

Synopsis of the thesis

"An Analysis of the Words melek and sar in the Biblical Literature"

by M. Nathaniel Bension

The term sar denotes always an appointed agent who, serving a sovereign or a government of national or local character, fulfills the functions of a spokesman, an administrator in civil matters, of a military officer or, in relation to foreigners, of an ambassador. The fact that he holds his office as an appointee of a king or other governing authority also characterises his social rank.

The basic meaning of the word melek is to be compared with that of the term lô'êš "adviser". The king has his functions in peace and war and especially in regard to the official cult of the state. His traditional prerogatives are to be noted, inter alia, pertaining to the matters of the standard of weights and measures and the appointment of sârîm, as well as in the significance of the expression 'elôhîm wâmelek.

The divine melek is defined as the deity presiding over a nation. The heavenly sârîm may be compared with those on earth. One may conclude that just as the human king is surrounded by the members of his court, the divine melek is surrounded by subordinates who are designated not only as sârîm but also as b^enê 'êl, b^enê 'elôhîm and hakkôkâbîm.

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Hebrew Letters
and the ordination as Rabbi

Referee: Dr. Julius Lewy

Submitted by: M. Nathaniel Bension

May, 1946.

An Analysis of the Words mélek and sâr
in the Biblical Literature

Table of Contents

Part I. On Earth

Chapter 1	1
-----------	---

The sâr

Chapter 2	10
-----------	----

The melek

Part II. In Heaven

Chapter 3	15
-----------	----

The Melek

Chapter 4	28
-----------	----

The Sâr

Notes	38
-------	----

Bibliography	43
--------------	----

Chapter 1

The word sār, in the early historical books of the Old Testament, where a human being is referred to or implied, is used in a sense roughly translatable as official appointee or appointed functionary officer. Sār is not interchangeable, in the same context, with other words denoting dignity of position in local or national government, though the substitution of such a word for sār, in the same context, would appear superficially to confirm the identity in meaning of the substituted word with sār.

In Nu. 22,7, the word zâqên is given, in the plural construct state, in the phrase zignê Mô'ab. The sense of the phrase is clear; the persons termed z'qênîm are here emissaries of a government, despatched upon a diplomatic mission. The following verse, in the identifying phrase -- obviously discussing the same persons, substitutes sârê for zignê.

That the word sar here designates the appointee to the position of ambassador, as a technical term obliterating the emissary's proper station in life, is evidenced by the references in vv. 13 and 15. In the light of v. 5, which describes Balak despatching mal'akîm -- personal messengers -- to Balaam, sârê Bâlâq, in verse 13, are the personal emissaries of Balak, which persons the narrative identifies with the persons designated as z'qênîm.

Moreover, Balak is described in v. 15 as sending to Balaam

"greater and more honoured śārīm." The inference is that the latter are greater and more honoured by virtue of their own station within the land, not by appointment to the embassy, which appointment would confer the same honour upon every appointee. Zâqên, then, is here the proper status of the appointee, the śâr, independent of his appointment; zâqên is his proper station within his community.

The narrative of Ju. 8 offers another example of apparent equivalence in the meanings of the terms 'îš, zâqên and śâr. Gideon's plea for provisions, aid and comfort for himself and his men, is made in v. 5 to 'anšê Sukkôt. The refusal to lend him aid comes in the name of śârê Sukkôt, apparently the same persons. V. 8 mentions that this refusal, which this verse attributes to 'anšê Sukkôt, is similar in tenor to the reply given Gideon by 'anšê P^{nû}'êl, when he asks the latter for help. Returning victorious from battle, Gideon captures (v. 14) na'ar me'anšê Sukkôt, who writes for him a list of śârê Sukkôt and its z^{qên}īm. When Gideon reaches the city, he casts the words of 'anšê Sukkôt -- said in v. 6 by śârê Sukkôt -- back in their teeth and avenges himself upon them ('anšê Sukkôt). The role of zignê Sukkôt is not clear in v. 16.

The interchangeability of 'îš, zâqên and śâr in this narrative, however, is not indiscriminate. When, in v. 5, Gideon approaches the city -- 'anšê Sukkôt -- he does so as one approaches today

a government or nation. That the approach is to an individual, having the attributes of a human being, is understood. The spokesman, the sâr, responds; thus in v. 6 sârê Sukkôt speak, enunciating the policy of the city with regard to Gideon. No indication is given of the proper station of the sârîm. They are merely the voice of civic policy, not necessarily those who determine it. To Gideon, of course, their answer is that of the people of Sukkot, 'anšê Sukkôt. Since, in v. 8, the reference to P^cnû'él is general, a detailed account of the process through which Gideon is denied help from that city would be tediously redundant, and is unnecessary. "The people of P^cnû'él" refuse to aid him, as did "the people of Sukkôt", though the statement of refusal comes from the sârîm.

This is supported by v. 15, where Gideon reminds 'anšê Sukkôt of their answer to his plea, although in v. 6 it is quoted in the name of their spokesmen, sârê Sukkôt. The z^cgênîm -- vv. 14. 6 -- and the sârîm compose the government. V. 14 bears this out; seeking to discover those responsible for the harsh treatment of himself and his men, Gideon obtains a list of the sârîm and the z^cgênîm of the city. But his vengeance is explicitly said to be taken against 'anšê Sukkôt and 'anšê P^cnû'él, which agrees with what has been said above concerning vv. 6.8.

The sâr in these verses, then, is the spokesman of the government. He is the voice of policy, not necessarily the

policy-maker, though his permanent association with the government, or, at least, his equality in tenure with the zâqên is here implied.³

Ju. 9 is the story of the complicity and subsequent strife of Abimelech and ba'le Š'kem and of his battles against Migdal Š'kem and Tēbēs. Abimelech is the king (vv. 6.22); ba'le Š'kem are his subjects. They chart the city's political course and are distinct from the populace⁴ (v. 51: kol ha'nāšim w'hannāšim w'kōl ba'le hā'fr). The appointed representative (v. 28) of the king is the governor of the city, šār hā'fr (v. 30). His authority is maintained and enforced by the king (vv. 39-41),⁵ to whom he owes loyalty (v. 31). The term šār is here qualified by the special duty of the appointee: šār hā'fr -- the šār over the city. Among the duties and the functions of šār hā'fr is the preservation of royal law and order among the citizens, which may lead him to expel undesirables (Ju. 9,41) or to imprison them (IIKings 22,26).

The latter verse indicates that responsibility for custody of the prisoner rests upon šār hā'fr and ben hammélek, the son of the king. IIKings 22,27 phrases the royal command in the imperative plural. Ben hammélek is associated with the royal house through birth, of course, but he is found as an officer⁶ of the government as well. His rank and social status are those of the court.⁷ He needs no formal elevation to the rank

of sâr. Still, his incumbency in offices other than the throne⁸ is subject to appointment by the king, e. g., in IISam. 15,4. There Absalom bemoans the fact that he has not been appointed sôfêṭ. The relevance of the verse in this discussion becomes clear upon comparison with Ex. 2,14: "Who has appointed you as sâr w' sôfêṭ?"⁹ Use of two complementary terms to define one concept is a device frequently employed in Biblical Hebrew.¹⁰ Sâr w' sôfêṭ signifies "appointee to the judicial office." The verb "to appoint" is rendered in the Hebrew by the root šm. IISam. 15,4 omits the word sâr since ben hammelek, Absalom, needs no elevation to the rank sâr but only the assignment to his particular duties.

Hence it may be inferred that the sâr is elevated to the social level of the court,¹¹ a technical requirement prerequisite to functioning in the government. While this may be true of the above-cited verses, it is not necessarily an accurate characterisation of the sâr such as mentioned in Ex. 18,21(.22). .25(.26). There the sâr is not part of a royal court, though his relation to the nucleus of ultimate authority is the same¹² as it would be if he were; a situation similar to that in Ju. 8, a chapter previously discussed. The verses in parentheses specify the function of the sârīm as judicial officers.

The social relationship between the king -- melek -- and the sâr can be discerned in the following contexts. Is. 9,5 gives four names by which a son is to be called. This parti-

cular son -- so states the verse -- is the perfect ruler (watt' hî hammiśrâ 'al šīkmô), a versatile sovereign who embraces in his person all capacities and functions for government. The following verse is quite explicit in defining him as king upon the throne of David. Of the four names given the son in v. 5, only the first -- péle' yô'êš -- and the last -- śâr šālôm -- concern this discussion. Comparison with Mi. 4,9, where yô'êš is parallel to mélek,¹³ will show that in this description of the ideal king on the throne of David péle' yô'êš can be understood as péle' mélek, a wondrous king. Particularly significant in this verse is the inclusion, under the heading of hammiśrâ, of yô'êš (= mélek) and śâr. It indicates that the ruling unity, the government, is -- mélek and śâr together -- as one in the public eye. It may be extreme to assert that ecstatic poetry utters itself in calculated niceties, with due regard to technical terminology, but it is undeniable that this can be accepted as a picture of the quantity we term the court, as it was seen -- both as governing entity and social sphere -- by the eye of Isaiah, supposedly acquainted with court scenery, and, with greater force, by the eye of the common man.¹⁴

Thus far, we have observed the śâr as ambassador, city governor, and judicial officer. The common element in the three designations is the fact of appointment by the royal or other ruling authority.^{9.16} This element is to be found also in the mention made of another type of śâr, the military. It

is evident in Nu. 31, 14 where Moses waxes wroth against p^eqûdê
hepâyil sârê hâ lârîm w'sârê hammêôt habbâ'îm miss' bâ' hammilhâmâ.
 V. 48 and II Kings 11, 15 agree with this verse as to the equi-
 valence, in their respective contexts, of the meanings of the
 words p^eqûdîm and sârîm. The three verses discuss the military
sâr. That he is called pâqûd is of especial interest, indicating
 his status as appointed officer; the word is the passive parti-
 ciple of the verb pâqad, which may mean "ordered" or "commissioned".
Pâqûd, then, being the passive participle of the verb, can here
 be translated as "one who is ordered," and when the context denotes --
 as in the three verses cited -- military appointment, especially
 since the word appears in apposition to sâr, the translation
 "commissioned officer" is entirely possible.¹⁵ That the military
sâr may derive his authority from royal appointment is clear
 from ISam. 18, 13. It will be noted that the formal phrase of
 appointment is here retained.¹⁶

The general term for military officer is sâr gâbâ' or
sâr hâyil.¹⁷ Special terms are given to officers where the unit
 or branch of their military service is specified. Such terms
 are sâr g^edûd,¹⁸ sâr rekeb,¹⁹ sâr hattabbâhîm,²⁰ or they consist mere-
 ly of the word sâr followed by the name of the unit he commands.
 The context, however, determines whether a sâr mē'â, for example,
 is a judicial or military officer.²¹

Frequently, the word sâr occurs, in a context which would
 appear to indicate a military officer, without apparent modifi-

cation. II Sam. 18,5 is one such instance. In this verse, however, the word needs no modification. Hasšārīm is an elliptic expression of the formal terms in v. 1. Repetition in v. 5 is therefore unnecessary. Similarly, Jer. 39,3 (šārē melek Bābel) assumes what is stated in the first verse of the chapter (N' būkadre'ssar melek Bābel w'kol hēlō). Jer. 38,22 also reads šārē melek Bābel without explicit definition of the type of šār described. But the general context of this chapter and of the one following leave no doubt in the mind of the reader as to the military status of these šārīm, especially when the expression is quite clear in Jer. 39,3, if, as was said in the beginning of this paragraph, v. 1 is taken into account.²²

Still another type of šār is mentioned which is perhaps the most fitting appendage to a royal court, the šār hārāšīm.²³ This šār is one of the personal servants of the king, of a group of šārīm with special duties regarding the maintenance of the king and his household. Others of this group are šār migne,²⁴ šār hammašqīm,²⁵ šār hā'ōfīm,²⁶ šār m'nūhā,²⁷ and šār šārīšīm.²⁸ Šār missīm,²⁹ however, partakes -- with šār pelek³⁰ and šār habbīrā³¹ -- more of the nature of an administrative official in the national government, a type discussed above under šār hā'ir.^{5b}

Conclusion

The sâr is an official appointed by the sovereign to the local or national government, serving it as an administrator of civil affairs, as a military officer, as functionary in the royal household, or, as spokesman and ambassador, in foreign policy. His social status is that of the royal court or other governing unity.

From the previous chapter, it can be deduced that the police working, in the ultimate covering, in the realm. The police are the agents of the legal and political power. In the police, they are all parties in whatever area of endeavour

Chapter 2

... of the police working of police, as the word appears police working in the ultimate covering, in the realm.

... of the police working of police, as the word appears police working in the ultimate covering, in the realm.

... of the police working of police, as the word appears police working in the ultimate covering, in the realm.

... of the police working of police, as the word appears police working in the ultimate covering, in the realm.

... of the police working of police, as the word appears police working in the ultimate covering, in the realm.

... of the police working of police, as the word appears police working in the ultimate covering, in the realm.

... of the police working of police, as the word appears police working in the ultimate covering, in the realm.

... of the police working of police, as the word appears police working in the ultimate covering, in the realm.

... of the police working of police, as the word appears police working in the ultimate covering, in the realm.

From the previous chapter, it can be deduced that the mélek, the king, is the ultimate sovereign in his realm. His sārīm are the agents of his legal and political person. As his appointees, they are his proxies in whichever area of endeavour they have been appointed to act.

One of the notable meanings of mélek, as the word appears³² in the Bible, in a context which indicates an earthly king, is that indicated in Mi. 4,9. There the word mélek¹³ is parallel^{33a} to the word yô'êš. The same is true in Job 3,14. The meaning of the verb yâ'as is "advised", yô'êš being the singular masculine participle in the Qal. Following this, one can derive the idea of king from that of the deliberating statesman, or, more accurately put, the authority ultimately responsible for the determining of policy.

It is interesting to note that the Akkadian form of the mlk root takes the primary meaning "to advise", from which the word^{33b} "prince" is derived. The association of the Hebrew words yô'êš and mélek, then, arises from the similarity in the meanings of the roots thereof, most noticeable in Hebrew in the comparison of yâ'as with the Nif'al form of málak. Both yô'êš and mélek, in contexts which regard them as parallel terms, are to be understood as referring to the king. This is supported by

Is. 7,5³⁴ and, more clearly, by Mi. 6,5. Both verses make use of the verb yâ'as in the sense of action decided upon and taken by the ultimate sovereign authority.³⁵

The connection between the śâr and the mélek has been demonstrated above for the purpose of generally defining the position of the śâr. The references given there are equally valid for the delineation of the sphere of the mélek, and the recapitulation of them does not involve the risk, either as regards mélek or śâr, of begging the question.

In the final analysis, the authority of the mélek is the power appointing the śâr, where the mélek is the ultimate sovereign. This is especially clear in such a context as is afforded by IKings 14,27 (śârê hârâšîm haššômîm petab bê hammélek). Since the function of śârê hârâšîm is the king's personal service, they necessarily depend upon his authority for their position. That the same dependence upon the king's authority is present in other types of śârîm has been shown in the previous chapter. Nevertheless, it is not amiss to observe from this point of view such a passage as Ju. 4,7.³⁶ The direct dependence of the authority of śâr haššabâ upon the mélek is here explicit. The personality of the mélek is channelised through his agent,^{39b} śâr haššabâ. Less explicit, though equally clear in this respect, are IISam. 24,2 and IKings 15, 20;22,31.³⁷

Implied by the concept of the mélek as the ultimate sovereign authority is the phenomenon of royally designated and approved weights and measures. This appears in IISam. 14,26 (má'talim s'qálm b'e'eben hammélek)³⁸. Taxation by and for the royal household and administration, another derivative of central royal authority, is reported in IKings 4;9,15.³⁹

As to the physical appurtenances of the mélek and his court,⁴⁰ odd bits of information may be gleaned for the most part. A wealth of detail is given in the first book of Kings, chapters 5, 9, and 10, but while the descriptions need not necessarily be regarded as exaggerated or utterly untrue, they cannot be taken as a basis for the picture of a typical royal court in Judah or Israel.

IKings 16,18 conveys the definite term given to the royal palace ('armôn hammélek). IKings 22,39 mentions the house of ivory (bêt hassén) which Ahab built. As to what it was and⁴¹ how it was furnished, we can only conjecture.

Another fragment of information is available in Jer. 22,14, which gives the general description of the appearance of a royal palace to the eyes of the prophet (bêt middót wa'liiôt⁴² m'rûuábm w'qará lô hallónái w'sáfún báárez únásoah baššášar). Jeremiah affords yet another detail as to the living habits of the king in Jerusalem. In 36,22 there is mention of the winter palace, at least one room of which is heated by an open fire burning in some type of receptacle for the burning fuel.

Connoted in the general picture of the typical appurten-

ances of the royal court are the royal stables and stable cities, which are mentioned in IKings 9, 15-19; 10, 26. Installations such as are described being constructed and maintained by Solomon probably continued to function in the capacity for which they were intended, even if to a lesser extent. For amplification of these meagre details, recourse must be had to such archaeological evidence bearing on this subject as is available.⁴³

The relation of the mélek to the religious cult is that of patron. He gives official sanction to the religion and god he worships, which religion and god are accepted as the official state religion and deity. One of several examples of this is in IIKings 23, where Josiah's adoption and sanction of Yahwism⁴⁴ are described.

Beyond formally approving the cult, the mélek has under his special aegis the sanctuary of that cult as a royal chapel.⁴⁵ He participates in the liturgy and cult observance as worshipper and as officiating priest,⁴⁶ though, in Yahwistic observance his function in the latter capacity is questioned with the passage of royal influence from the Judaeian scene.⁴⁷ The close liaison between cult and king is expressed in IKings 21, 10. There, clearly, formal authority, the formally accepted prime mover of the social and political pattern of the country is one quantity -- lôhîm wâmélek. V. 13 of the same chapter

contains the same phrase, a quoted formula which is part of the formal accusation of treason against Naboth. Ultimate authority, we may then assume, was formally regarded as a unity embracing king and deity.⁴⁸

Concerning the liaison between king and cult, it may here be pointed out that such a connection seems the deliberate intention of Jer. 33, 17, 18, 21, 22.

Conclusion

The mélek is the ultimate sovereign authority in the realm he governs. His sârîm are the appointed agents of his legal and formal person. He gives official sanction and enforcement to matters of civil administration, such as taxation, standard weights and measures, as to the military administration of state, through his sârîm.

The palace and its business are centred around his personal household. He is the patron and defender of the faith, and the central sanctuary is the royal chapel, in which he occasionally officiates as priest. His god and he are the nucleus of formal authority in the state, and allegiance to the realm is thus expressed as loyalty to 'ēlôhîm wámélek, being a description in Hebrew of the single entity of authority.

Chapter 3

Père Marie-Joseph Lagrange, in his work Études sur les Religions Sémitiques, enunciates the following paragraph:

"Il est incontestable que le nom de mélék est à l'origine un nom commun; mais il est devenu, plus encore que baal, le nom d'un dieu particulier quoique la physionomie de ce dieu soit difficile à saisir, sans doute parce qu'elle ne fut pas partout la même.⁴⁹"

Without at the moment examining the entity and characteristics of the divine mélék, one can accept the transfer of the term itself and of its connoted concept of ultimate sovereign authority from the mortal sphere to the divine. The association, in the nucleus of authority, of king and deity, as described above, is indeed conducive to the easy transfer of the term and of its connotations. Examples of the spheres of activity in which the transfer of the term is most clearly perceptible follow.

As has been noted above (see end of note 22), temporal leadership is often, in its simplest terms, found in the pre-eminence of the leader in military prowess. The affinity between the temporal and the celestial mélék is strong in this respect. War gods are well known in the religious literatures available to us. Such a god as Ninurta is a

prime instance of the elevation to leadership of a war god.

Let us consider, as an example within the field of this study -- the Biblical literature -- Ex. 15,3.6. They read:

"Yahweh is a fighter, Yahweh is His name!"

.....

"Thy right hand, Yahweh, Is mighty in power;

"Thy right hand, Yahweh, Shatters the foe!"

An analogous sentiment is expressed in Ps. 24,8:

"Yahweh is mighty and powerful,

"Yahweh is powerful in battle!"

The verses from Exodus are cited by Albright, with the following comment:

"....Israel's God became 'Yahweh, God of (the) Hosts (of Israel),' one of whose primary functions was to defend His people against foes whose only aim seemed to be to destroy it utterly and to devote it to their impure gods."⁵⁰

While one may not necessarily agree with Albright's interpretation of Yahweh s' bā'ot (see below), and while one may wonder how a people utterly destroyed may be devoted to anything, one cannot but recognise that the traits of military prowess by which Yahweh is praised, both in the quotation from Exodus and in the one from Psalms, may, out of context, be applied, with the change in the name of the subject, to any desired human hero. Albright mentions that the poetic structure of the verses from Exodus is, however, of atypical reli-

gious poetic pattern found in Ugaritic literature of a similar type. This is a point I am not competent to discuss.

Battles between peoples, then, resolve themselves from this viewpoint into struggles between the gods of the belligerent nations, each god protecting and striving for the victory of his own adherents. Sennacherib, for instance, will piously ascribe his victory over the south Palestinian coalition⁵¹ and its Egyptian allies to Asshur. Similarly, Mesha speaks of the deliverance of Chemosh and of how the latter⁵² has saved him from all the kings.

The clearest instance of war waged by the deities, however, is found in the Song of Deborah, in Ju. 5. It is a paean of victory to Yahweh, as the third verse states:

"I, to Yahweh do I sing, I chant to Yahweh, the God
of Israel!"

V. 8 provides the reason for the battle, the struggle for supremacy by other gods against Yahweh's sovereignty over Israel. The actual clash is described in vv. 19.20.

"The m^elākīm came and fought, Then fought the m^elākīm
of Canaan..."⁵³

These m^elākīm are the deities against whom Yahweh battles.

V. 20 is explicit: "...From the heavens they fought..." That this cannot refer to the stars -- kōkābīm in the verse, of which more will be said -- is clear from the Masoretic accents,⁵³ as Nyberg demonstrates. Hence, those who are mentioned as

fighting from the heavens are the m^elākīm of Canaan, namely, gods. V. 23 is a violent condemnation of those who "did not come to the help of Yahweh, to the aid of Yahweh among the mighty." Clearly, the m^elākīm are arrayed against Yahweh in this struggle. That this chapter is of a battle between gods is unmistakable.⁵⁴

Mélek can be taken, then, as a divine name. It appears in theophoric names such as that of Mesha's father, Chemosh-melek (Chemosh is Melek), or the frequent Biblical name Malkiāhū (Yahweh is Melek) or Malkiā. Whether such a name as Ébedmélek is theophoric in significance is questioned by Noth in the discussion of the name's occurrence in Jer. 38,7. However, that the name has a theophoric element in other contexts is conceded.⁵⁵

As of the temporal mélek, so is it true of the divine that he is regarded as the sovereign of his realm. He is the ruling entity of the physical state, another point of correspondence with the mortal monarch. Ju. 11,24 quotes Jephthah as saying to the king of the Ammonites, "Whom thy god, K^emôš, has caused thee to inherit, him shalt thou inherit, and whomever Yahweh, our god, has driven out from before us, him shall we inherit." K^emôš is not the god worshipped by the Ammonites, and Albright questions the placing of this verse in the time of the Judges,⁵⁶ but the idea of the sovereignty of each deity over his own territory is clearly presented.

Jer. 49,1 is another expression of the same world view.

"To the sons of 'Ammôn. Thus saith Yahweh:

"Hath Israel no sons, and hath he no heir?

"Why, then, has Malkâm inherited Gâd, and his people
dwell in the cities thereof?"

Lagrange reads Malkâm as Milkôm, the deity worshipped by the
58 Ammonites, and not as mélék -- king -- with the third person plural masculine pronominal suffix. And in Jos. 13,24, the territory given as an inheritance to the tribe of Gad is described as including half the country of the Ammonites. Thus, it is not impossible that the latter should drive back the former -- the tribe of Gad -- and occupy its territory. That Gâd in the verse from Jeremiah means a deity, namely, the god of the people occupying the territory of Gad, is clear, first, from the juxtaposition of the word with the divine name Milkôm, and, second, on the basis of a Hebrew seal reading Gadmélék,
59 which is reported by Schrader, meaning "Gâd is mélék." Jer. 49,1 is an exemplary expression of the idea that the deity of a nation is sovereign in its territory, and that, consequently, defeat of the nation militarily and exile or dispossession thereof imply defeat of the mélék, the divine sovereign.

From the mention made of Milkôm, the deity of the Ammonites, it can be discerned that the divine name mélék is not only the title but the proper name of the deity. What the final

m represents is an etymological question which Lagrange discusses, describing it as phonetic variation without importance, a mimation such as is found in South Arabic names. The possibility is broached by Lagrange that the final m may represent 'Am, the meaning of the name thus being: 'Am is Mélek. My own opinion tends to the interpretation of the letter as a mimation; however, in matters of etymology, I have not the preparation to judge competently.

In any event, whether Mélek is the divine proper name or merely the description of the divine sovereign is a fine distinction. It is entirely possible that from the state of being a description of the deity, it evolved into the proper name of the god. Other divine names, such as Râm and 'Al, when translated, also afford meanings which are characterisations of the deities so named. Moreover, that the divine names have meaning is an approved assumption which has been used in the investigation of ancient religious literature to great advantage and with gratifying results.

However, general statements are not necessarily applicable to any given particular instance. Nyberg renders Hos. 10,3: "When they say, 'We have no Mélek; we do not fear Yahweh and what can the Mélek do for us?'..." Here Melek refers to a specific deity, to whom Hosea quotes Israel as referring. Whether his proper name is Mélek, or whether the remainder of his title is understood or assumed as understood by the author is

difficult to decide. That Mélek is here meant to refer to a particular deity is obvious, however, from the contrast of the name with Yahweh, another specific and explicit name of a particular deity.

The same chapter of Hosea gives other instances of the divine name Mélek, in which the name is qualified by a descriptive term, the meaning of which is not entirely certain but which can be conjectured from the context. V. 6 speaks of the sacred symbol of the deity Āl being brought as tribute to Mélek Iârêb⁶². The context indicates that the reference is to an Assyrian god. This appears to be the meaning also in Hos. 5,13: "And Ephraim saw his sickness... then went Ephraim to Assyria, and he sent to Mélek Iârêb; but he is not able to heal you..." Parallel references to Yahweh in 6,1 and 11,3 indicate that Mélek Iârêb must be a deity.

Hos. 10,7, the following verse, foretells the doom of Samaria, and by implication -- as stated above -- the doom of its Mélek. "Gone is Samaria, namely its Mélek, like a splinter floating upon the water." Nidme in the Hebrew must mean "gone" and not "similar" because of the parallel word w'nîsm'dû at the beginning of v. 8. The construction "Samaria, namely its Mélek" will be familiar to the reader, no doubt, as the Arabic badal construction. The simile of the splinter floating upon the water is particularly apt, since the reference is to the image of the Mélek. The transla-

preclude the possibility of the primacy or pre-eminence of the latter as a deity.

To return to Am. 5,26, the verse in question, one can also see Kêwân as a divine name. Schrader goes so far as to conjecture that Kêwân salmêkem -- for Kiun is to be read Kêwân -- is the double name of a deity, containing the elements Kêwân and Salm or Selem, with the second person plural masculine pronominal suffix. This, however, while possible, is not entirely necessary. He does affirm that Kêwân and Sikkût are names of gods (the latter to be read Sakkût).⁶⁷

Hence, it can be discerned that Sikkût malkêkem in the verse is to be understood as: Sakkût your Mélek, Sakkût being the proper name of the deity and Mélek the description thereof.

Yahweh is also described as Mélek. "Behold the voice of the cry of the daughter of my people from a distant land: 'Is Yahweh not in Zion? And is not her Mélek within her?'..." says Jer. 8,19. Yahweh is here parallel to Mélek or, more accurately put, to the expression "her Mélek," i. e., the Mélek of Zion.

And in Zeph. 3,15 we find the same characterisation of Yahweh as the Mélek, here of Israel. "...The Mélek of Israel, Yahweh, is in thy midst; thou shalt fear evil no more." Here, not as the result of parallel structure in the verse, but through the apposition of the expressions "the Mélek of Israel" and "Yahweh" do we identify Yahweh as Mélek.

Whether the concept heretofore delineated of the divine

Mélek can be applied wherever a deity is indicated is a matter of some doubt. A Biblical passage such as Is. 21,41 may quite possibly connote the Mélek as we have described him. "'Bring near your argument,' saith Yahweh; 'bring near your quarrel,' saith the Mélek of Jacob." On the face of it, this verse does not evince a different view of the Mélek than we have discussed. Yahweh is indicated, here again through parallel structure, as the Mélek of Jacob. Moreover, this is a polemic apparently addressed to rival claimants to the status of the deity worshipped by Israel. V. 23 urges these rivals to show whereby they may establish their claim. The verse is explicit in saying, "...that we may know that ye are ʾĕlōhîm (gods)..." But the question is rhetorical; v. 24 continues, "Behold, ye are of nothing..." That the prophet argues against these deities is evidence of the popular esteem in which they must have been held, and of the prevalence of their cults -- whatever they were -- as a threat to Yahwism. But his viewpoint is considerably different from that which was examined in the discussion of the Song of Deborah and its concept of the divine Mélek. Yahweh is no longer a territorial sovereign for a given people, but rather along the lines of a universal deity, than whom there is no other.

This shift in viewpoint -- while not within the strict limits of this study -- may be mentioned here in connection with Is. 44,6. The verse reads: "Thus saith Yahweh, the Mélek of Israel and his redeemer, Yahweh š' b'ā'ôṭ: I am the

first and I am the last, and beside Me there are no gods."

Yahweh is in apposition with Mélek, and we may thus see Mélek referring here, too, to Yahweh. (For the explanation and discussion of the divine appellation Yahweh g' bā'ôt, see below Chapter 4.) And yet, in spite of the familiar phraseology, the meaning of the term Mélek which we have come to recognise as implying the sovereignties of several deities, each within his own, is specifically and formally denied by the last three words in the Hebrew verse. That the denial should at all have been voiced is evidence of the hold of ideas to the contrary upon the minds of the audience to whom the prophet was preaching. But where Hosea's diatribe is directed against alien sovereigns seeking to encroach upon the territory of Yahweh, Isaiah denies to any deity but Yahweh divine sovereignty. Hosea condemns worship of other gods by Israel, since such worship is a breach of faith on the part of the people who should be devoted to their divine sovereign and protector, Yahweh. But Isaiah looks upon worship of others than Yahweh as benighted heathenism. "Isaiah," in this paragraph, of course, means the author of the two verses offered as examples.

Like the earthly Mélek, the divine Mélek also has his agents. Those who are lesser deities and who partake of divinity themselves are discussed in the following chapter. But the human agents of the divine Mélek are mentioned in Hos. 7,7,

for example. In the simile of Israel as a burning oven, the prophet says, "They will all heat like the oven and consume their šōf'ṭīm; all their M'lakīm have fallen; none among them calls to Me." The prophet is speaking for Yahweh. The latter reproaches Israel for deserting Him in favor of the Canaanite deities, the divine M'lakīm, and tells of the doom in store for those deities and for their šōf'ṭīm. Nyberg points out that the šōf'ṭīm are the bearers of the mišpāt of the divine Mélek,⁶⁸ the preceptors of the ethical and ritual codes of the divine deities. This is poisoned precept as far as Israel is concerned, and the doom coming upon Israel is less for the observance of this code, which observance is lax (Hos. 10,3), than for the failure of the people to adhere once again to Yahweh and His mišpāt. Possibly, the šōf'ēt may be equivalent to the priest, though this does not appear reasonable in view of Hos. 10,5, which mentions the word for "priest" -- kômer -- as well. More probably, the word is to be understood in the sense of "judge" or "local magistrate". The relation of such a dignitary to the deity he serves is expressed in Ju. 8,22-24, where Gideon is desired by the people he has led to victory to assume the hereditary office of king. They employ the verb mašal, which is applied to the rule of royalty in I Kings 5,1, one of many possible examples. There it is stated that Solomon reigned -- hāiā mōšēl -- over

all the kingdoms -- mamlākôt -- from the Euphrates through the land of the Philistines until the boundary of Egypt. But Gideon refuses the kingship, saying, "Yahweh will reign (imšôl) over you."

Gideon's ministry continues after the emergency which has brought him to the fore has passed; he is a šôfê⁶⁹t. We gather a similar meaning from Ju. 3,9.10. The spirit of Yahweh rest upon Othniel, who "judges" (waillšpôt) Israel even to the extent of leading them to battle under the standard of Yahweh. The šôfê⁷⁰t is a popular leader; before the institution of royalty in Israel and Judah, this is the only type of leadership available. He is a leader summoned by divine authority, at a given emergency.

With the development of the institution of royalty in Judah and Israel, the king is the anointed of Yahweh, but, indubitably, the šôfê⁷⁰t maintains some of his traditional position as interpreter of the divine ethic and ritual. To this does Hos. 13,10 refer when it says, "Alas! Where is your Mélek that he may save you in all your cities, and your šôfê⁷⁰tîm to whom ye said, 'Give me a Mélek and šârîm!' " Hosea reviles the popular leaders, in this verse, the šôfê⁷⁰tîm to whom the people turned to give them the cult of the divine Mélek. (The šârîm in the verse are discussed in the following chapter of this study.) These are the same type of dignitary

described in the book of Judges as devoted to the spread of Yahwism, and to the welfare of the cult and of its adherents.

Conclusion

Mélek is a divine name applied to or properly belonging to the deity presiding over a nation. The defeat by or victory over another nation of his own national group of adherents constitutes his defeat or victory. The bearers of tradition concerning the ethic and ritual of the Mélek cult, i. e., the mišpāt of the Mélek, are the sôf'ṭim. Yahweh is also described as Mélek.

The name of the deity, Mélek, may be also a description added to the proper name thereof, or it may be qualified by the addition of the place of his sanctuary or area of his dominion.

Chapter 4

Having discussed the entity and the characteristics of the divine Mélek, we now stand at the threshold of the examination of his Court. The lesser deities ^apartaking of the divine, which are in the retinue of the Mélek, are designated as sárfm in the Canaanite pantheon, as it appears in the Biblical literature. For a fuller acquaintance with the divine sâr, one must turn again to the source giving the fullest detail of and most interested in Canaanite Mélek-religion, the book of Hosea. As may have already been observed, this prophet is one of the chief sources of our information in this field in the Bible.

Hos. 7,3 reads as follows: "With their evil they delight Mélek, and with their deceit -- Sárfm." The message of the prophet in this chapter has been discussed in connection with v. 7 thereof, in the preceding chapter of this study. There it was shown that Malkêhem in the verse referred to the Canaanite deities who are the objects of Hosea's zeal for Yahweh. Vv. 1-3 in the chapter of Hosea under discussion begin this prophetic message with the information that Yahweh knows of the evil being committed by His people. This evil is the adherence to the Canaanite Mélek cult, the doom of which is foretold in v. 7. Mélek in v. 3 refers to the same Canaanite deity as is mentioned in the plural in v. 7.

The word šārīm is parallel with the word Mélek in this verse from Hosea, and there can be little doubt that it also indicates divinity, though of a lesser degree and magnitude. These šārīm are, in their relation to the divine Mélek, equivalent to the earthly šārīm in relation to the mortal mélek. We have recognised the transfer of the term mélek from the mundane to the celestial. It follows logically that the court of the mélek is a concept that is transferable similarly, and with equal facility.

Thus, Hos. 13, 10, which was discussed in the examination of the term šôfêṭ above, would read Mélek as the divine sovereign of the Canaanite cult, and šārīm as his lesser satellites. That these two terms must refer to ^{the} heavenly court is unmistakable from the context. V. 9 reproaches Israel; Yahweh is the source of help to which the people must look. V. 10 says: where is the Mélek who will help Israel? This verse is a deliberate contrast with the preceding, where help is affirmed to come from Yahweh to Israel. Mélek is contrasted with Yahweh, and the parallel consideration by the prophet of these two words can leave no doubt that Mélek is here a deity.

The šôfêṭīm and their function have been indicated above, but, to sum up, one may say they are the representatives of the cult and its exponents is ethnic and ritual who are nearest to the common people, and who are not professionally identified with the cult from birth. šôfêṭêkā in the verse is thus clear in meaning, and further clarifies the phrase: "...give me a

Mélek and Sârîm!" Mélek has already been shown to be, in this verse, a deity. The šôfêtim, the protagonists of the cult, are besought by the people to provide the latter with Mélek, a deity, and Sârîm, which must be also deities.

The best expression -- for which also we must look to Hosea -- of the association as a divine court of the Mélek and Sârîm is in 8, 10. "...When I gather them (for judgment), they will take little of the dicta of the Mélek Sârîm." This expression, Mélek Sârîm, is a direct parallel of Yahweh s'baôt,⁷¹ according to Nyberg. It signifies the entity of the divine government, by this deity, as constituted of his sovereignty. He is the soul of authority, as it were, which with the body of his satellites makes up the divine government.⁷²

At this point, it may be well to investigate the meaning and application of the term Sâr, where the latter signifies a divine personage. Deut. 32, 8.9 read:

v. 8: "When Eliôn gave the nations their heritages,

"When he separated the sons of Adam,

"He fixed the territories of the peoples

"According to the number of b'ne Isrâ'el."

v. 9: "For the portion of Yahweh was His people,

"Jacob was His inherited possession."

B'ne Isrâ'el must be read as b'ne 'el.⁷³ The meaning of the verse is clear if Eliôn is understood to be a divine name. It can

so be understood on the basis of Gen. 14, 19-20, where Melchizedek, the priest of El 'Eliôn, blesses Abraham in the name of his god for having overcome his enemies in battle. This deity is supreme over the earth and all it contains, as his name signifies, as well as being sovereign over all other gods.⁷⁴

The verse means, then, that El'ôn divided the earth and its population among the several deities below him in rank, that they might be the sovereigns within their territories, each within his own. These deities are the b'né 'él, the sons of the supreme god. One of them is Yahweh, whose share is His people Jacob.

Within their territories, each of these b'né 'él is a Melek, having Sârîm beneath him, as we have just observed him in his relation to the supreme El'ôn. B'né 'él is a term particularly interesting because of its relevance to this discussion. It is, in Job 38,7, parallel to the term kôkâbîm. The verse reads:

"When the morning stars (kôkâbê bôqer) sang together,

"And all b'né 'lôhîm shouted aloud."

We may take as equivalent the two terms b'né 'él and b'né 'lôhîm. We thus find that ban 'él is, for our purpose, synonymous with kôkâb. This astral being, who partakes of the divine, is seen by Albright in Gen. 6,2.4, where his offspring, as the result of union with mortal women, are called n'filîm (=meteors).⁷⁵

That kôkâb may be regarded as a divine name was suggested
64.65
above, and we can now assume it as fairly certain. We come,
then, to the actual relation between the subordinated kôkâb
and his liege lord, the Melek, in the examination of the verse
mentioned above, Ju. 5, 19.20. There we identified the M^elâkîm
as deities, against who Yahweh wages war. V. 20 states that
53
they fought from the heavens, and adds that the kôkâbîm fought
from their (own) orbits "with" Sisera. As the opposing forces
have been outlined, Yahweh fights on the side of Israel, and
the Canaanite M^elâkîm deities fight as allies of Sisera; so
that the kôkâbîm must be allies of Sisera. Hence, "with" in
v. 20 must mean with as distinct from against. The Hebrew
53
'im is quite possible in this meaning.

That the kôkâbîm must be, in this passage, allies of
the M^elâkîm and of Sisera, and not of Yahweh, is clear from
v. 21. There the Kishon is said to have swept them away.
Water is the weapon of Yahweh, as we see in v. 4. Thus, it
is entirely proper to see the opposing forces as M^elâkîm,
kôkâbîm and Sisera on one side and Yahweh, his weapon of flood
53
and rain, and Israel, on the other.

We have seen that the kôkâbîm are the satellites of the
Melek, and that they are, according to Nyberg, the divine Šârîm.
I am inclined to accept this interpretation as reasonable and
convincing, and, on this basis, I see in the divine Šâr the
traits that have been indicated for the kôkâb and the ben 'el

or ben 'lôhîm. The divine šâr is of the heavenly court and of the retinue of the divine Melek. In this he is the counterpart of the mundane šâr in the relation of the latter to the earthly melek. He accompanies the Melek into battle and fights with him against a common enemy, a rival Melek.

In connection with what has been stated above concerning the analogy of the expression Melek šârîm with the expression Yahweh š'ba'ôt, both being evidences of the view that the presiding deity is sovereign over a celestial retinue, Is. 6 springs to mind. It is an impressive description of the vision Isaiah sees of Yahweh in His palace, seated upon His throne. Vv. 3.5 are of especial interest to us. V. 3 reads: "Holy, holy, holy is Yahweh š'ba'ôt;..." and v. 5: "...for mine eyes have seen the Melek Yahweh š'ba'ôt." In this context, one can hardly fail to see the perfect correspondence between Yahweh š'ba'ôt and Melek šârîm. The prophet conveys the overpowering effect which the sight of the divine sovereign -- haMelek -- amid His court and retinue, has upon him. The phrase Yahweh š'ba'ôt is now so real to him that he repeats it during the description. It is more than a formal title, though it is certainly that in the mouth of the seraph who intones praise of Yahweh's holiness. It is the evidence of the supreme authority of Yahweh over Israel on earth as over the hosts (š'ba'ôt) of heaven, the kôkâbîm and b'ne 'el.

That the Śār is an integral part of the cult-myth can be seen from Hos. 3,4: "For many days shall Israel dwell without a Mélek, without a Śār, without sacrificial offerings..."

The context of the entire verse is of cult-elements. The authenticity of the verse is slightly suspect, however, partly, as Nyberg says, because the usual references to celestial Śārîm have the word in the absolute plural, and partly -- this is merely my own conjecture -- because of the Messianic bent exhibited in v. 5 following.

A better example is Hos. 7,5, which Nyberg renders:

"On the day of Our Mélek, the Śārîm grow heated from wine..."

"Our Mélek" is a name denoting a specific deity, a parallel name in modern times being "Nôtre Dame." The picture of the celestial Śārîm drinking heavily is one which is familiar from cognate religious myths.

In the Mélek-cult, the Śār -- as part of the picture of a heavenly court -- is deified by the worshippers thereof.

This is the view taken by Hos. 8,4: "They have chosen their Mélek without My sanction; they have given eminence to their Śārîm and I have not known; their silver and their gold have they made for themselves as idols..." This verse is said by Yahweh, condemning Israel's breach of its devotion to Him.

It is worthy of particular interest because it uses the Hiph'il of the verbs mâlak and śârar to denote empowering by worshippers of their Mélek and Śār deities, respectively.

Thus far we have depended upon Hosea for the view taken of the divine Mélek

of the divine Mélek and his Śârîm. Indeed, this prophet is one of the main Biblical sources for whatever information we possess concerning this matter. His struggle at close quarters with this cult and his extremely detailed diatribes against its encroachments upon the worshippers of Yahweh have afforded us indirectly a mass of valuable information as to exactly what he was fighting. The truly great apparently immortalise their enemies as well as their friends.

However, we do hear elsewhere of the Śâr as a subordinate to the divine Mélek, though, without the foregoing development of what we have available from Hosea and from the Song of Deborah, we should hardly be in a position to evaluate and interpret these other statements correctly. Jer. 49,3 reads: "For Malkâm shall go into exile, his priests and Śârîm together." Jer. 49,1-6 is one prophecy of doom for the Ammonites. We have already indicated that in v. 1, ⁵⁷Malkâm is to be read Milkôm, the proper name of the deity of the Ammonites, and the divine name element Mélek and its place in this name have already been discussed. In this verse -- v. 3 -- the same reading is necessary. ⁵⁷Hence, the verse means that the Śârîm of Milkôm will accompany him into exile. The religious connotation -- and we must bear in mind the close connection between the religious and political destiny of the nation in the

viewpoint of the peoples of Semitic lands -- of the verse is affirmed by the inclusion of the word kôhⁿnâu, "his priests."

Almost the identical phraseology is to be found in Am. 1, 15. Here, too, the prophet foretells the doom of the Ammonites for their grievous sins -- not worshipping a god other than Yahweh, but for inhuman cruelty and encroachment upon the territory and personal happiness of His people. "'And Milkôm shall go into exile, he and his Śârîm together,' saith Yahweh." In this verse also, Milkôm is read for Malkâm.⁵⁷ Śârîm are here also, furthermore, the divine subordinates of the Melek.

It will here be recalled what was stated as regards combat, victory and defeat among deities. The last few passages cited are excellent examples of the view that the divine Melek and his authority rest upon the political sovereignty or, at least, political entity of the national group of his worshippers.

In marked contrast to the amount of information available concerning the specialisation of duties among the earthly śârîm, the Bible offers comparatively little such information as regards their celestial counterparts. Jos. 5, 14 mentions Śar S^e bā Yahweh, Yahweh's general. This is taken by Nyberg⁸⁰ to be an authentically ancient passage. This officer, presumably, would be in command of the heavenly hosts of which Yahweh is the sovereign authority. Much later, we find mention (Dan. 8, 25; 10, 13. 20. 21; 12, 1) of divine Śârîm, filled with

far greater authority and power than heretofore indicated. Their position towards Yahweh is, in that later period, analogous to the position we have observed being occupied by Yahweh in relation to Eliôn in the discussion above of Deut. 32,8.9.

Conclusion

The divine Mélek, like the mortal king, has his court over which he is sovereign. His subordinates are the Šârîm, also designated as b'ne ʿêl, b'ne ʿlôhîm and kôkâbîm. The celestial Šâr has the rank of the heavenly court, as his counterpart does upon earth. There is less mention made of special duties which the celestial Šâr performs as his function in the court. There is, however, a reference to Šâr š'bâ Yahweh, the military commander of Yahweh's court.

1. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 2. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 3. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 4. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 5. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 6. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 7. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 8. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 9. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 10. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.

Notes

1. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 2. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 3. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 4. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 5. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 6. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 7. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 8. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 9. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 10. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 11. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 12. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 13. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 14. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 15. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 16. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 17. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 18. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 19. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.
 20. 25. 10. 1931. 10. 11. 1931. 14. 10. 1931.

1. Cf. Ju. 9,31. Cf. also IISam. 11,19.22.

2. The meaning of the verse rests upon the word expressing the **actual** punishment, waliôda'. Gesenius (14 ed., p. 259) reads waliâdâš to agree with v. 7. This is not convincing. V. 15 quotes v. 6 directly and is still not identical in wording.

3. Ju. 8, 14. The contrary is implied in Nu. 22,15.

4. V. 57: 'ansê Š'kem instead of the usual Ba'le Š'kem. Also, Ju. 9,49: 'ansê Migdal Š'kem in contrast with ba'le Migdal Š'kem. Both variations may be interpreted as was Ju. 8,6.8.16.17.

5. a) IIKings 23,8 would indicate that sar hâ'îr may become locally memorable, but this is no evidence of his independence of royal authority.

b) Regarding sar as royal appointee, cf. nâšib (pl., nišâbîm), IKings 4,7.19;5,7. The root of the word denotes the status of the officer as appointee.

6. Jer. 36,26.

7. IISam. 9,11;13,23-29; IIKings 10,13.

8. Though see IKings 1,33.34.48.

9. The full form of the phrase to appoint as judicial officer is šîm (l')sar w'šôfêš. Ex. 2,14;18.21.22; ISam. 8,5.

10. Dan. 4,10.20.

11. Nu. 21,18; Is. 23,8; Zeph. 1,8.

12. Ex. 18,12;19,7.

13. a) Cf. Mi. 4,8.

b) See note 33.

14. Cf. Ju. 9,28; Is. 32,1; Prv. 8,15.16.

15. Note also pâqîd, Ju. 9,28; Jer. 52,25.

16. Cf. IISam. 18,1; IIKings 11,4.8. Note also ISam. 8,5.

17. Gen. 21,22.32;26.26; Ju. 4,7; ISam. 14,50;17,55; IISam. 24,2; IKings 15,20; IIKings 9,5; Neh. 2,9.

18. IISam. 4,2; IKings 11,24.

19. IKings 22,31-33.

20. Gen. 37,36; 39,1; 40,3.4;41,10.12. Cf. raḅ haṭṭabbāhîm, IIKings 25; Jer. 39. Ṣār and raḅ are identified, Jer. 39,3.13.

21. Ex. 18,21.22.25.26. Cf. Nu. 31,14.48.

22. Jer. 38,4.25.27. It is not clear whether these are military officers or no. This is a fine distinction, however, since the emergency rendered everyone in authority a military leader. Indeed, leaders of national groups connote military leadership. Cf. Ju. 7,25.

23. IKings 14,27. Gesenius (14 ed., p. 273): Trabanten.

24. Gen. 47,6.

25. Gen. 40,2.

26. Ibid.

27. Jer. 51,59.

28. Dan. 1,7.

29. Ex. 1,11.

30. Neh. 30, 11ff.

31. Neh. 7, 2.

32. Gesenius (14 ed., p. 388).

33. a) Job 3, 14 -- yô'sê éres -- is directly parallel to Ez. 27, 33 and Ps. 148, 11 -- mal'ê éres.

b) Cf. Delitzsch, F., Assyrisches Handwörterbuch, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 412-413: ܝܪܝܫ.

34. Ārām = mélēk Ārām. Cf. Nu. 22, 2-4.

35. Cf. Is. 14, 24, 26, 27; 19, 12.

36. Ju. 4, 2.7; Nu. 22, 7.8 (note 34). 13.15; ISam. 8, 11.12.

37. The key expression is šer lô or šer ittô.

38. Burrows, M., What Mean These Stones?, New Haven, 1941, pp. 105, 176.

39. a) Note use of the term nâsīb and cf. note 5b concerning dependence of officer upon royal authority. Also cf. note 38.

b) Cf. IKings 5, 27.28; 12, 18.

40. Cf. ISam. 8, 11-17.

41. Burrows, M., op. cit., pp. 131, 192.

42. V. 15 defines it as a royal palace when it uses the word hētīmlôk.

43. Burrows, M., op. cit., pp. 119-122; Albright, W. F., From the Stone Age to Christianity, Baltimore, 1940, p. 223.

44. IKings 12, 28-33; 13, 33; IIKings 5, 18.

45. Albright, W. F., op. cit., pp. 225, 230. Cf. Am. 7, 13.

46. IKings 12,33; IIChr. 27,16.

47. IIChr. 27,16ff.

48. Is. 8,21.

49. Lagrange, M.-J., Études sur les Religions Sémitiques, Paris, 1905, p. 99.

50. Albright, W. F., op. cit., p. 219.

51. Delitzsch, F., Assyrische Lesestücke, 1900, Sennacheribs "Taylor prism", Col. II, ll. 78-79.

52. Barton, G. A., Archaeology and the Bible, Philadelphia, 1937 (7th ed.), p. 460.

53. Nyberg, H. S., Studien zum Hoseabuche, Uppsala, 1935, pp. 47-48.

54. Jü. 5,3, however, is obviously addressed to earthly kings.

55. Noth, M., Die Israelitischen Personennamen Im Rahmen Der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung, Stuttgart, 1928, p. 118, particularly Footnote 3. Mélek as theophoric element, cf. Gen. 14,18; 46,17; Is. 31,2; Jer. 21,1;38,6; IChr. 3,18.

56. Albright, W. F., op. cit., p. 220.

57. Lagrange, M.-J., op. cit., p. 100, Footnote 1,

58. Cf. IKings 11,33; IIKings 23,13.

59. Schrader, E., Die Keilinschriften, Berlin, 1903, p. 479.

60. Lagrange, M.-J., op. cit., pp. 99-100.

61. Nyberg, H. S., op. cit., pp. 73,79.

62. Ibid., pp. 74-75.

63. Ibid., pp. 75-76.

64. Lagrange, M.-J., op. cit., p. 135. and Footnote 1.

65. Schrader, E., op. cit., p. 374.

66. Ibid., p. 476.

67. Ibid., p. 410.

68. Nyberg, H. S., op. cit., p. 55.

69. This is in contradistinction to śar w^esōfêṭ, as in the first chapter of this study.

70. Nyberg, H. S., op. cit., p. 103.

71. Ibid., pp. 48, 64.

72. Cf. note 14.

73. Albright, W. F., op. cit., p. 227, gives this reading in the name of T. J. Meek, Univ. Toronto Quar., VIII(1939), p. 196. I have heard it credited also to Nyberg.

74. Nyberg, H. S., op. cit., p. 58.

75. Albright, W. F., op. cit., p. 226.

76. Nyberg, H. S., op. cit., p. 124, Footnote 1.

77. Ibid., p. 47.

78. Ibid., p. 49.

79. Ibid., p. 50.

80. Ibid., p. 48.

Bibliography

- Albright, W. F., From the Stone Age to Christianity, Baltimore, 1940.
- Barton, G. A., Archaeology and the Bible, Philadelphia,
1937 (7th ed.),
- Burrows, M., What Mean These Stones?, New Haven, 1941.
- Delitzsch, F., Assyrisches Handwörterbuch, Leipzig, 1896.
- Delitzsch, F., Assyrische Lesestücke, Leipzig, 1900.
- Lagrange, M.-J., Etudes sur les Religions Semitiques, Paris, 1905.
- Noth, M., Die Israelitischen Personennamen Im Rahmen Der
Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung, Stuttgart, 1928.
- Nyberg, H. S., Studien zum Hoseabuche, Uppsala, 1935.
- Schrader, E., Die Keilinschriften, Berlin, 1903.