PSALMS 1–2

Hebrew Bible Monographs, 37

PSALMS 1–2

Gateway to the Psalter

Robert L. Cole

SHEFFIELD PHOENIX PRESS

2013

Published by Sheffield Phoenix Press
Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield
Sheffield S3 7QB

www.sheffieldphoenix.com

A CIP catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Typeset by CA Typesetting Ltd
Printed on acid-free paper by Lightning Source UK Ltd, Milton Keynes

ISBN-13 978-1-907534-30-0

Contents

Preface

Recent decades have seen an issue raised that has been virtually neglected for the better part of the last century and based on extant evidence, only sporadically previous to that. I refer to the question of the order and shape of the Psalter and its consequences for interpretation. Scholars in recent decades have been put on notice that we have before us not an evolved collection slowly taking shape by accretion, but rather a discrete and integrated whole, a book in every sense of the word.

Important studies in recent years have discussed the overall structure of the Psalter as well as more detailed examinations of specific and limited sequences therein. As of yet a detailed textually based study of the entire sequence as a means of understanding the purpose of the book has not appeared. The present work is also a more modest, although vital contribution toward the goal of understanding the purpose and message of the entire composition. The opening two psalms, as is true for the beginning of any text biblical or otherwise, set the tone and agenda for what follows.

The following study represents the fruit of the better part of two decades of reading, teaching and meditating upon these two remarkable examples of Hebrew poetry. I would be amiss not to mention the many students who have contributed through their eager participation to a better understanding of the Psalter's introduction. It is to them I dedicate this work, and it is them that I challenge to join in this yet unfinished endeavor.

Abbreviations

BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BDB	Francis Brown, S.R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)
BHS	*Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia* (ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1983)
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
DCH	*Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (ed. D.J.A. Clines. Sheffield, 1993–2011)
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
ESV	English Standard Version.
GKC	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (ed. E. Kautzsch, revised and trans. A.E. Cowley; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910)
HALOT	L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner and J.J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (trans. and ed. under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
IBHS	B.K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OTE	*Old Testament Essays*
Proceedings EGL & MWBS	Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Bible Societies
PWCJS	Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies
RB	*Revue biblique*
SAP	Sheffield Academic Press
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
TLOT	*Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (ed. E. Jenni, with assistance from C. Westermann; trans. M.E. Biddle; 3 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997
TNIV	Today's New International Version.
TWOT	R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr and Bruce K. Waltke (eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Chicago: Moody Press, 1980)

TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	*Vetus Testamentum*, Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WJK	Westminster John Knox
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Chapter 1

Introduction

While awareness of the close relationship between Psalms 1 and 2 and their function as an introduction to the entire book has been recognized frequently in recent years, it is by no means a recent phenomenon.[1] It has, in

1. Examples of recent studies on the first two psalms are: Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, *Die Psalmen*. I. *Psalm 1–50* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 2003), p. 45: 'Auf der Ebene der Schlußredaktion bilden Ps. 1 und Ps. 2 das zweiteilige Prömium zum Psalmenbuch…'. Matthias Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994), pp. 9-10: '*Psalm 1/2* werden in verschiedenen Handschriften als ein Psalm gelesen… Ps. 2 ist verschiendentlich zusammen mit Ps. 1 als ein Psalm angesprochen worden… Sowohl der palästinische Talmud (jTaan 2,2,65c; J. Ber. 4,3,8a) als auch der Babylonische Talmud (b. Ber 9b.10a) ziehen vereinzelt Ps. 1 und 2 als einen Psalm zusammen… Sie sind damit als eine unterschiedene Einheit von zwei Psalmen zu sehen.' Luis Alonso Schökel and Cecilia Carniti, *Salmos*. I. *Salmos 1–72: Traducción, introducciones y comentario* (Estella, Navarra: Editorial Verbo Divino, 2002), p. 148: 'El que compuso el Sal 1 como prólogo de todo el salterio quiso engancharlo al salmo siguiente… La operación es intencional, significativa, y nos obliga a mirar el Sal 2 en su conexión con el primero.' Jean-Marie Auwers, 'Le voies de l'exégèse canonique du Psautier', in J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (BETL, 163; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), pp. 5-26 (13): 'Les commentateurs admettent généralement que le Ps. 1, de facture récente, a été ajouté avant le Ps. 2 pour former avec celui-ci «l'introduction duelle» au livre des Psaumes'. Jamie Grant, *The King as Exemplar: The Function of Deuteronomy's Kingship Law in the Shaping of the Book of Psalms* (SBL Academia Biblica, 17; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), p. 42: 'an apparent editorial connection between Pss 1 and 2… Could it be that Pss 1 *and* 2…actually form a *dual* introduction to the Psalms?' Amos Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim* (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1990), p. 3: (ג) שני המזמורים הראשונים משמשים פתיחה תהלים כלו. Samuel Terrien, *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commmentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), p. 79: 'It may have been placed here as a twin brother of Psalm 1 in order to form a preamble to the final edition'. Christopher Seitz, *Word without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Theological Witness* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), p. 159: 'The presence of a clear conclusion would raise the question of the presence of an introduction, and again most acknowledge that Psalms 1 and 2 serve this special purpose, not just for Book 1, but for the Psalter as a whole'. For more examples, including nineteenth-century commentaries see the list in David C. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms* (JSOTSup, 252; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), p. 73 n. 19.

fact, a long history that stretches back apparently as far as the third century BCE.[2] As noted by Mitchell, in the entire LXX Psalter only these two initial psalms lack titles.[3] Given the LXX's propensity to add superscriptions there would apparently have been no good reason not to append the same to the first two psalms. Their absence would appear to indicate recognition of their mutual prefatory function.

The well-known textual variant to Acts 13.33 refers to Psalm 2 as the first (τῷ πρώτῳ) psalm, an enumeration known to numerous Church Fathers between the second and fifth century.[4] For example, Diodore of Tarsus (fourth century CE), declares: 'Now, you ought to realize that in the Hebrew the first and second psalms are not divided, being combined into one'.[5] The Fathers also reveal some understanding of interpretive implications of such a unity. Theodoret, in comments on the second psalm, declares that it

> begins carrying over the theme from the end of the first psalm… Having concluded the first psalm with a reference to the ungodly, he opened the second in turn with this same reference so as to teach us that the aforementioned end of the ungodly lies in wait for both kings and rulers…[6]

Gregory of Nyssa observes the first psalm has no inscription and comments that it 'advises separation from evil', to which the second is 'appended that we might be without impiety…the first psalm is an inscription of the second'.[7]

Both the Babylonian (*b. Ber.* 9b–10a) and Jerusalem Talmud (*y. Ber.* 4.3, 8a; *y. Ta'an.* 2.2, 65c) recognize their combination.[8] As will be seen, this evidence from antiquity contrasts with more recent research, as noted by Brennan in his article from 1976:

2. Indeed, the initial position of any text in a biblical book would incline readers to its consideration as an introduction. Psalm 1, a discrete poem, would be an initial candidate for this function, but analysis of its multifaceted integration with Psalm 2 suggests that they introduce the book in tandem.

3. Mitchell, *The Message*, pp. 17-18, 73.

4. See the discussion in Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (United Bible Societies, corrected edn, 1975), pp. 412-14, and John T. Willis, 'Psalm 1–An Entity', *ZAW* 91 (1979), pp. 381-401, who lists Justin Martyr, Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem IV*, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, Athanasius, Diodore of Tarsus, Hilary of Poitiers and Jerome among those aware of the combined enumeration.

5. Diodore of Tarsus, *Commentary on Psalms 1–51* (trans. Robert C. Hill; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), p. 10.

6. Craig A. Blaising, and Carmen S. Hardin (eds.), *Psalms 1–50* (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, 7; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008), pp. 11-12.

7. Blaising and Hardin, *Ancient Christian*, p. 12.

8. Mitchell, *The Message*, p. 73. The terminology of *b. Ber.* 9d for the two is: אשרי האיש ולמה רגשו גוים חדא פרשה היא) חדא פרשה).

> The early rabbinic and patristic commentators, on the other hand, often point out the continuity between one Psalm and another, or even among several Psalms in sequence. Their lead was followed by some commentators as recently as the nineteenth century. Modern Psalm-study however, gives scant attention to such considerations.[9]

The ancient rabbinic debate recorded in the Talmud over a sequential (סמכין) versus chronological reading of Psalms is not unlike recent discussions.[10] Rabbi Abbahu's response to the argument was that those who seek meaning apart from juxtaposition, such as a chronological reading, would run into difficulties that do not exist for those who read a psalm in light of the immediately preceding psalm.[11] Contemporary commentators are not as apt to 'chronologize' the psalms as they are to 'gattungize' them. This approach however is at a loss to explain how two 'generically' different psalms such as 1 and 2, or 2 and 3 (and many more), were juxtaposed. Gunkel, having recognized this, simply rejected the canonical sequence and replaced it with a modern definition of genre.[12] So the implications of the juxtaposition and deliberate integration at various levels of the first two psalms is essentially avoided, with the result that the first is typically identified as 'wisdom' or 'torah' and the second as 'royal' or 'coronation' or the like. But this bifurcated reading is at odds with the abundant and overt linguistic evidence that binds them together, revealing the redactor's intended coherent reading of the pair.

While evidence from Qumran does not explicitly support the unitary reading of the first two psalms, it certainly does not contradict it. The fragmentary text of 4QFlor contains a *catena* of quotations including Ps. 1.1; Isa. 8.11; Ezek. 37.23 and Ps. 2.1.[13] Psalm 1.1 is quoted after being introduced by the term מדרש (line 14), as if opening a new section, since the commentary of this lemma follows the formula פשר הדבר (line 14), as does that of Ps. 2.1 (פשר הדבר, line 18). Intervening are the texts of Isaiah and Ezekiel, introduced by the phrase אשר כתוב. So מדרש functions to present the principal text under consideration, with אשר כתוב introducing those seen as

9. Joseph P. Brennan, 'Some Hidden Harmonies in the Fifth Book of Psalms', in R.F. McNamara (ed.), *Essays in Honor of Joseph P. Brennan* (Rochester, NY; St Bernard's Seminary, 1976), pp. 126-58 (126). Fortunately, the trend seen in the nineteenth century, which was then eclipsed by the influence of Gunkel, has experienced a revival of sorts in recent years, as will be traced below. U. Cassuto also noted how the arrangement of Psalms was virtually ignored by contemporary scholars in 'The Sequence and Arrangement of the Biblical Sections', in *Biblical and Oriental Studies*. I. *Bible* (trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1973), pp. 1-6 (2).

10. *b. Ber.* 10a.

11. *b. Ber.* 10a, אמר ליה אתון דלא דרשיתון סמוכין קשיא לכו אנן דדרשינן סמוכין לא קשיא לן.

12. Hermann Gunkel, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), p. 93.

13. John M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4*. I. (*4Q158-4Q186*) (DJD, 5; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 53.

related to it.[14] Psalm 2.1 is then quoted directly without any use of מדרש as in 1.1, followed instead, as noted above, by פשר הדבר, which could quite possibly be construed as a continuation of comments on the first psalm. So the evidence is suggestive although not wholly conclusive.

What is quite certain in these ancient comments from Qumran on Psalms 1 and 2, and those between them, is the eschatological interpretation given to them as shown by repeated use of the prepositional phrase באחרית הימים in lines 15 and 19 and in the comments on 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Chronicles 17 of line 12.[15] Indeed, the interpretation offered in this present study will come to the same conclusion as that of the ancient commentator(s): that Psalms 1 and 2 were intended as prophecy in the ultimate sense. Barbiero likewise sees an eschatological perspective in these two psalms, based not only on their content but also on their position following Malachi 3.[16]

The medieval Jewish commentator David Qimḥi (RaDaQ) is familiar with the tradition of counting both psalms as one and quotes the Talmudic passage (*b. Ber.* 9d), apparently without agreeing with it.[17] The Karaite commentator Japheth ben Eli (10th century CE) likewise recognized the interrelatedness of Psalms 1 and 2, following previous rabbinic and early Jewish tradition.[18] According to Ibn Ezra, Saadiah Gaon sought, illegitimately in his opinion, to link one psalm to another.[19]

Erasmus in his exposition of Psalms devotes an extensive discussion to the numbering of Psalm 2 as the first in Acts 13.33 and concludes that the second psalm 'does not follow the preceding one, but is continuous with it… It is as one with the preceding psalm.'[20] Calvin and Luther hardly broach the subject of their relationship.[21]

14. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4*, p. 53. Cf. כאשר כתוב in line 12 introducing Amos 9.12 as a supporting text to the principal one of 2 Sam. 7.10-14.

15. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4,* p. 53.

16. Gianni Barbiero, *Das erste Psalmenbuch als Einheit: Eine synchrone Analyse von Psalm 1–41* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999), p. 34.

17. Menahem Cohen (ed.), *Miqra'ot Gedolot Haketer: Psalms I* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2003), p. 5.

18. Friedmann Eissler, *Königpsalmen und karäische Messiaserwartung: Jefet ben Elis Auslegung von Ps. 2.72.89.110.132 im Vergleich mit Saadja Gaons Deutung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2002), p. 33. Japheth also read both Psalms 1 and 2 eschatologically, as noted by Eissler (p. 34): 'Jefet deutet—auch damit bewegt er sich im Rahmen der Tradition—die beiden Psalmen von der universalen eschatologischen Thematik her, die er im Wesentlichen aus Ps. gewinnt'.

19. Cohen, *Miqraot gedolot*, p. 8, רצה הגאון רב סעדיה…לקשור כל המזמורים זה עם זה…ואין יכולת במפרש לקשור ככה.

20. Desiderius Erasmus, *Collected Works of Erasmus*. LXIII. *Exposition of the Psalms* (ed. Dominic Baker-Smith; trans. Michael J. Heath; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), p. 73.

21. Martin Luther, *Luther's Works.* X. *First Lectures on the Psalms I: Psalms 1–7*

Much later in the nineteenth century there appears renewed interest in the arrangement of the Psalter and specifically the juxtaposition of Psalms 1 and 2. F. Hitzig recognizes the unifying effect that the lack of superscription has for the first two psalms in contrast with those following and the connections that bind them together in spite of perceived differences.[22] So for instance, the repetition of אשרי encloses both psalms 'zu einer gewissen Einheit zusammen'.[23] While his view of Psalm 2 as specifying what is only generally stated in Psalm 1[24] does not agree with the reading taken here, he rightly identifies the futility ('Nichtigkeit') of those critics that see only separating factors and assign each to different authors and times.[25]

Another nineteenth-century commentator, E.W. Hengstenberg, denies that the first two psalms constitute an undivided whole, but is well aware of common subject matter such as the destiny of the righteous and the wicked of the first, repeated in the second with application to the Messiah and his enemies.[26] Also noted by him is the benediction beginning the first and ending the second, reference to perishing in the way in 2.12 and 1.6, and meditation of the nations in the second contrasted with the meditation of the righteous in the first.[27] He concludes that, although separate, both psalms were authored by the same individual.[28] In spite of these parallels noticed by Hengestenberg he does not produce a thoroughgoing and integrated interpretation of them. Rather, his discussion of their resemblances is aimed at proving common authorship. Since there are 'important grounds in Psalm second for ascribing it to David, we would hence be entitled to regard him as the author also of the first'.[29] In spite of the suggestive statement that 'both Psalms were composed by the same author, and were meant by him as different parts of one whole', Hengstenberg did not follow through with further corroboration.[30]

(ed. Hilton C. Oswald; St Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1974), pp. 11-41. John Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, I (trans. James Anderson; 5 vols.; Edinburgh: The Calvin Translation Society, instituted in 1843; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999), pp. 1-27.

22. Ferdinand Hitzig, *Die Psalmen* (Leipzig: C.F. Winter, 1863), p. 1, 'Die beiden Stücke bilden also keineswegs zusammmen Ein opus bipartitum; gleichwohl besteht zwischen ihnen Verbindung und Verwandschaft'.
23. Hitzig, *Psalmen*, p. 1.
24. Hitzig, *Psalmen*, p. 1.
25. Hitzig, *Psalmen,* p. 2.
26. E.W. Hengstenberg, *Commentary on the Psalms* (trans. P. Fairbairn and J. Thomson; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 3rd edn, 1851), p. 5.
27. Hengstenberg, *Psalms*, p. 6.
28. Hengstenberg, *Psalms*, p. 6.
29. Hengstenberg, *Psalms*, p. 6.
30. Hengstenberg, *Psalms*, p. 6.

F. Delitzsch likewise recognizes corresponding vocabulary between the two along with their introductory character, while denying their original unity and common authorship.[31] However, he cannot see common subject matter between the two even if 'they coincide in some respects'.[32] Consequently he suggests that the two are related only so far as that 'the one is adapted to form the *præmium* of the Psalter from its ethical, the other from its prophetic character' and that Psalm 1 is 'the proper prologue of the Psalter'.[33] This view persists to the present by many of those who purport to take seriously the canonical arrangement.

Joseph Alexander, another nineteenth-century commentator, understood that the book of Psalms 'was not thrown together at random'.[34] As for Psalms 1 and 2, he discerns 'a very strong affinity between them' and considers that the similarity in vocabulary of 1.1 and 6 with 2.12 'brings the two into connection, as parts of one harmonious composition'.[35] Such statements certainly are an improvement on those of Delitzsch and Hengstenberg but lack the requisite accompanying elaboration and explanation.

A relatively overlooked study from the same century is that of Forbes.[36] His observation of arrangement in the external shape of the Psalter led him to study the internal connections.[37] He concludes regarding the internal arrangement that 'the order in which we now possess them they have been arranged and connected together with very great care, so as to bring out and enforce certain important truths with a clearness and distinctness not to be mistaken'.[38] Concerning Psalms 1 and 2, he notes connections between them such as the like beginning of the former and end of the latter ('blessed') and the common verb הגה, but he considers the relation of each to the 'revealed law of Jehovah' as most important.[39] So Psalm 1 designates righteousness as the end to be attained and Psalm 2 faith as the means to that end.[40] However, it is the same blessedness predicated of the individual in Ps. 1.1 (אשרי האישׁ) that is applied to all who trust in 2.12 (אשרי כל), not 'righteousness' specifically. The opening term אשרי of 1.1 is defined as absolute success in v. 3 along the lines of

31. Franz Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*. V. *Psalms* (trans. F. Bolton; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), pp. 19-20, 82.
32. Delitzsch, *Psalms*, p. 82.
33. Delitzsch, *Psalms*, p. 82.
34. Joseph A. Alexander, *Commentary on the Psalms* (Edinburgh: A. Elliot & J. Thin, 1864; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1991), p. 12.
35. Alexander, *Psalms*, pp. 20, 27.
36. John Forbes, *Studies on the Book of Psalms: The Structural Connection of the Book of Psalms, Both in Single Psalms and in the Psalter as an Organic Whole* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1888).
37. Forbes, *Studies*, p. 2.
38. Forbes, *Studies*, p. 2.
39. Forbes, *Studies*, p. 197.
40. Forbes, *Studies*, p. 199.

Joshua's victory, which is further elaborated in Psalm 2. So the precise and explicit message of the dual introduction is that the faithful participate in the list of successes attributed to the individual throughout both psalms. This is not to deny that implicitly their trust in 2.12 also clarifies their attributed righteousness in 1.5-6. Nonetheless, Forbes's serious attempt to interpret and integrate the shared lexical data of two deliberately juxtaposed psalms was a step in the right direction.[41]

The indisputably dominant figure of twentieth-century psalm studies was Gunkel, and his influence casts a long shadow to this day. His negative verdict on the usefulness of the Psalter's arrangement has had a chilling effect on subsequent study reaching to the present day:

> Daß die Anordnung der Psalmen nicht aus einem sachlichen Einteilungsgrunde erfolgt ist, ist leicht einzusehen. Nach den einzelnen Gattungen sind sie jedenfalls nicht zusammengestellt worden… Auch nach den in den Überschriften genannten Verfassernamen ist das Ganze nicht geordnet worden… Da einfache klare Gründe für die Anordnung der Psalmen nicht nachzuweisen sind…[42]

Due to his influence, the little progress that was made at the end of the nineteenth century was put on hold for the better part of one hundred years. Auwers has correctly diagnosed commentaries subsequent to his influential work:

> L'exégèse du Psautier héritée de Hermann Gunkel s'est largement désintéressée de la configuration du recueil lui-même. Les dernières pages de son *Einleitung in die Psalmen,* consacrées au Psautier comme ensemble, montrent que le père de la *formgeschichtliche Schule* considérait le rassemblement des psaumes en collections successives comme étant sans incidence sur l'interprétation des piéces elles-mêmes. Les commentaires du Psautier sont encore largement tributaires de ce jugement de valeur.[43]

41. Forbes's analysis of the sequence of Psalms 2–3 (*Studies*, pp. 201-202) is more convincing, as will be noted below in Chapter 4.

42. Hermann Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen: Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels* (Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, Ergänzungsband zur II Abteilung; completed by J. Begrich; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933), pp. 434-36. See also Gunkel in *Reden und Aufsätze*, p. 93: 'In der Sammlung des Psalters steht jedes Lied für sich allein, ohne daß wir das Recht hätten es mit dem vorhergehenden oder dem folgenden zusammenzunehmen'. The confidence with which Gunkel makes these sweeping and dismissive statements about the arrangement is unsettling. His reasoning based on the fact that they do not follow *Gattungen* of his own making overlooks the possibility that the redactor's editorial agenda was quite unlike his own. Likewise, the fact that superscripted authors are not grouped together does not negate the possibility of a purposeful arrangement based on other criteria. His assertions, apparently accepted by many since, are simply preliminary and uncorroborated.

43. Jean-Marie Auwers, *La composition littéraire du psautier: un état de la question* (Cahiers de la Revue biblique, 46; Paris: Gabalda, 2000), p. 5.

In light of Gunkel's very own diagnosis, his form-critical method and the wholistic or canonical reading offered here are fundamentally at odds with each other. Form criticism rejects *a priori* the canonical arrangement and then rearranges the Psalter according to its own criteria. Consequently, attempts to combine the two mutually exclusive approaches are ultimately flawed.

In spite of the dominating influence of Gunkel through the better part of the twentieth century, and its attendant stifling effect on study of the *configuration canonique*, there were exceptions to the trend. M. Manatti and E. de Solms asserted that the location of each psalm was not fortuitous:

> …ceux qui ont accompli la tâche de rassembler les psaumes et de les mettre dans l'ordre actuel, ont fait un travail qui dépasse de loin la simple compilation: la place de chaque psaume n'est pas fortuite, et l'ensemble est comparable à une œuvre musical avec retour des mêmes motifs, chaque fois transposés.[44]

Indeed, the analogy with musical composition is apt given the many examples of repetition at every level throughout the Psalter.[45] Concerning Psalms 1 and 2, they have rightly noted that the juxtaposition was not artificial, but rather the latter provides continuity to the themes introduced in the former, and together they form an introduction to the Psalter:

> N'est-il pas dit d'ailleurs que la voie des rebelles se perd (v. 12) comme se perd celle des impies en Ps. *1*, 6? Ce n'est pas par un procédé artificiel que le Psaume *2* a été joint au Psaume *1* pour former le prélude du psautier; malgré la différence de style, ils ont été mis intentionnellement à la suite l'un de l'autre, pour préciser que l'opposition des deux voies est un gigantesque affrontement, que la réussite de Juste, c'est le Jugement du Roi-Messie, que l'ère messianique, c'est la réalisation, à travers les aléas et les bouleversements visibles de l'histoire, du plan d'un Dieu tout puissant, qui fait avorter ces tentatives désespérées rien que par son rire. L'Alliance (Psaume *1*) et l'élection s'actualisent en alliance davidique (Psaume *2*) et élection de Sion (*2*, 6).[46]

These commentators seem to understand the logical interpretive outcome of juxtaposition and various linguistic parallels between both psalms, relating the wicked of Psalm 1 with the rebellious of Psalm 2, and likewise the Righteous with the King Messiah, in spite of the contemporary dogma of form criticism. The caveat above regarding difference in style ('malgré la

44. M. Manatti and E. de Solms, *Les Psaumes*, I (4 vols.; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1966), pp. 17-18.

45. One example of many that could be shown is the phenomenon of repeated interrogatives that characterize Book III. See Robert L. Cole, *The Shape and Message of Book III (Psalms 73–89)* (JSOTSup, 307; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), p. 231.

46. Manatti and de Solms, *Les Psaumes*, p. 92.

différence de style') between the two psalms may be rooted in form-critical presuppositions, and the assertion that these gathered texts originated in the cult ('des compilateurs se sont préoccupés de rassembler les texts utilisés pour le culte')[47] confirms that suspicion. Nonetheless, it did not prevent them from recognizing the general purpose implied by their pairing.

Another study that touched on the subject, albeit briefly, of the first two psalms, was that of Zimmerli in 1972.[48] Among the twin psalms mentioned besides the first two are 3 and 4, 32 and 33, 39 and 40, 43 and 44, 69 and 70, 73 and 74, etc., with an extended discussion of the two pairs of Psalms 111–112 and 105–106. He observes the example of *dislegomenon* in Psalms 73 and 74, which constitutes a fitting illustration of how the sequence of the Psalter is surely deliberate, and consequently interpretive.[49] His rhetorical question regarding such links, 'Ist das nur Zufall?', is appropriate in light of the numerous examples he mentions, and to them could be added many more.[50]

As for Psalms 1–2, Zimmerli mentions the conspicuous linking *Stichwörter* of הגה, דרך and אבד.[51] The characterization of the repeated הגה in 1.2 and 2.1 as 'gewiß nicht ganz gleichartige', fails to grasp the role of Psalm 2 in supplying information missing in Psalm 1 regarding either the wicked or the blessed one.[52] Psalm 1 does not reveal to its readers the object of the wicked's meditation, which information is supplied in 2.1-2. The contrast between the individual's meditation on the Lord's instruction (תורת יהוה), and the nations' (who are the wicked of Psalm 1 now specified more fully) deliberated rebellion in 2.2 against that very Lord, is in fact closely drawn. Likewise, the non-session of Ps. 1.1 (לא ישב) is deliberately paralleled in 2.4 with actual session (יושב), as will be seen in the discussion of Chapter 3.[53]

47. Manatti and de Solms, *Les Psaumes*, p. 17.

48. Walther Zimmerli, 'Zwillingspsalmen', in Josef Schreiner (ed.), *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch: Beiträge zu Psalmen und Propheten* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1972), pp. 105-13.

49. Zimmerli, 'Zwillingpsalmen', p. 106. The twice-only repeated term is מִשְׁאוֹת/משׁוֹאוֹת (Pss. 73.18; 74.3).

50. Zimmerli, 'Zwillingpsalmen', p. 106. For example, the collocation of זקף כפופים occurs only in the adjacent Pss. 145.14 and 146.8, not only in the Psalter but in the entire MT. Otherwise, the root כפף itself appears only five times, including the latter two. The combination of הוללים and רשעים is found only in Pss. 73.3 and 75.5 in the entire MT. Here the answer to the complaint of Ps. 73 comes two psalms later, not in the immediately following Ps. 74. The masculine plural ptc. הוללים appears only once again in the MT in Ps. 5.6, but even there it is preceeded in v. 5 by the singular רשע. Again, 'Ist das nur Zufall?'

51. Zimmerli, 'Zwillingpsalmen', p. 106. Somehow, the equally 'conspicuous' contacts of ישב in 1.1 and 2.4, or נתן in 1.3 and 2.8, are omitted.

52. Zimmerli, 'Zwillingpsalmen', p. 106.

53. This lexical parallel is accompanied by further confirming phonological and semantic ties.

C. Barth analyzed the sequence of psalms in Book I and included a listing of what were, in his opinion, conspicuous links from psalm to psalm.[54] The choice of Book I stemmed from its supposed antiquity and generic uniformity.[55] Here modern conceptions of genre are introduced early and confirmed by his conclusion that this analysis of the psalms according to context is a viable method along with Gunkel's equally valid claims.[56] After a cataloguing of verbal parallels the data is categorized and analyzed briefly.

In the case of Psalms 1 and 2, Barth lists four verbal parallels he considers conspicuous, leaving out half a dozen others apparently either considered casual or simply overlooked.[57] He does refer to the pacement of Psalms 1 and 2 at the beginning presumably as a 'Proömium' to the entire Psalter, but without further elaboration.[58] Later the double occurrence of אשרי in Psalms 1–2 and Psalms 40–41 is identified as a frame around the first book.[59]

As for the repetition of the root הגה in Pss 1.1 and 2.1, Barth characterizes it as one of two cases of 'purely superficial similarities'.[60] Such a conclusion is certainly preliminary without a previous detailed analysis. Likewise, the vocabulary reckoned as evidence of *concatenatio* is not accompanied by any meaningful discussion of their purpose and role. One cannot help but suspect that the debilitating influence of *Gattungsforschung* prevented an honest appraisal of the well-integrated pair that is Psalms 1–2. Among examples of such unfounded certainty, perhaps none surpasses that of B.D. Eerdmans:

> But for Pss i and cl, an opening and a closing psalm of a general character, various types of songs are heaped up in it higgledly-piggledly, like manuscripts in the corner of a Genizah…[61]

Ironically Eerdmans's disparagement of the order is found within a discussion that rejects Gunkel's categories.[62] Nonetheless, he still attempts

54. Christoph Barth, 'Concatenatio im ersten Buch des Psalters', in B. Benzing, O. Böcher and G. Mayer (eds.), *Wort und Wirklichkeit* (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1976), pp. 30-40.

55. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 33 n. 18.

56. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 39. On pp. 37-38 Barth speculates on a later insertion of Pss. 8, 19 and 29 which do not conform to the sequence of *Gattungen.*

57. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 33. Those Barth omitted (נתן, ישב, ענה, על, כל) can be shown to be equally important in the integrated message that Psalms 1 and 2 express, as will be argued in Chapters 2 and 3.

58. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 33.

59. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 36.

60. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 36, '*rein äußerlicher ähnlichkeit*' (italics his).

61. B.D. Eerdmans, *The Hebrew Book of Psalms* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1947), pp. 6-7.

62. Eerdmans, *The Hebrew*, pp. 6-11.

to locate these texts as prayers or songs from a variety of ancient Israelite contexts that includes the temple.[63] Psalm 1 is labeled 'a piece of wisdom', and nary a reference is made to *concatenatio* between it and the second psalm in comments throughout.[64]

As for Barth, he concluded that the *concatenatio* found between most of the psalms in Book I does not prove it is thoroughgoing or uniform.[65] In support of this assertion he lists various pairs of psalms where the parallels are 'weak', such as Psalms 7–8, 8–9, 22–23, among others.[66] The case of Psalms 22–23 in fact exhibits a strong and deliberate contrast between full assurance of God's presence (23.4, אתה עמדי) and desperate protest at his abandonment (22.2, למה עזבתני). Likewise the contrast between a sheep enjoying full care and security in Psalm 23 (vv. 1-4), and the attack by wild animals on the subject of Psalm 22 (vv. 13, 17, 21) is undoubtedly deliberate. So such a characterization of Book I is preliminary at best.

The sequence of Psalms 2–3 is identified by Barth as one of those that exhibits only one single example of 'Verkettung' (הר קדשׁ, 2.6; 3.5), in support of the idea that Book I lacks uniformity.[67] This overlooks the important repetition of על (as 'against') in both 2.2 and 3.7, or the interplay of 'I… you' in 2.6, 7 and 'You…I' in 3.4, 7, among others.[68] Furthermore, the repetition of רשׁעים in Psalm 1 and Psalm 3, characterized by Barth from other examples as 'skipping over' a psalm (Psalm 2), misses entirely the fact that the wicked of the first psalm are identified through various means as the recalcitrant rulers and nations of the second.[69] In sum, Barth's analysis goes little beyond a mechanical listing of parallels and even in that task comes up short.

Claus Westermann's study of the Psalms entitled *Praise and Lament in the Psalms* certainly betrays its form-critical stance from the outset.[70] Nonetheless, he takes issue in an added chapter on the formation of the Psalter[71] with those seeing no classification according to content, but rather only formal criteria behind the arrangement.[72] Earlier in the book he had

63. Eerdmans, *The Hebrew*, p. 90.
64. Eerdmans, *The Hebrew*, pp. 94, 91-100.
65. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 38.
66. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 38.
67. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 38.
68. The present study will argue that the integration of these psalms is such that it extends to and includes what is perceived as common Hebrew vocabulary, as well that which is more distinctive. An example in Pss. 1–3 is that most common preposition על.
69. Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 37, 'übersprungen'.
70. Claus Westermann, *Praise and Lament in the Psalms* (trans. Keith R. Crim and Richard N. Soulen; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981).
71. Westermann, *Praise*, pp. 250-58.
72. Westermann, *Praise*, p. 250.

stated that, 'in the structure of the Psalter, many more interconnections are to be found among them than is commonly assumed in Introductions to the Psalms'.[73] He also lays the blame at Gunkel's feet for the unquestioned acceptance of formal categorizations in research up to that time.[74] According to Westermann, Gunkel 'had no interest in how the collection was handed to us',[75] and provides support for this assertion from Gunkel himself:

> That the arrangement of the Psalms is not the result of a classification system based on subject matter is easy to see. In any case they have not been grouped according to separate literary categories. Thus, for example, in Book One of the Psalms the hymns (Pss 8, 19, 24.1-2, 20, 33) are not side by side; the royal Psalms (Pss 2, 18, 20, 21) do not form a homogeneous group, and the songs of the lament of the individual, just to name one more, are scattered about (Pss 3, 5, 6, 7, 13, 22, etc.). The remaining books produce the same results.[76]

Westermann is undoubtedly correct here in his analysis of Gunkel, who instead of considering that there may have been another principle at work simply dismissed the present arrangement without further consideration.

However, Westermann's theory of an earlier Psalter beginning with Psalm 1 and ending with 119 since both belong 'to religious wisdom or to the religion of the law' or the framing of Psalms 3–88 'by two royal psalms, Psalms 2 and 89', also ignores evidence for the traditional canonical arrangement. The evidence linking the first two psalms is disregarded in order to reconstruct the supposed earlier shape, as are the literary bonds between Psalms 88 and 89, or 89 and 90ff. Again, the form-critical stance inherent in his labeling of the first two psalms inhibited appreciation of the role they play vis-à-vis each other. Furthermore, there are also numerous examples of cohesion between Psalms 1–2, and 3 immediately following, as will be shown in Chapter 4. In spite of these shortcomings, Westermann's willingness to cast doubt on Gunkel's negative assessment of the Psalter's arrangement undoubtedly began to open the door for future progress on the issue. According to Auwers, Westermann was 'Le premier exégète rompu aux méthodes gunkéliennes à se préoccuper de la configuration du Psautier'.[77]

Peter Craigie's commentary also includes a section on 'The Compilation of the Psalter'.[78] This particular discussion is introduced by a comparison

73. Westermann, *Praise*, p. 12.
74. Westermann, *Praise*, p. 251.
75. Westermann, *Praise*, p. 251.
76. Westermann, *Praise*, p. 252. Westermann's citation of Gunkel is from the latter's *Einleitung*, p. 434.
77. Auwers, *La composition*, p. 17.
78. Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC, 19; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), pp. 27-31.

of the Book of Psalms with contemporary hymnbooks, and so it is deemed 'the hymnal of Israel', consisting of 'an anthology' of songs from different people and centuries.[79] The presence of an unmusical Psalm 1 (defined as a 'wisdom psalm' by Craigie himself) at the very outset militates against a 'hymnbook' theory.[80] One might expect the first piece of a hymnbook to be a hymn. Even if Psalm 1 were simply a more prosaic introduction to the hymnbook that follows, one could expect some preludial reference to the music or its performance at the outset. He does recognize Psalm 1 (and possibly 2) as an introduction, and 150 at the other end as a conclusion, but denies that any 'grand design' is discernible.[81]

As for Craigie's discussion of the first two psalms themselves, they are categorized in typical fashion under the labels wisdom and royal.[82] As a result, the analysis of linking evidence between Psalms 1 and 2, both textual and historical, is predictable. The only internal textual evidence mentioned, among the many that exist, is the macarism of אשׁרי at either end.[83] Given the fact that overt linking evidence is hard to ignore, he attempts to combine it with the traditional classifications and concludes that they 'intended to provide a double perspective in introduction; Psalm 1 provides an introduction from the perspective of wisdom, whereas Psalm 2 provides a prophetic approach to the book'.[84]

The modern Hebrew commentary by Amos Hakham also notes briefly the lexical ties from psalm to psalm. In the case of Psalms 1–2 he characterizes them as joined together into one unit and serving as the opening to the book.[85] He observes that the opposing stance of the wicked against the righteous in the first psalm corresponds to the same of the wicked nations against the Lord and his messiah in the second.[86] Note is taken as well of the repeated terminology of אשׁרי, and the combination of דרך and אבד.[87] Typically, however, as is far too common, there is no thoroughgoing or integrated reading of the two psalms beyond these brief observations.

Joseph Brennan's commendable article discussing the sequence of Psalms 1–8 argues for 'an inner coherence for an otherwise apparently disorganized collection' and notes 'the highly distinctive nature of many

79. Craigie, *Psalms*, pp. 27-28, 30.
80. Craigie, *Psalms*, p. 58.
81. Craigie, *Psalms*, p. 30.
82. Craigie, *Psalms*, pp. 58, 64.
83. Craigie, *Psalms*, p. 59.
84. Craigie, *Psalms*, p. 60.
85. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. 3 (ג): שני המזמורים הראשונים משמשים פתיחה לספר תהלים כלו; p. 10 [י]: והוא מצטרף אל מזמור א לחטיבה אחת.
86. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. 10 (י).
87. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. 10 (י).

of the verbal links'.[88] He also observes that the sequential reading 'opens the way to an eschatological and messianic interpretation of many texts which had originally only a limited national and historic setting'. Here of course he evinces a form-critical stance while at the same time attempting to grapple with canonical linking evidence of a linguistic nature. As for Psalms 1–2, he points to the various connecting verbal links, and the inclusio surrounding them, which he describes as binding 'the two compositions into a unity'.[89] Nonetheless, a thoroughgoing discussion of their integration, which admittedly would be beyond the scope of a single article, is lacking.

William Brownlee's study of Psalms 1 and 2 includes analysis of common vocabulary (four items) and theme as 'coincidental' originally, but 'this was strengthened through editorial adjustment of the language of the second psalm to that of the first'.[90] The four verbal parallels include אשרי (1.1; 2.12), ישב (1.1; 2.4), הגה (1.2; 2.1) and דרך אבד (1.6; 2.12).[91] His characterization of the repetition of ישב as 'sheer coincidence' overlooks the accompanying semantic and phonological parallels that taken together constitute a deliberate reprise between the two psalms.[92] Three examples given of thematic parallels between the two psalms are well founded (counsel in 1.1 and 2.2, law and decree in 1.2 and 2.7, success of man in Psalm 1 and victory of son in Psalm 2), but lack, as is customary with most commentators, a discussion of their ultimate implications for interpretation.[93] However he includes comments such as the following:

> The just man recites Yahweh's Law and the king recounts Yahweh's decree… the prosperity and success of the godly man of Ps. 1 has its counterpart in the victory of the Lord's 'son' over the nations in Ps. 2.[94]

Following these suggestive observations Brownlee asserts the pair was used historically as a coronation liturgy and their pairing is 'not a merely messianically inspired fusion of the two psalms'.[95] He does discuss briefly the

88. Joseph P. Brennan, 'Psalms 1–8: Some Hidden Harmonies', *BTB* 10 (1980), pp. 25-29 (25, 28).

89. Brennan, 'Psalms 1–8', p. 25.

90. William H. Brownlee, 'Psalms 1–2 as a Coronation Liturgy', *Biblica* 53 (1971), pp. 321-36 (322-25).

91. Brownlee, 'Psalms 1–2', p. 323. He has overlooked the use of נתן in 1.3 and 2.8, שפט in 1.5 and 2.10 and יום in 1.2 and 2.7. As will be seen, the albeit ubiquitous preposition על used with the locative force in 1.3 and 2.6 is deliberately accompanied by phonological and thematic resonance as well.

92. See the discussion in Chapter 3.

93. Brownlee, 'Psalms 1–2', p. 325.

94. Brownlee, 'Psalms 1–2', p. 324.

95. Brownlee, 'Psalms 1–2', p. 334. John Willis's critique of Brownlee in 'Psalm 1–An Entity', pp. 381-401, rightly takes him to task for taking the two psalms as a single piece. However, it does not follow that they are to be read in isolation one from

messianic interpretation of the two but essentially relegates it to a secondary status for interpretation.[96] His conclusion that 'the psalms serve as a fitting introduction to the Psalter; but this does not necessarily explain the purpose of their fusion' is revealing of his interest, not in their function and meaning within the Psalter, but rather in reconstructing on the basis of meager, if any evidence, some ancient coronation rite.[97] Undoubtedly Brownlee took serious note of the effort to fuse the first two psalms together, in contrast to Gunkel's view of two conflicting *Gattungen*. On the other hand, the latter's influence is such that their *primary* role as introduction to the book is basically overlooked. Indeed, it was difficult for Brownlee, as is still common, to escape the long shadow cast by *Gattungsgeschichte*.

By contrast, a decade later the French scholar Pierre Auffret produced a study of Psalm 2 on strictly literary grounds, including a fruitful discussion of its relationship to Psalm 1.[98] He founded his observations not only on lexical similarities but also on 'crossed symmetry' of surface literary structures.[99]

> In both psalms four terms are used sometimes in reference to the righteous (or, the anointed one) and sometimes in reference to the wicked (or, kings of the earth)…the way of the wicked (or, of the kings) appears at the beginning and at the end of the whole formed by the two psalms, and it is set in opposition to the way of the righteous in one of the central units.[100]

another. He argues for the discreteness of the two based on differing form-critical categories of 'Wisdom Psalm' versus 'Royal Psalm' (and so a different original *Sitz im Leben* for the latter from the former), but never attempts an explanation for the fact that the Psalter's redactor clearly did not take modern categories as the basis for its editing (p. 392). Arguing against their interrelatedness based on the premise of form criticism is to beg the question. A comparable example from another biblical book can be found in Prov. 31.1-9 and 31.10-31 (an alphabetic acrostic), two discrete texts. Nonetheless, the redactor of the book has made it clear that the two were juxtaposed purposefully and meaningfully, as numerous verbal parallels confirm: לנשׁים חילך, 31.3 and אשׁת חיל, 31.10; עני ואביון, 31.9 and לאביון…לעני, 31.20; פתח פיך, 31.8, 9 and פיה פתחה, 31.26, etc. Again, Willis states that 'Pss 1 and 2 must be interpreted as two separate psalms', since Ps. 1 has its own 'internal unity and strophic structure', but such evidence does not support the isolated readings of either one (p. 393).

96. 'However, one should not settle for this purely Messianic interpretation without seriously considering a coronation use, either late pre-Exilic or early post-Exilic' (Brownlee, 'Psalms 1–2', p. 326).

97. Brownlee, 'Psalms 1–2', p. 325.

98. Pierre Auffret, *The Literary Structure of Psalm 2* (trans. David J.A. Clines; JSOTSup, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1977).

99. Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, p. 31. While the 'crossed symmetry' may be disputed, the lexical, and accompanying syntactical, morphological, and phonological links all point to a deliberate editorially induced integration of the two texts.

100. Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, p. 34.

Here he notes the logical implication of parallel terms such as דרך, ישב, הגה and שפט across both psalms is to associate the righteous of Psalm 1 with the anointed one of Psalm 2, and the wicked of Psalm 1 with the kings of Psalm 2. Auffret observes further links between the two psalms based on thematic analogy and the lexical parallels of 'giving' (יתן) of fruit in 1.3 and 'giving' (ואתנה) of the nations as an inheritance in 2.7-9, along with 'daily' (יומם) of 1.2 and 'today' (היום) of 2.7:

> Psalm 1.4 and 2.7-9 do not present us with identical words, but we can see well enough the analogy between what the wind does in face of the impotent resistance of the stubble in 1.4b and what the 'son' does in face of the impotent resistance of the nations in 2.9… Thus in both places the reappearance of the adversaries is intentional. But in 2.7-9 uses again two words from 1.2-3: *ym* and *ntn*. In 1.2-3 it is the righteous man who chooses to meditate on the law all day long and thus in the end yields his fruit. In 2.7-9 it is Yahweh who chooses the day when he makes of his elect one his son and gives him the nations as an inheritance. So there are two choices, and two gifts, which correspond well to one another.[101]

While Auffret does not identify the righteous man of Psalm 1 with the anointed son of Psalm 2 exclusively, his recognition of implications based on linguistic data is impressive. As will be seen later, there also exists parallel phonological data between 1.4 and 2.9 (and between 1.3 and 1.6) that supports a more precise and exclusive identification of personae between the two psalms.

In a later study Auffret makes highly suggestive statements regarding the correspondences created by ישב and הגה in 1.1-2 and 2.1, 4, that anticipate comments in Chapter 3 of this present study:

> Les deux termes *yšb* et *hgh*…sont employés en sens contraire de l'un (session des méchants/murmure du juste) à l'autre (murmure des nations/session de Yahvé) psaumes, mais dans la même succession méchants–nations/juste–Yahvé au psaume 1 (*yšb*/*hgh*) comme au psaume 2 (*hgy*/*yšb*), l'ordre des mots récurrents étant seulement inversé. On voit ainsi se répondre session (*mwšb*) des méchants et murmure des nations de même que murmure du juste et session de Yahvé, et cela à l'intérieur de correspondances globales (1,1 // 2, 1–3 et 1, 2–3 // 2, 4–6).[102]

He follows logically the linguistic data in relating the wicked of Psalm 1 with the nations of Psalm 2, and on the same basis the 'juste' with 'Yahvé'.[103]

101. Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, pp. 32-33.

102. Pierre Auffret, *La sagesse a bati sa maison: études de structures littéraires dans l'Ancien Testament et spécialement dans les psaumes* (Fribourg, Switzerland: Editions Universitaires, 1982), p. 175. Note that in Ps. 2 the session is predicated specifically of 'Adonay', a difference of some import as will be seen.

103. Auffret, *La sagesse*, p. 175.

Nonetheless, in a listing of the four terms, דרך, ישב. הגה and שפט, and their referents in either psalm, the root ישב is said to describe the wicked and the righteous in 1.1b and Yahvé in 2.4a.[104] In fact, the heavenly session of 2.4 is predicated of אדני, not יהוה. Furthermore, Ps. 1.1 emphasizes where the righteous man does not sit, leaving identification of its precise locale until Psalm 2. Multiple links to Psalm 1 beyond the repeated Hebrew root ישב in 2.4 lead logically to another more startling conclusion: the actual session of the righteous man of Psalm 1 is identified in 2.4.[105]

Auffret rightly perceives the thorough integration of 2.11-12 into the second psalm itself, against Lipiński's view that they constitute, along with 1.1-6, an earlier 'halakhic paraphrase'.[106] Indeed, there exists abundant evidence (as will be presented in Chapter 3) supporting the cohesiveness and homogeneity of Psalm 2's final verses with the rest of Psalm 2. In sum, because Auffret analyzes the textual evidence linking these two psalms without explicitly stated form-critical preconditions, his conclusions are far more in line with the original intentions of the canonical editor. Their ancient pairing and lexical linking of what modern scholars typically label as distinctly different 'torah', or 'wisdom' and 'royal' psalms, reveal the absence of any such notions in the ancient juxtaposition of these texts.

Joseph Reindl examined the Psalter from the perspective of its final shape and asserts correctly that what we have is a unified work, not a more or less ordered collection of individual psalms.[107] However, his analysis is heavily influenced by similar preconceptions. So Psalms 146–149 are all 'Lobpsalmen (allerdings aus unterschiedlichen Gattungen)'[108] and Psalm 1's shape and content 'weist den Ps. 1 als ein Stück weisheitlicher Lehrdichtung aus…'[109] In Reindl's view the latter was put at the beginning of the Psalter to serve as its preface and so give the book its interpretation.[110] But he offers no discussion of Psalm 1's overt ties to Psalm 2, presumably because the latter does not exhibit these 'wisdom' characteristics. While Reindl recognizes that there is a special relation of individual psalms to their neighbors ('sie wären nich mehr als einzelne Psalmen…sondern

104. Auffret, *La sagesse*, p. 177.

105. See the full discussion in Chapter 3 below.

106. Auffret, *La sagesse*, p. 178 n. 38. See Edward Lipiński, 'Macarismes et psaumes de congratulation', *RB* 75 (1968), pp. 321-67 (331, 339).

107. Joseph Reindl, 'Weisheitliche Bearbeitung von Psalmen: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Sammlung des Psalter', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Vienna, 1980* (VTSup, 32; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981), pp. 333-59 (336, 339).

108. Reindl, 'Weisheitliche', p. 337.

109. Reindl, 'Weisheitliche', p. 338.

110. Reindl, 'Weisheitliche', p. 339: 'dieses Lehrgedichtes…er hat ihn aber offenbar als geeignet befunden, als Vorrede für den Psalter zu dienen und damit seine eigene Aufassung von diesem Buch auszüdrucken'.

jeweils in eine besondere Beziehung zu den benachbarten Psalmen gesetzt worden'),[111] the sway of received tradition prevented full appreciation of the editor's purpose in creating a paired introduction.

Another discussion of the association and close relationship of Psalms 1 and 2 was offered by Gerald Sheppard in 1980.[112] He addresses the problem, inherent in a form-critical approach, of how Psalm 1 serves with Psalm 2 as a preface to the Psalter.[113] The 'form critical problem', as he expresses it,[114] of whether Psalm 1 is wisdom or torah is solved for Shephard by combining the two.[115] He then goes on to claim that the first psalm 'explicitly charges its readers to study "the Torah" ', an assertion not supported by any paraenetic or volitive vocabulary within it.[116] It is remarkable how form criticism has limited the discussion to two options, wisdom and torah, which ignores the best option, the man (האישׁ) as the central subject and theme of the psalm. All verbs and pronouns in the first three verses, which constitute close to two-thirds of the poem, have as subject or antecedent this individual.[117]

Sheppard's discussion of the correspondence between Psalms 1 and 2 at the thematic and verbal level is impressive, as is his statement that, 'Ps. 1 and 2 are so linked redactionally that it is a natural consequence that they may be evaluated *in tandem* as the first psalm of the Psalter… Ps. 1 and 2 have been redactionally ordered into a combined prologue to the Psalter.'[118] Likewise is his recognition that the wicked of Psalm 1 are identified as nations and rulers in Psalm 2, and the king of the latter walks in the way of the former.[119] Nonetheless, the filter of form criticism has prevented him from recognizing of the royal and military characteristics of Psalm 1's main subject. Psalm 1 is not 'a didactic generalization…modeled in historical terms by Ps. 2', and certainly the redactor of the Psalter who paired it with the second psalm did not consider it as such.[120] Rather, he understood as perfectly the two complementary. Nor is their juxtaposition and placement at the head of the Psalter the result of 'a redaction, which gives a secondary context

111. Reindl, 'Weisheitliche', p. 336.

112. Gerald T. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament* (BZAW, 151; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1980), pp. 136-44.

113. Sheppard, *Wisdom*, p. 142.

114. Sheppard, *Wisdom*, p. 137.

115. Sheppard, *Wisdom*, p. 138: 'the precise function of Ps. 1 with its concern for Torah and wisdom…'.

116. Sheppard, *Wisdom*, p. 138.

117. Even the pronominal suffixes of פריו יתן בעתו are ultimately referring to this individual.

118. Sheppard, *Wisdom*, pp. 141-42.

119. Sheppard, *Wisdom*, p. 142.

120. Sheppard, *Wisdom*, p. 140.

to once independent psalms'.[121] As the present study will reveal, the integration on many levels between the pair may render the term 'redaction' for this literary production otiose. The remarkable harmony and resonance between them suggests they were deliberately composed for their present place and function.

Sheppard was a student of Childs, whose introduction in 1979 addressed the eschatological coloring produced by the canonical shaping principally through the placement of so-called royal psalms.[122] So he accepts as a given Gunkel's formulations in spite of the fact that they fundamentally and methodologically undermine a serious grappling with the canonical shape:

> The crucial historical critical discovery came with the form-critical work of H. Gunkel who established conclusively that the historical settings of the psalms were not to be sought in particular historical events, but in the cultic life of the community…in general the main lines of Gunkel's form-critical analysis have been sustained… Indeed the breadth of the modern consensus which has formed around the general outlines of Gunkel's programme remains impressive. There is a wide agreement which is both international and interconfessional that Gunkel succeeded in bringing a new order into the study of this literature.[123]

His concurrence with the method produced a predictable analysis of Psalms 1 and 2. Read through the prism of form criticism they appear to be disparate and unrelated:

> Although the content of Pss 1 and 2 differ greatly, there are some signs that the redactor sought to link the two psalms together… Perhaps one should leave open the question of whether or not Ps. 2 was conceived of as a formal part of the introduction. The evidence is not sufficient to press the point.[124]

In fact, the opposite is actually the case, with the evidence being quite compelling. Links of a lexical, thematic and phonological nature confirm not only their deliberate juxtaposition but also their resulting introductory function. For the redactor, both psalms were of a coherent and consistent message. Since the latter was obviously not operating from a form-critical

121. Sheppard, *Wisdom*, p. 144.

122. Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), pp. 515-18.

123. Childs, *Introduction*, pp. 509-10. This assessment of the method is much rosier than that offered by Childs himself in an earlier article: 'The classical form critical method…seems now to be offering diminishing returns…when the proposed *Sitz im Leben* rests on an extremely fragile and hypothetical base' (Brevard S. Childs, 'Reflections on the Modern Study of the Psalms', in Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke and Patrick D. Miller, Jr [eds.], *Magnalia Dei, The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976], pp. 377-88 [378]).

124. Childs, *Introduction*, p. 516.

perspective, it behooves readers interested in the 'canonical shaping'[125] and its effect to adopt the same reading strategy. As with Brennan, the psalms in Childs's view have been given a new meaning compared with that of their 'historical setting of ancient Israel'. They 'have been loosened from a given cultic context and the words assigned a significance in themselves as sacred scripture'.[126] In fact, the so-called cultic context of these two psalms is mere speculation while their fully integrated role and function is increasingly evident.

Another student of Childs, Gerald Wilson, produced a study on the canonical shaping of the Psalter that marked a turning point in the field.[127] Wilson discerned evidence for editorial shaping in the Psalter in the headings 'to group Pss and to provide transition between groupings…provide further evidence of editorial concern in the juxtaposition of Pss'.[128] As regards Psalms 1 and 2, he is heavily influenced by form criticism and follows the analysis of Willis and Childs.[129] So Psalm 1 alone serves as introduction to the entire Psalter since its subject matter is 'timeless and didactic', as opposed to the second psalm which is bound to historical events and so a separate piece.[130] He agrees with Willis in maintaining that although the two psalms share 'certain words and phrases…it does not show they should be interpreted together as one psalm'.[131] Indeed, discrete psalms they are, but this certainly does not negate evidence for their mutual interpretation.

Psalm 1 offers the reader according to Wilson, a pair of 'hermeneutical spectacles' with which to view the book's content, but overlooks evidence for its function in tandem with Psalm 2, to which it is inseparably joined.[132] Wilson discusses in more detail the role of Psalm 2, along with 72 and 89 in the overall shape of the Psalter's seams,[133] while again overlooking the interpretive implications behind the juxtaposition and similarities with Psalm 1. In fact, it appears that he subsequently ignored his own stated proposal when analyzing the first two psalms:

125. Childs, *Introduction*, p. 515.
126. Childs, *Introduction*, pp. 515, 517.
127. Gerald H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS, 76; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985).
128. Wilson, *The Editing*, p. 173.
129. Wilson, *The Editing*, pp. 205-208.
130. Wilson, *The Editing*, pp. 204-206.
131. Wilson, *The Editing*, p. 205. Here he quotes Willis ('Psalm 1–An Entity', p. 393).
132. Wilson, *The Editing*, p. 143. Rather than emphasizing 'individual meditation', the first psalm emphasizes *a specific individual's meditation*, which befits the chosen king à la Deut. 17.18-19 who is then identified in Ps. 2 as the chosen anointed king.
133. Wilson, *The Editing*, pp. 207-209.

> I am convinced that any progress in understanding the purposeful arrangement of the psalms in the Psalter must begin…with a detailed and careful analysis of the linguistic, literary and thematic linkages that can be discerned among the psalms.[134]

But contrary to his own words, he reads Psalm 1 as the introduction to the entire Psalter, while Psalm 2 is interpreted as the beginning of Book I, thus effectively separating what the final redactor plainly and deliberately knit together.[135] So Psalm 2 is to be read vis-à-vis Psalms 72 and 89 at the seams of Books II and III principally, not the immediately preceding Psalm 1.[136] Undoubtedly the Davidic resonance of Psalm 2 finds echoes in those particular psalms, as will be seen in comments on it here. But to speak of 'the disconnection that occurs' in attempting to bind Psalms 2 and 1 together, in spite of the enormous effort on the part of the redactor to join them, is undoubtedly due to the overriding influence of form criticism.[137] Wilson faults Sheppard for failing to 'recognize the significant placement of other royal psalms at the seams of the first three books', but he himself has ignored the cohesive and coherent nature of the two-psalm introduction.[138] As with any literary work, the misreading of the programmatic introduction to a book results in a flawed understanding of its content.

Wilson's initial work was certainly a watershed in the field and the result was an increasing number of studies that took seriously the canonical shape of the Psalter. However, as in most cases cited above, the new approach was simply added to the habitual practice of form criticism as if two methods that are fundamentally at odds with each other could be combined. Again, Wilson's own commentary showed very little application, if any, of his above quoted programmatic statement.[139] Following Wilson, scholars began to take note of canonical evidence, but the continuing influence of form criticism impeded a full appreciation not only of the Psalter's introduction but also the book at large.

134. Gerald H. Wilson, 'Understanding the Purposeful Arrangement of Psalms in the Psalter; Pitfalls and Promise', in J. Clinton McCann (ed.), *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (JSOTSup, 159; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 42-51 (50).

135. Wilson, 'Understanding', p. 201, and Gerald H. Wilson, 'The Use of Royal Psalms at the "Seams" of the Hebrew Psalter', *JSOT* 35 (1986), pp. 85-94 (88).

136. Gerald H. Wilson, *Psalms*, I (NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), p. 108. Also Gerald H. Wilson, 'King, Messiah, and the Reign of God: Revisiting the Royal Psalms and the Shape of the Psalter', in Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller, Jr (eds.), *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (VTSup, 99; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005), pp. 391-406 (395).

137. Wilson, *Psalms*, p. 395.

138. Wilson, *Psalms*, p. 395.

139. Wilson, *Psalms*.

In their commentary of the early 1990s, two German scholars, F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger, recognized the various problems that beset form criticism, but still considered it to be fruitful and not to be disputed.[140] So Psalm 1 is categorized according to traditional categories as a wisdom psalm, teaching a lesson for living and having its origin in political life and the wisdom school.[141] Psalm 2 (specifically vv. 1-9) is on the other hand a royal psalm that, along with Psalms 72 and 89, made up an earlier collection in the Psalter.[142] At the same time they recognize the redactionally produced unit that is Psalms 1 and 2, formed by 'Stichworte', and the consequent tie between the wicked of the first and recalcitrant nations of the second.[143] Nonetheless, fascination with form-critical categories has again precluded full recognition of the function of Psalm 1 vis-à-vis Psalm 2. In addition, once the role and function of the Psalter's introduction are understood, it becomes clear that the whole is not simply a meditative prayer book, as they maintain. Although Psalm 3 immediately following is a prayer in nature, its actual purpose in the Psalter must be determined following recognition of its overt cohesiveness and coherence with Psalms 1–2. As will be seen, it provides further exposition on the message of the introduction.

In a monograph on the composition of the Psalter, Matthias Millard notes similar terminology and themes between both psalms and the fact that they were read as one in various manuscripts.[144] He observes in particular the common theme of opposition or contrast between a godly individual and the ungodly, 'trotz des unterschiedlichen Motivfeldes von Weisheits—bzw. Königpsalmen'.[145] Parallelism is recognized between the two psalms so that Psalm 2 specifies the righteous (plural) of Psalm 1 with the king, and the wicked of Psalm 1 as the enemy kings.[146] Overlooked here is the fact that Psalm 1 also portrays a single king corresponding to the same in Psalm 2. Textual evidence, as will be seen, points to this identification, unless a prior categorization of the first psalm as a 'Weisheitspsalm' is assumed, which

140. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Die Psalmen*, p. 18: 'Daß der gattungsgeschichtliche Ansatz in der Psalmenexegese sehr fruchtbar war und sein kann, soll nicht bestritten werden. Aber seine Grenzen sind ebenso deutlich. Wir sehen vor allem folgende *Probleme*…'

141. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Die Psalmen*, p. 45: 'Ps. 1, der in Sprache und Bildwelt von der Weisheit als »Lebenslehre« geprägt ist… Die Gattung hat ihren »Sitz im Leben« ursprünglich im staatlich-politischen Leben und in der Weisheitschule.'

142. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Die Psalmen*, pp. 15, 51.

143. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Die Psalmen*, pp. 45, 51.

144. Millard, *Die Komposition*, p. 9.

145. Millard, *Die Komposition*, p. 9.

146. Millard, *Die Komposition*, p. 21: 'Ps. 2 spezifiziert den Gerechten von Ps. 1 auf den König und die Frevler von Psalm 1 auf die feindlichen König, dem entspricht die Ansage von Heil für den Gerechten bzw. den König'.

leads to a generalizing reading of it. Again, for the redactor of the Psalter in its canonical form there was no distinction in *Gattung* between the two psalms. Categories of 'wisdom' and 'royal' are modern impositions unrecognized by the ancient redactor. When two or three consecutive psalms do happen to come under the identical modern form category, such as Psalms 5–7,[147] it is due to the role they play in the unfolding message as envisaged by the book's redactor. The sequential Psalms 1–3, of wholly different categorization according to the modern method, are juxtaposed with definite compositional purposes in mind.

In the Spanish commentary by Luis Alonso Schökel and Cecilia Carniti, it is declared that the identification of Psalm 1 as a wisdom psalm is sure, and so the explanation of its relationship to Psalm 2, a royal psalm, is again predictable.[148] According to them, a secondary redaction connected the second psalm to the first by addition of the אשרי, and then additional verbal and thematic parallels took on further significance.[149] As a result Psalm 2 purportedly describes a concrete case, which the previous psalm had announced generally, but the correspondences should not be pushed too hard, and in the end it has too much individuality to become simply the illustration of a general principle.[150] Here the linking lexical and thematic evidence do not receive a thorough analysis since the two are of distinctive *Gattung*. Again, the weight of Gunkel's 'estudio de los géneros' prevents an appreciation of the ancient redactional and compositional intentions.[151]

Jean-Marie Auwers, in a commendable and useful study that opens with an informative history of the canonical approach since antiquity[152] and a thorough analysis of current studies (up to 2000), also discusses the shaping and present shape of the Psalter. Auwers understands well the radical departure from Gunkel that a unitary reading of the Psalter represents. Included is a discussion of Psalms 1 and 2 as 'l'introduction duelle' to the book of Psalms.[153] The 'dual' role is based apparently on the idea that Psalm

147. Gunkel, *Einleitung*, p. 172, classifies these under his category of individual laments.

148. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 130.

149. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 148.

150. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 148.

151. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 91. They list 11 different 'tipos o géneros' (pp. 91-92) and discuss them extensively (pp. 91-106).

152. Auwers, *La composition*. His opening statement (p. 5) summarizes well the history of interpretation in Gunkel's wake: 'L'exégèse du Psautier héritée de Hermann Gunkel s'est largement désintéressé de la configuration du recueil lui-même… Les commentaires du Psautier sont encore largement tributaires de ce jugement de valeur.'

153. Auwers, *La composition*, pp. 97-101, 123-29. The expression is not original to Auwers, as he notes (p. 123 n. 382).

2 functions as a preface to a 'national war songbook', and Psalm 1 makes of the collection a 'prayer book of the righteous'.[154]

Using standard form-critical terminology, Auwers labels Ps. 2.10-12 'sapiential' by virtue of their similar tone and vocabulary to Psalm 1, yet they are presumed to be at odds with 2.1-9.[155] He overlooks the fact that parallel vocabulary between Ps. 2.1 and Ps. 1.2 (הגה) should presumably identify the first verse of Psalm 2 as a wisdom piece. Likewise, the common vocabulary and theme between 1.1 and 2.4 place the latter (2.4) in the same category.[156] But since Psalm 2 (vv. 1-9) is a 'royal psalm',[157] this evidence is not pursued. Furthermore, form-critical assumptions require that the verbal parallels הגה (1.2; 2.1), נתן (1.3; 2.8) and ישב (1.1; 2.4) be downplayed and categorized as 'isolées et moins éloquentes', and that Ps. 2.10-12 be taken as in tension with the rest of the psalm.[158] In fact, these lexical parallels, being accompanied by others phonological, semantic and thematic, are integral and essential to a proper appreciation of the twofold introduction to the Psalter. Auffret rightly criticizes the restriction of parallels between Psalm 1 and Psalm 2 to the last two verses of Psalm 2:

> Il n'est donc pas justifié, selon nous, de limiter la parenté des deux psaumes à Ps. 1 + Ps. 2, 11-12… Les parentés de construction et de vocabulaire semblent bien indiquer une articulation entre les deux psaumes en leur entier, lesquels nous paraissent être l'un et l'autre des compositions fortement unifiées.[159]

While Auwers's study is laudable, and certainly an improvement on the standard fare, Psalm 1, instead of being the product of a purported wisdom school, is in fact the portrait of a royal sacerdotal conqueror established

154. Auwers, *La composition*, p. 127: 'En d'autres termes encore, si le Ps. 2 faisait du recueil qu'il préfaçait un *Kampf-Liederbuch* national, le Ps. 1 fait de l'ensemble *das Gebetbuch der Gerechten*'.

155. Auwers, *La composition*, p. 18: 'Le recueil primitif était encadré par deux compositions sapientielles: les Ps. 1 et 119…encore remarquer que les psaumes royaux… se trouvaient dispersés à travers l'écrit definitive…'. See also p. 128: 'Le Ps. 1 n'est pas un prière, mais un discours de sagesse'. Cf. also pp. 124-25: 'Le ton et le vocabulaire des vv. 10-12 du Ps. 2 sont ceux de l'exhortation sapientelle…finale du Ps. 2 renoue ainsi, pardelà les vv. 1-9, avec la thématique et le vocabulaire du Ps. 1…les vv. 10-12 du Ps. 2 sont en tension avec le reste du poème.' The isolation of Ps. 2.10-12 as sapiential and originally separate from the 'royal' vv. 1-9 (pp. 100-101, 124-26) follows, among others, E. Lipiński, 'Macarismes et psaumes de Congratulation', *RB* 75 (1968), pp. 321-67 (331).

156. Also characteristic of 'wisdom' literature in 2.4 are ישב שׂחק, and לעג. Cf. Prov. 1.26.

157. Auwers, *La composition*, p. 112: 'les psaumes royaux…en tête du premier recueil davidique, le Ps. 2…'.

158. Auwers, *La composition*, p. 124 n. 384, 125.

159. Auffret, *La sagesse*, p. 178.

upon the waters of the eschatological sanctuary of Eden.[160] This is of course consistent with the chosen monarch's establishment in the temple on Mt Zion of 2.6. The two psalms are not of a qualitatively different genre and message, but as the numerous and multi-level links reveal, communicate a coherent and consistent message.

Form-critical assumptions also govern the work of Christoph Rösel.[161] Psalms 2 and 89 are labelled, 'Königspsalmen',[162] and so the study predictably focuses on the theorized previous collection of Psalms 2–89. Lexical ties to Psalm 1 in Psalm 2 are cursorily mentioned,[163] but, as with Auwers and Lipiński, he maintains in the face of evidence to the contrary that the bulk of the so-called wisdom content occurs in 2.10-12.[164] In fact, there are abundant lexical contacts (at least seven) between Ps. 2.1-10 and Psalm 1, often accompanied and affirmed by those phonological and thematic.[165] In addition, Psalm 2 itself from beginning to end exhibits evidence of an original and thorough integration, as will be demonstrated in Chapter 3. Again, the shadow cast by Gunkel is long and obscures a full appreciation of the purposes of the final redactor of the first two psalms, as well as those subsequent.

Another example of commentaries that attempt to combine these two fundamentally opposite approaches is that of J. Clinton McCann.[166] His assessment of form criticism is that it 'still remains a viable and vital approach' and so a list and description of the well-known categories is included.[167] Conse-

160. See the full discussion in Chapter 2.

161. C. Rosël, *Die messianische Redaktion des Psalters: Studien zu Enstehung und Theologie der Sammlung Psalm 2–89* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1999).

162. Rosël, *Die messianische*, p. 92.

163. Rosël, *Die messianische*, p. 102 n. 72.

164. Rosël, *Die messianische*, p. 102: 'Auf ein literarisches Wachstum des Psalms deuten die Unterschiede in Inhalt und Stil zwischen V. 1-9 und V. 10-12. V. 10 beginnt mit einer weisheitlichen Anrede…fehlt in dieser Mahnung an die feindlichen Befehlshaber jeder Hinweis auf den in v. 6-9 so eindrücklich beschriebenen irdischen Herrscher…daß V. 10-12 später ergänzt wurden…Auch die vielfach beobachteten Berührungen von Ps. 1 zu Ps. 2 konzentrieren sich vor allem auf V. 12'. See also p. 105: 'Für V. 1-9 ist eine Verbindung zum Königskult und damit eine vorexilische Enstehung wahrscheinlich'. The idea that vv. 10-12 lack a reference to the ruler of vv. 6-9 can only be asserted after conveniently emending him out (p. 102 n. 70), which in spite of wide support is illegitimate, as will be demonstrated in comments on v. 12. Cf. likewise, Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. IV. *Psaumes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), pp. 5, 102.

165. See further detailed comments in Chapters 2 and 3.

166. J. Clinton McCann Jr, 'The Book of Psalms', in Leander E. Keck, *et al.* (eds.), *The New Interpreter's Bible*, IV (12 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), pp. 639-1280 (641-77).

167. McCann, 'Psalms', pp. 644-52.

quently, the titles for Psalm 1, 'Delight in God's Teaching', and for Psalm 2, 'The Reign of God', exhibit such a disposition.[168] Psalm 1 is 'a beatitude, a form usually associated with wisdom literature',[169] and Psalm 2 is 'a royal psalm'.[170] The translation for Ps. 1.1 accepted by McCann, 'Happy are *those*…', makes explicit the generalizing interpretation applied.[171]

McCann's view of the Psalter's final editing is, like many others, of the light touch-up variety, whereby the final editor did not conform

> every psalm…to an overarching editorial purpose, but rather that the psalter in its final form often reflects the earlier shape of the smaller collections of which it is composed…editorial activity most likely took place at the 'seams' of the psalter—that is, at the beginning or conclusion of the whole or of the various books.[172]

According to this view, the final editor introduced royal psalms at various seams, but for some unknown reason was unwilling to bring order and meaning to much of the intervening material. Here McCann's inability to explain many psalm sequences throughout the Psalter is undoubtedly due, not to their randomness, but rather to a firmly held form-critical disposition. Gunkel himself could also not make sense of it and so concluded it was senseless, although admitting that sometimes related psalms stood together.[173] The recognition that the Psalter is not arranged in many cases according to preconceived categories should motivate modern readers to consider alternative approaches to the text, instead of forcing upon it a method tried and found wanting. In fact, whole psalms (e.g. Psalms 22, 89) are often composed of differing so-called genre. Consequently, not only was the Psalter itself not composed or redacted on this basis, but likewise its individual parts.

In the specific case of Psalms 1 and 2, McCann rightly declares that they 'are meant to be read together…by the literary links between them', and so the wicked of Psalm 1 are identified as the nations, peoples, kings and rulers of Psalm 2.[174] Similarly, '…the beatitudes in Pss. 1.1 and 2.12 frame what I take to be a paired introduction to the Psalter'.[175] However, vital links of

168. McCann, 'Psalms', p. 678.
169. McCann, 'Psalms', p. 683.
170. McCann, 'Psalms', pp. 660-61.
171. McCann, 'Psalms', p. 683.
172. McCann, 'Psalms', p. 659.
173. Gunkel, *Einleitung*, p. 3: 'Und nun zum Schluß die wichtigste Beobachtung, nämlich diese, daß uns seine innere Ordnung unter den einzelnen Psalmen im ganzen nicht überliefert ist: in der Sammlung des Psalters stehen zwar manchmal verwandte zusammen…' Cf. also n. 33 above.
174. McCann, 'Psalms', p. 689.
175. J. Clinton McCann Jr, 'The Shape of Book I of the Psalter and the Shape of Human Happiness', in Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller, Jr (eds.), *The Book of*

various types are not included: ישׁב in 1.1 and 2.4 נתן in 1.3 and 2.8, ענה in 1.3 and 2.10; as well as the phonological and thematic links between 1.1 and 2.4, 1.4 and 2.9, etc. Their recognition is fundamental to understanding the purpose of the pair's juxtaposition.

For McCann, Psalm 1 informs the reader to 'receive the whole collection as instruction'.[176] While this approach differs from common form-critical understandings of it as general wisdom instruction, and reads it in light of the entire Psalter, it fails to appreciate the enormous effort of the final redactor to thoroughly integrate it with the second psalm. Furthermore, the idea that Psalm 2 preaches essentially that 'the Lord reigns', while deemphasizing the strong and sustained focus on the anointed king, is undermined by evidence within Psalm 2 itself and the numerous verbal parallels it shares with both Psalms 72 and 89. The latter two psalms have a decided emphasis on the rule of the Davidic son. It appears that the attempt to downplay the anointed king of Psalm 2 can only be motivated by, and anticipatory of, the unsustainable view that the Davidic covenant is abandoned subsequent to Book III.[177] Here he follows Wilson's claim that following Psalm 89 there is a move away from hope in Davidic kingship to that of direct divine kingship, as evidenced in Book IV.[178]

One of the main arguments for this claim is the supposed decreasing presence of Davidic psalms in the latter half of the Psalter.[179] Wilson counts 64 per cent of psalms in the first three books attributed to David but only 28 per cent in the last two, and in Book IV specifically, only two Davidic psalms.[180] However, his choice of evidence here is very selective. If decreasing presence of David in superscriptions is proof that his covenant is transcended, then Book III would represent the near absence of reference to that pact since only one Davidic psalm (86) is found among 17 total. But not

Psalms: Composition and Reception (VTSup, 99; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005), pp. 340-48 (342).

176. McCann, 'Psalms', p. 688.

177. McCann, 'Psalms', p. 662: 'a fitting answer is provided by Psalm 90 and the subsequent psalms in Book IV—namely Israel's true home is, always has been, and always will be God alone'. See also Wilson, *The Editing*, p. 213, and 'King, Messiah', pp. 391-406. One of Wilson's arguments in the latter (p. 401) for the abandonment of the Davidic covenant following Books I–III is that they are 'highly Davidic' in their headings while subsequent books are not. This overlooks the fact that Book III contains only a single Davidic psalm (Ps. 86), while Book IV has two and Book V fifteen. By this reasoning Books IV and V are more Davidic than III.

178. Wilson, 'The Use of Royal Psalms', pp. 92, 108. Also Wilson, 'King, Messiah', pp. 391-406, and Gerald H. Wilson, 'Psalms and Psalter: Paradigm for Biblical Theology', in Scott J. Hafemann (ed.), *Biblical Theology: Retrospect and Prospect* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), pp. 100-110.

179. Wilson, 'King, Messiah', p. 401.

180. Wilson, 'King, Messiah', p. 401.

even he will argue that Book III has moved beyond the Davidic covenant. The following book includes two Davidic psalms, and following Wilson's logic there must then be an increasing validation of that covenant. Book V, with its 15(!) occurrences,[181] would imply a full acceptance of its perpetuity. In fact, 'the role of the Davidic מֶלֶךְ' does not 'recede', but rather increases from Book III onward based on this type of reasoning.[182]

With regard to Book V, Wilson argues that David decreases there as well due to the fact that only three psalms mention him outside of the headings.[183] However, the three psalms Wilson hails as stressing 'the authorization of Davidic kings' (Pss. 2, 72, 89)[184] are all lacking in Davidic headings. This simply proves that lack of reference to David in a title is no proof of disinterest in the covenant made with him. Similarly, Psalm 78 is attributed to Asaph, but the covenant with David is in view (cf. 78.70).[185]

Wilson has maintained that Psalm 89 represents a failed human Davidic covenant and that in Book IV the focus shifts to divine kingship. But linguistic evidence belies such a theory. In fact, the portrayal in Psalm 2 of the heavenly reign of a very anthropomorphic figure (seen in Psalm 1) anticipates the evidence in Book IV. Numerous links at practically every level between 1.1 and 2.4 and the parallels between 2.4 and 110.1 (two psalms exhibiting otherwise a whole host of verbal and thematic parallels) point to a *divine* anthropos on his throne.[186] The same is true when overt verbal links between the eternal Davidic throne in 89.5 (עד עולם אכין…כסאך) and 89.37-38 (יפון עולם…וכסאו) and that of Yhwh in 93.2 (נכון כסאך מאז מעולם אתה) and 97.2 (צדק ומשפט מכון כסאו) are seriously considered. The latter phrase is essentially identical to 89.15 (צדק ומשפט מכון כסאך), thus confirming the existence of deliberate intertextual ties between the final psalms of Book III (Ps. 89) and those of Book IV immediately following. This sort of evidence is overlooked both by Wilson and those following him.

Following Book III directly in Psalm 90 are answers of a temporal nature (vv. 1-4) to the corresponding query of Ps. 89.47 (עד מה…לנצח). This repeats a pattern seen for numerous similar interrogatives across Book III (74.1, 10; 77.8-10; 80.5; 88.11-13) to which pointed answers are given in subsequent psalms.[187] Furthermore, much of Book III, right from the initial Psalm 73 onward, voices complaints over the absence of the expected conditions of an ideal Davidic kingdom portrayed in Psalm 72. Never is that hope

181. Not mentioned by Wilson, 'King Messiah', p. 396.
182. Wilson, 'King, Messiah', p. 404.
183. Wilson, 'King, Messiah', p. 396.
184. Wilson, 'Psalms and Psalter', p. 106.
185. ויבחר בדוד עבדו.
186. See the discussion below on 2.4 (Chapter 3).
187. Cole, *The Shape and Message*, ad loc.

extinguished. Rather, Book III reaffirms its promises repeatedly, in spite of their delay. Likewise, Book IV gives no hint of the Davidic covenant being eclipsed.

Another study following in Wilson's wake was that of John Walton, who attempted to spell out the purpose of the entire Psalter as following a chronological sequence from David's early life through the exile and expected return.[188] The idea of a chronological Psalter was already tried and found wanting by the rabbis, who noted the anachronism of Psalms 3 (flight from Absalom) and 57 (flight from Saul).[189] As is common, the Gunkelian categories are accepted without question as the following indicates: 'Genre discontinuity is evident starting with Psalm 14…there are few sections in all of the Psalter that are so lacking genre indicators or that send such confusing genre signs as Psalms 14–22'.[190] So although the introductory purpose of Psalms 1–2 together is recognized, their integration is not and a twofold title is applied, 'Vindication of the Righteous', and 'Theocratic Sponsorship of the Israelite (Davidic) King'.[191] Due to an uncritical acceptance of form criticism, the royal character of Psalm 1 and its full integration with Psalm 2 is overlooked. Such an approach undermines the theory of a cantata about the Davidic covenant since one would reasonably expect the very first psalm to open with some reference to the principal theme. Ironically, however, once the coherence of Psalms 1 and 2 is recognized for what it is, the man described in the former, as in the latter, is the eschatological conquering *Davidic* king.

A relatively recent commentary of a popular type by J. Limburg illustrates another attempt to combine the two ultimately irreconcilable approaches.[192] So he advises that, 'each psalm can be read and studied *on its own*', or '*in its literary context*'.[193] In what is apparently a reading of Psalms 1–2 in their literary context, 'the pair form an introduction and kind of "reader's guide" to understanding the psalms that follow'.[194] However, the first psalm is described as 'a note of happiness, with the sounds of prayer and meditation and the sight of a tree…' while the second 'returns to the everyday world of politics and of plot', but both are 'artfully linked' through verbal parallels.[195] Following form-critical categories the second psalm is read as

188. John H. Walton, 'Psalms: A Cantata about the Davidic Covenant', *JETS* 34 (1991), pp. 21-31. See p. 24 for his outline of the book.
189. *b. Ber.* 10a.
190. Walton, 'Psalms', p. 24.
191. Walton, 'Psalms', p. 24.
192. James Limburg, *Psalms* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2000).
193. Limburg, *Psalms*, pp. xvi-xvii.
194. Limburg, *Psalms*, p. 5.
195. Limburg, *Psalms*, pp. 4-5.

'designed for an occasion when a new king was being installed'.[196] The reason why a tightly joined pair of psalms at the introduction would address such different subject matter, all the while using similar 'artfully linked' vocabulary (he mentions the parallels of 1.1 with 2.12 and 1.2 with 2.1),[197] is never explained in detail except to designate 'happiness' as the common theme.[198] Other numerous lexical parallels are not mentioned, nor are those phonological and thematic. Again, the lens of *Gattungsforschung* prevents recognition of the thoroughgoing integration of the two psalms into one coherent and consistent message. Supporting such a unitary and integrative reading, as will be seen, is the lack of an intervening superscription, the beatitudinal envelope and further abundant and overt linguistic linkages.

In an article discussing specifically the first two psalms, Jesper Høgenhaven affirms that the first two psalms are 'to be read as one introduction to the whole of the Psalter'.[199] He also perceptively notes that through the influence of Gunkel's method Psalm 1 has been classified as a wisdom psalm and the second as a royal psalm. As a result, most modern interpreters assume that the first two psalms 'would seem *a priori* to be set very far apart'.[200] Another positive characteristic of his analysis is recognition of the eschatological nature of judgment in Psalm 1 and likewise the future envisaged in Psalm 2.[201] However, the characterization of Psalm 1 as 'ethical' and 1.1 as referring to 'those who have chosen the right one of the two possibilities' disregards the unique royal, priestly and eschatological language characterizing a specific man in *both* psalms.[202] Høgenhaven cites attempts to classify Psalm 1 as royal but finds them unconvincing and concludes that it contains 'very general terms'.[203] Thus he is apparently unique in not presuming the assumptions of form criticism, but fails nevertheless to recognize the thoroughly integrated nature of the twofold introduction.

Thus Høgenhaven, while recognizing the propriety of reading the first two psalms as one introduction, has overlooked characteristics of their integration. Following an incomplete list of verbal parallels, which evidence is dismissed as 'inconclusive', he opts for examination of 'thematic

196. Limburg, *Psalms*, p. 5. The idea of a coronation liturgy opening with a question as to why the rest of the world and its rulers is plotting to overthrow that newly crowned king seems unusual, to say the least.

197. Limburg, *Psalms*, pp. 5-6.

198. Limburg, *Psalms*, p. 6.

199. Jesper Høgenhaven, 'The Opening of the Psalter: A Study in Jewish Theology', *SJOT* 15 (2001), pp. 169-180 (173).

200. Høgenhaven, 'The Opening', p. 172.

201. Høgenhaven, 'The Opening', pp. 175, 177.

202. Høgenhaven, 'The Opening', pp. 174, 179.

203. Høgenhaven, 'The Opening', p. 172.

correspondence'.[204] In fact, the verbal parallels are the basis upon which any thematic correspondence must be built. By minimizing the importance of those linguistic links listed and failing to consider others, Høgenhaven has ignored the signposts to meaning erected by the redactor. Furthermore, his reference to the 'unmistakable shift' in theme occurring at the border between the two flies in the face of the lack of superscription in Psalm 2 (which he observes correctly in the MT and LXX as well) and the enveloping inclusio of אשרי.[205] Such initial overt evidence accompanied by numerous lexical, phonological and thematic links (as will be seen) is strong indication that the two were to be read as cohesive, coherent and complementary texts. To the absence of a superscription one could add that the phonological link between רשעים of 1.6b and the rare Aramaism רגשו of the immediately contiguous 2.12a militate against the idea of a wholly 'new theme' introduced by Psalm 2.[206]

Willem VanGemeren's commentary on the Psalms considers, if only briefly, the evidence linking the first two psalms.[207] So the inclusio around the two formed by אשרי is noted, but the numerous remaining ties are overlooked.[208] Instead the first psalm is said 'to stand on its own and is a 'didactic psalm', while by contrast the second is 'a royal psalm'.[209] While VanGemeren is of the opinion that form criticism 'has a limited value' and prefers 'the literary "form" of each psalm as it more or less corresponds to the formal features of a particular genre',[210] the categorization of the first two as didactic and royal, language identical to that of form criticism, leads to the same result. Since the first two psalms are presumed from the beginning to be of different genres, the contrary evidence, also of a literary nature, revealing their cohesiveness and coherency is either ignored or given short shrift.

Norman Whybray's work in the mid-1990s took up the question of the Psalter's composition in general, and reviewed various theories offered up to that point.[211] He concluded that

> there was no comprehensive editing of the Psalter along any of the lines suggested above…no evidence that there was a systematic and purposeful redaction of the whole Psalter in any of the suggested ways…most

204. Høgenhaven, 'The Opening', pp. 173-74.
205. Høgenhaven, 'The Opening', p. 173.
206. Høgenhaven, 'The Opening', p. 173.
207. Willem A. VanGemeren, 'Psalms', in Frank E. Gæbelein (ed.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. V. *Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991), pp. 1-880 (53).
208. VanGemeren, 'Psalms', p. 53.
209. VanGemeren, 'Psalms', p. 53.
210. VanGemeren, 'Psalms', p. 13.
211. Norman Whybray, *Reading the Psalms as a Book* (JSOTSup, 222; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

> individual psalms, whose apparent randomness of arrangement (for instance the mingling of psalms of praise with psalms of lament) remains a stumbling-block for those who fail to find any consistency or overarching structure or plan to the book. Any theory of a coherent pattern ought surely to provide some explanation of the arrangement of the *whole* collection… the study of concatenations…'catchwords' and repeated identical poetical lines…can probably be put down to coincidence or are for other reasons devoid of editorial significance… Thematic linking is another matter; but… such evidence of small-scale editorial work does not in any way conduce to the plausibility of a comprehensive theory of a single, purposive redaction of the whole Psalter.[212]

Whybray's expressed skepticism of the theory of the Psalms as a book for private spiritual reading may have some merit. However, the denial of coherence to the whole due to its failure to follow a form-critically based arrangement is to beg the question. Indeed, from the start the study presumes the validity of Gunkel's categories, with a discussion of the 'wisdom psalms',[213] and so his view that we are dealing with a random arrangement is based on the same classification. His review of the contents of each section of the Psalter proceeds along typical form-critical lines and on this basis he concludes there is no 'all-embracing structure for the book as a whole'.[214]

But such a conclusion presumes that the form-critical method is somehow beyond question and the rule by which all other approaches are to be measured. To state it baldly, Whybray is arguing that when choosing between traditional form criticism and the canonical approach to the Psalms, the canonical approach is invalid because it does not follow form-critical categories!

Without a doubt the present arrangement is not based on these modern conceptions of form and genre, but that does not exclude an alternative modus operandi on the part of the book's editor. The initial Psalms 1–3 and many other sequences such as Psalms 72–73, 86–87, 44–45, etc., are of distinctly different *Gattung* according to modern conceptions, but nonetheless can be adequately explained if only long-held predispositions are set aside for the sake of analysis. Characterization of Psalm 119 as a psalm 'which now sprawls incongruously between a psalm of thanksgiving and a lamentation' is language that exemplifies Whybray's unwillingness to approach the subject on any other grounds.[215]

Whybray appears to agree somewhat with Brueggemann's idea of movement from obedience to praise principally because it does not attempt 'to

212. Whybray, *Reading*, pp. 118-21.
213. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 15.
214. Whybray, *Reading*, pp. 34-35.
215. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 41.

account for every detail in the structuring of the Psalter'.[216] However unsuccessful attempts may have been up to that time, or to the present, they do not exclude the possibility that it is a thoroughly integrated composition. Furthermore, Brueggemann's generalizing attempt, while valuable in its observation of a change in dominant mood from one end of the book to the other, is ultimately preliminary in its analysis of selected psalms. The focus on Psalms 1 and 150 initially, followed by the singling out of Psalms 25, 103 and 73 to support the thesis, overlooks the evidence of deliberate collocation and integration of these individual psalms in their particular position and context. For example, the integration of Psalms 1 and 2 is thorough and coherent, revealing from the beginning an unmistakeable theology by the book's redactor.[217] Likewise, the *dislegomenon* of מִשְׁאוֹת/מַשָּׂאוֹת in 73.18 and 74.3 (or of 145.14 and 146.8) demands an explanation, as do the strongly contrasting moods accompanied by vocabulary linking 72 with 73 (חמס in 72.14 and 73.6, עשׁק in 72.4 and 73.8, שׁלוֹם in 72.3, 7 and 73.3) of 73 with the previous 72. These latter are not all 'common vocabulary in the Psalter'.[218] Whybray's assertion that concatenations are coincidental or 'devoid of editorial significance'[219] cannot be sustained, particularly when it can be shown at selected soundings that they produce an interrelated reading that is coherent, comprehensible, and consistent with those observed elsewhere. Psalm 73 is clearly a protest (and not the only one in Book III) directed to the non-appearance of the conditions portrayed confidently in Psalm 72.[220]

Whybray's discussion of the relationship between Psalms 1 and 2 is found in a chapter entitled, 'Wisdom and Torah Material', revealing the biased basis of the discussion.[221] Psalm 1 is identified initially as a torah psalm[222] and then characterized as breathing 'the rarified atmosphere of the wisdom or Torah instruction'.[223] Between it and Psalm 2 there is presumably 'total dissimilarity' because the latter has to do with an attack on the chosen king[224] and is thus a royal psalm.[225] Although he has maintained

216. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 122. The article by Walter Brueggemann is 'Bounded by Obedience and Praise: The Psalms as Canon', *JSOT* 50 (1991), pp. 63-92.

217. Brueggemann correctly notes the need to move from 'literary shape to theological claim, and that connnection is the crucial one for canonical study' ('Bounded', p. 64 n. 1).

218. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 121.

219. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 121.

220. Cole, *Shape and Message*, pp. 15-27, 30, 219.

221. Whybray, *Reading*, pp. 36-87.

222. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 36.

223. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 80. Whybray earlier (p. 37) considers that wisdom and torah piety were closely related but not identical.

224. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 80.

225. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 88.

that wisdom psalms can be identified, not by literary form, but by their use of 'characteristic language or terminology',[226] the 'wisdom' verb השכילו in Psalm 2.10 is denied this role. Furthermore, Psalm 1 is apparently bereft of royal characteristics and thus completely unlike Psalm 2, in spite of the fact that previously he links it to Deut. 17.18-19, the 'law of the king'.[227] In addition, the twofold use of אשרי at 1.1 and 2.12, although 'dubbed an inclusio', are 'not really comparable' because to 'take refuge in Yahweh is not a wisdom concept',[228] and the repetition of דרך and אבד at 1.6 and 2.12 is apparently concidental.[229] Further parallels at every level between the two psalms, as will be adduced below, are not mentioned, but even the evidence listed and then discounted, should have been sufficient to give pause to the rigid form-critically derived separation of the two.

Klaus Seybold's introduction to the Psalms is a thoroughly form-critical study and thus its conclusions are again quite predictable.[230] The present shape of the Psalter shows a 'lack of order in the texts', and the fivefold division has no explanation other than correspondence with the Pentateuch.[231] Instead a chart illustrates the way groups and collections were incorporated into an ever-expanding archive that cut across the five divisions.[232] Later the five books are labelled as an 'unequal' division of the material.[233] The present sequence of the psalms is due to the fact, 'that Jewish scribes left the part-collections of the Psalter as they found them'. [234] So even if within the groups 'the connecting of psalms seems in many cases to operate according to subject matter, in others according to key-word relationships, but also often according to origin', they 'only relate to neighbouring groups in a few cases'.[235] Overall he sees no broad theological unity across the entire corpus and concludes that it is a mistake to look for such because 'diversity is better than uniformity'.[236]

Seybold includes a study of Psalms 1–10, which notes that from Psalm 2 and following 'the links in the chain are by no means thrown together capriciously. They are arranged with care' by means of a progression of shared ideas, form-critical similarities, repeated verbs (חסה, בטח) of trust

226. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 37.
227. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 39.
228. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 80.
229. Whybray, *Reading*, pp. 79-80.
230. Klaus Seybold, *Introducing the Psalms* (trans. R. Graeme Dunphy; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990).
231. Seybold, *Introducing*, p. 18.
232. Seybold, *Introducing*, p. 22.
233. Seybold, *Introducing*, p. 124.
234. Seybold, *Introducing*, p. 124.
235. Seybold, *Introducing*, pp. 124-25.
236. Seybold, *Introducing*, p. 140.

and faith, etc.[237] On the other hand, he sees a large gap between Psalms 1 and 2 so that they are 'quite separate from one another'.[238] The lack of intervening superscription and the repetition of אשרי at either end (the only two parallels between Psalms 1 and 2 mentioned) are simply formal evidence, which counts for little.[239] Rather, the differences in 'style, form and message' are so great, so as to overcome any attempt to read the two as one psalm.[240] Indeed, we can agree they are not originally a single psalm, but this does not invalidate their overall integration. He observes similar evidence in Psalms 2–10 when arguing for their coherence, but not for Psalms 1–2. Only because Psalms 2–10 share, according to Seybold, the common form-critical category of 'Individual Psalms of the Enemy' are the other linking devices taken seriously.[241] But, the presence of many such linking devices between Psalms 1 and 2 are ignored, principally because they do not conform to the notion of *Gattungen*. Indeed, adherence to the latter notion is to accept a method fundamentally at odds with that elaborated by the ancient editor. The resulting disposition predetermines, almost in every case, that the sense and logic of the order is misconstrued.

In a study focused not on the first two psalms, but rather on the entire Psalter, David Mitchell argues for its orderly arrangement and eschatological message.[242] He does include however a discussion of the linguistic and thematic links binding together the first two psalms, and comments as follows:

> The combined effect of Psalms 1 and 2 together may be that Psalm 1 foretells the triumph of the righteous divine king who meditates on Yhwh's Torah, and Psalm 2 shows him going forth to battle with its predicted outcome. Or Psalm 1 delineates the person who will share in the king's triumph, possibly as a warrior, and Psalm 2 pronounces that one's blessedness. The two psalms together announce that the ensuing collection is a handbook for the eschatological wars of the Lord, describing the coming events and the Yhwh-allegiance required of those who would triumph.[243]

Obviously he leaves open the option of a generalizing interpretation of Psalm 1 in the second sentence. There is no explicit reason given for the inclusion of this alternative, but one might suspect the usual culprit. Indeed, he previously had judged Gunkel's categories as 'useful tools of broad categorization'[244] and also noted the strategic placement of 'royal'

237. Seybold, *Introducing*, pp. 126-27.
238. Seybold, *Introducing*, p. 126.
239. Seybold, *Introducing*, p. 126.
240. Seybold, *Introducing*, p. 126.
241. Seybold, *Introducing*, p. 127.
242. Mitchell, *The Message*.
243. Mitchell, *The Message*, p. 87.
244. Mitchell, *The Message*, p. 50.

psalms.[245] Nonetheless, the first of the above quoted sentences is remarkable for its faithfulness to the linguistic evidence when compared with the usual verdicts pronounced on Psalm 1 in its relationship to 2.

Gianni Barbiero in a lengthy work has focused specifically on the first book of the Psalter (Psalms 1–41) 'as a unit' (*als Einheit*).[246] This study constitutes an analysis based principally on lexical parallels (Wortverbindungen) between juxtaposed, but also groups of, psalms.[247] Thematic ties (*Motivverbindungen*) are sometimes included in addition to numerous lists of parallel terms and roots.[248] The presentation of parallel lexical data is extremely valuable in and of itself for research in the first book. Given the careful observation of linguistic and thematic parallels and a commitment to understanding their implications, it is not surprising that many positive insights would emerge concerning the arrangement.

Nonetheless, Barbiero assumes the usefulness of form criticism in a reference to Millard's work: 'Die Verdienst der Arbeit von M. Millard ist, die formkritische Methode'.[249] He also notes with approval the methodology of Millard moving from individual psalms to small psalm groupings, which he himself will carry out. But he proposes correctly to go further than Millard to analysis of the entire first book.[250] Indeed, this sequence of method is sound, but is flawed by the instinctive application of Gunkel's categories at the initial level of individual psalms. So he states that 'Psalmen 1 und 2 sind von ihrer Gattung her zu unterschiedlich', which ignores again the plain fact that the redactor saw them as perfectly compatible by juxtaposing them and exploiting the complex network of intersecting links between them.[251]

His next statement, 'die Wort-und Motivverbindungen sind nicht sehr zahlreich', is debatable at a minimum and undoubtedly influenced heavily by the form-critical disposition taken *a priori*.[252] Furthermore, the list given of verbal parallels between the two psalms is ironically incomplete, failing to include the parallel locative use of the preposition על in 1.3 and

245. Mitchell, *The Message*, p. 86.

246. Barbiero, *Das erste*, pp. 11-18. Barbiero counts four structural units (Struktureinheit) within Book I: Pss. 3–14; 15–24; 25–34; 35–41.

247. For the lexical parallels between Pss. 1 and 2 see Barbiero, *Das erste*, pp. 35-36.

248. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 36.

249. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 23.

250. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 24.

251. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 34. Note as well on p. 41 his observation that Psalm 1 is stamped with the eschatological perspective of Psalm 2, and Psalm 2 with the wisdom perspective of Psalm 1. The diminishing usefulness of such categorizations becomes increasingly apparent as one seriously grapples with the interpretive implications of linguistic parallels.

252. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 34.

2.6, which are accompanied by phonological and thematic ties as well.[253] In addition, the temporal forms עת and עתה in 1.3 and 2.10 (from the identical root ענה) and their implications are also overlooked.[254]

In spite of the above criticism of Barbiero, his discussion has much to commend itself beyond what is commonly found. When the parallels are listed as they are, they cannot but point, for instance, to the identification of the wicked of Psalm 1 with the kings of Psalm 2.[255] He also observes that both the righteous and messiah are opposed by a greater crowd: 'In beiden Fällen wird somit der eine (Gerechte, Messias) einer großen Menge gegenübergestellt, wie es Millard korrekt bemerkt'.[256] The conclusion that 'Der "Messias" von Ps. 2 wird somit zum Subjekt von Ps. 1' and 'der Analyse der Wortverbinderungen wurde bereits bemerkt, dass sie ein Identifikation andeuten; auf der einen Seite Zwischen dem איש von Ps. 1 und dem מלכי von Ps. 2…' is cogent and follows the textual evidence logically.[257] However, Barbiero does not consider the possibility that the man of Psalm 1 is deliberately and exclusively portrayed as the king of Psalm 2 rather than in a general, or as he puts it, a 'democratizing' sense.[258] So for him, Psalm 1, following the standard approach, refers to any 'Mensch'.[259] The following words reveal how the identification of the first psalm's genre as 'wisdom' essentially predetermined the generalizing view:

> Die Dialektik von Weisheit/Prophetie, die in der Einheit der Ps. 1–2 zum Ausdruck kommt, geht konform mit derjenigen von Einzelperson/Kollektivität. Adressat von Ps. 1 ist, wie gewöhnlich in der Weisheitsliteratur, der einzelne.[260]

As will be argued in the following two chapters, the man of Psalm 1 is portrayed as a priest, king and conqueror, which functions are also attributed

253. These are common forms indeed, but without a doubt exploited in the integration of these two psalms. The same preposition is found in 2.2 in the sense of 'opposition', which is taken up again in the same sense by Ps. 3.2, 7.

254. These forms will be discussed in detail in the next two chapters.

255. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 37: 'Sie deutet eine Identifikation der רשׁעים von Ps. 1 mit den מלכים von Ps. 2 an'.

256. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 38.

257. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 43.

258. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 43, 'Demokratisierung'.

259. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 44. Here he follows Patrick D. Miller Jr, 'The Beginning of the Psalter', in J. Clinton McCann Jr (ed.), *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (JSOTSup, 159; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 83-92.

260. Barbiero, *Das erste*, pp. 43-44. Technically speaking on the basis of verbal forms used, Psalm 1 does not *address* anyone directly, but *describes* an individual and a group. No volitive forms are found whatsoever. Characterizing it as an address is a corollary of form-critical assumptions.

to the anointed one in the second psalm. He is in fact the central figure and dominating 'Motiv' of the Psalter's entire introduction.

Barbiero also argues that the twofold introduction is a prologue, not only to the whole Psalter but also specifically to the first book of 41 psalms.[261] Numerous lexical links between the first two psalms and Psalms 40–41 are listed in support.[262] While the links are undoubtedly genuine and redactionally induced, the same can be said for Psalms 72 and 89. So the domination of 'the ends of the earth' (אפסי ארץ) is found in Pss. 2.8 and 72.8. Likewise the kings (מלכים) and nations (גוים) that serve (עבד) the chosen king in 72.10, 11 are the same seen in 2.1, 2, 10, and are commanded to serve in 2.11. The fruit of 1.3 (פריו) is found again in 72.16. Similar parallels are found at the end of Book III, where the chosen king will call God his Father (אבי אתה) (89.27), an exact counterpart to 2.7 where God refers to the king as his son (בני אתה). Such evidence does not imply that Psalms 1–2 function as a specific introduction to Books Books II or III or to Books I–III any more than they do to Book I. Instead it points to the role of Psalms 1–2 as an introduction to the entire Psalter.

Comments by Barbiero on the canonical position of Psalms and its prologue following the Prophets include a listing of striking verbal parallels between Joshua 1, Malachi 3 and Psalms 1–2.[263] He observes that parallels with Joshua 1 and Malachi 3 are found in both of the first two psalms and so support their inseparability as prologue.[264] Indeed, as he recognizes, the position of this first pair immediately following Malachi 3, and the numerous examples of *concatenatio* give them a definite eschatological coloring.[265]

In another recent study Beat Weber labels Psalm 1 as 'wisdom' like that found in 'the whole ancient Near East' and thus 'international'.[266] As a consequence of such identification the psalm must be of a 'directive' type.[267] This of course has no explicit support in the psalm itself, as noted above. Weber's

261. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 31.
262. Barbiero, *Das erste*, pp. 52-60.
263. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 34.
264. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 34.
265. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 34: 'Das Ganze steht unter der Verkündigung des eschatologischen Gerichts, in Mal. 3, 13-24 wie in Ps. 1–2…'. If Pss. 1–2 as eschatological judgment is inferred by their position and parallels vis-à-vis Malachi, the parallel position and overt parallels with Josh. 1 imply a similar reading for the latter, the opening of the entire prophetic corpus. The effect would be an eschatological wrapping for the entire sequence from Joshua to Malachi. Furthermore, the eschatological thrust of the Psalter's introductory pair sets the pattern for all ensuing psalms.
266. Beat Weber, 'Psalm 1 and its Function as a Directive into the Psalter and towards a Biblical Theology', *OTE* 19 (2006), p. 242.
267. Weber, 'Psalm 1', pp. 237-60 (249).

statement, 'the members of the audience are not addressed directly', concedes as much, as does the explanation that the 'wisdom-pedagogics and paraenesis' are found 'indirectly via the effect of a macarism'.[268] Additionally, since the psalm must be directive in style, reference in it to unmitigated righteousness ('completely good'[269]) must be somehow modified. So for Weber there is no 'sinlessness' or 'infallibility' present, but simply 'loyalty to the Lord'.[270]

Given such a classification and subsequent reading of Psalm 1 the die is cast so to speak, and its relationship to Psalm 2 predictable. In spite of the overt verbal and thematic parallels between them, some of which Weber lists,[271] the well-worn categories seen so often in this regard overpower the natural and logical implications of abundant linguistic parallels. Differing *Gattungen* must mean different messages, and so the book opens with a 'double portal'.[272] Although the Psalter's redactor read and indicated rather pointedly that the two were to be read as one integrated introduction, Weber protests at length:

> But Ps. 2 differs from Ps. 1: it is not a sapiential psalm that strives to direct the individual reader or listener to the Torah, but has a collective horizon. It is not the wisdom teacher of Ps. 1 that speaks; but (in the words of the narrator) the heavenly king YHWH also speaks in prophetic-paraenetic language… Through the juxtapositioning of Ps 1 and Ps 2, and especially though [*sic*] the 'bracketing' with a brace of blessing, various aspects are linked together and related to one another: Torah-wisdom on the one hand and divine rule as well as expectation of a saving king on the other; individual orientation on the one hand and collective or even universalistic expansion of the view on the other; 'Theology from below' (obedience) on the one hand and 'Theology from above' (power) on the other. The listener or reader, who enters the Psalter through the dual portal of Pss 1 and 2, also receives dual instruction: The Psalter should be recited and meditated upon as Word of God (Torah), but they witness about the divine rule of YHWH and keep the expectation of an earthly salvatory king (Messiah) alive.[273]

Rolf Rendtorff has noted, as others have done, the 'emphatic position of the royal psalms' in the Psalter, which conclude 'subsidiary collections (72; 89) and provide a framework for the first collection (2; 110)'.[274] Consequently, he is of the opinion that 'there can be no doubt that at this

268. Weber, 'Psalm 1', pp. 242, 244. Note the strictly indicative mood of אשרי in 1 Kgs 10.8.
269. Weber, 'Psalm 1', p. 243.
270. Weber, 'Psalm 1', p. 244.
271. Weber, 'Psalm 1', p. 251.
272. Weber, 'Psalm 1', pp. 251 n. 61, 252.
273. Weber, 'Psalm 1', p. 253.
274. Rolf Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. John Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), p. 249.

stage they were understood in messianic terms: the praise of God is not only directed to the past and the present, but also includes the messianic future'.[275] While he has apparently taken seriously the shape of the Psalter in his interpretation of it, including the effect of concluding *halleluyah* psalms, the unquestioned acceptance of the standard categories[276] again hinders appreciation of the canonical arrangement. Psalm 1 is labeled a 'Torah psalm' in contrast to the royal label given to Psalm 2.[277] As a result, the relationship between Psalm 2 and the 'royal psalms' 89 and 110 is emphasized to the detriment of that with its immediately preceding Psalm 1.[278]

In a later work, Rendtorff labels Psalm 1 as part of the '"wisdom" tradition', and so full appreciation of its integration with Psalm 2 is lost.[279] He does follow to some extent the effect of juxtaposition and cohesion, but the conflict between a fully integrated reading and the traditional categories is evident:

> The theme of Ps. 1 is continued in the next psalm… Ps. 2 has a quite different subject: the turmoil of the nations 'against the Lord and against his Anointed One'. But this theme is closely connected with the previous one. The nations who rage against God are the wicked.[280]

Here then is recognition of the logical equation between the wicked of Psalm 1 and the nations and kings of Psalm 2, but not that of the individual who is a king and conqueror in Psalm 1 (modeled after Joshua and Joseph) and the 'Anointed One' of Psalm 2.

Jamie Grant's study of Psalms assumes from the beginning the entire edifice of *Gattungsforschung* in spite of the fact that the present 'shape' of the Psalter (see his title) was obviously accomplished without any such assumptions.[281] He does admit as much, finding it 'unlikely that the redactors of the Psalter used genre classification as an organizational tool—content…rather than type seems to have directed the editorial placement of the psalms'.[282] But at the same time there is discussion of the problem of categorizing torah and wisdom psalms, taking the entire enterprise as a given.[283] He does pose the rhetorical question as to the legitimacy of a canonical approach, but never for form criticism, the latter presumed to be unassailable.[284] Grant argues for

275. Rendtorff, *Old Testament*, p. 249.
276. Rendtorff, *Old Testament*, p. 246.
277. Rendtorff, *Old Testament*, p. 248.
278. Rendtorff, *Old Testament*, p. 248.
279. Rolf Rendtorff, *The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. D.E. Orton; Leiden: Deo, 2005), p. 320.
280. Rendtorff, *Canonical*, p. 320.
281. Grant, *The King as Exemplar*.
282. Grant, *The King*, p. 15.
283. Grant, *The King*, p. 20.
284. Grant, *The King*, p. 12.

use of the canonical approach in addition to 'form-critical analyses, close readings of individual psalms or discussion of the historical function'.[285] This of course ignores the fact that the canonical approach and form criticism are fundamentally at odds, with the latter being formulated by Gunkel on the premise of a chaotic shape of the Psalter. Statements such as 'both torah and kingship psalms play a significant role in the final redaction of the Psalter' illustrate the attempt to combine two contrary approaches.[286] As for close readings of individual psalms, they are completely compatible with the canonical approach and can, in fact, reveal with more clarity the purpose of the arrangement. Reconstruction of an imagined 'historical function' of each psalm entails lifting it out of the literary context in which it is found and reconstructing an imagined *Sitz im Leben* on the flimsiest of evidence.

Grant's estimation that theories purporting to show linkage between all 150 psalms 'testify more to the ingenuity of the author than to the structure of the Psalter' is wholly preliminary.[287] No analysis yet exists that follows the entire sequence with a thoroughgoing analysis of each individual composition accompanied by the same for its relation to those surrounding. In other words, a serious grappling with the entire sequence and with each member without a form-critical predisposition has not been undertaken to date. However, soundings taken at different points across the Psalter, sometimes of entire books, reveal concrete data of a linguistic and thematic nature that cannot but be compositionally induced linking. Consequently, it is illegitimate to conclude at this point that evidence of deliberate arrangement is sporadic, especially when such judgment springs from a stance at odds with the canonical arrangement, as is *Gattungsforschung*.

A recent article by Pedro Astorga Guerra explores intertextuality between the two first psalms as well as their canonical role and resonance with texts such as Josh. 1.1 and Mal. 3.22-24.[288] Astorga asserts from the beginning that Psalm 1 indicates how the Torah 'should' be the object of meditation of the blessed man and that it 'invites' such activity on the part of the reader.[289] So in his estimation Psalm 1 seeks to instruct and has characteristics of the Israelite sapiential tradition.[290] The paraenetic function of the psalm is a set-

285. Grant, *The King*, p. 15.

286. Grant, *The King*, p. 27.

287. Grant, *The King*, p. 19.

288. Pedro Astorga Guerra, 'Meditar la Torah en la historia y la historia desde la Torah: Sal 1 y 2 desde una lectura intertextual-cánonica (I)', *Estudios eclesiásticos* 84 (2009), pp. 3-40 (6-7): 'señala a la Torah como aquello que debe meditar el hombre dichoso…es que se invita a meditar la Torah' (pp. 6-7).

289. Astorga Guerra, 'Meditar', p. 6.

290. Astorga Guerra, 'Meditar', p. 22: 'Esta instrucción tenía en cuenta, además algunos rasgos de la tradición sapiencial israelita…'.

tled question for Astorga Guerra, but, we should note, at the risk of redundancy, the complete absence of volitive forms in Psalm 1 and the exclusive presence of indicatives belies such certainty.[291] Psalm 2 is then identified as a text with more 'concrete historical context', which then leads to the statement that the two texts 'maintain two theological ideas in tension'.[292] But as seen previously in case after case, the tension springs more from a predisposition to modern imposed genre classification from without than from signals in the text itself.

A most recent study on Psalm 119 exemplifies the continuing power of Gunkel's spell over modern scholarship and the kind of reasoning that results.[293] It is argued astonishingly that the reading of Psalm 1 should take place primarily in the context of Psalm 112, not Psalm 2.[294] So the primary context of Psalm 1 is Psalm 112, one hundred and eleven psalms later, not the immediately juxtaposed Psalm 2. Indeed, Psalm 112 is relevant to the discussion of Psalm 1, just as is Psalm 110 to Psalm 2, as will be shown later. However, Psalm 110 should not be analyzed through Psalm 2 to the exclusion of Psalm 109 and the entire previous contextual sequence, nor Psalm 1 through 112 to the exclusion of Psalm 2.

291. Astorga Guerra, 'Meditar', p. 7.

292. Astorga Guerra, 'Meditar', p. 7: 'quizá con un contexto histórico muy concreto en su origen…en Sal 1 y 2 están presentes tanto la Torah como la historia en su vertiente profética y escatológica…quizás los textos quieren mantener en tensión dos líneas teológicas muy importantes de la Biblia: la Torah y la profecía'.

293. Kent Aaron Reynolds, *Torah as Teacher: The Exemplary Torah Student in Psalm 119* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2010). Note the customary discussion of 'genre' (pp. 21-29) where the application of the traditional dogma is taken as a given. The minimal discussion of the role played by Ps. 118 in informing Ps. 119 (p. 150) is suggestive, but a serious analysis of the canonical place of the latter would require much more attention. Psalm 119, which he admits lacks any admonishing of the reader (p. 14), is very much like Ps. 1, which also lacks any sort of paraenesis. One might expect at least one example out of 176(!) verses. The words of Ps. 119 portray one not subject to the failings of mortal creatures, a model whose example would discourage any individual. Indeed the words of Ps. 119 are a perfect illustration in first person of the attitude attributed in third person to the man of Ps. 1. Scholars have also retreated from application of the unmitigated success of Ps. 1 to any and all. See Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59: A Continental Commentary* (trans. Hilton C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), p. 121: 'Everything stated in Psalm 1 about the צדיק basically entails a character that transcends any one individual…definitely bears the features of the super individual, the paradigmatic person': or Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary* (trans. H. Hartwell; The Wartburg Press, 1959; repr. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1969), p. 36, who warns that the strong optimistic faith in this psalm can be 'dangerous if it is distorted into a calculating belief in recompense…or if the idea of success becomes the sole motive of action'. See also my discussion below in Chapter 2 on Ps. 1.2-3 and the differences between its indicative verbs and those imperatival and conditional of Josh. 1.7-8.

294. Reynolds, *Torah*, 159.

Undoubtedly it is a form-critical premise driving the discussion that prevents appreciation of the integration of the first two psalms. When the overriding concern is to combine 'generically' similar psalms, the explicit markers and thus intent of the book's redactor is given short shrift. Lip service in this study is given to the parallels between Psalms 1 and 2, but 'lexical links, repetitions of motifs, and juxtapositions' are just the beginning of the abundant and largely overlooked evidence linking these two psalms.[295] Even minimal consideration and discussion of the lexical links alone would lead to different conclusions. As will be shown in the following study, the unappreciated or unobserved parallels on various levels are abundant and lead quite logically to the conclusion that together Psalms 1–2 function as a coherent, cohesive and consistent introduction to the book. This of course is what one would expect given the overt evidence of detachment of the two as a pair through lack of superscriptions and explicit inclusio in contrast to the ensuing sequence.[296] However, the fascination with theorized 'forms' precludes a proper appreciation of the compositional and redactional intent.

A serious and thorough undertaking with all the linguistic evidence binding these two psalms together can only lead to the conclusion that themes and characters introduced in the first are present in the second and vice versa. Scholars mentioned previously (such as Manatti and de Solms, Auffret, Barbiero, Auwers, and Sheppard)[297] who grapple with the texts more or less impartially, albeit with only the most overt parallels, inevitably

295. Reynolds, *Torah*, p. 159. He also states that 'one of the themes is not necessarily prioritized by the juxtaposition', referring apparently to my claim that the king is present in both introductory psalms. However, grammar and simple arithmetic prove the point. All verbs in the first three verses (10 in all) refer to the man, either directly or by way of metaphor. Likewise every third masculine singular pronominal suffix (5 total) has him as referent except for one in v. 2b (referent is Yhwh). Details of the man's blameless life in v. 1 (15 words) and his ultimate eschatological future (cf. Ezek. 47.12 and Ps. 1.3) in v. 3 (17 words) substantially outnumber the description of his loyalty to torah (9 words). Furthermore, attachment to the torah (v. 2) is the principal task of the ideal king (Deut. 17.18-20) found in Ps. 2 undoubtedly. No mention of torah is found at all in vv. 4-6 of Ps. 1. So the one reference in v. 2 to it is simply given as an aspect of the description of the central royal figure of the psalm. He, not torah, dominates entirely the first three verses of the psalm (41 words), which themselves outweigh the last three in number (26 words). He is not 'one of the themes' (Reynolds, *Torah*, p. 159) but the principal subject of Ps. 1. The elevation of torah as the dominant theme in Ps. 1 is simply due to a form-critical predisposition (see further discussion below in Chapter 2).

296. Sheppard, *Wisdom*, pp. 139-40: 'It is striking that Ps. 2 lacks a title…part of the same redactional effort behind the addition of the concluding formula'.

297. Manatti and de Solms, *Les Psaumes*, p. 92; Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, pp. 31-34; Sheppard, *Wisdom*, pp. 141-42; Barbiero, *Das erste*, pp. 34-50; Auwers, *La composition*, pp. 123-24.

recognize the intended coherence between them at the redactional level. While form-critical presumptions are still present in these studies, the mere fact that linguistic ties are recognized and considered thoughtfully often leads to the same general conclusion of coherence. Absent a willingness to focus on the textual data, and present the influence of Gunkel, the results will be predictable.[298]

Consequently, until scholarship is willing to acknowledge the fundamental and irreconcilable opposition that exists between a serious grappling with the canonical shape and Gunkel's explicit rejection of it, the arrangement and resulting purpose and message of the Psalter's final designer will be resisted and obscured. *Gattungsforschung*, when applied, works at cross purposes with a unitary canonical reading of the Psalter. The previously mentioned observation of Auwers continues its relevancy as this most recent example demonstrates: 'L'exégèse du Psautier héritée de Hermann Gunkel s'est largement désintéressée de la configuration du recueil lui-même'.[299]

While examples could be multiplied of modern commentators on Psalms 1 and 2, the preceding examples have focused mainly on those purporting to take seriously the arrangement of the Psalter. While in the nineteenth century there were signs of interest in the canonical arrangement of the Psalter, including Psalms 1 and 2, the work of Gunkel at the beginning of the twentieth century had an evident stultifying effect. With the work of figures such as Westermann and Zimmerli, cracks begin to appear in the monolith of form criticism, as noted above. The studies of Childs and then Wilson in particular were highly effective in shifting focus to the significance of the canonical shape of the book. However, the continued fascination with Gunkel's paradigm and categories resulted in numerous attempts to combine two contradictory approaches. This has hindered further insight into the purpose of the Psalter's arrangement at large, and the first two psalms in

298. Reynolds, *Torah*, p. 159. His option of 'dual introduction' for Pss. 1–2 is entirely predictable. Likewise Grant, *The King*, p. 42: 'Could it be that Pss 1 *and* 2 (a torah psalm and a kingship psalm), actually form a *dual* introduction to the Psalms?' Wilson, *Psalms*, p. 108: 'These two psalms emphasize the centrality of *torah* in the *present* life of the faithful (Ps. 1) while stimulating enduring hope in the *future* messianic deliverance and rule of Yahweh (Ps. 2)'. Craig C. Broyles, *Psalms* (New International Biblical Commentary; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), p. 44: 'They appear to establish twin guides for reading it: we are to meditate on this "torah"…we are to take refuge under Yahweh's rule and in his Anointed One', Richard J. Clifford, *Psalms 1–72* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), p. 37: 'Psalm 1 is concerned with the individual facing wickedness in the world, and Ps. 2 is concerned with the king…confronting hostile nations'. Astorga Guerra, 'Meditar', pp. 6-7: 'Quizás los textos quieren mantener en tension dos líneas teológicas muy importantes de la Biblia: la Torah y la profecía'.

299. Auwers, *La composition*, p. 5.

particular. The following study will analyze Psalms 1 and 2 in detail, beginning with each psalm individually and as an integrated pair. Their thorough cohesiveness at various linguistic levels and the resulting coherence of theme and message, in spite of their so-called 'generic' differences, exposes the folly of form-critical categories in any attempt to understand the canonical Psalter.[300]

300. The same terms 'coherence' and 'cohesion' are used in an article on Pss. 1 and 2 not mentioned above: H.E. Hosch, 'Psalms 1 and 2: A Discourse Analysis', *Notes on Translation* 15.3 (2001), pp. 4-12 (4). However, Hosch argues repeatedly throughout that Ps. 1 is didactic in nature and 2 royal, declaring emphatically that they 'stand clearly for what they are—didactic torah and royal decree' (p. 11) and so concluding that they have 'different' (p. 4) or 'separate themes' (p. 12). He does recognize cohesion by shared verbal features (p. 4), but the idea of coherence as 'shared knowledge, implications and inferences that exist in the Israelite community…' (p. 4) fails to appreciate the effect and meaning of the explicit linguistic signposts.

Chapter 2

Psalm 1

Structure

Various literary features indicate that the first psalm is a unity. First of all, it contains evidence at either end of an abbreviated alphabetic acrostic. The first word of the poem is *'ālēp̄*-initial (אשרי), being the first consonant of the Hebrew alphabet. A verb form beginning with *tāw* (תאבד), the final consonant of the alphabet concludes the psalm. This minimal acrostic supports the first psalm's original discreteness. Nonetheless, the deliberate juxtaposition of the first two, lack of intervening superscription, the inclusio at either end and numerous links at various levels support a deliberate integration as its introduction.[1] As will be seen below, the final colon of Psalm 1 (v. 6b) and the opening of Psalm 2 (v. 1a) are linked by consonance, creating an almost seamless transition between what are originally two discrete compositions.

The two terms that form the acrostic at either end of Psalm 1 also add to the message of contrast seen throughout. Blessedness (אשרי) is characteristic of the man introduced in v. 1, while his opposites, the wicked, will suffer destruction (תאבד) according to the final clause of v. 6.[2] Verse 1 by itself has already expressed the same dissimilarity. Then the two major divisions of the psalm (vv. 1-3 and vv. 4-6) embody the identical distinction. So the contrast expressed fully in v. 1 and thereafter through the psalm's structure is also inherent in its acrostic envelope.

Proof that this minimal acrostic is not accidental can be found in Psalm 112, where the entire alphabet is displayed and at either end are the identical terms (אשרי…תאבד).[3] Furthermore, the same verb תאבד concluding

1. Cf. Mitchell, *The Message*, p. 73, 'First of all, the Psalter begins, as many commentators note, with an introduction consisting of Psalms 1 and 2'. See also my article, 'An Integrated Reading of Psalms 1 and 2', *JSOT* 98 (2002), pp. 75-88.

2. Since this man's benefits are derived from divine watch care (cf. v. 6), the term 'blessed' is more appropriate than the bland, 'happy'.

3. Walter Vogels, 'A Structural Analysis of Ps. 1', *Biblica* 60 (1979), pp. 410-16. Observe how Ps. 119, the Psalter's most lengthy and sustained acrostic, also opens with the form אשרי, and in its final verse (119.176) is found again the verbal root אבד.

both psalms is also preceded in either case by the identical noun רשׁעים.[4] It is therefore safe to assume that although the acrostic of Psalm 1 may be abbreviated, it is nonetheless deliberate.

Further evidence for the deliberate use of the acrostic form can be found in the first verse of Psalm 1. Not only does the opening word of v. 1 begin with *'ālepō*, the following two do likewise (אשׁרי האישׁ אשׁר).[5] Following the first three words are a series of three clauses, each of which contain a *bêṯ*-initial prepositional phrase, this consonant being the second in the alphabet (בעצת…בדרך…במושׁב). This has been called an 'incipient alphabetic acrostic' (א…א…ב…ב…ב).[6]

Lexical repetition at either end of the psalm (inclusio) further supports its unity and integrity. The opening verse refers to 'the wicked', 'the way', and 'sinners', and repeats three times the negative particle to describe those locales in which the blessed man is not found. At the other end of the psalm, vv. 5 and 6 repeat each of these four forms found in the first, and through use of the negative describe where the wicked will not be found:

לא…רשׁעים…ובדרך חטאים לא…לא v. 1

לא…רשׁעים…וחטאים…דרך…ודרך רשׁעים vv. 5-6

Consequently, through use of identical terms at either end the poet has segregated absolutely this man from the wicked. Although the latter example is traditionally numbered as two verses and the first as one, in terms of size they are analogous—fifteen words in v. 1 and seventeen in vv. 5-6.

Between the negated final clause of v. 1 and the first clause of v. 5, also negatively framed, a further contrast is evident through two prepositional phrases. Verse 1 defines the man by where 'he does not sit', while the wicked in v. 5 are defined by where 'they will not stand'. He does not sit with the wicked scoffers and the latter will not stand with the righteous. This semantic contrast is heightened in the Hebrew text through consonantal alliteration. The man does not sit 'in the seat' (בְּמוֹשַׁב) and the wicked will not rise 'in the judgment' (בְּמִשְׁפָּט). Not only are the three consonants repeated in the same order, but following them are the phonetically similar bilabial stops ב

4. רשׁעים האבד.

5. The second form is actually prefixed inseparably by the definite article *hē* (האישׁ), but the intentional threefold initial repetition of *'ālepō* is unmistakable.

6. David L. Petersen and Kent Harold Richards, *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), p. 94. The repetition of *bêṯ* continues in v. 2 as well in the two prepositional phrases 'in the instruction of the Lord…and in his instruction…'. Given this incipient alphabet sequence at the psalm's opening one begins to suspect that the psalm's final collocation of רְשָׁעִים תֹּאבֵד is a deliberate expression of the final three consonants (*rêš-šîn-tāw*).

and פ. As is often the case in Hebrew poetry, consonance functions here to underscore the semantic contrast between the session of the wicked and the place where the righteous rise.[7]

Another pair of phonetically similar but ultimately contrasting prepositional phrases is present in these verses. Verse 1 declares that the blessed man did not walk 'in the counsel' (בַּעֲצַת) of the wicked, while v. 5 reveals that sinners will not stand up 'in the congregation' (בַּעֲדַת) of the righteous. Except for one consonant in each case, the contrasting prepositional phrases exhibit identical consonantal sequences and morphology.[8] Even the odd consonants (צ and ד) are both considered alveolars.[9] So the explicit expression of contrast dividing the psalm into two parts at v. 4 (לֹא כֵן) is accompanied and supported by phonological parallels.

Verses 5 and 6 continue the contrast begun previously in the psalm, but instead of an individual, as in v. 1, there are many who also are sharply distinguished from the wicked. So while the psalm began with a single uniquely pious and successful king,[10] never having participated in scorn or rebellion, it concludes with the vision of a larger company of righteous. This pattern is repeated in the following psalm by referring at the outset to the king (2.2) and by concluding with the righteous who are defined as those who trust in *him* and are thereby eligible to participate in his blessings (אַשְׁרֵי in 2.12 and 1.1).[11] The wicked are defined as those in rebellion against Yhwh and his chosen king, but even they can possibly join ranks with the righteous through obedience and trust.

Numerous parallels, exist then, between the beginning and end of Psalm 1 in order to distinguish between the blessed one and the wicked. At the center of the psalm are two vivid similes from the natural realm, each

7. Psalm 2.4 will inform the reader as to where this blessed man does sit, and the contrast is effected by repetition of the same consonants (יוֹשֵׁב בַּשָּׁמַיִם and יִשְׁחָק…וּבְמוֹשָׁב).

8. Note that the LXX renders both of these terms identically: ἐν *βουλῇ* ἀσεβῶν (v. 1), ἐν *βουλῇ* δικαίων (v. 5). Daniel Grossberg, *Centripetal and Centrifugal Structures in Biblical Poetry* (SBLMS, 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), p. 10, notes regarding sound repetition, 'The phonological level of the text is also a potent unifying force. The recurrence of the same sound ipso facto forms a link. The similarity of sound can closely knit the work. If the sound correspondence reflects a semantic relationship, the two levels combine to create yet a denser weave. The assonance or alliteration by itself suggests a notional correspondence between words that otherwise might not be semantically compared'.

9. Peter James Silzer and Thomas John Finley, *How Biblical Languages Work* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2004), p. 64.

10. The royal characteristics of this individual will be discussed later.

11. As will be noted in comments on Ps. 2.12, the reading בַּר in the MT is perfectly coherent and acceptable from a literary compositional point of view, being one of at least two Aramaisms.

fulfilling the same function. Verse 3 evokes the metaphor of a healthy tree to describe the blessed man, and v. 4 compares the wicked to driven chaff. Consequently, the description of the blessed man extends from vv. 1 to 3 and that of the wicked from vv. 4 to 6, which divides the psalm into two stanzas, each containing two sub-units or strophes.

A.	vv. 1-2	The blessed man contrasted with the wicked
	B. v. 3	Simile of the blessed man—fruit-bearing tree
	B.' v. 4	Simile of the wicked—driven chaff
A.'	vv. 5-6	The wicked contrasted with the righteous

Each of these two stanzas exhibits a consistent focus, whether on the blessed man (vv. 1-3) or the wicked (vv. 4-6). Verse 1 opens with reference to the individual man as one blessed and ends in the final clause of v. 3 confidently declaring his unmitigated (military)[12] success. Stanza two commences with a direct reference to the wicked being unlike the blessed man and ends in the final clause of v. 6 with their assured destruction. Furthermore, at the beginning of both stanzas is found the negative particle (לא, vv. 1, 4). Thus, the man does *not* walk, stand or sit with the wicked (v. 1), but the latter are *not* so (v. 4). In each case the negative contrast is then followed immediately by the transitional form 'but rather', כי אם, vv. 2, 4b:

לא…לא…לא…	v. 1
כי אם…	v. 2
לא…	v. 4a
כי אם…	v. 4b

Prominent at the opening of each division is the definite article, a form less common in poetry. So we read of 'the man' and 'the wicked' (האישׁ, הרשׁעים, vv. 1, 4). By its limited twofold distribution and prominent location, the article focuses on the principal contrast of the psalm:

אשׁרי הָאישׁ	v. 1
לא כן הָרשׁעים	v. 4

In the case of the second stanza an inclusio is formed by the plural noun רשׁעים(ה) in the first clause of v. 4 and the last clause of v. 6. The identical form is also found in v. 5, proving that this group is the principal focus of stanza two. Reference to the wicked is found only once in the first stanza (v. 1), and is there simply to provide a contrast to the uniquely upright man.

12. As the parallel text of Josh. 1.8 proves.

Both stanzas begin with reference to their principal subject matter, the blessed man and the wicked (אשרי האישׁ, לא כן הרשׁעים) in vv. 1 and 4, while ending in vv. 3 and 6 with their ultimate destiny (תאבד, יצליח). In this manner each stanza is enveloped by identical sequences of subject stated and destiny declared. Here the war between them that Psalm 2 will expound in greater detail is already implied. As noted above, the 'success' of v. 3 (יצליח) involves destruction and domination of one's enemies in battle (Josh. 1.8). That destruction is expressed in v. 6 at the conclusion of the second division of the poem by the contrasting verb תאבד. Consequently, both psalms speak of a great conflict to take place between the blessed man and the wicked, ending with the destruction of the latter (1.6; 2.12) and victory of the former (1.3; 2.9).

The first stanza of Psalm 1 does not reiterate the noun 'man' in the same manner that is seen with 'the wicked' in the second. Rather, a series of third-person masculine singular verbs in v. 1, third masculine singular pronominal suffixes in v. 2, and further third masculine singular verbs in v. 3 maintain a consistent focus on him throughout the stanza. In addition, there is a curious threefold use of the relating particle אשׁר across this stanza (vv. 1, 3 [twice]) that provides a glue of sorts.[13] Only once does this particle occur in the second stanza (v. 4). Common consonantal alliteration between this particle אשׁר and the noun האישׁ, as well as 'blessedness' (אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר), functions to maintain focus on him through sound, in addition to grammar.[14] The relative pronoun אשׁר is anaphoric syntactically and phonologically to the immediately previous האישׁ, and to the opening אשׁרי. The result is a linking of blessings to this man, not only through juxtaposition of terms but also through consonantal resonance.

Literary features exhibited in the two similes also heighten the contrast between this individual and the wicked. To begin with, the simile of the tree and its accompanying interpretation found in v. 3 totals seventeen words. On the other hand, v. 4's picture of the wicked as chaff consists of only nine terms. Such a contrast in length matches the contrast in temporal length between a planted tree that endures to bear fruit without withering and chaff, which disappears quickly before the driving wind.

One reason for the lengthier size of the tree simile is the added explanation ending v. 3, וכל אשׁר יעשׂה יצליח. The poet abandons figurative language to make explicit that the fruitful tree refers to the man's success in all he does. Figurative language portraying the wicked as wind-driven chaff is without added explanation, apparently needing none.

13. A rarer form in Hebrew poetry. See Wilfred G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry* (JSOTSup, 26; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), p. 54.

14. Although the immediate surface grammatical antecedents to אשׁר in v. 3 are יֵ֫ and כל, they are ultimately anaphoric to האישׁ of v. 1.

The added clause at the end of v. 3 to explain the meaning of the tree simile gives the entire figure an appropriate conclusion. Its verbal predicate יצליח (hiph.), usually rendered as 'to be successful',[15] concludes the explanation, a decided contrast with the final term in the immediately following simile of v. 4, רוח, 'wind', being ephemeral and empty. It is probably not coincidental, in view of the repeated instances of consonance, that both of these terms concluding each simile end with the identical Hebrew consonant *ḥêṯ*. So repeated sound again highlights a semantic contrast (יצליח…רוח).

Both similes in vv. 3 and 4 are formed with the Hebrew preposition כ, 'like'. The poet has gone further however in the use of phonological resonance and attached the preposition to the words 'tree' and 'chaff', which are both monosyllabic and end with the same consonant (כעץ, כמץ).[16] Healthy trees and chaff both belong to the plant kingdom but are entirely different in value and endurance. For this reason the poet did not necessarily need to begin v. 4 and its description of the wicked with the emphatically positioned 'not so' (לא כן), since the contrast is plain enough between the two natural elements. However, the negative particle in this phrase also serves the function of drawing special attention to the same negative particle in v. 3, 'do not wither' (לא יבול). The leaves of this tree do not wither or dry up as does chaff and so both similes exhibit the negative particle to again underscore contrast. Likewise the strong divide between the righteous one and the wicked expressed through the triple use of לא in v. 1 is reiterated here in v. 4.

Beginning the simile of chaff with the negative particle 'not so' (לא) in v. 4 then required the poet to follow with the adversative form 'rather' (כי אם), to introduce the simile of chaff.[17] This compound particle recalls v. 2, where the identical form was found in order to produce another strong contrast. Verse 1 revealed that his lifestyle and activities were wholly distinct from them, and v. 2 that he *rather* (כי אם) meditates constantly in the Lord's torah. Verse 4 now reveals that the wicked are wholly distinct from him and by contrast are like chaff. So the writer has repeatedly sought to completely distinguish him from the wicked, expressing the same idea in the two divisions of the poem. He is wholly distinct from them in his piety and practice, and through priority of place and length of description, in fact, the principal topic of Psalm 1.[18] Psalm 1 is not extolling gnomically the

15. *HALOT*, *s.v.* צלח.

16. Another term for chaff or stubble (?) (קַשׁ) found in Mal. 3.19 could have been put to use in the psalm, but obviously the poet sought to utilize the phonetic parallel as a means of drawing a contrast.

17. If he had not begun with the negative, there would have been no need for the adversative compound particle; it would have been 'The wicked are like the chaff which…'

18. Vogels, 'A Structural Analysis of Ps. 1', p. 414: '…the man and not the Torah is the subject of the narrative… The man, not the law, is central'.

virtues of torah meditation but rather the virtues of the unique and militarily successful אישׁ who practices it.

Commentary

1.1. The opening form of Psalm 1 can be classified formally as a plural construct noun (אשׁרי), and appears to have an exclamatory sense.[19] Thus, it could be rendered as 'O the blessings of'.[20] The extent of those blessings is defined in the final clause of stanza one (v. 3c); *everything* he does has a prosperous or successful outcome. As noted previously, stanza one (vv. 1-3) opens with acclamation of his blessings (אשׁרי האישׁ) and concludes with his *unqualified* triumph in every endeavor (וכל אשׁר יעשׂה יצליח). His triumphs (cf. the military context of the parallel wording in Josh. 1.8) are portrayed through a metaphor from nature in v. 3, and Psalm 2 will concretize it as complete and forceful domination of the world's rulers.

This particular term 'blessings' (אשׁרי) that opens the psalm duplicates the consonants of a verb meaning 'to advance' or 'go straight on', and a noun, 'step, going'.[21] So it is probably not coincidental that immediately following in this same verse are two clauses, the first describing a 'walk' (הלך), and the second a 'way' (דרך).[22] Apparently the poet is exploiting this similarity in his particular choice of terms for the idea of 'blessing'. The form used suggests from the beginning that divine favor accompanies this man's steps previous to the definitive statement in v. 3.

This particular opening term אשׁרי also creates a clever contrast with the wicked mentioned in the subordinate clause immediately following. Its consonantal sequence is *'ālep̱-šîn-rêš*, while for the 'wicked' the order is *rêš-šîn-ʿayin* (רשׁעים). Both *'ālep̱* and *ʿayin* are guttural with the result that the former presents the sequence guttural-*šîn-rêš* (אשׁרי) and the latter *rêš-šîn*-guttural (רשׁעים). Although the consonants in both terms are practically

19. GKC, §93*l*: '(a word which is only used in the *constr. st. pl* and at an early period became stereotyped as a kind of interjection)'. *IBHS*, §40.2.3b: 'אשׁרי "O the blessings of, enviable the situation of", a petrified plural noun found only in construct phrases… or with suffixes…' Cf. 1 Kgs 10.8; Deut. 33.29.

20. As a verb the root is found in contexts (Gen. 30.13; Mal. 3.12; Ps. 72.1; Prov. 31.28; Cant. 6.9) of blessings pronounced on an individual or group. The forms in Prov. 31.28 and Cant. 6.9 parallel the verb 'to praise' (הלל), while in Ps. 72.17 the more common verbal root translated 'to bless' (ברך).

21. BDB, *s.v.* אשׁר. Cf. Ps. 73.2, אַשְׁרַי.

22. Note how the verbal root אשׁר in Prov. 4.14; 9.6; 23.19 appears in the context of the same noun 'way' (דרך). Cf. Konrad Schaefer, *Psalms* (Berit Olam; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001), p. 3. Furthermore, the root is found in both senses in the two approximate verses of Ps. 40.3, 5 (אַשְׁרֵי…אַשְׁרֵי הגבר אשׁר) along with the same relative pronoun.

identical, the sequence is reversed. Phonetic similarity draws attention to the semantic contrast, while the reversed order mirrors and anticipates the opposite fates awaiting the one man and the wicked.

Within v. 1 are three clauses of similar character, all following and subordinate grammatically to the initial exclamation. Each of the three contain four terms: a prepositional phrase governed by *bêṯ*, a masculine plural noun of similar meaning (wicked, sinners, scoffers), and a negated third masculine singular perfect verb. Their striking similarity to each other highlights the discrete nature of the initial sequence, 'O the blessings of the man who…'. Some have labeled this rhythmically distinct opening to the psalm 'anacrusis', which is illustrated below:[23]

אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר
לֹא הָלַךְ בַּעֲצַת רְשָׁעִים
וּבְדֶרֶךְ חַטָּאִים לֹא עָמָד
וּבְמוֹשַׁב לֵצִים לֹא יָשָׁב

The effect is to focus special attention on the exclamation, in addition to that which it accrues by its position at the head of the psalm and of the entire book. Indeed, it serves as a fitting title for not only Psalm 1 but likewise for the introduction consisting of Psalms 1–2 and the Psalter as a whole.[24]

Psalm 2 will proceed to offer further comment on this acclaimed individual.[25] There he is identified as the Lord's messiah, king, and son of God.

23. Petersen and Richards, *Interpreting*, p. 92. Note their comments on the opening words of Ps. 1.1: 'Since this colon is rhythmically separated from the rest of the poem, the reader will recognize the importance of its words, which, after all, are the first ones in the Psalter. They point to the central individual, the blessed individual, who is the focus of this entire collection of poetry.' See also Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York: Basic Books, 1985), p. 114, who brackets off the initial words of Ps. 1 'as an introductory formula or virtual title before the first line, since otherwise line 1 would begin with an impossibly long rhythmic unit'.

24. Note Mayer I. Gruber's comments in *Rashi's Commentary on Psalms 1–89 (Books I–III)* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), p. 45 n. 1: 'Both the mss. and the printed editions of Rashi's commentary preface Rashi's introduction to the psalter with the first two words of Ps. 1. In fact, these two words serve in the Hebrew Bible as the title of the Book of Psalms… In a number of mss.…the scribe sets Rashi's introduction to the psalter apart from Rashi's commentary on Ps. 1 by prefacing each of these with the first two words of Ps. 1.1 in bold letters.' Similarly, Terjel Stordalen, in *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), pp. 448-49 n. 216: 'The psalm and its title (אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ/*Beatus vir*) was conceived as superscript to the Psalter for centuries in both Jewish and Christian Bible tradition'.

25. Cf. also Ps. 26.1, 3-5, 11 for descriptions of the righteous individual formally similar to Psalm 1, but spoken in first person.

Since both psalms in tandem constitute the introduction to the entire book, the importance of this figure cannot be overemphasized.

His designation as האישׁ has traditionally been rendered 'the man'. However, this masks a distinction that is absent in translation. The same noun is used in Deut. 17.15 in reference to a potential (unsuitable) candidate for Israel's throne. In Joshua 1, a text related to the royal description of Deuteronomy 17, potential enemies who would attempt to stand against Joshua are also designated as אישׁ. These foes could only be Canaanite kings in the land about to be conquered. Examples of intertextuality between Ps. 1.2, 3 and Josh. 1.8 indicate a deliberate borrowing of vocabulary, with אישׁ being another example. Furthermore, Psalm 2, where the man of Psalm 1 is identified as God's chosen king, will depict the rebellion against him with the same terminology (יתיצבו, Ps. 2.2) as that of Josh. 1.5 (יתיצב). Hence אישׁ may be employed to refer to a king and is confirmed in this case by flawless adherence (v. 2) to the royal command of Deut. 17.18-19.

The interpretation given here, reading the text as descriptive of a particular man, contradicts the widespread and long held view of Psalm 1 as a universal prescriptive program for righteous living.[26] Although traditionally the most common rendering has been 'the man', even for those holding to a prescriptive view,[27] more recent translations of v. 1 have made that view more explicit with, 'Happy are those'[28] or 'Blessed are those'.[29] Again, the term 'blessed' or 'blessings (of)' used here is preferred due to the fact that the overt resonance v. 3 shares with Gen. 39.3, 23 and Josh 1.8 indicates a divine bestowal of benefits on this particular man. Furthermore, the way (דרך) he avoids in v. 1 points to the way he certainly takes (דרך צדיקים, v. 6), which is carefully monitored by Yhwh.[30] This view is confirmed by the juxtaposition of Psalm 2 where the *giving* of fruit in 1.3 is defined precisely as the *giving* of the nations to the son of God in 2.8.[31]

Both descriptive and prescriptive views of Psalm 1 are ancient. The midrash lists rabbinic comments identifying various Old Testament figures

26. The fourth-century Antiochene Diodore of Tarsus comments, 'The first psalm, then, is both moral and general in scope, instructing not any particular person but people in general' (Diodore of Tarsus, *Commentary on Psalms 1–51*, p. 5).

27. Cf. the ESV (Wheaton: Crossway, 2001), p. 537, which translates, 'Blessed is the man', but adds in a footnote, 'The singular Hebrew word for man (ish) is used here to portray a representative example of a godly person'.

28. *The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989).

29. *The Holy Bible: Today's New International Version* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005).

30. Contra Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, p. 61: 'The state of blessedness or happiness is not a *reward* (italics his); rather, it is the result of a particular type of life'.

31. See comments on Ps. 2.8 below.

as its referent and also includes the prescriptive view.[32] On the descriptive side, Augustine saw a reference to Christ in this verse, as did Justin Martyr.[33] Richard Clifford divides patristic figures between those who read this psalm christologically (Hippolytus, Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus and later Latin figures) and those holding an 'ethical view' (Hilary, Ambrose, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria and the Antiochene School).[34]

In the modern era there is no doubt that the prescriptive view has held sway among commentators in spite of the unqualified and unmitigated description of perfection. He is blameless in his abstinence from evil (v. 1) and participation in goodness (v. 3). However, not all interpreters have overlooked this fact. Kraus notes that 'everything stated in Psalm 1 about the צדיק basically entails a character that transcends any one individual… definitely bears the features of the super individual, the paradigmatic person. The "Pharisee", with his utmost rigoristic obedience to the Law, cannot fill out this picture.'[35] So also Eaton: 'the absolute manner in which the man of God is portrayed, a man perfect…beyond human possibilities'.[36] Furthermore, the threefold activity of walking, standing,[37] and sitting/dwelling has been seen by some as an allusion to Deut. 6.7 (cf. 11.19), an expression of life in its totality.[38] As such this man of Psalm 1 is an entirely unique Israelite, flawless in all aspects.

32. William G. Braude (ed. and trans.), *The Midrash on Psalms*, I (2 vols.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), pp. 3-23. Among those listed are, David, Abraham, Noah and the tribe of Levi. Theodore of Mopsuestia (fifth-century CE) argues against its identification by commentators as Josiah, who is disqualified by sending temple treasures to Hazael, and then dubs it 'a moral psalm…moral instruction is laid out' (*Commentary on Psalms 1–81* [trans. Robert C. Hill; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006], pp. 6-7).

33. Augustine, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*. III/15. *Expositions of the Psalms 1–32* (ed. J.E. Rotelle; trans. M. Boulding; Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2000), p. 67. Justin Martyr, *The First and Second Apologies* (trans. L.W. Barnard; New York: Paulist Press, 1997), pp. 50-51.

34. *Psalms 1–72*, pp. 41-42. The prescriptive view is also expressed in 4Q174 (4QFlor) from Qumran according to Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4*, pp. 53-55.

35. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, p. 121.

36. J.H. Eaton, *Psalms* (London: SCM Press, 1967), p. 31.

37. The idiom, 'standing in a way', is a figure also found in Jer. 6.16b (עמדו על דרכים), and refers to a stance from which one chooses a path, a way of living. The correct path endures forever (v. 16c), is good (v. 16d), and brings rest to one's being (v. 16e). 1 Kgs 2.3 defines obedience to God's laws as 'his ways' (בדרכיו), in which David commanded his son Solomon to walk. Abraham commanded his sons to keep the 'way of the Lord' (דרך יהוה, Gen. 18.19). In Gen. 6.12 the same term describes the corruption of all flesh (כי השחית כל בשׂר את דרכו). Jeremiah 10.2-3 warns against following 'the way of the nations' (דרך הגוים), i.e. idolatry and fearing signs in the heavens.

38. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Die Psalmen*, pp. 46-47, Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. ד (4).

The aforementioned translation, 'Blessed/Happy are those', effectively nullifies any gender and number distinction in translating the definite masculine singular noun האישׁ. As just noted, such a translation ignores the unqualified piety and achievement of this man, making the generalizing rendition unlikely.[39] Furthermore, discussion of Psalm 2 will reveal explicit links at the phonological, lexical, semantic and thematic levels equating the chosen messianic king with the man of the first psalm. Similarly, the wicked of the first psalm are clearly identified with the recalcitrant nations and rulers of the second. Further support for the identification of a specific male individual is based on the fact that a generalizing and inclusive phrase was otherwise available, as in Est. 4.11, כל איׁש ואשׁה אשׁר. Presumably in Psalm 1 it would have taken the form אשׁרי כל איׁש ואשׁה אשׁר or simply אשׁרי כל איׁש אשׁר.

The specificity expressed through the articular האישׁ (as opposed to an anarthrous form כל איׁש ואשׁה) is significant in that Hebrew poetry, in contrast to prose, generally eschews use of the article and the relating particle אשׁר as well, both of which appear in Ps. 1.1.[40] This deliberate choice of uncommon expression draws further attention to the man beyond that implied by his primary position. Twofold repetition of the relating particle אשׁר in v. 3 maintains special focus on him. The second instance of v. 3 (וכל אשׁר) is found in a sequence referring to his unqualified success, an idea already inherent in the parallel expression at the outset of the psalm (אשׁרי האישׁ אשׁר). So v. 3 explicitly provides further comment on the divinely bestowed blessings of v. 1. But just as v. 1 is deliberately linked to 2.12 by repetition of אשׁרי, so is 1.3, creating a phonologically and lexically linked chain across the first two psalms:

אשׁרי האישׁ אשׁר	1.1
אשׁר…וכל אשׁר	1.3
אשׁרי כל	2.12

As can be appreciated here, v. 3 provides an intermediary link between the oft-noted inclusio between 1.1 and 2.12.

The implication behind this deliberate association is that divinely bestowed successes and blessings on the unique man of Psalm 1 are enjoyed by those who trust 'in him' (בו). Once the lexical and phonological cohesion between 1.3 and 2.12 is recognized, the idea that the masculine pronominal suffix of בו should be understood as a reprise of the same form clustered throughout 1.2-3 (חפצו…ובתורתו…פריו…בעתו) becomes more persuasive as well.[41] As will

39. Note the comments of J. Roy Porter, 'The Succession of Joshua', in G.N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville (eds), *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), pp. 139-62 (150), regarding Ps. 1: 'It might therefore have the function of setting before the new king an ideal of royal behavior'.

40. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, p. 54.

41. Within Psalm 2 itself, the distribution of the same pronoun suffix of בו across vv. 2, 5, 12 (משׁיחו…באפו…אפו) is consistent with this observation.

be shown in comments on Ps. 2.12, the antecedent of this masculine singular pronominal suffix (being the same as that of אפו in the same verse) is assuredly the son (בר), a term deliberately chosen for its unique resonance with vv. 9 and 11.[42] This son, the object of trust in 2.12, is none other than the man of 1.1-3, an identification linguistic links to 1.1 and 3 have already implied.

In contrast to this man are the wicked (vv. 1, 4, 5, 6)[43] whose fourfold appearance marks them as a special focus of this psalm. They likewise reappear throughout the Psalter (beginning immediately after the introduction with Ps. 3.8), which contains more references to the wicked than any other book in the Hebrew Bible.[44] Their ultimate destruction is assured in Ps. 1.6, but their delayed demise will provoke numerous questions and protestations across the book.[45] Indeed, near the Psalter's end (Ps. 146.9), the thwarting of 'the way of the wicked' (דרך רשׁעים) is declared, precisely the expression of 1.6. As in Psalm 1, a contrast is created with the divine love directed to 'the righteous' (צדיקים, 146.8). Such evidence highlights the importance of Psalm 1 as an introduction to themes that envelope (and punctuate) the entire book.[46]

1.2. Verse 2 is introduced by a strongly adversative particle כי אם (*But rather*), setting this man's activity in direct contrast to v. 1.[47] By this means the poet has signaled the absolute distance between him and the wicked, and so is consistent with observations of a structural nature mentioned previously.

42. The bulk of commentators who seek to emend this *lectior difficilior* have overlooked the rhetorical flair exhibited by this Aramaism. Note the lengthy and varied attempt at emendation in the critical apparatus of *BHS*.

43. Note again the use of the article in the initial presentation of the wicked (הרשׁעים), creating thereby a deliberate juxtaposition between them and the man of v. 1 (האישׁ). No such article is prefixed to the righteous.

44. C. van Leeuwen, 'רָשַׁע', *TLOT* III, pp. 1261-65. The term is found 82× in the Psalter, 78× in Proverbs, 28× in Ezekiel and 26× in Job. Miller in 'The Beginning', pp. 83-92, states that references to the wicked number 26 in Psalms 3–41 (the first book), as opposed to 37 references in the rest of the Psalter. Therefore the wicked constitute a major focus not only of the Psalter as a whole but especially Book I, immediately following the introduction of Psalms 1–2.

45. For example, Pss. 10.2, 4; 73.3, 12.

46. The demise of the wicked (רשׁעים) is also reiterated in texts such as Pss. 75.5, 11; 147.6.

47. The particle כי אם serves both here and in v. 4 to create contrast in a most emphatic manner. Samuel Terrien characterizes it as an 'abrupt adversative'. See his *The Psalms*, p. 72 n. 9. According to Christo H.J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé and Jan H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), p. 303, when speakers utilize this combination they 'make it very clear that not only is an alternative involved, but that it is *the only possible alternative* [emphasis theirs]'.

Between vv. 1 and 2 is found the pattern, כי אם…לא…לא, which is then repeated in v. 4, כי אם…לא as noted above. Stating that this man is not like the wicked (v. 1) and that they are not like him (v. 4) may appear redundant. However, there are important differences. The first adversative in v. 2 introduces the principal habit of the man; the second in v. 4 moves straightaway to the ultimate fate of the wicked, without mention of their activities. Verse 3 will delineate in a relatively lengthy manner the ultimate fate of this individual man, as opposed to the brief summary of the wicked in v. 4. For the poet, the latter are not worthy of the sustained attention given to the practices and ultimate end of the favored man. Nonetheless, Psalm 2 will supply more specific information lacking here concerning their identity and activity.

The practiced principal activity of this man is that commanded of Joshua, as strikingly similar terminology demonstrates:

Josh. 1.8
ספר התורה…והגית בו יומם ולילה…לעשות ככל הכתוב בו כי אז תצליח את דרכך

Ps. 1.1-3
ובדרך…כי אם בתורת…ובתורתו יהגה יומם ולילה…וכל אשר יעשה יצליח

While the poet has closely characterized this individual according to the pattern of Joshua, there exists one important difference evident in the grammatical mood. The context of Josh. 1.7-8 is hortatory in character, with various imperatives directed to the leader of Israel as a condition for his success in conquest, while those of Ps. 1.2-3 are expressed solely in the indicative mood. They constitute statements of accomplished fact.[48] Joshua was admonished not to abandon or turn from the Torah but to meditate on it day and night (אל תסור…לא ימוש…והגית),[49] with the accompanying promised result of success (אז תצליח, Josh. 1.8). By contrast, this individual does ponder (יהגה) the Torah day and night without fail, and will be (והיה)[50] successful (יעשה יצליח, Ps. 1.2-3). He is thus portrayed ideally beyond the historical Joshua, who in fact failed at certain times in what was otherwise a successful campaign against the Canaanites.[51]

48. Phil J. Botha, 'Intertextuality and the Interpretation of Psalm 1', in Dirk Human (ed.), *Psalms and Mythology* (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2007), pp. 58-76, commenting on the success of Ps. 1.3 notes 'important differences between Joshua 1 and Psalm 1… Success is not made dependent on compliance with the Torah in Ps. 1, but is described as a *fait accompli*' (p. 67).

49. The *weqatal* takes on the volitive force of the preceding prohibition. Wolfgang Schneider, *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch: Ein Lehrbuch* (München: Claudius, 2001), p. 186: 'so können Folgesätze mit Perfectum consecutivum angereiht werden, die die erste Aufforderung entfalten und fortführen'.

50. See comments on v. 3 regarding this form.

51. Ai (Josh. 7), Gibeon (Josh. 9).

In Josh. 1.7-8 the Lord admonishes Joshua, Moses' successor,[52] in terminology very similar to that of Deuteronomy 17 wherein a future king is likewise warned. He is commanded to copy the Torah onto a scroll and heed it all the days of his life, neither turning from it to the right nor to the left:

ולבלתי סור מן המצוה ימין ושׂמאול למען Deut. 17.20

אל תסור ממנו ימין ושׂמאול למען Josh. 1.7

Evidently Ps. 1.2 intimates a ruler, and Psalm 2 will make that association explicit.[53] Corroboration comes from the fact that later kings such as Solomon and Josiah are characterized according to the template of Joshua (2 Kgs 22.2; 1 Chron. 22.11-16; 28.3-20; 2 Chron. 7.11).[54] In being portrayed after the pattern of Joshua, this individual is also by implication like Moses, whose life the conqueror of Canaan resembles in multiplied ways.

While Josh. 1.8 speaks of 'this book of the Torah', referring canonically back to some form of the Pentateuch, the Lord's torah in Psalm 1 probably has a wider and more general sense. The terms 'book' or 'written' in Ps. 1.2 (cf. Deut. 28.61; 29.20; 30.10; Josh. 1.8; 8.31, 34; Neh. 8.1, 3, 31; 2 Kgs 22.8) are present elsewhere in the Psalms (Pss. 40.8, 9; 69.29; 139.16; 149.9). This suggests the totality of divine instruction beyond the תורת משׁה in Ps. 1.2, although the latter would certainly be included.[55] In Isa. 1.10

52. Joshua himself is portrayed as a second Moses throughout the book and in his death is called 'servant of the Lord' (Josh. 24.29), a title given to the lawgiver in his death (Deut. 34.5). Hence, Joshua was 'a prophet like Moses', but the writer of Ps. 1 portrays yet another figure of greater stature.

53. Heinrich Ewald comments on the characterization of Joshua: 'As the author, with his words of prophetic aspiration, hides himself under the high shield of Moses the great Prophet, so under the portraiture of Joshua he conceals the ideal King of his own times such as he would have him, a realiser of what is essentially better', *The History of Israel. I. Introduction and Preliminary History* (ed. Russell Martineau; London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 4th edn, 1883), p. 118.

54. Miller, 'The Beginning', pp. 91-92. H.G.M. Williamson, 'The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles', *VT* 36 (1976), pp. 351-61 (356), observes how, 'the transition of leadership from Moses to Joshua clearly served as a model for the Chronicler in his understanding of the transition from David to Solomon'. J.A. Soggin, 'Zum ersten Psalm', *TZ* 23 (1967), pp. 81-96 (91), 'Nun ist es aber wohlbekannt, daß im Zweistromland seit jeher…eine enge verbindung zwischen dem am Paradiesstrom gepflanzten Lebensbaum (ein Begriff, den auch das A.T. gut kennt, Gen. 2, 9ff. wobei ich noch die targumische Paraphrase unseres Verses anführen möchten) und dem König besteht'.

55. Marc Brettler, *The Jewish Study Bible* (ed. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 1-7 (1-2), in an introductory essay to the Torah states: 'THE TERM TORAH, "TEACHINGS, INSTRUCTION", derives from the root *y-r-h*…it is best to understand the biblical term *torat moshe*, the earliest

God's torah (תורת אלהינו) is equivalent to the divine word spoken through Isaiah (דבר יהוה).[56]

Verse 2 is a bicolon, although the first half is a nominal clause stating a condition and the second a dependent action.[57] In other words, this man's delight is the Lord's torah, so as a consequence he meditates upon it day and night.[58] 'Day and night' (יומם ולילה) expresses a merism whereby two elements of time envelope the whole. The same phrase in Pss. 32.3, 4 (כל היום: כי יומם ולילה), 42.4 (יומם ולילה…כל היום) and parallels, as can be seen, the expression 'all of the day', indicating the constancy of the activity. Another example of 'all-day meditation' on the torah of the Lord is Ps. 119.97, מה אהבתי תורתך כל היום היא שיחתי, which words would certainly qualify as those uttered by the man of Ps. 1.1. Psalm 119 is an example on a substantial scale of uninterrupted devotion to the torah.

It is not the *yiqtol* יהגה which indicates the continuing meditation, but rather the temporal adverbial adjunct (יומם ולילה). Verse 2 is the positive counterpart to v. 1, the latter repeating three negated *qatals* ('perfects' so-called) which undoubtedly describe *ongoing* action.[59]

A possible ambiguity exists in the distribution of third-person masculine singular pronominal suffixes across v. 2:

B	A
כי אם בתורת יהוה חפצו ובתורתו יהגה יומם ולילה	

At the semantic level the opening compound conjunction (כי אם) does double duty across the bicolon.[60] The pronominal suffix of the form חפצו presumably has as its grammatical antecedent האישׁ of v. 1. Immediately following the *caesura* between A and B is another pronominally suffixed noun (ובתורתו) whose presumed antecedent is now יהוה of A. Here then are apparently two successive identically suffixed nouns functioning ana-

extant term for these five books, as "the instruction of Moses".' Throughout Proverbs 'torah' often refers to human instruction, be it from a mother or father (Prov. 1.8; 3.1; 4.2).

56. Cf. also Jer. 6.19. It is probably not coincidental that reference to torah occurs at major junctures of the Hebrew canon following the Pentateuch: Josh. 1 at the head of Prophets, Isa. 1 opening the Latter Prophets and Ps. 1 opening the Writings.

57. Diethelm Michel, *Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1960), pp. 108-10.

58. Michel, *Tempora*, pp. 109-10: 'die Vershälften nicht parallel zu sehen, sondern die Handlung von dem Zustand abhängig zu sehen'.

59. Michel, *Tempora*, p. 109, 'Die Auskunft, in v. 2b gebe das impf. eine wiederholte Handlung an, kann letztlich auch nicht befriedigen, denn natürlich soll in v. 1 nicht gesagt werden, der צדיק sei nur einmal nicht nach dem Rat der Frevler gewandelt, sondern er wandle immer wieder nicht nach ihm'.

60. The opening *šûreq* of B carries on the force of the initial compound.

phorically to two *different* preceding nouns.[61] However, one might argue just as easily that the two successive pronoun suffixes must have the identical antecedent, being the man. As will be seen, this deliberate ambiguity is reinforced by further phonological evidence.

Presumably the phrase בתורת יהוה in A is paralled by ובתורתו in B, the suffix of the latter replacing יהוה in the former. At the same time the slot occupied by the divine name יהוה in A is replaced by יהגה in B:

בתורת יהוה…ובתורתו יהגה

While these two forms differ grammatically and in syntactical function, they are quite similar phonologically. Three out of four consonants[62] are identical and appear in the same sequence.[63] The resonance appears quite deliberate, but its purpose is not clear. The subject of יהגה appears on the surface to be האישׁ, but this explicit parallelism of position and of form draws closely together the deity and the verbal predicate 'he meditates'. This apparent association between the one who meditates and Yhwh may be linked to the ambiguity of pronominal reference in ובתורתו. If the 'his' of 'his torah' refers to the man himself, even as does the 'his' of 'his delight' (חפצו ובתורתו), he then partakes somehow of the identity of Yhwh. The torah of Yhwh is also his (the man's) torah. The ambiguity of pronominal reference coupled with explicit parallel members and features opens the door to such a reading. The attribution of divine characteristics to the man of Psalm 1 is much more overt in Ps. 2.4 as will be seen.[64] The hints of it described here may simply be a harbinger of the more overt evidence there.

Near the conclusion of Book I is another expression of *delight* in God's will and *his torah* (Ps. 40.9 …חפצתי ותורתך…) by an individual speaker identified as David in the superscription.[65] This would appear to constitute another inclusio across the initial division of the Psalter, and also suggest that the flawless man described in Psalm 1 is given voice through Psalm 40. In Ps. 41.12 the speaker becomes the object of Yhwh's delight (כי חפצת בי). So Psalms 1 and 2 introduce the Psalter, and Book I, with a portrayal of the blameless all-conquering king, while the words of David and other

61. Rashi considers both of these third masculine singular pronoun suffixes to have the same referent, i.e., the man: מתחלה היא נקראת תורת יי; משעמל בה היא נקראת תורתו (Cohen, *Migra'ot, gedolot*, p. 2)

62. To be precise, the final *hē* represents a vowel.

63. I owe this observation to my student, Aaron Hale.

64. Lexical, semantic and phonological parallels between Pss. 1.1d and 2.4 draw a clear line of identification between these two verses and their subjects.

65. Miller, 'The Beginning', p. 86 'The psalmist in this context offers himself or herself as one who conforms to the model set forth in Psalm 1…'.

individual speakers from Psalm 3 onward are presented as giving prophetic expression to his suffering and piety.[66]

The Hebrew verbal root הגה, usually translated 'mediate', is closely associated with verbs of remembering (זכר), musing (שׂיח) and speaking (דבר).[67] Subject nouns commonly governing these verbs are those referring to organs of speech such as the throat, mouth and tongue, but also the heart or mind.[68] Within the Psalter, this root is often found in first-person singular speech.[69] Psalm 37.30-31 refers to the righteous one in language reminiscent of Ps. 1.2:

פי צדיק יהגה חכמה…תורת אלהיו בלבו Ps. 37.30a, 31a

Note likewise the noun form of the same verb הגה in another psalm in which the torah of Yhwh is also identified as the speaker's focus and meditation:

יהיו לרצון אמרי פי והגיון לבי לפניך Ps. 19.15

Here as in the aforementioned Ps. 119.97 (מה אהבתי תורתך כל היום היא שיחתי) the selfsame individual king presented at the outset of the Psalter is given voice.

1.3. The principle subject of vv. 1 and 2 is the man (האישׁ), being the subject of all four verbs. He is likewise the subject of the opening והיה in v. 3,[70] which introduces a simile identified by the Hebrew particle כ ('like, as'). Following the simile, the poet returns to prosaic language, וכל אשׁר יעשׂה יצליח, and as was the case in v. 2, the language is reminiscent of Joshua in Josh. 1.7-8:

בכל אשׁר תלך…אז תצליח

but likewise of Joseph in Gen. 39.2-3, 23:

ויהי איׁש מצליח …וכל אשׁר הוא עשׂה יהוה מצליח בידו vv. 2-3
ואשׁר הוא עשׂה יהוה מצליח v. 23

66. Note how the speaker's enemies (characterized as בליעל) in 41.9 lie down (שׁכב) in death, never to arise again (לא יקום), as is true of the wicked in 1.5 (לא יקומו). As will be discussed below in Chapter 4, the speaker of Ps. 3.6 (which psalm the Psalter's redactor indicated should be read in light of Ps. 2 and functions as the words of the latter's chosen king) will also lie down (שׁכבתי) in death, but then awaken (הקיצותי).

67. Cf. Pss. 37.30; 63.7; 77.13; 143.5.

68. Cf. Pss. 35.28; 37.30; 71.24; 115.7; Isa. 33.18; 59.13; Prov. 15.28; 24.2.

69. Pss. 35.28; 63.7; 71.24; 77.13; 143.5.

70. Schneider calls this an *Einleitungsformeln* ('introductory formula') in *Grammatik*, pp. 245-47. It can also serve to articulate smaller units (p. 257).

and Solomon in 2 Chron. 7.11, as noted above:

ואת כל הבא על לב שלמה לעשות בבית יהוה ובביתו הצליח

The addition in v. 3 of a prosaic piece to the arboreal metaphor not only explains its meaning in concrete terms, but also fortifies the links to Josh. 1.8 previously established through v. 2 (ובתורתו יהגה יומם ולילה). Implied is a reading of Joshua in the opening book of the Prophets by the writer of Psalm 1 at the head of the Writings as a harbinger of the future eschatological conqueror to come.[71] Similarly, the writers of Kings and Chronicles saw in the figure of Joshua a prototype for future monarchs such as Solomon and others that followed.[72] But both of these books conclude on a note of expectancy indicating that the ultimate royal 'Joshua' had not appeared.[73]

Consequently, Psalm 1 speaks of a future conquering king using Joshua as a pattern and, as such, is as 'royal' a psalm as the following Psalm 2.[74] Its affixing to, and close integration with, Psalm 2 simply confirms further that a king is in view.[75] As will be discussed below, links at every level between the two psalms point to the latter monarch being none other than the blessed man of Psalm 1,[76] and the rebellious kings of the second psalm the wicked

71. Thus figures of royal tinge appear at the outset of the Torah (Adam, as Gen. 1.28 reveals with וכבשה ורדו. Cf. Pss 72.8; 110.2; 1 Kgs 5.4), Prophets (Josh. 1) and Writings (Pss. 1–2).

72. Williamson, 'The Accession', pp. 351-61. Porter, 'The Succession', pp. 139-62. Ewald, *The History of Israel*, p. 118. G. Widengren, 'King and Covenant', *JSS* 2 (1957), pp. 1-32 (14). R.D. Nelson, 'Josiah in the Book of Joshua', *JBL* 100 (1981), pp. 531-40.

73. Being portrayed deliberately from beginning to end in the book as a second Moses, the figure of Joshua thus represents the roles of prophet and priest, to which can now be added king.

74. Contra Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, p. 114: 'But there is no indication in Psalm 1 that the statements there could refer to a king', and a more recent statement such as Richard P. Belcher, Jr, *The Messiah and the Psalms: Preaching Christ from all the Psalms* (Fearn, Ross-Shire Scotland: Mentor, 2006), p. 13, regarding Psalm 1: 'Nothing distinctly Messianic is found in this psalm. There is no mention of a king or a kingdom (as Pss 2 and 110)…'

75. Porter, 'The Succession', p. 149: 'It has been suggested that the position of Psalm 1, which invokes a blessing on the one who keeps the law, just before Psalm 2, which is part of a royal enthronement festival, is not fortuitous, and that they belong together as part of the liturgy for the king's accession'. Indeed they belong together, not at all as a hypothesized coronation liturgy, but rather to open the entire Psalter with an integrated portrayal of the victorious eschatological priest-king.

76. See Manatti and de Solms, *Les Psaumes*, p. 92, who relate the success of v. 3 to King Messiah: 'que la réussite du Juste, c'est le Jugement du Roi-Messie…'. In footnote 11 on the same page, they note that the verb 'to succeed' of Ps. 1.3 (יצליח) is applied to the messianic king in Ps. 45.5 (צלח).

of the first. Note Botha's conclusion after examining Psalm 1, not so much in light of Psalm 2 but of Joshua 1 and 1 Chronicles 22, that the 'individual of Psalm 1, who is blessed like a tree in the presence of Yahweh, might just prove to be the ideal and righteous king in Israel'.[77]

The introductory verb form in v. 3 (והיה) is forward looking,[78] and consequently the future of this irreproachable man is in view. Presumably his abstention from the wicked of v. 1 and his attention to God's word in v. 2 will have as their eventual result the unqualified success of v. 3.[79] A temporal gap is therefore created between the stated piety of this individual and his promised, yet still distant future, success. This particular *weqatal* form in many cases introduces descriptions of that time period often designated as 'the end of days'.[80] Deferral of the ultimate outcome will occasion multiple complaints throughout the Psalter.[81]

The blessed man, portrayed metaphorically as a tree, will be planted by channels of water (פלגי מים), terminology and imagery that resonate with several other passages.[82] The opening chapters of Genesis first describe fruit-bearing trees (עץ פרי…עץ עשׂה פרי, Gen. 1.11-12, פרי עץ, Gen. 1.29) and well-watered trees of Eden (כל עץ נחמד…ועץ החיים…ועץ הדעת…מכל עץ, Gen. 2.9, 16), vocabulary self-evidently resonant with that of Ps. 1.3 (מים…פריו…כעץ). Scholars have recognized that the paradise of Eden and the tabernacle

77. Botha, 'Intertextuality', pp. 58-76 (76). He suggests 'In view of the fact that David's role is down-played in the final form… it would seem that a more Messianic and eschatological interpretation than a Davidic interpretation would apply' (p. 76 n. 52).

78. 'Voraus-Perspektive' or 'Vorausschau', in Schneider, *Grammatik*, pp. 184, 197 respectively. GKC, §112y: 'Very frequently the announcement of a future event is attached by means of וְהָיָה *and it shall come to pass*…'. Rudolf Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik*. III. *Satzlehre* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1972), p. 55: 'וְהָיָה „und es wird sein"…dazu dient, die nachfolgende Aussage als futurisch festzulegen'.

79. Wilson, *Psalms*, p. 97.

80. Cf. Isa. 2.2; 7.18, 21, 22, 23, 25; 8.8; 11.5; 62.3; 65.10; 66.23; Jer. 30.8; Ezek. 47.9(2), 10, 12; Hos. 2.1; Joel 3.1, 5; Amos 6.9; Obad. 18; Mic. 4.1; 5.6, 9; Nah. 3.7; Zech. 13.2, 3; 14.9, 13, 16, 17. Admittedly, these are mostly examples without an explicit subject (requiring the dummy 'it' in English translation), whereas in Ps. 1.3 it is clearly identifiable. However, Hos. 2.1 is relevant in this regard, in that an explicit subject is named for the same initial verbal form, and is likewise followed by a simile, relative pronoun, and negative particle, as in Ps. 1.3:

והיה מספר…כחול…אשׁר לא…ולא Hos. 2.1
והיה כעץ…אשׁר…לא Ps. 1.3

81. Cf. Pss. 10.1; 74.1, 10; 77.8; 79.5, 10; 89.47.

82. Charles Augustus Briggs and Emilie Grace Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, I (ICC; 2 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), p. 6.

'share common symbolism', indicating that this garden represented a primeval temple.[83] Connections between Pss. 1.3 and 2.6, and similar texts in the Psalter, as will be seen, lend further support to the sanctuary setting of this arboreally compared individual.

As noted above, the verb והיה introducing v. 3 is often used to introduce descriptions of the ultimate eschatological restoration. Likewise the image and language of water channels (פלגי מים) is found in texts pointing to the future, as in Isa. 30.25:

והיה על כל הר גבה ועל כל גבעה נשׂאה פלגים יבלי מים Isa. 30.25[84]
והיה כעץ שׁתול על פלגי מים Ps. 1.3

A further parallel to Psalms 1–2 in the Isaiah passage exists in the location of these water channels on high mountains (על כל הר גבה). As will be seen in the discussion below, the placement of the chosen king on holy Mt Zion (על ציון הר קדשׁי) in Ps. 2.6 is closely linked to 1.3 on several levels. Consequently, the linkage between these two psalms is supported within a single verse of Isaiah 30.

The conclusion of Isa. 30.25 places this restoration in a time of great slaughter and deposition (ביום הרג רב בנפל מגדלים). The strong linkage between Psalms 1 and 2 produces the same result since the watered paradise of the former is followed in the latter with destruction of recalcitrant kings and potentates. In addition, the term 'mountain' of Ps. 2.6 (הר), which as will be seen corresponds to the paradise of 1.3, is also found in Isa. 30.25. Again, the combined message of the first two psalms repeats what is proclaimed in the single verse of Isa. 30.25.

Ezekiel 47, which contains a vision of Eden restored, is highly relevant to the interpretation of Ps. 1.3.[85] It opens with a vision of water flowing out from beneath the threshold of the eschatological temple, a description whose terminology resembles that used for the outflow of waters in the primeval garden. Each river's egress is depicted using the same participial form: והנה מים יצאים מתחת (Ezek. 47.1, similarly 47.8, 12), ונהר יצא מעדן (Gen.

83. Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC, 1; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), p. 65. See also Gordon J. Wenham, 'Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story', *PWCJS* 9 (1986) pp. 19-25. Cherubim guarding the entrance in Gen. 3.24 is a notable example of how the garden resembled later sanctuaries. Cf. also Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, pp. 448-49 and William P. Brown, *Seeing the Psalms: A Theology of Metaphor* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2002), pp. 59-79.

84. Isaiah 30.18-33 is identified as 'of an eschatological nature' by Benjamin D. Sommer, 'Isaiah', in Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler (eds.), *The Jewish Study Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 2004), pp. 780-916 (844).

85. Observe the use of the same verbal form והיה in Ezek. 47.9, 10 as that opening Ps. 1.3.

2.10). The trees along the river (Ezek. 47.7, עץ, 12, כל עץ מאכל), swarming creatures (Ezek. 47.9, כל נפש חיה אשר ישרץ) and fish of the sea (Ezek. 47.10, כדגת הים) likewise recall the opening chapters of Genesis.

Ezekiel 47.12 in particular displays striking parallels with both Ps. 1.3 and Gen. 2.9. Along both sides of this river grow 'every tree for food whose leaves do not wither' (כל עץ מאכל לא יבול עלהו). The first phrase recalls Gen. 2.9 (כל עץ…למאכל) and the second Ps. 1.3 (ועלהו לא יבול). Parallel language between Ezekiel 47 and Psalm 1 and their similar use of Genesis 1–2 indicate a common eschatological thrust. This pious and perfect man at the head of the Psalter will ultimately be established (והיה שתול) in the eschatological sanctuary garden.

Support for the temple context of Ps. 1.3 can also be found in the Psalter itself. Psalm 46.5 declares that there is a river whose 'channels gladden the city of God, the holy place of the dwellings of the Most High', undoubtedly a reference to the temple in its restored and geographically altered condition:[86]

נהר פלגיו ישמחו עיר אלהים קדש משכני עליון

Here the repetition of the same uncommon term (פלג)[87] indicates the language of Ps. 1.3 is in fact sanctuarial.[88] In addition, the 'river' (נהר) flowing through this city again recalls Eden as the paradigm for the restored Zion temple.[89] By combining the reference to channels of water (פלגיו) with the holy place (קדש), Ps. 46.5 corroborates the linkage of the blessed man's planting as a tree 'on' channels of water (על פלגי מים, Ps. 1.3) with the establishment of God's king 'on' holy Mt Zion (על ציון הר קדשי, Ps. 2.6).

86. פלגי מים. Cf. Jerome F.D. Creach, 'Like a Tree Planted by the Temple Stream: The Portrait of the Righteous in Psalm 1:3', *CBQ* 61 (1999), pp. 34-46, who argues that Ps. 65.10, Isa. 30.25 and 32.2 (where the same root פלג is used) likewise describe water egressing from the temple on the holy mount.

87. 4× in entire Psalter (1.3; 46.5; 65.10; 119.136). Note that the פלג אלהים of Ps. 65.10 is found in a temple context (cf. v. 2). Cf. Brown, *Seeing the Psalms*, p. 74. Psalm 119.136 is the only exception.

88. Cf. Brown, *Seeing the Psalms*, p. 74, and Susan Gillingham, 'The Zion Tradition and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter', in John Day (ed.), *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), pp. 308-41.

89. נהר, Ps. 46.5 and Gen. 2.10, 13, 14. Cf. J.J.M. Roberts, 'The Enthronement of Yhwh and David: The Abiding Theological Significance of the Kingship Language of the Psalms', *CBQ* 64 (2002), pp. 675-86 (685): 'The mythological glorification of the city in the Zion hymns as built on a high mountain and watered by the streams of a river (Psalms 46, 48)—a veritable reembodiment of the primeval garden of God…'.

Relevant also in confirming the sanctuary setting of Ps. 1.3 is Ps. 92.13-14. As in Psalm 1, there is reference to the wicked (רשׁעים, v. 8),[90] their destruction (יאבדו, v. 10)[91] and the planting of the righteous one as a tree in the temple of the Lord (צדיק כתמר…שׁתולים בבית יהוה, vv. 13-14).[92] Likewise, the content of Ps. 52.10 (ואני כזית רענן בבית אלהים) recalls the arboreal sanctuary imagery of Ps. 1.3.

A restored future sanctuary in Ps. 1.3 implies that the blessed one established in it functions as an eschatological priest.[93] Verse 2 characterized him in royal language (cf. Deuteronomy 17, Joshua 1), and now v. 3 locates him in a sacerdotal setting. This dual royal-sacerdotal role is reiterated in Ps. 2.6, where the Lord establishes him as his king (v. 6a) on the holy temple mount of Zion (v. 6b). This is one of many example of the consistency and coherence between the first two psalms in their role as an integrated introduction.

Jeremiah 17.7-8 also reveals numerous close parallels to Ps. 1.1, 3, albeit with important differences.[94] In a comparison between the man who is cursed (Jer. 17.5) and the one blessed[95] (17.7-8), the salient feature of the latter is his trust in the Lord, while the former trusts in man (Jer. 17.5):

Jer. 17.7-8
ברוך הגבר אשׁר יבטח ביהוה…והיה כעץ שׁתול על מים…עלהו רענן…ולא ימישׁ מעשׂות פרי

Ps. 1.3
והיה כעץ שׁתול על פלגי מים אשׁר פריו יתן בעתו ועלהו לא יבול

Clearly the fate of both הגבר and האישׁ in these two texts is the same, as the close parallels demonstrate. However, the immediate and canonical context of Psalm 1 implies a special distinctiveness for the man there depicted. Jeremiah 17.5 and 7 distinguish the fates of the faithful and the unfaithful by use of two generalizing articular singular nouns, the blessed and the cursed (ברוך הגבר…ארור הגבר). Psalm 1.1 and 4 on the other hand differentiate between the single blessed one and the wicked through use of two articular nouns, one singular and the other plural (האישׁ…הרשׁעים).[96]

90. Cf. Ps. 1.1, 4, 5, 6.
91. Cf. Ps. 1.6, תאבד.
92. Cf. Ps. 1.3, כעץ שׁתול.
93. Adam in the garden is portrayed sacerdotally. See Wenham, 'Sanctuary Symbolism', p. 21: 'If Eden is seen then as an ideal sanctuary, then perhaps Adam should be described as an archetypal Levite'. Note the similarity of the clothing of Adam and Eve, and Aaron's sons: Gen. 3.21; Exod. 29.8; 40.14; Lev. 8.13.
94. Cf. Creach, 'Like a Tree', pp. 34-46 and James A. Durlesser, 'Poetic style in Psalm 1 and Jeremiah 17:5-8: A Rhetorical Critical Study', *Semitics* 9 (1984), pp. 30-48.
95. ברוך instead of אשׁרי as in Ps. 1.1.
96. These are the only two consonantally represented definite articles in the psalm.

If the intention of the poet was to compare the righteous and the wicked in general, one would expect to find the plural הצדיקים in 1.1 as a direct contrast to הרשׁעים of 1.4. Only at the conclusion of the psalm (vv. 5-6) do the righteous (צדיקים) in a generalizing plural appear. Their qualification as righteous is then defined at the conclusion of the second psalm (vv. 11-12), as the explicit parallel wording with 1.6 (תאבדו דרך) indicates. Through faith (כל חוסי בו)[97] they escape divine wrath and perdition, and presumably participate in the same blessings of the flawless man of Psalm 1 (אשׁרי 1.1, 2.12). Indeed, faith or trust in Yhwh is precisely the source of blessing in Jer. 17.7.

So the righteous (and their opposites, the wicked) in Psalms 1–2 exhibit faith and trust in similar fashion to those of Jeremiah 17 resulting in the same ultimate reward. As will be seen in the discussion of Ps. 2.12, however, their faith is placed specifically in 'him', which pronoun's antecedent is the divine son of God. The latter monarch of Psalm 2 can be identified as האישׁ of Psalm 1, and so a distinctive presence when compared with Jeremiah 17.

Use of the particular noun אישׁ(ה) in Ps. 1.1 may be due to several factors.[98] In the related text of Deut. 17.14-20 (v. 19 requires daily Torah reading which the man of Ps. 1.2 obeys without fail), the king will be an אישׁ (v. 15), but not a foreigner.[99] Joshua 1, another closely related text to Psalm 1 promises Israel's leader that no אישׁ (v. 5) would stand against him. Undoubtedly the writer has in mind any Canaanite king resisting Joshua's invasion. So the noun אישׁ of Ps. 1.1 was well-suited to specify a monarch, and the royal trappings of vv. 2-3 confirm such identification. Absent in Jeremiah 17 are any such evidences of a regnal portrayal.

The portrait given then by the first three verses is of an eschatological priest-king along the models of Adam, Joseph and Joshua. Psalm 2 will again focus on his person, privilege and position with more detail. In the remaining three verses of Psalm 1, the ultimate destiny of his opposites, the wicked, will be revealed. To show that the blameless and unblemished monarch does not remain alone in his righteousness, the poet will also include in the final two verses the company of הצדיקים, whose inclusion under this rubric will be explained at the conclusion of Psalm 2.

This would seem to be deliberate, just as the only two *nota accusativi* of Ps. 2 (vv. 3 and 11) are deliberately and conspicuously present for purposes of contrast, as will be argued below.

97. Note the use of כל here, but conspicuously absent in 1.1. It is present in 1.3 (וכל אשׁר יעשׂה יצליח), but only to designate the absolute and unqualified success of this one man.

98. The phrase כל אישׁ אשׁר was common enough if a generalizing sense was intended (cf. Exod. 35.22, 23; 25.2; Lev. 21.18, 21; Josh. 1.18; 1 Sam. 22.2; 2 Sam. 15.4; Ezek. 9.6).

99. Cf. Miller, 'The Beginning', pp. 83-92.

1.4. The last three verses of the psalm focus on the wicked, who previously played simply a contrastive role in v. 1. There, reference to 'the man' (האישׁ) signaled the focus and principal subject of the first half of the psalm (vv. 1-3), and now, in the only other explicit use of the definite article, it is 'the wicked' (הרשׁעים) that dominate the second half (vv. 4-6). The final two verses (vv. 5-6) continue this focus on the wicked with 'the righteous (ones)' playing the contrastive role. Consequently the psalm ends in the same fashion as it began.

A future or eschatological description of the man of Ps. 1.3 generates the expectation of the same in the description of his opposites, the wicked. Indeed, the figure of chaff is used to describe their ultimate fate, which metaphor could not be more different (note the introductory particle לא כן) from that of an established fruitful tree. It is followed immediately by an explanation in non-figurative terms (vv. 5-6), as did v. 3 conclude the first simile in more concrete language. Absolute and ultimate success is the destiny of the blessed man, while the wicked will suffer ultimate destruction.[100]

As noted previously, the two similes of this psalm are produced with identical consonants at beginning and end (כעץ, 1.3a, כמץ, 1.4b). To be more specific, two out of the three consonants are identical in form and order. As is often the case in Hebrew poetry, close parallels on the level of sound serve to highlight semantic opposites.[101] A tree has life, roots and solidity, giving it stability and permanence, and its fruit gives life to man and beast alike. Chaff is lifeless, weightless, ephemeral, subject to any force of nature upon it and unfit for consumption.

Further phonological parallels can be seen in the combination of particles, preposition and nouns in the first two clauses of v. 4 that repeat threefold the consonantal sequence *kāp-mêm*. Indeed, the explicit simile (כמץ) closely associating the wicked ones and chaff is further heightened by such consonance:

לא כֵן הרשׁעים כי אם כמץ Ps. 1.4

Note the decreasing distance between the two consonants until they are juxtaposed in the final form of the sequence. A particular focus on the negative identification with 'chaff' is thus achieved.[102]

100. Cf. Ps. 92.8c where the wicked are destroyed forever (רשׁעים…להשׁמדם עדי עד). Also, Pss. 9.18, 19 and 83.14, 18 where are found requests that God's enemies be like chaff before the wind (כקשׁ לפני רוח) and be shamed, terrified, ashamed and destroyed forever (יבשׁו ויבהלו עדי עד ויחפרו ויאבדו).

101. Cf. Petersen and Richards, *Interpreting*, p. 95: 'The reader hears phonologic similarity within the context of remarkable semantic contrast'.

102. A similar phenomenon involves the sequence of the consonants ב and ר in Ps 2.11-12a.

Of the seven instances where the particular term 'chaff' is found in the Hebrew Bible, four appear in contexts of final divine judgment against the wicked, often identified explicitly as nations.[103] Mitchell has observed that the predominant imagery used for the eschatological battle against Jerusalem and the destruction of the wicked in general is that of the threshing floor.[104] Psalm 1.4 is no different, pointing to their ultimate assize.

The parallels between Ps. 35.5-6 and 1.4 are striking and merit further comment:[105]

Ps. 1.4, 6	כי אם כמץ אשׁר תדפנו רוח: דרך רשׁעים תאבד
Ps. 35.5-6	יהיו כמץ לפני רוח ומלאך יהוה דוחה: יהי דרכם חשׁך

In the one instance (Ps. 1) they are identified simply as the wicked, but in the latter (35.5), they are enemies of the psalmist whose life they seek (מבקשׁי נפשׁי, 35.4). Likewise, in Ps. 31.14cd the 'many' (רבים, cf. 3.2, 3) seek the life of the speaker (בהוסדם יחד עלי לקחת נפשׁי זממו), as they do in 35.4. But 31.14cd is a text very close to 2.2bc (ורוזנים נוסדו יחד על יהוה ועל משׁיחו). So the overt linguistic ties between 1.4, 6 and 35.5-6 indicate the same wicked, destined for destruction, are in view. In both Psalms 1 and 35 they are destined for perdition, but the latter also adds that they seek the life of the psalmist, as in Psalm 31, which matches closely the wording of Psalm 2. Consequently, the identification of the wicked of Psalm 1 with the plotters of Psalm 2 is confirmed by later psalms, and the words of the individual speaker of Psalms 3, 31, and 35 (David according to the superscription) are to be read as those of the unique and divinely favored king in the book's introduction.

103. Zeph. 2.2; Isa. 17.13; 29.5; 41.15. Daniel 2.35 (in Aramaic) describes the eschatological (see reference to 'the last days' in 2.28-29) destruction of world kingdoms using remarkably similar terminology to Ps. 1.4: 'and they were like chaff from summer threshing floors and the wind carried them and no place was found for them' (my translation). Pursuing this connection further, the destruction wrought by 'the stone' of Dan. 2.35 (אבנא) would correspond to that performed by the 'son' in Ps. 2.7-9. Parallels between Dan. 2 and 7 are well-known and the latter also speaks of one like a 'son of man' (כבר אנשׁ) who is given a universal kingdom, power and authority. Identification of the same 'son' of Ps. 2 in v. 12 using the Aramaic בר would then strengthen the intertextual evidence between the Psalter's introduction and Daniel.

104. Mitchell, *The Message*, p. 191. He identifies Pss. 1.4 and 35.5 as 'eschatological contexts', both of which portray the wind-driven chaff.

105. Cf. Federico G. Villanueva, *The 'Uncertainty of a Hearing': A Study of the Sudden Change of Mood in the Psalms of Lament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2008), p. 174: 'The next imprecation in vv. 5-6 is a clear allusion to Psalm 1. The occurrence of מץ and דרך betray the connection. The former occurs only in Psalms 1 and 35 in the whole of the Psalter. More significantly, both are employed along with the word רוח'.

1.5. The first two verses of the psalm and the last two (A and A') function in complementary roles. Verse 1 reveals what the blessed man does not do and the fifth what the wicked will not do. He does not walk, stand or sit with them (v. 1), and they will not arise with the righteous (v. 5). Separation from them here and now assures the same in the distant future judgment.[106] Verse 2, after v. 1 has described what the blessed man does not do, goes on to describe what activity does occupy him, that is, meditation in the Lord's torah. Likewise v. 6, immediately after v. 5 has described the non-participation of the wicked in the final resurrection, goes on to describe what will happen to them, that is, their way will be destroyed.[107]

Verse 5 opens with the compound particle על כן ('therefore'),[108] indicating a close link to the simile of v. 4 and providing an explanation for it.[109] Disappearance as chaff is to be understood in this context as denied participation in the resurrection of the final judgment.[110] Previously v. 3 had foreseen the final eschatological destiny of the blessed man as a fruitful tree in the garden paradise, followed by an explanatory comment in the final clause that this meant absolutely unqualified success. Verses 4-6 will prophesy likewise the final end of the wicked, first through a simile, then also followed by an explanation of its meaning.

106. Cf. Høgenhaven, 'The Opening', p. 175: 'In the opinion of the present writer, the verse refers to an eschatological judgment. In this world the righteous must dissociate himself from the company of the sinners. At the future judgment, however, the sinners will not be allowed to join the righteous. Thus the ways of the righteous and the wicked are always and must always be separate. The righteous must and should choose this separation now, for in the future, ultimate separation will be enforced by divine judgment'.

107. Note that only in these functionally parallel vv. 2 and 6 does the Tetragrammaton occur in the psalm.

108. BDB, 754a, *HALOT,* 833b.

109. According to *IBHS*, §39.3.4e על כן 'usually introduces a statement of later effects…' Waltke and O'Connor cite Isa. 15.5-7 and Num. 18.24, translating in each case, 'As a result'. Here in Ps. 1.5 this compound particle appears to introduce a result and *explanation* of the previous, much like in Gen. 2.24. Note how לא כן ('not so') of v. 4 emphatically separates vv. 3 and 4, while על כן links v. 5 closely to the immediately previous verse.

110. Cf. Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, pp. 6-7: 'Wicked men will not rise up, that is, in the resurrection which takes place in the Judgment, at the end of the age of the world. Only the righteous ones share in that resurrection. So Isa. 26[14-19], the people of God rise, their wicked oppressors do not.' Note the wording בל יקמו of Isa. 26.14 and יחיו מתיך נבלתי יקומון of 26.19 in clear references to resurrection from the dead, and also the use of ותאבד, a root found in Ps. 1.6. The form הקיצו (awake) of v. 19 is also found in Ps. 3.6, and as will be shown also indicates awakening from death.

Interpreting v. 5 as referring to eschatological resurrection and judgment is not innovative. Ancient translations such as the Targum,[111] Septuagint[112] and Vulgate[113] all read this as a reference to the final resurrection and judgment. Likewise, the Midrash on Psalms includes a similar interpretation of this verse,[114] as do the medieval commentators Rashi[115] and Qimḥi.[116] Use of the root קום ('to rise') as reference to resurrection can be found in numerous examples across the OT canon: Pss. 20.9; 41.9, 11; 88.11; Isa. 26.13, 19; Hos. 6.2; Job 14.12;[117] 19.25; 1 Kgs 13.21.

Since the wicked are denied any hope of resurrection in the judgment, the logical inference is that their opposites, the righteous, do participate in that event. Phonological parallelism supports such a conclusion, drawing a link between the righteous and their rising at the positionally parallel ends of the bicolon:[118]

A' B' B A
לא־יקמו רשׁעים במשׁפט וחטאים בעדת צדיקים

At the heart of this bicolon is a pair of semantically and phonologically parallel prepositional phrases (B and B'). The two masculine plural endings and their accompanying prepositional phrases, each beginning with *bêṯ* and ending with the dental stops *ṭêṯ* and *tāw*, represent deliberately matching sounds at the heart of the bicolon to accompany the parallel (contrastive) meaning. Not surprisingly, when one looks to the remaining components at either end (A and A'), parallelism of the same sort is present. The repeated consonantal sequence of *qôp-mêm* (יקמו…צדיקים) at either end

111. מטול כן לא יקומון רשׁיעי ביום דינא רבא, Luis Díez Merino (ed.), *Targum de Salmos: Edición Príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil no. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora* (Madrid: Instituto Francisco Suárez, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1982), p. 79.

112. διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ αναστήσονται ἀσεβεῖς ἐν κρίσει. See Sue Gillingham, 'From Liturgy to Prophecy: The Use of Psalmody in Second Temple Judaism', *CBQ* 64 (2002), pp. 470-89 (480).

113. '…non resurgent impii in iudicio…'.

114. 'These are the four kingdoms which will have not a leg to stand on in the day of judgment' (Braude, *Midrash*, p. 32).

115. Gruber, *Rashi's Commentary*, p. 50 (p. 1 of Heb. text): לא תהא הקמת רגל לרשׁעים ליום הדין.

116. 'Therefore the wicked, who walk in the way of evil in this world, shall not stand **in the judgment:** he means that in the day of judgment, that is, the day of death, they shall have no resurrection…they shall not stand (rise): but their souls shall perish, and they shall go to Abaddon…' (*The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimḥi on the Book of Psalms* [trans. A.W. Greenup; 8 vols. London: Palestine House, 1918], pp. 12-14).

117. Note the similarity of this form (ולא יקום) in Ps. 1.5 to Job 14.12 in which there is a clear reference to resurrection.

118. Setting aside the linking particle על כן as an example of anacrusis. See Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, pp. 110-11.

draws together implicitly the concepts of righteousness and resurrection.[119] The righteous will have a part in the resurrection while the wicked do not (לא יקמו), as v. 6 will confirm (ודרך רשׁעים תאבד).

Support for the eschatological reading of this verse also comes from a well-known tradition in the Hebrew canon of placing Psalms at the head of the Writings, following immediately after Malachi 3.[120] The final chapter of Malachi includes topics discussed in Psalms 1–2 such as the Torah (תורת משׁה, 3.22), division between the wicked and the righteous along with judgment of the wicked, who are compared to chaff or stubble (כל, רשׁעים צדיק לרשׁע, רשׁעה קשׁ, 3.18-19, 21), statutes and judgments (חקים ומשׁפטים, 3.22), serving God (עבד אלהים 3.18), fearing God (יראי שׁמי, ליראי יהוה, 3.16, 20), etc. Juxtaposition of these two verbally linked texts implies a uniform and consistent eschatological interpretation at the canonical level.[121] A remarkable consistency has been achieved between Psalms 1–2 and the conclusion of the Prophets, as well as their beginning. The well-known link between Josh. 1.8 and Psalm 1 is now accompanied by another between Malachi 3 and the Psalter's introduction.[122]

So the blessed man does not remain alone, but is apparently accompanied by a larger group. Further information regarding this congregation, the righteous man, and the wicked as well, will be given in Psalm 2.

Phonologically supported contrasts continue in v. 5. The blessed man did not sit 'in the seat' (במושׁב) of the scorners (v. 1), but now they are excluded from presence 'in the judgment' (במשׁפט). In each case the preposition *bêṯ* is followed first by a *mêm*-initial noun, then *šîn*, and finally a bilabial stop, either *bêṯ* or *peh*. By drawing such sound similarities between each phrase,

119. Psalm 37.28d-29 contrasts the same righteous and wicked, promising the former eternal (לעד) habitation upon the land, certainly a reference to eternal life. Daniel 12.2-3 also contains another description of the righteous (מצדיקי הרבים i.e. those that led many to righteousness) who rise from the dead and live forever (לעולם ועד).

120. Luke 24.44 describes the Hebrew canon with the words '…in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and Psalms', suggesting at a minimum that Psalms followed the prophetic corpus in this tradition and perhaps served as a title for the entire third division. Qumran reveals evidence of a tradition that apparently refers to the third division as 'David'. See Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.* V. *Miqṣat Ma'aśe ha-Torah* (DJD, 10; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 58-59, 111-12. The internal evidence of the tripartite Hebrew canon, and especially that of the Writings, exhibits a perspective and reading strategy that is certainly pre-Hellenistic in origin and date. Literary genre and chronology, two factors evident behind the order in LXX manuscripts, are clearly not the basis for its structure. Most discussions on the date of the canon ignore this vital evidence and focus on external references.

121. Barbiero, *Das erste*, pp. 33-34.

122. A corollary of this evidence would be that not only does the consistency and coherence between Pss. 1–2 and Mal. 3 argue for a like eschatological reading of the former, but also the links to Josh. 1 imply the same for that book.

the poet has underscored the complete absence of the blessed one from participation in the session of scorners, while the latter, (also known as the wicked) are entirely excluded from position in the final judgment.

Further contrasts supported by consonance are found in v. 5. The latter repeats the word pair רשׁעים…וחטאים (‘wicked ones…sinners’) in the same order seen in v. 1. The new term not seen before in the psalm is ‘(in the congregation of) the righteous’ (בעדת צדיקים). And yet, the prepositional phrase בעדת resonates phonologically with בעצת (in the counsel) of v. 1.[123] Twice v. 1 refers to conclaves of the wicked, which the blessed man did not frequent,[124] and twice v. 5 tells of righteous conclaves from which the wicked are excluded.[125] Neither pair within each verse exhibits overt consonantal parallels of the type seen in their opposites at the other end of the psalm. Indeed, ‘parallelism’ is present here between the ends of the psalm as densely as that within any individual bicolon. In this case the effect is to distinguish absolutely between the righteous and the wicked in their ultimate destiny.

The one remaining locale of three mentioned in v. 1 but absent in v. 5 is ‘the way’ (דרך) of sinners. In other words, the counsel of the wicked and seat of scorners in v. 1 find their exact and consonantally resonant antipodes in v. 5, but a parallel to ‘the way of sinners’, the last remaining arena, is absent. Verse 6 will supply the contrast by using twice the identical term דרך. Both the righteous and wicked/sinners frequent a ‘way’, (ובדרך חטאים…דרך צדיקים ודרך רשׁעים), but as v. 6 will reveal, their ends are wholly opposite.

1.6. The particle כי conjoining vv. 5 and 6 is causal in force.[126] Thus, v. 6 will supply the underlying reason why the wicked will participate neither in the resurrection nor the congregation of the righteous. Because the Lord ‘knows’ (יודע) the way of the righteous, meaning he watches over it,[127] they will participate in the proceedings of v. 5. That divine knowledge is not

123. Three out of four consonants in each phrase are identical and in the same order.

124. בעצת רשׁעים…במושׁב לצים.

125. במשׁפט…בעדת צדיקים.

126. *IBHS*, §38.4a.

127. Cf. the same verb ידע in Ps. 31.8 where ‘knowing’ is tantamount to attention that delivers the speaker when in distress. ‘Knowing’ in Ps. 37.18 involves protection as well. Psalm 139 uses the verb numerous times (vv. 1, 2, 4, 6) to express not simply knowledge of the speaker’s whereabouts, but vigilance and care over him (cf. vv. 5, 10). Note Exod. 2.25 where God’s ‘knowing’ resulted in action to deliver Israel. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, pp. 57-58, translates, ‘For the Lord *protects* the way of the righteous’ (emphasis mine). Cf. also Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. ה (5)H ‘The Lord watches over the way in which the righteous walk to guard them from all evil’ (ה׳משׁגיח על הדרך שׁהצדיקים הולכים בה לשׁמרם מכל רע) (translation mine). He cites Deut. 2.7 (ידע לכתך) in support.

simply mental awareness, but includes preservation and extends beyond the grave to the resurrection at the judgment mentioned in the previous verse. He is undoubtedly cognizant of the way of the wicked as well, but they have no part in that gathering because their 'way' (דרך)[128] is to be destroyed.[129] Given the eschatological context indicated by the psalmist,[130] v. 6 is predicting the eventual complete and eternal destruction of them, their lifestyle, and works.

Some have supposed that the objectless verb 'perish' (תאדב) portrays the way of the wicked simply perishing naturally in accord with the laws of life.[131] However, Ps. 146.9 uses the same phrase (דרך רשׁעים, 'way of the wicked') as object of the governing verb יעות (piel) in which the Lord Himself is active subject. God's active participation in the destruction of the way of the wicked is also confirmed by the linguistically parallel Ps. 2.12, where divine anger directly causes their destruction (פן יאנף ותאבדו דרך). Furthermore, within Psalm 1 itself are indications of direct divine intervention in the judgment. First of all, the eschatological context beginning from v. 3 onward points to a divinely induced punishment, as does the figure of wind driven chaff in v. 4. Then v. 5 describes a deliberate and active deprivation of the wicked from participation in a resurrection of the righteous. Implied is a divine choosing between men on a moral basis, and so subsequent perdition in v. 6 can only be a result of God's active will.

That eternal or eschatological destruction is in view can be supported from evidence elsewhere in the Psalter and the Hebrew Bible. Psalm 9, like the first, takes special note of the wicked (רשׁעים/רשׁע, vv. 6, 17, 18), judgment (שׁפט, vv. 5, 8, 9, 17, 20) and their destruction (אבד**,** vv. 4, 6, 7, 19), which is eternal (לעולם ועד, v. 6, 19). These enemies of God, and of the individual speaker (vv. 4, 7), are identified as nations (גוים, vv. 6, 16, 18, 20, 21) and peoples (לאמים, v. 9), precisely the terms used in Ps. 2.1. The juxtaposition in Ps. 9.6a of three terms (גוים אבדת רשׁע) parallel to Psalms 1–2 also confirms the integrated reading of the first two psalms, along with the idea of eternal destruction (לעולם ועד, 9.6b).

Psalm 83 foretells the destruction of God's enemies, Gentile nations, who will become like chaff before the wind (v. 14 כקשׁ לפני רוח). These are terms

128. As noted above, a chosen way of life. Cf. Jer. 6.16.

129. Cf. Ps. 92.8-10 where the wicked are again in view (רשׁעים, v. 8), reaffirming that they will be destroyed (יאבדו, v. 10, same verb as here in Ps. 1.6b) and their destruction is eternal (להשׁמדם עדי עד, v. 8). Psalm 9.6 also describes the never-ending destruction of the wicked (אבדת רשׁע…לעולם ועד). Cf. also Ps. 83.14, 18 (יבשׁו ויבהלו עדי עד ויחפרו ויאבדו) for the same.

130. See above comments on והיה, v. 3, the imagery of a restored Eden, and of chaff in v. 4.

131. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, p. 61 and John Goldingay, *Psalms*. I. *Psalms 1–41* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), pp. 88-89.

reminiscent of Ps. 1.4 (כמץ…רוח), and Mal. 3.19 (כל עשה רשעה קש).[132] Then in 83.18 those foes will be ashamed, dismayed (ויבהלו, cf. Ps. 2.5, יבהלמו) *forever* (עדי עד), abashed, and *destroyed* (ויאבדו), the latter repeating the same root from Pss. 1.6 and 2.12.

Psalm 92 also has the wicked in view (רשעים, v. 8) and their eternal destruction (להשמדם עדי עד…יאבדו, vv. 8-10, cf. 1.6, 2.12). This same psalm portrays the righteous one as a blossoming tree, planted in the temple courts (vv. 13–14), using terminology reminiscent of Ps. 1.3 (כתמר…כארז…שתולים). Thus within Psalm 92 are found close parallels to both Psalms 1 and 2, which evidence supports an integrated reading of the twofold introduction. Outside the Psalter are other instances of the root אבד indicating eternal destruction.[133] Thus the context of the immediate psalm, that of the Psalter itself, and the Hebrew Bible indicate that the destruction of Ps. 1.6 is ultimate and irrevocable.

The phrase 'way of the wicked' (דרך רשעים) exhibits metonymy, replacing reference to the wicked themselves (as in v. 4) with the area of their activity.[134] This phrase hearkens back to the opening verse of the psalm where the counsel of the wicked is the realm in which the man does not 'walk' (הלך). Those destined to perish are, in fact, those very ones who walk in it. Verses 4 and 5 have already revealed that the wicked themselves are destined for destruction, and the following psalm will supply further details. There the wicked are specified as recalcitrant nations, and their leaders (Ps. 2.1-3, 10) are then warned directly, lest 'you perish [in] the way' (ותאבדו דרך, 2.12). The more general adjectival noun 'the wicked' of the first psalm is given flesh and bone reality in the second. Likewise the more opaque 'counsel' and 'way' are defined precisely as highhanded rebellion against God and his chosen leader.

Metonymy is likewise present in colon A, wherein the divinely observed (יודע יהוה) 'way of the righteous ones' (דרך צדיקים) indicates watch over their very persons. Their status as righteous ones is also clarified by the

132. It should be recalled again that Mal. 3 is followed directly by Ps. 1 in many manuscript traditions of the MT, indicating a coherent reading of the two by the compiler.

133. So in Jer. 49.38, within a series of prophesies of judgment against Gentile nations (Jer. 46–51) in the last days (48.47, 49.39). Likewise in Obad. 8, Edom will be destroyed 'in that day', later described as 'the day of the Lord' (v. 15), both eschatological references. Again, the destruction of the king of Tyre in Ezek. 28.16 will endure forever (עד עולם, v. 19). Otzen, 'אבד, אבדה, אבדן, אבדון', *TDOT*, I, pp. 19-23 (21), 'In the prophets in particular, one often encounters the idea that Yahweh will destroy the heathen "at the end of the days"'.

134. E.W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1968), p. 538: '*Metonymy* is a figure by which one name or noun is used instead of another, to which it stands in a certain relation'.

next psalm. They have obeyed the commands to serve and rejoice in God, and 'kiss' his potentially wrathful son (2.11-12). The latter outward gesture involves inward trust in him (חוסי בו, v. 12) and assures them participation in the blessings enjoyed by this chosen king (אשׁרי, 1.1, 2.12).[135]

Together vv. 5 and 6 exhibit a chiasm based on references to the wicked and to the righteous:

A the wicked (v. 5a)
  B the righteous (v. 5b)
  B' the righteous (v. 6a)
A' the wicked (v. 5b)

Double references to the righteous at verse boundaries and the connecting particle opening v. 6 create strong bonds between the two bicola. The righteous ones have a part through resurrection in the final assize 'because' (כי) the Lord is actively mindful of them. Accompanying these links is another connector on the phonological level. The righteous are a congregation (בעדת) in v. 5b, and in v. 6a the Lord knows (יודע) them, forms that exhibit repetition of the consonants *ʿayin* and *dāleṯ*:

vv. 5b–6a וחטאים בעדת צדיקים כי יודע יהוה דרך צדיקים

Consonantal resonance confirms lexical and syntactical bonds between the two verses, which together affirm the ultimate fates of the two groups. The wicked are consigned to eternal destruction without resurrection, and the righteous are subject to eternal divine attention including restoration from death.

At the heart of v. 6 stand juxtaposed references to the two ways, that of the righteous and that of the wicked:

דרך צדיקים דרך רשׁעים

While semantic parallelism is overt, there are again morphological ties. Both phrases are construct chains headed by an identical singular noun דרך ('the way of') and followed by two masculine plural semantically opposite nouns, צדיקים, רשׁעים ('the wicked', 'the righteous'). The explicit parallelism between the latter two phrases isolates the remaining members of the bicolon at either end. If we exclude again the opening conjunctive particle כי (which does double duty across the bicolon), what remains in parallel positions at either end are the contrasting predicates, 'the Lord watches over' and 'shall perish'.

(כי) יודע יהוה...תאבד

135. Presumably the divinely bestowed benefits attributed to this royal figure include the privileges and rights enumerated across both psalms, now also accessible to the faithful through their trust in him.

Indeed, his presence in colon A versus absence in B, and his watch care versus destruction serve to corroborate the absolute divide between the two groups.

Further contrast between the two clauses derives from the fact that colon A consists of four members, due to the subject 'the Lord', while colon B contains only three.

(3) (4)
(כי) יוֹדֵע יהוה דֶּרֶךְ צַדִּיקִים וְדֶרֶךְ רְשָׁעִים תֹּאבֵד

Thus colon A is 'weighted' more because of the presence of the Lord, an apt qualification of the way of the righteous. This difference in ballast between the wicked and the righteous in this verse is consistent with the imbalance seen previously in word totals for the two similes of the tree (seventeen) and chaff (nine).[136]

The dominance of the consonant *dāleṯ* (underlined above) in three out of four members of colon A, and two out of three in B is striking. The repetition of this consonant is probably deliberate as it opens the twice-repeated term דרך ('way') and is present, along with a guttural, in the contrasting verbal predicates (יודע…תאבד). Undoubtedly the purpose of this repeated sound across the bicolon is to highlight the contrasting fates of divine attention and destruction.[137]

Psalm 1 thus concludes its description of the eschatological future promising the destruction of the wicked and preservation of the righteous. It began with a contrast between the one blessed individual of royal and priestly characterization, and a general group identified as the wicked. It concluded in vv. 5 and 6 with a brief reference to the larger group of righteous ones. Their relationship to the blessed man and their status as righteous was not divulged. Neither was his precise identity, means of attainment of eschatological military victory, nor exaltation, defined with any precision. Similarly, the wicked also were identified only in a very general manner. Psalm 2 will provide further detailed descriptions of these three: the blessed man, the wicked, and the righteous.

136. Cf. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler, 'Psalms', in Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler (eds.), *The Jewish Study Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 2004), pp. 1280-1446 (1285), '…the second half is substantially shorter than the first, mimicking the structure of vv. 4-5 in contrast to vv. 1-3, again emphasizing the insubstantial nature of the wicked'.

137. Psalm 2.11-12 similarly contrast, by means of consonance, between service to the Lord (עבדו) and destruction (ותאבדו), the latter root identical to that used in 1.6b. There may be further similarities between each psalm's conclusion. Each comparison includes the identical root אבד, while the other two are consonantally similar (ידע, עבד, where two out of three radicals are identical). One suspects, therefore, that the latter two roots may have been deliberately chosen to draw a link between God's care (ידע) and service (עבד) to him.

Chapter 3

Psalm 2

Structure

Whereas Psalm 1 exhibited several explicit examples of inclusio rounding off the entire poem, Psalm 2 does not. In its final verse it repeats elements from the first psalm's end and beginning. So, the final pronouncement of blessing in 2.12 repeats the opening of Psalm 1, and the warning of destruction in the way affirms again the conclusion of 1.6. For this and other reasons, including the lack of superscription between them and numerous verbal links, the two psalms have been correctly seen as an introduction to the entire Psalter.

Such evidence does not mean the two were of one piece in antiquity.[1] As observed previously, the integrity of Psalm 1 as a separate poem from Psalm 2, is supported by the numerous structural features. Psalm 2 also has its own distinctive and unifying literary features. Nonetheless, their juxtaposition is certainly purposeful and the second psalm offers further explicit comment on subjects introduced in the first. Any attempt to reconstruct the process through which these two psalms reached their present complementary shape is mere speculation and cannot be reconstructed with any precision. However, their thorough integration is a fact, and is determinative for interpretation. The subsequent Psalm 3 does not exhibit the same type of parallels with the previous and is superscripted with a distinct title. Nonetheless, it too unmistakably furthers the discussion of topics begun in the first two.

Inclusio or enveloping elements surround the bulk of Psalm 2. So in Ps. 2.2a, 'the kings of the earth' (מלכי ארץ) are in rebellion while in v. 10 those same 'kings' are warned, followed in the second colon by a warning to the judges 'of the earth' (ארץ…מלכים). These kings rule 'nations' (גוים), the very ones in revolt in v. 1, but who in v. 8 have come under the dominion of the son of God. Indeed, between these two plural instances of the noun is the singular מלכי (v. 6), identifying God's chosen king, to whom all others must submit. He is identified as anointed one at the outset, as son of God in the middle, and son again at the conclusion. Their rebellion has been against

1. Contra Brownlee, 'Psalms 1–2', pp. 321-36.

Yhwh and his anointed (v. 2) and so their submission is appropriately to both Yhwh and his son (vv. 11-12a). Between the themes of authority and rebellion at either end is found the official granting of universal authority by Yhwh to his son.

גוים...מלכי ארץ...יהוה...משיחו vv. 1-2

מלכי...בני v. 6

גוים...מלכים...ארץ...יהוה...בר vv. 8-12

The divine name Yhwh also functions in contrasting contexts at either end of the psalm. If in v. 2 the kings are in revolt against Yhwh, they are warned to serve him in 11. However, the revolt is against both Yhwh and his anointed (v. 2), and so again service to Yhwh (v. 11) is commanded, as well as to the son (v. 12).

The second psalm's structure can best be depicted as four stanzas of approximately equal length (vv. 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12). Those stanzas can be delineated based on the change of speakers and/or those addressed:

A. Kings of the earth speak rebellion against the Lord and his messiah (vv. 1-3)
  B. The response of the Lord and his king (vv. 4-6)
  B.' The relationship of the Lord and his son (vv. 7-9)
A.' Kings of the earth warned to submit to the Lord and the son (vv. 10-12)

In the opening stanza the rebellious kings are introduced by an anonymous third-person speaker in vv. 1, 2 and then they are quoted directly in 3. Those rulers are later admonished directly in the fourth (vv. 10-12) by either the anonymous psalmist or the divine voice cited in v. 7b.[2] Stanza two (vv. 4-6) opens with the response of laughter and derision of the seated one, i.e., the heavenly anthropos, and ends citing the proclamation of his installation by Yhwh himself. His heavenly session in vv. 4-5 is explained in v. 6 and his granted authority to terrorize the recalcitrant nations in vv. 8-9. Verses 7-9, the third stanza, express the words of God but cited by the newly crowned king. Presumably v. 7 represents the newly crowned king quoting God's words to him upon his installation.

Verses 4-9 (stanzas B and B') constitute a heavenly reaction and conversation in response to the earthly rebellion. However, the change of speakers between vv. 6 and 7 from Yhwh to his divine king signal a division in the psalm. The fourth stanza demands obedience to both Yhwh and his son, which is a logical response to the plot against both of them in stanza one.

2. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. 6 (ו), suggests either the king or the poet as speaker of vv. 10-12. It is also possible that the cited divine direct speech begun in v. 7b continues through the end of the psalm.

Spatially the psalm moves from earth in stanza A (kings of the earth in v. 2) to heaven in stanza B (one sitting in heaven in v. 4), continuing presumably in heaven in stanza B'. Warnings to the earthly rulers in stanza A' (v. 10) presume a terrestrial context, and so the movement is from earth (A) to heaven (B), continuing in heaven (B') and back to earth (A'). So the psalm opens with an earthly rebellion against heaven (A), to which a heavenly response and reaction is given (B), followed by a heavenly decree (B'), and closes with a direct warning to those on earth (A').

Repeated forms across the psalm often uncover purposes of the poet otherwise unnoticed. The only two occurrences of the first-person singular independent pronoun אני occur in B (v. 6) and B' (v. 7), and the subject is the Lord in each case: '*I* have established my king', and '*I* today have begotten you'. The first instance is direct divine speech (Yhwh) and likewise the second but cited by his crowned son and king.

The two instances of the pronominally suffixed preposition אל are limited to vv. 5 (B, אלימו), and 7 (B', אלי).[3] First the Lord speaks 'to them' in his anger (v. 5), but the same Lord spoke, as quoted by his king messiah, 'to me' (v. 7). Presumably such repetition indicates that the content of the verbal response to the rebels (אלימו) in vv. 5 and 6 is explicated more fully by the address to the son (אלי) in v. 7. Furthermore, within v. 7 itself the same preposition without regard to suffixes is repeated twofold, אל חק יהוה and אלי. As will be discussed below, having this same preposition in successive clauses suggests a deliberate linking of its objects, first the Lord's decree and the following declaration to his son.[4]

Although it may be objected that reiteration of such a common preposition cannot be structurally nor thematically significant, accumulated evidence argues otherwise. For example, earthly rebellion against the Lord and his anointed is expressed by a double use of the preposition 'against', (על) in v. 2 (stanza A). In response, the deity will establish his king 'upon' (formally the same preposition על), Zion. Equally significant are the twofold instances of what are apparently innocuous and common forms, such as the pronominally suffixed preposition מן (vv. 3, 8), and the object marker את (vv. 3, 11).[5]

As previously noted, a deliberate contrast exists between the rebellion of stanza A (vv. 1-3) and the subsequent warning in A' (vv. 10-12). An example of such occurs between v. 3 at the end of stanza A and v. 10 at the opening of stanza A'. The suffixed noun 'their bonds' of v. 3 is written defectively (מוסרותימו), appearing as if from the same root יסר for 'be corrected' (הוסרו) of v. 10, although actually from אסר (to bind).[6]

3. Verse 7a contains another example but without pronominal suffix (אל).
4. See below on v. 7.
5. See below on vv. 3, 8, 11.
6. Cf. לאסר in Ps. 149.8.

Furthermore, v. 3 contains the cohortative (volitive) verb form 'let us throw off' (נשליכה), a form that resonates phonologically with the imperative (also volitive) 'be wise' (השכילו) of v. 10. As seen already throughout Psalm 1, such punning reveals deliberate semantic contrast here in the second psalm. The warning is hurled back at the rebels in resonant form, thus heightening its rhetorical power.[7]

Canonical Function

Topics raised in the introductory Psalms 1 and 2 are reiterated at important junctures in the book, but especially its conclusion, that is, Psalms 146–150.[8] For example, the wicked and righteous of Psalm 1 are taken up again at the end (צדיקים דרך רשעים, Pss. 1.5-6; 146.8-9). Psalm 2 makes reference to a revolt of the peoples (לאמים, v. 1) and the kings of the earth (מלכי ארץ, v. 2) and includes a warning to the judges of the earth (שפטי ארץ, v. 10). These very same rulers are commanded to praise the Lord in Ps. 148.7, 11 (הללו…מלכי ארץ וכל־לאמים…שפטי ארץ). In the following Ps. 149.7-8, praise is a weapon to bring about vengeance and rebuke on the nations and peoples (בל אמים, read בלאמים…בגוים) seen revolting in Ps. 2.1 (גוים לאמים). Praise serves to bind (לאסר) with fetters and shackles of iron (ברזל) those very kings who sought in Ps. 2.3 to remove restraining bonds (מוסרותימו), and consequently they are in danger of being shattered with an iron (ברזל) staff in 2.9.

Part of the command to recalcitrant kings of Ps. 2.11 was to 'rejoice' (וגילו) with trembling, a seemingly incongruent imperative in the context of service with fear and trembling.[9] However, its occurrence here may function as a deliberate parallel to Ps. 149.2 (יגילו), a psalm seen to be fraught with parallel vocabulary. Manatti and de Solms have noted various ways that Psalm 149 responds to Psalm 2, including the new song of 149 replacing the tumult of the nations in 2, and the blessings of 2.12 corresponding to the glory of 149.5.[10] Furthermore, Ps. 97.8b likewise commands rejoicing (ותגלנה) in the context of judgment (משפטיך יהוה, 97.8c).

Enveloping echoes to the two introductory psalms are also found at the close of the first four books. Psalm 41 opens with אשרי, the same form surrounding

7. Willis, 'Psalm 1–An Entity', p. 395.
8. Cf. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Die Psalmen*, p. 51.
9. See comments below on v. 11 for further defense of the text of the MT.
10. Manatti and de Solms, *Les Psaumes*, p. 92 n. 11: 'A l'autre extrémité du psautier, le Psaume *149* (psaum final, si on considére *150* comme une doxologie) répond au Psaume 2; les rois et les princes…qui ont voulu rejeter les liens de IHWH seront liés et enchaînes, peuples et nations insurgés seront châtiés. Le chant du renouveau remplacera le tumulte des nations liguées; et aux bénédictions accordés aux sujets fidéles correspond la gloire des *hassidim*.'

Psalms 1–2. In 41.3 it is repeated in verbal form (יאשר). The fourfold use of עלי ('against me') in Ps. 41.8, 10, 12 quotes the first-person speaker under attack from his enemies, as did Ps. 2.2 portray an attack against the Lord and his anointed by means of the same preposition (על). Both instances of the preposition in Ps. 2.2 and 41.8 are governed by verbal predicates qualified by the adverb יחד.[11] That personal attack of Psalm 2 is portrayed again in Psalm 3 (עלי, vv. 2, 7). It is his very life in Ps. 3.3 (לנפשי) that is threatened, as it is in Ps. 41.3 (בנפש). Just as he is in danger of lying down (שכב) in death according to Ps. 41.9,[12] so it is for the persecuted one of Ps. 3.6.[13]

In the penultimate psalm of Book I are found the individual psalmist's own words expressing delight in doing God's will and in keeping his torah within himself (חפצתי ותורתך, Ps. 40.9). Such a description replicates that given of the man in Ps. 1.2 whose delight is also the divine torah (חפצו ובתורתו).[14] Likewise, the Psalter's opening term אשרי is also found in Ps. 40.5, resulting in a total of three instances across Psalms 40–41.

In the case of Book II, the final Psalm 72 appears to resonate more closely with Psalms 1–2 than with its initial Psalm 42 (and 43).[15] Furthermore, in spite of the indisputable presence of a book-concluding doxology at the end of Psalm 41, there exists evidence of continuity across this seam, unlike others.[16] Both Psalms 41 and 42–43 portray the individual who suffers at the hands of his enemies (אויב, 41.6, 12; 42.10; 43.2), and who directly addresses the deity using the second-person pronoun (אתה, 41.11; 43.2), and who pleads for his own life (נפש, 41.3, 5; 42.3, 5, 7, 12; 43.5). As Wilson notes, 'a slight softening effect' occurs across the transition through the repetition of למנצח between Psalms 41 and 42.[17]

11. Psalm 41.8, יחד עלי יתלחשו; Ps. 2.2, נודסו יחד על יהוה על משיחו. The latter can be shown conclusively to describe a plot to kill by Ps. 31.14c, d, בהוסדם יחד עלי לקחת נפשי זממו.

12. The entire clause reads: ואשר שכב לא יוסיף לקום. Cf. also ימות in v. 6.

13. Cf. Job 14.12 where the same three roots שכב, קיץ, and קום are found in an explicit reference to death.

14. Gordon Wenham, 'Towards a Canonical Reading of the Psalms', in Craig G. Bartholomew *et al.* (eds.), *Canon and Biblical Interpretation* (Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, 7; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006), pp. 333-51.

15. Lack of an intervening superscription and the common refrain of Pss. 42.6, 12 and 43.5 constitute powerful evidence for a single psalm.

16. The common element למנצח occurs in Pss. 41.1 and 42.1, in spite of authorship changes (see Wilson, *The Editing*, pp. 57, 166-67), while no repeated form is found between superscriptions bordering Books II and III nor between Books III and IV. Furthermore, unlike between Books I–II, the transitions between Books II–III and Books III–IV are marked by notable changes in mood and content, although continuity is preserved through lexical links. The transition between Books IV and V resembles more that from I to II. See my *Shape and Message*, pp. 15-16, 219-35.

17. Wilson, *The Editing*, p. 167.

Consequently, Psalm 72 appears to serve as a coda to not only Book II but also to the entirety of Books I and II. In this visionary prayer, kings throughout the earth bring offerings to the son of David, and worship him (vv. 10-11). All the nations will serve him (כל גוים יעבדוהו, Ps. 72.11), precisely what 2.11 required of them (עבדו את יהוה). His dominion will stretch to 'the ends of the earth' (אפסי ארץ, Ps. 72.8b), a phrase identical to the inheritance of the son of God in Ps. 2.8. Psalm 72 reaffirms the promise to the king given in Psalm 2. A coherent reading of the Psalter demonstrates how 'psalms' (מזמור), as is Psalm 3, and 'prayers' (תפלות), as is Psalm 72 (v. 20) were recognized as prophecy, that is, future predictive oracles, by the book's redactor. The voice of the future eschatological messianic king of the twofold introduction is heard in subsequent texts.

Here it will be argued, based principally on a lexical link between Pss. 1.3 and 2.8 (יתן, ואתנה),[18] that the simile of a fruit-giving (פריו) tree to describe the blessed man (1.3) will be defined as the ultimate inheritance of the nations given to the son of God (2.8). Consistent with this unitary reading of Psalms 1 and 2 is the fact that 'his fruit' (פריו) in Ps. 72.16 appears in the context of worldwide homage to him.[19] Furthermore, the agricultural imagery of Ps. 72.16 is expressed by means of a simile, 'like Lebanon its fruit… like the grass of the earth', as was that of Ps. 1.3, 'like a tree…its fruit':

כלבנון פריו…כעשׂב הארץ Ps. 72.16cd
כעץ…פריו Ps. 1.3ab

The eschatological Edenic (and sanctuary) nature of imagery in Ps. 1.3 is sustained through that verse's relationship to Ezek. 47.12 and Genesis 1. Predictably, the imagery of Ps. 1.3's parallel, Ps. 72.16, also displays further echoes of the creation narratives:

הארץ…עשׂב…פרי…פרי…הארץ…עשׂב…פרי…הארץ עשׂב Gen. 1.11-12[20]
בארץ…פריו…כעשׂב הארץ Ps. 72.16bc

The king of Psalm 72 will preside over a restored Eden, just as will the monarch of Psalm 1.[21]

18. Supported further by the twofold use of the root ענה in the temporal forms בעתו (1.3) and ועתה (2.10).

19. For the redactor of the Psalter, the words of Ps. 72, presumably a prayer, represented a prophetic vision of the ultimate fulfillment of the promise to David. In fact, for the redactor, David was the speaker of these words (cf. Ps. 72.20) and thus a prophet (cf. 2 Sam. 23.1-2).

20. The noun פרי in the narrative of Gen. 1 is qualified by subordinate clauses such as עשׂה פרי למינו or אשׁר זרעו בו למינהו. These are the functional equivalents of פריו in the poetry of Ps. 72.16.

21. The eschatological reading of Pss. 1–2, as argued here, is as ancient as Qumran.

Given the deliberate creation or Edenic imagery punctuating the Psalter at its opening of Psalm 1 and the major juncture point of Psalm 72, it is not surprising to find the same at the book's conclusion. So Psalm 148 commands the entire created (ונבראו, 148.5) universe to praise its creator. The list includes the sun, moon and stars (שמש וירח…כוכבי, v. 3), the heavens (שמי השמים…השמים, v. 4), the waters (המים, v. 4), the earth, the sea monsters and the deep (הארץ תנינים…תהמות, v. 7), fruit-bearing trees (עץ פרי, v. 9), living creatures, cattle, creeping things and winged creatures (החיה…בהמה רמש…כנף, v. 10), all terminology found in Genesis 1.

As noted previously, the same recalcitrant and then admonished kings, judges and peoples of Psalm 2 (vv. 1, 2, 8, 10) were commanded to join in the universal praise of Psalm 148 (v. 11). Similarly, Ps. 72.8, 10-11 exhibits a reprise of this theme from the Psalter's introduction, but now expressed in the indicative mood. The rule of the king in Ps. 72.8 will extend to the 'ends of the earth' (אפסי ארץ), precisely the terminology used to describe the extent of the king's dominion in 2.8 (אפסי ארץ), as noted above. Kings of specific nations are named in 72.8 (מלכי…מלכי), bringing offerings to the chosen monarch, and then the entirety of them in 72.11 (כל מלכים) worship him, and likewise all the nations serve him (כל גוים יעבדוהו). Likewise, the rebellious nations of Ps. 2.1 (גוים), become the chosen king's inheritance in 2.8 (גוים), and the rebellious kings of 2.2 (מלכי) are commanded in 2.10-11 (מלכים…עבדו) to serve the Lord. Psalm 72 reiterates and confirms the eventual fulfillment of promises and commands made in Psalm 2.

Additional enveloping material between Psalms 1–2 and Psalm 72 appears in the latter's preliminary conclusion of v. 17 (before the doxology, vv. 18-19, and editorial addition of v. 20):

ויתברכו בו כל גוים יאשרוהו Ps. 72.17cd
אשרי האיש…אשרי כל חוסי בו Pss. 1.1, 2.12c

Three out of four terms in 2.12c are paralleled in 72.17. Prominent in both is the prepositional phrase בו ('in him'), whose object is ultimately the same person, the royal son (2.7; 72.1) of both psalms.[22] The statement in 72.17 that all nations bless themselves in/through him, corresponds to their blessings received by trust in him of 2.12. Their universal blessing *of him* in 72.17d reciprocates the blessing they find *in him* of 72.17c and 2.12c.

The reciprocating nature of these two texts appears to be supported on the formal level as well so that the sequence of the three paralleled terms in Ps. 2.12 is neatly reversed in 72.17:

The phrase 'end of days' (אחרית הימים) appears in comments to the first two psalms (lines 15, 19, 4QFlor [MidrEschat[a]]). See Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4*, pp. 53-55.

22. See comments below on Ps. 2.12.

(2.12) A אשׁרי
B כל
C בו
C' בו
B' כל
(72.17) A' יאשׁרוהו

Parallels between the Psalter's introduction of Psalms 1–2 and Psalm 72, the final psalm of Book II, reveal a predominant focus on the Davidic covenant and through it the restoration of creation.[23] That same covenant is prominently and explicitly introduced in Ps. 89.4 (כרתי לביחרי…לדוד) at the conclusion of Book III. Consequently, it would not be surprising to find material parallel to Psalms 1–2 in the latter. Psalm 2 discloses a father-son relationship revealed in the words of the father but quoted by the son: '(he said to me) you are my son' (בני אתה, v. 7b). The perfect complement to those words is then uttered by the son but quoted by the father in Ps. 89.27a: '(he will call me) you are my father' (אבי אתה).[24]

Immediately following the declaration of sonship to this chosen king in Psalm 2 is the description of his inheritance. He is given (ואתנה) the nations (2.8), and the latter include the rebellious kings of the earth (מלכי ארץ, 2.2). Likewise, Ps. 89.28, immediately following the reference to the father-son relationship (v. 27), cites the giving of him (אתנהו) as firstborn and highest of the kings of the earth (מלכי ארץ, 89.27b).

So major seams of the Psalter (Pss. 72, 89, 146–149), display overt verbal connectors to its introduction. The absence of such in Psalms 41 and 106, the conclusions to Books I and IV, may perhaps be explained preliminarily by the absence of discontinuity at their seams, as opposed to the transitions from Books II to III and III to IV.[25] Book III is dominated by corporate questioning of God's continual anger against his people, as opposed to the individual cries for deliverance in Books I and II. Furthermore, the promises of Psalm 72 are in stark contrast with the bitter questioning opening Psalm

23. A restored creation or Eden under a Davidic monarch who has conquered all his enemies in Pss. 1–2 finds its echo in Ps. 8.

24. Cf. the words of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chron. 17.13 and 2 Sam. 7.14 (אני אהיה לו לאב והוא יהיה לי לבן) 'I will be a father to him and he will a son to me'.

25. As in the case of the transition between Books I and II discussed previously, Pss. 107ff of Book V continue the mood and themes of the previous Book IV. Praise is commanded explicitly beginning in Ps. 95, and concludes with three psalms containing the imperative הללו יה (Pss. 104.35; 105.45; 106.1, 48). This is the predominant term at the conclusion of the Psalter (Psalms 146–150), but also punctuates Book V (Pss. 111–113; 116–conclusion; 117; 135). Similarly, the imperative הודו ('Give thanks!') opening Pss. 105 and 106 creates seamless continuity into Book V's opening Ps. 107 and is repeated later in Pss. 118 and 136.

73.[26] At the other end, Psalm 89 concludes this long series of temporal questions, and the following Book IV is dominated by the confident assertion of the Lord's rule and reign.[27]

The foregoing evidence indicates that the first two psalms are indeed an introduction to the entire Psalter. Topics and terminology introduced at the beginning reappear at major junctures in the structure of the book. It has also been shown that Psalm 2 has its own individual structure and integrity. However, there is convincing evidence, based on verbal and conceptual links to the previous psalm, of their cohesive and coherent integration. The following list of verbal links provides a basis for the discussion of such amalgamation:[28]

Psalm 1		Psalm 2	
אשרי	1.1a	אשרי	2.12d
ובמושב…ישב	1.1d	יושב	2.4a
יהגה	1.2b	יהגו	2.1b
יומם	1.2b	היום	2.7c
כ(עץ)…כ(מץ)	1.3a, 4b	כ(כלי)	2.9b
על	1.3b	על	2.2, 6
יתן	1.3c	ואתנה	2.8a
בעתו	1.3c	ועתה	2.10a
וכל	1.3e	כל	2.12d
במשפט	1.5a	שפטי ארץ	2.10b
דרך	1.1c, 6a, 6b	דרך	2.12b
ודרך…תאבד	1.6b	ותאבדו דרך	2.12b

26. See my *Shape and Message*, pp. 15-16.

27. Divine rule declared in Book IV is described in terms that equate it with the Davidic kingdom, so lamented for its absence in Ps. 89. In fact, the evidence within Ps. 89 itself leads to the same conclusion. So David's throne and seed are to be established forever in 89.5 (עד עולם אכין זרעך…לדר ודור כסאך), cf. also v. 30, and likewise the divine throne of 93.2 is established forever (נכון כסאך מאז מעולם אתה). The established divine throne of 89.15, identical except for the pronominal suffix to 97.2 (צדק ומשפט מכון כסאך cf. David's throne in Isa. 9.6) parallels lexically (כסא and כון) David's in 89.5, 89.37-38 (וכסאו כשמש נגדי כירח יכון עולם). The result is a close association of divine and Davidic throne in 89.5, 15, 37-38, 93.2 and 97.2. As will be seen in the discussion of Ps. 2.4 and its relationship to 1.1 and 110.1, this equation of divine and human royal session is already announced in the Psalter's introduction. See my *Shape and Message*, pp. 223-30 and 'Integrated Reading', pp. 75-88. Cf. also the discussion of Eric N. Ortlund, 'An Intertextual Reading of the Theophany of Psalm 97', *SJOT* 20 (2006), pp. 273-85: 'The link between the perpetuity of divine rule and creation and David's line is all but explicit' (p. 283).

28. Analysis of the role Ps. 3 plays in relation to the first two will take place following comments on Ps. 2. Psalm 3's function in relation to Pss. 1–2 will clarify the stance from which all subsequent psalms should be understood.

Commentary

2.1. Psalms 1 and 2 lack superscriptions, which are otherwise seen in practically every psalm of Book I. This, along with the repeated form אשׁרי enveloping the two constitutes formal evidence of their deliberate integration.

Opening a psalm with the interrogative 'Why?' (למה) is not unique to the second psalm.[29] Especially pertinent is Psalm 10, a superscriptionless psalm, which opens questioning God as to why (למה) he stands far off, 'hiding in times of trouble' (תעלים לעתות בצרה, Ps. 10.1b). Undoubtedly this interrogative, uttered in times of distress, pointedly reminds God of his role described in the previous psalm as 'a refuge during times of trouble' (משׂגב לעתות בצרה, Ps. 9.10b).[30] Repetition of this infrequent phrase signals overtly the purposeful juxtaposition of Psalms 9 and 10.

Psalm 2's opening interrogative functions similarly in relation to the first psalm. It follows directly on the heels of the promise of Psalm 1's final clause (1.6b), which states emphatically that the wicked will be destroyed.[31] A full-fledged international rebellion against the Lord and his messiah in Ps. 2.1-3 seems to belie the previous asseveration.

The verb 'meditate' (יהגו) in v. 1, describing the activity in which the peoples are engaged, represents an overt link to the previous psalm. In Ps. 1.2b the same activity was predicated of the blessed man (יהגה), but also accompanied by the object of his meditation, Yhwh's torah. However, Psalm 1 did not comment on the meditation of the wicked or its object. This is but one example of information not given in the first psalm being provided in the second. The wicked, identified specifically as the nations and their rulers (v. 2), meditate in vain (ריק), a pointed contrast to the object of meditation in Ps. 1.3, the Lord's torah.[32] Verse 2 goes on to identify the purpose of their meditation as rebellion against the Lord and his messiah.

29. Cf. Pss. 10.1; 74.1. Psalm 22.1, except for the opening double vocative, opens with the same interrogative form.

30. Some would argue that Psalms 9 and 10 are a single poem since evidence of an alphabetic acrostic can be found across the pair. Lack of a superscription over Psalm 10, in Book I where superscriptions are ubiquitous, is another argument adduced in support of their unity. Cf. Wilson, *Psalms*, pp. 221-47, where the commentary treats both as a unity. The LXX numbers them as one.

31. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 37: 'Auch ist das Ende von Ps. 1 mit dem Anfang von Ps. 2 verbunden. Der „Weg der Gottlosen" (1,6b) wird konkret in 2,1-3 dargestellt; es ist der Weg derjenigen, die gegen JHWH und seinen Gesalbten aufstehen. Hierbei wird wiederum eine Identifikation zwischen den „Gottlosen" und den „Nationen" angedeutet'.

32. Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, p. 18, see ריק functioning adverbially: 'in vain, of labour wihout benefit or advantage'.

Verse 1 exhibits common Hebrew parallelism, with each half of the bicolon consisting of three members.[33] At the juncture of colon A and B are the two semantically parallel nouns, 'nations' and 'peoples' (גוים לאמים). They are the subjects of verbal predicates preceding the former and following the latter, resulting in a pattern of *ab//b'a'* at the heart of the bicolon:

a' b' b a
רגשׁו גוים ולאמים יהגו

The initial interrogative למה serves double duty for both cola. It has no semantic or syntactic counterpart in colon B, as does not the final accusative noun 'emptiness', so that the overall semantic pattern is *abc//c'b'd*.

d b' c' c b a
למה רגשׁו גוים ולאמים יהגו ריק

As a result, the unparalleled elements isolated at either end highlight the reason for the speaker's astonishment, 'Why…emptiness?' (למה…ריק).

Between the final clause of Ps. 1.6 and the first of 2.1 there exists a phonological parallel, which represents another connector between the two psalms. The rare, and hence calculated, choice of the verb form רגשׁו of 2.1a[34] resonates closely with the plural noun רשׁעים of 1.6b. The consonants *rêš* and *šîn* in both forms are accompanied by *ʿayin* in the first case and *gîmel* in the second:

…ודרך רשׁעים תאבד 1.6b
למה רגשׁו גוים… 2.1a

The Septuagint's transliterations of the city names Γάζα for עזה and Γόμορρα for עמרה indicates the articulation of Hebrew *ʿayin* was close phonetically to that of *gîmel*. The medial position of *gîmel* (רגשׁו) may have occasioned less velar constriction, and thus was probably produced with an even closer resemblance to *ʿayin*.[35]

33. The MT unites the last two words as a single accentual unit (by means of a *maqqef*) giving a stress pattern of 3×2, due perhaps to the fact that ריק is monosyllabic. Word counting gives a very symmetrical 3×3 pattern. See Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, p. 125, where he calls v. 1 a 'precise double triple'.

34. It appears only three times in verbal form and three times in noun form in the entire Hebrew Bible (BDB, p. 921, *s.v.* רגשׁ). It also occurs three times as a verb in the Aramaic portions of Daniel (6.7, 12, 16).

35. The consonant *ʿayin* is characterized in a recent grammar by Allen P. Ross, *Introducing Biblical Hebrew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001), p. 24, as 'a pharyngeal…producing a guttural sound *rgh*… In its strongest form, it is similar to the beginning of the *g* sound, but it is not *g*—not enough closure takes place in the throat to make *g*.'

This evidence on the level of sound points to a purposeful connection between the wicked of Psalm 1 and the recalcitrant nations in Psalm 2.[36] In fact, if the plural subject noun 2.1a, גוֹיִם, (which adds an additional phonologically resonant *gîmel* and masculine plural morpheme ים) is included in the comparison with the plural noun רְשָׁעִים of 1.6b, the resulting resonance is stronger yet. Once the identification of the wicked with the nations is made, it is only logical to assume that הָאִישׁ of Psalm 1 is the messiah, king and son of God of Psalm 2.[37] Numerous parallels on various levels between Ps. 2.4 and 1.1, as well as between 2.6 and 1.3, will confirm that proposition. It therefore becomes increasingly clear that the transition between Psalms 1 and 2 is practically seamless.

Phonological parallels not only link the two psalms together at their juncture, but also the bicolon of 2.1 within itself. The sequence *lāmeḏ-mêm-mêm-mêm* at the beginning of colon A is found at the outset of B as well (לָמָּה…גוֹיִם וְלְאֻמִּים). As a result one hears echoes in B of the initial interogative 'why?' In addition, a sequence of *rêš-gîmel* or *rêš-qôp̄* (*gîmel* and *qôp̄* being velar stops) is repeated in the final two members of each colon (רגשׁו גוים… יהגו ריק…). Furthermore, the final two members of each colon contain two velar stops each and a *yōḏ*. So colon A's final two members exhibit the sequence *rêš-gîmel-gîmel-yōḏ*, resembling closely B's *yōḏ-gîmel-rêš-qôp̄* (רָגְשׁוּ גּוֹיִם…יֶהְגּוּ רִיק).[38] Thus, the plotting of the nations in colon A (see next paragraph) is closely linked through sound to the idea of meditation on vanity of B. Phonology provides a cohesion that does not exist on the level of syntax, which is different for these last two members of each colon. Colon A has the word order, verbal predicate followed by subject noun, as opposed to the different sequence of verbal predicate followed by object noun in colon B. Here we see again how the ancient poet manipulated the language, exploiting parallelism at the levels of syntax, semantics and sound.

The activity of the nations in colon A is described using the rare verbal root רגשׁ, as noted previously. It has been rightly characterized as an Aramaism.[39] In verbal form it is found only here in the Hebrew of the

36. Common vocabulary to declare the destruction of the way of the wicked in 1.6 and of the way of kings and nations in 2.11-12 points to the same identification.

37. Wenham, 'Towards', p. 338, 'The juxtaposition of Psalms 1 and 2 suggests that the righteous of Psalm 1 could be identified with the king of Psalm 2, while the wicked of Psalm 1 could be the king's enemies'.

38. See the discussion of Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, pp. 11-13.

39. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, p. 126, and *HALOT*, *s.v.* רגשׁ. So the psalm opens with an Aramaism and concludes with another, בר (2.12). The verb תרעם of v. 9 is often taken to be an Aramaic form. See Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, p. 124 (although here it will be read as a Hebrew form; see comments on v. 9). See also Klaus Seybold, *Die Psalmen* (HAT, I/15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996), p. 30. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, p. 5.

MT.[40] Three times as a verbal form it is repeated in the Aramaic of Daniel (6.7, 12, 16), and both Peshiṭta (ܐܬܪܥܘ)[41] and Targum (מתרגשין)[42] translate using the identical verbal root. In Daniel 6 the form portrays the collective movements of satraps and officials in a deceptive plot to destroy Daniel.[43] Hence the nations are involved, not in a general uproar, but rather a considered scheme.[44] Psalm 2.2 will focus on the leaders of those nations involved in the plotting of v. 1, and so they form a closely linked pair.[45] Their activities will be likewise characterized as conspiratorial in nature while detailing the target of their plan.[46]

2.2. The 'kings of the earth' (מלכי ארץ) and 'rulers' (רוזנים) constitute a common word pair.[47] The initial verb יתיצבו ('take their stand') indicates a hostile stance taken against the Lord and his messiah.[48] The plural subject 'kings' indicates an alliance in this plot, which the plural noun and predicate in the

40. Twice in noun form the root appears in Pss. 64.3 and 55.15, parallel to the Hebrew noun סוד ('counsel, council'). BDB, *s.v.* סוֹד. Note the verb נוסדו in Ps. 2.2 whose root is presumably יסד, but *HALOT* (*s.v.* יסד) suggests the latter is an 'alternative form from סוד'.

41. D.M. Walter, A. Vogel and R.Y. Ebied (eds.), *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshiṭta Version.* II/3. *The Book of Psalms* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), p. 1.

42. Díez Merino, *Targum de Salmos*, p. 79.

43. Note the similarity in context of Dan. 6 to Ps. 2. These officials scheme against the sovereign ruler Darius to do away with his chosen official Daniel, whom he desired to put in charge of the entire kingdom. Likewise, the nations and rulers of Ps. 2 desire to revolt against both the sovereign Yhwh and his messiah, whom he elevates in similar manner.

44. A. Bowling, 'רגשׁ', *TWOT* II, p. 833.

45. Cf. Frederick Clark Putnam, *Hebrew Bible Insert; A Student's Guide to the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew* (Quakertown, PA: Stylus, 1996), p. 29: 'For example, the grammatical chiasm in Ψ2.1-2b (*qatal-yiqtol-yiqtol-qatal*) reinforces each verse's parallel syntactic chiasm (verb-subject//subject-verb). This grammatical and syntactic patterning in turn emphasizes 2c, which stands outside the pattern'.

46. נוסדו יחד, 'conspire'. Cf. *HALOT*, *s.v.* יסד (II), and Luis Alonso Schökel, *Diccionario bíblico hebreo-español* (Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo, 1991) *s.v.* יסד (2), 'conspirar'. Schaefer, in *Psalms*, p. 9, comments on vv. 1 and 2, 'As in Psalm 1, the wicked form a conspiracy, and four verbs are used to describe it: "conspire", "plot", "set themselves", "take counsel together"'.

47. Five out of six times that it is found in the Hebrew Bible, the term רוזנים is parallel to מלכים (Judg. 5.3; Hab. 1.10; Prov. 8.15; 31.4). The sixth time (Isa. 40.23) has it parallel to שׁפטי ארץ, as in Ps. 2.10.

48. Cf. Num. 22.22; Josh. 1.5; Judg. 20.2. Alonso Schökel renders it 'to ally themselves' or 'enter into an alliance' (aliarse), *Diccionario bíblico*, *s.v.* יצב.

second clause confirm. The rulers 'take counsel together' (נוסדו יחד), thus emphasizing the unified stance of the conclave.[49]

On the face of it, a rebellion against the deity (יהוה) would appear to be absolute folly, which may explain the use of ריק (emptiness, futility) in the previous verse. The second named target of their intrigue is Yhwh's own anointed one. Presumably the only visible target of this international conspiracy is the human king, but the writer informs the readers that they are in fact attacking the deity as well. As will be seen in subsequent verses, the two are in fact inseparable.[50] The anointed monarch is the divine representative in every sense of the word.

The verb יתיצבו is also found in Josh. 1.5,[51] and so the second psalm, like the first, is resonant with the opening chapter of the Prophets.[52] Just as there is an alliance of kings arrayed against the messianic king here, so there was against Joshua (Josh. 9.1-2).[53] For the psalm's composer, the narrative of Joshua described not only the past, but was a harbinger of a far greater leader and conflict yet to be seen.[54]

Colon A of this second verse finds a close parallel in Ps. 31.14: '…when they conspired together against me, they plotted to take my life'. The idiom used in both cases is the same, niphal verb of the root יסד, adverbial form יחד, and verbal complement governed by the preposition על:

49. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, 6 (ו): 'They were united in one counsel' (התחברו בעצה אחת).

50. Note the plural pronominal suffixes in v. 3, the identity of the seated one in v. 4, the sonship relationship in v. 7 and the subservience rendered to both in vv. 11-12. Cf. the comments of Luis Alonso Schökel and Cecilia Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 156: 'contra el Señor y contra su Ungido, son inseparables', or Berlin and Brettler, 'Psalms', p. 1285: 'The relationship between God and king is very close; the attack *against the* LORD is equated with that *against His anointed*, suggesting that the (Davidic) king was viewed by some as God's earthly representative. (See also the striking filial language in v. 7 and Ps. 45.)'

51. יתיצבו, Ps. 2.2; יתיצב, Josh. 1.5. The latter promises that no 'man' (איש) would stand against Joshua, a reference presumably to the kings eventually vanquished and listed in Josh. 12. They are described as 'the kings of the land' (מלכי הארץ, Josh. 12.1, 7), a phrase quite close to the 'kings of the earth' (מלכי ארץ) of Ps. 2.2. Joshua completely subdues the kings of the land and inherits (תנחיל, Josh. 1.6) it, just as the king Ps. 2 will destroy the kings of the earth and take the entire earth as his inheritance (נחלתך, Ps. 2.8).

52. Psalm 2.10 will warn the kings to 'be wise' (as the verb השכילו is usually translated) or have their way (דרך) destroyed. Joshua 1.7-8 promised 'success' (same verb, תשכיל) in his way (דרכך) to Joshua if he meditated on the Torah.

53. כל המלכים…ויתקבצו יחד Josh. 9.1-2
יתיצבו מלכי…יחד Ps. 2.2

54. The book of Joshua portrays the leader consistently according to the pattern of the prophet Moses. But the latter is also patterned after the royal figure Joseph (Gen. 37.8), as is Joshua himself (Josh. 24.29-32).

נוסדו יחד על…על Ps. 2.2b
בהוסדם יחד עלי לקחת נפשי זממו Ps. 31.14cd

The parallels are especially striking and, from a unified view of the Psalter, point to the historical David (Ps. 31.1) being the voice of God's messiah in the Psalter's introduction. Furthermore, Psalm 31 makes clear that the conspiracy of Psalm 2 had as its goal the death of the messiah. It was a plot to kill. The third psalm will provide further details on this intrigue.[55]

Some have relegated the concluding twin prepositional phrases of v. 2 to the status of a secondary gloss.[56] Much of the psalm evinces common rhythmic patterns of Hebrew poetry, such as the 3 x 3 word count of v. 1, also in the first two clauses of v. 2, which these two phrases disturb. Overlooked, however, is the fact that the idiom נוסד יחד, as illustrated by the parallel form in Ps. 31.14 (see above), is also followed by the preposition על and its object. Apparently the latter functions as an obligatory verbal complement in both Pss. 31.14 and 2.2.

The term מׁשיח of v. 2 can refer to a king such as Saul (2 Sam. 1.14), David (2 Sam. 19.22; 22.51), Cyrus (Isa. 45.1), to the high priest (Lev. 4.3), or to the future eschatological king (1 Sam. 2.10; 2 Sam. 19.22; Pss. 18.51;[57] 20.7; 28.8; 84.10; 89.39, 52; 132.10, 17; Dan. 9.25, 26).[58] The latter sense is in view here since textual signals noted above concerning האיׁש of Psalm 1 revealed him to be the eschatological priest, king and conqueror, and now Psalm 2 is simply providing a further description of the same individual.[59]

55. The use of the same preposition in Ps. 3.2, 7 (עלי) in its hostile sense ('against') reveals that the persecuted messiah of Ps. 2.2 speaks there in first person. For the plot to kill compare Pss. 6.11, 7.6, 9.14, 13.3-5, etc.

56. Cf. *BHS* apparatus, 'frt gl'. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, p. 124, considers it to be 'very likely a secondary addition that announces the purpose of the hostile and coalition and seeks to explain the plural suffix ("their cords")'. Seybold, *Die Psalmen*, p. 31: 'Die sehr ebenmäßige Struktur…ist an einigen Stellen sekundär durch Interpretamente gestört. So bildet 2b einen prosaischen Zusatz….'

57. ועׂשה חסד למׁשיחו לדוד ולזרעו עד־עולם, Ps. 18.51 (2 Sam. 19.22). The pronominal suffix in the phrase 'his messiah' is proleptic to both David and his seed.

58. Note how David's name is employed in Ezek. 34.23, 37.24-25 to identify not himself but his eschatological descendant.

59. The 'messianic' reading of Ps. 2 is longstanding. Rashi acknowledges as much: 'Our rabbis interpreted the subject as concerning king messiah; but according to its meaning, and for a reply to the Christians, it is correct to interpret it as concerning (David) himself, in accord with the subject which is spoken of "and the Philistines heard that they anointed David as king over them"'; and similarly Ibn Ezra: 'Spoken concerning David…but if concerning the messiah the matter is more clear', Cohen, *Miqra'ot gedolot*, p. 4 (translation my own). An ancient midrash comments on this verse: 'Should it be reported to the lord Messiah in the time-to-come, locusts come and smite it…they will come and bow down to the lord Messiah', Braude, *Midrash*, p. 37. Cf. Mt. 3.17; 17.5, and synoptic passages. Also Jn 1.49; Heb. 1.2; Rev. 11.18; 19.19.

He was the unambiguous focus of Psalm 1, the wicked being only portrayed in comparison with him, and likewise is the principal subject of Psalm 2. Psalm 1 portrays him as king (v. 2), priest (v. 3) and conqueror (v. 3), and as will be seen, the same is true of Psalm 2 (priest-king in v. 6, son of God and heir in vv. 7-8 and conqueror in vv. 9-12).

In the wake of the Psalter's eschatological and messianic two-psalm introduction, all subsequent psalms are to be read accordingly. Psalm 3 immediately following reveals as much through explicit verbal and thematic connections to the introduction. Such patterns of cohesiveness and coherence between Psalm 3 and the introduction, as well as between Psalms 1–2 themselves establish an editorially produced reading strategy for the rest of the book.

The verbs of vv. 1 and 2 seem to alternate randomly between *qatal* and *yiqtol* (traditionally labelled 'perfect' and 'imperfect'). The exact function of the Hebrew verb, above all in poetry, is still something of an enigma. Some promising advances have been made by Wolfgang Schneider and others using a textlinguistic approach.[60] His view is that the dominant verb form in Psalms, as in other non-narrative *Gattungen*, is the imperfect, while the perfect functions retrospectively throughout.[61] However, this does not solve satisfactorily the verb sequence in these verses. As already noted, the verbal sequence in vv. 1-2, alternating between two verb 'tenses' within parallel bicola (perfect-imperfect-imperfect-perfect) is baffling. Briggs interprets the imperfect in v. 1a (יהגו) aspectually as 'frequentative of repeated action' and notes that the 'change of tense is awkward in a question'.[62] Goldingay does not discuss the issue, but does attempt to translate vv. 1-2 according to an aspectual view.[63]

A generally overlooked inductive study by Michel, based specifically on the Psalms, may offer some solutions to this question.[64] The initial perfect of v. 1, according to this view, declares an independent or self-standing

60. Schneider, *Grammatik*, p. v (Vorwort): 'Den textgrammatischen Ansatz in der Syntax habe ich beibehalten… Alviero Niccacci sowie Eep Talstra und Mitglieder der societas Hebraica Amstelodamensis haben meine Anregungen aufgenommen und weiter geführt'.

61. Schneider, *Grammatik*, pp. 177-82. See the chart on p. 197.

62. Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, p. 18. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. ו (6), from a modern Hebrew view imposed on the biblical system states, '"they are in commotion" in the past tense parallel to "they will meditate" in the future. The meaning of both is the present' (my translation of רגשׁו' בעבר מקביל ל'יהגו' בעתיד. והכונה בשׁניהם להוה').

63. Goldingay, *Psalms*, p. 92: 'Why have nations thronged, do countries talk emptiness, Do earth's kings take their stand, have leaders taken counsel together…?'

64. Michel, *Tempora*. It should be noted that he finds it difficult to explain the 'Chiasmus' of 2.1 and many other texts from the Psalms exhibiting the same verbal sequence (pp. 186-87).

fact (*selbstgewichtig*),[65] while the imperfect reports an action that is dependent on that previous perfect.[66] So the meditation by peoples on emptiness of v. 1's colon B (imperfect) comes out of or is a consequence of the initial plotting of A (perfect) anterior to it, and the recalcitrant stand taken in v. 2a, colon A (imperfect) continues with the results of that same intrigue. Indeed, there is a logical progression from the initial general statement of conspiracy (רגשו, colon A) to its labelling as folly (יהגו ריק, colon B) and finally to its general stance of opposition (יתיצבו, colon A, v. 2). The perfect of v. 2b (נוסדו, colon B) then adds another independent or self-standing statement of fact describing the unified conspiratorial nature of this general plotting introduced initially in v. 1a. The semantic similarity of these two perfects (נוסדו and רגשו) is striking, although the adverbial יחד following the second supports its independent status. Furthermore, the second adds the twofold adverbial complement (על יהוה ועל משיחו) identifying the objects of this conspiracy. So two imperfects in vv. 1b and 2a narrate facts consequent to the initial perfect of v. 1a, while the second perfect of v. 2b is followed by two prepositional phrases (adverbial complements) also dependent on it. So Michel's view, if accurately portrayed here, may solve the otherwise enigmatic verbal sequence of vv. 1-2.[67]

Following Michel's theory, the two cohortatives of v. 3, ונתקה…ונשליכה, also continue to describe actions dependent on or stemming from the united conspiracy of v. 2b, expressed by the perfect נוסדו. They verbalize expressly the words of those rulers in v. 2b who have come together against the Lord and his messiah (v. 2c). Of note is the fact that both dependent cohortatives are *nûn*-initial, as is the initial governing perfect niphal נוסדו. The ensuing four imperfects of vv. 4-5 express the counter measures as a result of the rebellion uttered in v. 3, and so again represent dependence on or consequence of נוסדו.[68] Note that the same pronominal morpheme מו—unites this entire triad of vv. 3-5 in addition to the common imperfect/cohortative verb forms. Consequently, the sequence of verbs in vv. 3-5 express action developing out of the self-standing perfect of v. 2b.

Only in v. 6a is this sequence of imperfects broken with another perfect, נסכתי, that establishes another autonomous act as a counter measure to the perfect of v. 2b (נוסדו), both also being linked phonologically as well (see discussion in v. 6). Just as the first two perfects were semantically close

65. Michel, *Tempora*, p. 99.

66. Michel, *Tempora*, p. 176. It may not be coincidental that each of the first three psalms open with perfects.

67. It should be noted that the triad of an initial independent perfect (רגשו) and two dependent imperfects (יהגו…יתיצבו) crosses the boundary between bicolon (v. 1) and tricolon (v. 2). Nonetheless, this does not necessarily invalidate the argument.

68. Michel, *Tempora*, p. 176 (#7).

(רגשו…נוסדו), so the triad of perfects in vv. 6-7 (נסכתי…אמר…ילדתיך) all relate directly to the inauguration of the chosen king. This exhausts all perfects in the entire psalm, and so in addition to Michel's idea of the self-standing independent nature of the perfect there is apparently a related attribute of semantic or conceptual similarity at work in this case.[69]

2.3. Following the described actions of rebellious kings in vv. 1 and 2, v. 3 cites their stated intentions. By means of two plural cohortative verbs they express the firm and resolute desire to tear off (נתקה…נשליכה)[70] the bonds that restrict them. The plural implies they speak as a group, reiterating in unison the joint (יחד) purpose expressed in v. 2. They seek to rid themselves of their (the Lord and his messiah's) bonds and ropes.[71] The immediate antecedents to the twofold plural pronominal suffix מו of v. 3 are the Lord and his messiah (v. 2), whose rule and authority are presented as one. A joint conspiracy is arrayed against joint authority.

The response to these two cohortatives by both the Lord and his messiah will be expressed in the same mood. The messiah speaks in v. 7 with determination to recount (אספרה) the Lord's decree declaring him as chosen ruler. Verse 8 cites the Lord's own words declaring his determination to give (ואתנה) rule and authority to his anointed son. Thus the twice-stated firm desire of earthly rulers to rebel against divine joint authority is met with a twofold response, first from the chosen king and then the Lord himself. Both responses are directed to the same issue of rule and authority. The nations' desire is to be free from God's rule through his messiah. God's desire is to establish his messianic king over them, which vv. 10–12 will confirm along with a warning and consequences.

The terms 'bonds' (מוסרותימו) and 'ropes' (עבתימו) are metaphorical for servitude, as various other texts demonstrate.[72] Jeremiah 5.5, one of those

69. This idea would certainly apply as well to the threefold sequence of perfects in Ps. 1.1.

70. From the roots נתק 'to tear off', and שׁלך 'to cast'. GKC, §48e defines the cohortative's function as expressing 'the will to an action and thus denotes especially self-encouragement (in the 1st plur. an exhortation to others at the same time), a resolution or a wish…' and also (§108a) 'in general an endeavor directed expressly towards a definite object…lays stress on the determination underlying the action, and the personal interest in it'.

71. Rarer third-person masculine plural pronominal suffix מו.

72. In Jer. 2.20, 5.5; 27.1-8, 30.8; Nah. 1.13 the same idiom 'tear off bonds' (נתק מוסרות) is found in the context of the term 'yoke' (על or מוטה). In each of the Jeremiah passages (except for 5.5), the root 'to serve' (עבד) is also found. To serve a monarch is to wear the bonds or yoke he imposes, and Ps. 2.11, in a manner consistent with these texts, commands the earth's rulers to serve (עבדו) the Lord. Jeremiah 2.20 is interesting in this context because there the Lord had torn off Israel's bonds, but the ungrateful nation had said it would not 'serve' (לא אעבד). So they were freed

texts, equates bonds (and a yoke) with knowing the way of the Lord and his judgment.[73] Here in Psalm 2, the earthly kings have rejected submission to the Lord's rule, but v. 11's command, 'serve ye' (עבדו, cf. Jer. 27.7, ועבדו), grants them an opportunity to repent. Submission and servitude to God are resisted by the nations, ignoring apparently the fact that trusting and submitting to God's son brings blessing (v. 12). Those are the same blessings ascribed to the ideal man of Psalm 1.[74] Trust in him (the son) has as its results a share in his blessings.[75]

Verse 3 is a bicolon, consisting of two three-word clauses.[76] Syntactically they are practically identical, beginning with the cohortative verbal predicates and ending with plural noun direct objects, both suffixed identically. Only between the predicate and object in each case are found differing forms, the object marker in colon A (את) and pronominally suffixed preposition in B (ממנו). They seek freedom from 'their' (the Lord's and his messiah's) bonds, the object introduced by את, while v. 11, having the only other occurrence of the *nota accusativi* in the psalm, demands the opposite, subservience to the Lord. Verse 12 demands subservience to the son as well, a fitting response then to the rebellion against both Yhwh and his messiah.

The parallel cola indicate a sequence of actions. Tearing off the bonds (colon A) is followed by a further gesture, casting them away (B).[77] These rulers desire freedom (ננתקה) *and* distancing (נשליכה) from the strictures imposed by the divine will. Substituting the prepositional phrase 'from us' (ממנו) in: B for the object marker (את) in A accentuates the distance desired from any semblance of submission on the part of the speakers. At the same time, it can be argued that their effect is reciprocal between A and B. The prepositional phrase 'from us' in B not only parallels and succeeds the

in order to serve the Lord, but had refused. Note also how Jer. 27.1-8 portrays Nebuchadnezzar in ways similar to the messianic king of Ps. 2. God gives him (נתתי) all the lands (Jer. 27.6) and predicts that the nations would serve him (עבדו…הגוים, Jer. 27.7). In v. 6 he is identified as 'my servant' (עבדי).

73. כי המה ידעו דרך יהוה מִשפט אלהיהם, Jer. 5.5bc
אך המה יחדו שברו על נתקו מוסרות

74. אשרי is the identical term in 1.1 and 2.12.

75. As will be shown below, there is no reason to emend the MT text of v. 12.

76. Stress counting renders 2×3, but word count 3×3.

77. Cf. James L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), p. 1, who defines 'The Parallelistic Line' (title of Chapter 1), as 'A is so, and what's more, B', and states that the form is 'basically a sequence', and that one role among many of the second colon is to carry on further the first one. Such would appear to be the case in v. 3. Cf. also Alter, *Art of Biblical Poetry*, p. 10, who proposed that biblical parallelism demonstrates a 'dynamic movement from one verset to the next…'. In the same vein is Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. 7 (ז): 'first he tears off the bonds and then afterwards he casts them away' (תחלה מנתקים את הקשורים ולאחר מכן משליכים אותם), translation my own.

object marker of A, it also appears to do double duty for colon A.[78] In other words, the earthly rulers seek to tear off the bonds 'from themselves' (colon A) as they do the ropes in B.

Support for this syntactical reciprocity comes from the phonological parallelism between the two cola. Prevalence of the consonant *mêm* is obvious in the final two members of each colon, and contributing to this repetition is the more archaic and poetic suffix מוֹ. It is found as suffix in the final form of colon A ('their bonds', מוֹסרוֹתימוֹ), but, as can be seen, it opens with the same. Colon B ends of course with the identical sequence (עבתימו), and immediately preceding is the prepositional phrase ממנו. This results in the same consonant *mêm* encapsulating the entire object noun ending colon A (note that the entire syllable מו is repeated), as it does the prepositional phrase and object noun at the conclusion of B:

מוסרותימו...ממנו עבתימו

Likewise the consonant *tāw* is dominant across the bicolon. It is present in the *nota accusativi* and in the feminine plural marker of the two nouns 'bonds' and 'ropes':

את מוסרותימו...עבתימו

The intended effect of this phonological parallelism appears to confirm the reciprocal syntax of the object marker as well as the preposition as suggested above. Indeed, the object marker is comparatively rare in Hebrew poetry but here is vital to the composition of the bicolon.[79]

Consequently, parallelism has been activated at several levels in v. 3, including the syntactical (two final direct objects, initial cohortative verbs), semantic (bonds and ropes, tearing and casting away), morphological (third-person masculine plural pronominal suffixes, plural feminine nouns, plural cohortatives), and phonological (repeated consonants). The overall effect of this intertwining resonance is to emphasize the deep-rooted nature of the opposition to the authority established by God through his messiah.

The threefold repetition of the morpheme מוֹ may be deliberate for reasons beyond the cohesiveness of the bicolon. The same sequence is found in מַשִּׁיחֹו of v. 2, although separated by intervening consonants. This morpheme functions as a plural third-person pronoun in v. 3 (as well as vv. 4 and 5), whose antecedents are the Lord and his messiah immediately preceding. However, the phonological resonance noted here suggests that resistance to the messianic king is tantamount to resistance to Yhwh himself:

78. Usually a form doing double duty is found in A, but here it is found in B and apparently functioning in reverse.

79. GKC, §117a.

v. 2 מַשִּׁיחֹו
v. 3 מוֹסְרוֹתֵימוֹ...עֲבֹתֵימוֹ

The first role of the prepositional phrase ממנו (‘from us’) of colon B, as described above, has been to intensify the nature of the rebellion described in A. At the same time, it functions to provide a formal contrast with the only other instance of the preposition of the psalm in v. 8. Kings and nations seek to rid ‘from us’ (ממנו) the strictures imposed on them while God directs his son to ask ‘from me’ (ממני) the inheritance of the nations. Each time the suffixed preposition occurs as part of cited direct speech within two councils at war with each other. Kings and rulers speak among themselves of their plans for a coup against heaven (v. 3), while the Lord speaks with his chosen king of his plan to impose heavenly authority upon them.

Verse 3 has expressed forcefully then the unambiguous intransigence of nations and their rulers in the face of divine authority. It ends the first stanza of the psalm on a dramatic note. Psalm 1.5-6 had promised judgment of the wicked and exoneration of the righteous, but now the rebels have asserted their wickedness in the strongest manner possible. Such high-handed rebellion not only explains the astonished interrogative with which the stanza opened in v. 1 but also creates expectancy that God will respond. Indeed, stanza two will spell out his reply.

2.4. The divine response to this rebellion actually extends from vv. 4 through 12. However, vv. 4 and 5 are directed more explicitly to its ringleaders through use of the same pronominal suffix מו (‘them’) seen in v. 3. He laughs and then derides ‘them’ (v. 4) before speaking to ‘them’ in anger and terrifying ‘them’ (v. 5). As is often the case, the exact same linguistic form highlights the contrast. Verse 6 will represent transition from the emotion of the first two verses (laughter, anger) to his words of response.

As seen above, v. 1 contained a direct verbal link to the first psalm, and so provided further commentary on it. Verse 4 however contains multiple overt linguistic ties to the previous psalm, specifically v. 1. It will supply further information not given in the first psalm as seen already. To wit, the ‘meditation’ of Ps. 2.1 informed the reader of the thoughts of the wicked seen in Psalm 1, where only the meditation of the blessed man had been identified. While he meditated on God’s torah (Ps. 1.2), the second psalm informs the reader that they meditated on emptiness and futility (2.1).

Here in 2.4 the reference to session, or ‘sitting’, takes up again subject matter from 1.1. Psalm 1 identified the session of the wicked, and now any session in Psalm 2 would presumably discuss that of their counterpart, the blessed man, and so it is.[80] An overt lexical link signalling the parallel to the

80. For an earlier discussion of this issue see my ‘Integrated Reading’, pp. 83-96.

first psalm occurs in the first colon of v. 4. There is one who 'sits' (יושב) in heaven and laughs, while scorners of Ps. 1.1c had their 'seat' from which the blessed man abstained, did not 'sit' (ישב…במושב). So where does he in fact sit? As just noted, one would expect any sitting that might occur in the second psalm to supply that information. However, Ps. 2.4 portrays the heavenly session (בשמים) of Adonay, while Ps. 1.1c that of a fully human male (האיש).

Before resolving the identity of the heavenly seated one, it should also be noted that further links exist to the session of Ps. 1.1 at the semantic and phonological levels. In addition to verbal roots repeated (lexical parallelism) between Ps. 1.1c and 2.4a, the prepositional phrase 'in the seat of' plus indicative verb '(did not) sit' and 'the one sitting in heaven' produce multiple examples of consonance. Each and every consonant of 2.4a is matched in 1.1c:

ישב (לא)…במושב Ps. 1.1c
יושב בשמים Ps. 2.4a

Such overt similarity highlights the contrast between two sessions, whether in the company of scorners, or of heaven.

Further consonance can be seen between 2.4b and 1.1c in the repetition of *lāmeḏ* (twice) and *mêm*:

לַצִים לַא Ps. 1.1c
יִלעג לַמו Ps. 2.4b

Confirming this linkage at the phonological level is the accompanying semantic similarity between 'scorning' and 'deriding'. Indeed, the laughter and derision of 2.4 are appropriate responses to the scorn of 1.1.[81] Although the two reactions across v. 4 are similar, there is in fact an ominous development from laughter to derision. Likewise, the following v. 5 exhibits intensification from the anger of colon A to the fury of B. Taken together, these two verses exhibit the sequence of laughter, derision, anger, fury.

Given the undeniable multilevel resonance between Pss. 1.1c and 2.4b, it remains to explain what appears on the surface of the two psalms to be session of the blessed man in heaven. First of all the immediately preceding

81. Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, p. 14, suggests without further comment 'a reminiscence' between the initial למה of Psalm 2 and the sequence למו concluding vv. 4 and 5. It is possible that these responses signal through consonance that the questioned revolt has been addressed. Auffret also observes (p. 15) how the same ending מו of v. 3ab, consisting of one bicolon, is repeated at the end of each of the two stichoi (bicola) of vv. 4 and 5 conveying the divine reply, implying apparently the 'impotent outburst of the princes'.

context should be examined. Both his messiah and Yhwh himself are explicitly mentioned in v. 2, as those against whom the rebellion is directed. Verse 3 again refers to them in the masculine plural pronominal suffixes ('their bonds…their ropes'), resulting in their close association in consecutive vv. 2 and 3.

In v. 4 itself, the activities of both sitting and laughing are decidedly human, and so identifying their subject as the Lord's messianic king would not be surprising in and of itself. However, these activities take place *in heaven*, presumably a place restricted to the deity, and so there exists a double anthropomorphism. Furthermore, the named subject of the heavenly session in: A is אדני, referring presumably to Yhwh named in v. 2 (יהוה), not to 'his messiah' (משׁיחו) immediately following. The change in divine name would appear on the surface to be incidental.[82] However, the use of אדני is apparently deliberate, given that יהוה would have removed any ambiguity as to its referent. Note that Ps. 59.9 (ואתה יהוה תשׂחק־למו תלעג לכל־גוים), a remarkably similar verse, employs the Tetragrammaton instead as subject of the same verb pair (שׂחק…לעג) and lacks reference to session, the most explicit anthropomorphism of 2.4. Hence the use of אדני in 2.4 is quite deliberate, as is its accompanying reference to human session.

Relevant to this discussion is Isa. 6.1, where the prophet states that he 'saw the Lord sitting on a throne' (ואראה את אדני יושׁב על כסא). This vivid anthropomorphism (continued in the same verse by reference to his garments, that is, high priestly robes, שׁוליו) is expressed by the identical masculine singular participle of Ps. 2.4 (יושׁב) and divine epithet (אדני). It would appear that the title אדני is a calculated choice in anthrpomorphic contexts. This will be confirmed shortly by another text in the Psalter itself. At this point however, the evidence supports a human subject for the seated one (יושׁב) of v. 4. The lexical, phonological and semantic ties to Ps. 1.1 strongly indicate that האישׁ is in fact that subject. Added to his portrayal in the first psalm in royal, priestly, military and eschatological terms, along with moral perfection, is his divine position in heaven. The act of coronation in heaven will be spelled out in v. 6 and his relation to יהוה in v. 7.

The deliberate use of אדני in Ps. 2.4b is confirmed by comparison with the analogous Ps. 110.1, נאם יהוה לאדני שׁב.[83] Parallels to Ps. 2.4 are overt, including the same root 'to sit' (ישׁב), and the epithet 'Lord' (אדני). Masoretic vocalization in Ps. 110.1 imposes the reading, 'to my lord' (לאדנִי), but

82. As noted by the apparatus of *BHS*, numerous manuscripts have the Tetragrammaton instead. The principle of *lectio difficilior* would support the present reading אדני.

83. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. 7 (ז), notes that some see in the term אדני a reference to authority and lordship. Undoubtedly this is true, given the fact that all the nations and ends of the earth are the Lord's to give as inheritance to his son (v. 8). However, this does not fully clarify the use of this particular epithet.

pointing aside, the consonantal form of the epithet אדני is identical in each case. In fact, the vocalization is not consistent within Psalm 110 itself. Both instances of אדני fall in closely parallel contexts (cf. לאדנִי שֵׁב לימיני of 110.1 and אדנָי על ימינך of 110.5), and yet the Masoretes have not applied the same *nequddot*.

The numerous verbal correspondences between Psalms 110 and 2, especially the two verses in question, all confirm that the אדני of 2.4 and 110.1 are one and the same.[84] His heavenly session of Ps. 2.4 is thus revealed in 110.1 to have come about through the decree of יהוה. The suspicion that the messiah of 2.2 is the subject of divine heavenly session in 2.4 receives confirmation in 110.1. The latter distinguishes between two divine personages quite explicitly (אדני and יהוה), and so begins to explain the enigma of Ps. 2.4.

As noted above, numerous ties at various linguistic levels between Pss. 1.1 and 2.4 point overtly to the identification of the blessed man of the former as the one seated in the heavens of the latter. Phonological parallels were an integral part of this linkage. Consonance also confirms the identification of the messiah of 2.2 with seated one of 2.4:

2.2 מִשִּׁיחֹו
2.4 בַּשָּׁמַיִם יִשְׂחָק

The nearest masculine singular antecedent to יושב in the psalm is מִשִּׁיחֹו of 2.2. The latter noun includes the sequence *mêm-šîn* while the prepositional phrase בַּשָּׁמַיִם repeats it in opposite order, *šîn-mêm*. Following immediately in v. 4 is the verb יִשְׂחָק, which contains the sequence *šîn ḥêṯ*, very similar to the sequence *šîn-yōḏ-ḥêṯ* of מִשִּׁיחֹו. The medial vocalic *yōḏ* of the latter form also finds its parallel in the consonantal *yōḏ* of בַּשָּׁמַיִם. As in many cases already observed, and yet to be observed throughout this psalm, the poet has produced remarkable examples of consonantal parallels. Their purpose in many cases is to confirm otherwise implicit connections across the individual poem, and with those adjacent. Here it becomes clear that the heavenly situated divine figure אדני who participates in the very human activities of sitting and laughing, is in fact the Lord's messiah of v. 2 and the conquering monarch of Psalm 1.[85] A further response to the insubordinate

84. Additional terms common to both psalms include אתה ילדתיך קדש ציון. (In both psalms the Lord addresses his chosen king using this pronoun: in 2.7 to declare sonship of a king who already is portrayed sacerdotally and in 110.4 to declare his dual royal/sacerdotal role.) מלכי, אפו, מלכים, גוים. בהדרי is very close to בהררי, a common variant, which would be the plural of רה found in 2.6. In each psalm the chosen king in anger smashes enemy kings into submission through the authority given him by the Lord.. See also Rendtorff, *Old Testament*, p. 248.

85. The Targum renders v. 4 as follows: דיתיב בשמיא ידחך מימרא דייי ידחך להון,

rulers follows in v. 5, and then 6 will supply information on the manner in which this Lord messiah arrived at his heavenly seat.

2.5. Laughter and derision in v. 4 turn to fierce wrath in the next. The ominous sequential particle 'then' (אז)[86] introduces this change of mood. The reader learns that he speaks (ידבר 3rd masc. sing. imperfect) to them (אלימו). The latter, referenced again as in v. 4 by the plural pronoun form מו, identifies them as the plotters of vv. 1 and 2, and quoted in v. 3. The speaker is presumably the one seated (masc. sing. participle יושב) in heaven of the immediately preceding v. 4. Although it is announced that he will speak, it is the manner and effect of his speech on the listeners that is supplied, not the words themselves.

In addition there appears to be a deliberate link, again of an aural type, confirming the source and target of the intensified mood and emotion:

אדני ילעג למו v. 4b
ובחרונו יבהלמו v. 5b

Both nouns are characterized by the common sufformative morpheme ון, confirming Adonay as the source of the hot anger. Likewise the common consonantal sequence למו identifies the objects of derision to be now the objects of wrath.[87]

His words are spoken 'in his anger' (באפו), a pronominally suffixed noun repeated in v. 12. There the closest named antecedent to the masculine singular pronoun is the son of v. 12 (בר). As just noted, the antecedent of the two verbs in v. 5 is the masculine singular participle of v. 4, which, as argued above, can be identified as משיחו, 'his messiah' of v. 2. Consequently, the pronoun suffix in both cases of אפו (vv. 5, 12) has as its referent the same king messiah and son of God seen throughout the psalm.

rendering אדני in the MT as מימרא דיי, (Díez Merino, *Targum de Salmos*, p. 79). Perhaps this represents an attempt to soften the effects of the overt anthropopathism of laughter and anthropomorphism of session. Cf. Domingo Muñoz León, *Dios-Palabra: Memra en los Targumim del Pentateuco* (Granada: Institución San Jerónimo, 1974), p. 633: '*Las manifestaciones y acciones divinas*…que aparecen sustituidas con Memrá, indican no que la Palabra sea un Dios distinto, sino que Dios se comunica o actúa no en figura antropomórfica, sino en su Palabra'. Cf. also pp. 105-106.

86. אז is taken here as temporal adverb 'then, afterward', that is, temporally following v. 4, as in Deut. 29.19; Pss. 19.14; 51.21; 126.2; Isa. 35.5; 41.1; Hos. 3.4; Zeph. 3.9. BDB, *s.v.* אז, takes this as 'strictly temporal', and notes that 'in poetry אז is sometimes used to throw emphasis on a particular feature of the description…$\psi 2^{5}$'. Note the comments of Alexander, *Psalms*, p. 23: '*Then*, after having thus derided them, *then*, as the next stage in this fearful process, *he will speak to them*, as they, after rising up against him, spoke to one another in ver. 3'.

87. This example of consonance was pointed out by a student whose name is unknown now to me.

The bicolon that is v. 4 exhibits parallelism on various levels.[88] Semantically it is constructed as a chiasm, (*ab//b′a′*):

(אז) ידבר אלימו באפו ובחרונו יבהלמו
a *b* *b′* *a′*

'(Then) he speaks to them in his anger, in his wrath he terrifies them'.

Both *a* and *a′* are parallel by position at either extreme and have the identical objective plural pronominal suffix מו, preceded by *lāmeḏ* in each instance (למו…לימו), which sequence links it to the same sequence concluding v. 4 (למו).[89] Between them (in v. 5) is the repeated objective singular pronominal suffix ו, creating an unbroken fourfold repetition of this same long vowel across the bicolon. It is preceded by two bilabials in colon A (מו…פו), and by two nasals in B (מו…נו). The effect desired is presumably to unite the source of anger, expressed by a pair of nouns at the heart of the bicolon,[90] with its target in the surrounding pronoun suffixes. In other words, the heavenly messiah's wrath will be assuredly concentrated on the recalcitrant rulers and nations.

Between the two verbal predicates of *a* and *a′* there is an intensification from 'speaking' to 'terrifying'. Linking these two verbal predicates (and the adverbial of colon B) is the phonological sequence of *bêṯ*-liquid (*rêš* and *lāmeḏ*):

ידַבֵּר…ובַחֲרוֹנוֹ יְבַהֲלֵמוֹ

Likewise the 'anger' of colon A (באפו) is strengthened immediately to 'burning wrath' (ובחרונו) in B. These two prepositional phrases are also linked phonologically by the common sequence of *bêṯ -ḥōlem wāw*, in order to bind together this noun pair expressing progressively intensified indignation at the heart of the bicolon.[91] Reiteration of the anger in v. 12 confirms that the divine emotion is real and begins to answer the interrogative of v. 1 concerning the uprising of nations and their leaders. Verse 5 demonstrates that the promised divine judgment on the wicked in Ps. 1.5-6 (now

88. Both word and stress counts reveal the same 4×2 pattern. Without the opening particle אז that does double duty, the pattern is 3×2.

89. Could the *mêm-lāmeḏ* sequence of מלכי in the subsequent v. 6, constitute a phonologically based contrasting response to the threefold *lāmeḏ-mêm* sequence of the previous two verses? If so, it would be accompanied by the forceful change from third-person pronoun suffixes and verbal forms of vv. 3-5 to the first-person independent pronoun and verb form in v. 6.

90. Here the collocation באפו ובחרונו unites two nouns that are often in construct together, although usually in reverse order, as with חרון אפו in Jer. 4.26.

91. From the verbal root חרה, 'to burn'. A similar escalation from plain anger to the metaphorical burning occurs in v. 12, where the verb 'to be angry' (יאנף) in colon A is followed by the verb 'to be kindled' (יבער, subject is אפו) in colon B.

identified as the nations of Psalm 2) was not an idle statement, but rather a certain and coming reality, backed up by divine wrath. Furthermore, the unmitigated military triumph (וכל אשׁר יעשׂה יצליח) à la Joshua of the blessed man in 1.3 also precluded the success of any uprising. Thus the futility or emptiness (ריק, v. 1) of such a rebellion is confirmed.

Military combat is already suggested by the root בהל, as the context of the same in Ps. 83.16 demonstrates.[92] There the psalmist requests divine action against his enemies (v. 3) consonant with that effected against ancient neighboring peoples (vv. 7-12). Verses 9 (roots נפץ and רעה) and 12 (אבד) here in Psalm 2 also confirm the bellicose and destructive nature of the conflict promised to participants in the revolt against Yhwh and his messiah. Briggs correctly captures the sense in his comment that, 'The nations are ready to revolt, but Yahweh is ready for war'.[93]

But before characterizing the future conflict of vv. 9-12 the matter of divinely authorized royal installation will be addressed in 6. Previously v. 2 had referred to the Lord's chosen and established messiah, whose authority was resisted. His heavenly seat of power followed in v. 4. Now v. 6 will explain his attainment of such an exalted celestial throne (v. 4), and 7 will cite the covenantal promise behind it. Verses 8 and 9 go on to cite the divinely granted basis of his authority to subjugate those nations.

2.6. Here the initial independent pronoun and prefixed *wāw* (ואני), 'But as for me', places strong emphasis on the determination of the speaker in contrast and counter to the previous activity and words of multiple rulers.[94] The latter were performed and uttered in vv. 2 and 3, to which the contrast is directed, not to the immediately previous 4 and 5. Emphasis on the individual motivation of the first-person speaker and his act of installation is confirmed further by the fact that this pronoun is technically redundant to the verb following, whose first-person subject is evident enough through the perfect form itself, נסכתי.[95]

92. תבהלם in Ps. 83.16 (cf. ויבהלו, v. 18), יבהלמו in Ps. 2.5, both from בהל. Furthermore, note how the language describing military destruction in the one psalm of Ps. 83.10-18 combines that of two juxtaposed psalms, Ps. 1.4, 6 and Ps. 2.5, 12. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. ז (7), likewise understands war and destruction in the language of v. 5 (ורומז לרוח סערה וקול רעם שה׳ מפיץ בהם את אויביו בשעת מלחמה).

93. Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, pp. 14-15.

94. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. ז (7), renders 'But I' (אבל אני). To this pronoun is affixed then an example of the disjunctive *wāw*, rightly characterized by Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, p. 15, as having 'a strong adversative force'. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 145, comment that the construction ואני presumes an unspoken phrase, thus, 'vosotros os rebeláis, pero yo…'.

95. The affixed morpheme *–tî* of the first-person singular perfect.

The force of this change to first person can also be felt by the contrast with v. 2. Instead of the more distant third-person 'his messiah' (מְשִׁיחוֹ), v. 6 refers to 'my king' (מַלְכִּי). Verse 2's third-person language perhaps mirrors the disaffection of the rebellious rulers felt for God's messiah, while v. 6 reflects his deeply felt personal preference for him.

The combined prepositional phrases עַל יהוה וְעַל מְשִׁיחוֹ of v. 2 also inform the reader as to the identity of the speaker in 6. Since the messiah of 2 is the Lord's (מְשִׁיחוֹ), a speaker who refers to establishing 'my king' in 6 can only be the Lord himself (יהוה).

Use of the verb נסכתי is further evidence at the phonological level of a contrast aimed specifically at the intrigue of rulers in v. 2. It responds through word-initial repetition of the sequence *nûn-sāmek̲* to the international conspiracy designated by the verb נוסדו in v. 2 (נסכתי).

Lexical repetition also contributes to this pointed converse of v. 6. Employment of the noun מַלְכִּי ('my king') is surely a direct counter to מַלְכֵי ('kings of') in 2. If the subordinate prepositional phrases are taken into consideration it becomes evident that a deliberate contrast has been produced between the two:

v. 2 מַלְכֵי...עַל...וְעַל
v. 6 מַלְכִּי עַל

Kings have conspired *against* the Lord and his messiah, but set against that strategy is the divinely placed chosen king *upon* Mt Zion.[96]

Verse 6 opens with the first-person singular independent pronoun which continues throughout the bicolon. Thus we read, 'But as for **me**, **I** have established…**my** king…**my** holy hill' (וַאֲנִי נָסַכְתִּי מַלְכִּי...הַר קָדְשִׁי). As argued above, such authority establishing a king can only come from Yhwh. However, the LXX has rendered the verbal predicate נסכתי in the passive (presuming niphal נִסַּכְתִּי) voice (κατεστάθην), and instead of 'my king' (מַלְכִּי), reads 'king by him' (βασιλεὺς ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ), resulting in a reading of, 'I have been established king by him'. Likewise the Greek translator maintained the third person in the final noun phrase, 'his holy mountain' (ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ). So for the LXX, the words of v. 6 are put in the mouth of the crowned king.[97] On the other hand, the Peshiṭta, like the MT, is entirely first person,[98] as is the Targum throughout, but with the addition of a verb in colon B.[99]

96. The semantic range of עַל cannot be imitated in English translation.

97. Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, pp. 20–21, retrovert the LXX of v. 6a as ואני נִסַּכְתִּי מלכו. They consider the LXX rendering of Ps. 2.6 as assimilation to Prov. 8.23, where the verb is niphal (נִסַּכְתִּי).

98. ܐܢܐ ܐܩܝܡܬ ܡܠܟܝ ܥܠ ܨܗܝܘܢ ܛܘܪܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܝ.

99. ואנא רביתי מלכי ומניתיה על ציון טור מקדשי. Note pael of √רבי.

It is probable that the Greek translator sought to harmonize the first-person speech of v. 6 with the same in 7 immediately following. Since the MT's vocalization preserves the more difficult reading it is probably to be preferred. It presumes the same referent (יהוה) for the twofold appearance of the independent pronoun אני in vv. 6 and 7. But while v. 6 has announced the coronation from the perspective of the deity, 7 then recounts it from the point of view of the king himself.

The verb נסכתי, whose root נסך is glossed by BDB as 'set, installed' only for this verse and Prov. 8.23, in most instances exhibits the idea of 'pouring out' or 'casting'.[100] From the same root comes the term 'prince' (נסיך), presumably designating an installed ruler.[101] So *HALOT* connects this latter noun and the verb here in 2.6 with the idea of 'pouring out'.[102]

Whatever the correct understanding of this particular verb, its use in the sense of royal installation is uncommon. Here the purpose is likely due to its aural resonance with נוסדו of v. 2 in order to highlight this immutable and determined divine decision in the face of human rebellion. They have opposed his anointed messiah but he replies by establishing him with universal authority. Alonso Schökel suggests the reason for this rare choice of the root נסך in the sense of anointing is due to its alliterative quality with נשׁק in v. 12.[103] Indeed, kissing the chosen king and son of God would be an appropriate response to his divine appointment as universal ruler. Quite possibly the author sought to connect all three verbs through the consonantal sequence of *nûn*-sibilant: נשקו…נסכתי…נוסדו. It links together the coalition's revolt, Yhwh's selection of a king in the face of such recalcitrance, and finally the appropriate response of human rulers to the divine will.

The function of the perfect in this particular verb נסכתי may be to refer to an anterior event, 'I have (already) established him', not simply as a reaction to the international rebellion. Indeed, he is sitting in heaven in the previous v. 4. Or, it may be simply stating, without regard to relative time, the fact of his installation.[104] According to Michel, time is not the deciding fac-

100. BDB, *s.v.* I נסך, 'pour out', and III נסך, 'set, install'. Cf. Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, p. 20.

101. BDB, *s.v.* III נסך, p. 651.

102. *HALOT*, *s.v.* II נסיך, p. 702 and I נסך, p. 703: 'for נָסַכְתִּי rd. נִסַּכְתִּי מַלְכִּי to **be consecrated be made leader** (with a libation)'. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 145, suggest the verb could be a denominative from נסיך, 'prince', or from נסך, 'pour out' (the oil of anointing, not a libation).

103. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 157: 'El verbo *nsk* con el significado específico de ungir es único. ¿Por qué lo ha escogido el autor? ¿Para crear una aliteración con *nšq*?'

104. On this view the designation 'perfect' would obviously be unsuitable and the more neutral *qatal* preferable. Note the comments of Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, p. 66:

tor in the use of the perfect, but rather its independent status relative to subordinated verb forms, in this case the intervening imperfects, cohoratives and imperatives.[105] On this view the perfects in vv. 1, 2 and 6, stand as independent action to which intervening verbs are functioning in a subordinate manner. Such a reading of the verbs might also require a re-evaluation of v. 6 in the structure of the psalm.[106]

Whatever the significance of verb distribution in this psalm, it seems clear that v. 6 functions as another retort to, and direct contrast with, the intrigue of 2. The nations have sought to kill the Lord's anointed, the very one who was installed as king by divine will. At the level of syntax there exist further links between vv. 2 and 6. Both conclude with prepositional phrases (introduced by על) governed by phonologically parallel verbal predicates (נוסדו, נסכתי).

As shown previously, the language of the heavenly session in v. 4 identifies its subject, through various associations, as the man of Psalm 1 and the messiah of 2.2. The enthronement of that man in heaven as Lord (אדני, v. 4), capable of terrifying the nations (v. 5), begs for an explanation, which is then provided by v. 6. He was installed on the heavenly holy mountain of Zion (see discussion below on celestial location) by a deliberate act of Yhwh himself. Initial proof of its heavenly location is provided by Ps. 3.5: הר קדשו, a reference identical to 2.6. Note as well further proof from the closely parallel Ps. 110.1-3, where אדני sits at the right hand of Yhwh (v. 1) in Zion (v. 2), a place further defined (v. 3) as the holy (קדשׁ) splendors/mountains(?). Hence, v. 6 expounds on the location of the messianic throne and the arrival there of its occupant, while his relationship with Yhwh is the subject of v. 7.

The syntagmatic parallelism in v. 6 is unlike that seen throughout the psalm, except for the double prepositional phrase concluding v. 2.[107] Colon A is a main clause which, instead of being followed by another verbal clause of similar syntactic and semantic content (as in the previous five verses), is instead followed in colon B by a subordinate prepositional phrase. Colon A designates the establishment of the king and B the place or seat of his

'Verse 2 implies that the anointing has already taken place, and v. 6 indicates that the candidate was now officially king'. Craigie correctly recognizes that v. 6 is not the first reference in the psalm to this king's selection.

105. Cf. Michel, *Tempora*, p. 21: 'Das perf. schien ein Faktum anzugeben, das absolut am Beginn einer Handlungsreihe steht oder losgelöst vom Gang der Handlung explizierend verweilt'.

106. I have identified it as the final verse of stanza II (vv. 4-6), but this analysis of the perfect would support its role as the opening of III. Further support for such a scheme is found in the change of speaker from king messiah of vv. 4-5 to Yhwh in v. 6.

107. Verse 2 displays standard paradigmatic parallelism in the first two clauses but ends with the two syntactically subordinate prepositional phrases.

throne. As noted above, there is repeated use of the first-person singular pronoun forms, which extends across both cola, but little otherwise in the way of semantic parallelism. There may be an intended repetition of the consonant *nûn* plus sibilant (*sāmeḵ* and *ṣāḏeh*) found in the verb predicate and the place name Zion (נָסַכְתִּי…צִיּוֹן).[108] This would bind together closely the act and location of installation. Nonetheless, beyond this there are very few of the numerous examples of parallelism seen previously. In a real sense this verse, as well as the final phrases of v. 2, break the pattern of parallelism throughout. This constitutes syntactical and poetic markedness, fitting for the official installation of the divinely chosen king.

The heavenly location of the holy hill of Zion (ציון הר קדשׁי) is clarified by the use of the same in Ps. 3.5 (ויענני מהר קדשׁו). There the Lord answers the supplicant from his holy hill, the latter presumably the dwelling of the deity. It is true that the construction lacks the proper place name Zion in 3.5 (and in 15.2). However, Ps. 48.2-3 makes it clear that the holy mountain (הר קדשׁו, v. 2) is also named the hill of Zion (הר ציון, v. 3), being the city of God (בעיר אלהינו, v. 2) and his eternal dwelling (אלהים בארמנותיה, v. 4, בעיר אלהינו אלהים יכוננה עד עולם, v. 9). The previous v. 47.9 mentions a *holy* throne as God's dwelling (אלהים ישׁב על כסא *קדשׁו*, clearly anticipating the *holy* mountain of 48.2 (הר *קדשׁו*). Previous to these texts in Psalms 47 and 48, and directly anticipating them, is the 'city of God' (עיר אלהים) in 46.5. It is again called *holy* (קדשׁ), and has a river whose water channels (נהר פלגיו) gladden that city and which have been seen in Ps. 1.3 (פלגי מים), the eschatological garden of reconstituted Eden.[109] Note how in one verse (46.5), the two terms פלגיו and קדשׁ point back to Pss. 1.3 and 2.6, proving that the integrated reading of the two is intentional and editorially produced.

Psalm 48.3 locates Mt Zion using the terminology 'sides of the north' (ירכתי צפון), a designation of the heavenly realm, as Isa. 14.13 (ירכתי צפון) demonstrates.[110] The city and mountain of God, Zion, as 'the joy of the whole earth' (משׂושׂ כל־הארץ) in 48.3 is undoubtedly an eschatological portrayal of the city.[111] The remaining verses of Psalm 48 continue the descrip-

108. Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, p. 15.

109. Historical Jerusalem never enjoyed the abundant water supply of a river. This description of abundant water is similar to the נחל of Ezek. 47.6, 7, 9, 12 flowing out of the eschatological temple and the נהרים of Eden in Gen. 2.10-14.

110. Isa. 14.13-14 place this locale in the heavens, above the stars of God (בשׁמים אעלה ממעל לכוכבי אל), above the clouds (אעלה על במתי עב) and like the Most High (אדמה לעליון). The same root *ṣpn* is found in Ugaritic texts in reference to a mountain dwelling of Baal. See Cyrus H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Analecta Orientalia, 38; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1965, reeditio photomechanica, 1967), p. 475, *s.v. ṣpn*, and the texts cited there.

111. Cf. משׂושׂ דור ודור, Isa. 60.15, in an extended address to the restored eschatological Zion. Rashi (לעתיד לבא) and Radaq (גם זה המזמור לימות המשׁיח) read Ps. 48 eschatologically as well Cohen, *Miqra'ot gedolot*, pp. 148-49.

tion of universally triumphant Zion using further terminology reminiscent of Psalm 2 (cf. נבהלו of 48.6 and יבהלמו of 2.5). This heavenly mountain and city will be restored to God's people in the last days, as many passages, principally from the Latter Prophets, demonstrate.[112]

Evidence from within Psalm 2 points to a heavenly and eschatological context as well. First of all, it was shown above that the heavenly session of v. 4 was accomplished by the messiah of v. 2. His enthronement on Mt Zion in v. 6 is simply an explanation of his ascension to that position. From there he takes dominion over the entire earth and violently destroys the plotting rebellious nations (vv. 9, 12). It was also observed previously that the heavenly session of v. 4 is taken up again in Ps. 110.1, 5, there described as sitting at the right hand of Yhwh. Psalm 110.2-3 locates that heavenly session in Zion (מציון) in splendors (mountains?) of holiness (בהדרי קדשׁ), and thereby creates explicit verbal links to Ps. 2.6. The closely parallel text of Psalm 110 also describes this same monarch in a dual role of priest-king (Ps. 110.4). The same is implied in Ps. 2.6 where the king is installed on Mt Zion, an alternative reference to the temple, God's dwelling place.[113]

Supporting the eschatological sanctuary setting of Ps. 2.6 are correspondences on various levels to the simile of Ps. 1.3. As shown above in comments on 1.3, the imagery of a fruitful tree (ועלהו לא יבול) is essentially identical to that of Ezek. 47.12 (לא יבול עלהו) where the future temple is portrayed as a restored Eden.[114] If Ps. 2.6 is manifestly resonant with Ps. 1.3, then the former is necessarily envisioning the same sanctuary setting.[115]

Multiple correspondences do exist of a lexical, semantic and phonological nature between 1.3 and 2.6. Psalm 1.3 portrayed the blessed man as a fruitful tree planted 'upon' (על) channels of water. The same preposition is used in Ps. 2.6 to describe his installation 'upon' (על) Mt Zion, as noted previously.[116] In both cases the subject is established on a geographical feature—waters and a mountain.

112. Isa. 2.3; 11.9; 27.13; 56.7; 57.13; 65.11; 66.20; Jer. 31.23; Ezek. 20.40; 28.14 בהר קדשׁ אלהים היית (Here God's holy mountain is connected with the garden of Eden in v. 13, בעדן גן אלהים היית, as is true of Psalms 1–2. See comments below), Joel 4.17; Obad. 17; Zeph. 3.11; Zech. 8.3.

113. Cf. Ps. 132.13-17 where Zion is Yhwh's dwelling place and residence of priests, along with the messianic king, descendant of David. The temple, God's dwelling, can often include the entire city, as in Pss. 46.5; 48.2. The term 'Zion' appears to often have a cultic, sanctuary significance. Cf. F. Stolz, *TLOT s.v.* ציון 'In particular, however, Zion designates Jerusalem as the city of Yahweh and his dwelling, the temple'.

114. The endtime context of Ps. 1.3 is indicated by the *weqatal* form והיה, as noted above. In addition, parallels with Ps. 92.13 support the temple context of Ps. 1.3.

115. See comments above on 1.3.

116. This is not the only formal link, and if it were the claim would be weak indeed. As noted before, the verb יתן and the noun עתו(ב) also function as lexical ties between

At the semantic level similarity is evident between the verbal predicates governing this preposition, being the 'planting' (שתול) of the tree (1.3) and 'installation' (נסכתי) of the king (2.6). In addition both verbs contain the consonantal combination of sibilant and *tāw*, creating a phonological tie. Immediately following these two verbs are strikingly similar sequences. Both 1.3a and 2.6 exhibit the combination of preposition על and a noun composed of the sequence bilabial stop (*mêm* or *peh*), the consonant *lāmeḏ*, a palatal-velar, ending with a long *i*-class vowel represented by *yōḏ* (*ṣērê yōḏ* and *ḥireq yōḏ*).

על פלגי Ps. 1.3a
מלכי על Ps. 2.6

This is, of course, only one example of many phonological links between these two psalms with interpretive implications. The preposition על, a common form indeed, is the initial flag pointing to a possible, but not certain connection between these texts. It is the supporting evidence on various levels, that confirms the intended mutual correspondence.[117]

The analysis of Ps. 2.4 demonstrated on many levels that the one seated in heaven was none other than the blessed man of Psalm 1. Now that same celestial man is enthroned as king by means of a description containing pointed parallels to Ps. 1.3. The latter portrays him metaphorically as a tree planted over waters in the restored Eden sanctuary, which event is represented in the more concrete terms of 2.6 as his royal installation upon the restored Zion mountain sanctuary. Merging of the royal and sacerdotal roles was implied in Ps. 1.2-3 (v. 2, fulfillment of royal duty, v. 3, installation in the restored Edenic sanctuary), and likewise 2.6 represents the installation of the king in a temple setting.[118]

2.7. Whereas, the speaker of v. 6 was YHWH, declaring the establishment of his own king, v. 7 represents the voice of that very monarch. He expresses the firm desire to recite (אספרה cohortative) Yhwh's declaration to him. Verse 8 also contains a cohortative (ואתנה) spoken by Yhwh to his son-king. Together they represent a response to the twin cohortatives in v. 3 expressing a determined international rebellion against Yhwh and his king. The decree of Yhwh, which the son will recount (אספרה),[119] expresses

this 'successful tree' imagery of Ps. 1.3 and the inheritance along with submission of nations given to the messianic king in Ps. 2.8-10 (ואתנה…ועתה). I should add that the military success implied by Ps. 1.3c's use of the figure Joshua is preparatory to the violent war imagery of Ps. 2.

117. Note the two identically vocalized *segholate* nouns פֶּלֶג and מֶלֶךְ.

118. Cf. the royal priest of Ps. 110, a text as already noted, with numerous parallels to Ps. 2.

119. The piel of ספר indicates a rehearsal of the decree, as in Pss. 44.2, 78.3 and

his ultimately powerful position and dominion over the rebels. The essence and outworking of that decree is the giving (ואתנה) of those nations into the hands of the chosen son of God.

The citation of this decree includes a dialogue between Yhwh and his heir marked by the two independent personal pronouns, אני and אתה, with the former (אני) found in v. 6 as well. In the following Psalm 3 the same two pronouns are repeated (vv. 4, 6) in a further example of conversation between Yhwh and his king messiah of Psalm 2.[120] Accompanying these personal pronouns in both instances are references to the holy mountain (מהר קדשׁו, 3.5, הר קדשׁי, 2.6). In Psalm 2 the king is placed *on the holy mount* while in Psalm 3 he is answered *from the holy mount*. This seems to indicate that Psalm 3's events precede those of Ps. 2.6, that is, before the his establishment on the heavenly temple mount. Indeed, the context of Ps. 3.1-3 is one of intent to kill the speaker, exactly as the plot of Ps. 2.2. So David's words as he fled from Absalom (Ps. 3.1) were understood by the Psalter's composer as prophetic of the future eschatological king messiah in his distress, before being established on restored Zion over all the nations.

Verse 7 contains only the second instance of the Tetragrammaton in the psalm, with the other found in v. 2. The third and final appearance will come in v. 11. This distribution appears to be calculated. Its first occurrence in v. 2 took place in the context of rejection of his rule, 'against Yhwh'. Now it appears again in direct response to that rebellion as the promulgation of the law imposing his own choice for king over all others, 'the decree of Yhwh'. Finally, v. 11 repeats the divine name in a command to those same recalcitrant rulers, 'serve Yhwh!' Together they express the essence of this psalm: rebellion against the Lord, his counter decree and the warning to obey.

This decree of Yhwh found in vv. 7 through 9, establishing his king as world ruler with power, demonstrates how the rebellion and plot to kill of v. 2, while outwardly against the human figure of the messiah, is ultimately against the deity as well (על יהוה). Because it was Yhwh's decree that installed king messiah, rebellion and plotting against the latter is tantamount to rebellion against the former.

What follows with reference to the חק of the Lord is a restatement of the Davidic covenant revealed first in 2 Samuel 7. The term חק often refers to decrees, rules, laws, statutes and the like, but also can include the concept

70.13 where deeds are recounted. The following preposition אל used to introduce the content is rare, but is found in Ps. 69.27, and to be rendered 'concerning'. See BDB, *s.v.* ספר (Pi.), p. 708.

120. The colloquy continues in Pss. 4.9 (אתה); 5.5 (אתה); 5.8 (אני); 5.13 (אתה), and so on.

of covenant, as in Pss. 50.16 and 105.10 (ברית…חק).[121] Hence, the 'decree' of the Lord here in 2.7 undoubtedly refers to the covenant with David, being stated more explicitly in the second half of v. 7.[122] David himself characterizes the covenant made with him as a *torah* (תורת האדם, 2 Sam. 7.19) another term closely parallel to חק.[123] Note how Ps. 1.2 reveals that the Lord's *torah* is the object of the blessed man's continual meditation, as is fitting of a king according to Deut. 17.18-20. Now in Ps. 2.7 he emphatically recounts an aspect of that divine revelation, the edict concerning the speaker himself.[124]

The promise of divine sonship for a Davidic scion is found in the parallel texts of 2 Sam. 7.14, 1 Chron. 17.13, and as noted previously, Ps. 89.27 as well. The text of 1 Chron. 17.12-14 declares in prophetic words to David that his descendant, and yet son to God as well, would build him a temple and be established in it eternally. The eschatological Eden of Ps. 1.3 and Mt Zion of Ps. 2.6 are identified here as his eternal sanctuarial residence. As David's and God's son he now cites the divine words addressed to him, 'You are my son'. However, he is God's son in an absolutely unique sense, having been identified as אדני and seated in the heavenly throne of power (2.4). Consequently he in fact partakes of the divine nature and so it is not surprising that trust in him is the source of blessing (2.12). Nevertheless his humanity is evident through the expressed anthropomorphisms of 2.4 and his identification as איש in 1.1-2.

The extent of a divine kingdom is presumably universal and so it is declared 'the ends of the earth', Ps. 2.8. Psalm 2.6 depicts a qualitatively different kingdom from that ruled by the historical Davidic dynasty.[125] Indeed, it presides over the entire earth from its heavenly seat of Zion.[126]

121. BDB, *s.v.* חֹק. Cf. also 2 Kgs 17.15, וימאסו את חקיו ואת בריתו.

122. Berlin and Brettler, 'Psalms', p. 1286: 'The *decree* cited may be 2 Sam. 7.14…'.

123. Cf. Mal. 3.2; 2 Chron. 33.8; Deut. 27.10.

124. Brownlee, 'Psalms 1–2', p. 324.

125. Terrien, *The Psalms*, p. 85, remarks, 'A conquest of all the extremities of the earth (v. 8) does not apply even to the most audacious ambitions of David or his successors'.

126. Note the appropriate comments of Forbes, *Studies*, p. 4: 'The language of the Psalm, by whomsoever composed, could not have been meant for David, since the words, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee" (v. 7), are evidently borrowed from the great promise made to David (in 2 Sam. vii.12-16) with reference, not to himself, but to a "seed" to be set upon his throne when he should "sleep with his fathers", and of whom the Lord says, "I will be his Father, and he shall be my son" (v. 14). Neither could the Psalm be meant for Solomon (the Peaceful), since the king designed is evidently to be a man of war, against whom "the nations and peoples rage, and their kings and rulers take counsel together"—whom he shall "break with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel". The Psalm, if we will take its words in their plain, obvious meaning, can apply to none but the Messiah; for to what king else can the promise of Jehovah be referred without hyperbole, "Ask of me, and I will give thee

The second half of v. 7 continues the declaration from divine father to divine son. As in v. 6, Yhwh speaks using the otherwise redundant first-person singular independent pronoun, 'I' (אני).[127] Repetition of the same pronoun in vv. 6 and 7 serves to link the general content of these two verses.[128] Installation of the king in 6 is continued in 7 but described as 'begetting' (ילדתיך). The 'day' (היום) in which Yhwh 'begot' his son is likewise the time of his installation as king, and so 'my son' and 'my king' refer to one and the same monarch.

As noted by Hakham, the term 'today' (היום) probably expresses the sense of 'from this day and forward'.[129] This temporal expression also reveals that the 'begetting' does not refer to a physical conception because the son is being addressed as a monarch, an impossibility for a recently conceived child.[130] In fact, the declaration of sonship is a nominal clause expressing a condition or state. On the other hand, the clause 'I have begotten' is verbal, denoting an action. This means the king's status as God's son was a fact before being established or 'begotten' as king over heavenly Zion.[131]

the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession" (v. 8)? The king here invested with so universal dominion, the reflecting Israelite would naturally identify with the seed of Abraham, in whom "all the nations of the earth were to bless themselves"'.

127. The pronoun is not grammatically necessary accompanying the first-person singular perfect, ילדתיך.

128. Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, pp. 23-24, sees a reversal between vv. 6a and 7b 'shaping them into two statements which it has addressed to the anointed one (second-person pronoun):

6a	**ʾny**	**nskt**		
			mlky	
7aγ			**bny**	**ʾth**
7b	*ʾny*…	yldtk		

…as v. 6a is made specific and reinforced in v. 7aγb…'

129. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. ז (7): מהיום הזה להבא. He cites use of היום in Jer. 1.18.

130. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. ז (7): ולא אביך שילדך למעשה. See also Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 158: 'No es un hecho biológico, sino un acto jurídico. El mejor término para explicarlo es adopción'. Berlin and Brettler, 'Psalm', p. 1285: 'Adoption language expresses the close kinship between God and the king…'.

131. Regarding nominal clauses before those verbal, Michel, *Tempora*, p. 184 (§29), states, 'Da der NS (Nominalsatz) einen Zustand ausdrückt, der VS (Verbalsatz) dagegen eine Handlung, bedeutet diese Konstruktion, daß vor bzw. bei Eintreten oder Vollzug der Handlung ein Zustand andauert'. The same is implied in Prov. 30.4, a context in which a sequence of six queries are directed toward the identity of the creator. The final two ask regarding the name of the creator and of his son, the latter presumably present as well at the event, מה שמו ומה שם בנו. Furthermore, textual parallels to Ps. 2.8, 12, also exist here: Prov. 30.4, מי הקים כל אפסי ארץ, and the following v. 5, מגן הוא לחסים בו.

The concept of 'begetting' refers then, to the official act of installation or enthronement. Similar to this is the description of foreigners becoming citizens of Zion, literally 'born' (יָלַד) in her, of Ps. 87.4, 5, 6.[132] The Gentile nations in the latter are declared citizens of the same Zion ('city of God', Ps. 87.3) mentioned in Ps. 2.6, over which the son of God now reigns. Certainly Ps. 110.2-3 with its similar vocabulary (מציון…ביום…בהדרי קדֹשׁ…ילדתיך–Zion, a special day, holy place, birth) likewise portrays the same coronation and establishment of this king.[133]

Verse 7 appears to be a tricolon, only the second since v. 2. However, the layout of *BHS* appears to isolate the first clause as a monocolon and the last two as a separate bicolon. As will be seen, parallelism on various levels supports a division, even if secondary, at the center of what for *BHS* is colon B, beginning with בני. It is with the latter form that the citation begins, the two previous clauses (אספרה אל חק יהוה אמר אלי) functioning as introduction. Both are put in the mouth of that installed king, who then quotes directly Ywhw's words in the final clauses of the same (בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך).[134]

It appears that the poet has intentionally introduced the voice of the king in the first two clauses of v. 7. Even if omitted, the reader would nonetheless understand the change from address to the rebels by Yhwh (v. 6), to his direct address toward the king being installed (vv. 7bβ–7c). The twofold use of אני in vv. 6 and 7 referring to the same subject (Yhwh) confirms the identity of the speaker, in spite of the change of audience. Therefore, inclusion of this otherwise unnecessary double introduction is quite deliberate. Prominent in the first clause is attribution of the decree to Yhwh, apparently a deliberately expressed recognition that his royal and heavenly position is not of his own prerogative. His position is confessedly due, not to himself, but to his father. The second clause, 'he said to me' (אמר אלי) reaffirms that submission, but beyond that suggests a very close and privileged relationship with Yhwh. What follows immediately, 'you are my son' (בני אתה), and use of the redundant first-person independent pronoun אני highlights that confidence and affection.[135]

132. Note the consonance of the passive verb ילד with לידעי ('those I know') of Ps. 87.4, implying a close relationship between Yhwh and these Gentiles.

133. As noted above, there exist numerous lexical parallels between Pss. 2 and 110, not the least between 2.4 and 110.1. The priestly function stated in 110.4 of this king has been seen in Ps. 1.3 and in its parallel, 2.6. The enigmatic 'dew' of 110.3 (טל ילדתיך) would appear to be metaphorical for oil as in Ps. 133.2-3 (כשמן…ירד…כטל…שׁירד). Consequently, there would appear to be a connection between נסכתי of 2.6, in the sense of anointing, and the begetting (ילדתיך) of 2.7. Berlin and Brettler, 'Psalms', p. 1408, also compare 110.3 and 2.7.

134. Verses 8 and 9 continue the direct citation of Yhwh's words to his son.

135. Note the comments of Berlin and Brettler, 'Psalms', pp. 1285-86: 'Adoption language expresses the close kinship between God and king, and is common in the ancient

Undoubtedly the fondness implied in the introductory clause אמר אלי (‘he *said* to me’) anticipates the very opposite emotion of Ps. 3.3 in the words, רבים אמרים לנפשי (‘many are *saying* of my life’). Those many are rising up against the speaker in order to take his life, believing God will not deliver him.[136] Note as well the ‘Thou…I’ sequence in vv. 3.4, 6 (ואתה…אני), repeating the same in 2.7 (אתה אני).

Parallelism exists on multiple levels in what is apparently a tricolon of v. 7 between the first two cola, and then between the second and third, but little between the first and third. Colon B is pivotal since the initial two words continue the double introduction of the king begun in A, while its final two open the direct citation of Yhwh’s words to the son-king continued in colon C. In other words, the first colon and a half are words of the king himself but they introduce the words of Yhwh to him in the final half colon of B and entirety of C:

Yhwh’s words cited		*King’s words (double intro.)*	
בני אתה	אני היום ילדתיך	אמר אלי	אספרה אל חק יהוה[137]
Bβ	C	Bα	A

Colon A and the first half of B (Bα) refer to Yhwh in third person, but in the second half of B (Bβ) and entirety of C he speaks in first person. The change of person corresponds to the formal parallels that exist between colons A and Bα, and those between colons Bβ and C. In fact, the entire verse could theoretically be relabelled as two bicola exhibiting parallel elements. The first would consist of the following:

אמר אלי	אספרה אל חק יהוה
B' A'	B A

Note the repetition of the same preposition אל in both B and B', although with differing objects, the decree of Yhwh in the first case and ‘me’ in the second. At the phonological level there is consonance between the two verbs governing the identical prepositions. Each verb exhibits the sequence *ʾālep̄*-bilabial stop (*peh* in the first case, *mêm* in the second)-*rêš*:

Near East. Some biblical passages may suggest that some groups in ancient Israel viewed the king as divine.’

136. Psalm 2.2 expresses from the third-person standpoint a plot ‘against’ the Lord and his messiah (על יהוה על משיחו), while in 3.2 the latter quotes king messiah in first person when attacked by many rising up ‘against me’ (עלי). A fuller discussion follows in the next chapter.

137. *BHS* isolates the first clause by itself, with the remainder set up as a bicolon. Masoretic punctuation also differs from *BHS* and the division suggested here, determining the major division of the verse to be at אתה, as the *athnach* reveals.

A אֲסַפְּרָה אֶל
A' אֲמַר אֵלַי

Both of these consonantally resonant verbs are closely related on the semantic level as well ('recounting' and 'speaking'). As for syntax, two corresponding initial verbal predicates and identical prepositions are followed in each case by the objects of the latter, the first being חק יהוה (the decree of Yhwh), and the second being the first-person singular pronominal object suffix 'me'. In this manner the poet has placed in parallel slots (objects of same preposition אל) the decree of YHWH in A, and the 'me' of A', who is the chosen king messiah. Such parallel syntax suggests a deliberate association of Yhwh's edict of A (אל חק יהוה) with the speaker, the king, addressed in A' (אלי). Indeed, the edict is wholly concerned with the chosen king messiah, as the remainder of v. 7 and the following two verses confirm.

The second half of the verse (Bβ, C), citing directly Yhwh's words, can also then be analyzed as a bicolon exhibiting parallelism on different levels.

בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך

The idea of sonship, בני ('my son') in colon A, is matched in B by the related concept of generation, ילדתיך ('I have begotten you'). The first-person singular pronominal suffix of בני is resumed in colon C by the independent first-person singular pronoun אני. Common to each form at the conclusion is the syllable-*nî*, producing further cohesiveness on the level of phonology. Both cola conclude with reference to the second person, either by the independent second-person singular pronoun אתה (colon A) or the second-person pronominal suffix ך(ילדתי) of colon B.

The sequence of first-person pronominal suffix, second-person independent pronoun in A (בני אתה) mirrors B's first-person independent pronoun, second-person pronominal suffix (אני…ילדתיך). This sequence produces a morphological chiasm of A B B' A'. At the same time, the sequence of pronominal suffix, independent pronoun//independent pronoun, pronominal suffix exhibits the pattern A B A' B'. One result of this reversed pronoun pattern is the juxtaposition at the center of two independent pronouns: …אתה אני… ('…you I…'). Here the close reciprocal relationship between Yhwh and his divine regent, implied through the repeated preposition אל and its object (אל חק יהוה…אלי) as noted above, is strengthened further.

The foregoing analysis of v. 7 suggests the following scheme of two bicola where the second constitutes direct speech and the first an extended introduction to it:[138]

138. Compare the apparent bicolon of Ps. 3.3 with introduction (v. 3a) followed by direct speech (v. 3b).

אספרה אל חק יהוה אמר אלי

בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך

BHS's editor isolates the first introduction as a monocolon since it also functions to introduce the second (אמר אלי) as well as the ensuing direct speech. So there may be merit to the form in which it is laid out in *BHS*, but the observed extensive parallelism within each supports the existence of two bicola.

Whether v. 7 is a tricolon, two bicola or a monocolon followed by a bicolon, it clearly deviates from the dominant binary patterns of parallelism in most of the psalm. Verses 2 and 11 also constitute deviations from the norm, the first being a tricolon and the second, as will be argued below, also a tricolon.[139] It is also these three verses that exhibit the only instances of the Tetragrammaton accompanied also by references to the messianic king. So in v. 2 he is designated מִשִּׁיחוֹ, being the target of intrigue along with Yhwh. In v. 7 he is בני, the chosen son of Yhwh, and in eleven (first clause of v. 12) he is בר, to whom submission is commanded, even as it is to Yhwh. In other words, v. 2 describes a rebellion against both Yhwh and his messiah, v. 7 details the close father-son relationship between them, and finally, vv. 11 and 12 demand submission to both. The juxtaposition of the two in every case reveals a concerted effort to highlight their close relationship. Their rule is indivisible. The one case of אדני, the only other divine name in the psalm, was in fact attributed to the messianic king seated in heaven. Note that the psalm concludes with the son as object of trust (חוסי בו),[140] a characteristic of the deity (Ps. 18.31; Prov. 30.5).[141]

2.8. Following the monarch's installation in v. 6 and declaration as son in v. 7, the ensuing v. 8 will cite the granting of his inheritance. He is enthroned in heavenly Zion from which he will subdue and rule the entire earth.

Verse 8 begins with an imperative, the first in the psalm, requesting of the son that he ask for his inheritance. Another series of imperatives are directed to earthly kings in vv. 10 through 12, wherein they are commanded to render service to Yhwh and his son. Once again similar forms produce a contrast between the newly installed king who receives universal dominion by divine fiat and all other kings who by the same token must render obeisance.

139. Taking נשקו בר of v. 12 as the third imperatival clause of v. 11. Verse 12 is also lengthy, even without the initial imperative because of the final macarism. It is however closely connected to the threefold imperatival warning series of v. 11 through the particle פן, and so could be considered as an extension of it.

140. The nearest antecedent to בו is בר, the latter reference needing no emendation as will be argued below.

141. מגן הוא לכל החסים בו.

Yhwh's command to ask 'from me' (ממני) recalls the only other use of this preposition in suffixed form from v. 3, 'from us' (ממנו), the latter also preceded by a volitive (cohortative) form, נשׁליכה.[142] Such a limited use of this preposition is certainly deliberate and produces another sharp contrast through similar or identical forms. The quoted determination of kings to throw off both Yhwh's and his messiah's restrictions is rebutted by the divine determination to impose his rule upon them.

Resemblances to Solomon are present in v. 8 by this imperative and following cohortative, שׁאל…ואתנה ('ask…and I will give').[143] In his dream at Gibeon, Solomon was commanded in similar manner to ask of God what he should give him, שׁאל מה אתן לך (1 Kgs 3.5; 2 Chron. 1.7). In the narration of that dream (1 Kgs 3.5-14) the verbal root שׁאל is repeated eight times and נתן five times.[144] The king here in Psalm 2 is of course beyond Solomon both temporally and spatially, having been given eternal universal dominion from a heavenly throne. Nonetheless, the portrayal of David's immediate son in 1 Kings 3 and later chapters is a narrative harbinger of this eschatological scion, even as the previously described parallels between Psalms 2 and 72 suggested.[145] If David's immediate son Solomon was given riches and fame beyond contemporary kings, the Davidic and divine son of Psalm 2 inherits the entire earth, its nations and their kings. All the kings of the earth (מלכי הארץ) came to hear Solomon (1 Kgs 5.14) and similarly the formerly rebellious kings of the earth (מלכי הארץ) in Ps. 2.2 are ordered to submit to the greater scion (מלכים…ארץ Ps. 2.10). Likewise, worldwide dominion is assumed in the prayer for the son of David, Solomon, of Ps. 72.8 (אפסי ארץ), the same dimensions granted to the son of God here in 2.8 (אפסי ארץ). Undoubtedly Ps. 72.8-11 is further commentary and confirmation of the promise given initially in 2.8, as is 89.28. Consequently, David's prayer (cf. 72.20) 'for Solomon' in 72.1 is apparently understood by the Psalter's editor as 'prophetic',[146] functioning in much the same way as his prayer of Psalm 3.[147]

142. Consonance produced through repetition of the sequence *šîn-lāmeḏ* in both verbal forms (נַשְׁלִיכה….שַׁאל) accompanies the identical prepositions, strengthening aural links between the two verses, which again highlights the counteractive nature of v. 8.

143. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. ח (8): והלשון דומה ללשון חלום שׁלמה: שׁאל מה אתן לך.

144. In the abbreviated parallel text of 2 Chron. 1.7-12 the same two verbs are repeated four and three times respectively.

145. Psalm 72 is superscribed by לשׁלמה. Note the 'prayer' of Hannah in 2 Sam. 2 includes references to a then non-existent monarch (v. 10), death and resurrection (v. 6), etc.

146. In the sense of 'foretelling', not 'forthtelling'.

147. As will be shown, the words of Ps. 3 are hardly apropos to the spirit and content of 2 Sam. 17–18.

Yhwh's determination to *give* (ואתנה) his son an inheritance recalls the use of the same root נתן in Ps. 1.3 (יתן). There the blessed man is a tree *giving* its fruit or harvest. That simile is interpreted in the final clause of v. 3 as success in all his endeavors, a promise made to Joshua with clear military connotations (Josh. 1.8). So the success of the man in Psalm 1 is explained in Psalm 2 as reception of authority and power over the nations. Later in the discussion of Ps. 2.9 it will be seen that the judgment on the wicked of 1.4 is likewise given further exposition.

Also included in this inheritance are the same nations (גיום) who were conspiring against him in v. 1. The folly of their rebellion against God's king has become evident, even as divine derision (v. 4) implies. They are part of the divinely chosen king's own inheritance (v. 8) and possession. He is granted authority to force them into submission if need be (v. 9). On the other hand, they are also presented with the option of voluntary obeisance (vv. 11-12).

Verse 8 can be characterized as a bicolon, although the 5×3 word count is unique thus far in the psalm.[148] Removal of the initial imperative and prepositional phrase would result in a more common 3×3 pattern. Nonetheless, as noted above, the parallel to the preposition ממני in v. 3 (ממנו) supports its originality, as does the consonance evident between the two preceding volitive forms—ונשליכה ממנו…שאל ממנו. Indeed the verbal pair in v. 8 appears to be specifically chosen as an aurally resonant response to v. 3's uprising, also expressed through two verbs. The result is a phonological chiasm:

v. 3 ונשליכה…נתקה

v. 8 שאל…ואתנה

Suggestions then to delete v. 8's opening overlook its role beyond the immediate bicolon.[149] Parallelism in Hebrew poetry is by no means limited to the immediate context of bicolon or tricolon. Likewise, the clustering of imperatives begun with v. 8 and continuing through v. 12 support the deliberate use of this opening command to the son of God. It is also consistent with morphological and phonological parallelism produced with the previous two clauses of v. 7 that begin the divine speech—בני…אני…ממני. The focus on self by the divine voice reveals a deeply personal relationship and affection toward his son: 'You are *my* son, *I myself* have begotten you this day, ask *from me* and I will give…'.

The determination on Yhwh's part to grant his son's inheritance is expressed by a singular cohortative verb form, ואתנה, and is the second of this specific form in the psalm after the son's declaration, אספרה ('I will

148. Or 5×2 according to stress count.

149. Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, p. 22, label it a gloss.

certainly recount'), of v. 7. As noted above, the two cohortative verbs employed in v. 3 by the rebellious rulers are now countered by two spoken by those against whom they are in revolt. This latter expression of the divine will to make the nations the possession of God's son nullifies the entire conspiratorial cabal at the psalm's opening.

Psalm 89 also provides further commentary on v. 8. Previous discussion above demonstrated the reciprocity between 2.7 and 89.27. When the following v. 28 is included the parallels are numerous and overt:

89.27 הוא יקראני אבי אתה ורצור ישׁועתי
89.28 אף אני בכור אתנהו עליון למלכי ארץ

2.7 אמר אלי בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך
2.8 שׁאל ממני ואתנה גיום נחלתך ואחזתך אפסי ארץ

The father-son relationship is paramount as the mutual confession reveals (בני אתה, אבי אתה) and in each case the granting (ואתנהו, ואתנה) of universal authority follows (89.28; 2.8). In one case (2.8) it is expressed as the giving of the nations and ends of the earth as inheritance/possession to the son, and in the other (89.28) the giving of the son as firstborn. The latter presumably means the son is given primary status as the firstborn, which is then defined (89.28b) as king over all kings (עליון למלכי ארץ). Clearly both Psalms 2 and 89 have in view the same Davidic covenant. Psalm 2 has confidently asserted its validity while 89 pleas for its restoration in the face of apparent failure (89.50). Furthermore, the construct chain מלכי ארץ in 89.28 repeats precisely the same in Ps. 2.2, to which 2.8 functions as a counter (discussed above). In other words, 89.28 is recalling and reiterating the words of Psalm 2 assuring king messiah's eventual domination over earthly monarchs. That lofty position is reiterated as well in Ps. 72.11 where all kings (כל מלכים) and nations worship and serve him.[150] Indeed, psalms at the conclusion of Books II (Psalm 72) and III (Psalm 89) are especially resonant with the introductory Psalm 2.[151]

150. וישׁתחוו לו כל מלכים כל גיום יעבדוהו (72.11). Service to this king (יעבדוהו) repeats the same commanded to Yhwh in 2.11a, implying the equivalency of service to the son and to Yhwh in 2.11-12a. Their pairing in 2.2 as targets of rebellion implied the same.

151. Wilson, 'The Use of Royal Psalms', p. 87, notes 'the presence of distinctly "royal" psalms at the "seams" of these first three books (Psalms 2, 72, 89)'. Cf. Norbert Lohfink and Erich Zenger, *Der Gott Israels and die Völker* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994), p. 149: 'Die Psalms 2 72 und 89 stehen auf der Ebene des Psalmenbuchs an kompositionell markannter Stelle: Psalm 2 steht an der Spitze des ersten Psalmenbuchs (Ps. 3–41) bzw. an der Spitze des (redaktionsgeschichtlich gesprochen) »elohistischen Davidpsalters«, der mit Psalm 72 abgeschlossen wird (Ps. 72,20: »Zu ende sind die Gebete Davids, des Sohnes Isais«). Psalm 89 beschließt makrostrukturell das 3. Psalmenbuch 73–89. Redaktionsgeschichtlich gesprochen bildet Psalm 89 den Abschluß des…»messianischen« Psalters 2–89'.

Similar in role to other elements in v. 8 discussed above are the two nouns גיום and ארץ which function as a counter movement to the rebellion of vv. 1-3.[152] The first two verses of the psalm contain the same forms in their respective initial cola (v. 1a–גוים, v. 2a–ארץ). Verse 8 now deliberately repeats the same pair in a divine promise that those same nations and their domains have now been declared the possession of the king against whom they rebelled. The bicolon that is v. 10 will address the same nations through the pair מלכים (colon A) and שפטי ארץ (colon B), which produces a direct link and, consequently, a response to מלכי ארץ of v. 2 (colon A).

As noted above, if the initial imperatival clause שאל ממני (‘ask from me’) were separated from v. 8, a standard bicolon would obtain:

ואתנה גוים נחלתך ואחזתך אפסי ארץ

As such it exhibits a 3×3 word count pattern, with the initial verb ואתנה doing double duty for the two objects (גוים…אפסי ארץ) and adverbial adjuncts (נחלתך ואחזתך). The objects and adjuncts form a semantic chiasm:[153]

A' B' B A
גוים נחלתך ואחזתך אפסי ארץ[154]

Both of these terms are often used in reference to the promised land of Canaan that was conquered and then distributed to Israel’s tribes.[155] Note as well the stance of the enemy kings in Ps. 2.2 (יתיצבו) identical to that of Canaanite kings in Josh. 1.5 (לא יתיצבו). The previous Ps. 1.2-3 also exhibited overt parallels to Joshua 1 with the result being that the conquest of the promised land is read as a harbinger of worldwide dominion. Indeed, the military conquest in view here in Psalm 2 involves the entire earth, not the restricted boundaries between Mesopotamia and Egypt. It was apparent to the psalmist that David’s promised eternal kingdom would be universal as well.[156] If it

152. In v. 8 the two appear in the same order as in vv. 1-2 and in each case the second, ארץ, is the *nomen rectum* in a construct chain.

153. A–nations, B–your inheritance, B'–your possession, A'–ends of the earth. Cf. *DCH s.v.*, אחזה and p. 188 where נחלה is identified as a synonym. See Deut. 4.21 (את ארץ כנען אשר אני נתן לבני ישׂראל לאחזה) and Deut. 32.49 (הארץ הטובה אשר יהוה אלהיך נתן לך נחלה).

154. The collocation of נחלה and גוים seen here in v. 8a is repeated in Ps. 111.6, but there the nations are the inheritance given ‘to his people’ (לעמו). Psalm 47.4, 5 likewise indicate the nations are his people’s inheritance. Psalm 2.12 implies the same co-possession of inheritance between son of God and his faithful since they share the same blessings (אשׁרי).

155. Gen. 17.8, 48.4; Num. 26.53-56; Deut. 4.21, 32.49; Josh. 13.6-7, 14.2, etc. Cf. A.F. Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), p. 10.

156. Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, p. 16: ‘the Northern kingdom Assyria, the Southern

were to endure longer than the Davidic dynasty traced through the books of Samuel and Kings to its eventual exile, there could be no competing rivals.

2.9. The granting of a covenantal and intimate relationship as God's son in v. 7 was followed by the resulting universal inheritance in v. 8. Now v. 9 portrays vividly the might and power available to destroy any opposed to his rule. However, the granting of universal dominion in v. 8 and the power to enforce it does not bring about automatic and voluntary submission. Indeed, the rebellion of vv. 1-3 is deep-seated, and the son's anger, already highlighted in v. 6, will be demonstrated in action. Nevertheless, vv. 11 and 12 indicate an opportunity for repentance and service to God and his king, and thereby escape perdition.[157]

For Terrien and others, the imperfects of v. 9 (תנפצם…תרעם) constitute a direct order.[158] However, the imperative in v. 8 and string of five in vv. 10 and 11 (and beginning of 12) would seem to indicate that, if desired, the poet could have utilized formal imperatives here in v. 9 likewise. Whatever the exact grammatical mood, there is undoubtedly dependency upon v. 8.[159] The son of God will prevail over his enemies (v. 9), either by command or predicted inevitability, due to the fact he has been given universal authority (v. 8). Later in the Psalter, assurance is given that his scepter will be wielded with righteousness and hatred of wickedness (Ps. 45.7, 8— שׁבט מישׁר שׁבט מלכותך אהבת צדק ותשׂנא רשׁע) upon his enemies (45.6).[160] Here the assumption is that psalms subsequent to Psalms 1–2 unfold the topics introduced therein, and the example of Psalm 3 immediately following gives credence to that theory.

Verse 9 is a bicolon[161] beginning and ending with two pronominally suffixed verbal predicates (תרעם…תנפצם)[162] that denote destruction of a particularly ferocious and merciless type.[163] Consequently, the terror displayed

by Babylon. These arose successively as the great world-powers; making it evident that if the Davidic kingdom was to be in fact an everlasting kingdom, it must be a world-power, and have ultimate and universal dominion.'

157. Note Alexander, *Psalms*, p. 25: 'This extensive grant had been accompanied by that of power adequate to hold it. That power was to be exercised in wrath as well as mercy. The former is here rendered prominent, because the previous context has respect to audacious rebels, over whom Messiah is invested with the necessary power of punishment, and even destruction'.

158. Terrien, *The Psalms*, p. 85: 'The Messiah is peremptorily ordered to tame his adversaries "with a rod of iron" '. Hossfeld and Zenger, *Die Psalmen*, p. 52, 'Die Verbformen sind jussivisch gemeint: »Du sollst…«'.

159. Michel, *Tempora*, p. 128: '…muß das impf…eine Handlung bezeichnen, die nicht selbstgewichtig ist…kurz: die abhängig ist'.

160. Note the repetition in 45.7 of the identical term שׁבט from 2.9.

161. A common pattern of 3×3 exists, whether by stress or word count.

162. Antecedent to the pronoun suffixes are the אפסי ארץ and גוים of v. 8.

163. The second verb is found in Ps. 137.9, ונפץ את עלליך אל הסלע, 'he will smash your

by recalcitrant rulers in v. 5 is well founded, as is the command to fear and tremble in v. 11. Verses 5 and 12 name the wrath of the son while v. 9 portrays its devastating effects.

Between the two verbal predicates of v. 9 are two prepositional phrases, the first in colon A indicating the instrument of destruction ('with an iron rod/scepter'), the second of B through a simile, the object destroyed ('like a potter's vessel').

בשבט ברזל ככלי יוצר

Each preposition governs a construct chain whose *nomen regens* consists of implements from daily life, the first a solid rod or scepter of hard unbreakable substance, the second a brittle and breakable clay pot. The substantial difference between iron and pottery reveals the utter folly of resistance and rebellion against the Lord and his messianic king. Similarly, the first psalm portrayed the contrast between the righteous man and the wicked as a healthy solid tree versus insubstantial and ephemeral chaff.

Psalm 1 was dominated at its center by two similes while Ps. 2.9b is the lone simile of the second (each introduced by the Hebrew simile marker כ). Beyond utilization of the same literary device, the second half of 2.9 exhibits further parallels with Ps. 1.4:

1.4b כמץ אשר תדפנו רוח
2.9b ככלי יוצר תנפצם

Both compare opponents of the righteous king to impermanent substances, chaff and pottery. These are followed in each instance by forms that exhibit the consonantal sequence sibilant-*rêš* (אשר, יוצר). Then the verbal predicates, both pronominally suffixed imperfects indicating destruction, exhibit the sequences *tāw-peh-nûn* or *tāw-nûn-peh*.

As noted previously, the antecedents to the verbally suffixed pronouns are the nations and ends of the earth of v. 8. Those nations were seen in 2.1 and in their plotting (רגשׁו) were shown in the very next clause to be the wicked (רשׁעים) of 1.6.[164] So it is not surprising that the simile of the wicked as chaff in 1.4 would be matched by the only simile in Psalm 2, which also portrays the destruction of what is ultimately the same group. That the wicked will perish has been declared already in 1.6, but now their end is revealed to be devastatingly violent in 2.9b.

The initial verb of v. 9, תְּרֹעֵם ('you will break/smash them'), as vocalized in the MT is an Aramaism (root רעע, corresponding to Hebrew רצץ).

infants against the rock'. Cf. also נפץ in Jer. 13.14, ונפצתים…לא אחמול, 'I will smash them… I will not have pity'; 48.12, ונבליהם ינפצו, 'and their jars they will smash', all similarly piels.

164. See discussion above for phonological parallels between these two.

The LXX has translated it as ποιμανεῖς ('you will shepherd'), implying a vocalization of תִּרְעֵם (from root רעה).[165] Since colon B describes a violent breaking (נפץ), one might expect the same in A and thus the Aramaism רעע would appear to be preferable. Nonetheless, semantically synonymous parallel verbal pairs are not always present, even in Psalm 2 itself. So the bicola of vv. 1 (רגשו…יהגו) and 5 (ידבר…יבהל) do not exhibit synonymity in their verbal predicates.

Support for reading the verb as shepherding/ruling comes from Mic. 5.3. There the future ruler from Bethlehem will stand and 'shepherd' (ורעה) in the strength of the Lord. The same verse describes his rule as extending to 'the ends of the earth' (אפסי ארץ), a phrase identical to Ps. 2.8b, immediately previous to the verb תרעם. Micah 5.5 then describes how God's people will 'shepherd' (ורעו) Assyria with a *sword*, not dissimilar to the messiah of Psalm 2 'shepherding' the ends of the earth and the nations with a rod/scepter of iron. Consequently, use of the term 'shepherding' to depict forceful and even violent rule over nations is not unusual.

Further support comes from Ps. 78.71 where the verb 'shepherding' and noun 'inheritance' occur in the same context, as here in 2.8-9:

לרעות…נחלתו וירעם Ps. 78.71-72
נחלתך…תערם Ps. 2.8-9

A nation or nations given as an inheritance are to be 'shepherded' or ruled by the inheritor. The same pair is found in Ps. 28.9 (נחלתך ורעם).

Consequently, intertextual parallels exist supporting the רעה (shepherd) reading, whether one considers the previous נחלתך of 2.8b (Pss. 28; 78), or the immediately following phrase שבט ברזל (Mic. 5).[166] However, as already noted above, colon B of 2.9 describes violent smashing as with pottery[167] by means of the verb נפץ, which would correspond closely to the Aramaic reading רעע in colon A.[168] Indeed, the expectancy that these two verbs should

165. רעה, 'to shepherd', which metaphor is used for the rule of a people, as in Ps. 78.71, 72; 2 Sam. 5.2; Mic. 5.3.

166. Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, p. 22, argue that presence of a scepter supports taking the verb as shepherd rule, even if it is of iron. He also notes the numerous uses of the Hebrew רעה in the Psalter (78.71, 72; 28.9; 49.15; 80.2), to which could be added 37.3 and 80.14. In fact, Ps. 2.9 would be apparently the only instance in the Psalter of the Aramaic verb רעע. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, p. 124, argues the opposite, appealing to the parallel verb נפץ in colon B. The latter opinion is based on the expectation of synonymity in parallel poetic cola.

167. Note the incisive comments of A.F. Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, p. 11: '*a potter's vessel*] An emblem of easy, complete, irreparable destruction. The confederacy is shattered into fragments which cannot be reunited'.

168. An Aramaism would not be unusual in Psalm 2, as the verb רגשו in v. 1 and the noun בר in v. 12 illustrate. Note the identical noun and Aramaic verb in Jer. 15.12,

be practical synonyms may have inspired the MT's vocalization. It appears then, that the *lectio difficilior* is represented by רעה, as the LXX interpreted it, and should be preferred.[169] Such a reading lessens the violent imagery in colon A as opposed to B, but that is not inconsistent with what follows in vv. 10-12. Commands to submit in those verses are also accompanied by threats of destruction and a promise of blessing.[170]

The idea of a shepherd wielding a rod of iron may appear odd, but not apparently for the ancient Hebrew writers.[171] Shepherding became a metaphor for king and ruler, who could resort to 'an iron fist' when faced with opposition, as is the case here and in Mic. 7.14. Reference to a rod of iron in colon A carried with it the implied threat then made explicit in colon B. Therefore there is no necessary incongruity between shepherding in A and smashing in B.

The noun שֵׁבֶט depicts an instrument used for both protection and punishment, and as a symbol of authority, and so could be translated variously as rod, staff or scepter.[172] Use of the shepherd metaphor would apparently indicate a rod or staff, as would its use as an instrument of war in colon B. If however rulership is emphasized through this metaphor, שֵׁבֶט would then refer to a scepter. An iron scepter would, in the words of Kirkpatrick, be 'a symbol of a stern and irresistible rule'.[173] As will be seen in vv. 10 and 12, the two terms שֵׁבֶט and ברזל were probably chosen deliberately due to their phonological resonance with warnings given there.

2.10. Verse 10 opens the psalm's fourth and final stanza. It is marked by a change of speaker, from Yhwh's words to his son as quoted in vv. 7 and 8, now to a direct address towards recalcitrant kings. Yhwh and his son are mentioned in third person (v. 11) and so the identity of the speaker is unclear. The opening two verses of the psalm, and vv. 4, 5, likewise refer

הירע ברזל. Cf. Ps. 2.9, ברזל…תרעם. However, there are text-critical problems with Jer. 15.12—see the apparatus in *BHS*.

169. Contra Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 159: 'del verbo *rʿʿ*, forma aramaizante del hebreo *rṣṣ* = triturar. En esta hipótesis, los dos hemistiquios repiten y complementan el sentido…', who also expects semantic synonymity between the two clauses.

170. Cf. Goldingay, *Psalms*, p. 101: 'The line then lays alternative possibilities before the nations—either firm shepherding or devastating destruction. Verses 10-12 as a whole will certainly do that'.

171. Contra Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, p. 11, who calls it an 'oxymoron'.

172. For punishment cf. Exod. 21.20; Prov. 13.24; Isa. 10.15 and 2 Sam. 7.14, and for battle see 2 Sam. 23.21. Cf. Ps. 23.4 and Mic. 7.14 for its use by a shepherd for the protection of his flock, and Gen. 49.10 and Ps. 45.7 as a symbol of authority. B.K. Waltke, 'שֵׁבֶט' *TWOT* 2, p. 897.

173. Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, p. 11.

in third person to Yhwh and his king, and so the same anonymous speaker is heard.

Accompanying the change in speaker is an opening temporal adverbial form ועתה ('And now…') that draws a conclusion from previous statements.[174] This understanding of ועתה suggests a continuation of the same divine speaker from v. 9. Indeed, warnings to change of v. 10 are a logical corollary of the violence threatened against them in v. 9. However, the third-person reference to Yhwh in v. 11 might imply a change of speaker.

Verse 10 also marks a transition through change of tone from threatened destruction to warning and exhortation.[175] In spite of overt rebellion against Yhwh and his king, an opportunity to change their thinking is offered to the world's monarchs. Temporally speaking, the 'now' opening this verse refers to a window of time between the rebellion in the first verses and the forcible implementation of the son's worldwide kingdom described in vv. 9 and 12.

The bicolon exhibits an uncomplicated 3×3 stress and word count. Its opening temporal transition serves double duty across both cola and the remaining five members form a chiastic pattern on the semantic level: A (kings), B (show insight), B' (be corrected), A' (judges of the earth). Juxtaposition at the heart of the bicolon of the two imperatives may function to focus on the demand that they change their attitude toward Yhwh and his king.

Psalm 148.11 addresses the same group of rulers (מלכי ארץ…שׂפטי ארץ)[176] commanding them to praise Yhwh (הללו, 148.7, יהללו, 148.13). They will be enjoined in 2.11 (וגילו) to do the same and thus repeat at the end of the Psalter, although in a much more universal scope, what is found at the beginning. The following Psalm 149 also exhibits repetition of forms from Psalms 1–2 in vv. 8 (לאסר, מלכיהם, ברזל) and 9 (משׁפט). Note that the one verse of 148.11 contains three nouns from 2.1, 2, 10 (שׂפטי ארץ, מלכי ארץ, לאמים).[177]

174. BDB, *s.v.* עתה, pp. 773-74: '**1. e.** with an Imv., as an encouragement, implying that the time has come for the exhortation or advice to be followed…**2. b.** ועתה and, *now,* or *now,* therefore…drawing a conclusion, esp. (cf. **1 e**) a practical one, from what has been stated:…*ψ*2[10]'.

175. Terrien, *The Psalms*, p. 85: 'The bellicose aspect of the commission imposed on the Lord's Anointed in the preceding strophe is now mitigated…' Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. ח (8): 'אמנם נתן ה׳ רשות להשמידכם אבל אין רצונו בכך' ('Indeed the Lord gave authority to destroy them but it is not his desire to do so' [translation mine]).

176. The noun שׂרים ('princes') is also included. The particular phrase שׂפטי ארץ is a *dislegomenon* in the Psalter, found only at the beginning (Ps. 2.10) and end (Ps. 148.11).

177. The first of the latter three nouns is found parallel to the term רוזנים (rulers) of Ps. 2.2 in Isa. 40.23—שׂפטי ארץ…רוזנים. As a result, the plural מלכים (or construct מלכי) in vv. 2 and 10 is found parallel to the two nouns רוזנים and שׂפטי ארץ, which are also parallel to each other in Isa. 40. So all three belong to one semantic domain, to which could be added שׂרים of 148.11.

The warning of v. 10 seeks a change of thinking expressed through two juxtaposed imperatives, הִוָּסְרוּ הַשְׂכִּילוּ (‘show insight, be corrected’), at the heart of the bicolon. Their similarity at the level of form (plural imperatives) and sound (consonance) provides cohesion at the boundary between colon A and B. Notable is the repeated consonantal sequence of *hē*, sibilant (*śîn*, *sāmeḵ*) and liquid (*lāmeḏ*, *rêš*) between these two plural imperatives (הַשְׂכִּילוּ הִוָּסְרוּ). These phonological correspondences were achieved in spite of the fact that one imperative is niphal and the other hiphil.

The evidence also supports the present verb form הִוָּסְרוּ as opposed to the variant הִוָּסְדוּ found in a few Hebrew manuscripts and in the Cairo Genizah (see *BHS* apparatus). The variant is attractive for its correspondence to v. 2 (נוֹסְדוּ), which would provide another example of contrast, consistent with many seen thus far. However, in its present form this verb exhibits a phonologically parallel counter warning to the phrase מוּסְרוֹתֵימוֹ of v. 3 (see discussion below).

Sound parallels also bind closely each verbal predicate and its subject within the individual cola, perhaps to add an extra edge to the warning. A repeated sequence of sound can create semantic linkage among terms as well. Colon A exhibits the combination of *lāmeḏ-kap̄*, in the subject noun ‘kings’, which is reversed in the verbal predicate as *kap̄-lāmeḏ*, מְלָכִים הַשְׂכִּילוּ.[178] Through sound a close connection is drawn between the ‘kings’ addressed and the command to them to ‘show insight’.

Following in colon B, the combination sibilant-*rêš* in the verbal predicate becomes *rêš*-sibilant in the subject הִוָּסְרוּ…אֶרֶץ. The evidence has shown then that following the opening temporal transitional form וְעַתָּה, phonological cohesion is created from one word to the next to the end of the bicolon. Less consonance is evident between members of the bicolon that are noncontiguous. ‘Kings’ and ‘judges of the earth’ do not evidence phonological parallels, although their semantic similarities are self evident, and so sufficient for cohesion across the bicolon.

While the transitional form עַתָּה lacks phonological parallels with the rest of the bicolon, it does exhibit lexical parallelism with the previous Psalm 1. The metaphorical tree would give its fruit or harvest (explained in 2.8 as reception of the inheritance of the nations by the son of God) in its time, בְּעִתּוֹ, a prepositional phrase whose object noun derives from the same root עָנָה. As a result, the ‘now’ of 2.10 is the time of harvest in 1.3 when the blessed man/king messiah receives his inheritance of universal authority and obedience.

The first command הַשְׂכִּילוּ (‘show insight’) is a verbal root found twice in the instructions given to Joshua, תַּשְׂכִּיל (Josh. 1.7, 8),[179] describing the

178. Cf. Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, p. 26: ‘Verse 10 seems eager to indulge in play with the consonants’.

179. Cf. M. Sæbø, ‘שָׂכַל’, *TLOT* 3, pp. 1269–72: ‘…the “insightful” person acts cleverly and intelligently, thus successfully, then, as chiefly queens and other leaders are

insight and its subsequent success that he would enjoy as a result of daily meditation in the Torah. The latter activity is predicated of the blessed man in Ps. 1.2, and so these kings are being commanded implicitly to imitate him. Indeed, if they serve Yhwh and trust in the son (Ps. 2.12), they will enjoy his very blessedness as well.

Both verbs of v. 10 also reveal through consonance a direct response to the cited words of rebellion in v. 3. In seeking to cast off their strictures the kings utilized the term ונשׁליכה (‘let us cast away’), whose root, pattern and mood resonate closely with the counter command השׂכילו (‘show insight’). Both exhibit a root consisting of a sibilant (*śîn* and *šîn*), *lāmeḏ* and *kap̄*. Each is a volitive form (cohortative and imperative) of the hiphil pattern. Once again, formal similarities draw attention to a contrast, this time between the words of foolish rebels and a warning to the contrary.

The second imperative הוסרו (‘be corrected’) of colon B likewise recalls through formal similarity the noun מוסרותימו (‘their bonds’). While the verb הוסרו is derived from the root יסר, and the noun מוסרותימו from אסר, the quiescence and then disappearance altogether of *ʾālep̄* (found in every instance of the latter noun) facilitated the comparison. Here the semantic connection between ‘bonds’ of v. 3 and ‘correction’ of v. 10b sharpens the contrast between the rebellion and subsequent warning.

These phonological parallels linking vv. 3 and 10 are found in juxtaposition at the center of each bicolon, forming a chiasm:

B	A
ונשׁליכה	מוסרותימו
A'	**B'**
הוסרו	השׂכילו

Surrounding the two verbal commands are those to whom they are directed, מלכים and שׁפטי ארץ. Verse 2 identified מלכי ארץ as those standing against divine rule, but now that phrase is split between cola A (מלכים) and B (ארץ). Undoubtedly this is another technique by which the poet indicates a direct response to those previously mentioned rebels.

The final phrase of v. 10, שׁפטי ארץ, also exhibits similarities on various levels with that of v. 8, אפסי ארץ. Besides the identical genitival attribute ארץ, both phrases open with masculine plural construct nouns that combine a sibilant (*sāmeḵ* and *šîn*) and the consonant *peh* (שׁפטי, אפסי). The deliberately drawn association between these phrases highlights the fact that the realms over which terrestrial judges preside are in fact the

said to do (David…Solomon…Hezekiah…also Joshua…)…the coming righteous king…and the elevated servant of Yahweh (Isa. 52.13…) will be characterized by insightful, successful leadership’. Sæbø also notes here that frequently the verbs *bîn* (‘to understand’) and *yᵈ* (‘to know’) are found parallel to שׂכל.

inherited domain of the son of God, and so they must needs submit to his correction.

Reference to judges (שֹׁפְטֵי) recalls the same root of the judgment (מִשְׁפָּט) of 1.5. The latter announced the certainty of a final judgment in which the wicked will not arise, but rather will be destroyed. The wicked of Psalm 1 have been identified in the following psalm as the rebellious kings and 'judges', and ironically they now find themselves in danger of judgment for rebellion against the ultimate judge of the earth.

Use of 'judges' also functions to draw a phonological connection between the instrument of rule and judgment, and those feeling its effects. So the son of God wields an authoritative rod, שֵׁבֶט, of iron (v. 9) over the judges of, שֹׁפְטֵי, the earth (v. 10).[180] The consonantal sequence in each case is very similar: *šîn*-bilabial stop (*bêṯ* and *peh*)-*ṭêṯ*. 'Leaders' are now under threat of 'lead' for their insubordination.

Verse 10 has admonished earthly rulers to show insight and accept correction, but without specifying how to put this into practice. Those details are supplied of course in the following v. 11. Attitude and thought (inward) changes in v. 10 are to be followed in v. 11 by outward actions proving the repentance. Finally, v. 12 will outline the dire consequences of disobedience and the benefits of obedience.

2.11. Verse 11 exhibits the first two cola of a tricolon, for which colon C opens v. 12.[181] The three clauses, each of which begins with a plural imperative, follow the previous two also addressed to earthly rulers of v. 10.

Scholarly attempts to radically emend the MT text overlook literary evidence in its support,[182] as Barthélemy has ably noted.[183] First, he notes the use of the same Aramaic term בר in Prov. 31.2 (three times) and the fact that it avoids the '*cacophonie*' that בן would cause with פן.[184] The sense of בר is clear from בני אתה in v. 7. Second, the anarthrous nature of בר is not grounds for rejection since Ps. 21.2 exhibits the same with מלך yet with the definite sense, that is, 'the king'.[185] Third, the so-called bizarre idea of kissing

180. Cf. Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, p. 27: 'the *špṭm* will have a good opportunity to sample the *sbṭ* of the anointed one'.

181. The remainder of v. 12 (excluding the final macarism) constitutes another bicolon, opening with the particle פן. Cf. Pss. 7.3, 13.5, and Prov. 30.9.

182. Certainly the principle of *lectior difficilior*, when applied here, would support the MT. In addition, the role of בר within the tricolon (consonantal alliteration) and the entire psalm (ברזל) is similar to that of other terms such as שֵׁבֶט and שִׁבְטִי, נְשַׁלְּיכָה and הַשְׁכִּילוּ, עִבְדוּ and תֹּאבְדוּ, etc.

183. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, p. 5.

184. Two bilabial stops followed by *nûn* in monosyllabic forms.

185. Perhaps the fact that it is Aramaic could also account for the absence of a

the son has parallels in 1 Sam. 10.1 and Exod. 18.7, where נשׁק represents an honorific gesture. Finally, he notes that such a gesture of submission towards the son in v. 12 corresponds to the revolt against the anointed of the Lord, as does the correspondence between the commanded submission to the Lord in v. 11 and the revolt against him in v. 2.

In *BHS* the first clause of v. 12 is correctly displayed as the last clause of v. 11, against the Masoretic punctuation. However, the suggestion to delete the entire clause in the apparatus ignores the function of both terms across the entire psalm and within the tricolon itself. As noted above in comments on v. 6, Alonso Schökel has pointed out the alliterative relationship between נסכתי in v. 6 and נשׁקו of v. 12.[186]

An additional reason for the use of בר in this particular location may be to ward off a possible misidentification with another son in Psalm 3. In the latter, David's son Absalom (בנו) is hounding his father with intent to kill him, just as the rulers of Psalm 2 plot the same against God's messiah. The anointed son of Psalm 2 is receiving the universal inheritance and divine authority to destroy all his enemies. Obviously the son of David in Psalm 3 cannot be the son of God (and David)[187] of Psalm 2. Indeed, the immediate son of David is בנו while the ultimate divine son of David is בר in v. 12, and בני (Yhwh speaking) in v. 7. So the distinction in essence is confirmed by distinction in language.

The distribution and variety of references (4) to the chosen king appears to be deliberate. Distinct references to him are made, never repeating the same noun. In the first half of the psalm a pair of terms related to monarchs occurs, the first with a third-person pronominal suffix and in the second a first-person pronominal suffix: מלכי/משׁיחו. In the second the two associated terms highlight the close relationship between him and the deity: בני/בר.

Likewise there is a cross correlation between the two pairs. Both משׁיחו and בר at either extreme of the psalm represent, and are found in contexts of interaction with nations and kings. (Use of Aramaic is often, if not always, found in contexts of interaction with foreigners—Jer. 11.10; Dan. 2.4-7; Ezra 4.8–6.18; 7.12-26). By way of contrast, the two intervening nouns מלכי and בני highlight his relationship and interaction with God. Suffixed first-person pronouns further confirm the close rapport.

Each imperatival clause across vv. 11-12a decreases in size from the first to the third, and the adverbial modifier in each concludes with a sequence of

Hebrew definite article. As such its absence would preserve the intended alien quality instead of a quasi assimilation into Hebrew.

186. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 157. Nonetheless, their translation is 'besadle los pies', p. 142 n. 1, so they fail to recognize the function of בר across the bicolon and psalm and label the entire phrase, 'enigmática' (p. 147).

187. The language of Ps. 2.7 is clearly a reprise of 2 Sam. 7.14.

bêṯ and *rêš,* the last consisting of only these two consonants: בְּיִרְאָה…בְּרַעְדָה בַּר (2.11-12a).[188]

עִבְדוּ אֶת יְהוָה בְּיִרְאָה
וְגִילוּ בְּרַעְדָה
נַשְּׁקוּ בַר

The result is a concise, and climactic conclusion to the tricolon, focusing attention on the final command. The repeated sequence of the consonants *bêṯ* and *rêš* in the first two phrases associates closely the same sequence in 'son' with 'fear' and 'trembling'. Those who fail to obey the threefold order will presumably suffer the consequences of his wrath, as v. 12 relates it, and the weapon which he wields in v. 9. Indeed, weapon and its wielder are also drawn together by consonance. The same consonants in בר are identical to the first syllable of the noun בַּרְזֶל ('iron', v. 9).

The same sequence is exhibited in יִבְעַר, ('will burn') of v. 12, which confirms the threat already implied. A chain of this sequence *bêṯ-rêš* is created from vv. 9-12, associating together with the son the concepts of iron weapon, fear, trembling and burning anger:

בַּרְזֶל…בְּיִרְאָה…בְּרַעְדָה…בַּר…יִבְעַר

So the warning is to show submission to the בר, lest you feel the force of the ברזל.[189] Use of the Aramaic term for 'son' thus lends power to the warning, which would not be present in the Hebrew בן.[190] As discussed previously, the same type of effect was produced in the consonance between שִׁפְטֵי (v. 10) and שִׁבְטְ (v. 9), and will be seen in עבדו and תאבדו of vv. 11, 12.

Syntactical parallelism exists between all three cola in that each opens with a plural imperative: עִבְדוּ…וְגִילוּ…נַשְּׁקוּ ('Serve…rejoice…kiss').[191] The adverbial modifiers in each case differ, the first consisting of direct object and prepositional phrase (את יהוה ביראה), the second a prepositional phrase (ברעדה), and the last a direct object (בר). The sum of the adverbial modifiers of colon B (prepositional phrase) and C (direct object) equals that of A (direct object, prepositional phrase). Furthermore, a close semantic

188. Stress counting gives a 3×2×1 pattern, word counting a 4×2×2 pattern.

189. Aramaic is a fitting language for contexts where Gentiles are in view, such as Jer. 10.11 and Dan. 2–7. Daniel 7.13 is a fitting parallel in its use of the term בר with reference to a heavenly ruler. To him authority over all nations is given, precisely as in Ps. 2.

190. To simulate the Hebrew consonance one might express it in English as, 'kiss the scion or you'll feel the iron'.

191. 'Kissing' in 1 Sam. 10.1 demonstrates Samuel's recognition of Saul as king, and worshippers in 1 Kgs 19.8 kissed Baal as an act of submission and servitude. The same verb is used in describing the authority given to Joseph over all Egypt (Gen. 41.40).

similarity exists between the prepositional phrases of cola A and B: ברעדה, ביראה, 'with fear, with trembling', suggesting the same between the objects of A and C: בר, את יהוה ('the Lord, the son').[192] The following illustration makes clear how the poet has linked Yhwh (b) and his son (b') across the tricolon.

a	b	c
Serve the Lord	with fear	
a'		c'
rejoice	with trembling	
a"	b'	
kiss	the son	

Just as the earthly rebellion in vv. 1-3 was directed equally against Yhwh and his messiah, so vv. 11-12a implies the equation of submission to Yhwh and the son. In fact, the tricola here and in vv. 6-9 indicate that service to Yhwh is accomplished by submission to his son.[193]

Furthermore, vv. 2 and 11-12a are tricola in what is a psalm characterized generally by bicola. Verse 7 also breaks the pattern of standard bicola although difficult to label precisely, as discussed above. So vv. 2, 7, 11-12a, 12bcd stand as 'marked' in the psalm. In each case the 'extra' components of the lengthier verses focus on the messiah, king or son of God:

על יהוה ועל מׁשיחו	v. 2c
אני היום ילדתיך	v. 7c
נׁשקו בר	v. 12a
אׁשרי חוסי בו	v. 12d

The final macarism of v. 12d appears to function as a monocolon concluding both Psalms 1 and 2, and so functions at a higher level as well, even beyond the apparent tricola of vv. 2, 7, 11–12a. So a measure of prominence is bestowed on the final prepositional phrase בו ('in him'), being the coda of not only Psalm 2 but also the integrated pair of Psalms 1–2. Its immediate antecedents are the identical masculine singular pronominal suffix of אפו in 12c, the verbs of 12bc (יאנף and יבער), and son (בר) of 12a. Consequently, an explicit reference to the king-son of God is maintained in each of these elongating third cola.

The initial command to serve (עבדו) Yhwh of v. 11 functions first of all as a phonologically resonant response to the expressed rebellion of v. 3

192. Similar close identification between Yhwh and his messiah was seen in vv. 2-3.

193. Cf. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, p. 64: 'Thus vv 10-12 comprise a passage in which the earthly rulers are required to serve *God* and to acknowledge his *king*; this double theme nicely counteracts the rulers' rebellion, which was said to be directed against both God and his anointed (v. 2)'.

(עבתימו, 'their ropes'), each form exhibiting an initial sequence of *ʿayin-bêṯ*-alveolar.[194] Second, like v. 10, in which the warning series of imperatives begins, it opens with an *ʿayin*-initial form (ועתה, עבדו). The effect is to confirm the linking of vv. 10 and 11 together, already indicated by common plural imperatives. In fact, the first two imperatives of v. 10 are preparatory, being attitudinal in their thrust ('be wise…be admonished') to the first performative imperative ('serve') of v. 11. Third, the prepositional phrase ברעדה and initial imperative עבדו also reveal how consonance reiterates what semantic and syntactic parallelism between ביראה and ברעדה had already implied. Service to Yhwh is to be performed with fear *and* trembling.[195] Fourth, the consequence of not obeying the imperative to serve, עבדו (v. 11) is destruction, ותאבדו (v. 12). In each case the verbal root exhibits an initial guttural followed by the sequence *bêṯ-dāleṯ*.[196] Finally, the possibility of the son's wrath being kindled is expressed by the verb יבער, whose root also displays two out of three consonants common to עבדו, being *bêṯ* and *ʿáyin*. Here the consonance heightens the warning that failure to serve will raise the ire of the son. It is noteworthy that the verbal predicates ותאבדו and יבער of the bicolon of v. 12 exhibit little parallelism of any type, but are linked closely together through consonance to the imperative עבדו of v. 11.[197] Trembling, ברעדה, in v. 11 is also connected to the fiery wrath of v. 12, יבער, through common juxtaposed consonants *bêṯ*, *rêš* and *ʿáyin*. Failure to tremble in fear will kindle the heat of the son's anger. This entire intricate network of consonance buttresses the solemn command to serve in v. 11, as well as the two imperatives following.

What on the surface appears to be simply an innocuous example of the *nota accusativi* את in v. 11 proves in fact to be carefully selected as another example of verbally highlighted divine counter measures to the revolt in stanza one. Preliminary indication of its special function is indicated by being only

194. Recall that the previous v. 10 exhibited phonologically explicit responses to v. 3 as well.

195. Cf. Ps. 55.6: יראה ורעד יבא בי.

196. The same two verbal roots are deliberately juxtaposed for rhetorical effect in Jer. 10.11, an Aramaic verse: אלהיא די שמיא וארקא לא עבדו יאבדו מארעא. Perhaps not coincidentally, these two phonologically resonant verbal roots in Ps. 2.11-12 surround an Aramaic form (בר) and likewise correspond to an entire Aramaic verse in Jer. 10. Through consonance the writer of Jer. 10.11 has highlighted the impotence of foreign deities. A Hebrew rendering of the same (עשׂו יאבדו) would not have achieved like effect. Note the use of the two latter roots in the Hebrew of v. 15: יאבדו…מעשׂה. Could it be that Aramaic is used in v. 11 precisely because of its alliterative effect? As observed previously, employment of the Aramaic terms רגשׁו and בר in Ps. 2.1, 12 was based on their phonological resonance with רשׁעים and ברזל of Pss. 1.6 and 2.9 respectively.

197. Otherwise, the two forms יאנף and אפו do exhibit close lexical parallelism in v. 12.

the psalm's second instance of the direct object marker, the first found in the words of rebellion in the initial colon of v. 3. This particular particle is not common in poetic texts and so its appearance once would be uncommon.[198] The twofold occurrence here in Psalm 2 then is striking. As observed previously, vv. 10-11 contain numerous direct responses to the rebellion voiced in v. 3. Clearly the command to serve Yhwh (את יהוה) responds to the rebel rulers' stated desire to tear off the divine bonds restricting them (את מוסרותימו). Another indication demonstrating that this contrast is deliberate lies in the fact that the idiom 'to tear off bonds' of v. 3, is often found within the context of the same verb 'to serve' of v. 11:[199]

נתקתי מוסרתיך ותאמרי לא אעבד	Jer. 2.20
ומוסרותיך אנתק ולא יעבדו בו	Jer. 30.8
ננתקה את מוסרותימו…עבדו את יהוה	Ps. 2.3, 11

Consequently, the command of v. 11 pointedly demands the exact opposite of the insubordination expressed in v. 3, and the repeated particle את adds to the contrast.

Auffret has noted the sound parallels between vv. 3 and 11 exhibited by ננתקה and נשקו.[200] Both are cohortative and imperative forms respectively ('let us tear off', 'kiss!') whose roots begin and end with the consonants *nûn* and *qôp̄*. This constitutes simply another of numerous responses to the uprising as expressed in v. 3 using consonantally parallel forms. In fact, a sort of *chiasmus* between vv. 3 and 11 is produced when the first and final form of each is compared:

B A
ננתקה…עבתימו

A' B'
עבדו…נשקו בר

This evidence reveals that both the means (see above) and extremes of vv. 3 and 11 function in correspondence with each other to create an aurally effective riposte to the international uprising.

The tricolon of vv. 11 and first clause of 12 is bounded on either end in cola A and C with commands of submission to Yhwh and his son ('Serve Yhwh…kiss the son'). However, colon B's command to rejoice (גילו) appears dissonant in a context of demands for fear (ביראה) and trembling (ברעדה). Nonetheless, Ps. 96.11-13 command the heavens and earth to be joyful (ישמחו השמים ותגל הארץ) in light of the fact that Yhwh is coming to

198. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, p. 54.
199. See also Jer. 27.1-8; 30.8. See comments on v. 3 above.
200. Auffret, *The Literary Structure*, p. 26.

judge (לִשְׁפֹּט הָאָרֶץ…יִשְׁפֹּט תֵּבֵל) the earth. Judgment is what Ps. 1.5-6 promised, and now 2.11 commands the judges of the earth (שֹׁפְטֵי אָרֶץ) to rejoice with trembling (וְגִילוּ בִרְעָדָה), lest fiery divine anger destroy them (2.12). Likewise Ps. 100.2 commands service (עִבְדוּ) with joy (בְּשִׂמְחָה). The two concepts of rejoicing and dread service in light of pending judgment are thus not mutually exclusive.[201]

Use of the imperative גִּילוּ (rejoice) also produces phonological parallelism with the previous bicolon of v. 10. Kings were commanded to הַשְׂכִּילוּ (‘show insight’) and now to גִּילוּ (‘rejoice’). The two syllables of the latter are almost identical with the final two of the former. Only the unvoiced (כ) versus voiced (ג) opening velar stops differentiate the two sequences. By this sound link the stated subjects of v. 10 (kings and judges) are assumed present in 11. That assumption is already founded on common plural imperatives between the bicolon of v. 10 and tricolon of vv. 11-12a, but now strengthened through consonance.

The final colon C (v. 12a) provides even further phonological resonance across the psalm. The imperative נַשְּׁקוּ (‘Kiss!’) produces the sequence *nûn*-sibilant-unvoiced velar stop, as does v. 6 in citing the divine declaration נָסַכְתִּי, ‘I have established’.[202] Implied through such parallels of sound is the admonition that submission to the son is the appropriate response to his divine enthronement. Not coincidentally, the object complement immediately following these two verbs refers to the same chosen monarch and son of God. *Nûn*-initial verbal forms dominate the psalm, beginning with the group rebellion in vv. 2-3 (נוֹסְדוּ, נִנְתָּקָה, נַשְׁלִיכָה) and concluding with the singular divine rejoinder of vv. 6, 11 (נָסַכְתִּי, נַשְּׁקוּ).[203]

2.12. (b, c, d) While the first clause of v. 12 (נַשְּׁקוּ בַר) functions as colon C of the tricolon begun in v. 11, the brief final clause (אַשְׁרֵי כָל חוֹסֵי בוֹ) appears to stand independently. However its final prepositional phrase בוֹ has as antecedent the third-person singular masculine forms of v. 12bc. Remaining at the heart of v. 12 is what may have been an originally discrete bicolon, bound at its center and either extreme by warnings of the consequences for those who do not follow the previous imperatives. The beginning and end repeat the consonant *peh* and root אנף (אַפּוֹ…פֶּן יֶאֱנַף),[204] while the center is linked through the repeated consonant *kap̄* (…דֶּרֶךְ כִּי…), concluding the noun at the

201. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, p. 124, takes the seeming incongruity of ‘trembling exultation’ as a reason for emending the text.

202. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 157, as noted above on v. 6.

203. Two plural cohortatives in v. 3 are necessarily *nûn*-initial, preceded by a niphal form in v. 2, all of which receive their response in perhaps deliberately chosen *nûn*-initial verbal roots of vv. 6, 12.

204. The combination *peh-nûn* is found twice at the beginning and once at the end (assimilated in אַפּוֹ).

first colon's end, and the immediately following subordinating clause marker כי opening the second colon. As noted previously, the particle פן can open entire bicola (Pss. 7.3; 13.5 and Prov. 30.9). Note that wrath opens the bicolon in verbal form (יאנף) and concludes it in nominal form (אפו).

The final macarism of v. 12 ascribes the same blessings to the faithful as those attributed to the man of Psalms 1.1. Through the repetition of this vocative at 1.1 and 2.12, the entirety of Pss 1 and 2 not only is enveloped into a unity but also identifies blessings as a major emphasis of the pair. Implicit in this correspondence between 1.1 and 2.12 is the sharing of blessings due the man of the first psalm with those who trust in him. Since the closest antecedent to בו in 12d is the בר of 12a, which is the subject of both יבער and יאנף in 12b, c (and reference of pronoun suffix of אפו), it becomes clear that trust in the divine son of God is the source of blessings already attributed to him in 1.1 and detailed throughout both psalms.

The preceding can be demonstrated through lexical and phonological correspondence between the two psalms as well. This final enveloping clause of 2.12 is obviously linked explicitly to 1.1 through the common אשׁרי, but also to 1.3, which itself connects to both the previous 1.1 and 2.12:

1.1 אשׁרי האישׁ אשׁר
1.3 אשׁר…וכל אשׁר
2.12 אשׁרי כל

The thrice-repeated prosaic relative pronoun אשׁר of 1.1, 3(twice) clearly attributes to the man of 1.1 the unqualified success of v. 3. Thus the blessings of the man of 1.1 are equated with the perfect success (military, Josh. 1.8; position, Gen. 39.3, 23) of 1.3. Trust in the son of God (2.12d) qualifies any and all for participation in his privileges and success. In other words, both 1.1 and 2.12 are quite explicitly linked by אשׁרי, while כל appears in both 2.12 and 1.3, implying that the blessings of האישׁ in 1.1 are defined as *unrestricted* success in 1.3, and participation in those blessings are offered to those *without restriction* who trust in 2.12.

Those privileges include establishment in the eschatological Eden sanctuary (1.3), resurrection in the judgment, divine election, status as righteous ones (1.5, 6), session in heaven through divine decree, universal inheritance, and eventual victory over all opposition (2.4-9).[205] However, suffering because of violent opposition is also present as the plot to kill in 2.2 reveals, and as subsequent psalms starting with Psalm 3 indicate.

205. The NT texts of Eph. 1.3, 20 and 2.6 would appear to be derived from a serious grappling with the application of this same form אשׁרי, both to the impeccable man of Ps. 1.1ff. and the faithful of Ps. 2.12.

The bicolon of v. 12bc introduces the negative consequences of insubordination by the conjunction פֶּן, whose sequence *peh-nûn* is the reverse of *nûn-peh* concluding the following verb יאנף. As noted previously, the final noun אפו parallels through lexical root and consonance these initial two. Colon B opens with the subordinating conjunction כי and its verbal predicate יבער ('is kindled') parallels well semantically and morphologically (3 ms impf.) the יאנף of colon A.

It is the second clause of A, ותאבדו דרך that appears distinct and isolated by its lack of parallels to the immediate context. Its awkward and distinct syntax, literally, 'you (plural) will be destroyed way', where the grammatical status of the noun is unclear also contributes to its uniqueness across the entire bicolon. The collocation is in fact unique in the Hebrew Bible.[206] Ancient translators noticed the ambiguity and supplied what they saw as an implied מן preposition.[207]

If the syntactical role of this clause in the bicolon is ambiguous, its function across Psalms 1–2 is clear. A comparison with 1.6 confirms it as another example of *concatenatio* between both psalms:

1.6b ודרך רשׁעים תאבד
2.12b ותאבדו דרך

Such similarity with the previous psalm as opposed to the immediate psalm and bicolon, may suggest a deliberate compositional insertion in 2.12b by the poet. Cohesiveness and coherence with the conclusion of Psalm 1 overrode parallelistic style that might otherwise have been generated within 2.12 itself. Through this parallel the רשׁעים of Psalm 1 have been identified again as those who refuse to signal their service to Yhwh by kissing (v. 12a) and trusting in (v. 12d) his son. Indeed, they are specified as the nations and rulers of 2.1-2 who are in conspiracy against the latter two, an identification based among other reasons on the consonance of רשׁעים and רגשׁו. The absence of the plural masculine noun רשׁעים in 2.12b may be significant for the definition of wickedness itself, not only the identification of its practitioners. By omission in 2.12 of the noun (רשׁעים) that was present in Ps. 1.6, wickedness is defined now in 2.12 as refusal to submit to and trust in the son of God.

Consequently, the differences between the above-illustrated 1.6b and 2.12b are significant, as well as the similarities. Note as well that in the first example of 1.6b it is the way (of the wicked) that is destroyed, while the very subjects themselves suffer devastation in the second (2.12b). However,

206. Eissler, *Königspsalmen*, p. 105, n. 322: 'Der Verbindung von אבד mit דרך ist biblisch in dieser Form nur hier belegt'.

207. The LXX renders it, 'from the righteous way' (ἐξ ὁδου δίκαιας), the Peshiṭta 'from his way' (ܡܢ ܐܘܪܚܗ ܕܝ) and Vulgate 'from his way' (*a via eius*).

this simply reiterates again the simile of 1.4 promising destruction of those wicked themselves, along with the end of their way in 1.6.

So the unique characteristics of the clause ותאבדו דרך of 2.12 within its immediate environment may argue for its primary role beyond the bounds of the bicolon and even the psalm itself. Nonetheless, the consonance produced by similar roots between ותאבדו and עבדו (2.11) and its resulting admonitory effect, suggest an important role within Psalm 2 itself, being integrated fully into the poem.[208] So on the one hand its syntax is awkward, and yet also appears to be original to the poem given the cleverly produced consonance. The extra bite given the warning by such paronomasia is typical of the poet in this psalm, as has been pointed out numerous times.

The presumed absolute singular noun דרך of 2.12b undoubtedly refers to the 'way of the wicked' in 1.6, but also the 'way (דרך) of sinners' in 1.1. It may be that the singular number is maintained in 2.12b in order to more pointedly resonate with the examples in Psalm 1, all singular as well (1.1, 6a, 6b). As such, it refers to a lifestyle whose destruction was assured in 1.6, a fact reiterated now in 2.12b. However, 2.12b has also confirmed the destruction of the wicked themselves through the second-person plural ותאבדו, thus expressing, albeit awkwardly, what 1.4 and 1.6 have stated: that both the lifestyle and its practitioners will be destroyed.

The destruction threatened over the recalcitrant rulers is caused by the wrath of the בר (son), immediately antecedent to יאנף. That lack of submission to him produces the anger that destroys them. They have failed to recognize his divinely ordained position as king of all kings. Colon B is a further explanation of the wrath of the son introduced in A. Their warned destruction in A is not to be taken lightly because (כי) his wrath is kindled 'quickly' (כמעט) against them. Because his anger is kindled quickly, it is imperative that the 'now' beginning the commands of v. 10 be taken seriously as well. In fact, there may be deliberate consonance between the two in the common sequence of *ʿayin*-alveolar stop (ועתה…כמעט).

Just as the verb תאבדו ('destroy') in colon A resonated aurally with the command עבדו ('serve') in v. 11, so it does with the verb יבער ('kindle') in B. The former opens with the consonantal sequence *ʿayin-bêṯ*, while the latter exhibits in its verbal root the same consonants in reversed order, *bêt-ʿayin*. Sound parallels highlight the fact that failure to serve results in both destruction and anger.

The verb יבער also repeats the consonantal sequence of *bêṯ-rêš* seen in each imperatival clause of v. 11 (ביראה…ברעדה…בר…יבער), adding further emphasis to the consequences of disobedience. One of those

208. In addition, the prefixed *wāw* (ותאבדו) conjoins it deliberately to the previous clause פן יאנף as a sequential result.

sequences of v. 11, ברעדה (‘with trembling’), repeats three consonants (*bêṯ-rêš-ʿayin*) having close resonance with the sequence *bêṯ-ʿayin-rêš*, of the same verb יבער of v. 12. Once again, consonance adds further force to the warning.

If the first word of this final clause (אשׁרי) surrounds and envelopes the entirety of Psalms 1 and 2, the final prepositional phrase בו (‘in him’) refers back on phonological and grammatical levels to the final forms of the previous bicolon, אפו (‘his wrath’), and tricolon, בר (‘son’) of vv. 11-12a. The noun בר is the immediate masculine singular antecedent to the masculine pronoun suffixes of אפו and בו. Phonologically speaking, the prepositional phrase בו exhibits the sequence of bilabial stop and long ‘o’ vowel, as does the suffixed noun אפו. The monosyllabic noun בר begins with the same voiced bilabial stop as that of the monosyllabic prepositional phrase בו. Through these grammatical and phonological links the poet highlights the fact that regard of the son (בר) determines whether one receives his wrath (אפו) or through him (בו) blessing. The wrath (אפו) here in v. 12 of the son is formally identical to that of v. 5 (אפו), whose antecedent was the seated one in heaven. Indeed, both are one and the same divine messiah, king and son of God.

In conclusion, Psalms 1 and 2, in spite of being discrete and self-contained texts, together open and introduce the Psalter with an integrated and unified message. Psalm 1 announces by its opening phrase אשׁרי האישׁ a focus on the blessed man, whose conduct is entirely blameless and separate from the wicked. The first half of the psalm (vv. 1-3) is devoted to a full description of this man, including his abstention from wickedness on the one hand and his dedication to the instruction of Yhwh on the other, the latter a trait of righteous kings. Then in v. 3 is found an extensive description of his future establishment in the eschatological garden sanctuary (thus a priestly figure), concluding with an affirmation of his absolute and unqualified success in every endeavor. This lengthy and pointed focus on one man identifies it as the primary topic of the psalm. Since the psalm opens the book as a whole it also has implications for the message of the entire work.

By contrast, the ultimate destiny of the wicked is depicted in the second half of Psalm 1. As opposed to the ultimate and eschatological destiny of the man in v. 3, they and their way of life will suffer utter and ultimate destruction without participation in the final resurrection of the righteous at the judgment. The single blessed man opening the psalm is now joined by a company of righteous suggesting the possibility of participation in his benefits. The second psalm will point the way to that privilege.

Psalm 2 opens with a further description of the wicked, now identified as rebellious nations and their rulers who plot against Yhwh and his messiah, not wanting to serve them. A response comes from the heavenly figure, seated and laughing, who can be identified as the faultless man from Psalm 1 and

who did not participate in the session nor the scorn of the wicked. His laughter turns to anger in 2.5, which will be illustrated in v. 9 and named again in v. 12. His heavenly session is explained in v. 6 followed by his father-son relationship with Yhwh in v. 7, and finally his received inheritance of all nations throughout the world in v. 8. The following v. 9 illustrates the power he will wield to bring his unruly inheritance into submission. Finally, vv. 10-12 warn the earth's rulers to submit to Yhwh and the son or they will be destroyed, repeating and affirming the promise of 1.6. For those who trust in the son of God there is promised participation in the very blessings ascribed to him from the opening of Psalm 1 to the end of Psalm 2.

The reading offered here of each of Psalms 1 and 2 and their reciprocal unity is based on a close analysis that is sensitive to the compositional signals at every level of the poetry.[209] The literary context of each and the literary characteristics of each are primary in determining their message and purpose. Traditional form criticism has ignored textual signals that illuminate the purpose behind their juxtaposition, due to the fact that it relegates them both *a priori* to presumed generic socially or cultically based categories. Having labeled them as such, the details of the psalm itself and overt links to those surrounding are usually ignored, since a final diagnosis of the text has been reached without their examination. Clearly the Psalter's editor did not regard such typecasting when uniting the first two psalms, and certainly not in the subsequent placement of the third. A serious reckoning with the textual evidence reveals that literary devices at many levels are more than aesthetically pleasing adornment (although they are that as well) and point to the complex integration of the pair, as well as each individually. In the next chapter it will be seen that Psalm 3 continues discussion of matters raised in the first two, again based on conjoining textual evidence. The latter, in fact, explains the canonical sequence, a literary *Gestalt* which form criticism lacks the power to explain.[210]

209. Cf. the conclusion of Sheppard regarding the first two psalms: 'In sum, Ps. 1 and 2 have been redactionally ordered into a combined prologue to the Psalter' (*Wisdom*, p. 142).

210. Note the comments of Norbert Lohfink, 'Psalmengebet und Psalterredaktion', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 34 (1992), pp. 1-22 (11-12): 'Die Psalmen 1, 2 und 3 sind ihrer Gattung und ihrem Thema nach ganz verschieden… Die dennoch vorhandenen Stichwortverbindungen sind umso erstaunlicher… Diese Verkettung erreicht nun eine ganz bestimmte Wirkung… Durch die Verkettung werden sie gerade in ihrer Unterschiedlichkeit gewissermaßen übereinandergelegt oder ineinandergeschoben. Der Gerechte und der Gottlose, der erwählte König Israels und die gegen ihn aufbegehrenden Nationen, der Verfolgte und seine feinde—das sind plötzlich nicht mehr disparate größen. Sie treten in beziehungen zueinander.' Although Lohfink appears surprised at the interlinking of such form-critically disparate psalms, for the Psalter's editor the three psalms were perfectly suited to each other, and their '*Thema*' were in fact quite consistent.

Chapter 4

Psalm 3

The foregoing analysis of Psalms 1 and 2 examined in detail the composition and message of each, as well as their integration as introduction to the entire book. Here the discussion of Psalm 3 will be limited to an analysis of its potential relationship to the previous two psalms and a review of its past interpretation.

The study of Psalms 1–2 revealed that the initial sequence in the Psalter is accompanied by overt lexical, thematic and structural evidence of integration. That evidence in and of itself between the first two psalms raises the possibility that the cohesiveness extends to the following Psalm 3. The simple fact of juxtaposition is sufficient basis to examine possible evidence of linkage.[1] However, an initial demarcation between the two-psalm introduction and Psalm 3 is evident through its superscription, being absent in Psalms 1–2. This could suggest a deliberate separation from the twofold introduction. Nonetheless, Psalm 4's superscription does not disqualify it from consideration in light of Psalm 3, and indeed, explicit lexical parallels such as שכבתי ואישנה of Ps. 3.6 and אשכבה ואישן of Ps. 4.9, and the identical רבים אמרים in 3.3 and 4.7, are examples that confirm their intended and meaningful juxtaposition. In a book such as Isaiah, chapter 2 is superscripted, as is Habakkuk 3,[2] and yet this does not require that they be read in isolation from their literary context. So superscriptions do not override the effects of juxtaposition.[3]

The superscription (3.1) itself is not without its connections to the previous psalms. Mention of David (לדוד) is appropriate following what amounts to a restatement of the Davidic covenant in 2.7. David's seed in 1 Chron. 17.11 and 2 Sam. 7.12 (זרעך) will also be the son of God (1 Chron. 17.13,

1. Note the cogent observation of J.-M. Auwers, 'Le vois', p. 6: 'La figure de livre demande à être honorée, et le titre traditionnel de *sefer tehilîm* mérite d'être pris au sérieux: le livre, avec tous ses éléments canoniques, est ainsi un horizon vers lequel regarde l'interprète, avec la conviction que, dans l'assemblage final, chaque psaume est devenu l'élément d'un tout dont il reçoit du sens autant qu'il lui en donne'.

2. Cf. also Hag. 2.1, 10, 20; Prov. 10.1, 25.1, 30.1, 31.1; Jer. 46.1, etc.

3. The lengthy doxology of Ps. 72.18-19 and the coda of v. 20 do not negate the role of Ps. 73 vis-à-vis 72 as described in *The Shape and Message*, pp. 15-27.

2 Sam. 7.14). However, the immediate son of David, Absalom (בנו), is pursuing his father in the superscription of 3.1, and so cannot be the previously mentioned son of God (בר, בני) of 2.7, 12.[4] Furthermore, David himself cannot be the one designated king in Psalms 1–2 since his flight from Absalom described in this superscription is due to his sin, unlike the blameless and invincible priest-king seen there. So there is a deliberate attempt to distance, through this superscription, the historical David and his family from the entirely flawless, utterly successful, and heavenly son of God seen in the introduction.

Consequently, it appears at first glance that the reader has moved in Psalm 3 from the eschatological king messiah of Psalms 1–2 to the words of the very human and flawed David fleeing from his own son. At the same time, the words of Psalm 3 are incongruent with those of 2 Samuel 15–18 in critical ways. David's words of v. 8, in which his enemies are struck on the cheek and their teeth smashed, do not square with his efforts to save the life of his own son and subsequent mourning over his death. In a related sense, David in the narrative of 2 Samuel 15–18 does not label Absalom and his army as foes and enemies (Ps. 3.2, 8), even though the Cushite does so rather naively in the king's presence (2 Sam. 18.32). The reclining and awakening of v. 6 have no definite parallel in the narrative account. In general, Psalm 3 lacks specific references (apart from the superscription) that would link it directly to the events surrounding David's flight. Childs considers that the psalm has no specific linguistic parallels with the Samuel narrative, only conceptual ones, which could be found in many other psalms.[5] Kraus simply denies any historical connection whatsoever between the narrative and Psalm 3.[6]

A solution to this incongruity between the events of 2 Samuel 15–18 and content of Psalm 3 can be found by taking seriously its literary context following directly after the Psalter's introduction. In other words, just as the reading of Psalm 2 in the light of Psalm 1 illuminated its meaning

4. The immediate antecedent to the בנו (Absalom) of the superscription in Ps. 3.1 is the formally different Aramaic noun בר of 2.12. Perhaps the intention is to distinguish between the eschatological son of Ps. 2 and the immediate son of David, Absalom.

5. Brevard S. Childs, 'Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis', *JSS* 16 (1971), pp. 137-50 (143). He notes 2 Sam. 15.12 (ויהי הקשר אמץ והעם הולך ורב את אבשלום), which resembles Ps. 3.2 in its use of the root רבב, and 2 Sam. 18.31 (מיד כל הקמים עליך), which resembles also Ps. 3.2 (רבים קמים עלי). He also notes that 2 Sam. 16.14ff and 17.22 tell how David arrived weary at the Jordan, spent the night there and arose just before daybreak to cross the river, which supposedly was linked with Ps. 3.6. For Childs, the presence of 'general parallels between the situation described in the Psalm and some incident in the life of David' was the most important factor in the formation of Psalm titles, while 'linguistic parallels, especially word-plays, were of secondary importance' (pp. 147-48).

6. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, p. 139.

and function, so it is that Psalm 3's message becomes quite clear in light of the previous introduction. The following list of lexical links (practically one per verse) points initially to an editorial intention behind the juxtaposition of Psalms 1–2 and 3. Further examination reveals a thematic coherence confirming the surface evidence, some of which are indeed common forms.

על	2.2	עלי	3.2, 7
אמר	2.7	אמרים	3.3
אתה	2.7	ואתה	3.4
ואני	2.6	אני	3.6
הר קדשׁי	2.6	מהר קדשׁו	3.5
בני	2.7	בנו	3.1
ביראה	2.11	אירא	3.7
רשׁעים	1.1, 5, 6	רשׁעים	3.8
יקמו	1.5	קומה קמים	3.2, 8

Barbiero likewise presents a relatively thorough listing of linguistic parallels, along with 'theme connections' (*Motivverbindungen*), between Psalms 2 and 3 in his study on Book I.[7] Included is the common preposition על.[8] So the list is exhaustive except for the curious omission of the pronoun אתה in 2.7 and 3.4, while the first-person pronoun אני (2.6, 7; 3.6) is noted.[9] Both pronouns and the preposition are critical for understanding the relationship between Psalms 2 and 3.

The instances of על in this listing all take a personal subject as complement (2.2, 3.2, 7). Excluded is the formally identical preposition of 2.6 (על ציון) whose complement is locative and, as shown previously, exhibits close links on several levels to the previous Ps. 1.3 (על פלגי מים). It is not clear how or if על in 3.9, also locative, functions as further comment on 2.6.

Opening both Psalms 2 and 3 (preceded by the Tetragrammaton in the latter) are expressions of astonishment, the first an interrogative form 'Why?'

7. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 66.
8. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 66.
9. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 66. Christoph Barth, 'Concatenatio', p. 33, lists the repetition of the clause '*'th yhwh*' in 3.4, 4.9 and 5.13, but fails to list the pronoun itself as a linguistic link between Pss. 2.7 and 3.4. He does note the common references to the 'holy mountain' in 2.6 and 3.5.

(למה, 2.1) and the second an exclamatory particle 'how!' (מה– 3.2).[10] Forbes has noted that Psalm 1 also commences with an exclamation 'of admiration… "Oh! the blessednesses of the man!"'[11] This threefold sequence of wonderment is fitting with the opening content of each consecutive psalm. The ultimate and unmitigated success of the eschatological priest-king-warrior is the focus of Ps. 1.1-3 and is worthy of wonder and astonishment: 'Oh…!' Psalm 2.1-3 on the other hand wonders at the folly of the plot against him: 'Why…?', and Ps. 3.1-3 expresses astonishment at the number of those engaged in that intrigue: 'Oh Lord, how…!'

At the other end of v. 2 is the prepositional phrase עלי, identifying the speaker as the focus of attack by the multiplied number of foes. While use of such a common preposition in two consecutive psalms may appear inconsequential at first glance, the accompanying thematic and structural parallels leave no doubt as to their associative role. The particular collocation קום על often expresses an attack against the life of a personal object (cf. Pss. 27.3; 86.14; 124.2-3; Isa. 4.22; 31.2; Judg. 9.18, 43; 2 Sam. 17.35; 18.31, 32;[12] 2 Kgs 17.7; Deut. 28.7). Indeed, here in Ps. 3.3 the enemy expresses confidence that their target is doomed. Furthermore, the lying down, sleeping and arising of 3.6 is tantamount to death and resurrection, as the only parallel to this threefold combination of verbs in the Hebrew Bible, Job 14.12, reveals. As mentioned in comments on Ps. 2.3, the particular language of plotting together in v. 2b (נוסדו יחד) carries with it the intent to kill, as Ps. 31.14 confirms (בהוסדם יחד עלי לקחת נפשי זממו).[13] So both psalms open with words of astonishment, first at the folly (2.1-2) and second at the numbers (3.2-3) of those plotting to kill the anointed king.

It is worthy of note in passing that for both Psalms 2 and 3 the attack by foes described in the opening verses (2.2, 3.2) is followed immediately with a direct citation of their words (2.3, 3.3). Consequently structural parallels between these two psalms support those verbal and conceptual.

Introducing the words of the attackers in 3.3 expressing certainty of the speaker's death is the phrase רבים אמרים לנפשי which contrasts with use of the same root in the clause אמר אלי of 2.7. The latter introduces a direct

10. These two forms possibly could have been listed among formal parallels in the previous chart. The particle מה could be either exclamatory or interrogatory, but here the former best suits the context, as in Pss. 8.2, 10; 21.2; 31.20 (מה רב); 36.8; 104.24 (מה־רבו), BDB *s.v.* מה. Note the formal similarity between מה and מה(ל).

11. Forbes, *Studies*, p. 197.

12. The use of this particular collocation in these verses of 2 Sam. 18 on the heels of the attack against David may provide support for a linguistic link between the narrative account and this prayer of Ps. 3 (cf. קמים עלי of Ps. 3.2 and הקמים עליך of 2 Sam. 18.31). Indeed, in both cases a revolt occurs. However, critical differences such as David's reaction in 2 Sam. 19.1 versus the words of Ps. 3.8 cannot be overlooked.

13. Note as well use of the same noun נפשי (my life) in 3.3 and 31.14.

citation from God describing his unique relationship with the king. By use of the same root אמר there appears to be a disparity between the previous divine declaration of sonship and the present, apparently successful, attempt on his life. That the particular phrase of 3.3 (רבים אמרים) plays a key role in the sequencing of these psalms can be seen by its exact repetition in 4.7.

Verse 4 opens with a direct address to the Lord, although preceded by the conjoined second-person singular pronoun (ואתה יהוה). While use of this independent pronoun to open poetic lines is not uncommon in the Psalter,[14] its use within the context of similar sequences in both Psalms 2 and 3 indicates a deliberate resonance between the two. These parallels point to a continuation of the dialogue of Psalm 2 between deity and monarch on into Psalm 3:

ואני	2.6	ואתה	3.4
הר־קדשׁי	2.6	מהר קדשׁו	3.5
אתה	2.7	אני	3.6

The uses of אני in 3.6 and 2.6 are essentially redundant to the first-person perfect verb forms they both precede. Thus their deliberate presence is confirmation that the special relationship and communication between God and his chosen king messiah continues across the boundary between Psalms 2 and 3.

A structural similarity also exists since the attack against the king and accompanying direct speech (2.1-3; 3.2-3) are followed by his exaltation (2.6-7; 3.4-6). Furthermore, each initial independent pronoun (2.6; 3.4) is introduced by the disjunctive *wāw* (ואתה, ואני), indicating an emphatic contrary reaction to the previous attack. Indeed, the evidence points to the words of Psalm 3 representing those of the chosen, anointed, and yet persecuted, king in Psalm 2.[15]

The divine reaction to revolt in Ps. 2.6 consists of a declaration that the Lord has established his king *on* Mt Zion (על ציון הר קדשׁי), while in 3.5 that king is calling to the Lord and receiving an answer *from* the same place (מהר קדשׁו). Apparently in Psalm 3 the chosen king has not yet been established nor seated on that holy and heavenly mount, as Psalm 2 had affirmed. Rather, the distress in which he finds himself is a further account of the life-threatening situation of Ps. 2.1-3. Psalm 3 then focuses specifically on the

14. Cf. Pss. 12.8, 18, 28, 29; 22.4, 20; 32.5; 41.11; 44.5.

15. According to Miller, 'The Beginning', p. 88, Ps. 3 'is understood easily, if not preferably as the voice of the king surrounded by his foes and praying for God's deliverance and blessing on the people of nation'.

attack as it plays out against the chosen king. Here he calls out to Yhwh for help, revealing a dialogue and interaction between them not revealed in the divine dialogue and events of Psalm 2. This sets the pattern for all subsequent psalms, each of which contributes additional information to the previous.

Another structural parallel can be seen in the distribution of pronouns in the chart above. The first-person pronoun of 2.6 (ואני) and the second-person pronoun of 3.4 (ואתה) have the same referent. It is Yhwh speaking in 2.6, but addressed directly in 3.4. Likewise, the second-person pronoun of 2.7 (אתה) represents the addressed chosen king messiah, who then speaks in 3.6 in first person (אני). This evidence is consistent with the different emphasis in each psalm. Psalm 2 focuses on God's words of promise to his son-king, while the third psalm highlights the king's prayer of confidence spoken out of a desperate situation. Clearly the book's redactor considered David's words in Psalm 3 as prophetic of the coming eschatological king portrayed in Psalms 1–2.[16]

In his opening state of confidence of 3.4, the king uses a collocation of verb and noun (ומרים ראשׁי)[17] found also in 27.6 (ירום ראשׁי) and 110.7 (ירים ראשׁ). Each context speaks of victory over enemies. Consequently the particular idiom in 3.4 expresses the certainty of an eventual deliverance from the deadly predicament in which he finds himself, and victory over the many arrayed against him of vv. 1-2. That triumph will be described in vv. 6ff.

As noted above, the answer received *from* the holy mount in 3.5 reveals that the king has not yet been established on that holy hill. Implied is the location of this particular cry and response in the events of 2.1-3 preceding his exaltation to that same sacred mount. He was confident of an answer in 3.4 and receives it in v. 5, with v. 6 revealing further details of the deliverance.

Just as v. 5 opens with a clause expressed in first person (אקרא), and ends with the response to that cry by Yhwh in third person (ויענני), so v. 6 opens with three consecutive first-person verbs (אני שׁכבתי ואישׁנה הקיצותי) and ends with a third-person verb whose subject is likewise (יסמכני). Presumably the Lord's support (יסמכני) of the king in v. 6 constitutes the answer (ויענני) of

16. David is recognized as a prophet in 2 Sam. 23.1-2 and Acts 2.29-30. 'Both Jewish and Christian traditions entertain the possibility that David was a prophet'. Harry P. Nasuti, 'The Interpretive Significance of Sequence and Selection in the Book of Psalms', in Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller Jr (eds.), *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (VTSup, 99; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005), pp. 311-39 (321).

17. Undoubtedly this participial use of the root קום and first-person singular pronominally suffixed noun (ומרים ראשׁי) was chosen to rebut the threat of v. 3 introduced with another combination of participle and first-person suffixed noun (אמרים לנפשׁי). The consonance accompanying the grammatically similar forms confirms a deliberate and pointed response.

v. 5. However, the generally accepted interpretation of v. 6 as enjoyment of a full night of sleep does not appear to constitute an answer (v. 5b) to the life-threatening predicament he is in. Indeed, v. 6 involves more than a good night's sleep.

The initial verb of v. 6 (שכבתי) is found 198 times in the qal and another 13 times in other patterns.[18] In the qal pattern this root, according to Hamilton, appears 'primarily with the meaning "to lie down (in death)" or "to lie down (for sexual relations)"'.[19] In both Kings and Chronicles it is commonly used when monarchs died and 'slept' with their fathers.[20] It refers to death in 60 of approximately 211 occurrences of the root.[21] Within the Psalter itself death references are found in Pss. 41.9 and 88.6, to which could be added Ps. 4.9 (אשכבה ואישן), if the case here in the deliberately paralleled 3.6 (שכבתי ואישנה) is proven.

The immediately following verb form of 3.6 (ואישנה) appears 25 times in the MT with 5 of those instances indicating the sleep of death.[22] The case of Ps. 13.4 (פן אישן המות) is especially relevant, given the numerous lexical parallels of this psalm to Psalm 3.[23] The text of Dan. 12.2 (ורבים מישני אדמת עפר יקיצו) expresses a clear reference to resurrection and exhibits the identical sequence of verbal roots ישן and קוץ as Ps. 3.6 (ואישנה הקיצותי).

As for the root קיץ (to awaken),[24] the statistics are similar, with 5 (6 if 2 Kgs 4.31 is included) out of 21 examples describing revival from the dead.[25] Especially relevant to Ps. 3.6 is the text of Job 14.12 in which the same three roots are found referring explicitly to death. These two verses constitute a dislegomenon in the MT of this particular triad.[26]

Job 14.12 ואיש שכב לא יקום עד בלתי שמים לא יקיצו ולא יערי משנתם

18. Abraham Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Bible* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1982), pp. 1140-41.

19. V.P. Hamilton, 'שכב', *TWOT* 2, pp. 921-22.

20. E.g. וישכב מנשה עם אבתיו, 2 Chron. 33.20.

21. Based on my personal counting, BDB *s.v.* שכב, p. 1012, lists about the same number referring to death. *HALOT*, *s.v.* שכב, p. 1486, notes that the root also appears in Phoenician, Punic and Ethiopic in the sense of death. According to Luis Alonso Schökel, *Treinta salmos: poesía y oración* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1986), p. 57, commenting on Ps. 3: 'Dormir y despertar son símbolos acostumbrados de muerte y resurrección'.

22. Job 3.13; Jer. 51.39, 57; Dan. 12.2; Ps. 13.4.

23. נפשי, Pss. 3.3, 13.3; עלי, 3.2, 7, 13.3, 6; איבי, 3.8, 13.3, 5; צרי, 3.2, 13.5; ענה, 3.5, 13.4; אני, 3.6, 13.6; ישע, 3.3, 8, 13.6; רום, 3.4, 13.3.

24. All examples of this root in hiphil.

25. Isa. 26.19; Jer. 51.39, 57; Job 14.12; Dan. 12.2.

26. Menahem-Zvi Kadari, *Milon ha'ivrit hamiqra'it* מלון העברית המקראית (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press), p. 1086, *s.v.* שכב, cites three texts, including Isa. 14.8, Job 3.13 and Job 14.12 to illustrate the use of שכב in the sense of death.

Job here declares that a man lies down (שכב) and will not arise (קום), will not awake (קוץ), and will not rouse himself (עור) from his/their sleep (שנה, from root ישן). Two verbs normally used for wakening from sleep (קוץ and עור) are used metaphorically in this example to describe resurrection from the dead, one of which is also found in Ps. 3.6. Indeed, resurrection from death in 3.6 as a divine answer to his call makes sense in light of the life-threatening attack of vv. 2-3, and the similar antecedent in Ps. 2.2.[27]

It appears then that the plot against the life of the messiah in Ps. 2.2, further described in 3.2-3, was successful. With good reason his foes, later named 'my enemies' (איבי, v. 8), were confident that there was no hope for his life (נפשי, v. 3). However, v. 4b seems to anticipate the deliverance from death in v. 6 by the confident expression that Yhwh, his glory (כבדי), will *raise his head*. A similar scenario in Ps. 7.6 portrays the same sort of demise of the speaker at the hands of the enemy, his life being trampled to the ground:

7.6 ירדף אויב נפשי וישג וירמס לארץ חיי כבודי לעפר ישכן

Note the syntactically and semantically parallel references to 'my soul/life' (נפשי), 'my life' (חיי) and 'my glory' (כבודי). Consequently, the latter term כבוד is inseparably connected with the concept of one's life. Its use in v. 4 (כבודי) replaces the same basic concept of human life in v. 3 (לנפשי), both of which are suffixed by the first-person singular pronoun.

So the successful attack on his life of vv. 2-3 explains the need for resurrection, while v. 4 is a confident assertion of its accomplishment. The cry and subsequent answer in the following v. 5 confirms the confidence of the previous verse, followed by v. 6's summary statement of death and resurrection. Verse 7 then returns in summary fashion, presumably to the scenario of vv. 2-3, as its parallel vocabulary (מרבבות…עלי) indicates.

The explanatory clause concluding v. 6 (כי יהוה יסמכני) reiterates the confidence in resurrection of v. 4's final clause and the fact of an answer from heaven expressed in the final clause of v. 5. While the root סמך is usually glossed as 'to support'[28] or the like,[29] its distribution also indicates a sense of restoration, or revivification. So in Ps. 119.116 the speaker asks that the Lord 'restore' (סמך) him so that he may live (סמכני כאמרתך ואחיה).[30] In Ps. 145.14 the Lord 'reestablishes' or literally 'puts back on their feet' (סמך)

27. Both *1 Clement* 26.2 and Augustine read Ps. 3.6 in this manner: *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians* 26.2 (*ANF* 1, p. 12). Augustine, *Expositions of the Psalms 1–32*, pp. 76-84.

28. *HALOT*, *s.v.* סמך.

29. BDB, *s.v.* סמך, 'to lean, lay, rest, support'. *Diccionario bíblico*, *s.v.* סמך, 'sostener, apoyar, mantener, afirmar, afianzar'.

30. This and following translations are mine.

those who have fallen down (סומך יהוה לכל הנפלים). These two roots of סמך and נפל are also collocated in Ps. 37.24, wherein the fall is not final because the Lord 'reinforces' the righteous' hand (כי יפל לא יוטל כי יהוה סומך ידו). Similarily the Shulamite in Cant. 2.5 requests that she be 'reinvigorated' (סמך)[31] with sustenance because she is lovesick (סמכוני באשישות).[32] In Ps. 51.14b the same verb's parallel in colon A is 'restore' (השיבה, plural imperative of hiph. שוב). Consequently, the verb's distribution in the MT and the context of Ps. 3.2-6 as discussed above suggest the root סמך depicts revivification from death.

Verse 6 contains further links to Psalm 2 beyond the common initial independent pronouns (אני, 2.6, 3.6), as illustrated earlier.[33] At the structural level both Pss. 2.6 and 3.6 function as responses to the plot to kill in 2.1-3 (v. 2b specifically) and 3.2-3. In fact, a primary function of Psalm 3 is to provide further details on the murderous attack of Ps. 2.1-3. Both divine responses begin in v. 4 of the respective psalms and continue through v. 6 and beyond. Furthermore, the initial verbal form of 2.6 and final one of 3.6 bear resemblances on at least two levels:

2.6 ואני נסכתי
3.6 אני…יהוה יסמכני

At the semantic level both roots סמך and נסך resemble each other in describing the (re)establishment or setting up of either the speaker (Ps. 3) or the chosen king (Ps. 2), being ultimately the same person. At the phonological level the identical consonants *sāmeḵ* and *kap̄* in סמך of 3.6 are sufficient to evoke remembrance of נסך in 2.6.

Implied by these numerous connections between 2.6 and 3.6 at several levels is an editorial attempt to link the events described in both. The verb יסמכני of 3.6, as discussed above, portrays a reestablishment or resuscitation from death after the murderous attack in vv. 2-3, as does the establishment of the king in 2.6 on heavenly Zion after the plot to kill in 2.1-3. Reading 2.6 as an elevation of king messiah from the grave to a celestial throne is clarified in light of 3.6, and undoubtedly that was the purpose behind the redactor of the Psalter's juxtaposition of the two poems. The idea can be ascertained implicitly in 2.2-6, but the adjoining of Psalm 3 confirms it.

While the above discussion has been based on lexical links between Psalms 2 and 3, an obvious tie to Ps. 1.1, 5, 6 exists in the term רשעים of 3.8. Those wicked were further identified in Psalm 2 as nations and their rulers by virtue of their common destruction (1.6, 2.12) and consonance between 1.6b

31. Cf. *Diccionario bíblico*, *s.v.* סמך, 'reanimar'.

32. Piel of סמך in this case.

33. Recall as well the previously mentioned triad of אתה, הר קדשׁ and אני creating cohesion between 2.6-7 and 3.4-7.

and 2.1a.[34] Psalm 3 assures the shattering of the teeth of the wicked in v. 8d (שִׁנֵּי רְשָׁעִים שִׁבַּרְתָּ), also defined as the personal enemies of the royal speaker in v. 8c (אֹיְבַי). Antecedent to this twofold reference to hostiles in v. 8 is the myriads of a nation in v. 7 (מִרְבָבוֹת עָם) and numerous foes in vv. 2-3 (רַבּוּ צָרָי רַבִּים…רַבִּים), all further descriptions of the rebels of Psalm 2 and wicked of Psalm 1.

Furthermore, Ps. 3.8 has portrayed a violent smashing of the teeth of the wicked without mentioning the means, which the iron rod of 2.9 fittingly supplies.[35] Accompanying the neat pairing of the weapon and its devastation are consonantal parallels that confirm the conceptual association:

בִּשְׁבֶט בַּרְזֶל 2.9a
שִׁבַּרְתָּ 3.8d

It cannot be fortuitous that 3.9 concludes the poem with a blessing on Yhwh's people, as did Psalm 2. In Ps. 2.12 the blessings come by trust in the son of God, here by simply being the people of Yhwh. While the speaker of Psalm 3, that is, the son of God in Psalm 2, is the target of a murderous attack (עָלַי, 3.2, 7), God's people are the target of blessing (עַל עַמְּךָ, 3.9). The latter are contrasted with the people (עַם) of v. 7 that set themselves against this king. If both psalms conclude with blessings, they also open similarly with an attack on the anointed monarch (2.1-3; 3.2-3).

As demonstrated here, Psalm 3 can be read as a coherent sequel to Psalms 1–2. The following Psalm 4 exhibits numerous linguistic parallels, proving that it takes up again for discussion themes of the immediately previous psalm(s). In fact, the paired reading of Psalms 3–4 is commonly recognized, as opposed to that of Psalms 2 and 3.[36] Nonetheless, the latter

34. רְשָׁעִים and רָשַׁע.

35. Cf. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 65: 'Einen Hinweis darauf bildet die wiederaufnahme des Motivs der Königlichen Keule aus 2,9 in 3,8'.

36. The connections between Pss. 2 and 3 have not been ignored by all commentators, as will be discussed below. Following is a sampling of those who have recognized the affinity of Pss. 3–4 to the neglect of Pss. 2–3: Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, p. 29, state, 'Ps. 4 was originally…a mate to Ps. 3, an evening prayer following naturally a morning prayer'. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, p. 72, comments on Ps. 3: '…its relationship to Ps. 4, with which it has many close parallels…the location of these two psalms next to each other in the Psalter would not be accidental…for use in the morning and evening worship respectively', Seybold, *Die Psalmen*, pp. 37-38, speaking of Ps. 4: 'Der Psalm is in verschiedener Hinsicht mit 3 und 5 verwandet… Sein Ort zwischen 3 und 5 erklärt sich aus den engen beziehungen zu beiden'. Alonso Schökel and Carniti, *Salmos*, p. 173, in their discussion of Psalm 4 include a paragraph on its relationship to 3, in which they list lexical and thematic parallels, concluding that these evidences 'pueden haber influido en la colocación contigua al ser coleccionados', but include nothing on the relationship of Psalms 2–3. J. Goldingay, *Psalms*, p. 117, states: 'Pss

two psalms (2–3) were also assumed by the Psalter's redactor to be interrelated, sharing a common message. Nonetheless, Psalms 1–2 constitute an integrated and discrete introduction to the book, and as such are set apart from the ensuing sequence of Psalms 3ff. Likewise Psalms 3–4 display a close unity of theme and vocabulary, being the first two psalms to follow the original introduction to the entire book. Their common focus is the united murderous attack on the persecuted king (begun in Ps. 2.1-3), his prayer in the midst of it, and his stated confidence in an ultimate deliverance. Psalms 3 and 4 are just the first of a series of individual prayers that dominate Books I and II and reveal that for the Psalter's redactor they represent the petitions of the persecuted eschatological messianic king portrayed in the introduction. In other words, the transition between Psalms 1–2 and Psalm 3 points the way to the reading strategy behind the present canonical shape of the Psalter.

While a coherent and cohesive reading of Psalms 2 and 3 may appear innovative to some, substantial evidence exists of such in both ancient and modern sources. *Midrash Psalms* 3.2 explains the juxtaposition of the two as follows:

> R. Jacob said in the name of R. Aḥa: Why is the Psalm on Gog and Magog (Ps. 2) placed next to the Psalm on Absalom? To tell you that a wicked son works greater cruelty upon his father than will the wars of Gog and Magog.[37]

Such an explanation at the juncture of 2 and 3 reveals the difficulty this particular sequence represented for ancient interpreters. The midrash following immediately adds comments giving further evidence for the same:

> When R. Joshua ben Levi sought to arrange the Psalms in their proper order, a heavenly voice came forth and commanded: 'Do not rouse that which slumber!'[38]

Nonetheless, the ancients properly recognized the need to explain the particular sequence.

A corollary of these statements is their implication for dating the Psalter. Clearly these ancient rabbinic figures are centuries beyond the final

3 and 4 offer prayers for morning (3.5) and evening (4.8[9]); there are other verbal links between the two psalms that could have encouraged their juxtaposition… This prayer psalm has many verbal links with the psalm that precedes', but he also offers no comments on the relationship of Psalms 2–3. M. Oehming, *Das Buch der Psalmen* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000), p. 63: 'Nachdem in dem doppelten Proömium Ps. 1 und 2…wendet sich ab Ps. 3 die Stimmung, und zwar radikal. Jetzt folgt eine Gruppe Psalmen, die mehr oder weniger von der Situation der Klage geprägt sind (Ps. 3–7)'.

37. Braude, *Midrash*, p. 50.
38. Braude, *Midrash*, p. 50.

redaction of the book. The order is mystifying to them. As a consequence the book could not have been completed at any time close to the second century, when the Midrashim were being compiled, nor in the lifetimes of the rabbinic figures quoted.[39] Further support for an earlier dating of the Psalter in its canonical form comes from the fact that the Greek version, a product of either the second[40] or the third century BCE,[41] is essentially the same in content and arrangement as the MT.[42] Absence of Greek influence in the Psalter, whether in language or in structural and compositional features, also supports a pre-Hellenistic date for its final redaction.[43]

Saadiah haGaon, in addition to noting the lexical links between Psalms 1 and 2, also saw coherence between Psalms 2 and 3.[44] He observed that the fate of Absalom was the same as the rebellious nations of Psalm 2, and beyond that read all the psalms in connection one with another. For this, he was criticized by Ibn Ezra.[45] Simon has shown that while Saadiah 'makes a concerted effort to explain the topical connection between each psalm and its predecessor and to elucidate the conceptual and literary logic of their order', at the same time he (Saadiah) recommends it as a hypothesis and not

39. Braude, *Midrash*, pp. x-xi: 'Though the method is old, it was not until the second century of the Common Era that the compiling of Midrashim was actually begun… Of the teachers whose sayings are reported in Midrash Tehillim, the earliest in point of time are Hillel and Shammai (*ca.* 1st century BCE)'.

40. David C. Mitchell, 'Lord, Remember David: G.H. Wilson and the Message of the Psalter', *VT* 56 (2006), p. 546: '…the generally accepted dating of LXX in the second century BCE'.

41. Cf. Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995), p. 5: 'the Greek Psalter in context, viz. as a document of one of the most fertile periods in Jewish history and religion, 300 BC to AD 200'. Seybold, *Introducing*, suggests 200 BC on his chart of p. 12 and then on p. 14 that, 'the 3rd or 2nd centuries BC seem to be the most likely dates'.

42. Mitchell, 'Lord, Remember David', p. 544: 'For LXX features exactly the same psalms as MT in the same order, varying only in enumeration and minor additions'.

43. Psalm 137.1, 'On the rivers of Babylon, there we sat and also wept', indicates at a minimum an exilic *terminus a quo*.

44. Eissler, *Königpsalmen* p. 107: 'Außerdem, so Saadja, wird deutlich, dass Ps. 3 mit Ps. 2 verknüpft ist… Ps 2 spricht von solchen, die sich gegen den Ewigen und seinen Messias verbünden. Dafür gibt Ps. 3 ein Anschauungsbeispiel und wird deshalb hier angeschlossen.'

45. Cohen, *Miqra'ot Gedolot*, p. 8: רצה הגאון רב סעדיה…לקשור כל המזמורים זה עם זה. These are the words of Ibn Ezra regarding Saadiah when commenting on Ps. 3.1. He then quotes Saadiah on Ps. 3 (אחר 'רגשו גוים'…כי יקרה להם במקרה אבשלום) demonstrating how he connects it with Ps. 2, illegitimately in his opinion (ואין יכולת במפרש לקשור ככה), because it was not in chronological order. Absalom's uprising here in Ps. 3.1 of Book I occurred after the events of Ps. 142.1 in Book V where David hides in a cave (שהיה קדם דבר אבשלום). So for Ibn Ezra, the lack of chronology excludes a purposeful arrangement.

certainty for the entire book.[46] It is possible that Saadiah's attempt to find unity in the book is due to the polemical nature of his argument against the idea that 'the Book of Psalms has any literary uniqueness within the biblical canon'.[47] Since the other books evince unity and integrity it would be natural to assume the same for Psalms. However, setting aside his underlying motive to attack the Karaites, it is still legitimate to ask whether Psalms would be the one and only book in the canonical corpus whose arrangement and order is devoid of significance. Obviously, contemporary debates over the legitimacy of a serious grappling with the sequence of the psalms is not new, as evidence in *Midrash Psalms* and medieval commentaries confirms.

As already noted, recent interest in the order of the Psalter was preceded by nineteenth-century precursors. Alexander traces a development across the first three psalms as follows:

> In these three psalms there is a sensible gradation or progressive development of one great idea. The general contrast, which the first exhibits, of the righteous and the wicked, is reproduced, in the second, as a war against the Lord and his Anointed. In the third it is still further individualized as a conflict between David, the great historical type of the Messiah, and his enemies.[48]

His commentary is prefaced with the sound statement that 'the arrangement of the psalms in the collection is by no means so unmeaning and fortuitous as may at first sight seem to be the case…'.[49]

Hengstenberg saw a general resemblance between Psalms 1–2 and 3–4, pointed out a lexical link between Psalms 2 and 4, and remarked on the role of David's words in Psalm 3:

> It is certainly not to be regarded as an accident, that Psalms third and fourth immediately follow the first and second. They are occupied, as well as Psalm second, with a revolt against the Lord's Anointed, and Psalm fourth especially shows a remarkable agreement with it, first in sentiment, and then also in expression–comp. 'imagine a vain thing' in ii. 1 with 'love vanity' in iv. 2. In this third Psalm the personal experiences and feelings of David are most prominent, and they formed the basis on which he reared the expectation of the events which were to befall his successor, the Lord's Anointed.[50]

Delitzsch also comments concerning the arrangement of the Psalms that 'the collection bears the impress of one ordering mind' and 'the psalms

46. Uriel Simon, *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra* (trans. L.J. Schramm; State University of New York Press, 1991), p. 30.
47. Simon, *Four Approaches*, p. 5.
48. Alexander, *Psalms*, p. 27.
49. Alexander, *Psalms*, p. 12.
50. Hengstenberg, *Psalms*, p. 44.

follow one another according to their relationship as manifested by prominent external and internal marks'.[51] However, after such an optimistic statement he laconically observes regarding Psalms 2 and 3 that both mention the 'holy hill' without further comment.[52]

Forbes' obervation on the arrangement close to the end of the nineteenth-century bears repeating:

> I have been enabled to trace the connection in various groups of Psalms, and even in whole books, in a manner sufficient, I trust, to satisfy unbiased inquirers that we must not regard the Psalms merely as isolated productions, but that in the order in which we now possess them they have been arranged and connected together with very great care so as to bring out and enforce certain important truths with a clearness and distinctness not to be mistaken…When the Psalms are seen, in the form in which we now possess them, to have been grouped together as parts of a connected series, in order to bring out and give expression to some definite idea or important truth, we gain a certainty, not otherwise to be attained, of the meaning to be put upon the whole series, as well as upon individual expressions in each Psalm, which might otherwise be ambiguous.[53]

He likewise concludes that a messianic expectancy is discerned in the book when the order and connection of psalms is examined.[54] His analysis of the juxtaposition of Psalms 2 and 3 is not inconsistent with lexical and structural evidence presented here:

> Both, it will be observed, are occupied with a revolt against the *Lord's Anointed.* Both begin with an exclamation of astonishment at the *numbers* of those in insurrection, the hardihood of their rebellion, too, being characterized in similar terms: 'Why do the nations, peoples, kings, rulers, set themselves against Jehovah and His Anointed?' (Ps. ii. 1, 2). 'How many are mine adversaries—Ten thousands of the people that have set themselves against me?' (Ps. iii. 1 and 6). In Ps. iii., in short, called forth by the personal experience of David, we have evidently the original and occasion which prepared David, or whoever was the writer of Ps. ii., for receiving the inspiration which foresaw and foretold the still more general and desperate revolt against the promised 'seed of David'.[55]

These comments, as far as they go, indicate a serious grappling with the fact of their juxtaposition. However, such analyses practically cease in the twentieth century, due to the subsequent dominance of form criticism.

Form criticism is actually an attempt to rectify what is seen as a haphazard arrangement, as Gunkel's own words reveal:

51. Delitzsch, *Psalms*, pp. 19, 21.
52. Delitzsch, *Psalms*, p. 100.
53. Forbes, *Studies*, pp. 2-3.
54. Forbes, *Studies*, pp. 2-3.
55. Forbes, *Studies*, p. 202.

> No internal ordering principle for the individual psalms has been transmitted for the whole…no internal relationship can be discovered between neighboring psalms…the particular task of psalms studies should be to rediscover the relationships between the individual songs that did not occur with the transmission or that occurred only in part…but if someone researching the past wants to obtain the true picture of what happened, that researcher first has to disregard the context in which the items came to us more or less accidentally.[56]

He rejects as accidental the Psalter's arrangement instead of considering the possibility of logic behind it. Centuries before Augustine apparently had sought to understand the logic of the Psalter's arrangement, but candidly confessed his inability to comprehend it.[57] He suspected, as anyone might for a literary work, that the order was intentional and meaningful. His admission reflected humility and honesty. Instead of jettisoning the idea preliminarily he confessed it was a mystery 'not yet' (*nondum*) revealed to him.[58]

By contrast, Gunkel declares emphatically, 'In der Sammlung des Psalters steht jedes Lied für sich allein, ohne daß wir das Recht hätten, es mit dem vorhergehenden oder dem folgenden zusammenzunehmen'.[59] Such a broad and dogmatic statement is undermined by overt evidence throughout the Psalter of a purposefully edited arrangement, revealed in textual links that are evident from the beginning. Gunkel identified Psalm 1 as a wisdom psalm,[60] Psalms 2–3 as royal psalm and complaint song of the individual, respectively,[61] and so chose to ignore whatever overt textual evidence of association might exist.[62] Being previously disposed to his idea of categorization, he does not seriously consider the

56. Hermann Gunkel, *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel* (trans. J.D. Nogalski; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998), pp. 2-3.

57. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos CI – CL* (ed. D.E. Dekkers and I. Fraipont; Turnhout: Brepols, 1956), p. 2190: 'Quamuis ordo psalmorum, qui mihi magni sacramenti uidetur continere secretum nondum mihi fuerit reuelatus'; translated as, 'The order of the psalms seems to me to be a very holy mystery, and its content has not yet been revealed to me', in Augustine, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*. III/20. *Expositions of the Psalms 121–150* (ed. B. Ramsey; trans. M. Boulding; Hyde Park, NY: New City Press,
2004), p. 508.

58. Augustine, *Enarrationes*, p. 2190: '…continere secretum nondum mihi fuerit reuelatus'.

59. Gunkel, *Reden*, p. 93.

60. Gunkel, *Introduction*, p. 17.

61. Gunkel, *Introduction*, pp. 72, 19.

62. 'So stehen z. B. im ersten Buche die Hymnen (*Ψ* 8. 19. 24 1–2. 29. 33) nicht beieinander, die Königpsalmen (*Ψ* 2. 18. 20. 21) bilden keine zusammengehörige Gruppe, auch die Klagelieder des Einzelnen, um noch diese zu nennen, stehen verstreut (*Ψ* 3. 5. 6. 7. 13. 22 usw.)' (Gunkel, *Einleitung*, p. 434).

possibility of another principle of arrangement at work. More recently Nasuti admits the possibility that, 'modern form-critical definitions of individual psalms…might not necessarily have been shared by those responsible for the shaping of the Psalter'.[63] Indeed, the first three psalms examined here, as well as numerous other examples across the Psalter, confirm that these categories were absolutely not the operating principle behind the arrangement.

Gunkel's argumentation used to discount the ancient canonical order is remarkable. In his view, since the Psalter's sequence does not follow his own particular categories, it cannot have been reasonably arranged. He assumes the inviolability of his own conceived categories and on that basis rejects the ancient order out of hand. The circularity of such reasoning is patently obvious.

A serious reading of the Psalter requires at a minimum a sympathetic consideration of the present arrangement. Wilson apparently understood this, as his stated program reveals:

> In my opinion, the only valid and cautious hypothesis with which to begin is that the present arrangement is the result of purposeful editorial activity, and that its purpose can be discerned by careful and exhaustive analysis of the linguistic and thematic relationships between individual psalms and groups of psalms… My own preference is to work without a hypothesis (other than that cautious one mentioned above) and to allow any sense of the structure that develops to derive from an intensive and thorough analysis of the psalms in question in terms of their linguistic, thematic, literary and theological links and relationships.[64]

The Psalter's order deserves, like any other book, to be seriously considered on its own merits. But this cannot be done without setting aside as much as is possible modern predispositions and approaches so as to allow the evidence, thoroughly examined, to inform the final verdict. This is the method endeavored here for the first three chapters of the Psalter, and the evidence supports a purposeful and meaningful sequencing of these texts.

Scholars continue to discount the arrangement in more recent times in the same manner. As the following example illustrates, form-critical categories are often assumed as self-evident:

> They paint on a very broad canvas, paying insufficient attention to the contents of most individual psalms, whose apparent randomness of arrangement (for instance the mingling of psalms of praise with psalms of lament) remains a stumbling-block for those who fail to find any consistency or overarching structure or plan to the book.[65]

63. Nasuti, 'Interpretive Significance', p. 322.
64. Wilson, 'Understanding', p. 48.
65. Whybray, *Reading*, p. 120.

So as was the case with Gunkel, Whybray likewise rejects the ancient arrangement out of hand simply because it does not conform to presumably inviolate twentieth-century categories.[66]

Further examples of this circular argumentation can be cited. A recent introductory text offers a list of generic categories of psalms, which then becomes the basis for rejection of Wilson's broad analysis of the book's seams and his argument for consideration of the immediate context of each psalm:

> And no overall organizational structure to the book may be observed… laments far outnumber hymns in the Psalter…Except under rare circumstances, it is inappropriate to exegete a psalm in the literary context of the psalms that precede and follow it. On the positive side, the structure of the Psalter shows the need for genre analysis. The primary literary context for the study of a psalm, therefore, is not the psalms that border it, but the psalms that are generically similar to it.[67]

The dominating influence of Gunkel's subsequent approach throughout the major part of the twentieth century is evident in the scarcity of detailed discussion, not only of the links between Psalms 1–2 and 3, but of any sequence in the book. There have been exceptions of course, one being the previously mentioned article by Christoph Barth (1976) in which he examines the evidence for intentional sequencing in Book I.[68] Another (1982) study preceding Wilson was by Goulder on the Korahite psalms.[69] His opening comment arouses expectancy of a genuine study of the Psalter's arrangement, and is worthy of repetition:

> The oldest commentary on the meaning of the psalms is the manner of their arrangement in the Psalter: that is, the collections in which they are grouped, the technical and historical notes they carry, and the order in which they stand.[70]

66. Note the comments of Christoph Barth, who, after presenting a good case for the consideration of the canonical arrangement, feels obliged to reassert the validity of Gunkel's categories, not recognizing the ultimate incompatibility of the two approaches: 'Neben *Gunkels* unverändert gültiger Forderung einer an den Gattungen orientierten tritt so die einer „kontextmäßigen" Psalmenerklärung', Barth, 'Concatenatio…', p. 39.

67. Tremper Longman III and Raymond B. Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervans, 2nd edn, 2006), pp. 246-55. They rightly question Wilson's idea of a failed covenant (p. 254), but this does not invalidate other evidence for unity.

68. Christoph Barth, 'Concatenatio…', pp. 30-40.

69. Michael Goulder, *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah* (JSOTSup, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1982).

70. Goulder, *The Psalms*, p. 1. While this statement is laudable and commendable for its time, one might go further and state that the arrangement is more than

Disappointingly, however, he does not examine the actual order of the Psalms and extracts the collection identified by superscriptions from the sons of Korah: Psalms 42, 44–49, 84–85, 87–88, extended for associative reasons to 42–49, 84–85, 87–89.[71] Indeed valid reasons are offered for linking Psalms 42 and 43, or 88 and 89,[72] but the conspicuous issue of their actual collocation with non-Korahite psalms such as the Davidic Psalm 86 or Asaphite Psalm 50, etc., is not addressed.[73] Gunkel does, as Goulder notes, treat the order of the Psalms as 'nugatory', but isolation of the Korahite psalms out of their context likewise indicates non-acceptance of the arrangement.[74] The study could in the end be identified as a cult-functional approach, given its attempt to identify these psalms as 'a coherent collection, seemingly arranged in some purposeful order, largely in connection with public ritual worship…'.[75]

The appearance of Wilson's work on the Psalter's editing,[76] preceded by Childs' earlier remarks,[77] opened the door to more studies related to the canonical shape of the Psalter. Wilson's recommended program for further studies at the time was, and still is, a succinct and suitable statement for discovering the intended message of individual psalms as well as the entire book:

> As must be obvious by now, I am convinced that any progress in understanding the purposeful arrangement of the psalms in the Psalter must begin, as in these last two studies, with a detailed and careful analysis of the linguistic, literary and thematic linkages that can be discerned among the psalms.[78]

commentary and is in fact definitive and paramount for the meaning of the individual psalms (although defining their discreteness can be problematic, as in Psalms 9–10 or 42–43, which simply proves the point) as well as the whole.

71. Goulder, *The Psalms*, p., 2.

72. Goulder, *The Psalms*, pp. 2, 8-9, 12.

73. The Asaphite psalms (50, 73–83) are also dispersed, as are those Davidic.

74. Goulder, *The Psalms*, p. 8, states that a student trained in Gunkel's method, according to Goulder, 'suppresses as naïve his instinct that it is proper to study 1 before 2, and that there is something curious in beginning a book on the Psalter with the 110th, or 89th psalm'. Indeed, and yet a student's good instincts would also lead him to ask why Psalm 86 should not be included in the analysis of 84–89, or the collocation of Psalms 49–50. The statement 'There is no obvious connection between 87 and 88…' (p. 12) also illustrates the same point.

75. Goulder, *The Psalms*, p. 16. Note that ch. 1 is entitled 'A Sequence of Festal Psalms', or ch. 4, 'The Pre-Festal Lament', ch. 7, 'The Nadir of the Feast', etc.

76. Wilson, *The Editing*.

77. Childs, *Introduction*, pp. 511-23.

78. Wilson, 'Understanding', p. 50. These same words are repeated three times in this one article by Wilson, pp. 48 (2), 50.

Unfortunately Wilson did not follow his own recommendation and his later commentary on the book represents little advance beyond the traditional *Gattungsgeschichte*. Indeed, his comments on Psalm 3 lack any reference to its relationship to the first two, and likewise on Psalms 1–2 (and the rest of the psalms) there is scant discussion of their numerous lexical and thematic links.[79] He appears in fact to be distancing himself from earlier stated proposals. Nonetheless, recognition of editorially induced links and continuity between psalms hardly started with Wilson, although his early work certainly represented a watershed in Psalms studies, and will not end in spite of his abandonment of it.

Brennan had previously described continuity in the limited sequence of Psalms 1–8, which he also had observed throughout:

> A consecutive reading of the Hebrew Psalter leads to the conclusion that one of the principles governing the compilation of this collection was that of juxtaposing Psalms in such a way that various key words and expressions in one pick up and develop a theme already enunciated in another… an inner coherence for an otherwise apparently disorganized collection… impossible in this article to examine more than the first eight Psalms, but what we shall observe in them is a pattern which is repeated regularly throughout the rest of the collection.[80]

Beyond observation of links between Psalms 1 and 2, he notes that Psalm 149 develops 'many of the themes first set forth in Psalm 2, thus forming an inclusion which embraces the entire collection'.[81] Regarding Psalms 2 and 3 specifically, he associates correctly the king and enemies of Psalm 2 with the same in 3.[82]

79. Wilson, *Psalms*, pp. 89-126. He does discuss briefly (p. 108) the idea that Psalms 1 and 2 should be read as a 'single, combined introduction to the whole Psalter', and finds it 'persuasive', but then claims it has the unfortunate effect of 'obscuring Psalm 2's concurrent function to assist in the shaping of the first three books of the Psalter'. So he takes away what he appears to give initially. He also speaks of the 'special character of the untitled Psalms 1 and 2 as introductory' (p. 89). Later he notes that there are 'those who suggest that Ps. 2 functions together with Ps. 1…note the appearance of the term *ʾašre*…at the beginning of Ps. 1 and the end of Ps. 2 as evidence that these originally separate psalms were intended to be read together' (p. 113). But this is hardly the stuff of his earlier defined program and the reticence to follow it is conspicuous.

80. Brennan, 'Psalms 1–8', p. 25.

81. Brennan, 'Psalms 1–8', pp. 25-26. Cf. the similar observations of Manatti and de Solms, *Le psaumes*, p. 92 n. 11: 'A l'autre extrémité du psautier, le Psaume *149*… répond au psaume 2; les rois et les princes…qui ont voulu rejeter les liens de IHWH seront lies et enchaînés, peuples et nations insurgés seront châtiés. Le chant du renouveau remplacera le tumulte des nations liguées; et aux bénédictions accordées aux sujets fidèles correspond la gloire des *hassidim*.'

82. Brennan, 'Psalms 1–8', p. 26. However, his comment that 'the only clear verbal

Amos Hakham's modern Hebrew commentary also takes note of the arrangement of psalms and ancient discussions of it in the Talmud.[83] He concludes that common allusions and matters between juxtaposed psalms explain the arrangement.[84] Concerning the relationship of Psalms 2 and 3 he observes 'a small amount of similarity' (במקצת) between them, including divine help to subdue the king of Israel's enemies and the common phrase, 'holy mountain'.[85] Presumably his assessment that the commonalities between Psalms 2 and 3 were few is based on comparison with those between Psalms 1 and 2 and those between Psalms 3 and 4. Indeed, he notes numerous linguistic parallels at these seams and considers Psalms 1 and 2 to be 'an integrated unit' (לחטיבה אחת).[86]

More recent studies have also seriously grappled with the collocation of Psalms 2 and 3. Barbiero's work on Book I includes a listing of linguistic and thematic parallels throughout,[87] and his conclusions regarding Psalm 3 are generally consistent with those who take into consideration the linguistic and thematic connections. He finds, unlike Hakham, numerous thematic and linguistic ties between it and the previous Psalm 2:

> Damit wird eine Identifikation des Beters von Ps. 3 mit dem „Messias" von Ps. 2 angedeutet. Die Verfolgung des einzelnen wird zur Verfolgung des Messias und seines Volkes (עמך 3,9). Der Kampf, der in Ps. 2 programmatisch angekündigt wird, wird jetz konkret dargestellt. Einen Hinweis darauf bildet die wiederaufnahme des Motivs der Königlichen Keule aus 2,9 in 3,8. Als Nachbarpsalmen zeigen Ps. 2 und Ps. 3 außerdem zahlreiche Wort- und Motivverbindungen… Der Beter von Ps. 3 nimmt den Spruch JHWHs von 2,6 wieder auf. Weil JHWH gesagt hat, daß Zion „der Berg *meiner* Heiligkeit" ist (2,6), kann jetzt der Beter eine Antwort „vom Berg *seiner* Heiligkeit" (3,5) erwarten.[88]

Note his identification of the speaker in Psalm 3 with the messiah of Psalm 2 as does Brennan, along with the conflict in both psalms. Brennan stated that 'it was easy to perceive the continuity of sense between these two Psalms',

link is the reference to Yahweh's *holy mountain*…' ignores the numerous additional ties noted above.

83. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. לו (36).

84. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. לו (36). He also cites the ancient rabbinic observation (*Berakhot* 10a) that chronology was not the basis of the order.

85. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. יג (13).

86. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, pp. טז, י (10, 16). The rendering is that of the recent English translation; Amos Hakham, *The Bible: Psalms with the Jerusalem Commentary* (Jerusalem, Mosad Harav Kook, 2003), p. xxxiv.

87. Regarding Book I as a whole, Barbiero's conclusions are that 'Eine Kohärenz und eine Entwicklung wurden deutlich, nicht nur zwischen benachbarten Psalmen, sondern auch zwischen den verschiedenen Struktureinheiten sowie zwischen Anfang und Ende des Buches' (Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 719).

88. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 65.

and indeed that appears to be the case.[89] Hakham noticed that both psalms were similar in content by virtue of divine assistance to the king of Israel against his enemies, without explicitly identifying the two monarchs as one.[90]

In contrast to Brennan and Hakham, however, Barbiero has grasped the eschatological thrust of Psalms 1–2, and so also that of 3 through juxtaposition and numerous literary and thematic links to it.[91] He cites similar supporting comments by N. Lohfink and J.-M. Auwers.[92] Lohfink describes the effect of the blurring of boundaries between Psalms 1–3 as follows:

> Die Grenzen zwischen der Torheit gottloser Individuen, dem Aufbegehren der Nationen gegen den Geschichtsplan Gottes, der Verfolgung der Gerechten in Israel selbst verschwimmen. Ebenso die zwischen dem Gerechten, Gottes Gesalbten und dem ungerecht Verfolgten…[W]as in den Psalmen 2 und hiesig und jetzig zu sein scheint, gerät am Ende von Psalm 1 her in eine eschatologische Beleuchtung…[93]

In a similar vein Auwers considers Psalm 3 to have been chosen to provide continuity between Psalms 1–2 and the psalms that follow:

> Le Ps. 3 semble…avoir été choisi à dessein pour souligner la continuité entre le prologue et la suite, car, si on peut facilement reconnaître les Nations dans les 'nombreux ennemies' qui 'se lèvent' contre le psalmiste au Ps. 3, on peut aussi entendre la voix du roi-messie dans les accents royaux avec lesquels le psalmiste s'y exprime. Seul un roi peut d'ailleurs avoir comme ennemis les ennemis même de la nation.[94]

So Auwers, as did Brennan also, recognized that Psalm 3 has been chosen to provide continuity with Psalms 1–2. He also considers it easy to recognize the nations of Psalm 2 with the enemies of 3, and the king of the former with the royal speaker of the latter. In a later work Auwers repeats essentially the same for not only Psalm 3, but also for the rest of the Psalter.

> Et l'impression est ainsi créée que c'est la même voix qui s'exprime tout au long des psaumes. Celui qui dit, dès le Ps. 2: «Pourquoi ce tumulte de Nations?» (v. 1) est aussi celui qui dit: «YHWH, qu'ils sont nombreux mes adversaires!» (Ps. 3, 1), et ainsi de suite.[95]

89. Brennan, 'Psalms 1–8', p. 26.

90. Hakham, *Sefer Tehillim*, p. יג (13): בעזרת ה״ מכניע מלך ישׂראל את אויביו הרבים בתכנו דומה המזמור במקצת למזמור לפניו.

91. Barbiero, *Das erste*, pp. 33-34, also notes the interpretive effect of similar themes between the juxtaposed Mal. 3.22-24 and Psalms 1–2, a common Hebrew manuscript tradition, including the eschatological judgment announced in both.

92. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 66 n. 14.

93. Lohfink, 'Psalmgebet', p. 12.

94. Jean-Marie Auwers, 'Le Psautier hébraique et ses éditeurs: Recherches sur une forme canonique du livre des psaumes' (PhD dissertation, Louvain, 1994), p. 336 (unavailable to me, cited by, Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 66 n. 14).

95. Auwers, *La composition*, p. 93.

Auwers has correctly pointed the way for the interpretation of all subsequent psalms. Indeed, Psalm 4 immediately following exhibits numerous lexical parallels with the preceding Psalm 3. Barbiero lists ten lexical repetitions, four of which are in fact entire phrases.[96] Indeed, it is not difficult to observe continuity between Psalms 3 and 4, even from a cursory reading of the two.

The expectancy from reading any text, whether modern or ancient, is of unity and coherence, including an introduction of some sort to the principal characters and themes. The initial probes taken here of the Psalter's beginning indicate that this is the case, in spite of the fact that it is composed of approximately 150 discrete poems.[97] Evidence at every level indicates it is an integrated text, in spite of the fact that it does not conform in many instances to our modern preconceived protocols of what a book should be. It simply strains credulity to believe that the repeated and constant evidence of *concatenatio*, not only in the first three psalms but evident throughout the book, is simply literary adornment lacking interpretive significance. Auwers notes the difficulty in believing that common elements between psalms such as Ps. 145.14 and 146.8 could be fortuitous.[98] The same could be said of the preposition and plural noun לִמְשָׁאוֹת/למִשְׁאוֹת found in Pss. 73.18 and 74.3, a case of *dislegomenon* not only for the Psalter but for the entire Hebrew Bible.

We have shown, then, that Psalms 1 and 2 are intimately bound together as a unified and consistent introduction to the Psalter, and that Psalm 3 explores further topics raised in them. This is, however, only the beginning of the task that lies ahead, of analyzing in a similarly detailed manner each and every psalm according to the manner of their arrangement.[99] Auwers'

96. Barbiero, *Das erste*, p. 70. The four are רבים אמרים, 3.3, 4.7; ואתה יהוה, 3.4 and כי אתה יהוה, 4.9; אקרא ויעני, 3.5 and בקראי ענני, 4.2; שכבתי ואישנה, 3.6 and אשכבה ואישן, 4.9.

97. The modern critical edition *BHS* reflects a total of 149 psalms, as the Masoretic numbering reveals. Ps. 150 is numbered קמט.

98. Auwers, *La composition*, pp. 91-92: 'D'autres récurrences, par contre, peuvent difficilement être fortuites: ainsi, le verbe כפף «être courbé», qui est un des éléments qui assure l'enchaînement des Ps 145 et 146, ne se recontre qu'une seule fois ailleurs dans le Psautier (Ps. 57,7)'. Auwers goes on (p. 92) to state that it is impossible to determine if such common elements are or are not editorially inserted redactional sutures intended to reinforce the coherence of the whole. However, more important is the question of their effect on the reading of the two psalms. Redactional or not, these rare repeated terms (in this case it is an entire phrase, Ps. 145.14, וזוקף לכל הכפופים, Ps. 146.8, יהוה זקף כפופים) are clear evidence of cohesiveness between the two psalms, and intimate to the reader the need to discover the coherence to which they point.

99. We return then to the task defined, and yet ultimately abandoned apparently by Wilson, 'Understanding', p. 50: 'As must be obvious by now, I am convinced that any

words are again worth repeating as they cogently characterize and recommend to interpreters the basis for future research:

> Le Psautier n'était pas un simple amalgame de poèmes accumulés au cours des siècles, mais un «livre», au plein sens du terme, dont la forme même es porteuse d'une intention théologique qui rejaillit sur la signification des pièces individuelles.[100]

progress in understanding the purposeful arrangement of the psalms in the Psalter must begin, as in these last two studies, with a detailed and careful analysis of the linguistic, literary and thematic linkages that can be discerned among the psalms'.

100. Auwers, *La composition*, p. 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Joseph A., *Commentary on the Psalms* (Edinburgh: A. Elliot & J. Thin, 1864; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1991).

Allegro, John M., *Qumrân Cave 4*. I. *(4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD, 5; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

Alonso Schökel, Luis, *Treinta salmos: poesía y oración* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1986).

—*Diccionario bíblico hebreo-español* (Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo, 1991).

Alonso Schökel, Luis and Cecilia Carniti, *Salmos: Traducción, introducciones y comentario*. I. *Salmos 1–72* (Estella-Navarra: Editorial Verbo Divino, 2002).

Alter, Robert, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York: Basic Books, 1985).

Astorga Guerra, Pedro, 'Meditar la Torah en la historia y la historia desde la Torah: Sal 1 y 2 desde una lectura intertextual-cánonica (I)', *Estudios eclesiásticos* 84 (2009), pp. 3-40.

—'Jesús, el hombre dichoso e Hijo de Dios: Sal 1 y 2 desde una lectura intertextual-cánonica (II)', *Estudios eclesiásticos* 84 (2009), pp. 309-36.

Auffret, Pierre, *The Literary Structure of Psalm 2* (trans. David J.A. Clines; JSOTSup, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1977).

—*La sagesse a bâti sa maison: études de structures littéraires dan l'Ancien Testament et spécialement dans les psames* (Fribourg, Switzerland: Editions Universitaires, 1982).

Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos CI – CL* (ed. D.E. Dekkers and I. Fraipont; Turnhout: Brepols, 1956).

—*The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*. III/15. *Expositions of the Psalms 1–32* (ed. J.E. Rotelle; trans. M. Boulding; Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2000).

—*The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*. III/20. *Expositions of the Psalms 121–150* (ed. B. Ramsey; trans. M. Boulding; Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2004).

Auwers, Jean-Marie, 'Le Psautier hébraique et ses éditeurs: Recerches sur une forme canonique du livre des psaumes' (PhD dissertation, Louvain, 1994).

—*La composition littéraire du Psautier: un état de la question* (Cahiers de la Revue biblique, 46; Paris: J. Gabalda, 2000).

—'Le voies de l'exégèse canonique du Psautier', in J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (BETL, 163; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), pp. 5-26.

Barbiero, Gianni, *Das erste Psalmenbuch als Einheit: Eine synchrone Analyse von Psalm 1–41* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999).

Barth, Christoph, 'Concatenatio im ersten Buch des Psalters', in B. Benzing, O. Böcher and G. Mayer (eds.), *Wort und Wirklichkeit* (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1976), pp. 30-40.

Barthélemy, Dominique, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. IV. *Psaumes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005).
Belcher, Richard P., Jr, *The Messiah and the Psalms: Preaching Christ from All the Psalms* (Fearn, Ross-shire, Scotland: Mentor, 2006).
Berlin, Adele and Marc Zvi Brettler (eds.), *The Jewish Study Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 2004).
Berlin, Adele and Marc Zvi Brettler, 'Psalms', in Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler (eds.), *The Jewish Study Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 2004), pp. 1280-1446.
Blaising, Craig A., and Carmen S. Hardin (eds.), *Psalms 1–5*0 (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, 7; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008).
Botha, Phil J., 'Intertextuality and the Interpretation of Psalm 1', in Dirk Human (ed.), *Psalms and Mythology* (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2007), pp. 58-76.
Braude, William G. (trans.), *The Midrash on Psalms*, I (2 vols.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959).
Brennan, Joseph P., 'Some Hidden Harmonies in the Fifth Book of Psalms', in R.F. McNamara (ed.), *Essays in Honor of Joseph P. Brennan* (Rochester, NY: St Bernard's Seminary, 1976), pp. 126-58.
—'Psalms 1–8: Some Hidden Harmonies', *BTB* 10 (1980), pp. 25-29.
Brettler, Marc Zvi, 'Torah', in Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler (eds.), *The Jewish Study Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 2004), pp. 1-7.
Briggs, Charles A., and Emilie Grace Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, I (ICC; 2 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906).
Brown, William P., *Seeing the Psalms: A Theology of Metaphor* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2002).
Brownlee, William H., 'Psalms 1–2 as a Coronation Liturgy', *Biblica* 53 (1971), pp. 321-36.
Broyles, Craig C., *Psalms* (New International Biblical Commentary; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999).
Brueggemann, Walter, 'Bounded by Obedience and Praise: The Psalms as Canon', *JSOT* 50 (1991), pp. 63-92.
Bullinger, E.W., *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1898; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1968).
Calvin, John, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, I (trans. James Anderson; 5 vols.; Edinburgh: The Calvin Translation Society, instituted in 1843; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999).
Cassuto, U., 'The Sequence and Arrangement of the Biblical Sections', in *Biblical and Oriental Studies*. I. *Bible* (trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1973), pp. 1-6.
Childs, Brevard S., 'Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis', *JSS* 16 (1971), pp. 137-50.
—'Reflections on the Modern Study of the Psalms', in Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke and Patrick D. Miller Jr (eds.), *Magnalia Dei, The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), pp. 377-88.
—*Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).
Clifford, Richard J., *Psalms 1–72* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002).
Cohen, Menachem (ed.), *Miqra'ot gedolot haketer: Psalms*, I (2 vols.; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2003).
Cole, Robert L., *The Shape and Message of Book III (Psalms 73–89)* (JSOTSup, 307; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
—'An Integrated Reading of Psalms 1 and 2', *JSOT* 98 (2002), pp. 75-88.

Craigie, Peter C., *Psalms 1–50* (WBC, 19; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983).
Creach, Jerome F.D., 'Like a Tree Planted by the Temple Stream: The Portrait of the Righteous in Psalm 1:3', *CBQ* 61 (1999), pp. 34-46.
Delitzsch, Franz, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes.* V. *Psalms* (trans. F. Bolton; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982).
Díez Merino, Luis (ed.), *Targum de Salmos: Edición príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil no. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora* (Madrid: Instituto Francisco Suárez, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1982).
Diodore of Tarsus, *Commentary on Psalms 1–51* (trans. Robert C. Hill; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).
Durlesser, James A., 'Poetic Style in Psalm 1 and Jeremiah 17:5-8: A Rhetorical Critical Study', *Semitics* 9 (1984), pp. 30-48.
Eaton, J.H., *Psalms* (London: SCM Press, 1967).
Eerdmans, B.D., *The Hebrew Book of Psalms* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1947).
Eissler, Friedmann, *Königspsalmen und karäische Messiaserwartung: Jefet ben Elis Auslegung von Ps. 2.72.89.110.132 im Vergleich mit Saadja Gaons Deutung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2002).
Erasmus, Desiderius, *Collected Works of Erasmus*. LXIII. *Exposition of the Psalms* (ed. Dominic Baker-Smith; trans. Michael J. Heath; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997).
Even-Shoshan, Abraham, *A New Concordance of the Bible* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1982).
Ewald, Heinrich, *The History of Israel*. I. *Introduction and Preliminary History* (ed. Russell Martineau; London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 4th edn, 1883).
Flint, Peter W., and Patrick D. Miller Jr (eds.), *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (VTSup, 99; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005).
Forbes, John, *Studies on the Book of Psalms: The Structural Connection of the Book of Psalms, Both in Single Psalms and in the Psalter as an Organic Whole* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1888).
Gillingham, Sue, 'From Liturgy to Prophecy: The Use of Psalmody in Second Temple Judaism', *CBQ* 64 (2002), pp. 470-89.
—'The Zion Tradition and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter', in John Day (ed.), *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), pp. 308-41.
Goldingay, John, *Psalms*. I. *Psalms 1–41* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006).
Gordon, Cyrus H., *Ugaritic Textbook* (Analecta Orientalia, 38; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1965, reeditio photomechanica, 1967).
Goulder, Michael, *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah* (JSOTSup, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic press, 1982).
Grant, Jamie, *The King as Exemplar: The Function of Deuteronomy's Kingship Law in the Shaping of the Book of Psalms* (SBL Academia Biblica, 17; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004).
Grossberg, Daniel, *Centripetal and Centrifugal Structures in Biblical Poetry* (SBLMS, 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).
Gruber, Mayer I., *Rashi's Commentary on Psalms 1–89 (Books I–III)* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).
Gunkel, Hermann, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913).
—*Einleitung in die Psalmen: Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels* (Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, Ergänzungsband zur II Abteilung; completed by J. Begrich; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933).

—*Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel* (trans. J.D. Nogalski; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998).
Hakham, Amos, *Sefer Tehillim* ספר תהלים (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1979).
—*The Bible: Psalms with the Jerusalem Commentary* (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 2003).
Hengstenberg, E.W., *Commentary on the Psalms* (trans. P. Fairbairn and J. Thomson; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 3rd edn, 1851).
Hitzig, Ferdinand, *Die Psalmen* (Leipzig: C.F. Winter, 1863).
Høgenhaven, Jesper, 'The Opening of the Psalter: A Study in Jewish Theology', *SJOT* 15 (2001), pp. 169-80.
The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989).
The Holy Bible: Today's New International Version (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005).
Hosch, H.E., 'Psalms 1 and 2: A Discourse Analysis', *Notes on Translation* 15.3 (2001), pp. 4-12.
Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger, *Die Psalmen*. I. *Psalm 1–50* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 2003).
Howard, David M., Jr, 'The Psalms and Current Study', in D. Firth and P.S. Johnson (eds.), *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press Academic, 2005), pp. 23-40.
Justin Martyr, *The First and Second Apologies* (trans. L.W. Barnard; New York: Paulist Press, 1997).
Kadari, Menahem-Zvi, *Milon ha'ivrit hamiqra'it* מלון העברית המקראית (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2006.
Kimḥi, David, *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimḥi on the Book of Psalms* (trans. A.W. Greenup; 8 vols.; London: Palestine House, 1918).
Kirkpatrick, A.F., *The Book of Psalms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902).
Kittel, D.R., *Die Psalmen* (Liepzig: A. Deichert, 1922).
Kraus, Hans-Joachim, *Psalms 1–59: A Continental Commentary* (trans. Hilton C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
Kugel, James L., *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981).
Limburg, James, *Psalms* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2000).
Lipiński, Edward, 'Macarismes et psaumes de congratulation', *RB* 75 (1968), pp. 321-67.
Lohfink, Norbert, 'Psalmengebet und Psalterredaktion', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 34 (1992), pp. 1-22.
Lohfink, Norbert and Erich Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994).
Longman, Tremper, III, and Raymond B. Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2nd edn, 2006).
Luther, Martin, *Luther's Works*. X. *First Lectures on the Psalms I: Psalms 1–7* (ed. Hilton C. Oswald; St Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1974).
Manatti, M. and E. de Solms, *Les Psaumes*. I (4 vols.; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1966).
McCann, J. Clinton, Jr, 'The Book of Psalms', in Leander E. Keck, *et al*. (eds.), *The New Interpreter's Bible*, IV (12 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), pp. 639-1280.
—'The Shape of Book I of the Psalter and the Shape of Human Happiness', in Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller Jr (eds.), *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (VTSup, 99; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005), pp. 340-48.

Merwe, Christo H.J. van der, Jackie A. Naudé and Jan H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
Metzger, Bruce M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, corrected edn,1975).
Meyer, Rudolf, *Hebräische Grammatik*. III. *Satzlehre* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1972).
Michel, Diethelm, *Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1960).
Millard, Matthias, *Die Komposition des Psalters* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994).
Miller, Patrick D., Jr, 'The Beginning of the Psalter', in J. Clinton McCann Jr (ed.), *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (JSOTSup, 159; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 83-92.
Mitchell, David C., *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms* (JSOTSup, 252; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
—'Lord, Remember David: G.H. Wilson and the Message of the Psalter', *VT* 56 (2006), pp. 526-48.
Muñoz León, Domingo, *Dios-Palabra: Memra en los Targumim del Pentateuco* (Granada: Institución San Jerónimo, 1974).
Nasuti, Harry P., 'The Interpretive Significance of Sequence and Selection in the Book of Psalms', in Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller Jr (eds.), *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (VTSup, 99; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005), pp. 311-39.
Nelson, R.D., 'Josiah in the Book of Joshua', *JBL* 100 (1981), pp. 531-40.
Oehming, M., *Das Buch der Psalmen* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000).
Ortlund, Eric N., 'An Intertextual Reading of the Theophany of Psalm 97', *SJOT* 20 (2006), pp. 273-85.
Petersen, David L., and Kent Harold Richards, *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).
Porter, J. Roy, 'The Succession of Joshua', in G.N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville (eds.), *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), pp. 139-62.
Putnam, Frederick Clark, *Hebrew Bible Insert: A Student's Guide to the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew* (Quakertown, PA: Stylus, 1996).
Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4*. V. *Miqṣat Ma'aśe ha-Torah* (DJD, 10; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
Rahlfs, Alfred, (ed.), *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).
Reindl, Joseph, 'Weisheitliche Bearbeitung von Psalmen: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Sammlung des Psalter', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Vienna, 1980* (VTSup, 32; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981), pp. 333-54.
Rendtorff, Rolf, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. John Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).
—*The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. D.E. Orton; Leiden: Deo, 2005).
Reynolds, Kent Aaron, *Torah as Teacher: The Exemplary Torah Student in Psalm 119* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2010).
Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, I (10 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1885–87; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994).
Roberts, J.J.M., 'The Enthronement of Yhwh and David: The Abiding Theological Significance of the Kingship Language of the Psalms', *CBQ* 64 (2002), pp. 675-86.
Rosël, C., *Die messianische Redaktion des Psalters: Studien zu Enstehung und Theologie der Sammlung Psalm 2–89* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1999).

Ross, Allen P., *Introducing Biblical Hebrew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001).
Schaefer, Konrad, *Psalms* (Berit Olam; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001).
Schaper, Joachim, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995).
Schneider, Wolfgang, *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch: Ein Lehrbuch* (München: Claudius, 2001).
Seitz, Christopher, *Word without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Theological Witness* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998).
Seybold, Klaus, *Introducing the Psalms* (trans. R. Graeme Dunphy; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990).
—*Die Psalmen* (HAT, I/15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996).
Sheppard, Gerald T., *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament* (BZAW, 151; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1980).
—'Theology and the Book of Psalms', *Interpretation* 46 (1992), pp. 143-55.
Silzer, Peter James and Thomas John Finley, *How Biblical Languages Work* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2004).
Simon, Uriel, *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra* (trans. L.J. Schramm; State University of New York Press, 1991).
Soggin, J.A., 'Zum ersten Psalm', *TZ* 23 (1967), pp. 81-96.
Sommer, Benjamin D., 'Isaiah', in Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler (eds.), *The Jewish Study Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 2004), pp. 780-916.
Stordalen, Terje, *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000).
Terrien, Samuel, *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003).
Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on Psalms 1–81* (trans. Robert C. Hill; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).
VanGemeren, Willem A., 'Psalms', in Frank E. Gæbelein (ed.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. V. *Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991), pp. 1-880.
Villanueva, Federico G., *The 'Uncertainty of a Hearing': A Study of the Sudden Change of Mood in the Psalms of Lament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2008).
Vogels, Walter, 'A Structural Analysis of Ps. 1', *Biblica* 60 (1979), pp. 410-16.
Walter, D.M., A. Vogel and R.Y. Ebied (eds.), *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshiṭta Version*. II/3. *The Book of Psalms* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980).
Walton, John H., 'Psalms: A Cantata about the Davidic Covenant', *JETS* 34 (1991), pp. 21-31.
Watson, Wilfred G.E., *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOTSup, 26; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986).
Weber, Beat, 'Psalm 1 and its Function as a Directive into the Psalter and towards a Biblical Theology', *OTE* 19 (2006), pp. 237-60.
Weiser, Artur, *The Psalms: A Commentary* (trans. H. Hartwell; The Wartburg Press, 1959; repr. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1969).
Wenham, Gordon J., 'Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story', *PWCJS* 9 (1986), pp. 19-25.
—*Genesis 1–15* (WBC, 1; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987).
—'Towards a Canonical Reading of the Psalms', in Craig G. Bartholomew, *et al*. eds.), *Canon and Biblical Interpretation* (Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, 7; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006), pp. 333-51.

Westermann, Claus, *Praise and Lament in the Psalms* (trans. Keith R. Crim and Richard N.Soulen; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981).

Whybray, Norman, *Reading the Psalms as a Book* (JSOTSup, 222; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

Widengren, G., 'King and Covenant', *JSS* 2 (1957), pp. 1-32.

Williamson, H.G.M., 'The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles', *VT* 36 (1976), pp. 351-61.

Willis, John T., 'Psalm 1–An Entity', *ZAW* 91 (1979), pp. 381-401.

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

—'The Use of Royal Psalms at the "Seams" of the Hebrew Psalter', *JSOT* 35 (1986), pp. 85-94.

—'Understanding the Purposeful Arrangement of Psalms in the Psalter: Pitfalls and Promise', in J. Clinton McCann Jr (ed.), *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (JSOTSup, 159; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 42-51.

—*Psalms*, I (NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002).

—'Psalms and Psalter: Paradigm for Biblical Theology', in Scott J. Hafemann (ed.), *Biblical Theology: Retrospect and Prospect* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), pp. 100-10.

—'King, Messiah, and the Reign of God: Revisiting the Royal Psalms and the Shape of the Psalter', in Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller Jr (eds.), *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (VTSup, 99; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005), pp. 391-406.

Zenger, Erich, H.-J. Fabry, G. Braulik, G. Hentschel, *et al*., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Stuttgart: Verlag Kohlhammer, 6th edn, 2006).

Zimmerli, Walther, 'Zwillingspsalmen', in Josef Schreiner (ed.), *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch: Beiträge zu Psalmen und Propheten* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1972), pp. 105-13.

Indexes

Index of Biblical References

Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

Index of Authors