1985

The Son of the Morning and the Guardian Cherub in the Context of the Controversy Between Good and Evil

Jose M. Bertoluci

Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations

Part of the Biblical Studies Commons, and the Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons

Recommended Citation


This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.
Thank you for your interest in the

Andrews University Digital Library
of Dissertations and Theses.

Please honor the copyright of this document by not duplicating or distributing additional copies in any form without the author’s express written permission. Thanks for your cooperation.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or “target” for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of “sectioning” the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.
Bertoluci, Jose Maria

THE SON OF THE MORNING AND THE GUARDIAN CHERUB IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN GOOD AND EVIL

Andrews University  Th.D.  1985

University Microfilms International  300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1985 by
Bertoluci, Jose Maria
All Rights Reserved
Andrews University
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

THE SON OF THE MORNING AND THE GUARDIAN CHERUB
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN
GOOD AND EVIL

A Dissertation
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Theology

By
José M. Bertoluci
June 1985
THE SON OF THE MORNING AND THE GUARDIAN CHERUB
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN
GOOD AND EVIL

A dissertation presented
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Theology

by
José M. Bertoluci

APPREVAL BY THE COMMITTEE

William H. Shea, Chairman
Professor of Old Testament

Lawrence T. Geraty, Professor
of Archaeology and History of
Antiquity

Gerhard F. Hasel, Professor
of Old Testament and Biblical
Theology

Jacques B. Doukhan, Associate
Professor of Old Testament
Interpretation

John H. Sailhamer, Associate
Professor of Old Testament
and Semitic Languages
Trinity Evangelical Divinity
School

Gerhard F. Hasel, Dean
SDA Theological Seminary

Date Approved
10 May 1985

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
ABSTRACT

THE SON OF THE MORNING AND THE GUARDIAN CHERUB
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN
GOOD AND EVIL

By

José M. Bertoluci

Chairman: William H. Shea
Problem

Isaiah 14:12-15 and Ezekiel 28:12-19 have been used, since the times of the Church Fathers, to explain the origin of sin in the universe, and interpreted as depicting the fall of Satan from heaven. However, through the years—especially from the end of the nineteenth century and on—theologians have affirmed that those passages report historical events, making use of mythological material in their narratives; and therefore have not to do with the origin of sin or Satan. It is the aim of this dissertation to verify these claims.

Method and Results

Chapter 1 reviews the interpretations of the passages from the first centuries of the Christian Era till the present. Until
the end of the nineteenth century, both passages were interpreted in two main ways: (1) referring to Satan or (2) referring to some historical figure, perhaps some Babylonian ruler. From that time the mythological view has added to the interpretation.

Chapter 2 examines the alleged origins and parallel material found in Sumerian, Akkadian, Hittite, Greek, Ugaritic, as well as Biblical literature. The research demonstrated that although similar motifs and imagery are present in the passages under study as well as in literature of Israel's neighbors, a myth of Heiel ben Shahar and of the Guardian Cherub, which would reflect the Biblical account in its main aspects, could not be found. It seems the similarities in the use of the terms and pictures are due to cultural continuity or common elements in the ancient Near East.

Chapter 3 examines the structure of Isa 14 and Ezek 28 in relation to the immediate context and the whole books; and exegeses the passages in the light of the whole Bible.

The exegesis shows that: (1) these passages depict Heiel and the Cherub in a language which transcends the earthly realm; (2) the immediate context and the whole books (especially Isaiah) shows a tension between earthly and cosmic dimensions, as well as a struggle between the forces of good and evil; (3) Isa 14 uses the words mashal and Babylon in a particular way; and (4) a comparison between these two passages shows they depict the same figure. These factors carry us to the conclusion that the two passages portray the fall of the chief angel Satan from heaven and his role in the controversy between good and evil.
To Nancy

without whom ...

... וכרה יך

Jeremiah 2:2
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The way we face, interpret, and understand the matter of the origin of evil—and its implications—in the Scriptures affects and determines in great measure the outcome of our exegesis of many biblical passages.

Depending on the view we take in the matter, our theological understanding of the main basic doctrines of the Bible varies from one extreme to the other in the spectrum of biblical theology.

It is important, therefore, that we should carefully study those passages in the Scriptures, the understanding of which should enable us to arrive at a sound comprehension of that aspect of Bible truth.

It is well established in Scripture\(^1\) that there is a struggle between the forces of good and forces of evil going on in the universe which transcends the particular affairs among the inhabitants of this world.

In the scholarly world,\(^2\) this struggle is known as "the conflict between cosmos and chaos" and can be perceived from the

\(^1\) Cf. Gen 3:6; Job 1, 2; 26:12-13; Ps 82; Zech 3:1-3; Matt 4 (and parallels).

beginning to the end of the Scriptures, from Genesis to Revelation. The Bible reflects the presence of a kind of disorder which is resisted by God and those who are on His side. And it seems that the plan of salvation itself is God's answer to overcome such disarray of the universe's order, the result of which would be the restoration of perfect harmony planned by the ruler of the universe.

When, according to the Genesis record, God created this world and set Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, He did it perfectly.\(^1\) God had created the world as a harmonious whole; but when the first couple disobeyed God, something extraneous or outside of God's creation of this world came in. Childs affirms that Gen 2 can be understood as an antithesis of chap. 3, "wholeness versus fragmentation; trust versus suspicion; faith versus unbelief."\(^2\)

It seems that the seed of disorder or disharmony was already present even before the fall of Adam and Eve; it transcended the affairs of our own world. The Scriptures offer implicit and explicit information about this struggle which develops itself in this world, but whose seed came before the world and transcends the affairs of this world.\(^3\) This cosmic war appears as a theme in such books of the Bible as Job, Habakkuk, etc.

Despite the information we can obtain about the struggle between these opposing powers and the presence of evil in our world which came through the disobedience of our first parents, nothing

\(^1\)Gen 1:10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31.


\(^3\)Gen 3; Job 1, 2; Zech 3; etc.
is explicitly said in the OT about the origin of evil in God's universe.

However, we have in the Bible two very interesting passages--Isa 14:4b-23 and Ezek 28:1-19--which have provoked several interpretations. Among these is one which holds that the passages speak about the origin of sin in heaven.

Since the OT does not explicitly explain why and how evil originated before the events occurred in the Garden of Eden, and since the two poems concerning Babylon and Tyre are among the few texts which a number of theologians have used to explain the origin of evil in the universe, it is worthwhile to pursue a detailed exegetical and theological examination of the passages. Such an examination should take into account the immediate and the larger biblical context of the material that bears upon this interpretation and of other related passages.

It is proposed here, therefore, that we investigate the historical and theological contents of Isa 14:4b-23 (especially vss. 12-15) and Ezek 28:1-19. This study also includes a comparative study of the two passages. The reason for choosing to examine these two passages together seems obvious, for throughout the centuries they have been identified as being related to each other in their language, nature, and content. This study also intends to demonstrate that these two particular passages complement each other in a possible identification of the main figure to which they refer.
A Survey of the Literature on the Interpretation of Isaiah 14

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Probably the first attempts to interpret Isa 14:12-15\(^1\) are found in the pseudepigraphical works relating to the OT. In one of these, The Life of Adam and Eve, the devil is quoted as saying: "I will set my seat above the stars of heaven, and will be like the highest."\(^2\) Since this statement obviously is derived from Isa 14:13-14, it indicates that the author of this work probably interpreted the passage in such a way as to apply it to the devil. A similar idea is referred to in Slavonic Enoch, a pseudepigraphical work currently dated in the second century A.D.

One from out the order of angels, having turned away with the order that was under him, conceived an impossible thought, to place his throne higher than the clouds above the earth, that he might become equal in rank to my power. And I threw him out from the height with his angels, and he was flying in the air continuously above the bottomless.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\)Although we are going to deal with the whole song (vss. 4b-23), in searching the history of the interpretation of the passage, we are more concerned with the author's understanding and interpretation of vss. 12-15.

\(^2\)Vita Adae et Evae 15.3 [c A.D. 100-c. 200], in R. H. Charles, APOT 2:137. Julian Morgenstern ("The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," HUCA 14 [1939]:109), besides admitting that the author of The Life of Adam and Eve could have copied the expression literally from Isa 14:13, thinks the more probable was that "the wording of this statement was used in the version of the myth still popularly current in oral form at the time of composition of the book." In the Apocalyptic book of Sybyline Oracles [c. A.D. 70], a reference is made concerning a battle of the stars (which Charles [APOT 2:373] thinks is in the future where it is said that "Lucifer waged battle... the might of doughty Lucifer burned up Aquarius. Heaven itself was stirred till it shook the warriors, and in anger cast them headlong to the earth" Sib or 5:516, 527-29 (Charles, APOT 2:406).

\(^3\)Slavonic Enoch 29. 4-5 [c. A.D. 2nd Cent.] (Charles, APOT 2:447).
Although we cannot say for certain the writer of 1 Enoch is quoting from or commenting on the Isaianic passage, he seems to have had it in the back of his mind in the two references to this same idea:

And I saw, and behold a star fell from heaven . . . . And again I saw in the vision, and looked towards the heaven, and behold I saw many stars descend and cast themselves down from heaven to that first star.

And I saw one of those four who had come forth first, and he seized that first star which had fallen from heaven, and bound it hand and foot and cast it into an abyss: Now that abyss was narrow and deep, and horrible and dark.

Jewish Interpreters

The Jews in the Talmudic period interpreted the Isaianic passage as having to do with immediate historical events in which Nebuchadnezzar was identified as the "Oppressor." In the Midrash Rabbah this passage is applied to that same king.

1 Enoch 86.1-3 (Charles, APOT 2:250).
2 Ibid., 88.1 (Charles, APOT, 2:251). George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr. (Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Interessential Judaism, HTS 26 [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972], p. 79) thinks the account of Antiochus' (Epiphanes) death (2 Macc. 9.7 ff.) was influenced by the language of Isa 14.
3 From the third century to the fifth century A.D.
4 Shab. 149b; Pes. 94a, 94b; Hag. 13a; Hul. 89a.
5 See Midr. Gen 36:33; Midr. Exod 7:1; 12:2, where it interprets Isa 14:12 as saying that Nebuchadnezzar used to worship the sun; Exod 14:15; Midr. Lev 16:1ff., where Isa 14:13 is applied to Nebuchadnezzar before his sickness, and vs. 17 is applied with reference to Evil-Merodach, who was set in Nebuchadnezzar's place during Nebuchadnezzar's years of sickness, and was later confined in prison after the senior king's healing; "and whoever," says the commentary, "entered prison in his days never came out, as it is said 'He opened not the house of his prisoners.'" See also Midr. Num 22:2; Midr. Esth 1:1, which comments on Isa 14:22 affirming that "name" refers to Nebuchadnezzar; 'remnant' refers to Evil-Merodach; 'offshoot' refers to Belshazzar; and 'offspring' refers to Vashti. Another explanation: 'Name' refers to their Script; 'remnant' refers to their language; 'offshoot' and 'offspring' refer to son and grandson.
Church Fathers

Origen (c. A.D. 185-c. 254) applied the passage to Satar, emphasizing that he had been in heaven at one time, but had fallen and had his glory turned into dust. He connects Luke 10:18 with the Isaian passage.¹ Origen is one of the first to interpret this passage in relation to Ezek 28. Tertullian (c. A.D. 160-c. 225) espoused the same view as Origen and said that the text referred to the one "who has raised up children of disobedience against the Creator Himself."²

From the beginning of the third century, the Church Fathers interpreted the Isaian passage in two different ways:

1. Applied to Satan. Among those who followed the view of Origin and Tertullian are Cyprian (c. A.D. 200-c. 258),³ Gregory Thaumaturgus (c. A.D. 205-c. 265),⁴ Gregory Nazianzen (c. A.D. 329-c. 390),⁵ Gregory of Nyssa (c. A.D. 331-c. 400),⁶ Jerome (c. A.D.

---

¹Origen De Principiis 1.5.5 (ANF, 4:259); Against Celsus 6.43 (ANF, 4:593).
²L. Tertullian Against Marcion, 5.11, 17 (ANF, 3:454, 466).
³Cyprian Epistles 54:3; Treatises 12.3.118 (ANF, 5:339, 556).
⁴Gregory Thaumaturgus Second Homily (ANF, 6:64).
⁵Gregory Nazianzen Oration on the Theophany 38.9 (NPNF, 2nd ser. 7:347).
⁶Gregory of Nyssa Cantica Cantorum Homiliae 5:14 (PGM 44:881, 1081); Christi Resurrectionem Orat 1 (MPG, 46:608).
In singing in his poems about the origin of sin and the fall of the angels, Prudentius used the thought of Isa 14. In his interesting comments on "the Spirit of Pride," John Cassian (c. A.D. 360-c. 448) identifies the figure of vss. 13-14 as Satan and equates him with the serpent which deceived Adam and Eve. From Augustine (A.D. 354-430) to Gregory


2The author of iniquity is not God.
In mind of fallen angel sin was bred,
Of one that like a mighty star once shone (cf. Isa 14:12)
And with created splendor brightly burned.
All things created are from nothing made;
Not so is God, true Wisdom, and Holy Spirit,
The living Trinity that ever was,
But even angel ministers He made.
One from their number, fair of countenance,
Fierce in his might and by his strength puffed up,
Upraised himself with overweening pride (cf. Isa 14:13-14)
And of his brightness made a bold display,
Till he persuaded some he was begot
Of his own power, and being from himself
Had drawn, to no creator owing birth."

3John Cassian Institutes 12.4 (NPNF, 2nd ser. 11:280-81); Conferences 5.7; 8.25 (NPNF, 2nd ser. 11:342, 386).

4Augustine The Confessions 10.36.53 (NPNF, 1st ser. 1:159); The City of God 11:15 (NPNF, 1st ser. 2:213-14); Homilies on the Gospel of St. John 3.17; 17.5.16 (NPNF, 1st ser. 7:21, 116) Exposition on the Psalms 36.15; 48.3; 89.12 (NPNF, 1st ser. 8.90, 164-65; 432-33; Augustine maintained that Satan fell through pride, and Isa 14 and Ezek 28 were used to support his view. Martin de Braga Writings of Martin de Braga, in FaCh 62:45, 46. Aurelius Cassiodorus [c. A.D. 468-] Expositio Psalmorum (CCL, 97:352, 426, 535; 98:784, 806, 1113); Primasius [A.D. 6th Cent.] Commentariorum Super Apocalypsim Libri 5.9 (PLS, 4:1213).
the Great (c. A.D. 590-604)\(^1\) most of the church fathers followed the interpretation of Isa 14:12-15 as referring to the devil. As had happened to Prudentius, several poets from the fifth century on were influenced by the earlier interpretation of Isa 14 and Ezek 28 in connection with Rev 12. In their compositions they sang Satan's fall from heaven in peculiar ways.\(^2\)

2. **Applied to immediate historical context.** The Syrian father Aphrahat (c. A.D. 220-c. 350)\(^3\) and Chromatius Aquileiensis (A.D. 4th century)\(^4\) applied the words of Isa 14:13 simply in an immediate historical sense and attributed them to Nebuchadnezzar. Chrysostom (c. A.D. 347-407) says they refer to a "barbarian king" and relates them to Ezek 28.\(^5\) Hippolytus (c. A.D. 170-c. 236) related this passage to the Antichrist and saw it as depicting an event to happen in the future. He quotes Ezek 28 side by side with Isa 14.\(^6\)

\(^1\)Gregory the Great Book of Pastoral Rule 2.4 (NPNF, 2nd ser. 12:14-15); Epistles 18, 21 (NPNF, 2nd ser. 72:166, 172); Gregory says that Satan's first war was provoked because of his pride (he quotes Isa 14), and connects Rev 12:7-9 as referring to the same event. XL Homiliarum in Evangelia 2.34 (MPL, 76:1251).

\(^2\)Claudius Marius Victorius [A.D. 5th cent.] Alethia (CCL, 128:127); Dracontius Carmen Deo (MPL, 60:808-09). There were times in the epoch of the Church Fathers and in the Middle Ages when the subject of Satan and his war in heaven was not discussed so much in theological treatises as it was sung in poetry.

\(^3\)Aphrahat Demonstrations 5.4 (NPNF, 2nd ser. 13:353).

\(^4\)Chromatius Aquileiensis Tractatus 50 (CCL, 9a:445).

\(^5\)Chrysostom Homilies on the Statues 11.4 (NPNF, 1st ser. 9:414).

\(^6\)Hippolytus Treatise on Christ and Antichrist 53 (ANF, 5:215).
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Throughout the Middle Ages several writers such as Walafridus Strabus (c. A.D. 808-849) and Haymo (A.D. 9th cent.) applied the passage to the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar and to Satan. Others adhered to the traditional view of the fathers. Peter Lombard (1100-1160) contended that Lucifer was the most eminent of all angels. When Satan became proud, he decided to make himself equal with God, and God cast him down from heaven. The angel's pretensions and fall are cited from Isa 14 and Ezek 28.

Albertus Magnus (1205-1280), who relied much upon Lombard's writings, saw Lucifer (Isa 14:12) as the principal angel who led the revolt and attracted a large number of other angels to his cause. Lucifer's sin was that of desiring equality with God. Pride which proceeded from envy was the devil's first sin.

1 Walafridus Strabus, Glossa Ordinaria-liber Isaiæ Prophetæ, 14.5ff. (PLM 113:1253).
4 Peter Lombard Four Books of Sentences 2.2-6 (MPL, 192: 1031-1035).
Although he does not explicitly quote the thought of Isa 14:12-15, the Italian poet and theologian Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) makes use of it in describing the acts of Lucifer, whom he interprets as being Satan.¹

The most important and influential scholastic theologian and philosopher of the Catholic Church, Thomas Aquinas (c. A.D. 1225-1274),² and the so-called "Morning Star of the Reformation," John Wycliff (c. A.D. 1330-1384),³ shared the Church Fathers' view, seeing in the passage the acts of the fallen angel from heaven.

From the Reformation to the Nineteenth Century

Although Caspar Schwenckfeld (1490-1561)⁴ maintained the traditional view of the Fathers, the two great reformers Martin Luther (1483-1546) and John Calvin (1509-1564) broke with the traditional interpretation held by the fathers and scholars in the Middle Ages. Luther affirmed that "this (14:12) is not said of the angel who once was thrown out of heaven (Luke 10:18; Rev 12:7-8)


but of the King of Babylon, and it is figurative language."¹ Calvin repudiated the application of the passage to Satan and interpreted it totally in historical terms:

The exposition of this passage, which some have given, as if it referred to Satan, has arisen from ignorance; for the context plainly shows that these statements must be understood in reference to the king of the Babylonians. But when passages of Scripture are taken up at random, and no attention is paid to the context, we need not wonder that mistakes of this kind frequently arise. Yet it was an instance of very gross ignorance, to imagine that Lucifer was the king of devils, and that the Prophet gave him this name. But as these inventions have no probability whatever, let us pass by them as useless fables.²

In his commentary on Isaiah, Calvin identified the figure of Isa 14 as Nebuchadnezzar,³ while in his commentary on Psalms he identified him as Sennacherib,⁴ and since Calvin was the first to see in the figure an Assyrian king, it is a high point in the history of the interpretation of this passage. Post-reformation theologians such as Thomas Manton (1620-1677) followed the view of Luther on this passage.⁵ J. Lightfoot (1602-1675) applied Isa 14:12 with Luke 10:18 to Satan, stating in addition that "Lucifer falling from

³Calvin, Commentary on Isaiah, 1:443.
⁵Thomas Manton, Epistle of Jude, in Works of Thomas Manton, 22 vols. (Worthington, PA: Maranatha Pub., 1970), 5:191-92, says that "the fathers usually quote Isa 14:12-13 to explain the origin of sin. But it is but a metaphorical passage concerning the king of Babylon, and the ground of the mistake was because the angels are often in Scripture set forth by stars, as Job 38:7."
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heaven (vs. 12) is the King of Babylon, divested of his throne and
dominion."¹

From the seventeenth century come two great works of Puritan
literature: John Milton's *Paradise Lost* and John Bunyan's Holy
*War*. In interpreting and commenting² on the Isaian text, Bunyan

¹John Lightfoot, *Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations upon
J. F. Dove, 1823), 12:92.

²John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, 1.40; 5.689, 715-16, 766 in
*The Works of John Milton*, ed. Frank A. Patterson et al. (New York:
Columbia University Press, 1931-38), 2:9, 11, 168-69, 176. See also
*Areopagita*, 4:353; *Eikonoklastes* 15, 5:218. It is very interesting
that Milton himself, in *De Doctrina Christiana*, omits Isa 14 and Ezek
28 from the texts used to present Satan's character and history.
There is much dispute concerning the sources Milton used to produce
his "War in Heaven" description; see Harris F. Fletcher, *Milton's
and J. M. Evans, *The Paradise Lost and the Genesis Tradition* (Oxford:
Milton's material came to him not from Hebraic or other Semitic books
or manuscripts. On the view that the basis for his picture of the
war in heaven is the Bible and not the writings of the poets of the
past, see Austin Dobbins, *Milton and the Book of Revelation: The
Heavenly Cycle* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1975),
pp. 26-52. Milton presents "envy" as Satan's first sin; this was also
the view of the author of the apocryphal book of *Wisdom of Solomon*
(2.24); of the Pseudepigraphical Book of Adam and Eve (13-16, Charles
2:137); and of Lactantius [c. A.D. 260-330] (*The Divine Institutes*,
2.9; 4.6 [ANF 7:52-53; 105]). For comments on the sin of Satan, from
the seventeenth century on, see S. P Revard, *The War in Heaven*

John Gulliver (Philadelphia: Bradley, Garretson & Co., 1873), p. 371,
depicts in a very imaginative and metaphorical way the struggle that
has been going on between man and the enemy of the soul, and ultim-
ately between God and the devil. In his description Bunyan says that
"This Diabolus is indeed a grand and mighty prince, and yet both
poor and beggarly. As to his original, he was at first one of the
servants of King Shaddai, made, and taken, and put by him into most
high and mighty place; yea, was put into such principalties as
belonged to the best of his territories and dominions. This
Diabolus was made son of the morning, and a brave place he had
of it; it brought him much glory and gave him much brightness, an
income that might have contented his Luciferian heart, had it not
been, insatiable and enlarged as hell itself." (p. 371)
This is without doubt an interpretation of Isa 14:12-15 as applied to
Satan.
and Milton used what scholars call the "method of accommodation," advocating that the passage referred to Satan and his fall. Basing their views on the OT passages of Isa 14 and Ezek 28, along with texts from the NT, material of Semitic origin, in general, views and comments of the Church Fathers, and possibly some materials from the Renaissance, they enlarged the vision concerning Lucifer.

The American theologian and philosopher Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758) interpreted the passage under discussion as applying to the King of Babylon, but he did not provide a detailed interpretation of the text. In preaching about evil angels John Wesley (1703-1791) applied Isa 14 to Satan: "There is no absurdity in supposing Satan ... styled 'Lucifer Son of the morning' to have been at least one of the first, if not the first archangel." Bishop R. Lowth (1710-1787), along with his poetic analysis of this passage, interpreted

---

1The "Theory of Accommodation" had its origins in the first centuries of our era and was frequently used by the intellectuals of the Renaissance. It was an attempt to explain some biblical anthropomorphism, especially that of the OT. Theologians such as St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and Calvin made use of accommodation. For quotations and comments on the matter, see Roland M. Frye, God, Man and Satan (Princeton: University Press, 1960), pp. 7-13; C. A. Patrides, "Paradise Lost and the Theory of Accommodation," in Bright Essence, Studies in Milton's Theology, ed. W. B. Hunter et al. (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1971), pp. 159-63; Edward A. Dowey, Jr., The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), pp. 3-17.


it as a prophecy foretelling the fall and destruction of Babylon by the Medes and Persians.¹

In the nineteenth century some new developments occurred in the study and interpretation of Isa 14. Kelly for example saw in the Babylonian power depicted in Isa 14... a type of him who will wield imperial power against the glory of God in the last days... What we have in Isaiah furnishes the groundwork for that which meets us in the Revelation. Thus the strong language in vs. 9-14 could scarcely be said to have been exhausted in Nebuchadnezzar or Belshazzar. There was pride and self-exaltation in the one, and most degrading and profane luxury in the other; but what we have here will be fully verified in the last days and not before. After taking this place of power, the lofty one is to be abased as no Babylonish monarch ever was historically.²

Kelly was the earliest commentator noted who clearly applied the Isaian passage to the "Beast" of Revelation and identified him as Rome and the papal power. Franz Delitzsch remarked that

Lucifer, as a name given to the devil, was derived from this passage, which the fathers interpreted, without any warrant whatever, as relating to the apostasy and punishment of the angelic leaders. The appellation is a perfectly appropriate one for the king of Babel, on account of the early date of the

¹R. Lowth, Isaiah: A Translation with Preliminary Dissertation and Notes (London: Thomas Tegg & Son, 1837), pp. 215-24. Bishop Lowth dramatizes vs. 4-28 presenting several scenes which depict the fall of Babylon, of the tyrant, his arrival at the regions of the dead ones, etc., and gives his appreciation of the poem in the following words: "I believe it may with truth be affirmed, that there is no poem of its kind extant in any language, in which the subject is so well laid out and so happily conducted, with such a richness of invention, with such variety of images, persons, and distinct actions, with such rapidity and ease of transition, in so small a compass as in this ode of Isaiah. For beauty of disposition, strength of colouring, greatness of sentiment, brevity, perspicuity, and force of expression, it stands among all the monuments of antiquity unrivalled." (p. 218)

Babylonian culture, which reached back as far as the grey twilight of primeval times, and also because of its pre-ominant astrological character.¹

But he adds that

A retrospective glance is now cast at the self-deification of the king of Babylon, in which he was the antitype of the devil and the type of antichrist (Dan. xi. 36; 2 Thess. ii. 4), and which had met with its reward.²

Although a little confused in his assertion, Delitzsch seems to be the first theologian to say that the historical figure typologically related to the figure of Satan standing behind it.

From the end of the nineteenth century, theologians began to see mythological elements in the passage. Thus, from that time on, interpretation of the passage would in general be classified in three main views: Satan View, Historical View (which sometimes was blended with the previous view), and Mythological View.

Satan View

From the end of the nineteenth century on, when critical methods for the interpretation of the Bible were begun and scholars had in hand more comparative material with which to interpret the OT, the Satan view has been held by very few theologians.³

In the 1930s Roberts revived the Church Fathers' view—seeing in the passage the figure of Satan.⁴ Roberts also saw the overthrow of Babylon as necessary for the return of Judah, but he believed that it was not only the city the prophet had in view. He compared

¹Isaiah, pp. 311-12. ²Ibid., p. 312.
³Even conservative biblical exegetes such as Vanderburgh, etc., did not see Satan behind Isa 14.
it to the mystic-Babylon, the ecclesiastical-political system
presented in the Book of Revelation. Besides seeing in the passage
the figure of Satan, Roberts affirmed that "we can only attribute
this language to the pope himself, impersonated by Satan, or to
the eight heads of the beast who may occupy his place and go into
perdition (2 Thess 2:3; Rev 17:11-18; 19:19-20)." He also con-
nected the persecutor power of Dan 10-12 and the figure in Ezek 28
with the Isaianic passage.

Among those who have seen the figure of Satan in the pas-
sage in this century we may note: Fausset,^ Chafer,^ Ironside,^  

1 ibid., pp. 40-41.

2 A. R. Fausset, "The Book of the Prophet Isaiah," in A Com-
mentary on the Old and New Testaments (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,
1945), 3:610. Fausset thinks the passage applies
"to the Babylonian king primarily, and at the same time to
shadow forth, through him, the great final enemy, the man of
sin of St. Paul, the Anti-christ of St. John, and the little
horn and blasphemous self-willed king of Daniel. He alone shall
fulfill exhaustively all the lineaments here given. . . . The
fall of Babylon as a self-idolizing power, the type of mystical
Babylon in the apocalypse (Rev 17:4, 5), before the providence
of God, is described in language drawn from the fall of Satan
himself, the spirit that energized the heathen world-power, and
now energizes the apostate Church, and shall hereafter energize
the last secular Antichrist. Thus Lucifer has naturally come
to be applied to Satan (Luke 10:18; Rev 12:8, 9; Jude 6)."
(p. 610)

3 L. Sperry Chafer, Systematic Theology, 8 vols. (Dallas:

4 H. A. Ironside, Expository Notes on the Prophet Isaiah
(New Jersey: Loiseaux Brothers, 1952), pp. 88-92, states that
"Lucifer is a created angel of the very highest order . . . this
passage is highly poetical, but describes in no uncertain terms
the other destruction of the last great enemy of Israel in the day
of the Lord" (pp. 88, 90).
Historical View

In 1830 A. Jenour applied the passage historically to Babylon and equated Lucifer to "Venus, the brightest... star in the heavens." A few years later J. A. Alexander related the

1Merrill Unger, Biblical Demonology (Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen Press, 1953), pp. 184-5. Unger sees in vss. 12-17 the entire career of Satan, from his primeval state as Lucifer till his fall to the depth of the pit (Rev 20:3). He goes on saying that Satan was placed in charge of the earth when this plane was originally created, and it was then, says Unger, quoting G. S. Faber, that he (Satan) said in his heart, "I will ascend into heaven..." (Isa 14:13-14). "Evidently for this presumptuous act God pronounced judgment upon this pre-Adamite earth and it became chaotic as described in Gen 1:2" (p. 184).

2Giovani Papini, The Devil (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1954), pp. 31-32. Papini makes the following interesting comment: "The chapters in Isaiah (13-14) where these verses appear, have, as their basic theme, the war between Good and Evil and therefore it is by no means impossible that the Prince of Evil himself is sketched in it also. All the more so, since the kings of Babylon, like other kings of the ancient Orient, believed themselves--or passed themselves off as being--of divine origin, come from heaven to reign despotically over the earth. So, in a certain sense, they were, by virtue of their dual claim, like Satan, 'diabolic'. The end of one of them could very well recall another pride, another fall, that of the Prince who used to trample and who still tramples the nations under his foot." (p. 32)

3"Lucifer" [Isaiah 14:12], SDABC, ed. Francis D. Nichol (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1953-1957), 4:170. Here it is clearly affirmed that the passage "applies to Satan before his fall, as next to Christ in power and authority and head of the angelic hosts" (p. 170).


passage to the antichrist of 2 Thess 2:4, as well as to Ezek 28. He also attempted to retain the immediate historical application. As Calvin had done before him, he challenged the traditional Church Fathers' application to Satan, stating that from such an explanation "has arisen the popular perversion of the beautiful name Lucifer to signify the Devil." E. Henderson also opposed the traditional view: "The scope and connexion then that none but the King of Babylon is meant. . . . The application of this passage to Satan, and to the fall of the apostate angels, is one of the gross per-versions of sacred writ. . . . "

C. W. E. Nagelsbach observed that "as early as the LXX, this passage (vss. 12-15) seems to have been understood of Satan. It points that way if they change the second person into the third; τοὺς ἐξετασάν, etc." He interpreted the passage as referring to Babylon and its exaltation, but added, "The world-power is by its very nature inimical to God: its aim is to supplant God and put itself in His place. This tendency is indwelling in the world-power derived from its transcendental author, Satan, and is realized in every particular representative." Ewald went a step further in studying the literary structure of the poem but did not comment much on the identification of the figure, treating the passage as

1J. A. Alexander, Isaiah (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1851), pp. 200-204.


4Ibid., p. 188.

5See below, pp. 149-50.
a prophetic utterance more concerned with Babylon than with an individual.¹

F. Delitzsch affirmed that the application of the passage to the apostasy of the angelic leader is without warrant; but he stated that the King of Babylon in his self-deification was the antitype of the devil and the type of antichrist (Dan 11:36; 2 Thess 2:4). He still emphasized the predictive nature of the text.²

In his famous study on Biblical laments,³ C. Budde discussed the structure and nature of the passage, but he did not interpret it in specific terms; it seems that he accepted Lowth's view that the song refers to the fall and death of the King of Babylon. ⁴

Duhm applied the passage to the immediate historical events at the end of the Babylonian empire and also saw some mythic elements in it.⁴

In 1896 Cobb made a study of the poetical structure of the poem. He advocated that a redactor inserted the word יִשָּׁב־י in the text to apply it to Babylon. From the deletion, he held that originally "the ode says nothing about a city, but is a song of

⁴Bernhard Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia, GHK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1892), pp. 117-20. It seems that Duhm was the first theologian who attempted a possible link between the biblical Helel story with the Greek fable of Phaeton, p. 119.
triumph and derision over the fall of some king." \(^1\) He went on to reject the application of the passage to any king of the Neo-Babylonian period, affirming that only Sennacherib of Assyria would fit the text and context of the passage. \(^2\) Early in the twentieth century Vandenbergh assigned different dates and authors to the "oracle" (chap. 13) and the "Ode" (chap. 14) on the King of Babylon. \(^3\) He affirms that the Ode was not composed with reference to any particular Assyrian or Babylonian king but was ready-made when the Book of Isaiah was completed in post-exilic times. \(^4\) "The Ode was written with the purpose of inspiring the Israelites with hope for deliverance from a domination of which Sennacherib was an antitype." \(^5\) In 1927 Williams affirmed that the reference to the fall of Lucifer in Isa 14:12 is merely a metaphorical description of the collapse of the Babylonian power. \(^6\)

The prince of twentieth-century theologians, Karl Barth, did not discuss Isa 14:12-15 beyond mentioning it as a description of


\(^2\) Following Hugo Winckler, Cobb asserts in the article that the Ode came from the eighth century B.C., resisting the increased views begun by the turn of the century against Isaiah's authorship of many parts of the book which bears his name.

\(^3\) Frederick A. Vandenbergh, "The Ode on the King of Babylon, Isaiah XIV:4b-21," AJSL 29 (1912-13): 114-16.

\(^4\) Vandenbergh, p. 25, holds the view that the book of Isaiah was not completed until the second century B.C.

\(^5\) Nabonidus, at the end of his reign, is also presented as a possible subject to which the Ode refers (ibid., p. 120).

the King of Babylon as the radiant morning star (Lucifer) cast down from heaven. He thinks the text is "so uncertain and obscure that it is inadvisable to allow it to be a basis for the development of the doctrine of a fall of angels and therefore of an explanation of the existence of the devil and demons."¹

Several other theologians have applied the passage historically, but since their interpretation is blended with mythic views they are discussed in the next section.

**Mythological View**

In discussing the mythic view we perceive there is some overlap with the Satan and historical views; but since the major emphasis is on the mythical elements it is advisable to include them in this section.

T. K. Cheyne was one of the first commentators to see in the passage some relics of a mythical stage, and to relate the morning star with Venus.² In his pride the King of Babylon had

¹Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 12 vols., ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958-1969), 3:530-31. Barth goes on to say that this interpretation "arises from the superfluous need to ground our knowledge of the fall of man upon the notion of a metaphysical prelude which it was quite inappropriately thought should be located in heaven. . . . To bring angels and demons under the common denominator of this fatal concept of freedom is to confuse and obscure everything that is to be said of both. A true and orderly angel does not do what is ascribed to some angels in this doctrine (in obscure speculation concerning this derivation). And on the other hand it cannot be said that a real demon has ever been in heaven. The demons merely act as if they came from heaven. But the devil was never an angel. He was a murderer and a liar. He never stood in the truth. No truth was ever in him." (p. 531)

²T. K. Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, 2 vols. (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890), 1:90-91. Attention is called to the fact that in the Assyrian texts we find reference to a masculine and a
been like the morning star in anticipating his lordship
over the sacred mountain of Israel. Cheyne admits, on the other
hand, a possible link with Ezek 28:13, 14 in which talks of the
"holy mountain" by the garden of God. Skinner follows Cheyne in
the matter of interpreting the passage (vss. 12-15) as a probable
reference to the planet Venus and believes it derived from "some
Babylonian astral myth."¹

Gunkel also saw in the passage a nature myth which he tried
to reconstruct. He suggested that it could have had either a
Babylonian or a Phoenician origin.²

Twentieth Century

By the turn of the century scholars began to press the view
held by some previous scholars³ concerning the date and authorship

feminine Venus: "The former had a title (Mustelil) closely related
to the Hebrew hêlêl, rendered here 'Shining One'; its period was from
sunset onwards, that of the feminine Venus from sunrise onwards."

¹J. S. Skinner, The Book of Isaiah, 2 vols., CBSC (Cambridge:
University Press, 1896), 1:122.
²H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos, pp. 133-34. In the myth,
Hêlal ben Shahar (The Morning Star, or the Son of the Dawn), who shines
in the skies in the morning, has his brightness dimmed by the sun's
rays. Gunkel, following Duhm, also talks about the similarity of the
Greek myth of Phaeton, son of Eos, p. 134; Otto Procksch, Jesaia I,
KAT (Leipzig: A. Deichertische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930), p. 197,
agrees with Gunkel in the view that an astral myth glitters in vss.
12-13, and discusses several aspects of Babylonian myths which,
according to him, parallel the material of this passage. Cf. also
Ackroyd (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 36; Gottfried Quell,
"Jesaja 14:1-23," in Festschrift Friedrich Baumgärtel, ed. J. Herrmann
³J. G. L. Eichhorn (Einleitung in das Alte Testament
treated the entire oracle (13:1-14:23) as post-exilic; W. Gesenius,
of the "oracle against Babylon." G. B. Gray saw the date of the composition of the prose oracle as coming no earlier than the exile.\(^1\) He held that the poem (14:4b-21), for which it is difficult to propose a date, refers to the fall of Babylon. Babylon could be to the writer a symbolic name for all those that oppress Israel. Concerning vss. 12-15, Gray affirms that "the tyrant is half compared half (for the moment) identified with the radiant hero of some astral myth."\(^2\) This could have originally come from Babylon or Phoenicia, but we cannot determine its exact original form. In his dissertation on the prophecies against Babylon in Isaiah,\(^3\) Lohmann proposed that the passage was a reference to a version of a known myth of Hezir ben Shahar. The king is compared to the radiant morning star. He suggests that the poet could have had the Babylonian

---

\(^1\)G. B. Gray, p. 233, considers 14:1-4a (22-23) as post-exilic and that the author of 14:4b-21 is not the author of 14:1-4a. He believes that a post-exilic editor wrote 14:1-4a to connect the two poems (13:2-22 and 14:4b-21) and possibly added 14:22-27. Gray says, "If v. 19 be imaginative prophecy, then it is simplest to see in the entire poem a paean over Assyria, or Babylon, personified (cp. 10:5-13), or 'totum corpus Regum Assyriorum et Babylonicorum,' rather than over a particular Assyrian or Babylonian king. So it is of the character and achievements of a people rather than of a single definite monarch that Ezekiel thinks, even when he uses the term 'king of Tyre,' 'king of Egypt,' in prophecies that have several points of contact with this poem: see Ezek 28-32. For a brief example of a lament written to suit merely anticipated and not actual conditions, see Amos 5:1f.

But if v. 19 refers to an actual historical event, it refers to details of which nothing is otherwise known, whether the king in question be Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, or Nabonidus." (p. 251)

\(^2\)G. B. Gray, Isaiah, p. 525.

\(^3\)Paul Lohmann, Die anonymen Prophetien gegen Babel aus der Zeit des Exils (Berlin: Rostock University Press, 1910), pp. 24-25.
Ishtar myth in view, and it has nothing to do with the Itana myth. The concept of the mount of meeting in the north, says Lohmann, was taken up by the Israelites in older times from Babylon through the Canaanites.

After the discoveries of Ras-Shamra in 1929, the primacy of the alleged myth became strong because there was a tendency to replace the old Pan-Babylonian approach with Pan-Ugaritism. De Vaux presented several correspondences in phraseology which he saw between the Isaianic passage and the material from Ras-Shamra. From those he arrived at the conclusion that the poem of Isa 14 was inspired by a Phoenician model. De Lange, Jacob, and Gray are a sample of those who have adopted a similar view.

In his lengthy article on Psalm 82, J. Morgenstern held the

---

3. Hl1 and Shr form the two parties of the Ugaritic Pantheon. Hl1 is the father of goddess Kosharōt. Shr forms with Sim the couple of the "graceful gods," sons of El; the Mount of Assembly (גוג יט גוג) may be compared to the "Assembly of the sons of God" shown in one text, or with the Mount of El Saphon, the mountain of the gods, etc. See CTA 1:17.2.27; 1:23.52-53; 1:24.5-6, 40-42.
view that the passage (vss. 12-14) is a combination of two variant versions of a myth which had been current in Israel for some time prior to the composition of Isa 14, but which was not native in Israel. It is his conclusion that

. . . the myths we have found cited in several variant forms in apocalyptic and N.T. writings, the myth of the fall of Satan and his associate angels from heaven to earth, or even into the abyss, is identical with the myth of Helel ben Shahar of Isa. 14:12-14, that, in other words, we have to do in all these passages with only one myth, which must have been current in Judaism for a very long period and which quite naturally in the course of its evolution and its adaptation to various purposes, historical and theological, developed several slightly variant forms. . . .

He assigns the chapter a date of composition (c. 486-476 B.C.) and identifies the figure of the King of Babylon with either Darius or, more likely, Xerxes.

Walther Eichrodt, in his famous OT Theology, thinks Isaiah used the figure of Hēlāl as "a poetic simile for the outrageous self-aggrandisement of the earthly world-ruler. But behind it stands a myth stemming indeed from paganism, of the rebellion of an angelic being against the most high God, which ended in his being thrown down into the underworld." In his extensive

1 "The Mythological Background," p. 109. Morgenstern identifies Helel ben Shahar with the figure of Ps 82:6, but is criticized by Matitiahu Tsevat ("God and the Gods in Assembly," HUCA 40-41 [1969-1970]:131), who says that "if the chief protagonist was generally known, this name could hardly remain unmentioned in our Psalm passage."

2 Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. J. A. Baker, OTL, 2 vols. (London: S.C.M. Press, 1967 [original German, 1950]), 2:208. Two decades later Eichrodt (Der Herr der Geschichte BAT 17, II [Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1967], p. 25) rejects the identification of Lucifer with Satan, but thinks that the prophetic usage of the story of the rebellion of the morning star prepared the way for the new insight concerning the career of Satan which (according to him) obtained its impression through the NT message.
A discussion of the Lucifer theme in the Bible, Schmidt applies the song primarily to the king of Babylon.¹ He goes on to say that

Hinter solchen angeblich nur bildhaften, übertragenen Wendungen steckt doch viel mehr, und damit geraten wir in den Bereich des Mythus. Ein solcher Mythus gilt einem letztlich hintergründigen Vorgang, einem dämonischen, einem göttlichen Geschehen, dessen Hintergrundigkeit die Vordergrundigkeit der Geschichte, des menschlichen Geschehens erheilt.²

And he says further,

Das ein asiatischer Grosskönig als Lucifer, Sohn der Aurora, auftritt, ist zu spezifisch, als das da eine abgegriffene, übertragene Sprache vorliegen könnte. Man möchte ja wohl an sich den Vergleichspunkt zwischen Babelkönig und Morgenstern allein darin sehen, dass beiden Gestalten strahlende Macht eignet. Der Prophet ist aber in seinen Drohworten nicht nur damit beschäftigt, sondern er weist sofort auf den Sturz beider Grössen aus der Höhe in die Tiefe. Und dazu dommt, dass der Grosskönig sich die Bezeichnungen Hellal und Sohn des Sachar beilegt bzw. sich beilegen lässt.³

Eichrodt said, "The myth no longer has a life of its own ... but belongs to the treasure-house of poetry, on which poets and prophets liked to draw in order to clothe their thoughts in rich apparel."⁴

K. L. Schmidt criticized this by saying that myth and history should not be "played off" against each other. The Isaiahic Lucifer-declaration manifests richness and power when one understands it in its complexity of heavenly and earthly, of demonic and human, of enigmatic and evident. Finally he adds, "Ist es durchaus keine metabasis eis allo genos, wenn der als Lucifer apostrophierte Babel-König mit dem Teufel gleichgesetzt worden ist."⁵

² Ibid., p. 166. ³ Ibid. ⁴ Eichrodt, Theology, 2:115.
⁵ Schmidt, "Lucifer," p. 173; cf. Rivkah Schärf Kluger, Satan in the Old Testament (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1967). Kluger affirms: "It therefore might not be going too far to see in them (passages, including [Isa 14:12-15] the real germ cells of the later concept of Satan as the fallen Lucifer" (p. 117).
Pope believes that due to information available from the Kumarbi and Ulikummi myths and from what is known of the fall of El in the Ugaritic myths, we can say that the background of the Isaianic passage and related texts (Ezek 28, Ps 82, etc.) is pre-Israelite and originally had nothing to do with YHWH.

... the ultimate mythological background of this allegory, as also in the case of the Prince of Tyre in Ezek. xxviii, is a theomachy or Titanomachy, similar to the Hurrian and Greek versions, in which El and his champion (Prince Sea) and his cohorts were defeated and banished to the netherworld.

In one of the most detailed studies of Isa 14:12-15, P. Grelot has taken up Gunkel's suggestion that the "Morning Star" is Phaeton. He has endeavored to reconstruct the so-called "original myth" which he thinks lies behind the Isaian passage. This he has done especially by examining South Arabic, Ugaritic, and Greek materials. He concludes that the same myth is found—although in variant forms—in the literature of Ugarit, Greece, and Israel. This evidence suggests to him that Kelel is the same figure as

---


3 E. Theodore Mullen, Jr. (The Assembly of the Gods, HSM 24 [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980], p. 242) criticizes Pope, saying that "it is impossible to agree with M. Pope that the myth underlying Isa 14 and Ezek 28 was a revolt by 'El himself in an attempt to regain the position taken by Ba'el. Both texts make it perfectly clear that the revolt was against, not by the god 'El."

4 Pope, p. 103.

Phaeton-Venus.\(^1\) Grelot suggests that vss. 12-15 could be a possible portion of the 'Attar myth which is partially preserved in the Ugaritic material.\(^2\)

At the end of his article Grelot points out that the biblical prophet utilized themes from pagan myths and applied them in the biblical context, or in the context of the battle of Yahweh against His human enemies, as well as against the angels, etc. In the end he admits that the utilization by the ancient Christian theologians of Isa 14 to evoke the fall of Satan was not an arbitrary decision; Helel the son of the dawn became, with good reason, the poetic prototype of the fallen angel.\(^3\)

In an extensive article on the Isaian passage, Quell has held that vss. 4b-21 were not produced by Isaiah but derived from a pagan source. Vss. 12-15 especially bring evidence from the mythical sphere of the ancient form. The poem has nothing to do with God; it deals with gods. A minor prophet may have obtained a work of pagan poetry, translated into Hebrew, and then Yahwehized it. Quell thinks that originally the poem had nothing to do with Babylon, that it must have originated in a myth. He did not apply this passage to any specific figure.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\)See below, pp. 80-81, for criticism of this view held by Grelot.

\(^2\)"Isaie XIV," pp. 43-45. In his interpretation of Helel as being equivalent to 'Attar, Grelot is supported by Nickelsburg, Resurrection, p. 69; Mullen, The Assembly of the Gods, pp. 238-42; and J. Gray, "Day Star," IDB, 1:785.


Brevard Childs\(^1\) agrees with Gunkel that the old translations of Helal as the morning star, and the reference to Baal Zaphon indicate that the passage (vss. 12-15) derives from Canaanite mythology as a nature myth. According to Childs, the prophetic writer reworked the old myth\(^2\) into his taunt song. Childs rejects the suggested parallels from Babylonian literature and points towards a Canaanite provenience of the myth, although he recognizes that an exact parallel in Canaanite literature has not yet been found. He sees the use of the myth in this passage as of "only illustrative value as an extended figure of speech."\(^3\)

W. H. Schmidt holds the view that in Isa 14:13-15 originally separate traditions are fused:

> Der Text ist nicht nur literarisch, sondern auch traditionsgeschichtlich spät. ..., Deshalb ist von hier aus kein Schluss auf die alten Traditionen statthaft; der Text lässt sich nicht ohne weiteres auf einen kanaanäischen Mythos zurückführen.\(^4\)

In comparing the Isaian passage with Ezek 28:11-17 he adds:

> Ident so die Vertreibung aus dem Gottesgarten zur Verstossung vom Gottesberg wird, gleicht sich die Erzählung vom Fall des irdischen Königs dem Mythos vom Sturz des Himmelswesens (Jes 14:12ff.) an.\(^5\)

---


\(^2\) See Childs, *Myth and Reality*, p. 69, for his suggested reconstructed myth.

\(^3\) Childs observes that "it was a serious misunderstanding of this passage when Christian commentators (Tertullian, Gregory the Great, etc.) interpreted the fall of Heial in the light of Luke 10.18 as referring to the pre-history of Satan and revived a mythology already overcome in the Old Testament" (p. 70).


\(^5\) Ibid., p. 35.
In her studies on the mythological elements in the OT, Ohler affirms that Helel ben Shahar became a model of the conduct of arrogant kings, as well as the first created model for the city of Tyre. Ohler emphasizes that Helel ben Shahar strives to reach up into the highest regions of heaven, but he is, nevertheless, in heaven itself already. He is thrown out of heaven into earth, into the pit. A myth, otherwise unknown to us, is reckoned as according the highest honor to the arrogant aims of this Helel ben Shahar. Several reasons are presented by Ohler to show that the being in Ezek 28:11-17, and Helel are two different figures. Each is based upon a different myth.

Oldenburg has made a detailed study on 'Attar's myth in South Arabia, but he was unable to demonstrate any trace of it present in Isa 14. He thinks that El of the Ugaritic pantheon, who had his residence upon Mount Sapân, may be reflected in the words of Isa 14:13. Summing up, Oldenburg admits that there are no myths in the Hebrew Bible. However, illustrations from Gentile mythology are used as parables expressing spiritual truths. Whereas El is Yahweh, who is indeed the only true god, every other rival deity was identified with the devil. Thus the myth of the fallen star in reality describes Satan's downfall in primeval times.

2 Ohler points out that a distinct difference between these two stories is the fact that they take place in different realms: the divine realm from which it falls down in the one myth is heaven and in the other is the earthly mount of God (p. 176).
J. W. McKay examined Grelot's article and points out that his analysis of the Greek material is interesting and illuminating and agrees with him in "that the Hebrew and the Greek myths correspond." McKay goes even further in fitting the correspondence and admitting "that Phoenician mediation may still be maintained." However, he sees some remaining serious difficulties such as the non-correspondence of the parent-deities, "for Eos was a goddess whose beauty the Greeks extolled, while Shahar, with his brother Shalim, is a voracious young male god who roams the desert fringes."

In continuing his efforts to solve the "alleged mythological allusions" in Isa 14:12-15, McKay has made a study of the use of the word Generally it is taken as referring to a personal being, according to the MT. It is thus taken as a reference to a natural phenomenon. McKay admits the possibility of its being found in the mythological motifs of the myths of Helel and Phaeton, but he is aware that "there is no known Canaanite or Phoenician myth which shows close correspondence with those myths." Finally he thinks it possible that upon its entrance into Canaan, the Greek myth underwent change and modification in a way which made it into a wholly Canaanite tale even though the roles of its characters were modified. McKay suggested a list of steps by McKay, "Helel," p. 455. 3Ibid., p. 461. 4Ibid.
which the Greek myth came to be altered.\textsuperscript{1}

Seth Erlandsson sees mythological allusions in vs. 12 and a relationship of it with Ezek 28:11-19. Components of a myth have been used to represent the king's arrogance and fall. Besides that Erlandsson believes "allusion is also made to Oriental royal ideology with divine kingship as an example of hybris."\textsuperscript{2} Since Erlandsson's central contention is that Isa 13 and 14 have their "linguistic and historical context in the accounts of the prophet Isaiah on the occasion of the Assyrian occupation," he obviously must see behind the poem (vss. 4b-21) the figure of an Assyrian king, i.e., Sargon II or Sennacherib.

Craigie\textsuperscript{3} carries further Fohrer's\textsuperscript{4} view that Isaiah 14:12-15 is an adaptation of certain themes associated with the Canaanite god Athtar by finding a better translation for an epithet of Athtar which would be "luminous" and would stress the character as a "shining one." He emphasizes that the name ben Shahar is not an indication of genealogy but a reference to in descent (the fall of the Venus star at dawn); this stresses Athtar's character as a warrior.

In his commentary on Isaiah,\textsuperscript{5} Wildberger holds the view that the poem was written later than Isaiah's times. He presents,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 463-64.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Seth Erlandsson, The Burden of Babylon, CBOT 4 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1970), pp. 121, 123, 161, 166.
\item \textsuperscript{3}P. C. Craigie, "Helel, Athtar and Phaeton (Isa 14:12-15)," ZAW 85 (1973):223-25.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Jesaja, 1:179-80.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Hans Wildberger, Jesaja, BKAT 10 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neuchirchener Verlag, 1974), pp. 542ff.
\end{itemize}
with some reservation, the idea that Nebuchadnezzar could fit the
gure in the passage. He holds that it was written before the
death of this monarch. Wildberger points out that this personage
is not identified. Since it was common in those days to identify
such gures in presenting the oracles against the foreign nations,
this gure could represent a more general world power—in the
same way "Babel" has become a general code name for a world power.
The text, according to Wildberger, would have some historical
reference, but not of any ultimate signi cance. Hence, the passage
could deal primarily with the type.

In 1975 D. Gowan presented some considerations concerning
the interpretation of the Isaian passage through the years. He
sees considerable afnities with the Ugaritic material in it and
agrees that the Ras-Shamra texts have shed new light on many terms
which occur in Isa 14. These include the rephaim, Saphon, etc.
However, Gowan criticizes the idea that because of such similarities
in both materials there must have existed a Canaanite myth like
Isa 14:12-15, from which the latter was derived.\(^\text{1}\)

Gowan takes the great mythological themes which appear in
Isa 14; (1) the ascent into heaven, (2) the fall from heaven,
(3) war in heaven, etc., and compares them with similar themes in
related literature from other cultures. From these comparisons he
arrived at the following conclusions:

1. "No one has yet discovered a close parallel to the
myth recounted in Isa 14; even though each of the elements in it

\(^\text{1}\)Donald Gowan, When Man Becomes God, p. 45.
appears in other literatures they are always combined in significantly different ways.\(^1\)

2. "The structure of Isa 14.4-21 makes a human being the subject of all these themes."\(^2\)

3. "The passage tells of a rebellious god, with the subject changed; now it is a human being."\(^3\)

In concluding he observes that the Israelite writer has almost "exalted man to heaven, at least to the point that he can dream of equality with the most high."\(^4\)

O. Loretz\(^5\) declares that equating the hybris of the ruler of Babylon and his fall with the myth of רַבִּים מַרְאֹה and mythologizes its destiny. The myth, he affirms, appears in the passage already in the casing of the astral angelology which appears also in Isa 24:21-22. The following then would be seen in Isa 14:12-15:

1. The poem on the fall of the king reaches back to the tradition of the Canaanite poetry.

2. It transferred to the fate of the King of Babylon.

3. The fall of the King of Babel was explained by the Helel ben Shahar myth.

4. This interpretation that occurred through the myth of Helel ben Shahar came to supply the background of the views about the origin, work, and fate of the good and evil spirits and angels. Babylon and its ruler thus developed into a manifestation of the

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 65-66. \(^2\)Ibid. \(^3\)Ibid. \(^4\)Ibid. \(^5\)O. Loretz, "Der Kanaanäisch-Biblische Mythos vom Sturz des Sahar-Sohnes Helel," UF 8 (1975):135.
fallen heavenly beings who are contrary to God.

Loretz adds:

Babylon wird auf diese Weise als eine dämonisch-satanische Macht beschrieben und der überlieferte Text im Sinne der neuen Theologie interpretiert, die wohl unter iranischen Einfluss den bösen Geistern oder Engeln Einwirkung auf das Geschehen in der Welt zuschreibt.⁴

Hermann Barth, in his well-researched commentary on Isa 14:12-15,² sees in Shahar, El, and Elyon the mount of assembly, the top of Saphan, mythical unity-motives; but he adds that

Jedoch stellt der Abschnitt nicht einfach eine ad hoc komponierte Addition solch einzelner Traditionselemente dar, sondern greift einen mythologischen Stoff auf, in dem verschiedene einzelne Vorstellungselemente bereits innerhalb der Darstellung eines Vorgangs verbunden waren.³

Barth believes that the origin of the imagery employed come to this myth from Canaanite sources, but he does not think it is very likely that vss. 12-15 are based upon the reconstruction from a myth. He thinks the identification of Helel with 'Attar is doubtful, holding that the episode in the Baal cycle contains important differences from the acts described in Isa 14:12-14. He also rejects the identification of Helel with the Greek Phaeton. He compares Isa 14:12-15 with Ezek 28:11f.⁴ and arrives at the conclusion that the former is to be seen against the backdrop of a concept in which the king or primitive man is banished from the mount of God because of his self-exaltation. From there he was cast down to earth.

¹Ibid., p. 136.
²H. Barth, Die Jesaja-Worte, pp. 131-35.
³Ibid., p. 132. ⁴Ibid., p. 134.
Our conclusions derived from this review of the literature on the interpretation of Isa 14 are summarized below after the literature on Ezek 28 has been reviewed.¹

**A Survey of the Literature on the Interpretation of Ezekiel 28**

**Jewish Interpreters**

Among the Jewish commentators we find the passage (Ezek 28) applied to Hiram, King of Tyre,² to Nebuchadnezzar,³ and to Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden.⁴ We also find a very interesting commentary on Ezek 28:13-14 which says:

Adam deserved to be spared the experience of death. Why then was the penalty of death decreed against him? Because the Holy One, blessed be He, foresaw that Nebuchadnezzar and Hiram would declare themselves gods; therefore was death decreed against him. Thus it is written, Thou wast in Eden the garden of God (Ezek. xxviii, 13): was then Hiram in Eden? Surely not! But He said thus to him: "It is thou who causedst him who was in Eden [sc. Adam] to die." R. Hiyya, the son of R. Berekiah's daughter, quoted in R. Berekiah's name: Thou wast the far-covering cherub—kerub: It was thou who didst cause that youth (robeh—sc. Adam) to die.⁵

We see in this quotation the Ezekiel passage connected to Isa 14 (Nebuchadnezzar being the oppressor), and the Cherub, who is represented by the King of Tyre, as being the one who caused Adam to fall.

**From the Church Fathers to the Reformation**

As we have seen in the case of Isa 14, the passage of the "Guardian Cherub" (הַמָּנוֹן הָרֹבֶּצ) of Ezek 28 has--from the time of

¹See pp. 48-51.
²Baba Bathra, 75a; Hull, 89a; Midr, Gen 38:1; Exod 7:1; Lev 15:1.
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Origen to the Reformation--been connected with the "Morning Star" ( استراتيجية ) and generally been applied to Satan. Besides that we have seen some other instances in which the Ezekiel passage was interpreted or commented upon independently. In refuting the dualistic theogonies of Gnosticism, Origin refers to Ezek 28 by saying that the passage (vss. 12-17) cannot be understood of a man, but of some superior power which had fallen away from a higher position. . . . These powers (angels) were not formed or created so by nature, but fell from a better to a worse position, and were converted into wicked beings.¹

Tertullian furthers Origen's view, stating:

For in the person of the prince of Tyre it is said in reference to the devil: "Moreover . . ." (Ezek 28:12-16). This description, it is manifest, properly belongs to the transgression of the angel, and not to the prince's: for none among human beings was either born in the paradise of God, not even Adam himself, who was rather translated thither; nor placed with a cherub upon God's holy mountain, that is to say, in the heights of heaven, from which the Lord testifies that Satan fell; nor detained amongst the stones of fire, and the flashing rays of burning constellations, whence Satan was cast down like lightning (Luke 10:18). No, it is none else than the very author of sin who was denoted in the person of a sinful man: he was once irreproachable, at the time of his creation, formed for good by God, as by the good Creator of irreproachable creatures, and adorned with every angelic glory, and associated with God, good with the Good; but afterwards of his own accord removed to evil.²

Cyril of Jerusalem (c. A.D. 315-c. 386)³ and Ambrose (c. A.D. 340-397) held the same view.⁴ Jerome has an interesting comment on this passage which we quote at length:

---

¹Origen De Principiis 1.5.4 (ANF, 4:258).
²Tertullian Against Marcion 2.9-10.
³Cyril of Jerusalem Cathechetical Lectures 2.4 (NPNF, 7:8-9).
⁴Ambrose De Paradise 1.2.9 (MPL, 14:294).
He is the one to whom the words of Ezechiel are addressed: "You were stamped with the seal of perfection." Notice exactly what the prophet says: "the seal of perfection." He did not say to the devil, you are the sign of perfection, but the seal of perfection. God had set His impression upon you and made you like unto Himself; but you afterwards destroyed the resemblance. You were Created in the image and likeness of God.

In that same prophecy it says, moreover: "With the Cherub I placed you; you were in the Garden of God among precious stones, the beryl and the garnet. And you fell," Ezechiel says, "and were banned from the mountain of the Lord." This prince is the king of Tyre, the king of Tyre from the time he fell—inaasmuch as Tyre in Hebrew means SOR, that is tribulation. That prince, therefore, who at first was in heaven, has now become the king of Tyre, the king of the tribulation of this world. "You shall fall like one of the princes." Since it says "like one," it shows that there are others also.¹

Throughout the centuries scholars such as Gregory the Great,² Rabanus Maurus (c. A.D. 776-856),³ Thomas Aquinas,⁴ and Caspar Schwenckfeld⁵ shared the view of the Church Fathers in the interpretation of Ezek 28 as being applied to Satan.

The Reformers

Luther comments very briefly on Ezek 28, and says, "For thus Ezekiel says to the Devil under the name of the prince of Tyre (Ezek 28:3): 'Behold, you are wiser than Daniel'."⁶

---

²Gregory the Great Expositio Librum Job 32.40.23 (MPL, 76:664-65).
³Rabanus Maurus Commentariorum in Ezechielem 11 (MPL, 110:792).
⁴Thomas Aquinas Summa Theologica 1.317.
⁶Luther, First Lectures on the Psalms, in Luther's Works, 10:347.
Calvin stopped his commentary on Ezekiel in chap. 20, so we do not have his comments on chap. 28, but it is almost certain he rejected the patristic application to Satan as he did with Isa 14.¹

In the Nineteenth Century

W. J. Schroeder held the view that the Cherub in this passage has little or nothing at all to do with paradise. He supposed that the designation Cherub simply points to the temple at Jerusalem, and especially to the most holy place there. He connects it with the influence Tyre had there in the time of David and Solomon when the Tyrians helped in the building enterprises in Israel.²

In 1876, Fairbairn, the great typologist, interpreted the passage as applying only to the historical Tyre. He criticized the Church Fathers and others who had applied this text as having to do mystically with Satan.³ The passage is taken as an historical parable in which the kings of Tyre were first personified as one ideal man.

Keil interpreted this passage (vss. 1-10) as applying to historical events that occurred in Tyre in the sixth century B.C.: "The threat applies, not to the one king, Ithobal, who was reigning at the time of the siege of Tyre by the Chaldeans, but to the

¹Calvin, Isaiah, 1:442.
King as the founder and creator of the might of Tyre...

Concerning the lament (vss. 12-19), Keil says Ezekiel compares the situation of the prince of Tyre with that of the first man in Paradise; drawing in vss. 15, 16 a comparison between the fall of the King of Tyre and the fall of Adam.

Keil dedicates nine pages of his commentary to citing ancient sources with which he tries to explain the fulfillment of this prophecy about Tyre, from the famous thirteen-year siege by Nebuchadnezzar, the struggle of Alexander the Great to overcome it, etc. In the end, he says, the prophecy finally was fulfilled.

At the close of the nineteenth century Bertholet saw this passage not as referring to an individual but merely to a typical individual who represents Tyre's sin; his guilt is that of considering himself a god. For him the paradise conception is the same here as that in Gen 3, and thus it probably was borrowed from that source.

Toy affirmed that "the prophet had before him not the latter (Gen 2), but a fuller Babylonian narrative, out of which that in Genesis also was probably drawn up"; and interpreted the Cherub as

---


2 Ibid., pp. 417-25.

3 A Bertholet, Das Buch Hesekiel, KHC (Leipzig: J. C. Mohr, 1897), pp. 147-49.

4 C. H. Toy, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, SBOT 12 (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1899), p. 154; he adds that "the Jewish exiles in Babylonia, however, appear to have transferred Paradise to the sources of the Euphrates and Tigris in the north, because they believed that God dwelt in the north, and not, as of old, at Horeb. Cf., the notes on Ezek 1:4, Isa 14:13, and Jastrow, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (Boston, 1898), pp. 506, 577" (p. 154).
guardian, not as the king. Kraetzschmar viewed the passage as an imaginative handling of the Paradise story by Ezekiel, while Gunkel calls it an older and more mythological recension than Gen 2-3.

The Twentieth Century

By the beginning of the twentieth century most interpreters held the hypothesis that the Israelite and neighboring peoples probably knew an ancient myth from which these two passages (Ezek and Gen) derived. Both of these Hebrew writers are thought to have adapted the legend of a glorious being who dwelt in a Paradise to their purposes, which explains the similarities in the accounts.

One of the commentators representative of this group is John Skinner, who in 1908 wrote that "the king here is simply the representative of the genius of the community." Skinner held that the Prince in vss. 1-10 is conceived as a man, and the King in vss. 11-19 appears as an angelic being, an inhabitant of Eden, and

---

1 R. Kraetzschmar, Das Buch Ezechiel, HAT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, Ruprecht, 1900), p. 217.
2 H. Gunkel, Genesis GHK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, Ruprecht, 1901), pp. 34.
3 See, e.g., O. Procksch, Geschichtsbetrachtung und geschichtliche Überlieferung bei den Vorexilischen Propheten (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902), pp. 161-64; and A. A. Bevan, "The King of Tyre in Ezek XXVIII," JTS 4 (1902-1903):500-05, who held similar ideas, and affirms that "the legend of the primeval garden served to explain the decorations of the Sanctuary, and the Sanctuary, in its turn, seemed to an uncritical age a standing witness to the truth of the legend. . . . The functions ascribed to the living Cherub in Paradise may, by a very natural figure of speech, be ascribed also to the symbolical Cherub in the Tyrian Temple."
a companion of the Cherub, sinless at first and falling from his high state through his own transgression. "... The passage only clothes in forms drawn from Babylonian mythology the boundless self-glorification of Tyre."¹ According to Skinner, Ezekiel must have obtained a knowledge of some fragments of these mythical notions during his sojourn in Babylon.² Several authors have suggested mythological origins for the passage such as "a theomachy or Titanomachy similar to the Hurrian and Greek versions";³ the myth of Prometheus;⁴ but except for the mentioned Prometheus myth, no myths have been presented upon which the allusions are based.⁵

Most twentieth-century scholars see this passage in Ezekiel, to a greater or lesser degree, as derived from or reflecting the Genesis narrative.⁶

¹Ibid., p. 253. ²Ibid., p. 257. ³Pope, El, p. 103.
In 1954 J. L. McKenzie, following Cooke, took the position that Ezek 28:12-18 contains a variant form of the tradition which appears in Gen 2-3. He admits "indisputably common features" in the two passages but recognizes some remarkable divergences.

passage, but the lament has been considerably expanded. Wevers tries to recover the original text by removing what he thinks were redactorial insertions. Walther Eichrodt, Ezekiel, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1970), p. 392, has the opinion that the passage is closely realted to the story of Gen 2-3, but Ezek 28 has clear traces of its heathen origin. This suggests other traditions besides the Paradise story which were known to Israel and dealt with the beginnings of the human race. C. Westermann, Genesis, BKA (Neukirchen-Vyvyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), p. 335, recognizes similarities and sees more mythical elements in the Ezekelian passage than in Genesis. Walther Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:90, 91, 95, believes that the passage deals with the person of the first man and sees in the text a kind of older form of the paradise tradition; the clear distinction the passage makes of creature and Creator shows its Yahwehist saturation. Like Wevers, he sees redactional insertions in several parts of the text and makes an attempt to remove then so the original can be recovered. He applies the lament to the king of Tyre, where he is compared to a mythical figure; but at the same time he thinks that it was transformed by a post-exilic interpreter to a permanent paradigm (p. 689). Norman C. Habel, "Ezekiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man," CTM 38 (1967):516-24, believes Ezek 28:12-19 is a "reformulation of a Fall tradition in terms which are meaningful and appropriate for the Tyre situation of the time of Ezekiel. Ezekiel made the Fall event relevant for the king of Tyre by describing the downfall of that king as though he were the first man" (p. 523).

1J. L. McKenzie, "The Literary Characteristics of Gen 2-3," TS 15 (1954):531-53. In an article McKenzie wrote two years later ("Mythological Allusions in Ezek 28:12-18," JBL 75 [1956]:322-27), he again criticizes the authors who say Ezekiel "either recounts a foreign myth or alludes to one" but cite no myth upon which the allusions are based. He concludes by restating his previous view that Ezek 28:1-19 "has more points of contact with the Paradise story than with any other biblical passage or with any known mythological pattern" (pp. 322, 327).

2Ezekiel, p. 313.

3Cf. Ernst Haag, Der Mensch am Anfang, TTS 24 (Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 1970), pp. 73-100, who has made a detailed study of Gen 2-3, comparing it to Ezek 28:1-19 (especially vss. 12-16) arriving at the conclusion that the affirmations of Genesis have directly furnished the structural principle for Ezekiel's prophetic utterances, Ezek 28 being a real variant of the Yahwistic original form.
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After criticizing some aspects of the views of Kraetzschmar,\(^1\) Gunkel,\(^2\) Cooke,\(^3\) and Hölscher,\(^4\) McKenzie stressed the superiority of the Hebrew account in comparison to the Mesopotamian cosmogony and affirmed that there is a similar circle of ideas in which the Hebrew account and Mesopotamian mythology move; there was a general common knowledge about the paradise story among the Semitic peoples. He views the figure in vss. 12-19 as no more than a human one.\(^5\)

G. Fohrer\(^6\) holds the view that the myth of the Garden of Elohim is originally from Mesopotamia, and that later it was identified with Eden in Israelite tradition. He also thinks Ezekiel may have been enriched by the Canaanite-Phoenician myth with Babylonian motifs or vice-versa.\(^7\) Herbert G. May believes that the Ezekelian

---

\(^1\)Ezechiel, p. 217; Kraetzschmar thinks that this passage is an imaginative handling by Ezekiel of the paradise story.

\(^2\)Genesis, p. 34; Gunkel has called Ezek 28 an older and more mythological recension than Gen 2-3.

\(^3\)Ezekiel, p. 313; Cooke believes that "the folklore upon which Ezekiel drew had been steeped in Babylonian mythology from early times."

\(^4\)G. Hölscher, Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch, BZAW 39 (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1924), p. 142, held that the material was a Babylonian myth.


\(^7\)McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions," pp. 322-23, disagrees with Fohrer, saying that although the existence of mythological allusions in the OT cannot be denied, "experience shows that it is rarely possible, if ever, to reconstruct these myths from biblical allusions alone with any degree of accuracy."
passage must have been based on a story of a royal first man and "Adam" who was king.¹

Kalman Yaron has published a detailed article on Ezek 28:12-19, in which he starts with the crucial question concerning whether the dweller in the Garden of God was a Cherub (MT) and if the Cherub (reading vss. 14-16 with the LXX) plays the same role as it does in Gen 3:24.² He holds that it is important to determine the function of the Cherub in order to correctly interpret this passage.

At the end of his article Yaron concludes, "in opposition to McKenzie and in agreement with Pope, that the allegory describing the descent of the Prince of Tyre to the pit is built of exactly the same elements as the Phoenician epic of El, and does not fit any lesser godlike being, such as the cherub."³ He finds that the dweller of the Garden of God was modeled after the pattern of the "kingship ideology" of the Ancient Near East, i.e., the king-priest, etc. He also admits that Ezekiel's ideas are in accordance with the monotheistic story of the Garden of Eden.

In his commentary on Ezek 26-28, Van Dijk clearly sets himself on the side of MT when exegeting 28:14-16. He identifies


³Ibid., p. 54. See Mullen, p. 242, who criticizes Pope's and consequently Yaron's position on the matter. See above p. 27, n. 3.
the Cherub with the king of Tyre or with "םָּשְׁמ" of vs. 12.\footnote{H. J. van Dijk, Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre, BO 20 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), p. 114.}

Although Van Dijk does not explicitly identify the main figure of the passage, he quotes Cornill's thought: "For most evidently the prince is presented as a fallen angel," which he says is "a very relevant suggestion."\footnote{Ibid.}

Ohler contends that the passage is an independent myth which serves as an illustration of the threatening of the downfall of the city of Tyre. God cast down from the heavenly realm to the earth, a special creature who, on account of his pride, had sinned. The prophet could be applying to Tyre an old Israelite teaching concerning the fall of a special being which found expression in the myth. What may be related to the pagan notions about other gods, the writer ascribes to Yahweh.\footnote{When Man Becomes God, pp. 19-25.}

O. Gowan compared alleged mythological themes—as he did concerning Isa 14:12-15—with similar themes found in other related cultures.\footnote{When Man Becomes God, pp. 19-25.} From his comparison he arrived at the conclusion that the paradise myth in its particular Hebrew form was the main source of all the materials the prophet presented. He rejected any suggestion that Ezekiel was quoting a lost Phoenician myth. Both passages, Isa 14 and Ezek 28, have to do—in Gowan's view—with cases of hybris, when man wants to become God. He also rejects any interpretation of those passages which would relate them to the fall of angels.

After discussing the views of several scholars who wrote from the end of the nineteenth century to the present, Williams recently wrote concerning this passage:

It may be that in this passage we have less a derivation from a fully contained original tale but more a combination of elements from the traditions of the time, mythological as well as contemporary, used to make a satirical attack against an important figure utilizing phraseology which was well known at the time.1

Thus an alternative explanation of Ez 28:12-19 is that it is not taken from a lost myth of a primeval being or even that it is a fuller version of the Genesis 2-3 story. Rather it is a castigation of the Tyrian ruler on the grounds of his hubris in commercial activities and his participation in the local sanctuary rites of sacral kingship. With firm use of illustrative metaphor the prophet drives home his attack using language and terms easily understandable at the time. If anything this should serve to show that he is not so much bound by the material he is using as employing it in an imaginative way for his own purposes.2

As he did with Isa 14, Loretz makes a stichometric analysis of the poem of Ezek 28:1-19.3 After examining the passage in this way, he has selected some phrases upon which he believes the oracle was based. The connection between the basic original material from the myth of creation of man and the king took place later. The presence of the paradise myth in the Tyre oracle points out an ability of the prophet to incorporate new material. Finally Loretz thinks that a post-exilic interpreter transformed the directly impending events into a permanent paradigm. He adds: "Die verstärkte Hereinnahme des Mythos dient der Auswertung der

2Ibid., pp. 60-61.
Vorlage über ein historisch begrenztes Anliegen hinaus."¹

Some scholars² have advanced the view that Ezek 28:12-19 has to do with aspects of the Tyrian religion and its temple, and that the city-god Melkart was meant by the King of Tyre.

Finally, there exists a very small group of scholars who apply the passage especially to Satan and/or to the antichrist typologically, as did the Church Fathers. They do not deny that the narrative has some historical bearing, but they say that Ezekiel discerned behind the earthly monarch attitudes of the motivating force and personality that were impelling him in his opposition to God. Those commentators usually resist the idea of any importation of a foreign mythology or pagan legends into the text. Among those theologians are Chafer,³ Fausset,⁴ SDABC,⁵ Ironside,⁶ Scofield,⁷ and

¹Ibid., p. 458.


³Systematic Theology, 2:39-44.


⁵"King of Tyrus" [Ezek 28:12], SDABC, (1953-57), 4:675.

⁶Isaiah, pp. 88-89. Ironside believes that the words of this passage "cannot apply to any mortal man," and that the Cherub of Ezek 28 is Lucifer of Isa 14. He was the greatest of all angels and perfect, till he fell through pride.

⁷C. I. Scofield, The New Scofield Reference Bible (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), comments on Ezek 28:12-17. He says: "Here, as in Isa 14:12, the language goes beyond the king of Tyre to Satan... The unfallen state of Satan is here described; his fall in Isa 14:12-14. But more is here. The vision is not of Satan in his own person, but of Satan fulfilling
Feinberg. This latter writer is one of the few contemporary theologians who goes against the mainstream in the interpretation of this passage. Feinberg strongly resists the views which say that (1) there is in this chapter an interpretation of foreign mythology or pagan legends; (2) Ezekiel was following a free imagination; (3) the narrative behind the prophecy was supposed to be an adaptation of the paradise story in Genesis; and (4) the prophet made use of irony in presenting his prophecy or lament. On the other hand, Feinberg takes his side on the interpretation of the passage stressing that (1) it is impossible, by any stretch of the imagination, to apply most of the passage to any earthly king; (2) the prophet saw the work of Satan, whom the king of Tyre was emulating in so many ways; (3) the anointed Cherub was none other than Satan himself in his position of honor about the throne of God; (4) only if we admit the two previous items can the passage be eminently intelligible and in place.

Conclusions

From the survey of the literature covering the interpretation of the passages discussed above, several conclusions emerge:

Observations Concerning Isa 14

From the first century A.D., when explicit interpretations of the passage (especially vss. 12-15) began to appear, through the

himselv in and through an earthly king who arrogates to him- self divine honors, so that the prince of Tyrus foreshadows the Beast (Dan 7:8; Rev 19:20)."
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era of the early Church Fathers, through medieval times, and up to the beginning of the Reformation, most of the interpreters applied the passage as referring to Satan. Jewish interpreters applied it as having to do with immediate historical events, such as the oppression by Nebuchadnezzar.

The two great reformers, Luther and Calvin, broke with the traditional interpretation of the fathers and repudiated the idea by applying the passage only in historical terms, i.e., to the king of Babylon.

In the seventeenth century, Milton and Bunyan, in their writings, accepted the traditional view of the Church Fathers.

New developments occurred in the study of Isa 14 in the nineteenth century when theologians started seeing mythical elements in it. By the end of the century the passage had undergone more detailed study on several aspects:

1. **The nature of the passage.** The lament form—which uses the Qinah Meter—was detected.

2. **The structure of the poem.** The textual boundaries of the song had tentatively been determined and its strophic division had been suggested. Proposals about possible textual corruptions began to appear.

3. **Reidentification and relationships.** New identifications for the main figure of the narrative had been suggested, and the relationship of the main elements in the passage to mythic materials was discussed.

4. **The origin of the material.** The possible relationship between the passage and the religious culture and mythic material.
of the Fertile Crescent area was investigated by scholars. The Pan-Babylonian approach was strongly emphasized in this search, and a tentative reconstruction of an original astral myth behind it was proposed. New dates for the poem later than the time of Isaiah were proposed. The identification of the morning star with the Venus Star—identical to the Greek Phaeton—has been held by many scholars since the end of the nineteenth century till the present time.

After the discoveries of Ras-Shamra in 1929, the Pan-Babylonian approach has been replaced by Pan-Ugaritism and a more decided emphasis upon Canaanite sources in the background of this work. With it has come a tendency to interpret the passage in the light of that material. The Phoenician model has attracted most theologians but South Arabic and Greek parallels have also been suggested.

On the other hand, the twentieth century has produced many scholars who continue to defend the earlier position of the Church Fathers; nor has it lacked those who apply the passage to the work of the antichrist throughout the ages, past and future.

Summarizing the examination of the main body of literature on the matter, we presently have several views concerning the interpretation of the taunt against the King of Babylon in Isa 14 (especially vss. 12-15):

1. The lament constitutes a pure myth\(^1\) of Canaanite-

\(^1\)Among the interpretations of Helel and Shahar we find that they are identified with: (1) different aspects of the moon, (2) different aspects of the sun, (3) Helel is identified with Jupiter, (4) Helel is identified with Venus (Greek Phaeton and South Arabian Athtar), the brightest star in the morning.
Israelite setting with Arabic and Greek influence. This idea was first introduced into the text with the fall of Babylon and it was applied to that event. In this, the fall of Babylon or the king of Babylon has been compared to the fall of Helel. Some interpreters of this school of thought hold that "the myth no longer has a life of its own but belongs to the treasurehouse of poetry, on which poets and prophets liked to draw in order to clothe their thoughts in rich apparel."^1


2. The passage also has an historical sense. Although fragments of mythic nature can be found in the lament, the composition is Isaianic, and the message of the passage has some bearing on a historical figure--Sargon II and others have been suggested.

3. The passage can be applied literally to immediate historical events, but it can also be considered symbolic of what happened, is happening, and will happen in a cosmic struggle between God and Satan, between good and evil. Human agents are shown as carrying on such a struggle in some biblical passages, but in this passage the mastermind of the cosmic war is clearly emphasized. In other words,

Behind such alleged only illustrative transferable phrases, there is much more, and with it we get in the domain of myth. Such a myth applies to a finally enigmatic incident, to a demonic, to a godly event, which illuminates the foreground and background of the history of the doings of mankind.2

Observations Concerning Ezekiel 28

The Ezekelian passage (especially vss. 12-19) has, from the time of Origen to the Reformation, been associated with that of Isa 14 and applied to Satan. The main exceptions to this view have been those of some Jewish commentators who applied it to Hiram of Tyre, Nebuchadnezzar, or to Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden.

From the time of the Reformation to the beginning of the nineteenth century, the view of the Church Fathers was held. From the second half of the nineteenth century till the present, interpreters have developed the following trends and views.

1. One small group has followed the view of the Church Fathers and apply the passage especially to Satan and/or the antichrist typologically. This group admits that the narrative has some historical bearing, but the main objective of the passage transcends the historical reality.

2. A second group says the passage is a poetic lamentation which has to do only with the king of Tyre or the city of Tyre itself.

3. The third group, the one which is followed by the majority of modern interpreters, sees the passage as related to the Paradise narrative of Gen 2-3. This point of view has been developed with several different modifications:

   a. It is borrowed directly from the Paradise narrative—a comparison between the fall of Adam and the fall of Tyre has developed from this idea.

   b. The prophet had in mind a known Babylonian myth from which the Paradise story of Genesis and the Ezekelian
passage derived—this was applied to Tyrian self-glorification.

c. Although details of Ezekiel's ideas are in accordance with the monotheistic story of the Garden of Eden, the account is built rather upon the same elements as the Phoenician epic of El—the dweller in the garden of God being modeled after the pattern of the "royal ideology" of the ancient Near East.

d. There is a circle of ideas in which the Hebrew account and Mesopotamian mythology move and a generally common knowledge about the Paradise story among the Semitic peoples--from this milieu Ezekiel's account derived.

4. The fourth group believes the passage is an independent myth which serves as an illustration of the threat of the impending downfall of the city of Tyre. The prophet is here applying to Tyre an old Israelite teaching concerning a special creature who was cast down from the heavenly realm, an idea which also found expression in myth.

There is, of course, a rather broad variation in the details expressed by different interpreters of the passage, but the ones expressed above represent the main spectrum of the most representative views.

**Aim and Plan of the Study**

The main reason for our research on these two passages is to determine the degree to which they relate to the origin of evil. From the survey of the literature on the interpretation of these passages from the beginning of the Christian era to the present time,
a related problem has emerged: We are far from having developed consensus on the interpretation of these passages. A variety of views represents the thinking on such multiple topics as:

(1) origins of the material; (2) dating of the lament in its present form; (3) identification of the figures, places, and expressions; and (4) the original form of the text as produced by the biblical writer.

Since a great number of scholars in the 1980s believe that these two texts have more or less drawn their ideas and content from mythical material of the nations in the Fertile Crescent, a useful approach is to commence this study with an examination of those extra-biblical materials and to compare them with biblical narratives to determine if the authors drank directly from similar literary sources of the ancient Near East and if there was a common belief about this subject among peoples of that world. Such an examination can also look at other Israelite texts to see if there was a particular Israelite background form which the texts specifically emerged. Chapter 2 is dedicated to that task.

In chapter 3 the passages are exegeted. The text, structure, and context of these two main passages are then examined in detail in order to determine, as far as possible, the most original form of the text.

Based on a linguistic and historical approach, an attempt is made to determine whether the text should be understood in the immediate historical context, prophetically— or eschatologically— or both. A comparative study of the two passages is carried out to determine whether the claim made by some commentators that "Lucifer"
and the "Guardian Cherub" are the same personage is accurate or not.

An effort is also made to discover, as far as possible within reasonable limits, the significance of the theological content of the passages in relation to their respective prophetic books. The context of the whole Scriptures—Old and New Testaments—is also kept in view in this process of carrying out this examination of these particular passages.

In view of the problems raised in the introduction and the above review of literature, the plan of study presented above is justified, especially since a dissertation, as far as can be determined, has not been written which studies these two passages together with the emphases and directions described above.
As noted in chapter 1, Bible interpreters, starting with the Church Fathers, perceived the similar nature of the passages studied in this work and began to relate them to each other. Later they interpreted the passages in two main ways: (1) in the context of immediate historical events and (2) figuratively—having typological meaning.

Modern scholars and commentators\(^1\) have seen these passages (Isa 14 and Ezek 28), to some extent, as a borrowing from ancient myths, bringing them from extra-biblical or biblical sources.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\)See above, pp. 15-16; 40-44.

\(^2\)Scholars agree that it was Bishop Robert Lowth who in 1753 (De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum [Oxini: E. Typogratheo Clarendoniano, 1753], p. 252), with his idea of Stilus Parabolicus, opened the way for the concept of myth into biblical study. Cf. Christian Hartlich and Walter Sachs, Der Ursprung des Mythosbegriffes in der modernen Bibelwissenschaft, SSEA, 2 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1952), pp. 6-10. Hartlich and Sachs have made an historical investigation of the myths related to the biblical material from Lowth (1753) until the middle of this century. See also G. Henton Davies, "An Approach to the Problem of Old Testament Mythology," PEQ 88 (1956):83-84. The names of J. G. Eichhorn and J. P. Gabler—who made studies of mythology in the Old and New Testaments—should be mentioned as scholars who started seeing more clearly the myth problem in the Bible. See Hartlich and Sachs (pp. 11-19) and G. L. Bauer, who in 1802 produced his Hebräische Mythologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments (2 vols. [Leipzig: Weygand, 1802]) which became a classic on the matter until the present.
Although Jenour, Alexander, Cheyne, Duhm, Delitzsch, and others had referred to the identification of Helel with Venus or some astral body, it was Herman Gunkel who categorically affirmed that we have here the Helal myth which was not of Israelite origin. Later he tried to reconstruct that myth and suggested some probable places of origin. From Gunkel on several suggestions have appeared that present myths from which the material of Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:2-19 might have originated. It is to the examination of those alleged mythic origins or parallels of passages—both extra-biblical and biblical—that we now turn our study.

Methodology

In interpreting passages of the nature of Isa 14, Ezek 28, and other related passages such as Isa 27 and Ps 82, etc., scholars have usually fallen into two extremes: One is dictated by the so-called "myth and ritual" school which assigns these passages to and interprets them in the realm of mythology and ritualism; the other is represented by the group which sees the passages as free from any influence of the cultural milieu and any mythological overtones.

1 Isaiah, p. 272. 2 Isaiah, p. 200.
3 The Prophecies of Isaiah, 1:311. 4 Jesaja, p. 90.
5 Isaiah, p. 119.
6 Schöpfung und Chaos, pp. 132-34. 7 Ibid., p. 134.
Because of the nature of these passages, there probably will always be some sense of uncertainty concerning their full and complete meaning. Nevertheless some controls, if applied in this interpretation, will help us to formulate a reasonable understanding of these passages. Some principles or controls which should be observed in our methodology of comparing Near Eastern mythological materials with the biblical text are as follows:

1. Ideas of the OT should not be compared with mythological materials of the ancient Near East on the basis of "occasional similarities" or certain details, but by asking what place these details occupy in the total structure of each religion.¹

2. The context should be respected in that excerpts from the passages be not compared in isolation from the block of text in which they are found.²

3. The interpreter should be aware of the possibility that "independent development of analogical cultural features"³ could have occurred, and that although resemblances and parallels may occur, the intrinsic meaning and applicability can conceivably be completely different.⁴


4. The interpreter should be aware of the fact that certain mythical elements can be present in various mythologies without the myths themselves being identical as totalities. One element—which obviously must be supposed to express a certain limited idea—can be combined with one set of elements in one religion and with other sets of elements in other religions.¹

These four brief principles provide some guidelines which should be observed in this type of research study.

Isaiah 14

Extra-Biblical Literature

In 1895 Gunkel² proposed—and he was supported in this by Skinner³—that the Isaian material could have had its origin in Babylon. Lohman⁴ affirmed that the poet could have had the Babylonian Ishtar myth in view. In 1930 Boutflower⁵ suggested an Assyro-Babylonian source, with Ishtar and Nanna or Inanna in view. König⁶ proposed that Isa 14:13-15 was an allusion to the Etana Myth, but more recently Childs suggested that "the Etana myth has only a vague connection"⁷ with the Helal myth. Because of these assertions

²Schöpfung und Chaos, p. 134.
⁴Die anonymen Prophetien, p. 25.
⁶König, Jesaja, pp. 181-82. ⁷Myth and Reality, p. 69.
and views we now turn to the examination of the Mesopotamian material.

Sumerian

The Sumerian myth "Inanna's Descent to the Netherworld" is the predecessor and prototype of the Semitic myth "Ishtar's Descent to the Netherworld." In this myth Inanna, "queen of heaven," decides to visit the netherworld. She arrays herself in all the divine accouterments, dresses herself with the royal robes and jewels, and readies herself to travel to "the land of no return." Before going to the netherworld Inanna instructs her messenger Ninshubur to fill heaven with complaints for her, and to plead with Enlil not to allow harm to his daughter. If Enlil refuses to help, the messenger should go

---

1 The text of this myth is reconstructed from about thirteen tablets and fragments found in Nippur. Although we cannot determine the date of the first composition, extant tablets come from the first half of the second millennium B.C. While some parts of the myth were published earlier (see RA 34 [1937]:12, and BASOR 79 [1940]:18 for references), it was Samuel Noah Kramer who published a first full edition of the text ("inanna's Descent to the Netherworld," RA 34 [1937]:93-134), based on the eight tablets then available. In another two articles ("Additional Materials to 'Inanna's Descent to the Netherworld,'" RA 36 [1939]:68-80; "Ishtar in the Netherworld According to a New Sumerian Text," BASOR 79 [1940]:18-27), he published some other pieces of the myth (cf. also S. N. Kramer, Sumerian Mythology [Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1944], pp. 83-88, for a more detailed story about the gathering of the myth). A new edition of the text, based on all the tablets and fragments we have today, was produced by Kramer in PAPS 85 (1942): 293-323. Other studies of the text with translations, based on previous publications, were published by A. Falkenstein ("Zu 'Inannas Gang zur Unterwelt,'" AFO 14 [1942]:113-38), and Maurus Witzel ("Zur Sumerischen Rezension der Hölinentfahrt Ischtars," OR 14 [1945]:24-69). Kramer has also published the Sumerian version of the myth in ANET3, pp. 52-57; and E. A. Speiser the Semitic version in ANET3, pp. 106-9. In this study we follow especially the translation found in ANET.

2 This process gives us an example of literary borrowing and transformation.
to Ur and present the same request to Nanna (the moon-god). If Nanna denies the protection, the messenger should go to Eridu and make the same plea before Enki, the Sumerian god of wisdom who knows "the food of life" and "the water of life." He would certainly be able to save her from death.

After those instructions Inanna descends to the netherworld whose queen is Ereshkigal (Inanna's older sister, but her enemy). The gatekeeper wants to know the reason for her visit. Inanna says that she was invited and presents some reasons for the invitation. The gatekeeper, on instructions from his mistress, allows Inanna to enter through the seven gates of the netherworld. As she passes each of the seven gates, her garments and jewels are removed piece by piece. After the last gate she is naked and is brought before Ereshkigal and the Anunnaki judges who decree her death. She is turned into a corpse which is then hung from a stake. After three days and three nights, seeing that his mistress has not returned, Ninshubur starts to approach the gods as Inanna had instructed. Enlil and Nanna deny any help for Inanna but Enki makes plans to save her life. He fashions the Kurgarru and the Kalaturru, two sexless creatures, entrusting to them the "food of life" and the "water of life," and commanding them to go to the netherworld to revive Inanna's impaled body by sprinkling "food" and "water" six times upon her corpse. They do as commanded, and Inanna is revived. As she ascends to the earth she is accompanied by dead and ghostly creatures from the netherworld. Accompanied by that crowd Inanna goes from city to city in Sumer. As we can see, there are some elements in the myth of Inanna which could be related to elements
in Isaiah's Helel accounts. On the other hand, however, striking
differences can also be seen in several facets of the two accounts.

**Resemblances** may be pointed out as follows:

1. There are, in both accounts, scenes in three different
realms, and a shift of the main figure from one realm to the other.
In Isaiah there is the movement: Earth — netherworld — Heaven —
earth.\(^1\) In the Inanna myth the movement is: Heaven — netherworld
— earth.\(^2\)

2. The language of both materials is vivid and figurative,
and some elements are common to both accounts. These are descending
to the netherworld or to the grave; personages that are displeasing
to God, or the gods;\(^3\) the pursuit of power; etc.

**Differences** may be noted as:

1. In the myth Inanna descends to the netherworld and
ascends from there again; in Isaiah Helel is brought to the grave—
to the depths of the pit—but he does not return from there, his
fate is final.

2. In the myth, Inanna sets her mind to go to the netherworld;
in Isaiah Helel has been cast down to the pit because his power or
ruership has been broken because of his proud attitude, his
aspirations, and his oppression over the nations.

3. The Isaianic language is very vivid and figures of speech
are used to make the description more impressive. For example, trees

\(^1\) Isa 14:4b-8; vss. 9-11; vss. 12-15; vss. 16-21.

\(^2\) Lines 1-71; 72-272; 273-328. ANET\(^3\), pp. 53-57.

\(^3\) In Inanna myth we do not have the displeasing act explicitly
stated, but the context and events presuppose it.
and the spirits of the departed ones speak.\textsuperscript{1} A similar kind of language and figures of speech are presented in the myth of Inanna. However, the narrative in Isaiah is objective, clear, and logical in sequence. This is not the case with the Sumerian myth; it is quite repetitious and presents fantastic episodes such as the incident where Inanna entered the seven gates of the netherworld and lost her clothes and was left naked,\textsuperscript{2} and the hanging of Inanna's body on a stake.\textsuperscript{3}

Having examined the myth and pointed out some resemblances and differences in relation to Isaiah, we arrive at the conclusion that although it is not impossible that the prophet made use of Sumerian tradition, the differences are such that it would be unfair to say that the Inanna myth is the source for the Isaian lament. Some isolated elements of partial parallels are found, but the total content is completely different. The phrases which show some similarity are common in the descriptions of material of the same nature, although expressing different or even opposite realities.

**Akkadian**

*The Descent of Ishtar to the Netherworld.* The "Descent of Ishtar to the Netherworld"\textsuperscript{4} myth is, as noted above, a kind of

\begin{enumerate}
\item Isa 14:8-10.
\item Lines 126-156, ANET\textsuperscript{3}, p. 55.
\item Lines 167-168, ANET\textsuperscript{3}, p. 55.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{4}This myth has come to us in two recensions coming from Ashur (c. 1200-100 B.C.) and from the library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh. The older recension ("A") has been published by E. Ebeling ("Ein Heldenlied auf Tiglatpilisier I und der Anfang einer neuen Version von 'Istars Höllenhafart' nach einer Schultertafel aus Assur," OR 18 [1949]:30-39; KAR I [WVDOG 18 (1915-1919)] [pls. 1-4], and p. 321). The other recension ("N") was published by C. B. F. Walker

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
adapted version of the Sumerian Inanna myth. The general outlines of the story agree in both accounts: the goddess descends to the netherworld, goes through the seven gates losing her garments in the process, is killed at the command of Ereshkigal, is restored with the help of Enki (the Semitic Ea), and ascends to the earth. On the other hand, as Kramer says, "few of the details that go to fill in these skeleton lines of the myth are alike in the two versions." Kramer continues his comments—with which we agree—on the comparison of the two versions by stating:

What is even more interesting is the palpable difference in style and tone. For the temper of the Sumerian version, like that of Sumerian literature as a whole, is calm, subdued, passive and unemotional; the incidents are recited impassively and repeated to the point of monotony. The Semitic version, on the other hand, glosses over many of the particulars, but expands with language that is characteristically passionate and intense those details which are rich in emotional possibilities. There is little doubt that the Sumerian version is

---


3The details of the differences between the two versions are not discussed here because they are not crucial for the purpose of our research.

4Ibid., p. 20.
the more original: the Semitic account developed from it in the course of the centuries as a result of modifications made by the Babylonians in accordance with their own temper and genius.¹

The Ishtar account does not have those "abandoning" and "descending to the netherworld" phrases encountered in the Inanna myth.² In addition the description of her preparation of her apparel for the trip and her dialogue with the messenger concerning action to be taken in case she does not return are lacking from the Akkadian version.³ On the other hand the Akkadian version presents Ishtar's violent attitude toward the gatekeeper of the netherworld and gives different reasons for going into the "land of no return." Details about her entrance through the seven gates and losing her apparel are presented—with some differing nuances—in both versions.⁴

Next the Semitic version presents the miseries which Ereshkigal cast upon Ishtar⁵ and the consequences of Ishtar's departure from the natural world.⁶ The Akkadian version does not refer explicitly to the death of Ishtar.

In the Ishtar myth we have next the creation of Asushunamir (a eunuch) and his being sent to the "land of no return" to bring

²Lines 3-13, ANET³, p. 53.
³Lines 14-120, ANET³, pp. 53-54.
⁴Lines 121-160, ANET³, p. 55; and lines 38-64, ANET³, pp. 107-8.
⁵Lines 65-74, ANET³, p. 108.
⁶Lines 75-80 (obverse), 1-10 (reverse), ANET³, p. 108.
the goddess back. The same ritual for this—with slightly different nuances—is present as in the Inanna version. The long intercession of the messenger before the gods is found in the Sumerian version but is absent from the Akkadian. On the other hand, the Semitic version presents a dialogue between Asushunamir and Ereshkigal with some threat of the latter against the former, and the devaluation of Ishtar's apparel as she passes back through the netherworld gates. These two incidents are absent in the Inanna version. The end of the Akkadian version presents the Restoration of Tammuz, Ishtar's lover, to life.

The same observations made concerning the Sumerian version of the myth could legitimately be made for the Semitic version. The differences between them are in details which do not modify the main identity and nature of the original myth to any great extent. As was said before, the differences are—in great measure—in style and tone and are accounted for as result of the more passionate and emotional nature of the Semitic version. The Akkadian version does not add any phrase, as far as we can perceive, that would supply material that would help us to identify the Ishtar myth with the Isaian Helel ben Shahar story. The same observations made concerning the Sumerian version can thus be applied to the Akkadian version of the descent of the goddess to the netherworld.

1 Lines 11-37, ANET, p. 108.  
3 Lines 47-59, ANET, p. 109. This is the first time that Tammuz appears in the myth.  
4 Vandenburgh, "The Ode," p. 118, calls attention to the fact that the poem of the Ishtar myth is, as the Isaian Ode, a pentameter.
The myth of Zu. Zu is a divine figure (called the bird god) mentioned in several Mesopotamian texts, who became for a time the lord of the world after having stolen Enlil's Tablets of Destinies. The Semites described Zu as a "doer of Evil, the one who raises the head of evil." The story says that Zu was once in attendance on the god Enlil, when

Heidel
5. His eyes behold what Enlil does as sovereign.
6. The crown of his sovereignty, the robe of his divinity.
7. The tablet of destinies (belonging to) his 'divinity(?)' Zu beholds again and again.
8. And as he beholds again and again the father of the gods, the god of Duranki,

Speiser
The exercise of his Enlilship his eyes view.
The crown of his sovereignty, the robe of his godhead.
His divine Tablet of Destinies Zu views constantly.
As he views constantly the father of the gods, the god of Duranki,


3Cf. ibid., p. 166.

4"God of Duranki," according to Heidel and Speiser, is an epithet of Enlil. Duranki (meaning "the bond of heaven and earth") was the name of the temple tower at Nippur.
9. He conceives in his heart a desire(?) for Enlil's position;  
   The removal of Enlilship he conceives in his heart.

10. As Zu beholds again and again the father of the gods, the god of Duranki,  
   As Zu views constantly the father of the gods, the god of Duranki,

11. He conceives in his heart a desire(?) for Enlil's position.  
   The removal of Enlilship he conceives in his heart.

12. "I will take the tablet of the destinies of the gods, even I!"  
   "I will take the divine Tablet of Destinies, I,

13. Also the omens of all the gods I will control!  
   And the decrees of all the gods I will rule!

14. I will establish (my) throne and will control(?) the decrees!  
   I will make firm my throne and be the master of the norms,

15. I will control all the Igigi together!"  
   I will direct the totality of all the Igigi.

16. After his heart has planned the attack,  
   His heart having thus plotted aggression,

17. He waits for the beginning of the day at the entrance of (Enlil's) chamber, which he had beheld repeatedly.  
   At the entrance of the sanctuary, which he had been viewing,  
   He awaits the start of day.

18. As Enlil was washing in clear water,  
   As Enlil was washing with pure water,

19. After his tiara had been taken off and placed on the throne,  
   His crown having been removed and deposited on the throne,

20. He seized the tablet of destinies with [his] hand  
   He seized the Tablet of Destinies in his hands,  
   Taking away the Enlilship; suspended were [the norms].

21. And usurped sovereignty (the power), to issue decrees.  
   When Zu had flown away and repaired to his mountain.

As Gowan has remarked,\(^2\) this myth seems to be the only good example

\(^1\) Here begins the parallel account of the Akkadian version; see ANET\(^3\), p. 111a.
\(^2\) p. 60.
in the ancient Near East (outside the OT) of a rebel who is unsuccessful in his attempt to grasp the kingship of the god. When we compare some portion of the Zu myth with the Isaian passage, we can detect some similarities, as well as some differences in the main themes and elements of both materials.

Similarities can be listed as:

1. A failed attempt to grasp the kingship and control everything — Zu wants Enlil's position, and Helel wants "to be like Elyon."

2. A process which went on in the figure's heart, a process of envy and a desire to become like the supreme God. Several steps occur in the development of the projected act to reach the pinnacle of power.  

3. The establishment of a throne or the enthronement of the Rebel. This is clearly attested.

   **Zu**
   
   (Heidel) "I will establish my throne."
   (Speiser) "I will make firm my throne."

4. A mountain to which Zu flees after having stolen the tablet of destinies. Helel seeks to be enthroned on the "Mount of Assembly" in the "heights of Zaphon."  

---

2 Lines 12-16; Isa 14:13-14.  
3 Line 14.  
4 Isa 14:13b.  
5 Line 22; see also lines 37, 45, 49, 93 (ANET, p. 113), where the "Assembly of the great gods" is mentioned.  
6 Isa 14:13c.
5. Zu being described by the Semites as "doer of evil, the one who raises the head of evil." Helel's characteristics are also those of an evil personage. Although not as explicit, this comparison seems legitimate.

Differences that can be distinguished are:

1. The context of Zu's myth is obviously polytheistic and consequently several gods are called to besiege Zu and bring back the Tablet of Destinies. In Helel's story the context shows his designs being frustrated by Yahweh, who brings him down to the pit.

2. Zu belonged to the underworld. Helel was thrown down into the pit, but did not live there before.

3. The main theme in the Zu myth is his striving to steal Enlil's Tablet of Destinies which he finally got. Helel's story has nothing concerning such a tablet.

4. Zu became for a time the lord of the world, while the Isaian passage does not give any hint that Helel was at some time the lord of any domain.

We have to admit that despite the several differences presented, these two literatures are indeed very similar in major trends such as rebellion of a subject, attempt to grasp kingship, etc. On the other hand we know that war among gods and the striving to defeat a more eminent god is very common among the myths.

---

1Fish, p. 166. 2Lines 27ff., ANET3, p. 113.

3See vss. 5, 22. It is true that these two vss. are out of the main passage (vss. 12-15) which are said to come from a mythic source; but in vs. 13b a Supreme God (יְהוָה) is mentioned, which parallels the "most High" (יְהוָה הַיִּשְׁרָאֵל) in vs. 14b.
Summarizing, we would say that we cannot prove that the biblical writer borrowed his ideas from the myth discussed; but neither can we prove that the author of the Zu myth was not inspired by some knowledge he had of the same remote event.

The Etana Myth. Keeping in mind Childs' statement about the relationship of the Etana myth, we now turn our attention to an examination of that myth. Etana was a legendary ruler of the post-flood Dynasty of Kish, known as "a Shepherd who ascended to heaven." His life was marred by the fact that his wife was childless. The only remedy would be to get the plant of birth, which Etana would have to bring from heaven in person. The solar deity gives him intelligence to perceive that he should make use of an eagle to transport him to Anu's heaven to bring the plant of birth from there. Before doing so, however, Etana had to rescue the eagle from a pit into which she had been thrown by the serpent because of her betrayal of her friend. The eagle, once rescued,

---

1 Childs, Myth and Reality, p. 64, says that "the Etana myth has only a vague connection" with the Helal myth (Isa 14:12-15). Cf. Lohmann (Die anonymen Prophetien, p. 25), who says "Mit dem Itana-mythus selber hat jedoch unsere Stelle wahrscheinlich nichts zu schaffen, wenn auch die Farben des Liedes an denselben erinnern."

2 The texts of the myth come to us in fragments of three recensions: Old Babylonian (A); Middle Assyrian (B); and Neo-Assyrian (C). See ANET, p. 114, for the references of the publication of the various texts. Our research uses the reconstructed text of the three versions published by E. A. Speiser, ANET, pp. 114-18.

agrees to transport Etana to Anu's heaven, saying,

"My friend, bright [. . .].
Up, I will bear thee to the heaven [of Anu]!
Upon my breast place thou [thy breast],
Upon the feathers of my wings place thou [thy hands],
Upon my sides place thou [thine arms]!"

Etana follows the eagle's instruction and is carried to the third heaven, which belongs to Anu. Apparently the plant of birth was not found, for they went higher to Ishtar's heaven. Looking down, however, Etana was taken by fear and plunged down together with the eagle. 2

Comparing the account of Etana's myth with the Isaian passage is a task that is complicated by the fragmentary state of the Akkadian text and the nature of the material involved. We find some sparse elements which could be said to resemble each other. In Etana's myth we find the realms of heaven (several heavens), earth, and the pit (or netherworld). There is an ascending to heaven; there is the failure to reach the objective; and there is the consequent plunging down from on high (probably into the pit, though we are not sure since the text is incomplete at this point).

On the other hand, we are faced again with remarkable differences or divergences: (1) The purpose for ascending to heaven is quite different in the two accounts. The Isaian story shows Helel trying to establish his throne in the utmost heights of the


2In a more recently published text, J. V. Wilson ("Some Contributions to the Legend of Etana," IRAQ 31 [1969]:8-17), shows that Etana obtained the plant of birth and suggests that the story had a tragic ending, whereas Speiser (ANET 3, p. 114) suggests a happy ending to the story.
sacred mountain; Etana ascends to get the plant of birth. (2) The Etana myth says nothing about his oppressing rulership, while the Isaian account does.\(^1\) (3) The polytheistic nature of the myth contrasts with the biblical passage. (4) The myth is repetitious and its language is less natural; it personifies the elements of nature to a greater extent than does the biblical passage.

To say that we have the same myth in both accounts would be quite inaccurate. That the Isaian passage had its origin in the Akkadian myth is very difficult to demonstrate; that some elements came directly from the Akkadian material into the biblical account is yet to be proved.

It could be that both accounts have elements of the same mythical—or pre-historical—original event, but if that were the case—and we are not sure that it is—there are no convincing arguments to demonstrate it. If such a procedure were carried out, we believe it would be found that the elements involved were "combined in significantly different ways."\(^2\) The more probable explanation of some generally common elements or resemblances between the two stories would be that of the existence of "common circumstances or something basic to human nature."\(^3\)

\(^1\)Vss. 4-6, 16-17.

\(^2\)Cf. Gowan, When Man Becomes God, pp. 55-66, who believes that the main elements in the Isaian passage are found in the Fertile Crescent literature, but sees a radical difference in the structure of the story; he thinks Isaiah deals with a human being's attempt to become god.

\(^3\)Cf. ibid., p. 52. We return to this aspect in the conclusion of this chapter. See also Gowan, pp. 54-58, for suggestive mythical elements parallel to Isa 14:12-15 in other Ancient World material.
Some scholars have suggested that the Kumarbi and Ullikummi Hittite myths are more original forms of the material of Isa 14: 12-15. In one of the epics we learn that there was a heavenly kingship which went through several generations of gods such as Allalu, Anu, Kumarbi, and the storm-god Teshub. Allalu was driven away by Anu, who then reigned in heaven. The "mighty Kumarbi" who was servant of Anu revolted against Anu and made him flee. Kumarbi threw him from heaven and castrated him. Anu foretold that three children would be born to Kumarbi, one of which was the storm-god, usually called Teshub. After several acts of rivalry between

---

1The tablets found were written between 1400 and 1200 B.C.; the original composition could be from the fifteenth century B.C. The bulk of the texts was published in cuneiform by H. Otten ("Mythische und magische Texte in hethitischer Sprache," KUB 33 (1943), and E. O. Forrer ("Eine Geschichte des Götterkönigtums aus dem Hatti Reiche," AIPH 4 [1936]:687-713). The texts (fragmentary copies) contain two epics: "Kingship in Heaven" and "The Song of Ullikummi," which, based on the preserved parts, were reconstructed by Hans G. Gütterbock ("The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths: Oriental Forerunners of Hesiod," AJA 52 (1948):123-34; and "The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth," JCS 5 [1951]:135-61; 6 [1952]:8-42). A new translation was made by Albrecht Goetze in ANET³, pp. 120-25. See E. A. Speiser, "An Intrusive Hurro-Hittite Myth," JAOS 62 (1942): 98-102, for the view that the myth is not originally Hittite but an adaptation of a Hurrian product.

2Pope, El, p. 97; Paul D. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11," JBL 96 (1977): 207-09, where a comparison of mythical pattern between the material of Isa 14 and the Hittite myth is made.

Anu, Kumarbi, and his son the storm-god, the latter seems to have taken over the kingship of heaven.¹

On the essence of this myth Güterbock concludes that the Song of Ullikummi describes the continuation of the battle between older and younger gods.² Unsatisfied with the supremacy of the storm god, and desiring to continue as the “father of the gods,” Kumarbi creates the sea monster Ullikummi. The latter was a threat against the storm god, who devised plans to destroy Ullikummi.

In examining these myths we find motifs which resemble some found in the Isaian passage, but we find also striking differences in the account.

**Similarities** may be pointed out as:

1. A rivalry is developed, and there is opposition against gods (God).
2. One is ascending to take up the kingship.
3. A seat is prepared for a god to sit upon.
4. The defeat of one of the parties is noted, with the subsequent “dragging down from the sky.”

**Differences** noted are as follows:

1. The context of the Hittite myths is a polytheistic one, where many gods are involved in a confused and complicated rivalry.

In the biblical passage somebody raises himself against God (El) who is the Most High (Elyon).

¹The outcome of the battle unfortunately is not preserved, but the “Song of Ullikummi” presents the storm god as a king. See ANET³, p. 121.

2. The biblical material—although difficult—is more clear and intelligible than the Hittite myth which is diffuse and hard to understand as to the sequence of events.

3. The sublimity of the Isaianic account contrasts with the grotesque level of the Hittite myth; for example, the myth cites an incident in which Kumarbi swallowed Anu's manhood.\(^1\)

Despite some superficial resemblances presented above, it is very unlikely that this myth would be a "more original form" of Isaiah's material. Those scholars who suggest that have had difficulty in demonstrating such a dependence.\(^2\)

---

**Greek**

In 1877 F. Delitzsch called attention to the fact that Helel derives its name from its striking brilliancy and is called son of the dawn "just as in the classical mythology it is called son of Eos."\(^3\) Dilmann\(^4\) agreed with Delitzsch, and Duhm\(^5\) explicitly compared Helel to Phaeton and said that both were inspired by an

---

\(^1\)ANET\(^3\), p. 120.

\(^2\)Pope (El, pp. 97-98) suggests that there was a known "myth of the vanquished and banished god or gods" in the Old and New Testament times (cf. also Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background," pp. 29-126) from which Isa 14:12-14 derives, and connects the Kumarbi and Ullikummi myths with the Isaian passage. But he is confused in the identification of Helel. Cf. McKay, "Helel," p. 463, n. 1.

\(^3\)Isaiah, p. 311. Delitzsch also mentions that among the Semites the morning star is personified as a female. According to W. Baumgartner (Israelitisch-Griechische," p. 157), O. Gruppe in the 1880s was also discussing the similarities between Isa 14:12-14, and the Greek myth of Phaeton.


astral phenomenon; but he identified the star with Mercury. Until the middle of the twentieth century scholars have paid little attention to the equation Helel-Phaeton. Grelot, however, was one who made a more detailed study of Phaeton's role in the Greek texts.  

The figure of Phaeton in Greek mythology does not have a clear identity. His genealogy is confused, and his story is presented in several variants. Among the more relevant Greek texts examined by Grelot we find:

1. **Odyssey** 23.246. Phaeton is presented as one of the colts that bear the chariot of the dawn.

2. **Theogony** 986-91. Hesiod presents Phaeton here as a god, a strong son of Eos and Cephalus, whom—in his youth—"Aphrodite

---


4According to Hesiod (Theogony 986-91 [trans. H. G. Evelyn-White, LCL, pp. 153]), Phaeton is son of Eos and Cephalus; according to Ovid (ibid., 2.1ff.), son of Apollo (Helios) and Clymene.


623.246 ἄδου ταῦτα ὑπενθύμισεν. Grelot ("Isaie 14:12-15," pp. 25-32) in examining this and other Greek texts has demonstrated—despite the nuances in using the term Phaeton—that the term is a rather common epithet for the astral deities, and that Lampon and Phaeton are the planets Mercury and Venus.

7Hesiod, Theogony, p. 153.
seized and made a keeper of her shrine by night, a divine spirit." ¹

3. A Greek story of another Phaeton, who is described as son of Apollo (Helios) and the nymph Clymene. Mention of him appears in several ancient writers,² but Ovid³ supplied us with the most details.⁴

One day Phaeton had a dispute with Epaphus, son of Zeus and Io, who scoffed at the idea of Phaeton's origin. He complained to his mother who sent him to Helios to ask information concerning his divine birth. Helios confirmed that he was his father, and Phaeton made Helios promise to prove before the eyes of the gods that he

¹P. Mazon (cf. Grelot, "Isaïe 14:12-15," pp. 28-30 comments on this passage based on the context—that the description of Phaeton as a "genie Nocturne" identifies him as the evening Star, Venus. Grelot supports him. After examining the quoted texts and the meaning of the words Phaeton, Eosphoros, Esperos, Phosforos, and Lucifer, Grelot arrives at the provisional conclusion that "Hêlêl fils de Sahar est le même personnage mythique que Phaéton fils de Ès. Sur ce point, ou bien le mythe grec dépend du modèle phénicien connu de l'auteur d'Is. XIV, ou bien tous les deux remontent à un même prototype. Le personnage en question n'est autre que l'astre du matin personnifié: Èosphoros-Phosphoros. De ce fait, les traductions d'Is. XIV 12 dans les LXX (ἐσοφόρος) et la Vulgate (Lucifer) sont excellentes, et la paraphrase du Targum est bien dans la ligne du texte original" (p. 30).


³Metamorphoses 2:1-400.

⁴Concerning this recension, Grelot says ("Isaïe 14:12-15," p. 31) "Assurément dans cette recension, le mythe s'est dégradé en fable et son inspiration originelle est difficile à retrouver derrière les excroissances d'une imagination décadente."
was his son. After Helios promised, Phaeton demanded permission to drive the sun's chariot for one day. Helios tried to dissuade the boy, showing him the dangers of such an enterprise, but it was in vain. Because of his oath, Helios granted permission.

The youth took the chariot and drove it. When the steeds perceived that they were being driven by different and weaker hands, they rushed headlong and left the traveled road, going wildly through space. Phaeton looked down upon the earth and was shaken with terror. The horses, now unrestrained, went up and down, almost touching the stars at one extreme and the earth at the other. As a result the rivers of the earth began to dry up, and the soil to burn. Seeing the danger, Zeus struck Phaeton with a thunderbolt throwing him into the waters of the Eridanns river, which quenched his burning body. His sisters, as they were lamenting his fate, were turned into poplar trees on the banks of the river.

The first recension of Phaeton's story attributes to him a different genealogy than the one presented in the Theogony. In the former, Phaeton is son of Helios and Clymene; the heros are semi-gods; and the account is a kind of moralizing fable. In the Theogony, Phaeton is a god, son of Eos and Cephalus, and the account is a cosmogony. Although the association with the chariot of the sun (and of the dawn) remains, as says Grelot,¹ the figure of Phaeton-Eosphoros has been divided in two: (1) a star of the morning, Lucifer, who is related to the dawn;² and (2) an impoverished and imprudent god whose ambition is explained through his solar

¹"Isaie 14:12-15," pp. 31-32.
²Ovid, Metamorphoses, 2.111-15.
Thus Phaeton son of the sun seems an avatar of Phaeton son of the dawn.

After examining these Greek texts which introduce us to Phaeton, we recognize attached to Helel-Ben Shahar of Isa 14:12-15, a similar motif of the ascending and falling which was attached to Phaeton Son of Eos. Both also seem to bear a relationship to the Venus Star. Grelot has helped us to understand the fact that although the Phaeton term is an epithet applied to several astral bodies such as the sun, the moon, etc., it relates most directly to the Venus Star. Although the prophet seems to use an astral phenomenon—which was used by the pagan myth—to illustrate the fall of the figure in his lament, we find some differences between the two stories which militate against identifying the mythic Phaeton with the Isaian figure as Grelot and McKay advocate.

Let us consider some of these points:

---

1Ibid., 1.748-76.
2With Grelot ("Isaie 14:12-15," p. 32), and Duhm, Jesaia, p. 119.
3Duhm had mistakenly identified the myth with Mercury.
6Ibid., pp. 455-60. McKay tries in his article to demonstrate that although נָטָם appears used in the OT translation as a natural phenomenon, it appears in the MT most of the time accompanied by active verbs—and never prefixed by temporal preposition and descriptive phrases which express the time element—which would indicate that נָטָם was a personalized being. He also identifies נָטָם as an ancient female deity, a dawn-goddess. After a sequence of comparisons of pagan deities, McKay arrives at the conclusion that Grelot is correct in equating Helel and Phaeton and proceeds to trace some steps by which he thinks the Greek myth became changed to appear as it does in Isa 14:12-15 (ibid., pp. 463-64).
1. There is a difference in gender among the parent deities;¹ Shahar is a male god while Eos is a goddess.

2. The motive for Phaeton ascending into heaven in the sun’s chariot is to confirm his origin, and after his attempt he was thrown down from heaven. The Isaianic figure wanted to ascend into heaven to be enthroned in the mount of assembly and to make himself like the Most High. There is an attempt to usurp the throne of the Most High God; somebody is trying to supplant a god. This does not occur in the case of Phaeton.

3. The context of the Isaian account is not the same as the one in the Greek myth either. Although Isaiah’s poem uses quite a number of images, it has its own integrity and is far from having the same nature as the Greek fable. Insufficient elements are present to establish an organic connection between the story in Isaiah and that in Phaeton’s myth. And even if some of the symbols were derived from a common source, it still would be necessary to ask if the meaning— in a new context—is the same or different from the other.

**Ugaritic**

Gunkel² was the first scholar to suggest (1895) that we might have in Isa 14 some material of Phoenician origin. In 1912 G. B. Gray³ mentioned Phoenicia with certain reserve. It was after the Ras-Shamra discoveries that the view that Isa 14:12-15 had been

---

¹Despite McKay’s (ibid., pp. 456-64) effort to justify the difference of gender of these two figures, the difference remains.  
²Schöpfund und Chaos, p. 134.  
³Isaiah I-XXXIX, p. 255.
inspired by Ugaritic mythology flourished. In 1932 Albright sug-
gested, in view of the striking similarity to the style of a
Canaanite epic, that the passage (vss. 13-15) was a quotation of
the Baal Epic.\(^1\) De Vaux admits that Isaiah is not a text parallel to
the Ras-Shamra material, but affirms that there are points of
contact between the two bodies of material.\(^2\) In his article on
Ps 82\(^3\) Morgenstern pointed out that the original myth for the
material of Isa 14:12-15 and other passages in the OT came from
the Northern Semites. Thus from the 1930s onwards the idea that
Canaanite material is behind our passage became the view of most
scholars.\(^4\) Grelot tried to reconstruct the myth by drawing
especially upon Greek and Ugaritic materials. Based on the root
and meaning of the proper names in different source materials in
their respective languages,\(^5\) in the hybris ambition and immoderate
attitude motives of the personages, he arrived at the conclusion
that the biblical prophet imitated a prototype of a Phoenician

\(^1\)"The North non-Canaanite Epic of 'Al'êyan Ba'al and Môt,"
that the Canaanite myth is quoted "almost verbatim." Cf. also
Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore: Johns
Hopkins University Press, 1942), p. 84, where 'Ashtar is related
to Helel; Albright held the same view in 1968 (Yahweh and the Gods
of Canaan, JLCR VII [London: Athlone Press (University of London),
1968], pp. 201-2); and Miller, The Divine Warrior, p. 23.

\(^2\)"Les Textes," p. 547.

\(^3\)"The Mythological Background," p. 112.

pp.19-48; W. H. Schmidt, Konigtum Gottes, p. 35; Schmidt thinks that
in Isa i4 there is a fusion of different kinds of mythical streams;
Mullen, The Assembly, p. 148, calls the passage a "highly Canaanized
dirge."

\(^5\)Phaeton, Eosphoros, 'Attar, Helel, being equated to the
morning-star, or the planet Venus.
myth. He added that, although it is found in variant forms, the same myth appears in the Greek, Ugaritic, and Israelite literature.  

There seems to be little doubt among the scholars that many terms in the Isaiah passage are very similar to the Ugaritic material and demonstrate points of contact. This they also expect since Israel occupied the land of the Canaanites and the two cultures were close in several aspects. But beyond the individual elements, it has been affirmed that Isa 14:12-15 is a quotation of the "Ashtar passages" in the Baal Epic texts.  

We now turn to an examination of those texts.

Ashtar texts. The most important Ugaritic text to give information about the mythic story of Ashtar is the one belonging to the called "Ba'al and Anath" cycle. After the death of Baal,
his sister Anath came back to El's dwelling and,

(40) She lifts up her voice and cries:
"Now let Asherah rejoice and her sons,
Elath and the band of her kinsmen;
For dead is Puissant Baal,
Perished the Prince, Lord of Earth."
Loudly El doth cry
To Lady Asherah of the Sea:
(45) "Hark, Lady A[sherah of the S]ea,
Give one of thy s[ons] I'll make king."
Quoth Lady Asherah of the Sea:
"Why, let's make Yadi Yalhan (yd' ylb') king."
Answered Kindly One El Benign:
(50) Too weakly.4 "He can't race with Baal,
Throw jav'lin with Dagon's Son Glory-Crown!"
Replied Lady Asherah of the Sea:
"Well, let's make it Ashtar the Tyrant;"
(55) "Let Ashtar the Tyrant be king."--
Straightway Ashtar the Tyrant
 Goes up to the Fastness of Zaphon
(And sits on Baal Puissant's throne.
(But) his feet reach not down to the footstool,
(60) Nor his head reaches up to the top.8

2 See CTA, p. 39, n. 6, for commentaries on the mutilation of this line, and bibliography.
3 C. Gordon (Ugaritic Literature: A Comprehensive Translation of the Poetic and Prose Texts SPIB 98 [Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1947], p. 44) has "one who knows how to govern"; see Grelot ("Isaie 14:12-15," p. 36, n. 2) for more comments on these terms.
4 dq anm--"One feeble of frame" (Gordon); "Petit encore" (Grelot).
5 Ktmsm--Gordon has "when the parley is finished . . . ."
6 ttr 'rz--". . . the terrible" (Gordon); "l'arrogant"
   (Grelot).
7 Srrt Spn--"the heights . . . ." (Gordon); Pope (p. 103),
   follows Ginsberg; Grelot renders it "les Sommets . . . ." Cf. Langhe,
   "Les Texts," 2:240. Sapan was Baal's holy mountain, and conversely he
   was the god of the mountain Sapan. Cf. Kapelrud, Baal, pp. 57-58.
8 apsh--see Pope, p. 72, for discussion of this term.
So Ashtar the Tyrant declares:
I'll not reign in Zaphon's Fastness!"
Down goes Ashtar the Tyrant,
Down from the throne of Baal Puissant,
(65) And reigns¹ in El's Earth,² all of it.

When we compare this text with the Isaianic passage we perceive that some elements could be presented, in both passages, which have some degree of similarity:

1. Ashtar³ is called a tyrant.⁴ Helel may also be referred to with a similar term (םַעַבְּע).⁵

2. Ashtar aspires to be king ("to sit on . . . throne"), to have supremacy.⁶ Helel aspires "to set his throne on high."⁷

3. Ashtar in pursuing his aspirations "goes up" to the fastness of Zaphon.⁸ Helel aspired to be enthroned "in the far north."¹⁰

³Grelot translates wymlk "Il va régner . . . ," expressing the intention of Ashtar.
²Grelot prefers "la terre du dieu" (referring to Baal, "Lord of the earth" [line 15]).
⁴'ttr 'rz, CTA 1:6.1.54-56, 62; ET in ANET³, p. 140.
⁵Isa 14:4-6, 12, 16-17. ⁶CTA 1:6.1.55, 68, 64. ⁷Isa 14:13.
⁸Grelot ("Isaie 14:12-15," p. 37) disagrees with Gordon and Ginsberg in rendering the 1 as a negative particle la (in Ashtar's statement:لام i bšrt spn), and proposes it to be the particle of affirmation lu (UH 18:1052 and 1053); this could be a fair possibility, despite the circumstances presented in lines 31-32.
⁹ššrt spn--CTA 1:6.1.57, 62. For identification of Zaphan geographically and in Canaanite literature, see Q. Eissfeldt, Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kastos und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer (Hale: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1932), pp. 1-65. Eissfeldt identified Ba'al Saphon with Southern Casius. Albright ("The Old Testament," p. 31, n. 88) and Dahood (Psalms, 1:290) have stated that the expression זוֹה יִשְׁרֵה is semantically equivalent to the Ugaritic Ššrt Spn. Mullen (p. 149) calls our attention to the interesting fact that "no tradition within Canaanite mythology associates the assembly..."
4. El appears three times in the text we are examining. In this text, as in the Ras-Shamra material in general, he is the supreme god of the Ugaritic pantheon. The Isaianic passage also has the term El once.

But if we have similarities between these two texts, we find also striking differences:

1. Ashtar strives—to replace Baal on his throne which became vacant by his death. Helel is not striving to replace a god who died, but is trying to supercede all with Ba'1 or his mountain, and 'El likewise is never associated with Sapan.' Cf. P. M. F. Abel, Géographie de la Palestine, 2 vols. (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1933-38), 1:385-86; 2:260; de Langhe, Les textes 2:217-44.

2. This expression appears also in Ps 48:3, and is considered as a reference to the Ugaritic material; cf. Gaster, Thespis (1950), p. 86; Dahood, Psalms 1:289-90. See de Langhe, Les Textes 2:239-42, for suggestions on the meaning of the expression. We discuss this in detail in the section on the biblical parallels.

3. For possible uses of El as a proper name in the Bible, see Cross, Canaanite Myth, pp. 44-46.

4. Lines 16, 22, 37.


6. Isa 14:13. The name of a god appears once more in the poem (vs. 5), which some scholars think, due to the poetic structure and the nature of the passage, is not original to the lament cf. Cobb, p. 22; Wildberger, pp. 533-34, 544; but Yahweh is mentioned.


8. For Baal's place in the pantheon, his character and task, see Kapelrud, Baal, pp. 86-93.
other "stars of El" and to be "like the most high." Thus in Ugarit the issue is the rulership of Baal, which is not given to Ashtar, but in Isaiah the issue is about the rulership of El.  

2. The goddesses Anath and Asherah are intermediaries between Ashtar and El; and their pretensions with reference to Ashtar are presented openly. Helel does not have any intermediary, he talks for himself, seemingly in a secret way ("in his heart").

3. Ashtar is not fit to occupy the throne because "his feet reach not down to the footstool, nor his head reaches up to the top." In the case of Helel the reason is not explicitly presented, but it seems that his attitude of self-sufficiency and arrogance could be identified as a likely factor.

4. Ashtar comes down from the throne of Baal and goes to reign in El's earth. Helel "is brought down to Sheol, to the depths of the pit." No rulership is involved after his fall.

In his efforts to identify Ashtar with Phaeton, and subsequently with Helel, Grelot presents another fragment of the

---

1 Isa 14:14: יִּלְלֵי. R. Dussaud (Les Decouverts de Ras Shamra, p. 170) thinks the word is attested in the Ras Shamra materials; Gordon does not include the term in his Ugaritic Handbook; Pope (El, pp. 55, 58) says that Elyon is not mentioned, but admits that the epithet 'ly could "be a reminiscence of Elyon in the extant Ugaritic texts." The term Elyon appears--joined to El--in the Sujin inscription. Cf. S. Ronzevalle, "Fragments d'inscriptions araméennes des environs d'Alep," MUSJ 15 (1931):235-60. Gaster, Thespis, p. 86, advocates that "'elyon in this passage need not mean 'the most high' but merely 'one of the upper gods'."

2 Cf. Fritz Stolz, p. 211.

3 Isa 14:13.

4 Lines 31-32.


6 Grelot ("Isaie 14:12-15," p. 38) suggests that the language of the biblical text related to Helel would be in a good situation at the moment of the enthronement.

7 Lines 35-37.

8 Isa 14:15.

9 Pp. 34-35.
Baal poems\(^1\)--where El requests that Kothar-wa-kha [sisj build a palace for his favorite children Yamm and Nahar. Ashtar shows his dissatisfaction with that decision and presents his complaints. This shows Ashtar's ambition, his impetuous nature, and his unreceptivity to advice. This text also shows a divine society full of rivalry and internal disputes. But the text contains crucial lacunae, especially where Ashtar was supposed to talk.\(^2\) His argument concerning the rivalry among the gods has small weight, since this is a common situation in many mythical materials. It pervades almost the whole of Ugaritic mythology and it would be difficult to present only the texts related to Ashtar as having that identifying characteristic.\(^3\)

Another text which has been used to identify the passage in Isaiah with the Ugaritic material is the poem about the birth of Dawn and Dusk or the birth of the gracious and beautiful gods.\(^4\) This brings the term Šbr\(^5\) (Dawn) alongside Šlm (Sunset)\(^6\) as

---

\(^1\) Gordon, UH, Text 129:1-24; ANET\(^3\), p. 129.

\(^2\) Lines 18-19.

\(^3\) Grelot ("Isaie 14:12-15," pp. 33-35) admits the precarious situation of this argument drawn from the text, and the general character of the parallelism he has tried to demonstrate.


\(^5\) See for the occurrences of the term in ancient literature, and the thesis that these two figures were astral deities, Gaster, Thespis, pp. 228-31.

\(^6\) Clifford (p. 165) thinks that "they are apparently the hypostases of Ashtar as Venus and "another indication of the single story ultimately behind both Isaiah 14 and CTA 6.1."
a name for a god who is a son of El, probably through his wife Asherah. Based on the information given in this text and others, Grelot has tried to solve the problem of the genealogy of Ashtar in a way that would fit it to the ones in the biblical and greek material, by advocating that Ashtar could be identified as son of the dawn. Although he sometimes places an over-reliance upon the mythological information—from which he himself recognizes we should not demand perfect coherence or immutability in the matter of genealogy—there is no great problem in accepting the fact that Ashtar came to be identified with Phaeton and, subsequently, with Venus, the morning star. However, the identification of the figure found in Isa 14:12-15—set in a single context free of so many names and the complicated situation so frequent in the Ugaritic material—with any one of the figures of the Ugaritic mythology—is a task which has not yet been successfully accomplished.

Some individual Ugaritic mythical expressions and the alleged parallels in Isaiah 14. Terms or expressions such as "Helel," "the stars of El," "the mount of assembly," and "above the heights of the clouds" have been presented as mythological references which make the Isaian passage dependent upon the Phoenician model:

1 Pp. 40-42.
2 Ibid., p. 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah</th>
<th>Ras Shamra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Helel Son of the Dawn&quot;, (~הלל ב-י)&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Daughters of Shouting&quot; (Gordon)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(דואות של בואנה&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;Daughters of Joyful noise&quot; (Ginsberg)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ktrt.bnt.hll.snnt)</td>
<td>(אשכנז בחינה&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Stars of El&quot; (~ב-יHz)</td>
<td>&quot;The stars [ ]&quot; (Gordon)⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ירח בע]-[ף)</td>
<td>(wllbbkn.kn[-])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Mount of Assembly&quot; (~ר-הצ'נ)</td>
<td>&quot;Convocation of Assembly&quot; (Gordon)⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ר-הצ'נ)</td>
<td>&quot;Assembled Body&quot; (Ginsberg)¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Above the heights of the Clouds,&quot; (~נ-י)&quot;</td>
<td>(ר-ק')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(נ-י)</td>
<td>&quot;Rider of the Clouds,&quot;¹³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Vs. 13. ²Ugaritic Literature, pp. 63, 64, 87, 88.
³ANET³, p. 150.
⁴CTA 1:17.2.27-40; CTA 1:24.5-6, 40-42. Cf. de Vaux, "Les Textes," p. 546. The term Hll (UH, 18, 598) is found in the Ugaritic pantheon as the father of the goddess Ktrt, and the term always appears in the stereotyped formula Ktrt.bnt.hll.snnt. On the meaning of the term, see Grelot, "Isaie 14:12-15," p. 22, n. 1; see also Ackerman (pp. 413-16), where he emphasizes--although without certainty--F. M. Cross' suggestion that bn Ślm (CTA 1:23.2, 22) could be an epithet of the gods of Dawn and Dusk and could bear some relation to Isa 14:12-15.
⁵Vs. 13. Pope (El, p. 103) translates "the highest stars," in which he is followed by G. Fohrer (Jesaja, 1:172).
⁶Ugaritic Literature, p. 61.
⁷CTA 1:23.1.54. T. H. Gaster ("A Canaanite Ritual Drama, the Spring Festival at Ugarit," JAOS 66 [1946]:54) and René Largement (La naissance de l'Aurore. Poème Mythologique de Ras Shamra—Ugarit, ALBO 2/11 [Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1949], p. 43) have wllbbkn.kn[m], "and to the fix[ed] stars."
⁸Vs. 13. ⁹Ugaritic Literature, pp. 13, 14; cf. UH 18, 1629.
¹¹CTA 1:2.1.14, 20, 31. See Pope, El, pp. 68-69 for discussion on the "11" of this text.
¹²Vs. 14.
¹³Ugaritic Literature, pp. 15, 18, 19; ANET³, pp. 132, 133, 137.
Kapelrud (Baal, p. 61) prefers "Driver of the Clouds," and Dahood (Psalms, 2:136) "The Mounter of the Clouds." rkb. <rpt is a poetic
Despite the scholars' efforts to identify Helel with the Ugaritic god Hl1,1 we do not find the term connected with any myth that could be offered as a parallel to the passage in Isaiah.2

Concerning the "Stars of El,"3 the alleged Ugaritic parallel text has a lacuna which does not allow us to know what the text once said, although the expression "stars sons of El" would fit the context of the myth. Grelot suggests Job 38:7, where the "morning stars" are in parallel to the "sons of Elohim," as another allusion to this myth;4 but because of the interchange in use in the OT5 of El and Yahweh to identify the true God, and the use, by Daniel,6 of expressions such as "host of heaven" and "host of the stars" in expression which is only used in parallelisms (see Kapelrud, Baal, p. 61).

1^CTA 1:2.4.8; 1:3.2.40; 1:3.3.35; 1:4.3.11: 1:4.5.122; 1:5.2.7; etc.
2^The meaning of the term is discussed in chapter 3.
3^For El in the Semitic languages and in the OT, as well as for a good bibliography, see F. M. Cross, ">£ X," TDOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 1:242-61; Canaanite Myth, pp. 3-75. We deal with this term in more detail in the exegesis of the Isaianic passage in chapter 3.

4"Isaie 14:12-15," p. 21; Clifford (The Cosmic Mountain, p. 161) says that "they (stars of El) are to be identified with the members of the divine assembly." Albright (Yahweh and the Gods, p. 202, n. 69) identifies the "stars of El" as the circumpolar northern stars which never set. Cf. also Cross, Canaanite Myth, p. 45.


6Dan 8:10.
an Israelite context, it is not necessary to think that the Isaianic expression "the stars of El" is an allusion to the Canaanite myth.

The expression "the mount of assembly," which demands a "divine council" or "assembly of gods," seems to be a "common religious motive in the cultures of Egypt, Mesopotamia, Canaan, Phoenicia and Israel."\(^1\) There is evidence in the OT for a heavenly assembly or council presided over by God and composed of created beings,\(^2\) but Israel's concept of a divine assembly—although it had some similarity with the one of the surrounding cultures—was utilized in different ways.\(^3\)

Several scholars have studied the Ugaritic material related to the "sacred mountain," or "mount of assembly,"\(^4\) and R. Clifford has made his research on the ancient Near Eastern religious element... 


\(^3\) The assembly in the Bible was composed of angels, created beings; while in the neighboring cultures it was formed by gods. Cf. Miller, Divine Warrior, p. 66; Clifford, pp. 139-81.

of "the Cosmic Mountain"\(^1\) in Canaan and the OT. His conclusions were that "mountains played an important role in the religious thought of the ancient Near East of the first and second millennia" (B.C.);\(^2\) "the holy mountains held their sacredness from specific beliefs. The mountain could be the meeting place of the divine assembly"; "under the presidency of El, the high god, decisions were made about divine power which affected the order and running of the cosmos and the life of the individual believer"; "the conflict evident in life was a reflection of primal events on the mountain."\(^3\) The mountains were cosmic in these and other senses.

It was also found that "elements of the Canaanite traditions of the mountains of El have influenced Israelite traditions of Sinai... where Yahweh issues His decrees, although the divine assembly plays no role in the Exodus tradition."\(^4\) On Sinai Yahweh has His tent—a copy of His heavenly one—which mediates His presence to His people. One must emphasize, however, the interesting fact that after the Israelites left Baal Zaphon\(^5\) (Gebel Ataqah), they go south to Sinai.\(^6\) Could it be a deliberate contrast chosen by Yahweh?

Baal's mountain Zaphon is a place of combat in which issues

\(^1\)See his definitions in The Cosmic Mountain, pp. 3, 7, 33, 97, 190.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 190.

\(^3\)Clifford, p. 191. For location of El's dwelling, see Cross, Canaanite Myth, pp. 36-39.

\(^4\)Clifford, p. 191; see also pp. 107, 123, 180-81.

\(^5\)Exod 14:2.

\(^6\)I am indebted to Dr. William Shea for this observation.
of life and death are decided,\(^1\) and Mount Zion becomes the new Zaphon.\(^2\)

After examining the Ugaritic and Israelite material on the "Divine Council" and "Mount of Assembly," we find that both sources present the "assembly of the gods (or divine beings)." In Ugarit the assembly is formed by gods presided over by El, the head of the Ugaritic pantheon; in Israel Yahweh presides over the council formed by angels.

The elements of the traditions of the Ugaritic mount of El—where the god dwells and where the assembly meets, and issues that affect the universe are decided—and Baal's mountain, Zaphon (a combat place where issues of life and death are decided), have influenced the phraseology the Israelites employ in their traditions of Zion. In Ugarit and Israel earthly holy mountains are connected with the holy mountains in the heavenly sphere. A major difference here, however, is that El is frightened by the attacks from lesser gods, and Baal has periodical defeat on their mountains, but Yahweh is never afraid or defeated on His holy mountain without His personal agreement. It thus becomes a symbol of the secure place.

Summarizing we would say that there are similarities and differences between the two sources of material on the matter that lead us to believe, with Cross,\(^3\) that the religion of Israel is not

\(^1\)Clifford, pp. 97, 137-70, 192.

\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 131-40, 153-60, 192.

\(^3\)Canaanite Myth, p. viii; Cross criticizes Yehezkel Kaufmann (The Religion of Israel, trans. Moshe Greenberg [Chicago: University Press, 1960], p. 2) for insisting that Israelite religion "was absolutely different from anything the pagan world ever knew," saying that his attitude "violates fundamental postulates of scientific historical method."
an "isolated phenomenon, radically or wholly discontinuous with its environment." Although we agree to some extent with Kaufmann that "foreign elements did not play a substantial, creative role in the formation of the popular culture" of Israel, we cannot avoid the fact that there are in the Hebrew traditions mythical phraseology which is found in other traditional sources, as, for example, Ugaritic. Whether they "are common elements in myths and customs of different peoples due to common circumstances or something basic to human nature," or "are to be explained as the result of diffusion from an original source," we do not totally know. On the other hand, as Gowan says, "to establish areas of cultural continuity is not necessarily to determine the meaning of the symbols involved for the people who used them."

Baal's epithet, "rider of the clouds," appears several times in Ugaritic literature and recalls to us the expression "heights of

---

1The Religion of Israel, p. 3. 2Gowan, p. 53.

3Ibid.; Gowan prefers the former view, although he sees an effective diffusion within the Middle East.

4Ibid.

5Baal probably has this epithet because in being a fertility god, the rain-god, he is commanded to go down to the earth and take along wind, clouds, and storm. Says Kapelrud (Baal, p. 94), "Rain, storm and clouds were no accidental or occasional attributes of Baal. They were parts of his whole character and to such an extent that he had to take them with him even when he was obliged to descend into the earth. The close connection of the rain with Baal could give it its poetical name: the rain of the Rider of Clouds, rbb. rkb 'rpt, mentioned parallel with the dew of heaven and the fat of earth [§]l. Šmm. Šmm. aršnt:II:39f."

6Fourteen times. See p. 92, n.14 for texts where the expression occurs.
the clouds" of Isa 14:14. However the Isaianic passage is talking about Helel ben Shahar, who undoubtedly is not Baal. Cloud imagery is very often used in the OT, including passages where God is presented as one "who rides upon the clouds," 

"(who) is riding on a swift cloud," "who makes the clouds His chariots." Ps 68:34 refers to the one who "rides in the heavens, the ancient heavens," and Ps 18:11 presents, "He rode on a cherub, and flew, he came swiftly upon the wings of the wind." The two verses which follow show that his flight was through his clouds.

Grelot has observed that "בניא ne désigne pas ici (semble-t-il)"

The expression could refer only to the height, or that the figure wanted to ascend "upon the backs of the clouds," i.e., as Baal and Yahweh (Ps 68:4; 104:3). Cf. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography I," Bib 44 (1963):302; C. Fensham ("Winged Gods and Goddesses in the Ugaritic Tablets," Or Ant 5 [1966]:161) affirms that the expression "has nothing to do with a flying Baal with wings, but rather with a charioteer who drives the clouds of heaven."


1 The expression could refer only to the height, or that the figure wanted to ascend "upon the backs of the clouds," i.e., as Baal and Yahweh (Ps 68:4; 104:3). Cf. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography I," Bib 44 (1963):302; C. Fensham ("Winged Gods and Goddesses in the Ugaritic Tablets," Or Ant 5 [1966]:161) affirms that the expression "has nothing to do with a flying Baal with wings, but rather with a charioteer who drives the clouds of heaven."


4 רָדָב בֵּעַרְבֵּרָה , Isa 19:1.

5 מִןָּבֵעְּרַבְּרָה , Ps 104:3.

6 רָדָב בֵּעַרְבֵּרָה .

7 רָדָב בֵּעַרְבֵּרָה רַעְמַי רַעְמַי עַל-כַּפָּי הָאָד. 
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les nuées en mouvement, portentes de la pluie fécondante, mais plutôt la nue immobile où se dissimule le tréfonds du ciel (yarrkethé ṣaphon!)."¹ Thus the possibility of borrowing should not be pressed.

As we said above, cloud imagery is often used in the OT, and more than half of those instances associate clouds with the manifestation or intervention of Yahweh. Luzzarraga concludes that "the coming on" the clouds is an exclusively divine attribute (Isa 19:1, Ps 104:3, etc.).² When the prophet uses the cloud imagery in the Isaian text, he seems to be aware of the fact that Helel in his pretensions wanted to usurp the divine prerogatives, to be on a level that only God could occupy. Taking into account the nature of the description and the contextual setting, and the common use of cloud imagery, it seems more logical to think that even though there could have been some similarity in the use of terms and pictures due to cultural continuity or common elements in the ancient Near Eastern area, the Hebrew material and prior biblical parallels may well have been the source (if a source was necessary) for the prophet's terminology or imagery.

Biblical Literature

Since the times of the Church Fathers, some Bible Interpreters have identified the figure of the Isaian passage as Satan. This interpretation has, in all probability, been affected by the presence of this view in pseudepigraphical³ as well canonical

¹"Isaie 14:12-15," p. 28, n. 4. ²Luzzarraga, p. 201. ³As, for example, 1 Enoch 86.1. See Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background," pp. 95-105, for more discussion on them.
literature. Here those biblical passages which are older than or contemporary to the Isaian one are considered a possible source for some Church Fathers' concepts found on this passage.

There is no doubt that the passage which resembles Isa 14 most (as has been perceived since the times of the Church Fathers) is Ezek 28; but since that text is going to be studied along with the Isaian passage in the next chapter, it does not need to be considered here.

In his studies on the mythological background of Ps 82, Morgenstern arrived at the conclusion that there were at least two myths that "had been current for a considerable period" of time in Israelite circles. As evidence for this, he suggests a relationship with passages such as Gen 6:1-4, Ps 82, Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19. Let us consider briefly the first two passages.

**Gen 6:1-4**

This passage has been a matter of debate from the beginning of the Christian Era—if not before. Scholars are far from

---


2 The myth of the "fallen ones" (Morgenstern, "Mythological Background," pp. 86-88, 106-14) which had developed in two "different and quite divergent versions": (a) the sin of the fallen angels consisted in "refusal to obey God's command and do homage to Adam because of his having been created in God's image"; (b) the sin of "rebellion against the Deity and Satan's attempt to set his throne above the clouds . . . and to supplant . . . the ruler of the universe" (pp. 107-8). The other myth, which Morgenstern thinks Gen 6:1-3 relates to more closely, was the one concerning the consort between angels who came from heaven with human women in the times of Noah.

3 See also Mullen, pp. 238-44, who adhered to the same idea.

reaching a consensus on the interpretation of this text.¹

Morgenstern in his study has used the root כָּאָרָה (Gen 6:4), which also appears in Ps 82:7 and Isa 14:12, as the connecting point between those passages. He thinks they were developed from the myth of the fallen angels. Such a connection with Gen 6:1-4 may be possible, but that still would not provide evidence for the origin of the concept found in Isa 14 and Gen 6. Most of Morgenstern's

¹See, for comprehensive bibliography on the passage, C. Westerman, Genesis 2:491-93, 500-17. Exegetes have advanced four main interpretations concerning this passage: (1) The Angel interpretation, which sees the "Sons of God" who sinned with the "daughters of man" as being angels. This view is the oldest one and was held by a great number of Church Fathers and many contemporary scholars today such as U. Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, 2 vols., trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1961), pp. 291-96; Zimmerli (1 Mose 1-11, ZBK [Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1967], pp. 261-66); G. von Rad (Genesis, OTL [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961], pp. 109-12), etc. For more comments and bibliography, see also: Closen, Die Sünde der "Söhne Gottes," p. 1; Jesus Enciso, "Los 'Hijos de Dios' en Gn 6:1-4," Est Bib 3 (1944):189-227; F. Dexinger, Sturz der Göttersöhne oder Engel vor der Sintflut? WBTTh, 13 (Vienna: Herder & Co., 1966). (2) The Mythology Interpretation, which interprets the phrase "sons of God" as referring to "divine beings." Starting with Gunkel, (Genesis, p. 51), this view has been exposed by several distinguished scholars such as: Chlids, Myth and Reality, p. 49; G. Cooke, "The Sons of (the) God(s)," pp. 22-47; W. H. Schmidt, "Mythos im Alten Testament," EvTh 27 (1967):237-54; O. Loretz, Schöpfung und Mythos SBS 32 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968), pp. 32-48, and others. (3) The Nobles (rulers) Interpretations, which advocates that the "sons of God" were members of the noble families who married women of humble social level, "The daughters of men." Among the defenders of this view we have M. Kline ("Divine Kingship and Genesis 6:1-4," WTJ 24 [1962]:187-204); for another suggested link of this passage with kingship, see E. G. Kraeling, "The Significance and Origin of Gen 6:1-4," JNES 6 (1947):193-208. (4) The Pious and Wicked Mixed Marriage Interpretation, which interprets the expression "Sons of God," to mean the godly men descendants of Seth and the "daughters of men" are understood as the rest of the people, or specifically the Cainites. Among the supporters of this view we find G. E. Closen, H. C. Leupold (Exposition of Genesis [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1956], pp. 249-60); J. Murray (Principles of Conduct [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957], pp. 243-49); etc.
argument is based on what extra-biblical writers have said about the passage in Genesis, and that literature was written many years after the Isaiah's time.

Psalm 82

In his study Morgenstern arrived at the conclusion that Ps 82 pictures the judgment procedure of Yahweh in the assembly of the gods or angels—members of the host of heaven—upon the new year's day. On this occasion he pronounces their punishment or fate, which was the loss of immortality. According to Morgenstern, the background of part of this Psalm was of Canaanite origin and came from a myth—

1 The date of the material of the Psalm is very much debated; W. Schmidt (Königtum Gottes, p. 41) thinks it is very ancient; J. S. Ackerman (pp. 441-42) maintains that this Psalm originated in the pre-monarchical period; Dahood supports the view. S. Mowinckel (The Psalms in Israel's Worship, trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962], 1:221) assigns the Psalm to the later monarchy period. O. Eissfeldt (Introduction, p. 111) ascribes it to David's time; A. Gonzales, "Le Psaume LXXXII," VT 13 (1963):309; Morgenstern, "Mythological Background," p. 121.


3 He advocates that vss. 2-4 do not belong to the original Canaanite poem, and vs. 5 was an addition to connect vss. 2-4 to vss. 6-7; and vs. 8 was not an integral part of the original Psalm. The redaction was made in order to adapt it for incorporation into the official liturgy of the Jerusalem Temple and to remove the story of the crime of the fallen angels which was adverse to the ethical standard of the people after the exile. The material (vss. 2-5a) about the denunciation of the corrupt earthly judges would be more appropriate to the setting. For a survey of the interpretation of this Psalm, see E. G. Wright, The Old Testament, pp. 3-41. Among those who defend the integrity of the passage are T. O. Callaghan ("A Note on the Canaanite Background of Psalm 82," CBQ 15 [1953]:311-14) who also uses Ugaritic parallels and states that vss. 2-4 belong to the original poem and increases our respect for the transmission of the consonantal text. Cf. also ibid., "Echoes of Canaanite Literature in the Psalms," VT 4 (1954):173-74; Gonzalez, "Le Psaume 82," pp. 293-309; and R. J. Tournay ("Les Psaumes Complexes," RB 56 [1949]:50-53), who thinks the passage is well preserved (also Kraus, Psalmen, 2:509) and that Morgenstern's exegesis
which had developed itself in several versions—which talked about the fall of certain angels from heaven because of disobedience or rebellion. He goes on to say that it is impossible not to identify this older version of the myth with that of the fall of Helel ben Shahar in Isa 14:12-14. He contends that the phrase "in vs. 7 would be metrically perfect, and would unquestionably be far more vigorous and effective than the present reading. Thus to a certain extent, Morgenstern's contention is that Ps 82 and Isa 14:12-15 are parallel.

is very exaggerated. The most thorough study on Psalm 82 is Ackerman's dissertation on the exegesis of those eight verses; he correctly defends the integrity of the passage.

M. Tsevat (pp. 123-34) makes an interesting interpretation of this Psalm, saying that "the Psalm offers no textual or linguistic difficulties" (p. 126), and "Psalm 82 shares with Deut 32 the myth of the 'allotment' of the nations, whose number He determined by the number of the sons of 'God/El'... (see Deut 32:8-9; cf. Tsevat, pp. 132-33)... Ps 82 must be seen as a historical Psalm, historic in the sense that whatever its date, the thought expressed in it represents a watershed in the history of ideas. The poem presents two views of the gods, an earlier one and a later one, the former and prevailing one yielding dramatically to the new and true one. It centers on a vision of the divine council, the visionary response to the judgment made in that council, and judgment and response together herald the end of paganism" (p. 134). See also Tsevat's statement on "actuality" and "nonactuality," p. 125.

1Pp. 95-114. The versions, he says, were originally independent.

2Ibid., p. 108. He views Ezek 28:11-16 as referring to the same myth.

3See Tsevat (p. 131) for criticism of Morgenstern's interpretation. He affirms that "the psalm text hardly bears the weight of this (Morgenstern's) exegesis... If Ps 8 in its mythology makes reference to another myth the name of whose chief protagonist (be it Helel ben Sahar or another) was generally known, this name could hardly remain unmentioned in our Psalm passage because its bearer is to serve as an example (cf. Isa 65:15); anonymous examples are not likely to be exemplars." Mullen (pp. 241-42) also criticizes Morgenstern's interpretation and proposes an alternative suggestion such as having "shining ones" for בם and "Adam" for אדם, as a reference to the revolt of the first man against God.

4At least four interpretations have been proposed concerning...
Morgenstern has been criticized for this view because of the way he tears the "composition to pieces on tenuous evidence in order to rebuild it according to his own notions." He has in view the unsatisfactory literal interpretation of Psalm 82, which was drawn, using Wright's words, from "the large amount of evidence in the OT for the heavenly assembly or council, presided over by the beings condemned to death in the Psalm: (1) they are Israeliite rulers and judges; (2) they are the rulers and judges of the nations; (3) they are gods, members of the divine assembly; (4) they are a combination of the second and third combinations presented above. For a discussion of the interpretations presented, see Ackerman, pp. 1-78; Hans W. Jüngling, Der Tod der Götter, SBS 38 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969), pp. 11-37; and Mullen, pp. 228-38. The fourth interpretation does not destroy the unity of the text as does Morgenstern's view, neither does it apply the passage totally on the earthly or human realm. Mullen's conclusions are that vs. 7 is the climax of the psalm and may reflect a myth of the revolt of the gods in heaven," although he believes that "this revolt is not the reason for their condemnation," but "the myth of the rebellious gods is used here, however, to emphasize the fate of the gods who failed to carry out their appointed functions" (p. 238).


2Such as, for example, Wright's, pp. 34-41; he uses several resorts such as the occurrence of syncretism and the figurative use of the language to justify his views. Here would be in order H. W. Robinson's "The Council," p. 151, warning: "One of the chief perrils in the exegesis of ancient writings is that we should take figuratively that which in origin was meant quite realistically. It is easy to forget that the whole outlook of the ancient writer was in important respects very different from our own. He could say and mean something which it would be impossible for us to say and mean in any literal sense, just because of the mass of knowledge, or of half-knowledge, which enters into the modern Weltanschauung and sharply separates it from that of the ancient world. To realize this, in its many ramifications, requires laborious patience and constant watchfulness. Even the professed student will often take the short cut of calling the ancient usage a figure of speech. That can be perilous, not only because it can rob us of the deeper historical meaning, but..."
over by God and composed of divine attendents, heralds, and administrators." In addition Morgenstern added to the context of vss. 1, 6-7 passages such as 1 Kgs 22:19-23 (= 2 Chr 18:18-21); Job 1:6-12 and 2:1-7a, etc. We tend to view Ps 82 as offering parallel elements to Isa 14:12-15. Isa 14:13 talks about the "mount of assembly" as a place where the Most High sits enthroned. Ps 82:1 speaks about God taking His place in the "Divine Council." Isa 14:12-15 speaks about someone who lived in heaven and tried to usurp God's prerogatives, but who is said to have been thrown to the earth and then to the depths of the pit, or grave. This means that figure would, sooner or later, meet death. Ps 82:6-7 speaks because it opens the way to quite arbitrary uses of the word or words in question."


1The Old Testament, pp. 32-33. See also Robinson, "The Council," pp. 151-57; Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background," pp. 40-43; Mullen, pp. 113-20. The divine council is designated in the OT by the terms, מֵרָאָתָן מִרְּאוֹת (Job 15:8); בְּרוּסָתְךָ בֵּרֹעָתָךָ (Ps 89:8); מֶרְאוֹת בָּרוּסָתְךָ (Jer 23:18, cf. vs. 22); בֵּרֹעָתְךָ בְּרוּסָתְךָ (Ps 89:6); מֵרָאָתָן מֵרָאָת (Ps 82:1). The members of the Council are called, בְּרֹעָתְךָ בְּרֹעָתְךָ (Gen 6:2, 4; Job 1:6, 2:1); בְּרוּסָתְךָ בְּרוּסָתְךָ (Deut 32:8); בֵּרֹעָתְךָ בֵּרֹעָתְךָ (Ps 29:1); בֵּרֹעָתְךָ בֵּרֹעָתְךָ (Ps 82:6); בְּרֹעָתְךָ בְּרֹעָתְךָ (Ps 97:7). For the use of מֵרָאָת as meaning "assembly" or "council" in Amos 8:14 and other biblical passages, as well as in ancient Near Eastern literature, see Frank J. Neuberg, "An Unrecognized Meaning of Hebrew Dor," JNES 9 (1950):215-17; P. R. Ackroyd, "The Meaning of Hebrew מֵרָאָת Considered," JSS 13 (1968):3-10. See also 1 Kgs 22:19-23; 2 Chr 18:18-21; Isa 6:1-8, 24:21-22. As scholars have pointed out, the terminology designating the assembly and the members of the divine council in Ugaritic and Hebrew are mentioned in similar terms, showing a common tradition. For comments on those terms in both literatures, see Wright, p. 33; Cross, "The Council," pp. 274-77; Miller, pp. 12-23, 66-74.

2Mullen's (pp. 226-44) interpretation of Ps 82 which suggests that "the beings condemned to die (vs. 7) are gods (בְּרֹעָתְךָ בְּרֹעָתְךָ), the members of Yahweh's council, and not human rulers or judges" is attractive and less hurtful to the text than Morgenstern's.

3And Ezek 28.
about some members of the Divine Council,\(^1\) who because of some fault\(^2\) would die like men,\(^3\) or become mortal.\(^4\)

**Individual Elements**

As far as the individual elements and terms of the Isaian passage are concerned, we find biblical parallels for several. We have already mentioned the cloud imagery, which is very often used in the OT;\(^5\) the "stars of God (El)" "are to be identified with the members of the divine assembly,"\(^6\) which are present in passages such as Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7; Ps 29:1, 82:1, 6-7; etc. The imagery of "bringing down" or "going down to the grave" and the "depths of the pit," found in vs. 15, occurs in Ps 88:4-6,\(^7\) and Ezek 26:20; the expression נַרְדָּתָה occurs also in Ezek...

---

\(^1\) For the function of the assembly or divine council in Mesopotamian, Ugaritic, and Israelite thought, see Miller, pp. 12-23, 66-73; Mullen, pp. 175-209, 226-44.

\(^2\) Mesopotamian, Ugaritic, and Israelite depictions of the heavenly assembly present the leader of the council as the one who pronounces the judgment upon gods and men. See ref. n. 1 above.

\(^3\) Or "like Adam," Mullen, p. 230.

\(^4\) Yahweh is judge of human beings as well as of divine beings; see Job 4:17-18; Isa 24:21. Cf. Mullen, pp. 226-44 (esp. p. 236), who presents helpful parallels from Ugaritic and Mesopotamia--on the punishment of the gods because of their failure to exert justice in behalf of the oppressed ones--in relation to the Hebrew thought; he supports Morgenstern's view in the aspect of the heavenly assembly.

\(^5\) See above pp. 96-98.

\(^6\) Clifford, p. 161, n. 84.

\(^7\) We do not know for sure the date this psalm was written (Briggs [Psalms, 2:244], based on the content and following ancient commentators, explains this psalm as a "national lament during the extreme distress of the exile"; cf. also Jacquet, pp. 670, 674), but the imagery was current in the Israelite milieu.
Concerning vss. 13ab and 14b, the hybris attitude was a common one in the ancient Near East, and Israel was no exception to this.  

An element of the Isaian passage which has been much discussed is רָּבָה יִצְבָּא. The term רָּבָה יִצְבָּא occurs almost 200 times in the OT, and in most cases is used to indicate one of the cardinal points of the compass. The expression רָּבָה יִצְבָּא appears five times in the OT: Ps 48:3, Ezek 38:6, 15, 39:2, and in our passage. In the three passages of Ezek where the final victory of Yahweh over the nations is described, an invasion against the people of God is carried out by Gog––the identification of whom is not known––whose kingdom is located in the "uttermost pasts of Saphon." In these passages the prophet does not mention anything which would identify the kingdom of Gog with Mt. Casius; and in 39:2 it is said that Yahweh would "drive (Gog) forward, and bring him up (נָלֵל) from the uttermost parts of צִבָּא." If the references were to a mountain, the verb would be "bring down" (ורָבָה).  

---

1See also Lam 3:55, where a synonym of the term רָּבָה יִצְבָּא is used with equivalent meaning.

2See Gowan (pp. 75-92) where extra-biblical and biblical examples are discussed.

3The modern English translations render "the far north" (RSV); "the utmost heights of the sacred mountain" (NIV); "farthest sides of the north" (NKJV); "recesses of the north" (NASV).

4Eissfeldt (Baal Zaphan, pp. 11-17) has advocated the view that the biblical צִבָּא of passages such as Ps 48:3, Isa 14:13, Ezek 32:30, etc., has the meaning given to צִבָּא of the Ugaritic texts, and refers to Mount Casius. Cf. also Gray (Legacy, pp. 287-88) who sees in these passages echoes of the Canaanite mythology. De Langhe (Les textes de Ras Shamra, pp. 231-44) rejects Eissfeldt's proposition.

In comparing the Ezekiel passages with Isa 14:13, we perceive that in the latter the expression could have two possible meanings: (1) "In the uttermost parts of Saphon" (or "In the extreme north"), (2) "On the utmost heights of Saphon" (or "on the summit of Saphon"). It is true that parallel expressions in the passage favor the vertical sense; and the antithesis makes it harder to reject it.

Although the terminology is the same in Isaiah and Ezekiel, the meaning of the expression differs between them.

In Ps 48:1-3, we read:

Great is the Lord and greatly to be praised
In the city of our God.
His holy mountain, beautiful in elevation,
Is the joy of all the earth.

Mount Zion, in the far north (רְבָּךְ הָרֶשֶׁם רְבָּךְ הָרֶשֶׁם)
the city of the great king.
Within her citadels God
Has shown himself a sure defense.

1Clifford (pp. 161-62, n. 85) views not as parallel to the Mount of Assembly, but to a mountain (dwelling of God) to "heaven".... It is easy to imagine the development of the meaning of Zaphon, under Israelite impulse, from 'mountain (dwelling of God)' to 'heavens (dwelling of God)'. See also H. L. Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon in Isaiah after 715 B.C.," JAOS 88 (1968):51. J. J. M. Roberts ("Sâpôn in Job 26:7," Bib 56 [1975]:554-57) criticizes Clifford and takes Zaphon as parallel to "Mount of Assembly." Cf. also Mullen, p. 148, n. 64, and Dahood, Psalms 1:290, who supports Roberts.

2For the origin and meaning of כֵּסִיסֵי, see de Langhe, Les Texts, 2:240; Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background," pp. 79-80; Dahood, Psalms 1:289-90.

3The date for the composition of this Psalm is much debated among the scholars, and ranges from the time of Senacherib to the immediate pre-Maccabean period. See Morgenstern, "Psalms 48," HUCA 16 (1941):1-5; 23ff., for discussion of the matter.
In one of the most extensive articles on Ps 48\(^1\) Morgenstern discusses Jewish ideas about the cosmic north; his conclusions can be summarized in his own words:

From all this evidence it is clear that from about the end of the sixth century B.C. on there was a positive tendency in Jewish circles to identify various sacred mountains of Jewish tradition, and particularly the Temple Mount, with the mythological Șafon in precisely the same manner as a thousand years earlier the people of Ugarit in their literature identified their sacred mountain, Casios, with Șafon, as the people of southeastern Syria and northern Palestine seem also to have identified Hermon with Șafon, and in somewhat the same manner as the Babylonians seem to have envisaged Șafon in their seven-staged temple-towers. Actually it would appear that this identification of the Temple Mount with Șafon would be easier and more ready to hand than the identification of almost any other sacred mountain with Șafon.\(^2\)

As de Langhe says,\(^3\) the poet does not want to say that the holy Mount Zion can be found or is located in the "farthest north" or that it is very high, but presents Zion as the true mount of God, in contrast with Zaphon, the Semitic Olympus, which the pagans believed to be the mountain of the gods. "Mount Zion is to Yahwism what Mount Zaphon (present-day Mount Cassius) is to Canaanite religion; namely, the dwelling of God and the most hallowed spot of the land," observes Dahood.\(^4\) Isa 2:2-5 and Mic 4:1 show that the idea of Zion as the highest mountain was not unknown to the prophets. Gaster has affirmed that "the Hebrew expression רֵיחַ הָאָרֶץ (mushè ūaron) is ... employed in exactly the same way [as

\(^1\)"Mythological Background," pp. 1-95.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 85.  
\(^3\)Les Textes, 2:242.

\(^4\)Psalms, 1:289-90. Some have suggested that the Psalm could be referring to the theme of Zion being the "navel of the earth." See Gaster, Thespis (1966), p. 183, for bibliography on the matter.
in Ps 48:2] in Isaiah 14:13-14."¹ Although the terms employed are the same, and both have some mythic coloring, it is not correct to use the phrase "in exactly the same way"² as Gaster does. Isaiah gives it a different dimension, and this aspect is studied in detail in chapter 3.

Although some linguistic parallels can be found between Isa 14 and these other passages, and they may contain some mythological coloring, the way and dimension in which יְהֵלֶל בֶּן שָׁחַר is used by Isaiah is different.

Conclusions

1. The investigation into extra-biblical literature from Mesopotamian, Hittite, Greek, and Ugaritic areas has revealed that there is no such a thing as a myth of Helel ben Shahar which reflects the Isaian account in its totality.

2. On the other hand it seems clear that in expressing his message in the lament against that curious being, the author of the passage made use of the imagery of Venus, the morning Star which shows itself in certain periods of the dawn but vanishes by the time the sun rises. A knowledge of the behavior of Venus is well attested in some cultures of the ancient world, and it has been taken up into the expression of their myths: Greek (Phaeton); Ugarit (Attar).

3. Some elements present in the Isaian lament ("mount of assembly," "utmost heights of the north," etc.) are also found in

¹Thespis (1950), p. 86. Cf. also Kraus, Psalmen, 1:343.
²Thespis (1950), p. 86.
other ancient Near Eastern literatures—especially in Ugarit—but then are found in the biblical literature in a context free from the polytheistic nature of the extra-biblical material. It seems that the similarities in the use of the terms and pictures are due to the cultural continuity or common elements in the ancient Near Eastern area; but the biblical prophet used the imagery and elements known in his times—biblical or extra-biblical—and applied them in the context and purposes he thought would better express God's given message.

4. It seems that the event described in Isa 14 would transcend the historical realm and has some implications related to one of the heavenly council members.

5. Ezek 28 is the passage that most resembles the Isaianic passage. The comparison of the two passages is made in detail in the next chapter.

Ezekiel 28

It was at the close of the nineteenth century that scholars started to suggest that material of Ezek 28 had been borrowed (1) from Gen 3, (2) from a Babylonian source, or (3) from a Phoenician myth.

A Bertholet, Das Buch Hesekiel, pp. 147; Kraetzschmar, p. 217; see above, p. 40., n. 3, for additional exponents of this view.


Matthews, p. 105; Yaron, pp. 51-53; Fohrer (Ezechiel, p.
Gunkel\(^1\) holds that its traditions are not originally Israelite, but since it relates to traditions common to the whole Near East, direct borrowing should not be assumed.

Concerning the first oracle (vss. 1-10),\(^2\) scholars have focused their observations—related to possible borrowing derivation or relationship to mythical material—especially on vss. 2 and 3.\(^3\) Vs. 2 talks about the prince of Tyre who said he was \(\text{םלוע}^4\) and sat in the heart of the seas. Vs. 3 presents the prince as being wiser than \(\text{םלוע}^5\).

\[\text{םלוע}^4\]

It has been long recognized that the Semitic word \(\text{םלוע}\) is found in almost all the Semitic languages as the generic term for "god." It occurs commonly as a theophorous element in proper names.\(^4\) Many scholars had suggested the existence of El as the proper name of a specific deity,\(^5\) but it was the discoveries of the Ugaritic mythological texts that confirmed that view beyond any doubt.\(^6\) In

162) suggested that the myth of the Garden of Elohim was originally from Mesopotamia, and later was identified with Eden in Israelite tradition; he adds that Ezekiel could possibly have enriched the Canaanite-Phoenician myth with Babylonian motifs or vice-versa. See also Pulley, pp. 13-15, for some refutations of the idea that the Ezekiel passage originated from any specific pagan myth. Cf. also McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions . . . ," pp. 322-23.

1\(^1\) Genesis, p. 32.


3\(^3\) See Pope, pp. 12-13; McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions," p. 325; Yaron, p. 54; Clifford, pp. 168-73.

4\(^4\) See Pope, El, pp. 1-8.

5\(^5\) Ibid., pp. 3-8.

6\(^6\) See Eissfeldt, El im Ugaritischen Pantheon, pp. 7-10; cf. also Pope, El, pp. 5-8.
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the Canaanite texts El is also the personal name for the head of the Ugaritic pantheon.\(^1\)

In the OT we find \(\text{El}\) used—besides the use in proper names—about 226 times.\(^2\) It could refer to the God of Israel as well as a heathen god.\(^3\) Pope, following Cassuto, says that "in prose when \(\text{El}\) refers to the God of Israel it is usually grammatically determined by the article, the possessive suffix, a genitive or an attributive, or another divine name," but "in poetry . . . \(\text{El}\) is used without the article or other adjunct in the function of a proper name."\(^4\) Although the article is omitted in poetry,\(^5\) and it is difficult to apply Cassuto's grammatical rule there, it seems that we can more or less determine most of the references which are applied to the God of Israel, and the few which could allude to a heathen god.\(^6\)

Concerning Ezek 28:2a,\(^7\) Cassuto\(^8\) believes that El (in


\(^3\)See Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh," pp. 26-30, for use of El as proper name in the OT; also Pope, El, p. 12, who affirms, "In view of the fact that it is now assured that \(\text{El}\) was anciently, at Ugarit and elsewhere, the proper name of a specific and very important deity, as well as an appellative, it seems altogether likely that in the O.T. in cases where it is a synonym of the God of Israel \(\text{El}\) is to be taken as a proper name."

\(^4\)El, p. 9.\(^5\)Cf. GKC, p. 15; 126h, p. 405.

\(^6\)Pope, El, p. 9.

\(^7\)Ezek 28:2, 9 are the only two texts in that book where God is independently defined as \(\text{El}\).

\(^8\)"Il nome divino El nell' antico Israele," SMSR 8 (1932):
is an appellative, but admits that he is inclined to take it as a reference to the Phoenician god El. In the immediately following phrase, Cassuto takes as a generical designation of divinity; but obviously he has problems with vs. 9 where we find being used in the sense of of vs. 2.

Pope calls our attention to this "discrepant use of and " but advocates that the expression makes it apparent that the allusion is to the abode of El as depicted in the Ugaritic texts." Zimmerli, in commenting on Pope's double meaning of the text, emphasizes that the text requires that must be understood as an appellative for two reasons: (1) the author repeats the expression in vs. 9 using ; (2) the antithesis in the literary content supposes these words being used as

135; see also The Goddess Anath, trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1971), pp. 45, 86, where Cassuto affirms that the passage refers to the Phoenician El.

1 El, p. 12. He adds that "the use of is perhaps intentionally ambiguous," but presents the reference to the "Seat of in the heart of the seas" as a suggestion for taking El as the Phoenician god; and his argument is that the gods dwell on the Mount of Assembly and not in the heart of the seas, thus the text refers to a specific god whose abode is in watery environs. (Cf. also Gray, Legacy, p. 114.) We strongly disagree with Pope on several grounds: (1) the prince of Tyre says that he sits "on the throne of a god in the heart of the seas" not meaning that the god, whom the pretentious figure tries to emulate, dwells in the "heart of the seas," but that the emulator sits in the heart of the seas. Tyre was in the heart of the seas, and the text could refer to that, as Pope himself admits. (Cf. also Van Dijk, p. 96; Zimmerli, Ezechiel 2:77-78; (2) Pope identifies the power of vss. 1-10 as the same as the one of vss. 12-19, with which we cannot agree; see reasons on pages 250-52 below.

2 Ezechiel 2:78.
appellatives. Zimmerli\(^1\) also calls our attention to Isa 45:22
(כֹּל אֵלֵי אֲדוֹת) and 46:9 (כֹּל אֵלֵי אֲדוֹת) in connection with 41:4,
42:6, 43:11, where Yahweh and El are used interchangeably as God
the Creator.\(^2\) Eissfeldt\(^3\) takes Ezek 28 and Isa 14:13 as referring
to the god El--independent and different from Yahweh--on the basis
that the two passages are concerned with the behavior of non-
Israelites and refer to something which occurred outside the sphere
of Yahweh. In 2 Chr 35:21, however, we find Necho who was a pagan,
using זהה. Thus if we have זהה and זהה used interchangeably
in Isaiah, in the mouths of pagan kings like Necho and the king of
Babylon, why cannot הזה in Ezek 28:2 be taken in the appellative
sense since we find the interchange in vs. 9? Thus there are reasons
to agree with Van Dijk who says that "there is no reason to presume
in Ezek 28:2 an allusion to Canaanite mythology."\(^4\)

I Sit on the Throne of a God in the
Heart of the Seas (כֹּל אֵלֵי אֲדוֹת)

In 1932 Cassuto\(^5\) already suggested that the phrase could
convey reference to the Phoenician El. He was followed by Pope
who asserted that "the gods do not dwell in the heart of the seas,

\(^1\)Ezechiel 2:78; cf. also Oldenburg, The Conflict, p. 15.
\(^2\)See also Isa 31:3; Hos 11:9.
\(^3\)"El and Yahweh," p. 28. Cf. also Yaron, pp. 48, 54, who
interprets vs. 2 as a reference to the Phoenician god El.
\(^4\)Ezekiel, p. 97. Cf. also McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions,"
p. 325.
\(^5\)"Il nome divino," p. 135; cf. also The Goddess Anath,
pp. 57, 145.
but on the Mount of Assembly. The allusion (Ezek 28:2b) thus cannot be to the general abode of the gods, but to the specific abode of a god who does dwell in watery environs. And who could this be but the Ugaritic El?1 But Pope himself admits it could also apply to the "insular position of new Tyre" and would naturally refer to "the king of Tyre in glory residing in the island-fortress as a god on his throne."2

The argument of Pope3 and Clifford4 that the allusion to the term שֵׁעָה and הָעַזֶּה shows that this expression derives from Phoenician mythology is weakened by the points discussed above and below. Clifford thinks that although the primary meaning of the phrase seems to be the island of Tyre, it originally designated the abode of El.5 The Ugaritic texts presented to support this claim say that El's messengers to

"im 'ili mabbīḵi nahārēm:
girba 'apiqī tīḥamāṯēmī"6

Toward El at the sources7 of the two Rivers,
in the midst of the pools of the8 Double-Deep.

1El, p. 98.
2Van Dijk, p. 97. As Van Dijk points out, שֵׁעָה לְאָרֶם הָעַזֶּה may be translated as "the seat of a god," or "a divine seat." Cf. also Zimmerli, Ezechiel 2:77-78.
5Ibid. Clifford presents the "revolt in the heavens, the stress or wisdom which is characteristic of El, the anomalous use of 'el" as arguments to support his view. See also Mullen, p. 15, who presents similar arguments.
6CTA 3.5.13-16; 4.4.20-24; 6.1.32-36; 2.3(?).4-5; 17.6.46-49.
7On the meaning of girba, see James A. Montgomery, "Notes on the Mythological Epic Texts from Ras-Shamra," JAOS 53 (1933):111; and W. F. Albright, "The Ancient Near East and the Religion of Israel," JBL 59 (1940):106, who renders the whole clause "to El who causes the rivers to flow in the midst of the fountains of the two deeps."
8Mullen (p. 13) renders it "to the midst of the streams."
Clifford summarizes his observations concerning the expression by saying that "םירב ששם appears to be the Hebrew equivalent of Ugaritic qrb 'qrb thmtm." Although that might be correct, it seems improbable, as is noted by Zimmerli who thinks that "heart of the seas" in Ezekiel refers to El's dwelling.

Already in the nineteenth century scholars started questioning whether the Dan(i)el of the Book of Ezekiel could not be another person than the prophet by that name. It seems that R. Dussaud was the first to suggest——after the Ras-Shamra discoveries——that the Daniel (דaniel) of the Ugaritic Aqhat epic should be identified with the righteous and wise Daniel of Ezek 14:14, 20; 28:3. Many scholars have since followed that proposal. The main arguments in

1P. 170. Clifford points out correctly that "both Hebrew and Ugaritic use organs of the middle of the body for 'in the midst of', e.g., beṭen, leb, kabid, qirbu" (p. 170, n. 91).

2Ezechiel 2:78. See Ezek 27:4, 25, 26, where the expression refers to the island situation of Tyre.

3See C. A. Heinrich, Commentar über den Propheten Ezechiel (Erlangen: C. Heyder, 1843), p. 207; L. Zuns, "Bibelkritisches (Ezechiel)," ZDMG 27 (1873):676-81, who suggests that the three personages were non-Israelites.


5CTA, 17-19.

favor of Daniel of Ezekiel's book being the person in the Ugaritic
Aqht text are:

1. The spelling of the word in the Aqht text (dn'1)\(^1\)
and in Ezek (דניאל) are the same, while in the book of Daniel it
is different (דניאל);\(^2\) thus he may not be the biblical prophet.

However, as Albright says,\(^3\) the name Danilu/Daniel was
well attested in antiquity, and in different spellings. The name
of King Nebuchadnezzar is also spelled variously in the book of
Daniel and in the book of Jeremiah.\(^4\) Thus a difference in spelling
is not a very strong proof that the Daniel of Ezekiel was a person
different from the prophet Daniel.\(^5\)

2. The fact that Daniel is mentioned with Noah and Job,
who were not considered Israelites, contextually suggests that he
do\(\) also was a non-Israelite.\(^6\) The allusion to Daniel in Ezek 28:3 in

\(^1\) CTA 17.1.7, 10, 13, 15, etc.
\(^2\) See H. L. Ellison, Ezekiel: The Man and His Message
(Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1956), p. 59; J. B. Taylor, Ezekiel,
\(^3\) "The Chaldean Inscriptions in Proto-Arabic Script," BASOR
128 (1952): 41, n. 7; and BASOR 130 (1953): 26, n. 1. J. C. L.
Gibson ("Myth, Legend and Folklore in the Ugaritic Keret and Aqhat
Texts," VTSup 28 [1975]: 67, n. 18) admits the fact that "Ezekiel
simply uses the traditional spelling of the name without the
internal Mater Lectionis."
\(^4\) ספכראצרא—ספכראצרא.
\(^5\) Cf. P. Jouon, "Trois noms de personages bibliques à la
lumière des textes d'Ugarit (Ras-Shamra) רברבררים, התר兩ו, "
\(^6\) See Albright, "The Seal of Eliakim," p. 99; Zimmerli,
Ezekiel, 1:14-15, who says "the mention of three pre-Israelite, or
even non-Israelite, heroes makes clear that Ezekiel was here speaking
in a universal way of the divine righteousness." Cf. Eichrodt,
Ezekiel, pp. 188-90.
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connection with the King of Tyre also suggests that he was well known in Syro-Phoenicia. Dressler rejects such an identification and says that "one needs no particularly fertile imagination to view an Israelite Daniel flanked by a pre-Israelite and a non-Israelite to arrive at an equally satisfying theological construction."

In replying to Dressler, B. Margalit noted that "if the prophet were interested in a paradigm of Israelite righteousness the choices would surely have Abraham and Moses at very least (cf. Jer 15:1). The choice of Noah and Job demonstrates surely that what the prophet is after—at least in chap. 14—are paradigms of non-Israelite righteousness (cf. Gen 6:9; Job 1:8; 42:7ff.)." It seems that the arguments presented on both sides above are only tentative and neutral, although as Margalit has noted, the alternative represented by the sixth-century contemporary of the prophet is decidedly less attractive.

3. The middle position of the name points to a "well-known figure of ancient time," for if Noah and Job—two men from

---


2H. H. P. Dressler, "The Identification of the Ugaritic DNIL with the Daniel of Ezekiel," VT 29 (1979):157. J. Day (p. 175) replies to Dressler affirming that he "ignores the fact that Noah is not only a pre-Israelite, but also a non-Israelite, so that this is most naturally the case also with Daniel and anyway, the only Israelite Daniel who might be regarded as a possible candidate, the hero of the book of Daniel, is already ruled out on chronological grounds."


antiquity—flank Daniel, it implies that he was an ancient person and not Ezekiel's contemporary. Keil\(^1\) thinks we have a climax order in this passage: "Noah saved his family along with himself; Daniel was able to save his friends (Dan 2:17, 18); but Job, with his righteousness, was not even able to save his children."\(^2\)

It could thus be suggested that the passage presents diminuendo in amplitude concerning the deliverance theme: Noah was the agent for the salvation of all of those who accepted his call to enter the ark; Daniel was the agent for the salvation for the wise men of Babylon (Dan 2); Job delivers himself only. All the points presented, however, are not strong enough to prove either of the two views about the Daniel of Ezekiel.

4. Another argument asserts that the personage of the book of Daniel was too young by the time Ezekiel wrote his book, and thus it was impossible for him to have had the broad reputation which Ezekiel assigns to him by that time.\(^3\) It would be more plausible to believe that the text refers to a more ancient Daniel. This argument should not, as pointed out by Dressler, be ruled out.\(^4\)

\(^1\)Ezekiel, 1:186.

\(^2\)F. W. J. Schröder, "The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel," CHSL (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 13:151, does not accept Keil's proposition but does not make himself clear on the suggestion—which Dressler (p. 156) calls "order of elevation"—he gives.

\(^3\)As for example, Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1:314; J. Day, p. 175, who points out that "the framework . . . suggests a figure of patriarchal times . . . or hoary antiquity," for Job as well as for Daniel. Cf. also Jack, pp. 22-23; E. W. Heaton, The Book of Daniel TBC (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 25.

\(^4\)Pp. 157-58, he emphasizes that if any of the following possibilities concerning the passage occurred:
5. Some scholars affirm that since Ezek 28 has to do with oracles against Tyre, it would be natural that the hero mentioned in vs. 3 comes originally from the Syrian region, or was "close to Phoenician tradition."^1

But we have to remember that the hero of the Book of Daniel became the chief of the wise men in Babylon about 600 B.C. When Ezekiel, who lived among the exiles not far from Babylon,^2 was performing his prophetic ministry (591 B.C. for Ezek 8:1 section),^3 Daniel was already famous and could have deserved this contemporary reference from Ezekiel.

6. Discussions on the characteristics of Ezekiel's hero have also been examined.^4 These include: (1) righteousness, (2) deliverance,^5 and (3) wisdom.^6

a. "If the date for the composition of Ezekiel is the third century B.C."
b. "If a later redactor inserted the references to Daniel"
c. "If the passage is an (post-exilic) allusion to the Daniel of the Exile, who was alter to appear as the hero of the Book of Daniel" (cf. H. G. May, "Ezekiel" IDB (1962), 6:218)
d. "If Ezekiel's authorship and the unity of the book is maintained" (cf. Howie, p. 100, who believes the book was published approximately by 570-567 B.C.), it would be possible to accept the biblical Daniel as being the one referred to by Ezekiel.


^2Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 1:13, 16.


^5Ezek 14:14-20. ^6Ezek 28:3.
1. Righteousness. It has been recognized that the word  šdg never appears, in relation to Daniel, in the Aqht poem; and despite some scholars' affirmation that Daniel's function as a judge would make him "righteous," as de Langhe stated, "les actes de justice... ne suffisent pas à faire de Daniel un type de 'juste'."  

2. Deliverance. Since the issue in Ezek 14:12-20 is the one of 'Deliverance', and because it is specified that neither those men's sons nor daughters would be delivered by their righteousness, the exilic Daniel would not fit the character since he was not known to have any children, while the Phoenician Daniel would fit the picture better, for as in the case of Noah and Job, the Ugaritic Daniel "passed through the midst of disaster to deliverance...

---

1 Virolleaud, La Légende Phénicienne de Danel, p. 121; de Langhe, Les Textes de Ras-Shamra, p. 151.  
2 CTA 17:v. 4-8; and CTA 19.1.19-25.  
3 Wevers, p. 115; Stalker, p. 133; J. Day (p. 176) makes a strong case in favor of this interpretation, saying that "It is clear that Daniel's righteousness was not only ethical but embraced what we should call piety. That this is true of the Ugaritic Daniel is indicated by the constant reference to him as mt. rp'i 'man of Rp'u (El), which one may justly compare with the expression in Hebrew 'TS 'elōhîm, 'man of God'."

4 "Les Textes de Ras-Shamra," p. 153; cf. also Joüon, "Trois noms de personages," p. 285; Dressler, p. 154. J. Gray (The Legacy, p. 107) states that "Dn'el was no more noted for his justice than any other ancient king in the Near East, and indeed in the Krt text there is an almost identical definition of the judicial powers of the king. Ezekiel's impression of Dn'el as pre-eminently righteous (Ezekiel xiv, 14, 20) and wise (ibidem, xxvii, 3) is probably due to the etymology of the name rather than to anything in the Ugaritic text."

5 Noah saved his children (Gen 6:18, etc.); Job received new ones (Job 1:18-19, 42:13-15). See Spiegel, pp. 319, 328-29; J. Day, p. 179. For references and commentary on ideas on Daniel being a eunuch, and other legends, see Spiegel, p. 309, n. 7.
and his child was, in the same way, involved in the deliverance. But, as Dressier positively points out, "the text does not refer unambiguously to Aqht's resurrection," and he was not able to deliver his own son. On the other hand the exilic Daniel was an instrument of deliverance—although not of his son or daughter—of the wise men of Babylon.

3. **Wisdom.** Eichrodt asserts that "when Daniel is named in it (Ezek 28:3) as a proverbial manifestation of wisdom, then some figure of the past known throughout the whole Syrian region must be referred to. This excludes the Daniel of the OT book bearing that name."

Commenting on Ezek 14:14, 20, Eichrodt holds that the Daniel of Ezekiel should be identified with the Ugaritic figure. But in reality the word hkm ('wisdom') does not occur at all in connection with the Aqht text or with Danel. The hero is never portrayed as a sage who predicts future events, nor utters sayings, etc. Dressler asserts that he "cannot be considered a 'wise man'"

---

1 See J. Day (pp. 179-80) who advocates—following Gordon (UL, p. 85; Before the Bible [New York: Harper & Row, 1962], p. 169); G. R. Driver, (Canaanite Myths and Legends, OTST 3 [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958], p. 8); T. H. Gaster (Thespis [1966], p. 320); J. C. L. Gibson (Canaanite Myths and Legends [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978], p. 27)—that "the lost ending of the Aqht text went on to tell of Aqhat's resurrection."

2p. 155. 3Daniel 2.

4Ezekiel, p. 391. 5Ibid., p. 189.

or 'sage' in the technical sense of the word'; J. Day responds on the subject by stating that, although the extent Aqht epic does not explicitly refer to Daniel as a wise man, it does refer to him as such implicitly. To make his point Day shows how 1 Kgs 3 illustrates the connection between "just judgment and wisdom," and points out that the Ugaritic Daniel was noted for just judgment. Besides that, Day advances the point that the phrase "no secret is hidden from you" (Ezek 28:3) suggests that Daniel's wisdom is similar to the one referred to by H. P. Müller as "mantic or magical-mantic wisdom."

Despite his efforts to make this point, Day recognizes that "a number of Müller's attempts to discern magical-mantic wisdom in the Ugaritic Daniel are not particularly convincing." Besides this he bases his thesis on other Ugaritic or Canaanite texts which may have spoken more explicitly of Daniel's wisdom. After all, we have to say that the Legend of Aqht is not singled out for any specific connotation of wisdom. On the other hand, the issue in the book of Daniel is wisdom. The main issue in Ezek 14 is

---


2Po. 180-81.


4Day, p. 181.

idolatry; in Ugarit the hero is a good pagan polytheist.\(^1\)

Several scholars have advanced the idea that it is probable that an ancient wise hero called Daniel served as a prototype for the hero of the Book of Daniel,\(^2\) but it seems here that so far this proposition has not been proved.

In conclusion, we may say that the arguments in favor of the Ugaritic Daniel are more of a neutral nature. In general, arguments in favor of the biblical Daniel are stronger and fit better in interpreting this passage.

The second oracle (vss. 11-19) has produced more discussion concerning the sources of the material as well as the possibility of its mythical nature.

Mesopotamia

The suggestion—which arose at the end of the nineteenth century\(^4\)—that the material found in Ezek 28:11-19 has Babylonian origin has not been satisfactorily substantiated. Toy,\(^5\) Skinner,\(^6\)

---

\(^1\)See especially vss. 1-12.

\(^2\)See Dressler, pp. 158-61; cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2:670; Gordon, UL, pp. 85-103; J. Day, pp. 177-79, advocates that the Phoenician Daniel was a worshiper of El, whom he identifies with Yahweh, and sees the presence of the Baal and other deities in the Aqht texts as not an insuperable obstacle in defending his point.


\(^6\)Ezekiel, p. 257, who says that "The mountain of the gods is now known to have been a prominent idea of the Babylonian religion," and that Ezekiel got that knowledge "during his sojourn in Babylon."
Hölscher, G. A. Cooke, and Fohrer proposed a Babylonian origin but did not elaborate or give any reason for their view. In his publications George Widengren has presented some descriptive allusions to images and heroes from the Mesopotamian mythic material which resemble some elements of Ezek 28. Among them we have, for example, a "hero, whose body is shining splendor, who in the forest of fragrant cedar is cheered with joy, standing in the Sanctuary of Apsû, the adorned, purified with the sparkling lustrations." A garden or grove which is associated with a temple or sanctuary and cared for by a gardener is also shown to be customary in Mesopotamian culture. But as McKenzie asserts, "These are

1p. 142.

2Ezekiel, p. 315; Cooke affirms that "certain features of the story as given here, the mountain of God, the stones of fire, the gemmed robe, can hardly be of Hebrew origin; they come rather from Babylonia." Cf. Fohrer, Ezekiel, p. 162.

3Ezekiel, p. 162; see above p. 43, and also "Mythological Allusions," p. 323, for criticism of Fohrer.

4The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion, UUA 1951/4 (Uppsala: Lundskeistska Bokhandeln, 1951), p. 8. Widengren thinks that the LXX for Ezek 28:13 is more reliable, and since the stones mentioned were in the breastplate of the High Priest (Exod 39:10-13), the Urim and Thummim were included; and these, he thinks, "play the same role as the tablets of destiny in being the instrument by which the will of the deity is communicated to the leader of the people...." (The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book, UUA 1950/7 (Uppsala: Lundskeistska Bokhandeln, 1950), pp. 27, 94-96. Cf. McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions," p. 323, for criticism of Widegren's view. McKenzie affirms [TS 15 (1954):552, n. 51] that "Widegren [Mesopotamian Elements in Manicheism UUA 1946/3 (Uppsala: Lundskeistska Bokhandeln, 1946), pp. 16-30] has pointed out some elements of Mesopotamian mythology in Manicheism which are quite like the story of Ezekiel," which I could not at all detect.).

5Widengren, The King and the Tree, pp. 9-11.

6"Mythological Allusions," p. 323.
descriptive allusions,” and the differences are enormous. There is no fault or expulsion in Widergren’s pattern, the hero is a god.

Gowan points out the possibility that those gardens were "assimilated to a mythological paradise such as Dilmun the abode of the gods," but he observes that those references could be referring to a real gardener in each case. Besides the fairly prominent part sacred gardens or groves play in the Gilgamesh Epic, a garden of the gods is described in it as being adorned with precious stones. In addition, "the Cedar mountain, abode of the gods, throne seat of Irnini," is also mentioned.

The element, "the mountain of god," which appears twice in Ezek 28, seems to be "central to the experience of the Mesopotamians." The cosmic mountain or Weltberg concept has been rejected by modern scholars.

---

2 Cf. Gowan, p. 80.
3 A. L. Oppenheim, "Mesopotamian Mythology II," Or 17 (1948): 47. The text is in very fragmented condition, but the remnant words tell us about a garden adorned with precious stones, which reminds us of Ezek 28:13. Oppenheim suggests that it "seems to have been the scene of an episode dealing probably with another attempt of Gilgamesh to obtain a means of escaping death," p. 48. Cf. also ANET, p. 89.
4 ANET, p. 82.
5 Yss. 14, 16.
6 Clifford, pp. 9-10.
8 See Clifford, pp. 10-33, 190, etc. for discussion and bibliography. Cf. also B. Alfrink, Der Versammlungsberg im Außersten Norden (Isa 14)," Bib 14 (1933): 41-44.
The figures called Karibu\textsuperscript{1} are found in Mesopotamian material,\textsuperscript{2} where they are represented "as guardians of the tree of life," "supporters of the divine throne," and as "figures flanking royal thrones."\textsuperscript{3} Since the biblical material contains some similar concepts, along with some different ones in relation to the Mesopotamian view of the figure, we should not press the case for a borrowing by the biblical writer from the Assyro-Babylonian tradition.

The legendary King Adapa\textsuperscript{4} has been equated with "man"\textsuperscript{5} and the figure is presented in the myth as a "model of man."\textsuperscript{6} Gowan suggests that Adapa "seems to have been a king who was conceived of as a real Adam; a prototype so that his fate is the fate of all men."\textsuperscript{7}


\textsuperscript{2}T. H. Gaster, "Angel," IDB (1962), 1:131-32, thinks "the Cherub may be identified with the winged genius who is, indeed called Karibu (or Kuribu), 'intercessor'". Some scholars (see Yaron, p. 32) suggest that קֵרֻב is "an inversion of letters from the word כְּרֻב, 'to ride'."


\textsuperscript{4}For sources and a translation of the narrative reconstructed from the extant fragments of the Adapa myth, see ANET\textsuperscript{3}, pp. 101-3.

\textsuperscript{5}E. Ebeling, Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1931), 1:27, n. a.

\textsuperscript{6}Cf. ANET, p. 301, text A, 5-6. See also n. 1a on p. 101, where it says that "model" is to be taken in the same sense of "something to be followed."

\textsuperscript{7}P. 85. After the discoveries of the texts containing the Adapa myth, some scholars claimed that clear parallels between the Babylonian material and the story of Adam could be seen (see discussion by A. T. Clay, The Origin of Biblical Traditions, YOS.R, 12 [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1923], pp. 108-16). However, other scholars raised their voices saying that no parallel existed.
Gowan also discusses Gilgamesh’s characteristics which would make him something of a prototype for humanity in the Babylonian sense, but he recognizes great differences between Ezekiel’s great king and the Babylonian figure. His observations have some validity if we can establish with certainty that Ezekiel is really talking about the first man and not someone else.

Despite the great differences between the Babylonian account of Adapa and Gilgamesh and the Ezekiel figure’s account, we have to agree with Gowan and others that “most elements from between these two personages. Heidel (The Babylonian Genesis, p. 124), for example, affirms that "the Adapa legend and the biblical story are fundamentally as far apart as the antipodes." Cf. also B. R. Foster, "Wisdom and the Gods in Ancient Mesopotamia," Or 43 (1974):352-53; P. Kella, "L'inganno' di Ea nel mito di Adapa," OrAnt 12 (1973):265. W. H. Shea, "Adam in Ancient Mesopotamian Tradition," AUSS 15 (1977):27-41, has attempted to show that—in spite of dissimilarities—the parallels between those two stories are a reality, and "it is possible to view these two separate sources as independent witnesses to a common event" (p. 41), with a possibility that a "functional shift" could have occurred in some direction. Giving a kind of response to Shea’s article, Niels-Erik Andreasen ("Adam and Adapa: Two Anthropological Characters," AUSS 19 [1981]:179-94) tries to show that although the parallels between Adam and Adapa indeed exist "they are seriously blunted by the entirely different contexts in which they occur" (p. 192). He suggests that "in Adam and Adapa we have the representation of two different anthropological characters, ... two distinct characterizations of human nature" (p. 192). The parallels suggest "that these two characterizations have a common origin, whereas the contrasts between them may indicate that two branches of Near Eastern civilization took clearly distinguishable sides in the dialogue over human nature. Yet these lines are not so different that the resulting two characterizations of man are unable to dialogue" (p. 194).

Gowan, pp. 85-86, 88. The main differences listed are: (1) the Old Testament figure is perfect, which cannot be said of Adapa and Gilgamesh; (2) the Babylonian figures strived for immortality, but in the Ezekiel figure’s case it seems that since he was recompensed by death, we can deduce that until he sinned he would be immortal.

See Gowan, p. 90.
which Ezek 28:1-19 was composed appear to have been well known to the peoples of the Ancient Near East."¹

**Greece**

T. Gaster² has suggested the myth of Prometheus³ as a parallel to the Ezekiel passage. Trying to make his point, he contrasts Prometheus' characteristics such as "without evil," "teacher of arts and sciences to mankind," "fiery character," "savage insolence and overbearing boldness," with similar traits in the hero of Ezekiel's dirge. However, the myth is so embroiled in polytheistic features which are absent from Ezekiel's story, that it would be unfair to say that the two pieces of literature are parallel or that the biblical story derived from the Greek myth. Furthermore, the characteristics presented were so common in the affairs of the gods in ancient mythology as well among humans in their attitudes of hybris, that it is difficult to say that they have originally come from the same source and developed in their own particular ways.

¹Ibid., pp. 88, 90. See Davies, p. 90, for discussion of the view that it is "possible to approach the problem of mythology in the OT apart from the facts of borrowed and transformed mythology. It is possible to think of a mythology indigenous in the OT in terms of the personality and activity of Yahweh, the God of Israel."

²Myth, Legend, and Custom, pp. 622-23.

Ugarit

Scholars like J. Gray, K. Vine, F. C. Fensham, and Peter van Zijl have expressed some words of caution concerning the indiscriminate and hasty use of the Ugaritic texts. After examining the complexities of the Ugaritic texts, A. Ferch rightly points out that it is a methodological necessity to examine single parallel terms and motifs in the total context in which they occur. To study parallels in isolation is to open oneself to the danger of misreading elements of one culture in terms of another and of suppression of adverse evidence in the interests of a theory.

With these admonitions in mind and van Zijl's advice "to return to the texts again and again," let us examine the Ugaritic material to see the relation those texts have, if any, to the text of Ezek 28:10-19.

---

1 The Legacy of Canaan, p. 9; Gray affirms that "The tendency still unfortunately persists to use the Ras Shamra texts as a kind of literary lucky-bag out of which all sorts of odds and ends may be drawn."

2 "The Establishment of Baal at Ugarit" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1965), p. 251, where Vine even questions the existence of the Baal cycle.

3 "Winged Gods and Goddesses," p. 158. Fensham warns us that "we must bear in mind that religious conceptions were not identical all over the Canaanite world," and that "a certain concept must be interpreted in terms of the time in which it appears."

4 Baal, AOAT, 10 (Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer; Neukirchen-Vluyn; Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), pp. 1-2. Van Zijl talks about scholars' "Mistaken assumption that religious conceptions were the same throughout the Canaanite world," the "risks of associating concepts from different cultures," and advises the student of the texts "to return to the texts again and again and to examine them thoroughly for himself."

5 The Son of Man in Daniel Seven (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979), p. 61.

6 Baal, p. 1.
It has been said\(^1\) that the נְפֶר בָּאֵל mentioned among the precious stones in the Ezekiel passage is "reminiscent of the abn brq\(^3\) of Baal's abode,\(^4\) which is translated by Obermann\(^5\) as "stone of splendor"; by Gordon\(^6\) as "lightning; and by Ginsberg\(^7\) by "a thunderbolt."

Verse 14 talks about "stones of fire" (שָׂרָי לֶבֶן), which since the beginning of this century has been proposed to be emended to נְפֶר עַל,\(^8\) but as Zimmerli\(^9\) says, the double appearance in vss. 14 and 16 contradicts that class of variations in text. Eichrodt\(^10\) suggests (after relating the Ezekiel passage to Isa 14:13 and Ps 48:2) that "it is legitimate to interpret the fire-stones (with or without emending the 'stones' into 'sons') as the stars,

\(^1\)Pope, El, p. 99.

\(^2\)Vs. 13. The term נְפֶר בָּאֵל is used three times in the OT (Exod 28:17; 39:10; Ezek 28:13) and is translated by "beryl" (NIV), "emerald" (RSV), "carbuncle" (ASV, KJV), etc.

\(^3\)See R. C. Fensham, "Thunder-Stones in Ugaritic," JNES 18 (1959):273, for early tentatives in translating this expression.

\(^4\)CTA 1:3.3.23; see also Pope, El, p. 99, n. 77, for use of the expression in an Akkadian prayer and discussion concerning whether the two words should be taken separately or as in construct relation.


\(^6\)UL, p. 19.

\(^7\)ANET\(^3\), p. 136.

\(^8\)Kraetzschmar, Ezechiel, p. 217; cf. also R. Dussaud, "Les Phéniciens au Negeb et en Arabie," RHR 108 (1933):40; Dussaud sees in the term "the sons of El" "une expression phénicienne courante qu'on retrouve dans les tablettes de Ras-Shamra." Cf. also Nielsen, Ras Schamra, p. 113, n. 2; Clifford, p. 173.

\(^9\)Ezechiel, 2:685.

\(^10\)Ezekiel, p. 393.
i.e., the star-gods." Cassuto suggests that this expression seems to have a similar connotation to the Ugaritic brq, and that "they are stones of heaven in which is stored the fire that becomes visible to us in the form of lightnings (Ezek 1:13) וַיִּמָּשֶׁה ‏ֶַאֲנָוֶתֶּשֶּׁנְיָאָנָוָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָנְיָאָnוַיִּמָּשֶׁה 'and out of the fire went forth lightning'.

Pope contends for the authenticity of the term יָאָאָאָnוַיִּמָּשֶׁה. He suggests that "smelting is involved in the production of יָאָאָאָnוַיִּמָּשֶׁה and recalls the description of the marvelous construction of Baal's mythical abode on Mount Saapan" and adds that his explanation is not incompatible with Cassuto's "plausible explanation" because "the fact that Ugaritic myth deals with Baal's house, while the allegory of Ezek 28 concerns the general abode of the gods is no real impediment to the correlation of the two." Fensham thinks that any emendation is unnecessary, and that Cassuto's "stones of lightning" must be taken as thunder-stones. Pope's "especially

---

1See also Widengren, "Early Hebrew Myths," p. 167.
2Genesis, pp. 79-80; The Goddess Anath, p. 128; Cassuto comments: "The theme of the 'stones of fire' in the ancient Israelite poetry was one of the elements in which is still to be discerned the link with gentile religious concepts; consequently the Torah wished to nullify it, and, in accordance with its usual practice, passed it over in silence."
3See Obermann, "Sentence," p. 239, n. 15, for the character of abn brq in the Ugaritic building saga.
6Ibid., p. 102; see Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 393, who reacts against this view.
8The book of Enoch (18.6-9; 23-25) talks about seven mountains of magnificent stones located at the end of the firmament of heaven, and one of them was supporting the throne of God; it
striking associations of vss. 12-19 with Ugaritic mythological motives are yet to be shown. The Gilgamesh Epic describes the grove of the gods with trees of precious stones but does not supply us with material that would resemble the description in Ezekiel. We have to admit that the expression is very obscure, and despite the efforts to relate the expression to the Ugaritic abn brq, they have not been successful.

The existence of the concept of a sacred mountain—the counterpart of the biblical mountain of God—in the Ugaritic material is very real. The traditions surrounding Zaphon of Baal seem to have adhered to various sacred mountains all along the Levant. But because it was a common motif in the different ancient also describes a "burning fire that continues by day and night and which feeds [with Eichrodt (Ezekiel, p. 394); Charles (APOT I, p. 204) has "persecutes," but says that the word is corrupt] all the luminaries of heaven." Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 394, suggests that "here we may be meeting the same tradition as that which Ezekiel followed."

1El, p. 99.
3ANET, p. 89; cf. also AOT2, pp. 169-70; Heidel, The Gilgamesh Epic, p. 68.
4Pope, El, pp. 97-98, believes that the mountain of God is identical with the palace of Baal, located on the mountain of gods, Mount Sapon; but since this concept is common in the OT, Ezekiel "could," as says McKenzie ("Mythological Allusions," p. 324), "allude to the mountain of Elohim as he does here if he had never heard of the palace of Baal."

5Cf. Clifford, The Cosmic Mountain.
6Cf. Eissfeldt, Baal Zaphon, pp. 5-30.
7Clifford, pp. 180-81; cf. also Mullen, pp. 158-65.
Near Eastern countries, we could hardly say that Ezekiel borrowed
the expression specifically from the Phoenician material. W. H.
Schmidt\(^1\) says that Ezek 28:1-19 is a mixture of different mythical
materials. We would say that the prophet could have made use of
knowledge about the matter which was circulating in his days in
the whole Near East, and it was included in the message God wanted
him to give.

**Biblical Origin and Parallel Hypotheses**

Several biblical passages have been pointed out as sources
or parallels for the images and motifs found in Ezek 28:1-19:
(1) Gen 2-3; (2) Gen 6:1-4; (3) Ps 82.

**The Genesis Paradise Story**

**and Ezekiel 28**

It was mainly at the end of the nineteenth century that
scholars started saying categorically that the material of our
passage was borrowed from Gen 2-3,\(^2\) or from a fuller Babylonian
narrative out of which the one in Genesis also was drawn.\(^3\)

Among the presented\(^4\) similarities or common features
between Gen 2-3 and Ezek 28, we have: (1) Eden; (2) the Garden of
God; (3) "primeval perfection and bliss"; (4) a fall and expulsion

\(^1\)Königtum Gottes, p. 35.

\(^2\)A. Bertholet, *Das Buch Hesekiel*, pp. 147-48.


\(^4\)See McKenzie, "The Literary Characteristics," p. 552;
of a being from a good place; (5) the mention of a guardian
cherub.1

Because of the similar terminology it might be held that
we are dealing here with an "imaginative handling,"2 or an "older
and more mythological recension"3 of the Paradise story. But as
McKenzie observed, we find "some even more remarkable divergences"
between these two passages:

In Ezekiel the garden is full of precious stones; there are no
trees; the being is clothed; he is endowed with marvelous
attributes; he does not keep and till the garden, which is
located on the mountain of God; there is no serpent; and, most
important of all, there is no woman.4

Another striking difference is that the rejection of the
being in Ezekiel is final, and "hence no symbol of reconciliation
grace is to be expected. Rather, he was to be 'exposed' before
kings (vs. 17)."5

Cassuto6 has discussed at length what are considered the
main differences between these two passages.

---

1Cassuto, Genesis, 1:75, adds
"particular phrases like, on the day when you were created
(Ezek. xxviii 13), from the day you were created (ibid. 15),
which resemble the expression in our section (Gen. ii 4): when
they were created, which is parallel to, In the day that the Lord
God made (and further on, v 2: in the day when they were
created); or like, in the midst of the stones of fire (of the
garden of Eden) you walked (Ezek. xxviii 14), which recalls
the words in Genesis (iii 8), walking in the garden; or like,
and I turned you to ASHES [נָפָר נָפָר] upon the earth (Ezek.
xxviii 18), which reminds us of the verse, for you are DUST
[נָפָר נָפָר] and to dust you shall return (Gen. iii 19)."
Cf. also C. Westermann, Genesis, 1:335; and Habel, p. 22, who
presents a comparative list of features of the two passages, which
seems to have been made with some presuppositions in mind.

2Kraetzschmar, p. 217. 3Gunkel, Genesis, p. 34.
4"Literary Characteristics," p. 552.
5Habel, pp. 520, 522. 6Genesis, 1:75.
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The truth is that when we carefully examine the points presented above as similarities between the two passages, we perceive that they do not prove that the two authors are talking about the same event, in the same spot in time. The following are the similarities to consider:

1. **Eden, the Garden of God.** Cassuto\(^1\) has called our attention to the fact that in Ezek 28 the garden is called "garden of God" (גarden of God), while in Gen 2 the record says that the Lord planted the garden for the sake of man; in Genesis the garden is located in the East, but in our passage it is in the "Mountain of God." Basing his remarks on passages such as Ps 36:8-10; 92:12-14; Ezek 31:2-3, 8; Isa 14:8-14, etc., Yaron\(^2\) says that "the garden of Eden and the House of God are interchangeable," and that "there is no clear dividing-line between the mountain of God and the House of the Lord. Indeed, we can conclude from Isa 14:13 that there is no differentiation between Heaven, Eden, the side of the North, and the temple."\(^3\) Continuing, he says that the identity of Eden and the temple (the house of God) "explains the presence of the breast-plate and the 'shielding cherub' whose natural place is the temple, Ezekiel's garden of God." Yaron accurately observes that "here we have the key to the understanding of the second half of Ezek 28:18: 'thou hast defiled thy sanctuary'\(^4\) this justifies

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 76.
\(^2\)"The Dirge over the King of Tyre," p. 40.
\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 43-44.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 45; Yaron reads יִנְדָּה = sanctuary with some versions; see BHK, "apparatus."
the passage just quoted in the context which has to do with the "Garden of God." Thus the expression "Eden, the garden of God," does not necessarily have to be identified with the Garden of Eden of Gen 2-3.

2. "Primeval perfection and bliss." This expression in itself, apart from the context, could be applied to the home of Adam and Eve in the newly created earth, as well as to other places where God or the gods dwell. Perfection, wisdom, and perfect beauty could be applied to our first parents as well as to any other created being in realms other than this earth.

3. A fall and expulsion of a being from the good place. The picture which comes to mind in talking about being "blameless in your ways from the day you were created... till iniquity was found in you... and you sinned,"¹ and "I drove you in disgrace from"² is that of the fall of our first parents at the beginning and their expulsion from the Garden of Eden.

On the other hand there are alternative views. One of those has held, since the days of the Church Fathers,³ that Satan fell in sin before Adam and Eve did. He was cast from heaven to earth, and he was the one who caused them to fall and be expelled from the garden. This matter is discussed below in chapter 3. At this point it needs only to be mentioned that the fall and expulsion of the being in the Ezekiel passage may or may not be a point adequate to demonstrate that the prophet obtained his material from Gen 2-3 or a more ancient recension of the story.

¹Ezek 28:15-16. ²NIV. ³Based on passages such as Gen 3; Job 1-2; Isa 24:21-22; John 8:44; 2 Cor 11:3; Rev 12:7-9, 20:2.
4. The Cherub. Based on two different texts, the "Cherub" can be identified in two different ways: (1) If we accept the MT as the most reliable and original text, the Cherub dweller of the Garden of God is the subject of the dirge; if we follow the LXX the Cherub would be portrayed as the guardian or companion of the garden's dweller, fulfilling the same role as in Genesis.

Concerning the occurrence of the term in vs. 14, linguistically speaking, it could be taken either way since differences among these views are based on vocalization (which the original text did not have); on the use of commas and how we divide the phrases (there were none in the original text); and on the use of an extra א, which—as the Dead Sea scrolls have demonstrated—would be a dangerous basis upon which to say for sure whether the extra א belongs to the original text or not. Concerning the attestation of the word in vs. 16, it could also be interpreted in either way, since the word for "cast out" or "expel" could be vocalized as it is in the MT: מָכַר or מָכָר. The former interpretation would

---

1See discussion of the text in the exegesis of the passage in chapter 3.

2Among those who hold this view are Cassuto (Genesis, 1:8); N. H. Tur-Sinai, Halashon Vehasefer, 2 vols. (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1949), pp. 113-14; Widengren (The Ascension of the Apostle, pp. 94-97); Van Dijk (pp. 92-122); Feinberg (pp. 160-65); etc.

3The alteration would be very small: instead of the נַעֲרַש (vs. 14) of the MT, we would read הָכְדָש (LXX); MT's דֶּשֶׁת for נַעֲרַש of the LXX. Cf. detailed discussion in Yaron, pp. 30-31.

4Among those who hold this view, we have: Kraetzschmar, p. 217; Cooke, Ezekiel, pp. 313-17; Fohrer, Ezekiel, p. 16; Pope, 1:1, p. 98; McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions," p. 324; Kroeze, p. 23; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:672; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 393; Yaron, "The Dirge over the King of Tyre," pp. 30-31; Habel, p. 518.
mean that God was the one acting against the being, while the latter case would have the Cherub acting as the executor of the sentence upon the king.¹

Thus the motifs which seemed to identify the Ezekiel material with the Paradise story of Gen 2-3 have not proved to provide very strong reasons for doing so.² Besides this we have several remarkable divergences between these passages which cannot be easily dismissed. Although these passages describe different events, I admit the language of Genesis could have influenced the prophet's description.

**Gen 6:1-4**

In his article on Ps 82,³ Morgenstern has—based on his examination of biblical and extra-biblical texts—arrived at the conclusion that Gen 6:1-4,⁴ Ps 82, Isa 14:12-15, and Ezek 28:11-19 have an identical mythical background, from the myth of the "fallen angels."⁵ Morgenstern links Ps 82 and Isa 14:12-15 especially through the term נָשִׁיף (נָשִׁיף- Gen 6:4) which indeed appears in the cited passages, but is not present in Ezek 28.⁶ Despite the

---

¹See Kroeze, p. 23.
³Ezekiel, p. 163; cf. also Cassuto, Genesis, 1:76-81, especially p. 81.
⁴"Mythological Background," pp. 76-95.
⁵See above, p. 96, n. 2 for discussion of the interpretation of this passage.
⁷See ibid., pp. 107-14; and Mullen, pp. 238-44, who shares the same view.
possibility that the same myth could be behind all these passages,\(^1\) it cannot be said that the Ezekiel passage has its sources, or has a direct parallel, in Gen 6:1-4. Because those who affirm the existence of parallelism or connection between Gen 6:1-4 and Ezek 28:11-19 do not elaborate on the matter satisfactorily, it does not warrant further discussion here.

**Psalm 82**

Several scholars have—in one way or another—related Ezek 28 to Ps 82.\(^2\) There is no doubt that phrases such as "I am god, I sit in the seat of the gods," "yet you are but a man, and not god . . . ," "you consider yourself as wise as a god," "you shall die the death of the uncircumsised," "and you sinned," "I turned you to ashes upon the earth"\(^3\) seem to show that they have something in common with phrases in Ps 82:1, 6, 7, such as: "God has taken his place in the divine council; in the midst of the gods he holds judgment," "you are gods, sons of the most high, all of you; nevertheless, you shall die like men, and fall like any prince."

\(^1\)Although it is very doubtful that that would be the case with Gen 6:1-4, which interpretation is far from having a consensus among the scholars.


\(^3\)Ezek 28:2, 6, 10, 16, 18.
Most modern commentators on Psalms admit that if not the whole, at least vss. 1, 6, 7 of Ps 82 relates to the matter of God's heavenly council, or His angelic host. This carries in itself the idea of angels who, because of their commission of some sin,

In the most elaborate study on Ps 82, J. S. Ackerman has shown that starting with the LXX and Syriac translations (pp. 5-16) attempts have been made to show that Ps 82 has to do with God giving judgment to the gods in His council. Jerome sees that the Psalm is related to other passages in the OT where God is presiding over His council in the heavens (pp. 34-36) and adds that those condemned could be the pagan gods, political leaders of Israel, or Israelite judges (p. 35). During Reformation times there were three general categories: the condemned are (1) rulers and judges in Israel; (2) rulers and judges of the nations, or (3) the members of God's council (pp. 37-78). Ackerman discusses these three interpretations and their main defenders from the Reformation till the nineteenth century, when H. Hupfeld (Die Psalmen, 3:408-15), made a detailed study on Ps 82 and interpreted the "condemned as subordinate angels of the Lord" (pp. 55ff.). Gunkel (Die Psalmen, p. 360) interprets Ps 82 as presenting God's judgment upon His angelic host. For S. Mowinckel (Psalmenstudien [II: Kultprophetie und Prophetische Psalmen [Amsterdam: P. Schippers, 1961], pp. 1-105) Ps 82 comes from pre-exilic times and the condemned gods were both the gods of the nations and Yahweh's heavenly host; the מִלְחָמָה are divine beings who have opposed Yahweh's will; and this Psalm was a weapon used to reinforce monotheism. Morgenstern ("Mythological Background," pp. 29-126) splits the Psalm, saying that vss. 2-4 belonged to material connected with Jewish judges, while vss. 1, 6-7 belongs to a different Psalm and referred to fallen gods or angels; and, as we have said before, he believes that a common, current myth was behind passages such as Ps 82, Isa 14:12-15, Ezek 28:12-19, etc. Ackerman himself (pp. 301-34) has examined ancient Near Eastern literature and shown that the various gods were allotted "inheritances"—particularly city-state or country--concerning which they were responsible to the divine council, and that it was their duty to communicate and to administer decisions of the divine council concerning their city-states.

Besides that, one of the stipulations of agreement between the patron deity and the human ruler whom he selected was that the ruler was to care for and protect the poor, dispossessed, and defenseless—especially the widow and the orphan. Based on that and on a substantial exegesis of Ps 82, Ackerman has rightly defended the view that Ps 82:2-4 is related to vss. 1, 5c-8, or to the gods of the heavenly council, and not to Israelite judges and rulers only. Vss. 6, 7 from the climax of the lawsuit, in which the gods are condemned, and their fate is probably similar to "the בְּנֵי שִׁמְךָ (= bn Shm?) who were cast out of heaven following an attempt to rebel against Yahweh--Elyon's rule." (See Ackerman's dissertation summary, item 8). Elyon is probably an ancient epithet of El, which became an epithet of Yahweh in the Israelite tradition.
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were condemned by God.\footnote{See previous note; Mullen, p. 238.} As far as the Ezekiel passage is concerned, we also find scholars\footnote{See above pp. 48-49; Morgenstern, "Mythological Background," pp. 111-14, etc.; Mullen, p. 238.} who firmly believe that the mythical background of this text is concerned with the fallen angel(s). But right now we are more interested to know whether we find parallel motifs in the two passages, and if the older one served as a source for the later. The proposed background of the passages is addressed below in chapter 3.

Ps 82:1 talks about God taking His place in the divine council.\footnote{Concerning the judgment of the Council in Ps 82 see Ackerman, pp. 298-320; Mullen, pp. 226-44.} It is a pronouncement of judgment within the assembly itself. Mullen stresses the similarity of Ezek 28:2, 9: "You are a man, and not God"; of a significant parallel to Ps 82:7: "where the gods are sentenced to death 'like a man.'\footnote{Ibid., pp. 241-42. Mullen also thinks that the mythological background of the story referred to in Ps 82 and Ezek 28 is placed in "an historical framework in Dan 11:21-45." We discuss our view of the relation of this passage to Ezek 28:2-10 in chapter 3.} Gunkel points out that that comparison is not applicable because Ezekiel never admits that the prince of Tyre actually is a god,\footnote{Die Psalmen, p. 361.} "but in Ps 82 the condemned beings are called מנהלה without apology.\footnote{Ackerman, p. 60.} It seems that Gunkel is right in saying that, for the being in Ezek 28:1-10 was to be destroyed at the hands of "foreigners," human beings, while in Ps 82, the beings were to die like men.\footnote{Mullen (pp. 230, 243) prefers to translate מנהלה "like Adam" and not "like men," a suggestion that is very attractive.} But on...
the other side, Gunkel rightly points out that in vs. 14 the text is talking about a divine being. Indeed it seems that Ezek 28:12-19 describes a session of the divine council in which a heavenly being is being condemned. As has been noted above, the environment of vss. 14-18 seems to be a heavenly one.

Thus while it is clear that in Ps 82 the condemned ones are called gods (גְּדוֹלִים), by way of contrast we have in Ezek 28:2-10 a case of hybris. The idea of a divine council can be seen behind the two passages (Ps 82; Ezek 28:12-19); someone belonging to a divine council has committed a major sin and, consequently, has been condemned to death.

In conclusion it may be said that although there are dis-similarities in the nature and attitude of the beings in Ps 82 and the Prince of Tyre of Ezek 28:1-10, there are some similarities in the nature, attitude, and destiny of the beings in the Psalmist's and Ezekiel's material in addition to similarities in the setting of both accounts. A common tradition may well lie behind them.

Conclusions

1. Our research into hypotheses concerning the alleged origins of and parallels to the Ezekiel passage discussed reveals that there is, to start with, lack of certainty in the way scholars

---

1Die Psalmen, p. 361.
3See Gowan, p. 4, where he defines this term as "divine encroachment"; see also pp. 69-71.
4In Ps 82 for judging unjustly and in Ezek 28 because of pride, violence, and corruption of wisdom.
5Ps 82:6-7; Ezek 28:18-19. The time of the death is not specified in either of the passages.
relate the two oracles (vss. 2-10 and vss. 12-19) concerning the identification of the figure of the Prince of Tyre and the King of Tyre, and in their relation to each other. Because of this fact we have to separate, to a certain extent, these two texts in the search for possible origins and parallel materials.

2. Concerning the first oracle it has been found that although the passage deals with a case of hybris—which was quite common in ancient Near Eastern cultures—a study of phrases or motifs has indicated that expressions such as "I am god" (יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָה), "I sit on the throne of God in the heart of the seas," and "You are wiser than Daniel" (יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָה) cannot support the view that the author is here referring to Ugaritic materials or directly borrowing from other ancient myths. The rest of the content of the oracle makes use of words and expressions which are common to biblical literature elsewhere. In summary it may be said that although most of the terms and expressions used are common in the biblical text, it cannot be said that the author obtained his ideas from any specific material.

3. As far as the second oracle is concerned, our inquiry has shown that there are similarities between the Ezekiel material and the Mesopotamian and Ugaritic alleged parallels, but they are of the nature of "descriptive allusions." The differences between them are extensive. We cannot deny that some elements such as "the mountain of God," the "Cherub" (Karibu), etc., are found in Mesopotamian materials. But they also appear in the biblical literature expressed in a Yahwistic context. When we compare the Ezekiel account in its totality with those of extra-biblical
literature, we arrive at the conclusion that nothing can be found from which we could with certainty say the author derived his material.

4. Concerning the biblical material, research has led us to conclude that the Ezekiel passage seems not to have been derived from the Paradise story—with the first man as the main protagonist—as many scholars believe. The being, the environment, and the events experienced in vss. 12-19 are very different from those related to the first man as recorded in Genesis. The occurrences reflected in this oracle seem, in some aspects, to relate it to events which happened beyond the earthly realm; it resembles events that occurred on the divine council level as presented in Ps 82. It seems that both Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19 reflect the story of the fallen angels, which is felt, although not necessarily expressed, in explicit terms in many biblical passages.

From the discussion of this chapter it may be concluded that although the existence of some elements and imagery common with those in the literature from Israel's neighbors may be present here, the same elements are found--almost in their totality--in the OT. As a consequence it would be a safer procedure to perform the final interpretation of the text in biblical context where we can exert more control.

That being the case, this study turns next to an examination of the Isaiah and the Ezekiel passages by themselves in their own context, in relation to each other, and in the context of the rest of the OT. In so doing, an effort is made to interpret these texts in a way that identifies their main figures more clearly.
CHAPTER III

THE TAUNT AGAINST THE KING OF BABYLON AND THE
PRINCE AND KING OF TYRE

Isaiah 14:4b-21

Limits of the Poem

The limits of the pericope in which our passage is located are, according to the MT, vss. 3-23 (א-ט). The poetic passage is composed mainly of 3:2 qinah rhythm, with an introduction and conclusion in prose. The formula "when (the Lord) has given (you) rest" serves also as a connection. Concerning the content it seems that a new theme is introduced in vss. 3, 4a, about which nothing is especially spoken of before. The quality of the poetry and


3 רֹם הָרֹקחַ בְּרֹחַ רֹקחַ and אֵין הָרֹקחַ בְּרֹחַ רֹקחַ, but the one in our passage has the same function; see Wildberger, pp. 112-13, 536-37.

4 Robert Lowth (Isaiah: A New Translation and Notes [London: Thomas Tegg & Son, 1837], pp. 216, 218) states that it is "an ode of supreme and singular excellence . . . ," "For beauty of disposition, strength of coloring, greatness of sentiment, brevity, perspicuity, and force of expression, it stands among all the monuments of antiquity unrivalled." O. Eissfeldt (The Old Testament, An Introduction, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd [New York: Harper & Row, 1965], p. 197) states it to be "the most powerful prophetic dirge which we possess in the Old
its use of the qinah\textsuperscript{1} meter make the passage very distinct from its background. Although, as says Cobb,\textsuperscript{2} "we find it (the text) marked off form its context with only a narrow penumbra on either side," it seems that from vs. 24\textsuperscript{3} on we have a different matter.\textsuperscript{4} Concerning vss. 1-3 there is more disagreement among scholars, who are divided among those who believe those verses are the prophet's product\textsuperscript{5} and others who say they were written by a later hand.\textsuperscript{6} The case for editorial activity has been argued with vigor; the difference in

Testament . . . and indeed one of the most precious of all OT poems. . . ." O. Kaiser (Isaiah 13-39 OTL [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974], p. 29) adds that it "is one of the most powerful poems not only of the OT, but of the whole world."

\textsuperscript{1}See on the qinah C. Budde, "Poetry (Hebrew)," DB (1905-12) 2:5; idem, "Das Hebräische Klagelied," pp. 1-52; Eduard Sievers, Metrische Studien I: Studien zur Hebräischen Metrik (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1901); Wildberger, p. 537.


\textsuperscript{3}There are several different views concerning the end of the poem: Wildberger (p. 537) who thinks the poem ends with vs. 20; Marti (Das Buch Jesaja, KHC [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1900], p. 122); H. L. Ginsberg (The Book of Isaiah, A New Translation [Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Society of America, 1973], p. 44); A. Dupont Sommer ("Note exégétique sur Isaïe 14:16-21," RHR 134 [1948]: 72-80); and G. B. Gray (Isaiah, p. 232) argue for vs. 21 as the end of the ode. W. H. Cobb (pp. 24-25) closes the poem with vs. 22; E. J. Kissane (The Book of Isaiah, 2 vols. [Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1941], 1:167) ends it with vs. 23; etc.

\textsuperscript{4}Most of the scholars believe vss. 24-27 refer to the fall of an Assyrian King, probably Sennacherib; cf. Cobb, p. 18; E. Henderson, pp. 127, 138.


manner of speaking and style is self-evident. Both 14:1-4a and 22:23 appear to presuppose and use 14:4b-21 in its context.\(^1\) H. Barth notes several strong points\(^2\) in the passage which show that 14:1-4a and 22-23 form a kind of inclusio that he holds was shaped by the editing arrangement of the complex of 13:1-14:27.

Ouham\(^3\) came up with the argument and Cobb\(^4\) furthered the idea that the spirit of vss. 1-3 agrees with post-exilic literature, especially the book of Zechariah, and that the Isaiah passage must be dependent on the writing of the post-exilic prophet, where the expressions come in more naturally. Thus, although there is disagreement about by whom and when vss. 1-3(4a) were written, scholars are unanimous as far as the beginning of the song is concerned. The word \(\gamma\varepsilon\nu\) besides the points presented above--shows that the lament has started. Concerning the point at which the poem should end, we will return to this after discussing the stanzas delimited in the passage.

Poetic Structure and Form

It was only a little more than two centuries ago that this powerful song started to be seen as it should be, in the rhythmic form in which--with great probability--it was originally written.

\(^1\) H. Barth, p. 126.

\(^2\) As for example \(\beta\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\nu\) (against them) which refers back to the mentioned pluralistic independent item of vss. 20b, 21. The expression \(\gamma\varepsilon\omicron\nu\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\nu\upsilon\upsilon\nu\) (and shall rule over their oppressors, vs. 2), and the explicit or implicit distinguishing mark of slavery of the subject in vss. 2-6 is in conformity with the subjugation in vss. 4b-21.

\(^3\) P. 116.

\(^4\) Pp. 18-20.
In the eighteenth century, H. Ewald went a step further, dividing the poem into five stanzas and contributing some comments on the rhythm of the poetry. J. Ley and G. Bickell made further advances, but it was C. Budde who, in doing a study of the structure of the Hebrew poetry in the book of Lamentations, discovered the use of what came to be called qinah meter, which is well represented in Isa 14.

In qinah meter every line or poetic verse has five accents. The verses or lines are "uniformly composed in verses of two members, the length of the first of which stands to that of the second in the proportion of 3:2, giving rise to a peculiar limping rhythm, in which the second member as it were dies away and expires."  

Lowth equated the genre of the Isaiah ode to the one found in Lamentations of Jeremiah; Ewald was of the opinion that Ezek 19 served as a pattern to the writer of this poem; Budde believed in

---

6Lowth, Isaiah, p. 224.  
7Ewald, p. 162.
the possibility that the later author of Isa 14 had borrowed the art form from the book of Lamentations.\(^1\)

If on one side it is agreed among the scholars that the dirge was written in the qinah meter style, the situation is not the same concerning the strophical division of the poem. S. Drechsler finds two main lines in the song, vss. 4b-11, 12-21, each with three stanzas of regular alternating rhythms \(3:2:3; 4:2:4\):\(^2\) vss. 4b-6, 7-8, 9-11; 12-15, 16-17, 18-21. Ewald divided the poem into five stanzas, each having seven longer or shorter lines, with the exception of the last which--he says--fits the art form of the lament and has five lines; thus the division vss. 4b-8, 9-11, 12-15, 16-19, 20-21.\(^3\) Duhm,\(^4\) Meier,\(^5\) Quell,\(^6\) etc.,\(^7\) also see five stanzas or parts in the poem. Wildberger avoids the term "stanza" (strophe) and suggests "section" (Abschnitten).\(^8\)

It seems, then, that we can safely affirm that vss. 4b-8, 8-11, and 12-15 constitute the three first divisions or strophes of the poem and, as Ewald says, "They divide themselves according to

---

\(^1\)Budde, "Das Hebräische Klagelied," p. 15.

\(^2\)Quoted in ibid., p. 12.  

\(^3\)Ewald, pp. 158-62.

\(^4\)Pp. 116-22; vss. 4b-8, 9-11, 12-15, 16-19a, 19b-21.

\(^5\)Cf. Budde, "Das Hebräische Klagelied," p. 12. Meier's division is as follows: vss. 3-6, 7-10, 11-12, 13-17, 18-23.

\(^6\)Pp. 146-56. Quell's division is: vss. 4b-8, 9-11, 12-15, 16-20b; 20c-21; the last section is not considered a stanza.

\(^7\)See also Marti, pp. 123-27; Lohmann, Die anonymen Prophetien, pp. 19-20.

\(^8\)Wildberger, pp. 540-41.
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the three great divisions—earth, lower world, and heaven.¹

Let us now examine in more detail these clearly determined
three first divisions of the poem and, later, the rest of the poem.

Strophe I—Vss. 4b-8

The first bicolon of the stanza seems to have an undisturbed
qinah meter. The first word (אֶלְלֵי), which appears also in vs. 12,
is the characteristic fossil of the lament.² The second bicolon has
an extra stress in the first colon. Stark³ had already suggested
the striking out of מִדְרָה and read בְּרֹרֵא; Guthe⁴ favored
reading בְּרֹרֵא. Wildberger accepts these suggestions and says that
since the poem does not make use of God's name, the מִדְרָה in vs. 5
must be a secondary interference.⁵ However, since 1QIsa² brings the
tetragramaton in vs. 5, and we do not have any manuscript which

York: A. C. Armstrong, 1908), p. 409. For the development of the
history of the study of the strophic structure of Hebrew Poetry,
see Ch. F. Kraft, The Strophic Structure of Hebrew (Chicago:
University Press, 1938). Prinsloo (p. 434) has, by means of a
syntatical analysis of vss. 12-15, demonstrated how those verses
constitute a "neatly finished circular structure (ABA)," which
strengthens the view that vss. 12-15 are the third stanza of the
poem.

²See Wildberger, p. 539.

³W. Staerk, Das assyrische Weltreich, p. 227.

⁴See H. Jahnow, Das Hebräische Leichenlied, p. 239.

⁵Wildberger, p. 534.
omits it, E. Sievers' suggestion that we should keep the stress lying upon it and the verb as an anacrusis is still valid.

The third and fourth bicola of this strophe fit perfectly in the meter used in the poem, since the last stresses of both bicola are formed by two words in construct state: בְּכִירָהָהוּ, בְּכִירָהָהוּ and בְּכִירָהָהוּ כְּכָרָהָהוּ, and run smoothly. The last bicolon of the stanza is a regular five-stress one, except that the pause falls after the second stress with "a rhetorical" pause after the third.

Strophe II—Vss. 9-11

In the first two bicola the poet uses the particle זֶה in two different ways: as an enclitic זֶה (9a) and as carrying a full stress in itself (9b). That is a choice the writer can utilize in writing poetry. In the first colon of the third bicolon we find only two words, כָּל מֶלֶכֶת הָבֵרֶךָ, and here occurs Budde’s case #2, where instead of three words two weighty ones are used. The next

---


2 Budde’s Case #3 (the main accent falls in the second and not in the third word, and the first member of the bicolon is smaller than the second one); “Das Hebräische Klagelied,” p. 7.

3 Cobb, p. 21.

4 Only two words in each member, and because one is longer and more powerful it predominates and carries one point; “Das Hebräische Klagelied,” p. 7.
bicolon is, as shown in the MT, too short. Duhm\(^1\) and Cheyne\(^2\) perceived the lacuna but did not suggest any word to fill it. Cobb\(^3\) suggested נְבֵהוּ before בָּלָבָב, saying that "it would form an assonance with בַּלָּבָב, as in vs. 16." Marti\(^4\) suggested עַל-יָוֵשׁ אָלֶיךָ "with gladness"; and BHS הָרִים or הָרוֹם. However, as says Prinsloo, "it is risky to emend the text on the strength of the metre. The metre of 12b could be either a distinctive variation, or could even pass as 2:3 metre."\(^6\) The last three bicola of this second strophe do not offer any metrical problem.

**Strophe III—Vss. 12-15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>נְבֵהוּ</th>
<th>בָּלָבָב</th>
<th>אָלֶיךָ</th>
<th>עַל-יָוֵשׁ</th>
<th>הָרִים</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָרִים</td>
<td>הָרִים</td>
<td>הָרִים</td>
<td>הָרִים</td>
<td>הָרִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דַּעַת</td>
<td>דַּעַת</td>
<td>דַּעַת</td>
<td>דַּעַת</td>
<td>דַּעַת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לְעָלָדָה</td>
<td>לְעָלָדָה</td>
<td>לְעָלָדָה</td>
<td>לְעָלָדָה</td>
<td>לְעָלָדָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּכָרְבָּנִים</td>
<td>בְּכָרְבָּנִים</td>
<td>בְּכָרְבָּנִים</td>
<td>בְּכָרְבָּנִים</td>
<td>בְּכָרְבָּנִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָלֶיךָ</td>
<td>אָלֶיךָ</td>
<td>אָלֶיךָ</td>
<td>אָלֶיךָ</td>
<td>אָלֶיךָ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second bicolon is too short in its first colon if we want to preserve the 3:2 meter. The BHS, following a host of scholars from the end of the nineteenth century on,\(^7\) suggests filling the gap with התים as we found in the first bicolon (12a). Although the

---
\(^1\)P. 118.
\(^3\)P. 22.
\(^4\)P. 124.
\(^7\)Cheyne, Prophecies of Isaiah, p. 9; idem, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, p. 63; Duhm, p. 119; Marti, p. 124; Staerk, Das assyrische Weltreich, p. 227.
suggestions of Cobb and the BHS are attractives and their proposed emendations do not change the sense of the phrase but only correct the meter, we do not find the apparent lacking word supplied in any MS, including IQIs. The author could have written this 2:2 bicolon as an introduction to the direct address that follows, or intentionally produced the three first stanzas with one odd bicolon as a pattern. I do not see any other metrical irregularity in this third division of the poem.

Strophes IV and V--Vss. 16-21(22)

The word הָיָה (16b) is proclitic and forms one stress with the word that follows. If we have in this poem, as it stands, those fairly good--metrically speaking--divisions at first, the same is not true concerning the following two; for beginning with the fourth bicolon (vs. 17b) there is a disturbance in the sense and rhythm of the poem.

1Stanza I, vss. 4-8--6 bicolon written in qinah, the last one reversed in 2:3
Stanza II, vss. 9-11--6 bicolon written in qinah with the middle one reversed in 2:3
Stanza III, vss. 12-15--6 bicolon written in qinah, with the second one reversed or shortened to 2:2.

2Because of the apparent disturbance existent at the end of the fourth stanza and beginning of the fifth stanza, which makes it difficult to delimit them with certainty, we put them together and arranged the bicolon arbitrarily.
Budde calls attention to the Athnāh in the word לכוליכם נרות וכול רבים ב反过来 יבשה in vs. 18 and affirms that should be the fifth bicolon of the strophe; he cuts off יבשה in vs. 17 because, he says, no equivalent is found in the Greek and Syriac translations and suggests that the genuine conclusion of vs. 17 (or fourth bicolon of the strophe) should be the form אֵין יבשה. 

Cobb agrees that Budde’s suggestion restores vss. 17 and 18 to regularity but asks if “this is not secured at a too high price”; he proposes the dropping of יבשה and the reading of it over into the next verse. Grätz, Perles, and Kittel suggest the reading יַעֲפַרְוַיָהוּ אֲנָּא יַעֲפַרְוַיָהוּ which supplies the preposition י to the first word, and adds a new word (which in turn is formed by the י from יבשה plus from the beginning of vs. 18 by supplying an ב of the noun יבשה). The fifth bicolon of the stanza would then be formed by the next five words in vs. 18: יבשה וְיַעֲפַרְוַיָהוּ. As far as is concerned, Wildberger thinks it could be a gloss.

Dupont-Sommer thinks that it seems impossible to consider the colon כָלִים נְגַרְדוּ כָלִים ב反过来 יבשה "All the kings of the nations" as the complement of the last colon of vs. 17 and says that those words belong


2 P. 22; cf. also Marti, p. 126.

3 Cf. Marti, p. 126.

4 "Den Gefangenen öffnete er nicht das Haus des Gefängnisses." Wildberger (p. 535) follows this suggestion but vocalizes the last word of the bicolon as וָנָה (verb). ("Das Haus, da er sie verschlossen hielt.")

5 "Note exégétique," pp. 73-74.
with not to what precedes but to what follows; on the other hand he assents that form a perfect bicolon. That being so, Dupont-Sommer suggests that vs. 17c is incomplete and lacks a colon of two stresses to have an expected qinah bicolon. In similar fashion, vs. 18a constitutes the beginning of a new bicolon which lost several words. The other five bicola are, according to him, intact; with this arrangement the fourth strophe of the poem ends with the first bicolon of vs. 19. It seems that the first bicolon of vs. 19 makes sense and is in a perfect pentameter.

Ewald\(^1\) already perceived the difficulty in vs. 19 and, in trying to establish sense and rhythm, had set the words of the end of vs. 19 after the Athnāh of the same verse and pulled out the rest of the verse as first colon of vs. 20 ("Those who go down to the stones of the grave— with them art thou not joined in burial").\(^2\) But in this arrangement 19b is still too long for a regular qinah bicolon. Budde thinks that vs. 20a has something clumsy in its first bicolon and does not eliminate the possibility of damage in the context. He suggests that in the place of we should read,\(^3\) which makes (following Ewald’s suggestion) 20a a regular five-stress bicolon. Thus, following the above observations, vss. 19-20a would appear:

\[\text{Ewald’s suggestion:}\]

\[\text{Budde’s suggestion:}\]

\(^1\) P. 160.

\(^2\) Thus also Cobb, p. 23.

\(^3\) "Das Hebräische Klagelied," p. 13.
The text arranged according to Ewald, Budde, Duhm, and Cobb includes vs. 22 as belonging to the poem, completing the five stanzas of seven pentameter verses each. Dupont-Sommer,\(^1\) discussing in detail the metrical and contextual problems of vss. 19b-21, proposes that the passage 19b-20a should not antecede but follow 20b-21. In doing that the word יערם, which is superfluous, unintelligible, and in excess to the meter of 21b, would precede לעורפם (לברוח את א<ClientNote2084880>ויה), which would give sense to the word לעורפם. Besides that, it would complete the meter of that bicolon (Dupont-Sommer suggests a small emmendation of the word לעורפם, or that it be read as לעורפם, לעורפם, or לעורפם [לברוח] "naked, despoiled"). Thus the stanza would be presented as,

\[
\text{לברוח את איוה יערפם}
\]

Dupont-Sommer adds that the accident which caused that alteration was a very simple one: lack of space led a copyist to write in the margin the last three verses leaving in the column

---

\(^1\)"Note exegetique," pp. 75-80.

\(^2\)In Dupont-Sommer's view there was a loss of two words or stresses in 19c.

\(^3\)In behalf of better sense, 19d is transposed and placed after 20a.

\(^4\)Because you have destroyed your land, slain your people, Will never be named again the offspring of the wicked: Prepare a slaughter for his sons; because of the guilt of (their father): Lest they rise and possess the earth and fill the face of the world! Unclothed of (his) garment, slaughtered, pierced by the sword, They descend to the stones of the pit . . .

You will not join them in burial like a corpse trampled underfoot.
the first word of these three verses (נוהי); a later copyist, in re-introducing the passage from the margin into the column again, put it between stanzas four and five, instead of at the end; as a result לברם was separated from נוֹרִים and left to offer with נוֹרִים a strange combination. As far as the word נוֹרִים is concerned, left at the end of the poem, it was changed, more or less with the context, to נוֹרִים.

We have to agree with Dupont-Sommer that this reconstitution of the stanza offers a limpid sense. However, Dupont-Sommer's proposition has against it some strong points such as: (1) it demands a drastic alteration in the order of the members of the stanza; (2) it requires the transposition of two other words (כֶּבֶן רָבָּךְ) from the MT order; (3) it demands the emendation of the word נוֹרִים into נוֹרִים; and (4) if the mentioned scribe's change in the order of some verses really happened, we would have the chance—although a small one—of having some MS with the original or different reading (but 1QIs\textsuperscript{3} shows nothing of the kind). At any rate, Dupont-Sommer's suggestion, despite its attractiveness, still is only a conjecture. It is particularly attractive in one aspect—it contends for a poem of five stanzas of pentameter verses, ending with vs. 21, which it seems was most likely the original ending of the poem.\textsuperscript{1}

Other scholars have tried to reconstruct\textsuperscript{2} this apparently

\textsuperscript{1}Although BHS tries, in opposition to BHK\textsuperscript{3}, to write verse members in vss. 22-23, the results are, as notes Wildeberger, "only 'lines' with arbitrary meter without the characteristic parallelismus membrorum of the Hebrew poetry" (p. 537).

\textsuperscript{2}Duhrm (pp. 120-21) already recognized difficulties in vss. 19ff. due, according to him, to copyists' negligence, marginal
disturbed passage (vss. 19-20a) of the poem, but in doing so they dealt with the text arbitrarily and offered only conjectures. We do not discuss the details of these various views concerning the possible solution of this apparently disarrayed part of the poem, because it is not crucial to the main objective of this dissertation. We would like to say, however, that despite our ignorance in relation to the original arrangement of these five or six bicola, upon one thing most of the scholars agree: the poem was originally written in five stanzas of seven bicola each in qinah meter. We are almost sure that vs. 21 marks the end of the poem; the third stanza is a kind of climax or high point in the poem, and its language stands out as very distinctive in relation to the other four stanzas.

notes, etc.; and proposed for vss. 19-20a, the following reconstruction,

Du aber bist hingeworfen unter Erwürgte Schwerdt durchbohrte
Hinabfahrend zu den Steinen der Grube, wie ein zertretenes Aas.
[O wie bist du entfernt] von deinen Grabe, wie ein verabscheuter Spross
[O wie liegst du ohne Ehren,] bekleidet [mit deiner Schande]!
[Deine Väter] nicht vereinst du dich mit ihnen im Begräbnis.

Lohmann (Die Anonymen Prophetien, pp. 11-19) after detailed analysis of the text of LXX and of Duhm's, Bicknell's, and Siever's views, suggested the following for those five bicola:

"But you are cast out with the dead like a loathed miscarriage. Among the pierced by sword, who descend to the pit. How full of blood your garment, without your purity. Therefore you have been separated from your grave, like a corpse trampled under foot. You will not join your fathers in burial."
Mockery Lament

The superscription of the poem classifies it as a מָּשָׁל. The word is used forty-eight times in the OT, in both verbal and nominal forms.1 Examining the clear instances where the מָּשָׁל genre appears, we discover that "it was not characterized by a more or less fixed literary form,"2 but "applies to a variety of literary types."3 A מָּשָׁל was determined more by its content and function4 than by its literary form. It could be poetic, prose, long, short, and formulated in various literary types such as popular proverbs, allegorizing fable, a by-word, satirical taunt poems, etc.5

1The root מָּשָׁל is used almost two hundred times in the OT (see Lisowski, pp. 874-75, and Abraham Even-Shoshan, ed. A New Concordance of the Bible [Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1982], pp. 779-20), and has been used associated with two meanings: "to be like" and "to rule, or dominate" (cf. KBL, p. 576; BDB, p. 605). AKK. Mašâlu "to be similar" (cf. CAD, 10/1:353-58); and Arab. mitlun "likeness, the same" (cf. Joan Copeland Biella, Dictionary of UTD South Arabic HSSt 25 [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982], pp. 286-87). For the possible etymology of the word and discussion of the two meanings of the root mašal and their relationship, see J. Schmidt, Studien zur Stilistik der Altttestamentlichen Spruchliteratur (Münster: Aschendorff’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936), pp. 1-2; Allen H. Godbey, "The Hebrew Mašâl," AJSL 39 (1922-23):89-108; Maxime Hermaniuk, La Parabole Evangélique: Enquête exegetique et Critique (Bruges-Paris et Louvain: Desclée, de Brouwer, et Bibliotheca Alfonsiana, 1947), pp. 64-65. See also K. M. Beyse, "Mašâl" TWAT (1984), 5:70-74.


Despite the difficulty in explicitly defining the term māšāl,\(^1\) we can say that the term is "related to the ideas of likeness, resemblance, and comparison."\(^2\)

Among the māšāl passages of the OT, we find four (Isa 14:4b-21, Mic 2:4, Hab 2:6ff., Num 21:27-30) which have been considered as a kind of "satirical taunt poems,\(^3\) and as having a "dirge-like quality."\(^4\) The LXX translates the word māšāl in Isa 14:4 with ἔλεος (lamentation). Modern translations have rendered the term as proverb, byword, parable, taunt, riddle, or allegory. The use of the word מָשִׁל\(^5\) in the beginning of the poem and in vs. 12 confirms the lamentation nature of the text. Commenting on the nature of the poem, Budde says: "Gerade durch den Contrast zwischen der ironisch angewandten elegischen Form und dem höhnischen Triumpe des Inhalts erhält das Lied seine ätzende Schärfe."\(^6\) Lohmann\(^7\) sees in the poem "Satirical Song" (Spottlied) and "Funeral Song" (Leichenlied) blended; i.e., the Satirical Song clothes itself in the apparel of a dirge, where good qualities and good deeds\(^8\) of the deceased are sung and his loss is lamented. But as the poet starts his funeral song, instead of singing the good deeds and life of justice of the deceased, a description of his

\(^2\)Landes, p. 139. \(^3\)Ibid., p. 140.
\(^5\)Cf. 2 Sam 1:19, 25, 27; Isa 1:21.
\(^7\)Die anonymen Prophetien, p. 21. Cf. also Johnson, "המָשִׁל" p. 166.
\(^8\)Cf. 2 Sam 1:23; Isa 1:21-23.
tyranny and cruelty comes out. The poem describes the hateful character of the oppressor in dark colors in order to emphasize the greatness of the salvation that comes by his death. Jahnow says that the poet undertook a "conscious transformation of the Gattung of the lament," and calls the product a "Parodic funeral song." There is no doubt that the poem abounds in dirge motifs, where we can feel the diverse phases and scenes of a funeral song; but on the other hand one can catch some satirical elements blended in the lamentation.

It seems that after all that is said, Eissfeldt's "mocking funeral lamentation" and Jahnow's "parodic funeral song" are good expressions to describe the nature of this Isaiah poem. The term רוע is used correctly, but blends with the motif and meter of the qinah poetry. In the case of the poem being applied to an existing power, the funeral lament would be meaningless, since it is sung when the lamented one is dead. Duhm has seen in it "in spite of the perf. a prophecy"; and in that case, the poem would

---

1 P. 242 ("bewusste Umbildung mit der Gattung des Leichenliedes vorgenommen").

2 P. 231. See Eissfeldt (Introduction, pp. 91-92) for his considerations on the differences and similarities between "mocking song" and "funeral dirge."

3 Wildberger (p. 540) calls attention to the fact that what is called נב in Isa 14:4 is called פ in Ezek 27:2; 28:12, etc.; he believes that the joining of נב and נ and the application to a people or to the political enemy was not created by the writer of 14:4b-21.

4 With Wildberger, p. 540.

5 In Mic 2:4 the terms נב and נ stand side by side.

6 The same could be said concerning Ezek 28:11-19.

7 P. 117.
be talking of the end of the Babylonian power in the future, or of some other power which the ḫāḵā was intending.

Not satisfied with the frequent translations and definitions of the term ḵāšt—such as "parable," "proverb," "by-word," etc.—Herbert has written an article on the term and arrived at the conclusion that

the ḵāšt of the OT . . . is a powerful rhetorical or literary device . . . [which] has a clearly recognisable purpose: that of quickening an apprehension of the real as distinct from the wished for, or complacently accepted; of compelling the hearer or reader to form a judgement on himself, his situation or his conduct . . . [and is] used by the prophets [as] especially intended to awaken men to the supreme reality of God's present judgment. . . .

Polk examined Landes', Suter's, and Herbert's discussion on ḵāšt and concluded that their definitions and interpretation of the term were wanting. Studying the use of the word in Ezekiel he arrives at the conclusion that when used in and as religious discourse, the ḵāšt wants to do something to, with, or for its hearers/readers. That "something is more than simply conveying to them certain information, for information does not begin to exhaust the ḵāšt's meaning." He remarks that the meaning of comparison, analogy, to be like, does not exhaust the term's meaning

6Polk, p. 567.
and suggests the term *paradigm* to define it. The *masāl* combines
noetic and normative functions and performs an operation on the
audience. The *masāl* paradigm forces self-evaluation; the ordinances it prescribes are generally absurd. It is meant to
stimulate reflection among witnesses; it presents the virtues or
failures of a person or a people as a type for every hearer or
reader. Despite the fact that Polk’s observations about the
term would, perhaps, not fit in all the cases where the word
*masāl* is used in the OT, his remarks seem to be sound and in
order as far as Isa 14 is concerned. The *masāl* presented in
Isa 14, despite its possible immediate historical bearing, conveys
something beyond the eighth- or seventh-century incidents. It
is paradigmatic of the struggle of good and evil, and in so being,
it would be wise for the author of the poem to put in the center
of the poem—quite unexpectedly—the real source or origin of
every act of tyranny, self-sufficiency, pride, and arrogance.
And in so doing he would have to resort to an event in the
heavenly realm, since in Eden the seeds of evil were already
present.

The taunt (*ṭā‘") is addressed against the king of Babylon.
It is interesting to note that—besides being mentioned twice in
Gen 10:10; 11:9—the prophet Isaiah was the first one to use the
term *بابل* (Babel or Babylon) in the OT; at a time when the
Babylonian nation or city was not influential as far as its
relationship with Israel was concerned.¹

¹The city of Babylon was influential as far as the relation-
ship with Assyria was concerned. See below pp. 181-82.
Taking into consideration that
1. the term ʿ痫 means literally a "simile," "comparison," "parable," etc.
2. the poem under discussion was written in a prophetic form in a time when the Babylonian power, although influential, was not, as such, an enemy of Israel.
3. Isaiah picked up a term (ʿ痫) which had been used by the Book of Genesis (11:9) connotating confusion (ʿ痫) and opposition to God's plans (Isa 21:9)
4. the author of the Book of Revelation picked up Isaiah's use of the term and applied it to a power hostile to God, the mystic Babylon (Isa 21:9--Rev 14:8; Isa 48:20--Rev 18:2-4)
5. in his apocalypse (especially chap. 24:21-22), the prophet shows that in his message he has not only the immediate historical context in view but also a cosmic and more universal scope in mind and clearly presents the tension between the earthly and the cosmic realms in his writings, it is possible that the prophet is--despite the connection the poem could have with an immediate historical event, as, for example, the defeat of Babylon by the Assyrians in 689 B.C. or the death of an Assyrian monarch--talking about a power hostile to a God which reveals Himself in the actions of the nations and their rulers.

1See above, p. 160, n. 1.
2LXX ʿ痫; Vulg. Confusum.
3See below pp. 215-17.
It is true that we are dealing here with a poetic piece of literature which abounds in imagery and is difficult to be applied in its totality to an earthly or cosmic power; but it seems that in blending both realms and two genres of literature (qinah and mashal), the prophet reaches his objective of depicting the end of every power hostile to God.

Text--[Isa 14:4b-2]

Vs. 4. How the oppressor has ceased, the fury ended!

The hapax legomenon הנַנְמֶשׁ (MT) has defied scholars' explanations for a long time. Based on the parallel use of נַנְמֶשׁ and נַנְמֶשׁ in Isa 3:5, scholars emended נַנְמֶשׁ (in נַנְמֶשׂ) to נַנְמֶשׂ to have the same parallelism in the Isaianic lament; cf. Duhm, p. 118; Marti, p. 123; Gray, p. 252; Procksch, p. 195; Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon," pp. 51, 53, especially notes 38, 39, and heartily supports the 1 QISa's נַנְמֶשׁ, and severely criticizes H. M. Orlinsky ("Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll, IV," JQR 43 [1953]:334-37; idem, "Madhebah in Isaiah 14:4," VT 7 [1957]:202-3 for his proposal of an etymology for the massoretic נַנְמֶשׁ, and his assertion that the versions (LXX [τραπέζω του βασιλείου], Pesh [下面是小], Targ, and Vulg [tributum]) did not point to נַנְמֶשׂ. Erlandsson (pp. 29-32) has worked on the problem and arrived at the conclusion that נַנְמֶשׂ stems from Aramaic בַּזְזָד (Gold), the literal meaning being "gold tribute," and translates the term "tribute," supporting the Vulg translation. We really do not know which term was the original one, although 1QIsa rendering has made the choice of נַנְמֶשׁ a very possible one. Cf. G. R. Driver, "Notes and Studies," JTS 2 (1951):25; M. D. Goldman, "The Isaiah MS of the Dead Sea Scrolls," ABR 1 (1951):10-11. As for the meaning of the word, we also do not know for sure the correct one, but, based on the parallel word of the antecedent colon (טָא), the suggestions given by Gray ('terror'), Vulg and Erlandsson ('tribute'), NIV and O. Kaiser ('fury'), and Ginsberg ('tyranny') seem reasonable. Cf. also Wildberger, p. 533.
Vs. 5. Yahweh\(^1\) has broken the staff of the wicked, the scepter\(^2\) of the rulers.

Vs. 6. That smote the peoples in wrath with unceasing\(^3\) blows,\(^4\) that trampled the nations in anger with relentless\(^5\) persecution.\(^6\)

\(^1\)Since the end of the nineteenth century scholars have perceived that the first colon of vs. 5 is too long to fit the qinah meter of the poem, and the elimination of פַּלְגִּים (which does not appear in the rest of the poem, and is considered a conscious interpolation) has been proposed; H. Guthe (Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaja [Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1885], p. 41) suggested that we read the first word as בַּעַמִּים; Staerk (Das assyrische Weltreich, p. 227) as בַּעַמִּים. Cf. also Jahnow, p. 239.

\(^2\)The LXX, as frequently happens (cf. Isa 13:21; 14:1, 21) uses the same word (τὸν ἄρχοντα) for two different Hebrew synonymous terms (נַחַל and בֶּהָלָה); cf. Erlandsson, p. 32.

\(^3\)MT בַּעַמִּים. Lohmann (Die anonymen Prophetien, p. 19) has בַּעַמִּים.\(^4\)

\(^4\)He is a hapax legomenon, meaning 'stopping', 'ceasing'. The LXX has 'ἐξηλοῦσαν'; Vulg, 'insanabili'; Pesh has כָּרָה; all of the versions failed to catch the correct meaning. Cf. Erlandsson, p. 32.

\(^5\)Because of the parallel form for פַּלְגִּים in 6a פַּלְגִּים, the fact that פַּלְגִּים never stands before a perfect (cf. Wildberger, p. 534; KBL, p. 129), and the absence of a noun פַּלְגִּים, it seems that the inf. abs. פַּלְגִּים should be read (cf. KBL, p. 338) or פַּלְגִּים, a noun, not otherwise attested.

\(^6\)כָּרָה is a hoph. part. and as a noun means 'persecution' (cf. H. S. Nyberg, Hebreyisk Grammatik [Uppsala: H. Geber, 1952], § 75 q.; KBL [supl.], p. 168; cf. also J. Carmignac, "Precisions au Vocabulaire de l'Hebreu Biblique," VT 5 [1955]:351). Because of the parallelisms פַּלְגִּים and פַּלְגִּים, scholars have emended קָרָה to קָרָה, 'Dominion' with Targ.; the LXX seems not to have read the word and translated freely according to the context פַּלְגִּים פַּלְגִּים פַּלְגִּים פַּלְגִּים פַּלְגִּים 'smiting a nation with a wrathful plague'. But the MT is supported by 1QISa, Pesh, and Vulg (see also Auvray, p. 160; Erlandsson, p. 32). Since the noun פַּלְגִּים does not appear in the OT, we should rather follow the Pesh and the Vulg and read פַּלְגִּים or פַּלְגִּים (see Wildberger, p. 534).
Vs. 7. The whole earth is at rest and quiet, they break forth into singing.¹

Vs. 8. The junipers² rejoice at you, the cedars of Lebanon, saying, since you were laid low, against us³ no hewer⁴ comes up.

Vs. 9. Sheol beneath is stirred up⁵ to meet you when you come; it rouses⁶ the shades⁷ to greet you; all the rulers⁸ of the

¹The LXX makes 'staff' the subject of ἤστηκεν ἐν ἔρημῳ ('It rested in quiet') and attaches it to vs. 6 (cf. Erlandsson, pp. 32-33). The term ἐρημός occurs only in Isaiah (44:23; 49:13; 52:9; 54:1; 55:12; where it is parallel to נֶפֶל, and in Psalms (98:4, where it is parallel to נַחַל and נַעַל). The Vulg freely translates נַכָּל with 'gavisa est et exultavit'; KBL, p. 772, translates it 'to be serene'; Fohrer (cf. Wildberger, p. 534) translates נַכָּל with 'sie brechen in heitern Jubel aus'. Cf. akk. pisū, 'be white; be bright'.

²Juniper means, according to KBL, p. 148, the Phoenician Juniper (Juniperus phoenicea L.), and not Cypress (Cupressus sempervirens L.) as normally assumed. Cf. Immanuel Löw, Die Flora der Juden, 4 vols. (Leipzig: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1924-1938), 3:26-33. The LX X interprets בָּרֹכֶת as רָבָּה אַמָּו, 'the trees of Lebanon', paralleling to the second colon of vs. 8.

³The LXX and the Vulg attach לֹודְגָה to נַכָּל, the Pesh connects it to נַכָּל. Cf. Gray, Isaiah, p. 248, and König, Jesaja, p. 180, for both views.


⁵The LXX has ἐσσαρασάλον, 'was made embittered', for נָדַרְדָּה; Theod has ἀρρασάλον 'was irritated'; the Vulg has 'conturbatus est' (is confused); Erlandsson (p. 16) follows this translation. נָדַרְדָּה is feminine, but the three verbs following it are, in the MT, masculine and feminine. O. Kaiser (p. 28) suggests that נָדַרְדָּה and נָדַרְדָּה should (with BHS) be regarded as infinitives.

⁶See n. 5 above.

⁷הָרָפָה has two distinct meanings in the Bible. It refers
earth, it raises\(^1\) from their thrones all (who were) kings of the nations.\(^2\)

Vs. 10. All of them will speak\(^3\) and say to you: "You have become weak\(^4\) as we, you have become like us.


The word חֶרְבֵּי הָאָרֶץ means "ram" or "he-goat," but it is commonly used metaphorically as 'leader'. Cf. Zech 10:3. LXX has ἐξαιρέσθησαν ὑμᾶς; the Vulg, omnes principes terrae; and the Pesh, בְּלָא בְּלָא יִשְׂרָאֵל; the word has been interpreted by the LXX as מִצְלָמִים; the Vulg, omnes principes terrae; and the Pesh, בְּלָא בְּלָא יִשְׂרָאֵל.

\(^8\)The word חֶרְבֵּי הָאָרֶץ means "ram" or "he-goat," but it is commonly used metaphorically as 'leader'. Cf. Zech 10:3. LXX has ἐξαιρέσθησαν ὑμᾶς; the Vulg, omnes principes terrae; and the Pesh, בְּלָא בְּלָא יִשְׂרָאֵל; the word has been interpreted by the LXX as מִצְלָמִים; the Vulg, omnes principes terrae; and the Pesh, בְּלָא בְּלָא יִשְׂרָאֵל.

\(^1\)See n. 5 on p. 164.

\(^2\)The Pesh attaches בְּלָא בְּלָא יִשְׂרָאֵל directly to vs. 10.

\(^3\)The first colon is too short, and there is probably a gap. See p. 152 for discussion of the matter.

\(^4\)G. R. Driver ("Isaiah 1-39: Textual and Linguistic Problems," JSS 13 [1968]:43) does not want to derive מִצְלָמִים from מָיִי "being sick, weak," but from Ugaritic מָיִי, "was alone" and Arabic حَلَّ, "was vacant, disengaged." Wildberger (p. 534) criticizes him saying that "die traditionelle Auffassung einen guten Sinn ergibt." Cf. I. Eit an, "A Contribution to Isaiah Exegesis," HUCA 12-13 (1937-38):62. A. B. Ehrlich (Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel, 7 vols. [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1912], 4:55) thinks מִצְלָמִים is unsuitable to the context and suggests to emend it to מִצְלָמִים. The LXX has ἐξαιρέσθησαν ὑμᾶς; the Vulg, vulneratus "wounded"; the Pesh has מִצְלָמִים, "have you also been made weak?" and O. Kaiser (p. 28) agrees with this version in having the phrase as an interrogation.
Vs. 11. Your pomp\textsuperscript{1} is brought down to Sheol,\textsuperscript{2} the sound\textsuperscript{3} of your harps\textsuperscript{4} maggots are spread\textsuperscript{5} out beneath you and worms are your coverlet.\textsuperscript{6}

Vs. 12. How are you fallen from heaven, O shining one,\textsuperscript{7} son of the dawn! (How)\textsuperscript{8} you are cut down to the earth, you who laid the nations low.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{1}The Vulg translates \textit{superbia tua} as \textit{superbia tua}; and the LXX has \textit{νόημα σου.}

\textsuperscript{2}A. Sperber (Historical Grammar, p. 646) thinks that since \textit{superbia tua} is parallel to \textit{nóημα}, the word should be read \textit{γνώμη} and the colon translated as "the uproar of the pomp is brought down." The suggestion is attractive, but \textit{γνώμη} does not fit in the context, and the versions support the MT.

\textsuperscript{3}Instead of \textit{θηρεῖται}, 1QIS\textsuperscript{a} reads \textit{θαρεῖται} "your corpse," what is followed by the Vulg \textit{Cadaver Tuum.}

\textsuperscript{4}\textit{ες 

\textsuperscript{5}ιματις} sometimes means \textit{γνώμη}, "Pomp." J. Carmignac (cf. Wildberger, p. 534) thinks he can read in 1QIS\textsuperscript{a} \textit{θαρεῖται} (cf. \textit{σαφέρας} in Theod and in the Pesh), and translates "dans la mort ton cadavre . . ." but Wildberger rightly observes that "corpse" is not parallel to \textit{γνώμη}. The LXX has \textit{τοις} \textit{μνημοσύνην ρους}, "your great mirth."

\textsuperscript{6}Instead of \textit{θηρεῖται}, 1QIS\textsuperscript{a} reads \textit{θαρεῖται}. The LXX has \textit{και ἀρχαῖα καιάκουσται σου}, and the Vulg \textit{opercummentum}, "covering."

\textsuperscript{7}There is doubt concerning the vocalization of \textit{λαμπρήν.} L. Köhler (KBL, p. 231) and others (cf. Grelot, VT 6 [1956]:303) relate the term to the Arabic \textit{hilāl} (or \textit{hilālun}), "new moon," vocalizing it as \textit{hilām}, "shining." J. Carmignac (cf. Wildberger, p. 534) thinks he can read in 1QIS\textsuperscript{a} \textit{θαρεῖται} (cf. \textit{σαφέρας} in Theod and in the Pesh), and translates "dans la mort ton cadavre . . ." but Wildberger rightly observes that "corpse" is not parallel to \textit{γνώμη}. The LXX has \textit{τοις} \textit{μνημοσύνην ρους}, "your great mirth."

\textsuperscript{8}\textit{ιματις} (MT), Hoph. Duhrm (p. 119) suggests \textit{θρήνος} (noun-Ab.). cf. Jahnov, p. 239. Marti (p. 124) reads \textit{θρήνος} (noun-Cs.). Cf. BHS.

\textsuperscript{9}For \textit{θηρεῖται}, 1QIS\textsuperscript{a} reads \textit{θαρεῖται}. The LXX has \textit{και ἀρχαῖα καιάκουσται σου}; and the Vulg \textit{opercummentum}, "covering."

\textsuperscript{10}In the transitive sense "make weak, conquer," which follows the sense of the verb used in Exod 17:13 and Joel 4:10; cf. Wildberger, p. 535; Barth, \textit{Die}
Vs. 13. You said in your heart, "I will ascend to heaven; above the stars of God; I will set my throne on high, I will sit on the mount of assembly in the recesses of the north.

Jesaja-Worte, p. 121; etc. (1) in the transitive sense, "weakling," as used in Job 14:10; cf. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos, p. 132; Gray, p. 256; McKay, p. 453; Marti, pp. 124-27. To accept the transitive meaning we have to admit the emendation of נלע ('among') to כל ('all') agreeing with the LXX (ὁ ἐσόμενος πάντως ἐν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ). Gunkel understands נלע as intransitive "liegst starr auf Leichen," changing מנהרג into מנהרג. Cf. Guillaume ("The use of ונה in ..., Isa 14:12 ..., "JTS 14 [1963]:91). McKay (p. 453, n. 4) is right in observing that the transitive or intransitiveness of the verb in this passage depends on the subject of מנהרג; if it refers to the king of Babylon, it would be transitive "to be weak," if to Helel, then "weakling" in an intransitive sense would be desirable. Having in view McKay's arguments, he has reasons to believe the latter should be correct. (See pp. 453-54). I. Eitan (pp. 62-63), proposes that מנהרג כביר (with the LXX; [Erlandsson (p. 35) thinks the LXX's translator had מנהרג in mind]) "O reaper of all nations!" forms a "picturesque antithesis to the immediately preceding מנהרג, "(How) art thou cut down to the ground," and is a sound interpretation of the meaning of the text. The Vulg renders מנהרג as vulnerabas.

For כביר the LXX has ἐν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, "mind."

U. Cassuto (The Goddess Anath, p. 57) interprets כביר in this passage as the proper name of the Canaanite god El. But, as says Wildberger (p. 535), since the poem in the current context is understood as a testimony of belief in Yahweh, כביר is like יוהו as an equivalent of a superlative "the highest stars" (see for that, D. Winton Thomas, "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew," VT 3 [1953]:209-24), but Dahood ("Punic hkkbm כ and Isa 14:13," Or 34 [1965]:170-72) rightly refers to the close connection between God (כביר) and the stars; see i.e., Job 22:12-14; Ps 147:4; Isa 40:26.

Ceren must be, according to the context, "assembly of gods"; the Vulg renders in Monte Testamenti; the LXX the repetitious translation: ἐν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, ἐν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς δόξης. See above, pp. 92-93, and below, p. 190, for more commentary on the meaning of the word; cf. also Wildberger, p. 535.

לחי as an expression occurs in Ezek 38:6, 15, 39:2; and Ps 48:3, where it is associated with Zion. Luther (Lect. on Isaiah, p. 141) believed that the expression referred to the north side of the Temple-Mountain. See above, pp. 93-94, and pp. 199-202, below, for more commentary on the expression.
Vs. 14. I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will make myself like the most High.  

Vs. 15. But you are brought down to Sheol, to the recesses of the pit.  

Vs. 16. Those who see you will stare at you, and ponder over you. "Is this the man who shook the earth and made kingdoms tremble?

1Ginsberg (The Book of Isaiah, p. 44) has "mount the back of a cloud." The construct form "נַפֵּס" occurs several times in the OT poetic texts: Job 9:8; Amos 4:13; Isa 14:14, etc. As 1QIsa shows ("נַפֵּס") the form seems to derive from הנב and not הנב (see KBL, p. 132).

2נַפֵּס--most used in exilic times; and used also, according to Philo of Byblus, among the Phoenicians. See Cheyne, The Origin of the Psalter, p. 84.

3"Recesses of the pit (רָעָב)" contrasts with "Recesses of the north (לָנוּב)," vs. 13. The LXX interprets by רָעָב הַנַּהְרִים, which hurts the parallel between the synonyms Sheol and the grave. (Cf. Ps 88:4-6; Ezek 26:20). Thus נַפֵּס is the designation of the realm of the dead, or the graves (see Gunke, Schöpfung und Chaos, pp. 132-33, n. 8; Kraus, 1:230, 608-09; KBL, pp. 114-15; TWAT, p. 503). The expression occurs, besides Isa 14:15, also in Ezek 32:23, and according to H. Barth (pp. 121-22) shows a graduation inside the realm of the dead, and means the "äussersten (entlegensten) Bereich der Totenwelt," "die äusserst Tiefe der Unterwelt." On Sheol and grave, see Friedrich Nötscher, Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungsglauben (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1926 [1970]), pp. 209-12.

4רָעָב appears only three times in the OT (Ps 33:14; Cant 2:9; Isa 14:16), always in the Hiphil, and means "to gaze at," a critical testing look into something. Cf. Wildberger, p. 535. The LXX has "wonder"; the Vulg renders it inclinabuntur which, as Erlandsson (p. 36) says, must be associated with הַנָּב. The Pesh translates it יָרָעַב, "they will gaze."

5רָעָב, "to give heed to something."

6רָעָב, "causing to shake," is synonym to the following verb רָעָב רָעָב, and therefore a fitting parallel.
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Vs. 17. Who made the world like a desert and overthrew its cities, who his captives, all the kings of the nations, would not let go home?^

Vs. 18. Yet they all are in state, each in his own tomb,^  

^The LXX associates ב with ברשא, "to make," but the Pesh renders it =משה, "and he devasted," associating with במשה.

^It seems that because of רֶבֶנ, which is feminine, we should read with Syriac רֶבֶנ instead of רֶבֶנ (cf. Duhm, p. 120; Marti, p. 125; Lohmann, Die anonymen Prophetien, p. 20; Ginsberg, JAOS 88 [1968]:52, No. 28; BHS; Dupont-Sommer, p. 74; Ehrlich 4:56; Wildberger, p. 535). H. Barth (p. 22) says that no emendation should be made, for the incongruence rather explains itself by the character of the masculine as a "genus potius."

^From this verse till vs. 21 there have been much discussion concerning the structure and meaning of the text; several kinds of emendations have been proposed in order to restore the qinah meter, as well as to make the text more intelligible. At this point we make observations and try to understand what the MT in itself brings. The major proposed emendations and structure problems are discussed on pp. 147-63. The versions have taken הבטחנה בבנה (ה batta bein ha vista) as meaning that the oppressor did not allow the prisoners to go free (Vulg. [non aperuit carcerem], LXX, Pesh.). But since the הבטחנה of the MT does not seem to fit to this according to form and semantics (cf. H. Barth, 122), BH^, Auvray (p. 160), and Wildberger (pp. 532, 535) suggest that הבטחנה and the first word in vs. 18 לִי are scribal errors for הבטחנה ל. Erlandsson says (p. 36), this view has no support in the versions and IQISâ and is hardly possible. See H. Barth (p. 122) for a strong defense to keep the MT without any emendation. He contends that the pleonastic form of expression (cf. Erlandsson, p. 37) employed in vs. 18a is possible in Hebrew without problems. G. Gray (p. 249) does not translate the phrase, considering it corrupt. O. Kaiser (p. 29), following Budde, deletes הבטחנה and brings vs. 18b forward reading הטחה ל, "each (to) his home." Ginsberg ("Reflexes . . .," p. 52, note 29) says that the "MT is substantively insipid and linguistically suspicious," and emends the expression to read הבטחנה לבק, "who chained to his palace gate."

^3From this verse till vs. 21 there have been much discussion concerning the structure and meaning of the text; several kinds of emendations have been proposed in order to restore the qinah meter, as well as to make the text more intelligible. At this point we make observations and try to understand what the MT in itself brings. The major proposed emendations and structure problems are discussed on pp. 147-63. The versions have taken הבטחנה בבנה (ה batta bein ha vista) as meaning that the oppressor did not allow the prisoners to go free (Vulg. [non aperuit carcerem], LXX, Pesh.). But since the הבטחנה of the MT does not seem to fit to this according to form and semantics (cf. H. Barth, 122), BH^, Auvray (p. 160), and Wildberger (pp. 532, 535) suggest that הבטחנה and the first word in vs. 18 לִי are scribal errors for הבטחנה ל. Erlandsson says (p. 36), this view has no support in the versions and IQISâ and is hardly possible. See H. Barth (p. 122) for a strong defense to keep the MT without any emendation. He contends that the pleonastic form of expression (cf. Erlandsson, p. 37) employed in vs. 18a is possible in Hebrew without problems. G. Gray (p. 249) does not translate the phrase, considering it corrupt. O. Kaiser (p. 29), following Budde, deletes הבטחנה and brings vs. 18b forward reading הטחה ל, "each (to) his home." Ginsberg ("Reflexes . . .," p. 52, note 29) says that the "MT is substantively insipid and linguistically suspicious," and emends the expression to read הבטחנה לבק, "who chained to his palace gate."

^4רֶבֶנ means "grave" (cf. Fohrer I, p. 190; Ginsberg, JAOS 88 [1968]:52, no. 30; Ps 49:12; Eccl 12:5; Isa 22:16; KBL, on רֶבֶנ section 2, p. 122; TWAT I, p. 635-36), for that is demanded by vs. 19א (םִּפְרָכִיתמ) which is antithetical (cf. H. Barth, p. 122).
Vs. 19. But you are cast out from your tomb like a loathed untimely birth, clothed with the slain, with those pierced by the sword, who go down to the stones of the pit, like a corpse trampled underfoot.

1With H. Barth (p. 123), who presents an elaborated commentary on vss. 19-20, and emphasizes that alterations of the text are unnecessary. As G. Gray (p. 259) says, the passage is "clearly speaking not of disinterment, but of non-interment"; cf. Jahn, p. 246; Fohrer, p. 190. Also Eichrodt, Der Herr..., p. 20; Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon," p. 52; Wildberger, p. 535 (Gen. Privatvum).

2The LXX has ἑν τῶν ἀκατομμυρίων. BHK3 thinks it was a deterioration from ὅμοιοι τῶν ἀμαυμάτων, but Wildberger (p. 535) rightly says that this is unlikely because κατά follows immediately in the next line and is there indispensable. Passages such as Isa 5:25; 34:3; Ezek 32:5, which connect corpses with mountains, must have influenced that interpretation. The Vulg. has de Sepulchro Tuo and the Pesh.

3מְלָאך is uncertain. The LXX has for מִלָּאך the free translation ἐν καταράσει ἐβαλείται, literally "loathed carcase"; the Vulg. has "stirps," and the Pesh. מְלָאך, meaning "branch offspring of a family." On the other hand, Symm. has מְלָאך (מְלָאך "Abortion," like Aram. מְלָאך). Cf. Job 3:16.

Aq has מְלָאך, "sap, blood." Many modern theologians see no necessity to emend the MT text (cf. Fohrer, 1:190; Eichrodt, Herr..., p. 20; Erlandsson, p. 37; etc.), but since F. Schwally ("Miscellen [Jes. 14:19-21]," ZAW 11 [1891]:257-58), Sym's rendering has been defended as the most acceptable one (cf. Procksch, p. 199; Dupont-Sommer, p. 75; Friedrich Horst, Hiob 8KAT 16/1 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968]:50). Among the reasons for accepting this view the scholars say that: (1) מְלָאך is not supported by the versions; (2) מְלָאך is confirmed by Targ and Vulg; (3) it is in agreement with מְלָאך (cf. Job 3:16; Ps 48:8; Ecc 6:3); and (4) it fits the context in general (cf. H. Barth, p. 122; see also Wildberger [pp. 535-36] who rejects the traditional מְלָאך and affirms that "nobody asks himself whether an offspring, detested or not, should be buried; and also that מְלָאך is a good parallel to מְלָאך in 19b). Some theologians (cf. KB, on מְלָאך, p. 640) proposed מְלָאך but that seems an awkward suggestion (cf. Wildberger, p. 536).

4Every OT theologian agrees that vss. 19 and 20 are "packed with difficulties" (H. Barth, p. 122) and have been exposed to many attempts at emendations. It seems that the text was disturbed in some way; but since 1QIsa has the same text as the MT, if such supposed disturbance occurred, it happened before the second century B.C. Since 1QIsa and the versions, except the LXX, have the same text as the MT, we try, as much as possible, to base our translation on the Hebrew text. But we would not deny that the attempts (as for
example by Dupont-Sommer) to make the poem one of five stanzas of 7 Qinah meter verses are, for several reasons, very attractive. Those reasons are presented and discussed elsewhere in this chapter.

The LXX renders "with many dead who have been pierced with swords." Despite admitting metaphorical uses of מין (cf. Job 7:5; Ps 65:14), G. Gray (pp. 259, 249) doubts the text is at this point sound. Erlich (p. 56) affirms that for מין we should read מין, and that because of what precedes the preposition is erroneously omitted (cf. Esth 4:2; 8:15). He adds, "Ohne die Präposition könnte nur Part pass. im st. constr. sein, und dazu passt ἡ τερμή nicht." H. Barth (p. 123) thinks alterations of the text (as for example Procksch, pp. 199-200; Eichrodt, Herr ..., p. 20; and Ginsberg ["Reflexes on Sargon," p. 52, n. 32] who follows Erlich) are unnecessary, for מין continues the ננו of the previous bicolon by a participle, and it juxtaposes the honorable burial of the dead who is buried in clothes against the shameful burial of the one who is "dressed with killed men."

The LXX translates מין by מין "going down to the grave"; Aq and Theod ἐπὶ τὸ γήμαντος λείαν, upon the stones of the pit, the same happening to the Pesh: מין. Scholars (cf. H. Barth, p. 123) have seen difficulties in this expression in the fact that מין is taken as "pit, grave" (cf. Duhm, p. 121), it would be awkward; and if מין means, as usually, the "realm of the dead" (see above n. 7, p. 165), it would be even more improbable.

Since Gunkel (Schöpfung und Chaos, pp. 132-33, n. 8; cf. also Marti, p. 126; G. Gray, p. 260; Ginsberg ["Reflexes on Sargon," p. 52, n. 33; H. Barth, p. 123], it has been suggested that instead of מין it should be read מין, "Foundation, base" (cf. Job 38:6), which could agree with Sym (אַיֵּל תֵּמאַליֶּנְאַלָּן) and the Vulg (ad fundamenta laci), and which probably point to a reading מין מין מין (cf. B. Kedar-Kopstein, "Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome's Isaiah," Textus 4 [1964]:187). This reading would correspond to vs. 15 (רַעְּה יִדְּוַא). Wildberger (p. 536) reacts against it saying that this suggestion hardly hits the mark. He firmly believes that מין מין מין is misplaced and belongs as the first colon of the next line of the vs. König (Jesaja, p. 183, n. 4) believes that the expression is an illustration of scorning the dead ones and connects it with Josh 7:26, 8:29b, 2 Sam 18:17. Erlandsson suggests that it could probably refer to a "stone-lined grave." After his reconstruction of the text, H. Barth (p. 123) suggests that the verbal expressions מין (vs. 19a) מין (vs. 19a) מין (vs. 19b) form three stages and demonstrate the successive entering of the "Lamented one" into the Sheol (to be thrown down—to lie there in a shameful way of being buried—to go down into the realm of the dead); he also suggests that the middle phrase or vs. 19a is without comparison and the original text could have a מין before בִּלְוְ אֱ. (see
Vs. 20. You will not join them\(^1\) in burial, for you have destroyed your land and killed your people. The offspring of the evildoers\(^2\) will never\(^3\) be named\(^4\) again.

also Ginsberg, Isaiah, p. 45, for a different arrangement of the phrases of vs. 19 and the comparative). It seems that we should, in view of 1QIsa\(^8\) and some versions, keep the MT text as reliable in the discussed phrase.

\[^{1}\text{For } \text{the Vulg. has } \text{quasi cadaver putridum and the Pesh. } \text{"trodde}\text{d down." The LXX renders } \text{τοιούτου } \text{πλασμάτων } \text{όντων } \text{τοιούτου. (see Erlandsson, p. 38, for possible reasons for LXX free interpretation of these two words as well as for vs. 20 and the rendering of other versions).}\]

\[^{2}\text{The LXX has a very distinct translation for vss. 19-20, while the other versions tend more or less to agree with the MT. Concerning to whom } \text{they, with them,} 3\text{rd pl. refers, some exegetes (cf. Procksch, pp. 192, 200, etc.) think it refers to the entity mentioned in vs. 19 (some put } \text{יְהֵינָם } \text{לְהָלָא } \text{יְהֵינָם at the beginning of vs. 20a; see for that Dillmann, pp. 138-39; Cobb, p. 23; Fohrer, Jesaja, 1:190; O. Kaiser, p. 29), but others (as for example H. Barth, p. 124) say it could not be because there it is only spoken about those who are equal to the } \text{"Lamented one" (vss. 20a } \text{"You do not join them," cf. Marti, p. 217). Duhm (p. 122), Marti (p. 127), and Eichrodt (Der Herr . . . , p. 20) suggest the addition of } \text{τήματα } \text{τῆσας, which is a mere conjecture. It seems that } \text{τοιούτου } \text{πλασμάτων } \text{όντων } \text{τοιούτου in vs. 18 helps us in the identification of the suffix 3rd pl. masc. in vs. 20; the whole text wants to say that although they--the kings of the nations and the lamented one--are in the realm of the dead, the latter (in contrast to the former) has not an honorable burial. (Cf. H. Barth, p. 124.) Wildberger thinks } \text{τοιούτου } \text{πλασμάτων } \text{όντων should be a gloss to explain } \text{τοιούτου πλασμάτων.}\]

\[^{3}\text{Some scholars--probably because of the LXX's rendering (σώματα οὐκ ἔχουσαν) and Isa 1:4--have tended to render the pl. forms } \text{טֵבָעַת and בֵּית נַעַם (vss. 20b and 21a) in sing. forms: } \text{טֵבָעַה and בֵּית נַעַמה (cf. Duhm, p. 123; Marti, p. 127; Procksch, p. 200; Dupont-Sommer, p. 77; Quell, p. 145; 0. Kaiser, Isaiah 13-39, p. 29); but as H. Barth (p. 124) has observed, the LXX differs so much from the MT that we cannot safely rely on it; besides that, Wildberger (pp. 22, 536) rightly points out that } \text{טֵבָעַת does not mean "offspring of evildoers" but "generation that consists of evildoers" (cf. also G. Gray, p. 261).}\]

\[^{4}\text{Dupont-Sommer ("Note exégétique," p. 77) based on the LXX which has } \text{טֵבָעַת (which could correspond to the Hebrew } \text{טֵבָעַת) suggests the addition of } \text{τῇ } \text{ἄνω, which would supply us with the 3rd stress of the colon that seems to be lacking in the MT.}\]

\[^{5}\text{The LXX renders } \text{καταργήσας by } \text{καταργήσεσθαι, and Erlandsson (p. 38) thinks it depended on the easier reading } \text{καταργήσαι, probably}\]
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Vs. 21. Prepare the slaughter\(^1\) for his sons because of the
guilt of their fathers,\(^2\) that\(^3\) they rise not and possess the earth
and fill the face of the world (with cities).\(^4\)

because of "an attraction from וְכִּתְבָּה in vs. 21. The Vulg. has "Vocabitur," Driver (Jss 13 [1968]:44) thinks of מַעֲשֶׂה as a variant of מַעֲשֶׂה and translates "the brood of evil-doers shall no more appear" (cf. Wildberger, p. 536, who says it does not make better sense).

\(^1\) וְכוֹתִּבָּה (Hap. Leg.) could mean the slaughtering of animals, or the place of slaughter.

\(^2\) As mentioned above (see n. 2, p. 165), the LXX has מַעֲשָׂה (according to the recension of the Hexapla: מַעֲשָׂה). Dahood (Bib 44 [1963]:291: 70) understands מַעֲשָׂה as plurale excellentiae. Rinaldi (BeQ 10 [1968]:24; cf. also Wildberger, p. 536) suggests that מַעֲשָׂה is a fixed term: "guilt of the fathers." It seems that the MT text should be maintained.

\(^3\) מַעֲשָׂה (for מַעֲשָׂה or מַעֲשָׂה; cf. Dillmann, p. 139) seems (cf. G. Gray, p. 261) "to have the force so that . . . not . . .; and is confined to later literature."

\(^4\) מַעֲשָׂה "cities" is translated מַעֲשָׂה "war" by the LXX (followed by the Pesh. which has מַעֲשָׂה), which B. Gray (p. 261) thinks was a probable error for מַעֲשָׂה (cf. Aq., Theod., Sym., etc.; Henry S. Gehman, "Some Types of Errors of Transmission in the LXX," VT 3 [1953]:399), or מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה, from the Aram sense of enemy (Dan 4:16). Since the beginning of the nineteenth century (because the presence of the term would apparently be a contradiction to vs. 17) emendations have been proposed for the term: Hitzig (ref. by G. Gray, p. 261) suggested מַעֲשָׂה, "ruins, rubble" (cf. BHK; Vanderburgh, p. 114). Ewald (p. 160) proposed מַעֲשָׂה, "tyrants," as in 13:11 (see also 29:20; Jer 20:11). Dillmann (pp. 138-39) suggested מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה, "wasted cities." Cobb (pp. 23-24) ends the vs. with מַעֲשָׂה and begins vs. 22 with a substitute for מַעֲשָׂה, namely, מַעֲשָׂה (Hiphil of מַעֲשָׂה). T. K. Cheyne, "Recent Study of Isaiah," JBL 16 (1897):132-33, criticizes Cobb's suggestion and proposes "to enclose the whole word-group מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה within marks of interrogation." He thinks that we cannot even be sure the מַעֲשָׂה is correct, since it is not a good parallel to מַעֲשָׂה. One of the most common suggestions has been מַעֲשָׂה (cf. Dillmann, p. 139; Duhm, p. 122; H. Barth, pp. 124-25, who thinks that מַעֲשָׂה in the sense of "oppressor" provides an excellent parallel to מַעֲשָׂה of vs. 20 and מַעֲשָׂה of vs. 5) as an Aramaism. Confusion of מ and מ occurs often in the textual tradition of the OT (cf. F. Delitzsch, Die Lesen und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament [Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1920] § 108 a, b.). The uncertainty of knowing for sure if מַעֲשָׂה is the original word of the text has caused scholars to translate the last phrase of vs. 21 both positively--"that the earth may be filled with
Historical Context

Authorship and date of Composition

At the end of the eighteenth century E. F. Rosenmüller\textsuperscript{1} started the view that the oracle in Isa 14--cn the basis of the mention of Babylon--did not come from Isaiah of Jerusalem but has to do with the events related to the fall of Babylon in the middle of the sixth century B.C. Since then many scholars have advocated that view and proposed Nabuchadnezzar\textsuperscript{2} and Nabonidus\textsuperscript{3} as possible figures concerning whom the poem was pronounced. There are others who assign the passage to the times of Darius or Xerxes,\textsuperscript{4} or even

cities" (cf. Dillmann, p. 139; Ginsberg, "Reflexes," p. 52 and n. 37) --and negatively "... and that they do not fill the earth with cities" (cf. Erlandsson, p. 17; Wildberger, pp. 533, 536). Kissane (pp. 170, 174) has suggested the joining of the word to what follows and emends it to read: רְמִי רְמִי אֶל וַעֲרָבָּה אֵל ("I will intervene" and rise up against them." A very interesting and quite ingenious suggestion, proposed by Dupont-Sommer (pp. 78-79) would emend it to read: רְמִי רְמִי אֶל וַעֲרָבָּה אֵל "naked, unclothed," and detach the word from the end of vs. 21, placing it at the beginning of 19b: רְמִי לְבָן וַעֲרָבָּה אֵל. Although this proposition has, as the author says, its fair reasons (a more acceptable sense, and a restoration of the poem's metric) and a very attractive explanatory suggestion of how the text was disturbed (see p. 80), it constitutes a mere supposition. Since the MT text is supported by 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} and by the Greek versions, and since the LXX is very free in translating this part of the poem, we have to admit that if it is not original with the text (a reasonable possibility since its presence disturbs the sense and metric of the text), it was inserted very early in the history of the Biblical text.

\textsuperscript{1}E. F. Rosenmüller, \textit{Scholia in Vetus Testamentum} Sectio III (Lipsiae: J. A. Barth, 1791-93), 1-3.


\textsuperscript{4}I.e., Morgenstern, "Mythological Background," p. 110.
to that of Alexander the Great.¹

On the other side we have had scholars substantially defending the traditional view that the passage has to do with the Assyrian empire's events, and identifying the tyrant with Sargon II² or Sennacherib³ in the time of Isaiah of Jerusalem. We also find some who even think of Assuruballit.⁴ Starting at the end of the nineteenth century, some scholars strongly defended the end of the eighth century B.C. as the date for the composition of Isa 13-14. Cobb in his article on the ode of chap. 14, in which he contends it could not apply to the neo-Babylonian empire, concludes his remarks saying that "the historical and religious references point to Isaiah's time more distinctly than any other," "the language and style give confirmatory testimony of the most intricate and convincing nature"; and "the literary character of the whole piece is so elevated and powerful as to harmonize with the known writings of Isaiah."⁵ In another firm defense of this view, Ginsberg⁶ says,


³I.e., Cobb, pp. 26-28; W. Staerk, Das assyrische Weltreich im Urteil der Propheten (Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, 1908), pp. 144-47, 226-27; Vandeburgh, p. 120; S. Schiffer, "Un Chant de triomphe méconnu sur la mort de Sanherib," REJ 76 (1922):176; Eichrodt, Der Herr der Geschichte, p. 29; Erlandsson, pp. 86-91, 164; etc. Among the scholars who have wavered between Sargon and Sennacherib are A. Jeremias, pp. 526, 601; Kissane, 1:166.


after presenting his points: "The Poem (vss. 4-21) fits the unique event of the year 705 B.C. as admirably as was claimed above, is literally as worthy of Isaiah (and Isaiah as uniquely worthy of it) as was claimed above. . . ." In his already cited monograph, The Burden of Babylon, Erlandsson, after a detailed study of the language, motives, and historical context of Isa 13-14, arrives at the conclusion that

The linguistic and thematic content links it (13:2-14:23) closely with generally accepted authentic portions of Isaiah and the historical circumstances which form both the background and the cause of this account had occurred by 701 B.C. We have found that . . . the סכובאר תאמ has both its linguistic and historical context in the accounts of the prophet Isaiah on the occasion of the Assyrian occupation."

We have to agree with the last three authors cited in their strong defense of the traditional view, which advocates that the passage has, in many aspects, to do with events of the end of the eighth century and comes from the hand of Isaiah of Jerusalem. Vandenburgh, based on the fact that chap. 13 is an oracle on the fall of Babylon—which seems to have been written shortly before the fall of that great empire by the bands of the "Medes" (denoting the Persian Empire), and the difference in the literary style between those two sections—advocates that "the oracle (chap. 13) and the poem (chap. 14) were products of different periods" as well of "differently constituted minds." In his view, "when the book of Isaiah was completed, this ready-made song was inserted, most likely applying to Nabonidus. . . ." In post-exilic times "the ode was written for the purpose of inspiring the Israelites with hope for deliverance from a dominion

---

1P. 166. See also H. Barth (pp. 135-40) for discussion and support for the eighth-century view.

of which Sennacherib was an antetype. Quell affirms that the marginal words of vss. 1-4a and vss. 22-23—which are poor and without orientation—show that the poem (vss. 4b-21) was, through a violent process of redaction, incorporated into a prophecy, and that Isaiah has nothing to do with the poem—which has nothing to do with God but with gods, its origin being pagan and full of mythic material. Albright, Kapelrud, and Childs believe 14:12-15 was gotten from a Canaanite Epic. As says Heaton, the material (Isaian) is complex, and sometimes a passage must "from one point of view, be distinguished from its context, yet from another point of view it must be considered very carefully in relation to that same context." Although the prologue (vss. 1-4a) and the epilogue (vss. 22-23) and the use of the term "Babylon" seem to indicate that the prophecy was re-applied in the sixth-century exilic context we should not forget that the prophet could have been shown the whole situation long before the events occurred. Besides that, the use of the term "Babylon" (נָבֳע) does not demand that it was incorporated in the text in the sixth century B.C., since the term was used by the end of the eighth century (2 Kgs 20:12-19), and Sargon himself took the throne of Babylon and was king of both Assyria and Babylon. It could have been used also by the prophet with a different connotation.

---

1Pp. 120-21. 2Pp. 131-32, 156-57.
3"Book Reviews," p. 156. 4Baal, p. 56, n. 4.
5Myth and Reality, pp. 69-70. Childs argues that the myth is placed in a framework in which it is "thoroughly demythologized."
6Pp. 139-40. 7Cf. ANET3, p. 584.
8See above, pp. 164-66.
Summarizing, we can say that although there is a very probable chance that the author used a poem which was ready-made when he wrote the oracle, it seems that the immediate context (14:24-27) as well as a larger one in the Isaiah book (as for example 10:5-15) show that the "Burden of Babylon" should be dated as from the end of the eighth century B.C., and, consequently, that the author of the oracle, as we have it now, must have been Isaiah of Jerusalem.

**Historical Identification of the Tyrant**

It seems legitimate to say that most of the Bible prophet's oracles were related to immediate historical events—even in the case of those passages which interpreters have considered as having Messianic connotation or eschatological application, in many cases the prophetic message came or was pronounced having contemporary—or near future—events or historical situations in view. In the case of the Isaianic passage under discussion one would look for some relation to immediate historical events.

In 1896 Cobb examined the characteristics of the figure of Isa 14:4b-22, such as "oppressive tyranny," "world rulership," "famous for pomp and pride," and "his inglorious end"; rejected the idea that the passage referred to a generic king; and advocated that "at all events the traits described must characterize individuals before they can be predicated of a class."^4

---

^1 Kissane (*Isaiah*, 1:168; cf. also p. 155) has considered the possibility that an Isaiah prophecy on Assyria could have been converted into one to Babylon in the exile period. Concerning to which Assyrian king the passage refers, see below pp. 183-87.


^3 Pp. 25-35.

^4 P. 26.
Before determining the time of the event and to whom it refers, the interpreter is faced with the problem of deciding whether the description is something which—having as basis the time of composition—has already happened or is about to happen.\(^1\) We come back to this below on pp. 211-16.

**Individual application**

Opposing Cheynes\(^2\) views that the Isaian passage came from exilic times, and following E. Strachy's and Hugo Winckler's suggestion\(^3\) that Sennacherib's character would fit the Isaian passage, Cobb examines the characteristic expressions of the passage, contrasts them with the exilic twenty-eighth chap. of Ezekiel, and tries to show that the differences in language, vocabulary, and style are striking. At the end he shows that the vocabulary of Isa 14:4b-22 is the common one used in the whole book of Isaiah. This view has had a host of proponents\(^4\) from the end of the nineteenth century until today; but it was Erlandsson who, through his study on Isa 13-14, quite solidly showed (linguistically and in the

\(^1\) Cf. Kissane (The Book of Isaiah, 1:167) believes this passage is (as in 9:1-6) a past event only in the mind of the prophet; cf. also Duhm (p. 117), Marti (p. 123), and Lohmann (Die anonymen Prophetien, pp. 25-26, 42) who see the passage as a prophecy. Rost ("Jesaja," p. 175), on the other hand, thinks that due to the use of the perfect, the song speaks about some accomplished fall. Cf. also Staerk (Das assyrische Weltreich, p. 226) who says that "das Gedicht 14, 4ff. nur aus dem Eindruck einer epochemachenden geschichtlichen Persönlichkeit verständlich wird, darum auch nicht Weissagung von Zukunftigem, sondern nur Rückblick auf Vergangenes sein kann."

\(^2\) Introduction, p. 75.

\(^3\) See Cobb, p. 27. Later on Winckler waived his view, making Sargon the subject of the Ode.

\(^4\) See above pp. 180-82; and Erlandsson pp. 112-13. Cf. also Staerk, Das assyrische Weltreich . . . , pp. 144-45, who views the song as an echo of the death of Sennacherib in 681 B.C.
matter of theological motives) that the Isaian poem has conclusive characteristics which place it in the historical context of the end of the eighth century B.C.\(^1\) He also contends that if the passage should be applied to an historical monarch, Sennacherib would be the one. In this case the poem had been composed after the monarch's death which stimulated the imagination of the poet.

In 1903 Winckler advocated the application of the poem to the events concerning Sargon's death, and his view has been followed by many after him.\(^2\) Besides the reasons of linguistic and theological motives, we would say that we do have some hints--although not too conclusive--which would support the view that the text is referring to an Assyrian monarch from the last years of the eighth century (whether it be Sargon or Sennacherib): the oppressor spirit depicted in vss. 14b, 16-18 and the non-burial of the king's body in vss. 19-20. Winckler\(^3\) and Orr\(^4\) stressed the parallelism between Isa 14:18-19 and the fact that Sargon's body was apparently abandoned in the battlefield, and the reference in tablet K4730 which reports that Sargon "was not buried in his house."\(^5\) Besides

---

\(^1\) The Burden of Babylon, p. 166, etc.


\(^3\) Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, pp. 47-48.

\(^4\) Ref. by Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon," p. 50.

\(^5\) Cf. also H. Tadmor, "The Sin of Sargon," in Eretz Israel V (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1958), p. 93. See G. B. Gray, Isaiah, p. 251, who rightly observes that "'not buried in his house' . . . does not necessarily imply that he died a violent death, and lay unburied (cf. vs. 19): moreover, Sargon certainly did not involve his country and people in ruin (vs. 20); within twelve days of his death his son Sennacherib was recognized as king, and Assyria suffered no serious check for half a century after Sargon's death."
that, 2 Kgs 19:21-28, where the fall of Sennacherib is prophesied, makes us recall the Isaiah poem in many features.

We cannot deny that those who view the passage as related to the exilic times\(^1\) (and that it would be applied to Nebuchadnezzar or Nabonidus)\(^2\) have good points in the mention of the name Babylon\(^3\) in vss. 4 and 22 and the possible redactor's work in the introduction (vss. 1-4a) and conclusion (vss. 22-23) of the passage.\(^4\) In addition, some characteristics would quite fit the personality of the mentioned Neo-Babylonian rulers,\(^5\) unless one takes the position that vss. 1-4a and 22-23 were produced by a different hand and considers vss. 4b-21 separately.\(^6\) Vandenburgh has conjectured that the Ode could have been written in post-exilic times

---

1 See above pp. 178-79.

2 Although, as Jahnow observed (p. 242), Nabonidus did not fall in battle, nor was he executed by Cyrus, but he was taken prisoner and his final destiny is not known with accuracy.

3 Cobb (p. 31) contends in favor of the fact that the Assyrian rulers "repeatedly call (themselves) Sarri Babili," which would eliminate part of the tension in this passage. But Wildberger (pp. 541-42) points out that in Isaiah's time, the Babylonian kings were, as far as they were able to show their strength, against Assyria and in no way representative of a power under which the whole world had had to sigh. Due to the political situation, it seems improbable that Israel had at that time rejoiced at the end of Babel.


5 See Vandenburgh (p. 120), who cites the "plundering of forests for building material, the love for retreat and devotion in the presence of the gods and the subsequent injury to the nation occasioned by such regal neglect and by the imposing of heavy tribute on the people, as well as the dislike in the nation for this monarch (Nabonid). . . ." Cf. Staerk (Das assyrische Weltreich, p. 226) for strong argument against Nabonidus. See also Jer 50-23—where it is almost certain Nebuchadnezzar is meant—whose form and content seems to be related to Isa 14:4b-5.

6 H. Barth, p. 141.
for the purpose of inspiring the Israelites with hope for deliverance from a dominion of which Sennacherib was an anti-type. The memory of the reign of Sennacherib, who had left a lasting impression both on Palestine and Babylonia, was the germ for the growth of such a song, which was oriented with figurative characteristics of that conspicuous king, making of the song a parable.... When the Book of Isaiah was completed, this ready-made song was inserted, most likely as applying to Nabonidus, a view which appears to be confirmed by the great probability that the book of Isaiah could not have reached its final form earlier than the second century B.C.¹

We disagree with Vandenburgh's view as to the time when the poem was written as well as the time the book of Isaiah was completed; but we admit that in the time of the exile some addition by an editor could have been made in order to reapply the poem to a different historical situation, even though no Neo-Babylonian monarch fits the picture totally.

Summarizing, we may say that there is no reason to reject the view that the poem (as we have it today) came from the eighth century B.C.—written by Isaiah of Jerusalem—and bearing some relationship to one of the two Assyrian monarchs mentioned. On the other hand, an exilic writer could have added the introduction and the conclusion to the passage—or at least introduced the term יבב in vss. 4a and 22 into the text—and reapplied it to a different historical situation; but again we cannot find a Neo-Babylonian monarch who fits the descriptions in the poem, and the use of the term יבב and the apparent exilic standpoint of the prologue and epilogue are points which can be dismissed in favor of an eighth-century date of authorship. There are, however, problems in the text which militate against a definitive identification of the

¹P. 120.
historical figure. As H. Barth¹ has observed, we find an alternation between singular and plural number in relation to the tyrant of the passage.² He advocates that this lack of harmony conveys signs of editing layers in the text which were made in Isaiah's time (eighth century) or before. It seems almost impossible that a writer could have produced a piece of literature of the caliber of this Isaiah poem—a linguistic, poetic masterpiece—in quite perfect qinah meter poetry (vss. 4-17), using previous material, without setting it in an harmonious numerical form. If the writer had the capacity to introduce his editorial additions in the already written greater part of this pentameter piece, keeping the same high level of poetical expression and metrics, it is unlikely that he would have failed in resolving the disharmony in number. On the other hand, if that kind of variation in number was desired, it is not required that we attribute to the text two or more layers as far as the time of composition is concerned.

As far as vss. 12-15 are concerned, it is very difficult to apply them historically to any Assyrian or Neo-Babylonian ruler. It departs so much from any reasonable immediate historical situation that scholars have used all sorts of explanations (consideration of which constitutes a great part of this dissertation), but without reasonable certainty.

¹P. 127.
²See vs. 5: רֹ֣עָ֑י; vs. 20: בָּֽעְרָֽא; vs. 21: בָּֽעְרַֽא, where the plural number is present; and vs. 4b: נַּֽעֲרָֽא; vs. 16: נַּֽעֲרָֽא לָֽא, etc., for the singular.
Collective Application

As already mentioned, Cobb admitted that the passage could in some sense refer to a class instead of an individual. Dillmann affirms "der König . . . als Zusammenfassung des Volks und der Macht der Babylonier." Lohmann, after extensively discussing the matter of the subject of the poem and the time of its composition, arrived at the conclusions that


G. B. Gray also thinks the writer "has not in view merely a single individual." Other scholars adopted the same corporative view, and Eissfeldt recognizes that the funeral dirges were at an early date applied in a "transferred sense to collective entities," and that "it is clear that it (the poem) is directed at one of these two world powers (Assyria and Babylon), represented by the person of their king, under which Israel had so terribly suffered. . . ."

---

1See above p. 182.  
2P. 134.  
3Die anonymen Prophetien, pp. 26-42.  
5Isaiah, pp. 250-51; 253, 261.  
6Cf. P. Rost, "Jesaja, Kap 14:4b-21," pp. 175-79; etc.  
7Introduction, p. 97.
But while there are laments over cities, i.e., Ur\(^1\) and Jerusalem\(^2\), the Isaiah poem does not partake of the collective atmosphere which is present in the laments over the mentioned cities. Still others think the lament displays typical connotation and portrays a power hostile to God.\(^3\)

As we see, this passage is a very difficult one to interpret. Scholars are far from a consensus with respect to the identification of the figure(s) the passage presents. Among the problems we face in the identification of the personage(s) of the passage are:

1. Despite scholars' -- especially Cobb's\(^4\) and Erlandsson's\(^5\) -- efforts to show that the content of the poem fits linguistically into the context of the whole account of the prophet Isaiah on the occasion of the Assyrian occupation, we do not know for sure if Isaiah used a ready-made poem to compose his oracle concerning Babylon.\(^6\)

2. There is no consensus among theologians concerning whether the passage is -- from the standpoint of the time of its

---

\(^{1}\)See S. N. Kramer, "Lamentation Over the Destruction of Ur" ANET, pp. 454-63.

\(^{2}\)See the Book of Lamentations.


\(^{4}\)Pp. 18-35.


\(^{6}\)Cf. Wildberger, p. 542. As long as there is no evidence for a prototype, the poem should be attributed as an original work of the prophet.
composition—a prophecy or a description of something which has already happened.

3. Opinions are divided whether the poem, as it appears in the text, originated in the eighth century or sixth century B.C.

4. The alternating use of singular and plural in relation to the subject makes it very difficult to determine whether the personage is to be taken individually or collectively.

5. To make the identification more complicated, the third or central stanza seems to go beyond the earthly realm and to be speaking about a more-than-human figure.

Preliminary Conclusions

In response to our research so far, we have arrived at the following preliminary conclusions:

1. We have in this passage (Isa 14:4b-21) a masterpiece of Hebrew poetry written in an almost perfect qinah (vss. 4b-17) or pentameter-style bicola which, I think, were originally distributed in five stanzas of seven bicola each. The first three stanzas are well demarcated by the change of scenes or realms; the text of the last two stanzas seems to have been disturbed, deranging the symmetry of the poem, but the apparent disturbance does not detract from the intended message of the poem. The limits of the poem are very clear and distinct at its beginning. Its end, we are almost sure, occurs with vs. 21.

2. Although the poem is written in (although not exclusively) qinah meter rhythm, it was also written in a form of "mocking song." The poem seems to be a typical case of blending
the literary genre qinah and mashal (proverb, parabolic mocking
song).

3. The text does not show, in our view, any sign of
redaction in the poem itself.

4. The poem seems to have been composed in the time of
Isaiah of Jerusalem or before, and used initially by the prophet
to depict a picture that would make sense in the historical context
of his times.

5. In view of the content and characteristics of the pro­
logue and epilogue of the passage—or what precedes and follows
the poem—it could have been reapplied for a new historical context
in the exilic times.

6. In view of the last two items presented, it is very
difficult and unwise to identify the figure or subject of the poem—
in its entirety—as a specific person in a specific epoch; but it
seems that both the monarchs of the Assyrian Empire (Sargon and
Sennacherib, etc.), as well as the Neo-Babylonian Empire Rulers
(Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidus, etc.) could—depending on the epoch
of application—be meant. Besides that, the poem shows signs of
connoting more than individual personalities as its subject and
makes room for a collective or corporative application—by
transference or extension—of the subject. In that case the
entities under which Israel had intensely suffered could be ident­
ified as the world powers of Assyria or Babylon.

7. The use of the terms mashal and Babel seems to indicate
also that the power depicted in the passage is one that opposes God
and fits, in an extended sense, the powers which follow
self-sufficient, self-glorifying, rebellious, and God-opposing ways. The poem itself, the prologue and the epilogue, as well as the first part of the oracle against Babel (13:2-14:23) seem to present a tension between the description which could be applied to historical events and the description of events which belong to cosmic level. It seems that the prophet had in mind to depict something of cosmic scope, but in the process he makes use of immediate historical events which, in any instance, are part of the whole picture of the battle between God and the powers hostile to Him.

8. Vss. 12-15 are that point in the poem where the prophet, in a clearer way, gives the impression that the implications of the poem transcend mere historical figures in the human earthly realm. Those verses seem to pertain to the heavenly realm or the sphere of the heavenly beings. Examining those crucial verses in themselves, in relation to the whole poem, and in relation to other passages is the task of the following pages.

**Exegesis—vss. 12-15**

As noted above,¹ theologians since the end of the nineteenth century, have viewed these vss. (12-15) as of mythological origin; the Ras-Shamra texts have supplied some material which has strengthened the scholars' view that the material of this passage must have come (as already suggested by Gunkel²) from a Canaanite

---

¹Pp. 17-34.

²Schöpfung und Chaos, p. 133.
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setting. However, as noted in chapter 2, although we find elements in the Isaiah passage which seem to be present in the mythological literature from the Near East, we have not been able to find corresponding mythological phraseology for the Isaiah passage.

In addition to our concern of identifying the figure in vss. 4b-11 as the same one found in vss. 12-15, we are faced with the greater difficulty in this passage which derives from the fact that הָיְלֵל בֶּן־שָׁהַר, which could offer the information to identify, is unknown to us. Also, certain expressions in this third stanza of the poem have been difficult to interpret. These include, נָבָא הָיְלֵל, בֶּן־שָׁהַר, אֲפָזוּר, נֶר־בּוֹזֵר, שְׁכָּכִי־רַאֶל. Let us consider those expressions now in more detail.

Helel ben Shahar (הָיְלֵל בֶּן־שָׁהַר)

To start with, we have the task of discovering if we have in הָיְלֵל a verb or a noun, and if the root for the word is הָיְלֵל (to howl) or הָיְלָה (to shine). The Pesh. viewed the word—probably because of the use found in Jer 47:2 (הָיְלָה), Ezek 21:17 (הָיְלָה), and Zech 11:2 (הָיְלָה)—as a Hiph. of הָיְלָה and rendered it as מַדְפַּא (howl [aph. of מַדְפַּא].) Subsequent commentators seem to have followed this view. However, Henderson objects to the use of the

---


2Cf. KBL, pp. 382-83; BDB, p. 410.


4Cf. Henderson, p. 132; Young, Isaiah, 1:440. 5p. 132.
imperative in this text, saying that "the structure of the verse is 
decidedly opposed; the parallelism requiring כַּעָלִים " to 
describe the person before his having fallen from heaven, just as 
U y describes him previous to his having been felled 
to the ground. Any imperative interjected would spoil the beauty, 
and impair the force of the language."

The LXX (εἰμίστο τε), Targ. (חָלָלָן כַּעָלִים), \(^1\) and Vulg. 
(Lucifer), etc., \(^2\) took כַּעָלִים as coming from the root כַּעָלִים (to 
shine) and rendered it as a noun. As Alden says, \(^3\) we find in at 
least three Semitic languages besides Hebrew, a form of the word 
having the meaning "to shine"--the Akkadian e llu, \(^4\) the Ugaritic 
hll, and the Arabic halla. \(^5\) The MT vocalizes the word כַּעָלִים, but 
some scholars have preferred it vocalized כַּעָלִים, connecting it 
with the Arab hila\(^6\) and rendered "new moon." N. A. König\(^7\) sees

---

\(^1\) J. F. Stenning (The Targum of Isaiah [Oxford: Clarendon 
Press, 1949], pp. 48-49) translates these two words as "the bright 
star."

\(^2\) Cf. Henderson (p. 132) for a list of commentators who 
hold this view.

\(^3\) p. 36.

\(^4\) From halilu + elilu, "pure, shiny." The feminine form is 
ellitu and is a name for the goddess Ishtar; cf. Grelot, "Sur la 
vocalisation de כַּעָלִים (Isa 14:12)," VT 6 (1956): 303; Wildberger, 
pp. 534-35.

\(^5\) Cf. Wildberger, p. 535.

\(^6\) So Hugo Winckler, Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen 
... 2 vols. (Leipzig: E. Pfeiffer, 1895-1900), 1:24. D. Winton 
Thomas, BHK; cf. also KBL, p. 231.

\(^7\) König, "Lucifer," p. 479.
the last quarter moon, just about to disappear.\footnote{1}

Wildberger\footnote{2} thinks it is absurd to identify either the new moon or the last quarter moon\footnote{3} with the son of the dawn, adding that יָיָשע is good Hebrew and should not be emended.\footnote{4} He proposes the interpretation of יָיָשע as being an epithet of a deity.\footnote{5} It seems that with Grelot\footnote{6} we should maintain the MT vocalization and to admit that--based on the context in relation to יָיָשע—the word comes from יָיָשע (shine) and has an astral connotation;\footnote{7} and the translation יָיָשע (LXX) and Lucifer (Vulg.), and the paraphrase of the Targ., are in agreement with the original.\footnote{8}

The expression יָיָשע, as such, is a hapax legomenon in the OT; יָיָשע is not. In order to help in the interpretation of יָיָשע, the use of the words יָיָשע must be taken into consideration. The word יָיָשע occurs frequently\footnote{9} in the OT and

\footnote{1}{Some change יָיָשע, by which the moon (god) is designated in some Semitic languages, thus “New Moon, Son of the Last Quarter.” Cf. also McKay, p. 452.}

\footnote{2}{Cf. also Grelot, “Isaie 14:12-15,” p. 30.}

\footnote{3}{Cyrus H. Gordon ("A Marriage of the Gods in Canaanite Mythology," BASOR 65 [1937]:31-33) tends to interpret the term as meaning “new moon”; Driver (Canaanite Myths, pp. 106, 128), as the crescent moon; cf. also J. C. de Moor, "The Semitic Pantheon of Ugarit," UF 2 (1970):225sq.}

\footnote{4}{Cf. McKay, p. 452.}

\footnote{5}{Cf. McKay, pp. 451-55 for suggestions on the interpretation of יָיָשע.}

\footnote{6}{"Sur la vocalisation," p. 303.}

\footnote{7}{See also Oldenburg, "Above the Stars," p. 206, n. 121.}

\footnote{8}{Cf. also Lisowsky, pp. 1423-24; also McKay, pp. 456-60.}

\footnote{9}{Cf. Lisowsky, pp. 1423-24; also McKay, pp. 456-60.}
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is the normal Hebrew word (מֵשְׁכִּין) for the natural phenomenon "dawn."\(^1\) Isaiah's use of the term is undoubtedly with reference to the dawn phenomenon (cf. 8:20; 58:5). The word appears also in some personal names such as שלח נתי (1 Chr 8:26) and (1 Chr 7:10), but we cannot affirm with certainty that these words relate to any deity of dawn.\(^2\) Thus there is no reason to interpret the term נתי (in the OT and more specifically in Isaiah) as referring to a pagan god, since its biblical use is in the sense of the "dawn"—natural phenomenon. Thus the expression שלח נתי should be rendered "shining one, son of the dawn." The versions rendering of שלח נתי: LXX (יוֹם מֵשְׁכִּין), Vulg. (Lucifer qui mane oriebaris); and Targ. (יהי Woo יִשְׁמָר), express faithfully the sense of astral phenomenon of the dawn.\(^3\) McKay\(^4\) has discussed some interpretations of the "Helel ben Shahar" expression such as: its representing different aspects of the moon, different aspects of the sun, or of Jupiter;\(^5\) but he correctly admits that the most plausible theory is the one which takes Isa 14:12-15 as a nature myth and that Helel is the

\(^1\)McKay (pp. 456-59) says that MT uses נתי in a personalized way, but that the versions attempted to remove that connotation. However, this view seems improbable. Cf. also L. Köhler, "Die Morgenröte im Alten Testament," ZAW 44 (1926):56-59.


\(^4\)See Meadors (pp. 13-23) for a more detailed discussion on the versions' translation of the phrase.

\(^5\)Pp. 452-56.  

\(^6\)Ibid., pp. 452-53.
"shining one," the brightest star in the morning sky, Venus as the morning star." His views are summarized thus:

Venus, like Mercury, lies inside the Earth's orbit and appears in the west at evening following the Sun to rest and in the east at or before dawn rising before the Sun. Because of its orbital path it is never seen to attain the celestial zenith before it is blotted from sight by the light of the rising Sun. Instead it seems to the observer that it is unable to ascend "above the stars of El" and is compelled to descend from its highest point towards the morning horizon eventually disappearing from view, as it were "cut down to the ground" and "brought down to Sheol, to the recesses of the Pit" beneath the eastern horizon.  

McKay points out that this view does not require textual emendation and recognizes the normal meaning of the word (cp). Grelot, as noted above, started with Gunkel's and Duhm's suggested identification of Helel with the Greek Phaeton, and developed the idea and arrived at the conclusion that Helel is indeed the same personage as Phaeton-Venus, and that the same motive of  יהוּדָת attached to Phaeton Son of Eu is perceived in Helel ben Shahar. Grelot advocates the view that there was a prototype of a Phoenician myth, which was imitated by the Biblical author; and after being introduced into the Greek world, it developed itself into several independent lines. Also, as was discussed above, Grelot identifies Helel ben Shahar with the Phoenician Ashtar which personifies the planet Venus and admits


3Schöpfung und Chaos, pp. 132-34.  

4P. 119.

5"Isaie 14:12-15," p. 32.  

6Pp. 88-90.
that although a fall of Ashtar is not witnessed, there is testimony of Ashtar's ambitious immoderation which caused the fall of the Isaiah figure.\(^1\) However, he recognizes that the myth passed through mutations and adaptations, and its meaning is not simple. At the end of his discussions, Grelot admits that the theme of Ashtar's fall could well be the mythic explication of a natural phenomenon (as presented above, p. 80); but in relation to the biblical author, the polytheistic and pantheistic context is eliminated in behalf of Yahweh's faith, and Helel (which Grelot says is Ashtar) is presented only incarnated in the King of Babylon. Despite the uniqueness of Yahweh, use of literary allusions\(^2\) are made, and it seems that ancient mythic themes continue to be used to point to Yahweh as a God conquerer of the powers that oppose His plans.\(^3\) Childs,\(^4\) after presenting his reconstruction of the Helel myth, affirms that

The prophetic writer has taken this old myth and reworked it into his taunt song. He compares the mighty king of Babylon to the upstart, Helal. He also had a brilliant start, but then Yahweh hurled him down to become the laughingstock of the nations. . . . In spite of the highly mythical nature of the material, the framework into which it is now placed has had the effect of thoroughly demythologizing it. The myth of Helal has become merely a striking illustration dramatizing the splendour of the rise to fame and the shame of the fall which is sarcastically hurled at the king of Babylon. There is no tension whatever between the myth and its Old Testament

\(^1\)As we saw above on pp. 87-90, there are also difficulties in this view. See Wildberger, pp. 552-53; cf. Oldenburg, "Above the Stars," pp. 199-208.

\(^2\)Oldenburg ("Above the Stars," p. 208) and Childs (Myth and Reality, p. 70) call it "illustration."

\(^3\)Cf. Grelot, "Isaie 14:12-15," p. 46.

\(^4\)Myth and Reality, pp. 67-71.
framework since the myth carries only illustrative value as an extended figure of speech.1

In the light of the nature of the Isaiah text and others (as presented above on pp. 190-96, and below on pp. 205-16), it seems that what comes in vss. 12-15 is not only a "mere illustration" which dramatizes the Babylonian fate, but something that carries our mind to the ultimate origin of all antagonism to God's plans. This truth is in one way or another present in the myths of ancient cultures and peoples. Although using the mythical language, the prophet presents something considered mythological (but not necessarily unhistorical) in the monotheistic Yahweistic frame and context. Support for this view is revealed as our study progresses.

Other Alleged Mythic Expressions in Vss. 13-15

When Grelot affirms that "Tant de références mythologiques rassemblées en si peu d'espace laissent supposer une étroite dépendance du passage par rapport à son modèle phénicien;"2 De Vaux adds that "Ces correspondences, réunies dans quelques versets, suggèrent que la cantilène d'Isa 14 s'inspire d'un modèle phénicien,"3 and Albright suggests that the prophet probably quoted a dirge related to the 'Athtar of the Baal Epic.4 We have

1Ibid., pp. 69-70.
to admit that indeed the prophet is using a terminology that was familiar among the mythological language of the Ancient Near East, especially in the Phoenician culture.\textsuperscript{1} But what must be emphasized is that the prophet was not really dependent on the myths. He used their language to express something that was clear in his mind and which could not be grasped in the myth itself. Besides that, as we have already affirmed,\textsuperscript{2} those alleged mythic motives could have been, due to cultural continuity, common elements.

**Stars of El.** As noted above,\textsuperscript{3} El was the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, but the term is frequently used in the OT to designate the God of Israel as well as a heathen god.\textsuperscript{4} Concerning the expression \textit{הָאָהָבַבְּרֵי אֵל}, in fact, we find in the Ugaritic text\textsuperscript{5} --despite its badly broken condition-- chances of parallelism between הָאָהָבַבְּרֵי, "the Sons of El," and פִּרְבָּבִים, "the assembly of the stars."\textsuperscript{6} The form פִּרְבָּבִים has been found in the Phoenician Inscription of Pyrgi\textsuperscript{7} and could have had its origin in the Canaanite

\textsuperscript{1}See above pp. 84-98 for references and comments on this.

\textsuperscript{2}See above p. 96.

\textsuperscript{3}Pp. 92-93; 11-14.

\textsuperscript{4}Cross (">א", \textit{TDOT} [1974], 1:254) says that "El is rarely if ever used in the Bible as the proper name of a non-Israelite, Canaanite deity in the full consciousness of a distinction between El and Yahweh, God of Israel." Cassuto (\textit{The Goddess Anath}, p. 57) thinks that the word פִּרְבָּבִים in Isa 14:13, Hosea 12:1, and Ezek 28:2 refers to the Canaanite El; but see above pp. 91-92, and below p. 250

\textsuperscript{5}CTA, 1:10.1.3-4.

\textsuperscript{6}Cf. Dahood, "Punic הָבְבֵים," p. 170; Pope, El, p. 103; cf. also Fohrer, Jesaja, 1:175, who thinks the phrase is superlative, translating it "the highest stars."

mythic language, but as we have discussed above, that is not totally necessary. In Job 38:7, the "morning stars" are parallel to the Sons of God and, consequently, can "be identified with the members of the divine assembly." Of the thirty-seven times that the word הָעֹלָה is used in the OT, only Isa 47:13 and Amos 5:26 clearly refer to an astral cult, but Isa 14:13 is the only text where הָעֹלָה is related to גָּלָם.

Mount of Assembly. This expression was a common phrase in the religious language of the cultures of the whole Fertile Crescent. The OT also presents the concept of the "heavenly assembly" which was presided over by God and composed of created beings. Scholars think that Israel must have, to some extent, adapted this notion of the divine assembly from the neighboring cultures.

Recesses of the North. Concerning the expression הָעֹלָה, we have seen above that in most of the OT occurrences it indicates one of the cardinal points of the compass, but in

1So Cross ("רָעָם," TDOT [1974], 1:254) who calls it a "frozen, archaic phrase."
2Pp. 92-93. 3Clifford, p. 161, n. 84.
4Lisowski, p. 670.
5See above, pp. 92-93, especially n. 1 on p. 92 for bibliographical sources on the matter. See also Gray, Legacy, p. 24.
7Cf. Miller, Divine Warrior, p. 66; Clifford, pp. 139-43.
Isa 14 i t seems to have a different connotation. It seems that the term חַסְדָּה is the designation for the Ugaritic mythological mountain,¹ the dwelling place of Baal. But on the other hand, it is almost sure² that despite the linguistic parallels between the Isaiah expression and the ancient Near Eastern literature (especially Phoenician), the prophet uses it in a different context and dimension. In Isaiah the mountain has nothing to do with Baal or Mount Casius,³ but with something in the Yahwistic context. It is also doubtful that the Isaian expression has to do with Mount Zion itself;⁴ it rather seems that the passage is talking about a spot which is opposite that located in Sheol, the "depths of the pit," i.e., Yahweh's dwelling place in the heavenly realm. Ginsberg⁵ translates חֵֽרְבָּה חַסדָּה, "in Highest Heaven," and has the view that חַסְדָּה has in this passage the same meaning as in Job 26:7.⁶ Clifford interprets Zaphon not as a parallel to

¹See Eissfeldt, Baal Zaphon, pp. 1-30; de Langhe, Les Textes, 2:217-45. For an elaborated discussion on the view that the expression comes from the Babylonian concept of the "mountain of the world," see Alfrink, "Der Versammlungsberg," pp. 41-57. Cf. also Clifford, pp. 57-59; Montgomery, "Notes," p. 102; Ohler, pp. 156-60.

²See above, pp. 106-09.

³Against Young, [Isaiah, 1:441, n. 78.

⁴See above, pp. 108-09.


⁶This assumption is based on the fact that in Job 26:7: (אֶלֶּה הַגְּדוֹלָה אֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ הָאָרֶץ אֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ) means (due to the parallel) "heavens," and the word נִֽשְׁתַּל is used of הר כִּבָּא in several passages (Isa 40:22; 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 51:13; Jer 10:12; 51:15; Ez 12:1; Ps 104:2; Job 9:8), and in all the quoted passages except two (Isa 40:22 and Job 9:8), נִֽשְׁתַּל is paired with הַגְּדוֹלָה. E. Dhorme (Job, ET by Harold Knight [London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1967], p. 372) views נִֽשְׁתַּל as a "celestial region." Cf. also de Langhe, Les Textes, 2:237-44, for more discussion of the matter.
the Mount of Assembly but to בְּנֵי בֹרֶי, "the heights of the clouds," and advocates Ginsberg's view saying that "Zaphon's meaning seems to be practically 'heavens'."^1

J. J. M. Roberts strongly resists this interpretation of Job 2:7, which is also applied to Isa 14:13, advocating that the parallelism and progression of thought in the Job passage argue for taking מֵאָלֵךְ as referring to the sacred mountain. Also Ginsberg points out that the mountain on which the Ugaritic פְּרָמִיד meets is not מֵאָלֵךְ but מִלֶּךְ.^4

Despite the uncertainty of scholars concerning the real meaning of the term in Isa 14:13, as was pointed out by Ginsberg, מֵאָלֵךְ stands in antithesis to מִלֶּךְ, and the polar opposite of the nether world is the sky; Amos 9:2; Ps 139:8." The parallel passage in Ezek 28:12-19 corroborates with the idea that מֵאָלֵךְ means something else than Mount Casius or Mount Zion.5

---

^1Cosmic Mountain, pp. 161-62. Cf. also Ohler, p. 156.


^3UL, p. 13 (cf. also CTA, 1:2.1.14,21). See Pope, El, pp. 68-69, where the meaning of the Ugaritic is discussed.

^4Gaster (Thespis, p. 138) reads מֵאָל instead of מִלֶּך. Pope (El, p. 68) says that "even if the reading מֵאָל is established, it might of course, still be a scribal error." Eissfeldt (El im Ugaritic Pantheon, p. 33, n. 3) thinks מִלֶּך might not even be a whole word.

^5Clifford (p. 131) suggests that the translatio phenomenon could have happened in which the relics attributed to Zaphon could have been transposed to Zion, in a different context. See Gaster (Thespis, p. 169) for the thesis that the gods dwell in the north. See also Morgenstern, "Psalm 48," pp. 47-87, for the biblical and extra-biblical traditions concerning מֵאָל in the Semitic cultures and the tendency "of post-exilic period writers to invest the various mountains of Israelite and Jewish tradition with various of the
In Ezek 1:4-28 the prophet definitely implies that the glory of Yahweh comes from the north, and identifies the place from which Yahweh’s glory comes as the dwelling place of God. It is very interesting that Ezek 1 has some expressions (see vss. 4, 7-8, 13-14, etc.) which resemble the dwelling place of the Cherub in chap. 28, a passage which in several aspects is parallel to the Isaian one.

Summarizing we would say that it is very doubtful that the Isaiah writer had in view the Phoenician Mount Cassius. That he referred to Mount Zion, the location of the temple, is also improbable. The context and parallelism favor, as we see it, some region in the Celestial Sphere.¹

As far as the expression אֶלְעָה בֵּית יְהֹוָה יְהוָה, “I will ascend above the heights of the clouds,”² is concerned, we have mythological qualities and attributes of Safon.” K. Barth (Church Dogmatics, 3.9.§ 41) identifies “the mount of God, in the extreme north” (Isa 14:13) with the “cosmic polar point” and interestingly says that “Paul obviously has this in mind when he speaks in 2 Cor 12:2 of his rapture to the ‘third heaven’.”

¹See A. Barnes, Notes on the Old Testament — Isaiah, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1950), 1:272-74, for more discussion on the view of several Oriental cultures concerning the north as the residence of the gods. He also asserts that several passages in the OT (i.e., Ezek 1:4, 5; Job 37:22; Zech 6:1-8, etc.) show that the northern regions were regarded as the seat of striking and peculiar manifestations of the divine glory. Cf. also J. Savignac, “Note sur le Sens du term Saphon dans quelques passages de la Bible,” VT 3 (1953):95-96. A. Jeremias (p. 257, n. 3) comments that “the Rabbis imagine that the earth is surrounded by heaven, but the north is open. Comp. Herrschensonh’s Hebrew writing, Book of the Seven Wisdoms, pp. 4 and 12. ‘It is said in Baba bathra ii. 25b: The heavens surround the earth. For Aksadra (surrounded on three sides, not the north side) this is explained thus: there is no heaven there; that is, it is open there, there is a gap in the heavens.’ It is explained in other passages that the dwelling place of evil demons is in the gap; tempest, ghosts, shedim, lightning, and demons come from thence’.”

²Vs. 14a.
already commented on it in the previous chapter\(^1\) and arrived at the conclusion that when the OT writers use the "cloud" imagery, they associate it with the manifestation or intervention of Yahweh. The Isaiah passage then shows Helel's pretensions to usurp divine prerogatives. The divine name עליון occurs thirty-one times\(^2\) in the Hebrew Bible,\(^3\) most of them in poetic texts.\(^4\) Besides short notes in the commentaries, several scholars have written on this term more extensively.\(^5\) Nyberg advocates that אל, אל, אלהים, אל סדאם\(^6\) are the same deity which was absorbed by Yahweh.\(^7\) A statement in Sanchunyatho'n's Theogony\(^8\)--where אלהים (מן) is referred to as a distinct god in relation to אל belonging to one of the "Cosmogonic

\(^1\)Pp. 96-98. See also W. Boyd Barrick, "The Rich Man from Arimathea (Matt 27:57-60) and IQIs\(^4\)," JBL 96 (1977):235-39, for the meaning of הנבכנב.

\(^2\)Lisowsky, p. 1017.

\(^3\)Four times in Genesis (14:18-22); Num 24:16; Deut 32:8; 2 Sam 22:14; Isa 14:14; twenty-one times in the Psalms; twice in Lamentations (3:35, 38).

\(^4\)Except in two instances: Gen 14:18, 22.


\(^7\)Gaster (Thespis [1950], p. 86) thinks עליון (in Isa 14:14) "need not mean 'the most high', but merely 'one of the upper gods'."

\(^8\)Eusebius Praep. Ev. 1:10, 15-16.
pairs,"¹—and the presence of the term Elyon in the Sefire Inscription²—where it is ultimately associated to El, but presented as distinct deity—have puzzled scholars, especially since in Gen 14:15 and 19:7 are used as referring to the same deity. Della Vida³ says that if El and 'Elyon are two separate deities, the fact would help us better understand Num 24:16, where El and 'Elyon appear in parallelism. He adds that these two names should not be considered "as synonymous of Yahweh, but rather as two different, although related divine beings." For him, El is the Lord of Earth and 'Elyon the Lord of heaven.⁴ On the other hand, as Cross says,⁵ we can, using the biblical references for support,⁶ interpret this pair as a double name of a single god, although admitting that there is a chance that 'Elyon, early an epithet of 'El, has split apart into a separate cult, and hence 'El and 'Elyon may be paired as separate deities. This would support the view that 'Elyon is correctly

¹El as the Lord of Earth, and 'Elyon as Lord of Heaven.


³“El Elyon,” p. 3.

⁴Ibid., pp. 8-9.

⁵"Yahweh and the God," pp. 242-43.

⁶El is well attested in the Ugaritic texts as well as in the OT; and "‘Elyon is a name familiar from the OT, as an epithet of ‘El (Gn 14, 18-22; Ps 78, 35), of Yahweh (Ps 7, 18; 47, 3), of ‘Elohim (Ps 57, 3; 78, 56): it is also used in parallelism with ‘El (Num 24, 16; Ps 73, 11; 107, 11), with Yahweh (Dt 32, 3-9; 2 Sm 22, 14 [= Ps 18, 14]; Ps 91, 9), with ‘Elohim (Ps 46, 5; 50, 14), with Shaddai (Num 24, 16; Ps 91.1). It is also used alone in Ps 9, 3; 77, 11; 82, 6; Is 14, 14” (Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic," pp. 192-93).
used as an appellation of 'El in Genesis, and later, inter-changeably with El as an epithet of Yahweh.

R. Lack, after examining extra-Biblical and Biblical material on the term יְהֹוָה, arrives at the conclusion that the term was common in the Western Semitic culture, was applied to the Supreme God, was used by Israel before the occupation of the land of Canaan, and that

Disons plutôt qu'Elyon était pour Israel, à tous les moments de son histoire, le seul Grand Dieu El, le maître de tout l'univers, mais qui pour son peuple s'était révélé sous le nom de Jahwe.²

In view of the views presented above, and the use the OT makes of the term, it seems that there is no reason to reject the fact that יְהֹוָה is—in the OT use—an epithet of Yahweh.

Some Structural Observations

As was presented above, the Isaiah passage in discussion was written as a form of mockery lament³ in the qinah meter,⁴ or pentameter. The different scenes which occur in different realms⁵—earth, lower world, and heaven—show us that we have a poem built in stanzas of seven bicola each.⁶ In vss. 4b-8 we have a description of events that occurred in the earthly realm; after the tyrant's aggression, he is abased by the Lord, and men and nature lie at last

---


⁵See Ewald, p. 162; Smith, Isaiah, p. 409.

⁶Against Wildberger (p. 541) and Erlandsson (p. 122), who think "no division into stanzas can be determined with certainty."
in peace. In vss. 9-11 the oppressor's arrival to the nether world is depicted in very figurative language; the realm of the dead is clearly in view in this section. In vss. 12-15 we perceive a digression from what came before, as far as the chronological order of the existence of the tyrant—or of the figure he emulates—is concerned. The realm is without doubt a heavenly one.⁷ In vss. 16-19—despite the probable disturbance in the poetry—the thought seems to lead back to the nether-world realm. In vss. 19b-21 the scene switches—although not so markedly—back to the earthly realm where the oppressor's body faces exposure and no-burial. His destiny is made clear and the fate of his offspring is determined.

If we observe this poem attentively, we perceive that a kind of chiasm is present in its structure. The first and last stanzas present the end of the tyrant, vss. 4b-8 being an account of the things the deceased imposed on peoples and nations. Vss. 19b-21 account for the things which will be done to him. Both the first and the last stanzas present the earth finally in peace because of the destruction of the oppressor.

See Quell (pp. 150-54) for interesting remarks on the central stanza of the poem, which he defines as "ein geschlossenes mythisches Korpus" ("a closed mythical body"), and in which he confirms what is advocated here.
The second and fourth stanzas present the surprise of those who contemplate the oppressor coming to the grave (vss. 9 and 16); the change he suffered from the time he was in power to his inglorious end (vss. 10 and 16-17); the abject situation of his unburied body (vss. 11 and 19); and the kings of the nations who are mentioned as being in a better situation than he (vss. 9 and 18).

Another literary device used in this poem is the "envelope structure" which was already mentioned by Liebreich as appearing in vss. 9-15 and 16-21: the word נՉ appears in vss. 9 and 15, (also used in vs. 11); in vss. 16-17 we find נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך; and in vs. 21 נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך.

But the apex of this magnificent poem is without doubt the third stanza which takes us to an event which happened on high, for the text abounds in terms which belong to the divine abode. From the first bicolon (vs. 12a) to the seventh (vs. 15), the enigmatic being goes from "heaven" into the "depths of the pit." Between these two extremes we find those five pretensions of the great tyrant which are presented by those five first person singular verbal forms: נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נ�. In a salient manner we see the contrast between נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... נך... نך... نך... نך... ن�. The Pride Motif

As we perceive, and has also been analyzed by Erlandsson, the pride motif is very clear in the burden of Babylon as well as

2Pp. 139-42.
in the whole of Isaiah (2:9-11; 5:14-16; 9:8; 10:12-14; 16:6; 23:9; 37:22-25 [where some images present in 14:8-9 are used]; 47).

But we find this motif emphasized in other passages of the Old Testament, especially in Ezek 28:2-19. Though we cannot deny that the pride-motif is central in Isa 14 and Ezek 28, we should not forget Obadiah (3-4) which in its oracle against Edom uses a vocabulary which very much resembles that in Isaiah.

Nickelsburg has called our attention to the series of similarities and contrasts between Isa 52-53 and Isa 14,

- a) Both scenes take place in the sight of the kings (52:15//14:9).
- b) In both cases, the kings see one whom they formerly knew given over to a fate that is just the opposite of his former state.
- c) The kings react in amazement and incredulity (52:15//14:16f.).
- d) The Lucifer figure aspired to ascend to heaven and be like God and was cast down (14:12-15). The protagonist in Isaiah 52-53 is called the servant of Yahweh; his humility is stressed; his fate is to be exalted, lifted up, and made very high (52:13).

These parallels make a linking of Isaiah 52-53 and Isaiah 14 possible.

---

1 In Isa 10:12-14, where the haughty pride of the King of Assyria is portrayed, we find a self-sufficient spirit similar to the one found in 14:12-14, and six verbs in the first person singular are used by the arrogant king to describe his tyrannical attitude. This similarity in attitude seems to strengthen the view that an Assyrian king was meant in Isa 14 originally.

2 See, for that, Erlandsson (pp. 148-49), who presents the hybris in its two main modes of expressions as present in Gen 3:5 and 11:4, and its parallel in Isa 14 and Ezek 28:

- the aspiration to be like God
  
  אֱלֹהִים לְגַם אֶלֹהִים Gen. 3:5
  יִזְכֹּר לַיְשׁוֹב כָּלָלֶה יִבְשָׁמָהּ Is. 14:14
  אֶלֹהִים כָּלֶה יִבְשָׁמָהּ Ezek. 28:2
  אֶלֹהִים אָנָּנוּ Ezek. 28:9

- the aspiration to reach up to heaven
  
  אָלָלֶה לְגַם אָלָלֶה Gen. 11:4
  תְּיָשֶׁר לְגַם אָלָלֶה יִבְשָׁמָהּ Is. 14:13
  יִשְׁמָר לְגַם אָלָלֶה יִבְשָׁמָהּ Is. 14:13
  אָלָלֶה לְגַם אָלָלֶה יִבְשָׁמָהּ רָאָיְתָה על יִבְשָׁמָהּ Is. 14:14
  אָלָלֶה לְגַם אָלָלֶה יִבְשָׁמָהּ Ezek. 28:2
  אָלָלֶה לְגַם אָלָלֶה יִבְשָׁמָהּ Ezek. 28:2

See also Gowan (When Man Becomes God) for an in-depth study of human hybris in several passages of the OT, including Isa 14 and Ezek 28.

F. L. Moriarty, "The Lament over Tyre (Ezek 27)," Gregorianum 46 (1965): 84, has noted that "the condemnation of human pride ... is a common theme of the two prophets (Isaiah, Ezekiel)."
natural and strengthen the case for their juxtaposition in Wisdom.¹

Commenting on the Servant Songs,² W. F. Lofthouse noted that "they may be regarded as the summit of Old Testament prophecy, where


²The literature on the interpretation of Isa 52-53, as well as on the history of the interpretation of these two chapters, is immense. For bibliography on the matter see Christopher R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948); J. S. van der Ploeg, Les chants du Serviteur de Yahvé (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1936); Pierre Grelot, Les Poèmes du Serviteur (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1981). Through the centuries four main theories have been proposed for the interpretation of Isa 53 and the identification of the Sufferer Servant: (1) The Servant was an anonymous contemporary of Isaiah; (2) the Servant was the prophet himself; (3) the Servant was empirical Israel, ideal Israel, the pious remnant of the true Israel, the order of the prophets, together with combinations of these elements in different proportions; and this is known as the Collective Theory; (4) the Servant was the Messiah—or the Messianic Theory (for discussions on these theories and their exponents through the centuries see North, The Suffering Servant; van der Ploeg, pp. 107-60. I adopt the Messianic theory for the following reasons: (1) Even if the prophet initially had in view some anonymous contemporary or himself, he would depict a type of an eschatological figure to appear in the future (the tension between the present and the future, and between the earthly and cosmic is real in Isaiah; see pp. 219-20); (2) if the collective application is pressed, one could say that Christ was in a sense a personification of Israel; (3) the Jewish interpreters and the Targum itself interpreted the Servant as being the Messiah, and they probably "abandoned the messianic in favor of the collective interpretation as a means of defense against the Christians; to admit that the Servant was the Messiah was to lay themselves the more open to the assaults of the Christian propaganda" (North, p. 18); (4) the New Testament and Jesus Himself were conscious that Isa 53 was a prophecy of the Christ (see H. Wheeler Robinson, The Cross of the Servant: A Study in Deutero-Isaiah [London: Student Christian Movement, 1926], pp. 64ff.; F. R. M. Hitchcock, "The 'Servant' in Isaiah and the NT," Exp, Ser. 8 14 [1917]:309-20; North, pp. 23-26); and (5) a fair interpretation of Isa 53 in the context of the Scriptures shows that the prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus' life (see van der Ploeg, pp. 149-60; North, pp. 207-19; Grelot, Les Poèmes du Serviteur, pp. 138-89; H. W. Robinson, The Cross in the OT [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955], pp. 65-114).
prophecy indeed rises to something else to which I would give the name of myth.\(^1\) Even though we could refrain ourselves from classifying Isa 53 as having any mythical coloring—even in the sense Lofthouse uses—we have to admit that that song's very figurative language and the universal-scope emphasis raises the passage above the level of general prophecy.\(^2\) Isa 53 and Isa 14 share this universal-scope characteristic with an emphasis on eschatology, which identifies—to some extent—these passages with apocalyptic literature.\(^3\) Thus Isa 14 and Isa 53 seem to present two contrasting powers and their main protagonists in the "cosmic sweep" of the controversy between Good and Evil: the attitude of one the figures being a solution to neutralize the attitude of the other. Furthermore we should "recognize," as Lofthouse remarks, "that no 'solution' of the mystery of evil and of redemption, no exposition of the ineffable grace of God, has been more penetrating, outside the New Testament itself, which

---

\(^1\) Quoted by North, p. 212. The term myth here means "philosophic myth after the fashion of Plato . . . [which] illustrates our philosophical knowledge without adding to it . . . ken," C. C. J. Webb, God and Personality (London: George Allen, 1918), p. 170. Webb adds, "The philosophical myth may provisionally take the place of history which we have now at hand in memory or on record," ibid., p. 177; and in the words of North (Suffering Servant, p. 213) later on "genuine history would then to a certain extent supersede myth."


\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 18-19. Cf. also Leonhard Goppelt, Typos, trans. by Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), p. 234, who notes that "apocalypticism . . . is the successor of prophecy and carries on the purposes of prophecy in an universal and radically eschatological way. At the same time, however, it brings a certain amount of alienation from prophecy."
is here (Isa 53) so strangely foreshadowed or more evangelical.¹

In the same mood one cannot examine this third stanza in the Isaiah poem without also thinking of that magnificent counterstory which presents Jesus the "lowly one": Phil 2:5-11. In comparing these two passages we can perceive the opposite attitudes taken by the Isaiah figure and Christ Jesus:

![Diagram showing the comparison between Isa 14:12-15 and Phil 2:5-11]

The being in Isa 14 was a creature subjected to mortality. Christ in Phil 2, by His humiliation, became one with humanity, but is Immortal God at the same time. Zimmerli,² comparing Ezek 28:11-19 with Phil 2:5-11, says that both passages portray the true history of mankind; they are "more than mere episodic occurrences." Since Isa 14 emphasizes the same pride-motif and portrays a more perfect contrast to the attitude taken by the being in Phil 2, the comparison suggested by Zimmerli is an appropriate one.


²Ezekiel, 2:95.
Past Events as the Root of Motives of Present Condemnation

The Isaiah passage under study has some affinities to other biblical texts such as Ezek 28 and Rev 12 which deserve some consideration. All three of these passages describe some event, or pronounce some judgment, but at a certain point they stop talking about the present or near future situation and start presenting a past event which seems to lie at the basis of or is the moral cause of the present attitude. For example, in Ezek 28 the prophet describes the sin of the prince of Tyre (vss. 2-10), which is a kind of present situation; but from vss. 12-15 the writer starts talking about something which seems to have happened in the past and that seems to transcend the present historical realm; or something in the past which, if not mythological, is about the remote past and even gives a hint of an event that occurred in the heavenly realm. After reaching that point, the passage comes back again to the present or near-future event (sometimes smoothly as in the case of the Ezekiel passage, sometimes abruptly as in Isa 14 [vss. 15-16] and Rev 12 [vss. 9-10]). The sections in these texts which seem to refer back to a different but related event are Isa 14:12-15; Ezek 28:12-17; Rev 12:7-9. Grelot has grasped the truth of the different plans or realms in the antagonism between Yahweh and the opposing powers, which he presents as the opposing forces (1) at the creation, (2) in the theme of divine war in the angelic realm (where good and bad angels such as Michael and the

1There are other passages (as for example: Dan 7-8, etc.) where, in my view, the phenomenon occurs.
dragon are an example [Rev 12]), and (3) the earthly nations which oppose Yahweh's designs.¹

Thus Isa 14:12-15 sings about an event which does not belong (in point of time) to the two stanzas that precede it. As Quell² says, the material (which he considers mythological) of this stanza is without doubt of decisive value to judge the whole poem. This section not only illustrates a monarch's self-sufficient or proud attitude; it presents something which belongs to him and at the same time is beyond him. The prophet starts vs. 12 without giving any warning that there is a change of figure and context, but at the same time it is impossible not to think of that. Hanson corroborates this thesis when he, in commenting about the tension between cosmic dimension and the historical events, affirms that "primordial event, historical past, future salvation are all brought together into one dynamic tension-filled unity which permits Yahwism neither to be reduced to the one-dimensional historicizing of the deuteronomic history nor to escape into the timelessness of myth."³ Cross⁴ agrees that "in Israel, myth and history always stood in a strong tension,"

²Cf. Quell, pp. 150-53, for more on this matter.
⁵"Myth" here should be taken in the sense of "a symbolic, approximate expression of truth which the human mind cannot perceive sharply and completely but can only glimpse vaguely, and therefore cannot adequately or accurately express... It implies, not falsehood, but truth... an insight more
but adds, "myth serving primarily to give a cosmic dimension and transcendent meaning to the historical, rarely functioning to dissolve history."\(^1\) We also agree with Barr who declares, "It is thus perhaps possible to say that the central position in Israelite thought is occupied by history rather than myth, and that such survivals of myth as exist are controlled by the historical sense."\(^2\)

It seems that this tension is present in Isa 14, where historical and cosmic events, past, present, and future, are all brought together into the mentioned "dynamic tension-filled unity."

To confirm our thesis we have the very interesting and revealing text in the Apocalypse of Isaiah (chaps. 24-27), in which the prophet talks about God punishing "the host of heaven, in heaven, and the kings of the earth, on the earth," as if blending the two realms,\(^3\) bringing them into judgment and to an end together (24:21-22). This passage seems to bring light to the time of the

[ Footnotes: 
\(^1\)"The Divine Warrior," p. 19. \(^2\)"The Meaning," p. 8. \(^3\)See P. D. Hanson, "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined," Int 25 (1971):454-79, where he presents the view that "prophecy emerged from a mythopoeic environment, within which divine activity per se was regarded as occurring on a cosmic plane and within which the mundane sphere was regarded as a mere reflection of the drama of the gods" (p. 457), and discusses the tension between those two realms; see also below pp. 219-20. ]
event described, whether it is something which already happened, or it is about to happen. Kissane advocates that “the poem can be interpreted like 9:1-6, i.e., it is a past event only in the mind of the prophet,” taking the verb tenses as prophetic perfects. Rost thinks that the fall of the tyrant is something accomplished, since the use of the perfect is clear, and adds that “nur gezwungen von einer Weissagung gesprochen werden kann.”

It seems to me that the passage talks about something that has happened (objective for which the poem was originally written); what is happening (event or happening for which the poem is now secondarily applied); and what will happen (in the sense that [according to Isa 24:21-22] judgment will be brought against the hosts of heaven and the kings of the earth). Thus, as it appears in this passage, the poem—regardless of what the original author had in mind when the poem was composed—seems to be related to past and future events. Besides referring to some immediate historical event, Isa 14:1-21 portrays two other dimensions: it depicts the attitudes and judgment of power hostile to God and in addition carries us to the past (vss. 12-15) to a figure—in the heavenly realm—who seems to have had the same proud attitude and had an unhappy end.

Isaiah 14 and the Whole Book of Isaiah

It is not necessary to say that chap. 13 is related to chap. 14, for the heading בָּני בָּבֶל, "burden of Babylon," covers

---

1P. 167.  
2"Jesaja," p. 175.  
3On the meaning of בָּני see: P. A. H. de Boer, "An Inquiry
both chaps. (including 14:24-27). G. B. Gray has suggested that chap. 13 has in itself eschatological features.\(^1\) O. Kaiser\(^2\) also perceived the tension\(^3\) between the immediate historical events and a universal event, with the text switching from universal future event to local prophecy.

It is important that we understand that the term eschatology should be taken not only as meaning the doctrine of the things which concern the end of the world but, as Clements says, as "the study of ideas and beliefs concerning the end of the present world order, on the introduction of a new order," not obscuring "the intra-

\(^1\) Isaiah 1-39, pp. 237-38; Gray says that "whereas in vss. 17-19 the poem is quite clearly concerned with actual conditions, and possibilities closely related to them, in other places there appears the vagueness of an eschatological poem; the opening verses might well refer to superhuman armies of Yahweh, and by no means obviously suggest a single specific nation . . . ," and adds that "the darkness (vs. 10) and the universal commotion are eschatological features . . . ," pp. 237-38.

\(^2\) Isaiah 13-13, p. 8: "In 13:2-22 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." Kaiser warns us against any attempt by means of literary criticism to distinguish fragments of an older original within vss. 6-13, and urges us to accept these two natures of material as they are found apparently intermingled in the text (p. 9). Cf. also Vermeylen, pp. 288-91, for more comments on the eschatological nature of the passage.

\(^3\) See Hanson, "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined," pp. 457-61, who discusses the tension between the historical and the cosmic plane, for prophets always seem to "straddle two worlds, to view the deliberations and events of the cosmic realm, but then immediately to integrate that vision into events of the politico-historical order" (p. 459).
historical nature of such divine action."¹ Thus we perceive that there is no arbitrariness in affirming that in Isa 14 the prophet straddles two worlds, for that is true also in chap. 13 which belongs to the same block-passage called the Burden of Babylon.

Besides, it seems that the whole book of Isaiah has a constant tension between those two realms. It is found in chap. 6 where heavenly and earthly realms blend together, or are in tension. Even there it is difficult to know into which temple (heavenly or earthly) the prophet was taken. The so-called Apocalypse of Isaiah (chaps. 24-27) presents the same phenomenon, especially 24:21-22 where the judgment of the inhabitants of the two worlds or realms is emphasized in a distinctive manner.² In the second part of the Isaiah book³ the picture is the same. Chaps. 65-66 are an example of a text that intermingles the two realms in its structure (65:1-16 --17-25; 66:1-14--15-24); here Hanson's statement is pertinent that "in the eighth century Isaiah illustrates perhaps better than any other prophet the delicate balance achieved by prophetic Yahwism between the visionary element and the pragmatic integration of the cosmic vision into the events of that time."⁴

⁵The Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 19. See also pp. 23-25 for
Thus, the intermingling of the historical and eschatological, earthly and heavenly realms in the book of Isaiah strengthens our view that chap. 14:12-15 talks about an event that transcends the earthly realm.

Ezekiel 28:1-19

Limits of the Passage

The oracles against Tyre are very well delimited in their beginning (see 26:1; 27:1; 28:1, 11; observe the formula רֵעָה [רֵעָה] דֶּבֶרֶתֶּהוּ אֶלֶּהוּ לְאַלְמָרָה [רָאָתָה] בֵּ-אֵזוּם) and at the end of each of them (see 26:21; 27:36b; 28:19b). As Zimmerli\(^1\) has observed, the two oracles in Ezek 28 (1-10 and 11-19) have—on the basis of 28:19b being used as an epilogue for both—been intended as a unified whole and "fit together from the point of view both of content and of form."\(^2\) However, the two formulae for receiving the word of God in vss. 1 and 11 show that these two blocks must—in some way—be considered as having their own individuality. Besides, the nature of the material makes—in some aspects—the two passages distinct.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\)Ezekiel, 2:22, 73; cf. also Loretz, UF 8 (1976):455.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 22.

\(^3\)Zimmerli, Ezekiel, p. 73, observes that vss. 11-19 "operates to an unusual degree with material of a mythical nature, vss. 1-10, on the other hand, in spite of vs. 2, produce a more strongly formulaic impression."
Because the first part of chap. 28 is not introduced as a qinah, some commentators are inclined to view it as prose. BHS views the passage as prose, while BHK tries to present the oracle in metric form. Cheminant advocates that the whole oracle must have been originally written in the style of lamentation.

Budde suggests that at least vss. 9-10 resemble the qinah meter; and Cheminant proposes taking the last two words (לתובה מלח) from vs. 2—which he thinks are in excess there—to make a five-stress bicolon and to add them at the end of vs. 5, making of the last part of that a perfect five-stress bicolon. Although the presented suggestions would solve—at the expense of changes of word and order of the text—the problem of vss. 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10, we would not find qinah meter in vss. 4a, 5, 7, and 8. Zimmerli observes that it is difficult to recognize a consistent metrical form, for what we really have here is a "free alternating of three and two-foot lines combined into units of five, six or eight lines." Thus it is impossible to find a


3 "Das Hebräische Klagelied," p. 20.

4 P. 66. Cf. also pp. 67-71 for an attempt to find metric poetry in this oracle.

5 Ezekiel, 2:76.
regular qinah meter poetry in these verses. Zimmerli also observes that, "as already in chap. 27 (following chap. 26) and in chap. 19 (following chap. 17), so here too the lament follows directly after a divine judgment oracle." He also makes a critical review of the passage and contends that a "fairly succinct basic text has been secondarily enriched and had its content expanded by the motif of the wisdom of the king of Tyre." Attention is called to the "ugly repetition" which overloads vss. 6-7 (.) and other signs of the expansion of the text. Loretz, after making a stichometric analysis of the passage, admits "Sekundären Zufügungen."

Let us examine the text:

Prose

1Ezekiel, 2:87; cf. also 1:391. 2Ezekiel, 2:76, 87-89.

3"Der Sturz des Fürsten von Tyrus," pp. 455-58. Cf. also Frank Hossfeld, Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches, FZB 20 (Wurzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977), pp. 162-72, who thinks vss. 1-2, 6a, and 7-10 constitute the basic text, vss. 3-5, and 6b being an addition concentrated on the wisdom of the ruler of Tyre.
Besides the formula for receiving God's Word and the Commission to the prophet to address the Ruler of Tyre (vss. 1-2a), the poem presents three more phrases (vss. 2b; 6a; 10b) which were clearly written in prose. The three formulae for delivering God's Word used in the poem delimit the beginning and the end of the poem, as well as the transition between the indictment (vss. 2b-5) and the punishment (vss. 6b-10a) descriptions. We note that the two tricola present in the oracle are at the center of the poem, back-to-back. The rest of the two halves is an approximately even mixture of qinah and non-qinah bicola. The prose division comes between the two central tricola. The poem is perfectly balanced in its parts:

**Indictment (vss. 2b-5)**—44 words—174 letters

**Punishment (vss. 6b-10a)**—44 words—174 letters

Depending on the way we group the words belonging to the construct chains, we also come out with an identical number of stresses in both Indictment and Punishment, i.e., 41. Besides that, the repetition of words and phrases in both parts seems to show the design with which this poem was produced:
Observing this poem we perceive that we have in it half a dozen of what could be considered qinah verses; three being in the first part or Indictment (vss. 2c, 3a, 4b), and three in the second part or Punishment (vss. 9a, 9b, 10a). The Indictment ends with a tricolon (vs. 5) and the Punishment starts with a tricolon (vss. 6b, 7a). Although we could find some signs which might indicate some expansion of the text, the facts presented seem to demonstrate that the first oracle in Ezek 28 was written under design and seem to show that the material of this piece of literature was in it since the beginning.

Vss. 12-19

The oracle against the king of Tyre (vss. 12-19) is introduced as a qinah, and since the advent of Budde's famous article on

---

1 If we consider the words of the construct chains בולבְּךָ רְכִים as carrying a stress each.

2 Dr. W. H. Shea, chief adviser on this thesis, observes that this poem could have been written in a pattern which goes thus:
   Alternating Qinah in the first half,
   Back-to-back tricola at the center,
   Qinah all in a row at the end.
   I think this could be a possibility.

3 As, for example, the repetition found in vss. 6ff. (...ולכַּעַל). See Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:75.
Hebrew Lamentation, it has been—with some exceptions—recognized that despite metrical irregularities today, this oracle must have been written originally in the qinah or pentameter verse.

Hölscher's view is that only those parts in the book which were in a special qinah meter form were originally from the prophet, and the prose material, including 28:12-19, was spurious. Irwin, considered one of the most arbitrary analysts of Ezekiel's prophecy, reduced the second part of Ezek 28 to the words found in vss. 11-12 and part of vss. 13, 14, 17, as those that are original; the rest he considers a corruption and commentary on the original nucleus. Although, at first instance, this passage gives a "metrically very obscure impression," we find some verses where the qinah meter rhythm seems to be present: 12b, 18a, 18c.

1 ZAW 2 (1882):1-52.
2 Irwin, The Prophet, p. 216, considers it entirely prose.
3 Budde (p. 20) says that only "leise Anklänge" of the qinah meter could be perceived in vss. 12-17, and that only from vs. 18 and on can we see clearly the mentioned metrical structure. See also Cheminant, pp. 72-73, 85; Jahnow, pp. 221-28; Kraetzschmar, pp. 216-18; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:87.
4 Pp. 140-41.
5 Many scholars today (i.e., Howie, pp. 88, 119) recognize that much of the poetic material must have been reduced to prose in the process of writing it.
6 Cf. Howie, p. 86.
7 Irwin, The Problem, pp. 218-19, 314.
8 Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:87.
Wevers\(^1\) thinks the text of the lament is full of uncertainties and has been expanded considerably. He advocates that later "traditionists" added, on the basis of the previous oracle (vss. 1-10), the references to the wisdom of the King "full of wisdom" (vss. 12, 17a; cf. vss. 2, 7); to explain the mention of precious stones, a scribe added the nine gems found in the High Priest's breastplate from Exod 28:17-20. He thinks vss. 16a and 19 are other places added by some editor.

Zimmerli, continuing Wever's efforts to restore what they think was the original poetical structure of the text, eliminated parts which he considered additions, changed the position of some cola in the poem, and even altered some words. He arrived at what he calls nucleus (Grundtext) or basic text of vss. 11-19. In his reconstruction, the passage was transformed in four stanzas of three bicola each--the bicola of five stress each.\(^2\)

\(^1\)Ezekiel, pp. 215-16.

\(^2\)Based on the English version of his reconstructed text, Zimmerli's Hebrew text of the passage would look thus:
As Jahnow had done decades before, Zimmerli deals arbitrarily with the text, rewriting the poem the way he likes it. Let us now examine the biblical text of Ezek 28:12-19:

Du warst das Siegel der Vollendung, und die Krone der Schönheit,  
und aus Gold waren deine Eingrabungen.  

Im Gottesgarten warst du, auf den heiligen Berg stellte ich dich,  
Bei den Kerubim wardst du eingesetzt als schirmender Gesalbter.  

Im Kreise feuriger Steine wandeltest du, ein Gott warst du,  
Schuldlos warst du in deinem Wandel vom Tage, da du geschaffen wardst,  

Bis ein Vergehen an dir erfunden ward, du dein Heiligtum entweihest,  
Sein Inneres mit Frevel erfülltest durch die Grösse deines Handels!  

Da liess ich Feuer aus ihm hervorgehen, das frass dich,  
Vom Gottesberge rottete ich dich aus, aus dem Kreis der feurigen Steine.  

Hoffärtig war dein Herz ob deiner Schönheit,
The oracle starts with

The formula for receiving God’s Word (vs. 1).

The commission to the prophet to address the King of Tyre (vs. 2a).

Introductory messenger formula.

These are in prose.

We can see by the text shown above that this Ezekiel passage does not offer a regular qinah-meter poetry, nor a metric pattern in its cola. The poem initially presents seven bicola (vss. 12b-14b) which are followed by three alternations of tricola and bicola (vss. 15a, 16a; 16b, 17a; 17b, 18a) and ends with a series of four bicola. We would say that, as far as we can perceive, the text as we have it in the MT text has three distinct qinah-meter bicola (16a, 18a, 18c).

We agree that the text shows some unevenness in the flow of its language: (1) The mentioning of the nine stones in vs. 13 seems to separate the parallel members and (2) of MT is not attested in important versions; (3) (vs. 16a), which

\[
\text{du verdarbst deine Weisheit,} \\
\text{Deine Herrlichkeit stürzte ich zur Erde} \\
ob der Menge deiner Sünden. (5) (5)
\]

\[
\text{Vor den Königen gab ich dich preis,} \\
\text{ihre Lust auf dir zu schauen,} \\
\text{Ich machte dich zu Asche auf der Erde} \\
\text{Vor den Augen aller, die dich sahen.} (5) (5)
\]

\[
\text{Alle, die dich kannten unter den Völkern,} \\
\text{schauderten über dich,} \\
ein Schrecknis bist du geworden \\
und bist dahin für immer! (4+4)
\]

\[1\text{Cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:85.}\]
is characteristic of the Tyrian power, seems to be extraneous to
the basic text of the passage.

However, if the prophet Ezekiel produced his oracle in the
first half of the sixth century B.C., and used some extant material
about the Cherub, the last two above-mentioned problems disappear.
The prophet would have used Tyre's characteristics combined with the
story of the Cherub; and being a priest \(^1\) he could have added the list
of the stones which were on the breastpiece of the High Priest.
Furthermore, I think the whole passage—especially vss. 14-16—shows
us that it was produced under design, in a kind of chiastic structure
whose elements are parallel or antithetic:

Vss. 12b-13 present the situation of the being before its
expulsion from the Mount of God.

(\text{vs. 14})

(\text{vs. 14})

(\text{vs. 14})

(\text{vs. 14})

Vss. 17-[19] present the situation of the being after its expulsion
from the Mount of God.

\(^1\) Cf. Ezek 1:3.

\(^2\) In this second part of the passage the order of the elements
As we see, almost all the main elements found in vss. 12b-15 are repeated in inverse order and show the different circumstances in which the figure finds himself after his sin. The sin or rebellion of the Cherub is the climax of the passage. As Pulley has noted,¹ the mention of the unrighteousness is a transitional point in the text and the climax of the passage.

Thus, the design of the poem seems to show that it is a unified piece of literature and should belong to this prophet. Although we cannot affirm with certainty that the prophetic autograph has come to us retaining its original dimensions and wording,² it is unwarrantable to say that a main nucleus of material has been expanded by the prophet's disciple or subsequent scribes.³ B. Childs criticizes Zimmerli by noting that

Zimmerli's method of working from a reconstructed Grundtext to which has been appended commentary runs the danger of losing the inner dynamic of the full canonical passage. To divide a passage historically into stages often destroys the synchronic dimension of the text. A literary entity has an integrity of its own which is not to be identified with the sum of its parts. Zimmerli's method is vulnerable to the criticism of mishandling the text as literature. . . . (His) method shares the widespread assumption of historical criticism that the introduction of a historical dimension necessarily aids in illuminating the biblical text. Continually the reader is instructed which verses are historically later within the text than others. At times some of these observations are helpful; at other times the judgments are hypothetical and fragile. Frequently he has overestimated the significance which this historical dimension brings to the text of Ezekiel.⁴

is not the same as in the first one, but what is important is that we have the same elements after the climax of the passage as we have before it.

¹P. 44. ²Cf. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 351.
⁴Introduction, p. 370.
Despite the possible problems in the text, we can recognize the motive of the contrast between the past and present condition of the personage. The poem "has moved further away still from the straightforward lament over a human death..."¹ and seems to describe "in the style of a lament a judgment which had already happened instead of proclaiming a judgment which is still to come."²

We are going to deal with the text in its final form, as it comes to us in its present form, adopting Child's view of a "canonical process in which the experience of Israel with the use of its authoritative writings has been incorporated into the text itself as part of the biblical witness."³ Making use of textual criticism we will, where necessary, discuss some possible variations which—due to some structures we perceive in the text—could be proposed.

Concerning the claim that these two oracles (vss. 1-10 and 12-19) were written on different occasions and possibly by two different authors, the vocabulary of these two passages goes against such a proposition.⁴ If these two oracles were not written in the same epoch and by the same author (and I believe they were), at the very least one was designed after the other.

¹Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:89. ²Ibid. ³Introduction, p. 370. ⁴םֹּבוּנ occurs only in Ezek 28--three times in vss. 1-10 (vss. 4, 5, 7) and twice in vss. 11-19 (vss. 12, 17); the word רֹאֵב occurs once in vss. 1-10 (vs. 7) and twice in vss. 11-19 (vss. 12, 17); כֹּל occurs once in vss. 1-10 (vs. 5) and twice in vss. 11-19 (vss. 16, 18); לְגֹּבֹּר occurs twice in vss. 1-10 (vss. 2, 5) and once in vss. 11-19 (vs. 17); נֹפָּל occurs in vss. 7 and 17. Besides these we find an interesting play on the words יִתְנַע, "to pierce, slay," and יֵתְנַע, "to profane, pollute," in both oracles (vss. 7, 8, 9, 16, 18).
Text—Ezekiel 28:1-19

Vs. 1. And the word of Yahweh came to me

Vs. 2. Saying: "Son of man, say to the prince of Tyre:

'thus says the Lord Yahweh':

Because your heart is presumptuous and you have said, 'I am (a) God, I am sitting on the throne of

In the notes for this Ezekiel text we have relied to some extent on the excellent works on the text by Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2:74-76, 81-86; and van Dijk, pp. 92-122.

The Pesh. prefixes a superscription before several of the foreign oracles of Ezekiel's book, including this one (cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:6, 74, etc.).

Some MSS (see BHK) prefixὴροφρ(67) before the address.

The title ἄρχων "Prince, ruler, leader" is used by Ezekiel only in this passage; the titles κυρίος (cf. 12:10; 19:1; 22:6; 34:24; 38:2, 3; etc.) and κύριον (19:9; 21:25; 26:7; 28:12, 17; etc.) are commonly used—in relation to a foreign prince—in the book.

The title הָעִיר is the most frequent (122 times) introductory formula used by the prophet. Some MSS (see BHK) omit the word הָעִיר. For the divine introductory formulae in Ezekiel, see John B. Harford, Studies in the Book of Ezekiel (Cambridge: University Press, 1935), pp. 102-62; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:556-62.

The term יִתְנָה introduces several clauses (vss. 2-5) which lead to the judgment pronunciation through the יִתְנָה clause in vs. 6a; W. A. Irwin (The Problem of Ezekiel, p. 216) thinks that "the conjunction is taken up abortively by יִתְנָה in vs. 6... but the real sequence is in vss. 7ff." Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:75) advocates that vss. 3-5 destroy the "sentence structure... in an intolerable way" and considers those three verses as a "secondary comment."

Van Dijk (pp. 93-95) translates והוא "and you have thought," because of the monologue’s nature of the context, etc. It seems that his view could be a reasonable option.

Some scholars (such as Eissfeldt ["El and Yahweh," pp. 25-27]; Pope [El, pp. 98-102]; etc.) have rendered יִתְנָה "I am El" (the head of the Canaanite Pantheon); this is correctly rejected by theologians such as Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:77-79) and van Dijk (pp. 95-96). Zimmerli affirms, it is only accepting the term as an appellative that we can understand the case with which, in the repetition (vs. 9), the כֹּהָנִים ("gods") of the parallel in vs. 2 is taken over into the first clause and expressed as
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God in the heart of the seas, yet you are man and not God, though you consider yourself as wise as God.

Vs. 3. Behold, you are wiser than Daniel, no secret is hidden from you.

1. Has been interpreted as: "I sit in the seat of the gods" (RSV); "Am Göttersitz wohne ich" (Zimmerli); "I sit in a divine throne" (van Dijk); "I am sitting on the throne of God" (BJ); "I sit in the seat of God" (KJV). The RSV's translation of אֲלֵהֵי אֱלֹהִים as a plural does not fit the context (מֵאֲלֵהֵי אֱלֹהִים—vss. 2 and 9). Cf. van Dijk, pp. 96-97.

2. The JB translates כֵּלֵב יָם as "surrounded by the seas."

3. Kraetzschmar (p. 215) renders אתֵה יָם כֵּלֵב יָם אֲלֵהֵי אֱלֹהִים as "und doch dich in deinem Herzen dünkest wie ein Gott." and Zimmerman follows him with "but in your mind you have thought that you were like a god" (Ger. "Aber du hast dich in deinem Sinn Gott gleich gedünkt"). Ehrlich (5:1-6), on the other side, says that "the words could never signify this" and suggests: "Und meinst, deine Weisheit komme der Weisheit eines Gottes gleich." See Job 12:3; 34:10; 1 Kgs 5:9; Prov 8:5 for the use of אֲלֵהֵי אֱלֹהִים in the sense of "wisdom."

4. For MT וְהָנָּה, the LXX has ἢ, the Pesh. וְהָנָּה, and one of the Latin versions (C£) "nunquid" (all denoting an interrogation) which would suggest וְהָנָּה; but there is no reason to emend the MT. (See CTA 1:24.7, "הָנָּה גֶּלֶן תָּלְדָּבָן" "Lo a maid will bear a s[on]; cf. also van Dijk, pp. 29-30).

5. MT וְהָנָּה. C. E. Scrimgeour ("Ezekiel and the Phoenician Script," Exptim 20 [1909]:526-27)—based on his studies of the fragmentary Phoenician material extant in his times—suggested the unfolding of the word and read וְהָנָּה, explaining that ב and ד were so similar in the Phoenician script that they could be easily confused (cf. 2 Sam 23:29-1 Chr 11:30); and omission of the ו could point to an early Phoenician script. The translation would then read, "Behold thou art wiser than the sons of God; no secret do they conceal from thee." See above, pp. 112-20, for more comments on the form of the term וְהָנָּה.
Vs. 4. By your wisdom and your intelligence you have acquired wealth for yourself, and have gathered gold and silver into your treasuries.

Vs. 5. By your wisdom in your trade you have increased your wealth and your heart has grown presumptuous in your wealth.  

6MT הָלָּל לְךָ חֲכָמָיָּה וְאֵינֶנְךָ חֲכָמָיָּה (or "have not the wise instructed thee with their knowledge") by the LXX. Zimmerli (Ezekiel 2:74) thinks that the additional משנים presupposed by the LXX must have fallen out by haplography before theנא in vs. 4 and read משנים instead of משנים. Bertholet (Das Buch Hezekiel, p. 148) suggested כִּלְכָלָכָל יְסַרֶּף, "All Divinations." From the end of the nineteenth century (cf. Toy, Ezekiel [Heb], p. 85) and throughout this century (Herrmann, p. 170; Foerster, Ezechiel, p. 159; etc.), scholars have been attracted by the solution in the LXX. It seems that כִּלְכָל יְסַרֶּף (with Zimmerli [Ezekiel 2:74] who maintains that, because of the frequent occurrence of the term in vss. 3-4a, the root משנים is suspect) should not be emended. The Vulg. ("secretum"), Targ. (ך), and Pesh (ךךךךךךך) agree with MT. Cheminant (p. 59) mentions a possible primitive text קָדֻּמָה אֵין תְמוּנָה, "Les sages ne sont pas plus grands que toi," which is a mere conjecture.

7The Vulg. renders נַעֲשָׂה בַּעֲשָׂה בָּיִת ("absconditum a te") and the Targ. as נַעֲשָׂה אֶפְסָר מִיַּדֶךָ ("nothing is hidden from you"). Dahood (Psalm, 1:113), following the BHK suggestion, has linked דעך with הֵבֶל and translated it "is too deep for you" (cf. also van Dijk, pp. 100-103). In Ezek 31:8, הביל means "to rival," and in Lam 4:1, "to be darkened." Driver ("linguistic," p. 177) suggests that to solve the grammatic problem of vs. 3b (based on the support from cognate languages; cf. Bertholet, Das Buch Hezekiel, pp. 147-48) we alter הביל (Qal Plur.) into פֶּה הביל (or הביל - - cf. GKC §58f.) and translate the colon "no hidden thing doth perplex thee." In that he is followed by Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:74-75) who, nevertheless, does not think it necessary to make the verb. sing.

1For the use of הביל in connection with מַעֲשָׂה, see Num 24:18; Deut 8:17-18; 1 Sam 14:48; Ps 118:15; etc. Cheminant (p. 69) thinks it could have been an inversion in the MT, הביל מַעֲשָׂה would form better the second colon of the qinah.

2Bertholet (Das Buch Hezekiel, p. 148) thinks that הביל is, under the influence of הבילו, a corruption of הבילו.

3As noted above, p. 232, n. 6, Zimmerli views vss. 3-5 as a gloss; the הביל clause in vs. 2 should be followed by the הביל in vss. 6ff; cf. Loretz, "Der Sturz," p. 456. Cheminant (p. 70) observes that "la kinah de 5b est incomplète: on pourrait essayer de restituer le second membre en lisant הבילו הבילו de 2e: la pensée exprimée dans le premier stique serait alors précisée de la même façon qu'en 2c."
Vs. 6. Therefore thus says the Lord God: "Because you think you are as wise as God,

Vs. 7. Therefore, behold, I will bring barbarians against you, the most cruel of the nations, and they will draw their swords against the beauty of your wisdom and defile your shining splendor.

1 The expression נַעֲרֵי עָלְמֵי הָעִיר is lacking in some MSS; see p. 232, n. 5.

2 It seems, as Irwin observes (The Problem of Ezekiel, p. 216), that ׁיְבִרִי in vs. 6a is "abortive," and, according to Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:75), יִבְרֵי נְעַרֵי of vs. 6 overloads the sentence and becomes necessary as a result of the addition in vss. 3-5. He tries to make his point, showing that יְבִרִי of vs. 2 is harmonized with the יִבְרֵי of the material inserted (vs. 5), but יְבִרִי is carried without alteration to vs. 6, and the accusative particle הָעִיר is added. Irwin (op. cit.) sees the couplet 3-4a as showing "the marks of Ezekiel's thought," and that "its concise brevity has given the suggestion for the somewhat accurate interpretation in vs. 2 and ... also stimulated the expansions and repetitions in 4b-5. ... We may consider (it) the original nucleus of the passage."

3 יְבִרִי. See van Dijk (p. 110; cf. L. A. S. Snijders, the meaning of יְבִרִי in the Old Testament," OTS 10 [1954]:22-59) for reasons for the plausible suggestion to use "barbarians" as the best translation of the Hebrew word.

4 יְבִרֵי עָלְמֵי הָעִיר is translated as "the usurpers of peoples, the terrorists of nations" by Snijders (p. 28), who pays no heed to the superlative (see on the superlative, GKC, § 132c, 133g, h).

5 The expression נַעֲרֵי עָלְמֵי הָעִיר הַשְּׁפֶרֶת has since long been considered not original. Jouon ("Notes," p. 307) suggested that יְבִרִי was an alteration of יְבִרִי (cf. Prov 8-19, which talks about the fruit of יְבִרִי) and thinks it could be "une mauvaise anticipation" at the end of the verse or a suggestion from the identical term in vs. 17. Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:75) advocates that the present MT reading is an expansion in place of the "apparently superfluous יְבִרֵי עָלְמֵי הָעִיר" which was original and fell out (cf. also Eichrodt, Ezekiel, pp. 388-89). Since most of the versions support the MT text, there is no reason to alter it, although the possibility of an expansion in this verse is not ruled out.

6 Van Dijk (pp. 111-12), based on (1) a parallel use of the root יְבִרִי in Ezek 30:11 ("they will draw their swords against Egypt and cover the land with the slain [לַיְבִרִי], and (2) on the use of the term in the immediate context (vs. 8--ליָא--יְבִרֵי עָלְמֵי הָעִיר--"the death of a slain"; vs. 9--ליָא--ユָיָא--עָלְמֵי הָעִיר--"those who slay you"), rejects the usual rendering "to profane, or dishonor" and suggests we translate יְבִרֵי in vs. 7 as "slay." But the occurrence of the root in vs. 16 and...
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Vs. 8. They will throw you down to the pit\(^1\) and you will
die a violent death\(^2\) in the heart of the seas.\(^3\)

Vs. 9. Will you still say "I am God"\(^4\) in the presence of
those who kill you?\(^5\) But you shall be a man, and not God in the
hands of those who pierce you.\(^6\)

Vs. 10. You will die the death\(^7\) of the uncircumcised\(^8\) at the
hands of foreigners; for I have spoken, declares the Lord\(^9\) Yahweh.

18 seems to show that usual versions are not off when they render
"defile," or "profane"; see Snijders (pp. 29-30) for the suggestion
that כַּרְכָּל, "to profane," could be derived from כַּרְכָּל, "to pierce."

כַּרְכָּל appears again in vs. 17 only. Other translations
such as "glory" (Zimmerli), "Excellency" (van Dijk), and "pre­
eminent position" (Driver) have been proposed for כַּרְכָּל. Driver
("Ezekiel: Linguistic and Textual Problems," Bib 35 [1954]:158)
prefers—based on the Arabic yafa'a, "ascended,""grew up," and
wa'fan, "high building"—for the term a sense of "heightness"
rather than of "brilliance" (from כְּלָל). Cf. T. H.

כַּרְכָּל—sense of "underworld, grave."

כַּרְכָּל (Intensive pl.—cf. GKC, § 124d, e). See
Jer 16:4 for the only other place where כַּרְכָּל occurs. For כַּרְכָּל, the LXX has יַוְעַל, יְהוָה.

Seep. 233, n. 2. 4 Seep. 232, n. 8.

5 LXX (יוֹודֵה בָּלָא), Pesh. (עַבְרֵה), Vulg. (inter­
cidentibus), and מַחֲלֵה מִי מָיֵי of 9b, as well as the plural subject in vss. 7 and 8
(cf. also Herrmann, p. 170), favor כַּרְכָּל rather than כַּרְכָּל of MT.

6 MT כַּרְכָּל—"who profane you." The reading כַּרְכָּל has the support of Targ., Pesh., and Vulg., but כַּרְכָּל is
absent from the LXX.

As in vs. 8 (see n. 2, above) כַּרְכָּל is a plural of intensity.
It seems that the plural form was employed to suit the plural
כַּרְכָּל. Cf. Carl Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax (Neukirchen: Verlag der
Buchhandlung des Erziehungvereins, 1956), § 72b, p. 67.

8 Van Dijk (p. 113) in an interesting way contenus for
rendering כַּרְכָּל as "castrated ones."

9 Some versions omit כַּרְכָּל; see above p. 232, n. 5.
Vs. 11. And the word of Yahweh came to me saying:

Vs. 12. "Son of man, raise a dirge over the King of Tyre and say to him, 'thus says the Lord\(^1\) Yahweh; you were an examplar of perfection,\(^2\) full of wisdom\(^3\) and perfect in beauty.

\(^1\) see above p. 232, n. 5.

\(^2\) has been a crux interpretum for the scholars. is an obscure term and difficult to interpret and could be vocalized (verb), (noun), and a possible cons. (see Hugo Gressmann, Der Messias, p. 218). Irwin, (Problem, p. 218) says that the word should be vocalized "seal." The LXX renders these two words as , "seal of resemblance," that point to (see Jer 22:24, where the LXX translates as ) and (see Theodotian), who translates as , which seems to be the presupposition of the LXX in Ezek 28:12). The Pesh. has (in 1 Chr 28:11 the Pesh. renders ) and . "Signaculum similitudinis" points out to . The only other place where occurs is Ezek 43:10, where Zimmerli (Ezekiel 2:8, 410) thinks it is in an "uncertain textual context." He points to the root (found in 18:25, 29; Isa 40:12, 13; Job 28:29; Prov 16:27; etc., and rendered in its various verbal forms: "be right," "to put right," "to test," etc.) as the source of with the meaning of "correctness" (which seems to be KBL [p. 1029] "Vorbild") and translates the term as "completed." Several scholars from the end of the nineteenth century on have thought that is the AKK taknū, taknītū, and rendered it as: "careful preparation, model" (Toy, Ezekiel [Heb], p. 85); "perfect, beautiful" (H. Torczyner, "Presidential Address," JPOS 16 [1936]:4-5); "correctness, perfection" (Driver, "Ezekiel: Linguistic," pp. 158-59). Widengren who also believes comes from the AKK renders it "preserved thing" and thinks that the AKK source taknītū has to do with the keeping of the destiny tablets (cf. The Ascension of the Apostle, pp. 26, n. 18, 95). Following Cornill (Ezechiel, pp. 359-60) van Dijk (pp. 114-15) adventures in interpreting the term as an identifying noun; claiming an enclitic in (cf. 26:12, 20: 27:3 for unsuspected cases of enclitic , given by van Dijk) and advocating that -besides denoting the name "Eve" and the noun "village"--has the meaning of "serpent" in Phoenician and Aramaic (cf. Zellig S. Harris, A Grammar of the Phoenician Language AOS 8 [New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1936], p. 101; Donner and Röllig, 3:33). Van Dijk renders as "You, 0 Serpent of perfection" (see van Dijk, pp. 115-16, for discussion on extra-biblical material to make his point). Although van Dijk's suggestion is very attractive, especially because of the identification of with , his proposal is not supported by the MT or the versions. Cheminant (p. 74) suggested emmending ("perfect"). And Jouon ("Notes," p. 308),
Vs. 13. You were in Eden, the garden of God, every precious stone being your cover:¹ ruby, topaz and emerald, chrysolite, onyx and jasper, sapphire, turquoise and beryl.² Your settings³ and

based on the fact that in vs. 4 the companion word for וְסֶרֶךְ (which also occurs in vs. 12) is תֵּאָסָרָה, emended תֵּאָסָרָה into תֵּאָסָרָה; and using Cheminant's תֵּאָסָרָה, he translates the two words as "Parfait d'intelligence." But Zimmerli says (Ezekiel, 2:81) alterations like the last two presented, and the one by G. H. Cooke ("The Paradise Story of Ezekiel 28," in Old Testament Essays, ed. D. C. Simpson [London: L. Griffin, 1927], p. 32) תֵּאָסָרָה כִּנְסָיָא, "perfectly wise," are "not to be commended." Cf. also Gaster ("Ezekiel 28:12," ExpTim 51 [1939-40]:156) who suggests confidently to vocalize (the term) and derive it from the root תֵּאָסָרָה (after the pattern of תֵּאָסָרָה, or תֵּאָסָרָה from תֵּאָסָרָה, etc.) and translate the bicolon as "O thou that signest thyself with the title: full of wisdom and perfect in beauty," which is a very attractive proposition that fits the context very well and does not demand emendation of the text. Twenty years later Gaster (Myth, Legend . . . , pp. 621, 73) translates the expression as "thou wast the crowning achievement of art" ("thou wast the one that set the seal on [all] design"); cf. also Kroese, p. 21. There are those scholars who give up the expression altogether (i.e., Hölscher [see Yaron, p. 35]; G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, p. 316). See Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:81) for other suggestions on the translation of this difficult expression.

³For MT תֵּאָסָרָה, Pesh. has מַקְלַת מִסְתַּפְּלָה, "Seal of wisdom"; the LXX omits it, except in Codex Marchalianus which brings מַקְלַת מִסְתַּפְּלָה. Zimmerli thinks that this phrase belongs to the additions concerning the wisdom of the ruler of Tyre in chap. 28.

¹The term תֵּאָסָרָה has been interpreted in three ways: (1) As coming from the root תֵּאָסָרָה, being translated "Your covering" (so Vulg. Operimentum Tuum; cf. KBL, p. 657; HAWAT, p. 543; BDB, p. 697); (2) As derived from תֵּאָסָרָה (תֵּאָסָרָה) in the sense of "closing, enclose," (cf. KBL, p. 657), so LXX ἐνθάνετο, Sym. ἐνθάνετο, the Pesh. מַקְלַת מִסְתַּפְּלָה, "decked with"; (3) as coming from the root תֵּאָסָרָה "to anoint: or "to hedge out" (cf. HAWAT, p. 538; BDB, pp. 691-92). The word תֵּאָסָרָה (without dagesh forte—see BDB, p. 697) would derive then from that root with the meaning "to hedge out" (cf. Gen 33:17; Mic 7:4; for supporters of this view, see W. E. Barnes, "Ezekiel's Denunciation of Tyre," JTS 35 [1934]:51-52; and van Dijk, pp. 116-18, who translates מַקְלַת מִסְתַּפְּלָה as "your defense."

²For discussion of the meaning of the names of the different stones found in the MT, see Bertholet (Hesekiel, pp. 148-49), Cooke, (Ezekiel, pp. 316-17), Yaron (pp. 35-37), and Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:82-84); we have here followed the NIV in translating the names. The nine stones found in the MT are found among the twelve of the high priest's breastplate in Exod 28:17-20, although in different order. The LXX gives twelve precious stones' names, and gold and
engraving\(^1\) were made of gold; on the day you were created they were prepared.\(^2\)

silver are added to those stones (right in the middle of the list). The sequence in 28:13 (LXX) is the same as in Exod 28:17-20 (LXX). The Targ. and Vulg. have nine names; the Pesh., eight names, of which three are found in Exod 28:17-20 (Pesh.). Cooke (Ezekiel, pp. 316-18), followed by Zimmerli, strongly believes that the catalogue of gems was inserted by somebody who tried to specify them, using the lists in Exod 28:17-20 and 39:10-13.

\(^3\)For MT, "V 3 n r. D X is  a n r i, the LXX • ' •

\(^1\)For MT תֵּבַעְבִּים, the LXX لَفْتَبْفَم, "and your stores . . ."; the Pesh, لُفْتَبْفَم, "and your chests with precious stones," which, seems to be a kind of expansion to parallel the previous expression (cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:84). G. R. Driver's, "Uncertain Hebrew Words," JTS 45 (1944):14, on the basis of the Vulg. ("Foramina Tua"), and Schei's suggestion (as related to AKK. Neauib[um]) proposes "plaques of metal hollowed so as to hold precious stones." Van Dijk (p. 119) suggests--based on the use of the "notable" in Amos 6:1--"and splendor(?) on you."

Other suggestions have been proposed by H. Schmidt (Die Erzählung von Paradies und Sündenfall, SGV 154 [Tübingen: J. C. B.
Vs. 14. I created\(^1\) (placed) you\(^2\) as a cherub\(^3\) with outstretched...
shielding wings.\(^1\) You were in the (holy)\(^3\) mount of God, in the

\(^1\)MT יָעַרְךָ. Some commentators have questioned the vocalization of the term here and in vs. 16. Kraetzschmar (p. 217) has suggested קָרְכָּה (cf. McKenzie, Myths and realities, p. 177).

\(^3\)MT בַּרְגָּר. Some commentators have questioned the vocalization of the term here and in vs. 16. Kraetzschmar (p. 217) has suggested קָרְכָּה (cf. McKenzie, Myths and realities, p. 177).
midst of the stones of fire\textsuperscript{1} you walked.\textsuperscript{2}

Vs. 15. You\textsuperscript{3} were blameless in your ways\textsuperscript{4} from the day you were created, till evil\textsuperscript{5} was found in you.

Vs. 16. In the abundance of your trade you have filled\textsuperscript{6}

says, "this statement perfectly agrees with the words of the king in 28:2 "I am a god, a seat of the god(s) I sit upon/in the midst of the seas,' his translation being "a god thou wast, in the midst of the stones of fire thou walked." (Cf. also Gaster, [Myth, Legend . . . , pp. 621, 713] who has more or less the same view, saying that for "metrical and syntactical reasons, the word should be a separate clause.") Yaron (pp. 29-31) admits that Widengren's reading of this verse is the only one possible without alteration of MT, but goes on himself relying on the LXX and offering a different rendering. We do not agree with every argument Yaron (pp. 29-31) presents against Widengren's translation. Having in view the occurrence of the expressions \(\text{תַּחְתּוֹן} \text{ רָעָה} \) (vs. 13) and \(\text{מִלְיֹוהָה} \text{ רָעָה} \) (vs. 16), it seems almost certain that in vs. 14 the combination should be \(\text{תַּחְתּוֹן} \text{ רָעָה} \).\textsuperscript{7}

MT \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \) has for long been considered a gloss. Cheminant (p. 77) suggests that the meter demands the suppression of \(\text{קָדַשׁ} \) or \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \) (cf. BHK; Ehrlich, 5:109; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:85). Widengren (The Ascension . . . . p. 97) thinks that \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \) belongs to the original text; and Yaron (p. 31) observes that \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \) belongs to the text.\textsuperscript{8}

3MT \(\text{גִּבְעָן} \) is absent in the LXX; the Pesh. has \(\text{גִּבְעָן} \) but is attached to vs. 15. Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:86) follows the Pesh. (based on some remarks about the text by Origen—see Ziegler, Ezekiel, p. 223) and rejects Driver's ("Ezekiel: Linguistic," p. 159) view that the word has the same sense as Arab. Tahallaka and should be rendered "swaggering."

Zimmerli proposes the deletion of \(\text{גִּבְעָן} \), which he thinks "became necessary only after the false division between vss. 14 and 15" (Ezekiel, 2:86).

4For MT \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \), LXX has \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \). Toy (Ezekiel [Heb.], p. 86) views this variance as perhaps a dittography of the Greek scribe because of the following \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \). Yaron (p. 55—cf. also Ehrlich, p. 109) omits the word.

5MT \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \), used for practical emphasis (see GKC, § 90; BDB, 732b), is the same as \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \).

6MT \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \). Based on the LXX \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \) and Pesh. \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \), BHK has proposed \(\text{נָאֶשׁוּתֶו} \), which must have fallen out through neolography.
yourself with violence, and you sinned. So I expelled\(^1\) you as a profane thing from the mountain of God. And I expelled you,\(^2\) O guardian Cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.\(^3\)

**Vs. 17.** Your heart became proud because of your beauty, you corrupted your wisdom because of your splendour.\(^4\) I threw you to the earth;\(^5\) I exposed you before kings, that they may gloat\(^6\) over you.

---

1MT נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ. The LXX has ἐλέης (ἐλέης), "you have been cast down wounded." See van Dijk (p. 121) for reasons not to use ἐλέης as simply "profane away."

2MT נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ, a contracted form of נָאָשׁ אֶתְוַיְךְ (from הבא—cf. GKC, § 68k; BLeA § 53m; Davidson, AHCL, p. 2). LXX brings κατά τὸν ἀνόητον which corresponds to רֹעָה יָד (from יָד), נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ (cf. Yaron, p. 31), or נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ (cf. BHK). Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:86) suggests we read נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ. This verb introduces again the Cherub and makes a great difference if we accept the MT's or the LXX's reading. We accept the MT's reading; the reasons we do so are discussed throughout this paper.

3On נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ, see above on pp. 131-33.

4Gaster ("Ezekiel 28:17," p. 124) calls forth an Arabic root and Canaanite text parallels to interpret נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ as "upstart conduct." The word occurs also in vs. 7 (cf. p. 236, n. 7 above). The LXX inserts here וַיְהִי אֶתְוַיְךְ, an expression which appears at the beginning of vs. 18.

5On the basis of Gunkel's (Schöpfung und Chaos, p. 18) suggestion that נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ denotes "netherworld" in several biblical passages, and afterward confirmed by Aramaic, Akkadian, and Ugaritic literature (see Dahood, Psalms 1:106), Cassuto (Genesis 1:81) and van Dijk (pp. 93, 121) have translated the word as "sheol."

6MT נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ. Ms Ken (BHK) has נַעֲשָׂה אֶתְוַיְךְ (cf. the infin. form, GKC, § 75n).
Vs. 18. Through the abundance\(^1\) of your guilt\(^2\) in the unrighteousness of your trade\(^3\) you have desecrated\(^4\) my sanctuary\(^5\) so I will bring\(^6\) forth fire\(^7\) from the midst of it;\(^8\) and it will consume you, and I will turn you to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all who see you.

Vs. 19. All who know you among the peoples will be appalled at you; you shall become a horror\(^9\) and shall be no more for ever.

\(^1\)MT בְּמֹעַ; Vulg. has בַּמַּעַ (in multitudine).

\(^2\)MT is rendered עֹלֶיהֶ in multitudine by mlt MSS Edd (cf. BHK; Ehrlich, V, p. 110; Herrmann, p. 172). We agree with Zimmerli (Ezekiel, 2:86) that since the masc. עֹלֶיהֶ that appears in Ezek always in the sing., it should be read in that way here (see 24:23; 36:31, 33; 43:10, where the fem. pl. form is found). Cooke (Ezekiel, p. 324) advocates that MT עֹלֶיהֶ should with the LXX be transferred to vs. 17 (see above p. 243, n. 4), which repeats the words again here in vs. 18.

\(^3\)Cheminant (p. 82) thinks that עֹלֶיהֶ is a corruption or an explication of a primitive לִי. Ehrlich (p. 110), Jahnow (pp. 222-23), and Herrmann (p. 172) consider עֹלֶיהֶ to be a gloss. Yaron (p. 55) eliminates the first four words of vs. 18 as secondary.

\(^4\)For MT עֹלֶיהֶ, the LXX reads עָלֹודֶךָ. With the LXX, Vulg., Targ., and Pesh., we read vss. 18b-19 in the future tense (cf. also KJV and van Dijk, p. 93).

\(^5\)For MT עֹלֶיהֶ, MSS Edd (cf. BHK) have עָלֹודֶךָ; Sym. and Vulg. עָלֹודֶךָ (cf. also Gaster, Myth, Legend . . . , p. 622). BHK's editorial suggestion for rendering עָלֹודֶךָ should be accepted.

\(^6\)Morgenstern ("The Mythological Background," p. 111) thinks this vs. contains a reference to the quite independent myth of the Phoenix.

\(^7\)For MT עָלֹודֶךָ, we should read with Ehrlich (V, p. 110) and Herrmann (p. 172), עָלֹודֶךָ.

\(^8\)For MT עָלֹודֶךָ, LXX has γινόμενον, "you are gone to destruction"; Pesh. וְגַםְתִּבְלֵינֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶ, "you shall be brought to destruction." Modern versions render . . . horrible end (NIV), "dreadful end" (RSV).
Historical Context

Date of Composition

The traditional view for the date of composition of the prophecy of Ezekiel has been challenged by several scholars since the days of L. Zung (1832) until the 1980s. But reputed modern scholars such as Pfeiffer, Howie, Muilenburg, Ellison, Archer, Zimmerli, Harrison, etc., have defended the first half of the sixth century B.C. as a reasonable date for the composition of the main nucleus of the prophecy of Ezekiel, especially the oracles against Tyre whose well-established date for its siege by Nebuchadnezzar is about 585-572 B.C. We make our own Weir's


2Introduction, p. 521.

3Pp. 100-102.


7Ezekiel, 2:23-25.

8Introduction, pp. 831-32.

9Josephus (Against Apion 1:59) states that Nebuchadnezzar began the siege of Tyre in the seventh year of his reign; he is followed by M. Vogelstein, "Nebuchadnezzar's Reconquest of Phoenicia and Palestine and the Oracles of Ezekiel," HUCA 23/2 (1950/51):199-207, who proposes the date of 598-586 B.C. for Nebuchadnezzar's siege. Fleming, p. 44, thinks that "twentieth" should be read for Josephus' seventh year. That Josephus and Vogelstein are wrong, The Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings (ed. Wiseman, 1956) demonstrates, since they do not mention Tyre in the records of the years 598-594 B.C. when the chronicles referent to Nebuchadnezzar end. See also E. Unger, "Nebukadnezzer II und sein Sandabakku (Oberrkommissar) in Tyrus," ZAW 44 (1926):314-17; idem, Babylon (Leipzig: Walter de Gruyer, 1937), pp. 36-37; Howie,
words that "the Book of Ezekiel is substantially from the hand of
one author who was well acquainted with events in western Asia
between 592 and c. 570 B.C., and knew nothing of later events."\(^1\)

Morgenstern\(^2\) has contended that these Tyrian oracles
(28:1-10 and 11-19) are not the utterances of the prophet Ezekiel
himself, but were produced in the period of 490-480 B.C.; and the
two sections are practically contemporaneous and refer to the same
king of Tyre who was ruling that city in 485 B.C. Morgenstern's
view is far from being proved. However, these oracles do not offer
any specific clues which could help us to set a date for their origin;
and the typical tone of the material as far as the king of Tyre is
concerned makes it impossible to pinpoint an exact date for the
origin of the material. Because of what precedes and follows this
passage (chap. 28), I believe it is not unreasonable to think of the
passage as having been produced--in the form we find it in the
book--in the time Tyre was besieged by Nebuchadnezzar.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Cecil J. Weir, "Aspects of the Book of Ezekiel," \textit{VT} 2
(1952):97. Howie (p. i02), after his research on the date and
composition of Ezekiel, adds that "the book which bears his
(Ezekiel) name is largely the product of his mind, even though
written down, in part at least, by others."

\(^2\) "Psalm 48," p. 18, n. 60; idem, "Jerusalem--485 B.C."
\textit{HUCA} 28 (1957):19-31; idem, "The King-God among the Western

\(^3\) 26:1 gives the eleventh year (of Jeboiakim) or the
eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, which would be 587 B.C. Cf.
2 Chr 36:5-8; Parker and Dubberstein, p. 26; Wiseman, \textit{Chronicles},
pp. 32-33.
Historical Identification of the Prince and the King of Tyre

The task of identifying the main figure(s) of Ezek 28 is not simple for several reasons: (1) the passage does not offer any substantial clue for determining the possible historical personage(s); (2) we do not know for sure whether these two oracles (vss. 1-10 and 12-19) were produced in the same epoch; and (3) we do not know whether they belong to the whole block of the Tyrian oracles (chaps. 26-28).

But as we have discussed before, the chances of dating this oracle during or immediately before Tyre's siege by Nebuchadnezzar are great. Thus, if the oracles in chap. 28 belong together with chaps. 26-27, and if the personage is to be identified historically as an individual, that ruler should be Ithobal III. According to Josephus, when Nebuchadnezzar besieged Tyre, Ithobal III (Ithobaal or Ethbaal—ca. 591/0-573/2 B.C.) was king of Tyre. Baal II (ca. 573/72-c. 564 B.C.) would be too late to fit the probable date.

It is very improbable, however, that the Tyrian ruler received the message of Ezekiel.

---

1 Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:73, says that "the different ways of addressing the recipient in vss. 2 and 12 suggest that the two oracles were not composed at the same time." B. Mazar, "The Philistines and the Rise of Israel and Tyre," PIASH 1 (1964):7:21, thinks that Ezekiel wove into his prophecy (Ezek 26-28) excerpts of a Tyrian poem, which he had "learned from the inhabitants of Bit Surraia, a colony of Tyrian exiles in the neighbourhood of Nippur on the Chébar. The poem was apparently composed in the tenth-ninth centuries, at the time of Tyre's greatness."


3 Cf. Ellison, Ezekiel: the Man . . . , p. 99, who affirms that "the prophets' ministry was almost always to Israel, and if they spoke to Israel's neighbors, it was to enforce and explain their message to Israel. There is no reason at all for thinking that Ezekiel's
The first thought which comes to mind in interpreting this passage is whether the original author had in view, in using the expressions מֶלֶךְ֔ צְרוֹר (vs. 2) and בָּנֵבֶרֶזְר (vs. 12), the same or different personages.

Scholars are divided between those who believe that the terms are used indifferently and those who think the passage is talking of two different personages or entities. Some interpreters view the בָּנֵבֶרֶזְר as a man, others as a divine being.

The term בָּנֵבֶרֶזְר, "prince, ruler," is used more than forty times in the OT and is found in connection with charismatic leaders, Israelite kings, etc. As we see in the quoted texts, the term is interchangeable with מֶלֶךְ, and the word is used for foreign rulers.

messages in these chapters were ever carried to the countries mentioned, and it is most improbable that they could have been." Ellison adds that chaps. 26-28, while prophecies against Tyre, could be veiled reference to the fate of Babylon itself (pp. 100-101).

1 Cf. Davidson and Streane, p. 224; Redpath, p. 149, who notes: "The prophet now turns to the ruler of Tyre called 'prince' in vs. 2 and king in vs. 12"; Ellison, Ezekiel: The Man . . . , p. 108; Kroese, p. 20; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:90, who thinks that "the juxtaposition of מֶלֶךְ גוֹיִם and בָּנֵבֶרֶזְר . . . is to be explained . . . on the basis of the separate origins of the two oracles"; Yaron, pp. 45-46; Pulley, p. 30.

2 Cf. Skinner, Ezekiel, pp. 252-53; Mackay, pp. 239-41; Dus, pp. 179-82; Feinberg, pp. 158-59; etc.

3 Cf. Skinner, pp. 252-53; Mackay, p. 239; Habel, p. 517; etc.


5 Cf. 1 Sam 9:16; 10:1.

6 Cf. 1 Sam 13:14; 2 Sam 5:2; 6:21; 7:8; etc.
as well.\(^1\) Alt\(^2\) believes that the title יְהֹוָא has a religious connotation, one who is designated by Yahweh; and Zimmerli affirms that "alongside the more matter-of-fact title יְהֹוָא, 'king,' which is used in vs. 12 . . . seems to have a more solemn ring,"\(^3\) and that this difference in the titles should not be explained on the "basis of a differentiation between the human and divine ruler of Tyre . . . ."\(^4\) Ellison believes "the two titles are deliberately chosen to fit the contents of the two portions"\(^5\) to show that the ruler of Tyre was "merely Jehovah's nagid."\(^6\)

The authors of the books of the Former Prophets seem to have understood the terms יְהֹוָא and יְהוָא, in the beginning of the Israelite monarchy, as connoting rulership on two different levels. Several times the writers present God as saying that Saul,\(^7\) David,\(^8\) or other Israelite leaders\(^9\) would be the יְהוָא over His people, while the true King of Israel was the Lord, "... we want a king to rule over us— even though the Lord your God was your king."\(^10\)

\(^1\)Ps 76:13; Dan 9:26 (some scholars think this prophecy refers to a Jewish prince, not a foreigner).


\(^3\)Ezekiel, 2:77. \(^4\)Ellison, Ezekiel: The Man, p. 108.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 109. \(^6\)Ibid.

\(^7\)1 Sam 9:16; 10:1; 13:14.

\(^8\)2 Sam 5:2; 6:21; 7:8; 1 Chr 11:2.

\(^9\)Solomon (1 Kgs 1:35); Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14:7); Jehu (1 Kgs 20:5); Hezekiah (2 Kgs 20:5); 2 Chr 32:21 refers to the leaders (יְהוָא) in the Assyrian camp.

\(^10\)1 Sam 12:12.
I believe that in the same way the prophet used these two terms in the Ezekelian oracles to denote two different rulers in different realms. It is also very interesting that Christ is called a King in His activities in heaven (Rev 15:3; 17:14; 19:16), but in the Messianic prophecy of Dan 9 (vs. 25), He is referred to as prince (τῆ αὐτοῦ). This could be a manner to distinguish Christ's earthly and heavenly activities.

Although these two titles in Ezek 28 are frequently used interchangeably, it seems that in this particular passage they were used deliberately to denote two different personages, as we show in this study.

Vs. 2b. "I am (a) God." Since the prophet is voicing an oracle on the ruler of Tyre, whose pantheon had > at its head, it has not been easy to determine with certainty whether > means the Phoenician god or—if used in an appellative sense—has to do with Yahweh. As was discussed above, there are reasons to believe that vs. 2 is not an allusion to Canaanite mythology. In any event the ruler presents an attitude of hybris, boasting himself to be a god. Habel cites Isa 14:12ff. as a close parallel to Ezek 28:2-10, taking both passages as "arrogant humans trying to storm the heavens and usurp divine authority in some way." Although these two passages have several elements in common, the spheres where the figures act are quite different.

1With Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh," p. 29. See also Pope, El, p. 98, who thinks > is used in an appellative sense, but at the same time it is an allusion to the Ugaritic El.


4P. 517.
Vs. 2c. "I am sitting on the throne of God in the heart of the seas." Due to alleged mythological elements in the passage, scholars tend to view this phrase as referring to the dwelling place of the gods, but that seems improbable.

Ohler believes that this mythological name of the "height" of Tyrian pride is transferred at the same time to the natural geographic situation of the island city; but he also adds that a special myth need not stay in the background. It seems reasonable to believe that the last part of the phrase refers to the position of the city of Tyre on an island.

The expressions and are used several times in the oracles against Tyre (chaps. 26-28) and connote the city's island position. Furthermore the passage makes

---

1See above, pp. 111-14; Pope, El, pp. 98-99, also notes that the association of the netherworld and the "heart of the seas" in vs. 8 suggests rather strongly that the author had in view El's infernal sea. But see Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:79 for criticism of Pope's view. Cf. Gray, "The Hebrew Conception," pp. 272-73, on the idea of the powers of chaos typified by the unruly waters.

2See Pope, El, pp. 98-99; Gray, Legacy, p. 114; Mullen, pp. 150-51.

3See above, pp. 114-16.

4P. 173; see also van Dijk, pp. 97-99, for solid defense of the view that should be translated "the seat" rather than "dwelling place" of a god.

5Tyre was both an island Tyre and a mainland Tyre; but in time of war the inhabitants used to crowd onto the island to protect themselves and to resist the siege.

6I.e., Ezek 26:5, 17-18; 27:3, 4, 26, 27, 32; cf. also Mullen, p. 150; cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:78; Pope, El, p. 98, who present some ancient sources which depict Tyre as "a city in the sea," and a city whose king Baal "dwells in the midst of the sea."
clear that the personage is a "man and not a god"—"you will be but a man."  

Vss. 3-5. Some interpreters consider these verses as an expansion to explain the origin of the "pride of heart" and present Tyre's increase in wealth as a result of her wisdom and skill in trading. This success in commerce made her heart grow proud.

Vss. 6-10 describe the kind of death foreigners will impose upon the ruler of Tyre. Because of his hybris, pride of heart, he would suffer violent death "in the heart of the seas." As far as the relevance of the oracles against Tyre for the Israelites is concerned, the setting in which they were produced could explain it. As was said before, the first third of the sixth century B.C. is a reasonable epoch to assign for the origin of the Tyrian oracles. It would have been especially relevant after the 586 B.C. fall of Jerusalem, because after conquering and destroying Jerusalem, Nebuchadnezzar turned his attention next to Tyre. The same attitude of pride and self-confidence which was in the mind of the Tyrians was in some aspects shared by the Israelites, who inhabited the southern kingdom, especially Jerusalem. Gowam has noted that

1 Vs. 2.

2 Vs. 9; cf. Skinner, Ezekiel, pp. 252-53.

3 I.e., Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:75, 79.

4 See Prov 3:7; 26:12; Isa 5:21; Jer 9:22, for the idea about those who possess wisdom.

5 See above pp. 114-16 for comments on this expression. For detailed commentary on vss. 1-10 see Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:76-80, and van Dijk, pp. 93-113.

6 See above p. 247.
Tyre probably became a symbol of resistance for the Judeans as news came to them of her stubbornness, and hence it became a symbol to Ezekiel of the misplaced faith of his compatriots. This may be why so much is said about so small a state (three chapters, 26-28), for not only did he find it necessary to try to undermine a faith inadequately based on the inviolability of Jerusalem, but he also had to set the celebrated impregnable, wealth and pride of Tyre in its proper perspective.  

Vss. 11-19

This oracle against the king of Tyre is, as noted above, full of textual difficulties and obscurities which produce some frustration in interpreting it. The elusive language of the passage makes its exegesis difficult.

As in the preceding oracles against Tyre, this passage is introduced by a formula which determines the identity of the oracle. The oracle is described as a qinah concerning the king of Tyre. The subject of the qinah is לְבַע-

בֹּעֶר. Some scholars think that here the same personage who in vs. 2 is called לְבַע-

בֹּעֶר Others, however, identify him as a different personage. Besides that, biblical scholars are divided between those who think the passage refers to an individual and those who take

---

1Pp. 71-72.  
2Pp. 224-29.  
4See above p. 248.  
5Skinner, Ezekiel, p. 252, Dus, pp. 179-82; Feinberg, 160-64.  
6Keil, p. 408; Bertholet, Hesekiel, p. 147; Skinner, Ezekiel, pp. 253-57.
it as a personification of Tyre. Already in the nineteenth century Fairbairn observed that vss. 11-19 are "cast in an entirely different mould" than vss. 1-10. Skinner added that "the point of view is very different in these two sections" and suggests that "it almost seems as if the prophet had in his mind the idea of a tutelary spirit or genius of Tyre." Mackay shares a similar idea, saying that "the prophet's words reveal the two characters as separated by the width that divides the natural from the supernatural"; and the prophet reserves the name "king" for the second oracle to identify the patron deity of Tyre Melkart (melek Kart, "king of the city").

---

1 Fairbairn, p. 306; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:77, 80; Kroeze, p. 20; Habel, p. 516.
2 P. 260.
3 Ezekiel, p. 252; Skinner adds, "In the first the prince is still conceived as a man; . . . in the second, however, the king appears as an angelic being . . . sinless at first, and falling from his high state through his own transgression" (pp. 252-53).
5 "The King of Tyre," p. 239. Mackay presents several differences between these two passages such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Prince (vss. 1-10)</th>
<th>The King (vss. 11-19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Arrogant mortal</td>
<td>- Superhuman being of pristine perfection, whose fault is not in what he claims to be, but in what he no longer is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is &quot;above himself&quot;</td>
<td>- Is fallen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deals with the ruler of Tyre</td>
<td>- Looks beyond flesh and blood to the spirit or angel of Tyre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 P. 241; see Mackay's extensive explanation in an effort to fit Melkart into the Ezekiel passage (pp. 241-58). See also Steinmann, p. 147, who asks "si Ezéchiel n'a pas en vue ici ce que les apocalypses ultérieures appelleront 'l'ange de Tyre', c'est-à-dire le protecteur céleste de la ville ou mieux ce que nous appellerions aujourd'hui 'son âme'.”
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J. Dus has discussed these two sections of Ezek 28 (vss. 1-10 and vss. 11-19) and argued for their distinctiveness as well as their relationship in the fact that they are not in tension but they confirm and complete each other reciprocally. He also identifies the Ezekiel passage with Ps 82, saying that the "Gott-Volk-Vorstellung" is the key to interpreting Ezek 28:12-19 and in support of Mackay's view, he suggests that of vs. 12 could be a transference of the name of the Tyrian city god Melkart. Among the passages presented to support this idea are Isa 30:33 and 57:9 in which is vocalized molech.

This view has received severe criticism by Zimmerli, who presents the following points as militating against equating with Melkart:

1. The use of the title "king" elsewhere in the book of Ezekiel disallows this theory. They are always earthly rulers.

2. In the oracles against Tyre and Egypt, the city or the nation is addressed when the ruler is described as . It would be very strange to apply 28:11-19 as referring to Melkart; the evidences are not strong enough.

---


2 Melkart had as epithet "Ba'al Sor," "Lord of Tyre," and was connected as the god of the underworld. Cf. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion . . . , p. 81; Dussaud, Les Religions . . . , p. 366; H. W. Haussig, Götter und Mythen im Vorderen Orient, WM 1 (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 1965), pp. 297-98.

3 This proposition had already been presented by de Vaux, "Recensions," RB 45 (1936):282.

4 Ezekiel, 2:90.

5 I agree with Zimmerli that Ezek 28:12-19 refers not to the god Melkart, but think the text does not talk of any earthly ruler either; see below pp. 268-70.
Although Mackay and Dus are wrong in saying that the passage is talking about Melkart, they are correct in discerning the different realms of vss. 1-10 and vss. 12-19 and, consequently, that the beings referred to in vss. 2 and 12 are two different ones.\(^1\)

Vs. 12b. "You were an exemplar of perfection . . . " contains a linguistically obscure and enigmatic expression which has puzzled the interpreters,\(^2\) who have suggested several tentative translations.\(^3\) Although we are not able so far to know the definitive translation or meaning of the words הָנֵבַע הָנָבָע, the context indicates a special being who was a model or a pattern who had a special function in the realm where he lived. The figure here depicted is presented as having (at his creation) all the marks of a perfect being. He is portrayed as owning a great degree of excellency and "full of wisdom and perfect in beauty." If in vss. 2-4, 6 mention is made concerning the wisdom of the הָנֵבַע of Tyre, and vs. 7 refers to his "beauty and wisdom," vs. 12 portrays the הָנֵבַע of Tyre as being "full of wisdom and perfect in beauty." Both figures (the הָנֵבַע and the הָנֵבַע of Tyre) convey

\(^1\)Against Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:90, who thinks that the juxtaposition of הָנֵבַע and הָנֵבַע is due to "the separate origins of the two oracles, the first of which has been secondarily prefixed to the second with a variation in the title applied to the ruler."

\(^2\)See above, pp. 237 (n. 2), 238.

\(^3\)I.e., "ein Weiser von höchster Vollendung" (Kraetzschmar, p. 216); "a curiously wrought seal-ring" (Hitzig [cf. CHSL, 13:261]); "Seal of Completion" (Ewald [cf. CHSL, 13:261]); "Der Siegelabdruck des Ebenbildes" (Hermann, p. 171); "Siegelbewahrer" (Gressmann, Der Messias, p. 166); "Der Abdruck eines models" (Fohrer, Ezekiel, p. 161); "a completed signet" (Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:81); etc.
some similar characteristics, but the latter in a fuller amount.

Vs. 13a. "You were in Eden, the garden of God"; the mention of Eden here, as well as a "guardian Cherub" (vss. 14 and 16) and the expulsion of a being from a good place (vs. 16), have led commentators to think that our text derived from the Paradise story of Gen 2-3, or perhaps from a more mythological version of this story. But as noted above, the similarities are superficial and the divergences remarkable. We have to interpret this passage without the a priori thought that it derives from Gen 2-3. It could be admitted that because of the nature of the material and their contexts they have some distant relationships to each other. However we cannot say, to begin with, that both passages report the same event and refer to the creation, sin, and fall of the first man. The term יַעַדְתָּא is used several times in Genesis in connection with the garden God planted for our first parents, and as a country called Eden. Besides several occurrences of the word in the OT denoting a region, it appears as connoting a place of beauty and delight, which reflects the quality of the garden planted by God at the beginning.


6See 2 Kgs 19:12; 2 Chr 29:12; 31:15; Isa 37:12; Ezek 27:23.

7Isa 51:3; Ezek 36:35; Joel 2:3.
Of the seven uses Ezekiel makes of the term, four refer to the "trees of Eden" and relate Eden with the "garden of God." In 28:13 the trees are absent, but Eden is parallel to "garden of God." Although the term is sometimes related to the "garden of God," the root of the word means "delight," "loveliness," "to make glad," and could connote any "delightful" place.

We find some points which would make it difficult to identify the garden of God in Eden of Ezek 28:13 with the "garden of Eden" where Adam and Eve were put, for example: (1) In Ezekiel the garden is called ("garden of God"); in Genesis it is reported that the Lord God planted a garden in Eden ... and there put man ...; (2) the garden in Ezekiel is located on the "mount of God," while in Genesis it is "in the East"; (3) the mention in Genesis of precious stones and gold is related to the land of Havilah which had those things, while Ezekiel seems to refer to gold and precious stones as being the adornment of the figure.

Mackay, based on Ezek 31:3-9, 16 and some old sources, has said that "for the prophet the Lebanon was Eden the garden of
God"; but the prophet is only comparing the trees of Lebanon with the trees of Eden, not identifying Eden with Lebanon.

Some scholars believe that the prophet is describing the temple of Tyre. I think it is legitimate to associate מַעֲשֵׂה with temple, but that Ezekiel is referring to the pagan temple is far from being proved.

Vs. 13b. "Every precious stone being your cover...." The function of these precious stones has been interpreted in two ways: (1) as referring to the adornments of the royal or priestly garments; (2) applied as belonging to the ornament of the walls of the sanctuary where the splendid Being walked. All depends on the way we interpret the word מַעֲשֵׂה, as far as its original root is concerned. The traditional rendering has been the one that presents the stones as part of the figure's dress. But other interpreters who believe מַעֲשֵׂה should be pointed without

---

1"The King of Tyre," p. 250.
2Barnes, "Ezekiel's Denunciation," p. 51; cf. also Yaron, p. 43.
3See above, p. 136.
4See above, p. 238, n. 1, for discussion of the matter.
5The versions seem to render that. Cf. Fairbairn, p. 319; Kraetzschmar, p. 216; Schröder, p. 258; Cheminant, pp. 75-76; Herrmann, p. 170; Bertholet, Hesekiel, p. 100; Widengren, The Ascension, p. 97; Weaver, p. 23; Fohrer, Ezechiel, p. 161; Cassuto, Genesis, p. 79, who makes a distinction between the precious stones (vs. 13) which "constituted the covering of the cherub" and the stones of fire (vss. 14, 16) "in the midst of which the cherub walked"; Yaron, pp. 37-38; Habel, p. 518; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:82; cf. also Haag, p. 86.
Advocating this view, Barnes says that

The connexion between temple and garden is quite obvious to the Eastern mind. A 'temple' in the ancient East was not a building but a sacred enclosure round a (small) shrine. The earliest Semitic sanctuaries were gardens planted in oases where the unexpected fertility of the soil suggested to the Semite the presence of a beneficent deity. The Solomonic temple preserved the memory of Eden the garden-sanctuary, for its walls were adorned with figures of guardian Cherubim (cf. Gen. iii 24), palm-trees, and flowers (1 Kings vi 29, 32).

Passages such as Ps 116:19; 135:2; and 92:12-13 stress further the connection between "temple and garden." Yaron has demonstrated the interchangeable use of heaven, Eden, the sides of the north, and the temple, which, with expressions like "guardian cherub" (vss. 14, 16), "my (your) sanctuaries" (vs. 18), and "fiery stones" (vss. 14, 16), seem to indicate that the "garden of God" mentioned in the passage under discussion should be identified with a sanctuary. As far as the context is concerned our passage is related to a sanctuary and would justify the application of the

---

1 Yaron, p. 38, says that the vowel-points הַכְּדוּת found in most variants are "strange" and against all grammatical laws" and suggest that the original version could have been בָּכְדוּת (from הָכָד "to cover") and not בָּכָד.

2 JTS 35 (1934):51.

3 Cf. van Dijk, p. 117; van Dijk also calls attention to the Ugaritic suggestion for an analogous identification of "house of god" and "courts."

4 Pp. 40-45. 5 Cf. also van Dijk, p. 118.
term הממכה, both as related to the walls of the temple and/or to the clothing of the mentioned figure. Although the versions support the former view, and the precious stones in Ezekiel resemble the ones found in the wall of the new Jerusalem in Rev 21:18-24, there are reasons to believe that the latter is more correct: (1) the parallel passages (Exod 28:15-21; 39:8-13) speak of the stones as belonging to the breastpiece of the high priest, which is adornment or covering, and (2) as Zimmerli observed, the term can be a "preparation like a motto for the following (vss. 14, 16)."

Vs. 13c. "Your settings and engraving were made of gold" (רכתבים ומלאתה החיתות והכיסא אחרון). As noted above, this phrase is very obscure and our translation is tentative. In view of the context we suppose it has to do with the breastplate where the precious stones were mounted.

Vs. 13d. "On the day you were created they were prepared." The word used for "create" is אָרַךְ and occurs also in vs. 15 and is the term used in Genesis concerning man's creation. Morgenstern

1 See above, pp. 238-39, for a comparison between the Ezekiel list of stones and the ones in the Pentateuch. Cf. also Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:82-84.

2 Ezekiel, 2:82. Cassuto, Genesis, pp. 79-80, has correctly rejected the scholar's idea that the precious stones of vs. 13 should be identified with the "fiery stones" of vss. 14, 16.


4 The word occurs forty-nine times in the OT and is used exclusively to denote divine creation. Cf. K. H. Bernhardt, H. Ringgren, "בָּרָא," TDOT (1974), 2:245-46. Charles R. Smith (cf. Pulley, p. 38) has noted that אָרַךְ in this Ezekiel passage could refer to the "enthronement or birth of the king of Tyre, or even the founding of Tyre itself"; and H. H. Esser calls our attention to the fact that אָרַךְ "is also used to express God's new work of
understands לְאַרְבָּא in these verses (13, 15) as "self-creation" and identifies the "quality of self-creation . . . or self-generation or self-regeneration . . . (of) this Tyrian god-king with the Phoenix who rose . . . from the ashes of his former being, self-created, self-generated, as it were, to enter upon a new life-cycle," but his proposal is baseless. The niphal form is better regarded as passive.

Vs. 14. "I created (placed) you as a cherub with outstretched shielding wings . . . ." Crucial for the correct understanding of this passage is the role we attribute to the Cherub:

(1) as the subject of the dirge or (2) as playing the same role as the cherubim in Gen 3:24.

As we have seen in chap. 2, we can arrive at one or the creation extending into history, or rather, the historical continuation of His creative activity" ("Creation," NIDNTT [1975]: 1:379); cf. Ps 104(103):30; Eccl 12:1; Ps 51:10; 102:18, etc. However, neither of these views should of necessity be imposed upon the text. The context of the passage seems to require God as the direct subject of the term לְאַרְבָּא and the figure a created being (against Pulley, pp. 38-39).


3With Cassuto, Genesis, p. 75; Tur-Sinai, pp. 113-14; Widengren, The Ascension, pp. 94-97, who reads vs. 14 as אָם בְּדַבַּר מַמְּשָה מֵהֶהוֹ, וְהָאָרְבָּא הַבָּה שְׂדָאָה, אֶלְהַמִּשָּה הָרִים, בְּתוֹרָהָה אֲבָדָה אֶחָד הַחֲלִבָּה, translating it: "Thou wast a cherub, oh, what an anointed of the Shadower, and I placed thee on the holy mountain. A god thou wast, in the midst of stones of fire thou walked" (p. 97). Cf. also Feinberg, pp. 161-63; Gaster, Myth. Legend, p. 621. See also Yaron, pp. 28-30, for criticism of Widengren's view.

4With Cooke, Ezekiel, p. 317; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:85-86; Yaron, pp. 303.

5See above, pp. 138-39.
other conclusion depending on which text we adopt. The MT makes the cherub the subject of the dirge,¹ and the LXX sets the cherub as the companion of the garden's dweller.² Yaron gives several reasons why he prefers the LXX reading: (1) "the style is clear and fluent"; (2) a better "phrase combination" in the context; (3) the very small differences between the LXX and the MT.³ His observations are more or less plausible for vs. 14, but not for vs. 16 where in the MT God is the subject or the one who punishes, and in the LXX the cherub is the subject in punishing the king. Several reasons can be presented for accepting the MT reading: (1) as van Dijk notes, "the stylistic and idiomatic similarity of vss. 12-13 and vs. 14 suggests strongly the vocalization of ḫattā instead of ḫet 'with,' favored by many scholars";⁴ (2) the only way to parallel vs. 16 with vs. 14 without major alteration of the text is to have the cherub as the one who was punished by God; (3) the ascendancy of the MT text over the LXX in most of the disputed texts inclines us toward the reliability of the Hebrew text.⁵

¹ הַנְּתֵנָם שֶׁהָעַל נִיחוֹךְ.
² וְהֵּשַׁבְּדוּ לוֹ פְּנֵי הָעַל נִיחוֹךְ לְהַנּוֹת מִפְּנֵי הָעַל נִיחוֹךְ. (לְאָדָם בְּרָכֵּהוּ וּבָאָדָם בְּרָכֵּהוּ).
³ Yaron, p. 31.
⁴ p. 119.
⁵ See also Pulley, p. 40, who adds, "In each of verses 17 and 18, an indictment is followed by a description of judgment which is comprised of two parallel statements. In each of these statements, God is the subject. It follows that verse 16, paralleling, as it does, verses 17 and 18, should reflect the same pattern. Therefore, such emendation as Yaron and others propose is unacceptable. Since, then, the king of Tyre is in verse 16 described as a הַנְּתֵנָם, verse 14 may also be understood to address him in such a fashion."
The term cherub\(^1\) (pl. cherubim) has been used in the OT connoting two things: (1) as a cultic object, where it is represented by the figure of an angel with outstretched wings shielding the ark in the tabernacle or the temple;\(^2\) (2) as living celestial beings who execute God's orders.\(^3\) Although the passage under discussion uses the verb הַשהַן—which is used in the OT in relation to the action of the cultic object of "shielding" in the sanctuary\(^4\) and the Ezekiel passage connotes a sanctuary environment, it seems that the passage clearly speaks of a living creature in a very sublime place.

**Vs. 14b.** "You were in the (holy) mount of God." For earlier Israel "mountain of God" designated Sinai (Horeb).\(^5\) After the establishment of the temple, Mount Zion was considered God's holy mountain.\(^6\) Some scholars believe that סָפוֹן of vss. 14, 16 is identical with the "mount of assembly in the recesses of the north" (רָבָּה יָפָר) of Isa 14:13 and has to do with the Phoenician gods' sacred mountain.\(^7\) I believe that both passages speak of the

---

\(^1\)See above, pp. 138-39.

\(^2\)See Lisowsky, pp. 698-99, for uses of the term in the OT.

\(^3\)Cf. Gen 3:24; Ezek 10; etc. See Yaron, p. 32, on the boundary between animate and inanimate objects in relation to Ezekiel.

\(^4\)Cf. Exod 25:20; 37:9; 1 Kgs 8:7; etc.

\(^5\)Cf. Exod 3:1; 4:27; 18:5; 24:13, etc.

\(^6\)Ps 48:1-3. Scholars (i.e., Kraus, Psalmen, pp. 342-43; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:92-93; cf. also Eissafeldt, Baal Zaphon, pp. 14-16) think that the description "Mount Zion in the far north" is an "amalgamation with Canaanite-Phoenician tradition which knows Saphon in north Syria as the mountain of God" (Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:92).

\(^7\)Cf. Eissafeldt, Baal Zaphon, pp. 20-21; Dussaud, "Les Phéniciens," p. 40; see also pp. 93-95 above.
same location, but there are no solid arguments to compel me to think that the Ezekiel passage has anything to do with Mount Cassius or any other sacred mountain of the Phoenicians or Babylonians. On the other side there is some evidence that in ancient Israel "garden of God," "Eden," "mountain of God," "recesses of the north," and "Temple" are parallel or can be equated with "heaven" the dwelling place of God. The context of the passage favors this interpretation.

Vs. 14c. "In the midst of the stones of fire you walked." This phrase has already been discussed in chap. 2, where it was concluded that could hardly be related to the Ugaritic abn brq. Several suggestions as to its meaning were: (1) "lightning stones," (2) walls of precious stones fused by fire; (3) the expression should be emended and means the inhabitants of the place; (4) or the stars.

It is very improbable that these "stones of fire" should be identified with the gems listed in vs. 13. In any event the expression under discussion denotes the glorious environment from which the cherub, because of his sin, was expelled.

---

1 See above, pp. 93-95.
2 See G. W. Ahlström, Psalm 89 (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups, 1959), pp. 73-75, who affirms that "ideologisch gesehen ist es nichts Besonderes, dass Zaphon, der Götterberg, auch der Himmel sein kann, der ja Wohnsitz der Gottheit ist, denn Götterberg, Tempel und Himmel sind ja alle Ausdrücke für ein und dieselbe Sache, den Götterwohnsitz" (p. 74); and Yaron, pp. 40-45, who arrives at the conclusion that it is legitimate to equate the (holy) mount of God with "heaven."

5 See Cassuto, Genesis, pp. 79-80.
Vs. 15. "You were blameless in your ways from the day you were created till evil was found in you . . . and you sinned." At this point we arrive at a turning point in the passage. The climax of the passage is reached when the unrighteousness of the cherub is presented. What follows next is an explanation of his sin and a description of his judgment.

Vs. 16. "In the abundance of your trade you have filled yourself with violence, and you sinned." The first part of vs. 16—along with vs. 18a—fits well the situation of Tyre as a trade-minded power. The second part of the verse repeats the elements of vs. 14 with different verbs, showing the cherub's expulsion from the mount of God. Some scholars view the formula full of violence as a later hand's insertion into the text, referring to the "violence which arose as a result of Tyre's trading."³

Vss. 17-18 offers a double presentation of the cause-effect consequence in relation to the cherub's attitude.

Vs. 17—Because of beauty—heart became proud—throwing and splendor corrupting unclean to earth

Vs. 18—Many sins and Desecrated consumed and reduced to dishonest trade sanctuary ashes by his own fire

Vs. 17 deals with the pride of the individual, because of which his beauty; vs. 18 with the corrupt trade, strengthens Zimmerli's

1 See above, p. 229 for comments on the position of this verse in the structure of the passage.

2 Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:94, thinks they are a secondary expansion.

3 Ibid., pp. 93-94. Cf. also Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 394; Wevers, p. 216.
view that facts concerning Tyre's attitudes were inserted in the basic text which dealt with the "creature of surpassing beauty."¹ Eichrodt holds that "the description of the angelic being on the mount of God is employed merely as an allegory for the king of Tyre and did not carry with it any force to compel Ezekiel to follow slavishly the lines of the myth";² on the other side, he adds that "it would be perverse to assume, in view of the new formulation of the punishment, that the description departs from its subject in order to deal with the fate of the city of Tyre."³

Morgenstern believes that this Biblical passage identifies this Tyrian god-king with the phoenix in both stages of his life-cycle, in his self-cremation in fire⁴ which comes forth from his own body and reduces him to ashes, and in his self-creation or self-regeneration in that he rises from these ashes in rejuvenated form⁵ to begin this new life-cycle;⁶ but there is nothing in the text that substantiates this view.⁷

Vs. 19 is a kind of summary statement-refrain which was already used at the end of the previous Tyrian oracles (26:21 and 27:36). This conclusion "underlines the irrevocability and transcendence of Yahweh's decisions,"⁸ and דְָּעֲלִי stresses the finality of the destruction.⁹

¹Ibid., pp. 93-94; cf. also Wevers, p. 218.
²Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 394. ⁴Ibid., p. 395.
⁶"The King-god," p. 154; Irwin, Ezekiel, p. 221, also believes the text refers to the phoenix.
⁸Cf. van Dijk, p. 122.
Preliminary Conclusions

It seems clear that the chapter under discussion, as we have it today, is related to the Phoenician Tyre. The introduction to the oracle\(^1\) as well as of the Qinah\(^2\) heading clearly declare that what follows refers to that nation or her rulers. Elements of the passage also present characteristics which, from the geographical and historical information we have both from biblical and extra-biblical literature, identify them with Tyre: i.e.:

1. "In the heart of the seas"\(^3\)--the location of the old insular Tyre as well as her maritime activity.\(^4\)

2. "You have increased your wealth."\(^5\)

3. "Wisdom in your trade," "abundance of your trade," "unrighteousness of your trade."\(^6\)

4. "Beauty... and shining splendor."\(^7\)

5. "Pride of heart."\(^8\)

\(1^{\text{Vss. 1-10.}}\) \(2^{\text{Vss. 12-19.}}\)

\(3^{\text{Vss. 2, 8; 26:5, 17-18; 27:9, 25-29, 32-35; Zech 9:4.}}\)


\(5^{\text{Vss. 4-5; 26:12; 27:12-25, 33:34; 35c. Cf. Fleming, pp. 133-45; Jidejian's and Katzenstein's histories of Tyre.}}\)


\(8^{\text{Although we would not say that "pride of heart" was a}}\)
Although Tyre's power came to an end, we do not know if it happened in the dark way Ezekiel portrayed in vss. 7-10, 18. After a thirteen-year siege, Nebuchadnezzar did conquer Tyre,\(^1\) but, as the prophet notes,\(^2\) the effort would not be worthwhile, and Nebuchadnezzar would conquer Egypt as a recompense for the effort against Tyre.

It seems that as far as the historical connotations are concerned, these passages describe the city of Tyre in her political attitude, not a specific king (Ithobaal?). Although the passages deal with Tyre, whose pantheon's head was > הָיָשָׁר, the use in this chapter of the divine designation > הָיָשָׁר seems to be employed in an appellative sense. It is not certain whom the prophet wants to identify with the name > הָיָשָׁר, but as we saw in this study, the Israelite prophet Daniel of the Neo-Babylonian period fits the Ezekiel hero better than the Phoenician wise man of the Aqhat epic.\(^3\)

In vss. 1-10, we have a case of nybris where man wants to take possession of God's prerogatives. Because of beauty, wisdom, wealth, and skillfulness in trade, Tyre developed a self-sufficient and proud attitude. This, we are informed, is an abomination to Yahweh, and He will put an end to it.\(^4\) This oracle seems to be devoid of any mythical elements.\(^5\)


\(^2\) Ezek 29:18-19.

\(^3\) See above, pp. 116-24.


\(^5\) Against A. May, "The King in the Garden . . . .", pp. 167-68; Morgenstern, "The King-god," pp. 152-54, who identifies the Tyrian king with Baal Sham en and Melqart.
Vss. 12-19 are of a different nature than the previous verses. This is a lament that talks about a once perfect being who lived in Eden, the Garden of God, which is identified with a place with fiery stones and called the "Mount of God." Scholars' efforts to identify--because of the mention of Eden--this lament story with that of the paradise of Gen 2-3 have not succeeded, for the differences are too great to say that they are parallel or come from the same source.

The figure described in this lament is more than human and lived in a higher place than the earthly realm. The passage does not allow us to view the Tyrian king as the "living embodiment" or the "incarnation" of the Tyrian solar deity Baal Shamen-Melcarth. On the other hand, this marvelous being who lived in a heavenly realm seems to have his functions related to a temple or sanctuary. Although we cannot find a myth which would match this story of Ezekiel in its details, scholars who observe that we have in this passage some mythic strata seem to be right. The prophet seems to use a story of a being of the remote past which Tyre personifies. We can perceive in the passage adaptations of older material to the present Tyrian context or situation.

1 Against Morgenstern, "Jerusalem-485 B.C.,” p. 30, it can be said that there is nothing of the Phoenician polytheism in the passage.

2 Myth in the sense of something ancient, which is not necessarily "unhistorical" or "uninterested in history" (Barr, "The Meaning," p. 8) but has descriptions of some events which bring about the activity of gods or heavenly beings and which, in some sense, happens not according to the ordinary course of nature.

3 Pulley, p. 47, thinks that "Ezekiel's imagery stems from a variety of sources, including creation tradition, mythology, and features of Tyre's religion and culture with which the Hebrews (Exiles) would have been familiar."
Isaiah 14:12-15 and Ezekiel 28:12-19—
A Comparison

Although scholars, ever since the time of the Church Fathers, have seen some similarities between Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19, a major comparison between these two passages has not been made.¹ In the light of what has been discussed in this thesis, we would like to compare these passages, noting the similarities and differences, and consider whether we can draw some conclusions which could help in the interpretation of the passages.

Similarities

1. Both passages have a prophet as subject.²

2. Both have a foreign king as object,³ and appear in the sections on foreign oracles in their books. Babylon, in Isaiah, appears at the very beginning of the foreign oracles, and Tyre, in Ezekiel, comes at about the center.

3. Both passages are prominent in the book to which they belong.⁴

¹Lohmann, Die anonymen Prophetien, pp. 76-77, has made a comparison of these two passages in the aspect of structure and some characteristics motifs, but did not go far enough.

²Isa 13:1; 14:3, 4; Ezek 28:11, 12.

³The King of Babylon— Isa 14:4, 22; the king of Tyre— Ezek 28:12.

⁴There are five chapters (13, 14, 21, 46, 47) in the Book of Isaiah that deal with oracles, prophecies, gods, and the fall of Babylon. Chaps. 13 and 14 open the section on the foreign oracles, and chap. 14 presents one of the most impressive poems in the OT in form, content, and poetic beauty. Concerning the prominence of vss. 12-15 in chap. 14, see above, pp. 207-13. Ezekiel's oracles against the foreign nations start with the three chapters on Tyre. Chap. 28 with its ruler of Tyre and his hybris and the King of Tyre personified in that mysterious being is the climax of the Tyrian oracles.
4. Both have a mythological coloring, and if, on one hand, they are distinct from the context in which they are found, on the other, they are intermingled with elements that belong to the human entities to whom the context refers.

5. Both passages contain elements similar to the elements of the immediate context of the other.

6. The immediate context of each of these passages contains elements similar to the immediate context of the other passage.

7. Both passages depict a being who is singled out because of his excellence.

1As we have seen above, pp. 109, 143, 202-13, these two passages seem to refer to beings dwelling in a realm different from the earthly one.

2Isa 14:12b "You who laid the nations low": vss. 6, 16b-17 "Smote the peoples . . .," "Shook the earth . . ."; Isa 14:15 "but you are brought down to Sheol, to the recess of the pit"; vss. 9-11 "the grave below . . ."; Ezek 28:12, 17 "full of wisdom and perfect in beauty"; vss. 3, 4, 6-7 "wisdom," "understanding," "wise as god," "beauty and wisdom"; Ezek 28:16, 18 "abundance of your trade," "unrighteousness of your trade"; vs. 5 "your heart has grown proud"; Ezek 28:17 "splendor"; vs. 7 "shining splendor."

3The hybris attitude of the being in Isa 14:13-14, "you said in your heart, I will ascend to heaven . . . set my throne . . . sit enthroned . . .," resembles the hybris behavior of the ruler of Tyre in Ezek 28:2, "in the pride of your heart you say, 'I am god, I sit on the throne of god . . .'." Ezek 28:16 "filled with violence." vs. 19 "all the nations . . . are appalled at you . . .," resembles Isa 14:4-6 "oppressor," "anger," "fury," "unceasing blows," "relentless persecution," vss. 19, 16 "All . . . the kings of the nations . . . stare at you, they ponder your fate."

4Isa 14:16, 19 "... they ponder your fate. . . you are clothed with the slain, with those pierced by the sword, who go down to the stones of the pit." Ezek 28:7-10 "you will die a violent death . . ., those who slay you . . . will bring you down to the pit."

5In Ezek 28:12-16 his qualities are more explicit. In Isa 14:12ff. we have the expression of admiration, "how are you fallen from heaven, O shining one, son of the dawn!" and the fact that he aspired those pretentious objectives demonstrates his qualities.
8. In both passages the figure dwells in a place related to the mount of God, or heaven.¹

9. Both were thrown to the earth by God.²

10. Both were written in poetry of chiastic form; the Ezekiel passage with a chiasm in the passage itself, and with the climax depicting the sin of the Cherub; the Isaiah passage (vss. 12-15 third stanza) being the climax of the chiasm in the whole poem with the attempt to become like the Most High being the turning point in the chiasm.

Differences

1. In the case of Helel, the emphasized sin is his self-sufficiency and his desire to make himself like the Most High in power.³ In the Cherub's case it was that his heart became proud because of his wisdom and perfection in beauty.⁴ However, these two different emphases do not militate against each other, but are characteristics which can belong to the same figure.

2. The Cherub seems to be related to a sanctuary.⁵ Nothing is said about Helel's function.

3. The Helel story seems to be presented in a more wholistic way; in other words, in a more original way with respect to the form in which the story must have circulated in the days when the oracle was written. The Cherub story seems to have been adapted to fit

¹Isa 14:12-14; Ezek 28:16-16. See above, pp. 260ff. for equation of "garden of God" and "mount of God" with heaven.

²Isa 14:12; Ezek 28:17.

³Isa 14:13-14.

⁴Ezek 28:17.

the characteristics of the Tyrian power.  

In summary, we may say that the similarities between these two passages are remarkable not only in relation to the two main pericopes (Isa 14:12-15, Ezek 28:12-19), but concerning the immediate context as well. Each of these passages focuses upon the figure in view as central to the activities of those foreign kings.

The Story of Helel and the Story of the Cherub in Isa 14 and Ezek 28

The differences are the result of different information about the figure's person and attitudes, which do not in any form support the assumption that Helel and the Cherub are two distinct figures.

It seems clear that Isa 14 and Ezek 28 were directed to Babylon and Tyre, respectively, whether having in view an individual or the nation as a whole, as the oracles themselves inform. But as we have seen, at a certain point the mood of the oracle changes and the language of myth seems to be introduced. In the face of this phenomenon we have been asked several questions such as:

1. If indeed the prophet made use of myth, which myth was used? Was it taken from the neighboring nations or was it something which was in circulation in Israel during a long time?

2. Could it be that the prophet was only using mythological

1Ezek 28:16a, 18, and probably part of vs. 13.

2See Bruce K. Waltke, "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:13," BS 132 (1975):143, and Meadors, pp. 35-36, for comments on the relation between these two passages.

3Isa 14:3-4, 22; Ezek 28:2, 12.
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elements in order to convey his message, and, therefore, was not
dependent upon any particular myth?

3. What was the writer's main purpose in using figurative
or mythological language? Was he personifying in the person of
the King of Babylon or the King of Tyre the attitude of some
mythological hero? Or was the prophet referring to the religio-
historical context of the particular nations?

Based on the research completed so far, I present my
deductions on those matters.

As pointed out in chapter 2,¹ until now no myth has been
found from which we could say the stories in these two passages
came. Also, some elements found in these passages are indeed
found in the mythological material of other ancient cultures.
This does not necessarily prove that the prophet got them from
foreign material, since these elements could have been common to
the whole ancient Near East as a "result of diffusion from an
original source somewhere."² Besides that, all the main myth-
resembling elements found in the passages are found also in the
OT.³ Several suggestions have been proposed to explain the use of
the different nature of materials in Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19:

1. Gunkel⁴ says that Isa 14:12-15 deals with a nature myth

¹See above, pp. 109-10, 144-45.    ²Cf. Gowan, p. 53.
³See above, pp. 134-39. For the problem of myth in relation
to the OT, see Barr, "The Meaning," pp. 1-10; Henton Davies, "An
Rogerson, Myth in OT Interpretation, pp. 174-89.
⁴Schöpfung und Chaos, pp. 133-34. In face of the study done
by Grelot ("Isaie 14:12-15," pp. 25-32), it seems probable that at
least vs. 12 refers to a nature myth or a natural phenomenon in
which the morning star Venus is superseded by the sun in early morning.
which was personified to represent the King of Babylon.¹

2. B. Childs² agrees with Gunkel and notes that the prophet took the myth and reworked it into his dirge, comparing it to the attitude and fate of the King of Babylon. For him the story of Heel has become an illustration of what happened to the King of Babylon.³

3. M. Terry views Isa 14:9-20 as an example of apostrophe, a literary device in which the writer or speaker turns away from his immediate hearers and addresses an absent and imaginary person or thing.⁴

4. J. D. Pentecost says, concerning Ezek 28, "so as the prophet pronounces judgment upon the enemy of Israel in vss. 1-10, he moves on to speak a word of judgment upon the one who controlled these gentile princes."⁵

With these suggestions theologians elaborated their views on the interpretation of these two passages. I would like to comment briefly on these main views.

Isaiah 14:12-15

The Normal-Historical View

The Normal-Historical view,⁶ which has been expounded by a great number of biblical scholars, affirmed that the passage

²Myth and Reality, pp. 68-69. ³Ibid., p. 69.
⁶This phrase has been used by Meadors in his monograph. See also above, p. 17-21.
depicts the end of the king of Babylon. Although the writer of the text uses a very figurative and what seems to be a mythological language, the proponents of this view say the prophet makes use of the natural phenomenon of the appearing of the morning star in the sky, figuratively adapted in a pride-motif and applied to the King of Babylon in apostrophe. The holders of this view admit that the language of myth is used, but only as a vehicle to portray the Babylonian King's pretensions.

All the trends of this view cannot be reviewed here, but we may say that the holders of this interpretation fail to give heed to the following points:

1. Even though a great part of chap. 14 speaks about the immediate historical context, that does not impede the idea that part of the passage could mean—through personification, illustration, or apostrophe—somebody else. The change of language and realm in vss. 12-15 suggests the possibility.

2. The change of language, mood, and realm in vss. 12-15 seems to go beyond mere figurative language and to attribute that to "poetic license" is to stretch it too much.

3. The Normal-Historical View omits the possibility that the

---

1 Cf. Erlandsson, pp. 139-40.
3 See Young, 1:441.
4 For defenders of the Normal-Historical View and their points, see Vandenburgh, pp. 119-21; Young, 1:435-46; Alden, pp. 35-39; Meadors, pp. 82-88. Meadors discusses the view more extensively.
5 Meadors, p. 83.
passage could be speaking a "word of judgment upon the one who controlled these gentile princes." Vss. 12-15 could be referring to the origin of the power impelling the Babylonian monarch.

Meadors affirms:

It is certainly easy to see the character of Satan in the language found in pride-motif passages, but that is no basis for demanding that the passages be interpreted to Satan. That Satan inspired the wicked king, even as he rules all degenerate men, is undeniable, but that is quite different from saying Lucifer is Satan. If this kind of hermeneutic was applied consistently, every passage in the Bible which speaks of evil could be attributed to Satan, because all of the acts of degenerate men reflect him to some degree. Isaiah 14:3-20 is clearly a song of victory over Babylon. The tenor of its details [is] contrary to the fall of Satan but clearly describes the fall of an earthly potentate.

However, the Isaian passage not only carries the pride-motif but also contains elements which show that the protagonist (in vss. 12-15) is more than a human being. I cannot see how "the tenor of its (the passage's) details . . . clearly describes the fall of an earthly potentate," as Meadors says. Furthermore, we cannot affirm that "every passage in the Bible which speaks of evil could be attributed to Satan . . . ," but also we cannot deny the force that one would have in applying a passage like this to portray a struggle that goes on between good and evil as portrayed in the Bible.

In summary, it can be said that Isa 14:4-21, broadly speaking, can be concerned with Babylon and her monarch(s); however,

---

1Pentecost, p. 11. Pentecost is referring to the Ezekiel passage, but his comment is also applicable here.
2Alden, p. 39. 3P. 86. 4Ibid., p. 87.
5See above, pp. 199-203. 6Meadors, p. 86.
this research has shown that it is very difficult to interpret, especially vs. 12-15, as referring to an event that occurred in the immediate historical context of the whole oracle.

The Mythological View

As noted in chapter 1, many theologians from the end of the nineteenth century on have viewed Isa 14:12-15 as referring to an ancient pagan myth. Part of chapter 2 of this dissertation has been dedicated\(^1\) to the examination of the origins-and-parallels hypothesis concerning the Isaiah and Ezekel passages under study as related to some ancient myths.\(^2\) The research has demonstrated that, although a myth of Helel ben Shahar has not been found which corresponds to the Isaian passage in its totality, elements of the passage can be found in the cultures of the ancient Near East--especially Ugarit--and its mythology. But those elements are also found in the biblical literature in a context free from the polytheistic nature of the extra-biblical material, which could have happened because of "cultural continuity" or "common elements" in the ancient Near Eastern area.

It could also be that the prophet used a myth\(^3\) which was known to Israel as well to the neighboring cultures to illustrate or to explain the attitude of the Babylonian power. At this point the Mythological View would start overlapping with the Lucifer-

---

\(^1\) See above, pp. 60-110.  
\(^2\) See also, Meadors, pp. 66-73.  
\(^3\) Myth here is used in a sense of some event very primitive but not necessarily unhistorical which describes something related to the activity of heavenly beings in relation to historical events (see Henton Davies, "An Approach," p. 84).
Equals-Satan View which is discussed below when both passages (Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19) are analyzed in relation to the above-mentioned view.

Ezekiel 28:12-19

As considered in chapter 2, several views have been proposed through the years in interpreting this Ezekiel passage. At least four main views are worthy of considering briefly here in the light of what has been said in this thesis.

The Immediate Historical and Religious Context View

The Immediate Historical and Religious Context View which had Mackay and Dus as main proponents has some good insights, such as the distinction between the Prince and the King of Tyre as different figures and the discerning of the two different realms of vss. 1-10 and 12-19. But on the other side, there is nothing that solidly supports its contention that Тір Іріс is a transference of the name of the Tyrian city-god, Melkart; for, besides the arguments Zimmerli presents against this view, it is doubtful that such details of the Tyrian religion would be known and relevant to Ezekiel's audience in the exile. Despite the fact that this view interprets the passage in its Sitz im Leben, as Pulley says, this "approach arbitrarily limits the purview of Ezekiel's prophetic thought."

---

1 P. 282.  
2 See above, pp. 36-49  
3 See above, pp. 254-56.  
4 Ezekiel, 2:90; see also above, pp. 255-56.  
5 P. 24.
The Mythological View

Besides Gaster's suggestion that the Ezekiel account of the Cherub who lived upon the Mount of God came from the Prometheus myth,\(^1\) no myth has been cited by those who say that Ezekiel is using an ancient myth to write his oracle.\(^2\) Examining the alleged mythological phrases in the passage,\(^3\) I discovered that they are expressions which, although present in the literature of the ancient Near East, can be found in the biblical material as well, expressing facts pertinent to Israel's religious experience and theology.

The Paradise Story View

The Paradise Story View, which has as its proponents respectable scholars,\(^4\) holds that the Ezekiel passage is a variant of the story of the primal man in Gen 2-3. As noted above,\(^5\) if on one hand there are similarities between these two passages, the differences are striking.

No extra-biblical parallels have been found from which the Ezekiel and the Gen 2-3 accounts could be derived, despite the fact that, as McKenzie says, "it appears that Ezek 28:1-19 has more points of contact with the Paradise story than with any other

---

\(^1\) See above, p. 129.


\(^3\) See above, pp. 110-40.

\(^4\) See above, pp. 42-45; 134-37. Morgenstern, "Mythological Background," pp. 110-13, advanced the view that a myth for a long time current in Judaism is behind the Ezekiel and the Isaiah passages; this is discussed here along with the Satan-View.

biblical passage or with any known mythological pattern. To say that Ezekiel depicts the same event as Genesis is unwarranted.

The Satan View

As we have seen in chapter 1, the interpretation of Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19 as referring to Satan is one of the oldest approaches to these texts and was already held by some Church Fathers. Despite the fact that most of the influential scholars of the twentieth century do not espouse this view, we find a number of theologians in conservative Christianity who firmly believe that these two passages describe how rebellion against God started among the created beings. Some other reasons why these passages have been applied to Satan are:

1. The language of the passage seems to refer to a more-than-human figure.

2. The possibility that there is a connection between Isa 14:12 and Luke 10:18, where Jesus talks about Satan's fall from heaven, and also Rev 9:1, which mentions a star seen falling from heaven unto the earth.

---

1 "Mythological Allusions," p. 327.
3 pp. 6ff. 4 See above, pp. 6-9, 36-38.
6 See above, pp. 15-17, 48-49. See also Meadors, pp. 51-60.
3. Both passages give evidence of carrying in themselves an ancient myth concerning the rebellion of an angel against God and his fall. And when the Isaiah and the Ezekiel passages are compared with passages about Satan in the OT, NT, and Inter-Testament literature, it seems that they are related. Kluger notes that "it therefore might not be going too far to see in them the real germ cells of the later concept of Satan as the fallen Lucifer."^2

As already mentioned,^3 since the time of the Reformation and especially from the end of the nineteenth century to the present, scholars have resisted the application of Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19 to Satan. They justify this rejection on the following main points:

1. It is admitted that Satan is—a fallen angel and opposer of God's plans; however, since the Bible does not present when, how, and why that angel became the Evil One, it is unwarranted to identify the King of Babylon or the King of Tyre with Satan merely because one could assume some analogy between the descriptions of those personages.^4 Passages such as Obad 2-4 and Isa 47:8, 10 are presented as examples of texts "which speak to human kind in language which is beyond their capability. The point is not what they can do, but what they are attributed as desiring to do by the prophet."^5 Isa 14 could be classified in the same

---


^2 P. 117. Kluger adds that "the identification of Satan with the 'Lucifer' of Isa 14 by Tertullian and Gregory the Great, based on the comparison with Luke 10:18, is therefore an error only from the historical point of view; psychologically it should be evaluated as a genuine intuition."

^3 See above, pp. 10-54.

^4 Cf. Meadors, pp. 56-61; Pulley, pp. 19-25. ^5 Ibid., p. 61.
manner. Besides that, these scholars affirm, one should not forget that the biblical poet could be using the literary devices of personification or apostrophe which is used several times in the OT.¹

2. Those who see in those two passages the figure of Satan "fail to give reasonable consideration to linguistic and historical exegesis";² their "sort of approach to discovering the significance of the text is inconsistent with the grammatico-historical method"³ and "lacks sufficient controls."⁴

3. The Satan View suppresses or ignores the context of the passages, which are "plainly historical."⁵

4. The defenders of the Satan View are moved by "theological pressures" such as the "origin of sin" and the "gap theory" of Gen 1:1, 2,⁶ which are not sufficient reason to advocate that Isa 14 and Ezek 28 refer to Satan.

It is a consensus among most scholars that there is in the universe a struggle between the forces of evil and the forces of good.⁷ God and Jesus Christ and His angels are, obviously, those who contend for order in the created worlds, and peace and love among created beings; and Satan and his angels the ones who try

¹See above p. 276; also Terry, pp. 251-52.
²Meadors, p. 62. ³Pulley, p. 21. ⁴Ibid.
⁵Ibid., p. 22; Meadors, pp. 62-63; Ellison, Ezekiel, p. 109; Alden, pp. 38-39.
⁷See above, pp. 1-2; cf. 1 John 3:8.
to disturb the order God has established in the universe, and to disseminate discord, hate, and all sorts of evil among the created beings.\(^1\) It seems, according to the OT and the NT, that the one who opposes God belongs to the heavenly host,\(^2\) and that he must have been at peace with God in the beginning since God did not create evil.\(^3\) There have been some disputes concerning the epoch when Satan made war against God (through Michael and His angels),\(^4\) but based on passages such as 2 Cor 11:3; Rev 12:9, 14-15; 20:2, the serpent who deceived Eve as reported in Gen 3:1-15 was Satan. Thus Satan had already fallen by that time, for he was acting against God and His creation by trying to carry Eve and Adam to disobedience.

This research has shown that Isa 14 and Ezek 28--despite having been written in the form of poetry and in quite figurative language--were produced as a whole, having in view a real historical context. Besides the tension between the earthly and the cosmic realms extant in the passages as whole, at a certain point in the account, the prophet\(^5\) seems to abandon the historical or earthly

\(^1\) Cf. 1 Chr 21:1; Job 1-2; Zech 3:1-2; Matt 12:26; Mark 3:23; Luke 22:3; Acts 26:18; Rom 16:20; 2 Thess 2:9; 1 Tim 1:20; 1 John 3:8; Rev 2:10; 12:12.

\(^2\) Kgs 22:19-23; Job 1-2; Matt 25:41; 2 Cor 11:14; Jude 1:9; Rev 12:7-9.

\(^3\) There are different views concerning whether Satan was at the beginning a messenger of God to test created beings, or whether he started tempting people after his war against God; see for that, Kluger, pp. 118-32; Papini, pp. 69-71.


\(^5\) In Isaiah's case, see vss. 12-15.
realm and starts to describe events in a different sphere or realm. In Ezekiel's case, the prophet presents his description of the things belonging to the historical or earthly realm in one oracle addressed to the prince (מָלֵךְ) or Tyre; but the description of the events related to what seems to be a heavenly realm is addressed to the King (מלך) of Tyre and is introduced as a lamentation.

The examination of the literature of the Fertile Crescent has not provided us with any myth from which Isaiah and Ezekiel could have borrowed material for their oracles. Notwithstanding this fact, we have found that elements of both passages (Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19) can be found in extra-biblical and biblical literature. These similarities in the use of terms and pictures could be the result of cultural continuity or common elements in the ancient Near Eastern area.1

Morgenstern's study2 has shown, in our view, with some success, that a myth of the fallen angels is in the background of both the Isaiah and Ezekiel passage. A comparison of these two passages has convinced me that they speak of the same figure, and that he is more than human. Why Isaiah and Ezekiel used the story of that arrogant personage is not exactly known, but it could be as suggested by the following:

1. The King of Babylon and the King of Tyre could be a personification of the mentioned figure

---

1 See above, p. 110.

2. The myth could be an "illustration dramatizing the splendor"\(^1\) and the fall of those two pagan rulers

3. It could be that the prophet, at a certain point of his message, wanted to carry the mind of his readers to the source of the spirit of tyranny, violence, arrogance, and pride, so evident in those heathen rulers. He could have taken the ancient myth, undressed from the polytheistic elements, and used the elements—which possibly came from a monotheistic source—in a new framework to picture "the reality of the eschatological age."\(^2\) In discussing the Church fathers' combination of Luke 10:18 with Isa 14:12, K. L. Schmidt\(^3\) concludes that in the *Sitz im leben* in which Jesus pronounced the words found in the Lukan passage, the fall of the mighty angel is applied temporarily, so to speak, to the history of humanity—in the same way Isaiah used the fall of Lucifer in pronouncing his oracle on the fall of Babylon. Schmidt adds:

In der israelitischen Prophetenzeit ist der Babelkönig ebenso gesehen und nicht anders-von Jesus Christus sein Widersacher. Dies alles hat aber seine präexistente Vorgeschichte und seine postexistente Nachgeschichte. Erst wenn wir Anfang und Ende der Geschichte unter dem Gesichtspunkt 'Von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit'd h. von der einstigen Ewigkeit Gottes zur kommenden Ewigkeit Gottes, einbeziehen, wird die genannte Ambivalenz Lucifers in unserer geschichtlichen Existenz deutlich. Es handelt sich um den Teufel, der am Anfang einmal Lucifer gewesen ist und der das am Ende der Tage nicht mehr sein wird, der das aber zwischendrin bis zu einem gewissen Grade doch noch ist. Als der gefallene und gestürzte Oberste der Engel heisst der Teufel dennoch noch Lucifer. Und es sei unterstrichen, dass es sich dabei immer wieder um die Frage nach der rechten Macht handelt.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Cf. Childs, *Myth and Reality*, p. 70.

\(^2\) Cf. ibid., p. 71. If we have some survivors of myth they are, as Barr says ("The Meaning," p. 8), "controlled by the historical sense."

\(^3\) "Lucifer," pp. 173-75.  

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 175.
Next I would like to propose what I call a Typological Interpretation. It is true that this view blends aspects and elements of the already presented view—especially the Satan View, but it offers a new solution for the interpretation of these two passages.

The Typological View

Despite the fact that the word typology has been overloaded in its use in biblical hermeneutics, this method of exegesis\(^1\) has been proved legitimate by several modern influential biblical scholars.\(^2\) Although most typological interpretations have dealt with the Early Church interpreting the OT in order to better understand Jesus, and the Gospel, and the church itself,\(^3\) it seems that there are other dimensions in which the typological interpretation could be applied. Bible interpreters have recognized the presence of types in the OT,\(^4\) and von Rad notes that the prophets were the

\(^1\)Typology as a method of exegesis has been used from the beginning of the Christian Era to the present; for a survey of literature on the use of this method of exegesis see: Goppelt, Typos; Richard M. Davidson, Typology in Scripture, AUSDDS, 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), pp. 15-114.


\(^3\)See von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2:319-35.

\(^4\)See Charles T. Fritsch, "Biblical Typology," BSac 104 (1947):91-2; Fritsch notes, Already in the Old Testament there is what we might call a nascent 'typology.' Certain personages and events are related to a higher realm in which the truths and relations exhibited
first to use typology in the fullest sense.¹

Geerhardus Vos has affirmed that "a type can never be a type independently of its being first a symbol,"² and J. B. Payne furthers Vos' thought by saying that "perhaps the most important single principle in delimiting of typology is, namely, that a given item must be symbolical to its contemporaries before it can be considered typical for the future."³

Isaiah 14:4b-21

In examining Isa 14, we find three main reasons which suggest that we should make use of typology to speak about a larger truth than the one that first appears: (1) the use of the word masal, (2) the use of the word Babylon, and (3) the several dimensions of the poem and the content of vss. 12-15 in the context of the whole poem.

1. As discussed above⁴ the term masal is used to mean likeness, resemblance, and comparison; and, in a sense what is typology if not likeness, resemblance, and a kind of comparison to

in them were again to meet and obtain a more perfect development. The word 'Egypt' becomes a symbol of captivity, as seen in Hosea 8:13 (note the LXX here); 9:3, 6; 11:5 (where the writer makes sure that the term 'Egypt' be not taken literally). Also in Isaiah the experiences of the Exodus are used to describe the greater return of the exiles (cf. 48:20ff.). Cf. also Horace D. Hummel, "The Old Testament Basis of Typological Interpretation," BR 3 (1964):38-50.

¹Old Testament Theology, 2:319ff.


something else? Furthermore, if the term masāl in vs. 4 has the sense of paradigm, it would even strengthen the typological interpretation of the text proposed.¹

2. As far as the use of the term Babylon is concerned, it has been used, besides designating an ancient city and an empire, with several different connotations: (a) in Gen 11:11 it means confusion;² (b) after the fall of Babylon (Babel), it represents for later Jewish readers of Scripture, the very epitome and type of an ungodly and domineering city (Sibylline oracles 5:143, 158; 2 Baruch 11:1; 4 Ezra 2 all three describe the Roman power using the term Babylon);³ (c) in the New Testament (1 Pet 5:13; Rev 14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2, 10, 21) it is used in relation to the Roman empire, but going beyond that power, it describes a religious power which is rebellious against God. In the words of P. J. Minear,

[Babylon] was the fountainhead of all earthly rebellion against God. . . . In the prophet's [John], the name Babylon is a mystery and an aspect of the ultimate mystery of God's victory over evil (Rev 17:5, 7). . . . Babylon is an eschatological symbol of Satanic deception and power; it is a heavenly mystery, which is to be comprehended prophetically, and which is never wholly reducible to empirical earthly institutions.⁴

3. We have seen above⁵ that one of the characteristics of the poem in Isa 14 is the different dimensions or realms of the passage.

¹See above pp. 163-64.
²Some scholars see the Tower of Babel narrative (Gen 11:1-9) as having an etiological thrust (see for that H. Ringgren, "bābahel," TDOT (1974) 1:467.
The historical, underworld, and heavenly realms are depicted in the passage and have been detected long ago by several Bible interpreters. The horizontal and vertical dimensions are clearly portrayed in the passage. Vss. 12-15 include several characteristics which identify the Isaian passage as having an apocalyptic-like vertical dimension. The prophet is talking about a power that goes beyond the historical level, yet at the same time there is inter-relationship between the horizontal and vertical dimensions.

Taking into account the use of the terms מָסָל and בָּבֶל as discussed above, the clear vertical dimension of vss. 12-15, as well as the tension between the earthly and cosmic realms in the Book of Isaiah, it is sound to say that the King of Babylon is more than a human figure. He is a type of someone who is presented as Helel ben Shahar in the middle of the poem (vss. 12-15). The prophet carries the mind of the reader/hearer to the power who is behind the earthly power, to the source or fountainhead of all evil impulses. But at the same time the historical dimension of the passage is so embedded into the characteristics of the master mind behind it that it leads us to believe that the objective of the author was to portray the beginning, the career, and the end of the originator of evil.

In summary we would say that in using the term מָסָל, the prophet had in view not only to make a comparison or to lend to the passage a paradigmatic sense but also to show in a typological way the impellent force behind the evil activities of the world nations.
As noted above, the Ezekielian passage has two distinct sections (vss. 1-10 and 12-19) whose characteristics show that they belong or refer to two different realms. The oracle against the Prince (נְצֵיב) of Tyre refers, in my view, to activities and matters related to human or earthly rulers. The oracle against the King (מלך) of Tyre has to do with a being in a cosmic or heavenly sphere. These two sections, with their own characteristics and belonging to different realms, form a kind of horizontal as well as vertical typology. The Prince of Tyre is an antetype or paradigm on the horizontal level to powers such as, for example, the one mentioned in 2 Thess 2:3-4, 8^2 and Rev 17-18. On the other hand, the Prince of Tyre is a kind of type of the King of Tyre in the sense that both figures or powers are hostile to God—the Prince of Tyre because of his pride and pretention to be like God; the King of Tyre because of the wickedness found in him which developed into pride on account of his beauty and wisdom. The one had his activities in the earthly level, the other in the heavenly or cosmic realm.

At that time the archetype or King of Tyre was, in relation to the type or Prince of Tyre, a figure of the past (vss. 12-17) and of the future (vss. 18-19).^3 In using the terms Prince and King of Tyre^4 the prophet wanted to convey that they were related

^1 pp. 221-31; 269-70.

^2 Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 2:95, thinks that "In the pride and fall of the Prince of Tyre, there is repeated the story of 'primeval man'. This is 'Every-man story'; in other words, it is more than a mere episodic occurrence."

^3 See above, p. 244, n. 6.

^4 See above pp. 248-50 for OT use of each term in a different dimension.
in some way. But since the characteristics of the Prince of Tyre and the terminology to describe him denote an earthly dimension, while the King of Tyre is described in terms of a heavenly being, it is my view that one solution is to view one as the archetype or propelling force behind the other.

Conclusions

After all that has been said in this dissertation, it is my view that there are enough facts which justify the interpretation of Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19 as applying to the chief Fallen Angel known as Satan. Besides the fact that these passages offer a description which transcends the earthly or human realm. (1) They fit an angelic context where a rebellion against God would have occurred. (2) The context of the Isaian passage presents eschatological features and a tension between immediate historical events and a universal event with the text straddling two words. (3) The Isaian Apocalypse shows that the prophet was aware of the sin of angelic beings and their fall, as well as of their punishment. (4) The Book of Isaiah presents a kind of emphasis on the contrast between Babylon and Jerusalem (or Zion) and their final fate—which reinforces the point I am trying to make. In so-called First Isaiah, we find the oppression suffered by the people of God and Jerusalem and a promised happy end in contrast to Babylon's

---

1Ezek 28:14-16 even uses the term Cherub(im) which is used in the Scripture to identify angelic beings: Gen 3:24; Ezek 10.

2See above, pp. 214-20.

3Chaps. 24-27; see above pp. 219-20.

424:21-22.

5Chaps. 1-10:11; 11-12, etc.
(Assyria's) tyranny and her final defeat and destruction. In the Book of Comfort, chaps. 40-45, 48-64, it is spoken about God's people; in chaps. 46-47, about Babylon—chap. 47 is for Babylon what chap. 54 is for Jerusalem. It seems clear that Isaiah, in a typological fashion, picked up the term Babylon (גֵבֹל), which in Genesis is used in the sense of confusion, and through his masal (comparison, likeness, paradigm) depicted the career of a figure which is behind every self-sufficient, self-glorifying, and God-opposing power. Babylon which was a constant enemy of God's people, becomes from the time of Isaiah and on a symbol of powers hostile to God and His people. Thus it would be fair to admit that the prophet introduced in the middle of his poem on Babylon the real source of the enemies of God and His people. (5) The Pride-Motif is emphasized in the Book of Isaiah and fought by God who humbles the proud ones. It is also clear that "the Pride-Motif is . . . the connecting motif in Isa 13:2-18, 19-22, and

1Chaps. 10:12-34; 13-14.
2Cf. Remi Lack, La Symbolique, p. 103.
5Isa 2:11 "The pride of man shall be humbled";
Isa 2:17 "The haughtiness of man shall be humbled, and the pride of men shall be brought low";
Isa 5:15 "the eyes of the haughty are humbled";
Isa 9:9ff. God "raises adversaries" against those who speak "in pride and in arrogance of heart";
Isa 10:12ff. God fights against "haughty pride" of Assyria;
Isa 13:19 "God fights against 'splendor and pride' of the Chaldeans";
Isa 16:6; 25:11 God will lay low the "pride" of Moab;
Isa 23:9 God has purposed "to defile the pride of all glory";
Furthermore, the supreme examples of pride and humbleness in Isaiah's prophecy seem to be shown in Isa 14 and Isa 52-53 respectively. Assuming that (a) the Suffering Servant song is Messianic; (b) Jesus is the antagonist of Satan in the controversy between good and evil, and he came "to destroy the works of the Devil," to disarm the principalities and powers, and to make a public example of them and triumph over them; and (c) the two supreme examples of pride and humbleness in Isaiah are found in chaps. 14 and 52-53 and belong to the personages of these passages, not to an immediate historical realm but to a heavenly one, the figure portrayed in Isa 14:12-15 can be interpreted as being Satan. (6) The language used to describe the King of Babylon and the King of Tyre is similar to that used to describe or portray Satan: (a) he attributes to himself God's prerogatives and (b) his sin has to do with the beginning of sin. (7) Finally, it is my conviction that this research has demonstrated that the use of Typology is a reality in Isaiah 14 as well as in Ezekiel 28, and that both passages were written with the same purpose: (a) To show—in a prophetic way—to future generations that these nations (Babylon [or Assyria] in Isaiah and Tyre in Ezekiel) in their characteristic wickednesses were a type of every power—political and religions—

---

1Erlandsson, p. 149.  
31 John 3:8.  
4Col 2:15. 
5See also Phil 2:5-11. 
which in rebellious way are hostile to God and His people. This we call horizontal typology. (b) To show the power which is behind all wicked activities and to present the originator of the sins which are the source or fountain of every hostility against God and His government. This is introduced as Helel ben Shahar and the Guardian Cherub, which are the archetype of the King of Babylon and the King of Tyre as presented in these passages. This we call vertical typology. (c) To give the certainty that evil is an extraneous element in God's universe, and that it will have an end which is already determined; that at the end sin, its originator, and those who accept his politic, will have no "name or survivors"¹ and "will be no more for ever."²

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This research endeavored to study Isa 14 and Ezek 28 in order to certify better the nature and identity of the figures mentioned in the two prophetic oracles (especially Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19). Since for a long time both passages have been interpreted as having to do with the origin of sin in heaven—an idea which has been resisted by many notable scholars—this investigation attempted to examine the pertinent material from the beginning of the Christian era to the present time to ascertain the legitimation of the claims on both sides.

In the first chapter we surveyed the material written on the matter, examining the interpretations of the passages through the years. The pseudepigraphic material of the second century A.D. seems to be the first to identify the Isaiah passage with the fall of the chief angel. That idea was picked up by some of the Church Fathers such as Origen, Tertullian, Augustine, and Gregory the Great, who connected Isa 14 with Luke 10:18 and applied them to Satan. On the other hand, some of the fathers such as Aphrahat, Chromatius Aquileiensis, and Chrysostom applied the passage to the immediate historical context, the tyrant being Nebuchadnezzar or a "barbarian king." Hippolytus related the passage to the Antichrist and saw it as depicting an event to happen in the future; he also quotes Ezek 28 side by side with Isa 14.
The Jews of the Talmudic period interpreted the Isaiah passage as having to do with immediate historical events, Nabuchadnezzar being the "oppressor"; the Ezekiel passage they applied to Hiram, King of Tyre, or even to Nebuchadnezzar.

During the Middle Ages the Satan:Cherub:Lucifer view prevailed, having as its main exponents Dante Alighieri, Thomas Aquinas, and John Wycliff.

The two great reformers, Martin Luther and John Calvin, broke with the traditional interpretation held by the fathers and the scholars in the Middle Ages. Luther held that Isa 14:12 speaks not about the fallen angel who once was thrown out of heaven (Luke 10:18; Rev 12:7-9), but of the King of Babylon, in figurative language. But Ezek 28 he viewed as referring to the Devil under the name of Tyre. Calvin considered the application of Isa 14:12-15 to Satan as "very gross ignorance" and "useless fables"; he interpreted the passage in historical terms, with the tyrant being identified with Sennacherib or Nebuchadnezzar.

In the seventeenth century, Puritan John Milton and John Bunyan used the "method of accommodation" in interpreting the Isaiah and Ezekiel passages, applying them to Satan. Using some materials from the NT, Semitic sources, views and comments of the Church Fathers, and from the Renaissance, they enlarged the vision concerning Lucifer. Until the middle of the nineteenth century the traditional view was held by many scholars; the historical view, by a few with the Isaiah and the Ezekiel passages always being identified with each other.

At the end of the nineteenth century, some new developments
occurred in the study and interpretation of Isa 14 and Ezek 28. When serious Bible students began interpreting the Bible with critical methods and theologians had more comparative material to interpret the OT, scholars began to see mythical elements in both passages. From then on the interpretation of Isa 14:12-15 was generally classified by three main views: the Satan View, the Historical View (sometimes blended with the previous one), and the Mythological View. Concerning Ezek 28:12-19, four main views have been proposed since the beginning of the twentieth century: the Satan View, the Immediate Historical and Religious Context View, the Mythological View, and the Paradise Story View. The Mythological View has proposed several myths as being parallel to Isa 14:12-15. These include the Ishtar, Innana, Etana, and Zu myths from Mesopotamia; Kumarbi and Ullikummi myths from the Hittites; the Phaeton myth from the Greeks; and Ashtar and Śhr and Ślm from Phoenicia. Scholars have suggested Babylonian and Ugaritic sources for some elements of the passage, and the Prometheus myth as a story parallel to the prophet's oracle. The Paradise Story View holds that the Ezekiel passage was a variant form of the tradition which appears in Gen 2-3.

In chapter 2 we examined the various myths (a myth of Helel ben Shahar and of the Guardian Cherub could not be found). A comparison of the available myths with the biblical passages demonstrated remarkable differences. Nevertheless, it seems that in Isa 14:12 the prophet used for a moment the natural phenomenon of Venus, the morning star, which vanishes by the time the sun rises. A knowledge of the behavior of Venus is well attested in some
cultures of the ancient world and it has been taken up into the expression of their myths: i.e., Greek (Phaeton); Ugaritic (Attar). Elements were also found which are present in Isa 14 and Ezek 28 that make one think of them as the result of "cultural continuity" or having common elements from the ancient Near East area.

Biblical passages such as Gen 6:1-4, Ps 82, etc., which scholars have said are, in some aspects, parallel to Isa 14, were examined. It seems that Ps 82, Job 1-2, 2 Kgs 22:19-22, Isa 14:12-15, and Ezek 28:12-19 mention figures which are related to the heavenly council and behind Ps 82 and the Isaiah and Ezekiel passages there must have been an ancient Jewish myth of the fallen angel(s).

As for the Paradise story as the source for the Ezekiel oracle, our study shows that despite some similarities between the two accounts, remarkable differences are noted, thus it seems impossible to say that the two passages speak of the same event.

Chapter 3 examined the poetic structure of the two passages, discussed their form of material, made a detailed analysis of the two texts, and proposed a translation. An exegesis of the central parts of the passages was carried out.

The Isaiah passage seems to have been produced at the end of the eighth century at the time of the death of an Assyrian monarch, probably Sargon II. The poem seems to have been originally written in five perfect stanzas, each of seven pentameter verses. The clear delimitation of the stanzas and the change of realms among them show the third stanza (vss. 12-15) to be of different nature than the rest of the text. The central stanza is set in a prominent
position and presents an event which must have occurred in the heavenly realm.

Analyzing the Isaiah passage in its context in the whole oracle against Babylon and in the entire book of Isaiah, we perceive the prominence of the third stanza of the poem as depicting a power which opposes God's people and is hostile to God. It has been noted that in the book of Isaiah, Isa 14:12-15 and Isa 52-53 are the supreme examples of pride and humbleness, respectively. Assuming the Suffering Servant Song to be messianic, it seems that Isaiah 14:12-15 is referring to a more-than-human figure.

The views presented by the scholars through the years in interpreting Isa 14:12-15 have been faulty, except for one—the Satan View, which, despite the problems we face in adopting it, is the one that has gotten the closest to what I consider the truth. This view admits a heavenly realm for the passages; it is supported by the prophet's awareness of the existence of heavenly beings who assist God in heaven (Isa 24:21; Ezek 1, 10), and among whom are some who disobeyed and would have to be punished.

In order to present a view which would be more fair in the interpretation of Isa 14, and would help to analyze the passage in its several dimensions, I proposed what is called the Typological View. This view admits that the passage has to do with something on the historical level which is considered a type for something more universal still in the historical level, i.e., horizontal typology. On the other hand it sees in the passage a vertical typology where the figure depicted in the central stanza of the poem is an archetype of the political and religious powers which
through the ages are hostile to God and His people, and is, as well, the impellent force behind every evil activity. The use of the terms masāl and bābhel, as well the different nature of vss. 12-15 demonstrate that the prophet is talking about a being who is the impellent force of evil behind the human activities and fulfills his role in the controversy between good and evil.

The Ezekiel passage must have been produced between the time of the destruction of Jerusalem and the beginning of the siege of Tyre (587-585 B.C.). The text shows more signs of textual disturbances and redaction than Isa 14 and does not have its parts delimited by stanzas; but the divine formulae used make the first two parts of Ezek 28 very distinct. Vss. 1-10 seem to speak of a human figure, but vss. 12-19 speak about a different realm, a heavenly one. A comparison between Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19 shows major similarities which make us believe they speak of the same figure.

As in the case of the Isaiah passage, we proposed the Typological View which sees vss. 1-10 as portraying activities carried out in the historical or earthly level, in a horizontal typology where the Prince of Tyre is the archetype for powers such as the one found in 2 Thess 2, etc., and other cases of hybris. A vertical typology is also present in which the Prince of Tyre is the type of the King of Tyre (vss. 12-19) who ultimately represents the originator of evil.

Isa 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:12-19 are compared and the conclusions are that both of them describe, with slight nuances, the
same event which gave origin to sin in God's universe. Concluding, we would say with K. L. Schmidt,

The Isaian Lucifer Declaration [and I add Ezek 28] wins richness and power when one understands it in its complexity of heavenly and earthly, of demonic and human, of enigmatic and foregrounding. . . . Behind such alleged only illustrative, transferable phrases there is much more. . . . Such a myth applies to a finally enigmatic incident, to a demonic, a godly event, which illuminates the foreground and background of the history of the doings of mankind.¹

God, through his prophets, chose the expressions, King of Babylon and King of Tyre to portray the being who was the originator of evil and the propelling force behind every effort to disturb order in God's universe. These two passages also prophetically give us the certainty that evil is destined to be exterminated, and Satán and his followers will be no more forever.

¹"Lucifer," pp. 166, 173. Translated by J. Bertoluci.
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