

THE CORONATION OF ZERUBBABEL

PAUL HAUPT

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

In my paper *The Inauguration of the Second Temple* (JBL 33, 161)¹ I have shown that the offspring of David's loins, who is to be placed on Judah's throne, Ps. 132: 11^b, is Zerubbabel whose birth (c. 538) is hailed in the second stanza of the patriotic poem in Is. 9: 1-6 (JBL 35, 283, below). Ps. 132 was originally not included in the collection of the Songs of the Return (ZAT 34, 145; JBL 33, 163) but seems to have been substituted for Ps. 110 in which an enthusiastic follower of Zerubbabel expresses the hope that this Davidic scion will restore the national independence of Judah, shattering the great king, the head over the vast earth, *i. e.* Darius Hystaspis (AJSL 23, 231, n. 33). In the Achaemenian inscriptions the Persian kings repeatedly style themselves *šar qaqqari rapašti*, and in the Visions of Zechariah (4: 14; 6: 5) Darius is called *the lord of the whole earth* (JBL 32, 112, n. 18). The Jewish priests were inclined to support the Persian government, whereas the nationalists hoped that Zerubbabel would rule over Judah as the legitimate king (Heb. *malkî-šādq*).² The relations between the Davidic prince and the Persianizing priests may have been strained, but the patriotic poems of this period emphasize the fact that Zerubbabel is a faithful follower of JHVH (*cf.* Hag. 2: 23; Zech. 4: 6.9; 6: 13; Mic. 5: 3; Pss. 20: 4.7.8; 21: 2.6.8; 110: 1; 132: 10). Ed. Meyer, *Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine* (1912) pp. 1.96 says that Judaism is a creation of the Persian empire. The Persian kings supported the Jewish theocracy (Ex. 19: 6). Nor did Nebuchadnezzar suppress the religion of the Jews (EB¹¹ 15, 386^a).

For *lě-ólám* after *uě-attâ kôhén* in Ps. 110: 4 we must restore

¹ For the abbreviations see vol. 36 of this JOURNAL, p. 75.

² *Al-dibrati malkî-šādq* may have been an archaic legal formula. *Cf.* also Mic. 54, n. 40; JAOS 38, 332, and my paper *Zerubbabel and Melchizedek* in JSOR 2, 78.

límînî, at my right, as in Zech. 6:13 (JBL 32, 113). The reading *lě-'ólám* is due to the *lě-'ólám* at the end of the preceding line in which the second hemistich *kis'āká lě-'ólám* has been suppressed (OLZ 12, 67, n. 1). Both in Zech. 6:13 and Ps. 110:4 *kôhén*, priest, seems to have been substituted for *mälk*, king, or *môšél*, ruler (JBL 36, 140) just as in Zechariah's prediction of the coronation of Zerubbabel the name of the Davidic scion has been replaced by the name of the high priest Joshua. *Joshua* has been inserted instead of *Zerubbabel*, not only in Zech. 6, but also in Zech. 3 (JBL 32, 114). Also in Haggai (1:1.12.14; 2:2.4) the name of the high priest Joshua represents a subsequent insertion. In Zech. 6:13 we may read *mälk* instead of *kôhén*, and in Ps. 110:4 *tímšól*, thou wilt rule. Ps. 110:4 should be read as follows:

כסאך לעולם על-דברתי מלכי-צדק;	נשבע ולא ינחם ואתה תמשל לימיני
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

He swore and will not revoke:

Thy throne is for ever,

So thou shalt rule at my right hand

as the rightful king.

Gen. 14 was written at the same period (at the beginning of 519 B. C.) for the encouragement of the adherents of the Davidic scion: just as Abraham with his 318 servants was able to conquer King Chedorlaomer of Elam and the kings allied with him, so Zerubbabel will be successful in his rebellion against the great king of Persia (OLZ 18, 71; *cf.* also PSBA 40, 92). Elam is named in Gen. 14 instead of Persia, because in the days of Abraham Persia did not exist: Cyrus the Great is the first king of Persia; he welded the Persian tribes into a single nation; originally he was king of the Elamite district of Anšan (EB¹¹ 7, 707^a; 21, 206^b.253^a). The term *mälkî-šüdq*, rightful king, was afterwards misinterpreted as a proper name (*cf.* ZAT 34, 142; WF 198, n. 15; JAOS 34, 418). The Melchizedek episode in Gen. 14 is a subsequent insertion, added at a time when the high priest had become the head of the Jewish nation after the suppression of Zerubbabel's rebellion in the spring of 519. There was no high priest of Judah before the reign of Darius Hystaspis (521-486). The object of the Melchizedek episode is to inculcate the importance of the payment of the tithe to the priesthood (*cf.* EB 3845, last line; 4907, l. 2; 5104, l. 2).

Ps. 110 exhibits the same (elegiac) meter (*Mic.* 22, n. 1) as the other Songs of the Return, whereas Ps. 132 is composed of lines with 3 + 3 beats (JAOS 27, 109; JBL 33, 169). The priestly redactors may have considered Ps. 110 too revolutionary; therefore they substituted Ps. 132 which is more ecclesiastic. Similarly the tetrastich Hag. 2, 20-23, which stood originally at the end of c. 1, was suppressed and subsequently appended at the end of the Book (JBL 32, 113, below). In both Psalms, which may have been composed by the same patriotic poet, some revolutionary statements have been eliminated: as stated above, we must restore in Ps. 110 after the beginning of the second pentastich, *He swore and will not revoke*, the hemistich *thy throne is for ever*, and in Ps. 132: 10 the original line *Extend his sceptre from Zion that he conquer his foes in war* has been replaced by a tame variant of v. 16: *Let thy priests be clothed with right, let thy faithful shout for joy* (JBL 33, 162).

The coronation of Zerubbabel, which is predicted in Zech. 6: 11, where the priests have substituted the name of the high priest Joshua, is glorified in Ps. 21. The poet says there in the first triplet:

The wish of his heart Thou hast granted him,
not denied the request of his lips.
Thou'lt grant him blessings of goodness,
setting a crown of gold on his head.

The *wish of his heart* and the *request of his lips* were the coronation as King of Judah (v. 5, *he asked of Thee life, Thou hast given him length of days*, is a subsequent addition). The same desires were imputed 75 years later by Sanballat to Nehemiah (Neh. 6: 6). The Jewish priests, who sympathized with the Persian government, were opposed to the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. Their attitude is reflected in the Deuteronomistic chapter 1 S 8. Ezra told the people (Neh. 9: 36) that they were servants, and the land, which JHVH gave to their fathers, yielded its increase to the kings whom JHVH had set over them because of their sins. The poet therefore promises Zerubbabel in the second section of Ps. 21:³ *Thy hand will reach thy*

³Budde, *Die schönsten Psalmen* (1915) p. 105, regards vv. 9-13 as a later addition, and v. 14 as a liturgical conclusion.

foes, thy right hand will catch those who hate thee. This refers not only to the Persians, but also to the Jews who supported the Persian government, just as the Hellenizers in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164) abetted the Syrians. Their breed is to be swept from the land. The poet says: *Though they intended evil against thee, planned a plot, they will not prevail.* JHVH will make Zerubbabel a blessing for ever, so that future generations will say, Mayest thou be as blessed and successful as Zerubbabel. But the hopes of the enthusiastic followers of the Davidic scion were not realized: their patriotic uprising was nipped in the bud, and their leader, it may be supposed, was put to death, probably crucified (JBL 33, 161).

The Temple was not completed at that time, but the coronation no doubt took place before the altar within the Temple court, and the surrounding wall of the sacred precincts may have been restored. The restoration of the Temple had been begun in the fall of 520, and the coronation of Zerubbabel must have taken place in the spring of 519. Some of the ancient gateways of the Temple enclosure may have survived the destruction of Jerusalem in 586, even if the doors were burned. The poet does not refer to the *dēlatōt*, but to the *šē'arīm* and *pētaḥīm*.⁴ These venerable witnesses of Judah's former glory need no longer be downcast, they can lift up their head with pride, because there is to be a Davidic prince again on the throne of Judah. The section in which the poet apostrophizes the ancient gateways, through which the glorious king is to enter, has been detached⁵ and appended to the religious poem in Ps. 24 the first two lines of which should be prefixed to Ps. 8 (cf. JAOS 38, 329). The answer to the question *Who is the king of glory?* was originally not JHVH, but *our prince, David's son, Zerubbabel, our king.* For the lines praising his prowess (vv. 17.20 = Ps. 24:8.10) cf. the epithet *ēl-gibbōr[īm]*, leader of warriors, in the poem (Is. 9:5) written at the time of the birth of Zerubbabel (see my paper *Magnificat and Benedictus* in AJP 40, 64-75).

⁴ These terms do not denote a *cataracta* or *porteullis* (DB 2, 111b).

⁵ Cf. the remarks on Hagg. 2:20-23 in JBL 32, 113, below; also *Ecc.* 4, 1, 5; BL 96, n. 1. See also the abstract of my paper on *Suppressed Passages in the OT*, printed in the *Actes du Scizième Congrès International des Orientalistes* (Athens, 1912) p. 75.

If we append the final section of Ps. 24, the poem consists of three sections each of which comprises two triplets with 3 + 3 beats in each line. The first section is addressed to JHVH; the second to Zerubbabel; the third, to the gateways of the Temple enclosure. In the final triplet all listeners may have joined with the singers.

This poem may be translated as follows:

PSALM 21

- A i 2 aIn Thy strength the king joys, O JHVH;
in Thy help he greatly exults.
3 The wish of his heart Thou hast granted him,
not denied the request of his lips. { }β
4 Thou'lt grant him blessings of goodness,
a golden crown Thou'lt set on his head.
- ii 6 Through Thy help great is his glory,
Thou'lt lay on him splendor and majesty;
7 γThou'lt make him a blessing for ay,δ
Thou'lt gladden his face with joy.
8 For the king trusts in JHVH,
through Elyon's grace he'll not totter. {Selah }
- B iii 9 Thy hand will reach thy foes,
thy right hand will catch those who hate thee;
10 Thou'lt place them in a fiery furnace,ε
JHVH in His wrath will devour them;ζ
11 Their fruit thou'lt sweep from the land,
their descendants from among men.
- iv 12 Though they intended evil against thee,
planned a plot, they will not prevail;
13 θThou'lt aim at their face with thy bowstring,
thou'lt make them turn their back.
14 Arise, O JHVH, in Thy strength,
that we may sing and chant Thy deeds. [Selah]

(a) 1 For the Liturgy. Psalm. Davidic

(β) 5 He asked of Thee life, Thou hast given him length of days.

(γ) 7 for (δ) for ever and ay (ε) 9 to all (ζ) 10 at the time of thy wrath

(η) 10 fire will consume them (θ) 13 though

- C v 15 Lift up your head, O ye gateways!
 lift yourselves up, ye ancient portals!
- 16 Let the king of glory enter!
 who is the king of glory?
- 17 Our prince, the strong, the valiant,
 David's son, the valiant in battle.
- vi 18 Lift up your head, O ye gateways!
 lift yourselves up, ye ancient portals!
- 19 Let the king of glory enter!
 who, then, is the king of glory?
- 20 Zerubbabel, the captain of the hosts,
 our king is the king of glory. []

The *ma* after *bîšû'aṭēkâ* in the first line is the emphatic *-ma* which we find also in Prov. 30:13 and Ezek. 16:30 (*Est.* 49, 13; GB^{1a} 401^b, B). In Assyrian this enclitic *-ma* is often appended to suffixes; cf. JAOS 16, cix. Also the last word of the first line is enclitic (cf. JBL 36, 251): it was pronounced *môḏ*, not *mē'ôḏ* (cf. the remarks on *sôn*, shoe, and *šôn*, peace, in *Est.* 28; JBL 35, 283; contrast 36, 257).—The word for *request* in v. 3 corresponds to the Assyrian *erištu*, desire; it should be read *ārēšt*, with *ś*, not *ārēšt* (ZDMG 65, 561, l. 28; cf. JBL. 36, 257). In Arabic we have *uáraša*, to be greedy, to crave (syn. *ṭamī'a*, *háriça*, *jášī'a*). In Ps. 61:5 we may adopt Hupfeld's reading *árēšt*, desire, or, more correctly, *īērēšt*, a form like *gēḥért*, construct of *gēḥirâ*, instead of *īēruššât*, heritage. For initial Aleph = *u* and *ī* cf. ZA 2, 278; NBSS 203.—It is interesting that both in Ps. 21 and in Gen. 14 God is called *Elyon* which is generally supposed to mean *The Most High*, but which may denote JHVH as a god of the mountains; this is also the connotation of *šaddáj* (GB^{1a} 809^a; ZDMG 69, 171, l. 3).

Zerubbabel's throne was not very stable, but the poet assures him in v. 8 that it will not totter. Olshausen's view that the king looks back on a long successful reign is unwarranted. Hitzig suggested that *bē'ozzēkâ* in vv. 1.14 might allude to Uzziah (779-740). He thought that both Pss. 21 and 22 were composed in 811. He admitted, however, that *tēhaddēhû* in Ps. 21:7 and *nī'ôḏlâl* in Ps. 20:9 pointed to the post-Exilic period. But the Piel of *xadû*, to rejoice, is used also in Assyrian: *he*

cheered my heart (lit. *liver*) is *uzaddî kabittî*. Hitzig pointed out that the foes in v. 9 were not necessarily foreign foes; he deemed it better to refer especially v. 11 to internal enemies. According to De Wette-Baur (1856) Ewald believed that the king might be Josiah (640-609) or even a later ruler, but in the third edition of his *Psalmen* (1866) p. 85 he was inclined to refer this poem to Jeroboam II (783-743). Grætz referred Ps. 20 to Josiah,⁶ and Ps. 21 to Hezekiah (727-699). Kittel (1914) p. 80⁷ thinks that Ps. 20 originated in the period between Hezekiah and Josiah. Cheyne was inclined to refer both Pss. 20 and 21 to the Maccabee Simon (142-135). Duhm regards Ps. 20 as a Sadducean psalm glorifying Alexander Jannæus (103-76). Wellhausen, *Skizzen* 6, 169 (1899) says that Pss. 20 and 21 are undoubtedly post-Exilic, whereas Budde (1915)⁸ thinks that it is as clear as noonday that Ps. 20 is pre-Exilic. Sellin, *Serubbabel* (1898) p. 190 correctly referred Pss. 20 and 21 to Zerubbabel, but he assigned also Pss. 45 and 72, which glorify Alexander Balas (ZA 30, 94) and Ptolemy Philadelphus (JBL 33, 170) to the same period, whereas he regarded Ps. 110 as Maccabean (*cf. op. cit.* pp. 192. 194). According to Schultz (1888) both Pss. 20 and 21 are Davidic.

Duhm says that *tašîṭ* (v. 4) is *natürlich* preterite, but it is, of course, future.—The suffix *-ka* at the end of v. 7 is due to dittography.—For *timçâ* in the second hemistich of v. 9 we may substitute *taššîṭ*. Kautzsch and Kittel read *timhâç*, and Duhm: *tabô*; *cf.* the remarks on *mîšláht*, JBL 35, 288.—For *kě-tannûr* (v. 10) we must read *bě-tannûr*; Reuss rendered: *in eine feurige Esse stössest du sie*.—*Naṭû* (v. 12) is unobjectionable; Lat. *intendere* means *to stretch out*, stretch toward, direct toward (*cf.* Gen. 39:21; Is. 66:12; Ezr. 7:28; 9:9). Livy says *crimen in aliquem intendere*. It is certainly not necessary to read *himṭû*, they brought, from *měṭâ* (Dan. 4:25) = Ethiop. *amçé'û*, although we find in Arabic *ánṭâ* for *ámṭâ* (ZDMG 40,

⁶ A translation of Ps. 20 is given below, in the paper on Assyr. *dagâtu*, to look for, in the OT.

⁷ On the same page Kittel writes *Hošîa'-na* for *hōšî'ánnâ*, evidently regarding the *â* of the emphatic imperative *hōšî'â* as a *Paṭh* furtive. The imperative is either *hōšâ'* or *hōšî'â*. *Cf.* ZAT 28, 69.148; also *Proverbs* (SBOT) 67, 44.

736). Heb. *naṭâ* corresponds to Ethiop. *maṭṭáua*; cf. below, conclusion of the paper on the Tophet Gate. Wildeboer's rendering *pour out* (ZAT 17, 180) is gratuitous.—In v. 13 the two hemistichs must be transposed, and for *šākm* we must read *šikmám*, preceded by *lē-hafnôt* (cf. JBL 36, 252). Similarly *īēdaššēnē* in Ps. 20:4 is haplography for the emphatic *īēdaššēnēnná*, He will incinerate it.⁶ The omission of the suffix in *šikmám* is due to haplography, while the plural *ī* in *bē-mētarēka* is dittography of the *r* (cf. *Mic.* 74, ω; JBL 34, 59, l. 13; 36, 251). Reuss rendered correctly: *Du wirst machen, dass sie den Rücken kehren*, but this requires the addition of the suffix to *šūkm* and the insertion of *lē-hafnôt* (cf. 1 S 10:8). For *pēnēhém* at the end of v. 13 we may read *panēmô*; cf. Ps. 11:7 and *pirámô* at the beginning of v. 11. We may read also *zar'ámô* in v. 11, *šikmámô* in v. 13, and *īēballē'émô* in v. 10; the omission of the final *-ô* in the last two cases may be due to haplography.—*Kî* at the beginning of v. 13 is due to vertical dittography, as is also the *kî* before *tēšitēhu* at the beginning of v. 7.—The *lē* before the gloss *kol* in v. 9 should be omitted and prefixed to *'ólám ūa-'ād* at the end of v. 5, which is a misplaced gloss to *la-'ād* in v. 7.—For *panēka* in the gloss *lē-'ét panēka* we must read *appēká*; cf. *bē-īôm appô* in Ps. 110:5 (AJSL 23, 232). Briggs' rendering *in the time (of the setting) of thy face (against them)* is impossible. Also in Lam. 4:16 we must read *appē* (cf. *ürk appáim*, slow to anger, and Prov. 30:33) instead of *pēnē*; the two lines of this couplet must be transposed; the acrostic line is v. 16^b.

The Hebrew text should be read as follows:

ובישועתך-מה יגיל-מאד: ^a	יהוה בעוזך ישמח-מלך ^a	2i A
וארשת שפתיו בל-מנעת: ^b	תאות לבו נתתה-לו	3
תשית על-ראשו עטרת-כפן:	כי-תקדמנו בכרכות טוב	4
הוד-והדר תשוה-עליו:	גדול כבודו בישועתך	6ii
תחדהו בשמחה את-כפניו:	תשיתוהו ברכות לעד ^c	7
ובחסד עליון בל-ימוט: (וסלה)	כי-המלך נטח ביהוה	8

^a Cf. *Nah.* 27, below. Similarly we must read in Zeph. 1:14 *qarôh u-mēmahhēr-môd*, the last word being enclitic.

יְמִינְךָ תִּשְׂיַג שְׁנֵאֵיךְ:	9iii B תִּמְצֵא יָדְךָ אֵיבִיךְ
יְהוָה בִּאֲפֹי יִבְלַעְמוּ ^o	10 תִּשְׂיַתְמוּ בַתְּנוּר אֵשׁ
וּרְעוּמוּ מִבְּנֵי אֲדָם:	11 פְּרִימוּ מֵאֲרִיזֵן הַאֲבָר
חֲשְׁבוּ מִזְמָה בְּלִי-יִכְלוּ:	12iv כִּי-נָטוּ עַלְיֶיךָ רַעְהָ
וּתְשִׂיְתְמוּ לַהֲפָנוֹת שְׂכַמְמוּ:	13 בְּמִיתָרְךָ תִּכְוֹנֵן עַל-פְּנֵימוּ
וּנְשִׂירָה וּנְזַמְרָה גְבוּרָתְךָ: [סְלַח]	14 רוּמָה יְהוָה בַּעֲזָן
וְהִנְשִׂאוּ פִתְחֵי עוֹלָם:	15 v C יִשְׂאוּ שַׁעְרֵים רֵאשִׁיכֶם
מִי-יִזֶה מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד:	16 וַיָּבֹא מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד
בְּ-דֶרֶךְ גְּבוּר מַלְחָמָה:	17 נִשְׂיָאֲנוּ עֵזוֹן וּגְבוּר
וְהִנְשִׂאוּ פִתְחֵי עוֹלָם:	18 vi יִשְׂאוּ שַׁעְרֵים רֵאשִׁיכֶם
מִי-הוּא-יִזֶה מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד:	19 וַיָּבֹא מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד
מַלְכְּנוּ הוּא-מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד: []	20 זֶרְבַבְל שֶׁר הַצְּבָא

1 לכִּנְצָח כְּזִכּוֹר לְדוֹר (a) 5 חַיִּים שָׁאֵל מִמֶּךָ נִתְתָּה-לוֹ אֲרֵךְ יָמִים 0:
 7 כי (b) 6 (לְעוֹלָם וְעַד) 9 כָּל (c) 10 בְּיוֹם אַפְךָ (d) וְתֹאכְלֶם אֵשׁ (e) 13 כי

Cheyne (1888) said of this poem: The tone adopted toward the king reminds us of expressions in the Assyrian royal psalms. Gunkel, *Ausgewählte Psalmen* (1911) p. 40 has cited a number of Assyrian and Egyptian parallels in his interpretation of Ps. 20. Ps. 21 would read in Assyrian as follows (*cf.* JBL 31, 123. 125):

2 a]âma ina-danânika šarru-izâdi	ina-litikâ-ma ma'adiš irêš
3 Qummerat libbišu tušaksîdsu	erîšti šaptâšu lâ-taprusp{}
4 γKirbâti řâbâti tušamzaršu-ma	agî-zurâçi rêšašu tuppār
6 Ina-litika tanîttusu šurbât	melamme u-šalummatu elišu-tarâmi
7 Kiribta ana-mati-maš tašâkanšu	zîmašu ina-zidâti tunammar [kinu ⁹
8 Aššu-šarru ana-]âma ittakal-ma	ina-rêmi ša-il-šadi ul-uktammas.—Su-
9 Qâtuka âbêkaε imâçi-ma	imittuka zâ'irêka ikâšad
10 Ina-tinûr išâti tanâdi-šunûti-maγ]âma ina-uggatišu ibbatsunâtiñ
11 Nannabšun ištu-mâti tuzallaq	u-zêršun ištu-mârê amilûti

⁹For šukînu, participle muškinu, see my paper on *Selah*, reverential prostration, in the *Expository Times*, vol. 22, p. 375a; contrast JBL 36, 146, below. *Cf.* also my paper *The Son of Man* in *The Monist*, January, 1919, p. 124, and the abstract in JAOS 37, 14.

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|--------------|
| 12 | <i>Ša-elika limutta ikpudû-ma</i> | <i>đabâbê izsusû lâ-ultallaťû</i> | |
| 13 | <i>Eli-pânišun qaštaka tušallâ-ma</i> | <i>θkališun arkâti usaḡḡarû</i> | <i>[kînu</i> |
| 14 | <i>Iâma ina-danânika izizâ-ma</i> | <i>epšêtika nunâ'ad-ma nuzammar.—Šu-</i> | |
| 15 | <i>Bâbâni rêšêkunu šuqqû-ma</i> | <i>nêribêti ullâti našqâ-ma</i> | |
| 16 | <i>Šar tanitti lirub</i> | <i>mannu-šû šar tanitti</i> | |
| 17 | <i>Nasikuni dandannu qarrađu</i> | <i>mâr-Damîdi le'i tamḡari</i> | |
| 18 | <i>Bâbâni rêšêkunu šuqqû-ma</i> | <i>nêribêti ullâti našqâ-ma</i> | |
| 19 | <i>Šar tanitti lirub</i> | <i>mannû-ma šû šar-tanitti</i> | |
| 20 | <i>Zurub-Bâbîli mumâ'ir ummâni</i> | <i>šarruni šû šar-tanitti</i> | |

(α) 1 *ana dulli sa ili. zamaru. ša Damîdi*

(β) 5 *Aššu-balâti kâša uḡalli-ma arâk ûmê taddinšu*

(γ) 7 *aššu* (δ) 5 *ana matî-ma ana arkât ûmê*

(ζ) 10 *ina ûmi uggatika* (η) *išâtu ikkalšunûti*

(ε) 9 *kališun*

(θ) 13 *aššu*