

詩篇 18 篇の解釈に関する諸問題

津村俊夫

ABSTRACT David Toshio TSUMURA, “Some Problems Regarding Psalm 18 : I. v. 2 as a monocolon. II. vs. 8-20 and “Canaanite myths”. III. $\text{וַיִּתְּנֵם לְיָ} \text{(v. 40)} = \text{וַיִּתְּנֵם לְיָ} \text{(II Sam 22:40)}”$

I. V. 2 is a monocolon, which usually appears in important places, as the beginning of a psalm (cf. 23:1; 139:1).

II. It is often argued that vs. 8-20 is borrowed or adapted from the Canaanite myths of Baal but the evidence does not indicate this. In the Ugaritic mythology the Baal-Yam myth and the Baal-Mot myth are clearly distinguished. Baal when fighting with Yam does not exhibit any characteristics as a storm god; we find references to falconry and to one-to-one combat, no “storm” image, no mention of “lightning” or “thunder”.

The metaphors in Ps. 18 do use storm language, but the fact that they are metaphors shows that Yahweh is not thought of being a storm god himself. Description of a storm by war language and of war by storm language is common in the ancient Near East.

III. $\text{וַיִּתְּנֵם לְיָ} \text{(v. 40)}$ is linguistically more regular than $\text{וַיִּתְּנֵם לְיָ} \text{(2 Sam 22:40)}$, which is the “contracted (spoken) form” (Cross-Freedman); the shorter form can be explained as the result of “vowel sandhi” (Tsumura, 1991). This and other examples illustrate that the Samuel text is a “narrative” which is written as it was spoken .