The Divine Warrior in Early Israel

The Divine Warrior in Early Israel

Patrick D. Miller, Jr.

Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

The Divine Warrior in Early Israel

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Miller, Patrick D.
The divine warrior in early Israel / by Patrick D. Miller, Jr.
p. cm.
Originally published: Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press, 1973.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13: 978-1-58983-217-6 (paper binding : alk. paper)
ISBN-10: 1-58983-217-5 (paper binding : alk. paper)
1. Theomachy in the Bible. 1. War—Biblical teaching. I. Title.

BS1430.6.T447M54 2005
296.3'827—dc22 2005035101

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

This book is dedicated to my father

Patrick D. Miller, Sr.

who very early taught me that the life of the mind

is part of the service of God

PREFACE

Any reader familiar with the subject matter of this volume will recognize at once my indebtedness to Frank M. Cross of Harvard University. I would like to express my gratitude to him for his wise counsel and critical encouragement through the years.

The Ugaritic texts are cited according to Cyrus Gordon's classification in *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome, 1965) with Herdner's citation listed in parentheses immediately following. Although Herdner's system in *Corpus des tablettes en cuneiformes alphabetiques* (Paris, 1963) is slowly becoming the international standard, Gordon's *Textbook* continues to be the most nearly complete and the most accessible and widely used collection of the Ugaritic material.

I am grateful to the editors of *Vetus Testamentum* for permission to reprint a portion of my article, "The Divine Council and the Prophetic Call to War," *VT*, 18 (1968), 100-107; *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* for permission to use part of my article, "Fire in the Mythology of Canaan and Israel," *CBQ*, 27 (1965), 256-261; and *Harvard Theological Review* for allowing me to quote from my articles, "Two Critical Notes on Psalm 68 and Deuteronomy 33," *HTR*, 57 (1964), 240-243 and "El the Warrior," *HTR*, 60 (1967), 411-431.

I would like to thank Mrs. F. S. Clark for her editorial and secretarial help in the several revisions of this manuscript and my student James Benson Sauer for his careful and efficient work in compiling the indexes.

Patrick D. Miller, Jr.

Union Theological Seminary in Virginia

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION 1

PART ONE: DIVINE WARFARE IN THE LITERATURE OF SYRIA-PALESTINE 8

Sources 9

The Nature and Role of the Divine Assembly 12

Ba^{c}al and ^{c}Anat as Divine Warriors 24

El as Divine Warrior 48

Conclusion 59

PART TWO: COSMIC WAR AND HOLY WAR IN ISRAEL 64

The Divine Council in Israelite Thought 66

Nature and Function 66

Comparison and Contrast with the Divine Assembly of Other Near Eastern Religions 69

The Divine Warrior and His Army in the Early Poetry 74

Deuteronomy 33:2-5, 26-29 75

Judges 5 87

Psalm 68 102

Exodus 15 113

Habakkuk 3:3-15 118

II Samuel 22:7-18 = Psalm 18:7-18 121

Joshua 10:12-13 123

The Armies of Yahweh in Later Traditions 128

Early Prose Traditions 128

Joshua 5:13-15 128

Genesis 32:2-3 131

II Samuel 5:22-25 132
Ninth-Century Prophets 132
II Kings 6:15-19 133
II Kings 7:6 134
Later Prophetic Writings 135
Isaiah 13:1ff. 136
Joel 4:9ff. 137
Isaiah 40:26 and 45:12 139
Zechariah 14 140
Some Post-Old Testament Developments 141
The Ark of the Covenant and Yahweh $ṣ^{e}bā^{ɔ}ôt$ 145
The Pattern of Warfare in Early Israel 155
Holy Warfare as a "Synergism" 156
Holy War as a Sacral-Cultic Affair 156
March of the Ark and the Armies 157
The Role of Yahweh and the Heavenly Army 158
The Role of the People of Israel 159
The Primal March of Holy War 160
Israel's Warfare and Israel's God 162
SOME CONCLUDING IMPLICATIONS 166
Formation of the Epic Tradition 166
At the Theological Center 170
NOTES AND INDEXES 177

ABBREVIATIONS

AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. J. B. Pritchard, 2nd ed.
ARI	W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*
ASD	M. J. Dahood, "Ancient Semitic Deities in Syria and Palestine," *Le antiche divinità semitiche*, ed. S. Moscati
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BZAW	*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CML	G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*
CTA	*Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques*, ed. A. Herdner
EUT	Marvin Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*
HKAT	*Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	*International Critical Commentary*
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*

ABBREVIATIONS

JPOS	*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
LXX	*The Septuagint*
MT	*The Masoretic Text*
OT	*Oudtestamentische Studien*
PRU	*Le Palais royal d'Ugarit*, 5 vols.
1QH	*The Thanksgiving Psalms from Qumran Cave I*
1QM	*The War Scroll from Qumran Cave I*
SVT	*Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
UM	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Manual*
UT	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WM	*Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, ed. H. W. Haussig, vol. I
WMANT	*Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament*
ZA NF	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, Neue Folge*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

The Divine Warrior in Early Israel

INTRODUCTION

This monograph is a study of one of the major images of God in the Old Testament and its background in the mythology of Syria-Palestine. The conception of God as warrior played a fundamental role in the religious and military experience of Israel, one that has been recognized but not fully treated or analyzed in its various dimensions. One can go only so far in describing the history of Israel, or its religion, or the theology of the Old Testament without encountering the wars of Yahweh. In prose and poetry, early and late materials alike, the view that Yahweh fought for or against his people stands forth prominently. The centrality of that conviction and its historical, cultic, literary and theological ramifications can hardly be overestimated. Some of these matters have been dealt with in previous works; other dimensions are taken up in the present study. It is in no sense exhaustive. There are many facets of the subject which do not receive attention here, but I hope in what follows to highlight some aspects of Israel's understanding of the wars of Yahweh that have not received as much attention in other studies and to point to some wider implications of the divine warrior motif as it comes to expression in the documents of the Old Testament. That task cannot be accomplished apart from indebtedness and relationship to the work of others. It is necessary, therefore, at the beginning to say briefly how my study grows out of previous

contributions and what the particular focus and point of departure of these pages will be.

Among those works of the last three decades which have been seminal and influential in Old Testament studies, Gerhard von Rad's small monograph *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel* occupies a place of first rank. Although earlier scholars such as Schwally and Weber had called attention to the special character and importance of the early wars in Israel's history, von Rad succeeded in accurately describing the phenomenon which he and others have called holy war, distinguishing it from other conflicts and tracing the influence of these holy wars on the later history of Israel. Like all reconstructions of the early history of Israel, von Rad's work is subject to criticism and, particularly in more recent times, has received an increasing amount of critical comment. Nevertheless, his study was carefully done and essentially sound, even though criticisms of particular issues, such as his virtual relegation of holy war to Israel's defensive operations in the period of the Judges, may be justified. He has made us aware of the extent to which the history and faith of early Israel centered in the wars of the tribal league.

In its brief length and limited scope there were certain related matters which von Rad's monograph did not take up. For one thing, he did no extended comparison of the holy wars of Israel with military practices in other countries of the ancient Near East. Further, while von Rad has paid attention to some of the theological dimensions involved, he has not dealt extensively with the theological imagery which pictures Yahweh as divine war-

rior. This latter area, which is the principal concern of this book, was investigated in an earlier work by H. Fredriksson entitled *Jahwe als Krieger*. Fredriksson divided the *Gottesbild* of Yahweh as warrior into different categories under the large headings of Yahweh as leader of an army and Yahweh as individual fighter. Under these headings he took up one by one the different kinds of armies Yahweh leads, the various ways he functions as single warrior and the weapons he employs, and some of the technical terms associated with Yahweh's warring activity.

Fredriksson's work performed a valuable service in bringing together most of the Old Testament evidence for this remarkable imagery. Sometimes, however, his judgments and observations are less than accurate, as, for example, when he remarks that the ideas of Yahweh as leader of an army of heavenly beings appear sporadically in older sources as mere remnants with little influence on the general religious development. Further, the work suffers from being largely a list and a brief discussion of categories. It covers the whole of the Old Testament in a very eclectic way without focusing in depth at any point to see the role that imagery played. Nor does it give any serious attention to the mythological background of the imagery in the literature of the ancient Near East. So, while he has cited most of the relevant material in the Old Testament, Fredriksson has not exhausted by any means the work that needs to be done on this important subject.

One sees this most clearly in two recent articles by Frank M. Cross which take up this theme anew: "The Divine Warrior in

Israel's Early Cult" and "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth." In a fresh way, by focusing on the role of the divine warrior, Cross has broken through some old impasses, particularly on the relationship between myth and history and the nature of the early Israelite cultus, and suggested some new directions and approaches. A summary of his articles is unnecessary at this point because they are used and discussed throughout the following pages. In part, what follows is an outgrowth of Cross's work, but, even more, it represents a parallel approach to what he has been doing, with more attention to the mythological and less to the cultic aspects, though the two are not wholly separable. This work had its earliest form as part of a dissertation prepared under Cross's direction and submitted in 1963, three years prior to the publication of the first article mentioned above but while Cross was working on the subject matter. The constant dependence upon his work, not only in these two articles but also in many others, will be immediately evident to the reader.

Before describing briefly the approach I have taken, some mention should be made of a terminological issue that has arisen in the discussion of von Rad's work. In the more recent literature some scholars such as R. Smend and H.-M. Lutz have preferred to use the term "war of Yahweh" instead of "holy war" because the former expression is used in the Old Testament for the early wars and the latter is not. While Smend has rightly called attention to the Old Testament terminology, it is not necessary to make the modern designation precisely dependent upon Old Testament usage.

In the following pages "holy war" will be used generally because it has become established as the usual designation and will probably continue as such, as Smend acknowledges. Occasionally, for variation, the terms "sacral war" or "Yahweh war" will also be used. In any case, we are confronted in the early period with a sacral kind of warfare both in the involvement of the deity and the existence of certain cultic practices. Obviously other wars have or had a sacral character, but the designation in this case is applied to the "wars of Yahweh" in the premonarchic period and where elements or aspects of the early theory of warfare appear in later materials.

The focus of this work is upon divine warfare in ancient Israel, its mythological background, and its relationship to the wars of Israel. That is, I have sought to look at the mythological-theological conceptions which were associated with Israel's early wars, her reflections on them, and the divine involvement in them. Although later materials are drawn in, the basic source material is found in the corpus of early poetry as that has been worked out and defined particularly in the studies of W. F. Albright, F. M. Cross, and D. N. Freedman. By concentrating here, one has a reasonable chance to get at the understanding of the divine warrior in the early period. Special attention is given in the following discussion to the role of the divine or cosmic hosts of Yahweh in Israel's conceptions of how Yahweh was involved in her wars and fought for her. It is my contention that this was a far more significant factor in the imagery of divine warfare than is usually recognized, and one of the aims of this

study is to point that out.

That the God of Israel should be regarded as the commander of divine or heavenly armies should not be surprising when one considers conceptions of divine warfare in other parts of the ancient Near East. Until the studies by Frank Cross, this heavily mythological motif does not appear to have been examined in the light of other ancient Near Eastern representations of divine warriors. In this work I have sought to fill this gap in a partial way be devoting a significant part of the study to the extra-biblical materials from Syria-Palestine, specifically the Ugaritic texts and the work of Philo Byblius. Thus the divine warrior motif and the patterns that evolve out of the biblical data may be seen against this background out of which they come, although not without their own particular character.

A more extensive study would have to take into account Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Hittite texts. Except in specific cases these are for several reasons excluded from treatment here. Although they are important to the general picture, they do not appear to give a decisively different approach to the matters at hand. Further, they are less directly and extensively related to the literature and religion of Israel (see Part I), and the inclusion of such material would greatly alter the scope of this study without significantly altering our basic understanding.

Although this book is a study of one aspect of Yahwistic faith, it becomes a way into larger matters. It enables us to understand better the origins of that faith and its continuity and discontinuity with the religious world of which it was a

part. In a concluding section I have suggested also that the ancient epic of Israel's origins, which is in large part an account of the various conflicts through which the people moved to the establishment of a home and place in which to live and serve God, took its shape at least in part out of the hymnic accounts of God's leading his armies in the primal march of holy war and conquest. If that suggestion should be on the right track, then continuing attention to the question of the growth of the Pentateuch/Hexateuch is in order. Finally, I have underscored an observation that cannot be ignored when one engages oneself with the subject matter of these pages. That is the fact that the view of Yahweh as warrior can hardly be a peripheral matter in the effort to work out a biblical theology. Rather, it lies at the theological center and much of the traditional substance of God-talk when given content from an Old Testament perspective confronts one directly with the wars of Israel and the God who was active in them.

PART ONE

DIVINE WARFARE IN THE LITERATURE OF SYRIA-PALESTINE

This part deals with what is generally known as Canaanite religion, that is, the religion of Syria-Palestine.[1] The religion of Canaan and its mythological roots were a part of the general culture of the ancient Near East, which had, despite many differences, a certain basic homogeneity to it due to various factors including geographical proximity, language similarities, and cultural interpenetration and influence.[2] Nevertheless, that religion was an independent entity which grew out of its own soil while it was borrowing from and assimilating neighboring religions. Its significance in this context, however, lies in the fact that the material involved was closely tied to the world of the Old Testament, the history and religion of Israel. The influence of Egyptian and Mesopotamian history and culture on Israel was of course considerable. From Egypt Israel's life as a nation had its beginning. In Mesopotamia it reached its end for all intents and purposes. But it was on Syro-Palestinian soil that Israel's history and religion were cultivated, and that en-

vironment had an inevitable influence upon her, both by Israel's reaction against and her accommodation to the phenomena which she met in her surroundings.[3] The study at hand deals with only one aspect of this overall problem.

Sources

The main sources for the following analysis are two -- the Ugaritic texts and Philo Byblius' account of the "Phoenician History" of Sanchuniathon (Phoen. *Sakkun-yatōn*). The Old Testament and inscriptional material are brought in where enlightening, but these other sources are the foundation upon which any study of Canaanite religion must be based. Use of the Ugaritic texts needs no explanation. They speak for themselves as a primary source.

Philo's report, however, is another matter. Though regarded with great suspicion as to its accuracy, Philo was, until the discoveries at Ugarit, the main source for knowledge of Canaanite or Phoenician religion. The dubious regard in which his account was held was not without justification. Philo belonged to the first century A. D., a time when the flourishing religion of Canaan in the second and first millennia B. C. had long passed. His source was Sanchuniathon, who probably wrote around the sixth century B. C.,[4] although his date is still not entirely certain. Hellenistic influence, including a tendency toward theological speculation, was to be expected in Philo's account. The possibility of very late and secondary material being inserted was also a very live option. Indeed, all these possibilities are at

least in part probabilities as far as Philo Byblius is concerned. The fact remains, however, that since the discovery and publication of the Ugaritic texts as well as some Hurrian mythological texts, Philo's history has been vindicated and shown to be far more reliable than ever suspected, having been based on quite ancient and authentic sources.[5] Although some of his data may be late or secondary, still other parts of his or Sanchuniathon's reconstruction may represent an even earlier stage in the history of Canaanite mythology than that represented in the Ugaritic texts.[6]

That the Ugaritic texts and Philo Byblius should be valuable for the religion of Syria-Palestine throughout the second and first millennia is not surprising. Albright and Dahood have both properly stressed the homogeneity of the culture and civilization of that region during those two millennia.[7] The religion and culture were relatively stable not only over the *time* span, but also over the *geographical* span, although there were particular nuances and developments in certain regions. The texts from Ugarit did not have their origin and influence only in northern Syria; some of them (for example, the Keret epic) may have come from Phoenicia or even farther south. The deities worshiped at Ugarit were also worshiped throughout Palestine. Conversely, in the Old Testament, Psalm 29, probably a very early modified Canaanite hymn, may have had its origins in northern Syria.[8]

A careful analysis of extra-biblical materials has to start from the fact that the type of literature that is used as a source makes some difference in the information or conclusions

derived therefrom. That is to say, different forms of literature stress different aspects of the world of the gods, though these emphases may represent parts of the same overall conception. Various gods of the ancient Near East and their assemblies function at times as warrior forces. The purely mythological literature tends to stress the battles among the gods, while the historical texts emphasize the involvement of the heavenly warrior(s) in earthly affairs, and the hymnic literature often represents a mixture of these two aspects. The principal Ugaritic texts are heavily mythological though not entirely so. The Legend of Aqhat involves the relationships of the gods and goddesses to men, and the Keret epic is even more a narrative of human endeavors including a major military expedition, probably having a historical core or background.[9] But even here the gods play a definite role. The character of the existing material is, of course, important in itself inasmuch as these texts do not represent a merely casual find but are the literary remains of a key Syrian crossroads uncovered in a large amount of material by systematic excavation.

With regard to the Ugaritic texts, the emphasis in this section is placed on the Ba^{c}al and ^{c}Anat cycle,[10] though reference is also made to other relevant texts. The Ba^{c}al epic is primary because it furnishes the most information concerning Canaanite conceptions of the matter at hand, that is divine warfare -- war among the gods and their hosts and the participation of these cosmic forces in human battles, both aspects being derivative from or a reflection of the other. The analysis revolves around the

divine assembly as such and the three major deities of the text, El, Baʿal and ʿAnat, with reference to the other gods or goddesses as they relate to these three. The nature and role of the assembly are looked at in some detail both separately and in relation to the major deities. While most Ugaritic studies deal only briefly with the divine council and its role, its function is a major part of this study.[11]

The Nature and Role of the Divine Assembly

In Syria-Palestine, as in Mesopotamia and to some degree in Egypt and elsewhere, the assembly of the gods included among its constituency many of the familiar named deities, who involved themselves in one way or another in the activities of the celestial council. First place belonged to the great gods and goddesses: El, the theoretical head of the council, Baʿal, ʿAnat, Aṯirat, ʿAṯtart, Yamm, and Mot.[12] Among other deities mentioned in the Ugaritic texts as playing more or less significant roles were Šapš, Koṯar-wa-Ḫasis, ʿAṯtar, and Yariḫ. Still others, such as Ḫoron, Rešeph, and Dagan, are mentioned but according to our present knowledge do not play what can be regarded as a significant part in the Ugaritic texts.[13] These were not all the named deities; other gods and goddesses, some not yet precisely identified, belonged to the pantheon,[14] but it is not intended at this juncture to go into any lengthy discussion of them.

The assembly was, however, a much broader and more encompassing entity than the total of the gods listed above.[15] It was the totality of all the gods, the *pḫr ilm*. This phrase, which

was also the common designation for the divine assembly in Akkadian (*puḫur ilāni*) though not in Hebrew, is found frequently in the Ugaritic myths, sacrificial lists, and god lists. It occurs in different variations, all meaning the same thing: *pḫr ilm* (17:7[= *CTA* 29. rev. 7]); *p[ḫ]r bn ilm* (51:III:14[= *CTA* 4.III.14]); *mpḫrt bn il* (2:17, 34[= *CTA* 32.17,34] and 107:3[= *CTA* 30.3]); and, finally, *pḫr mʿd* (137:14, 15, 20, 31[= *CTA* 2.I.14, 15, 20, 31]). In at least one case (1:7[= *CTA* 34.7]) there is a reference to *p[ḫ]r bʿl* (see below). Examination of these passages in their context reveals an important fact. The term *pḫr/mpḫrt* appears to be a kind of semiofficial or formal designation for the assembly, that is, the *name* of the council of the gods.[16] Its use in mythological texts is confined to the two places in the Baʿal and ʿAnat cycle where there seems to be a kind of plenary session of the gods. Elsewhere it occurs in lists of deities or lists of sacrifices to them. This designation is by no means the only one for the assembly or even the most frequent. By far the most common terms are *ilm*, "gods," and *bn il(m)*, "sons of El" or "sons of the gods."[17] These are used everywhere to refer to the members of the assembly, but they do not seem to have the official or formal quality belonging to *pḫr*, enabling it to be a part of lists of the gods.[18] The tenth-century Byblian inscription of Yeḥimilk indicates the same usage of the word.[19] In lines 3 and 4 the official gods of the city are invoked: Baʿalat Gebal; her consort, Baʿal samem; and *mpḫrt ʾl gbl qdšm*, "the assembly/totality of the holy gods of Byblos." The use of the phrase *pḫr mʿd* in Ugaritic is a significant one because it has the Akkadian

technical term *puḫur* and the Hebrew or Northwest Semitic technical term *môʿēd*, which is originally a political term[20] and in at least one noted instance clearly refers to the assembly of the gods. Isaiah 14:13 designates the place where the gods meet as *har-môʿēd*.[21] The phrase *pḫr mʿd* in the Ugaritic texts would seem to refer specifically to a plenary session of the divine council and is best translated with Ginsberg as "the Assembled Body."[22]

Another term for the assembly of the gods similar in meaning and usage to *pḫr* is *ʿdt ilm*, "the council/congregation of the gods." Already known in the Old Testament from Psalm 82:1, it is found also in the Keret epic from Ugarit (128:ii:7, 11[= *CTA* 15. II.7, 11]). Baʿal beseeches El's blessing upon Keret before the *ʿdt ilm* (see below). The Keret epic and the sacrificial lists reveal still another term for the divine council, *dr*, "family," "circle," which appears in two forms: *dr il*, "family or circle of El," and *dr bn il*, "family or circle of the sons of El (that is, the gods)." The former phrase, *dr il*, appears in parallelism with *ilm* (128:iii:19[= *CTA* 15.III.19]) and along with *p[ḫ]r bʿl* (1:7[= *CTA* 34.7]). The latter, *dr bn il*, appears in line with *mpḫrt bn il* and *ab bn il* (2:17, 25, 34 [= *CTA* 32.17, 25, 34]; 107: 2[= *CTA* 30.3]). It is clear, therefore, that *dr (bn) il* is another designation for the pantheon at Ugarit, and one that indicates a close relationship with El. Finally, the term *bn qdš* should be noted as a title for the gods meaning "sons of holiness" or "sons of the Holy One," that is, "holy ones." Atirat's lackey or messenger has this as a part of his name, Qdš-w-Amrr. Furthermore, *qdš* is a well-known alternate name for Atirat, which raises

the possibility of a special relationship of the *bn qdš* to this deity.[23]

More recent texts from Ugarit have revealed that in Canaanite mythology, as in Mesopotamian, a group in the assembly, presumably the leadership or "upper house" of the council, was designated "the great gods." In *PRU* II, 90, lines 1-2, the first item on a list of jars of wine for distribution is "a *kd* for the house of the *great gods* (*ilm rbm*)." This was the first reference in the Ugaritic texts to a group called "the great gods." The one occurrence in an administrative text might suggest that this category played no role in the mythology of Ugarit; but the new mythological texts in *Ugaritica* V contain at least two and possibly three references to *ilm rbm*, albeit in contexts that give us little information about them. In one case we hear of *adn ilm rbm*, "father/lord of the great gods."[24] In the other cases they are referred to in one of the Ugaritic serpent charms in broken contexts but after the description of the participation of the various gods in assisting Šapš in "venom collection."[25] It is likely that "the great gods" refers to the aforementioned deities who also appear in the other Ugaritic serpent charm.[26]

Not surprisingly, "the great gods" appear again in the much later Arslan Tash incantation text as a part of the council of the gods.[27] Line 12 reads *wrb. dr kl. qdšn*, "And the great (ones) of the council of all the Holy Ones."

There are other references to specific groups which apparently belong to the divine assembly and which are usually defined or described only by their relationship to one of the major

deities. That is to say, a number of principal gods and goddesses are thought to have their own following or coterie of divine beings, although these may be simply alternate designations for the council as a whole or parts of it. These groups may overlap.

One such group about which the texts are often quite specific is the *messengers* of the gods called generally *mlakm, ʾilmm*, or in Text 137 (= *CTA* 2.I), *tʿdt*. These messengers, as far as can be determined, travel generally in pairs and are usually associated with a particular deity. Yamm has two unnamed messengers who are sent to demand the surrender of Baʿal by the assembly of the gods. Baʿal has two messengers, Gpn and Ugr, who go up and down the divine world on errands for their master, bringing messages to and from him. Qdš-w-Amrr is Aṯirat's attendant but also carries a message from Baʿal even as Gpn and Ugr carry a message from Mot. Not all the gods had their own messengers; ʿAnat, for example, in Text 49:IV (= *CTA* 6.IV) delivers her message to Šapš personally and in correct form.

Some of the chief gods and goddesses had still larger contingents. The divine assembly as a whole appears to have been regarded as belonging to El, its leader. The term *bn il(m)* may not actually indicate that fact, but the designation *dr il*, "family of El," seems to do so, especially when allied with the phrases *p[ḫ]r bʿl* and *ab bn il*.[28] El is the father (*ab*) of the gods. He is also called *bny bnwt*, "creator of creatures" (49:III:5,11 [= *CTA* 6.III.5,11]; 51:II:11[= *CTA* 4.II.11]; 51:III:32[= *CTA* 4.III.32]; 2 Aq I: 25[= *CTA* 17.I.25]). The conception of the council as peculiarly El's host on the basis of names for the council is

complicated by the question of Atirat's position as mistress or mother of the gods. As indicated above, she was also known at Ugarit and elsewhere as Qudšu, and it may be that *bn qdš* indicates a specific kinship with this goddess.[29] The principal epithet applied to Atirat is *qnyt ilm* (for example, 51:III:26, 30, etc. [= *CTA* 4.III.26, 30]). In such instances it may refer to all the gods or only to a group of them. The combination of these names and epithets points to the fact that the council of the gods was not only a separate entity and totality on its own terms, but was also regarded as the host of El and his consort, Atirat.[30]

Atirat apparently had a separate aggregation of deities associated with her whether the whole divine assembly was regarded as her family or not. One of the standard cliches of the Baʿal-ʿAnat cycle is *atrt . wbnh . ilt . wṣbrt aryh*, "Atirat and her sons/children, Elat and the band of her kindred" (49:I:12-13 [= *CTA* 6.I.40-41]). The phrase *ṣbrt aryh* is a difficult one, but the context and parallelism with *bn* and *aḫ* make the meaning clear and in accordance with proposed etymologies.[31] The terms used here do not in themselves point to the existence of a smaller group of gods associated with Atirat, nor do their contexts; but there is indication elsewhere of such a group, and it is quite likely that the terms in this cliché refer to the same thing. Mention has already been made of the *bn atrt* referred to frequently in the texts. In Text 51:VI:46 (= *CTA* 4.VI.46) they are designated as the *šbʿm . bn . atrt*, "the seventy sons of Atirat." The number must be taken seriously if not literally. It is possi-

ble that it is a poetic device referring to the totality of the gods, but there is no numerical parallelism here of which this would be a balancing part. In short, the term would appear to refer to particular deities gathered around the figure of Atirat, although reference to all the gods cannot be excluded. Whether or not all uses of the phrases *bn atrt* or *ṣbrt ary* refer to this possible sub-group cannot be determined.[32]

The rapid rise of Baʿal to leadership in the council of the gods -- a movement clearly evident in the Ugaritic texts -- makes it natural enough that he also would have a coterie. We have already drawn attention to the expression *p[ḫ]r bʿl* in Text 1:7 (= *CTA* 34.7).[33] Pope is probably right in suggesting that the phrase refers to an aggregation of deities around Baʿal.[34] One is tempted to see this as a later development representing a separate assembly under Baʿal's rule and centering on Ṣaphon, Baʿal's abode, although such a supposition is quite conjectural and made with great reservations.[35]

But there are further indications of a special coterie attached to Baʿal.[36] Two references are made to the *šbʿt ġlmh/k*, "his/your seven lads," or "his/your seven attendants" (49:VI:8[= *CTA* 6.VI.8] and 67:V:8-9 [= *CTA* 5.V.8-9]). The first passage is very broken and impossible to translate, but it has to do with the battle against Mot and may have told about their aid in that fight. The second passage is complete. *šbʿt ġlmk* is parallel to *tmn ḫnzrk*. The word *ḫnzr*, though admittedly enigmatic, is usually translated "pig" or "boar." That translation is a peculiar parallel to *ġlm*,[37] but in the light of the frequent use of animal

names for nobles and leaders in Ugaritic and Hebrew, it may well be correct.[38] New data possibly relevant to the problem have been put forth by F. Løkkegaard.[39] He points to the presence of *ḫa-ni-za-rum* in the Shemshara Tablets where, according to the editor of the texts, it appears to be a military title,[40] or at least the name of a high office of some sort, administrative or military. It may be that this word is the same as *ḫnzr* in the Ugaritic texts even if the latter is an animal term.[41] The word *ǵlmm* may have a similar meaning at times, particularly in *ʿnt*: II:4 (= *CTA* 3.II.4) where Driver translates "servitors"[42] and Ginsberg translates "picked fighters."[43]

The new texts from Ugarit have revealed still another clear and important reference to Baʿal's military retinue. In *Ugaritica* V, Text 9, line 8 (RS 24.643) one finds in a list of sacrifices to the gods of the pantheon *il . tʿdr . bʿl*, "the helper-gods of Baʿal." That the designation is plural rather than singular is confirmed by its presence in the Akkadian Ugaritic Pantheon text as *ilanu*^{m} *til-la-at*^{d}*adad*.[44] Although these gods do not play any role under this designation in the mythological texts discovered so far, they do appear several other times in Ugaritic pantheon lists.[45] They may have assisted Baʿal in various ways, but comparison with the "helpers" of Marduk and of Tiamat who marched at their side and the "helpers" of Rahab in Job 9:13 suggests that these gods were those divine beings who went forth with Baʿal into battle.[46]

There may be yet another reference to the warrior retinue of Baʿal in the difficult phrase *[ ]dt ilm tlth* in the Keret Epic

(128:II:7[= *CTA* 15.II.7]). Although usually translated -- albeit somewhat uncertainly -- "threefold," Svi and Shifra Rin have suggested: "It would be plausible to assume, however, that *tlth* is, like its cognate, שׁלשׁים, his lieutenants, his retinue, that is, the *ʿdt ilm*, the assembly of gods, Baʿal's companions or guards, such as each major deity has.... Thus *ʿdt ilm*, *ǵlmm* or *tlth* are the warriors accompanying a chief deity."[47]

All the above evidence makes it clear that Baʿal was understood to be the leader of an indeterminate host apparently conceived in part as a military force.[48]

Evidence for the presence of a special following around other gods is not so strong, nor should one expect there to be such evidence in every case. There are, however, a few references (usually broken, unfortunately) which suggest the possibility. ʿAnat as Baʿal's cohort and warrior goddess probably had such a coterie, although her conflicts usually involved single combat. Text 6:7 (= *CTA* 13.7), called by Cazelles a hymn to ʿAnat,[49] refers to *mhrk*, "thy warrior(s)," which could be such a divine coterie, although the text is broken, and there is no way of being certain whether the word is singular or plural. The Rephaim texts make definite reference to *mhr ʿnt* (124:9[= *CTA* 22.B.9]) though again the number is uncertain.[50]

As for Mot and Yamm, the texts allow us to say very little. In his battle with Baʿal, Mot seems to make a reference to his brothers (49:VI:10-11 [= *CTA* 6.VI.10-11]), although once again the reader is stopped by a broken text, and the reference is completely enigmatic. Kapelrud conjectures about the likelihood of

Yamm's having an army behind him in his battle with Baʿal,[51] and comparison with the Marduk-Tiamat battle, which is closely akin, enhances that conjecture, as does the warlike character of his messengers (see below).

One should take note also of Text 2004:15 (= *PRU* V 4:15) where reference is made to *rš̌p ṣbi*, possibly to be translated "Reš̌eph of the army." Although we know all too little about Reš̌eph's active role in Ugaritic mythology, it is not surprising to find this god described as leader of a battle force.

There are other groups of divine beings in the council with specific names. The *rpum* mentioned above and the parallel term *ilnym* indicate one such group. Although more extended discussion is given in the next section, it may be pointed out that we have here one or two sets of deities connected with the netherworld and the dead spirits who may be comparable to the Anunnaki and the Igigi in Mesopotamian mythology.[52] Their association with chariots and horses and with the terms *mhr bʿl, mhr ʿnt* and possibly *ǵzrm* (124:7-9[= *CTA* 22.B.7-9]) gives strong indication that the *rpum* functioned in some manner as a divine military host, although no texts as yet depict them in battle.

Notice should be given in passing to another particular group, the *ktrt*, or "skillful ones," whose main function may have been as birth goddesses, inasmuch as all their appearances are connected with birth or conception (Texts 77[= *CTA* 24]; 132 [= *CTA* 11]; and 2Aq[= *CTA* 17]).[53]

Finally, one may mention the *kbkbm/kkbm*, or "stars," as a constituent element in the divine assembly at Ugarit. The clear-

est indication of that fact is in Text 52:54 (= *CTA* 23.54)

šu . ʿdb . lšpš . wlkbkbm

Lift up, prepare for lady Šapš and for the stars.

Furthermore, *kkbm* is parallel to *bn il* in Text 76:I:3-4 (= *CTA* 10.I.3-4), but the first parts of both lines are broken. Driver reconstructs and translates reasonably:

[wrgm] . d l [.] ydʿ bn il

[d l ybn.] pḫr kkbm

[and tell], that the son(s) of El may know

(and) [that] the host of the stars [may understand],[54]

Over against previous readings of the following line, Mlle. Herdner in her critical edition of the texts has rightly suggested that line 5 probably reads *[ ] dr dt . šmm, [..]* "the family/ circle of the heavens," a very good parallel to the preceding lines.[55] In this passage, therefore, the stars are thus related to or identified with the gods and described with the same language as the divine assembly (*pḫr* and *dr*). In Text 6:13 (= *CTA* 13.13) Cazelles reads *kbkbm . tm . tpl . k . lbnt .* and sees here possible signs of a myth whereby ʿAnat gained dominion over the stars by a victory. Such an interpretation is quite tentative, however, particularly in light of the broken state of the text. Philo Byblius also notes that the stars were a part of the Canaanite pantheon:

phusikous de hēlion kai selēnēn kai tous loipous planētas asteras kai ta stoicheia kai ta toutois sunaphē theous monous eginōskon [56]

But they knew as gods alone, natural things, the sun and

> moon and the rest of the wandering stars (planets) and the elements and the things united in these.

The Canaanite mythological fragment contained in Isaiah 14 also appears to reflect the stars' position in the divine assembly when it refers to the *kôkᵉbê ʾēl*, "the stars of El."[57]

As an assembly, the gods in the Ugaritic texts do not have the widespread functions evidenced in the mythology concerning the Mesopotamian divine council. There are two main passages in which the gods are pictured as meeting as a body (Text 137 and 51:III[= *CTA* 2.I and 4.III]). Text 137 (= *CTA* 2.I) describes the *pḫr mʿd* gathered on Mount Ll[58] with El presiding, although he is clearly not entirely in charge of things. In both contexts the gods are dining and banqueting. The banquet, one of the few specific activities of the gods, is a dominant theme in their affairs and certainly influenced the development of later notions of an eschatological banquet. Here as in other matters the world of the gods and the world of man were a sort of mutual reflection, each being the pattern for the other.

The gods as an assembly as well as individuals were responsible for blessing and protecting their worshipers,[59] who made sacrifices to the assembly invoking their aid. When El blesses Keret and insures progeny for him (128:II-III[= *CTA* 15.II-III]), the gods are called together and as an assembly also give him their blessing.[60]

The role of the individual gods and the assembly as divine or cosmic warriors is discussed in the following sections.

Baʿal and ʿAnat as Divine Warriors

The activities of the god Baʿal and the goddess ʿAnat, the warrior deities par excellence in the Ugaritic texts, are intimately related and must be examined together. At the center of their affairs is a series of battles. These together with the divine epithets are the basis for study of this phenomenon in the Ugaritic corpus. The principal sources for investigation of that fact are the series of texts known as the Baʿal and ʿAnat cycle.[61]

Baʿal's initial conflict is with Prince Yamm, the Sea, narrated in Texts 137 (= *CTA* 2.I) and 68 (= *CTA* 2.IV), and it has been suggested that ʿAnat's reference to her conquests of *ltn, tnn,* and *šlyṭ* all have to do with this great battle.[62] This interpretation could be correct, especially in light of the fact that Tannin (*tnn*) appears as a sea-monster in the Old Testament (Ps. 74:13; Job 7:12), but this conclusion is not necessary, and there is strong evidence against it. Yamm is not equated with these three figures unless one assumes that because he appears first in the list all the other creatures named are to be identified with him. ʿAnat announced conquests over quite a few named enemies, not all of whom can be identified with one deity. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with the idea that Baʿal and ʿAnat fought several battles, some of which may have been related to one another. Baʿal's battles with Yamm and Mot are clearly two different conflicts, though they are aspects of a single mythological motif -- the conflict between cosmos or order and chaos.

The conflict between Baʿal and Yamm is in many ways quite

similar to that between Marduk and Tiamat. One of these myths is probably a reflex of the other, though it is difficult to tell which was original.[63] It is necessary, therefore, in this context to refer briefly to the relevant parts of *Enūma eliš*: the election of Marduk, the combat with Tiamat and her forces, and the events immediately following, particularly the building of the palatial abode for Marduk -- Babylon and Esagila.

As Thorkild Jacobsen has shown, the democratic nature of the assembly of the gods is a fundamental element in *Enūma eliš*.[64] It places immediately to the fore the role of the assembly in the cosmic conflict. On both sides the attitudes and actions of the respective divine forces rank with and affect the purposes of the principals involved. That is seen from the start when the plan of Apsu and Mummu to destroy the gods was immediately communicated to the gods and apparently could not be kept from them:

(Now) whatever they had plotted between them,
Was repeated unto the gods their first-born.[65]

The gods did not attempt on their own as an assembly or as an army to oppose the forces that threatened them. What they needed in the first place was a representative, a role taken by Ea because of his wisdom and insight. Even more, they needed and sought a leader in their battle against Tiamat, Kingu, and their army.[66] But the role of the assembly itself was not a minor one, as was recognized by Marduk when he sought kingship from the *puḫrum*, the assembly (Tab. II: lines 125ff.). Likewise Tiamat's decision to march against the gods was at the instigation of the

deities around her, enraged at the other gods and set for combat. When that decision was made, Tiamat's assembly lost no time in planning the attack and equipping itself for battle. The lines of the epic which recount these preparations make it clear that her coterie was an army ready to march forth at her side with its own commander-in-chief (Kingu), appointed by Tiamat and accepted by the assembly.

> She has set up the Assembly and is furious with rage.
> All the gods have rallied to her;
> Even those whom you brought forth march at her side.
> They throng and march at the side of Tiamat,[67]
> Enraged, they plot without cease night and day.
> They are set for combat, growling, raging,
> They have formed a council to prepare for the fight.[68]

The democratic procedures of the assembly are clear. The gods together, or at least a sizable segment of them, decided the course of action and in this case, though not always, planned to carry it out jointly. The dual nature of the *puḫrum* as deliberative council or assembly and as an army is nowhere more obvious than here where the two meanings have merged. Having met to draw up its battle plans, the assembly has become an army prepared to go out and do battle with the other gods. The familiar cliché describing the going forth of the gods to aid in battle, which appears in letters, historical inscriptions, and hymns is present here also: *i-da-a-šá al-ku*, "they march at her side" (1.14).[69]

The appointment of Kingu is described as follows:

From among the gods, her first-born, who formed her
Assembly,
She has elevated Kingu, has made him chief among them.
The leading of the ranks, command of the Assembly,
The raising of weapons for the encounter, advancing to
combat
In battle the commander-in-chief. . .[70]

It was a diverse host that followed Kingu and Tiamat into battle. Besides regular members of the divine assembly, there were eleven new beings created by Tiamat, fearful to behold, monster serpents (II, 1.20), dragons (II, 1.23), and the like.

She has set up the Viper, the Dragon, and the Sphinx,
The Great-Lion, the Mad-Dog, and the Scorpion-Man,
Mighty lion-demons, the Dragon-Fly, the Centaur --
Bearing weapons that spare not, fearless in battle.[71]

On the other side of the conflict, Marduk was chosen as leader by the members of the assembly, the Anunnaki (II, 88),the Igigi (III, 126), and the great gods (III, 130) being specifically mentioned as among that body. Kingship was granted to him, and in return he went forth with the gods who had crowned him to battle Tiamat and her army (IV, 63-64). The vivid scene depicting Marduk's preparation for battle makes clear that he assembled various forces other than the gods of the assembly to his aid. Functioning primarily as a storm god, Marduk summoned the winds, the lightning, and the flood,[72] mounted his storm chariot drawn by four steeds of destruction,[73] and backed by the gods and armed with these cosmic forces, marched forth to meet Tiamat and her

army. He challenged her to single combat and in the ensuing battle Tiamat was destroyed and her supporters captured. Victorious in the cosmic conflict, Marduk then created the universe, and the gods erected a temple for him where he might dwell as king.[74]

When one moves from *Enūma eliš* to the Ugaritic myth, it is obvious that Baʿal parallels Marduk, the rising young god seeking kingship. That Yamm and Tiamat represent the same kind of figure was already clear and is now confirmed by the equation *ym=* ^{d}*tamtu* in the "Ugaritic Pantheon" text.[75] Both myths represent a type of rebellion among the gods and the struggle for kingship or rule. Having said this, one must note also that the myths are in a number of respects quite different. Each developed in its own way.

Text 137 (= *CTA* 2.I) has as its setting a gathering of the assembly in official fashion apparently for a banquet. The beginning of the text is broken, but enough remains to indicate that the conflict between Baʿal and Yamm has already begun or is foreshadowed here. With standard cliche Baʿal invokes the aid of Ḫoron and ʿAṯtart against Yamm. Then the text switches abruptly to Yamm, who, in a clear-cut grab for power, sends his messengers forth to the assembly to demand their surrender of Baʿal to him. The terrifying effect of this message makes clear that Yamm's action is not merely audacious; he is powerful enough to frighten the whole assembly except Baʿal. Even El is scared.

At the sight of the messengers the gods cringe in fear:

(23) *tgly . ilm . rišthm . lẓr . brkthm . wlkḫt*

(24) *zblhm*

The gods lower their heads upon their knees

And on the thrones of their princeship.

But Baʿal, not at all intimidated, rebukes (*ygʿr*, 1.24) the gods and says:

(27) *šu . ilm . raštkm . lẓr . brkthm . ln . kht*

(28) *zblkm*

Lift up, O gods, your heads from your knees,

From the thrones of your princeship.

As Frank Cross has noted,[76] these lines form a very important background for the warrior procession of Yahweh and his hosts in Psalm 24:7 and 9. The cry of victory goes up:

Lift up, O gates, your heads.

Cross assumes that this imagery cannot be explained on the basis of raising the gates because to the best of our knowledge the city had no gates that went up. This expression must have its origin in the return of the victorious warrior god to the assembly after his defeat of the enemy. At Ugarit the shout is given in the text prior to the battle, while in Psalm 24 it is uttered on the return from battle. This is not as great a difference as it might seem at first glance. On the one hand Baʿal's cry is an announcement of impending victory, an assurance that the messengers of Yamm need not be feared. Even more important, in good poetic and epic style it is to be expected that the cry, "Lift up your heads, O gods," was repeated at Baʿal's return. No record of this repetition is left. One may suggest cautiously that the shout of victory could have been repeated at the beginning of

Text 51 (= *CTA* 4) where about twenty lines are missing. This break is just before the call for a castle for Baʿal, the natural result of his victory over Yamm. It is, of course, impossible to say for certain whether the repetition ever existed, but there is no question that the cries in Text 137:27-28 (= *CTA* 2.I. 27-28) and Psalm 24:7, 9 are victory cries of the warrior god and his host. The Old Testament version has been demythologized only insofar as "the gods" are replaced by "the gates." The imagery still remains that of the assembly, heads bowed in fear. The conquest in holy war and cosmic war is followed by the triumphal return of the victor and his earthly or divine army.

There is no notice in these particular texts of an army with the warrior god. That such was present in the context of Psalm 24 is obvious. In the Canaanite episode there certainly must have existed a military retinue accompanying Baʿal. Other contexts reveal the presence of such a following with Baʿal. Lines 18 and 34-35 may suggest the same thing if one could be certain to what *ʿnn* and *hmlt* allude. The word *ʿnn* in this case probably refers to Baʿal's attendants, but whether there are two or a larger group is unclear.[77] The comparable Marduk episode also leads one to conclude that Baʿal was aided by a host of divine beings. Whether these were the *ilm*, the *ǵlmm*, the *ḫnzrm*, the *rpum*, the *il tʿdr bʿl*, etc., or all of these, one cannot tell.

The fright of the gods -- also to be compared with *Enūma eliš* -- is due not only to the fact that Yamm has sent the messengers, but also to the appearance of the two messengers who boldly interrupt the assembly.

(32) *iš̌t . iš̌tm yitmr*

ḥrb . ltš̌t (33) *[lš̌/bym]nhm*

A flame, two flames, they appear

Sword(s) of sharpness, their tongue/in their right hands.[78]

The fear of the gods is understandable. The messengers of Yamm appear as warriors, flaming and with swords. In another context I have discussed this passage and the relationship of these figures to *iš̌t* and *dbb* in *ʿnt*:III: 42-43 (= *CTA* 3.III.42-43) as well as *Phōs*, *Pur*, and *Phlox* in Philo Byblius.[79] For our purposes here, however, it is important to stress again the significance of these warrior messengers of fire, who strike fear into the hearts of the gods, for the background of Israelite conceptions of the heavenly host. There are numerous places in the Old Testament where the divine messengers or attendants are mentioned. In quite a few of these cases they are pictured as warriors bearing sword in hand, for example, Genesis 3:24 where Yahweh places the cherubim (the plural probably meaning two) at the east of the Garden of Eden and a flaming, turning sword (*lahaṭ haḥereb*) guarding the way of the tree of life. The cherubim and flaming sword reflect the Canaanite fiery messengers or servants of Yahweh as *ʾēš̌ lōhēṭ* (or better *ʾēš̌ walahaṭ*) "fire (and) flame." The several references to an angel or divine being with drawn sword may also go back to this Canaanite conception. The *malʾāk* who stopped Balaam (Num. 22:31), the commander of the army of Yahweh (Josh. 5:13), and the *malʾāk* who brought pestilence as a result of David's census (II Sam. 24:16ff. and especially I Chron. 21:

27, 30) all belong to this same imagery, although their swords are not described as flaming.[80]

The other references to members of Yahweh's assembly reflect the incendiary character of these mythological creatures themselves rather than of their weaponry. The account of Moses' first encounter with Yahweh at Horeb says that the *mal'āk* Yahweh appeared to him "in a flame of fire" (*b^e labbat 'ēš*).[81] The parallel with the *išt* of Yamm is clear. The call of Isaiah takes place in the context of the heavenly assembly of Yahweh. In the vision Isaiah sees above Yahweh creatures (two?) called *ś^erāpîm*, "burning ones (?)." These beings also may have originated in the Canaanite imagery of the divine assembly and its fiery messengers.[82]

The above discussion has shown the significance of Text 137 (= *CTA* 2.I) for the portrayal of warrior motifs in the divine assembly at Ugarit as well as in the Old Testament. Text 68 (= *CTA* 2.IV) actually recounts the battle between Ba^c^al and Yamm, although the end of Text 137 (= *CTA* 2.I) narrates a thwarted attempt by Ba^c^al to strike the messengers of Yamm. Whether or not Ba^c^al and Yamm marched at the head of armies, the conflict itself is one of single combat similar to the battle between Marduk and Tiamat. Like Marduk, Ba^c^al is provided with divine weapons whose names reflect their purpose.[83] The object of the battles with Tiamat and Yamm is the preservation and maintenance of kingship over the gods.[84] *Ktr-w-Ḫss* says to Ba^c^al before the battle (68: 10[= *CTA* 2.IV.10]):

tqḥ . mlk . ᶜlmk

drkt . dt drdrk

You will take your eternal kingdom

Your everlasting dominion.

And at the end of the battle (68:32[= *CTA* 2.IV.32])

ym . lmt . bᶜlm . yml[k]

Yamm indeed is dead; Baᶜal shall rule.[85]

This fact is confirmed by the cliché of the gods; "Our king is Aliyan Baᶜal, our judge, and there is no one above him (51:IV:43-44[= *CTA* 4.IV.43-44]).[86]

A necessary consequence of the establishment of kingship by victory over the enemy, Sea, is the establishment of a palace or sanctuary for the god as a sign of his victory and rule. Unlike *Enūma eliš* where the gods immediately gave Marduk all he wanted, Baᶜal has to beg, cajole, and threaten for his palace although the other gods are regarded as already having palaces. In his request, the account of which is narrated in Text 51 (= *CTA* 4) and part of *ᶜnt* (= *CTA* 3), Baᶜal is aided considerably by ᶜAnat and Atirat, and after the latter appeals to El, Baᶜal's wish is granted.[87] *Ktr-w-Ḫss* builds a magnificent palace, which is burned until it turns into silver and gold, and a celebration is prepared.

Then in column VII of Text 51 (= *CTA* 4) appears a crucial passage which recounts the triumphal procession of the victorious god to his palace. The first seven lines are broken, but they appear to be further narration of the battle with Yamm (1, 4) in which apparently Baᶜal once and for all does away with him. That

supposition is strengthened by the fact that henceforth Yamm is out of the picture, and Mot appears already by the end of this column as Ba^{c}al's principal antagonist. Furthermore, it is after the action described in these seven broken lines that Ba^{c}al makes his triumphal march to his palace establishing his rule. It is natural to suspect that this event took place *immediately after* his final annihilation of his enemy.

Lines 5 and 6 contain reference to Ba^{c}al's abode "on the mountain" (*bġr*), "on Ṣaphon" (*bṣpn*) where his palace was established. Then beginning probably in line 7 is the actual narration of Ba^{c}al's march:

(7) *^{c}dr . l[--], ^{c}rm*

(8) *tb . lpd[r?] pdrm*[88]

(9) *tt . lttm . aḫd . ^{c}r*

(10) *šb^{c}m . šb^{c} . pdr*

(11) *tmnym . b^{c}l . [---?]*

(12) *tš^{c}m . b^{c}l . mr[-?]*

(13) *bt[--] b^{c}l . bqrb*

(14) *bt*

(9) Sixty-six cities he seized
Seventy-seven towns
Eighty (took) Ba^{c}al [ ]
Ninety Ba^{c}al of the sum[mit?]
[ ] Ba^{c}al in the midst of
the house

Having defeated Yamm, Ba^{c}al now marches victoriously to his palace conquering cities and towns on his way. It is quite probable

that Ba al was accompanied by his various military hosts, *il t^{c}dr b^{c}l, ġlmm, ḫnzrm, rpum*, etc.[89] He enters his house as the mighty warrior,[90] hesitant no longer to put windows in the palace. The magnificent scene reaches its climax in lines 29-37:

(29) *qlh . qdš [.] b[^{c}l . y] tn*

(30) *ytny . b^{c}l ṣ[at š]pth*

(31) *qlh . q[dš (?)]r . arṣ*[91]

(32) *[-----?] ġrm . (.t/a) ḫšn*

(33) *rḫq [---------]*

(34) *qdmym . bmt . a [rṣ--]*

(35) *tṯṯn . ib . b^{c}l t(!)iḫd*

(36) *y^{c}rm . šnu hd . gpt*

(37) *ġr*

Ba^{c}al gives forth his holy voice;

Ba^{c}al repeats the utterance of his lips.

His holy voice . . . the earth,

. . . . . the mountains . . . .

Afar . . . . . .

East (and) west the high places of the earth?

wobble;[92] the enemies of Ba^{c}al take to the woods; the haters of Hadd to the interior[93] of the mountain.

Ba^{c}al stands in the midst of his palace as the storm god and warrior. The earth trembles at his holy voice. With Yamm destroyed and all other enemies in flight, his rule is firmly established, his palace is built, and he does not hesitate to challenge all comers. The imagery of this scene is strongly reflected in the

warrior and storm concepts associated with Yahweh. Psalm 29, generally regarded as a Canaanite hymn taken over into the Israelite cultus by the replacement of Ba^{c}al by Yahweh in the text, pictures Yahweh in his palace (*hêkāl*, cf. Text 51 [= *CTA* 4] *passim*) surrounded by the gods, the divine ones. Enthroned upon the flood, he gives forth his mighty voice, which causes the earth to shake and tremble. If this psalm was originally a hymn to Ba^{c}al, it must have been understood in the context of his victorious entry and enthronement in his palace (51:VII:42-44[= *CTA* 4.VII.42-44]):

(42) *bkm . yṯb . b^{c}l . lbhth*

(43) *uml̊k . ublml̊k*

(44) *arṣ . drkt yštkn*

Thus Ba^{c}al is enthroned in his house

Neither king nor no-king

Shall establish the earth as a dominion.[94]

With these lines may be compared the climax of Psalm 29:10:

yhwh lammabbûl yāšāb

wayyēšeb yhwh melek l^{e}^{c}ôlām

Yahweh is enthroned on the flood

Indeed Yahweh is king forever.

The theophany passage of II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18 also has striking affinities with the picture of Ba^{c}al in his palace. The psalmist utters a cry, which is heard by Yahweh "from his palace" (*mēhêkālô*, II Sam. 22:7). Then (Ps. 18:7):

The earth did quake and shake,

The foundations of the hills shuddered.[95]

Verse 14 is similar to 51:VII:29 (= *CTA* 4.VII.29). Even as "Baʿal gives forth his holy voice," "the Most High gives forth his voice." Even as Baʿal puts to flight his enemies and the ones hating him, so it is said of Yahweh the warrior (II Sam. 22:18).

He delivered me from my strong enemy,
From the ones who hated me.[96]

The ancient war cry which was sung at the procession of the ark to and from battle in the early holy wars of Israel is similar to the description of the victorious Baʿal in Text 51 (= *CTA* 4):

Arise, Yahweh,
Let thy enemies be scattered;
Let the ones hating thee flee from before thee

Other passages could be pointed out, but enough has been said to show that the picture of Yahweh as storm god, warrior, and king bears striking resemblance to that of Baʿal in the same roles in Canaanite mythology.

The Baʿal-ʿAnat cycle gives further evidence of the role of Baʿal as warrior god, particularly in his conflict with Mot. This conflict is essentially a fertility myth[97] involving the death and renewal of life of both Baʿal and Mot, but, as in the battle with Yamm, the question of kingship is involved. Baʿal's death is cause for an attempt to produce a new king, but his return to life is occasion for renewed battle to reestablish his kingship. This conflict is recounted in columns V and VI of Text 49 (= *CTA* 6).

V (1) *yihd . bʿl . bn . a<u>t</u>rt*
(2) *rbm . ym<u>ḫ</u>ṣ . bktp*

(3) *dkym . ymḫṣ . bṣmd*

(4) *ṣḥr mt . ymṣḥ larṣ*

(5) *[yṯb.]b[ʿ]l . lksi . mlkh*

(6) *[bn dgn] lkḥṯ . drkth*

Baʿal seizes the sons of Aṯirat.
Rabbim[98] he smites with a weapon (sword).[99]
Dokyam he smites with a mace.
Burning (?)[100] Mot he kicks to the earth.
The Son of Dagan sits on his throne of kingship,
his seat of dominion.[101]

To gain his throne Baʿal is forced to do battle with the sons of Aṯirat, among these apparently *rbm*, *dkym*, *mt*, who oppose him on other occasions. Having conquered these enemies, he then assumes his rule again, but another battle ensues, this time the final one between Baʿal and Mot. This fight, recounted in column VI of Text 49 (= *CTA* 6), may have been a full-scale battle between Baʿal and his coterie and Mot and his followers. There are references to the seven lads of Baʿal (l. 8), the peoples (*limm*), and to beings whom Mot calls "my brothers." It is impossible to tell whether the plural verbs describing the battle refer only to Baʿal and Mot or whether they may indicate the conflict between the two gods and their forces, but the fight results in the submission of Mot and the kingship of Baʿal (ll, 34-35?).

There are other texts which refer to battles of Baʿal, such as the fight with the "devourers" and "renderers" (Text 75[= *CTA* 12]) -- if it may really be called a fight -- and the references to Baʿal's defeat of Tannin and Lotan (67:I:1ff.[= *CTA* 5.I.1ff.];

1001:1[= *PRU* II 1:1]). But the major battles are those with Yamm and Mot when Baʿal fights for and with the gods with the issues of kingship, sanctuary, and fertility at stake. The battle of the gods is the means whereby these three qualities of world order -- divine and human -- are established.[102]

Baʿal's titles and epithets are further indications of cosmic warfare. The most important of these is *aliyn*, a hypocoristicon from the verb *lʾy*, "to prevail, be powerful." The title also appears without the hypocoristic -- *ānu* ending as *aliy*. The basic nuance of this epithet is clear; but the precision of meaning is hindered by two problems: what is the grammatical form of the word without the hypocoristic ending; and to what extent does the word *aliy(n)* originate in a longer cliché, which gives the precise and original meaning?

As to the grammatical form and meaning of the word *aliy(n)* two lines of thought are possible. One would be to view the word as an elative adjective, "the most powerful,"[103] but several objections to that may be raised. Elatives, if they even existed in Northwest Semitic, are at best quite rare in Canaanite.[104] Furthermore, one would expect the form to be *ʾaqtal* rather than *ʾaqtil*. Also the *-anu* ending would be unnecessary and peculiar on the elative. A much more likely interpretation of the word is that it is the first person imperfect of the *Qal* or G stem of *lʾy*. The pattern is precisely that of the third weak verbs, *ʾalʾiyu*. Its meaning would be "I prevail."

The *-anu* ending indicates that *aliy(n)* is a shortened form of a longer phrase, a phenomenon quite common in Canaanite myth-

ology. The phrase is to be sought in the words which follow *aliy*. Albright has proposed that the full formula may be seen in the message of Baʿal to ʿAnat in ʿ*nt*: III:11-12 (= *CTA* 3.III. 11-12) and IV:51-52 (= *CTA* 3.IV.51-52).[105] He maintains that the full title was *ʾalʾiyu qurâdîma qâriyeya baʾarṣi malḥamati*, "I prevail over the heroes who meet me in the land of battle," but Goetze has criticized this view by pointing out that *qryy bars mlḥmt* is a part of the message itself, as evidenced by the fact that ʿAnat replies in a series of first-person phrases beginning with *aqry*.[106] In addition, it may be noticed that this message is not given by Baʿal alone; El also repeats it (ʿ*nt* pl. ix:II: 17-21[= *CTA* 1.II.17-21]).

Goetze is probably basically right. The phrase *qryy bars mlḥmt* must be separated from *aliy qrdm* unless one is to believe that the meaning of the formula has been forgotten and part of it cut off and associated with the message; but apparently out of dissatisfaction with Goetze's interpretation of *qryy bars mlḥmt*, Albright has maintained his original view. He has insisted correctly that the basic meaning of *qry* in Ugaritic is "to meet, oppose, encounter," as in Hebrew, rather than "to remove" as Goetze maintains.[107] Goetze's analysis of *qryy* as an infinitive absolute also does not fully solve the problem of that word, which is the *crux interpretatum* of the passage and does not appear to be the same as the succeeding imperatives, *šṯ* and *šk*.

In any event, the parallelism: *tḥm aliyn bʿl / hwt aliy qrdm* indicates that the formula does not extend any further than *aliy qrdm*. The presence of this parallelism in context where the mess-

age is different (67:II:10-11, 17-18[= *CTA* 5.II.10-11, 17-18]; 51:VIII:32-35[= *CTA* 4.VIII.32-35]) makes it clear that the original epithet was *aliy qrdm*, "I prevail over the warriors."[108] The title is a warrior epithet referring to Ba^{c}al's cosmic battles with the gods and, probably, to his aid in human conflicts. Its connection with the gods is suggested not only by the narratives of Ba^{c}al's battles, but by the title or description he gives his abode, *Ṣaphon* (^{c}*nt*: III:27-28[= *CTA* 3.III.27-28]):

(27) *bqdš . bġr . nḥlty*

(28) *bn^{c}m . bgb^{c} tliyt*

In the holy place, in the mount of my portion/ inheritance

In the pleasant place, in the hill of victory.[109]

The *gb^{c} tliyt* is not necessarily the place where the battles are fought, but it is the locale of his rule and kingship won by battle.

Three other epithets appear to be connected with the warrior characteristics of Ba^{c}al. One of these, *rkb ^{c}rpt*, "driver of the clouds,"[110] arises out of the storm imagery associated with him but reflects also his role as warrior and is often used when referring to him in this role.[111] The clouds are the war chariot of the storm god as he goes to do battle.

Although attested in the mythological literature only once and in a broken text then, the phrase *gmr hd* would appear to be an epithet of Ba^{c}al meaning something like "Annihilator Hadad" or "Avenger Hadad."[112] This phrase is also attested as a personal name in both Ugaritic and Akkadian texts from Ugarit. In *PRU*

II 4:16 and 107:12 *mgmr* appears as the name of a deity.

In Text 12, l.4 of *Ugaritica* V there may appear a new Baʿal name -- *bʿl ʿrkm*. Virolleaud does not seek to translate the last element but refers to the use of the plural participle of *ʿrk* in Hebrew to refer to men equipped for battle (for example, I Chron. 12:34 and 36; cf. Jer. 6:23 and 50:42). One might also note the divine appellation *yhwh ṣ^{e}bāʾôt ʾ^{e}lōhê maʿarkōt yiśrāʾēl* (I Sam. 17:45) "Yahweh of hosts, God of the ranks of Israel." If *ʿrkm* in the Ugaritic text is to be associated with these Hebrew uses of *ʿrk*, then the name would be Baʿal, the Man of War, or, better, Baʿal of the Ranks, referring to Baʿal as a leader of armies like *ršp ṣbi*.[113]

The name of Baʿal in Philo's account is Demaros. This name has been discovered in the Ugaritic texts in parallelism with Aliyan Baʿal and Hadad as *dmrn*. Pope connects this word with Arab. *ḏmr*, "brave, mighty."[114] If he is correct, this title also reflects the warrior nature of Baʿal.[115] Two personal names *ḏmrbʿl* (322:II:5[= *CTA* 102.II.5]) and *ḏmrhd* (322:VI:7[= *CTA* 102. VI.7]) may be cited in this connection, meaning "Baʿal/Hadad is my warrior" or something similar.

Before looking at the role of ʿAnat as Baʿal's warrior cohort, an examination of the Rephaim texts is in order here, as possible further evidence of Baʿal's military forces. These texts are difficult to interpret and may not necessarily belong to the Baʿal-ʿAnat cycle. They are usually associated with the Aqhat legend, but there are important connections with Baʿal and ʿAnat.

Because of the obscurity and very corrupt nature of the Rephaim texts (121-124[= *CTA* 20-22]) there will probably never be complete agreement as to their interpretation.[116] There are references to *il*, *bʿl*, *ʿnt*, and *dnil*, but these do not greatly illumine our understanding. The fact that *dnil* is mentioned has led a number of scholars to connect these texts with the Aqhat legend and the problem of Danel's progeny.[117] The etymological basis of the word *rpum* has not been fully settled, but it has been related to the roots *rpy*, "to sink, relax," and *rpʾ*, "to heal," with the latter root generally regarded as the proper etymology of the word. The *rpum*, commonly held to be shades or ghosts, denizens of the world of the dead, are thought to heal in that they restore to life. Thus Caquot concludes that the *rpum* are the dead ancestors of Danel's family line; and these texts are concerned with the restoration to life of Aqhat, who is called "the healed one of Baʿal" (*rpu bʿl*).[118]

This interpretation, which is masterfully argued, has many plausible points, though not all are convincing. The following comments are not meant to be an overall interpretation of these texts from a different point of view but to emphasize particular aspects of the *rpum* relevant to the conceptions of cosmic warfare among the Canaanites.[119] Regardless of the precise etymology of *rpum*, there are strong indications that these are divine or semi-divine beings,[120] who function to some degree as a military coterie of one or more of the high gods, presumably Baʿal and ʿAnat. The term *rpum* is regularly parallel to *ilnym*, a nominal plural form derived from a substantive *ʾln*, which survives

in Phoenician and means "god" (*ilnym* is parallel to *ilm* in *ᶜnt*: IV:78-79[= *CTA* 3.IV.78-79]).[121] It may be, as has been suggested by Gaster, that the *ilnym* and *rpum* are the "upper" and "lower" gods of Canaanite mythology comparable to the Igigi and Anunnaki of Mesopotamian mythology.[122]

In Text 121:I:4 (= *CTA* 20.B.4) the *rpum* ride forth on their chariots:

tᶜln . lmrkbthm . ti[ty]

They mount on their chariots; they go

The picture of divine beings riding forth on chariots can hardly be other than that of warriors riding out, even though in this case they do not go to battle.[123] In addition, reference is made more than once to *rpu bᶜl mhr bᶜl . wmhr ᶜnt*. Considerable disagreement exists among scholars as to whether *rpu* and *mhr* here are singular[124] or plural.[125] While the problem cannot be solved absolutely either grammatically or exegetically, since either singular or plural is possible in the context, an interpretation of the terms as plural is preferable because such interpretation is consistent with the clear plural character of the term *rpum* elsewhere and introduces no new problems such as the identity and function of this new individual who is called *rpu bᶜl*.[126] If the terms are plural, then these *rpum* are in some respects a military host associated with Baᶜal and ᶜAnat, regardless of what other function they may serve.[127] The noun *mhr*, as is clear from other contexts, is to be translated as "warriors," "soldiers," or heroes."

The fact that *rpu bᶜl* is paralleled by *mhr ᶜnt* as well as

mhr bᶜl is only one indication of the fact that ᶜAnat is a partner in Baᶜal's fighting exploits. The Egyptian evidence for this goddess shows her warlike character;[128] but even prior to her appearance in Egypt, the Ugaritic texts make clear the fact that in the Canaanite religion and mythology of the second millennium B. C. ᶜAnat was the warrior goddess *par excellence*. That was not the only important aspect of her character; nor were the other goddesses always peace-loving. A fluidity of personality and character among the Canaanite goddesses makes it impossible to separate out particular roles as belonging only to one or the other. But in the Ugaritic texts as well as in Egypto-Canaanite syncretism ᶜAnat's function as goddess of battle was primary.[129]

One of the basic aspects of this role was her association with Baᶜal in his battles,[130] a fact most clearly brought out in Baᶜal's address to her in Text 76:II:24-25 (= *CTA* 10.II.24-25):

(24) *nṭᶜn . barṣ . iby*

(25) *wbᶜpr . qm . aḫk*

We will plant my foes in the earth

And in the dust those who rise against thy brother.

Baᶜal who is equipped for war with his bow and *qsᶜt* (arrows?) calls ᶜAnat to join with him in battling his enemies.[131] That she does so or has done so is seen in the fact that she participates in or claims participation in all of Baᶜal's major conflicts (ᶜ*nt*: III:34-43[= *CTA* 3.III.34-43]):[132]

(34) *mn . ib . ypᶜ . lbᶜl .*

ṣrt (35) *lrkb . ᶜrpt .*

lmḫšt . mdd (36) *il ym*

lklt . nhr . il . rbm

(37) *lištbm . tnn . išbm[n]h (?)*

(38) *mḫšt . btn . ᶜqltn*

(39) *šlyṭ . d . šbᶜt . rašm*

(40) *mḫšt . mdd ilm . ar[š]*

(41) *ṣmt . ᶜgl . il . ᶜtk*

(42) *mḫšt . klbt . ilm . išt*

(43) *klt . bt . il . dbb*

What enemy has risen against Baᶜal,

Adversary against the Rider of the Clouds?

Verily I smote the beloved of El, Yamm;

Yea, I destroyed the River of El, Rabbim.

Verily I muzzled Tannin, really muzzled him

(And) smote the crooked serpent,

Šalyaṭ of the seven heads.

I smote the beloved of El, Ar[š]

I exterminated the calf of El, ᶜAtak (ᶜtk).

I smote the bitch of El, Fire;

I destroyed the daughter of El, Flame.

Some of these creatures do not appear in conflict with Baᶜal. But the only one of Baᶜal's opponents missing is Mot. Text 49 (= *CTA* 6) preserves in detail how ᶜAnat, enraged against Mot because of his conquest of Baᶜal, made short work of him and scattered him to fertilize the earth(?). It is therefore evident that much of ᶜAnat's warring activity is in association with and in support of Baᶜal and his forces.

Yet ᶜAnat also fights on her own. One of the most unusual

and puzzling scenes in the Ugaritic texts is *ʿnt*: IV (= *CTA* 3.IV), her bloody massacre of many warriors. The context of this passage does not give a reason for the action. It may reflect some sort of ritual associated with the cult of ʿAnat, but the activity of the goddess appears to have little meaning along that line. The most that can be said is that there is a type of blood satiation here not entirely unknown elsewhere. A similar motif is present in the attitude toward Kemoš reflected in the Mešaʿ Inscription as well as in some of the imagery associated with Yahweh, such as appears in Isaiah 34. The important thing to note is that the figures slaughtered by ʿAnat, *lim* and *adm* (ll. 7-8) are human, not divine beings. This is the only occurrence of the term *adm* except for the epithet of El, *ab adm*, which appears twice in Keret. The word *lim* occurs primarily in ʿAnat's epithet, *ybmt limm*. Whether there is any connection between this puzzling epithet and the reference to *lim* in this context is a tantalizing but unproductive question. In any event this passage records the only occasion in the myths in which a god or gods are engaged in battle with human beings. Furthermore, the human beings are characterized as warriors: *dmr//mhrm* (ll.14-15) and *mhr//ṣbim//ǵzrm* (ll.21-22).[133] It is thus important to note that the pattern of the cosmic battle is sometimes projected onto the realm of human life, producing conflict and battle between human and divine elements.

The epithets of ʿAnat, unlike those of Baʿal, do not reflect the warrior activity of this goddess. There may be, however, one occurrence of an epithet pointing to ʿAnat's bellicose character:

In Text 1004:12 (= *PRU* II.4.12) Virolleaud reads: *[l. e]lt . qb [l].*[134] There can be no question about the first word, and the second is quite plausible. As Virolleaud points out, the Mesopotamian goddess Ištar bears the epithet *i-lat qab-li*, "Goddess of Battle."[135] If the reading is correct, the reference is surely to ʿAnat, the principal warrior goddess of the Ugaritic texts. ʿAttart appears more than once in this text, and there is also a reference to *[ ] qdšt*, which would appear to be Atirat. ʿAnat does not appear unless in line 12.

El as Divine Warrior[136]

Two excellent monographs have been written by Pope and Eissfeldt on El,[137] so there is no necessity in this context for a lengthy general discussion of this deity. The thrust of most of the literature pertaining to him has been the assumption that while El is father of the gods and the "executive" deity of the pantheon at Ugarit, he is essentially a quiescent figure whose power seems rather limited when compared to that of other deities, whose fear of other gods is obvious, and whose gradual decline in the face of Baʿal's rise to prominence seems clear. Pope especially has pointed out that as far as the Ugaritic texts are concerned, El's actions and most of his epithets describe him as anything but a fierce warrior. Even a casual perusal of the texts reveals that fact and shows that El is on the way down, while Baʿal, the young warrior, is on the way up.[138]

In the light of the published texts the above interpretation of the Ugaritic evidence is basically accurate. Some modifica-

tions in this general picture may be necessary, however, when other sources are consulted and notice is taken of certain epithets and personal names. There is some evidence for a line of tradition in Canaanite mythology which portrayed El in part as a warrior deity or a deity whose might and power were recognized and acclaimed.

That El still had a certain degree of power even in the Ugaritic texts known at present is demonstrated in Text 49:VI:26-31 (= *CTA* 6.VI):

(26) *ik . al . yšm[ʿ]k . tr* (27) *il . abk*
l ysʿ . alt (28) *tbtk*
lyhpk . ksa . mlkk
(29) *lytbr . ḫṯ . mṯpṯk*
(30) *yru . bn . il* ⟨*m*⟩ *mt*
ttʿ . y (31) *dd . il . ǵzr*

How will Bull El, your father, not hear you?
Verily he will pull out the supports of your dwelling,
Yea overturn the throne of your kingship,
Verily he will break the scepter of your dominion.
Divine Mot was afraid,
Was fearful the beloved of El, the hero.[139]

In these lines the threat of El's hostility strikes fear into the heart of Mot, but El's power is confined largely to the matter of dispensing kingdoms, and Mot's fear is thus not of battle with him but of loss of his rule. One could not conclude from these lines alone that El was honored in any major way as a god of battle.

Yet the assumption that El was in no way a warlike deity leaves some questions unanswered. One could ask, for example, how El could ever have been king and ruler of the gods without some manifestation of his warrior might. In the human realm it was leadership in war that led to kingship or helped establish it;[140] so in the divine world one would expect such leadership, particularly in Mesopotamian and Canaanite mythology.[141] The status of El and Baʿal, as well as of other gods, is in flux in the Ugaritic texts. The mythological world was no more a static phenomenon than the human world, though repetition and maintenance of the status quo were basic aspects of that world. It may have been, therefore, that the character of El was in process of change and that a warlike spirit was more manifest at one moment or place than at another.[142]

The second question concerns the relationship between El of Canaanite religion and Yahweh of Israelite religion. Did all the warrior aspects of Yahweh's nature come from nowhere or only under the influence of the image of Canaanite Baʿal? Certainly there are clear and unmistakable similarities to Baʿal as the storm god and warrior, and these are frequently pointed out. But the early associations of Yahweh, if one may speak of such, were with El more than with Baʿal.[143] How does what is known of the warrior character of El or the lack of such fit in with that fact?

Philo Byblius' account of the "Phoenician History" of Sanchuniathon, the other basic source for Canaanite mythology, may give an answer or at least a clue. Accepting the need for caution, as stated earlier, one cannot ignore Philo's account

when it gives a radically different picture of El (that is, Kronos) from that in most of the Ugaritic texts. In Philo-Sanchuniathon, Kronos is a much more arrogant, domineering god, who ruthlessly runs things his way, even dispatching his own progeny for the sake of expediency. The center of attention is focused upon this deity rather than upon Baʿal/Demaros, as is the case in the Ugaritic texts, despite the fact that in the first millennium Baʿal is the dominant deity in Syria-Palestine. Like Baʿal, Kronos, as he is described by Sanchuniathon, does not hesitate to fight any of his enemies.

The particular passage most relevant to this discussion is *Praeparatio evangelica* I:10:17-21, concerning Kronos' first rebellion against his father, Uranos. Pope has convincingly stressed the similarity of this competition of the successive generations of gods to that recounted in the Kumarbi mythology[144] of Hurrian mythology.[145] He has also pointed out that the displacement of El/Kronos by Baʿal/Demaros may be present in the Ugaritic texts.[146] The account, therefore, of Kronos' displacement of Uranos, which corresponds to Kumarbi's dethronement and banishment of Anu, would appear to be reliably archaic and authentic.

> And Kronos having become a man, using the advice and assistance of Hermes Trismegistos -- for this one was his secretary -- he repels his father Uranos, avenging his mother. And to Kronos are born children, Persephone and Athena. Now the first died a virgin, but by the judgment of Athena and Hermes, Kronos made from iron a sickle and a spear. Then

> Hermes, conversing in magic words with the allies of Kronos, made (in them) a desire for battle against Uranos on behalf of Ge. And thus Kronos engaged in war, drove Uranos away from his sovereignty, and succeeded to the kingdom.[147]

El/Kronos is thus described in Philo as a god who does battle against his enemies.[148] In the total picture which Philo gives of Kronos he is hardly less a warrior god than any of the other deities. One of the most important pieces of information provided by this passage is that Kronos is regarded as having *allies* around him -- *tois tou Kronou summachois*. This fact agrees with the evidence of the Ugaritic texts. For the "allies" can hardly be separated from the *pḫr il* or the *dr (bn) il* of these texts and elsewhere and are to be compared with the *il tʿdr bʿl*, "the gods who help Baʿal." The *il tʿdr bʿl* and the *tois tou Kronou summachois* are semantically equivalent, that is, the gods who help Baʿal and the gods who kelp Kronos = El. The *summachoi* are the divine assembly or at least a part of it. This relationship is confirmed in Philo's account in paragraph 20:

> *hoi de summachoi Ēlou tou Kronou Elōeim epeklēthēsan*
>
> And the allies of Elos, that is, Kronos, were surnamed Eloim.

The allies of El are specifically the gods. Here as elsewhere Philo testifies to conceptions similar to or the same as those of the Ugaritic myths. Another reference apparently to these divine beings gives further information (*Praepar. evang.* I:10:37):

> *tois de loipois theois duo hekastō pterōmata epi tōn ōmōn hōs hoti dē suniptanto tō Kronō*
>
> But to the rest of the gods two wings to each on the

shoulders in order that they might fly with Kronos. In Canaanite and general Near Eastern religions,[149] wings were a well-known characteristic of gods and goddesses, as well as of subordinate beings, such as cherubim and seraphim. Here also the gods are associated with El/Kronos as a sort of coterie accompanying him in his exploits.

The "allies of Kronos" are first mentioned when Hermes creates in them a desire to battle Uranos. The word *summachoi* (and its related forms) has a definite military connotation. It means "fighting along with, leagued, or allied with." In paragraph 17 reference is made to the alliance (*summachian*) of Ge, which enabled her to ward off the attacks of Uranos. The alliance in that case refers definitely to a warrior host which fought along with or for Ge. So also the result of Hermes' intervention with the allies of Kronos is that Kronos makes war against Uranos and drives him out. Thus there can be little question that it is Kronos *and* his host who subdue Uranos, even though the allies are not mentioned in the sentence which tells of the conflict. One may see explicitly here what is perhaps implicit elsewhere, that when a conflict ensues between two gods, it may be more than single combat; the battle may involve the various divine or cosmic forces of the antagonists. Uranos also has allies (*summachōn*) which he sends against Kronos on another occasion (para. 23). These lines picture Kronos-El as a deity with a host that assists him in battle. He functions in much the same way as Baʿal. His belligerent nature is further reflected in his final *coup de grâce* to Uranos and his murder of his son and daughter and his

brother. The picture of El in Sanchuniathon's history is thus quite different from that in the texts from Ugarit.[150]

In the light of Sanchuniathon's description one is led to ask whether there is further evidence of the might and warring ability of El. Fragmentary and abbreviated though it may be, such evidence is present in the names and epithets. One possible example is the name itself of the god -- *ʾēl*. Numerous suggestions for the etymology of the name have been proposed, some incredible, others at least possible.[151] The most likely still remains that of W. F. Albright, who says that the word *ʾēl* "was almost certainly an adjectival formation (intransitive participle) from the stem *ʾwl*, meaning 'the strong, powerful one.'"[152] Perhaps certitude is not possible at this point, but there is no question that some etymology exists for the name of El as it does for the other gods and goddesses of Ugarit and elsewhere. Albright's proposal is plausible and not unlike other name formations of deities

Even more significant is one of El's most common appellatives at Ugarit -- *tr*, "Bull." This epithet has generally been interpreted as referring to his procreative powers,[153] but such an interpretation may be on the wrong track. To be sure, El has other epithets, such as *bny bnwt*, "Creator of Created Things," and *ab adm*, "Father of Man." But neither of these is necessarily to be taken as referring to procreation. The latter especially is probably indicative of a social relationship rather than a physical one.[154] El was of course the creator or begetter of the gods, but in the one instance where we have any description of

his involvement in the procreation he does a very poor job and hardly deserves the title "Bull."[155] And the fact remains that in the Ugaritic texts Baʿal, not El, is a fertility god and proves his procreative powers, whereas El fails to prove his.

The bull, however, has a dual symbolism in the ancient Near East. At times it is a symbol of fertility, but it is primarily a symbol of strength, of might, and of fighting prowess, both in the realm of the gods and in the realm of men.

The evidence of the Ugaritic texts agrees with this interpretation. Baʿal is associated with the bull, albeit more in artistic representation than in literary description. In Text 75 (= *CTA* 12) the "devourers" and "renderers" born to the "maid of Athirat" are described as bulls with Baʿal's face. The same text later describes the fallen Baʿal with the same language used to characterize his attackers. ʿAnat too is spoken of as one who has "horns of strength."

There is no question that the bull imagery in the Old Testament is indicative of might and strength. When applied to Yahweh it can hardly have anything to do with fertility. In other contexts also the imagery of the bull and of the horns appears as a symbol of strength and warring power. Elsewhere in the ancient Near East the bull is used to characterize gods, kings, and pharaohs as strong warriors.[156]

Two other possible epithets of El suggest his role at some time and place as a mighty or warrior god. If Frank Cross is correct in his analysis of the name and figure of Yahweh,[157] then El may have had as an early epithet *ʾēl, *dū yahwī ṣabaʾōt*, "El

who creates the (heavenly) armies,"[158] which became *(dū) yahwī ṣaba'ōt when Yahweh split off from El and is now preserved as Yahwe ṣ^ebā'ot.[159] Similarly the phrase 'ēl gibbôr (Isa. 9:5), which appears in a context that probably goes back to the early days of the Israelite monarchy,[160] may also have been originally an ancient epithet of the Canaanite El, that reflected his power as warrior.

Personal names having an 'ēl element have frequently been dismissed as of little value because they tell us nothing significant about the deity.[161] This dismissal, however, may be a little premature.[162] They at least can serve to corroborate information gained elsewhere and enlighten us as to various conceptions of the deity held by those who used such names. Certainly it can hardly be doubted now that the 'ēl element frequently refers to the particular deity El rather than being always a generic term.[163] Of central importance in this regard is the appearance of the name ilmhr (UT 2029:18) in recently published Ugaritic texts, a name which means "El is a warrior,"[164] but there are a number of other names which suggest the might and power of El, for example, Ugaritic mril, translated by Gordon,[165] "God [El] is strong," and Old Testament Pag'i-'el (Num. 1:13; etc.), "El attacks" or "El strikes down."[166] A.R. Murtonen in his list of West Semitic El names includes the following:[167] 'l'z (Old South Arabic, Hebrew), "El is strength"; 'lpr (Nabatean), "El is a bull (= strong)"; mr il (Arabic, Nabatean), "El has commanded"; *gbr(y)'l (Hebrew name appearing in Greek form), "El is my strength"; grm'l (Arabic, Nabatean), "El is strong"; dmr'l

(Old South Arabic),[168] "El is strong"; *hqmʾl* (Old South Arabic), "El has strengthened"; *yḥzqʾl* (Hebrew), "El is strong" or "El strengthens"; *sbʾl* (Arabic), "El is a lion (= strong)"; *ʿz(y)ʾl* (Arabic, Hebrew), "El is (my) strength"; Murtonen also mentions the Amorite name **ṣbʾʾl*, that is, *Ṣi-ba-HAL* (< *AN*), which he translates "A Warrior of El." If his analysis of the element *ṣi-ba-* is correct, a better translation would be "Army of El." Huffmon, however, in his study of the Amorite names from Mari, analyzes the element as a verbal form from **ṣbw* -- "to desire."[169] Another uncertain name is *ʿzrʾl* or *ʾlʿzr* which may contain either the root *ʿzr* I -- "to help" or the root *ʿzr* II -- "to be strong, mighty."

This list of names, to which others could perhaps be added, covers a wide temporal and geographical span. Rather than vitiate the accumulated force of the listing, this fact simply makes it even more clear that the deity El, worshiped in various forms and in various places, was regarded as a deity of strength and might.

New evidence for the strength and might of El may be found in *Ugaritica* V, Text 2 (RS 24.252) where he appears as one of the central figures, apparently bearing the title *rpu mlk ʿlm*.[170] If this appellation does refer to El, then we have in this text several references to the might of El. He is called in one place *gṯr wyqr*, "Strong and Precious." In lines 6 and 7 of the *verso*, which is broken, *ʿz* and *ḏmr*, "strength and might," appear in parallel and related to *rpu mlk ʿlm*. Also in line 9 we have *ʿzk ḏmrk l[a]⌜n⌝k*, "your strength, your might, your [vic]tory,"

phraseology which in part may be compared with Exodus 15:2, a most interesting parallel if the Ugaritic phrase refers to El.[171] The Israelite poet in the song of victory with reference to Yahweh uses a word series familiar from Canaanite circles where it was apparently applied to El.

Finally, it may be suggested that in light of the evidence above, more significance is to be attached to El's role in *Krt* A (= *CTA* 14). After the death of Keret's father, El comes to him in a dream, giving him elaborate instructions about planning a military expedition to seek another wife and describing at length the preparations to be made for the army, the people and number that are to march forth, and the way of the march. The fact that elsewhere in the Keret epic El exercises special care of Keret, who is also described as *bn il* (*UT* 125:20[= *CTA* 16.I.20]), does not diminish in significance the fact that it is El here who commands Keret to go to war; and it is under his aegis that Keret -- after first sacrificing to both El and Baʿal, as well as engaging in ritual purification -- marches out, even though battle is not necessary in order to accomplish his desire for offspring. Regardless of the motive for the expedition, El is here found commanding a military encounter and receiving along with the warrior god Baʿal the sacrifices necessary for its good outcome. This account can hardly be separated from that body of evidence which pictures the Canaanite deity El as strong and mighty, even a warrior at times.

Conclusion

In the mythology and religion of Canaan, as in Mesopotamia and elsewhere, notions of cosmic conflict were prominent: the warrior gods and goddesses who battled one another for the maintenance of order, kingship, and fertility; the involvement of the gods in human conflict; the imagery of the divine assembly, or segments of it, as a warrior host marching with and helping the great gods. The Old Testament recognizes that from earliest times Israel's religion was strongly influenced by Canaanite mythology, and the Ugaritic texts further confirm this fact. Although constantly in reaction against the religion of Canaan, Israel drew upon this store of religious language and imagery to express her own faith even when it was in mortal combat with that of the Canaanites. For this reason the preceding pages have gone into great detail to describe the Canaanite conception of the divine warrior and his conflicts with other gods as a setting against which the early religious conceptions of Israel may be examined. There are many similarities, emphasizing once again that Yahwism did not develop in a vacuum but, as is true of all religious phenomena, related itself to its context and environment by processes of integration, assimilation, subordination, and rejection.

Building upon the pioneer work of Alt, more recent studies by Eissfeldt and others have shown that the figure of Yahweh must be seen in strong relationship to the figure of Canaanite El. This discussion has taken a major step forward with the recent work of Frank Cross, who has demonstrated more forcefully than

ever the influence of the figure of El upon that of Yahweh, albeit along different lines and with somewhat different conclusions from those of Eissfeldt.[172] In the light of this work some important conclusions may be drawn with regard to the Canaanite deities El and Baʿal and the Israelite deity Yahweh.

There can be no doubt that in many respects the imagery associated with Yahweh is the same as that associated with Baʿal, particularly with regard to Yahweh as warrior. He battles as the storm god, riding or driving the clouds. He sends forth his voice and the enemies flee. He battles the monsters of the deep who represent death and chaos, as does Baʿal. Some of these creatures have the same names in the Ugaritic texts and in the Old Testament. Noting the similarities already mentioned (Text 137 [= *CTA* 2.I] and Ps. 24), one may assume that the direct contact with Baʿalism from an early period strongly influenced the way Israel conceived its God.[173]

The question still remains, however, as to the role El played in the understanding of Yahweh as warrior. That question is emphasized by the strong rejection in normative Yahwism of the worship of Baʿal, whereas from an early stage on, Yahweh seems to have been strongly related to El, as Cross, Eissfeldt, and others have shown. Part of the answer is to be seen in the fact that Baʿal and El shared certain characteristics which must have been assimilated in the character of Yahweh. Such could be the case with regard to the role of war leader. At Ugarit, however, it is Baʿal, the god rejected by Israel, who is war leader, whereas El, who appears to have borne kinship with Yahweh, is not

primarily a warrior or the leader of a military host, although in the preceding pages we have shown some indications of his warlike character even at Ugarit. The assimilation of Baʿal's characteristics by Yahweh could easily have resulted from the frequent tendency to syncretism and apostasy. One would expect, nevertheless, that the El figure would have manifested more influence upon the warrior aspect of Yahweh's role, which was *central* to Israel's early conception of her god. The Ugaritic texts in themselves do not suggest such influence. Philo, however, paints a different picture of El and suggests that also in the imagery of divine or cosmic warfare the association of Yahweh and El may have been strong.

One can no longer explain the differences between the Ugaritic picture of El and that of Philo or Sanchuniathon by ignoring the latter as erroneous; too much of Philo's account has been shown to agree with the earlier material. It is especially in the conflict with Uranos, the passage most relevant in this discussion, that Pope and others have shown strong ties with earlier myths.

If the Canaanite mythology of Philo cannot be ignored or dismissed, the most plausible explanation of the conflicting pictures of El is that the description in Philo, which is literarily the latest, actually represents an earlier stage in the tradition, which was still discernible at Ugarit in epithets -- certainly very ancient -- and an occasional personal name, as well as one or two episodes in the Baʿal and Keret cycles, where the center of interest in the theogony was passing on to Baʿal, but which may

have lasted on in the El religion of South Canaan and through that carried over into the conception of Yahweh. Philo's account would thus represent a tradition from an earlier stage or even a different area of Canaan and explain some of the differences in an otherwise rather homogeneous picture.

Pope has briefly hinted at this approach when he notes that El "in his earlier years" may have been capable of the deeds ascribed to him in Philo.[174] More important still is his recognition that El's displacement by Baʿal "need not have been general over all the area in which El was worshiped. . . . The El of the patriarchs was the god with whom YHWH was identified."[175] D. N. Freedman has also pointed out that the identification of El and Yahweh in the patriarchal traditions reflects an earlier stage of Canaanite religion than that depicted in the Ugaritic texts.[176] Sanchuniathon's picture of El as the warrior leading his hosts into battle must belong to that earlier stage preserved in South Canaan where, as Cross has noted, some sort of cultic unity must have bound the patriarchal elements with those people who in the Late Bronze Age formed a tribal confederation centering in the worship of Yahweh.[177] The centrality of El in the few pieces of decipherable epigraphic material from southern Canaan as well as the tendency to identify El with the strong creator god, Ptah of Memphis, who was at his height at this time,[178] testifies further to the preservation of an El tradition similar to that of Sanchuniathon in the area in which the relationship between El and Yahweh developed.

In this light, epithets such as *ʾēl gibbôr* and **ʾel dū yahwī*

ṣabā'ōt make more sense. Thus the imagery of Yahweh as warrior god, leader of the cosmic armies (see next part) -- an imagery central to Israel's religion from earliest times -- was a basic aspect of the concept of deity in the ancient Near East but bore special affinities to the warlike character of the Canaanite gods El and Ba al with whom contact was intimate and from whom certain other aspects were assimilated into the Israelite understanding of Yahweh and his rule of the universe.[179]

PART TWO

COSMIC WAR AND HOLY WAR IN ISRAEL

The gods of Canaanite mythology and religion in particular and of Near Eastern mythology in general fought their wars to maintain or enhance their own positions in the divine world, to save or punish peoples of the earth, and to ensure and preserve order in the universe. In this interrelation of the cosmic and the historical, such fundamental matters as kingship, salvation, creation, and the building of temples were related to and depended upon the military activities of the gods and their armies. So in Israel's understanding of deity, developed as it was in interaction with other cultures of the Near East, her early wars were in fact "the wars of Yahweh." The primal acts of deliverance and the process of forming a people or nation centered in these wars of Yahweh when as commander of the armies of heaven and earth he fought for Israel. This imagery of the divine warrior thus became a major factor in the formation of Yahwism and continued so throughout Israel's history.

The sources for this study are, first of all, Old Testament

texts from the early history of Israel into the tenth to ninth centuries. Literary material that can be dated with a high degree of probability provides valuable historical control, so we shall focus in this part on the early history.[1] When dealing with language and imagery, and sometimes even with cultic matters, however, one may eliminate valuable evidence by imposing precise temporal restrictions, evidence which belongs to the subject matter under investigation and which often has an older history than the present literary setting reflects. Thus passages which illuminate the subject but are somewhat later will also be used. This material further serves the valuable function of confirming the continuity in later traditions of the themes under study here.

Both prose and poetry furnish significant data. Prose emphasizes more often the historical practice of holy war, while poetry tends to emphasize the mythopoeic, the cosmic. It must be noted, however, that these distinctions, to some degree inherent in the nature of the material, are not rigid. Indeed, it is where the situation is reversed and the prose narrative points to the intervention of divine or cosmic elements while the hymnic literature reflects the mundane aspects of Israel's warfare along with the activity of the divine warrior and his hosts (for example, Judg. 5), that the fusion or conjunction of the human and the cosmic is most clearly seen.

Different types of poetic literature are relevant to the subject at hand, indicating that while form-critical questions are important, conclusions are not drawn merely by determining

the *Sitz im Leben* of a single particular genre.[2] Rather, the various types, together with their language, provide the basis for determining conclusions. The principal concern, therefore, in the exegetical comments which follow is recognition within the text of how Israel understood her god -- Yahweh as creator and leader of the warrior hosts of the cosmos coming to Israel's aid -- a conception determined both by the language, that is, the imagery, and by genre and structure.[3]

The Divine Council in Israelite Thought

Nature and Function

In many respects the Israelite notion of a divine assembly was quite similar to that of the surrounding cultures, particularly Canaan and Mesopotamia, and assuredly adapted from them.[4] As described in the Old Testament this assembly consists of a largely nebulous array of divine beings called *ʾelōhîm/bᵉnê ʾēlîm qᵉdōšîm*, *bᵉnê ʿelyôn* (Ps. 82:6), *ʿbādîm* (Job 4:18; Isa. 44:26), *mᵉšārᵉtîm* (Ps. 104:4), *mēlîṣ* (Job 33:23),[5] *rûaḥ* (I Kings 22:21; Ps. 104:3-4),[6] *ʿēd* (Job 16:19),[7] or in totality *ʿadat ʾēl* (Ps. 82:1), *dōr* (Amos 8:14),[8] *sôd qᵉdōšîm* (Ps. 89:8), *qᵉhal qᵉdōšîm* (Ps. 89:6), *môʿēd* (Isa. 14:13), *sôd yhwh* (Jer. 23:18), *sôd ʾelōah* (Job 15:8), and *ʿanānê šᵉmayyāʾ* (Dan. 7:13).[9] The somewhat enigmatic creatures called *kᵉrûbîm* appear to have been regarded as mythical creatures belonging to the divine assembly (for example, Gen. 3:24 where *kᵉrûbîm* guard the gate of Eden) as were the *śᵉrāpîm* (Isa. 6:2-6).[10] The members of the assembly functioned almost entirely anonymously and as a whole, with the principal ex-

ceptions of the *śāṭān* of Job and elsewhere and the *malʾak yhwh*, who plays a major role at many points and is often identifiable with Yahweh himself.

The host of heaven, *ṣᵉbāʾ haššāmayim*, also function as a part of the divine assembly.[11] Micaiah ben Imlah in his vision of the divine council sees standing about Yahweh "all the host of heaven" (II Kings 22:19). This host includes the sun, the moon, and the stars (Deut. 4:19 and 17:3) and is identified with the angelic host (Ps. 103:20-21; Ps. 148:2-3). In Job 38:7 *kôkᵉbê bōqer*, "morning stars," appears in parallelism with *bᵉnê ʾᵉlōhîm*. G. Westphal in an old but very important article has pointed out the basic military connotation of the term *ṣᵉbāʾ haššāmayim*.[12] The shift here between "host," "army," and "council" appears in other Semitic languages, for example, Akkadian *puḫru*, which can mean either "assembly" (divine or human) or "army," that is, a military assembly.[13] The military function of the divine council, which is a primary one, is elaborated in detail in the following pages.

But the assembly served also as judicial court (Ps. 82; Job 1--2; Zech. 3).[14] Psalm 82 particularly presents the members of the council as responsible for giving justice to the weak, the poor, the fatherless, and pronounces a sentence of death against the gods because of their failure to administer that responsibility. This was one of the ways Israel dealt with the phenomenon of the presence of divine beings over against the fact of the total rule of Yahweh in the divine realm. Although in this context (probably a relatively early one) the gods were sentenced

to death, they nevertheless remained in Israelite thought as ministers and servants of Yahweh. The centrality of the concern for justice is nowhere more dramatically or forcefully presented than in this psalm and testifies to the importance that the conception of the divine assembly held in Israelite culture.

The judicial role of the assembly relates also to another important function, that of bearing the message of the deity Yahweh, a message which is often a judicial verdict. The assembly itself may be addressed by Yahweh or one of his messengers and called upon to perform a task. The opening sentences of Second Isaiah (Isa. 40:1ff.) with their plural imperatives provide an excellent illustration of Yahweh's addressing his messengers.[15] In the following verses the herald voices transmit the directives of Yahweh to the council. Often the *mal'ak yhwh* is named specifically as Yahweh's messenger who addresses either the council or Israel.

In several instances the messenger of the council is a prophet. The most notable illustrations of this phenomenon are the call of Isaiah in chapter 6, when he is cleansed and sent to proclaim to the people, and the vision of Micaiah (I Kings 22) which is transmitted to the king. Other examples could be cited, but it is sufficient to say that the conception of a divine assembly around the throne of Yahweh formed a basic element in the Israelite understanding of prophecy. The prophet was one who stood in the council of Yahweh. His task was the proclamation of the will and message of Yahweh as declared in the heavenly assembly. It is rather surprising, therefore, that the fundamental role of the

council of Yahweh in the nature and function of Israelite prophecy has been so little recognized by those who have dealt with that subject.[16] Not only are the passages cited above clear indication, but Jeremiah is very explicit about the fact that the true prophet is distinguished from the false by the fact that the true prophet has stood in the council of Yahweh.

> For who has stood in the council (*sôd*) of Yahweh to see and hear his word . . .
>
> But if they had stood in my council, they would have caused my people to hear my words. (Jer. 23:18,22)

Finally, one may note the role of the council as a worshiping coterie in the divine theophany. The clearest example is the early hymn Psalm 29 in which the *bᵉnê ʾēlîm* are called to bow down and worship Yahweh at his appearance. The theophany of Yahweh and his hosts in the wars of Israel is discussed below.

Comparison and Contrast with the Divine Assembly of Other Near Eastern Religions

There are marked similarities and dissimilarities in the conception of the divine assembly in the mythology and religion of Mesopotamia, Canaan, and Israel. The basic notion of a council of divine beings grouped around a particular deity or deities is common to all. So is the fact that these are largely anonymous creatures, despite a tendency toward specific identification in the more polytheistic religions. Also, the terminology is almost exactly the same in Israel and Canaan, differences being rather minor with one notable exception. The most common designation for the assembly in both Mesopotamian and Canaanite mythology is

puḫur (Ugar. *pḫr*, *mpḫrt*) or, more fully, *puḫur ilāni* (Ugar. *pḫr ilm*, *pḫr bn ilm*) -- terminology which appears nowhere in the Old Testament. This absence is striking in view of the general duplication of terms and must have an explanation. It could be that the absence of the term *puḫru* represents a conscious rejection of an aspect of Canaanite mythology, but such an hypothesis is quite unlikely in view of the fact that there is little hesitation in using other terminology to express the same thing, some of which must have appeared in Israel under direct Canaanite influence. A more likely explanation is that a lexical shift took place in which *puḫru* fell out of use in Hebrew while the term *ṣābā'*, a word foreign to Ugaritic and Akkadian as a designation for the divine host, became the common one in Hebrew.[17]

One notes further the fact that the divine assemblies of these cultures all included the heavenly host, the sun, moon, and stars. A major difference, however, is the fact that Israel's was basically a monotheistic faith in which these heavenly beings were not independent, self-sufficient, major deities, but simply a part of the large group of divine beings subject to the will of Yahweh, whereas elsewhere they maintained independent status as major deities. The fact, however, that the Israelite concept included the heavenly host (again an explanation within her own framework of existence of divine phenomena in surrounding cultures)[18] opened the door to a possible elevation of these elements to a status equal with Yahweh so that they might be worshiped in their own right. This is precisely what happened in the seventh century (II Kings 21:5; 23:5).[19]

Another marked similarity, especially between Israel and Canaan, is the imagery of the messenger to and from the god(s).[20] The messenger is called a *mal'āk* in both Hebrew and Ugaritic, although Ugaritic also uses the term *t'dt*. In the Ugaritic texts messengers carry the proclamation of one god to another or even to the whole council (for example, Text 137 [= *CTA* 2.I]). So also as indicated above, Yahweh in the Old Testament sends heralds with a message or command to the council. In both cases we actually have the appearance of the messengers in the assembly and see strong similarities in them, particularly in regard to their rather warlike mien. In addition, one of the basic stylistic characteristics of the message formula in the Old Testament -- a series of imperatives -- is often a characteristic of the message style in the Ugaritic texts.

There are also some differences between Israelite and Canaanite religion with regard to the messenger imagery. In Ugaritic these messengers often have definite names. That tendency was a rather late development in Israel, reflecting a growing preoccupation in later stages with the council and its constituency. Fierce competition with the Canaanite cult in Israel's early history forbade this preoccupation with details in that time. The messengers of Canaanite mythology also appear to have moved in pairs, a fact which probably reflects actual practice on the historical plane.[21] In the Old Testament where identification of the messenger is made, it is primarily only one figure, although the plural *mal'ākîm* is often used as a general designation and sometimes more than one figure may appear (for example,

the three men who appear to Abraham and the two messengers who appear to Lot -- Gen. 18 and 19).

The single messenger is the *mal'ak yhwh*. In various texts this figure is often indistinguishable from Yahweh, and the proposal has been made that the *mal'ak yhwh* is merely an extension of Yahweh, an aspect of Israel's notion of "corporate personality."[22] Without denying the close association of the *mal'āk* to Yahweh in the Old Testament, one should note that the great wealth of Canaanite mythology available now makes it clear that the *mal'āk* originally was conceived of quite clearly as a distinct being within the council. Israel's tendency to identify the *mal'ak yhwh* with Yahweh himself probably represents in some contexts a tendency to avoid giving members of the council too much individual status although it may not have been as conscious an action as this would imply. The fact that the messenger was called the "messenger of *Yahweh*" may have contributed to the tendency. This characteristic of identifying or associating the messenger(s) with a particular deity Israel shared with Canaanite mythology, although in the latter case more than one deity could have a set of messengers, a phenomenon impossible in Israel. In the Elohistic or northern tradition in Israel, however,the interchange of *yhwh* and *mal'ak yhwh* did represent a tendency to substitute the *mal'āk* or *šēm* in the accounts of the activities of Yahweh himself. This tendency continued and was further elaborated in later Jewish tradition.

But more basic differences than these separated the imagery of the divine assembly in Israelite lore from that of Canaan and

Mesopotamia.[23] At the heart of the matter lies the distinction between a polytheistic development and a basically monotheistic thrust, a distinction expressed in the fact that in Mesopotamia and Canaan the council existed as a "primitive democracy,"[24] whereas in Israel, Yahweh was the absolute ruler. In Mesopotamian theology each member of the council had a voice, and decisions were made by the whole body or by subgroups within the body. Even "the great gods," "the seven gods who determine destinies," were subject to the will and decisions of the assembly.[25] At Ugarit matters were decided largely at the whim and impulse of various deities, the council as a whole acquiescing. But Israel's religion knew no pantheon of ruling deities in competition with one another. The members of her divine assembly were nebulous, anonymous beings who enjoyed no independent status, ministers (*m^{e}śār^{e}tîm*) and servants (*^{ca}bādîm*) of Yahweh; all decisions and judgments were made by Yahweh and imposed upon the rest of the council as well as upon Israel and other earthly powers.

The Israelite divine assembly knew no real distinctions between groups. Although different terms were used, most of them could apply to the council as a whole. The divine assemblies of Mesopotamia and Ugarit, however, consisted apparently of various groups of gods, though again precise distinctions are not always possible. In Mesopotamian mythology there were "the great gods" and "the seven gods who determine destines." At Ugarit there is no precise equivalent to the latter group, but *ilm rbm* appears several times (see preceding part), and, as noted previously,

there were other associations often in identification with particular deities. Also the *rpum* and *ilnym* may have corresponded in some manner to the Igigi and Anunnaki of Mesopotamian mythology.[26]

In short, the polytheistic impulse of surrounding cultures tended to produce the conception of the divine assembly marked by specificity, complexity, independence, and democratic rule, whereas the monotheistic impulse of Israelite religion tended toward a notion of the council of Yahweh marked by anonymity, uniformity, powerlessness, and autocratic rule. It must not be forgotten, however, that in terms of the dispensation of justice, kingship, and the affairs of war the divine assembly of the Old Testament must be looked at against the backdrop of the similar imagery in the extra-biblical literature of the ancient Near East. The last category, involving the warrior character of the god and his host, is the particular focus of attention in these pages.

The Divine Warrior and His Army in the Early Poetry

Most of the material here belongs to the earliest literary remains of Israelite history. While in the past some of these poems have been regarded as quite late, the careful philological and linguistic work of Ginsberg, Albright, Cross, Freedman, and others has produced a growing consensus about the antiquity of most of the poems of the Pentateuch and the historical books as well as a number of the Psalms. Thus it is possible to say that the phenomena and imagery of this literature reflect to a large degree the early conceptions of Israelite faith. Precise dating,

however, is not the most important question. For that reason, passages from the prophets and the other end of Israel's historical continuum as well as prose texts from various sources will be examined in the following sections to demonstrate the rather widespread character of the language and imagery of Yahweh and his cosmic army. Although a number of texts are relevant, it has already been recognized that many of them are related in terms of theme and form, thus affording a certain amount of uniformity as a basis for conclusions and some degree of variety as a basis for checking the conclusions as well as the extent of influence of the theme under discussion.

Deuteronomy 33:2-5, 26-29

For our purposes, investigation of these texts need not start with the earliest (Ex. 15) because chronological sequence within this corpus is not a significant consideration. The framework of the Blessing of Moses is representative of the themes common to the picture of God the Warrior in the early material and in its theophanic character is closely related to other passages. These verses (2-5, 26-29) present a hymn of praise to Yahweh, describing the conquest of Canaan in terms of a theophany of Yahweh and his heavenly host leading the armies of Israel.[27] The structure of the poem may be described simply:

1. Theophany of Yahweh and his heavenly army (vv. 2-3)
2. Establishment of kingship (vv. 4-5)
3. Israel's settlement in the land (vv. 26-29)

Verses 2-3[28]

yhwh msyny b'

wzrḥ mś'yr l ר'ת*mw*
lnw

hwpy' mhr p'rn

w'th-m rbbt qdš

mymynw 'šd ר'ת*lm*

'p ḥbb 'mym

kl qdšר'ת bydk

whmtkw lrglk

yṣ' -m dbrtyk

Yahweh from Sinai came

(And) he beamed forth from Seir for his peo[ple][29]

He shone forth from Mount Paran.

(And) with him myriads of holy ones,

At his right hand warriors of the gods,

Yea, the purified ones of the peoples.

All the holy ones are at thy hand,

(Indeed) they bow down at thy feet;

They lift up thy decisions.

The first tricolon is fairly straightforward. The only problem in the text is the form *lmw*, tentatively emended here to *l* ר'ת*mw*, on the assumption that a letter has fallen out.[30] Yahweh is pictured as marching forth from Sinai and the south, as is typical of the theophanic[31] passages in the early poetry.[32] The most important form in the tricolon is *hôpîa'*. This verb has as its basic meaning "to shine, illumine" and is associated three

times in the Old Testament with the shining of light (Job 3:4; 10:22; 37:15). In at least one other instance (Job 10:3) the context also clearly indicates the meaning "shine." All other uses of this verb refer to Yahweh and his theophany and may best be translated as "shine forth."[33] The verb *yp*ʿ has now been found in the Amorite names of Mari and among the onomastica of Ugarit.[34] These are theophorous names several times involving the warrior god Baʿal-Hadad as the divine element. Most instructive, however, is the use of *yp*ʿ in finite forms in the Ugaritic texts. It appears in only two contexts. One of these is *ʿnt*: III:34 // IV:49 (= *CTA* 3.III.34 // IV.49):

*mn . ib . yp*ʿ *. lbʿl .*

ṣrt . lrkb . ʿrpt .

What enemy has shone forth against Baʿal,

(What) adversary against the Rider of Clouds?

In this context the term *yp*ʿ clearly refers to the conflicts or battles between the gods. Text 137:3 (= *CTA* 2.I.3) which contains the other instance of a finite form of *yp*ʿ, is unfortunately broken. The context, however, is the conflict between Baʿal and Yamm. It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that its usage is the same as in *ʿnt*. The proper name *yp*ʿ*bʿl* points in the same direction. Sparse though the data may be, one is forced to conclude on this basis that *yp*ʿ is a term of battle particularly associated with deity. Aside from its presence in Job in a rather late context there is nothing in the Old Testament to modify that conclusion. Psalm 80:2b-4 gives an illuminating example of this meaning:

He who is enthroned on the cherubim, shine forth (*hôpîʿāh*)
Before Ephraim and Benjamin and Manasseh
Rouse up (*ʿôrᵉrāh*) thy might
And come to save us.
O God, restore us,
And make thy face to shine (*hāʾēr*)
That we may be delivered.

The context of these verses is clearly a call for victory in battle. Yahweh, who is enthroned on the Ark, is urged to "shine forth" in battle to rouse up his might for a victorious deliverance. The precise meaning of *hôpîʿāh* is spelled out in 4b where the victorious deliverance of the people is wrought by the shining of Yahweh's face.[35]

The first tricolon of Deuteronomy 33 is, therefore, a vivid description of Yahweh's coming from Sinai, shining forth for battle from the south, the region that is not only the dwelling place of the deity but also the line of march of the Israelites in their conquest of the land.

Problems and difficulties abound in the second tricolon. Not a single colon is without them. The translation of the first is that of Cross and Freedman.[36] It is assuredly correct, producing good sense and good parallelism and supported at points by the versions.[37] The term *qdš* as a basic designation for the divine beings in Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Hebrew has already been discussed.

But the translation of the second colon is much less certain. Of the various possibilities two seem to be the most

plausible. One of these is the reconstruction of Cross and Freedman, who assume an early damage to the text which produced *ʾšdt lmw* for *ʾšr ʾlm*. The assumption is quite conjectural but possible. It produces fairly good parallelism though not so satisfactory as that of Milik, who reads *ʾšrt* as a noun, "company, retinue."[38]

Another reading of the text is possible, however, which builds upon the work of Cross and Freedman together with a note of A. F. L. Beeston suggesting a South Arabic cognate.[39] We would propose to read as the original text with the early orthography:

mymn ʾšd ר֯כ֯ *lm*

At his right hand the warriors of the gods

The only consonantal shift here is reading *aleph* for *taw* with Cross and Freedman. The word *ʾšd* is, with Beeston, to be equated with South Arabic (Sabaean) *ʾsd*, which frequently has the sense "warriors." It is probably also related to Arabic *ʾsd*, which in nominal form means "lion"; in verbal form, "to be bold like a lion," "to be courageous," "to become strong, tall"; and in adjectival constructions "bold, daring (like a lion)." Furthermore the same word appears at a much earlier time in Amorite.[40] If this suggestion is correct, we would have then another possible animal name for a (war) leader and a hitherto unrecognized *hapax legomenon* in Hebrew with cognates in Amorite, Arabic, and Old South Arabic.

Cross, Freedman, and Milik's recognition that the verse contains a reference to the divine beings is incontrovertible in the

light of the context, the parallelism, and the LXX *aggeloi*. That holds true whether the solution proposed above is satisfactory or not. If it is, then the first two cola of this tricolon would be in excellent parallelism:

With him myriads of holy ones
At his right hand warriors of the gods[41]
(divine warriors)

The final colon poses problems also. We have suggested, following Mendenhall and Cross, that *hbb* may best be interpreted as a cognate of Akkadian *ebēbum/ubbubum*, "to be pure," "to purify."[42] The translation would read: "Yea, the purified (ones) of the peoples" (or "his people," if reading with LXX). The problem here is the intrusion of "the peoples," "the clans," into a theophany of Yahweh and his hosts. Poetically the reading is possible. The participle *ʾap* usually introduces a synonym or climactic element.[43] But *ʾap* can also connect elements that are both contrasting and similar types, for example, "day" and "night" (Ps. 74:16), "heaven" and "earth" (Ps. 89:12), "Yahweh rules" and "the earth is established" (Ps. 96:10). The *ʿammîm* thus are the opposite of the *ʾēlîm*, but in this context the two groups represent parts of a single element -- the entourage of Yahweh. The parallelism "warriors of the gods"//"purified of the peoples" is exact in form. The parallelism of meaning is evident too, for "the purified ones" must refer to those mustered and sanctified for war. The rest of the hymn pictures the holy warriors of Yahweh's host and Israel's host as marching forth to battle under the command of Yahweh with the conquest of Canaan

their ultimate goal.

The third tricolon may be passed over quickly because it simply continues the imagery of Yahweh and his assembly, but two or three problems of text exist. The *qdšyw* of the first colon is probably to be read as the collective *qdš* (cf. LXX).[44] The verbal form of the second colon is quite problematic. Along with Cross and Freedman's proposal to read an infixed *-t* form of *mkk*, mention should be made here of Milik's interpretation of the first two words as being Ugaritic *hm*, "lo, behold,"[45] and the verb *tkk*, known from Syriac and Arabic and then preserved in Hebrew in the noun *tōk*, "oppression." He translated: "Ils se present à ta suite (litt.: à tes pieds)."[46] Whether or not the verb *tkk* may be translated in such a mild manner is open to question.[47] The final line of the verse -- if Cross and Freedman are correct in their interpretation -- notes the role of the members of the assembly as executioners of Yahweh's will whether in war, justice, or other areas. The similarity to the role of Enlil in the Mesopotamian assembly as well as to the messenger of the god(s) in Canaanite mythology and the Old Testament is immediately obvious. Here they are concerned with the affairs of war, although judicial connotations are not far away.

Verses 4-5

twrh ṣwh lnw mšh
mwršh qhlt yʿqb
wyhw byšrwn mlk
bhtʾsp rʾšy ʿm
yḥd šbṭy yśrʾl

Moses commanded for us torah,

A possession of the assembly of Jacob.

Then (Yahweh) became king in Yešurun

When the leaders of the people gathered together

The assembly[48] of the tribes of Israel.

Although these two verses are associated here with the archaic framework, verses 2-3 and 26-29, it is likely that verses 4-5 are the torso of an alternate ancient introduction to the blessings which make up the main body of the poem, or a segment of the framework misplaced from another context (conclusion?). In that respect they were secondarily inserted into their present location in the history of tradition of this poem and were considerably disturbed in the process. Thus one must recognize a later stage when dealing with verses 4-5. This alternate introduction is, however, quite old in itself, as is the poem as a whole. It is legitimate, therefore, to say that at an early stage in Israel's literary history verses 4-5 were connected to the archaic framework, and to look at the significance of that fact, which is hardly by accident, despite the probable existence of literary or composition devices, for example, catchword association (*y^{e}šurûn*, *sînay*).

The original character of the segment is unclear, and Cross and Freedman do not even attempt a reconstruction of these verses. What they are about in their present form is well summarized by G. Ernest Wright: "As preserved, the verses refer to the organization of the nation in the wilderness, when Yahweh became its king in the constituting assembly and when Moses gave the

law."[49] Especially significant is the fact that at the stage of tradition in which the alternate introduction was attached to the framework, or vice versa, Sinai was understood not only as the mythological seat or abode of the god, as in surrounding cultures, but also as the place where the community was established by covenant. Yahweh's marching from Sinai was seen not merely as a mythological motif but in terms of the historical march of conquest from Sinai to Canaan. Equally important, in this action Yahweh became king. Unlike the basic tenet of most Near Eastern mythology, his kingship was established not primarily by the mythological battle of the gods, but by the historical victories of Yahweh and his earthly and heavenly armies over the enemies of Israel. Overtones of the cosmic battle of the gods appear quite strongly in other contexts, as is to be expected, but the basic thrust is always that seen in this hymn.[50] Israel's creation and deliverance were achieved by that fusion of the divine, or cosmic, and the historical represented in the coming of Yahweh and his heavenly army, not to fight other gods, but to fight the adversaries of Israel. This note is sounded further in the concluding verses of the framework.

That these verses do not in themselves make an acceptable transition into either the Blessings or the rest of the framework has long been recognized. Cross and Freedman, along with others, have suggested that verse 21b is probably to be connected with verses 4 and 5, but they have not believed it possible to reconstruct with any accuracy. Seeligmann has sought to do so and adds as a transition between verse 5 and verse 26 the following

cola:

wayy^{e}tannû ṣidqôt yhwh ʿāśāh

ûmišpāṭāyw ʿim yiśrāʾēl

to recount deeds of salvation performed by the Lord and His acts of deliverance on behalf of Israel:[51]

We cite this reconstruction, not from any certainty that it represents the original with exactness, but because of a conviction in the light of the text and the direction of the whole framework that the transition to verse 26 approximated this reconstruction. The recognition of the *ṣidqôt yhwh*, as in Judges 5:11, is surely correct and a conclusion to which I came independently before reading Seeligmann. As he puts it, "The tribes assemble to extol the glorious feats of deliverance performed for them by their God. Then they raise their voices exclaiming: אין כאל ישרון." Yahweh is acclaimed as king in light of the victories which he and his armies have wrought in the march of conquest.

Verses 26-29

After the interruption of the blessings these verses continue the hymn.[52] The point of focus in verses 26-29 is the conquest, the violent sacral wars of Israel under the command of Yahweh.[53] The imagery is entirely that of Yahweh as the warrior, but the warrior who brings historical conquest and deliverance rather than primeval victory.

The first colon of verse 26, probably to be read: "There is no god like the God of Ješurun," is to be compared with Psalm 89:7ff. and Exodus 15:11 and stands as an answer to the question cliché: "Who is like thee among the gods?"[54] Originally the

question and the answer must have been encomiums celebrating the victory of a god over opposing gods.[55] Psalm 89:7ff. still preserves that context. But in Deuteronomy 33:26 as in Exodus 15:11 Yahweh's cosmic or divine superiority is the result of his victories over Israel's enemies.

The rest of verse 26 in archaic manner common to Near Eastern mythology[56] describes Yahweh the warrior, rider of the clouds and the heavens, driving his chariot to battle. Verse 27 makes explicit the imagery in terms of the conquest:

And he drove out before you the enemy

And said, Destroy. . . (or "And destroyed the Amorite").[57]

The vocabulary is common to the conquest accounts. The verb *gārāš* is almost a technical term for Yahweh's activity in the conquest (Ex. 23:28-31; 33:2; 34:11; Josh. 24:12, 18; Judg. 2:3; 6:9);[58] and the command to "destroy" must be understood in terms of the *ḥērem* against the Canaanites (Josh. 7:12; 9:24; 11:14; 11:20; 24:8; Deut. 7:24; Amos 2:9).

In light of the above the expression *ʿam nôšaʿ byhwh* may be translated in a military sense as "an army victorious in Yahweh."[59] The following cola, referring to Yahweh as Israel's shield and sword, carry on the imagery of Yahweh as the warrior leading the army of Israel, and the rest of the passage is a description of Israel safely entrenched in Canaan, a picture which connotes the Promised Land, the object of Israel's journeys, the motive behind her holy war or conquest ideology.

The hymn of Deuteronomy 33 is a song of praise to Yahweh for his aid in the march of conquest. The center of the psalm is the

theophany of Yahweh and his hosts, but that theophany is a march of war, as Yahweh and his hosts lead Israel into the Promised Land. The origin of the theophany is Sinai, and the south. The references to Seir and Mount Paran, like the references to Edom and Teman in parallel passages (Judg. 5:4-5 and Hab. 3:3), are in part poetic devices, stylistic parallelism representing Yahweh's abode in the south. But, more than that, these geographic designations refer to Israel's march through the wilderness.[60] That fact is spelled out explicitly in the theophany of Psalm 68:8 (see below) and is self-evident here when the hymnic framework is looked at as a whole.

Parallels to this type of theophany often expressed in similar language are not uncommon in the literature of the ancient Near East,[61] and Israel's poetic literature certainly came under stylistic and thematic influence from these sources. In the parallel texts of Mesopotamia, however, the theophany is generally in reference to the battle of the gods or the going forth of Šamaš, or the like. In the classic theophanic descriptions of the Old Testament under discussion here, the divine assembly also forms the background, echoes of the battle of the gods are heard (for example, in Ps. 68 and Hab. 3), and indeed Yahweh is pictured as "shining forth" or beaming like the sun; but in these descriptions the context and the warrior language reveal that the theophany represents Yahweh and his heavenly host fighting with the earthly armies to take the Promised Land or to conquer enemies after the original settlement. And the kingship of Yahweh is established over Israel by his might and victory. This

picture in Deuteronomy 33 is further confirmed by other texts.

Judges 5

The Song of Deborah, which probably dates from the late twelfth or early eleventh century,[62] is a victory song similar to the hymn or psalm of praise, and in this respect is like the framework of Deuteronomy 33.[63] Like that passage also, the focus is on the victory of Yahweh and his armies over the enemies of Israel, although the movement of the song is not entirely consistent (as, for example, Ex. 15), and there are different forms within the poem. The song deals at times with the leaders, the tribes, individual feats, and the like; but the center of attention is -- the *ṣidqôt Yahweh*. Von Rad in his study of the holy war in ancient Israel has made this poem the point of departure and concludes, correctly no doubt, that the poem deals with one of the sacral wars of Israel within the context of the tribal league. The Song of Deborah belongs to a context of covenant, tribal league, and holy war set against the mytho-theological conception of the divine warrior's fighting with and for Israel. Without my going through all of the poem in detail, the following comments may make that context clear:[64]

Verse 2

bpr^{ɛ} pr^{ɛ}wt bysr^{ɔ}l

bhtndb ^{ɛ}m

brkw yhwh

When locks hung loose in Israel,

When the people offered themselves freely

Bless Yahweh!

The first line of this verse has always been enigmatic, with the translation of the root *prʿ* a subject of considerable disagreement. Hardly any two versions agree on the meaning of this line. The notion of "leading" and "leaders" is dependent upon Arabic roots and Septuagint translations. All uses of the noun in Hebrew relate to the hair of the head, and the verb is a normal Hebrew verb meaning "let go," "let loose," "unbind," sometimes having to do with the letting loose of the hair. Akkadian *pirtu* and Arabic *frʿ* also refer to long or abundant hair.[65] There can be little question therefore, that the line is to be translated as it is above or in some similar manner.[66]

The problem then becomes one of meaning and interpretation. Here again the conclusion seems rather obvious though it is not often drawn.[67] The hanging loose of locks may refer to the wearing of the hair unshorn as a vow and a sign of holiness according to the custom of the Nazirite vow. The law of the Nazirite in Numbers 6:5 makes it clear that wearing the locks (*peraʿ*) of hair long is to sanctify oneself, to separate oneself as holy to Yahweh. This is the only context in which specific reference to the hair in Judges 5:2 makes sense. The reference must be to the long hair of a type or group of warriors who consecrated themselves to fight the holy wars of Yahweh. If so, Judges 5:2 contains the earliest reference to this custom and would seem to point to the fact that the Nazirite vow may have originated in the ritual of holy war or at least have been closely associated with that ritual at the beginning, although by the time of the presentation of the Nazirite law in Numbers 6 (P) that associa-

tion had been lost.

The Samson story (Judg. 13--16) provides further possible evidence for this conclusion. Now greatly embroidered with legend and folktale,[68] this ancient story[69] probably centered about an authentically historical figure.[70] The key element here is Samson's long hair, the result of a Nazirite vow from birth and the only part of the vow which Samson seems to have observed throughout his life. The direct link between Samson's long hair and his great strength and ability as warrior would point again to the Nazarite as originally a type of holy warrior, especially inasmuch as he possessed a charisma also that contributed to his fighting ability (Judg. 14:19; 15:14).

But the same type of phenomenon may have been present among other peoples. Gunkel has pointed out parallels on the basis of comparative studies, but even more significant is the reference in Deuteronomy 32:42 to "the long-haired heads of the enemy (*rôš parᶜôt ᶜôyēb*). Two further pieces of data may be noted briefly although they are of necessity largely conjectural and may be put as questions. The LXX of I Samuel 1, now confirmed explicitly by 4Q Sam[a], preserves the tradition that Samuel was a Nazirite.[71] Even the MT of I Samuel 1:11 indicates that a vow was made that no razor should touch his head. There is no explicit sign of any warrior activity on Samuel's part, but could the clear dominance of Israel over the Philistines, which the Deuteronomist ascribes to his days of rule, have had anything to do with his Nazirite vow and its holy war connotations? Also one may ask whether the Rekabites, whose vow did not include the matter of unshorn locks,

could have had some similar relationship to the holy war tradition inasmuch as they were zealous warriors of Yahweh? At this point, however, evidence ends and so must conclusions.

The second half of Judges 5:2 must then also relate to the willingness of the warriors to consecrate themselves to Yahweh in battle. If Cross is right that *n^{e}dîbê* should be inserted before *ʿam* as in Numbers 21:18, then the reference would be only to the leaders inasmuch as *n^{e}dîbê* in Numbers 21:18 is parallel to *śārîm* (cf. Judg. 5:9).[72] This emendation, however, would not alter the meaning. One should not assume that because the people or their leaders were praised for their willingness to rally, they were not expected -- or commanded -- to participate. The fact that they were expected to join in does not preclude thanksgiving or self-congratulation at that fact, precisely because the tribes did not always rally even though under strong obligation to do so.

Verses 4-5[73]

yhwh bsʾtk mśʿyr
bṣʿdk mśdh ʾdwm
ʾrṣ rʿš
gm šmym ntpw[74]
gm ʿbym ntpw mym
hrym nzlw[75]
mpny yhwh zh syny[76]
mpny yhwh ʾlhy yśrʾl
Yahweh, when you went forth from Seir,
When you marched out from the field of Edom

The earth shook;

Even the heavens dripped,

Yea, the clouds dripped water,

The mountains streamed

From before Yahweh, the One of Sinai,

From before Yahweh, God of Israel.

These verses describe the theophany of Yahweh the warrior and as in Deuteronomy 33:2-3 form the appropriate beginning of the account of the victory of the divine warrior over Israel's enemies. Although no specific reference is made to the divine assembly, the picture is that of Yahweh, the warrior storm god, marching forth with his hosts to battle for Israel (see also Deut. 33: Ps. 68; Hab. 3). This passage is a key element in the hymn, linking the great theophany of Yahweh (and his army) to the holy wars of the people of Israel. Her wars were Yahweh's wars (I Sam. 18:17; 25:28; Num. 21:14), her victory dependent upon his mighty intervention. Although representing a particular genre or form found elsewhere, the theophany cannot be separated from its content; it describes Yahweh's coming to the aid of Israel against Sisera.[77]

Verse 8b[78]

mgn ʾm yrʾh wrmḥ

bʾrbʿym ʾlp[79] *byśrʾl*

Was shield or spear seen

Among the forty thousand in Israel?

Verse 8a is obscure and corrupt. The second half of the verse, however, is fairly straightforward and even the differences in the A and B texts of LXX are explicable in terms of the

reading in MT.[80] The absence of weapons in Israel can make sense only in the context of holy war where it was believed that weapons and numbers did not really matter because Yahweh came and fought for Israel.[81] This does not mean that in actuality there was no fighting with weapons. Rather, it was in the ideology, expressed so vividly in the poem, that weapons and human might were regarded as being of minimal value. Thus, contrary to Albright's view, the Israelites might well "celebrate a great victory by boasting that they had no weapons at all."[82]

Verse 11c

ʾz yrdw lšʿrym ʿm yhwh

Then went down the people of Yahweh to the gates

In this brief description of the march of the army to battle the phrase *ʿam Yahweh* is worthy of comment. Here as elsewhere (cf. v. 13), it refers to the troops of the tribal league, the earthly army of Yahweh, levied for battle.[83] Similar uses of the phrase are to be found in Judges 20:2 and II Samuel 1:12 (cf. Num. 17:6; I Sam. 2:24; and II Sam. 14:13). Equally significant is the fact that in the holy war instructions (1QM) at Qumran the same designation in the form *ʿmʾl* continues as the name of the forces of Yahweh which go out to battle (Col. I:5). The lead banner, which goes before all the army, is inscribed "People of God" (III:12). An early element of the holy war tradition is carried over here into apocalyptic.

Verse 12

ʿwry ʿwry dbwrh

ʿwry ʿwry dbry šyr

qwm brq

wšbh šbyk

bn ʾbynʿm

Awake, awake, Deborah!

Awake, awake, utter a song!

Arise, Baraq,

And take captive thy captivity,

Son of Abinoam.

The MT of these verses offers no problem by itself. The B text of LXX also follows MT precisely. But the A text is quite another matter and introduces more complexity. Burney, who ably discusses and analyzes the variants, sees no reason for departing from the "lucid text" of MT.[85] Cross, however, pointing to the great variety in LXX without apparent basis in the MT and to the fact that a number of variants are pre-Hexaplaric, maintains that the A text of LXX must be taken into consideration. Because it is difficult to assume conflation, he suggests plausibly, though tentatively, a tricolon in the first line somewhat as follows:[86]

ʿr ʿr dbr

ʿr dbr (w)šr

ʿr rbt ʿm

or

ʿrr rbtʿm

Awake, awake, Deborah!

Awake, speak (and) sing (the battle song):

Awake, mistress of the people!

or

Arouse the myriads of the people.

Then, following the A or Lucianic reading, Cross would add *ḥzq b^{c}z* or the like after *qûm* in the second line.[88]

This reconstruction does not solve all the problems, but it probably is the best that can be suggested now. Moore has correctly recognized that the imperatives do not call for Deborah to sing a victory song after the fight. Rather, the battle is at hand, and Deborah is enjoined to sing a battle song to rouse the people to fight for Yahweh, even as Baraq is urged to rise up and capture the enemy.

The presence of the imperatives immediately raises the question as to who the speaker is. The common answer is that it is the poet. In verse 23, however, the commands are uttered by the *mal^{ɔ}ak Yahweh*, so it is quite possible that in verse 12 also the angel of Yahweh addresses Deborah and Baraq from the heavenly assembly which marches with Yahweh.

The imperatives *^{c}ûrî* and *qûm*, common terminology for initiating or stirring up battle, apply to Israel in her holy wars (Josh. 8:1; Judg. 7:9; 7:15; 18:9) when Yahweh commands her to arise and fight because he has already given the enemy into her hand. But the verbs refer also to the warrior activity of Yahweh. The ancient battle song of the Ark discussed below enjoins Yahweh to rise up (*qûmāh*) and put his enemies to rout (cf. Ps. 7:7; 59:5; 80:3; Isa. 10:26; Zech. 13:7). Psalm 44, which is full of holy war motifs, urges Yahweh to awake (*^{c}ûrāh* -- v. 24), to rise up (*qûmāh* -- v. 27) and come to the aid of his people. Isaiah 42:13 pictures Yahweh the warrior as he goes forth:

Yahweh goes forth as a warrior

As a man of war he rouses up (*yāʿîr*) his zeal.

The closest parallel to the language of Judges 5:12 is in Isaiah 51:9:

Awake, awake, put on strength, arm of Yahweh.

Awake, as in days of old, generations long ago.

In this instance, however, the military terminology describing Yahweh as a mighty warrior is in the context of his primordial cosmic battle with the dragon, in part historicized in terms of the Exodus.

Verses 13-18

It is not necessary to go into minutiae on this section. Verses 14-16 are very difficult and corrupt while verses 17-18 are fairly straightforward. The important thing to note is the formal listing of ten of the tribes in the tribal league. Only Judah and Simeon are definitely missing. Machir appears here for Manasseh. One is not inclined to expect Machir to represent all of Manasseh as it was classically represented east and west of the Jordan, but it is possible for it to do so. Or perhaps Machir represents Manasseh but only a part of it. In any event, the equation Machir = Manasseh is unavoidable for this poem,[89] and the same is true of Gilead = Gad. Here also the equation is not quite normal because one usually expects Gilead to indicate a larger area, but the territory of Gilead is definitely associated with Gad, which occupied a portion of it(Deut. 3:12; Josh. 13:24-28), as well as Manasseh (Num. 32:39ff.). Note also that the Syriac as well as some manuscripts of LXX have Gad for Gilead. The dropping of the *lambda* could easily explain that change in the

Greek but not in the Syriac.

Another alternative is to include Gad and Manasseh in the list, making an even twelve tribes. There are two places where this could be done. One possibility is the beginning of verse 16 where Albright would place Gad.[90] Also the fact that Zebulon is mentioned twice in two different places in the list might suggest that in one instance another tribe was once present.

The almost universal interpretation of this list of tribes has been that it is a compilation of words of praise for Ephraim, Benjamin, Machir, Zebulun, Issachar, and Naphtali for their participation in the battle, along with rebukes of Reuben, Gilead, Dan, and Asher for failure to respond to the call to fight. There are difficulties in this interpretation, and another one may be suggested that is equally plausible, if not more so.[91] It is possible to see in verses 13-18 simply an account of the mustering and marching of the tribes to holy war against Sisera, with no indication of anything but full and complete participation. The problems posed to this interpretation in verses 16-17 are not so difficult as might seem at first glance; the *lāmāh* of verses 16-17, upon which much of the weight of common opinion depends, may easily have been originally an emphatic particle *lo-mi*, "indeed, surely," or the like, as Cross has suggested. The orthography would have been the same.

Furthermore, the list is a compilation of blessings or tribal sayings similar to Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33. It is rather remarkable that the closest parallels between Judges 5 and these two poems are in Judges 5:16-17 and the blessings of

Zebulun and Issachar in Genesis 49:13-15. Different tribes are involved, but the blessings are remarkably similar. Reuben in Judges 5:16 and Issachar in Genesis 49:14 dwell "among the sheepfolds(?)" (*bên hammišpatayim*);[92] Asher in Judges 5:17 and Zebulun in Genesis 49:13 both dwell "at the shore of the sea" (*lᵉḥôp yammîm*). Dan in Judges 5:17 and Zebulun in Genesis 49:13 are both situated at a place of "ships" (*ʾoniyyôt*). Only the comment on Gilead is unrelated to this section of Genesis 49. One is compelled, therefore, to see the poet of Judges 5 filling out his list from a blessings or sayings tradition reflected in Genesis 49, but not necessarily directly drawn from there -- a tradition which had nothing to do with war. Furthermore, the fact that these particular comments do not relate originally to the war may suggest an expansion at this point to include other tribes not originally here.

Strong credibility is given to this view by verse 23 where the town of Meroz (?) is clearly cursed for failure to respond. Here there can be no question of what is involved. The condemnation is strong and comes from the divine assembly itself (see below on vs. 23). Nothing in the tone of verses 16-17 compares with verse 23. One is thus led to see in 14-18 a list of blessings for the full cooperation of the tribal league as the traditions of sacral war demanded. The striking absence altogether of Judah and Simeon can best be explained on the assumption of their probable association at this time with a six-tribe league in the south which did not involve their participation with these tribes against Sisera.

Verse 20[93]

mn šmym nlḥmw hkwkbym

mm⌜z⌝ltm nlḥmw ʿm sysrʾ

From heaven fought the stars

From their stations they fought with Sisera

The reading of this verse poses no real problems. The emendation to *mimmazz*^{e}*lōtām*, which was first proposed by Winckler and may be seen in the LXX A text's *taxeōs*, "battle order," is now generally accepted by scholars.[94] The interpretation of the verse is fairly self-evident and need not be belabored, but it is central to the understanding of the poem and its imagery. In these lines the cosmic scope of the battle is hymnically elaborated. Not only the *ʿam Yahweh* (vv. 13ff.), but the starry hosts of heaven, the servants of Yahweh in battle order, fight for Israel in her holy war. The elements of nature joined in as verse 21 also shows.[95] The Kishon reflects less the context of the divine assembly and more a naturalistic event connected with the battle like the activity of the sea in Exodus 15, yet the verse follows the same train of thought as verse 20 and points further to the involvement of all the elements of the universe in the battle.[96]

Verse 23

ʾrw ⟨ʾ⟩rwr⟩[97] *mrwz*[98]

ʾmr mlʾk yhwh

ʾrw ʾrwr yšbyh

ky lʾ bʾw lʿzrt yhwh

lʿzrt yhwh bgbwrym

Curse <bitterly> Meroz,

Said the angel of Yahweh.

Curse bitterly her inhabitants.

For they did not come to the aid of Yahweh,

To the aid of Yahweh among the warriors.

The setting here is clearly the divine heavenly assembly of Yahweh. It reflects a particular type, the herald or messenger *Gattung*, in which the council of Yahweh is addressed and commended.[99] The mention of the *mal'ak Yahweh* is immediate indication of the form and context. The phrase *'āmar mal'ak yhwh* may be a gloss although it fits in terms of accent and syllable count, but if so, there is no reason to assume that it is not an early one and properly belongs in its setting. Cross suggests that it may have been a rubric, which correctly interprets the passage and would have been quite primitive. The repetition of identical plural imperatives at the beginning points also to the fact that the form is that of the messenger[100] who addresses the divine assembly and delivers Yahweh's command to curse the town or clan of Meroz for violating the covenant demand to come to the aid of the suzerain in battle.

The harsh quality of this command has been noted above. Verses 14-18 and 23 must be seen as a series of blessings and curses which reflect the covenantal form of Israel's early faith and the binding obligation of the tribes and clans to answer the call to holy war. The assembly of Yahweh stands behind this passage and the whole chapter both as participant in Israel's holy war and witness against those who violate the covenant by not participat-

ing themselves. Here is an extremely early attestation of the divine council background of the covenant lawsuit convincingly spelled out in detail by G. Ernest Wright.[101]

There may be a further reference to the divine council in this verse although here one speaks with much less certainty. Meroz is cursed for failure to come to the aid of Yahweh *baggibbôrîm*. The common and logical interpretation here is that *baggibbôrîm* should be read as "with warriors," referring to the warriors of Meroz,[102] but another plausible interpretation is that *baggibbôrîm* should be translated "among the warriors" (cf. LXX *en . . .*) and that the reference is to Yahweh among his divine warriors. The obligation of the tribes and clans to come to the aid of Yahweh and his cosmic army is no more anomalous than their obligation to come to the aid of Yahweh alone. Though not always recognized, the word *gibbôrîm* is a perfectly good designation for the members of the divine assembly. The clearest illustration is Psalm 103:20 where the members of Yahweh's entourage are specifically labeled *gibbôrê kōaḥ*. This designation occurs also in Joel 4:11 and Isaiah 13:3, which are discussed below. There may be other instances in the Old Testament,[103] but the above examples are sufficient and are matched by the frequent use of this terminology for the angels in the Qumran literature. In 1QM xv:14 the *gbwry ʾlym* are described as girding themselves for battle, and Col. xii:7 also appears to contain a reference to the angels as *gbwrym*. 1QH contains frequent reference to the *gbwrym* of the divine world: *gbwry šmym* (iii:35-36), *gbwry plʾ* (v. 21), *gbwry kwḥ* (viii:11-12), (x:34). So also the Angelic Liturgy[104] and 4QBer

(unpublished).

Verse 31[105]

kn y'bdw kl[106]

'wybyk yhwh

'hby ⌜k⌝[107] *ks't*

hšmš bgbrtw

Thus shall perish all

Of thy foes, Yahweh.

But thy friends be as the going forth

Of the sun in its might.

This verse is often regarded as a later addition unconnected with the original poem. There does seem to be a rather abrupt break between verses 30 and 31, but that is no reason for eliminating verse 31. It is a liturgical sentence climaxing and ending the poem and a paranetic extension and universalizing of the specific victory celebrated in the song. It expresses the spirit of the sacral war in which Yahweh vanquished his enemies and thus stands firmly as an integral part of the poem regardless of what particular moment it took its place. W. L. Moran, in his exposition of the covenantal background of the love of God in the Old Testament,[108] points out the significance of the *'ōh*^{a}*beykā*, "thy friends." The vassal was the "friend" and "servant" of the suzerain, Moran explains, and expressed his loyalty in terms of "love" (*ra'āmu*, *ra'amūtu*). So also Israel, bound by treaty or covenant to Yahweh, was his "friend" and depended upon that relationship of love for well-being. Moran has noted that *'hb* in Judges 5:31 is one of the earliest uses of this verb, and that it

is to be interpreted in this light.[109] Along with the blessings and curses of the chapter and its cosmic overtones reflecting the council of Yahweh, the reference to the "lovers" of Yahweh places the holy war traditions of the Song of Deborah squarely in the context of the Israelite tribal league and its covenant relationship to Yahweh, the warrior and judge, the divine champion whose victories were celebrated as the *ṣidqot Yahweh*.

Psalm 68

This ancient and confusing psalm has vexed scholars for centuries and has probably produced more comment and discussion than any other single psalm. Its problems are too vast to be elucidated to any large degree in this small scope, but recent discoveries and studies have produced new insights into the psalm.

Without going into all the suggestions that have been made,[110] one may mention two views which represent the extremes of contemporary interpretation of the psalm. In 1950 W. F. Albright produced a detailed discussion of Psalm 68, in which he put forward the view, already tentatively suggested by predecessors, that the poem is a catalogue of *incipits* or first lines of poems composed between the thirteenth and tenth centuries but put in present form probably around the time of Solomon -- a conclusion based upon linguistic, orthographic, metrical, and comparative analysis. He sees the poem as a literary composition apparently without a cultic setting in life.[111] In a full monograph written specifically as an answer to and criticism of Albright's interpretation, Sigmund Mowinckel, following the same point of view with regard to the Psalms that he espoused for over

forty years, maintains that Psalm 68 is virtually a perfect unity, belonging directly to the festival of the enthronement of Yahweh.[112] He disagrees emphatically with Albright at practically every point -- including metrical analysis -- except with regard to the Ugaritic or Canaanite background of some of the terminology and, strangely enough, with regard to date. Mowinckel also sees the psalm as an old one, having its origin in the time of Saul.[113] His reason for dating, that is, the assumed hegemony of Benjamin, is, however, quite different from that of Albright.

Most discusssions since these works were published have built upon them without following either all the way.[114] Mowinckel's attempt to find some sort of unity within a context of worship is a valid endeavor, but with regard to this particular psalm not necessarily a fruitful one. The possibility of an older unified poem underlying this one cannot be completely denied, but the present state of the text points much more clearly to a piecing together of isolated bits of poetry or *incipits*. The fitting of every single verse into a clear scheme, such as Mowinckel attempts, does not seem entirely feasible at this stage of our knowledge. Here Albright is surely correct in seeing that various parts of this psalm were not originally connected, even if his atomizing into thirty or more incipits seems rather extreme despite precedent in Akkadian sources.

Central to the psalm is a series of war songs or pieces of war poetry interspersed throughout the text.[115] They reflect battle or victory songs celebrating the victory of Yahweh and his

hosts either in the time of conquest or in the period of the Judges. Their similarity to such poems as Deuteronomy 33, Judges 5, and Exodus 15 is marked. As in Judges 5 there are strong signs that the psalm, or parts of it, had its setting in a cultic context in which the wars of Yahweh and his armies were celebrated. The text as it now stands associates with these war songs many other often baffling bits of poetry including adaptations to the royal cultus at Jerusalem.[116] It is possible to see in the pieces of war poetry a basic theme centering in the theophany of Yahweh and dealing with the battle of Yahweh and his armies against his foes and the foes of Israel. The cosmic background of Israel's wars is everywhere present, and Yahweh's kingship and the establishment of his sanctuary are themes which are also present in sections of the psalm.

Verse 2

yqwm ʾlhym

ypwʿ ʾwybyw

wynws mśnʾyw mpnyw

Let "Yahweh" arise;

Let his enemies be scattered

And let the ones hating him flee from before him

This verse is part of the ancient Song of the Ark, a variant of Numbers 10:35. Several points may be noted here. The verse forms the appropriate beginning of this psalm.[117] It was sung as Yahweh, enthroned on the Ark, went forth to holy war for his people. The enemies are Yahweh's, not Israel's. Here theophany and holy war are inextricably combined, casting Israel's under-

standing of warfare fully onto the divine plane and de-emphasizing the role of Israel, as the song of the return of the Ark in Numbers 10:36 makes clear. The battle is between the divine warrior and his enemy. Tribal participation was expected and commanded, as this psalm, Judges 5, and other texts indicate, but the invocation of the aid of the deity, a practice common in war in the Near East and elsewhere, in Israel led to the theophany[118] of Yahweh (and his hosts) -- a key element in her conception of what went on in battle.[119]

Verse 5

The point of interest here is the epithet applied to Yahweh in the second colon. The phrase *rōkēb ba*ʿ*ᵃrābôt*, perhaps to be read *rōkēb*ʿ*ᵃrāpôt*, is a common appellation of Baʿal in the Ugaritic texts (see preceding part), and refers properly to the driving of the clouds as a war chariot. Kapelrud,[120] Galling,[121] Goetze,[122] and, most recently and extensively, Mowinckel,[123] have shown that this phrase and other references to riding in the Old Testament must be understood in terms of the driving of a chariot, the principal vehicle of war in the second millennium. Again the imagery is of Yahweh's driving the clouds, the cherubim, the heavens, or other such vehicles into battle (see also v. 34; Deut. 33:26; Ps. 18:10; Isa. 19:1; Hab. 3:8; Ps. 104:3). The proper interpretation of the term *rkb* ʿ*rpt* is further reinforced by the fact that the members of Yahweh's council are pictured as riding on chariots (for example, v. 18 of this psalm -- see below).

Verses 8-9[124]

ʾ*lhym bṣ*ʾ*tk*

lpny ʿmk

bṣʿdk byšymwn[125]

ʾrṣ rʿšh

ʾp šmym ntpw

mpny ʾlhym zh syny

mpny ʾlhym

ʾlhy yśrʾl

"Yahweh," when thou didst go forth

Before thy people,

When thou didst march from[126] the wilderness,

The earth shook,

Yea the heavens dripped

Before "Yahweh" of Sinai,

Before "Yahweh"

God of Israel.

The similarity between these verses and Judges 5:4-5 is immediately obvious. There are definite distinctions or differences which led Albright to stress the separateness of the two occurrences; but these theophanies, virtually identical in form and vocabulary, must be kept together. In no way can one be said to have priority over the other. Certainly it cannot be argued that Psalm 68:8-9 is secondary to Judges 5:4-5, because of historical references in the former, but these references are most illuminating. In Psalm 68 Yahweh is pictured as leading his people, not from Seir and Edom, but from the wilderness. This is the march of conquest. Yet Yahweh is pictured also as the one of Sinai. The false dichotomy that results from separating the cosmic from the

historical, that is, Yahweh's coming from his cosmic mountain and his marching before the Ark through the wilderness, is clearly revealed when the theophanies of Judges 5, Deuteronomy 33, and Psalm 68 are looked at in their contexts. In the Song of Deborah the theophany of Yahweh's coming from a geographical location that might be construed as his abode is clearly in the context of a historical battle. The theophany can be only an echo of Yahweh's coming in conquest. Likewise the very mythopoeic theophany of Yahweh and his hosts from Sinai in Deuteronomy 33 is the center of a poem which recounts Israel's march from Sinai and the settlement in the land. Here in Psalm 68 where the imagery is clearly of Yahweh among his heavenly assembly (vv. 12, 18) and reference is made to Yahweh's battle against the cosmic enemies, Yamm and Bašan, the theophany is manifestly in terms of Yahweh's leading Israel. In all cases the picture of Yahweh and his council which is supposed to belong to the cosmic or mythopoeic realm, is set in a historical context and vice versa. Thus in these verses the fusion of the cosmic and the historical, the hosts of heaven and earth, in the conceptions associated with Israel's sacral wars and particularly the wars of the conquest is transparent. It is accentuated in what follows.

Verses 10-11[127]

These verses refer to the settlement of Israel in the Promised Land where Yahweh, associated here too with the storm god, provides for his people with rain and abundance. The marked resemblance in these verses to the content of Deuteronomy 33:26 further confirms the similarity of theme in these chapters.

Verses 12-13

ʾdny ytn ʾmr

hmbśrwt ṣbʾ rb

mlky ṣbʾwt

yddwn yddwn

The Lord gives a command;

The bearers of the word are a great host.[128]

The kings of the armies

They flee, they flee

. . . . . .[129]

Echoes of the messenger oracle appear here. The *mᵉbaśśᵉrôt* are the members of Yahweh's assembly -- a great host -- [130] who proclaim his commands for battle. Many assume that verse 13 is the proclamation but we cannot be certain. As Albright recognized, the reference is probably to the kings of the Canaanite city states and Israel's battles with them -- again in a fusion of the divine and human, the cosmic and the historical. Yahweh's action against the kings is picked up again in verse 15, though its precise connection with verses 12-13 is a problem and may not even have existed in the early stages of this composition.[131]

Verse 18

rbb ʾlhym rbtym

ʾlpᵣ ᵛšnᵣ n ʾdny

bᵣbʾwᵣ msyny bqdšᵛ

The chariots of "Yahweh" were two myriad,

A thousand the warriors/archers of the Lord,

When he came from Sinai with the holy ones.

Here the march of Yahweh and his hosts into battle is unmistakably present. "Chariots" can hardly refer to Israel's army at any early stage in her history; it is obviously the divine army here which marches forth to fight for Israel. Despite Mowinckel's difference of opinion, Albright has correctly solved the problem of the *hapax legomenon* *šn'n* by relating it to the word which appears in the Ugaritic texts as *tnn* and in the Alalakh texts as *šanannu* and refers to some class of warrior, possibly "archers."[132] If my reading of Deuteronomy 33:2 is correct, the *šnn* may be compared with the *'šd 'lm* of that verse.

The imagery of the heavenly army is further clarified when the difficult third colon is read correctly. The translation above builds upon that of Albright with only a change in the suffix, assuming instead of a third person plural a third person singular referring to Yahweh. Recognizing *qdš* as a collective "holy ones" provides a clue to the proper reading. The resulting tricolon is in good meter and parallelism and is reminiscent of Deuteronomy 33:2-3.[133] Albright maintained that the question of whether the warriors and chariots of the preceding cola are terrestrial or celestial is insoluble, although in light of II Kings 6:1[134] he favored celestial; and the new reading of the third colon makes the celestial nature of this army the more likely. We find, therefore, in Psalm 68 also the "ubiquitous motif" of Yahweh's march from the southern mountains (or Egypt) with his heavenly armies.[135]

Verses 20-21 are praise to Yahweh for his victory and Israel's salvation. The last colon of verse 21 seems to contain a

reference to Yahweh's victory over Mot (Death), which may form a connecting link with verses 22-23 recounting his victory over his cosmic enemies.

Verses 22-24

ʾk ʾlhym ymḥṣ

rʾš ʾybyw

qdqd "ršʿ" (?)

mthlk bʾšmyw

ʾmr ʾdny

ʾšbm bšn

ʾšbm mṣlwt ym

lmʿn tr̲ḥṣ

rglk bdm

lšwn klbyk

mʾybym mnḥw

How "Yahweh" has smitten

The head of his enemies

The head of the "wicked(?)"

Roaming in his guilt.

The Lord said:

I muzzled the Serpent,

I muzzled the Deep Sea

That you may wash

Your feet in blood,

The tongues of your dogs

From the enemies their portion. (?)

The picture of Yahweh's battle against his enemies is present here also, but now the enemies are interpreted as cosmic. Whether verse 22 refers to historical enemies, mythological monsters, or, more likely, both, cannot be determined. One of the most crucial words -- *śʿr* -- is highly uncertain.[136] But when verse 23 is translated correctly, we see that Yahweh's enemies are also the monsters of the cosmos. Albright in his earliest treatment of this psalm was one of the first to call attention to this theme in the verse and particularly to the mention of the serpent Bašan. But the emendations proposed there are too extreme and actually unnecessary. He refers to *ʿnt*: III: 35-44 (= *CTA* 3.III.35-44) as the basis for his readings, but does not note the fact that this passage contains almost precisely the equivalent of Psalm 68:23.[137] Dahood recognized the presence of the verb *šbm* in the second colon and correctly translated without consonantal emendation: "I smote the deep sea."[138] A simple transposition of the second and third elements of the first colon produces the same results there, although Dahood does not so interpret it. Thus I would translate as above, a translation almost identical to *ʿnt*: III:37-38 (= *CTA* 3.III.37-38):

ištbm tnn išbmʳnʾh

mḫšt bṯn ʿqltn

I muzzled Tannin, I muzzled him.

I smote the twisting Serpent.[139]

The similarity between the gory character of verse 24 and ʿAnat's massacre of the peoples (*ʿnt*: II = *CTA* 3.II) has been pointed out more than once.[140] Albright's discovery of ʿAnat in

this line is, however, as he says, more ingenious than convincing.[141] That there are mythological connotations can be inferred from the preceding verse; but if the *hērem* can be understood as in part a satiation of the deity, as appears to be the case in the Meša^{c} Stele and Isaiah 34, it is quite possible that verse 24 contains a reference to the *hērem* in the conquest.[142]

The remainder of Psalm 68 may be looked at as a whole, although it contains several parts not necessarily connected. Verses 25-28 describe the procession of Yahweh the king into his sanctuary. Because of the separation and independence of most of the elements in the poem, it is not possible to associate this action definitely with the victory march of Yahweh and his hosts; but comparison with a large part of the corpus of early poetry would suggest that we have here the march of the victorious warrior into his sanctuary. As Albright has noted, verses 32 and 33 can hardly be dated before the time of David or Solomon (as is true of the inserted reference to Jerusalem in v. 30). Verse 32 may have come into the poem because of the several references to the bringing in of tribute.

These last verses from 29 on are a paean of praise to the conquering warrior and a call for him to continue his triumphs, to make known his strength and majesty. Verses 34 and 35 are especially significant because they again describe Yahweh as the rider of the clouds and the heavens. The giving forth of Yahweh's mighty voice reminds one of the similar expression when Ba^{c}al established himself in his abode after the victory over his enemies (51:VII:28ff. = *CTA* 4.VII.28ff.) and testifies further to

the influence of Israel's milieu upon her conceptions of her warrior God.

Exodus 15

Yahweh the warrior, "terrible in glorious deeds," is nowhere more vividly described than here in the Song of the Sea. Set in the exodus and the conquest, the poem recounts Yahweh's deliverance of his people as he marches with his host from the south to take the land for Israel. The type of theophany is not the same as that in the passages previously analyzed; the divine assembly, while apparent in the background, plays no major role; but the motifs of battle, kingship, and establishment of sanctuary are all here.

Once again Cross and Freedman have analyzed carefully the details of the poem and clarified its relationship to mythological patterns and traditions of Canaanite literature.[143] More recently Cross has followed that up with two articles that treat the poem along the lines that have been laid out here, making unnecessary a further exhaustive study of the poem in these pages.[144]

The song begins as a hymn of praise to Yahweh for his victory over the Egyptians. Praise continues in the second verse, but verses 2 and 3, which introduce the section recounting the destruction of the Egyptians, identify by name and nature the God who is praised.[145]

ʿzy zmrtʳyˀ yh

wyhy ly lyšwʿh

zh ˀly wˀnwhw

ʾlhy ʾby wʾrmmnhw

yhwh ʾyš mlḥmh

yhwh šmw[146]

My might and my defense are Yah(weh)

He has saved me.

This is my God, whom I admire,

The God of my father, whom I exalt.

Yahweh is a man of war.

Yahweh is his name.

In these lines Yahweh, the object of Israel's praise, is characterized as the divine warrior. "This is my God," that is, the one who is "my might" and "my defense," the one who is a warrior. He has a name, Yahweh. He is also "the God of my father," the ancient designation of the tribal or clan deity.[147] Summarizing Alt, Cross aptly writes of this type of deity: "He may be described as an 'historical' god, i.e., one who guides the social group in its peregrinations, its wars, in short through historical vicissitudes to its destiny."[148] Exodus 15 thus provides one of the most ancient, if not actually the earliest, attestation of the identification of Yahweh and the god of the fathers.

Furthermore, in the context of this song the identification gains in importance. Although the imagery indicates Yahweh's destruction of the enemy by storm, and the heavenly hosts are referred to (v. 11), it is not primarily as the cosmic battler who comes with his coterie in bright theophany riding the clouds, giving forth his voice, sending his arrows, fighting the chaos monster, who destroys the Egyptians. It is rather as the tute-

lary divine warrior whose right arm destroys the threat to his people on the historical plane in holy war.

This does not mean the mythological dimension is absent. It is there both in the themes and in the overall pattern, as Cross has ably demonstrated.[149] The focus on the sea reflects Israel's use of available and influential mythic patterns as does the storm god imagery. The heavenly army plays no role, but the assertion of Yahweh's incomparability is made vis-a-vis the "gods," the "holy ones." The content structure or themes of the poem follow the familiar mythic pattern (see below). In the process of recounting the redemptive activity of Yahweh and praising him for it, the hymn fuses in partial fashion the themes of cosmic warfare and holy war.

So it is Yahweh, the god of the fathers, the one feared among the holy ones, who defeats the Egyptian army. The battle is recounted in verses 4-10 followed by the coda of praise in verses 11 and 12. The mode of destruction is the storm by which Yahweh overturns the Egyptians and drowns them in the sea.[150] From verse 13 onward the poem relates the march through the wilderness and the conquest. There is a definite progression which reflects the "ritual Conquest" in the Gilgal narratives of Joshua.[151] That progression, together with the desert connotations of *n^{e}wēh qodšekā*, "thy holy encampment," suggests that verse 13 recounts the march to Sinai; but it is possible that the verse refers to the battle camp at Shittim where Israel began the conquest across the Jordan and where the Ark was taken across in the Joshua traditions.[152]

Verses 15-16 stem from the traditions of holy war in which victory was believed to be accomplished, not by might of numbers and weapons but by terror (*ʾêmāh*; cf. Ex. 23:27f.; Josh. 2:9) and dread (*paḥad*; cf. Deut. 2:25; 11:25) which Yahweh wrought upon the enemy, that caused them to melt (*nāmōgû*; cf. Josh. 2:9, 24) before the Israelites.[153]

Then in verses 16b-18 the victorious march of Yahweh and his people is climaxed by the establishment of Yahweh's sanctuary and his kingship -- a motif familiar in Canaanite mythology.[154] Cross and Freedman cite *ʿnt*:III:26-27 (= *CTA* 3.III.26-27) for comparison here. Those lines read:

btk . ǵry . il . ṣpn

bqdš . bǵr . nḥlty

In the midst of my mount (who am) the god of Ṣaphon

In the holy place, the mount of my inheritance.

The final colon of this tricolon, which is not quoted by them, shows the close connection between the establishment of Baʿal's sanctuary and his victories in battle:

bnʿm bgbʿ tliyt[155]

In the pleasant place, in the hill of my victory.

A similar relationship with regard to Yahweh could be inferred from this parallel expression in Ugaritic, but Exodus 15 clearly shows the association of Yahweh's kingship and sanctuary with his victory over his enemies. The enemies of Yahweh, however, are not mythological; they are historical -- the very real enemies of Israel. Verse 16b is to be interpreted with Cross as the crossing of the Jordan. The sanctuary in verse 17 is Gilgal. It was

at this site presumably that the celebration of conquest and holy war reflected in this song and in Joshua 3--5 took place.[156]

Thus, as Cross has pointed out, the Song of the Sea preserves a familiar mythic pattern: the combat of the divine warrior and his victory at the Sea, the building of a sanctuary on the mount of inheritance, and the god's manifestation of eternal kingship.[157]

We know this pattern well from the Baʿal cycle at Ugarit and the Creation Epic in Mesopotamia, but it is reflected with various modifications in the other poems discussed in the preceding pages as well as in Psalm 24, which Cross has shown also contains the same historic-mythic fusion of cosmic war and holy war.[158] At the center of all these pieces there is usually both the march into war and then the procession of victory as the divine warrior and his hosts enter the sanctuary. This is the element which most clearly unifies the poems studied both individually and collectively. The hosts of heaven and earth participate in the affairs. The essential purpose of the divine warrior's activities -- and the dividing line between these poems and their mythological background -- is the "creation" of a people (Ex. 15:16). Yet even there the mythic pattern is not altogether absent, for creation is an overt or implicit element in the Mesopotamian and Canaanite myths.[159] The cosmogonic myths of kingship and salvation through the work of the divine warrior have, therefore, profoundly moulded the conceptual patterns of early Israel as reflected in her poetry.

Habakkuk 3:3-15

The third chapter of the prophecy of Habakkuk belongs to a much later period than Exodus 15. It is worth noting, however, that verses 3-7 and 8-15 are two sections which probably come from earlier sources.[160] The theophany of Yahweh the warrior here is in many ways similar to that of Judges 5, Deuteronomy 33, and Psalm 68. The picture is more detailed at points and is worthy of note because the emphasis is much more heavily upon the mythological chaos battle, the conflict between Yahweh and the forces of the sea and death.

Albright's translation of verses 3-8 is probably correct at all points except possibly verse 4 where his emendations are rather extensive.[161] This section of the hymn is entirely a theophany and begins, like Judges 5:4 and Deuteronomy 33:2, with Yahweh's march from the south. The emphasis in verse 3 appears to be upon the cosmic abode, but undeniably in the background of these verses is the memory of Yahweh's march before the people from Sinai. Paran is mentioned in this connection in Deuteronomy 33:2 and Teman is merely a synonym, both referring to Yahweh's coming from the mountains of the south.[162]

The imagery is of Yahweh the warrior coming in his glory. The elements of earth and heaven are violently disturbed. Peoples and nations tremble. Whether verse 4 is meant to denote Yahweh's fighting like a bull depends upon the validity of Albright's extreme emendation, which is open to question. The text is certainly corrupt in its present form. The first colon, the only one that makes sense, may be correct inasmuch as Yahweh's

"brightness as the light" compares with the effulgence or radiance of the theophany in Deuteronomy 33:2.

Verse 5, as has been recognized many times, comes directly from Near Eastern mythology, both Canaanite and Mesopotamian. The closest parallel is the march of Marduk with servants at either side, these sometimes being the gods of plague and pestilence.[163] Reshef especially is a well-known warrior deity of Canaanite origin.[164] Plague and pestilence here are personified members of Yahweh's host who accompany him into battle.[165]

The reference to Kushan[166] and Midian is perhaps significant. They may be simply other names for the southern region from which Yahweh comes in the theophany, but if these locations have any historical reference, another interpretation is plausible. Gerhard von Rad has demonstrated that the phrase "the day of Midian," which appears in the prophets (Isa. 9:3; 10:26), comes out of the traditions of holy war and the defeat of the Midianites in the period of the Judges.[167] It is,therefore, possible that the reference to Kushan and Midian may come from the same historical circumstances, although at a much earlier time than the Isaianic expression.

Verses 8-15 of this hymn are extremely corrupt, as any translation will show. Albright's effort involves many emendations -- some quite credible, others less so. Albright has recognized that for some verses translation perhaps should not even be attempted. Nevertheless, the picture of Yahweh the cosmic warrior battling the force(s) of chaos is certainly the thrust of the passage. The enemy is designated as River (*nāhār*, v. 8), Sea

(*yām*, v. 8), the Deep (*t^{e}hôm*, v. 10), Death (*māwet*, v. 13?), and possibly Earth (*ʾeres*, v. 12). As in similar descriptions, Yahweh bears a bow, arrows, and spear and rides or drives horses and a chariot.[168] Verse 9 appears to contain a reference to the satiation of Yahweh in battle, a note which is sounded in the apocalyptic vision of Isaiah 34. As in verses 3-9, Yahweh's advance in battle involves a great disturbance of the elements. The reference to the sun and moon is quite peculiar. They occupy a passive role, controlled apparently by Yahweh's spear and arrows. The details of the battle are described obscurely in verses 13b-15. It is important to note in this connection that in Yahweh's fight with the foes of Israel, described in the language of the mythological cosmic battle his opponent is understood to be accompanied by a warrior retinue (*przw*)[169] quite in keeping with mythological patterns of Canaan and Mesopotamia.

Most significant, however, is the fact that in the very center of this vivid description of the mythological chaos battle it is made clear that Yahweh's actions are for the deliverance of his people -- a note markedly absent in the battle myths of Baʿal and El. His warfare is not only against mythological forces, but against nations, whom he crushes (*dûš*) in order to save his people. Here again the cosmic and historical planes merge in Yahweh's warfare, but with different emphases. Whereas in the other texts examined, the focus has been upon the conflict of Yahweh's hosts against the enemies of Israel with the chaos battle brought in as a part of that conflict, in Habakkuk 3 the chaos battle dominates but its motive is for historical deliver-

ance of the *ʿam Yahweh*. The result is the same -- the theophany of Yahweh and his various forces to fight the historical enemies of Israel.

II Samuel 22:7-18 = Psalm 18:7-18

This royal psalm has been ably treated by Cross and Freedman,[170] but its striking similarity to previously discussed theophanic descriptions demands that it be noted here. Like most of the texts we have examined, II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18 is relatively early. As a royal psalm it naturally belongs to the monarchy but probably about the tenth and no later than the ninth or eighth century B.C.[171] As a whole, it treats of Yahweh's deliverance of the king in time of trouble and his training and equipping of the king for war. The dominant image or quality associated with Yahweh is again that of the warrior. The section of the psalm under scrutiny is not necessarily a separate part but is delimited here by its character as theophany and its comparative relationship to other such texts.

From his heavenly abode (*mēhêkālô*, v. 7) Yahweh hears the cry of the king for help and comes to his aid. Unlike the theophanies of Deuteronomy 33 or Judges 5, Yahweh does not come from a geographical point such as Sinai or Seir but from his "palace." He does not *go forth* or *come* (*yāṣāʾ, bāʾ, ṣāʿad*), but descends (*yārad*). The differences, however, are not as great as may seem, since the gods' cosmic dwelling places were recognized to be localized at particular places, and the verb *yārad* is not uncommon in theophanic descriptions, for example, Micah 1:3 where *yārad* and *yāṣāʾ* appear in parallelism.

The appearance of Yahweh is again accompanied by the shaking of the earth (*rāʿaš*, v. 8 -- cf. Judg. 5:4; Ps. 68:9) and the shuddering of the mountains (*rāgaz*, v. 8 -- cf. Hab. 3:7). The sources of the sea and the foundations of the world are laid bare (v. 16). Yahweh himself is pictured as the warrior storm-god breathing smoke and devouring fire (v. 9) and hurling his arrows and lightning[172] to panic (*hāmam*) the enemy, a major element in the theory of holy war. If the first colon of verse 13 is correct as it stands, which is not certain, then there is reference here also to Yahweh's "consuming brightness" when he appears to do battle. Although the clouds are at his feet, the chariot of Yahweh is not the clouds or heavens, as elsewhere, but the cherubim on the Ark -- the palladium of holy war, on which Yahweh rode to battle. Yet the cherubim were also members of Yahweh's court. In verse 11 the deity is pictured as flying on the wings of the wind. Verse 14 provokes the same comparison with a central passage in the Baʿal myth that has been noted elsewhere:

From the heavens Yahweh thundered,

And Elyon gave forth his voice.

From his heavenly abode (*hkl*) Baʿal, the storm god of Ugarit, also gives forth his voice against his enemies according to Text 51:VII:27ff. (= *CTA* 4.VII.27ff.).

Here the result of Yahweh's violent epiphany is not a victory over mythological forces but the defeat of the king's enemies and the rescue of the king. The remainder of the poem recounts this act and then details the role of Yahweh preparing

the king for battle.[173]

Joshua 10:12-13

šmš bgbʿwn dwm

wyrḥ bʿmq ylwn

wydm hšmš

wyrḥ ʿmd

ʿd yqm

gwy ʾybyw

Sun, stand still in Gibeon

(And) Moon in the valley of Aijalon!

And the Sun stood still

And the Moon stood

Until he had executed vengeance

Against the nation of his enemies.(?)[174]

Although this short poetic incipit is different from the longer passages previously examined, it is probably an ancient piece of epic poetry that tells again how the celestial bodies participated in the battles which Yahweh fought for Israel. Brief as they are, these lines have produced an extensive amount of discussion, largely because they appear to be one of the most singular miracle stories of the Old Testament. Most commentaries and studies deal primarily with the nature of the miracle, often seeking to rationalize or explain it. Such an approach would seem on the face of it to be inherently wrong even though verses 13b and 14 attempt in part to do that themselves. The conjunction *ʿad* in verse 13 suggests that the idea behind the poem was that the sun stayed long enough in the sky for Israel to defeat

her enemies, but that is as far as one can go. And problems still exist. What part does the moon play in these events? Is a naturalistic interpretation necessary to explain its role also?

One of the more original and recent interpretations is that of Jan Dus.[175] On the basis of several Old Testament texts he sees Gibeon as a cult place of the sun god Šamaš. Then building upon observations made by J. Heller, he interprets Joshua 19:12-13 as originally entirely separate, referring to Šamaš and Yariḫ as two deities venerated in Gibeon and Aijalon, who are commanded in a curse not to give oracles but "to keep silence." The curse may have originated in an Israelite sanctuary. Later, with the spread of Yahwism and the decline in the worship of these deities the true meaning of the poem was forgotten and it was connected to Joshua's battle at Gibeon. The proposed interpretation builds heavily upon the proposition *b^e-* in *b^egib'ôn* and in *b^eʿemeq ʾayyālôn*, meaning "in Gibeon," and so on, rather than "over," for which *ʿal* is always used. The prepositional usage is striking, but had no special significance in view of the increased knowledge of the great flexibility of meaning and relationship of the prepositions in early Northwest Semitic. Dus's views are interesting, but they depend too much on assumptions about sun worship at Gibeon; also he ignores some of the problems in the passage, being forced to maintain that the moon has no meaning here in its present form and that *yiddōm* and *dôm* mean "be silent."

Easily the most credible interpretation of this passage is that recently advanced by John S. Holladay, Jr.,[176] who sees an astrological notion here. Comparing the poem with Assyrian

astronomical texts, he finds that the simultaneous appearance of sun and moon in the sky can be a fortuitous omen and concludes:

> Within this context, the meaning of Josh. 10:12c-13b could hardly be more clear. The first stich is a prayer (or incantation) that the sun and moon will "stand" (*dmm* = *izuzzum*) in opposition (= *šitqulu*; hence the very necessary reference to Gibeon on the east and the valley of Aijalon to the west) on a day favorable to "the nation"(most probably the fourteenth of the month) rather than to her enemies (the result if the moon were to "flee" from the approaching sun, thus delaying conjunction until the unfavorable fifteenth of the month). The second and third stichoi, then, simply report a favorable outcome to the prayer, "the nation" in effect gaining its ascendancy over "its enemies" during those few fateful minutes of opposition when the great lunar and solar orbs "stood" in the "balance."[177]

Holladay would seem to be on the right track in getting at the phenomena behind these lines. Some questions remain, however, and even by his interpretation the poem in its context must be associated with the corpus of poetry already discussed. In any accounting of the poem Joshua's praying to or commanding the sun is strange, although of course not impossible. But even though verse 12a begins: "Then Joshua said . . . ," one should not jump too quickly to the assumption that the command was originally his. For one thing, Joshua speaks *to Yahweh*, as the verse says; but even more important, as Holladay and others have recognized, the poem must be looked at on its own terms as a sep-

arate unit which has been incorporated into the narrative. The poem includes 12b and 13a but only the former could be Joshua's prayer. The second line is clearly a poetic report of what happened as a result of the command in 12b. The two lines probably were a part of a larger poem. As Noth has observed, the insertion may have been due to the catchword "Gibeon" although, as he also points out, the poem may have originally still referred to this battle.[178]

The *ʿad* of verse 13a and, therefore, the understanding of the whole line is not clearly explained by Holladay's interpretation. The examples he cites do not indicate that the good or bad fortune will take place while the astronomical phenomena are happening but that they are indicators that such things *will* happen in the immediate future. This may not be an impossible stumbling block to Holladay's explanation, but it remains a problem.

The poem is a call to the celestial bodies to aid in battle -- a motif reminiscent of Judges 5:20.[179] Representation of the sun and moon as deities was common in the Near East.[180] In Israel they were absorbed into Yahweh's assembly as a part of the vast host gathered around him (for example, Ps. 148:3). Under Canaanite influence they would have occupied a prominent place -- but as members of the council of Yahweh. The line was sometimes so thin between acceptance of these as passive bodies under the control of Yahweh and as separate beings worthy of worship that in later times syncretistic tendencies in Judah produced worship of sun, moon, and stars. Job 31:26 also testifies to the strong temptation in Israel to worship the sun and moon.

Thus, although there is no sign of worship, it is not surprising to see the sun and moon personified in this context. They are called upon to help Israel by standing still (*dāmam*// *ʿāmad*).[181] A similar motif appears in Habakkuk 3:11:

> The exalted one, Sun, raised his arms, Moon stood (*ʿāmad*)
> on his lordly dias;
> By the light of Thine arrows they move, By the lightning
> sheen of thy spear![182]

Here again Yahweh goes forth to battle and, even as in Joshua 10,[183] the sun and moon participate. In light of the Habakkuk passage where the standing still of the moon and sun is associated with Yahweh's warfare, there is the strong possibility that the speaker and the actor of Joshua 10:12-13a are not Joshua and Israel but Yahweh; and command to the sun and moon is more likely to have come originally from the mouth of Yahweh or one of his messengers than from Joshua. The collector or editor of the text apparently recognized the peculiarity of the command's being ascribed to Joshua for he commented (v. 14): "There has been no day like that one before it or after it when Yahweh listened to the voice of a man." Then he added the recognition: "for Yahweh fought for Israel."

This last statement further indicates that the subject of *yiqqōm* in verse 13a is Yahweh rather than *gôy*. The LXX reads *theos* here, and Gruenthaner believes the reading may be original.[184] The other versions, however, follow the MT, making one hesitant to propose another reading, attractive as it may be. Furthermore, Yahweh may be the subject in the text as it stands.

In the first place, the word *gôy* is a rather unusual, though not impossible,[185] designation for Israel, especially in this literature.[186] It generally refers to the nations who were Israel's enemy (*ʾôyēb*). The term *ʿam* would be much more likely if Israel is meant. In addition, with the single exception of this verse, the verb *nāqam* when it takes an object always takes a preposition with the object.[187] The most satisfactory explanation, therefore, seems to be that a *mem* (for *min*, which is common with *nāqam*) was lost by haplography from the original form of the text:

ʿd yqm⌜m⌝gwy ʾybyw

which would translate:

> Until he had executed vengeance against the nation of his enemies.[188]

The reading is not certain, but in my opinion it is more satisfactory. The incipit would thus refer to Yahweh's command that the sun and moon stand still to lengthen the day in the battle against the enemy (vv. 10, 14). However the text may have originally read, even in its present form it attests to Israel's understanding that these cosmic elements were involved in her holy wars as "Yahweh fought for Israel" (v. 14).

The Armies of Yahweh in Later Tradition

Early Prose Traditions

Joshua 5:13-15

This fragmentary episode, though listed here among later traditions, is probably fairly ancient,[189] reflecting early in-

terpretation of how Israelite tradition viewed the conquest. It has received relatively little attention outside the commentaries,[190] although in some respects it is a focal point linking the Gilgal events of Joshua 3--5 with the narratives of the conquest beginning at Jericho. There are quite a few problems in the passage, not all of which are soluble. The question of locale is a difficult one. The text of verse 13 indicates that Joshua was "in" or "by" Jericho (*bîrîḥô*). But inasmuch as verse 15 indicates that the locale is a holy place, especially in its reference to a *māqôm*, and in view of the relationship of the passage to the preceding episodes, it is possible to see also a connection with the Gilgal sanctuary.

The text relates the appearance to Joshua of a man (אִישׁ) bearing a drawn sword, an immediate reminder of Numbers 22:23 and I Chronicles 21:16 where an angel with drawn sword appears to Balaam and to David.[191] In the Joshua passage, however, the figure has the appearance not of an angel but of a man arrayed as a warrior. Joshua sees him only as a warrior and asks him a question of a purely military nature: "Are you one of us or one of our adversaries?"[192] -- the equivalent of the more modern: "Who goes there, friend or foe?" The man answers that he is neither but is the "commander of the army of Yahweh" (*śar ṣᵉbā'-yhwh*), and Joshua immediately recognizes his heavenly visitor and worships. Then comes the sentence paralleled in Exodus 3:5. As Noth and others have recognized, the real message of the commander is now missing. The words "Now I have come" indicate an official visit and are meant to be followed by a message (cf. II Sam. 14:15ff.;

Dan. 9:22).[193]

At first glance the passage seems to be simply an isolated incident brought in by the collector of these narratives, this especially because of the truncated story that does not give the actual purpose of the visit of Yahweh's commander. Noth's interpretation is largely along these lines.[194] He sees the event as basically a type of cult legend associated with an unknown holy place near Jericho, which went back to Canaanite times but was used by the Israelites. The episode originally contained a longer message or conversation which has now been deleted by the "collector" because of religious reasons. The remaining record indicates that there were directions about the nurture and care of the sanctuary.

Brief as it is, Noth's treatment of these verses is still the principal one of recent times -- along with that of Abel -- and contributes several excellent observations. I find myself in greater agreement with Abel, however, because, caught up as he is with etiologies and *Ortsgebundenheit* (the association of traditions with places),[195] Noth fails to get at the core of the text and its significance. He is correct in working on a history-of-tradition basis, but he fails to see that in that history the associations of various traditions with other elements may have been stronger. It is precisely the tradition history which forces one to associate this episode primarily with the events in the conquest,[196] presumably even before the "collector" of the traditions.[197]

The association with a cultic locale is correct, probably

even apart from verse 15, but Noth ignores too easily the nature of the heavenly figure and the missing message. The earliest possible record of the event identified the visitor specifically as the "commander of the army of Yahweh," and apart from that identification the episode is meaningless from the start. This one is not designated as the *malʾak Yahweh*, though that figure appears in a similar manner elsewhere. The title is very specific and unusual and must be taken seriously. His message must originally have had to do with his nature and function. In the parallel passages -- Exodus 3:5; Numbers 22:23; I Chronicles 21:16 -- there is a message or purpose definitely related to the context. There is no reason for assuming otherwise for the original Joshua episode or for assuming that the message has been deleted, presumably because it was religiously offensive, though Noth does not say so. The message was simply lost in transmission, and only the first two words of the text remain. The most likely, indeed required, supposition is that the words of the commander of Yahweh's army related to the conquest. The events at Jericho were regarded as the first stage in the holy wars of the conquest. This episode provides the transition point from Gilgal to Jericho. Yet even apart from the missing message the *śar ṣᵉbāʾ Yahweh* links the heavenly, cosmic army with Israel's earliest holy wars, and the very presence of this figure declared that the ensuing conquest was sacral and that Israel's army would be led by Yahweh's divine army.

Genesis 32:2-3

As Gunkel and von Rad both have recognized, these two verses

are a fragment of an ancient tradition now etiologically connected with the name of the important city Mahanaim.[198] Abrupt and succinct in their context, they tell of a meeting of Jacob with the angels of God (*mal'^a^kê 'e^lōhîm*) and record that as he saw them coming toward him, he exclaimed: "This is the army (*maḥ^a^nēh*) of God," and therefore named the place Mahanaim. The fact that virtually nothing happens in the brief episode is strong indication that this is only the remaining framework of what was once a longer story.[199] The rest of the tradition would probably have been very illuminating with regard to the character and function of Yahweh's heavenly army in the patriarchal narratives, but this fragment indicates that those ancient traditions understood the host of Yahweh as a military force.[200]

II Samuel 5:22-25

Yahweh's peculiar reply when David inquires whether he should go up against the Philistines is to be understood in terms of this concept of the divine armies.[201] Yahweh tells David not to go up until he hears the sound of marching (*ṣ^e^ʿādāh*) in the balsam trees, but then to fight because Yahweh has gone forth before him (*yāṣā' yhwh lipneykā*) to smite the enemy. The language (for example, *ṣ^e^ʿādāh, yāṣā'*) and imagery in the prose narratives are virtually identical with that of the theophany of Yahweh and his heavenly army in the early poetry and elsewhere and give added weight to the notion in Israelite religious thought of a heavenly or cosmic army coming to help in holy war.

Ninth-Century Prophets

Further examples may be seen in the narratives of Kings,

particularly in traditions relating to the ninth-century prophets.[202] In his study of the oracles concerning foreign nations, R. Bach asks the important question as to how the summons to battle and the summons to flight were carried over from the early holy wars into the prophetic oracles and strongly agrees with von Rad that the prophets of the ninth century in the Northern Kingdom must be understood out of the traditions of holy war.[203] He then wishes to look even further back to see if at the earliest stages of prophecy there was a close relation between the prophet and the call to holy war. Whether that is so or not, it is important here that the ninth-century prophets are closely associated with the traditions of holy war and thus form a link between the tribal league practices of holy war and the later prophetic oracles.[204] They also form a connection between the early association of holy war theology with the heavenly army imagery and the later association of prophetic eschatology and the Day of Yahweh with that same imagery.

II Kings 6:15-19

In this episode Elisha's servant is terrified upon seeing the great army of the Syrians who have surrounded them by night and cries out, "Alas, my master, what shall we do?" Elisha reassures him with: "Fear not, for those who are with us are more than those who are with them." The phrase "fear not" (*'al tîrā'*, v. 16) is a familiar word of encouragement and battle cry of holy war (Ex. 14:13; Josh. 8:1; 10:8, 25; 11:6),[205] the demand for complete trust in Yahweh which lay at the very core of the theology and practice of holy war.[206] The basis for the lack of

fear is not merely that Israel's army is greater than that of the king of Syria -- a supposition that would probably be automatic if verse 17 were not in the text -- the army of Israel is not even present in this context. Rather, the servant looks up and sees on the mountain a mighty army of horses and chariots of fire, none other than the heavenly army of Yahweh, which comes to aid the prophet.[207] The imagery is especially similar to Psalm 68:18 where Yahweh is pictured as coming from Sinai with chariots and warriors.

II Kings 7:6

After the siege of Samaria by Ben-hadad has lasted for some time, four lepers decide their only hope is to go over to the Syrian camp. When they enter the camp no one is there, "for," the record explains, "the Lord had made the army of the Syrians hear the sound of chariots and of horses, the sound of a great army, so that they said to one another, 'Behold, the king of Israel has hired against us the kings of the Hittites and the kings of Egypt to come upon us.'" There can be little doubt that Israel understood in this account the sound of the heavenly army, exactly as in the preceding story and in II Samuel 5:24.

In this light the chariot and horses of fire which separate Elijah and Elisha at the former's ascent into heaven (II Kings 2: 11-12) are also seen to be representatives of the heavenly army who fought for Israel.[208] Whether the expression was originally so understood cannot be said definitely -- it is attributed also to Joash the king as Elisha lay dying (II Kings 13:14) -- but in the light of these passages it quite probably was. In any event

the designation is out of the holy war traditions, traditions in which Elijah and Elisha firmly stood. Immediately after Joash utters this cry over the dying Elisha, the prophet tells the king to shoot an arrow out the window and as he does so, the prophet cries out: "Yahweh's arrow of victory!" The cry is a sign of Yahweh's intervention with symbolic or magical qualities similar to Moses' raising his arms in the war against Amalek (Ex. 17:11) and Joshua's pointing his spear toward Ai (Josh. 8:18). The judgment of the anonymous prophet against Ahab for failure to carry out the *hērem* against Ben-hadad (I Kings 20:35ff.) is also strong indication that the ninth-century prophets played out their roles in Israel's history against a backdrop of holy war traditions.

Later Prophetic Writings

The warring armies of Yahweh appear in the prophetic writings themselves, especially in the later eschatological and apocalyptic literature, a movement which reaches its full force in the intertestamental period. If the Day of Yahweh has its origins in the ancient holy war traditions of Israel[209] as they were carried through the royal cultus,[210] then it is not surprising to see a revival or carry-over of the fundamental element, that is, the wars of Yahweh as a joint participation of human or earthly forces and divine or heavenly armies. In fact, this motif is precisely a central aspect of the end time. We shall not try to deal with all the prophetic passages which portray the divine warrior, but shall focus rather on those which reflect our basic theme, the march of Yahweh and his armies.

Isaiah 13:1ff.[211]

These verses, a doom oracle against Babylon, are part of a larger collection and may belong to a much later time than that of Isaiah.[212] They treat the Day of Yahweh as a great holy war involving the earthly and heavenly hosts. There are several problems in the text. The nature of the persons addressed in verse 2 is unclear. Is the verse a call to Yahweh's warriors to prepare for battle,[213] or is it an address to the enemy? It is even possible to interpret the commands as an address to the divine council, though that is not necessarily the best choice. In verse 3 Yahweh levies a mighty host for battle,[214] but here also it is impossible to tell whether these are heavenly or earthly hosts, or both. He calls them "my consecrated ones" (*m^equddā-šāy*), "my warriors" (*gibbôray* -- see below, note 218), and "my proudly exulting ones" (*ʿallîzê gaʾᵃwātî*). The use of the first person suffix might suggest that these warriors are indeed Yahweh's assembly. Most important is the use of the term *m^equddāš*, "sanctified, consecrated," which belongs to the practice of holy war, in which the soldiers were purified and set under certain taboos before battle.[215] Then come the words:

> Yahweh *ṣ^ebāʾôt* is mustering (*m^epaqqēd*)[216] a host for battle.
> They come from a far-off land, from the ends of the heavens,
> Yahweh and the weapons of his indignation, to destroy the
> whole earth.
>
> (vv. 4b-5)

Using the ancient designation "Yahweh of hosts," the prophet announces that Yahweh has summoned a great army "from the ends of

the heavens"[217] to wipe out the whole earth. If indeed *kol-ha - ʾarēṣ* is to be interpreted as the whole earth, as seems to be the case, the picture is one of final destruction -- wrought by Yahweh and his heavenly army (v. 5a) -- in the day of Yahweh. If the reference is only to Babylon or some other individual nation, then the army may be interpreted as a combination of earthly and heavenly beings. Late though the text may be, the themes of the passage are clearly in the tradition of Israel's understanding of Yahweh's warfare as a divine-human, cosmic-earthly endeavor.

Joel 4:9ff.

This passage, similar to Isaiah 13 in form and content, brings together a number of significant themes. Verse 9 begins with a heraldic call to the divine assembly to proclaim holy war (*qirʾû*). Then the proclamation of the assembly goes out to the nations:

qaddᵉšû milḥāmāh / haʿirû haggibbôrîm
yiggᵉšû yaʿᵃlû / kōl ʾanšê ḥammilḥāmāh
Sanctify war! rouse up the warriors!
Let them draw near and go up,
All the men of war.

The language is again a call to arms, to purify the warriors (cf. Josh. 3:5; II Sam. 11:11; I Sam. 21:6), to stir them up to go to battle (cf. Judg. 5:12; Isa. 51:9; and so on). The apocalyptic element appears prominently in verse 10 where the prophetic saying about the tools of war becoming the tools of peace is reversed, and plowshares and pruning hooks now become swords and spears. The weak and timid become mighty warriors. The nations

are commanded to gather around. But then in the midst of this command a significant change of address appears (v. 11b):

hanhat yhwh gibbôreykā

Bring down thy warriors, Yahweh.

As has been recognized, this can only be a call for Yahweh to come forth with his heavenly army.[218] The divine beings who make up the assembly of Yahweh are elsewhere called *gibbôrîm*,[219] and the verb *nāḥat* confirms the fact that the heavenly warriors are involved. They are brought down from above, whereas the nations are brought up (*wᵉyaʿălû*, v. 12) into the *ʿēmeq yᵉhôšāpāṭ*.

The purpose of this warlike activity is made abundantly clear in verse 12b:

kî šām ʾēšēb lišpōṭ ʾet-kol-haggôyim missābîb

For there I will sit to judge / all the nations round about.

Here is strong indication of the close connection between the imagery of Yahweh as warrior and Yahweh as judge of the nations (cf. Judg. 11:27).

Two aspects of divine warfare are present in the succeeding verses. The sun, moon, and stars are darkened (so also Isa. 13:10), reminiscent of their participation in Judges 5:20; Habakkuk 3:11; Joshua 10:12-13). In verse 16 Yahweh comes roaring from Zion "and the heavens and the earth shake" -- both aspects of theophany seen in Judges 5; Psalm 68; Deuteronomy 33; II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18;and Habakkuk 3. The closing verses with their announcement of the return of paradise and a final proclamation of doom against the enemies of Judah reflect much of the language and imagery of the early poetic material.

It should be noted further that if Wolff is on the right track in his interpretation of Joel 2:1-17, we may have there also a vivid picture of the march of the divine army on the day of judgment. Wolff contends with strong arguments that 2:1-17 is not a further description of the locust plague but a picture of the future, portraying an apocalyptic army modeled on the locust plague but using other traditional motifs.[220] In this graphic portryal Yahweh commands a mighty army which marches forth wreaking destruction in the Day of Yahweh:

> The Lord utters his voice
> before his army,
> for his host is exceedingly great;
> he that executes his word is
> powerful.
> For the day of the Lord is great
> and very terrible;
> who can endure it? (RSV)

If the locusts are excluded and the northern enemy, then it is natural to assume that the prophet describes here the familiar cosmic host, the military retinue of the divine warrior.[221]

Isaiah 40:26 and 45:12

Although these two verses do not involve the Day of Yahweh or oracles calling for battle against the enemy, note should be taken of Cross's observation that "here Yahweh is pictured as marshaling and mustering his heavenly army."[222] This interpretation is given further support by Muilenburg who writes with regard to Isaiah 40:25-27:

> Mowinckel believes that Yahweh is portrayed here as the shepherd of the stars. More likely the figure is military . . . God, the captain of the host, calls out his myriads upon myriads of stars, and each star takes its appointed place as its name is called. There they stand in their great battalions in response to the call of the captain. Not one is missing; each responds to the call of its own name.[223]

Christopher North has elaborated this observation most recently[224] by noting that we have here three military terms. One of these is of course the *ṣābā'*, the host. The second is the Hiphil of *yāṣā'*, which means in this case that "Yahweh leads them out as a commander leads an army" (cf. 48:17; II Sam. 5:2; 10:16); and the third, North says, is the term "by number" (cf. II Sam. 2:15 and Num. 1 [fourteen times]).

Zechariah 14

The motifs discussed throughout these pages reach their full eschatological bloom in late prophecy in the final chapter of Zechariah.[225] Incorporating the strong note of judgment that is central to the Day of Yahweh traditions, Zechariah 14 describes the final holy war when Yahweh's victory over all the nations will be manifest.[226] The passage re-echoes the language and themes of the ancient holy wars, for example, the *ḥērem* (v. 11) and the panic of Yahweh on the enemy (v. 13), and is, in fact, a kind of recapitulation of the pattern we discerned in several pieces of the early Israelite poetry, modified by other themes and influences coming out of the royal theology and eschatology:

Yahweh goes forth (*yāṣā'*, v. 3) to fight (v. 3) against the enemies of Israel and returns victorious with his hosts (*q^edōšîm*, v. 5).[227] The result is Yahweh's kingship over all the earth (v. 9), Israel's salvation and secure dwelling (vv. 5 and 11), Yahweh's established sanctuary (the elevation of Jerusalem, v. 10). Finally, all the nations, not just Israel, shall go up to the sanctuary to worship Yahweh the king.

Present also in this picture is clear creation imagery: the waters of life flowing from Jerusalem, the elimination of the seasonal alternations and day and night, the end of darkness. This is a "paradise" scene. Although one finds no battle with the chaos monster, chaos is again transformed into creation and order.[228] Yahweh's battle is with historical enemies as always, but the conflict is cosmic in scope and the cosmogonic battle lies clearly in the background.[229]

Some Post-Old Testament Developments

A detailed examination of later developments outside the Old Testament growing out of these lines of tradition and this conceptual framework does not belong to the scope of this work. It may be of some value, however, simply to indicate areas where the cosmic battle of Yahweh and his hosts comes to the fore and reflects earlier formulations and ideas.

The Book of Enoch is much concerned with angelology and the day of judgment. It is no surprise, therefore, to find here clear pictures of Yahweh and his hosts as the destroying army. The best example is the opening passage with its theophany of the divine warrior and his retinue, clearly dependent upon Old Testa-

ment imagery. God comes from his dwelling to tread upon the earth, but here "from Sinai" has transformed into "on Sinai." The notation is made that he appears "from his camp" (Ethiopic has "and appear with his hosts"). In typical fashion the mountains shake and the hills melt like wax. Then in 1:9:

> And behold! He cometh with ten thousands
>
> of His holy ones
>
> To execute judgment upon all,
>
> And to destroy [all] the ungodly[230]

The basis for these lines is obviously Deuteronomy 33:2. Similar passages appear throughout the book.

The purpose of the coming of God and his hosts is no longer historical victory in a particular battle with one of Israel's foes, but the final judgment and destruction of the wicked and vindication of the righteous. Here is the end stage of the ancient conception of the coming of the warrior host as mediated through prophetic eschatology.

In a quite different way the heavenly army plays a minor role in II Maccabees. For example, in 5:1ff. we are told of apparitions of the divine army in the sky over Jerusalem: galloping horsemen, spearmen, cavalry, and so on. Then in 10:27 the enemy forces see in the sky five warriors surrounding Judas Maccabaeus. Their arrows and thunderbolts panic the enemy so that they break up in disorder. The familiar panic of Yahweh which in the early holy wars seized whole armies is explained specifically here as the effect of the heavenly warriors. Then in 11:6ff. Judas prays to God for a delivering angel who soon appears at

their head as a white horseman, and we read: "They advanced in battle order, having their heavenly ally, for the Lord had mercy on them."

All these episodes are typologically later but quite similar to the prose accounts in Joshua, Samuel, and Kings of the intervention of the army of God.

The fullest expression of these developments, however, is to be found in the War Scroll from Qumran, which recounts the final holy war between the Sons of Light and Sons of Darkness. All along there have been signs that Yahweh and the heavenly host fight alongside Israel in their battles, but here it is explicit from the beginning:

> On the day when the Kittim fall there shall be a mighty encounter and carnage before the God of Israel, for that is a day appointed by Him from of old for a battle of annihilation for the Sons of Darkness, on which there shall engage in a great carnage the congregation of angels and the assembly of men, the Sons of Light and the lot of Darkness, fighting each in communion through the might of God with the sound of a great tumult and the war cry of angels and men for a day of doom. (1QM 1:9-11)[231]

Or in Col. xii:3-5:

> Mercy of blessing [for Thy thousands] and the covenant of peace Thou hast engraved for them with a stylus of life, so as to be king [over them] in all appointed times of eternity and to muster [the hosts of Thine el]ect by their thousands and their myriads together with Thy holy ones [and the

host] of Thine angels, for strength of hand in battle [to subdue] them that have risen against Thee on earth by the strife of Thy judgments, but with the elect ones of heaven are [Thy] blessing[s].

Finally, in lines 6-8:

And Thou, O God, [art terrible] in the glory of Thy majesty, and the congregation of Thy holy ones are amongst us for eternal alliance, and we [(OR:they) shall render] scoffings unto kings, scorn and derision unto mighty men, for the Lord is holy, and the King of Glory is with us, a people of saints; Migh[ty men and] a host of angels are among those mustered with us,the Mighty One of War is in our congregation, and the host of His spirits is with our steps.

Then follows the call to the divine warrior to rise up and do battle to establish his kingdom forever.[232]

These are only a few of the places that could be cited. The elements of holy war are present throughout: the tribes summoned to battle as the people of God, purification of the camp, the war cry ($t^{e}r\hat{u}\check{c}\bar{a}h$) and the panic ($m^{e}h\hat{u}m\bar{a}h$) of God. The language and terminology of Deuteronomy 33 and Psalm 24 and the like are invoked. The ancient epithets of the divine warrior are recalled. On the final day the mighty warrior God goes forth to battle, leading the armies of heaven and earth against opposing earthly and spiritual forces. The purpose of this apocalyptic encounter is, as in days of old, the defeat of the wicked, the redemption of Israel, and the establishment of God's kingship and kingdom forever.

The Ark of the Covenant and Yahweh ṣᵉbāʾôt

One of the most vexing problems in the history of Israel's religion has been the question of the nature and function of the Ark. It is not the purpose of this book to present an exhaustive study of the Ark in an attempt to solve all the difficulties associated with it[233] -- no one yet has succeeded in that task[234] -- but in this context it is important to point out that in the earliest texts having to do with the Ark it is clearly associated with the holy wars of Yahweh and perceived as a type of palladium in battle, embodying the presence of Yahweh as he marched to fight for Israel and acting as a security for victory over her adversaries. The starting point is the Song of the Ark in Numbers 10:35-36, the earliest testimony to the Ark now extant.[235]

There are two songs or incipits sung at the going out of the Ark to holy war and at the return. The first one is a variant of Psalm 68:2a. The meter, language, orthography, and context all lead to the conclusion[236] that these lines are archaic poetry:

qmh yhwh

[ ] ypṣw ʾwybk

[ ] ynsw mśnʾyk mpnyk

šwbh yhwh

<b> rbwt <qdš>

ʾlpy yśrʾl

Arise, Yahweh,

Let thy enemies be scattered,

Let thy adversaries flee before thee.

Return, Yahweh,

⟨With⟩ the myriads of ⟨holy ones⟩

With the thousands of Israel[237]

The warlike character of the Song of the Ark is self-evident. The imperative *qûmāh* is standard terminology for the call to initiate battle. In light of its usage here and in reference to the Ark in Psalm 132:8 it is probable that the phrase *qûmāh yhwh* arose in connection with the going forth of the Ark to battle and then spread to other situations and contexts.[238] The going out of the Ark was in order to bring about the destruction and flight of the enemies -- Yahweh's enemies, but unquestionably historical foes of Israel.[239] Whether mythological motifs lie be behind the language of verse 35 is difficult to determine. If indeed the Ark was of desert origin, Canaanite influence would be less expected. A striking parallel exists, however in UT 51:VII:35-36 (= *CTA* 4.VII.35-36) in the context of Baʿal's thunderous theophany in his palace:

ib . bʿl . tihd . yʿrm .

šnu . hd . gpt . ġr

The enemies of Baʿal take to the woods,

The haters of Hadd to the edge(s) of the mountains.

The flight of the "enemies" and "haters" of the Canaanite storm god is similar to the flight of the "enemies" and "haters" of Yahweh. In the Ugaritic text as in the Numbers passage and in other early poems elements of theophany and war are combined.

The return of the Ark to the Israelite camp is sung in verse 36. Attempts to separate verse 36 from verse 35 at an earlier

stage, which had nothing to do with the activity of war but referred only to the sitting still or resting of the Ark, are misguided and depend less on the testimony of the Song itself than on the context.[240] The leader god and war god were one and the same.

These two verses are very archaic war songs forming a unity. The present context associates them with the Ark -- an association which is certainly original -- and in the general context of the march of Israel through the wilderness. In all likelihood the brief songs were originally sung at the procession and return of the Ark at the head of the people as an indication that Yahweh the warrior and his hosts led them into battle. The present context in Numbers may not suggest accurately the origin of the Song. It is not to be doubted, however, that at a very early stage -- the wars in Canaan or before -- Israelite elements engaged in holy war with the Ark as the rallying point.

The conclusions drawn from Numbers 10:35-36 are borne out by other passages. One of these, Numbers 14:39-45 (JE), must be mentioned with some hesitation because its place in the history of the tradition is not certain. Some see it as quite late, though generally it is regarded as part of the epic tradition concerning the wilderness wandering and the beginnings of conquest.[241] In the account Moses warns the people not to go up against the Amalekites and Canaanites for they will lose because "Yahweh is not among you" (v. 42). The meaning of this sentence is in verse 44: "Neither the Ark of the Covenant of Yahweh nor Moses departed from the camp." The Ark was not in the battle, so

Yahweh was not there.

Judges 20 is generally recognized to be somewhat schematic and expanded with late elements introduced.[242] It certainly gives more detail on this battle than many of the others in the book. An explanation may be found, however, in the fact that the chapter is a very important one dealing with a holy war by the tribal league against one of its own members -- an inner Israelite conflict. Elements of holy war are present, for example, the levy of the tribes for war by sending out twelve pieces of flesh; inquiry of Yahweh; and the reply: "Go up, for tomorrow I will give them into your hand."[243] Parenthetically in verse 27 it is noted that the Ark was at Bethel. This reference may be a gloss, as is generally claimed, for it is the only reference in Judges to the Ark. Whatever its history, the reference conforms with the rest of our data and explains that the tribes had to go to Bethel to prepare for holy war because the Ark, the shrine center of Israel's sacral wars, was there.

The ark appears in the account of Israel's war against the Philistines in I Samuel 4, but there is indication that the Ark did not always go out to battle, as may be assumed anyway.[244] This tradition, however, may be the exception which proves the rule.[245] The Israelites, faced with impending defeat, sent for the Ark, but its arrival did not produce the expected victory. On the contrary, the rout was even greater. The narrator may well have been attempting to show the result when the presence of Yahweh in the battle was only a desperate afterthought on the part of the warriors.[246]

I Samuel 14:18 in the MT definitely associates the Ark with Saul's holy war against the Philistines, which resulted in victory because of a (divine) *m^e^hûmāh* in the battle. The use of this text may not be legitimate, however, inasmuch as most commentators follow the LXX and read "ephod" for "ark,"[247] because the Ark was confined to Kiryath-jearim at that time. In any event, if there is any possibility at all of reading "ark," its setting in the ritual of holy war is clear.[248]

The procession of the Ark to Jerusalem in II Samuel 6 is not ostensibly in a context of holy war, but it is my opinion that the episode does indeed arise out of the traditions of holy war -- the march with the Ark; the blowing of trumpets, the *t^e^rûʿāh*, David's dancing before the Ark.[249] But detailed analysis of that passage belongs to a more extended treatment than we can give here of the carry-over of the motifs and traditions of sacral warfare into the royal cultus and theology.[250]

II Samuel 11:11 again reveals the Ark on the field of battle with the tribal levies (not the king's soldiers) in the holy war against the Ammonites which resulted in Uriah's death because of his unwillingness to violate his state of purification and sanctification -- an act which would have saved his life although he did not know it.[251] On the other hand, in II Samuel 15:24ff. David sends the Ark back into Jerusalem presumably because his conflict with Absalom was not a matter of sacral war.

The two principal passages in the Psalms literature which involve the Ark[252] -- both of which are probably early, though they cannot be dated definitely -- indicate its warlike connotations

and associations. Psalm 24 makes no mention of the Ark, but verses 7ff. are almost unanimously believed to have their origin in the triumphal return of Yahweh and the Ark to Jerusalem.[253] If this interpretation is correct, the verses speak for themselves with regard to the relationship of the Ark to Yahweh's wars and to the name *Yahweh ṣᵉbāʾôt*. Likewise the explicit reference to the Ark in Psalm 132:8 which bears kinship to Numbers 10:35-36 designates the Ark as "the Ark of thy might" (*ʾᵃrôn ʿuzzekā*), an explicit reference to the warrior might and power of Yahweh which produced victories for Israel. In both Psalm 24 and Psalm 132 we have the Ark processional of Yahweh and his armies either to or from battle.[254]

There are numerous references to the Ark in the conquest narratives of Joshua 3-6, but these chapters are regarded as quite expanded and heavily oriented to the cult, and so may be dubious sources when dealing with such a matter as the Ark.[255] But, as Cross has plausibly suggested, the celebration of ritual conquest is at the base of these chapters;[256] and, noting the associations of the Ark with the holy wars of Israel in all other relatively early texts, one is forced to see that same association here. Regardless of the historical background of Joshua 6, it can hardly be doubted, *contra* Noth,[257] that the Ark played a central role in the earliest level of tradition about the march around the city, although the very numerous references to it are in part the result of expansion. The account of Joshua 6 relates a schematized holy war with emphasis upon the miraculous activity of Yahweh, and the Ark of the Covenant is inevitably set in that

context. The Gilgal traditions of Joshua 3--5 have a less war-like flavor to them, but they obviously involve preparations for war.[258] In any event, nowhere in Joshua apart from the Deuteronomistic section 8:30-35 can the Ark be separated from the holy wars of conquest.

The Ark plays no significant role in von Rad's analysis of the theory of holy war, being confined to one citation and a lengthy footnote.[259] He does associate it with the military activity of Yahweh in the early Song of the Ark, but goes no further than that, maintaining that the Ark appears in war only in the later time (for example, I Sam. 4--6; II Sam. 11:11). But more can be said than that. The Ark is at all points intimately and directly associated with the wars of Yahweh. One can not assume that the Ark went out at every battle any more than one can assume that the *ḥērem* or any other aspect of holy war was always present (a point von Rad has recognized). Nevertheless, the unanimous witness of the texts relating to the Ark would suggest that as a war shrine it played a central role in the sacral wars of Israel's early history.[260]

The *ṣᵉbāʾôt* epithet associated with Yahweh has drawn as much disagreement and discussion as has the role of the Ark, and numerous theories have been put forward to define it. The origin, the meaning, and the grammatical explanation of the name in its various forms have been matters of controversy; and the frequency of its occurrence (over 250 times) has compounded the question rather than solving it. The problem of the term is so complex that it has been the subject of an exhaustive, detailed disserta-

tion, which, however, has still not resolved the difficulties.[261] The reader is referred to this work and to other more recent studies for an analysis of the different opinions and theories which have been proposed.

The term *ṣ^eḇā'ôt* in this context has been said to refer originally to the armies of Israel, the stars, angels, natural powers, and all of creation. The basic point of agreement among most scholars has been the fact that the epithet in its earliest stages is to be associated with the Ark, the palladium of holy war.[262] This conclusion is based on its early usage in the Samuel narratives and is methodologically correct, but most analyses have succumbed to methodological faults. The term has to be analyzed on the basis of its contexts, of course, but this methodological foundation stone eventually gives out because of the great frequency of the epithet often in contexts which clearly reveal nothing about the original meaning of the phrase. It is necessary, therefore, to approach the term on a linguistic and lexical basis and in light of comparative studies. Albright and Cross separately have analyzed the term on this basis and thus, as far as our present knowledge is concerned, have produced the best interpretation of the divine name and epithet.

Two grammatical explanations of the name have vied for popularity. One is that despite its infrequency beside the short form, the longer form of the name -- *yhwh ʾ^elōhê* (*haṣ*) *ṣ^eḇā'ôt* -- is the original and that *ṣ^eḇā'ôt* thus stands in genitival or construct relation to either *ʾ^elōhe* or *yhwh*. Certainly the longer form must be explained in this manner. But if the short form is

original, as is most likely the case, then the explanation is less satisfactory though not impossible. An alternate view espoused by Eissfeldt is that the words *yhwh* and *ṣ^ebā'ôt* are grammatically independent of one another. He views the latter term as an abstract formation standing in apposition to *yhwh*, thus producing *Jahweh der Zebaothhafte*, "Yahweh the Mighty One."[263] This type of interpretation is not without precedent,[264] and is grammatically possible. It remains, however, a rather forced interpretation in light of the fact that *ṣ^ebā'ôt* is a perfectly good word as is, meaning "hosts, armies."[265]

The proper point of departure in the analysis of the name is Albright's recognition that in common with numerous West Semitic divine names, the name *yhwh ṣ^ebā'ôt* is a sentence name.[266] The word is patently a verbal formation, duplicated often by almost identical name formations in the West Semitic onomasticon of the second millennium.[267] It is a sentence name shortened to its verbal element without hypocoristic ending. Gramatically, *yahweh* is most likely a third person singular, causative imperfect of "to be," that is, "to cause to be, create, procreate," or the like.[268] The name originally would have meant "He causes to be" or "He creates." Both Cross and Albright have argued that in common with other divine names, *yahweh* originally was only one part of a longer name. The Old Testament itself gives a clue to its lengthier nature at an early stage in Exodus 3:14 where it appears as *'ehyeh 'ăšer 'ehyeh*.[269] From this text and on the basis of comparative materials, Cross has demonstrated convincingly that the original cultic name out of which the name and character

of Yahweh developed was *ʾel dū yahwī, "El who creates."[270] Furthermore, because of sense and of parallel formations both in Canaanite and Israelite literature, Cross and Albright have seen that the verbal sentence must have had an object.[271] The most likely candidate and the one most clearly preserved is ṣ^e bāʾôt.[272]

The meaning of the term ṣ^e bāʾôt has been the question that has drawn the attention of most scholars. That it encompassed several meanings throughout the history of Israel's religion is probably to be expected, but the primitive meaning of the term in this cliché may not have been so all-inclusive. The word ṣābā' is basically a military term,[273] used most often to indicate an army or warfare.[274] In the expression *yahweh* ṣ^e bāʾôt, then, must be recognized a military force -- "He who creates the armies." But in the original formation of the name were these armies divine or human? Because of the close association of the name with the holy wars of Israel in I and II Samuel, and because "host of heaven" is always singular (ṣābā') and never plural (ṣ^e bāʾôt), it has been assumed that the "hosts" referred to in the epithet *yahweh* ṣ^e bāʾôt were originally the armies of Israel. The validity of the first argument has been disqualified in this thesis, since both divine and earthly hosts joined in Israel's armies. The term ṣ^e bāʾ *haššāmayim* is actually strong indication that ṣ^e bāʾôt originally referred to nonhuman participants. It is always singular because it is a technical term referring to a fixed and specific group usually associated with astral elements.

The most valid interpretation has been given by Cross, who sees in the term a clear reference to the beings who made up the

divine assembly (including the "host of heaven").[275] It is an epithet of the god who was both warrior and creator and probably arose out of the cult of El in the south when he was worshiped both as the great creator god and the warrior god. The epithets of El and Atirat which designate their creative or procreative activities refer to their creation of divine beings, for example, *bny bnwt* (El) and *qnyt ilm* (Atirat). One may assume, therefore, that if Yahweh is recognized as originally a cultic name of El and if we suppose that the god Yahweh "split off from El in the radical differentiation of his cultus,"[276] then the name *Yahweh ṣ^{e}bā^{ɔ}ôt* was probably a very archaic designation for Israel's God: "He creates the divine armies." Despite its absence from the books of the Old Testament prior to I Samuel,[277] the probable history of the term, as well as its association with the Ark, marks it as one of the earliest epithets for the God of the Hebrews.[278] Albright has demonstrated that the official name of the Ark was probably "Ark of the Covenant of Yahweh of Hosts Enthroned on the Cherubim."[279] Thus the ancient shrine of holy war and its name testify strongly to the fusion of the heavenly and earthly armies in Israel's notion of holy war. Within this context the ancient cultic title probably soon came to refer to both the hosts of heaven and the hosts of Israel (cf. I Sam. 17:45).

The Pattern of Warfare in Early Israel

The use of the term "pattern" in this context is not meant to imply that there was a set ritual which was carried out precisely in *all* battles. The texts do not indicate that such uni-

formity ever existed; even the schematized and elaborated narratives of Joshua 1--12 show differences among themselves. Nevertheless, there were certain elements central to Israel's war activity and her conceptualization of it, and it may be of value to sum up by setting these forth in the light of the discussion presented in the preceding pages and that of other scholars.

Holy Warfare as a "Synergism"

At the center of Israel's warfare was the unyielding conviction that victory was the result of a fusion of divine and human activity. As the centuries passed and the traditions grew, there came a tendency to ascribe the victory solely to the miraculous intervention of Yahweh apart from any participation of the people but in the early period of Israel's history there was no such abdication on the part of the people. While might of arms and numbers were not the determining factors (note the contrast in the size of Gideon's army and that of the Midianites), it was yet possible for the people to see themselves as going to the aid of Yahweh in battle (Judg. 5:23). The emphasis, however, lay on the activity of the divine, the involvement of Yahweh as warrior and commander of the heavenly armies. The theophany of Yahweh and his coterie was the foundation stone. Yahweh fought for Israel even as Israel fought for Yahweh (Josh. 10:14; Judg. 7:20-22; and so on);the battles were Yahweh's battles (I Sam. 18:17; 25:28). Thus, as I have attempted to demonstrate in this book, Yahweh was general of both the earthly and the heavenly hosts.

Holy War as a Sacral-Cultic Affair

Ritual or cultic aspects were present in Israel's early war-

fare, though some of the evidence for this fact is derived from later sources. Prior to battle, oracle inquiry of Yahweh was made to see if the army would be victorious. In this endeavor the priests may have taken charge, though it is often associated with the war leader. Because the war was sacral, a sphere of activity in which Israel's God was present, the camp and the warriors had to be ritually purified (I Sam. 21:6; II Sam. 11:11; Deut. 23:13-15; Josh. 3:5; 7:13). Undoubtedly the prophetic call to "sanctify war," which is present especially in passages announcing the Day of Yahweh (Joel 4:9; Jer. 51:27-28; Jer. 6:4), reflects the ancient command to prepare for holy war. Most important of all, however, was the practice of *ḥērem*, the devotion of the spoils -- both men and property -- to Yahweh.[280] The category of goods which fell under the *ḥērem* varies; so it is difficult to determine the presence of the *ḥērem* solely by what was destroyed. The biblical accounts do not indicate that the *ḥērem* was carried out in every instance of what was otherwise a sacral military affair, but it is quite likely that the practice was in effect at times even when not mentioned, just as in other instances reference to the *ḥērem* may have been inserted at a later date. The *ḥērem* had its origins in the offensive wars of conquest.[281] Israel fought at Yahweh's command, which included the *ḥērem*. The spoil and prisoners of war were holy and separated, even as the warriors who fought for Israel were holy.

March of the Ark and the Armies

The function of the Ark in Israel's wars also was a reflection of their sacral nature and of the fusion of divine and human

elements in these battles. The holy war palladium, the Ark of the Covenant, was conceived of as the battle station from which Yahweh, the divine warrior, the creator of the divine armies, fought for Israel. Once again it must be stressed that the Ark is not evidenced in all the accounts. In one instance (I Sam. 4) its presence was delayed until defeat was impending. Yet its association with the holy wars is strongly indicated and the march of the Ark and the divine warrior, Yahweh, is probably to be seen even in texts where there is no specific reference to the shrine itself. Deborah's shout to Baraq, "Does not Yahweh go forth before you?" may refer to the procession of the Ark as Yahweh's throne. So also the poetic theophanies of Yahweh and his heavenly armies are to be viewed at least in part in this context. Psalm 68:8 is couched in almost identical terminology: "Yahweh, when you went forth before your people." Thus the march of the Ark with the armies occupied a place of importance both in the ritual of holy war and in the conceptualization underlying it.

The Role of Yahweh and the Heavenly Army

The precise manner in which Yahweh and his hosts aided Israel is not always specified. Often merely the fact of the heavenly army's marching forth with Israel is all that needed to be said, for example, Deuteronomy 33:2-3. Elsewhere the writers and poets are more specific. The members of the assembly are described as warriors with drawn swords, riding in chariots. Plague and Pestilence serve Yahweh. The astral beings fight for Israel. Most important is the fact that Yahweh and his warriors create an attitude within the enemy. They shake the earth and

disturb the elements. Tumult and confusion result. Yahweh thunders against the enemy and sends a panic upon them. In a quite definite sense Israel conceived of the victory as being primarily a divine one and indeed a cosmic one wrought by forces above and beyond any action on Israel's part, which, however, worked to Israel's benefit.

The Role of the People of Israel

The fact that victory was achieved by divine forces, and that Israel came to view this intervention as a type of miracle does not mean that the people themselves had no responsibilities. The narratives indicate that Israel was always engaged in very heavy fighting. Very few instances of battle show Israel as removed from true military engagement as does Joshua 6, and that narrative seems to reflect a later idealization of the battle. Yet even there where little emphasis is placed upon out-and-out fighting, the people still play a major and active role. The fact that the *ʿam Yahweh* saw itself often in this role as specifically a military grouping and that the clans were under obligation to "come to the aid of Yahweh" leaves no doubt that Israel understood herself as playing a vital role in war of Yahweh. The war leader, the earthly equivalent of the "commander of the army of Yahweh," filled with the divine spirit, led Israel forth to battle. The *tᵉrûʿāh*, the battle shout, was uttered by the people in the conflict. So also was the carrying out of the *ḥērem*. But primarily, as von Rad has recognized, Israel's role was to have faith in Yahweh and to fear not. Numbers and size of the army were regarded as less important factors. As long as Israel

trusted in Yahweh, victory would be achieved. So Israel could focus attention upon the might of Yahweh and his military coterie and ascribe an almost passive role to her own involvement despite the fact that in the narratives one sees that the wars of conquest and settlement in the land were bitterly fought.

The Primal March of Holy War

The journey of the Israelites into the land of Canaan appears to have been viewed throughout Israel's history from a very early time as the holy war or Yahweh war *par excellence*. The conquest in the Book of Joshua is schematically represented as the ideal holy war. But that notion permeates much of the early literature of Israel. It appears in the prose texts at all levels where narratives of holy wars at various stages of the journey from the wilderness on are related,[282] and it appears in the very early poetic material where Yahweh is viewed as marching from Sinai with his angels before him to aid Israel in battle.[283] Although composed of many separate battles involving groups at different times, the wars of the conquest were quite early viewed as one great sacral war in which the *ḥērem* was carried out to secure the land which Yahweh had given the people.

This original march of holy war had its origin in the theophany of Yahweh at Sinai, from which he marched with his hosts to aid Israel. Particularly in the poetic literature there are mythological notions of the mountain as the dwelling place of Yahweh, the cosmic abode of the storm god, but there is much more here than simply the appearance of the storm god or the sun god over the cosmos.[284] Yahweh does not go forth to fight mythologi-

cal monsters, nor merely to shine forth over the earth. He marches from Sinai to battle the historical enemies of Israel, and all his army goes with him. Sinai, thus, is the abode of Yahweh but it is also the region from which he goes forth to fight and the place where he has covenanted with Israel and created the *ʿam Yahweh*. Sinai, Seir, Edom, and Paran are vividly historicized as the wilderness of Israel's journey.[285]

From Sinai, Israel and her God proceeded to Canaan, engaging enemies and adversaries along the way. The ancient poetry sees the march through the wilderness as a military endeavor. That picture is reinforced by the prose narratives (for example, Num. 14:39ff.; Ex. 17:8ff.) but especially by the P account in the early chapters of Numbers where the people of Israel are described as a force in military formation, each tribe being rallied around its standard. The encampment is a battle camp. The census of the men is for military purposes. That these chapters represent a later interpretation of the wilderness march in many respects is certainly true, yet they cannot be dismissed entirely as a late fabrication. They fit too well into the general pattern of earlier materials. Furthermore, recent scholarship has been forced to take more seriously the details of the later material in Numbers.[286] The same may be true of the larger structures of the P material. Evidence for a military format to the wilderness march has been seen elsewhere (for example, Ex. 18:24). The general alignment of the people who came from Sinai through the wilderness in battle array is not incongruous with the evidence both narrative and poetic.

The culmination of this primal march of holy war is the crossing of the Jordan and the taking of the land. The result is on the one hand the establishment of Israel in the land which had been promised to her and on the other hand the establishment of kingship and sanctuary for Yahweh.[287] In this respect the Israelite conception of divine warfare compares with basic motifs in Near Eastern mythology, yet the assurance of Yahweh's kingship and holy dwelling place is accomplished on a thoroughly historical plane. Yahweh and his armies go forth to fight not Tiamat, Mot, Yamm, and other divine beings, but the Canaanites, the Amorites, the Amalekites, and all the other people who stand in the way of Israel's acquisition of her promised heritage. To be sure, the battle of Yahweh against mythological forces appears at points, but it is always a subordinate event fused with the more political, historical aspect of the warrior god's activity -- the defeat of Israel's enemies.

Israel's Warfare and Israel's God

In the origins of Yahwism and the worship of Yahweh in Israel two strains merged in the deity Yahweh, the tutelary clan deity, the god of the fathers; and the high god El, the creator of heaven and earth.[288] One may now note in light of the work of Alt, Cross, and others on the development of this phenomenon and in view of the detailed analysis in the preceding pages that the combination of Israel's institutional conceptions of holy war with the more mythological notions of cosmic warfare may have arisen from the early fusion of the patriarchal tribal god who covenanted with the tribe(s) and led them in battle with the high creator

god who created and led the cosmic armies to war. Information about the god of the fathers, especially his involvement in the wars of the tribe, is quite limited, yet there are occasional indications, some of them most important, as, for example, Exodus 15:2, where in a context celebrating Yahweh's deliverance of Israel in holy war he is called "the god of my father" and "a man of war." Also connected with the Exodus events is the meaning ascribed to the name of Moses' son, Eliezer: "The god of my father was my help and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh" (Ex. 18:4). There can be little doubt that Israel's understanding of her sacral warfare, a tribal and covenantal phenomenon, was intimately related to and derivative from the religion of the god of the fathers.

The other line of development which merges here, that of the "high and eternal one, El the creator of heaven and earth,"[289] who created the divine beings and led them forth into battle, the high god (Ba^{c}al-Yahweh) who fought the monsters of the deep and conquered them, has been discussed at length in these pages. It is at this point that the phenomenon of the divine warrior and divine warfare is placed on a cosmic level. It is in the fusion of this element with the god of the fathers that one is to find the origins of that particular Israelite conception of sacral warfare viewed as a cosmic and earthly endeavor involving the hosts of heaven and of Israel under the leadership of Yahweh. The divine name *Yahweh ṣ^{e}bā$^{\supset}$ôt* is thus probably to be seen as a type of cultic or liturgical "ancestor" of Yahweh, which reflects the coming together of these two strains in the God of Israel, whose

suzerainty relationship with Israel encompassed this fusion of tutelary deity and cosmic warrior-creator.

As I have often stressed, these developments in Israelite religion were not by any means isolated events devoid of any outside influence. On the contrary, Israelite conceptions were very strongly allied with those of her neighbors. The notion of the divine warrior, the assembly of the gods as an army, and the chaos battle are all motifs which reflect outside influence upon Israelite thought, as is indeed to be expected. Yet it is necessary to recognize that like the surrounding cultures which, because of geographical, linguistic, and other factors, developed each in its own way, Israel also manifested its own peculiar character in its religious history. In Israel the creator god was the war god who marched forth to save his people. Basic to the other religions of the Near East in one form or another was the mythological battle to preserve order. Gods fought for man. In this respect there were many similarities to the figure of Yahweh which must not be overlooked. But by and large, there existed a separation between the historical battles of the kings aided by the god or gods and the mythological battles of the gods against the gods. The gods acted to save men, but at the center of the religious concern was the battle for order over chaos, life over death, fertility over sterility. At the center of Israel's faith, however, lay the battle for Israel's deliverance, a conflict involving the theophany of Yahweh and his mighty armies to fight with and for Israel. This encounter took place on a definitely historical level, but the forces of the cosmos were in-

volved.[290] Insofar as the mythological battle of the gods existed in normative Yahwism it was brought into this complex. The mythological, etiological, and magical functions and purposes, which were of primary concern in the divine warfare of Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Hittite, Hurrian, and Canaanite religion, were subordinated in Israel to the historical purposes of election and covenant so that the whole march through the wilderness to Canaan was seen as a mighty holy war led by the divine warrior and his armies.[291] Finally and most important is the fact that the establishment of Yahweh's kingship and sanctuary and, in part, his creation (Deut. 32:6) grew out of this cosmic, historical, sacral war, whereas elsewhere these elements all resulted from and were associated with the mythological battle of the gods. The Israelite pattern subordinated all other beings to Yahweh and centered its attention upon his activity on behalf of Israel. Central to that activity was Yahweh's role as divine warrior, the "man of war."

SOME CONCLUDING IMPLICATIONS

The Formation of the Epic Tradition

For some time the scholarly consensus on the growth or formation of the Pentateuchal or Hexateuchal traditions has been based on the conclusions of von Rad in his form-critical study of the Hexateuch, to the effect that Deuteronomy 6:20-24; 26:5b-9; and Joshua 24:2b-13 represent a particular *Gattung* or genre, "the small historical credo," which is "already a Hexateuch in miniature" and which forms the basis or outline for the Hexateuch. Then in extended and brilliant fashion von Rad shows how the Yahwist formulated his account of Israel's early history by the processes of insertion, expansion, and addition of various traditions.[1]

While von Rad's assertion that the Sinai tradition was not an original part of the Exodus-Settlement traditions was early and widely criticized, most scholars have accepted the hypothesis of the archaic credo and then sought -- with varying degrees of success -- to account for the absence of any reference to Sinai in these credos.[2] More recently, rather severe and justifiable criticisms have been raised against the prior hypothesis, that is, that these three passages represent a single ancient form

which was the nucleus out of which the Hexateuchal traditions were developed. The questioning voices have been numerous and diverse: A. Weiser,[3] G. Fohrer,[4] L. Rost,[5] C. H. Brekelmans,[6] Th. C. Vriezen,[7] B. S. Childs,[8] J. P. Hyatt,[9] C. Carmichael,[10] and W. Richter.[11] There is no need to go into detail on the various criticisms. They have been well presented and with reference to other scholars in the work of Hyatt already cited. Briefly stated, the passages under discussion, particularly the basic one, Deuteronomy 26:5b-9, are heavily Deuteronomic in language and character; they are associated with three different cultic occasions and cannot be dissociated from them; and they probably represent different if related genres.

If von Rad's conclusions about the "credo" are now seen to be questionable, it still may be that he was on the right course in searching for a nucleus which was the principal basis for the formation of the Hexateuchal traditions or, preferably, the epic tradition.[12] Without assuming a monolothic schema of development and allowing for the possibility of varying formulations, it is quite likely that in some form or other the core of that early experience and history was expressed in brief fashion, easy to recount, then expanded and elaborated in various ways -- and probably at a quite early stage -- into the epic tradition. Such brief recapitulation may have taken more than one form, but at least one may be discerned whose credentials as a genuinely ancient recital of the saving events are far sounder than those of the "credos." Von Rad himself has seen this evidence but for various reasons has regarded it as secondary to the Deuteronomic

credos.

I refer in this case to Exodus 15. In the preceding section we pointed to the antiquity of this poem, a fact that can hardly be contested any more. A hymn to Yahweh recounting his deliverance of Israel, the poem begins with and focuses on the defeat of the Egyptians at the Sea, then recounts by stages the march through the wilderness and into the promised land where Yahweh's sanctuary is established and he rules as king. There is no certain reference to Sinai, though the "holy encampment" of verse 13 could refer to it,[13] but it is not necessary that specific mention of Sinai be a part of every account. There are other testimonies to it in other pieces of archaic poetry. Note further the reference in verse 2 to *ʾĕlōhê ʾābî*, "the God of my father." While no specific reference to the patriarchs is found in the poem, I find here a link with those traditions in a reference to what Alt and others have seen as the core of the patriarchal traditions -- the worship of the God of the fathers.[14]

The poetic character of this passage is probably a pointer toward its use as a foundation stone for the formulation of the JE epic tradition. For, as many have remarked, it is quite likely that the earliest formulations of that tradition were poetic, as indicated by the large amount of archaic poetic material in the Pentateuch and the many signs of a poetic sub-stratum, particularly in the books of Genesis and Exodus.[15] Further, the cultic character of Exodus 15 would have contributed significantly to its influence as an epic nucleus.[16]

Von Rad himself has cited Exodus 15 as one of the "free

adaptations of the creed in cult-lyrics."[17] But with the recognition of the relatively late character of the Deuteronomic "credo" and the early date of Exodus 15, it is preferable to start with the latter and see in it the basis for the later literary-theological activity of gathering and ordering the various traditions into a national epic. There may of course have been other early nuclei which played a part, such as the historical prologue of the covenant formulary.

We are led in this direction also by the recognition that in Exodus 15 we find a mythic-historic pattern which is found elsewhere in various forms in the early poetry: the march of the divine warrior to do battle with the enemies of Israel, the deliverance of the people and their establishment in the land, and the rule of Yahweh over Israel.[18] Its relationship to the cult is certain, but it also exercised a literary influence on other poems and hymns and presumably on the larger literary works. The hymnic framework of Deuteronomy 33:2-5, 26-29 may be cited as another example from the corpus of early Hebrew poetry. Again von Rad has referred to Deuteronomy 33:2-4 but as an example of the separation of the Sinai tradition. The problem in this case is that von Rad has assumed that verses 2-5 are to be understood by themselves, ignoring the fact that we have here the beginning of a framework which finds its ending in verses 26-29. There most explicitly one is dealing with the march of conquest and the settlement in the land. The basic elements of the mythic-historic pattern are there. They become also central elements in the epic unfolding of the story of Israel's origins.

It would be difficult to demonstrate in any conclusive and detailed manner how the epic tradition about Israel's beginnings came into being. Von Rad and Noth have both attempted to do this and indeed have provided valuable insights into the growth of the traditions, but one can hardly say that their important works have given us a consensus or even clear direction. Methodologically, it would be preferable to start with the earliest material and with the poetic, assuming all the while that in a complex history of tradition various influences would have come to bear from many directions and that the core or nucleus of the epic account could have been in several forms. Where it is not possible to work out the details, general hypotheses which rest upon a solid base of evidence will have to be formulated and used as tools or constructs for approaching the material afresh. The hypotheses of von Rad and Noth have served that function in a most valuable way, but it may now be necessary to suggest some new starting points and hypotheses. The most likely place to begin in such a case is with the early poetry of the wars of Yahweh.

At the Theological Center

An investigation of the theological meaning of God as warrior/fighter/commander is outside the scope of this book. Furthermore, I have dealt with some of the theological issues, albeit in relatively brief and preliminary form, in another context,[19] and more recently G. Ernest Wright has addressed himself to this theme in his Sprunt Lectures.[20] My aim in these concluding words is simply to call attention to the centrality of the divine warrior imagery and language in the Old Testament and

the consequent need for a major focus upon it in any theological treatment of the Old Testament. Even as any attempt to work out the growth of the epic tradition needs to start out from the songs of Yahweh's and Israel's wars, so any theology of the Old Testament or any overall interpretation of the Old Testament should give significant attention to the conception of God as warrior and the role that it plays in the literature.

From beginning to end this theme in various forms and with various ramifications comes to the fore. It is not possible to dismiss it as "primitive" without in effect dismissing the Old Testament. Yahweh as warrior was indeed a very early part of Israel's understanding of deity and during that early period perhaps the primary imagery evolved. The principal concern of this study has been on the earlier materials, but the pre-monarchical and early monarchical periods were in many respects high points in Israel's history. Even more important, the language and understanding of God as warrior dominated Israel's faith throughout its course. In prophetic oracles, in psalms of the temple, and especially in the development of eschatological and apocalyptic literature, the centrality of Yahweh as the divine warrior and commander of the armies of heaven and earth is very much to the fore and grows out of the earlier theological formulations.[21] It would not be amiss to say that the most elaborated conceptions of the divine warrior come at the end of the Old Testament period. So wherever one turns one encounters this theme.

It is in this context also that myth and history come together and illustrate their interaction in a profound way in

Israel's religious expressions. The picture and patterns of divine warfare come out of the mythological world of the ancient Near East. The heavenly armies are a mythopoeic ingredient; the battle with the monsters of chaos a cosmogonic element. But the context in which these factors play their principal part is the theological conviction that Yahweh was working to save or to punish Israel in her various internal and external conflicts. The language by which the Israelites sought to speak of these conflicts and God's involvement was mythological, drawn from common ways of thinking in the cultures of the ancient Near East; but the sphere in which the divine armies were understood to be involved was not primarily an otherworldly, mythological sphere. The cosmic powers were present and effective in the vicissitudes of human history. It is fashionable in these times to play down the historical sphere as medium and place of revelation in the Old Testament. Certainly justifiable criticisms have been raised against efforts to squeeze the Old Testament completely into that definition. But it can hardly be gainsaid that much of Israel's experience and knowledge of her God came from the wars of her history and the theological reflection on their meaning, a reflection which appropriately and naturally used the available mythological tools.

The divine warrior imagery speaks theologically about some very significant dimensions in the understanding of God from the Old Testament perspective and presumably when one moves beyond that. Ernest Wright has ably elaborated this fact in his Sprunt Lectures, but it may be well to underscore three or four points

in order to demonstrate how central that imagery and its content are in Old Testament theology.

Salvation. The notion of salvation can involve many kinds of deliverance from a variety of oppressors. In early Israel, salvation -- at least as a communal experience, which it was primarily -- was not spiritual but quite historical, the goal of the warring activity of Yahweh. The victories are spoken of as the *ṣidqôt Yahweh* (Judg. 5:11). As the "man of war" who fights for Israel, he is the strength and defence of the people, indeed their salvation (*yᵉšûʿāh*, Ex. 15:2; cf. Ex. 14:30). As a result of Yahweh's victory it is said that the people are "redeemed" (*zû gāʾālтî* Ex. 15:13) or "saved" (*nôšāʿ*, Deut. 33:29; cf. I Sam. 17:47). Yahweh fights for Israel quite simply to save them from destruction and to give the people life and home. So at the center of Israel's elaborated poetic and theological statements about God the warrior was the salvation theme, the awareness of having been saved this way, a conviction articulated not only with the mythopoeic vocabulary of divine warfare but also with the common theological vocabulary for salvation.

Or to put it in reverse form, at the center of the salvation experience and theology of early Israel was the "man of war," the divine warrior. If one wished to know concretely what salvation meant in the early period -- and indeed in later times also -- it was simply: Yahweh fought for us and saved us.

Judgment. This does not need elaboration. It is the other side of the coin, the negative dimension of the activity of the divine warrior. As he fought for Israel to deliver her, so he

could and did fight against her to punish. The prophets especially drew this obvious conclusion from Israel's theology. And it was this important assumption that kept the theology of Yahweh's wars from being purely ideological or a naive and simple "God is on our side" faith. To speak about the judgment of God in the Old Testament is to be confronted again with the imagery of the divine warrior.

Kingship. The same is true as far as the kingship and sovereignty of God is concerned. Whether over the gods or more particularly over Israel, it is the establishment of Yahweh's eternal rule and sovereignty that is the ultimate goal of Yahweh's wars. It has long been thought that the kingship of Yahweh originated out of the Jerusalem cultus, but that view is no longer tenable and in the light of extra-biblical material should have been suspect from the beginning. It is precisely in the *early* poetry of Israel that we see the kingship of Yahweh asserted (for example, Ex. 15:18; Deut. 33:5; Ps. 68:25; Num. 23:21; Ps. 29:10; Ps. 24:9). Yahweh's sovereignty is established by his victories over the enemies of Israel. He who defeats the foe claims dominion. The conception of the kingship of God is therefore from the beginning fully wrapped up in the early representations of the divine warrior. It is not possible to talk of God as king without talking of God as warrior.

There are other elements of Israelite faith and Old Testament theology related to the subject under discussion here. It is hoped that the matters mentioned above as well as the content of the book as a whole are sufficient to indicate that Old Testa-

ment theology and the theological use of the Hebrew Scriptures by church and synagogue will have to wrestle with this fundamental theme.

Notes

Indexes

NOTES

Part One. Divine Warfare in the Literature of Syria-Palestine

1. For the question of homogeneity of religion in this area see below. The religion of Israel is not the primary concern at this point, though there are many relationships, some of which will be discussed.

2. Note, for example, the Ugaritic Pantheon text equating Canaanite and Mesopotamian deities (Jean Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V, 42-64). Mitchell Dahood has argued that all three of the principal male deities at Ugarit, El, Baʿal, and Dagan, *may* have been of Akkadian or Hurrian origin rather than Northwest Semitic (M. J. Dahood, "Ancient Semitic Deities in Syria and Palestine," *Le Antiche Divinita Semitiche*, ed. Sabatino Moscati [Rome: Centro di Studi Semitici, Universita di Roma, 1958], 65-94; cited hereafter as Dahood, *ASD*). Dahood himself opts for the Syrian origin of Baʿal but is uncertain about Dagan and regards El as belonging to "the original Semitic pantheon" (p. 93). The designation of Dagan as one of the three chief gods at Ugarit is not on the basis of his very negligible role, if any, in the mythological texts but on his apparently significant place in the cultus at Ugarit evidenced by the temple and two steles dedicated to him as well as his presence in two lists of sacrifices to the gods (Texts 9:3 [= *CTA* 36.3] and 19:5 [= *CTA* 39.5]). Thus Dahood is able to conclude: "In spite of the presence of numerous Akkadian texts at Ras Shamra and the influence of Mesopotamian jurisprudence upon the legal system at Ugarit, the most ancient Northwest

Semitic religion was but slightly influenced by Mesopotamia" (*ASD*, p. 93).

3. As an example of what was involved in this meeting of Israel and Canaan, see the conclusions of Frank M. Cross in "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Theological Review*, 55 (1962), 225-259.

4. William F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 4th rev. ed. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956), p. 70; cited hereafter as *ARI*.

5. Marvin Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955), pp. 4-5; cited hereafter as Pope, *EUT*. Cf. Albright, *ARI*, p. 70, who says: "Since not only the names of gods and the mythological atmosphere, but also many details of Philo's narrative are in complete agreement with Ugaritic and later Phoenician inscriptions, we are fully justified in accepting provisionally all data preserved by him, though we may often remain in doubt as to the exact meaning of a passage or the original name underlying Philo's Greek equivalent. We must, of course, also allow for mistakes in interpretation made by Philo of his precursors." Also Albright, *History, Archaeology, and Christian Humanism* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), pp. 149-150.

6. This positive judgment does not offset Pope's wise stricture that "the use of Philo of Byblos and other late sources for the elucidation of the Ugaritic myths should be made with extreme caution" (*EUT*, p. 5). It should be noted that some Egyptian material is present and should be taken into account when seeking to discern the originally Canaanite data.

7. "The stability of Canaanite religion throughout the Late Bronze Age and all phases of the Iron Age as well as of the Hellenistic period is not difficult to establish" (Dahood, *ASD*, p. 70). Cf. W. F. Albright, "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955), pp. 1-2.

8. Emphasis upon the relative stability of Canaanite religion is not meant to deny the fact that over the centuries matters were in flux or transition even at Ugarit, a fact stressed by Pope and others and generally accepted by scholars in the field, or that certain areas emphasized the worship of particular deities (e.g., the Philistine worship of Dagon). But from an overall perspective the religion of Canaan was a unified, largely homogeneous entity.

9. Albright, Baumgartner, DeLanghe, de Vaux, Eissfeldt, and Pedersen, while not going to the extremes of other scholars, have all argued for a historical nucleus behind the Keret epic according to John Gray, *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955), p. 1. H. L. Ginsberg has also stressed this fact in some detail in his *The Legend of King Keret*, *BASOR* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1946), pp. 7-8. Cf. his excellent though brief discussion of the differences in style between Keret and the other two epics in the work just cited, p. 46.

10. There is still some uncertainty as to the relationship of some texts, e.g., *UT* 6 and 121-124 (= *CTA* 13 and 20-22) to the Baʿal-ʿAnat cycle or the other epics. Use of these texts, how-

ever, does not have to remain suspended until the question of proper locale is settled. Such settlement may be impossible in some cases.

11. Recent Old Testament studies which have given some attention to the divine assembly at Ugarit are Gerald Cooke, "The Sons of (the) God(s)," *ZAW*, 76 (1964), 22-47; J. L. Cunchillos Ylarri, "Los b^{e}ne ha'elohîm en Gen. 6, 1-4," *Estudios Biblicos*, 28 (1969), 5-17; Ferdinand Dexinger, *Sturz der Göttersöhne oder Engel vor der Sintflut* (Wien: Verlag Herder, 1966), pp. 29-41; Hans-Winfried Jüngling, *Der Tod der Götter* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969), pp. 52-60.

12. This enumeration of the major deities in the pantheon is based solely on their appearances in the texts. As has been noted before, the actual evaluation in the cultus at Ugarit around 1200 B.C. as well as elsewhere may have been different. The fluidity of the three goddesses ʿAnat, Aṯirat, and ʿAṯtart compels one to name all three here even though ʿAṯtart does not appear nearly as often as the other two. The somewhat arbitrary division of deities into groups is according to their relative importance in the main texts. It does not correspond to any tripartite division of the pantheon, which may, however, have existed at Ugarit according to Gaster's interpretation of the phrase *ʿdt ilm ṯlṯh* in Text 128:II:7 (= *CTA* 15.II.7), cited in Dahood, *ASD*, p. 66, n. 3. For a different interpretation of this phrase see below.

13. The texts published in *PRU* II and V and in *Ugaritica* V show that Reŝeph played a greater role than previous texts had

indicated, though little can be said about this deity at Ugarit. Cf. Dahood, *ASD*, pp. 83-85 and Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, p. 121.

14. See Michael Astour, "Some New Divine Names from Ugarit," *JAOS*, 86 (1965), 277-284, for a discussion of new gods appearing in the texts of *Ugaritica* V.

15. Syria-Palestine has not yet produced the number of deities (i.e., several thousand) that were worshiped in Mesopotamia, according to the lists of Deimel and Tallqvist. See Dahood, *ASD*, p. 65 and his remarks about the somewhat misleading impression these lists give.

16. Pope, *EUT*, p. 48, is correct in saying that the use of *phr* by itself "does not necessarily imply a plenary session or perfect attendance," but it appears he goes too far in maintaining that *phr* "is used loosely of any considerable aggregation of the gods." The contexts in which the word appears would indicate that it has a more specific and definite usage.

17. Albright, *ARI*, p. 72, points out the fact that *bn il(m)* means "'members of the *el*-group,' i.e., 'gods,' following a widely attested Semitic expression for members of a class or guild." The occurrences of *bn il(m)* in Ugaritic are discussed in J. L. Cunehillos Ylarri, *Estudios Biblicas*, 28 (1969), 5-17 and Jüngling, *Der Tod der Götter*, pp. 53-56.

18. The above comments do not mean that *phr* cannot mean simply "totality" or "assembly" without reference to gods as is often the case in Akkadian. It can and does.

19. A convenient publication and discussion of this in-

scription is that of W. F. Albright, "The Phoenician Inscription of the Tenth Century B.C. from Byblos," *JAOS*, 67 (1947), 156-157. Cf. Herbert Donner and Wolfgang Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, II (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1964), 6-7.

20. See its usage in the Tale of Wen-Amun and the discussion in F. M. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, I, ed. G. Ernest Wright and David Noel Freedman (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), 223-224.

21. Enticing as the suggestion may be, Ginsberg's attempt to read *b <p> ḥr mwʿd* here is not convincing to me. See "Lexicographical Notes," *Hebräische Wortforschung* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 79-80.

22. *ANET*, p. 130.

23. Note that Ugaritic apparently does not use *qdš* or *qdšm* by themselves as does the Old Testament, whereas the Old Testament does not use *bn qdš*, the Ugaritic term. This varying mode of terminology in the two sources is in contrast to references to *ilm* and *bn ilm*, which appear in both the Ugaritic texts and the Old Testament. The seventh-century incantation text from Arslan Tash uses the plural term *qdšn* in the phrase *kl dr qdsn*, "the council of all the Holy Ones," along with *bn ʾlm*, establishing this form as good Canaanite/Phoenician style even apart from its use in the Old Testament. For the latest transcription and translation of this text in the light of new photographs, see F. M. Cross and Richard J. Saley, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria,"

BASOR, 197 (February, 1970), 42-49. The parallelism of *ilm* and *(bn)qdš* is common to the style and language of the Ugaritic texts and the Old Testament, e.g., Ex. 15:11; Deut. 33:2. On the Old Testament examples see the following chapter.

24. Charles Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* V, 564, no. 6, lines 1-2 (RS 24.272). The reference appears to be to El.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 574-580, no. 8, lines 26 and 31 (RS 24.251). For extended discussion of these incantations, see Michael C. Astour, "Two Ugaritic Serpent Charms," *JNES*, 27 (1968), 13-36.

26. These gods are as follows (according to Text 8): *[i]l w ḥrn, bʿl w dgn, ʿnt w ʿṯtrt, yrḫ w ršp ʿṯtr w ʿṯtpr, ṯṯ w kmṯ, mlk b ʿṯtrt, ktr w ḫss*, and *šḥr w šlm*. In Text 8 not all of these are paired this way and *ḥrn* appears at the end. But the total list is the same except that *ʿṯtr w ʿṯtpr* is not in Text 7.

27. Cross and Saley have pointed out a number of lines of continuity between the Ugaritic and Arslan Tash incantations.

28. Pope thinks that the phrase *dr il wpḫr bʿl* (1:7 [= *CTA* 34.7]) refers perhaps to "separate aggregations of minor deities, one associated with El and the other with Baʿal (*EUT*, p. 90). Such an assumption may well be correct. Certainly this particular expression points in that direction. He is wrong, however, in stating flatly that the reference "can hardly be to the entire pantheon, since the major gods are specified by name in text 1" (*EUT*, p. 90). It is impossible to say definitely. But in Text 2 (= *CTA* 32) *dr bn il* appears several times along with *mpḫrt bn il* apparently referring to the whole pantheon unless *dr bn il* is only a part and *mpḫrt bn il* the whole, in which case why mention

the *dr bn il*? Furthermore, in Text 107 (= *CTA* 30) *pḫr ilm* appears in a list of gods in much the same way as *dr il* in Text 1 (= *CTA* 34), only without reference to sacrifices. Thus *dr* (*bn*) *il* may refer to a subgroup within the council or to the council as a whole.

29. Albright's explanation of the term *bn il* could, however, apply here also. See n. 17.

30. The growing relationship between Baʿal and Aṯirat evidenced in the Ugaritic texts is probably a necessary part of Baʿal's assumption of El's position. A list of sacrifices (Text 9 [= *CTA* 36]) mentions a sacrifice *lbʿl waṯrt* (l. 8). Baʿal's taking over of El's consort, more fully evidenced in the Iron Age, was part of his usurpation of El's role as leader of the divine assembly.

31. For etymological discussion see W. F. Albright, "The North-Canaanite Epic of ʾAlʾeyan Baʿal and Mot," *JPOS*, 12 (1932), 197, nn. 46 and 47; and Godfrey R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956), pp. 135, nn. 17, 30, and 150; cited hereafter as Driver, *CML*. Dahood has raised the possibility that *aryh* may be an animal name designation for nobles or warriors related to Hebrew *ʾaryeh*, "lion" ("The Value of Ugaritic for Textual Criticism," *Biblica*, 40 [1959], 161-162, n. 2). On this linguistic phenomenon in general see my "Animal Names as Designations in Ugaritic and Hebrew," *Ugarit-Forschungen*, II (1970), 177-178.

32. In 51:VI:44-46 (= *CTA* 4.VI.44-46) *šbʿm bn aṯrt* is in parallelism with *aḫh* and *a[r]yh*, the suffix referring to Baʿal.

33. *PRU* II 1: rev. 9-10 has two references to *pḫrk*. Unfortunately the broken text does not allow certainty about the antecedent. It could be Baʿal or ʿAnat inasmuch as both are mentioned, and ʿAnat is mentioned immediately after *pḫrk*. In this context *pḫr* is parallel to *bt* and may not even refer to the gods. Reference to the gods, the Rephaim (l. 2), and especially the phrase *w k mǵ ilm*, "and when the gods arrived," suggest, however, that a divine *pḫr* is involved.

34. See p. 16, n. 28.

35. If such a hypothesis has any validity, it would eliminate the problem of the combination of *har-mô̂ʿēd* and *ṣāpô̂n* in Isa. 14:13, which has caused Werner Schmidt (*Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel*, *BZAW*, 80 [Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1961], p. 26) to contend that this passage contains originally different traditions which have flowed together. The two terms *har-mô̂ʿēd* and *ṣāpô̂n* could be legitimately equated as referring to the locale of the *pḫr mʿd* of Baʿal. Pope (*EUT*, pp. 102-103) has a solution somewhat similar to the one proposed here. He identifies Mount Saphon with *ǵr ll* (137:20 [= *CTA* 2.I.20]),the place where the assembly meets. This identification within the Baʿal- ʿAnat cycle itself is difficult, however, inasmuch as El is still head of the *pḫr mʿd* and is not generally connected with Ṣaphon, whereas Baʿal resides at Ṣaphon, and no activities of the pantheon take place there in the Baʿal-ʿAnat cycle. If there was a *pḫr mʿd* at Ṣaphon, it is preferable to see it as a separate or later tradition representing the continued ascendance of Baʿal. The matter is further complicated by the fact that *ṣpn* and *il ṣpn*

appear in god lists and in the Ba^{c}al-^{c}Anat cycle. The latter term could refer to El, Ba^{c}al, Ṣaphon, or another deity altogether. There may have been confusion between El's abode and Ba^{c}al's Mount Cassius. In the Ugaritic Pantheon text Ṣaphon is equated with Ḫazzi, the mountain god of Hittite mythology (J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V, 44). The equation *ṣpn* = Ḫazzi = Mt. Cassius was recognized as far back as 1940 by Goetze (Albrecht Goetze, "The City Khalbi and the Khapiru People," *BASOR* 79 [October 1940], 32-34).

36. Text 137:18 and 34 (= *CTA* 2.I.18 and 34) appear to refer to Ba^{c}al's following, but the words *dtqh* and *dtqyn* are still problematical. Gordon relates these to Arab. *wqy*, which means "to keep, preserve," and in its eighth form "to fear, to honor (God)." Driver suggests this root or the Hebrew *qāwāh*, *qiwwāh*, "waited upon." There are problems in both cases. Most translators tend to translate, however, along these lines. Ginsberg may be cited as an example:

> *tn . ilm . dtqh ./ dtqyn . hmlt*
>
> Surrender the god with a following,
>
> Him whom the multitudes worship:

All the words except "Surrender the god" are italicized by Ginsberg (*ANET*, p. 130).

37. Albright, *JPOS*, 12 (1932), 204 at first accepted Virolleaud's identification of *ḫnzr* with "wild boar," but later expressed himself otherwise: "*Ḫnzr* probably has nothing to do with the word for 'swine'" ("Review of *Ugaritic Handbook* by Cyrus H. Gordon," *JBL*, 69 [1950], 389).

38. See my article referred to in n. 31.

39. F. F. Hvidberg, *Weeping and Laughter in the Old Testament*, ed. and trans., F. Løkkegaard (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), p. 26, n. 1. Løkkegaard added notes to this edition based on the results of recent scholarship and his own study.

40. Jørgen Laessøe, *The Shemshara Tablets: A Preliminary Report* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1959), pp. 77, 81, 83. Laessøe says that the word is not to his knowledge attested elsewhere and that it is "apparently an artificially Akkadianized form of a Hurrian(?) word" (p. 83). Hurrian terminology would not be unusual at Ugarit where Hurrian influence was strong. Hurrian texts have been found, and Hurrian characteristics influenced the literary style of the Ugaritic texts according to W. F. Albright, "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. Ernest Wright (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), p. 357, nn. 62-63. On the basis of the Shemshara usage Løkkegaard suggests "yeoman?" as a possible translation for *ḫanizarum*.

41. Cf. Edouard Lipinski, *Le poème royal du Psaume LXXXIX 1-5, 20-38* (Paris: J. Gabalda and Co., 1967), p. 39, n. 6.

42. Driver, *CML*, p. 85.

43. *ANET*, p. 136.

44. J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V, 45. Cf. M. Astour, "Some New Divine Names from Ugarit," p. 280, who is inclined to equate these gods with the "seven lads, eight boars."

45. C. Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* V, Text 9 (rev. 11) and Text 13, rev. 1 (only *il t'dr* written). Also to be restored

in *UT* 17:4 (= *CTA* 29, rev. 4) *i[l t d]r b l.*

46. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, p. 125, n. 89, proposes to render the designation "warriors of Baʿal."

47. Svi Rin and Shifra Rin, "Ugaritic-Old Testament Affinities II," *Acts of the Gods* (Jerusalem: Israel Society for Biblical Research, 1968), p. xli.

48. Text 67:V (= *CTA* 5.V) also includes in Baʿal's retinue *Pdry* and *Ṯtly* as well as various weather phenomena: *ʿrpt* (cloud), *rḥ* (wind), *mdl*(?), and *mṯrt* (rains). The *ʿrpt* here may have some relationship to the *ʿnn* (133:35 [= *CTA* 2.I.35]; 51:IV:59 [= *CTA* 4.IV.59]; 76:II:33 [= *CTA* 10.II.33]; *ʿnt*:IV:76 [= *CTA* 3.IV.76]) if the latter has anything to do with "cloud," as seems to be the case in terms of etymology. Further reference to Baʿal's host and its military character may be seen in the enigmatic Rephaim texts discussed below.

49. Henri Cazelles, "L'hymne ugaritique à Anat," *Syria*, 33 (1956), 49-57. Cazelles thinks *mhr* means "young warrior" and refers to the king in this context as the warrior of ʿAnat.

50. Cf. below on the Rephaim texts.

51. Arvid S. Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1952), p. 109, n. 4.

52. Cf. Theodor H. Gaster, *Thespis*, 2d rev. ed. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1961), p. 228. In an earlier context Gaster pointed out the parallelism between *rpi* and *p̱ḫr* in Text 128:III:14-15 (= *CTA* 15.III.14-15), which he took to be evidence that the term denotes properly "members of the assembly" (Gaster, "The Canaanite Epic of Keret," *Jewish Quarterly Re-*

view, 37 [1946-47], 287-289). The only problem with that assumption is that the relationships appear to be *btk/bp̱ḫr* or *rpi ar[ṣ]/qbṣ dtn*. Even with that parallelism the word still appears to have something to do with "gathering" or "assembly."

53. Cf. *UM*, Glossary, No. 989, and M. Pope and W. Röllig, "Syrien. Der Mythologie der Ugariter und Phonizier," *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 1961-), I, 1, pp. 296-297; cited hereafter as Pope, *WM*.

54. Driver, *CML*, pp. 116-117. Cf. Job 38:7.

55. *CTA*, 10.I.5. The *d* of *dr* and the final *m* are the least clear letters, but a careful examination of the photograph confirms Mlle. Herdner's reading.

56. K. Mras, ed., *Eusebius' Werke*, Vol. VIII, Pt. 1, *Die Preparatio Evangelica*, "Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte" (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954), p. 42, para. 29; cited hereafter as Mras, *Eusebius' Werke*.

57. M. Dahood would compare with this *km hkkbm*ʾ*l* in l. 10 of the Phoenician inscription from Pyrgi, which he would translate "like the stars of El" ("Punic *hkkbm*ʾ*l* and Is. 14, 13," *Orientalia*, 34 [1965], 170-172). For the issues and problems involved, see Joseph Fitzmeyer, "The Phoenician Inscription from Pyrgi," *JAOS*, 86 (1966), 295-296.

58. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 249, reads plausibly *ǵr ʿi*> *l*, "Mount of El" for *ǵr ll*. Cf. Pope, *EUT*, p. 69.

59. This fact is evident also in the *Yeḥimilk* inscription from Byblos and the Azitawadda inscription from Karatepe. The most convenient translation of these texts is that of Franz Rosen-

thal, *ANET*, pp. 499-500.

60. Text 128:III:18-19 (= *CTA* 15.III.18-19) gives a valuable piece of information about the gods and their abodes. After the gods bless Keret:

tity . ilm . lahlhm

dr il . lmšknthm

The gods come/go to their tents,

The family of El to their tabernacles/dwellings.

This passage along with 2 Aqhat V:31-33 (= *CTA* 17.V.31-33), which says the same thing of *Ktr-w-Ḫss*, is further indication that the Keret and Aqhat texts had their origin or context in a region other than Ugarit. These terms (*ahl* and *mšknt*) are used only in Keret and Aqhat and suggest strongly a semi-nomadic environment. In the Baʿal and ʿAnat cycle the gods dwell in the following structures: *bt* (51:V:75 [= *CTA* 4.V.75]), *hkl* (51:V:76 [= *CTA* 4.V.76]), and *ḥẓr* (51:IV:51 [= *CTA* 4.IV.51) but never in *ahl* or *mškn*. There are signs, however, that El dwelt in a tentlike structure at least part of the time. In the Ugaritic texts El's abode is a *qrš*, a term which indicates part of the tabernacle structure in the Old Testament. In Hittite mythology Elkunirša is described on one occasion as living in a "tent" (M. Pope, *EUT*, pp. 66-67). Driver (*CML*, p. 37, n. 13) is correct in referring to II Sam. 7:6 in this connection, although he makes no comment about it. Yahweh tells David that he did not dwell in a *bayit* when he brought the people of Israel up from Egypt, but rather moved about in an *ʾōhel miškān*. The depiction of Yahweh's dwelling in the time of the origins of Israel is not purely a nomadic and non-Canaanite

description but is reflected in Canaanite lore itself. This fact along with the tenacity of Yahwistic tradition may help explain how the Israelite tent or tabernacle, originating in the desert, was able to serve as the covenant sanctuary for so long in Canaan itself before demands arose for a *bayit* or *hêkāl* as Yahweh's "dwelling." Cf. F. M. Cross, *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, pp. 214, 224-228; Samuel Loewenstamm, "Review of W. Beyerlin, *Herkunft und Geschichte der altesten Sinaitraditionen*," *IEJ*, 12 (1962), 163; and W. Schmidt, "מִשְׁפָּךְ Als Ausdruck Jerusalemer Kultsprache," *ZAW*, 75 (1963), 91-92.

61. There are still questions as to the number of texts that belong to the Baʿal epic and the precise order. General agreement exists, however, as to which are the major texts, and there is a basic amount of consensus about the order of the texts. The main question on the order is whether Text 51 (= *CTA* 4) goes before the *ʿnt* (= *CTA* 3) text or vice versa. Ginsberg places Text 51 first because it still mentions Yamm as El's beloved, whereas *ʿnt* mentions Mot in that position. Gordon, Driver, and Pope put the *ʿnt* text first apparently because Baʿal still does not have a place in it. Ginsberg's argument does not appear to be as strong inasmuch as Mot is also present and challenging Baʿal at the end of Text 51. One must agree, with Ginsberg, however, that final judgment is to be reserved.

62. Kapelrud, *Baal*, pp. 101-102; Schmidt, *Konigtum Gottes*, pp. 37-38.

63. Thorkild Jacobsen, "The Battle between Marduk and Tiamat," *JAOS*, 88 (1968), 104-108, has argued cogently for the pri-

ority of the West Semitic Baʿal and Yamm conflict.

64. T. Jacobsen, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," *JNES*, 2 (1943), 159-172; reprinted in T. Jacobsen, *Toward the Image of Tammuz and Other Essays on Mesopotamian History and Culture*, ed. William L. Moran (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), pp. 157-170.

65. Tablet I, ll, 55-56. *ANET*, p. 61.

66. Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951), p. 21, n. 35.

67. A better translation of these two lines would be: "Along with those you yourselves created they are gone to her side./ Here they are massed(?), standing (lit. risen) here at the side of Tiamat."

68. Tablet II, ll, 12-18. *ANET*, p. 63.

69. For the Akkadian text the writer has referred to Rene Labat, *Le poème babylonien de la création* (Paris: Librarie d' Amerique et d'Orient, 1935).

70. Tablet II, ll, 33-37. *ANET*, p. 63.

71. Tablet II, ll, 27-30. *ANET*, p. 63.

72. See Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, p. 38, n. 70, on the question as to whether this term refers to a dragon or not.

73. It is in the light of this depiction of Marduk, as well as other factors, that Jacobsen has argued that the battle between Marduk and Tiamat was probably a motif brought to Babylon from the West, presumably by the Amorites.

74. On the building of temples by victorious gods and kings, see now A. S. Kapelrud, "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and

Kings," *Orientalia*, 32 (1963), 56-62; and F. M. Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," *Biblical Motifs*, ed. A. Altmann (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966).

75. J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V, 45.

76. F. M. Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," pp. 23-24.

77. For a discussion of the problems in the interpretation of *ʿnn* in these lines, see Moshe Held, "Rhetorical Questions in Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew," *Eretz-Israel*, 9 (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1969), 72, n. 15. I would see here a class of deified beings, i.e., "clouds." The phrase *rwḥy ʿnn* appears in the angelology of Qumran (4 Q Ber) and the pseudepigraphical literature. See John Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran - 4 Q *Serek Šîrôt ʿÔlat Haššabbāt*," *Congress Volume, Oxford, 1959* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960), pp. 329, n. 1; 333. The *ʿᵃnānê šᵉmayyāʾ* of the council scene in Dan. 7:13 are to be viewed in this context also.

78. For discussion of the alternatives here, see Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "Fire in the Mythology of Canaan and Israel," *CBQ*. 27 (1965), 257, nn. 7 and 8.

79. *Ibid.*, pp. 256-261.

80. Note that in the LXX of Judg. 3:22 the handle of Ehud's sword is described as "flaming" although nothing of this is said in the Hebrew. One might expect that in other cases the sword may have been a flaming one even though no mention is made of such. The similarity to the Canaanite messenger pair is evident in any case. Cf. the expressions *mlʾky šš* and *ʾly ʾwr* in the

Qumran angelology and the *rwhy* ʾš of Jub. 2:2, all cited by Strugnell, *Congress Volume, Oxford, 1959*, pp. 332-333. Note also the associations of fire with the throne of the Ancient One in the council scene of Dan. 7.

81. Exodus 3:2. *bᵉlabbat-* ʾēš = *bᵉlahabat-* ʾēš. Cf. the versions, commentaries, and lexicons.

82. On the basis of Egyptian evidence, the *śᵉrāpîm* appear to have been *griffins*. R.D. Barnett (*The Nimrud Ivories* [London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1957], pp. 73-74) maintains a Semitic origin for both the word and the creature. The relationship of Ugaritic *bšrp il* (107:16 [= *CTA* 30.16]) to the *śᵉrāpîm* of the Old Testament is impossible to determine at this stage due to the difficulty of interpretation of this controversial but important text.

83. On these names see Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 254.

84. On the kingship of Baʿal, see now Schmidt, *Konigtum Gottes*, pp. 21-52.

85. Schmidt, *Konigtum Gottes*, p. 62, notes the close similarity between the last half of this line and the cry at the enthronement festival of Marduk: *marduk-ma šarru*, "Marduk is king!"

86. The use of the term *tpṭ*, "judge," is significant here in that *tpṭ* is peculiarly Yamm's epithet. Recognition of Baʿal as *tpṭ* and *mlk* is a recognition of his rule over the gods by his defeat of Yamm.

87. The conflict between El and Baʿal is an undercurrent here and at various places where El seems to favor Yamm while doing little to assist Baʿal. Cf. now Ulf Oldenburg, *The Conflict*

between El and Baʿal in Canaanite Religion (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969).

88. On lines 7-8 see the reconstruction of Driver, *CML*, pp. 100-101, which is certainly in part correct.

89. The probability that these lines depict Baʿal marching at the head of an armed procession was pointed out in passing by F. F. Hvidberg, *Weeping and Laughter*, pp. 48, 55.

90. Ginsberg, *ANET*, p. 134, reads in italics: "Baʿal] dwells in his house."

91. The reconstruction is fairly obvious except in the case of the verb in line 31. Driver reads *t/r* = Akk. *tararu*, "to quake, tremble." Another possibility, perhaps even better, is *tbr*, "to break, shatter," which occurs several times in Ugaritic and appears in a similar context in Ps. 29:5, with reference to the voice of Yahweh breaking the cedars.

92. The contexts in which this word is used give the meaning "to wobble, reel," or perhaps "to jump," which relates it to Arabic *naṭṭa*, "to jump," and Hebrew *nûṭ*, "to shake."

93. On *gpt*, see the lengthy note by W. F. Albright, "The North-Canaanite Poems of Al'êyân Baʿal and the 'Gracious Gods,'" *JPOS*, 14 (1934), 134, n. 175.

94. Lines 49-51 in this column may also be Baʿal's announcement of his kingship, but there is difference of opinion as to whether it is Baʿal or Mot who utters these words. It would seem to be Mot who calls out.

95. The translation is that of F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18," *JBL*,

72 (1953), 23.

96. Cf. vs. 41.

97. There is no need in this context to deal with the difficult question of whether the fertility myth involves a yearly cycle, a seven-year cycle, or some other regular period. See the discussion in Pope, *WM*, pp. 262-264. A definite dissent against the interpretation of this myth as having to do with the cycles of fertility has been registered by Umberto Cassuto, "Baal and Mot in the Ugaritic Texts," *Israel Exploration Journal*, 12 (1962), 77-86. This article contains valuable insights into the nature of this myth particularly in his recognition that the questions of kingship and life and death are involved. Denial of fertility motifs, however, is not valid or at least argues from a very narrow definition of fertility. That is definitely a major part of what is involved in the struggle of life and death.

98. The words *rbm* and *dkym* are quite problematical. They may be adverbs, e.g., "greatly" and "crushingly." Pope, however, has questioned quite strongly the existence of adverbial accusatives ending in *-m* in Ugaritic ("Ugaritic Enclitic *-m*," *JCS*, 5 [1951], pp. 123-128). As Ginsberg's translation seems to indicate, it is difficult to separate these two words from *dokyām* and *mayim rabbîm* in Ps. 93:3-4. The context as well as the fact that elsewhere ʿAnat speaks of smitimg *rbm* (*ʿnt*: III:36 [= *CTA* 3.III. 36]) would suggest that these lines refer to some type of monster such as *tnn*, *ltn*, etc. Frank Cross would interpret *dkym* as "Breakers of Sea" (oral communication).

99. In parallelism with *ṣmd* the word *ktp* here seems to re-

fer to some kind of weapon. See *UT*, Glossary, No. 983.

100. This word is uncertain but may be connected with *ṣḫrrt*, which appears to have something to do with burning.

101. These lines can hardly refer to anything other than Baʿal's ascension to his throne.

102. A helpful treatment of the kingship battles of Baʿal is given in Norman Habel, *Yahweh Versus Baal* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1964), Chap. 3.

103. Pope, *WM*, p. 254, appears to interpret the word as an elative. He translates *aliy qrdm* as "Mächtigster der Helden" but does not comment grammatically.

104. H. Birkeland's early interpretation of the epithet as a broken plural noun form is subject to the same objections. Broken plurals are certainly scarce or nonexistent in Ugaritic. Birkeland's view is cited by Kapelrud, *Baal*, pp. 49-50.

105. Albright, *ARI*, p. 195, n. 11.

106. A. Goetze, "Peace on Earth," *BASOR*, 93 (February 1944), 17-20.

107. W. F. Albright, "The 'Natural Force' of Moses in the Light of Ugaritic," *BASOR*, 94 (April 1944), 34, n. 23.

108. The word *qrdm* can hardly be separated from the Akkadian words: *qardu*, *qarrādu*, and *qurādu*, all meaning "hero, warrior."

109. Cf. *ṣpn = ǵr tliyt* in Text 76:III:28-32 (= *CTA* 10.III. 28-32) and 1 Aq 84(?) (= *CTA* 19.I.84[?]).

110. Cf. Sigmund Mowinckel, "Drive and/or Ride in the Old Testament," *VT*, 12 (1962), 278-299.

111. Kapelrud, *Baal*, p. 62.

112. Driver, *CML*, pp. 81, 146. Cf. M. Dahood, "The Root GMR in the Psalms," *Theological Studies*, 14 (1953), 575-577.

113. Cf. Loren R. Fisher, "A New Ritual Calendar from Ugarit," *HTR*, 63 (1970), 488-490.

114. Pope, *WM*, pp. 255-256.

115. The equation Proto-Semitic *ḏmr* = Ugaritic *ḏmr* is quite legitimate as such. Ugaritic, however, has the word *ḏmr* referring to fighters or warriors and uses it fairly frequently always with *ḏ* rather than *d*. One would expect, therefore, that *dmrn*, if it comes from *dmr*, would be written *ḏmrn*. Because the consonant *ḏ* is unstable at Ugarit and in the process of shifting, the words are probably the same. It is difficult to separate them in terms of meaning. On the problems of the spirant *ḏ* in Ugaritic, see most recently Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 249-250. The major difficulty, however, lies in the fact that Philo has *d* instead of *z* as regularly in Phoenician.

116. The many diverse points of view may be seen in the study of the Rephaim texts by Andre Caquot, "Les rephaim ougaritiques," *Syria*, 37 (1960), 75-93.

117. *Ibid.*

118. *Ibid.*, pp. 91-93.

119. Kapelrud, *Baal*, pp. 107-108, takes brief note of the relationship of the *rpum* to Baʿal.

120. Contra John Gray, "The Rephaim," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 81 (1948-49), 127-139, who views the Rephaim as the king and some of his officials.

121. Caquot, *Syria*, 37 (1960), 78.

122. T. H. Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 228, n.b.

123. Cf. Mowinckel, *VT*, 17 (1962), 295. In a similar manner Yahweh and his retinue are pictured in the Old Testament as riding on chariots (e.g., Ps. 68:17; Isa. 66:15; II Kings 2:11-12; 6:17).

124. E.g., Virolleaud, Dussaud, Caquot, Driver, and Gray.

125. E.g., Gordon and Kapelrud.

126. Hardly any two scholars who read *rpu* and *mhr* here as singular agree about the nature and identity of the person so designated. The problem has been complicated by the appearance of *rpu mlk ʿlm* in RS 24.252 but the relation of that text to the *rpum* texts is unclear. I am inclined with others to identify *rpu mlk ʿlm* with El.

127. Even if *rpu* and *mhr* are singular, they might simply be terms referring to the leader or chief of the *rpum*, who are also warriors in chariots. Cf. H. Cazelles, "L'hymne ugaritique à Anat," *Syria*, 33 (1956), 49-57.

128. Cf. the excursus on the goddess ʿAnat in H. L. Ginsberg, "The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat," *BASOR*. 97 (February 1945), 8-10; and A. Kapelrud, *The Violent Goddess: Anat in the Ras Shamra Texts* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1969), pp. 48-63.

129. Ginsberg remarks that "sensuality and fecundity are primary, vigor and martial ardor secondary with Astarte; while the contrary is true in an even higher degree of Anath" (*ibid.*, p. 8).

130. Cf. Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts*, pp. 106-

107.

131. It is possible that the verb here is to be interpreted as referring to past action.

132. See Kapelrud, *The Violent Goddess*, pp. 54-63, for discussion of this passage and the various translations proposed.

133. On *ǵzr* see my "Ugaritic *ǴZR* and Hebrew *ʿZR* II," *Ugarit-Forschungen*, 2 (1970), 159-175.

134. The text is a list of deities to whom sacrifices are apparently offered.

135. *PRU* II, 14.

136. The following pages are drawn from my article "El as Warrior," *HTR*, 60 (1967), 411-431. For a somewhat more extended discussion and documentation the reader is referred to that source.

137. Pope, *EUT*. Otto Eissfeldt, *El im ugaritischen Pantheon* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1951).

138. Pope, *EUT*, pp. 27ff.

139. Cf. Text 129:17-18 (= *CTA* 2.III.17-18) where the same threat is made to *ʿAṯtar*.

140. Cf. T. Jacobsen, *ZA NF*, 17 (1957), 103ff. In these pages Jacobsen shows how in Mesopotamia the *lugal* was first the war leader in both the human and the divine realms.

141. The classic example, of course, is Marduk, who was given kingship of the gods in order to do battle against Tiamat. So also Baʿal is king after his defeat of Yamm (*UT* 68:32).

142. The best illustration of this phenomenon is the deity Dagon, who plays no role in the mythological texts from Ugarit

and yet must be reckoned as one of the principal male deities of that city in the light of his apparently significant place in the cultus of Ugarit evidenced by the temple and stelae dedicated to him as well as his presence in several lists of gods and lists of sacrifices to the gods as well as in the serpent charms published in *Ugaritica* V. That Dagon also was a significant deity in South Canaan is well attested from the Old Testament (I Sam. 5). Cf. M. Dahood, *ASD*, pp. 78-80; Hanna Kassis, "Gath and the Structure of the Philistine Society," *JBL*, 84 (1965), 265f.; and M. C. Astour, "Some New Divine Names from Ugarit," *JAOS*, 86 (1966), p. 279, n. 27. Thus inferences about the role of Dagon based only on the Ugaritic mythological texts would be somewhat misleading.

143. The strong association of Yahweh with El has been ably demonstrated most recently by Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), pp. 225-259.

144. Cf. the excellent summary of Hans G. Guterbock, "Hittite Mythology," *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, ed. S. N. Kramer (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 139-179. He notes the similarity to Sanchuniathon's account. The more extended treatment is his *Kumarbi*, "Istanbuler Schriften," XVI (Zurich-New York: Europaverlag, 1946), esp. pp. 110-115.

145. Pope, *EUT*, pp. 29-32 and 93f.

146. *Ibid.*

147. K. Mras, ed., *Eusebius' Werke*, p. 47, para. 17-19.

148. In his article on El in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament,* ed. by G. J. Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, Frank Cross has noted the warrior character of El/Kronos and commented properly that his battles fit not so much in the context of

cosmogonic myth but in myths of theogony. Cf. in this connection L. R. Fisher, *HTR*, 63 (1970), 489-490, n. 20.

149. Cf. Marie-Therese Barrelet, "Les déesses armées et ailées," *Syria*, 32 (1955), 222-260, and specific reference in *Ugaritica* V, Text 2 (RS 24. 252), p. 551, to ʿAnat's flying.

150. Pope, *EUT*, p. 45, notes that there is at least one instance in the Ugaritic texts where El's nature appears kindred to that of Kronos: "El is not always benevolent: in the lamentably fragmentary and obscure poem BH he contrives the undoing of Baal by a cunning and cruel stratagem, laughing inwardly as he sends out his female agents, BH I 12ff." It is unfortunate that this text (*UT* 75 [= *CTA* 12]) is as obscure and broken as it is. For it might reveal even closer kinship to Philo's Kronos. El appears in it as a belligerent deity perhaps in command of "allies" (gods?) who do battle for him against his protagonist. On the bull imagery which appears here, see below.

151. Pope, *EUT*, pp. 16-19, gives a number of these suggested etymologies and maintains a rather strong skepticism about all of them.

152. Albright, *ARI*, p. 72.

153. *Ibid.*, and Pope, *EUT*, pp. 35-42, who entitles this section of his book: "El as Bull: His Marital Relations." Eissfeldt, *El im ugaritischen Pantheon*, p. 56; Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan*, pp. 158f.; and W. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1961), p. 5, have seen that the term *tr* indicates strength more than procreation. In a more recent article Gray argues for a somewhat stronger character and role

for El than he is sometimes given ("Social Aspects of Canaanite Religion," *Volume du Congres, Geneve, 1965*, Supplements to *VT*, 14 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966], 170-192).

154. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan*, p. 159.

155. On *UT* 52, see Pope, *EUT*, pp. 35-42.

156. For more detailed discussion and examples in all of these areas, see Miller, "El the Warrior," pp. 418-425.

157. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 250-259.

158. Cross's translation. He regards this as "a title of the divine warrior and creator," *ibid.*, p. 256.

159. *Ibid.*

160. Cross describes this as "a phrase from a 'liturgical' sentence name or protocol of a kind," *ibid.*

161. Pope, *EUT*, pp. 22-24; Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan*, p. 160.

162. As an example of the effective investigation of personal names in the study of Near Eastern religions, see Jimmy J. M. Roberts, *The Earliest Semitic Pantheon* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972).

163. Cf. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan*, pp. 160ff.; Eissfeldt, "Malkiel (König ist El) und Malkijah (König ist Jahwe): Gottesglaube und Namengebung in Israel," *Kleine Schriften* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966), III, 384f.

164. The name also appears in Gordon's No. 321:I:9, although he reads it *ilmkr*. In Herdner's *Corpus des Tablettes en Cuneiformes Alphabetiques*, 211 (and fascimile), the name is read *ilmhr*. Cf. Eissfeldt, *El im ugaritischen Pantheon*, p. 46.

165. Gordon, *UT*, Glossary, No. 1545. Eissfeldt, *El im ugaritischen Pantheon,* 46, follows Virolleaud in questioning whether *il* at the end of this name represents the Semitic *il*.

166. T. Vriezen, "The Edomitic Deity Qaus," *OTS*, 14 (1965), 331.

167. A. Murtonen, *A Philological and Literary Treatise on the Old Testament Divine Names* אל , אלוה , אלהים *and* יהוה (Helsinki, 1952), 95-103.

168. On *dmr* as applied to El at Ugarit, see below.

169. Herbert B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 256.

170. The identification of El with *rpu mlk ʿlm* is not absolutely clear. Virolleaud makes this equation, and it is most probable when the text is looked at as a whole. El is one of the two deities most prominent in the text. Immediately after the mention of *rpu mlk ʿlm* at the beginning, the text says that El sits with ʿAṯtart, rules, and judges with Hadd. Further, the title *mlk* is El's title. The term *rpu* is enigmatic here as elsewhere. It may be a sort of honorific, as appears to be the case in regard to Danel who is called *mt rpi*. Cf. *btk rpi ar[ṣ]* (*UT* 128:III:14 [= *CTA* 15.III.14]). It may be possible that we have here "Rapaʾu of the Eternal King," i.e., Rapaʾu of El, and thus one of the warrior Rephaim which appear elsewhere in association with Baʿal and ʿAnat. In an unpublished study of this text presented to the Colloquium for Old Testament Research, August, 1970, however, I have assembled the evidence which suggests rather strongly that the deity involved is El.

171. For a different interpretation of *dmr* in the Ugaritic and Hebrew contexts discussed here, see S. E. Loewenstamm, "The Lord is my strength and my glory," *VT*, 19 (1969), 464-470. On the reading *l[a]ʿnʾk* see now Fisher, *HTR*, 63 (1970), 490, n. 20.

172. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 225-259.

173. Cf. W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*, 4th rev. ed. (Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 38, 42. "It is still unclear to what extent Baal was identified with Yahweh in the period of the Judges, but the frequency of Baal names among the families of both Saul and David (see below) makes it appear likely that syncretism between Yahweh and Baal was already favored in certain circles." And with reference to Gideon: "The fact that his own personal name was formed with 'Baal' while that of his father Joash was formed with 'Yahweh' vividly illustrates the confused religious situation prevailing at that time in north-central Israel."

174. Pope, *EUT*, pp. 44f.

175. *Ibid.*, p. 104.

176. "But the positive identification with El suggests a period for the patriarchal traditions when El was the dominant figure in the Canaanite religious pattern. This would take us back to an earlier stage of Canaanite religion for the background of the patriarchal narratives than that reflected in the Ugaritic poems," David Noel Freedman and Edward F. Campbell, Jr., "The Chronology of Israel and the Ancient Near East," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. Ernest Wright (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), p. 206.

177. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962).

178. Albright, *The Biblical Period*, 13 and especially Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 238.

179. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 258, lists the basic functions and traits of Yahweh in which kinship or comparison with El may be recognized. The one principal trait not listed is the warlike character of Yahweh. In light of this discussion that also may now be added.

Part Two. Cosmic War and Holy War in Israel

1. The various studies of Albright, Cross, and Freedman are basic here. In a Yale University dissertation entitled "Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry" (1966), David Robertson has analyzed the poetry of the Old Testament, coming to cautious conclusions generally confirming those of Albright, Cross, and Freedman, though not in every respect. He would propose a working hypothesis that puts Ex. 15 in the twelfth century, Judg. 5 toward the end of that century, Deut. 32, II Sam. 22 = Ps. 18, Hab. 3, and Job 5 in the eleventh to tenth centuries and Ps. 78 in the late tenth or early ninth. Robertson acknowledges clearly the tenuousness of this reconstruction (see pp. 228-233) but maintains that the one clear conclusion is the early dating of Ex. 15.

2. This method has been put to good use recently by Robert Bach, *Die Aufforderungen zur Flucht und zum Kampf im alttestamentlichen Propheten* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962). He examines a particular form in the oracles against the foreign nations and seeks to show its *Sitz im Leben* in the ancient tradition of holy war.

3. The chapter does not attempt to examine every indication of Yahweh as warrior. That kind of general survey has already been done by H. Fredriksson, *Jahwe als Krieger* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1945).

4. For further discussion of the divine assembly and its role in Israelite thought, see G. Ernest Wright, *The Old Testa-*

ment Against Its Environment (London: SCM Press, 1954), pp. 30-41; G. Widengren, "Early Hebrew Myths and Their Interpretation," *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, ed. S. H. Hooke (Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. 159-164; H. Wheeler Robinson, "The Council of Yahweh," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 45 (1944), 151-157; F. M. Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 12 (1953), 274-277; G. Cooke, "The Sons of (the) God(s)," *ZAW*, 76 (1964), 22-47; H.-W. Jüngling, *Der Tod der Götter* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk), 38-52.

5. This term for members of the divine assembly appears also in the Karatepe Portal Inscription, col. I, line 8. Cf. Roger T. O'Callaghan, "The Great Phoenician Portal Inscription from Karatepe," *Orientalia*, 18 (1949), 173-205; N. H. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job* (Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher Ltd., 1957), pp. 269-270, 472; H. Neil Richardson, "Some Notes on לץ and Its Derivatives," *VT*, 5 (1955), 169; and S. Mowinckel, "Die Vorstellungen des Spätjudentums von heiligen Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet," *ZNW*, 32 (1933), 102, n. 14. The basic meaning of the term is "interpreter, intermediary." *mēliṣ* in reference to the angels also occurs at Qumran in IQH vi:13. Cf. the discussion of Menahem Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961), pp. 83-84, 143, n. 2.

6. Cf. Julian Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Ps. 82," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 14 (1939), 40, esp. n. 25.

7. Mowinckel, *ZNW*, 32 (1933), 103. Cf. Ugar. *tʿdt*.

8. On the reading *dōr* here see F. Neuberg, "An Unrecognized Meaning of Hebrew *Dōr*," *JNES*, 9 (1950), 215-217.

9. On the significant use of many of these terms in IQM see Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 230-232. Their frequency in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is well known. It is paralleled now in the Qumran literature. Cf. IQH.

10. The arguments advanced against inclusion of these beings in the assembly are not convincing. They are primarily arguments from silence and assume more differentiation in the membership of the assembly than the evidence warrants. Furthermore, winged divine beings were exceedingly common in ancient Near Eastern mythology. See Cooke, *ZAW*, 76 (1964), 37-38.

11. Cf. Cross, *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274, n. 1: "The heavenly bodies, given 'personality' in protological fashion, were conceived as part of the worshiping host of beings about the throne of Yahweh."

12. G. Westphal, "צבא השמים," *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, II, ed. C. Bezold (Giesen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1906) 719-728.

13. *Ibid.*; cf. T. Jacobsen, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," *JNES*, 2 (1943), 166, n. 44 = *Toward the Image of Tammuz*, p. 163; and W. Muss-Arnolt, *A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language* (Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1905), pp. 796-797 where the use of *puḫru* in both senses is illustrated by examples from *Enūma eliš* in the preceding chapter.

14. See esp. Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment*, pp. 30-41; H.-W. Jüngling, *Der Tod der Götter*, and J. S.

Ackerman, "An Exegetical Study of Psalm 82," Th.D. dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, 1966. The divine council background of the "lawsuit" oracle has been greatly illuminated by G. Ernest Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), pp. 26-67. Cf. Herbert Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit of the Prophets," *JBL*, 78 (1959), 285-295.

15. Cross, *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274-277.

16. Cf. J. F. Ross, "The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 98-107; and John S. Holladay, Jr., "Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophets of Israel," *HTR*, 63 (1970), 29-52. Cf. Cooke, *ZAW*, 76 (1964), 37-42.

17. For illustrations of such lexical specialization see Zellig Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1939), pp. 85-86. The lexical selection may have been more complex, terms from a judicial (*ʿdt*, *mwʿd*), military (*ṣbʾ*, *alpm//rbtm*), and familial background having replaced *pḫr/qhl*. The shift could indeed have been that complex, but the question still remains as to why *puḫru/pḫr*, a word which itself has judicial and military connotations and which existed alongside most of these other terms in Ugaritic, should suddenly disappear altogether. Aside from this particular phenomenon the terminology is much the same in Ugarit and Israel. It may be legitimate, however, to say that the specifically military terminology, *ṣbʾ*, *alpm//rbtm*, rises to the fore in Hebrew to a degree not previously manifest.

18. Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment*, p. 39.

19. I find it difficult to separate sharply, as does H.-W. Jüngling, *Der Tod der Götter*, two traditions -- the divine assembly and the heavenly host -- which are then joined together. That Assyrian influences were felt and affected Yahwistic conceptions of Yahweh's host does not alter the fact that, as at Ugarit, from an early time Israel regarded the heavenly beings as part of the court/coterie of Yahweh.

20. Cf. Cross, *JNES*, 12 (1953), 275, n. 8.

21. Cf. T. H. Gaster, *Thespis* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 157-158.

22. Aubrey R. Johnson, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*, 2nd ed. (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961), pp. 28ff. Some valuable comments about the relationship and the problem of the one and many in Israelite thought are marred by an injudicious tendency to explain the Israelite understanding of the divine assembly, the *malʾak yhwh*, and even the prophet as messenger of the council almost entirely in terms of "an active 'Extension' of Yahweh's Personality" (p. 33). Extra-biblical evidence is used but not carefully, and often more important evidence is ignored. For example, the discussion of the use of the first person plural pronoun passages such as Gen. 3:22; 11: 5ff.; and Isa. 6:8 (pp. 27-28)could have profited more by an examination of the use of the same grammatical form in Ugaritic texts dealing with the assembly of the gods, e.g., Text 49:I:20, 26 (= *CTA* 6.I.48, 54); 51:IV:43-46 (= *CTA* 4.IV.43-46); 68:29-30

(= *CTA* 2.IV.29-30); *ʿnt*: V:40-42 (= *CTA* 3.V.40-42). Cf. Cross, *JNES*, 12 (1953), 275, n. 4.

23. Cf. the general comment of Cross, *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274, n. 1: "While some of the imagery and poetic language featuring biblical allusions to the council of Yahweh find their ultimate origin in the assembly of the gods common to the mythological *Weltbild* of Mesopotamia and Canaan, the conception of the heavenly assembly was radically transformed on being incorporated into the faith of Israel. Even in the early literature Yahweh's council consisted of colorless, secondary supernatural creatures who served him."

24. The term was coined and elaborated by Jacobsen, *JNES*, 2 (1943), 159-172. It is not entirely applicable to the assembly of the gods at Ugarit, but the Canaanite conception in this respect is closer to the Sumero-Akkadian assembly of the gods than to the Israelite. Cf. Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 191, for a suggestive comparison of the assemblies of Canaanite and Mesopotamian mythology along these lines.

25. Jacobsen, *JNES*, 2 (1943).

26. Note also the "upper" and "lower" gods of Hittite mythology discussed by A. Goetze, *Kleinasien*, 2nd rev. ed. (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1957), pp. 144-145.

27. It is not necessary to argue the separation of this hymnic framework from the blessings contained within. Form-critically the separation is clear and universally accepted. See, for example, the treatment of the theophany in these verses by Jörg Jeremias, *Theophanie* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), 62-

64, 127-128, 140 and *passim*. The work of Cross and Freedman ("The Blessing of Moses," *JBL*, 67 [1948], 191-210) is fundamental to the following interpretation. A very helpful later study is that of J. Milik, "Deux documents inédits du Désert de Juda," *Biblica*, 38 (1957), 245-268, esp. pp. 252-254. Cf. I. L. Seeligmann, "A Psalm from Pre-Regal Times (Dt. 33, 2-5, 26-29)," *VT*, 14 (1964), 75-92. The eleventh to tenth century date proposed by Cross and Freedman is most likely.

28. The reconstruction of these verses is largely dependent upon that of Cross and Freedman, *JBL*, 67 (1948), 193-196, and my "Two Critical Notes on Psalm 68 and Deuteronomy 33," *HTR*, 57 (1964), 241-243, which is summarized in brief in the following pages. There is no attempt here to reconstruct in terms of tenth or pre-tenth century orthography. *Waws* and *matres lectiones* are kept in place. Only the consonantal text is transliterated.

29. The *lāmo* of the Masoretic text is difficult as Cross and Freedman, as well as most commentators, have noted. The usual alternatives are *lānu*, "to/for us" (with the versions) or *l^{e}ʿammô*, "to/for his people." The arguments for reading "to/for his people" are given by Seeligmann, *VT*, 14 (1964), 76. Whether one reads *lāmô*, *lānû*, *l^{e}ʿammô*, the meaning is clear.

M. Dahood, *Psalms I* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966), p. 173, has pointed out several cases where *lāmô* appears and the versions read "to/for us," but his assumption that *lāmô* can therefore mean "to/for us" is questionable. Dahood is too reticent to assume textual error. Paleographic confusion between *mem* and *nun* or between *m* and *nw* is not unusual, as has

been pointed out in response to Dahood by E. Lipinski, "Le Dieu Lim," *La Civilisation de Mari: XV^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Liege: Universite de Liege, 1967), p. 156, n. 1. The suggestion of the latter, however, that one should see the god Lim in this word, though ingenious and well argued (e.g., the chiastic parallelism of the first two cola), does not seem likely.

30. See the preceding note.

31. The more traditional term "theophany" is used throughout, although a case can be made for the term "epiphany" as a more nearly accurate designation of what is described in these passages. See the discussion in Claus Westermann, *The Praise of God in the Psalms* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965), pp. 93-101, esp. p. 99 and F. Schnutenhaus, "Das Kommen und Erscheinen Gottes im Alten Testament," *ZAW*, 76 (1964), 1-22.

32. One should take note of the fact that the earliest known occurrences of the name "Yahweh" are as a toponym in two Egyptian inscriptions from the fourteenth century associated with Seir in Edom. See R. Giveon, "Toponymes oeust-asiatique à Soleb," *VT*, 14 (1964), 239-255.

33. Cf. Schnutenhaus, *ZAW*, 76 (1964), 1-22, and Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 62ff.

34. H. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts*, pp. 212-213, and F. Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), pp. 144-145.

35. Cf. Ps. 50:2 and 94:1 where the shining forth (*hôpîʿa*) of Yahweh is for battle and judgment.

36. See Cross and Freedman, *JBL*, 67 (1948), 198, nn. 7-9, for details. Cross would now read *qdš* as it stands as a collective following the lead of H. S. Nyberg, "Deuteronomium 33:203," *ZDMG*, 92 (1938), 335-336. So also Milik, *Biblica*, 38 (1957), 253, n. 2. See F. M. Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," p. 26, n. 49. The same form appears in Ex. 15:11 as indicated by the parallelism and the LXX. Cf. the preceding chapter, n. 23, and the reference there to the presence of this form in the Arslan Tash inscription.

37. "With him myriads" is reflected in LXX and "holy ones" in the Targum Onkelos.

38. Milik, *Biblica*, 38 (1957), 253. Milik's reading, however, does not give a basis for the corruption as do Cross and Freedman. He must assume a misreading of or damage to the *reš* and the omission of the *aleph*.

39. For a more detailed presentation see my article, *HTR*, 57 (1964), 241-243. Beeston's article is "Angels in Deuteronomy 33:2," *JTS* (1951), 30-31.

40. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names*, p. 169. (I failed to note the Amorite cognate in my original discussion. The article in the preceding note should be corrected to that extent.)

41. Cf. the similar idiom in the Qumran literature: *gbwry ʾlm*, "mighty ones of the gods" (1QM XV:14).

42. Miller, *HTR*, 57 (1964), 243, and Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," p. 26, n. 50.

43. S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, *ICC* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902), p. 410.

44. See n. 36.

45. Johannes C. de Moor has recently contested this meaning for Ugaritic *hm*. See "Ugaritic hm-Never 'Behold'," *Ugarit-Forschungen*, 1 (1969), 201-202.

46. Milik, *Biblica*, 38 (1957), 252. His translation of the last colon is also worthy of note: "ils se mettent en marche derrière toi." He interprets *yiśśāʾ* as an ellipsis meaning "to lift up the feet and take off," citing Gen. 29:1 and *Krt* A: 98f. and 186f. (= *CTA* 14.98f. and 186f.). The form *dbrt* is understood as a preposition "behind" reflecting the primitive meaning of *dbr*, "to be last, behind," (p. 252, nn. 3-4). The parallelism which this translation produces is quite satisfactory. The imagery again would be that of the army of Yahweh marching behind him.

47. As background for the second colon note the idiomatic series of verbs *hbr*, *qll*, *šṯḥwy*, and *kbd* (e.g., Text 49:I:9-10 [= *CTA* 6.I.37-38]), which are used in the Ugaritic texts to describe the attitude of any other divine being approaching El, the head of the pantheon, enthroned on his mountain.

48. Shemaryahu Talmon, "דת a Biblical Noun," *VT*, 3 (1953), 135.

49. Wright, The Book of Deuteronomy: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, II (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953), 529.

50. Gaster,("An Ancient Eulogy on Israel: Deuteronomy 33:3-5, 26-29," *JBL*, 66 [1947], 53-62), would see in verse 27 a reference to Yahweh's humbling the ancient gods. Seeligmann has fol-

lowed Gaster here arguing quite plausibly that such a motif may well have "played a part in epic poems glorifying the Conquest." I have reservations about Gaster and Seeligmann's reconstruction but admit there are strong arguments in its favor (e.g., the resolution of some syntactical problems). We would not agree with the judgment of Cross and Freedman, *JBL*, 67 (1948), 209, n. 84, that Gaster's reconstruction "diverges too far from Israelite religious concepts to permit ready acceptance.

51. Seeligmann, *VT*, 14 (1964), 76-78 and 85-86. See his discussion for indication of the valid parallels. The only way in which he has altered the text in any substantial way is in his reconstruction of the initial verb. That verb has been lost in the transmission (although Seeligmann sees it in *wyt*ʾ). There is no orthographic problem in reading *ṣidqôt* for *ṣidqat* for this ancient poem.

52. The following paragraphs do not present any new reconstruction of the text. For translation and details see Cross and Freedman, *JBL*, 67 (1948), 196, 209-210. It is possible to see in the *ʿezrekā* of vv. 26 and 29 a nominal form meaning "your strength" from *ʿzr II*. See Gaster, *JBL*, 66 (1947), and P. D. Miller, Jr., "Ugaritic ǴZR and Hebrew ʿZR II," *Ugarit-Forschungen*, II (1970), 159-175.

53. Cf. Wright, *The Interpreter's Bible* II, 533-534.

54. Cf. Ps. 95:3; 96:4; 77:14 where I would tentatively translate the first colon: "Thy dominion, O God, is among the holy ones," etc. Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms II* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1968), pp. 224, 230.

55. F. Stummer, *Sumerisch-Akkadische Parallelen zum Aufbau alttestamentlicher Psalmen* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1922) p. 57, cites Sumerian Akkadian instances of the cliché: "Who is like you. . .?" An extended study of these formulas in their Near Eastern setting has recently been made by C. J. Labuschagne, *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966).

56. Ugar. *rkb ʿrpt;* Akk. *rākib narkabati.* Cf. below the discussion of Ps. 68:5.

57. Cross and Freedman, *JBL*, 16 (1948), 210, n. 86. The alternate translation is that of Meek quoted by Cross and Freedman.

58. The common Deuteronomic term is *yāraš̌*.

59. T. H. Gaster, *JBL*, 66 (1947), 62.

60. Wright, *The Interpreter's Bible*, II, 332-333, 528.

61. Cross and Freedman, *JBL*, 67 (1948), 201-202, n. 19, cite one lengthy parallel. Others even more similar in language are given by Stummer, *Sumerisch-Akkadische Parallelen*, 38ff. Cf. Westermann, *The Praise of God in the Psalms*, pp. 93-96, who briefly notes the distinction elaborated here in more detail, and Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah: A Discussion," *Biblica*, 42 (1961), 65ff.

62. See the most recent discussion of the date and historical context of Judges 5 by W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*, 4th rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963), pp. 39-40 and 102, nn. 82, 83. The presence of Dan by the sea as well as the linguistic and poetic elements of

the poem confirm this date.

63. It is not possible or necessary to go into all the treatments of this poem. Among the important studies in recent times are the form-critical and traditions history studies of Artur Weiser ("Das Deboralied. Eine gattungs-und traditionsgeschichtliche Studie," *ZAW*, 71 [1959], 67-97) and Wolfgang Richter (*Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch* [Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1963], pp. 65-112) and the partial linguistic study of Frank M. Cross (*Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* [Baltimore, 1950], pp. 27-42). For treatments of the poem as a type of victory song, see *inter alia* C. Westermann, *The Praise of God in the Psalms*, trans. K. Crim (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965), pp. 90-93; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 142ff.; and P. C. Craigie, "The Song of Deborah and the Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta," *JBL*, 88 (1969), 253-265.

64. I am heavily indebted to the reconstructions of W. F. Albright, "The Earliest Forms of Hebrew Verse," *JPOS*, 2 (1922), 69-86, and F. M. Cross, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (and oral communication).

65. Cf. Egyptian *pr*^{c}, "energetic, valorous, prowess," which may, however, be unrelated to the Semitic word. Ugaritic evidences the root *pr*^{c}, but the contexts in which it appears are too broken or obscure to translate it with any certainty.

66. Valuable linguistic notes following the line of translation and interpretation given here are to be found in C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges* (London: Rivingtons, 1918), pp. 105-109. He even sees the connection with consecration for war. Cf.

Albright, *JPOS*, 2 (1922), p. 81.

67. Similar conclusions have been reached by Max Weber, *Ancient Judaism*, trans. H. H. Gerth and Don Martindale (Glencoe, Ill,: The Free Press, 1952), pp. 94-95, and to a lesser degree Johannes Pedersen, *Israel III-IV* (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), pp. 36-37, 264ff. More recently and in briefer scope may be cited R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, trans. John McHugh (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961), p. 467, and J. Blenkinsopp, "Structure and Style in Judges 13--16," *JBL*, 82 (1963), 63-66. The comments of the latter are worth noting in this context: "That the vow, i.e., Nazirite, moreover, was primitively connected with the holy war of the amphictyony is also inherently probable, and would be confirmed by the application of *nazir* to the warlike Joseph tribe in the two ancient tribal poems in Gen. 49:26 and Deut. 33:16, and by the fact that making the vow is considered as essentially the act of a young man or warrior. This is precisely the case with Samson. (Note: In Judg. 14:10 he is *baḥûr*. It might be worthwhile reopening the debate on the semantic interpretation of *pr*ʿ as 'lock of hair' in the title to the tribal poem of Deborah [Judg. 5:2] in the light of the *nazir* vow.)" Matthew Black has noticed a connection between the Nazirite vow and the warriors of holy war in a discussion of the Hasidim and Qumran in *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), p. 16. Cf. J. Gray, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1967), p. 276.

68. Cf. Hermann Gunkel, "Samson," *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913), pp. 38-64.

69. See the judgment of George F. Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges, ICC* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908), p. 314: "Whether from J or not, the chapters undoubtedly belong to the oldest stratum of the book."

70. Cf. Jacob M. Myers, "The Book of Judges: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, II (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953), 776: "While it cannot be doubted that some legendary accretions have attached themselves to the tales there can be little hesitancy in regarding Samson as a historical personality."

71. F. M. Cross, "A New Qumran Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR*, 132 (December 1953), 15-26. Cf. W. F. Albright, *Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1961), pp. 12-13.

72. Cross, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, p. 27.

73. Verse 3 continues the declaration of praise already indicated in verse 1 and leads into the theophany of verses 4-5. On these verses and their relation to Ps. 68:8-11, see W. Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*; Lipinski, "Juges 5, 4-5 et Psaume 68, 8-11," *Biblica*, 48 (1967), 184-206; and J. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 7-11 and 142-150. On pp. 142-144 Jeremias has effectively answered the arguments of Richter and Blenkinsopp that verses 4-5 do not belong originally in the poem and has pointed to the thematic character of their content throughout the poem.

74. On the basis of some Greek manuscripts and the Hexaplar

where *etarachthē* appears Albright, *JPOS*, 2 (1922), 75, n. 1 read *namoṭṭû* for *naṭ^{e}pû*. He maintained that "drip" was an anticlimax and the following phrase was added to explain the "absurd" preceding one. Cf. Moore, *Judges*, p. 141, and Burney, *The Book of Judges*, p. 112, who proposes *namôgû*. The reading certainly improves the metrical quality of the line producing a 2:2 line of 5 + 6 syllables. Since that time, however, Albright has changed his mind. Recognizing that *nāṭ^{e}pû* appears also in the parallel passage in Ps. 68:8-9, he has given up any attempt to emend the text but still prefers to see the word as meaning "quake, shake," or the like. He, therefore, derives the word from a stem *ṭpp*, meaning something like "toss," on the basis of Arabic and Aramaic cognates. See W. F. Albright, "A Catalogue of Early Lyric Poems (Psalm LXVIII)," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 231 (1950-51), 20. Albright's feeling for the proper word is not to be ignored, but the derivation is definitely forced.

75. Along similar lines as in the preceding note, Albright, *JPOS*, 2 (1922), 75, n. 2, has also suggested on the basis of LXX *esaleuthēsan* and the vocalization *hārîm nāzōllû* in Isa. 62:19; 64:2 that *nzlw* here should be vocalized the same way indicating a verb *zll* belonging with Arab. *zlzl*, "quake, of earth," and *zll*, "drip." His reading, which is in agreement with Burney, is much more plausible here, and the imagery is more appropriate. Cf. the reference of Myers, "The Book of Judges, p. 720 to Akkadian *ittarraru šadu*.

76. The appellation *zeh sînay*, once considered a late gloss, is now recognized as an ancient epithet, originally **zū-Sīnai*,

and similar to the Northwest Semitic formation of divine epithets in the second millennium. Cf. Albright, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology," *BASOR*, 62 (April 1936), 30; and F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Theological Review*, 55 (1962), *passim*. Judges 5:5 still has metrical problems unsolved. Albright, *BASOR*, 62 (April 1936), 30, proposes a reconstruction but one that is not entirely satisfactory. Perhaps the first *yhwh* is to be deleted or else *ʾelōhê* is to be read *ʾēl*. This would produce some order. But problems remain. Cf. the reconstruction of the parallel verse in Ps. 68 in Albright, *HUCA*, 23 (1950-51), 13. Another possible reconstruction of the middle cola suggested by Frank Cross is as follows:

ʾrṣ rʿšh hrym nzlw

ancient variants (*gm šmym nṭpw*
(*ʿbym nṭpw mym*

77. Cf. the summary statement of Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 142-144. "Zunächst fällt am Deboralied auf, dass die Theophanieschilderung V. 4f. zwar eine Einheit für sich bildet. . ., dass aber andererseits die Theophanieschilderung fest im Kontext des Liedes verankert ist, ohne sich aus ihm lösen zulassen. Denn der Tenor des ganzen Liedes weist ja darauf hin, dass es die Meinung des oder der Sänger dieses Liedes ist, dass Jahwe focht und die Schlacht entschied. Von Jahwes Heilstaten handelt das Lied (V. 11); die in die Schlacht ziehenden Israeliten waren nur seine Hilfstruppen (v. 23, 13 txt. em.). Jahwe selbst schlug die Schlacht durch die vom Himmel her kämpfenden Sterne (V. 20), und durch ihn riss der Bach Kison die Feinde ins Verderben (V. 21)."

78. Verses 6-7 and 9-11 tell of the interruption of the caravan trade (see Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, pp. 43-44) and describe the plight in Israel at the time. They are less germane to the song of battle except for *llb* where the singer(s) speak(s) of the recitation of the "triumphs of Yahweh" = "triumphs of his warriors (*prznw*) in Israel," one example of which is this song. On *pirzōnô* as "warriors" see Albright, *ibid.*, p. 43, n. 101.

79. On the military significance of *ʾelep* see G. Mendenhall, "The Census Lists of Numbers 1 and 26," *JBL*, 77 (1958), 52-66.

80. See Burney, *The Book of Judges*, p. 120 for textual analysis of the LXX here.

81. Cf. von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, p. 9.

82. Albright, *JPOS*, 2 (1922), 76.

83. Von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg*, p. 7. In addition to the bibliographical reference noted by him in n. 3 on that page, one might add C. Umhau Wolf, "Terminology of Israel Tribal Organizations," *JBL*, 65 (1946), 45, who notes that Akk. *ummānu* also means both "people" and "troops." The most recent discussion of the term *ʿam* is that of Ephraim Speiser, "'People' and 'Nation' of Israel," *JBL*, 79 (1960), 157-163. Cf. J. Wharton, "People of God," *IDB*, III, 727, who sees the probable origin of the phrase in the institution of holy war.

84. Cf. Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, p. 44.

85. Burney, *The Book of Judges*, pp. 120-122.

86. Oral communication.

87. The reconstruction is on the basis of a tenth-century orthography.

88. The structure of the second half of this verse is paralleled almost identically by 1QM xii:9:

qwmh gbwr Arise, O mighty one

šbh šbykh Take thy captives captive,

ʾyš kbwd Men of glory.

As Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, p. 317) has noted, the parallel of *šybkh* with *šllk* (1.10) is strong argument against reading *šbyk* "thy captors" in Judg. 5:12 as do some versions (i.e., Syriac, Arabic) and a number of commentators.

89. Cf. Burney, *The Book of Judges*, pp. 134-136, 142, 306-307; John Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 143.

90. Albright, *JPOS*, 2 (1922), 78.

91. The suggestion was made by Frank Cross. The elaboration given here has been worked out by myself.

92. The word *mišpatayim* occurs only in these two places. There is no certain meaning. The versions were nonplussed. Scholars vary between "sheepfolds" and "ashheaps." See the detailed discussion in Burney, *The Book of Judges*, p. 141. Note also the similar phrase in Ps. 68:14 where Albright plausibly equates the word with Ugar. *mṯpdm* meaning "hearth" (*HUCA*, 23.1 [1950-51], 22).

93. Verse 19 poses no problems. It begins the account of the actual battle and gives the location.

94. For discussion of the Akkadian cognates, see Burney,

The Book of Judges, p. 146. To these should now be added the Ugaritic forms *mzl* and *ymzl* in Krt A: 99, 188 (= *CTA* 14.99 and 188).

95. R. Smend comments: "The intervention of celestial powers is directly decisive for the war of Yahweh in Judges 5: 20." (He compares also as ancient evidence Josh. 10:12-13, on which see *infra*.). See R. Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*, trans. M. G. Rogers (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), p. 82.

96. On the textual reconstruction of v. 21 see Cross, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, pp. 34-35. For similar ideas in Egyptian and Akkadian, see Myers, "The Book of Judges," p. 726.

97. This reading has been proposed by Cross, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, p. 36, who argues that the *ʾrwr* has been dropped out by haplography. The reading is definitely an improvement in terms of meter and parallelism.

98. The reading *mēroz* is quite problematical. No such place is known. Probably Marom or Meron is to be read. Cf. for discussion Albright, *JPOS*, 2 (1922), 79, n. 5; and "Some Additional Notes on the Song of Deborah," *JPOS*, 2 (1922), 284-285; A. Alt, "Meros," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953), 274-277.

99. On the characteristics of this genre see especially Cross, *JNES*, 12 (1953), 274-277; also James F. Ross, "The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. B. W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), pp. 99-107.

100. Cross, *JNES*, 12 (1953), 275, n. 4.

101. Wright, *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 41-49.

102. Cross, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, pp. 30 and 37, reads *bgbrm* = *begibbōrêmô* "with their warriors" on the basis of the manner in which the text would be represented in early orthography. Cf. Albright, *JPOS*, 2 (1922), 79.

103. Including possibly the puzzling verse 13 of Judges 5, although it is too obscure to tell.

104. J. Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran-4Q *Serek Šîrôt ʿÔlat Haššabbāt*," *Congress Volume, Oxford, 1959* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), pp. 218-345, esp. 322 (4QSl 391 i:21) and 333. Strugnell also cites the use of *gbwrym* for divine beings in Enoch and Talmudic literature.

105. Verses 24-30 give the poetic account of Jael's killing of Sisera and may be omitted from the present discussion.

106. The arrangement of cola in this awkward verse is that of Albright, *JPOS*, 2 (1922), 83.

107. Reading with the Syriac and Vulgate. MT has *ʾhbyw*.

108. William L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *CBQ*, 25 (1963), 77-87.

109. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-85. "Certainly the conclusion has an archaic ring, and the reference to the Israelites as Yahweh's 'friends' becomes perfectly intelligible in the light of our remarks on the covenant background of the term love. The Israelites are those bound to Yahweh in covenant, and therefore naturally opposed to his enemies; the war and victory described in the Song are those of the people of God. It is probable therefore

that the term love goes back to a very early period in the Israelite covenant tradition."

110. W. F. Albright refers to a monograph published in 1851, in which Edward Reuss brought together exegeses of the psalm from over 400 commentaries. The studies and views put forward in the hundred or so years since then would make such a monograph a multi-volume work. See W. F. Albright, *HUCA*, 23, 1 (1950-51), 7.

111. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-39. For a more recent defense of his position, see *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, pp. 23-24.

112. Sigmund Mowinckel, *Der achtundsechzigste Psalm* (Oslo: I Kommisjon Jacob Dybwad, 1953), pp. 1-78.

113. *Ibid.*, pp. 672-673.

114. See, e.g., the commentaries of Artur Weiser, *The Psalms*, trans. H. Hartwell, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 277-290; Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalmen* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960), I, 464-477.

115. A purely form-critical analysis of the psalm, though distinguishing the various elements, does not go very far in solving its many problems. There are several types brought together here as in Judg. 5. For their elaboration, see Kraus. *Psalmen*, I, 468-469. If any single form lies behind this compilation, it is probably a type of victory hymn. Its place in Israel's cult is another matter although the overall form may point the way. Psalm 68 in its primitive form may have had its situation in life in a celebration of "ritual Conquest" such as Cross

posits in "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," *Biblical Motifs*, pp. 11-30.

116. The reference to Jerusalem in v. 30 is surely a later addition. The whole verse is meaningless, as Albright shows. Some corruption has obviously taken place. As it now stands, there is no certain reference to the Jerusalem temple anywhere in the psalm (except v. 30), although vv. 25, 30, 33, and 18 (which contains no reference to the sanctuary even in its present state) were probably early so understood. Albright reaches a similar but more tentative conclusion in another context. In "The Psalm of Habakkuk," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1957), p. 8, n. 28 he says that v. 30 "may not, however, have been included in the first Israelite form of the psalm." Albright seems to have changed his mind in his later study connecting the reference to Jerusalem with David's conquest of the city.

In their various studies of the early poetry Cross and Freedman have shown that in these contexts the various references to "shine," "sanctuary," "temple," not only do not have to apply to the Jerusalem temple but are properly understood as not having reference to the temple. They refer originally to the desert sanctuary, Yahweh's heavenly abode, or the amphictyonic tent shrine in Canaan. See Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," *JNES*, 14 (1955), 240; 248, n. 42; 249, n. 59; and "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18," *JBL*, 72 (1953), 23, n. 11.

117. That the part of the Song of the Ark referring to the

return is not used here may be by deliberate intention in the composition of the psalm, i.e., the psalm begins with God's going out to battle, not his return.

118. The second colon of v. 3 belongs intimately to the theophany imagery as comparison with Micah 1:4 reveals.

119. The problem, which Kraus, *Psalmen*, p. 475, raises, of how both the Ark and Sinai could be considered the seat or abode of Yahweh was probably less of a concern to the Israelite than it is to the scholar today and is in part resolved by the recognition of the war context of Yahweh's presence with the Ark. This is not to deny that the idea of Yahweh's abode on Sinai and his throne on the Ark did not originate in different contexts. One cannot say. But the evidence of these early poems is that Yahweh's coming from Sinai was represented probably at a very early time by the procession of the Ark. Cf. H. Eberhard von Waldow, "Theophanie," *Verkündigung und Forschung*, 14 (1969), 69-76, who argues for the original separation of Sinai and Ark. A fuller discussion of the whole question of the divine presence is given in R. E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965).

120. Arvid Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1952), p. 61.

121. Kurt Galling, "Der Ehrenname Elisas und die Entrückung Elias," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 53 (1956), 129-148.

122. In a communication to George M. A. Hanfmann, Albrecht Goetze remarks with regard to the phrase "rider of the clouds" that the clouds may be viewed as a chariot: "This is much more

likely because of the expression which finds its analogue in Akkadian." See G. M. A. Hanfmann, "A Near Eastern Horseman," *Syria*, 38 (1961), 252, n. 7.

123. Drawing upon Weiser's important work on chariotry in the Near East and Europe as well as his own study of Old Testament materials, Mowinckel has convincingly shown in some detail that *rkb* refers to "driving (a chariot)" rather than "riding (a horse)." "Drive and/or Ride in the Old Testament," *VT*, 12 (1962), 278-299.

124. The arrangement of cola here is that of Albright, *HUCA*, 23.1 (1950-51), 12-13.

125. *yšymwn* without the article is regularly a designation for the wilderness wandering of Israel either in the Exodus or the New Exodus (e.g., Deut. 32:10; Ps. 78:40; 106:14; Isa. 43:19, 20). For other notes on the details of the passage see the discussion of Judg. 5:4-5 above and Albright, *HUCA*, 23.1 (1950-51), 20.

126. Although it is impossible to be certain, comparison with the theophany forms of Deut. 33:2-3, Judg. 5:4-5, and Hab. 3:3 suggests that the preposition *b* in *byšymwn* should be translated "from" as is often the case in Ugaritic and Hebrew.

127. The translation, especially of v. 10, is rather uncertain. See E. Vogt, "'Regen in Fülle' (Psalm 68, 10-11)," *Biblica*, 46 (1965), 359-361 for a discussion of the textual and structural problems.

128. Another possible rendering is that of Albright in *HUCA*, 23.1 (1950-51), 37:

"Let * Y H W H give an oracle

Rejoicing a mighty host.

The verse would thus refer clearly to the holy war oracle prior to battle.

129. The precise translation of the second colon of v. 13 is difficult. It is certain that it has something to do with the division of booty.

130. Why *hamm^{e}baśś^{e}rôt* should be regarded as referring to "maidens" (so Weiser and others) is difficult to perceive. The ending can be regarded as a collective in *-ôt*, as perhaps may be true of a *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt*. See E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. A. E. Cowley, 26th ed. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898), para. 122s.

131. Note the use of the archaic epithet *šadday* for Yahweh. Its use in this context may indicate that at this time its primitive association with "mountain" was still known. If so, the verse provides valuable evidence for Cross's interpretation of El Šadday as "El, the Mountain One," especially in light of the fact that free use of the ancient names for Yahweh is not a characteristic of Ps. 68, this being the only one. See Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 244-250.

132. Albright, *HUCA*, 23.1, 25 and "Notes on Psalms 68 and 134," *Interpretationes ad Vetus Testamentum Pertinentes Sigmundo Mowinckel* (Oslo: Land og Kirke, 1955), pp. 2-4. For *tnn(m)* in the Ugaritic texts see Text 80:II:11 (= *CTA* 85.IV.1); 113:70 (= *CTA* 71.70); 303:1 (= *CTA* 116.1); Krt 91 (= *CTA* 14.91) and PRU II 26:4; 28:1; 30:1; 31:1. For *šanannu* in the Alalakh texts see D. H.

Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (London: The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953), nos. 145:43; 183:2; 226:6,11; 341: 1,9; 350:9; 352:6; 439:6,7, etc. and esp. p. 11, n. 4. Albright points out that the mistake in spelling could easily have arisen by dittography due to the series of letters *šn'n'*. Note also the Syriac *ḥyl'*, "troops," although this may be a guess. It at least recognizes what the word should mean. Mowinckel's unwillingness to accept this explanation of the word is rather puzzling. His own explanation is much more forced and difficult.

133. Cf. Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," p. 26, and J. T. Milik, *Biblica*, 38 (1957), 253, n. 2, who reads "He comes from Sinai among the holy ones" (apparently *b' msyny bqdš*). The translation of Cross and the writer is preferable to that of Milik stylistically and by reason of comparison with the theophanies of Judg. 5:4 and Ps. 68:8 where *b* + infinitive to express a temporal clause is also used.

134. Albright, *Interpretationes . . .*, p. 5.

135. Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," p. 25.

136. For the various possibilities see Albright, *HUCA*, 23.1 (1950-51), pp. 26-27. *rš'* seems the most likely option (cf. Hab. 3:13).

137. In his more recent work, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, p. 24, Albright accepts the translation of the two cola of v. 23 proposed by myself and by Dahood (see following notes).

138. M. Dahood, "*Mišmar* 'Muzzle' in Job 7:12," *JBL*, 80 (1961), 270-271.

139. See Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "Two Critical Notes on Psalm 68 and Deuteronomy 33," *HTR*, 57 (1964), 240.

140. Albright, *HUCA*, 23.1 (1950-51), 28-29; A. Haldar, *The Notion of the Desert in Sumero-Accadian and West-Semitic Religions* (Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistaka Bokhandeln, 1950), p. 49.

141. Albright, *HUCA*, 23.1 (1950-51), 28.

142. So also Weiser, *The Psalms*, p. 289.

143. Cross and Freedman, *JNES*, 14 (1955), 237-240.

144. "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult", and "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *God and Christ: Existence and Providence, Journal for Theology and the Church,* 5 (1968), 1-25. Cf. Norman Habel, *Yahweh Versus Baal*, pp. 58-62, and the bibliography cited in the second Cross article above, pp. 9-10, n. 27. Add to that the recent study of George Coats, "The Song of the Sea," *CBQ*, 31 (1969), 1-17.

145. See Cross and Freedman, *JNES*, 14 (1955), 243-244 and Cross, "The Song of the Sea. . .," p. 13 for details of text and translation. They advocate a transposition of *w^{e}ʾanwehû* and *wa-ʾ^{a}rom^{e}menhû* for metrical reasons. I am not as certain as Cross and Freedman that v. 2 is a secondary interpolation. The argument is based on metrical considerations, which cannot be ignored, particularly in this poem. In terms of meaning or sense the verse fits where it is. Furthermore, it contains archaic terminology and formulae, as Cross and Freedman have pointed out. Most recently there has come to light the parallel Ugaritic expression, *ʿzk. dmrk.* (*Ugaritica* V, Text 2 [RS 24.252], Verso, l.9), "your strength and your defense," further testifying to the antiquity

of the language and clichés of the verse. On this line one should note the discussion of S. E. Loewenstamm, "'The Lord Is My Strength and My Glory,'" *VT*, 19 (1969), 464-470.

146. Cross and Freedman may be correct in regarding *gibbôr* as a preferable reading to *ʾîš milḥamāh*. The meaning is the same in any event.

147. See Albrecht Alt, "Der Gott der Väter," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I, 1-78; F. M. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 225-259.

148. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 228.

149. "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *passim*.

150. *Ibid*.

151. Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," pp. 26f.

152. So Cross,"The Song of the Sea . . .," p. 23.

153. Cf. von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, pp. 10-11.

154. Cf. Cross and Freedman, *JNES*, 14 (1955), 240, 249-250, and Cross, "The Song of the Sea . . .," p. 24.

155. *tliyt* is clearly from the root *lʾy*, "to prevail" and related to Baʿal's epithet Aliyan. The absence of a pronominal suffix in clear parallelism to a word which contains one is not uncommon in either Ugaritic or Hebrew. The word is to be read as if it were *tliyty*, "my victory."

156. Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult."

157. Cross, "The Song of the Sea . . .," p. 24.

158. Cross, "The Divine Warrior . . .," pp. 19ff., and Part

One above, pp. 28-29. Cross regards Ps. 24:6-10 as a "tenth century B.C. liturgical piece," although dating of this piece is a little more precarious than in some other instances.

159. Cross, "The Song of the Sea . . .," pp. 8-9.

160. W. F. Albright, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, pp. 1-18. Albright says that vv. 3-7 were "probably taken with little alteration from a very early Israelite poem on the theophany of Yahweh as exhibited in the south-east storm, the *zauba^{c}ah* of the Arabs" (p. 8). Verses 8-15 he regards as adapted from an early poem or poems of Canaanite origin celebrating the triumph of Prince Ba^{c}al over his enemies. Reference to "the anointed" requires a time after David for vv. 8-15 (pp. 8-9). In addition to Albright, David A. Robertson, "Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry," has shown that Habakkuk 3 has characteristic forms of early poetry along with those of later standard Hebrew.

161. For a more recent textual and philological study of the poem -- albeit one that does not represent major improvements over that of Albright -- see J. H. Eaton, "The Origin and Meaning of Habakkuk 3," *ZAW*, 76 (1964), 144-171.

162. Albright, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 9, comments with regard to vv. 3-7: "The historico-geographical background reflects the period following the wilderness wanderings."

163. Johannes Hehn, *Hymnen und Gebete an Marduk* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinriche'sche Buchhandlung, 1905), p. 314, ll. 4-5.

164. See R. Stadelmann, *Syrisch-palastinensische Gottheiten*

in Ägypten (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), pp. 47-49.

165. Cf. the destroying angel who sends pestilence over the land in II Sam. 24.

166. Kušan probably represents a part of southern Transjordan south from the Arnon into Midian. W. F. Albright, "The Land of Damascus between 1850 and 1750 B.C.," *BASOR*, 83 (October 1941), 34. n. 8.

167. G. von Rad, "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," *JSS*, 4 (1959), 97-108.

168. The plural form "chariots" (*mark^{e}bōteykā*) may refer to the chariots of Yahweh and his divine army. Cf. Ps. 68:18 and the pertinent discussion on that verse in the preceding pages.

169. On this word see Eaton, *ZAW*, 76 (1964), 155, and Albright's note on *p^{e}rāzôn* in Judg. 5:7 (*Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, p. 43, n. 101).

170. Cross and Freedman, *JBL*, 72 (1953), 15-34.

171. *Ibid.*

172. The casting of arrows of lightning is a common element in the iconography of the storm god in the ancient Near East. See e.g., *ANEP*, p. 168, no. 490; p. 179, nos. 531-532.

173. On this latter motif see Cross and Freedman, *JBL*, 72 (1953), 31, n. 80.

174. LXX reads "until *God* took vengeance on *their* enemies."

175. Jan Dus, "Gibeon -- Eine Kultstätte des Šmš und die Stadt des benjaminitischen Schicksals," *VT*, 10 (1960), 353-374. Among older studies see M. J. Gruenthaner, "Two Sun Miracles of the Old Testament," *CBQ*, 10 (1948), 271-290; Robert Eisler,

"Joshua and the Sun," *AJSL*, 42 (1926), 73-85.

176. John S. Holladay, Jr., "The Day(s) the Moon Stood Still," *JBL*, 87 (1968), 166-178.

177. *Ibid.*, p. 176.

178. Martin Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), p. 65.

179. Cf. Rudolf Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*, trans. M. G. Rogers (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), p. 82, n. 30.

180. On the sun and moon in Mesopotamian mythology, see Edzard, "Mesopotamien. Die Mythologie der Sumerer und Akkadian," *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart: Ernest Klett Verlag, 1961-), Vol. I, pt. 1, pp. 101-103 and 126-127; Jean Bottero, "Les divinités sémitiques anciennes en Mésopotamie," *Le antiche divinità semitiche*, ed. Sabatino Moscati (Rome: Universita di Roma, Centro di Studi Semitici, 1958), pp. 44-48. On the sun and moon in Canaanite mythology, see Martin Pope and Wolfgang Röllig, "Syrien. Die Mythologie der Ugariter und Phönizier," *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, Vol. I, pt. 1, pp. 302-393, 308-309; M. J. Dahood, "Ancient Semitic Deities of Syria and Palestine," *Le antiche divinità semitiche*, pp. 90-91.

181. The parallelism with *ʿāmad* indicates *yiddōm* is to be read as "stand still" rather than "be silent."

182. This translation is that of Albright, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 12.

183. One of the weaknesses in Holladay's approach -- as is true of other treatments -- is that it does not take into account

this important parallel.

184. Gruenthaner, *CBQ*, 10 (1948), 279.

185. Holladay, p. 169, n. 15, cites the three examples in the Joshua *prose* traditions.

186. Cf. the lexicons and Speiser, *JBL*, 79 (1960), 156-163.

187. With one or two possible exceptions, this characteristic appears to be true of the noun also when used in the sense of "vengeance against."

188. A similar translation and interpretation is given by Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, p. 65, who notes that as far back as 1920 Delitzsch recognized a *mem* was missing.

189. So also basically Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, p. 23, who refers to "dieser alten Überlieferung."

190. Cf. F. M. Abel, "L'apparition du chef de l'armée de Yahveh á Josué (Jos V, 13-15)," *Miscellanea Biblica et Orientalia R. P. Athanasio Miller Oblata, Studia Anselmina*, 27-28 (1951), 109-113.

191. Note also the messengers of Yamm discussed in the preceding chapter and the cherubim and flaming sword in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3).

192. Abel, *Miscellanea Biblica et Orientalis*, pp. 109-110, who notes that this translation is both grammatically and textually correct.

193. Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, p. 23.

194. *Ibid.*, pp. 23, 39-40.

195. Elsewhere Noth describes Josh. 1--12 as "ätiologischen Einzelüberlieferungen im Verein mit einigen wenigen Heldenerzah-

lungen." M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 2nd. ed. (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957), p. 41

196. The question of whether Joshua originally figured in this episode is not relevant.

197. Noth's *Sammler*, which he dates c. 900 B.C. Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, p. 13.

198. G. von Rad, *Genesis*, trans. J. Marks (London: SCM Press, 1961), pp. 308-309; Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902), pp. 313-314.

199. LXX in v. 2 adds: "and looking up, he saw an army of God encamped (or arrayed for battle)."

200. I Chronicles 12:23 should be cited in this connection: "For from day to day men kept coming to David to help him until there was a great army like an army of God" (*maḥ^{a}nēh ^{e}lōhim*). Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbucher* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955), p. 106, regards this as merely the expression of a superlative. In light of the prior use of *gādôl*, the sentences make better sense when it is seen as a comparison between the greatness or size of David's army and the greatness or size of God's army, especially as the phrase *maḥ^{a}nēh* is already known as a designation for the heavenly army.

201. Cf. John S. Holladay, Jr., "Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophets of Israel," *HTR*, 63 (1970), 33, n. 21.

202. The material that follows in this section is taken from my article, "The Divine Council and the Prophetic Call to War," *VT*, 18 (1968), 100-107.

203. R. Bach, *Die Aufforderungen zur Flucht und zum Kampf*

im alttestamentlichen Prophetenspruch (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), pp. 102ff.

204. Cf. John Bright's description of Elijah in his *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 227, 229-231.

205. G. von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, p. 10.

206. G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy* (London: SCM Press, 1953), p. 48.

207. Holladay, "Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophets of Israel," p. 33, n. 21.

208. I. Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Könige* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1899), p. 131; Kurt Galling, "Der Ehrenname Elisas und die Entrückung Elias," *ZTK*, 53 (1956), 129-148; G. Westphal, *Orientalische Studien Theodor Noldeke*, p. 724. Rudolf Kittel (*Die Bücher der Könige* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1900], pp. 188-189), who correctly sees the heavenly army as the basis for the chariots and horses of fire here and in chap. 6, does not put the warrior title of the prophet in that context, although he does admit there may be some relationship.

209. G. von Rad, "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," *JSS*, 4 (1959), 97-108.

210. F. M. Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult." Note his statement: "The ideology of holy war makes possible the transition from the cultus of the league to the cultus of the kingdom, and ultimately to the ideology of apocalyptic" (p. 27).

211. On this passage see now the monograph of Seth Erlands-

son, *The Burden of Babylon: A Study of Isaiah 13:2--14:23* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1970).

212. Erlandsson, *ibid.*, in his extended study of the passage has challenged the general consensus at this point, arguing that Assyria was the enemy involved.

213. LXX apparently reads *pitḥû* "draw (a sword)," or the like for *pitḥê* in v. 2b, a reading that is probably to be followed. See Bach, *Die Aufforderungen zur Flucht*, p. 58.

214. *gam qārāʾtî* at the beginning of 3b is possibly to be read: "loudly I have called." Cf. Mitchell Dahood, "Ugaritic Studies and the Bible," *Gregorianum*, 43 (1962), 70.

215. G. von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, p. 7. Cf. von Rad, *JSS*, 4 (1959), 99.

216. The verb *pāqad* is used regularly for mustering the heavenly army in 1QM 12:4, 7. Cf. the discussion below of Isa. 40:26.

217. Erlandsson, *The Burden of Babylon*, p. 19, says: The expression מקצה השמים instead of the more usual מקצה הארץ seems due to ארץ being already used in the parallelism." He also cites the LXX use of *themeliou tou ouranou* where *themeliou* "was probably added to avoid giving the impression that the army came from heaven itself." But this is to miss the whole point that Yahweh's destroying armies did come from heaven as well as earth, as numerous examples in the preceding pages have indicated.

218. Cf. D. W. Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, *KAT* (Göttingen: 1897), p. 110; Arvid Kapelrud, *Joel Studies* (Uppsala, 1948),

pp. 162-163. I would agree with the latter's textual discussion insofar as he prefers to read with MT rather than the versions. In his recent excellent commentary on Joel, Hans Walter Wolff emends the text on v. 11b but acknowledges that the conception of the heavenly armies is present in MT. He compares Isa. 13:3b; Zech. 14:5b; II Chron. 20:22; Enoch 56:5ff.; and 1QM 1:10f. *Dodekapropheton: Joel* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1963), p. 88.

219. Ps. 103:20; possibly Judg. 5:23. The word frequently appears as a designation of the angels in the Qumran literature. In 1QM xv:14 the *gbwry ʾlym* are described girding themselves for battle. Col. xii:7 also appears to contain a reference to the angels as *gbwry*! 1QH contains frequent reference to the divine world: *gbwry šmym* (iii:35-36), *gbwry plʾ* (v. 21), *gbwry kwḥ* (viii:11-12). So also the Angelic Liturgy and 4 Q Ber. See J. Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran, 4 Q *Serek Šîrôt ʿÔlat Haššabbāt*, *Congress Volume, Oxford, 1959* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), pp. 318-345, esp. 322 and 333. Strugnell also cites the use of *gibbôrîm* for divine beings in Enoch and Talmudic literature.

220. Wolff, *Joel*, pp. 47-50. The similarities to Isa. 13 are pointed out by Wolff as well as by E. Kutsch, "Heuschreckenplage und Tag Jahwes in Joel 1 und 2," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 18 (1962), 81-94.

221. One should compare in this connection Ezek. 30:9 where Yahweh's messengers go forth to terrify Cush "on the day of Egypt."

222. F. M. Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES*, 12 (1953), 277, n. 21.

223. James Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40--66, Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. V (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), 442.

224. Christopher R. North, *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 88. Cf. George A. F. Knight, *Deutero-Isaiah* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 41-42.

225. For a helpful analysis of the way in which older materials and themes are incorporated and interwoven and the cosmic and historical combined, see Benedikt Otzen, *Studien über Deuterosacharja* (Copenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1964), pp. 199-212. Cf. Sigmund Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien, 2*, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: P. Schippers, 1961), pp. 231-234. More recently Walter Harrelson, "The Celebration of the Feast of Booths According to Zech. xiv, 16-21," *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968), pp. 88-96.

226. In a lengthy study of Zech. 14:1-5, H.-M. Lutz has investigated the history of tradition of this passage and demonstrated that its fundamental motifs or themes grow out of the ancient holy wars or Yahweh wars (as Lutz prefers). His study does not focus on the larger structure or context of the passage.(*Jahwe, Jerusalem und die Völker* [Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968], chap. 4). Most recently this chapter has been the subject of *Formanalyse* by Magne Saebø who overemphasizes, however, the lack of unity in the chapter and fails to take fully into account the interrelationship of Yahweh's war, theophany, Day of Yahweh, Yah-

weh's kingship, etc. *Sacharja 9--14* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), pp. 282-309.

227. I follow most critics in reading with LXX and the Syriac "with him" rather than "with you" in v. 5.

228. "The motif chaos-cosmos is clear throughout the chapter; the Lord is transforming the present world order by means of a convulsion of that order and the establishment of cosmos through and beyond the chaos" (Harrelson, *Religions in Antiquity*, pp. 90-91). Cf. Otzen, *Studien über Deuterosacharja*.

229. This passage is thus to be combined with those from II Isaiah which Cross has analyzed as combining notions of cosmic warfare with the theme of the Second Conquest or Exodus, and with the motif of the processional to Zion. See "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," pp. 28-30. He comments (on p. 30): "In these and other passages it is necessary to recognize the wedding of two themes: one derived from the ritual Conquest, one from the procession of the Ark to Zion and the manifestation of Yahweh's kingship."

230. The translation is from R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1912), pp. 7-8.

231. The following translations are those of Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*, trans. B. and C. Rabin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

232. Cf. Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," p. 30.

233. For examples of various approaches to the problem of

the Ark one may refer to W. Arnold, *Ephod and Ark* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917); Martin Dibelius, *Die Lade Jahves* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1906); Julian Morgenstern, *The Ark, the Ephod, and the "Tent of Meeting"* (Cincinnati: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1945); Johannes Maier, *Das altisraelitische Ladeheiligtum* (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1965). For further bibliography on the Ark see Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966), pp. 125-128; F. Langlamet, *Gilgal et les recits de la traversée du Jourdain (Jos., III-IV)* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Éditeurs, 1969), pp. 13-20; and G. Henton Davies, "Ark of the Covenant," *IDB*, I, 226.

234. Least of all is this true of J. Maier's study of the Ark where literary critical analysis is carried to extremes and produces very questionable results. Although my differences with Maier and objections to his approach may rest in part on prior assumptions or presuppositions, the problems of his work are more far-reaching than that. It has to be admitted that the problems with which Maier is dealing are among some of the most perplexing and disputed ones in Old Testament study. A detailed critique of his whole work is outside the scope of this section, but see below for some criticisms at a particular and important point. would agree with the judgments of Herbert Huffmon in his review of Maier's book in *Interpretation*, 20 (1966), 106-107. Although questioning some widely held assumptions about the Ark (including some held by myself), R. Smend is far more judicious and cautious in his chapter on this subject in *Yahweh War and Tribal Confeder-*

ation, pp. 76-97.

235. Maier, *Das altisraelitische Ladeheiligtum*, pp. 5-12 concludes that the "Ladesprüche" are two separate, independent liturgical phrases in no way "uralte." They did not originally belong to the Ark and are probably post-Exilic. Such judgments run so counter to prevailing opinions worked out just as carefully by other scholars that it would seem unnecessary to respond. But because Maier's is the latest major work on the Ark and he has gone into such detail it is appropriate to voice some criticisms of his analysis of Num. 10:33ff.:

(a) Verse 34 may well be an interpolation belonging elsewhere (i.e., after v. 36) as LXX indicates. But if LXX indicates a disturbance here, it does not do so in the rest of the passage.

(b) Maier does not make a convincing case on v. 33b. To begin with, it is not self-evident that vv. 35f. depend upon v. 33b. One would assume *a priori* reference to the Ark, but that does not make it necessary. Maier has shown *possible* signs of lateness in 33b, but all of them are questionable. Further, 33b may have originally said: "the Ark of Yahweh went before them" with the rest of the verse later interpolation. The argument that *nsʿ* is the verb for J and E in referring to the cloud and the angel is no argument. It is used all through the strata and is obviously the verb for journeying and for Yahweh's going before whether cloud, angel, or Ark.

(c) Maier's assumption that *ʾᵃrôn bᵉrît yhwh* is Deuteronomistic and therefore late cannot be demonstrated as clearly

as he assumes. His dating of all the Ark designations (pp. 82-85) is more precise than the evidence allows. Note the judgment of G. Ernest Wright in the light of the covenantal studies of the last two decades that "a more reasonable case can be made for the assumption that the title [i.e., "Ark of the Covenant"] is original and that the object was indeed the chest which held the holy 'Words'" ("The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. by B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson [New York: Harper and Brothers, 1902], p. 50, n. 54). At least one cannot automatically say it is late.

(d) Psalm 68 is not late and post-Exilic as Maier assumes, but rather part of the corpus of early Hebrew poetry and therefore an independent confirmation of the antiquity of Num. 10:35.

(e) Psalm 132 is ruled out too easily as depending on the Temple situation and a special *Tendenz*. The fact is that language clearly associated with the Ark in Ps. 132:8 is similar to the imperative of Num. 10:35.

(f) Maier maintains that *ʾalpê yiśrāʾēl* is only in P and literature dependent on that and is therefore late. This ignores the very careful and convincing study of George Mendenhall on the census lists of Numbers 1 and 26 with particular emphasis on the use of *ʾelep* in the P material which demonstrates the antiquity of the lists and the designation ("The Census Lists of Numbers 1 and 26," *JBL* [1958], 52-66). There is, therefore, nothing requiring that this be judged late terminology. (Cf. next paragraph.)

(g) Furthermore, Maier argues that *rib^{e}bôt* is to be deleted or changed to *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt*. Much more likely is that a word has dropped between *rib^{e}bôt* and *'alpê*. These two words are a common word pair in Hebrew and Ugaritic. (See n. 237.) The change to *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* is not necessary and violates the *lectior difficilior* rule in text criticism.

(h) With T. P. Sevensma, "Num. 10:35 and 36," *ZAW*, 29 (1909), 253-258 Maier regards the use of Piel participle of *śānā'* as late ("Alt ist die Verwendung des part. Pi'el von *śn'* aber nicht."). Sevensma, on whom Maier relies more than once,, is, however, a weak reed. He dates all the examples around the Maccabean period, a position that no longer merits serious debate. In actual fact the Piel participle of *śānā'* in this kind of context is *characteristic of poetry that is generally regarded as quite early*, e.g., in addition to Ps. 68:2; Deut. 32:41; 33:11; II Sam. 22:41//Ps. 18:41; and Ps. 89:24.

236. Among those more recent scholars who regard these verses as archaic and to be associated with the early wars of Yahweh, one may cite De Vaux, Cross, Smend, Eissfeldt, Beyerlin, Bentzen, Lipinski, von Rad, Weiser, Ringgren, etc. In a recent Kiel dissertation, W. Seeber comes to similar conclusions ("Der Weg der Tradition von der Lade Jahwes im Alten Testament" [cf. *TLZ*, 83 (1958), 722-723]). William McKane gives a helpful discussion of the early history of the Ark and its association with Num. 10:35-36 and with the holy wars in his article "The Earlier History of the Ark," *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society*, 21 (1965-66), 68-76.

237. The reconstruction and translation are those of Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," pp. 24-25, although the suggested reconstruction of the final line was independently proposed by myself several years ago also on the basis of Deut. 33:2-3 and Ps. 68:18. The parallelism (or combination) of *ʾalāpîm* and *rᵉbābôt* is largely a characteristic of the Ugaritic texts (e.g., *UT* 51:I:27-29 [= *CTA* 4.I.27-29] and numerous other passages) and early Hebrew poetry (e.g., Gen. 24:60; Deut. 32:30; 33:17; Ps. 68:18; I Sam. 18:7 = 21:12 = 29:5). The reversal of the two words in parallelism so that *rᵉbābôt* is the A element and *ʾalāpîm* is the B element is not unusual (e.g., Deut. 33:17 and Ps. 68:18). Metrically the line is improved by such a reading.

238. Cf. G. Henton Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," *Promise and Fulfillment,* ed. F. F. Bruce (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963), p. 60, who suggests that the commands of *qûmāh yhwh* and *šûbāh yhwh* elsewhere in the Psalms may refer to the Ark.

239. Cf. the designation "Yahweh's battles" for Israel's wars (I Sam. 18:17; 25:28).

240. This is the point of view of Hugo Gressmann, *Mose und seine Zeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913), p. 353.

241. Not only the passage as a whole, but the specific reference to "Ark of the Covenant of Yahweh" in v. 44b has been questioned (e.g., Maier, *Das altisraelitische Ladeheiligtum*, p. 4). De Vaux, however, sees no reason to deny the antiquity of Num. 14:44.

242. See, for example, the lengthy analysis of C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges* (London: Rivingtons, 1918), pp. 442-458.

243. Von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg . . .*, pp. 6-8. Cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Jonathan's Sacrilege, I Sm. 14, 1-46: A Study in Literary History," *CBQ*, 26 (1964), 432.

244. So also R. Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*, p. 78, n. 8.

245. W. McKane, "The Earlier History of the Ark," pp. 70-71, has given cogent arguments against the view that the entry of the Ark here is a last resort, indicating that it was not normal practice then for the Ark to accompany the warriors: "Even if this were conceded, it would be proper to ask whether then this had been customary at an earlier period and had been discontinued except as an extraordinary measure. This would be an intelligible development and the question which has to be asked is whether this is more credible than the proposition that I Sam. 4: lf. is to be regarded as an absolute innovation. My own view is that the reference in the book should be allowed more weight than the silence in the period of the Judges which may be accidental rather than significant. Hence von Rad's conclusion that the Ark was not carried into war in the period of the Judges does not seem to me to be soundly based."

246. The peculiar episode in I Sam. 5 concerning the Ark in the temple of Dagon in Ashdod has attracted little attention. I hope to treat this passage in a separate study, but a few comments are in order here. The story as it now stands is tied etiologically to a custom of stepping over the threshold. But mythological elements certainly lie hidden here though quite confused and now obscured. The basic element is the battle of the gods --

in this case Yahweh and Dagon. The initial fall of Dagon may be understood in one of three ways: (a) an act of worship; (b) an act of fear similar to that of the gods of the assembly in Text 137 (= *CTA* 2.I); (c) a fall in battle. Cf., e.g., the battles of Baʿal and Yamm, Baʿal and Mot. The cutting off of Dagon's hands and head is strikingly similar to ʿAnat's behavior in the gory massacre recounted in *ʿnt*:II (= *CTA* 3.II) where ʿAnat ties the head and hands of her victims to her back and waist.

Even here, however, where reflections of the cosmic battle of the gods may be evident, the context is a definitely historical one symbolizing and resulting in the destruction of the Philistines. Yahweh's enemy is not a primordial monster, but the national god of Israel's enemy -- a type of situation not very frequent in the Old Testament. Cf. now the study of M. Delcor, "Jahweh et Dagon," *VT*, 14 (1964), 136-154.

247. But cf. Moore, *Judges*, p. 111, who, although preferring the LXX reading, says: "Historically we could hardly object that the presence of the Ark at Kirjath-Jearim would decide against this text, because our author may not have known of its detention at Kirjath-Jearim."

248. On this passage see Blenkinsopp, *CBQ*, 26 (1964), 423-449. Although he sees the incident clearly as a holy war, he does not refer to the question of the Ark.

249. Cf. Cyrus H. Gordon, "David the Dancer," *Yehezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume*, ed. M. Haran (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1960), pp. 48-49.

250. See Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult."

251. On this passage see the brief but excellent treatment by R. Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*, pp. 83-84. On p. 83, n. 37 he notes the possibility of reading *ʾărôn* for *ʿārê*.

252. G. Henton Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," suggests other places in the Psalms where references to the Ark may be hidden. Some of his examples are quite convincing.

253. See the treatment of Cross, "The Divine Warrior . . .," pp. 19ff.

254. *Ibid.* Cf. the criticisms of Cross's interpretation of Ps. 132:8 by Delbert Hillers, "Ritual Procession of the Ark and Ps. 132," *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 48-55.

255. For example, Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, pp. 20ff.; von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg . . .*, p. 28, n. 45.

256. Cross, "The Divine Warrior . . .," pp. 26-27.

257. Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, p. 41.

258. Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, p. 164, has recognized the possible holy war basis for the activity around the Ark in these chapters. The significance of the Ark here could be understood in three different ways according to Kraus: (1) the leading presence of Yahweh, which is connected with the Ark (Num. 10:35f.); (2) the significance of the shrine in the cultic events of the "holy war" (Num. 10:35f. also); (3) the character of the Ark as a procession shrine. In actuality, however, these three functions are intimately related in the early history of the Ark. Cf. on the Ark in these chapters the detailed analysis of F. Langlamet, *Gilgal*, pp. 104-123; 139-144.

259. Von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg . . .*, pp. 9, 28, n. 45.

260. Cf. Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*, chap. 4.

261. B. N. Wambacq, *L'épithète divine Jahvé ṣ^ebā'ôt* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1947).

262. For example, W. F. Albright, "Review of *L'épithète divine Jahvé ṣ^ebā'ôt: Étude philologique, historique, et exégétique*," *JBL*, 67 (1948), 377-381; von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 18; Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 55; Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*, p. 81. Wambacq, *Jahvé ṣ^ebā'ôt*, and V. Maag, "Jahwäs Heerscharen," *Schweizerische Theologische Umschau*, 20.3/4 (1950), 32, disagree.

263. Otto Eissfeldt, "Jahwe Zebaoth," *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia*, 2.2 (1950), 128-150. *Kleine Schriften*, III (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966), 103-123.

264. The word *'^elōhîm* has also been interpreted as an abstract noun, "deity, divinity," or the like, analogous to *ḥayyîm*, *n^e'ûrîm*, etc. Although this interpretation of *ṣ^ebā'ôt* is not the most likely, B. W. Anderson's criticism that "it advocates an abstraction of thought which is not characteristic of the Hebrew mind" is not valid ("Hosts, Hosts of Heaven," *IDB*, II, 656).

265. For further criticisms of Eissfeldt's linguistic interpretation see the works referred to in Smend, *Yahweh War*, p. 83, n. 33. A new interpretation has been given by Matitiahu Tsevat ("Studies in the Book of Samuel, IV, Yahweh Seba'ot," *HUCA* 36 [1965], pp. 49-58), who regards the phrase as either noun plus

apposition or a nominal sentence, i.e., "Yahweh (the) armies" or "Yahweh (is) Armies." This is an interesting interpretation but does not seem a preferable solution. A nominal sentence name is quite legitimate but not if the divine element is itself a verbal form. Tsevat wishes to keep separate the question of the meaning of the name Yahweh and that of Yahweh *ṣ*^{e}*bā*$^{\flat}$*ôt*, but we do not believe that is the proper approach. The principal parallels Tsevat cites (II Kings 13:14 and Num. 10:36) are subject to quite different and more plausible interpretations as I have sought to show. Finally, the question of the identification of the "armies" still remains and is a part of the total issue. Here it would seem Tsevat has ignored the religio-historical perspective presented in these pages, i.e., the involvement of the divine armies in the wars of Yahweh. The same subject has been treated by J. P. Ross, "Jahweh *ṣ*^{e}*bā*$^{\flat}$*ôt* in Samuel and Psalms," *VT*, 17 (1967), 76-92, but his approach has too many problems and does not lay out any fruitful directions to follow.

266. Albright, *JBL*, 67 (1948), 377-381. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 250ff., has now marshalled a considerable amount of further evidence and examples.

267. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 250ff.

268. *Ibid.*, p. 253, n. 123.

269. *Ibid.*, p. 255.

270. *Ibid.*, pp. 255ff.

271. *Ibid.*; Albright, *JBL*, 67 (1948), 377-381.

272. David Noel Freedman, "The Name of the God of Moses, *JBL*, 79 (1960), 155ff., believes that prior to *ṣ*^{e}*bā*$^{\flat}$*ôt* the object

was probably *qin'ā* (Ex. 34:14) and/or *yir'ā* (Gen. 22:14).

273. See Westphal, *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke*, on lexical analysis.

274. In late literature it can be "toil, work" or "temple service."

275. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 256. Others have offered the same interpretation but on the basis of Old Testament materials alone while Cross has drawn in comparative materials from Canaanite mythology, which buttress this view considerably. Cf. the first chapter of this work.

276. *Ibid.*

277. The absence of the phrase in these books is not too unusual, as Albright and Eichrodt have recognized. The early sources are relatively fragmentary for one thing. It is also possible that the term could have been deleted for various reasons (so Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, I, 194).

278. Cf. Albright, *JBL*, 67 (1948), 381, who says that one is safe in supposing that "the expression was originally at home in very ancient litanies from which it was taken as a most suitable formula with which to designate the holiest cult object of Israel, placed at the head of every army going forth to battle enemies of Yahweh on behalf of His people."

279. *Ibid.*, p. 378. There is, of course, considerable disagreement with Albright's conclusion.

280. See on this subject the detailed study of C. H. W. Brekelmans, *De Herem in het Oude Testament* (Nijmegen: Centrale Drukkerij, 1959).

281. So also Brekelmans.

282. The P writer even speaks of the Red Sea events in the language of holy war (Ex. 14).

283. Judges 5, of course, deals with a later battle with the same imagery

284. Cf. the remarks concerning Judges 5 and Psalm 68 by J. Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah: A Discussion," *Biblica*, 42 (1961), 65: "It is, in fact, the theophany which gives the specific religious note to the Song and unifies it on the theological level. We should notice here a profound cleavage, often overlooked or played down between the warlike procession of the 'Gewittergott' of antiquity and the Coming of YHWH from Sinai; the enemies of the former are the mythological monsters of the primitive ocean, those of the latter are players on the stage of real history. Here and in Psalm 68 the theophany is a triumphant procession to a real destination marked by triumphs which history records."

285. See esp. Ps. 68:8-9. Even Judg. 5:4-5 belongs to this context.

286. For a good summary of this new attention to the reliability of the P writer especially in Numbers, see F. M. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, ed. G. Ernest Wright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 209-212. Numerous studies have appeared since Cross's work pointing to the antiquity of elements in the P tradition, e.g., Mendenhall, *JBL*, 77 (1958), on the census lists of Numbers 1 and 26. In the most recent issue of *JAOS*

at the time of writing appear back-to-back articles by Moshe Weinfeld ("The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East") and Jacob Milgrom ("The Shared Custody of the Tabernacle and a Hittite Analogy"), both arguing for the antiquity of material in this tradition (*JAOS*, 90 [April-June 1970]).

287. See esp. Ex. 15; Josh. 2--5; Pss. 24,29 and 68; Deut. 33.

288. Cross, *HTR*, 55 (1962), 259.

289. *Ibid.*

290. Cf. Ps. 82 for an involvement of the cosmic hosts on a life-or-death basis in the affairs of history and human activity. In this context it is a concern for social justice that is at issue.

291. Cf. Cross and Freedman, *JNES*, 14 (1955), 239, where they point out that in Ex. 15 Yahweh uses the sea as a "passive" tool for fighting historical enemies -- Pharaoh and his army. He does not battle the sea as some "opposing divinity of darkness" (p. 239). In Ps. 68 and Hab. 3 the heavy overtones of the mythological battle of Yahweh and the cosmic chaos are still understood as a battle for deliverance of the people.

1. Gerhard von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," *The Problem of the Hexateuch*, trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966), pp. 1-78.

2. For example, Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Exodus, Sinai, and the Credo," *CBQ*, 27 (1965), 101-113.

3. Artur Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development* (New York: Association Press, 1961), pp. 83-90.

4 Georg Fohrer, "Tradition und Interpretation im Alten Testament," *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Theologie und Geschichte (1949-66)* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1969), p. 69.

5. Leonhard Rost, "Das kleine geschichtliche Credo," *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum Alten Testament* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1965), pp. 11-25.

6. C. H. Brekelmans, "Het 'historische Credo' van Israël," *Tijdschrift voor Theologie*, 3 (1963), 1-11.

7. Th. C. Vriezen, "The Credo in the Old Testament," *Studies on the Psalms: Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenschap in Suid-Afrika* (Potchefstroom: Pro Rege-Pers Beperk, 1963), pp. 1-11.

8. Brevard S. Childs, "Deuteronomic Formulae of the Exodus Traditions," *Hebräische Wortforschung*, *SVT*, 16 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 30-39.

9. J. Philip Hyatt, "Were There an Ancient Historical Credo in Israel and an Independent Sinai Tradition?" *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament*, ed. Harry F. Frank and William L. Reed (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), pp. 152-170.

10. Calum Carmichael, "A New View of the Origin of the Deuteronomic Credo," *VT*, 19 (1969), 273-289.

11. Wolfgang Richter, "Beobachtungen zur theologischen Systembildung in der alttestamentlichen Literatur anhand des'kleinen geschichtlichen Credo,'" *Wahrheit und Verkündigung*, ed. L. Scheffczyk (München: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1967), pp. 175-212.

12. That is, the primal, unified, probably poetic account of Israel's early history, which lay behind the formulations by the Yahwist and Elohist.

13. More likely, with Cross, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," p. 23, it is the battle encampment of Shittim.

14. Cross, *ibid.*, p. 13, n. 42, is inclined to regard this verse as a secondary interpolation on metrical grounds. While acknowledging the metrical problems, I am less inclined to omit it from discussion of the hymn. The combination *ʿōz* and *zimrāh* is now familiar not only from later Israelite psalms but also much earlier in the Ugaritic texts. The phrase *ʾelōhê ʾābî*, while perhaps a secondary formulation in itself, is probably an archaic reference to patriarchal religion.

15. For a recent discussion of this see W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, chap. 1, "Verse and Prose in Early Israelite Tradition."

16. See Cross, "The Song of the Sea" and "The Divine Warrior . . . ." The former work is a seminal treatment of the use of this poem in the formulation of later traditions. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, p. 11, has called Ex. 15 a kind of

"Israelite national anthem."

17. Von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch*, pp. 8-11.

18. Cf. Cross, "The Song of the Sea . . . ."

19. P. D. Miller, Jr., "God the Warrior," *Interpretation*, 19 (1965), 39-46.

20. G. E. Wright, *The Old Testament and Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), chap. 5.

21. Cf. Cross, "The Divine Warrior . . . ." Also Paul Hanson, "Studies in the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1969).

Ugaritic Textual Index

1 (= *CTA* 34), 185n28
1:7 (= *CTA* 34.7), 13, 14, 18, 185n28
2 (= *CTA* 32), 185n28
2:17, 25, 34 (= *CTA* 32.17, 25, 34), 13, 14
6 (= *CTA* 13), 181n10
6:7 (= *CTA* 13.7), 20
6:13 (= *CTA* 13.13), 22
9 (= *CTA* 36), 186n30
17:4 (= *CTA* 29. rev. 4), 190n45
17:7 (= *CTA* 29. rev. 7), 13
49 (= *CTA* 6), 46
49:I:9-10 (= *CTA* 6.I.37-38), 218n47
49:I:12-13 (= *CTA* 6.I.40-41), 17
49:I:20, 26 (= *CTA* 6.I.48, 54), 213n22
49:III:5, 11 (= *CTA* 6.III.5, 11), 16
49:IV (= *CTA* 6.IV), 16
49:V-VI (= *CTA* 6.V-VI), 37
49:V:1-6 (= *CTA* 6.V.1-6), 37ff.
49:V:8-9 (= *CTA* 6.V.8-9), 18
49:VI:8 (= *CTA* 6.VI.8), 18, 67
49:VI:10-11 (= *CTA* 6.VI.10-11), 20
49:VI:26-31 (= *CTA* 6.VI.26-31), 49
51 (= *CTA* 4), 30, 33, 37
51:I:27-29 (= *CTA* 4.I.27-29), 252n237
51:II:11 (= *CTA* 4.II.11), 16
51:III (= *CTA* 4.III), 23
51:III:14 (= *CTA* 4.III.14), 13
51:III:26, 30 (= *CTA* 4.III.26, 30), 17
51:III:32 (= *CTA* 4.III.32), 16
51:IV:43-44 (= *CTA* 4.IV.43-44), 33, 213n22
51:IV:51 (= *CTA* 4.IV.51), 192n60
51:IV:59 (= *CTA* 4.IV.59), 190n48
51:V:75 (= *CTA* 4.V.75), 192n60
51:V:76 (= *CTA* 4.V.76), 192n60
51:VI:44-46 (= *CTA* 4.VI.44-46), 186n32
51:VI:46 (= *CTA* 4.VI.46), 17
51:VII (= *CTA* 4.VII), 33
51:VII:4 (= *CTA* 4.VII.4), 33
51:VII:6-14 (= *CTA* 4.VII.6-14), 34
51:VII:27 (= *CTA* 4.VII.27), 122
51:VII:28f. (= *CTA* 4.VII.28f.), 112
51:VII:29-37 (= *CTA* 4.VII.29-37), 35, 37
51:VII:32-35 (= *CTA* 4.VII.32-35), 41
51:VII:35-36 (= *CTA* 4.VII.35-36), 146
51:VII:42-44 (= *CTA* 4.VII.42-44), 36
52:54 (= *CTA* 23.54), 22
67:V (= *CTA* 5.V), 190n48
67:I:1ff. (= *CTA* 5.I.1ff.), 38
67:II:10-11 (= *CTA* 5.II.10-11, 41
67:II:17-18 (= *CTA* 5.II.18-19), 41

68 (= *CTA* 2.IV), 24, 32
68:10 (= *CTA* 2.IV.10), 32f.
68:29-30 (= *CTA* 2.IV.29-30), 213n22
68:32 (= *CTA* 2.IV.32), 33, 202n141
75 (= *CTA* 12), 38, 55, 204n150
76:I:3-4 (= *CTA* 10.I.3-4), 22
76:II:24-25 (= *CTA* 10.II.24-25), 45
76:II:33 (= *CTA* 10.II.33), 190n48
76:III:28-32 (= *CTA* 10.III.28-32), 199n109
80:II:11 (= *CTA* 85.IV.1), 234n132
107 (= *CTA* 30), 186n28
107:2 (= *CTA* 30.3), 14
107:3 (= *CTA* 30.3), 13
107:16 (= *CTA* 30.16), 196n82
113:70 (= *CTA* 71.70), 234n132
121-124 (= *CTA* 20-22), 43
121:I:4 (= *CTA* 20.B.4), 44
124:9 (= *CTA* 22.B.9), 20
124:7-9 (= *CTA* 22.B.7-9), 21
125:20 (= *CTA* 16.I.20), 58
128:II-III (= *CTA* 15.II-III), 23
128:II:7 (= *CTA* 15.II.7), 182n12
128:II:7, 11 (= *CTA* 15.II.7, 11), 14, 20
128:III:14 (= *CTA* 15.III.14), 206n170
128:III:14-15 (= *CTA* 15.III.14-15), 190n52
128:III:18-19 (= *CTA* 15.III.18-19), 192n60
128:III:19 (= *CTA* 15.III.19), 14
129:17-18 (= *CTA* 2.III.17-18), 202n139
132 (= *CTA* 11), 21, 32
133:35 (= *CTA* 2.I.35), 190n48
137 (= *CTA* 2.I), 16, 23, 24, 28, 60, 254n246
137:3 (= *CTA* 2.I.3), 77
137:14, 15, 20, 31 (= *CTA* 2.I.14, 15, 20, 31), 13
137:18 (= *CTA* 2.I.18), 30, 188n36
137:20 (= *CTA* 2.I.20), 187n35
137:23 (= *CTA* 2.I.23), 28
137:24 (= *CTA* 2.I.24), 29
137:27 (= *CTA* 2.I.27), 29, 30
137:28 (= *CTA* 2.I.28), 29, 30
137:32 (= *CTA* 2.I.32), 31
137:34-35 (= *CTA* 2.I.34-35), 30, 188n36
303:1 (= *CTA* 116.1), 234n132
322:II:5 (= *CTA* 102.II.5), 42
322:VI:7 (= *CTA* 102.VI.7), 42
1001:1 (= *PRU* II 1:1), 39
1001:rev. 9-10 (= *PRU* II 1:rev. 9-10), 187n33
1004:12 (= *PRU* II 4:12), 48
1004:16 (= *PRU* II 4:16), 42
1014 (= *PRU* II 14), 202n135
1026:4 (= *PRU* 26:4), 234n132
1030:1 (= *PRU* II 30:1), 234n132
1031:1 (= *PRU* II 31:1), 234n132

1090:1-2 (= *PRU* II 90:1-2), 15
1107:12 (= *PRU* II 107:12), 42
2004:15 (= *PRU* V 4:15), 21
2029:18 (= *PRU* V 29:18), 56
1 Aqht 84(?) (= *CTA* 19.I.84[?]), 199n109
2 Aqht (= *CTA* 17), 21
2 Aqht I:25 (= *CTA* 17.I.25), 16
2 Aqht V:31-33 (= *CTA* 17.V.31-33), 192n60
Krt 91 (= *CTA* 14.91), 234n132
Krt A:98f (= *CTA* 14.98f.), 218n46
Krt A:99 (= *CTA* 14.99), 228n94
Krt A:186f. (= *CTA* 14.186f.), 218n46
Krt A: 188 (= *CTA* 14.188), 228n94
ʿnt (= *CTA* 3), 33
ʿnt:II (= *CTA* 3.II), 111, 254n246
ʿnt:II:4 (= *CTA* 3.II.4), 19
ʿnt:III:11-12 (= *CTA* 3.III.11-12), 40
ʿnt:III:34 (= *CTA* 3.III.34), 77
ʿnt:III:26-27 (= *CTA* 3.III.26-27), 116
ʿnt:III:27-28 (= *CTA* 3.III.27-28), 41
ʿnt:III:34-43 (= *CTA* 3.III.34-43), 45
ʿnt:III:36 (= *CTA* 3.III.36), 198n98
ʿnt:III:35-44 (= *CTA* 3.III.35-44), 111
ʿnt:III:37-38 (= *CTA* 3.III.37-38), 111
ʿnt:III:42-43 (= *CTA* 3.III.42-43), 31
ʿnt:IV (= *CTA* 3.IV), 47
ʿnt:IV:49 (= *CTA* 3.IV.49), 77
ʿnt:IV:51-52 (= *CTA* 3.IV.51-52), 40
ʿnt:IV:76 (= *CTA* 3.IV.76), 190n48
ʿnt:IV:78-79 (= *CTA* 3.IV.78-79), 44
ʿnt:V:40-42 (= *CTA* 3.V.40-42), 214n22
ʿnt pl. ix:II:17-21 (= *CTA* i.II.17-21), 40
Ugaritica V pp. 42-64, 179n2, 188n35, 189n44
Ugaritica V 2, 57, 204n149, 236n145
Ugaritica V 6:1-2, 185n24
Ugaritica V 8:26, 31, 185n25
Ugaritica V 9:8, 19
Ugaritica V 9:rev. 11, 189n45
Ugaritica V 12:4, 42
Ugaritica V 13:rev. 1, 189n45

Biblical References

Genesis

3	241n191	32:2-3	131-132
3:22	213n22	49	96
3:24	31, 66	49:13-15	97
11:5ff.	213n22	49:26	222n67
18:19	72		
24:60	252n237		
29:1	218n46		

Exodus
3:2 196n81
3:5 129, 131
3:14 153
14:13 133
14:30 173
15 75, 87, 98, 104, 113-118, 168-169, 201n1, 260n287, 260n291
15:2 58, 163, 173
15:2-3 113-114
15:4-10 115
15:11 84-85, 114-115, 185n23, 217n36
15:12 115
15:13 115, 168, 173
15:15-16 116
15:16-18 116-117
15:17 116
15:18 174
17:8-9 161
17:11 135
18:4 163
18:24 161
23:27-28 116
23:28-31 85
33:2 85
34:11 85

Numbers
1 140, 250n235
1:13 56
6 88
10:33 249n235
10:34 249n235
10:35 104, 146, 251n236, 255n258
10:35-36 145-146, 150, 249n235
10:36 105, 257n265
14:39-45 147, 161
14:42 147
14:44 147
17:6 92
21:14 91
21:18 90
22:23 129, 131
22:31 31
23:21 174
26 250n235
32:39ff. 95

Deuteronomy
2:25 116
3:12 95
4:19 67
6:20-24 166
7:24 85
11:25 116
17:3 67
23:13-15 157
26:5b-9 166-167
32 209n1
32:6 165
32:10 233n125
32:30 252n237
32:41 251n235
32:42 89
33 91, 96, 104, 107, 118, 121, 138, 144
33:2 109, 118-119, 142, 185n23
33:2-3 76-84, 91, 109, 158, 233n126, 252n237
33:2-5 75-84, 169
33:5 174
33:11 251n235
33:16 222n67
33:17 252n237
33:21b 83
33:26 105, 107
33:26-29 75, 84-87, 169
33:29 173

Joshua
1--12 156
2:9 116
2:24 116
3:5 137, 157
3--5 117, 129, 151, 260n287
3--6 150
5:13 31
5:13-15 128-131
6 150, 159
7:12 85
7:13 157
8:1 94, 133
8:18 135

10:8 133
10:12a 125
10:12b 126
10:12c-13b 125
10:12-13 123-128, 138, 228n95
10:13a 126
10:14 127-128, 156
10:25 133
11:6 133
11:14 85
11:20 85
13:24-28 95
19:12-13 124
24:2b-13 166
24:12 85
24:18 85

Judges
2:3 85
3:22 195n80
5 65, 87-102, 104-105, 107, 118, 121, 138, 209n1, 259n 283, n284
5:1 223n73
5:2 87-90, 99, 222n67
5:3 223n73
5:4 118, 122, 235 n133
5:4-5 86, 90-91, 106 223n133, 233n 126, 259n285
5:5 225n76
5:6-7 226n78
5:7 238n169
5:8b 91-92
5:9 90
5:11 84, 173
5:11c 92
5:12 92-95, 137, 227n88
5:13 92
5:13-18 95-97
5:14-18 99
5:20 98-126, 138, 228n95
5:21 98
5:23 97-100, 156, 245n219
5:30 101
5:31 101
5:45 106
6:9 85
7:9 94
7:15 94
7:20-22 156
9--11 226n78
11:27 138
13--16 89
14:10 222n67
14:19 89
15:14 89
18:9 94
20 148
20:2 92

I Samuel
1 89
1:11 89
2:24 92
4 148, 158, 253n 245
4--6 151
5 203n142, 253n 246
11:11 157
14:18 149
17:45 42,155
17:47 173
18:7 252n237
18:17 91, 156, 252n 239
21:6 137, 157
21:12 252n237
25:28 91, 156, 252n 239
29:5 252n237

II Samuel
1:12 92
2:15 140
5:2 140
5:22-25 132
5:24 134
6 149
7:6 192n60
10:16 140
11:11 137, 149, 151
14:13 92
14:15ff. 129
15:24ff. 149

22 36, 138, 209n 1
22:7 36, 122
22:7-18 121-123
22:8 122
22:9 122
22:11 122
22:13 122
22:14 37, 122, 251n 235
22:16 122
22:18 37
24 239n165
24:16ff. 31

I Kings
20:35ff. 135
22:21 66

II Kings
2:11-12 134, 201n123
6:1 109
6:15-19 133-134
6:17 201n123
7:6 134-135
13:14 134, 257n265
21:5 70
22:19 67-68
23:5 70

I Chronicles
12:23 242n200
12:34-35 42
21:16 129, 131
21:27, 30 31

II Chronicles
20:27 245n218

Job
1--2 67
3:4 77
4:18 66
5 209n1
7:12 24
9:13 19
10:3 77
10:22 77
15:8 66
16:19 66
31:26 126
33:23 66
37:15 77
38:7 67

Psalms
7:7 94
18 36, 138, 209n1
18:2 36
18:7-18 121-127
18:10 105
18:41 251n235
24 60, 117, 144, 150, 260n287
24:6-10 238n158
24:7, 9 29-30, 150
24:9 174
29 10, 36, 69, 260n287
29:5 197n91
29:10 36, 174
44:24, 27 94
50:2 216n35
59:5 94
68 91, 102-104, 107, 109, 118, 138, 250n235, 259n284, 260n 287n291
68:2 104-105, 145, 251n235
68:5 105, 220n56
68:8 86, 158, 235n 133
68:8-9 105-107, 224n 74, 259n285
68:8-11 223n73
68:9 122
68:10 233n127
68:10-11 107
68:12 107
68:12-13 1-8, 224n129
68:13 224n129
68:14 227n92
68:15 108
68:17 201n123
68:18 105, 108, 134, 239n168, 252n 237
68:20-21 109-110
68:22-24 110-111
68:25 174
68:29-30, 32-33, 35 112

68:34 105
74:13 24
74:16 80
77:14 219n54
78 209n1
78:40 233n125
80:2b-4 77
80:3 94
82 67, 260n290
82:1 14, 66
82:6 66
89:6 66
89:7-8 84-85
89:8 66
89:12 80
89:24 251n235
94:1 216n35
95:3 219n54
96:4 219n54
96:10 80
103:20 100, 245n219
103:20-21 67
104:3 105
104:3-4 66
106:14 233n125
132 250n235
132:8 146, 150, 250 n235, 255n254
148:2-3 67
148:3 126

Ezekiel
30:9 245n221

Daniel
7:13 66, 195n77
9:22 129

Joel
2:1-17 139
4:9ff 137, 157
4:11b 100, 138
4:12 138
4:16 138

Amos
2:9 85
8:14 66

Isaiah
6:1-2 32, 68
6:2-6 66
6:8 213n22
9:3 119
9:5 56
10:26 94, 119
13:1ff 136-137
13:3 100, 245n218
13:10 138
14 23
14:13 14, 66, 187n35
19:1 105
34 47, 112, 120
40:1ff 68
40:25-27 139
40:26 139
42:13 94-95
43:19-20 233n125
44:26 66
45:12 139
48:17 140
51:9 95, 137
62:19 224n75
64:2 224n75
66:15 201n123

Jeremiah
6:23 42
7:4 157
23:18 66, 69
23:22 69
50:42 42
51:27-28 157

Micah
1:3 121
1:4 232n118

Habakkuk
3 91, 138, 209n1, 260n291
3:3 94, 233n126
3:3-7 118, 238n160
3:3-15 118-121
3:4 118
3:5 119
3:7 122
3:8 105, 118
3:9 120
3:11 127, 138
3:13 235n136
3:15 118, 238n160

Zechariah
3 67
13:7 94
14 140-141
14:3 141
14:5 141, 245n218
14:13 140
14:55 141

Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Qumran

II Maccabees
5:1ff. 142
10:27 142
11:6 142

Enoch
1:9 141
56:5ff. 245n218

1QH 211n9, 245n219
III:21 100, 245n219
III:35, 36 100, 245n219
VI:13 210n5
VIII:11, 12 100, 245n219
X:34 100

1QM 92, 211n9, 245 n219
I:5 92
I:9-11 142
I:10 227n88, 245n 218
III:12 92
XII:3-5 142
XII:4 244n216
XII:6-8 144
XII:7 100, 244n216, 245n219
XII:9 227n88
XV:14 100, 217n41, 245n219

4Q Ber 100-101, 195n 77, 245n219

4Q Sam[a] 89

Author Index

Abel, F.-M., 130, 241nn190, 192
Ackerman, J.S., 212n14
Albright, W. F., 5, 10, 40, 54, 74, 92, 96, 102-103, 106, 108-109, 111-112, 118, 151, 153-155, 180nn4-5, 181 nn7, 9; 183nn17, 19; 186nn 29, 31; 188n37, 190n46, 197 n93, 199nn105, 107; 204nn 152-153, 207n173, 208n178, 209n1, 220n62, 221n64, 222n 66, 224nn74-75, 225n76, 226 n82, 227nn90, 92; 228n98, 229n106, 230nn110-111, 231n 116, 233nn124-125, 128; 234 n132, 235nn135-137, 236nn 140-141, 238nn160, 162; 239 nn166, 169; 240n182, 256n 262, 257n266, 258nn277-279, 262n16
Allcock, P. J., 256n262
Alt, A., 59, 114, 162, 168, 228n98, 237n147
Anderson, B. W., 256n264
Arnold, W., 248n233
Astour, M., 182n14, 185n25, 189n44, 203n142

Bach, R., 133, 209n2, 242n203
Barnett, R. D., 196n82
Barrelet, M.-T., 204n149
Baumgartner, W., 181n9
Beeston, A. F. L., 79, 217n39
Benzinger, I., 243n208
Birkeland, H., 199n104
Black, M., 222n67
Blenkinsopp, J., 220n61, 222n 67, 223n73, 253n243, 254n 248, 259n284
Bottero, J., 240n180
Brekelmans, C. H., 167, 258nn 280-281, 261n6
Bright, J., 227n89, 243n204
Burney, C. F., 93, 221n66, 224 nn74-75, 226nn80,85; 227nn 89, 92, 94; 252n242
Buswell, G., 248n233

Campbell, E. F., 207n176
Caquot, A., 43, 200nn116-118, 121; 201n124
Carmichael, C., 167, 262n10
Cassuto, U., 198n97
Cazelles, H. S., 20, 22, 190n 49, 201n127
Charles, R. H., 247n230
Childs, B. S., 167, 261n8
Clements, R. E., 232n119
Coats, G., 236n144
Cooke, G., 182n11, 210n4, 211n 10, 212n16
Craigie, P. C., 221n63
Cross, F. M., 3-6, 29, 55, 59-60, 62, 74, 78-82, 90, 93-94, 96, 99, 113-117, 121, 139, 150-154, 162, 180n3, 184nn20, 23; 185n27, 191n58, 193n60, 195nn74, 76; 196n83, 197n95, 198n98, 200n115, 203nn143, 148; 205nn157-160, 207n172, 208nn177, 179; 209n 1, 210n4, 211n11, 212n15, 213,20, 214nn22-23, 215nn27-29, 217nn36,38, 42; 219nn50, 52; 220nn57, 61; 221n64, 223 nn71-72, 225n76, 227n91, 228 nn96-97, 229nn100-102, 231nn 115-116, 234n131, 235nn133, 135; 236nn144-145, 237nn146, 148, 151-152, 154, 156-159; 239nn170-171, 173; 243n210, 246n222, 247nn229, 232; 251n 236, 252n237, 254n250, 255nn 253-254, 256, 267-271; 258nn 275-276, 259n286, 260nn288-289, 291; 262nn13-14, 16; 263nn18, 21
Cunchillos, Yarri, J. L., 182n 11, 183n17

Dahood, M. J., 10, 111, 179n2, 181n7, 182n12, 183nn13-14, 186n31, 191n57, 200n112, 203 n142, 215n29, 219n54, 235nn 137, 138; 240n180, 244n214
Davies, G. H., 248n233, 252n 238, 255n252
Deimel, A., 183n15
De Langhe, R., 181n9

Delcor, M., 254n246
Delitzsch, F., 241nl88
Dexinger, F., 182nll
Donner, H., 184nl9
Driver, G. R., 19, 186n31, 188n36, 189n42, 191n54,192n 60, 193n61, 197nn88, 91; 200nll2, 201nl24
Driver, S. R., 217n43
Dus, J., 124, 239nl75

Eaton, J. H., 238nl6l, 239n 169
Edzard, D. O., 240nl80
Eichrodt, W., 256n262, 258n 277
Eissfeldt, O., 48, 59-60, 153, 181n9, 202nl37, 204nl53, 205nnl63-164, 206nl65, 256 nn263, 265
Erlandsson, S., 243n211, 244 nn212, 217

Fisher, L. R., 200nll3, 204n 148, 207nl71
Fitzmeyer, J., 191n57
Fohrer, G., 167, 261n4
Fredriksson, H., 3, 209n3
Freedman, D. N., 5, 62, 74, 78-79, 81-82, 113, 116, 121, 197n95, 207nl76, 209n 1, 215nn27-28, 217nn36, 38; 219nn50, 52; 220nn57, 61; 236nnl43, 145; 237nnl46, 154; 239nnl70-171, 257n272, 260n291

Galling, K., 105, 232nl21, 243n208
Gaster, T., 44, 182nl2, 190n 52, 201nl22, 213n21, 214n 24, 218n50, 219n52, 220n59
Gerth, H. H., 222n67
Ginsberg, H. L., 14, 19, 74, 181n9, 184n21, 188n36, 193n 61, 197n90, 198n98, 201nn 128-129
Giveon, R., 216n32
Goetze, A., 40, 105, 188n35, 199nl06, 214n26, 232nl22
Gordon, C., 56, 188n36, 193n 61, 201nl25, 205nl64, 206n 165, 254n248
Gray, J., 200nl20, 201nl24, 204nl53, 205nnl54, 161, 163; 222n67
Gressman, H., 252n240
Gröndahl, F., 216n34
Gruenthaner, M., 127, 239nl75, 241nl84
Gunkel, H., 89, 131, 222n68, 242nl98
Güterbock, H. G., 203nl44

Habel, N., 199nl02, 236nl44
Halder, A., 236nl40
Hanfmann, G. M. A., 232nl22
Harrelson, W., 246n225, 247n 228
Harris, Z., 212nl7
Heathcote, A. W., 256n262
Hehn, J., 238nl63
Heidel, A., 194nn66, 72
Held, M., 195n77
Heller, J., 124
Herdner, A., 22, 191n55, 205n 164
Hillers, D., 255n254
Holladay, J. S., 124, 126, 212 nl6, 240nnl76-177, 241nl85, 242n201, 243n207
Huffmon, H. B., 206nl69, 212n 14, 216n34, 217n40, 248n234, 261n2
Hvidberg, F. F., 189n39, 197n 89
Hyatt, J. P., 167, 261n9

Jacobsen, T., 25, 193n63, 194n 73,202nl40,211nl3,214nn24-25
Jeremias, J., 214n27, 216n34, 221n63, 223n73, 224n77
Johnson, A. R., 213n22
Jüngling, H.-W., 182nll, 183n 17, 210n4, 211nl4, 213nl9

Kapelrud, A. S., 20, 105, 190n 51, 193n62, 194n74, 199nn 104, 111; 200nll9, 201nnl28-129; 202nl32, 232nl20, 244n 218
Kittel, R., 243n208
Knight, G. A. F., 246n224
Kraus, H.-J., 230nll5, 232nll9

248n233, 255n258
Kutsch, E., 245n220

Labat, R., 194n69
Labuschagne, C. J., 220n55
Laessøe, J., 189n40
Langlament, F., 248n233, 255n 258
Lipinski, E., 189n41, 216n29, 223n73
Loewenstamm, S. E., 193n60, 207n171, 237n145
Løkkegaard, F., 19, 189nn39-40
Lutz, H.-M., 4, 246n226

Maier, J., 248nn233-234, 249 n235
Martindale, D., 222n67
McKane, W., 251n236, 253n245
Mendenhall, G., 80, 226n79, 250n235, 259n286
Milik, J. T., 79-80, 215n27, 217nn37-38, 218n46, 235n133
Miller, P. D., 186n31, 189n38, 195n78, 202nn133, 136; 205n 156, 206n170, 215n28, 217nn 39, 42; 219n52, 236n139, 242n202, 263n19
de Moor, J. C., 218n45
Moore, C. F., 94, 223n69, 224 n74, 254n247
Moran, W. L., 101, 229nn108-109
Morgenstern, J., 210n6, 248n 233
Mowinckel, S., 102-103, 105, 109, 140, 199n110, 230nn 112-113, 233n123, 235n132, 246n225
Muilenburg, J., 139, 246n223
Murtonen, A. R., 56, 206n167
Muss-Arnolt, W., 211n13
Myers, J. M., 223n70, 224n75, 228n96

Neuberg, F., 210n8
North, C. R., 140, 246n224
Noth, M., 126, 129-131, 150, 170, 240n178, 241nn188-189, 193-195; 242n197, 255nn255, 257
Nougayrol, J., 179n2, 188n35, 189n44, 195n75
Nowack, D. W., 244n218
Nyberg, H. S., 217n36

O'Callaghan, R. T., 210n5
Oldenburg, U., 196n87
Otzen, B., 246n225, 247n228

Pedersen, Joh., 181n9, 222n67
Pope, M., 18, 42, 48, 51, 61-62, 180nn5-6, 181n8, 183n16, 185n28, 187n35, 191nn53,58; 192n60, 193n61, 198nn97-98, 199n103, 200n114, 202nn137-138, 203n145, 204nn150-151, 153; 205nn155,161; 208nn174-175, 240n180

von Rad, G., 2, 4, 87, 119, 131, 133, 151, 159, 166-168, 170, 226nn81, 83; 237n 153, 239n167, 242n198, 243n n205-206, 209; 244n216, 251n 236, 253n243, 255n259, 256n 262, 261n1, 263n17
Reuss, E., 230n110
Richardson, H. N., 210n5
Richter, W., 167, 221n63, 223n 73, 262n11
Rin, Shifra, 20, 190n47
Rin, Svi, 20, 190n47
Roberts, J. J. M., 205n162
Robertson, D. A., 209n1, 238n 160
Robinson, H. W., 210n4
Rŏllig, W., 184n19, 191n53, 240n180
Rosenthal, F., 191n59
Ross, J. F., 212n16, 228n99, 257n265
Rost, L., 167, 261n5
Rudolph, W., 242n200

Saebø, M., 246n226
Saley, R. J., 184n23, 185n27
Schmidt, W., 187n35, 193nn60, 62; 196nn84-85, 204n153
Schnutenhaus, F., 216nn31, 33
Schwally, F., 2
Seeber, W., 251n236
Seeligmann, I., 83-84, 215n29,

218n50, 219n51
Sevensma, T. P., 251n235
Smend, R., 228n95, 240n179, 248n234, 253n244, 255n251, 256nn260, 262, 265
Speiser, E. A., 226n83, 241n186
Stadelmann, R., 238n164
Strugnell, J., 195n77, 229n104, 245n219
Stummer, F., 220nn55, 61

Tallqvist, K., 183n15
Talmon, S., 218n48
Tsevat, M., 256n265
Tur-Sinai, N. H., 210n5

de Vaux, R., 181n9, 222n67, 251n236, 252n241
Virolleaud, Ch., 42, 48, 188n37, 189n45, 201n124, 206nn165, 170
Vogt, E., 233n127
Vriezen, Th. C., 167, 206n166, 261n7

von Waldow, H. E., 232n119
Wambacq, B. N., 256nn261-262
Weber, M., 2, 222n67
Weinfeld, M., 260n286
Weiser, A., 167, 221n63, 230n114, 233n123, 234n130, 236n142, 251n236, 261n3
Westermann, C., 216n31, 220n61, 221n63
Westphal, G., 67, 211n12, 243n208, 258n273
Wharton, J., 226n83
Widengren, G., 210n4
Winckler, H., 98
Wiseman, D. H., 235n132
Wolf, C. U., 226n83
Wolff, H. W., 139, 245nn218, 220
Wright, G. E., 82, 100, 170, 172, 210n4, 211n14, 213n18, 219n53, 220n60, 229n101, 250n235, 263n20

Yadin, Y., 211n9, 226n84, 227n88, 247n230

Subject Index

Alalakh Texts, 109
ʿAnat, 12, 16, 20, 22, 24-25, 33, 40, 42, 45-48, 55, 111, 182n12, 187n33, 190n49, 201 nn128-129, 204n149, 254n246
Angel, 142, 152, 160
Anu, 51
Anunnaki and Igigi, 21, 27, 44, 74
Apocalyptic, 135, 137, 139, 144, 171, 243n210
Apsu, 25
Aqhat, Legend of, 11, 42-43
Archers, 109
Ark, 37, 78, 104-105, 107, 115, 122, 145-146, 151, 155, 157-158, 232n119, 247n229, 248nn234-235, 251n236, 252n 238, 253n245, 255n252
Arslan Tash Incantation Text, 15, 184n23, 185n27
ʿAtak, 46
Athena, 51
Atirat, 12, 14-17, 28, 33, 38, 48, 55, 155, 182n12, 185n30
ʿAttar, 12, 48
ʿAttart, 12, 182n12, 202n139, 206n170

Ban, 85, 112, 135, 140, 151, 157, 159-160
Baʿal, 12, 14, 16, 18-20, 24-48, 50-53, 55, 58, 60, 77, 105, 112, 116-117, 120, 122, 163, 179n2, 185n28, 186n30, 187n33, 188nn35-36, 193n61, 196n86, 202n141, 207n173, 237n155, 254n245
Baʿal-Hadad, 77
Baʿalat Gebal, 13
Baʿal Samem, 13
Baʿal and ʿAnat Cycle, 11, 13, 17, 24, 37, 42, 61, 117, 181 n10, 187n35
Bašan, 107, 111
Battle song, 37, 94, 103-105, 116, 144, 147, 159
Ben-Hadad, 134-135
Bull, 54-55, 118

Celestial bodies, 21-23, 67, 70, 98, 120, 123-128, 138, 140, 154, 158, 160, 240n18
Census, 161
Chaos, 24, 60, 118-119, 120, 141, 164, 172, 247n227
Chariot, 46, 60, 85, 105, 108-109, 120, 122, 134, 158, 232 n122, 239n168, 243n208
Cherubim, 31, 53, 66, 78, 105, 122, 155, 241n191
Commander of the armies of Yahweh, 129-131, 159
Conquest (tradition), 115, 117, 130-131, 160
Cosmic battle, 25, 95, 98, 101, 107, 109-111, 113-115
Cosmic mountain, 107, 116-117, 142, 160
Covenant, 99-102, 163, 165, 169
Creation, 64, 117, 141, 151, 155, 163, 165
Credo, 166-167, 169

Dagon, 12, 38, 179n2, 181n8, 202n142, 253n246
Danel, 43
David, 129, 132, 149, 192n60
Day of Yahweh, 133, 135-136, 139-140, 157
Death, 24, 60, 110, 118, 164
Demaros, 42, 51
Divine abode, 117, 121-122, 142, 160-162, 192n60, 232n 119
Divine assembly: Canaanite, 11-23, 29-32, 43-44, 60, 41-74; Hebrew, 14, 31-32, 66-74, 83, 98-99, 122, 126; Mesopotamian, 11, 13, 25-26, 67, 69-70, 73-74
Divine weapons, 27, 32, 38, 120, 122, 126

Ea, 25
Earth, 120, 122, 138
Egypt, 6, 8, 12, 45, 109, 113-115, 165, 180n60
El, 12, 14, 16, 23, 28, 33, 40,

46, 48-63, 120, 154-155, 162, 179n2, 185nn24, 28; 186n30, 187n35, 188n36, 193n63, 201n126, 203n148, 204nn150, 153; 207n176
Elat, 17
Elijah, 134-135
Elisha, 133-135
Elkunirša, 192n60
Enlil, 81
Epic tradition, 167-168, 170
Epithets, 16, 39-42, 47-48, 54-56
Esagila, 25
Eschatology, 135, 140, 142, 171
Exodus-Conquest, 113, 166

Fertility, 37, 46, 55, 59, 164, 198n97
Fire, 31-32, 46, 122, 134, 195n80

Ge, 52-53
Gilgal, 115-116, 129, 131, 151
God of the Fathers, 114-115, 162, 168
Gpn and Ugr, 16

Hadd, 206n170
Ḫazzi, 188n35
Hermes Trismegistos, 51-52
Holy war, 2, 4-5, 64, 85, 87, 92, 96, 99, 101, 115, 117, 119, 122, 131, 133, 135-136, 140, 145, 147-148, 150, 155, 160, 163, 165, 243n210, 251n236, 254n248
Horon, 12, 28
Host: as military term, 140, 155; of ʿAnat, 20; of Atirat, 17-18; of Baʿal, 18, 20, 38, 43, 190n48; of El, 16-17; of Kronos, 53; of Mot, 20; of Yamm, 20-21, 31-32
Hurrian mythology, 51, 179n2

Ištar, 48

Jericho, 129-131
Jerusalem, 141-142, 149-150
Judgment, 139-142
Justice, 67-68, 74, 81

Kemos, 47
Keret epic, 10-11, 14, 19, 47, 58, 61, 181n9, 192n60
Kingship, 25, 27-28, 32-33, 37-38, 41, 50, 59, 64, 74, 83, 86, 104, 112-113, 116-117, 141, 144, 162, 165, 168, 174-175, 196nn84, 86; 197n94, 199nn101-102, 202n141, 208n179
Kingu, 25-26
Kotar-wa-Ḫasis, 12, 32-33. 185n26, 192n60
Kronos, 51-53, 204nn148, 150
Kumarbi, 51
Kušan, 119

Levy, 148-149
Lotan, 38

Magic, 52, 135, 165
Mahanaim, 132
Marduk, 19, 21, 27-28, 30, 32-33, 119, 194n73, 196n85, 202n141
Marduk and Tiamat conflict, 25-28, 32, 194n73, 202n141
Mari, 57
Meroz, 97, 99-100
Meša ʿ Inscription, 47, 112
Mesopotamia, 6, 8, 12, 15, 50, 59, 69, 73, 86, 117, 119-120, 164, 179n2
Messengers: of the gods, 14, 16, 21, 31-32, 68, 71; of Yahweh, 68, 72, 99, 127
Micaiah ben Imlah, 67-68
Midian, 119, 156
Monsters, 111, 114, 141, 161, 163, 172
Mot, 12, 16, 18, 20, 34, 37, 39, 46, 49, 110, 162, 193n61, 197n254, 254n246
Mount Cassius, 188n35
Mummu, 25

Nazirite, 88-89

Oracle, 157
Order, 24, 59, 63, 141, 164

Palace, 33-36, 121
Panic, 122, 140, 142, 144, 159
Pantheon, Ugarit, 12, 14, 19, 28, 73, 179n2, 182n12
Paran, 118
Pdry, 190n48
Philo Byblius, 6, 9-10, 22, 31, 42, 50-52, 61-62, 180nn 5-6
Plagues-pestilence, 119, 158
Ptaḥ, 62
Purification, 136-137, 157

Qdš, 14, 17
Qdš-w-Amrr, 14, 16

Rabbim, 46
Rahab, 19
Rekabites, 89
Rephaim Texts, 20, 42-43, 190 n48, 200n116
Rešeph, 12, 21, 119, 182n13
Royal theology, 140, 149

Salvation, 64, 109, 113, 115, 117, 120, 141, 144, 164, 173
Šalyat, 46
Šamaš, 124
Sanchuniathon, 10, 50-51, 54, 62
Sanctuary, 104, 112-113, 116-117, 130, 141, 162, 165, 168
Ṣaphon, 18, 34, 41, 116, 188n 35
Šapš, 12, 16, 22
Satiation, 112, 120
Sea, 115, 117-119
Seraphim, 32, 53, 67, 196n82
Shemshara Tablets, 19
Sinai, 83, 86, 91, 106-107, 115, 118, 121, 134, 142, 160-161, 166, 168
Sisera, 91, 96-97
Storm god, 27, 37, 41, 50, 60, 91, 107, 114-115, 122, 160, 239n172
Sun worship, 124, 126-127
Sword, 31-32, 38, 129, 158, 195n80
Syria-Palestine, 6, 8, 10, 12, 183n15

Tannin, 24, 38, 46, 111
Teman, 118
Temple, 64, 117, 194n74, 231n 117
Tent dwelling, 192n60
Terror, 116
Theophany, 69, 75, 80, 86, 91, 104-105, 107, 113-114, 118-119, 121, 132, 138, 141, 146, 156, 158, 160, 216n31, 233n126, 259n284
Tiamat, 19, 21, 25-27, 32, 162
Tribal league, 2, 87, 92, 95, 97, 102, 133, 148
Triumphal procession, 29-30, 34, 112, 116-117
Ttly, 190n48

Ugaritic texts, 6, 9, 11, 13, 45, 55, 59, 61, 105
Uranos, 51-53, 61

Victory cry, 29-30, 112, 116
Victory procession, 29-30, 34, 112, 116-117

War cry, 37
War Scroll of Qumran, 143
Wilderness, 106-107, 115, 160-161, 165, 168

Yahweh: as divine name, 153-155; of hosts, 136, 138-140, 145-155
Yamm, 12, 16, 20, 22, 28-29, 31-35, 37, 39, 46, 77, 107, 162, 193n61, 194n63, 196n86, 202n141, 254n246
Yariḥ, 12, 124
Yehimilk Inscription, 13, 191n 59


9 781589 832176