 72 beholds a king who reigns and helps as the God of Israel did and does according to the witness of the OT.”

fruitfulness of the land. Moreover, Ps 72 already works with a universalized view of “land” (rather than the land of Canaan narrowly), for the middle section of the psalm vv. 8–11 highlights the theme of land on a magnified scale (e.g., v. 11, “may he rule from sea to sea [מַיִם לְיָם [עַד-יָם]).⁵⁹⁰

All this points suggests that the king is instrumental in a greater and more universal fulfilment of Abrahamic covenantal promises. In fact, Ps 72 evokes most if not all the major Abrahamic promises to the king: the promise of a great name (v. 17a), to be blessed and God’s agent of blessing (v. 17b), and land (vv. 8–11). Perhaps we may also include here the promise to become a great nation from which kings and nations will come (cf. Gen 12:2; 15:5; 17:5–6) given the psalm’s vision of the king’s *kingdom* to which nations are subject (v. 9–11, 17).

In sum, the prayed for king of Ps 72 embodies the fulfillment of God’s Abrahamic covenantal promises on a universal scale, culminating in the most important promise whereby God would mediate blessing and life to the nations, but do so *through the king*. Indeed, Kraus goes so far as to describe the king as “the universal bearer of God’s blessing.”⁵⁹¹ Furthermore, this universalized picture is consistent with that of “land” in the Psalter observed in Chapter Four, as well as the subjugation of nations under Davidic rule seen in royal psalms like Pss 2 and 110 and cast in distinctly Abrahamic terms in Ps 47 (see below).

⁵⁹⁰ See also Derek Kidner, *Psalms 1–72: A Commentary on Books I–II of the Psalms* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1973), 275, who sees a possible “reference to the promised boundaries in Exod 23:31, ‘from the Red Sea to the sea of the Philistines’ (i.e., to the Palestinian shores of the Mediterranean) ‘and from the wilderness to the River (i.e., to the Euphrates, RSV)’ so that “verses 10 and 11 make it the nucleus of an empire that is world-wide.” Similarly Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:388 sees vv. 10–11 as a reference to the whole known world.

We may also note in passing that the same description is found in Zech 9:10, which declares to the “daughter of Zion/Jerusalem” that “your king’s” rule shall be “from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth (מַיִם (עַד-יָם וּמִנְהַר עַד-אַפְסֵי-אָרֶץ).

⁵⁹¹ Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 80.

A central theme of Ps 72 that cannot be overlooked is the special importance placed on the king as one who establishes justice for the poor, in contrast to the usual depiction royal picture of a conqueror. For Goldingay this expectation of the king derives from God’s nature as rescuer and restorer,⁵⁹² hence the petition to *God* to equip the king to so act. Indeed, vv. 12–14, introduced by the conjunction **כִּי** seems to recall the primary petition that God give the king his **מְשֻׁפָּטִים** and **צָדִיקִים**, for it expresses the king’s responsibility to “deliver” (**יַצִּיל**), “have pity on” (**סַחֵם**), “save” (**יִשְׁעֵם**), and “redeem/restore” (**לְגַאֲלָם**) the poor and needy.⁵⁹³ For Craig Broyles everything else in the psalm—fertility, world-wide reign, etc.—depends on the king “saving” the poor. Appealing to the twice-occurring verb “to save” (vv. 4, 13), Broyles claims that the king “is no mere judge—he is a savior” of the poor.⁵⁹⁴

Psalm 72 as Royal Intercession for a Royal Successor

The editorial reuse of Ps 72 discussed in Chapter Two presupposes two royal figures: the prayed for royal son, “Solomon,” and the praying subject, who 72:20 suggests is (historical) David. To the extent that one may call Ps 72 an “intercession” for the royal son,⁵⁹⁵ editors’ Davidization of Ps 72 seems to indicate an intent to depict (historical) David praying for someone besides himself.

While the idea that David intercedes has obvious relevance to our hypothesis, questions about the royal son (72:1) are especially interesting: who is the king being prayed for? What is

⁵⁹² Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:389–90. See also Walter Houston, “The King’s Preferential Option for the Poor: Rhetoric, Ideology and Ethics in Psalm 72,” *Biblnt* 7 (1999): 341–67, who highlights this aspect of Ps 72.

⁵⁹³ **כִּי** here is most naturally read as causal, thus presenting the circumstances whereby the king would enjoy all that the psalm otherwise says about him in its jussive clauses. It is unlikely that **כִּי** here is emphatic in view of the regular hiphil imperfect forms **יַצִּיל** and **יִשְׁעֵם** in vv. 12–13 (rather than jussive forms **יַצֵּל** and **יִשְׁעֵם**).

⁵⁹⁴ Broyles, *Psalms*, 297.

⁵⁹⁵ Recall Kraus’ description above. Houston, “The King’s Preferential Option for the Poor,” 344, suggests that the rhetoric of Ps 72 is ambiguous as to “whether it is a prayer or a prophecy.” Indeed, it is arguably both, but opening 2d pers. imperative suggests that at least the former is the case.

expected of him? To this second question we have suggested that Ps 72 envisions the fulfillment of Abrahamic covenantal promises through him. The former question also merits some consideration, since at face value one might conclude that *only* historical Solomon is in view. If that is the case, then Book II would seem to end with a nostalgic look back to the “golden days” of David and Solomon, which quickly unravel as Pss 73–74 lament the prosperity of the wicked (Ps 73) and vivid description of the destruction of the sanctuary (Ps 74). However, the psalm lacks the historical and recitative character of other psalms that actually do function that way (e.g., the historical Pss 78, 105, 106, etc.). Moreover, if only historical Solomon were in view in Ps 72, these subsequent Asaph psalms, then it would seem that editors responsible for the so-called Messianic Psalter (Pss 2–89) understood Ps 72’s series of jussive clauses as *vain* hopes or that they viewed them ironically.⁵⁹⁶ Such a reading of Ps 72 seems at odds with the character of the psalm. Moreover, since the theme of “royal son” in 72:1 in some measure recalls Ps 2:7 and 11’s description of the king as Yahweh’s son,⁵⁹⁷ it seems more likely that editors identified him with that psalm’s messianic identification of the king. This would view “Solomon” in larger terms than the historical tenth century king. On the other hand, Ps 72 on its own does not allow more specific conclusions about whether editors understood לְשִׁלְמֹה in relation to any future Davidide or to *someone* specific. At the very least it places royal succession beyond the Davidic era clearly on the agenda, setting the stage for a shift of focus from the founding figure of the Davidic covenant to future Davidic kingship.⁵⁹⁸

⁵⁹⁶ Much as one must assume that editors incorporated Ps 89 as though the lament in vv. 47–52 signaled the death of the Davidic covenant rather than its temporary “rejection” by Yahweh (see Chapter Three).

⁵⁹⁷ Notwithstanding Ps 2’s more explicit description of the king as *Yahweh’s* son, יְהוָה בְּנוֹתָו might be understood also to embrace this idea, and not exclusively in terms of human royal succession. Indeed, Wilson’s argument concerning the placement of royal Pss 2 and 72 (and Ps 89) at the seams of the Psalter suggests that editors also recognized this connection.

⁵⁹⁸ Given Solomon’s historic role of building the temple, it is possible that (post-)exilic editors understood Ps 72’s idealized future Davidide as one who would restore the cult as per Kraus’ view of kingship in the DH. See

Psalm 72 in the Context of Book(s I–)II

Having examined Ps 72 itself, we must now examine its editorial placement in Book II. As Wilson points out, that Ps 72 is located in a place of great editorial importance at the conclusion of Book II. Moreover, if it is correct that, at the editorial level, Books I–II have “historical David” more clearly in focus (see Chapter Two), then our analysis of Book II (and to a small extent Book I) ought to bear this characteristic in mind. As background to this we shall first survey major allusions to the Abrahamic covenant.

Major Allusions to the Abrahamic Covenant in the Psalter and Their Particular Occurrences in Books I–II

The strongest criteria for Abrahamic covenantal allusions are direct references to “Abraham,” and intertextual allusions to the promises of many descendants and blessing for all nations (cf. Gen 12:2–3; 15:5–7, 18–21; 17:1–8). The following briefly identifies their incidence in the Psalter overall, but pays special attention to Book II in order to prepare for later exploration of Ps 72 in the context of Book II.

Abraham. As noted earlier, “Abraham” is mentioned by name in Ps 105:8. The only other mention of “Abraham” in the Psalter is in Book II in Ps 47:10, which declares that the “princes of the peoples gather as the people of the God of Abraham.” There can be little doubt this verse attribute the same covenantal status to the “princes of the peoples” as Abraham’s descendants enjoy. Psalm 47:10 thus envisions the eschatological realization of God’s kingship over all the nations, not just Israel.⁵⁹⁹ Within Book II, then, this “kingship of Yahweh” psalm anticipates the

Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, 195. See also Introduction.

⁵⁹⁹ Vangemeren, *Psalms*, 413–14, recognizes a strong prophetic and eschatological character to Ps 47. Similarly Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 470, raises the question whether אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם evokes the promises of Gen 12:1–3 and 22:18. Alternatively, Dahood, *Psalms*, 1:283–87, takes נְדִיבֵי עַמִּים נְאֻסָּפוּ as a vocative, translating עַם אֱלֹהֵי as “The God of Abraham is the Strong One.” Furthermore, Dahood reads the following clause כִּי לְאֱלֹהִים מְגִן אֶרֶץ not as “For the shields of the earth belong to God” but “truly God is Suzerain of the earth,” seeing there an echo of Gen 15:1, where he also translates מַגֵּן as “suzerain”: “Fear not, Abraham, I am your Suzerain (*māgān* [MT *māgēn*] *lāk*) who will reward you...very greatly” (*Psalms*, 1:16–18). If correct, this further strengthens the

adoption of foreign peoples as God’s people reflected also in Ps 72 (to say nothing of the “Yahweh Malak” Pss 93, 97, and 99). Psalm 72:9–11 and 17 clearly evoke the same idea,⁶⁰⁰ but with specific focus on David’s royal successor. As will be argued below, the royalization of this promise in Ps 72 is already reflected in the arrangement of the Korahite group (Pss 42–49). This group seems to associate Divine and Davidic Kingship very deliberately, anticipating Ps 72’s vision of nations paying tribute to David’s successor.⁶⁰¹

Other Intertextual Allusions to Genesis 12:3; 22:18; and 26:4. Psalm 22:28 offers a discernible allusion to Gen 12:3 via the phrase “all [the] families of nations” (כָּל־מִשְׁפְּחוֹת גּוֹיִם; cf. כָּל מִשְׁפְּחוֹת הָאֲדָמָה in Gen 12:3). Psalm 22:28 varies slightly by replacing הָאֲדָמָה with גּוֹיִם, “all families of nations” rather than “of the earth.” However, Gen 22:18 and 26:4 (כָּל גּוֹיֵי (הָאָרֶץ)) also vary their terminology from 12:3 at the same point, as seen in our earlier discussion of Ps 72:17. Yet despite its unique construction Ps 22:28 only uses lexemes from these other formulations, also retaining the universal thrust characteristic of this Abrahamic promise (cf. “all” [כָּל]). The result is an expression strongly reminiscent of Gen 12:3 and its reiterations. Significantly, Ps 22:28b–29 employs this allusion to anticipate the same idea present in Ps 72:9–11 and 17, but more directly in terms of divine kingship: “All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn to Yahweh, and *all the families of the nations* shall worship before you. For kingship belongs to Yahweh; he rules over the nations.” 72:11 and 17 seem to reflect the same

allusion to the Abrahamic covenant in 47:10. Dahood translates מַלְךְ as “suzerain” in Pss 3:4 and 84:12, taking שָׁמַיִם in the latter as “sovereign” on comparison with Ugaritic titles for Pharaoh or the Hittite overlord.

⁶⁰⁰ “May desert tribes bow down before him, and his enemies lick the dust! May the kings of Tarshish and of the coastlands render him tribute; may the kings of Sheba and Seba bring gifts! May all kings fall down before him, all nations serve him!...May people be blessed in him, all nations call him blessed!”

⁶⁰¹ It also increases the likelihood that editors also appreciated a connection between בֶּן־מֶלֶךְ in 72:1 and 2:7.

vision, but cast more specifically in terms of the Davidic kingship as a reflection of God's rule, justice etc.⁶⁰²

A second allusion is found in Ps 37:22, which connects blessing and cursing (קלל/ברך) with possession of the land: “for those blessed by Yahweh shall inherit the land, but those cursed by him shall be cut off” (יִרְשׁוּ אֶרֶץ וּמִקְלָלָיו יִכָּרְתוּ); cf. also יִרְשׁוּ-אֶרֶץ in vv. 8 and 29). Possession of the land proceeds from Yahweh's blessing, and “cutting off” from his cursing. Of course, Ps 37:22 does not “promise” Yahweh's blessing and cursing toward those who bless and curse Abram in quite the same way that Gen 12:3a does. Nevertheless, the two pual participles מְבָרְכָיו (“those blessed by him”) and וּמִקְלָלָיו (“those cursed by him”) and theme of land-possession evoke the Abrahamic promises in Gen 12:3a and 15:7 quite clearly, even though Gen 12:3 reserves ארר for the divine curse and employs קלל when speaking of those who curse Abram. Indeed, the verbal parallels appear stronger in the LXX, which has οἱ εὐλογοῦντες αὐτόν and οἱ δὲ καταρῶμενοι αὐτόν, which presumes a Hebrew *vorlage* with *piel* (active) participles מְבָרְכָיו and וּמִקְלָלָיו as Gen 12:3 does (מְבָרְכָיו and וּמִקְלָלָיו; cf. Syriac). On this LXX reading, possession of the land or being “cut off” are the reward or punishment for “those who bless/curse him (cf. 3d sg. suffix).” Who, then, is meant by “him” (αὐτόν/יוֹ)? Pointed as *puals* in the MT, the 3d. sg. suffix is more naturally understood as a subjective genitive naming Yahweh as “their” blesser: “those blessed/cursed by him.” But if editors read the unpointed text as *piels* as suggested by the LXX, the natural antecedent is “the righteous” (δικαιος/צַדִּיק) just mentioned in v. 21b. Given the allusion to Gen 12:3, it seems likely the LXX scribes understood this “righteous” (צַדִּיק) in some way as an *Abraham*-like “righteous” person (cf. Gen 15:6), whose “blessers” Yahweh rewards with possession of the land and whose “cursers” he “cuts off.” Understood thus, Ps 37:21b–22 echoes the same theological concerns as found in Gen 15:6–7:

⁶⁰² 72:1's petition, “Give the king your justice...your righteousness, etc.” suggests the king is expected to reign in conformity with divine justice and righteousness, thus instantiating divine rule (see discussion above).

Abraham's faith and "righteousness" (צַדִּיקָה) and Yahweh's promise "to give you this land to possess" (לָתֶת לְךָ אֶת-הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לְרִשְׁתָּהּ), with "those who bless him" as the beneficiaries of the original Abrahamic promise. Space precludes a fuller examination of Ps 37:21–22 as a possible example of "inner-biblical exegesis."⁶⁰³ But these connecting points with Gen 12:3 and 15:6–7 raise compelling possibilities in this acrostic psalm attributed to David. Already the Pss 15–24 arrangement earlier in Book I suggests that its editors well disposed to see the צַדִּיק as a royal figure.⁶⁰⁴ Accordingly, others are blessed with inheriting the land or cursed with being cut off according to their relationship to the king. That both royal psalms bracketing Books I–II reflect the same idea makes this even more probable. In Ps 2:10–12 the fate of "kings" is made dependent on their relationship to the royal son,⁶⁰⁵ while in Ps 72:17 the nations are blessed through the king (see above). Moreover, Ps 72's Davidic petition to God to give the royal successor his righteousness (צַדִּיקָה) is yet another indication that editors responsible for Books I–II viewed David as the quintessential "righteous" (צַדִּיק) as per Ps 37.

Clearly, then, Ps 72's focus on the king as agent of God's blessing for the nations is no afterthought to the theology of Books I–II, but concludes Books I–II with themes already well-

⁶⁰³ See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Of course, the themes of blessing/curse and land-possession remain a continuing focus of the Mosaic covenant as well (cf. Deut 28). Otherwise, the verb בָּרַךְ is common but not often easily associated with a particular covenant. Of its seventy-five instances, the overwhelming majority denote praise directed to Yahweh. E.g., בָּרַךְ often occurs in imperative forms with Yahweh as object or as the qal passive participle found in doxologies (i.e., בָּרְכוּ יְיָ יְהוָה etc.). Numerous other psalms make Yahweh or Elohim the subject of בָּרַךְ, but they show few clear signs identifying them with other covenantal texts—except for Ps 67:2, 7–8 (see Chapter Four). Such examples include Ps 5:13, where Yahweh "blesses" the righteous (צַדִּיק); Ps 45:3, where he blesses the king (לְעוֹלָם עַל-כֵּן בֵּרַכְךָ אֱלֹהִים); Ps 109:28, which asks that those who "curse" (קָלַל) be put to shame by Yahweh who "blesses" (בָּרַךְ); Ps 115:12–13, where Yahweh "will bless the house of Israel...the house of Aaron...those who fear Yahweh"; Ps 128:4–5, where Yahweh blesses "those who fear him...from Zion" (cf. 134:3); Ps 132:15, where Yahweh blesses Zion's "provisions"; and Ps 147:13, where Yahweh "blesses your children (בְּנֵיךָ) within [Zion/Jerusalem]." Clearly this theme persists strongly into Book V.

⁶⁰⁴ See Chapter Two.

⁶⁰⁵ cf. Ps 2's identification of the king as the righteous of Ps 1, discussed in the Conclusion.

established therein. As we look outside Books I–II, Pss 96 and 107 also offer recognizable allusions to Gen 12:3 and its reiterations. The command in Ps 96:7 to “ascribe to Yahweh, [you] families of peoples” (מִשְׁפָּחוֹת עַמִּים) employs the same familial language from Gen 12:3 as Ps 22:28 (cf. מִשְׁפָּחוֹת גּוֹיִם in 22:28). Although Ps 96:7 lacks “all” (כָּל), v. 9’s “all the earth” (כָּל-הָאָרֶץ) shows clearly that this “new song” (v.1) envisions Yahweh’s universal sovereignty wherein the nations join in praising Yahweh (see Chapter Six). Psalm 107:38 offers an even stronger case when it declares, “By his blessing they multiply greatly” (וַיְבָרְכֵם וַיַּרְבּוּ מְאֹד), thus echoing the Abrahamic promises of blessing and fruitfulness in becoming a great nation; this within Ps 107’s broader proclamation of Yahweh’s redemption and ingathering of his people (e.g., vv. 1–3).⁶⁰⁶ This follows directly from Ps 107:36’s focus on sowing and planting and a fruitful yield and echoes the same the theme of fertility connected with blessing seen in Ps 72. Moreover, as Chapter Six will show Ps 107’s collocation with the Davidic group 108–110 also associate these promises with the king as Pss 37 and 72 had done. Both the end of Book II and beginning of Book V thus reflect Abrahamic covenantal fulfilment in terms of the king.

Other References to (“the God of”) the Patriarchs. As noted above, Ps 47:10 identifies Yahweh as “the God of Abraham” (אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם). The avoidance of the usual gentilic nouns “Jacob” and “Israel” in favor of this description suggests a more deliberate effort to define the people in terms of “Abraham’s God,” thus bringing the Abrahamic covenantal promises more closely into view. The expressions “The God (אֱלֹהֵי/אֱלֹהֵי/אֱלֹהֵי) of Israel/Jacob” occur numerous times throughout the Psalter as well. Granted that “Israel” and “Jacob” frequently have a simple gentilic meaning, the expression, “the God of...” nevertheless draws attention to the relationship between Yahweh and the patriarch after whom the people are named, and to some extent recall introductory formulae such as “the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob” in, e.g., Exod 3:6, 15–16;

⁶⁰⁶ See Chapter Six, which discusses Ps 107’s connections with subsequent psalms in Book V.

4:5 (cf. 2:4) and God’s (Abrahamic) covenant with them (cf. the investigation of allusions to the covenant formula in the previous chapter).⁶⁰⁷

אלֹהֵינוּ/אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs in two Korahite psalms (46:8, 12; 84:9), three Asaph psalms (75:10; 76:7; 81:2, 5), Davidic Ps 20:2, and anonymous Pss 94:7; 114:7; and 146:5,⁶⁰⁸ and are therefore distributed quite broadly. Almost half the occurrences of אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל occur in three of the four major doxologies, Pss 41:14, 72:18, and 106:48, with the rest confined to Davidic psalms in Book II (59:6; 68:9, 36; and 69:7). Apart from the doxologies, then, only *David* identifies Yahweh as “the God of *Israel*.” This is an intriguing observation given that “Israel” is the new name given to Jacob when Yahweh renewed with him the Abrahamic covenantal promises in Gen 35:10–12.⁶⁰⁹ At the least, the expression presupposes that the proper

⁶⁰⁷ All these construct chains highlight the relationship between God and “Jacob” or “Israel,” and to that extent presuppose the covenant relationship that exists between them expressed in the covenant formula.

More generally, patriarchal names “Jacob” and “Israel” occur over one hundred times in the bodies of psalms, while “Isaac” turns up only the once in Ps 105:9. But “Jacob/Israel’s” normal gentilic use makes it difficult to assume editors automatically stressed the people’s covenantal identity beyond the normal use of these terms.

A similar objection regarding the Davidic covenantal/royal entailments of “David” in the Psalter is hard to sustain in the same way, however, for the situation is quite different with “David.” First, the name “David” has clear editorial importance and theological prominence in the Psalter, as evidenced by the placement of Royal Psalms and the editors’ deliberate use of superscripts/authorial attribution in arranging the Psalms (see Chapter Two). Moreover, “David” has no usual gentilic sense like “Jacob/Israel.” Rather, the name “David” has potential to evoke the royal office and its covenantal dimensions, though without losing complete sight of David’s significance as founding figure of the Davidic covenant. Indeed, we have suggested that editors viewed “David” in David I and II primarily in this latter sense, while suggesting that editors viewed “David” in psalms after Ps 72 psalms primarily in terms of a David’s successor(s) as per the Davidic covenantal promises in 2 Sam 7 (see Chapter Two).

⁶⁰⁸ Equivalent to these expressions are אֱלֹהֵינוּ (only in Ps 132:2 and 5) and קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל (in Pss 78:41 and 89:19—both very prominent psalms in Book III)

⁶⁰⁹ Genesis 35:11–12 read: “A nation and a company of nations shall come from you, and kings shall come from your own body. The land that I gave to Abraham and Isaac I will give to you, and I will give the land to your offspring after you.”

covenantal relationship between God and Israel is intact.⁶¹⁰ Moreover, its presence on David's lips in the David II group is consistent with our hypothesis regarding the central place given to David/the king in righting the relationship between God and his people.

Summing up: Abrahamic Covenantal Allusions in the Psalter. Psalms 105:8–11, 72:17, and 47:10 offer the most explicit allusions to the Abrahamic covenant/its promises. Psalms 22, 37, 47, 96, and 107 were also shown to have significant allusive potential. Half of these six psalms occur at or very near the “seams” of the Psalter (Pss 72, 105, 107). This confirms the editors' considerable interest in the Abrahamic covenant and its associated promises. Furthermore, many instances are confined to Books I–II, and almost half of them occur in quasi-Davidic or “royal” psalms (Pss 22, 37, 72), or with potentially deliberate editorial association with David in the case of Pss 47 and 105.⁶¹¹

Psalm 72 in the Context of the Structure and Covenant Allusions of Book II (Psalms 42–72)

Broadly speaking Book II is constructed from the Korah I group (Pss 42–49) and David II (Pss 51–72), between which lies Asaph Ps 50. In Chapter Two we agreed with Wilson's observation that editors used genre to soften transitions between differently authored psalm groups within the Psalter's Books. Though Pss 49, 50, and 51 differ in authorial attribution (Korahite, of Asaph, and Davidic respectively), each is designated a **מְזִמֶּה**. Nevertheless, the separation of Ps 50 from the main group of Asaph Psalms (73–83) is a highly conspicuous editorial characteristic of the Psalter. Accordingly, our investigation of Book II as Ps 72's primary “Book context” will be broken up into an initial analysis of the Korah I group, followed by the David II group with particular attention to how it relates to Ps 50.

⁶¹⁰ This preference for “Israel” over “Jacob” might imply a renewed Israel for whom the Abrahamic promises are realized (as per Gen 35:19–12), but it is difficult to say whether or to what extent that is the case.

⁶¹¹ Regarding Ps 47, see below. Psalm 105's close proximity to Davidic Pss 101 and 103 leads scholars such as Zenger (at least at a synchronic level) to view these final six psalms as quasi-Davidic (see Chapter Six).

Korah I (42–49). The first Korahite group begins with Pss 42–43’s yearning to meet God in festal procession to the house of God (42:5) amid the taunts of the enemies (42:4); apparently at some distance from Jerusalem (42:7). This is followed by Ps 44’s lament over God’s rejection of them (v. 10). In Ps 44 God has caused them to turn back from the foe (v. 12), has “sold” his people (v. 13), and made them a byword and a disgrace among the peoples (vv. 14–17). Both J. Clinton McCann and David C. Mitchell understand these psalms as reflecting Israel in exile, even if they differ on whether the exile is historical or eschatological.⁶¹²

The group ends with Ps 49’s universal call to “wisdom and understanding” (vv. 4, 21), warning about the vanity of wealth and might, and repudiating misplaced hope in them. Between these lies royal Ps 45, Zion Ps 46, Kingship of Yahweh Ps 47, and Zion Ps 48. Accordingly, Clinton McCann interprets the Korahite arrangement to mean that “the traditional hope embodied in the royal psalms, Zion songs and enthronement songs is modified and reoriented by the literary context,”⁶¹³ agreeing with Wilson that wisdom themes trump royal covenantal theology. If that were the case, however, it is odd that an enthronement psalm like Ps 47 should be woven among royal and Zion psalms, for according to Wilson and McCann Book IV uses enthronement psalms (Pss 97 and 99) to contrast Yahweh’s rule with David’s. Here in Pss 45–48, however, Davidic rule and Yahweh’s kingship seem to go together. Indeed, this is even more apparent within Ps 45, whose famous *crux interpretum*, vv. 7–8, appears to merge the identities of king and God and their respective “thrones” (45:7): “Your throne, O God, is forever and ever. The scepter of your kingdom is a scepter of uprightness; you have loved righteousness and hated wickedness. Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness beyond your companions... etc.” Notwithstanding the difficulty of this text, editors very likely perceived a

⁶¹² Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 250; McCann, “Books I–III and the Editorial Purpose of the Hebrew Psalter,” 100–103, who further notes how this is similar to the way in which Book III begins. Indeed, Book III, esp. Ps 74, contains more explicit description applicable to the exile.

⁶¹³ McCann, “Books I–III and the Editorial Purpose of the Hebrew Psalter,” 102.

close relationship between Davidic king and Divine King in this psalm (cf. Ps 2). These verses move seamlessly from addressing God to addressing the king.⁶¹⁴ Indeed, the Pss 45–48 sequence interweaves Pss 45 and 47 for which kingship is focal (Davidic and Divine respectively) and two Zion Pss (46 and 48), suggesting that editors shared Ps 45:7–8’s view of a close relationship between divine and human kingship. Rather than reorienting hope away from royal covenantal theology, then, Pss 45–48 package Davidic king, Zion, and Divine Kingship together. If “later editors” played off divine and human kingship against each other, they can only have done so against the grain of this Korahite arrangement. Indeed, the concluding psalm Ps 72 suggests not a diminished role of kingship in addressing exile or exile-like circumstances—be it historical or eschatological. It rather sharpens the focus on the royal office as God’s means of bringing blessing to the nations who gather before God in homage (cf. 47:10). Besides this, it bears asking what other entailments the Korah I group received from the editors who collated them, and what Pss 50–72 indicate about the place of kingship vis-à-vis the Mosaic covenant so prominent in Ps 50 (see Chapter Three).

Korah I and the Song of the Sea? Regarding this first question, other features and themes in the Korah I group suggest that editors responsible for Korah I interpreted a present or foreshadowed exilic crisis in terms of a new Egyptian-like slavery with the hope of a new exodus. Indeed, the arrangement of the Korahite group draws together the major themes of Moses’ Song of the Sea in Exod 15, as seemed to be the case regarding Pss 93–100, whose “new songs” (Pss 96 and 98) suggest that Exod 15 served as inspiration for the group (see Chapter Four). While no “new songs” are to be found in Korah I, not much earlier in Ps 40:3 David declares, “He put a new song (שִׁיר נְדָבָר) in my mouth, a song of praise to our God. Many will see and fear, and put their trust in Yahweh.” Furthermore, several other features in Korah I show

⁶¹⁴ See discussion in Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 246–48. Mitchell argues that v. 7, “Your throne, O God, is forever and ever” (כִּסֵּאֲךָ אֱלֹהִים עוֹלָם וָעֶד), is actually an address to the king. Mitchell concludes that Ps 45 is a Messianic psalm, and drawing on early Rabbinic and NT interpretation in support.

strong correspondence to the Song of the Sea. For instance, the refrain in Pss 42–43 repeatedly addresses God as “my Salvation and my God” (יְשׁוּעַת פְּנֵי וְאֱלֹהֵי) reminiscent of Exod 15:2 (וְיִהְיֶה לִּי לְיִשׁוּעָה). Psalm 44 then follows; a lament psalm that most clearly expresses the crisis to which subsequent Korah I psalms seem to respond. This psalm calls for God to act on behalf of his people as he had done in the Exodus and land-giving.⁶¹⁵ Verse 2 recalls God’s deeds in “days of old” (בְּיָמֵי קִדְמָה) when God set free his afflicted peoples “by your right hand and your arm and the light of your face” (כִּי־יָמִינְךָ וְזְרוֹעֶךָ וְאֹר פְּנֵיךָ). After complaining that God has “rejected us and disgraced us” (תָּרַחַח in 44:10; cf. 74:1 and 89:39), Ps 44 then calls on God to “awake” (עֲוֹרָה), in a manner similar to Isa 51:9’s call to Yahweh to bring about a new exodus from Babylon, “*Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of Yahweh; awake, as in days of old*” (עֲוֹרֵם עֲוֹרֵם לְבָשִׁי־עַז זְרוּעַ יְהוָה עֲוֹרֵם כְּיָמֵי קִדְמָה). Moreover, Ps 44:13’s “you have sold your people” (תִּמְכַרְתָּ עַמְּךָ) expresses the precise opposite of Exod 15:16’s description of the people as a “people you have acquired” (עַם־זוֹ קָנִיתָ), and its final petition to God to “redeem us” (וּפְדֵנוּ) offers a positive parallel to Exod 15:13’s earlier description of the people as “the people you have redeemed” (עַם־זוֹ גָּאֻלְתָּ); notwithstanding the different verb.⁶¹⁶ Thus, the manner in which Ps 44 couches its lament and petition closely resembles the way Exod 15 praises God’s salvation, asking God to respond to the present crisis as he had in the exodus.

Other major hallmarks of the Song of the Sea appear in individual Korahite psalms as well. However, the strength of the allusion comes from the psalm group as a whole—the convergence of these themes being the result of *editorial* arrangement.⁶¹⁷ For instance, in Ps 47 the theme of

⁶¹⁵ Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 250. See Barber, *Singing in the Reign*, 93–98, who makes similar observations.

⁶¹⁶ Exod 13:13 and 15 use פָּדָה in reference to Israelites’ redeeming their firstborn, though this is predicated on Yahweh’s salvific activity toward his people in the Exodus (cf. vv. 14–15).

⁶¹⁷ It may be argued that later editors did not necessarily share the concerns of earlier ones, especially given that scholars who posit some sort of multi-stage compositional history believe that the Korah I group was attached in the relatively earlier stages. Our basic point here is that the themes to be noted are the product of psalm arrangement

Yahweh's kingship (cf. **יְהוָה | יִמְלֹךְ לְעֹלָם וָעֶד** in Exod 15:18) predominates as the psalm proclaims the universal rule of God over all the earth (esp. vv. 7–10). But Exod 15 also ties this closely to the sanctuary. Exod 15:18's proclamation of Yahweh's reign follows directly after v. 17's anticipation that he will bring the people he has acquired (**עַם־זוֹ קָנִיתָ** in Exod 15:16) to his chosen sanctuary (**מִקְדָּשׁ**) as the "place for his dwelling" (**מְכוּן לְשִׁבְתֶּךָ**). Similarly, Pss 46–48 closely associate the sanctuary with the theme of God's universal kingship, but achieve this by "sandwiching" Ps 47 between Zion Pss 46 and 48.

Nestled within these psalms we also find Royal Ps 45, the first of the 45–48 sequence following Ps 44's lament. The positive tone of Pss 45–48 suggests that these psalms "answer" the lament in Ps 44, immediately directing attention to the royal figure praised in Ps 45. That is, the king receives primary focus as part of a God, sanctuary, Davidide "package" in Pss 45–48. The arrangement of Pss 45–48 thus suggests editors understood the Davidic king to occupy an integral and primary part in the (new-)exodus theology of Korah I.

Second, the king in Ps 45:3 is "blessed forever" because "grace is poured upon [his] lips" (**הַיּוֹצֵק חֵן בְּשִׁפְתוֹתַיךָ עַל־כֵּן בִּרְכָה אֱלֹהִים לְעֹלָם**). Psalm 45:3 seems to understand the king as receiver of divine blessing somehow in relation to his *speech*. Meanwhile the next major author group, David II (Pss 51–72), accentuates David's role as praise-giver (see below). This might suggest that Book II's editors interpreted **הַיּוֹצֵק חֵן בְּשִׁפְתוֹתַיךָ** in 45:3 in terms of David's praise-giving. Moreover, in view of the exodus motifs explored above it is possible that Book II's

rather than authorship alone. At least *some* editor(s) designed this group to yield the theological picture we see in this group.

Whether and what kind of multi-stage compositional theory might be entertained remains a different—if potentially important—question. Granting such possibilities, it is my contention that the more pressing question to ask—at least for the issue of covenant relationships—is how consistent were the views of such hypothetical "earlier" and "later" editors. This can only be assessed with comparison between the allegedly earlier and later portions of the Psalter as to their theological perspectives. Indeed, as our investigations will show, there seems to be considerably greater theological consonance between Korah I and Pss 93–100 than the theory of Wilson et al. would imply.

editors viewed the king's "gracious lips" in 45:3 akin to Moses' praise of Yahweh after the sea-crossing in Exod 15. This time, however, it is David who (proleptically?) praises God's exodus-like intervention in Israel's lamentable circumstances (Ps 44); an idea reinforced by 45:17's promise to "cause your name to be remembered in all generations; therefore nations will praise you forever and ever." Again, this is consistent with Ps 72's concluding focus on the royal successor as agent of blessing to the nations. And since the doxology in 72:18–19 precedes the postscript in v. 20 editors seem to have regarded as the final element of David ben Jesse's prayer. Accordingly, Book II's final psalm specifically highlights *David* as praise-giver to God in that way too.

Third, the very first word David utters in the David II collection, Ps 51:3, is the cognate verb of "grace" (יָן) poured on the king's lips in 45:3. Psalm 51:3 reads, "be gracious/have mercy on me" (יְנִי). Within Book II, then, Ps 45's praise of the king seems directed to "David" whose speech in the David II group dominates the latter part of the Book.

Moreover, 51:3 produces key lexemes from the grace formula: "have mercy on me, O God, according to your steadfast love (יְרַחֵם), according to your abundant mercy (רַחֲמֶיךָ) blot out my transgressions (פְּשָׁעֵי)." From a macro-structural perspective, this seems to anticipate the Psalter's characteristic association of *David* with the grace formula, whose fullest iterations are also found on "David's lips" (see Introduction and Chapter Six). In view of this pattern, it seems that (later?) editors of Books III–V deviate little from the picture created by Pss 45 and 51, notwithstanding a general shift in focus from historical David to his successor(s) pre- and post-Ps 72 (see Chapter Two).

David II (51–72): David as Exemplar and Fulfiller of Yahweh's Summons in Psalm 50

Chapter Three's examination of Ps 50 noted that psalm's character as a theophany and divine summons to God's (Mosaic) covenant people. It also noted Ps 50's conspicuous dislocation from the main Asaph group (73–83), raising the possibility that editors deliberately sought to associate Ps 50 with the subsequent Davidic group (Pss 51–72) and thus to highlight

David or the royal office in Book II's immediate response to that divine summons. Already the oft-noted thematic connections in regard to "sacrifice" between Pss 50 and 51 suggest a deliberate connection, so it remains to examine whether the David II group offers further indications that David II responds to Ps 50's Mosaic covenantal summons with David as the responder to that summons. Exploring this possibility has direct obvious relevance to the question of covenant relationships. It also has potential to explain *why* Ps 50 is located where it is in Book II at some distance from the main Asaph group in Pss 73–83.

The heart of God's address to "my people" in Ps 50 is the series of commands in vv. 14–15, "Offer to God a sacrifice of thanksgiving (תּוֹדָה), and perform your vows to the Most High (וְשַׁלַּם לְעֵלְיוֹן נְדָרָיִךָ), and call upon me (וּקְרָאֵנִי) in the day of trouble (בְּיָוֶם צָרָה); I will deliver you (אֶצַּלְלֶךָ), and you shall glorify me (וְתִכְבְּדֵנִי)." Several observations suggest that Book II intentionally presents David as the fulfiller of these commands.

Calling upon God in Trouble. In view of the circumstances evoked by its superscript, Ps 51's lament presents historical David "calling upon" God in his day of trouble. Right away David does what God calls his covenant people to do in 50:15a.⁶¹⁸ Indeed, that Yahweh would help the *king* "in the day of trouble" is incipient in royal Ps 20:1, "May Yahweh answer you in the day of trouble" (יַעֲנֶנְךָ יְהוָה בְּיָוֶם צָרָה). Books I–II thus seem to anticipate Ps 51's depiction of David fulfilling this aspect of Ps 50's summons.

Also significant for our investigation is the way David does this. Psalm 51's opening call to Yahweh to "be gracious" (חַנּוּנִי) is predicated on Yahweh's "steadfast love" and "abundant mercy"—terms reminiscent from the grace formula in Exod 34:6 (בְּרַחֲמֵיךָ בְּרַב וּבְחַסְדֶּיךָ in v. 3). In view of the fuller quotations in Pss 86:15; 103:8; 145:8, (later?) editors apparently regarded

⁶¹⁸ Similarly, Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2, 24*, offer a brief summary of the relationship between Pss 50 and 51, concluding that Ps 50 "calls for *todah* sacrifices (v. 14) arising out of knowledge of one's own helplessness (v. 15) and a right way of life. What the God of the theophany in Psalm 50 demands, the person praying the following Psalm 51 promises, as is evident especially in vv. 18–19."

the grace formula with a similar degree of importance as seen in Pss 50 and 51 so collocated, and similarly associated it with David. This would suggest that the theology of the grace formula and its particular association with David influenced the construction of the Psalter from its earliest to latest stages, however complicated a multistage model one may hold. Moreover, there seem to be even closer parallels between Pss 50–51 and later quotations of the grace formula. The major element of Psalm 50:15’s summons or charge—“you will call on me on the day of trouble,” “I will deliver you,” and “offer thanksgiving [offerings] to God”/“you shall glorify me”—broadly correspond to the three rhetorical purposes for which Pss 86, 103, and 145 use the grace formula. As the next chapter explores further, in Ps 86 “David” invokes the grace formula as he petitions Yahweh for help (“you will call on me on the day of trouble”). In Ps 103 “David” employs it to proclaim Yahweh’s gracious and merciful character in forgiving sins (“I will deliver you”). And in Ps 145 David invokes it as the essential reason to thank and praise Yahweh (“you shall glorify me”). If correct, this would suggest that editors consciously arranged these grace formula-bearing psalms in order to present the anticipated Davidic successor as fulfiller of God’s Mosaic-covenantal summons in Ps 50; a move foreshadowed by David II’s arrangement within Book II.

Fulfilling Vows. A second observation further suggests editorial intent to cast David as the one who fulfills Yahweh’s charge in 50:14–15. In Ps 50:14b God commands his people to “perform your vows” to the Most High (וְשַׁלְּמוּ... נְדָרֵי יְיָ). Within the Psalter, the expression, “to fulfill vows” (נְדָרַי + שְׁלֹמֶם) occurs in Pss 22:26; 50:14; 56:13; 61:6, 9; 65:2; 66:13; and 116:14, 18. Thus, all but two instances of the expression occur in Book II, and one of these is Davidic Ps 22. Besides Ps 50:14, the four other instances of this expression occur in Davidic or Davidized psalms. Indeed, anonymous Ps 66 has been Davidized and collocated with Ps 65 (wherein נְדָרַי + שְׁלֹמֶם is also found!). There can be little doubt, then, that the editors of Book II sought to associate the theme of fulfilling vows specifically with David, not simply the original authors of the psalms in question. Accordingly, Book II presents David as the preeminent vow-fulfiller in

response to God’s covenantal charge to his people in Asaph Ps 50:14. The only non-Davidic psalm represented here is anonymous Ps 116.⁶¹⁹ However in addition to this theme of vow-fulfilling, numerous factors suggests that the king is in view there too as we shall explore further in Chapter Six.

Offering Sacrifices of Thanksgiving. Another important element in Ps 50:14–15’s summons bears investigation: thanksgiving offerings. To what extent does David II (and the rest of the Psalter) similarly depicts David as offerer of thanksgiving (offerings)? Besides Ps 50:14 and 23, “sacrifices of thanksgiving” (תּוֹדָה + זֶבַח) occur in Pss 107:22 and 116:17 as clear allusions to the thanksgiving offering. Both these psalms came up in our earlier discussion of blessing and fruitfulness (107:38) and fulfilling vows (116:14, 18). Psalm 54:8 also expresses the same reality: “With a freewill offering I will sacrifice to you (בְּנִדְבָה אֶזְבַּח־הֶלֶל); I will give thanks (אֶתְּהַלֵּל) to your name, Yahweh, for it is good.” Thus, the contexts of these psalms make the sacrificial connotations of תּוֹדָה explicit, and Ps 54 suggests that David fulfills this aspect of Ps 50’s summons also. תּוֹדָה occurs alone (i.e., without זֶבַח) in 26:7; 42:5; 56:13; 69:31; 95:2; 100:1, 4; and 147:7. Since תּוֹדָה means “thanksgiving” or “praise,”⁶²⁰ the extent to which editors had in view a “*sacrifice of thanksgiving*” in such instances is less clear though still highly likely. In the Pentateuch תּוֹדָה occurs only in Lev 7:12–15 and 22:29 and always with the noun זֶבַח where it describes the “peace offerings (שְׁלָמִים) for thanksgiving.”⁶²¹ This suggests that תּוֹדָה

⁶¹⁹ Psalm 116 is part of the Egyptian Hallel on the heels of the Davidic group 108–110 (111–112?) in Book V. Indeed, Ps 116:4a, 13b–14, 17b–18 also mirrors Ps 50:14–15 quite vividly, for besides declaring “I will pay my vows to Yahweh (גִּדְרֵי לַיהוָה אֲשַׁלֵּם) in the presence of all his people” in v. 14, the psalmist also promises to “offer to you the sacrifice of thanksgiving (לְךָ יְיָ אֶזְבַּח תּוֹדָה) (v. 17a) and twice declares, “I will...call upon (אֶקְרָא) the name of Yahweh” (13b, 17b) in the “house of Yahweh” (בֵּית יְהוָה—v. 19).

⁶²⁰ Cf. “תּוֹדָה,” HALOT 1695; “תּוֹדָה,” BDB 392.

⁶²¹ זֶבַח and תּוֹדָה are paired in some later biblical literature, e.g., 2 Chr 29:31 (זֶבַח־חַיִּים וְתוֹדוֹת) and 2 Chr 33:16 (זֶבַח־חַיִּים וְתוֹדָה). On the other hand, תּוֹדָה appears alone in Josh 7:19 where appears not to entail sacrifice. There Joshua commands Achan to “give glory” to God and come clean about keeping the loot.

normally entails sacrifice, even if psalms that use ידה vocabulary accentuate the element of singing.⁶²²

In fact, analysis of the seven psalms just listed tends to support this conclusion. Psalm 26:6 clearly locates thanksgiving at “your altar” (וּאֶסְבֶּבֶה אֶת־מִזְבֵּיִךָ יְהוָה), implying sacrifice even though “thanksgiving” accentuates a *vocal* activity (לְשִׁמְעַת בְּקוֹל תוֹדָה).⁶²³ Similarly, although Ps 56 omits other explicit sacrificial terminology, v. 13 parallels “rendering thanks” (אֲשַׁלֵּם תוֹדָתִי) with performing vows (נִדְרֵי־יָי) like Ps 50:14 does, making the connection even more explicit as both seem to evoke the votive offerings of Lev 7 and 22.⁶²⁴ Although Ps 95:2 parallels תוֹדָה most directly with “songs” (זְמֵרוֹת) and Ps 100:4 parallels it with “praise” (תְּהִלָּה; cf. הוֹדוּ־לֵי in v. 4b), both psalms summons worshippers “before Yahweh” in terms consistent with Leviticus’ ritual instruction.⁶²⁵ Psalm 42 is similar. In v. 5 the psalmist reminisces on a former time when he

⁶²² So Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms*, 11.

⁶²³ Cf. Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1:384.

⁶²⁴ About one third of the Pentateuch’s thirty-plus instance of נָדַר (and/or נִדְבָה) relate to votive offerings: Lev 7:16; 22:18, 21, 23; 23:38; Num 15:3, 8; 29:39; Deut 12:11, 17, 26. Otherwise, the Pentateuch applies the term נָדַר in narrative in Gen 28:20 and 31:13, and in vows relating to Nazirites (Num 6:2, 5, and 21), to “valuing” persons (Lev 27:2), and in a more general sense some fourteen times throughout Num 30 and in Deut 23:19 and 22. Significantly, נָדַר does not appear to be used in vows to “praise” or “thanksgiving” (תוֹדָה) ways that would *not* involve sacrifice. It therefore seems more likely that editors would associate “vows of thanksgiving” with liturgical acts that include the thanksgiving sacrifice rather than exclude it as a purely vocal activity.

⁶²⁵ Psalm 95 uses imperatives “come” (לָכוּ), “let us meet” (נִקְדְּמָה) together with the prepositional phrase “before him” (פָּנָיו), and “come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before Yahweh our maker” (בָּאוּ וְעִבְדוּ יְהוָה). Psalm 100 similarly summons the people to “serve Yahweh” (עֲבַדוּ יְהוָה), “come into his presence/before him” (בָּאוּ לְפָנָיו), and “enter his gates with thanksgiving [offering]” (בָּאוּ שְׂעֵרְיוֹ בְּתוֹדָה). Though an otherwise common prepositional phrase, Leviticus frequently uses “before Yahweh” (לְפָנֵי יְהוָה) in its ritual instruction on offerings: Lev 1:3, 5, 11; 3:1, 7, 8, 12, 13; 4:4, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, 24; 5:26; 6:7, 18; 7:30; 8:26, 27, 29; 9:2, 4, 5, 21, 24; 10:1, 2, 15, 17, 19; 12:7; 14:11, 12, 16, 18, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31, 53; 15:14, 15, 30; 16:1, 7, 10, 12, 13, 18, 30; 19:22; 22:3; 23:11, 28, 40; 24:3, 4, 6, and 8. Nine of these instances (1:3; 3:1, 7, 12; 9:2; 10:19; 12:7; 16:1; and 22:3) use the verb “approach” (קָרַב) to convey the notion of “approaching [before] Yahweh”—with a further three of them using the verb “to bring” (הִפָּיָה). In light of this, editors likely viewed the summons of Pss 95 and 100 to “come before Yahweh with thanksgiving” such that it entails thanksgiving

led the “procession to the house of God (בַּיִת אֱלֹהִים) with glad shouts and songs of praise/[thanksgiving offering] (בְּקוֹל־רִנָּה וְתוֹדָה), a multitude keeping festival (הַמְּזֶמֶר חוֹגֵג).” But in v. 2 the psalmist asks, “When shall I come (אָבוֹא) and appear before God (פָּנַי אֱלֹהִים).” As in Pss 95 and 100, then, the combination of תוֹדָה with the theme of “coming before God/Yahweh” seems to have liturgical life under the Mosaic covenant in view; one enters the temple courtyard to offer thanksgiving offerings. Notably, the related verb יָדָה occurs in the threefold refrain of the Pss 42–43, “Why are you downcast, O my soul, and why are you in turmoil within me? Hope in God; for I shall again praise him (אֲדַבֵּר), my salvation and my God” (42:6, 12; 43:5). יָדָה occurs a fourth time in 43:4 in what appears at first blush to be *musical* praise: “I will praise you (אֲדַבֵּר) with the lyre.” However the psalmist’s declaration, “Then I will go to the altar of God” (אֶל־מִזְבֵּחַ אֱלֹהִים | וְאֶבְרָא) locates this “praise” in the temple. Therefore, editors likely associated יָדָה throughout Pss 42–43 with the celebration of the thanksgiving offering.⁶²⁶

Perhaps the only example that may not associate “thanksgiving” with the offering is Ps 69:31. Psalm 69:31 seems to distance תוֹדָה from offerings and parallels it with “song” (שִׁיר), whereupon v. 32 makes a comparative statement, “This will please Yahweh more than an ox or a bull (וְתִיטֵב לַיהוָה מִשׁוֹר פָּר) with horns and hoofs.”⁶²⁷ Yet even in this case it is probably too

offerings.

The liturgical command to “serve Yahweh” in Ps 100:2 seems to corroborate this. Although Leviticus itself never uses עָבַד to refer to “the worship of Yahweh” (Lev 25:39–40 apply it to ordinary human slavery or servanthood), it occurs over thirty times in Exodus, which contrast the harsh service of Pharaoh and Egypt with service of Yahweh (e.g., 3:12; 4:23; 7:16, 26; 10:26 etc.). Since the last twelve chapters of Exodus focus on Sinai theophany, instruction, and the construction of the tabernacle, the narratival trajectory of Exodus indicates that עָבַד has strong liturgical and Mosaic covenantal overtones. Cf. “עָבַד (‘ābad) work, serve,” *TWOT* 639, which also notes the use of עָבַד in Num 3:7–8; 4:23, 30, 47; 8:11, 19 etc. to the Levites’ service.

⁶²⁶ For a further survey of יָדָה see Appendix I.

⁶²⁷ Cf. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 64. Goldingay, *Psalms*, 353, suggests that the psalmist was not making a general comparison of sacrificial offerings and vocal thanksgiving, but praised the latter because he had no access to the temple.

simplicistic to assume that “thanksgiving” and “song” are purely vocal in 69:31, since “ox or bull”—or better, “ox-bull”— indicates that a specific kind of offering is the likely point of contrast, rather than offerings in general. Indeed, פָּר, “young bull,” is almost exclusively reserved for sin offerings and never used for thanksgiving offerings. If editors understood v. 32 to be talking about sin offerings, then it seems more probable that they perceived a distinction between a thanksgiving song with accompanying offering on the one hand, and sin offerings on the other (cf. Ps 50:7–15).⁶²⁸ Whether or not these verses contrast the thanksgiving song with offerings, Goldingay and Dahood are surely right to see wordplay between שִׁיר and שׁוֹר.⁶²⁹ Finally, Ps 147:7 is more difficult to assess because it associates תּוֹדָה most directly with singing (עֲנָה and זָמַר) and offers no further qualification.

Thus, editors are likely to recognize an allusion to thanksgiving offerings in Pss 26:7; 42:5; 56:13; 95:2; 100:1, 4; while similar allusions cannot be ruled out in 69:31 and 147:7. Looking at the Psalter as a whole, then, there are good reasons to conclude that editors especially associated David with the Thanksgiving offering. If so, it seems likely that editors viewed him as the chief fulfiller of Ps 50’s summons in this respect. Indeed, our study of “fulfilling vows” also seems to corroborate this. Psalms 26, 56, and 69 are Davidic; indeed the latter two in Book II and seem to substantiate our contention that David takes up the summons of Ps 50:14–15. Beyond Book II, the entrance liturgies Pss 95 and 100 are followed by Davidic Pss 101–103 where “David” appears to be instrumental in bringing about the vision of Pss 93–100, while the editorial

⁶²⁸ שׁוֹר is used of peace offerings in most of its ten occurrences in Leviticus: 4:10; 9:4, 18, 19; and probably 7:13 and 22:23, 27, and 28. However, פָּר is a sin offering in every one of its twenty-nine occurrences in Lev 4, 8, and 16 and a burnt offering one other time in 23:18. The question arises, then, whether מִשׁוֹר פָּר refers to one animal as suggested by the lack of conjunction, or two. Contrary to the ESV that implies the latter, Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:353, understands these terms as referring to the same animal via parallelism. Cf. Dahood, *Psalms*, 2:165, who sees the מ in מִשׁוֹר פָּר doing double duty for פָּר, which similarly suggests parallelism. This is less conjectural than the ESV addition of a conjunction (“or”) that implies two distinct animals are meant.

⁶²⁹ Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:353; Dahood, *Psalms*, 2:165.

connection between Davidic Ps 145 and the Laudate suggests something similar for Ps 147 (see Chapter Six). Even though the Psalter is a *literary* product, it does not follow that editors appropriating psalms with thanksgiving offering allusions should cease to view the thanksgiving offering as a central reality of its hopes concerning God’s people and the king, as some modern views of the Psalter as a literary product imply.⁶³⁰

Korah I and David II. This brief survey of תהלת may also offer clues about how David II relates to Korah I. Indeed, Pss 56 and 69 seem to take up Pss 42–43’s yearning to praise (thank!) God. In the context of these lament psalms David resolves to fulfill his vows and offer thanksgiving sacrifices in view of God’s anticipated or experienced deliverance (56:13–14; 69:31). Inasmuch as Pss 42–43’s thirsting for God and Ps 44’s lament over and allusion to exile set the agenda of Book II, these Davidic laments seem to funnel the lament through David as pray-er in the Psalms, depicting him as the predominant fulfiller of vows and giver of thanks in the Psalter. Another observation points in the same direction. The petitionary section of Ps 44, vv. 24–27, asks, “Why do you hide your face?” thus complaining that God has withdrawn his blessing. As noted in Chapter Four, Ps 67:2 offers the strongest allusion to the Aaronic blessing in the Psalter, “May God be gracious to us and bless us and make his face to shine upon us” (cf. v. 8). Indeed, this blessing to be obvious to all nations, who would perceive God’s blessing on

⁶³⁰ Harry P. Nasuti, “The Editing of the Psalter and the Ongoing Use of the Psalms: Gerald Wilson and the Question of Canon,” in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship* (ed. Nancy L. deClaissé-Walford; Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 13–19, rightly cautions against an overly narrow view of the function of the Psalter as an object of meditation. Commenting on the Psalter’s early reception history, Nasuti, “The Editing of the Psalter and the Ongoing Use of the Psalms,” 15, writes, “If, as Wilson claims, the Psalter’s final editors meant to rule out . . . recitation and performance in favor of reading and meditation, those who came after them seem to have been almost flagrant in their disregard for these editors’ intentions.” There is no doubt some truth in the claim that editors intended the Psalter to serve as an object of meditation, but Nasuti’s observations should sound a cautionary note to restrict the Psalter’s intended function to this. Moreover, such a narrowed view of its function precludes a prophetic or visionary function (cf. Mitchell) whereby the Psalter proclaims realities and hopes beyond the experience of its post-exilic audience.

his people, know his “way” (דַּרְכֵי־יְהוָה) and “salvation,” “praise” him (תְּהַלֵּלֵהוּ), “be glad and sing for joy” (שִׂמְחָה וְשִׁיר וְנֵגִינָה), etc. Thus as a nation blessed, the “us” of Ps 67 brings blessing to the nations as per the Abrahamic covenant. Moreover, within Book II *David* is the one to announce or at least anticipate this blessing and, by extension, shows God’s response to Ps 44’s lament and call for exodus-like divine intervention. David, then, answers Ps 44’s lament over the destruction wrought by enemy nations by announcing God’s blessing his people through which the nations would themselves be blessed. All these themes are echoed strongly in Ps 72’s portrayal of David’s royal successor as one who brings blessing to the nations.

Conclusion

In Ps 72 an aging David prays for his son and successor, through whom God would realize his Abrahamic covenantal promises—particularly the promises having to do with blessing for the nations and land on a universalized scale. Indeed, as we trace the royal psalms at the seams of Books I–III highlighted by Wilson, the depiction of the king in Ps 72 lies somewhere between the militarily victorious king of Ps 2 and the king who himself is “poor and needy” in Ps 86:1 (cf. also Ps 89 and the Davidized “prayer of a poor man” in Ps 102). More significantly for our purposes, this picture of the king reflects the broader picture just seen in Book II, where the David II group appears to answer Asaph Ps 50’s summons and Korah I’s lament preceding it. Indeed, we say that Korah I group already offers its own initial response to its lament in Ps 44 via the combined themes of Zion/the sanctuary, Yahweh’s divine kingship, and the king in Pss 45–48. If this group consciously reflects the theological contours of the exodus and Moses’ Song as seems the case, then the answer to exile—be it historical or eschatological—is Yahweh and the king as a joint force consistent with Ps 2.

The the above analysis suggests that David II group continues in the same vein. According to Ps 45 the king’s lips are imbued with grace to sing God’s praise, whereupon David II depicts David living this out (e.g., Ps 51:1). Similarly, David II presents David as the responder to Asaph Ps 50’s summons to his “faithful ones, who made a covenant with me by sacrifice” (v. 5). David

calls upon Yahweh in his trouble (51:3), and promises to fulfill his vows (56:13; 61:6, 9; 65:2; and 66:13), and make thanksgiving offerings. Thus Book II presents David in the role of covenant partner, doing what Israel is summoned to do according to Ps 50. Moreover, the David of Book II also invokes blessing upon the people (Ps 67), and in doing so the nations also learn God's way and salvation. Indeed, our analysis of Book II suggests that historical David and the covenant he represents proleptically fulfills God's expectations for his covenant people, but also announces and anticipates the fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenantal promises through one "greater than David" (Ps 72). Indeed, our analysis also showed that Ps 72:17's picture David's successor as an agent of blessing to the nations strikes a strong concordant note with Book I–II's allusions to Abrahamic covenantal promises (e.g., Pss 22, 37, 47).

Finally, we observed that David's opening words in 51:3 echo the key terms of the grace formula. In passing we also noted that the different rhetorical uses of the grace formula in Pss 86, 103, and 145 broadly correspond to 50:15's commands and promises as a blueprint for how Yahweh's people/faithful covenant partner ought to respond to their faithful God. Accordingly Book II affirms the Psalter's particular association of David with the grace formula, and may provide a theological blueprint for its threefold quotation in Books III–V.

CHAPTER SIX

EXODUS 34:6 IN PSALMS 86, 103, AND 145 IN THEIR BOOK CONTEXTS

As a compilation, the Psalter demonstrates obvious interest in the “grace formula” of Exod 34:6. The three psalms bearing “full” quotations of the formula (Pss 86, 103, and 145) show beyond question that the grace formula and its theology was of major importance to those who arranged the Psalter. This seems assured whether one posits multiple editorial stages or a single editorial impulse behind the Psalter’s composition.

This chapter shows that these quotations, distributed across Books III, IV, and V, occur at important places within the structure of those books. It also examines how the formula and its theology have been appropriated in these books at the editorial level, and to what extent this supports our hypothesis that editors anticipated a coming “David” through whose royal, messianic office Yahweh would restore his people and renew the covenant.

Indeed, there are good reasons to pursue this possibility. The Psalter associates the grace formula most obviously with “David.” Psalms 86, 103, and 145 are all attributed “to David,” despite the relative scarcity of Davidic psalms in the last half of the Psalter compared to the first half.⁶³¹ The grace formula’s appearance in Davidic psalms is most remarkable in Books III and IV, where a total of only *three* Davidic psalms can be found (i.e., Pss 86, 101, and 103). Indeed, *two* of these three psalms quote the grace formula (Pss 86 and 103). This situation is even more remarkable in light of Book IV’s unique interest in the figure of Moses, the great covenant

⁶³¹ Eighteen psalms out of the seventy-eight psalms comprising Books III–V are attributed to David: Pss 86, 101, 103, 108–110, 122, 124, 131, 133, 138–145. Psalm 127 is attributed to Solomon.

mediator of ancient Israel. Moses turns up seven times in Book IV, and only once elsewhere (Pss 90:1; 99:3; 103:7; 105:26; 106:16, 23, and 32; cf. Ps 77:20 [Book III]). In light of the traditional association of the formula with Moses reflected in Exod 32–34 (cf. Num 14:18), Book IV’s particular interest in Moses prompts the question of why we find it on “David’s” lips rather than Moses’. Moreover, we shall see that Ps 77:20’s mention of Moses—the only one outside Book IV—appears to reflect a similar editorial perspective. The arrangement of these central Asaph psalms seems to reflect the historical progression from Moses’ leadership to the royal office as solution to the people’s repeated covenant unfaithfulness. All this raises an important question for our thesis relevant to all three Books and their highly conspicuous quotations of the grace formula: by selecting psalms that place it “on the lips of David,” could the Psalter’s compiler(s) be crediting the traditionally Mosaic role of covenant mediator and intercessor to the (awaited) “Davidic King”?

Procedurally, this chapter explores this by examining the grace formula in Exod 34, identifying the Psalter’s manifold allusions to the formula and its special association of it with “David,” and investigating its appropriation in Pss 86, 103, and 145 in their Book contexts.

The Grace Formula: Exodus 34:6

In recent years there has been a spate of dissertations, master’s theses, and other literature that investigate the “grace formula” or “credo” in Exod 34:6–7 and its reuse throughout the Old Testament.⁶³² These studies demonstrate its importance to biblical theology and draw attention to

⁶³² Lane II, “Exodus 34:6–7: A Canonical Analysis”; Philip K. Pang, “Exodus 34:6–7 and Its Intertextuality in the Old Testament”; Susan Marie Pigott, “God of Compassion and Mercy: An Analysis of the Background, Use, and Theological Significance of Exodus 34:6–7”; Mary Vanderzee-Pals, “God’s Moral Essence: Exodus 34:6–7a and Its Echoes in the Old Testament”; Donna Petter, “Exodus 34:6–7: The Function and Meaning of the Declaration.” See also Alphonso Groenewald, “Exodus, Psalms and Hebrews: A God Abounding in Steadfast Love (Ex 34:6).” For examples of earlier work, see also, R. C. Denton, “The Literary Affinities of Exodus XXXIV 6f,” *VT* 13 (1963): 34–51, and Thomas B. Dozeman, “Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Yahweh’s Gracious and Compassionate Character,” *JBL* 108 (1989): 207–23.

the diverse contexts and ways in which later OT literature appropriates the formula. Indeed, the grace formula recurs in prominent places within the Torah (Num 14:18), the Minor Prophets (Nah 1:3; Jon 4:2; Mic 7:18–20; Joel 2:13), and Writings; (Pss 86:15; 103:8; and 145:8).⁶³³ As further proof of its importance to OT theology, these later appropriations of the grace formula cover multiple genres and all three major divisions of the Hebrew canon. The above studies also show that later OT appropriations of the grace formula frequently adapt the formula to their contexts in minor ways. Far from being “frozen” in nostalgic traditions from Moses’ lifetime, later authors use the formula flexibly. They thereby demonstrate the formula’s ongoing contemporary relevance to the community.

The conclusions offered in these studies do not, however, adequately answer the particular questions demanded by our investigation. One such study, Nathan Lane’s 2007 dissertation, “Exodus 34:6–7: A Canonical Analysis,” provides a very helpful analysis of the grace formula overall. Lane’s main thesis is that the grace formula’s OT “parallels mark a canonical movement from an emphasis on the intimate covenantal relationship between YHWH and ancient Israel towards an expression of the reign of YHWH over all of creation.”⁶³⁴ Indeed, this “movement” seems consistent with what we observed in Chapter Two, namely, the broader, unified view of “covenant” in the psalms. However, Lane’s 40+ page analysis of the Psalter follows the work of Wilson, McCann, deClaissé-Walford regarding the Psalter’s editorial-theological agenda without engaging the broader issues of editorial evidence or entertaining other models.⁶³⁵ Accordingly,

⁶³³ This list does not exhaust all the OT’s allusions to the formula. Moreover, some of its key terms are already anticipated in Yahweh’s self-description in the Sinai Theophany in Exod 20:5–6 (cf. Deut 5:9–10), “for I the LORD your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity (יִצְרָתֵךְ) of the fathers on the children to the third and the fourth generation of those who hate me,⁶ but showing steadfast love (רַחֲמֵי) to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments.”

⁶³⁴ Lane, “Exodus 34:6–7: A Canonical Analysis,” Abstract.

⁶³⁵ See Chapter Two. E.g., Wilson, *Editing*; deClassé-Walford, “The Canonical Shape of the Psalms”; McCann, “Books I–III and the Editorial Purpose of the Psalter,” 93–107.

Lane gives inadequate attention to the grace formula's occurrence in specifically Davidic psalms in their respective Books.

Hee Suk Kim's recent offering on the grace formula in the psalms likewise presupposes the editorial theories of Wilson et al.⁶³⁶ Kim rightly recognizes the grace formula's original context as one of "covenant rebuilding" of Israel as a community achieved "through a leader of a community, Moses."⁶³⁷ Having recognized Moses' agency as God has renews his covenant with the community, one might expect Kim to entertain the same possibility for David. But in fact Kim assumes the work of Wilson et al., interpreting the Psalter's appropriation of the grace formula in terms of a democratizing agenda. He sees the application of the formula to the king in Ps 86 giving way to its broader application to the community in Pss 103 and 145.⁶³⁸ Community and king are thus presented as alternative beneficiaries of Yahweh's grace and compassion. Overlooked here is the possibility that the community receive Yahweh's grace and compassion *through* and *for the sake of* the king, which would more nearly reflect the theological paradigm in Exod 33–34 Kim himself observes. There Israel received God's grace and mercy through Moses because he has Yahweh's favor (see below). It therefore behooves us first to reexamine Exod 34 further, and to follow up the unexplored idea that the Psalter presents David as Moses-like agent of covenantal renewal between Yahweh and the community. Indeed, we observed in Chapter Four that Dale Allison's study of Chronicles establishes the plausibility of a typological relationship between Moses and David also in the Psalter.⁶³⁹

⁶³⁶ Hee Suk Kim, "Exodus 34: 6 in Psalms 86, 103, and 145 in Relation to the Theological Perspectives of Books III, IV, and V of the Psalter" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, San Francisco, Calif., 20 November 2011), 1–10.

⁶³⁷ Kim, "Exodus 34: 6 in Psalms 86, 103, and 145," 2.

⁶³⁸ Kim, "Exodus 34: 6 in Psalms 86, 103, and 145," 6, 9.

⁶³⁹ Allison, *The New Moses*, 35–39.

Major Theological Entailments of the Grace Formula in Exodus 34

In the OT's first and foundational instance of the grace formula, Yahweh personally declares his name as promised to Moses in 33:19. In Exod 34:6–7 we read,

The LORD passed before him and proclaimed, "The LORD, the LORD, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children and the children's children, to the third and the fourth generation."

The terminology of the grace formula accentuates Yahweh's compassion (אֵל רַחוּם), grace/graciousness (וְרַחוּן), forbearance (אָרְךָ אַפַּיִם), "steadfast love" or "faithfulness" (וְרַב־חֶסֶד), and "steadfast love" displayed in Yahweh's liberality in forgiving sin (נִצֵּר חֶסֶד לְאֲלֹפִים), and "steadfast love" displayed in Yahweh's liberality in forgiving sin (נִצֵּר חֶסֶד לְאֲלֹפִים). Collectively, these terms underscore Yahweh's delight in forgiving and having mercy. Nevertheless, the formula does not lose sight of Yahweh's punishment of the wicked: Yahweh does not "clear the guilty" (וְנִקְיָה לֹא יִנְקֶה).

Importantly, Exod 34:6–7 connects these characteristics specifically with the divine name, "Yahweh." The divine characteristics proclaimed in the formula stand in apposition to the twice declared divine name: "Yahweh, Yahweh, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger...etc." Clearly Yahweh's name and character go closely together: Yahweh *is* the gracious and compassionate God. Moreover, the divine name is the means of access to this grace and favor; Israel and its priestly intercessors use the personal name of God to access His proper, personal character of being merciful and gracious.⁶⁴⁰ Indeed, Yahweh's original promise to "declare [his] name Yahweh" to Moses in 33:19 already suggests that Yahweh's goodness is accessed through his name, where Yahweh promises, "I will make all my goodness (כָּל־טוֹבִי) pass before you and will proclaim before you my name, Yahweh." Divine proclamation of the name and divine goodness are simultaneous experiences for Moses. Moreover, Moses would call upon Yahweh's *name* when beseeching him to forgive the people (32:11–13; cf. Num 14:13–

⁶⁴⁰ John W. Kleinig, "What's the Use in Naming God?," *LITJ* 26 (1992): 27–34.

20).⁶⁴¹ Moses, the intercessor between Israel and God, thus accesses Yahweh's grace and compassion toward people who have incurred God's wrath by calling on the name of Yahweh.⁶⁴²

Also significant is the broader context of the golden calf idolatry and Yahweh's gracious and merciful response to Moses' intercession (chas. 32–34). These events are set in the midst of the Book of Exodus' instruction and construction of the tabernacle as the place of regular access to Yahweh's grace, favor, and mercy. Indeed, chas. 32–34 fall neatly between instructions concerning the tabernacle's design (chas. 25–31) and its construction (chas. 35–40), which culminate in Yahweh's glory (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה) filling the sanctuary (40:32–27). This indicates their importance for the theology of the tabernacle and regular worship, which cannot be built until the covenant is graciously restored.⁶⁴³ In this light, the importance of Yahweh's promise to declare his name in 33:19 and its fulfillment in 34:6–7 can be seen more clearly. Moses and the Israelites would regularly gain access to Yahweh's "grace and mercy" through his name at the tabernacle. Indeed, the broader context of Exodus also makes it unsurprising that "name theology" occupies so central a theological place when it comes to the tabernacle as Yahweh's sanctuary. "Name theology" turns up at key points in the story of the Israelites' emancipation from Egyptian slavery. The notable examples include Moses' commissioning and request of God's name (3:15), Yahweh's commitment to deliver his people (6:3), and the Song of the Sea celebrating Yahweh's victory (15:3).⁶⁴⁴ That the Psalter also reflects a similar interest in the divine name (e.g., the EP)⁶⁴⁵ is therefore noteworthy, if unsurprising.

⁶⁴¹ In Num 14:13–19 Moses calls upon Yahweh's name, basing his petition that Yahweh "pardon the iniquity of this people" (v. 19) on Yahweh's international reputation (vv. 13–16) and the grace formula (v. 18).

⁶⁴² This is not to suggest that "calling on the name" amounts to some kind of magical formula for acquiring God's favor irrespective of faith, as the OT elsewhere makes clear (cf. Isa 48:1). Nevertheless, the abuse of the divine name (cf. Exod 20:7; Lev 19:12; Deut 5:11) does not abrogate its proper intended use.

⁶⁴³ See R. W. L. Moberly, *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32–34* (JSOTSup 22; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 109–10.

⁶⁴⁴ Throughout the Book of Exodus, Yahweh's name is clearly instrumental in his emancipation of the

When we look at the grace formula's nearer context in Exod 32–34 other important themes emerge as well. Prior to 33:19, when Yahweh promised Moses he would proclaim his name before him, Moses had interceded for the people after Yahweh had resolved to destroy them and begin a new nation through Moses due to the golden calf.⁶⁴⁶ Yahweh immediately relents; he will not destroy them (32:7–14). A second crisis follows when Yahweh tells Moses that he will not accompany the people on their journey lest he destroy them because of their “stiff necks” (33:1–3). Again Moses pleads with Yahweh, imploring him to go with them since that alone makes them “distinct” among the nations. Again Yahweh listens to Moses' intercession (33:1–17). Clearly, the intercessory role of Moses is key to the preservation of the Israelites, and to Yahweh's ongoing, favorable presence with them, for Yahweh is quick to heed Moses' intercession and slow to execute judgment, as the formula itself declares. Yahweh's immediate response to Moses' intercession underscores the effectiveness of his mediatory role (32:14; 33:17),⁶⁴⁷ which is already a well-established theme in Exodus with the cutting of the Sinai covenant in cha. 24.⁶⁴⁸

Israelites from their “harsh service” (1:14, עֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה, cf. 14:5, 12) in the house of Pharaoh through Moses (Exod 8:20; cf. Deut 7:8 and 1Sam 2:27) so that they may serve (עָבַד) him in his house (34:26), the tabernacle, and the land he would cause them to enter (see, e.g., 34:11–16). Indeed, Exod 32–34, especially 33:19 and 34:6–7, show that Yahweh's name is equally important in his bringing his people to serve him (see also Exod 3:12; 4:23; 7:16, 26; 8:16; 9:1, 13; 10:3; 13:5; cf. 5:18; 10:7–8, 24; 12:31; 20:5).

⁶⁴⁵ See discussion in Cha. Two and, e.g., Hossfeld and Zenger, “The So-Called Elohist Psalter,” 42–51.

⁶⁴⁶ Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 51, notes the scholarly tendency to underestimate Moses's role and significance in the divine-human drama in Exod 32 (e.g., von Rad), favorably citing G. W. Coats, “Moses Versus Amalek: Aetiology and Legend in Exodus 17:8–16,” *VT* 28 (1974), 37, “Moses is not simply the blind servant, dancing his minuet of obedience to the sound of an all-encompassing divine drumbeat. To the contrary, for Pentateuchal theology Moses is both servant of God and heroic giant.” Moberly himself, *op. cit.*, 44–110, stresses the importance of Moses' role as intercessor and mediator in Exod 32–34.

⁶⁴⁷ Cf. Num 14:20, where Yahweh's favorable response to Moses' intercession is also immediate, also highlighting the effectiveness of Moses' intercession. As noted above, Moses had based his petition on the grace formula (v. 18). Thus Moses' intercession in Num 14 parallels that in Exod 32–33; a point underscored by the final

Another important contextual factor with obvious relevance to our investigation emerges in cha. 34: the grace formula occurs in the context of *covenant renewal*.⁶⁴⁹ Directly after Yahweh pronounces the formula in 34:6–7 he confirms the covenant that Moses had mediated and the people had broken (Exod 34:10–28; cf. cha. 24). Thus the formula expresses the fundamental basis of this covenant renewal: Yahweh restores the covenant relationship because he is “gracious and compassionate, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love.” In concrete terms, then, Yahweh exerts his gracious and compassionate nature through forgiving the people’s breach of the covenant.

In summary, at least three major features emerge from this first and foundational context of the grace formula: the importance of the divine name “Yahweh,” Moses’ intercessory role, and the grace formula’s context as one of covenant renewal. Any examination of the Exod 34:6 citations in Pss 86, 103, and 145 must therefore take account of these themes.

The Psalter’s Allusions to the Grace Formula and Its Special Association with “David”

Besides Pss 86:15, 103:8, and 145:8 numerous other echoes of the grace formula are audible in the Psalter.⁶⁵⁰ Strong allusions to Exod 34:6 are found in Pss 111:4 and 112:4, which cite the distinctive combination of adjectives, חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם. These poems’ terse strophic character adequately explains the truncated form of the quotation, while their acrostic structure accounts for their reversed sequence (cf. חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם in Exod 34:6), for the phrase belongs to the פ cola in both psalms. The same situation ensues for acrostic Ps 145 in v.8, where the terms appear in the

words of his plea in v. 19: “just as you have forgiven this people, from Egypt until now.”

⁶⁴⁸ See the discussion in Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 88–91.

⁶⁴⁹ See Kim, “Exodus 34: 6 in Psalms 86, 103, and 145,” 2; Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 109.

⁶⁵⁰ Psalm 86:15 replicates Exod 34:6 precisely, only replacing the twofold Tetragrammaton יְהוָה | יְהוָה with יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ (or in many MSS: יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ) as befits its function as a petition rather than a self-revelation. Psalm 103:8 omits the initial אֱלֹהֵינוּ | יְהוָה entirely, as well as the final וְרַחוּם. Ps 145:8 modifies the formula in several small ways, but without obscuring its origin: חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲרֻךְ אֲפַיִם וְגִדְלוֹתֶיךָ.

same reversed order for the same apparent reason. Similarly, Ps 116:5's confession echoes these key terms, beginning with *חַנּוּן יְהוָה וְצַדִּיק* (*רחם וצדיק*) and concluding with a participial form of *רחם* (*וְאֵלֵהֶינּוּ מִרְחָם*).⁶⁵¹ Moreover, the placement of Pss 111–112 after Davidic Pss 108–110 and Ps 145 as the last of Davidic Pss 138–145 seems structurally significant, for they conclude sequences of Davidic psalms that stand at the beginning and end the Book. This together with other allusions to the formula in Book V suggests its editorial importance. Book V thus seems to accentuate the theme of Yahweh's grace and mercy already established in Books III (Ps 86:15) and IV (Ps 103:8),⁶⁵² and continues to associated it particularly with David. (esp. Pss 111–112 after Davidic Pss 108–110⁶⁵³ and Ps 145).

Other lexical features potentially allude to the grace formula also. The word pair *חַסֵּד וְאֱמֶת* found at the end of Exod 34:6 occurs eight times in the Psalms: Pss 25:10 (cf. other key terms from Exod 34:6–7 in vv. 6–7: *פֶּשַׁע*, and *חַסְדָּה*);⁶⁵⁴ 40:11–12 (with 2d. sg. suffixes; *חַסְדֵיךָ* parallels *חַסֵּד וְאֱמֶת* in v. 12); 57:4 (with 3d. sg. suffixes); 61:8; 85:11; 86:15 (as part of the full formula); and 89:15. In addition, *חַסֵּד* and *אֱמֶת* occur in parallel another seven times (Pss 26:3; 57:11; 69:14; 108:5; 115:1; 117:2; and 138:2—57:11 and 108:5 being “doublets”). Thus, almost half (15) of *חַסְדָּה*'s 37 occurrences in the Psalter associate it with *חַסֵּד*. The word pair is lacking in Book IV, however.

⁶⁵¹ BDB, “חַנּוּן” 337, view *חַנּוּן וְרַחֲמִים* as an older phrase and *חַנּוּן וְרַחֲמִים* as later. While this is likely given that Exod 34:6 is universally held to be the older text, the major motivation for the reversal seems to be poetic form rather than datable scribal habits.

⁶⁵² Cognates of these two terms also occur together in Pss 77:10 (with *חַסֵּד*), and 102:14 (see discussion above on Ps 103).

⁶⁵³ Zenger, “Composition and Theology,” 91.

⁶⁵⁴ Another term, “your goodness” (*טוֹבָתְךָ*) occurs in 25:7, which may recall “all my goodness” (*כָּל-טוֹבֹתִי*) in Exod 33:19 since in that text Yahweh tells Moses about his theophany in cha. 34, promising to “make all my goodness pass before you and...proclaim my name ‘Yahweh.’” (Nowhere does the Psalter reproduce this exact expression, but “your abundant goodness” [*רַב-טוֹבָתְךָ*] occurs in 31:20 and 145:7 in reference to Yahweh, and we find the expression “the goodness of Yahweh” [*טוֹב יְהוָה*] in Ps 27:13 [cf. 34:9]).

The expression רב־חַטָּאת (cf. רב־חַטָּאת in Exod 34:6) occurs in Pss 5:8, 69:14 (with בְּאַמְתָּ, ⁶⁵⁵ 106:7 (pl.)). The same expression with a preposition (בְּרַב חַטָּאוֹת) occurs again in 106:45 (*Qere* חַטָּאוֹת, and thus pl.), which we noted in our discussion of בְּרִית in that verse (see Chapter Three). Only Pss 86:15, 103:8, and 145:8 have it pointed רב־חַטָּאת as Exod 34:6 does.

There is also significant lexical and thematic overlap between Exod 34:6–7 and several other psalms: Pss 32:1–2, 5 (עוֹן, פְּשָׁע, and חַטָּאת each occur twice in the context of forgiveness); 51:3 (חַטָּאת וְפְשָׁעֵי; NB עוֹן and חַטָּאת are paired in vv. 4, 7, and 11, as are עוֹן and חַטָּאת in v. 5); ⁶⁵⁶ 65:4 (עוֹן and פְּשָׁע, which God “atones for them” [אַתָּה תְּכַפֵּרם]); 78:38 (וְהָרַבָּה לְהַשִּׁיב אִפְּוֹן); 79:8–9 (esp. the terms עוֹן, רַחֲמִים, כַּפַּר, and חַטָּאת); ⁶⁵⁷ 85:3 (נִשְׂאָה, עוֹן, and חַטָּאת); and to a lesser extent 107:17 (פְּשָׁע and עוֹן only, of which Yahweh “healed them” [רָפָא] in v. 20). In all these contexts the psalmist either seeks God’s forgiveness or confesses God’s forgiving character. Notably, consecutive Pss 78 and 79 each combine a cognate of רַחַם and the theme of atonement (כַּפַּר). Psalms 78–79 directly follow Ps 77, which contains cognates of both רַחַם and חַנּוּן in v. 10 and concludes with a clear reference to the Exodus, Moses, and Aaron. This suggests that the Asaph psalmists drew deeply on the memory of Yahweh’s gracious renewal of the Sinai Covenant as they sought Yahweh’s mercy and atonement for the nation’s sins. Similarly, the psalmist of Ps 102:14—a psalm wedged between Davidic Pss 101 and 103 and thus Davidized—announces that “you will arise and have pity (חַנּוּן) on Zion,” and that “it is time to favor her” (כִּי־עַתָּה לְחַנּוּנָהּ). More will be said on this below.

⁶⁵⁵ See also רַחֲמֵיךָ and כָּרַב רַחֲמֵיךָ as basis for the petitions to “answer me” and “turn to me” in v. 17.

⁶⁵⁶ Ps 59:4–5 also contain עוֹן, פְּשָׁע, and חַטָּאת, but in the context of the psalmist protesting his innocence rather than Yahweh’s forgiveness as in Exod 34:7. Also different in its use of key terms is Ps 109:14. Though it contains עוֹן and חַטָּאת this verse urges for the “wicked” (cf. v. 2) not forgiveness but that these be remembered (זָכַר). Meanwhile Asaph Ps 79:8–9 petitions God to “not remember against us our former iniquities (עוֹנוֹת) (רַחֲמֵינוּ)” and to “cover our sins (חַטֹּאתֵינוּ) for your name’s sake.”

⁶⁵⁷ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִקְדֶּם מִהַר יְקֻדְמוֹנוּ רַחֲמֵיךָ כִּי יִדְלוֹנוּ מֵאֵד ... וְכַפֵּר עַל־חַטֹּאתֵינוּ לְמַעַן שְׂמֹחַ

רַחֵם occurs some two dozen times in the Psalter in appeals to Yahweh to “be gracious,” usually as the stock plea: רַחֵם־נָּא.⁶⁵⁸ Several instances occur in psalms we have already encountered above (e.g., Pss 51, 57, 86, and 102), while another demonstrates stronger ties with different Mosaic covenant-related Pentateuchal texts (e.g., Ps 67:2 and Num 6:24–27). The possibility that the fuller expression of Yahweh’s character in Exod 34:6 lingers in the background of these pleas for grace is strengthened by other factors in specific instances, as we shall see, e.g., in the case of Ps 123:2–3.

To sum up: besides the full quotations of Exod 34:6 in Pss 86, 103, and 145, echoes of Exod 34:6(–7) occur in Pss 5, 25, 26, 32, 40, 51, 57, 61, 65, 69, 77, 78, 79, 85, 89, 102, 108, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, and 138. Although the extent of lexical and syntactical overlap with Exod 34:6–7 varies, this list shows some twenty-six psalms wherein editors likely recognized allusions to this foundational description of Yahweh’s attributes of grace, faithfulness, and forgiveness that he exercised when renewing the Sinaitic covenant. This list affords a few further observations. First, these psalms are spread throughout all five books of the Psalter, suggesting the grace formula’s importance to all five books. Second, many of these psalms are consecutive (77–79; 102–103; 111–112; 115–117), further suggesting that editors were aware of and used these allusions as lexical and thematic connections between the psalms involved. This is especially the case in Pss 78–79, 102–103 and 111–112, where the same lexemes appear in adjacent psalms. Third, the strong allusions in Book V (Pss 111–112 and 145) accentuate Yahweh as *gracious* (רַחֵם) and occur in psalms that Zenger regards to be structurally important to that book (see below). Fourth, despite its Mosaic covenantal roots the psalmists and editors seem to have applied these echoes of the grace formula to “other” covenants as well (see, e.g., רַחֵם־נָּא דַּחֲסִי in Ps 89:15). This is entirely in keeping with its versatility as evidenced in Numbers,

⁶⁵⁸ Pss 4:2; 6:3; 9:14; 25:16; 26:11; 27:7; 30:9 (רַחֵם־נָּא), 11; 31:10; 41:5, 11; 51:3; 56:2; 57:2; 67:2; 86:3, 16; 102:14 (15); 119:29, 58, 132; 123:2, 3; and 142:2.

Jonah, Joel, Nehemiah, and Nahum. It also sheds light on the covenants' theological unity suggested by our survey of *יְרֵי־יְהוָה*; namely, that their continuance and efficacy depends on *Yahweh's* renewing grace, love, forgiveness, etc., and that therein lies a, or perhaps *the*, major locus of the historical covenants' unity. Finally, over two thirds of the above psalms are Davidic, Davidized, or royal.⁶⁵⁹ This confirms the impression given by Pss 86, 103, and 145 that the Psalter predominantly associates the formula with the Davidic king.

Exodus 34:6 in the Psalms 86, 103, and 145, and their Book Contexts

Having traced these allusions to the grace formula, it remains to examine its fullest reiterations in Pss 86, 103, and 145 in the contexts of those psalms and their Books. Doing so will facilitate a fuller exploration of how editors understood and employed the grace formula in relation to David and the covenant(s). Moreover, it will allow further exploration of Chapter Five's suggestion that these psalms' use of the formula broadly corresponds to God's summons to his covenant people in 50:14–15: "Offer to God a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and perform your vows to the Most High, and call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver you, and you shall glorify me."

The Grace Formula in Psalm 86:15

Lane describes the grace formula's function in Ps 86 this way, "The psalmist uses the credo as an expression of the faithfulness of YHWH's character and the reason why YHWH should come to the aid of this worshipper."⁶⁶⁰ Thus, the formula serves as the basis the psalmist's petition to *Yahweh* for help. Psalm 86 concludes:

⁶⁵⁹ Sixteen of the above psalms fall into this category: Pss 5, 25, 26, 32, 40, 51, 57, 61, 65, 69, 89, 102, 108, 111, 112, and 138. This leaves seven psalms: Pss 77, 78 (though we may recall Ps 78's culmination with David!), 79, 85, 115, 116, and 117.

⁶⁶⁰ Lane, "Exodus 34:6–7," 165. Lane, *op.cit.*, 161–62, observes that modern scholars often view Ps 86 as a postexilic creation owing to its apparent borrowing from other psalms. See also Frank L. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 371. While objections could be raised, our present purposes require us to examine Ps 86 from the

¹⁴ O God, insolent men have risen up against me;
a band of ruthless men seeks my life, and they do not set you before them.

¹⁵ But you, *O Lord, are a God merciful and gracious,
slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness.*

¹⁶ Turn to me and be gracious to me; give your strength to your servant,
and save the son of your maidservant.

¹⁷ Show me a sign of your favor, that those who hate me may see and be put to shame
because you, LORD, have helped me and comforted me.

Unlike most other appropriations of Exod 34:6 in the Prophets, Ps 86's "prayer" does not seem appropriate the formula in terms of the psalmists' need for repentance and forgiveness. Indeed, Ps 25:6–7 provides an instructive contrast, for there ("historical") David alludes to the grace formula—albeit more obliquely—in a clear plea for Yahweh's mercy and favor for *himself* in view of his lifelong sinfulness,

⁶ Remember your mercy (רַחֲמֶיךָ) O Lord, and your steadfast love (וְיִסְדְּךָ), for they have been from of old.

⁷ Remember not the sins (חַטָּאוֹת) of my youth or my transgressions (וּפְשָׁעַי); according to your steadfast love remember me, for the sake of your goodness, O Lord!

By contrast, the psalmist in Ps 86 makes no pleas for forgiveness nor admits any guilt in his prayer.⁶⁶¹ Throughout the opening verses the royal pray-er petitions Yahweh to "answer me" (עֲנֵנִי), "be gracious me" (חַנּוּנִי), "keep my life" (שְׁמֹרָה נַפְשִׁי), "save" (הוֹשֵׁעַ), and "gladden the soul of your servant" (שִׂמְחַת נַפְשִׁי עַבְדְּךָ), but nowhere directly asks for forgiveness. Indeed, in v. 2 the psalmist even refers to himself as "faithful," חַסִּיד (a cognate of חֶסֶד). His self-description thus emphasizes his fidelity to Yahweh rather than dwell on the problem of sin.⁶⁶² Indeed, the

perspective of its position in the Psalter, not its authorship and cult-functional *Sitz im Leben*.

⁶⁶¹ Lane, "Exodus 34:6–7," 165.

⁶⁶² So Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 2, 371, observe as well: "The psalms appeal to the forgiving and merciful God without any hint of a confession of sin."

Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 2–5, rightly cautions that "righteousness" (צדקה/צדק) in the Psalms has more to do with trusting in Yahweh than "moral perfection." It should be acknowledged that the same could go for חַסִּיד here. Our point is not that חַסִּיד "proves" the psalmist's moral perfection but that the psalm lies open to such possibilities and does not draw specific attention to the psalmist's sin in any way.

problem about which the psalmist petitions Yahweh is *external* in the psalm, not internal: “insolent men have risen up against” the psalmist and “a band of ruthless men” seeks his life (v. 14). The psalmist thus expects Yahweh to demonstrate his gracious, compassionate, and faithful love by vindicating him amid threats posed by others, rather than by “forgiving” him.

The closest the Ps 86 comes to the theme of forgiveness is v. 5’s description of *Yahweh*, “For you, O Yahweh, are good and forgiving (וְסָלַחְתָּ).” Taking the psalm in isolation, such an appeal to Yahweh’s forgiving character might suggest the psalmist’s personal need for forgiveness. However, in addition to the “innocence” language of the psalm just noted, several considerations suggest that editors appropriated Ps 86’s “Prayer of David” as the prayer of an embattled and suffering royal intercessor for the people.

First, סָלַח’s appearance with other grace formula language in Ps 86 draws parallels to Exod 34:6–9 and Num 14:18–19 recalling Moses’ intercession for the people.⁶⁶³ As an adjective, סָלַח is semantically equivalent to the participle נָשָׂא in Exod 34:7 and appears as a finite verb in Moses’ petition a few verses later in v. 9, “pardon our iniquity and our sin” (וְסָלַחְתָּ לָנוּ וְלִפְשָׁנוּ וְלִפְשֵׁינוּ). It may be significant that another context reiterating the grace formula, Num 14:18–19, employs both terms to similar effect. A cognate of the relatively rare סָלַח and the verb נָשָׂא occur in Num 14:19 as Moses recollects his intercession for the people: “Pardon (וְסָלַחְתָּ) the iniquity of this people, according to the greatness of your steadfast love, just as you have forgiven (וְנָשָׂאתָ) this people, from Egypt until now.”⁶⁶⁴ This comes on the heels of v.

⁶⁶³ So also observes Kim, “Exodus 34: 6 in Psalms 86, 103, and 145,” 3–4, who notes the psalmist’s application of the grace formula to himself as עַבְד and follows Goldingay in identifying the psalmist as the king (Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:618–20).

⁶⁶⁴ Interestingly, the term “forgiving” is missing in the Syriac tradition. This omission may reflect awareness of v. 5 as an allusion to the formula and an attempt to keep it “pure.” Alternatively the omission of “forgiving” may offer a clue to how the Syriac scribes (or those of its *Vorlage!*) understood the petitioning psalmist; namely, as one who had no personal cause to seek “forgiveness” as a divine benefit. Of course, such conjectures are difficult to prove or disprove.

18's reiteration of the grace formula, suggesting a possible allusion and giving grounds to view the praying "David" of Ps 86 in terms of Moses' interceding in Exod 33–34 and Num 14. Moreover, by confessing that Yahweh is also "good" (טוֹב) Ps 86:5 combines key term from Yahweh's original promise to display his "goodness" in Exod 33:19 (אֲנִי אֶעֱבֹר כָּל-טוֹבֵי) (עַל-פְּנֵיךָ) fulfilled in 34:6–7. By so describing Yahweh, the psalmist seems to expect that Yahweh again show himself "good," "forgiving," and "full of mercy" (וְרַב-חֶסֶד) as he had to Moses. These allusions suggest an identification of the Davidic pray-er with Moses as an intercessor (rather than as an individual begging for forgiveness).

Second, after vv. 3–4's various appeals to Yahweh to deal graciously (חַנּוּן) with him and "gladden [his] soul" (שִׂמְחָה נַפְשִׁי עִבְדְּךָ), v. 5 then describes Yahweh's liberality in showing forgiveness to "all who call to you" (כָּל-קוֹרְאֶיךָ). Strictly speaking, then, "all who call on you" (לְכָל-קוֹרְאֶיךָ) are the direct beneficiaries of divine forgiveness in v. 5. It is a general statement, not a personal acknowledgment of guilt, and any connection between the psalmist's suffering and personal guilt must be inferred. Admittedly that inference is to some degree a natural one, for the psalmist is indeed calling to Yahweh for help. But it must be asked how editors viewed the psalmist as they read and incorporated Ps 86? Did they view "David" praying for himself alone or the people of his kingdom? Indeed, it seems quite possible to read Ps 86 as the prayer of an embattled king seeking God's help for his whole people in an intercessory capacity. Rhetorically speaking, v. 5's confession "reminds" Yahweh of his character v. 5 and therefore seems to place on him an expectation that he act in accordance his character toward all who call on him (לְכָל-קוֹרְאֶיךָ) as demonstrated throughout exodus and wilderness wanderings (esp. Exod 33–34; Num 14).⁶⁶⁵

⁶⁶⁵ Interestingly, each of the petitions in vv. 1–4 is already directly predicated on its own כִּי clause. Verse 5's כִּי clause is therefore distinct. Functionally, it seems either to add another reason why Yahweh should "listen" etc., or offer a quasi-petition of its own by expecting God to forgive and heed the people as *they* call to Yahweh (לְכָל-קוֹרְאֶיךָ).

Third, Ps 86's context in the Korahite group suggests as much, for Ps 85's pleas to Yahweh to renew his forgiveness toward "his people" (85:3, 7) sets Ps 86 in the context the *people's* experience of wrath and need for Yahweh's forgiveness. Indeed, 85:2–4 recalls Yahweh's past forgiveness to his people (גַּשְׁאֵתָ עֲזָן עַמְּךָ בְּסִיף כָּל־חַטָּאתָם) and the turning aside of his anger (הִשְׁיִבוֹתָ מִחֲרוֹן אַפֶּיךָ), whereupon vv. 5–8 petition Yahweh to divert his anger and restore/revive "us."⁶⁶⁶ Then v. 9 anticipates the divine response via its cohortative, "Let me hear (אֲשָׁמְעָה) what God the Lord will speak." Arguably, that proclamation comes in Ps 103 and its grace formula language, however in keeping with Book III's focus on the stricken/forsaken Davidic king (see esp. Ps 89), Ps 86 first depicts a praying Davidic king who petitions Yahweh for help on the basis of the grace formula.

Fourth, Hezekiah's intercession in 1Chron 30:18–20 offers precedent for such a royal, intercessory role. There the royal intercessor petitions Yahweh to pardon participants in the peace offering who had not been cleansed according to Levitical law. Yahweh "hears" (שָׁמַע) Hezekiah and "heals" (רָפָא) the people in response to his prayer (v. 20). That editors should likewise view "David" in Ps 86 as one who intercedes for others amid his afflictions is therefore very plausible.

Psalm 86 in Its Book Context

Broadly speaking, Book III consists of two main author groups, Asaph Pss 73–83 and Korahite Pss 84–88 with Davidic Ps 86 at its center. As discussed in Chapter One, authorial attribution thus plays a primary role in the editorial arrangement of Book III. Despite some obvious differences, the psalms bordering these two author groups (Pss 83–84) share the same genre (מִזְמוֹר), softening the transition between them.⁶⁶⁷ We also noted the unique way in which

⁶⁶⁶ The BHS editors suggest אָשׁוּבָנוּ for שׁוּבָנוּ in v. 5, suggesting a call to Yahweh to "turn," whereas the ESV translates "revive us." In any case, v. 7's "revive us again" (תְּשׁוּבָתָנוּ) is clearer, and the petitionary force of vv. 5–8 is otherwise obvious.

⁶⁶⁷ Differences include the addition of שִׁיר in Ps 83's superscript and לְמִנְצֵחַ עַל־הַגִּתִּית in Ps 84's superscript.

Ps 88's double superscriptional tradition connects the preceding Korahite group with the final "Ezrahite" Ps 89 concluding the Book, in contrast to the disjunctive transition from Ps 89 to Mosaic Ps 90.⁶⁶⁸ These superscriptional data thus underscore Book III as purposefully arranged subunit of the Psalter.

Within Book III Ps 86 offers the only exception to the editorial "softening" technique pointed out by Wilson, its superscript differing in authorial attribution and genre (תִּפְלֵה לְדָוִד).⁶⁶⁹ Zenger and Hossfeld propose that editors inserted Ps 86 later.⁶⁷⁰ As noted in Chapter Two, however, this assumes that scribes were predisposed to disturb the original integrity of discreet groups of psalms in the growing Psalter; a point we deemed unlikely (assuming Book III "grew" in several stages at all). On the other hand, the presence of Davidic Ps 86 in the midst of the second Korahite group scarcely renders it unrecognizable as a group, though it does succeed in bringing David to prominence at the center of that group. Indeed, Ps 85:10 petitions God to "see our shield" (מִגִּנִּי רְאֵה אֱלֹהִים), and "look upon the face of your anointed" (וְהִבֵּט פָּנַי מִשִּׁיחָךְ). The Korahites therefore already anticipate "David's" prayer for help by praying for him themselves. Psalm 86 is therefore in keeping with the group, and one can argue that the Korahite group was created around a praying David as its central theological theme. Moreover, David is already central to the preceding Asaph group in Ps 78, where he appears at the theological climax in vv. 70–72 (see Chapter Three). Other similarities (discussed below) also suggest that Davidic Ps 86 well fits its present location among the Korahite psalms, whereas Hossfeld's and Zenger's explanation of a later insertion seems an unnecessarily complicated one.

⁶⁶⁸ Wilson, *Editing*, 165. See Chapter Two.

⁶⁶⁹ Psalm 85's superscript reads, לְבִנְיָ-קָרַח מִזְמוֹר, and Ps 87's reads, לְבִנְיָ-קָרַח מִזְמוֹר שִׁיר.

⁶⁷⁰ Recognizing that Ps 86 bears phraseological similarities to other psalms, Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2, 5* regard Ps 86 to be a late editorial creation drawing on older psalmody and inserted at the final redaction of the Psalter.

Several observations about Book III are relevant to our investigation. First, the Asaph group concludes the so-called Elohist Psalter, whereupon the Korahite group takes up the name “Yahweh” as the predominant term of address once more. This is consistent with the grace formula’s “name theology” entailments in Exod 34. The more intimately prayerful tone of the Korahite psalms comes on the heels of the more historically-oriented, instructive, and prophetic character of the Asaph Psalms that accentuate God’s transcendence and judgment (see, e.g. Pss 78, 81, etc.).

Second, Ps 78’s centrality to the Asaph group and its extraordinary length make it focal for the Asaph group.⁶⁷¹ We noted in Chapter Three that Ps 78 is didactic in character (vv. 1–4). Psalm 78 instructs its readers about Israel’s pattern of breaking faith with God and his consequent rejection of the northern tribes (v. 67) in favor of Judah, Zion, and “David” (vv. 68–72) at the end of the psalm. Although David is mentioned only once, then, his appearance is at the center of the collection and theologically poignant: the election (וַיִּבְחַר בְּדָוִד עַבְדּוֹ in v. 70; cf. v. 68) of Judah, Zion, and “David” was Yahweh’s response to Israel’s cyclical covenantal faithlessness, and appears at the climax of this lengthy, centrally-positioned psalm. The structural significance of this increases dramatically when we observe David’s centrality also to the Korahite group via Ps 86, and the consistent way in which David is presented as “Yahweh’s Servant” in both places. In Ps 78:70, God “chose David *his servant*” (וַיִּבְחַר בְּדָוִד עַבְדּוֹ) to “shepherd Jacob his people” (לְרִעוּת בְּיַעֲקֹב עַמּוֹ), while the psalmist in Ps 86 thrice refers to himself as “your servant” (עַבְדְּךָ—vv. 2, 4, and 16). Moreover, the same description of David is Yahweh’s “servant” a further three times in Royal Ps 89 (vv. 4, 21, and 40).⁶⁷² Thus, all three places that mention

⁶⁷¹ Cf. Chapter One, where we identified centrality as a sign of intentional editorial arrangement.

⁶⁷² See 89:4, “I have sworn to David my servant” (נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְדָוִד עַבְדִּי); v. 21, “I found my servant David” (מָצָאתִי דָוִד עַבְדִּי), and v. 40, “You have abandoned the covenant of your servant” (נִאֲרַתָּה בְרִית עַבְדְּךָ)—the precise meaning of נֹאֵר being ambiguous, though it is undoubtedly used here with a strong, accusatory rhetorical force. Barber, *Singing in the Reign*, 93, notes the centrality of Davidic Ps 86 to the Korah II group as a point of interest. Indeed, “David’s” centrality also in the Asaph group (78:70–72) and status as “servant” in both places as

“David” in Book III reflect his status as Yahweh’s “servant.” These observations suggest that David’s centrality to the Asaph and Korahite groups is deliberate, and that Book III’s editors sought to present “servant David” as theologically central to the whole book, not just Ps 89.

David in the Asaph Group (Pss 73–83): Psalm 78:70–72. As noted above and in Chapter Three, “David” is in some sense God’s answer to the cycle of covenantal faithlessness in Ps 78. Psalm 78’s centrality to the Asaph group raises the question of how “David” relates to the Asaph group as a whole.

The best clues lie in Ps 78’s collocation with Ps 77 given the conspicuous parallels in how the two psalms conclude. Psalm 77:19–20 reads, “Your way was through the sea, your path through the great waters; yet your footprints were unseen. You led your people like a flock (נְתִיתָ עֲמָן עַמְּךָ) by the hand of Moses and Aaron.” Psalm 77 therefore ends with clear reference to the exodus and the shepherding motif, identifying “Moses and Aaron” as the leaders. But just as God led (cf. נְתִיתָ) his people “by the hand of” (בְּיַד) Moses and Aaron, so also in Ps 78:72 God took David, his servant, from the “sheepfolds” (v. 70) and led his people “with [David’s] skillful hand” (וּבְתַבּוּנוֹת כַּפָּיו יִנְחֵם) “to shepherd Jacob his people and Israel his inheritance” (לְרֻעוֹת) (וּבְתַבּוּנוֹת כַּפָּיו יִנְחֵם; v. 71). The collocation of Pss 77–78 is far from random in light of this thematic and linguistic concatenation. Indeed several observations suggest that by divine election in Ps 78 “David” takes on this *Mosaic* role as shepherd of the people. First, Moses is not identified by his traditional appellation “servant,” whereas Ps 78 clearly does describe David this way—a point that has general significance in Book III as we have seen. Second, while 77:20 only briefly refers to Moses and Aaron by whose “hand” Yahweh led his flock, 78:70–72 lingers on David’s vocation as shepherd more intensely, accentuating David’s “understanding” (תְּבוּנָה) as the instrument by which he shepherds and guides his people (וַיִּרְעֵם... יִנְחֵם) in v. 72 cf. לְרֻעוֹת

well as Ps 89 indicate the editorial and theological importance of “David” in Book III.

in v. 71).⁶⁷³ Indeed, the reference to David’s “upright heart” (פְּתָם לְבָבוֹ) makes it more natural to read *David* as the subject of the verbs in v. 72 rather than Yahweh. Second, we have suggested that editors likely understood “David” not to refer restrictively to the founding figure of the Davidic monarchy but with a view primarily to the institution of kingship embodied in the present (or future, eschatological) king. As noted in Chapter Three, this not only fits Ps 78’s contemporizing of historical traditions to later situations, but also Book III’s focus on the “present David”—whether that be amid the crisis of the historical exile (Wilson) or an eschatological one (Mitchell). This is seen most clearly in Ps 89, whose horizon clearly embraces Davidides beyond the founding figure of the Davidic dynasty when it speaks of “David.” To be sure, Yahweh made his promises to historical David, but the rub comes with the present/future Davidide who now experiences God’s apparent rejection, and it is upon his fortunes that Ps 89 focuses. Understood thus, there is a strong, virtually seamless continuity between David as founder of the dynasty to whom Yahweh originally made his promises in the Davidic Covenant and the present, “rejected” David. Promises made to historical David are promises for later Davidides, and the rejection of later Davidides is viewed as the rejection of historical David (e.g., Ps 89). This in turn suggests that Book III’s editors more likely viewed the reference to David in 78:70–72 in the same way, rather than as a purely nostalgic, historical, exclusive reference to historical David’s instrumental pastoral role in God’s care of his people. If this is correct, then “David” in 78:70 denotes the royal office and Yahweh’s purpose through it (and his sanctuary), both then in the time of historical David and “now.” This also coheres with our analysis of the postscript at 72:20 by implying that editors understood “David” thereafter to

⁶⁷³ Jones, “The Psalms of Asaph,” 87, recognizes a resumption of the shepherd/flock motif in 78:52–53 that “has been seen already in 77:20.” In 78:52–53 God “led out his people like sheep and guided them in the wilderness like a flock.” As Jones notes, this portion of Ps 78 recalls further the Exodus and Wilderness Wandering where Moses’ role, though unspecified here, was focal. Thus, within Ps 78 itself vv. 70–72 can be seen the movement to reapply this motif with its traditional Mosaic overtones to David as shepherd through whom God cared for his flock.

primarily denote someone other than historical David: his successor(s). Indeed, as the next mention of David after 72:20, Ps 78's historic yet contemporizing perspective fittingly transitions between the historical David as founding figure in the Davidic Covenant and the Psalter's burgeoning primary focus on the royal office as occupied by a post-David "David."

The juxtaposition of Ps 79 with Ps 78 indicates a further transition. Psalm 77 celebrates the Mosaic era of the exodus and Ps 78 celebrates "servant David" as Yahweh's answer to Israel's historic covenantal faithlessness. Then comes Ps 79's lament that the nations have defiled and destroyed of God's inheritance (vv. 1–4), which at the editorial level seems to depicts exile, as does Ps 80 after it. Psalm 79 is silent about David, though it laments the destroyed temple in v. 1 (thus taking up once more the major issue of Ps 74). Instead it laments the spilled "blood of [God's] *servants*" (עַבְדֵי־יְהוָה) and like its two predecessors concludes with pastoral motif in v. 12's use of covenant formula language, "we are your people, the sheep of your pasture" (אֲנֵנוּ כְּצֹאן עֵינֶיךָ).⁶⁷⁴ Thus Ps 79 shifts the focus from David as servant to the people as God's servants. However it is unlikely that the editors responsible for Book III understood a simplistic historical "progression" from Moses to David to exilic people.⁶⁷⁵ Indeed, a similar shift from David as "servant" to people as "servants" can be seen in Ps 89. There the threefold reference to David as עַבְדְּךָ is followed by a final petition to Yahweh to "remember the reproach of your *servants*" (עַבְדֵי־יְהוָה).⁶⁷⁶ Yet as noted in Chapter Three, this psalm binds together the fortunes of

⁶⁷⁴ Psalm 80:2 addresses God as "Shepherd of Israel" in its plea for restoration of God's people, thus continuing the shepherd-sheep motif.

⁶⁷⁵ If one posits different (earlier) editors for the arrangement of the Asaph group vis-à-vis the arrangement of Book III as a whole, then it is possible (though in our view unlikely) that those earlier editors intended a supercessional, quasi-dispensationalist "progression" from era to era that the later editors did not. Jones, "The Psalms of Asaph," 90 (also 187), reads the Pss 78–79 sequence in this way, claiming that "Psalm 79 is jarring for the reader and calls for a reassessment of the Zion-David theology." Jones here echoes Wilson's view of the Davidic covenant in the Psalter, following a similar historicizing approach as we noted in Chapter Three.

⁶⁷⁶ ESV: "Remember...how your servants are mocked." The Syriac tradition and more than twenty MSS of the LXX attest the sg. reading, which would make identify it as the prayer of the king himself in light of the 1st sg.

king and people—of servant *and* servants. This suggests that Book III’s editors were not disposed to read Ps 79’s silence about David as stripping him of his status as God’s answer to Israel’s Mosaic covenantal failings. On the contrary, the silence concerning “David” only distances him from any culpability regarding the divine judgment through exile, which contrasts sharply with how the Deuteronomic History assessed the situation of the historic exile.⁶⁷⁷ Indeed, we have already noted the lack of “fault” in David in Ps 89 on the one hand, and Ps 78’s diagnosis of Israel’s covenant unfaithfulness on the other. Looking beyond Ps 78’s immediate neighbors, Ps 81:12–17’s admonition to God’s people continues in the same vein as Ps 78, declaring that “my people would not listen to my voice” or “walk in my ways” (vv. 12–14). Its placement after Pss 79–80 thus offers the reason for the situation lamented in those psalms, the destruction and oppression of their enemies. God would “soon subdue their enemies” (**טַעַמְצֵי אֱוִיבֵיהֶם אֶכְנִיעַ**) if only his people listened to him (vv. 14–15). The enemies continue to be a problem through to the end of the Asaph group—seen especially in Ps 83:5–9’s “league of ten nations” that “covenant” and conspire against God, but Pss 78 and 81 make it clear that the people’s covenant unfaithfulness towards God is to blame, not “David,” adding weight to the idea that editors rather took 78:70–72 to affirm him as the solution to that problem.

David as the Central Figure of the Korahite Group (Pss 84–88). As noted above, Ps 86’s “Davidic” petitioner describes himself as faithful to Yahweh (**יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי**, v. 2), and petitions Yahweh for help because insolent and ruthless men threaten his life. The psalmist admits no guilt in his prayer, nor identifies any internal cause for the crisis he faces. This is also consistent with the way Book III elsewhere presents “David.” At the end of Book III, Ps 89 laments Yahweh’s apparent rejection of “David” (cf. 89:39), also without naming any fault in the king. Taking OT

subject of the verb following it (**יִשָּׁשׂ**).

⁶⁷⁷ This dissimilarity of assessment may result from a different, eschatological exile as these psalms’ interpretive horizon (cf. Mitchell), rather than represent a different take on the same historical circumstances prior to 587 that the DH addresses.

historiography as our point of comparison, Ps 89's silence about this is remarkable. The Deuteronomic History focuses especially on the unfaithfulness of the kings as the chief reason for Yahweh's judgment and the exile. Psalm 89, however, throws the ball completely in God's court. The crisis is *Yahweh's* inaction and apparent breach of his promises to David (see, e.g., vv. 2–5, 47–52). Such a picture of David coheres with Ps 78 also, for an unfaithful king could scarcely solve the nation's perpetual faithlessness.

When we draw all this together the following picture emerges from Book III: David, Yahweh's servant, appeals to Yahweh's gracious character expressed in the grace formula to aid him and the people he shepherds against the "insolent" and "ruthless." Furthermore, as Lane observes, 86:9 reflects the extension of God's love and mercy to all nations: "all the nations you have made shall come and worship before you, Yahweh, and shall glorify your name." Although the psalmist ostensibly prays for himself, ultimately his plea benefits all nations, reconciling them to Yahweh. Indeed, the theme of "the inclusion of the Gentiles" is a major concern in the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants (cf. Ps 72:17 and Chapters Four and Five) and other OT appropriations of the grace formula. In Jonah 4:2, for instance, it applies specifically to Yahweh's mercy toward the people of Nineveh, the *enemy* of Israel. Moreover, Ps 86 seems to offer echoes of Isaianic theology in these respects, which gives prominent place to the restorative role of the Servant (cf. Isa 40–55) and the eschatological ingathering of the nations to worship Yahweh (e.g., Isa 25). Isaiah's second "Servant Song," culminates with Yahweh's declaration to his servant: "It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the preserved of Israel; I will make you as a light for the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth" (49:6). Similarly Ps 86's Davidic psalmist and servant of Yahweh prays on account of those who seek his life, on the one hand, and to the ultimate benefit of the nations, on the other. Korahite Ps 87 then reinforces the theme of the inclusion of non-Israelites in Zion (vv. 4–7),

Among those who know me I mention Rahab and Babylon; behold, Philistia and Tyre, with Cush—"This one was born there," they say. And of Zion it shall be said,

“This one and that one were born in her”; for the Most High himself will establish her. The LORD records as he registers the peoples, “This one was born there.” Singers and dancers alike say, “All my springs are in you.”⁶⁷⁸

When we consider the relationship between Ps 86 and the Korahite psalms to the preceding Asaph group, several other observations further suggest that editors intended “David” to occupy a theologically central place in the inclusion of the nations and renewal of the sanctuary. The Asaph Psalms conclude the so-called Elohist portion of the Psalter, and are marked by a relatively greater focus on God’s judgment. By contrast the Korahite psalms bear more intimate, prayerful tone and reflect a more directed interest in Zion, as is characteristic of Korahite psalms (see, e.g., Pss 46 and 48). The transition between the groups is instructive here. Psalm 83 laments that a league of ten nations conspires against God and petitions him to make an end of them (vv. 6–19). On the other hand, Korahite Ps 84 changes the tone completely when it expresses the psalmist’s delight in Yahweh’s sanctuary in Zion. Even more striking, however, is the purpose for which Ps 87 presents its similarly styled list of nations. Whereas Ps 83 lamented and decried Edom, the Ishmaelites, Moab, the Hagrites, Gebel, Amalek, Ammon, Philistia, Tyre, and Asshur, Ps 87:4–6 celebrates the inclusion of Rahab, Babylon, Philistia, Tyre, and Cush, who will be regarded as natives of Zion. As noted above, however, Ps 86 already announces that “all the nations you have made shall come and worship before you, Yahweh, and shall glorify your name.” Within the broader structure of Book III, then, editors seem to have placed a praying David at the heart of this perspectival shift concerning the nations. Nor is it surprising that “David’s” appeal to the grace formula in Ps 86 should be nestled among the Korahite psalms with their interest in the sanctuary, for this reflects the same close association between the grace formula, covenant renewal, and the sanctuary as found in Exod 25–40. In Exodus, the tabernacle can only be constructed after Yahweh graciously renews covenant through Moses as covenant mediator (Exod 32–34). In like manner Ps 87’s “On the holy mount stands the city he founded;

⁶⁷⁸ See also Chapter Four’s discussion “son,” which noted Ps 87.

Yahweh loves the gates of Zion” follows directly from David’s appeal to Yahweh’s grace and mercy in Ps 86. Similarly, Davidized Ps 102—also a “prayer (תְּפִלָּה) of a poor man”—also announces Yahweh’s restoration of Zion and the fear of kings and nations, reflecting this theme there also.⁶⁷⁹

“Of David” or “For David?” One final important question requires attention; namely, whether editors understood לְדָוִד לְתִפְלָה atop Ps 86 as “David’s prayer” or “a prayer *for* David.” Zenger and Lohfink take the latter view: “Psalm 86 is and remains first of all a “prayer for David,” for the messianic king and for his messianic people, as the references to royal Psalm 72, but also to royal Psalm 89, which closes Book III, emphasize.”⁶⁸⁰ Surrounding psalms offer some vague support for why editors might “re-read” לְדָוִד as a lamed of advantage as in the case of לְשִׁלְמֹה in Ps 72’s superscript. The intercessory tone of the surrounding Korahite prayers and Ps 89’s lament for the Davidic monarchy might suggest that David is being prayed for also in Ps 86. However the editorial evidence makes this unlikely. Zenger and Lohfink’s appeal to Ps 72 as a precedent for this kind of editorial re-reading of the *lamed auctoris* comes with no specific reason why it should be precisely the same in the case of Ps 86. Indeed, the move in Ps 72’s superscript deposes Solomon as the author/prayer in favor of David because the editorial comment in v. 20 specifically indicates that editors reread it so. But that is not the case in Ps 86.⁶⁸¹ Thus, Ps 72 offers no real support for Zenger and Lohfink’s view of David as “prayed *for*”

⁶⁷⁹ See below.

⁶⁸⁰ Erich Zenger, “Zion as Mother of the Nations in Psalm 87,” in *The God of Israel and the Nations: Studies in Isaiah and the Psalms* (ed. Norbert L. Lohfink, and Erich Zenger; Everett R. Kalin; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000), 159.

⁶⁸¹ Thus, *lamed auctoris* is probably too narrow a definition, for although there is no cause to think that editors doubted these psalms’ original Davidic authorship the Psalter employs them as prayers and words of “David” to the contemporary or future situation. As discussed in Chapter One the 72:20 postscript does not, as many scholars suppose, indicate that “David” cannot be the praying subject of Ps 86 or any subsequent “Davidic” psalm. It is “David ben-Jesse” who has become the prayer in Ps 72—it is the last of *his* “prayers,” but whether editors arranged Book III to reflect the historical exile (Wilson etc.) or an eschatological one (Mitchell), it is certainly no longer

in Ps 86 rather than its petitioner. Also important here is Ps 78's prior description of David as God's "servant;" terminology that the psalmist of Ps 86 picks up in his threefold self-reference as "your servant." This suggests the speaker of Ps 86 is "David." Indeed, since both Pss 78 and 86 are central to their respective collection and Ps 78 attributes to David an active role in leading his people, it seems more likely that editors identified the self-proclaimed servant of Yahweh in Davidic Ps 86 in terms of the Davidic office introduced in Book III in 78:70. The editor(s) of Book III apparently viewed an incumbent of the Davidic royal office to be the prayer of Ps 86, not the one prayed *for*.

Summary

The foregoing analysis showed that Ps 86:15 is foundational to the psalmist's petition in that psalm. Psalm 86 depicts "David" petitioning Yahweh for help, basing his appeal in the grace formula as Moses had done (cf. Num 14:18). Similarly, the final verses of Pss 77 and 78 suggested that the royal Davidic office supersedes Moses's shepherding role. On the one hand, though open to be read as an intercession, Ps 86 most obviously petitions Yahweh to vindicate the psalmist from those who seek his life. On the other hand, Ps 86's Davidic attribution broadens the potential beneficiaries of the prayer (cf. also our discussion of v. 5 above). The king prays for Yahweh's vindication, but king and people both stand to benefit from such vindication. Indeed, Book III's final, twofold petition for "David" and "your faithful ones" in Ps 89:50–51 also parallel the fortunes of king and people, giving an important clue concerning how editors understood the Davidic psalmist's petition in Ps 86.

Moreover, we observed that the praying "David" of Ps 86 is consistently Yahweh's "servant" in Book III, and, as one embattled and rejected by Yahweh (Ps 89), resembles Isaiah's suffering servant. Indeed, David thus described appears at the center of both major author groups in Book III (Pss 78 and 86), attesting to his theological and structural importance in that Book

"historical David ben-Jesse" at the center of the crisis.

despite the relative dearth of Davidic psalms. David is a “stricken shepherd” to his people (Pss 78:70–72; 89:39–46, 50)⁶⁸² whose first introduction in Ps 78:70–72 indicates he is at the center of Yahweh’s solution to Israel’s cycle of rebellion.

This suggests that editors regarded Ps 86 as the prayer of a royal figure who remains central to covenant renewal, and whose role vis-à-vis the people is comparable to Moses and the people throughout the golden calf and wilderness wandering traditions. Indeed, that both 77:20 and 78:71 employ the shepherd-sheep motif to describe these figures’ relationships to the people invites comparison. Such comparisons set Ps 86’s passing description of Yahweh as “forgiving” (v. 5) in a greater theological context. If “Servant David” is Yahweh’s solution to Israel’s perennial covenant faithlessness, then he must have some role in procuring Yahweh’s forgiveness for the people; a role underscored by his prayerful use of the grace formula in addressing Yahweh.

Exodus 34:6 in Psalm 103

If “David” appeals to the grace formula when calling on Yahweh “in the day of trouble” (to cite Ps 50:15), in Ps 103 he uses it to declare Yahweh’s forgiving character just as Yahweh himself had done in Exod 34:6, thus announcing God’s deliverance (50:15). Indeed, several key features within Pss 101–103 affirm key editorial and theological interests already seen in Book III, and suggest that very similar theological concerns drive the editorial use of the formula in these books.

The Grace Formula in Psalm 103:8

Psalm 103’s use on the Day of Atonement is not surprising. It is unequalled in its declaration of Yahweh’s mercy and forgiveness. The whole psalm celebrates the forgiveness of sins as Yahweh had declared to Moses in the grace formula. Verses 7–14 read,

⁶⁸² See Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 201, 253–58.

⁷ He made known his ways to Moses,
his acts to the people of Israel.
⁸ *The LORD is merciful and gracious,
slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love.*
⁹ He will not always chide,
nor will he keep his anger forever.
¹⁰ He does not deal with us according to our sins,
nor repay us according to our iniquities.
¹¹ For as high as the heavens are above the earth,
so great is his steadfast love toward those who fear him;
¹² as far as the east is from the west,
so far does he remove our transgressions from us.
¹³ As a father shows compassion to his children,
so the LORD shows compassion to those who fear him.
¹⁴ For he knows our frame;
he remembers that we are dust.

Whereas in Ps 86 the psalmist ostensibly prays for himself, in Ps 103 “David” declares Yahweh’s love for his people by the forgiveness of sins. The focus is not on the psalmist’s personal need for forgiveness but that of Yahweh’s “fearers,” “man,” etc. (cf. vv. 10, 12, 13, 15).⁶⁸³ Indeed, the whole psalm calls all heaven and earth to praise him for his forgiving way toward frail and “grass-like” human beings, as can be seen from the way it begins and ends: “Bless Yahweh, O my soul” (v. 2, 22c) and “Bless Yahweh, O you his angels...all his host...all his works” (vv. 20a, 21a, 22a).⁶⁸⁴

⁶⁸³ It is, of course, natural to read Ps 103 in such a way as includes the psalmist among those who need Yahweh’s forgiveness. See, e.g., the psalmist’s address to “my soul” in vv. 2–4, which refer to Yahweh as he “who forgives all your iniquity, who heals all your diseases, who redeems your life from the pit, who crowns you with steadfast love and mercy.” Nevertheless, the predominant focus of the psalm is the frailty of human nature, making it possible to understand the psalmist as one who identifies with doers of iniquity, is acquainted with “the pit,” etc., but not himself at fault. Moreover, Ps 103’s participation in the Pss 101–103 grouping and the consistent first person speech throughout this Davidic group suggest an editorial perspective that sees the king identifying with sinful humankind rather emphasizing personal guilt. Indeed, Ps 101’s ideal presentation of the king amplifies his blamelessness as we shall see.

⁶⁸⁴ Lane, “Exodus 34:6–7: a Canonical Analysis,” 174, remarks, “The psalm begins with a list of the benefits of a relationship with this God who is great in loving kindness (103:1-5), but who also recognizes that the human covenant partner is weak and mortal (103:10, 12, 13, 15).”

Psalm 103 in Its Book Context

Compared to Books I–III, authorship plays a lesser role in the organization of Book IV. Apart from Mosaic Ps 90 and Davidic Pss 101 and 103, no other psalms are attributed to an author.⁶⁸⁵ Nevertheless, Pss 102’s “prayer (תְּפִלָּה) of one afflicted” is Davidized by the same sandwiching technique observed in Pss 10, 33, and 66–67, suggesting that this editorial technique has not been abandoned altogether, as Book V confirms.⁶⁸⁶ Accordingly, scholars have fruitfully explored other kinds of editorial evidence in their efforts to elucidate the structure of Book IV, particularly the concatenation of lexemes and important themes and the pairing of psalms like Pss 101–106. There is general agreement that the “Kingship of Yahweh” group in Pss 93–100 are of central and programmatic importance in Book IV.⁶⁸⁷

According to Hossfeld and Zenger Pss 90–92 have a transitional function between the so-called Messianic Psalter (i.e., Pss 2–89) and the Pss 93–100 group that declares Yahweh’s exclusive reign. For these authors Pss 101–106 “show themselves to be a later, paired translation, explication, and concretization of the theme of YHWH’s royal sovereignty,”⁶⁸⁸ and Book IV

⁶⁸⁵ Other superscripted psalms (that lack authorial attribution) include Ps 92, “a psalm song for the day of the Sabbath” (מִזְמוֹר שִׁיר לְיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת); Ps 98, “a psalm” (מִזְמוֹר); Ps 100, “a psalm for giving thanks” (מִזְמוֹר לְתוֹדָה); and Ps 102, “a prayer of one afflicted when he is faint and pours out his complaint before Yahweh” (תְּפִלָּה לְאִישׁ אֲחִיזָה), which has been “sandwiched” between Davidic Pss 101 and 103.

⁶⁸⁶ For example Book V, which makes generous use of authorship to group Pss 108–110 and 138–145, not to mention the common titles for the Psalms of Ascent (Pss 120–134). Zenger, “The God of Israel’s Reign over the World (Psalms 90–106),” 183, draws the same conclusion about the quasi-Davidic status of Ps 102, but for reasons incompatible with our explanation. He suggests that Ps 102’s title “is inspired by the Davidic psalm 142:2 [3].” In the context of Zenger’s multi-stage theory of the Psalter’s composition, this seems to presuppose that editors added Ps 102’s superscript after the incorporation of Book V of the Psalter; i.e., that titles played no real role in the arranging of Pss 101–103. As discussed in Chapter Two, however, authorship seems to play an important organizational role throughout the Psalter, even if Book V makes light use of it.

⁶⁸⁷ See esp. Howard, *The Structure of Psalms 93–100*, and more recently McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*.

⁶⁸⁸ Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2, 7*.

responds to the Messianic Psalter with a “theocratic” message befitting post-exilic life.⁶⁸⁹

Elsewhere Zenger concludes from his synchronic analysis that all final six psalms of the book are (quasi-)Davidic by virtue of their association with Pss 101 and 103.⁶⁹⁰ McKelvey structures the Book similarly to Hossfeld and Zenger, but divides the book into four main sections rather than three. For him the Kingship of Yahweh Pss in 93–100 and a Davidic group in Pss 101–104 are framed by two distinctively Mosaic groups in Pss 90–92 and the historical psalm pair 105–106.⁶⁹¹ Moreover, David M. Howard divides Pss 90–100 differently again, seeing Pss 90–94 and 95–100 as the two major subgroups.

Despite the variety of opinion, most seem to agree that the transition from the Mosaic/Kingship of Yahweh groups of psalms in Pss 90–100 to Davidic Ps 101 and subsequent psalms is marked by relatively greater disjunction.⁶⁹² Accordingly, we shall examine Ps 103 in relation to its immediate context (101–104), then in relation to the first major groupings of psalms (90–100), before returning to Pss 105–106 as the concluding psalm pair of Book IV.

Psalm 103 in its Immediate Context: Psalms 101–104. As was the case in Book III, Davidic psalms are rare but appear carefully placed in Book IV. Psalm 103 is the second of two psalms attributed to David in Book IV. The first, Ps 101, is a royal psalm in which “David” declares his commitment to Yahweh’s way (vv. 2–4), promises to destroy and cut off slanderers, the arrogant, the wicked, and evildoers from the land (vv. 5, 7–8), and will look favorably towards the faithful of the land (v. 6).⁶⁹³ The royal speaker of Ps 101 thus speaks and acts

⁶⁸⁹ Erich Zenger, “The God of Israel’s Reign over the World (Psalms 90–106),” 161.

⁶⁹⁰ Erich Zenger, “The God of Israel’s Reign over the World (Pss 90–106),” 161–90.

⁶⁹¹ McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 272–77.

⁶⁹² E.g., McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 266, finds relatively few conjunctive features to bind Pss 100 and 101 except in a general thematic way: “Psalm 101 is a Davidic royal psalm that emphasizes the righteous purposes of the king, who must emulate the Great High King” (i.e., Yahweh).

⁶⁹³ The Hebrew reads, *עֵינַי בְּנְאֻמֵי-אֶרֶץ לְשֹׁבֵת עִמָּדִי הִלְךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ תְּמִים הוּא יִשְׁרְתֵנִי*. The ESV translates, “I will look with favor on the faithful of the land, that they may dwell with me; he who walks in the way that is

according to an ideal of Yahweh’s vice-regent, establishing God’s justice in a manner consistent with Ps 72.⁶⁹⁴ Indeed, these two royal psalms offer a consistent picture of the king as one who does justice (טִשֵּׁפֵץ; cf. 72:1–2 and 101:1), suggesting that editors of Book IV likely understood the royal speaker of Ps 101 in the same ideal terms as David’s successor in Ps 72.⁶⁹⁵

Michael McKelvey, however, argues a very different editorial function for Ps 101. McKelvey believes that Ps 101 reminds the Psalter’s audience of “the failure of Judahite kings” that led to “the removal of human kingship from Israel in the form of exile.” The psalm purportedly achieves this by presenting an ideal of kingship that “never happened.”⁶⁹⁶ However, such editorial use of Ps 101 relies heavily on two assumptions. First, it assumes that the primary reason for Ps 101’s inclusion is to explain the confusion of the historical exile expressed in Ps 89. While this may be true to an extent, this precludes the possibility that Ps 89 reflects

blameless.”

⁶⁹⁴ John S. Kselman, “Psalm 101: Royal Confession and Divine Oracle,” *JSOT* 33 (1985): 45–62, argues on the basis of his structural analysis that vv. 1–2 comprise an introduction, vv. 3–5 the king’s “protestation of innocence,” and vv. 6–7 a divine oracle by which Yahweh responds to the king. Among Kselman’s evidence is a number of other instances of the “eyes of Yahweh” motif (Pss 17:2–3; 33:18; 34:16–17) as well as Jer 5:2–3 and 16:17. Kselman’s detailed and subtle structural analysis accounts for a chiasmus between vv. 3 and 7 achieved through such expressions as לְנֶגְדֵי עֵינַי, noting two other instances of it in vv. 5 and 6 that he thinks form a minor inclusio with those in v. 3 and 7 respectively, thus marking off vv. 3–5 and 6–7 as distinct sections of the psalm. While interesting, his conclusion that לְנֶגְדֵי עֵינַי refers to the two different sets of eyes—the king’s in v. 3 and Yahweh’s in v. 7—is not altogether convincing. For instance, other psalmic precedents of the “eyes of Yahweh” motif carry little weight when Ps 101 itself clearly applies the expression to the king in v. 3. Supposing the psalm functioned this way in a cultic context and editors understood the psalm this way too, “David’s” resolve to destroy slanderers and not abide evil, haughtiness, and arrogance is not thereby diminished in any case.

⁶⁹⁵ Kselman, “Psalm 101: Royal Confession and Divine Oracle,” 51, observes that the psalmist’s resolve to “walk with integrity of heart” (בְּתָם לִבְבִי) echoes the description of David in Ps 78:72 who “shepherded them with upright heart” (בְּתָם לִבְבוֹ). Indeed, besides these instances in 78:72 and 101:2, the term תָּם only occurs in Davidic Pss 7:9; 25:21; 26:1, 11; and 41:13—each time a quality of the Davidic psalmist (each example has the 1st sg. suffix [בְּתָמִי/כְתָמִי]), except for 25:21 where David says “may integrity and uprightness [תָּם וְיִשְׁרָ] preserve me for I wait for you)

⁶⁹⁶ McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 176–77.

eschatological exile as Mitchell proposes.⁶⁹⁷ Moreover, we may ask *how* Ps 101 responds to Ps 89. Does it supply a further layer of explanation for why the exile took place (in addition to, e.g., Ps 106)? Or does it rather reflect a coming king’s mediatory role in setting things right, whose appearance on the scene in this psalm to some extent also affirms Yahweh’s faithfulness to the Davidic Covenant so strongly expressed in Ps 89? This brings us to McKelvey’s second assumption; namely, that Ps 101, functions as a lament together with Ps 102. Indeed, McKelvey sees these psalms reflecting the failure of Davidic kings in particular as part of Book IV’s response to the “why” of exile.⁶⁹⁸ Yet the royal speaker in Ps 101 does not obviously lament anything in the psalm except the wicked whom he resolves to destroy, which is at most an interior lament (vv. 5–8). Moreover, at the rhetorical level the psalm does not overtly elicit the historical memory of unfaithful kings. On the contrary, that the speaker is David, himself a king, reflects positively on kingship. Thus McKelvey’s suggestion that the psalm laments the failure of Judahite kings forces an unnatural sense upon the psalm.⁶⁹⁹ The plainer sense of Ps 101, with its Davidic “I” as speaker, suggests an ideal royal figure who, praising and reflecting Yahweh’s “steadfast love and justice” (טֹדַר וְחַסְדֵּי יְהוָה in v. 1), now vows to do what Yahweh calls him to do in realizing the vision of the previous psalms (Pss 93–100).

Between the two Davidic psalms in Book IV, we find anonymous Ps 102, whose title reads: “The prayer of an afflicted man, when he pours out his complaint before Yahweh.” “Sandwiched” between these two Davidic psalms thus, the “afflicted” psalmist of Ps 102 is apparently “David.”⁷⁰⁰ The placement of such a psalm here is significant, for it again shows an

⁶⁹⁷ See Introduction.

⁶⁹⁸ McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 180, 191–92, 267, 313–314.

⁶⁹⁹ McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 276n17 acknowledges Allen’s summation of Ps 101’s form, in which he suggests it may be a royal complaint but “more precisely a psalm of innocence” (Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 4). Allen’s latter description seems to me a more accurate description of the psalm.

⁷⁰⁰ This is a common editorial technique in the Psalms, by which anonymous psalms are associated with an

afflicted David (cf. Pss 86 and 89), right after encountering Ps 101's more "usual" presentation of the anointed king establishing justice for the righteous and the wicked. Indeed, some of Ps 102's petitions closely resemble those of Ps 86 (e.g., "give ear to me" [הִטֵּה-אֱלֹהִים אָזְנוֹךָ] and "answer me" [עֲנֵנִי] in v. 3 [cf. 86:1]). As in Ps 86, the problem is not the psalmist's own sin and need of repentance, but *enemies* who taunt and attack, leaving the embattled psalmist struck down, groaning, tearful, etc. (vv. 4–12). Yet the psalmist envisages not his own restoration only, but especially that of *Zion*, which he proclaims in v. 14. Indeed, v. 14 uses key terms of the grace formula in this respect: Yahweh "will arise and have pity (רחם) on *Zion*" since "it is the time to favor her (לְחַנּוּנָהּ)," echoing the distinctive combination "gracious and compassionate" (רחום וְחַנּוּן) in the formula.⁷⁰¹ Psalm 102 therefore anticipates the grace formula declared by "David" in Ps 103, highlighting its importance there and applying this profound expression of God's love to the holy mountain on which His people worship.

Scholars have often noted the apparently deliberate pairing of Ps 104 with Ps 103 as well. This is reflected most obviously in their common opening, "Bless Yahweh O my soul" (בְּרַכֵּי יְהוָה וְנַפְשִׁי אֶת-יְהוָה); phraseology familiar from the doxologies concluding Books I–IV, which seems to suggest that also here "*David*" is praiser of Yahweh *par excellence*. However, Hossfeld and Zenger point out numerous other features shared by these psalms as well.⁷⁰² Such features include these psalms' depictions of Yahweh as a king in his heavenly court (103:19–22 and 104:3) and the theme of renewal (Ps 103:5 and 104:30). These themes cohere with our thesis as it relates to Book IV; namely, that Pss 101f present a coming king through whom Yahweh would realize or even "renew" the vision of Pss 93–100. Moreover, these themes take on cosmic dimensions in Ps 104, which more generally affirms Yahweh's sustenance and ordering of the created realm, and

"author" (e.g., Pss 10, 33, 66–67).

⁷⁰¹ See Barber, *Singing in the Reign*, 124–25.

⁷⁰² For a fuller discussion see Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 3*, 57–59.

thus reflect concerns that are central also to the Noahic Covenant. There the sign of the covenant, the rainbow, is “set in the cloud” (אֶת־קַשְׁתֹּי בְּעַנְנִים). In Ps 89:38 *David’s throne* was, like the celestial bodies, “a faithful witness in the skies” (וְעֵד בְּשָׁמַיִם נֶאֱמָן).⁷⁰³ It is at least possible, therefore, that by pairing Ps 104 with Davidic Ps 103, editors sought to Davidize its cosmic and Noahic covenant-like perspective, casting “David” as proclaimer of Yahweh’s cosmic renewal.

Finally, Ps 104 concludes with “Let sinners be consumed from the earth, and let the wicked be no more!” followed by “Bless Yahweh O my soul” once more to form an *inclusio* with v. 1. This echoes the same resolve expressed by the king in Ps 101, affirming its editorial importance and also further suggesting David’s instrumental role in Ps 104’s vision.

Altogether in Pss 101–104 we see “David” vowing to establish Yahweh’s justice, afflicted and in distress because of enemies, petitioning Yahweh for help, declaring Yahweh’s forgiving way with humankind (especially Zion), calling on heaven and earth to “bless” Yahweh for his forgiveness, and praising Yahweh for sustaining all creation. This composite picture echoes the different dimensions of “David” already encountered throughout the Psalter (i.e., Pss 2, 72, and 89). Thus, central to God’s love—expressed fundamentally in his forgiveness of sins and gracious restoration of the people—there stands a suffering “David” who puts an end to wickedness, identifies with the people in their suffering, announces the time for restoration for Zion, and proclaims God’s forgiving way with people.

Psalm 103 and Pss 90–100. In Chapter Four we observed the strong thematic and theological overlap between the Kingship of Yahweh psalm group and Moses’ Song of the Sea in Exod 15, in addition to similarities between Moses’ Song in Deut 32 and Pss 95 and 98.⁷⁰⁴ If it is correct to say that this “new song” (cf. Pss 96 and 98) implies a new exodus as argued in

⁷⁰³ See the discussion of Ps 89:37–38 in Chapter Three.

⁷⁰⁴ Howard, *The Structure of Psalms 93–100*, 61, and McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 104, identify several points in common.

Chapter Four, then the placement of Pss 101–103(104) directly afterward suggests that “David” functions in a manner analogous to Moses, Israel’s leader through whom Yahweh saved his people and taught them at Sinai. These Mosaic attributes overlap with those shown forth in Pss 101–103’s composite picture of “David.” “David” identifies with sinners and proclaims Yahweh’s restoration of Zion (Ps 102), and declares Yahweh’s character as gracious and compassionate (Ps 103). Just as Moses had identified with suffering Hebrews as Yahweh did (Exod 2:11–12; cf. 2:23–25; 3:7, 6:5) and later appealed to the grace formula when interceding for the people (Num 14:18), so Pss 101–103 present David. We shall return to Moses’ presence in Book IV below.

It therefore seems likely that editors intended the “David” of Pss 101–103(104) as an instrumental figure in realizing a new-exodus vision created by the preceding psalms. Indeed, it is at least noteworthy that Pss 96–97’s warnings about idolatry (96:4–5; 97:7), which are juxtaposed with the proper worship of Yahweh, lie centrally within the 93–100 group.⁷⁰⁵ Psalms 96–97 imply that idolatry threatens that vision, just as at the foot of Sinai when the golden calf (Exod 32) jeopardized the covenant and Israel’s God-given vocation as “a kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Exod 19:5). Thus, in a very similar way David’s grace-formulaic proclamation of God’s forgiving character in Ps 103 seems key to the realization of the vision in the first half of Book IV. Moreover, that group also brings into focus the needs of the righteous vis-à-vis the wicked who threaten them. Psalm 94:16 even asks, “Who rises up for me against the wicked? Who stands up for me against evildoers?”⁷⁰⁶ Indeed, the king’s vows in Ps 101 seem to offer a direct answer to that and similar implied questions. Its royal speaker presents himself as one who, like Yahweh, would look upon the meek and cut off the wicked. Thus, “David,” who

⁷⁰⁵ McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 114 notes this theme among the conjunctive features shared by Pss 96–97.

⁷⁰⁶ Chapter Four observed the contrast between the righteous and the wicked throughout this psalm group in 92:8, 11; 94:3, 12–13, 15, 21; 97:10–11.

both proclaims the divine grace and mercy (Ps 103) and is destroyer of the wicked and protector of the righteous (Ps 101), presents himself perfectly well as one who will fulfill the vision in Pss 93–100.

Finally, Ps 103's use of the grace formula elicits Book IV's introductory psalm in significant ways. Indeed, Mosaic Ps 90 begins the Book by underscoring the transitoriness of human life and its frailty in vv. 3–11, connecting these with the wrath of God and human iniquity. Psalm 103:15–16 repeats the “like grass” motif (כְּתִצְרִי in v. 15; cf. 90:5), but whereas Moses' address to Yahweh proclaims that “you have set our iniquities before you” (שָׂתָ עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ) (לְנִגְדֶךָ) in 90:8, in Ps 103 the Davidic psalmist declares that Yahweh “does not repay us according to our iniquities” (וְלֹא כְעֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ גָמַל עָלֵינוּ). Thus it appears that Ps 103 uses the formula to *answer* the Mosaic petition in Ps 90:12–17, in which Moses beseeches Yahweh, “Return (שׁוּבָה), Yahweh, How long? Have pity (רַחֲמֵיךָ) on your servants!” (v. 13; cf. Ps 89:47, 50). This suggests that David's mediatory role between Yahweh and the people is not so much exercised through intercessory prayer in Ps 103 but by voicing *Yahweh's* side of the divine-human conversation, as reflected by Ps 103's extensive use of the grace formula. By so proclaiming Yahweh's gracious response to the transitoriness and frailty of sinful humanity voiced by Moses, “David” repeats and expands on Yahweh's own self-revelation as he had given it to Moses in 34:6 and acts as his mouthpiece. Of course, within the composite picture presented in Ps 101–103, Davidized Ps 102's petitionary character indicates that David continues to intercede as one embattled in a similar way to Ps 86's prayer. So although Book IV highlights Moses' traditional role as petitioner for Israel, his prayer in Ps 90 (a תַּפִּלָּה לְמֹשֶׁה) is taken up and amplified in Ps 102's Davidized prayer (תַּפִּלָּה), shifting the focus to the latter as the contemporary or future-expected (eschatological?) mediator. Like any true mediator, “David”

speaks on behalf of both parties. Indeed, further evidence suggests that editors intended Pss 105–106 to function as “David’s” proclamation and intercessory petition, as we shall now discuss.⁷⁰⁷

Psalm 103 and Psalms 105–106. We have already investigated the major covenantal language of Pss 105–106 in Chapter Three’s examination of **בְּרִיית** psalms, where we noted the theological unity assumed for the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenant. We also noted these psalms’ primary concern with pre-monarchic history as they contrast Yahweh’s covenant faithfulness with Israel’s infidelity. As a reminder to present (post-exilic?) generations about pre-exilic Israel’s faithlessness, it is remarkable that Ps 106 does not touch the monarchic period. Yet this is consistent with the Psalter’s broader tendency not to pin blame on the kings when directly identifying the cause of Israel’s exile (e.g., Ps 89). This, as we have noted, contrasts the retrospective and historical perspective on failed kingship seen in the DH.⁷⁰⁸ Indeed, there are compelling grounds to conclude that editors viewed kingship favorably, and that its restoration occupies a central place in the fulfilment of covenantal history.⁷⁰⁹

In assessing the place that Ps 103 occupies in Book IV, a further issue deserves consideration; namely, whether the strong Mosaic character of 105–106 means that these psalms are in some sense *Moses’* answer to the theological crisis of exile rather than “David’s” answer (as Pss 101–103 seem to indicate). So McKelvey suggests when he argues that Book IV shifts the focus away from David’s “voice”—heard in Pss 101–104—to the voice of *Moses* in Pss 105–106.⁷¹⁰ McKelvey and Zenger⁷¹¹ appeal to similar features between Pss 90 and 106 as an *inclusio*

⁷⁰⁷ As noted in Chapter Three, references to Moses in Ps 106 are in the context of historical recollection, whereas the Davidic group Pss 101–103 (104) vow, petition, and proclaim in the “present.”

⁷⁰⁸ See Chapter Three.

⁷⁰⁹ E.g., Psalm 72’s theme of royal succession, not to mention the idealized presentation of kingship in Ps 101 and such eschatologically-oriented/messianic psalms as Ps 110.

⁷¹⁰ McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 231.

⁷¹¹ Though in contrast to McKelvey Zenger considers all Pss 101–106 to comprise a “Davidic” group.

that suggests Mosaic framing of Book IV—especially given the prominence of “Moses” (Ps 90 superscript and Ps 106:16, 23, and 16). Moreover, Zenger observes “obvious” key-word connections between Moses’ appeal that Yahweh “turn” (שׁוּבָה), “have compassion” (רַחֵם) on his servants, and satisfy them with his “steadfast love” (רַחֵם) in 90:13–14, and Ps 106:45’s recollection, “for their sake [Yahweh] remembered his covenant, and relented (רַחֵם) according to the abundance of his steadfast love (רַחֵם).”⁷¹² Zenger’s observation suggests that Ps 106’s historical recollection of God’s compassion and love for his people in some sense answers the petition of “Moses” in Ps 90. This correlation is noteworthy, but it does not follow that Moses’ “voice”—or more accurately a Mosaic perspective—now *replaces* “David’s” in these two final psalms, as McKelvey posits.⁷¹³ First, whereas Moses “speaks” in Ps 90, he is spoken *about* in Ps 106 as that psalm recollects God’s history with his people. Indeed, already in Ps 103:7 the Davidic psalmist has made a similar historical reference to Moses to whom Yahweh “made known his ways,” whereupon v. 8 declares Yahweh’s forgiving way by means of the grace formula. Except for Ps 90, then, Book VI recalls the memory Moses as a figure of history, whereas David “speaks” in Pss 101–103 in the first person. Second, although Book IV’s several mentions of Moses typically highlight his historical role as intercessor, the final mention of Moses in 106:32 recalls his faithlessness at Meribah amid Israel’s covenantal infidelity and rebellion. If anything, highlighting Moses’ single failure so only highlights the helplessness of covenant life “under Moses,” and may suggest the need for another intercessor. Third, 106:47 effectively repeats Moses’ petition in 90:13–14, so that the greater rhetorical purpose of the psalm is to urge Yahweh to “repeat history” by once again showing mercy despite the people’s sinfulness, just as he had in the exodus and wilderness (vv. 6–18, 24–33), at Horeb regarding the

⁷¹² Zenger, “The God of Israel’s Reign over the World,” 163–66.

⁷¹³ In my view, McKelvey’s method of analyzing Book IV predisposes him to overdraw distinctions between the “voices” of Moses, David, and High King Yahweh. Moreover, to speak of the “voice” of Moses beyond Ps 90 seems to confuse the very different ways in which his name is used in Pss 103, 105, and 106.

golden calf (vv. 19–23), and in the land (vv. 34–46). It thus turns to the Mosaic era to espouse the paradigmatic salvation of Yahweh toward his people,⁷¹⁴ in much the same way as Ps 89 declares God’s promises and faithfulness to the Davidic covenant in order to make its lament and ask “how long?”⁷¹⁵ The main difference between these two final psalms of their respective Books, however, lies in the confession of human sin. Human (royal) culpability is not obviously in view in Ps 89 (see Chapter Three) but Ps 106:6 opens with an explicit confession of covenantal infidelity: “Both we and our fathers have sinned; we have committed iniquity; we have done wickedness.”⁷¹⁶ Thus, on the face of it the psalm presents a confession on behalf of all Israel, past and present, before calling for Yahweh to “save” and “gather us from the nations” (v. 47). If the psalmist speaks with a Moses-like “voice,” it is only in the sense that he uses Mosaic language and recalls Mosaic history to flesh out that confession, not to “switch voices” to Moses once more.⁷¹⁷ Rather, the preceding Davidic Pss 101–103(104) indicate that editors intended “David” as the continuing speaker of Pss 105–106. If this is correct then “David” continues to speak to the end of Book IV, proclaiming God’s faithfulness (Ps 105) and confessing Israel’s (pre-monarchic!) unfaithfulness and petitioning Yahweh’s help (Ps 106). Moreover, in Ps 106 “David” restates Moses’ original plea in Ps 90:13–14 as one who leads the people in confession of sin (v. 6), and intercedes with the petition of v. 47 to “Save Yahweh our God, and gather us

⁷¹⁴ This also adds to the evidence that editors arranged the first part of Book IV with a “new exodus” in mind.

⁷¹⁵ In a similar vein, Ndonga, “Revisiting the Theocratic Agenda of Book 4 of the Psalter for Interpretive Premise,” 157–58, observes that Book IV and its ostensive focus on the Mosaic covenant ends “rather pessimistically and inconclusively,” just as Book III had done. However Ndonga views the Psalter’s solution in Book V differently. Ndonga sees a shift focus away from the Davidic to the Mosaic covenant in Books III and IV that is sustained in Book V through its accentuation of divine kingship at the expense of human/Davidic kingship (see Introduction).

⁷¹⁶ חָטֵאנוּ עִם־אֲבוֹתֵינוּ הָעֵינֵנוּ הַרְשָׁעָנוּ:

⁷¹⁷ This is perhaps all that McKelvey means. However, his demarcation between the “voices” of David and Moses between Pss 101–104 and 105–106 nevertheless downplays any notion that Pss 105–106 continue to represent the utterance of “David.”

from the nations” (הוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְקַבְּצֵנוּ מִן־הַגּוֹיִם); a petition answered in the following Ps 107:3 (וּמֵאֲרָצוֹת קְבָצָם). Indeed, Neh 9:33–34 offers an interesting parallel, for there also the “current” generation confesses the collective sins of Israel throughout her history: “Yet you have been righteous in all that has come upon us, for you have dealt faithfully and we have acted wickedly (רָשָׁע). Our kings, our princes, our priests, and our fathers (אֲבוֹתֵינוּ) have not kept your law or paid attention to your commandments and your warnings that you gave them.” Absent in Ps 106, however, is any explicit focus on royal culpability. Indeed, the pre-monarchic content of the history recalled in Ps 106 only underscores this, for it shifts the accent away from royal to national culpability as we have seen elsewhere in the Psalter (e.g., Ps 89).

Finally, the way in which Book IV draws on the memory of Moses lends support to the notion of “David” as an intercessor in the latter part of the Book. As is widely recognized, seven of the Psalter’s eight mentions of Moses occur in Book IV, including the superscript of Ps 90, “a prayer of Moses, the man of God” (תְּפִלָּה לְמֹשֶׁה אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים), and 99:6 103:7; 105:26; 106:16, 23, and 32.⁷¹⁸ Notably, most of these occur in Pss 105–106, and one mention precedes the grace formula in Ps 103:8, where the Davidic psalmist announces Yahweh’s gracious character *as Yahweh had revealed to Moses*. Significantly, J. Borger concludes that references to Moses in Book IV highlight his intercessory role.⁷¹⁹ This supports our contention that Ps 106:47’s plea, “Save us...Gather us...etc.” is indeed intercessory in nature. “David” demonstrates their need for an intercessor from history, himself fulfilling that function by confessing Israel’s collective guilt and petitioning Yahweh for help (v. 47). Moreover, v. 47’s plea continues, “that we may give thanks to your holy name” (לְהַדְוֹת לְשֵׁם קִדְשְׁךָ), affirming the name theology already integral to the grace formula in its original Exod 32–34 setting (see

⁷¹⁸ The remaining instance occurs in Book III in Asaph Ps 77:21 as a historical reference to God leading his people “by the hand of Moses and Aaron” (בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן).

⁷¹⁹ Borger, “Moses in the Fourth Book of the Psalter,” 173–74.

above). Moreover, the obvious importance of “giving thanks” in the Psalter is reflected in the prominence of the **לִיהוָה הוֹדוּ** formula in Book V. Indeed, this formula opens that Book at the beginning of the very next psalm, apparently responding to 106:47’s purpose clause by announcing God’s grace and favor.

Summary

Once again it is “David” who speaks the grace formula, declaring in Ps 103 Yahweh’s gracious and compassionate response to human sin as Yahweh himself had done in Exod 34. Indeed, the composite picture of “David” protecting the meek/righteous, cutting off the wicked, crying out to Yahweh, announcing the time of favor to Zion, and declaring Yahweh’s grace and compassion in Pss 101–103 suggests that he has an instrumental role in Yahweh’s realization of the vision of Pss 93–100; a “new song” for a “new exodus.” Thus, his significance vis-à-vis Moses’ cannot be assessed by a mere “head count” in Book IV. While Book IV opens with Moses’ prayer that essentially repeats Ps 89:47’s petition “How long?” (cf. “Return...How long?” in 90:13), it thereafter speaks about him in historical retrospect, in contrast to “David” who continues to speak in the first person “contemporary” address (Pss 101–103[104–106]). Now David intercedes for God’s perennially unfaithful people (Ps 106:47) and declares God’s grace and compassion (Ps 103), just as Moses had done in Israel’s pre-monarchic history.

Exodus 34:6 in Psalm 145

Having used the grace formula to “call on Yahweh in the day of trouble” (Ps 86) and then to proclaim God’s gracious and forgiving way toward frail and sinful humanity (Ps 103), “David” uses it again in Ps 145:8 in the context of praise and thanksgiving (cf. Ps 50:14–15).

The Grace Formula in Psalm 145:8

It is no overstatement to say that Ps 145:8 reflects the grace formula’s central importance to the Psalter’s theology as a whole. In vv. 1–7 the psalmist—once again “David”—declares that he and “they” will praise and extol Yahweh. Then follows the grace formula and the repeated assertion that “all your works” will join him in that praise in vv. 8–12:

⁸ *The LORD is gracious and merciful,
slow to anger and abounding [לִרְגָל] in steadfast love.*

⁹ The LORD is good to all,
and his mercy is over all that he has made.

¹⁰ All your works shall give thanks to you, O LORD,
and all your saints shall bless you!

¹¹ They shall speak of the glory of your kingdom
and tell of your power,

¹² to make known to the children of man your mighty deeds,
and the glorious splendor of your kingdom.

Accordingly, Lane concludes that the grace formula in Ps 145 encapsulates the “actual substance of... proclamation of praise from the people”⁷²⁰ so that it praises God’s grace and compassion, slowness to anger and abundance of steadfast love. This becomes especially significant when we consider Wilson’s widely accepted claim regarding Ps 145:21. Wilson claims that this psalm *introduces* the group of Halleluiah Psalms that conclude the Psalter (Pss 146–150). With the words, “My mouth will speak the praise of the LORD, and let all flesh bless his holy name forever and ever” in the final verse (v. 21), “*David*” leads all flesh in the climactic act of praise in the Psalter.⁷²¹ If the grace formula expresses the essence and basis of praise in Ps 145, then it also provides the theological basis for doxological climax of the Psalter.

⁷²⁰ Lane, “Exodus 34:6–7,” 185.

⁷²¹ The first and last verses of the “Laudate,” 146:1 and 150:6 echo the shift from “My mouth” to “all flesh” seen in 145:21’s paralleled lines. Psalm 146:1 reads, “Praise the LORD, O my soul! I will praise the LORD as long as I live,” while 150:6 reads, “Let everything that has breath praise the LORD!”

On 145:21 as introduction to Pss 146–150 see Wilson, *Editing*, 189 and 225–26. Scholars like Wilson take a different view of what this *means* however. Wilson himself understands 146:3’s call to “Put not your trust in princes, in a son of man, in whom there is no salvation” as an indication that editors wished to redirect hope away from human kingship to Yahweh’s Kingship. Along similar lines, deClaisse-Walford, *Reading from the Beginning*, 98–99, assumes a degree of irony, “If David, to whom any hope of fulfillment of the promises he was given by God seems forever lost, if David can remember and praise God and pass that memory along, then all Israel can and must do the same.” However such views presuppose that the Psalter “plays off” Divine and human kingship after Ps 89, which scholars like Grant have called into question (see Introduction), and which our analysis of Books III and IV does not substantiate.

Patrick Miller, “The Beginning of the Psalter” in *Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (ed. J. Clinton McCann; Jr.

The universal manner in which Ps 145 applies the grace formula is notable. Verses 9–12 declare God’s grace and favor to “all,” “all that he has made,” and the “children of man,” whereupon “all your works shall give thanks to you.” “David” announces both Yahweh’s grace and mercy to all and the thankful response of praise that all return to God. This universalization of the formula reflects the trend we saw in our earlier summary of its canonical use and, significantly for our investigation, seems to reflect Yahweh’s promise to bless all nations through Abraham’s seed (Gen 12:3; 18:22; 26:4). That “David” here declares the fulfillment of this promise comports well with Ps 72’s narrowing of that promise through David’s successor (see Chapter Five).

Moreover, Reuven Kimelmann notes that Ps 145:8 prefers **וַיְגַדֵּל־לְחַסְדֶּךָ** rather than the more usual **וַיְרַב־חַסְדֶּךָ** seen in Exod 34:6 and Pss 86:15 and 103:8. He observes that this produces a stronger parallel with Moses’ petition in Num 14:19 that Yahweh “pardon...according to the greatness of your steadfast love [**כְּגִדְּלֵךְ חַסְדֶּךָ**],” which immediately follows his iteration of the grace formula in v. 18.⁷²² On the reasonable assumption that editors knew the account in Num 14, it is plausible that they understood 145:8’s praise of Yahweh’s gracious character also with reference to his hearing and answering intercessory petition for grace and mercy, just as he had been quick to forgive at Moses’s request. Such would be a fitting conclusion to the other grace formula-bearing psalms given their petitionary (Ps 86) and proclamatory (Ps 103) natures.

Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 89–90, notes what amounts to a similar editorial move in the arrangement of Pss 7–9. Psalm 7:18 concludes with, “I will sing praise to the name of Yahweh, the Most High” (**וְאֶזְמְרָה שֵׁם־יְהוָה**) (עַל־יוֹן) reiterated almost exactly in Ps 9:2’s, “I will sing praise to your name, O Most High” (**וְאֶזְמְרָה שִׁמְךָ עַל־יוֹן**), thus affirming David’s resolve to praise Yahweh’s name as the intervening Ps 8 famously does (cf. vv. 2a and 10, “Yahweh, or Lord, how majestic is your name [**אֲשֶׁר־אָתָּה**] in all the earth!”).

⁷²² Reuven Kimelman, “Psalm 145: Theme, Structure, and Impact,” *JBL* 113 (1994): 43–44.

Psalm 145 in Its Book Context

In addition to the important relationship that exists between Ps 145 and the subsequent Halleluiah psalms, Ps 145 also relates to the foregoing groups of psalms in Book V in significant ways, especially where the grace formula is concerned. As noted above, in broad terms Book V consists of two (quasi-)Davidic groups, Pss 107–112 and Pss 138–145, with the intervening psalms consisting largely of the Egyptian Hallel group (Pss 113–118) and Songs of Ascents (Pss 120–134). Between these liturgical groups lies the giant acrostic Torah Psalm 119.⁷²³ Earlier chapters have discussed important themes and their implications for our thesis, so it remains here to draw some of these together as they relate to grace formula terminology in Ps 145:8.

Psalm 145 and the Beginning and Ending of Book V. Psalm 145 concludes the Davidic group (138–145) that appears to mirror Davidic Pss 108–110 at the beginning of Book V so that, notwithstanding anonymous Ps 107, the body of Book V begins and ends with “David.” His prominence in Book V is thus all the more obviously the product of deliberate editorial design. Furthermore, this symmetry is strengthened by the juxtaposition of the Pss 111–112 acrostic pair with Davidic Pss 108–110. Notably, both acrostics allude to the grace formula in their Π cola via the distinctive phrase, “gracious and compassionate” (Π Π Π), just as Ps 145:8 does with the full formula. This suggests that editors crafted Pss 108–112 and 138–145 as parallel groups of (quasi-)Davidic psalms to begin and end Book V. Regarding Pss 108–110 and Pss 111–112,

⁷²³ Similarly, Zenger, “Composition and Theology,” 91, believes that “Psalms 113–18 and 120–134 are two compositions which have either been shaped as liturgies or have been inspired by a liturgy in their structural schemata.” For a further discussion of scholarly theories on the structure of Book V see Zenger’s article, which offers a summary and reaction to proposals by Gerald Wilson, Klaus Koch, and Reinhard Kratz. Zenger’s major criticism of these proposals is their over-interpretation of the structural significance of the Π formula and Π . Indeed, on this basis Wilson divides the Egyptian Hallel group by accounting Ps 118 as part of a new subgroup of psalms due to its opening Π formula (see Cha. Two). W. Dennis Tucker Jr., “The Role of the Foe in Book 5: Reflections on the Final Composition of the Psalter,” in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship* (ed. Nancy L. deClassé-Walford; Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 179–91 (esp. 185–86), agrees that Zenger’s “challenge that both Wilson and Kratz have overly interpreted the use of Π and Π terms is probably merited.”

Zenger believes that royal Ps 110 identifies 112:1's "blessed man" (שִׂיֵּשׁוּרֵי־יְשׁוּעָה) as the sacerdotal king depicted there, so that this arrangement of psalms accentuates "David" as the God-fearer *par excellence* who keeps Yahweh's commands (112:1).⁷²⁴ Moreover, this Davidic identification of the psalmist suggests that he possesses attributes normally associated with Yahweh, as was the case with Pss 72 and 101. In fact, it is sometimes not clear to whom certain stock phrases apply in Ps 112, whether to Yahweh or the "blessed man" in question. This includes the grace formula allusion, "[he is] gracious, compassionate, and righteous," in the Π colon (v. 4), for theretofore the "blessed man" has been the main personal subject. Furthermore, the immediately preceding clause, "light dawns in the darkness for the upright," offers a direct antecedent for those grace formula descriptors: *the upright*. Another example includes, "his righteousness endures forever" (עֲמִדַּתוֹ עַד־לְעֹד) in v. 9, which, while similar to the stock formula used to praising Yahweh in such psalms as Ps 107, follows directly after "he has distributed freely; he has given to the poor." Once again this refers most obviously to the "blessed man" of whom the psalm ostensibly speaks, suggesting that "David" either embodies the divine characteristics of grace and mercy or that he in some sense facilitates them as God restores the people. Indeed, Chapter Three's analysis of Ps 111 suggested that that psalm praises Yahweh specifically for covenantal renewal, and that the psalmist embodies the righteousness Moses commands in Deut 6:5 (see "whole heart" in v. 1; a phrase that Chapter Four found to occur almost exclusively in Davidic psalms).⁷²⁵ Furthermore, if editors identified the blessed man with David as seems probable, then Ps 112's "blurring" of Yahweh and David's identities reflects their close association also in Ps

⁷²⁴ See Chapter Three.

⁷²⁵ Alternatively, it is perhaps possible to explain those elements of the psalm whose stock phraseology would normally be applied to Yahweh as interjections whereby the psalmist interrupts his general praise for the "blessed man," still applying them exclusively to Yahweh. But such referential distinctions seem too precise for this psalm whose language otherwise suggests continuity in the subject of its praise. That is, if these are "Yahweh-directed" interjections of praise, the psalmist goes to no effort to distinguish clearly between Yahweh and the "blessed man" about whom the psalm otherwise ostensibly speaks.

2:2 and the editorial identification of Yahweh's anointed (2:7) with the "blessed man" of Ps 1.⁷²⁶

We shall further examine the implications of Pss 1–2 for covenant relationships in the Conclusion.

Returning once more to Ps 107, it might seem that its anonymous nature spoils an otherwise "neat" symmetry between the two Davidic groups at each end of Book V. However, quite apart from the potential Davidizing influence of Book IV's concluding psalms (see above), the beginnings of Book V indicate that editors deliberately sought to "Davidize," if not the psalm itself, then its repeated call, "Let them thank the LORD for his steadfast love, for his wondrous works to the children of man!" (יִודוּ לַיהוָה חַסְדּוֹ וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו לְבְנֵי אָדָם) in vv. 1, 8, 15, 21, and 31. After this call to praise God's חַסְדּוֹ toward humanity there follows the (Davidic) psalmist's declaration in Ps 108:4 that "I will give thanks to you, Yahweh, among the peoples" (אֲדַדְּיָם בְּעַמִּים) and "sing praises to you among the nations" (וְאֶזְמְרֶיךָ בְּלִ-אֲמִים). This transition from Ps 107's recollection of Yahweh's deeds and call to "give thanks" to David's vow to praise in 108:4 suggests editorial interest in David as leader of praise and thanksgiving.⁷²⁷ Moreover, in light of Ps 107 it seems that "David" ostensibly praises God for redeeming his people from trouble (אֲלֵלָהּ in v. 2; cf. אֲלֵלָהּ עַם-יְיָ in Exod 15:13) and gathering them from the lands (v. 3). In this context 107:38 also accentuates the Abrahamic promises of blessing and multiplication as noted in Chapter Five. Yahweh "blesses them and they multiply greatly" (וַיְבָרֶכְם וַיְרַבּוּ מְאֹד); terms strongly reminiscent of God's promises to Abraham and his seed in Gen 12:3 (cf. 15:5), which are reiterated in very similar terms when Isaac blesses Jacob in Gen 28:3–4.⁷²⁸ We see the same

⁷²⁶ cf. also Chapter Five's discussion of Ps 45:7–8.

⁷²⁷ Zenger, "Composition and Theology," 89, notes the connection between Ps 107's refrain and 145:12, which he regards the "structural center" of Ps 145. There "David" announces that God's works would "make known to the children of man your might deeds and the glorious splendor of your kingdom" (לְהוֹדִיעַ לְבְנֵי הָאָדָם גְּבוּרַתְּךָ וְכְבוֹדְךָ) (הַדָּר מִלְכוּתְךָ), thus reinforcing the same idea of David as declarer of Yahweh's wonders to all flesh.

⁷²⁸ "God Almighty bless you (וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתְךָ) and make you fruitful (וַיַּפְרֵךְ) and multiply you (וַיְרַבְּךָ)."

combination of verbs, *ברך* and *רבה*, prior to this in the Pentateuch also: in the creation account in Gen 1:22 and 28 and within the divine address to Noah (Gen 9:2) that climaxes in the Noahic covenant.⁷²⁹ The Pss 107–108 sequence therefore implies that David praises Yahweh for responding to exile by redeeming his people and fulfilling his Abrahamic promises to make them a great nation. These allusions to Genesis and Book V’s universal focus on “all flesh” (e.g., 145:21; 150:6), suggest editors arranged 107–108 to depict “David” as praising God for fulfilling also the creational and Noahic covenantal “First Commission” to “be fruitful and multiply” (Gen 1:28; 9:1, 7). Whereas the Abrahamic covenantal texts above particularize such promises in terms of Abraham and his seed, Pss 107–108—like Ps 72—universalize and focus them in terms of the king. Understood thus, “David” in Pss 107f effectively answers (his own?) intercessory petition in Ps 106:47.

When it comes to Ps 145’s more immediate context in Davidic Pss 138–145, a few observations are noteworthy. First, Ps 138 begins very similarly to Ps 108, suggesting another parallel between the two groups of Davidic psalms. Just as David of “steadfast heart” (cf. *נָכוֹן* *לִבִּי* in v. 2; cf. 111:1) vows to “give thanks” in Ps 108:1–3, so he vows in Ps 138:1, “I will give thanks with my whole heart” (*אֲזַדְרֶךָ בְּכָל־לִבִּי*). This is especially noteworthy given Ps 138’s proximity to Ps 136, which echoes the call to “give thanks” more than any other psalm. The first

⁷²⁹ In both cases “God blessed (*ברך*)” precedes the command to “be fruitful and multiply (*פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ*).” The commission (*פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ*) also occurs in Gen 8:17 and 9:7 in connection with Noah and in Gen 17:6 and 20 regarding Ishmael. Leviticus 26:9 uses this verbal combination in the hiphil, where Yahweh promises he will turn to you and make you fruitful (*וְהִפְרִיתִי*) and multiply you (*וְהִרְבִּיתִי*) and will confirm my covenant with you (*וְהִקִּמֹתִי*) (אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אֲתָכֶם).” Interestingly, although the theme of “blessing” is only implicit (Lev 26 lacks *ברך*), v. 42 specifies that Yahweh will “remember” his covenant with *Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham* when he has mercy on his unfaithful people. The covenantal context of the commission is thus beyond doubt in Leviticus. Although *פרה* is absent from Ps 107:38, its conceptual and lexical overlap with such texts via *ברך* and *רבה* increases allusive potential.

Another common term is “families” (*מִשְׁפָּחוֹת*) in Ps 107:41b, albeit here in reference to “the poor” (cf. *אֲבִיוֹן* in v. 41a) rather than “families of the earth” in Gen 12:3 and its reiterations.

psalm of *both* Davidic groups—i.e., Ps 108 and Ps 138—responds to the summons of preceding יהוה psalms to “give thanks to Yahweh” with “*David*” declaring, “I will give thanks to you (with all my heart).” This seems to suggest editorial intent to present “David” as the one who fulfills Book V’s call to “give thanks to Yahweh.”

Moreover, the psalms preceding Ps 138 indicate that Yahweh should be praised for fulfilling covenantal promises, just as Ps 107 had done leading up to the first Davidic group, Pss 108–110(111–112). Already Chapter Four noted concatenation between Pss 135:12 and 136:21–22 regarding God’s promise of land, evidencing editors’ particular interest in this Abrahamic promise.⁷³⁰ More generally, Ps 136 praises God’s past victories over the Egyptians and Canaanite kings as Yahweh fulfilled this promise to give the land. Then follows Ps 137’s lament about exile, Babylon, etc., thus shifting the focus to a new, later historical crisis (as was the focus of Ps 107’s praise for deliverance). In light of the 135–137 sequence—a group that seems to transition between the Songs of Ascent and final Davidic group—Ps 138’s response to Ps 136’s call to thanksgiving seems to announce Yahweh’s redemptive response to present or eschatological exile as a new exodus/conquest (cf. above discussion of Book IV).

Interestingly, the series of laments found at the heart of the final Davidic group (i.e., Pss 140–143) portray a “David” still embattled, crying out to Yahweh for help. It seems, then, that “David” still “calls upon [Yahweh] in the day of trouble” (50:15) even at this late stage of the Psalter (cf. Pss 86 and 102). Indeed, Robert Wallace understands the final few Davidic psalms’ depiction of David in a manner commensurate with this key aspect of our hypothesis, “David is a humble supplicant interceding on his own behalf and, by extension, interceding on behalf of his people.”⁷³¹ However David’s kingship and his role as praise-leader are not thereby lost to view, for in Ps 144:9–11 “David” declares, “I will sing a new song to you, O God; upon a ten-stringed

⁷³⁰ See Chapter Four for a discussion of this theme and its universalization in Book V.

⁷³¹ Wallace, “Gerald Wilson and the Characterization of David in Book 5 of the Psalter,” 204.

harp I will play to you,” because he “gives victory to *kings*, who rescues *David* his servant from the cruel sword. Rescue *me* and deliver *me* from the hand of foreigners.”⁷³² This is consistent with Book IV’s “new song” reflected in the 93–100 arrangement (see above). However it seems more clearly to identify “David” as its singer and, by implication, the leader of a new exodus as royal servant.

The Egyptian Hallel Group (Psalms 113–118). In broad terms the Egyptian Hallel group (Pss 113–118) reactualizes exodus traditions (Ps 114),⁷³³ calling for trust in Yahweh (rather than idols) and announcing that God has “remembered” his people and will bless them anew (Ps 115:12–13). Significantly, when the psalmist of Ps 116 then praises God for his deliverance, he does so via allusion to the grace formula in v. 5: “Gracious is Yahweh and righteous, our God is merciful” (חַנּוּן יְהוָה וְצַדִּיק וְאֱלֹהֵינוּ מֵרַחֵם:). However several reasons suggest editors understood the psalmist in this individual thanksgiving psalm as royal. Indeed, at the macro-structural level Ps 116 resembles key psalms in our analysis that would suggest editors likely understood the psalmist as “David.” For instance, in vv. 1–2 the psalmist declares, “I love [Yahweh]...because he has inclined his ear to me (כִּי־הִטָּה אָזְנוֹ לִי).” Elsewhere we read the petition to “incline your ear to me” in Davidic or Davidized psalms that have featured prominently in our investigation: Pss 71:2; 86:1; and 102:2 (also 88:3, which is close associated

⁷³² הַנּוֹתֵן תְּשׁוּעָה לַמְּלָכִים הַפּוֹצֵה אֶת־דָּוִד עַבְדּוֹ מִתְּרַב רָעָה: פָּצַע וְהַצִּילָנִי מִיַּד בְּנֵי־נֹכַח

Wilson, ““King, Messiah, and the Reign of God,” 402, surveys the distribution of the terms מֶלֶךְ and מְלִיךָ in the Psalter, noting “remarkable change in the way these terms are used.” Wilson concludes that this terminology is reserved for Yahweh and foreign kings in Books IV and V whereas in Books I–III they frequently refer to David. However, 144:9–11 not only appear to identify “servant David” as the specific example of מְלָכִים to whom Yahweh gives victory, but differentiates the Davidic psalmist (“me...me”) from foreigners (בְּנֵי־נֹכַח). Thus Wilson’s statement that “these terms are *never employed* in specific references to the kings of Israel and Judah in the last to books of the Psalter!” (emphasis original) is too strong and suggests that a simple “head count” may be misleading in this instance. Cf. Wallace, “Characterization of David,” 199.

⁷³³ Similarly, Kratz, “Die Tora Davids,” 24.

with Ps 89). Second, Chapter Four suggested that at the editorial level “I am your servant, the son of your maidservant” (אֲנִי־עַבְדְּךָ בֶן־אֲמָתֶיךָ) in Ps 116:16 echoes similar references to David as עַבְדְּךָ and בֶּן in editorially prominent psalms: Pss 2 (introduction to the Psalter), Pss 78 and 86 (centrally located in their respective subgroups), and Ps 89 (concluding Book III). Again, all such references have David in view. Third, the psalmist declares that he will “fulfill [his] vows” (שָׁלַם + נִדְרֵי), which, as Chapter Five showed, is a prominent expression in Book II that occurs only in Davidic or Davidized psalms besides Ps 50:14’s programmatic summons.⁷³⁴ Of course, such examples are outside Book V. However all theories of the Psalter’s composition presuppose that Book V’s editors knew Book I–IV, whether as an arrangement they themselves constructed (e.g., Mitchell), or, more commonly, as a later addition to an existing Psalter. Whatever composition-historical model is favored, then, Book V’s editors were well-positioned to recognize these themes’ exclusive association with (quasi-)Davidic psalms earlier in the Psalter. In light of these similarities, Ps 116 seems to praise Yahweh for answering the royal petition of Ps 86 (cf. Ps 88) and quasi-royal intercession of Ps 102; Yahweh has heard “David’s” plea and now he renders thanks (as anticipated by Ps 50:14–15!).

In a similar way, Ps 118 may recall Ps 101, where “David” resolves to cut off the wicked. Three times the psalmist declares, “in the name of Yahweh I cut them off” in reference to the nations (בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה כָּיִ אֲמַלְתִּים in vv. 10–12). As noted earlier, Grant sees Ps 118 as a quasi-royal psalm deliberately paired with Ps 119 in a broader editorial effort to collocate Torah psalms with psalms that present an idealized picture of the king according to Deut 17.⁷³⁵ It is also hard to ignore the similarities between Yahweh’s promise to his anointed in Ps 2:9 that he would “dash in pieces” the nations like pottery and Ps 118:10–12’s announcement of the fact: “All nations surrounded me; in the name of the LORD I cut them off! They surrounded me, surrounded me on

⁷³⁴ Pss 22:26; 50:14; 56:13; 61:6, 9; 65:2; 66:13; and 116:14, 18.

⁷³⁵ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 121–88.

every side; in the name of the LORD I cut them off! They surrounded me like bees; they went out like a fire among thorns; in the name of the LORD I cut them off!”

Thus the Egyptian Hallel and Ps 119 seem to suggest a royal figure who keeps Torah with his “whole heart,” cuts off the enemy nations “in the name of Yahweh,” and gives thanks to Yahweh who has heard his cry to “give ear.”⁷³⁶ By reactualizing exodus traditions (Ps 114) this group of psalms suggests that this royal figure leads a new exodus, or has some prominent role in it (cf. our analysis of Book IV above).

The Songs of Ascent (Psalms 120–134). As a group, the Songs of Ascent envision a return or pilgrimage to the land from foreign places (Ps 120), praying for restoration (e.g., Ps 126).⁷³⁷ They thus fit in well with the ingathering and restoration themes announced in Ps 107. As we consider Ps 145:8 vis-à-vis Pss 120–134, it is notable that the term **חַסֵּד** itself is rare, occurring only once in penitential Ps 130:7 where it is paired with “redemption” (**פְּדוּת**). The psalmist urges Israel to “wait” on Yahweh in v. 6 (cf. Gen 49:18) for “with Yahweh there is steadfast love, and with him there is plentiful redemption” (**כִּי־עַם־יְהוָה הַחֲסֵד וְהַרְבֵּה עִמָּן פְּדוּת**). Besides this, Ps 123:3 offers a faint allusion to the grace formula in the petition, “Have mercy upon us (**חַנּוּן**), O LORD, have mercy upon us (**חַנּוּן**), for we have had more than enough (**רַב**) of contempt.” A possible allusion to the grace formula is discernable here via the imperative “have

⁷³⁶ Indeed, such associations suggest quasi-Davidic status of Ps 119 given that these themes are associated with “David” in psalms that have appeared prominently in our investigation. To recap: Chapter Four noted the psalmist’s thirteen-fold self-reference as “your servant” (119:17, 23, 38, 49, 65, 76, 84, 122, 124, 125, 135, 140, and 176) and “whole-hearted” devotion to Yahweh (**בְּכָל־לִבִּי/לְבָבִי** in vv. 34, 58, 69, and 145). “Servant” was applied to David in Ps 86 (three times, also as a form of self-reference) and in 78:70 and 89:4, 21, 40, (51), while the expression **בְּכָל־לִבִּי/לְבָבִי** found special association with David as well.

⁷³⁷ Hendrik Viviers, “The Coherence of the Ma’alôt Psalms (Pss 120–134),” *ZAW* 106 (1994): 275–89, concludes that individually the Songs of Ascent are “sophisticated, (original) unitary poetic works” (277), describing the arrangement of the collection overall as “a *non-rigid chiasmus*” based primarily on his form-critical and thematic analysis of the psalms. Primarily a literary arrangement, Viviers, *ibid.* 288, thinks that the collection “was probably used within and outside...the cult as >>devotieboekje<< and a meditation book.”

mercy on us” (cf. “gracious” [חַנּוּן] in the formula) and “more than enough (רַב) contempt” (contrasting “abounding [רַב] in steadfast love”). To the extent editors appreciated an allusion here, it would seem the psalmist was appealing to Yahweh to act according to his proper character expressed by the grace formula, implying that their present troubles belie Yahweh’s abundant רַב. Significantly, Ps 123 lies between Davidic Pss 122 and 124, suggesting that once again it is “David” who voices the petition on behalf of the people. Moreover, “David” declares, “Our help is in the name of Yahweh” in 124:8 shortly after v. 6’s “Blessed be Yahweh who has not given us as prey to their teeth.” Accordingly, Davidic Ps 124 apparently answers Ps 123’s petition via its “name theology,” effectively declaring that God has lived up to his character of being gracious etc. (Exod 34:6).⁷³⁸

Though most Songs of Ascent are anonymous, the theme of the kingship remains prominent. This is especially evident in Ps 122:5’s reference to Zion as the place where David’s thrones establish justice: “There thrones for judgment (כִּסְאֵי דִּינִים) were set, the thrones of the house of David (בְּיַד דָּוִד).” While petitioning God’s help, the group also announces God’s salvation as just seen in Davidic Ps 124.⁷³⁹ Moreover, Ps 132’s explicit focus on the Davidic covenant accentuates its ongoing importance in this group, which argues against Wilson’s contention that editors thought the Davidic Covenant failed. Chapter Four noted that Yahweh’s election of Zion (v. 13) follows directly from vv. 11–12’s recounting of Yahweh’s sure promises to David (vv. 11–12). Then the psalm describes Zion as Yahweh’s eternal resting place in v. 14. There Yahweh provides for and blesses its provisions and priests (vv. 15–16), and

⁷³⁸ Similarly Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 3, 348. Viviers, “The Coherence of the Ma’alôt Psalms (Pss 120–134),” 279, notes the almost identical expression in 121:2, commenting that “the creation tradition in 121 adjures idolatrous forces, while in 124 it adjures primordial forces (>>enemies<<),” adding that “Yahweh’s ability to save is underlined by his ability to create.”

⁷³⁹ Psalm 124:6–7 read, “Blessed be the LORD, who has not given us as prey to their teeth! We have escaped like a bird from the snare of the fowlers; the snare is broken, and we have escaped!”

causes “a horn for David” to sprout and erects a “lamp for [his] anointed” (שֵׁם אֲצִמִית קָרַן לְדָוִד) (עֲרֹכְתִי נֵר לְמִשְׁיַחִי) giving victory over his enemies (vv. 17–18). Far from envisioning a kingless theocracy, Ps 132 underscores the primacy of God’s faithfulness to his Davidic covenantal promises in its vision of a prosperous Zion, and seems also to recall Ps 2:6’s vision of the anointed on his throne in Zion. Moreover, Ps 132 has been sandwiched between Davidic Pss 131 and 133. Davidized thus, it seems clear that editors sought to amplify the already strong focus on David in this psalm.

Indeed, the whole collection is arranged with particular interest in David and Solomon more generally. The only attributed psalms in the 120–134 group are Davidic Pss 122, 124, 131, and 133 as well as the Psalter’s second Solomonic psalm, Ps 127. Interestingly, Ps 127 is the eighth psalm of the group and therefore central to the 15 psalms that comprise it.⁷⁴⁰ At the center of the group, then, we find Ps 127 affirming the importance of Yahweh “building the (royal) house” (וְהִקְיַמְתִּי אֶת־זִרְעֶךָ אַחֲרָיִךְ) in v. 1) and declaring that sons are a blessing (vv. 3–5; cf. 128:3–6). This suggests an allusion to Yahweh’s promise in 2 Sam 7:11–12 to build David a house (i.e., a dynasty) and to “raise up your offspring after you” (וְהִקְיַמְתִּי אֶת־זִרְעֶךָ אַחֲרָיִךְ), and further suggests that Yahweh’s faithfulness in preserving or restoring kingship is central to restored Israel. Indeed, we have already seen that the other Solomonic psalm, Ps 72, also reflects specific editorial interest in royal sonship and succession. When it comes to the four Davidic psalms, we find them divided in two pairs either side of 127, each pair separated by an anonymous psalm (i.e., Pss 123 and 132) as noted above. It appears, then, that the Songs of Ascent confirm the centrality of kingship in the restoration of God’s people, and that Book V’s interest in “David” is more than nostalgic historical reflection. It seems rather to envision a *David redivivus*.⁷⁴¹

⁷⁴⁰ Cf. the centrality of the king in Pss 15–24, bracketed by entrance liturgies.

⁷⁴¹ Cf. Viviers, “The Coherence of the Ma’alôt Psalms (Pss 120–134),” 286–87, who similarly sees a concentric arrangement in the Songs of Ascent based on his form-critical and thematic comparisons between psalms.

Summary

The grace formula seems to be integral to the structure of Book V. It also appears to be associated specifically with “David,” who whole-heartedly praises God (Pss 108:2; 111:1; 138:1) and leads all flesh in a “new song” (Pss 144:9; 145:21). As employed in Book V, the grace formula expresses the essential content of praise: Yahweh graciously and mercifully restores and multiplies his people in faithfulness to his Abrahamic/Mosaic covenantal promises, thereby answering the petition to “save” and “gather” God’s people (Ps 107:1–3; cf. 106:47). In this connection the new exodus motif enjoys considerable prominence in Book V, and it further seems that Pss 108–112, 116, and 118 identify “David” as its (Moses-like) leader (cf. Ps 132) and singer of its “new song.” Overall, then, Book V seems to give “David” the leading role in declaring Yahweh’s grace and compassion and the fulfilment of his covenant promises. Nevertheless, the picture of David remains broadly consistent with earlier Books as well, for “David” is presented variously as victorious over his enemies and a priestly figure (Ps 110; cf. 72 and 101), an embattled petitioner (Ps 142–143; cf. 86 and 102), and the implied leader of a new exodus.

Conclusion

Lane is undoubtedly correct that parallels to Exod 34:6 in the Psalter “emphasize YHWH’s reign over the entire earth.”⁷⁴² However, the above analysis shows that it also accentuates the role of “David” in the restoration of God’s people. David is depicted here as a Moses-like mediator

Viviers breaks down the collection into smaller groups comprising 120–122, 123–126, 127–129, 130–131, 132–134. Interestingly, this arrangement locates exactly one Davidic or Solomonian psalm in each subgroup (i.e., 122, 124, 127, 131, 133). However, Viviers seems not to see any significance to attributed psalms for the arrangement of the collection, and, e.g., does not comment on the apparent “sandwiching” of Pss 123 and 132 between Davidic psalms.

⁷⁴² Lane, “Exodus 34:6–7,” 150. Similarly, Kim, “Exodus 34: 6 in Psalms 86, 103, and 145,” 8, notes that בל occurs in some ten verses but only after v. 8’s iteration of the grace formula (vv. 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21), and draws the implication that “[v]erse 8 brings up YHWH’s fidelity that was applied to the covenantal community. Then, the following verses apply YHWH’s covenantal fidelity to YHWH’s universal reign.”

who prays as one embattled (Ps 86), declares forgiveness and the time of Zion's restoration (Pss 103[–104]), and gives thanks to Yahweh (Ps 145) for his grace and compassion as expressed in the grace formula. As suggested in Chapter Five, these three uses of the grace formula seems to echo the Ps 50:14–15's commands to his "covenant people" (v. 5), "Offer to God a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and perform your vows to the Most High, and call upon me in the day of trouble (וְקָרָאתֶנּוּ בְיָוֶם צָרָה); I will deliver you, and you shall glorify me." Indeed, in Ps 86:7 "David" specifically says, "In the day of my trouble I call upon you, for you answer me" (בְּיָוֶם צָרָתִי (אֶקְרָאָךְ כִּי תִעֲנֵנִי). He thus prays *exactly* as Ps 50:15 commands, suggesting that he fulfills God's summons to his covenant people in that psalm. Moreover, "David" identifies with weak and sinful humanity (Pss 86, 102, 103:15–16, 142–143), as one who is faithful (Ps 86:2) and characterized by whole-hearted piety (108:2; 111:1; 138:1) and blameless integrity (101:2). It must be acknowledged that it is possible to read texts such as Pss 86:5 and 103:3 so that the psalmist includes *himself* among those who need mercy and forgiveness. However we observed that such statements are—like the grace formula—general or even creedal in their declaration of God's forgiving character. We also noted that those psalms are focused on concerns other than personal guilt, whether external oppressors (Ps 86) or Yahweh's grace and mercy toward the "oppressed" (103:6) and "us" (Ps 103:10–14). Consistent with our study of Ps 89, Books III–V nowhere explicitly ascribe guilt to the king, but rather highlights the people's covenantal infidelity (e.g., Pss 78, 81, 106, etc.). In this light, it seems more likely that editors primarily had in view the king's identification with sinners, rather than personal guilt *per se*.

Beyond this we have also seen other aspects of how "David" is depicted in Books III–V. These other aspects give further theological context to "David" as speaker of the grace formula. He is Yahweh's embattled servant (Pss 78, 86, 89, 102), vindicator of the meek/righteous and destroyer of the wicked (Pss 101, 110), and a sacerdotal figure closely connected to Zion (Pss 110, 132). Moreover he seems to be the focal point of an anticipated "new exodus" sung about in such groups as Pss 93–100 and the so-called Egyptian Hallel Pss 113–118. Indeed, Ps 144:9

suggests that, like Moses before him, “David” himself sings this “new song” as he leads the people and all flesh in praise of Yahweh for his grace and compassion (Ps 145:21).

CONCLUSION

The foregoing investigation has sought to elucidate how editors perceived the relationship between the Davidic covenant and its pre-monarchic counterparts—the Mosaic and Abrahamic covenants. Scholars like Wilson understand Psalter’s editorial agenda in terms of a “problem-solution” paradigm, in which post-exilic life under the Mosaic covenant replaces “failed” royal covenantal theology. Against such views our hypothesis contended that editors anticipated an ideal Davidic successor who keeps Torah and intercedes for God’s people—even the world!—who are consistently portrayed as unfaithful to Mosaic covenantal stipulations.

To test this hypothesis, Chapters One and Two surveyed and reassessed major kinds of editorial evidence identified by scholars in the field. This enabled us to assess capacity of different kinds of evidence to reflect demonstrable editorial intent and to reevaluate the significance of certain kinds of evidence. We agreed with Wilson that superscriptional data—particularly author and genre—play an important organizational role that reflects editorial intent, and that the use of superscripts confirm the five Books as the Psalter’s major subgroups. While varying in strength, concatenation of lexemes and themes prove to be a useful kind of evidence for inferring editorial intentionality in collocating psalms as well, as recent scholarly interest in concatenation also reflects. On the other hand, scholarly views on what editors intended to convey through such concatenation often owe much to their macro-structural assumptions. The significance of another intriguing feature of the Psalter, the “doublets,” is also somewhat enigmatic, and scholars’ diachronic explanations have tended to be more speculative. Regarding 72:20, we suggested that this postscript signals a shift in major focus from “historical” David *ben Jesse* to a future “David” in subsequent Davidic and Davidized psalms in the latter three Books. While much remains unclear about the history of the so-called Elohist Psalter, more

theologically oriented explanations seem to have more merit. These underscore the importance of “name theology” to the editors. Chapter Two also examined what bearing external evidence from Qumran and the LXX has on the editing of the Psalter, finding Wilson’s evidence for a two-stage redaction less compelling than is often assumed.

Chapter Three then investigated the Psalter’s direct references to “covenant” by examining the term **בְּרִית** in Pss 25, 44, 50, 74, 78, 89, 103, 105, 106, 111, and 132. While several instances make it plain which historical covenant is chiefly in view (e.g., Pss 89 and 105), more normally **בְּרִית** is used in an absolute way that lacks explicit description while presupposing that the term is understood. This, together with the fact **בְּרִית** is always singular in number, suggested an essential unity and theological continuity undergirding the distinct “covenants.” We also found that more often psalms with **בְּרִית** allude to or specify promises or commitments pertaining to one covenant or another, most often the Mosaic covenant.

Chapter Four examined such allusive “criteria” in the Psalter, identifying their distribution and examining their particular association with David. Though preliminary in nature and sometimes inconclusive, this investigation showed that in numerous cases these allusive “criteria” gravitate around David. For instance, our analysis showed that allusions to the covenant formula seem to accentuate David as Yahweh’s covenant partner *par excellence*. Moreover, allusions to such foundational texts as Deut 6:5 occur predominantly in Davidic or Davidized psalms, highlighting David’s “whole-hearted” piety towards Yahweh. Similarly, allusions to the Aaronic blessing, while relatively few, suggest that the king announces Yahweh’s blessing (esp. Ps 67).

Chapter Five then examined Ps 72:17 as an allusion to Gen 12:3, 22:18, and 26:4 with Ps 72, and how that psalm relates to the key structural concerns of Book II. We concluded that Ps 72 identifies the “seed” of Abraham as the royal son (v. 1) for whom David *ben Jesse* (72:20) prays. Our analysis suggested that the editors responsible expected the key Abrahamic covenantal promise of blessing for the nations to be realized through an ideal royal successor. In considering the structure of Book II, we suggested that Ps 50’s dislocation from the main Asaph

group (Pss 73–83)—clearly the most conspicuous structural feature in Book II—could be accounted for by editors’ presentation of David as God’s covenant partner who responds to Ps 50’s summons in vv. 14–15. In the Davidic group that follows David calls on Yahweh in his day of trouble (Ps 51; cf. 86:7), and in the Psalter more broadly it is consistently David who will “fulfill [his] vows” to Yahweh and “offer thank-offerings,” in accordance with 50:14–15. Chapter Five also examined the arrangement of Korahite Pss 42–49, seeing a close association between David, Yahweh, and Zion in Pss 45–48 that presents the group’s immediate response to its own lament in Ps 44. Furthermore, this group brings together the same complex of major themes found in Moses’ Song of the Sea in Exod 15, suggesting that its response to Ps 44’s lament envisages a “new exodus.”

Finally, in Chapter Six we examined the grace formula. Its full citations occur only in Davidic psalms—Pss 86, 103, and 145, even in Books III and IV where there are only three Davidic psalms altogether.

Despite relatively few mentions in Book III David enjoys a theologically and structurally central place. After observing how Ps 78 identifies God’s election of David and Zion as his divine response to Israel’s covenantal faithlessness, we saw “David” presented in Ps 86 as the faithful servant of Yahweh who appeals to the grace formula as he petitions Yahweh for help from threatening enemies. Indeed, we noted a strong resonance with Isaiah’s suffering servant especially in light of Pss 88–89, where in contrast to the DH the crisis suffered by king and people is *not* attributed to the failure of kings. Furthermore, editors plausibly viewed Ps 86 as a royal intercession for his whole kingdom and people.

In Book IV we saw “David” announce Yahweh’s grace and compassion anew in the forgiveness of sins. This was a third major aspect of a composite picture of the Davidic ruler formed by Pss 101–103, who also succors the blameless and cuts off the wicked (Ps 101), and cries out to Yahweh under the oppression of enemies as he announces Yahweh’s restoration of Zion (Ps 102). This trifold portrait is located after Pss 93–100 with their multiple allusions to the Song of the Sea (Exod 15). Accordingly, it seemed that editors viewed “David” as instrumental

in bringing about a “new exodus,” whose “new song” of Yahweh’s reign is announced in Pss 93–100. Moreover, we saw that although Book IV emphasizes Moses, it does so predominantly in *historical* perspective (Pss 103, 105, and 106). The Book highlights his historic roles in the Yahweh-Israel relationship—especially that of intercessor—seemingly to accentuate “David’s” exercise of those same Mosaic qualities. “David” therefore takes on such historically Mosaic roles as leader of a new exodus, destroyer of idols and idolaters, and intercessor. Moreover Ps 103 presents him as revealer of Yahweh’s gracious character, more nearly parallels *Yahweh* who had declared his name and character before Moses in Exod 34. Although Ps 90 gives similar “present-tense” voice to Moses, we observed that the later Davidic group (Pss 101–103) both amplifies Moses’ lament and petitions and *answers* them. In light of this, it seems wrong to speak of one covenant superseding another in Book IV, and even more false to say that Mosaic covenantal life is Book IV’s proposed solution to a failed Davidic covenant. Rather, the two are presented in continuity with each other, whose fulfillments are realized through the speaker of Pss 101–103.

The last instance of the grace formula, Ps 145:8, expresses the core reason for the Psalter’s climactic crescendo of praise in Pss 146–150 and therefore confirms that the formula as a major focal point of the Psalter. Structurally, Book V accentuates the grace formula and reasserts its particular association with “David,” as seen also in the Books prior to Book V. Book V reiterates the major theological concerns seen so far, such as a “new exodus,” whose leader appears to be royal (Pss 113–118, esp. 116), and “David” as victorious sacerdotal king (Ps 110; cf. esp. Pss 2, 15–24). Moreover, the beginning and ending of Book V presents “David” as leader of thanksgiving who calls all people to thank Yahweh for fulfilling key covenantal promises (Pss 107–108; Pss 136 and 138), and it is in this context that we find him declaring the grace formula. As we have consistently found, then, David appears to be an inseparable and focal part of the Psalter’s solution to covenantal crises, not their cause.

Corroborating these findings, Pss 1–2 introduce the Psalter by presenting a very similar way of conceiving the relationship between the Davidic and pre-monarchic covenants. Having

had occasion to reference Pss 1–2 now and then throughout the preceding investigation, we now examine these psalms more fully.

Psalms 1–2 as Introduction to the Psalter

Scholarly opinion varies as to whether Ps 1 alone or Pss 1–2 together introduce the Psalter as well as their theological significance for the Psalter.⁷⁴³ In the ensuing discussion we shall confine ourselves to those issues with the most direct bearing on our hypothesis. One such issue is the form-critical classification of Pss 1 and 2 as a wisdom/Torah and and Royal psalm. This question is worthy of attention because their collocation suggests a deliberate effort to theologically relate Ps 1's two-way theology—strongly reminiscent of Deuteronomic theology—with Ps 2's Davidic covenantal theology.⁷⁴⁴ On the one hand, scholars like Wilson hold that Ps 1 was a later addition that usurped or greatly modified Ps 2 as an introduction to an earlier Psalter (Pss 2–89), suggesting that Wisdom or Mosaic covenantal themes refocus the newly expanded Psalter away from the older royal introduction in Ps 2. On the other hand, our hypothesis would suggest the reverse theological move: Ps 2 narrows Ps 1's Torah/Mosaic vision in terms of Yahweh's anointed. Accordingly, another important issue meriting attention is Ps 2's identification of Ps 1's "the blessed man" as the anointed king, which on face value suggests the Psalter opens by promoting the king as faithful Yahweh's covenant partner *par excellence*. Finally, prompted by Robert Wallace's recent thoughts on the issue, our examination of Pss 1–2 concludes with some brief reflections on the characterization of David there and in the Psalter overall.

⁷⁴³ For a good summary of views see Susan Gillingham, *A Journey of Two Psalms: The Reception History of Psalms 1 & 2 in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 270–87, 297–98.

⁷⁴⁴ Wallace, "Gerald Wilson and the Characterization of David in Book 5 of the Psalter," 197, observes, "If a Torah psalm (Ps 1) and a royal psalm (Ps 2) introduce the Psalter, it would seem to be an affirmation of both traditions" (i.e., Davidic kingship and Torah/wisdom). Wallace raises some important questions regarding the characterization of David (see below).

Genre and Editorial History of Pss 1–2. Scholars often emphasize the distinctiveness of these psalms according to their common form-critical classifications as a Torah or wisdom psalm (Ps 1) juxtaposed with a Royal Psalm (Ps 2). Indeed, the two psalms bring some obvious distinctive emphases when read independently, and raise several possibilities regarding what editors intended these psalms to communicate as they introduce the Psalter. As discussed in Chapter One, Gerald Wilson suggests that Ps 1 effectively replaced Ps 2 as the opening psalm of the Psalter, shifting the focus from cultic performance of psalms to private meditation.⁷⁴⁵ For Wilson Ps 1 was added along with Books IV–V, forming a “wisdom frame” to enclose the royal-covenantal orientation of Pss 2–89. By usurping Ps 2’s original introductory function in this way, Ps 1 places Torah at the forefront of the Psalter’s theology. According to Wilson this reflects later editors’ intention to address the failure of royal covenantal theology with Torah and wisdom concerns, all within a general “democratizing” of the Davidic covenant. Several objections may be raised in response. The first is methodological: Wilson’s conclusion relies entirely on his composition-historical model for which the evidence is at best only suggestive. Moreover, that evidence takes precedence in Wilson’s theory, despite relatively clearer evidence that Pss 1–2 have been deliberately conjoined such that Ps 1’s “righteous/wicked contrast” aligns with the contrast between Ps 2’s royal anointed son and the recalcitrant nations (see below). Indeed, these correspondences suggest theological continuity and complementarity rather than an editorial intention to so drastically modify or even trump the theological perspective of one psalm with the other. Second, as we have noted Wilson’s theory accentuates the distinctiveness of the Mosaic & Davidic Covenants to the point of pitting them as alternatives, implying that the former comes to the rescue when the latter “fails.” However, Chapter Three’s analysis of the

⁷⁴⁵ Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter”, 74, suggests that “Psalm 1 has been appended to the Psalter as a hermeneutical introduction” that “stresses private, individual meditation as an important mode of access to the theological message of the psalms and, in so doing, shifts the function of these compositions away from public, communal cultic performances.”

Psalter's 20 occurrences of בְּרִית instead suggested that editors saw a strong theological unity between the covenants, neither stressing their separateness or playing them off against each other.

Noting the conspicuous links between Pss 1 and 2, others view them as a dual introduction, albeit with varying views about the significance of their collocation.⁷⁴⁶ Most obvious among those links are the lack of superscript atop both psalms (unusual in Book I), the יְשׁוּעָה formulae in 1:1 and 2:12 forming an *inclusio* around the two psalms, and shared terminology such as “meditate” (הִגֵּד) in 1:3 and 2:1 and the combination of “way” (דֶּרֶךְ) and “perish” (אָבַד) in 1:6 and 2:12.

Patrick Miller is among those who see a “tension” between Ps 1 and Ps 2 in spite of such connection. Miller interprets the alleged addition of Ps 1 as a “democratizing move” akin to what some suppose happened in the final editing of Deuteronomy: “[w]hile Psalm 2 invites the reader to hear the voice of the Lord’s anointed in the following psalms, Psalm 1 says that what we hear is the voice of *anyone* who lives by the Torah, which may and should include the king. But as such, the anointed one is simply a true Israelite even as he is a true king.”⁷⁴⁷ Read in the sequence presented, however, these psalms communicate a *royalization* of the Torah-observance lauded in Ps 1, not a democratization of Ps 2’s royal vision. Indeed, while it is possible that editors recognized שִׂיחָה in the sense of “everyman,” Ps 2’s royal identification of שִׂיחָה indicates a progression toward a royal focus, not away from it.⁷⁴⁸ To assert the reverse progression requires

⁷⁴⁶ See, e.g., Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 60–65; Robert L. Cole, “An Integrated Reading of Psalms 1 and 2,” *JSOT* 98 (2002): 75–88; *Psalms 1–2: Gateway to the Psalter* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012); Miller, “The Beginning of the Psalter,” 83–92; Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 73–74, 244; Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 55–59.

⁷⁴⁷ Patrick Miller, “The Beginning of the Psalter,” 91–92.

⁷⁴⁸ Pressing this point further, Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, reasons that the definite article in שִׂיחָה even precludes a general “everyman” identity for the “blessed man.” Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 56, cites Esth 4:11 as an instance where such generalizing is conveyed through use of כָּל and gender differentiation ($\text{רַשָׁע וְאִשָּׁה אֶשֶׁר}$). He writes, “The

reading these psalms' purportedly disparate theological messages in reverse sequence. It is hard to imagine ancient editors expecting their ancient audiences to appreciate Ps 1 as part of a democratizing "frame" intended to dampen Ps 2's overwhelmingly positive affirmation of kingship.

At the other end of the spectrum, Robert Cole calls into question the form-critical identification of Ps 1 as a wisdom/Torah Psalm and Ps 2 as a Royal Psalm altogether. Cole claims that Pss 1–2, "were deliberately composed for their present place and function."⁷⁴⁹ He warns, for example, that scholars inconsistently apply the usual criteria for identifying wisdom psalms, and that on such grounds *הגה* in 2:1 and *הַשְׁכִּילֹו* in 2:10 argues for a similar classification for Ps 2.⁷⁵⁰ While Cole rightly warns that such classifications can diminish our appreciation of the links between Pss 1–2,⁷⁵¹ one may wonder why the author/editor composed two psalms rather than one if in fact both of them were *authored* for the purpose of introducing the Psalter as he suggests. Moreover, it can hardly be denied that Pss 1 and 2 bear distinct

specificity expressed through the articular *הַאִישׁ* (as opposed to an anarthrous form *איש ואשה*) is significant in that Hebrew poetry, in contrast to prose, generally eschews use of the article and the relating particle *אשר* as well, both of which appear in Ps. 1.1." Indeed, *אֲשֶׁר־כָּל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר* might more clearly render the sense in which Miller (and Wilson et al.) understand Ps 1 without affecting poetic meter, though Cole is perhaps pushing the evidence a little far at this point.

⁷⁴⁹ Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 18–19, writes (citing Gerald T. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament* [BZAZ, 151; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980], 144), "Nor is their juxtaposition and placement at the head of the Psalter the result of "a redaction, which gives a secondary context to once independent psalms."... The remarkable harmony and resonance between them suggests they were deliberately composed for their present place and function." For a fuller discussion of scholarly discussion see Cole's introductory chapter (pp. 1–45).

⁷⁵⁰ Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 24, reacting to the form-critical assumptions of Jean-Marie Auwers, *La Composition littéraire du Psautier: Un état de la question* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 2000).

⁷⁵¹ Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 46, describes "an almost seamless transition between what are originally two discreet compositions."

emphases on wisdom/Torah and the Davidic covenant respectively, and that editors combined these Torah/Mosaic and royal themes by so collocating Pss 1–2, whatever their authorial history.

Psalms 1–2 and the King. As noted briefly above, Ps 2 identifies the “blessed man (שׂאִי)” of Ps 1 as the Davidic son and Yahweh’s anointed. Paired thus, Ps 2 apparently interprets the righteous/wicked contrast in Ps 1 via its own contrast between Yahweh’s “anointed”/“son” (2:2, 7, 12)⁷⁵² and the recalcitrant nations (2:1, 8).⁷⁵³ The former “meditates” (הגה) on Torah in accordance with the Deuteronomy 17’s kingship law (1:2) while the latter “imagine (הגה) vanity (רִיק).” Accordingly, Grant argues that the editorial juxtaposition of Pss 1–2 promotes an idealized king who exemplifies Torah-piety and contrasted with the “wicked” nations; a point consistent with our thesis.⁷⁵⁴

This collocation of psalms has further implications important for our hypothesis. The warning to kings and judges of the earth to “be wise” in Ps 2:10–12 also seems to imply the royal son’s intermediary role between Yahweh and the nations, as we briefly noted in Chapter Four. After v. 10’s initial imperative to “be wise” (השְׁכִּילוּ), vv. 11–12 instruct the kings and rulers to “serve Yahweh with fear (עֲבַדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה בְּיִרְאָה) and rejoice with trembling” and then command them to “kiss the son lest he be angry and you perish in the way” (נִשְׁקוּ־בֶן פֶּן־יִאַנְגֶּף | וְתִאֲבָדוּ דַרְךְ). Their proper relationship with Yahweh thus depends more directly on their relationship and response to the royal son. Indeed, the parallel created with 1:5–6 seems to identify the “way of the righteous” known to Yahweh (1:5) with “kissing the son” (2:12) by virtue of the more obvious parallel between the perishing “way of the wicked” (1:6) with 2:12’s warning, “lest...you perish in the way” as a result of provoking the son to anger. Furthermore, the final אֲשֶׁר־יָאֲסִי formula announces as blessed “all who take refuge in him” (כָּל־חֹסֵי בּוֹ). Since

⁷⁵² And those who seek refuge in him/Yahweh, but by extension (see below).

⁷⁵³ Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 58.

⁷⁵⁴ Jamie Grant, *The King as Exemplar*, 41–70. Similarly Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 59.

the “son” is the most recent antecedent,⁷⁵⁵ a natural reading of the psalm suggests that obeisance to the royal son is tantamount to taking refuge in him (as opposed to incurring his wrath). Of course common idiom would normally suggest that all who take refuge in *Yahweh* are blessed, and this is certainly possible (cf. Pss 7:2; 11:1; 16:1; 18:3, 31; 25:20; 31:2, 20; 34:9, 23; 36:8; 37:40; 57:2; 61:5; 64:11; 71:1; 118:8–9; etc.). It must nevertheless be admitted that the antecedent of the 3d sg. pronoun is at least ambiguous and in some sense includes the royal son who elsewhere within Ps 2 enjoys pride of place together with *Yahweh* (cf. vv. 2, 11–12). Moreover, in v. 8 *Yahweh* has already invited the royal son to “ask of me (שׂאַל לַמֶּלֶךְ) and I will make (נַתַּן) the nations (גּוֹיִם) your heritage (נַחֲלָה) and the ends of the earth (אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ) your possession.” This is particularly significant given the usual description of *Israel* as *Yahweh*’s נַחֲלָה in Moses’ Song in Deut 32 and the intercessory context of Deut 9:25–29. It implies *Yahweh*’s invitation to the royal son is an invitation to intercede for nations just as Moses had done toward *Israel* more narrowly, and thereby gain *the ends of the earth* as his inheritance.⁷⁵⁶ Indeed, Chapter Four’s analysis of נַחֲלָה in Pss 28:9; 33:12; 78:62; 94:5, 14; 106:5 and 40 confirms precisely these entailments, for Moses-like intercession was frequently in view when the Psalter speaks of people as God’s נַחֲלָה.⁷⁵⁷ The Psalter’s introduction therefore appears to announce that the royal son does for “the ends of the earth” what Moses had done for נַחֲלָה *Israel*: ask for them from *Yahweh* and receive them.

If this is correct, then the juxtaposition of Pss 1–2 offers compelling support for several key aspects of our thesis that we have seen demonstrated elsewhere in the Psalter. First, Pss 1–2 introduce the Psalter by presenting the king and *Yahweh* as a “joint force” that cannot be played

⁷⁵⁵ So also Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 68.

⁷⁵⁶ Mays, *The Lord Reigns*, 101, observes that נַחֲלָה never extends to “the ends of the earth” in the OT, making the universalization of the promise here unique and remarkable.

⁷⁵⁷ See Chapter Four.

off against each other as Wilson’s theory does. Second, the “blessed” Torah-observer of Ps 1 is royal, suggesting that the king lives according to Torah as Grant, Cole, and others argue. Contrary to commending life under the Mosaic covenant as an alternative to failed Davidic covenantal theology, then, Pss 1–2 depict the king as fulfiller of Mosaic Torah.⁷⁵⁸ Third, the relationship of the nations and their leaders toward Yahweh depends on their disposition toward the king, through whom they either receive peace and refuge in right relationship to Yahweh (1:10) or are destroyed their way through his wrath (vv. 9, 12). Indeed, Pss 101 and 110 confirm that this aspect of the king remains important into Books IV–V.⁷⁵⁹ As just noted, the king has a mediatory role with respect to Yahweh and the nations (2:8) as Moses had with respect to Yahweh and Israel. He is in effect a “new Moses.” As an intercessor he “asks of” Yahweh, who gives him nations as his inheritance to the ends of the earth, so fulfilling the now universalized Abrahamic covenantal promise of inheriting the land. Moreover, scholars like Gillingham, Creach, and Cole observe that Ps 1:3’s simile of the tree alludes to Eden/the temple even before 2:6’s explicit reference to Zion.⁷⁶⁰ The “blessed man” thus situated, it is clearly possible to

⁷⁵⁸ As noted in Chapter Four, J. Clinton McCann, *A Theological Introduction*, 27, sees the twofold reference to Torah in Ps 1:2 as a reference to the Psalter itself as an object of meditation, rather than Mosaic Torah. While this is an intriguing possibility, it is hard to imagine editors overlooking the natural *Mosaic* association of מִוִּרְחֵי, especially given oft-noted similarities between Ps 1 and texts like Deut 17 and Josh 1:7–8. See also Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 58–63; and Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 56.

⁷⁵⁹ Additionally, Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 46–47, notes that both the “minimal” acrostic Ps 1 and the full acrostic Ps 112 begin with אֲשֶׁר־י and end with דָּאֲבָד. This may further indicate that Book V’s editor(s) were mindful of Ps 1. If Zenger’s view that Ps 112’s “blessed man” should be identified with the priest-king of Ps 110 “David” is correct, then Pss 1–2 and 112 also have in common the king versus wicked/nations contrast as well. Indeed, the two end very similarly. In Ps 112:10 it is the “desire of the wicked” (תַּאֲוַת רְשָׁעִים) that perishes, while in 1:6, “the way of the wicked (וַיִּדְרֹךְ רְשָׁעִים) will perish”.

⁷⁶⁰ See, e.g., Gillingham, *A Journey of Two Psalms*, 7–9, who argues that the theme of the temple is an important theological tie between these psalms. Similarly, Jerome F. D. Creach, “Like a Tree Planted by the Temple Stream: The Portrait of the Righteous in Psalm 1:3,” *CBQ* 61 (1999): 36, writes that Ps 1:3a “consistently includes vocabulary drawn from other texts in which Zion or the temple is depicted as a garden paradise. Thus, the writer of Ps 1:3a transforms the simile of the tree (as it appears in Jer 17:8) into a comparison of the righteous to trees planted

understand him in the way that Ps 2 makes explicit through its identification of the “blessed man” with the king established “on Zion” (v. 6) and interceding for the nations (v. 8). Thus it is very plausible that editors sought to accentuate Ps 2’s convergence of king, intercession, and sanctuary by collocating Ps 1 with it, casting the king in priestly tones akin to Ps 110:4.

In all these ways, then, the collocation of Pss 1–2 suggest plausible intent to “royalize” the Mosaic covenant rather than “democratize” the Davidic. In terms of our thesis, the editorial combination of Pss 1 and 2 seems to confirm its major tenets by identifying “the blessed man” as a king who is opposed by nations yet inevitably triumphs over them—a Torah-observing anointed one, royal son, and mediator. The ways of the righteous and the wicked in 1:5–6 (“known” by Yahweh and “perishing” respectively) are further defined in 1:10–12 as those kings (and by extension their peoples) who pay homage and take refuge in the royal son and fear Yahweh or who reject the son and continue their recalcitrant ways. After all, the king has been installed on Zion and, in Abrahamic covenantal terms, stands to “inherit the earth” at Yahweh’s invitation to “ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession” (2:8).

in the temple precincts.” Cf. Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 64–68. In keeping with his view that Pss 1 and 2 were authored together, Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 24, goes so far as to describe Ps 1 offering “the portrait of a royal sacerdotal conqueror established upon the waters of the eschatological sanctuary of Eden.”

Cole, *Psalms 1–2*, 26–27, also draws attention to other “vital links” he sees shedding light on Ps 2’s identification of the royal son as the “blessed man” of Ps 1. Among the vocabulary shared between Pss 1 and 2 are **שׁב** in 1:1 and 2:4, **נתן** in 1:3 and 2:8. Cole infers from this that Ps 1’s **שׁאֵי** not only “does not sit (**שׁב**) with scoffers” (1:1) and “give (**נתן**) [his] fruit in its season” like a watered tree (1:3) but also “sits (**שׁב**) in heaven” and laughs at rebellious nations, and to whom Yahweh will “give” (**נתן**) (2:8). Here Cole points out that **אֲדָנָי**, not **יְהוָה**, is used in 2:4, claiming that editors understood this in reference to v. 2’s “anointed” whom Ps 2 closely associates with Yahweh (**עַל־יְהוָה וְעַל־מְשִׁיחוֹ**). These are intriguing possibilities, though their validity seems to depend somewhat on Cole’s conjecture that Pss 1–2 were authored together, or at least that Ps 1 was authored to complement Ps 2 in such ways (which seems more plausible). The possibility finds some further support at the macro-structural level, however, in light of Ps 110:1’s “Yahweh said to *my lord*” (**יְהוָה אָמַר לַאֲדָנָי**). There **אֲדָנָי** clearly refers to a Davidic king who also has a priestly role (110:4).

The Characterization of David. As the above analysis suggests, Pss 1–2 introduce David and Yahweh as effective coregents. Indeed, Robert Wallace has raised questions about Wilson’s characterization of David in Book V which apply also to introductory Pss 1–2 and the Psalter more broadly. Wallace writes,

“how should one read the character of David in Book 5? Is there a case to be made to be made for Wilson’s subjugation of David to YHWH’s kingship? Could David and YHWH be considered coregents? With the conflation of the thrones of YHWH and David in Ps 2, and the kingship of God celebrated in the last psalm of David in the Psalter, Ps 145, when one speaks of the reign of David and the reign of YHWH, is it textual to speak of their kingships interchangeably?”⁷⁶¹

Wallace raises a very important question, to which our investigation has offered the beginnings of an answer by suggesting that Davidic psalms after Ps 72 chiefly have in mind (a) Davidic successor(s) whose identity and kingdom embraces Ps 72’s universalized vision. Indeed, the juxtaposition of Pss 1 and 2 seem to confirm this characterization while also introducing other key dimensions of the king’s role taken up in our study; he intercedes for the peoples/all the earth and inherits them. Our investigation has suggested that David’s reign is but one aspect of his characterization in the Psalter, and his role as royal (and priestly) covenant mediator/intercessor cannot be overlooked if we take full account of Davidic psalms and their careful placement in Books III, IV, and V. In this light it seems unhelpful to describe “David” vis-à-vis Yahweh as though it were a choice between them (as per Wilson), and that Wallace is on the right track when speaking of their coregency as part of a greater picture of the fulfilment of the covenant.⁷⁶²

⁷⁶¹ Wallace, “Gerald Wilson and the Characterization of David in Book 5 of the Psalter,” 197.

⁷⁶² Drawing on Robert Cole’s and David Mitchell’s work, Wallace, “Gerald Wilson and the Characterization of David in Book 5 of the Psalter,” 201, identifies Pss 110:1, 45:7, and Book III as places where Yahweh’s and David’s reigns appear to be “deliberately conflated.”

Moreover, Wallace's criticism of Wilson's characterization of David relates directly to the latter's view of the Davidic covenant as failed and replaced by Mosaic covenantal life. Again, Wallace writes,

[Wilson's argument] only works if the character "David" in the Psalter is really referring to the character David from the Deuteronomistic history, and if, therefore, the royal psalms that celebrate David and Davidic monarchy are really celebrating David and Davidic monarchy. "David" could be a metonym for YHWH's reign. Wilson would likely not accept a devalued YHWH in the text. "David" could represent an exilic Israel throughout the centuries or, more basically, Wilson could simply be reading the character of "David" wrongly. Perhaps, instead of David as YHWH's "priest," David remains "king."⁷⁶³

Wallace offers an intriguing array of possibilities here, the last of which relates most closely to our thesis. Rather than decide between the priestly and royal characterization of David, however, our study has shown that the latter half of the Psalter offers a larger view of David that includes both of these characterizations among others (e.g., a new, Moses-like, suffering "servant," and leader of the Exodus).⁷⁶⁴

⁷⁶³ Wallace, "Gerald Wilson and the Characterization of David in Book 5 of the Psalter," 195.

⁷⁶⁴ While assessing Wilson's view that Davidic kingship is trumped by Divine kingship in Book V, Wallace, "Gerald Wilson and the Characterization of David in Book 5 of the Psalter," 204, notes David's fluctuating fortunes throughout Book V, finding that it offers a "mixed portrayal," culminating in Ps 145's accentuation of Divine kingship and lack of "any concern for human kingship at all." Methodologically, Wallace's narrative approach traces the Davidic psalms in Book V, from which perspective it might suggest that Ps 145's "final" word on kingship supports Wilson's view about the final editors' supposedly low view of Davidic kingship. Wallace writes, "at the end of book 5, Wilson's reading seems to be on solid ground. Davidic monarchy is deemphasized and there is a strong concern for YHWH's kingship. David is a humble supplicant interceding on his own behalf and, by extension, interceding on behalf of his people." Indeed, that last sentence well fits the more complex characterization of David that has emerged in the process of our investigation. But it does not follow that one aspect of that characterization trumps the others. The fluctuation of David's "mood" or of the manner in which he portrayed (lamenting, interceding, ruling triumphantly, etc.) is a recurring feature of the Psalter (e.g., Book III, Pss 101–103, 108–110, etc.), which utilizes multiple psalms to achieve a fuller, usually multi-faceted characterization of "David." Indeed this sounds a cautionary note against drawing too firm a conclusion on whether or not David's kingship has been left behind on the basis of the presence or absence of a strong emphasis on David's triumphant rule at the end of the Psalter (let alone Ps 144:7–9 that arguably recognizes David as king and servant ; see Chapter Six).

As an aside, the relationship between Yahweh and “David” is clearly another very important, related question that merits further investigation beyond what has been possible here. Nevertheless, each dimension of David’s characterization identified in the course of our study offers a different perspective from which to view the relationship between Yahweh and “David.” For example, as king, David’s throne seems to be conflated (to use Wallace’s term) with Yahweh’s in Ps 2, suggesting their very close identification (cf. Ps 45:7–8). As priestly mediator/intercessor “David” stands close to both Yahweh and people and is in a theological position to represent Yahweh—a capacity in which Ps 103 seems to cast him, as bearer of the divine self-revelation of Exod 34:6. On the other hand, as royal “suffering servant” (Book III; cf. Ps 102) he identifies with people (Ps 89:50–52). These different dimensions of the characterization of David could be fruitfully explored further.

Conclusion

In conclusion, although each Book brings its distinctive emphases, there is strong continuity between their perspectives on the covenant and “David’s” place in its fulfilment. Diachronic questions remain to be sure. But attempts to deduce editors’ theological agendas from purported stages of the Psalter’s growth yield conclusions every bit as speculative as the diachronic assumptions they depend on. The approach taken above was therefore more synchronic than diachronic in its attention to existing textual data, while remaining mindful of diachronic possibilities. Repeatedly our analysis of such data suggested a consistency and coherence between the editorial-theological perspective of the Psalter’s Books in respect to our question. While it is possible to explain the movement between specific groups of psalms with a democratizing theological agenda regarding the (Davidic) covenant, our investigation has consistently demonstrated the plausibility of a “royalizing” agenda throughout the Psalter overall, especially within the editorial arranging of the Books II–V and the Psalter’s introduction (Pss 1–2). Although our investigation gave less opportunity to examine Book I, it likely fits this picture as well when we consider its strong Davidic focus and the arrangement of such

subgroupings as Pss 15–24, which centers on a Torah-observing (priestly?) king (Pss 18–21) who enters the sanctuary (Pss 15 and 24). On the other hand, other studies that limit the editors' hopes to their own contemporary historical realities—and therefore deny any real place to “David” except as an historical or even nostalgic example—seem unduly and anachronistically reliant on modern existentialist sensibilities.

Accordingly, although more detailed work could be done on each Book, we may conclude that the foregoing investigation substantially bears out our hypothesis. Editors seem to have anticipated an ideal future Davidide who, faithful and observing Torah, identifies with frail, dust-like humanity, and intercedes for them. Rather than *abandon* the positive and central role of kingship in covenant renewal through their purification of the cult that H. J. Kraus sees depicted in the DH,⁷⁶⁵ exilic and/or postexilic editors seem inspired by it. The Psalter and its Books appear to be crafted around the hope of a coming “David” through whom Yahweh would renew his people and Zion (e.g., Pss 102–103) and lead them in the thanksgiving and praise of God (Ps 145 et al.). Announced as Yahweh’s “anointed” and “son” in Ps 2, the Psalter presents him as both victorious over his enemies (Pss 2, 101, 110, 118, cf. 143:12) and as Yahweh’s servant who suffers as he identifies with the people (Pss 78, 86, 88–89, 102; cf. 18:1). This “David” is instrumental Yahweh’s fulfilment of his covenant promises to Abraham and exodus-like salvation of his people, announcing Yahweh’s grace and favor as Yahweh himself had done before Moses (Ps 103). Indeed, we see Moses presented as an intermediary figure in Ps 90, and scholarship has justifiably noted Moses’ prominence in Book IV and what that might mean for expectations concerning royalty. However, David soon takes the active intermediary role at the close of that Book (101–103[–106]) and in Book V. Just as renewal of the Davidic covenant entails renewal of the Mosaic within the Psalter’s singular view of “Yahweh’s covenant,” the Psalter anticipates “David” as a “new Moses” fulfilling the latter’s historic role as covenant

⁷⁶⁵ Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, 195. See Introduction.

mediator. Thus, the Davidic and pre-monarchic covenants exhibit a theological unity in their common fulfillment through the coming Χριστός and υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Ps 2) who would realize Yahweh's covenantal promises through his suffering and vindication by God.

APPENDIX A

THE LXX AND MT PSALTERS

Chapter Two briefly examined the LXX Psalter as a witness to the MT Psalter, concluding that its macrostructural dependence on the MT suggests the stabilization of the collection prior to the second century B.C. As an appendix to that discussion, what follows examines further a few specific matters of relevance to the issue. Those matters include: LXX and 11QPs^a agreements against the MT; further observations regarding LXX superscriptional evidence as it relates to the MT; the LXX's allegedly "more Davidic" character in contrast to the MT; and time-line issues and other LXX characteristics and their bearing on Wilson's two stage redactional theory.

LXX and 11QPs^a Agreements Against the MT

As noted in Chapter Two, the LXX clearly reflects the same sequence of psalmic text as the MT Psalter, notwithstanding different psalm divisions,⁷⁶⁶ more superscriptional material, and LXX Ps 151. Its *Vorlage* therefore supports the MT arrangement in contrast to the 11QPs^a. On the micro level, however, the LXX agrees with Qumran MSS against the MT in numerous instances.⁷⁶⁷ Concerning some "minor" differences, Flint suggests that the variations "may well

⁷⁶⁶ I.e., MT Pss 9–10 = LXX 9, MT 114–115 = LXX 113, MT 116 = LXX 114–115, and MT 147 = LXX 146–147. Wilson, *Editing*, 131, sees further reason here to affirm the MT's priority. He explains the strong Hebrew MSS evidence for the combination of Pss 9–10 as a "secondary attempt to resolve the problem presented by the presence of such "untitled" pss in their MT context," noting the same phenomenon in the LXX. Another reason might be that they were perceived as a "broken acrostic," but given that all LXX psalms except Pss 1–2 have a superscript and are therefore clearly distinguished from each other, Wilson's explanation seems more likely.

⁷⁶⁷ Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*, (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 232–35, lists some 21 instances in "minor" details such as differences in person, number, tense, suffix etc., and 10 more

have been present in the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint Psalter,” but that “caution is advised since the Psalms were generally not translated into Greek in an extremely literal manner.”⁷⁶⁸ In other words, we cannot be sure if some variations were due to the translator or the Hebrew *Vorlage*. However, Flint sees certain other examples as “strong evidence for a *Vorlage* that differs from MT.”⁷⁶⁹ Two stand out in particular. First, the LXX and 11QPs^a supply a 13 verse for the acrostic Ps 145 that is “missing” in the MT (v. 13b): πιστὸς κύριος ἐν τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁσιος ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ = נאמן אֱלֹהִים בְּדַבְרֵיוֹ וְחָסִיד בְּכֹל מַעֲשָׂיו. Second, both the LXX and 11QPs^a contain a form of Ps 151. Indeed, these cannot be attributed to copyist error, but nor can we rule out the possibility that scribes translated the MT Psalter, respecting its form but also adding supplementary psalmic material (e.g., Ps 145:13b and Ps 151) as they thought appropriate. Regarding the Ps 145 example, Skehan observes that 11QPs^a’s 13 verse is “really a doublet of the *šade* line in the same acrostic”—substituting אֱלֹהִים for the paleo-Hebrew tetragrammaton in the equivalent phrase found in the *šade* line (and in five other similar verses besides).⁷⁷⁰ Rather than the original form of Ps 145, then, 11QPs^a’s version is probably secondary, amounting to what Skehan terms a “clumsy repair” of an MT form of the psalm.⁷⁷¹ Moreover, the LXX differs from 11QPs^a by having κύριος instead of θεός (= אֱלֹהִים). Thus, the presence of the 13 verse in both 11QPs^a and LXX indicates the latter’s reliance on a Hebrew *Vorlage* similar to 11QPs^a’s version of Ps 145. But it also shows that the LXX translator was willing to deviate from that as

“major” examples. See also: Peter W. Flint, “Variant Readings of the Dead Sea Scrolls against the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint Psalter,” in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 337–65 (esp. 341–43).

⁷⁶⁸ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 233.

⁷⁶⁹ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 235.

⁷⁷⁰ Note the similar constructions in vv. 3 (אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה), 9 (טוֹב־יְהוָה), 14 (סוֹמֵךְ יְהוָה), 17 (צַדִּיק יְהוָה), 18 (קַרְיֹב יְהוָה), and 20 (שׁוֹמֵר יְהוָה); each leading off its alphabetic line.

⁷⁷¹ Skehan, “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” 171.

well. Consequently, this (near) “agreement against the MT” does not preclude the MT as the LXX translator’s primary *Vorlage*, but raises the possibility that translators drew on other MSS to fill in gaps like 145:13 or provide supplementary material they deemed fitting (e.g., Ps 151). Concerning Ps 151, v. 1 explicitly describes it as “outside the number” (ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ), implying that 150 is the recognized number of psalms in the Psalter.

Further Observations Regarding LXX Superscriptional Evidence in Relation to the MT Psalter

As noted in Chapter Two, the LXX and the MT Psalters superscripts show a large number of differences. We also noted, however, that the LXX superscripts almost always expand their MT equivalent or supply one where it is missing in the MT,⁷⁷² suggesting that the LXX is compositionally dependent on the MT in this respect. The only exception here is in the Songs of Ascent, where LXX Pss 121 and 123 (= MT Pss 122 and 124) lack Davidic attribution.⁷⁷³ However even the Greek witnesses are divided on this.⁷⁷⁴ Another apparent exception turns out to be an alternative *division* of psalms instead: the absence of Ἀλληλουια (= הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה) postscripts for LXX Pss 103–105 (= MT Pss 104–106), LXX 112–117 (= MT Pss 113–116), LXX Ps 134 (= MT Ps 135), LXX 145–147 (= MT 146–147), and LXX 149 (= MT 149). In every case the equivalent Ἀλληλουια appears atop the following psalms, resulting in a uniform pattern where Ἀλληλουια consistently functions as a superscript in the LXX, rather than a mixture of superscripts and postscripts as in the MT.⁷⁷⁵ These instances seem to reflect different division of psalms rather than textual additions.⁷⁷⁶

⁷⁷² Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 16–18, who notes the same expansive quality.

⁷⁷³ Anderson Jr., “The Division and Order of the Psalms,” 224, emphasizes this difference.

⁷⁷⁴ According to Rahlfs, two LXX MSS and Tg. omit Davidic attribution for MT Ps 122, while a few LXX omit it for MT Ps 124. However, \aleph attributes both to David.

⁷⁷⁵ E.g., MT Pss 111 and 112 begin with הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה, 115 and 116 conclude with הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה, while Ps 113 both begins and ends with it and 114 lacks הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה altogether. BHS only cites the LXX in support of 113’s final הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה being instead associated with Ps 114. MT Ps 147 is “split” in the LXX as Pss 146–147, yet even the component

In view of this, it is clear that the LXX superscripts overwhelmingly preserve their MT counterparts in accordance with the LXX Psalter's expansive character.⁷⁷⁷ This also suggests that the MT superscripts have been dependably preserved.⁷⁷⁸

Is the LXX Psalter a More "Davidic" Response to Exile?

Wilson interprets the LXX Psalter's relatively higher incidence of Davidic attribution to mean that LXX Books IV–V respond to the crisis of exile in a decidedly different way than their MT counterparts do. Wilson writes,

This tendency is especially strong in the fourth book (Pss 90–106), where no less than nine compositions are supplied with Davidic attributions. This is particularly striking in that six of these nine psalms are the *Yahweh Malak* psalms (93; 95; 96; 97; 98; 99) that proclaim in the Masoretic Psalter the alternate vision of the kingship of Yahweh. The addition of so many Davidic attributions changes the character of the fourth book from a segment in which David had receded into the background to a strongly Davidic collection. Rather than shift the emphasis from David to the kingship of Yahweh, the LXX heightens the profile and importance of David and the Davidic covenant. A similar emphasis on David is achieved by the addition in LXX of ten

comprising LXX 147 (= MT Ps 147:12–20) has received an *Αλληλουια* superscript where MT Ps 147:12 lacks one, thus testifying to the LXX editor's/copyist's effort to standardize these psalms in this way. The case of LXX Ps 148 is different. It has just one *Αλληλουια* in its superscript, despite MT 147's *הַלְלוּ אֱלֹהִים* conclusion and MT 148's *הַלְלוּ אֱלֹהִים* superscript, apparently in an effort to avoid duplication. Thereafter LXX Ps 148 adds the attribution *Αγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου* before *translating*, rather than transliterating, similar expressions in the body of the psalm (*הַלְלוּ אֱלֹהִים מִן הַיָּם וְהַיַּבֵּשׁ = Αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν* etc.).

⁷⁷⁶ Wilson, "The Use of 'Untitled' Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter," 411–12.; and *Editing*, 180; Interestingly, apart from Pss 9/10, all differences in psalm division between the MT and LXX occur in Halleluia groupings, i.e., the same places where these "minor" divisions involving *Αλληλουια* occur. This localizes the phenomenon significantly, and suggests that both kinds of alternative division may be part of the same "standardizing" effort.

⁷⁷⁷ It is also interesting that according to Flint's data virtually all the other agreements between the LXX and Qumran MSS against the MT result in a text of equal or greater length. This seems to accord with the LXX Psalter's expansionistic tendency we have observed in the superscripts.

⁷⁷⁸ We do not mean to imply here that all text-critical questions are to be decided by the MT alone. Our general composition-historical conclusion certainly informs the text-critical task, but it does not rule out the possibility that, within their respective transmission histories, the LXX might accurately preserve what the MT tradition corrupted in individual cases.

historical notices in the headings of Davidic psalms. While only four of these reflect specific events in David's life, the effect is further enhancement of the increasingly Davidic character of the LXX Psalter.⁷⁷⁹

That Wilson sees so great a contrast between the MT and LXX in their theological response to exile stems largely from his non-messianic reading of MT Book IV.⁷⁸⁰ Interestingly, R. Dean Anderson Jr. disagrees that the LXX is more "Davidic," even though he generally accepts Wilson's analysis of the Qumran evidence and two stage redactional model. Anderson claims that "a broad overview of the psalter reveals very little difference between MT and LXX, except for one clear group of psalms (Psalms 91–99)."⁷⁸¹ Outside this group Anderson indicates that the LXX has only five additional Davidic attributions, and even lacks attribution to David in Pss 121 and 123 (= MT Pss 122 and 124) in contrast to the MT, as just noted. Notwithstanding Anderson's observations, the nine additional Davidic attributions are very conspicuous (LXX Pss 90, 92–98, and 103). But if the LXX Psalter expands the MT superscripts as argued above, comparison of the two textual traditions reveals more about the LXX Psalter's interpretive character than the MT's compositional history. Nor are they "alternative traditions" in a *contemporaneous* sense if the LXX preserves and expands the MT superscripts. Consequently, the MT Psalter's lack of Davidic superscriptions in Book IV vis-à-vis the LXX does not amount to a relative disinterest in the Davidic king in the MT. To the contrary, the LXX offers a more explicitly Davidic interpretation of these psalms that plausibly reflect the original intent of the MT editors.

⁷⁷⁹ Wilson "The Structure of the Psalter," 241.

⁷⁸⁰ See Chapter Five.

⁷⁸¹ Anderson, "The Division and Order of the Psalms," 223.

Time-Line Issues and Characteristics of the LXX and Their Bearing on Wilson's Two-Stage Redactional Theory

For Wilson, the translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek need not preclude his two-stage redactional history of the MT, for he disputes that the Psalter's scope reflected that of the MT 150 at the time of translation. Wilson writes,

That there was a Psalter in the second century B.C. is not the question, but what were its contents! While it is generally agreed that the Torah was translated into Greek in Alexandria, Egypt in the second century B.C.E, this does not confirm the translation of the Psalter by that time, or especially of the *whole Psalter* given the existence of the two segments and their chronological relationship.⁷⁸²

Indeed, we lack any decisive *external* evidence to settle issue of the LXX Psalter's scope when "first" translated.⁷⁸³ Convinced about the "two segments and their chronological relationship," Wilson is left with two possibilities: either the Psalter was not yet among those books translated in second century B.C., or the translators in Alexandria had only the early form of the Psalter (Pss 2–89). However these are subject to a number of criticisms.

First, these alternative scenarios create chronological difficulties. The first scenario allows for the possibility that the LXX came about as an act of translation after the MT Psalter took final form, but since Wilson dates the final MT Psalter to A.D. first century, it would follow that the LXX Psalter was produced some time after that. The latter scenario divides the process into at least two stages of translation; i.e., LXX scribes initially translated the early form of the Psalter (Pss 2–89), and later translated the rest when the MT Psalter had achieved its canonical form—again not before A.D. first century. Such a late date becomes even later if we allow time for the MT 150 psalm-sequence to be recognized as canonically authoritative—especially if it had a rival of purportedly wide Jewish provenance as Wilson suggests; i.e., the "11QPs^a Psalter."

⁷⁸² Wilson, "King, Messiah, and the Reign of God, 394.

⁷⁸³ See, e.g., Steinmann, *The Oracles of God*, 50–54, who suggests that "it is best not to be dogmatic on the issue" of whether the prologue to Ben Sira testifies to the existence of a two or three part canon of scripture. Much less can the prologue confirm the Psalter's *contents*.

By contrast, it is less problematic to conclude that the MT had acquired its final canonical shape earlier in the postexilic period. Moreover, some recent studies on the translation of the LXX Psalter seem to confirm the traditional view. For instance Tyler Williams and Olivier Munnich argue that the LXX translation reflects one translation effort, which Williams dates to second century B.C. based on several compelling external factors.⁷⁸⁴ While it is impossible to “prove” that the LXX Psalter resulted from one translator/translation effort, their data is suggestive.⁷⁸⁵

⁷⁸⁴ Tyler Williams, “Towards a Date for the Old Greek Psalter,” in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 248–76; Olivier Munnich, “Indices d’une Septante originelle dans le Psautier grec,” *Bib* 63 (1982): 406–16.

⁷⁸⁵ Munnich pays particular attention to unique translations that recur throughout the LXX Psalter, consistency in translating the doublets, and other indications that the translator regularly consulted his own translation throughout. Williams, “Towards a Date,” 252, builds on Munnich’s work to “substantiate the unity of the translation...whether the text is a coherent and homogeneous translation produced by one or more translators, or a hodgepodge produced by any number of translators at various times,” and then establishes a *terminus ad quem* by identifying other sources that quote or show dependence on the translation. Obviously much depends on the first issue, and to that end Williams supplies three categories of translation data: “standard/default Hebrew-Greek renderings,” “isolate” or “etymological” renderings, and examples where “contextual or grammatical factors” consistently influence the Greek translation in distinctive ways. Williams rightly puts more stock in those examples that are rendered idiosyncratically rather than the first category, and recognizes the special need to demonstrate consistency across the Pss 89/90 transition (see esp. “Towards a Date, 259–60, for his discussion, of $\gamma\mu\psi$ /[$\epsilon\iota\sigma$]ἄκούω and ἐπι(ζ)ω). When it comes to dating the LXX, Williams, “Towards a Date,” 261–75, provides some compelling examples that the translator of LXX Isaiah and LXX Proverbs relied on an already translated Psalter, and some stronger quotation evidence in 1 Maccabees (first century B.C.) and Philo of Alexandria (20–15 B.C. to A.D. 50). If one accepts the unity of the LXX translation, these examples would date the LXX earlier than 11QPs^a.

See further, Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT 2/76; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 34, who concludes that the “Septuagint translation...is marked by a considerable degree of consistency” and it legitimate to conclude that the LXX Psalter was the work of a single translator. However Schaper himself believes it was a joint enterprise, since “such consistency can normally only be achieved through continual discussion and review of the work done and its subsequent standardization.” While this is debatable, Schaper’s view suggests a consistency in translation that befits a scenario where the whole MT Psalter was before the translators.

Second, Wilson's objection to the traditional second century B.C. view is clearly a consequence of his analysis of 11 QPs^a and editorial techniques in the MT—not a product of analyzing the LXX *per se*. Indeed, this seems to be the norm among proponents of the Qumran Psalms Hypothesis and its implications for the MT and LXX Psalters.⁷⁸⁶ Anderson is therefore a rare exception when he claims to find evidence of the two redactional stages in the LXX itself. Anderson appeals to the relatively greater number of Davidic attributions in LXX Books IV–V than in Books I–III. According to him this indicates that the first part of the Psalter was more stabilized than the second, even though the LXX is not more Davidic than the MT overall (contra Wilson).⁷⁸⁷ However, his argument loses force when one bears in mind that 42 out of 49 psalms lacking superscripts in the MT occur in Books IV–V. Of the seven anonymous psalms in MT Books I–III (Pss 1, 2, 10, 33, 43, 66, 67, 71) the LXX attributes Pss 32 (= MT Ps 33), 42 (= MT Ps 43) and 70 (= MT Ps 70) to David, while it conjoins Ps 10 with Ps 9. Whether or not the LXX reflects the original form of Pss 9–10, about half of the anonymous MT psalms in Books I–III are given Davidic attribution in the LXX; a higher proportion than in Books IV–V! Thus, the

⁷⁸⁶ E.g., Eugene Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Implications for an Edition of the Septuagint Psalter,” in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 323–36, raises the question of different literary editions of the Greek Psalter primarily through appeal to earlier Hebrew editions of the Psalter. Similarly, Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 236, suggests that,

if textual affinities are taken into account...it may be possible to identify specific Psalms scrolls that join certain Greek manuscripts (e.g. B) in preserving a proto-Masoretic form, while other Psalms scrolls and Greek manuscripts (e.g. R or 55) represent different editions of the Psalter. It must be noted that this suggestion is only preliminary, since firm results would require a thorough evaluation of variants in the Greek Psalter and their relationship to specific Dead Sea Scrolls.

Flint's own judgment about his suggestion reflects the speculative nature of the theory of earlier Greek editions of the Psalter, and its dependence on the correctness of the Qumran Psalms Hypothesis in the first place. See also, Flint, “Variant Readings of the Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls,” 337, where he briefly restates the possibility of earlier Greek editions.

⁷⁸⁷ Anderson, “The Division and Order of the Psalms,” 224.

predominance of this phenomenon in Books IV–V is not disproportionate and it is in keeping with the general expansionistic character of the LXX across the whole MT 150.

Summary

In keeping with Chapter Two's findings, the chronological problems that the Qumran Psalms Hypothesis raises, the LXX Psalter's apparent macrostructural dependence on the MT, and the LXX's Psalter's expansionistic tendency suggest that the LXX scribes(s) translated an established MT Psalter Pss 150, probably drawing on other sources as they "corrected" (e.g., Ps 145:13) and expanded it slightly (e.g., Ps 151). Since its text preserves that of the MT Psalter the LXX sheds no direct light on editorial data within the MT, except to confirm the canonical authority of both its psalms sequence and superscriptional content. It also seems clear that the LXX was translated at some temporal distance from the finalization of the MT sequence, making an A.D. first century date (Wilson) for that sequence most unlikely. Finally, internal evidence in the LXX offers no compelling support the two-stage redaction-historical model as Anderson holds. If anything, the LXX complicates that theory, especially if an early second century B.C. date is accepted as for its translation.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF DEUT 6:7'S COMMAND TO INSTRUCT FUTURE GENERATIONS IN THE PSALTER

The command to “teach [Yahweh’s words] diligently to your children” (וּשְׁנַנְתֶּם לְבָנֵיכֶם) is not repeated anywhere in the OT, though semantic equivalents occur quite frequently in the Psalter: Pss 22:31 (וְיִסְפָּר...לְדֹר); Ps 45:18 (אֲזַכֵּירָה שְׁמֶךָ בְּכָל־דֹּר וְדֹר); 48:14 (תִּסְפְּרוּ לְדֹר); 71:18 (אֲחַרְוֶן); 71:18 (עַד־אֲגִיד זְרוּעֵי לְדֹר); 79:13 (תִּסְפָּר תְּהִלָּתְךָ); 89:2 (לְדֹר); 89:2 (תִּתְכַתֵּב זֵאת לְדֹר אַחֲרָיו וְעַם נְבִיא יְהוָה־יִהְיֶה); 102:19 (וְדָר אֲוִדִיעַ אֲמוֹנֵתְךָ בְּפִי דֹר); and 145:4 (לְדֹר יִשְׁבַח מַעֲשֵׂיךָ וּגְבוּרָתֶיךָ יִגִּידוּ). These instances suggest that this theme largely coalesces around the figure of David.

First, half of them are Davidic or Davidized (Pss 22, 71, 102, and 145). In these psalms “David” reiterates the basic injunction of Deut 6:5. In Ps 71 the aging Davidic speaker determines to “tell another/generation,” soon to be followed by Ps 72’s prayer for his successor son.

Second, while not Davidic psalms, both Pss 45 and 89 are royal psalms. In Ps 45:18 the psalmist will “cause *your name* (שְׁמֶךָ) to be remembered in all generations,” referring most obviously to the royal groom whom Ps 45 celebrates, whose sons will rule in earth in v. 17.⁷⁸⁸ Since Yahweh’s faithfulness to the king is central to Ps 89’s focus (e.g., vv. 2–5; 20–38), this is

⁷⁸⁸ This is the most natural antecedent for שְׁמֶךָ in the psalm. See Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:62; Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, 340. Craigie also appears open to an alternative view that שְׁמֶךָ may refer to *God’s name* as might normally be expected for such lofty language. Interestingly, vv. 7–8 move seamlessly from, “Your throne, O God, is forever and ever” (בְּכֹסֶדְךָ אֱלֹהִים עוֹלָם וָעֶד), to, “therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness beyond your companions” (עַל־כֵּן מִשְׁחָךְ אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֶיךָ שָׁמֵן שָׁמֵן מִחַבְרֵיךָ). Thus, Ps 45 already seems to blur the identity of God and Davidide in its discourse (cf. their close association in Ps 2:2). If editors read Ps 45 this way, then they would have little reason to understand שְׁמֶךָ as a reference to God’s name *instead of* the king’s.

the obvious content that the psalmist will make known “to all generations” (לְדֹר וָדֹר). Moreover, the same expression, לְדֹר וָדֹר, is soon repeated with direct reference to Yahweh “building up” David’s throne in v. 5 (וּבְנִיתִי לְדֹר־וָדֹר כְּסֵאֶךָ), indicating that Yahweh’s sure promises to David are the substance of the psalmist’s proclamation to future generations.

Third, the possible allusion to/reuse of Deut 6:5 language in Ps 48:14 makes *Zion* the object of proclamation to future generations and is closely connected to the preceding example in Ps 45 given Pss 45–48’s interleaving of Royal (45), Kingship of Yahweh (47), and Zion Psalms (46, 48).⁷⁸⁹

This leaves Ps 79:13, in which “we your people, the sheep of your pasture... from generation to generation... will recount your praise,” resuming the pastoral motif that had been applied to David at the end of the preceding psalm (78:72; cf. 80:1). Accordingly, most of the Psalter’s possible echoes of Deut 6:7 gravitate around David, where either he instructs future generations or Yahweh’s faithfulness to him constitutes the essence of such teaching.

⁷⁸⁹ See Chapter Five.

APPENDIX C

SURVEY OF ALLUSIONS TO THE COVENANT FORMULA

Tables 1, 2, and 3 tabulate the number of times that **עַם** and **אֱלֹהִים/אֱלֹהִים** appear with pronominal suffixes with potential to reflect the covenant formula (see Chapter Four). Specific psalms and verses are indicated via footnote. Some forms of the suffix are irrelevant to the formula and are not represented here; e.g., *pl.* suffixes on **עַם**. The table distinguishes instances expressions used as a vocative in direct address from those stated by a third party, and also indicates instances conforming to Rendtorff's three categories of the formula.

Table 1. Suffixed Incidences of **עַם**

	Vocative/Direct Address	Third Party	Formula B/C
“my people” (עַמִּי) ⁷⁹⁰	2 ⁷⁹¹	2 ⁷⁹²	—
“your people” (עַמְּךָ)	—	14 ⁷⁹³	1 ⁷⁹⁴
“his people” (עַמּוֹ)	—	26 ⁷⁹⁵	1 ⁷⁹⁶

⁷⁹⁰ Omitting Pss 14:4 (= 53:5); 45:11; 59:12; 78:1; 144:2, where the 1st sg. suffix on **עַמִּי** does not refer to Yahweh. Moreover, Ps 144:2 is probably corrupt, since Sebir, Aquila, the Syriac and Jerusalem Targum have **עַמִּים**, which makes more sense in the expression, “He subdues *peoples* under me.”

⁷⁹¹ Pss 50:7 and 81:9. In Ps 50:7 **עַמִּי** is vocative, but note **אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵיךָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ** at the end of the verse.

⁷⁹² Ps 81:12, 14.

⁷⁹³ Pss 3:9; 28:9; 44:13; 60:5; 68:8; 72:2; 77:16, 21; 80:5; 83:4; 85:3, 7; 94:5; 106:4. The 2d sg. suffix in 110:3 refers to the king rather than Yahweh.

⁷⁹⁴ Pss 79:13.

⁷⁹⁵ Pss 14:7 (=53:7); 29:11 (x2); 50:4; 73:10(?); 78:20, 52, 62, 71; 85:9; 94:14; 105:24, 25, 43; 111:6, 9; 113:8; 116:14, 18; 125:2; 135:12, 14; 136:16; 148:14; 149:4. Psalm 73:10 is uncertain. LXX has *ὁ λαός μου* (= **עַמִּי**), and BHS suggests that it and the following word (**עַמּוֹ הַלֵּם**) should perhaps read **עַם אֱלֹהֵינוּ**.

⁷⁹⁶ Pss 100:3. The syntactical relationship between “we” and “his people” is complicated by “and not” (**וְלֹא**): **וְלֹא אֱנַחְנוּ עַמּוֹ וְצִאן מִרְעִיתוֹ**. However the Qere **וְלֹא** (“his”) is probably to be preferred.

Table 2. First Person Suffixed Incidences of אֱלֹהִים dan אֱל

	Vocative/Direct Address	Third Party	Formula A/C
“my God” (אֱלֹהֵי) (אֱלֹהֵי)	30 ⁷⁹⁷	13 ⁷⁹⁸	3 ⁷⁹⁹
“my God” (אֱלֵי)	3 ⁸⁰⁰	1 ⁸⁰¹	6 ⁸⁰²
“our God” (אֱלֹהֵינוּ)	2 ⁸⁰³	25 ⁸⁰⁴	3 ⁸⁰⁵

⁷⁹⁷ Pss 3:8; 5:3; 7:2, 4; 13:4; 18:29; 22:3; 25:2; 30:3, 13; 35:23, 24; 38:16, 22; 40:6, 9, 18; 43:4; 59:2; 71:4, 12, 22; 83:14; 84:4; 86:12; 91:2; 104:1; 109:26; 118:28; 145:1. In Ps 40:6 אֶתָּה serves as an emphasizing pronoun for רַבּוֹת עָשִׂיתָ. Thus אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה is vocative rather than a complement to אֶתָּה (cf. Ps 38:16).

⁷⁹⁸ Pss 18:7, 22, 29, 30; 42:6/7, 12; 43:5; 69:3; 84:11; 94:22; 104:33; 119:115; 146:2. Witnesses are divided as to whether אֱלֹהֵי concludes Ps 42:6 (3d per.) or begins v.7 (as a vocative). A few LXX and Syriac MSS support the former, which seems preferable given v. 6’s similarity to v. 12 as a refrain. We have counted this as a third person reference understood in apposition to “my salvation” rather than a vocative\ given that the psalmist addresses “my soul” in Ps 42 and 43’s refrain.

⁷⁹⁹ Pss 31:15; 86:2; 143:10.

⁸⁰⁰ Pss 22:2 (x2); 102:25.

⁸⁰¹ Ps 68:25. אֱלֹהִים is vocative in the first colon, but v. 26 switches to the 3d. per. in the second colon: הֲלִיכֹת אֱלֵי מַלְכֵי בְּקֹדֶשׁ.

⁸⁰² Pss 18:3; 22:11; 63:2; 89:27; 118:28; 140:7. In Ps 18:3 אֱלֵי is the fourth of eight complements for the subject יְהוָה, so syntactically follows the “He is/you are my God” pattern.

⁸⁰³ Pss 99:8; 106:47. In Ps 99:8 אֶתָּה and אֱלֹהֵינוּ are part of a chain of vocatives constituting the collective subject of the verb, not a subject and complement (אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶתָּה עֲנִיתָם).

⁸⁰⁴ Pss 18:32; 20:6, 8; 40:4; 44:21; 48:2, 9; 50:3; 66:8; 67:7; 90:17; 92:14; 94:23; 98:3; 99:5, 9 (x2); 113:5; 115:3; 116:5; 122:9; 123:2; 135:2; 147:1, 7. Psalm 90:17 uses אֱלֹהֵינוּ in a jussive clause, after which it addresses God with 2d per. imperatives (cf. בּוֹנֵנָה).

⁸⁰⁵ Ps 48:15; 95:7; and 105:7. Ps 48:15 אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵינוּ עוֹלָם וָעֶד has זֶה as a subject pronoun; Ps 95:7 (an allusion to the *bilateral* formula) and 105:7 use הוּא.

Table 3. Second and Third Person Suffixed Incidences of אֱלֹהִים dan אֱל

	Direct address	Third Party	Formula A/C
“your [sg.] God” (אֱלֹהֶיךָ)	—	6 ⁸⁰⁶	2 ⁸⁰⁷
“your [pl.] God” (אֱלֹהֵיכֶם)	—	1 ⁸⁰⁸	—
“his God” (אֱלֹהָיו)	—	2 ⁸⁰⁹	2 ⁸¹⁰
“their God” (אֱלֹהֵיהֶם)	—	2 ⁸¹¹	—

As to be expected, all second and third person suffixed instances of “God” (i.e., “your God;” “his/their God”) are spoken by a third party rather than God or the people/person implied in the suffix. In Ps 42:4 and 11, for instance, the psalmist cites the taunts of others, “where is *your God?*” to which the psalmist consoles his soul by affirming the relation via the first person suffixed form, “Hope in God, for I shall again praise him, my salvation and *my God*” (see Table 2).

⁸⁰⁶ Pss 42:4, 11; 45:8; 68:29 (?); 146:10; 147:12. Some witnesses omit the 2d sg. suffix in Ps 68:29 (i.e., אֱלֹהֶיךָ for אֱלֹהֵיךָ), presumably due to a second (vocative) אֱלֹהִים and the 2d per. discourse of the surrounding context.

⁸⁰⁷ Pss 50:7; 81:11.

⁸⁰⁸ Ps 76:12.

⁸⁰⁹ Pss 37:31 and 146:5.

⁸¹⁰ Pss 33:12 expresses Formula C. Psalm 144:15 appears to reflect Formula A and C in a relative clause: אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱשֶׁר יְהוָה הָעֵם שִׁיְהוּנָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. By introducing הָעֵם as the subject of its אֱשֶׁר clause, both אֱלֹהֵינוּ and הָעֵם are employed, but the covenant formula is still only stated from the one (people’s) perspective.

⁸¹¹ Pss 79:10 and 115:2.

APPENDIX D

OTHER FORMS OF ADDRESS TO YAHWEH/ELOHIM

Our study of the covenant formula showed that the expression “my God” often occurs in parallel with other epithets or forms of address. “David” calls Yahweh “my God” *and* “my rock” (צורִי) *and* “my salvation” (ישועתי) in Ps 89:27, thus offering parallel expressions to the normal vocabulary expected in the covenant formula. The Psalms also use many other common nouns as epithets with which to address Yahweh too. For instance, Ps 18:3 piles up some eight different terms, “Yahweh is *my rock* (סלעי) *and my fortress* (ומצודתי) *and my deliverer* (ומפֹּלְטִי), *my God* (אֱלֹהִי), *my rock* (צורִי), in whom I take refuge, *my shield* (מגני), *and the horn of my salvation* (וקרן־ישועי), *my stronghold* (משגבִי).” Similarly, Ps 62:8 reads, “On God rests *my salvation* (ישועי) *and my glory* (וכבודי); *my mighty rock* (צור־עֲזִי), *my refuge* (מִחֹטִי) is God.” Nouns used in this way abound in the Psalter. So in order to further test whether they predominate in Davidic or Davidized psalms as has been the trend in our survey so far, we will examine a few key terms that occur prominently in key covenant texts from the Pentateuch; namely, “rock” (צור), “salvation” (ישועה), and “shield” (מגן).⁸¹²

“My Rock” (צורִי; סלעי)

In general, the noun צור refers to a physical rock in the Pentateuch. But in the Song of Moses it is used specifically of Yahweh as Israel’s “Rock” (Deut 32:4, 15, 18, 30–31, and 37; cf. 3d pl. suffix in vv 30–31). “My rock” (צורִי) occurs predominantly in Pss 18:3, 32, 47; 19:15;

⁸¹² משגב, מצודה, piel pt. of פלט, for instance, do not occur in the Pentateuch at all, let alone in key covenant texts.

28:1; 31:3; 62:3, 7–8; 71:3; 89:27; 92:16; 94:22; 95:1; 144:1.⁸¹³ Psalms 31:3 and 94:22 are included here because although they lack 1st sg. suffix, their syntax reflects that of the covenant formula (היה and double ל) as a possible poetic allusion.⁸¹⁴ Similarly, Ps 95:1’s phrase, “the rock of our salvation” (צור ישענו) parallels “Yahweh” and has its equivalent in Deut 32:15 (צור ישעתי). Indeed, these two terms from Deut 32:15 are paired in Ps 62’s refrain in vv. 3 and 7, “He alone is *my rock and my salvation* (צורי וישועתי), my fortress; I shall not be [greatly] shaken.” Notably, eight of the psalms listed here are Davidic, leaving only anonymous Pss 92, 94, and 95. Interestingly, Chapter Four’s analysis of the Song of the Sea found numerous allusions in the Pss 93–100 group, suggesting that this grouping offers a “new song” like Moses’ original Song of the Sea. That this group should also demonstrate such similarities to Moses’ other song in Deut 32 in how it refers to Yahweh seems to underscore the general point that Pss 93–100 are a “new” Moses-like song.⁸¹⁵

In contrast to צור, the synonym סלע occurs only five times in the Pentateuch and never as an epithet for Yahweh.⁸¹⁶ Yet the Psalter uses it in this sense with 1st sg. suffix in three of the Davidic psalms just listed (18:3; 31:4; 71:3) as well as one Korahite psalm (42:10). All three Davidic psalms pair “my rock” with “my fortress” (סלעי ומצודתי); Pss 31 and 71 directly addressing Yahweh in a manner similar to Ps 89:27, “For *you are* my rock and my fortress” (כי־סלעי ומצודתי אתה). Indeed, Ps 31:3–5 is full of such expressions,⁸¹⁷ and amounts to a

⁸¹³ Psalm 78:35 recounts Israel’s history of both remembering (זכר) that “God was their rock” (צור) and yet flattering him, lying to him etc. (vv. 36–37).

⁸¹⁴ Psalm 31:3 reads, “Be a rock of refuge for me” (היה לי לצור־מָעוֹז); Ps 94:22 reads, “But Yahweh has become my stronghold, and my God the rock of my refuge” (ויהי יהוה לי למשגב ואלהי לצור מחסי).

⁸¹⁵ Similarly Howard, *The Structure of Psalms 93–100*, 61, and McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh*, 104.

⁸¹⁶ Numbers 20:8, 10, 11; 24:21; Deut 32:13.

⁸¹⁷ Cf. צור in v. 3 noted above and “for you are my refuge” (כי־אתה מעוני) in v. 5.

further poetic allusion to the covenant formula. Again, this data confirms the impression that “David” predominantly addresses Yahweh in this way, and that he adopts the posture of covenant partner of Yahweh in the Psalter more clearly and more often than any other implied speaker in the Psalter.

“My Salvation” (יְשׁוּעָה; יְשׁוּעָתִי; יְשׁוּעִי)

Especially when suffixed, the noun יְשׁוּעָה suggests possible allusions to the Song of the Sea (esp. Exod 15:1–2) in Pss 118:14, 21; and 140:8, as seen in Chapter Four. Indeed, Exod 15:2 and Deut 32:15 are the only places in the Pentateuch where יְשׁוּעָה functions as a virtual epithet for Yahweh, whose contexts evoke strong Mosaic covenantal and Exodus associations.⁸¹⁸ In Deut 32:15 יְשׁוּעָה is suffixed, but as the second term in a construct chain (צוֹר יְשׁוּעָתִי). In the Psalter, יְשׁוּעָה or its equivalent occurs in similar constructions in Pss 18:3, 47;⁸¹⁹ 25:5; 27:9; 51:16; 65:6; 79:9 (pl. suffix); 85:5 (pl. suffix); 88:2; 89:27; and 95:1, usually in the expression, “the God of my salvation” (אֱלֹהֵי יְשׁוּעָתִי/יְשׁוּעִי/יְשׁוּעָתִי), but occasionally with צוֹר as already noted in 95:1. On the other hand, Exodus 15:2 (וַיְהִי־לִי לְיְשׁוּעָה) uses a ל of possession/advantage in combination with ל of product (cf. syntax of the covenant formula!) to convey the same idea as the noun with 1st sg. suffix (יְשׁוּעָתִי). The difference is not so much semantic as syntactical and rhetorical: whereas Exod 15:2 celebrates Yahweh’s *becoming* “my salvation”⁸²⁰ and talks about it in the first person, in the Psalter יְשׁוּעָתִי and its equivalents either function as vocative (Pss 27:1; 38:23) or within indicative clauses that stress the present reality of the relationship (e.g., Ps 35:3, where the psalmist tells Yahweh, “say to my soul, ‘I am your salvation’ [יְשׁוּעָתִי אֲנִי],” and Ps 68:20, which declares, “God is our salvation” [אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְשׁוּעָתֵנוּ]).

⁸¹⁸ Neither יְשׁוּעָה nor יְשׁוּעִי appear in the Pentateuch at all.

⁸¹⁹ The Syriac tradition witnesses “my God *and* my salvation” (i.e., no construct chain). Interestingly, the parallel colon in 2 Sam 22:47 adds צוֹר, yielding a three-term construct chain, “the God of the rock of my salvation” (אֱלֹהֵי צוֹר יְשׁוּעִי) and more closely reflecting Deut 32:15..

⁸²⁰ See Rendtorff’s suggestion in Chapter Four’s discussion on the covenant formula.

The point here is not that these examples allude narrowly to Exod 15 or Deut 32, but that they employ the same concept of “Yahweh as my/our salvation” native to those two texts and their close association with the Mosaic covenant & Exodus traditions.⁸²¹

Altogether, eight of the above listed psalms are Davidic or Davidized, whose sg. suffixes identify Yahweh as *David's* salvation at the editorial level: Pss 18, 25, 27, 35, 38, 51, 65, and 68. Psalm 89 can be added here because it is the king who calls Yahweh “my salvation” (v. 27). Since Pss 88–89 show several signs of deliberate editorial association—calling Yahweh “[the God of] my salvation” (יְשׁוּעָתִי) being only one example of concatenation between them,⁸²² editors likely recognized Ps 88 as either the lament of the king himself or on his behalf.⁸²³ This makes a total of ten psalms in which “David” calls Yahweh “my salvation;” otherwise only one Asaph Ps 79, one Korahite Ps 85 (or two if Ps 88 is included), and anonymous Ps 95 use the expression.

Yahweh as “Shield” (מָגֵן)

The term מָגֵן occurs only twice in the Pentateuch, but in both cases it is used symbolically as an epithet for Yahweh. In Gen 15:2 God declares to Abr(ah)am, “Fear not, Abram, I am your shield (אֲנִי מָגֵן לְךָ); your reward (שְׂכָרְךָ) shall be very great” (Gen 15:1),⁸²⁴ and Moses concludes his blessing of the tribes in Deut 33:29 by declaring *Israel* “blessed” (אַשְׁרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) because Yahweh is “the shield of your help” (מָגֵן עֲזָרְךָ). Doubtless editors knew both foundational texts, and it is very plausible that they saw a theological connection between them

⁸²¹ This of course does not exhaust all instances of יְשׁוּעָה, יִשְׁע, and תְּשׁוּעָה in the Psalter, but represents only those instances where Yahweh is named with these terms in some way.

⁸²² See Chapters One and Two.

⁸²³ So Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, 258.

⁸²⁴ The second part, מָגֵן עֲזָרְךָ הַרְבֵּה מְאֹד, raises translation difficulties. The ESV translates it as a separate clause (see above), while the ASV renders it as a second complement, “and thy exceeding great reward.” In any case, שְׂכָר occurs only in Solomonic Ps 127:3 in reference to the “fruit of the womb,” not Yahweh.

and the nine psalms that similarly refer to Yahweh as a shield: Pss 3, 18, 28, 33, 59, 84, 115, 119, and 144. In several of these Yahweh is shield to *plural* entities: “them,” “us” etc. Psalm 18:31 declares that Yahweh “is a shield for *all* who take refuge in him” (מָגֵן הוּא לְכָל הַחֹטִים בּוֹ). Similarly, three times Ps 115:9–11 asserts that Yahweh “is *their* help and their shield” (עֲזָרָם וּמָגֵנָם הוּא) concerning Israel, the house of Aaron, and “*you* who fear Yahweh” respectively. Psalm 33:20 is identical but for the 1st pl., “he is our help and *our* shield” (עֲזָרָנוּ וּמָגֵנָנוּ הוּא), while Ps 59:12 addresses God as “*our/my* shield” (מָגֵנִי) ⁸²⁵ in its imprecatory petition against the psalmist’s enemies. These texts affirm the idea that Yahweh is a shield to his people collectively. However, in Pss 18:3; 28:7; 119:114; and 144:2 Yahweh is “*my* shield” (1st sg.), while in Ps 3:4 the psalmist declares, “But you, O Yahweh, are a shield about *me*” (וְאַתָּה יְהוָה מָגֵן בְּעַדִּי). Thus in five psalms—six if the LXX is followed for Ps 59—the psalmist calls Yahweh “my shield.” It is quite plausible that editors perceived these psalmists adopting the posture of Abraham or Israel—perhaps an exemplary Israelite for whom Yahweh is shield—according to the Abrahamic promise and Mosaic blessing. Notably, all of these except for Ps 119 are Davidic or Davidized, though Grant’s thesis would allow for the same possibility in Ps 119 also. ⁸²⁶

Summary

This brief investigation reflects a similar picture to Chapter Four’s analysis of the covenant formula: at the editorial level it is predominantly David who addresses Yahweh as “my Rock,” “my Salvation,” and “my Shield,” just as it is predominantly David who addresses Yahweh as “my God.” This supports Chapter Four’s analysis of allusions to the covenant formula, which

⁸²⁵ MT has 1st pl. suffix, but LXX has a sg. possessive (ὁ ὑπερασπιστής μου) also attested in the Syriac tradition.

⁸²⁶ Psalms 84:10 and 89:19, on the other hand, apply מָגֵן not to Yahweh but to the Davidic king, who is “our shield.” In Ps 84:10 the Korahite psalmist implores Yahweh to “Behold our shield (מָגֵנֵנוּ)...look on the face of your anointed (מְשֻׁחֵיךָ),” while Ps 89:19 declares that “our shield (מָגֵנֵנוּ) belongs to Yahweh, our king (מְלִכֵנוּ) to the holy one of Israel.”

suggested that the Psalter recognizes David as the primary covenant partner of Yahweh. It also suggests that Moses'/Israel's hymnic confession, "[God] has become my salvation" (cf. Exod 15:2), is predominantly a *Davidic* declaration in the Psalter, which seems further to underscore David as the singer of the Psalter's "new song," as Chapters Four and Six examine.

APPENDIX E

ADDITIONAL EXPRESSIONS REFLECTING A UNIVERSALIZED UNDERSTANDING OF “THE EARTH”

Chapter Four surveyed the theme of the gift of the land, examining the expression אֶרֶץ אֲפִסֵי אֶרֶץ. Some possible equivalents include: קִצֵּה הָאָרֶץ,⁸²⁷ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ,⁸²⁸ and perhaps even אֶרֶץ paired with שָׁמַיִם⁸²⁹ and absolute uses of אֶרֶץ meaning “the earth.”⁸³⁰ These expressions are very common and amply demonstrate the Psalter’s preoccupation with the whole created order (cf. esp. Ps 148) rather than “the land” narrowly conceived (i.e., Canaan). One can reasonably infer that this universal perspective reflects the anticipated fulfilment of the universalized Abrahamic covenantal promise first encountered in the Psalter in Ps 2. On the other hand, such expressions occur in Davidic or Davidized psalms only about half the time.⁸³¹ Taken in isolation,

⁸²⁷ Cf. Pss 46:10; 48:11; 61:3; 65:6; 135:7.

⁸²⁸ Cf. Pss 8:2, 10; 19:5; 33:8; 45:17; 47:3, 8; 48:3; 57:6, 12; 66:1, 4; 83:19; 96:1, 9; 97:5, 9; 98:4; 100:1; 105:7; 108:6.

⁸²⁹ Cf. Pss 69:35; 73:9, 25; 85:12; 89:12; 96:11; 102:20, 26; 108:6; 113:6; 115:15–16; 121:2; 124:8; 134:3; 135:6; 146:6; 147:8; 148:13. All these examples of אֶרֶץ and שָׁמַיִם in some way qualify the realm of Yahweh’s activity, power, rule etc. In Ps 103:11, however, אֶרֶץ and שָׁמַיִם appear in a simile for the greatness of Yahweh’s דָּוָד: “For as high as the heavens are above the earth, so great is his steadfast love etc.,” hence we have not included it here.

⁸³⁰ E.g., Pss 33:5, 14; 51:1; 67:3; 68:33; 74:12, 17; 75:4; 77:19; 82:5, 8; 89:28; 99:1; 96: 13; 97:1; 98:9; 104:5, 9, 13–14, 24, 32, 35; 110:6; 114:7; 119:19, 64, 87, 90, 119 [?]; 136:6; 137:15.

⁸³¹ Of the above listed psalms, at least thirteen are clearly Davidic or Davidized (Pss 8, 19, 33, 51, 59, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 108, 110, and 121; perhaps also Pss 104 and 124), and two are royal (Pss 45 and 89). That leaves Pss 46, 47, 48, 83, 96, 97, 98, 100, 105, 114, 119, 134, 135, 136, 146, 147, 148, almost half of which occur in Book V where David is more prominent as noted earlier (Chapter Six).

therefore, these data alone are inconclusive for determining whether editors understood these expressions as affirming Ps 2:8's royalization of the motif or a more "democratized" perspective.⁸³²

⁸³² For instance, Ps 138:4 opens the final Davidic group with its declaration that "all the kings of the earth (כָּל־מְלָכֵי־אֲרָץ) shall give you thanks, Yahweh." This is consistent with Ps 2's royal casting of the promise. However, it could be objected that *Yahweh* is the object of the kings' thanksgiving and implied subservience, so that the psalm implicitly replaces the king with Yahweh alone.

⁸³² On the other hand, Barber, *Singing in the Reign*, 14, sees a contrast between the Mosaic and Davidic covenant specifically on the latter's more universal horizon. Whereas the Mosaic covenant "was a national and exclusive covenant with Israel," the "Davidic covenant, made at Zion was international and was inclusive of both Israelites and Gentiles."

APPENDIX F

THE THEME OF ELECTION (בְּחִיר; בַּחֵר)

The verb “to choose” (בַּחֵר) and its cognate noun “chosen” (בְּחִיר) has turned up several times in Chapter Three’s survey. It remains to be investigated how the theme of election expressed via these terms is distributed in the Psalter.

בַּחֵר and cognates occur some fourteen times in the Psalter. Most of these cases make Yahweh the subject or implied subject of the verbal root: Pss 33:12; 47:5; 78:67–68, 70; 89:20; 105:26; 132:13; and 135:4.⁸³³ The “blessed nation” (אַשְׁרֵי הַגּוֹי) in Ps 33:12’s allusion to the covenant formula is the people Yahweh has chosen as his heritage” (הָעַם | בְּחֵר לְנַחֲלָה לּוֹ). Similarly, Davidic Ps 65:5 pronounces “blessed” those whom “you choose and bring near” (אַשְׁרֵי | תִּבְחַר וְתִקְרַב) within the temple, thus casting Yahweh’s election in terms of Israel’s liturgical and cultic life.⁸³⁴ While Ps 47:5 uses similar language to Ps 33:12, but with a different focus: “God chose our inheritance for us” (יִבְחַר־לָנוּ אֶת־נַחֲלָתָנוּ), which is further explained through parallelism as “the pride of Jacob whom he loves” (אַתְּ גָּאוֹן יַעֲקֹב אֲשֶׁר־אַהֲבָה). Since the pronominal suffix “us” appends a ל of advantage in this verse (“for us” לָנוּ) “our inheritance” and “pride of Jacob” apparently refer to *land* rather than the people themselves as an elect nation—even if this idea is essentially present as well.

⁸³³ The exceptions are Pss 25:12; 84:11; 119:30, 173.

⁸³⁴ Note the temple language in the rest of v. 5, “to dwell in *your courts* (חַצְרוֹתֶיךָ)! We shall be satisfied with the goodness of *your house* (בֵּיתֶיךָ), the holiness of your temple (קֹדֶשׁ הַיְכָלֶיךָ)” Several minor textual issue in v. 5 are inconsequential here.

As noted in Chapter Three, the final few verses of Ps 78 are especially imbued with the theme of election, declaring God’s choice of Judah, Mt Zion, and David over Joseph and Ephraim (vv. 67–68), and culminating with his choice of his servant David (v. 70), “He rejected (וַיִּמְאַס) the tent of Joseph; he did not choose (לֹא בָחַר) the tribe of Ephraim; but he chose (וַיִּבְחַר) the tribe of Judah, Mount Zion, which he loves. He built his sanctuary like the high heavens, like the earth, which he has founded forever. He chose (וַיִּבְחַר) David his servant and took him from the sheepfolds.” As noted, there appears to be a sequence here that progresses from broad to narrow (Judah–Zion–David) and culminating with David. Thus, while God elects both people and king, this sequence accentuates David’s role as “shepherd” of the people (cf. v. 71) as God’s response to the people’s covenantal unfaithfulness and draws particular attention to God’s sanctuary (v. 69). Thus Ps 78 presents David’s shepherding role and the liturgical life centered at Zion as God’s solution to the perennial problem of the people’s faithlessness toward the Mosaic covenant (vv. 5–65).

Psalm 89:20 again picks up Ps 78’s special focus on David, describing him as “chosen from the people” (בְּיָבוֹר מֵעַם). It is therefore noteworthy that Ps 89:39 uses the same verb “to reject” (מֵאַס) when it commences its lament as Ps 78:67 does in regard to Joseph—though Ps 89:39 uses it absolutely, without specifying a definite object (וַיִּמְאַסְהוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). Apparently the editors wished to compare God’s treatment of David with his historic rejection of the northern kingdom; this in addition to a comparison between God’s treatment of David with that of Saul via the same verb מֵאַס found in 1Sam 15:13 and 26.⁸³⁵ This is consistent with the rhetorical goal of Ps 89 to contrast Yahweh’s commitment to and apparent rejection of David. On the other hand, whereas the body of Ps 78 showcases the faithlessness of the people, Ps 89 has no such negative comment to make about David. Thus the repetition of מֵאַס appears to be the only real point of comparison between “David” and Joseph/Ephraim, the purpose being a

⁸³⁵ See Chapter Three.

rhetorical one of reminding Yahweh how ill-fitting is his apparent rejection of David in light of his promises. Moreover, in Chapters Two and Six we noted the editorially important placement of Pss 78, 86, and 89 in which David is described as Yahweh's/God's עֶבֶד. As just noted, two of these psalms, Pss 78 and 89, affirm God's election of David (בַּחַר).

In three other psalms Yahweh is the subject of בַּחַר. Historic Psalm 105:26 recalls Yahweh's "choice" of Aaron and sending of Moses (שָׁלַח מֹשֶׁה עֲבָדָיו אֶהְרֹן אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר-בּוֹ),⁸³⁶ In Ps 132:13 Yahweh "has chosen Zion; he has desired it for his dwelling place;" a causal clause following directly from Ps 132:11–12's reiteration of Yahweh's oath to David in the Davidic covenant. Finally, the allusion to the covenant formula in Ps 135:4 discussed earlier declares that Yahweh "has chosen Jacob for himself; Israel as his own possession (לְסִגְלוֹתָיו)."

The distribution of this theme in editorially conspicuous psalms like Pss 78, 89, and 105 at the very least indicates that editors were mindful of Yahweh's election when compiling the Psalter. Interestingly, Pss 78's dual focus on the election of David and Zion—as well as Ps 89's identification of David as Yahweh's elect—is picked up again in Ps 132:11–13, making it unlikely that editors envisioned a theological shift *from* David *to* the people as Yahweh's elect (e.g., Ps 135:4). Rather than the people superseding David as Yahweh's elect in some sense (i.e., democratization), it seems that the dual focus of the Davidic ruler and Zion are instrumental in bringing about or at least sustaining the people's status as Yahweh's "chosen" proper to the covenant formula expressed earlier in the Psalter (Pss 33:12).

⁸³⁶ A few Old Latin MSS and Syriac witness the addition of *waw* ("and Aaron"), suggesting that Moses and Aaron be understood as a dual object of שָׁלַח, and possibly בַּחַר by extension, although the latter's relative clause suggests Aaron alone (cf. sg. object וְאַהֲרֹן; N.B. several LXX witnesses have *ἐαυτῷ* [= לוֹ], so that "him" refers to Yahweh as indirect object).

APPENDIX G

“WISDOM”/DEUTERONOMIC THEMES AND DAVID: YAHWEH’S WAY, THE CONTRASTING WAY(S) OF THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WICKED, AND THE FEAR OF YAHWEH

Deuteronomy characteristically describes Israel’s covenantal obligation to keep Yahweh’s commands as walking in his “way(s)” (cf. Deut 8:6; 9:12, 16; 10:12; 11:22, 28; 19:9; 26:17; 28:9; 30:16; 31:29; [32:4?]),⁸³⁷ and/or “fearing” Yahweh (4:10; 5:29; 6:2, 13, 24; 8:6; 10:12, [17?], 20, [21?]; 13:5, 11; 17:13, 19; 19:20; 21:21; [25:18?]; 28:58; 31:12–13). While not as explicit as it appears Ps 1, the “two-way” motif seems to underlie such texts as Deut 30:15–16, where Moses equates Yahweh’s commands with an offer of “life and good” in contrast to “death and evil.” Frequently the psalms make or imply a contrast between the “ways” of the righteous and the wicked, suggesting that such contrasts also have potential to evoke life in or out of step with the Mosaic covenant. Indeed, Deuteronomy itself also describes the doing of Yahweh’s commands as “righteousness (יִשְׁרָאֵל) for us” (6:25; 24:13; 33:21)—while warning against misplaced confidence in one’s righteousness (9:4–6). This survey will therefore explore the distribution of Yahweh’s way, the two ways of the righteous and the wicked, and the fear of Yahweh in the Psalter.

⁸³⁷ Altogether the term “way” (דֶּרֶךְ) occurs some forty-eight times in Deuteronomy. Most of these other uses recall Israel’s path to the plains of Moab, primarily recalling Yahweh’s saving acts towards them rather than their obligation to faithful obedience.

Yahweh's Way(s)

“Yahweh’s way” or “ways” can, of course, be understood as a subjective genitive to mean *his* activities, which may or may not recall the benefits Yahweh worked for his people through the Mosaic covenant.⁸³⁸ For example, Ps 103:7 parallels “his ways” made known to Moses with “his acts” (עָלֵי־לִוְהָיוּ), suggesting that his historical salvific acts are primarily in view rather than the “way(s)” Yahweh’s commands his people to “walk in” made known through the Mosaic covenant (cf. Deut 30:15, 19).⁸³⁹ But in several cases “Yahweh’s ways” are “known/made known” or “taught” or “kept” in a way that suggests that Mosaic covenantal life/Torah is in view. Psalms 18 Yahweh’s ways are “kept” (שָׁמַר) in Pss 18:22 and 37:34, and taught (לָמַד) to “sinners” in Pss 25:4 and 51:15, and “not known” (עָד) in 95:10.⁸⁴⁰ In the case of Ps 18, v. 23 makes it clear that “keeping Yahweh’s ways” involves a proper orientation to his instruction in the Mosaic covenant, for the psalmist declares that “all his rules (כָּל־מִשְׁפָּטָיו) were before me, and his statutes (וְתוֹרָתוֹ) I did not put away from me.” A Mosaic covenant context is also clear in Ps 81 (see above), when in v. 14 God says, “Oh that my people would listen to me, that Israel would walk in my ways.” Since v. 12 alludes to Deut 6:5 (see above), v. 14 clearly operates

⁸³⁸ This does not mean that, depending on which of Yahweh’s miraculous deeds are in view, such acts may not recall the *historical* context of the Mosaic covenant (e.g., the exodus).

⁸³⁹ Cf. Pss 67:3; 77:14; 85:14; 138:5; 145:17. This distinction between Yahweh’s salvific ways and the ways his people are to walk should not, perhaps, be pressed too far, for the expression “Yahweh’s ways” in some of these instances could legitimately entail both aspects. We are therefore concerning ourselves here with those instances of Yahweh’s way(s) that *primarily* and clearly accentuate the “way(s)” Yahweh commands his people to walk in the Mosaic Covenant.

⁸⁴⁰ The referent of “my ways” in Ps 95:8 is open to a couple of possibilities. Verse 8’s recollection of the Meribah incident (Exod 17) historically situates Yahweh’s accusation that “they have not known my ways” (לֹא־יָדְעוּ דַרְכֵי יְהוָה) in the wilderness wanderings. So on the one hand, “my ways” in 95:10 could simply mean Yahweh’s provision for the Israelites in a general sense (i.e., water from the rock). On the other hand, since the people had complained that Yahweh had brought them out of Egypt at all, later editors of the Psalter could plausibly understand “they have not known my ways” to mean that that generation had no understanding of God’s ways revealed on Sinai and his salvific purpose for them in the Mosaic covenant.

within the thought-world of Deuteronomic theology and the Mosaic covenant as previously discussed). Similarly, in Ps 86:11 the Davidic psalmist asks Yahweh to “teach me your way (הַדִּבְרֵיךָ) ...that I may walk (הִלְכֵהוּ) in your truth” and “unite my heart to fear (יִרְאֶה) your name.” Psalm 27:11 has the same petition to “teach me your way.” If editors perceived an allusion to the command against false witness (Exod 20:16) in v. 12 as suggested earlier, then they are likely to have connected this teaching (יְרֵה) with Mosaic Torah.⁸⁴² Psalm 128 combines several wisdom/Deuteronomic features when it declares in v. 1, “Blessed (אַשְׁרֵי) is everyone who fears (יִרֵא) Yahweh, who walks in his ways (בְּדַרְכָיו).” Notwithstanding some textual difficulties,⁸⁴³ the psalmist in Ps 5:9 petitions Yahweh to “make *your way* (דְּרֹכֶיךָ) straight before me.” Parallel to this is the prayer to “lead me *in your righteousness* (בְּצִדְקֹתֶיךָ),” suggesting that Yahweh’s way is a “way of righteousness” in some sense. Moreover, v. 8’s promise to “bow down toward your holy temple *in the fear of you* (בְּיִרְאֵתֶיךָ)” associates Yahweh’s “way of righteousness” with “the fear of Yahweh” and locates it in worship, thus bringing together several potential Mosaic covenantal criteria from this survey. Indeed, vv. 8–9 represent a shift in focus to the psalmist himself (cf. אֲנִי in v. 8) after the previous verses have expressed Yahweh’s disdain for the “wicked” (רָשָׁע), “evil” (רָע), “all evildoers” (כָּל-פְּעֻלֵי אָוֶן), “those who speak lies,” and “the bloodthirsty and deceitful man” in vv. 5–7. The implied contrast between them and the psalmist thus contrasts Yahweh’s “way of righteousness” and “their” wicked ways. Thus, Yahweh’s way or ways as shows up as the *psalmist’s* proper path throughout the Psalter: Pss 5, 18, 25, 27, 51, 81, 86, 95, and 128 of which two thirds are Davidic. This lends support to Grant’s

⁸⁴¹ A few MSS have pl. דְּרֹכֶיךָ.

⁸⁴² Although the “false witnesses” in v. 12 occasion the psalmist’s petition because of the threat they pose, it is also clear that the psalmist’s desire to learn Yahweh’s way and the “level”/“just” path (בְּאֵרַח מִשְׁוֹר) sets him apart from his enemies the false witnesses.

⁸⁴³ BHS apparatus indicates that the Vulgate, which reverses the final two personal suffixes in v. 9 to read: “make *my* way straight before *you*.”

proposal concerning editorial interest the king as an exemplar of Torah piety. Moreover, the non-Davidic contexts just surveyed also lament the people's failure to walk in Yahweh's way(s), most notably in Ps 81 and in Ps 95's recollection of the Meribah incident. This point of contrast between David and people presents a picture consistent with our thesis that David's Torah-observance in some sense vicarious as he, by virtue of his his intercessory role, restores them as Yahweh's covenant people.

The Contrasting Way(s) of the Righteous and the Wicked

If the above psalms' references to Yahweh's way evoke Torah-obedience and its Mosaic covenantal framework, then the way of the righteous contrasted to that of the wicked has similar allusive potential for editors who obviously attentive to this motif (Ps 1!). Besides Pss 1 and 50, a number of other psalms explicitly contrast the "righteous" and the "wicked" in terms of their way (N.B. דָּרָךְ in 1:1 and 50:23): Pss 10, 18, 26, 32, 36, 37, 82, 84, 146, and probably Pss 12 and 125.⁸⁴⁴ In Ps 32:8 the psalmist says, "I will instruct you and teach you (יְרִיה) in the way (בְּדַרְךְ) you should go (הַלֵּךְ)," whereupon the listener is urged not to be like horse or mule (v. 9). Verses 10–11 then contrast "the wicked" (רָשָׁע) who has "many sorrows" with "the one who trusts in Yahweh," and commands the "righteous" (צַדִּיקִים) and "upright in heart" (כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵלִי) to rejoice. Acrostic Ps 37 also has a strong wisdom flavor, and contrasts the ways of the righteous and wicked throughout. צַדִּיקִים/צַדִּיק occurs nine times (vv. 12, 16, 17, 21, 25, 29, 30, 32, 39), רָשָׁעִים/רָשָׁע occur thirteen times (vv. 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 32, 34, 35, 38, 40), and דָּרָךְ appears five times (vv. 5, 7, 14, 23, 34) where it denotes the way of both the righteous (cf. יִשְׂרָאֵלִי in v. 14, and "when [Yahweh] delights in his way" [וְדַרְכּוֹ יִתְפַּן] in v. 23) and unrighteous (cf. עֲשֵׂה מְזֻמּוֹת in v. 7). Indeed, v. 34 encapsulates the function of the two way

⁸⁴⁴ Psalm 15:2–5 might be included here too. Verse 2 answers the question of v. 1, "Yahweh, who shall sojourn in your tent? Who shall dwell on your holy hill?" by declaring, "He who walks blamelessly (הוֹלֵךְ תָּמִים) and does what is right." The following verses then define this in terms of what that person does *not* do.

motif as Ps 37 employs it in its instruction, “Wait for Yahweh and keep his way (וּשְׁמֹר דְרָבּוֹ), and he will exalt you to inherit the land; you will look on when the wicked are cut off (בְּהִכָּרַת רְשָׁעִים; cf. 34:17).” This combination of the two way motif and focus on inheriting the land (cf. vv. 3–4, 9, 11)⁸⁴⁵ resembles Deut 28 (cf. vv. 11, 21, 37, 52, 64), again suggesting the Mosaic covenantal entailments of this “wisdom” two way motif in Ps 37. In Ps 146:8–9 Yahweh “loves the righteous” (יְהוָה אֱהָב צְדִיקִים) but “brings to ruin” the “way of the wicked” (וְדַרְךְ רְשָׁעִים יַעֲרֹף). This closely resembles the same basic contrast in Ps 1:6 at the beginning of the Psalter. Psalm 146—the first psalm of the Psalter’s final Hallel group (Pss 146–150—thus affirms this original claim of Ps 1 concerning the righteous and wicked.⁸⁴⁶ Psalms 18 and 125 are also recognizable cases of the two ways motif, but in their own idiosyncratic ways. In Ps 18:21–27 the psalmist contrasts his “righteousness” (cf. בְּצִדִּיקִי in vv. 21 and 25) with his avoidance of wickedness (cf. וְלֹא־רִשְׁעָתִי in v. 22), and claims in v. 22a, “I have kept the ways of Yahweh” (בִּי־שָׁמַרְתִּי דְרָבּוֹ יְהוָה; cf. God’s “perfect way” [תְּמִימִים דְרָבּוֹ] in v. 31). Though it differs by using the noun צִדִּיק and verb רָשַׁע rather than the substantival adjectives צְדִיק and רָשָׁע as the previous examples do, the two way motif clearly underlies the psalmist’s claims in Davidic Ps 18. In Ps 125:3 “the scepter of wickedness (הַרְשָׁע) ⁸⁴⁷ shall not rest on the land allotted to the righteous.” The psalmist then prays that Yahweh “do good... to those who are good and the upright in their hearts” (הִיטִיבָה יְהוָה לְטוֹבִים וְלִישָׁרִים בְּלִבּוֹתָם) in v. 4, before declaring that “those who turn aside to their crooked ways (עֲקָלְקָלוֹתָם) Yahweh will lead away (יוליכֶם) with evildoers.”

⁸⁴⁵ For Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 408, these two elements are central to the Ps 37’s essential message.

⁸⁴⁶ Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous in the Psalms*, 82, highlights 146: 9 in his brief summary of Pss 146–150 as the Psalter’s conclusion, and suggests that it encapsulates “what is perhaps the central message of the Psalter.”

⁸⁴⁷ A few MSS of Symmachus suggest “the scepter of *the wicked* (הַרְשָׁע),” thus effecting an even clearer contrast between רָשָׁע and צְדִיק within the one verse (cf. LXX: τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν).

Other psalms of those listed above implicitly contrast the “way” (דָּרֶךְ) of the wicked or how they “walk” (הִלְךְ) with the poor or with psalmist himself. Examples of this kind include Pss 10:5; 36:5; 82:4–5; 84:11–12; and possibly 12:9. Psalm 10 bemoans the prospering “way” (v. 5) of the wicked who oppresses the poor, boasts, renounces Yahweh etc. (vv. 2–4), and calls Yahweh to come to the aid of the poor and afflicted for whom he hears and works justice (vv. 12, 17–18). Similarly, Ps 36:2–5 describe the wicked who, in v. 5, “sets himself in a way (דָּרֶךְ) that is not good,” but the psalm ends by asking Yahweh to “continue your steadfast love to those who know you (לִידְעֶיךָ), and your righteousness to the upright of heart (לְיֹשְׁרֵי־לֵב),” and to not let “the hand of the wicked drive me away” (v. 12). Psalm 82:4–5 prays for rescue for the weak and needy from the wicked, and goes on to describe the latter as “walk[ing] about in darkness” (בַּחֹשֶׁכָּה יִתְהַלְכוּ). Psalm 84:11 contrasts being “in the house of my God” (בְּבַיִת אֱלֹהֵי)—which the psalmist prefers—with dwelling “in the tents of wickedness” (בְּאֹהֲלֵי־רָשָׁע). But the following verse suggests that this is a contrast of *ways* when it explains why the psalmist prefers Yahweh’s house: “For Yahweh God is a sun and shield; Yahweh bestows favor and honor. No good thing does he withhold from those *who walk uprightly* (לְהַלְכֵי־בְתָמִים).” Interestingly, the same combination of lexemes occurs in Yahweh’s charge to *Abraham* in Gen 17:1, “walk before me, and be blameless” (הִתְהַלֵּךְ לְפָנַי וְהָיִה תָמִים). Finally, Ps 12:9 laments, “on every side the wicked prowl” (סָבִיב רָשָׁעִים יִתְהַלְכוּן). While this verbal combination might refer to a literal “walking about” rather than the metaphorical walking characteristic of the wicked, the latter is probable in light of the psalm’s complaint against ungodly flattery, oppression of the needy etc. (cf. vv. 3–6).

Certain other psalms contrast the right “way” or right “walking” with the wicked. Psalm 26 contrasts sitting (ישב) with the wicked (vv. 4–5) with walking (הלך) in integrity (v. 1) and in “walk[ing] in your faithfulness” (בְּאֵמֶתֶךָ) in v. 3). The cultic language of vv. 6–7 noted earlier suggests that these expressions about “walking” include participation in worship

regulated by the Mosaic covenant.⁸⁴⁸ Moreover, Ps 26 shows striking similarities to Ps 1 in its presentation of the two way motif, using all three verbs “walk” (הלך), “stand” (עמד), and “sit” (שב) found in Ps 1:1.⁸⁴⁹ Similarly, in Ps 39:2 the psalmist says, “I will guard *my ways* (דרכי) from sin... so long as the wicked (רשע) are in my presence,” and in royal Ps 101 the psalmist ponders “the way that is blameless” (v. 2) and approves of those who walk in it (v. 6), while vowing to destroy “all the wicked in the land” (כל־רשעי־אֶרֶץ) in v. 8. Although these examples only use “two way” language (דרכי; הלך; רשע etc.) to describe “one” way, the contrasts they draw appear to reflect the same contours of thought as in fuller expressions of the two way motif like Ps 1:6.

Still other psalms contrast “the righteous/righteousness” and “the wicked/wickedness” more generally, without explicit mention of “way.” These include: Pss 7:9–10; 9:5–6;⁸⁵⁰ 11:2–7; 31:18–19; 34:10, 16, 20, 22; 45:8; 55:4, 20, 23; 58:4, 11–12; 68:3–4; 75:11; 92:8, 11; 94:3, 12–13, 15, 21; 97:10–11; 104:33–35;⁸⁵¹ 112:1, 4, 6, 10; 140:5, 9, 14; and 141:4–5, 10. Several observations are noteworthy about these cases.

⁸⁴⁸ Given that the *hithpael* of הלך normally means “to walk about” (cf. “הלך,” *BDB* 235), it is possible that v. 3, “For your steadfast love is before my eyes, and I walk (וְהִתְהַלַּכְתִּי) in your faithfulness,” has the same “walking” in mind as in v. 6, when the psalmist says, “I go around your altar” (וְאָסַבְבָּה אֶת־מִזְבְּחֶךָ). If correct, this could suggest that the two ways contrasted in Ps 26 could refer, rather concretely, to a life of proper participation in worship according to its Mosaic institution and the assembly of the wicked etc. in vv. 4–5.

⁸⁴⁹ In v. 1 the psalmist declares, “I have walked (הלך) in my integrity,” before stating that he will not sit (שב) with men of falsehood, hates the “assembly of evildoers” (קהל־מִרְעִים), and “will not sit (שב) with the wicked (עם־רָשָׁעִים)” in vv. 4–5. The psalmist again resolves to “walk (הלך) in my integrity” in v. 11, and declares, “my feet (עמד) stand on level ground” in v. 12. Cf. Creach, *Yahweh as Refuge*, 79, who notes Ps 26’s similarity to Ps 1.

⁸⁵⁰ Psalm 9:4 describes Yahweh on his throne “giving righteous judgment” (שׁוֹפֵט צַדִּיק), but the Targum has a definite substantival adjective form זכאה (= צַדִּיק), “judging the righteous.” Verse 5 declares, “You have rebuked the nations; you have made the wicked perish (עָשָׂה רָשָׁעִים לְאֵבֶרֶת)” (LXX has *καὶ ἀπόλετο = qal* אָבַד). Psalm 9:4–5 therefore contrast Yahweh’s treatment of the righteous and the wicked, describing the latter’s fate in similar terms as Ps 1:6.

⁸⁵¹ The end of Ps 104 contrasts the psalmist’s present and future joy toward Yahweh with the destruction of the

First, a few of them also utilize the theme of “the fear of Yahweh” (יִרְאַתַּי הַנְּהוּה), thus underscoring their wisdom character and affinity with Deuteronomic language and theology.⁸⁵² Psalm 34:10 exhorts Yahweh’s “saints” (קְדוֹשָׁיו) to “fear Yahweh” (יִרְאוּ אֶת־יְהוָה), whereupon v. 12 continues, “Come, O children, listen to me; I will teach you the fear of Yahweh (יִרְאַתַּי הַנְּהוּה)” (cf. Prov 8). Then v. 15 contrasts “evil” (רָע) and “good” (טוֹב), and vv. 16–17 state that “the eyes of Yahweh are on the righteous (צַדִּיקִים) and his ears toward their cry,” but that “the face of Yahweh is against those who do evil (עֲשֵׂי רָע), to cut off the memory of them from the earth.” Again, in v. 20 “the afflictions of the righteous (צַדִּיק)” are many, but in v. 22 “affliction will slay the wicked (רָשָׁע).” Thus Ps 34’s exhortation to “fear Yahweh” consistently contrasts the “righteous” and the “wicked.” Similarly, Ps 55 petitions God for help from “the oppression of the wicked (רָשָׁע)” (v. 4) who “do *not* fear (יִרֵא) God” (v. 20), and declares that God “will never permit the righteous (צַדִּיק) to be moved” (v. 23). Psalm 68:3–4 contrasts the joy of the righteous with the destruction (אֲבָד) of the wicked; the same fate their “way” receives in Ps 1:6. Although later in the psalm, v. 22 suggests that their different “ways” are in view when it declares, “God will strike...the hairy crown of him who *walks* in his guilty ways (מִתְהַלֵּךְ בְּבִצְמוֹתָיו).” Also notable is Ps 68’s final verse, “Awesome (גִּוֹרָא) is God from his sanctuary” (v. 36), which presents the theme of “fear of Yahweh” in a liturgical context.

Second, some of these instances of the two way motif resemble Ps 1 in certain features (cf. Pss 26 and 68 noted above). In Ps 92:7–10 the psalmist declares that Yahweh’s enemies “shall perish” (אֲבָד) after describing the “wicked” (רָשָׁעִים) as grass. By contrast, vv. 13–16 liken the “righteous” (צַדִּיק) to a palm tree and cedar “planted (שָׁתוּלִים) in the house of Yahweh,” echoing the planted tree motif in Ps 1:3 (cf. וְהָיָה כְּעֵץ שֶׁתוּלָה).

wicked. The psalmist “will sing praise” to Yahweh and “rejoices” in him (vv. 33–34), then declares, “Let sinners be consumed from the earth, and let the wicked (רָשָׁעִים) be no more” (v. 35).

⁸⁵² Here we identify psalms that refer to the “fear of Yahweh” as well as contrast the righteous and the wicked. See below for a list of the Psalter’s remaining references to “fear of Yahweh.”

similarities between Ps 94:12–15 and Ps 1 (see above). Finally, Ps 112 praises the virtues of the “righteous” (cf. צַדִּיק in vv. 4 and 6) whom the opening verse describes in strikingly similar terms as Ps 1 does and includes the theme of “the fear of Yahweh”: “Blessed is the man (אִשְׁרֵי־אֵישׁ) who fears (יִרָא) Yahweh, who greatly delights (חִפֵּץ) in his commands” (cf. Ps 1:1–2). (This follows immediately from the final verse of adjoining Ps 111, which states that “The fear of Yahweh is the beginning of wisdom [יִרְאַת יְהוָה | יְרֵאִת חֲכָמָה]; all those who practice it⁸⁵³ have good understanding.” Cf. 111:9, where Yahweh’s name is “feared” [וְנוֹרָא שָׁמֹו]). Psalm 112 also ends with a similar remark to the one found in Ps 1:6, “the desire of the wicked (רְשָׁעִים) will perish (אָבַד)” (v. 10).

Third, Pss 27 and 28 show possible signs of concatenation with Pss 25 and 26, precisely in respect to the two way motif. In Ps 27:11 the psalmist prays, “Teach me (יְרֵה) your way (דִּרְכֶךָ), O Yahweh, and lead me on a level path (בְּאַרְצֵךָ מִישׁוֹר).” In Ps 28:3 the psalmist dissociates himself from the “wicked,” asking Yahweh not to “drag me off with the wicked (עִם־רְשָׁעִים)” — the same prepositional phrase found in 26:5. Thus, editors appear to have used the two way motif in grouping Pss 25–28 together; Pss 25 and 26 elaborating it most fully, and Ps 25 associating it with the Mosaic covenant.

Finally, since so many psalms appear to structure their thought around the differing ways/fates of the righteous and the wicked, it is conceivable that editors interpreted other mentions of the righteous or wicked according to this contrast. For example, the only term Ps 3

⁸⁵³ ESV follows the Syriac, Hieronymus, and LXX (πᾶσι τοῖς ποιούσιν αὐτήν), which have f. sg. suffix, so that “fear of Yahweh” is the antecedent of “it” in v. 10’s commendation for “all who practice it.” However, the Heb. has 3d m. pl. suffix (לְכָל־עֹשֵׂיהֶם), which may pick up “all his precepts” (כָּל־פְּקוּדָיו) from v. 7. Understood thus, 111:10 and 112:1 practically say the same thing: that to “fear Yahweh” is to do/delight in his precepts/commands. If editors understood them this way, then this could partly explain these psalms’ sequence as they sought to juxtapose these two equivalent statements. Interestingly, Ps 112 follows directly from Ps 103 in 4QPs^b (cf. Wilson, *Editing*, 117). This shows that, despite the obvious stylistic similarities between Pss 111–112, these psalms were not uniformly regarded as a pair never to be sundered, but were creatively paired by the Psalter’s editors.

uses from those we have investigated is “wicked” (רָשָׁעִים) in v. 8. But since this describes the psalmist’s enemy in the context of his request to Yahweh to “save me,” the psalm clearly recognizes at least two camps: one to which the psalmist belongs (cf. “your people” [עַמְּךָ] in v. 9), and “the wicked.”⁸⁵⁴ Psalm 21:2–13 offers a similar example. Although it does not use terms like רָשָׁעִים/עֲצֻדֵי־קַי or רָדְדָה at all, it nevertheless contrasts Yahweh’s benevolence toward the king (vv. 2–8) and Yahweh’s recompense toward his enemies and haters (vv. 9–13), whose “fruit” (פְּרִי־מִוֶן) Yahweh will “destroy” (דָּבַח) from the earth (cf. same vocabulary in Ps 1:3, 6).⁸⁵⁵

The above survey and observations affirm the consistency with which the Psalter presents David as one committed to Yahweh’s way. Moreover, the connections with Ps 1 noted above and these motifs’ role in producing concatenation between groups of psalms further confirm editorial interest in the way of the righteous vis-à-vis that of the wicked.

Other Cases of the Fear of Yahweh (יִרְאַת יְהוָה)

From time to time in the above psalms we have noted the theme of “fear of Yahweh” (Pss 5:8; 34:10, 12; 55:20; 68:36; 112:1; 128:1; cf. 2:11 and 111:9–10;). The noun יִרְאַת־יְהוָה occurs a few other times with Yahweh as its implied object: Pss 19:10; 90:11; and 119:38. We have already noted the rich Torah language of Pss 19:8–10 and 119. Psalm 90 is the only psalm attributed to Moses, so it is likely that editors understood v. 11, “Who considers the power of your anger, and

⁸⁵⁴ Comparable situations occur in numerous other psalms. E.g., in Ps 14:4–5, “all the evildoers who eat up my people” are in terror, but “God is with the generation of the righteous (צַדִּיק).” In Ps 22:17, “dogs encompass me; a company of evildoers (עֲדַת מְרַעִים) encircles me.” In Ps 64:3 the psalmist asks God to “Hide me from the secret plots of the wicked (מְסֻדֵי מְרַעִים), from the throng of evildoers (פְּעֻלַּי אֲנִי).” The psalm ends with an exhortation to the “righteous” (צַדִּיק) to “rejoice in Yahweh and take refuge in him,” making the contrast more explicit.

⁸⁵⁵ Cf. Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous*, 59, who, after noting that Pss 1–2 “orient the reader to the nature of the righteous person and the plight of the righteous in relation to the wicked,” suggests that the “association of [Pss 3–41] with David gives a Davidic cast to the whole Psalter and presents David as representative of the righteous who cry out to God.” If this is correct, then the “righteous”/“wicked” contrast lies just beneath the surface of every Davidic individual lament psalm.

your wrath according to the fear of you (וּכְיִרְאָתְךָ)?” with the Mosaic covenant close in the background.⁸⁵⁶

The verb יָרָא often relates to fear in a general sense or fear of enemies in the Psalter, but in numerous places (besides those identified above) it relates to fear of Yahweh/God or his name, deeds etc. Yahweh is the object or implied object of fear in Pss 15:4; 33:8;⁸⁵⁷ 40:4; 47:3; 52:8;⁸⁵⁸ 67:8; 72:5;⁸⁵⁹ 76:8, 9(?), 13; 89:8; 96:4; and 130:4. Yahweh’s/God’s “awesome deeds” are in view in 64:10(?); 65:6, 9(?); 66:3, 5; 106:22; 139:14(?). Yahweh’s “name” is feared in Pss 86:11; 99:3; 102:16. And Yahweh’s “word(s)” or “judgments” are feared in Pss 119:38, 63, 120. Many of these examples employ the *niphal* participle יָרָאֹת/יָרָאֹתָ (i.e., those in Pss 47; 65–66, 68; 72; 76; 89; 96; 99; 106; 139; 145), so that any connection to “fear of Yahweh” is primarily lexical/conceptual rather syntactical.

These data permit a couple of brief observations. First, “fear of Yahweh” arises in psalms that our survey has identified in relation to Mosaic covenantal motifs (Pss 86, 111, 112, and 119) or בְּרִית itself (Pss 89 and 111). This adds to the likelihood that editors saw Mosaic covenantal entailments in its other instances as well. Second, several of these psalms fall at the seams of the Psalter, (Pss 2, 72, 89, 90) with several others showing evidence of deliberate editorial placement, e.g., Pss 86; 111–112, 119 (cf. Cha. One). This confirms the importance of the theme to the editors. Third, the vast majority of psalms are (quasi-)Davidic or royal with the king commending/teaching the fear of Yahweh or exemplifying it: Pss [2?], 5, 15, 19, 33, 34, 40, 52,

⁸⁵⁶ E.g., Exod 20:20, “Do not fear, for God has come to test you, that the fear of him may be before you, that you may not sin (וְהָיָה יִרְאָתְךָ עַל־פְּנֵיכֶם לְבַלְתִּי תַחֲטְאוּ).”

⁸⁵⁷ “Let all the earth fear Yahweh (מִיְהוָה)”

⁸⁵⁸ Here it is the “righteous” (צַדִּיקִים) who “see and fear.” Moreover, the psalmist then likens himself to “a green olive tree in the house of God” (וְאֲנִי כְפִזְיֹת רִעֲנָן בְּבַיִת אֱלֹהִים), thus employing a similar simile to that in Ps 1:3.

⁸⁵⁹ LXX has καὶ συμπαραμένει (= יִרְאֵי).

55, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 72, 86, 89, 102, and 139. As noted on various occasions, Grant understands the psalmist in Ps 119 to be of royal identity, while Zenger similarly sees a close connection between the king and Pss 111–112.

Summary

“Wisdom”/“Deuteronomic” themes and terms clearly pervade the Psalter, though individual instances vary in strength and explicitness. Although Wilson concludes that the Psalter’s final redaction responsible for adding Books IV–V was “shaped by the concerns of wisdom,”⁸⁶⁰ the “earlier” segment (Pss 2–89) is also heavily saturated with these themes. This suggests that Wilson may have overdrawn his contrast between the “royal-covenantal” and “wisdom” frames he observes in the Psalter. Indeed, Davidic or “Davidized” anonymous psalms in the first half of the Psalter account for most of the data just surveyed.

Of the psalms referring to Yahweh’s “way(s),” almost all were Davidic (Pss 5, 18, 25, 27, 37, 51, and 86), with just a couple of anonymous psalms (Pss 95, 128) and one attributed to either Asaph (Ps 81). Six of those seven Davidic psalms are from Books I–II. Of the psalms that use the two ways motif in a recognizable way, nineteen are (quasi-)Davidic (Pss 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 26, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, 55, 58, 68, 101, 140, 141), with two Asaph psalms (Pss 75, 82), one Korahite psalm (Ps 45), and eight anonymous psalms (Pss 92, 94, 97, 104, 111, 112, 125, 146), of which at least three follow closely after a Davidic group and, according to Zenger, are thereby quasi Davidic (Ps 104 after Pss 101–103; Pss 111–112 after Pss 108–110).⁸⁶¹ Fifteen of those eighteen Davidic psalms are from Books I–II. Seventeen of the psalms bearing *הַדָּוִדִי* just surveyed are (quasi-)Davidic or Solomonic: Pss 5, 15, 19, 33, 34, 40, 47, 52(?), 55, 64, 65, 66, 67, 72, 86, 102, 139. By contrast, our survey found one Mosaic psalm (90), one Korahite psalms (47), one Asaph psalm (76), one Ethan psalm (89), and nine anonymous psalms (2, 96,

⁸⁶⁰ Wilson, “Shaping the Psalter,” 80.

⁸⁶¹ Grant, *The King as Exemplar*; Erich Zenger, “Composition and Theology,” 91.

99, 106, 111, 112, 119, 128, 130). Of these thirteen non-Davidic psalms, Pss 2 and 89 are royal psalms with explicit focus on the Davidic covenant, while editors may have read Pss 111, 112, and 119 with the king in view (as per the views of Grant and Zenger just noted).

APPENDIX H

FURTHER EXAMINATION OF “STEADFAST LOVE” (חֶסֶד)

Our earlier investigation of Exod 34:6–7 already examined the term חֶסֶד to a significant degree, but here we shall make a more extensive investigation of the term in the Psalter. BDB translates it as “goodness,” “kindness,” or, when specifically an attribute of God, “lovingkindness in condescending to the needs of his creatures.”⁸⁶² On the other hand, Koehler and Baumgartner offer as their first definitions “faithfulness” and “loyalty,”⁸⁶³ implying an element of obligation within an existing relationship. Indeed, חֶסֶד appears in OT covenantal contexts so frequently that for the better part of the twentieth century חֶסֶד was widely understood as term with intrinsic covenantal connotations. Sylvain Romerowski attributes this to Nelson Gleuck’s influential 1927 thesis, which concluded that “*hesed* est la conduit en accord avec ces obligations.”⁸⁶⁴ On the other hand, Romerowski argues that the regular appearance of חֶסֶד in covenantal contexts has little bearing on its meaning, and denies that the term itself entails a sense of “covenantal obligation.”⁸⁶⁵ He understands חֶסֶד rather to mean “goodness,”

⁸⁶² “חֶסֶד,” BDB: 338–39.

⁸⁶³ “חֶסֶד,” HALOT: 336.

⁸⁶⁴ Sylvain Romerowski, “Que signifie le mot *hesed*?,” VT 40 (1990): 89–103 (esp. 90). Cf. Nelson Gleuck, *Das Wort hesed im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauche als menschliche und göttliche gemeinschaftgemässe Verhaltungsweise* (BZAW 47; Giessen, Germany: A. Töpelmann, 1927).

⁸⁶⁵ Romerowski, “Que signifie le mot *hesed*?,” 95–96, gives several key reasons for his view. First, contexts exist where “loyalty” or “faithfulness” seem unsuitable translations of חֶסֶד, such as 1Sam 15:6 where the Kenites had had no opportunity to show “fidelity” to Israel in a covenantal sense. Second, Romerowski notes its use in

“benevolence,” “affection,” “love,” “favor,” “pity,” etc., not “loyalty” or “fidelity;”⁸⁶⁶ he is wary of reducing דָּוָן to an obligation, preferring to describe דָּוָן as an attribute of God’s nature that he freely exercises.⁸⁶⁷

Romerowski’s response to Gleuck’s position seems like an attempt to resolve the apparent tension between Yahweh’s sovereign grace and Yahweh’s self-commitment implied by his “covenant;” i.e., he divests the term of covenantal entailments and thereby removes the tension. While this theological tension ought not be diminished, דָּוָן ’s actual use in the Psalter gives a better reflection of whether editors understood it in terms of Yahweh’s covenant. In around 22 percent of cases, דָּוָן occurs in word pairings that have demonstrated covenantal associations in numerous psalms (see above). This suggests a proclivity toward *covenantal* associations, and raises the possibility that editors normally read or applied the term to the relationship between Yahweh and his covenant partner(s).

parallel with expressions like סָפַח אֶת־אָזְנוֹ (Exod 34:6 and OT parallels) where the notion of pardon is focal rather than covenantal “fidelity.” Third, Romerowski claims that parallels with terms like $\text{נֶחֱם$ (e.g. Ps 109:12) and רַחֲמִים (e.g. Pss 25:6; 40:12; 51:3; 69:17; 86:5; and 103:4) imply a meaning closer to “love” than “fidelity.” On the other hand, Romerowski, “Que signifie le mot *hesed*?,” 100–1, suggests that the frequent pairing and paralleling of דָּוָן and אֱמֶנֶת (see above) does not constitute synonymous parallelism in which the meaning of both terms is roughly equivalent. Rather, the latter *qualifies* the former so that, for instance, the phrase אֱמֶנֶת דָּוָן comes to mean “loyal love.” (On the kind of parallelism implied here, cf. James Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History* [Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981], 52, “To state the matter somewhat simplistically, biblical lines are parallelistic not because B is meant to be a parallel of A, but because B typically *supports* A, carries it further, backs it up, completes it, goes beyond it.”) There is, then, an inconsistency to Romerowski’s argument: sometimes he deems a parallel term with which דָּוָן is commonly paired to be a *synonym*, while at other times he regards it as *qualifying* it with an essentially different meaning. In general, it may be observed that Romerowski does not take into account the “stock” formulaic character of אֱמֶנֶת דָּוָן and its probable echoes of Exod 34:6. This formulaic character better explains the selection of these two terms, rather than an intent to “qualify” the former term by the latter in each context where they appear.

⁸⁶⁶ Romerowski, “Que signifie le mot *hesed*?,” 103.

⁸⁶⁷ Romerowski, “Que signifie le mot *hesed*?,” 92.

Indeed, Brian Britt attributes the frequent formulaic use of **חֶסֶד** in post-biblical tradition to its traditional association of with certain key biblical texts. Building on the findings of Gordon Clark, who observes that **חֶסֶד** is paired with other key terms such as **אֱמֶת**, **רַחֲמִים**, and **צְדָקָה** in formulaic ways even more commonly than in the OT,⁸⁶⁸ Britt concludes:

For these post-biblical traditions, it seems as if the tendency to associate **חֶסֶד** with covenant and formulas of divine goodness intensified their importance to biblical tradition. The religious (and liturgical) importance of texts such as Deut. 7.9-10 and Exod. 34.6-7 may account for the continuing frequency of such patterned uses of **חֶסֶד**. The patterning of **חֶסֶד** in covenant formulas and phrases thus represents a qualitatively and quantitatively significant feature of the biblical Canon.⁸⁶⁹

Britt relates a tendency which, while more pronounced in post-biblical tradition, did not originate at that time, as many OT examples of the same phenomenon illustrate. It is thus likely that editors arranging psalms in the post-exilic period were attuned to these formulaic patternings. Two such formulaic pairings are the **חֶסֶד/אֱמֶת** combination and **חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת** as well as the expression **רַב-רַב חֶסֶד** and the less common pairing of **חֶסֶד** with **רַחֲמִים**, all of which we surveyed earlier. There we noted that **חֶסֶד** and **אֱמֶת** resembles the terminology of Deut 7:9, while **חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת** and **רַב-רַב חֶסֶד**—and cases of **חֶסֶד** with **רַחֲמִים**—bear closer resemblance to that of Exod 34:6. Furthermore, there are other good reasons suggest that editors were especially conscious of such word pairs and viewed them specifically in covenantal terms. For example, Ps 89's sevenfold use of **חֶסֶד** (paired or in parallel with **אֱמֶת** in vv. 2, 3, 25, 34, and 50; and paired with **אֱמֶת** in v. 15) has unmistakable covenantal associations given its obvious focus on the Davidic covenant. Psalm 88 also employs **חֶסֶד** in parallel with **אֱמֶת** (v.12). Since it is already clear from superscriptional evidence that editors deliberately collocated

⁸⁶⁸ Gordon Clark, "Hesed—A Study of a Lexical Field," *AbrN* 30 (1992): 34–54.

⁸⁶⁹ Brian Britt, "Unexpected Attachments: A Literary Approach to the Term **חֶסֶד** in the Hebrew Bible," *JSOT* 27 (2003): 296.

Pss 88 and 89 (see Chapter One), they undoubtedly understood Ps 88:12's אָמֹנָה/חֶסֶד parallel with the same *covenantal* connotations as in Ps 89.

Second, חֶסֶד also occurs in the formulaic call to praise, “Give thanks to Yahweh, for he is good, for his steadfast love endures forever” (הוֹדוּ לַיהוָה כִּי־טוֹב כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֶסֶדּוֹ), which James Hely Hutchinson terms a “new covenant slogan” on comparison with its appearances in Jer 33:11 and occurrences in Chronicles.⁸⁷⁰ The lexical overlap with Exod 34:6 is minimal (יְהוָה and חֶסֶד), but the theme of covenant renewal that attends the latter suggests a relationship at some level if Hutchinson is correct in his main assertions, which are soundly argued. The full formula occurs in Pss 106:1; 107:1, 118:1, 29; 136:1, and 100:4c–5a in slightly altered form while truncated forms include יוֹדוּ לַיהוָה חֶסֶדּוֹ in Ps 107:8, 15, 21, and 31, and כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֶסֶדּוֹ three times in Ps 118 (vv. 2, 3, and 4) and twenty-five times in Ps 136. Wilson in particular regards the הוֹדוּ psalms as key to Book V’s organization, and therefore editorially focal.

To summarize, חֶסֶד occurs numerous times in psalms with בְּרִית (e.g., Pss 25, 89, 103, and 106), some of which are highly important from an editorial point of view. It commonly pairs up with אָמֹנָה and אֱמֶת in formulaic ways that recall key texts like Exod 34:6 and Deut 7:9, and frequently occurs in the הוֹדוּ formula studied by Wilson, Hutchinson et al. and variations thereof. Altogether, formulaic uses of חֶסֶד account for over half of its one hundred and twenty nine instances.⁸⁷¹ This raises the possibility that editors routinely understood it as an attribute of Yahweh describing his grace toward the people to whom he had committed himself via his Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Davidic covenantal promises—even though not every psalm containing חֶסֶד spells this out. Indeed, it hardly stretches the imagination to suppose that Yahweh’s

⁸⁷⁰ James Hutchinson, “A New-Covenant Slogan in the Old Testament,” 100–121. The formula also occurs in 1 Chron 16:34, 41; 2 Chron 5:13; 7:3, 6; and 20:21. Hutchinson himself draws a comparison between his “new-covenant slogan” and the covenant formula, “I will be your God, you shall be my people” (Gen 17:7–8 etc.)

⁸⁷¹ Sixty-nine instances, (53%) by my count.

covenant relationship with his people/king undergirds the prayers, thanksgivings, laments etc. throughout the Psalter.

APPENDIX I

REFERENCES AND ALLUSIONS TO OFFERINGS

Beyond their general liturgical character, numerous psalms explicitly speak of offerings; a central reality of Mosaic covenantal life and significant given the common scholarly opinion that the Psalter's editors championed a temple theocracy over a failed or thoroughly democratized Davidic covenant (see Introduction).

Psalm 50 serves as a good point of departure for our survey also because of its numerous other references to sacrifice and its juxtaposition with Davidic Ps 51, whose final verses focus directly on this theme as well. In Chapter Three it was observed that Ps 50:5 connects “sacrifice” directly with God’s covenant when God addresses his **קִטְיִדִים**, “who made a covenant with me by sacrifice” (**בְּרִיתִי בְרִיתִי עָלֵי-זִבְחִי**). In vv. 14 and 23 **זִבְחֵי תוֹדָה** (“thanksgiving [offering]”) as its object, and in both places this “sacrifice of thanksgiving” results in “glorifying” God (cf. **כִּבְד** in vv. 15 and 23). In light of v. 13’s rhetorical question, “do I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats,” the question arises whether “offer to God a sacrifice of thanksgiving” (**זִבְחֵי לְאֱלֹהִים תוֹדָה**) in v. 14 means the thanksgiving sacrifice in Lev 7 and 22, or replaces offerings with purely vocal thanksgiving.⁸⁷² However, since the **תוֹדָה** was a fellowship

⁸⁷² See Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 27–29, for a summary of views on the meaning of vv. 18–19 in relation to the sacrificial system—whether these verses *reject* animal sacrifices *en toto*, make a relative value judgment about the merits of animal sacrifice vis-à-vis contrition, or recognize David’s sin as one that the sacrificial system did not cover. On any tradition-historical theory of the OT, editors living in the post-exilic period are certain to have known Leviticus 20:10 and its implications for David’s adultery with Bathsheba. Armed with this information they are likely to have read 51:18 as David’s acknowledgment that no sacrifices were available for his sin (cf. Geoffrey W. Grogan, *Psalms* [THOTC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008], 107). This suggests that vv. 18–19 do not reject

offering—the only kind of offering eaten by the *offerer*, Craigie seems right to suggest vv. 7–15 makes a different point: offerings are for people’s benefit rather than God’s. God does not eat “the flesh of bulls” but his people need to! Rather than contrast offerings with a purely vocal thanksgiving, then, vv. 14–15 envisage the proper covenant relationship between people and God wherein “thanksgiving could be expressed through the sacrificial cult.”⁸⁷³ In any case, v. 8 clearly states that the people’s sacrifices are not the reason for rebuke, thus maintaining an essentially positive view of offerings. Verse 8 also parallels the “your sacrifices” (זִבְחֵי־ךָ) and “burnt offerings” (עֹלֹתֶיךָ), thus using two important technical terms that together evoke the full range of offerings commanded by Moses. Significantly, this pair recurs in Ps 51:18 and 21 in which Yahweh “delights” or does “not delight” (חַפֵּץ). In v. 19 the Davidic penitent declares that “the sacrifices of God (זִבְחֵי אֱלֹהִים) are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart...,” anticipating that burnt offerings (עֹלָה) would be offered in Zion (vv. 20–21). Thus, these two psalms accentuate the God-pleasing use of sacrifice in conformity with the Mosaic covenant, even if scholars disagree about the nature of these psalms’ critique of sacrifices as noted earlier.

We explored the editorial significance of the juxtaposition of Pss 50–51 more fully in Chapter Five. Here we note the importance of the theme of sacrifice as we explore other instances of the same terminology and its coalescence around the personage of David elsewhere, especially תּוֹדָה.

sacrifices in principle (see Weiser, *The Psalms*, 409) or due to the abuse or insincere use of them (cf. Broyles, *Psalms*, 229; Kidner, *Psalms 1–72*, 211).

⁸⁷³ Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, 365–66. Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:116, also understands תּוֹדָה as a thanksgiving offering. Alternatively, Terrien, *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary*, 398, overlooks this concrete sense of v. 14 when he suggests that the implied object of sacrifice (זִבְחַ) is in some sense the worshipper’s “own being.”

“Thanksgiving Offering” (תִּוְדָה)

For a survey and discussion of תִּוְדָה in the Psalter, see Chapter Five where we discuss the probably association of the term with sacrificial offerings (i.e., not only vocal thanksgiving).⁸⁷⁴

“Give thanks” (יָדָה)

The preceding section indicates that editors would have understood תִּוְדָה to entail sacrifice. We may further ask whether editors understood the related verb יָדָה (“to give thanks, confess”) with similar connotations in view. A second reason to raise this possibility is its appearance in the formula, “Give thanks (הוֹדוּ) to Yahweh for he is good; for his steadfast love (חַסְדּוֹ) endures forever,” noted by Wilson as having particular significance in the editorial shaping of Books IV–V (Pss 106:1; 107:1; 118:1, 29; 136:1; cf. similar formulae in 107:28, 15, 21, 31; 136:2, 3, 26). Whether Wilson’s specific proposals are correct or not, the verb יָדָה clearly drew the editors’ attention. Moreover, Gunkel observes the sacrificial context of this formula in Jer 33:11,⁸⁷⁵ suggesting just such a connection between the formula and the sacrificial cult.⁸⁷⁶

Whether editors understood all the Psalter’s sixty-seven instances of יָדָה to presuppose a thanksgiving offering is hard to substantiate. However, a few psalms do suggest a cultic context, e.g., Pss 42–43; 54:8; and 100:4 noted above. Psalm 118’s fivefold use of יָדָה (vv. 1, 19, 21, 28, 29) likely entails a thanksgiving offering in view of v. 27b, which declares, “Bind the festal sacrifice with cords (אֶסְרוּ־חַג בְּעֵבְתַיִם), up to the horns of the altar!”⁸⁷⁷ If this is correct, Ps 118 offers further evidence to suggest that editors presupposed observance of thanksgiving sacrifices

⁸⁷⁴ See also Barber, *Singing in the Reign*, 76–78.

⁸⁷⁵ Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms*, 11.

⁸⁷⁶ Cf. Hutchinson, “A New-Covenant Slogan in the Old Testament,” 100–121.

⁸⁷⁷ Goldingay, *Psalms*, 3:364, prefers the Targum’s interpretation of חַג as “festal offering” over Jerome’s and LXX’s suggestion of interwoven branches used in the feast of Sukkot, arguing that חַג nowhere else means “festal procession” and that עֵבוֹת likely does not mean “branches.” Alternatively, Zenger (Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms* 3, 243) favors עֵבוֹת to “branches” and thinks that v. 27 denotes a “ring dance” around the altar with branches.

when utilizing psalms bearing the הודו formula. Perhaps we could include Pss 52:10–11; 122:1–4; 138:1–2, which in various ways disclose the temple as the location for praise/thanks-giving (ידה).⁸⁷⁸ But ידה is more often directly qualified by verbs or adverbs of a musical nature. This need not preclude a sacrificial context, but nor does it demonstrate one.

Indeed, a few editorially important psalms use ידה with other key terms that Ps 50:14–15 connect closely with הודו. First, in Davidic Ps 86:12 the psalmist declares, “I give thanks to you (אודה), Yahweh my God, with my whole heart, and I will glorify (אֶגְדֹּל) your name forever,” thus fulfilling the same two functions—thanks-giving and glorification—that God 50:14–15 command. Both Pss 50 and 86 show signs of special placement; the one an isolated Asaph psalm juxtaposed with Davidic psalms (Ps 51–72), and the other an isolated Davidic psalm inserted amid Korahite Pss 84–88. This suggests that editors were probably conscious of these similarities between 50:14–15 and 86:12. Second, Ps 105:1, “O give thanks to Yahweh; call upon (קרא) his name,” echoes the commands to “Offer...a sacrifice of thanks-giving...and call upon me (אֶקְרָאֵנִי)” in 50:14–15—even if the latter specifies the “on day of trouble.”⁸⁷⁹ This connection is substantiated in Ps 106:47, which concludes that psalm—and with it the Pss 105–106 pair—with the imperative, “save us (הושיענו)...that we may give thanks (להודות) to your holy name.” As an inclusio for this historical psalm pair, 105:1 and 106:47 effectively reiterate and follow the command in 50:14–15—a point that cannot have been lost on the editors responsible for placing

⁸⁷⁸ Psalms 35 and 75 hint at a possible cultic context for ידה. Psalm 35:18 locates praise/thanks-giving “in the great congregation” (אודה בקהל רב), and Ps 75:2 follows ידה with a causal clause: “for your name is near” (אֶקְרָא וְיָקָרְבֵנִי), which suggests a temple context (cf. Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 258). However LXX reads *καὶ ἐπικαλεσόμεθα τὸ ὄνομά σου*, which would amend the Hebrew to read אֶקְרָא בְשִׁמְךָ (cf. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 103). On the other hand, while Ps 92:2–3 locate the thanks-giving in the morning (בבוקר) and at night (בַּלַּיְלֹת), Goldingay, *Psalms*, 3:54, rejects a reference to the morning and evening sacrifices (normally referred to via the term עֶרְבַּיִל), explaining v. 3 as a merism meaning “all the time.” Cf. Dahood, *Psalms*, 2:336, who translates the pl. בַּלַּיְלֹת as “watches of the night.”

⁸⁷⁹ Psalm 75:2 also combines ידה and קרא if the LXX is correct (see previous note).

them at the end of Book IV. It matters little whether they or earlier editors were responsible for Ps 50's placement. In both cases, the similarities that Pss 86 and 105 share with Ps 50 suggest the possibility that—for the editors at least—'דה entails the thanksgiving offering like in Ps 50. Third, Ps 116:17 refers to the thanksgiving offering, reflecting the language of Ps 50 as noted in Chapter Five. Finally, we may note that, besides its use in various formulae in Book V, twenty-seven of 'דה's sixty-seven instance (or 40%) occur in that book.

“Sacrifice” (זבח), “Burnt Offering” (עולה), “Gift (Offering)” (מנחה), “Sin Offering” (חטאה)

Psalms 20 and 40 allude to the sacrificial system as a whole by combining two or more technical terms for sacrifices: Pss 40:7 lists זבח, מנחה, עולה, and חטאה,⁸⁸⁰ and 20:4 combines מנחה and עולה. Other uses of זבח in a “positive” sense include Ps 4:6, “Offer right sacrifices (זבחו זבחי צדק), and put your trust in Yahweh;” and Ps 27:6, “And now my head shall be lifted up above my enemies all around me, and I will offer in his tent sacrifices with shouts of joy (ואזבחה באהל זבחי תרועה); I will sing and make melody to Yahweh.” The remaining uses of זבח are negative and not allusions to sacrificial worship.⁸⁸¹ Psalm 66:13–15 uses עולה in another clear reference to sacrificial worship, “I will come into your house with burnt offerings (אבוא בעולות); I will perform my vows to you... I will offer to you burnt offerings of fattened animals (עלות מחים), with the smoke of the sacrifice of rams (עם־קטרת אילים); I will make an offering of bulls and goats.” “Smoke” or “incense” (קטרת)—a term that occurs only in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers—otherwise only occurs in Ps 141:2 in a clear reference to daily services. The Davidic psalmist likens his prayer to the incense that rises before Yahweh (תבון תפלתִי), and “the lifting up of my hands” to “the evening sacrifice” (מנחת־ערב). מנחה is another relatively rare term in the Psalter. Apart from Pss 20:4, 40:7, and 141:2, מנחה occurs in

⁸⁸⁰ חטאה occurs in Ps 32:1 and 109:7, but context suggests that it means “sin” rather than “sin offering.”

⁸⁸¹ זבח occurs three times in Ps 106 in reference to child sacrifice (vv. 37–38) and “sacrifices offered to the dead” (v. 28), while זבח is a proper name in Ps 83:12.

a clear—if universalized—worship context in Ps 96:8, “Ascribe to Yahweh the glory due his name; bring an offering (שְׁאוֹר־מִנְחָה), and come into his courts! Worship Yahweh in the splendor of holiness; tremble before him all the earth!” Notably, all of the above psalms are Davidic except for Ps 96. Elsewhere מִנְחָה refers to royal tribute rather than sacrificial offering (Pss 45:13 and 72:10).

“Arrange” (עָרַךְ)

Beyond the technical terms surveyed above, Ps 5:4 alludes to the morning sacrifices via the verb עָרַךְ, whose basic meaning is “to lay out” or “set in rows.”⁸⁸² “in the morning I prepare [a sacrifice] for you” (בִּקְרֹר אֶעְרֹךְ-לְךָ). The psalmist’s declaration that “I...will enter your house. I will bow down toward your holy temple” (אָבוֹא בֵיתְךָ אֲשַׁתְּחֶנָּה אֶל־הַיְכָל־קֹדֶשְׁךָ) in v. 8 confirms the reference to sacrifice in v. 4. עָרַךְ occurs a further six times in the Psalter: Pss 23:5; 40:6; 50:21; 78:19; 89:7, and 132:17, but of these only Ps 23:5 and 132:7 allow themselves to be understood in relation to sacrifice. For example, despite its proximity to the four sacrificial terms in Ps 40:7, עָרַךְ is a term of comparison in v. 6: “none can *compare* with you” (אֵין עֲרֹךְ).⁸⁸³ On the other hand, in Pss 23:5 and 78:19 עָרַךְ takes “table” (שֻׁלְחָן) as its object. In Ps 78:19 context shows that “spread a table” (לְעָרֹךְ שֻׁלְחָן) refers to God’s provision of manna in the desert (cf. Exod 16). Psalm 23:5 is a different story, however. Since עָרַךְ occurs with שֻׁלְחָן in Exod 40:4 (as does its cognate מְעַרְכֶת in Lev 24:6), “You prepare a table before me” (תַּעֲרֹךְ לְפָנַי שֻׁלְחָן) in Ps 23:5 conceivably alludes to the bread of the presence or to the fellowship offering, especially since the psalmist declares in v. 6, “I shall dwell in the house of Yahweh” (וְשָׁבְתִי בְּבַיִת־יְהוָה).⁸⁸⁴ Concerning Yahweh’s “dwelling place” (cf. מוֹשָׁב in v. 13) and “resting

⁸⁸² Cf. “עָרַךְ,” HALOT 884; “עָרַךְ,” BDB 789, has “to arrange.” Both lexicons recognize the military connotations of the verb.

⁸⁸³ Psalms 50:21 and 89:7 appear to use עָרַךְ in a similar sense.

⁸⁸⁴ Terrien, *Psalms*, 241–42, notes that commentators usually recognize in v. 5 a shift from shepherd imagery to the imagery of hospitality. Terrien himself sees the shepherd imagery maintained to the end of the psalm and a

place” (cf. מְנוֹחָתִי in v. 14) in Zion, Ps 132:17 says, “There I will make a horn to sprout for David; I have prepared a lamp for my anointed (עֲרֵכְתִי נֵר לְמְשִׁיחִי).” In view of the instruction in Lev 24:4 to “arrange the lamps” (אֶת־הַנְּרוֹת יַעֲרֹךְ; cf. Exod 40:4b), “lamp” (נֵר) in Ps 132:17 would almost certainly evoke the temple furnishings to editors familiar with them.⁸⁸⁵ While not arrangement of sacrifices *per se*, עֲרַךְ has clear associations with the temple, and shows once again how intertwined are royal and cultic motifs are in Ps 132. Again, the surer examples above (Pss 5, 23, and 132) are all attributed to or about David.

Summary

The terms זֶבַח, תּוֹדָה, עוֹלָה, מִנְחָה, מְטָאָה appear to entail the sacrificial cult in Pss 4, 20, 26, 27, 40, 42–43, 50, 51, 54, 56, 66, 95, 96, 100, 107, 116, 118, and 141. Psalms 69, 95 and 147 plausibly belong here as well, as do Pss 86:12 and 105:1/106:47 since editors likely recognized a connection with Ps 50. Moreover, the resemblance between Pss 50, 86, 105–106, and 116 noted above suggest an avenue for investigating editorial perspective on covenant relationships, particular in light of Ps 86’s Davidic attribution. In Ps 5—and probably Ps 23—עֲרַךְ refers to the arranging of sacrifice, while in Ps 132:17 its associations with the temple furnishings are clear in any case. Altogether, numerous psalms scattered throughout the Psalter refer to offerings commanded by Moses. Of the above listed psalms, twelve are Davidic or “Davidized,” one is attributed to Asaph (50) and two to the Korahites (42–43), and the remaining ten are anonymous (including Ps 118). While none of the sacrifices are rejected outright, the Psalter seems to favor

cultic dimension becoming explicit in v. 6’s focus on the “house of Yahweh.” Cf. Grogan, *Psalms*, 75, who speculates along these lines. Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1:352, finds the suggestion that Ps 23:5’s background is “an actual temple thanksgiving meal” to be “prosaic,” and views “the suppliant as a member of God’s quasi-royal household.” Arguably, this was how peace offerings were viewed in light of Israel’s royal status in texts such as Exod 19:6.

⁸⁸⁵ Cf. Goldingay, *Psalms* 3:557–58, who also references Lev 24:3–4. Goldingay interprets 132:7 to mean that “David is the candelabra and his successors are the individual lights that burn from him.”

the thanksgiving sacrifice, as seems to be reflected in the concentration of תת at the end of the Psalter where David emerges as the leader of praise (cf. Ps 145, esp. v. 10; see Chapter Two).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, Susan. "The Personal is Political: Covenantal and Affectionate Love ('*āhēb*, '*ahābā*) in the Hebrew Bible." *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002): 437–58.
- Allen, Leslie. C. *Psalms 101–150*. Word Biblical Commentary 21. Nashville: Nelson, 2002.
- Allison, Dale C. Jr. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock, 1993.
- Anderson, R. Dean Jr. "The Division and Order of the Psalms." *Westminster Theological Journal* 56 (1994): 219–41.
- Augustine. *Expositions on the Book of Psalms*. In vol. 8 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1. Edited by Philip Schaff. 1886–1889. 14 vols. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Auffret, Pierre. *Merveilles à nos yeux: Étude structurelle de vingt psaumes dont celui de 1 Ch 16,8–36*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 235. Berlin, N.Y.: de Gruyter, 1995.
- . "'Allez, Fils, Entendez-Moi!' Etude Structurelle Du Psaume 34 et son Rapport au Psaume 33." *Eglise et Theologie* 19 (1988): 5–31.
- Auwers, Jean-Marie. *La Composition littéraire du Psautier: Un état de la question*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 2000.
- Barbiero, Gianni. "The Risks of a Fragmented Reading of the Psalms: Psalm 72 as a Case in Point." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 119 (2007): 67–91.
- Barber, Michael. *Singing in the Reign: The Psalms and the Liturgy of God's Kingdom*. Steubenville, Ohio: Emmaus Road, 2001.
- Barth, Christoph. "Concatenatio im ersten Buch des Psalters." Pages 30–40 in *Wort und Wirklichkeit: Studien zur Afrikanistik und Orientalistik 1: Eugen Ludwig Rapp zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Brigitta Benzing, Otto Böcher, and Günter Mayer. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1976.
- Beckwith, Roger T. "The Early History of the Psalter." *Tyndale Bulletin* 46 (1995): 1–27.
- Berlin, Adele. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Borger, J. "Moses in the Fourth Book of the Psalter." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002.
- Bos, Johanna W. H. "Psalms and Sinai Covenant." Ph.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1977.

- Bridge, Edward J. "Loyalty, Dependency and Status with YHWH: The Use of 'bd in the Psalms." *Vetus Testamentum* 59 (2009): 360–78.
- Britt, Brian. "Unexpected Attachments: A Literary Approach to the Term טֹדָה in the Hebrew Bible." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27 (2003): 289–307.
- Broyles, Craig C. *Psalms*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "Bounded by Obedience and Praise: The Psalms as Canon." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 50 (1991): 63–92.
- Brueggemann, Walter and Patrick D. Miller. "Psalm 73 as a Canonical Marker." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 72 (1996): 45–56.
- Brunet, A. M. "La théologie du Chroniste: Théocratie et Messianisme." Pages 384–97 in *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica*. Edited by J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and E. Massaux. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 12–13. Gembloux, Belgium: Duculot, 1959.
- Bullock, C. H. *Encountering the Book of Psalms: A Literary and Theological Introduction*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2001.
- Burnett, Joel S. "Forty-Two Songs for Elohim: An Ancient Near Eastern Organizing Principle in the Shaping of the Elohist Psalter." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (2006): 81–101.
- Buss, Martin J. "The Psalms of Asaph and Korah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82 (1963): 382–92.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- . *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- . "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 16 (1971): 137–50.
- Clark, Gordon R. "Chesed—A Study of a Lexical Field." *Abr-Nahrain* 30 (1992): 34–54.
- Clements, Roland E. *Abraham and David: Genesis XV and Its Meaning for Israelite Tradition*. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1967.
- Cole, Robert L. *Psalms 1 and 2: Gateway to the Psalter*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012.
- . "An Integrated Reading of Psalms 1 and 2." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 98 (2002): 75–88.

- . *The Shape and Message of Book III (Psalms 73–89)*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Craigie, Peter. *Psalms 1–50*. Word Biblical Commentary 19. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1983.
- Creach, Jerome F. D. *The Destiny of the Righteous in the Psalms*. St. Louis: Chalice, 2008.
- . “Like a Tree Planted by the Temple Stream: The Portrait of the Righteous in Psalm 1:3.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61 (1999): 34–46.
- . “The Psalms and the Cult.” Pages 119–37 in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David Firth and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- . “The Mortality of the King in Psalm 89 and Israel’s Postexilic Identity.” Pages 237–49 in *Constituting Israel: Studies in the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride Jr.* Edited by John T. Strong and Steven S. Tuell. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- . “The Shape of Book Four of the Psalter and the Shape of Second Isaiah.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 80 (1998): 63–76.
- . *Yahweh as Refuge and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplementary Series 217. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Croft, Steven J. L. *The Identity of the Individual in the Psalms*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 44. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987.
- Dahmen, Ulrich. *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs^a aus Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 47. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms*. 3 vols. Anchor Bible 16–17A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965–1970.
- Day, John. *Psalms*. Old Testament Guides. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990.
- deClassé-Walford, Nancy L. “The Canonical Approach to Scripture and *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*.” Pages 1–12 in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship*. Edited by Nancy L. deClassé-Walford. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- . “The Canonical Shape of the Psalms.” Pages 93–110 in *An Introduction to Wisdom Literature and the Psalms: Festschrift Marvin E. Tate*. Edited by H. Wayne Ballard and W. Dennis Tucker Jr. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- . *Introduction to the Psalms: A Song from Ancient Israel*. St. Louis: Chalice, 2004.
- . *Reading from the Beginning: The Shaping of the Hebrew Psalter*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1997.

- . “Reading Backwards from the Beginning: My Life with the Psalter.” *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 41 (2006): 119–30.
- Delitzsch, Franz. *Biblical Commentary on the Psalms*. Translated from the 2d German ed. by Francis Bolton. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1871.
- Dentan, R. C. “The Literary Affinities of Exodus XXXIV 6f.” *Vetus Testamentum* 13 (1963): 34–51.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. “Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Yahweh’s Gracious and Compassionate Character.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 207–23.
- Eaton, John H. *Kingship and the Psalms*. London: Student Christian Movement, 1976.
- Edwards, Timothy M. “The Targum of Psalms.” Pages 279–94 in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David Firth and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- . “The Old, the New and the Rewritten: The Interpretation of the Biblical Psalms in the Targum of Psalms, in Relationship to Other Exegetical Traditions, Both Jewish and Christian.” Ph.D. diss., Oxford University, 2003.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. “The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55:1–5.” Pages 196–207 in *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Edited by B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson. New York: Harper, 1962.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. “Der Psalter in Qumran.” Pages 137–63 in *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1998.
- Firth, David G. “Speech Acts and Covenant in 2 Samuel 7:1–17.” Pages 79–99 in *The God of Covenant: Biblical, Theological and Contemporary Perspectives*. Edited by Jamie A. Grant and Alistair I. Wilson. Leicester: Apollos, 2005.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- Flint, Peter W. “The Contribution of Gerald Wilson toward Understanding the Book of Psalms in Light of the Psalms Scrolls.” Pages 209–30 in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship*. Edited by Nancy L. deClassé-Walford. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- . “Variant Readings of the Dead Sea Scrolls against the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint Psalter.” Pages 337–65 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- . “The Book of Psalms in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *Vetus Testamentum* 48 (1998): 453–72.

- . *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. Studies on the Texts of the Deserts of Judah 17. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “The Psalms Scrolls from the Judean Desert: Relationships and Textual Affiliations.” Pages 31–52 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings from the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Flint, Peter W. and Patrick D. Miller, eds. *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 99. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Freedman, David Noel. “The Chronicler’s purpose.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23 (1961): 436–42.
- . “God Compassionate and Merciful.” *Western Watch* 6 (1955): 6–24.
- Gelston, Anthony. “Editorial Arrangement in Book IV of the Psalter.” Pages 165–76 in *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms: A Festschrift to Honour Professor John Emerton for His Eightieth Birthday*. Edited by Katharine J. Dell, Graham Davies, and Yee Von Koh. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 135. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Gerstenberger, Erhard S. *Psalms: Part 1 with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 14. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . *Psalms, Part 2, and Lamentations*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 15. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1988.
- . “Covenant and Commandment.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (1965): 38–51.
- Gese, Harmut. “Die Entstehung der Büchereinteilung des Psalters.” Pages 159–67 in *Vom Sinai zum Zion: Alttestamentliche Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 64. München: Kaiser, 1974.
- Gillingham, Susan. *A Journey of Two Psalms: The Reception History of Psalms 1 & 2 in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- . “The Messiah in the Psalms: A Question of Reception History and the Psalter.” Pages 187–208 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- . “The Zion Tradition and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter.” Pages 308–41 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- . “The Levitical Singers and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter.” Pages 91–123 in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 238. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010.
- Goldingay, John. *Psalms*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2006–2008.

- . *The Message of Isaiah 40–55: A Literary-Theological Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. “The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a): A Problem of Canon and Text.” *Textus* 5 (1966): 22–33.
- Gosse, Bernard. “Abraham and David.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 34 (2009): 25–31.
- Grant, Jamie A. “Royal Court.” Pages 668–72 in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry & Writings* Edited by Tremper Longman III and Peter Enns. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2008.
- . “The Psalms and the King.” Pages 101–18 in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David Firth and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- . *The King as Exemplar: The Function of Deuteronomy’s Kingship Law in the Shaping of the Book of Psalms*. Atlanta: SBL, 2004.
- . “Wisdom and Covenant: Revisiting Zimmerli.” *European Journal of Theology* 12 (2003): 103–13.
- Gregory, Bradley C. “The Legal Background of the Metaphor for Forgiveness in Psalm CIII 12.” *Vetus Testamentum* 56 (2006): 549–51.
- Grisanti, Michael. “The Davidic Covenant.” *Master’s Seminary Journal* 10 (1999): 233–50.
- Groenewald, Alphonso. “Exodus, Psalms and Hebrews: A God Abounding in Steadfast Love (Ex 34:6).” *Hervormde teologiese studies* 64 (2008): 1365–78.
- Grogan, Geoffrey W. *Psalms*. Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Grol, Harm van. “David and His *Chasidim*: Place and Function of Psalms 138–145.” Pages 309–37 in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 238. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *An Introduction to the Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*. Translated by James D. Nogalski. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Habel, Norman. “The Symbolism of Wisdom in Proverbs 1–9.” *Interpretation* 26 (1972): 131–57.
- Haran, M. “11QPs^a and the Canonical Book of Psalms.” Pages 193–201 in *Minhah le-Nahum*. Edited by M. Brettler and Michael Fishbane. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 154. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

- Heim, Knut. "The (God-)Forsaken King of Psalm 89: A Historical and Intertextual Enquiry." Pages 296–322 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar. "Bund und Tora in den Psalmen." Pages 66–77 in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition: Festschrift für J. Maier*. Edited by H. Merklein. Bonner biblische Beiträge 88. Frankfurt: Anton Hain, 1993.
- . "Bundestheologie im Psalter." Pages 169–76 in *Der neue Bund im Alten: Studien zur Bundestheologie der beiden Testamente*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1992.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger. *Psalms 3: A Commentary on Psalms 101–150*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011. Translation of *Psalmen 101–150*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 2008.
- . "The So-Called Elohist Psalter: A New Solution for an Old Problem." Pages 35–51 in *A God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller*. Edited by Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- . *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51–100*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005. Translation of *Psalmen 51–100*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 2000.
- . "'Von Seinem Thron sitz schaut er nieder auf alle Bewohner der Erde' (Ps 33, 14): Redaktionsgeschichte und Kompositionskritik der Psalmengruppe 25–34." Pages 375–88 in *'Wer ist wie du, Herr, unter den Göttern?'* *Studien zur Theologie und Religionsgeschichte für Otto Kaiser zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Ingo et al. Koltspierper. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
- . "'Wer darf hinaufziehen zum Berg JHWHs?' Zur Redaktionsgeschichte und Theologie der Psalmengruppe 15–24." Pages 166–82 in *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel: für Norbert Lohfink SJ*. Edited by Georg Braulik, Walter Groß, and Sean McEvenue. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1993.
- Houston, Walter. "The King's Preferential Option for the Poor: Rhetoric, Ideology, and Ethics in Psalm 72." *Biblical Interpretation* 7 (1999): 341–67.
- . "David, Asaph and the Mighty Works of God: Theme and Genre in the Psalm Collections." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 68 (1995): 93–111.
- Howard, David M. Jr. "The Psalms and Current Study." Pages 23–40 in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David Firth and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.

- . “Recent Trends in Psalms Study.” Pages 329–68 in *The Face of Old Testament Studies*. Edited by David W. Baker and Bill T. Arnold. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1999.
- . *The Structure of Psalms 93–100*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- . “Editorial Activity in the Psalter: A State-of-the-Field Survey.” *Word and World* 9 (1989): 274–85.
- Human, D. J. “An Ideal for Leadership—Psalm 72: The (Wise) King—Royal Mediation of God’s Universal Reign.” *Verbum Ecclesia JRG* 23 (2002): 658–77.
- Hutchinson, James Hely. “The Psalms and Praise.” Pages 85–100 in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David Firth and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- . “A New-Covenant Slogan in the Old Testament.” Pages 100–121 in *The God of Covenant: Biblical Theological and Contemporary Perspectives*. Edited by Jamie A. Grant and Alistair I. Wilson. Leicester: Apollos, 2005.
- Joffe, Laura. “The Answer to the Meaning of Life, Universe and the Elohist Psalter.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27 (2002): 223–35.
- . “The Elohist Psalter: What, How and Why?” *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 15 (2001): 142–66.
- Jones, Christine D. B. “The Psalms of Asaph: A Study of the Function of a Psalm Collection.” Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 2009.
- Jones, G. H. “The Decree of Yahweh (Ps II 7).” *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965): 336–44.
- Kalluveettil, Paul. *Declaration and Covenant: A Comprehensive Review of Covenant Formula from the Old Testament and Ancient Near East*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1982.
- Kidner, Derek. *Psalms 73–150: A Commentary on Books III–V of the Psalms*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1975.
- . *Psalms 1–72: A Commentary on Books I–II of the Psalms*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1973.
- Kim, Hee Suk. “Exodus 34: 6 in Psalms 86, 103, and 145 in Relation to the Theological Perspectives of Books III, IV, and V of the Psalter.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. San Francisco, Calif., November 20, 2011.
- Kim, Jungwoo. “Psalm 89: Its Biblical-Theological Contribution to the Presence of Law within the Unconditional Covenant.” Ph.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1989.
- Kimelman, Reuven. “Psalm 145: Theme, Structure, and Impact.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 37–58.

- Knauf, Ernst Axel. "Psalm LX und Psalm CVIII." *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000): 55–65.
- Koch, Klaus. "Der Psalter und seine Redaktionsgeschichte." Pages 243–77 in *Neue Wege der Psalmenforschung*. Edited by Klaus Seybold and Erich Zenger. Herders biblische Studien 1. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1994.
- Koh, Yee Von. "G. H. Wilson's Theories on the Organization of the Masoretic Psalter." Pages 177–92 in *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms: A Festschrift to Honour Professor John Emerton for His Eightieth Birthday*. Edited by Katharine J. Dell, Graham Davies, and Yee Von Koh. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 135. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Kratz, Reinhard Gregor. "Die Tora Davids: Psalm 1 und die doxologische Fünfteilung des Psalters." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 93 (1996): 1–34.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 1–59: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . *Psalms 60–150: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . *Theology of the Psalms*. Translated by Keith Crim. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.
- . *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1965.
- Kruse, Heinz. "David's Covenant." *Vetus Testamentum* 35 (1985): 139–64.
- Kselman, John S. "Psalm 101: Royal Confession and Divine Oracle." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 33 (1985): 45–62.
- Kugel, James. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Lane II, Nathan C. "Exodus 34:6–7: A Canonical Analysis." Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 2007.
- Laney, J. Carl. "God's Self-Revelation in Exodus 34:6–8." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158 (2001): 36–51.
- Lenzi, Alan C. "The Metonic Cycle, Number Symbolism, and the Placement of Psalms 19 and 119 in the MT Psalter." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 34 (2010): 447–73.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai & Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. New York, N.Y.: HarperCollins, 1985.
- . "The Davidic Covenant and Its Modern Interpreters." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 205–19.

- Levin, Christoph. "Die Entstehung der Büchereinteilung des Psalters." *Vetus Testamentum* 54 (2004): 83–90.
- . "Psalm 136 als Zeitweilige Schlussdoxologie des Psalters." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 14 (2001): 17–27.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "The Covenant Formula in Psalm 33." Pages 85–122 in *The God of Israel and the Nations: Studies in Isaiah and the Psalms*. Edited by Norbert L. Lohfink and Erich Zenger. Translated by Everett R. Kalin. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- . "Covenant and Torah in the Pilgrimage of the Nations." Pages 33–84 in *The God of Israel and the Nations: Studies in Isaiah and the Psalms*. Edited by Norbert Lohfink and Erich Zenger. Translated by Everett R. Kalin. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- . "The Concept of 'Covenant' in Biblical Theology." Pages 11–31 in *The God of Israel and the Nations: Studies in Isaiah and the Psalms*. Edited by Norbert Lohfink and Erich Zenger. Translated by Everett R. Kalin. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Longman III, Tremper. "The Psalms and Ancient Near Eastern Prayer Genres." Pages 41–59 in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David Firth and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- Longman III, Tremper and Peter Enns, eds. *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry & Writings*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2008.
- Maloney, Les D. "Intertextual Links: Part of the Poetic Artistry within the Book I Acrostic Psalms." *Restoration Quarterly* 49 (2007): 11–21.
- Martilla, Marko. *Collective Reinterpretation in the Psalms: A Study of the Redaction History of the Psalter*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe 13. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).
- Mays, James L. *The Lord Reigns: A Theological Handbook to the Psalms*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- . "Past, Present, and Prospect in Psalm Study." Pages 147–56 in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present, and Future*. Edited by James L. Mays, D. L. Petersen, and K. H. Richards. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.
- . *Psalms*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox, 1994.
- . "The Place of the Torah-Psalms in the Psalter." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 3–12.
- McCann, J. Clinton Jr. "The Shape of Book I of the Psalter and the Shape of Human Happiness." Pages 340–48 in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

- . *The Book of Psalms*. The New Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- . *A Theological Introduction to the Book of Psalms: The Psalms as Torah*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.
- . "Books I–III and the Editorial Purpose of the Hebrew Psalter." Pages 93–107 in *Shape and Shaping of the Psalter*. Edited by J. Clinton McCann Jr. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "Covenant in the Old Testament: The Present State of Inquiry." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 27 (1965): 217–40.
- McFall, Leslie. "The Evidence for a Logical Arrangement of the Psalter." *Westminster Theological Journal* 62 (2000): 223–56.
- McKelvey, Michael G. *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh: A Canonical Study of Book IV of the Psalter*. Gorgias Dissertations in Biblical Studies 55. Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias, 2010.
- Mendenhall, George E. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955.
- . "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition." *Biblical Archaeologist* 17 (1954): 50–76.
- Michel-Mainz, Andreas. "Ist mit der 'Gnadenformel' von Ex 34,6 (+??) der Schlüssel zu einer Theologie des Alten Testaments gefunden?" *Biblische Notizen* 118 (2003): 110–23.
- Millard, Matthias. *Die Komposition des Psalters: Ein formgeschichtlicher Ansatz*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Miller, Patrick D. "The Beginning of the Psalter." Pages 83–92 in *Shape and Shaping of the Psalter*. Edited by J. Clinton McCann Jr. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- . "Kingship, Torah Obedience and Prayer: The Theology of Psalms 15–24." Pages 279–97 in *Israelite Religion and Biblical Theology: Collected Essays*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 267. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- . "The End of the Psalter: A Response to Erich Zenger." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 80 (1998): 103–10.
- Mitchell, David C. *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplementary Series 252. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- . "Lord, Remember David: G. H. Wilson and the Message of the Psalter." *Vetus Testamentum* 56 (2006): 526–48.

- . “God Will Redeem My Soul from Sheol: The Psalms of the Sons of Korah.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 30 (2006): 365–84.
- Moberly, R. W. L. *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32–34*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 22. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- Moran, William L. “The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 25 (1963): 77–87.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. 2 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.
- Murphy, Roland E. *The Tree of Life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature*. 3d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002.
- . *A Study of Psalm 72 (71)*. The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology (Second Series) 12. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.
- Murphy, S. Jonathan. “Is the Psalter a Book with a Single Message?” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165 (2008): 283–93.
- Nasuti, Harry P. “The Editing of the Psalter and the Ongoing Use of the Psalms: Gerald Wilson and the Question of Canon.” Pages 13–19 in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship*. Edited by Nancy L. deClaisé-Walford. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- Newsome, James. “Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purposes.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 25–44.
- Ndoga, Sampson S. “Revisiting the Theocratic Agenda of Book 4 of the Psalter for Interpretive Premise.” Pages 147–159 in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship*. Edited by Nancy L. deClassé-Walford. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- Nogalski, James D. “From Psalm to Psalms to Psalter.” Pages 37–54 in *An Introduction to Wisdom Literature and the Psalms: Festschrift Marvin E. Tate*. Edited by H. Wayne Ballard and W. Dennis Tucker Jr. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- Noonan, Benjamin. “Abraham, Blessing, and the Nations: A Reexamination of the Niphal and Hitpaal of בָּרַךְ in the Patriarchal Narratives.” *Hebrew Studies* 51 (2010): 73–93.
- Pang, Philip K. “Exodus 34:6–7 and Its Intertextuality in the Old Testament.” Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2002.
- Parker, N. H. “Psalm 103: God Is Love. He Will Have Mercy and Abundantly Pardon.” *Canadian Journal of Theology* 1 (1955): 191–96.

- Petter, Donna L. "Exodus 34:6–7: The Function and Meaning of the Declaration." Ph.D. diss., Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, 1997.
- Pietersma, Albert. "The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter." Pages 12–32 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Pigott, Susan. "God of Compassion and Mercy: An Analysis of the Background, Use and Theological Significance of Exodus 34:6–7." Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995.
- Polaski, Donald C. "Reflections on a Mosaic Covenant: The Eternal Covenant (Isaiah 24.5) and Intertextuality." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 77 (1998): 55–73.
- Polzin, Robert. "'HWQY' and Covenantal Institutions in Early Israel." *Harvard Theological Review* 62 (1969): 227–40.
- Raabe, Paul R. *Psalm Structures: A Study of Psalms with Refrains*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 104. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Renaud, Bernard. "Le Psautier sous le signe du jugement." Pages 225–42 in *Le Jugement dans l'un et l'autre Testament*. Edited by Eberhard Bons. Lectio Divina 197. Paris: Cerf, 2004.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation*. Translated by M. Kohl. Old Testament Studies. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Romerowski, Sylvain. "Que signifie le mot *hesed*?" *Vetus Testamentum* 40 (1990): 89–103.
- Rose, Martin. "Psaumes." Pages 562–78 in *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*. Edited by Thomas Römer, Jean-Daniel Macchi, and Christophe Nihan. Le Monde de la Bible 49. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2004.
- Rösel, Christoph. *Die messianische Redaktion des Psalters: Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie der Sammlung 2–89*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1999.
- Sakenberg, Katherine Doob. *The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible: A New Enquiry*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 17. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Sanders, James A. "Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon," *McCormick Quarterly* 21 (1968): 284–298.
- . "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Quarter Century of Study." *Biblical Archaeologist* 36 (1973): 110–45.
- . "Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a)." *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966): 83–94.

- . *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a)*. Discoveries in the Judean Desert 4. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.
- Sanders, Paul. “Five Books of Psalms?” Pages 677–87 in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 238. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010.
- Sarna, N. “Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis.” Pages 29–46 in *Biblical and Other Studies*. Edited by Alexander Altman. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Saur, Markus. “Die theologische Funktion der Königpsalmen innerhalb der Komposition des Psalters.” Pages 689–99 in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 238. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010.
- Schaper, Joachim. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 76. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Seybold, Klaus. *Introducing the Psalms*. Translated by R. Graeme Dunphy. Edinburgh; T&T Clark, 1990.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament*. New York: de Gruyter, 1980.
- Skehan, Patrick. “A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs^a.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35 (1973): 202–5.
- . “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism.” Pages 163–82 in *Qumran: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 46. Gembloux, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1978.
- Smith, Mark S. “The Theology of the Redaction of the Psalter: Some Observations.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 104 (1992): 408–12.
- Sohn, Soeck-Tae. “‘I Will Be Your God and You Will Be My People:’ The Origin and Background of the Covenant Formula.” Pages 443–65 in *Ki Baruch Hu: Essays in Honor of Baruch A. Levine*. Edited by R. Chazan, W.W. Hallo, and L.H. Schiffman. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Steinmann, Andrew E. *The Oracles of God: The Old Testament Canon*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1999.
- Swanson, Dwight D. “Qumran and the Psalms.” Pages 247–61 in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David Firth and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. “Pisqah Be’emsa‘ Pasuq and 11QPs^a.” *Textus* 5 (1965): 11–21.

- Tate, Marvin. *Psalms 51–100*. Word Biblical Commentary 20. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1990.
- Tatu, Silviu. “The Book of Psalms: A Survey of Modern Approaches.” *Studia Theologica* 5 (2007): 124–32.
- Terrien, Samuel. *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary*. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . Review of Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary*, *Journal of Bible and Religion* 4 (1963) 334–36.
- The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 1885–1887. 10 vols. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Tov, Emmanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- . “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran.” *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1995): 581–600.
- Tucker, W. Dennis Jr. “The Role of the Foe in Book 5: Reflections on the Final Composition of the Psalter.” Pages 179–91 in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship*. Edited by Nancy L. deClassé-Walford. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- . “Democratization and the Language of the Poor in Psalms 2–89.” *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 25 (2003): 161–78.
- . “Empires and Enemies in Book V of the Psalter.” Pages 723–31 in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 238. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010.
- Vanderzee-Pals, Mary. “God’s Moral Essence: Exodus 34:6–7a and Its Echoes in the Old Testament.” PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 1996.
- Vangemeren, Willem A. *Psalms*. The Expositors Bible Commentary 5. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2008.
- Van Leeuwen, R. *The Book of Proverbs: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
- Vincent, Marvin A. “The Shape of the Psalter: An Eschatological Dimension?” Pages 61–82 in *New Heaven and New Earth—Prophecy and the Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*. Edited by P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Viviers, Hendrik. “The Coherence of the Ma’alôt Psalms (Pss 120–134).” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 106 (1994): 275–89.
- Wallace, Howard N. *Psalms*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.

- . “King and Community: Joining with David in Prayer.” Pages 267–77 in *Psalms and Prayers*. Edited by Bob Becking and Eric Peels. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Wallace, Robert E. “Gerald Wilson and the Characterization of David in Book 5 of the Psalter.” Pages 193–207 in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship*. Edited by Nancy L. deClassé-Walford. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- . *The Narrative Effect of Book IV of the Hebrew Psalter*. Studies in Biblical Literature 112. New York: Lang, 2007.
- Walton, J. H. “Psalms: A Cantata about the Davidic Covenant.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 34 (1991): 21–31.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. “The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 184–203.
- Weiser, Artur. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. Translated by H. Hartwell. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- Whybray, Norman. *Reading the Psalms as a Book*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Williams, Ronald J. *Williams Hebrew Syntax*. Rev. and enl. ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- Williams, Tyler F. “Towards a Date for the Old Greek Psalter.” Pages 248–76 in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Willis, Timothy M. “‘So Great is His Steadfast Love.’ A Rhetorical Analysis of Psalm 103.” *Biblica* 72 (1991): 525–37.
- Wilson, Gerald H. “The Structure of the Psalter.” Pages 229–46 in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David Firth and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- . “King, Messiah, and the Reign of God: Revisiting the Royal Psalms and the Shape of the Psalter.” Pages 391–406 in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . “Psalms and Psalter: Paradigm for Biblical Theology.” Pages 100–110 in *Biblical Theology: Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Scott J. Hafemann. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- . “A First Century C.E. Date for the Closing of the Hebrew Psalter?” *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 28 (2000): 102–10.
- . “The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPsa) and the Canonical Psalter: Comparison of Editorial Shaping.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59 (1997): 448–64.

- . “Understanding the Purposeful Arrangement of Psalms in the Psalter: Pitfalls and Promise.” Pages 42–51 in *Shape and Shaping of the Psalter*. Edited by J. Clinton McCann Jr. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- . “Shaping the Psalter: A Consideration of Editorial Linkage in the Book of Psalms.” Pages 72–82 in *Shape and Shaping of the Psalter*. Edited by J. Clinton McCann Jr. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- . “The Shape of the Book of Psalms.” *Interpretation* 46 (1992): 129–42.
- . “The Use of Royal Psalms at the ‘Seams’ of the Hebrew Psalter.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 35 (1986): 85–94.
- . “The Qumran Psalms Scroll [11QPs^a] Reconsidered: Analysis of the Debate.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985): 624–42.
- . “The Use of ‘Untitled’ Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 97 (1985): 404–13.
- . *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 76. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985.
- . “The Qumran Psalms Manuscripts and the Consecutive Arrangement of Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 377–88.
- Witte, Markus von. “Das Neue Lied: Beobachtungen zum Zeitverständnis von Psalm 33.” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 114 (2002): 522–41.
- Wittman, Derek E. “Let Us Cast Off Their Ropes from Us: The Editorial Significance of the Portrayal of Foreign Nations in Psalms 2 and 149.” Pages 53–69 in *The Shape and Shaping of the Book of Psalms: The Current State of Scholarship*. Edited by Nancy L. deClassé-Walford. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- Zenger, Erich. “Psalmenexegese und Psalterexegese: Eine Forschungsskizze.” Pages 17–65 in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 238. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010.
- . *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 7th ed. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2008.
- . “The God of Israel’s Reign over the World (Psalms 90–106).” Pages 161–90 in *The God of Israel and the Nations: Studies in Isaiah and the Psalms*. Edited by Norbert L. Lohfink and Erich Zenger. Translated by Everett R. Kalin. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- . “Der Psalter als Buch: Beobachtungen zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Funktion.” Pages 1–57 in *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1998.

———. “The Composition and Theology of the Fifth Book of the Psalms, Psalms 107–145.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 80 (1998): 77–102.

———, ed. *Der Neue Bund im Alten. Studien zur Bundestheologie der beiden Testamente. Quaestiones Disputatae* 146. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1993.

Zimmerli, Walter. “Zwillingspsalmen.” Pages 105–13 in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch: Beiträge zu Psalmen und Propheten: Festschrift für J. Ziegler*. Edited by J. Schreiner. Würzburg: Echter, 1972.

VITA

Adam D. Hensley was born in Kew, Victoria, Australia in 1977. After graduating from Luther College, Croydon, Victoria, Adam attended Luther Seminary (now Australian Lutheran College) from 1995 to 1998, gaining his Bachelor of Theology degree. Adam achieved his Graduate Diploma in Ministry at the same institution and was ordained in the Lutheran Church of Australia in 2000. After serving as a pastor in the Hamilton Lutheran Parish, Victoria, from 2001 to 2006, Adam began his graduate studies at Concordia Seminary St. Louis in 2007. Adam graduated in 2015 from Concordia with a Ph.D. in Biblical Studies. He is currently an Assistant Professor of Theology in Christ College, Concordia University Irvine, California.