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ABSTRACT

The "intertestamental period" sheds important light on the Christology of the New Testament and the preaching of Jesus. The expectation of the future in Jewish faith is focussed upon with special reference to the 17th and 18th Psalms of Solomon. The image of the "Anointed of the Lord" and the future expectation of the "Son of David" in view of Pompey's invasion of Palestine are of great importance to the understanding of the usage of the title Messiah/Christ in the Gospel and Acts.

A study of the New Testament presupposes a study of the world in which the different New Testament documents originated, and of the environment in which Jesus, his followers and his opponents lived. In addition to this, a study of the Old Testament confronts us with the question of how the various motifs of faith, and the conceptions, which we find in these collected works, developed within the context of the Jewish people after the Old Testament had been completed. The study of the history and literature of Judaism in the period which stretches approximately from 200 BC to 100 AD occupies a very meaningful area within the framework of the historical critical research of the Bible. The period is, for the sake of convenience, but nonetheless incorrectly so, described as the "intertestamental" period.

This study does not only afford interesting historical information and striking background detail, which although useful, is not essential - but renders an essential contribution towards the understanding of the preaching of the New Testament and to some Old Testament documents. No one can therefore write on the Christology of the New Testament without studying in depth the problem of the meaning and function of different names and expressions connected with Jesus in related earlier and contemporary literature. He must ask, further, whether there have been figures, other than that of Jesus of Nazareth, which people have approached with so much expectation, reverence and rejection.

*This article is a translation by Pieter G R de Villiers of Marinus de Jonge's inaugural lecture as reader in the University of Groningen in 1965. The text was originally published as De toekomstverwachting in de Psalmen van Salomo (Leiden: Brill). Because of the special nature of this article, it was decided to retain as much as possible of the original Dutch format, which included extensive footnotes.
The question to be asked is whether the writers of the New Testament documents, the followers of Jesus - yes, Jesus himself, were influenced by people, events and documents of their own time, either by accepting and making use of various ideas, or by rejecting certain notions against which they then preached. Insight into the interaction between the preaching about Jesus in different New Testament documents on the one hand, and the conceptions of people from the same or somewhat earlier period on the other, is of paramount importance for the correct understanding of that preaching. As an example, and there are many others, I refer to Ferdinand Hahn's treatment of the titles, Son of Man, Lord, Messiah/Christ, High Priest, Son of David, Son of God and Prophet, in his Christologische Hoheitstitel (1963) in which he not only talks about "Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum" (as the subtitle reads), but in which he also finds himself compelled to involve the Old Testament and the intertestamental period in his investigation.

What applies to the Christology naturally also applies to other facets of the preaching of the New Testament and the latter parts of the Old Testament. A thorough study of the intertestamental period is indispensable to a scientific research of the Bible.

In the Jewish faith and thought circa 200 BC-200 AD, the expectation of the future played a great part in certain smaller, quasi-sectarian groups, in which the apocalyptic documents originated (note in particular Beek 1950:55-69; Van Andel 1955 and Plöger 1959:37-68, especially 60-68, but see also 34-36). Man looked forward to the great day on which it would become clear that the Lord God would not let go the work of his hands (cf Ps 138:8), the day on which He would bring about the final turning-point in the course of history. Man expected a future in which the will of God would triumph and in which the law, the concrete embodiment of God's will, would be obeyed in practice by the people of Israel and all those who trusted in the Lord. It was the time in which the unfaithfulness towards God and opposition against the plans of God, within and without Israel, would come to an end.

The concepts which express this future expectation are complex indeed. Within the writings and sections of writings, which must be viewed as a unity, numerous expressions and symbols are to be found in juxtaposition in a quite unsystematised manner. The point at issue here is not a rational objective explanation, but a symbolic, often visionary-symbolic expression of an expectation of an event which, at most, has analogies with, but no parallels in the past. Famous researchers like Volz (1934), Klausner (1956) and Mowinckel (1956) attempted to systematise the concepts and to explain them in their essential meaning. But it became clear that a systematic approach was not applicable, as there appeared to be as many exceptions to the rule as there were cases in which the rules held true.

We must, therefore, be very cautious in our description and characterisation of the various elements in the Jewish expectation of the future. We can state differences and similarities in the usage of symbols in
the explication and application of Old Testament material and in the influence of non-Jewish concepts, but we must remember that the literature which we try to analyse derives not from philosophers or theologians, but from visionaries and followers of visionaries, who were poets rather than historiographers. Their language was more of a referring nature than it was descriptive and defining. We cannot trace the essential characteristics of the Jewish expectation of the future by analysing it in its literary form in a dogmatic-classifying way. We may succeed, however, if we try to understand the context of experience and the faith of the groups in which this expectation existed and developed in different ways.

New information in this field is becoming available. I refer particularly to the scrolls and fragments found at the Dead Sea, which do not only afford an insight into the Messiah concept of the community at Qumran, but which also throw new light on the Messianic expectations in other groups and in writings of the intertestamental period. In his dissertation Van der Woude (1957a) made an important contribution to this field. New, surprising evidence becomes available almost daily (by way of speaking), as is illustrated in his publication of new fragments from the so-called eleventh cave in Qumran (Van der Woude 1965).

In this essay attention is given especially to the future expectation as depicted in the Psalms of Solomon. The choice fell on these psalms because, in the first place, their representative material, primarily derived from the Old Testament, is comparatively easy to analyse; secondly, they are to be dated, in accordance with the opinion of the majority of researchers, approximately in the middle of the first century BC; thirdly, the image of the Anointed of the Lord in the 17th and 18th Psalms is of great importance towards understanding the usage of the title Messiah/Christ in the Gospels and Acts (of the many publications on this subject, I refer to Manson 1953, in particular chapters 1 and 3).

The Psalms of Solomon is the name of a collection of eighteen songs, which in many ways resemble the Psalms in the Old Testament. They probably originated between circa 70 and 40 BC amongst the people who called themselves "the pious and holy". These are usually taken to be Pharisaic groups, but it is not at all certain that this identification is the correct one. The Psalms are preserved in a Greek and in a Syriac version which originally derived from a Hebrew version, now lost. There is nothing substantial which reveals any relationship to King Solomon as known to us from the Old Testament. For chronological reasons it is completely out of the question that these songs could have been composed by the historical Solomon, but neither were they composed by an unknown poet or poets under the pseudonym of the great king from the past. The present title must have originated with those who collected the Psalms. They were led to this choice by the remark in 1 Kings 4:32 that Solomon did not only write 3,000 proverbs but also composed 1,000 songs. The 17th and 18th Psalms base their
hope on the house of David from which an ideal, God-pleasing king would be born. What could be more obvious than to ascribe this collection of Psalms to the son and successor David? In the Old Testament Book of Psalms there were, in addition to the many Psalms of David, indeed only two songs ascribed to Solomon, namely Psalm 72 and Psalm 127.

This can be seen in conjunction with what Ludin Jansen (cf Ludin Jansen 1937 and also Holm-Nielsen 1960:1-53) wrote on the milieu and the function of the late Jewish Psalms, to which the Psalms of Solomon belong. Solomon is to be seen as the wise one par excellence, and Ludin Jansen, who also discovered in the Psalms of Solomon various influences from the Old Testament wisdom literature, suggests that these songs originated in the circles of Scripture-studying pious ones who felt themselves to be inspired by what had been said by the writers of the Psalms, by the Prophets and the wise ones of Scripture. These songs served to admonish and to strengthen the pious who met in houses, in synagogues and probably also in the temple in Jerusalem, to confess their faithfulness to the God of Israel and their obedience to his Torah.

The future expectation of the pious ones in the Psalms of Solomon forms one facet and at that an important facet of their faith in the God of Israel. Their vision of the future is closely bound up with their vision of God’s acts in the present and the past and, naturally, also with their conception concerning God’s demands: in other words, with the interpretation of God’s law accepted within the group. The later Messianic expectations have two main sources according to Klausner (1956:384): decisive historical events and Holy Scripture. By trusting on the God who concluded his covenant with Israel, and studying Scripture, man tried to trace the intention of God with the present events and in this way strove to see present and future in the light of God.

Which decisive historical events are alluded to in the Psalms of Solomon and how are they interpreted? For the most part the Psalms speak only in general of the themes which were important for the pious ones, for example the contrast between the life of the pious person and that of the sinner (Ps 3; 13; 14; 15); hypocrites and blasphemers (Ps 4; 12); God’s actions in the creation (Ps 5); the blessings of prayer (Ps 6); God’s righteousness, his chastisement, punishment and forgiveness (Ps 2; 7; 8; 9; 10; 13; 16). They also speak of the redemption which God promised his people, especially in Psalms 11, 17 and 18. In the expectation of these themes traditional Scriptural motifs play an important part (Klausner: "Holy Scripture!"). Various motifs from Isaiah 40-55 appear in Psalm 11 (a short psalm which sings of the return to Jerusalem of Israel, dispersed amongst the peoples). It sees the return as a sign of God’s mercy over Israel and of the victory of his power (compare also 8:28; 17:18, 26, 31, 44). In Psalm 11 there is no clear allusion to historical events. In Psalms 2, 8 and 17 there are, indeed, such allusions but here one must reckon with the role played by traditional images.
and expressions, derived largely from Scripture. The authors do not want to write history. They are composing psalms.

Therefore, Psalm 8 describes the great Roman, Pompey, who in 63 BC, at the request of different Jewish parties, directly intervened in Palestinian affairs and occupies Jerusalem\(^{13}\) (with the result that Israel come permanently under Roman rule), as one sent by God, to punish the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (vs 1-2; 15). The eyes of the Jewish rulers seemed blinded by a spirit of error sent by God (v 14). Therefore, they welcome the Romans (vs 16-17) who would subsequently shed the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, kill the leaders and the wise men and take their children into exile (vs 20-21). God chastises his people through Pompey. The believer recognises God’s intention and ventures, on the ground of this chastisement, to appeal to God’s faithfulness and God’s mercy (vs 33ff). He prays (verses 27-30):

> Turn, O God, thy mercy upon us  
> And have pity upon us  
> Gather together the dispersed of Israel  
> with mercy and goodness,  
> For thy faithfulness is with us  
> and though we have stiffened our neck  
> Yet Thou art our Chastener.  
> Overlook us not, o our God  
> Lest the nations swallow us up  
> As though there were none to deliver.\(^{14}\)

Another description of the great Roman general is given in Psalm 2, which must have been written later than Psalm 8. Indeed, the heathen came to punish the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (1). In their arrogance, the alien troops even penetrated to the altar, because the sons of Jerusalem defiled that too (4-13). Jerusalem has been insulted and dishonoured. The author describes the city as a woman in mourning garments (19-21). But the heathen went beyond the limits set by God. They were not led by zeal for the cause of God, but by greed and lust (24). This is unacceptable to God, and the poet, therefore, asks Him to intervene. He need not wait long before he sees the destruction of the dragon (Pompey).

Verses 26-27:

> And I had not long to wait  
> before God showed me the insolent one  
> slain on the mountains of Egypt  
> esteemed of less account than the least on land and sea;  
> His body too, borne hither and thither  
> On the billows, with much insolence;  
> With none to bury him\(^{15}\).

This is a true reflection of the reports concerning the end of Pompey\(^{16}\). Fleeing from Caesar, after the battle at Pharsalus in 48 BC, Pompey hoped to
find asylum in Egypt, but at the moment before he set foot on shore, he was treacherously murdered. His decapitated corpse was left naked on the shore and, after some time, it was burned on an improvised funeral pile by some faithful followers. According to Dio Cassius, all this took place at the mountain Casion (also named Cas(s)ius) in the neighbourhood of Pelusium, on the way from Egypt to Palestine. It is understandable that the sudden, horrible death of the great Pompey made a deep impression, so that Psalm 2:26-27 describes the downfall of Pompey as a punishment of God. The Scriptural motifs in this description are, once again, very conspicuous: Pompey is called a "dragon", just as the Pharaoh in Ezekiel 29:3 and 32:2, Nebuchadnezar in Jeremiah 51:34 and (later) the anti-godly power in the Revelation of John 12 and 13 (cf also Rv 16:13 and 20:2). In Ezekiel 32:5 (cf 4; 27:5), we read that God will lay down the flesh of the Pharaoh on the mountains; in the LXX version of Isaiah 14:19 it is prophesied to the king of Babel that he would be cast away on the mountains together with many who descend to the underworld, after having met their fate through the sword. According to Psalms of Solomon 2:28-30, Pompey forgot that he was but a human being. He proclaimed himself as lord over earth and sea and did not recognise God as Supreme King, upon whom all rulers are dependent. The same is said of the king of Babylon in Isaiah 14 and of the Pharaoh in Ezekiel; also of Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel 11:40-45, whose end, according to Daniel, would come during a campaign against Egypt.

Thus, the events of the time are described in traditional symbolic terms. Events are also seen as part of a powerful world-drama led by God, in which, at times, mythical beings such as dragons, monsters and fantastic animals, play a large part. Already in Isaiah 27, for example, God's victory over the world powers is described as the "conquering of the Leviathan", a monster from primeval times (for further examples in apocalyptic writings, see Russel 1964:123-127). As distress increases, it becomes more difficult to remain faithful to the Lord, and, as more and more fellow-countrymen turn away from the Lord and collaborate with the godless heathen, man hopes fervently for the denouement, the final act of the world-drama.

In this regard the Psalm of Solomon 17 is very instructive. In this psalm it is clear how closely the present and the future are entwined. By deducing God's intention from the events, one concludes that the decisive turn which will be brought about by God, cannot be far off. At the beginning of this psalm we meet once again the well-known theme of God's righteous punishment for the godless (10) by means of a lawless enemy (11). However, this is at once connected with another motif, namely that of God's Kingship (this motif we find in the PssSol only here and in 2:30 and 5:18,19). The psalm starts (1) and ends (46) with the hymn of praise that God is our King to all eternity. And on this mighty King weak men may put their trust. This God is a Redeemer. He is merciful and He will show his Kingship by judging the nations (2-3). In verse 4 the motif of God's Kingship is connected with
God's promise that there will always be a descendant of David on the throne of Israel. The poet returns to this promise later in verse 21, when he sings of the action of the expected ideal Son of David but, already at the very beginning of this song, this motif plays a part in the description of the sins of the sinners: they have, though God did not promise them anything, arbitrarily usurped the royal power and caused the throne of David to stand empty and deserted. This must refer to the rulers of the Hasmonean dynasty. To punish them God sent a stranger, Pompey. He did his job thoroughly. There is an allusion to how some important Jews accompanied Pompey in this triumph in Rome.

But the stranger is arrogant, as Psalm 2 has underlined already: His heart is far from God. God will not be able to tolerate this any longer, He must take steps. Therefore, the passionate prayer: God, make haste to send the promised Son of David! Verse 45 therefore says explicitly: God will hasten his mercy upon Israel. He will deliver us from the uncleanness of unholy enemies.

The description of the fate of the pious ones, which precedes the description of the action of the expected Davidic King is noteworthy. There is no one left in Jerusalem who puts righteousness, mercy and truth into practice. Men from the highest to the lowest violate the Law of God. Those who love the meetings of the pious ones must flee and roam through deserts, just as the pious ones did in the time of the Maccabees, the community of Qumran and numbers of other fighters for the holy cause of God. As in the days of Elijah no rain falls and the springs give no water (cf 1 Ki 17-18; Sir 48:3; Hg 1:10,11 and AssMos 10:6; 4Ez 6:24). The poet says: Behold, O Lord and raise up unto them their King, the Son of David at the time which Thou knowest O God, that He may reign over Israel, Thy Servant.

The pious remind God of his Word. God has promised that there will never be a Son of David wanting in Israel. He is faithful and therefore man may pray to Him to free Israel through a Son of David and to cleanse it of all uncleanness and unrighteousness.

I would, in this regard, like to stress the fact that here the present and future merge into each other. The expectation is one of the imminent reversal of fortune. This is so because man has detected in the present and immediate past God's punishing and rescuing hand, and because man sees that God's work has not yet been completed. Man hopes for and trusts in the completion of that which has already begun. In this way the future has already become the present and precisely because of this, man yearns more deeply for that which is still to come. Man knows that he is included in a series of drastic and decisive events, in which God is working unmistakably and unavoidably on the realisation of his intentions with Israel, with the nations and with the whole world. New Testament scholars have, in recent years, often discussed the problem which is indicated by the terms...
"Naherwartung" and "realised eschatology". It seems to me that to shed new light on the arguments used in this discussion, they should be analysed in the light of the renewed study of the relationship between present and future in the Jewish expectation of the future during the intertestamental period. This could possibly lead to the conclusion that a number of the discussed problems were only fictitious.

The promise of God to David is a theme which is strongly accentuated in the Old Testament; Psalm of Solomon 17:4 refers to the so-called "prophecy of Nathan" in 2 Samuel 7, in which the continuity in the covenantal relationship between the Lord and the house of David is underlined. Of this prophecy, Von Rad said that it

in höchstem Masse traditionsschöpferisch geworden (ist), denn diese Zusage Jahwes ist nie mehr vergessen worden; sie ist in der Folgezeit immer neu interpretiert und aktualisiert worden; hier liegt der geschichtliche Ursprung und die Legitimation auch aller messianischer Erwartungen (Von Rad 1957:309, but read 304-351. Cf also Amsler 1963).

One can question the word "aller"26, but it is true that some songs which tell of the King (the so-called "Royal" Psalms 2,18,20,21,45,72,89,101,132) and prophecies which are connected with the House of David, or a figure of that house (e.g. Am 9:11; Hs 3:5; Is 9:1-6;11:1-10; Mi 5; Jr 23:1-8;33:14-26; Ez 34:23f; 37:24-28; Hg 2:21-24; Zch 4 cf 6:9-15) are based on the trust of God's promise to David and his descendants. They describe an ideal picture which has its base not in real life but in the promise of God. And, with special reference to the future expectation: the less man detects a realisation of this promise in the present, the more he yearns for God to send the son of David in the future - the one in whom God's promises to David would be fully realised.

Psalm of Solomon 17:21-46 stands fully in this tradition, just as Psalm of Solomon 18 does. In the description given here of the expected King from the seed of David, there are, indeed, and understandably so, many pronouncements incorporated from the above-mentioned Old Testament passages. Thus this King is called in verse 32 "Anointed of the Lord"25, a designation used for the king in the Old Testament and especially in the royal Psalms. It is striking that this expression is never used in the Old Testament for a king or any other person to appear in future. This usage is found for the first time in the intertestamental period, and the Psalm of Solomon 17 is one of the first passages in which this term is used in this way26. In addition, there is no question of it being used as a technical term, "the Messiah". In the first place this term is not yet used absolutely and in the second place nothing more is said other than: "For all shall be holy and the King an Anointed of the Lord" (32), just as his predecessors in the past. Psalm 18, which is clearly secondary in comparison with Psalm 17, and which should perhaps also be dated later, uses this "Anointed of the Lord" as more or less a technical term for the expected ruler27.
It is important to notice that this figure of a royal Anointed of the Lord, is mentioned only in Psalm 17 and Psalm 18. In Psalm 11 it is God Himself who will bring about the release and the return of the dispersed Jews to Israel. Also in other psalms, which relate a future intervention of God (Ps 7:10; 8:27-31; 10:5-8; 12:6; cf 9:8-11; 14:9,10; 15:12,13) no Anointed is mentioned. For the expectation of the future, as it is delineated in the Psalms of Solomon, it is thus indeed essential that God proves his mercy and his power by intervening in the course of events, but it is not essential that he uses an ideal King elected by Him. Whether a writer incorporates in his description of the future such a figure or not, depends on his choice from the material in the Old Testament or other sources. One could use the David-texts, but one was not compelled to do so.

In the Old Testament many prophetic passages do not mention David and his descendants at all. In the literature of the intertestamental period the figure of an ideal Davidic King is certainly not as dominant as is often assumed. In the Psalms of Solomon one can see that even within one collection of related songs, the function of the Anointed of the Lord can be interpreted in different ways. In addition, the term "Anointed" can indicate other figures than the Son of David, for example the High Priest, who is expected in Qumran, in addition to the King (cf on this, in addition to the studies mentioned in note 26, also Van der Woude 1957a).

In connection with the vision of the future Redeemer, or other mediators of God's salvation, the Jewish future expectation knows a large variety of concepts, which makes systematising a perilous matter. It is almost as with different mosaics where one needs to discover how, for every pattern and sometimes even for parts of one pattern, different tiles were used and how they were arranged.

How does the poet of Psalm of Solomon 17 see the person and the task of the promised Son of David? I would like to draw attention only to the following essential points (for the use of Old Testament material in this section of PssSol, cf in addition to the commentaries, also Chevallier 1958:11-17): The first is that the kingship of the Son of David is a kingship by the grace of God. God sends this King (21,42). He is, and stays King of the world, of Israel and also of the king of Israel (2:30,32; 5:18,19; 17:21). In no way does the Kingship of the Son curtail the Kingship of God. Psalm 17 begins and ends with a hymn of praise on the kingship of God (1,46). The Anointed is the ideal servant no more (as also in the corresponding parts of the Old Testament, cf e.g De Boer 1958 and Amsler 1963:75). There is a second point connected with this one. The rule of the expected Son of David will be realised in Jerusalem and in Palestine, the promised land. He will cleanse Jerusalem of heathen and sinners and will drive them out and destroy them (22-25,30,36). A sanctified people will live in Palestine. Evildoers will no longer be found there and strangers will not live there (26-29). The rule of the King will be extended further over the whole earth and
all peoples. They will serve under his yoke (30) and will come to Jerusalem to see the glory which God will give to the King and to Jerusalem. The exhausted children of Israel will be gathered from the dispersion and brought home.

Here too the aim and intention is not the setting free of the people or the destruction of internal and external enemies - even though the expectation of the future hinged largely on the hope of an end to all oppression. It is the realisation of God's purpose on this earth, thoroughly cleansed and totally changed by God, with Jerusalem as its centre. Although the expectation has national, political and even military facets, it is concerned primarily with theocracy, the realisation of God's rule over all peoples, groups and nations.

The third point which I would like to accentuate, is that the poet of Psalm 17 describes the King, not in the first place as a fighter or a ruler, but as an ideal scribe, a wise man par excellence as Solomon, the hero of the circles in which these psalms originated. There is in reality only one reference in this psalm to violent action against the enemies. This is, however, a traditional motif taken from Psalm 2:9; from the context it is clear that the psalmist sees a particular godly power at work. I refer here to verses 23-24; compare also 22a, where the second and third lines were inspired by Psalm 2:9:

Wisely, righteously, He shall thrust out sinners from the inheritance. He shall destroy the pride of the sinner as a potter's vessels. With a rod of iron he shall break in pieces all their substance. He shall destroy the godless nations with the word of his mouth.

The fourth line refers to Isaiah 11:4 which is echoed in 17:35,36 ("with the word of his mouth" is found also in the LXX. The Hebrew text has "the rod of his mouth"). Military operations are not necessary. The King has only to speak and his enemies are defeated, to threaten and the peoples flee (25). By the power of his word, he will judge the rulers and expel the sinners (36). But he surpasses all this; He is the King of whom is dreamt in Deuteronomy 17:16,17:

He will not put his trust on horse, rider or bow, and he will not multiply for himself gold or silver to wage war (33).

The expected Ruler will be taught by God Himself (32). He will be inspired by the Holy Spirit (37;18:7). He will judge and rule righteously (26f,29,32,36f,40f) and then in a distinctive way. Verse 43 says

His words shall be more refined than costly gold, the choicest. In the assemblies He will judge the people, the tribes of the sanctified. His words shall be like the words of the holy ones in the midst of sanctified peoples.

The tribes of Israel will once again live in the land (28,36,44). All the people will be holy and there will be no unrighteousness anymore (27,32).

It is clear that the expectation of the realisation of God's rule on earth is directly connected with the vision of the Torah of God, which was nurtured in the group of pious Jews in which the Psalms of Solomon originated. What
Beek said of the apocalyptic writings is true also of these psalms: "All apocalyptic originated from the world of the Old Testament and unfolded in the circles of those who were deeply concerned with the instruction as well as with the promise which had been given to Israel" (Beek 1950:4. Cf also Rössler 1960:45-54).

One last remark by way of conclusion - salvation would be realised here on earth, and therefore at the human level. But the King and his subjects possess superhuman attributes. There is no mention of the death and succession of the Son of David, nor of his eternal existence. The wise men were exclusively interested in the imminent turning-point in history, and this they described in symbolic terms. Words were inadequate to express what was soon to come to pass. What men longed for was to be granted soon. Truth and enduring values were to be fully realised. God's power would be victorious as promised. God was King in all eternity. This was all to be manifested in no uncertain terms, and therefore how it was conceived was of secondary importance.

According to the Gospel of Luke, an angel proclaimed to the shepherds that unto them a Redeemer, Christ the Lord, had been born in the city of David (Lk 2:10,11). The primitive Christian community witnessed to the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was the anointed of the Lord, and in Him the expectation connected with David was fulfilled. In Him God's Kingship on earth became manifest. It is not the task of the historian to decide whether this testimony is "true". But when his research on the intertestamental period seeks to discover what this testimony meant, how it was understood by those who heard it for the first time, and wherein the similarities and differences in the thought of the Christian community and contemporary Jewish expectation are to be found, his contribution is indispensable.

POSTSCRIPT
In its original Dutch form this article originated in the summer of 1965. Grateful as I am to Prof Pieter de Villiers for translating it and having it published in this journal, I feel it cannot appear after twenty four years without some additional comments.

For recent publications on the Psalms of Solomon one may consult Charlesworth (1981:195-197; 303-304), and Schürer et al (1986:192-197). Given the recent revival of interest in pseudepigraphical literature, contributions on the Psalms of Solomon are not numerous. I myself investigated the Psalms of Solomon again in De Jonge (1985:159-177).

The most thorough recent treatment of the Psalms of Solomon is the one by Schüpphaus (1977). He assumes two stages of redaction. A nucleus consisting of Psalms 1/2,8 and also 4,7,11,12 in their original form and parts of Psalms 5 and 9, originated as synagogal prayers in the situation of crisis and distress immediately after Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem in 63 B.C. Later, in the period between 48-42 B.C, the psalms in this collection were
edited, and new psalms were added. The result is the present collection, "eine geschichtstheologische Schrift psalmenartiges Gepräges" (Schüpphaus 1977:155) used for instruction and exhortation in circles of pious Pharisaic Jews. Schüpphaus claims to be able to determine the text of the psalms in their original form. So Psalm 17 in its first redaction consisted of verses 4, 5-6, 11-14, 21 abb, 22, 23a, 26, 28, 29-31, to which later were added verses 1-3, 7-10, 15, 21ba, 23b-25, 27, 29ff. Consequently we can distinguish two stages in the expectation of the anointed Davidic King. Schüpphaus finds a development from a charismatic Davidic Messiah to a righteous, divine Messiah who sees to it that Israel fully obeys God's commandments.

Schüpphaus' thesis of different redactions and development of ideas is plausible in itself. The present collection of psalms may contain reflections of pious wise men of different historical situations, and some final editing has to be assumed, for instance at the time when Psalm 18 was added as closing psalm. Yet I remain very sceptical about the possibility of reconstructing earlier stages of redaction and the wording of the original psalms. In our reconstructions we necessarily apply our standards of consistency that need not have been those of the pious in the first century B.C. Schüpphaus, it would seem, attempts to prove too much.

For a considerable time Wright has been working on a new edition which may be expected in the near future (see his contribution in Charlesworth 1985:639-670, especially 639). In the meantime one may consult Hann (1982). He lists and discusses all available Greek evidence (including three manuscripts not used in previous editions) and he presents a collation of all variants against the edition found in Rahlfs' Septuagint. The Syriac version has recently been examined by Trafton (1985). He, incidentally, is of the opinion that "the quality, variety, and amount of evidence which points to a Hebrew Vorlage over against that which points to a Greek Vorlage, tips the balance of probability in favor of Hebrew". Wright tends to disagree (1988:131-134).

In an article Hann reminds us that all Greek MSS that have this verse read χριστὸς κύριος. The Syriac version presupposes the same text (see Trafton 1985:159, 177 n 123). Hann rejects the theory of a transcriptional error and attempts to prove that the expression under discussion and its Hebrew Vorlage should be translated "the Lord Messiah". He points to νῦν ἦν in Dn 9:25 and the (later?) rabbinic expression "King Messiah". Referring to Foerster (1965), he points out that Herod the Great was called βασιλεὺς Ἰερώνυμος κύριος and that Agrippa 1 and 2 were called κύριος βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας. In a footnote Hann refers to possible influence of Psalm 110:1 (quoted in Mark 12:26).

One should note that there is no direct parallel, and that Hann plays down the expression "his anointed" in 18:5. He writes: "One may not assume that the usage of one particular psalm indicates or controls that of another which may have been composed differently, and brought into the collection at
a different time" (Hann 1985:626). This certainly applies to the conceptions in the individual psalms; as I argued above there is a difference in use of the expression "the anointed one" in Psalm 17 and 18. But does it also apply to the Greek wording? Most likely the whole collection of psalms was translated into Greek at the same time; consequently Psalm 18:5 may be used to establish the wording of Psalm 17:32. Hence I keep the translation "the anointed of the Lord"; I see no reason why the definite article should be used.

END NOTES

1 This term is not sufficiently explicit: it does not concern the attitude one has in general towards events which are to take place, but rather the expectation of the decisive turning point in history which will be brought about by the intervention of God. Yet, I prefer this broader concept to other formulations which are too limited.

The frequent use of the term messianic expectation e.g. suggests that mention is always made of a Messiah, an Anointed one. And because this is not so, as will be seen below, one tends to use the word messianic in a wider, symbolic sense. Klausner (1956) does this when he e.g. distinguishes between "Messianic expectation" and "belief in the Messiah". His definition of the first is: "The prophetic hope for the end of this age, in which there will be political freedom, moral perfection, and earthly bliss for the people of Israel in its own land, and also for the entire human race" (9). The word "eschatological" must stricto sensu be limited to the expectations which are coupled with the concept of the end of this world and that of a beginning of a new (or renewed) world. But because this concept is not always expressed, or better still: because the transition from "end" to "new beginning" can be illustrated in many ways, and a decisive and irreversible intervention by God can be posited where the gulf between old and new is not accentuated sharply, the term "eschatological" leads to misunderstanding. Moreover, it demands a distinction between and within the content of the messages of the different prophets and apocalyptists, (see e.g. Mowinckel 1956: chapters 5 and 8), which is more important for the analysis of the different components in the future expectation, than for a description of its essence. See further also Von Rad (1960:125-132), and note 36 below. The interdependence of terminology and theory is clear also from Vriezen (1954:363-386): "The Kingdom of God in the future expectation". Of particular interest is his distinction between "specific messianic expectations" and "general expectations of salvation" (364), the connection of the first expression with "all prophecies which contain a person as figure of salvation" (365) and finally his distinction between pre-eschatological, proto-eschatological, imminent (or "sich realisierend") eschatological and transcendent eschatological (380). See also Schubert (1964:1-54), with an outline of recent literature in the note on 42.
This is rightly emphasised by Wilder (1958-1959:229-245), who writes: "Ancient eschatological texts are, as literary remains, undecoded hieroglyphs and enigmas unless we are able to recreate the world of experience of which they are only ambiguous tokens. Modern study of biblical eschatology is constantly confronted with problems as to the proper interpretation of the cosmic and transcendental language" (229) and: "We urge that, especially for our greater texts, full recognition be given to the operation of the "mythical mentality", in all its creative and quasi-magical power. In the second place, we urge recognition of the sociological setting of the eschatology. The very impulse to such dualistic interpretation of the world-process rises out of a radical culture crisis in Judaism, but in addition the cosmic-eschatological language in many respects exhibits its relation to earthly situations, events and outcomes" (229-230). Of course not all authors were original and creative. A certain literary tradition developed in apocalyptic circles, just as in the case of the circles in which the Psalms of Solomon originated (see the studies of Ludin Jansen 1937 and Holm-Nielsen 1960). The words "original" and "creative" can also only partially do justice to the activity of the "greats" among the apocalyptic writers (and poets in other circles). Occupation with re-interpretation and actualising application of Old Testament data, especially of prophetic sayings (see the parallels mentioned in the commentaries on these writings) dominated. See on this inter alia Klausner (1956:384-386), and Beek (1950:9): "It is methodologically of no small importance to see these authors of the revelatory literature bowed over this Book".

Clearly there is a lack of coherence between Psalm of Solomon (hence PsSol) 18:1-9 and 18:10-12. Ryle and James (1891:147-148) presume that this is a case where fragments of two Psalms were joined together. It is noteworthy that Cod Vosianus Misc 15, which gives the text of PsSol 17:2 και ἡ ἐλπίς to the end of PsSol 18 on fols 79a-82b (cf Baars 1961b:441-444), leaves out the διάφορα between verses 9 and 10 but adds: "Psalm of Solomon 19". This codex is late (16th century); do we have here the conclusion of a later copyist on the grounds of the same considerations which led Ryle and James to their theory? Von Gebhardt (1895:136) and Schürer (1909:209) draw attention to the fact that an Ode of Solomon (probably the first), which is only preserved in Coptic, is called the nineteenth "Ode". That indicates that a completed collection of 18 "Psalms" was known. See also Harris and Mingana (1916-1920:13) and Bauer (1933:1).

δοσιν is found in 2:36; 3:8; 4:1,6,8; 8:23,34; 9:3; 10:6; 12:4,6; 13:10,12; 14:3,10; 15:3,7; 16 title; 17:16. δοτι in 11:1; 17:32(43).

See on this the extensive article by O'Dell (1961:241-257): "It is much more likely that the milieu out of which these psalms originated was that of the Chasidim. By Chasidim I do not mean a closed narrow party, but
rather a general trend of pious, eschatological Jews whose piousness was one of an individual nature rather than something imposed upon them by the group" (257). The last phrase is not quite clear, because one could conclude that the Psalms of Solomon were more likely a product of one pious person than of a group of pious law-abiders. In the following O'Dell expresses himself more clearly: "It is not necessary, indeed it is misleading, to dissect all Jewry of the intertestamental period into distinct religious and political groups. There were without a doubt a number of deeply spiritual and eschatologically oriented men who belonged neither to the Pharisees, Sadducees, nor to the priestly minded Qumran Essenes, but were nonetheless religious Jews. Such a man, or group of men, was the author of the Psalms of Solomon". The critique of Grelot on O'Dell (1962:19-50, especially 25-26) did not convince me, nor did the conclusion of Eissfeldt (1964:830-831). On 830 he writes: "Es ist vielmehr ein überall nachweisbarer Frömmigkeitsstypus, der hier zu positivem und negativem Ausdruck kommt. Der Pharisäismus war gewiss von seiner Art, aber nicht allein".

6 The best critical edition of the Greek text remains the one by Von Gebhardt (1895), now to be supplemented with the material mentioned by Baars (1961b). The Syriac text is to be found in Harris and Mingana (1916-20, compare now also Baars 1961a). Kuhn (1937) tried to prove that the Syriac translation was made directly from the Hebrew and thus has the same value as the Greek. The arguments in favour of translation of the Greek text from the Hebrew, are to be found inter alia in Ryle and James (1891:77-78), and Viteau (1911:105-125). The most convincing argument is that retranslation into the Hebrew illuminates a number of obscure passages. Bregich (1939:131-164) rejected the thesis of Kuhn. According to him the Syriac text is a translation of a Greek manuscript which occupied such an important place in the Greek tradition, that the Syriac translation must be taken into account seriously in attempts to reconstruct the oldest Greek text.

7 The Psalms of Solomon cannot therefore stricto sensu be reckoned under the pseudopigrapha. Pseudonymity is a phenomenon of the intertestamental period; often seen as an essential characteristic of apocalyptic - cf e.g Russell (1964:127-139).

8 The name Solomon appears in the titles of the psalms (only the first psalm has no title). The question as to when the titles were written, has very seldom been discussed thoroughly in the literature (cf Viteau 1911:94-104). The titles are written in a Greek which is in any case Hebraising - see particularly the often repeated τῶν (Σολωμών) which corresponds to the Hebrew ש. But since the Greek translation of the canonical Psalms also introduces the author's name in this way, one cannot infer from this fact a Hebrew origin for the titles. The same is true of the δυσφολμα after 17:29 and 18:9, which corresponds with the Hebrew פִּיל. It is striking to
read in the title of Psalm 8 εἶς μίκος while the psalmist speaks, not of victory, but of God's chastisement of Israel and of the capture of Jerusalem. The expression is in the LXX the translation of מְזִלֶּה but appears in Theodotian in the title of Psalm 13:1 as the translation of נְזָרָה. That could be an indication that the titles stem from the Hebrew and are therefore old. One problem, however, is that it is difficult to determine how old the Greek translation is. Viteau proffers a date between 40 BC and 70 AD (140-149), but considers it improbable that the psalms could have been ascribed to Solomon before 70 AD. This could only be done when one could no longer recognise any references to historical contexts.

He has to presuppose therefore that a Hebrew text was still in use for a long time after the Greek translation came into being and that it influenced the translation later on. A very forced construction! Viteau and Ryle & James (1891:90-92) advance the following arguments for a translation into Greek directly after the composition in Hebrew. i) There are no signs of Christian revision or Christian interpretations (but see note 25). ii) To the translator the writing must have had a particular relevance - and this is not conceivable after the debacle of 70 AD (argument mentioned by Viteau only). iii) The resemblance with the language of the New Testament, specifically that of the Magnificat (Lk 1:46-55) and the Benedictus (Lk 1:68-79). iv) Ryle and James point out the dependance of Baruch 5 on PsSol 2. Viteau omits this argument because he does not consider this dependence proven (on this matter see below note 11). None of these arguments is very convincing, especially not the second one; it was precisely after 70 AD that SyrBar and 4 Ezra were written. Similarly the theory of Viteau that the PssSol could be ascribed to Solomon only after 70, is not tenable. The historical allusions are so general as to be used mutatis mutandis in all sorts of situations, and to ascribe the Psalms to Solomon on the basis of the fact that the PssSol reflect the reign of Solomon described in Kings and Chronicles, has never been possible. We will have to admit that we have too little information to come to a satisfactory conclusion in these matters.

9 The books Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Canticles are ascribed to him, and the apocryphal writing Wisdom of Solomon bears his name. In Kings (1 Ki 3:1-15) as well as in Chronicles (2 Chr 1:1-13) the episode of Solomon's prayer for wisdom occupies an important place. In 6 codices the PssSol are found with other (canonical and apocryphal) Wisdom books.

10 Compare the Hodayot, found at Qumran, but which have a much more personal character than the PssSol (cf Van der Woude 1957a:7-15), even if it is possible that here the poet(s) sees himself (see themselves) as typical member(s) of the congregation. See the survey of the discussion in Maier (1960:62-63), and Lohse (1964:109-110). Other songs and
fragments of songs from Qumran are mentioned by Eissfeldt (1964:890-891). Concerning the Psalms found in the so-called eleventh cave in Qumran, and related Syriac material, see Sanders (1964:57-75). Von Rad (1960:314-328), emphasises the influence of wisdom-speculations on apocalyptic. He underestimates the influence of prophecy, however, and thus gives a very biased description of apocalyptic.

11 See the survey by Ryle & James (1891:73). PsSol 2 displays many parallels with 2Bar 5. In an elaborate study, Pesch (1955:251-263) tries to prove that PsSol 11 must be dependent on 2Bar 5. Because the various related motifs in Baruch form a unity with those used in the context, and PsSol is a more stylised and rounded composition, it is impossible that 2Bar 5 is dependent on PsSol 11, while it is very improbable that two relatively short passages could use so many of the same motifs from the prophetic literature, independent of each other.

12 Aberbach (1950-1951:379-396) has also found historical allusions in Psalms 4:11 and 23. His argument is unconvincing.


14 Here (and elsewhere) the text and the verse-division of Von Gebhardt are used. God's judging activity has in fact two aspects: verses 22-25 refer to its manifestation in the punishment of the sinners; He judges the whole earth. As to the pious ones: they are as innocent lambs among the nations (23b). Quite unnoticed the assessment of God's judgment changes, when it is said in 26b: "For you are the God of righteousness, judging for all with chastening". According to Psalm 7, God chastises the pious one, who accepts that as a sign of God's mercy - see verse 5: "For you are merciful and will not be angry to the point of consuming us". Ultimately God, according to verse 8, will have mercy on the people of Israel, and this is why verses 9 and 10 see the purpose of the chastisement in God's decisive "showing mercy on the day on which you promised (to help them)". Continuing this line of thought the poet of Psalm 8 can appeal to God's mercy toward Israel in the conclusion. Compare also PsSol 18:1-9! For an extensive treatment of this problem, see Viteau (1911:51-56), and Braun (1950-1951).

15 In 26 τὴν ὑπρων is an abstractum pro concreto. Translation into the original Hebrew and the assumption of a corruption (ננтел or שנות) rather than ננתל "the courageous one" - according to G B Gray in Charles (1913, *in comm in loco*); or instead of ננתל "his cadaver" - according to Perles (1902, col 276-277), is superfluous. ὑπὲρ ἑλάχιστον is a conjecture of Ryle & James and of Von Gebhardt. The MSS reads ὑπὲρ ἑλάχιστον.

On the grounds of the use of traditional motifs one could even defend the viewpoint that PsSol 2:25ff is not to be seen as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, but as a genuine prediction.

As found in verses 5-6. Notice that the sinners were raised as a result of "our" sins, i.e. the sins of the people. The "to whom you did not promise (anything)" must be connected in the Greek with "sinners" (for another explanation, after translation back into Hebrew, see Gray in Charles 1913:ad loc). Verse 6a has more than one interpretation. I think verse 6b should be translated: "they made the throne of David empty and desolate in their arrogance, which manifests itself in a change". A change namely, which consisted of the usurpation of the royal title (see Kuhn 1937:58).

Verses 7-14 describe the lawless opponent. It is remarkable that the verbs in verses 7-9a are in the future tense (*ναίλεψευ* in 9a is a conjecture, all MSS read ἐλεησεν). Often it is said that the aorist as well as the futurare in this section must be traced to a Hebrew imperfectum. That is quite possible, but still it remains conspicuous that the Greek translator changes the tense. Does it mean that the punishment for these particular sinners will go on until the bitter end (thus Viteau 1911:ad loc)? Kuhn (1937) argues for a later insertion (by the same author) of the verses 11-14. The Psalms would then be written before 63 BC after the lawlessness of Pompey became obvious. The "man who was alien to our race" in verse 7 must be the same as "the lawless one" in verse 11, namely Pompey (and not Herod, as has been suggested). It is possible that there could be an allusion to Dt 17:15 which forbids the appointment of a stranger as king, but refers to a king "from among thy brethren", "whom the Lord thy God shall choose". In PsSol 17:33 it is said that the ideal future king will submit to the rules given in Dt 17:16,17. There is an allusion to the triumph in verse 12 (ἐν ὀργῇ κόλλους) has, since Ryle & James been explained as a translation of a corrupt Hebrew text, which read  חָיֹב (his beauty) instead of  חָרָד (his anger). According to Josephus, Aristobul with certain family members were taken to Rome *(AntJud 14:79, BJ 1:154).* It goes without saying that the words τὰ δὲρισταὶ remind one of a triumph. Notice the explicit mentioning of a leading away to the *West* that is to *Rome.*

The conjecture ρόσσατο instead of ρώσσαται is unnecessary. See further Gray in Charles (1913:ad loc) and the textcritical commentary of Kuhn (1937:78f).

Cf the useful summary of the information by Hengel (1961:255-261). Notice also the role of the desert in the ministry of various prophets, who were active in the first century in Palestine according to Josephus (cf Meyer 1957:826f). Notice the description of the pious in verse 16b (cf also 8:23).

Once again the conjecture of Von Gebhardt εἶδαυ is unnecessary; the reading οὖν is to be preferred.
23 I cannot of course explicate this assertion in detail. Compare: Sevenster (1962) and (for a stimulating contribution to a new discussion on this material) Doeve (1962:32-38).

24 Compare Van der Woude (1964:especially col 1200). This article proves to be particularly useful in the orientation towards a survey of problems and theories. For the arguments of the Scandinavian school, consult Mowinckel (1956:1); a short survey is given by Ringgren (1956).

25 All Greek manuscripts read χριστός κύριος and the Syriac translation corresponds with this (see also Kuhn 1937:73f). In Ps 18 we find the expressions χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ (5), χριστοῦ κυρίου (7) and in the title τοῦ χριστοῦ κυρίου. The translation "Anointed of the Lord" ("his Anointed") is obvious and therefore in 17:32 an understandable mistake or a conscious correction of a Christian scribe has been supposed by many - compare Lam 4:20 LXX and varlect in Sir 47:11 (χριστός instead of κύριος), 2 Macc 3:30 (χριστοῦ instead of κυρίου) and the quotation from Is 45:1 by Barnabas (12:11). In contrast, Ps 110:1 and 51:10 are referred to for a possible analogous usage of the word κύριος (not of the expression χριστός κύριος, which appears only in Christian documents).

26 I refer for details to the above mentioned works of Volz, Klausner and Mowinckel. The last two devote much attention to the expectation in the Old Testament. Here mention can be made of the article χρίσω ktl in TWB 9, 482-576, in which the Old Testament section is written by F Hesse, and that on later Judaism by A S van der Woude and M de Jonge.

27 The expressions are "against the appointed day when he brings forth his anointed one" (5) and "under the rod of chastening of the Lord's anointed" (7). It is not clear whether ἀνασκεῖ means "bringing back" or "bringing upwards", "causing to rise". The collation, published by Baars (see note 3), of cod Vossius Misc 15 reads αἰνέσει. Manson proposed ἀναδειεί (see 1945:41f). That the expression ἔτι τοῦ χριστοῦ κυρίου is mentioned in the title, is insignificant, because the titles were added later (see note 8). In Psalm 18 too the term Anointed/Messiah does not appear without further qualification. Concerning the secondary character of Psalm 18, reference can be made to the repetition of different motifs from Psalm 17 in verses 5-10 and also of themes from earlier psalms (especially Ps 5:11; 14; 15; 13:9) in verses 1-4. In the whole section 1-9 the motif of God's παντελεία (see also note 14) is once again expressly connected with the motif of God’s Anointed (compare also 17:42). Gry (1906:230-248) refers to Psalm 18 as "un pastiche de celui qui précède" (232). He draws attention to the fact that the expectation in this psalm is much less intense than in Psalm 17; notice in particular that "in those days" is parallel to "for the coming generation" in 18:6, while the same expression in 17:44 is directly followed by the prayer to God to hasten his mercy (17:45). In the light of the two totally different parts of which Psalm 18 consists, (see
note 3), it must seriously be considered as a possibility that Psalm 18 was originally composed as a conclusion along with the other Psalms.

28 Compare Van der Woude (1964:1200): "Die Messiaserwartung ist daher eine spezifische Form und Konkretisierung der allgemeinen israelitischen Heilshoffnung ohne für die letztere eine unbedingte Voraussetzung zu sein. Viele Propheten und manche apokryphen und pseudographischen Schriften erwähnen den Messias überhaupt nicht".

29 It is noteworthy that the "to rule over Israel your servant" in verse 21b can refer grammatically to God as well as to the expected king. See also the note of Viteau (1911:352-353) on the following verses.

30 Note in particular verse 34b "he will have mercy on all nations in fear before him". Many changes in the text were proposed, because this saying is difficult to reconcile with the following "he will smite the earth with the word of his mouth for ever" (see list in Kuhn 1937:75). But we must retain the reading as it stands here; if we consider "in fear before him" as an addition to the "all nations", then the sentence makes for a first-rate translation. The attitude towards the nations is obviously ambivalent. On the one hand they are to be destroyed and driven away; on the other they are very welcome in Jerusalem if they honour God and serve the king, whereupon they will participate fully in the gifts God bestows in his mercy and grace. There are many Old Testament motifs in these verses. Chevallier (1958:11-17) mentions especially Isaiah 11 and 49. In connection with verse 34b, Psalm 2:10-12 can be referred to, in addition to 2:8-9; see also verse 43c of this psalm.

31 Manson (1953:8f): "A war for Jewish freedom was also a holy war, a war for the kingdom of God. This consideration is important in view of the assertion that used to be made - and still crops up occasionally - that Jewish Messianic ideals were "materialistic" or "purely political" or "this-worldly". The kind of Jew who had Messianic ideals in this period did not make these abstractions. He believed in a God who was actively participating in the course of history, and consequently he saw himself as a subject of this divine king here and now. If he took up arms against the unclean Gentile, it was not just a political move, it was also a religious undertaking. The campaigns of Israel could be regarded quite naturally as the wars of Jehovah. Where the whole activity of man from the cradle to the grave is taken into the ambit of his religion, there is no place left for the "purely political" or the "merely materialistic". See also Klausner (1956:7-12).

32 Compare on this particularly Gry (1906:248): "Le Messie des Psaumes de Salomon est un Roi glorieux dans ses deux fonctions de guerrier et de juge: mais, c'est avant tout, l'homme idéal, le Pharisien sans reproches, celui que l'on devait justement attendre comme un digne chef des 'Hasidim'." See also Lagrange (1931:149-163), especially 156f.
33 Wolfson (1946-1947:87) remarks that συνέγγυῃ must here refer to special meetings, "assemblies for administering justice".

34 The ἀγαθός according to the commentators are angels, as servants par excellence of God's holy will. An interpretation à la verse 32c has little sense. Notice how sanctified nations are mentioned alongside the one sanctified nation - see also verses 32,34b.

35 The conventional phrase εἰς τὸν αἰώνα appears very often in the Psalms of Solomon, in the general meaning "for ever". For an answer to the question which is being investigated here, the usage of this term is of no value. In 2 Sm 7:13,17; Ps 45:7; 89:5,30,37f it is explicitly the continuation of the house of David which is at stake.

36 The consequence of this is that in the scientific research on the multiplicity of motifs in the Jewish expectation of the future, one will have to lay more stress on the unity than on the diversity. On the whole one can distinguish two types of future expectation. M A Beek in his public lecture at Groningen on 29 January 1941, spoke of national and transcendent motifs (Nationale en transcendentente motieven in de Joodse apocalyptiek van de laatste eeuwen voor Christus, Assen 1941); others write explicitly of two tendencies and described them with two extensive series of opposing epitheta. It is noteworthy that each scholar, having indicated the two tendencies, emphasizes that these two types of future expectation are never found as such. I cited as an example Mowinckel (1956), who said explicitly that one should differentiate between the two types, and e.g. criticized J Bonsirven, W Küppers and H Riesenfeld for omitting to do so (267 note 2). He never tires of stressing the fact that it is alone tendencies which exist combinations of aspects, and not systems - as on 271: "A new eschatology came into existence, dualistic, cosmic, universalistic, transcendentental, and individualistic. But the old view and the new appear nowhere in the literature as two distinct systems: and they certainly never actually existed as such in the minds of individuals. They are always intermingled in a quite unsystematic combination, so that the main emphasis is put sometimes on the one aspect, sometimes on the other". In contrast to prevailing theories, Messel (1915) argued in favour of the unity. He, in fact, reduces all expectation to the original "nationale Zukunftshoffnung", which in some cases, however, uses new words and symbols. "Neue Ausdrucksformen, variierte Darstellungsmittel der alten nationalen Zukunftshoffnung, das und nichts anderes sind die Vorstellungen, in denen man Glieder einer neuen übernationalen und überirdischen Eschatologie erkennen zu dürfen meint. Zum Teil handelt es sich um Bilder, die unsere Forschung wörtlich genommen hat, zum Teil um Uebertreibungen des Ausdrucks, durch die man sich hat blenden lassen, zum Teil auch um neue Vorstellungen, deren nationalpolitisichen Charakter man verkannt hat" (7).
Messel is biased in his reduction to one type but this does not minimize the fact that he has made many true observations. It is a great pity that he was in fact not given due credit. It would be advisable to review his material critically once again in the light of the remarks of Wilder (1958-1959).
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