UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG

UNIVERSALITY AND PARTICULARITY IN THE DAY OF YAHWEH THEME WITH SPECIAL FOCUS ON ZEPHANIAH I

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES

BY

WESLEY IRWIN TOEWS

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

JANUARY 1980

UNIVERSALITY AND PARTICULARITY IN THE DAY OF YAHWEH THEME WITH SPECIAL FOCUS ON ZEPHANIAH I

BY

WESLEY IRWIN TOEWS

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

Most of the abbreviations used in this thesis are found in "Instructions for Contributors," Journal of Biblical Literature 95 (1976), 331-46.

The remaining two abbreviations are:

DY	the Day of Yahweh
MT	Massoretic Text

INTRODUCTION

The following investigation takes its point of departure from the results of previous literary-critical work on Zeph 1. It is usually noted that the phrase "the Day of Yahweh" (DY) occupies a central position in this chapter. Furthermore, interpreters have generally recognized that the core of the chapter (vv 4-16), with its focus on the judgment of Judah and Jerusalem, is set within a framework (vv 2-3, 17-18) which speaks of universal judgment. Several scholars conclude that the latter verses do not derive from the same author as do vv 4-16. They argue that the framework differs stylistically from the intervening material. Furthermore, they claim that Zephaniah, as all other pre-exilic prophets, spoke first and foremost to Judah and Jerusalem, and that therefore the universal perspective lay outside of his scope. These interpreters attribute the verses in question (vv 2-3, 17-18) to an eschatological redactor who worked during the exilic or post-exilic period. Thus they implicitly deny that Zephaniah could have given universal application to the DY theme.

This implicit denial requires testing. At its basis stands the claim that the universal perspective lay outside the scope of the pre-exilic prophets. This claim must also be carefully evaluated. Of course, the mere demonstration of

its invalidity will not suffice to prove the original unity of Zeph 1 since other pertinent literary-critical considerations must also be brought forward before any such conclusion can be reached. However, if the claim is shown to be invalid, this result will be sufficient to dismiss the assumption that Zephaniah, being a pre-exilic prophet, could not have given universal application to the DY theme.

However, the primary purpose of the following study is not to determine which are the authentic words of Zephaniah (although some light may incidentally be shed on that question). Nor is it our objective merely to show that Zephaniah may have given universal application to the DY theme. Rather, the central concern of this thesis is to inquire whether the dual perspective of universality and particularity as found in Zeph 1 is characteristic of the DY theme, or, stated in other words, whether the DY theme and the "pattern of universality and particularity" are closely related. Clearly the aforementioned literary-critical assumption that the universal perspective lay outside of the scope of the pre-exilic prophets would point towards a negative conclusion for this question, at least within the context of pre-exilic prophecy. This result serves to bring the question into sharper focus. Thus our special interest within the broader question concerning the relationship of the DY theme to the pattern of universality and particularity in the prophetic corpus as a whole is to inquire whether the two

themes were already interrelated in pre-exilic prophetic thought.

Initial confirmation of a linkage between the DY theme and the pattern of universality and particularity is given by the apparent collocation of the pattern with this theme in several passages outside of the Book of Zephaniah, namely, in Isa 2, 13, Ezek 7, 30, Joel 2, 4, and Zech 14. The first of two basic steps in the following investigation will be a careful examination of these texts to test whether it is plausible that in their original state they actually did exhibit the pattern of universality and particularity in connexion with the DY theme. This will give evidence as to whether or not these two aspects were closely interrelated. However, since several of these passages are certainly of post-exilic origin, it will be necessary in a second step to search for additional evidence in pre-exilic biblical literature to determine whether or not the universal dimension actually lay outside of the scope of the pre-exilic prophets. In this way support may be given to the thesis that the aforementioned pattern was already characteristic of the DY theme in pre-exilic times.

Before launching into the investigation itself it is further necessary to clarify what is meant by "the pattern of universality and particularity." Particularity shall refer to the narrowing of perspective in which a well-defined locality or group of people such as a city or a nation is

specified as the object of concern. Universality shall denote the generalizing of perspective in which precise definition of the object of concern is lacking. This general perspective is indicated by such terms as "world," "all nations," and "all the earth," or perhaps by the absence of any terms that might restrict the scope of reference. The collocation of universality and particularity shall be referred to as "the pattern of universality and particularity."

CHAPTER I

A SURVEY OF THE LITERARY-CRITICAL TREATMENT OF ZEPH I.2-3, 17-18

The Book of Zephaniah has been subjected to severe fragmentation since the early part of the nineteenth century when proponents of the literary-critical methodology began to question the authenticity first of small sections and finally of the greater part of Zeph 2 and 3. However, the authenticity of Zeph 1 was scarcely questioned until the early years of the present century when vv 2-3 and 17-18 came under question. At present no consensus of opinion has been reached with regard to the authenticity of these verses. The purpose of this chapter is to survey past critical work on Zeph 1 in order to isolate the criteria used in the literary criticism of these verses. The procedure will be to examine selected, pertinent sources in chronological sequence.[1]

As has already been stated, the authenticity of Zeph 1 was scarcely questioned during the nineteenth century. Therefore, the mention of two commentators from that time

---

[1]I will be very selective when dealing with sources dating to the nineteenth and early twentieth century, focusing particularly on those which introduce new dimensions into the interpretation of the verses under question, but I will deal rather exhaustively with sources published in the last fifty years.

will be adequate for our purposes. C. F. Keil did not entertain any doubt with regard to the authenticity of Zeph 1.2-3, 17-18.[2] J. Wellhausen rejected only the latter part of v 3 on the grounds that it was "intolerably repetitious" of the first part of the verse, and that the reśāʿîm were an unknown class of men before the time of Ezekiel.[3]

Shortly after the turn of the century J. M. P. Smith voiced some doubt as to whether the destruction spoken of in vv 17-18 should really be understood as universal in scope. However, he still leaned towards the opinion that these verses, along with vv 2-3, concerned a universal judgment.[4]

Similarly, W. Nowack questioned whether the scope of vv 2-3 was universal. He deleted kōl from v 2a, deleted v 2b, and thus deprived v 2 of its universal thrust. He considered it noteworthy that hāʾadāmâ rather than hāʾāreṣ appeared in v 3d. For him this choice of words indicated that the reference was to the prophet's own country. In vv 17-18 he judged everything after tēʾākēl to be a secondary addition.

---

[2]C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: The Twelve Minor Prophets, trans. James Martin, Clark's Foreign Theological Library (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1868), p. 126.

[3]Julius Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1898), pp. 150-151.

[4]J. M. P. Smith, W. H. Ward, and J. A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912), pp. 207 and 185-86.

Thus, universality was to be found neither in vv 2-3 nor in vv 17-18.[5]

E. Sellin introduced the idea that Zeph 1 comprises two authentic, originally distinct poems, namely, vv 2-6, 8-13 and vv 7, 14-18. He distinguished the two poems from each other on the basis that in the first poem Yahweh speaks in the first person singular whereas in the second he is spoken of in the third person singular. The two poems were given a thematic connexion by a later writer who inserted v 7 into its present position and added references to "the day" in vv 9, 10, and 12. In this way the DY theme which was already the focus of vv 14-18 was introduced to the first poem as well.

Sellin recognized the universality and particularity of the judgment pronouncement in the first poem (vv 2-6, 8-13), but he did not associate this pattern with the DY theme because, in his opinion, the DY theme originally belonged only to the second poem (vv 7, 14-18). According to his interpretation of the second poem, the DY was not a day of judgment particularly for Judah and Jerusalem, but, rather, it was a day of judgment with a universal scope. Sellin claimed that the DY was portrayed in the same universal dimensions by the older prophets.[6]

---

[5]W. Nowack, Die kleinen Propheten, 3rd rev. ed., Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922), pp. 291-92 and 296.

[6]Ernst Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, KAT

It was G. Gerleman, as far as I have been able to ascertain, who first denied the authenticity of vv 2-3 and 17-18. Of vv 2-3 he said:

> Die beiden Verse dürften nicht von Zephanja herrühren. Statt der folgenden geschichtlich orientierten Gerichtsschilderungen, wo bestimmte soziale Schichten oder geographisch angegebene Gebiete vom Gericht betroffen werden sollen, finden wir hier eine Weltgerichtsschilderung. Sie gehört in eine Zeit, wo der Gerichtsgedanke von der faktischen Geschichte losgerissen worden ist. Nur in dieser Gestalt besass für spätere Zeiten eine Gerichtsprophetie Aktualität. Hier ist die Weltgerichtsschilderung als eine stattliche Einleitung des folgenden eingefügt worden.[7]

Similarly, he said of v 18:

> Bei diesem Vers dürfte die spätere Hälfte, 18 bc, die übrigens reine Prosa ist, von demselben eschatologischen Bearbeiter herrühren, der das Zephanjabuch mit einer Einleitung versehen hat, V. 2 und 3. Hier wie in der Einleitung ist es die ganze Erde und alle ihre Bewohner, die vernichtet werden sollen, während im übrigen Teil des Kapitels das Gericht geschichtlich und örtlich verankert ist: es gilt Jerusalem. Weiter sind die Blicke des Propheten nicht gewandert. Auch finden wir sonst überall bestimmte Gruppen des Volkes, gegen die sich der Prophet wendet: den fremdenfreundlichen Hof, die ungerechten und religiös gleichgültigen Kaufleute und vor allem die Baʿalsverehrer, welche mit völliger Vernichtung bedroht werden.[8]

It is clear that Gerleman judged the collocation of universality and particularity to be inauthentic on the basis of

---

(Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, 1922), pp. 368-79. He suggests that such a universal dimension is apparent in Isa 2.12ff and Amos 5.18f, 8.9f.

[7]Gillis Gerleman, Zephanja: Textkritisch und literarisch untersucht (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1942), p. 5.

[8]Ibid., p. 22.

his conviction that the prophets of pre-exilic times were concerned only with their own country and that the universal perspective belonged to a later time.

According to F. Nötscher, all sections of the Book of Zephaniah, aside from some unimportant additions, are authentic. A redactor brought the sections into an outward unity. Nötscher distinguishes three sections in the first chapter, namely, vv 2-3; 4-6, 8-13; and 7, 14-18. He does not indicate clearly whether or not he considers these to be units distinct from each other. Of the DY he writes that it meant terror for all nations, and that the fate of Jerusalem in particular was meant to be seen as a warning for the other nations.[9]

L. P. Smith and E. R. Lacheman have taken the most radical view with regard to the authenticity of the Book of Zephaniah. They find that only Zeph 1.4-13 fits the sixth century. The rest of the book they believe to be a pseudepigraphon authored by an apocalyptic writer around the time 200 B.C. In support of this claim they attempt to show that the book is literally and linguistically dependant on the books of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Since, in their opinion, only Zeph 1.4-13 could be pre-exilic and authentic, vv 2-3, 17-18 must be of post-exilic origin.[10]

---

[9]Friedrich Nötscher, Das Alte Testament: Zwölfprophetenbuch oder kleine Propheten (Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1948), pp. 127-30.

[10]Louise Pettibone Smith and Ernest R. Lacheman,

A. Edens, in his translation of the Book of Zephaniah, indicates that he considers all of Zeph 1, with the exception of several small glosses, to be the authentic work of Zephaniah.[11] He rejects Sellin's idea that universality as a motif in the DY theme had its precedent in Amos 5.18f, 8.9f, and Isa 2.12ff. Edens thinks that those passages do not have a truly universal scope. In his opinion, the description of the DY as a day of universal judgment was Zephaniah's original and most significant contribution. Though his primary concern was with Judah and Jerusalem, Zephaniah also proclaimed a universal judgment. Neither the particular nor the universal were incidental to his message.[12]

C. L. Taylor ascribes vv 2-3 to an "eschatological writer whom nothing less than universal destruction would satisfy." Furthermore, if the reading in v 17, "I will bring distress on men," were shown to be correct, Taylor would consider it together with most of v 18 to be a secondary addition on account of its universalism.[13]

"The Authorship of the Book of Zephaniah," JNES 9 (1950), 137-42. As far as I have been able to determine, the thesis advanced by these authors has found no acceptance among scholars.

[11]Ambrose Edens, "A Study of the Book of Zephaniah as to the Date, Extent and Significance of the Genuine Writings with a Translation" (Ph. D. Thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1953), pp. 171-81.

[12]Ibid., pp. 130-34 and 166-67.

[13]Charles L. Taylor, "The Book of Zephaniah," IB, 12 vols (New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1956): 6, 1010.

In the opinion of K. Elliger, the several small units of Zeph 1 were only brought into unity by a redactor. With reference to vv 2-6, he considers it plausible that the same speaker might have concentrated especially on Judah and included this particular concern in the context of a universal threat. The older prophets were aware of the cosmic dimensions of the DY and did not limit their prophecies concerning it to their own land. However, Elliger thinks that vv 2-3 do not harmonize metrically with vv 4-6. He explains that a redactor may have taken what were genuine words of Zephaniah and given them a universal and eschatological significance. Elliger explains the relationship between v 16 and vv 17-18 in the same way. The metre of vv 17-18 (as also of vv 2-3) is irregular, almost prosaic. In content vv 17-18 are also similar to vv 2-3. Therefore Elliger prefers to understand these introductory and concluding verses as the work of a redactor rather than as glosses or incidental additions.[14]

D. L. Williams claims that Zephaniah's concern was with Judah, not with other nations. Therefore, any terms or phrases that indicate universality must be the work of a post-exilic editor. In William's own words, " . . . Zephaniah's theology of the Day of Yahweh contains no overtones of a universal destruction, which would prelude the

---

[14]Karl Elliger, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten, 3rd ed., ATD (Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 1956), pp. 59-61, 66-67.

end of the world."[15] He finds the concreteness of vv 4-16 to be inconsistent with the indefiniteness of vv 2-3. The judgment of vv 4-16 seems insignificant against that of vv 2-3. Furthermore, vv 2-3 are metrically irregular. In view of these considerations Williams concludes that vv 2-3 are editorially expanded. He restores a strophe that may be translated as follows:

> I will utterly destroy everything,
> says Yahweh,
> I will destroy man and beast,
> from upon the face of the ground.[16]

Williams also doubts the originality of v 18, especially the section following tē'ākēl which indicates a universal perspective.[17]

F. Horst doubts that vv 2-3 and 17-18 could be the work of a redactor. He says that Zeph 1, as it now stands, exemplifies a construction sometimes evident in oracles. A pregnant oracular kernel is spelled out in greater detail. In this case it is the "everything" of v 2 that is being detailed in vv 4-16. Horst finds it peculiar that the listing of creatures to be destroyed (v 3) is diverted into

---

[15]Donald Leigh Williams, "Zephaniah: A Re-interpretation" (Ph. D. Dissertation, Duke University, 1961), p. 57.

[16]Ibid., pp. 79-91. The reconstructed consonantal text is as follows:

> 'sp 'sp kl
> n'm yhwh
> 'sp 'dm wbhmh
> m'l pny h'dmh

[17]Ibid., p. 152-57.

a threat against the "wicked." The purpose of this diversion is to form a bridge with the verses which follow. In Horst's opinion, this bridge passage is certainly redactional.[18]

C. A. Keller judges v 6 to be a gloss. The rest of the chapter he considers authentic. The DY, in his interpretation, is directed not only against a particular people, but against all living persons.[19]

L. Sabottka does not doubt the authenticity of vv 2-3. He draws attention to other passages in the book, namely, 1.17f, 2.4-15, and 3.8f, in which he finds a similar universal dimension. He argues that other prophets, for instance, Nahum and Habakkuk, also placed their message into universal frameworks.[20]

A. S. Kapelrud also contends that vv 2-3 and 17-18 are Zephaniah's own work. If these verses are viewed only in connexion with vv 4-13, the difference is remarkable because of the radical change in perspective. On the other hand, Kapelrud urges, the structure of the entire book must be kept in the analysis. In vv 14-16 the prophet warns of the imminent DY. This warning is first and foremost directed

---

[18]Theodore H. Robinson and Friedrich Horst, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, 3rd ed., HAT (Tübingen: J C B Mohr, 1964), p. 191.

[19]Carl A. Keller and René Vuilleumier, Michée, Nahoum, Habacuc, Sophonie, CAT (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1971), pp. 187 and 194-96.

[20]L. Sabottka, Zephanja: Versuch einer Neuübersetzung mit philologischem Kommentar, Biblica et Orientalia N. 25 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972), p. 5.

against Jerusalem, but Zeph 2 leaves no doubt that the DY has serious implications for all the nations surrounding Judah. Even though the prophet does not include the whole world in his oracles against the nations, these oracles show that his scope is broad. Concerning the relationship between the universality and particularity of Zeph 1, Kapelrud explains, " . . . it was quite natural to start with a shocking utterance that the whole world was going to be gathered in and destroyed. It was a thundering fanfare which might serve to arouse the anxious interest of the prophet's audience."[21]

The most recent monograph on the Book of Zephaniah is an investigation by H. Irsigler which follows W. Richter's "literaturwissenschaftliche" method. Irsigler distinguishes the following units in Zeph 1: v 1; vv 2-3; 4-5; 6; 7; 8b-9; 10c-11; 12b-13b; 13c-f; 14-16; 17a-b, d-e, 18a; and 18b-c.[22] Within these units several small additions are to be found. Irsigler uses several criteria for the separation of these units from each other and from the additions. Among these criteria are repetition, change in person, change in scope, change in theme, and change in rhythm. Thus vv 2-3 are

---

[21]Arvid S. Kapelrud, The Message of the Prophet Zephaniah, Morphology and Ideas (Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø: Universitets-forlaget, 1975), p. 16. See also pp. 13-31.

[22]Hubert Irsigler, Gottesgericht und Jahwetag: Die Komposition Zef 1,1-2,3, untersucht auf der Grundlage der Literarkritik des Zefanjabuches, Münchener Universitäts-schriften, Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament (St. Ottelien: Eos Verlag, 1977), p. 111.

distinguished from vv 4-5 by the change in scope and by sticho-metric considerations. Vv 2-3 are also distinguished from the DY text, i.e., from vv 7, 14-16, by the change in person of the verb. Similarly, vv 17-18 are distinguished from vv 14-16 by the change in person of the verb, and by the change in theme. Moreover, in structure the stichs of vv 17-18 are much more symmetrical than those of vv 15-16.[23]

Regarding the relationship of the units to each other, Irsigler finds that the units vv 4-5, 8-9, 10-11, and 12-13 are thematically related to each other and compositionally linked with the DY units, i.e., with vv 7, 14-16.[24] He considers it possible that vv 7-13 may have been the first section to be compiled in the earliest stages of the formation of Zeph 1. This may have occurred during the early exilic period.[25] The last step in the formation of Zeph 1 would have been the addition of the units vv 2-3 and 17 a-b, d-e, 18a which are clearly secondary to vv 4-16. These units may stem from the same hand and belong to the exilic or early post-exilic times.[26]

From the foregoing survey of past critical work on Zeph 1 it is clear that scholarly opinion on the interpretation and authenticity of Zeph 1.2-3, 17-18 has been and remains divided. Several commentators, including Sellin,

---

[23]Ibid., pp. 100-1, 104, 108-11.

[24]Ibid., p. 113. [25]Ibid., p. 458.

[26]Ibid., pp. 112 and 459.

Nötscher, Edens, Keller, Sabottka, and Kapelrud, find little difficulty in interpreting these verses in a universal sense or in ascribing them to the pre-exilic prophet, Zephaniah. On the other hand, a significant group, including Nowack, Gerleman, Smith and Lacheman, Taylor, Elliger, Williams, and Irsigler, would deny the universal perspective to the pre-exilic prophets and, therefore, either deny the pre-exilic origin and authenticity of these verses or interpret them in a non-universal sense.

The criteria which have been advanced as a basis for a non-universal interpretation of these verses, or for distinguishing them from vv 4-16 and for questioning their authenticity include change in person (Irsigler), change in theme (Irsigler), and sticho-metric irregularity (Irsigler and Elliger). However, the criterion most often applied is that the universal scope was inconsistent with the perspective of the pre-exilic prophets. Of these criteria, the first three may be classified as literary-critical. The last will be classified as an ideological criterion because, on the part of the interpreter, it assumes a certain knowledge of the ideology of pre-exilic prophets and excises passages which are inconsistent with this assumption. The evaluation of this ideological criterion forms the basic agenda of this thesis.

Also evident from the foregoing survey is the fact that in past interpretations of Zeph 1 the pattern of

universality and particularity has seldom been associated with the DY theme.[27] In order to investigate the possibility of the interrelatedness of this pattern and this theme it may be instructive to compare several other prophetic texts that include the expression "the Day of Yahweh," to see whether they announce a judgment that has both a universal and a particular scope. If texts such as these are found to predate the time of Zephaniah, they will be treated as precedents which he may consciously or unconsciously have followed. If, on the other hand, some such texts are found to originate later than the time of Zephaniah, they will still provide useful confirmation for the thesis that the DY theme and the pattern of universality and particularity were characteristically interrelated. However, even if this thesis is confirmed by texts pre-dating Zephaniah, this will not necessarily prove that Zephaniah himself cast his announcement of the DY in both universal and particular terms. It could be that Zephaniah's message was later edited to correspond to an established pattern. What will be demonstrated is that the verses containing the universal perspective cannot be denied to Zephaniah merely on the basis of the ideological criterion discussed above.

Before other texts are brought into this investigation it is necessary to demonstrate that Zeph 1, in its present state, actually does exhibit the pattern of

---

[27]A notable exception is Edens, "A Study of the Book of Zephaniah," pp. 130-34.

universality and particularity. According to Nowack and Williams, vv 2-3, 17-18 originally did not have a universal thrust.[28] However, even Williams' reconstructed text of vv 2-3[29] can hardly be interpreted in a restricted sense. The kōl of the first line immediately suggests a generalized perspective. The significance of this word is explained by the phrase ʾădām ûbĕhēmâ. ʾādām is a generic term, and it together with bĕhēmâ can signify all life (cf. Jer 7.20, 21.6, 27.5).[30] The destruction of kōl means the destruction of ʾădām ûbĕhēmâ. The arena within which this destruction is to take place is hāʾădāmâ. The fact that hāʾădāmâ rather than hāʾāreṣ is used hardly lends support to a restricted interpretation.[31] The two words are often used as synonyms in parallel structure. Besides, the phrase pĕnê hāʾădāmâ suggests that ʾadāmâ is being used in a general sense as is often done (Gen 6.7, 7.4, 8.8, Exod 32.12, Deut 6.15, and I Sam 20.15).[32] Furthermore, it may be argued that the received text of Zeph 1.2-3 alludes to the flood story. Zeph 1.3 and Gen 6.7 have in common the phrase mēʿal pĕnê hāʾădāmâ and also the terms which follow in the catalogues of things that will be destroyed. The universal scope of

---

[28] See above, pp. 5 and 11.

[29] See above, p. 11.

[30] So Irsigler, Gottesgericht, p. 95.

[31] Contra Nowack, Die kleinen Propheten, p. 291.

[32] So Irsigler, Gottesgericht, p. 101.

the flood story cannot be doubted. Apparently the author of Zeph 1.2-3 intended to incorporate the same universal dimension into his own work. Thus, along with the majority of scholars, it is best to understand Zeph 1.2-3 in a universal sense.

Vv 17-18 are deprived of their universal force both by Nowack and Williams who declare everything after tē'ākēl to be secondary to the verse.[33] If they are right, this unit certainly does lose most of its universal force. Nevertheless, it should be noted that these verses lack terms that would suggest any kind of localization or restriction in scope.

Besides vv 2-3 and 17-18 there is one other section in this chapter with an unrestricted scope. In vv 14-16 no particular historical or geographical point of contact can be determined. The DY is perceived to be a day of cosmic consequence.[34]

The particularity in this chapter needs little discussion. It is obvious in the geographical designations in v 4 and vv 10-12, and also in the designation of certain social classes in v 8. Thus, in view of the foregoing discussion, especially with regard to vv 2-3, it is evident

---

[33]Nowack, Die kleinen Propheten, p. 296, and Williams, "Zephaniah: A Re-interpretation," p. 157. This opinion is also shared by other scholars.

[34]So Irsigler, Gottesgericht, p. 310, and Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, pp. 368 and 377.

that Zeph 1 exhibits the pattern of universality and particularity in its present state of compositional unity.

CHAPTER II

UNIVERSALITY AND PARTICULARITY IN SELECTED DY PERICOPES

A INTRODUCTION

The brief survey of critical work on Zeph 1 as presented in the previous chapter has served to define the problem so that this investigation may now proceed into its first step. The purpose of this chapter is to examine several DY pericopes, namely, Isa 2, 13, Ezek 7, 30, the Book of Joel, and Zech 14, to determine whether they actually do exhibit the pattern of universality and particularity. It will be important to inquire concerning the unity, the historical setting, and the date of these texts since the question being asked is not only whether this pattern and the DY theme are interrelated, but also during what time periods this association was made.

B ISAIAH II.6-22

Isa 2.12 contains the expression yôm lāyahweh, which is a variant of the DY phrase. This verse stands at the beginning of a short poem (vv 12-17) in which the scope of Yahweh's wrath is given expression. The first impression gained from this poem is that the judgment of the DY is not restricted to a particular locality or to a particular people. Yet vv 6-8, which provide the context for this poem, concern

a particular people, i.e., the house of Jacob. Thus it appears that Isa 2 is relevant to our discussion since it contains a reference to the DY and a contrast between a particular and a more general perspective.

This chapter is generally divided on the basis of its content into two distinct literary units, i.e., vv 2-4 and 6-22. Vv 2-4 comprise a salvation oracle that looks into the future. V 5 is generally seen as an exhortation which was added to join this unit with the one which follows in vv 6-22. Vv 6-22 contain an indictment against the house of Jacob and an announcement concerning the DY. It is generally agreed that these verses are not connected with vv 2-4 thematically, and that the link provided by the conjunction kî (v 6) is only artificial. Therefore, since the verses concerning the DY are found only in this second unit, vv 2-5 need not be considered in this context.

Vv 6-22 are generally admitted to be Isaianic though secondary additions are often recognized in some verses. Especially doubted are those verses which mention idols (ʾĕlîlîm; vv 8, 18, and 20) since this is thought to be a theme from exilic and post-exilic times.[1] Several scholars would date the authentic material to the early part of Isaiah's ministry. J. Milgrom, for instance, argues that

---

[1]Hans Wildberger, Jesaja, 3 vols, BKAT, X (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1972-), 1: 100, and Klaus Seybold, "Die anthropologischen Beiträge aus Jesaja 2," ZTK 74 (1977): 411-13.

v 7 reflects the material prosperity and military preparedness of the time of Uzziah's reign, and that the earthquake of Uzziah's time may have furnished the background experience for the poem on the DY in vv 10-22.[2] H. Wildberger also dates this material to an early period, but he suggests the time of King Jotham.[3]

Several problems face the literary critic as he focusses on vv 6-22. Immediately evident are the refrain-like repetitions. V 17 is very nearly a verbatim quotation of v 11, and v 9 is comparable to these verses thematically. (Isa 5.15-16a is another parallel for these verses, and some commentators would transpose it into this context.[4]) Furthermore, vv 10, 19, and 21 are also very similar to each other. However, in the present arrangement of vv 6-22 these verses are not placed as refrains in a regular strophic pattern. Only v 17, which stands at the end of the strophe concerning the DY, is positioned suitably as a refrain, whereas vv 9, 10, and 11, on the one hand, and vv 19 and 21, on the other, appear too close together to be considered as refrains of separate strophes.

It is also evident that v 6 could not originally have

---

[2]Jacob Milgrom, "Did Isaiah Prophesy During the Reign of Uzziah?" VT 14 (1964): 165-66. The association of vv 10-22 with the earthquake of Uzziah's time is fairly common among commentators.

[3]Wildberger, Jesaja, 1: 100, 105.

[4]For instance, Otto Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12, A Commentary, trans. R. A. Wilson, OTL (London: SCM, 1972), p. 32.

introduced the following poetry. The particle kî may once have joined it to one or more preceding strophes[5] or to a preceding refrain similar to vv 10, 19, and 21.[6] As it stands, kî joins v 6 to the exhortation in v 5 and, through this bridge passage, to the preceding salvation oracle in vv 2-4 with which it has nothing in common thematically.[7]

Furthermore, vv 6a, 9b, and 10 are structurally inconsistent with the rest of vv 6-22. The dominant point of view in the section as a whole is third person plural, but in vv 6a and 9b the writer addresses Yahweh in the second person and then in v 10 he addresses man in the imperative.

The concluding verses (20-22) are also problematic. V 20 is prosaic, v 21 is repetitious of v 19, and v 22 is very enigmatic. Vv 20-22 may plausibly be explained as glosses, or vv 20-21, as reinterpretations of vv 18-19.[8]

Superficially, at least, it appears that vv 6-22 lack thematic continuity. Vv 6-8 and 18-22 are directed against the superstition, materialism, and idolatry of the house of Jacob, whereas vv 11-17 describe Yahweh's day of judgment on all that symbolizes pride. The former are directed against

---

[5]So Bernhard D. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia, 2nd ed. HKAT, III (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1900), p. 17.

[6]So Karl D. Marti, Das Buch Jesaja, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, X (Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1900), p. 28.

[7]So Wildberger, Jesaja, 1: 95; against Edward J. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah, rev. ed. (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1960), 1: 22.

[8]So Wildberger, Jesaja, 1: 96.

the sin of a particular group of people, i.e., the house of Jacob; the latter are directed against the haughtiness of mankind in general. However, Wildberger does not consider the thematic link between these sections clumsy since the materialism and idolatry of man signifies pride. Thus, both sections concern man's pride. The mark of discontinuity, in his opinion, is that in vv 7-9a the prophet looks into the past, whereas in vv 12-17 he looks into the future.[9]

In their present condition vv 6-22 are irregular rhythmically. According to G. B. Gray, the rhythm of vv 12-17, up to lĕbaddô in v 17 (omitting hărāmîm wĕhanniś-śā'îm in v 13), is regular with three accents per line. Of the other lines some are of the same length, but several are very difficult to scan. The dominant rhythm of vv 6-22 is 3:3. Gray supposes that this may originally have been the unbroken rhythm of the entire section.[10]

Commentators have offered several explanations for the composition of Isa 2.6-22, three of which will be outlined here. Duhm suggests that two distinct poem fragments were conflated in Isa 2.6-22. Vv 11-17 were inserted into the text, perhaps because what was originally in that spot had become entirely illegible. In his opinion, this helps to explain the thematic and rhythmic discontinuity of the text

---

[9]Ibid., 1: 105.

[10]George B. Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah, 2 vols, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912), 1: 48-49.

as it now stands.[11] R. B. Y. Scott is in agreement with Duhm, except that he connects v 11 to the original poem, i.e., vv 6-11 and 18-22.[12]

G. B. Gray and G. Fohrer maintain that the text is a literary unity. Gray explains that the link between the two main subjects, i.e., the sin of the house of Jacob and the inevitable judgment, is characteristically prophetic. The sin of the people is pride. They pay homage to the work of their hands and trust in their munitions of war. The prophet proclaims judgment on such pride. Furthermore, Gray maintains that v 18 forms an excellent antithetical parallel to the third line of v 19: Yahweh will be exalted, but idols will perish. The verses that follow explain how idols will find their way into caverns after men have forsaken them.[13] Fohrer, similarly, does not question the unity of the text of vv 6-22. Its inner structure, he claims, is bound together through the description of Yahweh's day.[14]

Wildberger conjectures that this text comprises what was originally four distinct units, namely, v 6, vv 7-9a (18), vv 12-17, and v 19. He claims that the assumption of continuity between v 6 and v 7 is discredited by the fact

---

[11]Duhm, Jesaia, pp. 17-19.

[12]R. B. Y. Scott, "The Book of Isaiah," IB, 12 vols (New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1956), 5: 182-83.

[13]Gray, Isaiah, 1: 51-56.

[14]Georg Fohrer, Das Buch Jesaja, 2 vols, Zürcher Bibelkommentare (Stuttgart: Zwingli-Verlag Zürich, 1960), 1: 56.

that in v 6 Yahweh is addressed but not in v 7. The catchword mālāʾ only provides a secondary connection between v 6 and vv 7-8. Furthermore, according to Wildberger, v 10 is a variant of v 19 as v 11 is of v 17. This, coupled with the fact that vv 9b-10 are missing in a Qumran scroll (V^{Qa}), indicates that these verses do not actually belong here. Vv 12-17 form a complete section, clearly distinct from its context. V 18 is neither formally nor thematically continuous with vv 12-17. On the other hand, it does not belong with v 19, but originally it may have formed the conclusion for vv 7-9a. V 19 is a distinct fragment. Vv 20-21 are reinterpretations of v 19, and v 22 is a secondary addition.[15]

In view of these varying critical points of view on this text, our discussion could proceed along basically two different courses. Firstly, the literary continuity of the text could be affirmed along with Gray and Fohrer, and conclusions relevant to this thesis could be drawn on that basis. Secondly, one might agree with Duhm, Scott, and Wildberger that vv 12-17 are a unit distinct from the other verses, and draw conclusions accordingly.

If it is maintained that this text is a literary unit, one might still delete vv 9b-10 on the basis that their use of the imperative is structurally inconsistent with the rest of the text, and that they are absent from the Qumran scroll V^{Qa}. However, against Wildberger, considerations may be

---

[15]Wildberger, Jesaja, 1: 96.

brought forward in support of the view that vv 6 and 11 were originally united with vv 7-9a. Though the second person singular of the verb in v 6a is not easily accounted for, the verse itself provides a suitable introduction of the indictment against the house of Jacob for which Yahweh's judgment shall come (vv 9a and 11). Furthermore, v 6 begins the catalogue of accusations completed in vv 7-8, employing the same verb, mālā'. Also, v 11 provides a suitable refrain for vv 6-9a, though, admittedly, it is somewhat repetitious of v 9a. Seen thus, vv 6-9a and 11 form a satisfactory strophe.

Vv 12-17 form a second strophe. Against those who would dissociate it from vv 6-11 on the basis of the change in tense from the preterite (v 9a) to the future (v 17), it may be argued that this does not necessarily evidence a discontinuity. Such a change in tense is in keeping with the change of subject. The sinfulness of the people is described as a past and present condition, while Yahweh's day is predicted as a future judgment on these sinful people. Furthermore, one can hardly help wondering if modern commentators are not expecting too great a literary consistency of the ancient author. Can poets be expected to adhere strictly to one tense in the body of a poem?

It has also been noted that in vv 6-8 an indictment is brought against the house of Jacob on account of its superstition, materialism, and idolatry, whereas in vv 12-17

judgment is proclaimed on all that symbolizes pride. Because of this difference it has been claimed that there is a thematic discontinuity between these two sections. On the other hand, it should be understood that a land full of silver and gold, and horses and chariots (v 7) is a land that boasts a security of its own making. The pride of man is displayed in his act of worship to the idols which his own hands have made (v 8). Thus, the description of the sinful condition of the house of Jacob leads easily into the refrain of judgment on all such pride. Besides, a question may be raised against the interpreter's assumption that demands an altogether smooth and consistent thematic flow within and between strophes. Perhaps no more should be expected of the ancient author than a fitting flow in his argumentation.

Finally, against those who would separate this strophe from the preceding verses on metrical grounds, it may be argued that the rhythmic changes do not coincide with such a division.[16]

The remaining verses of this text (vv 18-22) are in such a confused state that it is impossible to reconstruct another strophe. V 18 does constitute a good antithetical parallel for v 17c, and man's flight in terror before Yahweh (vv 19, 21) might well be the result of Yahweh's judgment on the pride of man. On the other hand, the redundancy of

---

[16]Gray, Isaiah, 1: 48-49.

vv 20-21 and the unintelligibility of v 22 for this context make these verses difficult to fit into a strophic pattern. Fortunately, for our present purposes it is not necessary to solve the problems of these last verses.

A cautious conclusion advanced on the basis of this literary and formal analysis is that vv 6-9a, 11, and vv 12-17 form two strophes of a poem fragment whose beginning is lost and whose conclusion is damaged. It must be granted that these results cannot be considered certain because these few lines in their presently corrupted condition are incapable of giving the evidence required for a clear demonstration of their unity.

If it is granted that vv 6-17 are an original unity, as has been argued, then the pattern of universality and particularity in a DY context is evident. V 6 indicates clearly the particular subject of the immediate context. It is "the house of Jacob." Whether this refers to Northern Israel alone, or to Northern Israel and Judah, or only to Judah, is a question that need not be answered in this connexion. The reference to the house of Jacob in itself is specific and denotes a particular group of people. On the other hand, vv 9a and 11 are more general with respect to their subject. Humanity (ʾādām) and men (ʾănōšîm) in general will be humiliated. The declaration of judgment must be understood to apply first and foremost to Isaiah's particular audience, i.e., to the house of Jacob, but the terminology is general

and indicates that this judgment is for universal application on the pride of all humanity.

The description of Yahweh's day is also cast in general terms. Judgment will be directed against "all that is proud and lofty . . . " (vv 12-16). The word kōl is repeatedly used in each of the phrases which follow. It emphasizes that judgment will be all-embracing. Judgment is directed against trees, hills, fortifications, and ships. The list is representative of all the things that symbolize pride and self-sufficiency. Furthermore, judgment will affect Lebanon, Bashan, and Tarshish. Thus, the judgment is not localized. It extends beyond the borders of Israel to the North and to the South.[17]

Fohrer, in reference to vv 6-22, says:

> Deutlich ist ferner, dass das harte Nein zu Israels Erwählungsanspruch und Grösse nicht einem isoliert lebenden "Gottesvolk," sondern den "Menschen" überhaupt gilt. Israel is lediglich das konkrete Beispiel dessen, was grundsätzlich für alle Welt zutrifft.[18]

The prophet pronounces judgment first and foremost in response to the sinful pride of a particular people, but he simultaneously broadens his conceptual horizons to include

---

[17]It is significant to note that Tarshish is sometimes identified with Tartessus, Spain, which was a remote corner of the ancient world. So Gray, Isaiah, 1: 56. If this interpretation is correct, the scope of the poem is very broad. On the other hand, some commentators understand by this term the "ships of Tarshish" which may be in port in the deepest South, in the Gulf of Aqaba. So Wildberger, Jesaja, 1: 111.

[18]Fohrer, Jesaja, 1: 56-57.

the sinful pride of all mankind.

This conclusion would not be admitted if it were maintained with Duhm, Scott, and Wildberger that vv 12-17 are a unit distinct from vv 6-11. In that case it could not be ascertained against whom the judgment of vv 12-17 is directed in particular. One could speak only of an isolated oracle of judgment, the scope of which is very general, or even universal as has already been argued.

Thus, if the argument is pursued that Isa 2.6-22 is a literary unity, aside from some additions, this passage is an example of a DY text which exhibits the pattern of universality and particularity. On the basis of the foregoing study, this conclusion is preferred. If, on the other hand, vv 12-17 are distinguished from their present context as a separate unit, it can still be maintained that these verses constitute a DY text with a universal perspective. Of further significance is the scholarly consensus that this passage is an early Isaianic composition, and, thus, pre-exilic in origin.

C ISAIAH XIII.2-22

At first sight Isa 13 gives the appearance of a complete and uncorrupted literary unit warning of disaster that is coming with the approaching of the DY. Nations and kingdoms "from a distant land" and "from the end of the heavens" (v 5) will be the agents of Yahweh's wrath. His wrath will be poured out on the whole earth (v 5). This universal

perspective is brought to a particular focus as the poem progresses. The agents of Yahweh's wrath are identified as the Medes (v 17), and the object of his wrath, as the city of Babylon (v 19). Thus it appears that this poem also contains the combination of the DY theme and the pattern of universality and particularity.

Isa 13.1 acts as a heading to introduce 13.2-14.27, after which a new formula introduces 14.28-32. Thus the formulae in 13.1 and 14.28 clearly define the outer limits of a literary unit. However, most commentators also agree that 14.1-4a is to be separated from what precedes in 13.2-22 on the grounds that 14.1-4a begins a new theme and is written prosaically. Thus vv 2-22, though their inner unity is somewhat disputed, may be treated as the basic unit for our discussion.

The poem in Isa 13.2-22 is, for the most part, made up of carefully balanced distichs. There are tristichs in each of vv 3, 7-8a (?), 16, 17, and 18. The first word of v 8, wĕnibhālû, constitutes a rather serious irregularity. It gives a third balancing thought to the two stichs of v 7, but, because it is only one word, it is hardly sufficient to form a third stich on its own. Outside of this problem there are no serious difficulties with respect to poetic balance.

Metrically the poem seems somewhat inconsistent. Gray observes that vv 2-8 are dominantly in a 3:2 metre,

whereas the remaining verses are dominantly in 3:3 metre. He criticizes Duhm who, by "hazardous treatment of the text," gets 42 distichs in 3:2 metre.[19] Wildberger also recognizes that the metre is not a regular 3:2. In fact, he finds quite a variation in metre, including sections in 3:3, 2:2, and in 3:2 metre. Though this diversity in metre may suggest to some that the text is corrupt or that it combines poems of differing metrical structure, such conclusions are not necessary. Wildberger himself assesses, "Wir haben es also in Kap. 13 mit einem kunstvoll aufgebauten Gedicht zu tun, in welchem der Wechsel des Versmasses für das Verständnis hilfreiche Akzente setzt."[20] Also, D. N. Freedman, in his analysis of several acrostic poems, has shown convincingly that lines could vary considerably in length, although within a prescribed latitude.[21] Therefore, metrical considerations such as those offered above can hardly be used to discredit the unity of Isa 13.

Textually Isa 13.2-22 is in excellent condition. On this basis, as well as for sticho-metric reasons, one might conclude that the poem has been preserved intact.

From the literary-critical point of view, a serious difficulty with this poem arises out of the remarkable change

---

[19]Gray, Isaiah, 1: 234.

[20]Wildberger, Jesaja, 2: 509.

[21]David Noel Freedman, "Acrostics and Metrics in Hebrew Poetry," HTR 65 (1972), 367-92.

in the scope of reference. In this regard Kaiser says that

> the prophecy of the judgment of the world that is to take place on the day of Yahweh, and that of the conquest and destruction of Babylon, are remarkably intermingled. . . . Obviously the person responsible for the chapter as we have it was prepared to tolerate the tension which results from the interweaving of prophecies of a local and a universal future event. The present-day reader is tempted to separate the two and to ask whether there may not be, underlying the present text, separate units on which the proto-apocalyptic redactor drew.[22]

Such a statement finds its basis in the following observations: Vv 2-13 describe an event in which many nations (v 4) are summoned to execute Yahweh's judgment on the whole earth (v 5) and on all the proud and wicked men who inhabit the world (v 11). Even the celestial bodies participate in this event (v 10). The heavens and the earth shake (v 13). In contrast to this, the poem takes on a historical orientation in v 17, where it is stated that the Medes are being aroused to execute judgment on Babylon (v 19). Thus, it appears that the Medes correspond to the many nations being summoned by Yahweh and that the city of Babylon corresponds to the whole earth which is to be destroyed (vv 5, 11-13). Such correlations are difficult and require explanation.[23]

---

[22]Kaiser, Isaiah, pp. 8-9. Kaiser makes no attempt to separate the two strands. His concern is to deal with the text and its meaning as it stands.

[23]With regard to the literary criticism of this text one more observation should be offered, though it will not be considered at length because commentators take little notice of it. As in Zeph 1 and Isa 2, there is a change in point of view in this poem. Vv 2, 11-13, and 17 are written as divine speech in the first person singular, whereas vv 4-9 speak of Yahweh in the third person singular.

The position taken with respect to the historical setting in which the composition of this poem took place has implications for the solution of this literary-critical problem. A few commentators conclude that the poem is Isaiah's and that his own observations of the world-political situation occasioned it. According to this view, the Assyrians, who were politically in the forefront during Isaiah's time, occupy the foremost position in the poet's point of view. The greatest difficulty for this interpretation is the fact that Isa 13 lacks reference to Assyria, but makes reference, instead, to Babylon. For this reason most commentators deny the authenticity of this chapter. A message concerning Babylon would have been irrelevant as far as Isaiah was concerned because during his time Babylon was not a threatening world-power. It is suggested, therefore, that the poem must have had its origin after the ascendancy of the Neo-Babylonian empire. The difficulty for this point of view is to explain why the Medes rather than the Persians are named as the enemy.

I find it quite remarkable that in Zeph 1 and in Isa 2 (especially v 6a) this observation is used as an argument against the unity of the text, whereas in Isa 13 little notice is taken of the same phenomenon. Indeed, the uncorrupted and unified appearance of Isa 13.2-22 might be taken as evidence that the ancient poets did not consistently write from the same point of view, and, therefore, that the use of "change of person" as a criterion by which the unity of a text is judged is invalid. This bit of evidence might be taken into consideration retroactively into the criticism of Zeph 1 (see above, pp. 6 and 14) and Isa 2 (see above, pp. 23 and 27).

In this connexion it is necessary to devote a short excursus to the discussion of the possible historical circumstances which may be reflected in Isa 13.[24]

Excursus

The Medes are first mentioned in the annals of Shalmaneser III (852-824 B.C.) of Assyria. They became an increasingly important factor in Assyrian politics after the beginning of the reign of Shalmaneser V (727 B. C.), though it is "very unlikely that before the reign of Sargon their primitive tribal organization permitted any concerted political action."[25] By 674 B.C. Esarhaddon was feeling the threat of Kashtaritu (identified as Phraortes, the son of Cyaxares 1) who had begun to unite the Mannaeans, Medes, and Cimmerians. The Assyrians were able to resist the Medes and their allies until Cyaxares II succeeded his father Phraortes. Cyaxares II reduced the Persians to vassalage and finally in 612 B.C. also captured Nineveh.

---

[24]The information that follows in this excursus is derived from the following sources: William Culican, The Medes and Persians, Ancient People and Places, 42 (London: Thames and Hudson, 1965), pp. 31-63; Seth Erlandsson, The Burden of Babylon: A Study of Isaiah 13:2-14:23, trans. mainly by George J. Houser, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 4 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1970), historicl excursus on pp. 86-92; A. T. Olmstead, History of Assyria (New York & London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), pp. 175-357, 627-44, and History of the Persian Empire (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), pp. 29-38; and H. W. F. Saggs, The Greatness that was Babylon: A survey of the ancient civilization of the Tigris-Euphrates valley (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1966), pp. 105-53.

[25]Culican, The Medes and Persians, p. 43.

Babylon always remained an important city in the Assyrian Empire. Though held in subjugation, the city was allowed much freedom, often being ruled by a native prince. The Babylonian citizens themselves remained loyal to Assyria, but the city was repeatedly implicated in revolts which were instigated by the surrounding Chaldean tribes. Thus, after the death of the pro-Assyrian king of Babylon, Nabu-nasir (734 B.C.), the Chaldean chieftain Ukinzer revolted against his successor and eventually established himself as king in Babylon. Tiglath-Pileser III devastated the territories of the insurgent Chaldeans and himself assumed the throne of Babylon (729 B.C.) after having "taken the hands of the god" in the New Year ceremony in that city. Virtually the same pattern as set by Ukinzer was repeated when the Chaldean Merodach-baladan assumed the throne in Babylon (721 B.C.), Sargon, after dealing with threats from Syria, Palestine, and Urartu, forced the Chaldeans out of Babylon and also "took the hands of the god" (711 B.C.).

Merodach-baladan made another bid for the kingship of Babylon when Sennacherib succeeded Sargon. He had the support of the Chaldeans, Aramaeans, and Elamites, but he sought a more widely based coalition against Assyria. Probably this was his purpose for sending an embassy to Hezekiah, king of Judah (Isa 39, II Kings 20.12-19). At the New Year Festival of 703 B.C. Merodach-baladan re-instated himself in Babylon and prepared his defence against Assyria. This was

followed in 701 B.C. by the rebellion of the Palestinian states, Judah included. Sennacherib restored Assyrian sovereignty in both areas in turn, but hardly had the Assyrian army left Babylon when Merodach-baladan resumed his intrigues. Merodach-baladan died shortly after, but another Chaldaean leader, Mushezib-Marduk, continued to cause unrest after the same style.

Mushezib-Marduk continued to rely on the support of the Chaldaeans, Aramaeans, and Elamites. Sennacherib first turned his attention to destroying the power of the Elamites, and then, finally, in 689 B.C. he locked the Chaldaean forces in at Babylon, laid siege to the city and sacked it. In this respect he departed from previous Assyrian policy with that city. His successor, Esarhaddon, began the restoration of Babylon and maintained a secure position in it.

In 626 B.C. the Chaldaean leader Nabopolassar assumed the kingship of Babylon. He engaged in an alliance with Cyaxares II, king of the Medes, against the Assyrians. This alliance eventually brought about the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C. and, thus, of Assyria.

Apparently Nebuchadrezzar maintained friendly relations with the Medes, but these relations were definitely severed after Nabu-na'id ascended to power in 556 B.C. Through a marriage alliance between the daughter of the Median Astyages, successor of Cyaxares II, and Cambyses, son of the Persian Cyrus I, a second Cyrus was born. He became

king of the Persians in 559 B.C., though still as a vassal king to Media. In 553 B.C. he joined in an alliance with Nabu-na'id of Babylon against the Medes. After this alliance Cyrus II proceeded to tear the Median kingdom from the weakling Astyages while Nabu-na'id occupied himself in Arabia. With the fall of the Median Empire to Cyrus II, the Persians found themselves in control of a large empire which in parts of Mesopotamia laid claims conflicting with Babylon's imperial claims. It was inevitable that Cyrus II should in due time also take over Babylon. Through his propaganda against Nabu-na'id, and through his conciliating claim that he was the benefactor of Marduk, Cyrus won the loyalty of the Babylonian citizens. As early as 538 B.C. he set forward his oldest son, Cambyses, to "take the hands of the god" at the New Year Festival in Babylon.

Against the background of this historical sketch the positions of three interpreters will be evaluated in order to judge which one best reconstructs what may have been the historical Sitz im Leben for Isa 13.[26]

E. J. Kissane, in keeping with his stated intention to defend the traditional view of the Isaianic authorship of

---

[26]I have selected the following three interpreters, i.e., Edward J. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary, rev. ed., 2 vols. (Dublin: Browne and Nolan Ltd., 1960); Erlandsson, The Burden of Babylon; and Wildberger, Jesaja, because they represent three distinct positions.

the whole of the Book of Isaiah,[27] proposes that Isa 13 is an authentic prophecy that originally concerned, firstly, the chastisement of Israel by the Assyrians (vv 2-13) and, secondly, the rout of the Assyrian army and the overthrow of Nineveh (vv 14-22). He notes that apart from the references to Babylon and to the Chaldaeans in v 19 the poem has no concrete historical references. Vv 2-13, in his opinion, resemble Isaiah's prophecies concerning the ruin of Israel so closely that if they stood alone there would be no doubt as to their interpretation. Vv 11-13 do not refer to the whole world but only to the land of Israel. Though Kissane is obliged by his interpretation of vv 2-13 to interpret vv 11-13 in such a limited sense, he apparently cannot escape the universal implications of these verses. Therefore he explains that because Yahweh must come down from heaven when he intervenes on earth, every intervention must be a world judgment.[28]

Kissane claims that vv 14-22 are wholly consistent with the downfall of Assyria, but not with the downfall of Babylon, on the grounds that the Babylonians and the Medes were allies, whereas the Medes and the Assyrians were already engaged in military confrontations during Isaiah's time (740-690 B.C.?). One must only recognize that the original prophecy has been modified to suit a post-Isaianic historical

---

[27]Kissane, Isaiah, 1: v.

[28]Ibid., 1: 145-54.

situation by the exchange of the names "Babylon" and "Chaldaeans" for the original "Nineveh" and "Assyrians" (v 19), respectively.

Keeping in mind what Isaiah may have known of the contemporary political situation, Kissane's suggestion as to the historical setting of Isa 13 is plausible. However, considering that Isaiah was likely off the scene by the time Esarhaddon faced the threat posed by Kashtaritu and his allies, it is questionable whether the Medes could already have been viewed as such a potential threat during his lifetime.[29] Kissane avoids, to some extent, the main literary-critical problem, i.e., the problem of the conflict between the particular and universal perspectives, because he no longer interprets vv 11-13 as referring to the whole world, nor does he assume a direct link between these verses and v 19. However, the validity of his interpretation must be seriously questioned. Celestial and terrestrial participation in this event (vv 10 and 13) suggest a catastrophe on a very broad scale. Also, it is extremely doubtful that the Hebrew of these verses could be translated and understood to refer to some particular land and people. tēbēl (v 11) can only be translated in a general sense, i.e., "earth" or "world."[30] Also, ʾenôš and ʾādām mean "man" in a generic sense.

---

[29]See above, p. 36.

[30]tēbēl is usually used in parallel with ʾereṣ. With the possible exception of three instances, tēbēl, which is

It should also be asked why Isaiah provided a concrete geographical reference for vv 14-22 but not for vv 2-13. Surely the author himself would have wished to guard against the possible misinterpretation of his poem. As vv 2-22 stand, there is no indication given by the author that vv 2-13 should be understood as referring to a different people than vv 14-22. Hence, if such was the author's intention, misinterpretation is almost inevitable. On the basis of this one consideration alone, Kissane's division of the text appears very artificial.

Finally, it should be noted that Kissane's interpretation depends almost totally on his conjectural and questionable reconstruction of v 19.

Erlandsson, in his detailed discussion of Isa 13.2-14.23, also defends an early date for the composition of this poem.[31] He observes that in Isa 13.19 the text changes abruptly, i.e., it no longer deals with the affliction of the world by the horrors of war, but rather with the destruction of a city. The ʾălêhem of v 17 should not be

---

attested approximately 40 times in the Old Testament (BDB), must always be understood in the larger sense as "earth" or "world," rather than as "land" or "country."

[31]Erlandsson, The Burden of Babylon, pp. 128-66. He does not commit himself in a straightforward manner to a defence of the Isaianic authorship of this chapter, but his leanings in that direction are evident in his sixth chapter, which he devotes to an analysis of the diction of Isa 13.2-14-27 in comparison with that of the rest of the Book of Isaiah.

The following paragraphs are derived mainly from Erlandsson's conclusions on pp. 160-66.

correlated with bābel of v 19, but rather with rešā'îm and zēdîm of v 11. Vv 19-22 form a complete and self-contained unit that could be lifted out of its context without disturbing the rest of the poem. Consequently, Erlandsson interprets vv 2-18 as referring to the proud Assyrians and vv 19-22 as referring to Babylon.

Erlandsson finds a suitable historical setting for Isa 13 in the conflicts between the Medes and the Assyrians sometime during or after the ministry of Isaiah. He takes care to point out that Babylon suffered destruction at the hands of the Assyrians in 689 B.C., but never at the hands of the Medes or the Persians. Thus vv 19-22 found their fulfillment in 689 B.C. They were included with vv 2-18 by the same author because Babylon was a temptation to Judah to trust in alliances rather than in Yahweh, as had happened in the case of Hezekiah's alliance with Merdoch-baladan (Isa 39, II Kgs 20.12-19).

Erlandsson supports his case by a detailed comparison of the vocabulary and motifs of Isa 13.2-14.23 with the rest of Isaiah 1-39, on the one hand, and with Isa 40-55, on the other. He concludes that

> it is surprising that anyone could argue that the language of the Burden of Babylon can be clearly distinguished from that of "genuine" Isaianic texts and that an analysis of the diction confirms Is 13:2-14:23 to be a late interpolation in Isaiah.[32]

In addition, Erlandsson compares Isa 13.2-14.23 with

---

[32]Ibid., p. 138.

Jer 50-51 and finds that the author of the latter definitely made use of the former. The same motifs are applied by Jer 50-51 in a much more concrete manner to the Babylonian Empire with reference to Nebuchadrezzar and the fall of Jerusalem. Erlandsson dates Jer 50-51 around 590 B. C. and establishes this date as the terminus ad quem for the composition of Isa 13.2-14.23.[33]

Erlandsson's position avoids several of the objections raised against Kissane. Erlandsson does not resort to the conjectural reconstruction of v 19, nor does he find it necessary to give vv 11-13 a narrow interpretation. On the other hand, the most serious objection raised against Kissane is also applicable here. Erlandsson claims that vv 11-13 pertain to the Assyrians while v 19 refers to Babylon. If this is true one must ask, as was asked of Kissane, why the author himself did not give an explicit geographical reference in vv 11-13 to avoid confusion. As the poem now stands, vv 19-22 naturally become a focus from which it is interpreted. Accordingly, it is most easily understood as pertaining in its entirety to Babylon. Furthermore, as Erlandsson himself notes, v 19 picks up the catchword gĕʾôn from v 11, and v 22 picks up gārôb from v 6. If the author intentionally linked vv 19-22 with vv 2-18 through the use of catchwords, would he not certainly have avoided the risk of misinterpretation and have provided the

---

[33]Ibid., pp. 154-59.

intended referent for vv 2-13?

Erlandsson's analysis of the diction gives his argument strength, and his comparison of Isa 13.2-14.23 with Jer 50-51 certainly shows that the date of the composition of the latter must be established as the terminus ad quem for the date of the composition of the former. However, the date which he assigns to Jer 50-51 (ca. 590 B. C.) is not generally accepted, and it is doubtful that the components of the compilation as it now stands all derive from the same writer or even from the same period.[34]

Historically the setting which Erlandsson suggests is plausible. It is true that the Medes were a threat to the Assyrians near the end of Isaiah's lifetime and in the years following. It is also true that Babylon met with destruction at the hands of the Assyrians in 689 B. C. However, it is fallacious to assume that because Babylon never met with destruction at the hands of the Medes or Persians, vv 19-22 must be understood against the setting of the destruction of that city by the Assyrians. Another possibility with which one must reckon is that the poet actually considered the Medes a threat to Babylon around 553 B. C.,[35] but that his prediction concerning their destruction of Babylon never found fulfillment.

---

[34]J. P. Hyatt, "The Book of Jeremiah," IB 5: 1123-24.

[35]See above, pp. 38-39.

Wildberger would understand Isa 13 against the background of the destruction of Jerusalem by Babylon, and of the exilic period before Cyrus II entered Babylon in 538 B. C.[36] Though v 17 specifies the Medes as the agents of destruction, the Medes and the Persians collectively may have been meant since these names were often interchanged for lack of precise historical knowledge. However, Wildberger also considers it plausible that the author wrote before Persia swallowed up the empire of the Medes, when Babylon actually felt threatened by, and bolstered her defences against, the Medes.

Wildberger does not doubt the unity of the text:

> So verschiedener Herkunft die Bausteine sein mögen, die zum Aufbau der Drohung verwendet wurden, so gewiss ist das Gedicht doch eine gedanklich geschlossene Einheit.[37]

The text is tied together in the correspondence between vv 2-5 and v 17, and between vv 7-16 and v 19, where the latter verses in each case complete the information lacking in the former. Wildberger does not raise any question in connexion with the transition from the universal scope in vv 11-13 to the particular in v 19. Against Kissane he urges that it is not justifiable to excise "Babylon" and "Chaldaeans" from v 19, and that there is no good ground for the idea that the poem concerned Assyria rather than Babylon.

---

[36]Wildberger, Jesaja, 2: 507-11.

[37]Ibid., 2:508.

Against Erlandsson he argues that the fact that the Medes or the Persians never destroyed Babylon does not diminish the possibility that such was envisioned by a prophet before 538 B. C. He admits the validity of Erlandsson's diction studies, but argues that one must simply assume that the author of Isa 13 was familiar with and influenced by the Isaianic tradition.

Wildberger's judgment concerning the historical setting of this text is attractive. However, if the author wrote before 538 B. C., it is rather doubtful that he would mistakenly have referred to the Medes and the Persians with the single term "Medes" since he would have been aware of the hostilities between the Medes and the Persians and would not have identified the two under one name, particularly not as the Medes.[38] It is more plausible to accept Wildberger's alternate suggestion that the historical setting is actually before the time of the Persian's conquest of the Median Empire. Though the Medes and the Babylonians were allies against Assyria, and though friendly relations persisted throughout the reign of Nebuchadrezzar, the fact that Nabu-naʾid entered an alliance with Persia against the Medes in 553 B. C. testifies to the potential threat of the Median Empire to Babylon. Thus, the years before and around 553 B. C., when the Median Empire was at its zenith, are suitable to the material as found in Isa 13. In this

---

[38]Erlandsson, The Burden of Babylon, p. 164.

connexion, A. T. Olmstead, referring to Jer 13, 50, and 51, says that during the time of Nabu-naʾid "disaffected Jewish captives were predicting the fall of Babylon at the hands of the warlike Medes, but, as so often, they were disappointed."[39]

Wildberger's treatment of Isa 13 is probably the most satisfying of the alternatives discussed above. The historical setting which he proposes permits adequate explanation of the various factors in the text. It allows v 19 to be retained as it stands in the text, against Kissane. The reference to the Medes seems altogether appropriate in view of the fact that around 553 B. C. theirs was a large empire capable of providing a real threat to Babylonian independence. The description of the armies in vv 4-5 suggests the mountainous homeland of the Medes and the varied national backgrounds of the troops of the imperial Median army, and it recalls the Assyrian inscriptions which speak of "'the Medes dwelling far off' whose empire reached 'from the rising of the sun' . . . to the ridge of the Bikni mountains."[40] The generalized, or even universal sphere, in which judgment is to take place accords in a hyperbolical sense with the sphere in which the world-dominion of Babylon was exercised. There is little difficulty in following the author as he first pronounces doom on the whole of that empire and then

---

[39]Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire, p. 37.

[40]Erlandsson, The Burden of Babylon, p. 86.

shifts his focus to its capital. Wildberger's treatment avoids the problems incurred by Kissane and Erlandsson when they distinguish two spheres (Israel and Assyria, or Assyria and Babylon) upon which judgment is to fall, even though the text specifically mentions only one.

If it is granted that vv 2-22 are an unbroken unit concerning the coming of the DY against Babylon, then this also is a DY text that is characterized by the pattern of universality and particularity. This is true in two respects. Firstly, vv 4-5 suggest a widespread gathering of nations and kingdoms to war, but v 17 specifies the Medes. Secondly, v 5 says that the whole earth will be destroyed. Vv 11-13 say that the world (tēbēl) will be punished and indicate that the wicked (rĕšā^ʿîm), man (ʾĕnôš), and mankind (ʾādām) will meet their doom. This must be contrasted with v 19 where the city of Babylon is singled out as the centre on which this catastrophe will be concentrated.

However, even if Kissane's or Erlandsson's positions were adopted, the same pattern would still be evident. Both critics alike distinguish two distinct units with different geographical references, but they recognize that a thematic relationship is maintained between the two sections. Furthermore, both critics assign both units and their combination with each other to one author. Therefore, for our purposes, the chapter as a whole would have to be viewed as a literary unit. The pattern of universality and particularity

is to be seen in the contrast between vv 4-5, which speak of the widespread gathering of nations to war, and v 17, which specifies the Medes. Furthermore, vv 5, 11-13 express a universal judgment even though their particular focus, according to Kissane, is on Israel, or according to Erlandsson, on Assyria. Finally, attention is also directed specifically towards Nineveh, according to Kissane, or Babylon, according to Erlandsson (v 19).

Kissane and Erlandsson both consider Isa 13 to be authentic, though Erlandsson is not firmly committed to this position. In any case, Erlandsson would still date the poem to the period before 590 B. C. If this were accepted, Isa 13 would be the second pre-exilic text (Isa 2.6-22 being the first) in which the DY theme and the pattern of universality and particularity were found in collocation. On the other hand, according to Wildberger's dating of the poem, Isa 13 is found to be a poem exhibiting this combination of the pattern and the DY theme originating in the exilic period.

Scott and Fohrer also assign Isa 13.2-22 to the late exilic period.[41] This date, in itself, does not seem too unlikely. However, the criteria by which Scott and Fohrer reach their conclusion are similar in kind to the ones used by those interpreters who deny the authenticity of Zeph 1.2-3, 17-18. In both cases the scholars claim that

---

[41]Fohrer, Jesaja, 1: 165; and Scott, Isaiah, 5: 255.

certain ideology is inconsonant with prophetic thought of the pre-exilic era. Therefore, it would seem appropriate in this connexion to evaluate Scott's and Fohrer's position. Scott will be cited as representative of both.

Scott emphasizes that Isa 13 portrays an end-time judgment. According to him the picture of the DY

> does not correspond to Isaiah's in 2:10-22, but rather to the later eschatological expectations of universal judgment and catastrophe as found in characteristic form inserted in several prophetic books: cf. 24:1-12, 17-23; 34:1-4, 10-15; Joel 2:1-11, 30-32 (Hebrew 3:3-5); 3:9-16 (Hebrew 4:9-16); Zeph 1:14-18; 3:8; Zech 14:2, 6; for other doom oracles on Babylon in similar settings cf. 21:1-9; Jer 50:1-51:58.[42]

The darkening of the heavenly bodies and the stipulation that sinners, not enemies, are the object of Yahweh's wrath are characteristic features in the description of the cataclysm of the end-time judgment, according to Scott.[43] Therefore, since these concepts are more consonant with the ideology of a later period, he dates Isa 13 to the late exilic period. However, it is questionable whether we are actually familiar enough with the development of ideas among the ancient prophets to reach such conclusions.

Contrary to Scott's claim, Isa 2.10-22, like Isa 13.2-22, depicts a universal judgment. This has been argued particularly with reference to 2.12-17.[44] Thus, in

---

[42]Scott, Isaiah, 5: 255.

[43]Ibid., 5: 256.

[44]See above, pp. 30-31.

this respect there is continuity between these two descriptions of the DY. Furthermore, bearing in mind the association of the motifs of holy war with the DY,[45] it is instructive to compare the war song of Ps 68 which also suggests a generalized scope in vv 13 and 15[46] in its use of mĕlāk̂îm.[47]

Scott notes that sinners rather than enemies are the object of Yahweh's wrath in Isa 13. On the other hand, Isa 2.6-22 also directs judgment against sinners, specifically the proud and haughty. In this respect it is directly comparable with Isa 13.11c and 19a-b which also make reference to the sin of pride. Thus Isa 13 again shares the motif of the older DY poem. Again, Ps 68.21 should be compared.

Scott also distinguishes celestial participation as described in v 10 as a feature of the later descriptions of end-time judgment. It is easily shown that the participation of heavenly bodies was a motif of ancient holy war. In Judg 5.20 it is said that the stars fought against Sisera. In Josh 10.12-13 it is said that the sun and the moon stood still during the battle of Israel with the Amorites

---

[45]As Gerhard von Rad has shown in "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," JSS 4 (1959), 97-107.

[46]The versification of BHK is being followed wherever it differs from that of the English Bibles.

[47]Ps 68 is quite commonly dated to the pre-exilic period though parts of it are sometimes considered to be of later origin.

(cf. Hab 3.11).[48] The motif of celestial participation is also found in the context of another older DY text. Amos 8.9-10 has in common with the DY text in 5.18-27 references to darkness and festivals. It also belongs to the DY complex. It contains the statement, "I will make the sun go down at noon." Clearly this is celestial participation in the DY.

It may be argued, furthermore, that Isa 13 contains many motifs commonly found in the context of ancient passages concerning holy war. Closely related to the motif of celestial participation is that of the quaking of the earth and the trembling of the heavens as found in v 13. (Most commentators think that the DY poem of Isa 2.12-17 is descriptive of an earthquake which Isaiah experienced.) This same motif is found in II Sam 22.8=Ps 18.8, I Sam 14.5, Ps 68.8, and Judg 5.4-5.[49]

In the ancient concept of holy war the armies were considered Yahweh's army.[50] The pronominal suffixes in

---

[48]So Patrick D. Miller in The Divine Warrior in Early Israel, Harvard Semitic Monographs, 5 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 98 in reference to Judg 5.20 and pp. 126-27 in reference to Josh 10.12-13.

[49]Miller also recognizes this in his comments on these various passages. He emphasizes the use of this motif as an element in the description of the theophany of Yahweh.

[50]Gerhard von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel, 3rd. ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), p. 7. Rather than listing biblical references in support of these statements concerning the motifs of holy war, the reader is directed to von Rad's book where extensive lists are given.

Isa 13.3 indicate that the same concept is present here. However, this verse is also capable of an expanded interpretation. In holy war Yahweh's heavenly hosts could also enter combat, as is seen in Ps 68.17 and Josh 5.13-15 (cf. Gen 32.2-3, and 2 Sam 5.22-25), and, apparently, in Isa 13, too, they are being summoned.[51] The armies come "from the end of the heavens" (v 5b). This phrase is equivalent to "the ends of the earth," but the change in wording so colours the concept that it suggests that a heavenly army is being summoned. In this connexion Wildberger says, "Das alte Israel rechnet also damit, dass bei den Kriegen Israels eine kosmische oder himmlische Macht eingreifen kann, genauer: dass bei den Kämpfen menschliche und himmlische Kräfte zusammenwirken."[52]

Four more motifs common to Isa 13 and to the ancient concept of holy war may be briefly mentioned. In ancient Israel the holy war was Yahweh's war.[53] Isa 13.2-5 indicates that the same is true of this war, too. For a holy war the army was sanctified. This is also true in Isa 13.3. When Yahweh intervened in holy war, he struck panic into the enemy. The same idea occurs in Isa 13.7-8. In holy war the ban was enforced. Though Isa 13 does not speak explicitly of the

---

[51]Miller, The Divine Warrior, p. 136.

[52]Wildberger, Jesaja, 2: 514. He refers to Miller, The Divine Warrior, p. 100f.

[53]For these motifs in holy war see von Rad, Heilige Krieg, pp. 7-13.

enforcement of the ban, the concept is certainly present in v 12.

On the basis of the foregoing discussion it is apparent that Isa 13, though it may, as Scott says, "correspond to later eschatological expectations of universal judgment and catastrophe," also corresponds closely to Isa 2.6-22 and to the concept of holy war in ancient Israel with respect to its themes and motifs. In no way does this prove that Isa 13 was composed at an early date, but it does indicate that the ideological criterion, as used by Scott and Fohrer in assigning this passage to a late exilic origin, is very inadequate.

D EZEKIEL VII AND XXX.1-8

It is generally recognized that Ezek 7 and Ezek 30.1-8 are closely related. In both contexts an ominous day is said to be near (qārôb) (7.7, 30.3a-b), the word ʿēt is used in parallel with and as a synonym of yôm (7.12, 30.3c-d), and a dreadful end (qēṣ) is anticipated (7.2, 3, 6; 30.3d).[54] This common economy of words and concepts demonstrates a thematic relationship. Also, the scope of the threat is similar in

---

[54]That is, if one follows the Greek version for 30.3d which reads peras ethnon estai. Georg Fohrer, Ezechiel, HAT, 1, 13 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1955), p. 171; and Walther Eichrodt, Ezekiel, A Commentary, trans. Cosslett Quin, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), pp. 413-14, think that the Greek attests to the original, but not so Walther Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 2 vols, BKAT, XIII (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1969), 2: 724.

these two chapters. Both 7.2b and 30.3d forecast a doom of widespread, if not universal, proportions.[55] In both contexts this is followed by a threat that focusses on a particular nation, i.e., Israel/Jerusalem and Egypt, respectively. Moreover, these two chapters bear the characteristic marks of the DY material.[56] Thus, it appears that the pattern of universality and particularity and the DY theme are also found here in collocation.

For the sake of general orientation a brief prefatory statement concerning the past critical work on the Book of Ezekiel will precede the study of Ezek 7 and 30.1-8. Since the end of the nineteenth century when R. Smend affirmed the logical unity and authenticity of the whole of the book, critical opinion has taken radically different directions.[57] For instance, in the opinion of G. Hölscher the only authentic material in the book is its poetry, whereas C. C. Torrey thinks that the entire book is pseudepigraphical, originating around 230 B.C. in Jerusalem.[58] These theses have been taken up and modified by other critics. However, in the

---

[55]The interpretation of these two verse-fragments will be discussed in more detail below.

[56]This will also be discussed below.

[57]Rudolph Smend, Der Prophet Ezechiel (Leipzig, 1880), p. xxi, quoted in Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 1: 4*.

[58]G. Hölscher, Hesekiel. Der Dichter und das Buch: Eine literarkritische Untersuchung, BZAW, 39 (Giessen: n.p., 1924), and Charles Cutler Torry, Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy, Yale Oriental Series, Researches 18 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930).

work of several of the most recent commentators, W. Eichrodt and W. Zimmerli, to name the two most notable examples, there is a decisive turn from these radical positions. Zimmerli concludes that the book, having been transmitted within the circle of Ezekiel's disciples, received many expansions and explanatory additions, but that the basic material of the book derived from the spoken words of Ezekiel himself.[59] In this context Zimmerli's position has been adopted.

1. Ezekiel 7

The basic problem encountered in the analysis of Ezek 7 is to determine the authenticity of the various sections of the chapter and their relationship to each other. The results gained from research into this problem will provide the basic evidence which may be used to determine whether the passage actually contains the pattern of universality and particularity and whether it truly is a DY text. It is evident from the outset that the most crucial concern will be to determine the authenticity and the best interpretation of the phrase "the end has come upon the four corners of hā'āreṣ" (v 2b). If hā'āreṣ is interpreted to mean "the world," as will be argued below, then the universal dimension in the midst of the particular focus of the rest of the chapter is evident. On the other hand, if it is interpreted to mean "the land of Israel," one can hardly argue for the presence of the pattern of universality and particularity

---

[59]Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 1: 11*.

in this context.

Ezek 7 is very difficult both from a textual-critical and from a literary-critical point of view. Three of these difficulties may be briefly outlined. 1) The extent of its textual corruption becomes apparent with an examination of the critical apparatus in BHK. A comparison of the MT with the LXX reveals two very different arrangements of the material. In addition, the LXX text is shorter. 2) The chapter in its entirety falls quite readily into three sections, i.e., vv 2-4, 5-9, and 10-27, each of which is closed by a recognition formula (vv 4, 9, and 27). However, only two of these sections open with a messenger formula (vv 2 and 5), and, furthermore, vv 5-9 are very repetitive of vv 2-4. This also would indicate some corruption of the text. 3) The material contained in Ezek 7 is basically poetic, and it can be arranged into parallel or balancing stichs. However, there are many clauses or groups of clauses which do not display this poetic quality. This indicates that the text has received extraneous additions.

For our purposes it will not be necessary to separate out all of these extraneous additions. Particularly, the problems pertaining to vv 10-27 need not be researched in detail. It is significant to know the relationship of that section to the first part of the chapter, but the key concern is with the problems posed by vv 2-4 and 5-9 because of the crucial importance of v 2 for this study.

The material which follows the introductory formula in v 2 is reiterated in v 6, or, it could also be said that the ideas of v 2 are expanded in vv 5-7. Vv 3-5 are paralleled in vv 8-9, and to a large extent these two small sections are verbally equivalent. The Greek version has a very different arrangement of vv 2-9. There the verses of the MT appear in translation in the following order: 2, 7-9, 3-6a. The Greek version is almost as repetitious as the MT, and, in this regard, it does not help to solve the problem. On the other hand, it adds one more problem. One must seek to account for the different arrangement which is found in this text.

Commentators have taken basically two directions in seeking a solution to the problem of the relationship between vv 2-4 and 5-9. A few commentators consider both sections to be the authentic work of Ezekiel. Others are inclined to delete the parts which are repetitious. In this context a few commentators who represent the major points of view will be selected.

G. A. Cooke and G. Fohrer recognize the similarity between the two sections. In spite of this they maintain that both sections are authentic. Cooke explains that the prophet may have delivered several oracles in similar language and that the grouping of two of them into this one context leads to confusion and redundancy.[60] Fohrer, on the

---

[60]G. A. Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel, 2 vols, ICC (New York: Charles

other hand, explains that the two sections are not merely doublets or parallel passages. Rather, this seemingly redundant repetitiveness is an example of a phenomenon that recurs often in this book. Ezekiel is using the same theme in both sections, but in the second section he modifies and amplifies what he has said in the first.[61]

W. A. Irwin finds that Ezek 7 contains Ezekiel's longest and best extant poem.[62] Irwin's method may only be evaluated fairly when one takes into consideration his work with the poem as a whole. He finds that the chapter, as it stands in the MT, falls into two sections, vv 1-12 and 13-27. Beginning with the second section he breaks it down into five components, vv 14-16, 17-18, 19-20, 21-25, and 26-27. He notices that vv 17-18 are textually intact and that they fall neatly into three balancing poetic lines. In vv 19-20 he deletes both the third and the sixth clauses of v 19 and the last clause of v 20. In this way he finds another strophe with three balanced, poetic lines. In a similar fashion he proceeds through the remaining three sections, and in each case his work results in a strophe of three lines. Since he was successful in finding a consistent poetic structure in vv 14-27, Irwin looks for the same kind of

---

Scribner's Sons, 1937), 1: 75, 77.

[61]Fohrer, Ezechiel, p. 42.

[62]William A. Irwin, The Problem of Ezekiel: An Inductive Study (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943), pp. 91-98.

underlying construction in the section vv 1-13. Because of its repetitiveness he considers this section to be a conflate recension. Therefore, he reconstructs the first line of the poem from the several reduplicated announcements of the end. The second and third lines he discovers in vv 7 and 8, respectively. Thus, the original poem contained the following as its first strophe:

> Now is the day!
> The end has come
> upon you, inhabitant of the land.
> Now I will pour out my wrath on you
> and will expend my anger upon you;
> just as you have done I will requite you,
> and your abominations shall abide with you![63]

Irwin conjectures that vv 12-13 contain some of the material of another three line strophe, but at this point he feels uncertain of his reconstruction.

Zimmerli and Eichrodt offer similar solutions for the problem of the text of vv 2-9. Both find it necessary to delete one of the repetitive sections. Eichrodt excises vv 3b-4 because they are "an inferior variant" of vv 5-9,[64] but Zimmerli reasons that vv 6aβ-9 were not originally in the text.[65] He recognizes that the text as it stands contains only two introductory formulae (vv 2, 5), whereas it has three recognition formulae (vv 4, 9, 27). Thus one recognition formula is left without a corresponding

---

[63]Ibid., p. 96.

[64]Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 99

[65]Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 1: 160.

introductory formula. Using the evidence of the Greek version for the original continuity between v 6aα and v 10 he deletes vv 6aβ-9, and thus the recognition formula in v 9 is also deleted. There remain two corresponding sets of formulae and two sections, i.e., vv 2-4 and vv 5-6aα, 10-27. According to Zimmerli, these sections comprise the text that was first translated into Greek. At a later time the Hebrew text was enlarged by the insertion of vv 6aβ-9 between vv 6aα and 10. This intrusion tore the material following v 10 from its original place with the messenger formula in v 5. Thereafter, the Greek version was revised in accordance with the Hebrew, except that vv 6aβ-9 found their way into the text after v 2 through the agency of the catch-phrase peras hekei rather than after v 6aα as in the Hebrew. In this way the original continuity between the messenger formula in v 5 (v 9 in the Greek) and the material following v 10 was undisturbed in the Greek version.[66]

In evaluating these various solutions to the problem of the relationship between the parallel sections vv 2-4 and vv 5-9, those solutions offered by Cooke and Fohrer are less than satisfactory. The presence of so great an amount of repetitious, and, in the case of vv 3-5 and 7-9, verbally identical material is more easily accounted for by Irwin's suggestion that it is a conflate recension. However, Irwin's reconstruction of a strophe from the material of

---

[66]Ibid.

vv 2-11, though supported methodologically by the rather appealing results of his reconstruction of vv 14-27, is far too arbitrary in its selection of the "original" words and clauses. Eichrodt's solution is not much more satisfactory because he also chooses rather arbitrarily which section must be deleted. Zimmerli has given due attention to the formal aspects of the chapter, and his solution for the problem is to be preferred.

According to general critical opinion, vv 10-27 also contain numerous expansions and textual difficulties. However, for the present purposes these need not be singled out. More important is the question of the relationship of vv 10-27 to vv 2-4 and 5-6a . It has already been concluded with Zimmerli that vv 5-6a and vv 10-27 together comprise the second unit of this chapter so that the question actually concerns the relationship of this unit to vv 2-4. However, generally the thematic and literary unity of the entire chapter is recognized. This position has been adopted here.

Each of the commentators reviewed above, with the exception of Irwin, regards v 2 as the genuine work of Ezekiel. It is precisely in this verse that the universal scope of the prophet's judgment speech is to be seen most clearly. Certainly the messenger formula of v 2a specifies that the land of Israel is the addressee of the speech that follows. However, v 2b announces that "the end has come upon the four corners of hā'āreṣ." hā'āreṣ admits of two

interpretations. It could mean either "world" or "land." If it means "land," then clearly the land of Israel is indicated (cf. v 2a). In this case the entire phrase "the four corners of (ʾarbaʿt kanĕpôt) hāʾāreṣ" would have an unusually restricted significance. This same construction is used in Isa 11.12.[67] Similar constructions using the nouns kānāp and ʾereṣ are found in Isa 24.16, Job 37.3, and 38.13. In each of these cases the meaning of hāʾāreṣ is, without a doubt, "earth" or "world." Constructions with these two nouns in which hāʾāreṣ has a restricted sense are not found anywhere in Old Testament literature. A comparison can also be drawn between Ezek 7.2 and Gen 6.13. The latter stands in the context of the flood story, which certainly concerns a world-wide judgment. Gen 6.13, like Ezek 7.2, speaks of an end (qēṣ)[68] which is coming (bāʾ), and it also specifies the world (hāʾāreṣ) as the sphere of judgment. Another bit of evidence for the meaning of the phrase under consideration may be found in Assyrian inscriptions which speak of the

---

[67]There are two minor differences in construction. Isa 11.12 uses the preposition min in place of ʿal of Ezek 7.2. Also, Isa 11.12 uses the masculine construct form ʾarbaʿ, whereas Ezek 7.2 uses the feminine construct ʾarbaʿt. However, according to Qere (BHK) Ezek 7.2 should also read the masculine.

[68]It bears emphasizing that qēṣ in the context of Ezek 7.2 as also in Gen 6.13 does not carry temporal and apocalyptic significance (see BDB). It does not look forward to the end of time or to the end of history as it does in Dan 8.17, 19; 9.26b; 11.27, 35, 40; 12.4, 9, and 13. Both in Gen 6.13 and in Ezek 7.2 the primary significance of the word is "annihilation." So also Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 1: 170.

"four world-regions," meaning the whole world.[69] These biblical and extra-biblical parallels indicate that hā'āreṣ in the context of Ezek 7.2 means "earth" or "world."

This conclusion is contested by Fohrer who argues that the passages in Isa 11.12, 24.16, Job 37.3, and 38.13 are all later than Ezekiel and that the meaning here is "the four corners of the land of Israel."[70] H. G. May also denies that hā'āreṣ could have universal significance because "the context is against translating" it in this way.[71] Zimmerli, in response to those who take such a position, says:

> In 2b ist nun aber auch die weitere Eigenart zu erkennen, die sich für die Rede vom אדני יהוה ergeben hatte: die weltweite Ausweitung. Es bedeutet ohne Zweifel eine Überraschung und scheint einen logischen Widerspruch zu ergeben, wenn in einem an das "Land Israels" addressierten Wort vom Ende, das "über die vier Säume der Erde" kommt, geredet wird . . . Der logische Widerspruch zwischen 2a und 2b (Hölscher) wird nur denjenigen zu kritischen Operationen reizen, der verkennt, dass Ez hier eine längst vorgeformte, in anderen Horizonten erwachsene Form der Verkündigung vom kommenden Gott prophetisch aktualisiert.[72]

In the context of this poem, v 2b is the clearest indication of the breadth of the prophet's outlook, but Zimmerli also finds that the poem as a whole describes the

---

[69]Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 101.

[70]Fohrer, Ezechiel, p. 42. Even if these passages are later, one need not assume that the phrase has changed its meaning.

[71]Herbert G. May, "The Book of Ezekiel," IB 6: 99.

[72]Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 1: 169.

calamitous day in a strikingly general sense, and that it does not allow the specificity of a proclamation of judgment on Israel or on Jerusalem to dominate that picture.[73] It is in the material which interrupts the poetic style of these verses that the thrust is particularized the most. Zimmerli comments in this regard:

> Die Neigung, in der Rede vom יום יהוה von den konkreten Zügen der geschichtlichen Lage und Örtlichkeit abzusehen und die Fassungslosigkeit des Menschen angesichts dieses übergrossen Einbruchs göttlicher Nähe in menschheitlicher Allgemeinheit zu schildern, ist unverkennbar.[74]

He mentions Isa 2.9-22, Zeph 1, and Amos 5.18-20 as other passages in which such a tendency is noticeable.

This lack of concrete historical or geographical anchorage creates tension between the universal and particular aspects of the poem. As a result, the poem appears capable of general application if seen apart from the reference to the addressee in the messenger formula in v 2a. Yet it is drawn towards the particular because the "I" speaks directly to a particular "you" (vv 3-5). Thus, Ezek 7 opens with an announcement which is universal in scope and proceeds with a description of judgment which is capable of general application, but it is also given a very particular orientation by the messenger formula and by the direct address.

---

[73]Ibid., 1: 166.

[74]Ibid., 1: 167.

Having concluded that Ezek 7 exhibits the pattern of universality and particularity, the next task is to inquire whether this text also bears the characteristic marks of a DY text. Most commentators recognize that it does. Zimmerli refers especially to the monotonous, sinister repetitiveness of parallel formulations which also characterizes passages such as Isa 2.12-16 and Zeph 1.15-16.[75] It is also noteworthy that v 3 describes the end as a time when Yahweh lets loose his anger. This idea is characteristic of DY texts (cf. Zeph 1.15a, 2.2, Isa 13.9). V 12 speaks of the day as one that is drawing near. The DY is often described in the same way (cf. Zeph 1.7, 17, Obad 15, Joel 1.15, 2.1, Isa 13.6).[76] In addition, v 10 in the Greek contains the phrase "the day of the Lord," and v 19, in the MT, speaks of "the day of the wrath of Yahweh." Fohrer thinks that in v 10 the Greek attests to the original and that the reading of the MT originates through haplography.[77] Zimmerli does

---

[75]Ibid., 1: 167-68.

[76]Even if Ezek 7.6aβ-9 is considered an addition (Zimmerli), it is instructive that this passage bears the same characteristic marks of DY descriptions. V 7 describes the day as one which is "near," and v 8, as one of "wrath" and "anger." Furthermore, v 7b introduces an antithesis. The day is one of tumult, not of rejoicing. This is reminiscent of the antithesis in Amos 5.18 where the day is said to be one of darkness and not of light. In both cases it is as if popular opinion looks forward to a beneficent day, but the prophet must correct that notion.

[77]Fohrer, Ezechiel, p. 44.

not agree.[78] Nevertheless, even if the Greek has expanded the original to arrive at this phrase, it bears witness to the fact that, already at the time of its translation, this chapter was interpreted as one concerning the DY. V 19c, which contains the phrase in the MT, is missing in the Greek. It is a direct quotation from Zeph 1.18, and very likely it is a late intrusion. Even so, this intrusion bears evidence to the ancient interpretation of this passage. On the basis of this evidence, it is safe to include Ezek 7 with the texts that are known to belong to the DY materials.

It remains to inquire concerning the date of composition of Ezek 7. The poem looks forward to the fall of a city, i.e., Jerusalem. Indeed, it is written as if the siege were just in progress (vv 14-19). Zimmerli insists that "without a doubt" this composition originated before 587 B. C.[79]

On the basis of the foregoing investigation of Ezek 7, it is reasonable to conclude that this passage is another example of the DY text which is characterized by the pattern of universality and particularity, and, furthermore, that it originates in the time period just prior to the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B. C.

---

[78] Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 1: 162.

[79] Ibid., 1: 168.

2. Ezek 30.1-8

The analysis of Ezek 30 must also begin with questions concerning the delineation and authenticity of the basic units. The chapter is well supplied with formulae which serve to indicate the limits of the various units. V 20 contains a dating formula which separates the chapter into two basic sections, i.e., vv 1-19 and 20-26. This division is given further confirmation by the messenger formulae which introduce both sections (vv 2 and 20) and by the recognition formulae which conclude each section (vv 19 and 26). The division of vv 1-19 is facilitated by four more introductory formulae in vv 2, 6, 10, and 13, three of which are balanced by corresponding concluding formulae in vv 8, 12, and 19. Thus, three units are delineated, i.e., vv 6-8, 10-12, and 13-19. It is noteworthy that v 9 falls outside these units, and, indeed, it is commonly agreed to be a commentary on the foregoing verses, its secondary character being betrayed by the introductory formula <u>bayôm hahû'</u>. It is also noteworthy that the messenger formula in v 1 does not have a corresponding concluding formula. This difficulty is alleviated when, as is commonly done, v 5 is recognized as secondary. It is explained, furthermore, that the introductory formula in v 6 was added because v 5 had caused a serious interruption in the sense of the poem. The removal of v 5 and of the introductory formula in v 6 allows the reconstruction of the original unit vv 1-4, 6-8.

A further possibility to be considered is that vv 7-8 might be a supplement to the original unit vv 1-4, 6 since v 6 also contains a concluding formula. Though Zimmerli recognizes this as a possibility, both he and Eichrodt delineate the first section by vv 1-4, 6-8.[80] Zimmerli finds that 29.9-16 expands on 30.6-8, that 29.10 depends on 30.6, and that 29.12 depends on v 7. This suggests that the author of 29.9-16 had a united 30.1-4, 6-8 before his eyes. In the light of this observation, the concluding formula in 30.6 must be understood as a light caesura,[81] and vv 1-4, 6-8 must be taken as an original unit.

The authenticity of Ezek 30.1-19 is seriously doubted. Irwin and May emphasize the late eschatological character of this passage. Irwin thinks there may be authentic fragments in v 6a-b and v 13b. May finds an authentic fragment only in v 4a.[82] For Cooke the absence of a date and the poverty of language point to the secondary character of all of vv 1-19.[83] Zimmerli is inclined to agree with Cooke. At most he would consider vv 1-4, 6-8 to be authentic. He observes that this section has marked similarities with Ezek 7 but that it lacks the stylistic power of that chapter.

---

[80]Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 2: 728, and Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 415.

[81]Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 2: 728.

[82]Irwin, Ezekiel, pp. 192-3, and May, "Ezekiel," IB 6: 228-9.

[83]Cooke, Ezekiel, 2: 331.

This, together with the fact that the customary dating formula is missing, makes the authenticity of even this section suspect, in his opinion. He conjectures that vv 1-4, 6-8 may have originated in the school of Ezekiel's disciples who worked with the same vocabulary and thematic material as did the prophet himself.[84] Eichrodt, Wevers, and Fohrer, on the other hand, think that the unit vv 1-4, 6-8 contains authentic material. Fohrer would add vv 10-12 to this as another authentic unit.[85] In view of such disagreement, it is best to allow for the possibility that vv 1-4, 6-8 are inauthentic and that they originated later than the time of Ezekiel.

Vv 1-4, 6-8 contain the phrase yôm layahweh (v 3), which is a variation of the DY phrase. It is clear that this DY has consequences particularly for Egypt. However, it may also be understood that it has universal implications. In this connexion the sense of v 3d requires clarification. Seen in the context of v 3 alone, this phrase is a general statement that could well be understood to include all the nations of the world. This interpretation is denied by Fohrer who thinks that it refers only to those nations who are Egypt's helpers.[86] That the fall of Egypt is

---

[84]Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 2: 728-29.

[85]Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 415; John W. Wevers, Ezekiel, The Century Bible, New Series (London: Nelson, 1969), p. 227; and Fohrer, Ezechiel, pp. 170-72.

[86]Fohrer, Ezechiel, p. 170.

consistently viewed against the background of her fallen helpers in vv 6-8 would seem to support Fohrer's interpretation. Zimmerli, on the other hand, says of v 3, "Wird man bei dem 'Gewölk' an die Elemente der alten Jahwetheophanie denken (Ex 19:9.16.18), so bei dem Völkeraufgebot an einen weltweiten Völkeraufbruch."[87] One might add to this the argument that, in view of the close relationship between the first section of Ezek 7 and Ezek 30.1-4, 6-8 and especially between 7.2b and 30.3d, the latter should be understood in terms of the former. If the scope of 7.2b is universal,[88] the same must be true of 30.3d. Admittedly, this argument is not decisive.

The pattern of universality and particularity is also evident in vv 7-8. Egypt and her cities in particular shall lie in ruins in the midst of the widespread ruin of other countries and their cities. It is not explicitly stated that all the nations of the world lie in ruins; yet one could certainly speak of a specific focus on the ruin of Egypt within the context of a general description of the ruin of the nations.

It may be concluded that Ezek 30.1-4, 6-8 is a DY text originating sometime after Ezekiel, and that it exhibits the pattern of universality and particularity.

---

[87]Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 2: 729-30.

[88]See above, pp. 63-65.

E THE BOOK OF JOEL AND ZECHARIAH XIV

Both the Book of Joel and Zech 14 make reference to the DY (Joel 1.15, 2.1, 11, 3.7, 7.14, and Zech 14.1). Indeed, of Joel it is said that his "major theme is the Day of Yahweh. No other Old Testament witness gives as detailed and systematic a treatment as he does. Every section of his book may be understood as a contribution to this theme . . . ."[89] In the Book of Joel the DY is first presented as a day of judgment for Judah and Jerusalem (chaps 1-2), and then also as a day of salvation through the outpouring of Yahweh's spirit (chap 3) and through Yahweh's intervention against the nations (chap 4). Somewhat the same structure is to be found in Zech 14. According to Zech 14.2 the city of Jerusalem is at first conquered by the armies of the nations, but then, according to vv 3-5, Yahweh intervenes on Jerusalem's behalf against the nations. In both texts the judgment of the DY is focused first particularly on Jerusalem (and Judah), but, furthermore, in each case the motif of "all the nations" gathering to fight against Jerusalem makes it evident that the DY is conceived of as having consequences for the entire world. Each of these texts will be considered in more detail below.

---

[89]Hans Walter Wolff, A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos, trans. Waldemar Janzen, S. Dean McBride, and Charles A. Muenchow, ed. S. Dean McBride, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), p. 12.

1. The Book of Joel

For the sake of a brief overview, the Book of Joel may be conveniently divided into two sections consisting of chaps 1-2 and 3-4, respectively.[90] The first section comprises a description of a locust plague (1.4), a call to lamentation (1.5-14), songs which lament the destruction caused by the DY (1.15-20), a cry of alarm occasioned by the approaching DY (2.1-11), a call to repentance (2.12-14), an admonition for the peaple to assemble themselves at Zion to beg Yahweh for mercy (2.15-17), and a salvation oracle (2.18-27). This section is quite firmly rooted in the world of real experience. Indeed, according to the interpretations of many commentators, it has its setting in an actual historical locust plague.[91] The second section, on the other hand, looks forward to the future. It speaks of salvation for Judah and Jerusalem as did 2.18-27, but not in terms of material prosperity. Rather, 3.1-5 promises the

[90]This division is not accepted by all critics. For instance, Wolff (Joel and Amos, p. 57) sees the turning point in the book at 2.18. However, for the present discussion the simple division into chaps 1-2 and 3-4 is convenient.

[91]For the sake of brevity this survey requires some oversimplification. Though an actual historical locust plague may have provided the inspiration for the composition of Joel 2.1-11, its imagery shows that it transcends the world of real experience. Wolff (Joel and Amos, p. 42) explains very plausibly that chap 2 depicts an apocalyptic locust plague. At one time Ernst Sellin (Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, 2nd and 3rd rev. ed., 2 vols, KAT 12 [Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1929], 1: 145) also took this point of view. However, his latest interpretation is that both chapters are rooted in a historical locust plague.

outpouring of Yahweh's spirit before the great DY comes, and chap 4 looks forward to a great day when Yahweh will save Judah and Jerusalem by bringing all the nations into judgment in the "valley of Jehoshaphat" (4.2, 12). This place is mentioned nowhere else in the Old Testament, but since the fourth century A. D. it has been identified as the valley of Kidron, an identification that is doubtlessly wrong. Joel is not thinking of a specific geographical location, but of a spacious place where all the armies of the nations may be gathered for Yahweh's judgment (therefore, yĕhôšāpāt).[92] This indicates that the chapter as a whole does not have a historical or geographical orientation. The author is looking forward to a DY which cannot be conceived of as taking place in the world of historical experience. The DY is here depicted in apocalyptic eschatological terms.

As can be seen from this overview, the Book of Joel, at least in its present form, is permeated by the theme of the DY. However, the authenticty of the verses concerning the DY in chaps 1-2 and the unity of the book as a whole have been brought under suspicion. It has been questioned whether one author could have composed both the historically and the eschatologically oriented sections.

Wolff cites Duhm as having forwarded the most

---

[92]Wolff, Joel and Amos, p. 76, identifies this name as an apocalyptic cipher.

effective challenge to the assumption of the book's unity.[93] According to Duhm, the poem describing the locust invasion (chaps 1-2) was composed first, and later the eschatological section (chaps 3-4) was written by another author during the Maccabean times. The second author incorporated the first two chapters into his work by adding to them the verses concerning the DY, i.e., 1.15, 2.1b-2a, and 11b. In separating these verses out as later additions, Duhm denied that the original poem in chaps 1-2 made any reference to the DY. Duhm's thesis was accepted with some modifications by several other commentators including J. A. Bewer, E. Sellin, and T. H. Robinson.[94]

Among the most recent commentators there has been a decided tendency in the contrary direction, i.e., to argue for the unity of the Book of Joel. Here one might mention Kapelrud, Weiser, Bourke, and Wolff.[95] These commentators maintain that 1.15, 2.1b-2a, and 11b are integral components of the first two chapters, and, therefore, that the DY theme

---

[93]Ibid., p. 6. The reference is to B. Duhm, "Anmerkungen zu den zwölf Propheten," ZAW 31 (1911), 187.

[94]Smith, Ward, and Bewer, Critical and Exegetical Commentary, pp. 49-56; Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, 2nd and 3rd rev. ed., 1: 145-46; and Robinson and Horst, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, p. 55.

[95]Arvid S. Kapelrud, Joel Studies, UUÅ 1948/4 (Uppsala: A. B. Lundequist, 1948), p. 176; Artur Weiser, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten, 3rd ed., ATD, 24 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), p. 103; J. Bourke, "Le Jour de Yahvé dans Joël," RB 66 (Jan-Ap, 1959), 7-18; and Wolff, Joel and Amos, pp. 6-10.

is inseparable from these chapters. They argue that the book as a whole evidences careful symmetry of construction, that its two major sections are bound together by the use of catch-words, and that it is the work of a single author.[96] It appears that the argument for the unity of the book is substantial, if not decisive, and that in recent years a consensus has been reached in this regard.

If, in agreement with these commentators, it is granted that the Book of Joel is a literary unity, it is quite obvious that the prophet is directing attention first to Yahweh's judgment of a particular nation, i.e., Judah (chaps 1-2), and then to Yahweh's judgment of all the nations of the world (chaps 3-4). The relevance of chap 3 in this connexion may be questioned, but it should be noted that though this chapter, in an unrestricted sense, predicts the future outpouring of Yahweh's spirit upon all flesh (kōl bāśār, 3.1), it also predicts a cosmic upheaval that will precede the DY (vv 3-4). It appears certain from v 5 that the DY is a day of doom for the entire world, except that those "who call upon the name of Yahweh" shall be delivered. Thus, it is evident that between chaps 1-2 and chaps 3-4 the focus of judgment follows a pattern moving from the particular to the universal. Furthermore, the context of this judgment is consistently the DY.

---

[96]Even so, it is still generally recognized that the book does have some secondary additions such as 4.4-8 and 18-21.

The change in time perspective between chaps 1-2 and 3-4 is noteworthy. In chaps 1-2 the danger is imminent, in fact, it is said that the DY has already come (2.1).[97] Chaps 3-4, on the other hand, refer to a time in the more distant future, as is indicated by the phrase ʾaḥărê kēn (3.1).[98] This change corresponds to the change from the focus of judgment on Judah to its focus on the nations. Such a change in time perspective was not encountered in Isa 2, 13, Zeph 1, Ezek 7, or 30. In the latter no distinction could be seen between the time of the particular judgment and the time of the universal judgment. The DY was depicted as a day in which judgment came on the universal and on the particular simultaneously. In the Book of Joel, on the other hand, the DY as judgment for the particular, i.e., Judah, is imminent, but for the universal, i.e., the nations, it is further in the future. Yet it is one and the same DY. The imminent DY in an anticipatory way participates in the future DY.

Thus it may be maintained that the Book of Joel as a whole displays the pattern of universality and particularity

---

[97]According to 2.12-17 the DY may still be averted if the people repent. Therefore, in actuality it has not yet come, but its coming is so certain that the prophet may speak of it in the "prophetic perfect tense" as if it had already come. The emphasis is on the certainty and imminence of its coming.

[98]Wolff, Joel and Amos, p. 65.

in a DY context. However, both in chaps 2 and 4, taken as separate units, the same pattern may also be found.

Chap 2 opens with a specific geographical reference. Zion is the place where the alarm must be sounded because the DY is coming upon Judah and Jerusalem. In vv 12-17 the reference is also specifically to the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem who are urged to repent in view of the coming DY. However, in vv 3-11 this particularity is lost. V 3 speaks of a complete reversal of creation into chaos, but no particular place on earth is mentioned where this is to occur. The impression one receives is that all creation is returning to chaos. In v 6 reference is made to the anguish of "peoples," but no particular group of people is specified (cf. Isa 13.7-8). It seems that all people are in anguish. In v 9 the invasion of a city is described, but no particular city is named. It could be any city. V 10 tells of cosmic alterations on the DY. The earth and the heavens quake and the luminaries are darkened (Cf. Isa 13.10, 13). These verses are cast in very general terms. The perspective is actually universal. Thus chap 2 exhibits a pattern of universality (vv 3-11) in a framework of the particular (vv 1-2, 12-17).

In Joel 4 the pattern of universality and particularity is found in a somewhat altered form. At first Judah and Jerusalem, in particular, are threatened by all the nations

in general. In explicit DY contexts this polarization is new. The earlier DY passages (i.e., Isa 2, 13, Ezek 7, 30, and Zeph 1) depicted Yahweh, on the one side, as a judge against the whole world, which was on the other side. From this universal scope, attention was narrowed to one nation in particular. In Joel 4, however, Israel and the nations are at opposite poles. At first Yahweh is on the side of the nations. In an ironic way he issues a summons to all the nations to gather for war, but then he himself takes the side of his people and moves out from Zion (v 16) to destroy all the nations. In this chapter the universal is constantly kept in view. All the nations are always included in the activity of the DY. Particularization occurs in the division of the nations into two camps, Judah and all the nations. The pattern of universality and particularity in the DY is still present, but it is expressed in a different way. For Judah and Jerusalem the DY is a day of salvation if they repent. For the nations it is inevitably a day of judgment.

It is commonly agreed that the Book of Joel is a post-exilic composition.[99] Usually it is dated to the fourth century B.C. Therefore, on the basis of the foregoing analysis, it may be concluded that the Book of

---

[99]Only a few commentators, for instance, Kapelrud, Joel Studies, pp. 191-92, still argue for a pre-exilic date for the Book of Joel.

Joel is a post-exilic text which is permeated by the DY theme and exhibits the pattern of universality and particularity.

2. Zech 14

Zech 9-14 is commonly held to be of anonymous authorship, usually attributed to more than one author. These chapters do not readily yield evidence by which they may be dated, but, in any case, they are post-exilic compositions. A more precise dating is not required for our purposes.

The unity of Zech 14 has been questioned. Horst, for instance, claims that the chapter is made up of several individual sections, namely, vv 1-5; 6-8, 10-11; 12, 15; 9, 16-19; and 20-21.[100] Elliger, on the other hand, denies that the chapter is such a loose compilation of various units. In his opinion, it has the evident plan of a unified whole, although the text has received extensive expansions in vv 4c, 5a-c, 10, 11a, 12, 15, 18, and 20-21.[101] The most convincing analysis of this text is that presented by P. D. Hanson. He claims that the chapter conforms basically to "the pattern of the conflict myth." He shows from various

---

[100]Robinson and Horst, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, pp. 213 and 257-60.

[101]Elliger, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten, pp. 177-78.

examples such as the myth of the Baal-Yamm conflict in Ugaritic literature which parallels the Mesopotamian Enūma eliš, and the biblical psalms 2, 9, 24, 29, 46, 47, 48, 65, 68, 76, 77.17-21, 89.6-19, 97, 98, 104, 106.9-13, 110, and Isa 11.1-9, that myths of conflict are composed with certain recurrent elements in a definite pattern.[102] Zech 14 is also composed according to such a pattern. It may be schematized as follows:

> Threat (vv 1-2)
> Conflict and victory (v 3)
> Theophany and procession (vv 4-5)
> Shalom (vv 6-8)
> Manifestation of Yahweh's universal reign (vv 9-11)
> Covenant curses (vv 12-15)
> Procession of the nations (vv 16-19)
> Sacrifice and banquet (vv 20-21).[103]

Formal similarities between Zech 14 and Joel 4 may also be demonstrated:

> Threat (Joel 4.1-3, 9-12; Zech 14.1-2)
> Conflict and victory (Joel 4.13; Zech 14.3)
> Theophany (Joel 4.14-16; Zech 14.4-5)
> Shalom (Joel 4.18; Zech 14.6-8).

The fact that Zech 14 follows such a pattern supports the conclusion which Elliger has already offered, that this chapter is constructed according to a conscious plan and that is is a unified whole.

---

[102] Paul D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 300-16.

[103] Ibid., p. 372. This is an abbreviated form of Hanson's scheme.

Zech 14 begins with the announcement, "Behold Yahweh's day comes" (hinnê yôm bā' layahweh), indicating that its theme, like that of Joel 4, is the DY. It is clear that the DY has implications for the whole world because Yahweh is gathering all the nations against Jerusalem. In this respect it is like Joel 4 where Yahweh issues a summons to all the nations to assemble for battle against Jerusalem.[104] The difference between the two texts is that according to Zech 14 Jerusalem is actually taken by the enemy. Yahweh first allows some of its inhabitants to experience punishment, but then he comes to bring Jerusalem salvation from all the nations as he did in Joel 4.

Zech 14.16-19 is, in a sense, parallel to vv 1-5. In this section also the focus is on Jerusalem. Again all nations assemble themselves to that place, but not for purposes of war. They assemble to Jerusalem to worship Yahweh at the annual feast of booths.

The pattern of universality and particularity in Zech 14 is exactly the same as in Joel 4. The DY has universal implications. All the nations of the world are in view, but they are divided into two camps with Jerusalem on the one side and all the nations on the other. In vv 1-5 the

---

[104]In Joel 4 it is not explicitly stated that the nations are assembling to attack Jerusalem. Yet this is a recurrent theme in the Old Testament, and doubtlessly Joel 4 should be interpreted in this way. The fact that the valley of Jehoshaphat has often been identified as the Kidron valley shows that this interpretation has been generally assumed.

nations come to Jerusalem with hostile intent. Yahweh participates first on the side of the nations, summoning them up to Jerusalem, and then on the side of Jerusalem in battle against the nations. In vv 16-19 all the nations come to Jerusalem to worship. Here Yahweh has clearly chosen to champion the cause of his own city. Any nation which does not come to worship him there will be punished. Thus, the pattern of universality and particularity is not the same as in the earlier prophetic texts. In those texts Yahweh, on the one side, judged the whole world which was on the other side. Judgment was first pronounced upon the whole world and then upon a particular people or nation. In Zech 14 Yahweh still comes to judge the world, but the world is divided into two camps, Jerusalem on the one side and all the nations on the other. The DY has implications for the whole world, but for one particular people, i.e., the inhabitants of Jerusalem, it is a time of salvation, whereas for the rest of the world it is a time of judgment.

F CONCLUSION TO CHAPTER 2

We may now summarize the results gained in this chapter from the study of several DY texts. 1) We have concluded that Isa 2.6-17 is a pre-exilic composition which is centred on the DY theme and that its perspective includes both the universal (vv 12-17) and the particular (vv 6-8). However, some scholars have denied that vv 6-8 were originally in unity with vv 12-17. Even so, it can still be

maintained that Isa 2.12-17 is a pre-exilic DY text which exhibits a universal perspective. 2) In Isa 13 the pattern of universality and particularity is very distinct. Though some critics date this chapter to the pre-exilic period, it seems more likely to be a late exilic composition. 3) Ezek 7 and 30 portray the DY as a day with universal implications but with special consequences for a particular nation, i.e., for Israel and Egypt, respectively. Ezek 7 originates from the early exilic period. Ezek 30 is most likely a post-exilic composition, though some critics consider it authentic and would therefore date it to the early exilic period. 4) The Book of Joel and Zech 14 were authored in the post-exilic period. In these passages also the pattern of universality and particularity has been found in combination with the DY theme.

On the basis of these results, one may conclude that the prophets, at least from the time of Isaiah up to the time of the author of Zech 14, perceived that the DY had consequences which were especially significant for one particular people or nation, but that it also had cosmic and universal implications. Thus, the first step of this investigation is accomplished. The nature of the relationship between the DY theme and the pattern of universality and particularity has been determined. The thesis that they are integrally related has been confirmed. It must be concluded that the pattern of universality and particularity is a

motif which belongs to the DY theme.

On the basis of this conclusion, the question concerning the unity of Zeph 1 must be reconsidered. That chapter also exhibits the pattern of universality (vv 2-3, 17-18) and particularity (vv 4-16) in connexion with the DY theme (vv 7, 14-16).[106] The fact that several other DY texts bear this pattern would suggest that its utilization in Zeph 1 might also be original and, therefore, that the verses with a universal perspective should be considered authentic. This, admittedly, is not a necessary conclusion since it is possible that the pattern could have been achieved by an editor. However, the fact that at least one other pre-exilic text, Isa 2.12-17, gives the DY a universal dimension would indicate that those who deny the authenticity of Zeph 1.2-3, 17-18 on the basis that the universal perspective is foreign to the ideology of the pre-exilic prophets in general and of Zephaniah in particular are using an inadequate criterion. It may be objected that this claim requires more substantiation than this one pre-exilic text can give. Therefore, more evidence must be sought in pre-exilic literature before a final conclusion can be reached with regard to the presence or absence of the universal perspective in pre-exilic prophetic ideology.

---

[106]Above, pp. 17-19.

CHAPTER III

UNIVERSALITY IN PRE-EXILIC BIBLICAL TEXTS

A INTRODUCTION

The results obtained from the first step of this investigation, i.e., the study of several DY texts, show that the pattern of universality and particularity was a motif in the DY theme in Old Testament prophetic literature. However, the evidence adduced was insufficient to establish conclusively that this relationship existed in pre-exilic times. Indeed, it may be impossible to prove this decisively. However, in the second step of this investigation additional pre-exilic texts will be cited as evidence that the universal perspective as such was present in pre-exilic ideology. If this step can be successfully accomplished, this will lend definite plausibility to the thesis that the pattern of universality and particularity could already have been a motif in the DY theme in pre-exilic prophetic ideology.

In this connexion an important distinction between "pre-exilic prophetic ideology" and "pre-exilic ideology" must be recognized. The two terms are not equivalent. The former ideology is a part of the latter, but the latter cannot be fully expressed by the former. Hence, it is possible that a concept might belong to the latter, but not to the

former. To demonstrate the existence of a concept in pre-exilic ideology, one may adduce evidence from any pre-exilic biblical text, but to demonstrate its existence in pre-exilic prophetic ideology, evidence must be sought only in pre-exilic prophetic texts. Herein lies a difficulty for this thesis, because the method of investigation so far has been to rely on the consensus of scholarly opinion in questions of authenticity and date. Being aware that many commentators deny that the pre-exilic prophets held a universal perspective, any text which contains the aspect of universality and which is found within a pre-exilic prophetic book must be approached with the foreknowledge that its authenticity will have been denied by some commentators. Thus, it will be difficult to adduce evidence from prophetic texts, though an attempt will still be made. However, if it can be established that the concept of universality was present in pre-exilic ideology, this will already show that it is entirely plausible that it also was present in pre-exilic prophetic ideology.

There are many Old Testament texts outside of the DY pericopes which may be cited as evidence for the universal perspective in pre-exilic ideology. Several of these texts are structured according to what Hanson calls "the ritual pattern of the conflict myth,"[1] and this commonality will lend a certain cohesiveness to the study of these texts. On

---

[1]Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 303. This subject is discussed on pp. 300-10.

the other hand, some relevant texts are not easily related to this myth, but they also must be considered.

The conflict myth appears in two basic variations, namely, the "chaos-conflict motif" and the "nations-conflict motif."[2] The "chaos-conflict motif" designates the mythical representation of the primordial conflict between the god and the Sea-monster, such as the Baal-Yamm conflict found in the Ugaritic texts and the Marduk-Tiamat conflict found in the Enūma eliš, or between the god and death, such as the Baal-Mot conflict found in the Ugaritic texts. In the Old Testament tradition, the "chaos-conflict motif" is frequently historicized. This results in the variation which has been called the "nations-conflict motif." Historicization is to be observed in that foreign nations now take the place of the watery chaotic forces that threatened to destroy the cosmos.

The use of the chaos-conflict motif in biblical tradition is illustrated by Ps 24. This psalm reflects the Ugaritic account of the Baal-Yamm conflict, as can be demonstrated by several comparisons. In the first place, victory shouts of striking similarity are to be found in both contexts:

> Lift up your heads, O gates! (Ps 24.7, 9)
>
> Lift up, O Gods, your heads![3]

---

[2]This is the terminology used by Fritz Stolz, Strukturen und Figuren im Kult von Jerusalem, Studien zur altorientalischen, vor- und frühisraelitischen Religion (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1970).

[3]Frank Moore Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic:

Secondly, the kingship of the god is celebrated in both contexts. Thirdly, the god is depicted as a mighty and victorious warrior, and, finally, the creation motif is evident in both texts.

Ps 24 should be interpreted in light of the Ugaritic myth. In the myth Baal's conflict with Yamm and Nahar represents the god's conflict with the powers of chaos, i.e., the sea or the river, which threaten to destroy the cosmos. Baal is acting to preserve creation. In Ps 24 it must also be understood that Yahweh has gone out to fight the powers of chaos. In fact, v 2 alludes to this when it mentions yammîm and nehārôt, which correspond exactly to the names of Baal's enemies, i.e., Yamm and Nahar, as the foundations for Yahweh's creation. The victory shout celebrates the triumph of the god. In the Ugaritic texts this shout is addressed to the divine council before Baal goes out to battle against Yamm. According to Cross, "we can claim confidently, in view of the repetitive style of the Ugaritic texts, that the shout was repeated, addressed to the council of gods, when Baʿl returned in victory to receive the kingship."[4] In Ps 24.7 and 9 the shout is not addressed to the divine council, but rather to the gates of Jerusalem which are

---

Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), p. 98, citing the Ugaritic text III AB B: 19-37. Our discussion of Ps 24 depends heavily on Cross' analysis.

[4]Ibid., p. 99.

personified. This must be viewed as an adaptation of the myth to harmonize it with Yahwist theology. According to Ps 24.7 and 9 it would appear that the victory shout occurs at the time of the victorious king's triumphal procession to his temple. The fact that the victory and the kingship of Yahweh are celebrated simultaneously leads to the conclusion that Yahweh, like Baal, has proved his right to kingship by his triumph against the forces of chaos.

The pattern of the conflict myth in Ps 24 is outlined in the following manner by Hanson:

> "1 Manifestation of Yahweh's universal reign
> "2 Combat vs. seas/rivers -- victory
> "(3-6 Entrance Torah)
> "7-10 Victory shout
> " Procession after victory to temple"[5]

As has already been indicated, the relationship between the chaos-conflict motif and the nations-conflict motif is explained in that the latter is a historicization of the former. The two motifs are actually variations of one theme.[6] The "Song of the Sea" (Exod 15) is an example of a very ancient poem in which such historicization occurs.[7]

---

[5]Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 301.

[6]That this is Stolz's position is evident from the phrase, "Denn die feindlichen Völker, in denen sich nach mythischem Weltverständnis das Chaos konkretisiert . . ." (Strukturen und Figuren, p. 91). Hanson, Cross, and Kraus do not delineate these two motifs, and, therefore, one must seek to infer whether they actually would view them as part of one theme. From the following discussion on Exod 15 and Pss 46 and 48 it should be clear that they are in basic agreement with Stolz.

[7]So Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic. p. 301; and Cross, Canaanite Myth, pp. 142-43, if read in the context of

As Hanson says, "The hymn is suspended precariously between the cosmic and mundane."[8] The cosmic dimension is evident in the traces of the primeval battle between the god and the sea, but the historical perspective has altered the mythical pattern so much that the sea actually becomes the passive instrument for Yahweh's battle against the Pharaoh and the Egyptians. The threat of the chaotic waters, known from the ancient mythical pattern, is replaced in this context by the threat of a hostile nation. Yet the essential structural elements of the conflict myth are present here:

> "Combat-victory (1-12)
> "Theophany of Divine Warrior (8)
> "Salvation of the Israelites (13-16a)
> "Building of the temple and procession (16b-17)
> "Manifestation of Yahweh's universal reign (18)"[9]

Two more texts which illustrate the relationship between the motifs under consideration are Pss 46 and 48. H. -J. Kraus interprets that the waters of Ps 46.4 are actually the waters of chaos, and that these chaotic,

---

pp. 79-90. Actually Cross's statements seem to run contrary to this: "It will not do to describe the process as a progressive historicizing of myth." However, this is written to contrast his own position with that of the so-called myth and ritual school. Cross emphasizes that "The reenactment of primordial events of cosmogonic myth gave way to festivals reenacting the epic events in Israel's past . . ."(p. 143). Thus, the debate between Cross and the myth and ritual school concerns two different perspectives on the process of the historicization of myth. Both are agreed that the ancient chaos-conflict motif has reappeared in historic dress.

[8]Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 301.

[9]Ibid., cf. Cross, Canaanite Myth, p. 142.

ruinous forces are given historic dress in v 7. The nations in v 7 are in tumult like the waters of chaos, and they threaten to overthrow the created order.[10] Kraus states his interpretation even more clearly in his comment on Ps 48.5:

> Der Völkersturm unter Anführung der "Könige der Erde" ist die geschichtliche Weise, in der das Chaos gegen das zentrale Bollwerk, den Sitz des Schöpfers und Weltherrn, anbrandet. Es handelt sich hier um eine historisierende Variante zu dem urzeitlichen Chaoskampf der Weltentstehungsmythen.[11]

Having clarified what is meant by the term "conflict-motif," and having cited several biblical texts which illustrate the use of this motif, three groups of texts which bear some relationship to it may now be presented for consideration: 1) Of the psalms the so-called "Zion," "Enthronement," and "Royal" Psalms are relevant for this discussion. 2) This motif may be traced into some prophetic texts in the Book of Isaiah, but, also, it may be conjectured that its basic idea underlies many more prophetic texts right through to the time of Joel and Zech 14 where the motif has already been recognized.[12] 3) At the background of the flood story of Gen 6-9 one may also perceive the outlines of that primordial conflict in which the powers of chaos destroyed the cosmos.

---

[10]Kraus, Psalmen, 1: 344, and Weiser, The Psalms, pp. 368 and 371.

[11]Kraus, Psalmen, 1: 358.

[12]See above, pp. 81-82.

B PSALM TEXTS

1. The Zion Psalms

Kraus includes in this type Pss (46) 48, 76, 84, 87, 122, and (132).[13] Of these, Pss 46, 48, and 76 are selected for discussion because they are commonly held to be pre-exilic; they have the essential structural elements common to the conflict myth;[14] and they give evidence of a universal perspective in pre-exilic ideology.

These three psalms tell of Yahweh's conflict with and defeat of the nations which are attacking Jerusalem. However, no historical battle known to have occurred at Jerusalem provides a setting for these psalms. Nor do the geographical details in Pss 46 and 48 suit Jerusalem. There is no river flowing through or near that city (cf. 46.5), nor is Jerusalem in the "far north" (cf. 48.3). Actually these details must be explained as mythical features that derive from old Canaanite mythology.[15] Furthermore, it is clear that the deliverance of the city is not accomplished by the military might of men, but rather by the Divine Warrior who prevails against the threatening forces of the nations. This conflict with and defeat of the nations must be understood

---

[13]Kraus, Psalmen, 1: LIV. The parentheses indicate his uncertainty as to classification.

[14]Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 308, n. 17.

[15]Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, 2 vols (New York & Evanston: Harper and Row, 1962), 1: 46-47.

as a variation of the chaos-conflict motif which also derives from ancient mythology.[16]

The universal perspective of these psalms is apparent in the idea of the nations gathering at Jerusalem. In addition, the concept of Yahweh is that of a universal god. Yahweh's works have consequences that reach to the ends of the earth (46.9-10). He is "exalted in the earth" (46.11). His praise "reaches to the ends of the earth" (48.11). His judgment and salvation are effectual in all the earth (76.9-10). These psalms give clear evidence of a pre-exilic theology in which Yahweh is known as the Lord of the whole earth.

2. The Enthronement Psalms

Pss 47, 93, and 96-99 are generally considered to belong to this type. These psalms celebrate the kingship of Yahweh. The conflict and victory of Yahweh over the forces of chaos is an essential element in the ideology of his kingship.[17] In these psalms this motif is evident in Yahweh's battle and victory over the floods (93.3-4; cf. 29.10). The nations-conflict motif is evident in the references to the subjugation of all nations to Yahweh (47.4, 9; 96.10; 99.2).

These psalms also depict Yahweh as a universal god,

---

[16]Kraus, Psalmen, 1: 344 and 358.

[17]John Gray, "The Kingship of God in the Prophets and the Psalms," VT 11 (1961), 3.

as "the King of the whole earth" (47.3, 8, 9; 96,10; 97.1), and as "the Judge of the world" (96.13; 98.9). There is not a great distance between this concept of Yahweh as judge of the earth and the prophetic concept of Yahweh who comes to destroy the earth in judgment. In fact, the prophetic concept presupposes that of these psalms, i.e., of Yahweh as Lord of the whole earth. However, not all commentators are agreed that these psalms are pre-exilic. Therefore, the problem of their dating must be considered.

R. A. Rosenberg may be cited to illustrate one point of view. He asks where the concept of Yahweh as creator of all the earth and as absolute master of nature and history, as elaborated by Deutero-Isaiah, originated. His answer is, to a great extent, determined by his claim that "the first promulgation of the idea of a universal god in the Ancient Near East seems to have come during the eighth and seventh centuries B. C. in the Neo-Assyrian empire."[18] At this time Yahweh was still a national god, limited by the borders of his nation, but the Assyrian concept of a universal god was slowly mediated to Israel through the contact forced on them by their vassalage to Assyria. Vassalage to Babylon only helped to entrench this concept further into the minds of the Jews. This new concept of Yahweh was given expression by Deutero-Isaiah and also by Pss 95-99. Rosenberg, like

---

[18]Roy A. Rosenberg, "Yahweh Becomes King," JBL 85 (1966), 298. The article is found on pp. 297-307.

H. Gunkel, thinks that these psalms were composed in dependence on Deutero-Isaiah.[19] Thus he must date them in the exilic or post-exilic period.

Rosenberg's position invites two responses. Firstly, the work of W. F. Albright shows that the idea of a universal god is much older than Rosenberg supposes:

> . . . the cosmic gods of Mesopotamia were naïvely and unquestionably believed to rule the entire world, each in his own designated sphere or function. The following excerpt from a Sumerian text extant in a copy of about the nineteenth century B.C. well illustrates the prevailing attitude, as it is expressed or taken for granted in thousands of documents:
>
> "Unto Enlil do foreign lands raise their eyes (in adoration),
> Unto Enlil do foreign lands pay homage.
> The Four Quarters (of the earth) bloom like a garden for Enlil."[20]

Secondly, Rosenberg allows his concept of the development of Israelite theology to determine his dating of these psalms. Though this procedure is not invalid, it would be possible to date these psalms as he does only if it could indeed be demonstrated that the concept of a universal god was a latecomer into Israelite theology. In the absence of

---

[19] Ibid., p. 305, and Hermann Gunkel, completed by Joachim Begrich, Einleitung in die Psalmen: Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 99-100.

[20] William Foxwell Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1940), p. 143, quoting S. H. Langdon, Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Inscriptions, I (1923), p. 50. So also Kraus, Psalmen, Exkurs 4, 1: 197-201.

decisive evidence for this point of view one could just as well cite these psalms in support of a claim that the concept of Yahweh as a universal god belongs to pre-exilic theology.

Commentators of like persuasion with Gunkel and Rosenberg support their position by listing the ways in which these psalms are dependent on late prophetic literature. A. R. Johnson has observed that "such a list may prove to be a two-edged sword, and that as a result quite the opposite conclusion is possible," meaning that the late prophetic literature may well be dependent on the Enthronement Psalms.[21] Kraus dates Pss 93 and 99 to the pre-exilic period. He does not attempt to date Ps 47, but the rest of the Enthronement Psalms he considers to be of post-exilic origin.[22] On the other hand, S. Mowinckel insists that all of these psalms are of pre-exilic origin and that they were used in the annual pre-exilic enthronement festival.[23] In view of the diversity in scholarly opinion on the dating of these psalms, two alternatives will be explored.

---

[21]Aubrey R. Johnson, "The Psalms," The Old Testament and Modern Study: A Generation Of Discovery and Research, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Clarendon, 1951), p. 194.

[22]Kraus, Psalmen. See his comments on the individual psalms.

[23]Sigmund Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, 2 vols, trans. D. R. AP-Thomas (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), 1: 116-18. I have merely sampled some of the commentators on the Psalms. Many others could have been consulted, but the various points of view have already been well represented.

Firstly, one may tentatively accept Mowinckel's judgment that all of the Enthronement Psalms are pre-exilic. Then the following argument could be sustained: The concept of Yahweh in these psalms can doubtlessly be described as universal. He is "a great king over all the earth" (47.2, cf. vv 7, 8), and he is "the Lord of all the earth" (97.5). The nations are subdued under him (47.3, 8; 99.2) and so are the gods (96.4-5, 97.7). Moreover, he is the Judge of the whole earth (96.10, 13; 98.9). This concept of Yahweh as judge does not appear to be too far removed from the concept seen in the prophetic literature, even though the destructive, avenging aspect is missing in these psalms. The concept of Yahweh given by these psalms, momentarily assumed to be pre-exilic, is of a universal Lord and Judge.

On the other hand, one might accept Kraus' dating of these psalms, but a similar argument could still be supported. Ps 93.1 depicts Yahweh as creator of the world. Ps 99.1-2 tells of Yahweh's dominion over the peoples and of the earth quaking before him. Furthermore, Kraus is convinced of the pre-exilic origin of Ps 24.[24] There, also, Yahweh is known as "King" (vv 8, 10). V 1 acknowledges his ownership of the earth and of all its peoples, and v 2, his creation of the world. On the basis of these observations, even if only these three psalms are allowed as evidence, the argument that the concept of a universal deity is to be

---

[24]Kraus, Psalmen, 1: 195.

found in the pre-exilic ideology of the kingship of Yahweh is still sustained.

Kraus gives further support for this argument. He discusses the biblical concept of Yahweh against the background of a widely-held oriental conception of the "highest god." This type of god was known in the ancient orient, especially in the Canaanite-Syrian world, and had precedence over all other powers and numina. He was known as "King," "Lord of the Heavens," "Prince of the Earth," and "Judge." The concept had a decided tendency towards universalism. Kraus thinks that Yahwist theology was heir to such traditions, especially from Jerusalem. The designations for Yahweh as known from the Psalms, namely, sōpēt (Judge), melek (King), ʾadōn kōl hāʾāreṣ (Lord of all the earth), and ʾēl ʿelyōn (El Elyon) are, in his opinion, derived from the Jebusite cultic traditions. Thus, the immigration of the Israelites with their god into the world of Canaanite religion brought about a very significant broadening of horizons. Yahweh was raised to the position of "highest god" in the pantheon. All other gods became known as the "sons of God" (Ps 82), i.e., as Yahweh's servants. Kraus says:

> Dabei ist in aller Deutlichkeit festzustellen, dass der "Universalismus" in der Theologie der alttestamentlichen Psalmen nicht das Spätprodukt eines religiösen Entwicklungsprozesses innerhalb der Geschichte Israels, sondern vielmehr ein im Typos der Verehrung des "höchsten Gottes" bereits vorgegebenes Element der kanaanäischen Welt ist.[25]

---

[25]Ibid., 1: 199-200. Even if Kraus' theory of the

Using the results of this brief study of the Enthronement Psalms, it must be concluded that according to pre-exilic theology Yahweh was known as universal Lord and Judge. Only if one accepts Gunkel's dating of these psalms to the post-exilic era, which has been generally abandoned in recent scholarship, is this conclusion called into question.

3. The Royal Psalms

The argument which has been developed in the study of the Zion Psalms and the Enthronement Psalms is strengthened by considerations arising out of the Royal Psalms. In several of these psalms the idea that the dominion of Yahweh's anointed is world-wide is quite evident (2.7-11, 72.8-11, 89.25, 110.5-6, cf. 18.43-48). The pre-exilic origin of these psalms is generally acknowledged, and thus the evidence they bear for a universal perspective is relevant for our discussion.

In Ps 2.7-11 Yahweh promises to give his anointed "the nations" and "the ends of the earth" as a possession. In Ps 110.5-6 the king receives the promise that Yahweh "will shatter chiefs over the wide earth" on his behalf. Pss 72.8-11 and 89.25 describe the dimensions of his

---

dependence of Yahwist theology on Jebusite theology in this respect is rejected, the case can still be made for the existence of this type of "highest god" in ancient theology and for the propriety of identifying Yahweh as a "highest god."

kingdom in poetic fashion:

> May he have dominion from sea to sea,
> and from the River to the ends of the
> earth! (72.8)
>
> I will set his hand on the sea,
> and his right hand on the rivers. (89.25)

M. Saebø argues convincingly that the background of these verses is to be sought in older expressions which were used to indicate the expanse of the nation or, particularly, of the kingdom.[26] The empire of David and Solomon was viewed as an ideal in later times. Its dimensions were expressed in a formulaic manner (min --ᶜad, 1 Kgs 4.21, Exod 23.31). According to Saebø, the formulae in Pss 72.8 and 89.25 are a poetic expansion of these older expressions. Their significance has been broadened into universal dimensions without their tie to the historical-geographical expression of the dimensions of the Davidic empire being lost.[27]

As Kraus argues, this conception of the universal rulership of the Davidic kings should not be explained by recourse to the idea that it is an imitation of foreign "court-style," or that it is based on oriental kingship-ideology. Rather, the Davidic empire, because of its magnitude, provided the starting point for this conception of a world-empire in the psalms. It is not to be doubted that

---

[26]Magne Saebø, "Vom Grossreich zum Weltreich: Erwägungen zu Pss. lxxii 8, lxxxix 26; Sach. ix 10b," VT 28 (1978), 83-91.

[27]Ibid., p. 91.

there is in this concept a certain participation in the old oriental kingship-ideology, but the essentially Israelite significance is that, since the king is Yahweh's anointed, his kingdom must be understood on the basis that Yahweh is Creator and Lord of the universe. Yahweh owns the nations and the ends of the world. Therefore he can give them to his anointed, and he can give a world-embracing mandate to his anointed.[28] Thus, the universal perspective in royal ideology depends on the concept of a universal deity.

This universality in royal ideology and in Yahwist theology should be understood as an ideological precedent to the prophetic concept of Yahweh as a universal judge. Whereas the Enthronement Psalms did not depict Yahweh's judgment as destructive, and whereas the date of those that depict him as Judge of the world is disputed, in Ps 110.5-6 the judgment of Yahweh is clearly destructive and also universal. The step from this judgment description to that which is given in the DY texts already discussed is very small.

C PROPHETIC TEXTS

According to Hanson, the ritual pattern of the conflict myth was appropriated by the royal cult, but the classical prophets, because their conceptualization of divine activity was so inextricably tied to the historical realm, discarded this pattern altogether.[29] With reference to the

---

[28]Kraus, Psalmen, Exkurs 1, 1: 14-16.

[29]Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, pp. 303-4.

appropriation of the pattern by the royal cult, Hanson is no doubt right. However, with regard to the classical prophets, especially Isaiah, the texts listed by Stolz and von Rad give sufficient evidence that the general pattern of God's conflict with the powers of chaos, i.e., the nations, is still present.[30] It may be anticipated, however, that the conflict motif will sometimes be found in a drastically altered pattern.

The nations-conflict motif is clearly evident in Isa 17.12-14, a passage whose authenticity is seldom questioned. In this text the nations are gathered for war, presumably around Jerusalem, but there is no indication as to the identity of the nations, nor is there any clue as to what may have been the historical setting. In this way this passage bears a striking resemblance to the Zion Psalms 46, 48, and 76. Indeed, Isaiah's dependence on the Zion tradition is generally acknowledged. In both cases it is not man's military might but Yahweh's intervention that dispels the threat. No doubt the ancient myth of the conflict of the god with the chaos monster provides the imagery for this Isaianic passage as well as for the Zion Psalms.[31] The universal perspective and the concept of Yahweh as Lord of the world, already found in the Zion Psalms, are also

---

[30]Stolz, Strukturen und Figuren, pp. 86-87, and von Rad, OT Theology, 2: 156-59. So also Gray, "The Kingship of God," p. 13.

[31]Among others, von Rad, OT Theology, 2: 156.

evident in Isa 17.12-14 in the gathering and defeat of the nations.

The poem in Isa 29.1-8 has the same schema as was found in Isa 17.12-14, although in a somewhat altered form. From the description of the activity of the assembled nations it would appear that the mythical elements of 17.12-14 have been historicized. No longer do the nations "thunder like the thundering of the sea" or "roar like the roaring of mighty water" (17.12). Rather, they encamp around Ariel and raise siegeworks against the city (29.3). Also, there is a partial reversal of the schema in that Yahweh, at first, is the instigator of the hostilities of the nations against Zion, but, finally, he does intervene graciously, and, in the same miraculous way as was seen in Isa 17.12-14, he delivers Jerusalem. The authenticity of this passage is held in doubt by several commentators.[32] Therefore it is offered tentatively as evidence in this investigation. The assembly of the nations and the concept of Yahweh as sovereign over the nations indicates that the same universal perspective is present here as in Isa 17.12-14.

Isa 2.2-4=Mic 4.1-4 prophesies of the pilgrimage of the nations to Zion. The age and authenticity of this passage is much disputed. Four alternative solutions to the

---

[32]However, most recently Wildberger, Jesaja, 2: 1100-1101, has argued in support of its authenticity.

problem present themselves: 1) The passage is Isaianic, quoted by Micah. 2) The passage is Micah's composition, quoted by Isaiah. 3) Micah and Isaiah appropriated the passage from a tradition known to both. 4) The passage is a later insertion in both books. Each of these solutions has found scholarly support.[33]

In this context it is not appropriate to pursue this much debated problem. However, it is noteworthy that the considerations given against the pre-exilic authorship depend much on the commentators' concept of the development of Israelite ideology. For instance, it is thought that the idea of the physical raising of the mountain (a reflection of the paradise myth), the concept of Zion as the centre of pilgrimage, and the unbounded universal perspective belong to post-exilic ideology. Conclusions with regard to the evidence this passage gives for the present investigation must be offered tentatively in view of the disagreement concerning its authenticity.

---

[33]The first, most recently by Wildberger, "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion. Jes II 1-5," VT 7 (1957), 62-81, and Jesaja, 1: 78-81; also Duhm, Jesaia, p. 15; Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, 2nd and 3rd ed., pp. 328-29; and von Rad, "The City on the Hill," The Problem of the Hexatuch and other essays, trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken (Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966), pp. 233-34. The second point of view is not taken by recent commentators. The third is supported by Kapelrud, "Eschatology in the Book of Micah," VT 11 (1961), 392-405. The fourth has much scholarly support: E. Cannawurf, "The Authenticity of Micah IV 1-4," VT 13 (1963), 26-33; Weiser, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten, 24: 262; Horst, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, p. 140; and Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12, pp. 24-25.

It is noteworthy that the picture in Isa 2.2-4 is a complete reversal of the nations-conflict motif. Zion is still the centre to which an unidentified group of nations assembles itself, but in this context it is for the worship of Yahweh rather than for war. This passage, as Wildberger notes, certainly bears some relationship to Pss 46, 48, and 76 which have already been discussed above.[34] The universal perspective of this passage is certainly in harmony with that of these psalms. The concepts of a world-wide assembly of nations to Zion and of the universal Judge, Yahweh, are plainly evident.

At this point we might interject a related passage from Nah 1. Of particular interest is the acrostic poem. Its authenticity has been doubted because formally and thematically it is different form the rest of the book.[35] Its acrostic pattern, variously thought to end at vv 8, 9, 10, 15, or even at 2.3, distinguishes it from chaps 2-3. Its announcement of doom is generalized, the object of doom being Yahweh's adversaries, enemies (v 2), or the world (v 5), whereas in chaps 2-3 the announcement is made specifically against Nineveh. However, recently D. L. Christensen has argued in support of the authenticity of an acrostic poem which ends with the letter k in v 8. He assigns it to a

---

[34]Wildberger, "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion. Jes II 1-5," pp. 68-70.

[35]Elliger, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten, pp. 2-4.

date before 612 B.C., perhaps as early as 639-37 B.C., or even 652-48 B.C.[36] Since there is no scholarly consensus with regard to the authenticity of this poem, it is necessary again to advance conclusions tentatively.

In this poem, as in Pss 46, 48, 76, Isa 17.12-14, and 29.1-8, Yahweh himself takes action against his enemies. His action against the yām and nĕhārôt (v 4) is reminiscent of the ancient chaos-conflict motif. Yahweh is again portrayed as the Lord of the universe who intervenes on behalf of his own people (v 7) against unidentified adversaries and enemies (vv 2 and 8), and, indeed, against the whole earth and all its inhabitants (v 5). If the authenticity of this poem is admitted, it also is a pre-exilic composition in which universality is evident.

Returning to the Book of Isaiah, several more passages which betray the same dependence on the tradition of the nations-conflict motif are Isa 14.24-27, 28-32, and 10.27b-34. In these passages Isaiah's confidence that Yahweh will deliver his own people is clearly seen. His opposition to alliances with foreign powers is supported by this same confidence (Isa 7; 31.1-3). In von Rad's opinion, this conviction of Isaiah that confidence in Yahweh is the

---

[36]D. L. Christensen, "The Acrostic of Nahum Reconsidered," ZAW 87 (1975), 17-30. Sampling a few other commentators, Horst, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, p. 158, urges caution about the denial of its authenticity; Elliger, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten, pp. 2-4, is not certain that Nahum is the author; and C. L. Taylor, "The Book of Nahum," IB, 6: 954, explicitly denies its authenticity.

sole prerequisite for deliverance from foreign threats derives from the ancient tradition of Yahweh's holy wars. In those wars Israel was called upon to trust in Yahweh, whose intervention by means of falling stones (Josh 10.11), frightening thunder (1 Sam 7.10), and earthquakes (1 Sam 14.15) brought deliverance.[37]

This explanation by von Rad suggests that there was a certain relationship between the holy war tradition and the conflict myth, or, at least that Isaiah appropriated the aspect of "confidence" from the former and linked it with the latter. That the two should actually be viewed as part of the same tradition is a conclusion one must draw from the work done by Cross on ancient cult and holy war.[38] Yahweh the Divine Warrior must be recognized in the conflict with chaos (Pss 89.10-11; 93.1-4), but also in the epic events such as the Reed Sea event (Exod 15) and in ancient holy war.

It may be suggested that in ancient holy war, as in the conflict myth, the enemies are to be understood as the forces of chaos which threaten the cosmos established by the

---

[37]Von Rad, OT Theology, 2: 159. However, Wildberger (Jesaja, 1: 270-72) does not think that Isaiah is depending on the holy war tradition when he admonishes the king to trust Yahweh. Rather, the admonition is a formal part of the salvation-oracle for the elected king. The confidence that Yahweh will deliver his people (Isa 17.12-14) does not arise out of the holy war tradition, but out of the tradition of the inviolability of Zion which stems from the pre-Israelite Jebusite tradition (p. 668).

[38]Cross, Canaanite Myth, pp. 79-144.

Creator.[39] With the classical prophets a change in concept becomes evident. No longer is it only foreign nations who are Yahweh's enemies. The people of Israel are also his enemies, and just as he worked for Israel in holy war against foreign nations in the past, so he will raise foreign nations against Israel in holy war at the present. (Jer 6.1-5).[40] Thus, the people of Israel may also be identified with the forces of chaos.[41]

It is probable that the DY text Amos 5.18-20 should be understood against this background. Generally it is inferred from this passage that Amos has adopted a popular phrase, "the day of Yahweh," and has denied the significance popularly attached to it.[42] It is supposed that in the popular view the DY was anticipated as the time when Yahweh would come with salvation for his people, but that Amos denied this. The DY would not be a day of weal but of woe. Amos illustrated this in the story of an unlucky fellow who

---

[39]So Gray, "The Kingship of God," p. 18.

[40]See J. Alberto Soggin, "Der prophetische Gedanke über den Heiligen Krieg, als Gericht gegen Israel," VT 10 (1960), 79-83, for a discussion on the reversal of this tradition.

[41]So Gray, "The Kingship of God," p. 18.

[42]To my knowledge, Meir Weiss, "The Origin of the 'Day of the Lord' -- Reconsidered," HUCA 37 (1966), 29-60, is the only one who would argue against this inference. He thinks that Amos coined the phrase himself. On the contrary, the way in which it is used in this passage indicates that Amos is raising a point of contention with a view popularly held.

escapes from the danger posed to his life by his encounters first with a lion and then with a bear only to be fatally bitten by a snake when he reaches his own home where he ought to be most secure. This tale is to be interpreted as a simile.[43] The unfortunate fellow is representative of the nation of Israel. His two escapes from wild animals represent previous times when on the DY Israel was given victory over her foes. However, just as the fellow mistakenly thought he was secure in his own home only to be fatally bitten, so Israel's present security based on previous experience is also false. Because of Israel's confidence that Yahweh will again rise to intervene on her behalf, she does not fear the war which Amos threatens against her (2.14-16, 3.11, 5.3).

This passage is illustrative of the reversal of traditional concepts. The DY is no longer a day for Israel, but rather a day against Israel. Holy war is no longer against foreign nations. It is against Israel. Israel is the enemy of Yahweh. Israel is the power of chaos which Yahweh will fight.

Other passages in which the traditional motifs are reversed are found in the Book of Jeremiah. Jer 6.1-5 threatens holy war against Jerusalem.[44] The same threat is

---

[43]Following Wolff's interpretation, Joel and Amos, pp. 254-56.

[44]Soggin, "Der prophetische Gedanke," p. 79.

in view in Jer 4.5-31. The individual units of this section are bound together by the common theme of war catastrophe for Judah and Jerusalem. In some cases the units appear to be premonitions of disaster, e.g., vv 5-8 and 13-17; in others destruction is accomplished, e.g., vv 19-21, 23-26, and 29-30. Commentators are agreed that most of these units are genuine.

The short poem in vv 23-26 is a close-knit, compact unit. It describes the return of creation to chaos. The earth becomes waste and void (tōhû wabōhû, v 23) as it was in the beginning (Gen 1.2). Light disappears from the heavens (v23), hills and mountains quake (v 24), man and birds are gone (v 25), and rural and urban property is devastated (v 26). The cosmic perspective is unmistakeable. It is a full-scale return to chaos. This passage with its universal perspective is inserted into a chapter which concerns particularly the coming destruction of Judah and Jerusalem. That it is a DY text is not explicitly evident, though J. Bright describes it as such.[45] Nevertheless, the passage when taken in the context of Jer 4 does bear the pattern of universality and particularity.

That this poem is authentic is affirmed by C. H. Cornill, W. Rudolph, J. Lindblom, and A. Weiser.[46]

---

[45]John Bright, Jeremiah, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965), pp. 32-33.

[46]Carl Heinrich Cornill, Das Buch Jeremia (Leipzig: Chr. Herm. Tauchnitz, 1905), pp. 53-54; Wilhelm Rudolph,

Though the general content of the poem hardly offers adequate proof of its authenticity for W. L. Holladay, he finds positive evidence in its vocabulary. The phrase ʿôp haššāmayim nādādû (v 25) is also found in Jer 9.9 "which is part of an undisputably genuine oracle," but nowhere else in the Old Testament. The phrase wĕcōl ʿārâw nitṣû (v 26) has the verb nātaṣ in common with Jer 1.10 and might be viewed as a fulfillment of that verse. These two bits of evidence together with "the superb economy, imagery, coherence, and balance of the poem" indicate that the poem is Jeremiah's in Holladay's estimation.[47]

On the other hand, J. P. Hyatt doubts that Jeremiah could have written these verses because portrayals of cosmic destruction are found nowhere else in Jeremianic writings.[48] F. Giesebrecht rejects this passage because it looks like a late apocalyptic description.[49] B. S. Childs also wonders about the authenticity and particularly about the dating of this passage. According to his study of rāʿaš which is found in v 24, the word is a "terminus technicus within the

---

Jeremia, 2nd ed., HAT, 1, 12 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck , 1958), pp. 30-33; J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973), p. 127; and Artur Weiser, Das Buch Jeremia, 6th rev. ed., ATD, 20/21 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), p. 40.

[47]William L. Holladay, "Style, Irony, and Authenticity in Jeremiah," JBL 81 (1962), 47-48.

[48]J. P. Hyatt, "The Book of Jeremiah," IB, 5; 840.

[49]F. Giesebrecht, Das Buch Jeremia, 2nd rev. ed., HAT, III, 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907), p. 28.

language of the return of chaos," and it was used in this way during the exilic and post-exilic periods.[50] He leaves open the question of the passage's authenticity, but he doubts very much its pre-exilic dating.[51]

V. Eppstein shares Hyatt's and Giesebrecht's doubts as to the prophet's eschatology. According to him, "Jeremiah's view of history, like that of the other literary prophets, was as incompatible with the apocalyptic eschatology as von Rad cogently argues."[52] The prophet foresaw disaster but not a cosmic reversal of creation. Eppstein does not question the authenticity of the original poem, but he does think that the poem has suffered severe corruption and alteration during the period of its transmission. This is seen in that vv 25 and 26 do not have a direct object after rā'îtî, whereas vv 23 and 24 do. He conjectures that this is due to a series of omissions and misreadings. The words which had been omitted were later restored in the margin, and a still later hand used these marginal restorations to construct v 23. Even later tōhû wabōhû was added from Gen 1.2. According to Eppstein's reconstruction, the original, authentic poem read as follows:

> I beheld the mountains, and lo! They were [quaking],
> while all [their] hills rocked to and fro.

---

[50]B. S. Childs, "The Enemy from the North and the Chaos Tradition," JBL 78 (1959), 189.

[51]Ibid., p. 195.

[52]Victor Eppstein, "The Day of Yahweh in Jeremiah 4.23-28," JBL 87 (1968), 95.

I beheld the heavens, and lo! Their light was gone,
while all [their] birds had fled.
I beheld the Land, and lo! The farmland was
uncultivated,
while all its cities were in ruin.[53]

Eppstein's emended text does merit careful consideration. There is no denying that vv 25 and 26 do lack a direct object for rā'îtî in contrast to vv 23 and 24, but that this constitutes sufficient evidence for the emendations and reconstructions proposed by Eppstein is questionable. One might object that he is demanding too rigorous a consistency of construction from the original poet.

It should also be remembered that, though the grammatical incongruencies of this text pose part of the problem for which Eppstein is seeking a solution, the basic problem arises in the eschatological viewpoint which, supposedly, could not possibly be Jeremianic. The foregoing study on various psalms and passages from the prophetic literature has already shown that the threats posed by the forces of chaos were to be reckoned with in pre-exilic ideology. It has also been suggested that with the prophets came a reversal of motifs. In the psalms Yahweh invariably intervened on behalf of Jerusalem and Israel against the forces of chaos. In Amos 5.18-20, according to Wolff's interpretation, Yahweh turned against his people in war. So also according to Jer 6.1-5 Yahweh has arisen in holy war against Judah.

---

[53]Ibid., pp. 95-96. I have gathered his scattered reconstructions and notes to form this "original" poem.

Jer 4.23-26 may be interpreted against this background. No longer does Yahweh intervene on Judah's behalf against the forces of chaos. On the contrary, just as in the time of the flood, he allows the forces of chaos to overwhelm the earth.

On the basis of these considerations, it is not implausible that Jeremiah is the author of Jer 4.23-26. If this is so, the passage would best be assigned to the period 605-597 B.C.[54] The description is certainly of a universal destruction. Yet, its application to Jerusalem and to Judah is evident from its context in Jer 4.

Though it is difficult to relate Jer 25.15-38 to the conflict myth, yet this is one more passage that is pertinent to the discussion of universality in early prophetic literature. In its present condition it clearly gives universal scope to Yahweh's judgment (especially vv 26, 29, 30-32). Exactly this characteristic is used as a criterion by which several critics judge more or less of the passage to be inauthentic. Nevertheless, at least a nucleus of this section is generally acknowledged to be genuine. It is often pointed out that since Jeremiah was a "prophet to the nations" (1.5), it is only to be expected that the book by his name should include prophecies directed towards the nations such as the one presently under consideration (cf. also 9.24-25, and 12.14-17). Thus, it is accepted that

---

[54]Bright, Jeremiah, p. 34; and Weiser, Jeremia, p. 38.

Jeremiah's perspective went beyond Judah and Jerusalem, but it is questioned whether it was ever broadened out to the universal.

According to Rudolph, vv 26-31 are inauthentic. In addition, he regards the recurrent phrase, "all the kings of . . ." in vv 20-26 as secondary. Thus he denies the authenticity of all those verses which have a universal scope. His basis for such a decision is that according to v 15 the commission to Jeremiah is restricted: "make all the nations to whom I send you drink it." This implies that he is not being sent to all nations.[55]

Several commentators who wrote before Rudolph deny the authenticity of different verses, but the results with regard to the universal perspective are always the same. Hyatt suggests that "perhaps" vv 15-16 and vv 30-31, 34-38 are authentic, but he goes on to say that they bear more of an apocalyptic tinge than is to be expected of Jeremiah.[56] Cornill, Giesebrecht, and A. S. Peake are inclined to accept more of the text than Hyatt does. They agree that behind vv 15-26 there lies an authentic core which has suffered expansion.[57] In order to reclaim this authentic core each

---

[55]Rudolph, Jeremia, pp. 151-52.

[56]Hyatt, "The Book of Jeremiah," IB, 5: 1002-4.

[57]Cornill, Jeremia, pp. 292-96; Giesebrecht, Jeremia, pp. 137-38; and A. S. Peake, Jeremiah and Lamentations, 2 vols, The New Century Bible (New York: Henry Frowde, and Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1911), 2: 15-22.

of these commentators performs his own surgery on the text and thus deprives it of any elements that may suggest universality.

Weiser is the only commentator among those consulted who defends the authenticity of the verses which bear a universal perspective.[58] According to him, vv 15-16 and 27-29 belong together. Vv 17-26 are an interpolation which was originally inserted to replace the foreign nation-oracles (chaps 46-51) when they were torn from their place with these verses. The authenticity of the remaining verses, 30-38, he does not question.

Weiser argues against Rudolph that the clause, "the nations to whom I send you," is not to be understood as a restriction of the commisssion to a definite number of nations.[59] Jeremiah's world-wide perspective can quite easily be understood in view of the rise of the Babylonian world power (see 27.6-7, 36.2) and in view of the fact that this universal perspective already had its place in the cult of pre-exilic times.[60]

Thus, basically two views have emerged with regard to Jer 25.15-38. The majority of scholars doubt those verses

---

[58]Weiser, Jeremia, pp. 222-26. It would seem that Bright also should be mentioned here, but, though he thinks that vv 15-29 include authentic material (Jeremiah, pp. 164), he does not offer any details as to what might be secondary.

[59]Weiser, Jeremia, p. 224.

[60]Ibid., pp. 225-26.

which have a universal perspective on the ideological basis that Jeremiah was concerned to prophesy to Judah and Jerusalem and to a restricted number of nations. In support of this position is the possible interpretation of "the nations to whom I send you" as a restricted commission. On the other hand, Weiser's argument for the original continuity between vv 15-16 and 27-38 is also very plausible. If his point of view is accepted, the universal perspective is clearly seen in vv 29-31. Tentatively, then, it could be suggested that Jer 25.15-16, 27-38 is a pre-exilic or early exilic passage which exhibits a world-wide perspective.[61]

D THE FLOOD, THE TOWER OF BABEL, AND THE BLESSING OF ABRAM

Of the three stories to be discussed here, only the flood story can be related to the conflict myth. The flood reverses the act of creation whereby dry land and all life dependent on dry land appeared.[62] The waters of the flood bring about a reversion to primeval chaos, although this only happens under the sovereignty of God. Both the J source (Gen 7.10) and the P source (6.17, 7.6, 17)[63] refer

---

[61]Rudolph, Jeremia, pp. 151-52, suggests that the date given in Jer 25.1 applies to this passage as well. Then it is pre-exilic.

[62]For the connexion of the flood story with the conflict myth, it is noteworthy that some flood stories from the Ancient Near East are actually at the same time creation stories. It has already been noted that the creation motif belongs to the conflict myth. See Claus Westermann, Genesis, BKAT, I (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1974-), 1: 70.

[63]Recognizing that some commentators find more than

to hammabbûl which, according to J. H. Marks who quotes J. Begrich, "'is an ancient designation for the heavenly ocean' which 'lies directly at Yahweh's feet.'"[64] Marks adds, "Then the notion would be that just as God in Gen 1 separated the waters of the primeval world, giving each its place above or beneath the firmament, so he allowed them, according to P, to flow together again in the flood story to form a new chaos."[65]

According to both the J source and the P source, the magnitude of the flood was universal. Though J expresses the universality of the flood clearly enough (6.7, 7.4, 23, 8.9), P emphasizes it by indicating that all the highest mountains were covered to a depth of fifteen cubits (6.13, 7.18-21). As far as the dating of these stories is concerned, there is no doubt that the tradition of the flood was current long before the biblical stories were composed, as is known from the Gilgamesh Epic and other extra-biblical parallels. The J source is generally thought to have been composed in the tenth century B.C.[66] The P source has

---

two sources, the twofold division given by E. A. Speiser, Genesis, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1964) is adopted here. Also in agreement are von Rad, Genesis, A Commentary, rev. ed., trans. John H. Marks, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), and Westermann, Genesis.

[64]John H. Marks, "The Flood," IDB, 4 vols plus suppl vol. (Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1962), vol E-J: 280, citing J. Begrich, "Mabbul, Eine exegetischlexikalische Studie," ZS 6 (1928), 135-53.

[65]Marks, "The Flood," p. 280.

[66]Speiser, Genesis, p. XXXVIII.

usually been dated to the post-exilic period, although there is a growing tendency to date some portions of it to pre-exilic times.[67] Thus, at least in the J source of the flood story we have a clear example of a judgment of universal proportions dating from pre-exilic times.

The story of the Tower of Babel (Gen 11) is, similarly, a story of a universal judgment. It is stated that "the whole earth had one language" (v1) and that the purpose of the tower-project was to preserve the community of all mankind (v 4). However, just as this hybristic attempt included all mankind, so the judgment came in equal dimensions, for it is said that Yahweh "confused the language of all the earth" (v 9). This story belongs to the J source. It is, therefore, a pre-exilic text in which the judgment of mankind is seen from a universal perspective.

The story of the blessing of Abram (Gen 12.1-3), also from the pre-exilic author J, should be interpreted as a story of Yahweh's gift of grace after judgment.[68] The judgment at Babel separated man from man and scattered him into all the nations of the world, but through the blessing on the one man Abram, grace was to be conferred to the same

---

[67]Ibid., pp. XXV-XXVI.

[68]In each of the three preceding accounts of judgment in Genesis God also gives grace: Adam and Eve are expelled from the garden, but Yahweh clothes them; Cain is cursed, but Yahweh grants him protection for his life; the whole world is judged in the deluge, but Noah and his family are saved. See von Rad, OT Theology, 1: 163-64.

universal extent.[69] In this composition also the perspective is universal, though not in connexion with judgment but in connexion with grace.

E CONCLUSION TO CHAPTER 3

This chapter has brought together the evidence of several Zion, Enthronement, and Royal Psalms for universality in pre-exilic ideology and theology. Though most of these psalms are generally admitted to be of pre-exilic origin, it was found that even if those Enthronement Psalms about which there is considerable doubt (i.e., 47, 96-98) were left out of the consideration, positive evidence for universality in pre-exilic thought was still abundant. Evidence was found for universality in royal ideology in the concept of the king's world-wide dominion, and in Zion ideology in the gathering of the nations against Jerusalem and their subsequent defeat by Yahweh. Furthermore, there was no lack of evidence in any of these three groups of psalms for universality in Yahwistic theology. Yahweh was presented as a god whose works have universal consequences, a god who can present the nations as a heritage to his chosen king, who created the earth, who is king over the world, and who is judge of all the earth. In one case he was even portrayed as one working destructive judgment over the whole earth.

---

[69] Ibid.

It would appear that this constitutes conclusive evidence for universality in pre-exilic ideology and theology. However, it could be objected that it has little or no bearing on the question of universality in the perspective of the pre-exilic prophets because the theology of the royal courts was different from the theology of the prophets. Hanson has claimed that whereas court religion was mythopoeic, prophetic religion discarded mythical models in favour of new models tied inextricably to the historical realm.[70] That such a neat distinction cannot be maintained is shown by several prophetic texts which share the mythical tradition, i.e., the conflict myth, and the universal perspective with the psalms. These texts include Isa 17.12-14, 29.1-8, 2.2-4=Mic 4.1-4, and Nah 1.1-8. The strength of this evidence is lessened somewhat by the fact that the authenticity and thus the pre-exilic origin of the last three of these texts is disputed. Evidence for universality in pre-exilic prophetic literature was also advanced on the basis of Jer 4.23-26 and 25.15-38, though tentatively, due to doubts concerning the authenticity of these passages.

Finally, evidence was found in three pre-exilic compositions by J, i.e., the Flood Story, the story of the Tower of Babel, and the story of Abram's blessing. Of these, the first two told of destructive judgments which were universal in scope. The third told of a promised

---

[70]Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 304.

blessing that would come to all nations through Abram.

On the basis of these results it is safe to conclude that universality was not foreign to the pre-exilic ideology. However, because of the method here employed whereby evidence was sought in texts of undisputed authenticity, it has been somewhat difficult to obtain evidence from pre-exilic prophetic texts. Invariably the authenticity of a text which has a universal perspective has been denied by some interpreters, usually precisely on account of its perspective. Nevertheless, the evidence gained from other pre-exilic biblical literature shows that universality was not foreign to pre-exilic thought. From this result alone it is possible to argue the likelihood that the pre-exilic prophets shared this perspective.

CHAPTER IV

UNIVERSALITY AND PARTICULARITY IN ZEPHANIAH I

Since we have completed the two steps of our investigation[1] we may now return to test the implications of our results for Zeph 1. On the basis of the conclusions from the last chapter it follows that the separation of units with a universal perspective from the remainder of Zeph 1 on the basis of the ideological criterion that this perspective was foreign to the pre-exilic prophets is invalid. It has been shown that universality was a common motif in pre-exilic literature, and it is altogether plausible that Zephaniah also could have incorporated this motif into his own work. Furthermore, the investigation of several DY texts has shown that the combination of the pattern of universality and particularity with the DY theme was somewhat typical in prophetic literature. The earliest examples of such texts are Isa 2.6-22 and Ezek 7 which date back to pre-exilic and early exilic times. Again, it is plausible that Zephaniah himself brought the two aspects together in

---

[1]The first step (chap 2) involved the examination of several DY texts to determine whether they originally did exhibit the pattern of universality and particularity. The second step (chap 3) was accomplished in the search for additional evidence in pre-exilic biblical literature to substantiate the disclaimer that the universal perspective was not foreign to pre-exilic ideology.

his own work.

In spite of these positive gains, we cannot yet conclude with certainty that the combination of the DY theme with the pattern of universality and particularity derives from Zephaniah himself. It has only been shown that the presence of a universal perspective is no valid obstacle to such a conclusion. The further question, i.e., whether or not Zephaniah himself was responsible for this combination, requires that other factors be considered. In this connexion the results gained by Irsigler in his exercise of W. Richter's "literaturwissenschaftliche" method are relevant.

The purpose in this context is not to enter a detailed re-examination of Zeph 1 from a literary-critical point of view. That would only be a repetition of Irsigler's work. Rather, the purpose is to point out those other factors that need consideration before the question concerning the extent to which Zephaniah is to be credited with the composition of Zeph 1 as it now stands can be answered.

Irsigler subjects the text of Zeph 1.2-2.3 to three basic inquiries.[2] First he examines the text for duplication of phrases or of ideas. These duplications he then judges to be either authentic or secondary. For example, the phrase mē ʿal pĕnê hāʾădāmâ is common to v 2b and v 3d. Also, ʾāsēp ʾādām (v 3a) is parallel in meaning to hikratî

[2]Irsigler, Gottesgericht, pp. 93-113.

hā-ʾādām (v 3c). Having isolated these repetitious phrases, Irsigler judges that v 3c-d is superfluous and, therefore, secondary.

Irsigler's second inquiry into the text is for tensions. He finds two kinds of tension in Zeph 1. The first is due to the change of person. According to Irsigler's analysis, vv 2-5, 8-9, 12a-b, and 17a are written in the divine speech form in the first person singular. Vv 10-11 are transformed into divine speech secondarily by the introductory formula. In v 6, even though Yahweh is spoken of in the third person, the form of speech is not readily discernible. The remaining verses, 7, 14-16, and 17b-18, speak of Yahweh in the third person singular.

The second kind of tension Irsigler finds is due to the change in scope of the various units. In vv 2-3 the destruction of all life is threatened. Vv 4-5 are directed against Judah and Jerusalem and particularly against religious syncretists. V 6 is directed not against syncretists, but against those who forsake Yahweh. Vv 8-9 indicate no particular locality, but definite social classes in Jerusalem are brought into view. In vv 10-11 certain areas of the city of Jerusalem are mentioned, and vv 12-13 pertain to a certain class of men. Nothing about vv 7, 14-16 suggests a restriction to any locality or people, except that unnamed fortified cities and battlements are mentioned in in v 16. V 17 refers to men, in no way defining any

particular group, and v 18 quite evidently has a world-wide scope. Irsigler sees the same tension between vv 17-18 and the foregoing as between vv 2-3 and vv 4-5.

Irsigler's third inquiry is for parallel texts in other biblical literature. He finds the following parallels: v 13c-f || Amos 5.11c-f, v 15d-e || Joel 2.2, and v 18a(b) || Ezek 7.19c.

Irsigler concludes that Zeph 1 is made up of the following basic units: v 1; vv 2-3; 4-5; 6; 7; 8b-9; 10c-11; 12b-13b; 13c-f; 14-16; 17a-b, d-e, 18a; and 18b-c.[3] He reserves judgment concerning the authenticity of most of these units. However, he dates the compilation of the first section of Zeph 1, namely vv 7-13, into the exilic period and places the completion of the chapter by the addition of vv 2-3 and 17-18 near the end of the exilic period or near the beginning of the post-exilic period.[4]

Though Irsigler's conclusions, in many cases, are quite compelling, it must be recognized that the criteria and considerations at the basis of his work do not necessarily lead to these conclusions. There is a certain subjectivity involved in the judgments a literary critic must make, and it is not surprising that the same examinations carried out by another critic could lead to very different conclusions. It could certainly be questioned whether

---

[3]Ibid., p. 111.

[4]Ibid., pp. 458-59.

Irsigler does not demand too great a literary consistency from the ancient author. However, the critical results gained by Irsigler certainly require consideration before the question concerning the authenticity of the combination of the pattern of universality and particularity with the DY theme in Zeph 1 can be answered.

Another approach that would require consideration for the resolution of this problem is Kapelrud's morphological approach.[5] This method stands within the form-critical tradition, but it is not limited to the analysis of genre. It deals with verbal patterns and stylistic tendencies, seeking the smallest meaningful units in a composition and determining the nature of their relationship to each other.

On the basis of the contents of Zeph 1.2-2.3, Kapelrud distinguishes two units, i.e., 1.2-6 and 1.7-2.3. Within these sections he distinguishes smaller units and asks how they are related to each other. He lists three possible types of association: accidental, primary, and secondary. The two basic types of data by which he determines the nature of the relationships are catchwords and content. For instance, v 2 and v 3 both end with the same concluding formula. That would seem to indicate that they are two separate units, but the catchword ʾāsēp indicates to the contrary that they are in primary association and

---

[5]Kapelrud (The Message of the Prophet Zephaniah) discusses his method on pp. 9-12 and applies it to 1.2-2.3 on pp. 13-33.

that they actually make up one unit. The second unit, v 4, is associated with v 3 by the catchword hikratî which holds a central position in both verses. This association Kapelrud judges to be primary. Vv 4-6 are closely connected to each other by theme. Thus vv 2-6 make up one unit, its parts being held together in primary associations.

In the second major unit, 1.7-2.3, Kapelrud finds false formulas which bring discontinuity into the text. For instance, vv 8a, 9a, 10a, and 12a place the DY into the indefinite future. Kapelrud conjectures that these time indicators were added by one of Zephaniah's disciples in an effort to avoid causing offence to the "officials" and the "king's sons" (v 8). Kapelrud adopts Sabottka's division of the section into smaller 'rhetorical' units: v 7, an introduction about the DY, units in vv 8-9, 10-11, 12-13; v 14, a new introduction, units in vv 15-16, 17-18, and 2.1-3.[6] He finds that these units are brought into a structure according to their form, and that they are given a primary connection by their contents. They are not independent units loosely tied together, but rather units which depend on each other for their meaning. Thus, they are integrally bound to each other.

It is clear that Kapelrud, in comparison to Irsigler, allows the ancient author a great deal more latitude with respect to consistency of style and form. He agrees with

---

[6]Ibid., p. 28, citing Sabottka, Zephanja, pp. 27-29.

M. J. Buss that "Violent changes of grammatical forms . . . are characteristic of prophetic style."[7] At the same time, it is evident that the amount of objective data (catchwords, contents) used in determining the interrelationship of the smaller 'rhetorical' units is not very substantial, and that in the final analysis the conclusions drawn are quite subjective. However, this approach also merits careful consideration before conclusions are drawn concerning the interrelationship of units in Zeph 1.

The final conclusion with regard to the authenticity of the combination of the DY theme with the pattern of universality and particularity in Zeph 1 must be öffered tentatively. The study of several DY texts and pre-exilic biblical texts has shown that an affirmative conclusion is plausible. However, a careful evaluation of the evidence gained through the literary-critical approach to the text is still required. Irsigler's evaluation, of course, leads to a view in which the text is seen as a loose association of independent fragments. According to this view, the authenticity of the combination in question would have to be denied. Yet the same evidence could possibly be evaluated quite differently. Kapelrud's morphological approach, which leads him to view the text as an authentic composition comprised of numerous integrally related 'rhetorical' units,

---

[7]Ibid., p. 27, citing M. J. Buss, The Prophetic Word of Hosea. A Morphological Study, BZAW III (Berlin: 1969), p. 35.

shows some promise for the resolution of the problem in an affirmative sense. In any case, whatever criteria might be brought against the authenticity of Zeph 1.2-3, 17-18, the one used most often, i.e., the incompatability of the universal perspective with pre-exilic prophetic thought, has to be discounted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I Works pertaining to the DY theme

Černy, Ladislav. The Day of Yahweh and Some Relevant Problems. Prague: "Nákladem Filosoficke Faculty University Karlovy," 1948.

Cross, Frank Moore. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Everson, A. Joseph. "The Days of Yahweh." JBL 93 (1974), 329-37.

Fensham, F. C. "A Possible Origin of the Concept of the Day of the Lord." Biblical Essays. Bepeck, S. Africa: Potchefstroom Herald, 1966. Pp. 90-97.

Gray, John. "The Day of Yahweh in Cultic Experience and Eschatological Prospect." SEA 39 (1974), 5-37.

Klein, R. W. "The Day of the Lord." CTM 39 (1968), 517-25.

Langevin, Paul-Emile. "Sur l'origine du 'Jour de Yahvé.'" Sciences Ecclesiastiques 18 (1966), 359-70.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. Psalmenstudien II: Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie. Videnskapsselskapets Skrifter II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1921, 2. Kristiania: Dybwad, 1922.

_____. Psalmenstudien III: Kultusprophetie und Prophetische Psalmen. Videnskapsselskapets Skrifter II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1922,4. Kristiania: Dybwad, 1923.

_____. He That Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson. New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1954.

_____. "Jahves Dag." NorTT 59 (1958), 1-56.

Rad, Gerhard von. "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh." JSS 4 (1959), 97-107.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Schunk, K. D. "Strukturlinien in der Entwicklung der Vorstellung vom 'Tag Jahwes.'" VT 14 (1964), 319-30.

Stuart, Douglas. "The Sovereign's Day of Conquest." BASOR 221 (1976), 159-64.

Weiss, Meir. "The Origin of the 'Day of the Lord' Reconsidered." HUCA 37 (1966), 29-60.

II Commentaries and Critical Works on the Book of Zephaniah

Driver, S. R. The Minor Prophets: Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. The Century Bible. London & Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1906.

Edens, Ambrose. "A Study of the Book of Zephaniah as to Date, Extent and Significance of the Genuine Writings with a Translation." Ph. D. Thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1953.

Elliger, Karl. Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten. 3rd ed. ATD, 25. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

Gerleman, Gillis. Zephanja: Textkritisch und literarisch untersucht. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1942.

Heller, J. "Zephanajas Ahnenreihe; eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Bemerkung zu Zeph I." VT 21 (1971), 102-4.

Hyatt, J. Philip. "The Date and Background of Zephaniah." JNES 7 (1948), 25-29.

Irsigler, Hubert. Gottesgericht und Jahwetag: Die Komposition Zef 1,1-2,3, untersucht auf der Grundlage der Literarkritik des Zefanjabuches. Münchener Universitätsschriften. Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament III. St. Ottelien: Eos Verlag, 1977.

Kapelrud, Arvid S. The Message of the Prophet Zephaniah, Morphology and Ideas. Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø: Universitests-forlaget, 1975.

Keil, C. F., and Delitzsch, F. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: The Twelve Minor Prophets. 2 vols. Translated by James Martin. Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 4rth series, 18. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1868.

Keller, Carl A., and Vuilleumier, René. Michée, Nahoum, Habacuc, Sophonie. CAT XIb. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1971.

Langohr, Guy. "Livre de Sophonie et la Critique d'Authenticité." EThL 52 (1976), 1-27.

Nötscher, Friedrich. Das Alte Testament: Zwölfprophetenbuch oder kleine Propheten. Echter=Bibel. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1954.

Nowack, W. Die kleinen Propheten. 3rd rev. ed. Göttinger handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922.

Robinson, Theodore H., and Horst, Friedrich. Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. 3rd ed. HAT I, 14. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964.

Sabottka, L. Zephanja: Versuch einer Neuübersetzung mit philologischem Kommentar. Biblica et Orientalia N. 25. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972.

Sellin, Ernst. Das Zwölfprophetenbuch. KAT 12. Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, 1922.

Smith, John Merlin Powis; Ward, William Hayes; and Bewer, Julius A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

Smith, George Adam. The Book of the Twelve Prophets commonly called the Minor. Rev. ed. 2 vols. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.

Smith, Louise Pettibone, and Lacheman, Ernest R. "The Authorship of the Book of Zephaniah." JNES 9 (1950), 137-42.

Taylor, Charles L. "The Book of Zephaniah." IB. 12 vols. New York & Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.

Wellhausen, Julius. Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt. 3rd ed. Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1898.

Williams, Donald Leigh. "Zephaniah: A Re-interpretation." Ph. D. Dissertation, Duke University, 1961.

_____. "The Date of Zephaniah." JBL 82 (1963), 77-88.

III Commentaries and Critical Works on other Old Testament Literature

Albright, W. F. "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems -- Ps 68." HUCA 23, 1 (1950/51), 1-39.

Anderson, Arnold Albert. The Book of Psalms. 2 vols. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1972.

Bewer, Julius A. "On the Text of Ezekiel 7.5-14." JBL 45 (1926), 222-31

Bourke, J. "Le Jour de Yahvé dans Joël." RB 66 (Jan.-Ap., 1959), 5-31 and 191-212.

Bright, John. Jeremiah. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Cannawurf, E. "The Authenticity of Micah IV 1-4." VT 13 (1963), 26-33.

Christensen, Duane L. "The Acrostic of Nahum Reconsidered." ZAW 87 (1975), 17-30.

Cooke, G. A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel. 2 vols. ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.

Cornill, Carl Heinrich. Das Buch Jeremia. Leipzig: Chr. Herm. Tauchnitz, 1905.

Dahood, Mitchel. Psalms. 3 vols. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Davidson, R. "The Interpretation of Isaiah II 6ff." VT 16 (1966), 1-7.

Dentan, Robert C. "The Book of Zechariah: Chapters 9-14." IB. 12 vols. New York & Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.

Duhm, Bernhard. "Anmerkungen zu den zwölf Propheten." ZAW 31 (1911), 1-43, 81-110, 161-204.

_____. Das Buch Jesaia. 2nd rev. ed. HAT III, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902.

Eichrodt, Walther. Ezekiel, A Commentary. Translated by Cosslett Quin. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.

Eppstein, Victor. "The Day of Yahweh in Jeremiah 4.23-28." JBL 87 (1968), 93-97.

Erlandsson, Seth. The Burden of Babylon: A Study of Isaiah 13:2-14:23. Translated mainly by George J. Houser. Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series 4. Lund, Sweden: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1970.

Fohrer, Georg. Das Buch Jesaja. 2 vols. Zürcher Bibelkommentare. Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag Zürich, 1960.

_____. Ezechiel. HAT I, 13. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955.

Gaster, Theodor H. "Ezekiel and the Mysteries." JBL 60 (1941), 289-310.

Giesebrecht, F. Das Buch Jeremia. 2nd rev. ed. HAT III, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907.

Gray, George Buchanan, and Peake, Arthur S. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

Gunkel, Hermann, completed by Joachim Begrich. Einleitung in die Psalmen: Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Holladay, William L. "The Recovery of Poetic Passages of Jeremiah." JBL 85 (1966), 401-35.

_____. "Style, Irony, and Authenticity in Jeremiah." JBL 81 (1962), 44-54.

Hölscher, C. G. Hesekiel: Der Dichter und das Buch: Eine literarkritische Untersuchung. BZAW 39. Giessen, 1924.

Hyatt, J. P. "The Book of Jeremiah." IB. 12 vols. New York & Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.

Irwin, William A. The Problem of Ezekiel: An Inductive Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Johnson, Aubrey R. "The Psalms." The Old Testament and Modern Study. A Generation of Discovery and Research. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1951. Pp. 162-209.

Kaiser, Otto. Isaiah 1-12, A Commentary. Translated by R. A. Wilson. OTL. London: SCM, 1972.

_____. Isaiah 13-39, A Commentary. Translated by R. A. Wilson. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.

Kapelrud, A. S. "Eschatology in the Book of Micah." VT 11 (1961), 392-405.

_____. "God as Destroyer in the Preaching of Amos and the ANE." JBL 71 (1952), 33-38.

_____. Joel Studies. UUA 1948/4. Uppsala: A. B. Lundequist, 1948.

Kissane, Edward J. The Book of Isaiah Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Dublin: Brown and Nolan, 1960.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim, Psalmen. 2nd ed. 2 vols. BKAT XV. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961.

Marti, Karl. Das Buch Jesaja. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament X. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900.

May, Herbert G. "The Book of Ezekiel." IB. 12 vols. New York & Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.

Mays, James Luther. Amos, A Commentary. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.

Milgrom, Jacob. "Did Isaiah Prophesy During the Reign of Uzziah?" VT 14 (1964), 164-182.

Mitchell, Hinckley G.; John Merlin Powis Smith; and Julius A. Bewer. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. The Psalms in Israel's Worship. 2 vols. Translated by D. R. AP-Thomas. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.

Peake, A. S. Jeremiah and Lamentations. 2 vols. The New Century Bible. New York: Henry Frowde and Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1911.

Rad, Gerhard von. Genesis, A Commentary. Rev. ed. Translated by John H. Marks. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. Jeremia. 2nd ed. HAT I, 12. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958.

Scott, R. B. Y. "The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39." IB. 12 vols. New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.

Seybold, Klaus. "Die anthropologischen Beiträge aus Jesaja 2." ZTK 74 (1977), 401-15.

Speiser, E. A. Genesis. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1964.

Spiegel, Shalom. "Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel?" HTR 24 (1931), 245-321.

Taylor, C. L. "The Book of Nahum." IB. 12 vols. New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.

Thompson, John A. "The Book of Joel." IB. 12 vols. New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy. Yale Oriental Series, Researches, 18. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930.

Weiser, Artur. Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten. 3rd ed. ATD 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.

_____. Das Buch Jeremia. 6th rev. ed. ATD 20-21. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

_____. The Psalms. Translated by Herbert Hartwell. OTL. London: SCM, 1962.

Westermann, Claus. Genesis. BKAT I. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1974-.

Wevers, John W. Ezekiel. The Century Bible, New Series. London: Nelson, 1969.

Wildberger, Hans. "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion. Jes II 1-5." VT 7 (1957), 62-81.

_____. Jesaja. 3 vols. BKAT X. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1972- .

Wolff, Hans Walter. A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos. Translated by Waldemar Janzen, S. Dean McBride, and Charles A. Muenchow. Edited by S. Dean McBride. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Young, Edward J. The Book of Isaiah: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes. 3 vols

The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.

Zimmerli, Walther. Ezechiel. 2 vols. BKAT XIII. Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969.

_____. "The Message of the Prophet Ezekiel." Translated by Mrs. Lewis Wilkins and James P. Martin. Int 23 (1969), 131-57.

_____. "The Special Form- and Traditio-Historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy." VT 15 (1965), 515-27.

IV Reference Works and other pertinent sources

Albright, William Foxwell. From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1940.

Childs, B. S. "The Enemy from the North and the Chaos Tradition." JBL 78 (1959), 187-98.

Christensen, Duane L. Transformations of the War Oracle in Old Testament Prophecy. HTR: HDR, 3. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.

Culican, William. The Medes and Persians. Ancient People and Places, 42. London: Thames and Hudson, 1965.

Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Translated by J. A. Baker. OTL. London: SCM, 1961.

Gray, J. "The Kingship of God in the Prophets and the Psalms." VT 11 (1961), 1-29.

Hanson, Paul D. The Dawn of Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Lindblom, J. Prophecy in Ancient Israel. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973.

Marks, J. H. "Flood (Genesis)." IDB. 4 vols plus suppl. New York & Nashville: Abingdon, 1962. Vol E-J: 278-84.

Miller, Patrick D. The Divine Warrior in Early Israel. HSM 5. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Muilenburg, James. "Abraham and the Nations: Blessing and World History." Int 19 (1965), 385-98.

Munch, Peter Andreas. The Expression 'Bajjôm Hāhū': Is it an Eschatological Terminus? Avhandlinger Utgitt Av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse. 1936. No. 2. Oslo: Dybwad, 1936.

Olmstead, A. T. History of Assyria. New York & London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

_____. History of the Persian Empire (Achaemenid Period). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Rad, Gerhard von. Der Heilige Krieg im Altem Israel. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

_____. Old Testament Theology. 2 vols. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York & Evanston: Harper & Row, 1962.

_____. "The City on the Hill." The Problem of the Hexateuch and other essays. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966. Pp. 232-42. First printed in EvT, 8th year, Munich, 1948-49, pp. 439-47.

Rosenberg, Roy A. "Yahweh Becomes King." JBL 85 (1966), 297-307.

Saebø, Magne. "Vom Grossreich zum Weltreich: Erwägungen zu Pss. lxxii 8, lxxxix 26; Sach. ix 10b." VT 28 (1978), 83-91.

Saggs, H. W. F. The Greatness that was Babylon: A Survey of the Ancient Civilization of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley. London: Sidgwich and Jackson, 1966.

Smend, Rudolf. Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation: Reflections upon Israel's Earliest History. Translated by Max Gray Rogers. Nashville & New York: Abingdon, 1970.

Soggin, J. Alberto. "Der prophetische Gedanke über den Heiligen Krieg, als Gericht gegen Israel." VT 10 (1960), 79-83.

Stolz, Fritz. Strukturen und Figuren im Kult von Jerusalem. Studien zur altorientalischen vor- und frühisraelitischen Religion. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.