

# *Theology* on the *Web*.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_ibs-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php)

## STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE IN PSALMS OF LAMENT.

J.G. McConville.

Psalms of Lament, while they have been described in detail in a number of ways, are broadly speaking those which express some agony of soul, whether of an individual or on behalf of the community. but embody within them either petition(such as the ubiquitous "How long O Lord? Wilt thou forget me for ever?" Ps.13:2 (1 EVV) or expressions of confidence in God such as Ps.6:10f. (9f.); or indeed both. My concern in this article is particularly with psalms which move from distress to confidence, and indeed with the transition itself. For here we have a problem of interpretation: for what reason do such transitions occur? Can we, indeed, know anything about the circumstances in which they occur? Can we account for the fact that they occur not just a few times, but frequently, and more or less according to a pattern? In what follows I propose to look critically at some suggested answers (one in particular) and offer some reflections of my own.

Answers to the question thus posed fall broadly into three categories, namely literary-critical answers, psychological explanations and answers which postulate the activity of a cultic functionary, usually thought of as a prophet, who uttered oracles which altered the mood of the worshippers. The last of these has certainly been the most influential, and we begin with it.

### The Cult-Functionary Explanation.

The names most frequently associated with the theory of the cult-prophet are those of S. Mowinckel and A.R. Johnson. In their studies the role of the prophet is much more extensive than the mere provision of oracles at crucial moments in certain psalms. Rather, they compose whole psalms, and indeed other compositions not now contained in the psalter. e.g. Habakkuk 3. The work of Mowinckel and Johnson constitutes a major contribution to answering the complex question about the relationship between psalmody and prophecy. That is a debate which we cannot enter here in any comprehensive way. It is important simply to notice that it forms the background to our particular question. That is, when we ask whether a transition from distress to confidence

within a given psalm may best be explained by appeal to a cult-prophet we are engaging with a whole approach to biblical psalmody and indeed to the prophetic literature which looks for explanations of literary phenomena in postulated cultic occasions. The approach is far-reaching and has affected Jeremiah and Isaiah 40-66 perhaps chiefly among the prophetic books.<sup>3</sup> While our task is more limited than to offer a challenge to that whole system of interpretation, our point of concern is a not unimportant aspect of it, for the system referred to requires for its credibility such particular evidences as the prophetic "oracle" in certain psalms is often held to be.

Let us now outline in more detail what the nature of the proposal about prophetic oracles is. An example is afforded by Ps.6. Vv.7f.(6f.) picture the psalmist weary with his moaning, his eye "wasting away because of grief". Then suddenly, vv.9-11(8-10):

Depart from me all you workers of evil,  
for the Lord has heard the sound of my weeping.  
The Lord has heard my supplication:  
The Lord accepts my prayer.  
All my enemies shall be ashamed and sorely troubled;  
they shall turn back. and be put to shame in a moment.

If the change of mood which happens here has been produced by the utterance of an oracle. it is clear that the oracle has not actually been included in the psalm. It must be regarded as falling between vv.8 and 9 (7 & 8). The majority of psalms which exhibit a change of mood such this one are similar in this respect, that an oracle is assumed to have been uttered though not recorded. Proponents of the cult-prophet theory can, however, point to certain psalms which do contain words which may lend substance to the theory. One such is Ps.12. This begins (vv.2-5)(1-4) with a protest against the prevalence of falsehood, drawing a cry for help from the psalmist. Then in v.6(5) we find:

"Because the poor are despoiled, because the needy groan, I will now arise," says the Lord;  
"I will place him in the safety for which he longs".

There follow statements of confidence in the Lord's promises. Other more or less similar cases are Pss. 60:8-10(6-8) 85:9(8), 91:14-16.

It may seem, therefore, that we have two different categories of psalm before us: one in which the change of mood may be explained by an oracle, plain for all to see, and one in which it cannot, or not so readily at least. They should, however, all be viewed together. This is first of all because the theory in question has classically applied to both categories. It is true that some interpreters have<sup>4</sup> been less confident and applied it only selectively. Where such selectivity occurs, however, it is not necessarily along the line of separation between psalms which contain oracles and those which do not. W.H. Bellinger, in a recent work on psalmody and prophecy, makes ad hoc decisions about the likelihood of spoken oracles, finding for it, for example, in Ps.31, but against it in Ps.57, where he thinks that the Psalmist's new certainty could simply have arisen from his faith.<sup>5</sup> Such choices only raise the suspicion of subjectivity. In any case, we have already noticed that the oracle-theory is only a part of a broader general approach to the psalms, and the leading exponents of the theory have not been interested in merely partial explanations.

Indeed, the need to discover concrete evidence for the oracle-theory has been keenly felt by its advocates (just as it has been called for by its critics).<sup>6</sup> The most influential attempt to do so was that of J. Begrich's "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel".<sup>7</sup> It is worth spending a moment on his thesis, because it continues to be at the source of flirtation with the oracle-theory. His specific contribution was to identify in Isaiah 40-55 examples of the "priestly oracle of salvation", i.e. precisely the kind of oracle which is required to demonstrate the theory in question for the psalms. To give one example among many, Isa.49:7 is seen as a suitable response to the appeal of the psalmist in Ps.31:16-19 (15-18). This (or a similar statement) could, therefore, constitute the oracle which is deemed to have fallen between vv.19(18)

and 20 (19), where, following the lament pattern, statements of re-assurance begin.

Begrich's thesis, therefore, is that oracles used in the cult, though largely not preserved in the psalms, have been taken up by the prophet in Isaiah 40-55 for his purpose of announcing salvation to the Babylonian exiles.

While Begrich's view has been much quoted and widely influential,<sup>9</sup> it is open to criticism on a number of counts. First, it may reasonably be objected that the language shared by the lament psalms and Isaiah 40-55 is merely the common coin of religious affirmation, the searching questions being one side of the coin and the prophetic assurances the other. Secondly, there is a serious question-mark beside Begrich's logic. As T.M. Raitt puts it:

First the evidence in Second Isaiah was used to solve a question in Psalms research. Then the same passages were taken as evidence of a cultic setting for the prophet's salvation-oracles. This is flagrant example of a circular or self-validating argument.<sup>10</sup>

The "evidence" for the priestly oracle in Isaiah is no evidence at all, because there is nothing in Isaiah to suggest the priestly origin of the statements cited. The argument is really a double argument from silence: the (almost complete) silence of the Psalms as to the oracle, and the silence of Isaiah 40-55 as to its cultic setting. A third objection (if more were needed) is that the alleged match between the gap in the Psalms and the affirmations in Isaiah 40-55 is not as satisfying as may appear at first glance. One of the assurances in the latter place has the plural address-form (e.g. 51:7-8), though Begrich's thesis is entirely in terms of the individual lament. More seriously, he has been "loosened up" by the prophet for his own purposes, meaning that it has in places expanded from an original one-liner into a second line (as in 41:10).<sup>11</sup> This is simply to illustrate that what has been found in Isaiah 40-55 does not, in the

end, even correspond to what was originally sought. The conclusion is inevitable that Begrich was dazzled by a promising theory- even to the extent of arguing that where one of Isaiah's "oracles" fails to find a corresponding <sup>12</sup>psalm, the omission from the psalter is mere chance!

Begrich, then, has not found the independent evidence which the oracle-theory requires. Is there such evidence in any other quarter? It is sometimes said that 2 Chr. 20:14-17 provides just such evidence. In this chapter King Jehoshaphat prays to God for deliverance on the occasion of an attack on Judah by an alliance of Moabites and Ammonites. His petition (vv.6-12) resembles statements found in many lament-psalms, emphasising the kingly power of God, his promises to his people and even their own faithful response, and appealing to God because of their apparently imminent defeat. The context of the prayer is a great assembly of the people of Judah. Such is, almost by definition, a "cultic" assembly; particular indications that this is so are the expression "seek the Lord" (typical for worship in Chr.), the proclamation of a fast (v.3), and the prayer itself. In the midst of this expectant assembly, and in direct response to Jehoshaphat's prayer, the Spirit of the Lord comes upon a Levite, Jahaziel-ben-Zechariah(v.14), who delivers a word from God, assuring the people of victory and indeed instructing them to adopt a particular vantage-point from which to observe God's victory (vv.15-17). Thanksgiving and praise are accordingly offered by all the people (vv.18f).

Superficially, this event looks very like those which Mowinckel, Johnson and others have sought as the Sitz-im-Leben of lament psalms. A cultic functionary gives a prophetic word of assurance following a lament-petition, and the mood of the people changes from fear to joy. However, there are two reasons why 2 Chr.20 does not provide the evidence needed to clinch the cult-prophet theory. The first lies in the nature of the occasion described in that place. Far from being one of the regular cultic assemblies of Israel(as per

Exod.23:14-17), it is a special event born of the impending crisis. Its particularity is reflected in Jehoshaphat's prayer (with its reference to Moab and Ammon, v.10) which thus distinguishes the prayer from the more generalized petitions of the lament-psalms. Neither the event itself nor the prayer offered, therefore, provides a real analogy with the situations postulated by the theories of Mowinckel, Johnson and others, which are precisely those of regular worship. The second reason why 2 Chr.20 is unsuitable as evidence for the *Sitz-im-Leben* of lament-Psalms is that Chronicles has a particular interest in the role of prophets in general, and Levites (like Jahaziel) in particular.<sup>13</sup> The oracle here should be seen in the context of that special interest. This is not to say that the event described could not have happened, but the point illustrates again that, in seeking to solve a problem in Psalms-interpretation by appeal to what happens in a different kind of literature, one cannot ignore the special characteristics of the latter.

Before proceeding to other possible explanations of the change of mood in lament-psalms, I want to make just two more observations on the problems of the cultic-functionary explanation. The first is that the Psalms do not always follow the pattern which can make the theory look plausible. Pss.42 and 60 illustrate the point. Both these Psalms feature the phenomenon of the change of mood. Neither, however, has a single, definitive one. Ps.42 has a binary structure within which the Psalmist twice moves through gloomy thoughts to memories of God's goodness culminating in the refrain:

Hope in God, for I shall again praise him,  
my help and my God, vv.6,12(5,11).

In Ps.60, likewise, the "oracle", vv.8-10(6-8), one of those which has been allegedly preserved, does not appear to have the desired effect, as the Psalmist's mood of rejection, expressed initially in v.1, survives it, v.12(10)! The renewed confidence comes only in v.14 (12). These Psalms make it extremely difficult to imagine what the event postulated by Mowinckel's theory

might actually have been like. Even in relation to Psalms which seem to fit it better, the idea of a cult-figure emerging, on cue, to say his lines (for he would presumably have been called upon each time the Psalm was used) strains credulity.<sup>14</sup> In Pss.42 and 60 the imagination has either to admit defeat or devise absurdities.

The second (closing) observation on the cult-functionary theory is that it betrays little sensitivity to the literary poetic character of the Psalms, which is certainly at least part of the answer to the problem posed by the change of mood. The binary form and double climax of Ps.42, already noticed, is a function of literary artistry, not of any hypothetical *Sitz-im-Leben*. To show this in detail would require reference to a variety of Psalms. I shall confine myself to one, namely Ps.12. This too has been mentioned already, because it is one of those which possess a word of God which has seemed to some to be one of the elusive prophetic oracles required by Mowinckel's theory. However, P.C. Craigie has called attention in a way of understanding the words of God in terms of the meaning of this particular Psalm. He rightly points out that the Psalm is essentially about speech. Vv.2-5(1-4) are about the lying, flattering speech of the wicked. V.6(5) follows in stark and immediate contrasts, one of those utterances of God which are further described, v.7(6), as "pure". If the words of the wicked cannot be trusted, those of the LORD most certainly can. As Craigie insists, the oracle of God can be adequately explained in terms of poetic device, and in general the literary quality which is one of the Psalmists' concerns.<sup>15</sup>

#### Other Explanations.

The main contenders offered in the history of scholarship as rivals to the cult-functionary theory are the literary-critical and the psychological explanations. The former need not delay us long. The juxtaposition of contradictory sentiments in the Psalms is rarely explained these days in terms of the diverse origins of the parts (as was done, for example, in the ICC commentary in the early part of this century).<sup>16</sup>

Such an approach could not in any case cope with what Mowinckel was at least trying to take seriously, namely the regularity with which certain kinds of jarring juxtaposition occur.

The psychological explanation is more interesting. Its leading advocate, Friedrich Heiler,<sup>17</sup> believed that the act of praying itself brought about the assurance. As faith had led to prayer in the first instance so faith, in the context of prayer, issued in peace of mind. It hardly needs to be said that such experiences can and do happen in the life of the believer. However, there is an important difficulty here too if we attempt to explain the phenomena we have observed in the Psalms in this way. The difficulty is that it cannot explain the regular or repeated use of any given Psalm. Granted that a Psalm did originate in this way, it is already a "given", in its entirety, for any subsequent user. The psychological explanation would only be adequate if we could suppose that each reader or user reproduced the emotional experience, indeed the sequence of emotional experiences, of the author after him. Such is hardly true of the psychology of worship. We do not in fact, as worshippers, register the whole gamut of emotions from despair to joy within the few minutes it takes to read a Psalm - or at least we do not do so purely by virtue of reading it. To this difficulty may be added the observation that the psychological explanation may be felt not to handle easily the more or less regular pattern of the lament-Psalms. This, however, is a less important objection than the former one, since poets can indeed express their highly individual sentiments in regular or prescribed forms. If we reject the psychological explanation, however, we do so as an explanation of the lament-Psalms as a vehicle of regular (and at least in the case of community-laments, public) worship. This does not preclude the possibility of the original inspiration of an individual through a specific experience. It simply asks how that inspiration relates to the kind of usage of the Psalms which (presumably) has led to their collection together in a book.

A Different Suggestion.

Hitherto I have assumed that the Psalms are interesting not simply (indeed not even primarily) as the deposit of various individuals' experiences, but as the material used by people other than the authors in their worship and spirituality. Thus far, therefore, I have accepted the form-critical postulate of Gunkel, which also underlay Mowinckel's work. However, I do not wish, as they did, to locate the great majority of the Psalms in the corporate worship of the Jerusalem Temple. Some recent scholarship at least is looking again at the possibility of a variety of life-settings for the Psalms, including private meditation, family worship and indeed the range of situations thrown up by whatever kind of "pastoral" ministry may have been exercised in ancient Israel.<sup>18</sup> This seems entirely healthy. I do not wish to claim or exclude any particular settings for the Psalms; many Psalms may have been usable in a variety of ways. What does seem to be important is that Psalms were brought to situations in order to assist worship.

Having said this I have already distanced myself from the major proposed explanations outlined above. In their different ways, both the psychological and the cult-functionary explanations saw the Psalms as emerging from worship; I wish to see them as being brought to it. That is to say, I want to see the Psalms as having their own coherence and completeness (which is denied by Mowinckel's view), and as having potency apart from their original and underlying inspiration (contra the psychological view), which potency is the very reason for their preservation.

How, then, are we to understand the jolting phenomenon of the change of mood in the Psalms of lament. The answer lies both in an observation drawn from biblical theology and in one drawn from the psychology of religion and spirituality. The theological category referred to is that of memory. The biblical writers know well the deficiencies of the worshipper's memory. The theme gains its fullest expression in Deuteronomy, where the tendency

of those who are satiated to forget God their benefactor is eloquently stated (Deut.8:11-20). The Psalmists know this too. The author of Psalm 73 sees, as did Deuteronomy, that memory has a moral dimension. Only when he comes before God in worship does he shed his misconceptions (vv.4-14) and see things once again as they really are (v.17). Here is a theology for the Psalms of lament. Their function is to draw the worshipper back to those settled convictions which are his, despite the challenges to them presented by circumstances and his own inconstancy. In giving expression to his doubts, fears and protests, they meet him in his disturbed state of mind and lead him through, or better back, to faith, understanding and equilibrium.

Such a view corresponds exactly with what seems to me to be actual experience or worship, again whether in a formal setting or in private spirituality. In fact, when we use Psalms, we do not switch on a range of emotions as we read. The interaction between Psalm and reader is not so mechanical. It cannot be uncommon to come to a Psalm of joy while feeling deep sadness, or indeed to a Psalmic expression of grief while elated. The discrepancy between what is real and what is felt can produce feelings of unreality and unease. Yet the nature of the process between Psalm and reader is genuine - if rightly understood. For there is indeed a correspondence between the sentiments expressed in the Psalm and the reader's experience. The sentiments are all those which are familiar to him. If they are not all his at the moment of reading, they are his in that they characterize his experience at one time or another. The Psalms gather up, perhaps in a stylized way, the whole range of the believer's experience with God, and provide a vehicle with which to express it. But they do more. For they can actually "lead" the Psalm-user's mood. It is in this sense that both the psychological and the cult-functionary theories have missed something special about the Psalms. They sought to explain the uncomfortably abrupt change of mood in terms of some cause either at the moment of composition or in the course of some "original" and unrepeatable worship-event. In each case

an explanation was imported into the Psalm (a conjectured original experience, a cult-figure) which failed to reckon with how Psalms actually work repeatedly in routine worship. The real explanation of the change of mood is precisely its potency to effect a change of mood in the user. As he engages with the Psalmist's experience, so he identifies, first with the expressions of fear, distrust etc., and then with the movement back to faith, as underlying convictions are reclaimed. It is clear that such an explanation is not incompatible with the belief that the Psalms were composed as the result of individuals' specific experiences. I have sought to show, however, that it is not enough to show how the Psalms originated, but also - and primarily - how they function in worship, since it was that function which led to their preservation, and which is of continuing interest to us today. The relation between the Psalmist's experience and the reader's is not automatic; the Psalm does not contain a blueprint. Nevertheless, those who gathered the Psalms together for the purpose of worship were well aware that the Psalms of lament, with their abrupt change of mood, required no other explanation or justification than their actual evocative power.

NOTES:

1. See W.H. Bellinger, Psalmody and Prophecy, Sheffield, JSOT, 1984, pp.22-24, and p.98, n.1.
2. S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, Oxford, Blackwell, 1962, vol.II, pp.58-75; A.R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, Cardiff, Univ. of Wales, 1944; and The Cultic Prophet and Israel's Psalmody, same publisher, 1979.
3. On Jeremiah, H. Graf Reventlow, Liturgie und Prophetische Ich bei Jeremia, Gütersloh, Mohn, 1963, has expounded Jeremiah's so-called "Confessions" otherwise frequently seen as an outstanding example of personal devotion, as liturgical compositions. On the Book of Isaiah, cf. J.H. Eaton, Festal Drama in Deutero-Isaiah, London, SPCK, 1979.

4. A. Weiser seems to distinguish between a larger number of Psalms for which an oracle has been claimed and a smaller number for which the theory may be presumed to have been "proved true"; The Psalms, London, SCM, 1962, p.79.
5. Bellinger. op.cit. pp. 37,55.
6. Bellinger cites G. Quell (ThLz 81, 1956, cols. 401ff) and R. de Vaux (Ancient Israel, 1961, pp. 384ff.) as sceptics. Quell in particular calls for a historical, rather than purely form-critical, argument; op.cit., p.16.
7. ZAW 11 (1934), pp. 81-92.
8. Begrich, p.84.
9. See Bellinger, op.cit.,79-81, and his references there.
10. T.M. Raitt, A Theology of Exile, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1977, pp.154f.
11. Begrich, p.85.
12. Ibid. p.91.
13. Cf. H.G. M. Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles,London, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1982, pp.30f.
14. Cf. M.D. Goulder's sceptical remarks, The Psalms of the Sons of Korah, Sheffield, JSOT, 1982, p.110.
15. P.C. Craigie, Psalms 1-50, Waco, Word Biblical Commentary, 1983, p.137.
16. C.A. and E.G. Briggs, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms I and II, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1906, 1907.
17. F. Heiler, Prayer: a Study in the History and Psychology of Religion, ET London, OUP, 1932.
18. Cf. W. Brueggemann, "Psalms and the Life of Faith A Suggested Typology of Function", JSOT 17(1980)pp.3-32.